

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 10 JULY 2023

(C/2024/4147)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2023-2024 SESSION

Sittings of 10 to 13 July 2023

STRASBOURG

Contents	Page
1. Resumption of the session	3
2. Opening of the sitting	3
3. Statements by the President	3
4. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting	4
5. Composition of Parliament	4
6. Verification of credentials	4
7. Request for waiver of immunity	4
8. Composition of committees and delegations	4
9. Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (Rule 71)	4
10. Signing of acts adopted in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure (Rule 79)	5
11. Corrigendum (Rule 241)	5
12. Proposals for Union acts	5

Contents	Page
13. Order of business	5
14. Resumption of the sitting	6
15. Industrial Emissions Directive – Industrial Emissions Portal – Deployment of alternative fuels infrastructure – Sustainable maritime fuels (FuelEU Maritime Initiative) - Energy efficiency (recast) (joint debate – Fit for 55 and Industrial Emissions)	6
16. Protection of journalists and human rights defenders from manifestly unfounded or abusive court proceedings (debate)	29
17. European Citizens' Initiative 'Save Cruelty Free Cosmetics – Commit to a Europe without animal testing' (debate)	40
18. Management, conservation and control measures in the area covered under the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) (debate)	46
19. Protection of workers from extreme heat and other extreme weather phenomena resulting from the climate crisis (debate)	51
20. Implementation of 'passerelle' clauses in the EU Treaties (short presentation)	55
21. Banking Union – annual report 2022 (short presentation)	57
22. Fostering and adapting vocational training as a tool for employees' success and a building block for the EU economy in the new industry 4.0 (short presentation)	60
23. One-minute speeches on matters of political importance	64
24. Agenda of the next sitting	71
25. Approval of the minutes of the sitting	71
26. Closure of the sitting	71

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 10 JULY 2023

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Resumption of the session

President. – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday, 15 June 2023.

2. Opening of the sitting

(The sitting opened at 17.00)

3. Statements by the President

President. – Dear colleagues, good afternoon and welcome back to Strasbourg. I have three points from my end. First of all, this weekend marked 500 days since the start of Russia's large-scale invasion of Ukraine; 500 days of Ukraine beating the odds; 500 days of Ukrainians inspiring the world; 500 days of Europe and a democratic world united like at few other times in history.

I want to say how proud I am that our European Parliament has stood with Ukraine and its people from day one. That this House has led calls for Ukraine to be granted EU candidate status. That our Parliament has pushed forward the political momentum for humanitarian, military and financial support. That when Ukraine needed us to help procure generators, our pan-European Generators of Hope campaign provided heating and light. That when it came to legislation, the deals we have reached with the Council on the joint procurement in defence and the Act in Support of Ammunition Production will make a real difference. And here, let me thank all those colleagues who are involved in these critical files.

So let me say again: this Parliament, our European Union, will continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with the courageous people of Ukraine for as long as it takes for Ukraine, for Europe, for democracy, for liberty to prevail.

We are also marking 100 days since the illegal detention in Russia of *Wall Street Journal* reporter Evan Gershkovich. As we have done since his capture, let me reiterate once again our solidarity, our support and our determination to see him freed immediately.

In the next days, we will also mark 300 weeks since the assassination of Daphne Caruana Galizia. This House will continue to call for justice to be served. Because being a journalist takes courage, but this Parliament is committed to ensuring that we have the right legislation in place to make sure that people should not be forced to be brave to do it. And that is our commitment.

Dear colleagues, last Saturday, we also witnessed what happened with the violent disruption of Tbilisi Pride in Georgia. Anti-LGBTIQ rhetoric, disinformation and violence have no place in these debates, and the lives and safety of the LGBTIQ community must be a priority. People deserve to live their lives free from fear. From here, I wanted to signal our solidarity and our support.

4. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting

President. – The minutes and the texts adopted of the sitting of 15 June are available. Are there any comments? That does not seem to be the case, therefore the minutes are approved.

5. Composition of Parliament

President. – Following the resignations of Álvaro Amaro and Peter van Dalen, and on the proposal of the Committee on Legal Affairs, Parliament takes note, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, of the vacancy of their seats from 7 July and 4 September 2023 respectively, and will inform the national authorities concerned thereof.

The competent authorities of Germany have notified me of the election of Thomas Rudner to the European Parliament, replacing Ismail Ertug with effect from 3 July 2023.

The competent authorities of Portugal have notified me of the election of Carlos Coelho to the European Parliament, replacing Álvaro Amaro with effect from 7 July 2023.

I would like to welcome these two colleagues and recall that they take their seats in Parliament and its bodies in full enjoyment of their rights pending the verification of their credentials.

6. Verification of credentials

President. – On the proposal of the Committee on Legal Affairs, Parliament has verified the credentials of Nikos Papandreou with effect from 3 May 2023.

7. Request for waiver of immunity

President. – I have also received a request from the competent authorities in Greece for the parliamentary immunity of Georgios Kyrtos to be waived. This request is referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

8. Composition of committees and delegations

President. – The S&D and The Left 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. Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (Rule 71)

President. – Several committees have decided to enter into interinstitutional negotiations pursuant to Rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure. The reports, which constitute the mandates for the negotiations, are available on the plenary webpage and their titles will be published in the minutes of the sitting.

Pursuant to Rule 71(2), Members or political groups reaching at least the medium threshold may request in writing by tomorrow, Tuesday, 11 July, at midnight, that the decisions be put to the vote. If no request for a vote in Parliament is made within the deadline, the committees may start the negotiations.

10. Signing of acts adopted in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure (Rule 79)

President. – I would like to inform you that, since the adjournment of Parliament's session on 15 June, I have signed, together with the President of the Council, one act adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure, in accordance with Rule 79.

I would also like to inform you that on Wednesday I shall sign, together with the President of the Council, four acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure. The titles of the acts will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

11. Corrigendum (Rule 241)

President. – The AGRI Committee has transmitted a corrigendum to a text adopted by Parliament. Pursuant to Rule 241(4), this corrigendum will be deemed approved unless, no later than 24 hours after its announcement, a request is made by a political group or Members reaching at least the low threshold that it be put to the vote.

The corrigendum is available on the plenary webpage. Its title will be published in the minutes of the sitting.

12. Proposals for Union acts

President. – I would also like to announce that, pursuant to Rule 47(2) of the Rules of Procedure, I have declared admissible two proposals for a Union act:

1. a proposal for a Union act on the establishment of an independent authority to investigate the side effects of COVID-19 vaccines. This proposal is referred to the ENVI Committee as responsible committee;
2. a proposal for a Union act on the need to amend EU legislation to address the problems facing livestock farms as a result of bovine tuberculosis. This proposal is referred to the AGRI Committee as responsible committee and to the ENVI Committee for an opinion.

13. Order of business

President. – We now come to the order of business. The final draft agenda, as adopted by the Conference of Presidents on 6 July pursuant to Rule 157, has been distributed.

I understand that François Alfonsi wants to make a point of order.

François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, nos collègues députés Carles Puigdemont et Antoni Comín n'ont pas rejoint Strasbourg pour participer à cette session. La raison en est l'absence de garanties sur le respect de leur immunité parlementaire au moment de gagner le Parlement en France. Cette session est très importante et chaque vote va compter pour l'adoption, ou non, de textes parmi les plus importants de la mandature. Leur absence est donc préjudiciable à la vie démocratique de notre Parlement.

Ils vous ont sollicitée pour obtenir un soutien, comme il est de tradition quand certains d'entre nous sont en butte à des privations de nos libertés d'élus et pour obtenir aussi une intervention ferme pour faire en sorte qu'ils puissent participer à notre session. Nous regrettons vivement que vous ne l'ayez pas fait et nous vous posons une question solennelle: pourquoi?

President. – Now we move to the changes to the agenda.

For Wednesday, the ID Group has requested that a Commission statement on 'The continuing repression of the democratic opposition in Germany, particularly remarks by the President of the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution' be added as the seventh item in the afternoon, before the debates on breaches of human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

As a consequence, the sitting would be extended to 23.00. 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! In Deutschland sieht eine weisungsgebundene Behörde, der sogenannte Verfassungsschutz, seine Aufgabe darin, die Opposition zu behindern und zu verhindern. Präsident Haldenwang sagte kürzlich, es sei nicht allein seine Aufgabe, die Umfragewerte der AfD zu senken. Nein, es ist gar nicht seine Aufgabe, dies zu tun.

Dies ist eine ganz klare Kompetenzüberschreitung und außerdem eine eklatante Verletzung des Neutralitätsgebots. Zu diesem Ergebnis kommen zumindest mehrere renommierte Staats- und Verfassungsrechtler. Eine der Regierung unterstellte Behörde, die die Opposition verunglimpft und sie systematisch behindert, schützt nicht die Verfassung, sondern schützt die Regierung und stellt somit einen klaren, verfassungswidrigen Tatbestand dar.

Derart eklatante und offensichtliche Verstöße gegen Prinzipien von Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit kann und darf dieses Haus nicht unkommentiert und auch nicht unwidersprochen stehen lassen. Ich beantrage daher im Namen der ID-Fraktion hierzu eine entsprechende Erweiterung der Tagesordnung für eine Aussprache und eine Stellungnahme der Kommission hierzu für Dienstagnachmittag mit entsprechender Verlängerung der Sitzung am Dienstag.

President. – Does any colleague want to speak against this request? No? Then we 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.

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

Vizepräsidentin

14. Resumption of the sitting

(Die Sitzung wird um 17.14 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

15. Industrial Emissions Directive – Industrial Emissions Portal – Deployment of alternative fuels infrastructure – Sustainable maritime fuels (FuelEU Maritime Initiative) – Energy efficiency (recast) (joint debate – Fit for 55 and Industrial Emissions)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die gemeinsame Aussprache – „Fit für 55“ und Industrieemissionen – über

— den Bericht von Radan Kanev im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über den Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Richtlinie 2010/75/EU des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 24. November 2010 über Industrieemissionen (integrierte Vermeidung und Verminderung der Umweltverschmutzung) und der Richtlinie 1999/31/EG des Rates vom 26. April 1999 über Abfalldeponien (COM(2022)0156 – C9-0144/2022 – 2022/0104(COD)) (A9-0216/2023),

— den Bericht von Radan Kanev im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über die Berichterstattung über Umweltdaten von Industrieanlagen und zur Einrichtung eines Industrieemissionsportals (COM(2022)0157 – C9-0145/2022 – 2022/0105(COD)) (A9-0211/2023),

— den Bericht von Petar Vitanov im Namen des Ausschusses für Verkehr und Tourismus über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über den Aufbau der Infrastruktur für alternative Kraftstoffe und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 2014/94/EU des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates (COM(2021)0559 – C9-0331/2021 – 2021/0223(COD)) (A9-0234/2022),

— den Bericht von Jörgen Warborn im Namen des Ausschusses für Verkehr und Tourismus über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über die Nutzung erneuerbarer und kohlenstoffarmer Kraftstoffe im Seeverkehr und zur Änderung der Richtlinie 2009/16/EG (COM(2021)0562 – C9-0333/2021 – 2021/0210(COD)) (A9-0233/2022) und

— den Bericht von Niels Fuglsang im Namen des Ausschusses für Industrie, Forschung und Energie über den Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Energieeffizienz (Neufassung) (COM(2021)0558 – C9-0330/2021 – 2021/0203(COD)) (A9-0221/2022).

Radan Kanev, rapporteur. – Madam President, dear colleagues, I would like to start my presentation of the IED report with rather political than technical considerations. And I would first say that we all see in the last weeks we face quite a dangerous polarisation in our vote here in the hemicycle, in this House. A polarisation which endangers the political legitimacy of our decisions, or at least diminishes this political legitimacy before trilogues and before the general public. So far, in the work on IED in the ENVI Committee, we did not fall in this trap and we found a balanced approach. Therefore, I would very much like to thank all my colleague shadow rapporteurs, Mr Chahim, Mr Wiezik, Ms Paulus, Ms Zalewska, Mr Lancini and Ms Matias.

We maintained a rather strong ambition to protect health and the environment for European citizens but, at the same time, we avoided further red tape and bureaucracy for our industry. We maintained the trend to industrial transformation and transition agreed with the Green Deal, climate law and 'Fit for 55' package but, at the same time, we encourage innovation throughout Europe as the sole solution to the dangers that we face for our industry.

I must say, as we all know, there is one major point in the report where we could not find an agreement. We found no compromise. And it is the agricultural part of the report. It is the inclusion of higher thresholds of animal rearing in the scope of the report and, most particularly, the inclusion of cattle rearing in the scope of the report. There was no compromise here in my point of view, mostly because of miscommunication before the report was presented by the Commission to both the Council and Parliament. Therefore, it is a rather natural political conflict that we face.

And I must say, although we had no compromise at ENVI level, we moved a lot towards each other. The alternatives that we will face tomorrow in the plenary are not showing polarisation within our House. They are showing different approaches, different views, but also a very good faith and good spirit between partners who disagree on certain topics.

Therefore the vote, whatever the outcome, will show democratic differences within our society. By the way, I cannot make a forecast on the vote, and I'm sure no one in this House can make it. We don't know the outcome, but what we know is that it will show the democratic representation of our Members for their constituents back home.

This is the reason – and here is where I went with my first four minutes – the reason for my call for moderation, whatever the outcome of this controversial vote, because we achieved a lot – a lot for both the benefit of our citizens and our industry. And we moved as close as we could on the controversial issues.

Therefore, I call that, at the end of the day, no matter the outcome of this controversial part of the vote, we still support Industrial Emissions Directive and Industrial Emissions Portal for the good of our citizens' health, of our environment and of our competitive, innovative industry.

Петър Витанов, докладчик. – Г-жо Председател, мобилността и транспортът са от жизнено значение за европейските граждани и ключови за европейската икономика. Наред с ползите обаче, транспортът нанася и огромни щети върху околната среда, отговорен е за над една трета от парниковите емисии в Европа.

Сигурен съм, че стремежът на всеки един човек в тази зала е транспортният сектор да се промени така, че да бъде все по-малко зависим от ископаеми горива, да допринася за декарбонизацията на континента, да съхрани конкурентоспособността си без да лишава бедните и уязвимите от правото на достъпна мобилност.

Активното внедряване на възобновяемите източници и нисковъглеродни горива трябва да върви ръка за ръка с изграждането на географска уплътнена инфраструктурна мрежа за зареждане на електроенергия и презареждане с гориво, за да се улесни навлизането на пазара на превозни средства с ниски и нулеви емисии и да се насърчат хората да ги ползват. В крайна сметка това е целта на този регламент, да могат всички превозни средства, било то плавателни или въздухоплавателни, да се придвижват с лекота по основните европейски трасета.

Получих досието след като голяма част от работата беше свършена и не искам да си придавам важност, но в качеството си на координатор на S&D по транспорта, искам да изкажа благодарност от мое име и от името на всички колеги към Исмаил Ертуг, човекът с основен принос за тези множество малки и не чак толкова малки победи, които Европейският парламент успя да постигне в хода на преговорите. И ако ми позволите, бих искал да изложа в резюме само някои от тях.

На първо място, регламентът вече обхваща ключовия липсващ елемент от предложението на Европейската комисия, а именно железопътния транспорт, който всички отдавна сме приели за транспорта на бъдещето. Развитието на алтернативните горива е важно за железопътния сектор, където поради различни причини директната електрификация не винаги е възможна. Вече имаме налични технологии за замяна на дизеловите влакове с електрически, с такива задвижвани от батерии или с водородни. Именно развитието на тези технологии изисква изграждане на подходяща инфраструктура за зареждане на териториите на страните членки.

На второ място, имаме завишени цели по отношение на инфраструктурата за зареждане на лекотоварните превозни средства, която трябва да осигурява 30% повече електричество на всеки регистриран електрически автомобил от 1 киловат на 1,3 киловата и от 0,66 на 0,8 при плъг-ин хибридите. Отчита се факторът разстояние, така че през 2025 г. да може да осигурим свободно трансгранично пътуване с достатъчно зарядни станции по пътя. Регламентът предвижда още разполагането на зарядни станции. При тежкотоварните автомобили също се предвиждат повече станции с увеличен енергиен капацитет.

На трето място, но не по значение, са текстовете, насочени към потребителите. Операторите на бързи зарядни центрове над 50 киловата ще трябва да осигуряват възможности за плащане с карта. Повишава се и прозрачността за начина на таксуване на зареждането. Например при бързите зарядни станции цената трябва да се базира изцяло на цената на киловатчас, докато при бавните има различни опции било то на киловатчас, на минута, на сесия или при други компоненти. Създаването на европейска точка за достъп ще повиши осведомеността на европейските граждани и ще помогне да пътуват ефективно, осигурявайки цялостна информация за инфраструктурата на алтернативните горива. Регламентът предвижда още разполагането на зарядни станции за водород с възможност за надграждане след преценка. Същевременно се ограничава до минимум инфраструктурата за втечен природен газ при сухопътния и водния транспорт. Запазват се текстовете за осигуряване на електрическо захранване на летищата, задължителни изисквания имаме за разполагане на станции за водород и така нататък, и така нататък.

Като цяло споразумението е балансирано и съдържа значително по-прогресивни позиции в сравнение с първоначалното предложение на Комисията. Вярвам, че прогресивният подход трябва да остане в основата на промените, с които днес чертаем едно по-чисто и по-устойчиво бъдеще за Европа и нейните граждани.

Jürgen Warborn, Föredragande. – Fru talman! Kommissionär, ärade kollegor. Det är med stolthet jag står här idag och markerar målgången efter nästan två års arbete med att förhandla fram lagen om sjöfartens klimatomställning. Det är ett banbrytande beslut som EU är på väg att fatta. Aldrig tidigare har det utarbetats ett så omfattande och effektivt ramverk för att ta itu med utsläppen från sjöfarten. Aldrig tidigare har någon global makt med EU:s tyngd satt kraft bakom orden om att sjöfarten ska göra sin del av klimatomställningen.

Kommissionen har gjort ett gediget förberedelsearbete, och därefter vidtog processen i parlamentet i oktober 2021. Jag, som huvudförhandlare, inledde en dialog med många olika parter, med hamnar, rederier, fackföreningar, miljöorganisationer och bränsleleverantörer från alla delar av Europa. Sedan vidtog intensiva förhandlingar här i parlamentet, följt av trepartsförhandlingar med ministerrådet. Tidigt på morgonen den 23 mars nådde vi en överenskommelse.

Texten som nu ligger på bordet är utan motstycke världens mest ambitiösa klimatlag för sjöfarten. Rederierna kommer gradvis att behöva byta till renare bränslen och koppla upp sina fartyg till landström för att minska skadliga luftförureningar i de mest trafikerade hamnarna. Som jag sa är överenskommelsen ambitiös, men den är också realistisk. Som ansvarsfulla politiker måste vi ta hänsyn till många olika perspektiv: givetvis klimatet, men också sociala aspekter och företagets konkurrenskraft. 75 procent av vår handel går med fartyg. Europeisk industri är alltså helt beroende av en fungerande, tillgänglig och prisvärd sjöfart. Alla förstår att klimatomställningen kommer att kosta pengar, men takten vi genomför den i, och sättet vi gör det på, det spelar roll för notan.

Därför har vi lagt en utsläppsminskingsplan som börjar väldigt modest, för att sedan ta ordentlig fart efter 2035. Det ger branschen en tydlig färdriktning samtidigt som den får rimliga tidsmässiga och praktiska förutsättningar för att genomföra de investeringar som krävs. I nya effektivare skrov och motorer, i nya bränsle- och produktionsanläggningar och bunkringsinfrastruktur, och genom att bygga nya försörjningskedjor och fortsätta forska.

Genom den gradvisa infasningen beaktar vi också den sociala och ekonomiska dimensionen. Vi ger andrum till sektorn och undviker därmed infasningsproblem och kortsiktiga pristoppar. Detta är naturligtvis mycket viktigt i inflationstider, att vi skyddar familjer och företag från orimliga prisökningar. Vi har också tagit hänsyn till geografiska särarter, så att lagstiftning inte innebär orimliga bördor för någon enskild region. Därför har vi specialbestämmelser för isklassade fartyg, för små öar och för de yttersta randområdena.

Ledstjärnan för mig i förhandlingarna har varit praktisk genomförbarhet och att få mesta möjliga utväxling för varje satsad euro. Att EU:s plan ska bli så framgångsrik att resten av världen vill ta efter.

Vi har redan sett de första stegen i samma riktning. När Internationella sjöfartsorganisationen IMO sammanträdde förra veckan antog man en ambitiös utsläppsminskingsplan. Nu gäller det att trycka på för att den också ska utmynna i konkreta och bindande globala bränsle regler, så att de stora orden blir verklighet.

EU visar att det går. Med fartygsbränsleförordningen vi ska rösta om i morgon tar Europa, med aktiv handling, tåten i omställningen av sjöfarten. Eftersom lagen kommer att tillämpas oavsett vilken flagg ett fartyg har, så fort de anlöper en europeisk hamn, får vi ett globalt förhandlingstryck, som jag är övertygad kommer att sporra ytterligare framsteg inom IMO. För inget rederi som vill trafikera Europa kommer längre att kunna blunda för den helt nödvändiga klimatomställningen. De kommer behöva anpassa sig.

Nu pekar vi alltså med hela handen vartåt vi ska. Vi garanterar sjöfartssektorn långsiktiga spelregler och förutsägbarhet, så att den kan samla kraft att investera. Vi utformar reglerna så att rederierna och hamnarna kan fokusera sina resurser på de åtgärder som ger störst klimatnytta och mest pang för pengarna.

Innan jag avslutar vill jag säga att jag tycker att vi har uppnått en väldigt bra balans i den här överenskommelsen som ligger på bordet, och jag vill rikta ett varmt tack till alla ledamöter och personal som har bidragit till arbetet, liksom till kollegerna i rådet och på kommissionen för er professionalism och samarbetsanda. Jag vill uppmana alla kollegor att stödja överenskommelsen vid omröstningen i morgon.

Niels Fuglsang, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, over the last couple of years, remarkable changes in Europe's energy system have taken place. Our dependency on Russian natural gas has fallen significantly. In just four months, from August to November 2020, natural gas consumption fell by 20 % compared to the same period the year before. Three Member States even managed to reduce natural gas consumption by more than 40 %. This was something that experts said could not be done.

We proved them wrong. We did it. And, friends, now we need to do it again because the energy crisis is not over, the climate crisis is certainly not over and we are looking at hard times ahead, when we look at the climate but also if we just look a couple of years ahead when it comes to our energy system – the prices might rise again, hitting the most vulnerable people in our society.

That is why we need to make some structural changes. We need to make sure that our energy system is efficient. And that is what we set out to do in this directive. I think we have proven here in Europe that we have been able to react swiftly when it comes to our energy system, and we need to prove that one more time.

This Energy Efficiency Directive that we have agreed on – the broad majority in the European Parliament, the main groups of the European Parliament – sets out for some significant changes in our energy system.

First of all, we agree that we need to reduce energy consumption by 11.7 % in 2030. That is a big challenge, but it can be done if we make sure to insulate our homes, make sure to roll out more district heating and make sure that we use the excess heat which is created from factories and data centres that use much electricity but also create a lot of heat, which is now often being wasted, we need to use that heat in our district heating systems to make sure that it will be benefiting consumers and not wasted.

In this directive, we set a yearly energy savings obligation standing at 0.8 %, going towards 1.9 % each year. That means the Member States will have to do an effort to save 1.9 % of their energy consumption each year. It's a huge effort that this requires, but we can make it happen and we need to make it happen.

We set out in this directive to have a 3 % renovation rate of public buildings, so 3 % of the public buildings need to be renovated to become nearly zero-emission buildings every year. We make sure that we prioritise the people who suffer from energy poverty and we strengthen the energy-efficiency-first principle, which means that when you do make an energy project, you have to make the analysis to see can this actually be solved by increasing energy efficiency instead of increasing energy consumption and building more energy.

We also say that municipalities with more than 45 000 people living in them have to make heating and cooling plans to analyse where can we have district heating, where do we need heat pumps and how can we make that as efficient as possible?

We set a whole lot of targets and a whole lot of effort is being required by this directive. This will not come easily. It will not be achieved with business as usual. But we know that we can make it happen and we need to make it happen for the climate and for our energy security. This directive will be good for the climate and bad for Mr. Putin. I would like to thank the groups in the European Parliament, in particular. Ms Weiss, Mr Danti and Ms Paulus, who negotiated and secured a broad majority. Let's make it happen, let's vote for the Energy Efficiency Directive and let's do this.

Tiemo Wölken, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit*. – Frau Präsidentin! Sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, schön, dass Sie heute hier sind! Ich spreche jetzt zu einem Teil dieser drei Berichte, über die wir heute reden, nämlich über den Bericht über nachhaltige Schiffskraftstoffe.

In der Tat waren es sehr intensive Verhandlungen, die wir geführt haben. Ich glaube, dass wir als Europäische Union einen ersten Schritt in Richtung Dekarbonisierung des Schiffsverkehrs gehen. Wir sind als Parlament noch einmal deutlich ambitionierter, als es die Kommission war, als es der Rat war. Das ist gut, insbesondere, dass wir weltweit endlich ein Mandat für E-Fuels haben. Ab 2031 – das ist ein richtig guter Schritt und ein notwendiger Technologiewechsel, den wir hier bekommen haben. Auch die Landstromversorgung ist zentral, insbesondere dort, wo Häfen auch in den Städten sind, weil damit auch für bessere Luft gesorgt werden kann.

Damit jetzt zu den schlechten Nachrichten: Ich glaube, dass wir hinter den Möglichkeiten zurückgeblieben sind, gerade was die Landstromversorgung, aber auch die Ambition angeht, wirklich bis 2050 klimaneutrale Schifffahrt hinzubekommen. Während wir das aufgrund der konservativen Mehrheit hier jetzt nicht durchsetzen konnten, hat die Internationale Schifffahrtsorganisation gerade beschlossen, 2050 klimaneutral zu sein. Also haben wir hier einen ersten Schritt gemacht, aber wir sind noch lange nicht am Ziel, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen.

Rasmus Andresen, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Industrie, Forschung und Energie*. – Frau Präsidentin! Endlich gibt es Klimaziele für die Schifffahrt. Das sind gute Nachrichten, denn der wachsende Sektor muss deutlich mehr tun, um die Klimaziele umzusetzen.

Die FuelEU-Maritime-Verordnung ist ein Einstieg, um die Schifffahrt grüner zu machen. Das erste Mal formulieren wir verbindliche Ziele, um die Schifffahrt emissionsfrei zu machen, und wir schaffen verbindliche Ausbauziele für erneuerbare Kraftstoffe. Das ist nicht nur gut für das Klima, sondern gibt der Industrie auch Verbindlichkeit, um zu planen und zu investieren.

Das ist eine Riesenchance für unsere maritime Industrie: Schiffe werden bald nicht mehr da gebaut, wo die Produktion am günstigsten ist, sondern da, wo die innovativsten Antriebe entstehen. Die emissionsfreien Schiffe der Zukunft werden in Schweden, in Frankreich oder bei mir zu Hause in Norddeutschland gebaut. Gut bezahlte Industriebeschäftigte entstehen bei uns vor Ort.

Aber diese Verordnung kann nur ein Einstieg sein. Leider ist es zu vielen Lobbygruppen gelungen, Ausnahmen für kleine Schiffe oder auch den Fährverkehr zu Inseln in das Gesetz hineinzuformulieren. Das Ziel von minus 80 % Treibhausgasausstoß bis 2050 reicht nicht aus. Wir brauchen 100 %! Dafür werden wir Grüne weiter kämpfen.

Benoît Lutgen, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission de l'agriculture et du développement rural*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, *that's enough*, ça suffit. Non, l'agriculture n'est pas industrielle en Europe. Elle est familiale, elle est locale. Elle se développe avec des critères sans cesse relevés sur les plans environnemental, sanitaire ou encore du bien-être animal. L'agriculture n'a rien à faire dans cette directive sur les émissions industrielles. L'agriculture n'a rien à faire dans un texte qui concerne les incinérateurs ou encore la cimenterie.

L'agriculture mérite tout notre soutien et ce texte va à l'encontre même du bien-être animal. Il va à l'encontre même de la protection de l'environnement, par la concentration que cela entraînera demain d'exploitations agricoles encore plus grandes. Pourquoi? Parce que les coûts qui sont demandés aux agriculteurs pour une purification qui est limitée seront à nouveau insupportables pour le monde agricole. Et d'aucuns revendront leur exploitation agricole. Voilà les conséquences de ce texte pour l'agriculture.

Je vous demande de soutenir pleinement l'ensemble des amendements qui ont été défendus par la commission de l'agriculture, pour éviter notamment que le secteur bovin ne soit demain couvert par cette directive.

Adina-Ioana Vălean, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the Parliament, ladies and gentlemen, today's debate and tomorrow's vote shows that we are delivering on our Green Deal ambition.

Let me start with the two proposals on industrial emissions. I want to thank the rapporteur Mr Kanev, the ENVI Chair Mr Canfin and all the shadow rapporteurs for the work on this file. The Commission supports the ENVI report for many core elements of our proposal, notably ensuring more consistent emissions limits across the EU, promoting resource efficiency, facilitating public access to information, and making the legislation more forward-looking with better links to innovation.

The European Parliament has been discussing the widening of the scope to cover more livestock farming activities. The Commission would like to stress that this widened scope would only concern the largest livestock farms. This would help relieve the pressure on the smallest farms in meeting the overall climate adjustment efforts required in the agricultural sector.

Turning to the two transport files, I welcome the compromise text on the new Alternative Fuels Infrastructure Regulation and the FuelEU Maritime Regulation. On both files we have an ambitious and a balanced result. I would like to thank the rapporteur Mr Warborn and the former rapporteur Mr Ertug, as well as the shadow rapporteurs for their excellent work and the good cooperation with the Czech and Swedish presidencies and as well with the Commission.

The AFI Regulation will ensure a market-driven rollout of sufficient and user-friendly alternative fuels infrastructure everywhere in the EU. We also have for the first time mandatory deployment targets for key recharging and refuelling infrastructure, and these include electric recharging infrastructure for light and heavy-duty vehicles on the road, hydrogen refuelling infrastructure for road vehicles, onshore power supply in TEN-T ports in alignment with FuelEU Maritime, and electricity supply to stationary aircraft in all TEN-T airports. As you know, we would have appreciated higher targets for heavy-duty vehicle recharging and hydrogen refuelling infrastructure. But the end result is very good considering the starting position of the Member States.

The FuelEU Maritime Regulation will play a crucial role in decarbonising the maritime sector. Importantly, FuelEU Maritime remains an incentive and goal-based regulation. It keeps the door open to new technologies and allows technology suppliers to develop solutions, meeting the needs of different shipping segments. It also recognises the role e-fuels will play in the future and provides incentives to support their cost-competitiveness and uptake.

FuelEU Maritime also provides the inspiration for regulating shipping emissions globally. Following the milestone decision at the 80th meeting of the Marine Environment Protection Committee which concluded just last week, a global fuel standard modelled on our European approach should be adopted by 2025 as one of mid-term measures to decarbonise shipping by mid-century.

The Commission also welcomes the agreement reached on the proposal for the recast of the Energy Efficiency Directive. We convey our warmest thanks to the rapporteur Mr Fuglsang and the shadow rapporteurs for their efforts in reaching this result. This is a major piece of the EU's energy policy. By boosting energy efficiency, the EED recast provides the EU with a solid framework to reach our climate goals and to increase our energy independence. We welcome the agreement on an ambitious energy efficiency target of 11.7% covered by a strong governance mechanism and an annual energy savings obligation target of 1.49%, as well as the target for energy reduction in the public sector of 1.9%.

In conclusion, I would like to thank you again for the constructive work on these five proposals, all very relevant to implement the European Green Deal.

Alexandr Vondra, zpravodaj Výboru pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin. – Paní předsedající, já jsem byl stínový zpravodaj stanoviska k AFIR, čili k alternativní infrastruktuře, k alternativnímu nabíjení, a řeknu k tomu následující: ti z nás – a k těm já se také počítám –, kteří si myslí, že není moudré zakazovat spalovací motory, ale nechat to s nějakými *incentives* trhu, tak ti se samozřejmě a logicky kloní k tomu, že daleko lepší by to bylo nechat tržnímu prostředí a tomu, jaká je vlastně poptávka, a ne jaksi socialisticky něco budovat podle různých pětiletých plánů, něco zakazovat, něco příkazovat.

Realitou je ale tady, že v tomto prostředí a v této ctihodné instituci převážil ten názor socialistický, to znamená zakazovat, příkazovat. A když tedy lidem chceme zakazovat ty spalovací motory – a já znovu říkám, já s tím nesouhlasím –, tak jim samozřejmě musíme nabídnout i něco, aby mohli jezdit a aby mohli nabíjet.

