



C/2023/1406

8.12.2023 г.

ПЪЛЕН ПРОТОКОЛ НА РАЗИСКВАНИЯТА ОТ 15 ФЕВРУАРИ 2023 Г.

(C/2023/1406)

ЕВРОПЕЙСКИ ПАРЛАМЕНТ

СЕСИЯ 2022—2023

Заседания от 13 до 16 февруари 2023 г.

СТРАСБУРГ

Съдържание	Страница
1. Откриване на заседанието	4
2. Преговори преди първото четене в Парламента (член 71 от Правилника за дейността) (предприети действия)	4
3. Една година от руската инвазия и агресивната война срещу Украйна (разискване)	4
4. Индустриален план на Зеления пакт за епоха с нулеви нетни емисии (разискване)	26
5. Възобновяване на заседанието	35
6. Декларация на председателството	35
7. Промяна в дневния ред	36
8. Възобновяване на заседанието	36
9. Време за гласуване	37
9.1. Изменение на Регламента относно европейските фондове за дългосрочни инвестиции (A9-0196/2022 - Michiel Hoogeveen) (гласуване)	37
9.2. Споразумение между ЕС и Северна Македония: оперативни дейности, провеждани от Европейската агенция за гранична и брегова охрана в Северна Македония (A9-0027/2023 - Lena Düpont) (гласуване)	37
9.3. Упълномощаване на Полша да ратифицира изменението на Конвенцията за опазване и управление на запасите от сайда в централната част на Берингово море (A9-0007/2023 - Elżbieta Rafalska) (гласуване)	37

Съдържание	Страница
9.4. Протокол към Споразумението за сътрудничество относно Гражданска глобална навигационна спътникова система (ГНСС) между ЕО и Корея: присъединяване на България, Хърватия и Румъния (A9-0006/2023 - Cristian-Silviu Buşoi) (гласуване)	37
9.5. Съвместни предприятия в рамките на програмата „Хоризонт Европа“: Съвместно предприятие „Интегрални схеми“ (A9-0012/2023 - Eva Maydell) (гласуване)	37
9.6. Консултация относно разпоредбите за прилагане на европейския омбудсман (A9-0010/2023 - Paulo Rangel) (гласуване)	38
9.7. Положението на бившия президент на Грузия Михаил Саакашвили (RC-B9-0106/2023, B9-0106/2023, B9-0109/2023, B9-0112/2023, B9-0114/2023, B9-0117/2023) (гласуване)	38
9.8. Присъединяването на ЕС към Конвенцията на Съвета на Европа за превенция и борба с насилието над жени и домашното насилие (A9-0021/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari) (гласуване)	38
9.9. Приоритетите на ЕС за 67-ата сесия на Комисията на ООН за положението на жените (B9-0100/2023, B9-0103/2023) (гласуване)	38
10. Възобновяване на заседанието	38
11. Индустриален план на Зеления пакт за епоха с нулеви нетни емисии (продължение на разискването)	38
12. Одобряване на протокола от предишното заседание	45
13. Подкопаване на принципите на правовата държава в Гърция: скандалът с подслушването и свободата на медиите (разискване по актуални въпроси)	45
14. Закljučения на Съвета на ЕС: необходимостта от бързо финализиране на пътната карта (разискване)	60
15. Европейска централна банка — годишен отчет за 2022 г. (разискване)	74
16. Възобновяване на заседанието	94
17. Достъп до суровините от изключителна и стратегическа важност (разискване)	95
18. Разисквания относно случаи на нарушаване на правата на човека, на демокрацията и на правовата държава (разискване)	113
18.1. Положението на защитниците на правата на човека в Есватини, и по-специално убийството на Тулани Масеко	113
18.2. Насилие срещу активисти от опозицията в Екваториална Гвинея, и по-специално случаят с Хулио Обама Мефуман	117
18.3. Неотдавнашното влошаване на нечовешките условия на лишаване от свобода на Алексей Навални и други политически затворници в Русия	120
19. Обяснение на вот	125
19.1. Положението на бившия президент на Грузия Михаил Саакашвили (RC-B9-0106/2023, B9-0106/2023, B9-0109/2023, B9-0112/2023, B9-0114/2023, B9-0117/2023)	125
19.2. Присъединяването на ЕС към Конвенцията на Съвета на Европа за превенция и борба с насилието над жени и домашното насилие (A9-0021/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari)	125

Съдържание	Страница
20. Дневен ред на следващото заседание	126
21. Одобряване на протокола от настоящото заседание	126
22. Закриване на заседанието	126

ПЪЛЕН ПРОТОКОЛ НА РАЗИСКВАНИЯТА ОТ 15 ФЕВРУАРИ 2023 Г.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Откриване на заседанието

(The sitting opened at 09:02)

2. Преговори преди първото четене в Парламента (член 71 от Правилника за дейността) (предприети действия)

President. – In relation to the decisions by several committees to enter into interinstitutional negotiations, pursuant to Rule 71(1), announced at the opening of the session on Monday, 13 February, I have received no request for a vote in Parliament by Members or political groups reaching at least the medium threshold.

The committees may therefore start the negotiations.

3. Една година от руската инвазия и агресивната война срещу Украйна (разискване)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements – One year of Russia's invasion and war of aggression against Ukraine (2023/2558(RSP)).

Josep Borrell Fontelles, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, for the Council. – Madam President, Madam President of the Commission, Members of the European Parliament, I'm going to speak in Spanish and while you are using your headphones...

Quiero usar estos primeros minutos para recordar la figura de un presidente del Parlamento Europeo, Gil Robles, que nos dejó hace unos días. Un gran europeísta, presidente de los federalistas europeos, con quien he compartido muchos caminos en la construcción europea.

Señoras y señores diputados, intervengo en este debate en nombre y representación del Consejo de la Unión, cuyas formaciones de Asuntos Exteriores y Defensa tengo el honor de presidir. Hablo, por tanto, desde el punto de vista intergubernamental, uno de los dos pilares sobre los que funciona la Unión Europea. Después, la presidenta de la Comisión hablará desde la perspectiva comunitaria. Voy a intentar no contarles dos veces la misma cosa. Sin embargo, la función del Alto Representante para la Política Exterior y de Seguridad Común es también hacer de puente y coordinar las acciones y las decisiones que toman los Estados miembros con la política exterior de la Comisión Europea. Esta función es doble: por una parte, la política exterior, y, por otra parte, la seguridad y la defensa. Que no es lo mismo, aunque una cosa, a veces, es la continuación de la otra.

La guerra en Ucrania ha puesto de relieve la importancia de la política común de seguridad y de defensa. Ha sido un despertar para Europa, un despertar geopolítico. Como dijo el canciller Scholz unos días después de la invasión, esto ha sido —y seguramente lo voy a pronunciar mal en alemán— un *Zeitenwende*. Pero no solo lo ha sido para Alemania. Lo ha sido para toda Europa. Un despertar frente a una realidad nueva para nosotros: la guerra, que habíamos sacado de nuestro horizonte intelectual. Habíamos bajado la guardia, y buena prueba es el bajísimo nivel de nuestros arsenales militares y la escasa capacidad de nuestra industria de defensa para reponerlos. Sí, la invasión rusa de Ucrania ha representado una extraordinaria llamada de atención porque nos embarca en un mundo nuevo; un mundo donde todo se ha convertido en un debate geopolítico y al que la Unión Europea ha dado una respuesta que les toca a ustedes hoy

juzgar y debatir.

Espero que este debate sirva para eso, para poner de relieve lo que hemos hecho. Ustedes ya lo saben, no se lo voy a repetir. ¿Cómo lo juzgan los representantes de los pueblos de Europa? ¿Qué otra cosa podíamos hacer? ¿Qué hemos hecho? Apoyar a Ucrania militar, económica, financiera y diplomáticamente, tanto como hemos podido. Mucho, pero en mi opinión no lo suficiente.

He estado en Ucrania recientemente con la presidenta de la Comisión y mis colegas comisarios, atendiendo también a la Cumbre entre la Unión Europea y Ucrania. Allí he visto una vez más a un pueblo que defiende su libertad y su independencia y a unos líderes que tratan de hacer frente a esta dramática situación siguiendo el camino hacia Europa. Se lo dijo aquí el presidente Zelenski hace unos días. Y sí, hoy la situación en Ucrania es dramática. Pero los ucranianos miran a Europa como tantos otros pueblos —también el mío— la miraron, como un futuro prometedor. Puede que su camino sea largo porque la guerra va a ser larga, pero hemos de hacer todos los esfuerzos posibles para que esta promesa no se frustre; para que, al contrario, Ucrania salga vencedora de esta guerra y encuentre en la familia europea, a la que ya pertenece *de facto*, el futuro que necesita.

Hoy la situación militar en el terreno es extraordinariamente preocupante. Hay más de 360 000 soldados rusos, el doble de los que había antes de la guerra. La contraofensiva rusa ha empezado, aunque sea a pequeña escala, y, por primera vez, Ucrania no tiene la ventaja del mayor número de tropas en el terreno. Por eso, Ucrania continúa llamando a los Estados miembros de la Unión y a todos los que la ayudan. Por eso, los países que coordinamos la ayuda militar a Ucrania nos reunimos ayer en Ramstein, para ver dónde estamos, qué hemos hecho, qué les hemos dado como ayuda y qué necesitan —en particular, más municiones y más entrenamiento para sus soldados— y para seguir demostrando que no vamos a cejar en nuestro apoyo a Ucrania.

Señoras y señores diputados, me voy a poner la venda antes de la herida. Voy a decirles que a mí la guerra me gusta tan poco como a cualquiera de ustedes. No soy un *warmonger*.

Je ne suis pas un va-t-en-guerre.

No tengo ningún ardor guerrero; no me gusta la guerra. Claro, prefiero la paz, como casi todos ustedes. Como todos. No hace falta que lo repitamos. Pero lo que sí tenemos que repetir y discutir es cómo se alcanza la paz: para alcanzar la paz tenemos que seguir apoyando militarmente a Ucrania, más de lo que lo hemos hecho. Este va a ser uno de mis mensajes fundamentales.

Para ganar la paz primero hay que ganar la guerra. Se puede ayudar militarmente a Ucrania y al mismo tiempo hacer todos los esfuerzos diplomáticos necesarios para que la paz llegue cuanto antes. No son dos cosas alternativas ni contradictorias; hay que hacer las dos cosas a la vez. Apoyarles más, hacer más esfuerzos diplomáticos, y pronto en la Asamblea de las Naciones Unidas tendré ocasión de hacerlo y pedir al secretario general que inicie, si puede y quiere, un proceso de mediación, de interlocución en el que hasta ahora todo el mundo ha fracasado, porque todo el mundo que ha hablado con Putin ha vuelto con el mensaje de que quiere continuar esta guerra hasta conseguir sus objetivos militares.

Es de una extraordinaria ingenuidad pedir que se pare la ayuda militar a Ucrania para que la guerra sea más corta y para que se construya más pronto la paz. Y digo ingenuidad por no utilizar una palabra más fuerte. No, se pueden hacer las dos cosas, y si dejamos de apoyar militarmente a Ucrania, la paz que conseguiremos no será una paz, será una victoria de Rusia, que para nosotros sería una extraordinaria amenaza a nuestra seguridad.

Entonces, ¿qué hemos hecho? ¿Qué ha hecho el Consejo, al que represento aquí hoy? Pues primero ha aprobado un impresionante paquete de sanciones: nueve paquetes y el décimo está en camino —seguro que la presidenta de la Comisión hará referencia a él—, con el objetivo de debilitar la economía rusa.

¿Se ha conseguido? Muchos dicen que las sanciones son ineficientes, que no han debilitado a la economía rusa, que al contrario, nos producen efectos negativos sobre nosotros mismos. Bien, es cierto que la economía rusa no ha colapsado y que la tasa de crecimiento de su PIB no es la que se había previsto. Es cierto que el año pasado tuvo unos ingresos excepcionalmente altos, tanto por gas como por petróleo. Pero las cosas están cambiando, gracias a nuestras sanciones y en particular gracias al *cap* que hemos impuesto en el petróleo.

Si ustedes miran los tres parámetros fundamentales de una economía, los ingresos por hidrocarburos, el propio ministro de Hacienda ruso decía hace dos días que en enero son el 46 % más bajos que en enero del año pasado. Sí, tuvieron muchos durante el año 2022, porque los precios escalaron de una forma histórica y nosotros todavía dependíamos de ellos. Ya no lo hacemos. Uno de nuestros grandes éxitos ha sido reducir a prácticamente cero nuestra extraordinaria dependencia energética de Rusia, un 46 % más baja de enero sobre enero.

Si miran el déficit público, el déficit público ruso está explotando. Es 14 veces más alto en enero de 2023 que en enero de 2022: de 2 billones a 1,8 trillones. Y, si miran la balanza comercial, verán que sí tuvieron un gran surplus en el 2022, entre otras cosas por una extraordinaria cosecha de trigo, pero en enero del 2023 está en su mínimo histórico de la media desde el año 2007.

Déficit comercial, déficit público, ingresos por hidrocarburo: las sanciones son un veneno de acción lenta, como los que están hechos en base a arsénico. Tardan en producir sus efectos, pero lo hacen y lo hacen de una forma irreversible.

El 45 % de la dependencia tecnológica de Rusia es con respecto a Europa. Sus fábricas de coches y aviones han perdido el 80 % de su capacidad. Sí, el rublo es fuerte artificialmente, pero la economía rusa va a pagar un precio altísimo por esta guerra: han perdido su principal cliente energético, que somos los europeos, y no lo volverán a tener. No va a ser fácil, casi imposible, encontrar un cliente alternativo para su gas, porque China está demasiado lejos y su petróleo lo venden a 40 dólares el barril, es decir, a la mitad del precio del Brent, y se lo compran a rebaja India y China, y esa rebaja es debida también al efecto de nuestro *price cap*, que es un gran éxito político, porque ha conseguido reducir los ingresos de Rusia y no alterar el mercado petrolero mundial.

Sí, nuestras sanciones están surtiendo efecto lentamente, pero seguramente minando las bases tecnológicas, comerciales y energéticas de la economía rusa. Putin ya ha perdido la batalla de la energía, como también está perdiendo moral y políticamente la guerra, incluso hasta ahora, militarmente, aunque Ucrania todavía no haya ganado.

La segunda cosa que ha hecho el Consejo, además de aprobar estos paquetes de sanciones propuestos conjuntamente por la Comisión y el Alto Representante en un trabajo conjunto —quiero agradecer a la presidenta de la Comisión por su liderazgo y energía en esta materia—, hemos armado a Ucrania. Sí, por primera vez, la Unión Europea utiliza sus recursos —no de su presupuesto, pero sí recursos del conjunto de los Estados miembros— para armar a un país en guerra. Si sumamos lo que hemos dado con el Fondo Europeo de la Paz y lo que cada país ha hecho por su cuenta bilateralmente, estamos alcanzando un importe de ayuda militar que ronda los 12 mil millones de euros, dentro de un paquete de ayuda total que supera los 60 mil millones de euros. Globalmente, nadie ha hecho más que Europa para ayudar a Ucrania en términos económicos y financieros.

Nuestra ayuda militar, menor, sin duda, que la americana, no es en absoluto despreciable, pero ayer en Ramstein dije, y lo quiero repetir aquí, que tenemos no solo que continuar esta ayuda, sino que la tenemos que incrementar. Hago una llamada a todos los países europeos que disponen de carros de combate modernos y eficaces, que están acumulando polvo en sus cuarteles y que no sirven para nada, a que los den a Ucrania. Y que los den cuanto antes, porque esta primavera y verano serán decisivos. La guerra se va a decidir en esta primavera y verano.

Hemos estado demasiado tiempo discutiendo si dábamos o no dábamos los famosos Leopards. Mientras tanto, Rusia preparaba su ofensiva. Hemos estado demasiado tiempo discutiendo decisiones que tenían que haber llegado antes, temerosos de que nuestra involuación en la guerra nos condujera a una pseudobeligerancia. No, hemos anunciado que daremos carros de combate y no ha habido ninguna Tercera Guerra Mundial. Por cierto, los carros de combate todavía no están allí y tardarán en llegar.

Como el tiempo es fundamental y el tiempo se mide en vidas, es mi papel, como responsable del Fondo Europeo para la Paz, el de coordinar las acciones de los Estados miembros en la ayuda militar, pedir más y más rápida ayuda a Ucrania. Ese es el mensaje fundamental que quisiera pasarles, pero a continuación debo repetir la idea de que esta ayuda militar no es ni contradictoria ni alternativa a la búsqueda de la paz por medios diplomáticos. Que una cosa puede ir con la otra. Créanme, no entiendo a aquellos que dicen que para negociar primero hay que dejar de apoyar militarmente a Ucrania. Al contrario, hay que hacer las dos cosas a la vez. Esto no es un debate entre palomas y halcones. Esto es un debate desde el realismo, conociendo cómo son las cosas en el terreno y qué podemos y debemos hacer.

Esta también es una llamada de atención para que Europa entienda que su capacidad militar tiene que ser mucho mayor de lo que es; que nuestra industria militar tiene que ser más potente; que la capacidad de nuestros ejércitos para hacer frente a una situación como esta tiene que ser mayor, porque se ha demostrado que no era suficiente. Esta guerra será larga y nosotros tenemos que abordarla desde el convencimiento de que una guerra de desgaste es, en el fondo, una batalla logística. Es una batalla de información, viendo la dimensión geopolítica de esta guerra, porque el Wagner que nos encontramos en el Sahel es el mismo Wagner que está luchando en Ucrania y responde al mismo papel geopolítico de una Rusia que utiliza su petróleo, su trigo, su capacidad nuclear civil y sus minerales para desarrollar una geopolítica a la que tenemos que hacer frente con mayor determinación.

Este es el trabajo que también tienen ustedes que hacer, señoras y señores diputados, porque tenemos que convencer a los ciudadanos europeos de que no cabe flaquear; que la guerra tiene un coste, pero que la libertad también lo tiene. Que el coste de verdad lo está pagando Ucrania, que el nuestro es pequeño comparado con el suyo y que sería mucho mayor si Putin ganara la guerra. No, no la puede ganar. Esta guerra la tiene que ganar Ucrania para construir una paz estable en Europa.

Ursula von der Leyen, *President of the Commission*. – Madam President, it's now almost a year ago, on the night of 24 February, that Russia invaded Ukraine and war was back to Europe. That night, I think all of you remember that our thoughts and also our prayers went to our friends in Ukraine. I remember vividly how we followed the news from the Donbas and Kyiv with unbearable tension. And we were all wondering whether the Ukrainian friends would be able to withstand the onslaught of the Russian invaders. Today we know, yes, they would.

One year on, Putin's perfidious plans continue to be foiled by the brave Ukrainian nation. One year on, Russia has completely alienated itself from Europe – its most important economic relationship – and is isolated on the global stage. One year on, this very Parliament last week welcomed the President of Ukraine, Volodymyr Zelenskyy, as the true hero he is. And one year on, Putin's imperial fantasies have woken up to a bleak reality, while Ukraine's dreams of freedom are stronger than ever. And they will prevail. I am deeply convinced.

Honourable Members, what a difference one year of unity and resolve can make. In the early hours of 24 February, when Russian tanks rolled into Ukraine, a whole continent was holding its breath. Some predicted that Ukraine would fall in a matter of days. But instead the legendary bravery of the Ukrainian people stunned the world. That fierce resistance at the gates of Kyiv. The civilians who stopped Russian tanks in the south. The counter-offensive of Ukraine's armed forces in Kharkiv and Kherson. We can never match the sacrifices and the bravery of the Ukrainian people. But what we can do is stand firmly by their side. And that's what we've done from day one. And we will continue to do that. They can rely on us.

And indeed, a whole continent has mobilised: from the volunteers at Warsaw station who welcomed the Ukrainians fleeing Putin's bombs, to all citizens and companies who have cut their electricity demands. Together with you, honourable Members, we have focused on three main goals. First, to support Ukraine's resistance against the invader unwaveringly. Second, to undermine Russia's war machine. And third, to build Ukraine's European future together. These three strands of action have guided us over the last year and will continue to guide us in the months to come.

Je commencerai par notre soutien continu à la résistance ukrainienne.

Depuis le début de la guerre, le soutien économique, humanitaire et militaire de l'Union européenne à l'Ukraine s'élève à 67 milliards d'euros: c'est de l'aide budgétaire à la reprise rapide, de l'énergie aux capacités militaires, de l'aide humanitaire à l'aide aux réfugiés ukrainiens. Tout cela est une contribution concrète à l'effort de guerre de l'Ukraine.

Poutine voulait l'effondrement de l'État ukrainien; nous avons aidé l'Ukraine à rester opérationnelle. Même durant les heures les plus sombres, l'Europe a dynamisé la résistance ukrainienne, et nous continuerons à le faire. Nous garantirons un flux constant d'aide financière tout au long de 2023. La première tranche de ce paquet, comme vous le savez – 18 milliards d'euros –, est déjà arrivée en Ukraine. Notre solution continuera d'être stable et prévisible, chaque mois. C'est ce que l'Europe avait promis, et nous avons tenu notre promesse.

L'Europe soutient également les entreprises et les travailleurs ukrainiens toujours en activité malgré la guerre. Pour cela, nous avons mobilisé la puissance de notre marché unique, nous avons intégré nos économies, rapproché nos gens, jumelé nos villes, synchronisé nos réseaux électriques. Nos corridors de solidarité permettent à l'Ukraine d'exporter ses marchandises vers le monde entier, ce qui a déjà représenté 20 milliards d'euros de revenus pour les entreprises ukrainiennes en cette période de guerre. Et nous pouvons faire plus.

Lors de notre visite à Kiev, nous nous sommes mis d'accord sur une feuille de route pour améliorer davantage l'accès de l'Ukraine à notre marché unique. Poutine voulait tuer le rêve européen de l'Ukraine; aujourd'hui, l'Ukraine se dirige vers l'Union européenne plus rapidement et plus résolument que jamais.

En parallèle, nous affaiblissons la capacité de la Russie à maintenir sa machinerie de guerre, et c'est là mon deuxième point. Avec neuf paquets de sanctions en place, l'économie russe régresse. Et pour maintenir une forte pression, nous proposons un dixième train de mesures. Il contient de nouvelles interdictions commerciales et de nouveaux contrôles des exportations de technologies vers la Russie. Ce paquet vaut en tout 11 milliards d'euros. Nous proposons notamment des restrictions sur des dizaines de composants électroniques utilisés dans les systèmes armés russes, tels que les drones, les missiles et les hélicoptères.

Mais il y a aussi des centaines de drones, fabriqués en Iran, que la Russie utilise sur les champs de bataille en Ukraine. Ces drones iraniens tuent des civils ukrainiens, c'est atroce. Donc, pour la première fois, nous proposons également de sanctionner les opérateurs iraniens, y compris ceux liés aux gardiens de la révolution. Il est de notre devoir de le faire, c'est notre devoir de sanctionner cela.

Putin ging davon aus, dass unsere Unterstützung für die Ukraine nicht von Dauer sein würde. Er dachte, dass es ein Leichtes wäre, Europa zu erpressen mit unserer zugegebenermaßen hohen Abhängigkeit damals von russischem Öl und russischem Gas. Aber auch da lag er falsch. Heute, ein Jahr nach Kriegsbeginn, hat er den von ihm entfachten Energiekrieg schon verloren. Wir haben uns neu aufgestellt, und zwar mit der Hilfe von verlässlichen Partnern, und das Ergebnis kann sich sehen lassen.

Russlands Einnahmen aus dem Verkauf von Öl und Gas, insbesondere das Gas nach Europa – die Einnahmen sind um zwei Drittel gesunken. Durch die Ölpreisbremse, die wir global zusammen aufgestellt haben, verliert Russland jeden Tag 160 Millionen EUR. Die Gaspreise in Europa sind heute niedriger als vor Russlands Überfall auf die Ukraine.

Und wir in Europa investieren inzwischen in saubere Energien und damit in Energieunabhängigkeit wie nie zuvor. Wir stellen beim Ausbau der erneuerbaren Energien einen Rekord nach dem anderen auf. Zum Beispiel haben Wind und Sonne letztes Jahr zum allerersten Mal mehr Strom geliefert als Gas. Wir haben mit europäischer Geschlossenheit und mit einer klugen Energiepolitik nicht nur dem russischen Druck widerstanden, sondern uns auch von der Abhängigkeit befreit.

Unserer Wirtschaft geht es heute besser als vorhergesagt. Wir konnten am Wochenanfang die Wachstumsprognosen nach oben korrigieren. Der Kreml muss dagegen inzwischen Goldreserven verkaufen, um angesichts fehlender Öleinnahmen seine Löcher zu stopfen. Putins Erpressungsversuch ist damit krachend gescheitert. Und das ist auch gut so!

Meine Damen und Herren Abgeordnete, Präsident Selenskyj hat oft mit mir darüber gesprochen, was die Menschen in der Ukraine eigentlich angesichts des Grauens dieses Krieges noch antreibt, trotz der Massaker in Butscha und Irpin, was ihnen Hoffnung gibt, auch nach der Bombardierung von Mariupol und Dnipro: Es ist der feste Glaube, dass die Zukunft dieses Landes und die Zukunft ihrer Kinder in der Europäischen Union ist.

Und das ist unsere dritte Aufgabe, vor der wir stehen. Wir wollen den Ukrainerinnen und Ukrainern eine Brücke der Hoffnung bauen – von dem Grauen des Krieges, in dem sie heute leben, in eine bessere Zukunft in unserer Mitte.

Rebuilding Ukraine, and its progress on the path towards our Union go hand in hand.

You've heard it from President Zelenskyy in this very hemicycle, I've seen it with my College in Kyiv, I know it from the colleagues at the Commission who confirm it every single day: Ukrainians are making tangible progress despite the war, despite fighting the aggressor.

They know that the accession to our Union is a merit-based process. They have passed legislative reforms that others thought would take years. They are making this progress because they are striving for Europe with all their heart and soul. Ukraine is a nation defined not only by its history and heritage, it is a nation defined by its dreams, and Europe is one of these dreams.

So, distinguished Members, let's honour these dreams by standing up for Ukraine for as long as it takes, so that one day the representatives of the Ukrainian people will have their place in this very hemicycle. Long live Europe, *slava Ukraini!*

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President Metsola, Madam President von der Leyen, High Representative Borrell, almost one year has passed of unimaginable suffering, bloodshed and destruction for Ukraine and the Ukrainian people. 7000 innocent children, women and men have been killed. Many of them died in hospitals, schools and their homes at the hand of Putin's army. Over 8 million Ukrainians fled their country, their home, looking for a safe haven in Europe.

This is the reality that Ukrainians have been waking up to every day since 24 February 2022, 357 days ago. It was a historic moment for Europe when President Zelenskyy was with us last week in the European Parliament. I want to thank Roberta, our President, for inviting him and for managing this. It was a touching moment for all of us, but it also had an important message.

One year ago, when we saw him on the screens, we didn't know if he could survive, or if Ukraine could confront Russia successfully. Yes, President Zelenskyy, his army and all its soldiers, and his over 40 million compatriots stand united, and they have been successful until now. They show us what it means to follow the European way of life. Our Ukrainian friends show us every day what it means to be European. They show us that if people have a choice, they choose democracy over autocracy, the rule of law over rule of few, and freedom over tyranny. That is called the European way of life.

President Zelenskyy used this phrase around 20 times in his speech last week. Allow me to recall how much the Socialists and the Greens were fighting against a special portfolio inside the European Commission last time to promote and protect the European way of life. As the EPP, we fought for it, and today it is the headline. You do not want to hear this, but it's the headline of President Zelenskyy and probably the motivation for our Ukrainian friends – the European way of life. We should be proud of this.

Roberta Metsola, as our President, was the first to risk going to Kyiv. 'We are on your side' was Roberta's main message. Ursula von der Leyen was leading efforts to grant candidate status to our Ukrainian friends. Let's be clear, this was not welcomed so much by Scholz, by Macron, by Sanchez or by Costa. That's why I want to thank our two Presidents for their leading role in a historic moment to keep Ukraine on our side.

For us, as the EPP, it has been clear from the very first moment. We stand beside our Ukrainian friends who seek live and defend the European way of life. Putin wants to destroy this. He is the opposite – he hates it. His dictatorship stands for suppression, censorship, war crimes and totalitarianism. Putin is a war criminal and he must lose this war.

This war has shaken Europe to its core, but Europe has been united and stronger than ever before. We imposed unprecedented sanctions, which will weaken Putin's war machine, and we welcome very much the new proposals now. We supported Ukraine with around EUR 50 billion – EUR 65 billion was your figure – for financial, humanitarian and military support. We send weapons now, including finally tanks. I would say there is one open question still on the table, and that is about building up a real European defence capability. High Representative Borrell mentioned it, but there is not so much in terms of initiatives currently on the table to do so.

Finally, there cannot be – let me use a historic comparison – any kind of Munich event in the next year, where democratic politicians accepted splitting up Czechoslovakia in order to get peace, or at least a dream of peace. The future of Ukraine will not be decided in Berlin, in Paris, in Brussels, or in Washington. Only Ukrainians decide about the future of Ukraine. We will not leave them alone in their fight for peace and for the freedom to fight to live the European way of life. *Slava Ukraini!*

Pedro Marques, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, one year of the brutal Russian war of aggression against Ukraine. It resulted in the death of thousands and thousands of innocent lives. The destruction of a country. Millions of refugees. Increased insecurity and suffering for Europe and the world. The EU stood by Ukraine for all of this time. We will continue to support them for as long as it takes. Ukrainians can count on our political, diplomatic, humanitarian, financial and military support. Putin from his side, can count with our strong, resolute and increased sanctions, as was just proposed today, – for which we are thankful – to drain his power.

Now, our unity in the support of the Ukrainians has proven to be one of the biggest strengths against the Russian aggressor. That is why it is so concerning for this Parliament. I would say, I would hope for, this Parliament as a whole, but unfortunately not, that some in the ranks of the EPP are now trying to put things the other way around. It was appalling to hear Mr Berlusconi excusing Putin from his responsibilities and blaming Ukraine for this war. We have seen, yes, it was. I thank you for your applause, Mr Weber, it's important that you do so. But let me be clear also on this: you just said we defend the European way of life for the Ukrainians, good, but what concrete actions will you take regarding Mr Berlusconi, regarding his party, Mr Weber? What concrete actions will you take? You have defended here with all of us sanctions regarding those that have supported Putin in this war. What kind of sanctions will start in your own political family regarding Mr Berlusconi so that we stand united, we remain united against the Putin aggression?

Malik Azmani, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, President of the Commission, High Representative, colleagues, one year ago we lived in a different world. And today we see Ukrainian families torn apart because of Russia's war of aggression. Tens of thousands of people have died and I would like to extend my condolences to their loved ones. We all remember the images from Bucha – a European Union keyring attached to a lifeless hand.

Dear colleagues, Ukraine's hopes are our objectives. One year on, we see NATO strengthened. Ukraine is firmly in the centre of our European family, and we have to continue to provide massive support to Ukraine, also with more military materials, without taboos.

Dear colleagues, on this sad anniversary, we need to show our determination. We need to be united in this House – also a reaction to Mr Weber on behalf of the EPP. Our voice needs to be united, especially today, a year after this huge tragedy – the start of the war in Ukraine.

Dear colleagues, let us expand the EU sanctions list to 6 000 Russian individuals. Let us hold Russia accountable through the Tribunal for the crime of aggression in The Hague. And let us use the confiscated Russian funds to start rebuilding Ukraine as soon as possible. *Slava Ukraini!*

Terry Reintke, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ein Jahr nach der brutalen Eskalation des Krieges in der Ukraine ist absolut klar: Wir stehen fest an der Seite des angegriffenen demokratischen Staates Ukraine, und unsere Unterstützung – sei sie finanziell, sei sie politisch, oder sei sie militärisch – ist absolut sicher, auch wenn wir jetzt und gerade aus dem Mitgliedstaat, aus dem ich komme, immer wieder Stimmen hören, die versuchen, krude Narrative in diese Debatte zu streuen, um die öffentliche Diskussion zu zermürben.

Deshalb will ich einige Sachen mal klarstellen: Nicht Waffenlieferungen an die Ukraine verlängern diesen Krieg – Wladimir Putin tut das. Waffenlieferungen schützen die Ukraine vor ihrer Auslöschung und Millionen Menschen in der Ukraine vor Gewalt und Besatzung. Und genau wie der Hohe Repräsentant gesagt hat, Waffenlieferungen schließen absolut keine Verhandlungen aus. Ein Land in seiner Selbstverteidigung zu unterstützen bedeutet nicht, keine Diplomatie mehr zu wollen. Es bedeutet, internationales Recht zu schützen.

Und drittens – und ich finde es wichtig, das in der Debatte sehr klar zu sagen: Es wird kein Zurück zum Status quo ante geben, nicht mit diesem Russland. Die gesamte Sicherheitslage in Europa hat sich verändert, und eine neue Welt braucht neue Antworten und nicht die alte Leier.

Und deshalb: Anstatt sich von Faschos für Unterschriftensammlungen beklatschen zu lassen, wäre es jetzt an der Zeit – gerade an all die, auch aus Deutschland, die diese alte Leier von vor dem 24. Februar 2022 weiter singen –, endlich mal nach Riga, nach Warschau oder nach Helsinki zu fahren und nicht andere zu belehren, sondern da zuzuhören und endlich zu sehen, dass wir in einer neuen Welt weiterhin klar an der Seite der Ukraine stehen müssen.

Jaak Madison, on behalf of the ID Group. – Madam President, first of all, when I heard from our representative that it was a wake-up call what Russia did one year ago, I was really surprised: were we really born yesterday? I think the war started already nine years ago, in 2014. And it is no surprise that Russia has ambitions to go back in history to the Soviet Union times; they very clearly stated that in December 2021, when they asked impossible things: that there will be no new NATO member states, that there would be some kind of puppet countries next to the Russian border, like Ukraine, Finland, Sweden, that they are not allowed to join NATO. And they also said that if you don't do as we are asking, and if all NATO troops don't leave the NATO member states like Poland, Estonia, Latvia, we will attack you. I think it wasn't a surprise. It was clearly visible for the last 30 years.

When the socialist colleagues were attacking EPP colleagues here, I should remind you that, unfortunately, your friend in the German Government, Mr Schulz, is blocking more military aid. They're waiting for his signature to send tanks. And now, one year later, they're like, 'Oh, we have to check in which condition we have for tanks'. One year later, and now they're checking for the condition for tanks. Very surprising. 2014, when the war started already, it wasn't a problem for the Germans to continue with Nord Stream 2. It wasn't a problem at all. No, let's go further. It's just an economic relation. There is no economics without politics.

It's the same thing with the Americans. Ukrainians asked the fighters already in March last year and Americans were blocking that. Poland said, 'We will give our old Russian fighters to Ukraine. Just please send us F16 fighters.' America: 'No, no. We are too afraid. No. Maybe we would escalate the conflict.' The fact is weakness is provocation. Our weakness is provoking Russia to go further and that's a historical fact. So don't be weak. Don't be too pro-Russian. Act now, fight now and win this war.

Beata Szydło, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Przewodnicząca von der Leyen! Szanowni Państwo! Ukraina broni dzisiaj pokoju w Europie. I naszym, Europejczyków, obowiązkiem jest stać u boku Ukrainy, wspierać ją – bo to będzie również podziękowanie za to, co oni dla nas robią. Naszym obowiązkiem jest wspierać Ukrainę politycznie, gospodarczo, humanitarnie i militarnie. Decyzje muszą być podejmowane odważne i muszą być podejmowane szybko. Tu nie ma czasu na polityczne kalkulacje, zastanowienie i wątpliwości.

Przypomnijmy sobie wydarzenia, które poprzedziły ubiegłoroczną inwazję Rosji na Ukrainę. 2008 rok – polski prezydent, Lech Kaczyński, w Gruzji powiedział bardzo wyraźnie, wtedy, kiedy Rosja podjęła próbę zaatakowania Gruzji: dzisiaj Gruzja, jutro Ukraina, potem może mój kraj, Polska.

Czy wyciągnięto z tego wnioski? Nie. Cały czas była współpraca z Rosją. Putin był przyjmowany na salonach, była polityka resetu z Rosją. Polski były premier Donald Tusk rozmawiał z Putinem jak równy z równym. Wtedy były przecież realizowane gospodarcze projekty, takie jak Nord Stream 2, wcześniej Nord Stream 1. Wtedy była próba tak zwanego resetu polityki z Rosją.

A potem był rok 2014. Czy wyciągnięto z tego wnioski? Nie. Były kanclerz niemiecki zasiadał w radzie Gazpromu. Nadal realizowana była polityka wspierania gospodarczego Rosji.

Mówię o tym nie dlatego, żeby robić wyrzuty, tylko dlatego, że musimy wszyscy wyciągnąć wnioski z przeszłości. Trzeba wspierać Ukrainę, tak jak robią to kraje europejskie, które rozumieją, że zwycięstwo Ukrainy to będzie zwycięstwo nas wszystkich. Chcę podziękować tym wszystkim Europejczykom, którzy otworzyli swoje serca dla Ukrainy. Chcę podziękować i muszę podkreślić rolę Polek i Polaków, polskiego prezydenta Andrzeja Dudy i polskiego rządu.

Ukraina musi zwyciężyć, a my musimy cały czas wspierać ją i cały czas wyciągać wnioski, aby już nigdy więcej w przyszłości nie wydarzyła się tak potworna agresja w Europie.

Mick Wallace, on behalf of The Left Group. – Madam President, Commissioner, High Representative, Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine is unforgivable. The devastation, debt and destabilisation wrought by it has led to unthinkable horrors, as in all wars. Also unforgivable is how willing Western leaders are to ensure this becomes a war without end.

Instead of calls for ceasefires, dialogue and peace talks, we are deepening Western involvement in the war with no apparent concern for the repercussions. We are calling for Ukraine to take back Crimea. Experts on both sides of the ocean say that this was madness and will lead to a possible breakout of nuclear war. And it will also rally the Russian people towards the defence of Crimea, if we go to that space.

Zelenskyy has been making the rounds begging for more weapons, but not one word to say about peace. How many of his own people must he conscript and feed into the carnage before he sits down to negotiations? And how many of the people of Europe must lose their jobs or their homes before NATO will allow these negotiations to happen?

And lastly, I'd like to know what has happened to Germany, the jewel of Europe. Scholz told us that there'd be no peace in Europe without Russia. First you send helmets, now you're sending tanks to kill Russians. I worry for Europe.

Marcel de Graaff (NI). – Voorzitter, Oekraïne wordt, volgens de secretaris-generaal van de NAVO, Jens Stoltenberg, reeds sinds 2014 opgeleid en bewapend door het Westen. Oekraïne beschiet en doodt reeds sinds 2014 Russischsprekende burgers in het oosten van het land. Een jaar geleden begon Rusland terug te schieten om een eind te maken aan dit racistische geweld.

Volgens paus Franciscus is deze oorlog duidelijk door het Westen uitgelokt. Rusland staat namelijk de heerszuchtige ambities van de Verenigde Staten in de weg, omdat het soeverein wil blijven en zijn eigen identiteit wil behouden.

Een jaar later staat de EU er slecht voor: zij is zwaar getroffen door haar eigen sancties en de economische vooruitzichten zijn ernstig verslechterd. Erger nog, de Nord Stream-pijpleidingen zijn opgeblazen door de VS.

Ik verzoek de Europese Commissie toenadering te zoeken tot Rusland en Noorwegen aan te spreken op zijn rol in deze verschrikkelijke aanslag. We moeten de sancties opheffen en meewerken aan de vrede en de wederopbouw van de economie, identiteit en soevereiniteit van de lidstaten.

Rasa Juknevičienė (PPE). – Madam President. Thank you, Ukraine. Thank you for defending peace. What would Europe be like if Putin had taken over Ukraine in three days, as he planned? Yes, it was a horrible year. However, it would be much worse if the infection of Putinisation took over a large part of the European continent.

Today, Ukraine is winning this war. But it depends on us, how fast the decisive Ukrainian victory will be achieved. A year ago, Ukrainians got not scared fending off terrorist Russia. We are safe behind Ukraine's shoulders. And we also should not be scared. We must provide Ukraine with everything they need: air defence systems, fighter jets, tanks, long-range missiles.

We must deliver on opening EU membership negotiations as soon as possible this year. We must not repeat the Bucharest NATO summit mistake: we must invite Ukraine to join NATO at the Vilnius NATO summit this year.

Our bravery will bring the victory faster and save many Ukrainian lives. This can also bring change in Russia itself. But we must not be afraid of the fall of Putin's regime. I didn't want to say this – what I will say now today – but I have to. Yes, Berlusconi is horrible, but he is not alone. Socialist Schröder, Socialist Presidents of Croatia, Bulgaria, Socialist leader in Slovakia – let's condemn all of them. Let's fight all proxies of Putin on our own courtyards. *Slava Ukraini!*

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Madam President, Madam Commission President, Mr High Representative. The ongoing political crisis in Moldova shows us that Russia is not limiting its assertive actions only to Ukraine. Through disinformation and foreign interference, Russia is trying to provoke a political crisis within the European Union and along European borders.

With one year since the start of the Russian aggression, what are the lessons to be learned? There are a couple of them – we need to continue supporting Ukraine as long as it takes to defend itself; we need to make our sanctions more efficient and close all the gaps that enabled their evasion; common foreign, defence and security policies cannot remain the soft spots of our integration; we need to be strategically autonomous when it comes to essential industries and services; we need to continue working together on reducing our energy dependence; prioritising trade and economic relations without insisting on our political values leaves Europe exposed to crisis, and we need more Europe to address all these challenges. *Slava Ukraini!*

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Madam President, Council and Commission representatives, dear colleagues, Russia's imperial chauvinism has triggered war in Ukraine, fuelled tensions and instability, and condemned the Ukrainian people to unprecedented suffering. For a whole year we have been hearing lies, slander and threats from Russia, whose intentions remain unchanged – ready to continue the war in the near future.

Stopping an aggressive Russia means defeating it on the battlefield in Ukraine, providing the Ukrainians with everything that will enable them to achieve victory, to shorten the war and the suffering it has caused.

Dear colleagues, no one here wants to discuss a resolution on two years of Russia's invasion and war of aggression against Ukraine, so let's help Ukraine with everything that is necessary, let us continue weakening Russia's and Belarus' war capacities and let us punish the guilty according to their unforgivable crimes. It's a great historical moment and chance for Europe to emerge stronger, more united and less dependent on authoritarian regimes.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, HR / VP Borrell, President of the Commission, dear colleagues, a year ago, I stood here warning Putin that the attack on Ukraine would be the end of Russia as we know it, that the imperial overstretch would doom Russian hopes of regional domination.

The war that Putin aimed to last three days has been now waging for a year. A dying empire is desperately trying to destroy the Ukrainian state and identity but all this is in vain because the brave people of Ukraine are fighting not to conquer but to defend, not for domination but for survival. The unimaginable price Ukrainians are paying for freedom keeps us all free, because Ukraine is defending us and every democracy, because the freedom that some take for granted is never free, it is paid for by the sacrifice of brave men and women.

We do not need to be convinced: Ukraine is Europe. And we will all continue supporting the bravery for as long as it takes and with all we have.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Ich habe den Ausführungen des Herrn Selenskyj vergangene Woche in Brüssel hier im Plenum auch gelauscht und habe dazu zwei Anmerkungen.

Das Erste: Ich finde es etwas befremdlich, dass dazu keine Debatte stattgefunden hat, denn ein Parlament ist der Ort der Streitkultur, wo Argument und Gegenargument aufeinandertreffen sollen und der Versuch stattfinden soll, irgendwo das Beste herauszufinden.

Und das Zweite ist, dass der Herr Selenskyj den Berichten von Medien zufolge herumgegangen ist und Listen ausgeteilt hat, was er von welchem Staat gerne hätte: da ein paar Kampfjets, da ein paar Panzer, jetzt sind auch U-Boote auf der Bestellungsliste. Aus meiner Sicht ist das der falsche Weg. Krieg ist und kann nie eine Lösung sein.

Ich weiß, Sie verurteilen jeden hier, der irgendwo die Stimme für den Frieden erhebt, aber ich tue es wieder und erhebe meine Stimme für den Frieden. Dieses Europa ist gebaut auf der Grundlage der Prinzipien Frieden, Freiheit und Wohlstand.

Wenn Sie halbwegs ernst genommen werden wollen, dann spielen Sie jetzt eine aktive Rolle bei Friedensverhandlungen. Es geht darum, das Sterben in der Ukraine zu verhindern. Jeden Tag, wo wir mehr Waffen dorthin transportieren, sterben mehr Leute. Daher setzen Sie sich bitte für Frieden ein!

Anna Fotyga (ECR). – Mr President, High Representative, Vice-President. The alarm bell we have been speaking about since the beginning of this debate is still on, and the war is not over. Thousands of Ukrainians have perished in this war, and the Russian atrocities because of this criminal war of aggression are unbearable. Russia has to be defeated. The alarm bell is still on for Ukraine and for all of us.

We have to deliver whatever is needed to achieve this result now – fighter jets, fighter helicopters and air defence systems with appropriate range. We do this for ourselves and for our children. We have to know this.

Silvia Modig (The Left). – Arvoisa puhemies, ensi viikolla tulee kuluneeksi vuosi siitä, kun Venäjä aloitti brutaalin ja laittoman hyökkäyssodan Ukrainaa vastaan, eikä rauhaa ole vielä näköpiirissä. Me puhumme todella paljon aseista ja aseellisista ratkaisuksista, mutta hyvin vähän me puhumme rauhasta. Rauhan on oltava oikeudenmukainen, eikä sen saattaminen ole helppoa, mutta rauhan on oltava meidän prioriteettimme numero yksi.

Ukrainalla on oikeus puolustautua, ja meillä on velvollisuus auttaa heitä onnistumaan siinä, sillä tukemalla Ukrainaa autamme maata suojelemaan siviiliväestöään, joka on joutunut Putinin iskujen kohteeksi ja mahdollisten sotarikosten uhriksi. Venäjän on lopetettava hyökkäys ja vetäydyttävä valtaamiltaan alueilta, jotta pääsemme vihdoin rakentamaan rauhaa. Mitä pidempään sota jatkuu, sitä syvemmät ovat sen arvet, ja ne säilyvät sukupolvien yli. Tämän me valitettavasti Suomessa suomalaisina omasta historiastamme ja kokemuksestamme tiedämme.

Ukraina tarvitsee meiltä monenlaista tukea. Sota on aiheuttanut laajan humanitaarisen hädän, valtavan ympäristötuhon, ja siviili-infrastruktuuria on tuhottu laajalti. Jälleenrakentamisen pitää alkaa heti, kun se on mahdollista, ja Venäjän on osallistuttava kustannuksiin.

Márton Gyöngyösi (NI). – Mr President, most of us are rightly appalled by the official position of Hungary on this conflict. The pro-Russian propaganda, the undisguised rooting for the aggressor by Prime Minister Orbán, and the recent visit of Foreign Minister Szijjártó to Minsk, while cynically talking about peace with the aggressor and its allied regime. However, don't let that mislead you vis-à-vis the Hungarian people. A majority of Hungarians know that Ukraine's fate today and our legacy of 1956 are analogous. The story of both nations fighting for their freedom against Russian aggression is the same. And just like in 1956, when official Hungary, the regime, rooted for the Russians, it was the voice of the people that mattered and what the world remembers today.

And finally, while Europe was numb and silent to the Hungarian cause, delaying by decades the potential reunification of our continent. Today, it understands the call of history. And it is also brave enough to act.

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! In neun Tagen jährt sich der verbrecherische, vollumfängliche russische Angriffskrieg gegen die Ukraine zum ersten Mal.

Wir sollten zunächst der unschuldigen Opfer dieses Zivilisationsbruchs gedenken, der Kinder, Frauen und Männer, die getötet, vergewaltigt, gefoltert wurden, die flüchten mussten, die alles verloren haben, und auch der ukrainischen Soldatinnen und Soldaten, die für eine gerechte Sache – die Verteidigung ihrer Heimat – gefallen sind.

Damit das abgründig Böse in Europa nicht wieder obsiegt, müssen wir Europäer, der vereinte Westen, die gesamte demokratische Welt weiter zusammenstehen und jetzt das Notwendige tun. *First things first*: mehr Munition, stärkere Luftabwehr, mehr Artillerie, die alle Teile der besetzten Ukraine erreichen kann, Kampfpanzer, nicht um Territorien zu befreien, sondern Menschen, die unter der grausamen russischen Besatzung und täglichen Willkür leiden. Und da sich Russland keine Beschränkungen auferlegt, müssen auch Kampfflugzeuge Teil der ukrainischen Verteidigung werden.

Diejenigen in meinem Heimatland, die aus Naivität, Antiamerikanismus oder insgeheim aus einer historisch falschen deutsch-russischen Geistesverwandtschaft glauben, den Ukrainern Waffen verweigern zu müssen, rufe ich zu: Erkennt das wahre Gesicht des Diktators im Kreml! Das ist der angewandte Faschismus des 21. Jahrhunderts.

Never again! Slawa Ukraini!

Sven Mikser (S&D). – Mr President, dear colleagues, this war will have to end with every square inch of Ukrainian sovereign territory liberated. Because, otherwise, if Russia should walk out of this with territorial gains and with the current regime still intact and in power, the international rules-based order will have failed, if not entirely collapsed.

I would like to underscore two points made by High Representative Borrell. First, implementation. It is commendable that the decision was taken to build the tanks, but now those tanks would really have to arrive and all countries who have equipment to spare will have to step up.

Secondly, it is not simply sufficient to continue supporting Ukraine militarily, but we will have to step up the support significantly so as to turn the tide of the war and make sure that Ukraine emerges victorious.

Finally, we should seek on this very issue unity in this House, deliberately heightening political partisanship is irresponsible. It is not helpful. It is not even elegant.

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Haut Représentant, il y a une semaine, le Président Zelensky est venu nous demander de l'aide. Un an après le début de l'agression russe, l'Europe doit se rendre à l'évidence: nous avons intérêt à une victoire de l'Ukraine et nous devons faire tout ce qui est en notre pouvoir pour qu'elle gagne.

Faire tout ce que nous pouvons, cela veut dire faire plus et plus vite: plus de livraisons d'armes et de munitions, de celles qui donneront un avantage décisif à l'Ukraine. Plus question de tergiverser, de tarder, d'hésiter quand des vies humaines sont en jeu.

Faire plus, ce sont plus de sanctions à l'encontre de la Russie et une lutte plus déterminée contre leur contournement. Ceux qui, en Europe, violent les sanctions doivent être poursuivis. Ceux qui, hors d'Europe, aident la Russie à les contourner doivent redouter des sanctions secondaires.

Certains, jusque dans cet hémicycle – on les a entendus –, appellent à une négociation immédiate mais, pourtant, l'échec des accords de Minsk devrait nous avoir vaccinés contre les cotes mal taillées et la tentation des conflits gelés.

Ceux qui prêchent l'apaisement face à la Russie devraient se souvenir de cette phrase de Churchill: «Celui qui pratique la politique de l'apaisement nourrit un crocodile en espérant être dévoré le dernier».

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, gerbiama Komisijos Pirmininke, kolegos. 2014 metais prasidėjusi Rusijos agresija Ukrainoje vis intensyvėjo, nes mes, Vakarai tam laiku neužkirtome kelio. Susigundžiusi pigesniais resursais Europa sutiko būti mažiau principinga. Buvo kalbama apie strateginę partnerystę, kuri tik padėjo Putinui sukaupti pakankamai lėšų invazijai. Parlamente vis dar girdime, kad nesame pasirengę atsisakyti priklausomybės nuo trečiųjų šalių. Ir vėl bandomė ieškoti pateisinimo savo neveiksumui. Ar ne laikas darbais įrodyti, kad pasimokėme iš savo klaidų? Iš tiesų, jeigu norime, kad Ukraina laimėtų, kodėl vis dar dvejojama, ar tenkinti jos prašymus dėl ginkluotės? Duokime viską, ko reikia Ukrainai ir paverskime žodžius realiais darbais. Slava Ukraini!

Susanna Ceccardi (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, un anno fa le bandiere rosse dell'ex Unione sovietica sventolavano sopra i carri armati russi che invadevano l'Ucraina. Un messaggio inequivocabile all'Occidente intero, un attacco alla libertà, all'integrità territoriale di uno Stato sovrano.

L'Europa ha dovuto schierarsi, e ci siamo schierati a favore della libertà, della sovranità e della dignità del popolo ucraino.

Dodici mesi dopo, però, il rischio che il conflitto si trasformi in un perenne congelamento è elevato. Una situazione pericolosissima, che dobbiamo scongiurare, per i civili ucraini, le prime vittime di questa guerra, e per le nostre imprese e i nostri cittadini, che subiscono i rialzi di bollette e merci.

L'Europa avrebbe potuto fare di più per raggiungere l'obiettivo della pace? Se la soluzione per accelerare il conflitto fosse stata quella di inviare più armi, perché non lo abbiamo fatto subito? Io penso che la soluzione diplomatica e anche la via diplomatica debba essere percorsa e dobbiamo lavorarci insieme. Le fughe in avanti dei primi della classe non garantiscono la promozione di tutta la classe, ma solo la consapevolezza che, ancora una volta, è divisa. E questo è veramente l'obiettivo di Putin.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Pane předsedající, rok od ruské invaze na Ukrajinu se objevují informace o nové plánované ruské ofenzivě. Slyšíme o dění v Moldavsku. Putin je schopen udělat cokoli, aby dosáhl alespoň malého náznaku vítězství a byl schopen Rusům vysvětlit, proč musely zemřít desítky tisíc obyčejných lidí.

Nedávno jsme slyšeli vyjádření vůdce Wagnerovy skupiny Prigožina, že má plán, jak dosáhnout *La Manche*. Jestli nás ani tato slova nedonutí zvýšit vojenskou pomoc Ukrajině, pak už nevím, co by mělo. Česká republika už poskytla Ukrajině obrovské množství vojenské techniky a budeme pomáhat i dále, jak jen je to v našich silách.

Na druhou stranu čteme názory některých zemí, jako je například Švýcarsko, které nejen že odmítají Ukrajině pomáhat, ale aktivně blokují pomoc ostatních zemí. Takové jednání je třeba také hlasitě odmítnout. Tak jako odsoudit ty, kdo jsou schopni naše bezpečí obětovat za pár eur nebo franků.

Andrea Bocskor (NI). – Elnök Úr! Egy éve tart Oroszország jogtalan háborúja Ukrajna ellen, melyet elitélünk, és minden fórumon kiállunk Ukrajna szuverenitása és területi integritása mellett. A háború óriási áldozatokat követelt, családokat szakított szét, fiatalok jövőjét és álmaikat törte ketté nemzetiségtől, anyanyelvtől függetlenül, hisz az Ukrajnában élő magyarok, románok és más nemzetiségek egyaránt elszenvedői az orosz agresszióknak, és vállvetve harcolnak a győzelemért.

A háború nehézségei ellenére Ukrajna folytatja európai integrációs útját. Bízom benne, hogy a csatlakozási feltételek teljesítése során az országban élő nemzeti kisebbségek nyelvi és oktatási jogait is garantálják a koppenhágai kritériumoknak megfelelően. A múlt decemberben elfogadott kisebbségi törvény azonban nem felel meg a jogegyenlőség elvének, ezért módosítani kell, és erre az Uniónak is fokozottan figyelni kell.

Az ukrajnai háború tragikus képei egy éve benne vannak a hírekben, de nem szabad, hogy a világ belefásuljon, és a szolidaritás üres frázissá váljon. Amivel valóban életeket lehetne menteni, az a béke. A törökországi földrengés tragikumát nem tudtuk megakadályozni, Ukrajnáért viszont nagyon sokat tehetünk.

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Przed rokiem pod polskie dachy, do polskich rodzin trafiły miliony kobiet, dzieci, uciekinierów, bo Putin w bandycki sposób napadł na sąsiedni kraj, nie pierwszy raz zresztą. Solidarność, nasze rezolucje, natychmiastowy apel o jedność i bardzo twarde stanowisko to ciągle za mało, bo władza jest w rękach rządów. I tak jak pan przewodniczący powiedział, nie mamy czasu. To skąd rodzą się te wątpliwości, np. w sprawie embargo na energię atomową? Dlaczego działają jeszcze ciągle rosyjskie firmy na rynku europejskim? Wszyscy, którzy mają wątpliwości, są pomocnikami, pomocnikami Putina - trzeba to mówić bardzo wprost. Ja apeluję o natychmiastowe działania rządów w sprawie próśb Ukrainy o pomoc. Wszystkie prośby powinny być realizowane natychmiast, bo to Ukraińcy walczą za nas i o przyszłość oraz pokój w Europie. I my jesteśmy do tego zobowiązani.

Chciałbym Panią Przewodniczącą również prosić o zwrócenie uwagi na Mołdawię. To kraj, który także cierpi z powodu tej wojny i wymaga pomocy.

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Goście! Drodzy Koledzy! Agresja Rosji trwa. Przynosi przerażające skutki. Dziesiątki tysięcy zabitych i zniszczona gospodarka Ukrainy. Nikt z nas tej wojny nie chciał i nie chce. Ale ona nas dotyczy.

Musimy pomagać Ukrainie ze względów humanitarnych i prawnych, ale też dla własnego bezpieczeństwa. Ukraińcy bronią siebie i nas.

Często słyhać, także w tej sali, apele o szukanie dyplomatycznego rozwiązania. Nigdy nie ma mowy, kto i jaką cenę miałby zapłacić za pokój. To prawda, że dyplomacja jest często najlepszym rozwiązaniem. Ale nie jest prawdą, że jest tak zawsze.

W Monachium Francja i Wielka Brytania przehandlowały czeskie Sudety za złudzenie pokoju. Rok później Niemcy podbiły Polskę i wkrótce inne kraje, w tym Francję. Czy dzisiaj Donbas i Krym mają być ukraińskimi Sudetami? Czy za rok i dwa wynagrodzony agresor ma zaatakować kolejne kraje?

Mamy tylko jeden rozsądny wybór: to pełna pomoc dla Ukrainy pozwalająca na powstrzymanie agresora.

Dragoș Tudorache (Renew). – Mr President, Madam President, High Representative, dear Colleagues. One year ago, Russia unravelled a plan, which we now know was in the making for many years. Putin's frustration with history went back to the USSR, to the breakdown of Yugoslavia, to the Bucharest NATO summit and, in general, to the moment when he looked himself in the mirror and thought he was not big enough for the rest of the world to fear. Therefore, he had to rewrite history at any cost. In order to do so, he lied and he killed, and he will continue to lie and to kill until we give Ukraine the arms they need to stop him.

In direct contrast, we heard President Zelenskyy speak to this House just last week. We all saw his determination and dedication to Ukraine's European hopes. This is the type of leader that is big enough – and not for others to fear, but to follow and feel proud to bring to the EU table. We must continue to support him, match his level of ambition when it comes to EU integration and be bolder in our actions. Be bold like Ukraine is.

Witold Jan Waszczykowski (ECR). – Mr President, we keep asking the question, why this war lasts so long? The answer is simple, because many still too many of those who decide care more about future phase of Russia than about the security of Ukraine. It's a paradox that the way to create peace and maybe put democracy in Russia is to defeat Putin's regime. The first step to achieve this goal is to help Ukraine not only to defend itself, but to defeat Russia. A free, democratic, sovereign Ukraine, a Member State of the European Union will be the best message for the Russian society that there is an alternative way of being the country.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señor presidente, tengo un minuto tan corto como son los minutos de silencio. Pero, si guardáramos un minuto de silencio por cada víctima de Putin, no pronunciaríamos una palabra esta mañana. Y, si leyéramos la lista de los asesinados por Putin, no acabaríamos en cuatro horas. Esto no es una guerra, esto es un genocidio. Esto es un crimen contra la humanidad y no está ocurriendo a las puertas de Europa, está ocurriendo en Europa, aquí y ahora.

Los ucranianos, hoy, son tan europeístas como fueron los franceses o los alemanes después de la Segunda Guerra Mundial. Y por los mismos motivos. A los jóvenes les están diciendo que no hay paz sin pagar un precio. A los demócratas, que la libertad se gana cada día. Y, a los europeos, que hay quien está dispuesto a morir por aquello que el *Brexit* despreció: una Europa de hermanos que trabajan juntos.

No habrá paz hasta que no derrotemos al tirano. Europa es la esperanza de aquellos pueblos que son masacrados. Por eso, no nos vamos a rendir. Sabemos que la guerra puede ser larga, pero no podemos rendirnos y no nos rendiremos. *¡Slava Ukraini!*

Jens Geier (S&D). – Herr Präsident, verehrter Herr Hoher Beauftragter, verehrte Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! In wenigen Tagen – viele Kolleginnen und Kollegen haben es gesagt – jährt sich der verbrecherische Angriff Russlands auf die Ukraine zum ersten Mal, und ich kann mich nur in Achtung verneigen vor der Tapferkeit und dem Freiheitswillen des ukrainischen Volkes. *Slawa Ukrajini!*

Es ist die Aufgabe der EU – Josep Borrell hat es gesagt –, diesen Freiheitswillen zu stärken, indem wir der Ukraine die Mittel geben, die sie brauchen: finanzielle Mittel, humanitäre Hilfe, militärische Hilfe. Mir ist wichtig, alle diese Dinge zu betonen, denn sie gehören zusammen. Und vor diesem Hintergrund frage ich mich schon, welche Funktion die zahlreichen Aufforderungen zu Waffenlieferungen an Deutschland hatten und auch noch haben – viele davon in diesem Plenum.

