

**VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 18 JUNE 2025**

(C/2026/1392)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2025-2026 SESSION

Sittings of 16 to 19 June 2025

STRASBOURG

Contents	Page
1. Opening of the sitting .....	4
2. Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (Rule 72) (action taken) .....	4
3. Upcoming NATO summit on 24-26 June 2025 (debate) .....	4
4. Resumption of the sitting .....	36
5. Voting time .....	36
5.1. Macro-financial assistance to Egypt (A10-0037/2025 - Céline Imart) (vote) .....	36
5.2. Adoption by the Union of the Agreement on the interpretation and application of the Energy Charter Treaty (A10-0009/2025 - Anna Cavazzini, Borys Budka) (vote) .....	36
5.3. EU/Euratom Agreement on the interpretation and application of the Energy Charter Treaty: adoption by Euratom (A10-0008/2025 - Borys Budka) (vote) .....	37
5.4. Implementation report on the Recovery and Resilience Facility (A10-0098/2025 - Victor Negrescu, Siegfried Mureşan) (vote) .....	37
5.5. The Commission's 2024 Rule of Law report (A10-0100/2025 - Ana Catarina Mendes) (vote) ..	37

Contents	Page
5.6. 2023 and 2024 reports on Montenegro (A10-0093/2025 - Marjan Šarec) (vote) . . . . .	37
5.7. 2023 and 2024 reports on Moldova (A10-0096/2025 - Sven Mikser) (vote) . . . . .	37
6. Resumption of the sitting . . . . .	38
7. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting . . . . .	38
8. Stopping the genocide in Gaza: time for EU sanctions (topical debate) . . . . .	38
9. Freedom of assembly in Hungary and the need for the Commission to act (debate) . . . . .	52
10. Safeguarding the rule of law in Spain, ensuring an independent and autonomous prosecutor's office to fight crime and corruption (debate) . . . . .	71
11. Clean Industrial Deal (debate) . . . . .	87
12. Electricity grids: the backbone of the EU energy system (debate) . . . . .	92
13. Composition of committees and delegations . . . . .	114
14. Rise in violence and the deepening humanitarian crisis in South Sudan (debate) . . . . .	114
15. Debate on cases of breaches of human rights, democracy and the rule of law (debate) . . . . .	120
15.1. Media freedom in Georgia, particularly the case of Mzia Amaglobeli . . . . .	120
15.2. Case of Ahmadreza Jalali in Iran . . . . .	124
15.3. Dissolution of political parties and the crackdown on the opposition in Mali . . . . .	128
16. Digital Markets, Digital Euro, Digital Identities: economical stimuli or trends toward dystopia (topical debate) . . . . .	131
17. Oral explanations of vote (Rule 201) . . . . .	138
18. Explanations of votes in writing (Rule 201) . . . . .	139
19. Agenda of the next sitting . . . . .	139

---

Contents	Page
20. Approval of the minutes of the sitting . . . . .	139
21. Closure of the sitting . . . . .	139

## VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 18 JUNE 2025

IN THE CHAIR: ROBERTA METSOLA

*President*

### 1. Opening of the sitting

*(The sitting opened at 09:02)*

### 2. Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (Rule 72) (action taken)

**President.** – Good morning, dear colleagues.

First of all, in relation to the decision by the LIBE Committee to enter into interinstitutional negotiations pursuant to Rule 72(1), announced at the opening of the session on Monday 16 June 2025, I have received no request for a vote in Parliament by Members or political groups reaching at least the medium threshold.

The committee may therefore start negotiations.

### 3. Upcoming NATO summit on 24-26 June 2025 (debate)

**President.** – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on the upcoming NATO summit from 24 to 26 June 2025 (2025/2748(RSP)).

I would like to remind you that we continue with the so-called 'test' of the new format for this debate. So there will be no speakers list. Therefore, after the first round of speakers, Members who received speaking time from their political groups will be called to speak and will be reminded of their allotted speaking time. The normal rules regarding blue cards and the catch-the-eye procedure will apply throughout the debate.

Now we start. I give the floor, and also wish a happy birthday, to High Representative and Vice-President Kaja Kallas.

**Kaja Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.** – Madam President, thank you for the good wishes. Next week, leaders will meet in The Hague for the NATO 2025 Summit. The significance of the context cannot be overstated. We are living in very dangerous, tough times. Russia is already a direct threat to the European Union. Russia is violating our airspace; conducting provocative military manoeuvres near EU borders; targeting our trains and planes; attacking our pipelines, undersea fibre-optic cables and electricity grids; assaulting our industry, including companies supporting Ukraine; and recruiting criminals to carry out sabotage attacks. It is also steadily building up its military forces and expanding its nuclear arsenal.

Last year, Russia spent more on defence than the European Union combined. This year, Russia is spending more on defence than its own healthcare, education and social policy combined. This is a long-term plan for long-term aggression. You don't spend that much on the military if you do not plan to use it.

Those who border Russia have always felt Russia's provocations more. Those of us with a history of Soviet imperialism feel it the most. But Russia's threat to transatlantic unity and security is a problem for us all. Every European country – and indeed every NATO ally – must be thinking about defence. In 2014, NATO countries pledged to actually invest over 2 % of their GDP in defence by 2024. But in one year, the geopolitical situation has shifted so dramatically that we are now looking at a 5 % target. Europe's collective economic might is unmatched. I don't believe that there is any threat that we can't overcome, if we act together and with our NATO allies.

So I have three points. First, the NATO summit is first and foremost about ramping up defence spending. President von der Leyen said to this House in March that the European Union must pull every financial lever we have to do this. The national escape clause of the Stability and Growth Pact provides budgetary space for Member States to spend more on defence. This could mobilise up to EUR 650 billion for defence over the next four years, and add 1.5 % of GDP to Member States' defence budgets. The new Security Action for Europe instrument – SAFE, as it is known – is an offer of EUR 150 billion in loans based on a few principles: they finance purchases mainly from European producers and therefore boost European defence industry in the process; the contracts are multiannual, so industry gets the predictability it needs; and they focus on joint procurement, which will push industry to scale up quickly while prices come down. The SAFE instrument is also open to EU partners who sign security and defence partnerships. We have signed seven of these already, including with four NATO allies: Norway, Albania, North Macedonia and the United Kingdom. We hope to adopt one more within a very short time frame, with NATO ally Canada very soon.

When NATO leaders discuss defence spending at the summit, these examples underline how the European Union directly helps our 23 Member States that are also NATO allies to meet their NATO targets. And a stronger European Union is also a stronger NATO.

Second, on Ukraine, the European Union is doing its part here too, not least because Ukraine is Europe's first line of defence. We know that Russia responds to strength and nothing else. That is why we have just proposed the 18th sanctions package to pile on the pressure. Every sanction weakens Russia's ability to fight this war. Do not be fooled: thanks to the EU sanctions, Russia has lost tens of billions of euros in oil revenues. Its sovereign wealth fund declined by 6 billion only last month. Sanctions work. In parallel, the European Union is the biggest provider of support to Ukraine, including over EUR 50 billion in military assistance.

We have to do more for Ukraine, for our own security too. To quote my friend, NATO Secretary General Mark Rutte, if we don't help Ukraine further, we should all start learning Russian. The stronger Ukraine is on the battlefield today, the stronger they will be around the negotiation table when Russia finally is ready to talk.

And third, the importance of unity. Dear President, honourable Members, Europe is under attack and our continent sits in a world becoming more dangerous every day. But Europe's will to act together is real. Over the past seven decades, we have built a common market, strong European economies and an unbreakable European spirit. Has it been hard? Of course it has, we have 27 democracies, and the voices in this Chamber only underline how many diverse opinions there are in Europe. But what unites us – what must keep uniting us – is our goal to keep our citizens safe. This is a goal we share with every single one of our NATO allies, including the United States. I spoke at the start of Russia's threat to Europe, but Russia poses a 360-degree threat in the world, from helping shield the Assad regime's use of chemical agents against the Syrian people to arming and training mercenary forces from Sahel to Sudan, or using its shadow fleet to smuggle weapons to Libya, in direct breach of the international arms embargo. Russia is a threat to global security.

During the Cold War, the United States and its allies far outclassed the Soviet Union, and it won them the Cold War. Today, against NATO and the EU, Russia doesn't stand a chance. But we must stick together. When NATO leaders meet next week, keeping unity in the alliance is as much a priority as spending more on defence.

Dear President, honourable Members, tough times require tough resolve. Europe has always shown this when it needs to, and that is the message we take to the NATO summit next week.

**Nicolás Pascual de la Parte**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, thank you High Representative for your introductory remarks, in the run up to the NATO summit next week, we have to ask ourselves why NATO has been the most successful defence organisation ever in history.

I think there are three elements. First of all, because we Europeans and Americans share the same principles, we share the same convictions. This is the strength of our relationship. Second, because of the strength and the ability and capability of NATO to adapt to the new realities; the flexibility of the organisation. And third, the unwavering leadership of the US. That's why we have to strengthen our link with the US.

We perhaps have to recognise that we have to start the debate on the geographical application of NATO because the geopolitical, geostrategic and economic situation has evolved, obviously, and most of the items are not decided only in the Atlantic but also in the Indo-Pacific.

The Indo-Pacific and the Atlantic are interrelated. That's why we should perhaps start thinking about extending NATO to like-minded countries around the world and to have a global NATO because if we are not in the right geographical position, we will be out of business very quickly.

Concerning the financing, as the HR/VP has said, one of the main items of this summit will be the ramping up of the money that we have to put for our common defence. It's not only a matter of numbers. We firstly have to decide what are our main threats and risks; secondly, what are the capabilities that we need to have in order to face these risks; and thirdly – but thirdly, not first – how much money we need to finance our capabilities.

That's why, I think, we will come to a good conclusion that we have to ramp up our efforts to have fairer burden-sharing with the US, but also to identify our capabilities in the near future.

**Γιάννης Μανιάτης**, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας S&D*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η επικείμενη σύνοδος του NATO έρχεται σε μια στιγμή που οι απειλές για την ασφάλεια της Ευρώπης βρίσκονται στο υψηλότερο σημείο τους. Ο πόλεμος στην Ουκρανία, οι συγκρούσεις στη Μέση Ανατολή, η ανάδειξη νέων περιφερειακών αναθεωρητικών δυνάμεων —όλα αυτά δημιουργούν ένα νέο γεωπολιτικό περιβάλλον. Οι κίνδυνοι πλέον δεν περιορίζονται στις απειλές για μια συμβατική στρατιωτική αντιπαράθεση. Αντίθετα, βλέπουμε αύξηση των υβριδικών απειλών, επιθέσεις σε κρίσιμες υποδομές, ακόμα και στις δημοκρατικές διαδικασίες των κρατών μελών.

Την επόμενη εβδομάδα, η σύνοδος κορυφής του NATO αποτελεί μια πολύ καλή ευκαιρία για την ενίσχυση της συνεργασίας Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης – NATO, που παραμένει ασφαλώς ένας από τους βασικούς πυλώνες της συλλογικής μας άμυνας. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, η ενίσχυση της κοινής αποτρεπτικής δύναμης και της διαλειτουργικότητας είναι απαραίτητα βήματα που θα μας βοηθήσουν στη συλλογική μας άμυνα.

Επίσης, είναι απαραίτητο να υπάρχει μια ξεκάθαρη δέσμευση όλων στις προβλέψεις του άρθρου 5 του NATO, που αποτελεί τον θεμέλιο λίθο της Συμμαχίας. Παράλληλα, είναι προς το συμφέρον όλων η δημιουργία ενός ισχυρού ευρωπαϊκού αμυντικού βραχίονα, ικανού να ενεργεί αυτόνομα και συμπληρωματικά με το NATO, ώστε να παρέχονται οι απαραίτητες εγγυήσεις ασφαλείας στην Ένωση και τα κράτη μέλη της, στο πλαίσιο του άρθρου 42 παράγραφος 7 της Συνθήκης, και να μειωθεί η εξάρτησή μας από τρίτες χώρες.

Τέλος, καθώς αναμένεται να αποφασιστεί η αύξηση του στόχου για τις αμυντικές δαπάνες, θα ήθελα να υπογραμμίσω ότι η αύξηση αυτή δεν μπορεί να γίνει σε βάρος των δαπανών για το κοινωνικό κράτος και την κοινωνική συνοχή. Για εμάς, δεν μπορεί να υπάρχει ασφάλεια χωρίς ισχυρή αποτρεπτική δύναμη που προστατεύει τα κοινά ευρωπαϊκά σύνορα αλλά και ισχυρό κοινωνικό κράτος, που μειώνει τις ανισότητες και προστατεύει τους πιο αδύναμους συμπολίτες μας.

**Harald Vilimsky**, *im Namen der Pfe-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Wenn man sich die Debatte hier vor Augen führt, hat man mehr den Eindruck, in einer Art Schmalspurpentagon zu sitzen und weniger im Europäischen Parlament. Diese EU – oder Europäische Gemeinschaft vorher – ist doch gegründet worden, um Frieden, Freiheit und Wohlstand zu generieren, und nicht, um sich als eine Art Militärbündnis zu generieren. In diesem Kontext sehe ich es mehr als positiv, dass heute eine Stimme aus der Slowakei von Ministerpräsident Fico kommt, der sagt, er will den aktuellen Milliardenforderungen der NATO nicht nachkommen und dieses Geld mehr in seine Krankenhäuser und Straßen investiert haben. Genauso wie der ungarische Premierminister Orbán sagt, er will sich im Konflikt Russland-Ukraine hier als Friedensverhandler betätigen und nicht mitmachen bei immer mehr Aufrüstung und immer mehr Sanktionen und den falschen Weg beschreiten.

Ich frage mich, was die EU überhaupt zu tun hat auf einem gemeinsamen Gipfel mit der NATO. Die NATO hat hier in Europa ein mehr als unrühmliches Bild gemacht. Ich erinnere nur an den Angriff auf die Serben vor gut 25 Jahren. Ich erinnere nur daran, dass die NATO mit ihrer völlig überzogenen Expansionspolitik Richtung Osten zumindest Mitverantwortung hat dafür, dass es eskaliert ist im Konflikt zwischen den Russen und der Ukraine.

Ich appelliere dafür – und ich glaube, das ist der einzig richtige Weg, der von der Mehrheit der Bevölkerungen mitgetragen werden kann –, dass die Europäische Union sich auf ihre ursprünglichen Werte besinnt, alles unternimmt, sich als Ort der Begegnung und des Friedens anzubieten, sich darauf besinnt, aktiv Gespräche mit den unterschiedlichen rivalisierenden Parteien zu führen, anstatt immer mehr mitzumachen, sich in eine Art kriegerische Entwicklung mit hinein zu involvieren und damit den Menschen alles andere als etwas Gutes zu tun.

**Alexandr Vondra**, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, dear friends, war is at our door. We all know it, and if we strive for peace – and I certainly do – we won't wish it into existence by nice speeches, but we must work hard for it. Trump's America may not always treat us kindly, but those are the rules of the game now, and we would better learn to play accordingly. NATO remains by far our best chance to defend ourselves. The upcoming NATO summit in The Hague is an excellent opportunity to prove to our transatlantic ally that we mean it seriously.

The EU is not a military project. Its fundamental aim has always been the peaceful cooperation of nations, but peace without strength is an illusion. The freedom and prosperity achieved after our forefathers fought so hard will vanish in an instant if we refuse to defend them. Higher defence expenditure will of course cost us something, but in comparison to Ukraine as a wasteland left behind by the Russian aggressive behaviour, the 5 % of GDP is the price we dare to pay.

I see two killers of EU defence: the bogeyman of European bureaucracy and the green over-regulation that sucks our limited resources. The former must be thrown away for good. The latter must be radically reworked. This would certainly require a mental shift, which we must undergo. And if we miss this opportunity, then we will lose everything.

**Valérie Hayer**, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute représentante, chère Kaja, chers collègues, nous devons une vérité aux Européens. L'équilibre mondial entre grandes puissances repose souvent non pas sur l'entente, mais sur la peur. Et en droit international, cette peur, elle a un nom, la dissuasion. Pour citer Raymond Aron, la dissuasion repose sur la certitude pour l'adversaire que les risques qu'il prend sont supérieurs aux avantages qu'il pourrait espérer. La dissuasion, chers collègues, c'est la paix, c'est la garantie de l'équilibre des puissances.

Or, pendant des décennies, l'Europe a nié cette réalité, Elle l'a même sous traitée aux États-Unis, à l'OTAN, avec une forme de naïveté stratégique coupable. L'article cinq, cette promesse de la défense collective, c'était toujours les autres, ce n'était jamais nous. Aujourd'hui, chers collègues, les conséquences de cette attitude nous rattrapent. Nous n'avons pas seulement sous-investi dans notre défense, nous avons occulté la possibilité d'être de nouveau sous la menace d'une armée étrangère. Et nous y sommes. Nous avons vécu dans la certitude que les dividendes de la paix ne cesseraient jamais. Le 24 février 2022 a été un choc intégral. Nous n'étions pas prêts, pas prêts pour aider militairement l'Ukraine, pas prêts pour nous défendre, pas prêts pour produire, pour fournir, pour dissuader.

L'OTAN, chers collègues, est le pilier le plus puissant dont les alliés disposent aujourd'hui, avec sa posture double de réassurance et de dissuasion. Or, le partage du fardeau a été déséquilibré depuis la fondation de l'alliance. Et ce partage ne peut plus rester une promesse sur papier. Il doit devenir enfin une réalité. Pas pour faire plaisir à Donald Trump, non, pour notre indépendance, pour notre sécurité, pour la sécurité des Européens. Et fixer un chiffre, c'est un pas évidemment important. Aller vers les 5 %, c'est la bonne direction. Mais disons-le clairement, cela ne répond pas encore à la question de notre stratégie. Cela ne dit pas comment créer enfin un marché militaire unique dont l'Europe a besoin urgemment. Cela ne répond pas à la question stratégique de l'adhésion de l'Ukraine.

Chers collègues, après trois ans de guerre sur le sol européen, nous devons décider et agir. Que faisons-nous, nous Européens, pour notre propre sécurité? Mon groupe, chers collègues, Renew Europe, appelle à des mesures concrètes pour doter l'Europe de véritables capacités de défense. Le Parlement européen a adopté un programme concret pour l'industrie européenne de défense. Nous appelons le Conseil à le mettre en œuvre sans délai, pour combler le fossé stratégique actuel, pour créer un véritable marché unique de la défense, pour rationaliser les achats et pour renforcer la coopération industrielle en Europe.

Il est aussi grand temps de faire progresser les discussions sur la dissuasion européenne. Fini les tabous! Nous plaidons pour un parapluie nucléaire français élargi. Nous plaidons pour le développement d'une culture militaire entre Européens avec une académie militaire européenne. Nous plaidons pour un Conseil de sécurité européen pour cette nouvelle matrice de défense. Voilà les enjeux du prochain sommet de l'OTAN.

**Bas Eickhout**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, High Representative, it's very clear that the big topic in the NATO summit will be about the investment percentages in defence. And yes, Europe needs to invest much more in its own defence, and as Greens we see this necessity as well. But the real question will also be: who is going to pay?

As the far right is trying to divide us, it's more important than ever that we invest together. Our current European defence system is not functioning because of our fragmented approach. Pouring more money into a non-functioning system will not do. We need a truly European approach with joint procurement and common standards, and we need a European fund for increased investments in security with joint borrowing, and ensure Member States actually use the exemption from budget rules for defence. This is the only way states will not end up tearing down their healthcare, education and social security with destructive austerity measures. You can invest all you want in weapons and tanks, but Europe can only stand stable and strong if we have the support of our people, and people will support as long as we can live in freedom with a roof above our heads and are able to pay our bills.

Essential for the future of Europe is a broader concept of security and defence. Security also means energy security, societal resilience, infrastructure innovation and cybersecurity.

And a last point: make sure taxpayers' money does not just disappear into the pockets of defence industry shareholders. Let's be honest: with billions of euros coming their way, everyone can predict massive windfall profits will be made. This is why we need a European windfall profits tax on the defence industry, and these taxes must go into a European societal resilience fund so we bring the investments back to our people. Only with this broad approach to defence and security will the extra NATO percentages deliver an EU that stands strong, stable and united on our own two feet.

**Marc Botenga**, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, l'OTAN est quand même, il faut le dire, aujourd'hui, dirigée par quelqu'un qui se comporte un peu en gangster international. M. Trump menace de détruire l'Iran, d'occuper le Groenland, d'envahir le Panama. Et maintenant, ils exigent aussi une guerre contre notre propre population en cassant nos pensions et notre sécurité sociale pour mettre 5 % de notre PIB dans la guerre. 5 % ce serait en Belgique 6 000 euros par famille et par an. Je ne sais pas qui chez nous a 6 000 euros à donner à la guerre chaque année.

Chers collègues, il faut changer un peu votre disque: vous dites que c'est pour nous défendre, mais l'OTAN dépense déjà aujourd'hui huit fois plus que la Russie en armes. On devrait dépenser vingt fois plus pour être en sécurité? L'Europe toute seule, sans les États-Unis, a déjà quatre fois plus de navires de guerre, trois fois plus de chars et deux fois plus d'avions de chasse. Donc dites la vérité: cet argent, ce n'est pas pour se défendre, c'est pour attaquer! Aujourd'hui peut-être en Iran, demain la Chine, c'est ça qu'il faut dire.

Moi je vais vous dire: je ne veux pas sacrifier nos populations, notre sécurité sociale sur l'autel de la guerre. Nous, c'est la sécurité sociale, pas votre guerre mondiale.

**René Aust**, *im Namen der ESN-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die NATO war Garant für Sicherheit im Kalten Krieg. Sie hat Freiheit in Europa möglich gemacht, und auch deshalb ist sie heute wichtig. Es geht um die Sicherung von Rohstoff- und Absatzwegen, es geht um die Sicherung des Luftraums und um Cybersecurity. Aber gerade deshalb müssen wir ehrlich sein: Europa und besonders Deutschland haben sich zu sehr auf die USA verlassen. Diese Abhängigkeit war bequem, wurde aber immer wieder auch ausgenutzt. Die Konsequenz daraus kann aber nicht sein, mehr Macht nach Brüssel zu verlagern. Es braucht keine EU-Militärbürokratie, sondern ein starkes europäisches Standbein innerhalb der NATO, getragen von souveränen Nationalstaaten, die koordiniert handeln – nicht gegen die USA, sondern mit ihr, aber auf Augenhöhe und mit dem Mut, endlich mehr Verantwortung für sich selbst zu übernehmen.

**Michael Gahler (PPE)**. – Madam President, colleagues, the wake-up calls are behind us. We have woken up and we are taking necessary steps. Among others, thanks to Commissioner Kubilius for the White Paper and also the first Omnibus on defence. To show such resolve credibly, we need a common threat assessment and I think we have it. I'm very grateful to you, Kaja Kallas, that you were so clear about the description of what Russia actually does. And the German, Hungarian and Slovak-speaking Putinists will not prevail, I'm quite sure about that.

This summit will be crucial for our future security. We need the reassurance that all partners, including the US, abide by their treaty obligations. We are a value-based alliance, but that means also that we need to share the responsibility, and that also means the cost. We Europeans need to contribute more and we will.

I prefer to deliver better through more common planning, common procurement, making full use of the existing legal framework. We have had a single market on defence since 2011. Let's finally make it a reality. We need to profit from economies of scale through such common procurement and have more effects of interoperability. If we make use of the legal framework that we have, we can also prove to our transatlantic partner, the US, that we are helpful and supportive partners and are not only helpless as we have seen in the past.

**Sven Mikser (S&D)**. – Hea Kaja. Tähtsad asjad kõigepealt. Palju õnne sünnipäevaks!

Dear colleagues, let me make three brief points.

First of all, on defence spending, I think it's absolutely imperative that our leaders at the NATO summit agree on substantially increasing our defence spending. But when this agreement has been reached, implementation is key. I vividly remember the NATO summit in Wales in 2014, when agreement was reached to ramp up defence spending to 2 % of GDP. And now, fast-forward 11 years and more or less two thirds of the members have met that commitment. So implementation is key. Also, I think we need to avoid a situation whereby our leaders meet around the NATO table and make a pledge and then a few weeks later they meet around EU tables and act as if they have never heard about that pledge. Let's be honest: this has happened in the past, so there needs to be a unity of effort between our two organisations.

Second, I don't think that any one of us can or could call the NATO summit a success unless a strong pledge is made to continue and indeed increase our support to Ukraine. This is the outstanding security crisis and we must meet this challenge.

Finally, I think it's imperative that NATO remains a values-based alliance, an alliance where every member state sees mutual defence of democracies as their own vital national-security issue, that we do not allow the alliance to morph into a purely transactional organisation where security of fellow members is seen as a service to be provided for cash.

**Jean-Paul Garraud (PSE).** – Madame la Présidente, le sommet de l'OTAN qui se tiendra ce mois de juin doit nous permettre de rappeler quelques points essentiels. Je m'attacherai à l'un d'eux, concernant l'Ukraine.

Dans un contexte de guerre prolongée entre la Russie et l'Ukraine, certaines voix s'élèvent encore pour demander son adhésion à l'alliance. Je le dis avec clarté, l'Ukraine ne doit pas devenir membre de l'OTAN. Ce n'est pas que le peuple ukrainien, valeureux et meurtri ne mérite pas notre appui, bien au contraire, mais cet appui, qu'il soit diplomatique, logistique ou humanitaire, n'exige nullement une adhésion formelle à l'OTAN, car celle-ci ouvrirait mécaniquement la porte à un affrontement direct avec la Russie, engageant, au titre l'article 5 du traité de l'Atlantique Nord, l'ensemble des membres de l'alliance dans un conflit généralisé. Sommes-nous réellement prêts à cela? Sommes-nous pleinement conscients des conséquences dramatiques qu'un tel engrenage ferait peser sur nos peuples?

Il faut maintenir une ligne rouge. L'OTAN ne peut pas devenir un instrument d'extension aux frontières russes. Ne tombons pas dans la provocation permanente dont les conséquences pourraient être terrifiantes. «J'ai plus peur de nos propres erreurs que des plans de nos ennemis», prévenait Périclès. Ni aujourd'hui, ni demain, l'Ukraine ne peut et ne doit rejoindre l'alliance. L'escalade n'est pas une stratégie, c'est un enchaînement fatal pour nos peuples.

En parallèle, il est grand temps que l'Europe redéfinisse sa place au sein de l'OTAN. Depuis trop longtemps, nous sommes les supplétifs de la puissance américaine. Or, les intérêts des États-Unis ne coïncident pas toujours avec ceux des nations européennes et le retour de Donald Trump le démontre semaine après semaine. Nous devons exiger plus d'autonomie stratégique, plus d'équilibre dans les contributions, plus de respect pour les intérêts de sécurité propres à chaque nation européenne. La France, forte de sa dissuasion nucléaire, de son industrie de défense et de son héritage diplomatique, doit montrer la voie.

Ce n'est pas dans une soumission aveugle aux États-Unis que nous préparerons la paix, mais dans une Europe des nations puissante, souveraine, enracinée. La lucidité doit primer sur l'idéologie. L'intérêt des peuples exige sang-froid, fermeté et responsabilité.

**Adam Bielan (ECR).** – Madam President, Madam High Representative, the upcoming NATO summit in The Hague will be a defining moment for the alliance's credibility and Europe's security. For us on NATO's eastern flank, we know too well that NATO is and should remain the irreplaceable shield of our freedom and our security, as well as the strongest deterrent against those who seek to undermine peace in our region.

Today, we face a dramatically changed security environment, from Russia's never-ending blood-thirst in Ukraine to the escalating crisis in the Middle East and a renewed axis of autocracies. In light of this, NATO's upcoming summit must reaffirm our commitment to the founding principles of our alliance: sovereign nations that unite to guarantee each other's security in a credible manner. As such, raising defence spending, strengthening armed forces and accelerating capability development have been urgently needed.

The ECR Group fully supports upcoming talks during the summit to 5 % of GDP in defence spending by 2035. Europe must share a greater responsibility for its own defence, work on a more equal footing with the US, and take part in its own deterrence. This will be a timely opportunity to engage with all involved actors and identify solutions for scaling up production, strengthening interoperability and driving defence innovation.

Last, the ECR Group will always stand with Ukraine and NATO and uphold the values that define the transatlantic alliance. Ukraine continues to fight not only for sovereignty, but also for the rules-based international order that has been protecting Europe for decades. Victory for Ukraine must remain NATO's strategic objective.

**Dan Barna (Renew).** – Madam President, Madam High Representative, next week in The Hague, our leaders will gather for a pivotal NATO summit shaping the future of European security in an era of unprecedented challenges.

The long peace we have taken for granted was not a lucky chance. It was the product of vigilance and strength. For years, we spoke of 2 % of GDP for defence as an ambition. Today, in the face of blatant aggression on our continent, it is a dangerously low baseline.

We must look beyond it. Let us be clear eyed and courageous. We must chart a realistic course towards 5 % of GDP for our collective defence. This is not a matter of choice. It is the premium. We must pay for the freedom and the cost of deterring those who wish us harm.

This increased investment must be smart. It must be coordinated. For too long, our national defence efforts have been fragmented, leading to duplication and inefficiency. It is time to build a true, powerful and coherent European pillar within the NATO alliance. This meant joint procurement share capabilities and seamless interoperability. A stronger Europe makes for a stronger alliance.

To achieve this. We must unleash the potential of our own defence industrial base. We must slash the suffocating bureaucracy that slows down procurement and prevents innovative small and medium sized enterprises prices from contributing. We need a regulatory environment that fosters speed, scale and cross-border collaboration.

Finally, as we build this renewed strength, we must deepen our engagement with our allies in the United States. A more self-reliant Europe is not a rival to the United States. It is the credible, capable and reliable partner they need. Let the message from this Parliament to the summit in The Hague be ambiguous. We are united, we are resolute, and we are ready to do what is necessary to defend our people, our values and our peace.

**Mārtiņš Staķis (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, dear colleagues, our threat has one clear name: it's Russia. And that's why NATO countries have to do more than just make a stand. Ukraine is leading by example with courage, with strategy and with a refusal to back down.

We all saw what Ukraine achieved when it reached deep into Russian territory, and destroyed the very bombers that had been terrorising its cities and people. Most of us cheered, but not all. Some here travelled to Moscow to cheer with the aggressor, and some still attend events that twist truth and excuse the war crimes. The rest understand the stakes, but a one-size-fits-all defence strategy is not going to work.

It's time to focus. If one house is on fire, you don't split firefighters across the whole neighbourhood. You concentrate resources where the threat is greatest. And in this case, it's the eastern flank.

It's not about building 1 000 tanks that stay parked in Western Europe. It's about sending 100 tanks where they are needed, where Europe's security is truly tested. To protect Europe's future, we must invest in the Baltic Defence Line and support all frontline countries. This is smarter and cheaper than spreading resources across all countries.

Defending Europe means defending the most vulnerable edge: Europe's border with Russia. That must be our shared mission.

**Özlem Demirel (The Left).** – Frau Präsidentin! Die Welt brennt schon – Gaza, Ukraine, Sudan. Kriege und immer mehr bewaffnete Konflikte. An jeder Front mit dabei: Waffen *made* in der EU. Und als ob das nicht reicht, schreit man jetzt nach noch mehr Kriegsgerät. Beim kommenden NATO-Gipfel wird ein Ziel von 5 % des BIP für Rüstung beschlossen, und mehr Soldaten. 5 % hört sich wenig an, es sind aber Gigasummen. Eine Milliarde Sekunden sind 30 Jahre, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Und Sie fordern nicht 1, nicht 100, sondern Frau von der Leyen will bis zu 1000 Milliarden Euro für Waffen ausgeben in den kommenden Jahren.

Im Vergleich dazu sagt die UN, dass man etwa 40 Milliarden EUR bräuchte, um den Hunger weltweit zu stillen. 40 Milliarden EUR, das wollen Sie nicht beschließen? Nicht mehr Geld für Bildung, nicht mehr Geld für Gesundheit, sondern für Waffen – Waffen und Schulden, die dann kommende Generationen möglicherweise auslöschen können.

Sie behaupten, die NATO wäre ein Wertebündnis, ein Verteidigungsbündnis. Das ist ein Märchen, an das kein Kind in dieser Welt mehr glaubt.

**Milan Uhrík (ESN).** – Vážená pani predsedajúca, pani eurokomisárka Kallas. Všetci vieme, že ste známa svojou fanatickou protiruskou nenávisťou. Ale aj tak sa čudujem, že máte odvahu prísť sem a pýtať od občanov prakticky zdvojnásobenie výdavkov na obranu, na zbrane, na rakety, na samopaly. V čase, keď Európsku úniu predbiehajú štáty BRICS-u v hospodárskom raste prakticky všade vo svete. V čase, keď európski občania musia čeliť rekordnej konsolidácii a zdražovaniu, tak vy pridete s geniálnym nápadom, aby sme dali dvakrát toľko peňazí na zbrane a vyžmýkali z ľudí, čo sa ešte dá. No s týmto rozhodne súhlasiť samozrejme nemôžeme a mňa by zaujímalo a povedzte to nahlas, že proti komu majú byť všetky tie zbrane namierené? To treba nahlas ľuďom povedať. Povedzte mi nahlas, kto má s všetkými tými zbraňami ísť bojovať. Lebo vaši synovia, priatelia, to nebudú. Vy by ste si prví vybavovali pre nich výnimky. A povedzte mi nahlas, kto všetky tie zbrojné výdavky zaplatí? Takže z týchto dôvodov my samozrejme nemôžeme podporiť navýšenie výdavkov na zbrojenie. Keď to má ísť na úkor životnej úrovne.

**Ruth Firmenich (NI).** – Frau Präsidentin! Die NATO wird eine gigantische Aufrüstung beschließen. US-Präsident Trump will die Verdoppelung der Militärausgaben auf 5 % des Bruttoinlandsprodukts – das macht 3 Billionen Euro. Mit Verteidigung hat das nichts zu tun, und schon gar nicht mit einer eigenständigen Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik Europas. Das Steuergeld, das die EU in die NATO pumpt, dient einzig der globalen Hegemoniepolitik der USA. Während Europa den US-Stellvertreterkrieg gegen Russland allein fortsetzen soll, führen die USA mit Israel nun einen Angriffskrieg im Nahen Osten und wollen im Indopazifik auch noch China herausfordern.

Für Europa bedeutet die Aufrüstung sozialen Krieg gegen die eigene Bevölkerung. Allein Deutschland soll künftig seinen halben Haushalt – 225 Milliarden Euro – für Rüstung aufwenden, übrigens mehr, als Russland derzeit insgesamt ausgibt. Dieser Wahnsinn nutzt nur den Rüstungskonzernen. Jeder Euro für Rüstung wird bei Bildung, Rente und Gesundheit fehlen. Der weitere soziale und wirtschaftliche Abstieg Europas ist so vorprogrammiert.

**Ingeborg Ter Laak (PPE).** – Madam President, I am proud the Netherlands will host the NATO summit in The Hague. It comes at a time when we need to commit ourselves to a growth path of the postponed 3.5 %, and an additional 1.5 % defence spending at NATO. We cannot continue to hide ourselves behind Trump's back for our security. Without further increase of our security budget we cannot expect ourselves to be able to defend ourselves when the EU will be attacked.

We must innovate in ReArm Europe; use common procurement; use the Ukrainian defence industry to further support Ukraine, as well as harmonise our weaponry. And we need to create resilience among our population. We need to create a long-term commitment to our defence market and industry. But it is not only about defence, it also goes hand in hand with securing our critical raw materials, increasing competitiveness for our defence industry and creating more sustainable and green defence supply chain.

**Eero Heinäluoma (S&D).** – Arvoisa puhemies, Eurooppa on saanut kovaa oppia turvallisuuden ja puolustuksen merkityksestä. Ensinnäkin Venäjä hylkäsi allekirjoittamansa Etyj-asiakirjat ja kaikki aiemmat sitoumuksensa ja hyökkäsi rajanaapurinsa kimppuun. Venäjä ilmoitti vastoin kansainvälistä oikeutta liittävänsä itsenäisen ja suvereenin rajanaapurin Ukrainan alueita itseensä. Tämä oli tietysti yritys toistaa vuoden 2014 Krimin laittoman liittäminen kaavaa.

Sitten Yhdysvaltain uusi hallinto on tehnyt selväksi, ettei sen sitoumus Eurooppaan ole ehdotonta, vaan ehdollista ja suhteellista. Euroopan on aika aikuistua. Sen on aika ottaa todellinen vastuu myös omasta puolustuksestaan. EU-maiden tulee esiintyä tulevassa Nato-huippukokouksessa yhtenäisellä viestillä: Täytämme omat puolustusvelvoitteet tinkimättä. Toivomme, että Yhdysvallat on valmis yhteistyöhön ja läsnäoloon Euroopassa myös jatkossa.

Euroopan puolustus ja Ukrainan tukeminen on yhteinen etumme. Siksi jokaisen EU-maan on otettava puolustussitoumuksemme tosissaan. Meidän on edellytettävä, että kaikki jäsenmaat täyttävät minimivaatimukset, niin puolustuksessa kuin Ukrainan tukemisessakin.

Nyt taakka Euroopan turvaamisesta jakaantuu kovin epätasaisesti. On maita, jotka ovat laittaneet puolustukseensa neljä prosenttia kansantuotteesta ja Ukrainan auttamiseen kaksi prosenttia kansantuotteesta. Samalla on maita, joiden puolustusmenot häidin tuskin yltyvät prosenttiin ja Ukraina-tuki prosentin kymmenesosaan.

On korkea aika ottaa puolustus tosissaan. Tämän täytyy olla viestimme Haagissa.

**VORSITZ: SABINE VERHEYEN**

Vizepräsidentin

**Anna Bryłka (NI).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Żyjemy w świecie olbrzymich geopolitycznych napięć. W bezpośrednim sąsiedztwie Unii Europejskiej trwa wojna rosyjsko-ukraińska, na Bliskim Wschodzie trwa konflikt Izraela z Iranem. Ład światowy jest coraz bardziej zagrożony globalnym konfliktem.

Tymczasem Unia Europejska kolejny raz doszła do wniosku, że to najlepszy czas na to, aby pod płaszczykiem tego zagrożenia federalizować się i wprowadzić mechanizm finansowy, którego finalnym beneficjentem będą Niemcy. To cyniczna gra przewodniczącej von der Leyen, która jeszcze nie wytłumaczyła się z afery Pfizera, a dziś chce arbitralnie decydować o uzbrojeniu krajów Unii Europejskiej.

My Polacy, jako naród szczególnie doświadczony rosyjskim imperializmem, od lat zbroimy się na potęgę i przeznaczamy blisko 5% PKB na obronność. Kiedy Niemcy pompowali rosyjski gaz, my dywersyfikowaliśmy źródła energii. To jest jedyna droga dla Europy: zbroić się oraz budować swoją niezależność energetyczną i gospodarczą. Unia Europejska jednak w tym przeszkadza, forsując zabójcze dla gospodarki i energetyki regulacje klimatyczne.

Obronność nie może być kolejnym sektorem, w który wkracza brukselska biurokracja. Wszystko, czego dotknie się Komisja Europejska kończy się katastrofą. Unijne regulacje zrujnowały europejski przemysł, doprowadziły do fali bankructw europejskich przedsiębiorców, a nawet zagrożiły bezpieczeństwu na ulicach naszych miast. Polityka obronna jest tak strategicznym obszarem w dzisiejszych czasach, że lepiej będzie, jeśli Unia Europejska będzie trzymała się od tego z daleka.

Najważniejszy cel rozporządzenia SAFE to wzbogacanie się Niemiec kosztem krajów Europy, a nie umocnienie bezpieczeństwa. Wzrost nakładów państw narodowych na zbrojenia, kooperacja ze Stanami Zjednoczonymi i NATO to jedyna droga do wspólnego bezpieczeństwa. Sprzeciwiamy się kolejnemu wspólnemu długowi, sprzeciwiamy się europejskiej armii i sprzeciwiamy się odbudowie niemieckiego imperializmu, do którego w ostatnich latach służy Unia Europejska. Zaczynjcie od tego, żeby wydawać na zbrojenia tyle, co Polska.

**Rasa Juknevičienė (PPE).** – Madam President, I appeal to the leaders of the Member States.

We cannot make any more mistakes and let dictators think that we are weak, that democracies are unable to defend themselves.

We could have been on safer ground if we had mobilised all possible military assistance to Ukraine when their brave soldiers pushed the Russians out of Kharkiv and Kherson two years ago.

But then there were frightened voices of the threats of world war three. And here we are, approaching it, because those who had to act were scared.

Responsibility for the security of the continent is passing into the hands of the Europeans as never before.

However, I completely disagree with the approach to Ukraine's membership in NATO.

This country is already sacrificing more for NATO, for us, than many NATO members themselves. Ukraine is already acting as a de facto NATO member. Ukraine is the cornerstone of European security.

We are making an existential historical mistake again by allowing Russia to use a veto on NATO decisions.

Let's stop spreading the Kremlin's narratives – NATO expanded because us, nations and people wanted and still want it. NATO, like the EU, is expanding for stable peace, not for war.

**Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR).** – Voorzitter, wat hebben we de afgelopen decennia in Europa veel naïviteit gezien! Na de Koude Oorlog meenden velen dat de dreiging aan de Europese grenzen definitief voorbij zou zijn. Lidstaten verwaarloosden hun defensie en sukkelden langzaam maar zeker in slaap, tot Europa abrupt wakker werd geschud door de Russische inval in Oekraïne. Opens stond de NAVO als hoeksteen van ons veiligheidsbeleid weer volop in de belangstelling. De verdragsorganisatie was al die jaren weliswaar aanwezig, maar was in Europa helaas erg ondergewaardeerd geraakt.

De toegenomen dreiging vereist een goede krijgsmacht. Dit standpunt brengt mijn partij al jarenlang naar voren. We zijn ons ervan bewust dat er een gedegen langetermijnstrategie nodig is om de opgebouwde achterstanden weg te werken.

Ik roep de lidstaten daarom op om tijdens de komende NAVO-top een krachtig engagement te tonen voor het versterken van onze defensie. De defensiebudgetten moeten fors worden verhoogd. Maar laten we ons niet blindstaren op het 5 %-doel. We moeten kiezen voor een strategische aanpak, met het NAVO-programma voor defensieplanning als leidraad. Daarnaast moeten de landen helder in kaart brengen welke militaire capaciteiten nodig zijn, en moet de capaciteitsopbouw vervolgens goed worden verdeeld over de lidstaten. Dit vereist een robuuste financiële dekking via de nationale begrotingen en niet via risicovolle Europese leningen.

**Petras Auštrevičius (Renew).** – Madam President, dear Kaja – I wish you a happy birthday, and I wish you strength, dear colleagues, clearly the forthcoming NATO summit in The Hague will not be a mere celebratory meeting. It must address issues of collective security of the utmost importance.

We must ensure the safety and unconditional security of our societies and population. Security comes at a price, but peace is priceless.

Although NATO's decision in 2014 to increase defence spending to 2 % is not yet fully implemented by a third of members, it is insufficient today. A new benchmark of 5 % for defence spending is urgently needed in order to bolster allies' defence capabilities.

NATO is a defence and security alliance that poses no threat to peaceful neighbours. But we cannot submit to Russia's provocations, such as calls for NATO forces to withdraw from the Baltic states or demands regarding Ukraine's surrender.

Russia and its allies and enablers are creating security chaos and challenges. That's why we are far from all the provocations we might see. And NATO's response must be proportionate and pre-emptive.

Clearly, NATO members in Europe must make a significant defence commitment and do so immediately. All EU Member States must be creators of security, but not only consumers.

My main anticipation and call for the NATO summit in The Hague is that it will demonstrate our unity and set ambitious actions to ensure our security and deter any further provocations by Russia or its followers.

**Sebastião Bugalho (PPE).** – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, a cimeira da NATO, no final do mês, revelará duas coisas: a capacidade de a Aliança resistir a uma nova realidade e a capacidade de os seus membros cumprirem as metas acordadas entre si.

Como europeu, acredito que corresponderemos a ambas. Como português, vindo do Estado-Membro mais distante da guerra, reafirmo aqui o compromisso de um governo que cumprirá os 2 % de investimento em defesa até ao final do ano e que não abdicará de cumprir o acordado nesta cimeira.

Senhora Presidente, hoje é cada vez mais claro que o investimento em defesa é a forma mais urgente de solidariedade europeia. Aqueles que têm um Estado social como prioridade sabem que não haverá serviços públicos sem defesa. Aqueles que têm o crescimento como prioridade percebem que não haverá economia sem defesa. Aqueles que têm as fronteiras como prioridade compreendem: não haverá segurança interna sem defesa. Hoje, há médicos europeus que estudam medicina não com batas, mas com coletes à prova de bala. Há unidades hospitalares construídas não nas nossas ruas, mas debaixo do nosso chão.

A escolha é, portanto, simples: ou investimos em conjunto, ou falharemos um por um. Cumpramos em conjunto.

**Hannah Neumann (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, as we discuss next week's NATO summit, I can't help but think of the old fairy tale 'The Emperor's New Clothes'. A vain ruler parades around in invisible garments, and everyone nods along, too afraid to point out the obvious. Welcome to The Hague, 2025. Enter Donald Trump, emperor extraordinaire, complete with 19th century parades and self-glorifying AI videos. The summit lasts just one day, because that's his attention span. Everything is carefully choreographed so he won't be bored, or worse, offended. No talk of climate, gender or disinformation – too risky. Real security threats – too complex. Instead, capitals around the alliance are called in a bidding war over percentages. Simple numbers may be Trump's favourite dress, but they for sure won't make us safer.

While we all tailor new imaginary suits of statistics to flatter the emperor, hybrid attacks, military conflicts, climate risks, and authoritarian threats only grow. Yet no one dares to lift the veil and say he's actually not wearing any clothes. Dear colleagues, we don't need kings; we need security. If the ruler from Washington needs to be told that he wears the best of all dresses, fine. But let's make sure that before all, we need a dress of real security for our citizens and our friends in Ukraine.

**Merja Kyllönen (The Left).** – Arvoisa puhemies, Nato ja EU ovat suuren murroskauden keskellä. On helppoa sanoa, että lisätään tietty prosenttimäärä puolustukseen. Sitä ei kuitenkaan pidä tehdä ilman valmistelua ja yhteistä tilannekuvaa, jossa myös linjataan, mihin ja minkälaisiin toimiin rahoitusta konkreettisesti tarvitaan. Turvallisuus on puolustuksellisen valmiuden lisäksi energiaomavaraisuutta, ravinto-omavaraisuutta ja kestävästä yhteiskuntapolitiikkaa, jossa koulutus, työmahdollisuudet ja arjen palvelut turvaavat hyvinvoivat ja henkisesti vahvat ihmiset.

Nato on ennen kaikkea sotilasliitto, jota EU ei ole. On totta, että Naton kautta monet puolustuspoliittiset elementit osuvat myös EU:n tontille, mutta meidän ei pidä lähteä kilpailemaan siitä, kuka on eniten kovan sotilaallisen toiminnan puolella.

Turvallisuus on huomattavasti sotilaallista ulottuvuutta laajempi kokonaisuus. EU kykenee itsenäisesti vahvistamaan niitä elementtejä, joita myös Nato tarvitsee. Esimerkiksi ympäristö, huoltovarmuus ja teollisuuspolitiikka ovat osa-alueita, joissa EU:lla on merkittävästi toimivaltaa ja Natolla ei. EU voi järkevästi toimimalla vahvistaa myös Natoa, sillä meillä on ne elementit, jotka tuovat tämän tuen.

**Pekka Toveri (PPE).** – Madam President, High Representative, dear colleagues, we all know that the threat of Russia is acute and that time to prepare our defence is short. We also know that we are too weak and need to be stronger.

Some people claim that investing more in our defence will ruin our welfare. That is a clear lie. NATO countries used, before the end of the Cold War, for decades around 4 % of their GDP on defence, some even more. Germany used to have 2 500 main battle tanks plus 1 500 in reserve. Now they have less than 300. Holland had 450 tanks, now zero. But still NATO countries were able to build the base of the Western welfare system we all enjoy today.

To say that we can't afford to invest in our defence is a lie. We can do both defence and welfare, as long as we are wise and focused on how we use our money. What we can't afford is to lose thousands of people and rebuild our societies if our deterrence fails. Russia is an aggressive, imperialistic dictatorship which will threaten Europe even after Putin is gone. Now it's time to be strong, not weak. *Si vis pacem, para bellum.*

**Elio Di Rupo (S&D).** – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute représentante, mon pays, avec une industrie de la défense solide tant en Wallonie qu'en Flandre, s'engage pour une Europe de la défense qui serait renforcée, y compris par un effort budgétaire accru. Mais je veux être clair: moi, je veux la paix et pas la guerre.

Le monde vacille en Europe. La menace militaire, il faut le dire, est aussi une menace morale. Si nous nous affaiblissons, ce sont aussi nos valeurs qui sont en danger: valeurs de liberté, égalité entre les hommes et les femmes, protection des minorités. Dans ce contexte, une coordination industrielle entre les États membres est indispensable et la Commission veut jouer un rôle moteur pour l'accélérer. Je dirais simplement bravo.

Renforcer l'autonomie de l'Union européenne sur le plan militaire va renforcer l'OTAN, et non le contraire. Alors soyons lucides seulement; tous les États membres ne pourront pas consacrer 5 % de leur PIB à la défense. On l'a dit, pour les Belges, cela représente 6 000 euros par habitant. Il y a aussi d'autres priorités: la santé, la lutte contre la pauvreté, l'emploi, le pouvoir d'achat.

Enfin, Madame la Haute représentante, je suis convaincu qu'en 2027 on n'y arrivera pas. Et je crois qu'il faut prendre exemple sur Schengen ou sur la zone euro, avancer avec un noyau de pays et laisser la porte ouverte aux autres pays.

**Roberto Vannacci (Pfe).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, *s'ils n'ont pas de pain ? Qu'ils mangent de la brioche!* Eh sì, perché ieri io sono andato a fare la spesa al supermercato. Non l'ho incontrata, signora Kallas. Evidentemente, Lei e la signora von der Leyen la spesa la fate fare da qualcun altro.

Ma non era un supermercato qualsiasi, era il *Kiel Institute*, e sono andato immediatamente nel reparto carri armati e ho trovato un listino prezzi: il carro tedesco Leopard 2A8 costa 29 milioni di euro, il carro russo T-90 ne costa quattro di milioni di euro e il carro cinese 99 Alfa ne costa 2,3.

Poi ho cambiato reparto e sono andato al reparto dei semoventi di artiglieria. Il semovente tedesco PzH 2000 costa 17 milioni di euro, mentre il semovente coreano K9, appena comprato dalla Polonia, costa 3 milioni di euro e il semovente russo 2S19 costa 1,5 milioni di euro.

Vedete, aumentare la spesa militare al 5 % o al 3,5 % in queste condizioni di non competitività a livello economico ed energetico non ha alcun senso. Ma queste condizioni non sono cadute dal cielo, ma sono figlie delle politiche scellerate di questa Europa a trazione socialdemocratica degli ultimi vent'anni, che Lei, signora Kallas, sostiene e che la Sua Presidente e la Sua Commissione continuano a sostenere.

Signora Kallas, ci vada al supermercato ogni tanto e li guardi i prezzi, come fanno tutti i cittadini europei, che 250 anni fa non ne hanno voluto sapere di mangiare delle brioches al posto del pane e che oggi non vogliono sentir parlare chi al posto del pane vuole dar loro dei cannoni.

**Sebastian Tynkkynen (ECR).** – Madam President, for decades, NATO has guaranteed peace, security and stability on our continent.

However, in today's world, raising our defence spending is more critical than ever. Europe has underinvested in its defence for far too long – we can't speak of autonomy, deterrence or a stronger NATO unless we are willing to pay for it. We must be ready to face it: NATO's 2 % of GDP target for defence spending is no longer enough.

A stronger and better equipped European defence strengthens NATO, our own continent and global security. The transatlantic bond needs to be unwavering, but we must take responsibility for our own defence spending.

Security is not an exception – like anything else, it must be paid for and protected.

**Wouter Beke (PPE).** – Voorzitter, mevrouw de hoge vertegenwoordiger, we kunnen hier een heel debat voeren over de NAVO-top en dat is bijzonder belangrijk. Maar eigenlijk is de vraag: wat kunnen wij als Europa intussen zelf doen? Wij moeten slim en Europees investeren. Dat wil zeggen: geen zeventien tanksystemen maar één tanksysteem. Dat wil zeggen: meer standaardiseren, één strategie en onder een Europese paraplu.

Die Europese aanpak kan ons 60 miljard EUR aan efficiëntiewinsten bijbrengen. Dat is de grootte van het defensiebudget in Frankrijk op dit ogenblik. Europese veiligheid is onze verantwoordelijkheid. Maar het gaat ook over het geld van de belastingbetalers. Dus: Europese veiligheid is Europese defensie.

De top vindt plaats in Den Haag, waar Winston Churchill in 1948 opriep om te komen tot een Europees leger. De meest efficiënte manier om onze veiligheid te garanderen, is om die woorden van Churchill in de praktijk te brengen.

**Dan Nica (S&D).** – Doamnă președintă, doamnă Înaltă Reprezentantă, sunteți persoana care veți gestiona toate lucrurile care țin de viitorul Uniunii Europene din punct de vedere militar, al securității și în pregătirea summitului NATO, aș vrea să vă spun câteva din lucrurile care sunt importante pentru România.

Flancul estic trebuie tratat ca o prioritate strategică în arhitectura de securitate a Europei. România, ca stat aflat în prima linie a frontierelor NATO și Uniunii Europene, are nevoie de o prezență consolidată, inclusiv prin investiții în infrastructura militară, mobilitate și interoperabilitate pentru a răspunde amenințărilor convenționale și hibride. Securitatea cibernetică și războiul hibrid nu mai sunt riscuri viitoare, le-am trăit și le trăim în prezent. România a fost ținta acestor atacuri hibride, inclusiv în campaniile electorale care s-au desfășurat în ultimele luni în România, din păcate.

Avem o mare vulnerabilitate în sectorul energetic. 80 % din invertoarele care sunt folosite în sistemele energetice din Uniunea Europeană, dna Înaltă Reprezentantă, sunt din afara Uniunii Europene și, mai mult decât atât, toate datele sunt colectate și transmise în afara Uniunii Europene și toate aceste sisteme sunt gestionate de entități care se află în afara Uniunii Europene. Este inacceptabil pentru o industrie strategică și care are atât de mare impact și poate avea un impact negativ catastrofal să acceptăm aceste lucruri.

Consolidarea capacităților de apărare și nevoia de a investi în industria de apărare este o necesitate atât pentru România, cât și pentru celelalte state, dar vreau să vă atrag atenția asupra noilor tehnologii. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să investească acolo, avem nevoie de apărare, de apărare la cel mai ridicat nivel tehnologic, pentru că doar așa putem să ne asigurăm că suntem protejați și că democrația noastră nu poate fi supusă niciunui fel de amenințări și nici măcar nu poate fi pusă la îndoială identitatea noastră ca națiuni europene.

**Hans Neuhoﬀ (ESN).** – Frau Präsidentin! Die EU ist im Begriff, Opfer ihrer eigenen Propaganda zu werden. Es ist Propaganda, wenn verbreitet wird, Russland wolle nach der Ukraine einen EU- und NATO-Staat angreifen. Die Wahrheit ist, Russland hat weder die menschlichen Ressourcen noch einen Grund, einen solchen Schritt zu tun. Die NATO verfügt nach Aussage ihres eigenen Geheimdienstchefs über keinen einzigen Beleg dafür, dass die russische Führung solche Absichten hegt.

Die gemeinsame Sicherheitspolitik der EU wurde 1993 mit dem Vertrag von Maastricht begründet. Trotzdem ist die EU heute kein sicherheitspolitischer Akteur, der von den Großmächten ernst genommen würde. Der Glaube, man könne das nur durch hektische Aktivität ausgleichen, ist illusorisch. Eine sicherheitspolitische Selbstständigkeit der EU ist bis auf Weiteres nicht absehbar. Wir sind daher gut beraten, die NATO-Strukturen abzusichern, auch wenn die USA sich daraus zurückziehen.

Europa erfindet sich heute neu als rüstungsindustrielles Phantasialand, statt sich den realen Bedrohungen zu widmen: dem Migrationsdruck, dem demografischen Wandel, der Energiekrise und dem islamistischen Terror. Das ist nicht strategisch, das ist verantwortungslos.

Was es braucht, sind ein realistisches Bedrohungsszenario und die Rückbesinnung auf Diplomatie. Dann – und nur dann – wird Europa seinen Beitrag zum Gleichgewicht der Kräfte leisten und den Frieden in den internationalen Beziehungen sichern können.

**Ioan-Rareș Bogdan (PPE).** – Doamnă președintă, Excelențele Voastre, ideal ar fi să punem mai multă pâine pe masă, nu să apărăm cu arma în mână și sisteme sofisticate de *defence* pâinea noastră cea de toate zilele. Dar copiii și bătrânii înțelepți ai Europei nu se pot apăra singuri. Cine afirmă că nu trebuie investiții pentru apărare este rupt de realitate sau face jocurile Kremlinului, ale Iranului și ale celor care vor o Europă pradă ușoară.

Churchill, Winston Churchill, cerea mereu investiții în apărare, deoarece Hitler aloca în anii '30 sume astronomice pregătirilor de război. I se răspundea de unii, ca mulți din această sală, că ar fi o povară prea mare pentru economia țărilor europene de atunci. În 1936, Churchill a afirmat: „Cât de mărunte ne vor părea aceste argumente dacă peste un an sau doi, inamicul ne va prinde în laț, plinuți, prosperi, fericiți să ne exercităm libertatea de exprimare, dar fără apărare”. Ce a urmat știți foarte bine. Să învățăm din istorie!

Nu acceptăm concesiile în ceea ce privește Ucraina și procesul de înarmare a Bătrânei Doamne, Europa noastră. Nu trebuie să uităm ce a făcut Occidentul în 1938, la München, dând mână liberă lui Hitler să anexeze regiunea Sudetă. A urmat un dezastru. Să nu abandonăm Estul Europei! Trebuie susținut și înarmat. Dacă cade Ucraina, urmează Moldova, Polonia, țările baltice și România în meniul de la Kremlin. Iar apoi urmează dezastrul pentru Europa Occidentală și ani de teroare!

**Branislav Ondruš (NI).** – Vážená pani predsedajúca, kolegyne a kolegovia, dôrazne protestujem proti financovaniu zbrojenia na úkor investícií do rozvoja školstva, zdravotníctva či sociálnych služieb. Nie je pravda, že dokážeme zvyšovať výdavky na zbrojenie bez zníženia investícií v prospech ľudí. Veď v júli budeme hlasovať o návrhoch Európskej komisie na presmerovanie zdrojov Európskeho fondu regionálneho rozvoja a Európskeho sociálneho fondu na podporu zbrojoviek. Napríklad z finančnej podpory sociálnym podnikom profituje celá spoločnosť. Sociálne podniky netvoría súkromné zisky. Lenže mamutie zbrojovky áno. Je neprípustné, aby sme z daní občanov zvyšovali zisky zbrojárskeho korporácií. Európsky parlament by mal členov NATO vyzvať, aby zohľadnili záujmy pracujúcich a ich rodín, nie miliárdarov zo zbrojárskeho priemyslu. Prečo by sme nemohli napríklad regulovať ceny a zisky zbrojoviek? Požadovať, aby mali podpísané kolektívne zmluvy, ak chcú žiť z daní našich občanov? Varujem, že preteky v zbrojení ekonomicky nezvládneme a neprispějú k rastu, pokoju a mieru, ale k nárastu medzinárodného napätia. Ďakujem pekne.

*(Rečník súhlasil, že odpovie na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty)*

**Maria Grapini (S&D),** întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”. – Ați spus în intervenția dumneavoastră că ar fi bine să investim în spitale, în școli, în social și nu în industria de apărare. Vă întreb, credeți că sub război, sub bombardament, se poate face educație, se poate face sănătate, se poate face creșterea salariilor? Cum putem sub bombardament, de exemplu, cum e în Ucraina acum, să facem ceea ce spuneți dumneavoastră? Nu credeți că întâi trebuie să avem pace, trebuie să avem liniște, să nu avem război și după aceea să investim în ceea ce spuneți dumneavoastră?

**Branislav Ondruš (NI),** odpoveď na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty. – Pani kolegyňa, my máme jednu organizáciu, ktorá sa volá Organizácia pre bezpečnosť a spoluprácu v Európe a táto organizácia má teda vo svojom názve jasné poslanie. Má prispieť k bezpečnosti a k stabilite v medzinárodných vzťahoch v Európe. Táto organizácia nemá žiadne zbrojárske výdavky a táto organizácia nie je určená na zbrojenie. Vážená pani kolegyňa. Medzinárodná stabilita sa nedosahuje zbrojením. Pani komisárka Kallasová dnes jasne povedala: nebudete zvyšovať výdavky na zbrojenie, ak zbrane neplánujete použiť. A presne toto dnes robí Európska únia. Plánujeme výdavky na zbrojenie, aby sme ich použili. A bezpečnosť a stabilita sa zabezpečuje diplomatickými rokovаниami a spoluprácou, nie nepriateľstvom.

**Riho Terras (PPE).** – Lugupeetav eesistuja! Kõrge esindaja! Head kolleegid! NATO tippkohtumise õnnestumine sõltub sellest, kas kõik liikmesriigid saavad üheselt aru, et Venemaa kujutab Euroopale eksistentsiaalset ohtu. Lisaks Vene ohule on laiem julgeolekupilt muutunud väga tumedaks. Selleks et meid ümbritsevaid ohte tõrjuda, tuleb kõikidel liitlastel panustada oluliselt enam. Viis protsenti SKPst võis olla paar aastat tagasi täiesti ulmeline eesmärk, kuid täna on see reaalselt vajalik selleks, et tagada meie heidutus ja kaitse. Selle eesmärgi saavutamiseks on kiire. Ei piisa sellest, kui riigipead ja valitsusjuhid lepivad kokku viie protsendi taseme saavutamise 2030. aastaks. See eesmärk tuleb saavutada oluliselt varem, eelistatavalt juba järgmisel aastal. Mitmed Venemaaga piirnevad liikmesriigid on viie protsendi tasemele väga lähedal või selle juba saavutanud. Paraku ei piisa, kui suured ja jõukad riigid eeskju ei järgi. Kui Eesti paneb järgmisel aastal kaitsekulutusse 5,4 protsenti SKTst, siis peavad panustama viis protsenti ka Hispaania ja Itaalia. Ka Eesti pensionärid ja lapsed vajavad toetust. Aitäh teile!

**Tobias Cremer (S&D).** – Madam President, dear colleagues, I grew up in a Lutheran vicarage that was shaped by the peace movement. I understand the longing to live in a different time, one where we can speak about disarmament instead of deterrence. I, too, would sometimes prefer to live in a different time. But colleagues, we don't. The post-war leader of the SPD, Kurt Schumacher, once said that politics begins with the recognition of reality. And reality today is stark. Europe faces the most serious threat to our safety in a generation. Putin is rearming on a massive scale, and his sights are not only set on Ukraine, he wants to test NATO, break apart the EU and erode our democracies from within. He has made that clear time and time again, and he is preparing to act not in the far distant future, but in this decade. And why? Not because he is scared of NATO. Putin actually thinks that NATO is weak, and that's actually part of the problem. But what Putin is afraid of is our way of life. Because successful, free and democratic societies expose the lies that his rule is built upon. That is why we are already subject to his hybrid warfare, disinformation, cyber attacks, sabotage and contract killings on European soil.

Colleagues, that is not fiction, but a grim reality. Even if some in this House don't want to acknowledge it. Colleagues, the people of Europe rightly expect us to protect their safety, and that is why it is good that NATO leaders are meeting in The Hague, and it is good that we are mobilising more resources. But let me be clear – drones and tanks are not enough. What ultimately makes our society strong is the social cohesion they are built upon. That is what Putin fears and that is what he targets. So let us embed our defence spending in a broader security strategy. Focus on infrastructure, on resilience, and on the social fabric and solidarity that make our societies worth defending in the first place.

**Jaak Madison (ECR).** – Austatud kolleegid! Hea proua Kallas! Kuigi ma ei ole teie suurim fänn, siiski palju õnne sünnipäevaks! Rääkides NATOst, siis paljud kolleegid on siin rääkinud sellest, kuidas tuleb tagada sotsiaalhoolekanne, võidelda inflatsiooniga, inimeste toimetulek. Täiesti nõus. Ma olen ka nõus sellega, et suuresti on majandusprobleemides süüdi ka Euroopa Liit ise, kuid see ei muuda mitte kuidagi fakti, seda, et sõja ajal, kui agressor ähvardab su riiki, pole sellest koolist ega pensionist mitte mingit abi. Kõik on kadunud. Ehk kui sa ei suuda oma riiki kaitsta, see võetakse lihtsalt ära ja me näeme Euroopas piisavalt riike, kes siia maani mõnulevad oma kuskil unelmas, et nendel ju probleemide pole, aga samal ajal räägivad midagi solidaarsusest, ühtsusest, koostööst. No ei ole väga hea koostöö, kui mõned riigid lasevad rahulikult üle ja teised riigid rabelevad üksinda, sest et osadel riikidel on jube mõnus olla kuskil lõunas või läänes. Ja rääkides kuludest, siis oluline pole väga protsent, kas see on viis protsenti, on ta neli või kuus. Küsimus on efektiivsuses. Mis on meie kaitsevõimed? Mis on meie tehnoloogia? Ehk lõppkokkuvõttes see, mis on oluline. Kuidas saada pauku teha, mis võtab vaenlase maha. See, mis see hind on, on omaette küsimus. Ehk et see viis protsenti on vahel nagu mull, kus me jääme kinni. Küsimus on meie kaitsevõimes: kuidas me suudame heidutada potentsiaalset vastast. Aitäh!

**Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, colleagues, High Representative, whether we end up spending 3 % or even 5 % of our GDP on defence, the core principle must remain the same. We have to spend it on what we actually need. It's not just about more money. It's about smart money.

Due to high costs, poor coordination and low efficiency, we don't get the military capability we should pay for what we spend. Throwing more money at broken systems will not protect us. We must learn from the most experienced and adaptive army in the world today. The Ukrainian armed forces. They have shown how to do more with less. How to be agile, innovative and focus.

Ukraine teaches us, for instance, that asymmetric drone swarms can beat all of our current weapon systems, and cost only a fraction of them. This cannot be a race of national egos or parallel procurements. It must be a joint European effort. Coordinated and goal driven. Air defence, cyber resilience and battlefield readiness are not optional but essential.

And let's not forget the why. This is not a blind ramping up of military budgets. It's about securing our democratic way of life against a aggressive regime that wants to see us divided and paralysed in an ever more polarised world. Delaying action only makes the final bill higher.

So yes, 5 % is a big number, but the real threat is doing too little, too late.

**Michał Szczerba (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Słowa zamieniliśmy w czyny. Polska prezydencja nadała ton i kierunek. Budując europejską obronę, wzmacniamy europejski filar NATO. Wydając blisko 5% PKB na obronność, Polska daje przykład. Na szczycie NATO jedziemy z podniesioną głową i jasnym celem: potwierdzenia spójności sojuszu, zobowiązania sojuszniczych, więzi transatlantycznych, przyjęcia strategii wobec Rosji jako stałego zagrożenia (to kraj terrorystów odpowiedzialny za zbrodnie) i konsekwentnego wsparcia Ukrainy.