Čili z tohoto hlediska samozřejmě ta legislativa AFIR má svůj velký význam. Proto jsem se také účastnil jejího vyjednání. I tady musím konstatovat, že to má daleko do toho, abych nad tím výskal a nadšeně s tím souhlasil. Taková situace zde určitě není prostě proto, že my bychom, naše frakce, upřednostňovali daleko širší míru technologické neutrality. Zase tady preferujeme dominantně elektromobilitu, čili vlastně vydáváme evropský průmysl všanc tak, aby nás tady prostě převálcovala Čína. To si myslím, že je obrovská chyba. Ale není sporu o tom, že budou-li lidé jezdit elektromobily, musí mít i kde nabíjet, a pokud jim to zakazujeme a přikazujeme, tak jim musíme nabízet i nějakou alternativu.

Bas Eickhout, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety*. – Madam President, I am not sure my colleague was really speaking as ENVI rapporteur. I didn't get that feeling.

I will speak here as ENVI rapporteur on the energy efficiency file. First, I really would like to thank the rapporteur and all the shadows for the great work on energy efficiency. I think it is very important. We are always talking about energy efficiency first, but still energy efficiency has been one of the three targets that has never been binding. So we have targets on emission reductions, on renewables, and then we had efficiency targets not being binding. And guess what? Those targets until 2020 were the most difficult to meet.

I think something has changed finally, both in the Commission as also with the Member States, now with the war in Ukraine. That energy that we are not using, we don't need to import, we don't need to replace it by expensive alternatives. We just don't need the energy. We don't need the wasting of this energy. That is now also being put forward, and I think that is a very great result.

Last point quickly on the Industrial Emission Directive will be the tightest vote. Please, colleagues, remember when we are talking about cattle and some targets, we are talking about the big farms. The ENVI compromise is encompassing 3 % of the farms but more than 20 % of the emissions. We are talking about big farms, industrial farms. And think of that when you vote.

Michael Bloss, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Industrie, Forschung und Energie*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Unter den zehn meistverkauften E-Automodellen im Jahr 2022 ist gerade mal eins aus der Europäischen Union. Der Rest kommt aus den USA und aus China. Leider haben die europäischen Hersteller hier schon den Anschluss verpasst, und manche in diesem Haus hängen immer noch an den E-Fuels und an den Verbrennermotoren und machen dadurch die Modernisierung der Wirtschaft noch schwieriger.

Dabei ist klar: Wer gute Jobs und Industrie erhalten will, der muss jetzt in die Modernisierung investieren. Das heißt: Natürlich brauchen wir schnell viele Ladesäulen für E-Autos, für E-Lkws. Das ist aber nicht alles. Mobilität ändert sich. Wir brauchen auch E-Busse, mehr Verkehr auf Schienen und Radwegen, und wir brauchen vor allen Dingen eines: eine breite Unterstützung für den Grünen Deal und die ökologische Modernisierung der Wirtschaft. Mit Ihrem Kampf gegen den Grünen Deal kämpfen Sie gegen die Modernisierung und befördern die Deindustrialisierung. Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, stehen Sie zum Grünen Deal, schaffen Sie Sicherheit für Jobs, für die Industrie, für Investitionen, dafür, dass Europa beim Rennen um die Weltmarktführerschaft nicht leer ausgeht!

Tom Berendsen, *Rapporteur voor advies van de Commissie vervoer en toerisme*. – Voorzitter, collega's, vanuit de Commissie vervoer hebben wij dit dossier met aandacht gevolgd.

Energie-efficiëntie is een onderwerp dat eigenlijk veel te weinig aandacht krijgt – ook in de publieke discussie – want minder gebruiken is uiteindelijk essentieel.

We zijn allerlei grote strategieën in Europa aan het optuigen over hoe we minder afhankelijk kunnen worden, hoe we zelf meer energie kunnen gaan produceren, hoe we zelf meer grondstoffen kunnen gaan mijnen. Maar uiteindelijk komt alles op het volgende neer: als wij in staat zijn iets minder te gebruiken, efficiënter te worden, dan betekent dit dat we allerlei andere zaken minder hoeven te doen.

Daarom complimenten voor de collega's die hier al die tijd zeer intensief mee bezig zijn geweest. Ik hoop van harte dat we dit tot een goed einde kunnen brengen.

Niklas Nienass, rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Regional Development. – Madam President, it is necessary to ensure that no citizen, whether he lives at the city, village or in a remote territory, is left behind. Alternative fuel systems will only be effective when a specific person can move freely within the whole territory of the European Union and to be sure about to be able to use the alternative fuels infrastructure at any time of the whole trip. This means immediate action at the full-fledged action. The European regions be they small or big, be they rural or urban, or be they in the centre of Europe or in the outermost regions.

In order to achieve a well-functioning network, we should look even wider than the European Union and include third countries into the cooperation, especially those candidates for the Union membership. It is not only the density of the network of alternative fuels, but is also important that the adaptation of the network is specific to the specific needs of the people. So it needs to be inclusive and accessible for all people, especially those with disabilities or reduced mobility.

Before approving investment, it is therefore necessary to ensure that these systems are being developed in order to meet the needs and capacities of all people, because only an inclusive system can ensure faster results towards climate neutrality.

Alice Kuhnke, föredragande av yttrande från FEMM-utskottet. – Fru talman! 40 miljoner människor i EU lever i energifattigdom. Det är kvinnor, det är fattigpensionärer, det är ensamstående föräldrar som tvingas välja mellan att betala elräkningarna eller ge sina barn mat. Situationen har förvärrats efter Rysslands invasionskrig i Ukraina. De som främst drabbats av energikrisen, det är de som redan innan hade för mycket månad kvar i slutet av lönen.

Men det finns en lösning lika enkel som effektiv, lika billig som rättvis: energieffektivisering. Tack vare gruppen De gröna ligger ett betydligt tuffare förslag på bordet än kommissionens ursprungsförslag. Det svenska ordförandeskapet kämpade tyvärr för att sänka ambitionen. Nu har vi chansen att se till att de inte lyckas.

Sara Skyttedal, föredragande av yttrande från ITRE-utskottet. – Fru talman! Vi debatterar nu industriutsläppsdirektivet. Att inkludera nötkreatur i ett direktiv om industriutsläpp är i grunden ett feltänk. Våra kor är inte några utsläppsmaskiner och våra bönders fastigheter är inga fabriker. Vi borde inte heller behandla dem som om de vore det.

Nötkreatur är, med svenska landsbygdsministern Peter Kullgrens ord, "vandrande, levande beredskapslager". När vi stiftar lagar på nationell eller europeisk nivå bör vi göra det med den här utgångspunkten. Det som föreslås här är istället att se på kor som ett problem, som skulle behöva ytterligare reglering. Det är fel.

Europa behöver fler bönder, inte färre. Vi behöver göra det enklare och mer attraktivt, inte svårare och mindre attraktivt, att bedriva jordbruk. Jag ber därför mina kollegor att stödja ändringsförslaget från AGRI-utskottet om att inte inkludera nötkreatur i direktivets bestämmelser.

Jens Gieseke, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin Vălean, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das ist ein wichtiges Signal heute! Fehlende Ladeinfrastruktur ist immer noch ein großes Problem. Ohne Akzeptanz bei den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern wird es keine Reduktion der Emissionen geben. Wir brauchen eine europaweite Erfolgsgeschichte und nicht ein paar Ladesäulen in einigen wenigen Ländern. Die AFIR war hier ein großer Erfolg, auch für die EVP. Wo andere wieder ausschließen wollten, haben wir auf Technologieoffenheit gesetzt, rechtlich bindende Ziele vereinbart, die Planungssicherheit geben. Das muss jetzt von den Mitgliedstaaten umgesetzt werden.

Die AFIR war da nur der Startschuss. Mehr Engagement ist notwendig, insbesondere aufgrund des Verbrennerverbots ab 2035, wobei wir da ja noch auf den Vorschlag von Vizepräsident Timmermans für die Anerkennung klimaneutraler Kraftstoff warten. Nun ja, entweder kann er nicht oder will er nicht, in jedem Fall: Geliefert hat der Herr Vizepräsident bislang nichts.

Die Verbotspolitiker bleiben sich treu. Obwohl die Lkw-Ausbauziele in der AFIR abgeschwächt wurden – im Rat gab es schlicht keine Mehrheit für mehr Ehrgeiz –, wollen Grüne das Verbrenner-Verbot nun auch bei Lkw und Bussen. Ich finde, das ist nur noch weltfremd und realitätsfern. Wir brauchen alle Lösungen: Elektro, Wasserstoff, LNG, nachhaltige Kraftstoffe. Wir sollten nichts ausschließen. Am Ende haben wir bei dem technischen Dossier AFIR einen guten Kompromiss erzielt. Ich möchte allen Beteiligten danken, und erlauben Sie mir eine persönliche Aussage: Der Kollege Ertug hat das Haus verlassen. Lieber Ismail, dir und deiner Familie alles Gute, und ich hoffe, wir sehen uns außerhalb des Parlaments wieder.

Mohammed Chahim, *namens de S&D-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de richtlijn industriële emissies is hard nodig. Niet alleen om de natuur te beschermen, maar ook voor onze gezondheid.

Het is voor iedereen wel duidelijk dat vervuiling grote nadelige gevolgen heeft voor het milieu, maar ook voor onze gezondheid. De nadelen zijn groot. De giftige stoffen die vrijkomen in onze lucht, ons water, onze bodem vormen een directe bedreiging voor de natuur en de gezondheid van ons en onze dierbaren. Ze dragen bij aan luchtwegenaandoeningen en hart- en vaatziekten. Omwonenden van dit soort bedrijven hebben vaak meer kans op kanker en andere ziektes. En te vaak zijn het de meest kwetsbare gemeenschappen die in de buurt van vervuilende fabrieken wonen en lijden onder die nadelig effecten op de gezondheid, en dat is onacceptabel.

Daarnaast is de herziening van de richtlijn ook belangrijk voor een gelijk speelveld in Europa. Het kan niet zo zijn dat er in het ene land heel lage en strikte uitstootnormen zijn en dat in andere landen veel hogere limieten worden toegestaan. Dat creëert een ongelijk speelveld voor onze industrie binnen Europa. Daar moet een eind aan komen.

Het is goed dat we deze richtlijn herzien, dat het recht op compensatie wordt verbeterd en dat hogere boetes kunnen worden opgelegd bij overtredingen, en dat we in heel Europa strengere eisen stellen aan emissies van zware industriële installaties. Het is belangrijk dat onze kinderen een gezonde toekomst tegemoet kunnen zien en zonder zorgen in open water kunnen zwemmen. We moeten winsten niet boven onze gezondheid, ons leven plaatsen.

Nog één opmerking over landbouw, Voorzitter, want er wordt hier gedaan alsof een bepaalde partij de enige is die opkomt voor de landbouw. De grootste bedreiging voor de kleine en middelgrote familiebedrijven is juist de industrialisatie van de landbouw. We hebben het over minder dan 3 % van de veebedrijven die we onder deze richtlijn willen laten vallen. Juist bedrijven die door hun schaalvoordeel oneerlijk concurreren met die kleine en middelgrote familiebedrijven. En die boerenbedrijven, die hebben zeker een toekomst in Nederland, en in Europa.

Michal Wiezik, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, tomorrow we vote on the Industrial Emissions Directive. Despite tough negotiations, we agreed on a complex position with a solid von der Leyen majority. The report found a good balance between ensuring a high level of protection of the environment and human health and balancing the burdens imposed on business.

We have strengthened the cross-border elements of the file and general management of water within industrial use. We significantly improve the aspects of environmental performance and emission limits and provided the public with easier access to justice in those cases where an IED permit was breached and caused human health harm. Please vote in favour of the report and against the amendments which weaken the report, including on environmental performance limit values.

The only main question that remains open is the inclusion of intensive, large scale cattle farming into the scope of the Directive. And I believe we will approve this important element as well. With the adoption of the ambitious Industrial Emissions Directive, we hold to our goals and priority towards the European Green Deal.

Jutta Paulus, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich könnte hier auch eine halbe Stunde reden, denn von den Gesetzen, die wir hier gerade besprechen, habe ich vier mitverhandelt.

Ich fange mal mit der Energieeffizienzrichtlinie an, die ist das maßgebliche Instrument, um endlich Schluss zu machen mit der Energieverschwendung, denn hier hängen die Früchte so niedrig, dass man sich nach ihnen bücken muss. Wir haben zwar viel erreicht, aber wenn man sich die Entwicklungen bei den Erneuerbaren, bei der Elektromobilität, bei der Gebäudewärme anschaut, dann muss man konstatieren, dass das Ziel, auf das man sich letztlich einigen konnte, ziemlich genau bei der Hälfte von dem liegt, was potenziell möglich wäre. Aber ich bin Optimistin, wir können ja immer besser sein als die Richtlinie.

Zu den nachhaltigen Schiffstreibstoffen hat mein Kollege Rasmus Andresen schon das meiste gesagt. Auch hier: Die Investitionen, die geplanten Investitionen der größten europäischen Reederei alleine reichen schon aus, um die E-Fuel-Quote zu erfüllen. Damit ist, glaube ich, ziemlich viel gesagt zur Ambition dieses Gesetzes.

Die Industrieemissionsrichtlinie – wir haben es gerade von den Kollegen gehört – steht auf der Kippe, und auch da – das ist eines der wirksamsten Instrumente zur Verringerung von Umweltverschmutzung und zum Schutz der Gesundheit von Bürgerinnen und Bürgern – wird das hier politisiert auf dem Rücken von Mensch und Natur.

Wo stehen wir also beim Grünen Deal? Wir sind beim Klima ganz gut vorangekommen. Aber der zweite zentrale Pfeiler, der Erhalt unserer Lebensgrundlagen, der droht hier gerade unterminiert zu werden. Wenn wir die Umweltverschmutzung nicht eindämmen, dann gehen unsere Ökosysteme weiter zugrunde. Wenn wir nicht dafür sorgen, dass weniger Emissionen, insbesondere auch aus den großen tierhaltenden Betrieben, in die Umwelt gelangen, schaffen wir auch unsere Klimaziele nicht. Die Verordnung über die Wiederherstellung der Natur, über die wir am Mittwoch abstimmen werden, fällt in die gleiche Kategorie. Alles, was nicht originär Klima oder Energie ist, wird verhetzt, wird politisiert, es wird zum Gegenstand populistischer Angriffe gemacht und es wird den Leuten Sand in die Augen gestreut. Denn wenn wir so weitermachen wie bisher, ist das der sichere Weg, wie wir weder unsere Klimaziele noch unsere Biodiversitätsziele noch das Null-Schadstoff-Ziel erfüllen können, und damit ist der Grüne Deal de facto kastriert.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, machen Sie das nicht mit! Unterstützen Sie die Verordnung über die Wiederherstellung der Natur und auch die Industrieemissionsrichtlinie, denn es geht hier um mehr als um populistische Debatten und Wahlkämpfe!

Carlo Fidanza, a nome del gruppo ECR. – Signora Presidente, signora Vicepresidente, onorevoli colleghi, *green*, sostenibilità, decarbonizzazione sono il mantra che ha portato alla presentazione del pacchetto *Fit for 55*.

Anche in questa sessione voteremo una serie di provvedimenti che ne fanno parte e che risentono tutti dello stesso vizio di origine: ci stanno chiedendo di fare una costosissima rivoluzione industriale verde per contribuire di uno «zero virgola» alla riduzione delle emissioni globali, mentre i paesi più inquinanti si arricchiranno, vendendoci quello che serve alla nostra transizione, realizzato grazie a nuove centrali a carbone e magari grazie al lavoro minorile.

Le transizioni, la storia ce lo insegna, offrono opportunità ma presentano il conto: intere filiere industriali che rischiano di saltare, lavoratori disoccupati, famiglie in difficoltà. E chi paga questo conto? Le imprese, i cittadini o, nelle migliori delle ipotesi, gli Stati membri, che poi siamo sempre noi, ai quali non viene nemmeno concesso di scorporare quegli investimenti obbligatori dai parametri del debito.

Un'impostazione centralista, a tratti totalitaria, fondata su analisi di impatto discutibili, sulla costante violazione del principio di neutralità tecnologica, sulla mancata fiducia nelle imprese – da sempre il miglior volano all'innovazione – sulla corsa sfrenata all'elettrico tutto e subito, che ci consegnerà alla dipendenza dalla Cina proprio mentre ci liberiamo faticosamente da quella della Russia.

Non paghi di voler mettere in ginocchio l'*automotive*, i trasporti, la meccanica, la chimica, la farmaceutica e molti altri settori manifatturieri, il commissario Timmermans e il suo collettivo ultra-ambientalista, spalleggiati dalle sinistre verdi e rosse, provano a dare il colpo di grazia anche al settore agroalimentare. Lo fanno già da tempo, a dire il vero.

Oggi rilanciano con la legge sul ripristino della natura e provano il colpo di grazia con la direttiva sulle emissioni industriali, che vorrebbe di fatto equiparare gli allevamenti bovini alle fabbriche inquinanti, con esiti disastrosi per il settore, per la nostra stessa sicurezza alimentare e, in fondo, anche per l'ambiente perché saremmo costretti a maggiori importazioni da paesi terzi molto meno sostenibili di noi.

Ma ormai il re è nudo e non vi basterà la giovane Greta, qui tra qualche ora; tra un anno saranno i cittadini europei a presentarvi il conto.

Marie Dauchy, au nom du groupe ID. – Madame la Présidente, le texte dont il est question traite du déploiement d'une infrastructure pour carburants alternatifs, mais il aurait en vérité pu s'intituler «déploiement d'une infrastructure pour faire payer toujours plus les propriétaires de voiture individuelle».

Car il faut que nous arrêtons collectivement de nous mentir et, surtout, de mentir au peuple. Ce que la Commission européenne, avec l'aval de la gauche écologiste, nous vante depuis maintenant plusieurs années, est une gabegie sans nom. La mobilité tout électrique que vous imposez sans consentement finira d'achever l'une des dernières industries européennes dominantes à l'international, en aggravant la crise climatique et en créant les conditions d'un massacre social pour les peuples. Le déploiement des bornes électriques à marche forcée qui est prévu dans ce contexte n'est qu'une manière d'accélérer sa mise en place, au mépris du principe de neutralité technologique qui voudrait que chaque État soit libre des technologies qu'il emploie pour décarboner les transports.

L'Union européenne se transforme petit à petit en Union soviétique européenne où des technocrates non élus et déconnectés imposent des décisions absurdes contre l'intérêt des peuples. Mais n'oubliez pas qu'en démocratie, c'est le peuple qui décide. Et dans quelques mois, vous risquez de réapprendre cette leçon à vos dépens.

Marisa Matias, em nome do Grupo The Left. – Senhora Presidente, a Lei das Emissões Industriais é uma das poucas que adota uma abordagem integrada da proteção ambiental como um todo, prevenindo a poluição na fonte através do controlo mais rigoroso das emissões, mais fiscalização e compensação, acesso à informação e planos de transformação das instalações industriais.

As negociações foram difíceis, sobretudo quanto à inclusão da pecuária. A proposta original abrange uma parte ínfima dos setores da produção do gado, de suínos e de aves, mas, sem surpresa, mobilizou uma campanha agressiva do lobby da agricultura industrial.

A proposta que vamos votar é, por isso, mais fraca do que o deveria ser. Ainda assim, temos a obrigação de aprová-la.

Revisão de licenças, aumento de penalizações, mais rigor na poluição da água e das incineradoras de resíduos, inclusão da exploração e produção de combustíveis fósseis, descarbonização, evitando a perda de biodiversidade e prevenindo acidentes de trabalho, proteção dos pequenos agricultores, são alguns dos motivos.

Esperamos, por isso, que o agronegócio e a direita não destruam esta proposta no voto de amanhã.

Pernille Weiss (PPE). – Fru Formand! De seneste uger har venstrefløjen tudet os ørene og de sociale medier fulde af påstande om, at biodiversiteten står med det ene ben i graven, hvis ikke naturgenopretningsloven stemmes igennem. Vi, der er borgerlige og vil bæredygtige løsninger, har hørt på meget vrøvl. Vrøvl, der sammen med populisme, spin og personangreb, faktisk godt kan gå hen og ødelægge vores demokratiske biodiversitet. Vi skal altså blive bedre til at samtale og arbejde på tværs her i parlamentet. Et godt eksempel på, at vi faktisk kan det, er opdatering af direktivet om energieffektivisering. Energieffektivisering er jo den mest omkostningseffektive og hurtige metode til at reducere udledningerne af CO₂ på, hvilket er til direkte gavn for biodiversiteten. Jeg forhandlede på vegne af EPP et direktiv med høje ambitioner og en meget stor værktøjskasse til at føre dem ud i livet i hvert eneste EU-land. Jeg er altså også ret stolt over, at jeg som den eneste dansker i EPP lykkedes med at få min gruppe med på, at energieffektiviseringer fremover bliver bindende for alle EU's medlemslande, så vi ved, hvor meget hvert land bidrager med frem mod målet om klimaneutralitet inden 2050. For os borgerlige er bæredygtighed afgørende, og det ødelægges altså ikke biodiversiteten. Tværtimod så sikres det, at vi får de mest effektive løsninger vedtaget.

Vera Tax (S&D). – Madam President, dear Commissioner Vălean, it's a hot and historic day in Strasbourg today. Historic because the EU countries are the first in the world to take action in decarbonising shipping. We will decrease the greenhouse gas intensity of fuels used by the ships, by every single ship that calls in the ports of Europe. And you know what? The European shipping industry is very much in favour of this legislation. It gives them a clear pathway for their investments in green ships and in green fuels. Or, to quote a clean fuel producer, 'we have never seen such a clear and economic positive incentive for the uptake of fuels in a long time'.

And you know what else? Our citizens are really happy with this legislation. Container and cruise vessels whom at the moment are responsible for heavy air pollution in our ports like Rotterdam or Hamburg, they will be obliged to use electricity in the port, so no more air pollution in our ports in Europe.

So, you would think I am a happy Member of the European Parliament, of the Transport Committee. That is not the case. Because just a few days ago, I was in London at the International Maritime Organization meeting on the same subject and where the EU transformed the shipping sector to a speedboat in line and path with 1.5 degree warming, the IMO failed to do so. They improved just a little bit. But on a global scale there is still no real action plan to be in line with the Paris Agreement. The IMO is too slow for what this planet needs. This is a big disappointment, but if you are disappointed, get going, work harder and try to convince other and more people to join you.

So, I have my hopes up for the USA that they will introduce action legislations like we did and will join to be a front runner in transitioning to zero emission shipping, creating new jobs in Europe and in the States, and unlocking new opportunities for developing nations who have the sun and the wind to produce zero emission fuels.

Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wenn vom Verbrenner-Aus die Rede ist, denken ja fast alle immer direkt ans Auto. Tatsächlich ist in den letzten Monaten noch ein anderer wichtiger Schritt Richtung Dekarbonisierung des Verkehrs gelungen. Mit der AFIR, der Verordnung über die Infrastruktur für alternative Kraftstoffe, bringen wir auch die Elektrifizierung des Güterverkehrs endlich voran. Künftig wird es alle 60 - Kilometer eine Ladestelle für Lkws geben. Damit schaffen wir die Voraussetzung, dass die Logistikbranche rasch auf batteriebetriebene oder alternative Kraftstoffe bei Lkws umsteigen kann. Laut Prognosen könnte schon 2030 mehr als die Hälfte der in Deutschland zugelassenen Lkws klimaneutral sein.

Damit nicht genug. Die Bahn wird ja oft beim Thema Güterverkehr und Dekarbonisierung des Transports einfach vergessen. Wir Grünen haben dafür gesorgt, dass auch der gesamte Bereich Schiene klimafit wird. Denn bisher sind auf der Schiene nur 54 % der Strecken in der EU elektrifiziert, und vor allem im Schienengüterverkehr dieseln noch viel zu viele Züge durch die Gegend.

Es ist ein echter Durchbruch, meine Damen und Herren, dass die Mitgliedstaaten bis 2026 Maßnahmen zum Ausbau alternativer Antriebe der Schiene erbringen müssen. Denn wir brauchen ja in einer klimaneutralen Welt irgendwann mal auch das Verbrenner-Aus für die Dieselloks.

Grzegorz Tobiszowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Należy docenić i podkreślić, że w dyrektywie w sprawie efektywności energetycznej, jeśli chodzi o postanowienie dotyczące systemów ciepłowniczych, przepisy te wywrą bardzo duży pozytywny wpływ na modernizację istniejących systemów w nadchodzących dekadach, co pozostaje kluczowe w zapewnieniu przystępnego cenowo ciepła w domach, u końcowych odbiorców. Ale nie zmienia to jednak faktu, że wysoko niepokojące pozostają nowe cele efektywności energetycznej, np. w art. 4 unijny cel redukcji zużycia energii do 2030 r. do 11,7 %, a w art. 8 zapewnienie rocznych oszczędności końcowego zużycia energii przez państwa członkowskie w latach 2024–2030 o średnio 1,49 %.

To są tak duże cele i ambicje, które sprawiają, że niektóre kraje zgłaszały, że nie będą w stanie zrealizować tych założeń. I pojawia się pytanie – w sytuacji tak trudnej, kryzysowej, ekonomicznej i geopolitycznej Europy w relacji do innych krajów, do innych kontynentów, w sytuacji, kiedy zakładamy cele i nie będziemy ich w stanie osiągnąć, tracimy wiarygodność jako kontynent wobec innych kontynentów i krajów, jak Chiny, jak Stany Zjednoczone, a także tracimy w bardzo dużej mierze wiarygodność u naszych obywateli i przedsiębiorców. Bowiem zakładane limity nie zostaną zrealizowane. I to nam zgłaszały poszczególne kraje i poszczególne środowiska.

Anders Vistisen (ID). – Fru Formand! Det er, som om man her i huset tror, at når man vil redde planeten, redde den grønne omstilling, redde klimaet, så handler det om, at politikere skal sidde i et rum og finde de vise sten. Det handler om, at man her, med de særinteresser der er, skal »pick the winner«, skal friholde de industrier, man selv er nær ved, eller som har en national interesse, og komme op med et stort bureaukratisk monster af et lovgivningskompleks, som i virkelighedens verden kun kommer til at forsinke og fordyre den grønne omstilling. Det er nemlig ikke det, at vi skal tilbage til stenalderen i forhold til vores forbrug, eller at vi tror på, at vi i Europa kan løse klimaudfordringerne alene, der kommer til at redde kloden. Det, der kommer til at redde kloden, er, hvis vi formår at skabe den innovationskraft, formår at skabe en teknologineutral lyst til innovation i det frie marked. Det er sådan, menneskeheden har løftet sig igen og igen – ikke gennem bureaukrati, ikke igennem parlamentarisk regulering og overregulering, men gennem det frie initiativ på en fornuftbaseret teknologineutral regulering. Det er det, Europa og verden har brug for, og det er det, vi ikke leverer her i huset.

Έλενα Κουντουρά (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω τον εισηγητή και τους σκιώδεις εισηγητές, με τους οποίους εργαστήκαμε εντατικά τους τελευταίους μήνες στον κανονισμό για τα εναλλακτικά καύσιμα. Βελτιώσαμε σημαντικά την αρχική πρόταση της Επιτροπής και πετύχαμε να θέσουμε φιλόδοξους αλλά απόλυτα ρεαλιστικούς στόχους για την ανάπτυξη υποδομών, εναλλακτικών καυσίμων και κυρίως της ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας στο οδικό δίκτυο, στα λιμάνια αλλά και τα αεροδρόμια της Ευρώπης.

Επίσης, δημιουργήσαμε τα εργαλεία ώστε τα κράτη να εξασφαλίσουν την απαραίτητη διαφάνεια στις τιμές και την προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των καταναλωτών, που είναι κρίσιμοι παράγοντες κατά τη μετάβαση στη νέα αυτή πραγματικότητα για την αποφυγή αισχροκέρδειας και την εμπιστοσύνη των πολιτών στην ηλεκτροκίνηση. Είναι πλέον ευθύνη των κρατών να εφαρμόσουν τον κανονισμό και να εξασφαλίσουν ότι η μετάβαση θα είναι δίκαιη για όλους. Οι πολίτες αλλά και οι επαγγελματίες στις μεταφορές πρέπει να συνεχίσουν να κινούνται απρόσκοπτα και με προστό κόστος. Πρέπει να δοθεί επαρκής ευρωπαϊκή και εθνική χρηματοδότηση για τις υποδομές και για να καλύπτονται οι ανάγκες μετακίνησης όλων χωρίς αποκλεισμούς.

Miroslav Radačovský (NI). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, jednoznačne budem hlasovať proti smernici o priemyselných emisiách. Som europoslanec zo Slovenska a rešpektujem odborné stanovisko Slovenskej poľnohospodárskej a potravinárskej komory. Znižovanie emisií skleníkových plynov kysličníka uhličitého, metánu tak, že znížime chov hovädzieho dobytká na Slovensku zo súčasných 600 dobytčích jednotiek na 150 je pre slovenských poľnohospodárov a potravinárov jednoducho neprijateľné.

Znížiť emisie skleníkových plynov je možno aj iným spôsobom. Je potrebné starať sa o prirodzené pohlcovače emisií, lesy, vodu, vzduch, a o tieto lesy, vodu a vzduch, ktorých je na Slovensku dostatok, by sa mali starať predovšetkým tí, čo v týchto lesoch hospodária: lesníci, neštátni vlastníci. A ekologickí aktivisti, prípadne mimovládne organizácie niekedy neskúsenosťou a neodbornosťou narobia viac škody ako osohu, hoci chápem, že aj ekologickí aktivisti aj mimovládne organizácie majú čo do čistoty ovzdušia povedať.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die ersten Sekunden meiner kurzen Redezeit möchte ich nutzen, um beim Thema Energieeffizienz denjenigen wie Niels Fuglsang und Pernille Weiss zu danken, die einen guten Kompromiss ausgearbeitet haben. Ich glaube, und wir als EVP glauben, mit national verbindlichen Zielen wäre es noch besser gewesen, aber da hat uns leider der Rat gestoppt. Ich bitte auch alle Journalisten, darüber mal zu schreiben, dass wir hier gemeinsam ambitioniert sind und der Rat uns da gebremst hat.

Zum Thema Industrieremissionen: Danke an den Berichterstatter Radan Kanev; er hat einen Text der Kommission, der schlecht war, deutlich verbessert. Meine Bitte an die Kolleginnen und Kollegen wäre morgen bei der Abstimmung: Bitte Unterstützung für die Anträge des Agrarausschusses. Rinderhaltung ist nicht industriell. Ich kenne das jedenfalls nicht aus meiner Region, und ich glaube, auch anderswo in Europa haben Rinder Frischluft, und wir sollten sie nicht einsperren. Und bitte die Anträge von Dennis Radtke, die er ja mit vielen Kollegen aus vielen verschiedenen Fraktionen eingereicht hat, zum Thema Dekarbonisierung unterstützen. Viele Unternehmen, unter anderem das größte Stahlwerk Europas, das ich letzte Woche besichtigt habe, machen sich auf den Weg zur Klimaneutralität. Darauf sollten wir uns konzentrieren. Das ist das Ziel dieser Änderungsanträge von Radtke und Co. Ich bitte um Unterstützung für diese Änderungsanträge!

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D). – L-ewwelnett nixtieq nifrah lir-rapporteur u anke l-kollegi tieghi għall-hidma li għamilna fuq dan ir-rapport importanti li għandu l-ghan illi jiggwida lill-industriji Ewropej biex jilhqu l-ambizzjoni tat-tniġġis żero sal-2050.

Nemmen li d-Direttiva dwar l-Emissjonijiet Industrijali kienet u hija kruċjali biex jitnaqqsu t-tniġġis u l-emissjonijiet mis-setturi industrijali u għib benefiċċji ambjentali, klimatiċi u għas-saħħa tal-Unjoni Ewropea.

Bhala shadow rapporteur fil-Kumitat ITRE dwar ir-reviżjoni tad-Direttiva dwar l-Emissjonijiet, nilqa' b'mod partikolari l-introduzzjoni ta' kapitolu gdid dwar il-promozzjoni tal-innovazzjoni li jipprevedi b'mod partikolari l-holqien ta' centru ta' innovazzjoni għat-trasformazzjoni industrijali u l-emissjonijiet operat mill-Kummissjoni, li jiġbor u janalizza informazzjoni dwar tekniki innovattivi.

Dan ir-rapport jindirizza l-aktar kwistjonijiet importanti ta' din ir-reviżjoni, illi fl-aħħar mill-aħħar isibu bilanċ importanti bejn il-harsien tal-ambjent u s-saħħa tal-bniedem, imma fl-istess hin jaraw illi ma npoġġux piż sproporzjonat fuq l-industriji Ewropej illi fl-aħħar mill-aħħar ma jkunux jifilhu għalihom.

(Il-kelliem aċċetta li jwieġeb mistoqsija "karta blu")

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. –Ja mam do Pana pytanie. Dlatego, że 23 czerwca tego roku Greta Thunberg skreśliła swój wpis sprzed pięciu lat, że dwudziestego trzeciego czerwca tego roku będzie zagłada ludzkości. Ona wykreśliła ten swój wpis. Czy nie zastanawia się Pan nad tym wszystkim, co się mówi o tym pakiecie klimatycznym, także w świetle tego, że mamy już informacje z Komisji Budżetowej, że na przyszły rok, 2024, rok wyborczy, planuje się ścięcie o 50% wydatków na płatności? W styczniu tego roku 100% państw Unii Europejskiej prosiło o pełne dopłaty do płatności. Komisja je ścina. Skąd pieniądze? To jest moje pytanie: skąd Pan weźmie pieniądze na te cele, o których się tu dzisiaj mówi?