Nachdem die Voraussetzungen geschaffen worden sind, nämlich ein gemeinsames Vorgehen der NATO-Verbündeten, liefert Deutschland Leopard-2-Panzer im Dutzend und Leopard-1-Panzer in den Hunderten. Und wo sind die Verbündeten? Nach den Zusagen der Verbündeten – der sogenannten Panzerkoalition – befragt, sagt der deutsche Verteidigungsminister: Das ist nicht so berauschend. Und damit wir uns nicht missverstehen: Im Deutschen ist das ein ironischer Ausdruck dafür, dass die Zusagen bisher ausgesprochen übersichtlich sind.

Polen, Norwegen und Portugal helfen, aber da geht noch viel mehr. Denn die Unterstützung für die Ukraine muss eine gemeinsame Aufgabe sein. Und wenn Deutschland dies entsprechend seiner Möglichkeiten tut, dann sollten die Verbündeten aufhören, sich dahinter zu verstecken.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, commissievoorzitter von der Leyen, de oorlog in Oekraïne woedt al bijna een jaar, met veel menselijk drama en leed tot gevolg. Ook wij ondervinden daar de gevolgen van. Ik denk dat we het er allemaal over eens kunnen zijn dat deze oorlog moet stoppen, op enkele sprekers na, die wellicht door autoritaire regimes worden betaald en die ik niet bij naam zal noemen. De enige oplossing is een overwinning voor Oekraïne en een Europa met haar op de tanden.

Wij moeten ervoor zorgen dat Oekraïne onverwijd de middelen krijgt die zij nodig heeft, waaronder straaljagers, tanks en munitie.

Voorts moeten we een Europa tot stand brengen dat haar op de tanden heeft. Verschillende lidstaten vragen zich momenteel af hoe zij hun defensie beter kunnen inrichten. Deze kwestie moet echter op EU-niveau worden geregeld. Mevrouw von der Leyen, wij moeten onverwijd een defensie-unie en een Europese krijgsmacht tot stand brengen.

Ten slotte zitten we inmiddels aan het tiende sanctiepakket. Wij beschikken over een lijst van zesduizend namen, maar voegen niettemin aan elk nieuw pakket slechts enkele banken en namen toe. Wij moeten deze zesduizend namen toevoegen.

Laten we samen tegen Poetin zeggen: “Poetin, je zult de oorlog nooit winnen!”

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Mr President, President von der Leyen, High Representative, one year after the start of the war, we have to say clearly thank you to the people of Ukraine. The fight of the people of Ukraine is heroic. It is an inspiration to all of us. It is an inspiration to the free world. And we have the duty to say thank you.

Our second duty is as long as the people of Ukraine are fighting we have to help them. We have to support them with all we can. Soon, fast. Because between the time we make a decision and the moment support gets on the ground, time passes. So we need to accelerate the speed of our decisions.

The choice is not between war and peace. War is a terrible thing. None of us like war. We all want peace. But the choice is between fighting or surrendering. And as long as the people of Ukraine are fighting, it is our duty to stand by their side.

And it is also our duty to tell to the people of Europe that Russia is failing. Russia is losing militarily, economically, politically and morally. Russia is talking about an imperialistic past which is long gone. We are building together a future for the people of Ukraine, for the people of Europe, and we are building it together. That's the difference.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Presidente von der Leyen, signor Alto rappresentante Borrell, a un anno dalla criminale invasione di Putin, la Russia non è riuscita a piegare la resistenza del popolo ucraino.

L'Ucraina lotta, lotta per l'indipendenza e per gli stessi valori di democrazia e di libertà. E tuttavia i nostri aiuti non sono riusciti a fermare l'aggressione e abbiamo il dovere, colleghi, il dovere di incrementare il nostro sostegno a Kiev. E allora vale la pena chiederci qui oggi quanto stanno costando al popolo ucraino le nostre indecisioni, per esempio sugli aiuti militari? Quanto è costato alla nostra credibilità internazionale? Quanto costano le parole inopportune come quelle che abbiamo ascoltato ieri, vergognose, da Silvio Berlusconi, contro Zelensky? Io, credo, molto.

E allora, accanto alle grandi risorse mobilitate, le nostre scelte devono essere accompagnate da scelte politiche coraggiose per punire gli atti criminali di Putin contro la popolazione e per sostenere con ogni mezzo la difesa dell'integrità territoriale ucraina e garantirle un futuro all'interno della nostra Unione.

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Mr President, this war can be stopped tomorrow if Mr Putin will decide to withdraw his troops from Ukraine. However, since it is not realistic, the only way to end this international crime is to defeat Russia in the battlefield. The first year of a brutal war has shown that the combination of highly motivated Ukrainian defenders and the Western weapons are much stronger than the Russian military capacity. That is why the delivery of the Western weapons is the most crucial factor which can bring the end of this war. I repeat, it depends only on the West how long this bloody war will continue. I am convinced that all the possibilities to help Ukraine to achieve its victory during this year.

For that to happen, the West has to stop being afraid of Russian defeat impact on the future of Russia. On the contrary, in order to have a sustainable peace on European continent, Russians need to be convinced to abandon their nostalgia of an empire. That will happen if Russia will be defeated in Ukraine, if Putin will be brought before the International Criminal Court, and if Ukraine will be invited to join NATO. *Slava Ukraini!*

Catch-the-eye procedure

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, llevamos un año de guerra cruel e injusta de Rusia contra Ucrania. Desgraciadamente, las sanciones económicas a Rusia no tuvieron en el año pasado el resultado esperado. Espero, sin embargo, un efecto positivo de las últimas medidas que hemos tomado en materia de petróleo.

Las sanciones, como dice el *New York Times*, son un maratón, no un esprint; un veneno lento, como dice el señor Borrell, que esta mañana nos ha dado unas cifras importantes sobre el retroceso este mes de la economía rusa. En todo caso, no hemos logrado el aislamiento económico de Rusia. Hay Estados que la ayudan a conseguir los productos que necesita y que también le compran el petróleo y el gas. Además, han improvisado una flota de barcos cargueros.

Es muy conveniente que muchos de los países que han condenado la agresión se sumen también a nuestras sanciones. Pero aun así, China y la India contribuyen al mantenimiento de la economía rusa. Celebro que el Consejo Europeo recientemente se comprometa a incrementar las medidas para luchar contra la elusión de sanciones. Veremos el apoyo y el alcance de la nueva Resolución de las Naciones Unidas. Lo que tenemos que hacer es seguir debilitando a la economía rusa para que no siga alimentando una maquinaria de destrucción y muerte.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente Karas, llevamos un año de guerra injusta y criminal de Putin contra Ucrania. Pero hay que remontarse muchos años para recordar un Parlamento cuya mayoría amplia esté tan unida en el ejercicio del liderazgo frente a ella por parte del alto representante Borrell y de la presidenta von der Leyen.

Este Parlamento ha apoyado las medidas humanitarias para las personas desplazadas, ha apoyado la apuesta por la autonomía estratégica y la autonomía energética, ha apoyado las sanciones contra Rusia y también respalda la ayuda militar a Ucrania. *No warmongering*. Efectivamente, no hay ninguna contradicción. Al contrario, reafirma la apuesta europea por la paz: apoyar al agredido frente al agresor.

Pero me encuentro entre quienes, cuando se habla de *Zeitenwende* —de cambio de época—, confían en que la Unión Europea también vaya a aprovechar este liderazgo para estar más unida en la construcción de una política exterior, de defensa y de seguridad común cohesiva para reparar el coste social y económico que tienen las sanciones, también para los más vulnerables, en la Unión Europea; y para recuperar el lema perdido de cuando ratificamos el Tratado de Lisboa: «Una Unión más perfecta».

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, tulee kuluneeksi vuosi Venäjän brutaalista ja rikollisesta hyökkäyksestä Ukrainaan. Tämän sodan aikana Euroopan unioni yhdessä länsiliittoutuman kanssa on osoittanut ennennäkemätöntä yhteinäisyyttä suhteessa sanktioihin Venäjää kohtaan ja Ukrainan avussa, mutta näitä toimia on voimistettava. Eurooppa oli aivan liian riippuvainen aivan liian pitkään Venäjän energiasta, ja se hidasti tehokkaiden sanktioiden asettamista.

Olen hyvin tyytyväinen, että nyt valmistellaan jo kymmenettä sanktiopakettia. Näitä pakotteita on kovennettava. Samoin aseapua Ukrainaan on nyt vauhditettava, erityisesti raskasta aseistusta ja panssarivaunuja, joista moni jäsenmaa on tehnyt jo lupauksia. Näitä tarvitaan nyt nopeasti Ukrainan avuksi. Ukrainan kansa taistelee vapauden ja demokratian puolesta, ja he tarvitsevat siihen kaiken meidän tukemme. Meidän on tuettava Ukrainaa tässä taistelussa ja tuettava heidän polkuaan kohti Euroopan unionin jäsenyyttä.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Mr President. Thank you, High Representative Borrell, for your leadership on this and for your personal commitment in the past years. We have to stop giving Ukraine just enough not to lose. We need to give Ukraine what it needs to win as soon as possible. That's our task. Not after the summer. Not next month. Now! We have to stop the incrementalism on both the sanctions and the military support.

Now on the tanks, I want to ask you, High Representative, if you can take an initiative to coordinate this, because since the decision about the tanks, we heard, 'No, not the leased tanks. No, we have some tanks in the mothballs that we want to refurbish'. We need to coordinate this in a European way, in a European spirit, to get these tanks as soon as possible in Ukraine and to also use currently operationally used tanks for that matter. So I would be very appreciative if you could take initiative on that. Thank you. And *slava Ukraini!*

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Г-н Председател, какво научихме през тази една година? Първо, военната помощ, когато е дадена навреме, е по-необходима за мира от дипломатията. Второ, мирът е възможен само след като и последният руски агресор напусне украинската земя. Трето, който днес в разгара на войната говори за мир, всъщност помага на Путин. Четвърто, господин Борел, Вие говорихте убедително днес, но така трябваше да говорите преди една година в Москва. Поуката е, че мирът е невъзможен докато Путин е в Кремъл.

И накрая, надявам се, че в българския парламент ще се намерят достойни депутати, които ще поискат импийчмънт на проруския български президент.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule Înalt Reprezentant, vreau să încep prin a vă felicita, domnule Borrell, pentru că în intervenția dumneavoastră ați avut această declarație extraordinară, și anume aceea de a pronunța cuvântul pace. Eu nu sunt de acord cu ce a spus colegul meu mai înainte, că dacă spunem pace îl ajutam pe Putin. Nu, ajutam să nu mai moară oameni. Și da, trebuie să faceți această intervenție la ONU.

Putin a omorât prin atacul Ucrainei suficienți oameni. Nu sunt de acord nici cu ce s-a spus, că armele nu armele ajută, nu omoară oameni. Armele omoară oameni. De aceea, domnule Borrell, mergeți pe această cale. Ținem legătura, ca Uniunea Europeană, și cu NATO, pentru că știm bine, Moldova este acum deja supravegheată de Putin și trebuie să dăm importanță și Moldovei.

Țara mea este la graniță cu Ucraina. Am ajutat Ucraina, România a ajutat Ucraina, Uniunea Europeană a ajutat cetățenii de acolo, dar trebuie să găsim o cale de oprire a acestui dezastru și a morții a mii de oameni.

Özlem Demirel (The Left). – Herr Präsident! Seit einem Jahr tobt der Krieg in der Ukraine, das heißt, seit einem Jahr sterben die Menschen in der Ukraine. Ein Jahr Krieg bedeutet auch ein Jahr brutaler Machtkampf zwischen der NATO und Russland auf dem Rücken des Volkes in der Ukraine und der Völker weltweit. Gestern erklärte Herr Stoltenberg, dass dieser Krieg seit 2014 absehbar war. Dann muss man fragen: Warum wurde er nicht mit allen Mitteln verhindert?

Ja, Russland hat den Angriff auf die Ukraine gestartet und gehört dafür verurteilt. Aber was macht die NATO seither, außer real und verbal aufzurüsten? Hören Sie auf damit! Warum haben Sie geschwiegen, als Großbritannien und die USA die Friedensverhandlungen in der Türkei letztes Jahr torpediert haben?

Mit Solidarität mit dem angegriffenen Volk hat Ihr Vorgehen überhaupt nichts zu tun. Seien Sie wirklich solidarisch mit den Menschen in der Ukraine und hören Sie auf, Ihre geopolitischen Interessen über das Leben der Menschen zu stellen!

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εδώ και ένα χρόνο η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και οι κυβερνήσεις εμφανίζουν τον ιμπεριαλιστικό πόλεμο στην Ουκρανία ως μονόπρακτο έργο. Όμως είναι το αποτέλεσμα μιας πολύχρονης πορείας κλιμάκωσης της σύγκρουσης ανάμεσα σε NATO, Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και την καπιταλιστική Ρωσία στο έδαφος των μεταξύ τους σφοδρών μονοπωλιακών ανταγωνισμών. Θύματά τους ο ουκρανικός και ο ρωσικός λαός, που για επτά δεκαετίες στη Σοβιετική Ένωση ζούσαν ειρηνικά. Ψευτοδιλήμματα περί δημοκρατικής Δύσης από τη μία και ολοκληρωτικής Ρωσίας από την άλλη. Και οι δύο πλευρές είναι καπιταλιστικές. Το Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα της Ελλάδας έχει καταδικάσει τις ευρωατλαντικές επεμβάσεις και το πραξικόπημα στην Ουκρανία το 2014 και την απαράδεκτη εισβολή της Ρωσίας και αγωνίζεται ενάντια στην εντεινόμενη ελληνική εμπλοκή της συγκυβέρνησης της Νέας Δημοκρατίας με τη στήριξη της νατοϊκής Αριστεράς του ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, τη μετατροπή της χώρας σε αμερικανο-νατοϊκό ορμητήριο και στόχο αντιποίνων. Οι λαοί να δυναμώσουν την αυτοτελή τους πάλη για απεμπλοκή από τους ιμπεριαλιστικούς σχεδιασμούς, για τα δικά τους συμφέροντα, τη δική τους εξουσία.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señor presidente Othmar Karas, alto representante Josep Borrell, gracias por su intervención de esta mañana. Yo coincido exactamente en esa idea de que la diplomacia es también una herramienta a nuestra disposición, junto a todo el apoyo militar que debe ir a más en Ucrania, siempre teniendo en cuenta que el objetivo tiene que ser una paz justa, es decir, que Ucrania recupere su soberanía y su integridad territorial.

En ese sentido, veíamos hoy en el *Financial Times* un nuevo titular: «*Russians amassing aircraft within striking range of Ukraine target*». Efectivamente, hemos sido demasiado lentos. Hace un año, se decía que llegará demasiado tarde la ayuda de los tanques y de los aviones de combate, pero nadie sabe cuánto va a durar la guerra. Por tanto, esa estrategia podría haber sido todavía más eficaz. En un año de guerra, Ucrania ha recuperado la mitad del territorio inicialmente ocupado por Rusia. Vayamos a más y más rápidamente.

Fulvio Martusciello (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quando sono arrivato qui in Parlamento stamattina pensavo di trovare un'Aula piena di europarlamentari, di ascoltare interventi tutti mirati a riaffermare la posizione che il Parlamento europeo ha sempre avuto: quella di difesa dell'Ucraina e di condanna dell'invasione russa.

Spiace constatare che tanti colleghi hanno scelto di non partecipare a questo dibattito – l'Aula è tristemente semideserta –, e spiace constatare che alcuni colleghi hanno preferito la polemica politica alla riflessione, invece, su quello che significa un anno di guerra.

Forza Italia ha sempre rimarcato, in ogni suo voto e in ogni suo atto, la condanna nei confronti dell'invasione dell'Ucraina. Non c'è un solo atto in questo Parlamento europeo che vada in maniera differente. Spiace constatare che alcuni colleghi socialisti, anziché utilizzare il tempo concesso loro per parlare dell'invasione della Ucraina, l'hanno utilizzato per attaccare l'Italia e per attaccare un leader politico come Silvio Berlusconi. Hanno sbagliato e spero che lo capiscano.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Rok inwazji Putina na Ukrainę to rok ogromnej tragedii i jeszcze większego smutku. Miliony osób uciekły ze swojego kraju, a tysiące zostały zabite, brutalnie zabite, jak czernostolaty ze swoim psem zamordowany podczas spaceru w Bachmucie dwa tygodnie temu. Zdjęcie wysłał mi fotograf ze Śląska, który dokumentuje na miejscu zbrodnie Rosjan. Wołodimir Kliczko, który był jednym z gości mojego panelu w Brukseli, powiedział, że to jest wojna cywilizacyjna, że Rosja traktuje Ukrainę jako coś gorszego i dlatego chce totalnej likwidacji języka, historii, kultury i społeczeństwa.

Chcemy pokoju. Sam określam siebie jako pacyfistę, ale trudno nim być, gdy niczym nieusprawiedliwiona wojna toczy się tuż obok naszych granic. Jedyne pokój, jaki możemy zaakceptować w tym Parlamencie, to zwycięstwo Ukrainy nad Rosją i więcej broni dla Ukrainy. Teraz, dopóki nie jest za późno, niech żyje wolna, suwerenna i europejska Ukraina.

Katarína Roth Neveďalová (S&D). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, na začiatku ma fascinuje, že pri takejto téme, ako je rok vojny na Ukrajine, kolegovia z EPP to využívajú trápne na to, aby útočili na nás ako svojich politických oponentov.

Ale myslím si, že treba hovoriť aj o veciach, ako je obeť občanov Európskej únie, ktorí žijú na hraniciach s Ukrajinou, a to konkrétne napríklad občania Slovenskej republiky, Poľska, ale takisto Rumunska, ktorí otvorili svoje domovy a pomáhali ako dobrovoľníci a pomáhali utečencom, ktorí prichádzali z Ukrajiny, ženám a deťom. A naozaj, častokrát to boli ľudia, ktorí sami nemali veľa z toho svojho a dali aj to posledné, aby týmto utečencom pomohli, keď vláda nemohla. Čiže ja sa im chcem veľmi pekne poďakovať a spomenúť aj ich v tejto diskusii, pretože je to veľmi dôležité vidieť, že naozaj čo si ľudia myslia.

A myslím si, že títo ľudia nechcú hovoriť o zbraniach, chcú hovoriť o mieri. A preto si myslím, že aj my ako politici by sme mali hovoriť aj o tom, že mierový projekt, akým je Európska únia, by mal ponúknuť mier aj pri boji na Ukrajine a pomôcť ukončiť túto vojnu. Pretože smrť a utrpenie tých žien a detí, ktorí umierajú každý deň na Ukrajine, je hrozná.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Mr President, dear colleagues, most of us agree that the EU and our partners should increase and speed up support to Ukraine.

As High Representative, you said to our military aid, it must include everything that is needed for Ukraine to defeat the Russia army and regain full control of its territory, including air defence systems, fighter jets and long-range missile systems.

As the President of Commission said, we need to implement a new sanctions package. But this is not enough. The EU also need to take a stronger position on any individual or entity that is helping Russia to avoid imposed sanctions. Any company in Europe that is trying to profit from the war situation should be placed under criminal investigation, have its assets frozen and confiscated, and its owners tried in the court as supporters of terrorism.

At the same time, we must show that EU is ready to start negotiation with Ukraine for accession to the EU process this year. *Slava Ukraini!*

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, High Representative, honourable Members, first of all, let me thank this House for today's debate and for your interventions, because this is an important moment – an emotional one, too, and a moment of determination.

It was important to have this debate. Today, it gives us – the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council – an opportunity to strongly reconfirm our full support to Ukraine, to reiterate our unconditional solidarity, and to do everything it takes – as long as it takes – to undermine Russia's war machine.

Each of us – literally everyone – remembers where we were when we heard the horrible news one year ago. I remember very well. I never imagined a moment in my life that I will wake up my wife and say 'the war has started'. The first thing we did was call our parents, but by that time they were already somewhere deep in shelter. I will never forget those hours waiting for their reply. Unfortunately, those hours will stick deep in me for many, many years.

24 February 2022 changed this world. It changed each and every one of us. And we would probably not have imagined that we would stand here today having this debate 357 days into a brutal war. Mariupol, Bakhmut – once thriving, beautiful European cities. Today, they don't exist.

From the very beginning, Putin's condition for peace – so-called peace – was to wipe out Ukraine: their culture, their tradition, their people. Are you ready to look Ukrainian children in the eye and say that rape and loot is their future? Because that would mean the future of our children, too.

So let me say again: today's debate was important: we cannot repeat and reconfirm our support and solidarity often enough. Any support of ours will never match the sacrifice of the Ukrainian nation. President von der Leyen has made it very clear that we will continue as long as it takes to keep Ukrainians' dream of freedom alive. To praise the legendary bravery of the Ukrainian people. To bring Ukraine closer to victory and closer to the European Union, where they truly belong.

We continue to bring our markets closer, our towns and our cities, our people. We have built bridges and we continue to build more of them – building the Ukrainians' European future together. And reconstruction is going to be another chance to show true European solidarity – build Ukraine back even better, greener and stronger. Rebuild the beauty of Ukraine. We need to lay the groundwork for a green reconstruction, also holding Russia accountable for all damage that they have done. And I truly hope that in one year this debate will be about our efforts to rebuild Ukraine.

Honourable Members, President von der Leyen has said it: Ukraine's dreams of freedom are stronger than ever. I can only confirm this. I can confirm this personally. Today's debate has sent a very strong message. We will help Ukraine so that these dreams one day become a reality. We will stand united. We will not allow Putin to divide us. His attempts to divide us have failed, and we will make sure they will never succeed.

Because today has shown again that we are united in our firm belief that Ukraine's future will be a European one. We owe this unity to Ukraine, to their children and to our children, too. Thank you. *Slava Ukraini!*

Josep Borrell Fontelles, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, for the Council. – Mr President, I thank you and all the Members who are following this debate. Thank you, colleagues. Mr President, for this debate to make full sense, I should be able to try to answer what I heard from the Members that intervened, because they said very interesting things.

I ask for your help if I take some minutes more, because I have to answer and you have to share your views. Otherwise, it's not a debate. I will switch to Spanish as it will be quicker...

Algunos de ustedes han dicho que no reaccionamos después de Crimea. *Right*. Es verdad. Después de Crimea pusimos unas cuantas sanciones económicas, no demasiadas, y seguimos comprando gas ruso, aumentando nuestra dependencia de Rusia y construyendo el Nord Stream. Es cierto. Pero la historia no se rebobina. No vamos a resolver los problemas de hoy flagelándonos por los errores de ayer. Los asumimos y los corregimos.

Otra observación que he oído: Zelenski tiene una lista de compras. Viene aquí pidiendo tanques, aviones, municiones. Sí, claro, ¿y qué harían ustedes si estuvieran en su lugar? Vendrían a cualquier parte a pedir ayuda, y la ayuda consiste en eso. Las armas matan. Sí. *Weapons kill. Yes, they are done for that*. Y sabemos que nuestra ayuda militar también, desgraciadamente, causa bajas. El problema con Zelenski es que le sobran aplausos y le faltan municiones. Va largo de aplausos y de *Slava Ukraini*, pero sus soldados no tienen municiones para continuar batallando. ¿Saben por qué? Porque los aplausos son gratis y un Leopard cuesta 10 millones de euros. ¿Por qué no nos miramos a los ojos y decimos que sí, que muy bien, pero que hay que hacer más y comprometerse más? Deberíamos poner sobre la mesa recursos adicionales para sacar de los cuarteles los tanques parados, para movilizarlos y que vayan a Ucrania antes de que Rusia lance su ofensiva de primavera-verano.

Esto, señoras y señores diputados, es lo que estamos discutiendo. Ustedes tienen un papel aquí que desempeñar. El mío es mantener a los Estados miembros unidos. Porque todas las sanciones se aprueban por unanimidad y cada euro que sale del Fondo Europeo de Apoyo a la Paz es por unanimidad. Tengo que mantener a veintisiete Estados unidos y, créanme, no es siempre fácil. A veces tenemos que hacer excepciones y tenemos que aceptar comportamientos que no nos gustan porque tenemos que mantener la unidad. También ustedes pueden ayudar con eso.

Algunos han dicho —lo acepto y asumo— que hay que hacer más y más deprisa. Hay que convencer a las opiniones públicas europeas de la necesidad de hacerlo. Otros han criticado el excesivo incrementalismo de nuestra ayuda. Comparto esta crítica. Si hubiéramos hecho antes algunas cosas que hacemos ahora, habríamos ahorrado vidas y habría sido más fácil la defensa de Ucrania. Algunos creen que la solución pasa por parar la ayuda militar —algunos que ya no están aquí para escuchar la réplica—. Yo, francamente, no entiendo cómo desde la izquierda se puede decir que la solución pasa por dejar de ayudar militarmente a Ucrania. No, no lo entiendo. No entiendo el 'filoputinismo' o la extrema ingenuidad de los que piensan eso desde la izquierda —y tengo amigos que lo piensan y algunos de ellos me producen un gran respeto intelectual—. Pero ¿de verdad creen que, si dejáramos a Ucrania sin las municiones que necesitan cada día o cada hora para seguir defendiéndose, eso llevaría a Putin a una mesa de negociación? ¿O le llevaría

a aumentar su ofensiva militar? Pongan los pies en el suelo, por favor. Pongan los pies en el suelo. A mí me duele tanto como a ustedes cualquier muerto que cualquier arma causa. Pero si queremos que la guerra dure menos, la solución no es ayudar menos a Ucrania. La solución es ayudarla más y más deprisa.

La guerra dura porque está en un empate, un empate que tiene que deshacerse. Las sanciones tienen que ayudar a eso. Ha habido mucha crítica a los efectos de las sanciones. Insisto: si alguien pensó que las sanciones económicas conseguirían de la noche a la mañana que Putin no pudiera seguir financiando la guerra, vivía también en otro mundo. La sanción tiene un efecto lento pero seguro y las cifras cantan. Sí, señorías, las cifras cantan. El año pasado fue un año extraordinariamente bueno para la Hacienda rusa, porque los precios de la energía se dispararon y nosotros todavía dependíamos de ella. Pero este año las cifras dicen que sus ingresos están cayendo, que su déficit aumenta y su déficit comercial también. La dependencia tecnológica de Europa empieza a surtir sus efectos, luego hay que seguir por este camino.

Otros han planteado que, a fin de cuentas, solo la OTAN cuenta a la hora de defender Europa. Eso plantea de nuevo el debate sobre la responsabilidad estratégica de Europa. Sí, la OTAN juega un papel fundamental en la defensa territorial de Europa. Sí. Pero eso no nos exime de nuestra responsabilidad, que pasa por tener capacidades militares que no tenemos. Porque nos habíamos acostumbrado al sueño de la paz y habíamos dejado de tener nuestros almacenes llenos por si acaso venía la guerra. La guerra ha venido y hay que hacerle frente.

Y también ustedes han hablado. La presidenta ha hablado de Irán y ha hecho muy bien en recordar el papel de este país en el apoyo militar a Rusia. Pero también tenemos que tener en cuenta cómo piensa el resto del mundo. Lo veremos la semana que viene en las Naciones Unidas. Porque no todo el mundo piensa como nosotros, ni valora igual las causas o las consecuencias de esta guerra. Yo tengo la suerte de poder entrevistarme con líderes de África, de América Latina y del Sudeste Asiático. Muchos se han creído la propaganda rusa, la desinformación de que los precios de la energía y de los alimentos son consecuencia de nuestras sanciones. Hay que hacer una gran tarea pedagógica para explicar que no es así. ¿Cómo se puede decir que el precio del alimento sube cuando el que lo dice está bloqueando con sus barcos de guerra la salida de 20 millones de toneladas de trigo de Ucrania? Esa batalla contra la desinformación también hay que hacerla. Porque, nos guste o no, hay todavía en África un sentimiento anticolonial y en América Latina un sentimiento antiimperialista que hacen que muchos de sus líderes y de sus habitantes miren a esta guerra con unos ojos distintos de los nuestros. La verdad es polidrica y no tenemos que imponer nuestra verdad, sino convencer con argumentos y con razones.

Yo he procurado traerles cifras a este debate porque creo que esa es la base del argumento sobre el cual tenemos que basar nuestras políticas. Yo nunca he visto ningún país que tuviera en la idea de Europa una esperanza existencial tan grande como la que tiene Ucrania. Europa siempre ha sido, para los pueblos que han vivido en dictaduras faltos de libertad —como el mío— un faro en la noche que guiaba nuestra voluntad y futuro. Pero nunca he visto un país para el que fuera tan existencial la pertenencia a la Unión Europea como lo es para Ucrania.

Et c'est pour cela que cette promesse européenne, nous devons la supporter sans oublier que le chemin sera long et difficile, parce que pour gagner la paix, d'abord il faut gagner la guerre. Mais quand je dis qu'il faut gagner la guerre cela ne veut pas dire qu'on oublie le travail diplomatique pour trouver la paix.

Repito: no son dos cosas contrarias ni alternativas. No digan que para negociar la paz hay que dejar de ayudar militarmente a Ucrania. Digan que hay que hacer las dos cosas a la vez. Digan que hemos de empezar a pensar cómo será el orden de seguridad en Europa cuando esta guerra acabe. ¿Cuál será el papel de Europa? Porque no me gustaría que la guerra se acabara de la mano de China, de Turquía y de Estados Unidos solos.

Ahora tenemos que empezar a pensar de qué manera reconstruiremos no solo la Ucrania destruida, sino la cooperación y la comunicación en el continente europeo. Probablemente necesitaremos nuevos líderes en Rusia que asuman su responsabilidad por lo que han hecho y sean capaces de llevar a su país hacia la reconciliación y hacia un futuro común, como hubo en Europa líderes después de la Segunda Guerra Mundial que fueron capaces de reconciliar y reconstruir. En eso también nos tenemos que emplear ahora. Todos, ustedes también.

Señorías, este debate para mí ha sido muy importante porque me ha hecho ver cómo todavía hay miembros de este Parlamento que creen que lo que estamos haciendo no es lo correcto. Me gustaría que me dijeran ¿cuál es la alternativa? Que me miren a los ojos y me digan que aceptan que las tropas rusas entren en Kiev y que instalen allí un régimen como el de Bielorrusia. Porque esta sería la consecuencia si parásemos nuestra ayuda militar a Ucrania. Como eso no lo queremos, tenemos que seguir empleando nuestras sanciones, ese veneno lento que mina las bases de una economía. Tenemos que seguir apoyando militarmente a ese país, siendo menos incrementalistas, siendo más rápidos y asumiendo más riesgos.

Déjenme que les diga que estamos en una guerra. No la hacemos nosotros. Nuestros jóvenes no van a morir a Kiev. Pero es una guerra que nos afecta porque de su resultado depende nuestra seguridad. Todavía no tenemos ese *mindset* —esa mentalidad— de afrontar, como dice el presidente Macron, *une économie de guerre*. No, todavía no la tenemos. Y hemos de tenerla, si bien no en nuestra vida cotidiana —afortunadamente—, sí al menos en el momento de tomar decisiones políticas como las que tenemos que tomar y que espero que este Parlamento apoye.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. PINA PICIERNO

Vicepresidente

Presidente. – Grazie all'Alto rappresentante Borrell e naturalmente a tutte e a tutti gli intervenuti nel dibattito.

Comunico di aver ricevuto sei proposte di risoluzione conformemente all'articolo 132, paragrafo 2, del regolamento.

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà giovedì 16 febbraio 2023.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), în scris. – Printr-o tragică ironie a sorții, declanșând acest război împotriva Ucrainei, Putin a semnat, de fapt, condamnarea Rusiei la scara istoriei. Acest război este sfârșitul Rusiei așa cum o știam până în 2022: partener strategic al UE, membru al organizațiilor internaționale și partener de afaceri pentru lumea occidentală.

Sute de mii de ruși au părăsit Rusia și au devenit refugiați, speriați de mobilizare și represiuni politice. Putin pare însă susținut de oligarhi. Au pierdut averi uriașe din cauza războiului, dar tac. Potrivit cercetărilor sociale, la un an de la invazia Ucrainei, Putin nu ar câștiga alegerile astăzi. Iată un scurt sumar al acestui an de război.

În oglindă, avem o Ucraină condusă de „liderul moral al lumii democratice”, Volodîmîr Zelenski, o țară care luptă eroic pentru viitorul ei european, și o Uniune Europeană onorată să își deschidă porțile pentru acest popor de viteji. UE nu va cunoaște liniștea până când toți cei vinovați de crimele din Ucraina nu vor da socoteală în fața justiției, pentru toate aceste vieți frânt.

Victor Negrescu (S&D), în scris. – A trecut un an de la momentul invaziei nelegale a Ucrainei. Un an în care agresiunea Federației Ruse a provocat suferință, moartea a zeci de mii de persoane, exodul a milioane de persoane și a amplificat provocările cu care ne confruntăm la nivel european. Conform datelor recente, trei sferturi din cetățenii europeni susțin ajutorul acordat Ucrainei de către UE, dar amenințarea nu a trecut.

Independența Ucrainei și valorile noastre comune sunt în continuare în pericol. Trebuie să protejăm cetățenii din Ucraina, împingând totodată guvernul ucrainean către reforme majore și respectarea cerințelor normative europene, precum protejarea drepturilor minorităților și criteriile de mediu. Trebuie să privim și către statele aflate la frontiera cu Ucraina, care nu sunt state membre UE și întâmpină dificultăți semnificative.

De exemplu, Republica Moldova, țară candidată la UE, are nevoie de sprijin, confruntându-se cu multiple provocări în plan economic, social și militar, ca urmare a războiului, și cu o amenințare directă din partea Federației Ruse. Totodată, trebuie să fim atenți la efectele negative ale războiului asupra cetățenilor, să ne asigurăm că sunt protejați în fața riscurilor prin măsuri active care să întărească reziliența și capacitatea societății europene. Ne așteptăm în continuare provocări majore ridicate de acest conflict la care avem datoria să răspundem în solidar.

Urmas Paet (Renew), kirjalikult. – On äärmiselt oluline toetada Ukrainale sõjalise abi andmist nii kaua kui vaja. Liikmesriigid peaksid tõsiselt kaaluma Kiievile hävituslennukite, helikopterite ja sobivate raketisüsteemide andmist. Samuti peaksid liikmesriigid oluliselt suurendama laskemoonasaadetisi. Ukraina peab saama end kaitsta ning taastama kontrolli kogu oma rahvusvaheliselt tunnustatud territooriumi üle. Kümnes sanktsioonipakett Venemaa ja selle liitlaste vastu peab jõustuma juba veebruaril lõpus, kusjuures oluliselt tuleks laiendada sanktsioonide kohaldamisala. Lisaks on vaja tõhustada varem kehtestatud sanktsioonide jõustamist ning takistada nendest kõrvalehoidumist. Tulevikku vaadates on vaja kiiresti välja töötada õiguskord, mis võimaldab ELis külmutatud Vene varad konfiskeerida ning kasutada neid Ukraina ülesehitamiseks ja Venemaa agressiooni ohvritele hüvitise maksmiseks. Kui sõda lõpeb, tuleb Venemaad kohustada maksma Ukraina ülesehitamise rahastamiseks suuri reparatsioone. Mul on hea meel Ukraina nimetamise üle ELi kandidaatriigiks. Osapooled peaksid alustama ühinemisläbirääkimisi juba käesoleval aastal, võttes siiski arvesse tulemuspõhise liitumisprotsessi korda, kriteeriume ja tingimusi.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), písomne. – Opätovne a dôrazne odsudzujem ničím nevyprovokovanú a bezprecedentnú ruskú agresiu voči ukrajinskému ľudu. Ruský teroristický režim už rok vedome pácha vojenské zločiny, pretože cielené útočí na civilné obyvateľstvo a kritickú infraštruktúru. Všetky tieto zločiny musia byť riadne zdokumentované a vinníci náležite potrestaní. Európska únia nesmie poľaviť pri pomoci ukrajinskému ľudu, či už sa jedná o humanitárnu, ekonomickú alebo vojenskú pomoc, práve naopak, musíme pomoc zvýšiť. Zdôrazňujem, že Ukrajinci nebojújú len za svoju slobodu, ale aj za slobodu celej demokratickej Európy, preto im musíme zabezpečiť všetko, čo na túto obranu potrebujú.

Riho Terras (PPE), kirjalikult. – 24. veebruaril möödub aasta päevast, mil Venemaa alustas täiemahulist rünnakut naaberriiki Ukraina vastu. Ikka ja jälle tuleb meelde tuletada, et Venemaa on Ukraina vastu sõda pidanud juba üheksa aastat. Alates 2014. aasta veebruarist, mil okupeeriti Krimmi poolsaar ning alustati sõjaliste operatsioonidega Ukraina idaladel. Õppetunde möödunud aastast on mitmeid. Olulisemad nendest on: Ukraina demonstreerib iga päev ja tund, et ülekaaluka sõjalise vastase vastu on võimalik võidelda. Hirmule Venemaa ees, mida Putini režiim on viimase 20 aasta jooksul ning Venemaa praktiliselt kogu oma eksistentsi jooksul kultiveerinud, tuleb vastu seista ja võidelda. Ukraina võitleb oma eksistentsi, riikluse ja rahva ellujäämise nimel.

Kuigi meile meeldib mõelda, et oleme ületanud Euroopas mitmeid olulisi künniseid ja teinud suuri samme Ukraina abistamisel, pole see paraku piisav olnud. Vaja on rohkem, suurema laskeulatusega relvi ning laskemoona. Ukraina kasutab ühes päevas rohkem lahingumoonat, kui kõik NATO riigid suudavad mitme nädala jooksul toota. See olukord peab muutuma.

Euroopa, lääs laiemalt peab mõtlema strateegiale, kuidas aidata Ukrainal see sõda võita, sest vastasel juhul jätkab Venemaa oma imperialistlikke püüdlusi läbi vägivalda oma naabrite suhtes. Täna ei saa olla enam mingit kahtlust, et võimul oleva Venemaa režiimi eesmärk on olemasoleva lääne julgeolekuarhitektuuri ajalukku saatmine. Seda ei tohi juhtuda.

4. Индустриален план на Зеления пакт за епоха с нулеви нетни емисии (разискване)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sul piano industriale del Green Deal per l'era a zero emissioni nette (2023/2559(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, thank you for the opportunity to address this Chamber. Today, we are witnessing uncertain times in Europe and globally. This is putting our economies under intense strain and requires new ways of thinking and decisive collective action. That is why today's debate about the Commission's communication on a Green Deal Industrial Plan is very timely.

The Commission's plans provide a basis for us to reflect on what we need to do in the short term to strengthen our industrial and technological base. We also need to analyse further the potential negative consequences of actions taken by other global actors. But, even more importantly, we cannot simply react to external events. If we want the EU to be a leader in clean tech and other fields, we have to be proactive and get serious about strengthening our productivity in the long term. Therefore, it is essential that we start work on removing barriers for productivity and enhancing investments in clean and digital technologies. Predictable and competitive conditions for our companies across the EU will help us to become the frontrunner of the green and digital transition.

With this purpose in mind, the Special European Council last week underlined the need to intensify the work along several strands of action. For instance, we need to simplify the regulatory framework and shorten administrative procedures. This is crucial to ensure that we have the necessary manufacturing capacity to reach the EU's climate-neutral goals.

To ensure a successful green and digital transition in Europe, we need to equip citizens with the appropriate skills. We have to take ambitious action to provide education, training, upskilling and reskilling.

In order to grow and thrive, businesses also need access to capital. Existing EU funds can play a part, but even more important is private investment. Therefore, we need to finalise the Capital Markets Union to make sure that Europe can remain a continent of production and innovation.

But we cannot stop at Europe's borders. To be world-leading, European companies must have access to world markets. Thus, the European Council stressed the importance of supporting the WTO and the multilateral rules-based system for trade. Fair and transparent free trade and investment agreements should allow resilient and reliable supply chains to develop and the European Union to access new markets. These are fundamental pillars for drawing up a Green Deal Industrial Plan for a net-zero age.

Last but not least, let me add that we look forward to the Commission's proposal for a long-term strategy at the EU level to boost competitiveness and productivity. Working on the long-term challenges of increasing productivity will be crucial for attracting investment, as well as safeguarding our businesses' and industries' ability to compete globally. This is a discussion that we will come back to many times during the spring and indeed in the coming years. It is about making our economy more futureproof and recovering the lost ground. Despite the pressing issues of the day, this is a challenge we must tackle now.

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, good morning colleagues and good morning Minister. I think we all know that this is a decisive decade, that by 2030 we plan to cut emissions by 55%, and that this work started three years ago with the European Green Deal. We set out a very detailed roadmap, Fit for 55, and we accelerated our work with Next Generation EU using EUR 800 billion-worth of investment to emerge from the pandemic with a stronger, more sustainable Europe.

Russia's war of aggression requires us to accelerate again this work, as Putin is weaponising his country's energy exports in a failed attempt to weaken our resolve. But this is a difficult time for European citizens, for families and businesses. Europe is being tested by war, by geopolitical tensions, by trade rivalries and climate change. We need to show that we can step up to these challenges and we need to continue to show our resolve as we work towards 2030 and net zero by 2050.

Half the emissions we need to cut by 2050 depend on technology not yet ready for market, or technology that does not yet exist. That is a challenge, but it is also an opportunity. The EU's net-zero startups were worth over EUR 100 billion in 2021, twice as much as they were worth the year before, and that will keep growing: economic growth, competitiveness and innovation, on the one hand; sustainability on the other. These objectives are not in conflict. But we need the right environment in Europe to make sure these goals support and build on each other.

On 1 February, the Commission presented a Green Deal industrial plan to make Europe the home of clean tech and innovation on the road to net zero. It is built on four pillars: the regulatory environment, financing, skills and trade. And I want to just briefly go through those four pillars.

First, on the regulatory environment, this is about speed and access. We need to enable the clean-tech industry to scale up and to scale up fast. We know that companies complain that permitting is too slow and there are too many barriers to bringing innovations to market. So one of our main measures will be a new net zero industry act that will, for example, look at how to fast-track permitting for clean-tech production sites.

Second, financing – money. We need to speed up investment in clean-tech production. We will adopt our state aid rules to speed up and simplify processes on a temporary basis for the decarbonisation of industries and for sectors we need to reach net zero. We will have easier calculations, simpler procedures and accelerated approvals. But we will also pay attention to the level playing field in the single market. Not all Member States have the same capacity to use state aid. As we mark 30 years of that single market, we should recognise the value of our state aid rules for all Member States, big and small. So our temporary rules will allow for time-limited, proportionate and targeted state aid where that's necessary to roll out renewable energy, decarbonise industry and support investment in strategic sectors for net zero.

Public funding is important, but it will not by itself be sufficient. The bulk of the money to fund green tax and clean tax will not come from the public purse, but from private investors. The US has the Inflation Reduction Act, but it also has thriving capital markets that secure the country's competitiveness. Here in the European Union we need the same: we need the Capital Markets Union and we need to accelerate our work. And I want to thank colleagues in this House who are working hard on our proposals for CMU, because it is about allowing businesses to access more sources of funding as they start out. It's about making sure that startups born in Europe can scale up in Europe. It's about giving investors more opportunities to invest in different projects and companies, including green tech and clean tech.

The third part of the Green Deal industrial plan is skills. We cannot do any of this work without the necessary people. We need people to drive the clean-tech revolution. We will need 800 000 skilled workers by 2025 in the battery industry; 1 million skilled workers by 2030 in the solar industry, twice as many as there are today. This is a chance to create well-paying, skilled jobs for the future. And this is the absolute priority in this European Year of Skills.

Fourth, and finally, we are focusing on trade because we want to deliver net zero at the global level. We need strong and resilient supply chains to access raw materials, to open up markets for our products. We need an ambitious trade agenda, making the most of the deals that we have and closing deals that we are negotiating.

So in closing, President, honourable Members, I know we face challenging times, but it is in times like this that the European Union does its best work. I look forward to your views on how we can turn this Green Deal industrial plan into a reality so that Europe reaches net zero by 2050 and leads the way as a net zero industrial powerhouse.

Christian Ehler, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in 2020, the Commission proudly announced a new industrial policy to implement the European Green Deal as a growth strategy. Yet it took a loud bang from the US to wake up the von der Leyen Commission. Three years later, they finally woke up to the fact that simply placing Fit for 55 regulation is not enough. We need a business case for the European industry that the industrial transition will be a success.

The EPP Group welcomes, therefore, the Green Deal Industrial plan, but the EPP Group really wants to make sure that the von der Leyen Commission hears this final warning shot loud and clear.

So far, the Commission approach has to be too prescriptive, too ideological, and too much focused on regulating the demand side of the European market. Technology neutrality was an afterthought rather than a leading principle. What we need is a serious effort to create a regulatory framework that gives our industry certainty and freedom to innovate and invest. This requires simple, fast, predictable decisions on state aid and permitting, for example, and domestic sourcing of raw materials.

Productivity is our industry's competitive advantage, not even mentioned in the statement from the Commission. Our social and energy costs are among the highest in the world, but so is also the quality of our scientists and engineers. We need to address these high costs, but most importantly, we need to unleash the potential of our innovation-driven productivity growth. To ensure our competitiveness on the global market we also need an ambitious free trade agenda, and yes, we want to ratify the pending trade agreements. If the von der Leyen Commission realises what needs to happen, the European economy can thrive and provide quality jobs for our citizens also in the future. And only if our economy thrives, the European Green Deal can be a success.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, queridos compañeros, la carrera de subsidios ha comenzado. Estados Unidos, China, Japón o India están en la misma competición. Es positivo que países aliados como Estados Unidos apuesten por la transición hacia un mundo sin emisiones. Pero la Unión Europea no puede permitir caminos desleales y que vulneren las normas de la Organización Mundial del Comercio.

Ha llegado la hora de reaccionar. Nos hemos quedado atrás en sectores como la fabricación de microchips o el mundo digital. Ni un solo de los gigantes digitales o de las grandes redes sociales es europeo. El Plan Industrial del Pacto Verde presentado por la Comisión Europea no puede ser una oportunidad perdida. Su actual planteamiento ignora los derechos de la clase trabajadora y su financiación está en un limbo.

Debemos aprovechar el momento decisivo de la revolución verde y digital para modernizar nuestra economía. Lo más urgente es una reforma del mercado eléctrico, porque su actual diseño es la principal desventaja de la industria europea.

También necesitamos una revisión del modelo de ayudas públicas a las empresas que nos permita un despliegue acelerado de los proyectos estratégicos en el marco de los planes nacionales de recuperación y en sectores que garanticen una mayor autonomía estratégica, tecnológica y energética, como las energías limpias, los semiconductores y los vehículos eléctricos.

Pero la revisión de las ayudas de Estado no solo requiere una modificación de los umbrales, sino un instrumento que equilibre las diferencias de tamaño y margen fiscal de los Estados miembros. Bajo ningún concepto podemos permitir que la carrera global de subsidios se convierta en una carrera interna entre los Estados miembros que fragmente nuestro mercado único.

Otro paso debe ser la adopción de la financiación verde para movilizar la inversión pública y privada necesaria. El apoyo a los presupuestos nacionales puede prestarse con reglas fiscales adecuadas en un renovado Pacto de estabilidad y crecimiento a través de la movilización de un instrumento financiero inspirado en el programa SURE.

El Plan Industrial del Pacto Verde solo será una realidad si se protege el corazón que bombea la industria europea desde hace dos siglos: la clase trabajadora. Sin trabajadores y trabajadoras no hay industria. Cualquier empresa que reciba ayuda pública debe impulsar los derechos laborales, salarios decentes, condiciones de trabajo dignas, negociación colectiva y derecho sindical.

Señorías, el objetivo prioritario del Plan Industrial del Pacto Verde debe ser competir de manera eficaz con Estados Unidos y China, no entre Estados miembros dentro del mercado único. Y no hay mejor manera de conmemorar el trigésimo aniversario del mercado único que contribuir al nacimiento de una industria europea competitiva, sostenible, digital y que respete la dignidad de la clase trabajadora que merece.

Stéphane Séjourné, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, le risque d'un décrochage brutal de notre compétitivité s'éloigne. Pour le moment, nous agissons dans l'urgence, et tout le monde accueille favorablement les premières décisions du Conseil.

Mais il y a une véritable différence entre la loi IRA américaine et notre réponse, entre la politique chinoise et la nôtre: nous sommes trop dispersés, nous tâtonnons, là où les compétiteurs sont décidés à s'organiser et à réfléchir sur cinq, dix ou vingt ans. Notre économie européenne a besoin d'une direction et d'une réponse claires. Notre marché commun demande une réponse commune. Notre économie a en réalité besoin de plus d'Europe.

Plus d'Europe dans les aides d'État, c'est mettre en place des projets communs, financés ensemble par un fonds de souveraineté.

Plus d'Europe dans les politiques de concurrence, c'est faire émerger des champions européens, ce que font d'ailleurs les Chinois et les Américains.

Plus d'Europe dans les marchés publics, c'est arrêter d'être naïf: tout compétiteur doit respecter nos normes environnementales et sociales communes.

Plus d'Europe dans les échanges internationaux, c'est instaurer une nouvelle politique commerciale tournée vers les démocraties et l'exportation de nos valeurs. Nos standards environnementaux et sociaux doivent être la base de nos futurs accords commerciaux.

Plus d'Europe dans notre stratégie industrielle, c'est voter rapidement le texte sur l'industrie à zéro émission nette, mais c'est surtout travailler sur la réforme du marché de l'énergie – et j'appelle les groupes à s'engager rapidement à examiner ce texte. Notre économie, d'ailleurs, ne peut attendre, au vu des taux d'inflation et des problèmes de pouvoir d'achat qu'il y a aujourd'hui en Europe.

Plus d'Europe, enfin, c'est plus de cohésion et d'efficacité de notre marché commun, c'est la neutralité carbone. Nous avons une tentation, entre les groupes, de détricoter le pacte vert – on l'a vu. Je trouve cela absurde. À l'heure où les États-Unis se sont convertis à notre vision sur la transition énergétique, il faut d'ailleurs y mettre les moyens, tous les moyens.

J'entends que le groupe du PPE ne votera pas cette résolution du Parlement européen, peut-être par calcul politique interne, peut-être pour mettre en difficulté la présidente de la Commission sur des échéances, au PPE, qui sont internes, peut-être par cynisme.

Mais je veux croire que, au sein des délégations du PPE, il y a un peu de responsabilité: responsabilité pour nos industries, responsabilité pour notre transition énergétique, responsabilité pour nos emplois de demain. Et j'espère qu'il y aura, chers collègues du PPE, des délégations responsables.

En tout cas, mon groupe appellera à voter la résolution du Parlement européen pour un nouveau modèle, pour des mesures d'urgence. On peut faire tellement plus et tellement mieux!

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, my thanks to the Commission for their Green Deal industrial plan that they have launched. And it brings of course the discussion right where it should be. It is about Europeans' competitiveness. But some people in this room are defining competitiveness purely as productivity that needs to go down, productivity costs that need to go down. This is a race to the bottom. This is a race to the bottom undermining our workforce and the quality of our life. That's also what you're undermining: you are undermining that European way of life. And this is also why we should be more proud of Europe.

The world competitive ranking has at number one, Denmark. So apparently something is going right in Europe. And when you read the reasoning, it's because Denmark has been very at the forefront of a sustainability policy, a predictable policy that is showing the way for our industry, where we should be going. And that's exactly what we need in Europe. We are not having a problem with bureaucracy, we are having a problem with a divided, fragmented Europe and a Europe that is not clear and predictable, and that needs to be fixed.

And this is also why the Green Deal industrial plan is a good start, but we need more from the Commission to make sure where our industry can go to, not only with public funding, there we need public funding, but we also need more clarity on private funding – I'll just mention a green finance agenda that seems to be lost.

But on the last point, people, we need more a European vision on where we want to go because 27 fragmented national visions on our industry, that's killing our industry. We need a European answer, and we need that together also in a European Parliament that is united on that vision.

Marco Zanni, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo che il piano industriale verde che la Commissione europea ha presentato abbia due difetti: il primo nei presupposti e il secondo nella direzione, a mio avviso sbagliata, che prende questa iniziativa. Vado a spiegarne i motivi.

Il primo motivo riguarda l'inseguire gli Stati Uniti, e già partiamo sconfitti se questo è il presupposto. L'Unione europea non è gli Stati Uniti d'America, non abbiamo gli stessi strumenti, non abbiamo la stessa struttura, e partire cercando di imitare quello che fanno dall'altra parte dell'Atlantico vuol dire partire già sconfitti.

Il secondo punto riguarda una deriva, che io credo pericolosa, da parte della Commissione europea. Cioè mi sembra che stiamo tornando indietro a esperienze di pianificazione economica e industriale che abbiamo già visto in passato in altri sistemi e che non hanno funzionato, evidentemente. Io guardo con preoccupazione al fatto che oggi la Commissione europea presenti piani e iniziative di politica industriale che dicano alle imprese cosa fare, quando farlo, in che tempistiche farlo e come farlo. Secondo me, questo non è efficiente in un libero mercato come quello dell'Unione europea.

Il terzo punto, ancora più importante a mio avviso, è il vero nocciolo della questione. Oggi l'Unione europea, nelle sue proposte sulla transizione verde, sta abbandonando un principio che in ogni regolamentazione industriale, a mio avviso, è fondamentale: quello della neutralità tecnologica. E questo vuol dire che non stiamo più parlando di come ridurre le emissioni di anidride carbonica, ma stiamo parlando di puntare tutte le nostre *fiches* su una tecnologia che addirittura è una tecnologia che presenta certe ombre. Non siamo sicuri che sia la tecnologia migliore, e questo vuol dire ammazza gli investimenti in ricerca e in tecnologia.

L'ultimo punto – e vado a chiudere – riguarda quello che invece possiamo fare oggi. Oggi, parlando con imprese e investitori, il primo ostacolo a far fluire la liquidità privata in Unione europea anche su questo tipo di investimenti è quello del garbuglio di norme e di regolamentazioni che spesso ammazzano l'industria. Ecco, tagliare la regolamentazione inutile, renderla più semplice, credo sia un passo fondamentale che possiamo fare davvero per non portare la desertificazione industriale in Europa. Purtroppo, abbiamo visto in pandemia cosa vuol dire non avere più certe produzioni sul nostro territorio.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ten komunikat Komisji Europejskiej jest jednostronny, bardzo jednostronny. W zasadzie potrzebujemy planu, ale planu bardziej rozwiniętego, bardziej kompleksowego. Dzisiejsza gospodarka, nasza dzisiejsza baza przemysłowa jest przecież ciągle inna. Istnieje więc potrzeba realistycznej strategii dla tej gospodarki, która rzeczywiście istnieje, a nie tej, która istnieje w marzeniach Komisji za 20, 30 lat.

W mijającym roku podejmowane przez Komisję działania ze względu na wojnę odbiegały przecież znacznie od wszystkich planów na przyszłość. Ale czy Komisja, tworząc ten plan i pisząc ten komunikat, brała pod uwagę, że wojna może potrwać jeszcze lata? W końcu te Leopardy trzeba będzie wyprodukować z jakiejś stali, prawda? W związku z tym powinniśmy mieć też strategię dla przemysłu stalowego.

Trudno też nie pytać, czy przeregulowana gospodarka rzeczywiście może być innowacyjna i efektywna? A mimo deklaracji regulacje są coraz większe. Niestety muszę powiedzieć, że coraz bardziej przypomina to gospodarkę nakazowo-rozdziałczą, jak kiedyś mówiono. I nie jest to gospodarka, która służy efektywności i kreatywności, i jest rzeczywiście konkurencyjna.

Martin Schirdewan, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! Der *Inflation Reduction Act* ist ein Albtraum für alle europäischen Transatlantiker. Joe Biden setzt auf Protektionismus und *America first*, und sein IRA ist ein Angriff auf die industrielle Basis in der EU und damit die wirtschaftliche Zukunftsfähigkeit, weil er aktiv darauf setzt, industrielle Produktion über aggressives Steuerdumping aus Europa in die USA zu locken. Und alles, was den Konservativen – wie gerade in der Debatte gehört – dazu einfällt, ist, mehr Freihandel zu fordern, was in diesem Zusammenhang – *pardon my French* — wirklich großer *bullshit* ist.

Stattdessen braucht es jetzt ein radikales Umdenken in der europäischen Industriepolitik. Die überkommene Investitionsbremse – also die alten Schulden und Defizitregeln – muss endlich weg. Wir brauchen eine Reform des Beihilferechts und des Wettbewerbsrechts. Zukunftsinvestitionen und der öffentlichen Daseinsvorsorge darf nicht wieder die Luft zum Atmen abgeschnürt werden. Unsere Leute brauchen öffentliche Investitionen in gute Jobs, in eine Industrie, die zukunftsfähig und sauber ist. Unsere Leute wollen sauberen Strom und Wärme, wollen einen funktionierenden, nachhaltigen Verkehr, und unsere Leute haben ein Anrecht auf gute Bildung und Gesundheit. Kurz: Wir brauchen eine Industriepolitik für die 99 %.

Die Kommission hat nahezu panisch auf den Angriff aus den USA reagiert. Aber, Frau Kommissarin, das, was Sie hier vorlegen, ist alles nicht zu Ende gedacht. Bidens IRA ist ein massives Investitionsprogramm, dessen Finanzierung auf der Besteuerung der Multis und dem Schließen von Steuerschlupflöchern für Unternehmen basiert. Umverteilung von oben nach unten, um in eine nachhaltige Zukunft zu investieren – das ist der richtige Weg, auch für die EU.

Und zugleich müssen die Fördergelder an soziale Bedingungen wie etwa eine angemessene Entlohnung, die Anzahl von Ausbildungsplätzen, die Förderung gewerkschaftlicher Organisation geknüpft sein. Der Schutz unserer Arbeiterinnen und Arbeiter und Klimaschutz sind kein Widerspruch; sie gehen Hand in Hand.

Tiziana Beghin (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, il Movimento 5 Stelle condivide gli obiettivi del piano industriale del Green Deal, ma abbiamo perplessità circa il percorso individuato per raggiungerli. Insomma, condividiamo il fine ma non completamente il mezzo.

L'IRA statunitense mette in campo sussidi, sconti fiscali pari a 370 miliardi di dollari, e quello che ci preoccupa maggiormente è l'esclusione delle aziende europee da questi aiuti. Si tratta di una vera e propria concorrenza sleale che denunciavamo da settimane.

Siamo amici, siamo alleati degli Stati Uniti, ma proprio perché amici e alleati dobbiamo pretendere rispetto. E la politica del «fai da te» con una maggiore flessibilità sugli aiuti di Stato non basta, perché creerebbe distorsioni e danneggerebbe il mercato unico europeo.

Condividiamo invece la proposta di un fondo per la sovranità europea, ma bisogna finanziarlo con l'emissione di debito comune. Il bilancio europeo è saturo e non si possono chiedere nuovi contributi agli Stati membri. Difendere la nostra competitività non è una spesa, ma è un investimento necessario per la sopravvivenza stessa dell'Unione europea.

Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner, we are talking about boosting industrial competitiveness. This means, first, we have to foster the green and digital transition, but at the same time increase our competitiveness on the global market. We cannot only focus on building windmills. We are leaders in the chemical sector, we have a competitive manufacturing industry. All important sectors of the competitiveness must be included in an industrial strategy.

Second, we have to ensure fast permitting procedures and predictability to set up new projects while reducing the administrative burden to a minimum.

Third, we need affordable prices for energy. The reform of the electricity market will be instrumental, but equally important will be to kick-start the clean hydrogen market to include low-carbon hydrogen as a transition energy.

Lastly, we need to avoid fragmentation in the single market, and any European fund must be integrated in the MFF after a clear assessment of the costs and investment gaps.

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D). – Sinjura President, huwa importanti hafna li naċċeleraw it-Tranzizzjoni l-Hadra tal-ekonomiji taghna filwaqt li nassiguraw illi nżommu fl-Ewropa impjegji ta' kwalità.

Għalkemm hija pass fid-direzzjoni t-tajba, il-komunikazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni fuq l-istrategija industrijali, għandha bżonn ferm aktar miżuri konkreti u ferm aktar ambizzjoni. Jekk din hija r-risposta taghna għall-Att Amerikan dwar it-Tnaqqis tal-Inflazzjoni, ngħid illi qegħdin nipprovaq insolvu l-problema biss billi nwaddbu aktar flus fuq il-problema u billi nipproponu biss illi nnaqqsu l-piż tal-leġislazzjoni Ewropea. Dan mhux se jagħtina soluzzjonijiet għall-isfidi li għandna quddiemna.

Ir-rilassament tar-regoli tal-Istate Aid mingħajr monitoraġġ, mingħajr evalwazzjoni, mingħajr kundizzjonijiet, mhux ser jahdem u ser johloq aktar divergenzi u inugwaljanzi bejn il-kbir u ż-żgħir, bejn ir-regjuni u l-Istati Membri għonja u dawk l-aktar fqar.