Unia Europejska jest silniejsza niż kiedykolwiek ze strategią gotowości 2030, z tarczą Wschód jako filarem unijnej obrony, ze 150 mld euro na zbrojenia, z pakietem uproszczeń przepisów Defence Omnibus, by przyspieszyć inwestycje w przemyśle zbrojeniowym. Bezpieczna Polska w Europie. Kontynuujemy naszą służbę.

**Marina Mesure (The Left).** – Madame la Présidente, dans quelques jours, l'OTAN se réunira pour graver dans le marbre un objectif insensé, consacrer 5 % du PIB à la défense, soit 1 100 milliards de dollars par an supplémentaires, 1 100 milliards de dollars pour s'enfermer dans une logique d'allégeance aux États-Unis pour faire tourner leur machine de guerre, alors même que M. Trump se désengage du continent et méprise profondément les Européens.

1 100 milliards, dans un cadre d'austérité budgétaire, c'est un choix politique lourd de conséquences, car de telles dépenses se traduiront forcément par des sacrifices dans les dépenses sociales. Il n'y a plus d'argent pour les écoles, les hôpitaux, nos services publics, mais il y en aura pour construire vos chars d'assaut.

1 100 milliards, c'est aussi ce qu'il faudrait pour permettre aux pays du Sud de respecter l'accord de Paris et freiner le changement climatique. Mais vous préférez faire feu de tout bois pour la course à la guerre plutôt que d'éteindre l'incendie planétaire. Pourtant, l'atténuation et l'adaptation aux changements climatiques, vous le savez, sont des enjeux de sécurité majeurs. Donc l'urgence, c'est la paix, l'indépendance, le non-alignement, le climat et la justice sociale, et pour tout cela il faut sortir de l'OTAN.

**Sarah Knafo (ESN).** – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, si par malheur nous étions attaqués demain matin, serions-nous capables d'intercepter 200 missiles tirés simultanément pour éviter la destruction complète de nos villes? La réponse est non.

Les batteries antimissiles déployées en Europe ne couvrent même pas 10 % de notre territoire. La France, pourtant meilleure armée d'Europe, comme elle le prouve encore cette semaine au salon du Bourget, dispose de moins de batteries antimissiles qu'un pays comme Israël pour un territoire métropolitain pourtant 25 fois plus grand. Par la faute des politiciens imprévoyants qui nous ont gouvernés, nous manquons de chars, de drones, d'hélicoptères, d'artillerie, de munitions, de porte-avions, de frégates. Surtout, nous manquons à notre devoir de puissance et donc de protection. Désormais, même les plus atlantistes d'entre vous l'ont compris, nous ne pouvons plus dépendre des États-Unis. M. - Trump, au moins, nous le dit sans faux-semblants: «Débrouillez-vous!»

Alors, chers collègues, vous qui avez cru que les guerres étaient derrière nous, vous qui avez soutenu qu'il fallait baisser les dépenses militaires, vous avez eu tort. Je vous le dis un 18 juin: aujourd'hui, vous n'avez plus d'excuses. Vous devez entendre ce que nous vous répétons depuis toujours. Armons-nous, protégeons-nous, défendons-nous nous-mêmes.

**Ondřej Dostál (NI).** – Paní předsedající, ve světle současného dění si pojdme připomenout, co NATO není. Zprvé, alianční smlouva není charita. Smyslem členství je snížit bezpečnostní rizika pro členy, ne je zvyšovat. Přijetí nového členu znamená pro každý členský stát přijetí vojenského závazku bránit jej. Pokud se vyhodnotí, že rozšíření NATO pouze zvýší riziko války se třetí zemí, může každý člen zcela legitimně rozšíření NATO vetovat. Počítejme s tím. Zadrhé, NATO je obranná aliance, ne nástroj imperialistické politiky. Pokud se některý člen NATO vojensky připojí k agresi Izraele proti Íránu a dočká se patřičné vojenské odpovědi, není to důvod k aktivaci článku 5. Evropským členům NATO lze proto doporučit, aby se k agresi nepřipojovali ani nepřímou, například poskytnutím základen, neboť i to může být vyhodnoceno jako válečný akt, který není obranou a smlouva o NATO jeho důsledky nepokrývá.

**Angelika Niebler (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Vizepräsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Die NATO ist und bleibt der zentrale Pfeiler unserer Verteidigung hier in Europa und darüber hinaus. Von dem NATO-Gipfel in Den Haag muss ein Signal der Stärke und des Zusammenhalts ausgehen. Sicherheit gibt es nicht zum Nulltarif. Wir müssen unsere Verteidigungsfähigkeit stärken und unsere Fähigkeiten weiter massiv ausbauen. Wir müssen in Rüstungsgüter, in Infrastruktur, in den Zivilschutz, in Cybersicherheit investieren und unsere eigene Produktion auch hier in Europa hochfahren.

In den vergangenen Monaten hat die Europäische Union dazu viel in Bewegung gesetzt. Das Programm SAFE, gemeinsame Produktion und Beschaffung, Finanzierung von Flaggsschiffprojekten wie ein eigenes Luftverteidigungsschild sind angestoßen worden. Wir brauchen auch einen europäischen Markt für Rüstungs- und Verteidigungsgüter; der Markt ist heute noch total fragmentiert, das gefährdet letztendlich das Leben unserer Soldatinnen und Soldaten und kostet Milliarden. Auch hierfür liegen die Vorschläge auf dem Tisch. Ich hoffe sehr, dass dieses Signal der Stärke und des Zusammenhalts in Den Haag ausgesendet wird.

*(Die Rednerin lehnt eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ von Özlem Demirel ab.)*

**Tonino Picula (S&D).** – Madam President, High Representative, colleagues, the upcoming NATO summit is happening in much different circumstances than a year ago. Now, more than ever, we must show our commitment and responsibility for the future of this alliance.

Within these commitments, we will pursue the new spending target for defence. However, defence is not only about percentages. No other global player currently faces such turmoil on almost all its borders like the European Union.

The European Union needs to step up and join forces on a realistic approach. We cannot entrust our security every four years to swing voters in the United States, but establish some guidelines and initiatives to go along with these changing times. In this sense, the upcoming summit is crucial in pioneering an up-to-date and realistic EU security approach.

I strongly believe we have to reiterate our commitment for international law and the rules-based international system. That means unwavering support for Ukraine. Russian aggression against Ukraine must be an integrative and not divisive factor.

The Russian Federation meddles not only in the European Union Member States, but also in our immediate neighbourhood – the Western Balkans. The NATO summit must address this issue too.

In these difficult times, we also need to be focused on the NATO interest in the Arctic and the Baltics and ensure security and stability in these ever-important regions.

Therefore, this NATO summit has crucial importance primarily for us Europeans to define and strengthen our security in upcoming years. It's a task and responsibility our citizens are asking us to take up. Security, for sure, is a key to preserving life in a democracy.

**Pierre-Romain Thionnet (Pfe).** – Madame la Présidente, dans l'histoire des alliances militaires, l'OTAN fait figure d'anomalie. À ses origines, la puissance sur laquelle le gros de l'effort de l'alliance allait reposer – les États-Unis – s'est vue en quelque sorte forcée de garantir son soutien à l'Europe occidentale par un traité. L'OTAN n'allait pas de soi pour les Américains, restés, pour certains, fidèles aux pères fondateurs, George Washington notamment, qui invitaient les États-Unis à renoncer aux alliances contraignantes. Depuis 1949, les États-Unis ont systématiquement veillé à ce que jamais leur liberté d'action ne soit entravée par une alliance. L'Amérique sait bien sûr se montrer solidaire et l'histoire le prouve. Mais elle a d'abord la volonté de penser et d'agir par elle-même, en solitaire.

L'alliance atlantique demeure aujourd'hui le cadre premier dans lequel les États européens inscrivent leur défense collective. Mais nous devons interroger ce qu'est une alliance militaire: est-ce avoir des valeurs communes. À la marge. Est-ce un instrument technologique ou normatif? Pas seulement. Une alliance, c'est d'abord le partage d'intérêts stratégiques. Voilà pourquoi nous devons poser cette question capitale: partageons-nous constamment les mêmes objectifs et intérêts que les États-Unis? La pression sur certains alliés proches, la volonté de s'entendre avec des compétiteurs et adversaires par-dessus l'Europe ou encore l'absence de consultation permettent d'en douter. L'OTAN ne peut pas être une alliance dans laquelle chaque membre doit visiter le bureau ovale pour s'assurer de sa validité.

Alors que tous les États européens engagent un réarmement important, il est essentiel qu'ils envisagent aussi un accroissement de leurs responsabilités au sein de l'alliance. C'est ce que le prochain sommet de l'OTAN doit permettre: confirmer à l'Amérique que l'Europe entend bien prendre toute sa part dans sa défense et donc toute sa part, et pas moins, dans la prise de décision et la direction de l'alliance. Nous ne pouvons pas accroître nos capacités tout en demeurant des nains stratégiques.

**Stephen Nikola Bartulica (ECR).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, zahvaljujem kolegice i kolege. Mir putem snage, „peace through strength”, mora biti i dalje načelo koje vodi našu obrambenu politiku. Tu istinu je Hrvatska dokazala za vrijeme Domovinskog rata kada je uspjela osloboditi zemlju od srpske okupacije i to načelo vrijedi za sve nas i danas.

Vidimo na primjeru Ukrajine da sankcije i druge mjere nisu rješenje i ne mogu odvratiti agresora, tako da je s jedne strane dobro da će europske zemlje sada izdvajati više za obranu. To je bilo dugo potrebno i treba to pozdraviti.

Međutim, pitanje je kako će se to financirati. Nemam povjerenje da je Europska komisija u stanju to učinkovito voditi. To treba ostati u nadležnosti nacionalnih država. Nije vrijeme za novo zaduživanje ni povećanje europskog proračuna.

**Massimiliano Salini (PPE).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nei prossimi giorni al vertice NATO non sarà tema solo o soprattutto con quanto denaro o come ci difenderemo, ma che cosa difendiamo, anche attraverso organizzazioni come l’Alleanza atlantica. A tema c’è il futuro della civiltà occidentale. La domanda non è quindi come collocare la spesa nazionale dentro le politiche di difesa.

Noi abbiamo assistito nel recente passato, con la dipartita frettolosa nel maggio 2021 dall’Afghanistan, ad uno dei peggiori momenti della politica occidentale, dove con una sorta di complesso di inferiorità, tipico purtroppo della politica estera degli Stati nazionali, e con il timore di un’escalation abbiamo generato una delle peggiori escalation della storia recente.

Da quel momento, poi, abbiamo avuto l’attacco del 2022 della Russia in Ucraina e, nel 2023, l’attacco terroristico voluto dall’Iran contro Israele, per non parlare dell’escalation cinese contro Taiwan.

Oggi a tema per noi quindi non c’è, attraverso gli eserciti, l’esportazione della democrazia, ma la difesa della sua origine, anche attraverso la difesa militare, con tutti gli strumenti che la politica mette a nostra disposizione. Non è una questione nazionale, ma è una questione di civiltà, e l’Europa esiste per questo.

**Evin Incir (S&D).** – Madam President, the most urgent priority at this moment is to prevent further escalation of wars and conflicts worldwide, before past mistakes become a harsh reality once again. Both the European Union and NATO bear a responsibility to act. We have rightly supported Ukraine in its fight for sovereignty and territorial integrity, and we must continue to do so to ensure its victory and bring an end to Russia’s ongoing acts of aggression. Putin has repeatedly demonstrated his unwillingness to engage in genuine peace negotiations. The only way to force him is to continue strengthening Ukraine.

The recent escalation, specifically between Israel and Iran, is yet another deeply concerning conflict. This conflict is costing innocent civilians their lives. While I hold zero sympathy for the regime in Tehran, Israel’s actions are also unacceptable. Respect for international law must be upheld by all parties, as there should be no special legal privilege for war criminals and oppressors like Netanyahu, Khamenei or anyone else.

**Lucia Yar (Renew).** – Madam President, High Representative, colleagues, even in Europe, peace has its price tag. Neglecting this reality has left us with a critical defence capabilities gap. The upcoming NATO summit is therefore a critical juncture. It is no longer about if, but precisely how fast we can increase defence expenditures to a sufficient level. It’s not our thirst for militarisation, colleagues, Mr Fico, Mr Orbán. It’s because of Putin.

Intelligence agencies across Europe have been warning us that Russia plans to test NATO and the EU in just a few years, if you didn’t hear. My country, Slovakia, remembers it very well. This coming Saturday marks 34 years since the last train carrying Soviet troops left Czechoslovakia – the true end of the occupation. To me, this is a clear reminder that freedom is not a given, that our democracy needs to be defended. We know exactly what is at stake when Russia threatens us with a new war.

So, what should we do? The European Union, through the activation of the escape clause, has provided Member States with the exceptional ability to raise defence expenditures. Member states will also have the opportunity to borrow cheaply through the SAFE instrument. But let us also make sure that this money, these investments, do not end up in the hands of some defence oligarchs, and that we will be paying for things that our armies and our security actually need.

Let's act very strategically. It's for future generations. We need to think across the Union about how to actually build that powerful European pillar within NATO to protect our citizens, because doing this together is cheaper, it unites us, and ultimately it makes us stronger.

**Mika Aaltola (PPE).** – Madam President, High Representative Kallas, we in Europe made a fatal mistake. We started treating risk management as a foreign policy strategy. Playing it safe. Avoiding the necessary. Defeating Russia in Ukraine.

Now we face the consequences. No real mobilisation, no clear plan. And the threats keep growing. When they strike, we won't manage the risks. The risks will manage us. This is a warning.

This is why the EU must stop being a spectator. NATO is the backbone. Yes. But we must become the muscle. Enough of symbolic solidarity. We need deterrence, strength and readiness. We must stop fearing escalation more than defeat.

This summit is not about alliance. It's about building deterrence. Europe must face what is coming with clarity, with courage and with steel in its spine.

**Γιώργος Γεωργίου (The Left).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Kallas, ας μιλήσουμε, λοιπόν, για το NATO. Να σας πω εγώ ποιο είναι το NATO, ως Κύπριος, που ξέρω από πρώτο χέρι. Είναι εκείνο το οποίο προκάλεσε το 1974 ένα φασιστικό πραξικόπημα στην Κύπρο και ώθησε την Τουρκία να εισβάλει στο νησί μου. Είναι εκείνο το οποίο στηρίζει, χαϊδεύει και εξοπλίζει την Τουρκία, η οποία 51 χρόνια μετά κατέχει εδάφη ενός κράτους μέλους. Είναι το NATO εκείνο που γέννησε και στήριξε τις δικτατορίες τη δεκαετία του '70 σε Ελλάδα, Ισπανία και Πορτογαλία. Είναι εκείνο το οποίο ισοπέδωσε το Ιράκ, τη Γιουγκοσλαβία και το Αφγανιστάν. Είναι εκείνο το οποίο υποδαύλισε και συντηρεί τον πόλεμο στην Ουκρανία. Είναι εκείνο το οποίο σήμερα θέλει να κλέψει λεφτά από το υστέρημα των ευρωπαϊκών λαών για να πλουτίσει τους εμπόρους του πολέμου. Είναι ένας πολεμοχαρής οργανισμός, ο οποίος θρέφεται από το αίμα και τον φόβο που ο ίδιος σκορπίζει.

Και η Ευρώπη; Η Ευρώπη είναι ένας πολιτικός νάνος, μια θλιβερή ουρά του NATO, που παρακολουθεί τα πράγματα με ενοχή και αμηχανία. Και εμείς που θέλουμε την ειρήνη σας λέμε ότι, όσο υπάρχει NATO, οι λαοί δεν θα έχουν ειρήνη.

**Davor Ivo Stier (PPE).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, hvala. Visoka predstavnice, sretan rođendan. Prije puno godina kao doktor sam služio kao hrvatski diplomat u NATO-u i bilo je gotovo nezamislivo da će Amerikanci podržati razvoj europskoga stupa unutar NATO-a. Danas oni to očekuju od Europe. Zašto?

NATO ostaje, naravno, okosnica europske sigurnosti, ali Amerika sve više gleda, naravno, na Indo-Pacifik kao njezin prioritet. Za nas prioritet mora ostati sigurnost europskog kontinenta. Amerika će i dalje davati kišobran nuklearnog odvraćanja, obavještajne podatke, ali jasno je da se od europskih saveznika očekuje da preuzmu primarnu odgovornost za sigurnost vlastitog kontinenta.

I upravo zbog toga je potrebno izgraditi taj europski stup unutar NATO-a, imati europsku stratešku autonomiju, ne protiv Amerike, nego zajedno i u savezništvu s Amerikom, bez obzira tko je trenutno stanar u Bijeloj kući.

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D).** – Gerbiama Pirmininke, Vyriausioji įgaliotinė. Karas vyksta Ukrainoje, tačiau Rusijos agresiją jaučiame ir mes, Europos Sąjungos šalys. Štai Baltijos jūra jau tapo nuolatinio Rusijos karo lauku. Todėl šiuo sudėtingu laikotarpiu mums kaip reikalingas solidarumas, stiprus ir patikimas NATO aljansas, turintis pakankamai išteklių, pajėgų atremti bet kokią grėsmę. Ir labai tikiuosi, kad NATO lyderiai susitikimo metu susitars dėl principinių klausimų. Pirma, tai gynybos finansavimo didinimas iki 5 proc. Antra, kad bus išpareigota ginti ir stiprinti rytinį Europos flangą, kuris kol kas išlieka pažeidžiamiausia vieta Europoje. Ir trečia, susitarti dėl nenutrūkstamos visokeriopos pagalbos teikimo Ukrainai. Mano šalis Lietuva, suprasdama realias grėsmes iš Rusijos, jau kitais metais viršys penkių procentų ribą saugumui ir gynybai.

**Georgiana Teodorescu (ECR).** – Doamnă președintă, criza din Coreea de Nord, confruntarea din Taiwan, conflictul India-Pakistan, războiul Iran-Israel, războiul din Ucraina, iată doar câteva din cele 28 de focare de instabilitate care clocotesc astăzi pe glob. Prin urmare, viitorul summit NATO trebuie să privească harta geopolitică a lumii în complexitatea ei și cu specificitatea fiecărei regiuni în parte. De aceea, orice soluție care va fi avansată, fie că vorbim de mărirea contribuției la bugetul de apărare, ori de rolul Alianței Nord-Atlantice în oricare din aceste conflicte, va trebui să fie adaptată la nevoile, pericolele și particularitățile regiunilor și țărilor membre.

De aceea, Uniunea Europeană trebuie să fie fermă atunci când vine vorba de propriile industrii de apărare, de modul în care statele ei membre își vor adapta contribuțiile în NATO și în funcție de sprijinul acordat indirect Alianței, prin intermediul multor măsuri luate deja până în prezent, precum și de renegocierea unor clauze *offset* categorice. Până la construirea unei viitoare armate a Europei, singura apărare reală și eficientă pe care o avem este NATO. Deci trebuie să o îmbunătățim constant, având totodată grijă și la întărirea capacității naționale de apărare, precum și a industriei naționale militare.

**Reinier Van Lanschot (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, dear colleagues, without America, NATO doesn't work. NATO's commander: American. NATO's intelligence: American. NATO's weapons: American. And Trump's big betrayal of Zelenskyy in the White House showed us that, at best, the US is unreliable.

So how can we make NATO work for Europe? That depends on next week's NATO summit, which only seems to be about how much money each country will spend. A percentage. This is so shortsighted. Spending more money will not protect us. It's about how we spend it. Because if we do what we always did, we get what we always got.

We need a European supreme allied commander. We need a European intelligence service. And we need a European nuclear deterrent. Putin will only attack us if we are weak. A European army makes us strong.

**Željana Zovko (PPE).** – Madam President, happy birthday High Representative – it's not a nice way to spend your birthday, listening to all of us here giving the speeches. On 5 %, it's quite realistic that we have to increase spending in order to seriously engage with our transatlantic partners and talk about strengthening the European pillar of NATO. The European Union must understand that without the American security guarantee at this moment, we cannot deal in this shaky global geopolitical political arena, but we have to send a strong message, and I'm very happy that our leaders are agreeing on that, that we are thinking seriously about our defence and our defence of our citizens.

It is not only our borders that are unsafe: as a Croat, I know very well where the danger is coming from: the east, south and west; so regardless of where you live, you cannot be safe if you seriously don't engage and communicate to your public that these are dangerous and challenging times and we all have to pay for it.

**Rihards Kols (ECR).** – Madam President, dear colleagues, at The Hague, NATO must face reality. Russia is not a 'challenge', it is an enemy, and we must continue to call it that. It does not act alone: Iran, North Korea and China stand behind it, forming an authoritarian axis and fuelling each other's aggression. This is not regional. This is systematic.

Europe must stop hiding behind US guarantees, NATO's strength must grow to meet threats in Europe and beyond, and it is time to go back to basics. If the US shifts focus, Europe must defend itself and carry its share. The proposed 5 % GDP target for defence is a necessity, not because GDP ratios win wars – they don't. Strength, capabilities and action do. Ukraine cannot be sidelined. Its future is inseparable from NATO's security.

And finally, while the NATO-Russia Council absurdly still exists, perhaps we could instead invite Putin to the following address in The Hague: Oude Waalsdorperweg 10. I'm sure the ICC would gladly receive him.

**Irene Montero (The Left).** – Señora presidenta, señora alta representante Kallas, Israel y los Estados Unidos son la mayor amenaza para la humanidad en este momento, y ustedes están alimentando al monstruo.

Israel ataca ilegalmente a Irán mientras continúa su exterminio del pueblo palestino. Y ¿qué hacen ustedes? Ursula von der Leyen apoya a Israel diciendo que tiene derecho a defenderse cuando es el agresor, señora Kallas. El canciller alemán da las gracias a Israel —cito literalmente— por «hacer el trabajo sucio por todos nosotros». ¿Esos son los valores europeos? ¡Qué repugnante y qué vergüenza, señora Kallas! Ustedes dicen que el peligro son las armas nucleares de Irán —suena a lo que decían de Irak—, pero es Israel quien tiene armas nucleares. Son los Estados Unidos el único país del mundo que se ha atrevido a lanzar una bomba nuclear.

En la próxima cumbre de la OTAN, ustedes van a firmar el 5 % en gasto militar y dicen que es para defendernos. Pero ¿de verdad nos protege, señora Kallas, estar a las órdenes de Trump? ¿Nos protege gastar el dinero de las pensiones y de los hospitales —como ha dicho el secretario general de la OTAN— en armas? ¿Nos protege que Israel presuma de vender ahora, durante el genocidio, más armas que nunca a Europa gracias a sus «éxitos»?

Ustedes con el rearme están financiando el genocidio. Así que, señora Kallas, deje de arrodillar a Europa ante Trump y Netanyahu, que nos están llevando a la Tercera Guerra Mundial. Si quieren guerra, vayan ustedes.

**Eszter Lakos (PPE).** – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! A NATO Európa és Magyarország védelmének sarokköve, ugyanakkor a védelmi kiadások GDP-arányos 5%-ra emelése a társadalmi és egészségügyi kiadások rovására történik. Csak akkor szabad elköteleződnünk, ha készek vagyunk felismerni a minket potenciálisan érintő fenyegetéseket.

Bár a hagyományos katonai képességek továbbra is fontosak, a hibrid fenyegetéseket is ugyanolyan komolyan kell venni. Emellett meg kell erősítenünk a társadalom ellenállóképességét, a védelmi ipart és a technológiákat Európa-szerte.

A magyar kormány kettős játéka különösen szembetűnő a honvédelem terén. Százmilliárdokat készüln hadseregfejlesztésre költeni az orosz fenyegetés ellensúlyozására, miközben baráti kapcsolatokat ápol Putyinnal. Eközben pedig semmiféle magyarázatot nem ad a magyar embereknek arra, hogy miért ilyen égető ez a védelmikiadás-növelés, és hogyan kívánja előteremteni ennek fedezetét egy amúgy is gyengélkedő költségvetésből.

Senki sem szolgálhat egyszerre két urat, ahogy a latin mondás is tartja. A jelek szerint a magyar kormány mégis erre tesz kísérletet. De ha megnézzük, hogy a védelmi ipart a történelmi léptékű kiadásnövelés előtt privatizálták, egyvalami biztosnak tűnik: az úr, akit kiszolgálunk, nem más, mint a magyar oligarchák.

**Волгин Петър (ESN).** – Г-жо Председател, НАТО трябваше да се разпусне веднага след края на Студената война, както стана с Варшавския договор. Ако това се беше случило, днес нямаше да има нито война в Украйна, нито риск от трета световна война. Обаче вместо да прекрати съществуването си, НАТО се превърна във вампир, който, за да живее, трябваше да пие кръвта на други, тоест да се разширява с нови държави. Именно заради този маниакален стремеж към разширяване на Северноатлантическия пакт избухна войната в Украйна. А най-големите печеливши както от войната, така и от продължаващото съществуване на тази организация – вампир, са големите производители на оръжие.

Днес ни казват, че всяка държава членка трябва да отдели по 5% от своя БВП за отбрана. Утре сигурно ще увеличат процентите на 10, нали така? Вместо за образование и здравеопазване, огромни суми ще отиват за оръжие. Така хем ще ставаме по-бедни, хем опасността от глобална война ще нараства. Колкото повече НАТО се въоръжава и разширява, толкова по-зловещо ще надвисва над света облакът на ядрената гибел.

**Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE).** – Señora presidenta, señora Kallas, muchas felicidades. La cumbre de la OTAN de la próxima semana debe marcar un punto de inflexión. Los europeos debemos demostrar nuestra mayoría de edad estratégica y nuestra responsabilidad con la defensa propia. Lamentablemente, no todos los socios parecen estar dispuestos a cumplir con su parte.

El Gobierno de mi país, España, ya ha declarado que elevar la inversión de defensa hasta el 5 % del PIB es un enorme error y que el 2 % es más que suficiente, pero no podría estar más equivocado. El objetivo del 2 % corresponde a una realidad muy lejana: la realidad del año 2014. Un decenio más tarde, la guerra ha llegado hasta las puertas de la Unión Europea y sobrevuela nuestro flanco este. Se suceden los ataques contra nuestras infraestructuras críticas, desde cables submarinos hasta hospitales. Hemos alcanzado un número récord de ciberataques, hasta 45 000 cada día, tan solo en España. Por eso no podemos esconder la cabeza.

Es hora de ser responsables, de hablar a los ciudadanos como adultos, y de invertir en una Europa más segura.

**PRESIDE: JAVI LÓPEZ**

*Vicepresidente*

**José Cepeda (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señora Kallas, lo primero que quiero hacer es felicitarla. ¡Muchas felicidades, *happy birthday!*

Espero que el debate de hoy vaya más orientado a hablar de paz que de guerra, para felicitarle el día, ¿no? Pero déjeme que le diga que, de cara a la próxima cumbre, vine un poco preocupado de la Asamblea Parlamentaria que tuvimos en Ohio, en Dayton, más preocupado casi de lo que había ido. Fundamentalmente, porque me di cuenta de que había una sensación basada en un debate que toda esta mañana hemos mantenido aquí y, *a priori*, me parece profundamente falso: y es hablar de los porcentajes, de lo que cada uno de los países puede aportar.

Sinceramente, creo que es mucho más importante para Europa ir pensando en ese gran escudo europeo, en esa gran estrategia que, desde la Comisión, ustedes tienen que desarrollar para crear una auténtica estructura militar de defensa europea. No podemos hablar de una guerra cada uno de los veintisiete por nuestro lado. Me gustaría, por ejemplo, preguntarle qué decisiones toman ustedes en la Comisión. Sobre qué sistemas, sobre qué bases de inteligencia toman ustedes las decisiones. ¿Sobre informes que le pasan los veintisiete? Es un lío.

Yo creo que Europa tiene que tener un modelo propio, tiene que tener un ejército propio, que los países tienen que aportar más al presupuesto de la Unión Europea, para hablar de una realidad que usted esta mañana ha dejado clara y evidente: y es que existe una amenaza real por parte de Rusia que, de cara a los próximos tres o cinco años, puede ser una realidad. Y, frente a eso, no caben solamente discursos en torno a la industria, en torno a las empresas o en torno a un paquete Ómnibus, como el que ayer nos presentó el comisario Kubilius, solamente para simplificar no se sabe muy bien qué. Lo que tenemos es que pensar de verdad en la defensa europea.

**Petra Steger (Pfe).** – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Kommende Woche findet der NATO-Gipfel statt, und damit ist die Bühne wieder eröffnet für die Rüstungsfanatiker Europas. Genau das werden wir erleben: zahlreiche Politiker, die anstatt sich für Frieden einzusetzen, Europa immer mehr in den Krieg ziehen wollen; Politiker, die, wie hier im Parlament, die Europäische Union lieber heute als morgen zur Verteidigungsunion unter NATO-Herrschaft machen wollen. Die werden wieder schreien nach mehr Waffen und noch mehr Waffen, die werden wieder die Propaganda- und Angstmaschinerie anschmeißen und behaupten, Europa wäre nicht verteidigungsfähig, wenn Russland angreift. Dabei geben die NATO-Staaten zehnmal so viel Geld für Rüstungsgüter aus wie Russland.

Zu glauben, dass man für Frieden sorgt, wenn immer mehr Waffen produziert werden, ist schlicht und ergreifend hanebüchen und verantwortungslos. Was ist aus der angeblichen Friedensunion geworden? Es ist Zeit aufzustehen gegen die Profitgier der Rüstungsfirmen und für Diplomatie und Frieden, es ist Zeit aufzustehen gegen den Souveränitätsraub der Europäischen Union. Denn das Ziel ist klar: Dieser Krieg soll dafür missbraucht werden, noch mehr Kompetenzen nach Brüssel zu verlagern.

Aus österreichischer Sicht ist das alles schon längst nicht mehr mit unserer Neutralität vereinbar. Ich sage, Österreich ist neutral und hat auch neutral zu bleiben.

(Die Rednerin lehnt eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ von Marta Wcisło ab.)

**Jüri Ratas (PPE).** – Suur tänu, austatud president! Head ametikaaslased! Kõrge esindaja Kaja! On hea meel eesti keeles soovida Sulle siin palju õnne ja jõudu. Eesti on panustanud üle kümne aasta kaks protsenti oma sõjalisest riigikaitseks. See on tähendanud meile vähem raha tervishoidu, teedesse, elukeskkonda, aga me oleme mõistnud, et see on kõige olulisem. See on taganud meie iseseisvuse, on taganud meie demokraatia ja julgeoleku. Nüüd, NATO tippkohtumise eel, on vaja oma ambitsioone tõsta ja on vaja panustada viis protsenti. Kindlasti see on õige suund, mida ma mida pean oluliseks Euroopa Parlamendi liikmena, aga ka Eestist valitud poliitikuna. Ma olen jätkuvalt seisukohal, et Euroopa Liit ja USA on strateegilised partnerid, kuid Euroopa Liit peab ka oma jalad kõhu alt välja võtma. See on nagu koolipoiss, kes läheb eksamile ja siin poolest rehkendusest ei aita. Siin on vaja ära teha terve rehkendus. Ma usun, et sellises dünaamilises julgeolekukeskkonnas üldse ellu jääda peavad kõik panustama sõjalisest riigikaitseks, sest kokkuvõttes on Euroopa julgeolek kaalul. Aitäh!

**Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σε λίγες μέρες το ΝΑΤΟ θα συνεδριάσει ξανά και η Ευρώπη οφείλει να πάει εκεί με σχέδιο και πυξίδα. Δεν γίνεται να μιλάμε για κοινή άμυνα και να περιμένουμε από την άλλη πλευρά του Ατλαντικού να μας φυλάει τα νώτα. Ήρθε η ώρα για ευρωστρατό —όχι για να υποκαταστήσει το ΝΑΤΟ αλλά για να υπηρετήσει τον σχεδιασμό, την αυτονομία και την αξιοπιστία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Δεν γίνεται να μην έχουμε σαφές χρονοδιάγραμμα. Δεν γίνεται να πηγαίνουμε βλέποντας και κάνοντας. Οι απειλές δεν περιμένουν. Οφείλουμε να δράσουμε τώρα.

Δεν μπορώ να μην καταθέσω, όμως, το εξής: η χώρα μου, η Κύπρος, ένα κράτος μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, παραμένει υπό κατοχή από χώρα μέλος του ΝΑΤΟ. Η Τουρκία παίζει διπλό παιχνίδι στην Ευρώπη και η ανοχή μας γίνεται συνενοχή.

Όρα να μιλήσουμε ξεκάθαρα και με πράξεις. Η σύνοδος του ΝΑΤΟ δεν μπορεί να είναι απλώς ένα ακόμα ραντεβού. Πρέπει να είναι σημείο καμπής. Αν θέλουμε ασφάλεια, χρειαζόμαστε στρατηγική. Αυτό πρέπει να είναι τώρα το ζητούμενο. Στρατηγική και δράση.

**Niels Fuglsang (S&D).** – Mr President, dear colleagues, we are not at war, but we are not living in a time of peace either. I think it's safe to say that, in our lifetimes, we are seeing the greatest threats that we have ever seen with Putin and his war in Ukraine. And who will be next if we do not stand together and invest in our common defence?

Many countries, including my own, Denmark, have not invested sufficiently if we look at the past decades. We have let down our defence system and we have not realised how important it is for our security that we are able to defend ourselves here in Europe and not rely on other forces.

We are changing that. We are investing massively in Denmark. We are investing massively in other countries as well. But we have to realise that there are huge differences when you look at how much money that we, in the European Union, spend on defence, and we need to change that. So I urge you, colleagues, go to your governments. Tell them to invest. Tell them that we need a decision in The Hague that we invest in our common defence. Let's do it, and let's do it now.

**Engin Eroglu (Renew).** – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Hohe Vertreterin! Wir diskutieren den NATO-Gipfel, und es ist eine wirklich wichtige Diskussion. Ich freue mich, dass die Europäische Union nach und nach endlich begreift, dass es Sicherheit nicht umsonst gibt und dass wir uns für unsere Sicherheit auch einsetzen müssen und auch für unsere Sicherheit bezahlen müssen. Die Lehre der Geschichte der Menschheit zeigt ja auch, dass eine Welt, die ohne Verteidigung, ohne Sicherheit möglich wäre, nicht existiert. Deswegen ist es ganz wichtig, dass wir jetzt innerhalb der NATO diese Verantwortung übernehmen und auch als Europäische Union eine starke Stimme werden. Das bedeutet, dass wir eine Stimme brauchen. Liebe Frau Kallas, ich traue Ihnen das zu – Sie sind eine starke Frau: Seien Sie die Stimme der europäischen Sicherheit, seien Sie die Stimme der europäischen Verteidigung!

Das bedeutet nicht nur, auch den anderen zehn Nicht-EU-Mitgliedstaaten in der NATO zu sagen, wo wir in der Europäischen Union stehen, sondern auch innerhalb der Europäischen Union Reformen anzutreiben. Denn eine Sache ist ja richtig: Wir haben heute gehört, dass wir über 300 Milliarden Euro für die Verteidigung ausgeben und als Europäische Union nicht verteidigungsfähig sind. Das kann wirklich nicht sein. Wir haben auch Kolleginnen und Kollegen gehört, die ganz klar gesagt haben: Wir müssen unsere Verteidigung auch neu denken, wir müssen eine ernste Luftabwehr haben. Wenn ich hier im Haus die Linken höre, die viel Geld für Bildung und Verteidigung, für Krankenhäuser ausgeben, möchte ich ihnen zurufen: Was sind dann unsere Krankenhäuser wert, wenn nachher Raketen auf sie fallen? Wir brauchen eine europäische Luftabwehr.

Wir brauchen aber auch eine Cyberabwehr, wo wir ja ständig angegriffen werden. Das ist ganz, ganz klar. Aber auch ganz klar ist: Wir müssen weg von den schweren Waffensystemen. Wir brauchen Drohnen in allen Bereichen, zu See, zu Luft und am Boden, damit wir letztendlich auch in einem Verteidigungsfall so viele Menschenleben schützen können auf europäischem Boden.

Frau Kallas, setzen Sie sich für diese Reform innerhalb der Europäischen Union ein; dann sind wir sehr, sehr stark nach außen und können der NATO auch sagen, wo es langgeht – und das müssen wir tun!

**Miriam Lexmann (PPE).** – Mr President, Vice-President, just yesterday we witnessed another brutal bombing of Kyiv. Each such act reminds us of the threat that Russia poses – and other totalitarian regimes – to Ukraine, to Europe and to world-based global order.

It is high time to take our security seriously and adequately invest in defence. But we must do that responsibly and in cooperation with our allies. Raising our defence capacity is not just about tanks and missiles. Access to critical raw materials is of crucial importance for the future of European defence, especially while totalitarian China is misusing its dominance. We must ensure that investments in critical raw materials, particularly mining, refining and the production of essential components, are counted towards the increase of NATO defence spending.

**Kathleen Funchion (The Left).** – *A Uachtaráin*, whilst I recognise the sovereign right of each Member State to choose their own foreign policies and whether or not they participate in military alliances, such as NATO, I hope each of you too recognises the sovereign right of my country, Ireland, to maintain its historical policy of neutrality. We in Ireland have a proud history and tradition of UN peacekeeping, and long may that continue.

Now make no mistake, we do require investment in order to ensure that the men and women of the Irish Defence Forces are properly paid and are properly equipped, but this cannot be used as an excuse by our government to move away from neutrality. Colleagues, I feel it is important to reference the creeping militarisation into EU politics. This debate has been a combination of maddening and depressing for the past two hours, listening to the vast majority of speakers. I would also remind people that, at its core, the EU is supposed to be a peace project, and we should not move away from this. We also should not be allowing any funds or vital programmes, such as the European Social and Cohesion Funds, to be used for any military purposes whatsoever.

**Ana Miguel Pedro (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, Portugal leva à cimeira da NATO uma mensagem: estamos prontos para cumprir.

Durante demasiado tempo Portugal ficou aquém do exigido, e isso mudou. Estamos a recuperar o tempo perdido com um plano ambicioso, sólido e coordenado entre o Ministério da Defesa e as Forças Armadas, plenamente alinhado com os objetivos estratégicos da NATO. Este investimento não é apenas uma resposta à exigência externa; é uma escolha nacional consciente, com impacto direto na nossa segurança, na credibilidade internacional e na economia, ao dinamizar a base tecnológica e industrial de defesa.

Portugal deu, finalmente, um grande passo na dignificação das nossas Forças Armadas e na valorização da condição militar. Depois de anos de investimento, hoje reconhece-se, com seriedade, o papel essencial daqueles que servem o país em farda, um sinal de que honramos quem nos protege.

Portugal não deseja a guerra; Portugal deseja a paz, mas sabe que não haverá paz sem força, nem força sem investimento, preparação e vontade política.

Devemos à NATO mais de sete décadas de estabilidade. A Europa falhou demasiadas vezes os seus compromissos, e chegou a hora de cumprir.

*(A oradora aceita responder a uma pergunta «cartão azul»)*

**João Oliveira (The Left),** Pergunta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul». – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Deputada Ana Miguel Pedro, como é que a senhora pode achar que o futuro dos povos pode ser a guerra? Que o futuro dos nossos jovens pode ser a morte e a destruição?

Como é que a senhora pode vir defender o investimento no militarismo e na corrida aos armamentos, achando que isso não acrescenta perigos de guerra, que não acrescenta perigos de conflitos militares, de dimensões particularmente catastróficas, considerando a capacidade de destruição, sobretudo a nível nuclear, que hoje existe?

Como é que a senhora deputada é capaz de dizer aos jovens portugueses que o único futuro para o qual podem olhar é um futuro de preocupação, sem saberem qual é a guerra para a qual vão ter de ser empurrados para morrer?

Senhora Deputada, o militarismo e a guerra não são futuro para povo nenhum e também não o são para o povo português.

**Ana Miguel Pedro (PPE)**, *Resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul»*. – Senhor Deputado, permita-me recordá-lo, porque às vezes a memória é curta quando convém, de que o senhor deputado foi apoiante convicto de um governo — o governo da geringonça — que foi responsável pelo maior desinvestimento na defesa em décadas.

E, do nosso ponto de vista, o investimento em defesa é politicamente viável, é socialmente responsável e é, até, estrategicamente necessário, pois muito daquilo de que fala não é possível sem termos segurança.

**Francisco Assis (S&D)**. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Comissária, a história não nos ensina tudo, mas ensina-nos algumas coisas.

Os pacifistas dos anos 30 tornaram-se, grande parte deles, em apoiantes do nazismo nos anos 40 e apoiantes do sistema totalitário soviético nos anos 50 e nos anos 60. Foi assim que acabaram. Acabaram deixando de defender os regimes democráticos. A NATO teve um papel fundamental nas últimas décadas na defesa, precisamente, de um conjunto de valores e princípios que são exatamente os mesmos que inspiram a União Europeia e que estão na base do modelo das democracias liberais que compõem esta nossa aliança de países.

Estamos num momento particularmente difícil. Há tensões no interior da própria NATO; há um comportamento errático por parte dos Estados Unidos; há a certeza de que a Europa tem de fazer mais pela sua própria defesa e que temos de aumentar o volume de investimento nesse setor.

Eu não sou daqueles que pensam que devemos ter determinados números absolutamente pré-estabelecidos, como os 4 % ou 5%. Teremos de agir em função das nossas necessidades e também das nossas possibilidades. Em nenhuma circunstância devemos pôr em causa outros aspetos e outros compromissos absolutamente essenciais.

Mas a verdade é só uma: não há soberania nacional, nem soberania europeia, se não tivermos capacidade para nos defendermos dos nossos inimigos. Não somos nós que escolhemos os nossos inimigos; são os nossos inimigos que nos escolhem a nós, como seus inimigos.

**Matej Tonin (PPE)**. – Spoštovana komisarka, podpredsednik, drage kolegice in kolegi. V Sloveniji imamo nekaj ljudskih modrosti, ki držijo kot pribito, tudi na področju obrambe in varnosti. In sicer: skupaj smo močnejši in skupina je močna toliko, kot je močan najšibkejši člen.

Nato je obrambno zaveznístvo, ki vsem državam ponuja kolektivno varnost, in kolektivna varnost je bila vedno cenejša in zmogljivejša kot varnost, ki si jo zagotavlja vsaka država članica posebej.

Ampak kolektivna varnost deluje samo, če vsak član zaveznístva izpolnjuje svoje domače naloge. Le ob izpolnjenih zavezah lahko računamo tudi na realizacijo petega člana Severnoatlantske pogodbe, ki pravi –napad na enega je napad na vse.

In zato lahko računamo, da bodo ob napadu priskočile vse članice Nata. Oziroma, kot je nekoč rekel ameriški predsednik Bush v Vilni, vsak napad na Litvo bi se štel za napad na Združene države Amerike.

Za manjše države, kakršna je tudi Slovenija, je to ključno zagotovilo. Zagotovilo, da v primeru agresije in terorističnih napadov ne bomo sami.

**Johan Van Overtveldt (ECR).** – Voorzitter, commissaris, te midden van een alsmaar chaotischer en dreigender wereld staan we op een kantelpunt. De Europese Unie en haar lidstaten hebben een keuze te maken: ofwel versterken we onze defensie, onze veiligheid en onze weerbaarheid, ofwel zullen onze democratie en vrijheden ondermijnd worden. Wie dat minimaliseert, bewijst de Europese waarden absoluut geen dienst en geeft wind in de zeilen aan de antidemocratische krachten, zowel binnen als buiten onze grenzen.

Het mag daarbij echter niet alleen om meer uitgaven gaan. We hebben slimme, gerichte investeringen in defensie, innovatie en strategische autonomie nodig. Daarbij is een stevige, structurele rol van de privésector van het grootste belang. Zo maken we de verhoogde defensie-inspanning ook tot een sociaal-economisch succesverhaal. Deze investeringen zijn ook absoluut noodzakelijk om te voorkomen dat verhoogde defensie-uitgaven zich vooral gaan vertalen in alleen maar prijsverhogingen doorgevoerd door de bestaande defensiebedrijven.

Laten we dit moment dus aangrijpen om de Europese Unie op het vlak van defensie, veiligheid en weerbaarheid te verbeteren en sterker te maken, in plaats van er alleen maar geld tegenaan te gooien.

**Anders Vistisen (PfiE).** – Mr President, we meet here today to discuss NATO and European security, but what is the value of those words if this Chamber refuses to name the real and rising threat to Europe? The greatest danger we face is mass migration and the following Islamisation of our societies. And behind these external threats stands one radical force: the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Iran is not just a middle eastern problem, it is a European problem. It has carried out assassinations and terrorist plots on European soil. It openly calls for war against the West, and it funds jihadist movements and sows division and violence on our streets. And now it's only a few weeks away from getting a nuclear bomb. With its long-range missile programme, it will have the means to hit the heartlands of Europe – Paris, Berlin, even Copenhagen. And yet, what is our response? Moral confusion, strategic blindness and European leaders that line up not to confront Iran, but to condemn Israel: the one nation that defends our values and does not lack the courage that we should have had long ago.

Let's be honest, Israel is doing our dirty work. They are striking at Iran's terrorist proxies. They are confronting a regime that we know all too well is a root cause of instability. And for this we repay them not with applause, but with lectures and accusations. It is shameful and it is hypocritical. No European is safe as long as the ayatollahs rule Tehran. There will be no peace, no stability and no safety until the Iranian regime is overthrown and its nuclear missile programme is disbanded completely and for good. That must be our political objective: not appeasement, not dialogue with tyrants, but actions guided by principles and the hard lessons of history.

**Marta Wcisło (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! NATO to zasada: „Jeden za wszystkich, wszyscy za jednego”. Artykuł 5 dziś znów staje się fundamentem naszego bezpieczeństwa. Szczyt w Hadze musi wysłać jasny sygnał: Europa stoi zjednoczona wobec zagrożeń i gotowa bronić każdego skrawka ziemi i każdego obywatela, w tym na wschodniej granicy – na Lubelszczyźnie, na Podlasiu, na Podkarpaciu.

Nie możemy dopuścić do wycofania wojsk amerykańskich z Polski czy Bułgarii – państw na linii frontu, bo obecność USA to nie tylko symbol, a dobre relacje i czynnik odstrasżający agresję.

Dzisiaj musimy wzmocnić europejski filar w NATO, wydając powyżej 2% PKB na obronność. Polska już daje przykład odpowiedzialności: zakupiła 96 śmigłowców uderzeniowych Apache, przeznaczając 5% PKB na obronność.

Kluczowe inwestycje dla NATO i Unii to Tarcza Wschód i Bałtycka linia obrony, przy zaangażowaniu Programu Inwestycji NATO.

Po szczycie NATO Europa musi być silniejsza, a 500 milionów obywateli Unii Europejskiej – bezpiecznie patrzeć w przyszłość. Jak mówi przysłowie: „Chcesz pokoju, szykuj się do wojny”.

**Ville Niinistö (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, looking at the NATO summit from Finland that has over 1300 km of border with Russia, it is a no brainer to support the 3.5 % target on actual core military spending.

NATO stands at a turning point and we Greens support credible deterrence, but it must be strategic and accountable. And the EU has a vital role in this. The EU can make sure that the added spending is mainly focussed on joint capabilities that EU-NATO countries have the capability also to act alone without the support of the US. This is necessary to negate the threat of Russia.

The EU can also make sure that much more is spent on European defence industry and on joint procurement. We need to mainly support Ukraine and stockpile our own reserves, and that means priority orders and not to give grants to an already lucrative industry in sales to dubious third countries, and not to spend at the cost of spending cuts on the welfare of our citizens.

We need to base the spending on defence, on our European values. For those are the values that we want to protect.

**Sandra Kalniete (PPE).** – Godātais sēdes vadītāj! Kolēģi! Eiropai ir jāapzinās, ka Krievijas imperiālistiskie mērķi sniedzas tālāk par Ukrainu. Dažādu izlūkdienestu dati skaidri pierāda, ka Krievija bruņojas un gatavojas konfrontācijai ar NATO.

Tāpēc visiem sabiedrotajiem ir jāaņem neatliekami ieguldīt aizsardzībā 5 % no sava IKP. Hāgas samītā ir jānolemj šo ambiciozo mērķi sasniegt tuvākajā laikā.

Mana valsts Latvija pierāda, ka tas ir izdarāms, ja ir politiska griba. 2018. gadā mēs tērējām aizsardzībai 2 %, šogad jau 3,6 % un nākamgad ieguldīsim 5 %.

To nedrīkst atlikt, jo mums visiem priekšā ir nākamās vēlēšanas, ir vajadzība ieguldīt sociālās programmās, izglītībā, veselības aprūpē un citās prioritātēs. Taču pašlaik politisko līderu svarīgākais uzdevums ir modernizēt aliansi, paaugstināt tās militārās un operatīvās spējas. Citas alternatīvas ilgstošam mieram Eiropā nav.

**Daniilo Della Valle (The Left).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da alleanza difensiva la NATO si è trasformata negli anni in una macchina da guerra, e la colpa è anche di noi europei. L'Unione europea ha seguito acriticamente le linee di politica estera dettate dagli Stati Uniti, sia in Ucraina, sia sostenendo il criminale di guerra Netanyahu. E quali sono i risultati? Perdita di credibilità e irrilevanza più totale.

Von der Leyen ci è venuta a raccontare che il piano *ReArmEu* sarebbe stata la prima pietra per l'indipendenza strategica, ma è esattamente il contrario. Ha preparato il terreno per permettere agli Stati membri di aumentare le spese militari fino al 5 % del PIL, come dettato da Washington.

Miliardi di euro che dovremmo togliere alla sanità, alle pensioni, ai salari dei nostri cittadini. Ma per difenderci da chi? Come si fa ad avere ancora il coraggio di accusare altri paesi di essere delle minacce per la sicurezza globale quando la NATO, negli anni, ha lasciato una scia di sangue e terrore in ogni angolo del globo, quando oggi sostiene lo Stato terrorista di Israele nel genocidio contro i palestinesi e non dice nulla sull'aggressione al Libano, all'occupazione del Sud della Siria e, in ultimo, all'aggressione ingiustificabile all'Iran?

Oggi l'Europa dovrebbe mettere al centro gli interessi dei propri cittadini, mettere al centro un ruolo di pace e cooperazione e smettere di essere vassalli di chi semina terrore e progetti di guerra.

*Solicitududes incidentales de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)*

**Hélder Sousa Silva (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, a ameaça de uma invasão europeia deixou de ser claramente um cenário hipotético; é hoje uma possibilidade concreta. E não é só na fronteira com a Rússia ou com a Bielorrússia. Em todas as fronteiras da União Europeia temos hoje sérias ameaças.

Quero, por isso, saudar a Comissão Europeia pelas iniciativas recentes em termos orçamentais, nomeadamente o SAFE (Action for Europe) e o EDIP (European Defense Industry Program), com um montante de mais de 150 mil milhões € para ajudar os Estados-Membros e as suas indústrias de defesa a caminhar no sentido certo, no sentido da soberania europeia, em termos de produção de material, de segurança e de defesa.

Para além de garantir umas forças armadas mais preparadas, este investimento será também o motor de emprego, de inovação e de valorização do tecido económico nacional, bem como de alinhamento com os objetivos de investimento na NATO.

Espero que, na próxima cimeira da NATO, os países da União reafirmem o seu compromisso com a Aliança. Mas, acima de tudo, espera que demonstrem que o pilar Europeu da NATO pode e deve, sozinho, defender a nossa União e a nossa Europa.

**Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, stimată doamnă Înalță Reprezentantă, stimați colegi, summitul NATO care urmează să vină trebuie să înceapă de la ideea de pace și securitate, creșterea securității cetățenilor. Noi aici suntem aleși și reprezentăm interesul cetățenilor și dacă am face o întrebare în toate statele membre, cred că pe primul loc cetățenii pun securitatea. Sigur că avem nevoie de școli, de educație, de sănătate, dar dacă nu avem o securitate asigurată, nu putem să le facem pe celelalte.

Doamna Înalță Reprezentantă, suma aceea din proiectul SAFE, 150 de miliarde, trebuie alocată statelor membre pentru a produce, pentru a avea o industrie proprie, nu pentru a importa din țări terțe, pentru că așa creăm locuri de muncă și rezolvăm și probleme sociale și probleme de venituri pentru cetățeni. Cred foarte mult că avem nevoie de a înțelege, de a comunica către cetățeni de ce avem nevoie de o industrie a apărării. Pentru că pericolul este la graniță. Eu trăiesc într-o țară care este la graniță cu conflictul și da, trebuie să ne gândim și la Republica Moldova, să vedem cum o integrăm pentru a putea avea siguranța flancului de Est. Cred că unitatea și solidaritatea trebuie să existe. Doamnă comisar, Uniunea Europeană trebuie să aibă o poziție foarte fermă la NATO. Nu putem să lăsăm neapărați cetățenii din spațiul Uniunii Europene.

**João Oliveira (The Left).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária Kallas, a NATO é o mais perigoso instrumento à disposição do imperialismo norte-americano para manter o seu domínio hegemónico pela força da guerra e da destruição. A NATO é a maior ameaça à paz mundial.

A opção da União Europeia de se constituir como pilar europeu da NATO confirma a sua natureza militarista e é reveladora do alinhamento cúmplice e subserviente com essa estratégia belicista e agressiva dos Estados Unidos.

A NATO representa um projeto de destruição e de morte que é contrário aos interesses dos povos e que sacrifica os recursos que deviam estar destinados à melhoria das suas condições de vida.

Os povos querem paz, querem melhores condições de vida, querem trabalho e salários dignos, educação, saúde, habitação. A NATO e o investimento no militarismo e na corrida aos armamentos hipotecam tudo isso.

No seu conjunto, a NATO representa mais de metade das despesas militares do mundo e agora querem ir ainda mais longe, destinando 5 % do PIB de cada país ao militarismo, ao armamento e à guerra.

É urgente uma ordem internacional de paz, de soberania e de progresso social, pela segurança coletiva da Europa, assente nos princípios da Acta Final da Conferência de Helsínquia e na Carta das Nações Unidas.

**Petras Gražulis (ESN).** – Gerbiamas Pirmininke. Europa turi suprasti, kad NATO – tai Amerika. Ir, manau, akivaizdoje Ukrainos karo, kuris tęsiasi daugiau kaip trejus metus, turi suprasti ir daryti rimtas išvadas Europos Sąjunga. Ji turi turėti savo kariuomenę, savo ginkluotę, savo pramonę. NATO šiandien, galima sakyti, kad tai – Amerika. Ji turi savo interesus, bet Europa turi turėti savo interesus ir turi juos apginti. Ar ne gėda Europai, kuri negina Ukrainos per šitiek metų? O Rusija ir toliau veržiasi į Ukrainos teritoriją. Pretekstas, kad tai ne NATO narė, Ukraina, ir dėl to neginsime. O Izraelis – NATO narys? O Taivanas – NATO narys? Ten ginama ginklu. Ir dar vienas įsipareigojimas Europos ir Amerikos, tai Budapešto sutartis, kai Ukraina atsisakė atominio ginklo. Kur įsipareigojimai? Nėra. T. y. faktiškai Europa turi turėti savo kariuomenę ir ginkluotę.

**Lukas Sieper (NI).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Menschen Europas! Manchmal wünschte ich, wir wären wirklich allein die Lakaien der USA; dann wäre es nicht so schmerzhaft weltfremd, wenn manche hier behaupten, wir würden mit unserer Verteidigung allein amerikanischen Interessen dienen. Manchmal wünschte ich, in der Ukraine würde wirklich bloß ein Stellvertreterkrieg mit dem Westen geführt; dann würden diese Verzerrungen der Realität, die manche hier betreiben, nicht so eine schamlose Beleidigung der Tapferkeit und der Freiheit des ukrainischen Volkes darstellen. Manchmal wünschte ich, die Ausgaben für unsere Verteidigung würden wirklich einfach aus den Sozialtöpfen genommen; dann wäre dieses dilettantische Verständnis von Haushaltspolitik, das manche betreiben, nicht so peinlich für alle anderen Abgeordneten.

In einer perfekten Welt brauchen wir keine Armeen, keine Rüstung. Bis dahin brauchen wir die NATO.

**Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis (S&D).** – Mr President, I would like to wish the Commissioner a happy birthday. In the run-up to the upcoming NATO summit, the building of the European defence union is at the top of the European Union policy agenda and is essential to shielding European Union citizens' security and wellbeing from current geopolitical threats. This is a part of the EU Member States' solidarity – those who are also in NATO.

The European defence union should be a pillar of NATO. And we see that it is only one way to strengthen our security. European security, as argued in the Niinistö report, is a public good and that readiness is a common responsibility, and one way to respond to future challenges is to deepen cooperation across Member States, to leverage European economies of scale on defence and spending activities. We are speaking about 5 % of GDP, but we need to understand that the cost of non-EU in defence spending, in other words, the cost of not leveraging European economies of scale, is estimated to range from EUR 18 billion to EUR 57 billion per year – this was the estimate set out in a European Parliamentary Research Service study. We need to think about the necessity to spend also in social areas much more efficiently.

**Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σύνδοδος του NATO στη Χάγη. Στην πόλη, δηλαδή, όπου διαδήλωσαν εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες εκφράζοντας την αλληλεγγύη τους στον παλαιστινιακό λαό, ενάντια στη γενοκτονία και τον λιμό από το Ισραήλ με νατοϊκές πλάτες —όπως και τώρα, στην επίθεσή του σε βάρος του Ιράν, που ρίχνει λάδι στη φωτιά του πολέμου στη Μέση Ανατολή.

Βασικοί στόχοι της συνόδου είναι η κλιμάκωση του ιμπεριαλιστικού πολέμου στην Ουκρανία, το άνοιγμα νέων πολεμικών μετώπων και όχι η άμυνα, όπως προκλητικά ισχυρίζεστε. Μία άνευ προηγουμένου ολομέτωπη επίθεση σε βάρος των λαών. Για αυτό και η συμμετοχή των κρατών μελών εκτινάσσεται στο 5% του ΑΕΠ. Τα παζάρια για την Ουκρανία στο μέσο των ανταγωνισμών δεν γίνονται για τα άθλια προσχήματά σας αλλά για εδάφη, αγορές, σπάνιες γαίες, τα 500 δισεκατομμύρια της ανοικοδόμησης στα συντρίμια της ιμπεριαλιστικής σύγκρουσης.

Απέναντι στις νατοϊκές αποφάσεις της συνόδου και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των κυβερνήσεων, οι λαοί διαδηλώνουν απαιτώντας να μην υπάρξει καμιά εμπλοκή και καμιά θυσία για τα νατοϊκά πολεμικά σφαγεία. Απαιτούν ουσιαστικές αυξήσεις σε μισθούς, σε συντάξεις, στην υγεία, την παιδεία, την πολιτική προστασία.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señora Kallas, la próxima cumbre de la OTAN tiene como objetivo prioritario afirmar de una vez la autonomía estratégica de la Unión Europea, para empezar respecto a un socio principal —Estados Unidos— cuyo compromiso con la defensa común es cada vez más dudoso, y debe hacerlo, para empezar, sin ningún seguidismo de las instrucciones del Pentágono de incrementar todos los Estados miembros de la Alianza un 5 % el presupuesto de defensa. No solamente porque la Unión Europea tiene que garantizar su financiación sin perjuicio de sus políticas de cohesión, de solidaridad y de su pilar social —que ahora incluye la vivienda— sino también, sobre todo, porque ese no es el camino. El camino es la especialización de esfuerzos, no la suma de presupuestos nacionales. El camino es la industria común, con inversiones compartidas, las sinergias operativas y, por supuesto, la inteligencia compartida.

Ese es el camino para que la Unión Europea pueda ser significativa en su esfuerzo de defensa, no imponer acriticamente a todos los Estados miembros sacrificios presupuestarios, a costa de su cohesión social, vertebral y, particularmente, de los nuevos retos como es la política de vivienda.

*(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))*

**Kaja Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.** – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for this very intensive debate. I will just react on a few things.

Of course we need public support for these steps. We need to explain to our people why we have to do this, and why we also need to make sacrifices. The problem with defence spending is, when you need it, it's too late. You have to make these investments when you are in peace time, and then it's actually much harder to explain to the people why we need this.

Of course, as politicians, we have so many places that we want to put the public money into education, social affairs, roads, you name it, infrastructure... There is so much. But if we don't have defence and if we have the threats also pointed out by our intelligence services, and we don't take those threats seriously, then all the investments that we do in any other field actually will become in vain.

When we make defence investments, then it will also function as a deterrence, which means that hopefully the war is not coming to Europe.

Now, NATO is a defence alliance, and I don't agree with those who are spreading the Russian narratives that, you know, EU-NATO enlargement is somehow threatening somebody. Why are these countries wanting to join NATO? Why did Finland and Sweden join now? Because of the threat coming from Russia. NATO is a defence alliance, and that's why it is the only thing that actually protects us. Because together we are strong.

Now, when it comes to NATO having the military plans and then EU having the plans for the defence industry, it is to complement these two institutions. It is, like many of you said, not about the numbers, but actually the capabilities. What do we do with this money? And there I also echo what was said by many Members here, that we need joint projects. We need joint procurement. We need to do these things together, because we need to also address the threats that we have together, not, you know, national security, but actually the security of all of us all together.

There was also a question of against whom these weapons are used that we are buying. I mean, it's like having a security system at home. You don't need it unless somebody breaks in. So this is exactly the same. You don't need those weapons unless somebody attacks you. And like I said in my speech, as Russia is spending so much more on military, they will want to use it and against whom they want to use it, well, there are, of course, many options, but we have to make sure that this is not against us, and also that it's stopping there.

Then on the defence spending, we have a lot to learn from Ukraine. And I agree with those who said that it doesn't have to be only about enriching the defence industry. No, if we look at Ukraine, they have built the defence industry from zero, from scratch. So actually bringing also the costs down using much shorter procurement times. And we need to learn from there.

Also, I want to address the issue of peace. Everybody in Europe wants peace. Europe is a peace project. We all agree on that. But we very clearly see right now the talks about the ceasefire, that Russia doesn't want peace and it takes at least two to want peace, but it only takes one to want war. And that is why we need to prepare. So we are living in dangerous times. And in order to have peace, you need to prepare for this.

And I also want to address our Irish colleagues. I mean, yes, peace doesn't mean that the human suffering will stop. If you surrender, you have the aggressor and you say, ok, take all what you want, then it doesn't mean that the human suffering will stop. Our experience behind the Iron Curtain after the Second World War, countries like Ireland get to build up their prosperity. But for us, it meant, you know, atrocities, mass deportations, suppressing your culture and language. This is what happens. It is also peace. But it's actually not freedom. It's not freedom of choice for people. And that is what the European Union is all about. And that is what we are also fighting for.

Somebody said here that Russia has no reason to attack NATO. Well, Russia didn't have any reason to attack Ukraine either, or Syria or, you know, Georgia, the list is long. They are not acting rationally. And we are democracies. We look through this democracy prism thinking that it's not rational. They wouldn't do that. It's not rational to attack NATO. Well, we can't think how they think and we need to prepare and learn from our past mistakes and the past mistakes we have made in history. Many of you also mentioned this. I mean, there's not a lot and very far to see.

And what I want to stress to all of those are representatives coming from countries that are much further from Russia. Look at the world map, Europe is a very small continent. Whatever happens in one part of Europe has an effect on us all, and we are only strong when we act together, when we act together in NATO, when we act together in Europe, a stronger European Union is also a stronger NATO.

**President.** – Thank you very much, High Representative. I also take the opportunity to wish you a happy birthday from the European Parliament.

*Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 178 del Reglamento interno)*

**Vasile Dîncu (S&D), în scris.** – Summitul NATO de la Haga are loc într-un moment de răscruce. Războiul de agresiune al Rusiei împotriva Ucrainei nu este doar o amenințare regională – este o provocare existențială pentru securitatea europeană. Avertismentul Secretarului General, Mark Rutte, că Rusia ar putea fi pregătită să atace Alianța în următorii cinci ani, trebuie luat cu toată seriozitatea.

În acest context, Europa nu mai poate amâna asumarea responsabilității pentru propria apărare. Salutăm apelurile pentru creșterea bugetelor militare, dar avertizăm: nu este suficient să cheltuim mai mult – trebuie să cheltuim împreună, mai eficient și strategic.

De aceea, salutăm strategia pentru Marea Neagră propusă recent de Comisie – un pas important pentru apărarea flancului estic și securitatea Mării Negre, zonă critică pentru NATO și pentru Uniune. Dar această strategie trebuie articulată clar cu inițiativa ReArm Europe, evitând fragmentarea și încurajând sinergii reale.

Totodată, este esențial să avansăm în flexibilizarea cadrului legislativ european privind achizițiile comune, producția și livrarea rapidă de armament și muniție în interiorul Uniunii. Europa are capacități industriale, dar are și obstacole birocratice. Acestea trebuie depășite urgent dacă vrem să avem o industrie de apărare robustă și suverană.

La Haga, NATO trebuie să transmită un mesaj clar: Europa este pregătită, capabilă și unită în fața provocărilor viitorului.

**Kinga Gál (PFE), írásban.** – A NATO és az Európai Unió védelempolitikai együttműködésének megerősítése elengedhetetlen Európa biztonsága szempontjából. Támogatjuk, hogy a tagállamok megerősítsék és fejlesszék saját haderejüket és a határvédelmet, önállóan és egymással együttműködve. Azonban minden ilyen döntésnek nemzeti alapon kell megszületnie, a tagállamok szuverenitásának teljes tiszteletben tartásával. Ezért határozottan kiállunk az egyhangú döntéshozatal megtartása mellett ezen a stratégiai területen. Európa békéjét és biztonságát csak úgy őrizhetjük meg, ha megőrizzük a szuverén döntéshozatal alapelveit és megtartjuk az egyhangú döntéshozatalt a védelempolitika területén.

A biztonsági garanciát a tagállamok saját védelmi kapacitásainak megerősítése nyújtja, az uniós források felhasználását is ebbe az irányba kell tereelnünk és az orosz-ukrán konfliktus kapcsán pedig a béketeremtést kell előtérbe helyeznünk. Az uniós polgárok világos üzenetet küldtek: biztonságot, stabilitást és gazdasági fejlődést várnak, nem pedig háborús bizonytalanságot és fegyverkezési versenyt.

Továbbra is kiállunk amellett, hogy Ukrajna nem Európa kitolt „védelmi vonala”. Fontos, hogy a védelempolitika ne váljon ideológiai vagy geopolitikai játszmák eszközévé, ehelyett ugyanis hosszútávú védelmi- és békestratégiára van szükségünk. Bízunk abban, hogy a júniusi NATO csúcson is ezt a célt szolgáló megállapodás születik, hiszen ez egy védelmi szövetség és fontos, hogy meg is őrizzük annak.

**Victor Negrescu (S&D), în scris.** – Summitul NATO vine într-un moment decisiv pentru securitatea europeană. Pentru România, acest context reprezintă o oportunitate de a transforma investițiile în apărare în dezvoltare economică și inovare.

Uniunea Europeană trebuie să valorifice mecanisme precum SAFE, Fondul European pentru Pace și InvestEU pentru a sprijini proiecte comune, de exemplu, construirea unei nave în România cu tehnologie franceză și germană sau dezvoltarea unor capacități de producție militară în Polonia. Astfel de inițiative consolidează atât securitatea, cât și economia europeană.

NATO și Uniunea Europeană trebuie să acționeze complementar, printr-o coordonare strânsă și strategică. Alianța oferă garanții de securitate, iar UE poate susține efortul prin investiții în capacități industriale, inovare și reziliență. Europa are nevoie de o abordare unitară și pragmatică, care să combine apărarea colectivă cu autonomia strategică responsabilă.