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D), twegħiba karta blu. – Jiena nemmen illi, anke kif diġà għidt, il-bilanċ li ntlahaq kemm fil-Kumitat ITRE, kemm fil-Kumitat ENVI, kemm fil-Kumitati kollha, illi fl-ahħar mill-ahħar kellhom opinjoni fuq din il-legizlazzjoni li hija tant, u tant importanti sabiex fl-ahħar mill-ahħar insibu dan il-bilanċ, dan il-bilanċ nahseb u nemmen illi, fuq naha, qegħdin naraw illi nsahħu l-protezzjoni ambjentali, is-sostenibilità li hija tant u tant importanti. U ma jagħmel l-ebda sens illi nibqgħu ngħidu illi din il-problema ma teżistix imma fl-ahħar mill-ahħar ukoll l-importanza illi t-targets illi qegħdin inpoġġu quddiemna ma johlqox piż sproporzjonat fuq l-industriji Ewropej illi fl-ahħar mill-ahħar irridu naraw illi xorta wahda jibqgħu kompetittivi. Nemmen illi dan il-bilanċ intlahaq, u ntlahaq b'mod tajjeb hafna.

Elsi Katainen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komissaari, hyvät kollegat, huomenna äänestämme historiallisesta FuelEU Maritime -meriliikenneasetuksesta, joka tulee todella vahvasti vauhdittamaan EU:n meriliikennesektorin päästövähennyksiä. Haluan kiittää esittelijä Warbornia ja muita kansaneuvottelijoita hyvästä yhteistyöstä. Olen erittäin tyytyväinen neuvottelemamme tasapainoiseen lopputulokseen, joka asettaa kunnianhimoiset päästövähennystavoitteet ja tukee kestävien polttoaineiden ja myös tuulimekaniikan käyttöä.

Samalla turvaamme EU:n kilpailukykyä ja varmistamme toimivat sisämarkkinat tarkoituksenmukaisilla joustoilla ja kompensatioilla. Esimerkiksi talvimerenkulun huomioonotto lainsäädännössä on elintärkeää sisämarkkinoiden tasapuolisuudelle. EU on kestävä merenkulun globaali suunnannäyttäjä ja uskon, että FuelEU Maritime tulee kirittämään myöskin kansainvälisiä neuvotteluita.

Johan Nissinen (ECR). – Fru talman! Människan har i alla tider oroat sig för fattigdom. Allra värst är det när politiska beslut orsakar det. Vi som politiker bör därför göra vad vi kan för att inte utsätta människor för att hamna i fattigdom. Det måste man tyvärr påminna Europaparlamentet om, detta rymdskepp som är långt ifrån vanliga människors vardag.

EU-tjänstemän och politiker är väl omhändertagna av skattebetalarnas hårda arbete och behöver inte oroas sig för konsekvenserna av den förda politiken. Samtidigt som det råder inflation fortsätter en majoritet i parlamentet att driva igenom det gigantiska och aggressiva klimatpaketet *Green Deal*. Det består av förbud, regleringar, energiosäkerhet, absurda renoveringstvång och teknikfientlighet. Vi vet inte ens om det över huvud taget kommer att hjälpa klimatet med de här åtgärderna. Men en sak vet vi: våra medborgare kommer att bli fattigare.

Danilo Oscar Lancini (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non è facile comprendere come parte di questo Parlamento sostenga che le emissioni degli allevamenti possano essere assimilate alle emissioni industriali.

Collegli di diversi gruppi parlamentari e la stessa commissione AGRI hanno ripetutamente chiesto di trattare industria e agricoltura in modo diverso; non è una questione politica, ma di realtà.

Non possiamo lasciare che sia l'ideologia a imporre ai nostri contadini ed allevatori scelte che li penalizzano, invece di sostenerli come abbiamo sempre fatto. Credete veramente che includere il bestiame nelle emissioni industriali aiuti gli allevatori, la nostra agricoltura? E infine, che porti benefici alle nostre filiere produttive?

Per la Lega non è così, noi giochiamo a carte scoperte e con il voto di domani vedremo chi bara. Vedremo chi vuole veramente sostenere l'agricoltura europea e chi invece, per ideologia o chissà cos'altro, la sta colpendo in modo inaccettabile.

Concludo dicendo che votare a favore dell'agricoltura non è un voto contro l'ambiente, anzi valorizza generazioni di identità e culture tramandate di padre in figlio in molte regioni europee.

Io non credo che si possa pensare di dare ai nostri figli domani, dopo aver sacrificato il mondo dell'allevamento, la farina di grillo o le cavallette.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, acompanhamos o potencial na renovação e na inovação de redes de energia, parque edificado, transportes e demais serviços de utilidade pública, com vista a uma maior eficiência energética, mas preocupa-nos que as políticas energéticas, designadamente as relativas à eficiência energética, possam contribuir para uma maior exclusão social e o agravamento das condições de vida dos cidadãos, com o aumento dos custos da habitação, da mobilidade ou dos preços da energia. Mais ainda, num momento em que o aumento do custo de vida, nomeadamente da habitação, está a sufocar as famílias.

A definição de metas vinculativas, dissemo-lo desde o início, exigirá a uns Estados mais esforços do que a outros. Propusemos que os fundos mobilizados para promover a eficiência energética fossem excluídos do cálculo da dívida pública e dos défices orçamentais dos Estados-Membros para que pudessem fazer os investimentos necessários, proposta que foi rejeitada.

Defendemos que a recuperação do controlo público do setor energético é fundamental para garantir os direitos económicos, sociais e ambientais dos povos.

Christian Ehler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Die Industrieemissionsrichtlinie, wie sie vor der Revision bestand, trug erfolgreich zur Reduzierung von Emissionen in Europa bei. Im Grunde genommen ist sie auch ein modernes Instrument, denn sie hat einen Mechanismus, wo Industrie, NGOs, die öffentliche Hand über Jahre diskutieren, wie man technologischen Fortschritt erreichen kann.

Aber wir sind in diesem Fall vollkommen über den Rahmen hinausgeschossen. Das wird ein Beitrag zur Deindustrialisierung Europas sein. Es ist superbürokratisch, es sind riesige Auflagen für die Industrie, es wird kein Gramm Schadstoff reduziert werden. Es ist ein riesiges Beauflagungs-, Kontroll- und Dokumentationssystem für eine Industrie, die wir ohnehin mit Dokumentationspflichten, mit bürokratischem Aufwand schwer belastet haben.

Insofern müssen wir uns ganz genau überlegen, was wir wollen. Es gibt im Deutschen ein Sprichwort, das heißt: Viele Hunde sind des Hasen Tod. Ich glaube, es geht nicht darum, die Frage zu stellen, Emissionen in der Industrie zu reduzieren, sondern es geht um die Art und Weise. Es ist überbordend, es ist überbürokratisch, es geht hauptsächlich um Dokumentationen, und das wird der Industrie in Europa wie auch dem Klima nicht helfen.

Thomas Rudner (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit dem AFIR-Bericht haben wir als EU-Parlament einen großen Erfolg in Sachen Klimaschutz erzielt. Die Bestimmungen über die Ladeinfrastruktur für Pkw wurden erheblich verbessert, um einen schnelleren Aufbau von Ladesäulen zu ermöglichen. Wir haben einen schrittweisen Ansatz für die Ladeinfrastruktur für Lkw durchgesetzt, mit strengeren Zielen und einer Steigerung der Ladekapazität im Laufe der Zeit. Auch Wasserstofftankstellen sollen zügig gebaut werden.

Die Kommission wird zeitnah prüfen, ob diese Ziele nochmals verschärft werden sollen. Kartenzahlung soll an allen Schnellladesäulen und Wasserstofftankstellen Pflicht werden – ein großer Erfolg für den europäischen Verbraucherschutz. Zudem soll an diesen Säulen der Preis verbindlich Euro pro Kilowatt sein. Somit kann eine einheitliche Transparenz für alle gewährleistet werden.

Ein weiterer großer Schritt ist die Schaffung des *EU Access Points* zur einheitlichen Datensammlung. Fahrerinnen und Fahrer werden in Zukunft viel leichter europaweit sehen können, wann, wo und zu welchem genauen Preis sie laden bzw. tanken können.

Insgesamt ist die Einigung ausgewogen und enthält zahlreiche Gewinne für das Europäische Parlament. Der Vorschlag der Kommission konnte in mehreren Aspekten verbessert werden. Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich bitte Sie, dieses Dossier bei der Abstimmung zu unterstützen.

Nicola Danti (Renew). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, parlare di transizione verde significa saper coniugare ambizione e concretezza, senza cedimenti a ideologie o manifesti politici.

In alcuni casi non ci siamo riusciti e penso alla legge sul ripristino della natura e al voto di mercoledì; in altri, invece, abbiamo capito che gestire la transizione significa scegliere obiettivi sfidanti ma realizzabili.

È questo il caso della direttiva sull'efficienza energetica, che fissa un target vincolante di riduzione del consumo energetico dell'11,7 % al 2030, nonché obiettivi di risparmio energetico per ciascun Stato membro. Una legislazione fondamentale che rende realizzabili l'adagio per cui l'energia migliore, quella più pulita, è quella che non consumiamo, che non vuol dire decrescita infelice o stop alla produzione industriale, ma investimenti in sistemi di gestione del consumo dell'energia, efficientamento del parco immobiliare pubblico, incentivi per scommettere su apparecchi e prodotti più efficienti.

Misure che, abbiamo visto in questo anno di prezzi dell'energia impazziti, sono sempre più urgenti per abbassare le bollette e per renderci meno dipendenti da paesi terzi.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Polityka klimatyczna Unii Europejskiej niestety jest przykładem zwycięstwa ideologii nad rozumem i rozsądkiem. Bezwzględnie konieczne jest urealnienie polityki klimatyczno-energetycznej, tak by stała się instrumentem wzmocnienia bezpieczeństwa i gospodarki Europy. Niestety, lewicowo-liberalny mainstream chce de facto doprowadzić do deindustrializacji Europy. Chcą Państwo zwiększyć ubóstwo energetyczne, które już obejmuje 40 milionów ludzi, a propozycje dotyczące mobilności doprowadzą Unię Europejską do uzależnienia od Chin.

Według Międzynarodowej Agencji Energetycznej prawie 90% komponentów fotowoltaiki pochodzi z Chin. Państwu to nie przeszkadza. Podobnie jest z bateriami elektrycznymi. Niczego Państwo nie nauczyli się z tej sytuacji, którą przyniósł nam COVID. Przecież COVID wyraźnie pokazał, że długie łańcuchy dostaw można w każdej chwili zablokować i przeciąć. My musimy zadbać o bezpieczeństwo, również żywnościowe obywateli, a Państwo również w tę sferę chcą uderzyć. Mam dla Państwa dobrą wiadomość – Europejczycy obronią się przed Waszym szaleństwem, pokażą tej ideologii czerwoną kartkę w wyborach do Parlamentu Europejskiego w przyszłym roku.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, a pesquisa e a utilização de combustíveis alternativos que contribuam para a redução da emissão de gases com efeito de estufa associadas ao transporte marítimo são uma mudança que se pode afigurar positiva e necessária, mas tem de ser feita tendo em conta as realidades específicas dos Estados-Membros e do esforço necessário para responder a objetivos de descarbonização, alicerçada num quadro de investimento público que garanta essa mudança.

Pesem interrogações para as regiões ultraperiféricas, este regulamento preconiza a submissão aos mercados, o alargamento do perverso comércio de emissões, a defesa dos interesses dos grupos económicos que se aproveitam do filão das energias renováveis e dos gestores privados dos portos principais dos Estados-Membros e a perda de relevância do setor marítimo e portuário de países periféricos como Portugal.

Este regulamento, como de resto todo o chamado Pacote 55, é mais um contributo para aumentar desequilíbrios entre os Estados-Membros, deixando para trás, sem surpresa, dimensões como o serviço público, o controlo público de setores estratégicos, os direitos dos trabalhadores ou a soberania dos Estados.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca, Pani Komisarz! Poruszę dwie sprawy. Emisje przemysłowe to trudne, bardzo trudne rozwiązanie. Gratuluję sprawozdawcom, bo udało się doprowadzić je do końca. Sądzę, że trzeba w jakiś sposób poprawić to rozwiązanie w czasie naszego głosowania i iść w kierunku pomocy przemysłowi, aby mocniej przekierować inwestycje na zieloną transformację i ustalić orientacyjny charakter dopuszczalnych wielkości efektywności środowiskowej. Zachęcam do poparcia tych poprawek.

Jeśli chodzi o efektywność energetyczną, to jest w ogóle najważniejsza sprawa. Wszyscy o tym wiemy. Ale tu mamy powody do satysfakcji. Zabiegałem o poprawki także w komisji i o to, aby spełniono postulaty branży ciepłowniczej. W definicjach efektywnych systemów ciepłowniczych i sprawnej kogeneracji. W moim kraju, na przykład, aż 15 mln ludzi jest zależnych od branży ciepłowniczej i od dobrego rozwiązania związanego z efektywnością energetyczną.

Nicolás González Casares (S&D). – Señora presidenta, estamos completando los dossieres del paquete de medidas «Objetivo 55». Se van a aprobar posiciones y ratificar acuerdos cruciales para el futuro descarbonizado de la Unión. Adelante.

Quiero destacar el importante salto que da la Unión Europea con la rectificación de esta Directiva de eficiencia energética. Con más eficiencia energética también se combate la pobreza energética. En este sentido quiero destacar que, por primera vez, habrá una definición de pobreza energética europea, así como medidas enfocadas a aliviar y empoderar a los consumidores. Esto también lo estamos haciendo en el acuerdo que hicimos la semana pasada, recientemente, en el debate sobre el mercado eléctrico europeo: proteger a los más vulnerables e impedir que se desconecten.

Necesitamos avanzar en la lucha contra el cambio climático, todos juntos, por la descarbonización, por tener de verdad un consenso contra la lucha contra el cambio climático —aquí, en este Parlamento— y no romper los consensos, como están haciendo algunos grupos. No al negacionismo climático. Sí a avanzar. Adelante en eso.

Además, creemos que es imprescindible que la transición energética sea justa. Necesitamos un objetivo ambicioso y vinculante como el que propone esta Directiva, por primera vez, a nivel europeo.

Quiero dar la enhorabuena también a mi compañero Niels Fuglsang y a todos los ponentes por el gran trabajo desarrollado. ¡Adelante con la eficiencia!

Искра Михайлова (Renew). – Г-жо Председател, безспорно целта за намаляване на вредните емисии от индустрията е част от реализацията на Стратегията за растеж на Европейския съюз и превръщането на Европа в климатично неутрален континент. Това е направлението за развитие на европейската промишленост и предложението на Европейската комисия и позицията на Европейския парламент са от ключово значение за уеднаквяване на обхвата, индикаторите и целите за постигане от индустриалните компании.

Същевременно нито едно добро намерение не трябва да бъде за сметка на конкурентноспособността на европейската икономика и не би трябвало да създава административни пречки пред бизнеса и излишна бюрокрация. И точно това е един от основните елементи за дискусия по директивата, която обсъждаме. Необходим е баланс между изисквания, поставени цели и реален капацитет на компаниите за постигане на тези цели. Решението е в иновациите, дигитализацията и премерените стъпки на последователно въвеждане на изискванията. В тази посока са очакванията на бизнеса, европейската индустрия и изследователските центрове. Това се очаква и от Европейския парламент.

Herbert Dorfmann (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Diese Richtlinie vermischt industrielle Emissionen mit Emissionen in der Landwirtschaft, was an und für sich schon recht eigenartig ist. Aber dazu kommt noch, dass die Kommission landwirtschaftliche Betriebe zu Industriebetrieben erklären will, die in vielen Mitgliedstaaten ganz normale Familienbetriebe sind. Und das gilt ganz besonders für die Rinderzucht.

Natürlich können Emissionen in der Landwirtschaft auch problematisch sein. Aber die Frage, ob sie problematisch sind oder nicht, hängt ganz eindeutig davon ab, ob es ein vernünftiges Verhältnis zwischen Futterfläche und gehaltenen Tieren gibt. Wenn dieses Verhältnis stimmt, dann ist auch ein größerer Betrieb nicht problematisch. Wenn dieses Verhältnis nicht stimmt, dann kann auch ein kleiner Betrieb sehr problematisch sein, was die Emissionen angeht.

Deswegen, denke ich, ist es vernünftig, dass wir morgen die Änderungsanträge des Agrarausschusses annehmen, dass wir uns dann überlegen, wie man ein vernünftiges Kriterium findet, um jene landwirtschaftlichen Betriebe zu identifizieren, die wirklich problematisch sind, was die Emissionen angeht, und dass man nicht ein allgemeines Problem auch für kleine Betriebe schafft.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, oggi si apre una plenaria decisiva per le ambizioni che l'Unione si è posta con il *green deal*.

È quindi necessaria un'ampia condivisione politica della strategia che intendiamo seguire, piuttosto che spaccature all'interno del Parlamento che non ci consentiranno di avanzare in modo equilibrato.

In questo senso, per raggiungere efficacemente gli obiettivi di riduzione dell'inquinamento previsti dalla direttiva sulle emissioni industriali, occorre un approccio che contempli non solo i tre livelli di sostenibilità, ma anche le specificità di ciascun settore, a partire da quello dell'allevamento.

Il principio «*one size fits all*» ha infatti ampiamente dimostrato i suoi limiti e, come commissione AGRI, riteniamo quindi sia un errore paragonare le stalle europee alle ciminiere, assoggettando ai vincoli della direttiva anche gli allevamenti bovini.

Un errore scientifico e pratico che rischia di mettere a repentaglio decenni di avanzamento, capaci di farci raggiungere i più alti standard produttivi e di benessere animale al mondo.

Siamo pronti a lavorare insieme, caro Commissario, per sviluppare politiche altrettanto ambiziose ma che rispettino le peculiarità di differenti filiere produttive, a partire da quella bovina.

Jérémy Decerle (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, le sujet des émissions polluantes est certainement important, mais je n'imaginai pas que la Commission européenne ne verrait pas l'erreur grossière qui consiste à faire rentrer au forceps l'agriculture dans un cadre inadapté.

Vouloir assimiler l'élevage européen aux industriels avec autant de légèreté est dangereux et inopérant. C'est ignorer les progrès déjà faits dans le domaine, grâce notamment à la politique agricole commune. Car si notre agriculture n'est pas parfaite, elle reste la plus vertueuse au monde. Arrêtons de la fragiliser, protégeons-la.

Le pacte vert, pour réussir, doit cesser de chercher des symboles, des seuils, des chiffres, des contraintes qui, magiquement, régleraient tout. Cela ne marchera pas. Il faut pour l'élevage une approche globale de la durabilité. Alors, pour ma part, pour protéger, pour soutenir les agriculteurs, je ne vois pas d'autre choix que le statu quo sur le volet agricole de ce texte.

Maria Spyraiki (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner Vălean, dear colleagues, concluding Fit for 55 package, allow me to focus on the FuelEU Maritime Regulation on which I had the honour to be the shadow rapporteur on behalf of the ENVI Committee. According to my opinion, it is an essential stepping-stone towards establishing a forward condition for the energy transition of shipping. However, in order to meet our ambitious target, it is essential for the regulation to foster the production of alternative sustainable fuels.

Full decarbonisation of shipping requires alternative low— and zero-carbon maritime fuels and also breakthrough propulsion technologies to become widely available. To this end, close cooperation and action for all relevant stakeholders in the supply chain as it is, fuel producers, energy providers, shipyards and energy manufacturers, ports as well, is required.

Allow me to underline that the responsibility for the development and availability of renewable alternative fuels lies with the maritime fuel producers and suppliers, and it is important to stick to set obligations for the development and deployment of these fuels as in the case of road transport and aviation. It is a part of the level playing field, dear Commissioner.

Concluding, last but not least, we must always keep in mind that shipping is a global sector which requires global solutions at the IMO level. And in this regard we have to increase the levels we have as an entity, as the EU.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE). – Salut pachetul de inițiativă și în mod special Directiva privind eficiența energetică. Îi mulțumesc colegului Niels Fuglsang. Am avut și onoarea de a conduce o parte din trilogurile de negociere cu Consiliul, mulțumesc Comisiei Europene și Consiliului.

Este în mod evident un pas înainte către atingerea țintelor strategice: Fit for 55 în 2030, Green Deal în 2050, dar și către independența energetică și, mai ales, costuri mai bune pentru cetățeni și economie. Nu trebuie să uităm, însă, în niciun moment că avem nevoie de o industrie care trebuie să rămână competitivă. Nu trebuie să exagerăm cu obiective mult prea ambițioase sau nerealiste. Trebuie să găsim echilibrul necesar să fim mai puțin dogmatici și mult mai practici și mai pragmatici.

De aceea, vă rog, dragi colegi, ca mâine să susțineți amendamentele ITRE și să găsim acel echilibru necesar care să permită industriei europene să rămână competitivă.

Isabel García Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la movilidad debe ser un derecho universal y, por tanto, debemos asegurar que todos los ciudadanos puedan desplazarse libremente por todos los territorios y de la forma más sostenible y justa. Este Pleno, con el voto del Reglamento relativo a la implantación de una infraestructura para los combustibles alternativos y la iniciativa «FuelEU Maritime», lo hará posible.

Con el Reglamento relativo a la implantación de una infraestructura para los combustibles alternativos, impulsamos un transporte por carretera más responsable con el medio ambiente, fijando objetivos obligatorios en la distribución de puntos de recarga eléctrica de hidrógeno, para garantizar que todos los ciudadanos, vivan donde vivan, puedan acceder a ellos fácilmente. Esperamos que esto ayude a estimular el uso de vehículos más sostenibles y a hacerlos más asequibles.

Con la iniciativa «FuelEU Maritime», reduciremos emisiones en el sector marítimo, impulsando el uso de combustibles renovables e hipocarbónicos. Y lo hacemos contando con territorios como Canarias, Baleares y otras regiones costeras, cuya conectividad y desarrollo socioeconómico dependen en gran parte del tráfico marítimo, incluyendo medidas para evitar la fuga de carbono a puertos de terceros Estados y proteger así los puertos europeos como el de Algeciras o el de Valencia.

Seguimos trabajando por un Pacto Verde con el corazón rojo.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, the Industrial Emissions Directive is obviously aiming to overhaul the management of emissions from over 50 000 areas, including steelworks, chemical and plastics, coal factories and, of course, industrial farms. This is important to tackle greenhouse gas emissions from the point of view of the impact on the environment, but not just that, also the impact on human health.

Every year, air pollution causes 300 000 premature deaths in Europe. The air and water pollution caused by intensive livestock farming is well documented. The health and environmental costs of water pollution due to excess nitrogen and phosphorus amounts to 22 billion a year. But critically, we see that Europe, with less than 10% of the world's population, is accounting for 23% of new cancer cases linked to pollution.

Now, there had been a right to compensation introduced in this directive, but it was absolutely weakened down in negotiations. I think that's really regrettable. It puts profits over people's health. We need to put that back.

Ljudmila Novak (PPE). – Spoštovana predsedujoča, kolegice in kolegi! Poročevalci pravijo, da so dobro sodelovali, in to me res zelo veseli. To nam daje upanje.

Emisije zmanjšujemo na različnih področjih: v industriji, v cestnem, pomorskem in letalskem prometu. Veliko vlagamo v razvoj in nove tehnologije. Vse to skupaj mora prinesiti pozitivne učinke.

Strinjam se tudi s tistimi, ki pravijo, da podpirajo majhne kmetije, saj prispevajo k večji samooskrbi prebivalcev in se tudi v večji meri lahko prilagajajo, povzročajo pa tudi manj izpustov. V vseh panogah so potrebni razumni ukrepi, ki so tudi finančno podprti in pomagajo tako industriji, prometu, kot tudi kmetijstvu. Samo s skupnimi močmi bomo uspešni.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, in order to respond to the current climate, health and biodiversity crises, it is crucial that the EU tackles the pollution coming from Europe's most industrialised livestock farms. These farms represent a tiny minority of animal farms in Europe.

Contrary to the false claims made by the big-agri lobby, the Industrial Emissions Directive does not target small and medium family farms. And this is particularly true for the cattle sector. 97 % of all commercial cattle farms in Europe would be untouched by the revised directive. Excluding the entire cattle sector from the Industrial Emissions Directive would only favour the biggest polluters, responsible for the vast majority of ammonia and methane emissions coming from cattle farming.

Ireland has lost 140 000 family farms since the 1970s, largely due to the intensification and consolidation of farming in the country. Small-scale family farms are the backbone of food production in Europe. It is about time we supported them and stopped prioritising big agri, which is part of the problem, not part of the solution.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komissaari, nyt hyväksyttävästä ilmastopaketesta nostan esiin kaksi lainsäädäntöä. Ensinnäkin meriliikenteen vähäpäästöiset polttoaineet – mielestäni lopputulos on varsin onnistunut. Lainsäädäntö ottaa nyt huomioon erilaiset teknologiat ja kannustaa markkinaehtoisesti asteittain lisäämään vähäpäästöisiä polttoaineita meriliikenteessä. Tässä on otettu myös huomioon alueelliset tarpeet. Esimerkiksi oman kotimaani, Suomen, tärkeä näkökohta siitä, että talvimerenkulku on tässä erikseen huomioitu. Se, että jäävahvisteiset alukset käyttävät aina enemmän polttoainetta ja se on huomioitu nyt tässä laskennassa. Haluan kiittää tästä kaikkia neuvottelijoita. Lopputulos on mielestäni hyvin onnistunut.

Mutta sen sijaan kritisoin energiatehokkuuteen liittyvää direktiiviä. Siinä lähtökohdaksi on nyt otettu se, että energiankäyttöä täytyy vähentää jäsenvaltioissa, sen sijaan, että kannustettaisiin vähäpäästöisen energian käyttöön. Esimerkiksi ne maat, joissa on nyt erittäin paljon vähäpäästöistä energiaa, ja jotka haluavat investoida vetytuotantoon. Direktiivi on nyt toimimassa päinvastoin, kun se painottaa sitä, että kaikkien pitää vähentää energiankäyttöä, kun pitäisi kannustaa energiatehokkuuteen ja vähäpäästöiseen energiaan.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Adina-Ioana Vălean, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, dear Members, this has been a very interesting exchange. I have taken good note of your comments. I will also pass them to my colleagues, Commissioners Simson and Sinkevičius.

We look forward to the formal adoption of the three 'Fit for 55' files in the coming weeks. Accelerating the uptake of sustainable alternative fuels and increased energy efficiency are both cornerstones for achieving our 2030 climate ambition. It's also an effective contribution to decrease our reliance on fossil fuels imports and improve energy security and air quality in the EU.

On industrial emissions, I hope that Parliament will adopt its mandate for the trilogue negotiations this week. A trilogue agreement is still possible before the end of 2023. As always, the Commission remains available for support in this process. Thank you very much, and I wish you a successful session of Parliament.

Радан Кънев, докладчик. – Г-жо Председател, чухме колегите докладчици от страна на социалистите и на либералите в този парламент да поставят остро въпроса за ефекта на индустриалните емисии върху здравето на хората. Но, повярвайте ми, темата за здравето на гражданите е първостепенна и при всяко обсъждане в моята група, в Европейската народна партия.

Чухме колегите и от групата на социалистите, и от ЕНП, представители на комисията по енергетика и индустрия да поставят на първо място темата за иновациите. Темата за иновациите беше със сигурност първостепенен въпрос във всяко обсъждане и в комисията по околна среда. Чухме колегите от дясната страна на залата да поставят като приоритет въпроса за цената на селскостопанската продукция и отражението на всяко наше законодателство върху нея, но чухме и представителите на социалистите и представителите на либералите в комисията по земеделие да поставят този въпрос като първостепенен. Чухме от всички парламентарни групи единодушие по отношение на защитата на дребните, семейните фермери, но и разлики в това кои точно мерки и кои изменения, които ще гласуваме утре, ще се отразят най-благоприятно върху развитието на малките и устойчиви ферми в Европа.

Можем ли да създадем законодателство, което да отговаря на всички тези тревоги едновременно? Моят прост отговор е да, и по директивата за индустриалните емисии сме много близо до този положителен отговор. Но за да постигнем такова законодателство, трябва да си поставим една основна цел и тя е диалогът да не свърши утре, а да започне утре. Защото ние имаме преговори и със Съвета, но преди всичко защото Директивата за индустриалните емисии е основана на принципа на диалога между заинтересованите лица, между държавите, Комисията, индустриите, организациите, които се борят за по-добра околна среда и по-добро обществено здраве. Диалогът, който се провежда в Севиля.

Така че с гласуването утре, за което още веднъж призовавам да не стигаме до крайности, ние тепърва започваме диалога по изграждане на едно работещо европейско законодателство и за здравето на хората, и за здравето на европейската индустрия и земеделие.

Петър Витанов, докладчик. – Г-жо Председател, аз мисля, че съм облагодетелстван, защото по регламента, по който аз имах честта да говоря почти нямаше забележки. Това е една атестация за отлично свършената работа и симбиозата между различните докладчици в сянка и основният докладчик.

Две неща обаче ми направиха впечатление. Спомена се една от малкото критики да оставим нещата на пазара, ама докога ще го оставяме на пазара? Докога ще го оставяме на печалби, когато говорим за изкопаемите горива? Точно тези, които обаче генерират печалби, те не могат да усетят приближаващата катастрофа. Защо? Защото могат да си позволят да живеят на високо, където въздухът е чист, могат да си позволяват да ядат качествена храна.

Само че тази климатична катастрофа удря бедните непропорционално и несправедливо, защото те не могат нито да живеят където поискат, нито да ядат каквато храна искат, нито да се лекуват, когато става дума за европейско здраве, за здравето на гражданите да се лекуват както искат. Затова си мисля, че когато говорим за задължаващи изисквания това е изключително важно, защото само те гарантират инфраструктурата. А когато имаме инфраструктура, имаме чистия транспорт, транспорта на бъдещето, защото ако го нямаме, може да изпаднем пак в изолация, пак да има Европа на две скорости и въпреки географското положение на една или друга държава, това, че няма прилежаща инфраструктура да я превърне в икономическа пустиня.

И може би още нещо за инфраструктурата. И тук мога да успокоя пазарните фундаменталисти. Всъщност изискването за изграждане на инфраструктура ще върне пазарния модел, а пазарният модел тогава ще доведе до там, че електрическите автомобили няма да бъдат само играчка и лукс за богатите, а ще могат да бъдат общодостъпни.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Jörgen Warborn, föredragande. – Herr talman! Kära kollegor. Denna debatt har handlat om fyra olika ärenden, och det är ganska tydligt att fartygsbränsleförordningen inte har fått den mesta talartiden, utan det har istället varit industriutsläppsdirektivet.

Jag tar det som intäkt för att vi, när det gäller sjöfartens klimatomställning, har hittat rätt balans mellan konkurrenskraft, klimatet och de sociala frågorna. Jag tar det också till intäkt för att det, när det gäller just industriutsläppsdirektivet, finns mer att göra där. Jag stöttar dem som tycker att kossor inte ska definieras inom ramen för industriutsläpp.

De talare som har nämnt fartygens klimatomställning har talat mycket om just konkurrenskraft. Det har handlat om klimatet, naturligtvis, och det har handlat om inflation och de ökade kostnaderna. Det är en bra balans vi har hittat och jag hoppas att vi kommer att ha den här enigheten när vi röstar imorgon också, så att sjöfartssektorn kan få den förutsägbarhet och den arbetsro som behövs och så att EU:s förhandlare kan åka till IMO och med råg i ryggen skapa en konkret färdplan som kan skalas upp globalt.

Låt mig också personligen säga att jag är väldigt nöjd över att vi har fått genomslag för principen "en in, en ut" i den här lagstiftningen. Kommissionen åläggs nu att mycket noga övervaka regelbördan och säkerställa att den inte blommar ut för mycket. Detta är oerhört viktigt för europeiska företags konkurrenskraft och jag hoppas att den kan gälla i alla framtida lagförslag och i alla sektorer.

För att avsluta: jag är inte säker på att tolkarna kan översätta det här uttrycket från svenska, men det känns väldigt skönt att konstatera att nu är vi äntligen i hamn!

Niels Fuglsang, rapporteur. – Mr President, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner, I think this debate has been fruitful and it shows that we are in this House very much aware that we need to act and we need to act now. These legislative proposals that are on the table – I hope they will get a majority, all of them, because we need certainly stronger rules to deliver on our climate ambitions and our energy independence ambitions.

Some of you have talked about whether this Energy Efficiency Directive is binding, to which degree it is binding. Well, for the first time, we have an Energy Efficiency Directive which is binding for the EU as a whole. Previous directives on energy efficiency have not been binding. They have been indicative. Also for Member States individually, they will have to deliver on these measures that are in the Directive. They will have to make plans and show how they can increase energy efficiency and reduce energy consumption.

