Úřední věstník Evropské unie

C 147

České vydání

Informace a oznámení

Ročník 66

27. dubna 2023

Obsah

IV *Informace*

INFORMACE ORGÁNŮ, INSTITUCÍ A JINÝCH SUBJEKTŮ EVROPSKÉ UNIE

Evropský parlament

ZASEDÁNÍ 2022–2023

Dílčí zasedání od 3. do 6. října 2022

2023/C 147/01 Doslovný záznam ze zasedání z 3. října 2022 1

2023/C 147/02 Doslovný záznam ze zasedání z 4. října 2022 57

2023/C 147/03 Doslovný záznam ze zasedání z 5. října 2022 196

2023/C 147/04 Doslovný záznam ze zasedání z 6. října 2022 327

CS

Vysvětlivky k použitým symbolům

*	postup konzultace
***	postup souhlasu
***I	řádný legislativní postup: první čtení
***II	řádný legislativní postup: druhé čtení
***III	řádný legislativní postup: třetí čtení

(Druh postupu závisí na právním základu navrženém v návrhu aktu.)

Zkratky používané pro parlamentní výbory

AFET	Výbor pro zahraniční věci
DEVE	Výbor pro rozvoj
INTA	Výbor pro mezinárodní obchod
BUDG	Rozpočtový výbor
CONT	Výbor pro rozpočtovou kontrolu
ECON	Hospodářský a měnový výbor
EMPL	Výbor pro zaměstnanost a sociální věci
ENVI	Výbor pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin
ITRE	Výbor pro průmysl, výzkum a energetiku
IMCO	Výbor pro vnitřní trh a ochranu spotřebitelů
TRAN	Výbor pro dopravu a cestovní ruch
REGI	Výbor pro regionální rozvoj
AGRI	Výbor pro zemědělství a rozvoj venkova
PECH	Výbor pro rybolov
CULT	Výbor pro kulturu a vzdělávání
JURI	Výbor pro právní záležitosti
LIBE	Výbor pro občanské svobody, spravedlnost a vnitřní věci
AFCO	Výbor pro ústavní záležitosti
FEMM	Výbor pro práva žen a rovnost pohlaví
PETI	Petiční výbor

DROI	podvýbor pro lidská práva
SEDE	podvýbor pro bezpečnost a obranu
FISC	podvýbor pro daňové záležitosti

Zkratky používané pro politické skupiny

PPE	skupina Evropské lidové strany (Křesťanských demokratů)
S&D	skupina Pokrokové aliance socialistů a demokratů v Evropském parlamentu
Renew	skupina Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	skupina Zelených / Evropské svobodné aliance
ID	skupina Identita a demokracie
ECR	skupina Evropských konzervativců a reformistů
The Left	skupina Levice v Evropském parlamentu – GUE/NGL
NI	nezařazení poslanci

Pondělí 3. října 2022

IV

(Informace)

INFORMACE ORGÁNŮ, INSTITUCÍ A JINÝCH SUBJEKTŮ EVROPSKÉ UNIE

EVROPSKÝ PARLAMENT

ZASEDÁNÍ 2022–2023

Dílčí zasedání od 3. do 6. října 2022

ŠTRASBURK

DOSLOVNÝ ZÁZNAM ZE ZASEDÁNÍ Z 3. ŘÍJNA 2022

(2023/C 147/01)

Obsah Strana

1. Pokračování zasedání 3

2. Zahájení denního zasedání 3

3. Prohlášení předsednictví 3

4. Schválení zápisu z předchozího zasedání 4

5. Složení Parlamentu 4

6. Členství ve výborech a delegacích 5

7. Podepisování aktů přijatých řádným legislativním postupem (článek 79 jednacího řádu) 5

8. Plán práce 5

9. Evropské středisko pro prevenci a kontrolu nemocí – Vážné přeshraniční zdravotní hrozby (rozprava) 7

10. Impulz pro oceán: posílení správy oceánů a biologické rozmanitosti (rozprava) 20

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Obsah Strana

11. Úsilí o dosažení udržitelnosti a konkurenceschopnosti akvakultury v EU: další postup (rozprava) 28

12. Dopad nových technologií na zdanění: kryptoaktiva a technologie blockchain (rozprava) 34

13. Opatření EU v oblasti svobody náboženského vyznání nebo přesvědčení na celém světě (rozprava) 39

14. Opatření pro řízení, zachování a kontrolu platná v oblasti působnosti Komise pro tuňáky Indického oceánu (IOTC) (krátké přednesení) 45

15. Flexibilní pomoc územím (FAST-CARE) (krátké přednesení) 47

16. Jednominutové projevy k důležitým politickým otázkám 50

17. Schválení zápisu z tohoto denního zasedání a pořadu jednání nadcházejícího denního zasedání 56

18. Ukončení zasedání 56

DOSLOVNÝ ZÁZNAM ZE ZASEDÁNÍ Z 3. ŘÍJNA 2022

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Pokračování zasedání

President. – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday, 15 September 2022.

2. Zahájení denního zasedání

(The sitting opened at 17.05)

3. Prohlášení předsednictví

President. – Dear colleagues, first of all, I would like to make an announcement about the situation in Iran, which continues to remain of concern. The world heard the chants of 'women, life, liberty' – three words that have become a rallying cry for all those standing up for equality, dignity and freedom in Iran.

The brutal death of 22 year old Mahsa Amini marked a turning point. Colleagues, it is the daughters of Iran who, despite coming under increasing pressure, are leading the push for change. It is the women who are the change-makers, supported by so many courageous allies and friends.

Today we have Professor Azadeh Kian in the Chamber with us.

(Loud, sustained applause)

Ms Kian, to you and to every girl fighting for her rights in Iran, let me say: you are not alone. This European Parliament stands proudly with everyone demanding change. We are with you. Mahsa Amini will be remembered, just like Hadis, Minu, Ghazaleh, Hanane, Hayedeh, Machsa, Noka and many, many others. For women, for life, for liberty!

(Loud applause)

Last Saturday, the EU ambassador to Nicaragua was forced to leave the country and diplomatic relations with the Netherlands were halted. I condemn the latest unilateral measures by the Nicaraguan regime, only two weeks after this House called for an inclusive national dialogue to ensure a peaceful and democratic solution to the political, social and human rights crisis.

The Ortega-Murillo regime cannot continue to isolate the country from the international community. The European Parliament will always take a firm stand against the chipping-away of democratic structures. Together with like-minded partners, we remain committed towards restoring a rules-based order in the interest of the Nicaraguan people.

Finally, today marks nine years since the shipwreck of Lampedusa, resulting in the tragic loss – as you will recall – of more than 360 lives. 360 dreams shattered, 360 families forever broken. Many of whom where never able to be identified.

They are people, not statistics. Hopes not numbers. We cannot not become de-sensitised to the tragedy. The cruel truth is that the cemetery of the Mediterranean has claimed the lives of thousands more women, children and men since then.

We need to find a way forward on migration, that looks at the issue in a holistic, humane, European way. It is not enough to shrug and point fingers. We promised change nine years ago when 360 people drowned, we reiterated that promise when young Alan Kurdi washed up on our sandy beaches, and yet only a few days ago we saw girls die of dehydration off our coasts. When young girls are dying of thirst in our seas, then it is our failure and a failure of our shared humanity.

We can and we must do better on this. We must find a way forward. For all those who lost their lives, for all the victims of traffickers, for all those mothers waiting for news that will never come. We remember them.

(Applause)

I give the floor specifically on this point to colleague Pietro Bartolo.

Pietro Bartolo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nove anni sono passati da quella terribile notte. Da allora, i pianti, le voci, lo strazio e il silenzio dei sopravvissuti mi perseguitano, perché io ero lì, a Lampedusa, a soccorrere i vivi e a contare i morti.

Oggi rendiamo omaggio non solo alle 368 persone che hanno perso la vita di fronte alla mia isola, quella notte, inghiottite dal mare nel loro disperato tentativo di cercare una vita in Europa, ma anche alle altre 22 000 persone che da allora hanno avuto la stessa terribile fine.

Questo è un anniversario che ci riguarda tutti. Possiamo fermare questo massacro solo in un modo: con un cambiamento radicale della politica di immigrazione e accoglienza. Facciamolo insieme, in nome dell'essere umano, e che il 3 ottobre diventi la Giornata europea di tutte le vittime del mare. Grazie Presidente e grazie a tutti voi.

President. – *Grazie, onorevole Bartolo.*

Dear colleagues, as announced in an email last week, let me once again inform you that there is a dedicated crew that will now start to film with a view to updating the panoramic video screens at the Parliamentariums in all our capital cities. Apart from the filming of this opening of the session they will also be filming on Tuesday, tomorrow, from noon until one, during the vote – it's a short voting session so try to be there on time – and then on Wednesday during the key debate from 9 to 10 o'clock in the morning.

Just also to remind and to confirm that there will be no voice recording and the specific content of the debates will not be part of the film, but your attendance would be appreciated.

4. Schválení zápisu z předchozího zasedání

President. – The minutes and the texts adopted of the sitting of 15 September 2022 are available. Are there any comments?

That not being the case, the minutes are approved.

5. Složení Parlamentu

President. – Following the election of Jessica Stegrud as a Member of the Swedish Parliament, Parliament takes note of the fact that her seat fell vacant on 26 September 2022, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

Following the resignation of Bettina Vollath, Parliament takes note of the fact that her seat will be vacant from 10 October 2022, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

We will inform the national authorities concerned.

The competent authorities of Spain have informed me that Eva Maria Poptcheva has been elected Member of the European Parliament to replace Luis Garicano with effect from 15 September 2022.

The competent authorities of Sweden have informed me that Carina Ohlsson has been elected Member of the European Parliament to replace Jytte Guteland with effect from 26 September 2022.

The competent authorities of Germany have informed me that Matthias Ecke has been elected Member of the European Parliament to replace Constanze Krehl with effect from 3 October 2022.

I would like to welcome these new colleagues and to point out that they sit in Parliament and in its bodies in full enjoyment of their rights provided for by the Rules of Procedure.

6. Členství ve výborech a delegacích

President. – I have received from the S&D, Renew Europe and ECR groups decisions modifying the nominations to committees and delegations. Those decisions will be listed in the minutes of today's sitting and shall take effect on the date of the announcement.

7. Podepisování aktů přijatých řádným legislativním postupem (článek 79 jednacího řádu)

President. – I would like to inform you that, since the adjournment of Parliament's session on 15 September, I have signed, together with the President of the Council, one act adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure in accordance with Rule 79 of Parliament's Rules of Procedure. The title of the act will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

8. Plán práce

President. – We now come to the order of business. The final draft agenda as adopted by the Conference of Presidents on 29 September 2022, pursuant to Rule 157, has been distributed.

I would like to inform you that I have received one request for urgent procedure from the TRAN Committee pursuant to Rule 163 on 'slot utilisation rules at Union airports: temporary relief'. The vote on this request will be taken tomorrow and, if adopted, the vote will be held on Thursday.

Monday

We now move to the changes requested by political groups. For today, Monday, the ECR Group has asked that Council and Commission statements on 'the protection of children and families: sexual safeguards for minors' be added as the sixth item in the afternoon, before the short presentations. The debate would be wound up with a resolution, to be voted on Thursday. I give the floor to Ms de la Pisa Carrión to move the request on behalf of the ECR Group.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señora presidenta, pedimos la inclusión en la agenda de un debate sin resolución tras las infames declaraciones de la ministra de Igualdad de España, Irene Montero, sobre las relaciones sexuales de niños con mayores de edad basadas en el consentimiento. ¿Consentir? ¿Un niño? ¿De qué estamos hablando?

Necesitamos un debate serio en este Parlamento sobre el respeto a la inocencia de los niños, que hoy, desgraciadamente, está siendo acechada por políticas ideológicas con conceptos que un niño todavía no es capaz de asumir; que le dañan, lesionando el desarrollo normal de su personalidad. Su derecho a conocer la sexualidad a la edad adecuada debe venir de la mano de quienes verdaderamente le conocen, que son sus padres y no quienes le quieren corromper.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señora presidenta, la verdad es que a la extrema derecha que propone este punto le dan absolutamente igual los derechos de la infancia y de la familia. De hecho, su partido votó recientemente en el Parlamento español en contra de que se investigaran justamente los casos de pederastia en el seno de la Iglesia.

Lo único que le interesa a la extrema derecha es seguir extendiendo sus bulos contra las mujeres, el feminismo, el colectivo LGTBI y, también, contra la educación sexual.

Por lo tanto, llamo a votar en contra de esta propuesta para que la extrema derecha deje de utilizar este Parlamento como altavoz de sus odios y de sus mentiras.

(Parliament rejected the ECR Group's request)

Tuesday

President. – For Tuesday, the ECR and S&D groups have asked that a statement by the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the situation in Burkina Faso following the coup d'état be added as the fifth item in the afternoon. The ECR Group has requested that the debate be wound up with a resolution to be voted on in October II. The S&D Group has requested that the item be added to the agenda without a resolution.

Assita Kanko, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, as you all know, there is a new coup in Burkina Faso and jihadists are taking over – more than 40% of the country for the moment. Russian influence is getting visible and Western interests, like the French Embassy in Ouagadougou, have been under attack. This is not a local issue, but a geopolitical one. Several times I have already drawn the plenary's attention to the jihadist rise in the Sahel region. It is high time for our plenary to deal with this urgent matter and add it urgently to the agenda.

My Group therefore requests to add this item to the agenda as a debate this week, and we are aware of the fact that the plenary agenda is packed. So perhaps October II will be more suited for a resolution, but we need to have the debate urgently now. I hope you will support this.

President. – Thank you, Ms Kanko. Mr Marques, I ask you to move the request on behalf of your Group.

Pedro Marques, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, we are following the situation in Burkina Faso with great concern. It is the second time in a few months that we have a coup d'état that seizes power in Burkina Faso, a country that is already in a very dire situation. So we consider that yes, there should be a debate within this plenary in October I, but it is our understanding that the situation on the ground is changing on a daily basis. The instability will not stop in the next few days, so we do not see it as a priority to have a resolution on this matter either now or in October II.

What we want is a clear debate here and a statement by the High Representative this week so that we send a message to the ground, so that we send a message to Burkina Faso. The High Representative already urged the authorities to stabilise the situation and go back to the negotiations from a few months ago. Let us have the possibility to have this kind of clear statement also by the Parliament in this plenary.

President. – Thank you, Mr Marques. So I'll first put to the vote the request to add the item to the agenda, and then if carried, I will put to the vote the request to wind up the debate with a resolution to be voted in October II.

(Parliament agreed to both requests)

Wednesday

On Wednesday, the S&D and Renew Europe groups have asked that the Commission statement on institutional racism in the EU and the breach of fundamental rights of EU citizens, scheduled as the last item in the afternoon, be replaced by an oral question on the Dutch childcare benefit scandal, institutional racism and algorithms.

Agnes Jongerius, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, I think it should be said that thousands of lives were ruined by the Dutch tax authorities due to institutional racism, known as the 'child care benefit scandal'. And not even all victims have been accounted for. But at the moment, they estimate that 26, people were hurt and families were destroyed. And it took years to uncover the truth. And now the EPP, with their friends on the right, is again trying to bury this scandal. And I ask for support to keep the original debates about the oral question instead of the newly proposed Commission statement. I think we should shed light on the truth and not try to bury it. And therefore, pursuant to Rule 158, the S&D Group would like to replace the Commission statement 'Institutional racism in the EU and the breach of fundamental rights of EU citizens', Wednesday evening - last item, with the oral question on the Dutch child care benefits scandal, institutional racism and algorithms.

(Parliament agreed to the request by the S&D and Renew Europe groups)

President. – With that the agenda is adopted and the order of business is thus established.

9. Evropské středisko pro prevenci a kontrolu nemocí – Vážné přeshraniční zdravotní hrozby (rozprava)

President. – The next item is the joint debate on:

— the report by Joanna Kopcińska, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 851/2004 establishing a European Centre for disease prevention and control (COM(2020)0726 – C9-0366/2020 – 2020/0320(COD)) (A9-0253/2021), and

— the report by Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on serious cross-border threats to health and repealing Decision No 1082/2013/EU (COM(2020)0727 – C9-0367/2020 – 2020/0322(COD)).

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ

Wiceprzewodnicząca

Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, *rapporteure*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire – chère Stella –, chers collègues – pour ceux d'entre vous qui sont restés –, la crise de la COVID-19 a montré notre extraordinaire fragilité en matière de santé. En 2020, nos systèmes de santé nationaux se sont trouvés dépassés, et cette impuissance les a d'abord poussés vers des réflexes de protection nationale. Nous le disons: plus jamais ça!

Rapidement, les tentations de repli sur soi ont laissé place à la solidarité et à la coordination européennes. Nous devons désormais nous inspirer de cette réaction remarquable mais improvisée dans l'urgence.

Après de longs mois de négociations finalement fructueuses, j'ai la fierté, en tant que rapporteure, de vous présenter ici les points forts que nous avons défendus pour tirer les leçons du passé et pour faire de ce règlement un véritable plan d'urgence sanitaire européen.

Chers collègues, cette notion mérite votre attention ou, au moins, votre respect, merci!

Nous sommes plus forts ensemble, et c'est ensemble que nous devrons nous doter d'une Europe de la santé solidaire, coordonnée, indépendante et durable.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Une Europe de la santé solidaire en luttant contre les inégalités de santé au sein de l'Union – par la coopération entre les États membres –, en renforçant la collaboration avec les pays tiers – surtout les plus démunis – et en consolidant la coopération mondiale – notamment par le traité international sur les pandémies.

Une Europe de la santé coordonnée: coordonnée dans la collecte et le partage des données – qui ont souvent fait défaut –, coordonnée pour préparer toutes les menaces sanitaires – en intégrant le principe de santé globale ainsi que le principe de prévention et d'éducation à la santé dans toutes les politiques européennes –, coordonnée pour mieux préparer et anticiper l'impact d'une crise sanitaire sur les personnes porteuses de maladies chroniques – et je pense en particulier aux nombreuses victimes collatérales chez les patients atteints de cancers –, coordonnée enfin pour lutter contre le fléau de la désinformation – en s'appuyant sur le CDC comme relais d'informations scientifiquement vérifiées.

Une Europe de la santé indépendante en matière de médicaments: nous avons imposé plus de transparence vis-à-vis du Parlement européen et des citoyens dans l'élaboration des contrats d'achat conjoints, nous y avons intégré la notion d'une clause d'exclusivité pour empêcher les négociations parallèles avec l'industrie et pour garantir un accès équitable aux médicaments pour tous les citoyens européens, nous demandons que l'autorité sanitaire ERA ait les moyens de mieux se coordonner avec les instances et nous proposons une évaluation de ces actions pour déterminer si elle doit oui ou non devenir une entité distincte.

Une Europe de la santé durable, enfin, avec la création d'un conseil scientifique indépendant, avec la mise en place de dispositions sur l'absence de conflit d'intérêts des experts, avec la consultation de toutes les autres parties prenantes (organisations non gouvernementales, professionnels de santé…) au même rang que les industriels, avec le renforcement du rôle du Parlement – et donc de la représentation citoyenne – et avec l'implication des autorités régionales – en vue de favoriser la coopération dans les régions transfrontalières.

Ces avancées majeures n'auraient pas été possibles sans la mobilisation de mes très chères corapporteures – une équipe 100 % féminine! Elles ont été tout sauf fictives. Je tiens à les saluer chaleureusement, elles ainsi que leurs équipes, avant de leur laisser la parole.

Joanna Kopcińska, *Sprawozdawczyni*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Po niemal dwóch latach prac legislacyjnych nad pakietem Europejskiej Unii Zdrowotnej przystępujemy do zatwierdzenia jej dwóch kluczowych elementów –wzmocnionego mandatu Europejskiego Centrum ds. Zapobiegania i Kontroli Chorób oraz rozporządzenia w sprawie poważnych transgranicznych zagrożeń dla zdrowia. Obie regulacje są komplementarne i mają wspólne cele – przygotować nas jak najlepiej na ewentualne przyszłe kryzysy zdrowotne, zapewniając spójność działań prewencyjnych. Wzmocniony mandat ECDC, którego negocjacje miałam zaszczyt prowadzić w imieniu Parlamentu, jest niezwykle ważnym ogniwem naszego zbiorowego systemu opieki zdrowotnej, wraz z rozporządzeniem w sprawie transgranicznych zagrożeń dla zdrowia, nad którym pracowałam jako sprawozdawca pomocniczy grupy ECR.

Pandemia COVID–19 była ciężkim, ale w pewnym stopniu cennym doświadczeniem dla narodowych systemów opieki zdrowotnej. Była ekstremalną lekcją poświęcenia, solidarności i zaradności. Przede wszystkim kryzys pandemiczny uwidocznił znaczenie szybkiego reagowania na szczeblu lokalnym na pojawianie się ognisk chorobowych i pokazał, jak ważne jest odpowiednie szkolenie personelu medycznego i administracji państw członkowskich przy opracowywaniu krajowego planu działań. Dlatego we wzmocnionym mandacie ECDC specjalną rolę odgrywać będzie grupa zadaniowa Unii Europejskiej ds. Zdrowia przy opracowywaniu, analizowaniu i aktualizowaniu planów gotowości państw członkowskich. Ponadto przekonaliśmy się, jak wielkie znaczenie ma cyfryzacja w zarządzaniu zdrowiem publicznym. Wyrażam nadzieję, że będą tworzone skuteczne platformy cyfrowe do nadzoru epidemiologicznego.

Kolejnym wzmocnieniem systemów nadzoru epidemiologicznego będzie sieć funkcjonalnych unijnych laboratoriów referencyjnych, a także sieci bezpieczeństwa microbiologicznego. Pandemia, a zwłaszcza pierwsze etapy jej przebiegu, kiedy poruszaliśmy się jeszcze w obszarze wielu niewiadomych, ujawniła potrzebę ścisłej koordynacji działań Unii Europejskiej i Światowej Organizacji Zdrowia. Dlatego cieszę się, że wynegocjowany mandat pomoże lepiej dostosować i skoordynować zalecenia i działania Unii Europejskiej z zaleceniami WHO w celu zapewnienia ich spójności i komplementarności.

Jako sprawozdawca Parlamentu dokładałam również starań, aby mandat i ECDC wspierał krajowe działania w dziedzinie ochrony zdrowia publicznego, a nie zastępował ich. Konieczne jest poszanowanie zasady pomocniczości działań na szczeblu Unii Europejskiej w taki sposób, aby Unia wspierała i koordynowała działania państw członkowskich tam, gdzie działania wyłącznie na szczeblu krajowym byłyby nieskuteczne. Uważam, że wynegocjowany tekst dobrze wyraża te proporcje kompetencji, a powierzenie centrum dodatkowych zadań wpisuje się w wymogi naszych czasów. Żadne państwo nie jest w stanie samodzielnie stawić czoła kryzysowi w zakresie zdrowia publicznego o charakterze transgranicznym. Dlatego w pełni popieram proponowane zwiększenie mandatu ECDC do monitorowania zagrożeń epidemicznych w Unii Europejskiej i rekomendowania działań zaradczych w ramach regulacji transgranicznych zagrożeń zdrowia odnośnie kompleksowych ram prawnych działań Unii w zakresie gotowości i wczesnego ostrzegania.

Dziękuję wszystkim posłom kontrsprawozdawcom pracującym przy sprawozdaniu ECDC za znakomitą współpracę i wiele cennych uwag w procesie negocjacji. Proszę Państwa o poparcie mojego sprawozdania. Jednocześnie pragnę pogratulować sprawozdawcy rozporządzenia Transgranicznych Zagrożeń Zdrowia pani Véronique Trillet-Lenoir. Szanowni Państwo, jestem przekonana, że przyświecają nam te same intencje. Chcemy lepszego poziomu zdrowia naszych obywateli, solidniejszych systemów opieki zdrowotnej, a w czasach kryzysu działań spójnych i skutecznych.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to start by expressing my great appreciation to this House for your support in turning the European health union proposals from ambition into reality. This strong European health union, for many of us, has been a vision that we have shared.

In November 2020, we presented that ambition – a set of proposals to build a strong European health union and to make the European Union better prepared to prevent, to prepare for and to respond to cross-border health threats. In less than two years, we're gathered here for the final steps in the adoption on serious cross-border threats to health and the regulation extending the mandate of the ECDC. Both serve as very important building blocks for our European health union. Both fit neatly together with the other important pieces of legislation for the new European health security framework. Thanks to our joint work, we will extend the European Centre for Disease Control and Prevention's mandate.

What will this actually mean? A stronger ECDC will be able to issue recommendations to Member States regarding health-threat preparedness. It will be able to host a new network of excellence of EU reference laboratories and to establish an EU health task force for rapid health interventions in the event of a major outbreak. As we have all witnessed, the ECDC has been essential in making sense of and in managing this pandemic. With a stronger focus, we will be better prepared for the future. The new regulation on cross-border threats paves the way for a stronger EU role in preventing, preparing and managing health threats. You have been instrumental in delivering on citizen expectations for more EU in the area of health, something that we also heard consistently in the Conference on the Future of Europe.

Parliament has fought hard to have some key elements included in this package, and I need to extend my thanks especially to the rapporteurs, honourable Members Ms Kopcińska and Ms Trillet-Lenoir, and their whole teams for this. We have worked together tirelessly to get here today. You have each played your part in securing the provisions on joint procurement of medical countermeasures; you supported the inclusion of the one-health approach, and you made sure that prevention featured alongside response and preparedness activities. With your support, we made sure that Member States will have to report on stocks of critical medical countermeasures. They should take account of the Union preparedness plan when updating their national plans. The ECDC is empowered to access those national plans periodically, on top of periodic reporting to Member States. Meanwhile, the EU's Health Security Committee will be reconvened at senior level and will be able to issue recommendations and opinions. With Parliament's new observer status secured, I am pleased to say that this committee is even stronger. I must mention that the Commission does still have some institutional concerns on both texts and will be issuing statements on these accordingly.

In ending, honourable Members, this debate gives me the opportunity to really thank you again for your support to bring this package today and to work towards its adoption. And as we move into the implementation phase, we'll be taking further important steps together to turn this into a reality – because this can only mean better results for our citizens and this is what they rightfully expect from us.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Commission Statement on 'Serious cross-border threats to health' – Serious cross-border threats to health and repealing Decision No 1082/2013/EU (Regulation) – Trillet-Lenoir report – 2020/0322 (COD), SI(2022) 65/2

The Commission welcomes the overall agreement reached by the co-legislators on the proposal for a Regulation on serious cross-border threats to health. This new Regulation provides for a strong health security framework in the EU and will strengthen EU-level protection, prevention, preparedness and response against cross-border health challenges.

The Commission regrets that the agreed text does not fully align the Regulation with the principle of one Commission and singles out one specific internal Commission service, whereas the Regulation will be implemented by the Commission (including other Commission departments) and other actors. Therefore, the agreement reached between the European Parliament and the Council on the provisions that refer to a specific Commission internal service is without prejudice to any future legislative texts.

Moreover, the Commission also regrets that the co-legislators agreed to include a review clause, which includes an assessment of the need to establish the European Health Emergency preparedness and Response Authority (HERA) as a distinct entity from the Commission. Such an assessment goes beyond the scope of the Regulation and should remain within the Commission's remit as HERA is a Commission service. Moreover, it duplicates the assessment that is to be carried out under the Council Regulation on a framework of measures for ensuring the supply of crisis-relevant medical countermeasures in the event of a public health emergency at Union level.

Commission Statement on 'Reinforcement of the mandate of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control' – Amending Regulation (EC) No 851/2004 establishing a European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control – Kopcińska report – 2020/0320 (COD), SI(2021) 334

The Commission welcomes the overall agreement reached by the co-legislators on the proposal for a Regulation on the extension of the mandate of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. The new Regulation will reinforce the capacity of the Centre to support the EU and its Member States in the prevention and control of communicable disease threats and improve European preparedness for future health challenges.

The Commission regrets that the agreed text does not fully align the Regulation with the principles of the Common Approach on the EU decentralised agencies, as regards the voting regime of the Management Board concerning the rules governing the languages of the Centre. Therefore the agreement reached between the European Parliament and the Council on the language regime of the agency is without prejudice to any future legislative texts. The Commission remains convinced of the benefits of following all aspects of the Common Approach in relation to decentralised agencies.

José Manuel Fernandes, *relator de parecer da Comissão dos Orçamentos*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caras e Caros Colegas, é nossa obrigação tudo fazer para proteger a vida dos cidadãos e dar-lhes as melhores condições de saúde. Para isso, é necessária coordenação e partilha. Para isso, é urgente uma união da saúde, uma união da saúde que comprovou a compra conjunta e a investigação para as vacinas e que permitiu vacinas para todos e um preço mais barato.

É necessária esta coordenação também na área da investigação, onde se pode fazer mais, na área do cancro. Sempre defendemos um plano europeu de combate à prevenção e ao tratamento do cancro. Para além disso, os cuidados transfronteiriços são, obviamente, essenciais, tal como a possibilidade de um exame que é feito num país poder ser utilizado noutro país. Isto significa eficiência e significa poupança de recursos.

Para além de tudo aquilo que aqui referi, é necessário um trabalho conjunto para recuperarmos o atraso que tivemos na pandemia. Por exemplo, um país como o meu, Portugal, teve este ano, em relação à média da União Europeia, uma taxa excessiva de mortalidade que ficou muito para além da média da União.

Kim Van Sparrentak, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection*. – Madam President, dear colleagues. I would like to comment in particular on procurement, which is within the IMCO remit.

I welcome the provisions where our IMCO opinion was improved in a practical way. For example, the EU-exclusive procurement, meaning that countries would not be able to negotiate with different manufacturers in parallel. For this issue, a great compromise was found, which is that only after assessment it is decided if it is an EU-exclusive procurement. And this makes sense, since the EU exclusive procurement would be beneficial regarding counter-measures involving plenty of options on the market, for example with tests, but would not be beneficial for other measures where there might be a shortage, for example with vaccines.

Looking at the final text, although we certainly did not get everything we wanted from the Greens EFA and IMCO side, I still welcome this regulation which will surely contribute to strengthening the Union's coordinated response to public health emergencies.

Радан Кънев, *от името на групата PPE*. – Г-жо Председател, важно е да подкрепим това споразумение между институциите за обща европейска здравна политика, за обща политика срещу заразните заболявания. Тя е единствената възможност едновременно да защитим най-важното си достояние – свободата на движение и единния пазар, но да защитим и гражданите на Съюза от следващи подобни здравни кризи.

Преди всичко одобрените от институциите решения дават възможност научните изводи в медицината да се правят на база на половин милиард население в нашите държави, съчетано с една от най напредналите медицински науки в света. Обработката на тези данни, споделени между всички наши държави, ще даде възможност Европейският съюз да бъде лидер в медицинската наука, което автоматично значи и европейското население да бъде най-добре защитеното от здравни заплахи население в света – така, както трябва да бъде.

От особено значение – и с това приключвам – е да следим настоятелно за може би най-голямото постижение на Парламента в тези междуинституционални преговори с Европейския съвет. И това беше възможността да се работи върху връзката между заразни и хронични заболявания, да се изследват именно на база на тази огромна база научни данни взаимовръзките, които съществуват между тежките хронични заболявания и инфекциозните заболявания, и по този начин да осъществим исторически медицински пробив.

Sara Cerdas, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, há pouco mais de dois anos e meio, a União Europeia foi assolada pela maior pandemia dos últimos cem anos que atingiu todos no mundo, sem qualquer exceção.

A UE respondeu, na altura, com os instrumentos de então, mas cedo percebemos a necessidade de construirmos uma verdadeira União Europeia para a Saúde. Este regulamento é, assim, o culminar de vários meses de intensas negociações, com os princípios de «uma só saúde» e «saúde em todas as políticas» na sua essência, reconhecendo que a saúde é parte integrante de qualquer sociedade próspera.

Este regulamento contempla: a criação de planos de prevenção, preparação e resposta, a nível nacional e a nível europeu; o reconhecimento de emergência de saúde pública; uma maior articulação e coordenação com as entidades internacionais, como a Organização Mundial da Saúde, pois as crises não conhecem fronteiras; testes de stress e formação aos diversos níveis para os profissionais de saúde; mais transparência; laboratórios de referência e redução da carga administrativa para quem gere a crise; colaborações multissetoriais e uma clara aposta na literacia para a saúde e no combate à desinformação.

Este é, assim, um momento histórico. Temos um mandato mais robusto, pois em crise somos tão mais fortes quanto o nosso elo mais fraco.

Uma palavra final de agradecimento a quem tornou tudo isto possível: à Comissão, às duas Presidências que trabalharam connosco e, em especial, a ti, Véronique, e a toda a equipa de relatores-sombra, por termos conseguido estar à altura do desafio. Por uma União Europeia para a Saúde que não deixe ninguém para trás.

Nicolae Ștefănuță, *în numele grupului Renew*. – Doamna comisară, dragă Véronique, cât să mai fim pacienți de mâna a doua ? Cum e să fii bolnav și să știi, de exemplu, că în Belgia ai avea acces imediat, iar în România nu ai nici măcar un pat liber în spital? Să nu ai seringi, să nu ai săpun sau hârtie igienică! Uneori trebuie să cumperi și medicamentele din spital, să vii cu ele de acasă. Sibienii mei își doresc atât de mult un nou spital încât au făcut deja planuri, studii de fezabilitate, tot. Mai au nevoie doar de bani să îl construiască. Hai să trimitem banii promiși pentru sănătate acolo unde este cea mai mare nevoie.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Am trecut doi ani grei prin pandemie împreună și Europa a știut să fie împreună, iar Centrul European de Prevenire și Control al Bolilor a fost un adevărat scut pentru viață și sănătate. Dar Agenția are nevoie de noi ca să meargă mai departe. Are nevoie de bani, are nevoie de resurse, are nevoie de oameni. Acum este momentul să o ajutăm. Nu mai putem continua ca unii europeni să aibă și alții să nu, unii să trăiască și alții să moară cu zile. Vrem egalitate acum, vrem sănătate europeană acum!

Margrete Auken, *for Verts/ALE-Gruppen*. – Fru Formand! Først tak til et godt samarbejde med et dygtigt forhandlerteam. Vi grønne har især fokuseret på et helhedsorienteret syn på sundhed. Når vores natur og miljø trues, trues vores helbred også. Forringet biodiversitet og tiltagende forurening udgør en generel sundhedsrisiko og øger dertil faren for nye pandemier. Den helhedstænkning er kommet med nu.

Vi havde gerne set større gennemsigtighed, når det gælder fælles indkøb og forhandlinger med medicinalindustrien. Skatteborgerne har ret til at vide, hvordan deres penge bruges.

Vi fik en smule åbenhed i beslutningstagningen i og med, at der deltager parlamentarikere på flere niveauer. Det giver borgerne en chance for at følge med. Hvis regeringerne er alene, er der meget sjældent åbenhed om arbejdet, slet ikke på sammen måde, som vi har i Parlamentet.

Men hvad med global solidaritet? Det er decideret beskæmmende for industrien, der har modtaget milliarder af euro til f. eks. vaccineudviklingen og også fremover vil blive godt polstret fra det offentlige, at de bekæmper en deling af såvel viden som opskrifter på den livsvigtige medicin. Og det lige så beskæmmende, at vores regeringer tager deres og ikke menneskedens parti i denne sag.

Mathilde Androuët, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, il y a une certaine ironie à plaider pour toujours plus d'Union européenne quand, justement, l'Union européenne a prouvé qu'elle était inapte à faire mieux sur certains sujets, et notamment ici celui de la crise de la COVID-19 et de la santé. Ne vous en déplaise, dans le cadre de la crise de la COVID-19, les réponses les plus adaptées, les plus rapides et les plus efficaces ont été des solutions de proximité. Vouloir préempter un sujet qui appartient aux seuls États souverains pour se montrer encore plus maladroit, toujours plus éloigné des patients et surtout moins transparent, comme lors de la crise de la COVID-19 – qui s'est soldée par une commande surdimensionnée de vaccins, négociée dans des conditions auxquelles même les parlementaires européens n'ont pu avoir accès –, relève ainsi de l'hubris.

Vous vous souciez des menaces transfrontalières graves pour la santé: commencez par remettre des frontières – c'est une première prévention – et assurez-vous que l'Union européenne ne passe pas son temps à délocaliser l'industrie pharmaceutique. En effet, comment ne pas s'inquiéter du fait que 80 % des principes actifs de nos médicaments proviennent d'Inde ou de Chine? Laissez les États gérer leur système de santé et faites plutôt de l'Union européenne un outil de renforcement de notre indépendance médicamenteuse et de ces agences des pôles de recherche communs dont le but est de créer, d'avancer ensemble, et non de fliquer les États membres.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria Dalli y señora comisaria Kyriakides, queridos colegas, la crisis de la COVID-19 ha estado plagada de errores y de escasa transparencia, tanto en los Estados miembros como en las labores de coordinación ejercidas por la Comisión.

Estas propuestas deben servir para mejorar el acceso a la información y la coordinación para ganar agilidad en la gestión de las crisis. La mejora de los instrumentos sanitarios disponibles no puede suponer, en ningún caso, una excusa para imponer políticas orquestadas desde la Comisión Europea para vaciar paulatinamente de competencias a los Estados miembros.

Coordinar en materia sanitaria no implica imponer unilateralmente medidas desproporcionadas o desechar mecanismos eficaces a nivel nacional. La inminente reforma de la legislación farmacéutica europea demostrará si hemos sido capaces de trabajar de manera conjunta para encontrar el respeto al equilibrio de competencias que beneficie a la salud de los europeos, a la innovación y, a la vez, también, al desarrollo industrial y a la autonomía de los suministros.

Kateřina Konečná, *za skupinu The Left*. – Paní předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, přijetím těchto dvou nařízení dokončujeme práci, která započala s pandemií COVID-19. Ač mám vůči všem třem hlavním dokumentům tvořícím Evropskou zdravotní unii značné výhrady, pevně doufám, že nám jejich včasná a hladká implementace umožní dostatečně se připravit na další pandemii, která bezesporu přijde. Bohužel přijatá legislativa má značné limity, které vychází především z toho, jak málo se věnuje primární právo EU spolupráci mezi členskými státy v oblasti zdravotní péče. V dlouhodobém horizontu tohle musíme změnit. Spolupráce v oblasti veřejného zdraví a péče by si ve Smlouvách zasloužila zásadní předělání. Pokud k tomu nedojde, budeme navždy odsouzeni pouze kosmeticky látat díry, které se neustále

objevují.

Já se však v současnosti dívám k snad blížící se revizi v evropské farmaceutické legislativě. Jen ta nám může pomoci tlumit problémy v evropské zdravotní péči a její dostupnosti, které pandemie pouze odkryla. Je na váženou, že Komise tuto dekády očekávanou revizi stále nepředložila. Moc času v tomto volebním období již totiž nezbývá. Stávající rámec jak obecné farmaceutické legislativy, tak práv duševního vlastnictví či léků na vzácná onemocnění a přeshraniční zdravotní péči již nepostačuje požadavkům doby. Neustále se nám zhoršuje přístup občanů k lékům i zdravotní péči, prohlubují se rozdíly napříč EU a dá se předpokládat, že současný souběh různých krizí tyto problémy pouze akceleruje. Je pět minut po dvanácté, je třeba začít něco dělat především pro občany EU.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con la pandemia da COVID-19 gli Stati membri hanno compreso l'importanza di migliorare le risposte comuni alle emergenze sanitarie transfrontaliere. Il rafforzamento della cooperazione a livello europeo consentirà un coordinamento più efficace per prevenire e prepararsi a gestire non solo le malattie infettive, ma anche le differenti minacce per la salute pubblica di origine ambientale, alimentare, biologica e chimica.

Il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie sarà un attore fondamentale per il monitoraggio, l'analisi e la consulenza, sia prima che durante la crisi. La disponibilità di sufficienti forniture di prodotti e servizi sanitari che siano accessibili a tutti deve essere prioritaria nella pianificazione nazionale ed europea, così come ogni sforzo dovrà essere compiuto per ridurre la nostra dipendenza da Stati terzi sui farmaci e dispositivi medici.

Trasparenza e partecipazione devono essere caratterizzate in ogni processo decisionale, così come le negoziazioni con le industrie del settore. Più solida sarà l'Unione europea della salute, più forte sarà la protezione sanitaria dei diritti dei cittadini europei.

Esther de Lange (PPE). – Voorzitter, één minuut is veel te kort om dit hele onderhandelingsresultaat in de spotlights te zetten. Laat mij allereerst Véronique Trillet-Lenoir bedanken en alle leden van ons team. We waren misschien van verschillende politieke fracties, maar we hadden gemeenschappelijke prioriteiten en daar wil ik jullie voor bedanken.

In deze korte tijd wil ik drie dingen doen. Ik wil zeggen waar ik het meest trots op ben. Het meest trots ben ik in dit onderhandelingsresultaat op het feit dat de continuïteit van de zorg, het voorkomen van uitgestelde zorg, verplicht wordt meegenomen in de voorbereidingsplannen van de lidstaten. Je hoeft maar naar de rapporten over te laat gestelde diagnoses van bijvoorbeeld kinderkanker te kijken om te weten waarom dit een prioriteit was van het Europees Parlement.

Ik wil zeggen waar ik het meest van baal. Ik baal het meest van het feit dat geestelijke gezondheid niet verplicht wordt meegenomen in de nationale voorbereidingsplannen. Wij hadden dat als Parlement graag gewild en de Raad werkte daartegen. Volgens mij hoef je maar vanuit Straatsburg te kijken om te weten dat dit in heel Europa meer aandacht behoeft.

Tot slot wat ik het meest vrees. Wat ik het meest vrees is dat de Raad bij een volgende pandemie toch weer terugvalt op die nationale reflex. De Conferentie over de toekomst van Europa heeft laten zien dat de burgers dat niet wensen. Deze wetgeving maakt een Europese aanpak mogelijk. Daarom vraag ik om steun bij de stemming deze week.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Fru talman! Kommissionär! Än är pandemin inte över, men i EU har vi tack vare vaccin förhoppningsvis lagt det värsta bakom oss. I en europeisk hälsounion får vi nu nya verktyg för att hindra att nästa mutation av corona eller ett ännu okänt virus blir en ny pandemi.

Om medlemsstaterna tidigt kan dela data med varandra kan vi nämligen förutspå nästa steg, och vi kan införa lokala restriktioner redan innan viruset nått fram. Hela EU behöver skyddsutrustning, intensivvårdsplatser och testlabb, och om en medlemsstat har fulla testlabb kan en annan medlemsstat hjälpa till.

Det är genom ökad transparens kring gemensam upphandling som vi kan bekämpa desinformation och vaccinmotstånd. Virus och pandemier känner inga gränser, och jag ser verkligen fram emot bättre koordinering för att vi ska kunna bemästra virus och pandemier i framtiden.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Lepo pozdravljeni kolegice in kolegi, spoštovana komisarka.

Zdravje je temelj vsega. Brez zdravja ni delujočega gospodarstva, šolskih sistemov, socialnega varstva, politike … ničesar.

Dokler ga imamo, v vsakodnevnem življenju nanj radi pozabimo. Ampak pred dvema letoma smo vsi prejeli jasno opozorilo, ki je pokazalo tudi, kako zelo ranljive so posamezne države pri boju proti krizam takšnih razsežnosti.

Obvladovanje čezmejnih groženj in nevarnosti javnemu zdravju je odvisno od seveda številnih dejavnikov. Prvi je okrepitev mandata Evropskega centra za preprečevanje in obvladovanje bolezni.

Njegovo uspešno delovanje bo odvisno tudi od digitalizacije, zbiranja podatkov in njihove obdelave, pri čemer mora biti zagotovljena tudi ustrezna varnost. Kakovost zdravljenja in dostopnost do zdravil med tem ne smeta biti odvisna od države, iz katere prihajaš.

Zato potrebujemo enotne standarde in njihovo zagotavljanje, morda celo skupno javno naročanje zdravstvenih izdelkov prek agencije EMA. Najpomembnejše je, da imamo vzpostavljen učinkovit zdravstveni sistem, ker nihče od nas ne pozna prihodnosti.

Zdravje pa je, kot rečeno, temelj vsega.

Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais commencer par féliciter mes collègues pour leur travail sur ces deux dossiers, qui posent le préalable indispensable à un renforcement de la coordination européenne en matière de santé.

Je suis toutefois partagée: pour moi, l'Europe de la santé devrait s'inscrire en ligne droite avec les citoyennes et les citoyens, pour l'Europe. C'est l'Europe sociale qu'ils appellent de leurs vœux.

Pourtant, une fois encore, le Conseil et la Commission ont fait en sorte de limiter la demande du Parlement, qui réclamait plus de transparence et un droit de regard systématique sur l'argent public dépensé.

La transparence ne devrait pas être une bataille mais un processus acté, et je suis agacée par le fait que nos chefs d'États, après maintes requêtes, ne le reconnaissent pas.

Changer l'Europe et la renforcer, c'est avant tout construire une Europe dans laquelle nous avons confiance, et la transparence est essentielle pour cela.

Joachim Kuhs (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, werte Kollegen! Die in dem Bericht vorgestellten Vorschläge zur Stärkung des Europäischen Zentrums für die Prävention und die Kontrolle von Krankheiten (ECDC) hören sich zuerst mal gut an. Niemand ist dagegen, dass wir besser vorbereitet und gewappnet sind für kommende Pandemien und grenzüberschreitende Gesundheitsbedrohungen. Warum werde ich aber das dumpfe Gefühl nicht los, dass diese nützlichen Gründe für die Stärkung des ECDC nur weitere Schritte sind, um auf dem Weg der lückenlosen Erfassung aller Gesundheitsdaten aller Bürger eine Art grenzenloses Überwachungssystem à la China einzuführen?

Wenn die Generaldirektorin, Frau Gallina, vor zwei Wochen freudestrahlend im Haushaltsausschuss verkündet, sie habe nahezu eine Milliarde COVID-Zertifikate ausgestellt, dann erstirbt mir das Lachen im Hals. Das ist ein Angriff auf die Freiheit unserer Bürger. Das sollten wir nicht weiter unterstützen. Frau Kommissarin, geben Sie diese Aufgabe wieder zurück in die Hände der Mitgliedstaaten!

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Madame la Présidente, la pandémie nous a obligés, nous l'Union européenne, à faire un pas en avant dans le domaine des politiques de santé, et nous l'avons fait. C'est le mieux que l'on pouvait faire pour la santé, et ce règlement en est une expression concrète.

Nous nous réjouissons que, à l'issue des derniers trilogues, la version définitive de cette norme intègre certaines des propositions que nous avons émises. Faire en sorte, par exemple, que les autorités régionales participent à l'élaboration des plans de prévention et de préparation aux menaces sanitaires transfrontalières. Des gouvernements comme celui de la Catalogne, dont j'étais conseiller de santé, ont beaucoup à dire à ce sujet.

Mais il y a davantage dans ce règlement que nous célébrons: la vision holistique, par exemple, qui fait que ces plans de préparation tiendront compte de l'impact des menaces épidémiologiques sur la santé mentale et les autres maladies non infectieuses, ou encore l'incorporation des principes fondamentaux «One Health».

La pandémie nous a mieux que jamais fait comprendre le lien entre santé humaine, santé animale et santé environnementale, de même qu'elle nous a fait repenser toutes nos politiques de santé. Comment, dès lors, pourrions-nous mener des politiques de prévention sans reconnaître le rôle central des déterminants sociaux?

Il ne fait aucun doute que l'approbation de ce règlement est une bonne nouvelle pour le droit à la santé des citoyens européens, et nous nous en réjouissons.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! „The pandemic is over." Das sagte der US-Präsident Joe Biden und fügte hinzu: „We still have a problem with COVID." Und ich glaube, Joe Biden ist ziemlich nah an einer realistischen Einschätzung der Lage.

Wir sind jetzt in einer viel, viel besseren Situation als 2020 und 2021. Wir haben ein anderes Virus. Wir haben einen hohen Schutz durch einen sehr guten Impfstoff, der auch mithilfe der Europäischen Union hergestellt, entwickelt und zur Verfügung gestellt wurde. Vieles war nicht perfekt, aber wir sollten auch nicht vergessen, dass wir jetzt an einer viel besseren Stelle stehen, auch durch Handeln der Europäischen Union.

Wir können uns auf die anderen Sorgen konzentrieren, die die Menschen umtreiben. Und das müssen wir, weil diese anderen Probleme, zum Beispiel im Energiebereich, groß sind. Die beiden Texte, die jetzt zur Abstimmung vorliegen, sorgen dafür, dass wir beim nächsten Mal, wenn uns so etwas wieder passiert, besser vorbereitet sind. Danke an alle, die mitgeholfen haben, insbesondere für die EVP Esther de Lange und Radan Kanev.

Wenn wir nach China schauen, dann sehen wir, dass da das Problem noch nicht vorbei ist. Also ganz so schlecht hat es Europa nicht gemacht.

Günther Sidl (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Frau Kommissarin! Die Corona-Pandemie hat gezeigt, dass Alleingänge der Nationalstaaten in einer solchen Situation völlig verantwortungslos sind. Sie sind schon in normalen Zeiten nicht sinnvoll, aber bei einer gemeinsamen Krise braucht es mehr Solidarität und Zusammenarbeit. Es hat sich aber auch gezeigt, dass die Europäische Union hier über eindeutig zu wenig Kompetenzen verfügt hat. Die Menschen haben nach Brüssel geblickt, um Antworten und Lösungen zu erhalten, aber Europa hatte zu wenig Handlungsmöglichkeiten, und das müssen wir ändern. Wir werden nun mit den vorliegenden Verordnungen Schritte setzen, die eine bessere Vorbereitung und Reaktion auf künftige Pandemien ermöglichen.

Weiters werden wir in Forschung und Entwicklung investieren, unsere Abhängigkeiten reduzieren und die gemeinsame Beschaffung erleichtern.

Und eines ist mir persönlich ganz, ganz wichtig, und dort müssen wir auch hinkommen, nämlich zu starken öffentlichen Gesundheitssystemen in Europa. Sie sind der zentrale Anker für die Menschen in Krisenzeiten, und dies muss auch verbunden sein mit einem wirklichen Vorsorgedenken im Gesundheitsbereich.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Stelios Kympouropoulos (PPE). – Madame President, as the COVID-19 pandemic evidenced, there is currently a limited legal framework for EU-level coordination into serious cross-border threats to health. We need a common EU-level response to harmonise communication and to show solidarity among Member States.

Presenting these proposals sets a historical and more comprehensive legal basis for the EU to prepare and respond to future crises. In my view, to do so sufficiently, we should guarantee that every EU citizen has equal and easy access to all health-care systems among the Member States, and especially when moving freely from one state to another.

Moreover, as most of the consequences after a serious cross-border health threat have a great impact on mental health, we should invest in protecting our citizens' mental health by outlining a strategic framework that provides for mental wellbeing and support.

Dear Madam Commissioner, let's use the lessons learnt from COVID-19 to embrace EU guidance on preparedness, surveillance and risk assessment and early warning supported by improvement to data collection to better respond to future cross-border health threats.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señora presidenta, quisiera dar las gracias a la señora comisaria, aquí presente, y a los colegas que han trabajado en estas dos normas, que me parecen fundamentales, porque son los dos grandes pilares de la unión sanitaria, un proyecto que arrancó, obviamente, a raíz de la pandemia.

La comisaria ha señalado que hizo la propuesta en noviembre del 2020 y ahí sí que me permito una pequeña crítica: creo que tendría que haberse hecho incluso antes. «Bien está lo que bien acaba», pero ya en abril de ese año socialistas españoles como Javi López, César Luena y yo mismo planteamos a la Comisión la cuestión de la unión sanitaria. El Grupo de Socialistas y Demócratas también hizo la misma propuesta en mayo de 2020.

En cualquier caso, nos encontramos ahora en una situación en la que podemos sacarle a esta unión sanitaria el máximo partido. ¿Por qué? Porque, como se ha dicho, la pandemia del coronavirus virus no está completamente superada y la hipótesis más probable será seguramente tener que realizar campañas de vacunación anuales dirigidas al conjunto de la sociedad europea.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, sejamos claros: do que estamos a falar é de um caminho para o mercado da saúde na União Europeia. Fazer da saúde um negócio, promover a sua privatização, com os prejuízos que os portugueses bem sentem na pele, com a degradação do Serviço Nacional de Saúde e pondo em causa a sua dimensão universal, a qualidade e a garantia do direito à saúde.

Um caminho que a Comissão Europeia já vem trilhando através de constrangimentos orçamentais e das recomendações específicas por país, que impõem cortes na despesa primária do Estado na saúde. Estamos perante um caminho que visa escancarar as portas à liberalização, privatização e concentração no setor da saúde, transferindo, simultaneamente, competências dos Estados para a esfera supranacional.

Perdem os povos, salivam os grandes grupos económicos com as perspetivas de transformar a doença em lucro. A organização dos cuidados de saúde é uma competência nacional e assim deve ser, garantindo serviços públicos de elevada qualidade, gratuitos e universais, com adequados investimentos nas infraestruturas, nas respostas de especialidade e de proximidade, valorizando os profissionais de saúde e as suas condições laborais.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, and I think while there is certainly a need to improve and deepen European collaboration in order to prevent, monitor and respond to cross-border health threats, I think COVID, more than anything, has highlighted actually the harmful consequences of neoliberal policy adjusted to the health sector and promoted in the EU.

The commodification of health care is assaulting the principle that health is a fundamental right. And we see in countless states institutional abuse, lack of materials, exorbitant prices and the priority given to profit. And where is this coming from? It's coming from the Commission. We know that many Member States have been directed to slaughter their health budgets in order to balance the books. And we saw those devastating consequences then, in COVID, when people and economies had to be basically shut down, people were locked in nursing homes, nobody could visit them because of the fear of what would happen if there was an outbreak of COVID and the hospitals couldn't cope.

So we need to ensure that health is immune from the loss of the market. Health should be a fundamental right.

Przewodnicząca. – *(w reakcji na uwagi M. Spyraki wygłoszone przy wyłączonym mikrofonie)* Nie mam w wykazie, Pani Poseł, żeby Pani się zgłosiła.

Maria Spyraki (PPE). – Madam President, sorry, the machine said 'yes', and you have to behave fairly in this procedure.

Przewodnicząca. – Udzielam Pani głosu, bardzo proszę.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Κυριακίδου, κυρία Επίτροπε, ο κανονισμός για την Ένωση Υγείας, που ψηφίζουμε αύριο, αποτελεί ένα σημαντικό βήμα στη δημιουργία του νομοθετικού πλαισίου, το οποίο θα προχωρήσει σε άμεση εφαρμογή προς τα κράτη μέλη, ώστε κατ' αρχήν να συνεργάζονται στην ανταλλαγή δεδομένων με ασφάλεια και διαλειτουργικότητα και να μετατοπίζουν άμεσα τη στόχευσή τους στην πρόληψη των ασθενειών και των επιδημιών. Η περίοδος της πανδημίας μάς δίδαξε πως κανένα κράτος μέλος, όσο ισχυρό και να είναι, όση ισχυρή οικονομία και να διαθέτει, όσο σύγχρονο και στελεχωμένο σύστημα υγείας και να έχει στη διάθεσή του, δεν μπορεί να αντιμετωπίσει, χωρίς την ευρωπαϊκή συνεργασία και αλληλεγγύη, χωρίς την κοινή δράση, τις κρίσεις μεγάλης κλίμακας.

Η πρόληψη του καρκίνου και η διαρκής φροντίδα των πασχόντων, όπως περιγράφονται στο ευρωπαϊκό σχέδιο που εκπονήσαμε σε συνεργασία με την Επιτροπή, οφείλει πρώτα απ' όλα να εφαρμοστεί με ευλάβεια από τα κράτη μέλη και να αποτελέσει οδηγό για τα επόμενα βήματα. Ταυτόχρονα, η διασυνοριακή πρόσβαση στα καινοτόμα φάρμακα και την ιατρική περίθαλψη υψηλής τεχνολογίας αποτελεί υποχρέωση των κυβερνήσεών μας. Οφείλουμε να δώσουμε στους Ευρωπαίους ίσες ευκαιρίες στην πρόληψη και την περίθαλψη, είτε ζουν στο Καστελόριζο και το Νευροκόπι είτε στο κέντρο των Βρυξελλών και του Παρισιού.

Przewodnicząca. – Bardzo dziękuję, Pani Poseł! Oczywiście udzieliłam Pani głosu, mimo że nie mieliśmy odnotowane, że Pani się zgłosiła.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you, Madam President. Honourable Members, thank you for yet another very important debate.

Now, the solutions to this pandemic and other major health threats which challenge us lie, as some of you have already mentioned – MEP Cerdas, MEP Sidl – in collaboration and in solidarity. With the two rapporteurs of these important reports, we have often discussed this. And this is the way we are moving forward as a European Commission: putting forward proposals that are built on this solidarity and collaboration – the Pharmaceutical Strategy, the European Health Data Space, and Europe's Beating Cancer Plan. We must continue to take it to the next stage.

The COVID-19 crisis has shown us we could and we can do things better and differently. Many of us seem to have forgotten where we were in early 2020. We take it for granted that we would have safe and effective vaccines, that these would be available for all Member States at the same time, no matter how big or small. Member States had access to these vaccines, but 2.4 billion were also exported to the rest of the world. In fact, two thirds of what we produced in the EU was exported to the rest of the world.

This unprecedented health crisis showed the importance of what the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) can do, but also what we needed to improve, and that cross-border threats need a different approach. So it's only right that we've designed a stronger legal framework to enhance EU capacity in the areas of prevention, preparedness, surveillance, risk assessment, early warning and response.

Honourable Members, with these new regulations, we've shown that we can move forward together decisively and faster. And of course, I took note of what MEP Esther de Lange said on the importance of mental health. It remains a very high priority in this Commission, as it should do. You mentioned cancer as well. Two weeks ago, we proposed new screening guidelines with very specific targets for all Member States.

So this is a strong European Health Union we are building together, and this is how we can make this health union work for all its citizens, because they expect and deserve no less.

Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, *rapporteure*. – Madame la Présidente, madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, vous l'avez dit, cette proposition législative ainsi que la révision des mandats de l'EMA et de l'ECDC est une contribution majeure à l'Europe de la santé que nous construisons pas à pas depuis le début de ce mandat.

Je salue une nouvelle fois notre équipe de négociation, chères Esther, Sarah, Margrete, Johanna et Katerina. Nous avons défendu ce règlement au titre bien peu lisible: «Menaces transfrontières graves pour la santé», pour en faire ensemble un véritable plan européen de réponse aux urgences sanitaires.

Avec cet accord, nous répondons aux 74 % de citoyens européens qui souhaitent plus de compétences européennes en matière de santé et de gestion des crises. Cette construction, chère Stella, se poursuivra avec la révision de la législation pharmaceutique par laquelle, nous le voulons et nous le ferons, nous avancerons vers une véritable Europe du médicament.

Mais ces refontes législatives ne sont qu'un début. Notre projet se poursuivra dans le cadre d'une future convention sur la révision des traités européens et nous nous réjouissons que la Commission, que je remercie également pour son soutien pendant ce trilogue, soit de nouveau prête à relever ce défi.

Chers collègues, par votre vote de demain, vous pouvez convaincre les États membres de la pertinence d'une véritable politique européenne de la santé, au-delà des crispations sur les prérogatives nationales qui ont montré toutes leurs limites, voire leurs effets délétères. La santé ne doit plus être perçue comme un coût, mais comme un investissement durable en faveur du bien-être et du mieux vivre des citoyennes et des citoyens européens. Alors, en leur nom, je vous remercie pour votre soutien.

Joanna Kopcińska, *Sprawozdawczyni*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Dziękuję za wszystkie uwagi i komentarze, za wspólną, intensywną i rzetelną pracę. Pragnę podziękować także Pani Komisarz Stelli Kyriakides za propozycję rozporządzenia, jaką przedstawiła Komisja w pakiecie Unii Zdrowia. Dziękuję również za pomoc w kwestii zapisów budżetowych agencji. Chcę również wyrazić podziękowanie dla ówczesnej prezydencji słoweńskiej za negocjacje oraz liczne spotkania na poziomie technicznym. Dziękuję także Radzie za postawę otwartości i niezbędnej elastyczności negocjacyjnej. Wreszcie jeszcze raz moim kolegom i koleżankom sprawozdawcom pomocniczym za Państwa postawę merytorycznej i konstruktywnej współpracy.

Jeszcze raz gratuluję sprawozdawcy rozporządzenia Transgranicznych Zagrożeń Zdrowia. Wynegocjowane porozumienie daje szansę na synergię między środkami unijnymi i krajowymi i jednocześnie unika powielania podejmowanych prac. Odnosząc się do Państwa komentarzy, pragnę powiedzieć, że zgadzam się, że można było zrobić więcej. Praktycznie zawsze można zrobić więcej. Niemniej jednak sam Benjamin Franklin powiedział kiedyś, że najlepsi lekarze dają najmniej lekarstw. Dlatego kierując się tą zasadą, również jako lekarz z wykształcenia, starałam się znaleźć odpowiednie rozwiązania dotyczące synergii działań między ECDC, Komisją i państwami, przy jednoczesnym adekwatnym doborze środków do naszych realnych możliwości.

W pracy nad rozporządzeniem o ECDC skupiłam się na kluczowych aspektach dotyczących wzmocnienia gotowości, poprawie sprawozdawczości danych oraz rzetelnej analizie ryzyka, które wszyscy z Państwa również głęboko podzielaliście. Wierzę, że zaproponowane zmiany w istotny sposób rozszerzają mandat agencji, przez co zyskuje ona operacyjność, by lepiej zadbać o bezpieczeństwo Europejczyków.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę łączną.

Głosowanie odbędzie się jutro, tj. we wtorek 4 października 2022 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Bartosz Arłukowicz (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Drogie Koleżanki i Koledzy! Cieszę się, że dziś robimy ważny krok w kierunku urzeczywistnienia Europejskiej Unii Zdrowotnej, którą Przewodnicząca Komisji Europejskiej, pani Ursula von der Leyen, zapowiadała na Światowym Szczycie Zdrowia dwa lata temu (25 października 2020 roku).

Budujemy dziś podstawy silniejszej Europejskiej Unii Zdrowotnej, w ramach której 27 państw będzie ze sobą współpracować w celu wykrywania zagrożeń oraz wspólnego przygotowywania się i reagowania na nie. Ale jest jeszcze ważniejsza sprawa, którą mam nadzieję zajmiemy się już wkrótce. Chodzi o wspólne zakupy nie tylko leków czy szczepionek w czasach pandemii lub innych zdarzeń nadzwyczajnych, ale leków w ogóle. Na to czekają pacjenci w całej Europie. Istnieje ogromna dysproporcja w dostępie obywateli UE do terapii chorób rzadkich, skutecznych terapii onkologicznych, itd.

Nie zbudujemy silnej Europejskiej Unii Zdrowotnej bez stanowczych decyzji. Nie możemy oglądać się na koncerny i biznes. W centrum naszej uwagi musi zawsze być pacjent!

Robert Hajšel (S&D), *písomne.* – Chcem dúfať, že týmto rozšírením mandátu pôsobnosti Európskeho centra pre prevenciu a kontrolu chorôb budú Európska únia a jej členské štáty konečne lepšie pripravené na zvládanie možných budúcich zdravotných epidémií a pandémií. Podmienkou ale musí byť zachovanie dostatočných kompetencií na strane štátov v kritických rozhodovacích oblastiach. V prijatej legislatíve ide najmä o zlepšenie koordinácie postupov štátov, prevenciu cezhraničného šírenia chorôb a schopnosť komunikovať potrebné dáta. Ja by som privítal, ak by sme na úrovni EÚ viac koordinovali aj manažovanie neprenosných chorôb, ako sú kardiovaskulárne, onkologické a autoimunitné ochorenia, pri ktorých liečení sú v jednotlivých štátoch obrovské rozdiely v úspešnosti.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR), *písomne.* – Rozširovanie kompetencií EÚ v zdravotníctve malo začať analýzou dopadov, ako aj analýzou príčin problémov v tomto sektore. Žiaľ, Komisia prichádza s ďalšou centralizáciou a navyšovaním rozpočtu Európskeho centra pre prevenciu a kontrolu chorôb a vytváraním nových inštitúcií bez analýz vplyvov. Aby zdravotnícka únia fungovala, potrebujeme hlbšiu a odbornejšiu debatu o rozdelení kompetencií medzi členskými štátmi a EÚ, ako aj o tom, aké výsledky má nová regulácia priniesť. Podľa mňa by bolo dobrým krokom k európskej zdravotnej únii významne uľahčiť prístup občanov k liečbe hradenej z verejného poistenia aj v iných členských štátoch EÚ.

Alin Mituța (Renew), *în scris.* – Astăzi facem în Parlamentul European câțiva pași importanți spre Uniunea Sănătății. Reforma ECDC și echiparea UE pentru a proteja sănătatea cetățenilor în fața unor viitoare pandemii sunt de bun augur. Dar nu și suficiente. În Conferința privind Viitorul Europei, cetățenii au cerut apăsat o serie de măsuri pentru sprijinul sistemelor de sănătate naționale, care de multe ori nu mai fac față crizelor de sănătate.

Să ne gândim doar la crizele de sănătate accentuate de pandemie - criza problemelor de sănătate mintală sau criza cauzată de lipsa de diagnosticare sau tratament a afecțiunilor oncologice. UE ar trebui să protejeze sănătatea cetățenilor săi proactiv, sprijinind sistemele de sănătate pentru a atinge standarde minime a calității serviciilor medicale.

Mai mult, experiența achizițiilor comune de vaccinuri anti-COVID ar trebui să fie folosită cât mai rapid pentru a preîntâmpina deficiențele din aprovizionarea și accesul la medicamente esențiale. Uniunea Europeană este pe drumul cel bun în domeniul sănătății, dar ar trebui să accelereze pentru a prinde din urmă crizele de sănătate ce încep să-și arate colții. Dar pentru asta ar trebui să primească și un nou „motor", sub forma competențelor partajate în domeniul sănătății și deci modificarea Tratatelor UE.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), *kirjallinen.* – Arvoisa puhemies, EU ottaa tänään lopullisen ja erittäin tärkeän askeleen unionin yhteisen terveyden edistämisessä ja suojelussa, kun hyväksymme täällä Strasbourgissa neuvottelutuloksen Euroopan tautienehkäisy- ja -valvontakeskuksen ECDC:n vahvistamisesta ja rajat ylittävien vakavien terveysuhkien asetuksesta. Olen jo pitkään peräänkuuluttanut vahvempaa EU:ta terveydessä. Olemme myös terveyden saralla vahvempia yhdessä kuin erikseen, sen osoitti esimerkiksi koronaviruspandemia. Nyt otamme vihdoin käyttöön konkreettisia työkaluja siihen, että jäsenmaat valmistautuisivat ja reagoisivat terveyskriiseihin yhdessä, edulliset ja innovatiiviset lääkintätarvikkeet olisivat kaikkien saatavilla ja maat yhdessä parantaisivat tarttuvien tautien ja sairauksien ennaltaehkäisyä, hoitoa ja valvontaa. Tämä on ehdottomasti askel oikeaan suuntaan. Loistava uutinen on myös se, että asetukseen rajat ylittävistä vakavista terveysuhista on sisällytetty yhteishankintasopimukset lääkkeiden hankkimiseksi yhdessä. Tämän mahdollisuuden turvaaminen jatkossakin on todella tarpeellista yhteistoimintamme kannalta. EU:n on tärkeää toimia yhdessä mahdollisten koronaviruspandemioiden kaltaisten kriisien estämiseksi, mutta kriisitilanteiden lisäksi tarvitsemme enemmän myös normaaliajan yhteistyötä. ECDC:n mandaatin vahvistaminen on ehdottoman tärkeää, jotta Euroopan-laajuinen epidemiologinen seuranta, valvonta sekä varautuminen on yhtenäistä ja koordinoitua. Emme voi antaa COVID-19-katastrofin toistua. Tarvitsemme panostamista perussairauksien hoitoon, terveydenhuollon investointeihin ja henkilökunnan kouluttamiseen. Ei-tarttuvien tautien vastainen työ on yhä tärkeämpää väestön ikääntyessä. Esimerkiksi harvinaissairauksien osalta referenssikeskukset kokoavat alan parasta osaamista samaan paikkaan, ja niiden riittävästä resursoinnista pitäisi huolehtia nykyistä enemmän.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Edina Tóth (NI), *írásban*. – A koronavírus járvány mindenki életét gyökeresen felforgatta, és egy teljesen új világot teremtett, amelyben még inkább szükség van megvalósítható célokra és hatásos egészségügyi programokra. A jövőben az EU-nak gyorsabban kell reagálnia az előre nem látható egészségügyi veszélyekre. Az Európai Betegségvédelmi és Járványügyi Központ fejlesztése utat nyithat az uniós intézmények és a tagállamok még hatékonyabb együttműködése felé, így biztosítva állampolgáraink egészségének védelmét.

Azonban fontosnak tartom megjegyezni, hogy az egészségügy tagállami hatáskör és ennek a jövőben is így is kell maradnia. Egyszer már bebizonyosodott, hogy a nemzetállamok képesek gyorsan és hatékonyan cselekedni és reagálni, az uniós intézmények nem tudják kiváltani a tagállamok egyéni intézkedéseit. Az Uniónak kizárólag az általános célok mentén kell nagyobb erőkifejtést tanúsítania: erősítenie kell a lakosság védelmét a határon átnyúló egészségügyi veszélyekkel szemben, támogatnia kell a gyógyszerek, orvostechnikai eszközök hozzáférhetőségét és megfizethetőségét. Fontos tehát, hogy az európai egészségügyi unió a válságkezelést megkönnyítse, és ne újabb akadályokat gördítsen a tagállamok elé.

10. Impulz pro oceán: posílení správy oceánů a biologické rozmanitosti (rozprava)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie impulsu do działań na rzecz oceanów: poprawa zarządzania oceanami i różnorodności biologicznej (2022/2836(RSP)).

Adina-Ioana Vălean, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, let me thank you for the welcome opportunity to have this discussion today on ocean governance and biodiversity. The ocean is our planet's life-support system. And still, debates like this one are needed to keep the spotlight on the ocean and to reiterate our joint commitment towards better management and protection of our oceans.

Honourable Members, the ocean is not doing well. Insufficient progress has been made over the last years towards a clean, healthy, productive and resilient ocean. And this is our collective responsibility. Solutions exist and they are in our hands. They require bold choices, which need to be made now. And with the largest combined exclusive economic zone in the world, the EU and its Member States have a particular interest in steering this debate and reaffirming their ambition for an improved ocean governance. The role and the support of the European Parliament is crucial in this regard. Today's debate and the resolution that you will adopt later this week therefore come at exactly the right moment. And this year, 2022, is a pivotal year for ocean governance. Milestone events have taken place in 2022, like the one Ocean Summit in Brest or the UN Ocean Conference in Lisbon. In a few weeks time, the Climate Change COP 27 in Sharm El Sheikh will be an opportunity to further strengthen ocean climate change, mitigation and adaptation action. And the biodiversity COP15 in Montreal will aim at an ambitious agreement, including targets to protect land and global oceans by 2030.

Honourable Members, as we have often said, there is no green without blue and under the umbrella of the European Green Deal, this translates in both the international and the EU domestic strands of ocean related policies. With the joint Communication on the EU's International Ocean Governance Agenda of June this year, the EU confirms its commitments under the United Nations 2030 Agenda and ahead of the two decisive COPS later this year. In this context, one of the key priorities we have is to halt and reverse the loss of marine biodiversity. We hope to achieve this by concluding as soon as possible an ambitious UN treaty to protect biodiversity in the high seas, including a target of 30% marine protected areas by 2030 and new large-scale marine protected areas in the Southern Ocean.

With the High Ambition Coalition, which you have launched, we are at the forefront of the efforts to achieve an ambitious outcome to these negotiations. At the last negotiating round that took place in New York in August, the EU took a leading role and it was instrumental in achieving very good progress, even though, unfortunately, in the end no final agreement could be reached.

Another priority is to protect the seabed by prohibiting deep-sea mining until its effects on the marine environment, biodiversity, human activities have been sufficiently researched, the risks are understood and the technologies and operational practices are able to demonstrate no serious harm to the environment.

Furthermore, we need to ensure sustainable fisheries with a zero tolerance approach against illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. In this context, we welcome the multilateral agreement achieved in the World Trade Organization regarding the ban of harmful fisheries subsidies. Yes, it is only the first step, but the EU is fully committed to complementing this agreement as soon as possible with those essential elements not yet agreed. Our fight against climate change and against marine pollution continues as well. This includes decarbonising the maritime sectors and preserving the oceans-blue carbon function, as well as work towards concluding an ambitious, legally-binding global plastic agreement by 2024.

Last but not least, we need to step up efforts to build up ocean knowledge. Based on European programmes such as Copernicus and EMODnet, we want to support the implementation of a UN Decade Collaborative Centre for Ocean Prediction and encourage the establishment of an Intergovernmental Panel for Ocean Sustainability.

Honourable Members, our international efforts to improve ocean governance clearly mirror the ambition of our domestic policies. The ocean, which acts as a significant carbon sink - notably its seabed, is one of our strongest allies when it comes to reaching our climate goals. Let me recall that we proposed a new standard on greenhouse gas intensity of energy used on board ships. We are working with the co-legislators on extending the EU ETS to maritime transport and we are also helping the fishing sector to decarbonise and to become less dependent on fossil fuels. And climate mitigation efforts need to go hand-in-hand with sustained and robust action on adaptation, to make our oceans as resilient as possible. Nature based solutions are at the forefront of our action.

In this context, we have proposed legally-binding EU targets to restore marine ecosystems. Looking at how the ocean can support our decarbonisation efforts, offshoring renewable energy is one of the pillars of the EU's energy transition, but we will need to look beyond offshore wind. The energy from tides and waves are predictable and promise to complement today's technologies for wind and sun. Maritime spatial planning will help us to reconcile decarbonisation objectives, but also nature protection and restoration at sea.

As regards the oceans economic potential, the implementation of our communication on the sustainable blue economy has already brought many positive achievements. The implementation of the Commission's strategic guidelines for aquaculture has been advancing and we will shortly adapt an EU algae initiative which will bring new opportunities for our blue economy. In parallel will continue our joint efforts with Member States and coastal communities to make EU fisheries more sustainable. Important progress has already been made in the Atlantic, clearly showing that the sustainability pays off also economically, but additional efforts will be necessary also in other sea basins. We are fully aware that, first, Brexit and then the COVID pandemic and now the Russian ruthless invasion of Ukraine and its consequences pose enormous challenges to the fishing sector. The EU has reacted quickly, proposing two emergency packages in 2020 and 2022 respectively, to support the fisheries sector in addressing the socio-economic consequences. We now need to further help our fishermen and women to decrease their dependency on fossil fuels and make our fisheries more resilient.

Finally, let me mention research and innovation, which also play a key role to unlock the oceans for potential. Horizon Europe, and in particular the mission to restore the health of our ocean and waters by 2030, can contribute to scaling up solutions and help us to achieve the blue targets of the European Green Deal. And we also need to raise awareness about oceans and increase ocean literacy, in particular of the young generation. Our Ocean Literacy Initiative, the Youth for Ocean Coalition, the Network of European Blue Schools and the EU4Ocean Forum are instrumental in this regard.

Honourable Members, we all know that only healthy oceans can be climate mitigators and provide services for our blue economy. Therefore, it's not a luxury, but it is a necessity to prevent and mitigate the pressures provoking the biodiversity loss in our seas. We are now at a crucial moment in which we have the opportunity to put in place concrete actions to stop biodiversity loss, as well as restoring the marine ecosystems, and sustainable fisheries play a key role in this context, and the recent Commission proposal for a new nature restoration law, as well as the upcoming action plan to conserve fisheries resources and protect marine ecosystems, will not only contribute to protecting and restoring our seas, but also to making the fisheries sector in Europe more resilient in the long term. Thank you for your attention and I am looking forward for your comments.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Pernille Weiss, *for PPE-Gruppen*. – Fru Formand! Ocean Governance - altså området for politikker og aktiviteter, der vedrører havet og kystnære områder og de mange marine ressourcer får nu en betænkning her fra Europa-Parlamentet. Det gør den blandt andet, fordi vi i alt for mange år ikke har prioriteret havets biodiversitet og muligheder højt nok. Det må vi ikke blive ved med, fordi det på lang sigt jo handler om klodens overlevelse, og på kort sigt handler det om det Europa, vores børn og børnebørn skal overtage efter os. Men også fordi en stor del af vores økonomiske og økologiske bæredygtighed nemlig afhænger af, hvordan vi behandler havene i og omkring EU. Betænkningen er blevet noget lang, fordi den gentager en hel del af det, vi allerede har sagt, at vi er enige om i forhold til biodiversitet. Men den siger også noget nyt og noget vigtigt, nemlig at vi skal have sat skub i udrulningen af vindenergi – også den flydende del af slagsen. Vi skal selvfølgelig også blive ved med at bore klogt i havbunden, så vi kan få fat i den energi, vi simpelthen ikke kan undvære lige nu. Vi skal også blive ved med at bore klogt i havbunden for at skabe udvikling for CO_2 frem for lagring. Flere analyser viser, at det sagtens kan lade sig gøre, uden at det ødelægger de marine økosystemer. Og så skal vi generelt tillægge os en meget mere innovativ tilgang til havets skatte og muligheder. Den blå økonomi med søfart, turisme og endnu ukendte og ikke udbredte grønne teknologier skal have mere fokus, og det får de forhåbentlig med denne betænkning.

Cyrus Engerer, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, there are many legends that come from my island: they say that we are home to Atlantis, the legend of Calypso, and that we stand at the point where the plates of Europe and Africa kiss. And while the legends that we are told by fishermen weaving their nets are fables, the deep and intricate relationship between islands and oceans is not.