România trebuie să întărească prezența NATO și americană, să mențină Marea Neagră ca prioritate strategică, să susțină industria națională și să acceseze fonduri europene relevante.

Este esențial să negociem pragmatic și cu viziune, astfel încât fiecare investiție în securitate să însemne și dezvoltare durabilă pentru cetățeni. România are potențialul real de a deveni un hub regional pentru securitate, inovație și cooperare transatlantică, dacă acționează coordonat și strategic.

**Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), na piśmie.** – Zbliżający się szczyt NATO w Hadze w dniach 24–26 czerwca będzie kluczowym testem dla wiarygodności Sojuszu i zdolności Europy do wspólnej odpowiedzi na zagrożenia. Dla nas, krajów wschodniej flanki NATO, jasne jest jedno: NATO musi pozostać filarem bezpieczeństwa i najskuteczniejszym odstraszaczem wobec agresji.

Wobec rosyjskiej napaści na Ukrainę, destabilizacji Bliskiego Wschodu oraz coraz bliższej współpracy reżimów autorytarnych, Sojusz musi dziś jasno potwierdzić swoje zobowiązanie do obrony wolnych, suwerennych państw. To oznacza nie tylko deklaracje, ale konkretne decyzje: wzrost wydatków obronnych, modernizację armii, rozwój zdolności przemysłu zbrojeniowego i zwiększenie interoperacyjności.

Grupa EKR w pełni popiera cel przeznaczania 5% PKB na obronność do 2035 roku. Europa powinna dzielić odpowiedzialność z USA i wzmacniać własną niezależność strategiczną. Ukraina walczy dziś nie tylko o swoją wolność, lecz także o zasady, które przez dekady gwarantowały pokój w Europie. Jej zwycięstwo musi pozostać naszym wspólnym celem.

*(Se suspende la sesión a las 11:43 horas).*

IN THE CHAIR: ROBERTA METSOLA

*President*

#### 4. Resumption of the sitting

*(The sitting resumed at 12:00)*

#### 5. Voting time

**President.** – The next item is the vote.

##### 5.1. Macro-financial assistance to Egypt (A10-0037/2025 - Céline Imart) (vote)

**President.** – The first vote is on the report by Céline Imart on macro-financial assistance to Egypt (*see minutes, item 5.1*).

##### 5.2. Adoption by the Union of the Agreement on the interpretation and application of the Energy Charter Treaty (A10-0009/2025 - Anna Cavazzini, Borys Budka) (vote)

**President.** – The next vote is on the report by Anna Cavazzini and Borys Budka on the adoption by the Union of the Agreement on the interpretation and application of the Energy Charter Treaty (*see minutes, item 5.2*).

– *Before the vote:*

**Anna Cavazzini, rapporteur.** – Madam President, dear colleagues, Gazprom sued the European Union because of our efforts to limit Russia's influence on Nord Stream. ExxonMobil sued the Netherlands because they left a gas field because of earthquakes. These dangerous investor-state dispute cases undermine the EU's sovereignty. They undermine our climate and energy policy.

But luckily they will be an incident of the past, because this Parliament led the way for the exit from the dangerous Energy Charter Treaty. I think we should be very proud of this and today's vote is the final step in this long process. This inter-se agreement will neutralise the Charter's sunset clause between the EU Member States. The ECT should have never been applied intra-EU, and today we are setting this in stone.

I thank my co-rapporteur, Mr Budka from the EPP, and ask all colleagues to vote in favour in order to close this Energy Charter Treaty saga, to protect the EU and the Member States' budgets, and to protect our sovereignty.

I ask the Commission to enlarge the inter-se agreement also to Switzerland and to the UK, and to continue reforming the international investment protection system, to fully align it with the principles of the rule of law and democratic sovereignty.

### **5.3. EU/Euratom Agreement on the interpretation and application of the Energy Charter Treaty: adoption by Euratom (A10-0008/2025 - Borys Budka) (vote)**

**President.** – The next vote is on the report by Borys Budka on the EU-Euratom Agreement on the interpretation and application of the Energy Charter Treaty: adoption by Euratom (*see minutes, item 5.3*).

### **5.4. Implementation report on the Recovery and Resilience Facility (A10-0098/2025 - Victor Negrescu, Siegfried Mureşan) (vote)**

**President.** – The next vote is on the report by Victor Negrescu and Siegfried Mureşan on the implementation report on the Recovery and Resilience Facility (*see minutes, item 5.4*).

### **5.5. The Commission's 2024 Rule of Law report (A10-0100/2025 - Ana Catarina Mendes) (vote)**

**President.** – We now move to the vote on the report by Ana Catarina Mendes on the Commission's 2024 rule of law report (*see minutes, item 5.5*).

### **5.6. 2023 and 2024 reports on Montenegro (A10-0093/2025 - Marjan Šarec) (vote)**

**President.** – We move to the vote on the report by Marjan Šarec on the 2023 and 2024 reports on Montenegro (*see minutes, item 5.6*).

### **5.7. 2023 and 2024 reports on Moldova (A10-0096/2025 - Sven Mikser) (vote)**

**President.** – The final vote is on the report by Sven Mikser on the 2023 and 2024 reports on Moldova (*see minutes, item 5.7*).

*(The vote closed)*

*(The sitting was briefly suspended)*

**IN THE CHAIR: CHRISTEL SCHALDEMOSE***Vice-President***6. Resumption of the sitting***(The sitting resumed at 12:35)***7. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting**

**President.** – The minutes of yesterday's sitting and the texts adopted are available.

Are there any comments? No? The minutes are approved.

**8. Stopping the genocide in Gaza: time for EU sanctions (topical debate)**

**President.** – The next item is the topical debate on 'Stopping the genocide in Gaza: time for EU sanctions'.

I would like to inform Members that for this debate there is no catch-the-eye procedure and no blue cards will be accepted.

**Manon Aubry, auteur.** – Madame la Présidente, Madame Kallas, génocide, génocide, génocide. Je le répète volontairement car malgré 18 mois de massacres à Gaza, vous refusez toujours délibérément d'employer ce terme, Madame Kallas. 18 mois de tueries et plus de 55 000 morts, 18 mois de destruction dont 90 % des écoles, 18 mois de famine pour 2 millions de civils, 18 mois que le gouvernement israélien organise méthodiquement et délibérément le génocide du peuple palestinien.

Il aura fallu attendre que notre groupe de la gauche utilise sa possibilité d'organiser un débat pour que le mot génocide et la nécessité de sanctions apparaissent pour la première fois à l'ordre du jour officiel de notre Parlement européen. Nous faisons en somme ce que vous, Madame Kallas, et vous dirigeants européens, qui ne daignez même pas venir pour ce débat, avez refusé de faire jusqu'à présent: qualifier l'indicible pour agir, sanctionner, protéger et sortir de votre complicité.

Car oui, vous êtes complice, Madame Kallas, quand vous restez silencieuse face au blocus humanitaire imposé par Israël qui laisse pour seul rêve aux enfants de Gaza d'avoir une simple miche de pain. Ce blocus honteux qu'une députée de mon groupe, Rima Hassan, dont je veux saluer ici le courage, a tenté de contourner avec la flottille de la liberté. Leur arrestation dans les eaux internationales était illégale, leurs conditions de détention indignes. Mais les autorités européennes, et notamment vous Madame Kallas n'avez pas eu un mot pour appeler à leur libération. Apporter de l'aide humanitaire ne devrait jamais être un crime. Les seuls qui doivent être derrière les barreaux, ce sont les personnes poursuivies par la Cour pénale internationale, au premier rang desquelles Benjamin Netanyahu.

Madame Kallas je vous le redis, l'Union européenne et les dirigeants européens sont directement complices du génocide. Complices quand vous laissez Benjamin Netanyahu fouler le sol européen sans l'arrêter, complices quand vous déversez des millions d'euros au complexe militaro-industriel israélien à travers le programme de recherche Horizon, complices quand des États européens continuent à commercer et à livrer des armes à une armée génocidaire. Les mots ne suffisent plus, il faut des actes.

J'ai une question pour vous, chers collègues. Savez-vous combien notre Parlement et l'Union européenne ont adopté, à raison, de paquet de sanctions contre la Russie: dix-sept. Dix-sept! Et contre Israël qui organise un génocide? Zéro! C'est ce deux poids, deux mesures qui affaiblit toute l'architecture du droit international et qui est insupportable. Le soutien inconditionnel de l'Europe à l'extrême droite israélienne doit cesser. Cela aurait dû être fait depuis bien longtemps.

Mais vous avez une nouvelle opportunité le 23 juin prochain au Conseil des ministres des affaires étrangères, en décidant de suspendre l'accord d'association entre l'Union européenne et Israël. Et laissez-moi vous prévenir, Madame Kallas, vous ne pouvez plus tergiverser en proposant de réexaminer, peut-être dans un futur plus ou moins proche. Parce que les distributions humanitaires qui se font prendre pour cible par des tirs, ce n'est pas dans un futur, c'est maintenant. Parce que les Palestiniens, qui n'ont d'autre horizon que mourir de faim ou mourir d'une balle, ce n'est pas dans un futur, c'est maintenant. Parce que la survie, tout simplement du peuple palestinien se joue maintenant.

Tout doit être mis en œuvre pour faire plier le gouvernement de Benjamin Netanyahu. Il faut un embargo total sur les armes et des sanctions économiques et commerciales massives contre Israël. Ce n'est pas seulement notre groupe qui le demande, souvent seul, je dois le dire, dans cet hémicycle, mais ce sont aussi des centaines de milliers de personnes qui, de Rome à La Haye, de Paris à Bruxelles, se mobilisent partout en Europe et qui font bien plus que vous dirigeants européens en deux ans contre le génocide.

Alors Madame Kallas, pour finir, puisque les cris de douleur des Palestiniens vous indiffèrent, peut-être que leurs poèmes trouveront grâce à votre cœur pour qu'enfin vous sortiez de l'inaction. Écoutez ce poète palestinien Salem Joubran: «Si un enfant était assassiné et que ses meurtriers jetaient son corps dans la boue, seriez-vous en colère? Que diriez-vous? Je suis un fils de Palestine, je meurs chaque année, je me fais assassiner chaque jour, chaque heure. Exprimez-vous: qu'est-ce qui a provoqué votre soudaine indifférence? Quoi donc? Rien à dire?»

**Kaja Kallas**, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, first, let us remember where this whole thing started. On 7 October 2023, Hamas carried out the worst terrorist attack in Israel's history.

Israel has the right to self-defence, but what we see in practice from Israel goes beyond self-defence. We have made this very clear in recent weeks. Blocking food and medicine for Palestinians trapped in Gaza does not protect Israel. Bypassing UN aid deliveries does not help the people – it undermines decades of humanitarian principles. The humanitarian situation is deteriorating. Three warehouses were recently opened in Gaza, but only one is now accepting new deliveries. At every single opportunity, I have called on my Israeli counterpart to let the aid flow and allow aid organisations to operate freely. You must ask the same. Reports last night that Israeli forces killed over 50 Palestinian people waiting for flour in a Gaza aid site are beyond shocking. Every day this war continues, humanity slips further away. Enough is enough.

A month ago, Israel also began an offensive in Gaza. Operation Gideon's Chariots has involved a disproportionate use of force, the continued targeting of civilian infrastructure and an unacceptable death toll. Ninety per cent of people living in the Strip have already been displaced. Those who remain are entirely dependent on aid which isn't coming in. Israel's stated objective is to take control over the entire Gaza Strip. Altering, reducing or annexing territory is a direct violation of international law. Should all or parts of Gaza civilian population be permanently forced from their homes, this too would be a violation of international law. We must call it as such.

The West Bank in parallel, is in a state of chaos. Israel Defence Forces are dismantling Palestinian terrorist networks and terrorism is declining, but settler violence is increasing. This isn't logical if terrorism is to blame for settler violence. Intimidation campaigns, physical and verbal attacks, and the destruction and burning of property and homes are leading to the displacement of entire Palestinian communities. This is outright lawlessness. Israel must come face to face with its own extremists. And what is happening in the West Bank threatens the formation of a Palestinian state and peace for the region in the long run.

Honourable members, as the European Union, our job is not to lament, but to ask ourselves what we have in our power to do in response. Three points.

First, we must put the pressure on Israel. Last month, a majority of EU foreign ministers supported a review of the Association Agreement and Israel's compliance with Article 2. Article 2 imposes binding obligations on the parties to observe human rights. When we started the review, humanitarian aid had been blocked from entering Gaza for 11 weeks straight. The review is being conducted as we speak. Next Monday, we will discuss the review. I will also brief EU leaders at the European Council a few days later. I know that there are many outspoken voices here, but I have to underline that whatever happens, these are ultimately the choices for the Member States to take. We will move together as a union.

Second, we do everything we can possibly to do to alleviate suffering. The European Union is the largest international donor to the Palestinian people. Our humanitarian funding for this year alone is EUR 170 million. And since October 2023, the EU has helped transport close to 5 000 tonnes of humanitarian cargo to Gaza. I've said this many times now, including to my Israeli counterpart: the answer to threats of aid being weaponised is not to block the aid, but to flood the region with so much aid, it cannot be misused. There is more than enough to do this. The amount of aid is not the problem, but the access is.

Third, specifically on settlements: EU leaders have repeatedly condemned the Israeli Government's decisions to expand illegal settlements across the occupied West Bank. We have urged Israel to reverse these decisions. The EU has also repeatedly condemned the ongoing extremist settler violence in the West Bank, including in East Jerusalem. We have already adopted sanctions against nine individuals and five entities responsible for serious human rights abuses against Palestinians. Discussions are ongoing on further sanctions against extremist settlers and against entities and organisations which support them, and against Hamas supporters, but we don't have unity yet, and this is something we should all push for.

Honourable Members, we must remember where this began. Israel has the right to exist and defend itself, but no one should live in terror. Our focus must be on where this can lead. Pressure must increase on the Israeli Government. I will do this on my side, as I have repeatedly done. Likewise, we must use every avenue to pressure Hamas into handing over Gaza governance to the Palestinian Authority. A united Arab world can apply pressure here.

The European Union remains firmly committed to the two-state solution. The conference led by France and Saudi Arabia that was postponed from this week should take place. We need international mobilisation behind the two-state solution. The two-state solution is the right path and always will be. It is the only means for just and lasting peace for Israelis as well as the Palestinians.

**Hildegard Bentele**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, High Representative, dear colleagues, since 7 October, we have debated Gaza nearly every plenary.

No one here denies the suffering, but despite massive media coverage – often based on Hamas-supplied sources and political theatre across Europe, including university occupations and unilateral recognitions of Palestine – has any of this eased the humanitarian crisis? No. And suspending the EU-Israel Association Agreement, as loudly demanded by the S&D leader yesterday again, will not deliver a single kilo of food more to those in need.

As Chair of the EU-Israel Delegation, I have tried to be an honest broker. I warned early: Israel's break with UNWRA was serious. I also told Israeli partners: if you cut ties, you must propose alternatives. I have tabled amendments in this House to reflect that need.

Now is the time to act. Israel, the UN and aid groups must cooperate with one basic condition: that terrorists do not cease the aid. That should be obvious, and yet we cannot agree about it. Why? Because of some 'disdebate'. It's not about solutions. It's about hatred towards Israel.

Let me be clear: under international law, genocide is one of the gravest crimes imaginable. It requires mass suffering and proven intent to destroy a group as such. That threshold is extremely high. The International Court of Justice did not find Israel guilty of genocide. It called for humanitarian steps, but it did not confirm the accusation. On the contrary, the court's president, Judge Julia Sebutinde, clearly stated, and I quote, 'no plausible basis for finding genocidal intent'. She called the case 'essentially political'.

So I ask the colleagues on the left, why do you keep on repeating this claim? Words matter. False accusations fuel hatred, violence and antisemitism. Some respected members of the Berlin chapter of your party have left it, rather than remaining silent in the face of the anchoring of this toxic narrative.

Let us be united as Europeans and all choose truth over ideology, clarity over chaos, and collaboration over boycott.

**Nacho Sánchez Amor**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señora Bentele, ¿se pueden cerrar los ojos al desprecio y la criminalización de los tribunales internacionales? ¿Se pueden cerrar los ojos a nuevas oleadas de asentamientos ilegales? ¿Se pueden cerrar los ojos a los planes para demoler cien casas en Yenín? ¿Se pueden cerrar los ojos a retener la financiación debida a la Autoridad Palestina, a la muerte violenta de mil personas en Cisjordania, donde no hay guerra, a la criminalización de la honra y su sustitución por un engendro perfectamente disfuncional? ¿Se pueden cerrar los ojos a la destrucción de escuelas y hospitales? ¿Se pueden cerrar los ojos al desplazamiento de 700 000 personas, a la retención en la frontera de la ayuda internacional, a las declaraciones —porque las palabras importan, y usted lo ha dicho— orgullosamente genocidas de los ministros del señor Netanyahu sobre el uso del hambre como arma de guerra? ¿Se pueden cerrar los ojos a 56 000 muertes, entre ellas las de 17 000 niños y 1 000 bebés de menos de un año?

Señora Bentele, le estoy preguntando si se pueden cerrar los ojos a todo esto al mismo tiempo, porque todo esto está pasando al mismo tiempo. El mismo ejército que presume de ser capaz de poner con una precisión milimétrica un misil en un apartamento en un edificio de Teherán está bombardeando en alfombra la población civil en Gaza, como en Guernica, señora Bentele, como en Guernica.

Los dobles estándares, señora Kallas, son el cáncer de la política exterior europea. Claro que podemos hacer cosas: no cerrar los ojos, llamar a las cosas por su nombre, activar las cláusulas del acuerdo que nos dan alguna capacidad de influencia sobre esa situación, dejar de vender armas a Israel, reconocer el Estado palestino y perseverar en la solución de los dos Estados.

**Juan Carlos Girauta Vidal**, *en nombre del Grupo PflE*. – Señora presidenta, ya que no se avergüenzan ustedes, déjeme que me avergüence por usted, señora, por lo que acabo de oír. Ustedes vienen aquí con un título de debate que es una petición de principio —ese es el nombre de la falacia lógica—: detener el genocidio en Gaza. Es como si yo dijera: «vamos a debatir sobre detener el tráfico de drogas en su grupo político». Sería una mentira, igual que es mentira el genocidio.

¿Qué genocidio es ese que hace que se multiplique por diez la población palestina en Gaza desde 1950? ¿Qué genocidio es ese que hace que se multiplique por seis la población palestina en Cisjordania desde 1967? La acusación de genocidio al pueblo que ha sufrido el genocidio que ha manchado, lastrado y condenado a la modernidad en Occidente es una infamia y, además, es antisemitismo puro, según reza la propia definición de antisemitismo de la organización gubernamental llamada Alianza Internacional para el Recuerdo del Holocausto.

*(El orador pronuncia unas palabras en una lengua no oficial de la Unión).*

**President.** – *(Interjections from the floor)*

We will check it. Please, colleagues. We will check what was said.

*(Interjections from the floor)*

Please be quiet. We will check what has been said. Let the next speaker speak.

**Sebastian Tynkkynen**, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, if we dare to look at the facts, we will see that it's not Israel committing genocide.

Let me be clear. Hamas, which launched a massacre on 7 October, is a jihadist death cult that is dedicated to erasing every Jew from the river to the sea. That is a genocidal agenda. And what did Israel do? It defended itself – as any democracy must.

It is ironic how parts of this Parliament cry genocide at the only liberal democracy in the Middle East, while ignoring an Islamist regime that uses children as shields, aid as propaganda, and rapes women.

You want to talk about war crimes? Then ask why Hamas builds tunnels under hospitals and fires rockets from schools.

If Israel laid down its arms, there would be another Holocaust. If Hamas laid down theirs, there would be peace.

**Hilde Vautmans**, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, before I start, please stop the clock. I really need that we verify if he said 'Heil'. I really think so.

We cannot continue with somebody here on the tribune saying 'Heil'. We cannot speak – we can only look at the computer. Please do that. It will take 10 seconds and then we'll know.

**President**. – As I told you, we are checking into it. Please proceed with your speech because we will not wait until the system has checked it.

So please speak. We will come back to it.

**Hilde Vautmans**, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, colleagues, what you are witnessing in Gaza is not just a human tragedy. It's a giant failure of us as part of the international community. Every day Europe does not act, we become more and more complicit to acts of genocidal violence.

Yes, Israel has a right to exist and to defend itself. Yes, Israel has the right to use force to free the hostages. But what Netanyahu is doing has nothing to do with that. He is exacting collective punishment on the Palestinian people.

Tens of thousands of innocent civilians, children, mothers, aid workers have been killed. The entire Gaza Strip has been flattened. Starvation is used as a tactic of war. This is not self-defence, colleagues. This is the destruction of innocent human beings.

If Europe truly believes in a rules-based international order, then words are not enough. We must act.

High Representative, it's time for targeted EU sanctions on government officials responsible, on those blocking aid, on those fuelling illegal settlements. We need to suspend our Agreement with Israel now and stop Israeli imports to Europe.

The people of Gaza need our action to survive. We must draw the red line here. Draw the red line, colleagues.

**Tineke Strik**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, High Representative Kallas, my message to our EU leaders today is sound and clear: all eyes on Gaza. It seems evident, but apparently not for our leaders. Because time after time, Netanyahu manages to distract them from his severe war crimes against the Palestinian people, and get them on his side.

Because as a mass protest erupts across Europe demanding accountability, and as political pressure is on the rise, Netanyahu strikes Iran. That's not self-defence, but yet another display of Israel's total contempt of international law.

So, therefore, all eyes on Gaza. All eyes on the starvation, the strangling, shooting and bombing of the Palestinian people. All eyes on the destruction of their land and basic needs, and Israel's overt purpose to wipe the Palestinians out.

EU leaders, your accountability, your complicity is already a fact. But you still have a chance to stop this genocide now – not by declarations, but by actions that work.

**Hanna Gedin**, för *The Left* gruppen. – Fru talman! I Gaza försöker mammor amma sina barn, men de har inte någon mjölk att ge eftersom de själva svälter. Jag vill be er fundera över vad det gör med en människa att se sitt barn tyna bort av hunger – att inte kunna hjälpa, att inte kunna trösta. Och som mamma kan jag inte föreställa mig någon värre smärta.

I 620 dagar så har ni tittat bort, så har ni bett oss att vara tysta om folkmordet, så har ni vänt palestinierna ryggen. I 620 dagar har ni suttit på makten att agera, men valt att inte göra det. Förstår ni inte att era barn kommer att döma er för det?

Låt budskapet från Europas gator och torg eka här inne. Ockupationen kommer att falla, bomberna kommer att tystna, folkmördarna kommer att dömas och Palestina kommer att bli fritt. Agera. Agera nu.

**Marc Jongen**, im *Namen der ESN-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die linken Parteien dieses Hauses verurteilen theatralisch den von ihnen so genannten Genozid Israels in Gaza. Die Wahrheit ist: Israel geht in Gaza gegen eine Terrororganisation vor, die die eigene Bevölkerung als Schutzschild missbraucht und die ihrerseits ganz offen einen Genozid an den Juden ankündigt. Wo war denn Ihre Empörung nach den Gräueltaten der Hamas am 7. Oktober 2023? Wer nach diesem Datum noch mit Palästinensertuch ins Parlament kommt und „Free Palestine“ ruft, wer auf Demos mitmarschiert, wo „From the River to the Sea“ gerufen wird, der kann sich nicht auf Humanität und Moral berufen, der macht gemeinsame Sache mit dem Islamofaschismus, der übrigens von der EU seit vielen Jahren über die UNRWA mitfinanziert wird, die bekanntermaßen von der Hamas unterwandert ist.

Ein palästinensischer Staat, Frau Kallas, den Sie für die Lösung halten, der würde ja weiterhin gegen Israel hetzen und rüsten – das kann die Lösung nicht sein. Ja, das Vorgehen Israels in Gaza ist an mancher Stelle kritikwürdig, aber erzählen wir bitte die ganze Geschichte des Konflikts, bevor wir uns hier zu moralischen Richtern aufspielen.

**President**. – Colleagues, please try to avoid shouting here in the Chamber.

**Seán Kelly (PPE)**. – *A Uachtaráin*, Commissioner, there are no two ways about it: the broader destabilisation we are witnessing across the Middle East right now is deeply worrying. We need restraint, we need de-escalation and, above all, we need leadership – not through bombs, but through dialogue and diplomacy.

But let me say this, too: we cannot allow the broader conflict between Iran and Israel to distract from the horror that continues in Gaza. The indiscriminate killing of civilians, the blocking of humanitarian aid and the starvation of an entire people: these are not footnotes to a larger conflict. They are crimes in their own right.

Ireland has always stood firmly on the side of international law and human dignity. I welcome the Irish Government's leadership on illegal settlement goods and the Tánaiste's move towards robust legislation. These are not symbolic gestures. They are real acts of political courage and they matter.

We cannot be the Europe of values only in name. There will have to be consequences for clear and repeated breaches of human rights.

So, yes, we must act to prevent a wider war, but we must also refuse to look away from Gaza, because turning a blind eye now – as children starve and families are buried beneath rubble – would be an unforgivable betrayal of everything this Union stands for.

**Evin Incir (S&D)**. – Madam President, history will not be kind to those who stand by while innocent civilians in Gaza are being slaughtered and starved by the far-right Israeli Government. If this was a war against Hamas, there would not be so many civilian casualties, so many children. Moreover, we must not overlook the ongoing attacks on Palestinians in the West Bank also, including the expansion of Israeli settlements.

If these actions are not a violation of international law, then what is a violation of international law? If it looks like a genocide, smells like a genocide, let me tell you what it is: it is a genocide. Let us put an end to this hypocrisy. It's time to call out Netanyahu's war crimes and to end the slaughter of innocent Palestinians; suspend the EU-Israel Association Agreement, sanction Netanyahu and all his ministers – not a single one, all; implement the ICC and ICJ decisions, and ensure to adopt a weapon embargo against the far-right government, which slaughters children.

Today's debate concerns the very soul of our union. We can no longer claim to be committed to peace, respect for international law and promoting these values globally if we fail to stand up for them universally, everywhere.

Free Palestine.

**Beatrice Timgren (ECR).** – Fru talman! Kriget i Gaza får konsekvenser även i Europa. Vi har sett hur hot om våld från extrema delar av Palestinarörelsen nu riktar hot mot medborgare och politiker, däribland den svenska utrikesministern samt riksdagsledamot och min partikollega Jessica Stegrud.

Dessa hot utgör en allvarlig risk för vår demokrati. Det pågår inget folkmord. Hamas bär ansvaret för civilas lidande i Gaza genom att använda civila som mänskliga sköldar. UNWRA, finansierat med våra skattemedel, har kopplingar till terrorism och bör avvecklas. I stället bör andra lämpliga organisationer användas. Flera UNWRA-anställda har deltagit i Hamas attacker den sjunde oktober, och deras skolor används för att sprida antisemitism.

För att få fred och en säker framtid för både israeler och palestinier måste vi stoppa resurser till Hamas och UNWRA.

**Barry Andrews (Renew).** – Madam President, High Representative, colleagues, the highest court in the world, by an overwhelming majority ordered Israel to refrain from acts that could fall under certain articles of the Genocide Convention. Israel were further ordered to take measures to improve the humanitarian situation in Gaza.

Instead, in the week that followed, a thousand people were killed in Gaza. From March to May of this year, a complete humanitarian blockade was imposed. Yesterday, the shooting gallery that is the Gaza Humanitarian Foundation resulted in more than fifty Palestinian deaths. This is a policy of well-fed corpses.

We must move beyond empty statements. As I have previously argued, that means sanctions on those responsible for atrocities, and at least restrictions on trade and arms transfers.

The EU cannot continue funding aid for Palestinians with one hand, while maintaining privileged ties with their occupier with the other.

**Jaume Asens Llodrà (Verts/ALE).** – Señora presidenta, ayer le dije a la señora Kallas que sentía vergüenza de ser europeo, y más después de escucharla. Pero hay una Europa de la cual me siento orgulloso, porque hay dos Europas. La Europa de ella, de la señora Kallas, de la banalidad del mal, la que colabora activamente con armas y con dinero en el exterminio de un pueblo entero en Gaza, la que hemos oído hoy en boca del señor Girauta cuando ha dicho «Heil Israel» evocando el saludo nazi. Pero después hay otra Europa, la que pone el cuerpo y se juega el tipo en la Flotilla de la libertad, en el Open Arms, la de los puertos que se niegan a recibir los barcos del genocidio, la que es perseguida en El Cairo ante su silencio ensordecedor. Ni una sola palabra de condena, señora Kallas, ni siquiera cuando los afectados somos eurodiputados.

Esa otra Europa no olvida que «nunca más» era un compromiso con los pueblos perseguidos. Es la que cree que el Derecho internacional no es un lujo, sino una tabla de salvación frente a la barbarie. Es esa Europa de abajo que no preside cumbres, como la señora Kallas, pero encarna el sentido más profundo en nuestra memoria común y, en medio del horror, resiste y elige no ser cómplice. Esa Europa es la que nos salva, la que nos sostiene como humanidad y la que algún día, quizás, vencerá.

**President.** – Colleagues, I was a little less strict on speaking time in the first round, when they represented the groups. Now I have to be a little stricter, so please try to stick to the speaking time.

**Νίκος Παππάς (The Left).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, βρισκόμαστε αντιμέτωποι με μια ιστορική ντροπή, που θα μείνει ως παράδειγμα προς αποφυγή για τις επόμενες γενιές. Ολόκληρες πόλεις έχουν ισοπεδωθεί, ολόκληρες οικογένειες έχουν αφανιστεί, το 90% του πληθυσμού έχει εκτοπιστεί. Τόσους μήνες που συντελείται αυτό το έγκλημα, εσείς —οι περισσότεροι δηλαδή— αδιαφορείτε. Δεν έχουν, άραγε, αυτοί οι άνθρωποι αξία για εσάς; Δεν τους υπολογίζετε; Δεν τους μετράτε; Τι είναι; Υποδεέστεροι;

Κάθε φορά που ανεβαίνω σε αυτό το βήμα για να μιλήσω για την Παλαιστίνη, σε κάθε πορεία που συμμετέχω —είτε στην Αθήνα, είτε στις Βρυξέλλες, είτε στην πορεία προς τη Γάζα— δεν νιώθω ότι εκπροσωπώ κάποιον· εκπροσωπώ τη συνείδησή μου, που ουρλιάζει από θυμό, από αγανάκτηση, μπροστά στην αδικία, για όλο αυτό που βιώνουν αυτοί οι άνθρωποι εκεί στην Παλαιστίνη.

Είναι υποκρισία, λοιπόν, να μιλάμε για ευρωπαϊκές αξίες, όταν χιλιάδες άνθρωποι σκοτώνονται και λιμοκτονούν. Και η Ευρώπη, αντί να προσπαθήσει να σταματήσει τη σφαγή, συνδιαλέγεται με τους θύτες. Δεν ζητάμε απλώς αλληλεγγύη. Ζητάμε τιμωρία.

*(Η Πρόεδρος αφαιρεί τον λόγο από τον ομιλητή)*

**Kateřina Konečná (NI).** – Paní předsedající, kolegové, jste se sebou spokojeni? Přes rok a osm měsíců jste měli možnost zastavit genocidu, které se Izrael dopouští v Gaze, neboť izraelská armáda je na zbraních a financích z Evropské unie závislá. Ale neudělali jste to. Celou dobu přehlížíte, jak Izrael střílí do lidí, co si jdou vyzvednout pomoc, vraždí novináře a zdravotníky a zaživa upaluje civilisty v uprchlických táborech. Nyní, díky podpoře z Evropy, mohl Izrael napadnout Írán. Stíhanému válečnému zločinci Netanjahuovi jste umožnili rozpoutat další krveprolití, jenom aby se udržel u moci. Německý kancléř Merz pak přímo oslavuje izraelské válečné zločiny a prohlašuje, že za nás prý Izrael dělá naši špinavou práci.

Stydím se za Evropu. Hnusí se mi, že EU genocidu Palestinců fakticky podporuje, místo toho, aby ji zastavila. A žádám vás, nepodílejte se dále na těchto zvěrstvech, vyhlášte na Izrael zbrojní embargo a pozastavme asociační dohodu a donuťme Izrael zastavit genocidu a agresí vůči ostatním státům.

**Matjaž Nemeč (S&D).** – Madam President, dear colleagues, the horrors in Gaza continue. Innocent children and families are hunted for food, shot as targets every day by the Israeli army. Their only crime is hunger. Tens of thousands of Palestinians have been murdered. Hospitals, schools, refugee centres are almost completely destroyed. Yet this is still not enough for some European leaders, including the Commission President and you, Ms Kallas.

Enough is enough. The EU needs to immediately suspend the Association Agreement. On Monday, this must be the conclusion. We also need to sanction the extremists in the Israeli Government. Five Western countries have done it, including the UK and Canada. Where is the EU? When, Ms Kallas, will you follow? Seriously, what more needs to happen?

We need a weapons embargo and an end to trade with the settlements. Yet, instead of diplomatic pressure to stop the genocide, Europe is deaf and blind. This is not just disappointing; this is morally sickening. Peace and justice now.

**Christophe Bay (PřE).** – Madame la Présidente, depuis des années, le Rassemblement national, fidèle à la position de la France, s'est attaché à défendre la solution des deux États, un principe enraciné dans nos engagements internationaux. Mais il faut reconnaître que cet objectif se heurte à une réalité cruelle: Gaza est aujourd'hui sous le joug du Hamas, une organisation terroriste qui n'a plus organisé la moindre élection depuis 2006. L'État d'Israël évolue chaque jour dans un environnement extrêmement hostile et lutte pour sa sécurité.

Dans ces conditions, parler d'un État palestinien pacifique relève de l'illusion. Reconnaître à l'heure actuelle un État palestinien serait accorder une légitimité au Hamas, qui a multiplié les attaques violentes contre Israël, et, bien entendu, l'horrible carnage du 7 octobre. La flottille pour Gaza, orchestrée par des islamo-gauchistes, n'était rien d'autre qu'une mise en scène grotesque, guidée par l'idéologie et non par un réel souci de justice ou de paix. Loin d'apaiser les tensions, cette provocation n'a servi qu'à masquer les véritables responsables du drame: le Hamas, qui asphyxie toute perspective de paix durable.

Emmanuel Macron, qui a été prompt à s'émouvoir du sort de ces tristes personnages, reste muet face à la situation dramatique que vit Boualem Sansal. Cette indifférence révèle un mépris et une trahison des valeurs de la France. Emmanuel Macron s'incline devant cette extrême gauche par un confort idéologique et aussi, il faut reconnaître, par peur de la rue. Boualem Sansal dérange, parce que son discours se heurte aux bien-pensants. Il est temps que la France exige sa libération.

**Kristoffer Storm (ECR).** – Fru formand! Det eneste folkemord, der finder sted i Gaza, er det, som Hamas udsætter såvel deres egen befolkning som israelerne i området for. For det er almen viden, at alle jøder i Gaza enten er døde eller holdes som gidsler af Hamas. Til gengæld er der næsten to millioner palæstinensere, som lever og dyrker deres religion i Israel. Så at anklage staten Israel for at udføre folkemord mod palæstinenserne er ikke bare dumt, det er også en direkte løgn fra venstrefløjens antisemitter. Som de fleste andre, så håber jeg, at krigen snart slutter, så børn og andre svage kan få mulighed, for at få den hjælp, som de har brug for. Men så længe Hamas truer Israel og ønsker jøderne udryddet, så er der desværre intet, der tyder på det. For hvis venstrefløjen virkelig bekymrer sig for civilbefolkningen, så burde de vende sig mod deres venner i Hamas og i Iran og stoppe deres leflen for terrorister, for det er en skændsel mod vores frie demokratiske samfund. Lad mig minde jer om, at Israel kæmper vores kamp, faktisk hele Vestens kamp mod islamisterne for demokratiet.

**Илхан Кючюк (Renew).** – Г-жо Председател, в Газа се лее кръв отново. Само преди по-малко от 24 часа 51 души бяха убити, след като израелските сили откриха огън край място за раздаване на хуманитарна помощ. Те търсеха хляб, а намериха смърт.

Днес светът гледа как войната изяжда всичко човешко. Гледаме как деца умират, а домове се сриват. Това не е просто военен конфликт, това е целенасочено унищожение, подпечатано със съчастието на мълчанието.

И сега питам: Къде е международната общност? Къде са всички тези световни лидери? Колко още тела трябва да бъдат изнесени, за да е достатъчно?

Мълчанието вече е престъпление, а съчувствието бездействие и лицемерие. Призовавам за незабавно прекратяване на огъня, за международно разследване, за санкции, за реална хуманитарна помощ, за спасение на онова, което ни прави хора – съвестта. Не убивайте човечността!

**Ana Miranda Paz (Verts/ALE).** – Señora presidenta, ya no nos quedan palabras. 20 meses sin acción en Gaza. 20 meses de complicidad. La Unión Europea se ha callado ante el genocidio y es cómplice. Porque ser cómplice es no hacer nada ante la aniquilación del pueblo palestino. ¿La señora Von der Leyen puede levantar un teléfono para hablar con Netanyahu y no puede tomar sanciones? ¿Para qué este doble estándar? Se llama racismo. La verdad es que a la Unión Europea le importan poco las vidas en Gaza. No le importa que no haya comida para los niños, muchos de ellos huérfanos, porque a sus padres los mataron las bombas de Israel. Pienso que no le importa lo que piensa el clamor de las calles europeas, desde Galicia a Bruselas. ¿O no los escuchan?

El lunes 23 el Consejo tiene la oportunidad de enmendar esta vergonzosa posición de la Unión Europea. Exijan el alto al fuego y el acceso de ayuda humanitaria, adopten sanciones, prohíban la exportación de armas, prohíban la importación de bienes y servicios, cierren embajadas, corten la cooperación científica, cultural y deportiva, rechacen la asistencia que perpetúa la ocupación y el *apartheid*. Dejen de ser cómplices con el genocidio de Israel en Gaza.

**Isabel Serra Sánchez (The Left).** – Señora presidenta, señora Kallas, son ustedes tan inmorales como los genocidas. ¿Hasta dónde va a llegar su apoyo a Israel? ¿Hasta dónde van a apoyar a un Estado genocida?

Después de asesinar impunemente a 57 000 palestinos, quemar vivos a niños, arrasar Gaza, tratar de exterminar a toda la población con hambruna, Israel ha decidido emprender una ofensiva ilegal contra Irán que nos puede llevar a una guerra nuclear a nivel mundial. Y todo esto es gracias a su apoyo incondicional, a décadas y décadas de ocupación sobre el territorio palestino, a bombardeos día tras día sobre la población civil, a la industria armamentística israelí, a cambiar el UNRWA por una empresa privada que dispara a los palestinos cuando están muertos de hambre, les asesina y encierra y les enjaula como los nazis enjaulaban a los judíos en el Holocausto. ¿De verdad usted puede dormir tranquila por las noches?

A pesar de su apoyo incondicional y criminal, el pueblo palestino resiste. Resiste también gracias a la solidaridad internacional, como la Flotilla de la Libertad o como esa marcha a Egipto, a pesar de que la dictadura egipcia la está reprimiendo. No en nuestro nombre, no en nuestro nombre, el suyo aparecerá...

*(la presidenta retira la palabra a la oradora)*

**Ruth Firmenich (NI).** – Frau Präsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mehr als 50 000 Palästinenser sind mittlerweile von der israelischen Armee getötet worden. Israel zielt gemeinsam mit den USA auf eine ethnische Säuberung des Gazastreifens. Die Menschen in Gaza hungern, sie verhungern, man lässt sie verhungern. Was wir in Gaza sehen, kommt einem Völkermord gleich. Für das, was dort passiert, trägt der rechtsextreme israelische Ministerpräsident Netanjahu die Verantwortung. Verantwortlich sind aber auch seine Komplizen in Washington, in Berlin und in Brüssel.

Es ist eine Schande, dass weiter Waffen aus Europa an Israel geliefert werden und dass das Assoziierungsabkommen immer noch nicht ausgesetzt ist. Und das, obwohl Israel mittlerweile auch noch an der Seite der USA einen Angriffskrieg gegen den Iran führt. Es ist verstörend, dass Netanjahu nach wie vor auf Unterstützung der EU zählen kann.

Wenn Frau von der Leyen und Sie, Frau Kallas, diese Politik fortsetzen, könnte es sein, dass es auf Dauer nicht nur bei einem Haftbefehl des Internationalen Strafgerichtshofs gegen Netanjahu bleiben wird – und das zu Recht!

**Francisco Assis (S&D).** – Senhora Presidente, é com uma dupla tristeza que me dirijo hoje a esta Câmara; tristeza pelo sofrimento do povo palestino e tristeza por aquilo em que Israel se transformou.

Nos seus fundamentos teóricos, houve um tempo em que o sionismo inicial era uma forma de humanismo, e hoje Israel é a negação absoluta desse mesmo humanismo.

O plano do governo israelita para a apreensão total do território de Gaza constitui uma violação flagrante do direito internacional e assume contornos de limpeza étnica pura e dura.

Israel respondeu com barbárie à barbárie e, com isso, perdeu a razão toda que lhe assistia após o hediondo atentado de 7 de outubro de 2024.

A resposta da União Europeia à matança em curso na Faixa de Gaza não se pode limitar à suspensão do Acordo de Associação, ela tem de ir, claramente, mais longe.

Perante a extrema gravidade da situação, é imperativo que a União Europeia avance rapidamente com a aplicação de sanções individuais aos responsáveis políticos e militares israelitas, incluindo o congelamento de bens. Tem, além disso, de avançar com um embargo total ao fornecimento de armas a Israel e com a proibição do comércio com os colonatos ilegais.

Estas medidas são essenciais para proteger o povo palestino.

**Abir Al-Sahlani (Renew).** – Madam President, for too long have we spoken of Palestinians suffering. For too long have we done close to nothing. Just sending money over is not enough anymore.

I know that there is not so much you can do, Madam Commissioner. But there are some things that actually you can take a lead on, and be the one who will redefine how history will look at us.

There are 40 000 displaced in the West Bank; nearly 60 000 people dead in Gaza. But we still lack an EU common action. We need actions. No more words.

Stop the Association Agreement – that's where you can take a lead, Madam Commissioner. Sanction the Netanyahu regime, like we have done with the Russians – there you can also take a lead, Madam Commissioner. Sanction the settler economy – there also you can take a lead, Madam Commissioner.

We need a leadership of action. No more words. No more hiding behind 'We are sending money', because when the money is there, the aid is stopped. It's not reaching the starving people.

**Ignazio Roberto Marino (Verts/ALE).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo di fronte a un genocidio che grida giustizia: oltre 55 000 palestinesi deliberatamente uccisi, tra cui migliaia di bambini. Gaza è oggi il principale luogo di morte per i bambini nel pianeta.

L'Europa deve agire con sanzioni dure e durature, signora Kallas: embargo totale sulle armi, sospensione immediata di ogni accordo con Israele. Basta ipocrisia!

Netanyahu non va chiamato al telefono per essere sostenuto, come ha fatto Ursula von der Leyen. Che vergogna! Netanyahu deve essere arrestato e processato per crimini contro l'umanità. Ogni giorno di ritardo è un giorno di sangue.

Riconosciamo lo Stato di Palestina. Lo attendiamo da settantasette anni, probabilmente il doppio della sua vita. Fermiamo il genocidio.

**Per Clausen (The Left).** – Fru formand! Desværre er der ikke noget nyt eller overraskende i, at den ekstreme højrefløj støtter folkedrab. Men jeg vil tillade mig alligevel stadigvæk at være skuffet over, at det ikke får et klart svar fra EU's ledelse. Hvorfor er det, at vi ser stille til, mens uskyldige børn i Gaza betaler prisen? Og når jeg siger det på den måde, så er det fordi, at reelt, så har EU jo ikke lagt noget som helst pres på Israel. Det er jo ikke fordi, at man ikke kan finde på metoder. I går så vi, hvordan kommissionen foreslog et stop for russisk gas, sådan at man kunne slippe uden om enkelte landes veto. Det kan man jo også gøre i forhold til Israel, hvis man vil, og derfor er jeg nødt til at spørge »Hvorfor er det, at EU ikke vil gøre noget for at stoppe folkemordet i Gaza? Hvor mange flere uskyldige skal dø, før EU vågner op?

**Cecilia Strada (S&D).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, cara Commissaria, il governo di Israele ha attaccato l'Iran, un'altra violazione del diritto internazionale, e continua a commettere atti di genocidio a Gaza.

Nella Striscia ho un fratello, Gennaro Giudetti, un operatore umanitario dell'ONU. Ci sentiamo quasi tutti i giorni. Questo è quello che mi ha detto ieri sera.

Uno: la gestione degli aiuti tramite la *Gaza Foundation* è disumana. La distribuzione avviene solo in due grandi centri, dove la gente è costretta ad accalcarsi e litigare per ogni pacco di farina. Ogni volta muoiono decine di persone sotto il fuoco israeliano. La gestione degli aiuti deve essere affidata all'ONU, non a questa roba qui.

Due: l'82 % della Striscia è sotto ordine di evacuazione. La gente non sa dove andare. Dormono in spiaggia, sui marciapiedi, alle rotonde.

Tre: tra un paio di giorni finiscono le scorte di carburante. Poi niente più generatori per gli ospedali, niente ambulanze, niente di niente. Il lavoro dell'ONU è gravemente limitato, gli operatori umanitari muoiono insieme ai civili e l'Europa non riesce a fare nulla per fermare il massacro. Europa svegliati! Gli strumenti per fermare Netanyahu li abbiamo, bisogna volerli usare.

**Irena Joveva (Renew).** – Madam President, finally, with the title of this debate, this Chamber is officially acknowledging what some of us have been shouting for years: what's happening in Gaza is genocide. To those of you still refusing to see it and still hiding behind courts or legal formalities, you are not only complicit, you are shameless hypocrites. You are dismantling the very legal principles you so proudly aim – or claim – to uphold.

You let the screams from Gaza be drowned out by Israeli attacks on Iran. What a coincidence, right? Just when the pressure on Netanyahu is mounting. And then the audacity: some of you still dare say Israel has a right to self-defence in that context. In what context? The Israeli army is shooting at people lining up for food. These aren't stray bullets in the fog of war. This is deliberate, cold and calculated. They've turned the little humanitarian aid into a big, deadly weapon.

Stop being complicit. Impose sanctions on Israel. If not, you are still greenlighting the genocide, because when only one side has an army, military equipment and weapons, it's not a war, it is a massacre.

**Ville Niinistö (Verts/ALE).** – Arvoisa puhemies, kaikki ihmiset syntyvät vapaina ja tasavertaisina arvoltaan ja oikeuksiltaan. YK:n ihmisoikeuksien julistus takaa samat oikeudet lapsille niin Gazassa kuin Tel Avivissa tai Brysselissäkin. Tätä ei ole todellisuus Gazassa tänään: nälkiintyneet lapset, tapetut perheenjäsenet, väestön pakkosiirto keskitysleirimäisiin olosuhteisiin ja maan tasalle pommitetut kodit ja sairaalat. Yli 50 000 lasta on kuollut tai haavoittunut Israelin hyökkäyksen ja miehityksen seurauksena.

Niin kauan kuin tämä kansalaisten kansanmurha ja etninen puhdistus tapahtuu silmiemme edessä, on meillä velvollisuus puuttua siihen. Euroopan johtajien kaksinaismoralismi ja hiljaisuus tämän kansanmurhan edessä on sietämätöntä. Jos me emme puutu, me olemme osasyllisiä.

Humanitaarisen avun on päästävä Gazaan täysimääräisesti ja vakiintuneiden kansainvälisten toimijoiden kautta. Asekauppa Israelin kanssa on lopetettava, EU:n tulee kohdistaa merkittäviä pakotteita Israelille ja kansanmurhaa edistäville päättäjille ja EU:n ja Israelin välinen assosiaatiosopimus on jäädytettävä. Gazan lapsilla on oikeus elää.

**Özlem Demirel (The Left).** – Frau Präsidentin! Wenn ein deutscher Faschist, dessen Partei in Deutschland vom Holocaust als Vogelschiss der Geschichte spricht, hier eine solche Rede hält, wenn ein italienischer Faschist, der in der Tradition des europäischen Antisemitismus steht, „Heil Israel!“ sagt – nein, Frau Präsidentin, dann bleibe ich nicht ruhig. Das sind die Antisemiten hier in diesem Hause. Das sind diejenigen, die den Holocaust relativieren. Und das sind diejenigen, die in ihrem Rassismus heute den Genozid an den Palästinensern beklatschen.

Und ja, Frau Präsidentin, ich bleibe auch nicht ruhig, wenn ich mir die Lage in Gaza anschau. Israel begeht nicht nur einen Genozid an den Palästinensern, stellt nicht nur die komplette Existenz Palästinas infrage, sondern fängt auch einen Krieg mit Nachbarstaaten an. Und der deutsche Kanzler antwortet darauf gestern: „Danke an Israel, dass Sie unsere Drecksarbeit erledigen“. Dieser Zynismus, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ist so was von unerträglich. Und ja, ich als Mensch, ich als Antifaschistin, ich als friedensliebender Mensch bleibe dabei nicht ruhig. Ich sage: Die Palästinenser brauchen unsere Solidarität. Und die Heuchelei der EU ist für mich ...

*(Die Präsidentin entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)*

**Alex Agius Saliba (S&D).** – Sinjura President, Fl-ahħar, wara ghoxrin xahar dan il-parlament qam mir-raqda u għandna t-titlu li jixraq lill-Istat Izraeljan: ġenoċidju, sparar fuq in-nies, qtil tal-innoċenti.

Sahansitra, issa qegħdin naraw sitwazzjoni fejn refuġjati li qegħdin jikkjuwjaw sabiex jingħataw biċċa hobż, sabiex jingħataw flixxun ilma, qegħdin jinqatlu wkoll waqt li qed jistennew l-ikel. Din hija xi haġa inaċċettabbli u issa wasal iż-żmien wara li l-Kummissjoni Ewropea għogobha taħbi rapport tagħha stess, li kien qed jindika li dan huwa ġenoċidju, li twettqu krimini tal-gwerra. Issa wasal iż-żmien sabiex niehdu l-azzjoni. U iva, l-azzjoni nistgħu nehduha, l-azzjoni nistgħu nehduha, l-ewwel u qabel kollox biex il-Ftehim ta' Assocjazzjoni jitwaqqaf bl-aktar mod possibbli, abbażi ta' Artiklu 2, sabiex nimponu l-iktar sanzjonijiet b'sahħithom fuq dan l-Istat li qed iwettaq ġenoċidju u sabiex fl-ahħar mill-ahħar dan il-parlament, fost ohrajn ma jibqax jagħti red carpet treatment lil dawk li huma parti mill-gvern ta' Netanyahu, gvern li huwa assocjat b'mod dirett ma' ġenoċidju u ma' krimini tal-gwerra.

Ejja nqumu mir-raqda. Ejja naqbżu għal dawn il-vittmi li ta' kuljum...

*(Il-President irtirat il-kelma lill-kelliem)*

**Lucia Yar (Renew).** – Vážená pani predsedajúca, vážená vysoká predstaviteľka a vážení kolegovia, kolegyně. Správy z Gazy sú naozaj hrozné. Humanitárna pomoc blokována, nemocnice zbombardované, viac ako pol milióna ľudí čelí hladomoru. V posledných dňoch boli zabití desiatky ľudí pri čakaní na jedlo a vodu. Voláme po mieri, ale koľkí Palestínčania sa ho reálne dožijú? Koľko ľudí ešte musí zomrieť, aby sme si ako Únia uvedomili, že vieme použiť páky, ktoré máme teraz k dispozícii? Nikto nespochybuje právo Izraela brániť sa, ale to, čo dnes sledujeme, už dávno nie je sebaobrana. Uznania ani vyhlásenia už nestačia. Musíme byť naozaj róznejší, ak si ctíme hodnoty, na ktorých bola Európska únia založená. Musíme trvať na pozastavení asociačnej dohody Únie s Izraelom, lebo týmto krokom môžeme zachrániť ľudské životy. To je naše minimum. Nie je to o politickej strane, ideológii ani viere. Je to o ľudskej dôstojnosti a tá dnes v Gaze leží v prachu pod troskami.

**Γιώργος Γεωργίου (The Left).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Kallas, σήμερα έχετε τα γενέθλιά σας, να ζήσετε. Αλλά ξέρετε κάτι; Εκεί στη Γάζα δεν έχουν την πολυτέλεια να σκέφτονται τα γενέθλιά τους. Εκεί στη Γάζα, το μόνο που σκέφτονται είναι πότε θα έρθει η ώρα του θανάτου τους. Το λένε εξέχοντες Ισραηλινοί —ακόμη και ο κύριος Olmert, ο πρώην πρωθυπουργός— ότι ο Netanyahu διαπράττει γενοκτονία στη Γάζα, σκοτώνει παιδιά για χόμπι. Είναι ένας εγκληματίας πολέμου με βάση το Διεθνές Ποινικό Δικαστήριο. Τώρα επιτίθεται στο Ιράν, βάζοντας φωτιά σε όλη τη Μέση Ανατολή.

Διερωτώμαι αν είναι αυτή η Μέση Ανατολή που θέλουμε να φτιάξουμε. Η νέα Γκουέρνικα στις μέρες μας είναι η Γάζα και είναι η μεγάλη ντροπή του δυτικού κόσμου. Τερματίστε αμέσως τη συμφωνία σύνδεσης με το Ισραήλ. Συντελείται μπροστά στα μάτια σας μια γενοκτονία. Στους πόσους θανάτους θα αντιδράσετε; Γιατί συνεχίζετε να στηρίζετε έναν εγκληματία πολέμου; Σταματήστε, επιτέλους, να επιβραβεύετε τη βαρβαρότητα του Ισραήλ. Εκτός και αν έχετε γίνει και εσείς πλέον τόσο βάρβαροι.

**Elio Di Rupo (S&D).** – Madame la Haute représentante, la guerre en Iran gomme médiatiquement Gaza et ça arrange M. Netanyahu. Nous devons distinguer M. Netanyahu et son gouvernement de l'ensemble du peuple d'Israël et de l'ensemble des juifs du monde.

Moi, je me suis battu, toujours, contre l'antisémitisme et je le ferai jusqu'à mon dernier souffle. Mais ce qui se passe à Gaza est véritablement un génocide et j'ai beaucoup étudié les clauses juridiques: tout est la réalité aujourd'hui. Je pense sincèrement que l'Union européenne ne peut pas rester silencieuse. On doit sauver les Palestiniens. Ils ont le droit de vivre dignement, même s'ils sont sous la coupe, pour certains, du Hamas. On doit libérer les otages. Et quels sont les instruments que nous avons, si ce n'est pour le moment l'association qui existe avec Israël? Je pense qu'on doit montrer notre détermination, au nom de l'humanité et de nos valeurs humanistes.

**Billy Kelleher (Renew).** – Madam President, 50 000 people dead in Gaza, hospitals targeted by bombs, schools attacked, the West Bank killings, displacements, illegal settlements, International Court of Justice and International Criminal Court rulings, fundamental breaches of international law, genocide in Gaza, using food and aid as a weapon of war – as a weapon of war. Israel acts with impunity because we have granted it immunity.

We have done nothing to address the fundamental issues, which are that a two-state solution is required, that the Palestinians have an entitlement to statehood and their own lands, and that Israel has an entitlement to exist and defend itself. But we have always taken only one side in this debate. We are losing our moral authority. We are losing any shred of credibility. We have to act as an honest broker. The unconditional support by the President of the Commission to Israel simply is unacceptable, and a fundamental breach of trust and the Treaties on which this Union ...

*(The President cut off the speaker)*

**Estrella Galán (The Left).** – Señora presidenta, por primera vez en este Parlamento, se usa esa palabra que tanto está costando reconocer: genocidio. Han hecho falta casi sesenta mil muertos y que asesinen a un niño cada cuarenta y cinco minutos para mover una sola palabra. ¿Cuántos muertos más vamos a necesitar para que muevan ustedes un solo dedo?

El régimen criminal israelí está exterminando y matando a todo un pueblo, bloquea la llegada de ayuda humanitaria, secuestra y encarcela ilegalmente a una diputada de este Parlamento —a mi compañera Rima Hassan—, y ustedes no mueven un dedo. Ustedes siguen sin romper el Acuerdo de la Unión Europea con Israel, sin embargar el comercio de armas y sin llevar a Netanyahu ante la justicia.

Hoy, señora Kallas, que es precisamente su cumpleaños, creo que el mejor regalo que puede hacer a su conciencia y también a la nuestra es actuar de una vez, porque los ciudadanos están hartos. Y ¿sabe de qué? De que no se mueva un dedo, de este silencio cómplice. El régimen de Israel se está llevando por delante a un pueblo entero. Actúen antes de que también...

*(la presidenta retira la palabra a la oradora)*

**Ciaran Mullooly (Renew).** – Madam President, High Representative Kallas, President van der Leyen must clarify her recent remarks to the Prime Minister of Israel. Specifically, what does she mean, the right to defend oneself? What are the boundaries of that right?

Because what we're witnessing in Gaza is not self-defence. It's the deliberate starvation of women and children. It's the obstruction of humanitarian aid, food, water and medical supplies to an entire population. Even as the mother, as a former doctor, she knows what she's doing. This is the this is the result of her words.

As Members of this Parliament, we cannot remain silent, ladies and gentlemen, we must take a stance. The European Union has a moral duty, not just a diplomatic option, to intervene for the sake of the people. We must demand unrestricted access for humanitarian aid, including food and medicine. We can do these things even outside of the Council. Mobilise EU resources immediately to assist relief efforts on the ground, and we must demand that Israel provide meaningful cooperation, not just rhetoric, to avoid a worsening humanitarian catastrophe.

History will judge how we respond to that this moment. Some people in this House should be ashamed of what they haven't done so far. We must not be found wanting.

**Mimmo Lucano (The Left).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, chi rimane indifferente davanti a un genocidio è complice. Di fronte alla distruzione sistematica del popolo palestinese, le nostre istituzioni hanno voltato lo sguardo, coperto gli occhi, tappato le orecchie.

Qui, in quest'Aula, il silenzio è assordante. Avete legittimato la violenza coloniale con l'alibi della sicurezza di Israele. Ma quale sicurezza può giustificare l'uccisione di oltre 55 000 civili e la fame usata come arma? Israele ha superato ogni linea rossa, ha calpestato ogni principio di umanità.

Eppure, le porte dell'Unione europea restano aperte, gli accordi in vigore, le forniture militari continuano. Perché? Perché siete complici? Perché Ursula von der Leyen è complice, Kaja Kallas è complice e questo Parlamento è complice? Allora diciamolo apertamente: l'Unione europea ha fallito, è diventata garante dell'impunità israeliana, complice di un genocidio in diretta.

Proprio per questo oggi chiedo ciò che avrebbe dovuto essere fatto da mesi: sanzioni immediate contro lo Stato di Israele, sospensione dell'accordo di associazione, libertà per il popolo palestinese.

**Pernando Barrena Arza (The Left).** – Señora presidenta, Israel está cometiendo un genocidio contra el pueblo palestino. Ha sobrepasado todos los límites de la indecencia humana y la humanidad, hoy, relaciona el nombre de Israel con el de un país merecedor del máximo de los desprecios por parte de la comunidad internacional.

Israel ha vulnerado premeditada y flagrantemente la legalidad internacional en repetidas ocasiones y ha llevado a cabo constantemente una campaña de agresión contra sus Estados vecinos. Ha atacado el Líbano y Siria, y ahora está bombardeando Irán para provocar un cambio de régimen, esgrimiendo argumentos intervencionistas junto a los Estados Unidos.

Hay que cortar lazos con Israel. Israel ya es un Estado paria para la mayoría de la gente decente del mundo, que jamás en su vida podrá comprar una naranja de origen israelí, porque no podrá borrar de su mente que Israel ha asesinado a sesenta mil personas en el último año, y la mitad de ellas, niños.

Señora Kallas, ya no hay nada que esperar: hay que suspender ya el Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Israel. Europa no puede permanecer impasible y mucho menos convertirse en colaboradora necesaria de un genocidio.

**Jussi Saramo (The Left).** – Arvoisa puhemies, Israelin hirmutöissä ei ole ollut kyse itsepuolustuksesta. Täälläkin on suljettu korvat paitsi palestiinalaisten avunhuudoilta, myös Israelin johtajien omilta puheilta.

Kyse on koko ajan ollut palestiinalaisten hävittämisestä, etnisestä puhdistuksesta. Se on näkynyt puheiden lisäksi tekoina jo vuosikymmeniä: miehityksenä ja sortona. Estämällä rauha, jopa tukemalla Hamasia, on estetty Palestiinan valtion synty.

Nyt lapsia murhataan tuhansittain. Palestiinalaiset toimittajat tapetaan, ulkomaalaisia estetään raportoimasta. Mutta länessä toistellaan Israelin oikeutta puolustautua. Miten te pystytte nukkumaan yönnne? 1940-luvulla moni sanoi, ettei tiennyt. Mutta nyt sama selitys ei mene läpi. Kuvat EU-johtajista kätelemässä hymyillen kansanmurhaajaa jäävät historiaan.

Assosiaatiosopimuksen jäädyttäminen ei riitä. Tarvitaan kauppasaarto. Tarvitaan lopullinen kaksinaismoraalin hylkääminen ja johdonmukainen ihmisyyden puolustus.

**President.** – Dear colleagues, we have been looking into the matter you raised on a previous speech, and no language of the kind you referred to was used.

**Kaja Kallas**, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Madam President, I'm listening here, and you are speaking like I'm the sole responsible for what is happening in Palestine. But I'm not representing myself here, I'm representing 27 Member States. If it would be up to me personally, I would take these decisions, but it's not. I'm representing 27 Member States, and that is the frustration that I have.

There are accusations here that I've been silent. The gentleman Mr Lucano, from The Left – he came in before his speech and left after his speech. So, he didn't listen to my speech in the first place, and also my interventions afterwards.

So, how can you say that I've been silent? Because I haven't been silent. I've been very vocal about this, also about international law and everything. So this is just simply not true.

But I also try to do something to alleviate the human suffering that is happening in Palestine, like I was telling yesterday. But because many of you were not here in the Plenary, I can repeat what I said. Yes, it is very painful for me to see the suffering. When I'm hearing that 50 people have been killed in the line for getting flour, it is painful. Of course I ask myself, 'What more can we do?'

I'm in contact with the Israeli counterpart, because I'm putting the pressure on them to actually let the aid in, to help the people, not to weaponise the humanitarian aid, to use the structures that are already there to alleviate the suffering.

Sanctions need unanimity, and again, I'm representing 27. Yes, you can say, 'Take the lead and present these things.' But what use is it if I do this? I feel better myself that I've done something, but actually, I know that this will not go through. I know that this will not go through, and then it will just show that we don't have a common position.

All of those who have spoken here, I recommend you – especially from those countries whose governments are representing a different view – put the pressure on the governments to really change their position.

We had the discussion on doing the review of the Association Council. Two thirds of Member States were in favour of doing this, which shows that public support, public opinion in your Member States is changing, and that makes the governments also act and change their position in the Council.

Of course, there are tools, like I said yesterday. We also need consensus in the College. So those tools that don't need unanimity of all the Member States still require consensus in the College. In the College, we have 27 Member States represented, and the College Commissioners come with that.

Of course, there are violations of international law. I agree. I try to do as much as possible to help.

When it comes to parallels with Ukraine, the difference is that there we have 27 Member States all agreeing, and that's why we can do these things.

But sanctions need unanimity. They need everybody on board, and we don't have 27 Member States. That's the reality.

**President**. – Thank you very much for this. Thank you to all who participated in this debate.

The debate is closed.

## 9. Freedom of assembly in Hungary and the need for the Commission to act (debate)

**President**. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on freedom of assembly in Hungary and the need for the Commission to act (2025/2758(RSP)).

**Michael McGrath**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, good afternoon, honourable Members, the right to peaceful assembly is enshrined in the Charter and is a core element of our democracies. Our Union is founded on freedom and equality. Everyone should be able to be who they are, to live freely and love whom they choose.

Today's debate concerns recent changes to Hungarian law. I have already had the occasion to exchange with you on this matter in April and in May. The 15th Amendment to the Fundamental Law now enshrines the primacy of children's right to protection and care – essential for their proper physical, mental and moral development – over any other fundamental rights. This provision has already been implemented through a specific law, which entered into force on 15 April, which allows the police to ban public demonstrations that breach the so-called Child Protection Law. The new law also appears to allow the use of AI-assisted facial recognition to identify the participants in such public demonstrations, who may then be subject to a fine of around EUR 500.

The Commission is assessing the law and following its implementation on the ground. In this context, the Commission notes the recent decisions of the Budapest police to prohibit a public gathering scheduled for 28 June. We understand that the event in question is different from the annual Budapest Pride March, although follows its traditional route. We also note that this ban has been repeatedly subject to judicial review by Hungary's Supreme Court.

As regards the annual Budapest Pride, the Mayor of Budapest has announced that it will be organised as an event of the city of Budapest and, therefore, will go ahead on 28 June, as initially foreseen. While this would certainly be a very welcome development, we cannot ignore that this new legislation has already led to police decisions banning an LGBTIQ event and the back and forth with the Supreme Court, as I have just explained. And nobody has anything to fear from a pride parade.

We are currently analysing this new Hungarian law and the implications that it may have under EU law. The Commission is also examining the provisions of the law related to the use of facial recognition to identify those participating in the prohibited demonstrations, from the perspective of personal data protection and privacy, which we are currently assessing. The Commission services have contacted the Hungarian authorities requesting clarifications on a number of matters relating to the relevant provisions.

I want to recall that the Commission has already brought an infringement case against Hungary on the Child Protection Law. The case is pending before the Court of Justice, and a hearing in this case took place on 19 November last year. Sixteen Member States and the European Parliament intervened in support of the Commission.

The Advocate General issued her opinion on this case on 5 June. In this opinion, the Advocate General agrees with the Commission that the Hungarian law breaches EU law on a number of accounts – the Charter of Fundamental Rights in relation to respect for human dignity, the right to non-discrimination, freedom of expression and the right to private and family life. She also found violations of the fundamental freedom to provide services and secondary EU law. And I would highlight that the Advocate General considers that the Hungarian law infringes the values that are common to the EU, enshrined in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union. We are expecting the judgment of the Court of Justice in relation to this matter in the coming months.

Honourable Members, we are a union of equality. Let me conclude my initial remarks by assuring you that the European Union – and the European Commission – is ready to use all its tools to ensure that EU law is upheld right across our Union. I look forward to the contributions of the honourable Members in this debate.

**Tomas Tobé**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, the people of Hungary have the right to live free in a democracy that upholds the rule of law, respects their dignity and protects the fundamental freedoms of all citizens. That is actually what sets Europe apart: a union of freedom.

History has taught our continent the fundamental importance of defending these basic rights and values, and Hungarians know all too well the horrors and oppressive regimes that seek to destroy these liberties. The current government of Hungary should work for the people, not to enrich themselves.

Colleagues, opposition is rising in Hungary, and Orbán is clearly afraid, desperately trying to silence dissent and ensure that he and his corrupt inner circle can cling to power. They are doing everything they can to limit freedom of speech, restrict freedom of assembly and prevent people from determining their own future.

It could not be clearer: Hungarians deserve better, a free and prosperous nation. Hungary's place is in Europe, and the EPP will always stand on Hungary's side. We call on the Commission and the Member States to defend the fundamental freedoms of the Hungarian people and to prevent the kidnapping of Hungarian democracy.

**Iratxe García Pérez**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, la última línea roja que ha cruzado el Gobierno de Orbán no es un hecho aislado, ni siquiera una excentricidad nacional, es una vergüenza europea.