We have actually, in this Directive, given the Commission, the tools to, if Member States do not act, if they are falling behind and they are not showing how they will catch up on energy savings, then the Commission has the mandate to infringe them and to take them to court. I think this is an important part of the Directive. We don't wish for anyone to be taken to court, but we wish and mean that this Directive needs to be implemented.

Everybody, all the Member States need to take it serious. They need to increase the energy efficiency, and if they do not, well, there can be legal consequences. I think that is important because we have seen that in previous efforts have not been sufficient. Actually, we are not delivering on our ambitions as it is right now. So we need to take more actions, and I think I am convinced that this Directive will lead to exactly that point.

Der Präsident. – Die gemeinsame Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Dienstag, 11. Juli 2023, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D), por escrito. – Uma diretiva atualizada relativa às emissões industriais é um instrumento legislativo muito importante, quer na defesa da saúde pública e na criação de uma relação mais equilibrada com o meio ambiente, quer na prossecução da neutralidade climática para 2050. Ou seja, é uma peça essencial à concretização do próprio Pacto Ecológico Europeu.

Contudo, a proposta da Comissão Europeia apresentava, em particular no caso da produção pecuária, uma marcada distância da realidade e até mesmo do bom senso. A urgência exige ambição, mas sem atendermos às necessidades e limitações daqueles que, como os agricultores, têm de concretizar as ações no terreno, a ambição cai por terra. A ambição impõe-se, mas deve ser justa para as pessoas e feita com as pessoas.

Sara Cerdas (S&D), por escrito. – A transição energética no setor do transporte marítimo apresenta diversas dificuldades, consequência de infraestruturas limitadas e da dependência de tecnologias emergentes. Não obstante, importa destacar que a transição energética no transporte marítimo traz oportunidades, como a melhoria da qualidade do ar nas áreas portuárias e a redução das emissões de gases com efeito de estufa. O setor marítimo é essencial para o desenvolvimento das economias dos países e regiões costeiras, em especial as Regiões Ultraperiféricas, nomeadamente no transporte marítimo de pessoas e bens ou no desenvolvimento económico de vários setores, como o turismo.

As isenções nas viagens de e para os portos localizadas nas Regiões Ultraperiféricas vão ao encontro das especificidades destas regiões e da necessidade de salvaguardar a economia marítima. A redução, em 50%, da obrigatoriedade da utilização de combustíveis sustentáveis no transporte marítimo para as viagens de e para as RUP permitirá uma transição energética justa e que protege a coesão territorial destas regiões. Felizmente, mostramos ser possível defender a transição energética sem deixar nenhuma região para trás, garantindo mais flexibilidade e tempo de adaptação à transição verde.

Andor Deli (NI), írásban. – Az alternatív üzemanyag infrastruktúrára vonatkozó rendelet elfogadása egy nagyon fontos előfeltétele annak, hogy felgyorsuljon az elektromos és hidrogén töltőállomások kiépítése, ami nélkül megvalósíthatatlan az átállás a alternatív meghajtású járművekre. A technológiai neutralitás azonban megkívánja az egyéb, karbonsemleges üzemanyagok, mint pl. az e- vagy bioüzemanyagok támogatását is. Hiszen ezek épp ebben az átmenti időszakban játszhatnak kiemelkedő szerepet, megteremtve a lehetőséget annak, hogy a belső égésű motorokat fokozatosan leválasszuk a kőolajalapú üzemanyagokról, és ezzel egyúttal megőrizzük az európai járműipar világszínvonalát, és így munkahelyek tízezreit.

Végezetül, nem veszíthetjük szem elől a meglévő járműflottákat sem, illetve azt a tényt, hogy számos KKV-nek és polgárnak nem lesz módjában majd zéró kibocsátású járműre váltani, viszont szeretnének ők is hozzájárulni a zöld átálláshoz. Ezért a „senkit sem hagyunk hátra” elvét követve fokozottan kell támogatni a meglévő flották fiatalítását. Ha egy EURO 4-es 5-ös kamiont, EURO 6-osra váltunk, már jelentős CO₂ csökkentést tudunk elérni.

András Gyürk (NI), írásban. – A háború és az Európai Bizottság által rosszul megalkotott szankciós politika miatt az európai polgároknak és vállalkozásoknak az Európai Unió történetének legsúlyosabb energiaválságával kellett megküzdenie. A piaci árak elszabadultak, és csak a polgárok áldozatvállalásának és a tagállamok felelős intézkedéseinek köszönhetően kerültek el az ellátási nehézségeket. Bebizonyosodott, hogy az elegendő mennyiségű és megfizethető energia létfontossággal bír az európai gazdaság működtetéséhez. Az unió energiatartósságának megteremtésében a biztonságos energiaellátás mellett az energiahatékonyság is kiemelt szereppel bír.

Egyértelmű, hogy az a legolcsóbb, legtisztább energia, amit nem fogyasztunk el. Az energiahatékonysági irányelv azonban, ebben a formában, inkább hátráltatja az energiamegtakarítási törekvéseket. Egyrészt, a javaslatban megfogalmazott célkitűzések nem veszik figyelembe Közép-Európa országainak sajátos helyzetét. Brüsszel és a baloldal betiltanák a fosszilis energiatartósságban elért energiamegtakarítás elszámolhatóságát is, amivel olyan beruházásokra köteleznék a tagállamokat, melyek nem kivitelezhetők költséghatékony módon. Másrészt az energiahatékonysági projektek komplex, tőkeigényes folyamatok. Ezek megvalósításához a Bizottságnak fel kell hagynia a Magyarországnak és Lengyelországnak járó uniós források blokkolásával és minden tagállamnak azonnali hozzájárulást kell biztosítania az őt megillető támogatásokhoz.

Végül elfogadhatatlan, hogy a baloldal az energiahatékonyság kérdését is a genderideológia előmozdítására használja. Az energiaválság kezeléséhez és az energiatartósság megteremtéséhez ez nem járul hozzá. Ehelyett inkább felelős és gazdaságilag, valamint társadalmilag megvalósítható jogszabályokra lenne szükség.

Nora Mebarek (S&D), par écrit. – Alors que la planète bat quotidiennement des records de températures et que l'UE est la région du monde qui se réchauffe le plus rapidement, la mise en œuvre du Pacte Vert est plus que jamais une nécessité vitale. C'est pourquoi j'exhorte mes collègues à adopter massivement le texte sur le déploiement des carburants alternatifs, car il apportera une contribution essentielle au respect de nos engagements en faveur du climat. Nous le savons, les transports sont responsables d'environ un quart des émissions de CO₂ en Europe. Or, nous sommes à la traîne en termes d'électrification de notre réseau routier, et ce alors que 2035 et la fin des moteurs thermiques se profile. Ce texte est donc tout aussi important pour nos concitoyens, car il doit les convaincre que traverser l'Europe en voiture électrique sera bientôt aussi simple et pratique qu'avec une voiture thermique.

Adopter ce texte, c'est enfin préserver la santé de nos concitoyens, et particulièrement ceux qui résident dans des zones portuaires, où les émissions des bateaux contaminent l'air de villes entières. Les exigences en matière d'alimentation électrique pour les navires à quai vont permettre de réduire l'exposition de millions d'europeens à la pollution et ainsi éviter de nombreux cancers.

16. Protection of journalists and human rights defenders from manifestly unfounded or abusive court proceedings (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Tiemo Wölken im Namen des Rechtsausschusses über den Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zum Schutz von Personen, die sich öffentlich beteiligen, vor offenkundig unbegründeten oder missbräuchlichen Gerichtsverfahren („strategische Klagen gegen öffentliche Beteiligung“) (COM(2022)0177 – C9-0161/2022 – 2022/0117(COD) (A9-0223/2023)).

Tiemo Wölken, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, schön, dass Sie heute da sind. Wir müssen über ein wichtiges Thema reden. Wir müssen darüber reden, dass unsere Rechtssysteme ausgenutzt werden, um Berichterstattung zu unterdrücken, an der wir als Allgemeinheit ein großes Interesse haben. Wir müssen darüber reden, dass Berichterstattung, die Teil des öffentlichen Diskurses ist, immer häufiger von reichen Menschen, von Menschen mit viel Macht, von Unternehmen zum Schweigen gebracht wird. Das darf es in der Europäischen Union, die darauf stolz ist, dass wir eine Pressefreiheit haben, die stark ist, nicht geben. Das darf es in der Europäischen Union nicht geben, denn die Pressefreiheit ist ein Grundpfeiler der Demokratie. Ohne Kontrolle der Mächtigen ist eine Demokratie, die funktioniert, nicht vorstellbar.

Trotzdem sehen wir in immer mehr europäischen Ländern, dass es diese Klagen, die gegen Journalistinnen und Journalisten, NGOs, Aktivistinnen und Aktivisten geführt werden, immer häufiger gibt. Diese Klagen werden nicht geführt, weil man ein Problem mit etwas hat, mit einer Berichterstattung zum Beispiel, sondern diese Klagen werden allein deswegen geführt, weil man das Opfer zum Schweigen bringen möchte. Deswegen geht es gar nicht darum, den Fall zu gewinnen, sondern es geht wirklich darum, Menschen – Journalistinnen und Journalisten, NGOs, Aktivistinnen und Aktivisten – mundtot zu machen. Das dürfen wir nicht zulassen in der Europäischen Union.

Deswegen bin ich so froh, dass die Europäische Kommission einen Vorschlag gemacht hat, nachdem wir im Parlament ja auch schon einen sehr starken Initiativbericht geschrieben hatten. Ich hoffe, dass wir dann mit den Mitgliedstaaten zusammen eine starke Gesetzgebung hinbekommen, die Journalistinnen und Journalisten, Aktivistinnen und Aktivisten besser schützt. Denn das ist dringend notwendig.

Was wollen wir als Parlament? Wir wollen, dass Opfer von SLAPP-Klagen den Grund einbringen können, dass es sich um eine SLAPP-Klage handelt, und die Klage deswegen frühzeitig abgewiesen wird, um langwierige Verfahren und teure Verfahren frühzeitig zu beenden. Denn es ist nicht nur so, dass die Klage die Menschen, die davon betroffen sind, belastet, sondern es führt ja auch dazu, dass man sich Gedanken macht, ob man sich die Rechtsverteidigung leisten kann. Man muss zu Gerichtsterminen erscheinen, und das führt auch dazu, dass andere auch weniger berichten. Und das alles ist eine echte Gefahr für unsere Demokratie.

Wir wollen, dass Opfer von SLAPP-Klagen einen Anspruch auf Schadenersatz haben, um tatsächlich diese Klagen für diejenigen, die die Klage führen, auch teuer zu machen. Und wir wollen, dass den Menschen, die Opfer von SLAPP-Klagen sind, geholfen wird, indem wir die Beweislast umkehren. Das heißt: Derjenige, der die Klage erhebt, muss vorbringen, dass es sich nicht um eine SLAPP-Klage handelt.

Wir fordern die Mitgliedstaaten dazu auf, eine zentrale Anlaufstelle zu schaffen, an die sich Opfer von SLAPP-Klagen wenden können, wo sie Hilfe bekommen, wo Psychologinnen und Psychologen arbeiten, wo Rechtsanwältinnen und Rechtsanwälte arbeiten, die darauf spezialisiert sind. Und wir wollen die Überarbeitung des internationalen anwendbaren Privatrechts erreichen: Brüssel I und Rom II. Denn leider ist es so, dass gerade diese mächtigen Unternehmen, die reichen Menschen es sich leisten können, den Gerichtsstand auszusuchen, und dann dort klagen, wo sie am meisten Erfolgsaussichten haben, und nicht dort, wo sie eigentlich klagen müssten. Auch das ist eine weitere Hürde für die Betroffenen von SLAPP-Klagen.

Jetzt kann man sagen: Na ja, das sind wenige Fälle. Aber es sind immer mehr Fälle. Ich habe gerade in den Medien gelesen, dass ein ehemaliger Chef einer deutschen Boulevardzeitung tatsächlich gegen eine Berichterstattung über seine private Geburtstagsfeier vorgeht, obwohl er Chef einer Zeitung war, die über solche Feiern immer berichtet, wenn es auch nur ansatzweise Interesse daran gibt. Und er geht nicht gegen die Financial Times vor, weil er sich da vorstellen kann, dass der Verlag es sich leisten kann, die Klage durchzufechten. Er geht aber gegen ein kleines neues Unternehmen vor, und das ist genau ein Beispiel dafür, worum es geht. Genau diesen Missbrauch müssen wir verhindern, und dafür brauchen wir ein starkes Anti-SLAPP-Gesetz. Ich hoffe, dass wir das hier morgen auch gemeinsam verabschieden können.

Ramona Strugariu, *Raportoare pentru aviz, Comisia pentru libertăți civile, justiție și afaceri interne*. – Domnule președinte, încep prin a mulțumi colegilor care au făcut posibil ca astăzi să avem o propunere atât de curajoasă, care va fi adoptată în plenul Parlamentului European, lui Tiemo Wölken și echipelor de negociere și comisarei Věra Jourová, pentru că la șase ani de la moartea lui Daphne Caruana Galizia, ceea ce era cândva un vis a devenit, în sfârșit, realitate și are o contribuție directă la acest lucru.

Și aș vrea să continui cu o poveste de acum, așa cum a început colegul meu, din România, unde doi jurnaliști foarte curajoși de la două platforme media independente, Buletin de București și Centrul pentru Investigații Media, au scos la iveală una dintre cele mai brutale și crude povești ale ultimilor ani. Legătura dintre niște miniștri și apropiații lor și o rețea de azile de bătrâni în care sunt chinuți, înfomețați și bătuți oameni în vârstă bolnavi și fără niciun fel de apărare, o rețea de torționari de bătrâni în Europa a secolului XXI, posibilă cu complicitatea unor politicieni. Datorită acestor jurnaliști și unui ONG foarte curajos, Centrul pentru Resurse Juridice, astăzi avem un caz în justiție și o anchetă de amploare a procurorilor în plină desfășurare. Știți care a fost reacția doamnei ministru vizată în această anchetă? Că va da în judecată toată presa care a reacționat și care a legat numele ei și al familiei ei de această anchetă.

De asta avem nevoie de o directivă europeană anti-SLAPP foarte curajoasă și de o legislație națională pe măsură. Dacă vrem presă liberă, trebuie să o protejăm de abuz pentru ca ea să dezvăluie abuzuri și să apere interesul public.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, yes, it is true that since we started to work on this legislation, we heard about new and new cases. So just to react on Mr Wölken and his comment that there seemed to be not many cases – now we have good data which show that this is a broad issue and dangerous trend which needs the legislative reaction. That is why I am glad that we are already in the advanced stage of negotiations on this legislation.

Indeed, Madame Strugariu, I promise this to the family of Daphne Caruana Galizia that we will legislate against the anti-SLAPP cases, and so here we are. We have been seeing that the journalists face a multitude of challenges, and also human rights defenders. Our annual rule of law reports regularly identify issues that affect the freedom and pluralism of media in the EU and challenges to civil society, including rights defenders.

Journalists or rights defenders are still being targeted for doing their jobs, and this is not acceptable. More than that, I feel, I see that the justice system is abused, and as somebody who coordinates also justice policy in the EU, I have to repeat: this is unacceptable.

While it is mainly the responsibility of Member States to ensure that these key actors for democracy can do their work without constraints, we also have a duty to support the ecosystem at EU level. Over the past two years, the Commission has taken a number of initiatives to help improve the health of the media sector and of the rights defenders.

We have expanded our financial support in the area of media freedom and pluralism within the Creative Europe programme. We adopted a recommendation on the safety of journalists in September 2021. We proposed the Media Freedom Act in September 2022.

We adopted a report on the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights looking at the role of civil society, and we proposed in April 2022 a package to counter strategic lawsuits against public participation, so-called SLAPPs, which is what we are discussing here today. I am very grateful for having such a discussion. We need to act to counter the SLAPP phenomenon and prevent it from growing.

Our objective is clear to protect journalists and other important civil society actors against abusive court proceedings because they should use their time and resources in order to be the watchdogs needed for the health of our democracies and not to fight abusive court proceedings. To do this, we need a strong system of safeguards and deterrents, and we need it sooner rather than later. Time is of the essence.

Speaking about time, I am beyond time. Can I have one more minute, Mr President? Thank you. I believe that this is an objective which is shared by the European Parliament, that we need to fight a growing phenomenon because it reaches levels of seriousness that endanger our democratic societies. I would like to thank the Parliament for your efforts and for the swift progress made on this important file.

In particular, I welcome the fact that many of the adopted amendments in your report show a high level of agreement with our approach, including when it comes to important elements such as having a definition of cross-border cases and compensation for damages. Parliament suggests several improvements which we look at positively and introduces two entirely new chapters which we look forward to discussing.

That said, in our view, it would be preferable to regulate questions of international jurisdiction and applicable law in the two general instruments that deal with these matters horizontally. It was already mentioned here the Brussels Ia and Rome II Regulations. The review process for both instruments is underway, and SLAPP-specific considerations are very much part of that review.

I would also like to recall that the Commission's anti-SLAPP initiative is a comprehensive package. Our proposed directive provides cross-border civil procedure safeguards against SLAPPs, and in addition, we have also adopted, as you know, a horizontal recommendation which applies to all kinds of SLAPP cases, be they civil, criminal or administrative. It covers cross-border as well as domestic cases.

Some elements introduced by Parliament's report are closely related to topics touched upon in the recommendation. We are open to consideration as to what the best policy mix is in relation to these elements.

Magdalena Adamowicz, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Pani Komisarz! Panie Przewodniczący! Demokracja, praworządność i sprawiedliwość to stanie po stronie tych, którzy bronią prawdy, a przeciwko którym wymierzone są powództwa typu SLAPP. Dostęp do rzetelnych informacji, dostęp do prawdy jest naszym podstawowym prawem, a naszym obowiązkiem jest chronienie tych, którzy do prawdy docierają. Gdy nie bronimy tych, którzy walczą o prawdę, to pozwalamy, by prawdę zastępowało kłamstwo. Gdy nie bronimy dostępu do prawdy, to pozwalamy odebrać sobie wolność. Pozwalamy, aby autorytaryzm zastąpił demokrację. Nasze wartości muszą być chronione naszym prawem. Temu ma służyć dyrektywa przeciwko powództwom typu SLAPP, która jest kluczowym, pierwszym krokiem w przeciwstawieniu się tym, którzy kneblują usta stojącym na straży prawdy i interesu społecznego. Nasze cele są jasne.

Chcemy silnych środków ochrony prawnej dla ofiar i dotkliwych kar odstrasżających dla inicjujących powództwa typu SLAPP. Bo naszym nadrzędnym celem jest, aby ofiary miały pełne wsparcie i pomoc państwa, a oprawcy – poczucie absolutnej nieuchronności kary. Chcemy jak najwcześniejszego oddalenia bezpodstawnych pozwów, bo gdy sprawiedliwość nadchodzi zbyt późno, trudno mówić o jakiegokolwiek sprawiedliwości. Chcemy, by prawda nigdy nie była kneblovana w imię prawa do sądu. Dla mnie wolność od mowy nienawiści powinna być prawem człowieka. Ale też z pełną mocą zawsze będę powtarzała, że ochrona przed mową nienawiści nie może być argumentem do uciszania krytyki. I tylko niezawisły sąd może być miejscem, gdzie spór o prawdę i granice wolności słowa jest rozstrzygany. Chcemy wreszcie, by prawo do prawdy nie było tylko dla wybranych. Zagrożeniem dla naszej wspólnoty są nie tylko powództwa typu SLAPP o wyraźnym charakterze transgranicznym. Zaprzeczeniem fundamentów Unii są wszystkie SLAPP-y. Dlatego, podobnie jak w przypadku łamania praworządności, tu też musi obowiązywać czytelna zasada: uciszanie demokracji w jednym kraju członkowskim jest uciszaniem demokracji w całej Unii.

Ibán García Del Blanco, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, la existencia de una democracia sana tiene como presupuesto la existencia, a su vez, de una opinión crítica fuerte, de una opinión crítica sana, libre. Y, para eso, es imprescindible que los poderes públicos, que las instituciones pongamos medios para equilibrar la partida frente a quienes ejercen posiciones abusivas de poder, quienes tienen los suficientes medios económicos o políticos para poder ejercer de manera abusiva esos mismos medios para, de alguna manera, cegar a la opinión pública.

Y, en ese sentido, esta legislación anti demandas abusivas previene que haya una utilización abusiva por parte de estos poderosos de demandas judiciales, de procedimientos que establecen cargas financieras, cargas económicas insuperables para personas como activistas, como periodistas, como defensores de los derechos humanos, para aquellas personas que de alguna manera son la voz de nuestra conciencia, la conciencia de las democracias.

Y en ese sentido quiero dar las gracias a las personas que han trabajado en este expediente y, sobre todo, a mi compañero Tiemo Wölken, porque creo que a partir de hoy tenemos una democracia más sana en la Unión Europea. No solo es suficiente con esta norma; habrá muchas más, tendremos que poner encima de la mesa muchas más. Pero desde luego que a partir de hoy tenemos una democracia más justa.

Ilana Cicurel, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, SLAPP! Cela sonne comme une claque et c'est ainsi que l'on désigne les «strategic lawsuit against public participation», ces actions-bâillons, ces pratiques de harcèlement judiciaire dont sont victimes journalistes, lanceurs d'alerte, universitaires qui se voient poursuivis de manière acharnée par ceux qui veulent faire taire toute critique à leur endroit.

Ce phénomène est suffisamment massif en Europe pour qu'une directive soit sur le point d'être votée, inspirée par le remarquable travail de la coalition CASE. Ce texte est une avancée majeure, mais une interprétation trop restrictive de son champ d'application pourrait mettre en péril son efficacité.

Comme parlementaires européens, nous portons haut trois exigences. La directive qui vise les procès civils doit s'appliquer au volet civil de l'action pénale. Si elle ne s'applique qu'aux litiges transfrontaliers, cette notion doit inclure les sujets d'intérêt public européens ou les propos accessibles depuis au moins deux pays européens. Enfin, et c'est essentiel, la directive doit offrir à la victime de SLAPP une provision à la charge du «slappeur» lui permettant de financer sa défense.

Diana Riba i Giner, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, la libertad de expresión y de información se ha deteriorado de forma alarmante en los últimos años en Europa. El número de demandas mordaza impuestas en los Estados miembros ha incrementado gravemente. También lo han hecho los escándalos asociados al uso indiscriminado de programas espía contra periodistas, opositores políticos y activistas. En países como Polonia ya se han aprobado leyes de medios de comunicación que violan directamente el principio de la libertad de prensa.

Estamos en un contexto de avance de ideologías reaccionarias y esto coincide con la negociación y aprobación a nivel europeo de esta legislación y de la Ley de Libertad de los Medios de Comunicación. Pese a que esta legislación no es tan ambiciosa como nuestro Grupo habría querido, el texto que esta Cámara aprobará mañana es un paso importante en la lucha para defender nuestros valores democráticos fundamentales, y debemos evitar que su contenido se diluya en los diálogos tripartitos.

La libertad de expresión y el derecho a disentir no son meros privilegios, sino pilares esenciales de una sociedad vibrante y abierta.

Cristian Terheş, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, we as elected officials must legislate ensuring a fair and just balance between three competing rights in regards to the press. The right of journalists to seek and expose the truth, the right of media consumers to know the truth and the right of good people to a good name and reputation. When the rights of any of these three participants are violated, the party should have access to a court where the case will be tried impartially.

The Anti-SLAPP Directive started with a good premise, but unfortunately failed to provide this fair and just balance of rights and obligations between the three parties involved in this process.

This directive asks the EU Member States to regulate in their national law the so-called early dismissal of a case when a journalist claims that the case is a SLAPP. This concept of early dismissal is specific to common law, not to the European continental legal system.

It is totally justified to impose at the end of the judicial process a severe fine against the person who is filing abusive court proceedings against a journalist, especially with the purpose to harass or to threaten the journalist. But to allow for an early dismissal of a case at the beginning of the judicial process, just because the journalist claims it is a SLAPP, without the judge to actually check the merits of the case, is going to generate a dangerous precedent, which will undermine the credibility of the press, as well as endanger the rights of any person to defend his or her rights of good reputation and image.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, les poursuites-bâillons sont des poursuites judiciaires dont le seul but est d'intimider des journalistes ou des défenseurs des droits de l'homme afin de les décourager et de les faire taire.

Quand elles ont un caractère transfrontalier, l'Union européenne estime qu'il lui revient de les combattre. Au premier abord, l'intention paraît louable, car l'objectif affiché est de protéger la liberté d'expression et de veiller à ce qu'un débat public reste possible. Mais trois constats montrent que l'intervention de l'Union dans ce domaine n'est pas une bonne idée.

D'abord, le cercle des personnes à protéger a été exagérément étendu aux militants des ONG. Or je ne suis pas persuadé que les ONG soient aussi vulnérables que des journalistes. Qu'on songe par exemple à celle du milliardaire George Soros. Ensuite, la définition des affaires transfrontalières englobe les affaires dont le sujet est – je cite le texte – «pertinent pour plus d'un État membre ou accessible en ligne», ce qui permet d'englober n'importe quelle affaire. Enfin, les prétendues victimes pourront demander le rejet anticipé des poursuites les concernant et bénéficier ainsi d'un privilège procédural qui apparaît choquant pour quiconque considère que la justice doit respecter le principe d'égalité.

Personnellement, je ne veux pas cautionner la mise en place d'une justice à deux vitesses. Pour toutes ces raisons, je refuse de soutenir ce projet.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, la France a d'incroyables talents et je vais vous en présenter un. C'est notre maestro des procédures-bâillons. C'est un peu le Kylian Mbappé des dribbles judiciaires. J'ai nommé: Vincent Bolloré.

Depuis des années, Bolloré envoie des bataillons d'avocats harceler tous les journalistes et militants qui dénoncent la corruption, l'exploitation des travailleurs et les désastres environnementaux de son empire industriel. Mediapart, France Inter, Bastamag, Libération, Sherpa, React, ils en ont tous fait les frais. Bolloré perd la plupart de ses procès, mais il s'en fout, car il ne cherche pas à obtenir justice, mais à la détourner pour protéger son impunité.

Malheureusement, ce n'est pas le seul harceleur judiciaire en Europe. Pour toutes ces raisons, je suis heureuse de participer, comme rapporteure pour la gauche, à la négociation de cette directive ambitieuse contre les procédures-bâillons. Au Conseil maintenant d'avoir la même ambition. Une justice au service des puissants, c'est nécessairement une injustice. Alors, adoptons cette directive et empêchons que les tribunaux soient détournés de leur mission par des harceleurs judiciaires. Je vous remercie.

Sabrina Pignedoli (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ora ci stiamo occupando di accuse strumentali per azzittire la stampa, più tardi si parlerà della tutela internazionale dei giornalisti, due relazioni importantissime e necessarie.

Troppo spesso, tuttavia, nelle istituzioni europee ci riempiamo la bocca con libertà di stampa e Stato di diritto, senza passare dalle parole ai fatti.

Un esempio emblematico di cause giudiziarie mosse per azzittire o punire chi racconta la verità è quella di Julian Assange, in carcere da quattro anni senza una sentenza di condanna solo perché ha rivelato verità scomode, crimini di guerra, detenzioni illegali e torture. Ma dai vertici delle istituzioni europee non è arrivato nessun supporto, nessuna reale mobilitazione per la sua liberazione.

La libertà di stampa non può essere una bandierina da sventolare in televisione per autopromozione o solo quando è utile per la propria carriera.

Difendere il diritto dei cittadini a sapere la verità è un dovere delle istituzioni europee, soprattutto quando bisogna contrastare poteri forti. Dimostrate di averne il coraggio.

David Casa (PPE). – Eżatt wara l-qtal ta' Daphne Caruana Galizia, bank kriminali beda kampanja jhedded ġurnalisti Maltin. Heddidhom bi proceduri legali barra minn Malta għal miljuni kbar – proceduri illi setgħu jkrisruhomm.

Kien f'dak il-mument li bdejna kampanja biex neliminaw dawn it-tattici abbużivi illi jużahom min ikollu l-poter u l-flus biex isikket il-ġurnalist u jevita l-iskrutinju pubbliku. U llum tant snin wara, ilhaqna dan l-istadju.

L-appell tiegħi huwa wiehed ċar – eja ma nitilfux din l-opportunità: opportunità biex infixklu din it-theddida għad-demokrazija, biex insaħħu t-trasparenza u biex niproteġu l-istampa hielsa li hija tant importanti fis-socjetà tagħna.

Kollegi fil-Kunsill: nispera li ma jdagħjufux din il-liġi, liġi li tant tajjeb qiegħda tissejjah Daphne's Law. Kunu fuq in-naha taċ-ċittadini Ewropej minflok tgħinu lil dawk li jridu iżommuhom fid-dlam.

Irrid niringrazza lit-tim tal-Parlament b'mod partikolari wkoll lill-Viċi President Jourová illi mingħajrek ma konniex naslu s'hawn. Eġja niżguraw li Daphne's Law tkun il-vera denja ta' isimha.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, il y a quelques mois, alors que débutait l'examen au Parlement de la proposition de directive, je me félicitais du chemin parcouru. Enfin, la Commission européenne proposait un texte ambitieux, avec des mesures et des standards minimaux à l'échelle de l'Union pour protéger les victimes de ces procédures abusives, ces procédures-bâillons qui visent à garder sous silence des affaires qui mériteraient d'être mises au jour dans le débat public.

Ces atteintes aux libertés fondamentales, mais aussi à l'état de droit, entravent les systèmes judiciaires et ont des conséquences dramatiques pour les victimes prises dans la tourmente. Elles constituent une menace sourde, en augmentation constante, à l'encontre des journalistes, des médias, des ONG, pour ne citer que quelques cibles principales.

Malheureusement, entre-temps, le Conseil a adopté sa position qui balaie ces efforts prometteurs. C'est pourquoi j'en appelle à tous mes collègues députés d'adopter massivement la position constructive et ambitieuse du Parlement, de manière à peser de tout notre poids dans les discussions en trilogie. C'est seulement ce rapport de force qui protégera les victimes de tentative d'intimidation délétaire.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Hvala, gospod predsedujoči. Novinarji, civilna družba, nevladne organizacije. To so tri skupine, ki so za zdravo, demokratično družbo neprecenljive. In to so tri skupine, ki so zaradi iskanja resnice in opozaranja vladajočih na nepravilnosti neprestano pod pritiskom strateških tožb. To je najbolj podel mehanizem represivnih politikov, mimogrede.

In zato me veseli, da direktiva vključuje pravne varovalke za zaščito žrtev. Da vpeljujemo mehanizem za zgodnje zavrnitve takšnih tožb in da končno pozivamo k zbiranju podatkov.

Ampak nikakor ne smemo pozabiti, da ta direktiva, čeprav je dobra zakonska osnova, varuje žrtve samo v primeru čezmejnih sodb. Koliko je takšnih, zares še ne vemo. Vemo pa, da je takšnih tožb in sodb znotraj nekaterih držav na stotine. In nanje, žal, ta direktiva očitno ne bo vplivala, čeprav bi prav tam na začetku omenjene tri skupine takšno zaščito najbolj potrebovale.

Zato pozivam odgovorne in pristojne, naj najdejo rešitev tudi zanje oziroma tudi tam. Ker mi v tej hiši – tisti, ki nam je zares mar – smo storili vse, kar smo lahko.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – En dix ans, plus de 570 procédures en justice par des entités publiques ou privées ont visé des lanceurs d'alerte, des journalistes, des défenseurs des droits humains, de l'environnement, des ONG. Total Energies accuse Greenpeace de diffuser des informations fausses. Socfin, membre du groupe Bolloré, attaque des ONG qui l'accusent d'écoblanchiment et d'accaparement de terres. 47 procédures contre la seule journaliste Daphne Caruana Galizia avant son assassinat.

Le but systématique: empêcher l'émergence de questions d'intérêt public, mettre fin aux enquêtes de journalistes ou faire taire l'opposition politique. Les effets: peines d'emprisonnement, lourdes sanctions financières ou effet d'autocensure, dangereux pour nos démocraties et le droit à l'information de tous les citoyens.

La logique doit s'inverser. Les multinationales et les puissants de ce monde, dont les actions menacent l'intérêt public, doivent être sanctionnés. Celles et ceux qui dénoncent leurs agissements doivent être protégés tant par l'Union européenne que par nos gouvernements.

Ernő Schaller-Baross (NI). – Elnök Úr! Az európai baloldal újra kíván éleszteni egy intézményt, ami nekünk, középkelet európai állampolgároknak oly ismerős: az osztályharc intézményét az államszocializmusból. Elérkezett az előjogokkal rendelkező NGO-k ideje, akik első az egyenlők között. Az európai baloldal képviselői úgy határoztak, hogy az NGO-kat, jogvédőket, emberjogi aktivistákat kiemelik a tagállami bíráskodás alól, és egy példátlan kiváltságban részesülnek: hogyha egy per közéleti részvételüket veszélyezteti, az eljárást a bíróság azonnal megszüntethetné.