Allura nippretendi aktar mill-Unjoni Ewropea: aktar impenn favur il-familji; aktar impenn favur l-ugwaljanza; aktar impenn favur il-gustizzja ambjentali; xogħol ta' kwalità; kundizzjonijiet tax-xogħol decenti; pagi tajba; involviment tat-trade unions; rispettu lejn il-ftehim kollettiv; inqas sensji u inqas deterjorament tal-kundizzjonijiet tal-haddiema, għandhom ikunu centrali fl-istrategija industrijali taghna.

Martina Dlabajová (Renew). – Paní předsedající, paní komisařko, jsem hrdá na evropské podniky, velké i malé. Jsem hrdá na to, jaké hodnoty v Evropě vytvářejí a co pro náš kontinent dělají. A jsem hrdá na evropský společný trh. Evropa jej krůček po krůčku, cihlu po cihle staví již 30 let a je to jeden z největších přínosů evropské integrace. Musíme ho chránit jako oko v hlavě. Svět kolem nás se mění a my potřebujeme rychlou komplexní odpověď, kde musí ladit každý detail.

Naše podniky potřebují okamžitý přístup k financím, rychlé schvalovací procesy, dovednosti, inovace, globální obchodní příležitosti, skutečné investice a zjednodušení. Vše z toho teď máme na stole. Pojďme do toho. Pomoc je žádaná, ale musí být cílená, přiměřená a dočasná. Vyvarujme se u toho kroků, které budou svádět k protekcionismu, rozdrolí pracně vytvářený vnitřní trh a přinesou jen další zátěž pro naše podniky, hlavně pro ty malé a střední.

Společný trh musí zůstat fér, musí zaručit rovné podmínky pro všechny hráče a musí být stabilní a čitelný. Vždyť koneckonců o to jde. Podnikatelé chtějí podnikat, tak je podpořme a neházejme jim klacky pod nohy.

Anna Cavazzini (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, the EU Green Deal is a success story, and so successful that other continents are following suit. Finally, the global race for climate technology and net-zero industry is on. And one way to react to this race is to attempt to solve today's problems with outdated solutions from the past, like some in this House who seriously want to pause the Green Deal and to massively deregulate. And this is like putting on the bedroom shoes of your grandfather and trying to do a 100-metre sprint. The contrary is true: we need to accelerate our green transition to be at the forefront of this race.

The future of the EU industry in our internal market is powered by renewables. It's emission-free, it's energy efficient. Clear rules for reducing, recycling and circular business models will not only protect our strategic autonomy, help mitigating the climate crisis, but also bring our companies to the forefront of this global competition.

We must use subsidies strategically and focus on key green sectors like batteries, solar panels, wind turbines, heat pumps and electrolyzers. To protect the internal market we also have to ensure European financing of net-zero industries with fresh money. And one of the biggest untapped instruments is public procurement: 14% of our GDP. If we allow procurement authorities to give preference to sustainable goods, we will create a huge market for our green industries. The source of our long-term competitiveness lies in our ability to transform: let us seize it.

Jordan Bardella (ID). – Madame la Présidente, face au soutien massif des entreprises américaines par le président Biden comme face à la Chine, vous avez enfin décidé de réagir.

La mise en place d'un plan de soutien, le pacte vert industriel européen, est une prise de conscience: une incitation du bout des lèvres à la protection de notre économie, que nous avons tant défendue, de par le temps, devant les chantages du village global. Malheureusement, trois grands oublis affaiblissent vos ambitions, trois grands oublis qui pourraient vous condamner à l'impuissance.

Le premier, c'est l'absence de tout plan de soutien massif au nucléaire, alors qu'il est – nous le savons – l'un des moyens les plus efficaces pour parvenir à l'autonomie énergétique et à la décarbonation de notre économie.

Le deuxième, c'est la réforme du marché européen de l'électricité: l'explosion des prix du gaz a des répercussions majeures sur nos entreprises. En l'absence de remise en cause profonde de ce mécanisme de fixation des prix, elles fermeront ou bien elles partiront aux États-Unis ou en Chine, là où les prix de l'énergie sont bon marché.

Enfin, vous ne nous proposez aucune mesure de protection de nos marchés publics et aucun avantage donné à la production européenne. Vous continuez à vouloir être les meilleurs élèves du libre-échange au détriment des peuples, de nos filières et de nos intérêts.

Grand plan nucléaire, réforme du marché européen de l'énergie, «Buy European Act»: voici les trois grands axes efficaces d'une politique économique ambitieuse pour renouer avec la puissance, la prospérité et la souveraineté.

Pour nos entreprises comme pour nos États, la crise de la mondialisation, la montée des périls géopolitiques et des rivalités économiques rendent nécessaire une autonomie stratégique de l'Europe, qui ne peut plus être ce marché ouvert, à tous les vents, de la mauvaise concurrence internationale déloyale ni à la prédation étrangère.

Geert Bourgeois (ECR). – Voorzitter, het antwoord op de IRA mag niet protectionistisch zijn en mag de interne markt niet ondergraven met een versoepeling van de staatssteunregels ten koste van werknemers en bedrijven in kleine lidstaten. Het antwoord mag evenmin een soevereiniteitsfonds zijn met nieuwe schulden en nieuwe belastingen.

Het antwoord moet slim zijn: snellere vergunningen voor alle investeringen, minder verstikkende regels en meer structurele hervormingen, een verschuiving in de begroting naar meer onderzoek, ontwikkeling en innovatie, en de langverwachte voltooiing van de interne markt.

Deze maatregelen kosten niets, maar zullen ons wel helpen een beter concurrentievermogen en meer welvaart tot stand te brengen.

Marc Botenga (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, je pense que, quand on parle d'industrie, il faut aller voir les travailleurs. Et les travailleurs, quand vous irez discuter avec eux, Madame la Commissaire, vous allez voir qu'ils vont vous dire que la danse du ventre, devant les multinationales, ça ne marche pas.

La danse du ventre, cela veut dire: essayer de les séduire avec des aides d'État, des avantages fiscaux, tout ce que vous voulez. Parce que, partout en Europe – on peut aller en Belgique, en France, en Italie –, il y a des entreprises qui ont reçu des aides d'État et qui ont quand même fermé ou licencié des travailleurs.

Alors, ça ne marche pas: Il faut rompre avec cette logique-là et aller vers une logique publique. Une logique publique où on donne des investissements publics à des entreprises publiques et où on retire certains secteurs du marché.

Parce que, aujourd'hui, qu'est-ce qui est un obstacle massif pour l'industrie? C'est la différence des prix de l'énergie entre les États-Unis et l'Union européenne. Alors qu'en prenant en main le secteur de l'énergie, on peut baisser les prix pour les industries et pour les citoyens et, effectivement, garantir ici, publiquement, la transition écologique, comme l'a d'ailleurs fait le Danemark grâce à une entreprise publique, Ørsted.

András Gyürk (NI). – *(a felszólalás eleje mikrofonon kívül hangzik el)* ... hetven éve nem volt olyan legyengült és kiszolgáltatott állapotban, mint most. Több százéves munkanélküliség veszélye fenyeget. Mindez az átgondolatlan brüsszeli politikának és az elhibázott szankcióknak is köszönhető.

A Bizottság új csomagja sajnos nem alkalmas ennek a helyzetnek a kezelésére. A bürokrácia növelése, a különféle büntetések és szabályozások nem segítenek, hanem ártnak. Elüldözik a legmodernebb cégeket, és megfojtják a kisvállalkozásokat. Súlyos hiba, hogy Brüsszel iparvédelmi javaslatai kizárólag a jövőorientált technológiákat célozzák, ezzel sorsukra hagyva a hagyományos iparágakban dolgozók millióit.

A Bizottságnak most a munkahelyek védelmére és a versenyképesség javítására kellene koncentrálnia. A Parlamentnek felkéne hagyni a szabadkereskedelmi megállapodások blokkolásával, végül pedig azonnal folyósítani kellene a Magyarországot és Lengyelországot megillető forrásokat, ezzel biztosítva az egyenlő esélyeket a belső piacon.

Markus Ferber (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Die Europäische Kommission glaubt, mit ihrer neuen Industriestrategie eine Antwort auf den *Inflation Reduction Act* gefunden zu haben. Wenn die Mitteilung der Europäischen Kommission tatsächlich die Antwort ist, dann muss ich schon sagen: nicht besonders kreativ.

Im Prinzip basiert die neue Strategie nur auf zwei Ideen: Zum einen verschiebt die Kommission die wesentlichen Elemente ihres Arbeitsprogramms unter neue Überschriften, das heißt, wir haben alten Wein in neuen Schläuchen – mehr nicht. Wenn Sie aber nur die Überschriften ändern, an den Inhalten aber nichts, dann ist das keine Antwort.

Und die zweite Idee der Kommission ist leider ebenfalls die altbekannte, nämlich alle Probleme mit Geldausgeben zu lösen oder zu bekämpfen, seien es neue Subventionsprogramme oder – wie es ja auch einigen vorschwebt – neue schuldenfinanzierte Sondertöpfe. Beides bringt uns nicht weiter.

Was wir wirklich brauchen, sind weniger Bürokratielasten, geringere Energiekosten, gut ausgebildete Fachkräfte. Das wäre die richtige Antwort.

Mohammed Chahim (S&D). – Madam President, there are two thoughts I would like to share today in the context of the Green Deal Industrial Plan. The first one: panic is a bad adviser. It is true that the United States presented a huge package – the Inflation Reduction Act – which will be very good for their green industry. But some say that the Inflation Reduction Act could be seen as a reaction to our European Green Deal or to our carbon border adjustment mechanism.

We should not panic. We have many instruments in place to support our industry. Instead of panic, we should use our existing instruments effectively and targeted. And make no mistake here: industrial policy is green deal policy.

Secondly, we cannot build competitiveness on subsidies: giving state aid or EU subsidies to a company that is not competitive might be a quick fix, but is no long-term solution. To make sure the EU industry is resilient and competitive, it must decarbonise as soon as possible. The race to decarbonise ...

(The speaker was interrupted)

(La seduta è sospesa alle 11.48 per motivi di sicurezza)

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

5. Възобновяване на заседанието

(The sitting resumed at 15:03)

6. Декларация на председателството

President. – As you will know, dear colleagues, this morning there was a security incident in the Hemicycle that led to the suspension of the session for a short while. The situation is as follows: individuals having entered as visitors staged a protest from the visitors' gallery and refused to leave.

There was a concern that they would cause harm to themselves as part of their protest, but I am pleased to tell you that the situation was resolved peacefully, nobody was hurt and no one was injured. All the protestors are now out of Parliament's premises.

I would like to say that I am very grateful to all the services for the quick and professional handling of the situation. Our security teams worked extremely well under difficult conditions. I would also like to very much thank our colleagues, Members of the European Parliament Giuliano Pisapia, Evin Incir, Sergey Lagodinsky and Ilhan Kyuchyuk, who joined me in helping to keep the situation calm. So thank you very much.

This Parliament stands proudly for freedom of expression and the right to protest, but any demonstration must always respect our rules and procedures, public safety and not disrupt our democratic debates. I will not give their cause the publicity that they were looking for. This is not the way to get the attention of the European Parliament. I am proud that we are an open and accessible Parliament, but we debate, we discuss and we decide peacefully, calmly and not under threat. I have asked for a full report and I will keep you informed.

7. Прояна в дневния ред

President. – After the vote, which will be chaired by our colleague, Vice-President Silva Pereira, we will resume with the debate interrupted this morning.

And regarding the remaining debates, in accordance with Rule 158(2) and with the agreement of the political groups, I would like to propose to the House to postpone the debates on the Commission statement on 'The further repression against the people of Belarus, in particular the cases of Andrzej Poczobut and Ales Bialiatski' and the Commission statement on 'Developing an EU cycling strategy' to Thursday morning. As a result, the sitting will start at 08:30.

In addition, the debates on the Commission statement on 'Cross-border adoptions – the need for more transparency and international cooperation' and the oral questions on 'Adequate minimum income ensuring active inclusion' are postponed to the March I part-session.

Are there any objections? I don't see that to be the case. Therefore, these changes are adopted.

IN THE CHAIR: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA

Vice-President

8. Възобновяване на заседанието

(The sitting resumed at 15.07.)

Katalin Cseh (Renew). – Mr President, I would like to have a point of order according to Rule 195 of the Rules of Procedure based on Annex II's Code of Appropriate Behaviour. It prohibits this disrespectful conduct in this House and, by analogy, it is also applicable to Commissioners when they address this plenary.

Yesterday, Commissioner Olivér Várhelyi addressed our Chamber then took his seat and said, I quote, 'How many idiots are left?'. He has since issued a statement saying he was misunderstood. Instead of issuing a full public apology like he should have, he, in a signature cynical move, said he was sorry we misunderstood him. Honestly, there are very, very few people who believe him. In fact, he was referring to elected representatives in this House whose job is to hold the Commission accountable.

Of course, we are not surprised that Viktor Orbán's appointee has a contempt for democratic processes, but this is not his cushy, illiberal regime, this House does not operate this way.

This was yet another example that shows that the Commissioner is unfit to do his job. So we call on the Commission President, as we already did at the last plenary, to have a very long overdue investigation into the many allegations of misconduct by Commissioner Várhelyi, particularly around his dealings in the Balkans region.

And let me remind you, the Treaties very clearly state that Commissioners shall act in the European interest and in full independence, and if misconduct is proven, they must resign.

Sándor Rónai (S&D). – Mr President, under Rule 137 of our procedures, I inform you that Commissioner Várhelyi has labelled Members of the European Parliament ‘idiots’. After answering a question from a Member, when he took his seat, you can clearly hear him saying, ‘How many other idiots are still left?’ This is an unprecedented and brutal insult to the Parliament representing 450 million European citizens. It is particularly unacceptable for the integrity of the Parliament to be violated by a high-ranking leader of another EU institution, the European Commission. It’s no surprise that Várhelyi was nominated by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán. They both despise the Parliament and democracy. Now it’s up to us to decide whether Orbán is and will be allowed into this Chamber. We call on the President to take strong action to have Commissioner Várhelyi removed, especially because his fake apology turned the blame back onto our Parliament.

President. – The issues raised in these points of order are indeed serious. The President is aware of this episode, and she asked me to inform you that she is looking into it and she will take action.

9. Време за гласуване

President. – We will now move on to the votes.

(For the results and other details of the vote: see Minutes)

9.1. Изменение на Регламента относно европейските фондове за дългосрочни инвестиции (A9-0196/2022 - Michiel Hoogeveen) (гласуване)

9.2. Споразумение между ЕС и Северна Македония: оперативни дейности, провеждани от Европейската агенция за гранична и брегова охрана в Северна Македония (A9-0027/2023 - Lena Düpont) (гласуване)

9.3. Упълномощаване на Полша да ратифицира изменението на Конвенцията за опазване и управление на запасите от сайда в централната част на Берингово море (A9-0007/2023 - Elżbieta Rafalska) (гласуване)

— *Antes da votação:*

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, non, je n’ai pas de rappel au règlement, j’ai un souci mécanique avec ma carte, qui ne fonctionne pas.

9.4. Протокол към Споразумението за сътрудничество относно Гражданска глобална навигационна спътникова система (ГНСС) между ЕО и Корея: присъединяване на България, Хърватия и Румъния (A9-0006/2023 - Cristian-Silviu Buşoi) (гласуване)

9.5. Съвместни предприятия в рамките на програмата „Хоризонт Европа“: Съвместно предприятие „Интегрални схеми“ (A9-0012/2023 - Eva Maydell) (гласуване)

9.6. Консултация относно разпоредбите за прилагане на европейския омбудсман (A9-0010/2023 - Paulo Rangel) (гласуване)

9.7. Положението на бившия президент на Грузия Михаил Саакашвили (RC-B9-0106/2023, B9-0106/2023, B9-0109/2023, B9-0112/2023, B9-0114/2023, B9-0117/2023) (гласуване)

9.8. Присъединяването на ЕС към Конвенцията на Съвета на Европа за превенция и борба с насилието над жени и домашното насилие (A9-0021/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari) (гласуване)

9.9. Приоритетите на ЕС за 67-ата сесия на Комисията на ООН за положението на жените (B9-0100/2023, B9-0103/2023) (гласуване)

Presidente. – O período de votação está encerrado.

(A sessão é suspensa por alguns instantes.)

IN THE CHAIR: MARC ANGEL

Vice-President

10. Възобновяване на заседанието

(The sitting resumed at 15:27)

11. Индустиален план на Зеления пакт за епоха с нулеви нетни емисии (продължение на разискването)

President. – We now resume our debate on the Council and Commission statements on ‘A Green Deal Industrial Plan for the Net-Zero Age’ (2023/2559(RSP)).

I would also like to inform you, dear colleagues, that we will finish the list of registered speakers and, due to the time constraints, we will not have a catch-the-eye on this debate.

Mohammed Chahim (S&D). – Mr President, there are two thoughts I would like to share today in the context of the Green Deal Industrial Plan. The first one: panic is a bad adviser. It is true that the United States presented a huge package – the Inflation Reduction Act – which will be very good for their green industry. But some could say that the Inflation Reduction Act is a reaction to our European Green Deal or to our carbon border adjustment mechanism.

So we should not panic. We have many instruments in place to support our industry. Instead of panic, we should use our existing instruments effectively and targeted. And make no mistake here: industrial policy is green deal policy.

Secondly, we cannot build competitiveness on subsidies: giving state aid or EU subsidies to a company that is not competitive might be a quick fix, but is no long-term solution. To make sure the EU industry is resilient and competitive, it must decarbonise as soon as possible. The race to decarbonisation will determine the competitiveness of our industry.

So, Madam Commissioner, no panic. We are on the right track. But let us seize the moment and accelerate – for our industry, for our competitiveness.

Samira Rafaela (Renew). – Voorzitter, de transitie moet duidelijk groen en bovenal eerlijk verlopen. Het is belangrijk dat Europese burgers het thuis warm blijven hebben.

Helaas kunnen veel burgers hun energierekening nauwelijks betalen of slapen zij in de kou. De transitie moet eerlijk en inclusief verlopen. Hierbij is voor de industriële sector een zeer belangrijke rol weggelegd.

Wij moeten de industriële sector helpen de transitie duurzaam en innovatief aan te pakken. Wij beschikken reeds over de kennis en middelen die daarvoor nodig zijn. De industrie moet niet omvallen, maar meeveranderen.

Wij moeten ervoor zorgen dat de 96,5 miljoen Europeanen in de EU niet het risico lopen om toch in armoede te vervallen, bijvoorbeeld vanwege hoge energierekeningen. Hiervoor kunnen we onze handelsovereenkomsten goed benutten.

Laten we er door middel van handelsovereenkomsten voor zorgen dat onze partnerlanden aan onze normen voldoen en dat handelsovereenkomsten hoofdstukken betreffende duurzame ontwikkeling bevatten, zodat de hele wereld meegaat met deze cruciale transitie en uiteindelijk klimaatneutraal wordt.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, il y a une absence dans ce débat, et pourtant c'est une évidence: c'est la question de la préférence géographique sur nos marchés publics.

Nous faisons un texte pour réagir, notamment, au «Buy American Act» et nous ne parlons pas du «Buy European Act». Nous promettons des entreprises et des emplois sur le sol européen, mais nous ne nous donnons pas les moyens de privilégier les entreprises européennes sur nos secteurs stratégiques du numérique, des médicaments, évidemment de l'agriculture et particulièrement des énergies renouvelables. C'est un enjeu de souveraineté, c'est un enjeu de concurrence loyale.

J'entends même des personnes, à la Commission ou dans cet hémicycle, nous dire: «Mais nous allons entrer dans une guerre commerciale!». Mais depuis quand entre-t-on dans une guerre commerciale quand on utilise un instrument que tous les autres utilisent? Que tous les autres utilisent!

Il nous faut donc – et je l'espère, chers collègues, car nous l'avons déposé – un amendement pour inscrire un travail sur le «Buy European Act». On en a besoin pour la transition énergétique. On a besoin de démontrer aux citoyens européens que nous voulons des entreprises et des emplois en Europe pour faire cette grande transformation de l'économie.

Georg Mayer (ID). – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kollegen! Seit Jahren werden die Rahmenbedingungen dieser Europäischen Union für die Industrie verschlechtert und vorsätzlich schlechter gemacht. Das ist auch der Grund, warum natürlich die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Industrie am internationalen Markt schwächer wird.

Die Industrie hat ja nicht nur am Binnenmarkt zu bestehen, sondern die Industrie muss ja am internationalen Weltmarkt bestehen, und dafür müssen wir sie kräftigen. Es ist jetzt natürlich nur ein logischer Schluss, die USA hier zu kopieren und zu sagen: Wir stärken unsere Industrie, öffnen eine Neuverschuldung – das wollen wir auf keinen Fall; es gibt genügend Töpfe, wo noch – etwa im Corona-Topf – 200 Milliarden EUR liegen – und unterstützen unsere Industrie. Da sind wir auch dafür. Wir sind allerdings gegen eine Neuverschuldung. Das gilt es zu bewahren.

Und es zeigt sich wieder einmal, dass dieser *Green Deal* immer mehr zu einem *Green Disaster* für die Industrie in Europa wird. Wir sind dafür, dass man heimische Unternehmen, starke heimische Unternehmen, die sich am Weltmarkt bewähren, unterstützt, auch finanziell unterstützt. In meiner Heimat – in Österreich, in der Steiermark – etwa gibt es große Autoindustriezulieferer, die effizienteste Dieselmotoren produzieren, und die gilt es am Weltmarkt zu unterstützen.

Nicolas Bay (NI). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, pendant des années, nous avons laissé le monde entier bénéficier de nos subventions au nom de la lutte contre le réchauffement climatique. Des entreprises étrangères se sont enrichies avec notre argent.

Aujourd'hui, les États-Unis soutiennent leur industrie automobile électrique, subventionnent exclusivement des entreprises américaines et écartent donc les nôtres. C'est un acte de guerre commerciale.

Et vous découvrez, avec une candeur stupéfiante, que tous les pays du monde défendent d'abord leurs intérêts! La Chine subventionne massivement son économie – et triche, d'ailleurs, depuis des décennies. Les États-Unis se protègent, n'ont aucun complexe, et – il faut bien le dire – ils ont totalement raison.

Alors, arrêtons donc de quémander quelques gestes supplémentaires à Joe Biden. Nous devons répondre et cesser enfin d'être les meilleurs élèves du libre-échange mondialisé.

Faciliter les aides d'État en subventionnant notre économie, c'est un premier pas, mais il faut aller évidemment beaucoup plus loin: mettons en place, chaque fois que c'est possible, une vraie préférence locale, nationale et européenne dans les commandes publiques. Favorisons les allègements fiscaux pour améliorer notre compétitivité. Arrêtons, enfin, de signer des accords de libre-échange avec le monde entier. Cela a tué hier notre industrie, cela tuera demain notre agriculture.

Il est temps que l'Union européenne nous protège au lieu d'organiser notre impuissance collective.

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Pane předsedající, vršíme chybu za chybou. Čtyři roky po *Green Deal* přichází Komise s industriálním plánem. Měli jste přijít před čtyřmi lety, ruku v ruce s tím. Takhle je to s průmyslem tady.

Za druhé. Připravili jsme CBAM, aniž bychom to konzultovali s Amerikou a teď se divíme, že máme na stole IRU. Místo abychom to sladili předem dohromady. A co teď navrhujeme? Udotovat se k smrti? Na to nemáme. Zadlužit se k smrti? Na to nemáme. Nebo obchodní válku se Spojenými státy? Což teda znamená dekaplit s naším hlavním partnerem v době, kdy ho potřebujeme tváří v tvář čínské a ruské agresi. Anebo co? Hlavy dohromady, věci provázat dopředu a ne to látat takhle se zpožděním, kdy hrozí buď válka, nebo bída anebo oboje.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, depuis le début de ce débat, j'ai entendu certains collègues des Verts ou de Renew ironiser sur notre inquiétude pour l'avenir de nos entreprises, de nos industries, de nos agriculteurs. Eh bien oui, chers collègues, nous sommes inquiets, parce que bien des textes votés ici vont fragiliser notre économie sans aucunement sauver le climat.

L'Union européenne veut atteindre zéro émission en 2050. Il y a une manière très simple d'y parvenir: zéro production, zéro création, zéro énergie, zéro prospérité, zéro travail, zéro alimentation, zéro souveraineté aussi, zéro liberté, zéro vie. Et c'est ce scénario qui prévaut souvent, ici: un maximum de normes et un minimum de stratégie. Devrons-nous importer demain tout ce dont nous avons besoin?

Alors nous n'aurons pas sauvé la planète, mais nous aurons offert notre marché aux modes de production qui la détruisent. Il y a autant de projets d'ouvertures de centrales au charbon en Chine que de fermetures programmées dans tout le reste du monde. Voilà le modèle dont nous rendent dépendants ceux qui ont voté, hier, pour électrifier, par exemple, toutes les voitures en Europe. Les mêmes, d'ailleurs, qui votent toujours contre l'énergie nucléaire, et qui nous font acheter du gaz en nous vendant des éoliennes.

Il est temps, chers collègues, de sortir de l'hypocrisie: moins de normes, plus de stratégie. C'est ce qu'il faut pour le climat et pour l'Europe aujourd'hui.

President. – So far I would like to thank colleagues for respecting the speaking time. This makes it very easy for me during my first chairing not to use the hammer. Thank you very much, and I hope it will continue like this!

Stéphanie Yon-Courtin (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, enfin, mis au pied du mur par nos partenaires commerciaux, nous mobilisons les moyens nécessaires pour renforcer la compétitivité de notre industrie!

Alors, d'abord, répondons de toute urgence à la situation, avec les aides d'État, pour faciliter les investissements et les projets industriels pour la décarbonation en Europe.

Ensuite, donnons-nous des moyens pérennes pour investir, durablement et ensemble, dans des priorités stratégiques pour l'Europe.

Aujourd'hui, l'urgence est à la transition verte, mais le numérique, la défense, la santé, l'agroalimentaire sont autant de défis qui nous attendent.

Alors, utilisons et simplifions tous les outils existants pour renforcer et protéger nos entreprises et nos ménages, en particulier.

Activons notre nouvel instrument de lutte contre les subventions étrangères pour mettre fin à la concurrence déloyale sur notre marché intérieur.

Repensons la commande publique pour assurer notre souveraineté européenne, et – nerf de la guerre – assurons un marché de capitaux pour inciter les épargnants, *nos* épargnants, à investir dans l'économie réelle et dans nos industries européennes, qui font les emplois d'aujourd'hui et de demain.

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Herr talman! Kommissionär, minister, kolleger! USA inför nu massiva subventioner riktade till amerikansk industri. Detta blyxtbelyser också problemen vi har med EU:s konkurrenskraft. Men i sin iver att framstå handlingskraftig verkar EU-kommissionen ha glömt bort, vad som en gång gjorde Europa till en attraktiv kontinent för företagande och handel. Det är inte tullar och handelshinder, det är inte nya fonder eller mer bidrag som har byggt Europa starkt.

Det som krävs nu är en riktig agenda för EU:s konkurrenskraft, att bygga den långsiktigt stark. Det kräver mer frihandel, ökade investeringar i forskning och mindre byråkrati. Vi behöver utveckla den inre marknaden och inte avveckla den. Ytterst skapas tillväxt inte av politiker utan av framgångsrika människor och företag. Ge dem förutsättningar att verka, handla och konkurrera. Så kan vi bygga Europa starkt igen.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Mr President, I think we can say it has been years since we were able to look at the United States for inspiration. But Biden did it. His plans guarantee good paying union jobs. And we as the EU should not lower the bar. It would be a missed opportunity if we didn't invest in quality jobs now. And therefore, I must say, I was a little bit disappointed that the Commission didn't take the lead on this, because in the Directive on adequate minimum wages in the EU, we aimed for a collective bargaining coverage rate of 80%. And I should say any spending of public money should go only to companies that are covered by collective bargaining. We should put our money whether the law is.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Conselho, Caras e Caros Colegas, a competitividade, a produtividade, o empreendedorismo são palavras-chave importantíssimas e não são incompatíveis com o *Green Deal*, com o Pacto Ecológico.

A União Europeia precisa de ter, à escala global, uma força que nem sempre consegue ter por divisões internas, que nem sempre consegue ter por falta de projetos comuns, como, por exemplo, a união da energia, ou de soluções que evitem a distorção do mercado interno, como está a acontecer com as ajudas de mercado ou ainda com a não utilização de instrumentos como o InvestEU, que são essenciais, por exemplo, para a capitalização das empresas, e que são essenciais para investimentos críticos que o Conselho eliminou.

Tenho visto críticas à Comissão, mas muita da burocracia está no Conselho. É o Conselho que tem bloqueado a união da energia, foi o Conselho que cortou o InvestEU, foi o Conselho que evitou um instrumento para a solvabilidade das empresas e que eliminou a janela dos investimentos estratégicos.

Portanto, não nos esqueçamos que a Comissão, com alguns erros, tem feito um trabalho positivo, e eu tenho visto é o Conselho a bloquear esse mesmo trabalho.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, ciertamente la economía europea necesita más inversión privada, pero también más inversión pública para afrontar los retos del futuro industrial en el marco, por supuesto, de la transición energética.

Pero permítanme centrar mi intervención —estos pocos segundos que puedo hablar con ustedes directamente— en que no podemos pretender responder a las iniciativas de Estados Unidos dejando exclusivamente la capacidad financiera de apoyo público a los Estados. Porque, ciertamente, en ese caso, por intentar responder a Estados Unidos, podemos poner en cuestión la integridad y la cohesión del mercado único, uno de los grandes activos de la Unión Europea.

En este sentido, me atrevo también a sugerir a la Comisión Europea que no relajemos el control de las ayudas de Estado que realizamos sobre los Estados miembros hasta que no tengamos claro cómo es, cómo se financia y qué cantidad tendremos en el fondo soberano. Porque solo a través de un apoyo comunitario esa respuesta y esa política industrial tendrían sentido.

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you and good luck in office, but you will need the hammer on some occasions. Look, this debate was interrupted to this morning and I think many of us were perhaps not in the chamber, but very important points were made by colleagues both before and after the debate. And while there was urgency around what we do to build our industrial capacity, I think there is also a danger that we ignore the strengths we have as a European Union, and we need to play to those strengths. The proposals from the Commission are fit for purpose and I think, as I've said, there are four pillars to this, including skills, including around regulation, which will help our sectors become more competitive.

There were some comments made about a subsidies race. This is not how we see this. This is Europe being very future focused and perhaps less naive about how the world is today. And that is why there is an urgency to the work. To my good friend and colleague, Bas Eickhout, who suggested that the green finance agenda is lost somewhere, it's not. It's very much with me and we will continue to work on the green finance agenda and roll out the reporting that is required, notwithstanding the challenges this faces our companies with. So in other words, we're not doing a U-turn here. We are going forward with our long term strategy for a more sustainable European economy and society.

However, we need every so often to take a step back and look at are there areas that need to be addressed. And this is exactly what we are doing with this plan, this Green Deal industrial plan. I very much valued the contributions. I opened my remarks by saying that this is a decisive decade. And the truth is, it's a very divisive decade. It is a time of huge uncertainty for everyone, including people in this House and the people you represent. And I think that despite the differences I've heard in the debate, we all want the same thing. We all want a strong, resilient Europe that is showing leadership not just in green finance, but in environmental issues generally. But we want to have a balanced economy. And that is why when we come to discuss the European Green Deal industrial plan, I think we will see that we have more in common than might divide us.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you very much for this fruitful discussion. The European Parliament is clearly engaged in this common endeavour to make the European economy stronger and competitive, and building on our commitment with the green transition and clean tech industries.

In the debate, a couple of hours ago, I heard different views on the Commission's communication, which showed the importance and the complexity of the challenges we have to face.

We must absolutely avoid the fragmentation of the single market, one of the EU's greatest achievements. We should strengthen this competitiveness, also globally — our companies must be frontrunners. Let me also stress that there is no conflict between the green transition on the one side and increased competitiveness and productivity on the other. It is all decisive for our future prosperity.

I agree also with those who raised the need to improve the skills of our workforce. 2023 is the European Year of Skills. Let's make the most of it.

At the same time, let me emphasise that we don't just need public but also private investments. Any changes to state aid rules have to be targeted and temporary, while we can do more to unlock private investments, especially by finalizing the capital market union as Commissioner McGuinness mentioned in her first intervention also a couple of hours ago.

To conclude, the Council is examining the details in the various dimensions of the plan and we await the Commission's strategy to boost competitiveness and productivity at the EU level ahead of the March European Council.

Honourable Members, some of the initiative of the green industrial plan will likely involve a negotiation between the Council and Parliament. I am therefore sure that we will have discussion on this debate in the months to come. With that, I would like to thank you for your attention.

President. – That concludes the debate.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Sara Cerdas (S&D), por escrito. – O Plano Industrial do Pacto Ecológico, apresentado pela Comissão Europeia, tem como objetivo atingir uma rápida transição para a neutralidade climática da indústria. Este plano propõe-se a cumprir os objetivos climáticos da UE, nomeadamente a neutralidade climática até 2050, incentivando a capacidade de produção europeia para as tecnologias e produtos com zero emissões líquidas.

A agenda ambiciosa assenta em quatro pilares: um quadro regulamentar previsível e simplificado, a aceleração do acesso ao financiamento, a melhoria das competências e um comércio aberto para permitir cadeias de abastecimento resilientes.

Todas as revoluções industriais trouxeram importantes transformações sociais, com proteção para os trabalhadores e ajuda na adaptação dos setores tradicionais às novas realidades, sem deixar ninguém para trás.

O tecido empresarial, em especial o português, é constituído maioritariamente por micro, pequenas e médias empresas. Consequência disso, a aplicação do pacto deve ser feita dando especial atenção às fragilidades do tecido empresarial e à forma como estes se vão adaptar aos efeitos, sem esquecer as regiões ultraperiféricas, cujas realidades impõem desafios acrescidos e requerem uma acrescida atenção por parte das instituições.

O futuro é verde e social, não podemos deixar escapar esta oportunidade de alinhar todos os setores com uma nova Era de Impacto Zero.

Beatrice Covassi (S&D), per iscritto. – Il piano industriale che stiamo discutendo è fondamentale per il futuro dell'Europa. È evidente che solo uniti potremo trovare risposte convincenti per la sostenibilità e competitività della nostra industria in un mercato globale sempre più aggressivo.

È importante, però, che lo facciamo nel modo giusto. In primo luogo, non dobbiamo lasciare indietro nessuno e non possiamo creare nuove disuguaglianze. Nel mio paese la povertà assoluta è aumentata e tocca oggi quasi sei milioni di cittadini. Una famiglia su tre ha paura delle bollette. In secondo luogo, le risorse economiche sono cruciali. Abbiamo bisogno di un fondo sovrano comune per sostenere la transizione verde e, al di là della discussione sugli aiuti di Stato, occorre completare la riforma del Patto di crescita e stabilità. Ridiamo speranza alla nostra industria e ai nostri cittadini!

Josianne Cutajar (S&D), in writing. – Europe's Green Deal does not exist in a void; it must exist in synergy with our companies, our citizens, our means of reaching set goals. Whilst environmental ambition is key, we cannot keep on setting targets without offering adequate assistance and instruments, be they temporary or permanent, so as to help ensure a new greener reality for Europe. The scaling-up of the production of clean technologies, bridging the gap between supply and demand, investments in the approval and commercialisation of batteries, solar panels and heat pumps, are all essential components of Europe's future competitiveness. These objectives are, however, dependent on the legitimacy of our action, on visible and effective results, on actually improving the daily life for all Europeans. We cannot only respond to our global competitors, we must design our own holistic approach, whilst taking into account that Europe is diverse and has different regions with multiple and distinct needs and opportunities. Fast redeployment of critical industries for the green transition in Europe should also be a matter of equality, inclusion and ensuring a level playing field for all.

Enikő Győri (NI), írásban. – Óva intem Önöket az önámítástól. A határozattervezet szerint az Unió a kutatás-fejlesztés és innováció fellelvára. A valóság ezzel szemben az, hogy a vállalati és technológiai szakadék 20 éve nő Amerikához és Kínához képest. A világ száz legnagyobb vállalata közt 2010-ben 31 európai szerepelt, míg tavaly csak 14. Nálunk az energiaárak az eget verik, Amerika pedig paradicsomi feltételekkel csalogatja magához a befektetőket. Ha a nagyvállalataink áttelepülnek a tengeren túlra, az európai kkv-knak nem lesz kinek beszállítaniuk.

A Bizottság javaslata túl későn érkezett, és nem kínál hatékony megoldást. A tagállamok közötti támogatási verseny torzítaná a belső piacot, ami már eddig is a nagyoknak kedvezett. A Bizottság szuverenitási alapot emleget, gondolom, újra csak hitelből, ahelyett, hogy gyorsan engedélyezné a tagállami projekteket, és kifizetné az őket megillető pénzeket. Sajnos a helyreállítási források 28%-a ért csak célba eddig. A baloldal továbbá ideológiai alapon akar kereskedni. Ez a legjobb út ahhoz, hogy cégeinket elvágjuk a piacoktól és a nyersanyagoktól. Új piacra jutási lehetőségek nélkül pedig európai munkahelyek ezrei kerülnek veszélybe. Térjünk vissza a józan észhez. Szabad kereskedelem és versenyképesség-növelés révén lehet csak újra feltenni Európát a térképre.

Romana Jerković (S&D), *napisan.* – Neosporna je činjenica da živimo u vrlo teškim vremenima pandemije, inflacije i rata. Industrijskim planom u okviru europskog zelenog plana postupno gradimo snažniju Europu i uravnoteženo gospodarstvo.

Međutim, zanemaruju se prava najranjivije skupine, koja istovremeno predstavlja jedan od temelja naše industrije, a to je radnička klasa. Trebamo je poštovati kako bismo i dalje mogli ostvarivati prosperitet. Svaka tvrtka koja dobije financij-sku potporu trebala bi osigurati pristojne plaće i sindikalna prava radnika. Obrazovanje radničke klase trebao bi biti jedan od naših prioriteta jer upravo to omogućuje stvaranje kvalificirane radne snage.

Budući da imamo puno instrumenata i mjesta za podržavanje industrije, trebali bismo koristiti postojeće mehanizme učinkovito i ciljano kako bismo potakli njezin daljnji razvoj. Graditi konkurentnost na subvencijama može biti kratko-ročno, ali ne i dugoročno rješenje. Stoga, trebamo ubrzati zelenu tranziciju radi dobrobiti naše industrije i konkurentno-sti.

Osim toga, Europa treba više privatnog i javnog ulaganja. Ne možemo ne odgovoriti na protekcionističku politiku SAD-a te ne možemo ostaviti naša poduzeća na cjedilu. Konačno, ne smijemo dopustiti fragmentaciju jedinstvenog europskog tržišta, koje je, zahvaljujući svojoj uspješnosti, uzor brojnim drugim državama.

Krzysztof Jurgiel (ECR), *na pismu.* – Plan Przemysłowy Zielonego Ładu jest nie tylko unijną odpowiedzią na doko-nujące się głębokie zmiany w sektorze energetycznym, wynikające z działań ograniczających emisyjność dwutlenku węgla oraz będące konsekwencją wojny w Ukrainie i przyspieszonego odejścia od energii z Rosji, ale bierze również pod uwagę istnienie innych krajowych inicjatyw w obszarze związanym ze zmianami klimatycznymi oraz wspieraniem energetyki, jak np., amerykański Inflation Reduction Act, o wartości 330 mld euro, czy japoński plan zielonej trans-formacji o wartości ok. 140 mld euro. Komunikat Komisji zawiera elementy, które uważam za niezbędne do zapewnienia większego bezpieczeństwa Unii Europejskiej. Porusza on m.in. potrzebę wzmocnienia łańcuchów dostaw, a także konieczność dywersyfikacji źródeł zaopatrzenia w surowce krytyczne, mające kluczowe znaczenie w sektorze półprze-wodników. Z drugiej strony, aby w obecnej wojennej rzeczywistości osiągnąć cele w zaplanowanych obszarach, wspo-maga się unijne gospodarki w formie pomocy publicznej. W związku z tym, że dotychczas notyfikowana przez Niemcy i Francję pomoc publiczna, którą zatwierdziła Unia Europejska (na podstawie Tymczasowych Ram Kryzysowych) wynosi 77% całej zaakceptowanej przez Komisję pomocy, apeluję aby działać w tym obszarze w sposób bardziej zrównowa-żony, tak by zapewnić równe warunki działania wszystkim państwom członkowskim, a koncentracja pomocy dla dwóch państw nie pogłębiała istniejących dysproporcji w stosunku do reszty państw.

Edina Tóth (NI), *írásban.* – A bürokrácia növelése, a különféle büntetések és szabályozások nem segítenek, hanem ártnak. Elüldözik a legmodernebb cégeket és megfojtják a kisvállalkozásokat. Elfogadhatatlan, hogy a Bizottság javaslatai gyakorlatilag sorsukra hagynák a hagyományos iparágakban dolgozó európaiak millióit.

A Bizottságnak ideológiai kinyilatkoztatások helyett most a munkahelyek védelmére és a versenyképesség javítására kellene törekednie. A Parlamentnek pedig fel kéne hagynia a szabadkereskedelmi megállapodások blokkolásával. Míg Európában az energiaárak az egeket verik, addig Amerika paradicsomi feltételekkel csalogatja magához a befektetőket. Ha a nagyvállalataink áttelepülnek a tengerentúlra, az európai kvv-eknek nem lesz kinek beszállítaniuk. Az európai válasz pedig sajnos túl későn érkezett, és nem kínál hatékony megoldást.

A Bizottságnak gyorsan engedélyezni kellene a tagállami projekteket, és kifizetni az őket megillető pénzeket. Sajnos a helyreállítási források 28%-a ért csak célba eddig. Szabad kereskedelem és versenyképesség-növelés révén lehet csak újra feltenni Európát a térképre.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), *kirjallinen.* – On selvää, että EU:n kilpailukyvyyn parantamiseksi tarvitaan kiireesti toimia. Eurooppaan pitää voida uskaltaa investoida ja teollisuutemme on uudistuttava. Yhdysvaltojen Inflation Reduction Act -lakipakettiin on reagoitava, mutta emme saa samalla sortua protektionismiin.

EU-komission 1. helmikuuta vastatoimena Yhdysvaltojen pakettiin esittämä uusi vihreän kehityksen teollisuussuunnitelma sisältää joitakin askelia oikeaan suuntaan, mutta kokonaisuus jättää paljon toivomisen varaa. On hyvä, että suunnitelman tavoitteisiin sisältyy sääntelyn yksinkertaistamista. Suunnitelmassa aivan oikein noteerataan, että hitaat lupapro-sessit ovat usein pullonkaulana investoinneille. Yksi konkreettinen hyvä ehdotus on Euroopan yhteistä etua koskevien tärkeiden IPCEI-hankkeiden lupaprosessien sujuvoittaminen. Samoin pidän tärkeänä, että suunnitelma noudattaa reilun kilpailun ja avoimen kaupan periaatteita. Euroopan on jatkettava vapaakaupan puolustajana, sillä ainoastaan laajojen kumppanuussuhteiden ja vapaakauppasopimusten avulla pärjäämme globaalissa kilpailussa. Samoin tärkeää on nostaa

kriittiset raaka-aineet teollisuuspolitiikan keskiöön, ilman niitä emme pärjää kilpailussa emmekä voi toteuttaa vihreää ja digitaalista siirtymää.

Valitettavasti paketti ei kuitenkaan konkreettisesti onnistu edistämään tavoitettaan vauhdittaa investointeja, sillä mukana on liikaa markkinointia vääristäviä toimia. Suhtaudun kriittisesti valtiontukisääntöjen löysäämistä koskevaan esitykseen, sillä se rikkoo sisämarkkinain ja hyödyttää lähinnä isojen jäsenmaiden isoja teollisuusaloja, ei unionia kokonaisuudessaan. Erityisen huolestuttava on pakotin kylväminen kaavailtu uusi suvereniteettirahasto. Sille ei ole perusteita, etenkin kun korona- ja elämykspaketista on yhä paljon varoja hyödyntämättä.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – O Plano industrial do Pacto Ecológico para a Era do Impacto Zero configura um conjunto de medidas urgentes, que têm de inovar no conteúdo e no método para estarem à altura do desafio. Sendo um pacote para assegurar a autonomia estratégica na União Europeia e evitar o protecionismo individual, só será bem-sucedido se mobilizar de forma colaborativa todos os Estados-Membros sem pôr em causa as dinâmicas internas de convergência e de coesão. Tem de assumir o foco em agendas e opções para a liderança industrial da transição energética e da transição digital associada, que tirem partido das redes de conhecimento e das redes de capacidade produtiva no espaço da União.

Para isso, além da flexibilidade na afetação dos recursos financeiros disponíveis, é necessário injetar dinheiro fresco com uma lógica integradora e agregadora. Esse deve ser o papel chave do fundo de soberania, que deve, dentro do possível, ser financiado a partir de recursos próprios da União. Além de incrementar e mobilizar, nos múltiplos patamares, o conhecimento, a capacidade produtiva e o financiamento, o Plano tem de integrar também respostas sociais e benefícios para as pessoas, demonstrando a capacidade de a União Europeia trabalhar em conjunto para melhorar a vida quotidiana dos seus cidadãos.

12. **Одобряване на протокола от предишното заседание**

President. – The minutes of yesterday's sitting and the texts adopted are available. Are there any comments?

I see no comments in the room so the minutes are approved.

13. Подкопаване на принципите на правовата държава в Гърция: скандалът с подслушването и свободата на медиите (разискване по актуални въпроси)

President. – The next item is the topical debate under Rule 162 on ‘The erosion of the rule of law in Greece: the wiretapping scandal and media freedom’.

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

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης, Συντάκτης. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η δημοκρατία δεν μπορεί να υπάρξει χωρίς ένα ισχυρό και αξιόπιστο για τον πολίτη κράτος δικαίου, που εγγυάται την προστασία των δικαιωμάτων του απέναντι στην κρατική αυθαιρεσία. Τα τελευταία χρόνια οι θεσμοί έχουν υποστεί σοβαρά πλήγματα. Όμως η απάντηση σε αυτή τη διολίσθηση δεν μπορεί να είναι οι συμψηφισμοί μεταξύ αυτής και της προηγούμενης κυβέρνησης. Ο ελληνικός λαός αξίζει πολύ περισσότερα από έναν συνεχιζόμενο κατήφορο. Βρίσκομαι εδώ όχι μόνο ως συνάδελφος και θύμα μιας κατάφωρης παραβίασης των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, αλλά και ως πρόεδρος μιας παράταξης που δημιουργήσε στην Ελλάδα τις ανεξάρτητες αρχές και διαχρονικά αγωνίστηκε για τη δημοκρατία, τη διαφάνεια και την κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη. Τι, όμως, μάθαμε στους έξι τελευταίους μήνες, από τη στιγμή που οι υπηρεσίες του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου αποκάλυψαν την απόπειρα παγίδευσης του κινητού με το Predator; Ένας στενός πυρήνας στο Μέγαρο Μαξίμου με πρωταγωνιστή τον ανιψιό του πρωθυπουργού, εργαλαιοποιώντας την ΕΥΠ, παρακολουθούσε με το αιτιολογικό του δήθεν εθνικού κινδύνου, πέρα από εμένα, δημοσιογράφους, ευρωβουλευτές, ακόμη και εν ενεργεία υπουργό, αλλά και ηγετικά στελέχη των ενόπλων δυνάμεων. Μετά την αποκάλυψη, δημόσια έλεγαν ότι επιδιώκουν να έρθουν όλα στο φως, αλλά το μόνο που είδαμε ήταν σκοτάδι και προσπάθεια ενοχοποίησης των θυμάτων. Υπονόμευσαν το έργο της εξεταστικής επιτροπής στην ελληνική Βουλή, αποκλείοντας την κλήση κρίσιμων μαρτύρων και επιστρατεύοντας το απόρρητο. Δύο φορές άλλαξε τη νομοθεσία ο κύριος Μητσοτάκης για να αποτρέψει τη νόμιμη ενημέρωση των στόχων. Κυβερνητικά στελέχη προχώρησαν ακόμη και στην αποτροπή μιας δολοφονία χαρακτηριστικά του προέδρου της αρμόδιας ανεξάρτητης αρχής, κυρίου Χρήστου Ράμμου, επειδή συνέχισε τις έρευνες. Βέβαια, πριν από κάποια χρόνια, όταν σαν δικαστής ο ίδιος υπερασπιζόταν την ελευθερία του Τύπου από τις αυθαιρεσίες της προηγούμενης κυβέρνησης, τότε ήταν καλός για τη Νέα Δημοκρατία και κακός για τον ΣΥΡΙΖΑ. Αλλά, όταν πορεύεσαι χωρίς αρχές και αξίες, γρήγορα αποδεικνύεται ότι δεν θες να αντιμετωπίσεις το

τέρας, αλλά να το μιμηθείς. Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, δυστυχώς στις μέρες μας ο Τύπος αντί να ελέγχει, υποτάσσεται όλο και περισσότερο στην εκάστοτε εξουσία. Ακόμη και το αίτημα που έχω από το φθινόπωρο ανακοινώσει και καταθέσει μαζί με έγκριτους συνταγματολόγους, ώστε να διαπιστωθεί αν η ελληνική κυβέρνηση, όταν με παρακολουθούσε το 2021, παραβίαζε τους εθνικούς και ευρωπαϊκούς κανόνες για την ασυλία μου, σήμερα γίνεται αντικείμενο συκοφαντίας. Παρουσιάζεται από διαπλεκόμενα μέσα μαζικής ενημέρωσης ως μια προσπάδιά μου να προστατευτώ από ένα δήθεν σκάνδαλο που εμπλέκονται τρίτες χώρες. Όσο και να προσπαθούν, με σενάρια επιστημονικής φαντασίας που θυμίζουν QAnon και Trump, να λυγίσουν την αποφασιστικότητά μου, να είστε σίγουροι ότι δεν θα καταφέρουν τίποτα. Από την αρχή αυτής της υπόθεσης, πήρα όλες τις θεσμικές πρωτοβουλίες αξιοποιώντας κάθε δυνατότητα που μου δίνει η ελληνική και ευρωπαϊκή δικαιοσύνη, γιατί έχουμε χρέος πάνω από όλα να μπορούμε εμπόδιο στις δυνάμεις που οδήγησαν τη χώρα μας σε οικονομική απόκλιση, βάζοντας τον ελληνικό λαό σε μια δεκαετή οδυνηρή περιπέτεια. Και τώρα, με τις πρακτικές τους, οι ίδιες δυνάμεις οδηγούν τη χώρα σε μια θεσμική απόκλιση. Η ελληνική δικαιοσύνη έχει χρέος να αποκαλύψει τους πρωταγωνιστές και όσους επιχειρήσαν τη συγκάλυψη, προσβάλλοντας ταυτόχρονα και το Σύνταγμα αλλά και τη νοημοσύνη των Ελλήνων πολιτών. Σήμερα, το ζητούμενο είναι να αντιμετωπιστούν οι κίνδυνοι που απειλούν τη φιλελεύθερη δημοκρατία σε όλη την Ευρώπη. Ο μεγαλύτερος από αυτούς είναι ο εθισμός και ο συμβιβασμός των πολιτών με την ιδέα ότι είναι ανυπεράσπιστοι απέναντι στην κακόβουλη χρήση της τεχνολογίας. Ότι βρίσκονται στο έλεος της όποιας κρατικής ή ιδιωτικής υπηρεσίας έχει τη δυνατότητα να παραβιάσει το απόρρητο των επικοινωνιών και των προσωπικών δεδομένων. Ότι είναι ουτοπικό να αξιώνει τον σεβασμό στο Σύνταγμα, τους νόμους και την προσωπικότητα των ανθρώπων. Αφήσαμε το πεδίο ελεύθερο στην επέλαση των fake news και των τερατολογιών του διαδικτύου. Ας κάνουμε ως Ένωση κάτι δραστικό και θεσμικό για να προλάβουμε τον πλήρη ευτελισμό της έννοιας του κράτους δικαίου. Εκτός, βεβαίως, εάν πιστεύουμε ότι μπορεί να υπάρξει ενωμένη Ευρώπη χωρίς τις εγγυήσεις του κράτους δικαίου.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for inviting us to take part in this debate.

The Swedish Presidency has set the protection of our common values, such as the rule of law, democracy and fundamental rights, as a top political priority for this semester. We believe, like you, that we need to firmly defend those values, especially in the current situation we are facing, with a war raging at Europe's doors.

From the outset, I would like to express the full commitment of Member States to the principle of protection of privacy as reflected in the Charter and in our General Data Protection Regulation, which sets very high standards for the protection of individual freedoms.

The EU institutions and the Member States have a joint responsibility and a duty to ensure the fulfilment of these standards. Member States must investigate adequately and condemn any form of illegal surveillance.

However, to prevent violation in the first place, the Council is working actively to promote a common rule of law culture amongst Member States. For example, the Swedish Presidency will continue the work carried out by the previous presidency by organising the sixth round of country-specific rule of law dialogues in the Council.

The situation regarding the rule of law in Greece was discussed during the Rule of Law Dialogue in April 2021. Among other things, media freedom and the situation for journalists were also discussed. The Rule of Law Dialogues in the Council will allow us to complete the first cycle of this constructive dialogue. We believe, in fact, that this mechanism bears fruit.

In addition, we will advance the ongoing Article 7 procedures concerning Hungary and Poland in the General Affairs Council. During these discussions, media freedom features as a key enabler of the rule of law. It is an indispensable pillar of our democratic societies. It is also, as you know, a key element of the Commission's Rule of Law Report, which feeds into our debates.

I also wish to underline that the Council remains committed to advanced work on the key legislative proposals currently on the table, namely the proposed Media Freedom Act and Strategic Lawsuit against Public Participation Directive. Media freedom, as well as the protect protection of journalists, must be guaranteed at all times across the Union. Each Member States has a duty to ensure that any form of illegal surveillance, including on journalists, is investigated adequately and condemned.

In the current geopolitical situation where autocratic regimes try to suppress independent information and media pluralism, we must defend our democracy model and our fundamental values. This includes the effective exercise of the freedom of expression and information. We will continue to work for those rights to thrive in the Union.

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, Minister Roswall, colleagues, I represent Commissioner Reynders here in this debate and he expresses his regret that he could not, unfortunately, join us.

I want to say at the very outset that the Commission is monitoring developments concerning the rule of law in Greece in the context of its annual Rule of Law Report, as it does for all Member States. We adopted the third edition of this report in July last. It included – for the first time – country-specific recommendations to all the Member States. And let me outline the recommendations made to Greece, as well as other relevant developments concerning this Member State.

First, as regards the justice system, a recommendation to Greece in the 2022 Rule of Law Report concerns the need for involvement of the judiciary in the appointment of the President and Vice-President of the Council of State, the Supreme Court and the Court of Auditors, taking into account European standards on judicial appointments. This issue has been raised already in the first and second Rule of Law Reports, as well as by GRECO.

The report also notes that Greece has adopted a number of measures aiming to improve the efficiency and the quality of the Greek justice system, while several challenges still remain to be addressed – notably as regards the efficiency of justice. While we have seen improvements in the digitalisation of administrative justice, shortcomings still exist as regards the digitalisation of civil justice. The ongoing revision of the judicial map is a positive development, bearing in mind that judges who would be transferred in the course of the reform should benefit from procedural safeguards according to European standards.

Regarding the anti-corruption framework, the Rule of Law Report reflects that, while the number of asset declarations being filed has increased and all are verified for their completeness, their accuracy is only verified in a limited percentage. In this context, the Commission has recommended to Greece to ensure the effective and systematic verification of the accuracy of asset disclosures filed by all types of public officials.

Moreover, in 2021, a limited number of prosecutions related to corruption were taken forward, although progress on final decisions remains to be established. And this is why the Commission has also recommended to increase efforts to establish a robust track record of prosecutions and final judgments in corruption cases.

Let me move now to media freedom and media pluralism. The Rule of Law Report also addressed the situation of journalists in Greece, which has raised significant concerns due to the fact that several journalists have faced threats and physical attacks while their professional environment has further deteriorated.

The Commission issued a specific recommendation to Greece on this issue, aiming at establishing legislative and other safeguards to improve the physical safety and working environment of journalists, taking into account European standards on the protection of journalists, including the Commission's Recommendation on the safety of journalists, adopted in 2021.

The report also noted that the Greek Government has recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding on the protection, safety and empowerment of journalists and other media professionals, which contains a common framework of cooperation among the different ministries, including the preparation of proposals for legislative and non-legislative initiatives to ensure the protection of journalists. The Commission's proposal for a European media act, adopted in September last year, contains a number of provisions aimed at enhancing media freedom and protecting journalists, including articles dedicated to surveillance and the use of spyware by public authorities.

As regards other institutional issues – the last pillar of the Rule of Law Report – the Commission would like to underline that registration requirements for civil society organisations should be proportionate, whatever the field in which they act, in view of maintaining an open framework for them to operate as outlined and, indeed, underlined in one of our recommendations in the report. Such legislation continues to raise concerns as regards its impact on the ability of NGOs to operate in Greece and to receive financial support.

As regards the law-making procedures, whilst underlining that work on improving the quality of the legislation process continues, challenges remain, such as a short time frame for public consultation.

Let me move now to the issue of wiretapping and spyware. Let me reiterate that the Commission strongly condemns any illegal access to interpersonal communications, either by traditional means or wiretapping or spyware. The EU has a strong legal framework for data protection and privacy, which must be respected. The Commission notes that the Greek Government recently passed a law regarding the rules on wiretapping for purposes of national security and the fight against crime and the use of spyware.

As regards the purchase and use of spyware by public authorities, a decree –not yet adopted – has to specify all applicable conditions. The issue of spyware in Greece was addressed in the Rule of Law Report. We note that in the last months there were further reports of surveillance, including politicians, journalists and officials of the armed forces.

We also understand that various investigations are ongoing. The Commission expects that supervisory authorities and the courts will make full use of all their powers to thoroughly examine any such allegations and to restore citizens' trust. The individuals concerned must be able to exercise their rights to data protection and privacy, and their right to an effective judicial remedy, which presupposes their right to be informed about having been subject to surveillance or wiretapping. This right to be informed can be subject to delays and restrictions provided for by national law, if necessary to avoid jeopardising criminal and national security investigations.

The Commission received information from the Greek authorities on these recent developments and will keep on following the situation closely.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, εδώ και αρκετούς μήνες, σε κάθε Ολομέλεια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, συγκεκριμένες πολιτικές ομάδες, εμμονικά και σκόπιμα στοχοποιούν την Ελλάδα. Σοβαρά, συνάδελφοι, πιστεύετε ότι υπάρχει διάβρωση κράτους δικαίου στην Ελλάδα; Να μιλήσουμε με δεδομένα. Η υπόθεση των υποκλοπών εκκρεμεί ενώπιον της ελληνικής δικαιοσύνης, η οποία είναι η μόνη αρμόδια. Άλλωστε, η κυβέρνηση διευκρίνισε ρητά ότι δεν έχει καμία σχέση με παράνομα λογισμικά, ούτε βρέθηκαν στοιχεία περί του αντιθέτου. Οι νόμιμες επισυνδέσεις για λόγους ασφάλειας είναι αυτονόητο ότι είναι αποκλειστική ευθύνη, υπόθεση κάθε χώρας. Σημειώνω ότι, με νέο νόμο της κυβέρνησης, η Ελλάδα είναι η πρώτη χώρα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που θεσμοθέτησε απαγόρευση κατοχής, εμπορίας και χρήσης κακόβουλου λογισμικού. Δεν είδαμε να συμβαίνει παντού αυτό. Εννέα θέσεις ανέβηκε το 2022 η Ελλάδα στον Δείκτη Δημοκρατίας, σύμφωνα με τον Economist. Είναι μια από τις καλύτερες επιδόσεις. Και κατά την έκθεση της Διεθνούς Διαφάνειας, για τρίτη συνεχόμενη χρονιά η Ελλάδα εμφανίζει σημαντική άνοδο στον Δείκτη Αντίληψης της Διαφθοράς. Έχει ανέβει 16 θέσεις σε σχέση με το 2018. Η ελευθερία του Τύπου στη χώρα μου είναι συνταγματικά κατοχυρωμένη και σήμερα κυκλοφορούν περισσότερες εφημερίδες και ηλεκτρονικά μέσα από ποτέ. Γνωρίζετε ότι υπάρχουν μέσα που φτάνουν να καθυβρίζουν ακόμη και την κυβέρνηση και τον πρωθυπουργό και δεν τα έχει ενοχλήσει ποτέ κανείς; Η αντιπολίτευση στηρίζεται στη μη κυβερνητική οργάνωση Reporters without borders που κατατάσσει την Ελλάδα κάτω και από το Τσαντ και τη Μογγολία, χωρίς κριτήρια, χωρίς μεθοδολογία, χωρίς επιστημονική βάση, ενώ περιφρονεί την έκθεση για την ελευθερία της έκφρασης στη Media Pluralist Monitor, υπό την αιγίδα του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης που αξιολογεί την Ελλάδα πάνω ακόμη και από χώρες με βαθιά παράδοση. Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, η Ελλάδα είναι μια δημοκρατική χώρα και το ξέρετε καλά. Με την υιοθέτηση αυθαίρετων ισχυρισμών και με αθέμιτες παρεμβάσεις, ιδίως κατά την προεκλογική περίοδο, κάποιοι επιδιώκουν να πλήξουν την ελληνική κυβέρνηση στηρίζοντας την προεκλογική καμπάνια της αντιπολίτευσης. Αυτή είναι η αλήθεια.