La prohibición de la Marcha del Orgullo no es solo un ataque cobarde contra parte de su ciudadanía, es la enésima manifestación de un régimen autoritario que ha convertido el poder en un instrumento de miedo, de censura y de odio. Un Gobierno que espía con reconocimiento facial a quienes defienden los derechos humanos, que multa a quienes ejercen su libertad de reunión, que manipula la idea de la protección a la infancia para imponer una ideología de intolerancia. Un Gobierno que convierte al diferente en enemigo. Eso, señorías, es represión.

Y voy a advertir una cuestión a la Comisión Europea, a la que agradezco el compromiso que está manteniendo en este tema, pero realmente no se puede defender el Estado de Derecho retirando la Directiva sobre la igualdad de trato. Necesitamos coherencia política. Necesitamos que la Comisión solicite medidas cautelares al Tribunal de Justicia para suspender la escandalosa Ley de protección a la infancia. Necesitamos que impulse, de una vez por todas, el artículo 7 con toda contundencia, que mantenga congelados los fondos europeos que un Gobierno liberal no merece gestionar y necesitamos que sus comisarios estén el 28 de junio en Budapest, que es donde la ciudadanía les necesita.

Porque no se trata solo de Hungría, se trata de los ciudadanos y las ciudadanas. Cada vez que retroceden los derechos civiles en un Estado miembro, retrocede toda la Unión. Cada vez que una persona LGTBI es silenciada, nuestra democracia pierde una voz. Por eso, hoy decimos con orgullo: defender los derechos de la comunidad LGTBI+ es defender la libertad, la igualdad y la dignidad humana.

And to our Hungarian friends we say, you are not alone. We see you, we hear you! And on 28 June we will march with you in Budapest, side by side, proud and loud.

Hace diez años que perdimos al gran político y activista Pedro Zerolo. Él nos enseñó que la igualdad no se regala, se conquista, se disfruta, se defiende y, sobre todo, nos enseñó que el orgullo no se esconde, el orgullo se celebra.

Celebremos el orgullo con rebeldía, con esperanza y con convicción. Porque Europa solo será Europa cuando nunca haya alguien que tenga que ocultar a quien ama para sentirse seguro.

**Kinga Gál**, *a PFE képviselőcsoport nevében*. – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Öntsünk végre tiszta vizet a pohárba! Ez az újabb Magyarország-vita semmi újat nem tud felvetni, most sem az alapjogok érvényesüléséről szól. Tökéletesen illeszkedik abba a politikai boszorkányüldözésbe és hisztériakeltésbe, amelyet hosszú évek óta tapasztalunk Magyarország ellen.

Ez már pontosan a harmincadik alkalom, hogy az Európai Parlament balliberális, néppárti többsége napirendre tűzi hazánkat. Legtöbbször teljes érdektelenség mellett, ugyanazokkal a hazug vádakkal, felháborító kettős mércével. Politikai nyomásgyakorlásra használják a jogállamiságot, mert Magyarországon egy szuverén konzervatív kormány van, amely nem hajlandó alávetni magát a brüsszeli elvárásoknak, és bátran képviseli nemzeti érdekeit a fősodor diktátumai-val szemben. Nemet mondunk a háborúra, nem támogatjuk Ukrajna erőltetett uniós csatlakozását, és megvédjük határ-ainkat az illegális migrációtól. Most épp az a legnagyobb bűnünk, hogy kiállunk a gyermekek védelméért a genderlobbi-val szemben. Magyarországon mindenki szabadon élhet és gyülekezhethet, de számunkra a gyermekek érdeke és testi-lelki fejlődése az első. Ezt pedig mindenkinek tiszteletben kell tartania.

Miközben ez a Parlament Magyarországot támadja, kínosan kerüli a valóban súlyos botrányok napirendre vételét. Hol van a vita az Európai Bíróság Bizottságot elmarasztaló ítéletéről a Pfizer-ügyben? Hol van a vita a Bizottság átláthatatlan NGO-finanszírozásáról? Ezekben az ügyekben mély csend van. Hiába kezdeményeztek vitát a patrióták, javaslatainkat a balliberális néppárti koalíció rendre lesöpri. Ez nem más, mint a képmutatás csúcsra járatása, kedves képviselőtársak.

De rendezhetnek minden héten magyar vitát, zsarolhatnak minket bárhogy, mi továbbra is megvédjük a gyermekeinket a genderpropagandától, Magyarországot pedig a külső beavatkozással szemben. Kiállunk továbbra is a béke mellett. Nemet mondunk az illegális migrációra, mint ahogy nemet mondunk Ukrajna erőltetett csatlakozására is.

**Paolo Inselvini**, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ancora una volta in questo Parlamento si cerca di invadere la sovranità degli Stati nazionali. Si attacca l'Ungheria, che semplicemente vuole proteggere i propri bambini e il proprio futuro dall'ideologia *gender*, dall'ipersessualizzazione, dagli eccessi e dagli inganni che rischiano di minare la crescita libera e innocente dei più piccoli.

Ma perché invece non pensiamo alle vere violazioni della libertà? Per esempio, il 4 giugno a Bruxelles due attivisti pro-life sono stati arrestati per aver pacificamente esposto dei cartelli che recitavano: «I bambini non nascono nel corpo sbagliato». Nessuna violenza, nessuna provocazione, nessun atto osceno in luogo pubblico, a differenza di ciò che a volte accade in altre manifestazioni tanto care alla sinistra. Semplicemente queste persone affermavano una banale verità.

E su questo cosa fa il Parlamento europeo? Silenzio assordante. Chi manifesta la realtà dei fatti viene censurato. Chi crede invece a quelle teorie, che Papa Francesco definiva le «colonizzazioni ideologiche più pericolose del nostro tempo», viene favorito, finanziato e promosso.

Ecco, indigniamoci per questo. Basta invece con gli attacchi ideologici a un Paese membro come l'Ungheria, solo perché non si allinea al pensiero unico arcobaleno di certi grigi burocrati.

**Fabienne Keller**, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire McGrath, chers collègues, depuis plusieurs mois, nous débattons à chaque plénière des événements qui se déroulent en Hongrie: d'une nouvelle action du gouvernement de Viktor Orbán, d'une nouvelle atteinte aux valeurs de l'Union, de nouvelles restrictions des droits fondamentaux des citoyens hongrois. Je me permets de le répéter, comme à chacune de mes interventions: la Hongrie est sous procédure de l'article 7 depuis 2018 – depuis sept ans. Et depuis sept ans, le gouvernement de Viktor Orbán n'a fait que persévérer dans son démantèlement de l'état de droit. La moitié du titre de ce débat est la «nécessité que la Commission agisse». Monsieur le Commissaire, je vous le demande, qu'attendez-vous pour agir?

Je serai avec mon groupe Renew à Budapest pour la Pride le 27 juin prochain avec les socialistes, les Verts et The Left et d'autres j'espère, pour défendre nos valeurs. De votre côté, qu'attendez-vous, Monsieur le Commissaire, pour organiser la suspension du droit de veto et du droit de vote pour cet État membre qui bloque les décisions, vous le savez, du Conseil et plus globalement de l'Union européenne? Cet État membre qui n'a eu de cesse de nous montrer qu'il n'avait cure de respecter les valeurs fondamentales de l'Union. Cet État membre qui s'allie avec la Russie ou les États-Unis de M. Trump plutôt qu'avec ses voisins européens.

Avec mon groupe Renew, j'appelle la Commission et le Conseil à enfin mettre en œuvre les sanctions prévues à l'article 7. Nous avons tous suffisamment attendu.

**Terry Reintke**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner, the ban of this year's Budapest Pride is completely outrageous. And let me be clear: I will not accept living in a Europe where peaceful Prides can simply be banned and nobody speaks about it. The right to freely assemble is a cornerstone of all of our democracies. Attacking it means attacking human dignity.

And the Commission must act now, and also the Member States – because I'm tired of watching EU ministers basically hiding behind the Commission instead of speaking up and acting by themselves on what is happening in Hungary. This Parliament, for one, will not stand and watch while queer people are being threatened and slandered.

Viktor Orbán, you can ban also all sorts of things, but you cannot ban the existence of people. You cannot ban freedom and you cannot ban love. So let us send a strong message of solidarity to queer people in Hungary and all across Europe, and support Budapest Pride on 28 June.

**Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης**, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, συμφωνούμε με τις εκτιμήσεις σας. Τα παιδιά πρέπει να προστατεύονται από τη μισαλλοδοξία, από τον φόβο, τον ρατσισμό, τον φασισμό, από τα επιλεκτικά δικαιώματα για τους λίγους, από τη διαφθορά, από το μίσος. Έτσι ξέρουμε εμείς, έτσι το καταλαβαίνουν· όχι όπως το καταλαβαίνει μια αυταρχική κυβέρνηση. Τον 21ο αιώνα, δεν μπορεί να λες όχι στην αγάπη ή την ελευθερία ή την αλληλεγγύη ή τη συμπερίληψη.

Ο κ. Orbán κατακερματίζει βήμα-βήμα όλα τα κεκτημένα της σημερινής κοινωνίας της Ευρώπης και τις ευρωπαϊκές αξίες που κερδήθηκαν με πολλούς αγώνες και με πολλούς κόπους —και με αίμα, θα έλεγα. Κύριε Επίτροπε, ζητάμε και απαιτούμε την άμεση ενεργοποίηση νέων διαδικασιών επί παραβάσει κατά της Ουγγαρίας.

Στη Βουδαπέστη δεν μπορεί να απαγορευθεί ούτε η ελευθερία ούτε το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο. Οι ευρωβουλευτές του δημοκρατικού τόξου θα είμαστε εκεί. Θα συμπορευθούμε στις 28 Ιουνίου στη Βουδαπέστη. Να δώσουμε πολιτική κάλυψη στους ανθρώπους που διεκδικούν το δικαίωμα της ελευθερίας και της ύπαρξής τους. Ραντεβού στη Βουδαπέστη!

**Zsuzsanna Borvendég**, *a ESN képviselőcsoport nevében*. – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Magyarország belügyeibe sokszor avatkozott be külső erő. Megesett, hogy magyarok kértek magyarok ellen idegen segítséget, mint '56 őszén, amikor a kommunisták behívták a szovjet tankokat a pesti srácok ellen.

Manapság magyar politikusok kérik az Európai Bizottság fellépését saját hazájuk ellen. Ezt a magyarok nem szökták szeretni. A magyar többségi társadalom nem kirekesztő vagy homofób, egyszerűen csak ragaszkodik a hagyományos értékekhez, amelyek megőrzik és erősítik a társadalom kohézióját.

A gyülekezési jog nem korlátlan. Teljesen abszurd a hisztéria, amely a törvénymódosítást az alapvető jogok súlyos korlátozásaként állítja be. A gyülekezési jog gyakorlása nem lehet fontosabb, mint gyermekeink védelme a deviáns viselkedéstől és a megrontástól. Önök nem elnyomott emberek jogaiért küzdenek, hanem egy globális hálózat által finanszírozott lobbít támogatnak, miközben politikai harcot vívnak egy szuverenitását védő országgal szemben. Ezek a viták nem az európai értékekről szólnak, hanem a valódi európai sokszínűség eltüntetéséről és a nemzetek önrendelkezésének felszámolásáról.

**Michał Wawrykiewicz (PPE)**. – Madam President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, how many times have we debated in this House about the violations of the rule of law and fundamental rights in Hungary? It is hard to count, even during this mandate.

Of course, the representatives of Orbán's regime and their political friends will immediately start to explain to us that the European Union is determined to harass the sovereign country. But the truth is that we rely on law, on treaties, on charters, on conventions and on dozens of judgments of the European courts. And this is what the rule of law is all about.

The truth is that what we are currently witnessing in Hungary is the 'Putinisation' of its political system. The recent law banning Pride marches is a direct assault on the freedoms of assembly and expression, protected under the EU Charter. Orbán is following the path set by Putin: first came the anti-LGBT propaganda law, now a ban on assemblies that promote or display homosexuality or gender change to minors, effectively prohibiting Pride marches. And we all know what will come next if we do not act: a total ban, prohibition of any expression of views that are inconsistent with the government line.

**Klára Dobrev (S&D).** – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Az Európai Parlament többsége már számtalanszor kiállt a magyar emberek szabadsága, jogai, a demokrácia mellett, és ezt szívből köszönöm, mert talán miattuk is érezhetjük úgy, mi, európai magyarok, demokraták, hogy nem vagyunk egyedül. De a csalódásomat is el kell, hogy mondjam Önöknek, mert úgy érzem, hogy az utóbbi időben, amikor Európa támogatásáról beszélünk, akkor elsősorban a baloldali, a zöld és a liberális pártok támogatásáról beszélünk. Ők azok, akik bátran és határozottan elmondják a véleményüket, és úgy látom, hogy egyre többen vannak, akik mintha elsunnyognák ezeket a vitákat. A Parlament jobboldali frakciói miatt nem lehetett benne a mai vita címében az, hogy a meleg jogai. Úgy általában csak a gyülekezési szabadságról lenne szó, úgy tesznek. Ők azok, akik úgy gondolják, hogy az LMBTQ-emberek jogairól beszélni, az megosztó, esetleg szavazatokat lehet ezzel veszíteni. És hát az Európai Bizottság szintén jobboldali elnöke, azt látom, hogy nem mer az Európai Bírósághoz fordulni, hogy azonnali beavatkozást kérjen a Budapest Pride megmentése érdekében.

Azt tudom maguknak mondani, hogy az, amit Önök gyakran reálpolitikának hívnak, akár az európai, akár a magyar jobboldalon, az nem más, mint gyávaság, önfeladás. És tudják, hogy ha egy hatalom elhheti az emberekkel, hogy csak önfeladással lehet őt legyőzni, akkor az a hatalom már győzött is. Éppen ezért mi, baloldaliak soha nem fogjuk megadni magunkat, soha nem vagyunk hajlandók feladni az elveinket, és nem vagyunk hajlandók feladni azokat az embereket, akik úgy látom, hogy ma már csak bennünk bízhatnak. Mi ott leszünk a Pride-on. Baloldaliak, zöldek és liberálisok. Kedves néppárti, jobboldali kollégáim, Önök ott lesznek a Pride-on?

**Harald Vilimsky (Pfe).** – Frau Präsidentin! Meine Damen und Herren von der politisch Linken, und dazu zählt insbesondere die Europäische Volkspartei, Sie sind doch unterwegs wie eine politische *Titanic* Richtung Eisberg. Sie fahren den Kontinent politisch in den Abgrund mit Ihrer Politik und legen jetzt Ihr Herzblut in die Regenbogenparade. Und ich kann mir schon vorstellen, wie jetzt 70 von 100, wie angekündigt von Ihnen, nach Budapest reisen und die ganzen EU-Propagandisten – von einem Daniel Freund bis zu einem Herrn Péter Magyar, diese neue Kunstfigur der Brüsseler Eliten – dort hinfahren und inmitten von Leuten in Lack und Leder und in High Heels den Abgesang an alle Werte, die dieses Europa je präsentiert hat, politisch abzelebrieren.

Was Sie hier machen, ist politisch völlig der falsche Weg. Hier geht es nicht um die Freiheit der Liebe, hier geht es um die aggressive Zurschaustellung von Sexualität, die niemanden interessiert. Es interessiert niemanden die sexuelle Ausrichtung, es interessieren niemanden die Geschlechtsteile der Leute dort in Lack und Leder, diese ganze Hokuspokus-Geschichte, die dort abzelebriert wird. Nein, Viktor Orbán hat recht: Der Schutz der Kinder und der Familien geht hier vor.

*(Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)*

*(Der Redner lehnt eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ von Nicolae Ștefănuță ab.)*

**Nicolas Bay (ECR).** – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, les traités européens distinguent clairement les compétences de l'Union européenne des compétences des États membres. La législation hongroise de 2021 indique qu'il n'est pas possible de faire «la promotion», je cite, «auprès des mineurs de l'homosexualité et du changement de sexe». Alors, bien sûr, chacun est libre d'être d'accord ou pas avec cette loi, mais l'ordre public et la protection des mineurs sont clairement des compétences nationales et l'Union européenne n'a donc pas à interférer.

Par ailleurs, les exemples d'interdiction de manifestations en Europe sont très nombreux: en France, en janvier dernier, des manifestations agricoles ont été interdites; en Belgique, en 2024, une conférence conservatrice a été interdite également. Et là, nous n'avons pas entendu évidemment la gauche et les progressistes. La liberté de réunion est une liberté fondamentale, mais, évidemment, elle est exercée dans le cadre des lois nationales.

Par ailleurs, les citoyens dits LGBT, que vous réduisez d'ailleurs très souvent à leurs pratiques sexuelles, ont les mêmes droits que n'importe quel autre citoyen. Ils ne constituent pas une caste supérieure et rien ne justifie de céder à leurs revendications, qui sont souvent très éloignées de l'intérêt général.

Alors que l'Union européenne obtienne des résultats dans les domaines qui lui ont été dévolus et qu'elle cesse ses ingérences permanentes dans les choix démocratiques des...

(La Présidente retire la parole à l'orateur)

(L'orateur accepte une question carton bleu)

**Mélissa Camara (Verts/ALE)**, question «carton bleu». – Vous parlez de protection des enfants, vous considérez que les personnes LGBT constituent une menace pour les enfants de l'Union européenne?

Seconde question sur la protection des enfants: aujourd'hui, il y a 2 millions d'enfants qui se retrouvent avec l'un de leurs parents qui n'est pas reconnu. Par exemple, moi, si je déménage demain, je peux perdre tous mes droits sur ma fille. Est-ce que vous pensez que c'est protéger les enfants que de laisser des enfants comme ça, de familles homoparentales, sans droits les plus basiques auprès de leurs parents?

**Nicolas Bay (ECR)**, réponse carton bleu. – Vous savez, je crois que, quand on parle de droit des enfants, il s'oppose en réalité à une espèce de droit à l'enfant, qui a été construit de manière artificielle par les lobbys LGBT. On nous explique qu'on aurait un droit à l'enfant, un droit d'adopter un enfant, etc. En réalité, les droits fondamentaux des enfants, c'est les protéger de la propagande. Et en tout cas, on peut.

Encore une fois, ce sont des choix démocratiques des nations souveraines. On peut avoir des positions différentes là-dessus. Et manifestement, ma chère collègue, nous avons une vision différente de ces questions.

Mais, en tout état de cause, la Hongrie est une nation souveraine, avec des choix démocratiques, avec des élections libres, et c'est sur cette base-là que les Hongrois ont fait des choix. Ils ne sont pas les vôtres, mais vous...

(La Présidente retire la parole à l'orateur)

**Dainius Žalimas (Renew)**. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, regrettably, Hungary acts as a Russian Trojan horse within the European Union, eroding our fundamental values from inside and weakening our common security.

The Orbán regime echoes Moscow's disinformation and anti-LGBTQ policy. According to the classification adopted recently by the Venice Commission, Orbán's regime can be described as an electoral autocracy with unfair elections, regular abuse of state resources, erosion of civil liberties and subverted institutions. The more space this regime is given, the more aggressively it restricts fundamental rights, in particular the freedom of assembly. The regime does not hesitate to abuse laws, even rewrite the constitution with incredible speed in order to consolidate its power.

Will we tolerate these actions until the damage is irreversible? The time for hesitation is over. Apart from all the infringement procedures, ultimately Hungary's voting rights must be suspended at the Council.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question)

**Lukas Sieper (NI)**, blue-card question. – Thank you colleague, I'm up here in the middle for you. We have many colleagues today that claim that this all with the human rights by the European Union that we defended, that's an infringement of the Member States' rights of sovereignty.

As you know, I'm just a simple jurist, but you were a chairman of a constitutional court, so maybe you could take this moment to explain to our colleagues how it actually works on a legal level, with the rights guaranteed by the European Union and the sovereignty of the Member States in this regard. I would be very happy.

**Dainius Žalimas (Renew)**, blue-card answer. – Thank you very much, dear colleague, for the question.

As a lawyer, I can assure you that sovereignty doesn't mean the free discretion which international commitments are to be fulfilled or which are not. It is inseparable from the proper fulfilment of all international obligations, including those stemming from the EU membership in a goodwill.

And if no, if somebody wouldn't like those obligations, there is always the way to withdraw.

**Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, dear Commissioner, 'You are on your own' – that is what the Commission is telling the Hungarian LGBTI community by not acting against the Pride ban. The Commission has the legal tools but is scared to use them: scared because the Pride organisations could risk a prison sentence; scared while the LGBTQ people in Hungary are treated, in the words of the Advocate General, as if their lives are not worth the same as heterosexual and cisgender lives. Is this really the message that the Commissioner wants to send to them, and to Orbán? He can now ban any demonstration that opposes him, and he will do it again. Will the Commission act then?

Commissioner, we cannot fear Orbán. Act with courage now and request interim measures. In the meantime, 70 colleagues and I will do what the Commission won't: we will go to the Pride. We will show the Hungarians that they are not alone.

**Ilaria Salis (The Left).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, libertà di riunione nell'Ungheria di Orban? Solo per chi fa comodo al regime. Da un lato, si vieta il Pride, si censura la libertà di espressione di migliaia di cittadine e cittadini ungheresi ed europei, si criminalizza la comunità LGBTQI+ con l'assurda infamante accusa di essere pericolosa per i bambini e, dall'altro, si tollera la parata neonazista del cosiddetto Giorno dell'onore, che ogni febbraio infesta le strade di Budapest. Un raduno internazionale di militanti di estrema destra, razzisti, omofobi, suprematisti, fanatici religiosi, portatori di odio e di violenza, che rappresentano un pericolo reale per chiunque non si conformi alla loro orrenda ideologia.

Ecco quindi il volto di un regime compromesso con l'estrema destra più radicale. Un potere oscurantista non poi così diverso dai talebani o dagli ayatollah. Non possiamo accettarlo. Se il governo ungherese calpesta le libertà fondamentali e reprime le minoranze, allora va sanzionato e isolato. I soldi dei contribuenti europei non devono finanziare la repressione di un regime. Solidarietà al Pride e a chi avrà il coraggio di manifestare comunque per un'Ungheria migliore e libera. Solidarietà a Maja in sciopero della fame, che resiste con dignità e fierezza...

*(L'oratrice rifiuta una domanda «cartellino blu»)*

*(La Presidente toglie la parola all'oratrice)*

**Christine Anderson (ESN).** – Madam President, what in God's name is wrong with you? Your ritual of prosecution against Hungary is really getting ridiculous.

Hungary's parliament – the legitimate representation of the Hungarian people – has decided to protect their children. They reject to expose their children to sexualised performances during these 'Pride' parades. All Hungary is saying is, 'You want to protest? Fine. But put on some darn clothes, for crying out loud.'

Where you see scandal, I see reason, common sense and decency, and that's why you call for the Brussels Inquisition: infringement procedures, Article 7, financial sanctions. All that just because Hungary is saying, 'Our country, our laws, our children, our decision.'

Let's be clear: your demand for diversity and 'Pride' is really a demand for the public display of perversion and depravity, which not even the most beautiful symbol there is on the planet – the rainbow – can conceal. Your concept of diversity ...

*(The President cut off the speaker)*

**President.** – Thank you very much. Ms Anderson, there is a blue card. Do you want to take it?

I have three requests for blue cards. I will only take one.

**Christine Anderson (ESN).** – *(start of speech off mic)* ... I will not give more time to the Rainbow Mafia.

*(The speaker declined to take a blue-card question)*

**Judita Laššáková (NI).** – Vážená pani predsedajúca, vážení kolegovia, každá správa Komisie o právnom štáte hovorí o účasti občanov na demokratických procesoch. Je tragédiou doby, že zrovna my nemáme európsky pohľad. Keď boli prijaté covidové opatrenia, prvým zrušeným ľudským právom bolo práve právo zhromažďovať sa. Musím uznať, že nie všade v Európe. Chcem sa vás spýtať, kde ste boli v rokoch 2020 až 2023? Lebo viem, kde ste neboli. Neboli ste na Slovensku. Vtedy vlády používali vodné delá na demonštrantov, nehovoriac o gumených projektiloch. Ak chceme hovoriť o právnom štáte, snažme sa hovoriť o materiálnom právnom štáte. Právnym štátom bolo totiž aj nacistické Nemecko. Ale materiálny právny štát je taký štát, kde sú, kde sa písané zákony nielen prijímú ústavou predpísanou formou, ale sa aj uplatňujú bez rozdielu. Ak chceme kritizovať Maďarsko, čo je v poriadku, lebo vecná kritika posúva, skúsme si najskôr poupratovať pred vlastným prahom a nie kritizovať vtedy, kedy sa nám to hodí.

**Maria Walsh (PPE).** – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, in March, the Hungarian Government banned the freedom of assembly – we've heard this again and again today. It is one of the most important, core values of our democracy, a right that allows us to gather together for common purpose, including peaceful protests and demonstrations. This ban is one of the many cracks in the foundations of fundamental rights and the rule of law in today's Hungary. This ban has direct consequences for our LGBTI+ community and it's so blatantly clear that it bans Pride.

But these attacks on the rainbow community in Hungary are not new, and not only happening in this one Eastern Bloc country. A narrative is brewing that speaking out about minority rights only gives Orbán and other authoritarian regimes power. But what happens when we begin to ignore our LGBTI brothers and sisters, when we look away, hoping not to cause trouble? We lose something essential. We lose the very values – the very values – that define us. And that is, ladies and gentlemen, however you identify, our European values. The Commission and Council leaders cannot delay any further in holding this government to account for its blatant violations of rule of law and fundamental rights.

I am really proud to say I will be travelling to Budapest Pride to stand proudly with our rainbow communities and allies – because, ladies and gentlemen, in the face of oppression, there is absolutely no space for silence.

**Ana Catarina Mendes (S&D).** – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caras e caros colegas, é extraordinário que no dia em que aprovamos mais um relatório sobre o Estado de direito, tenhamos de estar, de novo, a falar sobre uma das mais grotescas violações do Estado de direito.

Senhoras e Senhores Deputados e Senhora Anderson, lamento, mas decência é defender o respeito pelos direitos humanos. Decência é perceber que a Hungria entrou no espaço da União Europeia para respeitar os direitos humanos, para respeitar o Estado de direito, para respeitar a democracia.

Aquilo a que estamos a assistir por parte de Orbán é uma violação enorme dos direitos humanos, proibindo o direito à manifestação, o direito à associação, o direito a ser, o direito a escolher quem sou. É disto que estamos a falar, de direitos humanos. E é neste Parlamento e com esta Comissão que temos de voltar a solicitar que o artigo 7.º seja mesmo aplicado.

Porque aqueles que são os prevaricadores, aqueles que não respeitam as leis europeias, não podem fazer parte deste espaço.

**Hermann Tertsch (PflE).** – Señora presidente, Hungría es, probablemente, uno de los países más seguros de toda Europa para los homosexuales. Es uno de los países donde no hay palizas, como las palizas que se dan en Francia, que se dan en España, que se dan en Alemania, que se dan en muchos sitios donde la policía recomienda que no haya muestras de afecto entre homosexuales porque les puede pasar algo ante esa inmigración que ha hecho de los barrios unos barrios musulmanes invivibles e islamistas.

Eso no es ningún problema en Hungría —que haya homosexuales, que tengan sus espacios, etcétera—. El problema está cuando ustedes —y, por eso, va a desaparecer la izquierda en Europa más pronto que tarde— se dedican a buscar unos elementos de marginación para elevarlos al canon social de Europa cultural, y eso es intolerable para cualquier país que quiera tener un crecimiento sano y que quiera tener una educación y unos hijos equilibrados.

**PRESEDÁ: MARTIN HOJSÍK***Podpredseda*

**Arkadiusz Mularczyk (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Zaczniemy od tego, że dzisiejsza debata powinna nosić inną nazwę. Nie dotyczy ona bowiem wolności zgromadzeń, tylko wolności oglądania publicznego obnażania się i deprawacji. Aby to szanownej Komisji unaocznić, pragnę przywołać sceny z podobnych parad, które odbyły się kilka dni temu w Warszawie. Dodam, że uczestniczył w tych paradach niedoszły prezydent Polski Rafał Trzaskowski, który w trakcie kampanii wyborczej na prezydenta odcinał się ostro od ruchów LGBT, mając świadomość, jak te działania bardzo niepopularne są w naszym kraju, w Polsce.

Przejdźmy jednak do tego, jak wyglądała parada LGBT w Warszawie kilka dni temu. W paradzie brali udział półnaczy mężczyźni, którzy w obecności dzieci wykonywali czynności, o których przyzwoitość zakazuje mówić na tej sali. Obecni byli także mężczyźni przebrani za karykaturalne wersje kobiet, czyli tzw. drag queen. Największą furorę jednak, drodzy państwo, zrobili sataniści, w tym osoba przebrana za demona, którego rogi zastępowała imitacja nóżek abortowanego dziecka.

Pytam zatem, Komisjo Europejska, czy to są owe europejskie wartości? Czy takie wartości promujecie w krajach Unii Europejskiej? Oczywiście, próbujecie narzucać je tylko poza czasem przedwyborczym.

*(Mówca zgodził się na pytanie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki)*

**Lukas Sieper (NI), blue-card question.** – Thank you, colleague, you just very colourfully outlined your interpretation of what happened at the Warsaw Pride. As it sounded to me, you automatically assume that every man who shows his body automatically scares children, that drag queens automatically scare children, that trans people automatically scare children. So I just wanted to ask you if, in your opinion, in your worldview, the people of the LGBTQI+ community are automatically a danger to children? And if not, where is the line for you?

**Arkadiusz Mularczyk (ECR), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.** – Panie pośle, w przeciwieństwie do Pana mam dwójkę dorosłych dzieci, które starałem się wychować według wartości bliskich mnie i mojemu krajowi – wartości chrześcijańskich, katolickich. Z przykrością obserwuję to, jak dzisiaj trudno wychować dzieci w oparciu o wartości chrześcijańskie. I nie zgadzam się na to, żeby propaganda LGBT była na siłę wciskana do szkół europejskich, do przedszkoli i na siłę zmieniała mózgi młodych dzieci i młodych Europejczyków, młodych Polaków. Na to nie ma naszej zgody. Dzisiaj Europa stoi przed kryzysem demograficznym. Skupcie się raczej na polityce rodzinnej, na promowaniu rodziny i dzietności w Europie, a nie na promowaniu LGBT.

**Moritz Körner (Renew).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich denke immer nach diesen Debatten: Wirrer können die Argumente von der rechten Seite eigentlich gar nicht werden. Aber dann kommt die nächste Debatte, und sie schaffen es immer wieder; es ist wirklich beeindruckend. Hier hat eben eine Kollegin gesagt, die Debatte heute sei ein ausländischer Einfluss, und hat ihn verglichen mit dem Einsatz sowjetischer Panzer 1956 in Ungarn. Sag mal, ticken Sie noch ganz richtig? Was sind das für Vergleiche? Hier eine solche Debatte damit gleichzusetzen.

Der nächste Redner hat dann gesagt, er wünscht sich, dass Daniel Freund High Heels bei der Pride trägt; das würde ich sogar noch unterstützen. Die nächste Rednerin redet dann davon, dass sie endlich mal ihre Kleider anziehen sollen. Dann wird hier von Satan geredet.

Also wenn man sich das hier anhört, die Argumente, das ist doch unglaublich. Es ist jetzt Zeit, dass wir nicht mehr darüber reden, denn offenbar sind Sie für sinnvolle Argumente nicht zugänglich. Wir brauchen endlich Handeln der Europäischen Kommission, um diese Bürgerfreiheiten auch endlich zu verteidigen. Und wir müssen entschlossen an der Seite derjenigen stehen, die auf die Pride nach Budapest fahren.

**Mélissa Camara (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Monsieur le Commissaire, la Pride de Budapest a été interdite. Mais face à cette volonté de censure, la société civile et la municipalité verte ont su faire preuve de courage et de résilience face à l'arbitraire. Je me souviendrai toute ma vie de ma première Pride. Comprendre que je ne suis pas seule, que tout ira bien, ressentir cette fierté, cette joie militante. Tous les jeunes queer doivent pouvoir vivre ce bonheur.

Interdire une Pride, c'est interdire la lutte pour la dignité. C'est une attaque délibérée contre l'état de droit et les droits fondamentaux. Et si l'Union européenne se tait, si la Commission se contente de condamner sans agir, alors nous serons complices. Monsieur le Commissaire, il est temps d'ouvrir de nouvelles procédures. L'argent européen ne doit pas servir celles et ceux qui piétinent nos valeurs. Le 28 juin, je serai à Budapest pour marcher avec fierté, pour dire que nos droits ne se négocient pas.

Et je veux dire ceci aux jeunes LGBT en Hongrie et partout en Europe: ce que vous vivez est politique. Vos existences dérangent car elles sont libres, car elles sont courageuses et fières. Tenez bon, vous n'êtes pas seuls, on se bat pour vous, on se bat avec vous.

*(L'oratrice accepte une question carton bleu)*

**Jacek Ozdoba (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.** – Chciałem się spytać, czy jeżeli pani pójdzie na tę paradę, czy na przykład tutaj, do tego budynku też pani przyjdzie na smyczy i w kagańcu? Bo taka forma, jak widać, zaczyna być bardzo popularna wśród mężczyzn na paradzie. Oczywiście pani to nie dotyczy, ale jeżeli pani mężczyźni przyjaciele będą chcieli pójść, to żeby pani zwróciła im uwagę, żeby jednak zachowywali się jak ludzie.

**Mélissa Camara (Verts/ALE), réponse carton bleu.** – La traduction en français était incompréhensible, mais je pense qu'en fait, ce que vous avez voulu dire était incompréhensible et profondément insultant. Donc il vaut mieux qu'il y ait des petits défauts de traduction parfois.

**Carolina Morace (The Left).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 28 giugno io ci sarò. Sarò a Budapest, a fianco della comunità LGBTQI+ ungherese, e non sarò sola, ma sarò con decine di eurodeputati e parlamentari nazionali. Cammineremo accanto a chi resiste, a chi lotta per rivendicare i diritti o semplicemente per dire: io esisto.

Vietare il Pride è l'ultimo atto della strategia repressiva di Orban contro i diritti fondamentali. Un attacco vergognoso alla libertà di riunione, all'uguaglianza e alla dignità delle persone. Una sfida aperta ai valori su cui si fonda l'Unione europea.

Oggi qui dobbiamo mandare un messaggio chiaro e forte: è inaccettabile che in uno Stato membro vengano soppressi i diritti garantiti dai nostri trattati. La Commissione europea non può più limitarsi a vuote parole di circostanza, ma servono sanzioni, blocco dei fondi, procedura di infrazione ora.

Il diritto di amare e di essere amati è un diritto di tutti e non un diritto di pochi – se siete amati, sempre ammesso questo.

**Milan Mazurek (ESN).** – Vážený pán predsedajúci, vy naozaj nedokázate pochopiť, že nahí muži prezentujúci svoje pohlavné orgány v uliciach našich miest ohrozujú mravnú výchovu mládeže? Nedokázate pochopiť, že nie všetci dokážu znášať, keď sa chlapi prezliekajú za ženy a prezentujú to malým deťom ako normálnosť? Že Maďarsko chce chrániť mravnú výchovu mládeže, že chce chrániť kresťanské hodnoty, že chce chrániť normálnosť? To všetko sú normálne veci, na ktorých bežným ľuďom skutočne záleží. A kto tu dnes Maďarsko kritizuje za to, že chce chrániť deti pred touto propagandou? Ľudia z krajín, ktorí vládnu. Kde v Paríži vidíme horiace mesto a gangy, znásilňujúce ženy a deti? Kde vidíme mesto zničené po obyčajnom futbalovom zápase? Nemecko. Kde sú ľudia zabíjaní pri hromadných teroristických útokoch a vraždení na autobusových staniach? Budapešť je stokrát bezpečnejšie ako všetky tieto západné mestá, kde vládne táto vaša takzvaná sloboda. Vy si môžete od Budapešti a od Maďarska brať príklad a nie ho tu chcieť trestať. Pretože chrániť normálnosť a chrániť malé deti je správna vec.

**Diana Iovanovici Șoșoacă (NI).** – Domnule președinte, de când minoritatea conduce o majoritate? Democrația înseamnă legea impusă de majoritate. Majoritatea, de exemplu, în România, 98 % suntem creștini. Nu suntem de acord cu homosexualitatea, nu suntem de acord cu căsătoriile dintre persoane de același sex, nu suntem de acord cu adopțiile făcute de persoane de același sex, nici cu parteneriatele civile.

Nu le interzice nimeni să existe, dar în dormitorul lor. Ce căutați pe stradă? Ce o fi atâta mândrie ca tu, bărbat, să ieși cu pilozitățile excesive pe stradă, cu o minijupă, să-ți arăți toate exterioarele, să îți arăți inclusiv organele genitale în fața unor copii pe care îi distrugi.

Pe mine mă deranjează, ca femeie, să văd un bărbat că își bate joc de feminitate. Pe mine mă deranjează că copii de 9 și 10 ani sunt învățați să se sărute pe stradă băiat cu băiat, fată cu fată. Pe mine mă deranjează, ca părinte, că vă bateți joc de copiii noștri. Luați etichete de pe copiii noștri!

**Arba Kokalari (PPE).** – Herr talman! Viktor Orbán har i åratal begått brott mot rättsstaten, nu senast genom ett förbud mot hbtq-personers rätt att träffas och mötas. Rätten att leva sitt liv öppet och tryggt suddas sakta ut i Ungern.

Mitt i allt detta, och under brinnande krig, har Orban närmat sig diktatorn Putin. Det här är ett svek mot det ungerska folket och det är ett svek mot EU:s grundläggande värden. Det är ett svek mot alla de européer som har kämpat för fri- och rättigheter i generationer.

EU är ingen fritidsklubb där man kan komma och gå som man vill. EU är ett åtagande för demokrati, för rättsstat och alla människors lika värde. Mänskliga rättigheter och demokratiska principer är inte förhandlingsbara. Så Viktor Orbán: det är dags att agera nu eller möta konsekvenserna i domstolen.

**Marc Angel (S&D).** – Mr President, dear Commissioner and dear colleagues, freedom of assembly is the heartbeat of democracy. And in Hungary, that heartbeat is faltering under the weight of repression. When people cannot gather peacefully to voice their concerns, when their right to protest is crushed by heavy handed tactics, it is a clear signal of a collapse of the very freedoms we claim to protect.

It is extremely sad that we, the pro-democratic groups, must keep repeating the obvious. What is currently happening in Hungary is not only a national or LGBTI matter, it is about the fundamental rights of every European citizen.

If we allow the Hungarian government's crackdown to go unanswered, we are sending a message that democracy is negotiable. We keep repeating these messages to highlight the urgency of the situation.

Dear Commissioner, Article 7 and infringement procedures are not optional tools, but essential duties. Our Union's credibility depends on the Commission's action and willingness to uphold democracy, fundamental rights and the rule of law. European citizens, including the Hungarian people, count on you.

I will march in Budapest to protest against the love story between Putin and Orbán.

**Paolo Borchia (Pfe).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, invenzione di emergenze, tante chiacchiere sui diritti fondamentali, ma va ve ne siete dimenticato uno: si chiama democrazia, si chiama rispetto delle scelte degli elettori che in Ungheria, per la quarta volta consecutiva, si sono scelti il governo.

Voi a volte siete maggioranza in questo Parlamento, ma molto spesso non lo siete nella vita reale. Quindi, che lezioni volete dare al popolo ungherese, alla sua storia, ai suoi valori e alle sue scelte?

E, dulcis in fundo, apprendo che un numero cospicuo di colleghi ha chiesto alla Presidente di questo Parlamento di garantire delle misure di sicurezza eccezionali in occasione della gita al «Budapest Pride», neanche steste andando in guerra. Quindi, questo è giusto per dare un altro fendente alla credibilità di questo povero Parlamento.

**Jacek Ozdoba (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Bliski Wschód płonie. Ukraina płonie. Mamy kryzys migracyjny, kryzys gospodarczy. Nie mamy broni. A wy debatujecie o tym, że Orban zakazał dzieciom uczestniczenia w paradzie, gdzie mężczyźni chodzą w stringach i w kagańcach. To chyba coś normalnego, że broni dzieci przed jakimkolwiek dziwnym zachowaniem. Zamiast rozmawiać o prawdziwych problemach, zajmujecie się czymś, co jest w waszych głowach. Ja nie widzę tutaj potrzeby – to do tych, którzy się śmieją: panie Śmiszek, panie Wawrynkiewicz i inni – żeby debatować o waszych preferencjach seksualnych i żeby rozmawiać o tym, kto ma wychodzić na ulicę.

A co do dzieci: Węgry bronią najmłodszych przed tym, żeby takie obrazy po prostu nie były przed nimi. To jest zwykłe prawo do zachowania dziecka praw do rozwoju bez jakichkolwiek negatywnych bodźców, bez jakichkolwiek obrazów. Nie wiem, czy w Warszawie parada z udziałem pana w kagańcu czy też stringach jest czymś, co jest naturalne. Ja uważam, że to jest zastępczy temat i absolutnie powinniśmy się zająć problemami Europy, a nie głupotami.

**Raquel García Hermida-Van Der Walle (Renew).** – Mr President, what an obsession with underwear. Dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, last time we stood here to discuss Orbán's attacks on the rule of law, I said he was a bit like the emperor without clothes. But actually, I have come to the conclusion that he's much more like the evil queen from Snow White.

He only cares about one thing. And it's not beauty. It is power. It is power to keep stealing from the Hungarian people and all of us Europeans. Mirror, mirror, who can keep tricking the EU into thinking that I'm untouchable? he keeps asking. But the restriction of the right to peaceful assembly, his attacks on the LGBTI community is Orbán showing that he's afraid, he can feel it, his reign is coming to an end.

So Commission, it is your role and that of the Member States to break the spell. Freeze all funding. Take away Orbán's rights to keep kidnapping the EU and our fundamental values. Support the Hungarian people. Be the princess who kisses Hungary back to democratic life.

**Daniel Freund (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, dear colleagues, Mr Commissioner, particularly for all the men here on the extreme right, I'm now going to make you all gay. Look! Two men holding hands.

*(The speaker held up a picture)*

*(The President cut off the speaker)*

**President.** – I'm sorry. This is not something that is in line with the Rules of Procedure. I have to cut you off.

Sorry, Daniel – you are showing pictures. So please put away the picture. Thank you.

**Daniel Freund (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, this is actually part of the police evidence to ban a Pride protest in Hungary.

I don't know about you guys, but I don't think about what other people do in the bedroom all day. But you guys seem very concerned about that.

Maybe it has to do with the fact that Viktor Orbán basically doesn't really meet women all day. There are 18 men in his cabinet – all-male cabinet. All his advisors in his Prime Minister's Office are all male. Apparently that environment leads you to such sexual insecurity that you need to ban Pride.

But obviously you guys are trying to launch some sort of culture war to hide the corruption and to hide that you're taking everyone's rights – not only of some, but of everyone.

The Commission needs to step up – not just stand ready, but act on this.

**Li Andersson (The Left).** – Mr President, Viktor Orbán has been attacking freedoms and fundamental rights by restricting freedom of opinion and by weakening the rights of minorities and workers for years. And now he is doing exactly what authoritarian leaders always do when they are not stopped – he is going further, by giving authorities broad powers to monitor, sanction or even ban activities of civil society, trade unions and media by withdrawing Hungary from the ICC and by attacking diversity and democracy through banning the Pride event. Enough is enough. The EU must be able to act to protect fundamental rights and freedoms of all Europeans, and this is a legitimacy question for the whole Union.

As parliamentarians, our most important job is to support the people in Hungary who are protesting against this, who are organising the Pride march despite the repression, and I, for one, am proud to be joining them.

**Tomasz Froelich (ESN).** – Herr Präsident! Ungarn ist ein souveräner Staat, Ungarn verteidigt traditionelle Werte, und Ungarn hat jedes Recht, die Pride zu verbieten, denn es ist richtig, Kinder vor sexuellem Exhibitionismus zu schützen. Sie veranstalten hier ein Tribunal gegen Orbán, um von eigenen Problemen abzulenken. Denn nicht in Budapest werden Frauen in Gruppen vergewaltigt, nicht in Budapest explodieren die Bomben von Terroristen, nicht in Budapest wird das Kalifat ausgerufen, sehr wohl aber in unseren Städten, in Berlin, in Brüssel, in Paris. Da halten Sie die Klappe. Aber wenn Orbán etwas macht, das Ihnen nicht passt, da drehen Sie völlig durch.

Sie respektieren Ungarn nicht, Sie erwarten Gehorsam. Wer nicht gehorcht, wird sanktioniert. Das ist wie ein Sozialkreditsystem auf supranationaler Ebene. In Ländern, die unter sowjetischer Knute standen, weckt das böse Erinnerungen, aber das kapierten Sie nicht. Sie kapierten nicht, wie demütigend und arrogant Ihre Worte in Ungarn wirken müssen, weil Ihnen jegliche Kultursensibilität fehlt. Ihre Vielfalt ist Einfalt. Ihre Toleranz gilt nur Gleichgesinnten. Sie führen sich auf wie wertemperialistische Kolonialherren, und Sie merken es nicht einmal. Lassen Sie endlich die Finger von Ungarn!

**Lukas Sieper (NI).** – Mr President, people of Europe, I am a man. I feel right in the body that I was born into. I am heterosexual. I am what's called an 'ally'. Someone who does not belong to a community, but who stands with them, who fights with them against fear, against hatred. I stand with a proud community because I believe in equal rights for all the people.

Because tens of thousands of homosexual and trans people have been murdered in German concentration camps. Because when I speak of love and intimacy with a woman, no one calls it propaganda. No one says it's a danger to children. No one calls it a sin.

I am an ally. And what I offer is this: my voice, my time, my solidarity, my rightful fury. I am a human being. And so are you. So are all the people. I am an ally.

**Mirosława Nykiel (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! W marcu 2025 roku, kiedy rząd węgierski przyjął ustawę ograniczającą wolność zgromadzeń, nie chodziło tylko o jedną grupę społeczną ani o wyłączne zablokowanie parady równości w Budapeszcie. To był kolejny etap stopniowego demontażu demokracji, który trwa na Węgrzech już od 2010 roku. To już nie spór o wartości. To rzeczywista utrata praw obywatelskich. Parlament Europejski jednoznacznie uznał, że Węgry przestały być pełną demokracją nie tylko ze względu na ograniczenie praw mniejszości, ale także na podporządkowanie sądów i mediów władzy wykonawczej.

Skutki takich rządów znamy dobrze wszędzie tam, gdzie dostają władzę populści i skrajna prawica. Dochodzi do osłabienia instytucji państwowych, a wolności obywatelskie stają się zagrożone. W Polsce udało się odwrócić ten trend w 2023 roku, ale powinniśmy pamiętać, że demokracja nie jest nam dana raz na zawsze i nie znika z dnia na dzień. Traci się ją stopniowo z każdym ograniczeniem praw i swobód obywatelskich. Dlatego dziś warto powiedzieć: marzenie o Budapeszcie, Warszawie czy jakiegokolwiek innej europejskiej stolicy nie ma nic wspólnego z wolnością ani państwem prawa. To przestroga, a nie wzór do naśladowania.

**Alessandro Zan (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, ho sentito l'estrema destra pronunciare parole piene di odio, di disprezzo verso la comunità LGBTQI+. Ma io mi chiedo: ma che vita infelice avete, colleghi, per provare tutto questo odio? Ci vuole anche molta energia per provare tutto questo odio verso le persone.

Guardate che il divieto al Budapest Pride imposto da Orban non è solo un attacco alla comunità LGBTQI+, ma una ferita alla democrazia europea e ai principi su cui si fonda questa Unione. Infatti, l'Ungheria non è più da tempo una democrazia, è un'autocrazia la cui violazione dello Stato di diritto, Commissario, l'Europa non può più tollerare.

Infatti, chiediamo più coraggio a questa Commissione, che è stata eletta con un mandato chiaro: costruire un'Europa più federale, dei diritti, che ascolti la voce dei cittadini europei, e non una Commissione che esita davanti agli abusi di uno degli Stati membri. La Commissione prenda provvedimenti concreti contro il governo Orban, contro il divieto del Pride, e sia presente in prima linea il 28 giugno. Io ci sarò, assieme ad altri colleghi. Ci siano anche i Commissari della Commissione europea al Pride!

**Jorge Buxadé Villalba (PFE).** – Señor presidente, señorías, a ustedes los homosexuales les dan absolutamente igual. Ustedes sirven a Soros, insultan a Hungría y solo quieren derrocar el Gobierno de Orbán.

Si los homosexuales les importasen, se irían a Irán, Mauritania, Nigeria, Arabia Saudí, Yemen, Qatar, Afganistán, Pakistán, Somalia o a los Emiratos Árabes Unidos, países musulmanes donde la homosexualidad está condenada con la muerte. A Mauritania, Ursula von der Leyen y Pedro Sánchez le dieron hace un año 500 millones de euros, y la Comisión Europea ha dicho que Nigeria va a ser uno de los principales beneficiarios de Global Gateway, financiado con 150 mil millones de euros.

A ustedes los homosexuales les dan absolutamente igual. Financian Estados islámicos que asesinan homosexuales, financian organizaciones islámicas que, en el corazón de Europa, promueven la sharía. Han rendido las fronteras y, ahora, lo único que quieren es atacar al pueblo húngaro, a su soberanía y a su Gobierno.

Repito (¿lo escuchan?): a ustedes los homosexuales les dan igual. Y todos lo sabemos.

**Tobiasz Bocheński (ECR).** – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the leftists and the Eurocrats have been making a circus out of this Chamber for years over Hungary. You found yourself a scapegoat because you don't like the Hungarian election results. You represent neocolonial contempt for people with different views. You seem to think that you have some sort of mandate to lecture the nations of Europe on what they are allowed to do and what they are not.

Let me inform you: you have neither such a right nor any legitimate authority. It is unbearable to watch the arrogant tirades against the Hungarian people, who have a tradition of liberty as long-standing as that of England or of Poland. When Hungary was independent, freedom flourished there, as old as the Golden Bull of the 13th century. Leftist ideologues, leave Hungary alone!

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question)*

**Raquel García Hermida-Van Der Walle (Renew),** *blue-card question.* – You said we think we have a mandate. We do have a mandate: the mandate of the Treaty of the European Union, Article 2, which says that everyone should be free of discrimination, among other things, which says that we have fundamental values that we have to abide by.

You don't feel bound by the Treaty of the European Union standing in this Chamber?

**Tobiasz Bocheński (ECR),** *blue-card answer.* – First of all, it seems you don't understand the Treaties of the European Union. First of all, you should read not only the first and the second but all the Articles, and understand the spirit of these Treaties.

Second of all, I feel bound to the spirit of European civilisation, which was built upon Rome, Athens and Jerusalem – what you, the leftists, don't understand at all.

**Kim Van Sparrentak (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, dear colleagues, Commissioner, when I went to my first Pride, it finally struck me. I was not alone. I deserved to be loved. And the people I belong to know how to organise a damn good protest.

I hope that in 2025, in a European Union, we would have reached a moment where human rights of LGBTIQ+ plus people and the fundamental freedoms, such as the freedom of assembly, are non-negotiable. That when a pride is banned, the European Commission would jump into action and immediately draw a clear line.

Commissioner, the values enshrined in Article 2 are not merely a suggestion. Please take action. And for the people on my right, queer people exist and have the same rights to visibly participate in public life. You might not like it, but you and your hate are also not really invited to our party. You can't ban our existence and you can't ban our Pride. Budapest I can't wait to march with you next week!

**Lena Düpont (PPE).** – Mr President, dear colleagues, the rule of law in itself is neutral. It is a collection of procedural rules to guarantee that a political system is fair, is free, is democratic, that encourages engagement and debates, that fosters cooperation instead of sowing divisions, so that societies can thrive, that businesses can grow, that a country can prosper.

Today, as usual, we hear colleagues saying they are fighting for their citizens. They are fighting against the Brussels elites. They are fighting for sovereignty. But let's remind everyone: the Hungarian Government is not in the midst of that debate because they want to protect children. The Hungarian Government is in the midst of the debate because for years now they have been undermining the integrity of the political system, undermining the independence of the judiciary, clamping down on citizens' rights, threatening journalists and opposition leaders. They are caught in the midst of various corruption scandals at the highest level.

So why frame the debate like today? Why focus on underwear and lacquered leather? Because it is meant to hide the blatant lack of respect for the rule of law, for the government's incapability to solve real problems on the ground, for not being able to deliver on behalf of their citizens.

The economy is weak; inflation is still high; businesses experience numerous obstacles. And in the need for money, the Hungarian Government reaches out to China and Russia. How on earth shall that help delivering for your citizens, shall that constitute a sovereignty act?

The reality is that the government is responsible for their action and their inaction, which is the most fundamental principle of the rule of law: accountability to your citizens.

**Krzysztof Śmiszek (S&D).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Za kilkanaście dni tysiące Węgrów przejdzie ulicami Budapesztu w Marszu Równości. Będę tam razem z nimi. Przejdziemy z odwagą. Przejdziemy z godnością. Przejdziemy z dumą. Orban próbował zakazać Marszu Równości, ale odwaga i przywiązanie do demokracji węgierskich obywateli oraz determinacja burmistrza Budapesztu sprawiły, że to wydarzenie dojdzie do skutku.

Dziękuję im z tego miejsca. Dziękuję wam za obronę europejskich wartości. Ale my tutaj, w sercu Europy, nie możemy milczeć. Wolność zgromadzeń to nie jest przywilej dla wybranych. To fundament demokracji, a prawa i wolności obywatelskie przysługują każdemu – czy się to Orbanowi podoba, czy też nie.

Zwracam się więc do pana komisarza McGratha. Dziękuję, że pan tu jest dzisiaj z nami. Nie czekajmy, aż stanie się jakaś krzywda. Nie czekajmy, aż stanie się jakieś nieszczęście. Postępowania, działania prawne, presja – mamy narzędzia. Komisja mogła wystąpić o środki tymczasowe do TSUE. Pytam, czemu tego nie zrobiliśmy? Wspaniale byłoby zobaczyć Pana, Panie Komisarzu, 28 czerwca maszerującego razem z nami w Budapeszcie.

**András László (Pfe).** – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A Budapest Pride-ot szervező szervezetek az elmúlt években százmillió forintos nagyságrendben kaptak külföldi támogatásokat, a különböző egyéb támogató szervezetek milliárdos nagyságrendben. Ezek a pénzek Soros György Nyitott Társadalom Alapítványától, a Soros-hálózat egyéb szervezetektől és külföldi kormányoktól érkeztek. Csak itt, az EP-ben több tucat balliberális EP-képviselő jelentette be, hogy részt fog venni a Budapest Pride-on.

Mindezek mellett a gyülekezési szabadság alapvető szabadságjog és fontos pillére minden demokráciának, ezért különösen védendő, de nem mindenképpen elébe való. Nekünk Magyarországon a gyermekek mentális és fizikai egészsége és fejlődése az első. Erről szól a gyermekvédelmi törvényünk. Ehhez igazítottuk a gyülekezésről szóló törvényt is, és erre a különböző nemzetközi emberi jogi szerződések lehetőségét is teremtünk.

Sajnos a Pride-felvonulásokon rendszeresen előfordul, hogy szexuálisan provokatív, világnézeti szempontból sértő, vagy egyszerűen csak nem utcára való felszerelésben jelennek meg emberek, és ennek semmi köze sincsen ahhoz, hogy kinek milyen a szexuális irányultsága. Ennek mi nem akarjuk kitenni gyermekeinket. A magánéletben mindenki azt szeret, akit csak akar. A magyar törvények garantálják a megkülönböztetés tilalmát. Szóval külföldi résztvevőkkel, külföldi pénzügyi támogatással, külföldi politikai támogatással szervezni akarnak Magyarországon egy rendezvényt, amely megsértené a magyar gyermekvédelmi törvényt, amelyet a magyar emberek túlnyomó többsége támogat. Ezt tartsák tiszteltben!

(A felszólaló hajlandó válaszolni egy kékkártyás kérdésre)

**Michał Wawrykiewicz (PPE)**, *blue-card question*. – Dear colleague, I would like to ask you a question. Have you read this opinion of Advocate General from 5 June of this year, which was mentioned by the Commissioner in this case? I suppose you read it. Good. You read it.

So your colleague has just recently said that you're calling from Law and Justice that we do not understand the Treaty. You know what the Attorney General has recently said? Hungary's measures deviate significantly from the model of constitutional democracy enshrined in Article 2 of the Treaty. What would you say to that? They are not also entitled to interpret European Union law?

**András László (PFE)**, *blue-card answer*. – There's also Article 14 of the Fundamental Rights Charter, which allows for each and every country to legislate on education affairs as they wish, according to the spirit and the worldview that parents think the education their children should get. Somehow, the courts always ignore Article 14.

As I mentioned in my speech in Hungarian – perhaps the translation was not adequate – the European Convention on Human Rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights all state in clauses about freedom of assembly that there are exceptions to this, especially national security, healthcare and moral reasons.

**Rasmus Nordqvist (Verts/ALE)**. – Mr President, thank you. I am appalled and alarmed that in 2025, a European government is trying to erase LGBTIQ people from the public space. That's not law and order. It's oppression. By banning Budapest Pride, the Hungarian Government are sending a chilling message that diversity is not welcome, equality is expendable, and that censorship is preferable to democracy and freedom of speech.

That's the reality. It's also the reality we hear from the far right here today who is trying to dehumanise LGBTIQ people by calling us an ideology. But we're not. We're human beings.

I think it's very important that the LGBTIQ community of Hungary, the people of Hungary, know that we stand with them for democracy, freedom of speech and freedom to be who you are. And I think it's utmost important that the Commission step up and act to show exactly the same to the people of Hungary.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question)

**Tomasz Froelich (ESN)**, *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Vielen Dank, dass Sie die Blue Card zulassen. Ich habe eine Frage. Haben Sie sich schon mal überlegt, dass es auch viele Homosexuelle gibt, die eigentlich gar nicht wollen, dass das Ganze so öffentlich zelebriert wird, weil das ja bei vielen Leuten auch auf Ablehnung stößt, auch bei Menschen, die eigentlich gar kein Problem damit haben? Wie erklären Sie sich, dass, wenn die europäische Rechte angeblich so homophob ist, die AfD unter Homosexuellen mit 28 % die stärkste Kraft in Deutschland ist?

**Rasmus Nordqvist (Verts/ALE)**, *blue-card answer*. – This is not about what I like or don't like. This is not about what somebody else likes or doesn't like. This is about freedom of speech. It's about the freedom of assembly. It's fundamental rights in a democracy. And I find it extremely interesting that a political party elected to a democratic assembly can question democracy in that way. Extremely interesting.

**Evin Incir (S&D)**. – Mr President, welcome to 'Orbánistan', where the government has made it their primary goal to dismantle the rule of law, human rights and democracy.

Mr Orbán, being elected does not grant you the right to transform Hungary into an Iran within the EU. By attacking LGBTQI rights, women's rights, migrants and civil society, you are not much different from the mullahs in Tehran. The Hungarian people are brave and will ultimately consign you to the dustbin of history.

Patience with Orbán has long since run its course. The Commission should, without delay, make full use of its toolbox to force the Hungarian regime to correct its unlawful measures.

Meanwhile, for colleagues that believe in equality for all, let us stand with the courageous people of Hungary on 28 June as they celebrate Budapest Pride. The very first Pride was a riot defending themselves from hate and violence. Let's show Orbán that all Pride marches are powerful expressions of resilience and freedom.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señor comisario McGrath, dieciséis años de asfixiantes mayorías absolutas de un partido de ultraderecha reaccionaria en Hungría, reforzadas por las reformas de su sistema electoral, han hecho que sean irreconocibles las reglas de sujeción de Hungría, que es un Estado miembro de la Unión Europea —como no lo es ningún Estado árabe ni africano delirantemente traído a colación en esta tribuna—, de modo que ya no resulta posible reconocer en Hungría la sujeción al Derecho europeo, al Derecho europeo legislado y a la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea, cuyo artículo 21 prohíbe toda discriminación por razón de orientación sexual.

Las delirantes leyes educativas de Hungría, que prohíben la difusión de contenidos sobre orientación sexual con el pretexto de salvaguardar la infancia del contagio de una orientación sexual, ahora se ven empeoradas por la prohibición de la Marcha del Orgullo de Budapest y la amenaza de utilizar reconocimiento facial y multas de 500 € a quienes se atrevan a participar.

Por tanto, la única conclusión es la que ordenó este Parlamento Europeo en 2016: es el artículo 7 y la privación de los derechos de voto de Hungría en el Consejo.

**Chloé Ridet (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, dans mon pays, la France, on entend souvent dire: l'extrême droite, on n'a jamais essayé. Alors, je recommande à mes concitoyens qui sont de cet avis de regarder ce qu'il se passe dans la Hongrie de M. Orbán, meilleur allié européen de Marine Le Pen et de Jordan Bardella.

D'abord, la Hongrie est le pays le plus corrompu d'Europe. Des milliards de fonds européens, nos impôts, sont détournés au profit de projets inutiles ou au bénéfice des amis personnels de Viktor Orbán. D'ailleurs, son ami d'enfance, Lőrinc Mészáros, chauffagiste de métier, est désormais milliardaire et l'homme le plus riche du pays. La liberté de la presse a disparu. Les chercheurs sont censurés et pourchassés.

Qu'en est-il des travailleurs? L'extrême droite hongroise serait-elle au service des plus modestes? Certainement pas. En 2019, Orbán a donné la possibilité aux employeurs d'exiger de leurs salariés, qui sont déjà soumis à un rythme de 40 heures de travail par semaine, de pouvoir travailler jusqu'à 400 heures supplémentaires par an.

La Hongrie est aussi le cheval de Troie de Vladimir Poutine en Europe. D'ailleurs, elle le prend en exemple quand elle s'attaque aux personnes homosexuelles qui sont continuellement discriminées et pointées du doigt pour ce qu'elles sont, qui n'ont plus le droit au mariage et qui sont même désormais interdites de manifestation et de réunion.

Nous ne considérerons jamais que la protection de nos enfants passe par leur apprendre la haine et l'homophobie. Nous n'accepterons jamais que, sur le sol européen, des gens soient interdits de manifester et nous ne laisserons pas l'autoritarisme détruire l'Europe de l'intérieur. C'est pourquoi nous irons marcher à Budapest le 28 juin.

*Vystúpenia na základe prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky*

**Sebastian Tynkkynen (ECR).** – Mr President, I am a conservative man, and that image Green MEP showed does not make me gay, I already am, but I cannot endorse everything that pride in the Western world has started to promote, including the idea that children should be taught they might be in the wrong body and that we should support the mutilation of their genitals. Insanity.

I have chosen the conservatives because they have not lost their minds, unlike you on the left. Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East and the biggest Pride organiser in the world. Yet you on the left keep attacking it. Today you even came to the defence of Iran's nuclear sites. A country that imprisons women for not covering themselves and throws us gays off rooftops.

Leftists, I am not on your side because you are not on the side of us gays. We are just a toy for you. To Orbán I say, do not ban protests because I am also supporting freedom of speech.

**Alexander Jungbluth (ESN).** – Herr Präsident! In einer der Vorreden wurde der ungarische Volksaufstand aus dem Jahr 1956 angesprochen. Damals hat Ungarn die Freiheit für ganz Europa verteidigt, und die Ungarn können auch heute stolz sein, die Freiheit für uns alle zu verteidigen. Die Frage ist, ob kommunistische Panzer der größere Feind sind, als es die woken Linken in diesem Parlament sind, denn gegen Panzer haben sich damals wenigstens Erwachsene verteidigen können, gegen die Protagonisten der EU müssen dagegen sogar Kinder verteidigt werden.

Ungarn ist das Bollwerk zur Verteidigung Europas. Geben Sie sich nicht auf, denn Ungarn verteidigt uns alle!

*(Konec vystúpení na základe prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)*

**Michael McGrath, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, can I thank all of the honourable Members for their contributions to this debate? Even if the contributions were often very divergent. But that is the essence of democracy – that people have the right to express their opinion.

Fundamental rights, including the right to peaceful assembly, are enshrined in the EU Charter and must be respected and protected at all times. Fundamental rights are not a threat; they are a foundation of our democracies.

The right to peaceful assembly and the right to love whoever we choose and to be whoever we want to be are the core tenets of our democracy and pillars of our Union.

As I said in my opening remarks, we cannot ignore that this new legislation has already led to police decisions banning an LGBTIQ event, and a back and forth with the Supreme Court. I've confirmed that we are assessing this new Hungarian law and the implications that it may have under EU law.

I have confirmed to the House that the Commission services have contacted the Hungarian authorities requesting clarifications on the relevant provisions relating to facial recognition, from the perspective of personal data protection and, indeed, privacy.

I have reminded the House that the Commission has already brought an infringement case against Hungary on the child protection law, and I have put on record the essence of the opinion of the Advocate General in relation to that case. Of course, we have to await the actual judgment of the Court of Justice itself in the months ahead.

There has been mention a number of times in this debate of Article 7. At the General Affairs Council on 27 May last, I conveyed to ministers the concerns voiced in the European Parliament at the last Plenary debate regarding the rule of law situation in Hungary, including on recent legislative developments. I also made clear that the Commission shares a number of concerns raised by the European Parliament in the Article 7 procedure concerning Hungary.

As the honourable Members will be well aware, it is the Council that remains in possession of the Article 7 procedure, but the European Commission stands ready to provide whatever support and assessment that is required.

Honourable Members, we draw strength from the diversity that exists across our Union. It enriches us, in my view, and it should be celebrated and not constrained.

The Commission has already on many occasions demonstrated its steadfast commitment to upholding European Union law, and we stand ready again to use all of the tools appropriately to ensure that EU law is upheld throughout the Union, including in Hungary.

Thank you once again for providing me with the opportunity to articulate the values that underpin the European Union.

**Predsedajúci** . – Rozprava k tomuto bodu sa týmto skončila.

## **10. Safeguarding the rule of law in Spain, ensuring an independent and autonomous prosecutor's office to fight crime and corruption (debate)**

**Predsedajúci** . – A ďalším bodom programu je vyhlásenie Komisie Ochrana právneho štátu v Španielsku, zabezpečenie nezávislej a autonómnej prokuratúry na boj proti trestnej činnosti a korupcii. A na úvod by som znova poprosil za Komisiu pána komisára McGratha. Nech sa páči (2025/2759(RSP)).

**Michael McGrath**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you very much, and thank you, honourable Members. The Commission is grateful for the interest of Parliament in discussing all topics related to the rule of law.

As highlighted in the plenary debate of yesterday, the EU has increasingly recognised that a proactive approach to promoting and defending the rule of law is at the heart of its success. The rule of law cycle, with the rule of law report at its centre, has bolstered mutual trust among Member States. It has shaped a better and a shared understanding of how to cultivate an environment in which the rule of law can thrive.

In the framework of the annual rule of law report, the Commission looks across all 27 Member States at developments and reforms related to the justice systems. This includes reforms pertaining to the prosecution services in Member States.

In this context, the Commission is following the reform that is under discussion in Spain as regards the organic statute of the Public Prosecutor's Office and a draft law on judicial and prosecutorial careers. The Commission has addressed recommendations to Spain to strengthen the statute of the Prosecutor General in previous editions of the rule of law report. As follow-up to these recommendations, Spain took a number of steps.

Last year's rule of law report referred to these developments, noting, however, that several issues remained under discussion, and recommended to Spain to continue strengthening the statutes of the Prosecutor General, in particular regarding the separation of the terms of office of the Prosecutor General from that of the government.