In 1967, one of the greatest marine conservationists of our time called for the ocean seabed to be designated as the common heritage of mankind: a concept still sacrosanct in Article 136 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. He called for international regulation to prevent the colonisation of our seabed and the monopolisation of resources to the detriment of our planet. That man was Maltese diplomat Arvid Pardo, father of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. And here I am today to reiterate his call, because colleagues, those of us who come from islands have known for all too long that our oceans are just as much a part of us as the land and trees. We depend on the oceans and our homes and livelihoods depend on the seas.

We are constantly reminded that exploitation and pollution will forever affect the global ecosystem that we call home. And today, there is renewed interest from the private sector to look into the commercial exploitation of these minerals. Technological advances and an increase in the long-term demand for minerals, industrialisation and globalisation have led to this strong path. In 1967, when the Maltese delegation brought forward the radical notion that our seabed is imperative to humanity's ecosystem, they were viewed with astonishment and great suspicion. But science has vindicated Arvid Pardo, and time and time again we are here to reiterate that message again today.

The latest smartphone and the next supercomputer made from seabed minerals are not worth the irreversible destruction of our planet. And I hope that this Chamber votes in this way on Thursday.

Catherine Chabaud, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, enfin un débat et une résolution sur l'océan! L'Union européenne doit s'appuyer sur sa dimension maritime, engager un pacte bleu au sein du pacte vert, et en faire une force pour porter ses valeurs à travers le monde.

Il y a urgence: tous les phénomènes météorologiques extrêmes que nous connaissons puisent leur énergie du réchauffement en profondeur de l'océan – une conséquence directe du réchauffement climatique, avec l'élévation du niveau de la mer et l'acidification.

Pour continuer à nourrir l'humanité, mais aussi à développer les économies des régions littorales, où se concentrera 80 % de la population mondiale d'ici 2050, nous devons impérativement accélérer sa restauration. C'est une question de survie, notamment pour les régions ultrapériphériques de l'Europe, qui lui assurent sa dimension maritime.

Régénérer cette «hydrosphère» – l'océan, les mers et les rivières –, comme l'appelle la mission Starfish, suppose de faire converger toutes les politiques européennes – biodiversité, climat, énergie, transports, eau, traitement des déchets – et de mieux coordonner la gouvernance.

À mesure que l'on explore l'océan, on découvre toutes ses richesses pour l'humanité: un réservoir aux multiples ressources – énergétiques, génétiques, minérales –, celles-là même qui s'amenuisent sur la Terre.

Mais ne reproduisons pas en mer les erreurs que nous avons faites sur terre. Le mouvement imprimé par les grandes conférences internationales de cette année 2022 poursuit l'objectif de donner un cadre: celui d'un avenir durable avec l'océan, et l'Union européenne et les États membres négocient l'avenir de la planète. Le Parlement doit impérativement s'emparer de ce sujet.

Il n'y a qu'un seul océan: il est notre bien commun, et il y va de notre responsabilité individuelle et collective de le préserver. C'est un instrument pour la paix et pour le multilatéralisme.

Chers collègues, j'appelle l'Union européenne à se tourner résolument vers la mer et à porter ce message, que moi-même, dans un mois, je porterai, Madame la Présidente, en retraversant l'Atlantique en solitaire. Ce sera mon défi, Madame la Commissaire, pour l'océan.

Grace O'Sullivan, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, there is great news from Ireland today. As of today, one of the largest living creatures on earth can celebrate a small victory. As of today, the great basking shark has been given protected status in Irish waters. And with this resolution we table in the European Parliament, as of today we make our voices heard that the protection of our ocean is not just a kind gesture to the very place where life began, but an urgent necessity if we are to protect biodiversity, the seas and even our atmosphere.

Our demands are modest, yet they still face opposition from powerful industrial and political interests. We want real marine protected areas for at least 30% of our oceans; an international moratorium on deep-sea mining now; and a total ban on oil and gas drilling in the Arctic and the Antarctic. These are real steps we can make in order to save thousands of species – such as the basking shark – from extinction. So support our coastal communities, support ocean life and support this resolution.

France Jamet, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Président, ça a été dit, pêche illégale, piraterie, protection des systèmes marins, l'économie bleue est à la fois l'un des grands défis du XXIe siècle, mais aussi un foyer d'innovation vers une nouvelle économie de la mer.

Face à la montée des tensions sur les océans, la France, deuxième domaine maritime mondial – est-il utile de rappeler ici? – sera en première ligne pour affronter ces crises majeures, notamment dans l'océan Indien et Pacifique, nouveau centre économique du monde de demain.

Certains États, comme l'Inde, ne demandent qu'à coopérer davantage avec nous. Ces coopérations internationales plus étroites dans l'Indo-Pacifique sont nécessaires car les défis sont communs. Avec la France, grâce à la France, l'Europe prendra toute sa part dans cette nouvelle économie.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de The Left-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, zeeën en oceanen zijn essentieel voor het leven op aarde. Desondanks gebruiken we de oceaan als vuilnisbak, als jachtgebied en als industrieterrein, en boren we de zeebodem kapot op zoek naar gas en olie.

Welke acties onderneemt de Europese Commissie om het wereldwijde beschermingsverdrag voor de internationale wateren zo snel mogelijk met succes aan te passen? Hoever is de Commissie met haar voorstellen om minstens 30 % van de zeeën in Europa en het liefst natuurlijk ook daarbuiten eindelijk echt te gaan beschermen?

Ik wil ook graag aandacht vragen voor de walvissen. Al sinds 1986 is er een wereldwijd verbod op de walvisjacht. Ondanks dit verbod jagen Noorwegen, Japan, de Deense Faeröereilanden – en sinds dit jaar helaas ook weer IJsland – op walvissen. Dat is wreed en onverantwoord. Walvissen (en hun poep) zijn cruciaal voor het ecosysteem en onmisbaar in de strijd tegen klimaatverandering. Het Europees Parlement doet daarom opnieuw een oproep aan Noorwegen, Japan, maar zeker ook aan IJsland en de Faeröereilanden, om de jacht op walvissen en dolfijnen voor eens en voor altijd te stoppen. Is de Commissie bereid om deze oproep te steunen en deze landen, inclusief IJsland, hierop aan te spreken?

Voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouw- en visserijsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, enfin nous avons une discussion sur la stratégie de l'Union européenne pour les océans! Et vous l'avez dit, chers collègues: il était temps! L'Union européenne est la première zone économique exclusive du monde et elle doit, aujourd'hui, assumer cette responsabilité: elle est légitime pour agir.

Cette négociation sur le texte que nous discutons ensemble, cette longue négociation, aura permis de faire apparaître entre nous – n'ayons pas peur de l'affronter – des désaccords évidents. Certains voudraient protéger la vie et l'environnement en multipliant les contraintes sur ceux qui travaillent en mer, notamment dans nos pays européens, au point de rendre impossible tout effort humain lié à la mer et à l'océan. Nous avons même entendu certains nous dire que le déclin de la pêche européenne, par exemple, serait une bonne nouvelle.

C'est ne pas comprendre que l'essentiel du défi environnemental, aujourd'hui, ne consiste pas à surréglementer plus encore les activités des professionnels européens – qui, déjà, respectent les normes les plus exigeantes au monde –, mais à faire en sorte que les autres puissances mondiales assument avec nous une responsabilité qui nous est commune.

Il est nécessaire que ce texte réaffirme l'impératif de la lutte contre la pêche illégale dans le monde entier, la nécessité de mettre en œuvre un plan déterminé contre la pollution plastique et celle de faire progresser la recherche sur ce monde encore très largement inconnu qu'est l'océan.

Au fond, nous ne nous sortirons pas du défi environnemental par moins d'efforts et de travail. Nous ne nous en sortirons que par plus de science, plus de recherche, plus d'engagement des hommes pour protéger ce patrimoine qui nous est commun.

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, gostaria, nesta breve intervenção, de saudar o empenho de todos os que participam ativamente neste importante trabalho. A saúde dos oceanos e da sua biodiversidade é essencial à vida, já o sabemos, bem como à sustentabilidade a longo prazo dos diferentes setores da economia azul. Desde o contributo para a segurança alimentar de milhões de pessoas, até ao fornecimento de energia renovável e de recursos minerais, passando pela criação de emprego nas comunidades costeiras, os oceanos são fonte de vida e também de imensa riqueza.

Ora, garantir a boa saúde dos oceanos implica também garantir, entre outras medidas, obviamente, que a frota da União Europeia continue a respeitar as medidas de gestão e conservação dos stocks de pesca. É fundamental assegurar a concessão de regras harmonizadas à frota da União Europeia, independentemente da área geográfica onde opere, não podendo ser esquecidas as condições de concorrência equitativa para todas as frotas que operam ao abrigo das convenções internacionais.

Quer isto dizer, para terminar, que deve existir um esforço contínuo também para que as medidas de conservação e gestão, adotadas no âmbito das diferentes convenções regionais, se aproximem o mais possível dos objetivos ambiciosos da política comum das pescas, como forma de alargar a linguagem da sustentabilidade dos oceanos a todas as latitudes.

Pierre Karleskind (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, 2022, c'est vraiment une année dédiée aux océans et donc cette résolution tombe à point. Cela avait commencé à Brest avec le *One Océan Summit*, ça s'est poursuivi à Lisbonne avec la conférence des Nations unies, on peut parler de Charm el-Cheikh aussi, et puis la COP-15 qui aura lieu au Canada sur la biodiversité, tous ces éléments qui sont réunis pour faire de l'année 2022 une grande année de l'océan.

Et puis 2022 pour l'Europe, c'est l'année européenne de la jeunesse. Je voudrais prendre quelques exemples. 120 ambassadeurs des océans étaient réunis à La Rochelle à l'occasion de la présidence française. Ils ont parlé de l'avenir des formations, d'un Erasmus+ maritime. Je veux parler aussi de cette excellente initiative de la Commission européenne qui date de 2020, *Youth for Ocean*, dans le cadre de la *EU for Ocean Coalition*. Eh bien, cette initiative a fleuri et ils étaient à Lisbonne, ces jeunes ambassadeurs de cette initiative, pour parler aux leaders du monde.

Et donc, on le voit, l'Europe donne l'opportunité à ces jeunes de se saisir de la question des océans. Comme 2022 c'est donc une grande année pour l'océan, 2022 c'est l'année européenne de la jeunesse, et je voudrais que cette résolution soit dédiée à ces jeunes. Donnons-leur la clé de nos océans parce que les océans, comme les jeunes, c'est notre avenir, c'est l'avenir de l'Europe.

Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE). – Madame la présidente, les océans sont dans un état d'urgence. Malgré ces mots du Secrétaire général des Nations unies, nous faisons trop peu pour répondre à la crise climatique, à la crise du vivant qui frappe les océans. Pire, une nouvelle menace apparaît, l'exploitation minière des grands fonds marins. L'industrie minière et certains États font pression et souhaitent être les premiers à mettre la main sur des minerais précieux dont regorgent les océans. Pourtant, les scientifiques nous alertent: cette activité entraînera des dommages irréversibles au fonctionnement des écosystèmes marins sur plusieurs générations et aggravera la crise climatique.

La Commission européenne et le Parlement ont pris une position forte contre l'exploitation minière des grands fonds. Un appel à un moratoire a déjà été signé par 250 parlementaires de plus de 50 pays. Les États membres de l'Union européenne doivent se positionner clairement en faveur d'un moratoire sur l'exploitation minière des grands fonds. D'ailleurs, la position du gouvernement français reste ambiguë sur le sujet. Notre responsabilité, c'est de stopper cette course folle pour les océans et pour nos générations futures.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, los océanos desempeñan un papel esencial en nuestro bienestar. Amenazas como la contaminación o la pesca ilegal exigen a todos los Estados una acción concertada. Lamento que la última ronda de negociaciones sobre un tratado de protección de la alta mar concluyese sin acuerdo.

El mar es una gran fuente de riqueza y de empleo, como bien sabemos en España y en Galicia, la primera región pesquera de Europa. La gobernanza de los océanos no se entiende sin una gestión sostenible de la pesca, tanto desde el punto de vista medioambiental como desde el económico y social y también de la seguridad alimentaria.

Por eso es tan decepcionante que la Comisión Europea adoptase recientemente un acto de ejecución que prohíbe la pesca de fondo en ochenta y siete áreas del Atlántico, sin consultas ni datos suficientes. Una medida que afecta gravemente a cuatro países, sobre todo a España.

Señora comisaria, rectificar es de sabios. Una vez más, pido a la Comisión Europea que suspenda la aplicación del veto a la pesca de fondo y revise esta apresurada decisión. Hay que contar con los últimos dictámenes científicos y con una evaluación exhaustiva del impacto socioeconómico.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Diese Entschließung, über die wir abstimmen, ist von zentraler Bedeutung. Alles Leben kommt aus dem Wasser, und trotzdem schützen wir unsere Meere noch immer viel zu wenig.

Wir haben viel zu wenige Schutzgebiete. Die biologische Diversität, die Vielfalt der Meere, sie wird nicht richtig geschützt. Sie ist noch nicht einmal richtig erforscht. Deswegen müssen wir, gerade als Europäische Union, hier eine noch viel stärkere Rolle einnehmen und endlich Schutzgebiete ausweisen und den Lebensraum Meer schützen.

Das gilt im Übrigen auch für die Ökonomie auf dem Wasser. Wir haben eine starke Schifffahrt. Das ist auch notwendig, damit Menschen zusammenkommen, damit Waren verteilt werden können. Aber Schiffe haben eine jahrzehntelange Lebensdauer. Deswegen müssen wir jetzt damit beginnen – und wir können das hier in der nächsten Woche im Plenum in Straßburg machen –, die Kraftstoffe zu dekarbonisieren. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass die Schiffe nicht mehr Dreckschleudern sind, sondern dass sie nachhaltig und sauber unterwegs sind. Damit schützen wir unsere Umwelt, und wir schützen damit tatsächlich dann auch das Klima.

Also: Volle Unterstützung für diese Entschließung mit einem klaren Fokus auf mehr Umwelt- und Klimaschutz und vor allen Dingen auf mehr und bessere Schutzgebiete.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, comparto la necesidad de reforzar la gobernanza de los océanos y de proteger la diversidad, pero recuerdo, como ha demostrado la política pesquera común, que conseguirlo obliga a implicar a todos los actores implicados.

No ha sido así con la Decisión mediante la quel la Comisión Europea pretende, el próximo 9 de octubre, clausurar 87 zonas de pesca a los buques europeos. Esta Decisión es arbitraria porque no incluye informes de impacto ambiental, social ni económico y porque no se basa en los mejores informes científicos disponibles.

Por eso no la comprende ni la comparte el sector. Por eso animo a que se retire y revise antes de que el 9 de octubre entre en vigor.

Protejamos el mar, pero contando con todos.

La política pesquera común es un ejemplo de cómo hacerlo. El sector pesquero ha vivido un durísimo ajuste socialmente aceptado y asumido desde la plena conciencia de que solo una pesca sostenible y la protección de la biodiversidad garantizan el futuro del sector.

En línea con esa realidad, hay que reconducir el discurso que suele lanzarse contra el sector pesquero europeo, ejemplar en cuanto al respeto de las disposiciones vigentes y que opera en el marco de las normas y medidas de control más exigentes del mundo.

Acusar a profesionales ejemplares de sobrepesca y de otras irregularidades no es cierto, carece de empatía con las personas que trabajan en durísimas condiciones y afecta a la credibilidad de la política pesquera común y de la Unión en su conjunto.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora presidenta, hablamos de gestionar los océanos del mundo y sus recursos para que sean saludables y productivos en beneficio de las generaciones actuales y futuras. Nada más loable, pero hay que hacerlo de forma equilibrada.

Observamos cómo la acción de la Comisión en este contexto tiene, a veces, efectos perversos e indeseables, tanto para los operadores de la Unión Europea como para el medio ambiente. Estoy pensando en algo que se ha dicho ya: en la reciente decisión de la Comisión de cerrar ochenta y siete áreas en el Atlántico, donde aparentemente existen —o es probable que existan— ecosistemas marinos vulnerables, pero sin tener en cuenta otros aspectos y llevando a la ruina a miles de familias de pescadores y al amarre de importantes segmentos de la flota europea. Y esto no lo podemos aceptar.

Por otra parte, cuanto más estrictas son las medidas que adopta la Unión Europea para la pesca y la acuicultura, más dependemos de productos importados y más se merma nuestra competitividad frente a terceros países con una gestión y gobernanza deficientes. Hagamos posible la sostenibilidad medioambiental, pero también la socioeconómica. Ese es el reto.

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Cara Comissária, a vida no nosso planeta começa nos oceanos. É nestes que se encontram ainda as maiores reservas de biodiversidade da Terra. Não teremos sucesso no Pacto Ecológico Europeu, nem na concretização dos Acordos de Paris sem uma estratégia que assegure o futuro dos nossos oceanos.

Cabe-nos encontrar soluções que nos permitam tirar ainda melhor proveito dos benefícios que estes nos oferecem, mas de uma forma sustentável. Se as comunidades que dependem do oceano sentirem as vantagens da sua proteção, os nossos esforços de conservação serão mais eficientes.

Quero, por isso, aplaudir a presente resolução e a abordagem holística e global que propõe, conjugando a proteção e a rentabilização da economia azul. Acrescento que a estratégia para os nossos oceanos deve passar por uma forte aposta na ciência e na investigação científica. Só assim alcançaremos este duplo desígnio: conservar e valorizar.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, quando discutimos a governança dos oceanos é essencial referirmos as regiões ultraperiféricas. São estas que permitem à União Europeia, no seu conjunto, ter a maior zona marítima do mundo. Portanto, o seu enorme potencial é e deve ser aproveitado ao máximo, seja ao nível da produção das energias renováveis, seja a nível do aproveitamento do potencial de biodiversidade existente nestas regiões, seja na implementação de projetos-piloto, inovadores e sustentáveis, que mudem a forma como a sociedade lida com o meio ambiente.

Não se trata apenas de pedir exceções para ter em conta as suas especificidades, mas também potenciar e fornecer a base regulatória e financeira necessária para que as regiões ultraperiféricas se assumam como líderes da transição climática dentro da própria União Europeia.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, it's good that in this resolution we're calling for international measures to end nuclear and military waste in the oceans.

Anywhere you find a foreign military base, you will find high levels of contamination and a marine environment struggling to cope. Look at Guam, look at Hawaii, French Polynesia, the Marshall Islands. The people and the marine ecosystems suffer catastrophically at the hands of the military industrial complex's total carelessness. We let them treat the oceans as if they were privatized, but they are not – the ocean is a global common good. The USA has conducted more nuclear weapons tests than all other nations combined, responsible for unspeakable levels of radiation in the Pacific.

If we fail to stand up to military contamination, then we may forget about EU efforts for ocean protection. We need denuclearization, demilitarization and peace, and a different approach between humans and the sea.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, I think it is a good motion on ocean governance and I too am glad to see the reference to military waste and activity, because military activity treating our ocean as a firing range is massively damaging to biodiversity. And just mentioning it isn't enough: we're going to have to do a lot more to tackle it. And of course we cannot ignore the methane explosion in the Baltic Sea as a result of the destruction of the Nord Stream pipeline. The UN has said this is the biggest single methane release ever recorded.

We know, of course, that methane is 80 times more powerful than CO_2 in heating the atmosphere, and methane leaked rather than burned is even worse and will have a massively lasting impact on the climate. The Nord Stream attacks have released 300 000 metric tonnes of methane. This is catastrophic. It is a climate and environmental crime. When we're looking at protecting the ocean, we need to factor in this sabotage, have it independently investigated and have consequences for the vandals who did it.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Adina-Ioana Vălean, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, thank you once again for this important debate and also for helping us to raise public awareness about the importance of the ocean. We face a 'now or never' moment when it comes to addressing the triple crisis of climate change, biodiversity loss and pollution. Ambitious outcomes of the COP27 in Sharm el-Sheikh and the United Nations Biodiversity Conference in Montreal are crucial, and the oceans play a key role in both.

Let me say a few words on some of the issues you raised during this debate. We agree that we need to protect the high seas and ensure that future activities in these sensitive areas are solidly based on the science. That's why the EU is working hard to ensure that a strong and ambitious treaty on biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction is agreed. We intend to continue to take a lead role in the negotiations, leading to an ambitious, fair and equitable agreement. We will aim to maintain the political momentum through the High Ambition Coalition on Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction.

The Commission also fully agrees that marine minerals in the area cannot be exploited until the effects of deep-sea mining on the marine environment, biodiversity and human activities have been sufficiently researched, the risks are understood, and technologies and operational practices are able to demonstrate that the environment is not seriously harmed, in line with the precautionary approach and the ecosystem-based approach. This has been clearly confirmed in our international ocean governance agenda.

With regard to the implementing act on vulnerable marine ecosystems, resulting in the closure of some areas for bottom fishing, we have always said that once the new scientific advice was available, we would carefully assess it and consider whether a revision of the implementing act was necessary. I understand that this issue is expected to be discussed in the Fisheries Committee on 10 October, where the Commission will have the opportunity to explain its position in more detail.

We are looking forward to the final resolution, which you will adopt later this week, and to working together with you on setting the course for a sustainable blue planet.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

IN THE CHAIR: DITA CHARANZOVÁ

Vice-President

President. – Thank you, Commissioner. The debate is closed. The vote will be held on Thursday.

11. Úsilí o dosažení udržitelnosti a konkurenceschopnosti akvakultury v EU: další postup (rozprava)

President. – The next item is the report by Clara Aguilera, on behalf of the Committee on Fisheries, on striving for a sustainable and competitive EU aquaculture: the way forward (2021/2189(INI)) (A9-0215/2022).

Clara Aguilera, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria Valean, en sustitución de comisario Sinkevicius, señorías: en primer lugar, quiero agradecer la buena colaboración de los ponentes alternativos de todos los grupos políticos, porque a veces no ha sido fácil, pero con este informe hemos llegado a un buen acuerdo, que creo que es equilibrado.

Señorías, a pesar de los avances del sector acuícola y de la financiación de la Unión Europea, nuestro sector de la acuicultura está lejos de alcanzar todo su potencial de crecimiento y de satisfacer la creciente demanda de productos alimentarios marinos.

La Unión importa más del 70 % de los alimentos marinos que consume y tengo que decirles algo, señorías: me gustaría que estos alimentos procedieran de Estados miembros de la Unión Europea, donde aplicamos las normas más elevadas de seguridad alimentaria y de calidad del mundo.

Para conseguir esto, pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión que aborden de forma decidida los principales problemas a los que se enfrenta el sector, muchas veces discutidos, pero no suficientemente abordados.

Proponemos soluciones tanto a corto como a medio plazo, que incluyan medidas en materia de acuicultura ecológica, pero, de igual manera, sobre otros modelos de acuicultura que son igualmente sostenibles y que deben desempeñar un papel clave en el crecimiento previsto del sector en consonancia con la transición hacia un sistema alimentario más sostenible en Europa.

En primer lugar, quiero destacar la necesidad de contar con un marco jurídico predecible, racionalizado y favorable a las empresas europeas, que tenga en cuenta los tres pilares de la sostenibilidad: el económico, el social y el medioambiental. Esta es la única forma de poder desarrollar el potencial de crecimiento del sector y es esencial para poder ofrecer unos alimentos sostenibles y de calidad, reducir nuestra dependencia de las importaciones de alimentos acuáticos y crear más empleo en la Unión Europea, especialmente en las regiones costeras.

Además, quiero llamar la atención sobre el hecho de que el sector de la acuicultura puede contribuir a ofrecer servicios ecosistémicos a la sociedad, y que la cría de algas, por ejemplo, o de otros productos acuáticos, puede contribuir a la descarbonización de la economía de la Unión Europea y a mitigar la lucha contra el cambio climático.

La acuicultura de agua dulce es muy importante en muchas regiones rurales de Europa. Por tanto, también quiero destacar que, en relación con este aspecto, debiéramos trabajar más sobre la trazabilidad, los modelos de empresa ecológicos y el bienestar de los peces, que son también factores importantes.

Los planes estratégicos nacionales plurianuales deben tener en cuenta los principales obstáculos al desarrollo del potencial del sector y reconocer la necesidad de asignar más espacio a la acuicultura.

La coordinación con las administraciones públicas nacionales, regionales y locales con competencias en el desarrollo de la acuicultura es muy necesaria para racionalizar la legislación nacional y elaborar orientaciones en el marco jurídico que sean de utilidad al sector.

Otro problema sobre el que quiero llamar la atención es disponer de ingredientes alimentarios sostenibles para la acuicultura de la Unión. Este es uno de los elementos claves en el que el sector puede contribuir plenamente a los objetivos del Pacto Verde.

Termino, señorías: son muchos los elementos. Uno de ellos es la situación que están generando los cormoranes. Lo único que les digo yo aquí, en relación con este apartado -y en el informe está bien recogido-, es que es un problema y debemos ser valientes. Debemos acometerlo en el debate y buscar soluciones.

Espero que haya un amplio apoyo en favor del informe.

Adina-Ioana Vălean, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, firstly, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Ms Aguilera, as well as the shadow rapporteurs for this very important report, which the Commission welcomes.

Following the Council conclusions of July this year and the opinions of the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions of last year, your report rounds up the broad support of the major EU institutions and bodies for the Commission's strategic guidelines for a sustainable and competitive EU Aquaculture of May 2021. The Commission fully agrees with your report. Aquaculture needs to have the prominent place it deserves as it is a crucial part of the sustainable blue economy, and it contributes to the objectives of the European Green Deal. We have also carefully taken note of the concerns expressed in your report when it comes to the current state of play of aquaculture in Europe. In fact, most of these concerns are actually already addressed in the Commission's strategic guidelines.

I would like to focus on two points that were highlighted in your report, namely access to space for marine aquaculture and administrative procedures. The Commission is now working to establish guiding documents, as both the question of appropriate access and efficient procedures are key enablers for our aquaculture to grow. We agree that further efforts are necessary in both areas, which is why we have prioritised these actions. The Commission is also managing and planning actions in areas you highlighted in your report, such as sustainable feed, animal welfare, and environmental performance, and we propose to use Horizon Europe funding to promote research and innovation for aquaculture.

On the topic of funding, I can confirm that the Commission regularly monitors strategic guidelines for sustainable and competitive aquaculture. These are duly considered in national programmes under the European Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund. Similarly, we insist that these guidelines are taken into account for the multiannual national strategies for aquaculture. Member States seem to have taken this strategy on board, for both the funding and strategy programmes, which we very much welcome, as it demonstrates our common vision when it comes to aquaculture.

We also know that the challenge for fisheries and aquaculture coming from increasing cormorant numbers in some areas of the EU is an important concern highlighted in your report. Let me recall that Member States can implement preventive measures to avoid or limit the damage caused by cormorants, including by using the derogations under the Birds Directive, and actions to address conflicts with cormorants can also be funded by the European Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund, and this includes prevention and compensation measures. Taking into account the existing instruments and tools, and that we already allow Member States to take preventive measures, the Commission is currently not planning to change the legal protection regime for cormorants. However, we are certainly ready to further support Member States and stakeholders with the existing EU cormorant platform. Furthermore, the mapping of good practices on the management of predators is part of the future guidance document on environmental performance, which the Commission will develop as part of the implementation of our strategic guidelines.

Regarding organic aquaculture, to which you paid special attention in your report, we have encouraged Member States to include an increase in organic aquaculture production in the revision of their national aquaculture strategies and in their programmes under the European Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund. This increased support for organic aquaculture by Member States will contribute to meeting the farm to fork strategy targets and, together with the Member States, we are working on identifying specific obstacles to growth of EU organic agriculture, which would also be a response to one of the calls in your report.

Finally, I'm confident that our combined efforts and support for sustainable and competitive aquaculture in the EU will help this important economic sector to realise its potential in the years to come, to the benefit of us all.

François-Xavier Bellamy, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, nous avons devant nous un très bon rapport pour soutenir l'aquaculture. Je voudrais remercier en particulier notre collègue Clara Aguilera du travail qu'elle a fait pour coordonner nos travaux. Soutenir l'aquaculture, c'est un engagement qui était attendu par un secteur qui continue de transmettre un héritage, un savoir-faire entretenu depuis des siècles, qui n'a cessé de se réinventer, mais auquel nous devons d'avoir modelé nos paysages, d'avoir équilibré nos écosystèmes. C'est aussi un engagement absolument indispensable pour améliorer la résilience alimentaire des pays européens.

Aujourd'hui, 70 % des produits de la mer ou de l'eau douce sont importés. Et si nous ne voulons pas mettre en danger les poissons sauvages, alors nous devons augmenter notre production en soutenant l'aquaculture. Pour cela, il faut une volonté politique qui tienne dans la durée. Il faut une confiance envers ce secteur et enfin avoir une stratégie globale pour la protection des écosystèmes.

Nous allons beaucoup parler du cormoran, car le cormoran a été protégé avec succès depuis des décennies par l'Union européenne. Mais aujourd'hui, cet oiseau qui n'a pas de prédateurs se porte bien. Il s'est sédentarisé et il met lui-même maintenant en danger des espèces de poissons qui sont susceptibles de disparaître. Il met aussi en danger tout l'équilibre de cette filière.

Nous devons enfin réviser cette protection au titre de la directive Habitats si nous voulons permettre à l'aquaculture de se développer dans la durée. C'est rétablir un écosystème, c'est prendre soin vraiment de notre environnement et de la nature que de mettre sur la table ce débat absolument nécessaire.

Isabel Carvalhais, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, começo por agradecer o excelente trabalho desenvolvido pela colega Clara Aguilera e pelos colegas relatores-sombra, tanto pela competência e pelo rigor técnico, como pela grande capacidade clara em encontrar os devidos equilíbrios entre os três pilares da sustentabilidade para o setor da aquacultura.

Uma aquacultura competitiva e resiliente é fundamental para alcançarmos os objetivos da autonomia estratégica alimentar da Europa. Em paralelo ao fornecimento de alimentos saudáveis, com elevado valor nutricional e com uma baixa pegada ecológica, este é um setor que, se bem orientado, pode auxiliar enormemente na proteção do ambiente e da biodiversidade, reduzindo a pressão sobre os recursos marinhos e apoiando na restauração eficaz dos stocks de pesca.

Importa, por isso, equacionar a importância de reforçar os apoios no sentido de permitir a este setor, em parceria com a ciência e a inovação tecnológica, o desenvolvimento de soluções que lhe permitam diminuir ainda mais o impacto da produção aquícola sobre o meio ambiente.

Assim se fará o percurso que me parece vital, fundamental, para diminuir a pressão sobre os oceanos, assegurando a autonomia estratégica alimentar das nossas populações.

Martin Hlaváček, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, we live in a time of concerns on food security. We want to produce more proteins, more sustainably, and we have climate ambitions. We know that aquaculture is a response to all of that. We've known that for many, many years. We had the first attempt when the previous Czech Presidency was in place in 2009. We have not moved enough.

Why don't we unleash this potential? I think we should be honest to ourselves. This is about resources and it is about consistency in our policies. And we have been failing for it, up until now. And I hope that this would be an incentive that we won't fail again because the opportunities are enormous.

But we should not hide from difficult issues. This is: how do we boost resources for production? How do we sort out placing those products on the market and how do we deal with their labelling? Why, today, can our fish farmers not label those products organic even if they are much cleaner than any other organic product from agriculture? Because we have the wrong approach in legislation.

Why are we not sorting out and hiding from the issue of cormorants? Again, if we pretend it does not exist, the problem won't likely disappear. So please let's act because this has a great potential and we need it as Europe.

Rosa D'Amato, *a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, un'acquacoltura sostenibile è una acquacoltura che garantisce il rispetto dell'ambiente, della salute umana e della sicurezza alimentare. Lontana quindi dai paradigmi dell'allevamento intensivo.

La sostenibilità passa attraverso la promozione di pratiche a basso impatto, circolari, come l'acquacoltura a bassi livelli trofici, multitrofica e biologica. Un'acquacoltura sostenibile è quella che garantisce che la produzione di mangime non abbia un impatto negativo sulla sicurezza alimentare dei paesi terzi.

Infine, è inaccettabile la richiesta di escludere i cormorani dalla lista delle specie protette dalla direttiva Uccelli. È invece necessario intervenire a livello locale, affinando le soluzioni esistenti per consentire al settore di gestire eventuali problematiche.

Investiamo allora nella ricerca, anche con i soldi del FEAMPA, e nell'assistenza agli operatori del settore, invece di lanciare una caccia alla specie che avrebbe gravissime conseguenze sulla biodiversità.

Ladislav Ilčić, *u ime kluba ECR*. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kad govorimo o uzgoju ribe u ribnjacima i uzgajalištima u moru, Europska unija vlastitom proizvodnjom zadovoljava samo 30 posto svojih potreba.

Podržavam ovo izvješće jer ide u smjeru povećanja te proizvodnje i drago mi je da su na Odboru prihvaćeni svi moj amandmani. Na Odboru su se javili i neki zastupnici koji nisu točno znali je li svrha ribnjaka hranjenje ptica kormorana ili stvaranje velikog akvarija u kojem će ribe što duže i što sretnije živjeti i na kraju umrijeti od starosti. Na sreću, ipak smo zaključili da je svrha ribnjaka proizvodnja hrane za ljude. Europske zemlje su se dosad navikle jeftino dobivati ribu, odnosno kupovati ribu od trećih zemalja, no tako je bilo i s energijom i sada ispaštamo zbog te lakomislenosti.

Zato moramo razmišljati o samodostatnosti i jačati domaću proizvodnju hrane.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de Fractie The Left*. – Voorzitter, visfokkerijen zijn de megastallen van de onderwaterwereld. Net als in megastallen op land worden dieren in visfokkerijen met veel tegelijk opgesloten in te kleine ruimtes. Net als in megastallen op land worden dieren in visfokkerijen zodanig gehouden dat ze hun natuurlijke gedrag niet kunnen vertonen en is hun leven één grote lijdensweg. Net als in megastallen op land leidt het op elkaar proppen van grote hoeveelheden dieren in visfokkerijen tot milieuvervuiling, tot ziektes en tot overmatig antibioticagebruik.

Het fokken van vissen is daarnaast verre van duurzaam. De Afrikaanse kust wordt letterlijk leeggevist om onze visfokkerijen in Europa en elders in de wereld van vismeel te voorzien. Voor het laten opgroeien van één zalm in zo'n visfokkerij zijn 350 uit het wild gevangen vissen nodig.

Een Spaans bedrijf wil komend jaar zelfs de allereerste octopusfokkerij ter wereld openen: een ramp voor dierenwelzijn en een ramp voor het milieu, zo waarschuwen wetenschappers.

Maar ondanks al deze desastreuze effecten voor mens, dier en milieu wordt hier in Straatsburg gepleit voor een sterke groei van het aantal visfokkerijen in Europa.

De Partij voor de Dieren wil voorkomen dat we dezelfde fout maken als in de veehouderij. Daarom zullen wij tegen dit verslag stemmen.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, mis mejores deseos de una pronta recuperación al comisario Sinkevičius.

Luchar por una acuicultura sostenible y competitiva en la Unión Europea es el camino a seguir. La acuicultura proporciona al consumidor productos sostenibles y de alta calidad. Sin embargo, aunque la acuicultura mantiene una tasa de crecimiento constante en todo el mundo, en la Unión Europea no ha alcanzado todavía todo su potencial. El desarrollo de la acuicultura de la Unión Europea está estancado y tenemos que darle un impulso. A nuestro grupo le preocupa, y mucho.

El Partido Popular lideró un informe sobre acuicultura que proponía noventa y dos acciones, entre otras, la simplificación de los procedimientos administrativos, garantizar la equidad en la interacción con otros sectores, mejorar la competitividad de la acuicultura dentro y fuera de nuestras fronteras, mejorar la información al consumidor, la realización de mejores campañas de promoción y comunicación, apoyar la investigación y la innovación, y garantizar una información adecuada.

Estos son elementos fundamentales y el informe que votaremos mañana insta a la Comisión a trabajar en estrecha colaboración con los Estados miembros para aplicar estas acciones. Hagámoslo así. Los gestos también importan, y fuimos capaces de incluir la acuicultura en el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca. Eso también era importante.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, como sabemos, en los últimos años la acuicultura ha crecido de forma espectacular en otras partes del mundo, mientras que la producción europea se estanca.

La acuicultura de la Unión Europea representa menos del 2 % de la producción mundial. La escasa producción europea implica que los Estados de la Unión tienen que importar productos del mar, que no siempre tienen nuestros niveles de calidad. Como recuerda el informe que hoy debatimos, la Unión Europea importa más del 70 % de los alimentos marinos que consume. Un balance inaceptable en un continente tan volcado al mar. Y hay gente en esta casa, en este Parlamento, que sigue empeñada en que esas importaciones aumenten.

Quiero felicitar a la ponente, Clara Aguilera, por un informe que recoge de forma acertada los principales problemas y retos a los que se enfrenta la acuicultura europea, propone soluciones para abordarlos, y apuesta acertadamente por la innovación y el cultivo de nuevas especies en acuicultura. El informe subraya también la necesidad de que los Estados miembros garanticen la seguridad jurídica para las inversiones en el sector.

Y termino: como diputado gallego, me satisface especialmente que el informe destaque como ejemplo de calidad la denominación de origen protegida «mejillón de Galicia».

Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, l'aquaculture est souvent présentée comme la solution pour limiter la surpêche tout en maintenant notre consommation de poisson, voire même en l'augmentant. Mais les formes d'aquaculture vraiment durables sont rares.

L'aquaculture n'est pas durable quand, pour nourrir des espèces carnivores, on importe des farines de poisson qui mettent en danger la sécurité alimentaire de plusieurs pays d'Afrique. L'aquaculture n'est pas durable lorsqu'elle menace les pêcheurs et les écosystèmes marins en pleine zone Natura 2000, comme c'est le cas avec la méga-ferme aquacole de Golfe-Juan. Elle n'est pas durable lorsque les animaux y sont entassés par centaines, sans aucune limite de densité, qu'ils sont contraints à des comportements contraires à leur nature.

Elle n'est pas durable lorsqu'elle a recours à des techniques d'abattage sources de souffrance comme l'asphyxie ou le coulis de glace, alors que des alternatives existent. Enfin, l'aquaculture n'est pas durable, elle est cruelle lorsqu'elle prévoit d'élever des poulpes, créatures si sensibles et si intelligentes.

La Commission devrait donc être plus prudente concernant le développement de l'aquaculture et profiter des réglementations à venir pour fixer un cadre protecteur.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Adina-Ioana Vălean, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, thank you for the very interesting debate tonight and for the interventions and comments. I would like to say a couple of words to address some of the issues you have raised.

Of course, it is important to use sustainable feed ingredients in EU aquaculture. This is an important aspect of the environmental performance of aquaculture, as mentioned in the Commission's strategic guidelines. These guidelines propose the development of a guidance document on environmental performance that includes the mapping of good practices at government and industry level. It should also cover the use of sustainable feed.

Then, the organic production action plan, which was adopted in 2021, provides for access to further promote the growth of organic aquaculture in the EU. Among these actions, the Commission would identify and address, as appropriate, any specific obstacles to the growth of EU organic aquaculture. The work is ongoing. We are consulting with national experts on these obstacles.

Then, in our strategic guidelines, we recognise that the administrative burden is a major obstacle that still needs to be addressed to attract investment to establish new aquaculture facilities. The guidelines provide concrete recommendations in this area. In addition, as part of the implementation of its strategic guidelines, the Commission will develop a guidance document gathering best practices to serve as a reference for the necessary changes in this respect in Member States.

To conclude, let me also mention that the Commission is now preparing an EU-wide communication campaign on EU aquaculture to promote awareness among consumers. Very recently, we held a joint event with the Committee of the Regions, dedicated to the regional authorities, which are often in charge of licensing and regulating aquaculture in the Member States.

The message is clear: by implementing the Commission's strategic guidelines, we have a unique opportunity to promote the sustainable growth and competitiveness of EU aquaculture and maximise its contribution towards making the European Green Deal a success.

Clara Aguilera, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, señorías, señora comisaria, me gustaría agradecer a la Comisión su sensibilidad al reconocer aspectos que en estos momentos son obstáculos reales: el acceso al espacio y los procedimientos. Por lo tanto, el trabajo de la Comisión va a contribuir a la mejora de estas cuestiones.

También me gustaría reconocer que las trabas administrativas son un auténtico problema para este sector. Evidentemente, no las trabas de la Comisión, sino las de todos los entes implicados (las instituciones nacionales, regionales y locales).

Por tanto, acojo con satisfacción estos aspectos y esta campaña, que espero que también sea de promoción de los productos acuícolas sostenibles, porque realmente merece la pena.

Querría señalar que, cuando hablamos de que no es suficiente con el Reglamento Europeo de Producción Ecológica, es porque, ahora mismo, con dicho Reglamento, que hemos aprobado y que ha entrado en vigor este año —es muy reciente, evidentemente— solo es posible la certificación como ecológica, en condiciones muy estrictas, de la cría de moluscos. Únicamente. Nada más. No es posible nada más.

¿Por qué es así? Porque el Reglamento Europeo de Producción Ecológica no ha mirado para nada hacia este sector, sino que lo ha ignorado. Se ha tapado los ojos, y, por lo tanto, ahora las normas no son aplicables. Es verdad que es un reglamento nuevo, pero habrá que mejorarlo con el tiempo, por supuesto.

Aquí hemos visto tanto a quien cree que la acuicultura es un elemento de futuro como a quien no lo cree. Y a quien no lo cree tampoco le vamos a pedir muchas aportaciones, porque quiere destruirlo.

Yo quiero que sea competitivo, que sea más sostenible. También en relación con la alimentación y los piensos, evidentemente. Quiero que ese 70 % que ahora compramos en Tailandia y Vietnam se compre en la Unión Europea, porque las normas de Europa no van a ser nunca los de estos terceros países.

Y con los cormoranes, no nos engañemos: está muy bien la Directiva de aves, pero aquí se habla de todo, y todo es mejorable. No hagamos que determinadas normativas sean intocables. Abramos la mente y veamos que aquí hay un problema y que hay que buscar soluciones.

Eso es lo único que le pedimos a la Comisión: soluciones para el problema de los cormoranes.

President. – That concludes the debate. The vote will be held tomorrow.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Carmen Avram (S&D), *în scris.* – Adoptarea raportului privind acvacultura europeană este un pas important în ajutorarea acestui sector strategic. Textul este echilibrat și reflectă situația în care se găsește sectorul și potențialul de dezvoltare al acestuia. Subestimată, acvacultura europeană are un rol cheie în asigurarea securității alimentare a UE. Este nevoie de soluții pe termen mediu și lung, pentru a permite acvaculturii să contribuie la îndeplinirea obiectivelor Pactului verde și pentru a atinge securitatea alimentară a continentului.

Să nu uităm că UE este un mare importator de pește și fructe de mare care vine din zone care nu aplică aceleași standarde de calitate și siguranță alimentară ca Europa. În schimb, acvacultura europeană poate oferi produse de calitate, poate contribui la reducerea dependenței de importurile din țări terțe și este capabilă să creeze mai multe locuri de muncă. Acvacultura este foarte importantă în multe zone din Europa, inclusiv în România, contribuind la revitalizarea zonelor rurale și la menținerea tinerilor în spațiul rural.

Dar să nu uităm problemele cu care se confruntă acvacultorii europeni: slaba finanțare, lipsa forței de muncă și, mai ales, problema cormoranilor, care creează daune ireparabile acestui sector. De aceea, este nevoie de măsuri rapide, concrete și, mai ales, sprijin financiar pentru acest sector.

12. Dopad nových technologií na zdanění: kryptoaktiva a technologie blockchain (rozprava)

President. – The next item is the report by Lídia Pereira, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the impact of new technologies on taxation: crypto and blockchain (2021/2201(INI)) (A9-0204/2022).

Lídia Pereira, *Relatora.* – Senhora Presidente, a economia europeia está a mudar. Se é verdade que as dificuldades estão mais presentes, não é menos verdade que também estão a surgir oportunidades. Os europeus, sobretudo os mais jovens, procuram hoje alternativas à poupança e ao investimento. Com a emergência de novas tecnologias, também os mercados financeiros encontraram novas soluções, soluções essas cada vez mais descentralizadas, mais acessíveis e mais presentes nas nossas vidas.

Aos decisores políticos não se pede apenas que respondam às crises do imediato. Pede-se, mais do que nunca, que, no quadro complexo, volátil e acelerado em que vivemos, legislem com inteligência e que encontrem soluções com os olhos postos no futuro.

Temos o dever de tornar a lei europeia mais amiga da inovação para que a lei nacional seja também um dínamo de progresso. Esta convicção é particularmente importante quando falamos de fiscalidade. Os impostos são instrumentos fundamentais para uma política de promoção da inovação, da competitividade e do crescimento. Infelizmente, são, muitas vezes, um obstáculo quando se quer encher os cofres do Estado à custa do sacrifício das famílias e das empresas. Como portuguesa conheço bem esse fenómeno, o da carga fiscal sufocante que espartilha a nossa liberdade financeira e sequestra o nosso futuro.

Uma política fiscal pró-inovação, competitiva e virada para o futuro não pode ignorar a emergência de novas tecnologias como a *blockchain* ou a multiplicação de criptoativos. Para potenciarmos as oportunidades da Europa nesta área, apresentámos estas propostas sobre o impacto das novas tecnologias sobre a fiscalidade. Que propostas são essas?

Em primeiro lugar, a afirmação clara de que a política fiscal é da responsabilidade dos Estados-Membros e que não devemos tributar ativos a qualquer custo para engordar os orçamentos nacionais. Cabe a cada um dos 27 Estados decidir sobre os impostos que cobram. Mas, num mercado interno com concorrência leal e saudável, tem de haver um mínimo de cooperação. No momento em que se decide tributar um ativo, o imposto deve ser justo, claro, transparente, previsível e proporcional.

Em segundo lugar, também as autoridades fiscais nacionais têm de se adaptar aos desafios da digitalização. Queremos um reforço claro dos recursos humanos e materiais, um programa de formação do pessoal a nível europeu e a criação de uma plataforma de partilha de boas práticas entre os países.

Em terceiro lugar, pedimos a coerência entre a lei europeia e a lei nacional e, já agora, entre as leis nacionais. As definições de «criptoativo», por exemplo, ou de «evento tributável» ou de «estabelecimento permanente», têm de ser comuns, sob pena de tratarmos de forma diferente situações que são semelhantes.

Em quarto lugar, queremos que a tecnologia *blockchain* seja aproveitada em toda a extensão de oportunidades que representa. As características desta tecnologia permitem-nos combater de forma mais célere e mais eficaz a fraude e a evasão fiscais e também podem tornar os procedimentos mais eficientes, reduzindo a burocracia para os cidadãos e os custos de contexto para as empresas.

Finalmente, queremos que a União lidere o diálogo para um instrumento internacional sobre a fiscalidade de criptoativos. Não faz sentido limitarmo-nos a legislar de país para país, uma realidade que não conhece fronteiras. Se a concorrência é saudável, ela também tem que ser justa e leal.

A mudança que estamos a viver na economia e nos mercados financeiros não pode ser travada. Enfrentaremos dificuldades complexas, mas também conheceremos oportunidades desafiantes. Cabe-nos estar à altura do tempo em que somos chamados a decidir e fá-lo-emos com os olhos postos no futuro.

Adina-Ioana Vălean, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, thank you. Honourable Members, I want to thank you on behalf of Commissioner Gentiloni for your report on the impact of new technologies (including crypto and blockchain) on taxation. Let me particularly thank the rapporteur, Madam Pereira, for the excellent work and for the opportunity to discuss this very important topic with you.

Let me start with some remarks linked to the challenges of rapid digitalisation in the area of taxation, in particular linked to the growth of crypto-assets. As you underline in your report, these are difficult to classify, value and administer. This poses a challenge to tax administrators seeking to tax them fairly and effectively. They often do this through administrative guidance, but some Member States have dedicated tax rules. Most Member States try to align the tax treatment of crypto-assets with that of comparable assets, while some Member States have a separate regime or rate for these. The EU should facilitate and foster the sharing of best practices among Member States in this area.

Then, a proposal to further revise the Directive on Administrative Cooperation to reflect the new reality of crypto-assets is under preparation. It aims to put crypto-asset service providers in a similar position to providers of traditional financial services. The Directive will also close the loophole for avoiding tax through the use of crypto-assets by ensuring that tax administrations have the information they need to tax these assets according to their tax rules.

Blockchain Technology. Now, your report mentions the role of technology in ensuring tax fairness and compliance. We are convinced of the potential of crypto and blockchain technology to build a new generation of decentralised trans-European systems in the area of taxation, as well as in customs. The Commission's services have been studying blockchain technology since 2017. Two successful proofs of concept with blockchain have been concluded since then. Eight Member States were involved in the last of these two pilots. We are assessing the feasibility of using EBSI as a platform for this new generation of trans-European systems. Yet we are cautious to make sure that such innovative solutions do not fall short of expectations, meet the legal requirements – such as the GDPR – and are fully supportable and maintainable in the long run. All this is being done under the Fiscalis programme.

Finally, the use of new technologies in the fight against tax fraud and evasion in the digital economy calls for capable tax administration staff. To this end, appropriate training and best practice sharing between the European tax administrations can only be beneficial. At their annual EU gathering (the 'TADEUS' event), their heads discussed what common projects they foresee in the area of digitalisation.

Honourable Members, let me conclude my introductory remarks here. I am looking forward to hearing your views.

Salvatore De Meo, *a nome del gruppo PPE*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, siamo tutti d'accordo che l'economia globale sta cambiando e che la sua progressiva digitalizzazione ci pone di fronte a nuove sfide che l'Unione europea e i suoi Stati devono affrontare in modo coeso e coordinato.

I principi dell'attuale quadro fiscale sono progressivamente superati e non garantiscono una tassazione equa, trasparente ed armonizzata sulle attività di criptovalute e di blockchain che, vista la loro esponenziale crescita, rischiano di alterare il mercato interno.

Ringrazio la relatrice per una risoluzione che affronta adeguatamente i vari aspetti, anche se, a mio avviso, nella definizione di un quadro fiscale aggiornato si dovrebbe tener conto anche dell'impatto ambientale della produzione di criptovalute, che per lo svolgimento delle operazioni di controllo e crittografia dei dati richiede importante quantità di energia e quindi emissioni di carbonio. Basti pensare, ad esempio, che la blockchain di Bitcoin consuma in un anno più energia dell'Italia.

Per questo va bene la creazione di un quadro normativo chiaro e trasparente, con una tassazione equa, che tenga conto anche dell'impatto ambientale dell'attività di Blockchain e garantisca la giusta competitività tra aziende, salvaguardando soprattutto quelle più piccole.

Aurore Lalucq, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je crois qu'on ne peut pas faire non plus comme s'il ne s'était rien passé cet été.

Alors on va se rafraîchir la mémoire ensemble. *Three Arrow Capital*, un fonds spécialisé dans les crypto-actifs, une faillite à 650 millions de dollars, des dettes à hauteur de 3,5 milliards. La plateforme *Celsius*, qui promettait des rendements à hauteur de 18 % sans aucune garantie des dépôts des utilisateurs, qui se sont fait plumer selon leurs dires, leurs comptes bloqués. Le créateur du Terra, le fameux *Stable Coin*, qui faisait la fierté de l'écosystème crypto, comme il s'appelle, qui est recherché aussi aujourd'hui par la police, son *Stable Coin* s'est auto-détruit en 24 h seulement.

Je pourrais aussi vous parler d'arnaques en tout genre, où des créateurs de certains produits financiers partent avec la caisse, de harcèlement téléphonique pour faire acheter à des petites gens des produits auxquels ils ne connaissent rien, de la chute du bitcoin ou de la perte abyssale de valorisation du marché des cryptos dans son ensemble.

C'est ça aujourd'hui le monde des cryptos, un marché qui s'est vendu comme celui des petits contre les grands, des faibles contre les puissants, David contre Goliath, anti-banques, anti-institutions publiques, anti-système, et qui a fait perdre à certaines personnes absolument tout.

Alors, en l'état actuel, quand on entend certains du secteur – je dis certains et je m'excuse auprès des acteurs honnêtes car il y en a, mais il faudrait aussi qu'ils se fassent un peu plus entendre –, le monde des cryptos est à l'alternative économique ce que Trump et Bolsonaro sont à l'alternative politique: un monde de vérité alternative qui prétend défendre les plus faibles alors qu'en réalité il les manipule pour défendre des intérêts privés, celui des plus puissants et des plus forts.

Et en plus, quand les petites gens se font plumer, on se moque d'eux. C'est vraiment d'un courage hallucinant. Alors oui, il faut les réguler. Oui, il faut les taxer, bien sûr, mais surtout pour les faire rentrer dans l'état de droit, tout simplement dans la démocratie.

Et je ne vais même pas parler du fond, je veux juste parler de la forme. Je voudrais remercier ma collègue Lydia Pereira, car on ne partage absolument pas la même vue sur les cryptos, et on a travaillé en responsabilité et en respect et en sens de compromis. Et on est arrivés à un rapport dont on n'a pas à rougir.

Martin Hlaváček, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, crypto and blockchain, they could serve us for good or they could serve us for the bad. So the question of today is: are we using their potential to help us to fight tax evasion, fraud, to combat all the tactics of those who want to avoid taxation? And the answer is, no. Why? Because villains are always ahead of legislation. And you have been for some time promising us something, and this is the DAC8, and we've been waiting, and we keep waiting. And until you move, we won't move this problem at all. So please, just stick to what we have promised to each other. Please put it in motion. Otherwise, today, it serves for the villains. I want to reverse it. I want crypto and blockchain to serve for us, to have fair standards and fair taxation in the digital space.

Mikuláš Peksa, *za skupinu Verts/ALE*. – Paní předsedající, řada lidí se nových technologií bojí, bohužel. Je to pro ně důvod snažit se kryptoměny zakazovat, komplikovat jejich využívání nebo se je pokoušet vytlačit z trhu. Taková snaha ovšem vždycky bude velmi nákladná, ať už ve smyslu peněz, administrativní náročnosti nebo narušování soukromí. Já věřím, že máme lepší volbu, protože pokud dokážeme nastavit základní férové podmínky a pravidla ohledně kryptoměn, otevírá se nám velká řada možností. Ty *smart* kontrakty, které lze díky blockchainu vytvářet, jsou cesta k novému decentralizovanému finančnictví, k tomu finančnímu sektoru, kterému už nemusí dominovat pár velkých bank s obrovskými právními odděleními, ale do kterého dokáže vstoupit parta programátorů sdružených ve startupu.

Transparence blockchainu – fakt, že celý jeho obsah je ukládán nezávisle na mnoha zařízeních najednou otevírá cestu k levnějšímu a efektivnějšímu výběru daní. Pokud díky tomu zabráníme daňovým únikům, může se jednat o krok k férovější společnosti, kde budou platit stejné podmínky pro malé podnikatele i obří nadnárodní firmy. Takže nebojme se nových technologií, pokud mají využití, ukáže se to. Pokud nemají, lidé je přestanou používat.

France Jamet, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, les transformations technologiques induites par la chaîne de blocs annoncent purement et simplement la disparition de l'autorité de l'État, garant des contrats individuels et des titres de propriété.

Il faut être bien conscient de ce qui se déroule en ce moment sous nos yeux: des pouvoirs naguère dévolus à l'État sont transférés à des réseaux d'entreprises et de financiers qui agissent en dehors de tout cadre démocratique, et, je dirais même, légal.

La décision de la Banque centrale européenne d'avoir recours aux services d'Amazon, société privée extra-européenne, pour la création de l'euro numérique, illustre parfaitement cette dérive fatale. Nous perdrons notre capacité à protéger nos données et à décider de la direction à faire prendre à ce secteur si sensible dans les années à venir.

Nous avons le devoir de garantir aux citoyens qu'aucune donnée publique ne sera traitée en dehors du cadre de la nation. Nous avons le devoir de faire émerger notre propre voix contre la toute-puissance des monopoles privés.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök asszony, Képviselőtársaim! Az új technológiák két oldalról állítanak kihívás elé minket. Fontos, hogy támogassuk a fejlődést, azonban megfelelően kell kezelnünk az ezekből származó veszélyeket. Így van ez a kriptoeszközök és a blockránc-technológia esetében is. Fontosnak tartom tehát, hogy átlátható és világos szabályozási keretet alakítsunk ki. Az unió versenyképesség érdekében a pénzügyekben is támogatni kell az innovációt, ugyanakkor a közterhek viseléséből ezek sem maradhatnak ki, ahogy azt nagyon helyesen leszögezi a jelentés. Az adóhatóságok munkája rájuk is ki kell, hogy terjedjen, nem lehetnek az adócsalás és az adóelkerülés eszközei.

A háború miatt romló gazdasági helyzetben, amelyet az uniós szankciók tovább súlyosbítanak, ennek jelentősége még nagyobb. Ehhez hasznos az uniós koordináció, azonban hangsúlyoznom szükséges, hogy itt is tiszteletben kell tartani a tagállami hatásköröket. Bár ezek a technológiák számos kérdést vetnek fel, ezek egyike sem adhat okot arra, hogy az adópolitikával kapcsolatos és a szerződésekben rögzített kompetencia megosztását bárki megkérdőjelezze.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, dear colleagues, in May 2021, there were about 9 000 different cryptocurrencies with a market capitalisation of almost EUR 2 trillion, driven mainly by Bitcoin, the most popular one with a market capitalisation of Bitcoin that was about 850 billion. The simulated potential revenue of taxing capital gains from Bitcoin in 2020 amounts to EUR 900 million, almost 0.3 % of total tax revenue for property taxation in the EU. These numbers make enough clear how much is urgent to act on the taxation of cryptocurrencies.

First, the Commission should assess the ways in which different Member States tax crypto-assets and the different national policies regarding the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion in the field of crypto-assets, underlining best practices and potential loopholes. Then the Member States should consider the specificities of the use of those assets in their national tax reforms to implement more effective systems that guarantee the fair, transparent, proportionate taxation of crypto-assets.

Would that be enough? Of course not. The only real solution always remains a unique fiscal policy at the EU level. How many years will we still have to waste before figuring it out?

Catch-the-eye procedure

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Iš tikrųjų pirmiausia noriu padėkoti už savalaikiai parengtą pranešimą. Mes, lietuviai, turime tokią gražią patarlę: nebeužtvenksi upės bėgimo. Tai aš manau, kad mes negalime sustabdyti naujų technologijų atėjimo į finansinį sektorių, ir ne apie tai dabar turėtume kalbėti. Mes turėtume kalbėti, kaip sudaryti teisingas žaidimo sąlygas, kad jos nekistų paties proceso metu, bet mes galėtume teisingai apmokestinti tiek kriptoturtą, tiek garantuoti socialines garantijas tiems žmonėms, kurie dirba šioje srityje, ir tiems žmonėms garantuoti, kurie įsitraukia naujai į naujų technologijų naudojimą, nes žinome, kad sudėtingesnėmis ekonominėmis sąlygomis žmonės linkę atsiliepti į tuos pasiūlymus, kurie atrodo finansiškai labai perspektyvūs. Deja, kaip minėjo kolegė, atsirandantys bankrotai, išnykstantys turtai žiauriai sukelia kančias tiems žmonėms, kurie čia dalyvauja. Todėl sveikinu pranešimą ir tikiu, kad mūsų pastangos sudarys sąlygas, kad mes galėtume teisingai apmokestinti ir sudaryti socialiai teisingesnes sąlygas.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamna comisară, stimați colegi, dezbatem impactul noilor tehnologii asupra impozitării. S-a spus aici, sigur, nu trebuie să fugim de noi soluții, de noi tehnologii. Singura problemă este că pentru a stabili o fiscalitate adecvată în funcție de soluție, trebuie să avem studii făcute și trebuie să le avem înainte de a intra în piață noile soluții tehnologice și noile tehnologii.

Din punctul meu de vedere, dacă am face acum o analiză, am putea vedea că în loc să avem un câștig cu intrarea noilor tehnologii, cu criptomonede, avem, din nefericire, așa cum s-a mai spus și aici, foarte multă evaziune fiscală și foarte mulți cetățeni care și-au pierdut veniturile. Nu s-a stăpânit acest sistem și cred că este bine ca mai întâi să facem regulile în piața internă, pentru că și așa aveam suficientă evaziune în piața internă pe politicile de fiscalitate clasice, nu mai era nevoie să adăugăm.

De aceea cred că odată cu acest raport vom putea să ajungem și la o definiție comună, trebuie să avem sisteme într-adevăr de competență națională, dar sub supraveghere, pentru a nu crea distorsiuni în piață, pentru a nu crea evaziune fiscală și, până la urmă, pentru a avea o coerență și o creștere economică și prin politicile fiscale adecvate.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Adina-Ioana Vălean, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for the quality of the debate today, which reflects the quality of your report. It is clear that new technologies will impact our tax systems. To ensure that this impact is positive and to achieve tax fairness and tax compliance through these technologies, we need to act in a coordinated manner at EU level. Your report contributes to this effort and I am looking forward to continue our collaboration on this topic with you.

Lídia Pereira, *Relatora*. – Senhora Presidente, o debate político é o campo da divergência. Mas é importante sublinhar que, quando falamos de novas tecnologias e de fiscalidade, há um amplo consenso com afirmações claras como, aliás, podemos ouvir nas intervenções ao longo do debate.

O primeiro consenso é que a fiscalidade tem de ser inteligente, tem que ser amiga da inovação e virada para o futuro.

O segundo consenso é que as novas formas de investimento e de poupança são oportunidades extraordinárias para todos, mas não devem ser janelas de oportunidade para a fraude e para a evasão fiscal.

O terceiro consenso é que as nossas políticas fiscais e as nossas autoridades tributárias têm de se adaptar rapidamente aos desafios da digitalização da economia e da descentralização dos mercados financeiros.

Finalmente, o consenso de que os impostos são nacionais, que a cooperação europeia é essencial e que um acordo internacional é fundamental.

Os tempos que vivemos, como também tive oportunidade de dizer mais cedo, são difíceis e são complexos. Estamos todos a ver as nossas contas a aumentar. As famílias veem a prestação da casa a subir de mês para mês e as empresas estão naturalmente inseguras com o aumento dos juros e a rutura das cadeias de abastecimento.

Portanto, este é o tempo de usar a política fiscal para ajudar as famílias e as empresas a ultrapassar a crise que já estamos a enfrentar e para antecipar os desafios de um futuro em que as novas tecnologias serão uma realidade do dia a dia.

Temos de estar, por isso, à altura do nosso tempo, mas sobretudo à altura do futuro que ambicionamos e que a Europa deve liderar.

President. – That concludes the debate. The vote will be held tomorrow.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Ondřej Kovařík (Renew), *in writing*. – With our economies moving away from the traditional models towards a more digital future, our taxation systems also need to be modernised. Therefore, amending the Directive on administrative cooperation in taxation (DAC 8) and the VAT Directive on tax in the digital area is apt. Thanks to new technologies such as Distributed Ledger Technology (DLT), our tax systems can adapt to the new reality, become more efficient and help improve tax submissions of individuals and companies. Notably SMEs could benefit from the use of DLT and smart contracts as these new technologies would facilitate SMEs' contact with tax authorities and thereby improve compliance with tax rules in the relevant jurisdictions in particular. As economies digitalise, strong cooperation not just on the EU level but also in international fora such as the OECD and G20 will be important to help streamline practices while addressing potential new forms of tax fraud and tax evasion. This report sends a strong signal from the European Parliament to tax authorities, highlighting the need to keep up with developments in the private sector, build on innovation and address the associated risks.

13. Opatření EU v oblasti svobody náboženského vyznání nebo přesvědčení na celém světě (rozprava)

President. – The next item is the Council and Commission statements on the EU's actions in the field of freedom of religion or belief worldwide (2022/2861(RSP)).

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I am pleased to discuss with you the EU sanctions in the field of freedom of religion or belief worldwide.

The EU is committed to respecting, protecting and fulfilling human rights in all areas of its external action. The freedom of religion and belief is a fundamental human right. It affects everyone. All persons have the right to manifest their religion or belief without fear of intimidation, discrimination, violence or attack. Protection must also apply to people who do not profess any religion or belief. The freedom of religion and belief is intimately connected to the realisation of other rights and values, including democracy, the rule of law, respect for human dignity, the principles of equality and solidarity, and respect for international law.

The Council has closely followed both persistent and new challenges facing the realisation of the freedom of religion and belief worldwide. The Council is well aware of the scope of freedom of belief violations that involves persecution, not mere intolerance of hundreds of millions of people around the world. Allow me to mention three recent issues.

First, especially in times of crisis, we often witness the rise of unjustified restrictions to human rights, including on the freedom of religion or belief. The Council recently highlighted that the COVID-19 pandemic has had a severe impact on the exercise of fundamental rights, including the freedom of religion or belief. As the Council stressed at the beginning of 2022, any restrictions to human rights in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic must be strictly necessary, proportionate, temporary in nature, and non-discriminatory.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Second, as we meet today, the international community is assembling at the Human Rights Council's 51st regular session in Geneva. The EU remains a firm supporter of the UN human rights system, including the Human Rights Council. Several of the issues recently highlighted by the EU and its Member States as requiring the Human Rights Council's urgent attention concern also the freedom of religion or belief, notably in respect of the human rights situation in Russia, Afghanistan, China, Eritrea, Myanmar and Nicaragua, among others.

Third, for many people around the world, religion and belief are a source of meaning, community and hope. In contrast, the growing number of violent conflicts across the world undermine the bonds that can support common efforts to address global problems such as climate change, the respect for all human rights, as well as the implementation of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Russia's continuing war of aggression against Ukraine has highlighted the need to ensure the protection of religious heritage sites and places of worship, especially when groups of people gathered in these places face threats. UNESCO recently reported that more than 70 religious buildings have been damaged in fighting in Ukraine this year alone.

These are just some of the challenges we face as we continue to work together to further strengthen the freedom of religion and belief worldwide. I trust that the European Parliament and the Council will continue this work together. Thank you very much for your attention.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, the European Commission is committed to ensuring respect for freedom of thought, conscience and religion. These are fundamental rights protected under Article 10 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

The Commission is also committed to fighting discrimination, racism and all forms of intolerance, including when linked to religion, and we make use of all means available under the Treaties to further that aim. EU law tackles different forms and manifestations of racism and intolerance, including hate crime and hate speech based on religion. The Commission is actively respecting these rights, observing these principles and promoting their application, in accordance with its powers and respecting the limits of the powers of the Union as conferred on it in the Treaties (Article 51 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union). The Commission has in past years launched several infringement cases against Member States that have not transposed them into national law. In order to put into effect in the Member States the principle of equal treatment, the Employment Equality Directive lays down a general framework for combating discrimination, including on grounds of religion or belief in the area of employment and occupation. The Commission carefully monitors that it is respected.

The Commission also promotes intercultural dialogue, including inter-religious dialogue, in its support for more inclusive societies for migrants and EU nationals with migrant backgrounds, in line with the action plan on integration and inclusion. In this context, the Commission is committed to protecting all Member States' religious groups from intimidation, discrimination, violence or attack, as well as from persecution within the EU.

On 5 October 2021, the Commission adopted the EU strategy on combating anti-Semitism and fostering Jewish life. With anti-Semitism on the rise in Europe and beyond, the strategy sets out a series of measures articulated around three pillars: to prevent all forms of anti-Semitism; protect and foster Jewish life; and promote research, education and Holocaust remembrance.

Freedom of religion or belief is also an essential feature in our external human rights policy. The line with all our partners across the world is clear. We consistently condemn discrimination, intolerance, violence and persecution against or by any person based on the grounds of religion or belief. We call on all countries to protect the right for everyone to have or not have a religion or belief, to manifest or to change their religion or belief, while condemning the criminalisation of apostasy and the abuse of blasphemy laws. We take a public stance condemning attacks against places of worship and against persecution and discrimination against people of all faiths, as well as non-believers. The EU also strongly condemns violence perpetrated in the name of religion, in particular violence against women or against LGBT persons.

Over the past year, we carried out key actions to promote and protect freedom of religion and beliefs. We raised our concerns in more than one third of the 60 human rights dialogues that we hold with partner countries. We also issue high-level statements and promote interfaith dialogue. We also promote and defend freedom of religion or belief in multilateral fora, where we support the mandate of the United Nations Special Rapporteur and yearly resolutions in the relevant United Nations human rights fora.

The EU has also taken several initiatives to foster freedom of religion and belief at local level, including involving civil society actors, faith-based organisations, humanists, atheists and religious actors. The implementation of the EU guidelines on freedom of religion and belief remains a key priority of the EU's external action. We are also providing concrete support to freedom of religion or belief through the EU's human rights and civil society programmes.

The Commission must act within its competence when addressing violations of freedom of religion or belief, while being mindful that the main responsibility lies with the EU Member States on this matter. But our objective is clear. There is no place for intolerance, intimidation, discrimination, attacks, persecution or violence in the name of religion or belief in the European Union and Member States or in any other partner country.

Jan Olbrycht, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Panie Ministrze! Rozmawiamy dzisiaj o jednej z najpoważniejszych kwestii, jednym z podstawowych praw człowieka. I oczywiście przyjmujemy z dużym uznaniem informację o tym, jakie działania podejmuje zarówno Komisja Europejska, jak i Rada. Mamy jednak wrażenie, że w dużej części są to jednak deklaracje, a niekoniecznie konkretne działania. Jako posłowie do Parlamentu Europejskiego wielokrotnie zwracaliśmy się o to, żeby szeroko rozpowszechniać sprawozdania i informować o sprawozdaniach, które są przygotowywane na temat łamania wolności religijnej. Wielokrotnie mówiliśmy o tym, żeby w sprawach bilateralnych strona Unii Europejskiej brała pod uwagę ewentualnie właśnie naruszenia wolności religijnej i żeby to miało swoje odzwierciedlenie w polityce zagranicznej prowadzonej przez służby zewnętrzne.

Od kilku lat czekamy na informacje dotyczące specjalnego wysłannika do spraw wolności religijnej i mamy nadzieję, że w najbliższych dniach dowiemy się nie tylko, kto będzie tym wysłannikiem, ale co stało się, że przez kilka lat nie można było tego wysłannika wyznaczyć. Chciałbym na końcu jeszcze powiedzieć, że jeżeli chcemy być wzorem dla całej Unii Europejskiej i dla całego świata, to powinniśmy również dbać o wolność religijną wewnątrz Unii. Sytuacja w Unii jest coraz bardziej skomplikowana i apeluję również do Komisji, do Rady o to, żeby zwróciły uwagę na temat wolności religijnej na terenie Unii Europejskiej.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, comisaria Dalli, si hay un punto de interés para el grupo que represento, el Grupo Socialista, en este debate sobre la libertad de religión o de creencias a escala mundial y la actuación de la Unión Europea, es precisamente el que nos recuerda que la libertad de religión, de creencias y de pensamiento es un derecho fundamental consagrado en la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea no solo para los ciudadanos europeos sino para todas las personas a las que se aplica el Derecho europeo, y que no existe mejor corolario de la libertad de religión que la libertad de no creer, de no profesar ninguna creencia y, por supuesto, de no estar obligado a confesar al respecto, así como el pluralismo religioso.

Para servir a ese objetivo, el Parlamento Europeo y la Comisión de Libertades, Justicia e Interior han apoyado un Instrumento para la Democracia y los Derechos Humanos que precisamente propicia el diálogo interreligioso y la cooperación con las comunidades religiosas, con el objetivo último, precisamente, de garantizar la separación de los poderes públicos con respeto de ninguna injerencia en el hecho religioso y en la libertad de religión.

Por tanto, apoyamos un fondo europeo, un Instrumento Europeo para los Derechos Humanos, para promover el diálogo interreligioso y la cooperación con las comunidades religiosas y la libertad de religión que tiene como corolario el pluralismo religioso en la Unión Europea.

Vlad-Marius Botoș, *în numele grupului Renew*. – Doamna vicepreședintă, doamna comisară, stimați colegi, libertatea religiilor și a credințelor religioase a fost recunoscută ca un drept esențial al omului. Este important ca Uniunea Europeană să susțină și să lupte pentru acest drept, cu atât mai mult cu cât în ultimii ani vedem încălcări tot mai grave.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Dreptul de a avea o religie vine cu o obligație de a recunoaște și respecta dreptul celorlalți de a nu avea aceleași credințe. Este inadmisibil ca în secolul XXI o tânără să fie omorâtă din motive religioase sau ca femeile să fie din nou și din nou abuzate dacă aparțin unor minorități religioase.

Este inadmisibil ca un scriitor să trăiască sub amenințarea morții pentru că a criticat o anumită religie sau ca un profesor să fie omorât doar pentru că a arătat elevilor niște imagini în care erau personaje religioase. Fie că aceste evenimente se întâmplă în Orient, în Statele Unite sau la noi acasă, în Uniunea Europeană, este important ca noi să utilizăm toate mijloacele care ne stau la dispoziție pentru a apăra dreptul de a avea propriile credințe, care până la urmă țin de intimitatea fiecăruia dintre noi.

Philippe Olivier, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, vous invoquez la liberté religieuse. Je pense qu'il ne viendrait à l'esprit de personne, ici, de contester cette liberté si essentielle à l'homme.

Pour autant, vous vous égarez lorsque, sous prétexte d'une politique inclusive dévoyée, vous faites la promotion du voile islamique – et je dirais même du voile *islamiste* – dans l'ensemble de votre communication institutionnelle. Des femmes et même des fillettes y apparaissent voilées, comme si on devait les réduire à n'être que des objets de concupiscence masculine. La liberté ne peut servir à promouvoir un symbole d'oppression des femmes, pas plus que la submersion de l'espace public par des démonstrations permanentes, même vestimentaires.

À l'heure où les Iraniennes se dressent pour leur liberté, votre indiscernement va à rebours de l'émancipation des femmes. En France, qui fut dans l'histoire un pays de terribles guerres de religion, nous avons trouvé un juste équilibre entre le libre exercice de la religion et le respect des consciences de tous: cela s'appelle la laïcité. Vous feriez bien de vous en inspirer.

Bert-Jan Ruissen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, mevrouw de commissaris, mijnheer de minister, vanavond heb ik eigenlijk maar één verzoek, en wel aan de commissaris: kom uw belofte na.

Ik heb het hier namelijk zwart op wit: een brief van mevrouw Von der Leyen. Een jaar geleden schreef zij mij – ik zal een kopietje bij u achterlaten –: "Geachte afgevaardigde Ruissen, de herbenoeming van de EU-gezant voor godsdienstvrijheid heeft mijn volle aandacht."

Maar er volgde nog een derde jaar, feitelijk zonder EU-gezant. Dat deze herbenoeming maar uitblijft, is dé reden van dit debat, dat begrijpt u wel. Met uw getreuzel stelt u namelijk niet alleen mij teleur en vele collega's hier in dit huis, u laat er miljoenen onderdrukte gelovigen mee in de kou staan!

Geloofsvervolging is springlevend en neemt zelfs toe: blasfemiewetten in Pakistan, antibekeringswetten in India, heropvoedingskampen in China, moordpartijen in Nigeria. Vandaag de dag ondervinden 360 miljoen christenen in vijftig landen zeer zware tot extreme vormen van vervolging. Dat alles mag u niet onberoerd laten. Ik vraag u: is de EU een gemeenschap van waarden of slechts van woorden?

Mijn oproep is dan ook: benoem die gezant, die regeringen wereldwijd aanspreekt op vrijheid van geloof. Zorg voor voldoende menskracht en budget. Doe wat u belooft!

György Hölvényi (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Mi a vallásszabadság? Az alapvető emberi jogok egyike, nem pedig vallási kérdés. Az ENSZ emberi jogi szerződései és uniós jogszabályaink is az emberi jogok közé sorolják a szabad vallásgyakorlást.

Az Emberi Jogok Egyetemes Nyilatkozatának 18. cikke alapvető jogként határozza meg a vallás szabad megválasztását és – nagyon fontos – annak gyakorlását is. Az EU-n kívüli vallásszabadságért felelős különmegbízottal 2019. január 15-én elfogadott jelentésünk is ezen alapvető jog nemzetközi érvényesítéséről szól.

Az uniós döntéshozatal szégyene, hogy a különmegbízottat azóta sem nevezte ki az Európai Bizottság. Mindez rossz üzenetet hordoz, az Európai Unió nem vállal szolidaritást a jogfosztottakkal. Az EU akkor lesz igazán hiteles, ha a poszt mellé érdemi felhatalmazást rendel. A három évvel ezelőtti jelentésünkben világosan és részletesen kifejtettük ezt a Bizottság felé.

Ismétlem: Amíg nem történik meg a kinevezés a megfelelő felhatalmazással, addig az Unió a szenvedők iránti közöny kultúráját terjeszti.

Joachim Kuhs (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Minister, Frau Kommissarin, werte Kollegen! Wir leben wahrlich in turbulenten Zeiten, und es besteht die Gefahr, dass wir vor lauter Angst vor einem Weltkrieg oder vor einer neuen Pandemie oder vor den Ideologen und Priestern der neuen Klimareligion wirklich wichtige Probleme, insbesondere das Schicksal der Menschen, aus den Augen verlieren, die wegen ihres Glaubens verfolgt werden. Dabei haben Zahl und Schwere der Fälle in den letzten Jahren in allen Erdteilen, besonders in der islamischen Welt, erschreckend zugenommen.

Unsere ID-Fraktion wird daher nächste Woche den Bischof von Nigeria als Vertreter einer stark verfolgten christlichen Gruppe zu Besuch haben.

Wir dürfen diese Probleme nicht ausblenden. Wir dürfen diese verfolgten Menschen nicht vergessen und nicht im Stich lassen. Sonst werden die Tyrannen dieser Welt, da sie auf keinen Widerstand stoßen, ungehindert ihr diabolisches Werk verrichten.

Werte Kommission, liebe Frau Dalli, bleiben Sie in dieser Sache nicht länger untätig und bestellen Sie endlich den Beauftragten für Glaubens- und Religionsfreiheit. Keiner von Ihnen hat bisher dazu etwas gesagt. Das kann doch wohl nicht wahr sein! Bitte tun Sie jetzt endlich etwas! Viele werden es Ihnen danken.