Katarina Barley, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Mr President, the situation of the rule of law in Greece has been deteriorating in recent times, and I found the report by the Commissioner really alarming. I mean, her having to remind a government to secure physical safety of journalists. This should really silence any critics about the critics, you know. And the most obvious issue you see it is media freedom. In the 2022 World Press Freedom Index by Reporters Without Borders, Greece marked the 108th country. And of course, the last country in Europe. And the most disturbing event probably was the murder of the investigative journalist Giorgos Karaivaz in April 2021. In almost two years, that has been close to no progress in the investigations. And in the last months, it turned out that at least 13 Greek journalists

have been targeted by the spyware Predator. One of them covered the introduction of laws by the Mitsotakis government, impeding the prosecution of money laundering and other financial wrongdoing.

Now you have to know that Predator and Pegasus are not just spyware. It is as if someone had your mobile phone in their hands. They can manipulate everything you do on your phone. They can listen to everything you do. They can switch on the camera whenever they want to. This is a very serious breach of privacy rights. And within the Pegasus inquiry committee, we were shocked to learn about the large scale of political use of this spyware in Greece, besides the use against investigative journalists. Also the opposition leader Nikos Androulakis, Member of this parliament, and other politicians were spied upon.

And all of this, the use of this wide-ranging spying software without ex ante judicial authorisation, ex post oversight and meaningful legal remedy is a clear breach of our union's fundamental rights. But it is not this alone. Moreover, we discovered close ties between the government and the company Intelixa that is selling this spy software Predator. It is a script that could be written in any textbook on corruption. Until last summer, the nephew of the Prime Minister, Mitsotakis, was his secretary-general/head of cabinet in his office. He was responsible for government contacts with the national intelligence service. Moreover, two friends of this nephew, Bitzios and Lavranos, happened to be key figures in the supply for communications surveillance material and both benefited from lucrative government contracts. The nephew had to resign, as well as the director of the intelligence service.

Now, elections have been called in Greece. This makes it even more urgent to end the illegal spying on journalists, as well as on opposition politicians or politicians in general. Greece is the birthplace of democracy. The current situation is a disgrace for this beautiful country. This mess needs to be cleaned up and it needs to be cleaned up now.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, a mushrooming political spying scandal touching even some of the colleagues present here. Systematic, illegal pushbacks of migrants. The murder of journalist Karaivaz still unresolved after two years. The Novartis scandal. Allegations of Mafia infiltration in the police. And today, the fresh, very alarming revelations on Team Jorge, a hack-for-hire firm in Israel, making money out of manipulating elections and claiming to be present also in Greece. And on and on and on. It's a highly alarming picture. And more alarming still is the reflex of secrecy and denial in government circles, instead of transparency and investigation. I salute the brave forces in Greece who are determined to investigate, uncover and prosecute crime. They provide the very essence of democracy, public scrutiny, and holding power to account. These people must be allowed to do their work freely, unhampered and safely. Instead of getting support, however, they become the target of attacks, harassment and intimidation. HDPA, the Data Protection Authority, investigative journalists, diligent prosecutors. And in this context, I am pleased with the recent exoneration of prosecutor Touloupaki.

The issues of predator spyware and Team Jorge must be fully clarified without delay. There should not be the slightest shadow of doubt over the Greek elections in spring. The democratic rule of law is severely under threat in Greece. It is code orange. This affects democracy in the EU as a whole. Yet the Commission stubbornly clings to the pretence of compliance myth. Your inaction, Commission, is a dereliction of duty.

Finally, colleagues, we are all loyal to our respective political families, and that's a good thing. But that loyalty shall not take precedence over something bigger: the democratic rule of law.

Η δουλειά μας δεν είναι να προστατεύουμε το ένα πολιτικό κόμμα ή το άλλο. Η δουλειά μας είναι να προστατεύουμε τη δημοκρατία για όλους. Όλοι μαζί.

Diana Riba i Giner, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, el retroceso de la libertad de prensa en Grecia no es ninguna novedad. Organizaciones como Reporteros Sin Fronteras han alertado de todo tipo de ataques al ejercicio del periodismo, desde impedimentos para cubrir libremente cuestiones migratorias hasta el riesgo de perder la propia vida.

El caso de Grecia es alarmante, pero es solamente el síntoma de una patología que se está extendiendo. Escuchas ilegales a periodistas y a opositores políticos; medios de comunicación en pocas manos y, en algunos casos, estrechamente ligados a la élite política; leyes que amordazan la libertad de expresión: como ven, algunas o todas las tendencias que vemos en Grecia servirían también para describir a otros Estados miembros, incluidos algunos que presumen de ser democracias plenas.

Por eso, si hay alguien aún que tiene dudas de la importancia de tener una Ley europea de libertad de prensa, en este debate debería resolverlas. Tener sobre la mesa la *Media Freedom Act* es una buena noticia y trabajaremos para que sea una regulación fuerte, ambiciosa y que refleje la importancia de la independencia y el pluralismo de los medios como bienes públicos.

Esta regulación, junto con otras medidas legislativas como pueden ser la Directiva anti-SLAPP o el informe que saldrá de la Comisión de Investigación de Pegasus, deberían ser la piedra angular de un ecosistema de medios democráticos y resilientes en Europa. Sin libertad de prensa no hay Estado de Derecho. Y estaremos atentos porque, como nos recuerda el Washington Post, la democracia frecuentemente muere en la oscuridad.

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

Laura Huhtasaari, *ID-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, heinäkuussa 2022 paljastui, että keskustavasemmistolaista PASOK-KINAL-puoluetta edustavan europarlamentaarikko Nikos Androulakis puhelinta yritettiin salakuunnella. Androulakis puhelimeen yritettiin asentaa Predator-haittaohjelma, joka voisi nauhoittaa hänen puheluita. Tämä johti valtavaan skandaaliin Kreikassa. Epäiltiin, että Kreikan pääministeri Mitsotákis järjesti salakuuntelun, jottei joutuisi seuraavissa vaaleissa oppositioon.

On hyvä, että näitä skandaaleja tulee esiin, ja niistä pitää puhua ja niihin pitää puuttua. Läpinäkyvyys on demokratian kulmakivi. Monipuolinen media on demokratian kulmakivi. Jos meillä ei ole monipuolista demokratiaa, mikä tarkoittaa monipuolisia arvoja ja mikä tarjoaa monipuolisia mielipiteitä, meillä ei ole oikeaa demokratiaa. Vapaa media ja vapaa sana, ilman niitä meillä ei ole muitakaan vapauksia. Valitettavasti Euroopassakin ollaan menty hyvin yksipuoliseen suuntaukseen median suhteen. Meidän pitää koko ajan olla tässä asiassa hereillä, koska kukaan ei omista totuutta. Aika näyttää sen, kuka oli loppujen lopuksi oikeassa ja kuka väärässä, joten monipuolisen median suojelun tulee olla tämän salin tärkeimpiä asioita. On kuitenkin harhaa, että EU:n keskushallintoa vahvistamalla korruptio jotenkin vähenisi tai läpinäkyvyys lisääntyisi. Päinvastoin. Muistetaan esimerkiksi se tosiasia, että kun Kreikka liittyi euroon ja antoi vääriä tietoja, taloudellisia tietoja, niin EU tiesi, että Kreikka antaa vääriä tietoja, mutta silti mentiin eteenpäin, joten se viisaus ei asu myöskään keskushallinnolla. Lähidemokratia ja vapaa sana on oikeasti Euroopan pelastus ja lännen ja länsimaisten arvojen suojelemista.

Beata Kempa, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Wolność prasy, niezależne media, wolność do wyrażania publicznie poglądów, nawet tych skrajnych, ale w ramach dyskursu publicznego to jest podstawa demokracji. Nigdy jednak nie stanę w obronie jakiegokolwiek osoby, która wykorzystując swoją funkcję i urząd, kłamie w celu odebrania godności i dobrego imienia. To trzeba bardzo mocno rozróżniać.

Szanowni Państwo, trzeba wiedzieć, że na pewno należy się sytuacji uważnie przyjrzeć w Grecji czy być może w innych krajach, gdzie ta wolność słowa jest czy będzie naruszana. Niestety zwracam się także do PPE. Donald Tusk wielomilionowymi pozwami atakuje dziennikarzy i redaktora Marcina Tulickiego ze stacji publicznej za przygotowanie materiału „Nasz człowiek w Warszawie”, który jednak pokazuje jego ówczesną prorosyjską politykę. To bardzo brutalna próba ograniczenia dostępu do wiedzy i niezależności mediów. Również wczoraj była konferencja pana redaktora Tomasza Sakiewicza, gdzie jedna ze stacji brutalnie ogranicza wolność wyrażania jego poglądów i jego stacji, niezależnych mediów w Polsce, i to w okresie wyborczym – tak być nie może i przeciwko temu protestuję.

Róza Thun und Hohenstein (Renew). – Madam President, when there are baseless accusations of a most serious nature against the most serious politicians of the European Union, I think you should react to it. Please listen to what the speakers, what the Members, say, and we expect the Presidium, yourself, to react.

Die Präsidentin. – Ich nehme dies zur Kenntnis, danke für Ihre Wortmeldung.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left.* – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, στην πατρίδα μου, την Ελλάδα, τη χώρα που γεννήθηκε η δημοκρατία, βιώνουμε τα τελευταία τέσσερα χρόνια ραγδαία υποβάθμιση της δημοκρατίας, μεγάλη διάβρωση του κράτους δικαίου, κραυγαλέα συρρίκνωση της ελευθερίας του Τύπου και του πλουραλισμού. Και η πολιτική ευθύνη για αυτή τη μεγάλη οπισθοδρόμηση, που την ακούσατε να καταγράφεται και από την Επίτροπο McGuinness και την έκθεση της Επιτροπής και από όσα πιο διπλωματικά είπε και το Συμβούλιο και από όσα είπε η εισηγήτρια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και της αρμόδιας επιτροπής, η συνάδελφος Sophie in 't Veld, που είναι μια κεντροδεξιά ευρωβουλευτής από την Ολλανδία και όχι κανένας άνθρωπος του ΣΥΡΙΖΑ. Η πολιτική ευθύνη έχει ονοματεπώνυμο: Κυριάκος Μητσοτάκης. Ο Κυριάκος Μητσοτάκης στις Βρυξέλλες εμφανίζεται ως ένας πολιτικός κεντροδεξιός με ευρωπαϊκό λούστρο και στην Αθήνα χρησιμοποιεί αυταρχικές πρακτικές όχι μόνο μέσω του Predator, αλλά και μέσω της ΕΥΠ, που είναι υπό τον έλεγχό του, που θυμίζουν την ανατολικογερμανική Στάζι. Θέλω να πιστεύω, για να μην πω είμαι βέβαιος, ότι ο Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης, θύμα αυτών των μεθοδεύσεων, θα συμβάλει προκειμένου να γίνει η Ελλάδα μια σύγχρονη δημοκρατική ευρωπαϊκή χώρα που να μην θυμίζει την Πολωνία και την Ουγγαρία, να έχουμε στις επόμενες εκλογές άλλη κυβέρνηση και άλλο πρωθυπουργό. Την πατρίδα μου, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι της Νέας Δημοκρατίας, δεν την δυσφημίζουν αυτοί που υπερασπίζονται την αλήθεια, τη δημοκρατία και τη διαφάνεια, αλλά αυτοί που συρρικνώνουν τη δημοκρατία και το κράτος δικαίου.

Λεωντέρνης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, παρακολουθούμε πραγματικά μια άσφαιρη αντιπαράθεση και κάλπικα διλημάτα περί δημοκρατίας και εκτροπής. Γιατί τα αστικά κόμματα σήμερα στοχεύουν να μείνουν στο απυρόβλητο οι ευρωνομοσυννομοί, οι οδηγίες, οι μηχανισμοί που έχουν συνδιαμορφώσει και ψηφίσει και θωράκισαν το απαράδεκτο αντιλαϊκό πλαίσιο φακελώματος ενάντια στον λεγόμενο εχθρό λαό. Με κανονισμό του 2021 τα κατασκοπευτικά λογισμικά θεωρούνται κανονικότητα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Τουλάχιστον 14 κράτη μέλη τα έχουν χρησιμοποιήσει. Οι ευθύνες της Νέας Δημοκρατίας και του πρωθυπουργού για τις υποκλοπές είναι τεράστιες, αλλά ευθύνη έχει και ο ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, το ΠΑΣΟΚ. Στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο μαζί ψηφίσαν τον κανονισμό. Μαζί με το ΜέΡΑ25 στην ελληνική Βουλή ενέκριναν την αστυνομική οδηγία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που γενικεύει το φακέλωμα, την εμπορία προσωπικών δεδομένων. Γι αυτό όλοι οι à la carte υπερασπιστές του κράτους δικαίου τηρούν σιγή ασυρμάτου για τις επιβεβαιωμένες υποκλοπές σε βάρος του ΚΚΕ εδώ και εξήμισι χρόνια. Δυναμώνουμε την πάλη ενάντια στη συγκάλυψη των παρακολουθήσεων αλλά και τους ευρωενωσιακούς μηχανισμούς φακελώματος, ενισχύοντας το ΚΚΕ με την κρυστάλλινη, αταλάντευτη θέση υπέρ της ανεμπόδιστης συνδικαλιστικής και πολιτικής δράσης της προστασίας των λαϊκών ελευθεριών.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Madam President, Council, Commissioner, dear colleagues. I believe that the rule of law is indeed under constraint across the European Union, and not only in Hungary or Poland, but this must not be a shabby peeking exercise for some political groups, especially when the criterion is the colour of the government and the electoral period. Mr Babiš was received by President Macron. We all know Mr Babiš's commitment to the rule of law.

Mr Fico is supported by the S&D Group in Slovakia. We all know Mr Fico's commitment to the rule of law. The Spanish Minister of Justice declared in this House that the Constitutional Court is a political court. Is this any commitment to the rule of law? By the way, Mr Papadimoulis, Stasi supporters are in your group – the Portuguese Communists always supported the DDR. They are your colleagues in your left group.

Since the very beginning, while taking revelations, the Greek Government fully cooperated with all institutions, this Parliament and the national parliament. Political responsibility was assumed; the people in charge were removed from office, and unique measures were taken even in the field of media freedom. Can you say the same about similar revelations in Spain, in Malta, in Hungary or Poland?

The rule of law deserves our full attention at all times in all Member States. Even in the best functioning democracies, there are always some issues of rule of law, but that is not the essential problem. The question is what they do to address them. That is the test, and the Greek Government...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta Regner, señora comisaria, señora presidenta del Consejo, una vez más debatimos en el Parlamento Europeo la erosión del Estado de Derecho y del pluralismo informativo. Y lo hacemos con fundamento. Desde que la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior mandató a la Comisión —al Comisario de Justicia Didier Reynders— que trajera anualmente un informe sobre el Estado de Derecho, la democracia y los derechos fundamentales en la Unión Europea, sabemos que hay Estados en los que se detecta un riesgo claro de violación sistémica de los valores comunes de la Unión. Pero en todos los Estados miembros pueden, efectivamente, darse problemas de erosión del Estado de Derecho y retrocesos de libertades que consideramos fundamentales.

Es el caso de la concentración de medios informativos, debatida hoy, en Grecia. Es importante que se sepa que este debate no concierne solo a un Estado miembro, sino al conjunto de la Unión. Desde luego, concierne al conjunto de la Unión la violación de los derechos fundamentales consagrados en la Carta, en el artículo 8, de nuestro colega Androulakis. Es inverosímil tratar de alegar que puede haber una amenaza a la seguridad que justifique una interceptación masiva de sus comunicaciones telefónicas y personales con un instrumento tan intrusivo y, a mi juicio, tan incompatible con la garantía de los derechos fundamentales de la Carta, como la herramienta Pegasus y, en el caso griego, la herramienta de *spyware* Predator.

Considero completamente inaceptable que se produzca en un Estado miembro una concentración de medios de comunicación en muy pocas manos y, particularmente, próximas al Gobierno. Porque es inaceptable que existan periodistas amenazados en la Unión Europea por ejercer su labor de investigación. Porque es inaceptable que se haya producido un asesinato de un periodista y sea escasamente mentado en los debates de esta Cámara, como es el caso de Georgios Karaivaz, en 2021, todavía no esclarecido. Porque es completamente inaceptable que no se esté velando en cada Estado miembro por la anticipación de lo que tiene que ser el cumplimiento estricto del Derecho europeo, que en estos momentos está en curso: la Directiva Anti-SLAPP, que, para que todo el mundo lo entienda, es una Directiva para prevenir la intimidación a través de litigación o interposición de querellas contra los periodistas independientes; la legislación europea de libertad de los medios de comunicación —Media Freedom Act—, que pretende proteger, precisamente, no solo la libertad de información, sino el pluralismo informativo; y lo que esperemos que sean las conclusiones de la Comisión de Investigación Pegasus —de la que soy miembro—, que ojalá establezca un marco, no ya regulatorio, sino de prohibición de unas herramientas tan intrusivas para la confidencialidad de los datos personales y de las comunicaciones personales, como son Pegasus y Predator.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein (Renew). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Kiedy demokracja w jakimkolwiek kraju członkowskim Unii Europejskiej jest niszczone, musimy krzyczeć, więc cieszę się, że jest ta debata. Tutaj musimy reagować. Komisja Europejska musi rzeczywiście szybko, zdecydowanie i ostro reagować. Dzisiaj w dodatku mówimy o degradacji demokracji w kolebce tej demokracji. Czyż to nie jest tragiczna rozmowa? Mówimy o niszczeniu wolnych mediów, o zastraszaniu dziennikarzy.

Byliśmy z komisją Pegasus w Grecji i słyszeliśmy tak tragiczne, okropne opowieści. Szkoda, że nie mamy wystarczająco czasu, żeby się tutaj nimi z Państwem podzielić. Użycie takich programów szpiegowskich przeciwko dziennikarzom i przeciwnikom politycznym jest absolutnym skandalem. Mam wielką nadzieję, że komisja specjalna, komisja śledcza, którą powołaliśmy tutaj w Parlamencie Europejskim, rzeczywiście pomoże obywatelom greckim, dziennikarzom wzmocnić demokrację, zachować prawa obywatelskie, prawa człowieka, również i w innych krajach, nie tylko w Grecji, i że uwolni ich od zagrożenia tymi strasznymi praktykami.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, tant que les dérives du gouvernement Mitsotakis l'exigeront, tant que la Commission européenne ne prendra pas les mesures nécessaires face aux trop nombreuses dérives que vous venez d'épingler, Madame la Commissaire, tant que la droite conservatrice de ce Parlement nous empêchera de faire notre travail correctement sur l'état de droit en Grèce – y compris au sein de notre commission d'enquête Pegasus –, croyez-moi, notre Parlement gardera la Grèce à la une de l'ordre du jour politique.

Nous refusons d'assister sans broncher aux écoutes illégales de journalistes ou d'opposants politiques. Aussi refusons-nous la pression continue qui est exercée sur la société civile, la criminalisation des migrants et de celles et ceux qui les soutiennent, les atteintes permanentes à la liberté de la presse, aux droits de l'opposition, à la séparation des pouvoirs – la liste ne fait que s'allonger, il suffit de consulter le rapport sur l'état de droit en Grèce.

La liste ne fait que s'allonger dans un pays où, pourtant, les priorités politiques, après autant d'années d'austérité, devraient être ailleurs, étant donné la situation sociale et économique, en souffrance. Regardons les choses en face: la Grèce suit le même chemin que la Pologne et la Hongrie avant elle.

Or, l'histoire nous a bien montré que, sans réaction ferme et immédiate des institutions européennes, les atteintes à l'état de droit, lorsqu'elles sont si avancées, s'aggravent, au détriment de toute la démocratie européenne et des droits fondamentaux, que nous sommes censés protéger.

Dans le berceau de la démocratie, l'état de droit défaille, et il nous appartient donc d'agir. Et il appartient à la Commission européenne d'être la garante des traités et de dépasser le stade des recommandations si des États membres s'en écartent à ce point.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, the Greek Prime Minister enacted a law which grants him direct supervision over the Greek Secret Service, which has since spied on its own ministers, a former prime minister who is now an opposition leader, a Member of the European Parliament, journalists and the head of the Greek military.

The Greek Government refuses to give any reasons for the surveillance. Under a new law, public officials will even be liable to criminal prosecution if they carry out audits about who's under surveillance and why.

Greece's Watergate scandal makes a mockery of the rule of law. The European Commission, however, is turning a blind eye. It prefers instead to bully EU-critical governments for practices allegedly politicising the judiciary but which in reality are commonplace in Germany.

The Commission should open Article 7 proceedings against Greece, as a matter of urgency.

Hermann Tertsch (ECR). – Señora presidenta, el escándalo de las escuchas telefónicas en Grecia se ha extendido sin cesar y, como suele pasar en estos casos, hay ya tantos perjudicados que cada vez va a ser más difícil encontrar al culpable, porque hay muchos perjudicados y pocos beneficiados.

Que en todos los países europeos se está creando una dinámica de refuerzo del Estado a costa de los derechos de los ciudadanos parece muy claro. Lo estamos viendo dramáticamente en España. Pero la falta de transparencia es una cosa que nos afecta a todos. Aquí estaba hablando López Aguilar antes del problema de la falta de derechos que se está creando en todas partes y muy particularmente en España.

En ese sentido, creo que la voz de alarma tiene que partir de aquí. Pero, respecto a la transparencia de aquí, convendría que empezara la Comisión por explicarnos, por ejemplo, qué pone en esos mensajes que tuvo con el jefe de Pfizer hablando de las vacunas. Cuando sepamos eso y tengamos transparencia aquí, podremos pedir transparencia al señor Mitsotakis y podremos pedirla en otros sitios. Mientras tanto, estamos aquí hablando al vacío.

Γιώργος Γεωργίου (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, Κυρία Επίτροπε, η πραγματικότητα βοά. Είναι όλα παράδεκτα πλέον μέσα από τη μετάδοση του ιού από την Κύπρο στην Ελλάδα και μέσα από το Predator, αλλά και από την Ελληνική Υπηρεσία Πληροφοριών, εις γνώσιν του Έλληνα πρωθυπουργού, παρακολουθήθηκαν Έλληνες βουλευτές, υπουργοί, δημοσιογράφοι και κόμματα. Δεν πρέπει να λογοδοτήσει για όλα αυτά ο κύριος Μητσοτάκης. Η Ελλάδα, βέβαια, δεν έχει δικτατορία. Είναι όμως αυτό κράτος δικαίου; Οι συστάσεις της έκθεσης της Επιτροπής Pegasus που εσείς, αλλά κι εσείς ως Συμβούλιο και η Επιτροπή απαξιώνετε, δείχνει τον δρόμο που πρέπει να ακολουθηθεί. Αποκατάσταση και ενίσχυση των νομικών και θεσμικών διασφαλίσεων. Κατάργηση επείγοντως όλων των αδειών εξαγωγής λογισμικού παρακολούθησης. Διασφάλιση ελεύθερης και ανεμπόδιστης διερεύνησης όλων των ισχυρισμών για κρίσεις spyware. Αποκατάσταση της πλήρους ανεξαρτησίας του δικαστικού σώματος και όλων των σχετικών εποπτικών οργάνων. Προστασία των μαρτύρων δημοσίου συμφέροντος. Διασφάλιση της ανεξαρτησίας της ηγεσίας της Εθνικής Αρχής Διαφάνειας. Επείγοντως αστυνομική έρευνα για κατάχρηση του λογισμικού κατασκοπείας και κατάσχεση φυσικών στοιχείων όλων όσων συνδέονται με αυτή. Τι θα γίνει με όλα αυτά, κύριε Μητσοτάκη; Θα κάνετε κάτι;

Tatjana Ždanoka (NI). – Madam President, I am from Latvia, our president, when addressing this Chamber yesterday, said that our values, our legal system, make the European way of life attractive for us and for others.

Today's debate shows that these words are very far from reality, not only in Greece, Spain and Poland but in my country, Latvia, as well. Life in Latvian prison, where student Tatiana Andriets was thrown some days ago just for her beliefs, is it an attractive way of life, Mr Levits? We know that the parliamentary inquiry committee for Pegasus has prepared a very good report and, well, thank you for this and we will vote, I am sure.

But what about what about another permanent mechanism which is already in force? I am speaking about just the rule of law mechanism and country reports produced by the Commission. Madam McGuinness, I do not agree with you that these five recommendations given to Greece you have cited will bring something fruitful. They are too general. In fact, these words are empty, for example, I repeat, 'take into account European standards of judicial appointments' or 'improve the physical safety and working environment of journalists', these recommendations too general to react.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Madam President, this is not the first time we are having this debate and, to be quite frank, I was not convinced about its added value. Unfortunately, so far nothing I've seen has changed my mind. This Parliament has a dedicated committee with a specific assignment to look into the abuse of spyware in the whole of the European Union, because this is not an issue of one individual Member State, but it is a European issue, and the bigger committee is doing its job. We already spoke to almost 200 people, including a lot about Greece, and we should also let it get on with its job. And as much as I understand the political appeal of bringing specific countries to this podium, especially with elections approaching, I really think the focus should be on our common work in the committee.

Now, we travelled to Greece and we had many fruitful exchanges with government representatives, journalists, civil societies. We received a lot of useful information. What we did not find was evidence of corruption or the kind of authoritarian practices we witnessed in Poland. But, of course, more can and should always be done to ensure transparency, and any allegations of abuse, of surveillance, have to be thoroughly investigated and necessary safeguards must be in place.

I would like to point out, though, that unlike some other countries, the Greek Government actually makes an effort to actively cooperate with our committee. They received us. They share their proposals for reforms to improve transparency and judicial oversight. And I look forward to seeing the results of those reforms in practice.

We need to investigate before we draw conclusions. There is plenty of work still to do, and we must continue that work in a thorough but also an objective manner.

Eero Heinäluoma (S&D). – Arvoisa puhemies, vaikea uskoa, että todellakin joudumme Euroopan parlamentissa keskukselle yhden meille tärkeän jäsenvaltion demokratian todellisuudesta. Oikeus vapaaseen mielipiteenvaihtoon ja oikeus myös salattuun viestintään ilman, että valtio kuuntelee – isoveli valvoo – on tärkeä osa meidän eurooppalaisia arvoja. Nyt olemme saaneet kuulla, että Kreikassa tiedustelupalvelu salakuuntelee toimittajia ja poliitikkoja – ja tietysti oppositiopoliitikkoja. Tämä salakuuntelu on ulottunut myös meille tärkeän elimen, tämän parlamentin, jäseniin. Se on uskomatonta. Miten tällainen voi olla mahdollista? Miten se on mahdollista yhdessä meille kaikille tärkeässä maassa eli Kreikassa? Koulussa opetetaan varmaan meille kaikille ja myös tuleville polville, että demokratian kehto on Kreikassa. Siksi tietysti kreikkalaisilla ja Kreikan hallituksella on tässä suuri vastuu, että asiat selvitetään ja tällainen demokratian rajoittaminen, opposition toiminnan vaikeuttaminen ja toimittajien työn estäminen loppuvat. Erityisen merkittävää on, että täällä meilläkin keskustaoikeistolainen EPP-ryhmä sanoutuu tästä irti, koska kyseessä on EPP-johtoisen hallituksen

toiminta. Kun Kreikan pääministeri on itse siirtänyt tiedustelupalvelun omaan alaisuuteensa, tarkoittaa se myös sitä, että hän on vastuussa siitä, mitä siellä tapahtuu, niin kuin jokainen ministeri kussakin maassa on vastuussa oman alansa asioista. Parlamentin pitää tässä olla tiukkana. Meidän pitää tukea demokraattisia toimintaperiaatteita jokaisessa jäsenmaassa.

Georgios Kyrtos (Renew). – Madam President, the moment I criticized Mitsotakis, I was banished from Greek state television. When I objected to the restriction of media freedom I was expelled from the governing party. My phones have been wiretapped for 18 months by the National Intelligence Agency, after being designated a threat to national security. The president of the independent authority, which safeguards the privacy of telecommunications, documented the wiretapping of my phones and was criticised by the government and the chief public prosecutor for overstepping his authority. Mitsotakis changed the law in order to take personal control over the National Intelligence Agency, developed a massive wiretapping system, along with his trusted nephew, Mr Dimitriadis. He also changed the law so that the victims of wiretapping, like myself and colleague Androulakis, lost the right to know why we have been wiretapped and the actual result of their wiretappings for at least three years.

I am saddened by the EPP's absence in the effort to defend the European rule of law. I was wiretapped by Mitsotakis even during the period when I was an EPP MEP. This is not a personal issue. We have to defend European values and the rule of law before it is too late. Otherwise, goodnight Europe and good luck.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Greece, State of Play, 2023. Eleni Touloupaki, former head of the corruption prosecutor's office, has been attacked by her own government after an investigation about the scandal involving the Novartis Pharma company. And now she suspects that she was spied on as many others were in the Greek political context. Meanwhile, the wiretapping scandal, we know, is ongoing.

Giorgos Karaivaz, a long-time crime reporter was assassinated in April 2021, and since then there's been no real follow-up to find out who killed him and what the motivation was. Journalists are terrified, activists too. NGOs working on migration issues are harassed. And even in this Parliament, it took us months to have this small debate on the agenda, not one on the wiretapping, but one on the systemic degradation of the rule of law, corruption, democracy, judiciary, media pluralism. And it doesn't seem that the Commission is sufficiently also challenging this. So I'm really wondering, have we not learned any lesson? Will Greece be the next sick man after Hungary of this Europe? And will we act once again when it's too late?

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο δρόμος προς την κόλαση είναι στρωμένος με καλές προθέσεις. Υπήρχαν καλές ευρωπαϊκές προθέσεις όταν προτάθηκαν οι ανεξάρτητες αρχές. Τελικά διαψεύστηκαν, ιδίως για την ελληνική ελάσσονα αντιπολίτευση. Ο διορισμός από την πλειοψηφία της Βουλής οδηγεί στον έλεγχο από την μείζονα μειοψηφία που ονομάζεται πλειοψηφία και στον συνολικό έλεγχο από τα συστημικά κόμματα, όταν απαιτείται συμφωνία δύο τρίτων του εθνικού κοινοβουλίου. Δεν βλέπουμε ανάδειξη προσώπων στην Ελλάδα εγνωσμένου κύρους που διασφαλίζουν το κράτος δικαίου και καταγγέλλουμε τον έλεγχο του παιχνιδιού από τον κυβερνώντα και τους συν αυτό. Καταγγέλλουμε ελεγχόμενες διοικήσεις που εκτελούν τα αιτήματα των διοριστών τους, προσβλέποντας σε μεταγενέστερα ανταλλάγματα. Και, ναι, καταγγέλλουμε το αυτονόητο. Οι ελεγχόμενες διοικήσεις των ανεξάρτητων αρχών στην Ελλάδα δεν μπορούν εύκολα να ελέγξουν την κυβέρνηση που τους διόρισε. Το Εθνικό Συμβούλιο Ραδιοτηλεόρασης αποτελεί μια τέτοια εξόφθαλμη κακή πρακτική. Καταπνίγει όσους διαφωνούν με την κυβέρνηση κρατώντας το παιχνίδι υπό συστημικό έλεγχο. Αν όντως θέλουμε δημοκρατία, ας αφήσουμε τους Έλληνες να αποφασίσουν ελεύθερα.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη μπορεί να παρατηρηθούν παραβιάσεις του κράτους δικαίου. Εκείνο που διαχωρίζει τις περιπτώσεις είναι το εάν και κατά πόσο κάθε κυβέρνηση προσπαθεί να επουλώσει την πληγή ή είναι η ίδια η πληγή. Στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, εδώ, η πληγή είναι ο ίδιος ο Κυριάκος Μητσοτάκης, ο οποίος αντιλαμβάνεται το κράτος ως ιδιοκτησία του. Από τις συλλήψεις γονέων και παιδιών σε κινηματογράφους επειδή παρακολουθούσαν την ταινία Τζόκερ μέχρι τις λίστες χρηματοδότησης φίλων μέσω (λίστα Πέτσα), τις δολοφονίες μικροπαραβατικών Ρομά από την αστυνομία, τα pushbacks, την αστυνομική εισβολή με ακραία βία στην οικία του σκηνοθέτη Ινδάρε, τις διώξεις δημοσιογράφων και εν ενεργεία δικαστικών λειτουργών, φτάσαμε στην οργάνωση και ενορχήστρωση παρακολουθήσεων πολιτικών και θεσμικών λειτουργιών της δημοκρατίας με εντολή και καθοδήγηση του ίδιου του κυρίου Μητσοτάκη. Συγκλονιστική είναι η αποκάλυψη ότι τα συστημικά media, οι ανώτατοι αξιωματικοί της αστυνομίας επικοινωνούσαν και δέχονταν εντολές από την Greek mafia. Και φυσικά δεν μπορεί να φύγει από το μυαλό μας ο Γιώργος Καραϊβάζ, ο δημοσιογράφος ο οποίος δολοφονήθηκε και ψάχνουμε ακόμα τους ενόχους. Σήμερα αποκαλύπτει ο Guardian χειραγώγηση των εκλογών σε 30 χώρες, και στην Ελλάδα. Κάτι συμβαίνει στην Ελλάδα. Και, βεβαίως, πιστεύουμε ότι αυτός εφιάλτης θα τελειώσει σύντομα για να νικήσει η δημοκρατία.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, the spyware scandal has shown of how little importance our fundamental rights are for some governments – in Hungary, Poland, Cyprus, Greece and Spain. They have not only violated the right to privacy, but also the right to freedom of thought. Pegasus, Predator and whatever spyware comes next are used by democratic governments to treat political dissidents like dangerous terrorists. Should journalists be treated like terrorists in a democratic state? Should attorneys be spied on while defending political dissidents? Should families and friends of politicians be on the secret services' radar? No, of course not. I wish I didn't have to state this in this parliament. We have the right to our freedom of thought. In Greece, at least, this is under investigation – but not in Spain, where Catalangate has just been covered up. The Commission has an obligation to put a stop to this.

Άννα-Μισέλ Ασημακοπούλου (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner, the real question today is why? Why does S&D insist on discussing Greek wiretapping again in this Chamber after resignations and inquiry in the Hellenic Parliament, a PEGA mission, the strictest legislation in all of Europe banning spyware and ongoing judicial proceedings.

Why are we discussing the rule of law in Greece when the Economist Intelligence Unit Democracy Index shows one of the highest rankings increase for Greece, as opposed to a clearly inaccurate index which ranks Greece below Burkina Faso?

Why is Greece being systematically slandered in this house by an à-la-carte centre-left majority spreading lies about alleged pushbacks and dead children?

And why does the draft PEGA report rely blindly on the unsubstantiated claims of Greek opposition newspapers, which in and of itself, by the way, proves that there is freedom of the press in Greece?

Could it be because the polls in Greece show a clear lead of Prime Minister Kyriakos Mitsotakis in the upcoming elections? And could it be that these slanderous attacks serve only to support the centre-left opposition in Greece?

Yes, the answer is that simple and so is the truth. And the truth is that we're not here today to discuss the rule of law in Greece, we are here because S&D and the Left wish to influence the outcome of the Greek elections. And that, dear colleagues, is for the people of Greece to decide. And I'll say it in Greek.

Η Ελλάδα είναι δημοκρατία και οι Έλληνες και Ελληνίδες πολίτες θα αποφασίσουν ποιος θα την κυβερνήσει.

Hannes Heide (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Ministerin! Ich werde jetzt die Antworten geben, die meine Vorrednerin eingefordert hat, nämlich: Bereits im September 2022 beschäftigte sich der PEGA-Untersuchungsausschuss dieses Parlaments mit den Spionage- und Abhörfällen in Griechenland. Griechische Journalisten, die über die Affäre berichtet hatten und in diesem Hearing Auskunft gaben, habe ich gefragt: Befindet sich Griechenland angesichts dieser Vorfälle auf dem Weg in Richtung Autokratie? Die Antwort: Noch nicht, aber das hänge davon ab, wie vor allem die griechische Regierung mit der Aufklärung umgeht, wie transparent der Untersuchungsausschuss im griechischen Parlament arbeiten wird, welche Auskunftspersonen geladen und welche Informationen gegeben werden.

In der Debatte im Haus – hier im September — haben wir gehört, Griechenland habe nichts zu verbergen. Aber die Entwicklungen in den letzten Monaten geben Anlass zur Sorge. Es gibt Anhaltspunkte, dass die griechische Regierung unter Ministerpräsident Mitsotakis rechtsstaatliche Prinzipien bewusst missachtet. Seit 2019, seinem Amtsantritt, ist der nationale Nachrichtendienst der direkten Kontrolle des Ministerpräsidenten unterstellt. Ein Hearing mit griechischen Regierungsvertretern im Untersuchungsausschuss dieses Parlaments geriet zur Farce.

Die Antworten auf die Fragen der Abgeordneten waren schlichtweg unzureichend. Der vom Ausschuss an die griechische Regierung übermittelte Fragebogen über den Einsatz von Spionagesoftware blieb bis heute unbeantwortet. Die Kooperationsbereitschaft der griechischen Behörden mit europäischen Institutionen ist nicht vorhanden. Der Untersuchungsausschuss über den unrechtmäßigen Einsatz von Spionagesoftware im griechischen Parlament endete bereits nach einem Monat ohne nennenswerte Erkenntnisse.

Besonders alarmierend ist auch, dass sich Griechenland im Bereich Presse- und Medienfreiheit im freien Fall befindet. Nach dem *World Press Freedom Index* 2022 ist das Land vom 70. Platz 2022 auf den 108. Platz abgerutscht und somit das Schlusslicht der Europäischen Union.

Der Mord am Journalisten Giorgos Karaivaz im Jahr 2021 ist bis heute nicht aufgeklärt. Journalisten sind Einschüchterungen und SLAPP-Klagen ausgesetzt. Und was rechtfertigt, dass unser Kollege Nikos Androulakis über mehrere Monate illegal abgehört wurde? Welche Gefahr geht von einem Abgeordneten aus, der acht Jahre hier im Europäischen Parlament gearbeitet hat, welche Gefahr für die nationale Sicherheit? Und warum wurde ein Oppositionspolitiker ausgerechnet wenige Monate vor nationalen Wahlen gezielt ausspioniert?

Ich erwarte von der Kommission klare Maßnahmen zur Verteidigung der Medienfreiheit und Rechtsstaatlichkeit in Griechenland. Wir sind alarmiert und müssen darauf achten, dass Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit nicht von innen heraus ausgehöhlt wird – nicht in Griechenland, in keinem Land der Europäischen Union.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Natürlich sind die Vorgänge in Griechenland besorgniserregend, die Ausspähung von Presse und Journalisten. Aber schauen wir auch mal auf das größere Bild. Heute berichten internationale Medien unter dem Titel *Story Killers*, dass eine Geheimfirma Wahlen in verschiedensten Ländern manipuliert, dass offen angeboten wird, dass man Spähsoftware nutzt, um Wahlen zu manipulieren. Das ist das Bild, was wir auch international haben.

Wir haben uns im Pegasus-Ausschuss intensiv mit Spähsoftware beschäftigt, die auf unseren Smartphones nicht nur ausspionieren kann, was dort ist, sondern auch die Kameras nutzen kann, zuhören kann und vieles mehr, sogar das Versenden eigener Nachrichten scheint teilweise möglich zu sein. Und dann sehen wir, dass das offenbar in Europa genutzt wird und auch weltweit, um Wahlen zu attackieren. Es geht also nicht mehr nur um unsere Privatsphäre – das wäre schon schützenswert –, sondern es geht auch im Kern um unsere Demokratie.

Und dann höre ich hier diese Debatte, und ich muss wirklich fragen, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen: Schämen Sie sich nicht ein bisschen über diese Debatte, wie dann hier wieder reine Parteipolitik gemacht wird? Wie der Kollegin In 't Veld, die als Berichterstatteerin auftritt und hier wirklich aufklärt, vorgeworfen wird, sie mache das rein aus parteipolitischen Gründen, wo es überhaupt keine liberale Partei in Griechenland gibt, die sie da verteidigen könnte? Wie viele Wahlen müssen eigentlich noch manipuliert werden? Wie viele Situationen muss es noch geben, bis wir merken, es geht nicht um Parteipolitik, sondern es geht um unsere europäische Demokratie. Das frage ich mich, und das hätte die Debatte heute hier in diesem Haus sein müssen.

Βαγγέλης Μεϊμαράκης (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πιστεύω ότι η σημερινή συζήτηση αδικεί τη χώρα μου. Αδικεί την Ελλάδα. Γιατί γίνεται τώρα, σε μια προεκλογική περίοδο, και θεωρείται παρέμβαση στις εκλογικές διαδικασίες ενός κράτους μέλους της Ένωσης. Μεταφέρουμε εδώ τις διαφωνίες τις οποίες έχουμε αναπτύξει στην Ελλάδα κατ' επανάληψη. Είναι γνωστό, συνάδελφοι, ότι το θέμα των υποκλοπών συζητείται από το περασμένο καλοκαίρι σε όλα τα επίπεδα και δεν θα επαναλάβω τα όσα με επιχειρήματα ανέφερε συνάδελφος Βόζεμπεργκ στην εισήγησή της, γιατί δεν έχω και τον χρόνο. Θα θυμίσω, όμως, ότι η Επιτροπή Θεσμών και Διαφάνειας της ελληνικής Βουλής έχει εξετάσει το θέμα λεπτομερώς. Οι ανεξάρτητες αρχές έχουν παρέμβει. Η Δικαιοσύνη το ερευνά. Κατατέθηκε πρόταση μομφής προς την κυβέρνηση και μετά από τριήμερες συζητήσεις ανανεώθηκε η εμπιστοσύνη της Βουλής στην κυβέρνηση. Ήρθε η PEGA στην Ελλάδα, συνεργάστηκε με τις ελληνικές αρχές και την κυβέρνηση και τώρα πλέον αναμένουμε όλοι τις αποφάσεις της ανεξάρτητης Δικαιοσύνης, η οποία είναι και η μόνη αρμόδια. Όλοι θέλουμε να χυθεί άπλετο φως. Κάναμε και θα κάνουμε επίσης ότι είναι δυνατόν να λάμψει η αλήθεια. Και αναλάβαμε και την πολιτική ευθύνη. Θεωρώ, λοιπόν, ότι η συζήτηση αυτή στη συγκεκριμένη αυτή περίοδο, σε αυτό εδώ το βήμα στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, δεν συμβάλλει στην προσπάθεια ανίχνευσης της αλήθειας, αλλά εξυπηρετεί τελικά πολιτικές σκοπιμότητες, οι οποίες δεν συνάδουν σε μια δημοκρατική χώρα μέλος μιας δημοκρατικής Ένωσης. Σύντομα, ο ελληνικός λαός θα αποφασίσει πηγαίνοντας για τις εκλογές και τότε, πράγματι, θα δούμε ποιος έχει δίκιο και θα έχουμε, θα περιμένουμε κιόλας και τις αποφάσεις της Δικαιοσύνης. Η συζήτηση, λοιπόν, σήμερα είναι άκαιρη, είναι άστοχη και το καταλαβαίνουμε όλοι.

Елена Йончева (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, Какъв е отговорът на премиера на една европейска страна, след като в продължение на месеци е подслушвал журналисти, бивши и настоящи министри, политически лидери опозицията, Никос Андрулакис, лидерът на ПАСОК.

„...законно е, но не знаех“, казва премиерът Мицотакис. Това е неговият отговор. Отговорността е негова. Месеци преди това е приет закон, който поставя разузнавателната служба под контрола на премиера. Но това не е просто поредният скандал. Подслушването на опоненти, използването на шпионски софтуери, днешни и бъдещи, е голям европейски проблем. Власт, която се стреми да контролира опозиция и журналисти, винаги може да облеche поругаването на нашите права в законни рамки. Виждали сме го не в една държава.

И наша е отговорността, колеги. Наша е отговорността това да не стане възможно. Затова е толкова важно да чуем и отговора от Атина. Как и защо допуснахте това?

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Madam President, the use of wiretapping technologies against independent journalists goes against the most basic principles of democracy and is a key feature of a police state regime. Journalists must be able to work without fearing for their own safety, and their sources must remain protected under all circumstances. This is something that the Greek Government should hear and understand if it claims to protect the rule of law.

The scandal in Greece confirms once more that the EU needs strong and clear legislation giving workers in the media sector the right tools to face the pressure and counter the threats to their independence. This is exactly why we need the European Media Freedom Act. The Act responds to the pressing challenges the media are currently facing by banning the use of spyware in journalists' devices and allowing us to sanction such practices.

The European Media Freedom Act can become an essential part of our framework for safeguarding European values. We owe it to the journalists, to those who support the free press, and to all those who fight to defend the rule of law in Europe.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora presidenta, se nota cierto nerviosismo en las filas de la izquierda. No sé si tendrá algo que ver con que se aproximen elecciones en Grecia y Nea Dimokratia lidere claramente todas las encuestas.

Señorías, por mucho que quieran ustedes dibujar una Grecia totalitaria y opresiva, los ciudadanos griegos son muy conscientes de los avances logrados en los últimos años en materia de Estado de Derecho. Algo que certifican, además, prestigiosas instituciones internacionales como The Economist o Transparencia Internacional. En apenas cuatro años, el Gobierno de Mitsotakis ha modernizado la regulación sobre ciberseguridad y sobre agencias de inteligencia y hoy lidera el debate sobre el Reglamento Europeo de Libertad de Prensa. Desde entonces, Grecia no ha dejado de mejorar su calidad democrática y de ascender en todos los índices, y se encuentra ya por encima de la mayoría de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea.

Por eso, dejen de buscar fantasmas. Dejen de intentar manchar la imagen de Grecia y reconozcan la realidad: Grecia es una democracia próspera y los griegos están hoy mucho mejor que hace cuatro años.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Voorzitter, Griekenland is in een jaar tijd van de 70e naar de 108e plaats gezakt in de World Press Freedom Index. Inmiddels is de persvrijheid nergens in Europa zo slecht als in Griekenland. Dit is een slechte zaak.

Het overgrote deel van de Griekse media is in handen van rijke eigenaren die nauwe banden hebben met de regering. Journalisten die nog wel onafhankelijk zijn, krijgen te maken met intimidatie, lastercampagnes en rechtszaken. Sterker nog, er wordt misbruik gemaakt van Predator-software om journalisten, activisten en politici af te luisteren.

Het Griekse spionageschandaal is niettemin juist dankzij uitstekende onderzoeksjournalistiek aan het licht gekomen. Wij worden door dappere verslaggevers op de hoogte gesteld van de illegale pushbacks en de erbarmelijke omstandigheden waarmee vluchtelingen op de Griekse eilanden te maken krijgen. De media moeten de stem zijn van mensen die niet gehoord worden. Een democratie kan niet bestaan zonder vrije pers. Nota bene in het land waar de democratie ontstond, ziet de overheid dit niet in.

Wederom lukt het sommigen echter niet partijpolitiek van de bescherming van democratische waarden te scheiden. Wij mogen dit voor niemand goedpraten en moeten maatregelen nemen om de vrije pers en de rechtsstaat in Griekenland te beschermen. Niet alleen voor de Grieken, maar ook voor Europa.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospa predsednica. Grožnje, poskusi nadzora, utišanja, podrejanja. Da se v novinarstvu soočajo s tem, žal ni novo. A v zadnjih letih se samo še stopnjuje, celo nov zagon dobiva: z novo tehnologijo nadzora.

Metod je veliko, obravnavati pa jih moramo celovito. Tudi v Evropi se dogaja. Ne dogajajo se „samo“ grožnje, „samo“ poskusi, „samo“ nadzor, dogajajo se umori. Že skoraj dve leti je od umora grškega novinarja Giorgosa Karaivaza, pa preiskava sploh še ni končana. Karaivaz je s smrtjo plačal preiskovanje povezav vrha policije, politike in organiziranega kriminala. Ločeno se je razkrilo, da se je vohunjenje – ne le za opozicijo, ampak tudi za novinarji – vodilo neposredno iz kabineta predsednika vlade.

V tem primeru se Grčija kaže kot divji zahod rušenja vladavine prava, žal pa ni edina. Digitalni nadzor novinarjev je treba preprečiti. Zakonodajo pripravljamo v aktu o svobodi medijev, toda brez kazenske odgovornosti tistih, ki uporabljajo te metode, uspeha ne bo. Storiti je treba točno to, zaradi česar izsiljujejo in vohunijo: jih razkriti in ustaviti, preden umre še kdo.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, este debate não admite que nos deixemos enredar em ingenuidades ou no laxismo. É absolutamente clara a deriva autoritária de Mitsotákis e a sua implicação na utilização do *Predator* contra Nikos Androulakis e outros adversários políticos, jornalistas e patentes militares.

A queda abrupta de 38 posições sofrida pela Grécia no *ranking* da liberdade de imprensa dos Repórteres Sem Fronteiras é um dos reflexos da regressão que o país tem vindo a registar em matéria de liberdade de imprensa e do Estado de direito.

A tudo isto acrescem a corrupção e uma série de reformas que atingiram a independência do sistema judicial, o pluralismo dos média, o espaço da sociedade civil. É um caminho lamentável e absolutamente perigoso.

E agora, Senhora Comissária, diante de tudo isto, o que eu pergunto é: a Comissão vai continuar enredada numa troca de missivas ou vai acionar o artigo 7.º? Quando é que vamos acionar o artigo 7.º? Esta é a grande questão, Senhora Comissária.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Sinjura President, kienet tkun tad-dahk kieku mhux tal-biki tisma' lill-kelliema tal-EPP, in-nazzjonalisti fil-Parlament Ewropew, jiskuzaw dak illi gara fil-Greċja semplicement ghaliex hemm gvern nazzjonalist. Meta mbagħad ikun hemm gvernijiet oħrajn minn partiti oħrajn għamlu plejtu illi ma jispicċa qatt.

Fil-Greċja mhux biss inqatel ġurnalist investigattiv – xi haġa hażina hażna li sfortunatament anke ġrat f'pajjiżi – izda saħansitra nbidlu l-liġijiet biex jagħtu poteri straordinarji lill-gvern li wasslu biex, għal xhur shah, il-gvern jispjija u jisma' b'mod illegali mill-inqas tlettax-il ġurnalist, attivisti u politiċi, anke minn dan il-Parlament, li jkunu ġejjin mill-partiti tal-oppożizzjoni billi jehdilhom kontroll tal-mobile phones tagħhom, u jkun jaf dak kollu li qegħdin jgħidu, u dak kollu li qegħdin jagħmlu fuq it-telefown tagħhom.

Il-monitoraġġ illegali ta' persuna huwa minnu nnifsu ksur gravi tad-drittijiet fundamentali ta' kull bniedem – ksur li qatt m'għandu jkun rappreżentanti ta' dak li jiddefinixxi lil din l-Unjoni Ewropea. F'dan il-Parlament qegħdin naħdmu sabiex ikollna l-Media Freedom Act. Għandna Kumitat li qed janalizzza l-ispijunaġġ, il-programmi li qed jintużaw minn spjuni bħal dan il-gvern. Nittama li n-nazzjonalisti, li l-EPP, ma jibqgħux ikunu partigġjani u jkunu konsistenti f'dak illi jgħidu.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Madam President, Greece embodies many of the challenges we are facing right now. I am always amazed by how short a memory we human beings have. We live in an era when we cannot expect progress in the fields of democracy, human rights and rule of law anymore, because all energy goes to defending previous battles that have been won. Our MEP colleagues from Nea Demokratia are asking why we asked for this debate. Let me take one example that might not be important for you, but it is for us. According to Reporters Without Borders' yearly Press Freedom Index of 2022, the situation for journalists in Greece has deteriorated dramatically to the extent that it fell from 70th place to 108th, becoming the lowest-ranking EU country.

Nobody has missed the wiretapping scandal – a scandal with serious consequences – as surveillance of the phones of journalists and opposition political figures. One of the victims is our own MEP colleague, Nikos Androulakis, the President of the Social Democratic Party in Greece, PASOK. When faced with this situation, the right-wing Nea Demokratia government replied by trying to downplay it. It is a shame. The Commission must act quickly. Building democracies takes years and decades, but destroying them take can take seconds.

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I've listened very carefully to this debate and will, of course, report to my colleague Commissioner Reynders, but I want to underline that the Commission will continue our dialogue and our focus on the rule of law situation in different Member States and also to say that we remain at your disposal in that regard, whether it's in plenary, in committee or in any other format.

When it comes to the situation in Greece, the Commission appreciates the willingness of the Greek authorities to have a dialogue on the reforms to be carried out. However, I would like to stress the importance of completing all necessary reforms in terms of judicial independence and efficiency, the fight against corruption, freedom of the media, and checks and balances, and to implement them in practice.

We will continue to monitor the rule of law situation in all Member States, including Greece, in the context of the preparation of the rule of law report for this year.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, the Council attaches utmost importance of the rule of law, the defence of media freedom and the protection of journalists.

We all need to step up our efforts to ensure and guarantee media freedom. It starts with us, as co-legislators, to make progress on the two legislative proposals which the Commission has recently put forward. I trust that we will be able to work constructively on those issues and I look forward to the upcoming negotiations.

This work, together with the other actions that we will take, will be crucial to ensure that our Union is a safe place for journalists where democracy thrives. We need it now more than ever, during a troubled time that we are going through.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

14. Заключение на Съвета на ЕС: необходимостта от бързо финализиране на пътната карта (разискване)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu den Schlussfolgerungen des Europäischen Rates: Das Erfordernis einer raschen Finalisierung des Fahrplans (2023/2572(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for inviting me to this debate. Last week the European Council clearly stated that the migration situation is a European challenge that requires a European response.

I think there is a common understanding among us all that we need a comprehensive asylum reform to overcome the shortcomings of the current system. This has been recognised by the European Council, which has called on both the Council and Parliament to continue the work on the Pact on Migration and Asylum in accordance with the Joint Roadmap, which we agreed on last September. The permanent representatives of the five rotating presidencies have been meeting regularly within the members of the Asylum Contact Group of the European Parliament. I understand that these meetings have proved very positive and I have confirmed that the political will that exists in both sides is to reach a timely conclusion on all files.

Let me now briefly comment on the implementation of the Joint Roadmap by the Council. During the Czech Presidency, a concept for a way forward on the reform of the EU's common asylum system was developed. This foresees a balanced system of solidarity, a crisis response mechanism and responsibility. Home Affairs Ministers considered this work a good and viable way forward at the December Council. Since the beginning of our presidency, work has started on the legislative proposal of the Asylum and Migration Management Regulation. We are confident that there is a willingness among all Member States to make progress and to agree on a mandate that will allow us to start the interinstitutional negotiation as soon as possible.

We are working on a system capable of ensuring solidarity and alleviating the burden for the affected Member States. At the same time, it should improve the function of the current system, including by addressing secondary movements. In parallel, discussions continue on the border procedure under the Asylum Procedure Regulation proposal, aiming at a fast and effective migration procedure at external borders. The Council is ready to start negotiations on this file as soon as the European Parliament adopts its mandate.

We also aim at making substantial progress on the Crisis Situation Regulation, and discussion at expert levels started at the end of last year. Given the important links with the Instrumentalisation Regulation, the Presidency is considering the best way forward on these two proposals.

Following the first useful exchange between the co-legislators on the Eurodac Regulation, the first substantive trilogue meeting will be held very soon, and we hope that we can make good, swift progress together.

You are aware that the Council also stands ready to start negotiations on the Screening Regulation as soon as the European Parliament adopts its mandate. Here, I would like to stress the importance of making progress on the inter-institutional negotiations on these files wherever possible, because delaying certain discussions may result in putting extreme pressure as we approach the end of this term. The incoming Spanish and Belgian Presidencies will then not have sufficient time to finalise work on all the proposals.

Finally, with the confirmation of the provisional agreements, progress was possible on the Qualification Regulation, the Reception Conditions Directive, and the Resettlement Framework Regulation. The future steps will depend on the progress in the negotiations in all the files under the Asylum and Migration Pact reform.

The European Council last week focused on the overall importance of managing migration to the EU. We agreed on stepping up our action to prevent irregular departures and loss of life, to reduce pressures on EU borders and on reception capacities, to fight against smugglers and to increase returns. This will be done by intensifying cooperation with countries of origin and transit, through mutual beneficial partnerships.

I would like to finish my intervention by reiterating once again that the Council remains committed to make all efforts towards the finalisation of all the files before the end of this term. Thank you very much for your attention.

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the conclusions of last week's European Council and the need to adopt the pact on migration and asylum before the end of the mandate, as agreed by co-legislators under the joint roadmap.

At the last plenary, President von der Leyen presented the Commission's view on the way forward. As the President proposed in her letter to EU leaders, the European Council clearly recognised migration as a European challenge that requires a European response, and this is the right and only approach.

It was a European response that made it possible to defeat the hybrid attack by Belarus in 2021. A European response made it possible to welcome millions of Ukrainian refugees fleeing Putin's bombs last year and indeed this into this year. Only a European response will allow us to manage migration properly, taking advantage of the potential of legal migration and reducing irregular migration in a humane and effective manner. The lesson learned is clear: we need to act together.

As proposed by the Commission, EU leaders agreed that the EU needs to act on two tracks: legislative and operational. Only a comprehensive renewal of our legal framework can offer a strong and sustainable foundation for EU action. The new pact on migration and asylum will make sure different work streams mutually reinforce each other, with a clear framework and rules on solidarity and responsibility.

Alongside the pact, the Commission has also made other proposals: to step up the EU's capacity to strengthen our external borders; to ensure that internal border checks become measures of very last resort, through a modernised Schengen Borders Code. The Council is ready to start negotiations. It is essential that this House adopts its position also with some urgency.

The pact remains a number one priority for us in the Commission and, indeed, I think that is shared by the Council and this House: we are all fully committed. To finalise the negotiations before the end of this mandate, I think is a priority and we are talking about February 2024. I would add that the Commission stands ready to support all your efforts, and we count on you, as well as the Swedish and Spanish Presidency, to meet the challenge.

In parallel to the negotiations on the pact, we need to address the challenges that we are confronted with today. We have the power to act and we have put on the table important operational measures. We now need to implement them.

The European Council last week had an open and frank discussion on the challenges and the measures to be prioritised in the short term. We all agree that external borders must be managed better. External borders are not just national, but they are European borders. We must strengthen them and prevent irregular migration. We are ready to increase the presence of Frontex, for example, in the Western Balkans, through agreements with our partners.

We are going to develop pilot schemes showcasing good practices on border procedures, acting as a precursor to the new pact. The objective is to support Member States in taking quick decisions so that persons who are in need of protection get their status recognised quickly, while returning those not in need of protection. The Commission will provide operational, technical and financial support.

We will discuss with interested Member States and expect to start one or more pilots in the first half of this year. We must focus on further enhancing the functioning of our external borders by fully implementing the advanced external border management that we have all already agreed on. In particular, when it comes to the IT architecture on the European external borders, we need to choose our priorities in terms of funding.

Member States are best positioned to define how they protect their borders, but they must abide by the EU law and respect fundamental rights. We also need to do better on returns and have a common European approach for faster and dignified returns. The European Council calls on Member States to apply the mutual recognition of returns decisions. A return decision taken by one Member State must be valid in all Member States.

As of next month, the Schengen Information System enters into operation and it will be a key tool for this purpose. We welcome that leaders support the need for making full use of the safe country concept, aiming in the future at common European lists. Secondary movements are a legitimate concern in some Member States. We must address this issue and reduce the incentives for such movement.

We will work with Member States to ensure that they fully implement the Dublin roadmap and at the same time better implement the voluntary solidarity mechanism while waiting for a permanent mechanism through the pact.

Finally, we will not manage migration properly without increased partnership with the countries of origin and transit. We need a win-win cooperation on migration that covers all aspects of our relationship, cooperation to fight smuggling, enhancing returns and readmission of irregular migrants, but also working together on ambitious legal pathways to set up talent partnerships, boosting international mobility and the development of skills in a mutually beneficial way.

In the central Mediterranean, we are ready to strengthen border management and search and rescue capacities in Libya, Tunisia and Egypt, working in close cooperation with the UNHCR and the IOM. For such a multidimensional phenomenon, we need a whole of government approach and a single voice to speak for the EU.

The Commission will continue to support putting these operational key actions into practice and to support the co-legislators' work on the swift negotiations on the pact. I now look forward to your interventions.

Jeroen Lenaers, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, it was about time that the European Council put migration on its agenda. 70 % of Europeans are concerned about migration, and the EPP has been warning for months now that we are sleepwalking into a new crisis, with the numbers being the highest since 2016, so it's good that everybody seems to have finally woken up.