The Commission also concluded in 2024 that Spain has made some progress to address the challenges related to the length of investigations and prosecutions to increase the efficiency in handling high-level corruption cases. It recommended that Spain should step up efforts in this regard, including by finalising the reform of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

The Commission is currently preparing the 2025 rule of law report, which we intend to present in early July. In that context, the Commission will look at the latest developments related to the draft law. In this framework, the Commission will present its assessment of the situation as it has evolved since July 2024. To inform its assessment, the Commission has gathered input from, and engaged during the country visit with, national authorities and other relevant stakeholders on the issues covered in the report, including as regards the ongoing reforms in this area.

In general terms, the Commission recalls that the organisation of national prosecution services and courts varies across the EU, and there is no single model for all Member States. This also includes the relations between the executive and the highest public prosecutors' offices, which vary from one Member State to the other.

In that context, in our work on the rule of law and in line with its methodology, we rely on common European standards, in particular the Recommendation of the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers on the role of public prosecution in the criminal justice system.

These standards acknowledge the plurality of systems possible for the organisation of prosecution services, highlighting safeguards to be considered in those frameworks, also in those national contexts where the public prosecution is part of, or subordinate to, the government. These institutional safeguards are meant to guarantee that the prosecution offices are sufficiently autonomous, and can carry out effective and impartial investigations.

Thank you for your attention, and I look forward to hearing the contributions from the honourable Members.

**Tomas Tobé**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, today we need to address something that is extremely worrying. We have come to a point where we need to be crystal clear. We have a serious problem with the rule of law in Spain: corruption, abuse of power, weakening of institutions. This House and the Commission can no longer stay silent.

The escalating corruption scandal linked to the Spanish Prime Minister, his close relatives, his party and government are, frankly speaking, unacceptable, as are the attacks on the free press, law enforcement bodies and the judges and prosecutors investigating these scandals.

Colleagues, the rule of law is not something that is optional. It does not apply to certain cases or to certain Member States. It is a foundation of our democracy and we need to defend it all over Europe.

The people of Spain deserve more than an apology. They deserve a serious commitment to rooting out corruption at the highest level of government and real accountability, because in democracy, no one – no one – is above the law. When public trust is broken, there is only one way forward; if something like this would happen in my home country, Sweden, the Prime Minister would resign and call for elections.

Please, Mr Sánchez, Prime Minister, the fiesta is over.

**Javier Moreno Sánchez**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías de la derecha y la extrema derecha: este debate no tiene sentido. España es una democracia plena, una de las veinticuatro que están reconocidas como tal en el mundo, y cuenta con un Estado de Derecho consolidado, como ha dicho el comisario. Por eso, este debate, propuesto por ustedes y consentido por sus grupos políticos europeos, no tiene cabida en esta Cámara.

Señorías: estamos en Estrasburgo, no en Madrid. Aclárense. Además, miren el respaldo europeo que tiene: bancadas vacías, sillas vacías. ¡Vaya respaldo! Pero, en fin, es verdad que llevan siete años pasando frío en la oposición, negando la legitimidad del Gobierno de España y con una estrategia de acoso y derribo en la que todo vale: bulos, desinformación, denuncias falsas, persecución... Además, es llamativo que los temas de Estado de Derecho solo se debaten en esta Cámara cuando afectan a Gobiernos socialdemócratas: eso lo dice todo.

Hoy han traído ustedes a esta Cámara, señorías de la derecha, de la extrema derecha, al fiscal general del Estado. Para que quede muy claro: esto es un caso de un ciudadano —la pareja de la presidenta de la Comunidad de Madrid— que ha defraudado a la Hacienda pública y de un investigador que investiga. Ahora bien, ustedes quieren desviar la atención del ciudadano que ha cometido el delito poniendo el foco en el investigador por una presunta filtración de la que no hay pruebas. Proteger al delincuente es una práctica habitual del PP, que incluso cesó a su propio líder, Pablo Casado, por denunciar la corrupción de su partido.

Señorías, la escuela de la corrupción es una empresa privada del Partido Popular y de la extrema derecha, sus aliados. Y en esa escuela destacan ilustres y brillantes alumnos, como el expresidente del Gobierno, Mariano Rajoy, que ha sido el único presidente del Gobierno de España censurado por la corrupción. Es más, el PP es el único partido condenado por corrupción, con numerosos dirigentes que han pasado por prisión y otros que van de camino.

Señorías, ninguna organización está libre de casos de corrupción, pero la diferencia entre ustedes y nosotros está en cómo se ataja. Ustedes destruyen pruebas a martillazo limpio y mandan mensajes de apoyo a sus corruptos. ¿Recuerdan el «sé fuerte, aguanta» de M. Rajoy al condenado Bárcenas? Ustedes protegen la corrupción; nosotros la combatimos. Nosotros actuamos con humildad y contundencia. Humildad: pidiendo perdón a la ciudadanía, concepto que como democristianos conocemos, por lo menos en teoría, pero no practican. Aprendan a pedir perdón. Contundencia: cesamos inmediatamente a quienes están bajo sospecha de corrupción. En mi partido practicamos la tolerancia cero ante la corrupción. Tolerancia cero.

Y volviendo a esta Cámara, ¿qué aportan ustedes a la sociedad y a la ciudadanía europea? Nada. Mejor dicho: solo ruido para tapar vergüenzas, fracasos y frustraciones. Nosotros sí sabemos dónde estamos. Seguimos trabajando con el Consejo y con la Comisión Europea, a la que —recuerdo— no han votado ustedes, para avanzar en esa agenda política progresista que ha situado a España en la vanguardia de los derechos sociales, crecimiento económico, creación de empleo, lucha contra el cambio climático e igualdad de género.

**Jorge Buxadé Villalba**, *en nombre del Grupo PSE*. – Señor presidente, en España no tenemos un Gobierno, tenemos una banda criminal; al mando, Pedro Sánchez, el número uno de la organización. No hay delito que no hayan cometido: su mujer, investigada por tráfico de influencias y negociaciones prohibidas con fondos públicos; su hermano, procesado por prevaricación.

Una mafia que obliga a dimitir a cuatro diputados para dar inmunidad a un socialista procesado, una red de comisiones ilegales y adjudicaciones amañadas dirigida por las dos personas de confianza del señor Pedro Sánchez, sus secretarios de organización, Ábalos y Santos Cerdán.

Una trama paralela de fraude de IVA con las compras de hidrocarburos, blanqueo de capitales y prevaricación masiva, sobrepagos en los contratos de compra de mascarillas, putas y drogas con varios ministros implicados.

Y lo peor está por venir. A nadie le sorprenderá si las investigaciones policiales nos llevan a la Venezuela del narco y del petróleo con Zapatero y Diosdado Cabello.

Y todo esto, sin embargo, no sería posible sin ustedes, sin sus pactos y componendas en Bruselas. La España decente no se merece que ustedes sigan colaborando con la banda, como han hecho hoy, aprobando un informe con la izquierda, sobre el Estado de Derecho, que oculta la corrupción de Sánchez, blanquea al autócrata y le anima a seguir asaltando la libertad de prensa y de opinión en las redes.

La España decente les exige que rompan con ellos aquí, en Bruselas, hoy mismo. Infinita distancia con los corruptos. La España decente quiere moción de censura y quiere juicios justos. Han de ir a la cárcel y devolver lo robado.

El tiempo del bipartidismo ha llegado a su fin. Los españoles quieren dictar sentencia. Ni cloacas ni puños en alto. Una España nueva y decente.

**Diego Solier**, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señor presidente, señorías, cuando en un Estado se retiran competencias a los jueces para entregárselas a los fiscales controlados por el fiscal general, puesto a dedo por el presidente del Gobierno, no hablamos de reformas, hablamos de demolición institucional: el Tribunal Constitucional, el Tribunal de Cuentas, el Consejo General del Poder Judicial, hacer dependiente al fiscal general del Estado, mandar en el Consejo de Estado, instrumentalizar el CNI, manipular la opinión pública con el CIS, usurpar el Banco de España, colonizar la CNMC, la CNMV, AENA, Radiotelevisión Española, la Agencia EFE, Red Eléctrica, Indra, Renfe, Correos, Hispasat, Telefónica y hasta Paradores. Lo que está sucediendo en España no es una crisis puntual, es un colapso deliberado del equilibrio de poderes.

Hoy apelo a los parlamentarios de todos los colores. La disciplina de partido no es un cheque en blanco, no lo fue nunca, y menos ahora, con un presidente cercado por la corrupción que usa el Estado como si fuera un cortijo. La lucha contra la corrupción es un acto individual, y lo digo por propia experiencia. Desde la sociedad civil no podemos entender que no haya 176 diputados honestos y con valores y sentimiento de Estado para parar esto. Y, mientras, en Europa, ¿cuáles son los mecanismos reales de la Unión para frenar un ataque frontal a la Constitución de uno de sus Estados miembros? ¿Vamos a quedarnos con los gestos simbólicos o vamos a defender la democracia auténtica?

Además, expreso mi más sincero reconocimiento a la UCO y a la Guardia Civil.

**Oihane Agirregoitia Martínez**, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, voy a intentar mantenerme en la esencia del tema y la defensa de la democracia, porque sinceramente no nos sentimos nada identificados e identificadas con las intervenciones que estamos viendo estos días y permítanme dudar de los intereses de la existencia de este debate en sí mismo.

Cuando la credibilidad de la política y la confianza de la ciudadanía está en juego, todos y todas debíamos intentar hacer las cosas lo mejor posible —que no es poco—, con prudencia y humildad. Y en este tema del fiscal general y la Fiscalía tenemos un informe de la Comisión Europea sobre el Estado de Derecho, con recomendaciones en relación con el Estatuto del Fiscal General y me refiero, por ejemplo, a la recomendación de disociar temporalmente los mandatos del fiscal general del Estado y del Gobierno para garantizar el cumplimiento de las normas europeas sobre independencia y autonomía.

En breve —lo decía el comisario— tendremos el nuevo informe y habrá nuevas recomendaciones. Aplíquense, por favor, para eliminar cualquier duda sobre intereses partidistas en la lucha contra el crimen y la corrupción.

**Diana Riba i Giner**, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, en 2018, Ignacio Cosidó —entonces portavoz del PP en el Senado— escribía un WhatsApp: «controlaremos la Sala Segunda del Supremo por la puerta de atrás». La misma Sala que juzgó y condenó por sedición a los líderes del Gobierno catalán.

Señorías del PP: hay que tener la cara hecha de cemento armado para que, precisamente, sean ustedes los que denuncian. Ustedes, que han utilizado y politizado el sistema judicial. Léanse, por favor, los informes del Grupo de Estados contra la Corrupción del Consejo de Europa, que llevan años alertando de la falta de independencia del sistema judicial español. Hay un problema profundo de separación de poderes. Sí, estamos hablando de jueces que se niegan a aplicar las leyes que aprueba el Parlamento. De eso estamos hablando.

Pero también hay un problema profundo de corrupción, y la ciudadanía debe de estar alucinando viendo cómo el PP y el PSOE se acusan mutuamente, porque entiendo que les suenan estos nombres: Gürtel, Nóos, Filesa, Fabra, Mercasevilla, Taula, Palma Arena, ERE, Marea, M. Rajoy... La corrupción es estructural. Señorías, que el rey emérito está exiliado por corrupción.

Por respeto a la gente: dejen de tirarse la corrupción a la cabeza y propongan reformas necesarias para proteger la democracia. Se puede gobernar sin robar. Y, hoy por hoy, nuestra exigencia es máxima con el PSOE: terminen con la corrupción, caiga quien caiga, tanto corruptos como corruptores.

**Isabel Serra Sánchez**, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señor presidente, España no es una democracia plena. El partido de los ERE en Andalucía ataca al partido de la Gürtel y, a su vez, el partido de la Púnica y de la señora Ayuso ataca al partido del caso Ábalos o del caso Santos Cerdán. Parece que están ustedes compitiendo por quién es el corrupto ejemplar, por cuál de los dos roba mejor.

Lo que hay detrás —de lo que se trata— es el caso «bipartidismo»: que tanto el Partido Popular como el Partido Socialista roban a manos llenas a la ciudadanía. Ambos, cada vez que gobiernan, demuestran que no están capacitados para hacerlo democráticamente y ambos gobiernan para grandes empresas que pagan los favores con sobres. Y miren, fíjense, mientras el bipartidismo roba de forma impune, quienes sí luchan para que en España haya una democracia plena son perseguidos. Los seis de Zaragoza, los seis de Suiza, los siete de Somosaguas, los cuatro de Rebeldía, los de Futuro Vegetal y tantas otras activistas represaliadas.

Yo misma fui condenada por movilizarme contra un desahucio con todas las pruebas en contra, porque los poderes económicos funcionan así: o te compran como al Partido Popular y al Partido Socialista o te hacen la guerra sucia judicial con las cloacas, precisamente por tratar de luchar para que haya una democracia plena en nuestro país. Pero que les quede claro que no vamos a abandonar nuestra convicción para que en nuestro país haya futuro y no lo roben.

**Dolors Montserrat (PPE)**. – Señor presidente, Pedro Sánchez es el primer y último responsable de una organización criminal corrupta en España. Es el jefe de una red de poder, dinero y silencios que implica a cargos públicos, ministros y hasta a su propia familia. Es el mayor escándalo político que ha visto este Parlamento.

Sánchez asaltó su propio partido amañando las elecciones internas. Su número dos repartía contratos —y fondos europeos— a cambio de comisiones millonarias. Su ministro de Transportes seleccionaba prostitutas, las colocaba en empresas públicas, las denigraba... y todo pagado con dinero público.

La mujer de Sánchez está investigada por tráfico de influencias y corrupción. Su hermano está procesado por malversación, prevaricación y tráfico de influencias. Una afiliada socialista, la llamada «fontanera», mantenía reuniones clandestinas para dismantlar la unidad policial que investiga la corrupción de Sánchez.

Y lo más grave: el fiscal general, elegido a dedo por Sánchez, está procesado por el Tribunal Supremo por filtrar información secreta para destruir a rivales políticos. Esto se llama corrupción de Estado y en cualquier democracia europea se pagaría con dimisión y elecciones.

Señorías socialistas y todos sus socios: no pueden seguir blanqueando más a este cobarde sin principios. Tienen hoy una gran oportunidad para reprobale en este Parlamento por tanta indecencia. No sean cómplices de esta infamia. Nadie, ni los españoles ni los europeos, nos lo merecemos.

**Evelyn Regner (S&D).** – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, we are once again witnessing a debate hijacked by national interests misusing the European Parliament for partisan gain. Frankly, it's irritating to watch the Spanish *Partido Popular* point fingers while refusing to confront their own records. From Gürtel to Bárcenas, Spain has seen institutional decay under conservative leadership. Allegedly, the PP even used the Interior Ministry to obstruct justice and block prosecutors.

Meanwhile, the current Sánchez government is acting swiftly and taking responsibility. So let's be clear: transparency isn't optional, it's the oxygen of democracy. Without it, corruption festers and accountability withers. And that's why the current Socialist government has invested in judicial reform, strengthened oversight and joined the European Public Prosecutor's Office. This is what real commitment to transparency looks like.

Independent prosecutors safeguard democracy – something the EPP, including the Spanish Members, has actually supported at European Union level. Yet the Spanish PPE blocks reforms at home. So endorsing EU oversight while blocking it domestically is like preaching fire safety while setting fires in your own backyard. It's simply hypocritical.

Fighting corruption isn't about slogans, it is about strong institutions. Too many in the EPP forget that in their scramble for power. But history shows that when conservatives weaken institutions – and therefore democracy – for their short-term gain, the far right picks up the pieces. So let's end the charade and return to the table. Not with finger-pointing, but with a shared commitment to defending democracy at home and across Europe.

*(The speaker declined to take a blue-card question from Enikő Győri)*

**Hermann Tertsch (PfE).** – Señor presidente, estoy muy de acuerdo con el Partido Popular en que aquí tenemos a los representantes de una organización criminal y de un Gobierno criminal. Sin duda. Pero ustedes han votado hoy todo con ellos, incluso para hacerle el enésimo acoso a Hungría con la Resolución sobre el informe de la Comisión sobre el Estado de Derecho.

España entera ha oído a los tres colaboradores más estrechos del jefe de Gobierno Sánchez cómo hablan de sus robos, sobornos, comisiones ilegales y prostitutas empleadas en empresas públicas. Es el hampa, con la familia Sánchez, que va sumando casos de corrupción, uno tras otro. Y llegan más grabaciones —hoy han llegado más— que implican a más ministros. O sea que esto acaba de empezar.

Ya es evidente que el PSOE es una organización criminal que ha secuestrado el Gobierno de España. Sánchez y su entorno están como el dictador Maduro: solo el poder impide que vayan a prisión. Por eso, a partir de ahora van a ser capaces de todo.

Sánchez ha secuestrado la fiscalía, la abogacía, ha corrompido a los medios, ha perseguido a periodistas, jueces y fiscales. Gracias al Partido Popular, Sánchez controla el Tribunal Constitucional para amnistiar a criminales propios y aliados. El Estado de Derecho en España, ya en ruinas, pende de un hilo. La ley Bolaños contra la independencia judicial puede ser el final, el golpe de Estado. Y todos ustedes y Von der Leyen han seguido haciendo aquí la alianza hacia allá, con toda la izquierda, en contra de la voluntad expresada en las elecciones.

**Nora Junco García (NI).** – Señor presidente, hoy vengo vestida con los colores de mi bandera porque me duele España, me duele profundamente. No puedo quedarme callada mientras mi país es saqueado desde el propio Gobierno.

Pedro Sánchez ha cruzado todas las líneas: su número dos y su número tres, imputados por corrupción; su hermano, investigado; su esposa, bajo sospecha de beneficiar a empresas amigas; y, aún así, no dimite. Pero es que no asume nada: se aferra al poder con el silencio cómplice y ha intentado manipular la justicia.

Se desacredita a la Guardia Civil, se presiona a jueces, se pisotea la independencia judicial. Esto no es una democracia saludable. Vamos en caída libre hacia un régimen autoritario. Como española, estoy indignada. Como europea, estoy alarmada de ver cómo Europa se queda mirando de brazos cruzados mientras un Estado miembro se corrompe desde dentro.

Defender España hoy es defender los principios democráticos que fundan esta Unión. Señor Sánchez, dimita: por vergüenza, por decencia y por respeto a una democracia que usted ha traicionado.

**João Cotrim De Figueiredo (Renew).** – Senhor Presidente, os atropelos do Estado de direito tanto acontecem em regimes extremistas de direita, como a Hungria, que hoje já discutimos longamente, como em regimes ditos moderados de esquerda, como a Espanha, cuja situação nos devia inspirar real preocupação.

Porque, em Espanha, o primeiro-ministro, Pedro Sanchez, põe sempre os seus interesses pessoais e políticos à frente do Estado de direito. Fez aprovar uma lei de amnistia negociada à socapa com fugitivos da justiça; exerceu pressões inaceitáveis sobre magistrados e jornalistas; entrou em «reflexão espiritual» para evitar pronunciar-se sobre problemas da sua mulher; inventou um cargo para empregar o irmão e agora é revelado o caso Koldo, um grave escândalo de corrupção envolvendo colaboradores muito próximos.

Isto não é tudo, mas já é de mais. Porque a partidarização descarada do aparelho de Estado pelo PSOE de Sanchez mina a confiança na democracia, dá força aos extremistas e paralisa o país.

Espanha está sem orçamento há dois anos e o parlamento não funciona. O resto do país também não funciona, o que já afeta outros países, como Portugal, que ainda hoje não sabe porque é que ficou sem eletricidade durante quase um dia, visto a Redeia, presidida por Beatriz Corredor, amiga de Sanchez, não ter ainda produzido um relatório sobre o apagão já lá vão quase dois meses.

Senhor Presidente, o oportunismo e o cinismo de Sanchez é perigoso para a democracia.

*(o Presidente retira a palavra ao orador)*

**Jaume Asens Llodrà (Verts/ALE).** – Señor presidente, que el Partido Popular venga hoy aquí a hablar de corrupción es como, no sé, Netanyahu hablando del pacifismo. Ustedes, que son los de «la Fiscalía te lo afina», que crearon la «policía patriótica» para perseguir adversarios, las cloacas para financiarse ilegalmente y amañar elecciones, ustedes que sí han sido calificados por los tribunales y la policía como organización criminal. Si es que tienen más de trescientos imputados o condenados por corrupción: podrían construir una cárcel solo con los del Partido Popular.

Ustedes no tienen ninguna legitimidad. Nosotros sí, porque nacimos para luchar contra su corrupción y la del Partido Socialista y en diez años no tenemos ni un solo caso de corrupción. Y desde esa legitimidad podemos decir que lo del Partido Socialista no son solo manzanas podridas o un caso aislado. Forma parte de una misma cultura de poder que comparte con el Partido Popular: la del bipartidismo de un régimen monárquico del 78, de ese bloque inmobiliario y financiero donde están las élites políticas y los constructores que se han forrado a costa de lo que es de todos.

Por eso, hoy hace falta algo más que palabras y ceses. Hace falta una regeneración democrática —no solo cosmética—, transparencia y ejemplaridad. Solo así recuperaremos la confianza de la ciudadanía.

**Lena Düpont (PPE).** – Mr President, dear colleagues, the rule of law is based, among other things, on the integrity of democratic processes, on the fight against corruption, on proper checks and balances and accountability in decision-making processes.

So where are we? We have 154 so-called 'royal decrees' being pushed through the parliament. We have reports about warning signs of a growing irrelevance of the parliament. We have smear campaigns against Guardia Civil officers investigating corruption, which means they do not only have the backing of the government for that important job. In fact, they are targeted because they are doing their job, further undermining the fight against corruption by not only not being on the forefront of investigation and prosecution, but being in the midst of numerous scandals involving the highest level of allegations themselves. Selling amnesty as a political tool, putting independent judges and prosecutors under pressure, undermining checks and balances further by draft laws on the judiciary, sparking not only protests by judges and prosecutors associations, but treating their rightful criticism in a way that actually five out of seven associations call now for a strike.

Above all, instead of being at the forefront of accountability, the government now faces thousands on the streets demanding exactly that accountability, while the government decides to attack opposition leaders. This is not only a worrying trend here, it is a call to action by all of us here in the House, in Spain and in the Commission.

**Francisco Assis (S&D).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, aqui há uns anos atrás, quando se realizou um referendo na Catalunha, ergueram-se várias vozes aqui no Parlamento Europeu, pondo em causa a democracia espanhola. E eu, na altura, levantei-me e fiz uma intervenção dizendo que nós podíamos concordar ou discordar da forma como o governo de Mariano Rajoy estava a lidar com a questão catalã, mas que em nenhuma circunstância tínhamos legitimidade para pôr em causa o caráter democrático da Espanha. E elogiei até o processo de transição democrática em Espanha.

E, hoje, venho aqui dizer exatamente a mesma coisa; a Espanha é um grande país democrático, a Espanha é uma das grandes democracias da Europa.

Há um plano do confronto político entre os partidos que é normal e natural e ocorre em todos os países. Ocorre também no meu país. Faz parte da democracia.

Agora, o problema das nossas democracias é quando os partidos de centro começam a comportar-se como partidos radicais. Não me espanta nada do que a extrema-direita diz. Nada me espanta. Para a extrema-direita, o grande delito criminal em Espanha é simples: é a esquerda estar no governo.

A esquerda governar é para a extrema-direita, já em si mesmo, um delito criminal, porque se eles verdadeiramente mandassem, a esquerda não estava a governar, estava na cadeia, como sempre estive no período do franquismo, e como estive em muitos países da Europa sempre que a extrema-direita governou. Essa é que é a diferença.

Mas o Partido Popular é um outro partido. O Partido Popular é um partido fundador, com o PSOE, da democracia espanhola. O Partido Popular governou durante muitos anos e, portanto, não venho aqui fazer nenhuma referência às situações de corrupção deste ou daquele. Quando há corrupção, ela tem de ser enfrentada. Quando há corrupção, esta tem, evidentemente, de ser tratada de forma adequada.

Mas virem dizer que em Espanha está em causa o Estado de direito democrático? Eu leio todos os dias a imprensa espanhola e vejo muitos jornais que são altamente críticos em relação ao governo. Quem olha para a imprensa espanhola todos os dias vê ataques brutais ao primeiro-ministro Pedro Sánchez, como, aliás, no meu país não acontece. Devo dizer que no meu país isso não acontece nos mesmos termos em que acontece em Espanha. O debate político em Espanha é um debate mais polarizado do que é em Portugal. Pode ser que um dia seja diferente.

Vamos às redes sociais e vemos a mesma coisa. Está em curso um processo de alteração do sistema judicial que está em linha com o que se passa pela Europa fora.

Portanto, é absolutamente («...»)

*(o Presidente retira a palavra ao orador)*

**Petra Steger (Pfe).** – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Die EU-Rechtsstaatlichkeit – *rule of law* –, das ist in Wahrheit nichts anderes als Heuchelei und Doppelmoral mit EU-Stempel, ein politisches Druckmittel gegen unlieb-same patriotische Regierungen. Genau das sieht man am Beispiel Spanien. Denn während wir hier ein Ungarn-Bashing in Dauerschleife erleben, drückt die EU in Spanien beide Augen zu und steckt den Kopf schon viel zu lange in den Sand. Das, was wir derzeit in Spanien erleben, ist kein Einzelfall mehr – das ist Staatskorruption auf höchster Ebene.

Premier Sánchez hat seine Macht mit einem Amnestiehandel an Separatisten erkaufte. Seine Familie ist in Korruptionsaf-fären verstrickt. Die Justiz wird offen manipuliert. Und was macht die Europäische Kommission? Genau – gar nichts! Während Viktor Orbán von Ihnen mit Kampagnen überzogen wird und Milliarden an Geldern rechtswidrig zurückge-halten werden, schauen Sie bei Sánchez gezielt weg. Während Journalisten, Richter und Ermittler behindert werden, halten Sie weiter schützend die Hand über Sánchez. Warum? Weil es sich bei Sánchez um einen proeuropäischen Sozialdemokraten handelt. Genau deswegen!

Wer EU-konform ist, der wird verschont. Sie brauchen nie wieder von europäischen Werten zu sprechen. Sie beweisen jedes Mal aufs Neue, dass Sie absolut ungläubwürdig sind.

**Siegfried Mureşan (PPE).** – Mr President, colleagues, Commissioners, Prime Minister Pedro Sánchez came to power by breaching the rule of law through his amnesty law. Now we are all witnessing that Prime Minister Pedro Sánchez wants to stay in power even more by further weakening the rule of law and by encouraging and tolerating the people around him, who are breaking the rule of law.

The rule of law, dear colleagues, means that the government does not control the judiciary. And if people close to the Prime Minister break the law, the obligation of the Prime Minister is to defend the law, not to defend his friends. Close friends, companions of the Prime Minister of Spain are involved in corruption cases. They are misusing European funds and this is a matter which Commissioner colleagues should concern all European institutions.

Whoever receives European funds should defend European values and we as a European Parliament want the people of Spain to receive as many funds as possible. Spain is one of the main beneficiaries of European funds. But unfortunately, the Prime Minister of Spain, through his deliberate actions against the rule of law, poses a risk to the people of Spain continuing to receive European funds.

If Spain and the Spanish Government continues on this track, I am afraid that sooner or later the European funds for the people of Spain will be put into question. We do not want this to happen. We want the people of Spain to benefit from all that Europe has to offer. But clearly, the actions of the Prime Minister are a risk in that sense. Spain deserves better. The people of Spain deserve better.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question)*

**Maria Grapini (S&D),** *întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonaşului albastru”.* – Stimate coleg, nu am înţeles, aţi spus că domnul Sánchez a ajuns la putere ilegal. Eu ştiam că a fost ales prin legea amnistiei. Puteţi să-mi explicaţi cum poate să ajungă ilegal pentru faptul că a dat o lege a amnistiei? Asta este 1 şi 2, legat de fondurile europene, ştiţi mai bine că sunteţi în comisia de buget, fondurile europene sunt controlate, există control. Eu sunt la Comisia pentru control bugetar, cum poate să fie vinovat, de exemplu, un prim-ministru, un preşedinte, dacă cumva cineva utilizează incorect fondurile europene?

**Siegfried Mureşan (PPE),** *răspuns la o întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonaşului albastru”.* – În primul rând, domnul Sánchez şi partidul său au pierdut alegerile în Spania, ei nu au câştigat alegerile. Au reuşit să formeze o majoritate parlamentară, obţinând sprijinul separatiştilor catalani, care de altfel încălcaseră Constituţia Spaniei prin referendumul de independenţă al Cataloniei. Au reuşit să obţină sprijinul lor politic, oferind o lege amplă de amnistiere a multor fapte care au constat în încălcări ale legislaţiei spaniole în cadrul aceluia referendum, dar şi multe alte fapte, inclusiv de corupţie.

**Sandro Ruotolo (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parlare oggi del governo spagnolo sembra più una mossa strumentale del Partito popolare che una reale preoccupazione per lo Stato di diritto in Spagna. Il Partito popolare ha provato in tutti i modi a delegittimare il governo socialista: *fake news* e disinformazione.

Allora, colgo l'occasione per ringraziare il Presidente Pedro Sánchez. Davanti a notizie gravi non ha esitato e ha intanto chiesto scusa ai cittadini e ottenuto le dimissioni del numero tre del PSOE. Questo è coraggio politico.

Un coraggio che manca invece ai popolari spagnoli, che in questi giorni stanno tentando di distogliere l'attenzione da un grave scandalo di frode che coinvolge il compagno della presidente della Comunità di Madrid, guidata, guarda caso, dal Partito popolare spagnolo.

Il tema della corruzione riguarda tutti, chi più e chi meno: destra, centro, sinistra, nessuno escluso. Dobbiamo essere noi, prima della magistratura, a far suonare i campanelli d'allarme.

Vogliamo parlare del governo di Giorgia Meloni, che abolisce l'abuso di ufficio, un reato spia per corruzione? Del torturatore libico Almasri, ricercato dalla Corte penale internazionale, arrestato in Italia e riconsegnato a Tripoli con un volo di Stato? Mezzo governo è indagato per questo.

E che dire di Carlo Fidanza, capo delegazione di Fratelli d'Italia al Parlamento europeo? Ha patteggiato una condanna a un anno e quattro mesi per corruzione. O della ministra del Turismo, Santanchè, sotto processo per falso in bilancio, bancarotta e truffa? Del sottosegretario Delmastro, del sottosegretario Sgarbi? L'elenco è incompleto. Mi devo fermare per questioni di tempo.

Smettiamola perciò di usare le aule parlamentari come armi contro l'avversario politico. Affrontiamo la crisi dello Stato di diritto in Europa, dove stiamo pericolosamente arretrando. Come selezioniamo le classi dirigenti? Dobbiamo rispondere a questa domanda.

## PRÉSIDENCE: YOUNOUS OMARJEE

*Vice-Président*

**Enikő Győri (PSE).** – Señor presidente, señorías, en España, desde hace años, no pasa un día sin un escándalo de corrupción vinculado al Gobierno socialista, a la familia Sánchez o al PSOE.

El Poder Judicial está bajo presión, la Fiscalía está bajo las órdenes políticas y la Constitución ya no es sacrosanta para la izquierda. La Fiscalía Europea ha tramitado más de 311 notificaciones en España, por un valor de 2 800 millones de euros en perjuicios. El Tribunal de Cuentas Europeo afirma que ha detectado graves problemas en el uso de fondos europeos. ¿Y la respuesta de Bruselas? Pues... ninguna.

¿Y qué pasa si gobiernan los conservadores? Te quitan los fondos y organizan un debate sobre ti en el Pleno cada mes, como pasa con mi patria, Hungría. Los polacos ya han aprendido. Si votan siguiendo el gusto de Bruselas, les dan el dinero. Esto se llama hipocresía y política de doble rasero.

Y como está muy de moda dar consejos políticos, yo tengo uno para el PP: que tenga el coraje de ir a las urnas, para que los españoles puedan elegir un nuevo Ejecutivo.

*(La oradora acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»)*

**Gabriella Gerzsenyi (PPE), kékkártyás kérdés.** – Nagyon örülök, hogy Képviselőasszony ilyen örömmel fogadja el tőlem a kérdést. Hogyha nem tudnánk, hogy most a Spanyolországról szóló vitán vagyunk, és ha nem hallottuk volna Önt éppen spanyolul beszélni, akár azt is gondolhattuk volna, hogy Magyarországról beszél, hiszen napi szinten kerülnek elő botrányok az Orbán-kormány korrupciójáról. Úgyhogy rendkívül érdekelné minket, hogy miért van az, hogy más országokkal kapcsolatban felvetik ezt a problémát, miért veszik észre más országokban a rendellenességet, és nem a saját házuk táján sepregetnek és teszik tisztába az ügyeket?

**Enikő Győri (PFE), kékkártyás válasz.** – Köszönöm a kérdését. Ön is nagyon jól tudja, hogy Magyarországon az igazságszolgáltatás rendkívül keményen kezeli a korrupciót. Voltak ügyek, és azok a megfelelő eljárás alatt vannak, és aki börtönben kell, hogy legyen, az ott van. Ha Önnek van bármilyen üggyről tudomása, kérem, menjen el, tegyen feljelentést a rendőrségen, és biztos lehet benne, hogy lesz megfelelő igazságszolgáltatás. A vádaskodásnak, az általános vádaskodásnak, amit itt megéltünk az előző vitában, annak semmi helye. Egyébként meg lehetne állapodni, hogy a belpolitikáról mindenki a saját háza táján rendelkezzen, és a magyar választópolgárok döntsenek arról, hogy tetszik nekik a kormány, vagy nem.

**Michał Wawrykiewicz (PPE).** – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, I am an external observer of this situation in Spain, from the country where the rule of law was devastated for years. I am truly saddened to have to admit that the state of the rule of law in Spain raises the most serious concerns. There comes a moment where the silence becomes complicity.

Today in Spain, the rule of law is not only eroding, it is being dismantled from within, because it is about the Prime Minister. We see a Prime Minister, Sánchez, whose right-hand man has been caught on tape negotiating kickbacks, whose own wife and brother are under corruption charges.

How does the Government respond? By launching smear campaigns against prosecutors, by declaring judges the real opposition, by tabling laws that retroactively protect those in power, and by politically motivated conversion of substitute judges into a permanent one.

Tell me it is not true. Convince me. Prove me I'm wrong, because you haven't done it yet during this debate.

Let us be clear. This is not governance. This is a systematic abuse of institutions for personal and political gain. The European Union cannot afford to be naive.

When a government instrumentalises justice, when it compromises its own courts, and when it writes amnesty laws to blur accountability, it is no longer fit to lead a democratic nation. Spain deserves better. Europe demands better.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question)*

**Nicolás González Casares (S&D), pregunta de «tarjeta azul».** – Usted sabe que la presidenta de la Comunidad de Madrid fue acusada por un caso de corrupción y que cambiaron al señor Casado por el señor Feijóo. Esa presidenta de la Comunidad de Madrid actualmente tiene un problema porque su pareja es un defraudador de Hacienda confeso y ella vive en un ático de su pareja. Pero lo que ocurre es que la número tres de la señora Ayuso, de la presidenta de la Comunidad de Madrid, está encausada. El número tres del PSOE ha sido encausado y ha dimitido y se le ha hecho dimitir de todos sus cargos. Pero esta señora, que es la número tres de la señora Ayuso, no ha dimitido. ¿Qué opinión le merece? ¿Y qué opinión le merece que el líder actual del Partido Popular se pasee en un barco con un narcotraficante? ¿Qué opinión le merece eso?

**Michał Wawrykiewicz (PPE), blue-card answer.** – Mr President, as far as I understand it, today we are discussing the rule-of-law crisis in Spain, and we are discussing what the government is doing, what the Prime Minister is doing. And here I have the article from *El Mundo*, which describes very precisely all of these issues, that I deliver to you. So this is my answer to your question!

**Evin Incir (S&D).** – Mr President, it is a shame how the EPP and the far-right are using our democratic House in their witch-hunt against the socialist government, one of the most successful governments as regards civil rights and social rights. The allegations against the sitting government are serious and should be handled as such and, by all indications, that is also what is happening. Prime Minister Pedro Sánchez acted forcefully as soon as the allegations against the former organisation and secretary of PSOE was brought to the table and expelled him from the party, as well as deprived him from the positions he had, while the PP in Spain has acted shamefully.

Colleagues, it is a shame to politicise such a serious situation, especially when the Prime Minister acted as a decent person should act. Furthermore, according to the Rule of Law Index, Spain is above the United States, on the 25th spot in the global ranking. So, what are we actually talking about here? We are spending the Parliament's time on political smear campaigns, not actually concern or debate about the state of the Union. The right and the far-right are only pretending to be concerned about the rule of law, only pretending to be.

If the right and the far-right was actually worried about the rule of law, we would be discussing the fact that, according to the same Rule of Law Index, where Spain is ranked number 25, Hungary is on spot 73, in the bottom half of the ranking, below Kazakhstan, and with the same score as Sri Lanka. We might have been discussing as well Greece, which has the same score as Georgia, and Croatia is only narrowly better. The situation in Slovakia is deteriorating rapidly. - There is no credibility behind the empty words and dishonest gestures of EPP and the far-right.

*(The speaker declined to take a blue-card question from François-Xavier Bellamy)*

**Csaba Dömötör (PFE).** – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Az itteni nagykoalíció számára kétféle kormány létezik. Az egyikfélét állandóan előveszik, és mindenféle eljárásokat indítanak ellenük. Ezek általában jobboldali kormányok.

Aztán vannak kiskedvenc kormányok. Ők hogy, hogy nem, mindig baloldaliak, és úgy látszik, hogy mindent megtehetnek.

Ezek közé tartozik a spanyol kormány. Újabb és újabb botrányok kerülnek nyilvánosságra a Sanchez-kormány viselt dolgairól. Egy 500 oldalas jelentés szerint egy valóságos szervezett bűnözési hálózat fonta körbe a kabinetet: prostitúció, hangfelvételek, venezuelai eszközök, minden van.

S mi erre a spanyol kormány válasza? Támadja a médiumokat, és támadja a bíróságokat.

Ugyanez megy Lengyelországban. A lengyel kormány figyelmen kívül hagyja a bírósági döntéseket, eltávolítanak bírókat, és jobboldali médiumok engedélyét függesztik fel.

Ezek az esetek ismertek. Mégis, hogyha kiskedvenc kormányokról van szó, valahogy sohasem indulnak jogállamisági eljárások. Miért?

Azért, mert ebben a házban a jogállamiság valójában a nyomásgyakorlás eszköze.

De hiába, a Patriótákat nem tudják megállítani, mint ahogy a Voxot sem Spanyolországban.

**Sebastião Bugalho (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, há uma semana, Espanha e Portugal celebraram a sua adesão ao projeto europeu. É justo dizer que esse aniversário não existiria sem os dois partidos populares e os dois partidos socialistas que fundaram as nossas democracias.

Num caminho com diferenças, mas muito em comum, há uma marca que nos aproxima e que distingue a nossa pertença europeia, o nosso internacionalismo, a nossa preocupação não apenas conosco, mas com aqueles que nos rodeiam.

Na crise democrática vivida em Espanha, é isso que está em jogo. Um governo cuja Lei de Amnistia foi dada como ilegal pela Comissão Europeia. Um primeiro-ministro que recusa eleições por negar o seu futuro resultado. Um governo que descreve juízes como membros da oposição e que nomeia ministros para a Procuradoria-Geral do Estado.

Tudo isto já não é só uma ameaça à democracia espanhola, é uma tragédia no seio da União Europeia, que tem como primeiro critério, para quem quer fazer parte dela, o cumprimento do Estado de direito. É um atentado à natureza desta União e, sobretudo, ao exemplo que os seus Estados devem dar lá fora.

Senhor Presidente, quando um partido do governo falha a Espanha europeia, não é Espanha que está a mais na Europa é o partido que está a mais no governo.

Citando uma carta recente: «enfrentamos uma operação de demolição moral com perigo para a democracia». O autor da carta é o autor da demolição.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Señor presidente, toda mi vida he combatido toda corrupción con un compromiso beligerante. Lo hice como ministro de Justicia, promoviendo reformas penales y la lucha contra el blanqueo y desplegando la actual Fiscalía Anticorrupción, pero eso no me impide rechazar esa cacofonía ofensiva tan injusta contra el Gobierno de España; una y otra vez estas derechas y ultraderechas emperradas en arrastrar la reputación de España ante este Parlamento Europeo.

Lo hacen quienes tienen entre sus filas a tres ministros de Aznar condenados a prisión, además de otro más en espera de juicio por crear una policía patriótica contra sus adversarios. Y tan solo en un año habrá otros treinta procesos penales con 150 imputados del Partido Popular.

Pero esto es ruido, que quiere impedir que razonemos y distingamos la diferencia entre la verdad y la mentira, la calumnia, la falsedad.

Y la Justicia, y la instrumentalización de la Justicia, nos lleva a un ejemplo. Hay un proceso penal en España: la Justicia Penal investiga el negocio consumado por la pareja de la presidenta de la comunidad autónoma de Madrid —del Partido Popular— en plena pandemia de la COVID-19 por corrupción, fraude fiscal y falsedad documental, que son delitos graves. Pero, por desmontar las mentiras de este sujeto contra la Fiscalía, el fiscal general del Estado ha sido acusado por revelar la verdad. Y lo de menos es que el proceso penal contra el fiscal general no sea firme y haya sido recurrido, ni que haya sido criticado por juristas y exmagistrados del Tribunal Supremo, ni que se hayan ignorado todos los testigos de descargo, ni que se hable de «instrucciones de Moncloa» sin una sola prueba, ni que en España las filtraciones judiciales tengan lugar todos los días sin que haya consecuencias penales.

No, lo más grave es esta saña incesante de las derechas y de las extremas derechas contra España, que nunca dicen ni una sola palabra sobre lo que realmente importa: crecimiento económico y empleo, convivencia democrática en Cataluña, financiar a las comunidades autónomas para la vivienda, una financiación de la defensa que no...

*(el presidente retira la palabra al orador)*

*(El orador se niega a que François-Xavier Bellamy le formule una pregunta con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»)*

**Fabrice Leggeri (Pfe).** – Monsieur le Président, alors que le Qatargate a élaboussé la gauche européenne, c'est aujourd'hui au tour du pouvoir socialiste espagnol d'être au centre d'un scandale majeur de corruption.

Un récent rapport d'enquête de près de 500 pages a mis en évidence un système généralisé de pots-de-vin entre des proches du premier ministre socialiste Pedro Sanchez et des entrepreneurs. Toutefois, l'affaire ne s'arrête pas là: son épouse est elle-même visée par une enquête pour trafic d'influence, son frère est renvoyé en justice dans une autre affaire liée au parti socialiste, et comble du cynisme, le ministère public, dirigé par une personnalité aujourd'hui elle-même inculpée, a systématiquement pris leur défense.

Si la Commission européenne prétend défendre l'état de droit, qu'elle commence par balayer devant la porte de ses alliés socialistes, au lieu d'en faire une arme contre les gouvernements de droite. Quant à Olivier Faure, toujours prompt à faire la leçon à mon parti, qu'il ait au moins la décence de condamner les agissements de son allié espagnol au Parlement européen.

**François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE).** – Monsieur le Président, un simple rappel au règlement pour dire que, depuis tout à l'heure, nos collègues socialistes – les électeurs socialistes et les citoyens espagnols ont le droit de le savoir – défilent à cette tribune pour diffamer sans aucune raison...

*(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)*

**Le Président.** – Non, c'est une intervention désolé, ce n'est pas un point d'ordre. Nous poursuivons. Non, vous avez eu deux cartons bleus refusés, je comprends que vous souhaitiez parler, il y a la procédure *catch-the-eye*, je vous demande de vous inscrire.

**Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE).** – Señor presidente, señor comisario, necesitaría, al menos, una hora para poder enumerar los ataques de Pedro Sánchez contra el Estado de Derecho en España, pero tan solo dispongo de un minuto. Un minuto para denunciar que España está viviendo una crisis de gravedad sin precedentes: un fiscal general del Estado procesado por sus injerencias políticas —procesado—; jueces y fiscales que están abocados a una huelga histórica ante el asalto que están sufriendo; un Gobierno que persigue a los jueces que investigan los trapicheos de la familia del presidente; un Partido Socialista que ha tratado de decapitar la unidad anticorrupción de la Guardia Civil, que estaba investigando sus prácticas mafiosas... por no hablar de la escandalosa trama de mordidas y sobornos de los máximos dirigentes socialistas.

España está llegando al límite. Las costuras institucionales de nuestro país están a punto de reventar. Es hora de poner pie en pared frente a la corrupción y la degradación institucional de Sánchez. Y, sobre todo, las instituciones europeas no pueden seguir tolerando...

*(el presidente retira la palabra al orador)*

**Juan Carlos Girauta Vidal (PFE).** – Señor presidente, el señor Zoido, que me ha precedido en el uso de la palabra, era ministro del Interior, un buen ministro del Interior, cuando se dio el golpe de Estado de los actuales socios del señor - Sánchez. Con ellos llegó al poder. Con ellos ganó la moción de censura. Con ellos ha pactado unas elecciones que perdió para poder seguir gobernando.

Lo que hay en España es indescriptible. El Partido Socialista Obrero Español no es lo que ustedes creen —si es que han hablado de buena fe algunos de ustedes—: es una trama de corrupción, es corrupción pura, es amiguismo, nepotismo, intereses personales, y además, cada vez que un juez se atreve a actuar contra ellos o a investigarlos, lo que hacen es pasar al ataque personal contra ese juez.

Han puesto al frente del Tribunal Constitucional a un personaje que se dedica a entrar en el fondo de los asuntos que han sido juzgados por el Tribunal Supremo, que son firmes y que no se pueden volver a juzgar. Es, insisto, indescriptible. Si ustedes creen que Europa no debe preocuparse de una situación como esa, no tenemos la misma idea de Europa.

*(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»)*

**François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE), question «carton bleu».** – Pardonnez-moi cher collègue, ma question ne s'adresse pas à vous, elle s'adresse aux députés socialistes qui, depuis tout à l'heure, font tout pour fuir les questions que nous voulons...

*(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)*

**Le Président.** – Non, Monsieur Bellamy, vous posez la question à la personne qui s'exprime à la tribune. Donc merci de jouer le jeu du règlement et merci d'adresser la question à notre collègue Girauta Vidal.

**David Casa (PPE).** – Sur President, kelli diskors preparat però se nbiddlu.

Nixtieq nifhem ir-raġuni vera għalfejn il-Partit Soċjalista Ewropew dejjem jiddefendi politiċi korrotti. Hekk għamiltu fuq Joseph Muscat. Illum tisthu. L-ex Prim Ministru Malti, wiehed mill-iktar politiċi korrotti fid-dinja. Illum tisthu. Għaliex? Għaliex Joseph Muscat ukoll kien ġie jgħidilna sorry. Kien qalilna sorry, imma l-poplu Malti ħareġ jipprotesta fit-toroq u l-poplu Malti sfurzah barra u illum Joseph Muscat m'għadux il-Prim Ministru ta' Malta.

Il-Prim Ministru Sanchez għandu jagħmel l-istess. Il-korruzzjoni hija hażina, hija serq mill-poplu tagħkom, hija serq anke mill-poplu Spanjol. Il-korruzzjoni toqtol, il-korruzzjoni qatlet lil Daphne Caruana Galizia u kontu tiġu hawn, il-Partit Soċjalista Ewropew, tiddefendu lil Joseph Muscat, li tahtu nqatlet ġurnalista għax kienet qed titkellem kontra l-korruzzjoni. Imisskom tisthu. Anke qed tagħmlu disservizz kbir lejn il-poplu Spanjol.

Jien nirrispetta l-poplu Spanjol. Komplu pprotestaw fit-toroq għax bil-protesti tagħkom għada l-Prim Ministru Sanchez ikun sfurzta jirreżenja: postu mhux Prim Ministru, postu jiffaċċja l-gustizzja.

**Ana Miguel Pedro (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, quantos escândalos cabem num só governo antes de deixar de ser governo e se tornar simplesmente num mecanismo de autoproteção?

Quando juízes, procuradores e o próprio Supremo Tribunal levantam a voz, não é formalismo institucional.

O Estado de direito, meus senhores, não se negocia, não se adapta aos caprichos dos que estão no poder.

Em Espanha, Sánchez chefia um esquema de sobrevivência onde a lealdade se compra com amnistias e o silêncio se recompensa com impunidade.

Não é governo, é captura.

Señor presidente, España se ha convertido en un teatro donde la corrupción no se niega, se relativiza; el delito no se comete, se interpreta. Y el Estado de Derecho, ese viejo pilar de la democracia europea, ya no es más que un adorno institucional y vacío.

La democracia espera suspendida como quien observa, con cierta vergüenza, que nadie se atreva a poner fin a la farsa. Porque los españoles lo saben: la justicia no es amnistía, y mucho menos impunidad. Cuando la Justicia es manipulada desde dentro, deja de ser un asunto interno de España para convertirse en una crisis europea.

Señorías, de aquel famoso club del PSOE solo queda un hombre por caer: Pedro Sánchez.

**Dirk Gotink (PPE).** – Mr President, colleagues, Spain's democratic decay has been ignored by the EU for too long. For the first time in EU history, a sitting general prosecutor is being sent to trial for leaking confidential information to damage the opposition and to protect the Prime Minister's narrative. After ignoring the Constitution to stay in power, we see now that Sanchez is also ready to undermine the foundation of our liberal democracies, namely the separation of powers. This is alarming because this is not just a judicial error, but a deliberate political strategy to undermine the independence of the judiciary.

The reality is that the Spanish Prime Minister embodies a new type of threat to the rule of law, Commissioner, one that is pro-European, progressive and liberal, but against the rule of law. Instead of confrontation, we see smiles and selfies with the EU. But behind the cover of Spanish domestic politics, we see democratic decay. The European Commission should not be fooled by this pro-European façade, and treat this with the same seriousness as other rule of law breaches.

Dear Commissioner, no double standards.

**Andrey Kovatchev (PPE).** – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, Spain is a beautiful country, close to my heart, and a great example for a peaceful transition to democracy. And this is why I have observed with big sadness the very serious, ongoing scandals over the past few years which have come to light involving people around Prime Minister Sánchez.

The media report includes misuse of the Prosecutor's Office, political interference in legal processes, the leaking of confidential information, and they are spread through the whole government. It seems they are not only isolated incidents, it's a clear pattern.

We see thousands of Spanish people going onto the streets in protest across the country, demanding justice and accountability. Spaniards are calling for the resignation of this government, early elections and return to proper democratic order. Justice should be universal and everybody should be equal before the law. Prosecutors must be independent. Judges must be free from pressure and apolitical.

Mr Commissioner, the European Commission must also show that they are hearing the voices of thousands of Spanish citizens calling for respect of the rule of law. Mr Sánchez should do the same, like the former Portuguese Prime Minister, Costa, who resigned and opened the way for early elections in his country.

I wish from the bottom of my heart success and prosperity for Spain. Thank you very much, and viva España.

**Javier Zarzalejos (PPE).** – Señor presidente, señor comisario. Estado de Derecho en España: bien, en septiembre del año pasado, el presidente del Gobierno afirmó públicamente que estaba dispuesto a gobernar sin el Parlamento.

Dicho y hecho: el Gobierno lleva dos años sin presentar el proyecto de Ley de Presupuestos Generales del Estado al Parlamento, a pesar de la obligación constitucional de hacerlo. Ha batido todos los récords en la producción de decretos, con más de 150 desde que el señor Sánchez es presidente. El decreto ley se ha convertido en la fuente ordinaria de producción legislativa.

Pedro Sánchez es presidente en virtud de un pacto político por el cual concedió la amnistía a los condenados y acusados por sedición y malversación, cuyo apoyo necesitaba para gobernar. El Consejo General del Poder Judicial ha tenido que salir en defensa de jueces que investigan casos de corrupción ante los ataques calumniosos del Gobierno.

Y es que el hermano del presidente del Gobierno se encuentra procesado por tráfico de influencias y prevaricación y la esposa del presidente del Gobierno está siendo investigada por tráfico de influencias, corrupción en los negocios, apropiación indebida e intrusismo profesional. Es que los dos últimos secretarios de Organización del Partido Socialista, número dos efectivo en la jerarquía, están siendo investigados ante el Tribunal Supremo por organización criminal y cohecho. Y es que el fiscal general del Estado ha sido procesado por el Tribunal Supremo por un delito de revelación de secretos y sigue en su puesto. Las asociaciones profesionales ya se han pronunciado contra las reformas que quiere introducir el Gobierno.

Pero ¿saben cuál es su problema, señores del Partido Socialista y de sus socios? Que va a venir más. Y ustedes no saben exactamente cuánto más va a salir.

*Interventions à la demande*

**José Cepeda (S&D).** – Señor presidente, ¡qué mal, señores del Partido Popular de España, les ha salido este debate! Pero, ¿cómo se atreven a venir aquí a hablar de corrupción en España y a manchar la imagen pública de todos los españoles?

Yo llevo veinte años trabajando contra la corrupción. Desde Madrid me he enfrentado a cualquier corrupto de cualquier partido, de cualquier color, en España, y ahora también desde Europa lo tengo que decir en voz alta. Pero, ¿ustedes —el Partido Popular de España— van a venir a darnos clase de corrupción? ¿Ustedes, señor Zoido? ¿Ustedes, señora Montserrat? Pero, bueno, si ustedes tenían de líder de la oficina de defensa contra los corruptos en su partido al señor Pradas, que acaba de ser sentenciado en firme a siete años de cárcel por corrupción.

Ustedes —la Comunidad de Madrid, el mayor foco de corrupción de España, liderada por el Partido Popular—, ¿hablan de familias? ¿Hablan de corruptos? Por favor, háganselo mirar y no vuelvan a traer aquí un debate que es estrictamente nacional, porque... ¿saben lo que les digo? No vamos a parar de denunciar lo que ustedes han hecho, también en Madrid, en toda España.

**András László (Pfe).** – Mr President, socialists, liberals and Greens somehow always get away with corruption. This was the case of socialists in Qatargate. This is the case of former Commissioner Reynders, a liberal. This is the case of former Commissioner Timmermans and the green NGOs.

All of these corruption scandals are swept under the rug because of the political alliance of the EPP socialists and the liberals. This makes the EPP and Partido Popular a hostage to Pedro Sanchez's corruption in Spain. But another topic.

Üdvözlöm a Tisza EP-képviselőit újra a Parlamentben! Itt voltak a délelőtti vitán, itt voltak a délutáni vitán, de délben nem jöttek be szavazni. Akkor, amikor a Magyarországnak járó uniós forrásokról szavaztunk. Akkor, amikor a Magyarország ellen folyó 7-es cikkelyes eljárás lezárásáról szavaztunk. A brüsszeli pártjuk pedig mindenben Magyarország ellen szavazott, ahogyan kérték tőlük. Kollár Kinga biztosan így is nagyon örül neki. Szégyelljék magukat!

**Sebastian Tynkkynen (ECR).** – Mr President, it has been extremely disturbing to learn about the serious accusations of corruption and abuse of power on behalf of the leftist government in Spain. It is disgraceful that these kinds of acts still take place in Member states. Such actions should have no place in a democratic society. They pose a serious threat to the rule of law and undermine the legitimacy of democratic institutions.

We live in an era of significant geopolitical turmoil. It is imperative that citizens can trust elected representatives to defend their interests and help them through these difficult times. What we have witnessed in the Spanish Government is the exact opposite. It is called betraying your people. I call for all those involved to take responsibility and answer for their crimes.

**Lukas Sieper (NI).** – Señor presidente, queridas personas de Europa, todos estamos de acuerdo: quien roba desde un cargo público debe ir a la cárcel, también si pertenece al Gobierno de Sánchez.

Pero ahora algunos aquí dicen que este Gobierno ha robado el poder. Olvidan que fue elegido por el pueblo español. También en democracia se puede elegir a políticos corruptos. Pero si hay corrupción lo deciden los tribunales.

La democracia no es perfección, sino cómo se afrontan los errores. El Estado de Derecho no es la ausencia de delitos, sino la respuesta a ellos. Espero que nuestros amigos españoles se tomen esto en serio. Europa está mirando.

*(Fin des interventions à la demande)*

**Michael McGrath, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, thanks to all the honourable Members who contributed to this discussion today, which I think demonstrates the importance for EU Member States to have in place independent and autonomous prosecution services.

Across the EU the organisation of national prosecution services, as I said in my opening remarks, varies and there is no uniform model for all Member States. However, let me reiterate, what matters is that institutional safeguards should guarantee the autonomy of the prosecution service, ensuring that public prosecutors can fulfil their professional duties without interference. This autonomy is crucial for enforcing both national and European criminal laws.

We currently see reforms of prosecution services in a number of Member States across the Union, and the Commission is following closely developments at national level and will continue to work with authorities in Spain, as in other Member States, to promote the rule of law, including within the framework of the annual rule-of-law cycle. We are also working with relevant stakeholders such as professional associations representing prosecutors and judges. They play a vital role in promoting the rule of law and provide us with valuable experience and information.

Preparations for the 2025 report, as colleagues will know, are well under way and we once again plan to adopt it in the first half of July. I stand ready to present the findings of the 2025 rule of law report in Parliament.

The final point I would make is to echo what I said yesterday when we were discussing the Parliament's own-initiative report on last year's rule of law report, and that was to encourage all Member States across the European Union to embrace the process and to see the annual rule of law report as an opportunity. Because the rule of law report, and specifically the country chapter, represents the Commission's assessment, on an independent basis, of the situation within each Member State under the relevant headings, and it is designed to assist and support Member States as they strive to improve compliance with rule-of-law standards.

Over the years, we have continued to deepen our assessment. For the preparation of last year's report, just to give an indication, we held more than 650 meetings across all 27 Member States and enlargement countries, with around 900 national authorities, ministries, courts, independent bodies, civil society organisations and other stakeholders. The nature of the report continues to evolve and to change. This year, for example, we will have a single market dimension for each country in the rule of law report. So it should be viewed as an opportunity. It should be embraced by every Member State, and used as the basis for making progress in respect of the rule of law. Thanks to all of the colleagues for their contributions to this important debate.

**Le Président.** – Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Commissaire. Le débat est clos.

## 11. Clean Industrial Deal (debate)

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur la question avec demande de réponse orale adressée à la Commission sur le pacte pour une industrie propre posée par Tom Berendsen, au nom de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie (O-000020/2025 — B10-0006/25) (2025/2656(RSP))

J'attire votre attention sur le fait qu'il n'y aura qu'un seul tour de parole des orateurs des groupes politiques. Il n'y aura donc pas d'interventions à la demande, ni de cartons bleus.

**Tom Berendsen, author.** – Mr President, dear colleagues, dependence is a risk. We have seen that in our reliance on the US for defence, on Russia for gas, and on China for goods and natural resources. And now we are at risk of becoming dependent on others for our basic industries, the backbone of our economy. Steel, chemicals, fertilisers: they're not just products, they are the foundation of today's economy and of tomorrow's prosperity.

But industrial companies leaving Europe is no longer a threat, it's a reality. Across our continent, businesses are shutting down, are relocating or are cutting investment. Right now, many decarbonisation projects are being paused or cancelled, companies that want to invest in clean production cannot justify it financially, and multinational firms choose to expand production outside Europe instead, because it simply does not make economic sense to invest here under current conditions.

Energy prices in Europe are two to three times higher than in the US and China, and even higher in some Member States, like my own, the Netherlands. But it's not just the cost of energy: overloaded grids, sluggish permitting, excessive bureaucracy – all are damaging our industrial competitiveness.

This must change, because if our industries leave, we lose the jobs, the innovation, and we lose the basis on which our social market economy is built. And the emissions: they are continued elsewhere, under lower standards, harming our climate. As a Christian Democrat, I believe in *rentmeesterschap* – stewardship – in passing on a better world to the next generation.

Let me be very clear: the future of European industry is clean, not only because we want to keep our promise to our children, but also because a clean industry makes us more competitive, more resilient and less dependent on energy from abroad. And that is why, as the EPP Group has said for years, climate policy must go hand in hand with industry policy. We cannot expect a green transition without enabling our industries to make it happen and to remain competitive while doing so. We need to adapt our approach.

The Clean Industrial Deal is a critical, long-overdue first step. It must be implemented faster, more effectively and with a constant eye on real world conditions. Our industry does not need more fine words. Our industry needs action, now. A reliable government is not only one that keeps its promises; it's also one that listens, adapts and is willing to sit down with industry to adjust legislation when needed to make the transition actually work.

Colleagues, I am hopeful. Europe has the knowledge, the technology and the capital to build a clean and competitive industrial base. If we work together, we can achieve it. And yes, there are different views among the political groups here in Parliament, but we managed to overcome those differences and found broad support for this resolution, a resolution that sends a clear message: we want our industry to stay in Europe, we want it to be competitive and we want it to decarbonise, and we are ready to take our part.

Commissioner, the message from this Parliament is clear: act now, deliver on what industry needs, deliver on what our economy needs, deliver on what a competitive Europe needs, because Europe cannot afford to be just a museum of industrial history. It must be the workshop of a clean future.

Now, Mr President, I have in front of me the oral question, but I have full trust in the fact that I think the Commissioner has this question as well, so I would like to use my time to give it to the Commissioner to have more time to answer the questions.

**Stéphane Séjourné**, *Vice-président exécutif de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, merci, Monsieur le rapporteur, pour le temps et, évidemment, nous partageons et je partage, à titre personnel, et vous le savez évidemment, l'urgence de la situation et notre capacité à devoir délivrer de plus en plus rapidement, dans un monde qui change et qui nous impose aussi une forme d'agilité et de flexibilité qui n'était pas le cas encore il y a quelques mois.

Vous soulevez donc l'enjeu essentiel de la concrétisation du pacte pour une industrie propre dans cette question orale. J'en profite d'ailleurs pour saluer et remercier également l'ensemble des parlementaires de la commission ITRE, des rapporteurs et des rapporteurs fictifs qui ont aussi contribué à ce texte, en particulier vous, Monsieur le rapporteur, et je n'enlève rien à ce que vous avez dit et à l'introduction que vous avez faite.

Depuis le début de ce mandat – un peu plus de six mois maintenant –, la Commission européenne ne ménage pas ses efforts pour redonner une véritable dynamique à l'industrie européenne. L'industrie européenne est devenue la priorité absolue des ambitions et de la réactivité de cette nouvelle Commission. Nous lançons donc un premier paquet de mise en œuvre du pacte, relatif notamment aux aides d'État (CISAF), qui sera présenté dès la semaine prochaine par la Commission européenne, et sera accompagné notamment d'une communication publiée le même jour, portant à la fois sur les énergies, sur la fiscalité et sur le mécanisme d'ajustement carbone aux frontières (MACF). Par ailleurs, je me félicite qu'un accord de trilogue ait été trouvé aujourd'hui même sur la simplification du MACF, dispositif pour lequel le Parlement a appuyé la proposition de la Commission.

Cette nécessité d'agir vite, nous la devons d'abord peut-être, et je commencerai par là, à notre industrie, car nous avons changé de monde, je le disais en introduction, et il faut répondre à un double objectif: d'abord renforcer notre marché intérieur et notre compétitivité, mais aussi assurer la cohérence de notre action en matière de sécurité économique et de diversification. Le pacte pour une industrie propre est ainsi la toute première stratégie industrielle européenne.

Je veux ici rappeler quelques fondamentaux: la méthode, le dialogue stratégique, les plans sectoriels sur lesquels la Commission s'est engagée à publier des textes et sur lesquels nous allons accélérer les éléments qui nécessitent notamment des décisions des colégislateurs, la préférence européenne, la stimulation de la demande, la protection de nos industries – vous l'avez rappelé, Monsieur le rapporteur – et les financements.

Sur ce volet financier, je tenais aussi à vous rappeler en introduction que le Fonds de compétitivité nous donnera également une nouvelle architecture dans le cadre du nouveau budget, plus lisible, plus stratégique, et à laquelle nous pourrions d'ailleurs adosser de nombreux dispositifs pour lesquels nous avons besoin, en termes de pilotage de la politique industrielle européenne, d'avoir à la fois de la flexibilité et une capacité de réaction. Cette nouvelle approche impose un rythme soutenu, tout en agilité, pour obtenir des résultats et c'est pourquoi la Commission lancera dès la fin de cette année les enchères pilotes sur la décarbonation et les produits de chaleur dans les processus industriels. Elle sera dotée d'un budget existant d'un milliard d'euros, au titre du Fonds pour l'innovation, et elle pourra être accompagnée par des contributions nationales via le mécanisme d'enchères en tant que service.

Au-delà de la question du financement, se posent évidemment celles de l'investissement et des conditions d'investissement, car, pour que l'avenir industriel décarboné soit en Europe, nous devons être pionniers sur les marchés porteurs et avoir le réflexe de la résilience et du «made in Europe». Nous poursuivrons la dynamique avec trois nouveaux instruments: le futur règlement pour accélérer la décarbonation industrielle, le cadre sur les marchés publics révisé, sur lequel j'ai à de nombreuses reprises été interrogé, à la fois en commission et dans cet hémicycle, et le futur règlement sur l'économie circulaire, qui est également attendu et qui est un marché en soi pour de nombreuses entreprises.

Pour être cohérents, il faudra également répondre aux enjeux extérieurs. La sécurité économique est plus que jamais au centre des préoccupations et de la politique industrielle européenne. Nous avons actuellement plus de 200 mesures de défense commerciale. Elles touchent par exemple aux batteries, aux véhicules électriques ou encore aux éoliennes. Et nous pouvons nous prévaloir de résultats prometteurs avec une base pratique et un déploiement qui atteint jusqu'à 90 % des objectifs sur ces dispositifs qui sont déjà prévus par la Commission.

Nous devons cependant poursuivre nos efforts, vous l'avez dit, la dynamique lancée par le pacte pour une industrie propre nous y aidera, j'en suis sûr. En tout cas, soyez sûrs, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, que la Commission européenne, pour sa part, s'engage à maintenir ses ambitions et à augmenter le tempo, vu l'urgence de la situation.

**Angelika Winzig**, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Exekutiv-Vizepräsident, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der *Clean Industrial Deal* ist das industrielle Programm der Europäischen Kommission und verspricht, Reindustrialisierung und Dekarbonisierung zu vereinen, sprich unter einen Hut zu bringen. Während wir uns in der letzten Legislaturperiode hauptsächlich mit dem *Green Deal* auseinandergesetzt haben und auf Timmermans' versprochenen Deal für die Wirtschaft vergebens gewartet haben, ist es jetzt höchst an der Zeit, dass wir die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit Europas wieder in den Mittelpunkt stellen. Unsere Betriebe leiden, und das können Sie bei jedem Betriebsbesuch hören. Keine bis minimalistische Wachstumsraten, starker technologischer Wettbewerb, hohe Energiepreise und ein spannungsgeladenes politisches Umfeld – das sind nämlich die Rahmenbedingungen, die unsere Unternehmen zurzeit vorfinden.

Unsere Betriebe, vor allem jene im energieintensiven Bereich, brauchen jetzt nicht nur Unterstützung bei der industriellen Transformation, sondern auch ein klares Bekenntnis zur industriellen Wertschöpfung in Europa. Hauptziel ist die Senkung der Energiekosten sowie eine leistungsfähige grenzüberschreitende Infrastruktur in diesem Bereich. Auch Maßnahmen wie Förderung und Stärkung der Wasserstoffwirtschaft und vieles mehr sind wichtig. Und mein Kollege hat es schon angemerkt – es muss auch schnell gehen. Ob wir jetzt für die Finanzierung tatsächlich die *Industrial Decarbonisation Bank* benötigen, das sei für mich dahingestellt, denn Strukturen und Bürokratie haben wir bereits genug.