Carlo Fidanza (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Ministro, signora Commissaria, da tempo ormai pare che la libertà religiosa sia un tema scomodo, da trattare con riluttanza, rigorosamente a tarda ora e senza mai votare documenti impegnativi. E quando capita di votarli si fa fatica a riconoscere chi siano le vittime e chi siano i carnefici, quasi come se questo diritto umano fondamentale fosse, verrebbe proprio da dire, figlio di un Dio minore.

Siamo inermi quando questa libertà fondamentale viene attaccata nella nostra Europa, dove si può morire sgozzati in una chiesa, come padre Hamel, o schiacciati da un tram mentre si fugge da un'aggressione antisemita, come Jérémie Cohen. Siamo inermi perché il politicamente corretto impedisce di riconoscere che il radicalismo è figlio di politiche migratorie e di integrazione sbagliate.

Ma siamo inermi anche di fronte alla persecuzione quotidiana a cui troppi esseri umani in tutto il mondo sono sottoposti in ragione della loro fede. E siamo inermi perché più dell'80 % di essi sono cristiani, e questo imbarazza chi vorrebbe il cristianesimo confinato nella sfera privata e le nostre radici giudaico-cristiane recise dall'albero della nostra comune identità europea.

Questo relativismo esasperato impedisce da tempo alla Commissione di istituire, anche soltanto per qualche tempo, perché ormai siamo a fine legislatura, l'inviato speciale per la libertà religiosa, una figura che eserciti il *soft power* dell'Unione europea verso i paesi terzi, affinché questo diritto venga sempre garantito nei confronti di tutte le minoranze perseguitate, magari condizionando alla sua protezione l'erogazione delle ingenti risorse che ogni anno spendiamo in cooperazione e partenariati. La situazione nel mondo è in continuo deterioramento. Non c'è più un solo minuto da perdere.

Peter van Dalen (PPE). – Voorzitter, mevrouw de commissaris, ik kom net uit Pakistan. In Pakistan zitten honderden mensen in een dodencel omdat zij geloven. Ahmadi's, christenen wachten op de doodstraf, beschuldigd van godslastering.

Dat is niet alleen zo in Pakistan. Er zijn talloze landen in deze wereld waar christenen en andere gelovigen worden vervolgd.

De EU heeft de verplichting, vastgelegd in het Verdrag, om op te komen voor de godsdienstvrijheid. Dus heb ik maar één vraag aan u: waar blijft de speciale gezant voor de godsdienstvrijheid? Ik heb met collega's hier in de zaal en zelf de afgelopen jaren misschien wel zes, zeven brieven gestuurd aan mevrouw Von der Leyen, christendemocratische Commissievoorzitter, mijnheer Schinas, christendemocratische commissaris verantwoordelijk voor die gezant. Waar blijft die gezant? Die moet benoemd worden! De man die daar al maanden warm voor loopt, kan vandaag nog beginnen. Dat wil ik van u horen, de benoeming van die gezant, vandaag nog!

Catch-the-eye procedure

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Bardzo dziękuję za tę debatę. Przyłączam się do apelu o powołanie nowego pełnomocnika wysokiego wysłannika do spraw wolności religijnych. To ważne. Prześladowania ze względu na wiarę to ważny i palący problem dzisiejszego świata, ale głównie dotykają one chrześcijan jako najliczniejszej wspólnoty wierzących. Według niezależnych sprawozdań prześladowanie wyznawców Chrystusa w mijającym roku osiągnęło historyczne rekordy. Jeden na siedmiu chrześcijan spotkał się z formą dyskryminacji i prześladowania. Ponad 360 mln wiernych w 76 krajach codziennie musi bać się o swój los tylko ze względu na wiarę, którą wyznają.

Dlatego tak ważne, abyśmy ze strony Unii Europejskiej zweryfikowali klauzule niedyskryminacyjne, bo w tym wypadku muszą one obejmować prawa do swobodnego wyboru i wyznawania religii. I wreszcie w mojej ojczyźnie, Polsce, obywatele w ramach akcji w obronie chrześcijan zebrali ponad 150 tysięcy podpisów poparcia zmiany prawa tak, żeby skutecznie chroniło katolików, kościoły, a także wyznawców innych religii. I z tego miejsca chcę im wszystkim bardzo serdecznie podziękować.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, for me, I've been a lifelong campaigner for the separation of church and state. Religion, for me, is very much a private matter and I myself am an atheist. But I absolutely defend the right of every person to practice their religious beliefs, whatever that may be.

I noticed that colleagues are very vocal about the discrimination against Christianity and absolutely there is discrimination against Christians. We only need to see what happened in Syria when the West, in its keenness to overthrow the Assad regime, opened up the borders, allowed ISIS in, and unleashed the gates of hell to the Christians inside Syria.

But the reality is that the biggest persecuted religious group in Europe are Muslims. We see that in racist legislation enacted in numerous of our Member States, conflating Muslims with terrorists, and so on. I think it would be completely remiss to have this debate without mentioning the appalling massacre of Hazara women and young girls in Kabul last week, who just wanted to have an education.

Religion has been used to divide and rule. Everybody's religion should be protected, and all should be equal.

(End of Catch-the-eye procedure)

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister, honourable Members, I want to thank you for this useful debate on this sensitive and important topic.

As I said in my earlier statement, we need to be mindful of national competences for protecting freedom of religion or belief. The situation of freedom of religion or belief is alarming in many parts of the world, as we have heard, and is related, in many respects, to conflict situations and unacceptable instances of religious persecution. It is therefore crucial to work together at EU level, with the European Parliament and the Council to address these issues. The role of the Special Envoy for freedom of religion or belief is therefore very, very important in this context. The Commission is currently assessing the options regarding the position of Special Envoy for freedom of religion or belief, and will shortly take a decision on his or her appointment.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members. Commissioner, as I noted at the outset, the freedom of religion or belief concerns us all. Its realisation is closely connected to all other human rights.

The EU's promotion and protection of the freedom of religion or belief can also support the EU's other external action priorities. The engagement of the European Parliament in the field of freedom of religion or belief worldwide is also essential.

Honourable Members, we are approaching the 10th anniversary of the Council's adoption of the EU guidelines on the promotion and protection of freedom of religion or belief. The EU guidelines continue to support the EU's action in this field. They are used regularly in context with third countries and with international and civil society organisations. The implementation of the EU guidelines has been followed up regularly by the Council's Working Group on Human Rights.

Today's discussion is part and parcel of the EU guidelines initial call for regular exchanges of views with the European Parliament on their implementation, evaluation and review. We hope that the European Parliament and the Council will continue to work together to further strengthen the EU's role in promoting and protecting the freedom of religion and belief worldwide.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Alfred Sant (S&D), *in writing*. – As a secular entity, the EU should by example and direct diplomatic action, give witness to its commitment to the freedom of religion and belief worldwide, similar to its commitment to democracy and fundamental human rights. Internally it should guarantee – clearly to all – that its Member States uphold in full this commitment to the free practice of all religions, so long these respect widely accepted norms of behaviour, by disallowing practices like genital mutilation and child marriage. The EU should communicate through political and diplomatic channels that it expects its partners to respect freedom of religion within their territory, not least for EU citizens. For countries that do not show such respect, and indeed create restrictions on the appropriate practice of their religious beliefs and practices by EU citizens resident there, the EU should interdict any initiative by such states meant to promote any religion within the EU. This without in any way, hindering the individual citizens of such states resident in the EU, from practising their religion.

14. Opatření pro řízení, zachování a kontrolu platná v oblasti působnosti Komise pro tuňáky Indického oceánu (IOTC) (krátké přednesení)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Gabriel Mato über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Festlegung von Bewirtschaftungs-, Erhaltungs- und Kontrollmaßnahmen für den Zuständigkeitsbereich der Thunfischkommission für den Indischen Ozean (IOTC) und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EG) Nr. 1936/2001, (EG) Nr. 1984/2003 und (EG) Nr. 520/2007 des Rates [COM(2021)0113 - C9-0095/2021 - 2021/0058(COD)] - Fischereiausschuss (A9-0312/2021)

Gabriel Mato, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, me gustaría dar las gracias a mis colegas ponentes alternativos, así como a la Presidencia del Consejo y a la Comisión, por el acuerdo que hemos alcanzado sobre la transposición a la legislación de la Unión Europea de las medidas para la gestión del atún adoptadas en la Comisión del Atún del Océano Índico.

Hay una importante flota de la Unión Europea que opera en esta parte del planeta que es campeona mundial en sostenibilidad y que proporciona, además, a los consumidores de la Unión Europea proteínas de pescado nutritivas de alta calidad, que, al mismo tiempo, aporta beneficios socioeconómicos a las empresas de la Unión Europea y a las comunidades costeras, y que contribuye a la economía local y al desarrollo sostenible del sector de la pesca en la zona.

La importancia estratégica de la presencia de la Unión Europea en terceros países es, por lo tanto, múltiple: beneficia a los operadores y consumidores de la Unión Europea así como a la sostenibilidad y a la buena gobernanza de los océanos. La Unión Europea, a través de la Comisión, a la que me gustaría elogiar aquí, es líder en estos foros internacionales.

Cuando se trata de transponer en la Unión Europea las decisiones adoptadas en dichos foros internacionales después de largas negociaciones, el principal problema para mí y para mi Grupo es garantizar que se transpongan lo más fielmente posible con el fin de establecer condiciones de competencia equitativas para todos los operadores que pescan en la misma zona y comercializan sus productos en el mercado de la Unión Europea. Si la Unión Europea impone medidas más estrictas para su flota nacional, esta última pierde competitividad frente a los operadores extranjeros. Garantizar condiciones idénticas para todos, al tiempo que se promueven las normas estrictas en materia de sostenibilidad de la Unión Europea en las organizaciones regionales de ordenación pesquera y en otros foros internacionales, es crucial para nuestros operadores y para mejorar la gobernanza internacional de los océanos.

Otra cuestión que me gustaría mencionar es la necesidad de transponer los acuerdos de estas organizaciones lo más rápidamente posible. Creo que todos estamos comprometidos con esto. Para mí la clave es encontrar el equilibrio adecuado entre la necesidad de ir rápido, pero, al mismo tiempo, hacer que las cosas funcionen bien.

En primer lugar, creo que tenemos que avanzar en la etapa en la que la Comisión elabora su propuesta. A este respecto, la propuesta de la Comisión a veces llega tarde a los colegisladores. Debemos mejorar en este aspecto.

La segunda cuestión en la que necesitamos mejorar es la calidad de la propuesta de la Comisión. A menudo la propuesta va más allá de lo que se decide en las organizaciones regionales de ordenación pesquera. Esto es así, aunque no les guste mucho que se lo recordemos.

Pero, viendo lo que ha sucedido con el Acto de ejecución de la Comisión por el que se clausuran 87 zonas, extralimitándose en sus facultades e incumpliendo la obligación de tener en cuenta los aspectos socioeconómicos, además de los medioambientales, es fácil entender por qué cada día somos más escépticos en otorgar poder a la Comisión.

Por lo tanto, sí a las medidas ambiciosas; sí a la rápida aplicación de los acuerdos internacionales, pero siempre buscando el equilibrio adecuado para garantizar la igualdad de condiciones para todos los operadores y, en todo caso, respetando siempre el papel de cada institución en el proceso de toma de decisiones.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, merci à Monsieur Mato, Monsieur le rapporteur. L'océan Indien est dans une situation qui est très préoccupante puisque le thon albacore est au bord de l'effondrement. Il y a dans la région des problèmes de pêche illégale et de sous-déclaration de captures. Il n'y a pas assez d'inspections obligatoires.

Donc, face à cette situation, la Commission européenne proposait une mesure supplémentaire de bon sens: une obligation de pesée des captures lors des transbordements, lorsqu'on transfère le poisson d'un bateau de pêche à l'autre dans les ports afin d'avoir plus de traçabilité.

Mais sous la pression des pêcheurs thoniers industriels, les États membres s'y sont opposés au prétexte que cela créerait des règles de concurrence inéquitable entre les navires européens et les navires de l'océan Indien. C'est une occasion manquée d'agir pour les océans. C'est inquiétant dans un contexte où est négocié le règlement de contrôle des pêches et que des États membres et une partie de ce Parlement demandent des dérogations aberrantes pour les navires thoniers industriels.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I appreciate today's discussion on the Commission proposals regarding the management measures of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and I want to thank the rapporteur and all those involved in the negotiations.

The main purpose of the Commission proposal regarding the IOTC is to implement into EU law the conservation and enforcement measures adopted by this organisation at its annual meeting of May 2021. The transposition of measures by the IOTC is a regular legislative exercise, as the organisation meets every year to update and adopt conservation and management measures related to the stocks it is entrusted to manage.

I believe that, overall, the amendments by the co-legislator improve the text and, at the same time, these amendments are in line with the organisation's conservation and management measures. The adoption of this amended regulation will allow EU vessels to fish in future fishing seasons on the same footing as vessels from other contracting parties of the IOTC, which is a recurrent request from many stakeholders across the EU.

In addition, our proposal included delegated powers to the Commission, in particular, concerning the use of non-entangling and biodegradable fish aggregating devices. Such delegated powers are important in order to ensure a simple and fast transposition into EU law of these technical rules that change every year. However, we regret that the co-legislators missed the opportunity to simplify the overall transposition process and that some of the avenues proposed by the Commission to streamline the process were not supported, despite Parliament's and the Council's early calls on the Commission to further improve the process. The transposition process lasts, on average, 18 months, from the drafting of the proposal by the Commission to its adoption by the co-legislators. This is far too long and we continue to believe that further simplification is necessary.

In this context, I ask for the inclusion of a statement on behalf of the Commission in the minutes of this debate, reflecting our position on this particular point. The Commission will, of course, continue to work together with the European Parliament and the Council on further improvements to the implementation process, and we hope that, in the future, we will be able to agree on a way forward.

What's more, the Commission cannot accept a relaxation of the rules undermining the accuracy of such data, what we call 'the margins of tolerance', and some amendments by the co-legislators to the Commission proposal on the revision of fisheries controls are specifically designed for the external EU tuna fleet and would undermine the international credibility of the EU. These amendments are in sharp contrast to the fact that the EU is pushing its partners for more accurate reporting within regional fisheries management organisations like the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission within the framework of international ocean governance and in the context of our zero-tolerance approach towards illegal fishing.

We are, however, confident that we will find common ground in the ongoing trilogue negotiations.

Written Statement by the Commission

The European Parliament and the Council have on several occasions underlined the need to further improve the process of implementation of conservation measures adopted by Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs), notably in terms of their timely adoption.

Against this background the Commission regrets that its attempt to streamline the implementation process has not been fully retained by the European Parliament and the Council. The Commission will continue to work together with the European Parliament and the Council on further improvements to the implementation process.

Die Präsidentin. – Vielen Dank, Frau Kommissarin! Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen. Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 4. Oktober 2022, statt.

15. Flexibilní pomoc územím (FAST-CARE) (krátké přednesení)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Niklas Nienaß über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1303/2013 und der Verordnung (EU) 2021/1060 im Hinblick auf zusätzliche Flexibilität zur Bewältigung der Folgen des militärischen Angriffs durch die Russische Föderation FAST - CARE (Flexible Assistance for Territories – Flexible Unterstützung für Gebiete) [COM(2022)0325 - C9-0218/2022— 2022/0208(COD)] - Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung (A9-0232/2022)

Niklas Nienaß, *rapporteur.* – Madam President, just before the summer break, the Commission proposed to us yet another emergency measure to tackle the consequences of the terrible war in Ukraine. It is, though, the fifth time within two years to finance an emergency tool out of the funds of EU regional development.

During the pandemic, we agreed upon more support for regions, citizens and the economies, as well as healthcare infrastructure through the Corona Response Investment Initiative, or CRII, then followed up with CRII+. This year we needed urgent help for regions, as regards to the support of refugees fleeing from the Russian aggression in Ukraine. We called it CARE, then another one CARE+. And now we are talking about FAST-CARE.

All these responses have shown that cohesion policy is able to help citizens in the long term but also, if need be, can react swift and in order to mitigate the impact of imminent crisis. However, we must take our responsibility as parliamentarians very serious and check very carefully if an emergency procedure is always justified. It cannot become the new modus operandi for the EU's policy to use emergency procedure over and over again.

Because what's next? What about the daily challenges and future ones, if we do not stick to the strategic goals of our policies and renounce resilience and preparedness? Cohesion policy is of utmost importance for the whole European Union. It is the main investment tool to help us eradicate social and territorial inequalities. Cohesion policy means solidarity within and amongst regions. Cohesion policy is not just a problem solver but a tool for democracy and we need that more than ever. We cannot and should not cut it whenever a crisis arises. Instead, we must find other solutions. The Commission must find different sources of funding.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Tomorrow, we will vote on FAST-CARE – the proposed urgent procedure gave the REGI committee a lot of headaches, to be honest, because of the matters of the principle that I already mentioned. We did take our time to look into the details of the proposal and to evaluate the substance of it. And this is our constitutional duty as co-legislators.

FAST-CARE now allows flexibility in terms of transfer between funds and regions, support for not only Ukrainians but also third-country refugees, allows for more funding money for regions due to 100% subsidies and some more. And the Commission has taken up on our call for direct funding for cities and municipalities that we express as the committee in various reports. Now, 30% of the money for helping with refugees will be spent by local actors. This is a good start, but FAST-CARE also allows for phasing of delayed projects in the current funding period. It is good to save this project and make sure that these resources already spent don't go to waste. But it may include projects like construction of regional airports which are not eligible at all anymore and this is for good reason.

All these measures are needed and, content wise, we support most of this without any hesitation. But all these measures simply mean cuts to the cohesion budget and do jeopardise the idea being behind cohesion policy, because it is a policy that not only has a real impact when it is implemented in a long-term approach by preparatory instruments and strategically considers all regions of Europe.

For emergency measures, fresh money is needed. We can't tackle them only by shifting the existing money from A to B. We need a more flexible MFF and not only a flexibilisation on an existing regulation.

You know, I am a young European, I was involved in the Conference on the Future of Europe process as well as the internal EP process and, of course, I am definitely in favour of modifying EU rules that are clearly outdated. But we exceptionally must take all fashion in one main regard when it comes to EU cohesion policy. We need to move back to the root of it as a strategic investment to secure overall harmonious development for all cities and regions in Europe in the long term.

With emergency measures like FAST-CARE we risk to undermine our common goals, we risk to leave regions behind and we risk European democracies as a whole. Because the political shift in Europe arises, particularly from regions and citizens that do not feel heard and seen, that are left behind. And this is what we contact with a holistic and strategic approach from cohesion policy. And if we should focus on that, we would not even have to invest in most emergency measures because we would support regions in becoming resilient for future challenges, be it a pandemic in healthcare systems, be it an economic crash, or the environmental crisis ahead.

We need commitment from the Member States, we need commitment from the Commission – for the Commission to act in solidarity. So I call for the Commission that if you should propose another emergency measure, I would ask you to provide also a plan on how to solve the issues in the long run, how to fade out from the emergency to regular legislation and how to finance them without dropping out of our future. Thank you very much and I am looking forward for support for this FAST-CARE proposal.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Tsvetelina Penkova (S&D). – Madam President, my remarks would be more or less in line with what the rapporteur just said. We saw during the COVID pandemic that cohesion funds could be crucial to help our citizens in crisis situations. However, we have to be careful not to turn the cohesion funds into a common pool where everyone could just take out money for various projects.

This is not the case now. The Cohesion's Action for Refugees and the following flexible assistance to territories are very needed instruments because they're the only way we could show real, measurable European solidarity to people fleeing war at the moment. They show this not only with words, but with specific and concrete actions.

It is crucial that this proposal be adopted as soon as possible, because otherwise our local and regional authorities and civil society organisations cannot get the funding quickly enough. In that case we would be risking to jeopardise our help and increase the disparities within the Union.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich will mich bei dem Berichterstatter Herrn Nienaß für die gute Zusammenarbeit bedanken.

Stimați colegi, acum este momentul să utilizăm toate mijloacele posibile pentru a sprijini ucrainenii care au fugit din calea războiului, femeile și copiii ucraineni care trăiesc temporar printre noi. Cetățenii europeni s-au mobilizat într-un mod absolut impresionant. Așa au făcut și românii mei în județele Maramureș, Suceava, în Tulcea. Acestea ne arată că spiritul european este încă la un nivel foarte ridicat, în ciuda propagandei antieuropene susținute în mod clar și continuu de către Putin și Rusia.

Însă nu este suficient efortul individual al oamenilor. Trebuie să găsim resurse, dar și să ne asigurăm că acestea ajung la cei care au nevoie de ele. Trebuie să ajutăm ONG-urile și autoritățile locale care se implică în gestionarea și integrarea refugiaților. În normele de aplicare, în discuțiile cu fiecare stat membru, este important să prioritizați proiectele de integrare și o minimă autonomie financiară a refugiaților, pentru ca aceștia să își poată singuri asigura nevoile minime pentru un trai cât de cât decent și să nu depindă exclusiv de gazda lor sau de autoritățile publice.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you, Madam President. Honourable Members, since the Russian aggression on Ukraine started, Europe has welcomed an unprecedented number of people – mostly women and children.

We stand united and our response – also thanks to this House – has been firm and unwavering in full solidarity with the Ukrainian people. Beyond the human suffering, the economic costs of Russia's unprovoked and unjustified war of aggression and weaponising of gas supplies are acutely felt in Europe. Among the measures introduced at Union level and with the indispensable support of this Parliament, cohesion policy has been instrumental in addressing these challenges.

But we hear time and again from all our partners, NGOs, regions and Member States, that the first two CARE packages were welcome, but more must be done. So FAST-CARE responds to these calls. It leverages cohesion funding to the aid of Member States and refugees, ensuring that support reaches those at the forefront of the solidarity effort, NGOs and local authorities. FAST-CARE also tackles the difficulties and delays in cohesion projects, due notably to shortages of supplies and inflated costs of raw material to ensure investments continue and projects do not come to a halt. FAST-CARE aims, first, to provide additional flexibility for projects addressing migratory challenges, second to alleviate the impact of public budgets by an extra EUR 3.5 billion of pre-financing, as well as higher co-financing rates, third to support local authorities and NGOs, making sure at least one-third of resources reach them directly and, fourth, to support projects delayed by implementation difficulties.

While we are introducing significant flexibility, we do not compromise on our core cohesion policy principles and objectives. With these measures in place, Member States and managing authorities will be able to finish major projects under the previous programming framework and move forward to the new programmes to achieve cohesion policy's long-term objectives of reducing disparities and promoting convergence.

This package is crucial, and time is of the essence. I am particularly grateful to this Parliament, the REGI Committee and the rapporteur for once again playing a decisive role in ensuring that Europe provides tangible solutions to the unprecedented challenges of the day.

FAST-CARE is yet another illustration of our Union's capacity for careful consideration and swift action at the service of citizens. These last two years, circumstances have many times required that we adopt new initiatives at maximum speed, and every time we have done this quickly – motivated by our common European values of solidarity. So many thanks to this House, and I commend this legislation to Parliament.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen. Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 4. Oktober 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Sara Cerdas (S&D), *por escrito*. – O relatório pretende permitir uma maior flexibilidade para fazer face às consequências da agressão militar da Federação da Rússia (Assistência Flexível aos Territórios) FAST - CARE. Esta proposta foi anunciada no plenário de julho e remetida à Comissão de Desenvolvimento Regional, sendo apresentada pela Comissária Elisa Ferreira. A proposta considera o impacto da agressão militar russa e proporciona respostas através de uma série de flexibilidades, que dizem respeito a vários aspetos fundamentais que também afetam as Regiões Ultraperiféricas, como a Madeira e os Açores, como os programas da política de coesão para 2021-2027 que devem reforçar a competitividade das economias locais, através do desenvolvimento do turismo e da produção agrícola ou de respostas para as necessidades básicas dos cidadãos através do financiamento, da habitação, do abastecimento de água, da gestão dos resíduos, das energias renováveis e das infraestruturas de saúde, bem como da formação e da educação. Todo este processo obedeceu a um procedimento simplificado, desde a apresentação da proposta da Comissão Europeia, durando cerca de 3 meses até chegar a votação no plenário do Parlamento Europeu onde o seu relator relembra a urgência para a entrada em vigor deste regulamento e por essa razão recomenda a aprovação pelo Parlamento sem alterações.

Elżbieta Kruk (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Agresja zbrojna Federacji Rosyjskiej na Ukrainę doprowadziła do destabilizacji sytuacji geopolitycznej i gospodarczej Świata. Eskalacja tego konfliktu szczególnie dotkliwie wpływa na środkowe i wschodnie regiony Unii Europejskiej, w tym Polskę, doprowadzając do poważnego kryzysu migracyjnego, załamania łańcuchów dostaw, jak i dramatycznego wzrostu cen oraz kosztów energii.

Sytuacja jest więc nadzwyczajna i wymaga pilnego działania. Dlatego wniosek Komisji w sprawie „Elastycznej pomocy dla terytoriów" (FAST-CARE) należy procedować jak najszybciej, by sprostać tym wyzwaniom w jak największym zakresie i w odpowiedzi na potrzeby poszczególnych państw członkowskich. W związku z tym należy zapewnić większą elastyczność wykorzystywania środków i umożliwić szybsze oraz pełniejsze wsparcie z Funduszy, aby odciążyć budżety krajowe oraz ułatwić realizację działań dotyczących zarówno wyzwań migracyjnych, jak i zakłóceń na rynku w kluczowych sektorach gospodarki.

Kryzys jest daleki od zakończenia i musimy skupić się na jego jak najszybszym zażegnaniu, dla dobra nas wszystkich. Jasne jest, że zmieniająca się sytuacja wymaga dodatkowych, wzmożonych działań.

Rovana Plumb (S&D), *în scris*. – Asistența flexibilă pentru teritorii (FAST – CARE) este un nou pachet legislativ care face posibilă obținerea de finanțare prin intermediul politicii de coeziune a Uniunii Europene, destinat autorităților locale, organizațiilor din societatea civilă și statelor membre care găzduiesc refugiați.

Acest lucru este de o importanță deosebită pentru regiunile care se confruntă cu fluxuri migratorii și, în special, pentru comunitățile UE care se învecinează cu Ucraina. Politica de coeziune este deci instrumentul care ne ajută să abordăm consecințele agresiunii ruse asupra poporului și teritoriului ucrainian. Trebuie să fim flexibili și, în consecință, să adaptăm regulile pentru a ne asigura că banii sunt cheltuiți în mod inteligent și că ajung la cei care au cea mai mare nevoie de ei.

16. Jednominutové projevy k důležitým politickým otázkám

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

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Doamna președintă, cu toții privim spre Ucraina, manifestându-ne aprecierile, empatia pentru victimele și suferințele acestui popor. Europa și lumea întreagă îi asigură mai departe întregul suport pentru a face față acestui război. Trebuie să fim conștienți însă de provocările cu care se confruntă statele aflate la granița cu Ucraina din perspectiva tranzitului de cereale.

România înțelege pe deplin importanța acestuia și necesitatea asigurării unei securități alimentare la nivel mondial. Tocmai de aceea am deschis noi puncte de frontieră și am redus la maximum posibil birocrația. Se constată însă un fenomen îngrijorător, respectiv rămânerea unor cantități însemnate de cereale din Ucraina pe teritoriul Uniunii Europene, dar mai ales în țările de la graniță, cum ar fi România, deși aceste cereale ar trebui să ajungă mai ales în țările africane.

Acest lucru generează o concurență profundă, neloială pentru fermierii din întreaga Uniune Europeană, din România, care se văd nevoiți să-și vândă propria producție mult sub prețul de cost. Solidaritatea trebuie să existe, dar asta nu înseamnă că trebuie să ne distrugem fermierii.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamna comisară, criza energetică se accentuează, iarna bate la ușă. Din punctul meu de vedere și din punctul de vedere al cetățenilor pe care îi reprezint, din România, Comisia Europeană mimează solidaritatea. Și am să vă explic de ce, doamna comisară.

România are doar jumătate din gospodării care utilizează biomasă. Mai puțin de jumătate din gospodării, 44 %, sunt racordate la gaz metan. O treime din locuințele din România sunt racordate direct la gaz metan. Consumul mediu de gaz metan pe locuință este sub media Uniunii Europene. România consumă sub un mega kilowatt pe oră pe locuitor energie electrică. Sunt alte state care consumă de două, de trei ori, de patru ori, de cinci ori. Și vine Comisia cu propunerea să scădem consumul, toate statele membre, cu 5 %.

România, dacă consumă sub un mega kilowatt pe locuitor, dacă mai scade cu 5 %, egal, cum ar scădea și Suedia, care consumă 4 %, ce se întâmplă cu locuitorul, cetățeanul din țara mea? Nu credeți că solidaritatea înseamnă să avem consum egal pentru toți cetățenii din cele 27 de țări? Românii s-au săturat de dublă măsură: nu suntem în Schengen, nu avem vize pentru America și ne puneți să trăim în întuneric și la lumânare.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospa predsednica. Kolegice in kolegi.

Države članice te Unije smo – kolikor vem – enakopravne. In – kolikor vem – so enakopravni tudi vsi naši jeziki. In – kolikor vem – imamo skupen trg. In zato ne vem, zakaj bi nekaterim multinacionalkam, ki so na naših trgih, dopustili, da tega ne upoštevajo.

Pravila, ki veljajo na našem enotnem trgu v fizičnem svetu, morajo veljati tudi v digitalnem. Seveda je pri tem pomembna tudi zakonodaja, to je jasno. A v tem primeru je prav toliko – če ne še bolj – pomembno, tudi zavedanje, da diskriminacije preprosto ne sme biti. Da moramo vsi imeti pravico do izbire, v tem primeru do izbire ogleda filma ali serije s podnapisi ali sinhronizacijo v maternem jeziku.

Noben jezik ni bolj ali manj pomemben, zagotovo pa je materni vsakemu najpomembnejši, meni torej slovenščina. Zato bom storila vse, kar lahko, za to, da se naša večjezičnost začne spoštovati na vseh ravneh, tudi na ravni vseh digitalnih platform.

In ker – kolikor vem – Slovenija ni edina, ki se sooča s to težavo, tukaj drage kolegice in dragi kolegi, računam tudi na vas.

Gianantonio Da Re (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 23 settembre la Presidente von der Leyen, riferendosi alle imminenti elezioni italiane, ha dichiarato: «Se c'è un governo democratico che vuole lavorare con noi, lavoreremo assieme. Al contrario, se le cose dovessero prendere una direzione difficile, abbiamo gli strumenti per intervenire.» Presidente von der Leyen, cosa intendeva dire con «direzione difficile»? Forse un voto non gradito all'élite dei palazzi europei?

Ebbene, l'Italia è un paese democratico. Il popolo italiano si è espresso liberamente, dando piena fiducia alla coalizione del centrodestra. Per assicurare un futuro all'Europa è indispensabile che la Commissione non interferisca nelle sfere di competenza che non le appartengono. Chiediamo il rispetto per la sovranità popolare, non solo dell'Italia, ma di tutti i paesi europei. Questa ingerenza nella politica italiana è stata grave e vergognosa. Il popolo italiano non è sicuramente ricattabile.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, o Conselho anunciou um conjunto de medidas para dizer que está a conter os preços da energia. São medidas que, sem surpresa, estão muito longe de corresponder ao necessário, que ignoram os efeitos das sanções que agravaram problemas já existentes. São temporárias, de alcance limitado e não tocam nos mercados que a todo o custo é preciso defender. Aos lucros das empresas, tão obscenos que já a Comissão Europeia os vem apelidar de superlucros, propõe-se uma taxa, mínima, risível, migalhas para que uns continuem a acumular riqueza à custa do empobrecimento dos povos.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

O que é preciso é intervir na formação de preços, fixar preços máximos na eletricidade, no gás, nos combustíveis, regular o mercado, recuperar o controlo público do setor da energia. Medidas que exigem outras para repor o poder de compra, combater o empobrecimento, aumentar o salário mínimo, aumentar salários e prestações sociais acima da inflação, controlar os preços dos bens essenciais, tributar os lucros de forma séria, substancial, revertendo para o investimento em serviços públicos e na produção nacional.

Aqui ficam, Senhora Comissária, algumas ideias para resolver os problemas concretos com que os povos se confrontam hoje.

Nadine Morano (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, je soutiens sans réserve les femmes iraniennes, leur courage, leur héroïsme, celles qui se battent pour se libérer du voile qui est une prison.

Elles risquent leur vie tous les jours, et nous, en Europe, alors que le voile n'est pas un simple vêtement, il est l'instrument politique d'un islam radical qui soumet les femmes, le voile n'est pas conforme à notre mode de vie européen, notre idéal de liberté au principe de l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes que nous défendons, je ne peux pas accepter ce prosélytisme permanent qui est fait par la Commission européenne à travers ses campagnes de communication à l'endroit de notre jeunesse, cet entrisme islamiste qui gangrène nos institutions.

Je demande à la Commission de diligenter une enquête interne afin de démasquer les responsables qui ont laissé produire de manière répétée une véritable propagande pour le voile.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, es un hecho que la Unión Europea se ha construido a través de sus crisis, uniéndose en su diversidad, y nada lo expresa mejor como la insularidad, las regiones insulares en las que viven nada menos que 20 millones de europeos. Se trata de sesenta regiones insulares, entre las que destacan las regiones ultraperiféricas, que son las únicas que están consagradas por su nombre en el Tratado de Lisboa.

En algunas de ellas, el gran protagonista es el turismo. Este es el caso de Canarias, la región de la que procedo, donde el turismo representa el 33 % de su PIB y más del 36 % del empleo.

Canarias se está reinventando, después de la pandemia y de la guerra de Ucrania, para relanzarse con una Convención Europea de Islas Turísticas que tendrá lugar en el mes de diciembre, apuntando a la Presidencia española del segundo semestre del 2023, con la idea de incorporar economía azul, economía verde, pero, sobre todo, innovación y digitalización para marcar el mensaje de superación y de cooperación público-privada.

Merece enteramente el apoyo de las instituciones europeas y de este Parlamento.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamna Președintă, vorbim de gândiri de criză energetică și căutăm soluții pentru a reduce dependența de gazul rusesc. Toate acestea sunt preocupări reale la nivel european. Sunt subiecte pe care le dezbatem în permanență aici. Ei bine, toate acestea sunt subiecte extrem de importante și la nivel local, acolo unde unii dintre colegii noștri primari, consilieri locali, politicieni locali sunt în legătură directă cu cetățenii și le aud zilnic îngrijorările.

Este incredibil însă cum primarii care găsesc soluții inovative, cum este colega mea, Clotilde Armand, primarul din Sectorul 1 București, pentru a crea energie verde, antreprenorii care vin cu metode noi pentru a produce energie regenerabilă la nivel local, se lovesc de micile dispute politice.

Dragi colegi care sunteți atât de vocali aici la nivelul Parlamentului European, convingeți-vă colegii de acasă că binele oamenilor primează, că proiectele care rezolvă soluția energiei și a poluării în același timp trebuie susținute, indiferent de la ce grup sau partid politic vin. Altfel, tot ce facem noi aici este doar demagogie pură.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Madam President, in Princeton, Ursula von der Leyen blatantly interfered in the Italian elections. She said, 'if things go in a difficult direction – and I've spoken about Hungary and Poland – we have tools'. Put bluntly, she threatened Italy with Article 7 legal proceedings and the withholding of EU funds. It's not normally my style to use coarse metaphors, but there's a time for figures and another for calling a spade a spade. The unelected, anti-democratic EU Commission, which is violating the EU treaties left, right and centre, is criticising fairly and democratically elected governments as undemocratic. I'm afraid, though, it rather resembles a seasoned prostitute chastising women for pre-marital cohabitation as right old slappers.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – The UN Charter is the foundational treaty of the United Nations, since 1945. When Russia invaded Ukraine, they breached the rules of the UN Charter. It was illegal. Sadly, it has been breached far too often.

I've just read this excellent book by Vijay Prashad and Noam Chomsky: *The Withdrawal*. It highlights how the UN Charter has been abused. Here are a few quotes from the book:

'The war in Afghanistan was unprovoked, it was an illegitimate aggression, and it was a severe atrocity.'; '40% of civilians killed by airstrikes were children.'; 'The US had no basis whatsoever for invading Afghanistan.'

The UN Charter was ignored.

The US assassination campaign by drones is the worst territorial campaign in the world so far. It kills people that the US believes pose a threat to the US or to its interests.

The UN Charter is ignored.

In 1991, the US refused to accept Saddam's surrender and bombed everywhere they could. When asked why, President Bush said, 'We've shown that what we say goes'.

The UN Charter was ignored.

It's long past time that all countries should respect the UN Charter, and the UN or the EU should have nothing to do with those that don't.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Madam President, recently, yet another instance of disinformation and slander of Greece's handling of migrants at its borders was proven to be categorically false when NGO Human Rights 360, which represents 38 asylum seekers stranded on the islet in the River Evros, admitted that it had been misled about the facts.

Thus, the assertions of the Greek Government and authorities were true all along – namely that the 38 migrants were stranded on Turkish territory, no person rescued was in need of hospitalisation, and there were no injured, missing or dead children. As in this case, Greece protects our European borders with full respect for international law and our humanitarian duties. By contrast, it is Turkey, which weaponises migrants, exploiting their plight and their suffering.

An apology is owed to Greece by those who slander it, which sadly includes opposition MEPs seeking petty political gains. But we will fight against those who discredit and slander Greece on the international stage because, as they say in my country, 'a clear sky fears no lightning', and in Greece the skies are blue and clear.

Lara Wolters (S&D). – Voorzitter, ik maak mij druk over het WK in Qatar. Dan heb ik het niet over de vraag of we dat WK wel of niet moeten boycotten. Dan heb ik het over de vraag hoe we concreet de uitgebuite arbeidsmigranten in Qatar kunnen compenseren.

Ik word heel erg kwaad als ik mensen bezig hoor over die vraag, want op dit moment zie ik vooral dat iedereen naar elkaar wijst. Nationale bonden wijzen naar de FIFA, de FIFA wijst dan naar Qatar, en dan zegt Qatar: "O, maar er is al zoveel verbeterd!", en uiteindelijk gebeurt er voor de slachtoffers en hun families helemaal niks. Ik heb het idee dat we bijna drukker zijn met de schuldvraag op dit moment dan met de slachtoffers zelf.

Pondělí 3. října 2022

Zo ingewikkeld is het eigenlijk niet, want Europese bedrijven die een oogje hebben toegeknepen in Qatar, die moeten de portemonnee trekken. En de Europese regeringen? Die moeten Qatar onder druk zetten, ook de Nederlandse regering. Dat moeten ze niet doen vanuit de skybox bij een voetbalwedstrijd. Europese voetbalbonden, die moeten de FIFA onder druk zetten. En niet zo'n beetje ook. En nationale bonden? Die moeten niet vanuit schuld, maar vanuit respect voor de slachtoffers zelf ook een steentje bijdragen.

Ik ben heel erg bang dat de karavaan zo meteen voorbij is getrokken en dat dan de mensen die letterlijk voor ons een feestje hebben gebouwd, nog steeds met lege handen staan!

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, month after month we gather here, and month after month, the people of Afghanistan suffer and die. They die from hunger, from lack of access to medicine, from earthquakes. They die because they want to send their girls to school! Fifty-three mainly young women slaughtered in Kabul last week and our President couldn't even mention them earlier. Increasingly, they die because they are Hazaras. Hundreds murdered, thousands persecuted – these people are at risk of genocide and yet the world says and does nothing.

And of course, now that the US and its friends have found a new theatre of war in Ukraine to test their weapons and launder their arms profits, Afghans are no longer needed. Discarded with all of the problems of 20 years of an intervention, left at the hands of the Taliban, whom the US created. It is an affront that the Biden administration has spent USD 15.2 billion on military intervention and war in Ukraine while seizing USD 7 billion of Afghan people's money. For God's sake, what have these people done to ensure this endless horror while the world does nothing? It is time to speak up, stand up and demand justice for Afghanistan!

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, studija Europskog parlamenta koja je izrađena na moj prijedlog kao izvjestitelja Kluba EPP-a za direktive o potrošačkim kreditima pokazala je alarmantne rezultate.

Naime, preko 340 milijuna bankovnih računa građana u Europskoj uniji opterećeno je takozvanim minusima, odnosno dopuštenim i pređenim prekoračenjima. U Hrvatskoj, državi iz koje dolazim, pređena prekoračenja odobrena su za gotovo 1 800 000 potrošača. Problem je što su prekoračenja jedan od najskupljih oblika zaduženja i mogu lako dovesti do prezaduženosti građana, posebno ako uzmemo u obzir da kamate na ove financijske proizvode u nekim državama iznose i do 35%. Stoga koristim ovu priliku da pozovem države članice da snažno podrže pregovarački okvir Europskog parlamenta kojim sam osigurao snažniju poziciju potrošača kao slabije ugovorne strane u pravnom odnosu s bankama. Tako banke više neće moći, bez prethodne najave i davanja mogućnosti obročne otplate, zatražiti povrate minusa, niti će moći, bez izričitog pristanka potrošača, povećati limit njihova zaduženja.

Vrijeme je da zaštitimo potrošače od rizičnih kreditnih proizvoda koji se pojavljuju na europskom jedinstvenom tržištu.

Nicolás González Casares (S&D). – Señora presidenta, mientras en el océano Atlántico se cierran numerosas zonas de pesca sin ninguna evidencia científica, y sin tampoco estudios de impacto socioeconómico, vemos como países que tradicionalmente eran autosuficientes en el consumo de pescado tienen que importarlo, lo que, además, es contrario al Pacto Verde.

Mientras restringimos la pesca europea, que es la más sostenible, la que lleva alimento con una baja huella de carbono a los hogares de los europeos, estamos importando cada vez más pescado de terceros países, que no controlamos, y que en muchos casos no pescan del mismo modo que nosotros, sobre la base de la sostenibilidad.

Por lo tanto, reclamamos a la Comisión Europea una verdadera sensibilidad, que no se está teniendo, con la gente que pesca en nuestros mares. Es hora de poner coto a este desequilibrio entre la sostenibilidad medioambiental y la sostenibilidad económica y social que está sufriendo nuestra gente del mar.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Po pandémii, po vojne na Ukrajine prišla obrovská energetická kríza, ktorá oprávnene vyvoláva beznádej a strach. Práve beznádej a strach je však aj to, čo u ľudí v Európe vyvoláva pokušenie uveriť fašistom. Dnes Európe hrozí nielen ekonomický kolaps, ale aj reálny návrat fašistov k moci, aký tu nebol od druhej svetovej vojny. Podobná situácia, podobná hospodárska kríza tu bola aj pred vojnou. Aj vtedy, aj dnes ľudia začali veriť fašistickému populizmu. Podľahli jednoducho pokušeniu. Dnes fašisti nehajlujú. Tvária sa, že centrom ich záujmu sú obyčajní ľudia. Je to klamstvo. Stále sú to fašisti. V ťažkých časoch žiadam všetky demokratické strany napravo či naľavo, aby nepodľahli pokušeniu ísť do akejkoľvek spolupráce s ľuďmi, ktorí ešte pred pár mesiacmi hajlovali, spochybňovali holokaust či hanobili iné rasy. Prestaňte, prosím, legitimizovať fašistov. Mnohí si počas druhej svetovej vojny mysleli, že na fašistic-

kom zozname smrti nebudú, lebo s nimi začnú spolupracovať. Prestaňte si, prosím, naivne myslieť, že vás sa to netýka.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Kull min ikun fit-tmexxija għandu għażla ekonomika quddiemu li tkun aktar u aktar importanti fi żminijiet ta' sfida bħal dawk illi qegħdin ngħixu fihom illum. Jew it-triq tal-partiti nazzjonalisti tal-awsterità li jpoġġu kwalunkwe piż ġdid bil-qalb fuq il-familji u n-negozji għaliex jemmnu li s-suq isuq, jew inkella t-triq ta' ekonomija progressiva li tinvesti fin-nies, tinvesti fil-familji u tinvesti fin-negozji. U ppermettili, Sinjura President, nitkellem dwar dak li qed jagħmel pajjiżi għaliex l-ekonomija progressiva li tpoġġi n-nies fiċ-ċentru tagħha hi waħda li qiegħda tħalli r-riżultati u ħalliet ir-riżultati matul dawn l-aħħar disa' snin, bl-ikbar rati ta' tkabbir ekonomiku fl-Ewropa u l-inqas rati ta' qgħad fl-istorja tagħna. U rrid inħeġġeġ lil ħaddieħor, inkluż il-Kummissjoni Ewropea, li meta tnaqqas il-piżijiet minn fuq il-familji u n-negozji tkun qiegħda toħloq klima ekonomika li ġġib u tinċentiva aktar tkabbir u aktar saħħa ekonomika. Pajjiż illi, minkejja li ma waqafx jgħin lill-familji u n-negozji sa mill-bidu tal-pandemija u issa matul il-gwerra, xorta għandu l-pjan tiegħu għall-finanzi tal-pajjiż li baqgħu *on track* skont ir-regoli Ewropej. Għaldaqstant, inħeġġeġ lill-Kummissjoni Ewropea u lil Stati Membri oħrajn sabiex jimxu fuq dan l-eżempju.

Marina Mesure (The Left). – Madame la présidente, chers collègues, ne tournons pas autour du pot. Admettons que le marché de l'énergie est un échec et l'ouverture à la concurrence de ce secteur l'une des pires décisions prises et imposées par l'Union européenne aux États membres.

Ce marché permet, en temps de crise, pour certains énergéticiens, de produire de l'électricité à 40 € le mégawatt pour la revendre tranquillement à 1 000 € le mégawatt, pour des bénéfices maximum des actionnaires, au détriment des millions de personnes qui ne pourront plus payer des factures de chauffage et à qui on demande honteusement de mettre un col roulé s'ils ont froid l'hiver.

Face à un tel scandale, les mesures proposées par la Commission et le Conseil ne sont pas à la hauteur. Ce dont nous avons besoin, c'est récupérer pleinement notre capacité à décider par nous-mêmes dans le domaine énergétique. Nous devons sortir du marché européen de l'énergie au profit d'un pôle public de l'énergie dont l'action sera dictée uniquement par l'intérêt général.

Une gestion publique qui protège les plus précaires, qui planifie selon les besoins, qui utilise les revenus de la production pour déployer le renouvelable, qui défend notre souveraineté énergétique face aux puissances étrangères. L'énergie est un bien commun qui ne doit plus être accaparé par le privé et que nous devons gérer et protéger.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora presidenta, el lunes entra en vigor un acto de ejecución de la Comisión Europea que es un golpe mortal para el sector pesquero español, un golpe más.

Creo sinceramente que la Comisión se ha extralimitado en sus competencias y tenemos, además, la duda de si, por otra parte, se han tenido en cuenta los informes científicos pertinentes y los más actualizados.

La Comisión dice que sí, que lo hace con los datos que le enviaron y que no le aportaron datos más actualizados. Los Estados miembros, en concreto España, dice que sí, que los aportaron.

En cualquier caso, la situación es muy grave. La Comisión tiene que explicar con datos y fechas si se han hecho los deberes y si se ha cumplido la normativa. También si ha habido algún tipo de negligencia que ha ocasionado que nos encontremos en esta situación.

En todo caso, sea quien sea el responsable, quienes desde luego no son responsables son nuestros pescadores, y por eso hay que dar una solución ya.

Se puede y se debe suspender la aplicación de este acto y hay que hacerlo antes del lunes.

Marc Botenga (The Left). – Voorzitter, vorige week was ik in Antwerpen en ik heb daar werkmannen ontmoet die bij Borealis een nieuwe fabriek bouwden. Ze werden gerekruteerd door een Italiaans bedrijf, IREM.

Dat zijn fiere mensen, bekwame mensen met ervaring en mensen die mee ons land en ons continent opbouwen. Zij kwamen uit Bangladesh, Turkije, Oekraïne. Voor zij naar hier kwamen, werden zij met allerlei valse beloften en soms zelfs met valse contracten verleid via een keten van onderaannemers; dan gingen zij via Hongarije – zonder job, zonder loon – naar Portugal. Ook daar geen werk, geen loon, nauwelijks geld om te eten. Dan in Antwerpen: uitgebuit en afgedreigd. Elf uren per dag, zes dagen per week!

Ja, compleet onvoorstelbaar dat dit binnen de Europese Unie kan, en bepaalde regels binnen de Europese Unie vergemakkelijken dat! Waarom beperken wij bijvoorbeeld het aantal niveaus van onderaanneming niet tot één niveau? Of waarom maken we de hoofdopdrachtgever niet verantwoordelijk voor de lonen en arbeidsomstandigheden? Dat moet nu toch kunnen?

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamna președintă, vreau să aduc în discuție o temă importantă. Evident că în această perioadă ne concentrăm cu toții atenția spre criza ce ține de energie și încercăm să-i ajutăm pe cetățenii europeni. Recent am adoptat Directiva europeană privind instituirea salariului minim european și este un pas important, pentru că trebuie să aliniem salariile la nivel european pe criterii sănătoase, ce țin de performanța economică.

Însă vreau să ridic o altă temă care mi se pare extrem de importantă, mai ales în condițiile în care avem sute de milioane de cetățeni care au nevoie de sprijin și în momente de criză, persoanele vulnerabile trebuiesc ajutate. Cred că este momentul să vorbim despre pensia minimă europeană. Avem milioane de cetățeni care duc o viață extrem de critică, o viață plină de lipsuri, iar noi, la nivel european, trebuie să instituim această pensie minimă europeană. În țara mea avem 5 milioane de pensionari și mulți dintre ei au o pensie de doar 200 de euro și cred că este important ca de pensia minimă europeană să beneficieze și cetățenii europeni care nu locuiesc în Europa, pentru că ei sunt cetățeni ai Uniunii Europene. Avem nevoie de această dezbatere.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, Mariupol, Buča, Irpiň, Izjum – všechno toto jsou názvy ukrajinských měst, kde se prohnal masakr, zvěrstva, kterých se dopouštěly ruská vojska. A já bych se chtěl nyní zaměřit na právní stránku věci, vymoženosti ochrany lidských práv. Mezinárodní právo vypadá, jako by bylo bezzubé. OSN je zablokována, protože právo veta drží členský stát Rady bezpečnosti, přímo stálý člen, Ruská federace. Myslím si, že EU by měla být připravena a začít s našimi partnery připravovat zřízení Mezinárodního trestního tribunálu, který bude tato zvěrstva, k nimž dochází na Ukrajině i na osvobozených územích, vyšetřovat. Musíme být aktivní a musíme ukázat, že mezinárodní právo není bezzubé, že odpovědnost stíhá i toho, kdo chrastí jadernými zbraněmi. To je nejlepší cesta, jak ukázat reálnou ochranu lidských práv.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

17. Schválení zápisu z tohoto denního zasedání a pořadu jednání nadcházejícího denního zasedání

Die Präsidentin. – *(Gemäß Artikel 202 Absatz 3 GO wird das Protokoll dieser Sitzung dem Parlament zu Beginn der Nachmittagssitzung des nächsten Sitzungstags zur Genehmigung unterbreitet.)* Die nächste Sitzung findet morgen, am 4. Oktober 2022, um 9.00 Uhr statt. Die Tagesordnung wurde veröffentlicht und ist auf der Website des Europäischen Parlaments verfügbar.

18. Ukončení zasedání

(Die Sitzung wird um 21.31 Uhr geschlossen.)

Úterý 4. října 2022

DOSLOVNÝ ZÁZNAM ZE ZASEDÁNÍ Z 4. ŘÍJNA 2022

(2023/C 147/02)

Obsah Strana

1. Zahájení denního zasedání . . . 59

2. Změna pořadu jednání . . . 59

3. Směrnice o rádiových zařízeních: jednotná nabíječka pro elektronická zařízení (rozprava) . . . 59

4. Středisko AccessibleEU na podporu politik přístupnosti na vnitřním trhu EU (rozprava) . . . 77

5. Pokračování denního zasedání . . . 87

6. Hlasování . . . 87

6.1. Pravidla využívání letištních časů na letištích Unie: dočasná úleva (C9-0225/2022) (hlasování) . . . 87

6.2. Evropské středisko pro prevenci a kontrolu nemocí (A9-0253/2021 – Joanna Kopcińska) (hlasování) . . . 87

6.3. Vážné přeshraniční zdravotní hrozby (A9-0247/2021 – Véronique Trillet-Lenoir) (hlasování) . . . 87

6.4. Úsilí o dosažení udržitelnosti a konkurenceschopnosti akvakultury v EU: další postup (A9-0215/2022 – Clara Aguilera) (hlasování) . . . 87

6.5. Dopad nových technologií na zdanění: kryptoaktiva a technologie blockchain (A9-0204/2022 – Lídia Pereira) (hlasování) . . . 88

6.6. Opatření pro řízení, zachování a kontrolu platná v oblasti působnosti Komise pro tuňáky Indického oceánu (IOTC) (A9-0312/2021 – Gabriel Mato) (hlasování) . . . 88

6.7. Flexibilní pomoc územím (FAST-CARE) (A9-0232/2022 – Niklas Nienaß) (hlasování) . . . 88

6.8. Směrnice o rádiových zařízeních: jednotná nabíječka pro elektronická zařízení (A9-0129/2022 – Alex Agius Saliba) (hlasování) . . . 88

6.9. Středisko AccessibleEU na podporu politik přístupnosti na vnitřním trhu EU (A9-0209/2022 – Katrin Langensiepen) (hlasování) . . . 88

6.10. Jednotný portál EU pro oblast celnictví (A9-0279/2021 – Ivan Štefanec) (hlasování) . . . 88

6.11. Statistika zemědělských vstupů a výstupů (A9-0285/2021 – Petros Kokkalis) (hlasování) . . . 88

6.12. Změna příloh IV a V nařízení (EU) 2019/1021 o perzistentních organických znečišťujících látkách (A9-0092/2022 – Martin Hojsík) (hlasování) . . . 88

7. Situace Romů žijících v osadách v EU (rozprava) . . . 89

8. Klíčové cíle pro schůzi CITES CoP19 v Panamě (rozprava) . . . 104

Úterý 4. října 2022

Obsah Strana

9. Pokračování denního zasedání 113

10. Schválení zápisu z předchozího denního zasedání 114

11. Doba vyhrazená pro otázky (Komise) Nástroj politiky soudržnosti jako prostředek boje proti vylidňování . 114

12. Návrh Komise na opatření podle nařízení o podmíněnosti dodržováním zásad právního státu v případě Maďarska (rozprava) 129

13. Smrt Mahsy Amíníové a represe vůči účastníkům demonstrací za práva žen v Íránu (rozprava) 147

14. Ověření pověřovacích listin 166

15. Doba vyhrazená pro otázky (VPC/HR) Rostoucí napětí mezi Arménií a Ázerbájdžánem v návaznosti na nedávnou vojenskou eskalaci 166

16. Situace v Burkině Faso po státním převratu (rozprava) 174

17. Strategické vztahy a partnerství EU s Africkým rohem (rozprava) 179

18. Vnější rozměr lidského práva na přístup k vodě (rozprava) 187

19. Vysvětlení hlasování 194

19.1. Vážné přeshraniční zdravotní hrozby (A9-0247/2021 – Véronique Trillet-Lenoir) 194

19.2. Úsilí o dosažení udržitelnosti a konkurenceschopnosti akvakultury v EU: další postup (A9-0215/2022 – Clara Aguilera) 194

19.3. Směrnice o rádiových zařízeních: jednotná nabíječka pro elektronická zařízení (A9-0129/2022 – Alex Agius Saliba) 194

20. Schválení zápisu z tohoto denního zasedání a pořadu jednání nadcházejícího denního zasedání 195

21. Ukončení denního zasedání 195

DOSLOVNÝ ZÁZNAM ZE ZASEDÁNÍ Z 4. ŘÍJNA 2022

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. PINA PICIERNO

Vicepresidente

1. Zahájení denního zasedání

(La seduta è aperta alle 9.01)

2. Změna pořadu jednání

Presidente. – A norma dell'articolo 158, paragrafo 2, del regolamento, su proposta della Presidente d'accordo con i gruppi politici, la seduta odierna sarà prolungata fino alle ore 23.00. Se non vi sono obiezioni, la modifica è approvata.

3. Směrnice o rádiových zařízeních: jednotná nabíječka pro elektronická zařízení (rozprava)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Alex Agius Saliba, a nome della commissione per il mercato interno e la protezione dei consumatori, sulla proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica la direttiva 2014/53/UE concernente l'armonizzazione delle legislazioni degli Stati membri relative alla messa a disposizione sul mercato di apparecchiature radio (COM(2021)0547 - C9-0366/2021 - 2021/0291(COD)) (A9-0129/2022).

Alex Agius Saliba, *rapporteur.* – Madam President, Executive Vice-President, today is a great day for consumers, a great day for our environment. This is the past, and this is the present: after more than a decade, the single charger for multiple electronic devices will finally become a reality, a reality in Europe, and hopefully we can also inspire the rest of the world.

Every year, more than 400 million new phones, small electronic devices and chargers are sold in Europe alone. Ten years ago, when the idea of a common charger came to life, there were more than 30 different chargers on the market. And here we are speaking only about mobile phones. Since then, there has been improvement, as well as a significant increase in new electronic devices and models on our market. People often replace their old phones or other electronics simply to update them with new ones or to be able to catch up with new trends. There has also been an increase in multi-device ownership and a shorter life cycle for such devices. And all that results in a pile of 11 000 tonnes of e-waste that we are producing each year from discarded and unused chargers, and more than 2 billion is spent annually on standalone chargers alone. Not to mention the lack of interoperability between different brands, between different models, pure safety requirements, costs for adapters and proprietary chargers, unpredictable charging times, and failed or lost chargers. The list is too long.

That is why today we are replacing this pile of chargers with just this. The simplest solutions are often the best and most practical ones. And the simple solution each year will save thousands of tonnes of electronic waste, facilitate the reuse of old electronics, better consumer convenience, reduce unnecessary costs and also help to save millions of euros. And that is why we are here today. The single charger will also minimise the environmental impact of discarded and unused chargers, address the sustainability of electronic products and empower consumers to make better choices, more sustainable choices.

The single charger is a huge success that will benefit everyone: the environment, consumers and businesses alike. Together with the shadow rapporteurs, it took us only six weeks to finalise negotiations with the Commission and also the French Presidency. All this just nine months after the Commission issued its proposal. This is a remarkable result: proof that there is a drive for European solutions that change people's lives for the better. Yet again, we have achieved more, much more than just speed. We have achieved quality, ambition and future-proof rules so that by autumn 2024, USB-C will become the common charging port for smartphones, eReaders, earbuds, keyboards, computer mice, portable navigation devices, tablets, digital cameras, headphones and headsets, handheld video-game consoles, and also portable speakers.

By the beginning of 2026, USB-C will also become the common charging port for all our laptops, including notebooks, portables, hybrids and netbooks. The Commission will also be regularly revising this list with new products that up till today have not yet been included in the scope. Charging speed will also be harmonised for devices that are supporting fast charging.

On wireless charging, yet again this has been another priority of the Internal Market Committee. It was important for us to propose a future-proof solution so we will leave no backroom doors open. This is why the Commission, with the help of European standardisation organisations, will develop in 24 months an appropriate standard also for wireless technologies in buying new products such as smartphones. People will be given a choice, a choice on whether to purchase the new device with or without a charger. This choice will be facilitated with improved information. A dedicated pictogram and label clearly visible on each and every package, so that people can easily understand if the charger is included or not in the product.

Last but not least, I want to thank the shadow rapporteurs, staff and everyone who worked on this process to ensure that the common charger will finally become a reality for millions of consumers in Europe and hopefully for the rest of the world. Thank you, and I really hope that you can support this agreement.

Margrethe Vestager, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. –Honourable Members, it is a pleasure to be here to take part and to witness the conclusion of the legislative procedure when it comes to the common charger for portable electronic devices.

The common charger will simplify the lives of Europeans. No more obsolete chargers piling up in drawers, reducing costs for European citizens; no need to buy a charger for each device. And this will represent savings of at least EUR 250 million annually. Last but not least, it will contribute to the reduction of more than a thousand tonnes of e-waste every year.

Please allow me to thank the entire European Parliament and in particular, of course, the rapporteur Agius Saliba of the committee for the support, the tremendous work done which allowed us to finalise the process within just nine months in total. The enlargement of the scope of this initiative, as proposed by the European Parliament, I think was well done. It has increased the cover to the broadest possible range of what we call 'radio equipment' and even increase the expected benefits for EU citizens and, of course, the environment. And for this reason, I really welcome what was edited: adding e-readers, keyboards, computer mice, portable navigation systems, earbuds, laptops to the scope of devices concerned. And the scope already included quite a range: handheld mobile phones, tablets, digital cameras, headphones, headsets, handheld video game consoles and portable speakers. So it is a lot. But the Parliament has also agreed to a transition period of 24 months after the entry into force for all devices and 14 months for laptops. Because these transition periods also allows for manufacturers to adjust their supply chains, to adapt to the legislation.

And these important texts that have been developed together are not, however, the end of the story. No, we will need to monitor the evolution of charging technologies. We will look at whether or not there is a need to improve consumer convenience, save costs, improve environmental performance. That will allow us to consider extending the scope of devices covered if justified, addressing wireless charging technologies, but also assessing possible further unbundling of charging cables.

To conclude, I want to thank the Parliament for its commitment to achieve this common charger. I think it is a very good demonstration of the Parliament's attachment to make things simpler. Also the relationship between products, consumers and the environment, and that is indeed needed. I hope this is a token of more to come because we are looking forward to future steps and, together with Parliament, continuing to improve our everyday life and, of course, our environment, while still allowing new technologies to develop.

Андрей Ковачев, *от името на групата PPE*. – Г-жо Председател, г- жо Комисар, Алекс, скъпи колеги, основната мотивация за приемането на този законодателен акт е улесняване на ежедневието за милиони европейски потребители на електронни устройства, не само мобилни телефони. Чакахме достатъчно дълго пазарът сам да се регулира. Сега е време за действие. Щастлив съм, че след премахването на роуминг таксите в Европейския съюз ние ще гласуваме и единното зарядно.

С този акт Европейският парламент доказа за пореден път способността си да отговаря на нуждите на гражданите и да улеснява ежедневието им. Благодаря на докладчика г-н Алекс Алива, на всички колеги, с които работихме по това досие, също така и на Комисията. Благодаря ви, че с общи усилия успяхме да разширим обхвата на действие на този акт. Няма да повтарям това, което казаха колегите за кои устройства става въпрос. Това е огромно постижение на Европейския съюз. Създава се удобство и се спестяват пари на гражданите, като същевременно има полза за околната среда, намалявайки генерирането на електронни отпадъци.

В същото време ние не спираме научно-техническия прогрес и редовно ще се отчитат и адаптират достиженията на техниката, включително и за единното безжично зарядно, както преди малко Алекс спомена. Предстои да разгледаме и възможностите за въвеждане на единно зарядно за много други сфери от бита и домакинството, навсякъде, където няма технически ограничения за използване на единното зарядно.

Също така да не забравяме, че с този акт ние задаваме и стандарт за света. Аз съм достатъчно убеден, че много други части на света ще последват нашия акт, така че отново Европейският съюз е пионер.

С това законодателство даваме свобода на потребителите. Те ще имат възможност да избират дали да си купят продукт със или без зарядно устройство. И накрая, не на последно място, етикетите върху опаковките за устройствата ще бъдат достатъчно лесни и ясни за гражданите, за да могат да се информират какво точно получават.

Благодаря отново на всички. Мисля, че това е много добър ден за европейските потребители.

Biljana Borzan, *u ime kluba S&D*. –Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovane kolegice i kolege, prije svega želim zahvaliti našem izvjestitelju Alexu koji se borio da ovaj prijedlog odgovara prije svega građanima, a ne proizvođačima.

Činjenica je da nakon više od deset godina uvodimo jedinstveni punjač i da je to zasluga prije svega europarlamentaraca koji su u interesu građana gurali ovu ideju i onda kada ju nitko nije htio slušati. Moja prva rasprava na ovu temu bila je 2013. kada je Hrvatska tek ušla u Europski parlament. Prema mojem istraživanju, čak 92,9 % građana Hrvatske podržava uvođenje jedinstvenog punjača za male uređaje. Lijepo je ispuniti obećanje, makar taj proces trajao dugo. U jesen 2024. mobiteli, slušalice, tipkovnice, tableti, navigacije, miševi, digitalne kamere, zvučnici, e-čitači i prenosive igraće konzole će sve imati isti punjač. Nakon toga uvest će se i za laptope i slične uređaje.

Budući da svatko od nas kod kuće ima ladicu punu punjača, a samo za mobitele ih na tržištu ima preko 30 vrsta, tržištu Europske unije, ovaj prijedlog donijet će velike uštede. Procjenjuje se da potrošimo više od dvije milijarde eura godišnje na nove punjače. Ovako ćemo imati mogućnost izbora i mogućnost uštede. Moramo osigurati da i proizvođači i trgovci cijenama održavaju različite opcije dostupne potrošačima. Svake godine u Europskoj uniji proda se više od 400 milijuna malih uređaja s punjačima, a baci više od 11 tona elektroničkog otpada. Ne možemo više trošiti i bacati kao da imamo tri planeta na raspolaganju. Ovaj prijedlog velik je doprinos održivijoj potrošnji i pomoći će zdravlju našeg planeta.

Pozivam sve da svojim glasom podržimo ovaj prijedlog u korist potrošača i okoliša.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, one could say, 'One charger? Big deal!', but this one will positively mark our everyday life. Because big projects like the common market consist of small bricks, sometimes very important bricks. And this one common charger is one such important element of our common market.

As we all know, it was not easy. It took some time. I also campaigned for this common charger for many years. Now finally we have it. We achieved a solution which will facilitate consumers' lives, and it will help the environment. So it is time for thanks. First, Commissioner Thierry Breton, who demonstrated political courage and came up with a legislative proposal after many years of the Commission being too patient with IT equipment manufacturers. The Commission followed calls coming from us, from the European Parliament and from the European citizens: thank you.

Thank you to Alex Saliba and the other colleagues – other shadows, especially – who cooperated on this big project, which is one of the bricks of the common market. Big thanks for working together so well and helping make the proposal of the Commission even more ambitious. We managed to expand its scope and cover more almost twice as many product categories as were initially proposed.

And now the common charger will really have an impact on the comfort of our lives, and what is probably most important to me and millions of other citizens is that we will decrease the use of raw materials. There will be less e-waste, I think, by thousands, if not millions of tonnes, and we will give our fellow citizens a chance – which you also underlined – to choose whether you want to buy a new device with a charger or without a charger. And this we always enjoy – choice. So enjoy, and thank you!

Anna Cavazzini, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Eines für alle, ein Kabel, mit dem man alle Geräte laden kann – das war jahrelang der Wunsch von vielen Verbraucherinnen und Verbrauchern hier in der Europäischen Union. Und jetzt wird dieser Wunsch endlich Wirklichkeit.

In Zukunft müssen Sie für drei verschiedene Geräte nicht mehr drei verschiedene Kabel mitnehmen, wenn Sie auf Reisen gehen. In Zukunft haben Sie keinen Kabelsalat mehr in Ihren Schubladen. Und schon bald werden wir in der Europäischen Union 1000 Tonnen sinnlosen Elektroschrott pro Jahr einsparen. So können wir Klima und Ressourcen schonen, und das, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ist gerade aktuell wichtiger denn je.

Das Parlament – das hat unser Berichterstatter Agius Saliba auch schon gesagt – hat den Kommissionsvorschlag an entscheidenden Stellen noch verbessert. Wir haben erreicht, dass noch mehr Geräte eingeschlossen sind, denn nur so können wir wirklich von einem Universal-Ladekabel sprechen. Auch das kabellose Laden soll in Zukunft vereinheitlicht werden: Nicht dass hier in ein paar Jahren wieder verschiedene Standards auf dem europäischen Markt unterwegs sind.

Außerdem: Bessere Informationen für Verbraucherinnen, damit sie nicht bei jedem Gerät ein neues Kabel dazukaufen müssen. Auf den Druck von uns Grünen hin muss die Kommission auch in Zukunft prüfen, ob nicht Kabel und Gerät gleich komplett separat verkauft werden. Denn das wäre am allerbesten für die Umwelt.

Das Parlament hat geliefert – gegen zahlreiche Lobbyinteressen und für die Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher in der Europäischen Union und für das Klima. Der Weg hierher war lang, sehr lang, das haben schon viele Kolleginnen und Kollegen erzählt. Seit über zehn Jahren hat die Kommission gezögert und gezaudert. Wir müssen jetzt endlich einen Zahn zulegen bei der Kreislaufwirtschaft, bei all den spannenden Initiativen, die noch in der Pipeline sind, wie bei dem Recht auf Reparatur.

Der jahrelange Kampf um das einheitliche Ladekabel hat gezeigt: Freiwilligkeit bringt nicht viel. Klare Regulierung, Rechtssicherheit, Planbarkeit sind der Schlüssel – auch im Sinne der Unternehmen. Produzieren, Verbrauchen und ab in den Müll – die Wirtschaftsweise unserer Wegwerfgesellschaft führt zu Ausbeutung von Ressourcen jenseits der Grenzen unseres Planeten. Wenn wir das nicht ändern, bräuchten wir bis 2050 drei Erden, um unseren Rohstoffhunger zu stillen. Diese lineare Wirtschaft heizt die Klimakrise an, sie führt zu Umweltzerstörung, zu Menschenrechtsverletzungen in den Lieferketten. Und wir machen uns krisenanfällig und abhängig von Rohstoffimporten. Klar ist: Unsere Wirtschaftsweise muss sich ändern, hin zu einer Kreislaufwirtschaft. Das einheitliche Ladekabel ist ein wichtiger Schritt dahin.

Virginie Joron, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, chers rapporteurs, chère Madame la Commissaire, enfin, après plus d'une décennie, nous obtenons un chargeur universel pour les petits appareils électroniques en Europe! L'Europe est toujours à la traîne quand il s'agit de défendre ou de protéger ses concitoyens contre les géants du numérique. On le constate tous les jours, comme avec le transfert de nos données personnelles vers les États-Unis annoncé en mars 2022 par M[me] Von der Leyen et Joe Biden, ou encore avec ce nouvel espace européen des données de santé géré par Microsoft Azure, ce fameux «data hub» que l'association Anticor avait dénoncé en saisissant le parquet national financier car le gouvernement français l'avait choisi sans l'avoir mis en concurrence avec des solutions européennes.

Mais revenons à ce détail: les chargeurs. En effet, il est ridicule que les consommateurs doivent se débrouiller avec toutes sortes de câbles de chargeurs différents. Et je suis sûre que chacun ici s'est un jour trouvé dans l'impossibilité de charger son téléphone portable parce que le bon câble de chargement n'était tout simplement pas disponible. Que cette situation ait pu perdurer aussi longtemps est inacceptable. L'obligation contraignante pour les fabricants d'offrir un système de chargeur universel est donc un développement bienvenu, quoique attendu depuis trop longtemps.

En 2009, le commissaire européen à l'industrie avait déjà demandé aux fabricants de se mettre d'accord sur une norme commune pour les smartphones; il aura fallu treize ans. Cela fait plus de dix ans que les membres du Parlement européen exigeaient une action décisive de la part de la Commission; pourquoi cela a-t-il pris si longtemps? Les monnaies d'échange n'étaient-elles pas assez importantes? Sans doute la Commission visait-elle l'autorégulation, et pendant ce temps l'industrie aura continué à traîner des pieds.

C'est là un autre exemple de l'échec du mantra libéral dominant, qui a inspiré la croyance naïve de la Commission, avec cette prétendue «autorégulation». Apple, notamment, a bloqué à lui seul les efforts visant à imposer des mesures juridiquement contraignantes, et ce pendant plus d'une décennie; cela a été confirmé après les publications effectuées dans le cadre de la loi européenne sur la liberté d'information.

Voilà qui montre une fois de plus l'immense pouvoir du lobbying étranger – américain, en l'occurrence – sur le processus décisionnel en Europe. Et ça marche: Amazon vient de décrocher le marché de l'euro numérique. Ce n'est pas la première fois que nous observons ce phénomène; il fait partie d'un schéma plus large. Nous croyons que le marché se régule lui-même, pour conclure des décennies plus tard que ce n'est pas le cas.

Je rappelle que, plus tôt dans l'année, nous avons approuvé le DMA: là encore nous avons permis aux GAFAM de s'arroger un pouvoir bien trop important sur nos pays et nos citoyens. Que cela serve de leçon pour l'avenir: au lieu de l'attentisme typique ou d'une naïveté complice, nous devons agir de manière décisive contre les grandes entreprises étrangères – si nécessaire.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Europejczycy mają w swoich domach, kieszeniach czy plecakach coraz więcej przenośnych urządzeń elektronicznych. To już nie tylko smartfony, ale także tablety, czytniki książek elektronicznych czy laptopy. Dzięki ujednoliceniu standardu ładowania korzystanie z nich będzie łatwiejsze, tańsze i pozwoli ograniczyć produkcję elektrośmieci i zużycie rzadkich metali. Grupa ECR od początku wspierała ten projekt i popierała rozszerzenie listy urządzeń, które będą wyposażone w gniazdo USB-C. Zwracaliśmy także uwagę, że konsumenci muszą być odpowiednio poinformowani, że wspólny port ładowania nie oznacza, że ta sama ładowarka będzie idealna dla każdego urządzenia.

Zaproponowany przez nas system oznaczeń graficznych, który Komisja ma zaprojektować, pomoże nabyć ładowarkę najlepiej odpowiadającą naszym potrzebom. Chcieliśmy też, aby klienci jak najdłużej mogli wybrać, czy chcą kupić nowe urządzenie z ładowarką czy bez niej. Rozumiemy także, że prace badawcze nad bardziej wydajnymi technologiami ładowania, także bezprzewodowego, muszą być kontynuowane, i oczekujemy, że Komisja będzie śledzić i wspierać innowacje w tym zakresie. A panu posłowi Alexowi Salibie należą się bardzo szczególne podziękowania.

Kateřina Konečná, *za skupinu The Left.* – Paní předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, kolegyně a kolegové, jsem velmi ráda, že nyní máme konečně příležitost se přiblížit ke konci boje za jednotné nabíječky pro mobilní telefony a řadu dalších elektronických zařízení. A rozhodně to nebyl krátký boj. Vždyť se již přes deset let snažíme z půdy Evropského parlamentu dotlačit Komisi k tomu, aby začala jednat a přišla s návrhem zavedení jednotných nabíječek.

Před osmi lety, v roce 2014, jsme schválili směrnici o rádiových zařízeních, ve které jsme Komisi vyzvali k zavedení jednotných nabíječek skrze delegovaný akt, ale až donedávna byla Komise v tomhle ohledu neaktivní. Přitom s problémem různých nabíječek pro různá elektronická zařízení se setkáváme všichni. V našich domácnostech se pak hromadí nabíječky, z nichž většina je určena jen ke svému specifickému zařízení. A to není pouze nepřehledné, ale také zbytečně drahé pro spotřebitele a opravdu velmi nešetrné k životnímu prostředí. Pokud Komisi skutečně záleží na životním prostředí, tak měly být kroky k zavedení jednotné nabíječky učiněny už dávno. Proč se tedy postavila k problému čelem až nedávno? Bála se snad postavit zájmům společností, jako je Apple či Amazon? Bála se postavit možné opozici vlády bývalého prezidenta Spojených států amerických Donalda Trumpa? Ráda bych připomněla, že Komise má hájit zájmy Unie, a nikoliv vlády USA či nadnárodních korporací. A pevně doufám, že od této chvíle bude mít Komise páteř a nebude se již bát skutečně začít hájit zájmy lidí, kteří v Unii žijí.

Ano, myslím, že ambice obsažené v návrhu směrnice mohly být vyšší. Mohlo se to vztahovat na daleko více zařízení. Přesto je přijetí a sjednocení standardu USB-C do dvou let opravdu důležitým krokem ke snížení elektronického odpadu a bezpochyby povede k usnadnění životů nás všech. Proto jako stínová zpravodajka doufám, že směrnici schválíme, a moc bych za práci chtěla poděkovat především panu zpravodaji.

Edina Tóth (NI). – Köszönöm a szót, Elnök Asszony! A mai napon egy több mint tízéves jogalkotási folyamat végére tehetünk pontot. A töltők egységesítésére irányuló törekvés végre célba ért.

Üdvözlöm, hogy a javaslat egyrészt jelentősen csökkenti az elektronikai hulladék mennyiségét, amely fontos lépés a környezettudatos Európa irányába, másrészt könnyebbé teszi a fogyasztók életét. Úgy gondolom, hogy az Európai Parlamentben végzett munkánk során a legfontosabb feladat, hogy olyan jövőorientált, fogyasztóbarát jogszabályokat alkossunk, amelyek a fenntarthatósági szempontokat szem előtt tartva közvetlenül segítik az állampolgárokat.

Bárcsak mindig ilyen hatékony, emberközpontú lenne az uniós jogalkotás! Parttalan ideológiai viták helyett több, a mostanihoz hasonlóan előremutató, az európai emberek mindennapi életét könnyebbé tevő javaslatra lenne szükségünk. Haladjunk tovább ezen az úton!

Andreas Schwab (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Vizepräsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ein einheitliches Ladekabel für kleine Elektrogeräte in der Europäischen Union ist mit Sicherheit eine gute Nachricht. Es ist eine gute Nachricht, weil die Einheitlichkeit oder die Normierung technischer Standards den Wettbewerb auf die Stellen zu konzentrieren vermag, wo die Bürgerinnen und Bürger, die Nutzerinnen und Nutzer am stärksten davon profitieren und an denen wir gleichzeitig all die positiven Nebeneffekte generieren können, die bereits beschrieben wurden.

Ich freue mich sehr, dass unser Kollege Toine Manders, der damals 2009 beim Bericht der Kollegin Weiler die Idee hatte, heute auch da ist. Es ist wichtig, dass wir bereit sind, technische Standards auch dann durchzusetzen, wenn sie in der Industrie und in der Wirtschaft zu Beginn kritisiert werden. Wir haben das auch mit dem GSM-Standard in Europa geschafft – vor 20 Jahren, vor 30 Jahren, als wir den Wettbewerb im Telekommunikationsmarkt tatsächlich über die Geräte organisiert haben und nicht über die Standards, wie es damals in den USA der Fall war.