Let me welcome the unity that the European Council showed. Political leaders from our party, from the Liberals, from the Socialists, from the Conservatives all agreed that this is a European challenge that needs to be addressed at the European level, and that more efforts are needed to adopt the pact, to properly protect our external borders and to pay full attention to the external dimension of migration.

All 27 leaders agreed on this, so I hope we can also mirror that same spirit here today. I want to make two concrete points. First, our external borders need to be strengthened. This was our main EP call for months, and we welcome the Council's call on the Commission to immediately mobilise substantial EU funding to support Member States in reinforcing border protection capabilities and infrastructure. I also welcome the immediate follow-up on this call by the Commission, and I look forward to seeing the concrete results on the ground as soon as possible.

We need to have control of our external borders, and since these are our common European borders, their protection must also be a common European effort. I am glad that all leaders, from north to south and from left to right, have put their support behind this.

Secondly, the pact on migration needs to be adopted. Progress is being made, but both the Council and Parliament need to step it up a notch. In this House, we truly need to work in a spirit of compromise between all the constructive parties on all the files. I want to be very clear on this – we either have a real compromise on everything, including screening, for instance, or on nothing at all.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, vivimos en una época de temores e inseguridades, de peligros y dificultades. La inmigración, tan antigua como la humanidad, es uno de los mayores retos. Nunca olvidaremos la llegada de un millón de sirios que huyeron de la muerte en 2015. Ni la de los cuatro millones de ucranianos que hemos acogido por la guerra de Putin, ni la de los muchos inmigrantes que día a día arriesgan sus vidas cruzando el Mediterráneo y los Balcanes.

Necesitamos proteger nuestras fronteras. Pero mientras las guerras olvidadas, la explotación de los pobres y las catástrofes naturales sean una realidad, nunca podrán construirse muros tan altos para detener a los más débiles. Ya hay más de cien millones de seres humanos en el mundo que han tenido que abandonar su hogar por la fuerza. Muchos de ellos están en Europa y serán muchos más.

En un momento en el que la negociación del Nuevo Pacto sobre Migración y Asilo afronta su hora decisiva, debemos elegir en qué Europa queremos vivir. ¿En la Europa de los muros que defiende el señor Weber y la extrema derecha, o en la Europa humanista que no cierra los ojos ante la pérdida de vidas humanas? ¿En la Europa xenófoba que azota a los inmigrantes o en la Europa del Derecho que quiere a los inmigrantes para el desarrollo de nuestras sociedades y de nuestras culturas? ¿En la Europa del miedo al diferente o en la Europa de la esperanza que trabaja por encontrar una solución?

No hay respuestas fáciles para tiempos complejos, pero no serán los muros los que mejoren nuestra convivencia, sino la unión de nuestras fuerzas para gestionar la llegada de inmigrantes según las posibilidades de cada Estado y el respeto a la legalidad.

Ahora que la extrema derecha acusa al señor Weber de copiar su modelo de Europa contra la inmigración, en la familia socialdemócrata dirigimos nuestra mirada a esa otra alma del Partido Popular que sí está dispuesta a acoger, a proteger, a integrar. Los muros y los nacionalismos nos empujan a consecuencias devastadoras. Superemos el miedo al diferente. Hagamos de Europa un lugar de encuentro de pueblos diversos, una tierra de paz, progreso y oportunidades, protegiendo, en primer lugar, la vida de todo hombre y de toda mujer. Porque el futuro de Europa solo será próspero si nos reconciliamos con los más vulnerables.

No European money to build walls.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, colleagues, I think before we are going into the substance of the matter, let's just remind ourselves briefly of the official role of the European Council as defined by the Treaties. It is neither a legislator nor a budget authority, and giving instructions to the European Commission constitutes nothing less than a grave violation of the Treaties. Just saying.

Meanwhile, all the populist rhetoric of government leaders cannot hide the fact they themselves have been blocking a common policy for seven years, and walls are not the answer to their failure. If the graveyards in the Mediterranean, the quasi concentration camps in Libya, the horrors of Moria and the forests on the Polish-Belarusian border have not deterred migrants, then walls will not stop them either.

Walls are a fake solution, even if the word walls is neatly wrapped up in euphemism and bureaucracies. On the basis of the roadmap, Parliament and the Council – the legislator – have been diligently and constructively working on the completion of a coherent and effective asylum and migration policy. We will deliver real results for citizens: realistic policies that allow us to handle migration in an effective manner and also in line with our much-proclaimed values.

The great achievement of European integration is that it has broken down walls. Let's not turn Europe into a gated community.

Tineke Strik, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Council Commissioner. The EU Council conclusions are just another chapter of the dystopian Fortress Europe playbook. Deterring arrivals, ramping up border surveillance and shifting our responsibility to third countries. This will not lead to solutions; it will lead to more deaths, more human rights violations and more suffering. That's not leadership; this is panic and it is campaigning mode.

The EU was founded upon taking down the fences that separate us, enhancing freedom and fundamental rights protection. Are we going to fund the destruction of these achievements? For many EU leaders, migration policy is equal to keeping people out at all costs, but instead of erecting fences, we must build solidarity. Instead of pushing back, we must strengthen our common asylum system and share the responsibilities fairly. Instead of concluding shady deals, we must support third countries that all together host the vast majority of the refugees worldwide and offer safe paths to protection.

As we are entering the crunch time to conclude the pact, I urge the Council to focus on what is really at stake and to work towards real and evidence-based solutions. Simple frames and rhetoric may produce some electoral gains in the short term for right-wing parties, but they destroy the societal support for a common responsibility for refugees. What we need is true solidarity, and that requires true leadership.

Annalisa Tardino, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la linea dettata dai leader in occasione dei lavori del Consiglio europeo sembra segnare un netto cambio di passo.

Forse finalmente è stata riconosciuta l'importanza per l'Europa tutta, e non solo per qualche paese, di assicurare il controllo efficace delle frontiere esterne, con un chiaro riferimento alle specificità delle frontiere marittime. È quello che chiediamo da anni, prendendoci insulti dagli stessi che oggi sono solo impegnati a criticare il governo italiano su un decreto, quello sulle ONG, legittimo e rispettoso delle normative internazionali. Gli stessi, ipocriti, che gridano a fantomatici muri, quando noi parliamo semplicemente di contrasto all'immigrazione clandestina e alle organizzazioni criminali che lucrano sulle morti in mare.

Potete continuare a insultarci, ma noi come Lega e governo nazionale siamo solo preoccupati di difendere gli interessi dei cittadini su tutti i fronti, compresa l'immigrazione, e in questo confidiamo che finalmente l'Europa passi ai fatti.

Charlie Weimers, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, Minister Roswall, Commissioner, today we are debating the need for the speedy finalisation of the roadmap.

Another headline could have been the 'open borders' left being desperate to approve the EU asylum and migration pact before next year's election. They fear the adoption of the pact, with its forced solidarity and the permanent power it transfers to Brussels, is in jeopardy.

Commissioner, the EU's own proposed pact would transfer power to foreign politicians and far away bureaucrats over who settles and lives in our countries. Now we hear that the EPP is finally ready to get tough on border control, on increasing returns, on preventing illegal – excuse me, irregular – migration. But a few dear EPP colleagues, including my friends from the moderates in Sweden, if you really had your 'road to Damascus moment' on migration, then why are you rushing to approve the pact now, before the EP elections? Why ally with Socialists, Greens, Liberals and The Left on migration against your citizens, progressive support, enabling pull factors and hampering border controls?

I mean, today we can hear how the left, the progressives, how they equal border control with Fortress Europe. It's very evident the direction such a compromise would take, and the redistribution of migrants that the progressives are fighting for would create a new pull factor, further increasing migratory pressure on Europe, not reducing it.

Voters do not want to hold hostage border control measures, and their own personal security, until Member States cave on enforced solidarity. But that's exactly what you get when you work with the left on migration. By clinging to asylum dogma from a bygone era, the pact ensures that migrants will continue to die en route to Europe, that human trafficking gangs will continue to profit, and that segregation spreads across Europe.

Instead, the way forward is to secure the border and throw forced solidarity in the dustbin of history!

Sira Rego, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señora presidenta, parece que no hayamos tenido suficiente con las decenas de muertos en la valla de Melilla. Tampoco con los escándalos de Frontex, vulnerando derechos humanos y expulsando refugiados con violencia. Parece que ya no nos escandalizan las devoluciones en caliente, la negación del derecho a asilo o la criminalización de ONG; incluso parece que ya no nos incomoda tanto escuchar los argumentos racistas de la extrema derecha.

Ahora ya es aceptable negociar una política migratoria claramente xenófoba, que niega derechos fundamentales como la protección a quienes huyen de guerras y conflictos, seguir financiando vallas o hablar de países seguros para deportar a seres humanos sin ninguna garantía.

No es verdad que la migración sea un problema; más bien al contrario. Solo hace falta trabajar para ello, destinar fondos a los lugares de llegada, plantear estrategias de acogida digna e impulsar una política de fronteras que respete los derechos y facilite una migración segura y con garantías.

Estamos a tiempo de que Meloni y Orbán dejen de controlar la agenda migratoria europea.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Madam President, dear colleagues, the latest European Council conclusions reflect an important development in the field of migration. Finally, the need for strong border protection has been acknowledged. To quote a classic: 'Welcome to the real world.'

When all this began in 2015, there was only one European leader who was on the right track. While everybody was talking about quotas and redistribution, he was talking about stronger border control and built a fence. His name is Viktor Orbán. Time has proven him right, while most others were either wrong or not brave enough perhaps to say what they really thought. In that context, it's refreshing now to see the EPP and Manfred Weber finally follow the path of the Hungarian Prime Minister. You're eight years late, but better late than never.

Hungary has been protecting the EU external border for eight years. We have spent over EUR 1.7 billion on that effort, and still the European Commission has not contributed a penny to the costs of the border wall. We are protecting the entire European Union. We demand a significant contribution by the Commission to those costs. It's time to pay the bills.

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Fru talman! Vi står vid ett vägskäl nu. Antingen fortsätter vi med den politik som innebär att människor dör på Medelhavet, att vi ser att väldigt många människor kommer till Europa som saknar asylskäl, där vi ser att det blir några få medlemsländer som får bära det stora ansvaret. Eller så väljer vi en väg där vi inser att vi har mer av en gemensam europeisk migrationspolitik.

Jag är helt övertygad om att vi här i Europaparlamentet, men också i rådet, kan samlas kring en politik som innebär att vi har kontroll på våra yttre gränser. Att vi ser till att de människor som har asylskäl ska få skydd i Europa. Men att människor som inte har asylskäl också behöver lämna. Och att vi behöver samarbeta med tredjeländer för att få den här politiken att fungera. Det här är en möjlighet som ligger framför oss nu.

I sju år har Europaparlamentet efterfrågat de förändringar som nu behövs. Nu är vi på väg tillbaka in igen i den kris som vi hade senast 2016. Det fungerar inte längre att tro att nationell politik kan lösa detta. Vi är med i en gemensam union och har gemensamma gränser. Nu är det dags att anta migrationspakten och se till att vi kan börja dialogförhandlingar.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Präsidentin! Unsere Verantwortung hier im Haus ist es nicht, populistisch zu züngeln, sondern die aktuelle Herausforderung ist, dass wir uns auf ein ausgewogenes Migrationspaket verständigen, entsprechend der Roadmap.

Die EU ist hier seit Jahren immer wieder handlungsunfähig, auch gerade weil der Rat blockiert ist und blockiert. Aber die jüngsten Debatten im Rat nähren auch die Zweifel, ob der Rat versteht, dass nur ein ausgewogenes Paket hier im Haus eine Mehrheit findet. Ich bin ja nicht verwundert, wenn die ID-Fraktion oder die ECR-Fraktion hier zündeln und sich Trump zum Vorbild nehmen; der schwärmte ja, er werde die beste Mauer bauen, die größte, die stärkste, nicht überwindbar. Dass aber die EVP hier zunehmend mit Rechten und Postfaschisten kuschelt und diese Trump-Rhetorik übernimmt, das ist fahrlässig. Weil Ängste gegen Migration schüren und versuchen, daraus politisch Kapital zu schlagen, das ist nicht bürgerlich, das ist einfach abstoßend. Und ich habe ja gesehen, dass die ID schon Herrn Weber die Mitgliedschaft angeboten hat.

Warum sind wir als S&D gegen Mauern? Weil Mauern und Zäune nicht helfen. Auch die Geschichte der USA, und wenn man sich die US-Mauer anguckt: Mauern halten Flüchtlinge nicht ab, sie erhöhen nur die Zahl der Toten.

Deshalb: EU-Geld, das anderswo aufgewandt werden kann, dafür aufzuwenden, ist populistisch, und vor allen Dingen, es löst die Herausforderungen nicht, die wir in Bezug auf Migration haben. Die können wir nur durch ein ausgewogenes Paket lösen.

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Madame la Présidente – chère Evelyn Regner –, Madame la Ministre des affaires européennes – chère Jessika Roswall –, Madame la Commissaire Mairead McGuinness, la réponse au défi migratoire, c'est le pacte sur la migration et l'asile.

Chers collègues, ce n'est pas un retour aux réflexes nationaux. Ce ne sont pas des solutions simplistes, comme la construction de murs. Le pacte, c'est notre meilleur atout pour établir des règles réellement communes entre tous les États membres, dans le respect de nos principes et de nos valeurs européennes.

Ce pacte prévoit des règles pour assurer l'accès à la protection internationale, mettre en place des procédures d'asile rapides, organiser les retours et gérer efficacement nos frontières extérieures. Ce sont bien ces quatre points qu'il nous faut réaliser en même temps.

L'adoption de cette réforme d'ampleur avant les élections européennes de mai 2024 est un impératif majeur pour apporter enfin une réponse européenne et courageuse, chers collègues, au sujet migratoire. Je suis convaincue de notre capacité, avec le Conseil, à y parvenir. Ne tardons plus.

Erik Marquardt (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich habe das Dokument des Rates gelesen, und eigentlich ist mir sofort in den Kopf gekommen, dass Abschreckung und Abschottung doch seit Jahren das Chaos erzeugen, das sie vorgeben zu bekämpfen. Ich glaube, dass wir einfach aufhören sollten – und das ist mir auch bei dem Dokument aufgefallen –, die Verantwortung für die Zukunft unseres Asylsystems hinter Mauern zu verstecken. Man wird am Ende die Menschen nicht alle abschieben können. Acht von zehn Geflüchteten, die gerade im letzten Jahr gekommen sind, kommen aus der Ukraine. Warum reden wir nur über Abschottung, nicht darüber, wie wir schneller dafür sorgen können, dass sie Teil der Gesellschaft werden?

Ich glaube aber auch, dass wir aufpassen müssen, dass wir die Verantwortung für die aktuelle Situation, die wir haben, nicht hinter einer Mauer aus Lügen verstecken. Es wird immer behauptet, wir haben offene Grenzen – wir haben keine offenen Grenzen. Im Gegenteil, wir haben tausende Tote an den Grenzen jedes Jahr und noch zehntausende, die illegal gepushbackt werden. Wir tun so, als könnten wir die Menschen an den Außengrenzen nicht registrieren und nicht überwachen. Aber das Gegenteil ist der Fall. Wir schicken Frontex ja sogar weg, zum Beispiel in Griechenland, weil sie zu viele Menschenrechtsverletzungen beobachtet haben.

Ich glaube, wenn wir nicht endlich anfangen, unsere eigenen Gesetze achten zu wollen, dann müssen wir eigentlich auch nicht so viel über neue diskutieren. Ich denke, dass wir vor allem aufpassen sollten bei allen Detailfragen, dass wir das Europa, das wir gerade in der Asylpolitik sehen, der nächsten Generation nicht so überlassen, dass wir uns für unsere Politik bei unseren Nachkommen schämen müssen.

Jean-Paul Garraud (ID). – Madame la Présidente, le Conseil européen spécial sur la migration s'est engagé sur la voie de la protection de nos populations en exigeant un renforcement des frontières extérieures de l'Union.

La Commission se dit prête à financer des infrastructures à cette fin; nous en prenons bonne note et nous veillerons à l'effectivité de ces annonces. C'est certainement un tort d'avoir raison trop tôt, mais c'est assez extraordinaire de voir, aujourd'hui, un début de mise en œuvre de ce que nous réclamons depuis des années.

Néanmoins, il reste beaucoup à faire: pourquoi la Commission refuse-t-elle ainsi toujours les demandes de plusieurs États de participer au financement de murs et de clôtures? Il en existe déjà des milliers de kilomètres dans plusieurs États aux frontières de l'Union européenne, certains d'entre eux étant gouvernés par des socialistes. Alors pourquoi les socialistes d'ici refusent-ils ce que demandent les socialistes de là-bas?

Il est grand temps que vous vous débarrassiez de vos œillères idéologiques et que vous répondiez aux aspirations légitimes de protection des peuples. Certes, il est regrettable d'édifier des murs dans une Europe qui se voulait généreuse et ouverte au monde, mais tout ceci est le résultat de votre politique.

D'ailleurs, si certaines mesures protectrices sont annoncées, vous vous empressiez aussi de négocier le nouveau pacte sur la migration et l'asile, qui favorise une immigration de masse, sans oublier la future loi du chancelier Scholz.

Alors il reste beaucoup à faire pour que l'Union européenne s'occupe en priorité des Européens. Cela continuera à être notre priorité.

Assita Kanko (ECR). – Voorzitter, wie van ons is trots op ons migratiebeleid? Wie zou een slachtoffer van mensensmokkel in de ogen kunnen kijken en kunnen zeggen: "Wij zijn goed bezig"?

Sinds 2019 zijn duizenden mensen in de Middellandse Zee verdronken. Het migratiebeleid is sindsdien echter niet concreet veranderd. Ook sinds de migratiecrisis van 2015 is niets veranderd. Wij hebben vergaderd, vragen gesteld, interviews gegeven en met de vinger gewezen naar elkaar en vooral naar landen die de toestroom van migranten niet aankunnen, maar hebben op dit vlak in feite geen enkele vooruitgang geboekt.

Het wordt tijd dat we de urgentie van deze kwestie inzien en ons migratiebeleid omgooien. Het is immers beter te voorkomen dan te genezen. Dit houdt in dat wij onze buitengrenzen fysiek moeten versterken en de asielpprocedure buiten de EU moeten organiseren. Alleen op deze manier kunnen we mensensmokkel en massale verdrinkingen tegen gaan. Dat zou pas humaan zijn.

Wij moeten de illusie van een menselijk opengrenzenbeleid laten varen, zodat wij onze solidariteit kunnen bewaren voor mensen die daadwerkelijk in nood zijn.

Dit is wat wij samen kunnen en moeten doen.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Ministro, Senhor Comissário, já aqui disse e repito: no PSD e no PPE, defendemos, convictamente, a dignidade de todas as pessoas, sejam refugiados, candidatos a asilo, migrantes económicos, cidadãos estrangeiros ou europeus.

Como disse o Papa João XXIII, toda a gente é pessoa e por isso só aceitamos uma política de migrações e uma política de fronteiras que sejam humanistas. Felizmente, o consenso quanto ao respeito pela dignidade de todos é muito elevado neste Parlamento. O problema é que algumas forças políticas, de maneira populista e hipócrita, querem instrumentalizar o tema dos refugiados e dos migrantes para fins de luta partidária.

O PSD e o PPE, porque respeitam a dignidade de todos e estão cientes da complexidade desta política, não fazem demagogia, não pregam uma coisa em Bruxelas ou Estrasburgo e fazem, como Sánchez, outra nos muros de Ceuta e de Melilha. Não fazem uma coisa aqui e outra no aeroporto de Copenhaga ou nas praias de Valeta.

O PPE não aprova uma política no Conselho, com todos os primeiros-ministros, incluindo os socialistas, e depois vem para aqui apregoar outras coisas no Parlamento.

Na Europa, por razões demográficas, precisamos de imigração. E quando falamos de migrantes, não falamos de refugiados. Queremos que eles entrem na Europa de modo seguro, com garantias de que não vão ser explorados nas herdades do Alentejo português ou amontoados num apartamento sem condições aos 20 e aos 30, no centro de Lisboa.

Em Portugal, destruiu-se o SEF e as estruturas de ajuda à migração e, agora, jura-se respeito aos migrantes e não se quer saber sequer das suas vidas.

Isto não é uma política humanista, isso sim, não é uma política com humanidade.

(O orador aceita responder a uma intervenção «cartão azul»)

João Albuquerque (S&D), intervenção «cartão azul». – Senhora Presidente, o Deputado Paulo Rangel veio aqui falar das contradições de líderes socialistas e a pergunta que eu lhe gostaria de colocar é se está em condições de assumir, perante esta Câmara, que o PSD rejeita, por completo, a quebra de tabu do seu líder parlamentar para que a União Europeia possa financiar a construção de muros e arame farpado na União Europeia com fundos europeus?

Paulo Rangel (PPE), resposta a intervenção «cartão azul». – Senhora Presidente, senhor Deputado, em primeiro lugar, tem de perguntar ao Primeiro-Ministro Sánchez por que é que tem muros em Ceuta e Melilha. Em segundo lugar, tem de perguntar ao Primeiro-Ministro António Costa por que é que aprovou as conclusões do Conselho. Essa é que devia ser a sua pergunta.

E, quanto a nós, posso-lhe dizer que não precisamos, em termos gerais, nem de muros nem de vedações. Do ponto de vista do PSD, essa política não é necessária e, seguramente, em Portugal não é necessária. Agora, são precisos fundos europeus para tratar de infraestruturas, postos de acolhimento, postos de controlo, *drones*, radares, investimento nas forças de segurança e nas forças de controlo. Isso, sim, é necessário.

Porque essa política, a política do Partido Socialista Português, sabe ao que é que levou? À morte de duas pessoas, no centro de Lisboa, muito recentemente. São sete anos de política que fez com que, agora, tenhamos migrantes vindos da Ásia Oriental por todo o Portugal a viverem aos 20 e aos 30 em camaratas, sem qualquer dignidade. Essa é que é a política humanista do Partido Socialista Português. Por isso, não tem nenhuma autoridade moral para falar connosco.

Elena Yoncheva (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, le système d’asile est en cours de réforme depuis plus de sept ans. Sept longues années, au cours desquelles nous avons été témoins de l’effondrement des systèmes nationaux sous la pression des mouvements populistes exploitant des tragédies humaines.

Et maintenant, pour la première fois, nous sommes sur le point d’avoir un nouveau système d’asile dans l’Union européenne. Mais nous avons très peu de temps pour franchir cette dernière étape. Nous devons donc aujourd’hui décider: allons-nous passer l’année prochaine à nous cacher derrière des excuses et des peurs ou allons-nous faire notre travail?

Car, s’il s’agit d’exploiter différentes solutions, rencontrons-nous et discutons! Discutons, chers collègues! Nous – le Parlement, le Conseil, la Commission – devons mettre en œuvre la feuille de route. Nous avons besoin de leadership et non d’excuses. Plus d’excuses, chers collègues!

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Warum kommen wir nicht weiter, fragen sich die Bürgerinnen und Bürger bei der Migrationspolitik. Und sie haben recht, sich diese Frage zu stellen. Seit 2015/16, seit der großen Migrationskrise, blockieren die Mitgliedstaaten jeden legislativen Fortschritt in dieser Frage. Und jetzt ist der Druck wegen einer großen Zahl zusätzlicher Flüchtlinge aus der Ukraine besonders hoch; auf kommunaler Ebene merken wir das. Und wir brauchen Antworten, und die Bürger erwarten Antworten. Und der Rat arbeitet jetzt, adressiert diese aktuellen Fragen.

Aber ich glaube, dass wir dabei manchmal das langfristige Ziel vergessen. Natürlich müssen wir kurzfristige Probleme adressieren. Natürlich müssen wir auch bei der Abschiebung besser werden und brauchen dafür Vereinbarungen mit Drittstaaten.

Aber das, was wir wirklich brauchen, ist endlich ein gemeinsames europäisches Asylsystem. Was wir endlich brauchen, ist eine Antwort auf die Frage, wie Solidarität zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten in Europa organisiert werden kann. Was wir endlich brauchen, sind schnellere Verfahren beim Asyl, und was wir endlich brauchen, das ist ein einfacherer und besserer Zugang zum europäischen Arbeitsmarkt, damit die Leute gar nicht erst im Asylsystem landen. Das ist das, was wir brauchen, und ich erwarte, dass der Rat da endlich vorankommt.

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman! Extremhögerns dröm om ett Europa omringat av murar med taggtrådsstängsel är på väg att bli verklighet. De hundratals miljoner euro som läggs på att hindra människor från att ta sig till EU kommer inte att sätta stopp för fattigdom, krig och naturkatastrofer. Det vet alla som tänker till. Det vet EU:s statsministrar och regeringar.

De vet också att det i stället kommer att göra att människor blir mer desperata och tar större risker. Vinnarna är säkerhets- och försvarsindustrin. Förlorarna är människor som flyr för sina liv. Murar och stängsel löser inte de stora problemen. Vi måste kunna bättre än så här. Vi kan bättre än så här.

Vincenzo Sofò (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo anni di accecante ideologia «no borders», pare finalmente che l’Europa inizi ad aprire gli occhi sulle drammatiche conseguenze dell’immigrazione incontrollata.

Dalle conclusioni dell’ultimo Consiglio europeo alla Strategia operativa per il Mediterraneo presentata dalla Commissione si evince come si stia capendo che l’unica soluzione possibile sia quella indicata da Fratelli d’Italia e dalle destre tutte.

Una risposta europea alla crisi migratoria è indispensabile e deve avere come principio cardine la difesa delle nostre frontiere attraverso pattugliamenti dei confini con filtri esterni per gli ingressi, sistemi efficaci di rimpatrio e rigorose regole di condotta per le ONG.

Ma questa risposta la sinistra, proprio su mandato di ONG terrorizzate dal perdere l’enorme fonte di business data all’immigrazione clandestina, vuole impedirla a tutti i costi. Ed è per questo che ha sguinzagliato le istituzioni da essa presiedute in un’operazione di boicottaggio dei decreti messi in campo dal governo Meloni, ai quali sempre più paesi e forze politiche guardano come modello da seguire. Decreti che, sì, è vero, ledono gli interessi economici di certe organizzazioni fintamente umanitarie, ma che sono necessari per tutelare la coesione economica, sociale e identitaria del nostro continente.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kolegice i kolege, područje Mediterana na kojem je nastajala europska zapadna civilizacija ponovno je, uz povezane kopnene pravce, pod najintenzivnijim pritiskom nereguliranih, nezakonitih migracija.

I najnaivnijim je danas jasno da dramatične brojke pokazuju da su postojeće europske politike migracija i azila zakazale. Nisu isporučile uređeni sustav. Treba nam zato odgovorna zajednička europska migracijska politika u kojoj je potpuno jasno i prije zaključaka Europskog vijeća da zaštita naših vanjskih granica nema nikakvu alternativu.

Države članice, a ne krijumčarske mafije, trebaju odlučivati tko ima pravo na ulazak na europski teritorij. Treba nam sustav koji je solidaran, koji je human prema svima onima koji su doista u potrebi, ali koji je istodobno i nepokolebljiv prema krijumčarima koji ugrožavaju živote tisuća ljudi, ali i prema onima koji pokušavaju zloupotrijebiti sustav.

Nemojmo i ne možemo zatvarati oči pred instrumentalizacijom sustava i pred dramatičnim pokušajima zloupotreba. Intenzitet i složenost pitanja migracija poziva Europu da se hitno prilagodi novoj stvarnosti. Europa to još nije učinila, ali su zaključci Europskog vijeća svakako pravi korak u tom smjeru.

Javier Moreno Sánchez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, señora ministra, señorías, señorías de las derechas, lo que no cabe en ninguna hoja de ruta migratoria es la construcción de nuevos muros fronterizos y menos aún con fondos europeos.

Señor Rangel, el presidente Sánchez no ha construido ningún muro. Tal vez usted tenga alma de albañil, pero él no. Él abre las puertas. La historia, además, nos ha demostrado que los muros son un fracaso. Volver a reclamar una «Europa fortaleza» es poner en evidencia que no han entendido nada.

Si realmente quieren poner fin a los flujos irregulares manejados por las mafias, a la trata y al tráfico de seres humanos, deben reclamar más canales de migración legal —que la necesitamos— y mayor cooperación con los países de origen y de tránsito, con los medios políticos y financieros adecuados, sobre todo, recordando que solo cerraremos el Pacto sobre Migración y Asilo si alcanzamos un equilibrio entre responsabilidad y solidaridad.

Por último, señora ministra, celebro los esfuerzos del Grupo de Contacto Europeo sobre Búsqueda y Salvamento y espero que se materialice cuanto antes en un mecanismo europeo, obligatorio, claro y eficaz. Porque, desgraciadamente, siguen muriendo todos los días migrantes en el mar.

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

Vizepräsidentin

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señora presidenta, queridos colegas, yo escucho a la señora Roswall, del Consejo, y me parece que está tocando el arpa. Con todo respeto. Los parches en materia de inmigración han estallado uno tras otro durante ocho años y el Consejo escribe conclusiones como si no hubiera estado hablando con el Parlamento durante ocho años y como si no hubiera hecho caer el paquete de migración y asilo hace tres y medio.

La clave —la primera cosa que tenemos que ver que no funciona— es el Reglamento de Dublín. Escucho también a la señora McGuinness hablar de las fronteras externas y sus problemas de corto plazo y me parece que está tocando el violín. Es que los países con fronteras exteriores, con más exposición a grandes flujos de personas, no pueden con una presión que es ya estructural —no es un tema de corto plazo—.

Así que estamos en este Parlamento esperando un milagro, entendiendo la palabra «milagro» como la voluntad, de verdad, de unirse y de sacar este paquete adelante. Porque el problema de la migración es exponencial y está intoxicándolo todo.

En 2015 hubo buenas palabras, pero no fueron sinceros muchos gobiernos ¿En 2023 van a serlo? Si no, no podremos ser ni justos ni eficaces.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Migration ist eine europäische Herausforderung, die einer europäischen Lösung bedarf. Leider wurden in den vergangenen Jahren bei der Suche nach dieser Antwort wenig Fortschritte erzielt. Nach Österreich kamen letztes Jahr über 100 000 Flüchtlinge, davon 75 000, die in einem anderen vorgelagerten EU-Land registriert hätten werden müssen.

Es gibt daher dringend Handlungsbedarf, denn auch in der Bevölkerung machen sich Ängste breit. Viele fragen zu recht: Was macht die EU? Ich begrüße daher ausdrücklich, dass auch auf Drängen von Österreich der Rat in seinen Schlussfolgerungen einen klaren Fahrplan für operative Maßnahmen zur Stärkung der Außengrenzen und zur Bewältigung des Flüchtlingsstroms darlegt, um Schleppern den Kampf anzusagen, um den Verlust von Menschenleben zu verhindern, um den Druck auf die EU-Außengrenzen durch die Stärkung von Frontex zu verringern, um die Rückkehr durch die Möglichkeit des Entzugs von Visa und Handelserleichterungen zu forcieren und um Pilotprojekte für effektives Grenzmanagement zu etablieren. Damit könnten wir eine echte Wende der Migrationspolitik einläuten.

Daher gilt es, sofort die Arbeit am Migrations- und Asylpakt sowie an der Modernisierung des Schengener Grenzkodex und an der Rückführungsrichtlinie fortzusetzen. Es ist bereits fünf vor zwölf, und wir wollen doch alle nicht, dass diese rechten Reihen noch stärker werden, die heute wieder einmal leer sind.

Carina Ohlsson (S&D). – Fru talman! Delar av toppmötet från förra veckan känns skamliga för vårt Europa. Istället för att diskutera paktens grundidé, det vill säga att tillsammans ta ett gemensamt ansvar för människor som är på flykt, handlade det också om var vi ska bygga stängsel och vem som ska finansiera det.

Handlar inte EU om att riva murar mellan människor i stället för att bygga nya? Är Donald Trump den nya inspirationsskällan? Att bygga murar är både populistiskt, meningslöst och ett totalt slöseri med våra skattepengar. Enligt de konservativa och högerextrema ska inga pengar till för att stötta människor på flykt. Men att lägga miljontals euro på en mur, då verkar det inte vara några problem. Murar är inte bara meningslöst, det är framför allt en handling som innebär allt annat än att ta ett gemensamt ansvar för människor på flykt och värna rätten att söka asyl.

Sverige var drivande i grundandet av pakten och nu som ordförandeland måste vi stå upp för paktens grundidé. Sveriges regering är dock beroende av ett högerextremt parti, vilket gör mig mycket orolig för var denna diskussion kommer att landa. Jag hoppas att jag har fel och att det går i rätt riktning.

Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, τα συμπεράσματα του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου είναι προς την ορθή κατεύθυνση. Είναι όμως αρκετά; Ακούω έντονη κριτική, αλλά δεν ακούω από κάποιες πλευρές εισηγήσεις για το πώς λύνουμε το μεταναστευτικό. Ακούω όχι σε φράχτες, όχι σε τοίχους. Εγώ μισώ περισσότερο από όλους και τους φράχτες και τους τοίχους, διότι η Τουρκία έβαλε στην Κύπρο έναν φράχτη και χώρισε την πατρίδα μου. Μισώ τους φράχτες. Πέστε μου, όμως, τι μπορούμε να κάνουμε όταν από την Τουρκία έρχονται καθημερινά δεκάδες άνθρωποι, όχι από εμπόλεμες περιοχές, αεροπορικά από την Τουρκία στις ελεύθερες περιοχές της Δημοκρατίας. Πού είναι η Frontex; Ποιος είναι ο ρόλος της Frontex; Η Τουρκία λαμβάνει δισεκατομμύρια από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και δεν τηρεί τις συμφωνίες της. Πώς μπορούμε να την υποχρεώσουμε; Αυτά τα θέματα πρέπει να δούμε και να αφήσουμε τους λαϊκισμούς.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, nous voici donc à un moment crucial dans les discussions et décisions relatives au nouveau pacte sur la migration et l'asile, sous la triple pression des États membres, de la Commission et de la droite de cet hémicycle.

Selon elle, il faudrait terminer au plus vite la réforme du régime d'asile européen commun, avec la justification de la fin du cycle 2019-2024. Réformer? Nous sommes d'accord sur ce constat: le système ne fonctionne pas et il faut le modifier. Mais terminer cette réforme, à quel prix? Où veut s'établir le fameux équilibre entre solidarité et responsabilité? Cet équilibre peut-il s'établir mathématiquement, en marginalisant les répercussions sur les vies humaines, d'une part, et celles sur le fonctionnement du système d'asile dans les principaux États membres d'entrée, d'autre part?

Le débat sur le financement du mur est une diversion, une instrumentalisation – si je peux m'exprimer ainsi –, car le xxi^e siècle ne devrait pas être celui qui fait écho au xx^e siècle, qui a vu la destruction des murs. Diversion encore, parce que les murs servent à générer d'autres passages et n'ont pas l'effet de dissuasion recherché. Aucun des murs érigés ne règlera le problème relatif à l'origine des dysfonctionnements ni ne délivrera les solutions à y apporter.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, Казват, че ако има воля, ще се намери и начин. Но контролът срещу незаконната миграция няма да стане по-ефективен нито с гръмки призови, нито с дискриминационни бариери пред разширяването на Шенген, а само с адекватни, бързи, солидарни и финансово обезпечени мерки. Няма как да постигнем укрепване на външните граници на Евросъюза без силна подкрепа за държавите на първа линия. Докато европейските институции са зациклили преговорите по новата пътна карта за миграцията, в страни като България, които първи посрещат мигрантския натиск, полиция загиват в изпълнение на служебния си дълг. Мощният рестарт, който всички искаме по отношение на цялостната политика по миграция, не може да се осъществи без допълнителни финансови ресурси. Те са необходими както за укрепване на защитната инфраструктура по външните граници, така и за подобряване на процедурите за връщане на нелегални мигранти, а също и за интеграция на бежанците. Ако не искаме да допуснем поредното кризисно лято, не трябва да губим повече време.

Janina Ochojska (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Trzy dni temu aktywiści pomagający na granicy Polski i Białorusi znaleźli ciało 28-letniej Etiopki, która zmarła w wyniku zamarznięcia. Leżała na ziemi skulona. Obok niej chrześcijański modłitevník z obrazkami świętych. Zmarła w lesie, w kraju, który uważa się za chrześcijański. Na tej granicy zmarły co najmniej 34 osoby. Co powiemy ich rodzinom? Że pozwoliliśmy na ich śmierć, bo polscy pogranicznicy nie dali im złożyć wniosków o ochronę międzynarodową, do czego mieli prawo? Nie dajmy sobie wmówić, że ochrona granic zewnętrznych powinna zaprzeczać humanitaryzmowi. Gdzie w wartościach, które stanowią Unię Europejską, jest miejsce na mury, czy jak chce PPE, fizyczną infrastrukturę? W forticy Europa mamy tysiąc osiemset kilometrów murów. To 13 razy więcej niż mur berliński. To my powodujemy wzrost migracji. Zabieramy ludziom ziemię, wpływamy niszcząco na środowisko i biedę w krajach rozwijających się, powodujemy konflikty.

Myślę, że wiem, co zrobić z migracjami, ale nie ma na to tu czasu. Brakuje mi prawdziwej debaty nad migracjami, wymiany poglądów i doświadczeń. Spójrzmy na tę pustą salę.

Die Präsidentin. – Wir kommen jetzt zu den spontanen Wortmeldungen. Ich habe fünf Anmeldungen, von denen zwei allerdings schon in der Debatte gesprochen haben. Deswegen werde ich drei berücksichtigen.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, queria levantar dois pontos no final deste debate e esperamos que este *road map* seja, de facto, um caminho que nos conduza à decisão política.

E os dois pontos que eu gostaria de levantar são os seguintes:

Em primeiro lugar, as experiências recentes em matéria de política migratória, de imigrações, de política de refugiados, após a guerra da Ucrânia, são as aprendizagens que nós temos de fazer e são aprendizagens importantes que devem ser determinantes na futura política de imigração da União Europeia.

O segundo ponto tem a ver com o não uso, e a nossa posição é muito clara: o dinheiro europeu, o orçamento da União Europeia, tem de ser usado para promover os valores europeus e não contra os valores europeus.

É por isso que rejeitamos, completamente, que o dinheiro europeu, que o orçamento europeu, seja usado para a construção de muros.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la migración es un hecho. No es una amenaza ni contra nuestra seguridad ni contra nuestra identidad y, desde luego, los muros no son la respuesta. La respuesta debe ser europea en su alcance, en sus valores, pero también en su Derecho legislado conforme a los principios de solidaridad vinculante y responsabilidad compartida.

Este Parlamento ha puesto en vigor ese Derecho legislado en migración y en asilo. Si estamos negociando un nuevo Pacto es porque ha habido incumplimientos por parte del Derecho de los Estados miembros, de los Gobiernos de los Estados miembros, y falta de solidaridad y de responsabilidad compartida.

Pero aún tenemos una oportunidad. Para ello es imprescindible que exista solidaridad vinculante y responsabilidad compartida desde las fronteras expuestas, desde Canarias hasta Lesbos, por parte de los Estados miembros.

El Parlamento Europeo va a hacer su trabajo. Por eso hemos asumido la hoja de ruta, el calendario antes del final de este mandato para que se aprueben esos cinco reglamentos. Es imprescindible, sencillamente, que el Consejo haga su parte del trabajo.

When there is a will, there must be a way.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, I am a member of the Development Committee here in the European Parliament, and I want to recall Article 208 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, which states that the primary objective of our development cooperation policy is the eradication of poverty.

The Council conclusions make reference to the use of NDICI-Global Europe funding for migration purposes. It is possible that it is a secondary objective of development cooperation. It is possible. But what was astonishing about these Council conclusions is that it doesn't make that other argument. It's fine to talk about returns, it's fine to talk about safe countries of origin, but there's nothing about illegal pushbacks, there's nothing about the horrible conditions in Libyan detention centres, there's nothing about restoring search and rescue, and there's nothing about condemning Fortress Europe and the building of walls.

It's fine to have these points that vindicate the far right, but you also have to have the other narrative, which is about a humanitarian European migration policy.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Mairead McGuinness, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, colleagues, thank you for this debate. I really appreciate the sense of urgency in the House and the approach of Members from whatever side that we need a common pact on migration and asylum.

Perhaps the last speaker in catch-the-eye stole a line of mine, but I do think we need to realise that we're talking about human beings. They could be people like you and I, and I think that is important for us to say in this debate. But we are letting down human beings who need protection; people who come here and who should have their status recognised quickly. This is not happening and that has to be addressed. Human trafficking must be tackled. Reducing irregular arrivals and increasing returns where that is appropriate is also important.

The European Council has agreed a two-track approach. So, the operational measures that I have mentioned, but more importantly the legislative action to underpin a European common approach to asylum and migration. This is the only sustainable solution, and I know there is a commitment to reach agreement by the end of this term, but I really would wish for speed in that work.

We are ready to assist the co-legislators. We need to agree on a sustainable, efficient and humane common migration and asylum policy. Therefore, this debate, with the many different views, should focus all of our attention on doing what we can to reach agreement so that we once and for all have a common approach on European migration and asylum.

Jessika Roswall, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, I say to the Commissioner, thank you for your remarks and comments and for the continuous debate on such an important matter and, as I hear, the need for a common European response.

As I stated in my opening speech, the Council has made concrete progress in the past months. We remain committed to our common goal of reaching an agreement on all legislative files in the migration pact before the end of this term, and we trust that the European Parliament will do the same.

Let me also say that the issue of protecting the EU's external border is not new; in fact, it has featured in Council conclusions for several years. But in order to reach a sustainable compromise on migration policy, we need to balance both elements: strong protection of our external borders and common rules for migration and asylum.

During the European Council meeting last week, the leaders stressed that the Commission should continue to fund measures to contribute to the control of the EU external borders, for example, border management, pilot projects, reinforcement of border protection capabilities and infrastructure. The Commission will take forward the operational action as agreed, including work with relevant Member States and agencies to identify pilot projects.

Finally, we are all aware of the negotiations on the pact will be extremely difficult and sensitive and that this will require time. But the joint roadmap agreed between the rotating presidency of the Council and the European Parliament sets out a clear goal: an agreement on all legislative proposals by the end of this legislative term. This requires joint efforts. We will do our best to make this happen. However, the European Parliament must also do its part and adopt its negotiating mandates on all legislative files contained in the pact. But I am looking forward to the negotiation to do this together with you.

Thank you again for the debate and for your attention.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

15. Европейска централна банка — годишен отчет за 2022 г. (разискване)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Rasmus Andresen im Namen des Ausschusses für Wirtschaft und Währung über die Europäische Zentralbank – Jahresbericht 2022 (2022/2037(INI)) (A9-0022/2023).

Rasmus Andresen, rapporteur. – Madam President, dear colleagues, President Lagarde, it is good to see you here in the European Parliament. The Russian aggression against Ukraine, disrupted supply chains and the ongoing climate crisis are threats to our economy and to price stability. With an unstable economic outlook, we cannot be sure that price stability and an economically stable environment for all citizens will be reached. Energy and food prices are still far too high, and our dependence on fossil fuels remains far too strong.

While profits of the biggest corporations are skyrocketing, a majority of citizens are suffering from real wage losses. The real wage growth declined in the first half of 2022 to —2.3%. In Germany, my country, the wage loss went to —3.9%. At the same time, we could observe a higher contribution of profits to inflation, for example, from energy companies like ExxonMobil, Shell and others. We need to have a science-based analysis.

We therefore call on the ECB in the report to begin to report also on profits contribution to inflation, the same as you are already doing with wages. We are calling on the ECB to take a step-by-step approach. The high inflation is a big concern for the European Parliament and we agree on that the ECB has the tools to bring demand driven inflation down. By accepting the primary mandate, we also need to be very clear: this current price explosion is different. The ECB has limited tools to address it.

We are facing exceptional supply shocks in the energy markets. The ECB cannot bring this inflation down at short-term level, but also needs to focus on the medium-term perspective. Our high levels of dependence on Russian imports and skyrocketing prices for fossil fuels are an important reminder how a climate-harming policy is also directly affecting price stability. Green monetary policy is not a nice-to-have but necessary to secure price stability and a prosperous economic outlook. This is why we dedicated an entire section in the report to the ECB's policies to actions against climate change.

We are welcoming the ECB climate roadmap and stress test you put forward last year. We discussed it in the Committee more than once, but we also think that we need to do more and we need to include climate— and environment-related risks through climate stress tests and also other tools. We are inviting you, President, also in the next months to discuss this further with the European Parliament.

Climate change is affecting price stability, and ignoring this fact will lead to big problems in the future. From a green perspective, important steps, first steps have been taken also in the report we could agree on in the Committee, but we still need to develop tools so that needed green investments will not be harmed by a tightening of monetary policy. I guess this will also be one of our major priorities for the next debates in our Committee when it comes to central banking and to monetary policy.

For the first time, the report also includes a chapter with recommendation for secondary objectives. For too long a time, the secondary objectives have been politically ignored, and let me state this in no uncertain terms: the ECB secondary mandate is legally binding and laid down in the treaties. So we are calling the ECB to explain in a designated chapter of its report how its monetary policy is affecting the general economic policies of the Union, including impacts on sustainable growth and employment or inequality.

Dear colleagues, the ECB is accountable to the European Parliament, and I really think we have a strong mandate and important work by calling the ECB to be more transparent and to explain much more on the monetary decision-making. So this report is a chance to go in the next steps in the dialogue together with President Lagarde and the ECB. I'm really looking forward to do this after hopefully a strong vote tomorrow and the debate here tonight. So once again, thanks for the President for attending the meeting, and I'm really looking forward to all of your contributions.

Christine Lagarde, *President of the European Central Bank*. – Madam President, Commissioner McGuinness, honourable Members of the European Parliament, I'm very pleased at this point in time during the day to be in front of you and to share this moment and to participate in today's important debate, as has just been indicated by the rapporteur.

The ECB was granted a democratic mandate to ensure price stability in the euro area. In other words, we safeguard one of the fundamental conditions for stable economic growth. To achieve this mandate, the ECB was also granted a high level of independence, and as you acknowledge in the draft resolution we are discussing today, the ECB's ability to take all necessary measures free from any political interference is essential to deliver on its mandate.

This is particularly the case at the moment, given the present circumstances. High inflation continues to have a large impact on all areas of our economy and on people's everyday lives, especially low-income households, as you also noted. This is why the Governing Council started normalisation of its monetary policy back in December 2021 and has raised ECB interest rates by 300 basis points since July 2022. It has recently – at its February meeting a few days ago – emphasised its determination to stay the course in raising interest rates significantly at a steady pace and in keeping them at levels that are sufficiently restrictive to ensure a timely return of inflation to our 2% medium-term target.

But independence comes also with a great deal of responsibility. The choices that we make as central bankers have a significant influence on society. So being accountable for our decisions is the necessary counterweight to our independence. This means that we need to explain our policies and the analysis that underpins them to ensure that people understand how and why our decisions are taken. But it also means that we must be attentive to the concerns of the public and carefully evaluate whether and how we can respond to these concerns within our mandate. After all, reinforcing trust in our institution also supports our monetary policy – for example by anchoring inflation expectations.

Today's debate on your draft resolution is crucial in both these aspects. So I'm here today to explain our policy, but also to listen to your views as elected representatives of the European citizens and to further reflect on how the ECB can act for the benefit of all Europeans within its mandate.

Let me start by briefly outlining our assessment of the euro area economy as was discussed by the Governing Council earlier this month. Euro area growth slowed, but didn't stall, in the fourth quarter of 2020. The outcome was better than was initially expected as the adverse economic effects from Russia's unjustified war were partly buffered by improving supply conditions and fiscal support related to the energy crisis. While confidence is rising and energy prices have fallen, we expect activity to remain weak in the near term.

According to Eurostat's flash estimate – and this number, by the way, is calculated using an estimate for German inflation at this point in time – inflation was 8.5% in January. It is likely to be revised slightly upwards when taking into account the German inflation numbers, which have now been published. The decrease compared with December was mainly due to a sharp drop in energy prices. At the same time, the prior surge of energy prices and other input costs is still feeding through to consumer prices.

Overall, price pressures remain strong and underlying inflation is still high. If, for instance, you exclude energy and food, inflation remains at 5.2% in January, the same as in December. Looking at the labour market, wages are growing faster, supported by robust employment dynamics, with the main theme in wage negotiations becoming how wages can to some extent catch up with high inflation. Even though most measures of longer-term inflation expectations currently stand at around 2%, these measures warrant constant and continued monitoring.

The risks to the growth outlook are now balanced or, rather, more balanced than they were in December. Russia's war against Ukraine and its people continues to be a significant downside risk. But a faster resolution of the energy shock would support growth. The risks to the inflation outlook have also become more balanced, especially in the near term.

So against this economic backdrop that I have summarised very briefly for you, what is our monetary policy? Well, at our latest meeting on 2 February, a few days ago, we decided to raise the key ECB interest rates by 50 basis points, and we expect to raise them further. So in view of the underlying inflation pressures, we intend to raise interest rates by another 50 basis points at our next meeting, in March. We will then evaluate the subsequent path of our monetary policy.

Keeping interest rates at restrictive levels will, over time, reduce inflation by dampening demand and will also guard against the risk of a persistent upward shift in inflation expectations. Our future policy rate decisions will continue to be data dependent and will follow a meeting by meeting approach.

At our February meeting, we also decided on the modalities for reducing the size of the Eurosystem balance sheet and the asset purchase program that I will call the APP for simplification purposes. As we communicated in December, the APP portfolio will decline at a measured and predictable pace, with the decline amounting to EUR 15 billion per month on average from the beginning of March 2023 until the end of June 2023. It will then subsequently be determined over time.

In the interest of simplicity and neutrality, the parameters for reducing the APP portfolio will be closely in line with what we have done previously. This will preserve consistency with our monetary policy stance, which is being set primarily by our interest rates.

For the Eurosystem's corporate bond purchases, reinvestments will be tilted more strongly towards issues with a better climate performance, supporting the gradual decarbonisation of our corporate bond holdings, in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement, without prejudice to our price stability objective.

Let me now turn to other important matters you have raised in your draft resolution – namely the expansion of the euro area and the work we must do to complete our economic and monetary union. On 1 January, we welcomed Croatia to the euro area, expanding our club from 19 to 20 countries. Croatia's accession is an impressive achievement not only for Croatia itself, but also for the euro. It shows that the euro is an attractive currency and once again reminds us that in Europe we are just stronger together.

Adopting the euro will bring tangible benefits to Croatia's 4 million citizens, Building on the broader positive impact the euro has had over the last two decades. As an anchor of stability, the euro has advanced European integration and strengthened the single market's role in driving growth. This in turn has elevated the EU's standing as the world's largest trading bloc and enhanced our autonomy on the global stage.

The euro has also become a symbol, and a binding symbol, and an integral part of our shared European identity, as its popularity shows. Support for the euro and for economic and monetary union has now reached an all time high at 80%. But with rising geopolitical tensions in the global economy, a stable euro will become even more important in ensuring that Europe continues to thrive. For that to happen, we need to collectively double down on the work that remains to complete our economic and monetary union. On that, each and every European policymaker needs to contribute.

Let me mention briefly, by way of conclusion, the three areas where progress can be made in the next 12 months before the EU elections in 2024 — which I know is already keeping many of you busy, but there is work to be done before that. Let me mention those three areas.

Number one, euro area financial integration. Number two, EU economic governance. Number three, the digital euro. Big projects.

If we look first at strengthening the euro area financial integration, the ECB is playing its part, notably by ensuring European banking supervision that is effective and consistent. We promote financial integration through our central bank services, for example by supporting EU debt securities to fund the NextGenerationEU programme. But the future of EU capital markets hinges on the broader regulatory environment, which is in your hands. Deeper, more integrated EU capital markets are essential for enhancing risk sharing and mobilising the private financing needed, especially for the green and digital transition.

I know that work is underway, that the Commission is playing its part and the ECON Committee is also active in that respect. But more needs to be done. It is critically important if we want capital to flow and to feed the ambitions that you have and that we legitimately have in relation to our green transition and digital mutation. Now, by the same token, we must not overlook the crucial work remaining for the completion of the banking union – an issue highlighted in your draft resolution and on which this Parliament has been vocal in pushing for progress.

Second, the reform of the EU economic governance framework. The ECB has highlighted – and has gone public in that respect – the importance of a simpler and more predictable framework, stronger national ownership and sustained implementation. I really encourage policymakers, including this Parliament in particular, to rapidly reach a viable and broadly-shared agreement that strengthens the foundations of our economic and monetary union.

Third, the digital euro. An appropriate regulatory framework needs to be laid down. The Digital Euro project is a truly European initiative which is moving ahead at a steady pace. In the autumn, the ECB's investigation phase will come to an end and the Governing Council may well decide on the next steps.

But let me be clear, that does not mean that we will then issue the digital euro. That would only happen at a later stage, based on a dedicated decision, and only after Parliament and the Council of the EU have adopted the legislative act. As EU policymakers, all the EU policymakers should continue playing their part, and I'm really counting on you, as the European Parliament, to swiftly start working on the legislative proposal, which the European Commission has been working hard on and intends to present in a few months.

So let me conclude at this point. We are committed to bringing inflation back to our 2% medium-term target in line with our mandate, and we will take the necessary measures to do so. As Thomas Jefferson once wrote: 'the price of freedom is eternal vigilance'. In a democratic society, central bank independence can only be legitimate if it is founded on a clear mandate and balanced with accountability, to ensure that the central bank follows and respects its mandate.

This also means that forceful efforts to ensure price stability need to be accompanied by equally forceful democratic scrutiny. In this spirit, we will continue our ongoing dialogue with you as the representatives of the EU citizens, as also advocated in your draft resolution. The ECB stands ready to agree on a formalisation in writing of the accountability practices between the ECB and the European Parliament. The ECB has made a proposal to the European Parliament and looks forward to finalising an agreement between our two institutions.

At this point of my conclusion, I would like to recognise the President of the ECON Committee. Ms Irene Tinagli, without whom progress would not have taken place. The entire ECON Committee has been a great partner in the work that we do together, but without her it wouldn't have moved. So thank you, and thank you to you all for your attention. I'm now looking forward to listening and, if more explanation is needed, of course I'll come back at the end of this debate.

President. – Thank you very much, Madam President, also for your patience to wait for several hours on this exceptional day – six hours. Thank you very much also to Commissioner McGuinness, who has the floor now.

Mairead McGuinness, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, as they say, 'What doesn't kill you makes you stronger'. I have to say, it's my unexpected pleasure to be taking part in this debate and to recognise Madam Presidents around me. This is an important debate because we do recognise the independence of the ECB, but there is also a democratic accountability piece, and I think you outlined that very well in your contribution.

My thanks to the rapporteur, Mr Andreson, for your work and indeed your colleagues on the committee. And I think it's also fair to say thank you to the chair of the ECON Committee, Irene Tinagli, who is a very good collaborator. My appreciation to all your colleagues.

Croatia joining the euro, the 20th member. A huge achievement for Croatia, but a European milestone also. The Commission shares the report's deep concerns about Russia's invasion of Ukraine and its consequences. The energy crisis led to a slowdown of economic activity, but our economies are proving to be a little bit more resilient than we might have expected. This is also evidenced by the recent Commission forecasts.

We, as a Commission, respect the ECB's independence in the conduct of monetary policy. We fully acknowledge that the ECB has taken decisive actions to tame inflationary pressures and ensure that inflation expectations remain well anchored, and the ECB's decision to bring inflation down to close to the target of 2%, avoiding a wage price spiral.

The draft report touches on the coordination of monetary, fiscal and structural policies, which is a topical issue. As monetary policy tightens, ensuring a consistent policy mix remains critical. Expansive monetary and fiscal policies played a huge stabilisation role and reinforced each other during the economic downturn caused by the pandemic crisis.

Now that our economies are being challenged by strong and persistent inflationary pressures, fiscal policy should avoid fuelling inflationary pressures. A further expansionary stance is not warranted. As the ongoing tightening of monetary policy reduces the available fiscal space, we should have a prudent fiscal policy. And, therefore, the euro area Member States should coordinate their fiscal policies to preserve debt sustainability and raise potential growth in a sustainable manner which would facilitate the task of monetary policy, bringing inflation back to 2%.

The Commission has strongly advocated a better targeting of the fiscal measures to cushion the impact of high energy prices on vulnerable households and companies. As energy prices have declined substantially, this becomes more relevant.

With the general escape clause being deactivated as of next year, it will be important to make swift progress with the discussions on the possible revision of the EU fiscal framework. A credible framework will contribute to safeguarding fiscal sustainability and promoting sustainable growth through investment and reforms. The Commission put forward orientations for a reform last year. We already had good discussions with the European Parliament and are also discussing this with Member States. On the basis of these discussions, the Commission will consider tabling legislative proposals.

Your report stresses the importance of addressing climate change. We welcome the ECB's efforts to incorporate climate change considerations in its monetary policy framework within its price stability mandate. This complements the actions taken by the Commission and Member States to address climate change and promote green investments, including, for instance, through the Recovery and Resilience Facility.

The implementation of the RRF and REPowerEU is all the more important with the new green industrial plan. Policy objectives enshrined in the REPowerEU Regulation explicitly include aims that are directly relevant to the industrial transition to climate neutrality, including industrial decarbonisation; the development of renewable and fossil-free hydrogen; green skills; and the support to develop value chains and technologies linked to the green transition.

I have to say, President Lagarde, I welcome very much your strong statement on Capital Markets Union. We cannot say it frequently enough. We had an excellent debate here yesterday evening on ELTIF reforms, and there is a shared desire to move this project forward. So, we really need to keep up the pressure and indeed also on banking union. I look forward to the debate.

Sven Simon, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Colleagues, what can be better than spending six hours in this beautiful city of Strasbourg? My colleague François-Xavier Bellamy knows that I will fight to keep the seat of the Parliament in Strasbourg. I have two remarks on this report where I perhaps disagree: one on proportionality and the other on climate change.

In paragraph 30, we stressed that where the ECB faces a choice between different sets of policies that are equally conducive to price stability, it will choose those that best support the general economic policies of the EU. No, it's not about economic policies of the EU. When we talk about proportionality, it is not a question of whether the ECB acts proportionally in relation to the economic policies of the EU. However, it will exceed its mandate if the effects of its measures disproportionately affect the economic policies of the Member States, because economic policies lie in the competence of the Member States. We had this dispute involving the German Constitutional Court, and then it went up to the Commission and back to the government. I would like to thank you for the cooperative and constructive engagement from the ECB in solving this problem.

Secondly, climate change: Commissioner McGuinness mentioned that in paragraph 36 of the report, it notes that price stability and a stable macroeconomic environment are needed to encourage green investment and would help, among other things, to create the right conditions for the implementation of the Paris Agreement, and invites the ECB to assess to what extent climate change affects its ability to maintain price stability. The last sentence is right, but with the first I have problems. Climate change will have implications for central bank balance sheets and policy objectives – that is true.

When we say the ECB should help to create the right conditions for the implementation of the Paris Agreement, no, definitely not. Impacts of climate change and policy transitions have consequences for the primary objective of price stability, but of course the ECB must not help to create the right conditions for the implementation of the Paris Agreement. It has to fulfil its task of price stability and thereby take into account climate change implications which might influence its policy objectives. That is something totally different, but obviously hard to understand.

Margarida Marques, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária McGuinness, Senhora Presidente Lagarde, o primeiro apelo deste relatório é a necessidade de existir uma maior e real coordenação entre política monetária e política orçamental. Esta coordenação foi crucial na crise da COVID-19. Na atual crise, há um défice de coordenação.

Como sublinhou a Comissão Europeia esta semana, os efeitos da política de aumento de juros do BCE são já visíveis. Os custos de financiamento estão a subir rapidamente para as famílias, empresas e Estados-Membros. O crédito está a reduzir-se drasticamente, primeiro para as famílias e, mais recentemente, para as empresas. O número de casos de famílias que viram reduzidos os seus rendimentos e que já não conseguem pagar os seus créditos à habitação é preocupante, com implicações imprevisíveis. A inflação tem-se reduzido ligeiramente, mas, sobretudo, via descida dos preços da energia.

Precisamos de respostas coordenadas e equilibradas no combate à inflação, mas precisamos também de respostas coordenadas para apoiar o crescimento, o emprego e os investimentos estratégicos. E este ponto leva-me a um segundo apelo deste relatório, para que o BCE atue, na linha dos Tratados, também de forma mais ativa no cumprimento do seu mandato secundário e apoie as políticas gerais da União. Esta é uma necessidade urgente, desde logo, no combate às alterações climáticas.

No relatório, destacamos ainda a urgência de completar a união bancária com um seguro europeu de depósitos; a avaliação do impacto e eficácia das recentes subidas das taxas de juro; a análise e a ação sobre os lucros excessivos da banca; a importância do Pilar Europeu dos Direitos Sociais e das PME; a necessidade de avançar no euro digital e monitorizar as criptomoedas; e a promoção da igualdade de género no BCE.

Presidente Lagarde – e termino –, conhecemos os desafios inéditos que a atual crise inflacionista coloca à política monetária. Para a enfrentar necessitamos de um BCE independente, mas necessitamos também de um BCE mais previsível nas suas decisões e mais cooperante com as demais instituições europeias e com os Estados-Membros.