**Nicolás González Casares**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, lo diré alto y claro: el futuro de Europa depende del éxito de la descarbonización. En 2019, empezamos un camino ilusionante de esperanza para el futuro de millones de europeos y europeas con el Pacto Verde Europeo. Renunciar a esa hoja de ruta sería hoy el mayor error de este siglo, y me preocupa que algunos ahora se quieran bajar de ese barco —simplemente porque sienten la presión de la ultraderecha— para caminar en dirección contraria a lo que nos indican la ciencia y la razón.

Nuestra senda es avanzar por una nueva economía basada en una transición hacia fuentes de energía limpias. No nos equivoquemos: lo que ha dañado nuestra industria ha sido nuestra dependencia de la energía fósil, esa que tenemos que importar. Por eso, necesitamos más energías renovables, más interconexiones y mercados que reflejen la asequibilidad de esas energías renovables. Una verdadera Unión Europea de la Energía. Con menos energías fósiles, más Europa.

Y hoy, en este debate, toca destacar el amplio consenso alcanzado para avanzar por esta senda. Ya es una seña de identidad: una Europa comprometida en la lucha contra el cambio climático. El Pacto por una Industria Limpia es la respuesta lógica para la reindustrialización de Europa en el marco del Pacto Verde Europeo.

Vemos cómo en los Estados Unidos se instalan la inestabilidad y la involución. Europa debe hacer de su estabilidad regulatoria un valor estratégico para atraer inversiones. ¿Simplificar? Sí. ¿Desregular? No. Este Pacto por una Industria Limpia debe servir para pasar a la acción con perspectiva social, con compromiso y con empleos de calidad. La financiación es imprescindible y damos la bienvenida a ese esfuerzo que hace la Comisión.

Y, por último, hemos logrado un amplio acuerdo. Todos hemos cedido en esta propuesta de Resolución, pero, más adelante, tendremos que concretar. Les pido a los que de verdad creemos en el proyecto europeo que no se distraigan, que hay que ser precisos, que no todo lo que reluce es limpio y sostenible a la vez.

**Paolo Borchia**, *a nome del gruppo PfdE*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi sembra che stiamo assistendo alla cronaca di una morte annunciata. Lo dico senza esultanze, che sarebbero fuori luogo, perché stiamo parlando dell'industria europea, della sua competitività e di posti di lavoro.

Tra concorrenza asiatica e necessità di riarmo – necessità, dobbiamo dirlo, anche gonfiate da una comunicazione ansio-gena a cui abbiamo assistito negli ultimi mesi – il *Clean Industrial Deal*, che presenta un nome e un programma, ha un carattere che è subordinato alla compatibilità delle misure ambientali con la sopravvivenza dell'apparato industriale europeo.

Personalmente mi stupiscono tante critiche a tutto l'impianto del *Green Deal* da parte degli stessi che l'hanno votato, perché a volte ho come l'impressione che gli oltre trenta tra regolamenti e direttive che lo compongono si siano votati da soli.

Poi, Commissario, le imprese industriali in Europa pagano fino a tre volte in più rispetto alle concorrenti dei paesi terzi. Questo divario strutturale mina la competitività, mina la possibilità di attrarre gli investimenti e di evitare soprattutto le delocalizzazioni. Per reggere la transizione verso l'energia pulita servono reti elettriche moderne, digitalizzate e capaci di gestire la variabilità delle rinnovabili.

In conclusione, Commissario, se non vogliamo che l'Europa diventi la zona a traffico limitato del mondo, serve cambiare la mentalità e soprattutto serve smettere di parlare in termini di ambizione, quella che in questa fase è solo una pericolosa illusione.

**Daniel Obajtek**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Europa w kryzysie przemysłowym. I widzimy dziś ten kryzys przemysłowy bardzo mocno. Ja odsyłam tylko do danych, jeżeli chodzi o PKB Stanów Zjednoczonych, gdzie jest ponad 9 biliona większe niż PKB Europy. Jeszcze 10 lat temu Europa w tym zakresie je wyprzedzała.

Dzisiaj mamy potworny problem z przemysłem. Dzisiaj nie tylko mamy problem z przemysłem energochłonnym tu i teraz, ale mamy również problem z innymi gałęziami przemysłu. Mamy kwestię przemysłu petrochemicznego. Walczymy z rosyjską ropą i gazem, ale nie widzimy, że produkty z rosyjskiej ropy i gazu trafiają na rynek europejski. Niszczą cały przemysł petrochemiczny, który niedługo będzie praktycznie nie do odtworzenia. Ja już nawet nie mówię o innym przemyśle: o farmaceutycznym, który bardzo szybko też uchodzi z Europy. Europa zaczyna się stawać powoli pustynią.

Ja nie mówię, że te wszystkie rozwiązania są złe. One są dobre – niektóre. Tylko brakuje nam czasu. Przemysł potrzebuje tu i teraz bardzo szybko kroplówki. Ta kroplówka musi być bardzo prosta. Niejednokrotnie o tym mówię: kwestia zawieszenia i reformowania ETS. ETS teraz nie służy technologiom, ETS przede wszystkim teraz służy do tego, żeby spekulować cenami i zapychać dziury budżetowe. To musimy jak najszybciej zmienić. Ja naprawdę apeluję, abyśmy mieli w tym zakresie jak najszybsze działania.

**Christophe Grudler**, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président. Monsieur le Commissaire, nous débattons aujourd'hui du soutien à notre industrie, notamment pour l'accompagner dans la réduction de ses émissions de carbone à travers ce pacte pour une industrie propre que vous portez, Monsieur le Commissaire Séjourné.

Tandis que nous voulons transformer nos objectifs climatiques en véritable opportunité industrielle, l'extrême droite, dont le Rassemblement national, dépose une résolution qui veut tout détricoter. Alors, je pose une question très simple à ces collègues: est-ce que vous allez expliquer aux citoyens que vous préférez laisser la Chine prendre de l'avance dans l'industrie décarbonée pendant que vous condamnez nos usines au déclin? Est-ce que vous allez dire aux ouvriers de Dunkerque, de Sochaux ou de Tarente, en Italie, que vous ne voulez pas d'acier propre, de voitures électriques européennes ou de batteries fabriquées ici, que vous choisissez la dépendance et la soumission plutôt que l'innovation?

Nous, nous faisons le choix de l'industrie propre, compétitive et européenne. Nous faisons le choix de l'emploi local, de la souveraineté industrielle et de la vérité climatique. Accepter cette transformation, c'est vraiment défendre notre industrie et croire en son avenir.

**Sara Matthieu**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, Europe can't win by playing yesterday's game. If we stick to fossil fuels, we are always going to lose to cheaper competitors, like the US or China.

But we can lead the world with clean tech and with renewables. In 2023 alone, they created one third of EU growth and millions of green jobs. So this, colleagues, is our moment. We need to maintain jobs and economic security right here in Europe, and we need to protect ourselves from climate disasters. We need to protect ourselves from unfair trade practices.

That's really what the Clean Industrial Deal is all about. That's why the 90 % climate target to 2040 in the strategy is such a big deal. That's why massive electrification, renewables and circularity should really be our investment priorities.

But, colleagues, these transitions must also work for the workers. Supporting our industry to decarbonise? Yeah. But tie it to fair wages and to workers' rights. No corporate handouts without high-quality jobs.

**Per Clausen, for The Left-Gruppen.** – Hr. formand! Det skulle være så godt. Vi skulle have en aftale, som sikrede gode jobs og arbejdernes rettigheder, og at den europæiske industri kunne styrke sin konkurrenceevne ved at stå i spidsen for den grønne omstilling. Hvis vi skal være ærlige, må vi sige, det er ikke det, vi har fået. Der lægges op til en politik, som er mere uren, end den er ren, og der er også tale om en aftale, som på ingen måde er en god aftale for de millioner af arbejdere, der rent faktisk påvirkes af den. Så for at undgå falsk markedsføring burde den omdøbes til det, den er; et urent knæfald for en forældet politik på bekostning af mennesker og miljø. Jeg kan bare sige, at jeg og Left gruppen stemmer nej, og det syntes vi alle andre også skulle gøre, fordi Europa har brug for andet og mere end en aftale, der ikke lever op til sit navn, og som skader mennesker og miljø.

**Anja Arndt, im Namen der ESN-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident! Seit einem Jahr bin ich im Europäischen Parlament und erlebe hier, wie Ursula von der Leyen Europa ruiniert hat mit einem *Green Deal*, der gar nicht grün ist, sondern tiefrot. Diese Politik basiert nicht auf Wissenschaft, sondern auf gespieltem – ja, gespieltem –, ökoreligiösem Fanatismus. Sie zerstört unsere Wirtschaft, unsere Landwirtschaft, unsere Energieversorgung und sogar unsere Umwelt und damit am Ende unsere Lebensgrundlage. Alle Bürger rutschen früher oder später in die Armut, Betriebe schließen, Unternehmen wandern ab. Und was macht die Kommission? Sie gießt noch mehr Geld ins Feuer. 100 Milliarden Euro für den neuen *Clean Industrial Deal*, ein weiteres, zweifelhaftes Fake-Wirtschaftsprogramm. Der *Green Deal* war ein Deindustrialisierungsdiktat, der *Clean Industrial Deal* ist die direkte Fortsetzung.

Frau von der Leyen, das ist keine Industriepolitik, das ist die Handschrift des *Great Reset*. Wer Scheitern zum System macht, betreibt keine Politik, sondern Sabotage an Europa. Meine Frage lautet: Wann kommt die wissenschaftliche Analyse der katastrophalen Folgen des *Green Deal*?

**Stéphane Séjourné, Vice-président exécutif de la Commission.** – Monsieur le Président, je remercie les intervenants et le Parlement pour ce débat sur le pacte pour une industrie propre, qui va bien au-delà, nous l'avons compris, d'une simple politique autour de la décarbonation, et qui est une vision de ce que nous voulons faire de nos industries européennes dans les trente ou quarante prochaines années.

Quelles sont les industries historiques que nous voulons sauvegarder pour des questions de souveraineté, pour des questions également de stratégie économique, et des questions d'emploi au niveau social? Quelles sont les stratégies de demain pour faire émerger de nouvelles filières, de nouveaux marchés porteurs? L'organisation de tout ceci nécessite – le message a été bien compris – de la rapidité et de la souplesse – surtout en ce moment où les négociations commerciales en cours suscitent un certain nombre d'inquiétudes sur les marchés privés. Elle nécessite également de la réactivité, ce qui n'est pas simple, pour pouvoir faire face à des difficultés et des mouvements d'humeur transatlantiques qui parfois nous échappent dans la communication et dans les médias.

Je voudrais peut-être conclure ce débat en vous disant que, oui, la Commission fera preuve de souplesse, car l'octroi de permis, l'exemption pour les émissions dans les phases de construction se feront sans aucun doute en suivant les clauses environnementales et les standards que nous avons fixés lors du dernier mandat, mais avec aussi la flexibilité nécessaire pour pouvoir atteindre nos objectifs.

Nous allons bien entendu également, dans la dimension sociale – vous avez été un certain nombre à évoquer ce sujet –, contenir l'impact sur les mutations et l'accélération de ces mutations via les industries nouvelles que nous connaissons. Sur les compétences notamment, nous comptons sur l'actualisation de la stratégie sur l'union des compétences et nous comptons donc aussi sur le Parlement européen. Sur les mutations également, nous prévoyons de nous appuyer sur le Fonds social européen et sur le Fonds de transition juste, et c'est l'esprit également du pacte sur l'industrie propre: à la fois regarder l'ensemble des composantes économiques de compétitivité et l'impact social et sociétal de notre transformation industrielle et technologique.

Vous l'aurez compris, le pacte pour une industrie propre fait de la compétitivité un impératif, oui, mais ce n'est pas l'objectif en soi. Notre objectif, c'est la prospérité européenne, et cette dimension doit également être prise en compte dans notre politique industrielle.

Je voudrais remercier une nouvelle fois le Parlement pour ces débats et remercier en particulier la commission ITRE pour l'ensemble de ses travaux. Vous aurez à analyser et à débattre dans les prochains mois d'un certain nombre de textes qui arriveront auprès des colégislateurs, textes très importants pour l'avenir de l'Europe, l'avenir industriel. En tout cas, vous aurez toujours, en ma personne et au nom de la Commission, le soutien nécessaire pour garder cette ambition et accélérer la dynamique.

**Le Président.** – Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Vice-président.

Je vous informe que j'ai reçu deux propositions de résolution pour clore ce débat.

Le débat est donc clos et le vote aura lieu demain.

*Déclarations écrites (article 178)*

**Piotr Müller (ECR), na piśmie.** – „Czysty ład przemysłowy” – brzmi dobrze, ale zapytajmy uczciwie: czyja przyszłość ma być „czysta”, a czyje miejsca pracy mają zniknąć?

Pod hasłami transformacji klimatycznej Komisja Europejska prowadzi politykę gospodarczego sabotażu.

Kolejne cele emisyjne oderwane są od realiów, a przemysł – zamiast wspierany – jest systematycznie tłumiony regulacjami, podatkami i biurokracją.

Wygasza się hutnictwo, zamyka cementownie, niszczy produkcję nawozów, stali i chemikaliów. Zakłady uciekają z Europy – do USA, do Chin – gdzie energia jest tańsza, a nikt nie tworzy ideologicznej dyktatury klimatycznej.

Efekt? Deindustrializacja, utrata suwerenności, zależność od importu produktów, które często mają większy ślad węglowy niż te wytwarzane lokalnie.

Absurd goni absurd.

Europa podcina gałąź, na której siedzi.

Bez przemysłu nie ma bezpieczeństwa, nie ma miejsc pracy, nie ma realnej siły. Komisja, zamiast chronić interesy gospodarcze Unii, prowadzi politykę, która działa wyłącznie na korzyść konkurencji spoza Europy.

To nie jest transformacja – to autodestrukcja.

## 12. Electricity grids: the backbone of the EU energy system (debate)

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle à présent le débat sur le rapport d'Anna Stürgh, au nom de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie, sur les réseaux d'électricité: l'épine dorsale du système énergétique de l'UE (2025/2006(INI)) (A10-0091/2025).

**Anna Stürgh, rapporteur.** – Mr President, Commissioner, just one year ago, I started my days just like everyone else: unplugging my phone, boiling my kettle for my tea and starting my computer to check my emails. Never really thinking about how the electricity that was powering my day actually got into my home. I just took it for granted.

Well, over the past year, I've spent my time learning everything I could about our electricity system, how our grids actually really work, remembering the difference between volts and watts and amps and hertz, and realising how simple yet complex electricity actually is. And it has been an absolute pleasure.

Now my days still start the same unplugging my phone, boiling my kettle, starting my computer. But now all these processes feel a little bit more special, knowing what it really takes to keep the power flowing. Now I take these ordinary routines for what they are, daily reminders that our electricity grids are in fact the backbone of the EU energy system.

The reasons for the need to modernise and expand our electricity grids are pretty straightforward. The ongoing electrification of our industry, our heating, our mobility is putting pressure on the existing systems. The intent to make sure that this electrification is sustained by clean energy sources, and the fact that soon about 70 % of renewables will be connected directly to the distribution grid, demands our existing grid to adapt. But even without these developments, there is need for action. Considering that around 40 % of distribution grids are now over 40 years old.

Having established why we need to do something, let's look at what we actually need to do. With high investments at stake and a clean energy union to win, we need to make sure that this grid buildout is done as efficiently as possible. That means strengthening the planning process to make sure that it is robust and integrated, combining the bottom-up knowledge and responsibility of the system operators with a stronger role for ACER to make sure that the European grid becomes increasingly interconnected.

We also need to put a stronger focus on the modernisation and digitalisation of the grids, and create a regulatory framework that will make alternative options to physical build out more economically feasible. Even if we manage to ensure that the buildout is done as efficiently as possible, it is clear that this comes with a price tag. Estimates show that around EUR 584 billion will be needed in the investment in grids by 2030.

So we need to strengthen CFE, make sure that national funds are available and proportionately used for grids, and we need to mobilise private capital.

But through strengthening the European supply chain and job market, we can make sure that those investments actually benefit European companies and European workers. But we have to be aware that the increase in interconnection can only be successful if we manage to make sure that the individual actors have mechanisms that make sure that the costs are equally as fairly allocated as the benefits are.

So a reform of the cross-border cost allocation and the Inter-TSO compensation mechanism is of the utmost importance.

It is high time this Parliament puts forward a position and provides a basis for the Commission to use in preparing the grid package, and I want to use this moment to thank sincerely all the shadow rapporteurs, but particularly also their teams, for all the work that we've put into this over the last few months and this wonderful cooperation we were having. Together we are building the energy system of tomorrow, so let's make sure we don't connect it to the grids of yesterday.

**Ekaterina Zaharieva, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for the opportunity to participate in this exchange. I would like to congratulate the rapporteur, dear Anna, for your excellent report. I was glad to witness the results of the vote in the plenary yesterday, and to see that there is a large majority behind this report. This is a very important political signal to the Member States and the Commission, and will help us in preparing our next initiatives coming later this year, as many of the key messages in your report align with our ongoing assessment.

Your report underlines that energy infrastructure is one of the key building blocks to ensure a competitive, affordable, secure and clean energy system in Europe. The investment needs are huge, as highlighted in your report, and we need to find ways to realise them without overburdening the consumers and public budgets. In this context, we welcome that the report acknowledges the framework for trans-European energy networks and the Connecting Europe Facility for energy as a powerful tool to strengthen our cross-border infrastructure in Europe, which are key to delivering our genuine energy union.

The report rightly highlights the EU grid action plan as an important stepping stone for further action. The report also aligns with the envisaged scope of the upcoming grid package as announced in the affordable energy action plan. The grid package will be a major step forward to accelerate the rollout of more secure and cost-efficient cross-border infrastructure that delivers secure, clean and affordable energy for European citizens and businesses. It will notably do so by: strengthening the cross-border energy infrastructure planning and delivery that support a more coordinated identification and follow-up of necessary cross-border projects to ensure sufficient interconnectivity between all Member States; more efficient use of existing infrastructure, also based on strengthened digitalisation and innovation;

more effective cost- and benefit-sharing mechanisms for infrastructure of cross-border relevance; better protection of critical energy infrastructure; measures to shorten permitting process for networks, renewables and storage by streamlining and simplifying procedures. The call for evidence and the open public consultation for the grid package was launched in early May, and we are now collecting the views of stakeholders and citizens.

In parallel to the grid package, the Commission is also preparing the proposals for the new MFF, which should be published in the coming weeks. I would like, once again more, to thank you, Anna, dear rapporteur, for your timely report, and ensure that the Commission stands ready to cooperate with honourable Members in the future.

**Seán Kelly**, *thar ceann an Ghrúpa PPE*. – A Uachtaráin, a Choimisinéir, Ba mhaith liom ar dtús mo fhíorbhuíochas a ghabháil do ...

... Anna Stürgkh, our very good rapporteur, and all the shadow rapporteurs for their excellent cooperation on this important report.

This report is timely and strategic, and I look forward to seeing our recommendations taken up by the Commission in the forthcoming grids package later this year.

I will make one point very clear: European competitiveness and net zero will not happen without a massively expanded and modernised electricity grid. I understand the calling for more lines, cables and pylons can come with its political sensitivities for some here. But the reality is simple: no new grid means no clean energy, no energy security and no competitive future for European industry.

In our report, we make a strong call for ambition in our approach to grid. In reality, we need to work backwards from our 2050 net-zero objective. What are the key grid reinforcements we need? How do we drive interconnection and complete the energy union? How do we unlock the offshore wind potential of the Atlantic and northern seas? And how do we finally move from vision to delivery on the European supergrid? This requires long-term planning, political ambition and investment visibility, so that supply chains can scale up and strategic infrastructure is built.

Lastly, and crucially, we need to fix the issues of planning and permitting. Across Europe, critical projects are being delayed for years – and even decades – by a combination of red tape, objectors and legal processes.

If we don't build the grid, Europe will be both uncompetitive and high-emitting – the worst of both worlds. The grids package is an opportunity to deliver the vision of this report and ensure this does not happen.

**Bruno Tobback**, *namens de S&D-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, onze burgers zien tegelijk negatieve stroomprijzen en hoge energiefacturen. Lidstaten leggen stroomproductie stil omdat ze niet op het net kan, terwijl in andere de energieprijzen onredelijk hoog zijn. Bedrijven die willen investeren staan op wachtlijsten omdat ze geen aansluiting kunnen krijgen en in sommige straten kan je een auto niet meer opladen omdat iemand anders net een warmtepomp heeft gekocht.

Die toestand schaadt onze welvaart, onze veiligheid en onze toekomst. Sterkere, slimmere, beter geconnecteerde stroomnetten zijn dus de meest noodzakelijke en de meest rendabele publieke investering die Europa vandaag kan doen. We kunnen investeren in kabels, *made in Europe*, die stroom transporteren, *made in Europe*, en energie leveren aan burgers en bedrijven die hier produceren. *made in Europe*. Of we kunnen voor 100 miljard EUR per jaar fossiele energie blijven importeren en anderen rijk maken.

De totstandkoming van dit verslag toont aan dat er in dit parlement een brede coalitie is die de juiste investeringen wil doen: die in een gemeenschappelijke Europese welvaart. Ik wil dan ook de collega's bedanken met wie we die coalitie hebben gebouwd en de Commissie oproepen om samen met ons daar werk van te maken.

**András Gyürk**, *a PFE képviselőcsoport nevében.* – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A következő évek nagy kihívása lesz az alkalmazkodás a villamos energia használatának növekedéséhez és az időjárásfüggő megújuló kapacitások tömeges megjelenéséhez. Ezért az európai gazdaság versenyképes működtetéséhez az áramhálózatok átgondolt, hatékony fejlesztésére van szükség. A Ház előtt lévő jelentés azonban ehelyett az energiarendszereinket egyoldalúan, az ismert brüsszeli zöld ideológia mentén alakítaná át.

Először is, a dokumentum kizárólag a megújuló energiaforrásokhoz kívánja az áramhálózati fejlesztéseket igazítani. Azonban az ilyen gondolatok a gyakorlatban több európai országban káoszhoz, sötétséghez és jelentős gazdasági károkhoz vezettek.

Másodszor, a jelentés az áramhálózati tervezésben a nemzeti hatóságokat meggyengítve különféle uniós szervezeteknek juttatna új hatásköröket. Azonban tapasztalatból tudjuk, hogy ennek súlyos ára van. Az ibériai áramszünet sújtotta országok mindenben követték a brüsszeli ajánlásokat, a baj mégis bekövetkezett.

Harmadszor, a jelentés teljesen figyelmen kívül hagyja a hagyományos erőművek és több ezer munkavállalójuk az áramhálózat stabilizálásában betöltött nélkülözhetetlen szerepét. Ettől még tény: atom- és szénerőművek nélkül nincs elegendő, folyamatosan rendelkezésre álló zsinóráram, gázerőművek nélkül pedig nincs ellátási rugalmasság.

Tisztelt Ház! Mi, Patrióták felismertük a jelentés hiányosságait, ezért egyedüli frakcióként átfogó módosító csomagot nyújtottunk be. Még nem késő, hogy támogassák.

**Ondřej Krutílek**, *za skupinu ECR.* – Pane předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, v předchozích 5 letech se v Evropské unii mluvilo jen o energetických zdrojích. Řešilo se, který je čistý, který je špinavý, jak dlouho tady s námi ještě bude, ale příliš se vsadilo na jednu kartu, na obnovitelné zdroje a hlavně se zapomělo na to, že potřebujeme i robustní, bezpečné a propojené sítě, které pomohou předejít *blackoutu*. Chtěl bych poděkovat zpravodajce, kolegyni Anně Stürgkhové, že skvěle moderovala práci na kompromisu, který budeme zítra hlasovat. Paní komisařko, pokud platí, že Komise přijde s konkrétními návrhy k elektrizačním soustavám už tento rok, tak ve zprávě najdete řadu věcí, které byste v nich měli zohlednit.

Zmíním dva body, které považuji za klíčové. Zaprvé, technologická neutralita. Jakkoli je připojování menších obnovitelných zdrojů velkou výzvou, musíme zajistit technologicky neutrální přístup k výrobě elektřiny. Bez toho se prostě neobejdeme. Za druhé, peníze. K modernizaci a výstavbě elektrických sítí budou potřeba obrovské veřejné i soukromé investice, a tak je nezbytné, abychom navýšili podporu z energetické části programu CEF hlavně pro přeshraniční propojení. Bavili jsme se tady o tom, že bude velká debata o novém víceletém finančním rámci, tak doufám, že jste si jako Komise dělali dostatečné poznámky.

**Christophe Grudler**, *au nom du groupe Renew.* – Monsieur le Président, les réseaux électriques sont le talon d'Achille de notre transition: s'ils cèdent, tout le reste suit. D'ici 2030, il nous faut mobiliser des milliards d'euros pour les moderniser et les développer.

Oui, la montée en puissance des énergies renouvelables complexifie nos besoins en connexion au réseau, mais elle relocalise aussi la production d'énergie dans nos territoires ruraux ou dans nos régions ultrapériphériques. C'est une chance, pas un fardeau. Le rapport Stürgkh porté par Renew est sans ambiguïté: investir plus, mais mieux, pour un réseau robuste face aux cyberattaques et aux chocs climatiques.

Côté interconnexion, les États membres doivent atteindre 15 % d'ici 2030 et aller au-delà. La BEI montre la voie avec son prêt de 1,6 milliard d'euros pour relier la France à l'Espagne via le golfe de Gascogne. Je m'en réjouis, car c'est exactement ce que nous proposons. Avec un volet énergie pour le mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe renforcé, avec enfin une préférence européenne dans nos marchés publics afin de consolider toute la chaîne de valeur des réseaux. Car sans réseau solide, il n'y a ni autonomie stratégique ni transition réussie.

**Kira Marie Peter-Hansen**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group.* – Mr President, I would like to first thank the rapporteur for her wonderful work, and also the team of shadows. I echo that I hope the Commission will take in a lot of the ideas.

And with this, I will switch to Danish.

Hr. formand! I Europa betaler vi to-tre gange mere for vores energi, end de gør i USA og Kina, og det skyldes ikke mindst, at vores elkabler er overfyldte, de er forældede, og de er dårlig forbundne. Det er uholdbart, for det bremser opsætningen af vindmøller og solceller, og det står i vejen for, at almindelige mennesker får grøn strøm, der er til at betale. Elektrificeringen er broen til den grønne omstilling. Vores biler skal køre på el. Vores huse skal opvarmes uden olie, og vores fabrikker skal drives af grøn strøm i stedet for kul og gas. De afgørende forandringer kræver et moderne elnet, som kan tilpasse sig den øgede efterspørgsel. Samtidig skal vi gøre det socialt retfærdigt, så ingen bliver ladet i stikken under den grønne omstilling. Elnettet er rygraden i vores energisystem, og lige nu kan det ikke bære den grønne fremtid, som vores planet har brug for. Derfor skal vi investere massivt i at udvinde, i at optimere og i at forbinde elnettet i EU på tværs af grænser. Sådan får vi mere sol og vind, og sådan bliver strømmen både billigere, grønnere og bedre tilgængelig. Det kræver både politisk vilje, og det kræver pengene til at gøre en forskel. Men vi skal sikre, at den grønne strøm rent faktisk når ud til forbrugerne både hurtigt og effektivt. Det er godt for klimaet, det er godt for økonomien, og det er godt for borgerne i hele EU.

**Dario Tamburrano**, *a nome del gruppo The Left*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Buckminster Fuller è più noto come architetto per la cupola geodetica, ma è stato anche un ingegnere visionario. Qui voglio riportare alcuni dei suoi pensieri di oltre quarant'anni fa, oggi attualissimi.

La sua proposta per risolvere la povertà e tanti dei conflitti internazionali era nello sviluppo, cito testualmente, di «una rete energetica mondiale, una rete elettrica per cui tutti siamo collegati alla stessa rete. All'improvviso non ci sarebbero più problemi, nessun conflitto internazionale. La nostra nuova base economica non sarebbe più l'oro o il dollaro, ma il kilowattora».

Presentò un piano, nelle sue parole, «per utilizzare le nostre crescenti capacità tecniche nella costruzione di linee di trasmissione ad alta tensione e superconduttive, e per realizzare una rete elettrica mondiale che integri i fusi orari dei due emisferi, quello diurno e quello notturno, aumentando così rapidamente la capacità operativa del sistema energetico globale e, contemporaneamente, il tenore di vita in un'impresa senza precedenti di cooperazione internazionale».

La rete elettrica europea è uno strumento di stoccaggio virtuale indispensabile, di compensazione della intermittenza delle rinnovabili, per cui gli elettroni fluiranno senza confini. Il sole spagnolo infuocherà le acciaierie svedesi e il vento del Baltico raffrescherà i condomini napoletani.

Ringrazio la relatrice e i colleghi. Questo testo contiene un contributo fondamentale per realizzare la vera Unione, l'Unione dell'energia, senza più ostacoli, confini, emissioni e dipendenze geopolitiche.

**Sarah Knafo**, *au nom du groupe ESN*. – Monsieur le Président, 2 000 milliards d'euros, il nous est demandé de voter 2 000 milliards d'euros pour financer des réseaux électriques jusqu'en 2050. On se demande naïvement ce qui peut bien justifier de telles dépenses, alors que l'Europe est déjà électrifiée depuis bien longtemps et que notre consommation d'électricité n'a pas augmenté ces quinze dernières années. Je vous donne l'explication: Mesdames et Messieurs les politiciens, c'est de votre faute.

Vous avez abandonné le nucléaire et installé partout des éoliennes et des panneaux photovoltaïques. Mais la nature étant ce qu'elle est, on ne sait jamais quand le vent s'arrêtera de souffler, ni le soleil de briller. Alors il faut rajouter toujours plus d'éoliennes, les répartir partout et puis rajouter des centrales à gaz, et toutes ces sources de production qui ne fonctionnent que 20 % du temps chacune, il faut les raccorder entre elles. Alors allons-y, dépensons des milliards en câbles et en réseaux haute tension.

Le comble, c'est que, quand le vent souffle et que le soleil brille, quand toutes ces installations, la plupart du temps improductives, se mettent soudain à produire toutes ensemble, alors on ne sait plus que faire de l'électricité en trop. Qu'à cela ne tienne, rien ne vous arrête, vous en concluez qu'il faut encore plus d'interconnexion pour que les éoliennes danoises puissent envoyer de l'électricité jusqu'en Sicile et que le soleil espagnol envoie de l'électricité jusqu'à Vilnius.

Une folie qui engloutira des milliards en répandant des pylônes, du béton et du cuivre partout pour rien. Voilà les raisons de votre fuite en avant. Au lieu de reconnaître votre fiasco, vous essayez vainement, à coup de milliards, de faire fonctionner un système intrinsèquement dysfonctionnel. Retenez bien cet adage: l'erreur est humaine, mais persévérer est diabolique.

**Angelika Winzig (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst möchte ich unserer Kollegin Anna Stürgkh herzlich zu diesem INI-Bericht gratulieren. Ja, die Dekarbonisierung und damit verbundene Elektrifizierung der Wirtschaft stellt Europa vor große Herausforderungen, vor allem, weil unsere Stromnetze bereits in die Jahre gekommen sind und ein echter Binnenmarkt für Elektrizität noch nicht in Sicht ist. Es wird geschätzt, dass bis 2030 in etwa 584 Milliarden Euro benötigt werden, um die Stromnetze zu modernisieren und die Mitgliedstaaten besser zu verbinden. Gleichzeitig wissen wir: Der beste Netzausbau nützt nichts, wenn er an lokalen Widerständen scheitert. Deshalb müssen wir die Bürgerinnen und Bürger ins Boot holen. Finanzielle Beteiligungsmodelle, transparente Planung und echte Mitsprache können die Akzeptanz steigern.

In Europa finden wir einige Beispiele, die wir nachmachen können. Zum Beispiel gibt es im Elsass Anwohneranteile für Energieprojekte, oder in Italien können sich Anwohner durch die Nutzung modernster Technik am Projekt beteiligen. Denn die Netze, die wir für morgen so dringend brauchen, müssen heute schon Akzeptanz haben.

**Mohammed Chahim (S&D).** – Voorzitter, onze energiemarkt kan veel Europeser. De prijsverschillen zijn groot en de capaciteit is niet overal gelijk. Ik droom van een Europa met een verbeterde connectiviteit tussen de stroomnetten van verschillende landen, waarbij bijvoorbeeld windenergie uit de Noordzee in Spanje kan worden gebruikt en wij 's winters kunnen koken op zonne-energie uit Portugal.

Ons stroomnet zit vol, bomvol. Dat betekent meer risico op storingen, maar ook dat mensen uit bijvoorbeeld Utrecht, Gelderland en Flevoland soms tot 2030 moeten wachten voordat er nieuwe huizen kunnen worden gebouwd en aangesloten op het net.

En wat te denken van al die bedrijven en mensen die dolgraag willen investeren in duurzaamheid? Die willen investeren in zonnepanelen of laadpalen? Niets is zo frustrerend en demotiverend dan te horen dat het net vol zit.

Als we die problemen serieus nemen, dan moeten we ervoor zorgen dat het elektriciteitsnet geen obstakel is, maar een versneller. Dat kunnen we vandaag samen doen.

**Aleksandar Nikolic (Pfe).** – Monsieur le Président, depuis février 2020, les prix de l'électricité ont augmenté de 33 %, selon Eurostat. Dans mon pays, la France, ils ont même augmenté de 53,85 % sur la même période. Un Français qui payait donc 200 euros d'électricité en 2020 doit désormais verser 307 euros en 2025. Et en 2026, la hausse va s'accélérer avec l'ARENH II.

Derrière ces chiffres que j'étaie, il y a des familles qui n'arrivent plus à se chauffer l'hiver et qui doivent surveiller la moindre dépense, voire rogner sur leur budget courses pour ne pas finir dans le rouge. Vous pourriez tirer des conséquences des erreurs en matière de production d'énergie en soutenant l'éolien et le photovoltaïque qui s'avèrent être une erreur, mais non, vous continuez et ce texte aggravera encore l'appauvrissement du peuple français.

En soutenant le développement des réseaux électriques décentralisés en Europe, vous savez pertinemment qu'ils ne sont pas compatibles avec les centrales nucléaires, qui produisent pourtant une énergie propre, abordable et abondante qui permettait aux Français de payer l'électricité la moins chère d'Europe. Vous assumez de vouloir les remplacer par des éoliennes et des panneaux solaires trop chers et qui fonctionnent un jour sur deux. Enfin, vous fermez les yeux sur les coûts exorbitants qui se répercuteront sur le portefeuille des Français et des Européens. Car oui, il va bien falloir les raccorder, ces éoliennes et ces panneaux. Et ça, ça coûte cher. Tout démontre que cette décentralisation fait augmenter le prix de l'électricité.

En résumé, vous choisissez de sacrifier nos peuples au profit d'une idéologie aussi folle que suicidaire. Nous, députés européens du Rassemblement national, défendrons toujours les intérêts des Français et leur pouvoir d'achat. Ne comptez pas sur nous pour vous aider à les trahir.

**Diego Solier (NI).** – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, señorías, podemos tener el mejor coche del mundo, pero si lo metemos por un camino de cabras, no vamos a ninguna parte. Y eso es lo que hacemos con la energía en Europa: meterla por caminos rotos mientras nos creemos campeones del futuro.

Europa no puede permitirse seguir perdiendo el tiempo. Hoy en España ya sabemos lo que es un apagón total, lo que es ver cómo la ineficiencia y el dogmatismo político dismantelan el sistema eléctrico y castigan a la industria. Esto es intolerable. No podemos seguir criminalizando unas fuentes energéticas frente a otras por ideología, mientras la red colapsa, la energía se desperdicia y nuestras empresas pierden competitividad.

Basta ya de colocar políticos sin experiencia al frente de los operadores de red. Queremos ingenieros, expertos, gente que sepa lo que hace, no soluciones mágicas o ideológicas que se escapan de la lógica, de la ciencia y de la tecnología. Europa necesita una red moderna, robusta y conectada. Sin eso, el futuro energético es una quimera. ¿Vamos a seguir apagando Europa poco a poco o vamos a actuar ya? Decídanse, porque el próximo fallo será sistémico. Es nuestra responsabilidad.

**João Cotrim De Figueiredo (Renew).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, sem infraestruturas modernas não há transição energética, não há competitividade e não há futuro.

A rede elétrica é a espinha dorsal da economia europeia e está, de facto, desatualizada, congestionada, fragmentada e não está preparada para uma procura que se estima e se espera que cresça fortemente.

O bellissimo relatório que hoje aqui debatemos mostra o caminho: mais investimento, mais tecnologia, mais mercado. São 584 mil milhões € até 2030, para responder à procura crescente e integrar as renováveis e reforçar as interligações.

Em troca, em troca teremos preços mais baixos e competitividade mais alta. Famílias e empresas poderão poupar até 40 mil milhões €, e a economia poderá crescer quase outro tanto. Isto é por ano, todos os anos. Não é utopia verde; isto é a tecno-sustentabilidade liberal.

Precisamos de regras claras, atualizações rápidas, investimento privado e inovação digital.

A eletrificação da Europa não pode ser adiada por burocracia ou protecionismos de alguns países, o que fez com que só esta semana se tenha acordado a ligação Península Ibérica-França.

Como disse Draghi, sem redes não há crescimento nem autonomia estratégica e, portanto, a escolha é simples: ou avançamos com coragem ou ficamos nesta dependência, incapazes de competir.

Está na hora de ligar a Europa à corrente.

**Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, meine Damen und Herren! Zunächst vielen Dank an Anna und die Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die diesen guten Bericht geschrieben haben; ich hoffe, er wird auch gelesen und umgesetzt. Meine Damen und Herren, diese Woche haben wir 40 Jahre Schengener Abkommen gefeiert, für Europas Stromnetze gilt allerdings immer noch oft: An der Grenze bitte warten. Denn die per EU-Recht geforderten Übertragungskapazitäten sind zwar seit Jahren gesetzlich festgelegt, aber oft immer noch nicht gebaut. Und dabei haben wir ja in der Energiekrise 2022/23 gemerkt, wie wichtig es ist, dass wir uns in Europa gegenseitig unterstützen können, und beim Blackout in Spanien und Portugal im April, welche drastische und teure Auswirkungen es haben kann, wenn diese Interkonnektoren fehlen.

Unser Stromnetz stammt aus der fossil-atomaren Ära der zentralen Kraftwerke, und jetzt gilt es, es fit zu machen für das Zeitalter der Erneuerbaren – das heißt, nicht nur auf die Autobahnen der Höchstspannung schauen, sondern auch auf die anderen Ebenen, alle einbeziehen und weg vom eindimensionalen Kupferverbuddeln. Wir brauchen Flexibilisierung, Digitalisierung und intelligente Nutzung.

**Markus Buchheit (ESN).** – Herr Präsident! Wenn meine grünen Kolleginnen von einem guten Vorschlag sprechen, dann gehen bei Industrie und Bürgern natürlich die Alarmglocken an, denn es heißt, es schlägt das nächste große Herzensprojekt hier der Europäischen Union, das nächste große Projekt der Zentralisierung, die nächste große Schrumpfkur für unsere Bürger und Unternehmen. Wo stehen wir denn gerade? 500 Milliarden Euro bis 2030, über 2000 Milliarden Euro bis 2050 – das nächste Großprojekt steht an. Jetzt aber das finale Großprojekt der großen Vereinheitlichung in der EU.

Haben wir nichts aus Spanien gelernt? Wissen wir nicht, wie wichtig die Grundlastfähigkeit ist? Wissen wir nicht, wie wichtig ein wirklich großer Energiemix ist? Herzlichen Dank für die Zustimmung, Frau Paulus! Das ist das Entscheidende. Wir können einzelne Energieträger nicht verteufeln. Wir können nicht die Fehlentscheidungen des gesamten Green Deal und den Flatterstrom, der uns seit Jahren hier das Leben zur Hölle macht, insbesondere unseren Industrien und Bürgern, jetzt einzementieren. Wir müssen uns entscheiden für einen großen, offenen Energiemix. Wir müssen uns entscheiden für günstige Energiepreise, und dieser Weg, dieser Vorschlag ist genau der Falsche.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ zu antworten.)

**Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE)**, Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Buchheit, haben Sie den Bericht gelesen, der heute rauskam über die Ursache des Blackouts in Spanien, dass nämlich die konventionellen Kraftwerke leider ihre Aufgabe nicht erfüllt haben, sondern angesichts der Überspannung vom Netz gegangen sind, statt die Spannung zu halten, wie es vorgeschrieben gewesen wäre?

**Markus Buchheit (ESN)**, Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Lesen, selbstverständlich. Ich habe auch vorher schon gesehen, woran es lag in Spanien. Ich glaube eben durchaus, dass, wenn wir eine solide Grundlastfähigkeit hätten im Bereich der Kohlekraftwerke, im Bereich der Gaskraftwerke, auch im Bereich der Kernkraft, uns das erspart geblieben wäre, was in Spanien passiert ist. Und Sie wissen auch haargenau, dass es gerade die Überkapazität, die Überspannung bei den Solarkraftwerken war, die ursächlich zu diesem Problem geführt hat.

**Fernand Kartheiser (NI)**. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, la panne d'électricité en Espagne, le 28 avril dernier, a mis à nu les failles périlleuses du pacte vert. L'addiction aux énergies renouvelables instable promues par des ONG et financées par l'Union européenne, menace de plonger nos citoyens dans l'obscurité. Notre politique énergétique doit s'appuyer sur la science et non sur des chimères idéologiques.

L'interconnexion des réseaux d'électricité doit renforcer la stabilité au lieu de semer le chaos. Les conditions météorologiques synchronisées à travers l'Europe rendent l'échange d'énergie verte illusoire. Le nucléaire, seule solution fiable pour décarboner tout en sécurisant l'approvisionnement, est inexplicablement négligé par l'Union européenne. La panne espagnole sonne l'alarme afin de protéger nos citoyens et nos entreprises, seuls les réseaux basés sur des sources d'énergie fiables peuvent être interconnectés.

**Paulo Cunha (PPE)**. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, caros colegas, a segurança energética na União Europeia é uma prioridade.

A guerra na Ucrânia e o recente apagão na Península Ibérica deixaram isso bem claro.

A falta de interligações energéticas afeta a nossa segurança e até a nossa soberania, mas não só. Também a competitividade das nossas empresas e o bem-estar das nossas famílias são seriamente afetados.

Como diz o relatório que aqui discutimos, a integração do mercado energético poderá permitir economizar até 40 mil milhões € por ano e, se houver um aumento de 50 % no comércio elétrico entre países, o produto interno bruto anual da União Europeia poderá crescer 0,1 % equivalentes a 16,7 mil milhões € por ano.

Acresce que interligar a Península Ibérica com a França também ajudará à integração de energias renováveis, reduzindo custos e promovendo a descarbonização. Para isso, precisamos de alcançar a meta de 15 % de interligações até 2030.

Felicitemos o acordo assinado entre Espanha e França para o projeto de interligação do Golfo da Biscaia, mas é preciso ir mais longe. Apelamos, por isso, às entidades francesas para que se comprometam a implementar, sem demoras, esta interligação, assim como as outras duas interligações energéticas com a Península Ibérica.

Conseguindo, seremos mais soberanos, teremos mais segurança energética e promoveremos um mercado energético mais competitivo e descarbonizado da União Europeia.

**Цветелина Пенкова (S&D)**. – Г-н Председател, г-жо Комисар, колеги, Енергийната свързаност в Европейския съюз е ключова за намаляване на разходите на електроенергия. Трябва незабавно да инвестираме в електропреносни мрежи. Държави като България имат възможност да затвърдят мястото си на енергийни лидери в съюза, защото сме в основата на европейските коридори на свързаност по осите юг – север и изток – запад.

Изграждането на сигурна и справедлива енергийна система изисква комбиниран подход. На първо място трябва да инвестираме в енергийна инфраструктура и на второ място трябва да изградим балансиран енергиен микс, основан на базови енергийни мощности като ядрената енергетика. Само така ще гарантираме дългосрочно намаляване на сметките на нашите домакинства, ще гарантираме конкурентноспособност за нашите индустрии и ще намалим риска от авария и прекъсване на захранването.

Днес все още виждаме огромни различия в рамките на нашия Съюз. Страни от Югоизточна Европа плащат десет пъти по-високи сметки за електроенергия от страни в Северна Европа. Това трябва да спре.

**Isabella Tovaglieri (Pfe).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche un bambino sa che non è possibile costruire il tetto di un edificio se prima non si costruiscono le fondamenta. Eppure, questa Europa miope e ideologica lo ha fatto. Sfidando le leggi del buonsenso e della razionalità, ha imposto per decreto la sua transizione elettrica, senza però preoccuparsi di approntare prima un'adeguata rete di produzione e di distribuzione che garantisse le necessarie fondamenta all'obiettivo nobile della sostenibilità ambientale.

Il risultato oggi è sotto gli occhi di tutti. L'edificio del *Green Deal* sarebbe già collassato su se stesso se non lo tenessero in piedi le centrali a carbone, il petrolio del Medio Oriente, la tecnologia cinese, ma soprattutto gli enormi sforzi di cittadini e imprese che oggi si trovano a pagare le bollette più care al mondo.

Siete partiti dall'ideologia e adesso, solo adesso, vi interrogate su come fare nella pratica, con un clamoroso ritardo che ci costerà altri milioni di euro. Tanto a pagare il prezzo delle vostre scelte folli sono sempre gli stessi: i cittadini che annaspano e le imprese che chiudono.

*(L'oratrice rifiuta una domanda «cartellino blu» di Dario Nardella)*

**Mariateresa Vivaldini (ECR).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, le reti elettriche devono essere strumento di sovranità energetica, ma dobbiamo essere consapevoli delle sfide che ci attendono.

Ritardi negli interventi e difficoltà nel rilascio delle autorizzazioni richiedono uno sforzo coordinato. Integrare le reti, renderle flessibili e digitali avrà delle ricadute positive sui costi di generazione, ma in un contesto reso sempre più complicato dalle tensioni geopolitiche occorre ragionare su una prospettiva di più ampio spettro, che includa tutte le fonti energetiche disponibili, compreso il nucleare, e non focalizzata solo sulle rinnovabili.

Il testo elaborato in commissione ITRE risponde a questa visione, ma è chiaro che dovrà essere la Commissione ad apportare i necessari correttivi a un piano che, a nostro avviso, va migliorato.

C'è poi il tema delle risorse ed aver previsto nel nostro testo la richiesta di un aumento della dotazione dell'MCE-E è un messaggio chiaro. L'Italia, ad esempio, sta investendo oltre 4 miliardi nell'ammodernamento della sua rete, per renderla più resiliente, interconnessa e pronta a fronteggiare il crescente consumo di energia. Ma avrebbe bisogno di 23 miliardi per completare gli interventi. Se allarghiamo il quadro ai 27, questo fabbisogno sfiora i 600 miliardi, e con le regole attuali gli Stati membri non riusciranno a tenere il passo.

Proviamo quindi ad essere lungimiranti, prevedendo anche l'immissione in rete del nucleare o degli altri tipi di energia, per non essere costretti, come sempre, a rincorrere la trasformazione tecnologica.

**Barry Andrews (Renew).** – Mr President, Commissioner and colleagues, wind now supplies a third of Ireland's electricity, and by 2030 we might be able to exceed domestic demand and be able to provide up to 2.5 % of Europe's electricity needs by 2050. But all of this depends on significant investment in our grids and robust adherence to planning timeframes.

According to the Draghi report, it can take three years for the most efficient Member States to deliver grid permitting and nine years in the least efficient ones. And, of course, sadly, Ireland ranks in the latter category. For Ireland, it's like having a huge free supply of water, but only a few small buckets in which to carry it away – an abundant renewable resource held back by a grid that cannot handle it.

I would like to commend the book *Supergrid – Super Solution* by the late Eddie O'Connor and Kevin O'Sullivan, which sets out plans for efficiently transmitting vast amounts of cost-competitive, regionally produced energy to where it's most urgently needed. And I'm delighted to see many of those ideas contained in the excellent report of my colleague Anna Stürgkh.

**Benedetta Scuderi (Verts/ALE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel solo 2024 sette Stati membri hanno buttato più di sette miliardi di euro in energia pulita non utilizzata. Ci sono 1 700 gigawatt di energia rinnovabile bloccati per attesa di connessione alla rete in 16 paesi. E questi sono soltanto i dati dei paesi che abbiamo.

Sono numeri che parlano da soli: senza reti robuste, performanti ed efficienti, la transizione ecologica rischia di rimanere incompiuta. Le reti elettriche sono una vera linfa vitale dell'economia e sicurezza europea. Ma il sistema attuale non è pronto. Spesso si basa su piani nazionali obsoleti, incapaci di cogliere l'accelerazione delle rinnovabili e guidare gli investimenti e di creare una rete europea interconnessa. Così facendo prolunghiamo la dipendenza dal gas con costi altissimi per le nostre imprese e le nostre persone.

È indispensabile modernizzare e digitalizzare le reti per integrare i sistemi di accumulo, sviluppare sistemi efficienti per la flessibilità della domanda, tecnologie pulite e decentralizzate. Solo così potremo garantire una transizione giusta e partecipata, in cui le persone, le comunità locali, siano protagoniste, e allo stesso tempo elettrificare l'industria per migliorare la competitività delle nostre imprese, abbassando i prezzi e le bollette.

**Marcin Sypniewski (ESN).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Mówicie, że wiatraki i panele to prawie darmowa energia z wiatru i słońca. Kłamiecie. To jest największe oszustwo naszych czasów. Zobaczcie, ile trzeba dopłacać do modernizacji sieci przez te wasze zielone zabawki. Ile na tym zarabiacie? Bo przecież ja nie wierzę, że jesteście aż tak naiwni, że promujecie najdroższe i najbardziej niestabilne źródło energii. Raport, nad którym dzisiaj debatujemy, to nie jest żaden plan na tanią i bezpieczną energię. To jest kosztowny manifest Zielonego Ładu, który zamienia Europę w poligon ideologicznych eksperymentów.

Komisja chce podwoić inwestycje w sieci elektroenergetyczne. A te koszty oznaczają, że każdy mieszkaniec Unii zapłaci ponad 1300 euro do 2030 r. za ten plan, a do 2050 r. ponad 5000 euro. Każdy mieszkaniec Europy tyle zapłaci za dostosowanie sieci. Im więcej odnawialnych źródeł energii, tym więcej kabli, kosztów biurokracji i ryzyka blackoutów. To jest droga donikąd. Potrzebujemy energii i rozsądku, a nie fanatyzmu.

(Mówca zgodził się na pytanie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki)

**Stine Bosse (Renew), blue-card question.** – I just want to ask you, what is your suggestion – to stay relying on Russian gas and oil and gas from the Middle East? What is your actual solution? What is your actual source of energy looking ahead? And do you know what investment means? That means investing now, with a relatively short payback period, with the cheapest energy you could ever imagine when we get the grid running.

**Marcin Sypniewski (ESN), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.** – Szanowna Pani, ja pochodzę z Polski. My mamy wielkie zasoby węgla. Węgiel jest podstawą naszej energetyki i dzięki temu mieliśmy się dobrze, a obecnie mamy nadal suwerenność energetyczną. Nie zależyśmy od ruskiego gazu, możemy czerpać z własnych złóż. A wy chcecie nam zamknąć elektrownie węglowe. Chcecie zamknąć nasze kopalnie i zmusić nas do korzystania z paneli i z wiatraków. My chcemy nadal korzystać z węgla i z atomu. I to są dwie podstawy, na której możemy oprzeć naszą gospodarkę energetyczną.

**Fidias Panayiotou (NI).** – Mr President, energy is the backbone of our economy. From driving our cars to taking a shower and even powering the AI factories of tomorrow, everything depends on reliable energy.

We need to reduce the cost of energy. To achieve this we must invest heavily in nuclear power. I know people have concerns, but nuclear is safer than you might think. We need to focus also on renewables – especially solar energy – and, just as importantly, on batteries to store the energy so we always have the power, day and night.

We must also recognise that not all countries start from the same place. Current green regulations and timelines are often too aggressive, leaving little room for regions still heavily dependent on fossil fuels to catch up – like my country, Cyprus.

If we get energy right, we will make Europeans richer and improve everyone's quality of life. I love you all.

**Mirosława Nykiel (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Koleżanki i koledzy! Energia elektryczna to krwiobieg nowoczesnego państwa. Bez niej nie działa nic – szkoły, szpitale, instytucje, fabryki, a nawet, jak mówiła pani reporterka, kawy rano nie możemy się napić. Niemniej jednak bez zintegrowanego systemu energetycznego, opartego również przejściowo o gaz ziemny, ale też atom i wodór, Unia Europejska nie będzie energetycznie zabezpieczona.

Koleżanki i koledzy! Świat, w którym żyjemy, to też agresywne reżimy atakujące nasze wartości, granice, ale także infrastrukturę, zwłaszcza tę krytyczną. Musimy być gotowi nie tylko technologicznie, ale też strategicznie. Musimy być odporni. Niestety europejska sieć elektroenergetyczna pozostaje niespójna i rozproszona. Dlatego opracowaliśmy sprawozdanie, które odpowiada na wezwania do lepszej koordynacji, strategicznego finansowania, uproszczenia procedur i realnego wsparcia dla sektora przemysłu europejskiego. Zadbaliśmy o to, aby sprawozdanie nie było ideologiczne, nie narzucało krajom członkowskim jednego modelu czy miksu energetycznego. Transformacja musi być oparta na współpracy, a nie przymusie.

Chcę pochwalić polski rząd, bo polskie sieci elektroenergetyczne przeznaczą na modernizację i unowocześnienie sieci aż 64 mld złotych do 2034 r. I kolejne trzy spółki główne – 14 mld zł. To zwiększy niezawodność i odporność sieci całego systemu. To dobre i potrzebne sprawozdanie. Bardzo dziękuję wszystkim, którzy nad nim pracowali.

**Γιάννης Μανιάτης (S&D).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα δίκτυα και η αποθήκευση αποτελούν τον πυρήνα του μελλοντικού ενεργειακού μας συστήματος. Είναι απαραίτητα ώστε να μπορέσουν οι φθιγνές ανανεώσιμες πηγές να καθορίσουν τις τελικές τιμές ενέργειας των καταναλωτών, κάτι που δυστυχώς ακόμη δεν το έχουμε καταφέρει.

Τόσο η αναθεώρηση του κανονισμού για τα διευρωπαϊκά δίκτυα όσο και ο επόμενος πολυετής δημοσιονομικός προγραμματισμός οφείλουν να επιταχύνουν τις επενδύσεις. Ένα πλαίσιο που θα δίνει προτεραιότητα στην ενεργειακή ασφάλεια και τη μείωση των διαφορετικών τιμών ανάμεσα στα κράτη μέλη, για να μην ξαναζήσουμε φαινόμενα όπως το πρόσφατο blackout στην βηρική και οι υψηλές τιμές ενέργειας στην Ελλάδα.

Τέλος, η Ευρώπη να δείξει έμπρακτη υποστήριξη των έργων κοινού ενδιαφέροντος για την αύξηση της ανθεκτικότητας, της αυτονομίας και της προστασίας των δικτύων από ακραία καιρικά φαινόμενα και κακόβουλες ενέργειες.

**Julie Rechagneux (PFE).** – Monsieur le Président, les réseaux électriques sont la colonne vertébrale du système énergétique européen, mais cette colonne vertébrale est aujourd'hui fragilisée. 40 % des réseaux de distribution en Europe ont plus de 40 ans et 60 % devront être rénovés ou remplacés d'ici dix ans. La Commission elle-même le reconnaît dans son propre plan d'action de novembre 2023: 584 milliards d'euros d'investissements seront nécessaires d'ici 2030, dont plus de 400 milliards rien que pour la distribution. Et pourtant, au lieu de mobiliser les États et leur capacité industrielle, vous persistez à imposer une planification hors sol, pensée à Bruxelles, dictée par les lobbys et incapable de répondre aux réalités du terrain.

Pendant ce temps, les délais de raccordement s'allongent partout en Europe, jusqu'à dix ans pour certains projets agricoles ou industriels. Tout cela parce que vous avez voulu construire un marché unique de l'électricité sans en garantir ni la stabilité, ni la souveraineté, ni la sécurité. Et pendant que vous parlez d'interconnexion, l'Europe perd chaque année jusqu'à 10 % de son électricité dans les réseaux, l'équivalent de la consommation de la France.

Nous, nous portons une autre vision: un réseau souverain pilotable, fondé sur le nucléaire, la stabilité et la maîtrise publique. Oui à des investissements européens, mais au service des nations, pas au service d'un dogme technocratique. L'électricité n'est pas une marchandise, c'est un bien vital, un levier de puissance, une affaire de souveraineté. Notre position est claire et constante. La France n'a pas à se faire dicter ses choix énergétiques par la Commission européenne.

**PRESIDENZA: ANTONELLA SBERNA***Vicepresidente*

**Ivars Ijabs (Renew).** – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, first of all, I want to congratulate Anna for an excellent report. To me, of course, the key part of that report is the resilience. We can't work on a single market for energy and electricity, we can't decrease prices for our citizens, if we do not think about the security of our networks.

I think that two elements are equally important, and they are covered in the report. These are cyber and physical infrastructure. The number of cyber-attacks has increased and that's why the implementation of the NIS2 Directive and the Cybersecurity Act are really vitally important.

And as for the physical infrastructure, the defence of our strategic infrastructure, especially undersea cables, in this age of growing offshore wind, is crucial. Security measures like sonar, like undersea drones, like sensors. The world is not secure anymore and our energy systems are targeted by unfriendly forces. Let's be aware of this and act accordingly.

**Michael Bloss (Verts/ALE).** – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Gestern haben wir beschlossen, kein Gas mehr aus Russland zu importieren, aber wir dürfen jetzt nicht einfach auf dreckiges Gas von Trump umsteigen. Wir müssen die Chancen nutzen von Sonne und Wind hier auf unserem Kontinent. Dafür braucht es eine Stärkung der Stromnetze, aber auch eine Stärkung von jedem einzelnen Haushalt, denn wir alle können von der Energiewende profitieren. Dafür muss aber umgesetzt werden, was längst europäisch beschlossen wurde.

Bürgerinnen und Bürger haben ein Recht auf einen digitalen Stromzähler, damit sie dann Strom nutzen können, wenn er günstig ist. Es kann ja wohl nicht sein, dass gerade in Deutschland nur 4 % der Haushalte über so einen Smart Meter verfügen. Wann kommt endlich die Möglichkeit für E-Auto-Besitzerinnen und -Besitzer, auch Strom ins Netz einzuspeisen? Wann kommt der Booster für die Batterien? Das sind alles Punkte, die den Netzausbau günstiger machen.

Die Menschen haben ein Recht darauf, von der Energiewende zu profitieren, und das sagt auch dieser Bericht, deswegen herzlichen Glückwunsch dazu.

**Andrea Wechsler (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin Zaharieva, sehr geehrte Frau Stürgkh, liebe Anna, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Europas Stromnetze sind das Rückgrat unserer strategischen Energiezukunft. Jüngste Projektionen zeigen: Weltweit wird sich die Stromnachfrage bis 2040 fast verdoppeln. Ohne stabile, leistungsfähige Netze bleibt jedoch jegliche Elektrifizierungsstrategie ein leeres Versprechen. Was wir aber sehen, ist, dass regional heutzutage Nachfrage und Infrastruktur längst nicht im Gleichklang sind, und daher müssen wir hart daran arbeiten. Wir brauchen resiliente und autonome Energiesysteme durch lokale Netzstrukturen, die Versorgung auch bei Krisen sicherstellen.

Aber lassen Sie mich auch eines klarstellen: Wir erleben heute vielerorts eine Schieflage – massiver Netzausbau ohne ausreichende Erzeugungskapazität oder reale Verbrauchernachfrage. Der Bedarf an Netzausbau, der muss sich an dem realen Verhältnis von Angebot und Nachfrage orientieren.

Lassen Sie mich auch klarstellen: Elektrifizierung darf nicht bedeuten, dass andere Energieträger an den Rand gedrängt werden. Elektronen und Moleküle müssen Hand in Hand gehen. Nur so sichern wir eine technologisch offene und resiliente Energiezukunft. Lassen Sie mich auch klarstellen: Bei der Frage des Netzausbaus müssen wir Cybersicherheit ebenso strategisch und zwingend mitdenken wie Fragen der strategischen Souveränität.

Meine Damen und Herren, Europas Stromnetze sind das Rückgrat unserer strategischen Energiezukunft. Lassen Sie uns die Netze klug ausbauen, sicher, bedarfsgerecht und technologieoffen.

**Dario Nardella (S&D).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, collega relatrice, signora Commissaria, in Europa abbiamo una rete complessa e invisibile, lunga oltre 11 milioni di chilometri, che collega 266 milioni di famiglie e imprese in tutta l'Unione europea.

Abbiamo una sfida epocale: rendere questa rete pronta alla neutralità climatica entro il 2050. Dunque bene il piano per l'energia economicamente accessibile e bene, per il 2026, il *Grid Package* per accelerare una struttura transfrontaliera più sicura ed efficiente in termini di costi, che fornisca energia sicura, pulita e accessibile ai cittadini e alle imprese europee.

Ma il consumo elettrico aumenterà del 60 % entro il 2030. Servono reti robuste, resilienti e intelligenti. E dunque un investimento totale di 600 miliardi di euro entro il 2040. Dove trovarli? L'80-90 % degli investimenti ricadono su Stati e operatori privati, quindi sui cittadini attraverso le tariffe, con rischio di forti disuguaglianze.

Occorre una strategia europea con un fondo europeo per le reti e *green bond* europei per investimenti a lunga durata.

**Mireia Borrás Pabón (Pfe).** – Señora presidenta, este informe confirma exactamente lo que desde VOX llevamos años denunciando, y es que han puesto en riesgo a millones de europeos con una transición energética tremendamente ideologizada, acelerada y técnicamente inviable. Y es que su modelo energético ha sido diseñado, señorías, para fallar: porque han sustituido tecnologías firmes, síncronas —como la nuclear o la hidráulica— por generación intermitente, asíncrona y sin respaldo suficiente. Han demolido nuestra soberanía energética, la de todos los europeos, en nombre del Pacto Verde Europeo. Han convertido este Pacto en su religión climática, y el resultado lo vimos el 28 de abril, día en el que España se apagó, se quedó a oscuras, en el que murieron, al menos, diez personas —mi pésame desde aquí a sus familias— y en el que sufrimos más de 1 600 millones de euros en pérdidas. Cincuenta y un días después, el Gobierno de España se ha limitado a repartir culpas como panfletos, mientras hemos tenido que presenciar aquí la bochornosa situación de una exministra de la ruina energética y su actual comisaria, Teresa Ribera, que salió corriendo, huyendo del debate del apagón.

No ha fallado la red, señorías, ha fallado su ideología. Han fallado ustedes, otra vez.

**Marion Maréchal (ECR).** – Chers collègues, le black-out espagnol d'avril dernier n'est pas le fruit d'un mauvais concours de circonstances, contrairement à ce qu'essaie de faire croire le gouvernement espagnol. C'est le résultat d'un mix énergétique déséquilibré où dominant l'énergie solaire et l'éolien. C'est une alerte qui devrait convaincre ce Parlement de renoncer à pousser les pays à s'engager vers un pourcentage très élevé d'énergies renouvelables intermittentes. Le tout avec un réseau inadéquat, dont le coût d'adaptation serait tel qu'il ferait exploser le prix de l'électricité pour les consommateurs.

Derrière les promesses vertes, il y a une autre réalité occultée. La présence massive des énergies renouvelables intermittentes force le nucléaire à moduler sa production, entraînant une usure prématurée des équipements, un coût d'exploitation plus élevé et une perte de rentabilité.

Ce black-out est un signal d'alarme. Si nous continuons avec les objectifs du pacte vert, nous prenons le risque de voir les pannes de courant se multiplier en Europe. Il n'est pas trop tard pour faire les bons choix, en favorisant davantage le nucléaire et les énergies renouvelables non intermittentes comme l'hydroélectricité, la géothermie ou la biomasse.

**Bart Groothuis (Renew).** – Madam President, dear Commissioner, Portugal and Spain's meltdown of the electricity grid in April happened because 2.5 GW fell off the electricity grid in capacity. Chinese company Huawei alone controls a solar inverter capacity in Europe of more than 100 GW. Six Chinese vendors collectively hold more than 200 GW of inverter capacity across Europe. That is more than enough to destabilise the entire European grid, and it can be done from Beijing remotely, silently and devastatingly fast.

Why are we allowing this vulnerability to grow? We already took action in 2021 on risky vendors in telecommunication infrastructure. And now it's time we do the same for our energy infrastructure. Now, it's time we have a binding grid security toolbox that bans risky vendors from our critical infrastructure. Our political assessment is exactly that, Commissioner. There are no quick fixes, but there are alternatives also from Europe, and, above all, there is a need for a path out of these unacceptable dependencies. And it's up to you and the Commission to lead us the way out of it.

**Virgil-Daniel Popescu (PPE).** – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, dragi colegi, este momentul să recunoaștem un adevăr simplu: fără rețele electrice moderne și interconectate, politicile noastre energetice rămân doar intenții. Tranziția verde nu va reuși dacă unele regiuni sunt condamnate la izolare energetică, la prețuri mari și la o competitivitate scăzută. Am propus și am susținut amendamente care cer măsuri concrete, investiții urgente și interconectări acolo unde lipsesc, cum este cazul între Austria, Ungaria și Slovacia, o evaluare realistă a blocajelor de rețea și un mecanism clar de compensare a pierderilor pentru dezvoltatorii de proiecte afectați de congestie.

Europa are nevoie de o infrastructură care să permită circulația liberă a energiei acolo unde este nevoie și când este nevoie, iar acest lucru înseamnă și solidaritate între regiuni, mai ales cu cele din Europa Centrală și de Sud-Est, care contribuie activ la securitatea energetică a Uniunii, inclusiv în sprijinul Ucrainei. Ca să înțelegeți exact, în urma războiului de agresiune al Rusiei împotriva Ucrainei și bombardarea rețelei energetice a Ucrainei, aceasta s-a transformat în importator net din exportator de energie. De unde ia această energie? Din zona Europei de Est, din zona limitrofă. A crescut cererea de energie. Interconectarea între Europa de Vest și Europa de Est este foarte slabă. Există o gâtuire în Austria, deci este clar că acolo nu avem energie suficientă și prețurile sunt mai mari.

Am vrut să înțeleagă toată lumea exact ceea ce se întâmplă pe frontiera cu Ucraina. Fac apel la Comisia Europeană și la statele membre să prioritizeze interconectarea, pentru că fără ea nu putem vorbi nici de decarbonizare, nici de coeziune, nici de autonomie strategică, nici de securitate energetică.

**Jens Geier (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal meinen Dank an die Berichterstatteerin: Liebe Anna, das ist ein großartiger Bericht, der uns sehr viel Material für die weitere Arbeit an der Energiewende gibt, denn wir müssen die Ineffizienzen, Ineffektivitäten im Stromnetz in Europa abstellen. Dafür brauchen wir eine europaweite Vernetzung – das ist unsere Aufgabe hier, das sicherzustellen und die Grundlagen dafür zu schaffen. Deswegen müssen wir auch – und darauf weist der Bericht hin – in Zukunft die Dekarbonisierung und die Digitalisierung zusammen denken; das ist ein gesellschaftlicher und wirtschaftlicher Auftrag. Gut dafür ist, dass die Europäische Investitionsbank eine Garantieabsicherung mit einem Volumen von 1,5 Milliarden Euro zur Verfügung stellen wird, um die Hersteller von Komponenten für das Stromnetz zu unterstützen. Das schafft Wachstum und Arbeitsplätze und am Ende dann auch eine zusätzliche Versorgungssicherheit.