Leider hat der Telekommunikationsmarkt, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, in Europa seither aber sehr viel verloren. Deswegen ist es wichtig, dass wir uns Gedanken darüber machen, wie wir dort wieder mehr Wettbewerb und auch attraktivere Märkte hinbekommen. Dazu ist sicherlich auch der heutige Bericht ein wichtiger Baustein. Deswegen herzlichen Dank an alle, die ihn unterstützen.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Fru Formand! Fru Kommissær! Vi har talt om det rigtig længe, som vi også lige har hørt. Faktisk næsten lige så længe, som jeg har været medlem af dette hus. Men nu sker det endelig: Vi får den her fælles oplader til vores elektroniske enheder, og det synes jeg godt, vi kan være stolte over. Jeg tror, vi allesammen har prøvet at stå i den meget frustrerende situation; Mobiltelefonen er løbet tør for strøm, og opladerstikket, vi har lånt, passer ikke. Eller når vi skal ud og rejse, og vi kæmper med at finde plads til vores opladere til mobiltelefoner, høretelefoner, kamera, laptops, tablets osv. En endeløs jungle af opladerstik og kabler. Det får vi nu gjort en ende på. Lightning eller USB B, eller hvad de forskellige opladerstik nu hedder, bliver erstattet af en enkelt opladertype i form af USB C. Og forbrugerne kommer selv til at kunne vælge, om de vil købe et nyt produkt med eller uden oplader. Livet bliver altså

nemmere, og det er godt for miljøet, og det er godt for vores pengepung. En fælles oplader vil nemlig ikke bare reducere vores økologiske fodaftryk, det vil også spare forbrugerne penge. Mere konkret – det har vi allerede hørt tidligere i dag – vil vi reducere vores mængde af elektronisk affald med omkring 11 000 tons om året, mens forbrugerne samlet set vil spare i omegnen af 250 millioner euro årligt. Penge, der i stedet kan bruges til at udfylde andre huller i husholdningsbudgettet. Så lovgivningen, vi har her, er altså en win-win. De eneste, der taber på dette, er de grådige virksomheder, der alt for længe har fået lov til at kapitalisere på de mange forskellige opladere. Det slutter nu, Apple! Derfor vil jeg også gerne sige tak til vores ordfører Alex Saliba. Det er et fantastisk stykke arbejde, du har gjort, og jeg er overbevist om, at lovgivningen kommer til at tjene både miljøet og forbrugerne rigtig godt.

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Madam President, we made it after many years of memorandums of understanding, after years of asking the Commission to act, we made it. The common charger is an example of the European Union making people's lives easier: no more searching for the right cable, while also protecting the planet from unnecessary electronic waste. Consumers will have a choice: the choice to buy a new device with or without a charger. More consumer choice should always be our goal.

At the same time, our decision today should not prevent future innovation. USB-C is the most efficient form of charger today, but USB-D may come tomorrow, or a new wireless standard. European legislation needs to dynamically adapt and not stifle innovation, so the Commission must ensure that we amend this legislation as soon as technological developments merit it. This is good progress today, but let's make sure it doesn't hold us back in the future.

Kim Van Sparrentak (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, Commissioner, finally, after more than 10 years of waiting for codes of conduct and goodwill of businesses, we are now setting a standard for a common charger in the EU. Today, finally, we are putting the interests of the environment and consumers above the interests of big tech companies through solid legislation. This achievement shows that we as the EU can set standards for a sustainable digital future. So why not make sure that the whole digital transition is sustainable from the start?

To my colleagues here and to the Commission: we do not have another 10 years to wait for voluntary agreements until we realise that we need clear environmental standards for electronic devices or, for example, data centres. We are in a climate crisis. We need to steer the digital transition to truly twin the green transition and make sure it doesn't harm people, but benefits them and the environment from the start.

Angelo Ciocca (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ben venga uniformare i caricatori di batterie. Ben venga semplificare, uniformando, la vita dei nostri cittadini. Resta però un fatto: tredici anni è inaccettabile per il semplice connettore. Dobbiamo occuparci della spina, ma dobbiamo occuparci soprattutto dell'emergenza che il nostro paese, che la nostra Europa ha, che è il caro bollette.

Questo è il vero tema, altrimenti la gente oggi si interroga: ma la priorità dell'Europa è occuparsi del connettore? La priorità dell'Europa deve essere occuparsi del connettore, ma non dimenticando che non si può partire dal camino dimenticando le fondazioni. Quindi diventa fondamentale che l'Europa dia risposte concrete e immediate al dramma che vede il 57 % degli italiani che sono in difficoltà a pagare una bolletta elettrica.

Voi pensate che un fiorista stamattina mi ha girato una bolletta elettrica: da 383 EUR è diventata 1 200 EUR! Capite che qualsiasi famiglia, qualsiasi attività imprenditoriale è a rischio chiusura in questa situazione. Noi abbiamo 3 000 imprese in Italia a rischio chiusura e 3 milioni di posti di lavoro che rischiamo di perdere. Abbiamo un Nord Italia, che è la locomotiva del nostro paese, che rischia veramente di far cessare attività importanti imprenditoriali e presìdi importanti imprenditoriali, come questa di un fiorista, che dobbiamo in tutti i modi evitare.

Quindi ben venga l'attività che si è fatta inaccettabile in tredici anni. Non possiamo pensare di dare risposte al caro bollette e al caro energia in tredici anni alla nostra Europa e al nostro paese.

Adam Bielan (ECR). – Madam President, Madam Vice-President of the Commission, today is a historic day for consumers in the European Union. We will no longer need to experience hassle whether we forget our charger or upgrade our phone. The introduction of a common charger will not only lower costs, but also improve the safety and interoperability of chargers and reduce electronic waste. I welcome the outcome of the negotiations, which focuses on a particular list of consumer devices such as mobile phones and portable gaming devices, whilst avoiding hampering innovation and the development of new solutions for consumers.

While today we are celebrating the common wired charger, let us not forget about the future. I believe the Commission should only use its powers where market solutions cannot be delivered. It is key that we leave enough space for entrepreneurs to deliver new consumer technologies that will improve our digital experience beyond what is known today.

Anne-Sophie Pelletier (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, enfin: une décennie d'attente et de demandes récurrentes du Parlement européen, et nous y sommes! Je me réjouis de l'issue favorable des discussions sur ce dossier du chargeur universel, qui représente une avancée incontestable pour les consommateurs européens. D'ici deux ans, un chargeur universel de type USB-C sera donc obligatoire pour tous les téléphones portables, mais aussi – et là encore, merci à l'ambition du Parlement européen – pour de nombreux autres appareils.

Cela se fait dans l'intérêt des consommateurs, mais également de la planète. Dans notre système capitaliste, la consommation à outrance est encouragée, sans limite: 57 millions de tonnes de déchets électroniques en 2021, dont une large majorité n'est pas recyclée.

Pourtant, je pointe l'inaction de la puissance publique pendant trop longtemps, mais aussi la responsabilité des grandes entreprises – Apple et consorts –, sans scrupules, qui ne cessent d'émettre des obstacles à la réparation et à l'interopérabilité de ces produits, se faisant des milliards de dollars de chiffre d'affaires sur le dos des consommateurs.

La planète ne peut plus attendre, les consommateurs européens non plus. Espérons que les consommateurs ne seront plus les vaches à lait de ce système et que ce texte aura un réel impact sur les abus des entreprises.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, význam digitalizácie neustále rastie a s tým aj význam zariadení, ktoré denne používame. Či už sú to mobily, notebooky, alebo reproduktory. Všetci ich poznáme a všetci poznáme aj nabíjacie zariadenia, ktorých je neúrekom. Tieto zariadenia musia slúžiť a uľahčovať život ľuďom. Preto je veľmi dôležitý tento návrh a som rád, že som stál pri zrode tejto iniciatívy. Je dôležité, aby digitálne zariadenia slúžili ľuďom, aby zjednodušovali život ľuďom pri ich používaní. Je dôležité, aby sme znižovali náklady, je dôležité, aby sme zlepšovali ochranu životného prostredia, a to všetko zabezpečuje tento návrh. Ako vieme, dokážeme tým ušetriť viac než 11 tisíc ton elektronického odpadu ročne. Je dobrou správou, že rozsah tohto nariadenia sa týka aj notebookov, čo bol od začiatku návrh Európskeho parlamentu. Je dobrou správou, že už o dva roky budeme mať zjednotenú nabíjačku na type USB-C, a je dobrou správou, že každých päť rokov sa bude technologický vývoj prehodnocovať. Jednotná koncovka neznamená obmedzenie bezdrôtového nabíjania. Jednoznačne bezdrôtové nabíjanie je celosvetový trend a pôjde to dopredu, ale zároveň je, samozrejme, nám všetkým jasné, že potreba káblového pripojenia tu ešte nejaký čas bude. Preto je tento návrh potrebný a kľúčový najmä pre uľahčenie práce s výpočtovou technikou, ušetrenie prostriedkov a, samozrejme, zlepšenie ochrany životného prostredia. Dámy a páni, som si istý, že práve týmto opatrením zadávame celosvetový trend. Ďakujem všetkým za podporu tejto iniciatívy.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, finalmente presto il caricatore unico diventerà realtà non solo per i cellulari ma anche per i laptop, i lettori di e-book, gli auricolari, le telecamere e altri dispositivi, che non saremo più obbligati ad acquistare insieme al cavo, ritrovandoci poi con vari caricatori inutilizzati in casa diversi fra loro. Un miglioramento apparentemente piccolo nella vita quotidiana dei singoli consumatori, ma che porterà a un risparmio annuale di 250 milioni di EUR a livello europeo. È un passo grande dal punto di vista della sostenibilità.

Pensiamo che la riduzione dei rifiuti elettronici si stima intorno alle 1 000 tonnellate l'anno. Vorrei quindi complimentarmi con il relatore Alex Saliba per gli ottimi risultati ottenuti in tempi rapidissimi, segno che quando si hanno proposte chiare e concrete, anche in ambiti circoscritti, l'Europa è in grado di tenere testa alle grandi imprese e alle grandi compagnie per un obiettivo che ci deve unire, vale a dire migliorare la vita delle persone passo dopo passo.

Sandro Gozi (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Vice-présidente Margrethe Vestager, cher rapporteur Agius Saliba, merci pour votre excellent travail. Enfin du bon sens, enfin de la cohérence, enfin une solution concrète! Voici la preuve que quand l'Union veut, elle peut.

Tout d'abord le chargeur commun est clairement un choix de bon sens: 84 % des consommateurs rencontrent des problèmes liés aux chargeurs de téléphone, et le coût de ce désordre et de cette confusion est énorme – pour ne pas parler des déchets électroniques, des 11 000 à 13 000 tonnes de déchets électroniques produites par an.

Ensuite, notre choix est un choix cohérent: cohérent avec notre volonté de créer un marché unique durable pour les consommateurs et les producteurs, cohérent avec notre stratégie d'économie circulaire, cohérent aussi avec notre volonté et notre effort d'affirmer une véritable liberté de choix pour les consommateurs. Nous rendons nos produits plus durables, nous encourageons la réutilisation, nous économisons les ressources et le CO_2 tout en permettant l'innovation technologique, nous assurons plus de transparence et une meilleure information, et nous facilitons ainsi la vie des consommateurs.

Enfin, l'Europe que nous voulons, c'est cette Europe-là, une Europe de solutions concrètes, qui multiplie les possibilités pour tous les citoyens européens. Ces règles sur les chargeurs communs représentent une victoire claire pour nous tous.

Marcel Kolaja (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Madam Executive Vice-President, please first allow me a reaction to Mr Ciocca. This is a debate about the common charger. I don't think that anybody underestimates the impact of the energy crisis, but this is a debate on a different topic.

On that topic, the incomplete harmonisation of charging solutions for electronic devices has been causing inconvenience for consumers and excessive e-waste for many years. Different connectors in devices imply that users had to work with multiple cables for different electronic devices, and it also provided an opportunity for some manufacturers to limit choice and lock users into proprietary ecosystems of accessories and peripherals. Proprietary charging protocols have been used to limit the power on purpose and make devices charge with reduced speeds when connected to non-proprietary chargers.

Therefore our group welcomes the outcome of the trialogue, which will give more control and ownership to consumers over the products they purchase.

To ultimately have a common charger, however, full interoperability is also needed on the other side of the cable – the external power supply, and therefore we are looking forward to the revision of the Ecodesign Regulation.

Beata Mazurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Dzień ustanowienia uniwersalnej ładowarki do urządzeń elektronicznych takich jak smartphony, tablety, konsole do gier czy nawet laptopy to wyjątkowy dzień dla europejskich konsumentów i koniec wieloletniej debaty. Dziś wysyłamy jasny sygnał: koniec z uciążliwym zarządzaniem licznymi ładowarkami, które ostatecznie kończą jako odpady elektroniczne. Kluczową zaletą dla konsumenta będzie możliwość korzystania z jednej ładowarki do wielu urządzeń elektrycznych, czyli np. ładowania laptopa i telefonu tym samym zasilaczem. Kupując nowy sprzęt, będzie można wybrać opcję bez nowej ładowarki i korzystać z już posiadanej, wydłużając czas jej przydatności. Jest to znaczny krok w stronę zapewnienia komfortu użytkownikowi. Dotychczas przy wymianie sprzętu stara ładowarka okazywała się często bezużyteczna, co generowało niepotrzebne koszty dla kupującego i powodowało nadmierną produkcję elektrośmieci.

Mówiąc krótko, jedna uniwersalna ładowarka wielokrotnego użytku ułatwi nam wszystkim funkcjonowanie w coraz bardziej zcyfryzowanym świecie. Jednocześnie musimy bacznie obserwować reakcje rynku na wprowadzenie tej dyrektywy, szczególnie w kontekście ceny i ewentualnej próby przerzucenia części kosztów na konsumentów spowodowanej utratą przychodów przez producentów ładowarek.

Chris MacManus (The Left). – Madam Chair, like probably all of us, I too warmly welcome this agreement. It is important that consumer rights and environmental considerations trump commercial interests at least some of the time.

There could be no justification for one company to insist on a different charger for its devices. That situation simply costs consumers money and led to unnecessary electronic waste. This standardisation is expected to save consumers in the region of a quarter of billion euros, which would be welcome news to many feeling the impacts of the current cost of living crisis.

It is not revolutionary, just plain common sense. Anything that protects consumers, the environment and saves money is always welcome. More of this, please, Brussels.

I commend the work of the European Parliament in widening the scope so that eventually laptops, e-readers, earphones, keyboards and a multitude of other electronic devices will work off a single common charger. We may have to come back here to tackle the issue of unbundling and wireless charging, but this is still a good day for consumers and the environment.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Madam President, a common charger for portable electronic products is a good news story. Why? Because it is a practical intervention by the European Union that empowers consumers while also doing something positive for the environment by reducing electronic waste and indeed the pressure on scarce sustainable resources.

Having so many different types of chargers for our various devices is, as we know, very frustrating for consumers and it isn't good for the environment. Consumers are always at the end of the line. They have felt frustration. Now today is a positive moment for them, where they can know they can have one single charger for frequently used small and medium portable electronic devices. Charging speeds will be harmonised for devices that support fast charging, and buyers can choose whether to purchase new devices with or without a charging device.

So it's an important development. It's been 10 years in the making and I thank all those who have brought us to this point. It's also an important element for our single market. The objectives of this directive would not be achieved if Member States were acting alone. That would lead to different requirements in each Member State, again making it frustrating for our consumers, but now the barriers in the single market are being reduced – administrative barriers for manufacturers, which of course will help the competitiveness of European industries. But most importantly, today is a very good day for the consumers, for European consumers, who know that they need one charger for all those small portable electronic devices.

Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, durante mais de dez anos ouvimos argumentos sobre os perigos que um carregador comum representaria para a inovação. Este é um preconceito frequente, mas raramente mais do que isso.

A inovação que nos interessa é aquela que melhora a qualidade de vida das pessoas e que respeita os limites do nosso planeta. Carregadores diferentes apenas nos trouxeram toneladas de lixo eletrónico, impedindo que pudéssemos usar os nossos carregadores antigos ou pedir emprestado a um amigo e enchendo as nossas gavetas de cabos inúteis, como o Alex mostrou hoje aqui.

Ficou mais do que demonstrado que a indústria nunca criaria um carregador comum sozinha e que a inovação deve ser guiada, como hoje aqui fizemos, na direção que beneficia as pessoas e o ambiente. A partir de 2024, teremos a inovação que precisamos, atualizando o carregador sempre que houver soluções mais rápidas ou mais eficientes de um ponto de vista energético.

O Parlamento pode assim, hoje, orgulhar-se de nos ter livrado da selva dos cabos em que vivíamos.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señora vicepresidenta, señor ponente, Europa, sin duda, avanza en las grandes crisis, pero también en las pequeñas cosas. Y esta es una pequeña cosa que va a facilitar la vida de nuestros ciudadanos de una forma extraordinaria y que da sentido, a veces, a lo que hacemos en este Parlamento. Y lo hace por varios motivos: en primer lugar, porque consigue, es evidente, menos cables, menos desechos, menos costes, menos residuos. Consigue más ahorro, más claridad, más información, más opciones y más protección del medio ambiente. Pero, sobre todo, porque lanza una señal en el sentido de que este Parlamento pone a los ciudadanos en el centro de sus debates, porque este Parlamento es ambicioso y no cede ante las presiones de los *lobbies*, terribles y muy potentes, y porque avanzamos imponiendo normas a escala mundial que no solo articulan nuestro mercado interior sino que lanzan señales al conjunto del planeta.

Creo que eso da pleno sentido a una labor legislativa. Diez años es demasiado tiempo, y eso también evidencia que la autorregulación no es suficiente, que no funciona y que este Parlamento y la Comisión tienen que ir de la mano para ser siempre más ambiciosos y recortar los tiempos porque diez años de esa maraña de cables que veo que el ponente tiene encima de la mesa significan mucha pérdida de tiempo, de recursos y de dinero, y mucha ineficiencia.

Por lo tanto, felicidades al ponente por su extraordinario trabajo y porque ese trabajo da sentido a este Parlamento. Porque cuando ponemos a los ciudadanos en el centro y trabajamos juntos, somos imparables.

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Commissioner, we all know the cable spaghetti creeping through our bags. While they are very often consisting of a lot of different chargers, this is not just a waste of money, it's also a waste of raw materials and it's creating piles of electronic waste.

We tried to actually regulate that much earlier already in 2009. But whenever we try to regulate something, we see industry coming up with, 'okay, we understand, let's have some voluntary measurements'. Well, most of the time voluntary measurements just don't work because it's the business of businesses to earn money and not to have good, let's say, environmental friendly and consumer friendly product designs. So, let's not be naive, by regulating now common chargers across the European Union, we're serving the climate, we're serving consumers, and we are ending the differences of chargers. So we're putting in place common chargers until the end of 2024, for laptops – and thank you for that compromise – until 2026. Here's industry. This is the European Parliament. We stand on the side of consumers.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, eindelijk is de kogel door de kerk! Er komt duidelijke wetgeving voor een universele oplader. Daar hebben we inderdaad heel lang op moeten wachten. De Commissie heeft er echt heel lang over gedaan om invulling te geven aan de wens van het Europees Parlement. Ik denk bij voorbeeld heel concreet aan het amendement van collega Manders uit 2009.

Zeker ook een deel van het bedrijfsleven was vanwege eigenbelang aanvankelijk geen voorstander. We moeten echter vaststellen dat de vrijwillige initiatieven niet tot het gewenste resultaat hebben geleid.

Met de standaardisering van de oplader zorgen we voor gebruiksgemak voor de consument, verminderen we het elektronisch afval en pakken we de marktversnippering aan in de Europese Unie. Daarom is het zo belangrijk dat we als Europees Parlement vandaag ja zeggen tegen de uitkomst van de trialoog. Voor een goede werking van de interne markt zijn gelijke standaarden van groot belang. Hier ligt een belangrijke meerwaarde voor Europese samenwerking, en de richtlijn voor een universele oplader voor elektronische apparaten is daar een heel mooi voorbeeld van!

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowne Koleżanki i Koledzy! 250 milionów euro rocznie oszczędności dla konsumentów, 11 tysięcy ton mniej elektroodpadów dla środowiska. Takie właśnie realne, konkretne korzyści przyniesie wprowadzenie przepisów dotyczących uniwersalnej ładowarki. Uniwersalna ładowarka oznacza również wygodę, gdyż dzięki niej Europejczycy będą mogli pozbyć się z domowych szuflad poplątanych kabli, z których trudno wyłowić ten właściwy. Uniwersalna ładowarka to również wybór, gdyż to do konsumenta będzie należała decyzja, czy kupić nowe urządzenie elektroniczne z ładowarką, czy też bez ładowarki.

Cieszę się także, że z uwagi na fakt, że rozwiązania technologiczne są powszechnie dostępne już jesienią 2024 roku europejscy konsumenci będą mogli ładować swoje nowe zakupione telefony komórkowe, aparaty, tablety, słuchawki i wiele innych urządzeń poprzez jeden uniwersalny port USB-C, niezależnie od marki urządzenia. Co również ważne, ładowanie to będzie odbywało się z taką samą prędkością za pomocą dowolnej kompatybilnej ładowarki. Nie ukrywam, że jestem zawsze szczególnie dumny, gdy na tej sali proponujemy rozwiązania, które w namacalny konkretny sposób ułatwiają życie codzienne Europejczyków, tak jak ma to miejsce w przypadku tej dyrektywy. Należą się wielkie podziękowania i wielkie gratulacje dla wszystkich, którzy przy tym pracowali, zaczynając od sprawozdawcy, przez wszystkich posłów oraz pracowników Komisji Europejskiej.

René Repasi (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Vizepräsidentin der Kommission, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, lieber Alex! Der deutsche Bundeskanzler Olaf Scholz hat in seiner Prager Rede das Folgende gesagt: Wenn wir über die Versorgung mit Rohstoffen reden, dann denken wir vor allem an die Herkunftsländer weit weg von Europa. Rohstoffe sind längst hier in Europa, und zwar in Kabeln und in Steckern, wie sie hier beim Kollegen Alex auf dem Tisch stehen. Wir brauchen, so sagte Bundeskanzler Scholz, eine echte europäische Kreislaufwirtschaft. Er sprach von einem strategischen Update des Binnenmarktes.

Genau darum geht es hier beim einheitlichen Ladegerät. Geben wir all diese überflüssigen Kabel weg zum Recycling, sodass sie als wertvolle Rohstoffe zurück in den Binnenmarkt kommen! Das zeigt, wie gute Politik für unseren Binnenmarkt funktioniert: kein falsch verstandener Wettbewerb, der alles dem Markt überlässt, sondern klare Leitplanken einziehen. Wir brauchen einheitliche Standards und Regeln für alle, die nachhaltig sind, weil konsequent auf das Recycling notwendiger Rohstoffe ausgerichtet.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamna vicepreședintă executivă, stimați colegi, domnule raportor Saliba, încărcătoarele comune au devenit de mult o necesitate, nu doar o dorință a consumatorilor. Am ajuns cu toții să avem acasă o mulțime de cabluri, fiecare cu alt tip de mufă pentru fiecare aparat în parte. Sau să avem nevoie la birou de un încărcător și să nu găsim niciunul care să se potrivească.

Discuțiile pro și contra durează deja de mai bine de 10 ani și chiar dacă nu toată lumea este de acord cu aceste încărcătoare unice, piața merge deja în această direcție, aproximativ 40 % din aparatele vândute în piața unică europeană având același tip de încărcător.

În această legislație s-a acordat prioritate intereselor consumatorului, fără a fi eliminată posibilitatea de inovare în acest domeniu. Va fi totuși nevoie să urmărim în permanență piața, pentru ca standardele europene să țină pasul cu inovația în domeniu. Sunt convins că un dialog permanent poate fi păstrat între Comisia Europeană, între agențiile responsabile și producători, așa încât inovarea, cât și interesele consumatorului să poată fi respectate.

Acesta este unul dintre acele dosare tehnice care are un impact benefic major pentru fiecare consumator, iar fiecare înțelege ceea ce am făcut noi astăzi și ceea ce vom vota în această săptămână. De aceea, este nevoie să sprijinim această modificare a Directivei privind echipamentele radio și totodată să urmărim în permanență actualizarea ei.

Sara Matthieu (Verts/ALE). – Voorzitter, tien jaar hebben we getimmerd aan de weg, maar nu is het zover! Eindelijk voeren we een universele lader in voor onder meer smartphones, laptops, e-readers enzovoort. Eindelijk is het gedaan met die kasten boordevol laders.

Dat is een driedubbele win, want het is goedkoper voor de consument, het is makkelijker en we verkleinen er ook de gigantische berg aan elektronisch afval mee. Alleen al voor smartphones, voor laptops, voor speakers besparen we zo een half miljard laders. Dat is meer dan 13 000 ton!

Maar collega's, laat ons hier niet stoppen, want er zijn nog heel veel besparingen die we kunnen realiseren voor mens en planeet. Laat ons daarom maximaal inzetten op de nieuwe wetgeving inzake ecologisch ontwerp rond circulariteit en het recht op reparatie. Want dat is goed voor de consument, goed voor de planeet en goed voor onze economie!

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, povjerenice, izvjestitelju, kolegice i kolege, put do uvođenja jedinstvenog punjača nije bio lak i jednostavan.

Dugo su nas proizvođači mobilnih telefona uvjeravali da će se problem s gomilanjem punjača riješiti dobrovoljno različitim neobvezujućim mehanizmima. Dobro se sjećam kad sam krajem 2019. kao jedan od inicijatora radio na rezoluciju o jedinstvenom punjaču. Nisu svi tada vjerovali da ćemo uspjeti uvesti jedinstveni punjač jer je lobiranje tehnoloških divova uistinu bilo do tada neviđeno. Zadovoljstvo mi je stoga što danas s plenarne govornice mogu ponosno reći da smo ostvarili jednu od najvećih pobjeda za potrošače i okoliš, da će jedinstveni punjač, od 2024. godine postati stvarnost. USB-c tako će uskoro biti standardni utor za sve pametne telefone, tablete, kamere, slušalice i drugu elektroničku opremu. Što je najvažnije, potrošači će imati priliku kupiti mobilne uređaje bez punjača koje u pravilu drže nagomilane u svojim ladicama, čime im dajemo mogućnost izbora.

Treba reći i to da će uvođenje jedinstvenog punjača, uz praktične i financijske koristi za potrošača, donijeti i one ekološke. Procjenjuje se da će se smanjenjem proizvodnje i odlaganja novih punjača količina elektroničkog otpada smanjiti za gotovo 1000 tona godišnje, čime pokazujemo odgovorno postupanje prema okolišu.

Ova inicijativa o uvođenju jedinstvenog punjača pokazala je i dokazala da je Europski parlament predan zaštiti interesa naših građana.

Adriana Maldonado López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, señor ponente del informe —estimado señor Agius Saliba—, hoy es un día importante en la Unión Europea. Se aprueba por fin un texto en el que vienen trabajando las diferentes instituciones europeas desde el año 2009. Pero coincidirán conmigo en que llega tarde: desde el año 2009… Más de trece años para aprobar esta Directiva sobre el cargador común europeo; yo suelo comparar este proceso con el del *roaming*.

Creo que Europa ha decidido ser valiente. Creo que tenemos que afrontar este tema que, sin duda alguna, los ciudadanos europeos ven reflejado en su día a día. Según los últimos Eurobarómetros, el 95 % de los ciudadanos europeos consideran que este cargador común es algo positivo para la integración europea y para nuestro mercado único.

Por eso, este texto contempla dos aspectos muy importantes: está englobado en la economía circular de la Unión Europea, por lo tanto, en esa ambición ciudadana que tenemos de seguir transformando nuestro planeta hacia un modelo mucho más verde; pero, sobre todo, también le planta cara al sector. No podemos seguir permitiendo que los ciudadanos europeos paguen por adquirir cargadores que ya tienen en su casa cuando compran un nuevo dispositivo.

Por lo tanto, Europa es valiente, estamos siendo valientes. Espero que también ahora, a partir del año 2026, la Comisión, tal como se ha comprometido en el texto, sea capaz de tener en cuenta también los cargadores inalámbricos, otro aspecto importante.

Engin Eroglu (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin Vestager, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, sehr geehrte Zuschauerinnen und Zuschauer, liebe Zuschauerinnen und Zuschauer auch an den Fernsehern zu Hause! Wir legen heute den USB-C-Standard fest als Ladekabel nicht nur für Smartphones, sondern auch für weitere Geräte wie zum Beispiel Tablets und E-Reader-Geräte.

Das ist eine Kleinigkeit, aber mit sehr, sehr großen Auswirkungen: über 100 Millionen EUR, die nicht mehr unnütz konsumiert werden, über 100 000 Müll, die nicht mehr hergestellt werden müssen, um die Umwelt zu schonen, aber auch eine Effizienz für die Wirtschaft, die das hergibt, die die Preise für die Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher senken wird.

Ich freue mich sehr, dass wir das hier als Parlament schaffen. Und ich freue mich auch sehr, dass wir das in so kurzer Zeit mit der neuen Mehrheit in Kommission und Parlament hinbekommen, und die zehn Jahre, die hier von vielen Kollegen in den Raum gestellt werden – man muss sagen, manchmal brauchen auch gute Dinge eine politische Mehrheit. Diese politische Mehrheit für mehr Realpolitik in diesem Parlament haben wir jetzt. Und, Frau Kommissarin, lassen Sie uns mit dieser Mehrheit weiter das Leben der Menschen in der Europäischen Union verbessern.

David Cormand (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, chers amis, on est tous très contents de faire notre minute pour dire qu'on a remporté une grande victoire avec cette histoire de chargeur – il aura quand même fallu douze ans, mais bravo, félicitations!

Ce que je voudrais dire, c'est que ce chargeur ne doit pas être l'arbre qui cache la forêt du désastre écologique potentiel du modèle économique du numérique tel qu'il est conçu aujourd'hui. Nous allons devoir, dans les semaines et les mois qui viennent, concevoir un numérique durable, ce qui aujourd'hui n'est pas le cas. L'exemple du fil de chargeur, c'est une toute petite partie visible de l'iceberg. Sous cette partie visible, il y a l'énormité de l'invisible, de ce que ce numérique, aujourd'hui, menace vis-à-vis de l'environnement, mais aussi du droit du travail et de nos libertés fondamentales.

Je forme le vœu que l'Union européenne soit novatrice pour concevoir un modèle économique du numérique qui préserve l'environnement – et, de grâce, ne mettons pas quinze ans encore pour résoudre ce problème, nous n'avons plus le temps d'attendre aussi longtemps!

Antonius Manders (PPE). – Voorzitter, mevrouw de vicevoorzitter van de Europese Commissie, toen ik in 2009 dit voorstel deed – wat toen niet echt serieus werd genomen door mijn collega's –, toen kon ik niet bevroeden dat alle radiostations in 2022 hiermee zouden openen in de Europese Unie. Kennelijk is het een van de meest belangrijke wapenfeiten van de Europese Unie van de laatste vijftig jaar, want ik kan me niet voorstellen dat radiostations daar anders mee openen. Eindelijk is hij er, in 2022, – in ieder geval het besluit voor – de universele lader, en pas over een aantal jaren wordt hij ingevoerd.

Waarom moet alles zo lang duren? Waarom duurt het zo lang? Dan stel ik me een aantal vragen, eigenlijk twee. Wetgeving is één. Handhaving is twee, controle. Hebben de multinationals te veel invloed, te veel macht, of heeft de Europese Commissie te weinig macht? Want dit had in 2011, toen het in het kader van de trialoog unaniem werd aangenomen, allang een vaststaand feit moeten zijn. Maar een tweede belangrijke les die ik hieruit trek, is: wij als Europa moeten ons veel meer bezighouden met onderwerpen die de burgers aangaan, die zij herkennen, die zij begrijpen. Anders zou er niet op alle radiostations vanmorgen mee geopend zijn. De grondstoffen in Europa houden is belangrijk.

And, for you. Commissioner, on the battery regulation, I introduce a raw material loop – a ban on the export of waste batteries – but that's rejected by the ENVI Committee. I cannot understand that. So let's have a debate afterwards.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna comisară, doamna președintă, stimați colegi, cetățenii așteaptă lucruri concrete și iată, astăzi putem să demonstrăm că împreună, Parlamentul, Comisia și Consiliul, putem să oferim cetățenilor ceva concret, și anume economisire. Cetățenii s-au bucurat enorm și cred că toți știți, atunci când roamingul a fost introdus, a fost pur și simplu o euforie, pentru că cetățeanul a simțit că are ceva concret. Așa se întâmplă și cu acest încărcător.

Sigur, s-a spus, aici se face economie la deșeuri, se fac economii la bani, dar eu, în calitate de vicepreședintă pentru piața internă, mă gândesc, doamna comisară, la cetățean. Nu mai trebuie să cumpere șapte, opt încărcătoare. Uitați, eu astăzi mi-am uitat încărcătorul acasă și trebuie să întreb nu știu câți colegi, să văd ce încărcător are, să se potrivească la telefonul meu.

Sigur, e un lucru bun, dar vreau să atrag atenția, doamna comisară, să nu uităm să urmărim această directivă: retehnologizarea continuă, digitalizarea - le avem în program; să facem o completare a acestei directive astfel încât să fim pas în pas … și să nu uităm că viteza de decizie trebuie mărită. De peste 10 ani vorbim despre această modificare de directivă și, iată, în sfârșit s-a întâmplat, dar trebuie să ne mărim viteza de decizie și trebuie să transmitem cetățeanului concret ce facem noi pentru consumatori, nu numai protecția privind calitatea, dar și protecția privind banii pe care îi cheltuie un cetățean. Succes și felicitări raportorului și întregii echipe pentru acest succes. Sunt convinsă că se va vota.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, mevrouw de commissaris, eindelijk zou ik zeggen! Eindelijk, na onze eerste oproep in 2020 geven wij hier vandaag groen licht aan die noodzakelijke universele lader.

Wij weten allemaal en jullie hebben het allemaal gezegd: het is goed voor de consument, goed voor de portemonnee van de consument en goed voor ons milieu. Gedaan met lades vol kabels. En als je er dan een zoekt, dan vind je nooit de juiste. Je hebt ze daar allemaal liggen, je steekt ze nog maar eens in de lucht, want het is toch echt wel een kluwen van laders waar we nu eindelijk komaf mee maken! Dat is broodnodig, want weet u dat er in het eerste kwartaal van dit jaar maar liefst 311 miljoen smartphones verkocht zijn, elk met een eigen lader? Dat zal nu gedaan zijn. De consument zal kunnen beslissen: ja, ik koop een kabel, of neen, ik koop geen kabel. Bovendien, het voordeel voor het milieu is toch wel enorm. Ik denk dat Sara het ook al gezegd heeft: 13 000 ton elektronisch afval van ongebruikte kabels dat we eigenlijk kunnen vermijden.

Alleen moet dit mij van het hart: voor mij gaat het te traag. Het gaat in vanaf 2024. Voor mij mag het vandaag al ingaan. Ik denk dat een andere collega de vraag al heeft gesteld: ligt het aan te veel macht van de industrie of te weinig macht van Europa? Ik kan alleen maar zeggen, mevrouw de commissaris, probeer toch nog te pushen, zodat het sneller zal doorgaan en zodat wij heel snel die broodnodige universele lader in onze kast hebben liggen!

Malte Gallée (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Als die die Idee von einem einheitlichen Ladekabel vor über zehn Jahren zum ersten Mal kam, da haben viele gelacht. Heute beschließen wir genau das, und das ist ein Riesenerfolg, weil wir zeigen: Wer zuletzt lacht, ist die, die das Gesetz macht.

Die EU setzt die Interessen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger durch gegen die Marktmacht der Tech-Giganten mit Gesetzen, die den Geldbeutel und die Umwelt schonen. Das ist ein Fortschritt, weil wir Millionen von Ladekabeln einsparen. Aber nicht nur das: Wir sorgen dafür, dass jedes funktionierende Handy, jede Kamera auch in 15 oder 20 Jahren noch nutzbar ist und nicht nur wegen eines verlorenen Kabels zu Müll wird.

Mit diesem Gesetz retten wir Geräte vor dem Tod auf der Müllkippe und kommen einen riesigen Schritt näher hin zu einer Kreislaufwirtschaft, die die Ressourcen verantwortungsvoll nutzt und irgendwann keinen Müll mehr produziert und die die Menschen vor Profite stellt.

Maria Walsh (PPE). – Madam President, the micro-USB charger was a major EU success story and it reduced the number of incompatible chargers in the market from 30 to 3. We've heard this this morning. This was essential in reducing electronic waste and making life easier for our citizens, our consumers. However, the move towards a common charger is still incomplete.

This directive will ensure that USB-C chargers must be the same for everything from phones to video game consoles and gadgets by 2024. Most importantly, it will be applicable to all manufacturers, including Apple. This directive underlines the EU's commitment to sustainability by reducing annual electronic waste by approximately 11 000 tonnes. This is a direct request from citizens in the Conference on the Future of Europe in the area of reducing consumption. We are here and we are listening. It will make everyday life easier for consumers and is a concrete example of a practical and positive change that our environment so desperately needs. Congratulations, Alex, and to your team.

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner and rapporteur, I'm very proud of you all. Societies are digitalising and we do need to take many, many concrete steps to make it fair and sustainable. A universal charger of USB-C standard is a very good step that we are taking now after ten years of lobbying and making the world to see what the MEPs wanted. This is a part of the broader action to address sustainability of the electronic products and reduce e-waste.

Now the consumers thinks 'is it finally'; unfortunately, two more years to wait to see it in the stores and shops. That is the deadline and Parliament succeeded to add laptops, and that will take place in 2026 under the scope. Altogether, six added products here was very, very good work from the rapporteur and from the Parliament. So now it is altogether 14 categories of products that need to use this common charger now decided.

Do industry need any rules? I think the speed limitation was the most brutal one, that you didn't get the right one if you didn't do it. So stupid piles of chargers and wasting the resources is why we needed this one. The next steps: I get a lot of complaints that there is no common EV payment systems, so let's think about how to make consumers life better.

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, temos carregador! Um carregador universal para os telemóveis e todos os dispositivos eletrónicos de pequena e média dimensão. *Tablets*, câmaras digitais, consolas de jogos, auscultadores e altifalantes portáteis, ratos, teclados sem fios e sistemas de navegação.

Parece simples, mas há mais de dez anos que o Parlamento Europeu e, em particular, a Comissão IMCO (Mercado Interno e de Proteção dos Consumidores) insistiam junto da Comissão Europeia e dos operadores de mercado para que fosse dado este passo.

Atingimos os objetivos. Com isso, ganham os consumidores que poupam dinheiro e veem as suas vidas facilitadas. Com esta redução do volume de resíduos eletrónicos, ganha também o ambiente, e este é um bom exemplo do papel regulador da União Europeia. Sem a nossa ação, esta fragmentação de mercado e este desperdício sem sentido continuariam a existir.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, paní komisařko, dámy a pánové, téma nabíječek za tu dobu osmi let, co jsem v Evropském parlamentu, tady už řešíme poněkolikáté. Já si myslím, že je potřeba to téma už jednou konečně uzavřít. Na hranicích EU zuří válka. Ceny energií v Evropské unii rostou a já si myslím, že máme určitě důležitější věci než opětovné povídání si o jednotném kabelu, který bude sloužit k nabíjení našich telefonů. Občané EU na nás spoléhají a ptají se, jakým způsobem jim pomůžeme řešit situace, které v současné době řeší. A já si myslím, že je potřeba v tuto chvíli už tu debatu uzavřít, jednotnou nabíječku definitivně schválit a jít od tématu. Dámy a pánové, prosím vás, pojďme se věnovat důležitějším problémům.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señora vicepresidenta, creo que hoy es un día en el que los ciudadanos europeos van a creer un poco más en nosotros. Van a comprobar que nuestras decisiones, que muchas veces consideran alejadas, les afectan muy directamente en su día a día.

Estamos hablando de la llegada del cargador único y universal para todos los móviles, algo impensable hace no mucho tiempo. Después de tantos años en los que hemos tenido que buscar distintos cargadores para distintos móviles y aparatos, por fin vamos a ver que un solo cargador servirá para cualquier teléfono móvil, pero también lo será para las tabletas, para las cámaras de fotos, auriculares, consolas, portátiles y otros dispositivos.

No hablamos solo de reducir residuos ni de abaratar costes. Por encima de todo, se beneficia a todos los ciudadanos, que podrán comprar sus teléfonos con o sin cargador y no tendrán que llevar distintos cargadores. Además, se va a hacer en un tiempo razonable. En nueve meses estará en vigor para la mayoría de los dispositivos.

Esta medida demuestra, una vez más, que desde el Parlamento contribuimos a un mayor bienestar de los europeos y seguimos apostando por las nuevas tecnologías. Y ese es un camino que no debemos abandonar. ¡Enhorabuena!

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, Αντιπρόεδρε Vestager, στην πολιτική η πρόοδος μπορεί να αντικατοπτρίζεται σε κρίσιμες αλλαγές στη ζωή των πολιτών μας, και σήμερα η καθιέρωση του ενιαίου φορτιστή για το κινητό, τους υπολογιστές, τις μηχανές παιχνιδιών, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των συσκευών της Apple από το 2024, είναι ένα σημαντικό βήμα προς την παραγωγή βιώσιμων προϊόντων ως κανόνα και όχι ως ενδιαφέρουσες εξαιρέσεις. Χρειάστηκε περισσότερο από μια δεκαετία για να έχουμε τη σημερινή σημαντική επιτυχία. Καταλαβαίνετε όμως όλοι εδώ στην αίθουσα, και σίγουρα οι καταναλωτές που μας βλέπουν, οι πολίτες που μας βλέπουν, ότι πλέον δεν έχουμε καιρό ούτε με όρους περιβαλλοντικούς ούτε με όρους οικονομικούς. Ο κανονισμός για τα βιώσιμα προϊόντα, τον οποίο έχω την τιμή να εισηγούμαι εκ μέρους της Επιτροπής Βιομηχανίας, Έρευνας και Ενέργειας, δημιουργεί το πεδίο για την παραγωγή και την πώληση κυρίως βιώσιμων προϊόντων που θα επισκευάζονται, θα επαναχρησιμοποιούνται και θα ανακυκλώνονται. Με τη σημερινή απόφαση για τον ενιαίο φορτιστή αντιμετωπίζουμε και τους 11.000 τόνους των ηλεκτρονικών απορριμμάτων που παράγουν οι διαφορετικοί φορτιστές. Το μέλλον είναι βιώσιμο, αρκεί να μη χρειαστούμε άλλα 15 χρόνια για να φτάσουμε εκεί.

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, il aura fallu une dizaine d'années, mais enfin nous y sommes arrivés, enfin un chargeur universel! Alors ne boudons pas notre plaisir dans la grisaille ambiante. J'ai la même sensation qu'il y a cinq ans, lorsque nous avions fait disparaître le *roaming* – les frais d'itinérance téléphonique – et par conséquent fait baisser les factures téléphoniques.

Notre rôle dans ces deux cas aura été de défendre l'intérêt des droits des consommateurs européens. Mais il s'agit aussi, ici, d'une victoire environnementale. En effet, il se vend 54 téléphones mobiles par seconde dans le monde, c'est-à-dire 1,7 milliard par an, et donc tout autant de chargeurs. Il est facile d'imaginer les milliers de tonnes de déchets générées par ces appareils. Nous avons d'ailleurs tous à la maison un tiroir rempli de chargeurs dont on ne sait que faire. Chaleureuses félicitations aux négociateurs, et notamment à notre collègue Alex Agius Saliba, pour cette belle victoire.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, this is a very positive development and it has caught people's attention. People understand it will save them money and reduce clutter in their homes. They also appreciate that electronic waste is a massive problem and it does urgently need to be tackled. People have also welcomed the common charger proposal because they are tired of consumerism. They are tired of consumerism in general, and in particular tired of the kind of pointless, unnecessary and utterly destructive consumerism that means the EU vastly exceeds its own planetary boundaries still.

This is a first step. We also urgently need a legally binding right to repair, and legislative measures to halve food waste by 2030. The Parliament's report on the EU's circular economy action plan called on the Commission to propose targets to significantly reduce the EU's material and consumption footprints by 2030 and bring them within planetary boundaries by 2050. This was a radical demand, but when will the Commission act?

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Margrethe Vestager, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, I want to thank you all for this debate. Of course we've been tossing a bit around in the situation that Europe is in: war on our doorstep, an energy crisis that is deepening the worries of families – can we pay our bills? – the cost of living crisis, the ongoing climate emergency. But I think this debate shows that it is the Parliament that is insisting to be on the side of citizens and to challenge also the corporate citizen to do the right thing. And in that respect, I see this as a token. And not only as a simple one, but something that will make real change in people's lives.

And I think it's a very important beginning of making everything digital sustainable in the broadest possible sense of it. We will only fight climate change with the use of digital, but it only makes sense if everything digital becomes green as well. And the step taken today is a big step in the right direction because it shows that it's doable and it's also part of building that recycling industry that is so crucial for circularity. It has been a really big pleasure to be here today. I congratulate the Parliament on this important step. Thank you very much to everyone involved.

Alex Agius Saliba, *Rapporteur* – Naħseb dan id-dibattitu wera kemm dan huwa parlament illi huwa perseveranti li baqa' jiġġieled matul dawn l-aħħar għaxar snin biex dak illi nemmnu fih – u naħseb l-iktar punt illi ħareġ b'saħħtu llum, it-twemmin illi dan il-parlament għandu fid-drittijiet tal-konsumaturi, fid-drittijiet taċ-ċittadini tagħna li jingħataw deal aħjar meta jixtru l-prodotti diġitali tagħhom – fl-aħħar mill-aħħar wassal għal riżultat tanġibbli.

Riżultat tanġibbli illi, fl-aħħar mill-aħħar, ħa jkun qiegħed jinħass mill-konsumaturi tagħna. U l-Parlament Ewropew, u anki fin-negozjati illi kellna – barra illi għalkemm konna ilna għaxar snin niddiskutu dan il-prinċipju, fuq bażi ta' Parlament Ewropew u fuq bażi ta' ħidma tal-Kumitat għas-Suq Intern – irnexxielna f'sitt ġimgħat biss ta' negozjati mal-Kummissjoni u anki mal-Presidenza Franċiża, nilħqu qbil.

U nilħqu qbil ferm u ferm aktar ambizzjuż mill-proposta wkoll oriġinali tal-Kummissjoni Ewropea fejn irnexxielna nirduppjaw il-lista ta' prodotti elettroniċi ta' daqs żgħir u medju illi ser ikunu qegħdin jiġu affettwati minn dan iċ-ċarġer komuni. Irnexxielna ndaħħlu wkoll prodotti bħal-laptops illi fl-aħħar mill-aħħar ser ikunu qegħdin iġibu rivoluzzjoni fil-ħajja tan-nies.

Irnexxielna, fl-aħħar mill-aħħar ukoll, inħarsu 'l quddiem għal teknoloġiji li diġà qegħdin magħna imma, fl-aħħar mill-aħħar, ħa jkunu aktar predominanti fejn jidħol is-suq taċ-ċarġers bħall-wireless charging.

Dan, fl-aħħar mill-aħħar, kif diġà għidna, għalkemm illum il-ġurnata lkoll kemm aħna qegħdin nitkellmu fuq din il-kriżi ekonomika u soċjali li qegħdin naffaċċjaw minħabba l-gwerra illi għaddejja fl-Ukrajna u r-riperkussjonijiet li qegħdin iħossu n-nies tagħna, però, fl-aħħar mill-aħħar, proposta tanġibbli bħal din ħa tkun qiegħda tħalli wkoll impatt pożittiv fil-bwiet tal-konsumaturi tagħna – kwart ta' biljun euro fis-sena li ser jibqgħu fil-bwiet tal-konsumaturi tagħna u allura kwalità ta' ħajja aħjar għall-konsumaturi.

Imma fl-aħħar mill-aħħar ukoll, kwalità aħjar għall-ambjent tagħna, għas-sostenibilità ambjentali tagħna bi ħdax-il elf tunnellata ta' skart elettroniku inqas iġġenerat minn dawn iċ-ċarġers żejda. Grazzi ħafna illi llum tkellimna b'vuċi waħda favur il-konsumaturi Ewropej.

Presidente. – Grazie all'onorevole Saliba. Voglio anch'io unirmi alle congratulazioni al relatore, a chi ha lavorato, alle colleghe e ai colleghi che sono intervenuti in questa bella discussione. Fatemi dire che è davvero bello vedere questo Parlamento così impegnato concretamente a risolvere le questioni che riguardano la vita dei cittadini.

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 4 ottobre 2022.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Leszek Miller (S&D), *na piśmie*. – W Unii Europejskiej każdego roku sprzedaje się kilkaset milionów telefonów komórkowych i innych przenośnych urządzeń elektronicznych. Liczba ta stopniowo rośnie wraz z rozwojem nowych technologii. Niestety rośnie również ilość wyrzucanych zbędnych kabli i ładowarek. Co roku przyczyniają się one do powstania 11 000 ton e-śmieci. Ta sytuacja jest uciążliwa dla konsumentów, którzy skarżą się na dodatkowe koszty i problemy z niekompatybilnymi ładowarkami.

Dzięki przełomowej decyzji Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady wkrótce nastąpi radykalna zmiana. Od 2024 roku wszystkie małe przenośne urządzenia, takie jak telefony komórkowe, słuchawki, czytniki e-booków czy konsole do gier, będą musiały być wyposażone w port ładowania USB-C, a w 2026 roku dołączą do nich laptopy.

Nowe rozwiązanie znacząco zwiększy wygodę używania sprzętu elektronicznego. Zamiast plątaniny kabli europejscy konsumenci będą mogli korzystać z jednej ładowarki do wszystkich swoich urządzeń, a w ich kieszeniach pozostanie około 250 milionów euro. Opakowania będą wyraźnie oznakowane i będzie można wybrać, czy kupuje się urządzenie z ładowarką czy bez. Skorzysta również środowisko naturalne. Mniej e-śmieci oznacza mniej zużytych surowców i energii oraz mniej emisji CO_2.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu*. – Vienas iš įstatymų leidybos tikslų turėtų būti jų supaprastinimas. Įstatymai turi tarnauti žmonėms, o ne žmonės įstatymui. Todėl verta palaikyti radijo įrenginių direktyvą, kuri visoje Europos Sąjungoje įves universalų, vienodą elektroninių įrenginių įkroviklį. Tai tikrai supaprastins Sąjungos piliečių kasdienį gyvenimą. Be to, naujosios taisyklės supaprastins radijo įrenginių naudojimą ir sumažins nereikalingas atliekas bei išlaidas, o tai bus ypač naudinga vartotojams ir kitiems galutiniams naudotojams. Jie taip pat prisidės prie įkrovimo įrenginių standartizacijos didinimo ir rinkoje siūlomų įkroviklių tipų skaičiaus mažinimo. Todėl manau, kad norint užtikrinti sklandų vidaus rinkos veikimą, geriau apsaugoti vartotojus ir aplinką bei užtikrinti lankstų ir į ateitį orientuotą požiūrį, kuris netrukdys kuriant naujus sprendimus įrenginių įrengimo sferoje bei neprives prie technologinės blokados, būtina Sąjungos lygmeniu veikti ryžtingai.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – Vivemos um momento político em que é cada vez mais fundamental ter a coragem de tomar medidas que, parecendo simples e óbvias, implicam conjugar múltiplos interesses, mas que servem as pessoas. Esta deve ser uma prioridade. A medida legislativa que vai permitir que seja obrigatório no mercado europeu adotar um modelo de carregador universal para dispositivos eletrónicos portáteis de pequena e média dimensão, como telemóveis, computadores portáteis, máquinas fotográficas digitais e auriculares, é uma medida de nova geração de grande importância que vai beneficiar todos os consumidores e o ambiente. Prevê-se, com esta medida, que os consumidores europeus poderão poupar cerca de 250 milhões de euros por ano e que seja reduzida em 11 000 toneladas a produção de resíduos eletrónicos. Esta medida, que se insere numa linha de inclusão digital, da qual a harmonização das taxas de roaming foi a que teve maior impacto, deve ser aplicada com a maior rapidez possível, tendo em conta os limites fixados na lei e garantindo que os standards escolhidos são os mais adequados. Os procedimentos de carregamento sem fios devem ser também harmonizados, devendo a Comissão Europeia desenvolver o trabalho necessário para que essa dimensão seja também incorporada na presente decisão.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – Tientallen jaren heeft de industrie tegengestribbeld, maar op aandringen van het Europees Parlement nam de Europese Commissie vorig jaar het heft in eigen handen. In recordtijd werd een Europees akkoord gevonden om een universele lader voor smartphones in te voeren. De laatste horde wordt nu definitief genomen met de plenaire goedkeuring in dit halfrond.

Eindelijk komt er een einde aan de frustratie van consumenten over de berg incompatibele laders die zich thuis opstapelt. Vanaf 2024 kunnen we met één lader onze smartphones en andere kleine elektronische apparaten zoals tablets en draagbare boxen opladen. Dit zal meteen ook een einde maken aan de overtollige opladers die jaarlijks nagenoeg 11 000 ton e-waste genereren ten koste van het milieu en duurzaam beleid.

Toch moeten we ook kritisch durven zijn: deze standaardtoegangspoort heeft te lang geduurd. We kunnen het ons niet permitteren om op deze digitale dossiers en de ontsluiting van onze datamaatschappij opnieuw decennia te wachten. Laat ons prioritair werk maken van de vormgeving van onze digitale architectuur. De akkoorden over de wet digitale diensten, de wet digitale markten en de verordening inzake Europese datagovernance waren alvast een goede start, maar het werk is nog lang niet af.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

4. Středisko AccessibleEU na podporu politik přístupnosti na vnitřním trhu EU (rozprava)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Katrin Langensiepenin sisämarkkina- ja kuluttajansuojavaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö ”AccessibleEU”-keskuksesta esteettömyyspolitiikan tukemiseksi EU:n sisämarkkinoilla (2022/2013(INI))(A9-0209/2022).

Katrin Langensiepen, *rapporteur.* – Madam President, the future is accessible because the present is not. Dear President, dear Mr Commissioner Breton – and I'm looking for Mr Breton as he is the Commissioner responsible because it's an IMCO file – but I'm very happy to have you here, dear Helena. You are our ally when it comes to the rights of persons with disabilities. But it is, of course, not only on your shoulders the whole huge topic when it comes to accessibility.

And dear colleagues, of course the outcome of our negotiation is a great success. For this, I would like to thank all those who have been so committed and active in bringing this own-initiative report to reality, especially to our shadows, my shadow colleagues from all the different groups. In recent years, the EU has approved several laws and technical standards, setting up a new ecosystem for accessibility such as the European Accessibility Act, the Web Accessibility Directive, directives on audiovisual media services, electronic communication and technical specifications for railway stations and vehicles.

Moreover, when allocating the EU funds and in public procurement, accessibility requirements have to be taken into account. Nevertheless, the implementation of this crucial set of laws at national level has not yet been satisfactory. This is mostly due to the lack of qualified accessibility experts at national level, both in public administration and among economic operators who would be able to implement highly technical accessibility provisions contained in legislation, but also in standards.

We would like to concretise these and other tasks in an AccessibleEU Centre. Without clear guidelines, inclusion remains arbitrary. The aim is therefore to harmonise the different ideas of inclusion in Europe and the Member States and to harmonise the different speeds in the implementation of existing legislation through organised knowledge-transfer. We need horizontal training programmes to increase expertise in accessibility. We also need strengthened coordination and cooperation frameworks between all acting levels and relevant stakeholders, which will permanently and sustainably ensure accessibility in all areas for persons with disabilities.

The EU strategy for the rights of persons with disabilities 2021-2030 envisaged exactly such a centre, which is what we are now trying to launch with the central flagship initiative. However, the centre needs a few essential basic prerequisites for this. It will only give added value if the centre will be structured in order to guarantee constant and targeted support to the Member States for implementing, monitoring and enforcing accessibility legislation, as well as to assist the Commission in updating and developing accessibility laws. For this, adequate resources are needed, both in terms of personnel and finance. The same then applies to the respect of centres in the Member States which also need to be established. The AccessibleEU Centre should consist of a lean structure composed of a secretariat, a forum and a number of subgroups of experts – 'hear nothing about us without us'. It should become the hub for the collection and transfer of knowledge on accessibility and inclusion.

This exchange must involve, as I said, persons with disabilities at all levels. Our direct involvement and the perspective of organisation, representing persons with disabilities should influence policy recommendation, actions and standardisation process through the centre.

Again, thanks to all my colleagues. I listen now to your speeches and I'm looking forward to fruitful cooperation with you, Helena Dalli, and, of course, Mr Commissioner Breton.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I appreciate that this institution attaches great importance to accessibility, and I thank the rapporteur, Ms Langensiepen, for her diligent work on this topic and the whole IMCO Committee for their overwhelming support for her report.

Your report on AccessibleEU confirms the need for dismantling barriers that persons with disabilities still face and for improving the accessibility of the built and virtual environments for persons with disabilities. These are also obligations for the EU and for Member States as parties to the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. AccessibleEU, as we created, will address many of the important challenges and issues, as well as the solutions that you propose in your report.

The strategy for the rights of persons with disabilities confirms that the European Commission attaches great importance to accessibility. Accessibility is an enabler of rights, autonomy and equality. It is a prerequisite for the full participation of persons with disabilities on an equal basis with others in a society, as well as in our democracy. With AccessibleEU we will be able to step up our efforts in this area. We have now adopted a good number of important legislative instruments on accessibility. AccessibleEU will be a European resource centre to increase coherence in accessibility and legislation to facilitate access to relevant knowledge. We have launched a call for tenders to build AccessibleEU and we aim to sign the contract by the end of the year.

We share many of the objectives set out in your report, and AccessibleEU will contribute to progressing in accessibility in various ways: networking, awareness, capacity building, training sessions and mutual learning. AccessibleEU will support the implementation of EU accessibility legislation, connect stakeholders, create a one-stop shop for knowledge on accessibility, and train highly skilled accessibility professionals. In its development, I assure you that we will work closely with Member States, stakeholders, and organisations of persons with disabilities, and we are more than prepared, of course, as ever, to continue working with you.

Salvatore De Meo, *a nome del gruppo PPE*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, voglio rivolgere un ringraziamento alla relatrice per il lavoro fatto e per aver trovato la sintesi di un testo equilibrato.

Nell'ambito della strategia per i diritti delle persone con disabilità, la creazione di questo centro si è resa necessaria per assistere la Commissione nel monitoraggio e implementazione della strategia, ma anche per supportare e coordinare i vari Stati membri, dove purtroppo si registrano ancora tante differenze e ritardi nell'attuazione delle direttive europee in materia di accessibilità.

Il Centro si propone principalmente la promozione di una reale cultura delle pari opportunità e della piena partecipazione delle persone disabili in tutti gli aspetti e gli ambiti della vita quotidiana. Sono soddisfatto che sia stata sottolineata l'importanza di aumentare i livelli occupazionali delle persone disabili, sia con l'utilizzo delle nuove tecnologie, sia con la necessaria cooperazione, non solo con le organizzazioni non governative, ma anche e soprattutto con il mondo delle imprese che va sensibilizzato a prendere atto delle grandi potenzialità derivanti dall'impiego di disabili, oggi spesso esclusi anche a causa di pregiudizi ormai smentiti dalle loro tante storie di lavoro e di successo.

In questo contesto è importante il ruolo degli enti locali, sia nella fase di analisi del fabbisogno dei territori, sia nella fase di attuazione delle politiche sociali. Io sono convinto che il Centro sarà lo strumento operativo con cui la Commissione e i singoli Stati, con un approccio coordinato e armonizzato, possono favorire concretamente tutte le condizioni di accesso vero alla vita reale, con la rimozione di ogni ostacolo fisico e culturale.

Tsvetelina Penkova, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, with no doubt our Union should strive for a further promotion and development of the accessibility in all the EU countries and institutions. The key to ensuring a more inclusive society in Europe is the collective efforts and cooperation among all the stakeholders. They have to share successful good practices and projects.

Our role in this Parliament is to enforce the EU commitment to safeguard the rights of the people with disabilities. We shall ensure a better quality of life and adequate accessibility to goods and services. Five key priorities for the S&D Group and Parliament took an integral part of this report.

The first one, need for stronger involvement in effective participation of all stakeholders. Second, adequate financial funding and human resources in ensuring the good organisation and functioning of those centres. Third, establishing of national accessibility hubs. Fourth, further implementation and building on already existing policies – and I am putting a strong emphasis here, because there are many policies, it has already been mentioned by the rapporteur, but they are not properly implemented to be effective. And fifth, a possible establishment of an agency.

We call for a strong AccessibleEU Centre by identifying to help and overcome the gaps and inconsistencies in the current accessibility legislation. Establishing the AccessibleEU Centre is a step in the right direction to increase the coherence in accessibility policies, to share good practices, and to create a more accessible and inclusive Europe.

Dita Charanzová, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, the Renew Europe Group has always been and will always be a voice for persons with disabilities.

I have said it before but it bears repeating: our society will never be complete until all our citizens can play a full part in it, including the more than 100 million EU citizens with a disability.

The report we discussed today highlights two of the barriers to an inclusive society, and they are access to information by our citizens with disabilities and the implementation of accessibility requirements.

European legislation creates many good and useful obligations on Member States and businesses to take into account different needs. But if our citizens with disabilities cannot easily access information about our rights, how can they exercise those rights? How can our citizens exercise their rights if the laws are not fully implemented?

Through this report, we call on Member States to establish national disability accessibility hubs and for the Commission to create a digital AccessibleEU Centre to address these problems. These hubs need both adequate funding and human resources to work in practice and Renew supports these calls for action.

To overcome the gaps and inconsistencies in current legislation and to overcome the knowledge levels of our officials is not going to be easy, but it is of vital importance. We need political will, and I can assure you that there is a political will in the European Parliament. Europeans with disabilities are not 'others', something apart, they are us, and each of us deserves the right to live a life to our full potential.

Tilly Metz, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! An meine Kollegin Katrin Langensiepen: Unsere Fraktion kann stolz auf deine Arbeit sein, die du Tag für Tag im Kampf für mehr Inklusion und Barrierefreiheit in Europa leistest. Ein EU-Zentrum für Barrierefreiheit, das war längst überfällig, denn ich kenne leider kein Land, nicht einmal eine EU-Institution, in der es für Menschen mit Behinderungen keine Barrieren mehr gibt, die ihnen das Leben erschweren oder sie sogar ausgrenzen.

Es müssen deswegen in der Tat schnell konkrete und radikale Veränderungen unternommen werden, wenn wir dem Versprechen einer inklusiveren EU gerecht werden wollen. Und wir wollen! Schöne Worte und gut klingende Strategien reichen nicht aus.

Alessandra Basso, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel Parlamento europeo parliamo molto spesso di mercato unico, di pari opportunità e di avere una Unione a misura di tutti i cittadini. Spesso però sono parole al vento. I nostri cittadini più fragili, quelli affetti da disabilità, hanno bisogno di maggiori tutele e di essere al centro dell'attività parlamentare.

Negli ultimi anni hanno visto la luce diversi provvedimenti che si impegnano a porre degli standard di accessibilità, ma purtroppo non si è fatto abbastanza. I nostri cittadini affetti da disabilità si trovano in un mondo che non solo non facilita le loro vite, ma anzi spesso li discrimina. E accolgo quindi con molto piacere il lavoro fatto dalla relatrice.

Nonostante i nostri gruppi siano politicamente distanti, su temi come questi ci siamo trovati in sintonia. È il momento che la Commissione europea ascolti non solo il Parlamento, ma anche quegli oltre ottanta milioni di cittadini che hanno bisogno di maggiori tutele per poter davvero far parte della nostra Unione e senza subire alcuna discriminazione.

Ieri, mentre aspettavo la navetta per l'aeroporto, ho incontrato una cara persona, una nostra amica che è in carrozzina, che mi ha detto: «Ho appena perso l'autobus perché il conducente, visto che sono seduta su una carrozzina, non mi ha vista, e alcune volte mi sento invisibile.»

Concludo ricordando ai membri di quest'Aula che ognuno di noi ha deciso di intraprendere la carriera politica per cercare di migliorare la vita delle persone che ci circondano. Nonostante non sia sempre facile, mi auguro che possa partire una nuova stagione europea in cui il bene dei cittadini e di tutti i cittadini venga posto in cima alle priorità superando i veti ideologici. Perché credete, nel 2022 è inaccettabile sentirsi dire: «alcune volte mi sento invisibile».

Adam Bielan, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, the European Union has been building a progressive strategy to support the rights of European citizens with disabilities for several decades. However, people with disabilities are still facing significant barriers to access education, employment, healthcare and sport. Moreover, it is clear that the pandemic has disproportionately affected disabled people, both economically and with regard to social inclusion. More often than others, they have been cut off from health services and lost access to the labour market or education.

This is why I support the creation of the AccessibleEU Centre, as well as the final report we will vote on today. It recognises the important work that has been done in recent years to support accessibility in the internal market. I welcome the approach taken whereby the centre can act as a hub to draw together expertise and share best practices for policy development between national authorities.

Last, I believe that oversight of the centre's activities should be carried out jointly by national competent bodies to ensure maximum efficiency of this essential piece of the EU's disability rights strategy. Its role and responsibilities should also be limited to its core mission, as an expanded mandate in the form of an agency, notably, may prevent it from reaching its objectives.

Anne-Sophie Pelletier, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, je remercie Katrin pour ce texte ambitieux et si nécessaire pour les personnes en situation de handicap, puisque, in fine, il permettra d'améliorer le quotidien de 87 millions de personnes en situation de handicap en Europe.

Le centre de ressources promet une meilleure connaissance et une meilleure expertise sur le handicap, en particulier sur les questions d'accessibilité: c'est grâce à cela que nous parviendrons à bâtir une société équitable.

Je me réjouis que dans le texte figurent mes propositions sur des moyens financiers et humains suffisants pour le bon fonctionnement du centre ainsi que sur la représentation des personnes en situation de handicap parmi le personnel du centre, afin de renforcer son rôle envers les institutions et les États membres ou encore y inclure des dispositions – sur l'accessibilité du langage par exemple.

Et là, permettez-moi, chers collègues, de penser que nous devons ici même être exemplaires. Où est la langue des signes internationale dans cet hémicycle? Où est le facile à lire et à comprendre dans nos textes? Et même ici: où est l'accessibilité pour les personnes à mobilité réduite qui voudraient venir discuter au centre de cet hémicycle? Nulle part.

L'accessibilité est un problème transversal, elle touche tous les domaines. Les normes PMR doivent occuper une place importante lors de la conception des objets, dans la façon dont sont pensés les transports, dans les règles des marchés publics et vis-à-vis des risques écologiques. *Accessibilité* doit donc être synonyme d'*au-to-no-mie*.

Ainsi, je ne peux espérer que l'adoption de ce rapport, car les questions de handicap et d'accessibilité doivent être réfléchies avec les personnes en situation de handicap. Elles doivent être au centre de nos politiques publiques, que ce soit au niveau national ou européen, parce que nos valeurs doivent s'inscrire dans une société équitable et dans le respect des droits fondamentaux des citoyens européens, et parce que oui, je le répète, les personnes en situation de handicap sont des citoyens qui ont des droits. N'oublions jamais qu'eux aussi doivent pouvoir avoir accès à nos textes, à ce que nous disons, comme ils doivent pouvoir avoir accès à leur quotidien, en toute autonomie.

Ádám Kósa (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Az akadálymentesítést a közvélemény gyakran csak fizikai vagy digitális környezethez kapcsolja, azonban annak definíciója és tartalma jelentősen eltér fogyatékossági csoportonként.

A siketek számára a sajátos nyelvi és kulturális identitásból adódóan az akadálymentesítés azt jelenti, hogy nemzeti jelnyelven teljes körűen hozzáférnek az információhoz és tudáshoz.

Az Accessible EU központnak világossá kell tennie, hogy az akadálymentesítés túlmutat az épített környezet és a szolgáltatások fizikai és digitális hozzáférhetőségén. Ez kiemelten fontos kérdés. A központnak támogatnia kell a tagállamokat, és sikeresen összekapcsolhatja a nemzeti és EU-s szerveket valamennyi felhasználócsoporttal, különösen a fogyatékossággal élő személyeket képviselő szervezetekkel, hogy az érintettek bevonásával, az ő érdekükben alakítsák a hozzáférés részleteit minden fogyatékossági csoport esetében.

Andreas Schwab (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit dem heutigen Beschluss zur Einrichtung eines Zentrums „AccessibleEU" machen wir für den Binnenmarkt einen Schritt, den vielleicht manche gar nicht so sehr erwartet haben, weil wir eben der Tatsache Rechnung tragen wollen, dass dieser gemeinsame Lebensraum, dieser gemeinsame Markt nur gemeinsam genutzt werden kann, wenn alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger die gleichen Rechte und auch die gleichen Chancen bekommen.

Denn Barrierefreiheit ist ja nicht nur Selbstzweck, sondern auch Mittel zum Zweck. Es ist richtig und wichtig, dass es uns gelingt, durch barrierefreien Zugang vor allem in den Bereichen, die heute für den Alltag von überragender Bedeutung sind, tatsächlich allen Europäerinnen und Europäern die gleichen Chancen einzuräumen. Das ist in manchen Mitgliedstaaten schwerer als in anderen. Deswegen ist es gut, dass mit dem Zentrum „AccessibleEU" jetzt ein Austausch ermöglicht wird, eine gemeinsame Zusammenarbeit unter einem Dach, die sicherstellt, dass die besten Ideen sich in allen Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union verbreiten und wir sicherstellen, dass alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger den adäquaten Zugang finden.

Dazu muss dieses Zentrum nun ausreichend ausgestattet werden, und die Mitgliedstaaten und die betroffenen Unternehmen müssen ihren Teil dazu beitragen, dass die Bürgerinnen und Bürger am Ende davon auch Gebrauch machen können.

Leszek Miller (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Koleżanki i Koledzy! Około 100 milionów obywateli Unii Europejskiej dotyka niepełnosprawność. Pomimo istnienia przepisów, które starają się zapewnić tym ludziom równe prawa we wszystkich dziedzinach życia, często napotykają oni bariery utrudniające im pełny udział w społeczeństwie. Naszym priorytetem jest stworzenie środowiska, które umożliwi osobom niepełnosprawnym pełen dostęp do każdego aspektu życia i gospodarki.

Dlatego tak ważne jest, aby Komisja Europejska przeznaczyła odpowiednie środki finansowe i ludzkie na utworzenie i funkcjonowanie Centrum AccesibleEU. Ono także będzie wsparciem dla państw członkowskich, zapewniając materiały i szkolenia w zakresie wdrażania, monitorowania oraz egzekwowania polityki dostępności. Za pięć lat powinna zostać przeprowadzona ocena działalności Centrum w celu jego usprawnienia i aktualizacji oraz podjęcia decyzji w sprawie ewentualnego powołania agencji. Mam nadzieję, że dzięki temu ważnemu projektowi znacząco poprawi się jakość życia osób niepełnosprawnych w Unii Europejskiej.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamna vicepreședintă, doamna comisară, stimați colegi, în Uniunea Europeană trăiesc și muncesc foarte mulți oameni cu dizabilități. Doar în România, în țara mea, sunt undeva la 800 000 de suflete și foarte mulți din acești oameni au talente, capacități deosebite și pot contribui în diferite moduri la progresul societății: fie că practică diferite sporturi, sunt profesori, unii dintre ei fac și politică, fie că organizează evenimente de amploare sau conduc companii de succes.

Mulți sunt modele de reziliență, de implicare, atât profesională, cât și socială. Este, de aceea, firesc să ne asigurăm că piața unică europeană este deschisă și pentru ei, că regulile de accesibilitate și incluziune sunt respectate, iar ei pot să se bucure de aceleași privilegii ca orice antreprenor din Uniunea Europeană.

Un centru de accesibilitate, însă, va fi cu adevărat de ajutor doar dacă este cunoscut și accesibil tuturor persoanelor cu dizabilități din toate cele 27 de state membre. Așa încât țin să subliniez că este absolut necesară diseminarea eficientă a informației și este necesar ca oamenii să fie încurajați să apeleze la serviciile acestui centru, indiferent în ce regiune europeană trăiesc și își desfășoară activitatea.

Laura Huhtasaari (ID). – Arvoisa puhemies, Suomessa on sellainen sanonta, että vahinko ei tule kello kaulassa. Kukaan meistä ei ole suojassa miltään, ei sairastumiselta tai vammautumiselta. Joillakin on rajoitteita elämässään jo syntymästä lähtien, ja on sivistyneen yhteiskunnan velvollisuus taata, että kaikilla on sairaudestaan tai vammastaan huolimatta oikeus ja mahdollisuus täysipainoiseen elämään.

EU:ssa on se tapa, että asia kuin asia halutaan ratkaista EU:n tasolla. Tämä ei usein ole se toimivin ratkaisu. Tämä on sinänsä ymmärrettävää, koska EU:sta halutaan tehdä liittovaltio ja liittovaltio tähtää siihen, että meillä on vahva keskushallinto. Täältä ylhäältä käsin aina tiedetään, mitkä ratkaisut missäkin maassa olisivat parhaita, ja samaa mallia halutaan esittää erilaisiin valtioihin.

Aina kun EU:n vaalilainsäädäntöä uudistetaan, halutaan uusia viranomaisia. Halutaan EU:n vaaliviranomainen. Se tietää uusia virkoja ja uusia rahanmenoja. Yksi esimerkki tästä on ajatus ”AccessibleEU” -keskuksesta, joka toisi taas uutta hallintoa. Ajatus on kaunis, mutta tarvitsemmeko uusia hallinnollisia rakenteita sihteeristöineen? Mielestäni hallinto ei paranna kenenkään elämää, se on vain uusi rahanmeno.

Suomessa näissä asioissa ollaan hyvin kehittyneitä, vaikka tietenkin aina parannettavaa on. Meidän tulisi enemmän keskittyä siihen, että me vaihdamme hyviä käytänteitä ja kerromme niistä ja sitten maiden johtajat päättävät, sopiiko tämä juuri meille ja olisiko tämä uusi innovaatio, vaikka tällaisenaan, hyvä ottaa juuri meidän maahamme. Minä en usko, että vahva hallinto on tässä se ratkaisu. EU valitettavasti on enemmän tämmöinen byrokratia eikä demokratia, koska jos me luotamme demokratiaan, niin me luotamme myös siihen, että kansallisvaltiot pystyvät parhaiten ajamaan omien heikompiosaistensa asiaa.

Geert Bourgeois (ECR). – Voorzitter, mevrouw de commissaris, mensen met een beperking horen thuis ín onze samenleving. Niet aan de rand, niet aan de zijlijn, maar er middenin! Zij wensen net als iedereen deel te kunnen nemen aan het economische, sociale en culturele leven. Zij willen niet betutteld worden vanuit een zorgperspectief, maar hun talenten en vaardigheden ten volle kunnen ontplooien.

Helaas botsen zij nog op veel te veel belemmeringen. Zo hebben mensen met een beperkte mobiliteit in meerdere lidstaten problemen om het openbaar vervoer te nemen. Mensen met een auditief of visueel probleem hebben vaak last om een job te vinden of om hun job te behouden. Mensen met een beperking moeten soms naar de andere kant van het land verhuizen om een geschikte woonst te vinden.

Dus moet het roer om: dit moet anders! Daarom steunen wij, mevrouw de commissaris, het voorstel om een Europees centrum, “AccessibleEU”, op te richten. Dit is een voorbeeld van hoe het moet: kennis verzamelen, kennis delen, steun geven en stimulansen geven aan de lidstaten om een sterk toegankelijkheidsbeleid te voeren.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, S potešením vítam túto správu, ktorá má za cieľ pomôcť 87 miliónom obyvateľov Európskej únie a pomôcť im v každodennom prekonávaní bežných prekážok, ktoré my zdraví ľudia častokrát považujeme za samozrejmé. Zriadenie centra bude mať náročnú úlohu dostatočne mobilizovať a prepájať odborníkov z praxe s jednotlivými vnútroštátnymi orgánmi zodpovednými za realizáciu európskych politík prístupnosti. Častokrát však nielen dostatok expertízy, ale najmä nedostatok politickej vôle komplikuje riešenie problémov tejto skupiny ľudí. Pritom zdravotne postihnutí občania neznamenajú nejakú menšiu hodnotu pre spoločnosť, neumenšuje to hodnotu človeka. Naším cieľom musí byť pomôcť pri zvyšovaní jeho kvality a možnosti plného zapojenia do spoločnosti. Aj preto som rád, že správa myslí aj na podmienky pracovného trhu a spomína sa tu aj správa o digitálnej dekáde, na ktorej som osobitne pracoval a zapracovával som tam aj podmienky ľudí so zdravotným postihnutím. Nové technológie môžu byť skvelým nástrojom a pomocníkom pre rozvoj a uplatnenie tejto skupiny ľudí. Dámy a páni, pomáhajme ľuďom so zdravotným postihnutím mať rovnaké príležitosti. Chcem tiež povzbudiť k aktívnemu zapojeniu národné orgány, pretože bez ich aktívnej a otvorenej spolupráce to nepôjde. Rád budem v tomto procese implementácie nápomocný na všetkých úrovniach.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissaria Dalli, negli ultimi anni l'Unione europea ha cercato di investire molto nel creare, con nuova legislazione e buone pratiche, un ecosistema accessibile che permettesse a tutti i cittadini, indipendentemente dalla loro disabilità o meno, di trascorrere la loro vita e vivere le loro relazioni interpersonali e sociali col massimo grado di libertà e indipendenza possibile. Trasporti, servizi, luoghi di lavoro, siti web, appalti, ambiente costruito: tutto a misura di ciascuno. Purtroppo, questo sforzo non è stato finora ancora adeguato. Mancano coordinamento e organicità delle misure e delle azioni, manca un approccio universale alla progettazione degli interventi pubblici e privati.