Milyen alapon jár ez a kiváltság az NGO-k részére? Milyen alapon különbek ők, mint a társadalom bármely más tagja? A válasz egyszerű, a nyílt társadalom ügyét képviselik választói felhatalmazás nélkül. Tisztelt Hölgyeim és Uraim, a fentiek szellemében hozott ítélet soha nem lehet igazságos. Ahol a jogszolgáltatás és az igazságszolgáltatás nem tartozik össze, az nem jogállam.

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, quand la sécurité des journalistes n'est pas garantie, les citoyens ne peuvent plus compter sur une information libre et juste. Or, nous le savons, le journalisme d'investigation est un élément indispensable des démocraties. Les journalistes doivent pouvoir travailler sereinement et sans autocensure. Cette liberté n'est pas donnée dans les pays totalitaires, mais elle n'est pas non plus donnée dans nos pays.

Quand les journalistes sont confrontés aux poursuites abusives, au harcèlement, aux intimidations, aux atteintes à leur réputation, ces poursuites abusives ont pour seule fin d'épuiser moralement et financièrement ceux qui se battent pour révéler la vérité. Ceci n'est tout simplement pas acceptable.

Daphne Caruana Galizia avait donné une définition éclairante de ce qu'est une poursuite abusive. Je la cite: «les lois qui ont été conçues pour protéger des personnes réellement blessées sont utilisées comme un outil d'abus et d'agression par des personnes au pouvoir contre des personnes sans pouvoir».

La proposition de directive contre les poursuites abusives est un pas important. Elle donne les outils pour permettre à la justice de poursuivre ceux qui abusent de nos lois et protègent ainsi l'esprit de la loi. Nous devons nous donner tous les moyens nécessaires pour protéger nos journalistes, tout comme les défenseurs des droits de l'homme, et ainsi sauvegarder la démocratie.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Demokracja zawsze umiera w ciemności. Umiera tam, gdzie nie ma trudnych pytań do władzy, gdzie jest tylko propaganda rządu, gdzie nie ma wolnych mediów.

Bo wolność słowa to nie tylko prawo do artykułowania swoich przekonań. Wolność słowa to dostęp do uczciwych informacji, a nie do papki propagandowej.

W Polsce marzeń Kaczyńskiego nie ma niezależnych mediów. W niej obowiązuje doktryna Moczara: „kto nie z Miecim, tego zmiem”. Przykładów jest wiele: Lex TVN, ogromne kary na TOK FM, przejęcie prasy lokalnej przez Obajtka, szykany dziennikarzy Wyborczej i Onetu pozwami czy też ostatnia próba zmian personalnych w redakcjach Wirtualnej Polski i Onetu. I ciągnęła, niekończąca się propaganda TVP rodem z Kremla, która obrzydza Unię Europejską i opozycję 24 godziny na dobę. Czy to są standardy europejskie?

Unia już raz zawiodła. Pozwoliła na zniszczenie niezależnych mediów na Węgrzech. Teraz czas działać w obliczu każdej próby zniszczenia wolnych mediów w Polsce.

Hannah Neumann (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, Maltese journalist Daphne Caruana Galizia had more than 40 SLAPP cases against her when she was killed; some were continued against her family. Nobel Peace Prize awardee Maria Ressa is, until today, blocked from leaving the Philippines without prior court permission because of pending SLAPP cases against her. And the only goal of such strategic yet baseless lawsuits is to intimidate, harass and silence critical voices.

Because once you are faced with a SLAPP case, you need to read that file. You need to hire a lawyer, you need to appear in court, you need to fight related smear campaigns, sometimes even your bank accounts are being frozen. In addition, such SLAPP cases overburden already strained judicial systems and undermine trust in legal proceedings.

Dear colleagues, this is simply a perversion of rule of law. It is about time that we stand up and stop it in the EU and all around the world. So thank you, Tiemo, for your report. It is a good first step and let's join forces to walk down that road even further.

Tatjana Ždanoka (NI). – Mr President, colleagues, the amendments as approved by JURI radically increases the demands to the court proceedings proposed by the Commission.

It is very important to enlarge by publishers, media organisations, whistleblowers, as well as civil society organisations, NGOs, trade unions, artists, researchers and academics the scope of those to be protected.

In the remaining seconds, I will not even be able to list the names of all those journalists, whistleblowers, researchers, NGO, activists in three Baltic states who are actually facing, in my opinion, strategic lawsuits against public participation. Juris Aleksejevs, Tatjana Andriječa, Olegs Buraks, Aleksandrs Gaponenko, Aleksejus Greičius, Vladimirs Lindermans, Algirdas Paleckis, Sergey Seredenko are facing criminal charges or already serving sentences as a result of unfounded lawsuits. The 14 journalists are under the court proceedings in Latvia just for publishing their articles in the 'wrong' media. The protection set up by the directive proposal gives hope to those who are at risk of such lawsuits.

Antonius Manders (PPE). –Voorzitter, commissaris, goed dat we maatregelen nemen om diegenen – journalisten in dit geval – te beschermen tegen oneigenlijk gebruik van procedures waardoor zij eigenlijk financieel kapot worden geprocedeerd en niet meer zijn wie ze zouden moeten zijn, namelijk mensen die zich bezighouden met het blootleggen van onrechtmatigheden in onze maatschappij.

Ik ben blij met de uitbreiding dat niet alleen journalisten beschermd gaan worden met deze maatregel, maar iedereen, elk individu dat het publieke doel dient. Want we zien steeds vaker dat het recht niet meer toegankelijk is voor iedereen, dat de kosten zo ontzettend hoog zijn dat individuen niet meer naar de rechter kunnen om hun gelijk te halen en dat ze dus accepteren dat hun onrecht wordt aangedaan.

Vroeger konden we terecht onder de lindeboom: de Germanen hadden rechtspraak onder de lindeboom, midden in het dorp. Daar waren geen kosten aan verbonden, maar er waren wel rechters die recht spraken. Ik hoop dat we hiermee de journalisten en iedereen die het publieke doel dient weer gaan beschermen om ervoor te zorgen dat we kunnen zien wat er fout gaat.

Katarina Barley (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Demokratien leben von einer freien und unabhängigen Presse. Sie leben von Menschen, die untersuchen, die aufdecken, die kritisch sind gegenüber ihren Regierungen. Genau das wollen Regierungen in undemokratischen Staaten nicht. Und auch manche Unternehmen versuchen, kritische Journalistinnen und Journalisten mundtot zu machen.

Wie machen sie das? Durch solche Klagen – SLAPPs. Das ist eigentlich eine Abkürzung: *strategic lawsuit against public participation*. Aber *to slap* heißt eben auch jemanden schlagen, jemandem eine runterhauen. Es heißt, Gewalt anzudrohen, Gewalt auszuüben, und das ist es, was diese Klagen tun. Denn sie kosten Zeit, sie kosten Geld, sie kosten Nerven, sie setzen unter Druck. Das ist genau das, was sie tun sollen.

Dagegen müssen wir vorgehen. Denn wir sehen es gerade in Ländern, wo die Demokratie unter Druck steht: Gerade da brauchen wir diese freie Presse. Wir müssen Journalistinnen und Journalisten schützen, aber auch Menschen, die sich in NGOs, in Verbänden engagieren, um Missstände aufzudecken. Von diesen Menschen lebt unsere Demokratie. Lassen Sie uns diese Menschen schützen, und bitte tut das auch im Rat.

Marc Tarabella (NI). – Monsieur le Président, nous devons prendre des mesures pour améliorer la protection des journalistes et des défenseurs des droits humains contre les procédures judiciaires abusives. Ces techniques d'intimidation, qui émanent souvent d'organisations ou de personnes puissantes, n'ont pour but que d'empêcher ces lanceurs d'alerte de s'exprimer et de les bâillonner, afin d'éliminer tout point de vue alternatif.

Il est important que ceux qui veillent sur les questions d'intérêt général, qui sont garants du bon fonctionnement de l'état de droit, puissent jouir de leur droit fondamental à la liberté d'expression sans crainte de représailles.

À chaque fois que l'on s'en prend, pour ses idées ou son travail, à un journaliste, à un défenseur des droits humains, à un syndicat ou à n'importe quel lanceur d'alerte, on s'en prend aux fondements mêmes de la démocratie.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, ¿por qué llevamos dos años debatiendo sobre la necesidad de proteger a organizaciones no gubernamentales, periodistas, editores de prensa, activistas de derechos humanos o de medio ambiente contra procesos manifiestamente infundados o abusivos? Porque en toda Europa la libertad de expresión y de comunicación está retrocediendo.

Y este Parlamento Europeo, con el informe de nuestro compañero Tiemo Wölken, está haciendo lo correcto obligando a los Estados miembros a adoptar legislación que permita rechazar inmediatamente, al no admitir a trámite, o de manera rápida en un procedimiento, con todas las garantías, aquellas demandas manifiestamente infundadas que tengan el objetivo de intimidar o de reprimir la libertad de expresión y de comunicación. Es la apuesta correcta en el momento correcto.

Y además es imprescindible que evitemos la búsqueda de foros de conveniencia (*forum shopping*), es decir que, a la hora de interponer demandas abusivas o manifiestamente infundadas, además se elija la jurisdicción más represiva al servicio de aquellos gobiernos liberales que están retrocediendo en libertad de expresión.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I think it is really appropriate that we are talking about the protection of journalists from abuse of court proceedings. But I think we have to be honest about it that it doesn't really get much more abusive than depriving somebody of their liberty.

In that sense, I think it was very appropriate for people to refer to journalists like Julian Assange, seven years in the Ecuadorian embassy, four years in a high security prison in Belmarsh in England, for having the audacity to hold US empire to account, outing the war crimes committed by the US in Iraq and Afghanistan. And while criminals who caused that war, like Bush and Blair, walk free, Julian Assange is currently awaiting judgment any day now, which could see him extradited to the US, where his life will be in grave danger.

What about Pablo Gonzalez? Basque journalist, 16 months in a Polish jail without a charge, extended pre-trial detention, not a single phone call with his family, limited visits. This is absolutely scandalous. If it was happening in Belarus and Iran, we'd be shouting and roaring about it. It is time to do something about these cases.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Mr President. We in the EU must champion journalists' protection and the urgent need for the strongest laws against SLAPPs. Europe and all our Member States should always stand on the principles of freedom of the press and the right to express opposing views.

Colleagues, we must not allow the governments and the Council to weaken the Commission's proposals. The rich and those with powerful interests must not be allowed to stifle journalists or silence activists. They all must be protected from the intimidation and the window-shopping of court proceedings.

I agree with the Commissioner: compensation for damages suffered by victims must be strong. And I thank Tiemo, my colleague, for this very strong report here in the European Parliament, because the brave journalists and activists risked their lives to shed light on the truth and we owe it to them to have the strongest benchmark laws possible here in the European Union.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, freedom of the press, of association and freedom of expression are the cornerstones of any healthy political system. Some MEPs in here have said that journalists are afraid to report the truth and they're right.

Pablo Gonzalez, a Basque journalist, is in prison for the last 16 months in Poland because the authorities didn't like what he was saying. Algirdas Paleckis is in prison in Lithuania. His crime: he was considered pro-Russian. Julian Assange: five years in Belmarsh high-security prison in London. For what? For telling the truth about US and NATO war crimes. What are we doing about saving him?

Meanwhile, most of our mainstream media in Europe have been bought by US empire, so most of our journalists are actually being paid not to speak the truth. They've been bought. Our media in Europe is in serious trouble. Independent media is almost non-existent today.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, this report marks an important step towards the adoption of this directive, which is necessary to protect democracy and freedom of expression against abusive practices. And the Commission fully supports an ambitious planning in order to have in place as soon as possible an EU legal framework against SLAPP.

The Commission will do its utmost in the upcoming trilogue negotiations to facilitate convergence between the positions of the co-legislators on a robust final text that is fit for purpose and supports victims on the ground. And I will do what I always do in the trilogue to defend the position of the proposal of the Commission and to defend the strong definition of cross-border cases and also damages, because I think that this creates a big part of our proposal.

But I am looking forward to the negotiations. I think that we will have a good result not only in this directive, but also maybe in a period of time we will see that also the recommendation which we gave to the Member States to introduce the anti-SLAPP measures also into domestic cases that we will see also for domestic cases some progress, because this is what I hear from the ministers.

What I always heard from the ministers was there are not so many cases, and second that we have to guarantee the equal access to justice for everyone, which was also mentioned here. I want to say that the SLAPPs are typical David versus Goliath battles. And I want to say that we, of course, recognise the right of even the rich and powerful people to go to the court and seek the fairness and justice. But at the same time, what we see at this moment is asymmetry in achieving justice and fairness. And what we are doing here is to correct this asymmetry.

And, a last comment, indeed, I wanted this law to be named Daphne's Law, but our colleagues the legislators said that it would be too creative, maybe. But I think that we can give it this nickname and remember this very courageous lady.

Tiemo Wölken, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, thank you very much to Commissioner Jourová for her words. I hope we will have a successful trilogue. For that we have to really make sure that what we as Parliament will adopt tomorrow will make it to the final text. Unfortunately, the Council's position is a bit less ambitious, but today's discussion here made for me very clear that we in the European Parliament are united.

We will send tomorrow a strong signal to every journalist in the European Union that his work, that her work will be protected and we will not allow in the future that they will be threatened with illegal, unfounded lawsuits. We will stand at their side. We will make sure that media freedom in the European Union prevails. And for that, we need a strong mandate. And I am very, very confident that we will get this strong mandate tomorrow from what I heard today. So, thank you very much to everyone who participated in this debate today.

I will not come to an end without thanking all the colleagues who worked with me on this draft, on this report. So, thank you very much to all the shadows and also to the opinion-giving committees, because their insights have been very helpful for the final report.

Dear colleagues, let me finish by underlining that we in the European Parliament will always defend media freedom, press freedom. We will stand at the sides of the ones under pressure and together we will protect them. And we will make sure that Daphne Caruana Galizia's case, who was mentioned very often today, will not repeat in the European Union. Thank you very much. Let's have a vote tomorrow which sends a very strong signal to the Council. We will not give up. We will fight for better protection for our journalists in the European Union.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 11. Juli 2023, statt.

17. European Citizens' Initiative 'Save Cruelty Free Cosmetics – Commit to a Europe without animal testing' (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Europäische Bürgerinitiative „Für den Schutz kosmetischer Mittel ohne Tierquälerei und ein Europa ohne Tierversuche“ (2023/2679(RSP)).

Maria Spyrali, *on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety.* – Mr President, Commissioner Jourová, the 'Save Cruelty-Free Cosmetics – Commit to a Europe without animal testing' European Citizens' Initiative has gained more than one million signatures from at least seven Member States, and its organisers presented this case in a hearing before the ENVI Committee on 25 May, and you were present, Madam Commissioner.

Members of the initiative expressed strong concerns that, despite the existing legislation banning animal testing for cosmetics, in vivo testing is on the rise. The initiative calls on the Commission to protect and strengthen the cosmetic animal testing ban and initiate a legislative change for all cosmetic ingredients without resorting to animal testing, also to transform the EU chemical legislation, in particular REACH, by managing chemicals without the addition of new animal testing requirements.

Third, to modernise science in the EU by setting the scheme with a new legislative proposal in order to plot a roadmap to phase out all animal testing in the EU before the end of the current legislative term.

While most colleagues in the ENVI Committee supported the initiative, there are concerns focused on the issue of visibility and reliability of the alternatives, particularly with regards to health and pharmaceuticals. The need for more research, of course, before completely phasing out of practice is undeniable, according to my opinion.

It is important for us in ENVI to ensure full implementation of existing legislation and to propose new initiatives to promote alternatives to animal testing. We have to increase the uptake and implementation of non-animal methods and also to overcome the default reliance on animal testing, particularly in light of the revision of *[inaudible]*, which is in the pipeline, and also on REACH. We also need to ensure a consistent approach on the question of broadening the scope of the ban of non-EU countries.

The Commission has also to do her job to accelerate the transition to non-animal testing by developing the guidelines in cooperation with the OECD and to consider alternative methods in upcoming initiatives. Increased cooperation and investments in the use of innovative technologies in *[inaudible]* origin is needed.

Dear colleagues, the current strategy is not sufficiently and effectively implemented. We need a holistic approach for phasing out animal testing. We also are convinced that animal testing would be phased out in due time, recognising the current limitations, particularly to the pharma sector, for important and rare disease.

Mazaly Aguilar, *en nombre de la Comisión de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural.* – Señor presidente, esta iniciativa, que parte de un gran número de ciudadanos de los diferentes Estados, está pidiendo a la Comisión proteger y reforzar la prohibición de la experimentación con animales para la industria de cosméticos, pero también está pidiendo modernizar la ciencia de la Unión Europea, eliminando progresivamente todos los ensayos con animales antes de que finalice la actual legislatura.

Desde una perspectiva científica, sobre todo en lo relacionado con las enfermedades cerebrales y, en concreto, con la enfermedad de Parkinson, una prohibición total del uso de animales en la investigación biomédica sería un error. Aunque se han logrado avances considerables utilizando alternativas a estos ensayos, la mayor parte de lo que puede aprenderse sobre el cerebro y su comportamiento sigue dependiendo directa o indirectamente de la investigación en modelos animales.

La eliminación, aunque sea progresiva, del uso de animales en la investigación médica tendría consecuencias negativas muy importantes y afectaría a los avances en la mejora de la calidad de vida de los muchos enfermos de estas afecciones cerebrales y neurológicas. Tenemos que garantizar que la prohibición de experimentación con animales para cosméticos no se extienda a la investigación médica.

Ana Miranda, *en nombre de la Comisión de Peticiones*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, en nombre de la Comisión de Peticiones del Parlamento Europeo quisiera aprovechar esta oportunidad para felicitar a los organizadores por su buen trabajo y por haber recaudado el apoyo de 1,2 millones de europeos y europeas comprometidos por eliminar los ensayos con animales en la UE antes del final de la actual legislatura. La herramienta ICE (Iniciativa Ciudadana Europea) vuelve a dar visibilidad a las iniciativas ciudadanas promoviendo la democracia participativa.

Si bien el fomento formal de los métodos de ensayos en animales es exclusivo de la UE, existen obstáculos burocráticos para su aceptación. Su uso no se aplica adecuadamente y la financiación para su desarrollo está siendo insuficiente. Algunos Estados miembros han adoptado medidas nacionales de ejecución que garantizan un elevado nivel de protección de los animales utilizados con fines científicos, mientras que otros solo aplican los requisitos mínimos.

A pesar de los avances logrados gracias a los ensayos con animales en el desarrollo de tratamientos médicos y vacunas, incluyendo las vacunas contra la COVID-19, los ciudadanos europeos apoyan la prohibición total y global del uso de animales en investigación. Es necesario reemplazar los ensayos con animales por métodos alternativos avanzados para cumplir con los objetivos sanitarios medioambientales establecidos en los distintos planes europeos.

Para lograr el objetivo de la Directiva 2010/63/UE, es crucial mejorar la coordinación entre los Estados miembros y las partes interesadas para desarrollar un plan de acción a nivel de la UE que promueva la reducción, el perfeccionamiento y la sustitución de los procedimientos con animales vivos. Esto debe hacerse sin comprometer la protección de la salud humana y el medio ambiente, ni poner en riesgo la soberanía tecnológica de la UE.

Es necesario fortalecer también el Espacio Europeo de Investigación y basar el plan en la investigación realizada en la UE hasta ahora. También son necesarios mecanismos de financiamiento preferencial para los métodos sin animales en todas las iniciativas de investigación.

Las instituciones académicas tienen un papel esencial y deben promover alternativas a los ensayos con animales, difundiendo nuevos conocimientos y prácticas. Debe priorizarse la educación y capacitación de científicos.

Hay muchos elementos que analizar y estoy segura de que la presentación de hoy será muy útil y constructiva.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of Parliament, thank you for the invitation to come and speak on behalf of the European Commission at this plenary debate on the initiative ‘Save cruelty-free cosmetics – Commit to a Europe without animal testing’.

First of all, I would like to thank the European Parliament for having organised a successful public hearing on 25 May, and on this occasion I also want to congratulate again the organisers for collecting 1.2 million signatures in record time. We heard from them their arguments. We listened very carefully. The organisers had a chance to present their initiative and the different Members to express their views also, and today’s plenary debate gives me and my colleagues preparing the Commission official reply another opportunity to listen carefully to the contributions and interventions from various Members.

This initiative reminds us that animal welfare is a significant concern for European citizens and a longstanding principle in European legislation. It requests to strengthen the animal testing ban under the Cosmetics Regulation. It then addresses all legislation requiring animal testing for chemical safety assessments, REACH legislation on plant protection products, biocides, pharmaceuticals and others. Lastly, it extends to basic and applied research, including biomedical research, training and education. On the first issue, related to cosmetics, it is important to note that the Cosmetics Regulation already bans animal testing for cosmetics products and ingredients for the safety assessment requirements of that regulation. However, other legislation may still require animal testing, for instance to assess hazards to workers’ health or the environment.

Regarding chemical safety assessments under different legislation, I would like to underline that already today animal testing is allowed only as a last resort. However, as experts of agencies like the European Chemicals Agency or Member State authorities confirm, we are not yet able to fully identify all hazards to health and the environment without some animal testing.

The good news is that we have seen significant progress in the development of non-animal methods in recent years. The workshop on new approach methodologies that the European Chemicals Agency organised with the Commission and stakeholders in June undoubtedly showed that the funding of research for alternatives to animal testing is highlighted in the initiative. I want to emphasise that the Commission already actively supports the development of such methods through research funding. Over the past two decades, the European Union has allocated over EUR 1 billion to more than 300 research projects.

Today's exchange of views will feed into our reflection. We will present our general conclusions, as well as the actions that we intend to take in response to the three objectives of this initiative, in our communication later this month. I wish you a fruitful discussion.

Marlene Mortler, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Kollegen! Wir haben viel zu lange geschwiegen. Wir haben zu wenig öffentlich informiert: Auch wenn wir Tierversuche in Europa einstellen – auch wenn sie noch notwendig sind – diese Forschung wird deshalb nicht aufhören. Dann findet sie eben außerhalb Europas statt, zu schlechteren Bedingungen, zu niedrigeren Standards, und diese führen wiederum zu weiteren Abhängigkeiten von Drittstaaten – so Spitzenwissenschaftler letzte Woche in Brüssel.

Gott sei Dank sind nur 4 % der Versuche für die Tiere schwer belastend. Doch alle Erkenntnisse kommen den Menschen oder den Patienten zugute. Aber auch Chemikalien wie Lösungsmittel, Weichmacher, Konservierungsstoffe sowie Industriechemikalien müssen auf ihre Giftigkeit getestet werden, bevor Menschen damit in Kontakt kommen.

Replace, reduce, refine: Die REACH-Verordnung verlangt die Prüfung tausender Stoffe. Sie sagt aber ausdrücklich, dass die Tierversuche auf ein notwendiges Minimum eingeschränkt werden. Doch Computer-Modellierungen können Grundlagenforschung noch nicht ersetzen, und Organoide nicht den gesamten menschlichen Körper mit seinem komplexen Zellsystem. Ich will jedenfalls nicht, dass wir unsere Probleme in andere Kulturkreise verlegen und dort statt an Tieren an Menschen getestet wird, die auf Geld angewiesen sind.

Niels Fuglsang, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner, today we stand on the shoulders of more than 1.4 million European citizens who have signed the Citizens' Initiative and demand that we treat animals in a more respectful and a more decent way.

There is a broad consensus, even among politicians, that animals are sentient beings. Unfortunately, the current legislation does not reflect that obvious fact. The use of animals in cosmetics and in other chemical tests is an example of just that. Even though – as the Commissioner states – we have explicit legislation saying that we cannot use animals, banning animal tests when we talk about cosmetics, we still see it happening today.

According to the Commission's own research, we have the number of animals being used for scientific purposes stagnating at 7.4 million animals per year. That's not good enough. We need to use the alternatives. They exist. Therefore, I would like to ask the Commissioner: can we expect that the Commission finally commits to a coordinated plan to accelerate the transition to non-animal science?

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, quiero expresar en este turno mi rotunda oposición al contenido de esta iniciativa y abogar por contestarla desde la transparencia y los criterios con los que trabajan los profesionales de la ciencia.

Desde hace años, la Asociación Europea para la Investigación Animal promueve y cumple a rajatabla las normas de bienestar aplicables a los animales de laboratorio. Practica, además, el código de las tres erres: reemplazo, reducción y refinamiento de los procedimientos, fomentando el uso de métodos alternativos.

¿Qué hacer cuando no hay otra opción? Escuchemos iniciativas como «Compromiso por la ciencia», impulsada por el Consejo Europeo del Cerebro, que nos pide apoyo para la investigación sobre las enfermedades neurodegenerativas y psiquiátricas. Recordemos, con la comunidad científica, que la experimentación con animales de laboratorio ha salvado y seguirá salvando vidas; entre ellas, sin ninguna duda, las de personas que, con su mejor voluntad, han podido firmar o apoyarían esta iniciativa ciudadana sobre el uso de animales para la ciencia.

Tilly Metz, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, 10 years ago, the European Union took the decision to completely ban animal testing for cosmetic products and ingredients, becoming the first market in the world to do so. It might feel like a symbolic move or even an unimportant issue to some, but for me – as a European who deeply cares for animals – it was a proud and happy moment.

This will be one area where European consumers could buy products in good conscience because they didn't have to worry if animals had suffered in labs. But then they discovered that this is not the case at all, as animal tests still are performed for workers' safety. This is a legal inconsistency that is also causing damage to the credibility of the Union and to the trust of our citizens.

Alternative testing methods exist and continue to be developed, and we should support them more. So I wait for the Commission that the announced roadmap is really among the answers that we will give on this ECI, and that we have a concrete step to phase out animal testing.

Elżbieta Kruk, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Blisko 1,5 miliona osób podpisało europejską inicjatywę obywatelską mającą na celu zakończenie nie tylko okrutnego wykorzystywania zwierząt w testach kosmetycznych i chemicznych, lecz także wszelkich eksperymentów na zwierzętach. Żadna inna europejska inicjatywa obywatelska nie otrzymała takiego wsparcia w tak wielu krajach. Popierana jest również przez naukowców i przemysł. Oficjalnie w Europie nie prowadzi się testów kosmetyków na zwierzętach, to jednak nie cała prawda. Rocznie ponad 10 milionów zwierząt cierpi podczas eksperymentów prowadzonych w unijnych laboratoriach. Wiele składników kosmetyków to bowiem chemikalia, które podlegają innej regulacji zobowiązującej do prowadzenia testów na zwierzętach.

Tymczasem dziś można już bezpiecznie obejść się bez zadawania cierpień zwierzętom. Nowoczesne, alternatywne metody sprawdzania kosmetyków są efektywniejsze niż przestarzałe i okrutne doświadczenia na zwierzętach. Wesprzyjmy obywatelskie postulaty wzywające Komisję do zmiany przepisów i przedstawienia planu stopniowego wycofywania się ze wszelkich eksperymentów na zwierzętach, wspierania rozwoju i wdrażania nowych technologii, w tym przekierowania finansowania z badań na zwierzętach na metody alternatywne. Połóżmy kres cierpieniu milionów zwierząt w europejskich laboratoriach.

Annika Bruna, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, les expériences sur les animaux pour tester des cosmétiques sont interdites depuis 2013. Mais en 2020, la Commission, dans les affaires Symrise, a contraint les industriels à tester les composants cosmétiques sur les animaux en invoquant le règlement REACH. Il nous faut donc sortir de l'ornière.

J'ai déjà eu l'occasion de présenter des solutions à la Commission, parmi lesquelles la possibilité pour l'Agence européenne des produits chimiques d'homologuer elle-même des méthodes alternatives aux tests sur les animaux, avec effet immédiat. La possibilité également pour le Laboratoire européen pour les alternatives à l'expérimentation animale d'homologuer ses méthodes, là encore avec un effet immédiat.

Je me suis rendue mardi dernier dans ce laboratoire qui est situé en Italie, à Ispra. Ces méthodes sont nombreuses – toxico-génomiques, organes sur puce et modèles de peau reconstituée, bioimpression, modélisation informatique ou encore simulation de mécanismes neurologiques.

Aujourd'hui, la science avance plus vite que le droit. Les méthodes alternatives se développent et sont reconnues comme fiables. Ce qui empêche de remplacer les tests sur les animaux, c'est l'inertie du droit et, il faut bien le reconnaître, l'inertie de la Commission européenne. Plus d'un million de citoyens ont les yeux rivés sur vous et attendent des réponses. Vous ne pouvez les ignorer.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovana povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, očito je da testiranje kozmetike na životinjama jest praksa koja izaziva zabrinutost među građanima diljem Europske unije. Osuđujemo, naravno, patnju i okrutnost koju životinje podnose u ime ljepote i sigurnosti proizvoda.

Prema podacima organizacije Prijatelji životinja, čuli smo različite podatke i brojke danas, međutim, ovo je nešto najsvježije, svake godine otprilike 35 tisuća životinja u Europi te milijuni širom svijeta izloženi su patnji zbog testiranja. Govorimo o kozmetičkim proizvodima ili njihovim sastojcima. Praksa je to koja nije samo okrutna, već je, više smo puta čuli ovdje, i zastarjela.

Postoje brojne alternative koje su dostupne i koje su napredovale u posljednjim desetljećima. Napredak znanosti i tehnologije omogućuje nam razvoj sofisticiranih in vitro metoda, organskih modela, računalnih simulacija koje su pouzdane, relevantne, a što je najbitnije, i etične.

Europska unija već ima naprednu regulativu koja zabranjuje testiranje kozmetičkih sastojaka na životinjama. Međutim, moramo ići dalje i pozivam stoga i Komisiju da napravi iskorak u tom smjeru prema gotovim kozmetičkim proizvodima koji se stavljaju na tržište. Budimo predvodnici onih etičkih standarda o kojima toliko govorimo i poticanja industrije da razvije održive alternative za testiranje.

Ova inicijativa vrijedna je, predstavlja korak naprijed prema etičkoj održivoj budućnosti i stoga je na nama da stvorimo Europu koja štiti životinje i to upravo jačanjem i promicanjem inovacija, a u tom smjeru išli smo četiri godine za vrijeme ove Komisije i ovog saziva parlamenta. Imamo novaca, imamo resurse, učinimo to.

Beatrice Covassi (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sembra incredibile che ancora oggi nel 2023 dobbiamo discutere in questo Parlamento dell'utilizzo di animali come cavie per prodotti cosmetici, quando, già negli anni '90, venivano lanciate le prime linee non testate su animali.

L'Unione europea è all'avanguardia: tra il 2004 e il 2013 abbiamo messo al bando i test sugli animali per i prodotti cosmetici e i loro ingredienti; nel 2007 abbiamo incluso nei trattati il principio del benessere degli animali. Questo mentre nel mondo l'80 % dei paesi non ha ancora normative in merito.

Eppure le nostre regole di fatto vengono eluse perché i cosmetici contengono anche ingredienti che ricadono sotto altre normative e vengono ancora testati su animali.

Oggi l'innovazione tecnologica ci permette già di testare in modo sicuro senza che nessun essere vivente debba soffrirne.

Da qui la lodevole iniziativa dei cittadini europei che discutiamo oggi, con oltre un milione e duecentomila firme e che lancia un fondato allarme.

Allora, cari colleghi, niente timidezze: abbracciamo una volta e per sempre un concetto di bellezza più profondo, dove il rispetto di ogni forma di vita possa essere terapeutico e trasformativo non solo dei nostri corpi, ma anche della nostra anima.

La nostra Europa sarà bella e grande nella misura in cui saprà essere sempre più dalla parte del rispetto della natura, degli ecosistemi, degli esseri viventi.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, opravdu ohromující počet občanů nás vyzývá k tomu, abychom zakročili proti testování na zvířatech. Máme samozřejmě ke zvířatům jako živým tvorům projevovat respekt a úctu.

Já se připojuji k těmto občanům. Je nepochybné, že zde máme dvojí legislativu, jednu, která zakazuje toto testování, a druhou, která říká, že pro chemikálie musí povinně dojít k tomu testování na zvířeti. Myslím si, že je to taková zákonná forma obcházení, a bohužel mnozí producenti farmaceutického průmyslu tuto výjimku využívají velmi často.

Se zájmem jsem si poslechl vystoupení paní komisařky. Jsem velmi rád, že upozornila na ty alternativní metody a dokonce jejich možnosti financování výzkumu, které jsou k dispozici. Pojďme být skutečně důslednější. Zvýšme sankce za právě to obcházení zákona. Možná, že dokonce zpřísníme tu legislativu. To je, myslím, jednoznačné. A měli bychom skutečně zakázat některou kosmetiku na trhu, která nedodrží tato stanovená pravidla.

Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, le règlement cosmétique de 2009 interdit des expérimentations animales sur les produits cosmétiques et sur leurs ingrédients. Il interdit aussi la mise sur le marché de produits qui avaient été testés ou dont les ingrédients avaient été testés sur des animaux. Pourtant, l'Agence européenne des produits chimiques continue d'exiger de certains fabricants qu'ils recourent à des tests sur les animaux. Rien aujourd'hui ne peut justifier que des tests sur les animaux soient pratiqués pour des cosmétiques.