Es ist auch zentral, dass die Kommission ihre Empfehlungen für die harmonisierte Methode für die Berechnung der Netzgarantien vorlegt. Das ist uns versprochen worden, Frau Kommissarin, für das zweite Quartal, und dieses Quartal endet übernächste Woche. Die Netzgebühren im Griff zu behalten, ist wichtig, denn es ist ja egal, ob die Haushalte und die Wirtschaft unter hohen Strompreisen leiden oder unter hohen Netzgebühren. Die Rechnungen dürfen nicht so hoch bleiben. Die hohen Energiekosten stellen eine entscheidende soziale Frage dar, und die müssen wir für das Klima, für die Menschen und für die Arbeitsplätze lösen.

**Nikola Bartůšek (PřE).** – Paní předsedající, dámy a pánové, zanechme, prosím, na chvíli politických ideologií a budme realističtí. To my sami si zavíráme levnější zdroje energií. Německo odstavilo jaderné elektrárny, my v Česku plánujeme předčasný konec uhelných zdrojů. Současně tlačíme obnovitelné zdroje bez ohledu na jejich dostupnost, stabilitu a cenu. Výsledkem jsou drahé energie pro naše občany a firmy. Levná a dostupná elektřina je přitom základem každé fungující ekonomiky. Bez ní neudržíme konkurenceschopnost, průmysl ani životní úroveň domácností. Decentralizace výroby energie zní dobře na papíře, ale v praxi je extrémně nákladná a nestabilní. Častější výpadky a možný kolaps přenosové sítě, to je ta reálná daň. Některé regiony nemají dost slunce, větru ani prostoru, přesto se na ně tlačí stejný model, jako by podmínky byly všude stejné. Energetická síť musí být technologicky realistická, ekonomicky udržitelná a sociálně spravedlivá. Jinak skončíme s drahou, nespolehlivou sítí a s občany, kteří si energii nebudou moci dovolit.

**Beatrice Timgren (ECR).** – Fru talman! Kommissionen kallar elnätet för ryggraden i Europas energisystem. Men vad hjälper en ryggrad om resten av kroppen är förlamad på grund av skenande elpriser och osäker tillgång?

I stället för att satsa på kärnkraft betalade Bryssel miljontals euro till NGO:er för att kampanja för sina intressen. Det var hemliga kontrakt, ledamöter fick bara läsa dem i övervakade rum, inte ha några mobiltelefoner. Och detta kallar man för transparens.

Och Sverige, ja, vi betalar priset. Våra elpriser dras upp av tyska energimissar för vi sitter fast i samma nät. Om kommissionen hade satsat på kärnkraft i stället för skattefinansierad propaganda hade vi haft både renare luft och lägre elpriser. Vi behöver billig, ren, pålitlig energi, inte manipulation av opinionen med offentliga medel.

**Wouter Beke (PPE).** – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, ons elektriciteitsnet is het meest geïntegreerde van de hele wereld. En toch stellen we vandaag pijnlijk vast dat het niet aangepast is aan de realiteit van de 21e eeuw. Ooit is het gebouwd op fossiele grondstoffen en gecentraliseerde productie. Maar vandaag bevinden we ons in een nieuw tijdperk: dat van wind- en zonne-energie naast nucleaire energie. Dat van elektrische voertuigen tot waterpompen en digitalisering.

Doen we niets, dan missen we niet alleen onze klimaatdoelstellingen, maar stellen we ons ook bloot aan nieuwe energiecrisisen. Zo ondergraven we onze economische groei van morgen. De nood is hoog. Burgers en bedrijven vragen betaalbare, betrouwbare en schone stroom. Lokale gemeenschappen willen bijdragen aan projecten rond hernieuwbare energie. Daarom moeten we dringend drie dingen doen:

1. Investeer grootschalig in het elektriciteitsnet met voldoende steun voor grensoverschrijdende projecten.
2. Versnel de vergunningsprocedures en zorg ervoor dat Europese milieuregels de energietransitie steunen in plaats van blokkeren.
3. Stimuleer stabiliteit en flexibiliteit en beloon burgers en bedrijven die investeren in hernieuwbare energie.

Collega's, het elektriciteitsnet is geen bijzaak. Het is de ruggengraat van onze toekomst. Investeer nu of we lopen het risico om grandioos achteruit te geraken.

**Nicolás González Casares (S&D).** – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, quiero dar la enhorabuena a la ponente y al ponente de mi Grupo, el señor Tobback, por el buen informe.

Se ha mencionado mucho a España y al apagón y quisiera despejar algunas dudas porque veo que hay gente que desconoce que, según los recientes informes, las renovables no han tenido nada que ver con el apagón. Las renovables son garantía del futuro de Europa y tenemos que seguir avanzando por esa senda, pero es cierto que las renovables necesitan una red más segura, necesitan avanzar en las interconexiones. Vamos hacia una mayor electrificación de nuestra economía —en esta senda de descarbonización— y necesitamos mejorar las redes.

Permítanme subrayar tres prioridades. En primer lugar, promover inversiones y hacerlas de manera anticipada, como dice la reforma del mercado eléctrico. En segundo lugar, aplicación e implementación de la legislación acordada. Y, en tercer lugar, conectar las periferias. La península ibérica y otras áreas de Europa no pueden estar por debajo del 15 % de interconexión.

Tenemos que avanzar en estas interconexiones, en integrar un mercado eléctrico con diferentes fuentes de energía: con sol en el sur, viento en el norte, agua en el este. Tenemos que integrarlo todo y hacer que esta descarbonización sea una oportunidad para una Europa más competitiva a través de mejores redes.

*(El orador acepta responder a varias preguntas formuladas con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»)*

**João Oliveira (The Left),** Pergunta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul». – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Deputado González, falou-nos a propósito do apagão e disse-nos que o problema não são as energias renováveis, e, de facto, não são.

Porque o problema que esteve na origem do apagão tanto podia ser provocado por energia produzida a partir de fontes renováveis, como por qualquer outra fonte. Há um problema que é a não diversificação das fontes que alimentam a produção de energia elétrica, porque os critérios de mercado determinam que assim seja.

A pergunta que lhe quero fazer é a seguinte: as redes e o sistema de produção e distribuição de energia elétrica podem continuar a ser determinados por critérios de mercado ou devem ser orientados em função das necessidades das populações e das necessidades da produção económica?

Porque se fossem esses os critérios, possivelmente até do ponto de vista da segurança das redes ficaríamos mais salvaguardados.

**Nicolás González Casares (S&D)**, respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – (inicio de la intervención fuera de micrófono) ... yo creo que los criterios económicos son importantes a la hora de hacer unas redes más eficientes. Por lo tanto, hay que tomar decisiones sobre la base, también, de esos resultados económicos, pero, sin duda, mejorando las redes, ampliando las interconexiones, su país, Portugal, y el mío —que confían en fuentes de energía renovables— tendrán más oportunidades, tendrán más industria.

Por lo tanto, más renovables y más redes son el futuro de la península ibérica.

**Mireia Borrás Pabón (Pfe)**, pregunta de «tarjeta azul». – Señor González Casares, yo creo que decir que las renovables no tuvieron nada que ver en el apagón es mentir y ser un poco irresponsable, porque ese día, precisamente, el 71 % de la generación eléctrica en España era renovable —el 58 %, concretamente, era solar—: fuentes asíncronas sin capacidad de estabilizar la red cuando cayó la frecuencia. Y esto no lo dice Vox, no lo digo yo, lo dice el propio informe del Gobierno: faltó generación síncrona y tecnologías firmes que pudieran mantener el sistema.

Así que, efectivamente, las renovables no son el enemigo. El problema es imponerlas a cualquier precio, sin planificación, sin una estrategia clara, sin respaldo y sin una red que lo soporte. Eso fue lo que provocó el colapso: su ideología y su política energética, tremendamente ideologizada, sin ningún tipo de estrategia, planificación ni sentido común.

**Nicolás González Casares (S&D)**, respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Usted misma lo ha dicho, señora Borrás: no fueron las renovables. En España hay días con más penetración de energías renovables y de energía solar, y usted lo sabe bien, lo que pasa es que yo no puedo coincidir en todas sus valoraciones porque yo no vengo a defender aquí una economía fósil, como sí hace su partido.

Por lo tanto, yo defiendo que las oportunidades de mi país están en las fuentes de energía autóctonas. El patriotismo también es confiar en nuestros recursos, no en los recursos de otros, como los de Putin o los de Trump, que son los que defienden ustedes. Yo no sigo ese camino, permítamelo.

**Gilles Pennelle (Pfe)**. – Madame la Présidente, le parc éolien offshore de Saint Brieuç, en Bretagne, en France, a été confié à la multinationale Iberdrola, qui facture à EDF le mégawatt heure à 155 € alors que la production par une centrale nucléaire française, c'est 65 € du mégawatt heure. Il faut ajouter à cela le raccordement, le réseau, qui coûte une fortune: 20 € du mégawatt heure. La France a en plus annoncé un plan pluriannuel de 37 milliards pour raccorder les plateformes offshore en mer.

Ces plateformes offshore défigurent nos paysages et sont un véritable défi lancé à nos pêcheurs. Alors nous payons cher effectivement le dogmatisme et l'idéologie verte destructive de l'Union européenne. Parce que nous perdons notre souveraineté alimentaire, nous mettons en danger les usagers. On l'a vu tout à l'heure, nous faisons de gros profits pour les multinationales et des coûts exorbitants pour les citoyens de l'Union européenne. Nous combattons cette politique. C'est une folle politique.

**Hildegard Bentele (PPE)**. – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kommissarin, liebe Kollegen! Ausfälle bei der Stromversorgung – das ist ein Szenario, das derzeit in der EU dank stabiler Stromnetze glücklicherweise äußerst selten droht. Doch der Energiebedarf steigt täglich, während der Netzausbau ins Stocken gerät, nicht nur wegen fehlender Planung, sondern zunehmend auch, weil Kabel und Transformatoren fehlen. Laut der Energieagentur dauert es inzwischen bis zu vier Jahre, um große Transformatoren zu beschaffen. Die Lieferzeiten haben sich seit 2021 fast verdoppelt, und das ist kein Zufall. Die Nachfrage nach Kupfer und Aluminium wird bis 2050 weiter um ein Drittel steigen; ohne gesicherte Lieferketten und strategische Rohstoffpartnerschaften wird das Netz nicht ausgebaut werden. Deshalb bringe ich mich auch als Parlamentsvertreterin im EU-Rohstoff-Board für eine bessere und sichere Rohstoffversorgung sehr, sehr aktiv ein.

Gleichzeitig brauchen wir endlich gezielte Maßnahmen gegen den Fachkräftemangel. Bis 2050 werden über 2 Millionen zusätzliche Jobs allein in der Stromverteilung benötigt. Wir brauchen daher eine neue Ausbildungsoffensive, technikorientiert, praxisnah und mit mehr Frauen im Energiesektor. Stromnetze sind nicht nur Infrastruktur, sondern ein strategisches Gesamtprojekt – Industriepolitik, Rohstoffpolitik, Bildungspolitik. Vielen Dank an die Berichterstatterin, und jetzt geht es an die Umsetzung.

(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ zu antworten.)

**Lukas Sieper (NI)**, Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Vielen Dank, Frau Kollegin, dass Sie die blaue Karte akzeptiert haben. Sie haben unter anderem den Fachkräftemangel angesprochen. Da sind die Zahlen ja ganz eindeutig, und so sehr ich Ihnen mit der Ausbildungs-offensive zustimme, so sehr, denke ich, werden Sie mir auch zustimmen, wenn ich sage, dass die Fachleute uns sagen, dass wir allein mit unserer eigenen Bevölkerung diesem Fachkräftemangel nicht beikommen können. Gleichzeitig gibt es ja in weiten Teilen der Bevölkerung und auch in diesem Parlament große Ängste vor Zuwanderung. Wie können wir denn effektiv die Zuwanderung nutzen, um dem Fachkräftemangel im Energiesektor und auch in allen anderen Sektoren entgegenzuwirken?

**Hildegard Bentele (PPE)**, Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Ohne jetzt genau zu wissen, wie viele Fachkräfte da sozusagen noch in der Warteschlange sind, kennen Sie ja aber auch die Initiativen in der Europäischen Union bezüglich legaler Zuwanderung. Wir haben ja auch einen Talentpool auf die Beine gestellt, wo sich eben Arbeitgeber mit potenziellen Arbeitnehmern vernetzen können. Ich glaube, das ist eine gute Initiative, und ich bin da vollkommen bei Ihnen: Wir brauchen legale Fachkräftezuwanderung.

**Sofie Eriksson (S&D)**. – Fru talman! Jag bor i Grängesberg i Ludvika kommun. Vi har varit världsledande inom överföring av energi i över 120 år.

Jag vänder mig nu hemåt – till er, elektriker, ingenjörer, montörer och arbetare. Ni som skruvar, lägger skivor, testar och bygger. Ni som förvandlar metall, koppar och kunskap till kraft. Ni förtjänar respekt och bra arbetsvillkor. För lång tid framöver kommer er yrkesskicklighet att bära Europa. Er världsledande kunskap om HVDC-system och transformatorer kommer att stärka Europa.

Och Europa letar efter er. Europa behöver er för att vi aldrig mer ska behöva stå på knä inför rysk gas, aldrig mer vara beroende av diktatorsers olja. I varje transformator, brytare, kabel, i varje arbetspass, kommer min hemkommun Ludvika att leda Europa mot ett starkare samhälle. Ett Europa som drivs av billig, egenproducerad energi som färdats genom Ludvikas arbetares hantverk. Det gör mig stolt.

**Niels Flemming Hansen (PPE)**. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, as a conservative politician, nothing – nothing – is more important than our duty to leave a safe and liveable planet to the next generation. In a time of uncertainty, this report on energy infrastructure sends a crucial signal of hope and decisive action.

We have to ask ourselves, not only as politicians, but also as citizens in Europe, what is more important? Building the infrastructure that keeps us safe and independent, or continuing long and difficult permitting procedures? I believe this can be done better.

The expansion of our electric grid is a matter of Europe's security and strategic independence. Our access to energy must not be in the hands of unfriendly regimes. We must be able to act as each other's batteries; so when the sun shines in Spain and the wind is blowing in Denmark.

Therefore, our message today is simple. Parliament has shown the way, now we expect the Commission to follow up with ambitious legislation and for Member States to turn words into action. Permits for energy infrastructure must be accelerated – our citizens expect it, future generations depend on it and our security requires it.

**Jüri Ratas (PPE)**. – Austatud president, head ametikaaslased! Austatud volinik! Me ei saa rääkida Euroopa majanduse konkurentsivõimest või energeetilisest iseseisvusest ilma tugeva, kaasaegse ja vastupidava energiavõrguta. Kui võrgud on meie energiasüsteemi selgroog, siis tuleb tõdeda, et see selgroog on hetkel veel liiga habras ega pea tulevikukoormusele vastu.

Elektritarbimine kasvab. Taastuenergia osakaal samuti tõuseb ning inimesed ootavad, et Euroopa suudab seda kõike hallata. Paraku näeme täna ikka veel viivitusi, kitsaskohtasid ja investeeringulünki. Euroopa ei saa endale lubada, et tema elektrivõrgud jäävad ajast maha. 584 miljardit eurot ei ole kulu. See on investering. Investeering meie julgeolekuse ja majanduslikku tulevikku.

Ma tean eestlasena väga hästi, kui ohtlik võib olla energeetiline sõltuvus ja mida tähendab sellest välja murdmine. Oleme juba teinud suuri samme: liitunud Põhjamaade elektrituruga, ehitatud ühendused Soome ja Lätiga ning desünkroniseerinud end Venemaa võrgust. Kuid sellest ei piisa, kui ülejäänud Euroopa jääb toppama.

Tänagi on Eesti elektrisüsteemi koormus kõikum ja hind on tundidel väga erinev, näiteks võrreldes Soomega. See ei ole õiglane ega jätkusuutlik. Aitäh!

**Michał Szczerba (PPE).** – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowna Pani Komisarz! Ta dyskusja jest bardzo ważna, ponieważ musimy postawić na modernizację naszych sieci elektroenergetycznych. Jest to bardzo ważne dla naszej gospodarki i bardzo ważne dla naszego bezpieczeństwa. Tylko nowoczesna infrastruktura może zapewnić stabilność systemu, jego odporność i skuteczne połączenia transgraniczne. Tegoroczna awaria zasilania w Hiszpanii, spowodowana przeciążeniem i przestarzałą infrastrukturą, pozostawiła dziesiątki milionów ludzi bez prądu. To był poważny sygnał ostrzegawczy dla Europy.

Ponad 30% sieci w Unii Europejskiej ma dziś ponad 40 lat, co skutecznie ogranicza możliwości rozwoju energetyki przydomowej i lokalnej samowystarczalności. Rolą instytucji Unii Europejskiej jest wspierać. Rolą Unii Europejskiej jest zabezpieczyć środki na modernizację sieci dystrybucyjnych. Oczekuje tego także mój kraj, Polska. Oczekujemy od Komisji Europejskiej odpowiadającego wyzwaniom pakietu legislacyjnego dotyczącego sieci elektroenergetycznych – Grid Package. Bezpieczna Europa to także bezpieczeństwo energetyczne.

**Δημήτρης Τσιόδρας (PPE).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, οι τιμές ενέργειας στην Ευρώπη παραμένουν ιδιαίτερα υψηλές σε σύγκριση με τους παγκόσμιους ανταγωνιστές μας, αλλά σημαντικές διαφορές υπάρχουν και μεταξύ των ιδίων των κρατών μελών. Ιδίως στην Ελλάδα και τη νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη, το ενεργειακό κόστος παραμένει ακόμη πιο υψηλό, πλήττοντας δυσανάλογα τους πολίτες και τις επιχειρήσεις. Αυτό το κοινωνικό και οικονομικό χάσμα δεν μπορεί να συνεχιστεί. Χρειαζόμαστε στοχευμένα μέτρα, για να μειώσουμε τις τιμές και να αποκαταστήσουμε την ισορροπία και τη συνοχή μεταξύ των κρατών μελών.

Τον Ιανουάριο του 2025 ο πρωθυπουργός της Ελλάδας Κυριάκος Μητσοτάκης πρότεινε δημιουργία task force για τον καλύτερο συντονισμό στην ενεργειακή πολιτική και την επιτάχυνση της ενεργειακής ένωσης. Χαιρετίζουμε τη σύσταση της στις 16 Ιουνίου. Ο εκσυγχρονισμός και η διασυνδεσιμότητα των δικτύων αποτελούν κλειδί σε αυτήν την προσπάθεια. Το σχέδιο δράσης για τα δίκτυα κινείται στη σωστή κατεύθυνση, όμως η πρόκληση είναι πλέον η ταχεία και συνεκτική υλοποίησή του. Η Ελλάδα, ήδη από τη σύνοδο κορυφής του Μαρτίου 2023, κατέθεσε συγκεκριμένες προτάσεις για τη διασύνδεση, την επιτάχυνση των αδειοδοτήσεων και τη δημιουργία ενιαίου Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Δικτύων.

Η Επιτροπή εκτιμά ότι θα απαιτηθούν 584 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ έως το 2030 για δίκτυα μεταφοράς και διανομής. Τα σημερινά κονδύλια δεν επαρκούν. Απαιτείται ενίσχυσή τους και μόχλευση ιδιωτικών επενδύσεων. Η στρατηγική για τα δίκτυα δεν είναι τεχνική, είναι ενεργειακή, βιομηχανική, κοινωνική και γεωπολιτική και πρέπει να γίνει πολιτική προτεραιότητα πρώτης γραμμής.

**Krzysztof Hetman (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca, Pani Komisarz, Szanowni Państwo! Obywateli Unii Europejskiej, przedsiębiorców i przemysł interesują akceptowalne cenowo, stabilne i niezawodne dostawy energii. W ostatnich latach rozwijano przede wszystkim odnawialne źródła energii. I słusznie. Ale skupiono się właściwie tylko na wytwarzaniu energii, a zapomniano o systemie zarządzania energią w sieci. Istotą tego problemu pokazał blackout w Hiszpanii i Portugalii, gdzie oparto się jedynie na elektryfikacji, nie uwzględniając innych źródeł energii.

Rezygnacja z finansowania infrastruktury gazowej była błędem i należy to zrewidować. Obecna architektura sieci wymaga modernizacji, integracji systemów przesyłowych, elektroenergetycznych, gazu ziemnego oraz przesyłu wodoru, m.in. poprzez zastosowanie spójnego systemu zarządzania wszystkimi źródłami energii. To oznacza konieczność integracji technologii, takich jak magazynowanie energii, systemy zarządzania popytem oraz automatyzację sieci. Chciałbym również podkreślić znaczenie połączeń transgranicznych, które umożliwiają budowę zintegrowanego rynku energii w Unii Europejskiej. Bezdyskusyjne będą ogromne nakłady inwestycyjne, które szacowane są nawet na poziomie ponad biliona euro do 2040 r. A zatem w związku z toczącymi się obecnie pracami nad wieloletnimi ramami finansowymi powinniśmy wypracować nowe, dedykowane tym celom, instrumenty finansowe, by rozwój nowoczesnych sieci elektroenergetycznych stał się priorytetem strategicznym.

**Andreas Schwab (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Energiebinnenmarkt ist das Herz eines der netzwerkgebundenen Elemente des europäischen Binnenmarkts. Deswegen tun wir gut daran, mit dem Bericht der Kollegin Stürigk sicherzustellen, dass wir in diesen Binnenmarkt investieren, um eine höhere Resilienz zu erreichen, denn wir haben es vor wenigen Wochen in Spanien gesehen: Wenn ein Land nicht über genug Konnektoren mit den anderen Staaten des Binnenmarktes verfügt, haben wir das Risiko, dass es zu einem Blackout kommt. Das können wir relativ einfach vermeiden, indem wir weitere Konnektoren bauen, indem wir den Binnenmarkt, in dem Fall den Elektrizitätsbinnenmarkt, weiter stabilisieren und mit weiteren Interkonnektoren versehen.

Das ist ein Thema, das wir seit Jahren diskutieren; schon Kommissar Oettinger hat in seiner Zeit im Europäischen Parlament dafür geworben. Aber es ist uns nicht gelungen, die Mitgliedstaaten davon zu überzeugen, dass es nicht nur eine gute Idee ist, sondern dass wir sie auch umsetzen müssen, dass die elektrischen Netze der *Backbone* des europäischen Energiesystems sind – der Titel des Berichts –, dass es dafür einfach auch um Investitionen geht.

Wenn wir uns anschauen, wie wir im globalen Wettbewerb dastehen, dann können wir das recht einfach zeigen: Die Industriebetriebe in den Vereinigten Staaten zahlen zwischen 6 Cent und 9 Cent pro Kilowattstunde, in China teilweise sogar noch weniger; in Deutschland und in Europa liegt der durchschnittliche Strompreis bei über 20 Cent. Das wird auf Dauer so nicht funktionieren. Deswegen ist es gut und richtig, dass dieser Bericht den Punkt noch einmal erörtert. Wir müssen in den europäischen Energiebinnenmarkt und in die Netze entsprechend investieren, wenn wir die Resilienz und die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der europäischen Wirtschaft erreichen wollen.

**Regina Doherty (PPE).** – Madam President, Commissioner, we often talk about politics in terms of keeping the lights on, but when it comes to our energy infrastructure, this literally is what it's all about. Europe relies on energy always being available to run all of our vital appliances, light and heat our homes and our businesses, and keep the world as we know, and expect it to be, running.

The last few years across Europe have seen how easy it is to disrupt our power supply; from systems failures recently in Spain to sabotage by Russia in the Baltics. And I think it's clear now that energy is a new front in global conflict.

In Ireland, for far too long we've been relying on a single interconnector from the UK. One incident on this connector, whether it's sabotage or an accident, and literally the lights would go out right across the entire Ireland. And that's why I welcome the soon-to-be-completed Celtic Interconnector with France, because we need to see much more of this vital investment.

In Ireland, we literally have spent the entirety of my political life – 17 years – talking about cross-country interconnectors, and whilst talk might seem cheap, it's racking up huge bills. If EirGrid had spent the last few years building the North-South Interconnector underground, rather than simply talking about it and going around in circles, we would now have a connector up and running, and actually it would have been much cheaper, cost-wise, than it's actually going to eventually cost to build.

We need to stop treating vital infrastructure like it's an afterthought. A modern European economy needs a reliable infrastructure supply for every EU country.

**Tomislav Sokol (PPE).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, nema konkurentnosti europske industrije i europske neovisnosti dok plaćamo cijenu energije nekoliko puta skuplje od SAD-a i Kine, a opskrba je sve nestabilnija. Neizostavni dio problema je elektroenergetska mreža u situaciji u kojoj se sve više obnovljivih izvora treba spojiti u sustav, a više od 40 % distribucijskih mreža starije je od 40 godina.

Koliko sam vidio iz medija, službeno objašnjenje za nestanak struje na Pirenejskom poluotoku je da se neimenovane klasične elektrane iz nekog nepoznatog razloga nisu htjele uključiti i stabilizirati sustav. Koliko god priča o njihovoj sabotaži djeluje neuvjerljivo, nekoliko zaključaka se može izvesti.

Prvo, oslanjanje isključivo na vjetar i sunce dovodi do destabilizacije mreže te je potreban energetska miks koji će ovakve situacije spriječiti. Taj energetska miks mora uključivati hidroenergiju, nuklearnu energiju i vodik, a ne da se neki od tih izvora gasa iz isključivo ideoloških razloga, kao što je slučaj u Španjolskoj.

Drugo, potrebne su velike investicije u prijenosne i distribucijske mreže u EU-u, gotovo 600 milijardi eura do 2030., integriranje različitih dijelova Europe i diversifikacija dobavnih pravaca. Time osiguravamo pouzdanu opskrbu, konkurentne cijene energije i što je ključno, stratešku neovisnost o vanjskim akterima.

*Procedura «catch-the-eye»*

**Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis (S&D).** – Madam President, Commissioner, may I remind you all of the joint declaration by Jacques Delors and Jerzy Buzek for a new European energy community. It was declared on 5 May 2010 – and still we are debating a European energy union. Can you imagine? 15 years – we are very slow!

An energy union that delivers competitiveness, security, decarbonisation and a just transition will provide end users with cheaper energy, primarily benefiting our industries and households. Ensuring a secure energy supply is a key to achieving this goal. Therefore, we are looking forward to the Commission proposals for the next MFF in July and to expect that protection and security of critical energy infrastructures – including physical, digital and cyber-related components, as well as reserves of essential elements required for a rapid restoration of the power system which are key to secure energy supply – will remain an important EU priority in the next MFF.

**Sebastian Tynkynen (ECR).** – Arvoisa puhemies, Euroopan maissa tulee panostaa sähköverkköjen toimivuuteen. Sähkösaanti on edellytyksenä käytännössä kaikelle kotitalouksista tuotantotalouteen ja koko mantereen turvallisuuteen.

EU:n päätöslauselmaesitys sähköverkoista sisältää hyviäkin kohtia, mutta jälleen kerran tärkeän aiheen rivien väliin on ujutettu tarpeetonta sanahelinää muun muassa sukupuolijakaumasta jakeluverkkoyhtiössä.

Mutta tiedättekö, mikä kuulostaa suomalaiselle kalliilta lauseelta? Tämä on suora lainaus tekstistä. Euroopan eduskunta toteaa, että ”yli 40 prosenttia unionin jakeluverkoista on yli 40 vuotta vanhoja ja ne on saatettava ajan tasalle”. Mitkä ihmehen unionin verkot? Ne ovat jäsenmaiden ja siellä toimivien yhtiöiden verkkoja. Suomalaisen tehtävä ei ole alkaa saattamaan ajan tasalle toisten maiden verkkoja. Jokainen hoitakoon tämän asian itse.

**Billy Kelleher (Renew).** – Madam President, we need to invest in the transnationalisation of our grid. We need a seamless transmission of electricity across the entire continent. The cost of electricity and energy is a significant threat to our collective competitiveness. At times, in certain parts of this European Union, we dump surplus electricity, rather than being able to use it in some other part of the continent. So we do need to ensure that we can transport energy across the continent. It will also drive down costs and increase our competitiveness.

But we do need to ensure that we have a stable mix of electricity sources: solar, wind, nuclear, hydrogen storage, and obviously gas in the short to medium term as well. And that will ensure that we have base-loading and balance and grid stability, which is a very important component in the modern world.

So from my perspective, I do want to see a great emphasis on an energy union, on investment in the transnationalisation of the grid and ensuring that when we do generate electricity, that we can use it for those that need it most in terms of our competitiveness, but certainly not in dumping electricity when we surplus production.

**João Oliveira (The Left).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária Zaharieva, em Portugal, no concelho de Évora, está neste momento em andamento um projeto para a instalação de uma mega central fotovoltaica que ocupará 1500 hectares, com 1 600 000 painéis solares, destruindo recursos agrícolas, paisagísticos, ambientais e património natural e arqueológico.

Este é um péssimo exemplo da forma como as opções relativamente à política de energia são conduzidas, ou seja, em função dos interesses do mercado, do lucro das grandes empresas multinacionais que fazem lucros no setor energético, desconsiderando e desprezando os interesses das populações, do desenvolvimento dos territórios, da coesão.

Este é um exemplo absolutamente flagrante do sentido errado em que vão as opções da política em matéria energética da União Europeia, seja em relação às redes elétricas, seja em relação às questões da produção, da distribuição e da comercialização.

Senhora Comissária, as populações não estão a ser ouvidas, não estão a participar neste processo, e a sua opinião não está a ser tida em conta. Inclusivamente, já foram dirigidas queixas à Comissão Europeia e apelos para que intervenha neste processo.

Portanto, o apelo que deixamos aqui em relação a este processo é para que intervenha, mas sobretudo para que as orientações políticas sejam outras, que sirvam verdadeiramente os interesses das populações e dos povos.

**Μαρία Ζαχαρία (NI).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πίσω από την πράσινη μετάβαση κρύβεται μια βιομηχανία που σαρώνει βουνά, δάση και χωριά για να στήσει αιολικά και φωτοβολταϊκά πάρκα ιδιωτών, υπηρετώντας το κέρδος τους —χωρίς δημόσιο σχέδιο, χωρίς περιορισμό στον αριθμό αδειών, εντελώς άναρχα. Στην Ελλάδα, ξεριζώνονται κορυφογραμμές σε περιοχές Natura, ξεριζώνονται δάση και διανοίγονται δρόμοι για ανεμογεννήτριες που δεν υπηρετούν ούτε την ενεργειακή αυτόρκεια ούτε τους πολίτες. Αντιθέτως, κόβουν το ρεύμα στους αγρότες.

Η πράσινη ανάπτυξη που υπερασπιζόμαι υπηρετεί τους ανθρώπους, τα ζώα, τη βιοποικιλότητα. Όχι το ξεπούλημα κάθε φυσικού πόρου. Ζητώ τον αποκλεισμό των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας από ευαίσθητα οικοσυστήματα και εφαρμογή του κανονισμού (ΕΕ) 2024/1999 για την αποκατάσταση της φύσης.

Υπέβαλα δύο γραπτές ερωτήσεις στην Επιτροπή: να αναγνωρίσει την Ελλάδα ως εύλωτη λόγω της δραματικής συρρίκνωσης του περιβαλλοντικού ισοδύναμου κατά 37% στην Αττική από τις πυρκαγιές και να απαιτήσει εθνικό χάρτη περιοχών απόλυτης προστασίας με απαγόρευση επιχειρηματικής εκμετάλλευσης αυτών, πάγωμα αδειών και στοχευμένη αναδάσωση. Αναμένω απαντήσεις.

**Lukas Sieper (NI).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, cari cittadini d'Europa, l'energia è la linfa della nostra società ma oggi le nostre reti elettriche sono troppo vecchie, troppo lente e troppe isolate.

Se vogliamo più energia rinnovabile, auto elettriche e industrie pulite, abbiamo bisogno di una rete elettrica europea forte, moderna e connessa. Una rete che unisca il sole del Sud, il vento del Nord e la forza dell'innovazione ovunque.

Per farlo servono investimenti, collaborazione tra gli Stati e meno burocrazia. Non possiamo permetterci dei ritardi. Il clima cambia, i costi aumentano e la sicurezza energetica è una sfida globale. Una rete europea dell'elettricità non è solo un progetto tecnico, è una promessa di solidarietà, sostenibilità e sovranità.

*(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)*

**Ekaterina Zaharieva, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, honourable Members, dear rapporteur, I would like once again to express my gratitude for this debate. The fact that so many of you participated shows how important this topic is for our competitiveness, our security, our autonomy and the everyday life of our citizens, so I very much appreciated all of your contributions and opinions.

What I will take from this debate is that – no matter that there will be different opinions on what type of energy we should develop – the grids' expansion and modernisation is really the backbone, the crossroad, no matter what we call it, of the many measures that we need to achieve affordable, secure and decarbonised energy. And we should really increase our investment and speed up the processes of permission.

I also will say that all of us know the transformation of our energy system is a complex and multi-phase challenge and requires coordinated efforts from all stakeholders involved. So many of you mentioned that we have discussed these energy unions for years, and we are still not there. But I really believe that the momentum is very, very important and I see a big support, as I said already, by voting yesterday for your excellent report, dear Anna, so I really believe that we can achieve our goals together.

So, I'm pleased to see that we have a reliable partner in this House, and I look forward to continuing our cooperation to address the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead of us.

**Anna Stürghh**, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I would like to say thank you, Commissioner, and thank you, colleagues, for this debate.

Now, I heard that the far-right in this House is quite worried, so let me address some of those worries. You seem to be quite shocked by the numbers of the investment needed: EUR 584 billion by 2030. Yes, that is a lot of money. But let me put it in perspective: EUR 1.8 trillion by 2030 is what we will spend on fossil fuel imports if we don't change our system. And you as patriots, as nationalists, you must be pleased to hear that we can invest in a grid with only EUR 584 billion, keeping that money in Europe instead of sending EUR 1.8 trillion at the same time to other countries, keeping it in Europe, benefiting European companies, benefiting European workers.

I also heard the worry that we need to make sure that interconnections really serve the Member States. Now, I am pleased that this shows support for our report because, let me quote, 'we are asking for binding interconnections based on a needs assessment, to make sure that we build interconnectors that are needed and not just thought of'.

I also heard a lot of worry about the energy mix, about nuclear being demonised. Well, I've read this report a couple of times and let me assure you: nowhere in this report is there a demonisation of nuclear. Rather, there is even a mention of the prerogative of nation states to choose their own energy mix. And let me be very clear, when Ms Knafo was saying, 'you don't want nuclear' – well, yes, in my country, for example, we don't want nuclear. But again, isn't that great? It's our prerogative to choose our own energy mix.

I also heard worries about fishers suffering from offshore wind; however, we see that they are actually thriving in offshore farms.

So, let me thank you again for this debate. I hope I lifted some of those worries, and I'm really looking forward not only to the vote tomorrow, but to working with all of you on the implementation and with you, Commissioner, and the rest of the Commission on getting this forward.

**Presidente**. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà giovedì 19 giugno 2025.

*Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 178)*

**Eszter Lakos (PPE)**, *írásban*. – Modern elektromos hálózatok nélkül nincs biztonságos és megfizethető európai energiaellátás. Azonban ahogy a Parlament új, elektromos hálózatokról szóló jelentése hangsúlyozza, jelenleg a vezetékállomány elavult; az engedélyeztetési és építési folyamat pedig túlságosan lassú.

Mindez Magyarországon is probléma, ahol a kormány az elmúlt évtizedben elhanyagolta a hálózati fejlesztéseket. Jelenleg kapacitáshiány miatt 2029-ig nem lehet új szélenergia- és napenergia-termelőket, illetve 2030-ig a hálózatra betápláló új napelemparkokat a hálózatra kapcsolni. Így pedig többek között pont az elavult elektromos hálózat miatt a magyar felhasználók kiemelkedően magas rendszerhasználati díjat fizetnek. Pedig az Orbán-rezsim korrupciós kockázatai miatt visszatartott EU-s helyreállítási alap forrásait épp ehhez hasonló elektrifikációs fejlesztésekre lehetett volna felhasználni.

A spanyolországi áprilisi áramszünet is megmutatta, hogy az elektromos hálózat fejlesztése nemzetbiztonsági kérdés. Jelenleg Spanyolországhoz hasonlóan Magyarország is egyoldalúan hagyatkozik az időszakosan elérhető napenergiára, ami az elavult hálózattal együtt felveti az áramellátás biztonságának kérdését. Egyes szakértők szerint olyan napokon amikor az erős napsütés miatt Magyarország is szinte kizárólag napelemekkel termel áramot, nem elképzelhetetlen egy spanyolországhoz hasonló országos áramszünet.

A hálózat problémáinak orvosolása és a megfizethető áramárak biztosítása mindannyiunkat érintő kérdés. A felelős tagállami kormányoknak ezért prioritásként kell a hálózati felújítási munkák felgyorsítását, az energiatároló kapacitások kiépítését, és a digitalizációt ösztönző intézkedéseket.

**Waldemar Tomaszewski (ECR), raštu.** – Ponia Pirmininke, daugiau kaip 40 % ES skirstomųjų tinklų yra senesni nei 40 metų. Tai reiškia iššūkius ir išlaidas ateityje, susijusias su energetikos tinklų ir mazgų rekonstrukcija. Remiantis Europos Komisijos duomenimis, iki 2030 m. į elektros tinklus turėtų būti investuota 584 mlrd. EUR. Atsižvelgiant į augančią elektros energijos paklausą Europos Sąjungoje, būtinos didelės investicijos ir energetikos tinklų modernizavimas, siekiant padidinti tarpvalstybinius ir nacionalinius perdavimo pajėgumus. Tačiau reikia nepamiršti ir pasirūpinti, kad infrastruktūros modernizavimas nelemtų elektros energijos kainų, kurios Europoje ir taip yra labai aukštos, padidėjimo. Paprasti žmonės negali nukentėti vykstant pokyčiams, kurie mūsų laukia šiame ekonomikos sektoriuje, jie negali mokėti už blogus ES sprendimus. Turiu omenyje pražūtingą ES energetikos politiką, kuri numato visišką perėjimą prie atsinaujinančios energijos. Tai absurdiška ir žalinga politika tų žmonių, kurie labiausiai nori pigios energijos, atžvilgiu. Lygiai taip pat pigios energijos reikia mažoms ir vidutinėms įmonėms, kurios yra ES ekonomikos ir verslumo pagrindas. Deja, šiandien kraštutinė kairioji *klimatizmo* ideologija yra svarbesnė už sveiką protą. Jei Europos Sąjunga nori būti ekonomiškai konkurencinga pasaulio rinkose, jei mūsų piliečiai nori gyventi oriai ir klestėti, reikia pigios energijos iš įvairių šaltinių, o ne tik iš atsinaujinančių energijos šaltinių. Europa šiandien negali sau leisti eksperimentuoti energetikos srityje. Jei Sąjunga nesusidoros su šiomis realijomis, jos ekonomika patirs vis didesnes išlaidas.

### 13. Composition of committees and delegations

**Presidente.** – Il gruppo ECR ha comunicato alla Presidente una decisione di modifica relativamente alle nomine in una commissione. Questa decisione sarà inclusa nel verbale della seduta odierna ed entrerà in vigore a decorrere dal presente annuncio.

### 14. Rise in violence and the deepening humanitarian crisis in South Sudan (debate)

**Presidente.** – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione della Commissione sull'aumento della violenza e aggravarsi della crisi umanitaria in Sud Sudan (2025/2751(RSP)).

**Ekaterina Zaharieva, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, thank you for the opportunity to address this Chamber on the situation in South Sudan, which we follow with great concern. The euphoria at the time of independence in 2011 has long gone, unfortunately. Instead of peace and economic advancement, South Sudan remains trapped in a cycle of violence, displacement, human suffering and prolonged instability.

Since February, we have been witnessing an upsurge in violence, including bombing on health facilities and attacks against civilians, which is fuelling a deepening humanitarian crisis. More than 9 million people – over 70 % of the population – depend on humanitarian assistance. Over 2 million are internally displaced. Also, since the outbreak of the civil war in neighbouring Sudan, 1.2 million have fled to South Sudan, straining already overstretched resources. This represents a burden on neighbouring countries and has potential consequences on migration flows.

The European Union is deeply concerned by the deteriorating security and humanitarian situation. We strongly condemn the recent violence in Upper Nile, Unity, Warrap and Jonglei. These are not isolated incidents, unfortunately – they reflect a broader erosion of the fragile peace established under the 2018 revitalised peace agreement, a peace that has been repeatedly violated, especially this year. The arrest of the first vice-president and members of his party has dangerously escalated the political crisis, pushing the country to the brink of civil war. Progress in implementing the peace agreement remains limited. Civic and political space is shrinking and impunity persists.

South Sudan's leaders bear full responsibility for the well-being of their people. The international community cannot build peace for them, but we can and we will support those working for stability, justice and human dignity. Indeed, the EU is not a distant actor in this crisis. Besides the efforts of our delegation in Juba, our Special Representative for the Horn of Africa, Annette Weber, has been at the forefront of diplomatic engagement. In early April, she toured the region and met with all key stakeholders in Juba to urge them to resolve their disputes through dialogues. However, she was denied access to Riek Machar, who remains under house arrest. This underscores the challenging political climate we face.

Nevertheless, we remain committed to using the diplomatic means at our disposal to help South Sudan move forward. We continue to provide sustainable humanitarian aid, and we remain one of the largest donors of development funding to South Sudan. Yet access to humanitarian organisations is increasingly obstructed by insecurity and bureaucratic obstacles. We call on the leaders of South Sudan to show political will to implement the peace agreement without delay, to release all political detainees, to refrain from incitement and ensure free humanitarian access. We support the work of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, the African Union and the United Nations Mission in South Sudan in advancing these goals.

The people of South Sudan have suffered enough. They deserve a future free from violence, hunger and fear, a future built on peace, accountability and democratic governance. The EU stands ready to accompany South Sudan on this path, but the responsibility to act lies first and foremost with its leaders.

**Michael Gahler**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, colleagues, while the world’s attention primarily focuses on the Israeli-Iran war, on the situation in Gaza and Russia’s continued aggression against Ukraine, South Sudan, the youngest nation in the world, is at the brink of yet another civil war. Political and ethnic tensions have flared up in recent months, leading to direct military confrontations between the South Sudanese army, under President Salva Kiir, and the White Army, linked to First Vice-President Riek Machar and his opposition force.

The Commission has said 9.3 million South Sudanese are in need of humanitarian assistance, while around 2 million are already internally displaced. And yet, while war is already raging in the countries neighbouring South Sudan, a full-scale war could still be prevented in South Sudan. Measures taken or not taken now by the South Sudanese leaders, by regional international actors and the EU will decide whether South Sudan goes down the path of its neighbours or embarks on a road towards peace and stability.

In order to stabilise the country, first, South Sudanese leaders must return to the 2018 peace agreement, which is at serious risk of collapse. Arbitrarily detained opposition figures – above all, Vice-President Machar – must be released, military operations by the South Sudanese army and opposition forces must be stopped, as a prerequisite for both warring parties to engage in dialogue.

Second, foreign actors must stop fuelling the conflict and fully retreat from South Sudanese territory. At the request of President Kiir, Ugandan forces have fought alongside the South Sudanese army, providing heavy military equipment for aerial bombardments, as well as 2 000 soldiers for ground offensives. While thanks to the pressure of the international community, particularly the African countries and the EU, Ugandan forces have become less visible in the country, they must fully retreat.

At the same time, the recent rapprochement of President Kiir with the Sudanese paramilitary and its regional sponsor, United Arab Emirates, presents a risk of regionalisation of the Sudanese civil war. Let us not let it happen, but do the utmost diplomatically for a peaceful way forward.

**Marit Maij**, *namens de S&D-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, Zuid-Sudan is een vruchtbaar land, rijk aan bodemschatten. En toch is het een van de armste landen ter wereld. Al vele decennia, en zeker sinds de onafhankelijkheid, wordt Zuid-Sudan geteisterd door oorlog en conflicten. Burgerdorpen worden gebombardeerd. Meisjes en vrouwen worden verkracht. Seksueel geweld wordt ingezet als wapen en politieke tegenstanders worden opgesloten zonder proces.

Meer dan 2 miljoen mensen zijn ontheemd en ruim 9 miljoen Zuid-Sudanezen zijn afhankelijk van humanitaire hulp. Toch worden zelfs medische posten aangevallen, waaronder recent een kliniek van Artsen zonder Grenzen.

Buitenlandse machten en corrupte leiders hebben baat bij deze instabiele situatie, omdat deze hen gemakkelijk toegang geeft tot de bodemschatten van Zuid-Sudan.

De Europese Unie moet inderdaad humanitaire hulp en toegang daartoe veilig stellen. Zij moet vrouwenorganisaties ter plaatse steunen, de diplomatieke druk op de leiders opvoeren en zich inzetten om het vredesakkoord van 2018 nieuw leven in te blazen.

Zuid-Sudanezen verdienen geen stilte. Zij verdienen solidariteit en gerechtigheid.

**György Hölvényi**, *a PFE képviselőcsoport nevében.* – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! 9,5 millió ember. Ennyien szorulnak az itt említésre került humanitárius segítségre Dél-Szudánban. Kétmillió belső menekült, hétmillió éhező ember. A hiteles európai fellépés azon múlik, hogy valós képességeinkhez mérten határozzuk meg szerepvállalásunkat. Most, amikor a mezőgazdasági szezon közepén kiújult fegyveres konfliktus miatt a gazdák nem tudják megművelni a földjeiket, a legsürgetőbb kihívás az éhínség enyhítése.

Egymagunk azonban nem rendelkezünk ezekhez szükséges eszközökkel. Éppen ezért minél hamarabb szükségünk van arra, hogy más humanitárius partnerek, különösen pedig, akármilyen nehéz is, a transzatlanti partnereinkkel együttműködve lépünk fel az éhínség enyhítésére. Meg kell találni az együttműködés lehetőségeit. Ezt várjuk a Bizottságtól.

Képviselőtársaim! A dél-szudáni humanitárius igények kielégítésére további 1,4 milliárd dollárra lenne szükség. Csakhogy az Unió ezt a forrást nem tudja előteremteni. Közvetítőként viszont hitelesek lehetünk a párbeszéd előmozdításában, a megbékélés elősegítésében. Így vethetünk gátat a humanitárius válság mélyülésének. Ebben kell a külügyi szolgálatnak eredményt elérnie. Ez az, ami valóban hitelessé teheti az Unió fellépését nemcsak ott, hanem saját polgáraink előtt.

**Adam Bielan**, *on behalf of the ECR Group.* – Madam President, dear Commissioner, South Sudan is once again on the edge of collapse. Since February, fighting between government forces and opposition groups has erupted again and devastated the Upper Nile, Jonglei and the Unity State. Entire communities have been displaced, hospitals destroyed and civilians killed. The humanitarian situation is dire. Over 165 000 people have fled in recent months, adding to the more than 44 million South Sudanese who are now displaced. Overall, nearly 70 % of South Sudan's population – some 9.3 million people – require urgent assistance, yet humanitarian access is increasingly constrained by insecurity, targeted attacks on aid workers and the looting of vital supplies.

In parallel to the struggle to deliver food and medical aid, there are attacks on human dignity and religious freedom. Christians are facing targeted violence, intimidation and the destruction of places of worship.

Colleagues, the international community cannot stand by while this crisis unfolds. The EU and international institutions must de-escalate violence, protect civilians and ensure unimpeded humanitarian access. We call on the Commission and the EEAS to link every euro of additional funding to verifiable, safe, rapid and unimpeded access for humanitarian agencies.

Let us not forget that behind these numbers are real people. The time for decisive action is now.

**Jan-Christoph Oetjen**, *im Namen der Renew-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Sudan ist ein krisengeschütteltes Land, eines der ärmsten Länder dieser Welt, und seit der Unabhängigkeit des Südsudans gab es nach einer kurzen Phase der Ruhe eigentlich auch dort nur eine sehr, sehr schlimme humanitäre Situation. Wir müssen uns vor Augen halten, dass Menschen vertrieben werden, dass Menschen hungern und dass es keinen Zugang für Hilfsorganisationen gibt in die betroffenen Regionen, die dafür sorgen können, dass Menschen geholfen wird. Ich möchte mich bei der Kommission ausdrücklich dafür bedanken, dass so klare Worte gefunden wurden über die Situation im Südsudan.

Ich glaube, dass wir als Europäische Union alles dafür tun müssen, dass das, was im Friedensabkommen von 2018 dargelegt wurde, auch tatsächlich weiter unterstützt wird und wieder neue Traktion gewinnt, damit dieses Land zur Ruhe kommen kann. Gleichzeitig wollen wir als Parlament die südsudanesischen Regierung dazu auffordern, endlich alle Attacken gegen die Zivilbevölkerung zu unterlassen, dafür zu sorgen, dass humanitäre Hilfsorganisationen in die entsprechenden Gebiete kommen, dass die, die politisch gefangen genommen wurden, einen ordentlichen Prozess bekommen und dass sie, wenn sie einfach so festgenommen wurden, auch wieder freigelassen werden.

Der Rechtsstaat muss auch im Südsudan gelten, auch in den schärfsten Krisenzeiten. Wir wollen als Europäische Union alles dazu beitragen, dass sich die Situation verbessert – mit der Hilfe, die wir leisten können –, aber den wichtigsten ersten Schritt, den muss die Regierung vor Ort selber tun.

**Erik Marquardt**, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Ich kann nur allen Vorrednerinnen und Vorrednern zustimmen. Es ist eine unglaubliche Situation, die so viel Leid erzeugt hat im Südsudan, dass wir inzwischen ja über die größte humanitäre Krise unserer Zeit reden müssen. Ich finde es richtig, dass wir heute darüber reden. Ich finde es richtig, die Zahlen anzusprechen, auch dass Menschen dahinter stecken, aber ich wollte meine Rede eigentlich auf einen anderen Aspekt lenken. Ich glaube nämlich, dass es am Ende schon auch so ist, dass wir nicht nur hier in den Plenarreden Dinge fordern dürfen, sondern wir müssen unsere Hausaufgaben als Parlament dann auch machen.

Wenn ich mir zum Beispiel anschau, dass wir als Parlament aktuell nicht mal in der Lage sind, eine klare Position zu finden angesichts des Wegbrechens der US-amerikanischen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit und humanitärer Hilfe, dass wir nicht in der Lage sind, uns hier auf eine Position zu einigen, die eine starke, auch europäische Stimme, eine Stimme des Europäischen Parlaments dann zum Beispiel bei der anstehenden Konferenz in Sevilla ausdrückt, sich für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, aber auch für humanitäre Hilfe einsetzt, dann frage ich mich schon, ob wir eigentlich alles dafür getan haben – auch wir als Parlamentarierinnen und Parlamentarier –, dass solche Krisen richtig angegangen werden. Ich wünsche mir, dass wir in Zukunft da besser sind, als wir es gestern waren.

**Özlem Demirel**, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die UN hat die Situation im Sudan und ihre Folgen für die Nachbarländer, also auch Südsudan, als die größte humanitäre Krise der Welt bezeichnet, aber das scheint kaum jemanden wirklich zu scheren. Dabei sieht man, wenn man heute auf Südsudan guckt, ein trauriges Beispiel europäischer Politik. Der Zustand in dieser Region ist auch Folge eines klassischen Stellvertreterkrieges, und europäische Staaten waren nicht unbeteiligt daran.

Die EU spielte eine aktive Rolle bei der Abspaltung des Südsudans, trotz mehrfacher Warnungen, dass es zu Machtkämpfen führen könnte. Die EU bildete auch Sicherheitskräfte im Südsudan aus, die heute Gewaltakte gegenüber der Bevölkerung ausüben. Es heißt, es handele sich bei dem Konflikt um einen ethnischen religiösen Konflikt, doch es ging die ganze Zeit im Konflikt um Südsudan und Sudan um Gold- und Erdölvorkommen.

Auch europäische Staaten waren schnell dabei, die Abspaltung voranzutreiben, um dazu Zugang zu haben. Und jetzt schauen die europäischen Institutionen weg, wenn wir die größte humanitäre Katastrophe dort haben. Das ist nicht akzeptabel, daran muss sich schnell etwas ändern.

**Ingeborg Ter Laak (PPE)**. – Voorzitter, commissaris, gekidnapt, misbruikt en voor dood achtergelaten worden... Dit is het verhaal van heel veel kindsoldaten in Sudan. In de hoop de dood van een familielid te wreken of toch wat eten te krijgen, komen ze terecht bij gewapende groeperingen. Eenmaal binnen worden ze als seksobject of menselijk schild gebruikt of worden ze bewapend als soldaat. Al deze kinderen zijn beschadigd voor de rest van hun leven.

De mensenrechtensituatie in Sudan is ronduit verschrikkelijk. Burgers en ziekenhuizen worden aangevallen en er wordt geplunderd. Meer dan 2 miljoen mensen zijn op de vlucht geslagen. Mensen worden verkracht en vermoord.

Tegelijkertijd blijven de voedselprijzen explosief stijgen, wat mensen tot wanhoop drijft. Het gevolg is dat bijna 8 miljoen mensen kampen met ernstige voedseltekorten. 2,3 miljoen mensen verkeren zelfs in een acute voedselcrisis en zijn echt ondervoed.

Europa moet hiertegen in actie komen. De oorzaak van dit alles is de strijd om grondstoffen en olie en de inmenging van buitenlandse actoren.

Er moet worden gebouwd aan vrede, samen met vrouwen en mannen uit de verschillende Sudanese gemeenschappen.

**Francisco Assis (S&D)**. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, caras e caros colegas, enquanto nos mobilizamos e nos indignamos, aliás, com inteira justiça, face ao sofrimento de outros povos, continuamos a menosprezar o sofrimento do povo sudanês.

Bombardamentos indiscriminados, utilização sistemática de violência sexual e restrições à ajuda humanitária. Há, pelo menos, 100 000 mortos e 11 milhões de deslocados.

Não há, neste momento, qualquer sinal por parte da União Europeia de esforços diplomáticos consistentes, tendo em vista a resolução deste problema. Não há uma responsabilização dos atores regionais que estão a alimentar o conflito — a começar pelos Emirados Árabes Unidos, o principal apoio das milícias paramilitares que tentam assumir o controlo do país.

A União Europeia não foi ainda sequer capaz de impor sanções contra os principais responsáveis pelo ciclo de violência no Sudão e contra os principais responsáveis também pelo fornecimento e aquisição de armas, apesar das várias recomendações emanadas deste Parlamento nesse sentido.

Haverá, talvez, um lugar nos futuros livros de História para salientar a indiferença da comunidade internacional face a esta guerra horrenda, a mais mortífera do nosso tempo.

**Barry Andrews (Renew).** – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, I've been to South Sudan a couple of times and it's really striking: the inaccessibility and remoteness of the country, areas with no paved roads about the size of Belgium. It's really quite an extraordinary place.

And it's great that we're having this debate, but we have to be realistic, and we're having this debate in the context of US withdrawal – this has impacted NGOs that are delivering humanitarian aid on the ground – and the withdrawal of EU Member States cumulatively and individually. That has had a massive impact.

And there's very little that the Commission can do, the European Commission has really stayed the course here. But there are two things that I would call on the Commission to do.

First of all, South Sudan is very much a fragile state affected by conflict, disease outbreak, etc., and it really underlines how urgently we need a fragility framework.

Secondly, I would call on the Commission to push back hard on the proposal to downsize the EU delegation in South Sudan. As violence and famine spread across the country, I am sure you will agree, Commissioner, that it sends out a very bad signal that the EU will withdraw after the US withdrawal.

**Murielle Laurent (S&D).** – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, le Soudan du Sud est à nouveau dans une situation critique. Imaginez un instant plus de 165 000 personnes déplacées en seulement trois mois. L'accord de paix de 2018 vacille à nouveau. Les violences s'intensifient et les tensions politiques s'aggravent à l'approche des élections. Ce sont toujours les mêmes qui paient le prix, les civils. Les populations souffrent et nous connaissons les conséquences: famines, épidémies, déplacements, violences sexuelles. Et où iront les populations dans des territoires déjà en grande difficulté?

L'Union européenne se doit d'être à la hauteur. Nous devons sécuriser les corridors humanitaires et protéger les civils, particulièrement les femmes et les enfants, souvent premières victimes de violences. Enfin, tout doit être mis en œuvre pour obtenir une paix réelle et durable. Madame la Commissaire, agissons maintenant et avec courage et compassion pour que le Soudan du Sud ne soit pas englouti dans un nouvel enfer de violence et de famine.

**Leire Pajín (S&D).** – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, el informe de las Naciones Unidas sobre ayuda humanitaria refleja que hay dos tendencias que están incrementando las necesidades humanitarias en el mundo: los conflictos y las devastadoras consecuencias del cambio climático.

Ambas se dan de forma desesperada en Sudán del Sur. Un país expuesto a las consecuencias del cambio climático, a los desastres naturales y a la violencia, pero, con todo, lo más difícil de todo a lo que se enfrenta Sudán del Sur es a nuestra indiferencia. La indiferencia de quienes pretenden que reduzcamos nuestro compromiso con la ayuda humanitaria y con la cooperación al desarrollo. La indiferencia de quienes miran hacia otro lado o quienes votan en contra del informe sobre la financiación para el desarrollo sostenible.

Señorías, si seguimos reduciendo nuestro compromiso con la ayuda humanitaria, si seguimos reduciendo nuestro compromiso con la financiación para el desarrollo, si seguimos dando señales de que los problemas del Sur Global no nos importan, no solo condenaremos a millones de personas, sino que, además, acabaremos poniendo nuestra seguridad y nuestras vidas en peligro.

*Procedura «catch-the-eye»*

**Alessandra Moretti (S&D).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quasi dieci milioni di persone hanno bisogno di assistenza umanitaria in Sud Sudan, dove dilaga il colera, la fame e dove si registra il più alto tasso di mortalità neonatale al mondo. Un paese in cui lo stupro è un'arma di guerra consueta.

A differenza di altri, questo è un conflitto totalmente dimenticato. Il Sud Sudan è sul precipizio di una nuova guerra totale. Tensioni politiche sfociate in violenze, milizie, bombardamenti tra ribelli ed esercito, profilazione etnica, detenzioni arbitrarie, attacchi a civili e ospedali, come quello di Medici Senza Frontiere, fatto esplodere con un bambino di nove mesi al suo interno. La popolazione fugge verso paesi fragili, aggravando così crisi già esistenti.

Dobbiamo chiedere con forza al governo il ritorno al trattato di pace del 2018, la liberazione dei prigionieri politici, la fine delle ostilità e l'accesso sicuro per gli aiuti umanitari. Non facciamo calare l'attenzione.

**Nikos Papandreou (S&D).** – Madam President, Commissioner, this is the fifth time we speak about Sudan, and I'd like to mention something that has not been discussed. And that is the role of the foreign actors in worsening the disaster in Sudan.

We have a member of NATO, and a country that wants to be part of the SAFE architecture, and it's called Türkiye. There's robust proof that Türkiye is selling drones and military equipment to both sides of the conflict.

If Türkiye wants to join the new architecture in the military, they should respect the sanctions on weapons to the war in Sudan. If they want to sit at the table, they should respect EU sanctions.

**Sebastian Tynkkynen (ECR).** – Madam President, the further escalation of violence in South Sudan has plunged the country even deeper into a devastating humanitarian crisis. Civilians are experiencing the full force of intensified clashes, leading to mass displacement, food insecurity and even a cholera outbreak.

South Sudan is already scarred with past civil wars. We do not want this young country to face another one. We must urgently call for a ceasefire and a renewed commitment to peace negotiations.

The European Union has a critical role in fostering diplomatic solutions that protect vulnerable populations. Failure to act risks prolonging this tragedy and destabilising the entire region. Let's act as mediators, call for peace and end the suffering.

*(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)*

**Ekaterina Zaharieva, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, honourable Members, this debate has shown the European Parliament's continued concerns and solidarity with the people of South Sudan. Your voices echoed the frustration and urgency felt by millions trapped in a crisis they did not choose. The international community cannot allow South Sudan to become a forgotten crisis. We must continue to speak out and to act through our diplomacy, through our development and humanitarian assistance.

I want to give you some facts, because in the debate it was said that the European Union is not actually investing enough and not supporting enough the humanitarian catastrophe that the people are facing there. As I said in my introduction, we are one of the biggest humanitarian supporters and development supporters for the South Sudanese people. Since South Sudan was declared an independent country, the European Union has invested over EUR 1.3 billion in development support for South Sudan and also a lot of humanitarian support: in 2024 it was EUR 110.2 million in humanitarian support, and this year EUR 71 million so far. I know that the needs are higher, and we are really trying to do as much as possible, but I think what is important is really to better coordinate the actions with the Member States as well.

The EU will continue working with regional partners, which is very important, to press for the implementation of the peace agreement. We will also remain firm in calling for respect of international humanitarian law and humanitarian access, and in our defence of civil space and human rights, including through the renewal of sanctions against those responsible for violence and obstruction. Above all, we must ensure that the people of South Sudan, especially its youth, women and displaced communities, are not silenced or sidelined in shaping their country's future. It's really important that they participate in shaping and forming, hopefully, democratic institutions. Thank you once again for your commitment and for keeping South Sudan high on our collective agenda.

**SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE**

*Priekšsēdētāja vietnieks*

**President.** – The debate is closed.

**15. Debate on cases of breaches of human rights, democracy and the rule of law (debate)****15.1. Media freedom in Georgia, particularly the case of Mzia Amaglobeli**

**Priekšsēdētājs.** – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debātes par septiņiem rezolūciju priekšlikumiem par mediju brīvību Gruzijā, jo īpaši Mzia Amaglobeli lietu (2025/2752(RSP)).

**Rasa Juknevičienė, author.** – Mr President, dear colleagues, journalist Mzia Amaglobeli has become a symbol of all Georgians imprisoned by the Bidzina Ivanishvili regime. A week ago, representatives of brave Georgians, who have been fighting for a European Georgia for over 200 days, attended the DROI Subcommittee hearings in the European Parliament. But yesterday, the Russian oligarch Ivanishvili's regime launched a full-scale legal assault against them.

The situation is getting worse every day. My speech this time will not be about the regime of the Kremlin's friends in Tbilisi. We have said everything about this in the resolutions adopted so far. We need to talk about us, the EU.

I do not understand the silence from the European Council, the Member States and the High Representative office. Mzia and her friends deserve respect and help. Serious sanctions against the regime are needed. Everyone who gets their hands dirty is afraid of them. We need to put pressure on the regime in every way and not ask them to return to the EU path anymore.

They will not return, because this regime is the Kremlin's dream. They lied to their people about their aspirations to the EU, they lied to us in the European Parliament and EU. Only new fair elections can help Georgians get their country back. EU political will is needed. There is almost no independent media left in Georgia, only Sputnik-type propaganda TV channels.

By the way, I do not understand why they, who spread poison about the EU, are still active here, in the European Parliament.

Let's act. The people of Georgia cannot be left alone.

**Tobias Cremer, author.** – Mr President, dear colleagues, media freedom is not a luxury, it is a democratic necessity. It shines light where corruption and autocracy hide. And that is precisely why the Georgian authorities have imprisoned one of the country's most respected journalists, Mzia Amaglobeli, for over 150 days now.

And Mzia's is not an isolated case. Over 400 Georgians – journalists, opposition figures, but also ordinary citizens – have been arrested, tortured or jailed.

Colleagues, the ruling Georgian Dream party fears the free press like a vampire fears the light, because they know that they can only survive in the shadows. In the shadow of the oligarch Bidzina Ivanishvili, who does not dare to step into the open because he knows the Georgians don't want him, and in the shadow of Putin's regime, which uses disinformation, intimidation and manipulation, because it knows that Georgians would never choose to live like Russians have to if they have the free vote.

Colleagues, the light of a free press and a free society is the strongest weapon against tyranny, so we can only appeal to the Georgian authorities to step out of the shadows, drop the politically motivated charges and let Georgian people choose their future freely – in the light.

**Małgorzata Gosiewska, autorka.** – Panie Przewodniczący! W Gruzji gasną światła demokracji. Władze zdominowane przez Gruzińskie Marzenie brutalnie tłumią prodemokratyczne protesty i prowadzą otwartą wojnę z wolnymi mediami.

Mzia Amaglobeli – szanowana dziennikarka – została aresztowana tylko za to, że odważyła się zaprotestować. W swoim dramatycznym apelu powiedziała „Nie zaakceptuję agendy reżimu. Prowadzę strajk głodowy. Wolność jest cenniejsza niż życie”.

Wolność jest cenniejsza niż życie.

Już prawie 4 lata więzieniem politycznym reżimu Iwaniszwilego jest były prezydent Gruzji – Saakaszwili. Gruzińskie Marzenie, kierowane zza kulis przez Bidzinę Iwaniszwilego, odwróciło Gruzję od Europy.

Ten kraj – aspirujący niegdyś do Unii Europejskiej i NATO – stał się satelitą Moskwy.

Nie możemy biernie się temu przyglądać. Gruzini walczą o podstawowe wartości. Walczą o demokrację, o wolność słowa, o normalne życie. Popieranie dyktatury, uległość wobec niej to zbrodnia. Obojętność i milczenie to również zbrodnia, szanowni państwo.

**Dainius Žalimas, autor.** – Mr President, dear colleagues in Georgia, we are witnessing the attacks on the rule of law, independent media, NGOs, freedoms of assembly and association. The Georgian nightmare is rapidly transforming the country into autocracy. A single-party system, apparently, is not compatible with pluralistic democracy.

Several times, our Parliament has already demanded the immediate release of all political prisoners and called for new, free and fair parliamentary elections. This is the only way to restore democracy. Our Parliament has also declared the legitimacy of the current parliament and president in Georgia. However, not many Member States follow the Parliament's line, nor the Commission, which supports, by the way, the accreditation of ambassadors to the illegitimate President of Georgia. Only a few Member States have imposed sanctions.

Therefore, the EU seems to be treating Georgia as a lost country. But this is a big mistake. The Georgian civil society continues to fight. They have not lost themselves, nor their European aspirations. We cannot abandon them if we really seek to support democracy.

**Lena Schilling, autor.** – Mr President, dear colleagues, Mzia Amaglobeli is Georgia's first and only journalist imprisoned as a political detainee. Her arrest is clearly political and based on fabricated charges. I was in Georgia and I attended one of her trials. And I can tell you something: her case is a direct attack on press freedom. Mzia symbolises a movement that, despite repression and intimidation, continues to fight for democracy and a European future. She is targeted because she stands for truth and refuses to be silenced. Today, hundreds of political prisoners, opposition leaders, activists and artists are jailed for opposing a system dismantling democracy and enforcing Russian control.

The people of Georgia are fighting for the very values this Parliament stands for: freedom, human rights and the rule of law. Supporting Mzia means standing for a free, democratic and European Georgia, and we need to step up here to support her and all the people in Georgia.

**Danilo Della Valle, autore.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo qui a votare l'ennesima risoluzione che parla di Georgia.