Istituire il Centro europeo «AccessibleEU» è un piccolo passo avanti in questa direzione, come indicato dalla strategia dell'Unione europea per le persone con disabilità. Un luogo di ricerca, di *expertise*, di conoscenza e di scambio, una risorsa preziosa per le autorità nazionali e locali che vogliano progettare con l'approccio universale, ma hanno bisogno di guide per gli aspetti tecnici. Non sprechiamo questa occasione di creare inclusione e andiamo avanti in questa direzione.

Susanna Ceccardi (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in questa relazione per l'accessibilità ci sono moltissime belle parole: diritti, rispetto, sensibilità, civiltà. Purtroppo non sempre alle belle parole seguono i fatti, nemmeno nel Parlamento europeo, nemmeno nell'edificio che più di tutti gli altri dovrebbe essere accessibile a chiunque.

Voglio raccontarvi un'esperienza diretta. Sono mesi che vorrei assumere Michela. Michela è una ragazza di Firenze, intelligente ma su una carrozzina, e dovrebbe venire a fare qui la stagista. Purtroppo, dopo lunghe ed estenuanti ricerche, Michela non è riuscita a trovare un appartamento accessibile a Bruxelles e il Parlamento non ha saputo come aiutarla. Eppure Michela vorrebbe soltanto fare un tirocinio come tanti suoi coetanei.

Le farò avere una copia di questa relazione. Lo stage per adesso non può farlo, ma intanto può consolarsi leggendo queste bellissime parole. Ho scritto alla Presidente del nostro Parlamento Roberta Metsola per denunciare questa vicenda. Nel frattempo, cerchiamo davvero di aiutare le persone disabili e le loro famiglie che vorrebbero poter vivere con dignità grazie al sostegno reale delle istituzioni.

Beata Mazurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! To sprawozdanie ma bezpośredni wpływ na życie milionów obywateli Unii Europejskiej borykających się z różnymi stopniami niepełnosprawności. I choćby z tego powodu powinno być ważne dla nas wszystkich. Swobodne uczestnictwo w życiu społecznym, politycznym, gospodarczym jest prawem każdego człowieka. Parlament musi działać na rzecz udrożnienia przepływu informacji, szczególnie w zakresie wszelkiego wsparcia merytorycznego dotyczącego wdrażania polityki dostępności, udzielanego przez ekspertów Komisji i państwom członkowskim. Warto tutaj wymienić choćby obszar dostępności dla niepełnosprawnych środowiska zabudowanego, w którym to obszarze mamy jeszcze wiele do zrobienia.

Wierzę, że ustanowione Centrum będzie przestrzenią do dialogu z osobami niepełnosprawnymi, które najlepiej rozumieją problemy, z jakimi muszą się mierzyć każdego dnia. Uważam ponadto, że Centrum spełni najlepiej swoją rolę, służąc zapleczem eksperckim stanowiącym źródło wiedzy dla organów unijnych i krajowych, inspirując tym samym do korzystania z rozwiązań i dobrych praktyk, które sprawdziły się w innych państwach. Nie powinno jednak zostać przekształcone w agencję wspomnianą w sprawozdaniu. Wspierajmy realne działania na rzecz osób niepełnosprawnych, zamiast skupiać się na tworzeniu nowych urzędów.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, Commissioner, about 90 million persons in the EU have some form of disability; 50% of persons with disabilities are in employment compared to 75% without disabilities.

Although major advances have been achieved in favour of people with disabilities, often these citizens are still faced with significant barriers to full participation in their communities. Efforts must continue if we are to achieve a more inclusive, fairer Europe, including access to employment and the rights of people with disabilities.

Member States have been lagging behind for years when it comes to implementing EU legal texts on inclusivity. With the new EU Centre for Accessibility, we would hopefully have an effective tool in coherently implementing accessibility in the EU.

I call on the Commission to guarantee adequate financial and human resources to ensure the effective operation of the centre. Let's make the world a more inclusive place. It is time to raise the living standards of European citizens, especially those who are currently represented.

And, finally, a shout out to the social farming initiative in my own constituency. The farmers involved are generously leading by example, by giving people with disabilities the chance to work on their farms. Initiatives like this should be encouraged and replicated all over the EU and in all aspects of human engagement.

Mónica Silvana González (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, la Unión Europea se examina el próximo año ante la Convención Internacional sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad y debemos llegar con los deberes hechos. El Parlamento Europeo debe estar en este mecanismo de seguimiento de la Convención. Este Centro de Accesibilidad Europeo va en la buena dirección; agradezco a la señora Langensiepen su trabajo en este informe, aunque nos hubiese gustado llegar a poder conservar un centro físico de accesibilidad.

Venimos del Acta Europea de Accesibilidad. Acordamos ahora el Centro de Accesibilidad y el objetivo es avanzar hacia una verdadera Agencia de Accesibilidad Europea.

Le pedimos a la Comisión que otorgue cuanto antes la gestión a consorcios en los que estén incluidas personas con discapacidad, y no a unas consultoras especializadas. Como bien dice el sector, «nada para nosotros sin nosotros», nada para las personas con discapacidad sin las personas con discapacidad.

Pedimos también que se destine la suficiente financiación para cumplir los objetivos y hacer realidad una verdadera Agencia Europea de Accesibilidad cuanto antes.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, dlhodobo v rôznych uzneseniach a správach deklarujeme, že prístupnosť je základom a nevyhnutnosťou pre plné zapojenie osôb so zdravotným postihnutím do všetkých oblastí života. Tento koncept sme následne pretavili do niekoľkých legislatívnych návrhov vrátane smernice o prístupnosti tovarov a služieb. Implementácia tejto legislatívy však nie je vždy včasná a efektívna a osoby so zdravotným postihnutím sa napriek mnohým snahám ešte stále stretávajú s prekážkami v každodennom živote. Chýbajú nám presné údaje, vyškolení odborníci, ale niekedy aj vôľa hľadať inovatívne riešenia. Práve preto oceňujem plány na založenie Európskeho centra pre prístupnosť, ktoré má tieto medzery preklenúť. Verím, že toto centrum vytvorí priestor pre spoluprácu členských štátov s odborníkmi, ako aj so zástupcami osôb so zdravotným postihnutím. Poskytne potrebné usmernenia a umožní výmenu najlepších postupov. Prístupnosť vo všetkých oblastiach života je kľúčom pre plnohodnotný život viac ako 87 miliónov osôb so zdravotným postihnutím v Európskej únii. Snažme sa, aby sa konečne stala realitou.

Marc Angel (S&D). – Madam President, more than 87 million people in our Union have some form of disability and they still face considerable barriers in accessing too many areas of life. Accessibility is an essential precondition for everyone to enjoy human rights and fundamental freedoms. Therefore, the aim of the European Union must be to identify and to overcome all gaps and inconsistencies in the current legislation and standards, and to create an accessible environment for all. In this regard, I am looking forward to the upcoming Commission initiative related to rules for applying for the disability card in order to facilitate mobility of persons with disabilities within the internal market.

Creating the AccessibleEU Centre is the right step in the right direction, but we also must make sure that each Member State will correctly implement the existing and forthcoming accessibility requirements in order to overcome existing and possible further fragmentations in the single market. To achieve our goal we need appropriate financing and also the provision of the adequate human resources, and it is also important to establish inclusive national accessibility hubs to facilitate the coordination among relevant stakeholders.

Madam President, we can be proud of this Parliament that in many, many committees we highlight the promotion of the rights of people with disabilities.

Erik Bergkvist (S&D). – Fru talman! Bästa ledamöter! Stort tack till föredraganden för detta mycket viktiga betänkande.

Ett samhälle som tar hänsyn till allas behov, även de med stora funktionsvariationer, är ett gott samhälle. Det blir ett bättre samhälle för alla. Därför är det här centret så oerhört viktigt. Att det sätter fokus på de här frågorna kommer att hjälpa oss alla att göra ett bättre jobb. Samtidigt är det oerhört viktigt: det här får inte bli en ö, det här får inte bli något som ”tar hand om problemet”, utan det måste bli integrerat i allt arbete som vi faktiskt gör.

Ett samhälles humanism kännetecknas ytterst av hur vi tar hand om varandra och hur vi tar hand om dem som kan ha de största behoven. Därför är detta också oerhört viktigt. Om vi ska bli framgångsrika och lyckas snabbt måste vi också sätta ett exempel. Därför måste Europaparlamentet i sitt eget arbete för tillgänglighet ta på sig ett stort ansvar att alltid ligga längst fram, att alltid vara mest tillgängligt. Då kommer vi att lyckas.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señora presidenta, después de la aprobación, por parte de este Parlamento y de las instituciones comunitarias de unas normas que establecen un ecosistema para favorecer la accesibilidad y la integración de las personas con discapacidad tuvo lugar la aprobación de la Estrategia Europea sobre Discapacidad, que otorgaba un mandato para la creación de este Centro Accesibilidad de la UE.

Se trata de un paso más hacia la inclusión y la igualdad.

Las normas comunitarias en relación con la accesibilidad no están armonizadas y, por eso, era necesaria una coherencia y una organización en esta materia.

Cuando hablamos de accesibilidad hablamos de cultura de igualdad, hablamos de participación plena, pero no solamente en el mundo digital y en el mundo del transporte, sino en todos los niveles: en la educación, en el trabajo, en la sanidad, en todos los aspectos de la vida.

Es muy importante estar a la altura de los valores que predicamos y por eso, la creación de este Centro reviste un carácter fundamental. Hoy es un día histórico porque significa que habrá diálogo, que habrá participación, que habrá igualdad, y, sobre todo, que habrá derechos humanos.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamna comisară, stimați colegi, vorbim despre persoane, aproape 80 de milioane de persoane din Uniunea Europeană care au o dizabilitate mai mare sau mai mică. Aproape 30 %, doamna comisară, sunt în prag de sărăcie. Sigur, avem o strategie pentru persoane cu dizabilități până în 2030, dar oamenii au nevoie de fapte.

Eu reprezint aici, în Parlamentul European, Partidul Umanist din țara mea și noi înțelegem că avem nevoie de fapte, nu vorbe. Da, avem nevoie să ajutăm statele membre unde nu au nici resurse umane, nu au nici buget pentru a crea aceste condiții persoanelor cu dizabilități și e nevoie să avem acest Centru și felicit raportoarea pentru ceea ce a prezentat aici. Cred că toți trebuie să susținem, să ajungem la lucruri concrete, pentru că trebuie și din partea noastră mai multă empatie.

Ieri am văzut în Strasbourg cum o persoană pe bicicletă electrică a dat peste o persoană cu baston alb. Cred că toți trebuie să fim mai empatici, dar avem nevoie de o coerență în Uniunea Europeană, de integrare adevărată a acestor oameni și de a-i asculta, pentru că nimeni nu știe mai bine decât asociațiile acestor persoane ce obstacole au și cum ar putea fi îndepărtate. Personal, lucrez în țara mea cu asociațiile persoanelor cu dizabilități, dar avem nevoie de coerență în toată Uniunea Europeană.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for all their valuable opinions and recommendations. We, of course, agree on many of them, and I believe that we are able to take a lot of them into account when shaping the AccessibleEU initiative. Next year, we should focus on the actual roll-out of the initiative. I am convinced that AccessibleEU will help us achieve a more accessible and inclusive Europe for persons with disabilities.

In spite of all this, I would say, of course, there is still a lot that needs to be done. There are still barriers for persons with disabilities which block them from participating fully in society as we have heard, the reality of poverty, the reality of employment, there is so much which still needs to be done. And I would say that we will not have the union of equality which we are striving for until every case of every person with a disability is addressed.

Katrin Langensiepen, *Berichterstatterin*. – Frau Präsidentin! Herzlichen Dank, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, für diese warmen, wertschätzenden und auch richtigstellenden Worte. *The future is accessible, the present not*. Die Zukunft wird hoffentlich barrierefrei, denn die Gegenwart ist es nicht. Noch immer ist es so, dass behinderte Menschen sich dafür rechtfertigen müssen, wenn sie ihre Rechte einklagen. „Was wollt ihr denn noch?", hört man in Parlamenten, im öffentlichen Raum.

Die UN-Behindertenrechtskonvention ist keine Wunschliste, es ist ein Menschenrecht. Bei Inklusion sprechen wir nicht über einen lustigen Kindergeburtstag, wo alle mal ganz bunt und vielfältig zusammenkommen. *Diversity* ist nicht irgendwas Lustiges, irgendwas wie „Ach, ich habe ja auch einen schwulen Freund, aber ansonsten interessieren mich die Rechte von queeren Personen eigentlich gar nicht." Und: „Ja, ich habe mal in einer Einrichtung gearbeitet, und die Menschen mit Behinderung, die waren so inspirierend. Ich fand es toll." Das nennt man Ableismus, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Wenn wir in der Europäischen Union uns gegen Rassismus stellen, gegen Antisemitismus, dann müssen wir uns auch gegen Ableismus stellen, Behindertenfeindlichkeit.

The future is accessible, the present not. Ich hoffe, dass wir, wenn wir konkret handeln wollen, hier auch eine Barrierefreiheitsagentur schaffen. Es muss sichtbar sein, unsere Rechte müssen sichtbar gemacht werden, und dafür muss man auch Kohle investieren – ganz klar. Ansonsten sind es Lippenbekenntnisse.

Die Kommission hat im Sommer, als wir fast alle im Urlaub waren, ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren eingeleitet gegen fast alle europäischen Mitgliedstaaten, weil sie nicht berichtet haben, wie der Stand in Sachen Barrierefreiheit war. Na ja, ich kann mal böse sagen: Da, wo nichts umgesetzt ist, da kann man ja auch nichts berichten. Es ist eine Schande, dass ist auch immer noch der Fall ist, dass die Antidiskriminierungsrichtlinie, die fünfte, immer noch im Rat blockiert wird. Was lange währt, wird endlich schlecht, glauben vielleicht die einen oder anderen. Zeigt mir wie wichtig dieses *AccessibleEU Centre* ist, bis hin zu einer Agentur, und dafür werden wir alle gemeinsam kämpfen.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan tänään tiistaina 4.10.2022.

(Istunto keskeytettiin klo 11.28.)

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Jarosław Duda (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Raport dotyczący promowania i wspierania dostępności na rynku wewnętrznym to kolejny ważny krok Parlamentu Europejskiego na rzecz wprowadzenia w życie Konwencji o prawach osób niepełnosprawnych, ratyfikowanej przez UE i państwa członkowskie.

Jako przedstawiciel PE w Europejskich ramach monitorowania wdrażania CRPD jestem szczególnie z tego dumny. Od lat obserwuję problemy we wdrażaniu Konwencji. Jedną z przyczyn jest niedostateczna wiedza decydentów o wymogach dostępności. Szokujące jest, że nie tylko nie znosimy w wystarczającym stopniu istniejących barier, ale tworzymy nowe, w całym majestacie zamówień publicznych. Od lat podnoszę kwestię powszechnego montażu w budynkach mieszkalnych i użyteczności publicznej „nowoczesnych" wind z panelami dotykowymi, ograniczających samodzielne funkcjonowanie osób niewidomych, niedowidzących i starszych. Windy w szpitalach wyświetlające informacje, do której wind wsiąść, aby wjechać na wybrane piętro, są zmorą nie tylko pacjentów, ale i w pełni sprawnych osób odwiedzających. Aby uniknąć takiej źle pojętej nowoczesności, trzeba korzystać z wiedzy ekspertów, zwłaszcza reprezentantów osób z niepełnosprawnościami, a także szkolić urzędników i decydentów oraz wymieniać dobre praktyki.

Bardzo liczę na to, że Centrum *Accessible EU* efektywnie wesprze instytucje, organizacje i przedsiębiorstwa wprowadzające zmiany na rzecz uniwersalnego projektowania i zwiększania dostępności towarów, usług, całego otoczenia dla wszystkich obywateli, bez względu na wiek czy stopień sprawności.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

5. Pokračování denního zasedání

(The sitting resumed at 12.00)

6. Hlasování

President. – The next item is the vote.

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

6.1. Pravidla využívání letištních časů na letištích Unie: dočasná úleva (C9-0225/2022) (hlasování)

6.2. Evropské středisko pro prevenci a kontrolu nemocí (A9-0253/2021 – Joanna Kopcińska) (hlasování)

6.3. Vážné přeshraniční zdravotní hrozby (A9-0247/2021 – Véronique Trillet-Lenoir) (hlasování)

6.4. Úsilí o dosažení udržitelnosti a konkurenceschopnosti akvakultury v EU: další postup (A9-0215/2022 – Clara Aguilera) (hlasování)

6.5. Dopad nových technologií na zdanění: kryptoaktiva a technologie blockchain (A9-0204/2022 – Lídia Pereira) (hlasování)

6.6. Opatření pro řízení, zachování a kontrolu platná v oblasti působnosti Komise pro tuňáky Indického oceánu (IOTC) (A9-0312/2021 – Gabriel Mato) (hlasování)

6.7. Flexibilní pomoc územím (FAST-CARE) (A9-0232/2022 – Niklas Nienaß) (hlasování)

6.8. Směrnice o rádiových zařízeních: jednotná nabíječka pro elektronická zařízení (A9-0129/2022 – Alex Agius Saliba) (hlasování)

6.9. Středisko AccessibleEU na podporu politik přístupnosti na vnitřním trhu EU (A9-0209/2022 – Katrin Langensiepen) (hlasování)

6.10. Jednotný portál EU pro oblast celnictví (A9-0279/2021 – Ivan Štefanec) (hlasování)

— *After the vote:*

Rainer Wieland (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich wollte nur kurz mitteilen, dass ich mit der richtigen Stimmkarte arbeite, aber offensichtlich scheint sie so kodiert zu sein, dass ich mit der Kollegin Monica Semedo von den Liberalen hier kollidiere. Ich möchte, dass weder sie Ärger bekommt noch ich, weil wir falsch abstimmen. Aber ich hätte zumindest gerne auch, dass es notiert wird. Ich konnte also heute nicht korrekt abstimmen, habe überall mit Plus gestimmt.

President. – Thank you, Vice-President. We will look into this.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the Commission regrets that the original dates foreseen in the proposal for the government-to-government exchanges were not retained by the co-legislators. This will reduce the capacity of the Union to deliver on its commitments under the Green Deal for the management of ozone-depleting substances and control and reduction of fluorinated greenhouse gases to prevent climate-relevant emissions. However, given the significant impact on customs of major current and past events, the Commission understands that Member States are facing great pressure.

At the same time, the Commission acknowledges that some Member States are already interconnected to the EU customs single window certificate exchange system, and some have asked for the possibility to interconnect before 2025. Therefore, notwithstanding the deadlines listed in the Annex, the Commission strongly encourages all Member States to take all the necessary steps to interconnect as soon as possible.

6.11. Statistika zemědělských vstupů a výstupů (A9-0285/2021 – Petros Kokkalis) (hlasování)

6.12. Změna příloh IV a V nařízení (EU) 2019/1021 o perzistentních organických znečišťujících látkách (A9-0092/2022 – Martin Hojsík) (hlasování)

President. – That concludes the vote.

(The sitting was briefly suspended)

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: DITA CHARANZOVÁ

místopředsedkyně

7. Situace Romů žijících v osadách v EU (rozprava)

President. – The next item is the debate on two oral questions on the situation of Roma people living in settlements in the EU (2022/2662(RSP)):

— the oral question to the Council on the situation of Roma people living in the EU by Dragoș Pîslaru, Miriam Lexmann, Milan Brglez, Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová, Romeo Franz, Elżbieta Rafalska, Eugenia Rodríguez Palop, on behalf of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (O-000022/2022 – B9-0018/2022); and

— the oral question to the Commission on the situation of Roma people living in the EU by Dragoș Pîslaru, Miriam Lexmann, Milan Brglez, Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová, Romeo Franz, Elżbieta Rafalska, Eugenia Rodríguez Palop, on behalf of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (O-000023/2022 – B9-0019/2022).

Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová, *autorka*. – Vážená pani predsedajúca, „Hľadáme Blaženu. Blaženu Kováčovú s jej slepým synom. Viete mi povedať, kde bývajú?“ – „Pri tom dome, kde v zime umrzli tie dve deti musíte odbočiť doľava.“

„Aha, nemám prsty na nohách ani na rukách.“ – „Čo sa vám stalo?“ – „Odmrzli mi.“

„Máš 13 rokov a čoskoro sa staneš matkou. Rozumieš tomu, čo sa stalo?“ – „Áno, ten ujo mi povedal, že som pekná.“

„Máte tri deti, chorú manželku. Vy ste ale mladý a zdravý, a predsa nepracujete. Prečo?“ – „Lebo som cigán z osady a musím v dome kúriť. Inak mi tu deti aj žena pomrznú. Kto ma zamestná, keď musím aspoň trikrát denne prikladať do pece?“ – „Čo pálite?“ – „Všetko, čo nájdem. Od dreva až po pneumatiky.“

Toto je zopár krátkych dialógov z rómskych osád, ktoré som pred mnohými rokmi absolvovala ešte ako novinárka.

V novembri 2021 som sa do slovenských rómskych osád vrátila ako europoslankyňa, pretože som tam viedla delegáciu Európskeho parlamentu. To, čo sme v osadách našli, ďaleko predčilo všetky naše očakávania. Našli sme tisíce ľudí bez elektriny, bez pripojenia k verejnému zdroju pitnej vody, bez kanalizácie. V Trebišove, čo je 23-tisícové mesto na východe Slovenska, žije v segregovanej osade 7,5 tisíc Rómov, ktorí sa počas daždivej jesene brodia vo vlastných výkaloch a vo výkaloch dokaličených psov. Ako v slumoch. Nemajú kanalizáciu, nemajú elektrinu, nemajú plyn. V celej osade je pre sedem a pol tisíca ľudí jeden jediný zdroj pitnej vody. Všade okolo sú tisíce a tisíce ton toxických skládok, ktoré zamorujú celé územia. Cez deň skládky obžierajú zúbožené psy, v noci z nich vyliezajú potkany, ktoré potom obžierajú deti v spánku. Deti majú viditeľné jazvy na tvárach, majú svrab a sú hladné. Ľudia v osade boli takí apatickí, že sa premenili na vlastné tiene, ktorými sme prechádzali. Pracovníci projektu Zdravé regióny spolufinancovaného z Európskeho sociálneho fondu, ktorí počas pandémie v osadách suplovali štát, nás upozorňovali na rozmáhajúci sa fenomén fetujúcich detí. Fetujú toluén, aby necítili, že sú hladné. Zároveň nás upozornili na extrémne vysokú úmrtnosť detí v osade. Evidujú 30 úmrtí na 1000 novonarodených detí, čo je úroveň rozvojových krajín. Tie deti zomierajú na podvýživu, na respiračné ochorenia. Keď je v chatrčiach zima, Rómovia pália, čo im príde pod ruku, napríklad aj toxický odpad zo skládok.

Na Slovensku sa stalo štátnou politikou zaraďovať deti z osád do špeciálnych škôl. Ich sociálnu depriváciu a ich neznalosť štátneho jazyka si pri testoch školskej zrelosti často zamieňajú za mentálnu retardáciu. A takto si štát už celé roky vlastnou segregačnou politikou vytvoril x-tú generáciu ľudí s neukončeným základným vzdelaním, ktorí sú kompletne závislí od štátnej pomoci a ktorí sú neschopní uspieť na otvorenom trhu práce. Európska komisia vedie voči tomuto, voči Slovensku, *infringement*.

Zatiaľ sa ale nič výrazné nezmenilo. Počas minulých slovenských korupčných vlád, ktoré doslova tunelovali fondy Európskej únie, sa peniaze na marginalizované rómske komunity rozdávali všadejakým organizáciám prisatým na vládnu chobotnicu. Napríklad na rekvalifikačné kurzy Ikebana určené pre dlhodobo nezamestnaných alebo peniaze dávali obecným futbalovým klubom, aby učili Rómov bez základného vzdelania digitálnym zručnostiam. Za veľa európskych peňazí sa dialo veľa ohavností, ktoré marginalizovaným rómskym komunitám priniesli len veľmi malú pridanú hodnotu. Súčasná vláda neodstránila byrokraciu zo systému čerpania eurofondov, a tak má Slovensko jedno z najnižších čerpaní vôbec. Z pôvodnej alokácie na marginalizované rómske komunity zo starého rozpočtu máme stále nevyčerpaných 70 %. Chýba politická vôľa tak na vládnej, ako aj na lokálnej úrovni a napätie medzi osadami a majoritným obyvateľstvom narastá.

Pretože tak ako sa žije ťažko ľuďom v osadách, tak sa žije ťažko ľuďom žijúcim v ich blízkosti. Investovať do rómskych osád sa stalo v našom regióne také nepopulárne, že peniaze z európskych fondov radšej necháme prepadnúť. Pritom 300 osád na Slovensku nemá prístup k verejným vodovodným sieťam, v 650 osadách obyvatelia nemajú prístup ku kanalizácii, v 50 segregovaných rómskych osadách nemajú žiadnu infraštruktúru, ani len asfaltovú cestu. Podľa UNDP má vodu z verejného vodovodu menej ako polovica všetkých rómskych domácností na Slovensku a značná časť z nich musí brať vodu z potoka alebo rieky. Nedodržiavajú sa zásadné smernice EÚ týkajúce sa vody a zneškodňovania odpadových vôd ani článok 34 Charty základných práv EÚ. V dôsledku toho je v osadách zvýšený výskyt rôznych infekčných ochorení medzi deťmi aj medzi dospelými. V osadách sa vo zvýšenej miere vyskytuje fenomén detí, ktoré majú deti, vo veku 12 až 15 rokov. Objavujú sa prípady detskej prostitúcie.

Opísala som vám situáciu na Slovensku, ale toto isté sa deje v Česku, v Maďarsku, v Rumunsku a v Bulharsku. Hovoríme o státisícoch ľudí, ktorých životné podmienky sú porovnateľné s podmienkami ľudí z rozvojových krajín. Ide o európsku hanbu, ide o európsky problém. Nemôžeme budovať *„social Europe where no one can be left behind“*, keď necháme deti v 21. storočí v srdci Európy zomierať na podvýživu a na respiračné ochorenia. Posledná vec, ktorú vám chcem povedať, je, že …

Predsedajúca odobrala rečníčke slovo.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, may I begin by thanking you for placing this important topic on the Parliament's agenda once again. Roma inclusion policy is an area in which, over the years, we have seen excellent cooperation – and indeed a broad consensus between the Parliament, the Council and the Commission. The subject of Roma inclusion is especially important to the Czech Presidency. I am proud to recall the Council conclusions on Roma inclusion that were adopted during the first Czech Presidency in 2009.

We all agree that the difficult situation of Roma living in marginalised settlements is a matter of grave concern and something that demands urgent action. Deep poverty, substandard housing, lack of basic services such as clean water, electricity and internet access – these are some of the impossible challenges still faced by segregated Roma communities. To change this deplorable situation, a joint effort is needed, both at the EU and national level. I recall the recommendation on Roma equality, inclusion and participation that the Council adopted last year. It is the latest and most important of a series of policy commitments that we have developed over the past decade and a half. But the to-do list is still long.

Let me start with measures to ensure equal access to adequate desegregated housing and essential services. In the 21st century, everyone must have access to tap water, clean drinking water, adequate sanitation, waste collection services, electricity, gas, transport and digital communications. Adequate housing is a basic human need essential for health and social inclusion. Concrete plans should be drawn up by the Member States to end segregation and to tackle housing issues with the involvement of local communities and Roma themselves. Integrated housing schemes, a vital prerequisite for social inclusion, should be promoted, for instance by means of micro-loans, saving schemes and construction training.

You rightly draw a link between segregation and anti-Gypsyism. In a context of rising populism, we must focus on combating and preventing all forms of discrimination, including racism against Roma, which is a root cause of exclusion. Here, I am also glad to recall the Union legislation and measures prohibiting discrimination and incitement to violence and hatred that the Council has already put in place.

Monitoring progress is an essential part of Roma inclusion policy. By next June, the Member States will notify the Commission of measures taken in accordance with the recent Council recommendation, and they will report to the Commission every other year, including on progress made. The Council has also called for full public disclosure of national reports on Roma. Finally, we have asked the Fundamental Rights Agency to carry out a regular Roma survey every four years.

As you rightly stressed in the motion for a resolution, the principle of equality should, of course, also be reflected in the EU funding. Indeed, one of the policy objectives of the European Social Fund Plus is a more social and inclusive Europe. It includes a specific objective for funding the socio-economic integration of marginalised people such as Roma. Vulnerable groups and marginalised communities, including Roma, are also explicitly mentioned as target groups that should benefit from the European Child Guarantee and the Recovery and Resilience Facility. The Council believes that the Member States should make full use of available instruments and funds relevant for preventing and combating discrimination of the Roma, including in the context of their national recovery and resilience plans.

Money is not everything, though. I can only echo your views regarding the importance of the participation of civil society. Many NGOs active in this field play crucial roles, including as a bridge between Roma communities and the rest of the society, as a source of expertise and funding and as agents of positive change and support at the grassroots level. Therefore, cooperation with civil society should underpin our work on every aspect of Roma inclusion, from policy design to policy implementation. Member States should continue their efforts to build broader alliances involving civil society, businesses and industry, academia and research. The European Roma platform, established in 2009 and strongly supported by the Council during the previous Czech Council Presidency, offers a valuable structure for this vital dialogue and cooperation with civil society stakeholders.

Let me finish with the most important. Life chances are already defined during the first years of childhood. Therefore, particular attention must be paid to preventing and combating child poverty. Above all – and this is the heart of the matter – we must ensure that Roma children have access to education. In order to flourish at school, children need quality early childhood education and care. I'm therefore happy to inform you that the Council has already begun work on the new Commission proposal for a new recommendation in this area, which we hope to see adopted before the end of the Czech Presidency. So thank you once more for this debate and thank you especially for placing so much emphasis on children. No one chooses to be excluded – whether they were born 50 years ago or whether they are a child being born today.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I want to thank Ms Nicholosonová for this and I want to start by confirming her testimonies because I saw with my own eyes two weeks ago what Ms Nicholosonová was recounting here today to this Parliament.

Roma are Europe's largest ethnic minority, with a population of 10 to 12 million. Of these, more than 6 million live here in the EU. They continue to suffer from extreme poverty, prejudice, exclusion, systemic discrimination, structural racism and anti-Gypsyism in all areas of life. The Commission condemns this. We address these issues through a comprehensive approach using all available legal policy and financial instruments. We tackle discrimination and anti-Gypsyism through both the EU-Roma strategic framework for equality, inclusion and participation and the anti-racism action plan, as well as by enforcing the existing EU legislation in place, such as the Racial Equality Directive and the Framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia.

Too many of the Roma communities throughout Europe are found at the fringes of society, living marginally and often in completely segregated settlements. Only a few days ago I visited different parts of Slovakia and could, as I already said, witness that such environments virtually exclude any prospects for a dignified life. Overcoming this spiral of exclusion and poverty is particularly difficult, and it requires concerted efforts through an integrated approach, adequate funding, genuine Roma participation, and, very importantly, political will. This is exactly the goal of the EU strategic framework, which the Commission adopted in October of 2020.

Building on the lessons from previous actions, this reformed and strengthened framework sets out a comprehensive three-pillar approach for equality, inclusion and participation until 2030. It introduces a stronger focus on the fight against discrimination and anti-Gypsyism and fosters Roma participation. This pillar of approach is essential to achieving more and faster progress and to ensuring effective equal access for Roma to quality, inclusive mainstream services, as well as education, employment, health and housing. Unlike its predecessor, this framework includes headline targets for 2030 and the proposed portfolio of indicators to monitor progress. This has been complemented with the Council recommendation on Roma equality, inclusion and participation that was adopted unanimously in March of 2021 to guide Member States' national measures.

National Roma strategic frameworks are essential to achieve the objectives which Member States were requested to develop, adopt and implement, following a common but differentiated approach which acknowledges the diversity of national situations and specific circumstances. The Commission is assessing these national frameworks and will publish its stocktaking by the end of this year. As of 2023, Member States will report on the implementation of their national frameworks every two years. These reports would be made public in order to increase transparency and promote policy learning. The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights will continue to provide tailored support to Member States in their efforts to develop indicators according to their needs based on census, administrative and survey data, to facilitate better monitoring processes at national level and increase accountability.

To support the implementation of the EU-Roma framework and the Council recommendation, the Commission calls on Member States to mobilise significant resources to address the situation of Roma people living in settlements and to ensure their socio-economic integration. Similarly, considering the challenges facing marginalised Roma communities in terms of access to basic services, the European Regional Development Fund contributes to improving their living conditions and development prospects through measures such as building or extending mainstream non-segregating educational facilities and non-segregated social housing, as well as ensuring accessible busing, in complementarity with the ESF+ actions. I will ensure that the Commission monitors implementation at national level and publishes regular reports on the progress achieved.

Miriam Lexmann, *za skupinu PPE*. – Vážená pani predsedajúca, to, ako žijú Rómovia v osadách, sme videli počas oficiálnej návštevy Európskeho parlamentu na Slovensku. Všetci, ktorí aspoň trochu poznajú realitu rómskych komunít, vedia, že je absolútne nevyhnutné nájsť riešenia na problémy, ktoré sa desaťročia nabaľujú. Nie je žiadnym tajomstvom, že aj v 21. storočí sú osady bez pitnej vody, sanitácie či perspektívy zamestnania alebo dôstojného života. Mojou snahou ako tieňovej spravodajkyne bolo dosiahnuť vyvážený text, ktorý by reflektoval mnohé nesplnené ciele a očakávania v rámci politiky pomoci marginalizovaným rómskym komunitám. Zároveň musíme brať do úvahy aj problémy, ktorým čelia mnohé mestá a obce a samosprávy pri implementácii projektov a riešení. Lebo sú aj úspešné projekty. Práve preto som navrhla a trvala na tom, aby táto správa obsahovala aj návrh, aby mestá a obce mohli použiť fondy nielen na zlepšenie situácie Rómov žijúcich v osadách, ale aj celej širšej komunity. Toto zahŕňa aj nulové spolufinancovanie projektov, ktoré mestám a obciam ako celkom a všetkým ich občanom umožnia napredovať a rozvíjať sa. A v neposlednom rade musíme odstrániť štrukturálne a byrokratické prekážky, ktoré im bránia v riadnom čerpaní fondov a odrádzajú ich od realizácie tak prepotrebných projektov.

Estrella Durá Ferrandis, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, señorías, no podemos seguir cerrando los ojos ante el hecho de que algunas comunidades gitanas siguen marginadas y viven en la más extrema pobreza y exclusión social. Su situación se agravará como consecuencia del aumento de la inflación y los precios de la energía, que van a afectar especialmente a las personas más vulnerables.

Necesitamos ya un plan de acción europeo para erradicar los asentamientos romaníes, que no solo carecen de viviendas dignas, sino que, además, no ofrecen acceso a servicios básicos, sanitarios, de salud ni de educación, por no hablar de empleo, inclusión social o, incluso, de los riesgos ambientales para la salud presentes en dichos asentamientos.

Es necesaria una acción coordinada a escala de la Unión Europea, en estrecha cooperación con las autoridades locales y regionales. Los esfuerzos realizados hasta la fecha por parte de los Estados miembros no son suficientes. Muchas veces los fondos europeos no se utilizan para erradicar la pobreza y la exclusión social de la comunidad gitana debido a la falta de voluntad política, a barreras administrativas o incluso a la discriminación indirecta, estructural o intersectorial. La Comisión y el Consejo deben adoptar una postura más activa. Debemos hacer todo lo posible para evitar la violación de la legislación europea, los valores fundacionales de la Unión y los derechos de las personas.

Por ello, mi grupo ha pedido que se establezca un mecanismo de alerta temprana para informar de los riesgos de abuso o uso indebido de los fondos de la Unión Europea destinados a abordar la situación de los gitanos en asentamientos marginales.

Por otro lado, y con esto finalizo, la erradicación de la situación de privación en que viven muchas comunidades gitanas se debe enmarcar en una estrategia antipobreza que mi grupo demanda con urgencia, con una inversión adecuada para combatir y erradicar la pobreza de manera efectiva a través de la implementación urgente de la Directiva de salarios mínimos, el aumento del presupuesto para la Garantía Infantil Europea, la intensificación de los esfuerzos en planes de rentas mínimas y el apoyo de la Unión Europea para una vivienda adecuada.

Dragoș Pîslaru, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, on behalf of the Employment and Social Affairs Committee, I would like to congratulate all my colleagues for the work done in supporting Roma minority rights, including the relentless efforts of our rapporteur today, Lucia Nicholsonová.

We have done an official mission to see those settlements. We have seen them with our own eyes; we have heard plenty of testimonials. We know that the situation is really unacceptable. We have a strategy, we have frameworks, we have recommendations, we even have money.

The Council representative said that the Council believes that Member States should make full use of EU resources, and it is good that the Council believes that, but the Member States do not make full use of resources. Money is not flowing where it should.

We have recommendations related to the child guarantee and how this should be implemented, but the latest statistics show that one in two Roma children aged four to six doesn't have access to education. The situation concerning housing and health conditions, and proper nutrition, access to jobs – all these are part of the resolution that we are going to vote on in Parliament tomorrow. This is a clear message that just relying on recommending Member States to do things is not the right way to go forward.

This has two important aspects. One is related to liberties and rights, and for that, the Commission should go with infringement over infringement over infringement, and to go with having direct responsibility of mayors and state officials for this situation. It's unacceptable to have modern slavery and to have children that have that problem today. And of course, the other part is investment. This is an investment in the European future. Just allowing the opportunity there and breaking the vicious cycle is the way to go forward.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, l'intégration – pardon, l'*inclusion* – des Roms constitue l'un des serpents de mer des programmes européens. Les présupposés sur lesquels ces derniers se fondent ne résistent pourtant guère à l'examen.

Il faut dire que traiter de cette question implique une bonne dose de lucidité, notamment en ce qui concerne la volonté réelle d'assimilation de tant de Roms au sein des populations majoritaires. À cet égard, la persistance de pratiques qui heurtent profondément notre sensibilité, telles que le mariage précoce ou le travail des enfants, justifie certaines spécificités. Cette persistance peut également expliquer en partie que le bilan des politiques publiques déployées ces dernières années en faveur de ces populations soit d'une rare indigence. Ce n'est pourtant pas faute de générosité: en témoignent, dans le domaine éducatif par exemple, les quotas et autres bourses d'études mis à disposition par certains États membres.

On ne saurait par ailleurs évoquer la ségrégation scolaire sans reconnaître qu'elle résulte trop souvent, comme je l'avais souligné par le passé, de décisions de parents d'élèves en désaccord avec la gestion de l'école quant aux perspectives de leurs enfants.

On le voit: les causes du statu quo actuel sont diverses et elles appellent une réponse mesurée. Tant que la Commission s'arc-boutera sur une condamnation sans nuance de certains États membres, une quelconque amélioration semble hors de portée.

Elżbieta Rafalska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Koleżanki i Koledzy! Tekst rezolucji Parlamentu Europejskiego odnosi się do palących problemów i słusznie postuluje poprawę warunków mieszkalnych społeczności romskich, większą integrację społeczną i walkę z ubóstwem. Aktywizacja Romów pokazuje dramatyczną sytuację mieszkaniową w romskich osiedlach i te wstrząsające warunki, o których tu była mowa, są absolutnie nie do zaakceptowania. Niestety tekst też jest w wielu miejscach nie do przyjęcia i całkowicie odbiega od głównego tematu rezolucji. Nawołuje do szybkiej implementacji ogólnego systemu warunkowości dla ochrony budżetu Unii, sugeruje, że państwa członkowskie naruszają traktaty Unii Europejskiej i niesłusznie oskarża niektóre państwa o segregację i dyskryminację Romów uciekających z Ukrainy.

Ale chcę też powiedzieć, żeby osiągnąć skuteczność na rzecz poprawy sytuacji Romów, niezbędne są dobre, przemyślane polityki krajowe, te lokalne i regionalne, i współpraca z tymi projektami i współfinansowanie ich z Unii Europejskiej. Mogę posłużyć się dobrą praktyką posłużyć z Polski. Tworzymy sieć nauczycieli wspomagających edukację uczniów romskich, mamy systemy edukacyjne, stypendialne na wszystkich poziomach. Asystenci edukacji romskiej wpisani są na listę zawodów. Myślę, że wszystkim jest potrzebna determinacja, współpraca, środki i ten efekt poprawy może być osiągnięty.

Lívia Járóka (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony, Biztos Asszony! A Szlovákiában található szegény- és cigánytelepek, romatelepek semmiben nem különböznek a nyugat európai szegregátumoktól, sajnos. Aki nem oda születik, annak ugyan problémás elképzelni, milyen nehézségekkel és esélyegyenlőtlenséggel indul azoknak az élete, akik ilyen telepre születnek.

A generációkon átívelő mélyszegénység azonban megállítható az európai uniós források jobb felhasználásával. Mindehhez azonban először le kell hívni a forrásokat, majd korrupció nélkül, a helyi közösség roma és nem roma vezetőinek bevonása mellett hagyni elkölteni.

Ma a háború és Covid utáni recesszió az európai szegényeket és köztük az európai romákat érte el legkorábban, és érinti leghúsbavágóbban. Ma már vannak éhező európai, roma és nem roma családok a Covid és a háború következtében. Ezért javaslom az összes tagállamnak a magyar kormány bevált intézkedéseit. Gyakorlatból beszélek, tapasztalatból, ezért kérem, hogy a tagállami stratégiákba a tagállamok ültessék be a hároméves kortól biztosított, kötelező óvodai oktatást, előtte a bölcsődei integrációt, a családi otthonteremtési programot, amelyben például egy magyar állampolgár 10 millió Ft kedvezményt kap lakásvásárlásra. A nagycsaládosok autóvásárlási kedvezményt kaptak, a sokgyermekes anyák örökéletű adókönnyítést, ugyanúgy, ahogy a 25 év alatti fiatal munkavállalók is.

Tehát ezek az említett ösztönzők, ezenkívül a kis és középvállalkozások fejlesztése, hogy romákat is fel tudjanak venni, a roma vállalkozók fejlesztése, hogy nagyobb cégeket tudjanak alapítani. Ezeket ösztönöznünk kell, mert az éhség és a munkanélküliség újra fenyegeti ezt a legszegényebb csoportot.

Maria Walsh (PPE). – Madam President, Roma experience significant inequalities and marginalisation in Ireland and across the EU due to their exclusion from mainstream society. Our health services are failing Roma communities because of the lack of insurance, discrimination by health professionals and segregation in health care facilities. Roma women in particular experience multiple forms of discrimination and gender-based violence, affecting both their physical and mental health.

We cannot continue with this 'out of sight and out of mind' attitude when it comes to the position of minority groups. We need to break the cycle of disadvantage. I am encouraged by the projects like the Roma Health Project in Ireland, a dedicated initiative to tackle Roma health inequalities. Their work ensures that there is no danger of segregation.

The Commission and the Member States need to implement the EU Roma strategic framework, which aims to give all Roma equal opportunity. We need to eradicate any form of structural and institutional anti-Roma policies that we discuss here, in this House, and ensure full equality in areas such as housing and health care, including mental health care.

I want to acknowledge the work Commissioner Dalli does on this in her mandate, as well as my colleagues here, on the floor, for this incredibly important time that we make an equal Europe for all, not just some.

Ilan De Basso (S&D). – Fru talman! Det går inte att förbjuda fattigdom. Medan högern attackerar fattiga människor, menar vi socialdemokrater att det är fattigdomen och ojämlikheten som ska bekämpas.

Dagens situation ska ses som en direkt konsekvens av vår historia och det omfattande strukturella förtryck och diskriminering som romer har utsatts för och utsätts för än i dag. Romer har plågats och förföljts genom sin historia och varit på ständig flykt. Romska kvinnor och barn tillhör de mest utsatta individerna, och här måste vi göra mer för att skydda dessa grupper.

Samtidigt begår regeringar övergrepp och hetsar mot minoritetsgrupper – och så sker också här i Europaparlamentet. Romers situation är alarmerande och förvärras ytterligare nu med ökad inflation och ökade energipriser. När kriser som dessa inträffar är det alltid de svagaste grupperna som drabbas hårdast.

Nu måste alla medlemsländer leva upp till rättighetsstadgan och de mänskliga rättigheterna. Kommissionen bär ett stort ansvar för att inleda överträdelseförfaranden mot medlemsländer som bryter mot våra gemensamma värderingar. Vi måste tillsammans säkerställa att ingen hindras från rätten till bostad, utbildning, en grundtrygghet vid sjukdom eller arbetslöshet, hälso- och sjukvård eller möjligheten att försörja sig själv.

Vi behöver en bättre strategi för att utrota fattigdom och motverka social exkludering. Effektiva lösningar kräver fullt engagemang på europeisk, nationell och lokal nivå för att där hitta gemensamma lösningar för att lösa situationen för romer och att ge dem möjlighet att delta på lika villkor.

Vi måste erkänna den diskriminering som romer utsätts för, och vi ska tillsammans ta ansvar för ett mer solidariskt och rättvist Europa. Vi vet nämligen att Europa kan bättre.

Атидже Алиева-Вели (Renew). – Уважаема г-жо Председател, уважаема г-жо Комисар, скъпи колеги, модернизацията и развитието са част от ежедневието ни, а ние днес отново говорим за пагубните последици на дискриминацията и значението на правата и свободите. Ангажиментът ни за социална закрила и възможности за работа за всички започва от най-уязвимите групи.

Най-голямото етническо малцинство в Европа – ромите, продължават да се сблъскват с дискриминация и пречки пред пълноценното им включване в обществото. Положението и условията на живот са особено тежки, тъй като липсват основни услуги като достъп до пътища, водоснабдяване, канализация и електричество. Ограниченият достъп до здравеопазване, грижи за децата, образование и заетост само задълбочават неравенствата.

В България ромските махали не изглеждат по европейски, нито животът, който водят ромите, е европейски. Вярвам, че е нужно да направим повече за реализиране на европейските ценности. Държавите трябва да положат още усилия за ефективно използване на средствата, които Съюзът предоставя.

Younous Omarjee (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, au cœur de l'Union européenne se trouvent des ghettos de Roms constitués de bidonvilles sur des montagnes de déchets, sans accès à l'eau potable, sans route, sans accès équitable aux soins, à l'éducation, au marché du travail ni aux aides sociales. C'est à cette réalité moyenâgeuse que nous avons été confrontés lors de la mission que notre commission REGI a menée dans l'est de la Slovaquie, et cette réalité est la même partout en Europe.

C'est pourquoi je pose la question: comment cela est-il possible, avec les 370 milliards de la cohésion? Cette réalité, Madame la Commissaire, dit un racisme institutionnel, et il y a une complicité à tous les étages pour que rien ne change. Je vous le dis en tant que président de la commission REGI: la programmation 2021-2027 devra voir une réelle concrétisation à l'égard des communautés marginalisées. C'est le devoir et l'obligation de la Commission européenne d'y veiller et de prendre toutes les mesures en cas de manquement.

Madame la Présidente, pour terminer je veux dire que nous n'acceptons pas, en Europe, une caste d'intouchables au sein de notre Union.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, και αυτή η έκθεση κάνει γνωστές και επαναλαμβανόμενες διαπιστώσεις, περιγραφές των προβλημάτων που πραγματικά αντιμετωπίζουν οι Ρομά σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Η έκθεση όμως δεν στοχεύει και δεν μπορεί να λύσει τα προβλήματα που διαπιστώνει αλλά στοχεύει στο να ξανασερβίρει την ευρωενωσιακή στρατηγική που υλοποιούν οι αστικές κυβερνήσεις και η οποία συνειδητά και διαχρονικά συντηρεί τους άθλιους όρους διαβίωσης, στρώνοντας το έδαφος για τη δράση κυκλωμάτων και δαιμονοποιώντας τους Ρομά για την εγκληματικότητα, ενώ μεταθέτει την κρατική ευθύνη σε διάφορους καλοθελητές και μη κυβερνητικές οργανώσεις, επιτείνοντας την εξαθλίωση και την ομηρία τους.

Διέξοδο δεν μπορούν να δώσουν Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και κυβερνήσεις που με τη στρατηγική τους τσακίζουν συνολικά τα εργατικά λαϊκά δικαιώματα. Για να σπάσει οριστικά ο φαύλος κύκλος της γκετοποίησης, χρειάζεται εξασφάλιση μόνιμης και σταθερής δουλειάς, σύγχρονης στέγασης, δημόσιων υπηρεσιών υγείας και παιδείας, καθώς και σεβασμός στην κουλτούρα και τον τρόπο ζωής των Ρομά. Αυτός είναι ο δρόμος για την ουσιαστική κοινωνική ένταξή τους κόντρα στις διακρίσεις, κόντρα στα πιεστικά προβλήματα που διαιωνίζει το σύστημα της εκμετάλλευσης.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, dámy a pánové, situace Romů ve státech EU je absolutně nepřijatelná. To, co můžeme vidět v řadě zemí, třeba na Slovensku, v Rumunsku nebo v Bulharsku, neodpovídá standardům 21. století. Romové jsou největší etnickou menšinou, ale žijí v podmínkách, které nejsou evropské. Bez čisté vody, ve špíně, bez vyhlídek na budoucí integraci do společnosti. Jak je možné, že utrácíme tolik peněz za romskou problematiku a nevidíme žádný efekt? Jak to, že se nenachází řešení této naléhavé problematiky, které by vedlo ke skutečnému vyřešení problémů Romů? Proč nezkusíme nějaké projekty, které jsme například s Petrem Pollákem na Slovensku zavedli, a chceme skrze ně řešit bydlení, práci a to, aby mladí Romové chodili do školy? Vždyť vzdělání je základ, tady to pořád opakujeme. A proč to pořád nechápeme? Proč pořád dáváme dílčí peníze do projektů, které nepřináší kýžený výsledek? Dámy a pánové, pokud vyřešíme a zvládneme vyřešit situaci Romů v Evropě, zvládneme opravdu změnit výrazným způsobem kulturní život ve státech Evropské unie.

Pierfrancesco Majorino (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono migliaia le persone che vivono negli insediamenti rom e sinti in Europa in condizioni non dignitose. Donne, uomini, ragazzi e bambini che vivono spesso in alloggi insicuri, senza acqua potabile, elettricità, servizi igienico-sanitari. Persone poste ai margini di percorsi educativi di qualità, che sarebbero la principale occasione di emancipazione, ed escluse da opportunità occupazionali capaci di restituire la dovuta dignità.

Tutto ciò porta ad un'assenza, peraltro, di un accesso effettivo all'assistenza sanitaria, con un tasso di mortalità infantile drammatico. Una condizione, cioè, di esplicita esclusione sociale, marginalizzazione e povertà estrema che dobbiamo definire per quello che è: assolutamente un fenomeno inaccettabile, incompatibile con i valori dell'Unione europea. E dobbiamo contrastare tutto questo non con politiche di ghettizzazione, discriminazione e segregazione, ma con interventi diversi che aiutino la promozione della persona, il riscatto, la piena inclusione sociale.

L'Europa ha bisogno in maniera molto più limpida, dunque, di politiche di contrasto alla povertà e di lotta all'esclusione sociale, anche in questo caso. Se non interveniamo velocemente, peraltro, in contesti come questi, cresceranno certamente forme di cronicizzazione nella povertà e anche forme di illegalità che non dobbiamo assolutamente ignorare e che si presentano come un terribile avversario rispetto all'obiettivo della piena inclusione sociale.

Abir Al-Sahlani (Renew). – Fru talman! Fru kommissionär, ärade kollegor! Återigen står vi här och förfasas över det vedervärdiga och omänskliga som många av våra romska medborgare tvingas leva med, och hur polisbrutalitet och rasism bara spär på fattigdomen och missförhållandena bland romska samhällen.

Vi förfäras över hur misskötsel och kommissionens oförmåga att agera tillåter diskriminering att fortsätta, som om det vore någonting nytt, och som om det vore första gången kommissionen ser mellan fingrarna när stater och regeringar slirar på sina demokratiska värderingar.

Varför händer det ingenting? I Bulgarien ser vi hur EU-pengar används för att träna poliser i att slåss mot så kallad radikalisering i romska samhällen. I Ungern läggs EU-pengar på att riva romska hus och vräka romska familjer och bygga segregerade bostäder bara för romer. Runtom i EU frodas antiziganismen mot romer, inte så sällan pådriven av regeringarna själva.

Det räcker nu! Den här kommissionen måste agera när länder förgriper sig på sin egen befolkning med hjälp av EU-pengar. Den här kommissionen måste visa att den på allvar vill stå upp för demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter och allas lika rätt och värde.

Monika Vana (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrter Herr Minister! Vor drei Monaten habe ich im Rahmen der Mission des Ausschusses für regionale Entwicklung eine Romasiedlung im Osten der Slowakei besucht. Kollege Younous Omarjee hat das schon angesprochen.

Was wir dort vorgefunden haben, machte uns fassungslos: mindestens 300 Menschen ohne fließendes Wasser, ohne Abwasser- und Abfallsystem, nur mit eingeschränktem Zugang zu Gesundheitsversorgung und Bildung, die Kinder keine Möglichkeit zu Transport in die Schulen, und das mitten in Europa. Und es ist ein Unterschied, ob wir hier darüber debattieren oder ob man es dann mit meinen eigenen Augen sieht.

Diese Siedlung in der Slowakei, wie heute schon wiederholt gesagt wurde, ist kein Einzelfall. Es gibt noch viel zu viele sogenannte segregierte Orte, wo Menschen in lebenswidrigen Verhältnissen leben müssen. Und warum? Weil einzelne Lokalpolitiker oder Lokalpolitikerinnen oft zögern, sogenannte Pro-Roma-Projekte umzusetzen, obwohl genug EU-Gelder zur Verfügung stehen. Und warum? Weil Antiziganismus und struktureller Rassismus immer noch weit verbreitet sind.

Es ist ein Teufelskreis, aus dem die Menschen, die es betrifft, europäische Staatsbürger und Staatsbürgerinnen, nur schwer entkommen können, und das darf nicht sein. Das ist eine Schande für Europa. Soziale und strukturelle Diskriminierung von Roma und Sinti müssen endlich entschieden bekämpft werden. Und da reichen eine unverbindliche Rahmenstrategie der EU und eine Empfehlung der Kommission nicht. Es muss mehr Druck auf die Mitgliedstaaten ausgeübt werden und die Umsetzung der Strategien auch auf Gemeindeebene überwacht werden. Und wir müssen schauen, dass EU-Geld wirklich dort ankommt, wo es am dringendsten gebraucht wird.

Peter Kofod (ID). – Fru Formand! Min tale bliver i hvert fald ikke som alle de foregående taler. For jeg synes, det er så nemt at stå på denne talerstol og hælde vand ud af ørerne som politiker og tale politisk korrekthed, så det basker. Det er simpelthen alt, alt for nemt. For hvad med jer selv? Hvad med os selv? Kunne I tænke jer at have en romalejr i jeres egen have? Kunne I tænke jer at have en romalejr i den lokale park? Kunne I tænke jer at have en romalejr rundt om hjørnet fra, hvor I selv bor? Og når I taler om social inklusion af romasamfund, kunne I så tænke jer, at det er jeres børn, der skal være med til at inkludere romaer i jeres egne skoler, i jeres egne fritidstilbud osv.? Jeg tror ganske enkelt ikke på det. Jeg kan lige så godt være ærlig og sige, at jeg ikke vil acceptere omrejsende grupper af romaer, der på grund af jeres frie bevægelighed kan rejse frit rundt i Europa. Det gør folk bekymrede, det gør folk bange, hvis der lige pludselig er en romalejr rundt om hjørnet. Og det vil jeg ikke acceptere.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, I welcome this debate and the resolution that goes with it – of course I do. Anything that gets the massive discrimination, repression and systemic exclusion faced by Roma onto the agenda has to be welcomed – and it's not nonsense, and it's not political correctness.

I know many Irish travellers. They've been educated with my daughter. They live in my community. They're in our parliament in Ireland. I am delighted that this is so.

But I have to say that debates like this are depressing because they just highlight the gap between speech and action. Sometimes it's like shouting into a void. Nothing changes.

In 2019, the Irish Government published its Irish Traveller Accommodation Expert Review. It was supposed to be the grand new beginning, following years of disastrous traveller accommodation in Ireland; it produced 32 recommendations. As of June this year, only six have been implemented. You could paper the walls in here and in the Irish Parliament with the likes of these resolutions, but nothing changes for the 6 million Roma and travellers who go on suffering outrageously.

I don't know what the solution is, but we do need to figure it out fast!

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, napriek tomu, že Európska komisia má v poradí už druhú desaťročnú stratégiu, napriek tomu, že posielame miliardy členským štátom na zlepšenie situácie Rómov, napriek tomu, že aj členské štáty majú svoje vlastné stratégie inklúzie Rómov, už po niekoľkýkrát v tomto parlamente hovorím: nestačí to. Prestaňte sa, prosím, všetci skrývať za deklarácie, stratégie či sľuby. Lebo dnešný život miliónov Rómov v Európe je často horší ako životy tých, ktorí žijú v treťom svete. Choďte sa, prosím, pozrieť, do ktoréhokoľvek geta alebo osady na Slovensku, v Maďarsku, v Rumunsku či Bulharsku a zistíte, že stav je naozaj šokujúci. Napriek miliardám, stratégiám či plánom, deti žijú v Európe bez vody, bez vzdelania, ich rodičia často bez práce, jednoducho bez budúcnosti. Dokedy, prosím, vážené kolegyne, vážení kolegovia, máme toto akceptovať? Dokedy sa máme prizerať, že v mnohých európskych krajinách chýba na úrovni miest a obcí politická vôľa postaviť vodovod, kanalizáciu, cestu, škôlku či školu? Dokedy nám budú stačiť stratégie bez reálnych výsledkov? Nestačí mať len prázdne slová. Potrebujeme páky na tých, ktorí odmietajú v členských krajinách niesť zodpovednosť a priniesť dôstojný život aj do najchudobnejších osád v Európe. Je neakceptovateľné, že mnohé samosprávy využívajú európske zdroje na čokoľvek, no na rómske osady a getá peniaze nechcú. Žiadam všetky európske inštitúcie, ale aj členské krajiny, prestaňte, prosím, rozprávať a začnite konať. Majte na pamäti, že aj rómske deti rovnako ako ostatné deti v Európskej únii majú právo plniť si svoje sny. Aj tieto rómske deti majú právo plniť si svoje sny. A je našou povinnosťou, psou povinnosťou každého z nás, či už na úrovni Európskej únie, alebo na úrovni členských štátov, aby sme začali konať, a nielen rozprávať.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Madam President, racism, discrimination in the labour market, forced evictions, marginalisation, hate speech – even by elected officials in this Parliament, even by Prime Ministers in our Union – racially motivated attacks, deprived of education. The list can be made long on the inhuman and degrading treatment of Roma people. According to the EU Fundamental Rights Agency, an estimated 80% of Roma families and their children in our Union live below our respective national at-risk-of-poverty thresholds. There is a lot in the EU I am proud of, but the treatment of Roma people is not one of them.

If you really want to know a society in depth, you should look at how it treats its people. We claim that our Union is built on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, equality and respect for human rights, including the rights of minorities. That we in modern times have settlements in the EU is a big failure for all of us. It is a big failure of our commitments to the Roma people.

We continue to fail to respect the fundamental rights of the Roma people while children are being deprived of their possibility to fulfil their dreams and grown-ups are having their lives crushed. Support to the Roma community, ending impunity for those committing crimes against Roma people, and infringement proceedings against Member States that on purpose continuously deprive the Roma community of their human rights are a few of the many things we must do. There is an immediate need for action in the EU and in the Member States.

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Fru talman! Fru kommissionär, kollegor! Vi kan inte acceptera ett Europa med diskriminering och exkludering, ett Europa där utanförskap gör att människor inte kan arbeta och försörja sig, inte kan utbilda sig, inte kan delta. Vi kan inte tolerera ett Europa, där romer fortsätter att ställas utanför.

Det är inte en tillfällighet att länder där rättsstaten är svag, eller till och med nedmonteras, är länder där romernas situation är extra svår. Dessa länder tar samtidigt emot stora summor EU-stöd. Det har sagts förut, men det måste sägas igen: Länder som bryter mot rättsstatens principer, länder som inte använder EU-stöd som det var tänkt, ska inte kunna fortsätta kvittera ut betalningar från Bryssel. EU är ett samarbete, inte en bankomat.

Romer är Europas största minoritetsgrupp och en av de allra mest diskriminerade. Detta måste få ett slut. Alla länder, även mitt hemland Sverige, har ett ansvar att så sker.

Στέλιος Κυμπουρόπουλος (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, την ώρα που η Ευρώπη αντιμετωπίζει πολυεπίπεδες προκλήσεις, οφείλουμε να μην ξεχνάμε πληθυσμιακές κατηγορίες όπως οι Ρομά· ομάδες, οι οποίες είναι καθημερινά αντιμέτωπες με διακρίσεις και τον κοινωνικό αποκλεισμό. Γι' αυτό το λόγο το ψήφισμα που έχουμε στα χέρια μας έχει ιδιαίτερη αξία, γιατί καλεί τις κυβερνήσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να σταθούν στο ύψος των περιστάσεων, και δεν μπορώ παρά να εκφράσω την ικανοποίησή μου που κάποιες από αυτές, όπως η ελληνική, αντιμετωπίζοντας αστοχίες και παραλείψεις του παρελθόντος, το κάνουν ήδη με μια ολιστική εθνική στρατηγική που δίνει έμφαση στην ενεργητική ένταξη τους και την προώθηση της ισότιμης μεταχείρισης και της ενεργού συμμετοχής τους στην κοινωνική και οικονομική ζωή. Με αυτά τα εργαλεία και με συμπαραστάτες τις τοπικές αρχές και τις ίδιες τις κοινότητες των Ρομά ας δουλέψουμε ώστε να μπορέσουν επιτέλους να ασκήσουν πλήρως τα δικαιώματα και τις υποχρεώσεις τους ως πολίτες αυτής της Ένωσης.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci poděkovat paní komisařce i panu ministrovi za velmi konstruktivní vyjádření. Romské osady jsou skutečně obrázkem ze středověku. Žádná energie, žádné připojení na plyn a čištění vody, žádné vzdělání a práce, šíření nemocí, to je skutečně jako obrázek ze středověku. A mě pojímá také hanba, kolik mých kolegů v tomto sále dnes nevyužilo právo mluvit, byť se do debaty přihlásili. Myslím si, že situace největší etnické menšiny v Evropě volala po tom, aby se i naši kolegové vyjádřili. Je to ostudné. Popisovat dále situaci těchto osad je nesmyslné. Bavíme se o tom již potřetí nebo počtvrté v tomto období. Potřebujeme najít řešení, izolovaná akce nemá smysl. Podle mě je důležité najít řešení na evropské úrovni v kombinaci s národním a regionálním řešením. A já se přikláním skutečně k tomu, aby byl vytvořen evropský koordinátor pro řešení romské problematiky, protože tato ostuda, které čelíme, už opravdu musí být ukončena.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Europa jest silna siłą swojej wielokulturowości. Jak dobrze wiecie ja sam jestem przedstawicielem mniejszości śląskiej, mniejszości dalej nieuznanej przez polski rząd. A nasz język, język śląski, *śląsko godka,* nie jest nawet uznany za język regionalny. Ale walczę o to i nigdy się nie poddam. Ba, czekamy na wyniki spisu powszechnego, gdzie okaże się, nie mam żadnych wątpliwości, że Polska nie jest krajem jednorodnym narodowo. I sam jestem ciekaw, jak to wyszło, bo zrobiliśmy wiele jako *śląska sztama*, żeby poinformować, że inny nie znaczy gorszy i że każdy ma prawo do swojej tożsamości i do swojego języka.

Śląsk to piękne miejsce na mapie, nasz *heimat*, piąta strona świata, gdzie przez lata żyli w zgodzie przedstawiciele różnych narodowości: Ślązacy, Polacy, Niemcy, Czesi, Żydzi i Romowie. I nie damy się skłócić. Kaczyński, Orban i inni nacjonaliści, nie z nami te numery. Inny nie znaczy gorszy.

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman! Det finns saker i vår omvärld som vi kan säga att vi inte kände till eller att vi visste väldigt lite om. Hur situationen ser ut för många romer i EU är inte en av de sakerna. I årtionden har vi makthavare fått rapport efter rapport som svart på vitt beskriver misärens alla gråskalor – från systematisk diskriminering i bostadsköer och på arbetsmarknaden till bristande läskunnighet, tiggeri och sexhandel med barn – i EU 2022.

Att påstå att rasismen och diskrimineringen mot romer i EU är normaliserad är ett *understatement*. Alla vet, ingen gör tillräckligt. Jag hoppas att det här betänkandet blir undantaget som bekräftar regeln. Låt det göra skillnad.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovane dame i gospodo, kad bilo koja skupina ljudi, pa tako i romska, prima značajno više socijalne pomoći iz proračuna nego što svojim radom uplaćuje u proračun, tada takva situacija izaziva animozitet ostalih građana pa se diskriminacija ne smanjuje, već se povećava.

I zaista, danas u pomanjkanju radne snage, osoba koja može raditi, a ne želi raditi, ne treba niti primati socijalnu pomoć. Zato podržavam svaki napor što boljeg uključivanja Roma u tržište rada. No, primjerice, Romi u Hrvatskoj koji rade, kada dobiju četvrto ili peto dijete daju otkaz jer im se više ne isplati raditi. Dakle, države članice često demotiviraju Rome da rade i dopuštaju kriminal među Romima koji inače ne dopuštaju kad, primjerice, dječje doplatke potroše očevi i time romska djeca ostaju diskriminirana. Dakle, ako želimo dobrobit Romima, onda trebamo biti svjesni toga da tako dugo dok mislimo da smo mi ti koji će povećati socioekonomski status Roma nećemo biti uspješni.

Mi moramo Romima omogućiti i motivirati ih da oni sami povećaju svoj socioekonomski status.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, según el Eurobarómetro, una mayoría de europeos considera que la discriminación de las personas gitanas está muy extendida en su país. Esta percepción está más que contrastada con datos e informes nacionales y europeos. En la Unión Europea las personas gitanas se enfrentan cada día a la discriminación y al angitanismo: cuando van a la escuela, entran en una tienda, hacen una entrevista de trabajo o tratan de acceder a una vivienda —por no hablar del acceso a la justicia—.

Necesitamos urgentemente políticas que aborden los estereotipos, los prejuicios, el racismo estructural o la violencia institucional a la que los gitanos están sometidos. Necesitamos instrumentos ambiciosos, como ese plan de acción europeo que votaremos mañana. Necesitamos una mayor coordinación, que los Estados hagan un uso pleno de la financiación disponible, que la Comisión evalúe las medidas adoptadas y que actúe como guardiana de los Tratados en caso de vulneración de derechos en determinados Estados.

El racismo y el antigitanismo son las causas fundamentales de que los gitanos no sean reconocidos en la práctica como ciudadanos de pleno derecho, de que se vean abocados, en muchos casos, a la pobreza y la exclusión social y de que no se reconozcan las aportaciones del pueblo gitano.

La lucha contra el racismo y el antigitanismo, que también estamos viendo en este debate, tiene que ser transversal y es imprescindible que aparezca en todos los principios del pilar social europeo.

En España, por ejemplo, se va a incluir el antigitanismo como delito de odio en el Código Penal y se ha creado en el Congreso una Subcomisión para el estudio de un Pacto de Estado contra el Antigitanismo. Se ha incluido la historia y la cultura gitana en los libros de texto de la enseñanza secundaria obligatoria y se ha incorporado un apartado específico de memoria gitana en la nueva Ley de Memoria Democrática, reconociéndose así el papel de la memoria colectiva en las vulneraciones de derechos que se siguen produciendo. Ojalá sigamos esta estela en el resto de Europa.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Stimați colegi, sigur, nu e prima dată când dezbatem situația romilor în Uniunea Europeană. Avem și un plan, însă, doamna comisară, vreau să atrag atenția asupra unui lucru care a rezultat și din această dezbatere. Am văzut că și raportoarea și alți colegi au nominalizat țările din Est că ar fi cele care discriminează romii.

Țara mea a fost de mai multe ori amintită aici, alături de Slovacia, alături de Bulgaria. Nu credeți că cetățenii romi sunt cetățeni și ei europeni și au voie să trăiască unde doresc - libertatea de mișcare? Întreb, și nu întreb prima dată: de ce Franța îmbarcă cetățenii romi și îi trimite spre România sau spre Bulgaria ? De ce nu îi integrează?

De ce se trimit acești oameni, care au dreptul lor de a alege unde să trăiască, în țările din Est, care sunt mai sărace, și nu dau bugete să îi integreze în țara unde au ales să meargă acești cetățeni? Pentru că, dacă vom continua așa, cu această segregare, să trimitem toți romii în țările din Est, evident, nu vom reuși niciodată, pentru că acești oameni au aceleași drepturi ca și cetățenii din fiecare țară.

Susanna Ceccardi (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho ascoltato tante belle parole, ma vorrei raccontarvi una storia. A Pisa, negli anni 2000 — a Pisa e in Toscana ha governato per tanti anni la sinistra - con i fondi della Comunità europea per circa un miliardo delle vecchie lire, 500 000 EUR, furono costruite delle villette per superare un campo rom che aveva centinaia e centinaia di abitanti. Ebbene, cosa successe? Che queste villette furono costruite, tra l'altro molto belle, completamente smontate per rivendere i pezzi dagli stessi abitanti, dagli stessi occupanti delle villette, e qualche anno fa in quel villaggio arrestarono un'intera famiglia che aveva costretto una quindicenne a un matrimonio forzato e l'aveva praticamente tenuta segregata con violenza e soprusi indicibili.

Ecco quel progetto, che poi diede vita a un'illegalità incredibile, fu finanziato con i soldi della Comunità europea. Ma mi chiedo e vi chiedo: non lo conoscete il vecchio detto che se a un uomo vuoi dare da mangiare non gli devi dare un pesce ma gli devi insegnare a pescare?

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, in March this year, the European Committee of Social Rights (ECSR) determined that Ireland was in breach of Article 16 of the revised European Social Charter, a binding human rights treaty, for a chronic failure to provide sufficient accommodation for travellers and maintain adequate conditions of existing sites.

The ECSR also ruled that Ireland was in breach of the charter as a significant number of local authority tenants resided in inadequate and substandard housing conditions. Since 2000, EUR 69 million earmarked for traveller housing hasn't been spent. It continues today. We are still underspending the money that's earmarked for them.

The questions posed by the Employment and Social Rights Committee to the Commission are good, but it is difficult to have faith in the Commission holding Member States to account given how long traveller and Roma people have had to endure these chronic failures and the weakness of the EU Roma Strategic Framework.

We talk forever in here about human rights. But you know what? Until we start treating all the people in the same way, we should shut up about human rights because we are only been hypocrites.

Mónica Silvana González (S&D). – Señora presidenta, efectivamente, este informe habla de voluntad política y de trabajo coordinado entre instituciones para poner fin a los asentamientos de población gitana.

En Madrid, una de las comunidades más ricas de toda Europa, se encuentra, a solo 14 kilómetros de la Puerta del Sol, uno de los asentamientos de población gitana más grandes de Europa, la Cañada Real. Estamos hablando de la coordinación necesaria de la Comunidad de Madrid para poner fin a esta situación: sí, el Gobierno ya destinó 5 millones de euros para los asentamientos, pero necesitamos que la Comunidad de Madrid también se implique. Por eso le pedimos a la Comisión que exija a la Comunidad de Madrid un trabajo coordinado para, cuanto antes, poner fin al dolor de 7 000 personas, entre ellas,1 800 niños, que llevan dos años sin luz. Lo más urgente es dar acceso a la electricidad a esta población, que pasa el frío, que pasa las nevadas, que pasa los altos calores que soportamos este verano sola.

Por lo tanto, le pedimos a la Comisión que exija coordinación a la Comunidad de Madrid y que, si esta última no lo hace, la Comisión le imponga sanciones, en aplicación del procedimiento de infracción, por vulneración de los derechos humanos de la población gitana en la Comunidad de Madrid.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I really wish to thank you for this debate and I want to say that I feel the frustration which many of you have vented during this session. And I think it would be an understatement to say that we must work much harder to improve the unacceptable living conditions of Roma people in settlements, and we can only succeed if we cooperate at all levels.

The Commission will continue to support the efforts of Member States in implementing their national Roma strategic frameworks in line with the EU framework, and in implementing funding programmes that are of direct relevance to Roma. We also need to strengthen the capacity of civil society organisations, increase political determination and ensure that Roma themselves can meaningfully participate in this process. I count on your support so that we can jointly deliver a Union of equality for Roma people.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for this opportunity to debate an urgent topic. We live in a time of multiple crises, but the long-term challenge of promoting Roma inclusion must not fall off the agenda.

We are speaking here of some 6 million of our fellow citizens, and in times of crisis, it is more important than ever that we come together and show solidarity.

The Council and the European Parliament, together with the Commission, have been close partners in the efforts that have been made at EU level over the past ten years to address the situation of the Roma people. We heard it very clearly during this debate. We must do more to improve the situation of many of our Roma citizens and to close the gaps to ensure that Roma people enjoy the same life chances as everyone else.

For instance, as several of you pointed out, we have to use better resources that are available and far more than that. I believe we all agree that a life of poverty, exclusion and discrimination must not be the automatic fate of any child born in Europe, whatever their ethnic group and social background. Together, we can and must change this.

The Czech Presidency is strongly committed to driving forward the Roma inclusion policy. Later this month, we will host a meeting of the Roma platform in Prague, where stakeholders, policymakers and experts will be able to meet and to work together. I look forward to seeing some of you in Prague.

President. – I have received one motion for resolution tabled in accordance with Rule 136(1) of the Rules of Procedure.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place tomorrow.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Milan Brglez (S&D), *pisno*. – Evropski parlament je v aktualnem mandatu opravil več razprav ter sprejel mnenja in poročila na temo boja proti diskriminaciji Romov in učinkovitih ukrepov za njihovo vključevanje v družbo ter gospodarstvo.

Tokratna razprava z ustnima vprašanjema Komisiji in Svetu ter resolucija, ki jo je Evropski parlament pripravil tudi na podlagi izkušenj z našega obiska v marginaliziranih romskih naseljih na Slovaškem, jih nadgrajuje z osredotočanjem na prostorsko segregacijo ter slabe bivanjske razmere v romskih naseljih v Evropski uniji.

Evropska unija in države članice morajo storiti veliko več za spopadanje z diskriminacijo Romov ter za njihovo dejansko vključevanje v družbo, začenši z odpravo prostorske segregacije, getoizacije Romov ter nezdravih in nevarnih bivanjskih pogojev. Slednji se namreč odražajo v neenakem dostopu do izobraževanja, trga dela, zdravstva, oskrbe in drugih temeljnih storitev, visokem tveganju revščine in socialne izključenosti.

Komisija mora ravnati kot varuh temeljnih pogodb in evropskih vrednot, na čelu s človekovimi pravicami in pravicami manjšin, ter preprečiti, da bi se evropska sredstva porabljala za projekte, ki poglabljajo segregacijo in neenakost Romov. Hkrati pa mora sprejeti ukrepe, ki bodo naslavljali pomanjkanje politične volje ali administrativnih ovir, ki preprečujejo, da bi se sredstva EU porabljala za socialno in družbeno najbolj ranljive skupine.

Miroslav Radačovský (NI), *písomne*. – Navrhovanému uzneseniu o situácii Rómov žijúcich v osadách EÚ sa v podstate nedá veľa vytknúť. Návrh uznesenia je objektívny, vecný a konštruktívny. Bývanie, vzdelávanie, životné prostredie, zamestnanosť musí byť prioritou, nielen pre EÚ, ale predovšetkým pre vlády národných štátov, teda aj pre vládu Slovenskej republiky. Na to sú však potrebné finančné prostriedky a ich správne nasmerovanie.

Finančné prostriedky musia byť nasmerované do regiónov, miestnych samospráv, starostom obcí, teda tam, kde sa problému rómskych osád najviac rozumejú.

Doterajšie financovanie prostredníctvom rôznych splnomocnencov, občianskych združení nesplnilo očakávanie.

Stotožňujem sa s tým, aby sa venovali aj vlády národného štátu, aj vláda SR. A pokiaľ sa chce, tak to pôjde.

Stotožňujem sa s tým, že je potrebné odstrániť rómske osady. Musí to byť civilizovaným a právne akceptovateľným spôsobom.

Ak by teda vláda chcela, problém by vyriešila.

Napríklad:

Súčasná Slovenská vláda dokázala postaviť mestečko s dôstojným bývaním s teplou vodou, kanalizáciou, a internetom pre amerických vojakov. Slovenský Róm nie je o nič menej ako americký vojak. Pokiaľ by sme amerických vojakov umiestnili do rómskych osád v Jasove, Jarovniciach, Kobeliarove a inde, som presvedčený, že v priebehu niekoľkých dní by tam bola voda, kanalizácia, internet a cesta. Takže pokiaľ sa chce, tak problém sa vyriešiť dá.