Caroline Nagtegaal, *namens de Renew-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, president Lagarde, al ruim een jaar hebben we in Europa te maken met de hoogste inflatie die we in decennia hebben gezien. Dit merken de burgers in hun portemonnee. Gelukkig is de ECB ontwaakt en voert zij haar strijd tegen de inflatie op.

De ECB moet echter niet almaar nieuwe manieren vinden om Zuid-Europese begrotingen te stutten, maar doen wat nodig is om de inflatie terug te dringen en uitstralen dat de strijd tegen deze inflatie menens is. Helaas lijkt de ECB meer belangstelling te hebben voor klimaatbeleid dan voor de torenhoge inflatie. Een wijs gezegde luidt: schoenmaker, blijf bij je leest.

Deze boodschap wil ik graag aan mevrouw Lagarde meegeven: richt u op de strijd tegen de inflatie, laat het klimaatbeleid over aan politici en laat landen hun begrotingen zelf op orde brengen.

Kortom, de ECB moet doen wat nodig is.

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ

Wiceprzewodniczka

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, presidenta Lagarde, comisario, la evaluación de la inflación es motivo de preocupación para nuestra ciudadanía. Sin embargo, tengo que decir que la decisión por parte del BCE de abordar el problema aumentando agresivamente los tipos de interés no es la receta adecuada.

Estamos ante la subida más pronunciada en un año de tipos de interés que han conocido muchísimos países en Europa. Sin embargo, sabemos que la inflación está impulsada principalmente por los precios de los combustibles fósiles, por los beneficios extraordinarios empresariales, como ha señalado el propio BCE, y es la consecuencia de décadas de retraso en la transición ecológica.

El BCE propiamente ha reconocido que el aumento de tipos no puede hacer bajar los precios de la energía, pero en cambio afectará negativamente los costes de endeudamiento de empresas y hogares, incluidas las hipotecas, las inversiones en eficiencia energética y el impulso también, por qué no decirlo, de las renovables. Y acabamos de escapar por muy poco la recesión en la eurozona.

La inflación actual solo puede abordarse acelerando la transición energética de una vez por todas. Y el BCE debería desplegar una política monetaria más ecológica, aplicando, por ejemplo, tipos de interés diferenciados para actividades verdes, como, por cierto, han empezado a hacer ya los bancos centrales de China y de Japón.

Esto significa ofrecer tipos de refinanciación más baratos para los bancos que aumentan los préstamos para proyectos verdes. El BCE tiene experiencia de sobra con este tipo de operaciones de préstamos condicionales tras las tres rondas ya de TLTRO. La mejor manera de combatir la inflación no es castigando más a los hogares, sino acelerando la transición ecológica.

Gerolf Annemans, *namens de ID-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, dit jaarverslag over de ECB behoort tot de vele obligate nummer-tjes die in dit halfroond worden opgevoerd om de instellingen overeind te houden door een blanco cheque uit te delen met de goedkeuring van het Parlement. Even obligaat zijn in dit verslag zinnen verwerkt waarin het Parlement “zijn bezorgdheid uit”, dit jaar meer bepaald over de historisch hoge inflatie, die zoveel Europeanen in de misère duwt.

Laten we elkaar in de ogen kijken en nagaan waar deze inflatie vandaan komt. Deze inflatie is het gevolg van een geldcreatie waarvan wij dit jaar de tiende verjaardag vieren. De euro is een onnatuurlijke munt, die gecreëerd is om politieke redenen, met louter politieke criteria en tegen de wetenschappelijke vragen in of één muntzone wel geschikt is voor landen en entiteiten die economisch zo ver uit elkaar liggen.

De elite van de Europese Unie, de meerderheid in het Parlement, heeft niettemin volgehouden om meer politieke eenheid te kunnen afdwingen en het begrotings-, het economisch en zelfs het sociaal beleid van de lidstaten te kunnen bepalen. De munt is een wurginstrument van deze eenheidsstaat. Toen deze onnatuurlijke munt begon te destabiliseren, hebt u bij Mario Draghi aangeklopt om koste wat het kost geld in dit systeem te pompen. Nu is er geen weg terug en tracht u met de verhoging van de rente weer greep te krijgen op de situatie.

De burgers van de Unie zijn de slachtoffers van dit verhaal. Uw politieke dromen over een eengemaakt Europa hebben hen in een monetair en economisch moeras gesleurd.

Johan Van Overtveldt, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de ECB heeft het structurele karakter van het inflatieprobleem, dat in de loop van het eerste kwartaal van vorig jaar al zichtbaar was, pas laat onderkend. Gelukkig heeft de aanvankelijke aarzeling plaatsgemaakt voor de noodzakelijke maatregelen op het gebied van renteverhogingen en balansafbouw.

We zijn er echter nog lang niet. De algemene inflatie daalt, maar de onderliggende inflatie is momenteel stabiel. Niettemin is deze nog altijd aan de hoge kant. Dit betekent dat er aanvullende inspanningen moeten worden geleverd.

Wat het langetermijnbeleid betreft, moet de inflatiedoelstelling van 2 % voor de prijzen van goederen en diensten onder de loop worden genomen. Na alles dat we de afgelopen tijd hebben meegemaakt, moeten we ons afvragen hoe zinvol het nog is om ons enkel op die ene norm of dat ene streefcijfer te richten. We moeten bijvoorbeeld kijken naar de voortdurende inflatie van activa die ons de afgelopen tijd op een aantal gebieden in aanzienlijke tot hoge mate parten heeft gespeeld. Het is naar mijn mening hoog tijd om in de beleidsvorming actiever ouderwetse aggregaten (geldhoeveelheid, kredietvolumes) op te nemen.

Hoe dan ook moet prijsstabiliteit voor de ECB de bepalende taak zijn en blijven. Prijsstabiliteit is immers van groot belang voor sociaal-economische stabiliteit. Andere doelstellingen, waaronder op het gebied van klimaatbeleid, zijn ondergeschikt aan de doelstelling van prijsstabiliteit.

José Gusmão, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, o Banco Central Europeu está atualmente a conduzir uma política monetária contraditória com as suas próprias análises. Foi o Banco Central Europeu que caracterizou a inflação que estamos a viver como decorrendo, essencialmente, dos preços da energia, dos bens alimentares e de estrangulamentos económicos resultantes da recuperação da crise pós-pandémica. Tudo fatores pouco sensíveis às medidas de política monetária tradicional.

E não por acaso, após vários aumentos das taxas de juro, o principal efeito de redução da inflação que estamos a observar resulta dos preços da energia. Aliás, mostrando o que seria a política correta: limitar os lucros absolutamente extraordinários e oportunistas das empresas do setor da energia e de outras empresas que estão a lucrar com a crise, protegendo a economia e protegendo as pessoas.

O que estamos a verificar é uma perda real dos salários, ao mesmo tempo que os lucros dispararam. Uma análise que, aliás, o Banco Central Europeu também fez quando mostrou que os lucros estão a ter um contributo recorde para a inflação a que estamos a assistir.

No entanto, quando o BCE avisa dos perigos de espirais inflacionistas, é apenas dos salários que fala, dos salários que estão a perder valor e nunca dos lucros que dispararam, o que mostra que o BCE é uma instituição bem mais política do que nos quer fazer acreditar.

A independência do BCE é isto: é o direito a lançar a economia europeia numa recessão, em nome de uma política monetária ineficaz, pela qual ninguém irá responder.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Az Oroszország elleni szankciók az egekbe lökték az egyébként is emelkedő energia és élelmiszerárakat. Ennek köszönhetően az infláció tavaly kétszámjegyű lett az Unióban, ez pedig a szegények adója. Így kulcsfontosságú, hogy az EKB teljes erejével az árstabilitás helyreállításán dolgozzon. Ez a nem euróövezeti országok számára is fontos, mivel nem tudják függetleníteni magukat az euróövezet történéseitől. Ennek fényében üdvözlök minden, az EKB által fogatosított, a pénzügyi ellenálló képességet és az árstabilitást szolgáló intézkedést.

Sajnálattal tapasztalom ugyanakkor, hogy a baloldal ismételtelen nem a polgárok érdekét nézi. Az infláció elleni küzdelem közepette ideológiai töltetet kívánnak adni a jegybanki tevékenységnek, és még az árak növekedésének megfékezését is akadályozná a monetáris szigorítás megszüntetésével. Az EKB erőfeszítéseit a zöldítés érdekében elismerem, a Magyar Nemzeti Bank is úttörő e téren, de az intézményt se zöld, se fejlesztési bankká ne változtassuk. A fő feladat a pénzügyi megállítása. Kérem, Elnök Asszony, ne engedjen teret az ilyen javaslatoknak, és tegyen meg mindent az árstabilitás helyreállítása érdekében!

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, Madame la Présidente de la BCE, je voudrais m'associer aux remerciements de mon collègue Sven Simon et à ceux de tous mes collègues pour vous dire que nous sommes très reconnaissants que vous soyez restée si tard – malgré les difficultés de la journée au sein du Parlement européen – pour cette discussion importante.

Vous avez cité Thomas Jefferson, qui disait que «le prix de la liberté, c'est la vigilance éternelle». Vigilance qu'il faut garantir envers les dangers qui ne sont pas encore passés, mais qui sont devant nous. Et l'un d'entre eux – je crois –, c'est celui auquel nous exposent les conséquences de l'insouciance, de long terme, de beaucoup d'États membres de l'Union européenne, qui ont vécu, pendant longtemps, dans un monde presque fictif.

«Whatever it takes», «quoi qu'il en coûte». Ces mots bien connus de l'un de vos prédécesseurs ont représenté une sorte d'autorisation de faire face à toutes les crises avec la même maxime: «quoi qu'il en coûte».

Hier c'était la COVID-19, aujourd'hui c'est la hausse des prix de l'énergie qui fait que les dettes publiques n'ont cessé d'augmenter dans beaucoup de nos pays. Or, nous le voyons, l'inflation – dont vous avez dit à quel point elle est pesante est éprouvante pour beaucoup de ménages européens – oblige la Banque centrale européenne à remonter ses taux d'intérêt.

Pour un pays comme le mien, la France – un pays comme le nôtre, même, Madame la Présidente –, chaque point d'augmentation des taux d'intérêt représente, à moyen terme, 20 milliards d'euros de dépenses supplémentaires sur cinq ans et 40 milliards d'euros sur dix ans. Chaque point d'augmentation!

Et vous l'avez dit: malheureusement, cela pourrait ne pas suffire à faire baisser l'inflation. Nous risquons de nous trouver dans une situation terrible: nos États n'auraient plus les moyens d'intervenir sur le plan social, en étant confrontés à cette asphyxie que créerait une nouvelle crise de la dette.

Alors, Madame la Présidente, je n'ai qu'une seule question à vous poser: craignez-vous, vous aussi, une nouvelle crise de la dette? Et ne croyez-vous pas qu'il est temps de revenir à cette autre maxime bien connue de Thomas Jefferson: «Ne dépensez pas votre argent avant de l'avoir gagné»?

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, presidenta Lagarde, hace ya algún tiempo, cuando el Banco Central Europeo revisaba la definición de la estabilidad de precios, algunos consideramos que había cierta incertidumbre en esa nueva definición.

Ese medio plazo albergaba dudas sobre si eran 18 meses, dos años, un año... ¿Qué era «a medio plazo»? Además, introducía incertidumbre sobre en qué medida podríamos definir el 2 % en ese medio plazo, si hablábamos de la media en ese periodo, de la mediana, de la moda.

En cualquier caso, más allá de estas incertidumbres, lo que parece claro es que la inflación está ya moderándose y que las propias previsiones del Banco Central Europeo sitúan la inflación en el cuarto trimestre de este año en el 3,6 %, lo que significa que en diciembre estaríamos en el 3 %. Además, las propias previsiones del BCE sitúan la inflación durante todo el año 2024 algo por encima del 2 %.

Por lo tanto, con estas previsiones *ceteris paribus*, sin asumir ningún cambio de política monetaria, en 18 meses tendríamos una inflación de poco más del 2 %. Yo pediría prudencia ante futuras subidas.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Madam President, I welcome the fact that we respect the independence of the ECB in this House. That's good to hear again and to be reinforced by most political groupings.

I just want to reference a couple of challenges that I see very close at hand that we have to address both in this House, but also in terms of the Council, the Commission and even the observations of the ECB, and that is the unwinding of this emergency escape clause and the reintroduction of a new stability and growth pact.

I am just very concerned that, with the rising costs of funds to households, to businesses, to sovereigns, we will be significantly challenged in the short and medium term if we can't bring forward a new stability and growth pact that underpins all we're trying to do in terms of monetary policy, from the ECB point of view, but also in terms of fiscal policy, from Member States across the European Union.

We are significantly challenged, and there is no point us pretending inside this House that a lot of Member States are not heavily indebted. We have to come up with solutions to ensure that they can weather that storm and that citizens will not experience what they experienced in 2008, 2009 and 2010 during the previous financial crisis.

Henrike Hahn (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Mit dem Jahresbericht 2022 zur Europäischen Zentralbank formuliert das Europäische Parlament klare Erwartungen. Wir wissen, Zinserhöhungen sind ein wichtiges Instrument für Geldpolitik, aber sie können weder Energiepreise senken noch die Inflation kurzfristig entscheidend beeinflussen.

Und gerade deshalb muss die EZB in Zukunft mehr Gewicht auf ihr Sekundärmandat legen, für eine sozial gerechte und grüne europäische Wirtschaftspolitik. Es ist verantwortungslos, dass der Abschnitt des EZB-Jahresberichts 2022 zur Klimapolitik der EZB durch die EVP-Fraktion so verwässert wurde. Und man fragt sich, welches Problem die EVP mit Klimaschutz gerade auch zur Wohlstandswahrung überhaupt hat und wie sie das vor den Menschen und der Industrie in Europa eigentlich rechtfertigen will.

Auch die EZB weiß, dass Geldstabilität und die Bekämpfung des Klimawandels zusammengehören, und deshalb brauchen wir die Einführung differenzierter Zinssätze für grüne Investments von der EZB, um die wettbewerbsfähige Transformation der Wirtschaft voranzutreiben.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Präsidentin! Die EZB macht den Ukrainekrieg und globale Ursachen wie steigende Energie-, Düngemittel- und Transportkosten für die Rekordinflation der Lebensmittelpreise verantwortlich.

2022 betrug die Lebensmittelpreisinflation im Euroraum 15,5 % und in Deutschland sogar 19,2 %. Im Vergleich – in den USA betrug sie 12,4 %, in Japan 6,4 % und in der Schweiz und Israel jeweils nur 4 %. Seltsam, wenn weltweit höhere Energie-, Dünger- und Transportkosten die Preise antreiben, wieso sind dann die Lebensmittelpreise im Euroraum fast viermal so schnell und in Deutschland fast fünfmal so schnell gestiegen wie im Hochalpenland Schweiz, das kaum Agrarfläche hat, oder im Halbwüstenstaat Israel?

Hier werden also Märchen erzählt, denn die Hauptgründe für die Rekordinflation sind die EZB-Geldpolitik – denn wer die Geldmenge innerhalb weniger Jahre um 70 % ausweitet, kann auf Dauer Inflation nicht vermeiden – und zweitens die nutzlose EU-Klimapolitik – nutzlos, weil der Einfluss der EU auf das Weltklima bei einem Anteil von nicht einmal 8 oder 9 % an den weltweiten Emissionen asymptotisch null ist – und drittens die Russland-Sanktionen, die uns mehr schaden als Russland.

Jahr für Jahr fällt die Eurozone wirtschaftlich zurück – weltweit und selbst gegenüber der Nicht-Euro-EU. Und die EU selbst fällt weltweit zurück; wir werden zweitklassig. Und deshalb sollten wir unser Geld in Zukunftssektoren investieren und nicht mit grünen Trautänzereien vergeuden.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Pani Prezes! Bardzo uważnie słuchałem wystąpienia pani prezes i muszę powiedzieć, że jednak kiedy mówimy o euro, to jest to też w pewnym sensie, jako waluta, projekt ideologiczny. Inflacja w Niderlandach wynosiła 17%, a w Polsce 18%. Polska nie jest w strefie euro.

Jeśli chodzi o unię bankową, oczywiście może jest bardzo istotne, żeby dojść do tej unii bankowej, ale jak pogodzimy w tej chwili takie dwa światy jak banki Południa – w Grecji, Hiszpanii, we Włoszech – i banki Północy? Są kolosalne różnice w ich funkcjonowaniu. Ilość nietrafionych kredytów w tych bankach południowych jest przerażająca. Wobec tego mamy tutaj kolejny problem.

Tak więc neutralność rynkowa Europejskiego Banku byłaby największą wartością, o którą wszyscy powinni się starać, żeby nie było tej presji politycznej i tej presji ideologicznej. Bo na przykład obok neutralności bankowej mamy ideologiczny projekt pod nazwą zazielenianie, zzielenienie, zazielenianie... do końca nie wiemy, o co chodzi. To wszystko jest niewyliczone, chociaż bardzo oczywiście cenne z punktu widzenia dyskusyjnego, bo wszyscy chcemy żyć w czystej przestrzeni ekologicznej. Jednak więcej realizmu ekonomicznego jest absolutnie nam potrzebne.

Słaba była też, moim zdaniem, reakcja Europejskiego Banku Centralnego w sytuacji po pandemii. W pandemii wspomniano w różnych krajach bardzo dużo środków finansowych, słusznie ratując gospodarkę. Ale reakcja po pandemii była trochę zbyt wolna, moim zdaniem, i trzeba by było szybciej opanować pieniądź, pusty pieniądź, który funkcjonuje na rynku ekonomicznym czy gospodarczym.

Krótko mówiąc ta reakcja dzisiaj, że będą jeszcze podnoszone stopy procentowe jest bardzo dobrym kierunkiem, będziemy taką reakcją popierać. Chcielibyśmy po prostu żyć w Unii Europejskiej, która będzie bardzo konkurencyjna względem Stanów Zjednoczonych i Chin, a do tego potrzebny jest po prostu eurorealizm gospodarczy.

Chris MacManus (The Left). – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, colleagues, five times in nine months the ECB has increased interest rates, with huge implications both economic and societal. It's the final straw for many struggling to get by at a time of immense pressure on working families and people.

In Ireland, this is compounded by the EU and our government's fixation on vulture funds. When family mortgages were sold off to vultures, those families were promised their full rights. Now, as the ECB turns the screw tighter, these families have found that such promises are now worthless. These mortgage holders are now trapped in schemes with little option to escape. Many have seen their repayments rise by thousands of euros a year, with further rate hikes likely. If they fall behind, they have less recourse to access solutions.

This Parliament, which lined up behind the EU proposal to back vulture funds, now knows the real human impacts of its policies. Targeted interest relief is needed in Ireland. The EU and ECB must stop prioritising vulture funds and banks over working families.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση προωθεί τον σχεδιασμό τραπεζικών και επιχειρηματικών ομίλων και της στρατηγικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και της Κεντρικής Τράπεζας που οδηγεί σε αυξήσεις στους τόκους έως 33%, γιγάντωση κόκκινων δανείων και γενικευμένους πλειστηριασμούς λαϊκής περιουσίας. Αυτόν τον στόχο υπηρετεί και η απόφαση του Αρείου Πάγου στην Ελλάδα για πογκρόμ πλειστηριασμών που στηρίζεται στον πτωχευτικό νόμο της κυβέρνησης της Νέας Δημοκρατίας και σε εκείνον της προηγούμενης του ΣΥΡΙΖΑ που παρέδωσε τα κόκκινα δάνεια στα αρπακτικά των funds. Όσο για την κούρσα τιμών και πληθωρισμού, είναι αποτελέσματα των γιγάντιων επιδοτήσεων στα μονοπώλια μέσω του υπερμνημονίου Ταμείου ανάκαμψης και του φτηνού δανεισμού με χρήματα των εργαζομένων. Τελικά πιο επεκτατική, πιο περιοριστική, η στρατηγική σας απαιτεί πάντα μισθούς και δικαιώματα στα τάρταρα. Μόνο ο λαός μπορεί να σώσει τον λαό, διεκδικώντας πραγματικά μέτρα προστασίας του εισοδήματος, απαγόρευση πλειστηριασμών, διαγραφή χρεών-πανωτοκίων των λαϊκών νοικοκυριών. Κόντρα στους ομίλους, τις τράπεζες και τα funds και στην καταστολή των κινητοποιήσεων του λαού που χάνει σήμερα τα σπίτια του.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteurs, as well as President Lagarde for her work, particularly in the ECB's interest in the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive (EPBD) for which I am rapporteur.

Inflation driven by high energy costs demonstrates the need for the ECB to further incentivise renovations in order to fulfil its price stability mandate. Buildings are the EU's most valuable financial assets, worth tens of trillions of euros. In my view, the EPBD is as much about assets and investment protection as it is climate change, as low EPC-rated buildings will be less valuable.

The reality is that public money will only stretch so far. There need to be much stronger links between the financial and the renovation sectors, as access to finance is one of the main barriers for people and businesses as they try to renovate.

In this regard, President Lagarde, what is your view on the proposed European Renovation Loan and the European Guarantee Fund for Building Renovations, as well as on incentivising commercial banks to provide renovation solutions?

Irene Tinagli (S&D). – Madam President, recently a Minister of an EU Member State said, complaining, that the ECB is not accountable to anyone except herself. This is simply not true. Not only is this debate proving that is not true, but so do all the practices that we have. The ECB President regularly comes to discuss ECB actions in the ECON Committee of this Parliament, and we scrutinise the ECB actions very seriously, very thoroughly.

However, as President Lagarde recalled, this accountability exercise is largely based on practices, most of which are not explicitly written or codified. But now we are ready to change this, and I'm really happy about it. We've been waiting for a long time. Twenty-five years ago, a Parliament report called for an agreement with the soon-to-be-established ECB. For over 20 years, no progress was made. But more recently, in the ECON Committee, during one of these debates, we started to discuss with President Lagarde about this need and we started with her a fruitful dialogue. I'm so pleased that the ECB is now ready to take this step and I want to thank President Lagarde for her openness, her availability. Please let me acknowledge her work.

The independence of the ECB must be preserved but, at the same time, independence and accountability must go hand in hand. This is what we have done, this is what we will do, and this will reinforce citizens' trust and silence the sceptics.

Claude Gruffat (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, Madame Lagarde, pour beaucoup de citoyens européens et de citoyennes européennes, la BCE est indépendante, elle est à Francfort et on y parle de taux directeurs. Mais depuis la guerre que mène M. Poutine en Ukraine, son rôle est devenu beaucoup plus concret, et notamment sur son choix de relever ces fameux taux.

La politique monétaire ne peut rien faire contre la hausse des prix de l'énergie ou du blé. Alors à quoi bon lui donner un tour restrictif? Ce serait un bon choix si la hausse des prix était due à une augmentation de la demande. Mais ce n'est pas le cas dans la zone euro, où nous subissons une inflation de pénurie et payons notre dépendance aux énergies fossiles. Des taux d'intérêt plus élevés ne permettront donc pas de contrer la hausse des prix et ils risquent surtout d'être extrêmement coûteux pour nos économies.

J'ai dès lors deux questions: si lutter contre cette inflation, c'est d'abord investir massivement dans des secteurs en tension, réduire nos dépendances et transformer la structure de l'offre et de la demande, en mettant en œuvre des outils pour adapter nos besoins, quelle action la BCE entend-elle mener dans ce sens pour l'année qui vient?

Et ma deuxième question: sachant – et je conclus – qu'il sera difficile de ramener l'inflation à 2 %, sauf à provoquer une forte récession et une hausse du chômage, la BCE entend-elle prendre des mesures pour lutter contre cela?

Antonio Maria Rinaldi (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Presidente Lagarde, signora Commissaria McGuinness, nel commentare la relazione 2022 della BCE, è necessario evidenziare che l'attuale incremento dell'inflazione è dovuto all'innalzamento repentino dei prezzi dei prodotti energetici e delle *commodities*, non solo a causa della guerra, ma ancor prima a causa delle precedenti scelte sulle politiche *green*, non sostenibili per il mantenimento della precedente capacità industriale europea.

Lo schema statutario della BCE è rigidamente monetarista e pertanto, in una situazione di inflazione da fattori esogeni, opera in termini prociclici, amplificando, con effetti depressivi, le criticità dei costi di interi settori produttivi, con conseguenti effetti negativi sui livelli occupazionali e retributivi reali.

L'azione della BCE non può correggere né le cause né gli effetti, ormai strutturali, di questa agflazione, ma può solo ottenere l'irreversibilità di una diffusa deindustrializzazione, accorpendo a un irrisolto problema sul lato dell'offerta anche una crisi da domanda, correlata alla maggiore disoccupazione e precarizzazione del lavoro, che già stanno intaccando, con la riduzione dei salari reali, i livelli di vita essenziali, con il caro energia e l'aumento del costo dei finanziamenti per le imprese e le famiglie.

Neanche una svalutazione dell'euro è perseguibile, sia per il permanere dei tassi alti che per la cosiddetta condizione di Marshall-Lerner. Con l'imposizione forzata delle politiche *green*, i prezzi di produzione per le imprese esportatrici che subiscono l'agflazione non sono riconducibili oltre certi livelli minimi. La FED, di contro, alza i tassi per attrarre capitali e preservare il ruolo internazionale del dollaro, potendo compensare le conseguenze recessive con politiche fiscali espansive, mentre le rigide regole dei trattati non lo consentono.

Questo rende inevitabile un massiccio allentamento della disciplina degli aiuti di Stato sancite dagli articoli 107 e 108 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, che però, stante la vostra linea di «*Quantitative Tightening*», sarà consentito solo a quei paesi con maggiori spazi fiscali e sarà invece precluso a tutti gli altri, a causa del costo insostenibile del finanziamento degli Stati sui mercati, che voi stessi avete determinato con l'aumento dei tassi e la vendita dei titoli di Stato.

Lo scenario ricorda il famoso detto: l'operazione è perfettamente riuscita, ma il paziente è morto.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, zvyšovanie úrokových sadzieb konečne prináša svoje ovocie vo forme klesajúcej medziročnej inflácie. Vysoká inflácia je vážny ekonomický problém, aj spoločenský problém, ničí kúpnu silu peňazí, ničí úspory, zvyšuje neistotu, znemožňuje plánovanie, odrádza investície. Znižovanie vysokej inflácie na dlhodobu nízkej úrovni preto musí byť aj naďalej maximálnou prioritou.

Sekundárne ciele by podľa mňa mali ísť do veľkej miery nateraz bokom preto, lebo je stále ohrozený primárny cieľ. Hoci nie každý uznáva, že inflácia v eurozóne má najmä monetárne príčiny, všetci uznávajú, že infláciu treba odstrániť najmä monetárnymi prostriedkami vrátane rastúcich úrokových sadzieb. Keďže od inflačného cieľa sme stále ďaleko, považujem za dôležité, aby Európska centrálna banka zachovala svoj súčasný reštriktívny monetárny kurz.

Sira Rego (The Left). – Señora presidenta, señora Lagarde, las decisiones que toman ustedes en el Banco Central Europeo son una pesadilla para cualquier familia trabajadora. Saben perfectamente, porque ya han salido reconociéndolo, que su empeño en subir los tipos de interés no está conteniendo la inflación, porque tiene que ver con los precios de la energía.

Por lo tanto, sus decisiones, que claro que están condicionadas políticamente, pero por quienes no se presentan a las elecciones, son un truco barato para seguir hinchando los bolsillos de las élites financieras y de la banca a costa de empobrecer a los trabajadores, entre otras cosas, por el brutal aumento de las hipotecas. Es un despropósito y una burla que, encima, ya haya amenazado con mantener y con incrementar.

Sé que para para ustedes es complicado, pero, para variar, sería magnífico, sería estupendo, que dejaran de gobernar contra la gente. Que no pasa nada porque los bancos no ganen un año más miles de millones de euros de beneficios obscenos. Hagan el favor de dejar de ser un activo tóxico para la ciudadanía.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, whether the interest-rate hikes are helping to control inflation is open to discussion. What is certain is that the ECB is giving a huge subsidy to banks.

As Spanish banks reach historical profits, I think it is timely to remember the bailout of 2012. Your Vice-President, Luis de Guindos, was then the Spanish Economy Minister. He promised that the bailout would be paid by the banks themselves. It never happened. Fifty-eight billion were pumped into banks, and only 10% have been recovered up to date.

What's more, Spain borrowed 43 billion from the European Stability Mechanism, and more than half are to be repaid. The burden falls entirely on the citizens. Disposable income is down by 7.85 – the worst figure in the OECD. It does not matter whether Rajoy or Sánchez are in charge: in Spain, the cronies always get their way with taxpayers' money from the Union. When a country has systemic deficiencies, it shows everywhere.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner, President Lagarde, the rise in interest rates is at best a necessary evil, but for the banking sector it is a time of fortune. With the higher interest rates, on their reserves, they are raking in profits. It's about EUR 92 billion this year alone.

Professor Paul De Grauwe concludes that this is an unnecessary subsidy of private banks from public money. There are ways to stop this – and I'm happy to hear that from you, President Lagarde – but, until then, make sure that these profits don't come for free. Instead of sending the unnecessary subsidy to shareholders, the extra profits should go into green investments and to keeping extra capital to prepare for climate change risks.

So, Madam Lagarde, use these profits to forge ahead in the greening of the financial sector, as the annual report suggests, ask for extra capital from polluting banks and stop accepting brown assets as collateral. Because if we don't act now, I know to who the banks will turn when the time gets hot and tough!

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Presidente Lagarde, o aumento da taxa de juros do Banco Central Europeu, no ano passado e no decorrer deste ano, é uma fraude, um autêntico escândalo. Esta subida, traduzida em língua da rua, pode chegar a 300 euros mensais a mais nas hipotecas das famílias que, como as galegas, têm cada vez menos recursos.

O BCE fabrica pobreza, promovendo políticas que favorecem os interesses do grande capital e são contrárias às maiorias sociais. O BCE fabrica pessoas pobres, famílias que dificilmente podem pagar a hipoteca ou que ficam sem casa ou trabalho, ou com trabalho precário. Resgata bancos e deixa abandonados povos como o meu.

Tenha alguma sensibilidade social pelo que estão a sofrer as pessoas. O BCE é responsável pelas políticas que empobrecem e pela austeridade, pelas políticas que aumentam a dívida pública na UE para salvar bancos privados, como os bancos espanhóis, que ganharam o ano passado mais do que nunca.

Contra esta injustiça, defendemos um resgate financeiro financiado pela banca para ajudar os afetados pelo aumento da taxa de juros. Parem de fabricar pobres, Senhora Lagarde! Parem de fabricar pobres!

France Jamet (ID). – Madame la présidente, Mesdames, Madame Lagarde, ç'a été dit plusieurs fois ce soir, effectivement: le rôle de la BCE est avant tout d'assurer la stabilité monétaire et de renforcer l'indépendance stratégique de l'Europe. La politique de verdissement idéologique de la BCE, aujourd'hui, au sens où l'entend l'Union européenne, la détourne non seulement de ses objectifs, mais aussi de son rôle.

Par contre, notre stabilité monétaire et notre indépendance stratégique passent par le soutien à la filière nucléaire, pierre angulaire sur laquelle la France a bâti sa prospérité. Décarbonée, abondante et abordable, elle doit être le socle de notre réindustrialisation, condition de notre indépendance et de notre compétitivité. C'est l'esprit du plan Biden, lancé au soutien de l'industrie américaine.

Que Bruxelles le qualifie de concurrence déloyale prouve qu'elle n'a rien compris aux enjeux politiques, économiques et géopolitiques auxquels nous sommes confrontés. Car c'est bien vers une relocalisation de notre politique énergétique et un patriotisme économique que nous devons nous orienter.

Notre souveraineté énergétique nous permettrait alors de protéger nos compatriotes, et particulièrement les plus précaires, contre la hausse des prix des denrées alimentaires, de l'électricité, du gaz, des loyers et du coût de la vie. Parce que, face aux abus de ce monde financiarisé, ce sont eux qui sont sanctionnés, car ce sont eux qui vivent dans l'économie réelle et qui paient le prix fort des dérives de Bruxelles.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, president Lagarde, in 2021 liep de inflatie op tot 5 %. Wij waarschuwen keer op keer dat alles duurder wordt en dat spaargeld en pensioenen verdampen.

Om de Zuid-Europese schuldenlast betaalbaar te houden, hield de ECB de rente zo lang mogelijk negatief en bleef ze staatsschuld opkopen. Mevrouw Lagarde, u deed niets tegen de inflatie. Sterker nog, u gooide olie op het vuur en zei dat de inflatie tijdelijk was.

Toen de inflatie in 2022 opklom tot boven de 10 % begon de ECB de rente te verhogen. Dit gebeurde echter te laat en te langzaam. Het Nibud adviseert Nederlanders vijftienduizend euro spaargeld aan te houden. Van die vijftienduizend euro is sinds 2021 bijna een vijfde verdampt.

Hoewel de inflatie momenteel daalt, is 8,5 % nog altijd te hoog. Het ingezette pad van renteverhogingen moet niet worden getemperd, maar versneld tot het streefdoel van 2 % inflatie is bereikt. De rente moet omhoog en de Zuid-Europese schulden moeten omlaag.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Presidente Lagarde, o BCE anunciou, recentemente, a quinta subida consecutiva das taxas de juro, prevendo novo aumento em março, como parte da resposta ao aumento da inflação, ignorando causas indissociáveis de opções da União Europeia e outros instrumentos e medidas monetárias e económicas que poderiam ser considerados.

Sucede que o mercado hipotecário não é homogêneo, predominando a taxa variável nos países da chamada periferia da zona euro. Os impactos das vossas políticas são, por isso, desiguais e sabem-no. As vossas opções sufocam milhares de famílias que, em alguns casos, como em Portugal, viram aumentar as prestações em 80%, estando simultaneamente confrontadas com a subida de preços de bens e serviços essenciais e acentuada desvalorização salarial.

Que tem a senhora a dizer neste impacto assimétrico nas famílias, mas também nas empresas e nas condições de financiamento dos Estados, que tenderá a agravar desigualdades, criando ainda mais dificuldades a estes países?

Já vimos este filme, Senhora Presidente Lagarde, em 2010 e 2012. Quer repetir essas políticas desastrosas?

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Madam President, President Lagarde, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, you may not be allowed to admit it, yet deflation has started.

Given that large part of the sky-high record inflation that was steeply driven that started arising after the end of the sanitary measures and eventually exacerbated by the war in Ukraine; given that energy prices have come down significantly, we are really concerned about further raises of ECB interest rates to cut demand and consumption in order to lower inflation. It just doesn't seem the right way to achieve it.

We need to address the root causes of inflation, tailoring the solution to the issue, which is mainly energy-related. I want to remind to all of us that, in this particular situation, it is up to the co-legislators to act, to continue with our efforts to diversify our energy sources and reduce energy consumption. I am afraid that keeping rising interest rates would only have a harsher impact on entrepreneurs and households, who we must defend – and I reiterate, defend – not threaten.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Präsidentin Lagarde! Die Zahlen sagen es, und die Menschen spüren es: Das Leben ist für viele Menschen nicht mehr leistbar. Die Inflation – Sie haben es gesagt, Präsidentin Lagarde – ist auf 8,5 % im Jänner 2023 angestiegen. Dagegen müssen wir etwas tun.

Und die Europäische Zentralbank tut das auch: Sie erhöht den Leitzins. Die gängige Wirtschaftslehre besagt, dass man bei hoher Inflation die Zinsen anheben muss, um die zu heiß gelaufene Wirtschaft abzukühlen. Aber die Wirtschaft war nicht zu heiß. Die Inflationskrise ist das Produkt des russischen Angriffskriegs in der Ukraine, der die Energiepreise in die Höhe hat schnellen lassen. Spekulation und unangemessene Erhöhungen der Gewinnspannen tun ihr Übriges dazu. Wir haben also einen Angebotsschock.

Und hier wird eine simple Erhöhung des Leitzinses, so wie es die Europäische Zentralbank macht, nicht reichen und birgt eine aggressive Zinserhöhung Risiken einer Rezession und Probleme für Menschen mit Krediten. Daher sollten weitere Schritte in Richtung einer Zinserhöhung erst einmal abgewartet werden.

Um der Inflationskrise tatsächlich etwas effektiv entgegenzusetzen, braucht es fiskalpolitische Maßnahmen. Denn wie immer in der Wirtschaft gilt: Wer Geldpolitik sagt, muss auch Fiskalpolitik machen. Ohne wird es nicht gehen.

Roman Haider (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Von 2019 bis 2022 hat die EZB ihre Bilanzsumme um 4,1 Billionen EUR erhöht. Jeden einzelnen Tag hat die EZB 4,5 Milliarden neue Euro gedruckt, und das ist auch die eigentliche Ursache für die hohe Inflation in Europa; da braucht man sich gar nicht auf den Ukrainekrieg herausreden.

Und warum hat die EZB das getan? Es war nichts anderes als verdeckte Staatsfinanzierung. Die EZB hat auf ihren Auftrag der Preisstabilität gepfiffen, um marode Staatsfinanzen zu sanieren. Und jetzt fliegt Ihnen diese ganze Politik um die Ohren.

Und da richten Sie auch gleich den nächsten großen Schaden an: Zuerst treiben Sie die Inflation mit einer Geldschwemme in enorme Höhen, und jetzt treiben Sie die Unternehmen mit abrupten Zinserhöhungen in den Ruin. Ihre Politik fügt sich leider nahtlos in die Politik der Kommission ein: ruinös, sinnlos, gefährlich für Bürger und Wirtschaft.

Dorien Rookmaker (ECR). – Voorzitter, mevrouw Lagarde, moet de ECB rekening houden met de mogelijkheid dat eurolanden de euro willen verlaten? Enige maanden geleden heb ik u gevraagd of de ECB een draaiboek heeft om de uittreding van eurolanden met hoge schulden die de rentelasten niet meer kunnen betalen, in goede banen te leiden. U reageerde daarop ontkennend en stelde dat de ECB daarvoor geen draaiboek heeft.

Intussen is de situatie veranderd en gaan ook in het rijke noorden stemmen op om de euro te verlaten. In Nederland stelde een oud-minister van Economische en Financiële Zaken onlangs dat het verlaten van de euro voor Nederland geen taboe meer mag zijn.

De gevaren van inflatie en onhoudbare schulden en de stabiliteitsrisico's zijn te groot. Het extreme lagerentebeleid heeft geleid tot opgeblazen huizenprijzen en aandelenmarkten, en een explosie van schulden. De ECB houdt de rente niet laag om de economie te stutten, maar om de rentelasten van schulden voor met name de zuidelijke landen te beperken.

De inwoners van alle eurolanden hebben het recht om voor het verlaten van de euro te stemmen. Ik wil u daarom vragen naast een behouden koers ook een uittredingsscenario klaar te hebben.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, danas imamo ovdje na raspravi, gospođa Lagarde nam je došla tražiti potporu za svoje izvješće za 2022. godinu.

Više puta je danas ovdje citiran Thomas Jefferson kako je visoka cijena slobode i tako dalje. Ima jedna druga Jeffersonova na koju bih se htio pozvati. Mislim da više vrijedi za zapad. Dakle, ako se dozvoli privatnim bankama da kontroliraju emisiju novca, da će se na koncu ljudi koji su izgradili kontinent pojaviti na njemu kao beskućnici.

Toliko o sekundarnoj emisiji, a što se tiče primarne emisije, kolkoliko je, gospođu Lagarde, u zadnjih nekoliko godina u odnosu na vrijeme prije krize stvoreno novih eura? Pitao sam komesara Gentilonija direktno, nije mi znao odgovoriti. Našao sam podatak da je negdje tridesetak posto, a dolara - podaci idu stotinjak posto, pa i više. Više se štampa nego što se uopće uspiju izvješća objaviti. U isto vrijeme imamo BRICS, koji planira napraviti novu, redovnu valutu. Pitam vas koja je onda budućnost eura i dolara kroz nekih deset godina?

Drugo, spominjali ste ulazak Hrvatske u eurozonu. Prvo ste spomenuli da, eto, se pokazuje da je eurozona još uvijek atraktivna. Drugo ste spomenuli da to jača zajedništvo. To su vam sve politički argumenti. Gdje su ekonomski argumenti? Zašto ste ih jedva dotaknuli? Zato što ih zapravo nema, zar ne?

Ovakvo izvješće vam sigurno neću poduprijeti.

Aurore Lalucq (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, Madame la Présidente Lagarde, cher rapporteur, bravo pour le travail que vous avez réalisé!

M^{me} Schnabel, du directoire de la BCE, a déclaré en janvier 2023: «Nous avons besoin d'une meilleure compréhension de la façon dont le dérèglement climatique va agir sur le secteur financier, et vice versa; pour cela, le développement de données de grande qualité sera clé». Ma question est simple: vraiment?

Est-ce que nous avons le temps d'attendre? Est-ce que, pour commencer, nous serons capables d'avoir des données de bonne qualité sur des événements que nous ne sommes aujourd'hui pas en mesure d'imaginer? Et est-ce que nous devons attendre pour agir? Comme le disait Keynes, «à long terme, nous serons tous morts». Est-ce que nous ne serons pas tous morts quand nous aurons les bonnes données pour pouvoir agir? Pourquoi ne pas agir tout de suite, notamment sur le prudentiel?

On sait que certains établissements bancaires sont extrêmement exposés au risque fossile, risque fossile qui peut engendrer un risque systémique, risque systémique qui peut être évité en augmentant les exigences de fonds propres. Voilà donc ma question, Madame la Présidente Lagarde.

Cela dit, je crois que nous pouvons quand même être fiers, en Europe, d'avoir une banque centrale, la banque centrale qui évolue le plus vite dans le domaine environnemental. Certains pays, notamment les États-Unis, n'ont pas cette chance.

Matteo Gazzini (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, signora Presidente, l'Europa sta affrontando una situazione di grande incertezza economico-finanziaria. Il conflitto in Ucraina ha provocato l'impennata dei prezzi dell'energia e delle materie prime. Secondo l'Eurostat, l'inflazione dell'area euro ha registrato un incremento annuale del 9,2 %.

Dopo aver alzato i tassi di interesse di 50 punti base a luglio dello scorso anno, la BCE ha deciso di proseguire con costanti rialzi e politiche monetarie di rafforzamento quantitativo. Queste misure influiranno negativamente, rimuovendo liquidità dai mercati finanziari e rendendo le rate sui mutui delle imprese sempre più difficili da sostenere, con un conseguente calo dell'occupazione. L'idea di tenere ad ogni costo l'inflazione al 2 % è un obiettivo arbitrario e non necessariamente condivisibile, i cui effetti si riverseranno negativamente sull'economia europea e in particolare sugli Stati maggiormente indebitati.

La maggior parte delle persone non potrà più accedere al credito e le imprese non saranno più incentivate a investire. Le misure della BCE per contenere l'inflazione sono del tutto sconsiderate e non tengono conto delle cause reali che hanno determinato l'inflazione. Non servono aumenti dei tassi e *Quantitative Tightening*. Serve, semmai, una distensione dei rapporti con la Russia, al fine di porre rimedio allo shock economico creatosi. Purtroppo, potremo valutare i discutibili provvedimenti della BCE solo nel 2024, quando le economie europee si troveranno in recessione.

Denis Nesci (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, signora Presidente Lagarde, come dice lei, la fiducia è un elemento trainante dell'economia, ma il trend di rialzo dei tassi rischia di interrompere la fiducia, che è il motore stesso dell'economia.

Il rialzo dei tassi di interesse della BCE, attuato nel mese di marzo, e quello da lei preannunciato per il mese di marzo generano preoccupazione. La lieve ripresa economica europea, nell'incerto scenario economico che stiamo attraversando, rischia di essere arrestata dalle soluzioni che la BCE sta attuando. Pertanto, questa strada potrebbe frenare l'economia e ridurre la liquidità sui mercati e sugli investimenti per la crescita.

I dati delle maggiori associazioni di riferimento evidenziano che i tassi di interesse dei prestiti e dei mutui hanno sfondato la soglia del 3 %. Il contesto socioeconomico, già fortemente stressato dalla guerra e dal caro energia, deve essere considerato alla luce del nuovo aumento dei tassi di interesse che la BCE ha inteso attuare per marzo. Dunque, la strategia messa in campo dalla BCE potrebbe condizionare negativamente le prospettive economiche per i prossimi mesi per consumatori, famiglie e imprese e potrebbe penalizzare l'intero sistema economico europeo.

Hervé Juvin (NI). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, Madame la Présidente de la BCE, votre courtoisie est renommée. Nous sommes très sensibles au fait que vous ayez la patience de rester avec nous ce soir, et je crois que tous mes collègues s'unissent à moi pour vous saluer.

La décision politique majeure que vous avez prise avec le verdissement de la politique monétaire de la BCE appelle de ma part deux questions, notamment en cette période de forte inquiétude quant au maintien du pouvoir d'achat.

La première question porte sur sa légitimité: ne conviendrait-il pas d'envisager une nouvelle négociation et une extension de votre mandat pour légitimer ce verdissement de la politique monétaire, avec ses conséquences?

Parce que ma seconde question porte sur l'inquiétude de nombreux économistes, qui considèrent que la préférence irrationnelle et exorbitante pour les énergies renouvelables aura des effets inflationnistes marqués.

Serait-ce la raison pour laquelle on évoque de plus en plus un objectif d'inflation glissant de 2 à 4 ou 5 %? Ne craignez-vous pas les effets inflationnistes du verdissement forcé de votre politique monétaire?

Zgłoszenia z sali

Lídia Pereira (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, controlar a inflação é uma urgência económica e é uma emergência social. 8,5 % é um valor alto, mas 14 % nos produtos alimentares é preocupante e o aumento dos juros do crédito à habitação só aumenta a apreensão. Os mais pobres são os mais afetados pela inflação e a resposta de alguns governos tarda.

Vamos para a sexta subida consecutiva das taxas de juro do Banco Central Europeu. É a decisão que está ao alcance dos governadores e pergunto: e os governos nacionais? Em Portugal, que tem uma inflação abaixo da média europeia, o poder de compra dos portugueses está, hoje, em níveis de 2018.

Sem executar bem os fundos europeus, sem políticas ativas de emprego e sem estratégia para investimento e para as exportações, não vamos controlar a inflação. E pior, não vamos dar o novo rumo de que as nossas economias precisam.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Mairead McGuinness, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, colleagues, this has been a really important debate. I think sometimes there is the impression that financial matters, fiscal policy and monetary policy belong to experts. But everything that we do in this area impacts people, and I think the President of the ECB has already reflected that.

I mean, many of you have expressed concerns about citizens, particularly vulnerable citizens, and that's why the Commission has said we need to target support to those most in need. Indeed, the same goes for business as well: those that are vulnerable need support.

In relation to the comments around greening of the financial system, more investments in climate, there are many different views in this House – that's the beauty of it. But the truth is that climate change will impact asset values and therefore we do need to integrate this huge issue into our financial system.

Last point is in relation to the digital euro. I just want to inform the House here, as I have with the ECON colleagues previously, that the Commission is now preparing a regulation based on Article 133 TFEU to establish the digital euro and regulate its main aspects, but of course leaving most of the technical design choices to the ECB. Indeed the final decision will be taken by the ECB, and I think, President Lagarde, you were very clear that this is an investigation that's been carried out.

One of the things that we will deal with in the regulation is an accompanying proposal on legal tender status of euro cash. One of the things I'm concerned about is that there is already a feeling that a digital euro will remove access to cash, and this is not what we have envisaged. There are concerns around privacy. So this is really an issue which this Parliament will have to have a fundamental role in.

I have to say that I had no questions addressed to me, which is a privilege and a joy, but I now yield the floor to the president of the ECB, who I think had a few questions.

Christine Lagarde, *President of the European Central Bank*. – Madam President, I wish to thank all the Members of this Parliament for addressing questions to me and for explaining their concerns, or the perspectives from which they are coming from. I would like on this occasion to thank Mr Andersen and his colleagues for the work that they've done and for the seriousness with which they did their work in coming to the ECB, visiting us and really going deeply into some of the issues that he has commented upon.

What I would like to do is focus my response on three key points which have been debated by many of you – and I apologise to those who had specific questions, but I think in the time that is imparted to me, I think I will not do justice to their curiosity if I focus on the 20 different Members who have asked questions.

So let me address three particular points that I think are on the mind of many. One, let me just go back a little bit to inflation and what our mission is and what our mandate will deliver. Let me then say a few things about climate change because clearly, as Commissioner McGuinness has indicated, there are multiple views – it's the beauty of this Parliament – but I would like to address specifically what we are doing, which in no way undermines the focus, the concern that we have for our primary mandate, which is price stability. I'll come back to the links between the two. Then I would like to have the benefit of this wonderful tribune to be able to make a few comments on the relationship between fiscal policy and monetary policy and the impact that it can have on inflation and, as a result, the monetary policy decisions that we make.

Allow me to get back to numbers and not use either fantasy numbers or to borrow from outside Europe, and the euro area in particular. Our headline inflation, which includes all components including energy and food was, in January, 8.5% – likely to be revised a little bit upward, as I have indicated, once the German numbers are included by Eurostat. That is way too high. There is no question about that. I think that, if anything, we all agree upon the fact that inflation is way too high, inflation is hurting and inflation is particularly hurting the most exposed, the most vulnerable and the most underprivileged. That is, I think, something that brings us together on this particular issue.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that inflation is not rising at the moment and, if anything, headline inflation is declining. It was at 10.1% in November, 9.2% in December, and it is now probably a little bit north of 8.5%. That is headline inflation. What is, on the other hand, not declining – because it is stable and has remained stable from December to January, having increased a little bit from November and December — is what we call core inflation, which is all components taken into account to measure the increase of prices, except energy and food. That level of inflation is currently 5.2%.

I think it's particularly notable that we have had an increase in what we call 'non-energy industrial goods inflation' – and that goes to the point made by some that inflation is currently essentially attributable to energy. It is not only attributable to energy. Energy played a significant part, is continuing to play its part, and indirect energy costs are also fuelling what I have called the 'non-energy industrial goods', as it does with services, which have slightly begun to decline a little bit, moving from 4.4% to 4.2%. But it remains to be seen whether that is going to be continued.

It's pretty obvious that a further weakening of demand would also contribute to lower price pressures than currently anticipated, especially over the medium term. I know Mr Fernandez had some really interesting, important questions about the actual determination of 'medium term'. I think that he would understand if I say that when inflation is particularly high and way too high, the medium term is probably a little bit closer than it would be if inflation was at a much more reasonable level. I think I'll leave it there because the medium term is something that obviously is going to depend on the instrument as well as the distance from which we are to target.

Now what we are seeing in the economy is price pressures that remain strong. But what has changed since our previous monetary policy meeting and the review that we have taken most recently, in February, is that risks to the inflation outlook have become more balanced, especially in the near term. And there are multiple factors for that. It's the decline of the high energy prices that continue to pass through to the rest of the economy – and we hope that this will move at as fast a path as it has passed through when energy prices were going up, but that remains to be seen. We have not really witnessed that yet. Fiscal energy, compensatory measures, temporarily dampened inflation, but – and I'll come to that in a second – could also temporarily upward the pressure in the medium term as those measures expire. I'll come back to that.

The risk of a stronger pass-through of high inflation to wages cannot be ruled out. At this point in time, we are not seeing any obvious sign of an emerging self-sustained wage price spiral but that could obviously happen and would come and fuel inflation. So we are monitoring very carefully these numbers. We are trying to be as detailed and sectorial as possible to really understand where this is heading, but it clearly could have an upward impact. As a result of that situation, as I have indicated, our monetary policy is determined to return inflation to 2% in the medium term, and we will do so and we will take the measures that are required in order to return inflation to 2%. This is the best service that we can provide to the economy so that economic actors understand what is the proposal in terms of prices, investors know under what terms they invest, borrowers know under what expected interest rates they borrow. This is actually the primary objective of the ECB, and we will deliver upon it.

Let me now say just a few words about another topic that has been on the mind of a few – and I will not touch on the special green rates, which is obviously an interesting topic, but not one that I can just address and resolve in this particular moment. What I would like to do is to clarify for you, particularly for those that are concerned about us not focusing our attention on price stability and the fight against inflation. This is our fight, this is our focus, and this is where we spend our energy but, as you know, within our mandate, we have also taken decisive steps to integrate climate change considerations into our monetary policy framework, financial stability monitoring and banking supervision. It is very clear to us that the ECB and any central bank is not in the driving seat for those measures. You are the drivers of this bus. Executive authorities are the drivers of this bus, not the European Central Bank, not any central bank, but as part of our primary mandate, which is price stability, we have to take into account the risks posed by climate change, and under our secondary objectives – as long as it is without prejudice to the primary objective – we should certainly look into what can be achieved in order to respond to what you have determined as critically important economic policies going forward. It is specifically indicated in the Treaty, as far as the secondary mandate of the ECB is concerned.

So what have we done? We have adjusted our monetary policy corporate bond holdings, and since October 2022 we have started to tilt the reinvestment towards issuers with better climate performance. That has led us to a reduction in APP reinvestment flows, and from March onwards the programme that we have to only partially reinvest is going to increase this tilting approach.

By the end of 2024 we will limit the share of assets issued by non-financial companies with a high carbon footprint in the collateral pool that we have. By 2026, we will introduce climate-related disclosure requirements based on the CSRD. That's on the central banking side of the ECB. If you look at the supervision side of the ECB, we are working – and started the work back in 2020 with the banking sector to alert them to the process that was underway – on climate stress testing to assess the impact of climate risks on the EU economy, credit institutions and the European balance sheets.

Some of you have expressed a concern and would like to continue to be informed of the progress of our Climate Action Plan. So I am committed to continue to inform the European Parliament and the public about the progress that we make, within our mandate, based on the primary objective, based on the secondary objective, to the extent that it does not prejudice the first. We will continue doing that, I am pleased to report that thanks to the energy of all members at the ECB, we are on schedule under the Action Plan and we are delivering like – as some of you said – no other central bank is delivering at the moment.

Now a few final words on the good coordination between fiscal policy and monetary policy. This matters enormously, and as you know we have repeatedly asked that the fiscal measures that have been decided at the national level be targeted, temporary and tailored. You've heard those Triple T's ad nauseum. Why is it? It's because of the target of fiscal policy, which is precisely to address those that are most exposed, most vulnerable, and that take the hardest hit, particularly as a result of high energy prices. When we say that it should be temporary, it's in order to align with the variation in the prices of energy. When we say that it should be targeted, it should be directed to those people most exposed. When we say that it should be tailored, it should be tailored in such a way that it actually continues to incentivise people to save energy.

Now, regrettably, of the many measures that have been taken – and this is a result of an exercise that we have conducted for the first time in the summer, but that we will deepen for our March monetary policy meeting – only a very small proportion of the measures that have been decided by fiscal authorities actually satisfy the Triple T criteria. The Bruegel Institute has most recently also issued its assessment, and I think they assessed that only 25% of the measures are targeted, temporary and tailored. This is critically important, because while those measures at the moment are likely to dampen inflation without consideration, unfortunately, for many of them, for those who are most exposed, when they are withdrawn, when they are retired, then of course the retirement of those measures will actually have an inflationary

impact on prices and that is likely to take place in 2024 and 2025, which is the medium term that we are concerned about when we determine if and when and how we going to reach target.

So our exhortation to members of government, in the euro area in particular, is to really stick to the temporary, targeted and tailored principles in order to make sure that their policies do not counteract with our monetary policy and does not lead us to having to tighten even more in order to reduce inflation and reach our target. I thank you very much for your attention.

Rasmus Andresen, Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich glaube, dass die Debatte hier heute einen ganz guten Einblick darin gegeben hat, wie kontrovers auch die Diskussionen waren, die wir zur Formulierung meines Berichts hatten im Kreis der Schattenberichterstatterinnen und Schattenberichterstatter. Ich möchte die Gelegenheit auch noch mal nutzen, mich bei den Schattenberichterstatterinnen und Schattenberichterstattern für ihren Einsatz und für die Kompromissbereitschaft am Schluss zu bedanken, sodass wir hier morgen hoffentlich bei allen kontroversen Themen auch mit einer guten und stabilen Mehrheit über diesen Bericht abstimmen werden.

Ich möchte auf eine Debatte noch einmal ganz besonders eingehen, weil es mir fast noch die stärkere Kontroverse zu sein scheint als die Geldpolitik – und das ist in der Tat die Frage: Wie halten wir es eigentlich mit dem Klimawandel? Und brauchen wir eine grüne Geldpolitik oder halt eben auch nicht?

Ich glaube, wir sind uns hier im Haus alle sehr schnell einig, dass wir besorgt sind über die Inflation, über die Preissteigerungen, die vor allem Menschen mit sehr wenig Einkommen in diesen Wochen sehr, sehr hart in allen Mitgliedstaaten treffen. Aber in der Analyse – was man dagegen tun kann, und was auch aus meiner Sicht offenkundige Zusammenhänge sind zu dem Bereich der Energiepreise, zu dem Bereich der fossilen Abhängigkeit, die viele unserer Mitgliedstaaten nach wie vor von fossiler Energie haben, aber in dem Fall dann auch von russischer fossiler Energie – da scheinen wir etwas auseinander zu liegen.

Und ich bin auch der Präsidentin Lagarde sehr dankbar, dass Sie letztes Jahr auch schon mehrfach deutlich gemacht haben, dass es den Zusammenhang gibt und dass Preisstabilität ohne eine grünere Geldpolitik eigentlich gar nicht mehr möglich ist.

Das, was wir jetzt an fossilen Preisexplosionen sehen, sollte das eigentlich für alle offenkundig machen, aber mir scheint es so zu sein, dass wir über diesen Punkt in den nächsten Wochen und Monaten hier im Parlament noch sehr intensiv diskutieren werden müssen.

Denn es gibt – und da möchte ich Ihnen auch widersprechen, Präsidentin Lagarde – es gibt Zentralbanken, die neben den guten Sachen, die Sie auch schon auf den Weg gebracht haben, noch mehr machen. Die Zentralbank von Japan ist da ein Beispiel, wo ganz gezielt auch mit grüendifferenzierten Zinssätzen gearbeitet wird. Und ich glaube, dass wir diesen Weg auch gehen sollten und das in den nächsten Wochen weiterdiskutieren müssen.

Jetzt freue ich mich aber morgen erst mal auf die Abstimmung und möchte Sie alle bitten, dem Bericht am Schluss dann auch zuzustimmen.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 16 lutego 2023 r.

(Posiedzenie zostało na chwilę zawieszono.)

16. Възобновяване на заседанието

(Posiedzenie zostało wznowione o godz. 20.20)

17. Достъп до суровините от изключителна и стратегическа важност (разискване)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie Rady i Komisji w sprawie dostępu do surowców krytycznych o strategicznym znaczeniu (2023/2531(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, the COVID-19 pandemic, the Russian invasion of Ukraine and the energy crisis have shown how the EU is vulnerable to disorder and disruption to supply chains.

Among other things, these crises have made evident that the EU's access to critical raw materials is highly relevant to functioning, sustainable and resilient supply chains. Therefore, the Council welcomes the Commission's announcement of a new regulatory initiative on critical raw materials.

The EU needs to keep control of areas related to its essential needs, including the access to critical raw materials. For example, lithium and rare earth elements will soon be more important to our economy than oil and gas. The green and digital transformation of the EU's economy and our transition toward carbon neutrality can only be achieved if we master net-zero technologies. We must be able to make these technologies available on the required scale.

But developing and manufacturing green technologies requires sufficient access to relevant critical raw materials. It is therefore important that we take the foundation for our net-zero future more into our own hands and ensure the supply of our companies with the required critical raw materials.

Currently, the sources for many of these strategic raw materials lie outside our continent, with a high concentration of supplies in a limited number of third countries. For this reason, we need to develop more strategic partnership with third countries and avoid the risk of becoming too dependent on individual supply countries.

We need to reinforce our international engagement and look very thoroughly into possibility for alliances with partners worldwide. To accomplish this, we have at our disposal a variety of elements to promote the EU's position as a leader in net-zero technologies, such as our network for free trade agreements, Sustainable Investment Facilitation Agreements, or the green investment under the Global Gateway.

As Europeans, we should not only facilitate the extraction, processing and recycling in third countries, but at the same time we should ensure high social and environment standards. And we need to maintain a sustainable level playing field, both in Europe and globally.

But what is perhaps even more important, there is also an untapped potential here in Europe to lower the EU's dependence and to extract strategic, critical raw materials. The discovery of rare earth materials in Kiruna, in Sweden, that was announced during the College of Commissioners recently, is the largest known deposit in Europe and is one of the great examples of this.

Furthermore, circularity must be at the core of our own new strategy. This includes strengthening waste rules, increased materials efficiency and use of European sustainability and technical standards. All these measures will not only provide the EU economy with the required security of supply, but it will also boost new quality jobs and growth.

Mairead McGuinness, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, colleagues, this is a debate about one of the most important and structural challenges that our industry faces. Investing in refining, processing and recycling of raw materials here in Europe, as well as working with our trade partners to build resilient supply chains, is one of the essential elements of what President von der Leyen addressed as the greatest industrial transformation of our times.