Cela fait des années que les fabricants et les associations de protection des animaux alertent sur ce scandale. Aujourd'hui, grâce à la mobilisation des dizaines d'associations et plus d'un million de signatures de citoyennes et citoyens européens, nous en discutons enfin! Merci à eux.

L'initiative citoyenne européenne nous invite aussi à nous poser plus globalement la question des tests sur les animaux. Les alternatives existent. Elles sont même souvent plus fiables que les tests sur les animaux. Pourtant, les tests sur les animaux diminuent à peine. Nous avons besoin d'un plan d'action complet qui mêle formation des professionnels, financements publics et réglementation pour réduire significativement les tests sur les animaux.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, firstly, to debunk one of the key myths about this European Citizens' Initiative, there have been claims that this proposal will be harmful and limiting to medical research with an outright ban on animal testing, which is untrue. Despite the ban on animal testing on cosmetic products it is an ongoing practice with certain ingredients that require testing by the European Chemicals Agency.

This initiative outlines a clear consumer demand to reduce mandatory chemical testing, with a proposal to transform and innovate EU chemicals regulation to ensure that human health and the environment are protected by managing chemicals without the barrier of new animal testing requirements, as outlined in a report by the European Environment Bureau.

This needs to be achieved through REACH regulation, which is responsible for testing requirements. So the revision of REACH legislation is crucial. But when will it happen? The Commission has been promising this for a while.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, I know we heard from the Commissioner that the Commission is listening. But if you are, I wonder, are you really hearing? Because we know that the Commission and the European Chemicals Agency are still standing over animal testing under the REACH Regulation for chemicals used exclusively in cosmetics, for which there is a possibility of workforce exposure or a risk to the environment.

Now, this is a double standard and a joke. As colleagues have said, the European Union lauded the fact that we became a world leader 10 years ago in banning cosmetics products being tested on animals. It is time for us to stop the double standards now. It is beyond time for us to respect the demand of the 1.2 million citizens who are demanding a legally binding act to end animal testing for cosmetic products and ingredients under REACH, including the safety of workers, and to put an end to the serious legal inconsistency that has been going on over the past period.

As colleagues have said, there are alternatives. We need to commit to a Europe without animal testing, and I really hope that the Commission comes up with a roadmap for that.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Věra Jourová, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, let me thank you for this rich debate with interesting perspectives and well considered statements from the different speakers. Your views on the different aspects of the Citizens' Initiative bring useful insights that we will take into account when finalising our response to the initiative.

So I can confirm I was not only listening; I also heard you. For us policy-makers, the support of citizens for a policy direction is key. This initiative reminds us how animal welfare remains a strong concern for European citizens, and we take that call very seriously. And not only this initiative – we had several initiatives in a row which concerned animals.

Coming back to this one, we are now in the final stage of the European Citizens' Initiative cycle, which is to finalise the Commission's formal answer to the initiative, covering our general conclusions as well as any action we may intend to take to follow up. This debate is timely because the College will have to adopt the communication by 25 July, so very soon.

This will be the second initiative replied to this month, as the Commission adopted last week its reply to another initiative concerning animal welfare, which aims at ending the trade of loose shark fins – a horrible practice, barbaric. I think that it's high time we react.

Before concluding, I am also glad to share with you that the Commission is currently examining one other successful initiative – Fur-Free Europe – to which the Commission will reply before the end of this year.

Citizens' engagement in the EU is growing ever stronger and I hope that it will also be reflected in the next elections. Demonstrating that we take seriously their concerns and clearly explaining our decisions will be essential for their trust in the EU and their continued involvement. That is why I am always repeating that I admire the initiatives and the efforts of the organisers, because this is really a very important contribution to our work. Thank you again for this fruitful debate.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

18. Management, conservation and control measures in the area covered under the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) (debate)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana João Pimenta Lopesin kalatalousvaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö ehdotuksesta Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston asetukseksi Eteläisen Intian valtameren kalastussopimuksen (SIOFA) soveltamisalaa kuuluvalla alueella sovellettavista hoito-, säilyttämis- ja valvontatoimenpiteistä (COM(2022)0563 - C9-0370/2022 - 2022/0348(COD)) (A9-0192/2023).

João Pimenta Lopes, relator. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Relatores-Sombra, noto, mais uma vez que, num debate sobre questões relacionadas com a pesca, o comissário responsável não está presente.

A proposta em apreço visa incorporar no Direito da União Europeia as medidas de conservação, de gestão e de controlo adotadas no âmbito do Acordo de Pesca para o Oceano Índico Sul (SIOFA – a Organização Regional de Gestão das Pescas, responsável pela gestão dos recursos haliêuticos na sua zona de aplicação).

As medidas de conservação e de gestão adotadas pela SIOFA são vinculativas para a União Europeia enquanto parte contratante. A proposta da Comissão, agora em apreço, visa transpor as recomendações definidas pela SIOFA desde 2016. Passaram já sete anos desde a decisão sobre tais recomendações.

A proposta da Comissão vai além de vários requisitos das medidas de conservação e de gestão da SIOFA. Por outro lado e na sequência de três processos negociais de transposição de recomendações de organizações de gestão e conservação, a Comissão volta a insistir, nesta transposição, na utilização das chamadas referências dinâmicas, colocando em causa o direito dos operadores a conhecerem as suas obrigações na sua língua materna, tal como estabelecido nos Tratados e reiterado pelo Tribunal de Justiça da UE.

O recurso às ditas referências dinâmicas tem sido sempre recusado pelo Parlamento Europeu, definindo um forte mandato para as rejeitar em negociações interinstitucionais.

Desta feita e após discussão e amplo acordo e maioria na Comissão das Pescas, propõe-se a rejeição da proposta da Comissão Europeia.

Lamentamos quer a apresentação tardia da proposta da Comissão após as recomendações da SIOFA, como a insistência contra a recomendação jurídica na apresentação das ditas referências dinâmicas.

Lamentamos também que, só na iminência de uma rejeição desta proposta por parte de um dos legisladores, a Comissão tenha decidido afirmar a procura de uma solução para esta e futuras transposições. O figurino das sugestões que a Comissão avançou é nebuloso, pouco claro ou sem ter um enquadramento legal ou orçamental que o possibilite.

Pedem que o Parlamento altere a sua posição, sem se comprometerem de forma clara com o abandono da insistência nas referências dinâmicas. Sugerir, atempadamente, que a proposta pudesse ser retirada. Tal permitiria interromper o processo e ganhar tempo a todos. Nada impediu ou impede a Comissão de o fazer.

Não posso, contudo, aceitar que a Comissão procure substituir-se ao Parlamento Europeu, imiscuir-se no seu papel de legislador, determinando o que este deve ou não fazer. Trata-se de uma postura inaceitável.

A posição assumida da Comissão das Pescas e que proponho manter foi muito clara: rejeitar esta abordagem e proposta, dar por encerrada a primeira leitura. Convidamos o Conselho a assumir a mesma posição, possibilitando à Comissão Europeia a apresentação de nova proposta que se restrinja às recomendações da SIOFA e que não inclua as ditas referências dinâmicas.

Tal permitirá que o Parlamento se possa pronunciar novamente sobre nova proposta no quadro do respeito entre instituições e os seus procedimentos internos. Posso dar a garantia de que este Parlamento estará tão empenhado, então como sempre, em encontrar uma solução que respeite o princípio do multilinguismo e o direito dos operadores a conhecer as suas obrigações na sua língua materna.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I would like to thank the rapporteur for his work on the implementation of the measures under the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement.

I welcome the fact that the European Parliament acknowledges that this implementation is an EU obligation under international law. Therefore, I regret even more the call to reject the Commission proposal due to divergent views on how to insert into the EU regulation the administrative forms and templates of the international organisation, which under international law operators are required to use in their original format and language in order to be compliant.

While seeking to facilitate the implementation of that specific requirement for EU fishers, the Commission remains fully committed to give practical effect to multilingualism in the European Union. Every citizen should be able to acquaint themselves with all rights and obligations in their respective EU language. We share these values with the European Parliament, and I regret that our institutions could not yet find a mutually acceptable solution that could address the concerns mentioned by the rapporteur.

The Commission has offered to make available, on the Commission website, translations into all EU languages of those forms and templates. Alternatively, and instead of dynamic references to measures of international bodies, the Commission is ready to explore the creation of an EU registry as a single point of reference for EU operators, containing all reference, relevant forms and templates of regional fisheries management organisations in their most updated version in all EU languages.

The proposed solutions would allow for swift information of operators in all EU languages in case of any changes of forms or templates at international level. This approach would ensure legal clarity regarding the correct forms to be filled in by EU fishers and avoid unnecessary procedural delays in the implementation of international measures, which would not only put EU fishers in a disadvantaged position but also at risk of involuntary infringement, which in turn could lead to reputational damage for the EU.

The Commission remains ready to discuss these solutions further. Therefore, I urge you to continue this work with the Commission and to refer this file back to the PECH Committee. I can assure you that the Commission will be willing to uphold a mutually agreed solution to this file – also in all future proposals of the same nature. I hope that, in the spirit of mutual sincere cooperation, you can accept the hand that I stretch out to you today.

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, é de começar por lamentar que o comissário da tutela não esteja aqui, hoje, connosco, para ouvir aquilo que temos a relatar sobre o acordo aqui em discussão.

Poderíamos discutir hoje as políticas públicas e as regras desenhadas no presente acordo, mas não o faremos. Poderíamos debater a urgência do apoio ao setor das pescas para que a sua gestão seja sustentável e eficiente, mas não o faremos.

Hoje, o que aqui defendemos é o respeito pelo trabalho de cada um de nós, representantes dos cidadãos portugueses, dos cidadãos europeus, enquanto legisladores do Parlamento.

Senhora Comissária, o Parlamento Europeu pediu e apresentou alternativas ao presente acordo. Adiou votações na Comissão das Pescas para dar tempo à Comissão para emendar as falhas a que sujeitou este acordo. A Comissão fez tábua rasa dos nossos pedidos. Podia discorrer sobre o conteúdo do acordo, mas vejo-me obrigada a sublinhar o facto de os serviços legais das três instituições europeias apontarem falhas à Comissão, a guardiã dos Tratados.

A não tradução dos textos em todas as línguas impede uma verdadeira compreensão e participação de todos os cidadãos na sua própria língua. Ao rejeitarem o multilinguismo, estão a desvalorizar a importância de todos aqueles que representamos e com isso não podemos pactuar.

Rejeitar este acordo é um voto pela igualdade de acesso e de respeito pela comunidade e pelos cidadãos. É um voto de preservação do multilinguismo e um voto que expressa o respeito que exigimos pelo papel do Parlamento Europeu, enquanto legislador.

Isabel Carvalhais, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Colegas, começo por agradecer as intervenções dos meus colegas e, muito em especial, a posição de grande hombridade do nosso relator na defesa do Parlamento enquanto legislador.

É lamentável, sabemos, ter de estar aqui e chegar a esta necessidade de propor rejeitar a proposta da Comissão. Contudo, nós não podemos aceitar que a Comissão argumente sobre este assunto como sendo apenas uma questão de divergências quanto à técnica legislativa que escolheu para os formulários de ORGP a utilizar pelos operadores.

Relembro que existem acórdãos do Tribunal de Justiça da União, nomeadamente os acórdãos de James Elliot e Stichting e ainda a recente opinião, com apenas duas semanas, da advogada-geral do Tribunal de Justiça no processo C-588/21P que, clara e consistentemente, afirmam que nenhuma medida pode substituir a obrigação de publicar todas as informações num jornal oficial.

Ora, defender a publicação de todas as informações nas línguas oficiais da União no Jornal Oficial é assegurar a acessibilidade e a aplicação dos documentos oficiais a todos os cidadãos, muito em particular, é a forma de garantir a segurança jurídica aos nossos operadores. Não é uma questão de divergência técnica.

Temos solicitado, em várias ocasiões, que a Comissão Europeia retire esta proposta no sentido de proceder à sua devida correção, porque o Parlamento só pode e só deve fazer o trabalho que lhe compete e nada mais.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, quiero anunciar en este debate mi oposición a la propuesta de la Comisión Europea, censurando tres aspectos de la misma:

En primer lugar está el retraso en transponer unas medidas de conservación, control y ordenación de pesca en el Índico Meridional adoptadas por el Consejo Consultivo de Pesca del Índico: el SIOFA, que llega siete años tarde. La Unión Europea es parte contratante de esta OROP desde 2008, por lo que sus acuerdos la vinculan.

En segundo lugar, la introducción de referencias dinámicas, que tienen la supuesta intención de acelerar la transposición, pero que van mucho más allá de los acuerdos originales, alterando las medidas que se deben transponer.

En tercer lugar, la resistencia a comunicar a los afectados en su propia lengua el alcance de estas medidas.

Hemos expresado estas posiciones claramente a la Comisión en estos meses, pero las posturas no se mueven. Por eso, es hora de decir no a esta forma de hacer que, una vez más, afecta negativamente al sector de la pesca europea.

France Jamet, au nom du groupe ID. – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, symbole de la puissance maritime française, située au cœur d'une zone de haute mer de 30 millions de kilomètres carrés, notre magnifique Île de la Réunion a été désignée comme siège de l'organisation issue des accords APSOI relatifs aux pêches dans le Sud de l'océan Indien conclu entre l'Union européenne, la France et six autres États maritimes. Et je ne peux que m'en réjouir.

Si, évidemment, je partage la position de M. Pimenta Lopes sur la forme, et notamment sur l'aspect linguistique que mes collègues viennent de relever, j'ai au-delà des remarques à faire sur le fond. Il est quand même préoccupant qu'au terme de ces accords, les politiques européennes aillent dans le sens d'un soutien indéfectible, et je dirais même systématique, à ceux que je qualifierai de financiers de la mer: la pêche macro-industrielle des multinationales.

À l'heure où l'enjeu environnemental est capital et où le développement de l'économie bleue est fondamental, il est nécessaire de préserver notre modèle de pêche traditionnel, ses emplois induits et l'environnement. À commencer par tout ce qui contribuera à lutter contre la pêche illégale, non déclarée et non réglementée, et contre la piraterie. Et pour cela, nous devons nous appuyer sur une coopération renforcée avec tous les États riverains de l'océan Indien, bien sûr, tous, y compris la Chine et l'Inde.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, quisiera, en primer lugar, destacar el trabajo que lleva a cabo la Comisión en las organizaciones regionales de ordenación pesquera, contribuyendo decisivamente a la gobernanza de los océanos a escala internacional. Muchas veces me ha escuchado el comisario mis críticas y hoy quiero reiterar nuestra oposición a las medidas discriminatorias e injustas para la flota de la Unión Europea adoptadas en la Comisión del Atún para el Océano Índico.

Dicho esto, señora comisaria, a la hora de transponer los acuerdos, la Comisión impone a los pescadores de la Unión medidas muy estrictas, lo que no sucede con las flotas no comunitarias, y ello implica desigualdad de condiciones entre todos los operadores que faenan en la misma zona y comercializan sus productos en los mismos mercados, con la consiguiente pérdida de competitividad de nuestros operadores frente a los operadores extranjeros.

Otra cuestión que quiero destacar, y ya se ha hecho hoy aquí, es que la transposición debe dejarse en manos de los colegisladores y no realizarse mediante actos delegados, sobre todo para evitar situaciones en las que la Comisión va mucho más lejos de lo acordado.

Finalmente, no quiero dejar pasar por alto una realidad preocupante: es absolutamente inaceptable que la propuesta de la Comisión llegue al Parlamento con meses o incluso, como es el caso, años de retraso, dándose la paradoja de que cuando aprobamos el texto las medidas ya han sido reiteradamente modificadas. Comisaria, establezcan una manera eficaz de transponer rápidamente las medidas adoptadas en las organizaciones internacionales, porque la buena gobernanza, además, empieza por respetar el papel que desempeña cada institución en la Unión Europea.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, the Irish fishing industry is predicted to lose EUR 43 million worth of quota share by 2026 under the EU-UK free trade agreement. This will amount to a 15% reduction in the overall value of Irish fish quotas compared to 2020. Ireland was proportionally massively more impacted by the Brexit agreement than any other Member State. The upcoming review of the common fisheries policy must address the hugely disproportionate impact of Brexit on the Irish fishing industry, including these imbalances in the quota transfers.

But it also needs to increase Irish quota shares overall. Let's not forget: the common fisheries policy shafted Irish fishermen right from the start. The CFP allows foreign boats to catch up to 85% of the fish in Irish waters. Yet Irish boats get no reciprocal access to the waters of other Member States. It looks like the EU solidarity is in short supply for Ireland's fishing communities.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, Honourable Members, I would like to thank you for this debate and briefly come back to certain questions raised. In concrete, I will react to the comments regarding the time aspects, translations and the registry.

First, on the time which is needed for transposing measures agreed several years ago, the Commission is working intensively to implement the decisions of all regional fisheries management organisations. However, given the limited resources available, a prioritisation of that work is inevitable. The Commission thus seeks to balance the economic and political significance of the measures to be implemented and the available resources to do that.

Over the last five years, we have been able to table seven such proposals, five out of which are already adopted. At the end of 2017, we had regulations covering measures of only three fisheries management organisations.

Now, on the official translations – as I said earlier – under international law, operators are required to use the relevant forms in their original format and language in order to be compliant, and they are used to doing that, in fact. At the same time, we take very seriously the aspect of being able to consult these forms in one's own language, which is why the Commission has been exploring alternatives that can combine the legal necessities with the principle of multilingualism, and at the same time ensure an efficient use of the limited resources available.

And the third comment is on the registry. The Commission has genuinely been trying to find a solution that will allow us to fulfil our legal obligations, and provide legal clarity for EU fishing operators and information in every EU language. This is how we started looking at the idea of an EU registry that would allow us – instead of having a dynamic reference to the website of a regional fisheries management organisation – to refer to an online EU registry containing all forms in force at the level of these organisations and making them available in all EU languages. The exact modalities of this EU registry would need to be determined, however, by all three institutions and respect the existing allocation of resources.

In conclusion, I hope that this report will be referred back to the committee so that our two institutions can continue their work and deliver a permanent solution for our fishermen and women.

João Pimenta Lopes, *relator*. – Senhora Presidente, Cara Comissária, Caros Relatores-Sombra, registo que a Comissão continua a não abrir mão da sua posição e a contribuir para uma solução.

Registo a insistência, e direi melhor, a teimosia da Comissão Europeia, a mesma teimosia que tenho identificado em outros ficheiros de maior monta e que temos discutido na Comissão das Pescas, com profundo impacto para o sector.

Direi: o bloqueio às possibilidades de renovação da frota, particularmente de pequena pesca costeira e artesanal, que se encontra obsoleta; a insistência em considerar os pescadores como incumpridores à partida, impondo ainda maiores restrições à pesca por via do regulamento de controlo; a insistência em confundir potência de motor com capacidade de pesca; a decisão de impor restrições à pesca de fundo em áreas sem envolver o sector e sem estudos adequados – são exemplos da inflexibilidade que a Comissão sempre demonstra e que, neste caso, continua a demonstrar.

A Comissão procura colocar o ónus da responsabilidade desta decisão sobre o Parlamento Europeu, quando a mão que diz estender, sabe-o tão bem como nós, não é uma garantia de solução.

O registo que propõe carece de acordo tripartido e não garante, neste momento, a inscrição no jornal oficial que oferece a garantia jurídica. Rejeitamos esse ónus que, insisto, recai inteiramente na Comissão nesta transposição.

Poderíamos não estar nesta situação. A posição unânime expressa pelas intervenções em plenário demonstra-o.

Senhora Comissária, aceite com humildade as críticas que aqui foram feitas. Estaremos disponíveis para continuar o trabalho com base numa nova proposta que, insisto, propomos à Comissão que venha a apresentar o mais rapidamente possível.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna tiistaina 11. heinäkuuta 2023.

19. Protection of workers from extreme heat and other extreme weather phenomena resulting from the climate crisis (debate)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana komission julkilausuma työntekijöiden suojelemisesta ilmastokriisistä johtuvilta äärimmäiseltä kuumuudelta ja muilta äärimmäisiltä sääilmiöiltä (2023/2788(RSP)).

Jäsenille ilmoitetaan, että poliittisten ryhmien puheenvuoroja on vain yksi kierros, minkä vuoksi pyynnöstä myönnettäviä puheenvuoroja ei anneta eikä sinisen kortin kysymyksiä hyväksytä.

Nicolas Schmit, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, honourable members, the last eight years were the hottest on record globally. And last week, Monday 3 July, we saw the highest average global temperature ever. According to a recent study by the ILO, by 2030 more than 2 % working hours worldwide is projected to be lost every year. Heat stress is a threat for workers' health and temperatures exceeding 39 degrees can kill. It obviously has an impact also on economic activity and on productivity. Europe is the fastest warming continent on earth, with earlier heatwaves, intensifying droughts and more flooding.

Climate change and heatwaves exert a profound impact on individuals with essential workers on the front lines bearing a particularly heavy burden. These workers endure heightened risks to their physical and mental well-being as they carry out their essential duties in extreme conditions. And these risks are expected to grow over the coming decades. Extreme heat events can cause, for example, heat exhaustion and heat stroke. Higher temperatures can also increase the risk of injuries due to lack of concentration. Moreover, higher temperatures may aggravate exposure to hazardous chemicals, for example, when working with solvents. In addition, a significant reduction in productivity occurs when temperatures raise too high. It is therefore urgent and important to properly address these kinds of risks because all workers are entitled to a healthy and safe working environment.

The need for risk assessment, including that of high temperature, is echoed in the EU legislation. In addition, the EU Strategic Framework on Health and Safety at Work 2021-2027 clearly refers to higher ambient temperature, air pollution and extreme weather as risks for workers' health and safety and the need for increased awareness. For this reason, we have been working on a range of guidance at EU and national level for climate change and associated osh risks. The recent high level meeting in Stockholm on health and safety has reaffirmed the necessity to implement the different elements of this strategic framework. The most recent example is the new guide Heat at Work Guidance for Workplaces from the EU Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA). The guide provides practical guidance on how to manage and prevent the risks associated with working in heat and information on what to do if a worker begins to suffer from a heat-related illness. Climate change is a reality and it will impact all areas of our life, including many working places, namely in sectors like construction, cleaning, agriculture and so on.

We will work with Parliament as well as with Member States and social partners to protect workers' health in conformity with our steady commitment for health and safety at the working place.

Helmut Geuking, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar Schmit! So sieht man sich wieder. Was Sie gerade gesagt haben, ist mir nicht genug, muss ich Ihnen ganz ehrlich sagen. Sie haben sich auf die IAO-Studie berufen – 2,2 % der Arbeitsstunden werden global bis 2030 wegfallen. Das macht 80 Millionen Vollzeitplätze in Gesamtvolumen von 2,1 Billionen Euro – nur mal so, um eine Größenordnung zu sagen. Mit Leitfaden können wir dem nicht begegnen.

Es ist auch nicht – wenn ich nach Deutschland schaue – zum Beispiel das, was die deutsche Regierung macht im Klein-Klein. Wir müssen Klima global denken. Wir müssen Maßnahmen ergreifen in Sachen Arbeitsschutz für die Menschen. Sie haben vollkommen recht, wenn Sie sagen: Die Menschen sind natürlich jetzt ganz anderen Stoffen ausgesetzt: Lösungsmitteln, die freigesetzt werden ab 35 Grad, woran man vorher gar nicht gedacht hat. Da sind Sachen, die auf uns zurollen, was ein enormer Kostenaufwand ist. Man geht alleine gesundheitspolitisch davon aus, dass wir – die ganzen Allergien zum Beispiel, denn der Pollenflug wird sich durch diese Erwärmung und durch diesen Klimaschutz um 40 bis 60 % erhöhen – viel mehr Krankheits- und Ausfälle haben werden, auch im Arbeitsleben. Die Hitze, wie Sie sagen: Arbeiten Sie mal im Straßenbau bei diesem Wetter, es ist schier unmöglich.

Das heißt, das ganze Leben, die Arbeitsbedingungen werden sich verändern müssen und werden sich verändern. Europa muss hier entsprechend tätig werden, und Europa muss hier entsprechend ganz klare Richtlinien herausgeben, woran sich die Länder auch halten müssen zum Wohle der Menschen, dass sie mit diesem Klima Schritt halten können und nicht schwer erkranken. Denn jeder Krankheitsausfall in den Firmen kostet bares Geld und Steuergelder.

Ja, leider ist die Redezeit zu Ende, es gäbe noch so vieles zu sagen.

Elisabetta Gualmini, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, le inondazioni torrenziali in Emilia Romagna del maggio scorso sono un caso esemplare dell'impatto della crisi climatica su imprese e lavoratori. Abbiamo avuto oltre 12 000 aziende agricole devastate, 14 000 altre imprese distrutte, 15 morti, tra cui lavoratori.

Noi ci crediamo veramente alla lotta al cambiamento climatico, certo con buonsenso, con ragionevolezza, accompagnando la transizione ecologica con compensazioni per famiglie e imprese, quindi senza fissazioni e ideologie.

Invece la destra in Europa al cambiamento climatico non ci crede. Non ci crede la destra al governo in Italia, perché ha cincischiato per un mese e mezzo prima di nominare un commissario alla ricostruzione, mettendo veti sull'unica persona che poteva farlo, cioè il presidente della Regione. Non ci crede la destra di Meloni che è affetta da schizofrenia per cui, da un lato, dice che per ricostruire servono nove-dieci anni e poi nomina il commissario per un anno, guarda caso proprio in concomitanza con le elezioni regionali. E non ci crede la destra di Meloni perché ancora non ha fatto richiesta del Fondo di solidarietà europeo, che la Commissione ha pure aumentato, la cui scadenza è il 25 luglio e si rischia di perdere centinaia di milioni sulla pelle dei lavoratori.

Perché tra destra e progressisti c'è una bella differenza sulle crisi climatiche e l'impatto sui lavoratori e l'ambiente: la destra è innamorata del fossile, la destra nega che il surriscaldamento sia tale.

Invece noi pensiamo che occorra prevenire, mitigare, aiutare tutti i lavoratori in un ambiente di lavoro migliore e ripristinare un po' di sana natura. Per fortuna destra e sinistra sono così lontane, e io dico, ben venga!

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne, au nom du groupe Renew. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, en 2022, 60 000 personnes sont décédées en Europe à cause des chaleurs extrêmes. 60 000 personnes. Un nombre inconcevable. Et même avec des températures excessives, les personnes directement exposées aux canicules sont toujours au travail. Ouvriers du bâtiment, agriculteurs, éboueurs, entre des centaines d'autres d'activités, ils restent toujours mobilisés pour le bon fonctionnement de notre société.

Vous l'avez dit, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous vivons une époque où les températures augmentent, où les vagues de chaleur deviennent de plus en plus extrêmes, rendant le travail toujours plus difficile, notamment à l'extérieur, notamment pour les travailleurs manuels, notamment pour ceux qui occupent des emplois précaires. Notre responsabilité reste de veiller à ce qu'ils soient tous en sécurité, quelles que soient les conditions climatiques. Et face à cette situation inédite, il nous faut mettre en place de nouvelles règles. Il nous faut aménager les conditions de travail, que ce soit avec des équipements de protection, avec des infrastructures adaptées ou même avec des mesures d'urgence.

La protection des travailleurs n'est que la face immergée de l'iceberg. Le sujet demeure toujours la protection de l'environnement. Elle doit aller de pair avec la lutte contre le changement climatique. Elle doit aller de pair avec notre engagement envers le pacte vert. Elle doit aller de pair avec notre engagement de justice sociale.

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, periodicamente ci ritroviamo qui a richiedere l'attivazione del Fondo di solidarietà in seguito a incendi, a inondazioni che colpiscono il Nord, il Sud e il centro dell'Europa.

Collegli, siamo tutti d'accordo che prevenire è meglio che curare? Sì. Ve lo chiedo perché in questo Parlamento c'è chi, con l'aiuto di certa stampa, non tutta, nega l'azione colpevole dell'uomo, nega il cambiamento climatico e, per di più, accusa noi Verdi di tutti i mali del mondo.

La verità è sotto gli occhi di tutti: questi eventi sempre più frequenti hanno un impatto spropositato anche sulle professioni più vulnerabili. Mi riferisco, in particolare, ai vigili del fuoco, una delle categorie più esposte.

Che ne è, Commissario, dell'attuazione della direttiva quadro 89/331 e delle successive? Come li proteggiamo dall'esposizione ad agenti chimici, fisici, biologici? Sono attuate le procedure di decontaminazione, dei dispositivi di protezione individuale? Che ne è della sorveglianza sanitaria? E, soprattutto, hanno la copertura assicurativa per gli infortuni?

Un corpo dello Stato che protegge la vita dei cittadini tutti i giorni, mettendo a rischio la propria, di vita, in molti Stati, come il mio, non gode neanche della copertura assicurativa nazionale.

I nostri ragazzi nella civile Europa sono mandati allo sbaraglio. È uno scandalo!

Ai cittadini dico: non abboccate alle bugie della destra. Saranno i primi a voltarsi dall'altra parte quando ne avrete bisogno, lo stanno già facendo. Navigano a vista, senza una visione chiara e senza soluzioni reali.

Oggi, qui, servono misure concrete per mettere i nostri territori in sicurezza e renderli resilienti. Non agire adesso avrà un costo incalcolabile domani e la pagheranno i nostri figli e i nostri nipoti.

Mathilde Androuët, au nom du groupe ID. – Madame la Présidente, l'Union européenne a une étrange tendance à déplorer les situations auxquelles elle contribue pourtant par ses politiques. Nous nous inquiétons aujourd'hui des températures extrêmes que subissent les travailleurs, mais, il y a moins de 24 heures, l'Union européenne a signé un accord de libre-échange avec la Nouvelle-Zélande, un accord qui devrait entraîner une hausse de 30 % des échanges commerciaux avec un pays parmi les plus éloignés de l'Union européenne.

Sans être devin ni climatologue, on peut dire que ce genre de décision est lamentable du point de vue du bilan carbone qui devrait mécaniquement gonfler, en plus d'être une décision criminelle vis-à-vis des emplois agricoles européens.

Tant que l'Union européenne pratiquera la religion du libre-échange mondial, ses choix en matière de politique environnementale de grande échelle seront sabotés. Tant que l'Union européenne encouragera la concentration des individus et la bétonisation mécanique de cette concentration forcément urbaine, nous ne cesserons pas d'affoler les thermomètres. Nous pouvons et devons reboiser. Nous pouvons et devons ralentir le ruissellement des eaux de pluie vers les mers et océans. Mais quelle utilité si nos pays ne sont que des déserts ruraux ponctués de métropoles fournaises?

Si nous ne rompons pas avec cette logique d'entassement ou d'étalement urbain qui dégrade la qualité de vie des Européens, qui appauvrit les sols, incapables de retenir les eaux de pluie, provoquant des inondations ou faisant monter le mercure, nous ne ferons que des cautères sur une jambe de bois.

Vouloir couvrir l'Europe de quartiers d'affaires comme la défense ou Bankenviertel ou de zones industrielles et commerciales composées de cubes de tôles faisant office de bureaux et de magasins où flâner condamnera toujours les travailleurs exposés aux fortes températures.

On a donc à l'ordre du jour un sujet pour donner des gages écologistes. Mais, dans le fond, rien ne changera, car vous ne voulez pas changer la philosophie de cette union. Vivement 2024!

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop, en nombre del Grupo The Left. – Señora presidenta, según la OIT, si aumentará la temperatura un grado y medio, España perdería cada año cerca de 7 700 puestos de trabajo y en algunos sectores precarizados con alta siniestralidad, como el de la construcción o la agricultura por ejemplo, no se hablaría ya de perder el trabajo, sino de perder la vida y la salud debido al calor, al estrés térmico y a otros riesgos asociados al cambio climático.

Está claro que, en materia de seguridad y salud en el trabajo, no basta con simples directrices, necesitamos normas vinculantes, también instrumentos como el Convenio 184 de la OIT. En España, gracias al Ministerio de Trabajo, la jornada laboral se tiene que adaptar a las condiciones meteorológicas cuando son extremas. Se ha optado por la prevención sobre una evaluación de riesgos laborales que considera tanto las características del trabajo como del trabajador.

Ahora queremos poner en marcha una estrategia nacional que incluya medidas de este tipo, porque cualquier trabajo que no se adapte al cambio climático será un trabajo en precario y porque, si no apostamos seriamente por esa adaptación, se impondrán las salidas ecofascistas que hemos visto en Texas, donde los trabajadores no pueden dejar de trabajar ni para beber agua.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, στη χώρα μου την Ελλάδα, άλλος ένας εργαζόμενος έχασε τη ζωή του πριν δύο μέρες, στα Ναυπηγεία Ελευσίνας, όταν στάλθηκε για υπερωρίες μέσα στο λιοπύρι, ενώ αντιμετώπιζε προβλήματα υγείας. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση κάνει κάποιες μη υποχρεωτικές συστάσεις και επιδιώκει να ρίξει την ευθύνη στην κλιματική αλλαγή. Όμως για τα δυστυχήματα -εργοδοτικά εγκλήματα- ευθύνονται όλες διαχρονικά οι κυβερνήσεις και η ευρωενωσιακή στρατηγική, που έχουν ξεχαρβάλώσει τις εργασιακές σχέσεις και τους κρατικούς ελεγκτικούς μηχανισμούς προς όφελος της κερδοφορίας των ομίλων.