Guido Reil (ID), *schriftlich*. – Die Botschaft die hier verkündet wird, ist dass die Roma überall und von jedermann diskriminiert und stigmatisiert werden. Wir sind alle potenzielle Antizyganisten. Sogar ganze Regierungen und Länder stehen unter Verdacht. Wenn wir noch mehr Geld in gescheiterte Projekten investieren, und eine umfassende Roma-Industrie und ein europäisches Überwachungssystem ausbauen, dann würden sich die Probleme von selbst lösen. Erneut verweigert sich das Parlament, die Realität anzuerkennen. Die Realität ist, dass viele Roma einfach nicht bereit sind um sich in unsere Gesellschaften zu integrieren. Eine der größten Hindernisse für eine Integration ist gerade die Ghettobildung in den Siedlungen mit ihren patriarchalisch-feudalen Strukturen. Aus verschiedenen Polizeiberichten geht hervor, dass Bettler aus Roma-Gemeinschaften organisierten Clans mit einer hierarchischen Struktur angehören und dass es eindeutige Anhaltspunkte für die Ausbeutung von Kindern gibt. Statt mehr europäische Zusammenarbeit im Kampf gegen die zunehmende organisierte Bettelei zu fordern, fordert das Parlament aber die Polizeikräfte auf, um vor allem die Roma nicht zu stigmatisieren und zu kriminalisieren. So löst man das Problem natürlich nicht. Es ist Zeit für eine andere Strategie. Ohne Tabus und mit den richtigen strukturellen Lösungsansätzen.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR), *в писмена форма*. – Вие постоянно се биете по гърдите как посещавате циганските общности. Изглежда, че виждате само това, което ви е политически угодно, но не и грозната истина.

Ето няколко нелицеприятни факта, които вие искате да пренебрегнем. Огромни помощи се изливат в тези общности от десетилетия. Те имаха всички възможности да си помогнат сами, както и със средства от държавата и обществото. Не можеш, обаче, да помогнеш на човек, който не иска помощ.

Цели поколения израснаха на социални и детски субсидии, защото е по-лесно да ги събират, вместо да работят. Децата им не ходят на училище, защото ги пращат да просят. Нищо не спира тяхната интеграция, освен собственият им мързел!

Общности, които нямат желание да се интегрират, нямат място в Европейския съюз! Хора, които не могат да четат и пишат и нямат никаква квалификация, не могат да претендират на каква работа да бъдат назначени! Хора, които живеят от години в незаконни постройки, които крадат вода и ток, които грабят и убиват нормалните работещи български граждани и пенсионери, не бива да бъдат толерирани!

Истината, уважаеми колеги, е, че етническата принадлежност не е привилегия. Всички права са съпроводени от задължения и отговорност към обществото.

Stefania Zambelli (ID), *per iscritto*. – Ancora una volta l'Unione europea si dimostra fuori dalla realtà. Nel bel mezzo di una crisi energetica senza precedenti, con famiglie e imprese che non riescono a pagare le bollette, la priorità è discutere di Rom e delle loro condizioni di vita. Anziché pensare ad aiuti e sussidi per far fronte al caro energia, siamo qui a discutere che aiuti e che strumenti mettere a disposizione delle popolazioni Rom, per meglio integrarle nelle nostre comunità. Il problema che sono loro stessi che non vogliono integrarsi, preferendo molto spesso vivere di criminalità, che di un vero lavoro. Dunque è inutile continuare a spendere soldi pubblici per la costruzione di case e appartamenti da destinare ai Rom, che, nella maggioranza delle volte, non hanno portato alla tanto sperata integrazione. Cominciamo piuttosto a concentrare le risorse al fine di smantellare i network criminali, in mano ai Rom, attivi nelle maggiori città europee. Grazie.

Úterý 4. října 2022

8. Klíčové cíle pro schůzi CITES CoP19 v Panamě (rozprava)

President. – The next item is the debate on two oral questions on key objectives for the CITES CoP19 meeting in Panama (2022/2681(RSP)):

— the oral question to the Council on key objectives for the CITES CoP19 by Pascal Canfin, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (O-000038/2022 - B9-0023/2022); and

— the oral question to the Commission on key objectives for the CITES CoP19 by Pascal Canfin, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (O-000039/2022 - B9-0024/2022).

Anja Hazekamp, *author.* – Madam President, I welcome the Commissioner and the Minister. In these times of climate and environmental crisis, we need to urgently step up the protection of the most endangered animals and plants. Crucially, this means that we need to protect more species via the annexes of the CITES convention, and we need to increase enforcement and tackle wildlife crime. I am very glad that my colleagues in the Environment Committee supported the proposal to write this ambitious resolution. This ambition is much needed because, all too often, the European Union made poor choices during the CITES negotiations. CITES was designed to maintain commercial trade in specimens of wild animals and plants, rather than protect them. However, shouldn't CITES regulate the trade, instead of stimulating it?

Today, I would like to focus on the role that the European Union plays. The EU's position is often the key reason for the failure of many CITES proposals. One would hope, with this Commission's loudly trumpeted commitments to halting biodiversity loss, that there would be greater support for the range states when they are making a desperate bid to protect their native wildlife populations at the upcoming CITES CoP. Why doesn't the Commission support the range states' proposals? For instance, proposals to protect the hippo and the elephant.

At the last CoP, the Commission refused to support the uplisting of the African elephant to Appendix I. Now, six years later, the situation with some of the African elephant populations is dramatic.

At this moment, 10 range states have proposed to transfer the common hippo to CITES Appendix I. These West African countries are bearing direct witness to the decline of this iconic species, and yet the Commission thinks that it knows better and seems determined to not support the hippo uplisting proposal. This Parliament, however, noted the African nations' concerns and is voicing its support for ending the commercial trade in hippo products in this resolution. We recognise that this will throw a lifeline to the species, which is jeopardised not only by habitat loss and climate change, but also by the trade in its tusks and teeth for ivory. I urge the Commission and Member States to support this hippo proposal. Do not make the same mistake as you made with the African elephant.

The same can be said for the proposal to list glass frogs on CITES Appendix II. These amphibians are becoming increasingly popular in the exotic pet trade. They are protected in many range states, but are collected and traded illegally. Also, these species fell victim to the EU's position at the last CoP.

We know that we can really make a difference when the EU steps up its action. For example, six years ago, the Morocco and the European Union promoted together the listing of the Barbary macaque. This has already borne fruit: we are now seeing the stronghold population in the Atlas Mountains recovering. Staying on the subject of the exotic pet trade, it is good that this resolution reiterates Parliament's support for an EU-wide positive list. This would also limit the number of wild species that can be kept by private owners and thereby reduce a huge amount of animal suffering of species that are unsuitable to be kept as pets.

I urge my colleagues to support the text as agreed by the Environment Committee.

I am hoping that the Commission listens to these and Parliament's other demands and soon delivers a revised action plan against wildlife trafficking, with real teeth and the funding to be able to tackle the overexploitation of other species. We need to increase enforcement and penalties for wildlife crime and decrease the demand for products from endangered species, particularly hunting trophies and traditional medicines. I'm looking forward to hearing the response of the Council and the Commission to the crucial points I raised and also to hear their answers to ENVI's questions, in particular, the need to address the link between wildlife trade and the risk of zoonotic pandemics. I would like to hear from the presidency about what they will do to make sure that this CoP, as well as those on climate and biodiversity,

will deliver the success that we so desperately need to protect our planet.

I would like to thank, lastly, all the ENVI shadows for the great collaboration on this resolution and look forward to its adoption tomorrow.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for inviting me to this debate.

We are witnessing an unprecedented global decline of nature. This is threatening around 1 million animal and plant species with extinction, and it is the direct result of human activity.

Reversing this trend is a major objective for the European Union and its Member States. We believe that CITES is a key international convention for biodiversity conservation and a valuable instrument for our efforts to fight wildlife trafficking.

The Council aims to adopt an ambitious position for CITES CoP19 in line with relevant Union policies and international commitments. As you know, the Union has submitted 13 of 52 proposals for amending the CITES' appendices that have been tabled for consideration at CoP19.

Our listing proposals are based on scientific criteria, the conservation status of the species concerned and the impact that trade has on the status of that species. We will do our utmost to gather support for these proposals and have them adopted by the CoP19 in Panama.

CITES also plays a very important role in the conservation of forests, and we support stronger and more consistent action between CITES and other forest-related organisations and processes. We have also proposed to add listing of additional tree species under CITES at COP 19.

In addition, the EU supports better protection through CITES of species which are imported to the EU illegally or at unsustainable levels, including various species of reptiles and amphibians, in particular several species of turtles imported to the EU as pets.

As I stated before, strengthening the global response to wildlife trafficking is a major priority for the EU, and we have done much in the context of the EU action plan against wildlife trafficking to address root causes, improve enforcement and strengthen the global partnership of source, consumer and transit countries.

This comprehensive approach should be reflected in the mandate for CoP19. In particular, addressing elephant poaching and ivory trafficking remains a priority for the EU, and our intention for CoP19 is to focus on promoting actions that directly address this problem and on harmonising the conditions for trade in live African elephants.

The COVID-19 pandemic has drawn considerable public attention to global wildlife trade because of the risk it poses for the emergence and spread of zoonotic diseases. And I know you are very attentive to these aspects. We acknowledge the role of CITES' place in accordance with its mandate in reducing potential risks to the health of animals and people.

However, this is a broader issue that requires collaboration of various organisations dealing with animal or public health, trade, food and transport in line with the one health approach. We strongly support the renewed commitment between the World Organisation for Animal Health and the CITES to work together on animal health and welfare issues worldwide to safeguard biodiversity and protect animals.

Let me assure you that the Presidency, together with the Commission and the Member States, is determined to take an active role to ensure that CITES continues to be an effective tool in attaining its main objectives: the conservation and sustainable management of our natural resources.

We are therefore prepared to conduct the upcoming deliberations in a spirit of cooperation, mutual understanding and joint interests in the protection of species that are threatened by trade in order to maintain a diverse and healthy environment for our future generations.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister, honourable Members, 2022 is a key year for reinforcing our commitment towards preserving biodiversity. With the Biodiversity CoP 15 in December and the CITES CoP 19 a month before, we have a unique opportunity to shape global efforts to halt and reverse the continued destruction of nature.

The international trade in wild animals and plants is estimated to be worth billions of euros annually and includes thousands of different fauna and flora species. This trade plays an important role in many economies. It ranges from live animals and plants to products derived from them, including food, leather goods, timber and medicines. At the same time, however, we must regulate the international wildlife trade effectively to ensure its sustainability, and to ensure it is consistent with the fight against species extinction. The EU has been actively engaged in advocating for strict global rules on wildlife trade and in the implementation of CITES through the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations. The Commission has also been actively promoting strong EU-wide enforcement of the rules.

Let me now reply more specifically to your three questions. The EU's main objective for the upcoming CoP 19 in Panama in November is to extend the CITES scope to additional species threatened by international trade. This would be done by including them in the CITES appendices when the relevant criteria are met. For this purpose, the EU has proposed to include a number of animal and plant species in the CITES appendices, and namely several timber and marine species, but also reptile and amphibian species. Demand for some of these species in the EU is significant. So by making proposals for listing, we take responsibility for ensuring that trade is sustainable. We count on partner countries to support the EU proposals.

A second priority is to ensure that the rules in place are transparent and uniformly understood and interpreted. For instance, trade in live elephants can only take place in limited circumstances based on the CITES framework and on transparent and robust scientific scrutiny. The EU has proposed to clarify the framework to ensure that it is as rigorous and as effective as possible. The EU will also continue to encourage building capacities of relevant authorities and strengthening cooperation between source, transit and destination countries.

As regards your second question, the Commission acknowledges that international trade in wildlife may pose a risk for the emergence of zoonotic diseases. At the international level, the EU fully supports the CITES Secretariat in its partnership with the World Organisation for Animal Health and sees the need for CITES to act within its mandate to limit the risks of the transmission of zoonotic diseases in the context of wildlife trade. The Commission has been supporting projects aiming to explore the links between the transmission of zoonotic diseases and trade in wildlife and to limit the risk of these transmissions.

Turning to your last question, we will soon publish the evaluation of the 2016 action plan against wildlife trafficking. This evaluation has found that over the last years wildlife trafficking has clearly risen up the agenda of policymakers, law enforcement agencies and stakeholders in the EU and worldwide. The EU and its Member States have scaled up enforcement measures, for instance, to enhanced cross-border investigations, resulting in more seizures and prosecutions. The EU has also led actions against wildlife trafficking in multilateral fora, notably under CITES, and the EU and Member States' diplomatic networks have been mobilised, actively engaging in bilateral and regional dialogues. Lastly, the EU has provided substantial funding for local communities' involvement in the management and conservation of wildlife, capacity building of law enforcement agencies and support for cross-border collaboration to combat wildlife trafficking and dismantle organised crime networks.

Despite these efforts, wildlife trafficking, combined with climate change and environmental degradation, continues to put a serious strain on wildlife, as well as on people's livelihoods and security. Trafficking routes and trafficked species change, while capacities and resources dedicated to fighting wildlife crime remain limited. This results in a relatively low number of prosecutions and convictions, despite an increase in seizures.

Building on the 2016 action plan and its evaluation, the revised action plan against wildlife trafficking, which we will adopt before the end of this year, will aim to respond to the current challenges in a comprehensive way. It will put more focus on capacity building along the enforcement chain and will encourage coordination and cooperation within and between Member States. It will also renew the EU commitment to fight online wildlife trafficking, harnessing the future adoption of the Digital Services Act to give enforcement actors the necessary tools to tackle wildlife crime online. It will also call for more transparency in decision-making, based on a stronger partnership of the EU and its Member States, with non-governmental organisations, international organisations and the private sector. We aim to establish a more robust framework for monitoring and evaluation of the action plan. This framework will build on existing reporting mechanisms in order to limit the burden on Member States and will take account of the inherent limitations of measuring action against illegal trade.

Lídia Pereira, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhora Presidente, os diferentes seres vivos que habitam a Terra são uma das suas maiores riquezas, e a biodiversidade é um bem fundamental que nos cabe a todos preservar.

A pergunta que há a fazer aos governos e à Comissão é se estamos a fazer tudo o que é necessário para salvaguardar o futuro do planeta e não apenas se podemos proteger mais espécies, mas se aquelas que já estão hoje identificadas como em risco e a necessitar de proteção estão efetivamente protegidas.

Não podemos compactuar com o ataque constante à biodiversidade do planeta por parte daqueles que pretendem ter espécies em perigo como animais domésticos apenas para divertimento. Temos de perguntar se, em particular, os animais e as plantas vítimas de tráfico ou comércio ilegal estão a encontrar na ação dos governos e no controlo das suas fronteiras uma resposta adequada, e se os criminosos estão a ser adequadamente punidos. Todos os elementos na cadeia de tráfico têm de ser alvo de uma resposta firme e sem tréguas.

Mais do que alterações de convenções, que são também necessárias, precisamos de reforçar a capacidade de fiscalização e a resposta da justiça.

César Luena, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, doy las gracias a todas las personas, compañeros y compañeras, que han participado en esta Resolución. Pero no seamos ni conformistas ni complacientes, señores y señoras miembros del Consejo y de la Comisión. creo que no es bueno.

Nuestro objetivo es triple: proteger la flora y la fauna salvaje, impedir el comercio ilegal y descontrolado y finalmente, proteger la biodiversidad.

Sin embargo, hay seis aspectos, que voy a mencionar de pasada aquí, en este Pleno, en los cuales podemos mejorar sustancialmente este Convenio CITES.

Primero, las enfermedades zoonóticas: tenemos que abordar los mercados de animales vivos, pero abordarlos de verdad, porque creo que la señal que hemos recibido durante los últimos tres años es bastante evidente.

Segundo, la ciberdelincuencia. ¿Qué es internet en este campo del que estamos hablando esta tarde? Pues es la gran grieta por la que se cuela todo el tráfico ilegal de especies silvestres. Pero tampoco somos ambiciosos. Lo citamos, lo mencionamos, señorías, sí, pero no somos ambiciosos.

Tigres y otros grandes felinos: no podemos permitir que se comercien cuando se crían en cautividad. No lo dejamos claro. Además, los tigres, por cierto, son una especie protegida y deberían criarse únicamente con de conservación, nunca comerciales.

Pregunto: ¿tenemos un marco jurídico claro para el comercio, en este caso, de los elefantes africanos vivos? Tampoco lo dejamos claro.

Por no hablar de que tenemos la obligación de reducir la demanda de animales silvestres vivos y de productos derivados de la fauna silvestre.

Claro, tenemos que decirles a nuestros conciudadanos europeos que hay que reducir esa demanda, que no podemos vivir más con esos modos de consumo.

Y, por último, necesitamos una lista positiva de los animales que pueden tenerse como animales de compañía. Tampoco la tenemos.

Por tanto, estamos dando pasos y podemos estar contentos, pero no son suficientes.

No seamos conformistas y mucho menos, complacientes. Hay que ser más ambiciosos cuando vayamos a Panamá.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, efectivamente, nos encontramos ante una importante y necesaria Resolución. Ya se ha dicho: tenemos que tener en cuenta que el negocio del tráfico ilegal de flora y fauna silvestre, por detrás del tráfico de drogas, el tráfico de personas y el tráfico y la falsificación de productos y monedas, es el cuarto comercio ilegal más grande del mundo y genera más de 23 000 millones de euros. Es, además, un comercio ilegal devastador para el delicado equilibrio ecosistémico.

Por lo tanto, proteger nuestra biodiversidad es absolutamente necesario y, en este ámbito, es preciso que, de cara a la próxima COP, seamos capaces de defender la aplicación de la Convención CITES. Hay grandes amenazas y grandes fallas en este comercio ilegal, fundamentalmente, porque no hay un cumplimiento adecuado de la Convención, no hay prioridad política por parte de las partes implicadas y no hay suficientes recursos.

Por eso pensamos que la Unión Europea, de cara a la próxima COP19 en Panamá, tiene que promover una dotación financiera suficiente, tiene que pedir que se adopte una legislación nacional eficaz, tiene que pedir una mayor coherencia y armonización entre las distintas convenciones, tiene que pedir que se apliquen sanciones disuasorias cuando la Convención se incumple.

También es necesario que la Unión Europea adopte un nuevo plan —un ambicioso plan— de acción contra el tráfico de especies silvestres. Y en este plan tenemos que incluir, ya se ha dicho también, una mejora de la coordinación y de las actividades policiales para luchar contra nuevos sistemas delictivos, como es el tráfico de especies silvestres por Internet. Tenemos que mejorar las actividades de inspección y la cooperación entre las administraciones implicadas, y tenemos que trabajar mucho por la sensibilización de la sociedad.

Ville Niinistö, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, biodiversity loss is an existential threat, and we must also address this challenge. This is not only important to the upcoming COP 15 on biodiversity, but also in the context of CoP 19 on the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) in Panama.

CITES is an agreement with the aim to make sure that trade in wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival in nature. The species listed in CITES are grouped according to how threatened they are by international trade. In the coming CoP, the EU should support proposals for uplisting species to better protect the species. Also, it is worth noting that this still leaves a lot of species outside the scope of CITES where other, often national, tools for data protection are needed and the EU must push for those as well.

There is no way of protecting species without also protecting their habitats. It is good that this resolution notes the importance of key habitats such as forests and oceans. This is important when we are addressing also climate effects to our planet, that biodiversity and species protection goes hand in hand with that as well.

I am pleased that in this resolution we recognise the role of the European Union as a major driver and as a transit and destination point for illegal trade. This must be stopped. There are major gaps in the EU's own wildlife regulations. Revision of the EU action plan against wildlife trafficking will be a great moment to tackle the role of the EU in driving demand for illegal trade. Not only is nature on the line; the wild and uncontrolled wildlife trade also increases risks for human health. Therefore, our job is now to make sure that wildlife can thrive without us humans threatening its existence and we also support our own future by doing that.

Catherine Griset, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, le nombre d'espèces touchées ne cesse d'augmenter dans le monde. L'existence d'une telle convention est donc une bonne chose, et il faut évidemment la soutenir. Encore faut-il que ce soit l'affaire des États souverains, les mieux placés pour agir efficacement; ne nous trompons pas d'échelle!

Même si certaines populations d'animaux se stabilisent – voire augmentent, en Afrique, grâce aux zones protégées et aux politiques de préservation mises en place par les États –, la plaie du commerce illégal menace ces efforts.

Mais ce n'est pas là la seule menace: la pression démographique et l'expansion des villes et des villages réduisent toujours plus les zones d'habitat des animaux. De même, les troubles civils, les conflits participent aussi à ce déclin, surtout quand ils sont chroniques. N'oublions pas la sécheresse et les problématiques liées à la gestion de l'eau, qui entraînent la dégradation des écosystèmes.

Enfin, il faut améliorer l'état des connaissances sur place, mieux évaluer les populations animales réelles et les enjeux liés aux communautés locales pour gagner en efficacité, et, bien sûr, intensifier la lutte contre le braconnage.

Pietro Fiocchi, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, I have a very practical question for the Commission, and regarding this topic, I will present a separate vote on a paragraph 39, which bans the import of a hunting trophy.

As a person that has worked a lot in Africa for many years, I know the situation very well, and I work on the side of people defending biodiversity. But, for example, in Namibia, trophy hunting, which is legal trophy hunting, is almost 5% of the gross national product and is very important from a biodiversity protection and an economic point of view, because all the meat goes to tribes, part of the money goes to the tribes for schooling, in exchange of not poaching. Because we have to remember that a lot of animal killings in Africa are done by the tribes to protect their agricultural land, for reason, because they need food, also for money. And so this system works; brings a positive economic effect, brings protection of biodiversity. So I would like to believe this is possible.

And by the way, I'm in contact with the ambassadors of Namibia, South Africa, Botswana and Mozambique, and I would like to bring them here to explain exactly the numbers in their respective countries.

Younous Omarjee, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, 100 000 euros pour une chasse obscène au rhinocéros, 15 000 euros pour une tête de buffle, quelques milliers d'euros pour une corne d'éléphant, quelques euros pour une planche de bois de rose, et combien pour les prétendues vertus aphrodisiaques des écailles de pangolin?

C'est à ce prix – 195 milliards d'euros par an, presque l'équivalent du trafic de drogue – que s'organise l'exploitation brutale de la nature par l'homme et, disons-le, les crimes de l'humanité contre le monde du vivant.

C'est pourquoi il est temps aujourd'hui, je crois, de pénaliser les acheteurs et les détenteurs des objets de ce trafic, car c'est la demande qui crée l'offre, et le marché, il est en Europe.

Je pense aussi qu'il s'agit là d'une question de civilisation, qui touche à la conception que nous avons de nous-mêmes. Le commerce des espèces dites sauvages est un commerce par nature barbare et sauvage, et je crois qu'on ne réglemente pas la barbarie: on la combat et on la pénalise.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΕΥΑ ΚΑΪΛΗ

Αντιπρόεδρος

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, quiero centrar mi intervención esta tarde en el apartado 87 de la Resolución que hoy debatimos. Me refiero a la inclusión, a propuesta de Panamá, de todos los tiburones de la familia de la tintorera o quenlla en el apéndice II de la Convención CITES, con el fin de dificultar su comercialización.

Esta cuestión ha suscitado mucha polémica en mi país, España, y en mi región, Galicia, donde la inclusión en CITES del marrajo dientuso ya provocó importantes quebrantos a un sector de la flota.

Quiero recordar que los dictámenes científicos no aconsejan la inclusión de la especie de la tintorera en el apéndice II de CITES. Las recientes evaluaciones sugieren que las poblaciones de tintorera no están siendo objeto de sobrepesca y que se mantienen por encima del rendimiento máximo sostenible.

Además, la propia Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura ha señalado que esta especie de tiburón no está amenazada y que no necesita una mayor fiscalización comercial. Advierte también dicha Organización que la inclusión de la tintorera en CITES puede tener un impacto socioeconómico a escala mundial que no ha sido tenido en cuenta.

Al adoptar decisiones en el ámbito de la pesca debemos guiarnos por la ciencia y el impacto socioeconómico, no solo por una visión esencialmente medioambientalista. El sector pesquero europeo lo está pasando mal desde hace tres años. El impacto de los recortes en las aguas y en las capturas o en las cuotas en aguas británicas tras el *Brexit*, la epidemia de COVID-19, el grave impacto de los elevadísimos precios de los combustibles, imprescindibles para la actividad pesquera, y ahora el veto a la pesca de fondo en ochenta y siete áreas del océano Atlántico.

Dificultar la comercialización de la tintorera supondría un nuevo golpe para un sector de la flota.

Me gustaría que la Unión Europea no siga dando la impresión de que se preocupa más por el bienestar de los peces que por el bienestar y prosperidad de los pescadores.

Martin Hojsík (Renew). – Madam President, Commissioner, Councillor, I am honoured to be part of the EP's delegation to the CITES CoP19 because the convention is more than just a tool to control trade in endangered species, it is about our relationship with wildlife as such.

Wildlife is a significant part of our heritage, our cultures. Our societies have to finally acknowledge the material and immaterial value that the habitats provide to us and the dependence of the wildlife on its good state. And the endangered species are the symbol of that deterioration.

We have to admit that we, humans, are at the core of this problem. We keep contributing to the habitat degradation. We have led the market of illegal trafficking to flourish and we did not sufficiently punish those involved in it. We still keep trading captive-bred, endangered species, legally in a number of occasions. Just look at the trade in captive tigers. Also in the European Union.

We have to be part of the solution. We finally need to equip the police, the customs officers and the authorities with the means to enforce the convention because they have been seriously understaffed. We have to invest in capacity building and training of enforcement and judicial capacities. We need to strengthen our cooperation by establishing specialised units, focusing on wildlife crime across the Member States. And we have to stop the trade in endangered animals from captive breeding. No more tiger trade. We all can help, also in this House, by sending a strong signal with our resolution on the CITES scope, but also by supporting a strong environmental crime directive.

Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Täglich sterben weltweit 150 Tier- und Pflanzenarten – jeden Tag. Wir erleben das größte Massensterben seit über 60 Millionen Jahren. Und wir wissen auch, woher das kommt.

Das CITES-Übereinkommen ist eben international das einzige scharfe Schwert, das wir haben, um den skrupellosen Handel mit gefährdeten Arten einzudämmen. Aber, wie meine Kollegen gesagt haben: Wir schützen damit auch die Ökosysteme, in denen diese Arten eben vorkommen. So beheimaten Wälder weltweit eine enorme Vielfalt an Lebewesen, und sie regulieren gleichzeitig unser globales Klima. Wir brauchen sie sowohl im Kampf gegen die Klimakrise als auch im Kampf gegen das Artensterben, denn artenreiche Wälder schenken uns das Leben.

Eine ambitionierte EU-Position bei der COP 19 in Panama, so wie im Umweltausschuss beschlossen, muss ein wahrer Gamechanger werden. Denn Ziel eines Verbots des Handels mit manchen gefährdeten Arten ist auch, das ausbeutende Geschäftsmodell der Abholzung unprofitabel zu machen. Lasst uns den Grünen Deal beim Wort nehmen und konsequent verhandeln!

Aurélia Beigneux (ID). – Madame la Présidente, il faut évidemment saluer ce texte, qui permet de mettre un terme à des pratiques barbares, qui pourtant existent encore en 2022. Que de temps nous avons attendu, à voir des espèces s'éteindre année après année en ne mettant en avant que des outils de prévention ou presque! Les trophées de chasse qui traversent les douanes, le commerce d'espèces protégées, animales comme végétales, sont autant de scandales qui ne doivent plus rester impunis.

Pénaliser les groupes et les individus est le seul outil qui puisse mettre fin à cette situation. Il faut des règles fermes et des peines qui doivent être appliquées, en liaison constante avec les premiers concernés sur le terrain: les scientifiques, les associations et les politiques.

Cependant, même quand les combats sont nobles, la Commission européenne reste une institution qui a horreur de la souveraineté de nos nations. Ce texte donne des prérogatives qui empiètent une fois encore sur les États membres. Ce sont pourtant les États, ici comme sur les continents concernés par les extinctions de masse, qui sont les échelles de décision les plus démocratiques et, surtout, les plus justes.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Pierwotnie celem Konwencji Waszyngtońskiej było zapewnienie, by międzynarodowy handel dzikimi zwierzętami i roślinami nie zagrażał ich przetrwaniu. Dziś wiemy, że przetrwanie to zbyt skromna ambicja, i powinniśmy zapewnić odpowiednie standardy transportu i warunki przechowywania zwierząt, aby ograniczyć ich stres i cierpienie. Dlatego doceniam tekst wspólnej rezolucji na temat konferencji w Panamie.

Uważam, że nasz głos powinien być silny i jednoznaczny. Musimy nie tylko uszczelnić i ujednolicić prawo zwalczające nielegalny handel, ale również zadbać o to, aby handel legalny był bardzo precyzyjnie monitorowany i by nie dochodziło do łamania prawa.

Szczególnie chciałabym zwrócić uwagę na handel dzikimi zwierzętami i przede wszystkim na transport żywych zwierząt przez wewnętrzne granice Unii. Te granice muszą być bardzo przejrzyste i stabilne. Muszą być ramy kontroli, tak by nieuczciwi handlarze nie mogli dłużej tłumaczyć się nieznajomością odmiennych procedur i nadużywać uproszczeń administracyjnych, jakie daje strefa Schengen.

Unia Europejska, w której standardy ochrony środowiska i dobrostanu należą do najwyższych, ma dziś do odegrania rolę nauczyciela i promotora wobec państw trzecich.

Agnès Evren (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, madame la Commissaire, la COP 19 est un rendez-vous stratégique pour la protection des espèces sauvages et la réglementation de leur commerce. L'enjeu est triple.

Premier enjeu évidemment, préserver notre biodiversité, alors que la sixième extinction de masse a d'ores et déjà commencé, des espèces s'éteignent à un rythme alarmant. Deuxième enjeu, sanitaire, la COVID, à juste titre ou non, a mis un coup de projecteur sur les zoonoses et il nous faut nous en protéger. Enfin, troisième enjeu, sécuritaire, le trafic d'espèces sauvages est une importante manne financière qui alimente criminels et groupes armés. La CITES, mais aussi notre législation européenne présentent encore d'importantes faiblesses dans lesquelles s'engouffrent, hélas, les trafiquants. Il convient donc de les corriger.

Au niveau européen, la révision du plan d'action de l'Union européenne devrait renforcer notre action sur le trafic des espèces sauvages. Il faut bien sûr réduire la demande de produits illicites issus d'espèces sauvages, mais aussi renforcer la répression, ce qui implique d'améliorer nos moyens d'inspection et la collecte de données. Ce sont nos autorités douanières et judiciaires qui sont en première ligne contre ce trafic. Nous devons leur apporter les moyens d'action nécessaires, notamment en matière de cybercriminalité. Car, nous le savons, une partie de ce commerce se joue désormais en ligne.

Anna Zalewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Słuchając koleżanek i kolegów, wiem jedno. Że nasza delegacja ma silny mandat, że wszyscy mówimy właściwie jednym językiem.

To ważne! Będzie miała odwagę forsować te wszystkie rekomendacje, które sprzyjają bioróżnorodności, które są za rozwiązaniami związanymi z zablokowaniem międzynarodowego handlu dzikimi zwierzętami. Dlatego cieszę się, że możemy powiedzieć, że jesteśmy za poprawą egzekwowania zakazów i ograniczeń w handlu chronionymi gatunkami, za przejrzystością, że jesteśmy za ułatwianiem i zabezpieczeniem finansowym we wdrażaniu tejże konwencji. Jednocześnie, że jesteśmy za wzmocnieniem roli Unii Europejskiej w globalnej walce z handlem, dziką fauną i florą oraz zapewnieniem realizacji planu działania Unii Europejskiej przeciwko handlowi, dziką fauną i florą na lata 2016-2020.

Życzę powodzenia i odwagi.

Peter van Dalen (PPE). – Voorzitter, haaien zijn essentieel voor het ecosysteem in onze zeeën en oceanen. Maar helaas, driekwart van de haaiensoorten wordt met uitsterven bedreigd, onder andere door overbevissing. De wereldwijde haaienstand mag niet achteruitgaan, want dan zullen onze ecosystemen gaan wankelen. Wij moeten dus de haaien beschermen. Helaas wordt slechts 25 % van de wereldwijde handel in haaienvinnen adequaat beheerd. Dat is echt te weinig, wij moeten meer doen.

Het is dus terecht dat de Europese Unie en ook gastland Panama bij de komende conferentie over de handel in bedreigde dier- en plantensoorten, zowel de hamerhaaien als ook de mensenhaaien volledig willen beschermen. Door die beide haaiensoorten op te nemen in de bijlagen bij de Cites-overeenkomst, kunnen deze populaties duurzaam worden beheerd en kan ook de handel door blijven gaan. Dus er is voldoende ruimte voor handel, maar er wordt ook voor gezorgd dat de populaties overeind blijven. Dat moeten we doen, want deze soorten haaien mogen niet uitsterven!

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister, honourable Members. I'm grateful for your interventions today and for allowing us to have this very important debate. And I will try to reply briefly to some of the main comments which were made.

With regard to the positive list for pets, the feasibility and advantages of establishing a positive list for exotic animals to be kept as pets needs to be carefully analysed as it is a complex issue, of course, cutting across animal welfare, human and animal health, trade and others, with potential implications in all of these areas. So the Commission is ready to conduct a study to look into the issue.

With regard to a regulation on the trade in wildlife, the Commission keeps EU policies under review and is ready to explore the need for added value and feasibility of new legislative and policy initiatives to ensure that EU action against wildlife trafficking remains sufficiently strong and proportionate to the threat posed by wildlife trafficking and the experience in implementing existing legislation, based on the rules of the country of origin, such as the EU Timber Regulation or the US Lacey Act, would need to be considered.

Another question on whether the EU position on the CITES scope is consistent with the biodiversity strategy. The Commission assessed the proposals in relation to the listing criteria and the obligations in the Convention, taking into account the precautionary principle. But ambition cannot be at the expense of not respecting the rules, of course.

So the Commission proposed to the Council to oppose only eight of the 52 listing proposals, and four out of those eight are to reduce the controls on certain species. So these proposals clearly do not meet the criteria in the Convention and the Commission proposal is ambitious as it supports 35 out of the 52 listing proposals. For nine proposals, the available information was not enough to judge the scientific merits, and therefore we proposed an open position, and this is for reconsideration should additional information become available.

Whether the EU should support all the proposals by the range states. For scientists to function effectively and to remain relevant and implemented, it is necessary to ensure that the listing of species is based on the criteria foreseen in the Convention, taking into account the best available scientific information, of course.

But not all proposals by the range states fulfil these criteria. So in such cases, the EU is committed to supporting range states to address the concerns in other ways, using tools that are better adapted than those under CITES, such as, for example, NaturAfrica – an extensive initiative that will support biodiversity conservation in Africa.

With regard to trophy hunting, the EU has been pursuing a balanced approach towards the trade of hunting trophies on which widely divergent positions are held by various countries and NGOs. So legal, well-regulated trophy-hunting programmes play an important role in delivering benefits for both life conservation and for the livelihoods and well-being of indigenous people and local communities living with wildlife.

So ensuring a return of benefits for local communities, certainly in areas where other resources are scarce, creates an incentive for local communities to be willing to live next to the wildlife and to continue to protect these species.

But EU law goes beyond the protection required by CITES for listed species. Permit issuance relies on the positive opinion of the scientific review group, which is mandated to ensure that inputs of listed species are kept at a sustainable level and will not deplete the species' population.

So the EU intervenes and stops imports when information reveals a threat for the survival of a population. So this corresponds with a precautionary, but also proportionate, approach based on the best available science.

With regard to proposals aiming to stop trade in live elephants, international trade in live elephants, especially when it takes the animals out of their natural range, is a very sensitive issue that generates expressions of public concern as we know.

It is a highly divisive topic amongst African countries, and the EU has submitted for consideration by the parties a working document to clarify the framework for trade in live elephants, taking a comprehensive approach and building a joint understanding amongst all the range states.

So to conclude on this, wildlife trafficking remains a worrying – a very worrying, I would say – global phenomenon, with wide-ranging ecological and socioeconomic impacts. As a source, transit and destination region for trafficked wildlife, the EU has a key role to play in the fight against illegal wildlife trade.

So let me thank you once again for following this topic so closely and for the importance which you attach to it, which is indeed merited.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I would like to thank you all for your interventions. They confirm the strong interest of this House in wildlife conservation and your desire for the EU to play a leading role at the CITES CoP 19.

As I mentioned in my initial intervention, the Council is currently working on the Union position for the CITES CoP 19. Parliament will, of course, be duly informed once it is adopted.

I can see great convergence of views on the fact that CITES CoP 19 is an excellent opportunity to further strengthen global efforts against wildlife trafficking, including through new listings of endangered species. The Presidency will do its utmost to have our proposals adopted in Panama.

President. – I have received one motion for a resolution tabled in accordance with Rule 136(1).

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place tomorrow.

(The sitting was suspended at 14.28)

PRESIDÊNCIA: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA

Vice-Presidente

9. Pokračování denního zasedání

(A sessão é reiniciada às 15h02)

Úterý 4. října 2022

10. Schválení zápisu z předchozího denního zasedání

(A ata da sessão anterior é aprovada.)

11. Doba vyhrazená pro otázky (Komise) Nástroj politiky soudržnosti jako prostředek boje proti vylidňování

Presidente. – Segue-se o período de perguntas à Comissão sobre Combater o despovoamento através do instrumento da política de coesão.

Quero dar as boas-vindas à Comissária Elisa Ferreira para este período de perguntas.

Este período de perguntas durará cerca de 90 minutos. Haverá um minuto para fazer uma pergunta, dois minutos para a resposta, 30 segundos para uma pergunta suplementar e dois minutos para a respetiva resposta.

Recordo que a eventual pergunta suplementar só será atribuída se estiver estritamente relacionada com a pergunta principal. Devemos respeitar esta regra e não aproveitar essa oportunidade para perguntas inteiramente novas.

Se desejarem fazer uma pergunta, convidamos os colegas a registar esse pedido agora, utilizando a função «catch-the-eye» na máquina de voto, depois de inserir o respetivo cartão de voto.

Durante o período de perguntas, as intervenções têm lugar a partir do lugar em que os senhores deputados estão sentados. Convido todos os oradores a respeitarem o tempo de uso da palavra atribuído.

Os colegas poderão precisar de algum tempo para registar o pedido de pergunta, pelo que solicito novamente que apresentem o vosso pedido.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, Europska unija suočava se s velikim demografskim izazovima u vidu starenja stanovništva, pada stope nataliteta i iseljavanje iz ruralnih u urbana područja, a sve to ostavlja vidljiv trag u Europi te dugoročno gledajući, depopulacija Unije postaje i sigurnosni problem.

Glavni uzroci demografskih promjena koje prisiljavaju stanovnike navedenih područja da odsele a druge odvraćaju da se dosele su loša zdravstvenu i obrazovna infrastruktura, slaba prometna povezanost i dostupnost javnih usluga, nepostojanje širokopojasnog interneta te manje mogućnosti za zaposlenje. Depopulacija predstavlja jedan od temeljnih izazova za naš kontinent te je pri osmišljavanju i provedbi programa prednost trebalo dati upravo rješavanju tog pitanja.

Konkretna pitanja: „Planira li Komisija donijeti posebnu strategiju za borbu protiv depopulacije?" i osim toga „Planira li Komisija u budućnosti provoditi analize i procjene učinaka javnih politika na demografiju?"

Elisa Ferreira, *Comissária*. – Senhor Presidente, eu gostaria de responder, concordando com a descrição do problema, que, aliás, é feito de uma forma muito correta e, se me permitem, gostava de cumprimentar o Parlamento por isso mesmo, pela vossa Resolução, de 20 de maio de 2021.

De facto, há um despovoamento de uma série de regiões na Europa que tem duas causas principais: uma é o envelhecimento da Europa e, digamos, a mudança demográfica da Europa, que nos indica um caminho de progressivo envelhecimento e de abandono de determinados territórios, e o outro fator resulta da captação que as regiões mais dinâmicas exercem sobre os jovens e sobre os mais qualificados.

Dito isto, a política de coesão tem instrumentos para contrariar ou limitar este fator. Chamo a atenção para o facto de a política de coesão ser uma política que é gerida em parceria com os Estados-Membros e, portanto, é *shared management*. Nesse sentido, é importante também que, do lado dos países, haja a perceção da relevância estratégica de reequilibrar o território e de contrariar esta perda progressiva de dinâmica numa série de territórios, em particular, territórios do leste da Europa, mas, também no sul e no oeste da Europa, há uma série de territórios que sofre de uma violenta tendência para o despovoamento.

Para isso, é preciso que as estratégias sejam definidas, sejam assumidas também a nível nacional, que haja protagonistas a nível regional e local e, depois, que o conjunto de instrumentos que estão disponíveis na política de coesão possam ser articulados de forma a atacar a raiz desses problemas.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Zahvaljujem na odgovoru.

Demografija u sebi sadrži sigurnosne, socijalne i ekonomske aspekte te smatram da treba biti temeljna okosnica za sve politike Europske unije, uključujući kohezijsku politiku. Apeliram na države članice i regionalne vlasti da za rješavanje demografskih izazova koriste instrumente kohezijske politike u najvećoj mogućoj mjeri, a posebno da promiču koncept pametnih sela i ostalih programa kako bi se u ruralnim područjima zadržalo stanovništvo i privukli mladi ljudi.

Pitanje: „Je li Komisija zadovoljna s primjenom i rasprostranjenošću koncepta pametnih sela? Razmišlja li Komisija o promociji pametnih sela s ciljem sprečavanja depopulacije?"

Elisa Ferreira, *Comissária*. – Senhor Presidente, sim, penso que o aprovisionamento de determinadas condições de vida nessas regiões requer uma estratégia em torno do papel dos centros, que não são normalmente nas áreas que sofrem de despovoamento, as grandes metrópoles, mas sim dos centros intermédios e dos pequenos centros urbanos.

É aí que a política de coesão tem também de incidir, através do aprovisionamento de bens públicos básicos, e estou a falar, naturalmente, não só de água, saneamento, tratamento de esgotos, mas também de Internet, serviços de saúde, serviços de educação e também de alguma dimensão cultural, de forma a criar condições para que uma jovem família se sinta capaz de se localizar, de optar por essa localização, beneficiando frequentemente de uma melhor qualidade ambiental e de condições de segurança e de qualidade de vida em geral, muito mais adequadas à educação das crianças e ao estabelecimento de uma jovem família, sem os custos exagerados da aglomeração dos grandes centros.

De facto, na sequência da pandemia e na sequência do uso reforçado de meios digitais, já assistimos neste momento na Europa a uma certa revitalização de centros que estavam numa trajetória de perda progressiva de jovens e de perda progressiva de população. Portanto, há aqui um instrumento adicional e uma oportunidade adicional que requer uma estratégia ao nível desses centros intermédios ou pequenos centros, onde se pode ancorar uma dinâmica de contenção demográfica e de atração de jovens.

Rovana Plumb (S&D). – Commissioner, I am thankful for the commitment shown by you and the Commission on the depopulation issue, in particular, the inclusion in the 2022 Work Programme of the initiative on brain drain.

I was leading the work within my political group to adopt a policy paper to find some of the answers to these challenges. One conclusion was that cooperation with citizens, civil society, small and medium enterprises, research and scientific institutions will be key to unleashing each territorial unit's potential by making tailored solutions for all the different types of territories.

And my question is: what is the assessment so far by the Commission on how Member States are using cohesion policy and addressing these issues in the partnership agreements? Are enough efforts being made? And can further improvements be made?

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for the question, dear MEP Rovana Plumb. It is, in fact, a concern of the European Commission to address this problem.

This is a reason why the Commission has done a study in 2020 on the demographic trends in the European Union. Later on, we did the long-term vision for rural areas that touches upon this. Also in the Eighth Cohesion Report, we addressed again the problem of what is happening to the different territories. But never in our common history in Europe have we had so many financial means, to address these problems.

So, in the agreements with Member States, we have been putting a lot of pressure for rebalancing growth to be high on the agenda. Because the truth is that with all the movement of young people, and also concentration of skilled and unskilled in the big cities, the trend of certain Member States is to go on concentrating means to solve the agglomeration of these economies.

And so, when we are thinking long-term, and that is the purpose of cohesion policy, it is very important that rebalancing the spatial impact of dynamic and of growth is put high in the political agenda.

So the means are there. We are just starting a new period of financial support, as you know, from cohesion. So, we have serious expectations and positive expectations that in the implementation phase, this objective is also ranked sufficiently high in the internal agenda of each Member State.

Rovana Plumb (S&D). – Thank you, President. Dear Commissioner, I would like to thank you for the work you've done, you do, and you will do. And for the answer, of course, I know how many efforts are made. There is no question, but I would like to stress that we need to make sure that the demographic realities, such as depopulation, do not lead to polarisation, and that internal cohesion in the EU is not put under strain.

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, Mr President, this was not actually a question. I agree with you. I think, in fact, we cannot do the rebalancing of growth if we don't have this long-term perspective and if we don't make sure that the different instruments of policies that we have in our hands, in particular, the recovery and resilience plan and also sectoral policies, don't take sufficiently into account the spatial impact of their action. Because, in fact, when we do trade policy, when we do agricultural policy, when we establish an industrial policy or even energy or digital plans, space, geography matters.

And being aware of where the impacts intervene, what kind of impacts you cause with the different actions that you make in order that we really have a long-term vision of where we want to be in 10 years' time, is absolutely essential for the adequate and efficient management with creating synergies and not contradictory agendas.

In fact, by using all these diversified instruments that we have in our hands. So, this is what we are asking Member States to do and asking them to refrain from addressing just short-term problems because if that is the case, we will end up with very, very imbalanced spatial situations. Also, these big, big centres are starting not to deliver what they could deliver in terms of contribution to development because they are somehow cornered by the amount of problems that agglomeration creates, from environmental problems to inefficiency in the management of the whole city.

Irène Tolleret (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la commissaire, le dépeuplement de certains territoires est une tendance inquiétante qui risque de miner la convergence économique et sociale en Europe. Une société vieillissante, un taux de migration élevé, un manque de services essentiels, une mauvaise connectivité sont le miroir du dépeuplement qui affecte surtout les territoires ruraux et éloignés.

En milieu rural, pourtant, nous disposons d'un outil précieux pour garantir le développement rural et combattre le dépeuplement. Il s'agit de LEADER. Ce programme est le meilleur exemple de l'Europe et de la proximité de l'Europe des territoires, de l'Europe, des citoyens engagés. LEADER est un vecteur d'innovation sociale qui permet aux citoyens de s'approprier le développement de leur région, de leur espace de vie et de concevoir des stratégies concertées.

Pourtant, la plus-value de LEADER est trop souvent sous-estimée et le programme n'est pas suffisamment valorisé. Est-ce que la Commission compte envisager un renforcement du programme LEADER d'un point de vue budgétaire? Est-ce que l'approche ascendante typique de ce programme pourrait être étendue à d'autres instruments financiers? Est-ce que les mesures de simplification existantes sont suffisantes pour favoriser l'approche plurifonds qui permettrait au programme LEADER d'être financé par plusieurs fonds structurels et ainsi garantir l'accès de ces fonds à des collectivités de plus petite taille et donc d'être plus précis pour résoudre ce problème de dépeuplement?

Elisa Ferreira, *membre de la Commission*. – Merci de votre question. Je crois que vous avez tout à fait raison sur la nécessité et le besoin qu'on a d'adresser le problème des régions éloignées, des régions avec une forte dépendance de la ruralité. Bien sûr, LEADER c'est un programme très performant. Nous avons en tout cas la possibilité ajouter d'autres instruments similaires à cette expérience positive.

La question, c'est surtout d'avoir une compatibilité et des synergies entre ce qui se passe au niveau local et les réponses aussi au niveau régional et au niveau national, en relation à une stratégie de redynamisation de territoires.

Vous avez noté, et vous l'avez très bien fait, le besoin d'avoir des structures de gestion qui sont inclusives et qui amènent les agents locaux, en particulier les maires, mais pas seulement les maires, les ONG, les partenaires à être engagés dans les structures de développement. Et on a plusieurs programmes, même au niveau d'autres programmes qui ne sont pas LEADER, qui sont très performants à cet égard.

Alors je suis complètement d'accord. On a essayé de simplifier les mécanismes d'accès aux fonds. On verra, quand le programme pour 21-27 commencera à fonctionner en pratique, comment la simplification qu'on a introduite fonctionne suffisamment ou pas. Mais aussi, je voudrais souligner le besoin que cette simplification soit aussi acceptée et utilisée au niveau des États membres, des régions et des localités. Parce que quelquefois, ce n'est pas seulement l'Europe qui impose des restrictions. Il y a tout un mécanisme qui n'est pas suffisamment efficace.

Irène Tolleret (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, la Commission a mis en avant beaucoup d'initiatives pour combattre le dépeuplement et favoriser le développement rural. La vision à long terme pour les zones rurales, le pacte rural ou encore l'initiative sur le retour des cerveaux en font partie.

Toutefois, ces initiatives ne sont pas de nature budgétaire. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle garantir qu'une portion adéquate des fonds en gestion partagée sera redirigée vers les territoires demandeurs, les territoires ruraux notamment? Une initiative miroir de l'initiative urbaine européenne, qui destine un pourcentage du FEDER aux villes, pourrait-elle être envisagée pour les zones rurales dans le futur?

Elisa Ferreira, *membre de la Commission*. – Un grand merci de nouveau pour cette question. C'est une question qui est posée très très souvent. Vous avez fait référence à la gestion partagée, alors on préfère avoir, du côté des États membres, une sensibilité, que les députés européens et nationaux peuvent aussi renforcer, de travailler le détail des différentes régions et différentes localités au niveau européen.

En vérité, il y a une diversité si grande que c'est difficile de faire une gestion *one size fits all*. Parce que vraiment, on a besoin d'avoir un niveau de perception et de définition stratégique qui prend en compte le niveau le plus adéquat, quelquefois c'est le niveau local, quelquefois c'est le niveau régional ou de département, pour établir une vision pour le futur.

On a pas mal de régions avec des problèmes, on a les régions périphériques, on a les RUP, on a les régions en transition industrielle et pour cela on a un fonds spécifique. Il y a des régions qui dépendent de la ruralité mais qui sont très riches avec la politique agricole. Il y en a d'autres qui sont assez pauvres.

Alors l'objectif serait de créer des mécanismes de stratégie de développement qui prennent en compte ce qu'il faut faire pour chaque typologie de problèmes et pas vraiment faire des allocations spécifiques pour les différents problèmes. Parce qu'en fin de compte, on a une diversité d'allocations qui peuvent ne pas être les meilleurs moyens d'assurer la gestion. Il y a une situation que je trouve importante au niveau de la qualité de ce qu'on fait, et pas nécessairement de l'argent qu'on applique à cet objectif.

Álvaro Amaro (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, nesta pergunta que se chama «Combater o despovoamento através de um instrumento da Política de Coesão», na verdade, todos sabemos que o despovoamento, o envelhecimento, o abandono rural, estão seguramente nos principais objetivos políticos da Comissão e dos Estados-Membros.

É, seguramente, uma prioridade europeia, mas como é que o fazemos? Envolvemos as pessoas das regiões, as forças vivas, os municípios, é preciso criar emprego – todos sabemos isso –, serviços públicos, acesso a redes Internet de muito alta velocidade, inovar na mobilidade, preservar a paisagem, a biodiversidade, promover as atividades económicas.

A transição para o futuro tem de ser digital – todos o sabemos –, tem de ser verde, mas também tem de ser demográfica. E na verdade – e esta é a questão –, porque é que nós, Senhora Comissária, não deveremos fazer uma pré-avaliação do impacto demográfico de todas as políticas europeias, em especial na área da coesão e do desenvolvimento rural? Porque se não o fizermos, andamos sempre a pôr dinheiro, mas os resultados não são os que nós esperamos.

Elisa Ferreira, *Comissária*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Deputado Álvaro Amaro, de facto, eu não poderia estar mais de acordo. Aliás, temos introduzido, de algum modo, nos textos, ao lado de (vou dizer em inglês porque ficou conhecido assim) «*do no harm to cohesion*», portanto, «não prejudicar a coesão», temos tentado colocar essa preocupação de «*do no harm to environment*», porque também no ambiente nós fazemos esse tipo de pré-abordagem.

Claro que introduzir uma pré-abordagem desse género formalmente em todos os textos e em todos os textos legislativos poderá ser uma forma de tornar muito complexo todo o processo legislativo, mas penso que, pelo menos politicamente – e era isso que eu estava a tentar dizer –, é muito importante que se trabalhem as sinergias perante um objetivo comum e é importante que, nesse objetivo comum para o desenvolvimento, algum reequilíbrio territorial a nível da Europa, isto é, entre Estados-Membros, mas também dentro dos Estados-Membros, seja tomado devidamente em conta.

Nós, neste momento, começamos a ter casos em que alguns países fazem uma aproximação muito grande à média da União Europeia, muito rápida, mas estão a fazê-lo à custa de grandes desequilíbrios internos. E esses desequilíbrios internos, a médio prazo, acabam por gerar aquilo que no oitavo relatório ficou conhecido como *middle-income trap*, isto é, «ficar preso no nível médio». Isto porque as capitais e os grandes centros crescem com uma grande dinâmica, mas não são suficientes para arrastar os territórios envolventes e os territórios envolventes, sem terem motores de crescimento, acabam por ficar numa situação de envelhecimento, de estagnação, de perda de dinâmica, que depois pesa na média nacional e, portanto, ter esta visão equilibrada é, em si, essencial.

Álvaro Amaro (PPE). – Senhora Comissária, nós temos discutido muito isso, também não posso estar mais de acordo com a Senhora Comissária e com a sensibilidade que lhe reconhecemos. Mas, repare, quer na Europa e, porventura, em cada um dos Estados-Membros – e falamos do nosso, que conhecemos bem –, é verdade o que a Senhora Comissária disse, que os polos importantes, próximos das grandes capitais, acabam por não se desenvolver, porque a grande capital atrai, e as outras grandes manchas do território, no caso concreto das regiões de baixa densidade? Aí é que existe mesmo a falta de polos de atração, por isso, é que eu acho que as políticas de coesão também deviam ser muito direcionadas e muito claras para esses polos, justamente porque isso ajuda a equilibrar cada um dos Estados-Membros.

Elisa Ferreira, *Comissária*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Deputado, penso que, de facto, essa estratégia é uma estratégia correta. Isto porque equipamentos de alto nível ou de maior sofisticação, sejam eles universidades, centros tecnológicos, hospitais de nível superior ou intermédio, não podem ser colocados em todas as pequenas unidades territoriais, isto requer que haja uma hierarquia de centros urbanos.

No caso deste – e voltando à pergunta da Deputada Tolleret –, penso que uma série de países, nomeadamente Portugal, neste momento no Programa 21-27, acaba por selecionar uma quantidade de centros urbanos em que voltamos quase a algo que era um conceito do passado, que é a hierarquia de centros urbanos, isto é, cada centro urbano, que funções tem de ter, que funções tem de ancorar, de modo a transformar-se numa referência para a área envolvente e, através dessa qualidade de vida que pode oferecer, incluindo a dimensão digital, a dimensão cultural, a dimensão educativa, as oportunidades de emprego, conseguir captar e segurar população qualificada, a população jovem e as empresas.

Portanto, ter um pouco essa noção de quais são não só as grandes metrópoles, mas também as cidades intermédias e as cidades âncoras das zonas rurais é, em si mesmo, uma estratégia que faz sentido e que reequilibra o território. Penso que, neste momento, há uma grande esperança de que isto seja realizado com estes fundos que foram aprovados em relação à maioria dos Estados-Membros. Nomeadamente, no caso do país que nós conhecemos, Portugal apresenta, de facto, uma estratégia nesse sentido, veremos se somos capazes, em conjunto, de a materializar.

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhora Comissária, como sabemos, de acordo com a Expon, até 2050, a população das regiões urbanas da Europa deverá aumentar cerca de 24 milhões de pessoas, ao passo que as pessoas nas zonas rurais, em princípio, terão uma redução de cerca de 8 milhões. Portanto, estamos aqui a falar de uma perda e, se pensarmos que isto acontece muito em particular quando falamos de jovens e de pessoas mais qualificadas, isto coloca as zonas rurais, como bem sabemos, num ciclo vicioso perpétuo de declínio que, em alguns casos, pode até resultar na ausência de capital humano que lhes permita depois dar resposta ao seu próprio desenvolvimento.

Para o combater é fundamental uma boa articulação de políticas. Por isso, indo ao ponto – e eu sei que também é extremamente sensível nesta matéria –, pergunto, em concreto, como é que a Comissão pode, por exemplo, melhorar e simplificar as abordagens multifundos para que haja uma articulação ainda mais eficaz entre as políticas, sendo que este é um dos pontos mais frequentemente destacados por todos os *stakeholders* que trabalham em concreto com o mundo rural?

Elisa Ferreira, *Comissária*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Deputada Isabel Carvalhais, de facto, o ponto que está a colocar é um ponto muito importante. No fundo, está a falar da sinergia entre os vários fundos para cumprir um determinado objetivo.

Neste momento, vários países estão a tentar fazer exatamente isso, através de uma imagem, um figurino a que chamamos «*integrated territorial instruments* (ITI)», portanto, «instrumentos de integração territorial», que procuram subir um pouco a escala a partir do nível mais baixo que, normalmente, na maior parte dos países, é o município, e tentar estabelecer um plano, uma visão e, a partir dessa visão, conseguir convergir na gestão dos vários fundos.

O modo como são geridos os fundos permite uma margem razoável e as unidades de gestão, que é uma opção de cada um dos países, e os países que conseguem concentrar e articular melhor a gestão em torno de uma visão para aquele território – a visão, em si, é essencial –, acabam por ter alguns sucessos e conseguir sinergias, que são aquilo que nós tentamos encontrar.

Relativamente às tendências que temos de defrontar, é evidente que há uma grande onda que é a tendência para a Europa envelhecer, a Europa perder população, mas a verdade também é que esta tendência é diferentemente sentida nas diferentes regiões e nos diferentes espaços e, portanto, os indicadores que começou por mencionar são confirmados também pela Comissão.

Em 2020, nós temos uma em cada três residentes nas regiões perde população, e este valor, em 2040, será uma em cada duas e, portanto, metade da população viverá em regiões que têm perdas substanciais de população como modo e é isso que nós temos de tentar limitar.

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, apenas gostaria de agradecer à Senhora Comissária a sua resposta e julgo que ela vem confirmar – se me permite a interpretação livre –, a importância de, num próximo programa de financiamento da União Europeia, termos efetivamente lugar a uma estratégia para o mundo rural, acompanhada, obviamente, de estratégias nacionais e regionais.

Isto porque é muito útil, efetivamente, esta ideia que aqui transmite e que nós sabemos que está a funcionar do *integrated territorial instruments*. Mas, depois, é importante assegurar ou acautelar que, de facto, a visão daquilo que é o rural e, inclusivamente, até mesmo a definição funcional da área rural não seja perdida. Julgo que aí a estratégia para o mundo rural será extremamente importante.

Elisa Ferreira, *Comissária*. – Senhor Presidente, só aproveitava esta oportunidade para agradecer o envolvimento de todos os senhores deputados neste objetivo, porque só assim é que ele pode ser assumido politicamente pelos diferentes Estados-Membros, como um objetivo de desenvolvimento e não de mero crescimento económico.

Penso que também a definição das responsabilidades das cidades, grandes cidades e pequenos polos ou cidades intermédias em relação à área envolvente é algo que precisa de mais atenção, porque os sistemas funcionam ancorados em centros com maior ou menor dimensão, mas temos de ter esta visão estratégica de quais são as funções que cada um destes centros pode exercer, sobretudo quando nós temos também a noção de que o envelhecimento gera necessidades especiais para as populações que ainda resistem nesses territórios.

Essas necessidades têm de estar associadas também àquilo que nós chamamos o *digital divide*, por exemplo, porque, quando ancoramos todos os serviços, inclusive serviços públicos, em redes digitais, há que criar as condições para que ninguém fique excluído do seu acesso. E, muitas vezes, as populações envelhecidas ou as populações de zonas rurais não têm essa capacidade, essa facilidade e essa flexibilidade de utilizar as potencialidades dos meios digitais. Isto pode acontecer, por exemplo, em serviços de saúde ou em serviços para a entrega das pensões.

Portanto, é preciso pensar o detalhe do modo como essas populações são retidas e como podem aceder a serviços essenciais, como seja a renovação de um cartão de identificação pessoal, o acesso a serviços de saúde, os serviços de segurança social ou até serviços de acompanhamento de prazo longo, no caso de perda de faculdades físicas, motoras ou psicológicas. Portanto, há que trabalhar o detalhe desses territórios de uma forma muito cuidada.

Piernicola Pedicini (Verts/ALE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, io porto la voce del Mezzogiorno d'Italia, la voce di un territorio che ancora oggi risulta più popoloso della Grecia, più popoloso della Svezia. È un territorio, però, che fa registrare il maggior ritmo vertiginoso di spopolamento negli ultimi anni e non ha uguali questo ritmo in nessun altro paese dell'Unione europea.

Però noi sappiamo che lo spopolamento si concentra dove c'è la povertà. Nonostante anni di politica di coesione, il divario tra Sud Italia e resto d'Europa aumenta ogni anno di più. Allora ci dobbiamo chiedere perché nel Sud Italia la politica di coesione non sta funzionando. Il punto è che non serve destinare sempre più risorse europee nelle aree disagiate, se poi lo Stato membro è libero di annullare la spesa ordinaria in quegli stessi territori.

In Italia da anni si spostano le risorse ordinarie dalla parte povera del paese alla parte ricca del paese, vanificando ogni possibile obiettivo di coesione. E allora lo spopolamento risulta solo una conseguenza della mancanza di controlli da parte dell'Unione europea su uno Stato che agisce in maniera iniqua come avviene per l'Italia.

Le chiedo: la Commissione europea sta intervenendo? Può intervenire? Può controllare? Perché è su questo che dobbiamo riflettere ed è su questo che dobbiamo intervenire.

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you for your question, Honourable Pedicini. Everybody that cares about regional development has been working and trying to address the issue of the Mezzogiorno in Italy. And in fact also Italians and the Italian Government have been attentive to it, so attentive that there was a minister for the Mezzogiorno. And I had the chance to speak both with the previous minister, Giuseppe Provenzano, and after I had long discussions with the minister Mara Carfagna.

And this is the big question – how to address the issue of the Mezzogiorno. It has been the object also of a lot of research, of a lot of debates, discussions since the old times of the *Cassa per il Mezzogiorno*, and everything, and cathedrals in the desert. So we tried a lot of things.

In this discussion with these ministers – yes, it's an European problem, but also an Italian problem – we have focused a lot on the reform of public administration, because we think that the quality of institutions can help.

And answering directly your question, the accountability, the choice of projects, how you manage, and of course, there are funds, there is this Just Transition Fund, but trying to improve the mechanisms by which the funds are managed, it seems to us that it is absolutely crucial. And this was also one of the aspects of the diagnosis from the Italian Government.

So we are supporting, through DG REFORM we are giving a lot of support, and very interested in improving the institutional framework on which the funds are managed to improve transparency and accountability, as well as better choices for the use of funds.

Piernicola Pedicini (Verts/ALE). – Grazie Commissaria, io però le vorrei dire che intanto il nuovo governo ha già annullato il Ministero del Sud, non esisterà più, e questo la dice lunga su quello che avverrà nei prossimi mesi.

Ma a questo vorrei aggiungere anche una questione: da anni la versione dei governi che viene riportata in Commissione, che viene riportata in Europa non corrisponde alla realtà. Perciò io la invito ad andare oltre a quello che dicono e quello che rendicontano gli Stati membri, perché lo Stato membro, come l'Italia, è il principale responsabile di questa situazione. Perciò andate al di là di quello che vi dicono.

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – I think, in fact, I take good note of your alert. Of course, cohesion funding is, by itself, more heavily supportive of the regions that need more support. Of course, as a constraint also or a characteristic of cohesion policy, it is managed in partnership with the Member State and we have got to accept the democratic choices of European citizens. In fact, I have not yet met the ministers in charge from the new government. So let's see what happens.

But of course, from our side, the rules, the principles and the requirements on which we manage the European taxpayers' money are quite rigid, they are quite demanding, and in fact, we will abide by the rule of law on which the funds are managed. So thank you very much for your alert, we'll see how things evolve.

But of course for Europe, the development or the getting out of this kind of trap from the Mezzogiorno is essential; not only for Europe, but also for Italy, because – I mean, that's what I've mentioned before – having a big part of the country in demographic terms, and in economic terms, and in geography terms that really doesn't grow, doesn't develop, is in itself a problem.

So of course, we are very attentive to this stimulus that we need to introduce and are trying to solve the bottlenecks that may still be hampering the development of an important part of Europe. Thank you very much for your alert.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowna Pani Komisarz! Czy nie uważa Pani, że należy zmienić paradygmat myślenia w kwestii związanej z wyludnianiem się regionów ? Czy takiej zmiany potrzeby nie dostrzega Komisja Europejska, ponieważ mówimy tutaj bardzo dużo o tym, jak zatrzymać wyludnianie się regionów. Natomiast moim zdaniem dzisiaj ogromnym problemem jest to, że duża część regionów w Unii Europejskiej właściwie już się wyludniła. Tam nie ma ludzi. I uważam, że powinniśmy zacząć zupełnie inaczej myśleć, stworzyć programy i możliwości, zachęty do tego, żeby ludzie chcieli tam wrócić, bo nastąpił ogromny drenaż młodych ludzi, mózgów z terenów wiejskich, z tych terenów, które się wyludniają, i oprócz tego, co robimy po to, aby ci ludzie tam zostali, trzeba się zastanowić, w jaki sposób zachęcić wielu innych, żeby wrócili, albo w ogóle żeby chcieli zamieszkać na tych wyludnionych terenach.

I drugie pytanie. Pani Komisarz już o tym mówiła. Na tych wyludnionych terenach przede wszystkim zostali starsi ludzie, seniorzy. Czy nie uważa Pani, że powinniśmy stworzyć specjalny program, specjalną linię finansowania, by stworzyć przyjazne środowisko dla tych starszych ludzi, nie tylko w kwestiach kompetencji cyfrowych, ale dostępności komunikacyjnej, dostępności służby zdrowia, wszystkich tych obszarów, które z punktu widzenia seniorów są niezwykle istotne.

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – You talk about a paradigm shift. I think it is a problem of renewal of the political interest in relation to what is happening in those areas, that I would really subscribe.

And you mentioned how you can attract young people to these areas or stop the brain drain. I think the movement of people is something that we really want to respect, but we want people to move because they decide to move, not because they are forced to move because they cannot find jobs in the areas where they were born and where they got the skills.

So for this, we need really to think about how the other policies impact the different areas in a country. So when you decide where you locate, for instance a university, where you locate a technological centre, this is an element, a fundamental element of attraction, of competence, of know-how. Of course, you cannot locate it just from a purely voluntary kind of perspective in an empty area, in the middle of a mountain, you cannot artificially create this kind of infrastructure.

But probably you can spot across the territory where there is still sufficient capacity to anchor these kind of initiatives, these kind of projects, and make sure that when you define your horizontal policies that you locate in those areas the critical elements that can create this kind of environment on which a young person, a young couple can raise a family, can locate, can find a job, and can have a better life.

So I think it is this strategy that we can just incorporate in the normal partnership agreements. It depends also on the will of Member States to implement it or not. But we are trying really to work with them in order to deliver it in that sense.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Dzisiejsza debata jest w formie pytań, więc czy mógłbym w związku z powyższym poprosić i liczyć na to, że uprzejmie Komisja Europejska, mimo wszystko, zastanowi się w jaki sposób jednak przekierować swoje myślenie na to, aby te wszystkie polityki, które realizujemy na rzecz regionów wyludnionych, realizować w ten sposób, mimo wszystko, aby tych ludzi przyciągać do nich, a nie tylko ich zatrzymywać?

Taki mój uprzejmy apel w formie pytania.

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Well in fact you touched upon something that I mentioned, I think in my first answer – how to change the mindset. And that is I think the crucial question, because in fact the mindset is the core of the question. And when I mentioned the number of Member States that really – because they are eager to compete internationally, they concentrate everything in the most developed pole. And now we see that the hyper-concentration of population in those areas kind of limits the capacity of these areas, these developed areas, to jump into innovation, new technologies, more sophisticated areas of value-added, because they are still faced with combating the pockets of poverty in the inner cities, the agglomerations around them and the traffic that this generates, addressing the pollution that it creates and the terrible quality of life of the people that really were kind of pushed out of their natural areas and that concentrate, creating all sorts of problems in security terms, poverty, disenchantment and often even political problems.

So in fact, the mindset – but this is something, and that's why I thank colleagues, because I think Members of Parliament, politicians, have this capacity to put in the agenda the right topics for the right discussions. And having this discussion here today is in itself something I value very much because this helps to change the mindset and to understand that it is for the good of a country or for the good of Europe not to create a lot of imbalances internally, internally to Europe, but also internally to the Member States.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D). – Señora comisaria, la despoblación es un tema de vital importancia. Genera pobreza y sufrimiento y pone en riesgo multitud de tradiciones y formas de vida en las zonas rurales de toda la Unión Europea.

La política de cohesión, además de equilibrio entre regiones, ofrece una oportunidad para luchar contra este fenómeno con herramientas como la Estrategia contra la Despoblación.

Se trata de un problema muy complejo que debemos abordar desde distintas áreas.

Disponer de buenas comunicaciones y telecomunicaciones entre zonas rurales y urbanas es fundamental para fijar poblaciones al territorio y para generar empleo. Las infraestructuras son necesarias para ello.

La movilidad también es un tema clave. Yo celebro el trabajo que la Comisión Europea ha hecho sobre el nuevo Marco de Movilidad Urbana Sostenible, pero me gustaría que ampliásemos el foco no solo a las zonas urbanas, sino también a las zonas rurales.

En ese sentido, quiera plantear varias preguntas; ¿estamos repensando la nueva política de cohesión?

¿Qué acciones tiene intención de desarrollar la Comisión para aplicar la Estrategia contra la Despoblación en los nuevos programas financieros de la política de cohesión?

Y, para terminar, ¿qué medidas tiene intención de adoptar la Comisión para que el trabajo en materia de movilidad urbana sostenible pueda contribuir también a la lucha contra la despoblación en la Unión Europea?

Elisa Ferreira, *miembro de la Comisión*. – Señoría, estoy completamente de acuerdo con lo que ha dicho sobre el equilibrio entre regiones, el papel de las comunicaciones y, en particular, de la sostenibilidad, y de la movilidad en las zonas urbanas, no solamente en las grandes metrópolis, sino también en los pequeños centros.

Es cierto que la política de cohesión actual financia medios de comunicación sostenibles, en términos de impacto climático, y que esto puede simplificar el funcionamiento de los núcleos urbanos más pequeños.

También hay un problema de sostenibilidad financiera que, en ocasiones, supone un impedimento para que puedan introducirse medios de comunicación más modernos y más sostenibles a nivel de las zonas rurales muy pequeñas. Por tanto, hay que trabajar no solamente en el ámbito de las infraestructuras, en términos de opción tecnológica, sino también en cómo articular un sistema que sea sostenible en cuanto a financiación para las pequeñas poblaciones, los pequeños núcleos.

Pero creo que por eso es importante que haya un fondo, como los fondos FEDER, que pueda garantizar que la inversión primaria sea una inversión cofinanciada —y cofinanciada de una forma bastante interesante— que disminuya la necesidad de que haya una sostenibilidad financiera, lo que sería un problema grave para muchos de los pequeños pueblos o pequeñas ciudades.

Rosanna Conte (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissaria Ferreira, il fenomeno dello spopolamento sta portando aree remote e montane ad attrarre e trattenere sempre meno popolazione. Questo perché fino ad oggi queste zone non hanno avuto il supporto necessario e gli strumenti giusti per prevenire questa fuga. È chiaro che se la popolazione e soprattutto i giovani non hanno accesso a servizi, occupazione e infrastrutture, perdono l'interesse a vivere nelle zone rurali e montane.

Per non parlare di altri problemi che diventano al contempo causa e conseguenza dello spopolamento. Ad esempio, la ricomparsa di animali selvatici nei centri abitati, come la presenza sempre più frequente di lupi nel Nord Italia, che ha impatti negativi non solo su allevamenti e aziende agricole, ma anche sulle famiglie locali e sulla popolazione potenziale, ovvero i turisti sempre più scoraggiati e impauriti.

Alla luce di questi episodi e della risoluzione del Parlamento sull'evoluzione demografica, le chiedo: gli Stati membri stanno già adottando misure della nuova politica di coesione per contrastare il fenomeno dello spopolamento? Ci sono stati progressi rispetto alla vecchia programmazione? Allo stato attuale, ritiene che il coinvolgimento delle autorità locali sia ad un livello soddisfacente?

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for your question. I think that if I correctly understand you, you describe the problem in the mountainous areas, rural areas, but then you say, OK, have local municipalities been sufficiently involved?

The organisation of the administrative structure of the management of funds varies from country to country, and the Commission cannot really interfere directly in how countries are organised. Some countries have a regional level, some countries do not have the regional level, and some countries have the municipality or the parish as the most adequate entity to manage the funds.

So the principle of cohesion is that in fact you have got to respect the internal organisation of each Member State, but local entities, regional entities and other entities, according to the partnership principle and stakeholders, have got to be involved. So how you decide, what you decide to implement depends on the internal organisation of each Member State. But in fact it has got to define a vision that takes a bottom-up approach to be combined with the top-down approach so that the funds, the instruments, can converge for the development of the local entities. And of course the local entities must be involved. The level of this involvement varies, as I mentioned, according to the degree of decentralisation that each country adopts. So that's all in relation to your question.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovana povjerenice, prilikom međunarodnog priznanja Republike Hrvatske Njemačka se pokazala ne samo kao partnerska, već i prijateljska zemlja Hrvatskoj.

Međutim, u proteklih deset godina Republika Hrvatska poklonila je Njemačkoj 18 milijardi eura. Naime, toliko je Hrvatska potrošila na edukaciju mladih ljudi koji su uglavnom odmah poslije diplome otišli u Njemačku i sada tamo doprinose razvoju njemačkog gospodarstva, a ne hrvatskog gospodarstva.

Kojim instrumentima kohezijske politike možete kompenzirati taj veliki trošak Republike Hrvatske kako sloboda kretanja unutar Europske unije ne bi bila na veliku korist isključivo jednim državama, a na veliku štetu drugima?

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for your question. In fact, the freedom of movement of people is something that we really want to keep in Europe. It is essential for Europe. The solution that I think can be the answer to your question is to define a development strategy.

I just came from Croatia last week to sign exactly the partnership agreement with Croatia for 2027, and I see within this partnership agreement the elements that can really foster the creation of new areas of research, of innovation, poles of development, not only in the capital of Croatia, but also in other areas – and I visited other areas. In fact, if the opportunities are there, people, young people, qualified people will come back, and you can even end up by attracting young people from other countries that may opt to live in Croatia because the quality of life in Croatia is probably much better than in the countries of origin.

So this movement of people going back and forth is part of Europe, and I think we should not restrict it because that would be a big, big loss. But we have to create conditions for people moving, willing to move into Croatia rather than willing to move into Germany or any other country. To create these conditions you have got to organise, together with all stakeholders in Croatia, the strategies that create the opportunities for these people to be there, to work there and to raise their families there. The way we are going in Croatia goes in that direction, with growth, with joining the euro, with Schengen. So I think in fact there is a good prospect for Croatia in that sense. As I told you, we just finished the partnership agreement signature last week.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsednik! Hvala za priložnost. Spoštovana gospa komisarka! Da mladi ostanejo na podeželju, potrebujemo kvalitetno infrastrukturo, vključno s sodobno širokopasovno povezavo, in pa delovna mesta. In vse to skupaj smo tudi zaokrožili v konceptu pametnih vasi, v katerem želimo ustvariti pogoje za poseljeno podeželje.

V sklopu tega je kmetijstvo, mobilnost na podeželju, turizem, energetika, skrb za starejše na podeželju, e-zdravje. Zato je tudi iz teh številnih dejavnosti jasno, da potrebujemo tudi različne fonde financiranja. Mi imamo „Leader“, v katerem je pet procentov programa razvoja podeželja, ko pa že za ta program poskušamo pridobiti sredstva iz regionalnega sklada, so na nacionalni ravni težave, se ne odločijo države, niti iz socialnega sklada.

Predlagam, da imamo v naslednji finančni perspektivi poseben sklad, podobno kot imamo za urbana središča, tudi za ruralna območja, v katerem bomo zložili sredstva iz različnih skladov in tudi zagotovili to sinergijo delovanja različnih politik na podeželju.

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for your question.

If I understand you correctly, you are suggesting a separate allocation of funds just for rural areas. I think you have rural areas that are quite rich, that benefit from agricultural policy, for instance, and you have rural areas that are extremely poor; you have mountainous areas; you have peripheral areas; you have areas going under transition; you have areas that are just outermost regions.

So, the different problems that we are facing across Europe, they all deserve a special approach. I don't think the special approach depends on creating allocations of funds. It depends, basically, on fulfilling the principle of the European Union. And in fact, all the rural areas, all the underdeveloped areas, they have per capita support from European funding that is much higher than the per capita financing that is associated with the more developed areas.

Apart from this, I think it is the quality of the instruments, the quality of the vision and policies that each country, each region proposes for each sub-area that can really help these areas to progress. If we segment all the funds into these different kinds of issues that we have to address, I don't think we can really expect to have more simplicity, more linear access to the funds, and we want to simplify it.

So, accepting diversity is in itself part of the policy and adjusting the instruments to the diversity of the areas, I think that is more adequate, but of course it's something to be discussed.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiama Komisijos nare, tikrai palaikau Jūsų pastangas ir darbus saugant mūsų gyventojus visoje Europos Sąjungoje. Ir sutinku su Jumis, kad ES valstybės narės turi daug atsakomybės šioje srityje. Bet yra dalykų, kurių valstybės narės negali padaryti, ir tai yra mūsų, Europos Sąjungos institucijų, atsakomybė. Turiu galvoje bendrą žemės ūkio politiką ir tiesiogines išmokas žemdirbiams. Stojant į Europos Sąjungą visiems buvo pažadėta vidutinės lygios išmokos už tą patį žemės plotą. Tačiau šiandien tiek Rumunijos, tiek Portugalijos, tiek mano šalies, Lietuvos, žemdirbiai gauna žymiai mažesnes tiesiogines išmokas ir tai labai atbaido, ypač jaunus ūkininkus, nuo pasilikimo kaime. Ar Jūs sutiktumėte paremti Jūsų kolegos Komisijos nario J. Wojciechowskio pažadą, kad reikia išlyginti tas tiesiogines išmokas ir sudaryti vienodas sąlygas visiems, dirbantiems žemės ūkyje bet kurioje Europos Sąjungos valstybėje?