Critical raw materials are of paramount importance for the deployment of the technologies that enable the green and digital transitions and strengthen our resilience. But it is true to say that the EU remains heavily dependent on concentrated supply sources from a few third countries. China provides over 90% of the EU's magnesium supply and 98% of rare earth supply. Turkey provides 98% of borate and South Africa 71% of platinum group metals.

We need, therefore, to combine an increase of domestic production where we can, including through recycling, with the diversification of sources of supply through reinforced international engagement, in full respect of highest environmental, social and governance standards.

To meet these challenges, we're preparing a European Critical Raw Materials Act, which will rest on four pillars.

First, the act intends to define the critical raw materials that can be considered as particularly strategic to rally a collective effort and give a much-needed signal to private investors on priority needs.

Second, the act intends to strengthen the EU's critical raw materials value chain, from mining to refining to processing, recycling and ensuring, as asked by this Chamber, the high social and environmental standards. To this end, we intend to support the emergence of strategic projects which would contribute to increasing the EU's capacity and would in turn benefit from more transparent approval procedures, streamline permitting, and better access to investment opportunities. We want to promote such strategic projects here in Europe, but also in third countries to reinforce partnerships and collaborations.

Third, we intend to promote circularity in the critical raw material value chain, including by removing critical raw materials from extractive waste. This is really important for permanent magnets.

And fourth, it's essential to set up a governance system that facilitates collaboration among raw materials agencies and increase risk preparedness.

Such an ambitious plan requires ambitious resources. We need a massive, unprecedented investment push. Besides the support of strategic projects, we're working closely with the business sector through the European Raw Materials Alliance to help project promoters get access to private finance. And we are advancing on State aid rules to help to accelerate the green and digital transitions, in particular when it comes to the temporary crisis and transition framework while maintaining a level playing field.

But the European Union cannot extract, process, recycle and refine all of the critical raw materials it needs. Today and for the foreseeable future, we will continue to rely on imports, but we need to diversify our supply sources. We need to enhance our partnerships with third countries to secure and boost trade flows, using the EU's vast framework of trade and investment agreements and extending our bilateral strategic partnerships, focusing on raw material value chains.

In doing so, we need to help third countries to move up and develop local value chains in a sustainable way so as to ensure that partnerships become win-win and help to strengthen economic and political bonds.

These challenges being global, we need a global response. As announced by President von der Leyen, the EU will establish a critical raw materials club to work together with like-minded raw materials consumers and resource-rich countries, using the Global Gateway framework to its full effect.

The EU needs to continue developing more strategic partnerships with reliable partners to diversify our supply sources, but also to consider how to make more sustainable and resilient our relationships with all our major trading partners in this sector. And, to this end, the act will be accompanied by a communication further detailing the EU integrated approach to ensure a secure and sustainable sourcing of critical raw materials with a specific focus on the external dimension.

On sustainability in particular, we need to ensure that the sourcing and investment in critical raw materials promote labour rights and environmental protection.

Honourable Members, when we talk about the green and digital transition, about technological sovereignty, we first need to talk about the supply of critical raw materials – its security, affordability and sustainability. And that's why I believe that the upcoming package is of huge importance to the European Union. I very much look forward to this debate and indeed there has been a link between all of the debates that I have participated in this evening, so it shows that things are circular and in the issue of critical raw materials, we are at a critical juncture.

Hildegard Bentele, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Kollegen und Kolleginnen! Warum brauchen wir ein EU-Rohstoffgesetz? Können wir uns nicht weiter darauf verlassen, dass sich unsere Unternehmen um die Rohstoffversorgung kümmern oder dass unsere Handelsbeziehungen einen ausreichenden Rahmen hierfür bieten? Warum ein neuer Rechtsakt auf der europäischen Ebene? Weil sich die Zeiten geändert haben.

Erstens: Unser Zugang zu Rohstoffen ist nicht mehr sicher, und unsere tief greifenden einseitigen Abhängigkeiten von einzelnen Lieferländern und einzelnen Unternehmen sind zu riskant geworden. Wir sehen es zum Beispiel daran, dass wir Nickel und Titan von den Russlandsanktionen ausnehmen mussten, dass die Ukraine als strategischer Rohstoffpartner vorerst ausfällt, dass Exportverbote verhängt werden. Wir sehen es aber vor allem daran, dass sich unser größter Konkurrent China schon vor Jahren mit Staatsunternehmen und auch Dumping die ganze Wertschöpfungskette kritischer Rohstoffe gesichert hat – von der Mine über die Verarbeitung bis zum Einsatz in den Produkten.

Zweitens haben wir uns ehrgeizige Ziele gesetzt, was den digitalen und erneuerbaren Umbau unserer Wirtschaft, unserer Industrie, unserer Mobilität und unserer Energieerzeugung anbetrifft. Das führt allen Prognosen zufolge zu einem stark steigenden Bedarf an kritischen Rohstoffen und schon jetzt zu Produktionsverzögerungen.

Daher ist eine bessere Absicherung unserer Rohstoffversorgung elementar für die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und die Technologieführerschaft in Europa. Wir müssen hier als EU aktiv werden.

Auf zwei Dinge kommt es im neuen europäischen Rohstoffgesetz besonders an:

Erstens: Wir müssen unsere eigenen Rohstoffpotenziale endlich ernsthaft erschließen. Das heißt, Genehmigungsverfahren beschleunigen, das heißt, Sicherheit bei der Finanzierung schaffen, das heißt, klare Standards und Fristen für die Beteiligung und Information der Betroffenen festlegen, und das heißt, Leuchtturmprojekte auf den Weg bringen.

Und zweitens darf sich EU-Gesetzgebung nicht widersprechen oder überlagern. Das heißt, dass wir zum Beispiel darauf achten müssen, dass die Sammlung, das Recycling und die Wiederverwertung kritischer Rohstoffe in den entsprechenden Richtlinien und Verordnungen verankert werden, und zum Beispiel auch darauf, dass neue Sorgfaltspflichten unsere Rohstoffversorgung nicht einschränken.

EU-Gesetzgebung muss außerdem Prioritäten folgen. Und diese Priorität heißt: unsere europäische Wirtschaft bei der Rohstoffversorgung auf sichere Füße stellen.

Mohammed Chahim, *namens de S&D-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, lithium, kobalt en nikkel zijn cruciaal voor de productie van batterijen en de verwezenlijking van de energietransitie en onze klimaatdoelstellingen. Er is dan ook een strategie nodig waarin de toegang tot deze grondstoffen goed wordt geregeld. Dit is van belang omdat er meer vraag zal zijn dan aanbod. Bedrijven willen vergroenen, maar hebben vaak beperkte toegang tot kritieke grondstoffen. Wij moeten daarom prioriteiten durven stellen.

We kunnen geen hulp verwachten van de onzichtbare hand, aangezien er nog geen functionerende markt bestaat. Het is aan ons om te bepalen wie waartoe toegang krijgt en wanneer. Bovendien moeten we de materialen waarover wij reeds beschikken, langer en efficiënter gebruiken. Voorts is de instemming van lokale gemeenschappen bij ontginning een absolute voorwaarde en moeten daarbij de hoogste standaarden worden gehanteerd.

Laten we dit daarom goed regelen. Het afkicken van fossiele brandstoffen mag niet leiden tot een andere afhankelijkheid. Het debat hierover zal een cruciale stap vormen bij de verwezenlijking van onze digitale en klimaatambities.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Ministre, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, les tensions avec la Chine l'ont fait craindre, l'agression russe de l'Ukraine nous l'a montré: des ennemis de l'Europe ont la mainmise sur l'accès aux matières premières stratégiques dont nous avons besoin.

Pour faire face à nos dépendances, vous nous proposez un plan: extraction européenne, transformation européenne, récupération. Des efforts qui doivent être durables et en adéquation avec le pacte vert. Il faut aider les filières européennes à voir le jour, se structurer, se développer face à une concurrence déloyale d'entreprises soutenues par des États souvent autoritaires.

Madame la Commissaire, ce sont des points que vous avez évoqués, et, nous le savons, nous devons aussi faire face aux enjeux sociétaux que pose l'extraction des matières premières en Europe. Nous devons nous assurer que la mise en œuvre de cette stratégie prendra en compte les réalités territoriales et les exigences environnementales.

La demande mondiale de matières premières stratégiques va être multipliée par cinq d'ici 2050. Nous savons que les ressources européennes ne suffiront pas – vous l'avez dit –, et la Commission entend multiplier les accords. Des accords qui crispent aussi, parce qu'ils mettent parfois nos entreprises, qui respectent nos principes et nos législations, en concurrence avec des États aux considérations opposées.

Mais parce que toutes ces questions interrogent, nous devons continuer à aller de l'avant par un travail efficace, un travail de négociation qui doit impliquer toutes les parties prenantes, un travail de concertation plus transparent. Madame la Commissaire, avec ce débat c'est bien plus que notre économie que nous devons protéger: c'est notre autonomie que nous devons affirmer et concrétiser.

Henrike Hahn, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Rohstoffe sind für den Übergang zu einer klimaneutralen Gesellschaft unerlässlich. Wir brauchen Rohstoffe für die grüne Transformation, für Zukunftstechnologien. Und klar ist: Wir müssen in Europa die Abhängigkeit von Rohstoffen insgesamt verringern, gerade auch von China – für strategische Autonomie.

Wir wissen, dass Rohstofflieferketten fragil sind, und Versorgungssicherheit ist wichtig. Und der Ausbau von EU-Kapazitäten für Rohstoffe ist zentral für die europäische grüne wettbewerbsfähige Industrie.

Und trotzdem muss auch klar gesagt werden: Es gibt ein großes Fragezeichen dabei, Bergbau per se als nachhaltig einzustufen, und dem müssen wir uns auch stellen. Bergbau in EU-Schutzgebieten wie Natura-2000-Gebieten kann nicht die richtige europäische Lösung sein.

Wir brauchen eine grüne Rohstoffstrategie mit hohen Umwelt-, Sozial- und Menschenrechtsstandards. Rohstoffpartnerschaften wie der Rohstoffclub können Beschaffung diversifizieren und auf eine globale Ausgleicheung der Rechtsvorschriften hinarbeiten. Und wir brauchen langfristige Lösungen. Wir müssen Recycling und die Recyclingquoten voranbringen mit Kreislaufwirtschaft im Fokus. Substitution und Effizienz ist wichtig auf diesem Weg. Genau dafür müssen wir auf Forschung und Entwicklung setzen, für neue europäische Technologien.

Wir erwarten jetzt vom EU-Rohstoffgesetz aktive europäische Rohstoffpolitik, die grüne europäische wettbewerbsfähige Industriepolitik fordert. Auf geht's!

Antonio Maria Rinaldi, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria McGuinness, nell'ambito del pacchetto di proposte «Fit for 55» abbiamo già constatato che l'approccio ideologico finora assunto ai fini della transizione energetica crea distorsioni potenzialmente devastanti, in particolare in termini di aumento dei costi per aziende e famiglie già colpiti dalla pandemia e dalla guerra.

Oggi però si discute di un'altra delle severe conseguenze delle rigide regole imposte nel quadro della strategia: il problema della disponibilità delle materie prime critiche e, in particolare, l'aumento della dipendenza europea e l'accesso ad alcune produzioni extraeuropee. Ciò che ci stupisce è il ritardo con cui Bruxelles, dopo aver diramato le diverse proposte di regolamento del Green Deal, che presto entreranno in vigore, si accinge a colmare un vuoto normativo che tenta di stimolare e tutelare la sicurezza dell'approvvigionamento.

Perché il legislatore europeo si pone solo adesso il problema? Lo stesso *Chips Act*, su cui le istituzioni avvieranno i negoziati a breve, ambisce a rilocalizzare in Europa la produzione di semiconduttori, che necessita di particolari materie prime. Diversi saranno gli elementi da tenere in considerazione durante l'iter del nuovo provvedimento, primo fra tutti il ruolo della Cina, che nel tempo ha accumulato molte materie prime specifiche anche depredando altri continenti come l'Africa. La Cina controlla più del 90 % della disponibilità delle terre rare e di scorte di rame e il 77 % del comparto mondiale dei pannelli solari, e ciò a fronte di una crescita esponenziale della domanda europea entro il 2023.

Emerge poi il ruolo americano del nuovo *Inflation Reduction Act* rivolto all'economia verde. Gli USA hanno deciso, ad esempio, di incentivare le famiglie americane ad acquistare prodotti con almeno il 40 % di materie prime estratte negli Stati Uniti. Sebbene ciò susciti preoccupazione e possa sembrare protezionismo, bisogna tenere in considerazione che è, geopoliticamente, il tentativo di difendere i propri interessi strategici nazionali.

A tal fine, ritengo pertanto opportuno e urgente predisporre uno studio sul reale livello di dipendenza della nostra economia dalle catene di fornitura cinese, in particolare nel settore delle rinnovabili, dei metalli, dell'elettronica e del farmaceutico.

Grzegorz Tobiszowski, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Komisja Europejska zaproponowała niedawno plan rozwoju przemysłu na naszym kontynencie w kontekście Zielonego Ładu. To ważny dokument, który ma za zadanie zwiększyć konkurencyjność europejskiego przemysłu i zarazem przyspieszyć wdrożenie czystych technologii. Aby mogły zdarzyć się te dwie kwestie, a więc konkurencyjność przemysłu europejskiego i zarazem wdrażanie czystych technologii, fundamentalną kwestią jest zapewnienie europejskiemu przemysłowi odpowiedniej ilości surowców krytycznych, w tym metali ziem rzadkich. Potrzebujemy ich m.in. w sektorze energetycznym, motoryzacyjnym, zbrojeniowym, informatycznym. Tymczasem Unia jest w ogromnym stopniu uzależniona od dostaw na przykład litu, kobaltu, magnezu czy właśnie metali rzadkich z takich krajów jak Chiny, Birma, Wietnam, Kongo, które nie dość, że degradują środowisko, bowiem nie stosują standardów, które my szanujemy i które my stosujemy, to daleko im również do tworzenia praw pracowniczych i ochrony praw człowieka. Zwiększenie zapotrzebowania na surowce krytyczne wywołało skokowy wzrost cen. Na przykład tona litu potrzebnego do produkcji akumulatorów samochodowych podróżała w moim kraju w Polsce od 2020 r. do 2022 r. o 1500%.

Realizując nasze cele klimatyczne, nie możemy dopuścić do powtórzenia sytuacji, gdy Unia uzależniła się od dostaw rosyjskiego gazu. Skutki tej nietrafionej polityki odczuwamy bardzo boleśnie w całej Europie. Stąd podzielam głosy pani komisarz, przedstawiciela Rady Europejskiej, iż ta debata jest bardzo ważna i surowce ziem rzadkich są bardzo istotne w osiągnięciu celów gospodarczych Europy.

Helmut Scholz, im Namen der Fraktion The Left. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Ministerin! Wenn die Kommission in drei Wochen ihren Gesetzesvorschlag zum Umgang mit kritischen Rohstoffen vorlegt, bitte ich Sie, dem Wunschtraum der schwedischen Bergbauindustrie nicht zu folgen.

Verpflichten Sie die Mitgliedstaaten nicht dazu, große Vorräte an kritischen Rohstoffen anzulegen! Die weltweite Wirkung auf die Preise wäre dramatisch. Vielen Ländern würde der Zugang durch den Preis abgeschnitten, wie es gerade die EU durch das Hamstern von LNG zu verantworten hat. Vielmehr sind Energiewende, Umweltaspekte, Mobilität – und zwar zukunftsfähige Mobilität – und wirtschaftliche Entwicklung zusammen zu denken.

Verbessern Sie stattdessen die Kooperation mit den Partnerländern, in deren Erde die begehrten Rohstoffe gefunden und gefördert werden! Helfen Sie den Ländern, selbst moderne, nachhaltige Anlagen zur Verarbeitung zu errichten! Das ist es, was der Mercosur, Chile, Peru und andere brauchen und wollen. Forschen Sie gemeinsam mit unseren Partnern in aller Welt am Ersatz für die giftigen Materialien, aus denen heute noch Batterien hergestellt werden!

Auch die kritischen Rohstoffe und Seltenen Erden sind endlich. Bringen Sie die Kreislaufwirtschaft voran! Einen konkreten Zeitplan erwarten wir. Wir brauchen kooperative, regionale wie auch globale Lösungen mit hohen Standards und verbindlichen Lieferkettengesetzen.

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Colegas, a Lei do Clima e o pacote *Fit for 55* exigem à nossa indústria que acelere as transições verde e digital. No entanto, ao mesmo tempo, a Europa não tem ainda uma verdadeira política para abastecer a produção industrial com matérias primas suficientes.

O ato legislativo sobre matérias primas críticas que a Comissão Europeia está a preparar é um passo na direção certa. Espero que esta iniciativa legislativa seja um meio para, primeiro, impulsionar a investigação científica e a inovação, tendo em vista desenvolver materiais alternativos. Em segundo lugar, para construir parcerias com países terceiros para diversificar os fornecedores, intensificar a cooperação e reforçar as cadeias de abastecimento internacionais. E, ainda, para desenvolver tecnologias que assegurem que a atividade mineira tenha o menor impacto possível no ambiente envolvente e na população, não descurando a responsabilidade social deste setor.

Não basta definir metas e objetivos. É preciso criar as condições para atingi-los.

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D). – Sinjura President, l-isfida tal-materja prima, il-provvista tal-materja prima, hija wahda reali fuq bazi Ewropea. L-Ewropa saret wisq dipendenti fuq l-importazzjoni ta' materja prima minn pajjizi terzi; materja prima importanti sabiex naghmlu t-tranzizzjoni, il-qalba hadra u dik digitali. Fis-sitwazzjoni geopolitika prezenti, dan kollu qed ipoggina f'sitwazzjoni ta' vulnerabbiltà strategika inaċċettabbli.

Il-pandemija u l-gwerra fl-Ukraina komplew iharbtu l-katina ta' provvista globali fejn ġew ikkawżati skarsezzi kbar ta' materja prima li hija kruċjali għall-intrapriżi tagħna. It-teknoloġija digitali u s-sovranità teknoloġika għandhom bżonn aċċess sikur għall-materja prima kritika. Għaldaqstant l-Unjoni Ewropea għandha bżonn pjan ta' azzjoni sabiex tiżviluppa katina ta' provvista reżiljenti, katina ta' provvista ddiversifikata, li thallaq mad-domanda prezenti ta' materja prima kritika għall-industriji Ewropej. Dan, jekk jirnexxilna naghmluh, jagħmilna aktar kompetittivi u jnaqqas l-iskarsezzi u d-dewmien ta' prodotti Ewropej sabiex jitpoġġew fis-suq, filwaqt li jissalvagwardja l-aqwa standards soċjali u ambjentali fl-Unjoni Ewropea.

Svenja Hahn (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kollegen! Wir haben es gerade von Kommissarin McGuinness gehört: China liefert 98 % unserer Seltenen Erden, Türkei 98 % des Borats, Südafrika 71 % unseres Platins. Die Zahlen sind von 2020, aber wir wissen doch schon viel länger, dass wir bei kritischen Rohstoffen große Abhängigkeiten haben, große Abhängigkeiten von einzelnen Ländern, und dass das eben oft jene Länder sind, mit denen wir uns auch noch in einem Systemwettbewerb befinden.

Seit dieser Erkenntnis ist aber zu wenig Handlung passiert. Wir brauchen mehr Handel mit mehr Ländern dieser Welt, damit wir eben nicht abhängig sind von einzelnen Autokraten. Die Rohstoffpartnerschaft mit Kanada ist zum Beispiel ein guter Anfang. Ich sehe auch viel Potenzial in dem *Trade and Technology Council* mit Indien, und, Ministerin Roswall, ich bin sehr dankbar, dass Sie die Funde von Seltener Erde in Kiruna angesprochen haben, denn wir müssen auch bereit sein, wortwörtlich vor unserer eigenen Haustür zu gucken und unsere eigenen Rohstoffvorkommen in der EU zu nutzen.

Denn kritische Rohstoffe sind kritisch, weil sie ja eben nicht einfach ersetzbar sind und so kritisch für moderne Technologie sind. Sie sind kritisch für eine nachhaltige Wirtschaft, für Arbeitsplätze und Wohlstand in Europa in Zukunft. Und sie sind deshalb auch ebenso kritisch für die Unabhängigkeit der Europäischen Union von Diktatoren und Autokraten und deswegen auch kritisch für unsere europäischen Werte.

Sara Matthieu (Verts/ALE). – Voorzitter, collega's, we moeten veel sneller naar 100 % hernieuwbare energie en elektrische auto's. Voor het klimaat natuurlijk, maar ook om onze afhankelijkheid van schurkenstaten zoals Rusland af te bouwen. Maar om die zonnepanelen, windmolens en batterijen te produceren hebben we kritieke grondstoffen nodig, en die hebben we niet of in beperkte mate in Europa.

We moeten een nieuwe afhankelijkheid van autoritaire regimes zoals China absoluut voorkomen. Daarom moeten we veel efficiënter en beter omgaan met onze grondstoffen, bijvoorbeeld door ervoor te zorgen dat onze producten veel langer meegaan en door onze batterijen en apparaten 100 % te gaan hergebruiken en te recyclen. Zo houden we die grondstoffen hier in Europa en creëren we ook heel wat nieuwe jobs in de circulaire economie.

Een nieuwe grondstoffenrush of een nieuw handelsbeleid in die richting, dat is geen oplossing. Integendeel. De circulariteit, dat is de toekomst voor onze economie, maar ook voor onze autonomie.

Alessandro Panza (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, sono felice che si faccia questo dibattito, perché finalmente sulla questione delle terre rare emergerà tutta la pochezza della politica energetica europea, tutta l'ipocrisia della Commissione e tutta l'ottusità con cui pretendete di salvare il mondo senza accorgervi che lo state massacrando, imponendoci un modello di sostenibilità che sostenibile non lo è affatto.

E sì perché mentre ci obbligate a comprare le auto elettriche, che contengono dai nove agli undici chili di terre rare, che nel loro ciclo produttivo consumano, secondo i ricercatori dell'Università della California, tre-quattro volte l'energia necessaria per un'auto a motore termico, non tenete in considerazione le conseguenze di queste scelte. Quali? Per esempio le conseguenze ambientali. Per ottenere un solo chilo di gallio servono 50 tonnellate di roccia, e addirittura 200 per un chilo di lutezio, processi che avvengono con il consumo di migliaia di metri cubi di acqua, acidi solforici e nitrici, poi scaricati nel suolo o in mare.

Inoltre, sostenere il cambiamento del nostro modello energetico richiede già il raddoppiamento della produzione di metalli rari ogni quindici anni circa e nel corso dei prossimi trent'anni sarà necessario estrarre più minerali di quanti l'umanità ne abbia estratti negli ultimi 70 000 anni, e alcuni potrebbero già esaurirsi nei prossimi quattro o cinque anni.

Per non parlare poi delle conseguenze geopolitiche. Alcuni di questi metalli, che sono fondamentali per la produzione di sistemi di comunicazione, armamenti e beni di uso comune, sono nel 90-95 % nelle disponibilità della sola Cina e nella restante parte di paesi a lei alleati, mettendo l'Europa in una condizione di dipendenza ben peggiore di quella dal gas russo.

La realtà è che basate le vostre ideologie ambientaliste su menzogne e omissioni. Sì, perché Germania, Svezia, Francia e molti altri paesi europei hanno giacimenti di terre rare, ma non li estraggono perché inquinano e quindi hanno deciso di delocalizzare l'impatto ambientale e l'inquinamento da estrazioni in paesi poveri, pronti a sacrificare il loro ambiente per arricchirsi, senza considerare che le conseguenze, comunque, le pagheremo tutti.

Sulle terre rare, di cui si parla sempre troppo poco, si consumerà probabilmente la fine della leadership europea, ma qualcuno sarà contento perché, anche se avremo un continente più povero, avremo raggiunto la neutralità climatica, ma ancora una volta sulla pelle dei cittadini che non ne possono nulla.

Robert Roos (ECR). – Voorzitter, als ik mijn huis wil verbouwen, kijk ik eerst welke materialen ik nodig heb. Of het te koop én betaalbaar is. En welke risico's er zijn. Pas dan hak ik de knoop door.

De EU doet het achterstevoren. Eerst wordt een groots plan tot uitvoering gebracht. Pas daarna worden de haalbaarheid, de betaalbaarheid en het risico bekeken. Tot 2010 produceerden de EU-landen meer gas dan Rusland exporteerde. Maar alle betrouwbare energiebronnen zijn daarna ingeruild voor onbetrouwbare hernieuwbare energiebronnen. Daarmee is de huidige energiecrisis gecreëerd en werden we compleet afhankelijk van Russisch gas.

En nu moeten we het hele wagenpark vanaf 2035 elektrisch gaan maken. De gevestigde partijen stemden braaf voor. We worden voor de grondstoffen nog meer afhankelijk van China. En pas nu gaan we bekijken hoe we daar een alternatief voor kunnen vinden. Dat is het paard achter de wagen spannen.

Ik ben voor strategische autonomie en ik vind het goed om daarin samen op te trekken. Maar laten we de volgende keer vooraf de haalbaarheid en risico's op orde hebben. De mensen thuis verwachten van de politiek dat we problemen voorkomen, niet dat de politiek bezig is met het oplossen van problemen die ze zelf heeft veroorzaakt.

Marina Mesure (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, la pandémie a montré à quel point nous avons besoin de ne plus être dépendants du reste du monde pour répondre à nos besoins essentiels. Il est donc temps de sécuriser nos approvisionnements en matières premières stratégiques, et notamment celles nécessaires à la bifurcation écologique.

En effet, continuer à se fournir abondamment en cobalt, en lithium, en terres rares sur d'autres continents, dans les conditions désastreuses que nous connaissons, est un non-sens social et écologique. S'il est vrai que le recyclage des composants électroniques, grâce à une économie circulaire renforcée, est un moyen de pallier le manque d'approvisionnement, cela n'est clairement pas suffisant.

Dans ce contexte se pose alors la question de l'exploitation des ressources minières en Europe. L'enjeu est important, mais gardons en tête que de tels projets ne sont envisageables qu'à la condition d'y appliquer les normes les plus strictes en matière sociale et environnementale.

Si nous voulons réussir la bifurcation écologique, les politiques industrielles que nous portons ici, dans cet hémicycle, doivent être acceptables et acceptées par la population.

Barbara Thaler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kollegen! Ich gebe zu, die geopolitische Sachlage ist komplex. Deshalb habe ich mir gedacht, wir brechen das auf ein einfaches Beispiel herunter.

Wir nehmen eine ganz normale Firma, und wir nennen diese Firma Europa. Diese Firma produziert tolle Produkte, bezahlt ihre Angestellten gut, wirft Gewinne ab und kümmert sich auch um die Umwelt. Nun will die Geschäftsführung dieser Firma in Zukunft ausschließlich Produkte produzieren, für die Rohstoffe gebraucht werden, die von den zwei Konkurrenzfirmen kontrolliert werden. Und wir nennen die Konkurrenzfirmen USA und China.

Wenn man jetzt als Anteilseigner die Geschäftsführung fragt, wie sie sich das dann so vorstellt, so wie ich das in meiner Anfrage an die Kommission gemacht habe, dann hört man, dass die Abhängigkeiten mittel- und langfristig steigen werden, aber man arbeite schon an einer Strategie.

Wir sind an einem Punkt, wo Europas Wohlstand und Europas Arbeitsplätze erneut vom guten Willen von Dritten abhängig werden. Ist das die strategische Souveränität, von der wir in jeder Überschrift lesen? Ist es das, was die 440 - Millionen Anteilseigner wollen? Ich glaube, wir müssen – bei all dem Guten, das ich heute gehört habe – darüber auch ganz kritisch reden dürfen.

Wo sind denn die Pläne, Energie in Europa endlich wieder so günstig zu machen, dass wir konkurrenzfähig produzieren können? Wo sind die Initiativen, die nicht nur Umweltauflagen in die Höhe treiben, sondern auch dafür sorgen, einen echten, technologieneutralen Zugang zu ermöglichen? Das würde ich im Sinne der Firma Europa gerne wissen.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora ministra, el acceso a materias primas fundamentales y estratégicas es esencial para las transiciones verde y digital, que nos permitirán alcanzar la neutralidad climática y también la autonomía estratégica en este nuevo contexto geoestratégico de profunda transformación del orden internacional, tal como lo conocemos.

Actualmente, la producción y el procesamiento de estos materiales se encuentran muy concentrados y la Unión Europea depende, en gran medida, como sabemos, de las importaciones, lo que genera dependencias y pone en peligro que pueda alcanzarse la autonomía estratégica. Por eso es muy bienvenida una ley europea que garantice su suministro.

Por un lado, fomentando la producción, el reciclaje y también la investigación y la innovación dentro de la Unión Europea, de tal manera que esta actividad esté basada en la sostenibilidad medioambiental, la social y la económica. Y aquí, en el Parlamento, trabajaremos, junto a actores locales, para que realmente esto sea así y se garanticen también los empleos de calidad.

Por otro lado, sabemos que debemos trazar, como se está haciendo, alianzas estratégicas con otros países, especialmente en la investigación y la innovación, sin que caigamos en dinámicas neocoloniales.

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Fru talman! Kommissionen, ministern! Vi befinner oss i en brytningstid. Att vi lämnar fossila bränslen bakom oss är inte bara avgörande för att rädda klimatet. Det är också en fråga om säkerhet. Vårt oljeberoende och många europeiska länders gasberoende har gjort oss fångade i ett osunt och farligt beroende av Ryssland och en rad oljediktaturer.

Jag är liberal och teknikoptimist, men inser också att digitalisering och elektrifiering ökar vårt beroende av kritiska råmaterial och vi riskerar att bli ännu mer beroende av Kina. Därför måste vi bli bättre på att återvinna. Men det kommer till exempel att dröja till sekelskiftet innan återvinningen kan stå för ens hälften av den mängd av sällsynta jordartsmetaller som vi räknar med att Europa och världen behöver då. Därför behövs alternativ. Vi måste använda resurser som finns inom EU. De finns i Norden, de finns i Sverige, de finns i Norge och vi måste fördjupa handelsrelationerna med andra demokratier.

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Minister, Commissioner, it has been said several times that the EU's supply with critical raw materials is not secure. That's true. But that's not news. That was true also ten years ago when we experienced the Senkaku crisis.

But what did we do since? We refused to learn our lessons! Today, we're more dependent on China than we were at that time. That's not because China controls all the raw materials, all the rare earths, as rare earths are not really rare, but the processing capacity that China controls, that's rare and concentrated, and that creates a dependency.

Even with the greatest realism regarding a max of green mining inside Europe and a max of circularity in the use of raw materials, we will remain a continent depending on critical raw materials imported from other corners of the globe.

That's why we must invest in partnerships with other countries, and I'm grateful, Commissioner, that you mentioned the Global Gateway Initiative. That should be the tool that we employ to create the win-win partnerships that help us in overcoming these dependencies.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left). – Señora presidenta, la transición verde digital podría estar muy bien si la pagáramos entre todos, si fuera justa y ajustada a los límites del planeta, que salvo terraplanismo, están bastante claros, pero no si sustituimos minas de carbón por minas de litio o campos fértiles por megaparques eólicos; no si convertimos unos territorios en las nuevas colonias de otros fragmentando el mapa europeo; no si sacrificamos la vida y la salud de los más pobres para incrementar las ganancias de los de siempre, los que antes eran especuladores del ladrillo y ahora son extra activistas; no si estresamos aún más a las zonas despobladas para ocupar las tierras y echar a la gente que quede como si esto fuera la conquista del Oeste; no si eliminamos las exigencias ambientales para favorecer, paradójicamente, al medio ambiente, porque la voracidad y la velocidad no son sostenibles.

Transición verde digital en Extremadura, mi región, en España; megaminería; macrominería de litio; macrociudad del ocio; macro azucareras; macrofotovoltaicas; megaregadíes; cultivos intensivos; megafábricas de residuos tóxicos industriales, gigantes vertederos: una fiesta.

En fin, transición ecológica sí, pero así no.

Sara Skyttedal (PPE). – Madam President, the most difficult part of being a politician is not to have good intentions, but to make difficult choices. Many important goals are in conflict with each other, and then we as legislators must have the courage to choose. This is a truth not only when it comes to critical raw materials, but perhaps it is especially worth reflecting on when we discuss this particular issue.

Europe now needs to choose strategic autonomy and access to critical raw materials. We must admit that this is more important than other things and, yes, it is more important than Natura 2000 or the interest of a single indigenous Sami village or the suggested nature restoration law. For the EU to pull off electrification to reach its green goals and reduce dependency on others, especially China, the secondary use of critical raw materials will not be enough. The Green Deal dream that the whole economy can consist only of recycling must end now.

We need to get critical raw materials from primary sources within Europe, from places such as the mines in Kiruna, in northern Sweden. If we are serious about this, that also means that we need to review how other regulations will affect our ability to make this happen. I think it is time to set our priorities right!

Bernd Lange (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner, Minister, indeed, we need a new quality in our raw material policy, sustainability instead of pure exploitation. We did in the past. Therefore, I guess you are quite right.

First, we have to mobilise our own resources inside the European Union. Sweden did move in the right direction on lithium, but I guess there's a lot of more potential.

Secondly, we have to do more on recycling. It is really a scandal that we have a recycling quota for lithium under 10% inside the European Union.

Thirdly, we have to create partnerships with third countries in real partnership so that we guarantee labour rights, environmental standards, and that our partners have also the possibility to add value in their production process so that they can profit in their development as well. So sustainability instead of pure exploitation.

VORSITZ: NICOLA BEER

Vizepräsidentin

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, since this issue became more prominent a few years back, a number of things have changed, quite rightly. The green and digital transition has become central to European policy, but also the geopolitical situation has become starkly more challenging, as many speakers have referred to, our Russia dependence, our China dependence ... So this is not just a moving target, but also a target that is moving away.

For that reason, I very much welcome the comments that you made at the beginning, Commissioner. You highlighted the importance of labour rights and environmental standards. And I think it would be a terrible shame if we repeat some of the mistakes of the fossil fuel extraction over the last 100 years. How ironic it would be that the green transition itself turns out to fail some of the targets and objectives of the Sustainable Development Goals. To remind you those SDGs, decent work, reduced inequality and responsible production, and all of the sustainable goals that go with that.

I would also finish by reminding that the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive will play a key role in this instrument in the future.

Ville Niinistö (Verts/ALE). – Arvoisa puhemies, tuulivoimalat, aurinkopaneelit, akut ja elektrolyysarit ovat tulevaisuuden energiajärjestelmän perusta ja niiden valmistaminen vaatii erilaisia metalleja ja mineraaleja. Metallia ei ole maailmassa loputtomiin ja sen kysyntä kasvaa energiamurroksessa moninkertaiseksi nykyisestä. Maapallomme luonto ei kestä tätä murrosta, jollemme muuta myös koko tapaamme hyödyntää luonnonvaroja kestäväksi.

On minimoitava energiamurroksesta aiheutuvat haitat ympäristölle ja pidettävä huolta sosiaalisesta kestävydestä niin Euroopassa kuin muuallakin. Meidän tulee parantaa selkeästi mineraalien kierrätystä, asettaa sitovia kierrätysvaatimuksia, lisätä resurssitehokkuutta ja valmistaa tuotteet helposti kierrätettäviksi. Tehokkaalla kierrätyksellä minimoimme neitseellisten raaka-aineiden käytön ja lisäämme EU:n raaka-aineomavaraisuutta. Edellyttämällä kierrätysmateriaalien käytön lisäämistä eri aloilla luomme samalla myös kilpailukykyä teollisuuden viherystävälliselle.

EU-maiden mahdollisuudet menestyä ovat juuri esimerkiksi vihreässä hiilineutraalissa kierrätysteräksessä. Me pärjäämme sillä, että me vaadimme paljon. On ehdottoman tärkeää, että varmistamme samalla myös kaivostoiminnan kestävyysnä niin sosiaalisesti kuin ympäristön kannalta sekä EU:n sisällä että sen ulkopuolella. Emme voi joutua olemassa olevista ympäristösäännöistä, ja kaivosten ympäristöriskeihin on varauduttava huolellisesti. Kaivokset eivät sovi ympäristökuormituksensa takia kaikkialle. Samalla meidän pitää kunnioittaa alkuperäiskansojen oikeuksia eli varmistaa, että ilmasto-kriisiin ratkaisut tapahtuvat kestävästi luonnolle ja ihmisille.

Izabela-Helena Kloc (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Pani Minister! Nie muszę powtarzać tego, co od dawna oczywiste. Pospieszna i chaotyczna transformacja energetyczno-klimatyczna negatywnie odbija się na naszej gospodarce. Wyzwaniem obecnych kryzysowych czasów jest ochrona wszelkimi dostępnymi środkami naszej rodzimej produkcji i stwarzanie równych szans dla europejskich firm. Odniosę się tutaj do węgla koksowego, który ma ogromne znaczenie dla produkcji stali, a produkty uboczne tego procesu są niezbędne dla energetyki odnawialnej. Zwracam się do Komisji z prośbą o zachowanie węgla koksowego na liście surowców krytycznych. Polska produkcja tego surowca nabiera ogromnego znaczenia w naszej części świata. Powinno to być jasne dla każdego, kto choć trochę rozumie sytuację geopolityczną.

I teraz kilka liczb: z 13 milionów ton węgla koksowego wyprodukowanego w Europie w 2020 roku 12 milionów wydobyto w Polsce. Generalnie mamy w Unii Europejskiej strukturalny niedobór węgla koksowego. Prawie całe unijne wydobycie jest zużywane wewnątrz Unii. Powiem więcej, cała Europa potrzebuje polskiego węgla koksowego.

Maria Spyraiki (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner McGuinness, dear minister, the EU is now well equipped to step up and seize the net-zero opportunity. Critical raw materials is one of the most important tools to serve this purpose, as without secure and sustainable access to the necessary raw materials, the ambition to become the first climate-neutral continent is at risk.

In light of the announcement of the industrial plan for the net-zero age, as the Commissioner has already mentioned and Ursula von der Leyen has done, we face a unique opportunity to work the challenge of safeguarding critical raw materials as a package. It is critical to understand that the manufacturing of EU net-zero technologies is only possible if access to relevant critical raw materials is ensured, including by diversifying sources and by recycling raw materials to lower the EU dependence on highly concentrated supplies from third countries, and boost quality jobs and growth in the circular economy.

And it is also important to say that we cannot proceed with ensuring the next-age sufficient amounts of raw materials to the EU if we do not serve the environmental goals intact. In order to achieve it, we shall preserve the level playing field on an equal basis, particularly with the treatment of strategic storage capacities, with the promotion of the secondary raw materials market.

Since the safe and secure extraction is safeguarded, we need to proceed further with getting advantage through the InvestEU programme. Countries like my home country, Greece, need financial instruments for catalysing private investments in EU priority areas.

The establishment of critical Raw Materials Club is a key scope to deliver a secure and affordable global supply of raw materials with a competitive and diversified international base, and could pave the next day for the critical raw materials presence.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, ci aspettiamo che il *Raw Materials Act* indichi concretamente – basta parole o promesse – quali scelte e quali atti compiere per avere sufficiente disponibilità di quelle risorse strategiche che proprio il modello di sviluppo che noi abbiamo scelto in Europa indica come necessarie.

Abbiamo scelto uno sviluppo che si basa sulle tecnologie verdi, che vuole un'energia del futuro, e quindi abbiamo bisogno di litio, terre rare, nichel, rame e cobalto. Se l'Europa non sceglie rapidamente, noi rischiamo di trovarci di fronte a due alternative, entrambe senza sbocco: o ridurre e indebolire la nostra crescita e il nostro sviluppo, o dipendere da altri paesi, peraltro inaffidabili.

Ecco perché, signora Commissaria, occorre un *Act* molto serio, molto concreto, per contrastare quelle critiche che qui abbiamo sentito di chi, antieuropeo, dice che noi abbiamo grandi visioni e grandi ambizioni, ma non abbiamo gli strumenti altrettanto consistenti e ambiziosi.

Alcune indicazioni sono già emerse. Dobbiamo diversificare gli approvvigionamenti, produrre quanto più possibile e recuperare con riciclo. E un'unica cosa: se faremo catene del valore di fornitore, attenzione non solo agli aspetti ambientali, ma anche ai diritti umani. Non bambini schiavi, non lavoratori schiavizzati per avere queste materie.

Klemen Grošelj (Renew). – Gospa predsednica, spoštovana komisarka, ministrica, kolegi. Vprašanje surovin je vprašanje prihodnosti evropske industrije. Brez dostopa do surovin po konkurenčnih cenah in v potrebnih količinah ne bo ne zelenega prehoda ne z njim povezanega tehnološkega preboja.

Zato potrebujemo dvojce: učinkovit in ekonomsko utemeljen model krožnega gospodarstva, ki bo zagotavljal ponovno uporabo surovin iz naših odpadkov. Ti so najcenejše in najlažje dostopne surovine. Nazoren je primer odpadnih jekel, s katerih uporabo bi lahko zadostili preko 60 % potreb po jeklu v Evropski uniji.

Drug ukrep so strateška partnerstva z državami, bogatimi s surovinami. Pri tem ne smemo stopiti v potekajočo tekmo z drugimi akterji, saj smo za to prepozni. EU mora pristopiti skozi mehanizem enakopravnih partnerstev, ki bodo prinašala dobrobiti tako nam kot državam lastnicam surovin. To bo zahtevalo prenos naprednih in trajnostnih rudarskih in predelovalnih tehnologij, ki bodo tem državam prinašale delovna mesta z minimalnim obremenjevanjem okolja, nam pa potrebne surovine po konkurenčnih cenah in v potrebnih količinah.

David Cormand (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers amis, beaucoup d'entre nous s'inquiètent de notre dépendance vis-à-vis des matières premières critiques. Pour lever ces inquiétudes, nous devons rejeter la fable d'un maintien de notre modèle de consommation actuel par la simple substitution de notre dépendance aux fossiles par une dépendance nouvelle aux matières premières critiques. Un tel scénario n'est souhaitable ni d'un point de vue économique, ni d'un point de vue géopolitique, ni d'un point de vue écologique.

Pour répondre à cette menace, nous devons construire une stratégie qui se fonde sur nos besoins réels, et non pas sur une trajectoire croissantiste et expansionniste. L'industrie de basse technologie, l'écoconception, la réparabilité, la réutilisation et le recyclage intégral des matières premières critiques doivent constituer notre feuille de route pour une économie européenne compétitive et innovante, c'est-à-dire en adéquation avec les ressources dont nous disposons.

Notre force d'investissement, nos capacités de recherche, notre industrie et les règles de notre marché intérieur doivent résolument se porter vers la sobriété et l'écoconception des équipements et des infrastructures, d'une part, ainsi que sur l'expertise du recyclage et du réemploi des matériaux, d'autre part.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, prechod od využívania fosílnych palív na nízkouhlíkové technológie zvyšuje dopyt po ťažbe netradičných surovín. Odporcovia ťažby týchto surovín argumentujú, že sa ňou ničia životné podmienky, najmä miestnej komunity. To isté však platí aj pri ťažbe fosílnych palív. Negatívne dôsledky ťažby treba riešiť aj v jednom, aj v druhom prípade. Zásadne rozdielne sú však oba prípady v objeme emisií skleníkových plynov.

Nemusíme vždy zlé riešenie nahradiť dokonalým. Stačí nájsť len riešenia, ktoré budú lepšie než dnešný stav. Jedným z nich by mohlo byť zlepšenie nastavenia systému tak, aby miestna komunita mala väčší podiel na príjmoch z poplatkov za vyťažенú surovinu.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Die Krisen der vergangenen Jahre sollten uns eines gelehrt haben: Europa muss resilienter werden. Dies bedeutet, dass wir unsere Abhängigkeiten verringern und unsere heimischen Ressourcen heben müssen.

Der Bericht des Parlaments zur Rohstoffstrategie 2021 macht deutlich: Wir setzen uns ambitionierte Klimaziele, wir sind aber massiv vom Import von kritischen Rohstoffen abhängig. Nur 1 % der Rohstoffe für Windenergieanlagen, weniger als 1 % der Lithiumbatterien, weniger als 1 % der Brennstoffzellen, nur 2 % der für die Robotik relevanten Rohstoffe und nur 1 % der Silizium-Photovoltaik-Baugruppen werden in Europa gewonnen bzw. hergestellt.

Es ist Zeit für eine intelligente Rohstoffpolitik. Dazu gehört aus meiner Sicht zweierlei:

Zum einen müssen wir die heimische Beschaffung von kritischen Rohstoffen ausweiten. Nachhaltiger Bergbau in Europa würde für das Einhalten der höchsten Umwelt- und Sozialstandards stehen. Außerdem könnten wir so das weltweite Angebot erweitern. Dies wird notwendig sein, denn die Nachfrage nach kritischen Rohstoffen wird in den kommenden Jahrzehnten steigen.

Und zweitens: Der Import von kritischen Rohstoffen wird weiter wichtig sein. Kritische Rohstoffe müssen daher auch Kernelement der europäischen Handelspolitik sein. Wir müssen dadurch auch unsere Lieferketten diversifizieren und können dadurch Abhängigkeiten verringern.

Josianne Cutajar (S&D). – Il-passat wera li s-suċċess tal-qalbiet ambjentali u digitali jiddependu fuq l-effiċjenza tal-ktajjen tal-provvista taghna. Filwaqt li qed nahdmu ghal aktar enerġija u teknoloġija nadifa, ejja ma ninsewx li l-materja prima kritika hija komodità essenzjali għall-ekonomija u r-reżiljenza tal-Unjoni.

Rajna li l-Istati Uniti, il-Ġappun, il-Korea t'Isfel jinvestu fit-tnaqqis tad-dipendenza tagħhom fuq l-istess estrazzjoni tal-materja prima. L-istrategija industrijali tal-Unjoni Ewropea għandna tkun sinjal tal-awtonomija tagħna li tiddefinixxi pjan shih, affordabbli u sostenibbli, fejn jidhlu l-ktajjen tal-provvista, id-diversifikazzjoni tagħhom, l-użu mill-ġdid u r-riċi-klagġ. Madanakollu, il-politika Ewropea ma tistax tagħti prijorità biss lis-sigurtà tal-materja prima bħal dik użata fil-batteriji u magni elettrici, imma trid tmur lil hinn. Għalhekk dan l-att u l-politika tagħna għandhom iħarsu wkoll lejn il-materji strateġiċi oħra fl-oqsma kollha bħal dawk tal-provvista tal-ikel u l-medicina li jolqtuna b'mod dirett, li jolqtu lis-soċjetajiet tagħna wkoll.

Emma Wiesner (Renew). – Madam President, lithium, copper, aluminium, iron, cobalt, nickel; the list could go on. We in Europe need metals and minerals if we are serious about the green transition and tackling climate change. And it's become painfully clear during the pandemic and the war in Ukraine how reliant we are on Russia and China and how dangerous though those dependencies are.

If we are to be serious, we need mines and we need mines in Europe. I really wish we could make batteries and turbines and windmills out of cotton candies and rainbows. But, colleagues, maybe it comes as a surprise to you, but you can't. And that's why we must stop shooting ourselves in the foot.

We can't, on one hand, say we want more raw materials and minerals and then, on the other hand, go regulate so it's impossible to open a new mine in Europe. We see this over and over again: in the Nature Restoration Regulation; in the deforestation file; in the Industrial Emissions Directive. Over and over again, we're making it impossible for industries to establish themselves in Europe. We do this over and over again. If we continue to do that, we will be continuing to rely on Russia and China, and that's dangerous.

Pär Holmgren (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman! När vi diskuterar dessa frågor kommer vi såklart in på gruvor och vi vet att gruvsdrift ställer till med utmaningar för naturen och lokalsamhällen. Jag tänker framför allt på norra Sverige, norra Finland och samerna, Europas sista urfolk. Där det bokstavligen blir ett existentiellt hot för renarna, rennäringen som är så central i deras kultur.

Sverige får ju år efter år kritik från FN för att vi inte lyssnar på samerna när nya gruvor öppnas. Så om EU ska ha någon som helst trovärdighet i dessa frågor måste vi verkligen ta hänsyn till samernas rättigheter och diskutera med dem. Och detta gäller såklart ursprungsbefolkningar runt omkring i världen. Många av dem är övertygade om att vi människor inte kan äga mark eller vattendrag eller att företag inte kan äga mark eller vattendrag eftersom det tillhör oss alla och allt. Jag tror att vi skulle kunna lära oss mycket av dem, inte minst när det gäller att respektera naturen.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, komissaari, ministeri, Venäjän hyökkäys Ukrainaan viimeistään osoitti sen, että Eurooppa ei saa olla liian riippuvainen yhdestä tuottajasta. Riippuvuus Venäjän fossiilienergiasta ei saa muuttua riippuvuudeksi kiinalaisista raaka-aineista.

Tällä hetkellä kuitenkin tiedämme, että sekä Euroopan vihreä siirtymä että digitalisaatio ovat molemmat erittäin paljon tuonnin varassa ja nimenomaan Kiinasta tuotavien raaka-aineiden varassa. Viime vuonna EU-alueella tuotettiin vain prosentti aurinkovoiman ja tuulivoiman tuotantoon tarvittavista raaka-aineista ja alle prosentti litiumakuissa ja poltto-kennoissa tarvittavista raaka-aineista.

Seuraavina vuosina näiden molempien tarve tulee moninkertaistumaan. Sekä Euroopan turvallisuuden ja talouden että myös ympäristön ja sosiaalisen kestävyyskannalta on välttämätöntä, että vahvistamme omaa tuotantoamme ja luomme myös kumppanuuksia muualle maailmaan.

Meillä on paljon mahdollisuuksia. Komissio on listannut 30 kriittistä raaka-ainetta, joissa olemme erittäin vahvasti tuonnin varassa. Oman kotimaani Suomen maaperästä löytyy näistä kriittisistä raaka-aineista 14.

Meidän on vain vauhditettava lupaprosesseja niin, että saamme kaivostoimintaa käyntiin. Se ei tarkoita sitä, että ympäristönormeista tingittäisiin. Samoin on lisättävä koulutusta, tutkimusta ja tuotekehitystä ja kaivannaisteollisuuden lisäksi huolehdittava siitä, että myös prosessit, jalostaminen ja kierrättäminen saa Euroopassa vauhtia.

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, strategické nerastné suroviny sú geopolitickým nástrojom a už čoskoro budú dôležitejšie ako plyn alebo ropa. V Európe musíme znižovať závislosť na dovoze kľúčových surovín z tretích krajín, ako to už dávnejšie robia Spojené štáty alebo Japonsko. Európa musí posilniť svoju autonómiu a odolnosť a ak sa chce stať svetovým lídrom v zelených technológiách, musí byť aj lídrom v ich produkcii. Inak nás skôr či neskôr čaká podobná lekcija ako v prípade závislosti na dovoze plynu z Ruska. Akurát tentoraz bude dávať lekcii omnoho ťažší súper, a tým je Čína, ktorá má napríklad dnes až 80-percentný podiel na trhu s výrobou solárnych panelov.

Potrebuje zdefinovať strategicky najdôležitejšie suroviny, posilniť investície a koordinovať dopyt a ponuku v členských štátoch v súlade s najprísnejšími ekologickými normami, musíme obnoviť udržateľnú ťažbu tam, kde je to možné, skrátiť povoloňacie procesy a mobilizovať verejné a súkromné investície aj zjednodušením prístupu k financovaniu z európskych zdrojov.

Tom Berendsen (PPE). – Voorzitter, beste collega's, we hebben de verantwoordelijkheid om een schoon energiesysteem te bouwen en daarmee onze wereld goed door te geven aan onze kinderen. Maar wij hebben daarbij ook de verantwoordelijkheid voor de grondstoffen die we nodig hebben om die transitie te maken, de grondstoffen voor onze windmolens, zonnepanelen en batterijen. Europa heeft dat jarenlang overgelaten aan andere delen van de wereld.

98 % van de zeldzame aardmetalen komt uit China, 69 % van de wereldwijde voorraad lithium uit Congo. Niet alleen zijn we daarmee veel te afhankelijk geworden, het eerlijke verhaal is ook dat we andere landen hebben opgezadeld met de impact op de omgeving van het delven van onze grondstoffen. En dat terwijl we ook kritieke aardmetalen kunnen winnen in Europa.

We moeten bereid zijn om zelf te mijnen en te raffineren. De linkerkant van dit Parlement wil maar al te graag sneller verduurzamen, maar zet tegelijkertijd een rem op het mijnen in Europa van de grondstoffen die we daarvoor keihard nodig hebben. Dat is niet mijn idee van verantwoordelijkheid nemen.

Laten we met Europese samenwerking de Europese mijnen zo snel mogelijk operationeel krijgen. Daarmee nemen we niet alleen onze verantwoordelijkheid voor de grondstoffen die we zelf nodig hebben, maar ook voor onze strategische positie in de wereld.

Erik Bergkvist (S&D). – Fru talman! Bästa ledamöter, kommissionär, statsråd! Motorn i klimatomställningen är de gröna tekniker som nu utvecklas i Europa och inte minst i norra Sverige. De kritiska råmaterialen får aldrig bli en flaskhals i detta. Vi måste öka Europas självförsörjning av de strategiska, kritiska råvarorna och vi måste bilda strategiska allianser med pålitliga nationer.

Vi måste bli föredömen i effektiva tillståndprocesser och samrådsprocesser med lokalsamhällena. Vi måste vara föredömen i yttre miljö och inre arbetsmiljö. Dessutom måste vi vara föredömen i en långsiktigt hållbar utveckling för lokalsamhällena. Gör vi detta kommer Europa att kunna fortsätta att leda och driva på den klimatomställning som världen så desperat behöver.

Pernille Weiss (PPE). – Fru formand! Kære formandskab, kære Kommissionen, kære kollegaer. Det blev tydeligt i debatten i går om fremtidens biler, at forsyningsudfordringerne vedrørende råstoffer til batterier er sløset undervurderet i EU. Debatten ligner lidt logikken hos dem, der fejlagtigt tror, at flere skatter, flere lån, flere regler og mere statsstøtte er vejen frem til klimamålene uden at skade vores konkurrencedygtighed. Udstillingsvinduet for ufatteligt uansvarlig omgang med Europas fremtid bliver større og større. I 2040 skal vi bruge 25 gange mere grafit, end vi gjorde i 2020, og op mod 42 gange mere litium. EU anvender i dag omkring 25 % af alle geologiske råstoffer globalt, men producerer kun selv tre procent. Vi er ved at blive en råstofjunkie med kreditter hos tvivlsomme leverandører langt væk. Det går simpelthen ikke. Vi skal forstå, at metaller bliver vigtigere, end olie og gas nogensinde har været. Men råstoffer regner ikke ned gratis fra himlen. De skal op fra jorden - også fra vores egen i EU - ud på det indre marked, ind i produktionslinjerne, hvorefter de skal køre rundt og rundt i den cirkulære økonomi. Nu!

Tsvetelina Penkova (S&D). – Madam President, we need raw materials to reach the goals of the green transition in Europe. Without the secured supply, we would not be able to deliver our plans for net carbon neutrality. At the moment, at the next plenary session, we're about to approve the Parliament's position on the Energy Performance for Building Directive, which aims to renovate the EU building stock. This directive will create thousands of jobs. However, these jobs will depend on whether a supply of raw materials is available so we can ramp up the domestic production and make the renovation of the building stock possible. Our industry needs the predictability so it can invest in the upcoming transformation.

We should also guarantee the safety of our citizens with access to compatible, crucial raw materials. We see how many problems our countries are having with recently access to the fuel for their nuclear power plants. Safety and affordability should be the main focus when we are making our choices for predictable supplies in the future.

Lara Comi (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, signora Ministra, se vogliamo realizzare una vera e sostenibile transizione energetica, dobbiamo assolutamente rafforzare sia la nostra competitività interna sia l'indipendenza dagli altri Stati, tra cui la Cina e gli Stati Uniti.

Attualmente, infatti, l'Europa fornisce meno dell'1 % delle batterie al litio e solo il 2 % delle materie prime relative alla robotica. Le materie prime critiche sono utilizzate in settori industriali chiave, tra i quali abbiamo la produzione dell'acciaio, la difesa, l'aviazione e la sanità. E queste materie prime essenziali sono importate principalmente da un numero limitato di paesi terzi, rendendoci così totalmente dipendenti da loro.

Però vi è di più: queste materie prime sono anche essenziali per garantire il raggiungimento del Green Deal europeo. Tuttavia, il mercato globale non è attualmente in grado di soddisfare la domanda, che è in rapida crescita. L'aumento del prezzo delle materie prime non è solo un problema per le imprese, ma soprattutto per i cittadini, sui quali ricade il costo finale del prodotto del servizio.

La ringrazio, Commissaria, perché sono convinta che lei su questo avrà una grande sensibilità e una grande collaborazione anche da parte di tutti noi.

Niels Fuglsang (S&D). – Fru formand! Kære kolleger, kommissær, minister. Når jeg lytter til debatten her i aften, bliver jeg egentlig optimistisk, fordi det lyder til, at de fleste af kollegaerne her er blevet klar over, at vi har sovet i timen. Vi har stolet blindt på globaliseringen, og vi er endt med at blive afhængige af fremmede magter, der ikke deler vores værdier. Vi gav Rusland kontrol over store dele af vores naturgasforsyning. Det fik fatale konsekvenser og skabte den største energikrise siden 1970'erne. Kina sidder tungt på forarbejdningen af kritiske råstoffer. 90 % af de sjældne jordarter og 60 % af litium er forarbejdet af Kina i dag. Det skal vi have ændret på, og vi skal ind i den nye globalisering 2.0, hvor vi ikke skal være protektionistiske, men samtidig må være realistiske i forhold til, at vi ikke bare kan overlade det her til det frie marked, at vi bliver afhængige af en fremmed magt, der slet ikke deler vores værdier. Og derfor skal vi i gang med at lave strategiske handelsaftaler med de lande, vi kan stole på, sådan at vi spreder vores import af råstoffer ud og altså bliver mindre afhængige af dem, vi ikke vil være afhængige af.

Christophe Hansen (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Gestern haben wir in diesem Haus für das Ende des Verbrennungsmotors gestimmt. Ich war dagegen und hätte mit einem Ziel von 90 % sehr viel besser leben können.

Nun gilt es aber, dafür zu sorgen, dass dieser grüne und digitale Wandel auch gelingt. Und dafür brauchen wir die kritischen Rohstoffe wie Lithium, Kobalt, Nickel, um nur einige davon zu nennen.

Wenn Grüne – die heute abwesend sind in diesem Plenum –, unterstützt von Liberalen und Sozialisten, jetzt beim Zugang zu den notwendigen Rohstoffen weiter rumeiern und kostbare Zeit verschwenden, dann platzt mir hier aber definitiv der Kragen.

Wir brauchen jetzt Handelsabkommen mit Chile, Mexiko, Australien, Mercosur. Und wir brauchen jetzt die nötigen strategischen Partnerschaften mit Ländern, mit denen ein umfassendes Handelsabkommen kurzfristig nicht möglich ist.

Diejenigen, die sich jetzt querstellen und Ausreden finden, um den Zugang zu kritischen Rohstoffen weiter zu behindern, sind verantwortlich, dass wir den Zug verpassen, um die Nachhaltigkeitswende zu schaffen. Und ja, es wird auch ihre Verantwortung sein, falls wir unsere gemeinsamen Klimaziele verpassen sollten.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Madam President, critical raw materials are essential for the deployment of the technologies that enable green and digital transitions and for building the economy of the future. This is why the upcoming CRM Act must not only be ambitious, but also in line with our industrial strategy and broader supply chain diversification. Today, the totalitarian regime of the Chinese Communist Party controls roughly 60 % of the world's production of rare earth minerals and materials. Those resources include lithium, cobalt and other elements crucial for making electric vehicles, batteries or semiconductors.

I am glad that the Union finally woke up to the need to diversify our supply chains. We need to use global gateway and other opportunities to invest and work with our allies to access critical raw materials. But we need to also ensure that this diversification does not lead to new dependencies and human rights breaches.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já vyslovuji naprostý souhlas s mými kolegy, že bez zdrojů surovin se zelená tranzice skutečně zvládnout nedá. Je jednoznačné, že je dokonce nemožná, ne-li tedy podlomená. A je důležité říci, že surovinová suverenita je podstatná. My bychom měli udělat rozhodně daleko více na poli naší diplomacie, protože nevyřešíme ani jenom oběhovým hospodářstvím, ani zajištěním dodávek ze spřátelených zemí naše surovinové potřeby.

Potřebujeme zajistit právě surovinovou diplomacii i na tomto poli, tak jak to bohužel dělá i Rusko. Podívejte se, kam všude jezdí ministr zahraničí Lavrov. Myslím si, že můžeme očekávat i od naší diplomatické služby větší zapojení v Africe a v dalších zemích. Takže já bych rozhodně chtěl i na toto apelovat. Nesmíme zapomínat i na environmentální dopady, ale pojďme zapojit všechny naše politiky, které máme k dispozici.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Mairead McGuinness, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, colleagues, this has been a very grounded debate and also a very sobering one. I think that's no harm because I think we have to get to grips with what faces us, and it is not an easy task because access to strategic, critical raw materials is not guaranteed unless we take action.