Voglio premettere che la libertà di stampa è importante, è un valore imprescindibile e che è giusto chiedere la liberazione di Amaglobeli. Però trovo insopportabile utilizzare i diritti umani e la retorica democratica per meri scopi geopolitici e attaccare i paesi che hanno scelto una politica estera diversa da quella che piace a Washington, von der Leyen, Merz o Macron.

Mi piacerebbe parlare di tutti i giornalisti che si trovano in carcere per il loro lavoro. A Gaza più di 200 sono stati uccisi dal 7 ottobre ad oggi e 34 si trovano nelle carceri israeliane. Penso a Shireen Abu Akleh, giornalista americano-palestinese uccisa deliberatamente dall'esercito mentre svolgeva il suo lavoro a Jenin. Questi nomi però non hanno la dignità di essere considerati qui dentro.

Esprimete il vostro sdegno per la Georgia, mentre siete silenti con Israele che attacca le tv iraniane in diretta mondiale. Qualcuno di voi osa dire anche che sta facendo il lavoro sporco per noi. Ma quale sarebbe il lavoro sporco da fare? Uccidere migliaia di donne e bambine innocenti, farli morire di fame?

Vi invito a parlare al singolare, perché milioni di persone in Europa stanno protestando in tutti i modi contro il genocidio in corso a Gaza e noi non saremo complici del vostro sporco intento genocidio.

**Petr Bystron**, *Verfasser*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kollegen! Das EU-Parlament setzt sich für Redefreiheit ein und für eine NGO-Aktivistin, die einen Polizisten angegriffen hat und deswegen im Gefängnis sitzt. Wenn Ihnen wirklich die Redefreiheit und unabhängige Journalisten am Herzen liegen, die im Gefängnis sitzen, dann schauen Sie erst mal in die eigenen Reihen, in die EU. Wir haben einen David Bendels, einen Chefredakteur in Deutschland, der sieben Monate Haft auf Bewährung bekommen hat, nur weil er eine Collage veröffentlicht hat, auf der die damalige Innenministerin Nancy Faeser draufstand mit dem Spruch: „Ich hasse Meinungsfreiheit“. Das ist der Zustand der Meinungsfreiheit hier in der EU, in Deutschland.

Oder Shlomo Finkelstein – zwölf Monate Verurteilung, neun Monate im Knast. Ein YouTuber, der hat keine Polizisten verprügelt, der hat sich nur für die Meinungsfreiheit ausgesprochen. Oder kehren wir auch vor der Tür der EU: Tommy Robinson, ein echter Journalist, der sich für die Meinungsfreiheit einsetzt; auch der saß mehrere Monate im Gefängnis, nur damit er seinen Film „Silenced“ nicht gezeigt hat.

Also bitte, setzen Sie sich wirklich für Journalisten ein! Unterstützen Sie keine NGOs im Ausland, die nur einem *regime change* dienen sollen!

**Liudas Mažylis**, *PPE frakcijos vardu*. – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, komisare, kolegos. Mzijos Amaglobeli atvejis signalizuoja apie dabartinės Sakartvelo valdžios antidemokratinį veiksėnos šabloną, kai su asmenimis, žiniasklaida ir pilietine visuomene susidorojama per teisminę valdžią. O tai nusižiūrėta nuo kaimyninių Baltarusijos ar Rusijos, o greičiausiai – ir Rusijos tiesiogiai inspiruota. Taip selektyvus teisinis spaudimas tampa režimo *modus operandi*. Minėtos žurnalistės sulaukymas bei paskirta neadekvati laisvės atėmimo baudmė jau nėra pavienis atvejis – tai autoritarinės sistemos bruožas. Todėl, kol dar Sakartvelo neištiko visiškas institucinis žlugimas, privalome didinti spaudimą konkretiems autoritarinio režimo įgyvendintojams, susitarant dėl tikslinių sankcijų. Sakartvelo žmonės, eidami į gatves, rizikuodami savo gyvybėmis įrodo, kad jų provakarietiška orientacija nėra pasikeitusi. Todėl mes turime daryti viską, kad padėtume ją išsaugoti.

**Nacho Sánchez Amor**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, uno de los aspectos más habituales y más molestos, a veces, de los regímenes autoritarios no es solo la represión, sino tratar a los ciudadanos como menores de edad, como niños, con todo tipo de fantasías. La idea del enemigo exterior es uno de los mecanismos favoritos de los sistemas autoritarios, y esta narrativa infantil, este cuento de niños, toma en Georgia el nombre de «Estado profundo». Cualquier cosa que molesta al Gobierno es «Estado profundo»: puede ser un tuit de un estudiante o puede ser cualquier pronunciamiento de esta Cámara sobre el país.

Pero, para conseguir que esa narrativa se implante, hace falta desplazar la información profesional y veraz hecha por periodistas como Mzia Amaglobeli. La libertad de prensa es un antídoto infalible contra las fantasías psicóticas de los sistemas autoritarios y, por eso, es necesario sacar del ambiente cualquier tipo de libertad de prensa, a veces con medidas ridículas, como es, en el caso de Georgia, perseguir judicialmente si algún periodista utiliza expresiones como «Parlamento ilegítimo», «Gobierno ilegítimo», «régimen oligárquico», «prisioneros del régimen» o «régimen prorruso»: estalinismo químicamente puro en un país que, hasta hace poco, era un candidato destacado a entrar en la Unión Europea.

**Thierry Mariani**, *au nom du groupe PflE*. – Monsieur le Président, la liberté des médias ne permet pas tous les excès. Elle n'est pas non plus un alibi permanent pour l'ingérence étrangère. Or, c'est précisément ce que fait le Parlement européen dans ce débat. M<sup>me</sup> Amaghlobeli est poursuivie pour avoir agressé physiquement, le 12 janvier dernier, un policier en service et, conformément aux lois de son pays, elle sera jugée à la prochaine audience de son procès. Cette scandaleuse instrumentalisation politique d'un dossier pénal cache mal l'obsession de l'Union européenne vis-à-vis de la Géorgie et surtout le mépris de Bruxelles pour le droit et la souveraineté de ce peuple.

Soyez clairs, vous voulez simplement renverser le gouvernement géorgien et tous les prétextes sont bons. Quatre résolutions du Parlement européen contre Tbilissi en moins d'un an, c'est de l'acharnement. Un acharnement et des ingérences à répétition que les Géorgiens subissent depuis plus de vingt ans. Car on ne compte plus les ONG, les fondations, les médias financés par les intérêts étrangers et dont le seul agenda est la déstabilisation de la Géorgie. George Soros et son réseau, par exemple, n'ont jamais caché leur volonté d'influencer la politique géorgienne. Sa fondation, l'Open Society, a déversé 85 millions d'euros dans le pays depuis 1994, dont près de 5 millions rien qu'en 2019. Tout le monde sait que ces financements massifs ont été injectés dans des structures militantes et, sous couvert de journalisme ou de droits humains, ont pour but de fragiliser les institutions de ce pays. Les Géorgiens n'ont plus d'ordres à recevoir de personne, ni de Moscou, ni de Bruxelles.

*Brīvais mikrofonis*

**Lukas Sieper (NI)**. – Herr Präsident, liebe Menschen Europas! Wenn man sich anschauen möchte, inwieweit sich ein Staat von der Demokratie entfernt, dann muss man sich anschauen, wie er mit Journalistinnen und Journalisten umgeht. Wenn in einem Staat Journalistinnen und Journalisten eingesperrt werden, dafür, dass sie ihre Arbeit machen, dann entfernt dieser Staat sich von einer Demokratie.

Jetzt haben Sie schon applaudiert, Herr Kollege Bystron, aber Sie haben ein bisschen zu früh applaudiert, Sie haben mir noch nicht bis zum Ende zugehört. Hören Sie zum Ende zu, dann können Sie gern Ihren Senf dazugeben! Das ist etwas anderes, wenn im Rahmen eines rechtsstaatlichen Verfahrens festgestellt wird, dass Menschen den Mantel des Journalismus benutzen, um das System zu zersetzen. Rechtsstaatlichkeit, Herr Kollege, die werden Sie ja auch in Zukunft weiter kennenlernen im Rahmen der diversen gegen Sie laufenden Strafverfahren.

Ich hoffe, dass diese Debatte, diese Entschließung angenommen wird. Ich hoffe, dass die zu Unrecht eingesperrten Journalistinnen und Journalisten in Georgien freigelassen werden und dass wir in Europa auch weiterhin den Mut haben, gegen jene vorzugehen, die das Institut des Journalismus bloß missbrauchen.

*(Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās beigās.)*

**Ekaterina Zaharieva**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, as many of you said, the situation in Georgia is deteriorating at an alarming pace. Under Georgian Dream, the country is drifting away from democratic norms. In recent months, journalists, civil society activists and opposition voices have faced harassment, intimidation and politically motivated prosecutions. Young protesters are receiving disproportionately harsh sentences. Independent media and political critics are being dragged through the courts – a tactic clearly designed to silence dissent and shrink the democratic space.

This is not the conduct we, the EU, and – more importantly – the Georgian citizens expect of a country seeking EU membership. What we are witnessing is a systematic assault on democratic institutions and fundamental rights. The Foreign Agents Registration Act, together with recent laws on broadcasting and civil society funding, introduce criminal liability that threatens the very existence of independent media and NGOs in Georgia. These measures strike at the heart of democratic governance. We urge the Georgian leadership to repeal these laws, guarantee the rule of law and protect the fundamental rights of its citizens. Georgia's European path remains open, but the Georgian authorities must choose to walk it.

Media freedom is also under grave threat. Independent media representatives are being targeted simply for reporting the truth and giving voice to the voiceless. Mzia Amaghlobeli is one such journalist imprisoned for her commitment to truth and justice. Her case is emblematic of the shrinking space for free expression. This is unacceptable in a country aspiring to join the EU, and we call for her release. Independent journalism and broadcasting are vital not only to expose injustice, but to counter the growing tide of disinformation about the EU spread by those in power. We stand firmly with Georgia's independent media.

Lastly, we see and admire the bravery of those Georgians who take to the streets each day demanding a democratic European future. They defend their fundamental rights and freedom despite the dangers they could face. The EU remains committed to pursuing measures to hold human rights violators accountable in Georgia.

**Priekšsēdētājs.** – Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

## 15.2. Case of Ahmadreza Jalali in Iran

**Priekšsēdētājs.** – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par septiņiem rezolūciju priekšlikumiem par Ahmadreza Jalali lietu Irānā (2025/2753(RSP)).

**Michał Wawrykiewicz,** *author.* – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, this resolution is about the citizen of one of the Member States of the European Union, Sweden, who was caught and sentenced to death by the Iranian regime. And what we are witnessing in the case of Mr Jalali is not an isolated miscarriage of justice – it is a very symptom of a regime that weaponises law to punish truth and uses human beings as bargaining chips in a cynical game of geopolitical extortion.

I rise today not only on behalf of the EPP, but in defence of the most basic principles we claim to uphold: the rule of law, human dignity and justice. Dr Jalali, an academic, a European resident, was sentenced to death on fabricated charges by the Iranian regime. For nearly a decade, he has endured confinement, psychological torture, brutal treatment, lack of legal aid, medical neglect, and just one week ago he suffered a heart attack. His life is hanging by a thread, and so is our credibility if we do not act.

We in the EPP call for the immediate unconditional release of Dr Jalali and all other political prisoners. Punishing a human being with death is an atrocity in itself that does not fit within the framework of our fundamental values we share. This is not about ideology. This is about principle. Human rights are not negotiable. Academic freedom is not expendable. And silence in the face of tyranny is not neutrality – it is complicity.

**Evin Incir,** *author.* – Mr President, time is running out. The Iranian regime is escalating its executions, leaving no one safe. Since 1 October 2024 over 1 000 individuals – comprising political prisoners, women, protesters and minority groups – have been executed in Iran.

Despite his suffering a heart attack last month, the Iranian authorities have persistently refused to transfer Dr Ahmadreza Jalali to a hospital where he could receive the urgent, specialised medical care he needs. This neglect is inhuman and utterly cruel. Dr Jalali has endured over nine years in Evin prison. He was sentenced to death following a sham trial. As a Swedish and Iranian citizen – as a European citizen – his case demands our urgent attention. Sweden and European Union bear a responsibility to ensure his safe return to his wife Vida and their children.

Free Ahmadreza Jalali now!

**Veronika Vrecionová,** *Autorka.* – Pane předsedající, je symbolické, že právě v těchto dnech řešíme další případ barbarství iránského režimu. Konkrétně upozorňujeme na nepřijatelný postup iránské vlády vůči občanovi Švédska, který je iránského původu. Pan Ahmad Reza Džalálí, lékař a uznávaný vědec, je již devět let vězněn na základě smyšleného obvinění ze špionáže a byl dokonce po vynuceném přiznání odsouzen k trestu smrti. Režim ajatolláhů mu k tomu navíc odmítá poskytovat adekvátní zdravotní péči a ohrožuje tím jeho život i jinak než hrozbou popravy. Pan Džalálí bohužel není jediným člověkem s dvojitým občanstvím, kterého iránský režim v nedávné době vzal jako rukojmí a vyrobil z něho špiona.

Chci proto iránský režim vyzvat: „Propusťte pana Džalálího z vězení, vzdejte se vývoje jaderných zbraní, kterými chcete vydírat okolní státy. Přestaňte dodávat putinovskému Rusku smrtící drony, které útočí na civilní obytné domy v Kyjevě i jinde. Propusťte už konečně všechny občany Íránu z žaláře, kterým je váš totalitní režim.“

**Abir Al-Sahlani**, *author*. – Mr President, nine years ago, Ahmadreza Jalali was arrested in Iran with fabricated charges of espionage. He was sentenced to death without a trial.

Under the influence of torture, he is held in the notorious prison Evin and at risk of being executed at any time. Jalali has constantly been denied medical care and held in isolation without any contact with his family, and in the last year his health has severely deteriorated. In May this year he had a heart attack and after all of that, no medical attention or help.

Sweden and Member States and the External Action Service bear a responsibility to increase their pressure on the regime in Iran for his immediate release.

And to you, Ahmadreza Jalali, we have not forgotten you. You're always on our minds. And I would like to extend the gratitude of the Members of this House to his family, especially his wife, for always reminding us about his case, for always being there.

Thank you for your fight for Ahmadreza Jalali.

Release Ahmadreza Jalali now.

**Alice Kuhnke**, *författare*. – Herr talman! I över nio år har den svenska läkaren Ahmadreza Djalali varit fängslad av den iranska regimen. I nio år har han utsatts för tortyr. Nu är risken att han mördas av regimen överhängande. Sverige och EU kan rädda hans liv, men då måste vi agera nu och använda alla verktyg som finns för att få honom fri.

Alternativet är oacceptabelt. Vi får inte överge Djalali. Vi får inte överge hans fru, hans barn och de tusen och åter tusentals människor som sitter fängslade utan rättegång i Iran. Det är inte för sent. Ahmadreza Djalali måste komma hem nu.

**Jonas Sjöstedt**, *författare*. – Herr talman! Den svenska medborgaren Ahmadreza Djalali, hans liv är i stor fara. Han är fängslad i Iran. Han är dömd till döden.

Israels våldsamma, olagliga bombningar av Iran ökar riskerna för att förtrycket nu hårdnar och för att fler dödsdomar ska verkställas. Djalali har utsatts för mycket hårdhänt behandling, för tortyr. Han har inte fått en rättvis rättegång och han förnekas tillgång till akut nödvändig medicinsk behandling.

Det finns överhuvudtaget ingen rättssäkerhet i Iran. Det finns inga rättvisa rättegångar. Djalali är en av många politiska fångar. Han måste frigges, få resa hem till Sverige och återförenas med sin familj.

**Sebastiaan Stöteler**, *auteur*. – Voorzitter, het dictatoriale terreurregime van de Islamitische Revolutionaire Garde houdt de heer Djalali al ruim negen jaar vast. Hij werd tijdens een werkbezoek opgepakt en zit sindsdien in de Evin-gevangenis in Teheran. De heer Djalali, die een permanente verblijfsvergunning had in Zweden, werd in 2016 gearresteerd op verdenking van spionage en in 2017 ter dood veroordeeld. In 2018 kreeg hij de Zweedse nationaliteit. Zijn gezondheid is er volgens recente berichten sterk op achteruitgegaan door een gebrek aan medische zorg. Zweden heeft mede daarom geprobeerd om hem vrij te krijgen, maar het terreurregime van de ayatollah erkent naar verluidt zijn Zweedse nationaliteit niet en weigert daarom te onderhandelen over zijn vrijlating.

Misschien is er licht aan het einde van de tunnel, nu het ayatollah-regime dankzij Israël vleugellam en bijna gevallen is. Intussen vormt deze resolutie in het Parlement een belangrijke steun in de rug voor degenen die zich actief inzetten voor zijn vrijlating.

**Alice Teodorescu Măwe**, *för PPE gruppen*. – Herr talman! I snart ett decennium har den svensk-iranske läkaren Ahmadreza Djalali fängslats och torterats av bödlarna i den teokratiska diktaturen Iran. Han är en av många som fått betala det högsta priset för mullornas islamistiska tyranni, i det land som avrättar flest människor i världen per capita och där människor hängs från lyftkranar vid soluppgången.

Regimens systematiska förtryck av kvinnor, oppositionella och homosexuella har kringskurit friheten för generationer av iranier och tvingat miljontals i exil. Samtidigt har den iranska hydran i decennier destabiliserat regionen med sina proxyarméer i Libanon, på Gaza och Jemen, och var nu i färd med att tillverka kärnvapen. Till mullornas bundsförvanter räknar Syriens störtade Bashar al-Assad, Nordkoreas Kim Jong-Un och Rysslands Vladimir Putin. En onskans axel som hotar global fred och säkerhet.

Tack vare Israels modiga precisionsattacker kanske vi skönjer en historisk brytpunkt, ett möjligt slut på 46 år av islamistiskt förtryck och världsomspännande terror.

Men kampen är inte över. Djalali sitter fortfarande fängslad, drabbad av svåra hälsoproblem. Han måste omedelbart frigges.

**Francisco Assis**, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, caras e caros colegas, os recentes acontecimentos no Médio Oriente fizeram com que alguns se tenham esquecido da verdadeira natureza do regime iraniano.

Este debate vem recordar-nos que o Irão é uma das mais sinistras e mortíferas teocracias do mundo. A tortura e a execução indiscriminada de opositores políticos ou a brutal repressão das mulheres são apenas alguns exemplos.

Mas podemos falar também da detenção de cidadãos de nacionalidade europeia com o intuito de chantagear a União Europeia e os respetivos Estados-Membros. É o caso do professor Ahmad Reza Djalali, de dupla nacionalidade sueca e iraniana.

Por isso, independentemente do contexto atual e dos hipotéticos desenlaces da intervenção israelita, a União Europeia tem de aumentar a sua pressão sobre as autoridades iranianas para que ponham fim à pena de morte, à obtenção de confissões por meio de tortura, à detenção arbitrária de dissidentes e cidadãos europeus e a outras atrocidades que têm sido a sua marca nas últimas décadas.

**Gerolf Annemans**, *namens de PflE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, waar op dit ogenblik een regen van ballistische raketten de realiteit van de dag schijnt te zullen worden, lijkt het lot van één man wellicht futiel. Maar het lot van Djalali is genoegzaam bekend. Hij is onschuldig ter dood veroordeeld en zit nu meer dan negen jaar opgesloten, in een steeds zorgwekkender medische toestand.

Zijn lot kan twee kanten uit. Een regime op de knieën kan fel uithalen. De allerzwaksten zijn dan het eerste slachtoffer: de burgerbevolking, maar ook de mensen in handen van het regime, dissidenten, politieke gevangenen en gijzelaars. Zo werden eergisteren in de verwarring nog tien gevangenen neergeschoten. Het kan ook een andere kant uit. Het Iraanse regime heeft wel andere besognes dan één iemand vast te houden. Indien er nucleaire en andere deals worden gesloten, wanneer het wapengekletter gaat liggen, mag de internationale gemeenschap het lot van deze en andere westerse gijzelaars niet uit het oog verliezen. Daarom hier en nu mijn oproep: het is tijd om Djalali naar huis te laten gaan.

**Hilde Vautmans**, *namens de Renew-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, negen jaar. Zo lang houdt het Iraanse regime dokter Djalali, onze VUB-professor, al gegijzeld. Een Europees burger, gemarteld, zonder medische zorg, ter dood veroordeeld na een schijnproces. Nu, met de toenemende spanningen, is zijn leven nog meer in gevaar. Iran gebruikt hem als pasmunt.

En wij? Wij kijken toe. Dit is geen individueel dossier meer. Dit is voor mij de lakmoesproef voor Europa. Zijn we in staat onze Europese onderdanen te beschermen? Zijn we in staat onze Europese onderdanen — en Djalali is de langst vastzittende Europese burger in Iran — nu vrij te krijgen? Voor mij is het nu echt het moment. Voor mij moet Djalali nu onmiddellijk en onvoorwaardelijk vrijgelaten worden. Als er onderhandeld wordt, is dit een *conditio sine qua non*. Geef Djalali terug aan zijn vrouw Vida en haar kinderen. *Free Jalali, free Jalali, now*.

**Wouter Beke (PPE).** – Voorzitter, commissaris, “Europese beleidsmakers zullen mee verantwoordelijk zijn voor mijn dood”. Dat zei de heer Djalali in april, exact negen jaar na zijn arrestatie in Iran. Toen hij gearresteerd werd, was zijn zoon vier jaar oud. Vandaag is hij dertien jaar. De heer Djalali zit al negen jaar opgesloten in de Evin-gevangenis. Negen jaar. Negen jaar zonder zijn familie. Negen jaar van foltering, ziektes, hartfalen, ondervoeding. Negen jaar zonder medische zorg. Negen jaar van gemiste kansen op vrijlating. Elke dag kan de laatste zijn. Als Iran hem niet executeert, dan sterft hij aan de gevolgen van ontbering.

En wij? Wij kijken toe. Wanneer stopt Europa met weggijken? Wanneer grijpt Europa echt in om deze onschuldige man vrij te krijgen? Het is geen vijf voor twaalf meer; het is geen twaalf uur meer. Het is half een. Hij moet vrijkomen. Nu. Onmiddellijk.

**Daniel Attard (S&D).** – Mr President, Ahmadreza Jalali is not a prisoner – he is a hostage held by a regime of executioners. Iran is not just violating human rights – it is waging a war on them. But Europe’s voice is often too timid, too selective. We roar against some regimes, but whisper against others. This is not foreign policy. I’m afraid to say that this amounts to moral cowardice.

Our credibility demands consistency. We must be unrelenting with Iran, but also strong with Israel’s brutality in Gaza, with Russia’s barbarity in Ukraine, with every tyrant who bombs hospitals and slaughters civilians. Human rights are not negotiable, and the world’s war criminals must know: Europe sees you, Europe will call you out and Europe will act. Because if we stay silent in the face of tyranny, then we are not just neutral, but we are complicit.

**Danuše Nerudová (PPE).** – Mr President, colleagues, on one side, we see the Iranian Government trying to arm itself and destabilise the world; and on the other, young Iranians, especially women, who simply want to dance, study free and enjoy life.

On one side, the Iranian people are protesting and standing up for their rights; on the other, the government is sending drones to Russia to kill the people of Ukraine.

On one side, we have an Iranian regime that executes more people than any other country in the world; and on the other, Dr Djalali, an imprisoned Iranian scientist who worked with European universities to save lives.

We need to pick a side – I already did, long ago. What’s happening in Iran concerns us all. If the regime stays in power, it’s not only the Iranian people who will suffer. The risk of global escalation is real and its impact will be felt in our homes. We have no time. The EU must act!

**Ekaterina Zaharieva, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, the European Union strongly opposes Iran’s distressing practice of arbitrary detention of EU nationals and dual EU-Iranian citizens, with a view of making political gains. The EU firmly supports Member States’ consular efforts. This unlawful practice undermines international law and stands in direct violation of Iran’s international obligations under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic and Consular Relations, as well as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This is deeply troubling and must stop.

The EU foreign ministers discuss this unlawful practice and stand united and resolute in their response. We continue to use all the tools at our disposal, including sanctions, as illustrated by the new package adopted in April 2025 for the use of the judiciary as a tool for arbitrary detention.

As Europeans, we also remain completely opposed to use of the death penalty in all cases and in all circumstances and call on Iran to pursue a consistent policy towards its abolition. The death penalty is a cruel and inhuman punishment, which fails to act as a deterrent to crime and represents an unacceptable denial of human dignity and integrity. We will continue working towards its universal abolition.

Dr Jalali, a Swedish-Iranian citizen, is in prison since 2016 and was sentenced to death in 2017 on arbitrary grounds. He is currently detained under conditions that not only overlook his rights, but also pose serious risks to his health. This is unacceptable.

Dr Jalali's situation highlights the broader issues faced by many others in similar predicaments in Iran. We have been closely monitoring Dr Jalali's case since the very beginning and we are proactive in advocating for his release on humanitarian grounds in our contacts with Iranian authorities at all levels, including most recently at the highest level with HR/VP Kallas and the European External Action Service Political Director. This is done with the aim of supporting consular efforts made by the Swedish Government.

Given Dr Jalali's delicate health condition, we urge the Iranian authorities to ensure he receives timely and adequate medical treatment outside of prison whenever necessary. The permanent release of Dr Jalali remains a top priority for the EU and we are committed to keep using all the tools at our disposal to ensure his freedom. In this spirit, and in full consistency with the EU critical engagement towards Iran, we will continue to call for his release and that of all EU-Iranian dual nationals arbitrarily detained in Iran until they can reunite with their families.

**Priekšsēdētājs.** – Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

### 15.3. Dissolution of political parties and the crackdown on the opposition in Mali

**Priekšsēdētājs.** – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debātes par septiņiem rezolūciju priekšlikumiem par politisko partiju izformēšanu un opozīcijas apspiešanu Mali (2025/2754(RSP)).

**Christophe Gomart, auteur.** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, au Mali, l'Europe a payé le prix du sang. Notre continent a payé un lourd tribut: 67 soldats européens – 58 Français, un Espagnol, deux Allemands, cinq Néerlandais, un Portugais – sont tombés dans la lutte contre le terrorisme islamiste. N'oublions pas leur sacrifice.

Nous sommes intervenus en 2013, à la demande du gouvernement malien de l'époque, pour empêcher l'arrivée des islamistes au pouvoir et la création d'un couloir pour les terroristes islamistes vers l'Europe. En 2020, un coup d'État a amené au pouvoir le colonel Assimi Goïta, qui a rapproché géopolitiquement son pays de la Russie. Et, le 13 mai 2025, la junte militaire au pouvoir a procédé à la dissolution des partis politiques, faisant plonger le pays dans un régime officiellement dictatorial. À ce titre, le Parlement européen vote cette semaine une résolution pour s'opposer à cette atteinte grave aux droits fondamentaux, qui expose davantage le Mali à son invasion totale par les groupes islamistes.

L'Afrique et l'Europe sont plus que des partenaires. Nous sommes voisins, liés par l'histoire, la géographie, l'économie et les peuples. Les porosités entre nos deux continents sont très fortes, pour le meilleur, mais aussi pour le pire. Plus de 800 000 Maliens habitent en Europe, principalement sur son flanc ouest, et à ce chiffre pourraient bientôt s'ajouter des centaines de milliers de migrants illégaux fuyant la dictature et l'avancée des groupes islamistes vers Bamako.

Nous avons trop sacrifié dans ce pays pour accepter l'effacement de leur liberté. Par solidarité, par responsabilité, l'Europe doit tenir la ligne: la ligne d'un lien renouvelé avec l'Union africaine via un partenariat stratégique renforcé et équilibré. Car l'Afrique comptera près de 2,5 milliards d'habitants d'ici à 2050, soit un homme sur quatre, et, en 2100, ce sera un homme sur deux. Être spectateurs sans agir au Mali pourrait conduire à une contagion chez ses voisins, élever le risque d'importation de la menace terroriste en Europe et accroître dangereusement le flux de migrants illégaux.

**Laura Ballarín Cereza, author.** – Mr President, dear colleagues, what we are witnessing in Mali is deeply worrying. Since the 2020 coup, the country has been trapped in a downward spiral of authoritarianism. The military junta, led by General Assimi Goïta, has not only failed to deliver on repeated promises of democratic elections – it has now taken the alarming step of dissolving all political parties and organisations. This is not just a violation of Malian citizens' fundamental rights. It is a direct attack on democracy, on civil society and on any prospect for peaceful political dialogue.

This Parliament condemns the arrests, enforced disappearances and intimidation of opposition figures. We must be clear – we care about Mali, and democracy cannot be suspended indefinitely in the country. The European Union must raise the pressure, continue supporting civil society and stand firmly against autocracy. We owe it to the European soldiers who lost their lives in the country, but also to the Malian people, who are also suffering from terrorist violence, foreign interference and economic hardship, to defend their rights and freedoms. This is why we demand the immediate restoration of constitutional order and human dignity in Mali.

**Catarina Vieira**, *author*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, the proposal to dissolve and ban political parties in Mali is concerning, to say the least. Anyone can see that such a ban is deeply undemocratic and a nail in the coffin of any self-respecting democracy. It is also at odds with the Constitution that was enacted in 2023.

But this is not a standalone development; it is part of a wider crackdown on opposition, civil society, critics of the regime and many political opponents, who have been abducted or arrested. The autocratisation trend – not only in Mali, but in the entire region – is extremely worrying.

So we stand here today, as Europeans, speaking about human rights and democracy in Africa; and as we do it, we cannot deny our colonial past. Neither can we deny our present, where so many of our relationships with countries that were formerly colonies continue to be deeply unequal. The EU must come to terms with our past and start treating African nations like equal partners, not only in words and in speeches, but also in actions, negotiations and trades.

**Ingeborg Ter Laak**, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de veiligheidssituatie in Mali gaat er sterk op achteruit. De gevechten tussen de Malinese autoriteiten, rebellen en jihadisten nemen in hevigheid toe. Daarbij worden grove schendingen van de mensenrechten vastgesteld. Alle oppositiepartijen en tegenstanders van het regime worden uitgeschakeld. Democratische verkiezingen lijken verder weg dan ooit.

De politieke rechten moeten worden hersteld en er moeten verkiezingen worden uitgeschreven.

Rusland heeft dit momentum aangewend om zijn invloed in Mali uit te breiden. Zo is Mali begonnen met de bouw van een door Rusland gesteunde goudraffinaderij en er worden “games” verspreid waarin wordt gevochten tegen het neokolonialisme van Europa en Amerika. Er is ook proactieve pro-Russische propaganda, die zich razendsnel verspreidt. Maar het gaat veel verder dan dat. Er zijn naar schatting duizend vijfhonderd Russische soldaten, die zich schuldig maken aan grootschalige schendingen van de mensenrechten: zij executeren Malinezen en intimideren de bevolking. Dit geweld moet stoppen.

**Marta Temido**, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, a dissolução dos partidos políticos no Mali é uma violação grave dos princípios fundamentais de qualquer Estado de direito e da ordem constitucional.

Sem pluralismo, sem liberdade de expressão, sem o envolvimento da sociedade civil e sem a participação democrática dos cidadãos, nenhuma estabilidade política duradoura poderá ser construída.

Do golpe de Estado de 2020 e da tomada de poder pela Junta Militar saiu o compromisso de um governo de transição com a responsabilidade de preparar eleições. Porém, o que se viu foi o prolongamento do mandato presidencial, o aumento da repressão da oposição, as prisões arbitrárias e o aumento das violações dos direitos humanos.

Deste modo, cresce a instabilidade e agrava-se o isolamento internacional do Mali.

Apelamos, por isso, às autoridades de transição para que restabeçam, com urgência, o espaço democrático, anulem a decisão que dissolveu os partidos e fixem um calendário eleitoral, claro.

Só assim poderá haver um verdadeiro futuro para o Mali.

**Reinhold Lopatka** (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, Europe has played an active role in supporting all the Sahel countries and mobilised more than EUR 600 million for Mali alone since 2014. This has included support for development, humanitarian aid and efforts to stabilise the region and fight and combat terrorism.

But we see in Mali, if we fail in our engagement, there is dissolution of political life, the erosion of freedoms are spreading and immediately Russia is active on the ground whenever they see an opportunity.

Just three weeks ago, we were on a mission in Mauritania, five kilometres away from Mali, and there we were in the Mbera camp. There are more than 120 000 refugees from Mali. This is another result, if we fail. Thousands of refugees are leaving their homeland.

So what I want to say is, even it's very difficult, we have to work very hard to bring Mali back on a democratic path in the interest of the people of Mali.

**Ekaterina Zaharieva, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, just one month ago in Mali, the military regime decided to dissolve all political parties and organisations. This decision, which stems from a long process of political, institutional and security degradation, marks a new stage in its authoritarian consolidation since the second coup in May 2021, while sending extremely negative signals about Mali's commitment to human rights.

Like in Nigeria and in Burkina Faso, the departure from the expected return to constitutional order, which was promised to the Malian population, is extremely regrettable. This decision also demonstrates the growing erosion and repression of the already reduced civil space and rule of law in the country, amid growing restrictive restrictions and attacks against critics and dissenting voices, including civil society organisations, human rights defenders and media professionals.

This decision shows once again that our bilateral relations with Mali remain complicated. How we manage them is crucial, crucial for the Malian population and crucial for the EU.

Honourable Members, as you know, HR/VP Kallas has been asked to work on a renewed approach for the Sahel, which includes Mali. Issues of governance and human rights will continue to be discussed with the Malian authorities through political dialogue. As demonstrated by the last visit of the EU Special Representative for Sahel to Mali, promoting an open dialogue is crucial to advance these and other values, interest in principles we hold dear. That includes, of course, strong support to Malian civil society organisations.

Honourable Members, we have heard your concerns on Mali and we share them. Like at the last sessions of the Human Rights Council, we will continue to raise concerns over systematic human rights violations in Mali, where the social and political context remains marked by serious human rights violations. Preserving the space for civil and democratic expression, in which all people can enjoy all their rights, is an essential condition for national reconciliation.

To this end, it is crucial to engage in peaceful and truly inclusive dialogue with all actors. We will continue to stand for such vital values and principles.

**Priekšsēdētājs.** – Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

*Rakstiski paziņojumi (178. pants)*

**Tomasz Froelich (ESN), schriftlich.** – Wir beklagen die Auflösung politischer Parteien und das harte Vorgehen gegen die Opposition in Mali. Moniert werden schlechte Regierungsführung, die schwache Stellung der Parlamente, die wachsende Kluft zwischen dem Volk und den politischen Eliten, Demokratiedefizite. Das erinnert unweigerlich an die Europäische Union. Deshalb stellt sich auch die Frage: Ist die EU überhaupt befugt, über Mali zu richten, wenn auf unserem Kontinent demokratische Wahlen annulliert werden wie in Rumänien, politische Todesurteile gegen Oppositionelle gesprochen werden wie in Frankreich, und die größte Oppositionspartei mit nachrichtendienstlichen Mitteln ausspioniert wird wie in Deutschland? Bevor wir andere Länder belehren, sollten wir erstmal das eigene Zimmer aufräumen. Hinzu kommt, dass die Entwicklungshilfe, die wir nach Mali schicken, die Missstände vor Ort verschlimmert: Denn sie fördert die Korruption im Land. Es profitieren einige wenige Privilegierte vor Ort und der NGO-Komplex, während das malische Volk den Glauben an die Demokratie verliert: Räuberische Eliten, Korruption, Unruhen – das lehnen die Malier ab. Kann man es ihnen verübeln?

## 16. Digital Markets, Digital Euro, Digital Identities: economical stimuli or trends toward dystopia (topical debate)

**Priekšsēdētājs.** – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debātes par aktuāliem jautājumiem saistībā ar digitālajiem tirgiem, digitālo euro, digitālajām identitātēm: ekonomiski stimuli vai ceļš uz distopiju.

Vēlos informēt deputātus, ka šajās debatēs nebūs brīvā mikrofona procedūras un netiks pieņemti zilās kartītes jautājumi.

**Rada Laykova, *author.*** – Mr President, dear colleagues, today we are discussing the very nature of money. The proposal to introduce the digital euro is framed as the inevitable next step in our digital evolution. But we must ask: at what cost does this come? Whether technology becomes a blessing or a curse depends both on those in power and on the rationality of the population. Because any rational citizen recognises the immense danger of the combination of the digital euro and the digital ID, and naturally rejects them.

These two developments – digital currency and digital identity – are advanced separately, but when you combine them, it's like putting a match to gasoline. The programmability and limitability of the digital euro, combined with the reduction of your financial life to a single account tied to a unified, all-purpose digital identity, is the dystopian dream of control-obsessed technocrats. The possibilities for authoritarian control are staggering, and what limited personal freedom still exists in our current system is due to anonymity and cash.

And you must know that the digital euro is not just a fancy gadget; it is a completely new monetary system. When combined with the digital ID, it exponentially increases the possibility to control individuals: programmability and usage limits would allow authorities to reward or punish the behaviour of citizens – and just imagine what this could mean when tied to systems like social credit scores or smart, 15-minute cities! If you reduce to one identity and one account, you have no way to opt out.

And speaking of coercion, for us Bulgarians, this entire situation is a double insult. We're being forced into the sinking ship of the 'Euro-Titanic' without our consent: our legitimate referendum was suppressed and the accession process has been a farce, with falsified fiscal reports, a blind Commission, inconsistent conclusions in the convergence report, and the EU Parliament's supervisory role conveniently delegated back to Bulgaria's ruling party, GERB.

This version of democracy is a complete joke, because checks and balances have been turned into a closed loop, without any citizen involvement. We Bulgarians are being dragged into this dangerously dystopian project of a digital euro and a digital identity without our consent. The EU and our so-called leadership elites prefer to govern by force, rather than allow for democratic citizen participation in a referendum on the euro-accession of Bulgaria.

With the programmability of the digital euro, central banks will be able to precisely manage the money supply. This is a dream for them, because they can expand the money supply and they can extract value from the population through forced payments and taxes under various key EU priority policy areas such as climate, sun, gender – you name it. Even universal basic income will no longer be unconditional. And yes, money can now also come with an expiry date. This allows wealth to be redistributed even faster without causing excessive inflation.

And to those who say that my digital dystopia is just a paranoid fantasy because it's not officially written down anywhere, I say: of course it's not written down, but the technical capabilities have already been put in place, and so have the incentives for the key actors to use them.

**Ekaterina Zaharieva, *Member of the Commission.*** – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for the opportunity to take the floor in today's debate. The topic of this discussion shows the importance of making sure that our policies support innovation and enhance our competitiveness, and safeguard the fundamental rights of our citizens in a rapidly evolving environment.

These objectives are central to Europe's digital strategy. They reflect both our ambition and our responsibility to share the digital transformation of our society in a manner that opens up new opportunities for businesses and empowers citizens to take back control and responsibility for their activities in the digital space.

There are a number of examples of recently adopted or proposed instruments that show a strong commitment to these objectives, and point to tangible results. Let me start with the example of the Digital Market Act. It aims to ensure that the doors remain open for the next waves of innovation in the digital economy. It gives companies of all sizes the chance to turn both ideas into real benefits and greater choice for EU consumers. It responds to long standing imbalances, where a few gatekeepers have controlled access to key digital markets.

The Digital Market Act restores fairness and protects open digital markets by imposing obligations that open space for EU start-ups to innovate, also through interoperable products and services we all use every day. For example, messaging services or connected devices such as earbuds or smartwatches.

By limiting cross-use of personal data it also contributes to stronger privacy protections by empowering users to take back control over how their data is accessed and used by digital platforms.

The experience also shows that a significant number of users has declined to deny what was previously a common corporate practice of wide data combination and profiling by the digital gatekeepers. We are already seeing concrete effects. Irrespective of whatever you use an iPhone or Samsung or any other phone, you have been asked to choose the web browser or search engine you prefer. This has contributed significantly to the uptake of alternatives, including those that focus on enhanced privacy or sustainability.

Turning to the digital Euro. This initiative addresses key concerns as payments increasingly shift to digital players, the role of public money risk diminishing. The digital euro would ensure that central bank money remains accessible, complementing and not replacing cash and supporting inclusion. It would also provide a guarantee of monetary sovereignty in the digital age, not least in view of the strong dependence of the European payments landscape on international card schemes.

The Commission's proposal is currently under discussion in the European Parliament and the Council. We welcome the feedback received and are ready to engage constructively with the co-legislators to ensure strong safeguards on privacy, security and new opportunities for European businesses.

In a growing digital economy and society, secure, trustworthy and privacy-driven digital identity is no longer a luxury. It is a fundamental necessity. Europeans are increasingly accessing essential services like healthcare, education and financial tools online. For this, they need robust and easy to use identification, also to avoid fraud and impersonation, targeting in particular our elderly citizens and less digital savvy groups.

This is the purpose of the European digital identity wallets. They are voluntary for our citizens to use and build on the core principles that citizens stay in full control of their data, offering an alternative to the market solutions we all have in our phones today, which require the disclosure of personal data for commercial purposes. In terms of security and privacy, they will be the gold standard with inbuilt technical functionalities that prevent any taking or tracing of users behaviour, be it by private companies or governments.

Each of these instruments creates new opportunities for European businesses while strengthening the protection of citizens rights. Taken together, they reflect a coherent vision for digital society that is innovative, inclusive and firmly grounded in European values and our human approach to digital policy and regulation.

**Fernando Navarrete Rojas**, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, ¿qué nos depararán las tecnologías digitales? La tecnología es simplemente habilitante y nos corresponde a nosotros, como responsables políticos, orientar su uso hacia el interés general. Asociar tecnología con bondad es tan absurdo como su contrario, o como confundir novedad con progreso. Si hacemos esto, corremos el riesgo de quedar deslumbrados por las nuevas posibilidades tecnológicas y olvidar el fondo de lo que pretendemos conseguir.

En el ámbito concreto de las monedas digitales minoristas, como el euro digital, corremos el peligro de caer en esta confusión por deslumbramiento. El objetivo es común: que los ciudadanos puedan pagar de forma fácil, segura y libre en toda Europa. Hoy, esa libertad está condicionada por una excesiva dependencia de proveedores no europeos. Es una vulnerabilidad económica y geopolítica que tenemos que corregir.

Pero cuidado: la solución no puede ser encerrar la innovación europea dentro de un producto único que presenta importantes riesgos económicos, que suscita preocupación de los ciudadanos por su privacidad y que previene el surgimiento de opciones alternativas. Hoy, gracias precisamente a los avances tecnológicos e infraestructuras que ya existen, tenemos una oportunidad real de construir un ecosistema de pagos paneuropeo, competitivo, innovador y autónomo. El éxito de esta ruta no está asegurado, pero su fracaso tampoco. No tiremos esta oportunidad por apostar todo a una sola carta, deslumbrados por la novedad. Marquemos una ambición compartida y exploremos sin miedo lo que las distintas soluciones de pago pueden ofrecer a los ciudadanos.

**Aurore Lalucq**, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Commission, chers collègues, qui peut vouloir priver les Européens d'un mode de paiement digital gratuit? Car je vous rappelle que vos cartes bancaires ne sont pas gratuites. Qui peut préférer que nos données soient stockées aux États-Unis – parce que c'est cela, la réalité – plutôt qu'en Europe? Qui peut refuser que nous soyons indépendants des moyens de paiement américains? Car je vous rappelle que quasiment tous nos moyens de paiement sont américains.

Qui peut vouloir abandonner notre souveraineté monétaire? Qui peut refuser de défendre l'euro, notre monnaie aujourd'hui concurrencée par des stablecoins américains sur notre propre sol? Qui peut préférer des acteurs américains proches d'une administration à qui l'Union européenne pose un problème, elle l'a dit clairement, qui cherche à déstabiliser nos agriculteurs, notre industrie, nos viticulteurs? Qui? Qui, en d'autres termes, peut nous refuser cette liberté de créer l'euro digital, notre moyen de paiement, indépendant des Américains notamment, qui?

Je vais vous le dire, ce ne sont pas des gens qui défendent les intérêts des Européens, ce ne sont pas des gens qui défendent les intérêts des classes moyennes, ce ne sont pas des gens qui défendent notre souveraineté, ce ne sont pas des gens qui défendent notre démocratie, et l'histoire les nommera.

Dans une période faite de populisme, vous allez entendre énormément de choses fausses sur l'euro digital, comme quoi la BCE voudrait prendre le pouvoir sur tout le monde, comme quoi nous allons faire des choses dingues avec vos données. Ce sera faux. C'est un combat éminemment politique, éminemment civilisationnel qui se joue ici. Il faudra tenir bon. Il faudra aussi aller vite, car aujourd'hui, l'euro a un rôle à jouer, majeur, celui de concurrencer le dollar, celui d'être la monnaie d'une des économies les plus fortes au monde. Chacun devra être du bon côté de l'histoire et, encore une fois, l'histoire les jugera.

**Piotr Müller**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Jestem ogromnym entuzjastą wszelkich rozwiązań cyfrowych, które mogą ułatwiać funkcjonowanie gospodarki, instytucji publicznych i wszelkie działania natury społecznej. Natomiast jestem przeciwnikiem jakichkolwiek rozwiązań, które miałyby mieć element przymusu.

Jedną z takich koncepcji jest między innymi wprowadzenie pieniądza cyfrowego jako wyłącznego środka płatności. To jest coś, co de facto spowodowałoby brak jakiegokolwiek prywatności, brak jakiegokolwiek pojęcia wolności społecznej. Dlatego też chciałem tutaj to wyraźnie podkreślić, że my jako grupa ECR jesteśmy przeciwni takiemu przymusowi w przyszłości.

Jesteśmy zwolennikami tego, aby publiczne usługi cyfrowe były łatwiej dostępne, ale jesteśmy przeciwnikami tego, aby stały się wyłączną bramą do tego, żeby na przykład korzystać z internetu, bo i takie pomysły były, żeby przez tożsamość cyfrową, tę właśnie państwową, dostęp do internetu przestał być anonimowy. Niektórzy na tej sali mieli takie pomysły, więc wyraźnie tego typu pomysłom trzeba powiedzieć nie.

Natomiast musimy oczywiście korzystać ze wszelkich nowych technologii po to, aby Europa się rozwijała gospodarczo i żeby korzystała z tych możliwości, które daje chociażby sztuczna inteligencja.

Ale korzystając z okazji, chciałbym jeszcze o jednej rzeczy powiedzieć: musimy też w tym miejscu rozpocząć debatę nad tym, w jaki sposób obywatele powinni mieć prawo do tego, aby kasować dane, które są przechowywane przez rejestry państwowe. Nie może być tak, że państwo wymusza na przykład przetrzymywanie danych osobowych, które nie są niezbędne, przez 15-20 lat. Rozpocznijmy też o tym dzisiaj debatę.

**Billy Kelleher**, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, I must say, it's weird that the far right have requested this debate and are attempting to portray attempts to digitise the European economy as dystopian. Perhaps they don't actually know what 'dystopian' really means. 'Dystopian' is defined as 'relating to or denoting an imagined state or society where there is great suffering or injustice'.

Within the world of film and literature, there's a particular genre that focuses on how humanity will survive in dystopian societies. They all have some fairly common features: centralisation of power, erosion of privacy, erosion of rights, spreading of false information and propaganda, the incitement of fear and suspicion. These dystopian symptoms are sadly on the rise across Europe.

However, it is nothing to do with the digitalisation of our society. These unkind and uncaring trends are all due to the underhanded, nasty, mean-spirited actions of the far right who peddle lies, whip up fear and hate, and seek to divide rather than unite society. So, to the far right in this house, take a long, hard look at yourselves and your actions before lecturing the rest of us and seeking to make our lives, our citizens' lives, easier and more prosperous.

**Sergey Lagodinsky**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, colleagues, I understand the fear of our extremist colleagues. But let's be honest: what you truly fear is anything that threatens the privileges of your billionaire friends or empowers democratic institutions. As long as it's not Kremlin murderers, who you support.

And Madam Laykova, I would like to tell you what is dystopian: dystopian are your fakes. You were saying that the EU is going to strip citizens of their savings within six months if the savings are not spent. This is fake! And this is what we are against.

The digital Europe is not a Silicon Valley fantasy. It's a public alternative to strengthen our monitoring sovereignty. The digital markets are needed, because to compete with US tech giants and Chinese communists, we need more Europe, not less.

And on digital identity, yes, we Greens rejected the Council deal. Why? Because we need more safeguards in order to prevent the wallet becoming a Trojan horse. But we've improved it and rights will be preserved.

Surrendering digitalisation to American billionaires and Chinese communists cannot be the solution. Nor to your Putin friends!

**Jussi Saramo**, *The Left-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, muutama yhdysvaltalaisyhtiö tietää meistä kaiken kännykän käyttömme ja maksuliikenteen seurauksena. Tämän seurauksena myös Yhdysvaltain hallinto tietää meistä kaiken, enemmän kuin omat hallintomme, ehkä enemmän kuin me itse. Haluammeko todella antaa tämän vallan Euroopan ulkopuolelle? Kyse on myös taloudesta – minunkin jokaisesta ostoksestani amerikkalainen korttiduopoli kerää siivun eurooppalaisten yritysten taskusta ja lopulta eurooppalaisilta ihmisiltä.

Tuntuu absurdilta, että tässä tilanteessa itseään isänmaallisina markkinoivat poliitikot vastustavat yritystä palauttaa hallintaa Euroopan kansojen yhteiselle, demokraattisessa valvonnassa olevalle keskuspankille. Digieurossa ei ole kyse käteisen korvaamisesta digirahalla. Siinä on kyse muutaman suuryhtiön hallitseman digirahan korvaamisesta eurooppalaisella demokraattisella vaihtoehdolla.

**Siegbert Frank Droese**, *im Namen der ESN-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kollegen! Kollege Kelleher ist gleich weggelaufen – ich hätte ihm jetzt gesagt, wir wissen als Deutsche, was Dystopie ist. Dystopie sitzt in seiner Fraktion und heißt Strack-Zimmermann. Was uns von den Eurokraten als Fortschritt verkauft wird, ist in Wahrheit ein gefährlicher Irrweg, der Menschen unfrei macht. Die Kommissarin hat hier heute gerade versucht, uns allen ein schönes, in Worten gekleidetes Märchen aufzutischen. Digitale Märkte – wir sagen Ja! Ja, wenn die Freiheit und der faire Wettbewerb gefördert werden. Doch was tut diese EU? Sie überreguliert, sie behindert Innovation und stärkt damit ausgerechnet die Tech-Konzerne, die ohnehin längst zu mächtig sind.

Der sogenannte digitale Euro ist keine harmlose technische Neuerung im Stil der Kryptowährung. Er ist der Einstieg in die totale Kontrolle über unser Geld, über das Geld der Europäer und damit über unser Leben. Bargeld soll so bald der Vergangenheit angehören, und damit wird die Freiheit der europäischen Bürger beerdigt. Das ist mit uns in der ESN-Fraktion nicht zu machen.

Was passiert denn, wenn die Bürger falsche Bücher kaufen, an eine politisch missliebige Partei spenden oder einfach zu viel Fleisch kaufen? Dann wird den Menschen der digitale Geldhahn von irgendwelchen Eurokraten in Zukunft hier in Brüssel abgedreht werden. Und die digitale Identität? Das klingt nach Komfort, ist aber in Wirklichkeit der Startschuss für den gläsernen Sklaven der Kommission. Geld, Konsumverhalten, Reisen, Impfstatus, politische Ansichten – alles zentral verknüpft, alles abrufbar. Der gläserne Mensch, von dem die Kommission träumt.

Wer Zugriff auf diese Daten hat, hat Macht. Und wer glaubt, diese Macht wird von Eurokraten nicht missbraucht, hat aus der Geschichte nichts gelernt. Die Technik muss im Dienste der Freiheit stehen, nicht im Dienste der Kontrolle. Kein digitaler Euro, keine digitale Idee, keine Überwachung durch die Eurokraten der Kommission!

**Lídia Pereira (PPE)**. – Senhor Presidente, a digitalização das nossas sociedades e economias deixou de ser, há muito tempo, um desafio para um futuro longínquo.

A transição digital é uma realidade de hoje e a inovação tecnológica ganhou uma velocidade que temos de acompanhar, sob pena de voltarmos a ficar para trás.

É claro que precisamos de um euro digital; se isso significar mais liberdade financeira para as pessoas. É claro que precisamos de uma identidade digital; se isso facilitar a relação com os serviços públicos ou processos tão simples como abrir uma conta bancária ou contratar um seguro. E é claro que precisamos de mercados digitais para aumentar o universo de oportunidades das nossas empresas, sobretudo as PME e as *start up*.

Tudo isto é evidente e tem de ser alcançado com a proteção dos dados e da privacidade. A escolha não é entre o progresso e a utopia, mas entre o digital que serve as pessoas e o digital que as controla.

É por isso que temos de fazer da soberania digital da Europa uma realidade. Para isso, precisamos de mais investimento e menos regulação, mais agilidade na decisão e menos burocracia na inovação.

Está na hora de deixarmos de ser o Velho Continente para sermos a Europa do futuro.

**Stefano Cavedagna (ECR)**. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo qui a discutere di euro digitale, di identità elettronica, di mercato unico dei dati. Sono tutti concetti che alla carta evocano progresso, crescita, competitività. Ma possono essere anche dei grandi limiti per il nostro spazio economico, perché talvolta strumenti di libertà possono diventare strumenti di vero e proprio controllo.

Sono convinto che finché difendiamo il denaro contante qualsiasi strumento di euro digitale possa essere sostenibile, a patto che, come previsto già ad oggi all'interno dei trattati e anche nei protocolli, si garantisca una equità nell'utilizzo di questi strumenti.

Ma vorrei pensare anche al tema dell'identità digitale. È già successo in alcuni paesi come la Cina che tuttora ci siano punteggi di valutazione dei cittadini erogando singoli servizi solo dietro alcune condizioni. Questo tipo di identità digitale o sistema di *scoring* o patente a punti è già stato giudicato da tutti i tribunali europei come lesivo della libertà. E noi tuteleremo sempre la libertà.

**Katri Kulmuni (Renew).** – Arvoisa puhemies, euroalueella on käytössä 350 miljoonaa maksukorttia. Niillä suoritetaan vuosittain yli 12 miljardia maksua ja kuusi miljardia käteisnostoa. Euroalueen 20 maasta 13 käyttää korttimaksuissa ainoastaan kansainvälisiä järjestelmiä.

Vaikka jokaisessa euroalueen maassa toimii ainakin yksi kansallinen maksukorttiohjelma, kortteja voidaan käyttää liikkeeseenlaskumaan ulkopuolella vain, jos niihin yhdistetään Visa tai MasterCard ominaisuus. Nämä kaksi yhdysvaltalaista yritystä hallitsevat luottokorttimarkkinoitamme siis suvereenisti.

EU pyrkii lisäämään omavaraisuuttaan. Me tarvitsemme omavaraisuutta myös maksukorttijärjestelmissä ja maksujärjestelmissä. Presidentti Trump on jo osoittanut tullipuheillaan, miten arvaamaton kumppani Yhdysvalloista on EU:lle valitettavasti tullut. Digitaalista euroa kannattaisikin kehittää tämä turvallisuusaspekti edellä eikä niinkään teknokraattisesti ja kalliisti kuten tällä hetkellä.

**Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, dear colleagues, let me humour you on the far right with a little dystopia of my own. Let's imagine you wake up tomorrow morning and you try to go to the bakery and buy a croissant, and suddenly it doesn't work; Visa and Mastercard are down – and with them, two thirds of all payments in the EU. Then you are slightly annoyed and hungry, and you go to your office and boot up your computer, and then suddenly your Microsoft Outlook doesn't work anymore. Then you try to text your boss and say, 'This doesn't work, I need to text them', and then suddenly WhatsApp doesn't work anymore. And then you want to check at least your files, and you see your cloud files are all gone.

Now you might think this is a crazy dystopia, but it is actually just a tiny little executive order. It's an executive order from your friend away from actually happening. And this is the dystopia we are facing.

We have to build real sovereignty in Europe – not the fake sovereignty that you are proclaiming – and really try to make sure that our payments work in the future, which is why we need the digital euro. We need the sovereignty of our innovators, which is why we need digital markets. And we need to make sure that we can debate freely and in a sovereign space in our digital world, and this is the Digital Services Act.

So let's make sure that we stand up for sovereignty – for European sovereignty – with a strong European regulation in the relevant fields.

**Milan Mazurek (ESN).** – Vážený pán predsedajúci, digitálne euro v čase, kedy už dnes disponujeme technológiou, ktorá nám umožňuje vykonávať prakticky okamžité digitálne platby, nie je žiaden nástroj na uľahčenie našich životov, ale naopak, nástroj na totalitnú kontrolu nášho obyvateľstva, kedy nám nevolení byrokraati budú určovať, koľko si akých vecí budeme môcť kupovať, koľko mäsa si budeme môcť kupovať, koľko benzínu či nafty si budeme môcť natankovať na základe nezmyselných emisných limitov. A títo ľudia nám tu otvorene klamú, že nechcú odstraňovať hotovosť. Slovenská republika prijala ako jediný štát v Európskej únii do svojej ústavy právo na hotovosť. My ho tam máme. Bol som poslancom Národnej rady, keď sme to odhlasovali. Sme jediný štát v EÚ, ktorý má právo na hotovosť garantované v ústave. Viete, čo urobila Komisia a Európska centrálna banka? Začala voči Slovenskej republike konanie a otvorene nás žiada, inak nás bude pokutovať, aby sme právo na hotovosť odstránili z našej ústavy. Ja sa pýtam, ak títo ľudia nechcú hotovosť odstrániť, aký reálny dôvod pre Európsku centrálnu banku na to, aby žiadala Slovenskú republiku, aby toto právo z ústavy odstránila, existuje? Žiaden. Klamú, špinavo zavádzajú občanov a hotovosť chcú odstrániť, aby nás mohli kontrolovať.

**Fabio De Masi (NI).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Durch Onlineshopping und den Einsatz von Smartphones wird das staatliche Bargeld immer weiter verdrängt. Staatliches Bargeld ist aber auch Schutz vor der Marktmacht digitaler Oligopolisten und auch vor Negativzinsen bei den privaten Banken. Visa zum Beispiel macht einen Gewinn von 0,50 Euro für jeden Euro Kreditkartengebühr; das ist moderne Piraterie.

Und ja, es geht auch um geopolitische Fragen. Als zum Beispiel die Enthüllungsplattform WikiLeaks US-Kriegsverbrechen veröffentlicht hat, wurde sie auf Druck der USA von Visa und Mastercard abgeschnitten. Deswegen könnte ein Zentralbankkonto mit staatlichem Digitalgeld tatsächlich einen Beitrag leisten – theoretisch –, um die Marktmacht der privaten Oligopolisten zu beschränken.

So ist der digitale Euro aber derzeit nicht gebaut, denn es soll Höchstgrenzen geben für die Guthaben. Man will sie niedriger verzinsen, damit es keinen *digital bank run* gibt, also damit die Leute nicht ihre Ersparnisse bei den Banken abziehen und in staatliche Euro Guthaben umschichten.

Deswegen hält der digitale Euro derzeit nicht, was er verspricht. Das Bargeld ist immer noch unzureichend geschützt. Es reicht, ein Schild hinzuhängen, um zu sagen: Wir nehmen kein Bargeld an! Deswegen ist der digitale Euro derzeit nicht in der Lage, sein Versprechen einzulösen.

**Paulius Saudargas (PPE).** – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, the development of digital markets, the introduction of the digital euro and trusted digital identities are the building blocks of a digitally resilient European Union. These initiatives strengthen the single market, empower our businesses to innovate, and give our citizens greater control and security in the digital age.

About 63 % of euro area card-based transactions are processed by non-European countries, and 13 out of 20 Eurozone countries are dependent entirely on international card schemes or mobile solutions. Foreign platforms dominate e-payment solutions and mobile apps. Reliance on intermediary banks costs eurozone firms EUR 20 billion annually in fees. With the digital euro, we ensure that monetary sovereignty remains in European hands, while enhancing our resilience in the face of international policy uncertainty.

**Marlena Małag (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Cyfrowe euro to nie odpowiedź na potrzeby obywateli, lecz narzędzie polityczne. Europejczycy już dziś mają dostęp do szybkich i bezpiecznych płatności.

Cyfrowa waluta nie rozwiązuje żadnego realnego problemu, za to tworzy nowe. Komu więc naprawdę służy? Europejskiemu Bankowi Centralnemu i Komisji Europejskiej. To oni, a nie państwa członkowskie, zyskują nowe uprawnienia.

Cyfrowe euro oznacza centralizację finansów w rękach instytucji oderwanych od narodowych interesów. Europejski Bank Centralny stanie się superbankiem: emitentem, operatorem, a w praktyce właścicielem danych obywateli.

To cios w suwerenność państw. Utracimy wpływ na własny system bankowy i politykę monetarną. Każdy kraj stanie się zależny od cyfrowej infrastruktury zarządzanej z Brukseli i Frankfurtu.

Czy chcemy, by decyzje o naszej gospodarce podejmowano poza naszymi granicami?

Cyfrowe euro to zagrożenie dla wolności obywateli i niezależności państw członkowskich. To również realne ryzyko inwigilacji pod pretekstem bezpieczeństwa i postępu instytucji Unii Europejskiej, które budują tak naprawdę kontrolę nad finansami.

**Diego Solier (NI).** – Señor presidente, señorías, nos están vendiendo el euro digital y la identidad digital como progreso, pero detrás hay algo mucho más oscuro: control total sobre los ciudadanos. Esto no va solo de tecnología, va de poder, de decidir cómo gastamos, qué consumimos, dónde estamos. Es la puerta a una vigilancia masiva donde nuestra libertad queda atada a una pantalla y a quien la controla. Y lo peor es que no hay garantías reales; no se habla de prohibir su vinculación con nuestros derechos fundamentales ni de proteger el dinero en efectivo como garantía de anonimato. Se diseña una herramienta de obediencia, no de servicio. Al mismo tiempo, vemos cómo en los mercados digitales se censuran contenidos, se frena la innovación y se castiga a las pymes.

¿A qué tipo de Europa nos están llevando? Europa nació para proteger libertades, no para ponerles código de barras. Si no actuamos ahora, mañana será tarde. La libertad no se digitaliza, se defiende. Y se defiende aquí y ahora.

**Gheorghe Piperea (ECR).** – Domnule președinte, digitalizarea a promis progres și inovare, dar poate aduce dependență și captivitate. În plus, în ritmul actual al reglementării, riscăm să înlocuim o dominație privată a corporațiilor *Big Tech* cu una instituțională.

Cine controlează digitalul deține adevărul, decide pentru noi și contra noastră ce este adevăr corect politic sau adevăr interzis și ce este dezinformare sau știre falsă. Decide dacă infectează internetul, azi omniprezent, cu algoritmi și inteligență artificială apte a camufla realitatea și a simula înțelepciunea.

Moneda digitală a băncii centrale face deținătorul să fie programabil, urmărit, limitat în mișcare sau blocat în funcție de comportament. Libertatea și proprietatea devin iluzii. Lumea devine un panopticum digital, o închisoare digitală. Am văzut deja sisteme bancare căzând, rețele de plăți întrerupte. Este timpul pentru o pauză de reflecție! Nu putem lăsa lumea să se transforme într-o bibliotecă Babel, unde cunoașterea devine imposibilă ca în profeția Jorge Luis Borges.

**Dick Erixon (ECR).** – Herr talman! Digitaliseringen i vår tid har enorma fördelar, men när EU klampar in på området finns skäl att vara på sin vakt. I stället för att stimulera ekonomin straffar EU:s förordning om digitala marknader, DMA, företag som skapar jobb och tvingar lukrativ teknikutveckling att fly från Europa.

Sedan har vi planerna på digital euro. Den riskerar att främja expansiv penningpolitik, vilket skulle urholka den finansiella stabiliteten.

Också idén om digitala identiteter har betydande baksidor. De kan bli verktyg för att spåra medborgarnas varje steg och förinta den personliga integriteten.

I stället för att närma oss en digital dystopi där frihet offras och tillväxt hämmas, bör EU förespråka digitalisering, skydda individens integritet och släppa marknadens innovatörer fria. Så skapar vi framtiden.

**Claudiu-Richard Târziu (ECR).** – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, vin din România, o țară care și-a câștigat libertatea cu sacrificii uriașe. De aceea privesc cu îngrijorare spre direcția pe care ne-o propune astăzi Uniunea Europeană – digitalizare accelerată, identitate digitală, monedă unică electronică. În teorie, este progres, în practică, este un risc. Cine controlează aceste instrumente și în folosul cui?

Nu sunt împotriva tehnologiei, dar sunt împotriva deciziilor impuse de sus, fără garanții clare pentru cetățean. Libertatea poate fi ștearsă cu un clic, iar încrederea nu se obține prin algoritm. Românii știu ce înseamnă controlul total, de aceea preferă să-și țină banii în casă, nu în servere. Nu putem construi o societate digitală fără să construim mai întâi încredere.

Cerem un viitor digital în care omul să fie pus în centru, nu procesorul. Vrem să avem certitudinea că euro digital nu înseamnă un buton de control centralizat și să fim convinși că identitatea digitală ne aparține nouă, nu sistemului. Suveranitatea nu e un moft, e garanția că viitorul ne aparține.

**Ekaterina Zaharieva, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, honourable Members, this debate shows how crucial it is that Europe remains in control of its digital future. And it's not because we are afraid, it's because it's really our responsibility.

I really think that all of us bring responsibility to their citizens to speak the truth and not actually try to use this really very respectful house for manipulation. I think that in my introduction, I managed to represent all the initiatives and measures that the Commission has already taken, from one hand also to really to strengthen European autonomy, which is really a must, but also is to really bring and support the European citizens to the digital transition. So this is really important at the same time, also to not forget those who really need our support and to protect the human rights and their datas.

So I really hear your concerns and I can assure you that what we in the Commission will do together, of course, with this House's support, is that we will remain ambitious in building a digital Europe worthy of the freedoms we defend, which is really, really important.

**Priekšsēdētājs.** – Debates ir slēgtas.

## 17. Oral explanations of vote (Rule 201)

**President.** – The next item is the explanations of vote.

Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir balsojumu skaidrojumi.

Tagad pievērsīsimies balsojumu skaidrojumiem par īstenošanas ziņojumu par Atvēršanas un noturības mehānismu.

Colleagues, I will switch to English because we expected to hear an explanation of vote from Seán Kelly. He is not in the room so that concludes the explanations of vote.

## **18. Explanations of votes in writing (Rule 201)**

*(Rakstiski iesniegtie balsojumu skaidrojumi ir iekļauti Parlamenta tīmekļa vietnē deputātiem paredzētajās lapās.)*

## **19. Agenda of the next sitting**

**Priekšsēdētājs.** – Nākamā sēde sāksies rītdien, proti, ceturtdien, 2025. gada 19. jūnijā, plkst. 9.00.

Darba kārtība ir publicēta un ir pieejama Eiropas Parlamenta tīmekļa vietnē.

## **20. Approval of the minutes of the sitting**

**Priekšsēdētājs.** – Šīs sēdes protokolu iesniegs Parlamentam apstiprināšanai rītdien pēcpusdienas sākumā.

## **21. Closure of the sitting**

*(Sēde tika slēgta plkst. 21.10.)*

—

*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
SEDE	Committee on Security and Defence
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, Climate and Food Safety
SANT	Committee on Public Health
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
FISC	Subcommittee on Tax Matters

*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
PfE	Patriots for Europe Group
ECR	European Conservatives and Reformists Group
Renew	Renew Europe Group
Verts/ALE	Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance
The Left	The Left Group in the European Parliament – GUE/NGL
ESN	Europe of Sovereign Nations Group
NI	Non-attached Members