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you, Mr President, and thank you very much for your question.

I will not discuss the content of the agricultural policy because my colleague Mr Wojciechowski will come if you wish, or you can have him with much more knowledge to discuss the details of the policy. What I would like to underline from your intervention is this call that I already mentioned in a previous answer and that I would like to reinforce here: we have got to be aware of and attentive to the impact that the different horizontal policies in Europe have on the different regions of Europe and different Member States of Europe.

This is valid for the European approach, but it is also valid for each Member State. When you have the smart specialisation strategy, when you define where you locate your universities, when you decide which roads or railways to build, when you decide the most neutral policy, the different realities on which the different policies intervene creates different dynamics in the different spaces.

Being aware of this regional impact of the sectoral policies, and even more, being aware with a strong instrument like the recovery and resilience plans, what the regional impact of each of these plans is, is in itself something to which I would like to call your attention because we cannot have contradictory instruments if we really want to converge to a more balanced and more equilibrium in the growth inside a country or inside Europe. That's why I thank you for having stressed this issue, because, in fact, it requires attention.

Susana Solís Pérez (Renew). – Señora comisaria, la despoblación es un problema que afecta a toda Europa, pero especialmente a países como España, donde tres de cada cuatro municipios pierden habitantes. Y me refiero no solo a municipios rurales pequeños, sino también incluso a las ciudades medianas.

Por eso era para mí tan importante que se recogiese la definición de zona despoblada en el Reglamento de los Fondos FEDER, porque eso permite que estas zonas tengan un plan de acción integral con el que revitalizarlas y atraer empleo.

Y para crear empleo es fundamental una de las medidas que ahora admite la Comisión y que consiste en permitir una fiscalidad diferenciada, beneficios fiscales a las empresas que estén establecidas en estas zonas. Y estoy hablando, por ejemplo, de bonificaciones a los trabajadores. Sin embargo, vemos que los Estados miembros no están utilizando esta medida. En el caso de España llevamos diez meses esperando y me gustaría conocer su opinión.

Y mi segunda pregunta se refiere al Fondo de Transición Justa, que es importantísimo para evitar la despoblación. También vemos que algunos Estados miembros aún no han presentado su plan de transición justa. Ahora corremos el peligro de perder una anualidad. También me gustaría saber si esto es así, si podemos perder una anualidad de estos fondos y qué tenemos que hacer al respecto.

Elisa Ferreira, *miembro de la Comisión*. – Señoría, muchas gracias por su pregunta. Sin duda, la definición de «zona despoblada» es un valor añadido que ustedes han introducido en la legislación.

La fiscalidad diferenciada es algo que, en el marco de la competencia en Europa, es posible en el caso de las zonas económicamente más frágiles de Europa.

Nosotros lo sabemos, pero sabemos también que se puede utilizar (y que se utiliza) no solo la fiscalidad, así como que es necesario hacer una diferenciación en materia de apoyo a la producción, a las pequeñas y medianas empresas mediante los sistemas introducidos por los Estados miembros, en particular, el apoyo al desarrollo de pequeñas instituciones económicas.

También es muy importante utilizar de la forma más eficaz posible el Fondo Social Europeo en combinación con el FEDER.

Sobre el Fondo de Transición Justa: estamos trabajando muy intensamente con todos los Estados miembros. Hay diferencias muy grandes entre unos y otros. Algunos, cuatro en particular, han finalizado los planes, que están plenamente en marcha. Otros tienen más dificultades para definir cómo hacer la transición y estamos trabajando en ello. Algunos cuentan con una línea presupuestaria autónoma para el Fondo de Transición Justa. Otros lo han integrado en el Plan de Desarrollo Regional.

Estamos trabajando muy intensamente con los Estados miembros para que los fondos asociados al Fondo no se pierdan.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, nonostante gli sforzi attuati dall'Unione europea con la politica di coesione, nell'arco degli ultimi otto anni il Mezzogiorno d'Italia ha subito un calo demografico senza pari nell'ambito dell'Unione europea. In particolare, le regioni come il Molise, la Calabria e la Basilicata hanno perso centinaia di migliaia di cittadini residenti.

Sappiamo come la politica di coesione rivesta un ruolo decisivo nell'affrontare sfide demografiche di tale portata e le chiedo pertanto se non ritenga necessario rivedere le strategie elaborate per le aree rurali e periferiche, prevedendo delle opportunità di finanziamento più specifiche, in modo da rafforzare l'occupazione giovanile, l'imprenditorialità, la digitalizzazione, l'accesso alla sanità e ai servizi pubblici.

Le chiedo poi in che modo la Commissione europea intenda tutelare l'attuazione delle strategie nazionali e regionali per le aree interne nel periodo di programmazione 2021-2027 attraverso un uso efficiente delle risorse europee, considerando che, ad esempio, nella mia regione, la Calabria, il finanziamento di alcune strategie territoriali per le aree interne è stato cancellato dal programma a causa dei ritardi nell'avvio di tali strategie.

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for your question. Part of the question on Mezzogiorno I already answered when another MEP from Italy asked about it.

I think the development problem in the present circumstances doesn't depend on ring fencing money. The problem is not lack of money. I'm sorry to say it, but in particular in the case of Italy, if you add together the Recovery and Resilience Plan and the 2021-2027 multiannual cohesion funding, the amounts are in fact quite robust, quite substantial, and you can even add to it what remains to be executed from 2014-2020. And you also have the Just Transition Fund exactly for certain areas in the South.

So I think more than allocating or ring fencing funds to tackle these issues. The crucial issue is to understand what is blocking the development and to address the elements that need to be tackled for that purpose, in particular, to address the instruments that you want to use, how you want to use the money and this plan. I saw it with the Minister Giuseppe Provenzano, with Minister Mara Carfagna, you know, we'll see, I mean, I didn't have a meeting yet with the new minister, but the crucial thing is to have a vision, to know what you want to reach, how we are going to tackle it. We are supporting also Italy and Mezzogiorno with the Just Transition Fund. We are supporting Italy also with the public administration requalification. So let's hope for the best, but the money is there, for sure.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, é essencial que não se perca nem um cêntimo da Política de Coesão 2014-2020 e que se acelere a Política de Coesão de 2021 a 2027. Em Portugal, o Portugal 20-30 corre o risco de, em 2022, não ter um único euro utilizado.

Para além disso, é muito importante ter uma atenção especial aos programas operacionais regionais. Pergunto à Senhora Comissária se tem a informação de que, no caso de Portugal, os programas operacionais regionais, da forma que estão a ser desenhados, vão dificultar ou até impedir os municípios com menos população de acederem a todos os eixos e aos montantes dos programas operacionais regionais? É que, se assim for, vai haver é mais despovoamento, vai haver é mais desertificação.

E pergunto se a Senhora Comissária tem esta indicação e como é que vai atuar? Porque eu sei que não é essa a forma com que pretende que a política de coesão seja executada. E mesmo para terminar, a articulação é essencial, como é que se vai fazer a articulação entre o FEADER e também os programas da política de coesão e os programas operacionais regionais?

Elisa Ferreira, *Comissária*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Deputado, concordo que é importante que não se perca nenhum dinheiro de 2014-2020. Não me parece que, no caso de Portugal, esse risco seja materializável. Para 21-27, também o acordo com Portugal já foi assinado, já é um país que tem um ritmo absolutamente normal ou acima da média em termos de execução.

Relativamente à estrutura do programa que foi aprovado, tanto quanto a Comissão se apercebeu, esse risco que aponta não parece evidente, inclusivamente porque há uma preocupação de criar subespaços e reservar para aquilo que se chama e que eu já referi, os ITI, portanto, «intervenções territoriais integradas». Foi essa a perspetiva que o governo nos apresentou e, com base precisamente na convicção de que o resultado vai ser positivo, foi aprovado o acordo de partenariado e assinado.

É evidente que o momento em que se assina o acordo de partenariado não é o fim de nada, é o princípio da execução e estamos convencidos, com Portugal assim como com todos os outros países, de que aquilo que os países propõem vai ser executado e da melhor forma possível.

Portanto, neste momento em que estamos a lançar os programas todos e já assinamos acordos de partenariado, penso que, neste momento, com 22 países ou mais, temos todos a expectativa de que os grandes problemas europeus e os grandes problemas que cada país enfrente sejam devidamente tratados, porque os meios estão disponíveis e as propostas que nos foram apresentadas são corretas e razoáveis.

Isabel García Muñoz (S&D). – Señora comisaria, ya lo hemos hablado en otras ocasiones; el reto demográfico de la despoblación es un reto democrático que merece la cooperación de todas las instituciones a todos los niveles y, por supuesto, a escala europea.

Usted ha hecho referencia a las estrategias a escala nacional y regional. Pues bien, mi región, Aragón, ha sido pionera al aprobar una Ley de Dinamización del Medio Rural que recoge políticas activas similares a las que proponía la Comisión en la Comunicación para una visión a largo plazo para las zonas rurales de la Unión; medidas dinamizadoras que pretenden luchar contra el desfallecimiento del entorno rural; iniciativas para aumentar el número de empresas y servicios en territorios demográficamente disminuidos; y también otros instrumentos, como la descentralización administrativa o la elaboración de un programa de gestión territorial de dinamización económica que promueva la cultura emprendedora, así como una de las novedades principales, que también habíamos pedido aquí, desde el Parlamento; la aplicación del principio de la verificación rural para evaluar la repercusión de las principales normativas sobre las zonas rurales.

Además de esas acciones a que usted hacía mención, a escala regional o nacional, por separado, mi pregunta es la siguiente: ¿se plantea una estrategia europea común para la lucha contra la despoblación con medidas vinculantes, y, en esa estrategia, incorporar la aplicación del principio de la verificación rural a los Fondos Estructurales?

Elisa Ferreira, *miembro de la Comisión*. – Señoría, muchas gracias por la pregunta y los ejemplos que nos ha transmitido.

Me gustaría subrayar la importancia de compartir buenas experiencias. Las experiencias que usted acaba de señalar me parecen muy interesantes, porque nosotros podemos, y debemos, compartir instrumentos de desarrollo que materialicen los objetivos que queremos conseguir. Por ello, me parece muy interesante lo que usted ha planteado.

Asimismo, cuando habla de principio de verificación rural, creo que es muy importante para comprender los impactos de todas las políticas no solamente en las zonas rurales, sino en todas las situaciones que encontramos en los distintos países. Hay regiones de carácter rural que sufren de despoblación; otras, son de montaña; otras son regiones periféricas; otras, ultraperiféricas; otras son regiones industriales en mutación; otras regiones adolecen de congestión demográfica. Me parece, pues, muy importante hacer una verificación de la cohesión, e incorporar en este concepto en las distintas situaciones que tenemos en Europa y dentro de cada país.

Me complace escuchar que Aragón tiene efectivamente una convergencia de políticas. Vamos a hacer un seguimiento y ver lo que podemos aprender unos de otros para no reinventar la rueda continuamente.

Muchas gracias por su intervención.

Niklas Nienaß (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I wish to thank the Commissioner, and thank you all, for this very interesting debate. I really liked the point on change of perspective – how can we bring people back to these areas? I think a lot of young families actually want to go back because I've talked to a lot of them and they say 'I would like to come back, but I don't have what I need. I don't have a kindergarten for my children a school or something like this.'

So we know what people need. They need jobs. They need infrastructure like social infrastructure, kindergarten, schools. They need mobility apart from cars, like trains, buses, etc. They need a culture and possibilities to do something. They sometimes just need a fucking pub, you know, to do something and relax a little bit.

I think this is the theory, and we now need to go to the practice. The practice means that every region is different and that we need to listen to the people and ask them, what do you need in your region? We have instruments for that, and that instrument is called CLLD. We have brought CLLD to the attention of the cohesion instruments like ESF and ERDF, but they are rarely used.

So my question to the Commission is, why are the Member States not using this tool that we offered them? Why do the Member States not include that in their policy? And the other question that I have is, how can we bring rural development together with the ERDF, together with the ESF? Because there is economy, there is a social infrastructure in rural areas and it is needed to be improved. So please use this tool also in the future cohesion policy.

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Yes, I know how engaged you are with this rural development. And I confirm that in fact there are several instruments. We are discussing LEADER. We are discussing CLLD. And this is a matter, I think, of political visibility, political will, political priority, because you said it, the instruments are there. We have the means, we have the instruments. So why Member States don't use it – I mean, some do. That's the kind of good examples that we have. We were just listening to a colleague from Aragon that says OK, we are doing the right thing. I mean, listening to each other. Maybe it's inspiring, but I think that sometimes when the instruments are managed and thought of at the central level, the bottom-up approach is too distant to be addressed.

And so the important thing also is to make sure that the chain that we have to respect of the administration in each Member State is not such that the initiatives that come from bottom up are not sufficiently taken into account and that there is enough flexibility to adapt the answers at the appropriate level. Probably what you are talking about can be operational and it can make a huge difference in creating some soft infrastructures. But probably if you need to have something else like a school or like a hospital or a technological centre, then you have got to have some listening capacity at the regional level, at the level of the lender or the level of the central government. And this capacity to react and to understand and to listen requires a lot of sophistication in the administration. So that is also part of the political will.

Vincenzo Sofo (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, solo negli ultimi dieci anni il Sud Italia ha perso quasi un milione di abitanti, quanto il Molise e la Basilicata messe insieme, e secondo le stime nei prossimi nei prossimi vent'anni ne perderà altri quattro milioni, quanto l'intera Puglia. Uno spopolamento che, lo sappiamo, è dovuto a povertà, mancanza di lavoro e servizi che hanno causato immigrazione e un crollo delle nascite del 40 % negli ultimi vent'anni.

Ora non credo e credo che non sia accettabile che la risposta a tutto questo sia quello che la sinistra chiama il cosiddetto modello Riace, che è stato per esempio applicato da Mimmo Lucano in Calabria, cioè compensare queste uscite con l'ingresso di masse di immigrati disperati che arrivano da altre zone con problemi ancora più grandi.

Quello che serve, invece, è un grande piano di sviluppo che porti strade, treni, aeroporti, ospedali, scuole, incentivi agli investimenti, all'impresa, al lavoro, alla famiglia e anche alla vita, a proposito di nascite, e tutto ciò che serve a garantire al Sud Italia quello che viene garantito in altre parti d'Europa.

Il punto è, ed è questa la mia domanda, come mai però la Commissione europea, così tanto attenta alla coesione, non abbia sorvegliato, in fase di definizione del PNRR da parte del governo Draghi, affinché ci fosse quest'attenzione nella destinazione delle risorse per il Sud Italia, cosa che sappiamo tutti non è avvenuta.

Elisa Ferreira, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, thank you very much. I think, as I mentioned before, the problem in southern Italy is not a lack of funding. It's probably a process of an historical nature. It's up to you to tell me what doesn't work in southern Italy or what has not worked, because in fact, since very early in cohesion policy, we had this concern with southern Italy, since the origin of cohesion policy in Europe. You had the *Cassa per il Mezzogiorno*, you had what then ended up being called cathedrals in the desert and now you have all this financial capacity that is offered for the development of southern Italy, including the Just Transition Fund as well.

I think the issue that we have to address there is to ask you to ask the people that live in the Mezzogiorno, what is the essence, what is the solution, in order to trigger the development that is possible from a financial kind of availability of funds?

So funds are there, Italy has a strong recovery and resilience plan, it has very strong financing for 21 to 27, so it's not lack of funding. What matters now is to understand what is not working and how we can reverse this spiral or this situation of being stuck in a level of development that is not sufficient to bring in young people, the young generation and to turn the wheel in the other sense.

In fact, I have a lot of hope that with all the work that has been done in previous governments, of preparation and all that, that there is a vision for southern Italy and that we end up solving forever the development problem of the Mezzogiorno. That's my wish. And *grazie mille* for your question.

Der Präsident. – Die Fragestunde ist geschlossen.

12. Návrh Komise na opatření podle nařízení o podmíněnosti dodržováním zásad právního státu v případě Maďarska (rozprava)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu dem Vorschlag der Kommission für Maßnahmen im Rahmen der Konditionalitätsverordnung im Falle von Ungarn (2022/2853(RSP)).

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for giving me the floor in this debate to discuss with you a very topical issue that is essential for the functioning of our Union.

The Council welcomes the framework established by the regulation on a general regime of conditionality for the protection of the Union budget, as there is a clear link between respect for the rule of law and the efficient implementation of the EU budget in accordance with the principles of sound financial management. We are of course satisfied that such regulation saw the light in 2020 with the work of the co-legislators and the strong support of the European Parliament.

It is in the context of the Conditionality Regulation that the Council has received a proposal from the Commission on measures for the protection of the Union budget in Hungary. I can inform you that the Council's preparatory bodies are currently examining the proposal in detail, both on process and on substance. Apart from discussions at technical level, the EU ambassadors will discuss tomorrow the proposal for a second time. All elements are being thoroughly considered by Member States, including the remedial measures proposed by Hungary. You are well aware of the political sensitivity of the file. Moreover, the fact that this is the first time that the mechanism foreseen in the Conditionality Regulation is put in motion requires Member States to treat this dossier in an even more careful manner.

Allow me to indicate a very important point: the role of the Commission in this process is crucial. We trust the Commission's role as guardian of the Treaties. The Council counts on the Commission's exhaustive assessment of the situation to take a sound and well-informed decision. So it is in this spirit that we work closely with the Commission, but also with the Member State involved to make a decision that is the best for the EU budget and for European citizens.

As you know, the time frame provided by the Conditionality Regulation is very strict. The Council will respect all deadlines foreseen in the regulation and act very swiftly. Therefore I can assure you that the Council is and stays fully committed to playing its role in protecting the EU budget as foreseen in the Conditionality Regulation.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear Minister, honourable Members, first I would like to thank you again for your commitment in the constructive dialogue on the enforcement of the Conditionality Regulation. The Parliament was always a very tough and vocal supporter.

As you all know, we have a whole toolbox of instruments with different methodologies to protect the Union budget. Within this toolbox, the Conditionality Regulation aims at protecting the Union budget when breaches of the principles of rule of law affect or risk affecting the Union's financial interests. Other instruments in the rule-of-law toolbox are dedicated to breaches of the rule of law per se.

As President von der Leyen also confirmed in the State of the Union address, the Commission will use the conditionality mechanism whenever the conditions are fulfilled. As you are aware, at the moment there is one ongoing case. On 18 September, the Commission adopted the very first proposal for a Council implementing decision under the Conditionality Regulation. It proposed measures to the Council for the protection of the Union budget against breaches of the principles of the rule of law in Hungary. This procedure started when the Commission notified Hungary on 27 April about its concerns relating to breaches of the principles of the rule of law that create a serious risk for the Union budget. To recall, these concerns are systemic irregularities and deficiencies and weaknesses in public procurement. Second, insufficiencies in addressing conflicts of interest and concerns regarding public interest funds. Further, weaknesses in the effective pursuit of investigations and prosecutions in cases involving Union funds. And finally, shortcomings in the anti-corruption framework.

Following several intermediate steps at the end of August, Hungary committed to 17 remedial measures to address the risks to the Union budget specified in the notification. This I explained and assessed in the recent Commission proposal for a Council implementing decision available to the Parliament. With these measures, Hungary has made important commitments in the right direction. I explicitly welcome this constructive engagement, I have to say, even if it arrived at a late stage in the procedure.

So some examples of the remedial measures: a new and independent integrity authority with extensive powers as regards the prevention, detection and correction of fraud, conflicts of interest, corruption and other irregularities affecting the Union's financial interests; an anti-corruption task force with strong involvement of specialised NGOs and the modification of the criminal procedure code to allow for an effective judicial review of prosecutorial decisions; further, the systematic use of the Commission's data-mining and risk-scoring tool ARACHNE, which is a comprehensive database of projects combined with public information to help identify risks related to beneficiaries, contracts or contractors; further changes to the Public Procurement Act to clarify rules applying to public interest funds; further reform of the

asset-declaration system for high-profile public officials, which means members of government but also MPs.

Our conclusion is that, taken together, the proposed remedial measures could in principle be capable of addressing the issues described in the notification. If – and I stress if – they are correctly specified in the relevant laws and rules and implemented accordingly.

Another conclusion I draw from this is that without the conditionality mechanism none of these reform measures would be in place, and without the European Parliament, the conditionality mechanism would not exist in its current form. Of course, pending Hungary's fulfilment of these criteria at this stage, the Commission considers that the risk for the budget remains – a reason for which the Commission proposed measures to the Council. Hence the Commission proposed the suspension of 65% of the commitments for three operational programmes under cohesion policy. This amounts to an estimated amount of EUR 7.5 billion, which means over a third of Hungary's cohesion envelope.

Why those three programmes? Because they will be mainly implemented through public procurement and the Commission considers that they are likely to be affected again by the breaches of the principles of the rule of law.

A second measure is the prohibition to enter into legal commitments with the so-called public interest trusts. The Council has now one month from 18 September to decide on the measures, and we have heard that probably there will be a decision tomorrow, if I was right. But they have to take the decision by qualified majority. So this period may be extended by a maximum of two additional months.

A number of key remedial measures should be implemented by 19 November 2022. And of course we will monitor these key elements very closely in the coming weeks. Hungary has committed to fully inform the Commission about the implementation of the remedial measures, but 19 November is also outlined in the timeline published in our proposal. At that point we will assess the situation again.

So rest assured that, as has been the case since the adoption of the regulation, the Commission will continue to provide you with updates on relevant developments. Our objective is again that the Union budget is no longer at risk and we hope to achieve this as soon as possible through the adequate reforms in Hungary – and not only the reforms but also, of course, more importantly, the proper implementation of these measures.

Petri Sarvamaa, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, Council, this is going to look and sound pretty dramatic because I'm just about to lose my voice. The previous time I was here at a key point in this regulation, I had so terrible neck pain that I almost collapsed. Maybe this shows you how seriously I take, as the co-rapporteur, this historic occasion.

It's been a long time coming. The Commission's work was, and is, not easy. We welcome the fact that we are now in the last stages of this particular journey with this regulation. Actually, this journey is completely defined by the regulation itself. A historic responsibility really now lies on the shoulders of the Commission and the Council.

Now, I don't think that anyone here would want to see any Member State's budget being cut by the European Union. Personally, it wouldn't give any satisfaction to me whatsoever. But we are dealing with the utmost important things that are actually the cornerstones of this Union. And the key here will be that the Commission and the Council just simply have to get it right. This doesn't mean necessarily that they have to cut the budget, but they have to get it right. I am worried, I have to say, because I do not necessarily share sometimes her optimistic view that we can then correct this if we don't succeed this time. I don't think there is any going back. We have to get it right now.

My question to you, Commissioner, is how on earth are you going to assess that the changes Hungary makes will be enough to reduce the risk to the EU budget before we actually see any implementation on the ground? So all eyes will be on our new Council and the Commission.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señor ministro, han sido muchas las veces que este Parlamento ha condenado sistemáticamente la falta de respeto al Estado de Derecho por parte del Gobierno húngaro. Y, de hecho, en el Pleno anterior adoptamos por una amplia mayoría una Resolución muy contundente a este respecto.

Pero ahora ya es el momento de pasar a la acción. Gracias al impulso de este Parlamento, contamos con el mecanismo de condicionalidad que permite adoptar medidas presupuestarias sobre un país que vulnera el Estado de Derecho de tal manera que afecta a los intereses financieros de la Unión.

Y es verdad que la Comisión podía haber sido más severa en su propuesta. Creo que no le faltan ni motivos ni pruebas para ello. Deberían haber hecho una propuesta que englobara más programas y mayores cantidades. En cualquier caso, tenemos una propuesta y no podemos esperar más. Y no podemos aceptar los compromisos que ahora sí quiere firmar el Gobierno de Orbán como garantía de que las cosas van a cambiar, porque hasta ahora no han hecho absolutamente nada. Así que el Consejo tiene que adoptar las medidas presupuestarias que propone la Comisión y congelar los 7 500 millones de euros.

Y si comprobamos que esos 17 compromisos, a los que Orbán ahora se compromete, no solo se cumplen sobre el papel, sino que además se aplican y son efectivos, entonces y solo entonces, podremos levantar las medidas.

Así que aprovechando que tenemos aquí al Consejo, le quiero pedir que tenga mucho cuidado con lo que aprueba, porque el orden de los factores, en este caso, sí que afecta al producto. Porque no es lo mismo aprobar la congelación de los fondos y revertir esa decisión, si de verdad hay avances, que cerrar el expediente porque nos creemos los compromisos y al final encontrarnos con que el Gobierno de Hungría no hace absolutamente nada.

No podemos olvidar cuál es el objetivo final de este mecanismo, porque no es sancionar a un país; el objetivo es hacer que se respete el Estado de Derecho y, hasta que esto no ocurra, el dinero europeo no puede ser desembolsado. Así que la decisión del Gobierno de Hungría es muy fácil: o Estado de Derecho o congelación de fondos. Y él tiene que tomar esa decisión.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, first of all, I note that we are having this debate with the Budget Commissioner, Commissioner Hahn, instead of President von der Leyen, despite the fact that in my view the rule of law is *Chefsache*. It is not a budget matter. I'm sorry, Commissioner, I disagree with you. This is not about protecting the budget of the European Union: it is about protecting our common values. That's what the regulation is about. I recommend that you look at the history of the regulation.

Now, we welcome the fact that the Commission proposes to freeze EUR 7 billion for Hungary. It's a good step, but it's way too small, Commissioner – I see you're very busy. They are Austrian friends. Yes. Thank you. Lovely country, Austria! – It's a good step, the EUR 7 billion, but it's far too small. And the escape clauses are already built in. And it turns out that the rule of law, after all, is negotiable for the European Commission, because we have here 17 criteria which are clearly falling short of what is needed, allowing Mr Orbán to make mere cosmetic changes. You're proposing a freeze of – not 65%, Commissioner – 15% of the money due to Hungary, let alone the 100% that should be frozen if we look at the state or the record of Viktor Orbán. So again, the rule of law is being negotiated because Mr Orbán gets extra time.

Now, can we trust the Commission to be tough in its assessment of Hungary's compliance with the already weak criteria? I'll be very honest with you, Commissioner Hahn: I am not 100% reassured if I look at the track record of this Commission and indeed that of Mr Orbán for the last 12 years. You are showing a lot of reluctance, to be honest, to apply this strictly. The Commission has been ducking the application of the regulation for two years, almost. And now that you have to apply it, you're trying to reduce the scope to the bare minimum.

For me, this is the key question. We gave you our vote of confidence in 2019. Your core duty is to uphold the Treaties and enforce the law. And if the Commission bows to kleptocrats, you no longer deserve our confidence. Please, Commissioner, prove me wrong.

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

Daniel Freund, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – *Frau Vorsitzende*, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner Hahn, almost two years ago we gave you a very powerful tool to protect the rule of law and EU money. And yet today we witness that you are dismantling this tool in front of our eyes.

Yes, a couple of weeks ago you announced that you want to suspend EUR 7.5 billion to the Orbán regime, and that sounds nice. But really what you're doing is you're breaking the most powerful tool we actually have to protect the EU's budget from the kleptocrat that is Viktor Orbán and his friends and family.

Dear colleagues, let me tell you why I fear that the Commission is actually not doing its duty. First, and the colleague has just said it, EUR 7.5 billion is only 15% of the EU funds that Hungary receives, so the lion's share goes untouched and into a corrupt system. Second, if you look at the 17 measures that Orbán now has to fulfil, it's actually impossible to monitor this over just a couple of weeks. So the Commission will end the procedure in December based on mere promises from Viktor Orbán. And to count on Orbán's word after 12 years, after time and again having been fooled by him, I think that's pretty ridiculous now to just trust his word and not his action.

Third, the anti-corruption authority that is the central pillar of the reform has no power to prosecute. So it relies on a prosecutor that we know is politically controlled by Orbán; it relies on courts where we know that they are politically controlled by Orbán. Which brings me to the fourth point, which is in this conditionality procedure on the rule of law, it seems that the Commission has somehow forgotten the rule-of-law part, because there is not a single measure concerning the rule of law, the independence of justice.

So, Mr Hahn, I fear that there is a very small window of opportunity here to use this tool and to do some good and to protect the rule of law in the Union. But if you are aware – and I know you are aware – of the corruption but you do nothing, then I think if this is out of fear to make full use of the tools that you have, well then you might not be the right person to protect the financial interests of the Union. Thank you very much.

Nicolaus Fest, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Abgeordnete! Jetzt also wieder Ungarn. Allerdings kann die Kommission gegen Ungarn, wir haben es eben gehört, nicht wirklich etwas vorbringen, was man nicht auch gegenüber anderen Ländern vorbringen könnte. Denn auch in Deutschland, Frankreich, Österreich, Spanien oder besonders Malta ist die Rechtsstaatlichkeit auf den Hund gekommen. Die Meinungsfreiheit ist bedroht, die Rechtsstaatlichkeit ist bedroht, und Korruption ist dort auch überall ein Problem. Aber diese Länder haben komischerweise kein Problem mit der Kommission, denn sie haben auch keine konservative Regierung, und nur konservative Regierungen werden von diesem Parlament und auch der Kommission mit Schmutz beworfen und mit Artikel-7-Verfahren überzogen.

In Deutschland hatten wir immer die höchste Zustimmung zur EU. Diese bricht gerade dramatisch ein, auch in anderen Ländern. Woran liegt das? Ich denke, es liegt auch an solchen Verfahren wie gegen Ungarn. Wir sehen, die Leute haben einfach keine Lust mehr auf die ewige Einmischung. Und wenn wir hier über Einmischung reden, dann insbesondere auf solche arroganten Einmischungen, wie Frau von der Leyen es gerade vor der Wahl in Italien gezeigt hat. Die Quittung ist dann ja umgehend gekommen.

Genau das Gleiche erleben wir ja auch in Ungarn. Gerade Frau von der Leyen, eine ungewählte, demokratisch nicht legitimierte Person, hat die Stirn, den gerade mit großer Mehrheit von den Ungarn wiedergewählten Ministerpräsidenten unter dem Beifall vieler Abgeordneter hier als einen Wahlautokraten zu bezeichnen. Man fragt sich wirklich, ob Sie alle noch die Regeln der Demokratie kennen.

Ich glaube, die Menschen haben genug von diesen Einmischungen, sie haben auch genug von diesen etwas sinnlosen Verfahren, die sowieso zu keinem Ende kommen. Sie leiden unter der Energiekrise, sie leiden unter der Migration, sie leiden unter der Deindustrialisierung vor allem von Deutschland. Ich weiß, Sie grinsen darüber, aber Sie wird es auch bald erfassen. Und ich denke, statt uns über Ungarn aufzuregen, sollten wir uns lieber mit den ernsten Problemen der Menschen befassen.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Zadziwiona jestem tym, że wnioskodawcy dzisiejszej debaty są aż tak bardzo bezwstydni. W obliczu szalejącej inflacji w Unii Europejskiej, wysokich cen energii spowodowanych uzależnieniem energetycznym Unii Europejskiej od Rosji i wojną w Ukrainie państwo miesiąc w miesiąc nieustannie zajmujecie się Węgrami.

Otóż na Węgrzech obywatele zdecydowali, żeby powierzyć swoją ojczyznę partii Fidesz - Orbanowi i to jest ich decyzja, to jest ich wybór. Ale państwo uważacie, że tam są łamane prawa i wolności, naruszony jest również mechanizm warunkowości. Już państwo grozicie komisarzowi Hahnowi, że zostanie odwołany, bowiem nie spełnia waszych oczekiwań. Chcielibyście Węgry zagłodzić! Polskę zagłodzić!

Przewodnicząca Komisji Europejskiej pozwoliła sobie również na przytyk w kierunku Włochów. Przed wyborami we Włoszech partia Bracia Włosi miała wysokie notowania. I oto Ursula von der Leyen powiedziała, że będzie można im również utrudnić funkcjonowanie w Unii Europejskiej.Państwo się dalece zapominacie.

Dziś kluczową debatą powinna być debata związana z łamaniem zasad solidarności unijnej, jeśli chodzi o sytuację na rynku gazu.

Proszę państwa, Niemcy blokują w Radzie wprowadzenie ogólnoeuropejskiego limitu cen gazu. Również w Parlamencie Europejskim delegacja niemiecka PPE zablokowała wezwanie do ustalenia limitu cen gazu. To Niemcy uzależniła politykę energetyczną Unii Europejskiej od Gazpromu…

(Przewodnicząca odebrała mówczyni głos)

Die Präsidentin. – Ich möchte die Besucherinnen und Besucher auf der Galerie ersuchen, nicht zu klatschen. Unserer Geschäftsordnung entsprechend sind Sie beobachtend hier, allerdings nicht um Zeichen der Zustimmung oder Nichtzustimmung zu geben. Sie sind herzlich willkommen zuzusehen, aber nicht durch Applaus einzugreifen.

Malin Björk, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, I am just back from the beautiful city of Budapest, where we were several hundred people gathered for three days of activism and mobilising for lesbian rights, for women's rights, for LGBTI rights, for democracy, for equality, for a vision and a future of democracy, where it is restored in Hungary and where it is protected everywhere in Europe.

And we all know that we are 12 years too late, Commissioner. We lost a lot of time. We failed our democratic allies in Hungary. So this time we have to stand more and stronger in solidarity with those that worked tirelessly in Hungary for a democratic country.

So the measures that you are proposing, they are far from enough. And let me be clear, the action proposed by Orbán are far from enough. There needs to be sincere steps to restore democracy in Hungary, rule of law, independence of the judiciary, media pluralism and freedom, fundamental rights. What is happening is not enough.

And we also have to make sure that the attacks on democracy does not spread. Other authoritarian leaders are watching very closely what is happening in Europe. And it will determine whether others also try to walk the path of Orbán where the far-right has approached power, as in my country, Sweden.

Third, this is a test for the conditionality mechanism. It will set the standards and the bar for how it can be used with other countries if we have to. So please don't fail this one. We cannot afford anything else than restoring democracy. Anything else would be a failure. This is our chance, this is your chance. Council, Commissioner, don't waste it, do more, do better and ask more from Orbán.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Minden politikai formáció életében vannak sorsdöntő pillanatok. Ezek gyakran akkor jönnek el, amikor baj van. A jelenlegi válság azt mutatja, hogy Európa nem áll a helyzet magaslatán. A háború és az elhibázott európai szankciók miatt az energiaárak az egekbe szöktek, vágtat az infláció, munkanélküliség és súlyos gazdasági recesszió fenyeget.

Mindez európai családok és vállalkozások millióit érinti, és még ebben a súlyos helyzetben is, az itt ülő szélsőséges képviselők folytatják az ideológiai zsarolást, és széthúzást szítanak. Magyar baloldali képviselőkkel karöltve a legabszurdabb vádakkal állnak elő csak azért, hogy a magyar emberek ne kapják meg a nekik járó forrásokat.

A helyzet az, hogy Magyarország és az Európai Bizottság között korrekt tárgyalásokon megállapodás született az uniós források felhasználásáról. Nem maradt olyan szakmai vagy jogi kérdés, amiben ne sikerült volna dűlőre jutni, de Önöknek itt teljesen mindegy, hogy mi milyen intézkedéseket hajtunk végre, mert Önök egy politikai küldetést hajtanak végre, amelynek az a célja – a saját szavaikkal élve –, hogy kiéheztessék Magyarországot és minden más konzervatív nemzeti politikát folytató kormányt is. Lásd a Lengyelország elleni szégyenletes támadásokat, vagy a még meg sem alakult olasz kormánynak való felháborító üzengetést.

Önöknek semmi sem lesz elég addig, amíg Magyarországon kereszténydemokrata kormányzás folyik, ezért folyamatosan öntik az olajat a tűzre, támadnak, hazudoznak és fenyegetőznek. Mindezt sok millió európai polgár nevében határozottan visszautasítom. Az Önök szégyenletes politikai tevékenységéről pedig majd a következő generációk és a történelemkönyvek fognak ítéletet mondani.

President. – I would really invite those in the visitors' gallery not to show any sign like clapping or support. According to our Rules of Procedure, our guests are invited to participate and to watch the debate, but not to clap or give any signs. If you do so, unfortunately I will have to ask the ushers that you leave the room. So if there is one more sign of support or noise, I will really have to do that. I invite you to participate and watch the debate – because for us it is very important that the public has the opportunity – but please remain silent.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Madam President, the EU has long been toothless in the fight to protect the rule of law in certain Member States. National leaders refuse to hold each other to account. And the other Article 7 procedures initiated by the Commission and Parliament failed to deliver real results.

So last year, January was truly a historic moment. Finally some teeth; finally an instrument that makes an impact, both because the language of money apparently is the only language truly understood in Warsaw and Budapest, but also because the European Council can no longer hide behind one or two Member States. So we welcome these proposed measures as a real step in the right direction, even though we would have expected even stricter demands.

We have known Mr Orbán for a long time now, and his past performance does nothing to reassure us about the future. There is a real risk of Hungary ticking the boxes as a paper reality only without really addressing the deficiencies. And this is why we insist on robust verification and monitoring. Only significant, tangible and lasting progress in rebuilding democratic and anti-corruption safeguards should enable the release of EU taxpayers' money. Declarations, working groups, frameworks: they all sound nice, but they are not sufficient and risk being empty shelves. The Council cannot afford to buy another peacock dance of Mr Orbán.

So two concrete questions to Commissioner Hahn. First, why are the agricultural funds not part of this ongoing process? And secondly, how does the Commission intend to proceed in the case of other countries, in particular Poland?

Csaba Molnár (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! A Magyarországra érkező európai uniós források nagy részét ellopják a miniszterelnök oligarchái. Mivel az Európai Bizottság felfüggesztette a pénzek folyósítását, ezek a kormányközeli vállalkozások megrendelések nélkül maradtak, ezért most a kormány mindent megtesz, hogy újraindítsa az európai uniós forrásokat. Persze nem az emberek érdekében, hanem azért, hogy folytatni tudják a lopást.

Most éppen egy nagy törvénycsomagot terjesztettek emiatt a magyar parlament elé. Például létrehoznának egy olyan, elvileg korrupcióellenes hatóságot, amelynek az elnökét a miniszterelnök egyik emberének a javaslatára a miniszterelnök másik embere fogja majd kinevezni. Független lesz ez a hatóság? Dehogy is lesz független, Hölgyeim és Uraim!

Vagy például elvileg bevezetnék, hogy bárki a bíróságok elé vihesse a korrupciós ügyeket, de ezt a törvényt a megszavazása után egy órával elküldték annak az Alkotmánybíróságnak vizsgálatra, amelynek minden egyes tagját, minden egyes alkotmánybíráját a jelenlegi kormánypártok nevezték ki. Lesznek így majd eljárások korrupciós ügyekben? Dehogy lesznek eljárások!

Ezek a javaslatok csak az Európai Bizottság elkápráztatását szolgálják. Messziről, hunyorítva talán úgy tűnhet, hogy ezek a törvények a korrupció megfékezéséről szólnak. Magyarországon viszont mindenki tudja, hogy ez csak színjáték, ez csak porhintés. A magyar parlamentben pontosan ezért szavaztunk nemmel erre a törvénycsomagra, mert mi azt akarjuk, hogy az európai uniós források a magyar emberekhez, a magyar önkormányzatokhoz és a magyar vállalkozásokhoz jussanak. Az Európai Bizottság átverését szolgáló új törvények viszont pontosan a lopás folytatásának a lehetőségét nyitják meg.

Minket nem tudnak ezzel át már átverni. Képviselőtársaim, Biztos Úr, kérem, Önök se hagyják magukat átverni.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Herr Kommissar! Wenn man der Debatte hier folgt, dann findet wieder das statt, was bei dieser Debatte üblicherweise stattfindet: Die Rechte hier im Parlament verteidigt Ungarn, sagt, das sei alles politisch und so weiter und so fort. Korruption gebe es in allen Ländern der EU.

Zehnmal so hoch, zehnmal so hoch wie in anderen durchschnittlichen Ländern ist der Missbrauch an EU-Geldern in Ungarn! Es geht einfach darum – das wollen Sie verstecken –, dass Gelder von Ungarinnen und Ungarn geklaut werden und in den Taschen von Viktor Orbáns Freunden landen. Darum geht es, und das versucht die Rechte hier im Parlament zu verstecken.

Gleichzeitig – und das muss man sich wirklich mal anhören, Herr Kommissar – loben die Rechten im Parlament das Vorgehen der Kommission! Das ist tatsächlich das, was hier stattfindet bei diesem Mechanismus. Denn wir wissen doch: Am Ende wird kein Geld zurückgehalten werden. Und das wird unter großem Applaus der Rechten und der Feinde des Rechtsstaates in Europa passieren.

Der Zeitplan, den Sie da als Ausrede nutzen – wo Sie sagen: Wir haben nicht die Zeit nach diesem Mechanismus, wir müssen das jetzt beschließen, und dann müssen wir uns die Maßnahmen zu dem Zeitpunkt anschauen –, das ist ein vorgeschobenes Argument. Es ist falsch. Sie könnten genauso gut die siebeneinhalb Milliarden Euro zurückhalten, aus meiner Sicht sogar noch mehr. Und dann hätte Ungarn unter diesem Mechanismus jederzeit die Möglichkeit, Beweise vorzulegen, dass diese Gesetze, die jetzt beschlossen werden – das ist ja gut, das schauen wir uns auch gerne an, aber wir wollen es sehen –, dass diese Gesetze, diese Änderungen tatsächlich in der Praxis etwas verändern, dass Geld nicht mehr in den dunklen Taschen versickert, dass Korruption bekämpft wird. Solange das nicht der Fall ist, sollten Sie die Gelder zurückhalten.

Frau Präsidentin! Ich nehme die *Blue Card* gerne an, ich wundere mich aber ein wenig, warum ich eben auf meinem Display keine *Blue Card* angezeigt bekommen habe. Das wundert mich schon. Ich hätte auch gerne den Kollegen Fragen gestellt. Wenn jetzt *Blue Card* möglich ist – sehr gerne, dann machen wir das in der Debatte, und ich nehme eine *Blue Card* natürlich sehr gerne an!

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte" gemäß Artikel 171 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Die Präsidentin. – Sie haben jetzt gerade eine blaue Karte gekriegt, eine Frage an Sie, und wenn Sie selbst eine blaue Karte stellen möchten, ist das möglich, wenn Sie Platz nehmen. Ich möchte allerdings sagen, dass ich, weil die Debatte sehr rege ist und wir im Anschluss noch andere Aussprachen haben, blaue Karten nur dann annehmen werde, wenn sie nicht von Rednerinnen und Rednern gestellt werden, die ohnehin Redezeit haben, um dann in ihrer Rede Input zu geben. Das sind jetzt die Regeln für diese Aussprache.

Ernő Schaller-Baross (NI), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“* – Herr Abgeordneter, ich wollte Sie gerne fragen: Wenn wir uns schon über Demokratie unterhalten, was denken Sie über die Aussage von Frau Bundesaußenministerin Baerbock, dass sie grundsätzlich die Meinung der deutschen Wähler nicht interessiert? Wenn wir über Demokratie reden, würde ich Ihnen diese Frage stellen.

Und auch in Ungarn haben sich die Wähler dieses Jahr entschieden für eine demokratisch gewählte konservative, christlich-demokratische Regierung. Bitte, Herr Abgeordneter, respektieren Sie das.

Moritz Körner (Renew), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“* – Ich brauche jetzt, glaube ich, keine aus dem Zusammenhang gerissenen Aussagen von Frau Außenministerin Baerbock hier zu kommentieren. Aber ich habe auch in keinster Weise zu irgendeinem Zeitpunkt in meiner Rede über Demokratie und die Frage, ob Viktor Orbán die Wahl gewonnen hat – die OSZE sagt, die Wahl war frei, aber nicht fair –, geredet.

Dass sie wieder auf Demokratie und Wahl gehen, zeigt, dass Sie eigentlich nicht darüber reden wollen, worum es hier geht, nämlich um Projekte, wo Geld ohne Ende in die Taschen von Viktor Orbáns Freunden fließt, wo das Europäische Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung sagt: „4 % aller EU-Gelder werden missbräuchlich verwendet.“ Darüber, über das Klauen von EU-Geldern, über das Klauen von Steuerzahlergeld, wollen Sie nicht reden. Deswegen immer diese Ausweiche, und das haben Sie gerade nochmal bewiesen.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I would ask what you do if you want to take big chunks of European money for your own benefit or to enrich those around you? Well, you go into government, then you create very loose public procurement rules – rules that you know you will not respect anyway – you manage to channel most of your funds to your son-in-law, for example, who will not build with this money what he is supposed to build, but he will keep most of the money for himself. This is documented by the European Agency for Anti-Corruption. It is discussed at length in this European Parliament. It is known in all European institutions. Courageous journalists will do reports on it. Then, when the Commission can no longer not take action on this because they have got pressure, when the Commission needs you to find a tweak to allow them to go on not dealing with the situation, that is when you wrap it up all with very good legalistic jargon and you pledge for a fake anti-corruption mechanism. This is when you have managed to legalise a decade of stealing.

Paolo Borchia (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, torniamo ad occupare i lavori della plenaria con l'ennesima discutibile strumentalizzazione dell'articolo 7, che ormai gli europei hanno imparato a conoscere come la pistola puntata alla testa dei governi meno allineati ai desideri di Bruxelles.

E fa sorridere, ma neanche tanto, che vi dichiarate preoccupati dai diritti delle minoranze quando siete i primi in quest'Aula a non rispettare il pensiero di chi ha un'idea di Europa diversa dalla vostra. Però è tutto drammaticamente coerente con la scellerata uscita della Presidente von der Leyen che, a pochi giorni dal voto in Italia, minacciava di avere strumenti a disposizione qualora le cose andassero «in una direzione difficile». Poi magari la Presidente ci spiegherà dov'è la «direzione difficile».

Io colleghi vi propongo una riflessione: ai fini della tenuta dell'Europa, è più pericolosa l'aspirazione di governi democraticamente eletti di sottrarsi al pensiero unico dei cosiddetti nuovi diritti o piuttosto l'autoincoronazione della Presidente della Commissione a guardiana dei trattati in materie che i trattati stessi non assegnano all'Unione?

Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, probabilmente la democrazia può fare dei passi in avanti in Ungheria così come in tanti altri paesi, ma di sicuro gli attuali vertici dell'Unione europea sono gli ultimi che possono impartire lezioni.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, «O votas lo que te decimos o sufrirás las consecuencias» va a ser el nuevo lema de la Comisión y del Parlamento. Desde las amenazas de reducir los fondos hasta el «cuidado con quién pactáis, cuidado con el gobierno que montáis».

Ahora ya estamos en el intento de ejecución de esas amenazas, ya que la Comisión pide suspender hasta el 65 % de algunos fondos en el marco de la política de cohesión a Hungría, solo porque dos tercios de los húngaros votaron a Fidesz y a Viktor Orbán. Eso sí, ni la propia Comisión sabe cuantificar la repercusión en el presupuesto de la Unión, que es el que dicen querer proteger.

Quien va a sufrir la sanción es el pueblo húngaro, en medio de una emergencia económica que ha provocado su fanatismo climático al ponernos a los pies de potencias extranjeras. Basta de utilizar las instituciones para contaminar procesos electorales en los Estados miembros e imponer su agenda ideológica.

Ahí fuera hay millones de europeos que ven el futuro con desesperanza y ustedes ofrecen amenazas y sanciones y lo único que van a necesitar es una manta para taparse del frío en invierno.

Ustedes van de mal en peor. Cada vez están más nerviosos y radicalizados. Pues ya les dije la última vez: si ustedes no saben, apártense. Estamos preparados y dispuestos. Somos la voz de la moderación y la voz del sentido común.

Younous Omarjee (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Ministre, Monsieur le Commissaire, je me souviens d'une époque pas si éloignée où, au Conseil, aucune opposition ne se manifestait lorsqu'il s'agissait de déployer la troïka pour obliger la Grèce, le Portugal, l'Espagne à épurer leurs budgets nationaux pour les soumettre à la doxa autoritaire des politiques «austéritaires» du semestre européen.

Mais lorsqu'il s'agit de corruption, d'indépendance de la justice, de nos valeurs, de l'application de la charte des droits fondamentaux – de l'état de droit, en fait –, alors là, on se tortille, et la marche est très fastidieuse.

Ce que nous demandons aujourd'hui à la Commission et au Conseil, c'est l'application pleine et entière du mécanisme «état de droit» – et non une application au rabais – contre la Hongrie. Et nous demandons aussi des garanties pour l'indépendance budgétaire du parquet européen.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu»)

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki**. — Jak rozumiem, pochodzi Pan z Francji. To jest moje pytanie, ponieważ bardzo dużo Pan poświęcił czasu w swojej wypowiedzi, przed chwilą, kwestiom prawnym i zarzucał Pan różnym osobom różne rzeczy, w swojej wypowiedzi, w obecnej sytuacji.

Ja Pana zapytam tak: czy Pan, jako obywatel francuski, też zabierał głos i zgłaszał zarzuty do pana prezydenta Macrona, kiedy wbrew zakazom kupował broń w Rosji ? Czy Pan też zgłaszał swoje uwagi?

Younous Omarjee (The Left), *réponse «carton bleu»* – Monsieur Rzońca, je pensais devoir répondre à une question sérieuse, mais je crois que vous m'obligez à m'abaisser à un niveau auquel je ne souhaite pas m'abaisser. Et je veux aussi vous dire que nous sommes, ici, des députés européens, que nous essayons d'embrasser l'intérêt général européen, et que dans le propos qui était le mien je n'ai attaqué personne. J'ai fait des remarques d'ordre général sur le mécanisme «état de droit» ainsi que sur les sanctions qui, je crois, doivent à présent être imposées à la Hongrie.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señora presidenta, el agravio comparativo entre el trato que la Comisión Europea da a países como Hungría y Polonia y el que otorga a España, no deja de aumentar. Lo que está pasando en los últimos meses lo confirma. A mediados de septiembre la Comisión propuso al Consejo que retuviera fondos destinados a Hungría por valor de 7 500 millones de euros por las violaciones del Estado de Derecho. Un paso muy necesario.

Pero mientras tanto, en España el Gobierno se niega a colaborar en la investigación del caso Pegasus, el Tribunal Supremo ignora la sentencia del Tribunal de Luxemburgo del pasado mes de julio, según la cual el presidente Puigdemont y yo mismo conservamos nuestra inmunidad de desplazamiento; el Tribunal Supremo la ignora y mantiene nuestra orden de detención, etc.

España incumple el Derecho comunitario y más del 60 % de las sentencias del Tribunal de Estrasburgo. Pero la Comisión no dice nada. No hace nada. ¿Qué pasa? ¿Solo se atreven a sancionar a los Estados miembros si son pequeños y del este? ¿Y si son grandes y del oeste, como España, entonces estos tienen barra libre? ¿Es esto?

Señores de la Comisión, el Tratado les obliga a actuar con imparcialidad y neutralidad. Y ustedes están faltando clamorosamente a este deber. La institución que se supone que es la guardiana de los Tratados es la primera en vulnerarlos. Y así es como se dinamita el proyecto europeo.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Senhor Ministro, caras e caros colegas, já o disse aqui mais do que uma vez, o respeito pelo Estado de Direito, pelos valores europeus não é uma opção, é uma obrigação. E não me sinto bem em estar sequer aqui a falar de um regulamento que nem deveríamos ter e que nem deveria ser necessário. Mas é importante que se diga que este regulamento não tem um caráter punitivo, não tem um caráter sancionatório. O grande objetivo é a prevenção e, em boa hora, o aprovámos, e a Comissão Europeia faz uma proposta e, agora, não nos podemos esquecer, está nas mãos do Conselho.

Senhor Ministro, quando é que o Conselho pensa decidir? O Conselho tem algum calendário? O Conselho tem algum trabalho preparatório nesta matéria? Está convencido de que vai ter uma maioria qualificada? Porque o Conselho também tem de respeitar o Estado de Direito, e só se fala da Comissão e se pressiona e bem. Mas queremos saber, depois, como é que cada chefe de Estado, cada governante no Conselho vai tomar posição em relação a esta importante matéria. E eu espero que a Hungria cumpra, a bem dos seus cidadãos e da União Europeia. Quem entrou na União sabia as condições, deve continuar a respeitá-la.

E termino só, também, com uma pergunta: porque é que o Conselho, que ajudava tanto o Estado de Direito, não aceita uma coisa tão simples como uma plataforma digital, onde todos os projetos aprovados por fundos europeus estejam disponíveis para todo o público? Porque é que recusaram?

Katarina Barley (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist das erste Mal, dass der Rechtsstaatsmechanismus angewandt wird. Ich wende mich heute vor allen Dingen an die Kommission und den Rat. Denn ich finde, bisher haben Sie es ziemlich vermasselt: Zwei Jahre gewartet, um den Mechanismus überhaupt anzuwenden, um am Tag nach der Wahl das Verfahren dann endlich zu starten.

Ehrlich gesagt, sind die Argumente, die wir jetzt hören, auf dem Silbertablett serviert, das ist eine halbherzige Anwendung nur für einen ganz, ganz kleinen Teil der Probleme, die wir in Ungarn sehen, und dann sich zufriedenzugeben – offenbar, das vermuten wir alle –, ohne dass man wirklich auf Wirksamkeit kontrollieren kann.

Mein Mann ist ein Coach, ein professioneller Sport-Coach, und ich lerne viel darüber, wie man ein Ziel erreicht und wie man eine Gruppe zusammenhält. Und eins weiß ich: Es ist alles *about leadership*. Wenn man bei den „Leadern“ nicht merkt, dass sie die Werte aufrechterhalten, dann folgt das Team nicht mehr, und dann fällt es auseinander. Ich sehe diese Gefahr hier und jetzt. Wenn Sie das vermasseln, dann verlieren Sie viele, viele engagierte Europäerinnen und Europäer auch hier im Haus.

(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren „blaue Karte“ gemäß Artikel 172 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Enikő Győri (NI). *„kékkártyás kérdés”* – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Tisztelt Alelnök Asszony! Ön egy elhíresült mondásával ugye azt üzente Magyarországnak és Lengyelországnak, hogy ki kell ezeket a népeket éheztetni. Azért ez nem csengett olyan jól egyik országban sem. Azt szeretném megkérdezni, hogy tudja-e Ön, hogy hány országban létezik egyáltalán integritás hatóság a korrupcióellenes küzdelemben? Majd utána megmondom a számot Önnek.

Illetve azt szeretném még megkérdezni, hogy tudja-e, hogy az OLAF-vizsgálatok hány százalékából lesz Magyarországon vádeljárás, és mi az európai uniós átlag? Ezt is nagyon szívesen megosztom, mert Magyarországon sokkal magasabb számban indulnak eljárások, mint az Unió átlaga.

Katarina Barley (S&D), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Wieder einmal habe ich die Gelegenheit, das richtigzustellen. Ich habe gesagt, ich will das korrupte System Orbán aushungern. Und genau das ist richtig.

Wenn Sie mir erklären können, wie der beste Schulfreund von Viktor Orbán, Herr Mészáros, an 1,3 Milliarden EUR Privatvermögen kommt, dann glaube ich Ihnen, dass Sie etwas gegen Korruption tun wollen. Sie sind ja noch nicht mal willens, *der* Antikorruptionsbehörde beizutreten, nämlich der EUStA, der europäischen Staatsanwaltschaft.

Wenn Sie keine Angst haben vor unabhängigen Ermittlungen, dann treten Sie dem doch bei. Das wäre unabhängig! Nicht irgendwelche Marionetten, die Sie nachher in schön aussehende Behörden setzen, in schöne Gebäude. Wenn das alles wieder Orbáns Marionetten sind – wir kennen das doch! In allen Behörden sitzen Orbáns Marionetten, der ganze Staatsapparat ist von denen durchzogen.

Treten Sie der EUStA bei, dann glauben wir Ihnen!

Katalin Cseh (Renew). – Madam President, the European Commission had a historic chance to slow down Hungary's slide to autocracy. And the tools are there; this Parliament made sure of that. You also said it in your speech, Commissioner. We worked very hard for this.

But frankly, we should be seeing real results by now. Let me remind you, the rule of law mechanism has been EU law since January last year, almost two years – 641 days, to be precise. We should be seeing real credible steps just like my colleague Katarina Barley said. For Hungary to join the European Public Prosecutor's Office, there is public support for that on the ground, we collected 700 000 signatures with the support of Akos Hadhazy, a member of Parliament who was denied of taking his oath for many, many months by the government, by the way.

So what we see now are only promises of minor reform by the Orbán government – a government that has shown over and over again that they are not acting in good faith, that they create institutions just to hollow them out when it is comfortable for them and they go back on their promises in a matter of a few days. And don't get me wrong, we are, of course, ready to support even small improvements. But to think that they will be sufficient is – I'm sorry – an illusion.

So what should be done? Help the people, not the government. Direct EU funds to local governments, to civil society, to schools and hospitals. This Parliament has made multiple calls for it. Commissioner, it is time to make that happen.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Commissioner, for three years I've been in this house now and every year the situation in Hungary got worse. For three years we have debates here, we have condemnations, we have strong resolutions. And what did Orbán do in this time? He circulated racist rhetorics about mixed races, he had unfair elections and – yes – he continued to steal money every day, European taxpayers' money.

So now finally you have him. You have him because we gave you the power and the tools to actually hold him accountable. So I ask you now, once again: don't push the conflict down the road to the RRF milestones and targets; make the money only available if there are actual reforms.

And as a final remark, I have to say, I think this shows us again that we need to elect the European Commission directly, that we actually reform the European Union so that we can hold our government accountable and actually push for change. Thank you very much.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Słyszeliśmy już w tej izbie o konieczności zagłodzenia Polski, Węgier. Dziś mogliśmy usłyszeć inne skandaliczne słowa, a mianowicie, że w końcu Komisji wyrosły zęby. Jak rozumiem zęby, żeby zagryźć taki kraj jak Węgry.

Szanowni Państwo, to wasze lewicowe postrzeganie rzeczywistości zaczyna już przybierać kabaretowy charakter i dajcie sobie powiedzieć, że im głośniej z tego miejsca krytykujecie rządy w Budapeszcie czy Warszawie, tym bardziej obywatele tych państw odwracają się właśnie od takiej Unii, którą reprezentujecie.

Szanowni Państwo, co prawda ta dzisiejsza debata dotyczy Węgier, ale była mowa tutaj też o Polsce. Proszę Państwa, Polska jest drugim krajem pod względem transparentności i skuteczności wydatkowania tych środków. I być może tu jest odpowiedź, dlaczego tak atakujecie mój kraj. Boicie się tego, że Polska się rozwija. Ale powiem Wam też: spieszcie się, bo te kabaretowe dyskusje przy okazji każdej sesji, raz Polska, raz Węgry, się kończą. Będziecie musieli dorzucić za chwilę Szwecję, być może Włochy. I straszycie dzisiaj Komisarza. Wcześniej straszyliście Przewodniczącą Komisji odwołaniem, jak nie będzie skutecznie zwalczała rządów prawicowych. Niestety dla was Europa się zmienia. Ten walec zmian postępuje i wy odejdzie do lamusa historii.

Milan Uhrík (NI). – Kolegovia, chcete odobrať Maďarsku eurofondy za to, že nedodržiava nejaký právny štát a európske hodnoty? A ja sa vás tu chcem spýtať, kto rozhodol, čo sú to tie európske hodnoty? Vy ste to rozhodli alebo tuto, pán Šimečka to rozhodol, alebo nebodaj Európska komisia rozhodla, čo sú to európske hodnoty? Rozprávate tu o tom, ale pritom sami dobre viete, že je to čisté pokrytectvo. Ide o obyčajnú zámienku tak, ako povedali kolegovia z Maďarska, o ideologický trest za to, že maďarská vláda sa nechce podvoliť liberálnej agende. Presne o toto tu ide. Rozprávate tu o demokracii, ale nikto z vás, nikto z vás nemá ani zďaleka taký mandát, ako má súčasná maďarská vláda, ktorú zvolilo 53 % voličov. Získal tu niekto viac percent? Nezískal. A to je to, čo vám vadí, že maďarská vláda je demokraticky zvolená a presadzuje vlastné hodnoty. Keď rozprávate o demokracii, bol by som veľmi rád, keby ste ju konečne začali aj rešpektovať. A kolegom z Maďarska v mene konzervatívne zmýšľajúcich Slovákov prajem veľa podpory a veľa silných nervov.

(Rečník súhlasil, že bude reagovať na vystúpenie po zdvihnutí modrej karty)

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew), *blue-card speech*. – You just asked, dear colleague, whoever decided on these European values. Well, my question to you is: do you know which country was the first country to ratify the Lisbon Treaty? It was Hungary. And I think all the values were laid down in the Treaties. So don't you think that Hungary was one of those who decided on the values?

Milan Uhrík (NI), *reakcia na vystúpenie po zdvihnutí modrej karty*. – Milá kolegyňa, práve preto, že Maďarsko bolo jednou z prvých krajín, ktorá sa prihlásila k tým európskym hodnotám, snáď má právo rozhodnúť o tom, aké hodnoty sú pre ich vlastných obyvateľov najlepšie. A snáď nechcete vy tvrdiť, že to viete z Bruselu lepšie ako samotní Maďari, ktorí žijú v Maďarsku, alebo Poliaci, ktorí žijú v Poľsku. To nemyslíte vážne.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, vážený pane komisaři, vážený pane ministře, tahle diskuze mi trošku připadá jako vystoupení šašků v kabaretu. Jeden šašek si oblékne prostě svůj dres a ptá se nás všech ostatních: Co jsou evropské hodnoty? To opravdu vám přijde normální, že nevíte, co jsou evropské hodnoty? Nevíte, co tady sdílíme? Opravdu vám přijde smysluplné přijít sem před ostatní poslance EP a ptát se na takové základní věci? Tvrdit, že někdo něco diktuje z Bruselu? Pane kolego, my jsme ve Štrasburku, tady není Brusel. Nikdo z nás není z Bruselu. Já jsem z České republiky a určitě bych neradil Maďarům, jak se mají rozhodnout ve spoustě věcí, které nejsou v jejich kompetenci. Ale copak není boj proti korupci základní hodnotou EU? Pokud není, tak tady nemáte co dělat, tak můžete tenhle sál opustit, protože to je základní pravidlo.

Maďarsko udělalo obrovský posun po tom obrovském tlaku, který jsme tady vyvinuli. Ale je potřeba, aby to slyšelo od nás, aby pokračovalo. A já nejsem rád z té debaty, že opravdu tlačíme na jeden členský stát, aby změnil legislativu, ale my prostě musíme ukázat, když chceme poučovat další země, že si sami umíme udělat pořádek uvnitř Evropského společenství.

Eero Heinäluoma (S&D). – Arvoisa puhemies, EU:n täytyy puolustaa omia arvojaan. Unioni ei ole vain rahaa ja taloutta. Se on myös arvoyhteisö, jossa demokratiaa, ihmisoikeuksia, vapaata lehdistöä ja oikeusvaltiota suojellaan. Parlamentti on ollut tässä johdonmukainen. Se on pitänyt huolta siitä, että meillä on uusi lainsäädäntö, joka antaa mahdollisuuden puuttua väärinkäytöksiin.

Komissio on vihdoinkin tarttunut toimeen. Se on pysäyttänyt EU-varojen toimittamisen Unkariin ja tehnyt selväksi, mitä uudistuksia tarvitaan. Jäsenvaltioita edustavan neuvoston on nyt syytä hyväksyä komission päätös. Se on ehdoton minimi. Unkarin hallitukselta odotetaan todellisia uudistuksia, jotta Unkarin kansalaisten oikeudet tulevat turvattua ja budjettivarojen asiallinen käyttö toteutuu. Tiukkaa linjaa tarvitaan myös tulevien sukupolvien oikeuksien varmistamiseksi.

Michal Šimečka (Renew). – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, dear colleagues, this House made it quite clear last month Hungary is no longer a full-fledged democracy. The Council and the Commission should now acknowledge this quite obvious reality, especially when discussing the protection of billions of EU taxpayers' money.

I have no doubt that the Commission triggered the conditionality mechanism involving up to a third of funds allocated to Hungary. When it did so, it found evidence of a systemic problem, which is exactly why it is hard to believe that suddenly, in a matter of months, the Orbán government would come up with a credible pledge to investigate all the stolen funds, that it would suddenly undo years of building up and sustaining a kleptocratic regime. Because corruption and misuse of EU funds is, unfortunately, an integral part of governing now in Hungary; it is a feature, not a bug.

Therefore, if the Commission is serious about protecting our taxpayers' money, the requirements must be considerably more robust. Namely, Hungary must and should join the European Public Prosecutor. And, crucially, the conditionality procedure should continue until we see tangible change, tangible results in Hungary itself. In other words, until the country returns to the path of rule of law and democracy.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Council, Commissioner, the Conditionality Regulation is now put to the test. Is it fit for purpose, are the institutions willing to use it? I urge the Commission to pass this test in assuring that Hungary reverses its deep and systemic rule-of-law flaws and that it ends the corruption and the captured judiciary.

As the Commission rightly stated itself, you can't protect the EU budget without an independent judiciary. The 17 measures cannot solve this rule-of-law crisis, because how can a new integrity body be effective in a dysfunctional system? And how can the improved rules and prosecution be adjudicated fairly by captured courts?

Commissioner, we urge you: be strict and steadfast, progress on paper and on limited issues are not enough. We need a systematic change and the Commission to enforce it. Giving in too quickly will render our most precious tool toothless. The rule of law and, therefore, our European values are non-negotiable.

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

Lívia Járóka (NI), *blue-card speech*. – Thank you very much for your speech. I would like to ask you if you know how many other countries have not joined EPPO.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE), *blue-card reply*. – I didn't speak about EPPO. I agree with the previous speaker, so it's good that he brought this up. There are indeed a few other Member States, and especially while there are so many corruption cases in Hungary, and if Hungary really wants to show it's working on an independent system and fighting corruption, it would be better to seek cooperation with the EPPO because that would give much more trust than we can have at the moment.

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Ursula von der Leyen, dans son discours sur l'état de l'Union, a affirmé que la Commission protégerait le budget de l'Union en utilisant le mécanisme de la conditionnalité. C'est ce que la Commission fait avec les propositions présentes concernant la Hongrie et sur lesquelles maintenant le Conseil doit se prononcer.

Si les mesures proposées sont destinées à protéger le budget de l'Union, les manquements à l'origine de ces mesures montrent bien que l'État de droit est en danger en Hongrie. L'indépendance de la justice y constitue un problème majeur. En effet, ni les principes de sécurité juridique ni l'interdiction de l'arbitraire du pouvoir exécutif ne sont garantis, ce qui est toutefois essentiel vu les constats d'irrégularités diverses, de déficiences systématiques et de faiblesses dans les marchés publics. Les intérêts financiers de l'Union sont manifestement en danger.

Or, il est inconcevable, d'autant plus dans les conditions de crise actuelles où nombre de citoyens de l'Union ont du mal avec les fins de mois, que des fonds européens soient attribués dans des conditions de non-transparence et dans un cadre de risque accru de corruption et de conflits d'intérêts. Que le Conseil réagisse vite!

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Presidente, Ministro, Comissário, não devia ser necessário lembrar: as democracias europeias assentam em valores fundamentais, entre eles o respeito pelo Estado de direito. Mas, sim, temos de o fazer! Há países que se colocam fora da regra. Tentam mesmo convencer-nos de que têm um conceito diferente.

Mas todos sabemos, Estado de direito é: separação de poderes, independência do sistema judicial, luta contra a corrupção e respeito pelos direitos fundamentais, pelas minorias, pela liberdade de expressão e de imprensa.

Temos uma base muito forte que não nos deixa dúvidas: os Tratados da União Europeia. Este regulamento tem de ser cumprido na íntegra. A Comissão tem de ser exigente e tudo fazer para que as Instituições europeias, o Parlamento Europeu e os cidadãos possam confiar.

Por exemplo, não basta afirmar que a Hungria vai criar uma autoridade independente. Tem de assegurar que essa autoridade é, de facto, independente na constituição e no funcionamento e independente do sistema judicial. Este é o ponto-chave.

Valérie Hayer (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Ministre, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, le meilleur ami d'enfance qui devient le plombier le plus riche d'Europe, le gendre qui reçoit un juteux marché public pour Noël. Les cas de corruption sont devenus légion dans la Hongrie de Viktor Orban. Une corruption systématique, selon les propres mots de la Commission européenne, une corruption contre laquelle la justice ne veut rien faire, je dis bien, ne veut rien faire et non pas ne peut rien faire, car les juges et les contrôleurs ont été placés dans des organes de contrôle stratégiques par Viktor Orban et son parti justement pour ne rien contrôler et justement pour fermer les yeux.

Alors j'en appelle à la fin de l'impunité. Soit Orban restaure l'état de droit dans ce qui est devenu une autocratie électorale, soit nous coupons les fonds européens. Et je vous alerte ici, monsieur le Commissaire. Que les députés du Fidesz adoptent des réformes sur le papier est une chose. Qu'elles mettent effectivement fin aux atteintes à l'état de droit en est une autre.

C'est donc à l'aune des résultats que nous devrons décider du dégel des fonds ou non. Et il en va de même bien évidemment pour le plan de relance. L'argent de l'Europe et par extension, l'argent des Européens, ne peut pas soutenir des projets antidémocratiques, filer dans les poches d'apprentis oligarques. Si nous ne suspendons pas les fonds, nous nous montrons complices de la construction d'un État corrompu au sein de notre union. Et ça, bien évidemment, c'est hors de question.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren! Die Sache ist doch eindeutig: Es ist richtig, wichtig und längst überfällig, dass der Rechtsstaatsmechanismus gegen Ungarn in Gang gesetzt wurde und empfindliche finanzielle Sanktionen vorgeschlagen wurden. Und der Konditionalitätsverordnungsentwurf ist der Beweis dafür. Er muss nur umgesetzt werden.

Denn die Feuertaufe ist noch nicht bestanden. Es ist ja auch eine Frage unserer Glaubwürdigkeit und unserer Handlungsfähigkeit, dass wir nach innen wie nach außen Sanktionen verhängen und unser Recht und unsere Werte verteidigen, wenn sie verletzt werden. Wir mischen uns dabei auch nicht ein, sondern wir schützen die Steuerzahler, alle Bürger, die Rechts- und die Wertegemeinschaft.

Der Mängelkatalog ist lang. Die Gefahr der missbräuchlichen Verwendung von EU-Mitteln besteht. Daher ist zu handeln, und es ist das Geld bis auf Weiteres zurückzubehalten.

Aurore Lalucq (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, le 8 octobre 2021, un accord mondial historique est signé sur la taxation minimale des multinationales par plus de 130 pays, dont les gouvernements polonais et hongrois. Il rapporterait plus de 50 milliards d'euros par an, dont nous aurions bien besoin en ce moment. La Commission, dans la foulée, propose une directive. Il y a des négociations, certains pays – Malte, l'Irlande – bloquent, on lève les blocages, on négocie de manière rationnelle.

Un seul pays fait exception: la Pologne. La Pologne, qui ne vote pas pour des raisons fiscales, mais parce qu'elle est en bisbille avec la Commission européenne pour des raisons liées à la question de l'état de droit. Et là, la Commission européenne fait une erreur: elle cède à ce chantage. La Pologne lève son blocage, évidemment, sur cette directive. En revanche, cela donne d'autres idées. Cela donne des idées à un gouvernement, le gouvernement hongrois, qui désormais bloque cet accord, qu'il a pourtant signé au niveau mondial.

Voilà ce qui arrive quand on faillit et quand on faiblit sur l'état de droit. On ne gagne pas du temps: on crée des myriades de problèmes. Le Parlement a voté une résolution cet été pour demander expressément à la Commission européenne de ne pas céder à ce chantage, qui, rappelons-le, est possible à cause de l'unanimité. Rappelons que la meilleure garantie pour notre démocratie et pour défendre l'état de droit, c'est la majorité qualifiée.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Madam President, the rule of law is a key European value. Dear Commissioner, the rule of law cannot be negotiated too much. It is a historically proven value.

What we see in Hungary is disrespect to the judgments of the international court, control of the media, of the press, violations of the independence of the judiciary, human rights, minority rights, et cetera. It is irrelevant how many times Mr Orbán was elected – the election cannot justify stealing European money and the violation of European values. The EU budget is supposed to protect the values of the rule of law. European funds cannot help to deny European values. How long do we have to wait before these values are finally protected? Now we finally have a tool with which we can achieve the protection of our values. Money is a tool that an autocrat understands.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Ministro, Senhor Comissário, estamos aqui a falar de um longo caminho de denúncias de corrupção, de ataques ao Estado de direito, de ataques à liberdade de imprensa e à liberdade de expressão. E estamos aqui a falar de um longo caminho na construção de um mecanismo capaz de proteger o orçamento europeu deste tipo de ataques.

Chegamos a um momento em que não podemos admitir meias tintas, nem podemos ficar a meio do caminho. É a nossa credibilidade, é a credibilidade de todos nós, da União Europeia, da Comissão Europeia e do Conselho Europeu que está em jogo. Os nossos eleitores, os cidadãos europeus, os nossos contribuintes não nos perdoarão se tomarmos medidas que ficam a meio caminho e que são meras promessas e meras operações de maquilhagem para não cortar os fundos europeus e não proceder à aplicação deste mecanismo.

Meus senhores, o tempo está a esgotar-se. É agora ou nunca!

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, pela primeira vez, desde sempre, a Comissão Europeia propõe ativar o Regulamento relativo à condicionalidade do Estado de direito e suspender o acesso da Hungria a importantes fundos comunitários. A primeira coisa a dizer é que esta é uma iniciativa significativa e muito importante que cria um precedente para o futuro. Só peca, aliás, por tardia.

É preciso que o Sr. Orbán perceba que os valores do Estado de direito, inscritos no Tratado de Lisboa, são para levar a sério e que não basta anunciar medidas. É preciso implementar, efetivamente, as medidas políticas e legislativas necessárias e suficientes.

Este Parlamento, que tanto se bateu pelo Regulamento relativo à condicionalidade do Estado de direito, só pode agora exigir que o Conselho aprove a proposta da Comissão e esteja à altura das suas responsabilidades.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ani jednego euro dla Viktora Orbana. To zdanie to płachta na pisowskich byków, którzy bronią tutaj zażarcie interesów przyjaciela Putina z Budapesztu. PiS broni człowieka, który jawnie działa w interesie Kremla. PiS broni człowieka, którego wrogiem jest wolna Ukraina. Co wam obiecał Orban, że stoicie po jego stronie? Może planujecie uciekać przed sądami i Trybunałem Stanu do Budapesztu? Przyznajcie się. Macie odwagę powiedzieć ludziom w Polsce, że bronicie Węgier, które torpedują sankcje na Rosję? Macie przyzwoitość, żeby powiedzieć wprost – człowiek, którego bronimy, sprał zwolennikom mózgi tak, że połowa z nich uważa, że za wojnę odpowiada NATO i USA? Macie tę odwagę, czy jej nie macie?

Ja na przykład Schrödera nie bronię. Wstyd, że nadal jest w SPD, jego zachowanie potępiam, podobnie jak cała nasza polska delegacja. Ale panie Brudziński, Jadwigo Wiśniewska, czy macie w sobie krztę przyzwoitości, żeby odciąć się w końcu od Orbana, przyjaciela Putina?

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospa predsednica, hvala lepa. Komisija je v okviru mehanizma vladavine prava predlagala zamrznitev sredstev Madžarski. Končno, ampak nismo še na cilju.

Prvi problem je, da to zadeva le del sredstev. Drugi problem je, da se iz aktualnega proračuna ta trenutek denar na Madžarsko steka nemoteno, korupciji in rušenju vladavine prava navkljub. Tretji problem je, da se s tem očitno ustvarja nek politični dogovor. Kompromisi z iliberalnimi vladami pa niso možni, veste, to bi se EU enkrat res že morala naučiti. V redu, sprejmem, da je mehanizem mogoče sprožiti ponovno ali ga razširiti. Kazen sprejmem tudi in upam, da to drži, da se za neodvisnost pravosodja ali tožilstva uporabi druge vzvode pritiska prek sklada za okrevanje in odpornost. Tu ne sme biti popuščanja, ker dvomim, da bo madžarska vlada kakorkoli spremenila svoja dejanja, kvečjemu na slabše.

Glede predlaganih ukrepov za sprostitev financiranja pa kaže, da se madžarska vlada pretvarja, da sprejema reforme, EU pa se pretvarja, da so te reforme zadostne. Upam, da se države članice tega zavedajo in bodo blokirale vsaj ta del.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, so we finally have some proposals now for action on the rule of law conditionality mechanism, though whether it'll actually come to anything or not is very much an open question. Because, to be honest, there is plenty of wriggle room for Hungary to escape sanctions. So I really will believe this when I see it.

But of course, the escape valves in the proposal aren't the only notable thing about this; Poland is also glaringly absent. The fact that Poland isn't even in the crosshairs on this one tells you something, because all along the idea of this regulation was to try and deal with the rule-of-law problems in Hungary and Poland.

But the Polish Government's abuse of the rule of law, of minorities, of women, of judges, of EU funds and all the rest of it has been conveniently left out for the moment. It's got its Resilience and Recovery Fund money released in the summer, despite loud protests from civil society and judges in Poland. And Hungary, of course, is not getting its.

The only possible reason for these wretched double standards is a geopolitical one, because Hungary has taken a different attitude to Russia. And I think that is shameful for all of those in Poland who are suffering from violations of rule of law, not to mention those in Spain, Bulgaria and France as well.

Isabel García Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la defensa de los valores fundacionales de la Unión Europea y el estricto respeto del Estado de Derecho deben estar por encima de todo.

Nos alegra que la Comisión haya activado, después de tanto tiempo y gracias al empeño del Parlamento, el mecanismo de condicionalidad contra el Gobierno de Orbán. 7 500 millones de euros es lo único que ha conseguido que el Gobierno húngaro se tome en serio las advertencias.