But I'm going to sober you all up a little bit more, because the truth is that Europe is not the only continent looking for access to these critical raw materials. There is a race for access and therefore we have to act fast and effectively. If I give you some examples, the demand for lithium is expected to rise 18 times by 2030. Demand for rare earths alone will increase fivefold by 2030. Demand for graphite is expected to increase 14 times by 2030. So I really appreciated in this debate a broad approach to what lies ahead.

Yes, of course, Global Gateway is really important to build and develop partnerships to diversify our supplies. Mining in Europe is also an issue we have to talk about, and of course, it has to be done in the correct way. I do want to thank the Swedish Presidency for inviting the Commission to Kiruna. The fact that I slept in an ice house is just another story, but it kept me awake.

The third point is circularity and recycling is key. I remember when I was in this House, some of the more important debates happened with a few of us in the Chamber. In my view, this is the most critical debate for our future, and we need to make it mainstream. I think all of you who have contributed to this debate with many different views are... It's been really important to get the message out that we have a challenge ahead.

We have to move away from harmful fossil fuels, so we will need access to strategic, critical raw materials. That will not happen by accident. We have to work hard, and I expect and I hope that this Parliament will work with us and the Council to achieve our objectives.

Jessika Roswall, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, Honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for this debate on a topic that rightfully deserves our attention. I was glad to hear that we share the same concern regarding the role of critical raw materials in the green and digital transition. The acceleration of the twin transition will speed up the increase in European and global demand for strategic critical raw material. The EU therefore needs to act urgently to ensure that we can secure the critical raw materials it will need in the future. As a representative of the Swedish government. I have obviously hope that we can play a part in doing so.

Thus, we need to work on several levels. We need to increase our own mining to satisfy this demand and reduce our dependencies on China and others. At the same time, we need we have to use these resources in an efficient and sustainable way, including, of course, recycling and sustainable trade links. Speeding up our road towards electrification and climate neutrality requires both, not either or.

The Council looks forward to receiving the proposal from the Commission very soon and will examine it without delay. I would like to say thank you for the debate and I assure you, Commissioner, this is a critical debate and I'm very glad to have had all of your attention.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist die Aussprache geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Estrella Durá Ferrandis (S&D), por escrito. – Para los y las socialistas, es un asunto central y geoestratégico, ya que estos materiales son clave para las transiciones digital y energética y para las industrias de esos sectores, como las de tecnología de energías renovables, electrónica, aeroespacial y defensa.

Además, actualmente se encuentran muy concentrados, tanto la producción como el procesamiento, y la Unión Europea depende en gran medida de sus importaciones, generando dependencias que ponen en peligro alcanzar la autonomía estratégica. Por lo que una ley europea para garantizar su suministro es muy bienvenida y que deberá basarse en la sostenibilidad medioambiental, social y económica, reforzar el reciclaje, las capacidades y la investigación e innovación en materiales y procesos y garantizar la generación de empleos de calidad.

Asimismo, debemos seguir creando alianzas estratégicas con países afines para garantizar un acceso seguro y sostenible materias primas fundamentales que permitan lograr la neutralidad climática.

En definitiva, deberemos evitar que la UE reemplace la dependencia de los combustibles fósiles por la dependencia de las materias primas.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), na piśmie. – Zabezpieczenie dostaw surowców krytycznych jest bez wątpienia kwestią o szczególnym znaczeniu, nie tylko z uwagi na ich znaczenie dla europejskiej gospodarki, ale również dla bezpieczeństwa i geopolityki. Według prognoz zapotrzebowanie na surowce krytyczne będzie w najbliższych latach systematycznie rosło: przykładowo, według obliczeń Komisji Europejskiej, Europa do 2050 roku będzie potrzebowała aż 60 razy więcej litu czy też 15 razy więcej kobaltu. Tymczasem już w czasie pandemii COVID-19 oraz rosyjskiej brutalnej inwazji na Ukrainę mieliśmy okazję przekonać się, jak bolesne mogą okazać się zakłócenia w dostawach krytycznych surowców naturalnych. Konieczne jest zatem tworzenie odpornych na zagrożenia oraz zdywersyfikowanych źródeł dostaw tych surowców. W perspektywie długoterminowej natomiast niezbędne jest zapewnienie unijnej autonomii w tym obszarze, poprzez koncentrowanie się na własnych zdolnościach wydobywania oraz przetwórstwa, inwestycjach w nowej technologii, oraz recycling surowców. W tym kontekście bardzo cieszę się z zapowiedzi przedstawienia przez Komisję Europejską Aktu o surowcach krytycznych, który mam nadzieję, będzie stanowił odpowiedź na stojące przed nami wyzwania.

César Luena (S&D), por escrito. – Para los y las socialistas, es un asunto central y geoestratégico, ya que estos materiales son clave para las transiciones digital y energética y para las industrias de esos sectores, como las de tecnología de energías renovables, electrónica, aeroespacial y defensa.

Además, actualmente se encuentran muy concentrados, tanto la producción como el procesamiento, y la Unión Europea depende en gran medida de sus importaciones, generando dependencias que ponen en peligro alcanzar la autonomía estratégica. Por lo que una ley europea para garantizar su suministro es muy bienvenida y que deberá basarse en la sostenibilidad medioambiental, social y económica, reforzar el reciclaje, las capacidades y la investigación e innovación en materiales y procesos y garantizar la generación de empleos de calidad.

Asimismo, debemos seguir creando alianzas estratégicas con países afines para garantizar un acceso seguro y sostenible materias primas fundamentales que permitan lograr la neutralidad climática.

En definitiva, deberemos evitar que la UE reemplace la dependencia de los combustibles fósiles por la dependencia de las materias primas.

Javi López (S&D), por escrito. – Para los y las socialistas, es un asunto central y geoestratégico, ya que estos materiales son clave para las transiciones digital y energética y para las industrias de esos sectores, como las de tecnología de energías renovables, electrónica, aeroespacial y defensa.

Además, actualmente se encuentran muy concentrados, tanto la producción como el procesamiento, y la Unión Europea depende en gran medida de sus importaciones, generando dependencias que ponen en peligro alcanzar la autonomía estratégica. Por lo que una ley europea para garantizar su suministro es muy bienvenida y que deberá basarse en la sostenibilidad medioambiental, social y económica, reforzar el reciclaje, las capacidades y la investigación e innovación en materiales y procesos y garantizar la generación de empleos de calidad.

Asimismo, debemos seguir creando alianzas estratégicas con países afines para garantizar un acceso seguro y sostenible materias primas fundamentales que permitan lograr la neutralidad climática.

En definitiva, deberemos evitar que la UE reemplace la dependencia de los combustibles fósiles por la dependencia de las materias primas.

Adriana Maldonado López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es un asunto central y geoestratégico, ya que estos materiales son clave para las transiciones digital y energética y para las industrias de esos sectores, como las de tecnología de energías renovables, electrónica, aeroespacial y defensa.

Además, actualmente se encuentran muy concentrados, tanto la producción como el procesamiento, y la Unión Europea depende en gran medida de sus importaciones, generando dependencias que ponen en peligro alcanzar la autonomía estratégica. Por lo que una ley europea para garantizar su suministro es muy bienvenida y que deberá basarse en la sostenibilidad medioambiental, social y económica, reforzar el reciclaje, las capacidades y la investigación e innovación en materiales y procesos y garantizar la generación de empleos de calidad.

Asimismo, debemos seguir creando alianzas estratégicas con países afines para garantizar un acceso seguro y sostenible materias primas fundamentales que permitan lograr la neutralidad climática.

En definitiva, deberemos evitar que la UE reemplace la dependencia de los combustibles fósiles por la dependencia de las materias primas.

Rovana Plumb (S&D), *în scris*. – Materiile prime critice - precum litiul și grafitul - și pământurile rare sunt considerate cruciale pentru tranziția verde și digitală, deoarece noile tehnologii se bazează pe utilizarea acestora. Potrivit Băncii Mondiale și a unui studiu recent publicat de Agenția Internațională pentru Energie, cererea globală de materii prime critice va crește cu 500 % până în 2050, ceea ce va atrage costuri exponențiale ale prețurilor acestor materii și riscuri crescute privind lanțurile de aprovizionare.

Foarte puține din aceste materiale se găsesc în Europa și, din păcate, pentru cea mai mare parte din ele depindem de China, Rusia, Brazilia, Australia, Congo. Acestea sunt țări care nu sunt foarte dispuse să ne dea materiile respective la un preț convenabil și atunci ne întrebăm dacă Pactul verde poate fi susținut în implementare.

În noul context geo-politic, situația este și mai presantă. Sper ca președinția suedeză, în colaborare cu CE, să ne furnizeze propunerea legislativă privind materiile prime critice. Această propunere ar trebui să fie o combinație de politici industriale și sociale, de preservare a locurilor de muncă în zonele industriale. Mai mult, ar trebui să existe și o componentă transversală legată de ecologie, dezvoltare durabilă și respectarea angajamentelor internaționale privind reducerea impactului schimbărilor climatice.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es un asunto central y geoestratégico, ya que estos materiales son clave para las transiciones digital y energética y para las industrias de esos sectores, como las de tecnología de energías renovables, electrónica, aeroespacial y defensa.

Además, actualmente se encuentran muy concentrados, tanto la producción como el procesamiento, y la Unión Europea depende en gran medida de sus importaciones, generando dependencias que ponen en peligro alcanzar la autonomía estratégica. Por lo que una ley europea para garantizar su suministro es muy bienvenida y que deberá basarse en la sostenibilidad medioambiental, social y económica, reforzar el reciclaje, las capacidades y la investigación e innovación en materiales y procesos y garantizar la generación de empleos de calidad.

Asimismo, debemos seguir creando alianzas estratégicas con países afines para garantizar un acceso seguro y sostenible materias primas fundamentales que permitan lograr la neutralidad climática.

En definitiva, deberemos evitar que la UE reemplace la dependencia de los combustibles fósiles por la dependencia de las materias primas.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es un asunto central y geoestratégico, ya que estos materiales son clave para las transiciones digital y energética y para las industrias de esos sectores, como las de tecnología de energías renovables, electrónica, aeroespacial y defensa.

Además, actualmente se encuentran muy concentrados, tanto la producción como el procesamiento, y la Unión Europea depende en gran medida de sus importaciones, generando dependencias que ponen en peligro alcanzar la autonomía estratégica. Por lo que una ley europea para garantizar su suministro es muy bienvenida y que deberá basarse en la sostenibilidad medioambiental, social y económica, reforzar el reciclaje, las capacidades y la investigación e innovación en materiales y procesos y garantizar la generación de empleos de calidad.

Asimismo, debemos seguir creando alianzas estratégicas con países afines para garantizar un acceso seguro y sostenible materias primas fundamentales que permitan lograr la neutralidad climática.

En definitiva, deberemos evitar que la UE reemplace la dependencia de los combustibles fósiles por la dependencia de las materias primas.

Mihai Tudose (S&D), *în scris*. – Am așteptat cu interes prezentarea liniilor directe ale viitorului act european privind materiile prime critice. Dependența masivă a UE și scurt-circuitarea lanțurilor de aprovizionare, în pandemie și acum, în condiții de război, ne obligă la măsuri pentru a încuraja extracția în UE și a ne diversifica sursele de aprovizionare.

În plan intern, avem nevoie de proceduri simplificate pentru autorizațiile de extracție și prelucrare, de ajutor pentru acest tip de investiții, dar și de îmbunătățirea reciclării.

În plan extern, înțeleg că se dorește crearea unui club între UE și alte state și organizații, pentru accesul la materii prime. Cred că prioritară trebuie să fie stabilirea de parteneriate directe, cât mai eficiente și avantajoase pentru UE. Sper că, la 8 martie, când e prevăzută comunicarea Comisiei Europene privind acest act legislativ, vom avea mai multe elemente concrete referitoare la răspunsul UE, nu numai la gradul actual de dependență cvasi-totală de importuri, dar și la perspectiva creșterii accelerate a cererii de materii prime critice.

Potrivit estimărilor Comisiei, tranziția digitală și ecologică ar urma să determine o creștere a cererii cu 500 %, până în 2030, în UE. Context în care întreb: este sustenabil ritmul transformărilor la care Comisia angajează Uniunea Europeană?

18. Разискванията относно случаи на нарушаване на правата на човека, на демокрацията и на правовата държава (разискване)

18.1. Положението на защитниците на правата на човека в Есватини, и по-специално убийството на Тулани Масеко

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über sechs Entschließungsanträge zu der Lage von Menschenrechtsverteidigern in Eswatini, insbesondere der Ermordung von Thulani Maseko (2023/2551(RSP)).

Ελένη Σταύρου, Συντάκτρια. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η κατάσταση στο Εσουατίνι, τη μοναδική χώρα με απόλυτη μοναρχία στην Αφρική και μία από τις τελευταίες απόλυτες μοναρχίες στον κόσμο, είναι εξαιρετικά σοβαρή. Στις 21 Ιανουαρίου 2023, ο Thulani Maseko, διαπρεπής δικηγόρος ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και επικριτής της απόλυτης μοναρχίας, γνωστός για τις προσπάθειές του για την προώθηση της δημοκρατίας, του κράτους δικαίου, της χρηστής διακυβέρνησης και των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, δολοφονήθηκε από άγνωστους ενόπλους στο σπίτι του. Αυτό συνέβη λίγες ώρες αφού ο βασιλιάς Mswati Γ' έκανε δημόσιες απειλές κατά μελών του κινήματος υπέρ της δημοκρατίας. Από το 2021 ξεκίνησαν διαδηλώσεις που απαιτούσαν δημοκρατικές μεταρρυθμίσεις. Η κυβέρνηση του βασιλιά ανταπέδωσε με αυθαίρετες συλλήψεις, παρενοχλήσεις, απειλές και απαγωγές δημοσιογράφων, υπερασπιστών των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, πολιτικών προσώπων, καθώς και με διακοπή της λειτουργίας του διαδικτύου και την απαγόρευση διαδηλώσεων. Η δημοκρατία, το κράτος δικαίου και τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα είναι θεμελιώδεις αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Ευρωπαϊκού Λαϊκού Κόμματος. Εμείς, ως δημοκρατικά εκλεγμένοι βουλευτές του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, θα πρέπει να καταδικάσουμε σθεναρά την παράνομη

δολοφονία και θα πρέπει να ζητήσουμε μια ανεξάρτητη και αμερόληπτη, διεθνώς υποστηριζόμενη έρευνα με άμεσο, ενδελεχή και διαφανή τρόπο. Θα πρέπει επίσης να καταδικάσουμε τις παραβιάσεις των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στη χώρα. Είναι απαραίτητο να παροτρύνουμε τις αρχές του Εσουατίνι να σεβαστούν τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, τη δημοκρατία και το κράτος δικαίου και να εργαστούν εσπευσμένα και κατά προτεραιότητα για την εθνική συμφιλίωση και τη διαρκή ειρήνη.

Hannes Heide, *author*. – Madam President, Commissioner, the two pro-democracy members of the Eswatini Parliament, Mthandeni Dube and Bacede Mabuza, have been in jail since July 2021. They were detained after the pro-democracy protests in Eswatini in June and July, in which, according to different sources, between 46 and 79 people were killed.

Their immediate release must be the primary objective of our resolution.

The cases of state violence against the people of Eswatini continue to increase and have reached a sad peak with a murder of Thulani Maseko, witnessed by his family on 21 January this year.

The country's absolutist monarch is making clear threats and attacks by the security forces on political dissenters, human rights and democracy activists, trade unionists, students, and protesters are following. People are confronted with systematic intimidation, arbitrary arrests, kidnappings and alleged torture.

The shutting down of the Internet and a ban of protests, impunity for the security forces involved and the discrimination against women and minorities complete this catastrophic situation.

It is the duty of the European Union, as the largest donor to the country, to review the support programmes for Eswatini and suspend them if the use of funds is not in line with human rights, just as long as fundamental and human rights are respected and promoted in the country.

Katalin Cseh, *author*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, with this resolution, the European Parliament pays tribute to Thulani Maseko. He was a courageous fighter for democracy, a human rights lawyer, and a beacon of hope for the people of Eswatini, who yearn for a free society.

Last month, he was brutally assassinated. He was shot in his own living room in front of his wife and small children. This happened mere hours after King Mswati III openly threatened the pro-democracy movement.

This House condemns the heinous crime and demands that the Eswatini authorities conduct an impartial investigation to bring perpetrators to justice. But also, to honour the legacy of this great man, we need more than just words. We must immediately review any financial support issued to the Kingdom of Eswatini and to make sure that these funds are not abused by a blatantly corrupt criminal regime.

While history will forget his cowardly murderers, Thulani Maseko's name will live on forever. It will continue to inspire all of us in the universal struggle for freedom and justice.

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana, *auteur*. – Madame la Présidente, l'Eswatini est la dernière monarchie absolutiste au monde, avec à sa tête le roi Mswati III.

En janvier 2021, un mouvement de contestation a vu le jour, qui réclame une réforme démocratique. Cette manifestation a été violemment réprimée. Des dizaines de personnes ont été tuées.

Mswati III avait promis d'entamer un dialogue national avec l'aide de la Communauté de développement de l'Afrique australe, mais sa promesse est restée lettre morte: la répression continue et la situation se détériore.

Mswati III fait preuve de cynisme en accusant de «criminels» les activistes prodémocrates qui osent se plaindre que des civils ont été tués par des mercenaires, alors que selon lui, ce sont les civils qui sont à la base d'actions criminelles, avec leurs protestations.

Le 21 janvier — il y a donc trois semaines —, Me Thulani Maseko a été assassiné. Il a été abattu à son domicile, devant sa femme et ses enfants. Il était l'avocat des droits de l'homme le plus connu de l'Eswatini. De nombreux militants prodémocrates étaient ses clients.

Son meurtrier est très probablement un mercenaire engagé par la monarchie, et qui travaillait pour une société de sécurité privée connue pour ses crimes durant l'apartheid.

Ce type de société de sécurité doit se voir retirer sa licence. Étant donné que le système judiciaire n'est pas indépendant, nous avons besoin d'une enquête indépendante, impartiale et efficace sur le meurtre de l'avocat, que nous condamnons.

Cette enquête devrait dès lors être dirigée par la Commission africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples et par les Nations unies, afin de faire toute la lumière sur les agressions dont les militants prodémocrates sont la cible.

Nous exigeons la libération de Mthandeni Dube, de Mduduzi Bacede Mabuza et de tous les prisonniers politiques. Nous demandons instamment aux autorités de l'Eswatini de respecter, de promouvoir et de protéger les droits de l'homme.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *autor.* – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Pamiętam, jak byłem małym dzieckiem, zbierałem znaczki pocztowe. Jedne z najpiękniejszych znaczków to były znaczki Swazilandu. Znaczki bardzo egzotycznego kraju i wtedy kojarzyły mi się z wielką egzotyką, z podróżami. Zapamiętałem ten kraj, który dzisiaj nosi inną nazwę Eswatini. Nie myślałem, że po kilkadziesiąt lat nie będzie on mi się kojarzył z filatelistyką, ze znaczkami, tylko z łamaniem praw człowieka. Ta enklawa na terytorium RPA (jedna z czterech na świecie, jedna z dwóch na kontynencie afrykańskim, druga to Lesotho) jest przykładem na to, że po latach przemocy, gdy był na tamtych terenach apartheid, niestety znowu dochodzi do łamania praw człowieka. Teraz ktoś inny jest tego autorem. To dobrze, że dzisiaj protestujemy ponad podziałami.

Nikolaj Villumsen, *stiller.* – Fru formand! Thulani Maseko kæmpede for demokrati og for retten til at tænke, tale og skrive frit. Det gjorde han i et af verdens sidste absolutte monarkier, Eswatini. Her tillader kongen ikke frihed. Her forfølges fagforeninger og demokratiforkæmpere. Her blev Thulani Maseko myrdet foran øjnene på hans familie. Ingen skal dræbes, fordi de ønsker demokrati. Det koldblodige mord skal kulegraves og efterforskes. Vi kræver en fri og uafhængig international undersøgelse. En undersøgelse, der bør foretages af FN og Den Afrikanske Kommission for Menneskerettigheder og Folks rettigheder. FN's menneskerettighedserklæring slår nemlig klart fast, at alle mennesker er født frie og lige i værdighed og rettigheder. Og det er på tide, at menneskerettighederne også tilfalder borgerne i Eswatini.

Stanislav Polčák, *za skupinu PPE.* – Paní předsedající, jak již bylo řečeno, Svazijsko je absolutní monarchie, ale to ji neopravňuje, tuto zemi, k praktikám, které jsou skutečně nepřijatelné. Omezování lidských práv, politické strany jsou mimo zákon a vlastně zásadní násilné akty vůči oponentům režimu, představitelům monarchie, to je skutečně nepřijatelné.

Pokud jsme svědky dnes dokonce vraždy Thulaniho Maseka, významného právníka a předsedy prodemokratického hnutí, tak to musíme jednoznačně razantně odsoudit. Potřebujeme vyzvat tuto zemi, aby dávala bezpečnostní záruky pro své představitele různých prodemokratických uskupení. Jsme svědky přesně opačného postupu. Bezpečnostní síly zastrašují soustavně a systematicky všechny politické aktivisty, odboráře a oponenty. Jednoznačně odsuzujeme smrt Thulaniho Maseka, ale je třeba říci, že budeme po této zemi chtít více, protože i my poskytujeme podporu této zemi.

Musíme volat po nezávislém a nestranném vyšetření. Nabízí se Africká komise pro lidská práva. Chceme vyzvat k respektu k základním lidským právům, k dialogu se zástupci dotčených prodemokratických uskupení a samozřejmě k propuštění vězněných zastánců lidských práv, ale dokonce i poslanců. V této zemi jsou vězněni i poslanci, a to je pro nás zcela nepřijatelné. Je to porušování základních politických práv. Jak jsem řekl, to, co máme k dispozici jako nástroje, to je samozřejmě diplomatické úsilí, ale i případné dočasné pozastavení programů pro Svazijsko a myslím si, že i toto je nástroj, který bychom se neměli bát využít.

Carlos Zorrinho, *em nome do Grupo S&D.* – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, no dia 21 de janeiro deste ano, duas balas entraram pela janela da casa de Thulani Maseko e mataram este advogado, ativista político, líder do Fórum Multissetorial (MSF) de partidos políticos e grupos da sociedade civil, que liderava a campanha pela democracia no reino, e era, ainda, um defensor dos direitos humanos.

Ao nada levar e ao deixar o rasto da morte, os assassinos gravaram a mensagem de que lutar pelos direitos humanos, sociais e políticos continua a ser perigoso e altamente letal em Essuatíni. Este assassinato é o último dos múltiplos episódios ocorridos neste país em matéria de limitação de direitos, liberdades e garantias de uma forma generalizada, de detenções arbitrárias e de repressão e de limitação dos direitos sociais mais básicos.

Apelo, pois, às autoridades de Essuatíni para que concedam o direito à liberdade de expressão, de manifestação, de constituição de partidos políticos, promovam um efetivo diálogo social e assegurem aos seus cidadãos – designadamente aos detidos políticos – os direitos, as liberdades e as garantias reconhecidos pelos acordos e tratados de que o país é signatário, nomeadamente o Acordo de Cotonu e a Declaração Universal dos Direitos Humanos.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Lefteris Nikolaou-Alavanos (NI). – Madam President, we unequivocally condemn the constant state repression, the murders - such as of Thulani Maseko, the abductions, torture and imprisonment against activists, members of trade and student unions by the autocratic Mswati regime.

We express our solidarity with the communist party of Swaziland in particular, recognising its important contribution for the organisation of the struggle for the people's needs against the reactionary regime that was established in 1973 and has since imposed a ban on political parties' constant restrictions on trade union struggle.

We condemn the arrests and torture against activists of the communist party, the false accusations, such as against recently Bongi Mamba and Mvuselelo Mkhabela, aiming at weakening the party's militant stance in favour of working people's interests.

We salute the struggle of the people of Swaziland. We support their just demands for the legalisation of political parties, the safe return of political exiles and refugees, the lifting of all restrictions of the right to protest, of media censorship, for unrestricted parliamentary elections.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Janez Lenarčič, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, the assassination of Thulani Rudolf Maseko, the human rights lawyer and chairperson of the multi-stakeholder forum, on 21 January in his house, came as a shock to all of us. Our thoughts and sincere condolences are with Mr Maseko's family, with his friends and community.

The European Union has publicly and strongly condemned this despicable act and looks forward to the results of the investigation already launched by the authorities. A speedy, effective, transparent and independent investigation is of paramount importance.

The Eswatini authorities need to ensure the safety of all its citizens, including political activists and human rights defenders. The civic space must be protected.

This tragic loss comes in a row of killings, arson attacks and other violent acts which have destabilised the country over the past months. It is high time that a comprehensive and inclusive dialogue is launched on terms facilitated by the Southern African Development Community towards national reconciliation, respect for human rights and the rule of law, and ultimately lasting peace.

The European Union has repeatedly raised its strong concerns about the situation in the country, through constant engagement, including with His Majesty King Mswati III, with the Eswatini Government and with the Southern African Development Community.

The European Union raises the issue of Eswatini systematically in all political dialogues with the Southern African Development Community member states. Moreover, High Representative Borrell discussed the situation in the country during his recent visit to South Africa and Botswana.

The European Union supports the Southern African Development Community efforts and equally understands an inclusive national dialogue is a peacebuilding tool. The European Union welcomed the communiqué of the extraordinary Southern African Development Community Troika Summit two weeks ago, urging the government of Eswatini to urgently initiate the process of the national dialogue and urging all stakeholders in the Kingdom of Eswatini to remain calm and participate peacefully in the national dialogue.

The protracted incarceration and the repeated denial of bail of two members of the Eswatini Parliament is also a cause of concern. Their right to a fair trial and due process needs to be respected, in line with Eswatini's national and international obligations.

With regard to the implementation of the Multiannual Indicative Programme under NDICI-Global Europe that was mentioned in this debate, I would like to recall that following the violence in 2021, it was already decided then that future EU programmes will be designed to directly benefit people at the grassroots level, supporting notably non-governmental organisations. The objective is to boost socioeconomic rights that should go hand in hand with the civil and political rights empowerment of the citizens and vulnerable groups.

We shall keep monitoring developments in Eswatini, calling on the authorities to fully respect fundamental rights enshrined in their constitution, laws and in international and regional conventions to which they have freely assigned to. We will insist on the need to advance democracy, the rule of law and respect of human rights for all. This is crucial for the people of Eswatini.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 16. Februar 2023, statt.

18.2. Насилие срещу активисти от опозицията в Екваториална Гвинея, и по-специално случаят с Хулио Обама Мефуман

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über sechs Entschließungsanträge zur Gewalt gegen Aktivisten der Opposition in Äquatorialguinea, insbesondere dem Fall Julio Obama Mefuman (2023/2552(RSP)).

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, autor. – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, quisiera dar mi más sentido pésame a los familiares de Julio Obama Mefuman, fallecido el 15 de enero de 2023 en una cárcel de Guinea Ecuatorial.

Lo que pide hoy este Parlamento con la Resolución que hemos negociado todos los grupos políticos es simple.

En primer lugar, la repatriación del cuerpo de Julio Obama a España. Julio Obama tenía doble nacionalidad ecuatoguineana y española. Por tanto, también era ciudadano de la Unión Europea. Fue encarcelado por su estatuto de opositor al régimen de Teodoro Obiang, que dura ya cuarenta y cuatro años, toda mi vida.

En segundo lugar, pedimos la liberación inmediata de sus compañeros opositores: Feliciano Efa Mangué, Martín Obiang Ondo y Bienvenido Ndong Ondo, tres presos políticos que también fueron secuestrados en Sudán del Sur y trasladados a Guinea Ecuatorial en una suerte de nueva Operación Cóndor en el continente africano. Allí fueron encarcelados y sometidos a torturas inhumanas, bajo una total falta de respeto a la legislación internacional y con un acceso consular muy limitado que, afortunadamente —y lo agradezco—, pudo ofrecer la Embajada de España.

Nadie debe morir ni sufrir por sus ideas. Estos activistas merecen todo nuestro amparo y toda nuestra protección. Pedimos, por tanto, a las autoridades ecuatoguineanas que cesen este hostigamiento y estas detenciones arbitrarias, tanto dentro como fuera del país.

Jordi Cañas, autor. – Señora presidenta, Guinea Ecuatorial está gobernada por un régimen dictatorial que viola sistemáticamente los derechos humanos desde 1979, un régimen que persigue y acosa a la oposición política en el interior y en el exterior del país, ejecutando secuestros, torturas y asesinatos extrajudiciales.

El régimen del dictador Teodoro Obiang Nguema secuestró en Sudán del Sur a finales de 2019 a cuatro opositores, que fueron ilegalmente trasladados a Guinea Ecuatorial en el avión presidencial, dos de ellos con doble nacionalidad española y ecuatoguineana: los señores Julio Obama y Feliciano Efa. Ambos fueron juzgados sin garantías y condenados en 2020 a 60 y 90 años de cárcel. Desde entonces sufrieron permanentes torturas, hasta que el 15 de enero de este año el señor Obama murió, probablemente a causa de dichas torturas.

Veinte años después de la última Resolución sobre Guinea Ecuatorial, este Parlamento rompe su silencio y condena y responsabiliza al régimen ecuatoguineano de la muerte del señor Obama. Exige el cese de la persecución de la oposición y reclama la inmediata liberación de todos los presos políticos.

Sabemos que estas peticiones no serán atendidas y, por ello, pedimos acciones concretas: que se investigue la Red Criminal de Seguimiento y Secuestro de opositores en Europa; que toda cooperación con el régimen esté condicionada al respeto de los derechos humanos y que se establezcan sanciones a los miembros del régimen.

Para concluir, espero que con esta Resolución los ciudadanos ecuatoguineanos sientan que Europa no les olvida y tengan la esperanza de que trabajaremos por un futuro democrático para Guinea Ecuatorial.

Malte Gallée, Verfasser. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Genau solche Debatten, die zeigen mir immer wieder, wie wahnsinnig froh ich bin, europäischer Staatsbürger zu sein – weil wir hier eben Opposition sein können ohne Todesangst.

Obama Mefuman hatte genau dieses Privileg nicht: Aus Äquatorialguinea wurde er verschleppt, aus dem Südsudan wurde er gekidnappt, verhaftet, vermutlich gefoltert und dann ermordet.

Wir fordern Sie, Herr Kommissar, auf, sich dafür einzusetzen, dass wir das Regime Obiang dafür sanktionieren, dass wir ganz klar ein Zeichen setzen, dass wir so etwas nicht akzeptieren.

Und an all die anderen Oppositionellen in der Welt, an all die anderen Oppositionellen in den ganzen Diktaturen dieser Welt, ob es in Uganda ist, ob es in China ist, ob es im Tschad ist, ob es Belarus oder Kamerun ist: Wir stehen an eurer Seite, wenn es darum geht, eure Rechte zu verteidigen. Wir werden dafür kämpfen, dass ihr mit uns gemeinsam für eine freie, für eine liberale Welt kämpft.

Wir stehen allgemein hier im Europäischen Parlament für genau diese Werte, dass wir sagen: Nein, wir wollen nicht, dass Oppositionelle für ihre politische Arbeit ins Gefängnis gehen. Wir wollen nicht, dass sie um ihr Leben fürchten müssen. Wir akzeptieren das nicht! Und wir senden ein ganz klares Signal: Wir sehen euch, wir hören euch, und wir werden dafür sorgen, dass ihr nicht untergeht und dass ihr gehört werdet.

Hermann Tertsch, autor. – Señora presidenta, yo les voy a contar la misma historia, pero con algo que se han olvidado aquí algunos. Se trata de este desgraciado incidente en la dictadura con el dictador más veterano del mundo.

En noviembre del 2019, cuatro miembros de la oposición —dos de nacionalidad española— son secuestrados en Sudán del Sur por agentes de Obiang. Tras ser encarcelados y torturados en Guinea, son condenados por intento de golpe de Estado a penas de sesenta y noventa años de cárcel.

La policía española consigue pruebas de que Carmelo Obiang, un hijo del dictador que vive en España, es el autor del secuestro. El juez español Santiago Pedraz emite una orden de detención, pero a los pocos días, cuando la policía se preparaba para detenerle, la revoca. Envía un requerimiento a Obiang, público, sin secreto de sumario ya. Este, lógicamente, huye. Después muere en la cárcel uno de los españoles condenados: Julio Obama Mefuman.

Ahora los socialistas quieren condenar en términos genéricos a Obiang y su dictadura, pero olvidan —y quieren olvidar— las suculentas relaciones comerciales de líderes socialistas del PSOE, como José Bono, Miguel Ángel Moratinos y Rodríguez Zapatero, con la dictadura de Obiang.

Nosotros condenamos los crímenes de la dictadura, pero el Gobierno español debe explicar qué pasó para que el juez Pedraz permitiera la huida del culpable, revocando aquel secreto de sumario y la orden de detención. Lo queremos saber.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *autor*. – Señora presidenta, ejercer la oposición en Guinea Ecuatorial es una actividad de alto riesgo, incluso para quienes, como Julio Obama, vivían en otros países.

Julio fue secuestrado en 2019 en Sudán del Sur, junto con otros tres opositores del régimen dictatorial de Obiang. Fueron secuestrados, torturados y condenados injustamente. Esto, que parece el guion de una película, es un plan sistemático de secuestros, torturas, detenciones y ejecución de opositores por parte del régimen de Obiang, un régimen que lleva más de 44 años reprimiendo a su pueblo, pero que también, no lo podemos olvidar, favorece los intereses de las empresas europeas que expolian los recursos naturales de Guinea. Es justo por eso cómo se explica que el secuestro y la tortura de dos ciudadanos españoles y otros dos residentes haya sido tratado hasta ahora con la mal llamada diplomacia del silencio, que solo sirve a los intereses de las dictaduras.

No es tiempo de silencios. Debemos de condenar rotundamente el asesinato de Julio, exigir la libertad inmediata de Feliciano, de Martín y de Bienvenido, los tres opositores detenidos arbitrariamente; denunciar todas las atrocidades cometidas por la dictadura de Obiang; embargar los bienes de la familia que tienen en países europeos, empezando justamente en el Estado español, y condicionar las relaciones políticas y comerciales con Guinea Ecuatorial al respeto a los derechos humanos. El pueblo guineano merece vivir en paz y que desde aquí mandemos un claro mensaje en este sentido.

Gabriel Mato, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, numerosos disidentes y opositores han sido encarcelados, torturados, asesinados o hechos desaparecer en Guinea Ecuatorial. También son muchos miles de guineanos los que se han visto obligados a vivir en el exilio. Pero no solo son opositores políticos los que están sufriendo la represión, también jueces, periodistas, policías y ciudadanos en general, por el simple hecho de expresar sus opiniones.

Entre los perseguidos y represaliados se encontraba Julio Obama —ciudadano español y, por tanto, europeo— que fue secuestrado, encarcelado sin juicio justo y sometido a brutales torturas en cárceles de Guinea Ecuatorial hasta su muerte. Las causas de su muerte deben ser inmediatamente esclarecidas y sus responsables, castigados. Es absolutamente necesario poner freno a todas las violaciones de derechos humanos en Guinea Ecuatorial. Las instituciones europeas tenemos la obligación de contribuir a ello.

La Unión Europea y los Estados miembros deben considerar, de una vez por todas, que en las relaciones internacionales no deben primar los intereses, sino los valores.

Isabel Santos, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, na Guiné Equatorial, os ataques às liberdades fundamentais vitimam opositores e ativistas, que são raptados, mantidos em cativeiro, torturados e assassinados às mãos do regime ditatorial de Obiang, no poder desde 1979.

Julio Obama Mefuman foi detido em 2019 e faleceu numa das prisões da Guiné Equatorial. Era um dos mais de 500 presos políticos neste país. Tinha também nacionalidade espanhola e morreu às mãos do poder político de um país que é membro da Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa desde 2014, sem cumprir os compromissos assumidos de reforma. Para vergonha e indignação de todos aqueles que amam a democracia e falam português como eu.

Não podemos fechar os olhos à opressão, à perpetuação das violações dos direitos humanos e à pena de morte na Guiné Equatorial. Exigimos a repatriação do corpo de Julio Obama e a imediata libertação de todos os presos políticos, e que a União Europeia atue de modo a proteger os seus cidadãos face às ações da Guiné Equatorial, violadores dos direitos humanos.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Julio Obama Mefuman est décédé en prison à Malabo, en Guinée équatoriale, alors qu'il purgeait une peine de soixante ans. Son seul crime était d'être membre de l'opposition. C'était un citoyen européen: de par sa double nationalité, il était en effet espagnol. Il a été d'abord séquestré, puis jeté en prison et torturé.

Dans son pays, le gouvernement réprime brutalement les groupes de la société civile et censure les journalistes. Le pouvoir judiciaire est sous contrôle présidentiel. La situation de l'opposition est désastreuse. Selon Amnesty International, les forces de sécurité pratiquent en toute impunité la torture et autres violences.

Le peuple de Guinée mérite mieux que cela. L'âge moyen de la population est de 22 ans. C'est donc un capital humain qui mérite un avenir digne de son potentiel.

Parallèlement à Julio Obama, trois opposants ont également été kidnappés, Feliciano Efa Mangué, Martín Obiang Ondo et Bienvenido Ndong Ondo, qui ont aussi été enlevés au Soudan et ont subi toutes sortes de tortures.

Nous demandons à l'Union européenne de sanctionner ces détentions arbitraires.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, in the last few months on the occasion of general elections, the European Union stressed that the citizens of Equatorial Guinea should have the right to participate in an open, free and peaceful electoral process and to exercise their freedom of expression, peaceful assembly and association in full compliance with international human rights law.

Today we need to recall this same appeal and to continue to urge the authorities of Equatorial Guinea to ensure democratic governance to the benefit of all its citizens, including by allowing political parties to operate freely and without fear of repression or reprisals.

The European Union therefore calls on authorities to undertake a thorough investigation of all the allegations of abuse and irregularities that have been made in recent months and to do so with utmost urgency.

The European Union has been in contact with the Spanish authorities who have followed the case of Mr Julio Obama Mefuman, a dual Spanish and Equatorial Guinea citizen, and that of the others arrested and detained together with him. Spain had limited consular access to Mr Obama during his detention and while he was in hospital. Mr Obama Mefuman died in hospital in January and the European Union extends its condolences to his loved ones.

The EU is not in possession of the full details of Mr Obama Mefuman's case. An inquiry on the circumstances surrounding his arrest and imprisonment is under way in Spain. The European Union is gravely concerned by the serious human rights situation in Equatorial Guinea, including with regard to prison conditions and the ill treatment of and violence against the detainees. The European Union urges authorities to address these and other serious human rights challenges they face and is ready to assist Equatorial Guinea in this endeavour.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 16. Februar 2023, statt.

18.3. Неотдавнашното влошаване на нечовешките условия на лишаване от свобода на Алексей Навални и други политически затворници в Русия

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über fünf Entschließungsanträge zur jüngsten Verschlechterung der unmenschlichen Haftbedingungen von Alexei Nawalny und anderer politischer Gefangener in Russland (2023/2553(RSP)).

Andrius Kubilius, *author*. – Madam President, I hope that everybody knows that since his arrest, Navalny has been subject to ill treatment, including torture, arbitrary punishment and psychologic pressure, including sleep deprivation and lack of medical care. Recently, as all of us have been informed, Navalny was moved to a 'penal confinement cell'. His lawyers report his deteriorating health. Alexei Navalny was not allowed to have visits for the last eight months. New trial with new charges against Navalny is set for March or April, with risk of new prison sentence of up to 35 years.

The behaviour of the Kremlin regime with political opponent and political prisoner Alexei Navalny is simply inhuman. It reveals the nature of the Kremlin regime, which is a clear brutal tyranny. Today Kremlin has the two major enemies: a democratic and free Ukraine and a freedom-loving, but freedom-denied Russian people. There is no hope that the Kremlin regime will come back to an endorsement of the principles of human rights and the rule of law.

But it is clear that Putin very soon will be on trial, not only by special International Tribunal for the crime of war aggression, but also by the justice system of democratic Russia for the crimes against the Russian nation.

We stand together in solidarity with Alexei Navalny, Vladimir Kara-Murza, Ilya Yashin, Aleksey Gorinov and all other brave Russian people and their families, with their personal sacrifice and in solidarity with their fight for democracy in Russia.

We urge the EU institutions and the EU Member States to give all the support to those who are struggling for the freedom of the Russian nation. For us it is clear that very soon, both Ukraine and democracy in Russia will win, and both victories will be a victory for Alexey Navalny.

Therefore, we call upon the EU and the whole democratic community of the West to have a clear strategy how to assist both victories: one of Ukraine and the other of democratic Russia. We are convinced that such a victory is the best action of our solidarity with Alexei Navalny and all the others who are fighting for the democratic future of Russia.

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, autor. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przygoda Rosji z demokracją była krótka. Zakończyły ją wywołane przez FSB eksplozje w budynkach mieszkalnych, które zostały wykorzystane przez Putina do rozpoczęcia drugiej wojny czeczeńskiej. Później nowy władca Rosji przystąpił do likwidowania wszelkiej prawdziwej opozycji. Korumpowano, zabijano, wsadzono do łagrów i więzień. Dzisiaj większość niezależnych polityków, działaczy społecznych i dziennikarzy, którzy nie wyjechali z Rosji, jest za kratami. Nasilenie represji politycznych było elementem przygotowania agresji na Ukrainę. Wszelkie protesty przeciw wojnie brutalnie zdławiono. Więźniowie polityczni, w tym Aleksiej Nawalny, są traktowani w sposób okrutny i bezprawny. Są torturowani, pozbawieni pomocy medycznej, kontaktu z rodzinami i adwokatami.

Swoją rezolucją chcemy dać znać, że pamiętamy o nich i zdecydowanie potępiamy postępowanie władz Rosji. Domagamy się uwolnienia więźniów politycznych i zmiany sposobu ich traktowania. Ludzie odpowiedzialni za prześladowania z policji, prokuratury, sądownictwa i więziennictwa powinni być objęci sankcjami Unii. Jednocześnie powinniśmy wspierać wszystkie osoby zaangażowane w Rosji i poza jej granicami w aktywizowanie społeczeństwa obywatelskiego. Rosję mogą zmienić tylko sami Rosjanie. Ci, którzy chcą Rosji demokratycznej i praworządnej, Rosji bez imperialnych ambicji, powinni móc liczyć na nasze wsparcie.

Bernard Guetta, auteur. – Madame la Présidente, sous toutes les latitudes, tous les codes pénaux le disent: c'est un crime, Monsieur Poutine, que de détenir un innocent entre quatre murs, un innocent, qui plus est, que l'on avait vainement tenté d'empoisonner. Oui, votre crime est établi, mais vous en perpétrez maintenant un plus grave encore.

À coups de mesures d'isolement, de harcèlement et de refus de soins médicaux vous assassinez lentement Alexeï Navalny. Cet opposant qui ne connaît pas la peur, ce combattant qui vous défie, vous le voulez mort, vous voulez sa tête, car vous le craignez.

Alors sachez, Monsieur Poutine, que, pas plus que le monde ne vous pardonnera le martyre de l'Ukraine, nous ne pourrions vous pardonner le meurtre du combattant de la liberté qu'est votre opposant.

Nous ne le pourrions pas car nous l'admirons. Nous ne le pourrions pas car il est admirable. Nous ne le pourrions pas car, le jour où l'histoire aura tourné votre si sombre page, la Russie aura besoin d'Alexeï Navalny et de tous ceux qui vous résistent aujourd'hui.

Sans eux, la Russie n'aurait pas d'étendards derrière lesquels se rallier, faire front et refuser ce nouveau temps de troubles dont votre guerre la menace.

Il faut un Navalny à la Russie, et, si vous l'en privez, c'est elle que vous achèveriez de détruire.

Sergey Lagodinsky, *Verfasser*. – Frau Präsidentin! Was gibt es zu diesem Thema noch zu sagen? Das unmenschliche Antlitz des Systems Putin spiegelt sich in der Verfolgung von Alexei Nawalny wider.

Ich erinnere mich an diesen Mann, als er noch frei war. Groß, immer lächelnd, ein leidenschaftlicher Jogger, der wusste, wie man Witze reißt und Menschen verzaubert, sogar im Krankenzimmer in der Charité, wo ich ihn nach seinem Koma besuchte. Nun sehe ich den Menschen auf den Bildschirmen der russischen Justizbehörden: einen dünnen Mann mit Augenringen und eingefallenen Wangen, in einem Käfig gehalten. Und ich sage mir: Ich erkenne dich wieder, Alexei, weil ich deinen Lebensgeist wiedererkenne, deinen Drang nach Freiheit, deine Liebe für deine Frau und deine Familie. Und ich erkenne deine Hingabe für dein Volk, das sich gerade moralisch absolut verirrt und verkracht hat, deinen Glauben daran, dass es sich lohnt, um seine Freiheit und seine Seele zu kämpfen.

Dieses Parlament, dieser Kontinent, denkt an dich, Alexei, genauso wie an andere: Ilja Jaschin, Wladimir Kara-Mursa, Alexei Gorinow. Wir fordern das Selbstverständliche für euch: Freiheit, einen Arzt, Besuch der Familie, Gespräche mit Anwälten. Wir fordern, weil wir wissen, dass diese schwarze Zeit, dieser Angriffskrieg gegen das stolze Volk der Ukrainer bald vorbei sein wird. Und dann? Dann schlägt auch eure Stunde, liebe Freunde, in den russischen Lagern – die Stunde der Freiheit, die Stunde der Gerechtigkeit.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *autor*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Nawalny nie jest jedyny, ale Nawalnych jest wielu. Tym bardziej trzeba docenić jego cierpienie, o którym tu była dzisiaj mowa. Pamiętam, jak gościliśmy w naszym Parlamencie najpierw jego córkę, a po kilku miesiącach jego żonę. Były z nami fizycznie, chociaż duchem i sercem były ze swoim ojcem i mężem.

Mówimy dzisiaj o wojnie w Europie Wschodniej. Myślimy o tym, co będzie po wojnie. Czy w Rosji będzie czas Nawalnego i tych, którzy wierzą w demokrację? Czy to będzie jeszcze inny czas, czas kogoś gorszego niż Putin. Solidaryzując się z Nawalnym, przesyłamy wyrazy solidarności z tymi Rosjanami, którzy chcą wolności. Może nie jest ich wielu, ale muszą czuć naszą solidarność ponad podziałami.

Eugen Tomac, *în numele grupului PPE*. – Doamna președintă, ce vrea de fapt acest Putin care este un laș și un om care și-a câștigat locul în istorie alături de Stalin și alți criminali care au bătuit prin Europa? Vrea un lucru foarte simplu: să transforme Rusia într-un gulag. Însă atât timp cât există oameni precum Navalnii, dispus să se sacrifice pentru demnitatea poporului său, nu trebuie să confundăm actualul regim criminal de la Kremlin cu poporul rus. Și este esențial să transmitem aceste mesaje de solidaritate cu deținuții politici din Rusia.

Putin este și va rămâne un criminal. El trebuie oprit din acest delir pe care l-a creat acum. Nu-și dorește decât un singur lucru: să transforme Rusia într-un gulag și, evident, să terorizeze zi de zi Europa. Însă nu va reuși, așa cum nu a reușit să ocupe doar în câteva săptămâni Ucraina, așa cum și-a propus.

Juozas Olekas, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, unfortunately, again, we are discussing about the situation on human rights in Russia. The politically motivated trial of Alexei Navalny and his team was a showcase for the Russian regime that will not stop against anything in order to defend its ruling position.

Now the regime and its officials are going even further. They're making inhuman living conditions for Alexei Navalny and later they are denying proper medical care. It should be made clear that each prison official and their master minds for this action can and will be tried in the future.

Yet again, I strongly believe that the fate of Alexei Navalny and other political prisoners in Russia or Belarus strongly depends on the success of the Ukrainian army against Russian invaders on the battlefield. Only by losing the war, Russia will have a chance to break free from that totalitarian grip.

Katalin Cseh, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, the whole world knows that Alexey Navalny sits in a prison cell for one reason, and one reason only: Vladimir Putin is a coward.

He is afraid of real opposition voices – he doesn't even have the courage to play hockey games against real opponents. So put this in contrast with Alexey Navalny, the embodiment of courage, who returned to Russia after the regime tried to poison him, and who just does not give up.

But we have all seen the reports and pictures; Alexey Navalny needs our help and time is running out. The EU must use its full diplomatic and economic leverage to push for his immediate release. So every time a European diplomat meets a Russian counterpart, the discussion, among many, many other topics, must include two demands: allow Navalny to see an independent medical expert and allow Navalny to see his lawyer in confidentiality. So in other words, stop violating Russia's own laws.

The world is watching and we cannot stand by while Navalny's health is deteriorating. We have to do something. Let's act together.

Markéta Gregorová, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, arrested, imprisoned and poisoned for his political activism and yet he returns to Russia and continues to fight for what he believes in, risking his own life. Aleksei Navalny and all political prisoners are the visible symbol for the millions of Russians who want a better future for themselves and for their country. This symbol grows every day, and as a paranoid 70-year-old tries to violently break Russia away from Europe and bind it with the dictatorships in the East. Europe is with Navalny and all the dreamers and believers in a free and democratic Russia.

Colleagues, let us help those who want to show to Putin that they will not be intimidated or silenced and that every dictator needs at one point to learn that you cannot silence ideals. And, dear Aleksei, I hope the guards play Beethoven's Ode to Joy next time during mealtimes as a punishment too.

Patricia Chagnon, au nom du groupe ID. – Madame la Présidente, jeudi dernier, M^{me} le ministre de la culture de France, Rima Abdul-Malak, qui devrait être le garant de la liberté d'expression, a menacé de fermeture des chaînes de télévision en France. On a compris qu'elle leur reprochait un manque de pluralisme et de ne pas traiter les affaires judiciaires avec mesure.

Est-il nécessaire de rappeler que la rédaction de chaque chaîne d'information fait un tri de l'information? Est-il nécessaire de rappeler que CNews traite différemment les faits divers que, par exemple, BFM-TV?

Il est vrai que CNews laisse notamment la place pour traiter des sujets relatifs à l'insécurité grandissante en France, souvent ignorée par d'autres chaînes. Est-ce que cela signifie un manque de pluralisme, ou est-ce que cela mettrait plutôt dans l'embarras le gouvernement français?

Quoi qu'il en soit, la ministre a, me semble-t-il, rompu avec son devoir de neutralité. Sa grave mise en cause de chaînes d'information est perçue par de nombreux commentateurs comme une atteinte directe aux libertés fondamentales.

Avant de s'ériger ici en chevaliers blancs de la défense des droits fondamentaux, certains d'entre vous, chers collègues, devraient commencer à balayer devant leur propre porte. Que n'aurait-on pas dit si cela s'était produit, par exemple, en Hongrie?

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Madam President, I've just listened attentively to the colleague, and I don't think she referred to the debate that we were having.

President. – This lies in the eye of everybody, but at the end she tried to get back on track so I think we can be a little bit flexible. To judge, it's about all who are listening; and to decide what she's saying is upon her.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Madam President, just as the autocrats in the Kremlin continue to wage their war of aggression against the people of Ukraine, they also continue in the persecution and oppression of the opposition, human rights defenders, and pro-democratic forces in Russia.

Alexey Navalny, the brave Vladimir Kara-Murza and other political prisoners continue to face draconian conditions. I welcome that this house continues to be unwavering in its united stance in support of all political prisoners in Russia.

However, it is also crucial to support those Russian human rights defenders and pro-democratic forces seeking shelter in our countries. This is why I find bewildering the recent decision by the Georgian authorities to deny re-entry to Anna Rivina, the founder and director of Nasiliu.Net, an organisation providing services and shelter to victims of domestic violence.

We must continue to support those who, like us, want to breathe freedom and want Russia free of oppression.

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, Putin's war against neighbours and so-called internal enemies is increasingly reminiscent of the Stalin repressions and the rise of totalitarianism.

In an environment of growing repressions, no one feels safe. The opposition is silenced by the prevailing fear, and the Kremlin itself is gripped by the sense of uncertainty about its future.

A policy of repression and intimidation in Putin's Russia has imprisoned political opponents with trumped-up charges and life-threatening prison conditions. Those who had a different vision of Russia – Navalny, Kara-Murza, Yashin, Dmitriyev, Gorinov – were accused of high treason and of activities dangerous to society.

It must be acknowledged that Putin does not understand the European language, so only the language of sanctions and united pressure remains possible. This is the only way to protect political prisoners and remnants of civil society in Russia.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein (Renew). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zgadzam się z tymi wszystkimi, którzy podkreślali tutaj, że znęcanie się nad Nawalnym, że znęcanie się nad przedstawicielami opozycji, dziennikarzami, nad słabszymi, to jest dowód na to obrzydliwe tchórzostwo Putina. To jego tchórzostwo i tchórzostwo jego reżimu wyraża się w jego okrucieństwie, w znęcaniu się nad każdym słabszym, nad każdym, kto mu się sprzeciwia. Tego wyrazem jest również atak, agresja na Ukrainę – kraj o wiele mniejszy, o wiele słabszy, o wiele biedniejszy, ale kraj, który prawdziwie dąży do demokracji i jest na drodze wejścia do Unii Europejskiej. Dlatego Putin i jego reżim morduje, prześladowa, znęca się nad każdym dziennikarzem, działaczem społecznym, politykiem, nad każdym obywatelem, któremu nie udało się złamać kręgosłupa przez ten nieludzki system.

Spojrzyjcie Państwo na zdjęcie Nawalnego, które wrzuciłam przed chwilą na media społecznościowe, sprzed uwięzienia i dzisiaj. Jego ciało, które cierpi – i możliwe, że Putin chce je wykończyć w więzieniu – i się niszczy, ducha jednak nie złamie, a my go będziemy wspierać do końca.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, me gustaría trasladar toda la solidaridad mía, de mi Grupo político de los socialistas y, diría también, estoy seguro, de todo el pueblo español y el pueblo europeo, a Navalny por esta situación tan inhumana y tan injusta.

Ciertamente, tenemos que hacer todo lo posible desde la Unión Europea para conseguir su liberación, y no solo por una razón humanitaria. Porque yo estoy convencido de que más pronto que tarde Ucrania prevalecerá en esta guerra y, también más pronto que tarde, el régimen de Putin colapsará en Rusia. Entonces podremos encontrarnos —reencontrarnos— con una Rusia libre y democrática que vuelva a las naciones europeas. Y Navalny, entre otros, será fundamental para construir ese nuevo orden: una Europa, recordemos, desde el Atlántico hasta los Urales, libre y unida.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Janez Lenarčič, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, the Russian authoritarian government is using a range of tactics to detain and deter the work of democracy activists, critical voices, human rights defenders and so on. Political trials, as well as restrictive legislation, are one of the primary tools of the Russian authorities in dealing with political opposition figures and critical voices in today's Russia.

The Russian opposition politician Alexei Navalny is one of hundreds of political prisoners in Russia, but his situation is unique and extremely concerning. From his prison cell, Mr Navalny courageously continues to speak out against the Russian authorities' suppression of freedom of expression and independent media.

Since last February, Russia's unjustified, unprovoked and illegal war of aggression against Ukraine has only amplified Russia's internal repression and systematic crackdown on the Kremlin's critics and the civil society as a whole.

Let me once again reiterate the European Union's strongest possible condemnation of the poisoning of Mr Navalny. We have imposed sanctions on those involved in this assassination attempt. We have also imposed sanctions on those involved in his arbitrary arrest, in his prosecution and his sentencing. We will, together with our partners, continue to call on Russia for Navalny's immediate and unconditional release because obviously his imprisonment is purely politically motivated.

Russia's full-scale war of aggression against Ukraine accelerated repression on the domestic scene, both in terms of more restrictive legislation and increased number of human rights violations. It took President Putin just eight days following the start of the full-scale invasion on Ukraine to sign a law introducing stiff prison sentences up to 15 years for, I quote, 'public dissemination of false information about Russian armed forces,' end of quote.

Russian authorities have doubled down their efforts in cracking down on journalists, human rights defenders, activists and even random anti-war minded people, with the aim to silence any criticism of the aggression against Ukraine or telling the truth about the atrocities that the Russian army is committing there.

The European Union stands by and continues to support the Russian civil society, independent media, human rights defenders, political prisoners and all Russian citizens who, despite the deepening crackdown, continue to defend the human rights in Russia and oppose authoritarianism and war, and they do so at great personal risk.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 16. Februar 2023, statt.

19. Обяснение на вот

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung.

19.1. Положението на бившия президент на Грузия Михаил Саакашвили (RC-B9-0106/2023, B9-0106/2023, B9-0109/2023, B9-0112/2023, B9-0114/2023, B9-0117/2023)

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Madam President, I welcome today's support for the resolution concerning the health of Georgia's ex-president, Mikheil Saakashvili. Once again, the message of this House to the Georgian authorities is clear: allow Mikheil Saakashvili to undergo medical treatment abroad without delay, in accordance with Article 283 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Georgia. Also, let me thank colleagues for supporting our calls to sanction Bidzina Ivanishvili for his role in the deterioration of this political process in Georgia. The oligarch bears primary responsibility for the situation, and the EU should act accordingly.

19.2. Присъединяването на ЕС към Конвенцията на Съвета на Европа за превенция и борба с насилието над жени и домашното насилие (A9-0021/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari)

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, akékoľvek násilie ostro odsudzujem. Je našou povinnosťou hľadať efektívne riešenia na násilie proti ženám, školiť napríklad políciu a tých, ktorí sú pre takéto ženy prvým kontaktom, a riadne implementovať našu legislatívu, ktorá je na Slovensku podľa odborníkov dobrá, avšak nie správne a dôsledne vykonávaná.

Tzv. Istanbulský dohovor a celá diskusia okolo neho však cieľu odstránenia násilia na ženách a domáceho násilia vôbec nepomáha. Dohovor nemá podporu medzi členskými štátmi a namiesto toho, aby sme sa rozprávali o rýchlej pomoci pre obeť, riešime to, ako donútiť členské štáty dohovor urýchlene prijímať.

Treba však pripomenúť, že dôvod, prečo Slovenská republika tento dokument neratifikovala, je ideologizácia celej problematiky a hrubé zasahovanie do morálnych a kultúrno-etických sfér a legislatívy. S takýmto postupom, ktorý sa doslova vysmieva tým, ktorí násiliu denne čelia, absolútne nesúhlasím.

Die Präsidentin. – Dieser Tagesordnungspunkt ist damit geschlossen.

20. Дневен ред на следващото заседание

Die Präsidentin. – Die nächste Sitzung findet morgen, Donnerstag, den 16. Februar 2023, statt. Wir beginnen um 8.30 Uhr, also nicht erst um 9.00 Uhr, sondern um 8.30 Uhr.

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

21. Одобряване на протокола от настоящото заседание

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

22. Закриване на заседанието

Die Präsidentin. – Die Sitzung ist damit geschlossen. Ich wünsche Ihnen allen eine gute Nacht.

(Die Sitzung wird um 22.53 Uhr geschlossen.)

Легенда на използваните символи

*	Процедура на консултация
***	Процедура на одобрение
***I	Обикновена законодателна процедура: първо четене
***II	Обикновена законодателна процедура: второ четене
***III	Обикновена законодателна процедура: трето четене

(Посочената процедура се базира на правното основание, предложено от проекта на акт.)

Съкращения на наименованията на комисиите

AFET	Комисия по външни работи
DEVE	Комисия по развитие
INTA	Комисия по международна търговия
BUDG	Комисия по бюджети
CONT	Комисия по бюджетен контрол
ECON	Комисия по икономически и парични въпроси
EMPL	Комисия по заетост и социални въпроси
ENVI	Комисия по околна среда, обществено здраве и безопасност на храните
ITRE	Комисия по промишленост, изследвания и енергетика
IMCO	Комисия по вътрешния пазар и защита на потребителите
TRAN	Комисия по транспорт и туризъм
REGI	Комисия по регионално развитие
AGRI	Комисия по земеделие и развитие на селските райони
PECH	Комисия по рибно стопанство
CULT	Комисия по култура и образование
JURI	Комисия по правни въпроси
LIBE	Комисия по граждански свободи, правосъдие и вътрешни работи
AFCO	Комисия по конституционни въпроси
FEMM	Комисия по правата на жените и равенството между половете
PETI	Комисия по петиции
DROI	Подкомисия по правата на човека
SEDE	Подкомисия по сигурност и отбрана
FISC	Подкомисия по данъчните въпроси

Съкращения на наименованията на политическите групи

PPE	Група на Европейската народна партия (Християндемократи)
S&D	Група на Прогресивния алианс на социалистите и демократите в Европейския парламент
Renew	Група „Renew Europe“
Verts/ALE	Група на Зелените/Европейски свободен алианс
ID	Група „Идентичност и демокрация“
ECR	Група на Европейски консерватори и реформисти
The Left	Група на левицата в Европейския парламент - GUE/NGL
NI	Независими членове