Οι εργαζόμενοι να μην αποδεχτούν ως κανονικότητα να δουλεύουν σε τέτοιες συνθήκες ούτε τη βαρβαρότητα ότι μπορεί να πάνε για δουλειά και να μην επιστρέψουν. Μέσα από τα σωματεία τους να απαιτήσουν άμεση διακοπή εργασίας σε θερμοκρασίες πάνω από 38 βαθμούς ή και χαμηλότερα, ανάλογα με τον τύπο της εργασίας, με πλήρη καταβολή του ημερομισθίου, περιορισμό των βαριών εργασιών και πλήρη αποχή από την εργασία των ομάδων υψηλού κινδύνου. Να κλιμακώσουν τον αγώνα για συλλογικές συμβάσεις εργασίας με αυξήσεις που να κατοχυρώνουν μέτρα ασφαλείας στην εργασία. Να απαιτήσουν στελέχωση των δημόσιων νοσοκομείων, του ΕΚΑΒ, γιατρών και νοσηλευτικό προσωπικό στους τόπους δουλειάς, ενίσχυση των κρατικών υπηρεσιών ελέγχου.

Nicolas Schmit, membre de la Commission. – Madame la Présidente, d'abord, je tiens à remercier le Parlement d'avoir mis ce sujet à l'ordre du jour et d'avoir organisé ce débat, puisqu'il s'agit-là d'un problème réel qui affecte des millions de travailleurs en Europe et au-delà. Vous avez amplement décrit les situations compliquées que ces travailleurs affrontent, compte tenu des températures. On nous annonce demain, à Strasbourg, plus de 37 degrés. Vous pouvez donc imaginer comment les personnes travaillent dans ces conditions.

Je tiens à rappeler d'abord qu'il y a un principe fondamental dans la directive-cadre sur la santé et la sécurité au travail. Il est de la responsabilité de l'employeur d'assurer la santé et la sécurité de ses collaborateurs, de ses travailleurs. Et je crois qu'un employeur engage sa responsabilité quand il fait travailler quelqu'un dans des conditions qui ont un impact extrêmement négatif sur la santé et présentent des risques, parfois mortels, comme cela vient d'être rappelé. Il faut donc rappeler cette responsabilité-là.

Par ailleurs, il existe un certain nombre de directives qui font déjà référence à ces situations de températures excessives et aux précautions qu'il faut prendre en pareil cas. Il y a toujours eu des gens qui ont travaillé dans des conditions extrêmement difficiles, surtout il y a quelques années. Cela a peut-être un peu changé. Dans une aciérie, près d'un haut fourneau, les températures dépassent les 30 degrés. Et donc, dans ce contexte-là, il est absolument indispensable que les employeurs aussi prennent des dispositifs pour protéger les travailleurs.

Et donc nous allons évidemment suivre maintenant l'évolution. Et je crois que, dans une première phase, ces lignes directrices sont très claires et sont exhaustives et précises quant aux des risques encourus par les travailleurs dans ces conditions de température excessive et rappellent aussi les responsabilités, notamment des employeurs.

C'est un nouveau sujet d'une certaine manière, puisque de nouveaux travailleurs, de nouvelles catégories de travailleurs sont exposés. Nous allons continuer à suivre ce dossier, comme je l'ai dit, avec les États membres, avec votre Parlement qui a montré une très forte sensibilité sur ce sujet et évidemment aussi avec les partenaires sociaux. Il faudra, le cas échéant, envisager des mesures supplémentaires.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Alicia Homs Ginel (S&D), por escrito. – El cambio climático tiene un impacto directo y perjudicial en la salud y la seguridad de los trabajadores y trabajadoras y las condiciones de trabajo. La intensificación de los fenómenos meteorológicos extremos provocará más lesiones físicas y también puede aumentar el riesgo de cáncer de piel, exposición al polvo y riesgos psicosociales. Trabajadores al aire libre en sectores como la agricultura, la silvicultura, la construcción y el turismo, o trabajadores del sector sanitario y de emergencias, que desempeñan un papel fundamental en la preparación y respuesta ante emergencias, como los bomberos y las enfermeras, están ya particularmente expuestos a la crisis climática.

La Comisión Europea debe establecer un mecanismo de alerta temprana dentro de la estructura interinstitucional actual para detectar dónde se necesitan ajustes y revisiones de las directivas sobre salud y seguridad en el trabajo existentes. Asimismo, la Comisión debe convertir la Recomendación de 2003 relativa a la lista europea de enfermedades profesionales, ya obsoleta, en una Directiva que cree una lista mínima de enfermedades profesionales y establezca los requisitos mínimos para su reconocimiento y una compensación adecuada para las personas afectadas.

20. Implementation of ‘passerelle’ clauses in the EU Treaties (short presentation)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Giuliano Pisapia:n mietinnön lyhyt esittely: EU:n perussopimuksiin sisältyvien siirtymälausekkeiden täytäntöönpano [2022/2142(INI)] (A9-0208/2023).

Annan puheenvuoron esittelijälle neljäksi minuutiksi.

Giuliano Pisapia, relatore. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come tutti sappiamo l'unanimità del voto in Consiglio, pensata come regola per rafforzare l'unità tra gli Stati membri, è diventata sempre di più causa di ritardi e compromessi al ribasso.

Dai negoziati sul fondo per la ripresa ai ritardi sull'approvazione delle sanzioni contro la Russia, il veto di singoli paesi ha rallentato, e talvolta indebolito, le capacità dell'Unione europea di reagire in tempi brevi alle crisi più importanti dei nostri tempi.

Troppo spesso decisioni su temi importanti, basti pensare alla salute, allo sviluppo, al contrasto alla fame nel mondo, allo Stato di diritto, sono state bloccate e/o ritardate per la mancanza delle firme di un solo Paese. L'unanimità rischia di essere, sempre più, non più elemento di garanzia e per questo va ripensata.

È giunto il momento di aprire il cantiere di modifica dei trattati. Sappiamo perfettamente che prima di entrare in vigore passeranno anni per le possibili modifiche dei trattati. Le clausole passerella sono uno strumento, forse l'unico strumento, che ci permetterebbe di superare l'unanimità in maniera evidentemente graduale e solamente in alcuni settori politici, ma strategici.

Negli ultimi dieci anni il Parlamento europeo ha approvato oltre 40 risoluzioni a larghissima maggioranza in cui ha chiesto l'attivazione di questo strumento; la Commissione europea si è espressa più volte a favore del loro utilizzo; di recente un numero importante di Stati membri ha chiesto che venissero attivate, almeno in alcune decisioni di politica estera e anche forse fiscale. Nonostante questo impegno trasversale, le clausole passerella sono state attivate una sola volta nel 2004.

Il problema che bisogna superare è che le cause passerella, per essere attivate, devono avere ancora una volta l'unanimità del Consiglio, il paradosso di utilizzare «l'unanimità per superare l'unanimità» può essere superato solo dai governi degli Stati membri e questo non è più attuabile.

Il Parlamento europeo domani voterà una risoluzione ambiziosa ma importante, che prevede un calendario graduale, perché siamo convinti che ci voglia la gradualità su un tema così delicato e dettagliato per l'attivazione delle clausole passerella nei prossimi anni.

Proprio per questo speriamo e crediamo nella Presidenza spagnola, sulla base anche delle proposte che emergeranno domani dal Parlamento europeo, per avviare un dialogo e un percorso con gli Stati membri e le altre istituzioni.

Attivare le clausole passerella in determinati settori più urgenti tra cui, ad esempio, in questo momento, purtroppo, la decisione sulla guerra in Ucraina, l'attuazione del green deal e tante altre, sarebbe un piccolo ma importante passo in avanti nel processo di integrazione europea e consentirebbe all'Europa di reagire sempre più efficacemente alle grandi sfide che stiamo affrontando e che affronteremo in futuro.

Per questo chiediamo al Consiglio europeo di ascoltare non solo noi, il Parlamento, che pure è importante e determinante, ma soprattutto di ascoltare i cittadini europei che, lo ricordo, nel corso della Conferenza sul futuro dell'Europa hanno espresso la volontà di rendere l'Europa più forte, unita, celere ed efficiente e di superare una volta per tutte la regola dell'unanimità.

Attivare le clausole passerella prima della fine di questo mandato, almeno in alcuni settori, almeno provarci, utilizzarle almeno una volta, sarebbe un bel segnale non solo per le prossime elezioni europee, ma anche e soprattutto per il processo di integrazione europea e la credibilità dell'Unione europea.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisario Schmit, no ha sido solamente la Conferencia sobre el Futuro de Europa, cuando se ha escuchado a la ciudadanía, sino que también este Parlamento Europeo se ha rebelado, una y otra vez, contra la unanimidad que deriva en bloqueo no solamente de decisiones cruciales, sino de legislación europea, como es el caso penoso de la Directiva contra la discriminación, la llamada Directiva horizontal contra toda forma de discriminación.

Por eso, tiene pleno sentido este informe que propone, por fin, utilizar la cláusula pasarela, que, por lo menos, permite pasar de la unanimidad a la mayoría cualificada y, consiguientemente, al procedimiento legislativo ordinario. El primer paso es el marco financiero plurianual. El segundo paso: la política exterior de seguridad y de defensa común, que no puede estar bloqueada por la regla de la unanimidad. Después, los recursos propios fundamentales para que la Unión Europea pueda honrar las ambiciones que proclama y, finalmente, la legislación antidiscriminación y, por supuesto, la legislación que afecta a la democracia y a la calidad de la democracia en la Unión Europea, incluido el sistema electoral, que se va a debatir en este mismo Pleno del Parlamento Europeo.

Tiene pleno sentido: cláusula pasarela para evitar la unanimidad.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Nicolas Schmit, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, I want to assure you the Commission remains and will always be on the side of those who advocate for a Union working at its best: acting swiftly and delivering efficiently – all of this in the general interest of EU citizens. This is our *raison d'être*, as was recalled to us all at the occasion of the Conference on the Future of Europe.

In her State of the Union speech following the conclusion of the conference, President von der Leyen underlined that the Commission will always side with those who want to improve the way we do things and the way we decide things. Therefore, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Pisapia, for his excellent work and the report presented today.

Time commands us: climate change, pandemics, Russia's invasion of Ukraine, the rising of energy costs – the list of events that we have had to face has become longer and longer over the past years, and they dictate us urgent responses. The EU institutions have, however, proved to be extremely resilient so far. We have found ways to tackle these challenges within the boundaries of the current Treaties – from NextGenerationEU to REPowerEU or ASAP.

But, as you point out rightly, there is still untapped potential in the Treaties. And here the position of the Commission on moving from unanimity to qualified majority voting is long-standing, consistent and well known.

Back in 2018 and 2019, the Commission made recommendations to activate the passerelle clauses to boost our capacities for action in key domains, and the four communications contained proposals for the activation of passerelle clauses for foreign and security policy, tax policy, energy and climate policy and social policy. In her political guidelines, President von der Leyen called to move toward full codecision power for Parliament and away from unanimity.

Again, in June last year, in our communication following up on the Conference on the Future of Europe, we reiterated our call to use the passerelle clauses to move to qualified majority voting in these areas I just mentioned. And especially when talking about common foreign and security policies, we need to go away from unanimity, especially when we have to decide on sanctions and human rights.

Honourable Members, you have an ally in the European Commission but you know perfectly well that the decision lies first with the Member States. And it is true what you have said: you can only activate the passerelle by unanimity. So abolish, in a way, unanimity through unanimity. This is the problem, and you know it.

But again, let me thank you, especially Mr Pisapia, for this fruitful contribution, at a very timely moment, to the ongoing discussions in the EU institutions on how the EU can work and decide better and more effectively, especially when speed and rapid action are absolutely needed.

Puhemies. – Kohdan käsittely on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna tiistaina 11. heinäkuuta 2023.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

László Trócsányi (NI), *írásban.* – Az Európai Unióban a döntéshozatali mechanizmust az alapító szerződésekben rögzítették a tagállamok. Ezek az eljárások alapos tárgyalások, mérlegelés eredményeként jöttek létre, kényes egyensúlyt kialakítva a tagállamok és az uniós intézmények között. A tagállamok a szerződések urai, ők döntenek arról, hogy alkotmányaikkal összhangban szuverenitásuk mely részét gyakorolhatja és pontosan milyen területeken az Európai Unió. Az egyhangú döntéshozatal fenntartása, a minősített többségű döntéshozatalra való áttérés elvetése bizonyos, stratégiaileg fontos területeken, lényegi okokból került rögzítésre a szerződésekben.

Nem a közös uniós döntés akadályozásáról van szó, hanem a döntéshozatali folyamat természetes részét képezi. A konszenzus azt szolgálja, hogy kulcsfontosságú területeken a tagállamok egységes álláspontot képviseljenek, mindenki hozzájárulását adja a döntéshez és így az jelentősebb súlyt is képviseljen. Az egyhangúság továbbá különösen a kis és közepes tagállamok nemzeti érdekeinek védelméért is szükséges, a nagyobb tagállamok dominanciára való törekvését ellensúlyozza. További, szorosabb együttműködési formákra a szerződések lehetőséget biztosítanak, így például megerősített együttműködésre.

Ilyen van hatályban a házasság felbontására alkalmazandó jog, a szabadalmak és pénzügyi tranzakciós adó területén, valamint az Európai Ügyészség létrehozása, sőt, az euró bevezetése is megerősített együttműködéssel történt. Mindezeket figyelembe véve a jelentés téves megközelítésen alapul. Mindössze pótcselekvés, hiszen kizárólag a tagállamok egyhangú döntésével lehetne újabb területeken áttérni minősített többséggel való döntéshozatalra.

21. Banking Union – annual report 2022 (short presentation)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Kira Marie Peter-Hansenin mietinnön lyhyt esittely: Pankkiunioni – vuosikertomus 2022 [2022/2061(INI)] (A9-0177/2023).

Annan puheenvuoron esittelijälle neljäksi minuutiksi.

Kira Marie Peter-Hansen, *rapporteur.* – Madam President, I think it is clear to all of us that even though the Banking Union is important, it might not be as interesting as, for example, the Nature Restoration Law. But I'm very happy to see the Commissioner and the Chair and greet them, because the last year has further shown the value of the Banking Union, while also calling for our collective efforts to continue in building a framework that fosters trust, transparency and accountability in the banking sector. Therefore I am also a proud rapporteur of the annual report on the Banking Union, which this year seems especially relevant, with two elements giving flavour to the report.

First of all, the failure of three US banks reminded us of how important it is to implement a sound prudential framework, and the EP report stresses that the EU should fairly, timely and comprehensively implement the internationally agreed standards. The recent political agreement reached with the Council will allow for this timely implementation. The management of these failures also demonstrates the need to have a robust deposit insurance framework that fosters depositors' confidence to avoid bank runs.

Secondly, the Commission published its proposal to revise the EU crisis management framework for banks, and everyone agrees that the EU resolution framework contains some loopholes that we need to fix. The management of Credit Suisse's failure also demonstrates the importance of having a credible resolution framework. Fifteen years after the great financial crisis, it is time to put an end to the 'too big to fail' issue. Obviously resolution aspects and deposit insurances go hand in hand, and I do hope that the co-legislators will now be able to agree on a comprehensive and coherent reform of the EU framework.

I am particularly proud that Parliament reiterates its commitment to complete the Banking Union against this background, and I would like in this context to also thank all the shadow rapporteurs for their constructive contribution and for the smooth work to draft the report that I hope will be voted with a broad majority.

This year's annual report also considers the economic and social impact of the Russian aggression on Ukraine and calls on competent authorities to carefully monitor ongoing developments. The report also acknowledges the decreasing trends of non-performing loans in bank balance sheets, while stressing that risk reduction in bank balance sheets should continue. So far, the progressive withdrawal of the public support measures adopted during the pandemic, as well as the rising interest rates environment, have not led to an increase of non-performing loans in bank balance sheets. However, our report stresses that we should continue to closely monitor the situation and continue the progress made in the reduction of risks in the balance sheets.

The report also acknowledges the banking sector's role in financing the green transition. There is a clear recognition by Parliament that climate change poses a threat to financial stability and it is now time that the financial and prudential framework fully embeds this reality.

Our report also deplores the lack of gender balance in top management positions, both in banks and in EU financial institutions. Gender-balanced boards are not only a matter of social justice: numerous studies have shown that the gender balance on boards and the workforce brings both societal and economic returns.

All in all, I truly believe that we have achieved an ambitious report which advocates for the deepening of our economic integration and the completion of the Banking Union. And finally, I will switch into Danish.

For til sidst vil jeg gerne appellere til mit eget land, Danmark, om at tiltræde bankunionen og dermed slutte flere års nøleri. Ved at tiltræde bankunionen vil Danmark både styrke sin egen finansielle stabilitet og det europæiske samarbejde inden for den finansielle sektor. Et dansk medlemskab vil også give os langt mere indflydelse på EU-lovgivning, der påvirker den danske finanssektor. Fordelene ved et dansk medlemskab af bankunionen er veldokumenteret. Så er det bare om at komme i gang.

VORSITZ: NICOLA BEER

Vizepräsidentin

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Madam President, we must continue to ensure the Banking Union and the Capital Markets Union are a priority of this Commission and the Parliament and the Council. And as we see interest rate rises across Europe, we have to ensure that we have mechanisms in place to give confidence to consumers and those that have deposits in banks. We also need to put a macro-prudential framework in place to ensure that there is proper oversight of our banking system, but equally that we have competition across the entire European Union when it comes to provision of services to our banking industry.

At the moment we have a very sheltered industry in many countries. Particularly from the point of view of Ireland itself, we have two major banks and then after that it is very, very challenging. So we do need to see more competition coming into the marketplace for consumers across the European Union.

So Commissioner I would urge you to continue on the path that you are progressing with regard to the Banking Union, and also from the Capital Markets Union perspective, to ensure that we have adequate capital to fund the Green Deal and in the meantime to ensure customers have a competitive advantage in ensuring they can shop around to get the best interest rates and loan approvals possible, particularly in Ireland due to our sheltered banking system at the moment.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, *vielen Dank* and good evening. This is a rather special debate. My thanks to the select few who have contributed two excellent contributions. It is about quality, not volume.

Can I just say thank you to rapporteur Peter-Hansen in particular, for her comment about nature restoration and the banking debate. In fact, we need the Banking Union and Capital Markets Union in order to provide the investment needed for nature restoration and the climate challenge. So while there aren't many here, I think it is important for us to state very clearly that the work you've done on this report, which is excellent, with the shadows, is very important – and not to the financial system alone; this is about the economy and society. We need to say that very loud and very clear indeed.

What I'd love is during the European election campaigns of 2024, the people would ask us about the Banking Union and the Capital Markets Union. I live in hope, and I think, Madam rapporteur your words should encourage people to do that.

So you know the Commission's position on the Banking Union, we know that we need to develop and strengthen and it is a work in progress. The good news on one part is that the Council and Parliament recently agreed to the final implementation of the Basel international banking standards in the EU. This is really welcome as it is a major contribution to the single rulebook. After 15 years we are turning the page on the post-financial crisis reforms and we can look to the future. But we still have this unfinished business with the Banking Union, and that's why this debate is important.

You rightly say, Madam Rapporteur, that we recently adopted the proposal for crisis management and deposit insurance (CMDI) back in April. It is an important reform and will help to address some of the challenges with how the rules are working in practice. It builds on the experience we gathered on the ground since 2014 and addresses many of the observations you make in your report. The review offered a good opportunity to look at what worked well and indeed what didn't work so well.

The goal of the reform is to ensure a more consistent approach to managing bank failures in the European Union, because we want to make sure that any bank can exit the market smoothly, regardless of its size or business model or location. This reform will strengthen financial stability, protect taxpayers and improve the confidence of depositors across the European Union. But most importantly, this reform is also intended to build new momentum, to relaunch discussions on completing the Banking Union.

As you rightly point out in your report, the CMDI Review is not, and should not be, a substitute for completing the Banking Union. The big missing element remains a European deposit insurance scheme (EDIS). EU citizens should be able to open a bank account wherever they are in the EU with the same level of protection. If we want every euro deposited anywhere in the Banking Union to have the same value, then we need to give it the same level of protection through a common deposit insurance scheme. A common European safety net will deliver more resilience to the system more efficiently, and it will make national schemes less vulnerable to large, local or systemic shocks. This will pave the way for deeper market integration – and that's critical for growth and resilience – as well as allowing the banking sector to better compete internationally.

There are different design options for EDIS and we acknowledge them in our communication. Alongside the crisis management proposals, we must continue working to finalise a more resilient and integrated Banking Union. I am confident that the CMDI proposal will pave the path for EDIS and that it will help us make a fully-fledged Banking Union a reality. But I really cannot say this strongly enough: we need the Banking Union. It will help the EU banking sector not only to weather geopolitical and financial turmoil, but also to boost its profitability and competitiveness. Again, it will help finance the green and digital transitions. It will make sure that our safety nets are effective and that enough funding is available to handle failing banks across the Banking Union in times of crisis. Last but not least, it will benefit European citizens because depositor confidence is a public good and we are responsible for protecting it.

So I encourage the European Parliament to remain ambitious on these files and I look forward to continuing to work with you on completing the Banking Union.

President. – Thank you very much that you were here so late in the evening. We will then switch to Commissioner Schmit for the next debate, but so far this debate is closed and the vote will be tomorrow.

22. Fostering and adapting vocational training as a tool for employees' success and a building block for the EU economy in the new industry 4.0 (short presentation)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Anna Zalewska über die Förderung und Gestaltung der Berufsbildung als Instrument für den Erfolg der Arbeitnehmer und als Baustein für die Wirtschaft der EU in der neuen Industrie 4.0 (2022/2207(INI)) (A9-0232/2023).

Anna Zalewska, Sprawozdawczyni. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Spędza Pan z nami dzisiaj bardzo pracowity wieczór. To rzeczywiście duża satysfakcja, że w Europejskim Roku Umiejętności chcemy przyjąć sprawozdanie o kompetencjach 4.0. Zanim będę mówiła o sprawozdaniu, chcę podziękować kompetentnym, posiadającym ogromne umiejętności koleżankom i kolegom sprawozdawcom ceniom, jak również ich doradcom, bo rzeczywiście rozumieliśmy się w lot, dogadywaliśmy się przy każdym kompromisie czy poprawce. Rzeczywiście świat zmienia się w tempie, nad którym nie możemy przejść do porządku dziennego. Musimy sprostać wyzwaniom. To świat 4.0. Pewnie za moment będzie 5.0.

Potrzebujemy nowych kompetencji, tych kompetencji, które potrzebne są przede wszystkim w świecie cyfrowym, bo to już nie tylko te podstawowe umiejętności, ale też te związane z zarządzaniem, programowaniem, analizowaniem, prezentacją, jak również umiejętności wymuszane przez inny sposób funkcjonowania, edukacji czy pracy. I inaczej wyglądają stosunki personalne, interpersonalne, społeczne, istnieją zupełnie inne potrzeby organizacyjne, ale oczywiście o wszystkim tym pamiętamy, bo wyznaczaliśmy też i trendy, i potrzeby, które są konieczne do zrealizowania, a nie tylko diagnozowaliśmy sytuację. Pokazywaliśmy, że konieczne jest, aby firma była w szkole, szkoła w firmie, żeby indywidualizować przez całe życie różne ścieżki doskonalenia, żeby wspierać pokolenia, żeby mentor mógł uczyć i pokazywać i wychowywać nowego pracownika.

Podkreślaliśmy również w sprawozdaniu, że ważne jest, żeby promować firmy, które potrafią w taki sposób edukować swoich pracowników, dawać im satysfakcję, uznawać, że są z nimi cały czas. To zresztą dla swojego własnego dobra i dobra rynku i konkurencyjności. A z drugiej strony, żeby szkoła, edukacja zrozumiała, że w firma może być właściwie online, że razem powinni się kształcić i razem powinni przygotowywać pracownika do rynku pracy.

Jednocześnie podkreślaliśmy, że promocja firmy, która potrafi wspierać pracownika, ma takie kompetencje, żeby posiadał wszystko to, czego potrzebuje rynek 4.0, że też firma taka powinna być promowana, też powinna funkcjonować jako wzór, jako przykład do naśladowania. Oczywiście wszystko to zostawiamy państwu członkowskim, bo to są ich kompetencje.

Na końcu mogę tylko powiedzieć, że taką formą promocji są w tym roku *Euro Skills*, i zapraszam wszystkich serdecznie: odbywają się w Polsce, w Gdańsku, w pierwszym tygodniu września. Mam nadzieję, że będą Państwo śledzić, jak ci, którzy rozwijają swoje kompetencje, jak ci, którzy promują szkolnictwo zawodowe, branżowe będą ze sobą rywalizować. Jeszcze raz dziękuję za doskonałą pracę.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já tento bod dnešní rozpravy velmi vítám. Vítám zprávu kolegyně Zalewské, protože Evropský rok kvalifikací ukazuje, co je naší nejzásadnější výzvou, co představuje největší výzvu pro budoucí období, a to je otázka právě rozvoje kvalifikace našich zaměstnanců.

Na té zprávě je mimo jiné zajímavé, že do roku 2030 bude 40 % Evropanů žít v regionech, kde bude docházet k úbytku pracovních míst. To znamená, je evidentní, že největší výzvu představují kompetence, celoživotní vzdělávání. A nejen pro téma Průmysl 4.0, přijde další téma Průmysl 5.0.

My evidentně budeme potřebovat každého v pracovním procesu a nikdo nebude moct být opomenut právě ve vzdělávání, být diskriminován v přístupu ke vzdělávání. To jsou velké výzvy a jsem rád, že se tomu skutečně věnujeme. Největší výzvou pro naši budoucnost je skutečně učit se.

Ilana Cicurel (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, faire de la voie professionnelle une voie d'excellence est un combat que je porte dans mon pays, la France, comme au sein de ce Parlement. La voie professionnelle doit cesser d'être une voie par défaut et devenir une voie choisie parce qu'elle conduit à l'emploi et à l'épanouissement personnel.

Je voudrais insister sur une des composantes de la valorisation de la voie professionnelle: la mobilité européenne. Monsieur le Commissaire, vous avez annoncé le lancement d'un nouveau cadre de la mobilité européenne en cette Année européenne des compétences. Nous demandons que la mobilité courte et longue des apprentis et des alternants en soit la priorité. Parce que la valorisation d'une filière va toujours de pair avec son internationalisation. Parce que la mobilité permet d'acquérir de nouveaux savoirs. Parce qu'elle permet à nos jeunes de développer ce que l'on appelle les compétences du XXI^e siècle: confiance en eux parce qu'on leur a fait confiance, capacité de s'adapter à un contexte nouveau, à travailler en équipe, à avoir un esprit d'initiative, à sortir de leur zone de confort, à découvrir les ressources insoupçonnées qu'ils ont en eux et que la mobilité révèle.

C'est un cadeau que l'Europe leur fait et se fait à elle-même, car ils deviendront demain d'excellents professionnels qui contribueront au rayonnement de notre union.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, estamos aqui a falar sobre a promoção da formação profissional em razão de uma crescente procura por parte das empresas para uma chamada Indústria 4.0, que se traduz em trabalhos com elevadas exigências digitais.

Preocupa-nos que a formação profissional possa ser uma forma de escamotear os reais números do desemprego, não promovendo o emprego com direitos; que possa ser uma forma de ocupar quem quer trabalhar, mas que, no final, em vez de um emprego com direitos, conseguirá, na melhor das hipóteses, um estágio.

Reconhecemos o valor da formação profissional no reforço e na atualização de competências e defendemos igualmente que esteja ao serviço da valorização profissional e salarial e da progressão nas carreiras.

Uma palavra de solidariedade para com os trabalhadores da Refinaria de Matosinhos, que devido ao encerramento da mesma estão há mais de dois anos no desemprego, aguardando a formação profissional que lhes abriria portas para um emprego, no mínimo com as mesmas condições, mas que não aconteceu em nome de uma transição que de justa tem muito pouco e que deixa trabalhadores para trás.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Nicolas Schmit, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, first I would like to express my gratitude for the Parliament's important work on skills and especially also the very strong support you give to the success of the European Year of Skills. We all know that skills are a critical factor for enabling the green and digital transitions, as well as to foster quality job creation and Europe's competitiveness. The rapid changes in EU labour markets put skills policy at the centre of today's action. That is why we have launched the European Year of Skills.

Your report on fostering and adopting vocational training as a tool for employees' success and a building block for the European economy in the new industry 4.0 – the Commission absolutely welcomes this report because it gives us a lot of good ideas of strong analysis, but especially also very practical proposals.

We fully support your call for well-functioning and modern continuing vocational education and training systems, with companies investing more in upskilling and reskilling and governments creating favourable conditions for such investments. I can say that I am personally a fan of EuroSkills. I visited, in my previous function, different EuroSkills and I must say, when you look at the enthusiasm of these young people, you can only support this initiative, which leads to better and broader vocational training systems. I will personally be in Gdańsk for the next EuroSkills in September.

Now there will be No Green Deal industrial plan, there will be No Green Deal without investing in people's – and especially also in young people's – skills. We really have to encourage young people to choose vocational training. And my experience shows me also that particularly in many areas very much linked to the green economy, but also to the digital economy, the right way is vocational training. We are already, we have a major lack of professionals in many areas which are very much linked to the greening of our economy to implement the Green Deal, but also in the area of digital skills. And there are a lot of ways how we can really help young people or people who have to change their professional orientation through vocational training or something which is very close to vocational training, not going back to school, the classical schoolrooms, but especially learning by doing, learning independently, learning by in a team. And you referred very much to the soft skills which are very important also in this major transformation we are going through.

Member States agreed to modernise vocational education and training to make it more attractive. And I think this is a big issue. How can we make vocational training more attractive? How can we bring more young people back to vocational training? I know that in many countries there is a lack of young people choosing vocational training, choosing the different professions you can learn by vocational training. In 2020, it was the German Presidency, the Council recommendation on that was adapted and improved, as well as the famous Osnabrück declaration was adapted, which includes also the request to more mobility for young people in those programmes. These are all instrumental for greater convergence between national systems, and I think we have to encourage Member States to work and to exchange good practices in the area of vocational training.

We are happy to acknowledge the progress on objectives to be reached by 25. The target on work-based learning is already achieved, and with nearly 80% in 2022, we are on track to reach our employment target for vocational graduates of 82% by 25. This is crucial since many jobs linked to the green and digital transitions will be technical and will require vocational education and training, they will also require up— and reskilling of the working age population. However, analysis shows that the EU is not on a par with other parts of the world in new technologies. Some 8% of adult workers in the EU work with robots and 9% of adult workers work with 3D printers as part of their main job.

In your report, you have pointed out critical challenges. Some 77% of businesses cannot find the talent they need, and in our fast-paced environment, technology changes quickly, triggering new needs. And we all talk now about artificial intelligence: every day there is a new evolution in artificial intelligence, new applications in many areas, in many professions, so we have to make sure that people learn how to handle artificial intelligence. It's not a question of how many jobs will disappear, it's a question of how many jobs will be transformed by artificial intelligence and how we are able to give people the skills to handle artificial intelligence.

We need to create a culture where the norm is to continuously upskill or reskill. That is why we have set an ambitious EU target that was supported at the Porto Summit in 21, with 60% of adults following a training every year. Your report is right in that we need to pay particular attention to vulnerable groups such as disadvantaged youth, NEETs and Roma people. Yes, we are all complaining about the shortage of skilled labour or labour, and we have 8 million young people who are nowhere, who are just out of the labour market, who are not in education, who are not in training. This is a challenge for Europe, this is a challenge for Member States, and we cannot just leave this challenge out. We have to do something if we want really to address the labour shortage we are facing.

I agree with you also on the role of companies and the need for specific support to SMEs. The Pact for Skills is one of our key initiatives on upskilling and reskilling of adults. So far, 1 500 organisations have committed to upskill at least 10 million people. This is a good result, but it is not yet enough. We have to reskill more, because it's millions of people, especially in industries 4.0 – and all industries become 4.0 industries, not only the automotive, all industries are in this process of transformation, so require also good vocational training. And I have seen recently in a big company how they train their young people, how they motivate also young people to choose the vocational way to learn.

So thank you very much for your report. Thank you for your proposals. And we all will be in Poland for the EuroSkills.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 11. Juli 2023, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Jarosław Duda (PPE), na piśmie. – Szanowni Państwo, Cieszę się, że podczas obecnej kadencji tak dużo uwagi poświęcamy sprawom społecznym, a zwłaszcza poprawie warunków pracy i życia osób zatrudnionych. Sprawozdanie to jest szczególnie istotne w kontekście Europejskiego Roku umiejętności. Jestem przekonany, że wysokiej jakości ustawiczne kształcenie i szkolenie zawodowe promuje ideę uczenia się przez całe życie i przyczynia się do dostosowania do dynamicznych zmian na rynku pracy, a co za tym idzie, do wydłużenia aktywności zawodowej. Mam na uwadze, że wdrożenie wysokiej jakości ustawicznego kształcenia i szkolenia zawodowego może stanowić znaczne obciążenie finansowe, zwłaszcza dla mikroprzedsiębiorstw i małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw. Dlatego chciałbym podkreślić rolę państw członkowskich i Komisji Europejskiej w opracowywaniu i wdrażaniu strategii wspierających i zachęcających przedsiębiorstwa do docenienia roli edukacji w miejscu pracy. Wierzę, że dzięki odpowiednim zachętom, programom wspierającym oraz dzięki cyfryzacji doprowadzimy do zwiększenia dostępności i przystępności cenowej szkoleń dla większej liczby przedsiębiorstw i pracowników. Dziękuję.

Livia Járóka (NI), írásban. – Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Ugyan arról nem érdemes megfejtkezniünk, hogy az oktatási, képzési és készségfejlesztési politikák tagállami hatáskör alá tartoznak, fontos a tagállamok közötti joggyakorlatok kölcsönös megosztásának mechanizmusát is kiépítenünk. Az elmúlt három év számos, számunkra mindezidáig ismeretlen kihívás elé állította közösségeinket.

Egy azonban biztos: ha az oktatás és kiváltképp a szakképzés területét elhanyagoljuk, a jövő generációinak kitörési, mobilizációs és felzárkózási lehetőségeit lehetetlenítjük el. Elfogadhatatlan, hogy 2021-ben a 16-24 éves romák 56%-a korlátozottan vagy szinte semennyire sem vett részt az oktatásban, de még a foglalkoztatásban sem. Komplex, a szakpolitikákra egységesen válaszolni képes stratégiát kell folytatnunk annak érdekében, hogy ezeken a tendenciákon javítani tudjunk.

Magyarország komoly eredményeket ért el a szakképzés átalakítása és az oktatási rendszeren belül történő korszerűsítése területén. Ezért is elfogadhatatlan az ilyen irányú forrásmegvonás és -visszatartás akár Lengyelország, akár Magyarország esetében. Próbáljunk meg végre a szakmai munkára fókuszálva tényleges cselekvési terveket megalkotva eredményre jutni. Politikai zsarolások és nyílt ideológiai viták helyett! Ajánlom a magyar példa tanulmányozását az Önök számára is!

Ádám Kósa (NI), írásban. – A szakképzés társadalmi megítélése a vonzóbb karrierlehetőségeknek, a mobilitási lehetőségeknek, valamint az oktatásban alkalmazott digitális megoldásoknak köszönhetően megváltozott, azonban – státuszának és arculatának javulása ellenére – még mindig nem az első választás a fiatalok körében, és azt az általános oktatást követő második, kevésbé vonzó választási lehetőségnek tekintik. Emiatt Európa-szerte – földrajzi régiók, országok szerint eltérő mértékben – sok ágazatban hiány mutatkozik a képzett munkaerőből (egészségügy, vendéglátás, építőipar, informatikai szolgáltatások).

A tanári szakma egész Európában egyike az öt legmagasabb munkaerőhiánnyal sújtott foglalkozásnak, amely befolyásolja azt, hogy mennyire biztosítható a diákok részére az az oktatás és képzés, amelyre a negyedik ipari forradalomhoz való alkalmazkodáshoz szükségük lesz. Másrésztől a mesterséges intelligencia és a virtuális valóság területén végbement fejlődés megváltoztatja a szakképzés területét is: a képzési lehetőségek hozzáférhetőbbé és megfizethetőbbé válnak. Ki kell használni ezeket a lehetőségeket, hogy olyan szakembereket képezzünk, akik naprakész tudással rendelkeznek. A duális képzés (a tanulmányok alatti gyakorlati tapasztalatszerzés) jó irány, de emellett hangsúlyt kell fektetni arra is, hogy a cégek megtartsák a tapasztaltabb munkaerőt, hiszen ők például mentorálni tudják a pályára belépőket.

Végül, de nem utolsósorban létfontosságú, hogy a fogyatékossgal élő személyeknek jobb lehetőségei legyenek a szakképzésben való részvételre és új készségek elsajátítására, mert ez a foglalkoztatás és a függetlenség előfeltétele.

23. One-minute speeches on matters of political importance

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

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, a mere month ago we called for justice, demanding the termination of proceedings and the release of Tihiran and Mykyta, two Ukrainian boys who faced unspeakable brutality at the hands of Russian authorities. They endured beatings and were subjected to electroshock torture. Despite our efforts, these boys are no longer alive. Russian soldiers shot them. Their lives were cut short.

This case is not an isolated incident. Countless families and children endure persecution and live in constant fear, robbed of the chance to experience a peaceful existence. Friends of these boys are now being targeted. Their parents face ongoing persecution and cannot even properly bury their sons, as Russia refused to release their bodies. We can only guess why. So we will not step down and we will prevail in our efforts to bring those responsible to justice. We have to ensure their sacrifice is not in vain.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, a coesão territorial nas regiões ultraperiféricas da União Europeia é crucial para promover o desenvolvimento económico e social e garantir igualdade de oportunidades.

Mas, na ilha da Madeira, a ocorrência cada vez mais frequente de ventos fortes tem provocado o encerramento temporário do aeroporto, por vezes horas, por vezes dias, afetando os locais, mas também todos aqueles que nos querem visitar.

Até ao momento, a Comissão Europeia ainda nada fez para atenuar estas graves quebras da conectividade.

Peço, assim, que haja mais investimento nas infraestruturas aeroportuárias resilientes através da certificação de aeroportos alternativos próximos, como é o caso do aeroporto na ilha de Porto Santo, e também através de uma ligação de *ferry* que exista todo o ano para o continente e que também seja feita através do navio que faz a ligação interilhas.

A União Europeia tem aqui de garantir que ninguém fica para trás e que nenhuma região fica para trás.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señora presidenta, quiero exigir con esta intervención al Gobierno francés que abra los pasos fronterizos que separan hoy las comunidades de la zona transfronteriza del País Vasco. Y quiero pedir a la Comisión que medie para acabar con estos cierres. Es una decisión incompatible con el Código de Fronteras Schengen. Y dos estudios distintos denuncian el tremendo impacto que la medida tiene en los derechos, la convivencia y el desarrollo económico y social de una comunidad que quiere seguir viviendo junta. Personas que aportan, desde dos Estados de la Unión, una lengua y una cultura milenarias. Una de las joyas que atesora nuestra Unión y su diversidad.

Este viernes, representantes de Euskadi y Nueva Aquitania lamentábamos, separadas por vallas y verjas, este sinsentido. Un cierre que, además, facilita prácticas inhumanas sobre personas migrantes, algunas de las cuales han perdido la vida intentando cruzar a nado el río Bidasoa.

La reforma del Código de Fronteras debe reforzar el blindaje contra estos abusos. Debe fomentar una política migratoria humana, la cooperación transfronteriza y la libertad de movimientos para personas y mercancías que hace grande nuestra Unión.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhora Presidente, quero mostrar o apoio como eurodeputada do Bloco aos trabalhadores do sector metalúrgico que no meu país protestam, desde 15 de junho, em defesa de salários justos e trabalho decente.

Os trabalhadores e as trabalhadoras saíram às ruas com grande apoio em Vigo, Pontevedra e Vila Garcia, num setor que é vital para Galiza. Reivindicam os seus direitos porque os empresários não cumprem os acordos.

Não se pode consentir na Europa a precariedade que tem o setor metalúrgico galego. Os sindicatos pedem diálogo. Se não há acordo, haverá greve por tempo indeterminado a partir de 18 de julho. O sindicato galego CIG falou alto e claro. O setor metalúrgico está a falar com contundência para não perder os direitos sociais conquistados em anos de luta, desde o Parlamento Europeu: «Convenio do metal, solución».

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR). – Señor presidente, compañeros, ¿qué se puede esperar de una sociedad que no aprecia la vida, la infancia, que ignora la familia, que no entiende a las personas más que de una manera instrumental?

Pues lo que podemos esperar es lo que está sucediendo, lo que lleva sucediendo durante años de gobiernos obedientes de agendas antinatalistas: en los setenta, Europa suponía más del 10 % de la población mundial; ahora el 5 % y en 2080 se espera que seamos simplemente el 3 %.

En mi país los jóvenes no pueden independizarse, tampoco aspirar a comprar una casa o construir su hogar, cumplir su anhelo natural de formar una familia y tener hijos. La realidad es que no ha habido voluntad política para resolver esto o la voluntad ha sido justo la de llegar a esta situación. ¿Europa se muere o a Europa se la está matando?

En España lo tenemos claro: allí donde está Vox se ha conseguido que el apoyo a la maternidad y a las familias sea siempre una prioridad. Una Europa sin niños es una Europa sin futuro. Queremos barrios llenos de la alegría de los niños. Queremos esperanza. Acabemos con este pesimismo existencial.

Marie Dauchy (ID). – Madame la Présidente, au mois de mars, j'ai déposé une proposition de résolution visant à coordonner la lutte contre l'endométriose – en clair, prendre ce que chaque État fait de meilleur en matière de prise en charge et de recherche. Ce texte n'a pas été retenu par les coordinateurs de la commission ENVI, au motif qu'il ne concernait qu'une maladie parmi d'autres.

Vous n'avez visiblement pas l'air de comprendre la gravité de cette maladie qui provoque des douleurs pires que celles d'un accouchement sans péridurale et pour laquelle il n'y a aucun traitement. En plus d'être une maladie handicapante, elle entraîne de graves conséquences psychologiques. Selon une récente étude, c'est 84,9 % des femmes atteintes de la maladie qui ont eu des idées suicidaires, sans parler de celles qui sont déjà passées à l'acte. Ce chiffre est alarmant et c'est un constat: l'endométriose tue. Il ne s'agit donc pas d'une simple maladie comme certains aiment à le laisser penser. Surtout qu'elle concerne 14 millions d'Européennes diagnostiquées – diagnostiquées seulement, puisque beaucoup d'entre elles sont encore dans l'errance et attendent avec impatience le dépistage salivaire pour enfin mettre un nom sur un mal qui les ronge depuis des années.

Dans le cadre de mes travaux, j'ai rencontré des dizaines d'associations qui soutiennent toutes ma proposition. J'ai également été soutenue publiquement par Camilla Fabricius, députée socialiste du Danemark, qui m'a félicitée. Voilà une personne intelligente qui pense d'abord à l'intérêt des femmes au lieu des petits calculs politiques. Honte à vous de ne pas vous préoccuper de la santé des femmes. Honte à vous de laisser des millions de femmes dans la détresse de cette maladie. Aujourd'hui, elles sont 14 millions à avoir un diagnostic. Mais demain, elles pourraient être vos filles, vos mères, vos sœurs ou vos épouses. Je continuerai donc à me battre au sein du Parlement pour qu'enfin leur voix soit entendue.

Die Präsidentin. – Frau Kollegin! Ich weiß, dass sind alles wichtige Tagesordnungspunkte und Themen, aber wir haben jeder eine Minute, deswegen wäre ich dankbar, wenn sich jeder an die Regeln hält.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, em março de 2022, o serviço de segurança ucraniano deteve Aleksander e Mikhail Kononovich, militantes do Partido Comunista Ucraniano, também ele alvo de um processo persecutório.

Após mais de 100 dias em paradeiro desconhecido e sem julgamento e em resultado de uma campanha de solidariedade internacional, Aleksander e Mikhail Kononovich estão agora em prisão domiciliária.

No entanto, persistem e acentuam-se inaceitáveis ameaças, nomeadamente à sua própria vida, incluindo por parte de elementos policiais. Como democratas, como antifascistas, expressamos a nossa solidariedade a Aleksander e Mikhail Kononovich, denunciámos e condenámos os maus tratos e as ameaças a que têm estado sujeitos e exigimos a sua imediata libertação.

Do mesmo modo, expressamos a solidariedade para com todos quantos na Ucrânia, tal como Aleksander e Mikhail Kononovich, anseiam por uma Europa do Atlântico aos Urais, de paz, segurança coletiva e cooperação entre todos os povos; paz, segurança coletiva e cooperação na Europa, que exige uma solução negociada para o conflito que se trava na Ucrânia, no respeito pelos princípios da Carta das Nações Unidas e da Ata Final da Conferência de Helsínquia.

Tatjana Ždanoka (NI). – Madam President, the parliament of my country has three weeks ago adopted the law banning the use of languages other than the state language, Latvian, in election campaigning. This ignores the fact that a third of the country's inhabitants speak minority languages – mostly Russian – at home.

This law runs counter to the reasoned judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the *Mestan v. Bulgaria* case. The leader of a political party was sanctioned for speaking in Turkish while campaigning for election to the Parliament. The Court held unanimously that there had been a violation of Article 10 on freedom of expression of the European Convention on Human Rights.

The Court I am citing stressed the importance of pluralism, tolerance and the protection of minorities in a democratic society, and observed that respect for minorities, far from weakening democracies, could only make them stronger.

So I want to address the following question to the EU legislators: is it not better to learn good experiences than to repeat the bad ones?

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl dnes svou jednu minutu využít pro to, abych se přimluvil za užší zapojení Ukrajiny do euroatlantických struktur. Byli jsme v posledním týdnu svědky velké diplomatické ofenzivy pana prezidenta Zelenského, i v České republice jsme jej přijali na návštěvě. Velmi si toho vážíme. Byl také v Turecku, setkal se s polským prezidentem, byl v Bulharsku a v dalších zemích.

Podle mého názoru tváří v tvář této diplomatické aktivitě stojí samozřejmě pokračování zavrženíhodné agrese Ruska a také jeho vnitřních sporů. A v tomto momentě my musíme být jednotní. Jsem přesvědčen, že členství Ukrajiny v euroatlantických strukturách, to znamená v Evropské unii a v NATO, je v našem bytostném zájmu. Měli bychom z hlediska Evropské unie poskytnout další preference přístupu na trh pro Ukrajinu, také mít širší aktivitu na poli vzdělávání, rovněž spolupráci v energetice, v zemědělství. A samozřejmě v budoucnosti jsem přesvědčen, že by se Ukrajina měla stát i členem NATO.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Zweieinhalb Meter lang und anderthalb Meter breit – das ist die Größe einer Isolationszelle im iranischen Evin-Gefängnis. Diskriminierung, Isolation und Folter gehören zum Alltag der Inhaftierten und auch die Ungewissheit, ob und wann man jemals wieder frei ist. Besonders in inoffiziellen Hafteinrichtung der Revolutionsgarden, die euphemistisch „sichere Häuser“ genannt werden, ist Isolation häufig, und für die Angehörigen der Inhaftierten ist dann nicht mal klar, wo sie eigentlich sind.

Seit dem Mord an Jina Mahsa Amini wurden über 20 000 Menschen inhaftiert. Aber auch schon vorher galt: Wen das Regime mundtot machen will, den lassen sie hinter dicken Mauern verschwinden. So auch den Rapper Tumadsch Salehi, der nach 252 Tagen Isolationshaft nun unschuldig zu sechs Jahren und drei Monaten verurteilt wurde. Auch wenn die Aufmerksamkeit schwindet, dürfen wir in diesem Haus nicht aufhören, Menschenrechtsverletzungen des iranischen Regimes zu benennen.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Madam President, at present, the European Commission is examining the continuation of Ireland's derogation concerning the Nitrates Directive. Recently, a water quality survey was published by Ireland's Environmental Protection Agency and it shows that despite the major increase in the dairy sector and production in Ireland since 2016, water quality has not generally diminished. The Irish Government is part of the Food Harvest 2020 Strategy, which actively promoted the increase in the dairy sector. Over the last number of years, farmers have put in place strong mitigation measures to reduce nitrogen emissions from dairy. But we need more time to see the full impact on water quality. Moving from 250 kg of organic nitrogen per hectare to 220 kg would cause major challenges for the Irish dairy sector. Not only would herd numbers have to be reduced, limiting farm incomes, it would also have a serious impact on the agri-food sector reliant on milk production.

Today I have written to Vice-President Timmermans and Commissioner Wojciechowski requesting that they would visit Ireland first and see first-hand and meet with farmers who are currently in the nitrates derogation. It is essential that they meet businesses, employees, marts and co-ops and the broader dairy sector and processing facilities to see the loss of the derogation and the impact it would have on Ireland.

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, 38 years ago, French Secret Service agents bombed the Greenpeace flagship *Rainbow Warrior*. An explosion ripped through the hull of our ship while it was moored in New Zealand, ahead of a protest against nuclear weapons testing in the Pacific. It was an act of terror, which killed my friend Fernando Pereira. The series of events that the French state set in motion with the bombing of *Rainbow Warrior* led me to this Chamber today, 38 years later.

Our activism continues despite their intimidation. And that's why today I am calling on President Macron for a full apology for the crew of *Rainbow Warrior*, for the family of Fernando Pereira and for the deadly precedent the French state set, legitimising violence against activists and civil societies. In 1985, we said, 'you can't sink a rainbow'. Tonight, I say here in the European Parliament, 'you cannot sink a rainbow'.

Johan Nissinen (ECR). – Fru talman! De brutala kravallerna i Frankrike är en skoningslös inblick i Västeuropas och Sveriges framtid. Integrationen har totalt misslyckats. Alla vet om det, men det är fortfarande tabu att prata om det i Bryssel. Migrationen har förändrat våra länder på ett sätt som jag tror att många inte ville, och framförallt har den förändrat våra länder för all framtid, både demografiskt, socialt, kulturellt och trygghetsmässigt.

Europaparlamentet älskar att engagera sig i alla världens problem, men man har inte ägnat en enda sekund, inte ett enda ord, åt upploppen i Frankrike som hände nyligen. Västeuropa har en stor del invånare som föraktar allting som vi står för. De hatar oss, trots att vi har öst ut bidrag och sällan ställt några krav på dessa människor. Det är dags att vi tar tag i dessa problem, innan det Europa vi alla älskar inte finns kvar längre.

Gianantonio Da Re (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da alcune settimane l'Europa assiste inerme alle violente proteste che si sono scatenate in Francia a seguito dell'uccisione del ragazzo nell'ambito del controllo di polizia.

La rabbia e l'aggressività, sfociate in saccheggi e vandalismi, sembrano essere lo sfogo di una società ormai basata solo su tensioni fra diverse etnie, derivanti da una immigrazione incontrollata e da una convivenza imposta dalle urgenze storiche.

L'Europa riconosca i palesi errori commessi sulla gestione dei flussi migratori, provocati dal lassismo giudiziario, e si attivi per adottare una politica migratoria comune e condivisa, basata innanzitutto sulla tolleranza zero per chi non rispetta le leggi degli Stati membri e dell'Unione europea.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, no passado dia 7 de junho, o Dr. Josef Skála, historiador militante do Partido Comunista da Boémia e Morávia, personalidade conhecida na República Checa, foi condenado a uma pena de 8 meses de prisão, suspensa condicionalmente por 18 meses, aparentemente por num programa radiofónico se ter expressado com base em vários estudos e relatos históricos sobre o massacre de Katyn, pondo em causa a versão propagandeada por Joseph Goebbels, Ministro da Propaganda Nazi.

O Dr. Josef Skála foi acusado e condenado sem haver base legal para a sua condenação, após um julgamento onde não foram garantidos os mais elementares direitos de defesa e em clara violação da Constituição da República Checa, como foi denunciado no seu país.

A sua condenação constitui um desrespeito dos direitos, das liberdades e das garantias democráticas, que expõe a tentativa de rever e falsificar a História para impor um pensamento único.

Expressamos a nossa solidariedade ao Dr. Josef Skála e associamo-nos a todos quantos, na República Checa e no mundo, têm denunciado esta perseguição política e exigem justiça.

René Repasi (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Am 12. Juli ist es so weit: der Moment, auf den viele *Swifties* gewartet haben. Der Kartenvorverkauf für Taylor Swifts Deutschlandtournee beginnt. Tickets für Megastars wie Taylor Swift und Beyoncé lassen nicht nur die Inflation in Schweden steigen, sie sorgen auch für goldene Zeiten bei Ticketverkäufern.

Das Phänomen heißt dynamische Preisgestaltung oder *dynamic pricing*. Dabei checkt ein Algorithmus nicht nur im Internet Angebot und Nachfrage, sondern beim jeweiligen Benutzer dessen Surfverhalten, das Gerät, mit dem er sich im Internet bewegt, oder das Betriebssystem, mit dem derjenige im Internet auf die Kartensuche geht. Dabei werden Ticketpreise erzeugt von bis zu 5 000 US-Dollar beim letzten Konzert von Bruce Springsteen in den Vereinigten Staaten.

Das ist Wucher, das ist Geldmacherei auf dem Rücken der Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher. Darum frage ich die Kommission: Halten Sie derartige Preisdiskriminierungen vom geltenden EU-Verbraucherschutzrecht für erfasst? Und wenn ja, dann tun Sie etwas dagegen. Wenn nein, dann brauchen wir schleunigst die notwendigen Entwürfe.

Katalin Cseh (Renew). – Madame President, dear colleagues, it is often hard to imagine what Viktor Orban's abusive regime looks like from the ground, especially for those of you who are fortunate enough to live in democracies. So imagine you are a 17-year-old student. You wrote a slam poetry piece criticising the unbearable crisis of public education. You recite it at a rally. And as a punishment, you are forced out of school and you are dragged through the dirt by Orban's propaganda machine. Now imagine you're a teacher and advocate for much needed reforms, and you get fired for engaging in a strike, after 23 years of teaching in a country with a massive shortage of teachers. These are the stories of Lili Pankotai and Katalin Torley. And these are not isolated cases. And from last Tuesday on, these police-state methods are enshrined in law. Under Orban's Revenge Law, voicing critical opinions is grounds for disciplinary action. The law mandates teachers to maintain faith in public education. Teachers can have their devices monitored or overworked without compensation, even sent away to work at distant locations. This law is cruel, autocratic, and has no place in the European Union, and the Commission must demand that it is repealed. The time for action is now.

Hannah Neumann (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, today Tomaj Salehi was sentenced to six years and three months in an Iranian prison for his rap songs about freedom. Tens of thousands of political prisoners are held on trumped-up charges in Iran because they advocate for freedom.

At least eight protesters are at imminent threat of execution for demanding freedom: Ebrahim Narouie, Kambiz Kharout, Shoeib Mir Baluchzahi Rigi, Manouchehr Mehman Navaz, Mohammad Ghobadlou, Mojahed Kourkour, Milad Zohrevand and Mansour Dahmardeh. And at least two EU citizens are being held hostage by the regime, and they are on death row because this regime fears freedom: Jamshid Sharmahd and Ahmad Reza Jalali.

And I request everyone who engages with this regime to start talks by saying these names, by demanding their release again and again. I will not be silenced.

(The speaker concluded in a non-official language)

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, als een kabinet valt, wordt dat vaak gezien als slecht nieuws. Het zou politieke instabiliteit en stilstand betekenen. Met de val van het kabinet-Rutte IV ligt dat anders.

Onder leiding van minister van Financiën Sigrid Kaag werd een onbegrijpelijke EU-strategie voor Nederland ingezet. Nederland vergooide haar sterke positie als financieel zuinig land. In plaats van Duitsland te steunen voor strenge begrotingsregels trok de Nederlandse regering met Spanje op. Schuld kon flexibel worden afgebouwd. Ook wilde het kabinet akkoord gaan met EDIS, een Europees depositogarantiestelsel waardoor Nederlanders garant komen te staan voor Zuid-Europese spaartegoeden. Rutte en Kaag liepen voorop om het vetorecht in de Europese Raad af te schaffen.

Voorzitter, de Nederlandse regering is gevallen, en dat is goed nieuws. Want als deze EU-plannen waren doorgevoerd, zouden we daar voor altijd aan vastzitten. Nu komen er verkiezingen aan. Wij kunnen het tij nu keren.

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, de graves émeutes ont embrasé la France du 27 juin au 3 juillet, suite à la mort tragique d'un jeune homme tué par un policier dans des circonstances que la justice devra éclaircir. Le Comité de l'ONU pour l'élimination des discriminations raciales a cru bon de dénoncer la gestion de ces émeutes par la France, tout comme le commissaire européen à la justice, Didier Reynders. Ils reprochent aux forces de l'ordre françaises un usage excessif de la violence. C'est se tromper de cible. Les violences illégales ont été l'œuvre des gangs et des casseurs qui se sont déchaînés et non des forces de l'ordre. 800 policiers, gendarmes et sapeurs-pompiers ont d'ailleurs été blessés. Je rends hommage à leur courage.

Le Comité de l'ONU demande aussi à la France d'adopter une loi qui interdirait le profilage racial. C'est méconnaître cette réalité qu'une telle loi existe déjà. La police française n'est pas raciste. Ses membres sont d'ailleurs d'origines diverses, à l'image de la société française. Et quand on soupçonne un policier d'avoir commis une faute, la justice française engage une poursuite judiciaire à son encontre. La France n'est pas un pays d'apartheid. C'est un pays qui reste fidèle à la Déclaration de 1789, et à son article 12, qui dispose que la garantie des droits de l'homme et des citoyens nécessite une force publique.

Manon Aubry (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, mardi dernier, un jeune homme de 17 ans, Nahel, a été froidement abattu par la police lors d'un contrôle routier. Sans une vidéo accablante, ce meurtre serait resté impuni. À l'horreur de ce drame terrible s'est ajouté un déferlement de haine raciste.

Dans quel pays européen peut-on imaginer qu'une cagnotte à la gloire d'un meurtrier recueille 1,6 million d'euros? La France est aujourd'hui une anomalie en Europe. Douze personnes ont été tuées pour refus d'obtempérer l'année dernière, contre une en dix ans en Allemagne. Les jeunes noirs et arabes ont 20 fois plus de chances de se faire contrôler par la police.

Le commissaire à la justice, Didier Reynders, et l'ONU ont demandé à la France d'y remédier. Mais le gouvernement français nie la réalité des violences policières et du racisme dans la police. Pire, il vient d'interdire ce samedi une manifestation demandant simplement vérité et justice pour les victimes et où des journalistes ont été violentés par les forces de l'ordre. Que reste-t-il alors quand les cadres d'expression démocratique sont supprimés? La France est entrée dans une dérive illibérale et autoritaire. Et ici, depuis le Parlement européen, je veux lancer solennellement l'alerte. L'Union européenne doit réagir.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, dragi colegi, summitul NATO de la Vilnius este determinant pentru a arăta unitatea și capacitatea noastră de a ne apăra interesele comune în fața oricăror amenințări.

Concluziile summitului trebuie să ofere un răspuns ferm și fără echivoc împotriva agresiunii barbare a Rusiei. Avem nevoie de întărirea prezenței militare NATO pe flancul estic, de garanții de securitate pentru Republica Moldova și pentru zona Mării Negre, de o colaborare extinsă cu Ucraina și de un plan clar pentru securitatea noastră comună.

În acest context, România poate fi un hub pentru NATO, mai ales pe zona industriei de apărare. De aceea, este esențial să ne consolidăm capacitatea logistică și de producție, de la materiile prime necesare până la resursa umană calificată, folosind inteligent fondurile alocate pentru apărare. Un exemplu ar fi inclusiv modernizarea fabricilor de armament din Cugir.

Fără NATO, oricare stat din regiune putea fi Ucraina. De viitorul NATO depinde securitatea noastră, iar o cooperare strânsă între Uniunea Europeană și NATO este vitală.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Verts/ALE). – În câteva zile, din Voluntari, iadul s-a coborât pe Pământ, dar bătrânețea nu este o boală. Cei mai mulți ajungem acolo și iată că statul ne parchează la marginea societății, uitați, furați și loviți, zoriți parcă spre groapă. Dar mă tem că această situație nu este izolată. Mă tem că e la fel pentru copiii din orfelinate, pentru bolnavii din spitale, pentru bătrânii din alte azile.

Putem să avem cele mai bune programe, dar dacă cei amărâți sunt lăsați în urmă și pe margine, Europa are rolul să intervină acolo unde statele dau eșec. Cer astăzi Comisiei Europene să facă un audit largit tuturor proiectelor sociale finanțate cu bani europeni din România pentru a verifica cum sunt tratați bătrânii, orfanii, copiii. Nu putem permite ca banul european să ajungă exact în buzunarele agresorilor.

Rușine administratorului Godei, funcționarului Țicu și primarilor Pandele și Negoită, sub nasul cărora oamenii au fost tratați de niște bestii.

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Sistematic, Comisia Europeană ne spune cât de importantă e asigurarea securității alimentare a Uniunii. Și tot sistematic, Comisia face propuneri și comunicări care sfidează logica și periclitează această securitate. De exemplu, în recentul supliment al studiului de impact al Regulamentului privind pesticidele, pe 227 de pagini, Comisia demontează toate studiile venite din mediul academic sau asociativ privind impactul cumulativ real al noii legislații UE asupra producției de hrană.

Sau Regulamentul privind restaurarea naturii, care, în pofida avertismentelor, obligă statele membre să aleagă între mediu și investițiile de miliarde deja făcute, iar sectorul agricol să se întrebe dacă merită să producă hrană în continuare. Straturi peste straturi de măsuri care ba se suprapun, ba vin în contradicție cu legislația precedentă îi năucesc pe agricultori.

Ambiții tot mai mari și nerealiste sunt aruncate pe piață cu valoare de certitudine, în timp ce oamenii care știu cel mai bine despre ce e vorba sunt complet ignorați. Până când vom trata echilibrul ca indezirabil și rațiunea ca nefrecventabilă?

Cristian Terheș (ECR). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, I publicly urge the European Commission to stop sending any money to the Palestinian Authority until they stop using their school books and other materials that spread hatred towards Jews and Christians, and while there is still glorification of radicalism and terrorism.

EUR 2.2 billion was sent by the EU in direct budget support to the Palestinian Authority between 2008 and 2020. Sadly, part of this money was used to print books to spread hatred against Jews. Additionally, the Palestinian Authority is supporting the indoctrination of Palestinian children that killing Jews is an act of martyrdom which will be rewarded in heaven.

No peace can be achieved in the Middle East while the EU is funding books that are still indoctrinating children, from very young age, to hate and kill Jews. Jihadist violence cannot be encouraged by misuse of European taxpayers' money, and nor should hatred be funded by our own money.

If the EU wants to be a peacemaker in the Middle East, it is imperative that, going forward, any money given to the Palestinian Authority be strictly conditioned by removing any educational materials that are inciting hatred, violence or terrorist activities among Palestinian children.

Lara Wolters (S&D). – Voorzitter, ik wil het even over Beyoncé hebben. *True story*: voor hetzelfde concert van Beyoncé met dezelfde staplaats betaalt de ene fan 200 euro en de andere 700. Absurd. Bedrijven als Ticketmaster en Live Nation noemen dit met een duur woord *dynamic pricing*. Ik noem het een ordinaire manier om heel erg veel geld te verdienen. Want wat gebeurt er? Ticketbedrijven houden doelbewust kaartjes achter om die kort voor het concert voor een veel hoger bedrag te kunnen verkopen. Met Europees consumentenrecht moet daar iets aan te doen zijn.

Vandaar dat ik deze week de Commissie oproep om na te gaan: één, of *dynamic pricing* eigenlijk wel mag onder Europese regels voor consumentenbescherming en mededinging. En twee, om te komen met maatregelen tegen exorbitante ticketprijzen, bijvoorbeeld door meer transparantie, door prijsplafonds of zelfs door de praktijken die ervoor zorgen dat een Bruce Springsteen-kaartje 5 000 dollar kan kosten te verbieden.

Muziek is er voor iedereen en ik wil een Europa waarin concerten geen privilege zijn voor rijken of voor ouderen.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

24. Agenda of the next sitting

Die Präsidentin. – Die nächste Sitzung findet morgen, Dienstag, 11. Juli 2023, um 9.00 Uhr statt.

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

25. Approval of the minutes of the sitting

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

26. Closure of the sitting

(Die Sitzung wird um 22.33 Uhr geschlossen.)

—

Key to symbols used

*	Consultation procedure
***	Consent procedure
***I	Ordinary legislative procedure: first reading
***II	Ordinary legislative procedure: second reading
***III	Ordinary legislative procedure: third reading

(The type of procedure is determined by the legal basis proposed in the draft act.)

Abbreviations used for Parliamentary Committees

AFET	Committee on Foreign Affairs
DEVE	Committee on Development
INTA	Committee on International Trade
BUDG	Committee on Budgets
CONT	Committee on Budgetary Control
ECON	Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs
EMPL	Committee on Employment and Social Affairs
ENVI	Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety
ITRE	Committee on Industry, Research and Energy
IMCO	Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection
TRAN	Committee on Transport and Tourism
REGI	Committee on Regional Development
AGRI	Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development
PECH	Committee on Fisheries
CULT	Committee on Culture and Education
JURI	Committee on Legal Affairs
LIBE	Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs
AFCO	Committee on Constitutional Affairs
FEMM	Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality
PETI	Committee on Petitions
DROI	Subcommittee on Human Rights
SEDE	Subcommittee on Security and Defence
FISC	Subcommittee on Tax Matters
SANT	Subcommittee on Public Health

Abbreviations used for Political Groups

PPE	Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats)
S&D	Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament
Renew	Renew Europe Group
Verts/ALE	Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance
ID	Identity and Democracy Group
ECR	European Conservatives and Reformists Group
The Left	The Left Group in the European Parliament – GUE/NGL
NI	Non-attached Members