Las continuas violaciones del Estado de Derecho en materia de lucha contra la corrupción y el fraude en la contratación pública, las deficiencias en el tratamiento de los conflictos de intereses y los ataques a la independencia del sistema judicial suponen un riesgo para el presupuesto europeo, por lo que es imprescindible tomar medidas para protegerlo.

Hungría es uno de los mayores beneficiarios de los fondos regionales europeos, por lo que si quiere estar en nuestro club tendrá que cumplir las normas establecidas. No solo se está para recibir ayudas, también hay condiciones que cumplir. Por ahora solo tenemos un compromiso de reformas, así que habrá que seguir presionando hasta que sean una realidad.

En el Consejo, por su parte, solo tienen que decidir si defienden la democracia y el Estado de Derecho o si prefieren mirar hacia otro lado.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, I'm not a fan of Orbán, but then I'm not a fan of any other leader either. In fact, I've never seen a government that I like.

I think the idea of respecting freedom of expression and respecting human rights is very important.

If there's things not being done, if behaviour is poor anywhere, we should criticise it, but I think it's very important that we do so evenly and consistently – and I don't see that.

Right now today, freedom of expression is under threat in Europe – anyone that criticises the general narrative to the war – and there are people that have been arrested for expressing their opinion when that doesn't suit the agenda.

Human rights. We talked about the Roma this morning. The Roma have never been given human rights across Europe. We have a housing crisis in many countries of Europe. So many people are being denied the human right to a house. We don't treat the poor people of Europe well. We don't respect their human rights. When are we going to become consistent in how we approach these problems?

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Die Präsidentin. – Herr Kommissar Hahn, Sie haben mitgekriegt: Es geht ums Eingemachte. Das Europäische Parlament achtet sehr darauf, was die Kommission tut. Ich ersuche Sie nun zum Schluss, uns seitens der Kommission Ihre Botschaft mitzugeben.

Johannes Hahn, *Mitglied der Kommission*. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich kann bestätigen, auch aus meiner Wahrnehmung, dass dies eine sehr lebhafte, durchaus polarisierende, aber diesbezüglich nicht überraschende Debatte war, was auch dadurch sichtbar wird, dass vergleichsweise viele von Ihnen von Anbeginn an bei dieser Debatte anwesend waren. Das zeigt eben die Bedeutung, die Sie diesem Thema geben. Wir haben uns ja vielfach schon hier ausgetauscht, und deswegen, glaube ich, ist es nicht notwendig, dass ich mich hier repetitiv wieder zu Wort melde.

Sondern ich möchte schon einen Fokus darauf legen: Wir haben nun einen Maßnahmenkatalog, den Ungarn öffentlich angekündigt hat, abzuarbeiten und zu erfüllen. Und natürlich, das ist Ihr gutes Recht, und ich habe auch bis zu einem gewissen Grad rein emotional ein gewisses Verständnis, aber unsere Aufgabe als Kommission ist es, Probleme zu fixieren und idealerweise auch zu lösen. Jetzt schon zu sagen, was immer hier in zwei Monaten oder eineinhalb Monaten geliefert wird, ist nicht ausreichend, würde ich sagen, ist zu früh. Es gibt einen klaren Arbeitskatalog, der ist abzuarbeiten vonseiten Ungarns. Irgendjemand hat von 17 Kompromissen gesprochen. Ich möchte festhalten: Es gibt keine Kompromisse. Wir haben eine klare Vorstellung, was notwendig ist. Wir stellen fest: Ist es falsch, was geliefert wird, oder ist es richtig? Und das jedenfalls ist unser *guiding principle* dabei, wie wir dann eine Beurteilung vornehmen, auf deren Basis der Rat eine Entscheidung zu treffen hat. Aber ich glaube, wir sollten hier nicht schon a priori aufgeben und sagen, das alles funktioniert nicht. Denn am Ende des Tages muss es unser großes Interesse sein, die Situation in Ungarn in überwiegender Übereinstimmung dieses Hauses hier zu verbessern, zu fixieren.

Deswegen ist es aus meiner Warte zum Beispiel sehr wichtig – und ich bitte Sie, das auch zu unterstützen –, dass sich für diese diese *Integrity Authority*, wenn sie tatsächlich so geschaffen wird, wie wir uns das vorstellen, mit dieser Unabhängigkeit, mit diesen Möglichkeiten, tatsächlich Menschen finden, die bereit sind, in dieser Behörde ihre Tätigkeit auszuüben, um in der Tat dann auch diese Maßnahmen und diese Resultate zu erzielen, die wir uns erwarten. Also, das wird auch eine gewisse Herausforderung sein, dass wir ausreichend Menschen – ich möchte gar nicht sagen: mutige Menschen – finden, die bereit sind, diese Tätigkeit auszuüben. Aber am Ende des Tages werden wir nicht umhinkommen, festzustellen oder zu akzeptieren, wir schaffen hier – oder Ungarn schafft – Behörden, die aber entsprechend auch zusammengesetzt sein müssen, die auch entsprechende Rechte haben, unabhängig sind etc.

Dann gehe ich davon aus – und ich gehöre bekanntlich zu denen, die das halbvolle und nicht das halbleere Glas sehen –, dass sich die Dinge zu einem Besseren ändern. Wenn das nicht der Fall ist, dann haben wir alle Möglichkeiten an der Hand, dieses Thema wieder aufzugreifen und entsprechende Maßnahmen vorzuschlagen.

Also, zunächst einmal gilt es zu sehen, in welchem Ausmaß hier diesen Vorgaben und diesen Zusagen nachgekommen wird. Dann gibt es eine Beurteilung und auf Basis dessen dann auch einen Vorschlag an den Rat, der schlussendlich die finale Entscheidung zu treffen hat. Aber nochmals sei klargestellt: Das europäische Budget und der Schutz des europäischen Budgets sind nicht verhandelbar.

Letzter Punkt: Üblicherweise reagiere ich ja nicht auf jemanden, der nicht mehr im Saal ist, aber der Herr Fest hat gemeint, Präsidentin von der Leyen sei demokratisch nicht legitimiert. Also wenn ich mich recht entsinne, wurde sie hier in diesem Parlament gewählt, und ich gehe davon aus, dass die überwiegende Mehrheit dieses Parlaments der Auffassung ist, demokratisch legitimiert zu sein. Daher ist auch die Wahl der Präsidentin der Europäischen Kommission eine, die in höchstem Maße demokratisch legitimiert und den Spielregeln der repräsentativen Demokratie gefolgt ist. Das nur Herrn Fest ins Stammbuch geschrieben.

Die Präsidentin. – Alle Institutionen sind gefragt, Parlament, Kommission. Minister Bek, Sie haben das Schlusswort.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you very much for this very rich debate and for all your remarks, which just show how important this topic is for the European Parliament.

Likewise, the protection of the EU budget and the financial interest of the Union, as well as the good management of the EU funds are paramount for the Council. European citizens need to see that the EU money is well spent in every single Member State, without exceptions.

I heard your clear calls for getting the process right, and you can rest assured that the Council will fulfil its role foreseen in the Conditionality Regulation with maximum responsibility. We rely on the Commission's objective assessment to protect the interests of the Union. As I stated in my initial intervention, EU ambassadors will have the opportunity tomorrow to thoroughly discuss the Commission's proposal and all relevant elements will be taken into consideration.

To respond to several of you who raised the issue of timing: yes, the Council has a clear time frame. As the proposal was received by the Council on 18 September, the latest day for the Council to take a decision is 19 October.

However, as you know, the Conditionality Regulation foresees that, if exceptional circumstances arise, the period for the Council to adopt its decision can be extended by a maximum of two additional months. In such a case, the deadline for the Council could be extended up to 19 December of this year. Rest assured that the Council will respect the deadlines foreseen in the regulation.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

13. Smrt Mahsy Amíníové a represe vůči účastníkům demonstrací za práva žen v Íránu (rozprava)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung des Vizepräsidenten der Kommission und Hohen Vertreters der Union für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik zum Tod von Mahsa Amini und zur Unterdrückung der Demonstranten für Frauenrechte im Iran.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, honourable Members, excuse me, I was running from one phone call to a meeting, but here I am, sorry for being late.

Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, it is important to have this opportunity to discuss today what is happening across Iran after the death of a young woman. Mahsa Amini was arrested by the police and was killed during her arrest in the police station.

Let me express my condolences to the family. This is something that has to be said, although it's not going to be very useful for them. Also, let me express our admiration for the demonstrations – mainly women, and men also – across Iran, protesting about her killing and the repression that they have suffered that has cost the lives of dozens of people. These are facts, they are not opinions. On the streets of Iran the repression of the demonstrators has left behind tens of people killed.

Mahsa Amini was only 22 years old. She was visiting the capital of her country. And the morality police – even the name morality police sounds bizarre to our ears – detained and mistreated her simply because of her headscarf. She ended up in hospital where she died shortly after. These are facts.

Following that, following her passing, or should I say her killing, we have seen a wave of indignation and outrage turning into nationwide protests in Iran. Iranians, and especially young Iranians, have taken to the streets to express their anger, their aspirations for a better future, free from oppression. There are countless testimonies of brave women and men expressing their dissent in their cities. On social media we have seen them chanting 'Women, Life, Freedom', three key words. These Iranian women have been the force driving the dissent. They ask for respect, justice and equality. Nothing more, nothing less.

As European Union representatives, we call immediately for the Iranian authorities to ensure the respect of fundamental rights of Iranian citizens. In a meeting in New York that President Michel and I had with Iranian President Raisi, we raised this situation directly with him and called for accountability for the death of Mahsa Amini and restraint in the government's reaction to the demonstrations. Unfortunately, it did not happen. Numerous reports clearly show that the response of the Iranian security and police forces has been disproportionate and resulted, as we said, in dozens of lives lost. Many more have been injured and detained, including several journalists covering the events. And we have to see clear indications of a credible investigation that could ensure accountability for what has happened. Accountability? Not at all.

Also, the internet has been shut down in many areas of the country. Iranians in the world lost access to information of what was happening there, as well as the opportunity to use online platforms to express their dissent, which is another deliberate violation of freedom of expression in the country.

I think it is important here for the European Parliament to show a strong and united reaction by the European Union. On my side, on behalf of the 27 Member States, I publicly expressed in my declaration of 25 September the widespread and disproportionate use of force against non-violent protesters, and consider it unjustifiable and unacceptable. People in Iran and anywhere else have the right to peaceful protest. It is as simple as that. And it's clear that this right has not been ensured.

Together with the Member States, we will continue to consider all the options at our disposal, including restrictive measures to address the killing of Mahsa Amini and the way the Iranian security forces have responded to the demonstration. I will raise this at the next Foreign Affairs Council with my colleagues. And when I say 'restrictive measures', I am using the wording of the Treaty, because in the Treaty you will not find the word 'sanctions'. The only thing you will find in the Treaty is 'restrictive measures', and that is what I am talking about.

David McAllister, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Mr High Representative/Vice President, ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, the massive protests that erupted following the death of Mahsa Amini in police custody have spread to 171 cities in all 31 provinces of Iran. The people are protesting against a deeply corrupt and violent regime that systematically oppresses women and responds to political resistance with brutal violence and repression. The violent crackdown of the mullahs security forces on peaceful protesters must stop immediately.

The Council ought to impose tough sanctions responding to serious human rights violations as soon as possible. Call them restrictive measures, call them tough sanctions – the main thing is they will be adopted; sooner, the better.

The regime in Tehran has manoeuvred itself into a dead end. As our President Roberta Metsola stated yesterday here in the plenary, we as the European Parliament stand in solidarity with the brave women and men and all their democratic aspirations in their fight for women's, human and minority rights, for the free flow of information and access to Internet, and for a free, secular and democratic republic.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor alto representante, en pleno siglo XXI, en Irán existe una policía dedicada a vigilar el cumplimiento de las normas de vestimenta y comportamiento de las mujeres. Y esa policía aborda y detiene a una joven porque, según ellos, enseñaba más cabello del que debiera por debajo del velo. Y esa joven ya no sale con vida del centro policial al que la trasladan. Increíble, pero cierto.

Parece una pesadilla, pero es la realidad que viven cada día las mujeres en Irán, que son tratadas como seres de segunda categoría, objetos propiedad de un hombre — su padre, su hermano o su marido—. Si un hombre mata a su hija, será condenado solo a unos pocos años, porque no hay ninguna ley que proteja a las mujeres. Pero si una mujer mata al hombre que la ha violado, por ejemplo, es ahorcada al día siguiente.

El régimen iraní ejerce una represión brutal contra los opositores y las mujeres son, por definición, las primeras opositoras, porque las autoridades intentaron desde el primer momento reducirlas a la nada. Pero ellas lucharon desde el principio y, aunque han logrado pequeñas victorias, no son suficientes.

La muerte de Mahsa Amini ha prendido una mecha que podría hacer estallar un régimen oscuro anclado en la Edad Media, ahogado por las sanciones económicas, contra el que cada vez más iraníes alzan la voz y se echan a las calles para protestar, arriesgando su vida. Según han confirmado las Naciones Unidas, se han producido muchas muertes en estas protestas que han podido no ser admitidas por parte de las fuerzas iraníes.

La renegociación del acuerdo nuclear con Irán que en estos momentos se está llevando a cabo y la especial situación de este país en medio de una crisis energética mundial no nos pueden hacer mirar hacia otro lado para no ver lo que está ocurriendo en Irán. Europa tiene que responder y apoyar a las mujeres, que son las que están liderando estas protestas. Mujeres, vida y libertad. Hermanas iraníes, estamos con vosotras.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, Mahsa Jina Amini fue detenida a golpes, golpeada durante su traslado, golpeada hasta la muerte en dependencias policiales. Desgraciadamente, su asesinato no es algo accidental o excepcional. Forma parte de una política de Estado dirigida contra los derechos de las mujeres.

Por ello, hoy Amini está en la valentía y en el coraje de miles de mujeres que han salido a la calle para levantarse contra un régimen que durante cuarenta y tres años ha querido someterlas a la explotación, a la opresión y a la exclusión.

La sociedad iraní ha salido a la calle en apoyo de las mujeres, pero, señor alto representante, sigue ahí, en la calle: clamando por la libertad, frente a un régimen represivo, dictatorial y teocrático. Están pidiendo un cambio real. Están pidiendo un régimen democrático.

La violencia a la hora de reprimir las protestas no es nueva. La impunidad en Irán tampoco. Lo hemos visto en las protestas de 2019, 2021 y en abril de este año. La Unión Europea sancionó, ya en 2019, a Hossein Salami, entonces responsable del Cuerpo de los Guardianes de la Revolución, hoy, su jefe, miembro del Consejo de Seguridad Nacional, responsable de la organización de la represión de las protestas con fuego letal.

Por eso, señor alto representante, necesitamos renovar las sanciones, actualizar las sanciones, ampliar las sanciones. Esta es la forma de acompañar al pueblo de Irán y de reivindicar los nombres de tantas mujeres muertas por su libertad.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, señor alto representante, los impactantes acontecimientos que se están desarrollando en Irán han alcanzado una magnitud sin precedentes en la última semana. Desde aquí, quiero enviar todo mi apoyo a las mujeres y manifestantes que han tomado las calles en los últimos días en defensa de sus derechos.

Al menos setenta y seis personas han muerto, mientras continúan las protestas en Irán contra la muerte de Mahsa Amini, quien fue golpeada y torturada mientras estaba bajo custodia policial. Han pasado ya más de dos semanas desde su muerte y las autoridades iraníes no han asumido ninguna responsabilidad por estos acontecimientos. Por lo tanto, hacemos un llamamiento a las autoridades iraníes para que permitan una investigación a fondo, independiente y rápida sobre su muerte y detengan la violencia contra los manifestantes pacíficos y los defensores de los derechos humanos.

Amini es otra víctima más de la represión sostenida y la discriminación sistemática contra las mujeres y de la imposición de códigos de vestimenta discriminatorios. Durante las últimas cuatro décadas, las mujeres iraníes han seguido protestando pacíficamente contra las reglas obligatorias del hiyab y las violaciones de sus derechos fundamentales; hoy queremos expresar nuestra solidaridad con todas ellas y con las protestas pacíficas.

Estas protestas, que ahora se han convertido en un movimiento, expresan un profundo descontento. Sí, un profundo descontento de las mujeres y de los hombres iraníes contra un Gobierno que aplica una opresión sistemática de todas las personas disidentes.

Pedimos a la Unión Europea, por lo tanto, y a sus Estados miembros que utilicen todos los canales a su disposición con las autoridades iraníes para poner fin a la represión violenta de las protestas y pedir la abolición de todas las leyes y prácticas que privan a las mujeres de su autonomía y sus derechos.

El respeto de los derechos humanos debe ser un componente central en el desarrollo de las relaciones entre la Unión Europea e Irán. No vamos a parar hasta que los derechos de las mujeres iraníes sean respetados. Desde aquí les queremos lanzar un mensaje muy claro: no las vamos a dejar solas.

Jean-Paul Garraud, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, Mahsa Amini, jeune femme de 22 ans, morte car rouée de coups par la police des mœurs en Iran pour ne pas avoir porté correctement son voile islamique. Hadis Najafi, 20 ans, abattue de six balles par la police pour les mêmes raisons. Comme elles, des milliers de femmes courageuses se battent en Iran pour se libérer de ce voile, symbole de l'asservissement de la femme.

Mais depuis des années, l'Union européenne, elle, participe à la promotion du port de ce même voile en Europe. Et récemment, en novembre 2021, la Commission européenne a cofinancé cette campagne affirmant que la liberté est dans le hijab. En février dernier, lors de la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe, est publié ce visuel: l'avenir est entre vos mains et met en scène une femme portant un hijab.

Cet avenir de l'Europe, nos peuples ne le veulent pas. Le 21 septembre, dans le cadre d'une campagne relative à Erasmus +, la Commission a diffusé cette affiche mettant en scène une fillette voilée. Toujours le 21 septembre, une délégation du mouvement Femyso, faux nez de l'islamisme selon une ancienne ministre française, s'est livrée dans les locaux du Parlement européen, à l'occasion d'une invitation du groupe socialiste, à un véritable exercice de prosélytisme en faveur du port du voile pour les femmes.

Mais le soutien de l'Union européenne à cette cause est aussi financier: 23 millions d'euros versés par la Commission à l'ENAR, qui regroupe de nombreuses associations refusant l'intégration à nos valeurs européennes et dont certaines sont reçues ici même pour accuser la France d'islamophobie.

Tout ceci n'est plus tolérable. Les Européens n'attendent pas de l'Union européenne qu'elle les convertissent à l'islam. Que Bruxelles entende les Iraniennes au lieu d'obéir aux ayatollahs.

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Garraud! Ich muss Ihnen sagen, dass das, was Sie hier in Ihrer Wortmeldung getan haben, nicht mit der Geschäftsordnung vereinbar ist. Ich bitte Sie, sich auch während Ihrer Rede an die Geschäftsordnung zu halten.

(Beifall)

Assita Kanko, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, the women who are now rising up against the Islamic brutality in Iran know what freedom is and why we must protect it. Those who defend the headscarf in Europe should take a good look at these women and learn what real courage is: it is not in the veil. It is also not inside a dependent man. A dependent man is a healthy man who cannot cook his own meal, who cannot do his own dishes, who cannot clean his own house, control his own sexuality, do his own damn laundry or be responsible for his own life.

I can understand that men cannot bear children, but I strongly refuse to be enslaved as a woman, refuse to see women be enslaved today, tortured and killed because they want to wear a T-shirt. This darkness that many still carry must stop. Therefore, all men should become independent and self-sufficient. That is your best contribution to the emancipation of women.

An independent man is a healthy man who does all his things by himself and picks the right side in the fight for freedom. It is a man who is not scared of women's intelligence and potential, not scared of their opinions, not scared of their ideas or sexuality. It is a man who knows that men are responsible for their own sexuality. It's a man who does not expect his wife or daughter to wear a hijab to protect men from their femininity. He clearly takes their side in the fight against the subjection of women. As women, we must also take our own side and fight to be first, work together to be respected.

The Iranian women are showing us the way. A woman died for freedom. Together, we need to say that we understand how they feel and support them.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, honte, honte à ceux qui ont assassiné Mahsa Amini et tant d'autres femmes parce qu'une mèche de cheveux dépassait de leur voile. Honte aux milices de la dictature islamiste iranienne qui arrachent aux femmes la libre disposition de leur corps. Honte à ce régime patriarcal obscurantiste qui bâillonne, écrase et emprisonne les femmes et tous ceux qui se mobilisent à leurs côtés. Honte à la théocratie des mollahs dont l'oppression des femmes et l'obligation du voile sont la clef de voûte. Honte à Emmanuel Macron qui serrait la main du président Raïssi quand la police tirait sous ses ordres sur la foule. Honte aux chefs d'État qui regardent leurs pompes quand les Iraniens qui se mobilisent ont besoin de soutien et leurs bourreaux de sanctions.

«Femme, vie, liberté», avec ces simples mots les Iraniennes mènent sous les balles la bataille de toutes les femmes et entraînent à leur suite tout un peuple rassemblé contre la corruption, la dictature et l'injustice. Leur courage nous oblige. Jamais notre solidarité ne doit faiblir. Nous devons lutter partout et tout le temps contre l'oppression des femmes, pour la conquête de leur liberté en Iran, comme pour la défense du droit fondamental à disposer de leur corps aux États-Unis, en Hongrie ou en Pologne.

Et je veux dire ici, quelle hypocrisie de la part de l'extrême droite de venir ici donner des leçons quand vous êtes les premiers à opprimer le droit des femmes à disposer de leur propre corps dans l'Union européenne!

Alors, en hommage au combat des femmes iraniennes, je termine par les vers de la poétesse Mona Borzouei, arrêtée pour ces mots: «Ses cheveux, drapeau que la nuit a souillé, nous les reprendrons à l'ombre de tes griffes. Oh magma de mensonges! Oh toi l'effrayé! Nous reprendrons ce pays de tes griffes.»

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, καταδικάζουμε τη στυγερή δολοφονία της Μαχσά Αμινί από το ιρανικό κράτος, καθώς και την άγρια καταστολή που αυτό έχει εξαπολύσει σε βάρος των μαζικών λαϊκών κινητοποιήσεων. Η δολοφονία της Αμινί, οι δεκάδες νεκροί, τραυματίες οι και αναρίθμητες συλλήψεις φέρνουν στην επιφάνεια το όργιο κρατικής βίας, τις οικονομικές, κοινωνικές, θρησκευτικές διακρίσεις που αναπαράγουν τη γυναικεία ανισοτιμία, τις σκοταδιστικές, αναχρονιστικές αντιλήψεις και πρακτικές.

Είναι απύθμενη όμως και η υποκρισία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, των ΗΠΑ και του ΝΑΤΟ, με τις αλά καρτ ευαισθησίες τους για τις γυναίκες του Ιράν, ενώ στηρίζουν καθεστώτα σε άλλες χώρες που επιδίδονται στις ίδιες αποκρουστικές πρακτικές σε βάρος των γυναικών. Στόχος τους είναι να χειραγωγήσουν τις λαϊκές κινητοποιήσεις και να τις μετατρέψουν σε εργαλείο στους εντεινόμενους καπιταλιστικούς ανταγωνισμούς, που κλιμακώνονται την ίδια ώρα στον ιμπεριαλιστικό πόλεμο στην Ουκρανία. Η οργή για τέτοια ειδεχθή εγκλήματα να γίνει ανυποχώρητος αγώνας ενάντια στην αντιδραστική οπισθοδρόμηση και τις σάπιες ιδέες που την καλλιεργούν, στην καπιταλιστική εκμετάλλευση και καταπίεση, για γυναικεία ισοτιμία και χειραφέτηση των λαών.

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Mr President, High Representative, women in Iran are fighting for their fundamental rights, their freedom. The shocking and unlawful death of a young woman of 22, Mahsa Amini, is a stark reminder of the abuse and violence women face every day from the regressive Iranian regime. Women and men have rightly taken to the streets to protest at the barbaric and honestly sickening treatment of women by the Iranian State and their so-called morality police. What morality, I ask? Whose values? Whose morals? Certainly not women's.

We in this Chamber must join the Iranian people and condemn this use of violence against women. And the continued use of such disproportionate violence against protesters is abhorrent and emblematic of such an autocratic regime. We must support women to have choice in the way that they live. We must support the fundamental rights of all women to live life as they see fit, free from state-sponsored violence.

The stories emerging are really totally unacceptable. They are dreadful, and I urge the High Representative to do everything in his power to take action against the state in a united way across Europe. Like so many of the women of Iran, Mahsa was brave and courageous. We must ensure that her death was not in vain.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Her name was Jina Mahsa Amini. A young Kurdish girl in Iran with her whole life ahead of her, deprived of her life by men and a regime who thinks they have the right to control women.

For over 40 years, women, girls, minorities and opposition groups have lived in horror. The Iranian feminist revolution is a democratic revolution that is taking place right now. The autocratic regime might think that they can suffocate and silence the people, but what they do is to fuel the anger. Right now, Iranian, Kurdish, Baluch and many other groups – especially women and young people – are leveraging their righteous wrath and shouting, 'The days of the regime are numbered!'

The cruel morality police and all those in the government behind the oppression of the people must be sanctioned. The discrimination laws that constitute the basis of the gender apartheid in the country must be abolished. The murderers of Jina and all those freely demonstrating and protesting must be brought to justice. We need to end impunity!

To be silent is to be compliant. Compliance can't be the way forward for the international community if we truly stand for what we preach – democracy, human rights, equality and justice. The cause of all women and people in Iran is our cause. Their freedom is our freedom.

(the speaker used a slogan in a non-official language) Women, life, freedom!

Katalin Cseh (Renew). – Mr President, dear colleagues, dear High Representative, please allow me to start my remarks with a message addressed not to this Chamber, but to the women of Iran.

Your courage is breathtaking. As you rise up against injustice, as you dare to defy the oppressive regime, you inspire to fight for women's rights everywhere. And as you honour the memory of Mahsa Amini, who was brutally murdered, you are teaching the world a lesson in solidarity, so that no women is harassed or killed because of a bigoted dress code ever again. We salute and admire your bravery.

And colleagues, our support cannot be limited only to words. European diplomacy needs to swing into action now. We need targeted personal sanctions, travel bans, asset freezes against members of the Iranian regime, and also including careful and strict implementation of every single existing sanction.

And we also need to help those whose lives are in danger by issuing humanitarian visas. The people of Iran who take the streets, the women who remove or burn their headscarves, they are risking their lives doing so. They deserve help from the European Union and the international community as a whole. Let us show them that we are on their side.

Diana Riba i Giner (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, señor alto representante: «Mujer, vida y libertad», mucho más que un grito de lucha y resistencia de las mujeres kurdas. Es una conjura, un aviso para navegantes: no puede existir una sociedad libre sin mujeres libres.

Hoy, en un mundo donde los conflictos, el autoritarismo y las desigualdades van en aumento, la libertad, la igualdad y la esperanza tienen nombre de mujer: Mahsa Amini, Hadith Najafi, Ghazale Chelavi, Hanane Kia y Mahsa Mogoi.

Las mujeres en Irán se están jugando la vida por su derecho a vivir según sus propios términos y por destruir el patriarcado, el Estado y la religión que las oprime, domina, somete y discrimina. Su lucha, su resistencia, es un ejemplo para todas nosotras.

Desde aquí quiero enviarles un mensaje de admiración y solidaridad: estamos a vuestro lado. Estaremos siempre al lado de las mujeres que exigen libertad para ellas mismas y para sus sociedades.

(La oradora finaliza su intervención en una lengua no oficial de la Unión)

Anna Bonfrisco (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Alto rappresentante, in molti avremmo voluto il coraggio delle sue parole di oggi anche da parte dell'Unione europea nel boicottare la cerimonia di insediamento di Raisi nell'agosto del 2021, perché è sulle azioni che veniamo e verremo giudicati.

Vorrei che lei fosse quindi più chiaro sul perimetro di queste sanzioni, perché siano le più vere e dure possibili, e che sia chiaro anche nel riconoscere tutti i massacri perpetrati dal regime iraniano dal 1988 ad oggi. Più chiaro nel definire un crimine contro l'umanità ogni incarcerazione illegittima e arbitraria, ogni tortura, violenza o pena di morte e discriminazione a cui sono sottoposte donne e ragazze in Iran e tutte le minoranze. Più chiaro nel promuovere indagini internazionali nei confronti del regime di Raisi, il macellaio di Teheran, per ridare giustizia al popolo iraniano. Più chiaro contro un regime che non fornisce alcun contributo all'umanità, solo morte e terrore. Più chiaro nei confronti di quel velo che porta sangue e morte. E quelle ciocche di capelli, i capelli delle donne iraniane, i nostri capelli, nei quali soffia la libertà delle donne, la libertà del mondo e del suo futuro.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Mr President, 'evil empire' – that's what President Reagan dared to call the Soviet Union. Remember that? Soviet dissident Natan Sharansky does. He fondly remarked, 'I remember what a burst of enthusiasm this gave us: when the West finally saw the Soviet Union for what it was, there would be hope for victory.'

Words matter. The Iranian people beg us to be their voice. And we should. But words must be matched by action. And this requires soul-searching here in Europe. Political prisoners and young girls don't get a burst of enthusiasm when European politicians don hijabs in front of the regime in Tehran.

Iranian-supplied suicide drones to Russia are used to kill Ukrainians. While Brussels clings on to a dead nuclear deal, where are the Magnitsky sanctions against the ruling elite? Will protesters chanting *(the speaker used a slogan in a non-official language)* – 'Women, Life, Freedom' – be given a hope for victory as Liberals and Socialists normalise relations with the murdering mullahs?

Mr High Representative, join me in declaring what the brave Iranian people already know all too well: the Islamic Republic is an evil republic.

Cornelia Ernst (The Left). – Herr Präsident! Tja, was sagt es über ein Regime aus, wenn dieses eine junge Frau zu Tode bringt, weil sie ihren Hidschab nicht richtig getragen hat? Das sagt aus, dass das Kapitel über ein solches Regime geschlossen werden muss.

Wer im Namen Gottes Menschen tötet, ist selbst gottverlassen. Wir werden niemals aufhören, Frauen zu unterstützen, die sich gegen archaische Unterwerfung und erniedrigende Bevormundung wehren. Und wir werden niemals aufhören, Proteste wie im Iran mit ganzem Herzen, mit unserer ganzen Seele zu unterstützen, weil sie gerecht sind. Irans Frauen sind längst ein Symbol des Widerstandes geworden, weil es bei ihnen um alles geht: frei zu atmen, das eigene Leben bestimmen zu können und als Mensch, ja als Frau respektiert, akzeptiert zu werden!

Man kann den Wunsch nach Freiheit, Gleichheit und Gerechtigkeit nicht mal mit einem Beil erschlagen. Diese Idee lässt sich weder ersticken noch verdammen. Der Iran ist ein wundervolles Land mit einer großen Geschichte und Kultur. Aber jetzt ist es Zeit, ein neues Kapitel aufzuschlagen – mit einer weiblichen Handschrift. Denn genug ist genug.

Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó (NI). – Mr President, the Iranian women's protest is a cry for freedom, for their freedom and for the freedom of the forgotten women of Afghanistan or Africa. We respect the protest for what it is. They rebel against the dictatorship of men who imprison them, bully them, torture them, limit their lives simply because they are women and want to live in equality.

There is a common thread that connects this protest with the protest of previous generations of women who took to the streets because they were not allowed to vote, they were not allowed to be involved in politics, they were not allowed to work within the same jobs as men, they were not allowed to earn the same salary as men. They ask for complete freedom. They ask to be able to live and to do with their future and their bodies what they want, decide their life for themselves, in full freedom. That is why they shout 'azadi, azadi, azadi' – freedom, freedom, freedom. And we must listen to this cry. We must help.

Javier Zarzalejos (PPE). – Seventeen days have passed since protests began following the killing of Mahsa Amini in Iranian police facilities. How many Iranians have been killed? Hundreds. How many have been arrested or injured? Thousands. We don't know for sure. Women are beaten and dragged away by police.

But let us get it right: this is not only about mandatory veiling or the hijab. This is about basic freedom. This is about a regime founded on systematic repression and cruelty against its people. A regime headed by someone fully involved in the massacre of 1988, a crime against humanity that has already come to European courts. A Swedish court has imposed a life sentence on an Iranian official for taking part in this crime.

There is an uprising going on in Iran, and we have not only to condemn repression, but to support the victims of repression. We need to send a clear sign of our concern and condemnation, but also an unequivocal message of support: Europe means pluralism, democracy, freedom of religion, respect for all belief, equal rights between men and women. And those Iranians struggling for their rights, risking their lives, deserve to see Europe firmly on their side. Europe at its best: friendly, supportive and committed.

There should be specific demands to the Iranian Government on the release of prisoners and accountability of perpetrators, no matter how long it takes. But neither the nuclear deal nor the oil resources of Iran can justify turning a blind eye or watering down our response. Appeasement, we should know, never works.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, depuis la mort de Mahsa Hamani, cette jeune femme de 22 ans victime de la police des mœurs iranienne et pour avoir mal porté son voile, des dizaines de personnes sont mortes et des milliers arrêtées pour avoir manifesté pour leurs droits. Et contrairement à ce que clame le chef suprême iranien, qui voit dans ces manifestations la manipulation étrangère, ces femmes, ces jeunes, ces hommes courageux ne demandent qu'une seule chose: la fin du régime qui les oppresse, qui les enferme, qui les massacre.

L'Union européenne dispose de leviers de discussion avec ce régime et nous devons les utiliser en exprimant notre solidarité avec ces manifestants, en exigeant la libération immédiate de tous les manifestants mais aussi de tous les défenseurs des droits de l'homme dans ce pays, en soutenant les revendications de ces manifestations, en réclamant les sanctions ciblées et en plaçant les droits de l'homme dans toutes les discussions et dans tous les accords que nous avons avec l'Iran.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Dear President, thank you very much and good evening, dear High Representative, dear colleagues, over 100 deaths and still counting, we all know the brutal story. Public protests in Iran broke out after Amini died in custody after she was arrested for not wearing the hijab correctly.

We cannot close our eyes to these atrocities. We must pursue a clear strategy in which we put women's rights on the top of the agenda. As Madeleine Albright once said: 'there is a special place in hell for women who don't help women'.

Therefore, Mr Borrell, if you don't want to go to hell – and I think you don't want to go to hell – I really urge you: provide access to our European universities, support civil society in their fight for women's rights, protect human rights defenders and target directly the leaders and people who are responsible for these crimes.

Let's never give up on women, the life and the liberty in Iran. They need our help.

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Det började med Jina Masha Amini, men de fängslade, de skadade, de mördade har många fler ansikten och lika många namn. Förövarna, mördarna och medhjälparna – de är också många. Men vi vet vilka de är och vad de ska ställas till svars för. Sedan har vi alla oss andra, vi som står vid sidan om. Vi som kan välja att leva våra liv som vanligt eller göra vad vi kan med det vi har.

Fred och frihet kommer inte gratis. De modiga kvinnor, män och barn som runtom i Iran gått ut på gatorna med livet som insats, de visar hur dyrköpt frihet är.

Omvärldens reaktioner och uthållighet kommer att avgöra om deras kamp, om deras död, var förgäves eller inte. Frihetsrörelsen i Iran behöver allt stöd den kan få, samtidigt som vi gör det obekvämt för den iranska mördarregimen. *(talaren använder ett icke-officiellt språk).*

Teuvo Hakkarainen (ID). – Arvoisa puhemies, kun Iranin uskonnollinen poliisi pieksee naisen kuoliaaksi Iranissa, Euroopan feministit vaikenevat. Ovatko islamin säännöt tärkeämpiä kuin tämän naisen oikeus elää? Kuka häntä olisi puolustanut täällä Euroopassa? Olisiko häntä syytetty jopa islamofobiasta? En ihmettelisi sitäkään.

Eurooppa voi ja sen pitää tuomita Iranin ja islamin harjoittama naisten sorto, mutta muuttaako se mitään. Vaikka nykyinen kiihkoislamilainen pappisvalta kaatuisi, tilalle tulee uusi islamilainen hallinto. Onko se vielä raaempi vai maltillisempi, vain siitä on kysymys. Islam ja sen naiskäsitys eivät katoa mihinkään.

Länsimaisen demokratian vienti islamilaisiin maihin ei ole onnistunut tähänkään asti. Eivät aiemmat arabivallankumouksetkaan muuttaneet tilannetta miksikään. Iranin naapuri Afganistan on pystyttänyt uusimman hirmuhallinnon. Entäpä Euroopan tulevaisuus? Tänne on avosylin otettu vastaan kymmeniä miljoonia tuon uskonnon pakkosyöttämiä ihmisiä, ja tulokset on nähty. Terrori-iskuja joka puolella. Ottaisiko Eurooppa tästä jo opikseen?

Anna Fotyga (ECR). – Madam President, Mr High Rep., Vice-President, Mahsa Amini, the young Iranian woman of Kurdish origin was beaten to death by the so-called law enforcement forces of Iran.

The regime – directly responsible for her killing, as well as for violent crackdowns, murders, violent crackdown of the massive protests that followed this crime – has been led for a few years already by President Raisi, a person directly responsible for judicial killings, a crime against humanity, towards the end of the 1980s.

Stop impunity for this kind of crimes. High Rep., it is high time that we impose, as you say, restrictive measures against those who lead this kind of barbarous regimes.

Jörg Meuthen (NI). – Herr Präsident! Werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Ermordung der jungen Iranerin Mahsa Amini durch die sogenannte Sittenpolizei ist zutiefst bestürzend, ebenso wie die brutale Gewalt, mit der nun die Proteste im Land erstickt werden sollen.

Es wird von über 100 Toten, Hunderten Verletzten und Tausenden unschuldig Inhaftierten berichtet, Opfer des verbrecherischen, ja mörderischen Regimes im Iran, eines Regimes, das viel zu lange von politischen Kräften am linken und rechten Rand – auch hier in diesem Hause – hofiert wurde. Ich bin beeindruckt vom Mut der jungen Menschen im Iran – gerade dem der jungen Frauen –, die in diesen Tagen ihr Leben riskieren für ein Leben in Freiheit, Selbstbestimmung und Würde und sich dabei nicht von der Gewalt und dem Staatsterror des Regimes der Mullahs und Revolutionsgarden einschüchtern lassen.

Aus dem Iran, liebe Kollegen, tönt der Ruf nach Freiheit. Wir dürfen ihn nicht überhören! Wir dürfen es nicht nur bei schlichten Solidaritätsbekundungen belassen. Als EU müssen wir die Regierung in Teheran und ihr menschenverachtendes System gezielt mit weiteren Sanktionen strafen. Das sind wir den verzweifelten, mutigen Menschen im Iran schuldig.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Mr President, High Representative, I deeply regret the death of Mahsa Amini. She was arrested for improperly wearing the hijab, a symbol of faith. She had to experience an inexplicable amount of violence by the Iranian morality police, which led to her death. And it's as if the faith can come from the force. God is not in beating, but in loving.

I strongly condemn the excessive actions by the Iranian authorities against the nationwide protests that have erupted after the incidents. The Iranian people are gathering in the streets to call for freedom – freedom of religion, freedom to exercise their basic human rights. Iran is a party to several international human rights treaties, but they fail to implement the binding principles enshrined in these legal documents.

I call on our European diplomatic services and the international community to monitor this process and to push for objective investigation of all other arrests and incidents related to the protests.

Robert Biedroń (S&D). – Piekło kobiet trwa w Iranie od lat. Bieda, przemoc, ogromne bezrobocie, brak ochrony przed tą przemocą, gwałtami małżeńskimi oraz wczesnymi czy wymuszonym małżeństwami – to codzienność w Iranie. 17 dni temu odważne dziewczęta i kobiety podniosły swoje głowy. Sprzeciwiły się temu haniebnemu reżimowi. Dzisiaj kobiety w Iranie wiedzą, że mają swoje prawa, i nie zawahają się już ich użyć.

Pytanie jest: co my, jako demokratyczny świat, zrobimy w tej sprawie? Dlatego, Panie Przewodniczący, mamy nie tylko moralne, ale także demokratyczne zobowiązanie. Musimy nałożyć mocne sankcje na reżim irański. W każdych rozmowach z tym reżimem musimy podkreślać wagę praw człowieka. Nie możemy zawieść tych kobiet. Kobiety w Iranie muszą wiedzieć, że nigdy więcej nie będą już szły same. To jest nasze zobowiązanie.

Bernard Guetta (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, 500, 800, 3 000 morts ou plus. Nous savons hélas que vous ne lésinerez pas, vous les pasdarans et autres bassidjis pour garder votre pouvoir. Oui, cette révolte populaire, cette révolte de femmes défendant les femmes et la liberté peut sans doute être écrasée par vos armes. Mais ce n'est pas dit. Et attention, attention à vous, profiteurs et défenseurs de ce régime!

Car souvenez-vous, souvenez-vous des foules rassemblées par la présidentielle de 1997 lorsque votre peuple a pu voter pour un candidat du changement. Souvenez-vous des mois de révolte contre la réélection frauduleuse de Mahmoud Ahmadinejad en 2009. Souvenez-vous de l'ampleur des manifestations de 2019 et de 2020. Souvenez-vous des 8 millions de signatures contre les exécutions de prisonniers politiques, souvenez-vous, et vous verrez que la colère iranienne ne cesse de grandir contre votre dictature d'incapables sanguinaires. Souvenez-vous, et vous verrez votre fin s'approcher.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, comment qualifier l'extraordinaire mouvement que portent avec tant de courage les femmes et les jeunes en Iran depuis l'assassinat de Mahsa Amini et de tant d'autres depuis?

Certains parlent de révolte. Non, c'est une révolution. Pas cette révolution islamiste, celle des mollahs qui n'est qu'une régression, ce régime de l'oppression et de la corruption, ce régime des assassinats, de l'emprisonnement des manifestants, des défenseurs des droits humains, des journalistes. Ce régime de la peur des femmes, de leur soumission par le voile et par la loi.

Ce que nous voyons avec tant d'admiration, c'est une révolution des consciences, des cœurs et des corps qui n'en peuvent plus d'étouffer et de souffrir. Une révolution de libération et de civilisation où les femmes, en arrachant leur voile, portent l'étendard de la liberté, de l'égalité, de la fraternité, de la sororité.

Alors, l'Union européenne ne doit pas transiger. Elle doit sanctionner les auteurs de ces crimes. Contre celles et ceux qui portent la terreur, soutenons celles et ceux qui défendent la libération des femmes. Les combats et les valeurs qu'elles portent sont celles de l'Europe: «Femme, vie, liberté».

Isabella Tovaglieri (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Masha Amini, Hadis Najafi, Roshana e chissà quanti altri nomi sono sfuggiti alle cronache di questi giorni. Ma quante donne ancora devono morire prima che l'Europa prenda una posizione forte contro il regime fondamentalista di Teheran e contro il processo di islamizzazione dell'Europa? È giunto il momento che Bruxelles esca dall'ambiguità, se vuole davvero essere solidale con quelle donne che oggi stanno combattendo e stanno morendo per protestare contro il hijab, non può spendere milioni di euro per propagandare in Europa l'uso del velo o di modelli sociali contro i quali queste donne oggi coraggiosamente si stanno ribellando al grido di donne, vita e libertà. Bruxelles non può tradire la fiducia di quelle donne che scappano e che fuggono in Occidente, dove credono di poter vivere libere da ogni sottomissione come Samam. Ora più che mai abbiamo il dovere di difendere con forza i nostri valori europei, perché quello che accade oggi in un paese apparentemente lontano non sia la drammatica anticipazione del nostro futuro.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Pane předsedající, nejdříve mi dovolte vyjádřit upřímnou soustrast rodině zesnulé Mahsy Amíniové a mnoha dalším rodinám, jejichž příbuzní byli během protestů zavražděni. Íránský lid opět dokazuje, že je třeba v zemi nastolit změny. Současný politický kurz je zcela neudržitelný. Zejména bych chtěla vzdát hold íránským ženám, které vyšly do ulic po celé zemi. Zaslouží si naši podporu a respekt. Musíme udělat vše, co je v našich silách, na podporu opozice a demonstrantů, kteří odvážně bojují proti brutálním represím režimu. Bojují za základní práva a svobody. Bez naší pomoci bude Írán nadále vyvážet terorismus, usilovat o získání jaderných zbraní a ohrožovat okolní země. Je třeba vyslat pevný vzkaz stávajícímu režimu, že jejich násilné represivní činy neuniknou spravedlnosti.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Mr President, do you know who Jina Amini is? Yes. She's the woman who paid with her life for being free. However, everybody here has called her Masha, ignoring her Kurdish identity. Women in Iran are showing us how to fight for freedom. Sadly, this struggle has also become the perfect platform to show moral superiority without any real action.

This is why nobody mentions that Amini was Kurdish, or that the most brutal repression in this crisis is happening in Kurdistan. These things remain hidden because they expose uncomfortable contradictions, like defending Kurdistan is difficult if one wants to be friends with Turkey.

What is being done to protect women in our countries that are forced by their communities to wear religious garments is basically nothing. We call this religious freedom knowing that religion or freedom have nothing to do with it. The struggle of women in Iran is the new frontier of human rights, of women's rights. We must rise above hypocrisy to support them with facts.

Radosław Sikorski (PPE). – Mr President, High Representative, colleagues, there are moments in the history of man's struggle for liberty when only poetry will do. I recommend to you a song called *Barai* by Sherwin Hajipour, whose lyrics are put together from messages sent by protesters that describe what this is about.

'For dancing in the streets. For fear when kissing. For yearning of just normal life. For this polluted air. For tears with no end. For this forced heaven. For pills of nerves and insomnia. For women, life, freedom. For freedom. For freedom!'

Dear Iranian sisters, I hope you win this, but you are already our heroes. From the bottom of my heart, I salute you!

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nach der Ermordung meines Großvaters kurz nach Gründung der Islamischen Republik floh meine Familie aus dem Iran nach Europa, um in Freiheit zu leben. Und es ist ihnen zu verdanken, dass ich als junge Frau hier in der Öffentlichkeit stehen kann und sprechen kann. Für Freiheiten wie diese gehen Frauen im Iran auf die Straße. Jahrelang wurden sie unterdrückt, und jeder Griff nach Freiheit wurde bestraft. Der Staat kontrolliert nicht nur das Aussehen, die Religion, die Identität, sondern auch die Information, die Menschen im Iran erreicht, und das, was sie nach außen tragen können.

Wenn wir nicht hinsehen, sind diese mutigen Menschen allein gegen ein skrupelloses, brutales Regime. Unsere Solidarität in Europa muss konkret werden. Wir müssen die EU-Sanktionen ausweiten. Wir müssen Visastopps für Regimeangehörige verhängen. Wir müssen Asyl garantieren. Und wir müssen laut sein, unsere Stimmen nutzen, um die der Protestierenden im Iran zu verstärken. Für Dschina Mahsa Amini, für Frauen, für das Leben, für Freiheit – *(Die Rednerin verwendet einen Slogan in einer Sprache, die keine Amtssprache ist.)*

(Beifall)

Frédérique Ries (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, *(l'oratrice utilise un slogan dans une langue non officielle)* – «Les femmes, la vie, la liberté»: ces mots résonnent aux quatre coins de l'Iran depuis dix-huit jours maintenant, depuis que Mahsa «Zina» Amini a été battue à mort par la police des mœurs de Téhéran. Elle était jeune, elle était kurde et, selon la loi des mollahs, elle ne portait pas tout à fait correctement son foulard.

Ce n'était pas la première, ce ne sera pas la dernière non plus. Près de cent morts et des milliers d'arrestations en dix-huit jours: ces femmes iraniennes donnent au monde une leçon de courage inouïe, et elles ne sont plus seules, elles sont rejointes par les hommes, les jeunes, les étudiants, les sportifs. C'est l'attaquant vedette de l'équipe nationale de football, Sardar Azmoun, une icône, qui aujourd'hui défie les autorités au nom des femmes. Une colère qui mobilise partout en Iran et dans le monde.

Alors, que faisons-nous, Monsieur Borrell? Sept pays demandent des sanctions supplémentaires, ciblées, personnelles, intelligentes. Je suis ravie de vous entendre soutenir cette demande car notre devoir impérieux est de répondre, et maintenant notre devoir, fort de nos libertés, est de dire son nom: Mahsa Amini.

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, human dignity, freedom, democracy – values that we claim to hold very dear in the European Union, values that are the basis of the functioning of our societies.

Now we see a protest movement in Iran that is fighting for exactly these values, led by brave women. A protest movement that has come together, and that can change not only Iran, but the whole region, and eventually the whole world. With a force and determination that is unprecedented, people are going to the streets, and they go to the streets knowing full well that they could sacrifice their own lives doing this. And they rightfully ask us, 'What are your words, your declarations, your banners worth if now, in this moment, you are not standing with us?'.

So the EU response has to be clear: more sanctions and more determined and louder condemnation of this brutal regime, and amplifying the voices of the people who are protesting and who have sacrificed so much in this revolution.

Jordan Bardella (ID). – Monsieur le Président, nous devons un soutien moral et unanime à la révolte des femmes d'Iran dont le courage a ému le monde. En brûlant leur voile islamique, ces femmes ont dirigé leur colère vers le symbole de l'oppression pratiquée par le régime des mollahs. Ce qui est rejeté par ces manifestantes c'est une société qui fait de la femme par nature, de la naissance jusqu'à la mort, un être inférieur à l'homme.

Mais c'est en réalité la duplicité de la Commission européenne que je souhaite pointer aujourd'hui. Vous condamnez l'obscurantisme en Iran, mais vous lui faites la courte échelle en Europe. J'en veux pour exemple cette communication officielle de la Commission européenne présentant une fillette voilée que vous avez fait disparaître en catastrophe quand des lanceurs d'alerte l'ont à juste titre dénoncée. En Iran, des femmes brûlent leur voile, en Europe, vous le portez en étendard.

Cette anecdote n'est pas isolée. Elle s'inscrit dans un contexte d'entrisme assumé des officines islamistes à qui vous osez offrir l'argent tiré du porte-monnaie des contribuables européens. Je pense à l'association Femyso, émanation des Frères musulmans, à qui vous déroulez le tapis rouge au sein même des institutions européennes. Votre relativisme, votre refus d'assumer l'identité de nos nations, votre soutien dogmatique à une politique d'immigration massive, votre financement déguisé d'associations ennemies mettent notre continent dans la salle d'attente de l'islamisme.

Notre continent, celui de la philosophie grecque, du droit romain, de la raison, notre continent façonné par des siècles d'intense foi chrétienne doit rester celui des hommes et des femmes libres. Cela ne sera jamais celui du voile islamique, de la soumission et de l'obscurantisme.

Dorien Rookmaker (ECR). – Voorzitter, ik heb oneindig veel respect voor de vrouwen en mannen in Iran die opstaan tegen een misdadig regime. Dat vraagt moed. Daar word ik stil van. Het vraagt weinig moed om hier te staan en mijn afschuw uit te spreken over het regime in Iran. In Europa kan ik mij kleden hoe ik wil en ik kan mij uitspreken over wat ik wil. De demonstranten in Iran stellen hun leven in de waagschaal in de hoop op een betere toekomst, een toekomst die veilig is en vrij. Dat is de primaire verantwoordelijkheid van elke regering. De demonstranten verdienen onze onvoorwaardelijke steun, niet alleen nu wij geconfronteerd worden met de afschuwelijke dood van Mahsa Amini, maar zolang het nodig is, zolang het misdadige regime van de ayatollahs in Iran aan de macht is. Aan de vrouwen in Iran en bovendien aan alle vrouwen in de wereld die opstaan tegen onderdrukking, wil ik zeggen: "Ik zie jullie, ik hoor jullie, ik bewonder jullie en ik sta aan jullie zijde."

Jérôme Rivière (NI). – Monsieur le Président, que d'hypocrisie à l'occasion du débat ce soir dans notre hémicycle. Alors que l'Iran est déchiré par les manifestations déclenchées par la mort de Mahsa Amini, arrêtée et assassinée par la police des mœurs pour avoir refusé de couvrir sa tête avec un voile islamique, la Commission européenne, soutenue par la majorité ici, poursuit la promotion de ce même voile, osant affirmer, et je cite, la liberté est dans le hijab.

Si la diversité est belle, non jamais le voile n'a été ou ne sera un symbole de liberté. En Iran, des femmes sont battues à mort, d'autres risquent leur vie en manifestant et les institutions européennes conçoivent des campagnes de communication que ne renieraient pas les islamistes au pouvoir à Téhéran. Déjà, en 2021, elles présentaient le hijab comme symbole de liberté choisie par les femmes. Des affiches affirmaient: «Mon foulard, c'est moi» ou encore: «Avec le voile, je peux être moi-même sans me cacher».

Que vaut votre soutien aux femmes iraniennes risquant leur vie pour être libres de marcher la tête découverte? Monsieur Borrell, assez de la duplicité de la Commission. Assez d'hypocrisie avec le voile islamique. Il a toujours été et restera un instrument d'oppression des femmes par des hommes.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Mr President, the death of Mahsa Amini is shocking, but sadly it's not surprising. It's not surprising to the people of Iran whose basic human rights are routinely trampled on. And it's not surprising to the United States, which is accused by Ayatollah Khamenei of instigating the protests. And it's not surprising to Israel, which Iran wants to wipe off the face of the earth. It's not surprising to the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, which regularly engages in terrorist acts and is now carrying out raids on the protesters.

It's not surprising, but it actually is terrifying that all of this comes from a country which is building nuclear weapons. It's even more sad that the European Union's response is currently basically statements and debates instead of actions. So please, High Representative, please, Mr Borrell, surprise us pleasantly and do something. I call upon you to immediately take steps to designate the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as what it is, namely a terrorist organisation.

Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, a morte de Mahsa Amini às mãos da polícia da moralidade iraniana, tão só por ter o véu islâmico mal colocado, é um caso de intolerável e chocante violência e restrição dos direitos mais básicos das mulheres. É um daqueles casos que pensávamos que já não existiam no nosso mundo, tal como a mutilação genital feminina. Mas aqui continuam entre nós.

Mais do que a nossa solidariedade, hoje é o nosso grito que se junta a todas as iranianas e iranianos que, desde então, com grande coragem se têm manifestado pelos seus direitos e pelo fim da repressão no seu país.

Senhor Alto Representante, a União Europeia deve continuar a exigir, no seio das instituições internacionais e em todas as interações que tem com países terceiros, na ajuda ao desenvolvimento ou em missões diplomáticas, o respeito pelos direitos das mulheres.

Como este Parlamento tem vindo a defender, a nossa política externa tem de ser uma verdadeira arma para os promover e defender em todo o mundo.

Abir Al-Sahlani (Renew). – Mr President, three weeks of continuous courage shown by the women in Iran. Persian, Azeri, Kurdish women are paying the ultimate price for freedom – their lives.

This is a courage that has not been met by you, Mr Borrell, when you didn't take the opportunity during the General Assembly in the UN and take a stand for the woman in Iran.

Enough for the press releases now, enough for the mumbling. It's time to speak out. It's time to act. The hands of the regime of the mullahs in Iran are stained with blood. Neither history nor Allah or God Almighty will forgive you for the crimes against humanity that you are committing against your own citizens.

We, the peoples and the citizens of the EU demand the unconditional and immediate stop of all the violence against the women and men in Iran. Until Iran is free our fury will be bigger than the oppressors. Until you, the women of Iran are free, we are going to stand with you: *(the speaker used a slogan in a non-official language)* – Women, Life, Freedom!

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist bei dieser Debatte sehr schwer, die Rednerinnen oder die Redner nach einer Minute oder einer Minute dreißig direkt abzubrechen, weil sie ja sehr persönliche, sehr emotionale und sehr richtige Schlussbemerkungen haben. Ich muss daher, weil ich hier in der Rede flexibel sein möchte, erstens die Rednerliste für die spontanen Wortmeldungen schließen und Ihnen zweitens sagen, dass ich je nachdem, wie der Zeitplan aussieht, maximal zwei bis drei Personen bei den spontanen Wortmeldungen drannehmen kann. Momentan sind acht oder neun gemeldet. Ich bitte dafür um Verständnis und um die Einhaltung der Redezeit, soweit das der Inhalt der Rede erlaubt.

Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, 'Women, Life, Freedom!'. I observe with deep admiration the breathtaking courage with which Iranian women stand these days against the dictatorship of Khamenei and his morality police.

The message of the Iranian protests is universal and resonates across the world. It is heard by women in Poland and the US, who are denied the right to their own bodies; it is heard by women in Italy, where ultra-conservative forces are coming to power. It is heard by women everywhere, where the same obscurants under different symbols wait for the nearest opportunity to trap free women in predetermined roles.

That is why I think it is essential that their slogans are heard today in this room over and over again: *(the speaker used a slogan in a non-official language)*.

Simona Baldassarre (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la morte di Mahsa Amini a 22 anni per una ciocca di capelli fuori dal velo è un orrore inaccettabile. Quel velo che mortifica e uccide, simbolo di sottomissione, ma promosso recentemente dall'UE come emblema di integrazione.

Come diceva Oriana Fallaci, vi sono donne nel mondo che ancora vivono dietro la nebbia fitta di un velo, la nebbia che avvolge il regime iraniano, responsabile di 76 manifestanti uccisi e migliaia di arresti solo nelle ultime due settimane. Tra questi un'italiana, Alessia Piperno.

Sollecito quindi la Farnesina e lei Commissario Borrell a utilizzare ogni strumento perché Alessia e gli altri europei in carcere tornino al più presto a casa. Mahsa Amini e tutte le altre Mahsa vittime del regime iraniano non devono essere dimenticate.

Per questo, Presidente, vorrei aderire all'iniziativa dell'Associazione rifugiati politici italiani e accendere una candela per non lasciare sola la coraggiosa ribellione delle donne iraniane.

Hermann Tertsch (ECR). – Señor presidente, en Irán están sucediendo monstruosidades. La policía del régimen terrorista de los ayatolás mata a una mujer mediante palizas y torturas por enseñar el pelo, por llevar mal puesto ese chador; por llevar mal puesto un pañuelo del cual hace propaganda la Unión Europea y al cual protege la Unión Europea en carteles y en publicidad propia.

Después la policía mata y mata y mata a mujeres y a hombres que protestan contra ese monstruoso régimen. Van más de 300. Y puede ser, puede ser que esto sea el principio del final de ese régimen.

Pero, curiosamente, sale muy poco en nuestros medios, en nuestros medios europeos, tan socialdemócratas y amaestrados, sale muy poquito porque hay otros intereses. En el año 2019, señor Borrell, tuvimos 1 500 muertos en el mes de diciembre. Un mes más tarde estaba usted dando la mano a las autoridades, a los jefes de los asesinos, a aquellos que mancharon todas las calles de las ciudades de Irán de sangre. Detrás, hay unos intereses, al parecer muy poderosos.

La Unión Europea tiene que acabar con los acuerdos con este régimen. La Unión Europea debe dejar de tratar a Irán como si fuera un socio cualquiera; es un socio terrorista, del que no se puede ser socio, en ningún caso. Bastante ha emponzoñado la política europea con sus financiaciones de comunistas españoles que están en este momento en el gobierno.

David Lega (PPE). – Mr President, High Representative, I say to the Iranian women – the changemakers in Iran – we support you. I want to be crystal clear that we wholeheartedly support the aspirations of the Iranian people who want to live in a free, stable, inclusive and democratic country. And we strongly condemn the compulsory hijab law. We condemn the morality police. And we condemn the brutal repression and violence.

But words are not enough. I call on the EU and the rest of the world to take action. We need an investigation and we need accountability. The abusers must be punished. Actions do speak louder than words. That is why I hope that the EU High Representative will never wear the hijab in meetings with Iranian counterparts again. The former High Representative, Federica Mogherini, failed in representing our EU values and that is why I hope the new Swedish Foreign Minister will never wear the hijab in meetings with Iranian counterparts; the former Swedish Foreign Minister and leader failed in representing European values. Enough is enough.

Pierfrancesco Majorino (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo al fianco delle donne che in Iran stanno lottando ogni giorno nel nome della libertà e della dignità. La loro lotta è anche la nostra. La repressione scellerata messa in atto in queste settimane colpisce innanzitutto loro, le donne. Colpisce le ragazze, colpisce chi rivendica il diritto a decidere di sé, come del resto in questi anni già aveva colpito spesso personalità del mondo della cultura, voci libere, cittadini non allineati con la voce autoritaria del regime.

In questi giorni assistiamo a persecuzioni violente, molestie, torture, incarcerazioni, in una repressione inaudita che dopo l'uccisione di Mahsa Amini ha prodotto decine e decine di vittime. Un clima di terrore di fronte a cui le nostre istituzioni devono rispondere inasprendo le relazioni diplomatiche ed esercitando la pressione massima senza farsi intimidire. Le ragazze e i ragazzi dell'Iran, nelle strade del loro paese e in tutto il mondo, stanno ripetendo tre parole che voglio anch'io ripetere qui: «Donna, vita, libertà».

Salima Yenbou (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Mahsa Amini, 22 ans, est morte à Téhéran. Morte de la brutalité de la police des mœurs pour une mèche de cheveux qui dépassait de son foulard. Une onde de choc féministe s'est répandue en Iran et dans le monde, comme en Afghanistan, où les femmes manifestaient aussi. Une révolte menée par les femmes iraniennes, accompagnées d'hommes et d'enfants face à cette dictature qui bafoue leurs droits, les opprime et les tue. Je salue le courage de ces femmes qui revendiquent leur droit à la liberté malgré les intimidations, les agressions, les viols et les assassinats d'État.

La brutalité de la répression témoigne évidemment de la peur du régime face à l'ampleur des soulèvements. Nous devons étendre et actualiser les sanctions à l'égard d'officiels du régime qui participent aux violences des droits humains en Iran. L'ONU doit ouvrir une enquête sur les violences et meurtres des manifestantes. Nous sommes et nous devons tous être Mahsa Amini. Pour toutes les femmes qui portent l'espoir d'un nouveau monde, levons-nous pour porter les voix de nos sœurs iraniennes: *(l'oratrice utilise un slogan dans une langue non officielle)* — «Femme, vie, liberté».

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, la mort de Mahsa Amini est une tragédie. La population iranienne en révolte démontre un courage exceptionnel vu la brutalité de la répression. Je me suis dit que la manière la plus appropriée de condamner les violences des autorités iraniennes à l'encontre de sa population, et des femmes en particulier, était de donner la parole à ceux qui se révoltent. Je citerai donc un de ces jeunes Iraniens anonymes mais déterminés qui se soulèvent et qui mettent beaucoup d'espoir en nous. Ce jeune Iranien avait l'intention de quitter son pays mais a décidé de rester et de lutter. Je le cite en anglais.

«We believe the world might have a wrong and distorted image from Iranian people, especially over the past decades. But we want to correct it. We are not this government, we hate it. We are Iranians, from a country with more than 2 500 years of history. We believe in love, peace, human rights. We hate brutal Islamic laws. And for this, our children, our young people are being killed by the regime. We might be arrested or killed.»

— Mais, continue-t-il, ceci n'est que le début pour un changement en profondeur. Ils nous demandent à nous Européens de les aider en refusant tout compromis avec un régime qui opprime. Soutenons ces jeunes iraniens dans leur combat.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Mr President, I am extremely horrified how the Iranian regime hunts down these brave Iranian women and men. But at the same time I'm proud, very proud, and proud of every single woman standing up for her rights, standing up for the rights of her sisters and daughters. And I'm proud of the many men supporting women's rights openly.

It is essential that all women around the world know that they are valuable, that they have rights. And these brave women in Iran are the reasons why these rigid structures begin to change. So we, as politicians from other parts of the world, have to show the Iranian government that we will not accept their crimes against their own citizens, not accept their crimes against these brave women.

So rest in power, Mahsa Amini.

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

Samira Rafaela (Renew). – Mr President, since the murder of Kurdish Mahsa (Jina) Amini, 92 people have died in Iran. Only because a brave woman stood for her individual choice. And the individual choice of women in Iran is at stake.

And all these women have fathers, just like Mahsa (Jina) Amini had a father – a man. And I've been thinking of what's been going on in his mind. Did I protect my daughter enough? Did I give enough resistance as a man in Iran to the morality police? Is this because of a piece of fabric and her identity that I lost my daughter?

What if all fathers stood up against oppressors of our daughters? Questions like these will continuously go through their minds in Iran. And only when these fathers, together with the strong women in Iran, stand up, they can change the regime of Iran.

Commissioner, we are always clear about what we are against, but let's also be clear on what we stand for. These strong women currently in danger need a safe haven. And therefore, I'm asking the Commission to investigate whether Europe can offer this to them.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Vice-Presidente e Alto Representante, Caras e Caros Colegas, em primeiro lugar, temos de expressar as nossas condolências para com a família e os amigos da Mahsa Amini. Infelizmente, foi assassinada pelo regime iraniano. Há que sublinhar que não é um caso isolado. E também deveríamos perguntar se temos feito tudo para condenar, repudiar e evitar que estes casos aconteçam.

O povo iraniano quer liberdade, pretende, no fundo, um Estado de direito, luta pela democracia. A nossa obrigação é, ou deveria ser, a de ajudar sempre, até porque, como referi, são milhares de iranianos que têm sido assassinados, que têm sido torturados por este regime.

Por isso, impõe-se, e termino, que a Comissão Europeia tudo faça, não só para condenar, mas para ter ações concretas, como sanções ou medidas restritivas, como o Alto Representante referiu.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor presidente, Mahsa Amini, 22 años, una joven iraní que mostraba demasiado pelo bajo el velo. Motivo suficiente para su detención por la Policía de la Moral, Policía de Prevención del Vicio y Promoción de la Virtud. Ya el nombre es un escándalo. Horas después, Amini estaba en coma y tres días después moría en el hospital.

Se ha desatado una ola de protestas en todo el mundo, que ha conducido en Irán a pérdidas de vidas y también a cientos de detenidos y heridos. Las fuerzas de seguridad de Irán han respondido de una manera muy violenta y hay restricciones en las comunicaciones.

Los agentes allí tienen el poder de dar el alto a cualquier mujer y examinar su vestimenta, examinar los mechones de cabello que tiene a la vista, la longitud de los pantalones o de su abrigo, o la cantidad, incluso, de maquillaje. La pena puede ser de detención, de latigazos, de multa o de cárcel. Eso, sin hablar de la multitud de leyes civiles absolutamente denigrantes. ¿Cómo es posible que la moral de un país entero dependa de si un trozo de tela se desliza accidentalmente o no sobre la cabeza de una mujer?

El mundo está mirando. Cuando se hace una violación contra una mujer, se ataca a todos nosotros. Mujer, vida y libertad.

Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor alto representante, señorías, las protestas de las mujeres y jóvenes se han extendido por todo Irán. Cientos han sido asesinados porque quieren vivir en un país libre, democrático y tener la libertad de vivir sus vidas sin tener que rendir cuentas al régimen de los ayatolás.

El régimen fundamentalista continúa fallando a su pueblo de manera constante y brutal. En lugar de escuchar las voces de la reforma, han optado una vez más por la represión, la brutalidad y la muerte de sus ciudadanos. En lugar de escuchar a las madres e hijas de Irán, el régimen optó por censurar sus voces, cerrando Internet en todo el país y persiguiéndolas. Es nuestro deber arrojar luz sobre lo que le está sucediendo al pueblo de Irán.

Señorías, yo les pregunto: un régimen que no escucha ni respeta a su propio pueblo ¿es de fiar? ¿Es un actor legítimo con el que se debe negociar? Constantemente este Parlamento solicita no negociar acuerdos con uno u otro país por falta de respeto a los derechos humanos. Pero negociamos en la Unión Europea con un Estado fundamentalista y dictatorial, como es el régimen de los ayatolás. No más negociaciones ya con el régimen de los ayatolás.

Maria Walsh (PPE). – Mr President, Mahsa Amini and the women of Iran are incredibly powerful. We've seen this at first hand, in large part because of the instantaneous connection we all have through social media, and the bravery of our trusted and free journalists.

The young women of Iran have grown up in an age of digitalisation, of connectivity, and because of this, are connected to the rest of the world in a way that older generations could never imagine. They explore, they learn, they decide for themselves. They hear the voices and see the faces of fellow change-makers their own age. They are powerful.

We are living in a time – thankfully – where young leaders are standing strong for their rights, for their freedoms, for their future. They too see fundamental rights are to be protected. Mahsa Amini should never have lost her life to hateful ideology. Never.

While the Iranian Government works to cut these brave young women off from the rest of the world, we see what they are fighting for. These women will not be silenced. No woman should ever be. Their protests are fundamentally changing the course of history for the generations to come. We here in Europe stand with you in the spirit of Mahsa Amini.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, le monde entier reçoit une leçon de courage de Mahsa Amini, Hadis Najafi, Ghazale Chelavi, et de tant d'autres qui risquent et perdent leur vie partout en Iran simplement pour ne pas vivre cachées, prisonnières d'un voile qui leur est imposé au nom de l'islam, même quand elles crient ne pas l'avoir choisi.

Ces jeunes femmes, avec leurs 20 ans, donnent une leçon de courage à l'Europe. Et ce continent, qui a porté dans son histoire l'exigence de la liberté de conscience et qui l'a payé si cher à chaque fois qu'il l'a oubliée, doit tout faire pour les protéger.

Vous ne savez pas, Monsieur le Haut-représentant, si le mot de «sanction» est le bon: peu importe, du moment que vous agissez pour montrer aux criminels iraniens que l'Europe ne reste pas silencieuse devant l'assassinat de la jeunesse de leur propre pays.

Mais commençons nous-mêmes par ne pas trahir ces femmes: ce parlement a voté en juin dernier une résolution qui refusait toute interdiction du voile, toute discussion sur le voile, au nom de l'intersectionnalité. Où était la gauche, si prompte à critiquer les religions? Où étaient les féministes, qui chassent le patriarcat dans nos pays et aux États-Unis? Tout le monde a joué l'indifférence quand nous avons dénoncé la campagne, financée l'an dernier par la Commission, qui proclamait que «la liberté est dans le hidjab». Est-ce que tout cela ne nous révolte pas, ne *vous* révolte pas maintenant?

«Apportez de la joie. Acceptez le hidjab»: c'était là le slogan du Conseil de l'Europe. Dirigeants du Conseil de l'Europe, est-ce que vous avez honte? Est-ce que vous demanderez pardon quand vous penserez à Mahsa, à Hadis, à Ghazale, mortes pour avoir crié que le hidjab, c'est l'oppression?

Il est temps de faire enfin la lumière sur les stratégies d'entrisme et les complicités coupables qui ont conduit à ces reniements terribles.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, current demonstrations in Iran following the death of Mahsa Amini have been going on for almost 20 days now. These protests, which have spread to all Iranian provinces, have been brutally repressed by the Iranian regime and so far led to 400 deaths and many injuries of people, including college and university students. In reality, the number of deaths could be much higher.

I am also very concerned about the fate of more than 20 thousand detainees where there is no guarantee that their fundamental rights are respected. This reminds me of the brutal suppression of the protests in November 2019.

We all know that the Iranian regime is responding with severe brutality but despite this, the Iranian people are still on the streets. So I do believe that the European Union should act now and call on President Raisi to stop the push back against the protesters immediately and free the political prisoners. People in Iran deserve freedom and respect of basic human rights.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Milan Zver (PPE). – Hvala lepa, spoštovani gospod predsedujoči ! Torej, po okrutnem umoru gospe Amini se je iransko ljudstvo ponovno prebudilo. Ne prvič, nazadnje leta 2019. A tokrat so v ospredju ženske in protesti obetajo spremembe. Toda tudi takrat, pred leti, in tudi danes iranski režim uporablja vse mogoče načine, nasilje, da prepreči upornikom, da bi dosegli demokracijo in svobodo.

Ampak to, kar sem vesel danes, nocoj, je to, da je cel Evropski parlament dokaj enoten – en glas v podporo iranski opoziciji v boju za demokracijo in svobodo. In to je dobro.

Ampak to, kar Evropa potrebuje ta hip, je, da bi vse evropske institucije bile bolj učinkovite. Zadnja leta nismo bili. Imeli smo dokaj medel pristop proti režimu, ki je v tem času ojačal, postal dejansko, faktično, tudi jedrska sila in ki ogroža tudi regijo nasploh. Še enkrat poudarjam želim, da si torej…

(predsedujoči je govorniku vzel besedo)

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, há cerca de dez anos estive no Irão. A nossa guia, uma jovem, partilhou connosco o terror em que viviam as jovens. Bastava que uma madeixa dos seus cabelos fugisse para fora dos seus véus. Viviam confrontadas no dia a dia, à saída de casa, à saída da universidade, com os grupos ditos espontâneos de defesa da moralidade.

Não esquecemos o custo da Revolução de 1979 para as mulheres iranianas, quando antes se tinham batido pela liberdade. Hoje assistimos a uma polícia da moralidade, que quer obrigar as mulheres a esconderem os seus corpos, que lhes retiram os seus direitos e liberdades, que as mata.

Alto Representante, a solidariedade concreta da União Europeia para com estas mulheres é fundamental e urgente, assim como para com aqueles homens, mulheres e jovens que, finalmente, com enorme coragem, reivindicam valores fundamentais. Não só os valores assentes na cultura europeia. Falamos de valores e de direitos universais.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the mullahs – religious fundamentalists – killed Mahsa Amini and the regime's repressive nature is now killing dozens of protesters, many of them women, who are demanding life and justice, life in freedom and dignity. All authoritarian regimes respond to popular unrest by claiming that they are the result of foreign interference, because they are simply unable to recognise that even under the most brutal circumstances, there are always citizens willing to sacrifice everything to defend human rights, human dignity and freedom.

We have to stand by those protesting against the repressive rule imposed on them. We have to use all the mechanisms at our disposal to get the Iranian regime to stop persecuting dissidents, to stop imposing policies on those that attack the most elementary human rights, and finally open up a country diverse in ideologies, thoughts, religions and minorities, a democratic country where Mahsa Amini would never have become the spark and the symbol that lit the fire of protest.

(Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās beigas)

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, honourable Members, this long debate justifies your continued interest and engagement on human rights in Iran in particular.

We all share the shock for what happened, to Mahsa Amini and for the violent repression of the protests. We also share the same support for the courage of the Iranian people who are demonstrating in the streets and facing a difficult situation.

We will continue to follow what's happening in the country and to use every opportunity to raise our position and our concerns about human rights in Iran. As I mentioned, we will continue to consider all the options at our disposal, including restrictive measures. The Foreign Affairs Council will decide this at the next meeting. This will be addressed by colleagues two weeks from now and I am sure that they will react accordingly with your wishes and concerns.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Esmu saņēmis septiņus rezolūciju priekšlikumus, lai noslēgtu šīs debates.

Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks ceturtdien.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (171. pants)

Dita Charanzová (Renew), *in writing*. – Mahsa Amini was just 22 years old, with her whole life ahead of her. Her brutal death at the hands of the morality police, for simply not wearing a veil correctly, left not just Iranians, but the whole world, devastated and indignant. The images we see daily from Iran are horrifying. The brutality of the regime against protestors is unacceptable. Women in Iran are courageously risking their lives to reclaim their basic rights. Mahsa Amini's death was not an accident. It was the result of systematic repressive policies against women's human rights in Iran. The message today is clear: the EU stands with the women of Iran. Now, we must back our words with actions - sanctions to those responsible, and it is time to re-evaluate our approach to Iran.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew), *in writing*. – The death of Mahsa Jina Amini has moved the public opinion all around the world and sparked public outrage across Europe. The abysmal human rights situation in Iran was brought, once more, to our attention and we simply cannot allow ourselves to sit by idly when the rights of women, activists, students and journalists are being trampled by the regime in Teheran. President Ebrahim Raisi said the unrest that followed the brutal murder of Masha Amini was the latest move by hostile Western powers against Iran. No, there is no plot against Iran. Hundreds of thousands of Iranian citizens, representing all segments of society demanded accountability for the death of Mahsa Amini and called for an end to violence and discrimination against women. We, in Brussels and the other European capitals, should hear their cry for freedom and their rejection of the ongoing oppression. We should show, as a Union, our unequivocal rejection of massive abuses on women's rights and human rights in Iran. I therefore call on the Council to adopt additional sanctions on Iran and to follow on that path the United States, who have already imposed sanctions on the morality police over the abuse of Iranian women.

Úterý 4. října 2022

14. Ověření pověřovacích listin

Sēdes vadītājs. – Paziņojums. Parlaments, pamatojoties uz JURI komitejas priekšlikumu, pārbauda Patricia Chagnon kundzes, Marie Dauchy kundzes, Marina Mesure kundzes, — es atvainojos, ja nepareizi, — Eric Minardi kunga pilnvaras, kas stājās spēkā 2022. gada 29. jūlijā, kā arī Ana Miranda kundzes pilnvaras, kas stājās spēkā 2022. gada 5. septembrī, un João Albuquerque kunga pilnvaras, kas stājās spēkā 2022. gada 13. septembrī.

15. Doba vyhrazená pro otázky (VPC/HR) Rostoucí napětí mezi Arménií a Ázerbájdžánem v návaznosti na nedávnou vojenskou eskalaci

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības jautājums:

Jautājumu laiks (PV/AP) (Reglamenta 137. pants)

Laipni lūdzu Žuzepu Borelu piedalīties šajā jautājumu laikā.

Jautājumu laika temats: Saspīlējuma pieaugums starp Armēniju un Azerbaidžānu nesenās militārās eskalācijas rezultātā

Atgādināšu jums procedūru. Šis jautājumu laiks ilgs aptuveni 60 minūtes.

Ir paredzēta viena minūte jautājuma uzdošanai, divas minūtes atbildei, 30 sekundes papildjautājumam un divas minūtes atbildei uz papildjautājumu.

Atgādinu, ka iespējamo papildjautājumu var uzdot tikai tad, ja tas ir cieši saistīts ar galveno jautājumu un nav jauns jautājums.

Ja vēlaties uzdot jautājumu, aicinu jūs savu pieprasījumu reģistrēt jau tagad, izmantojot brīvā mikrofona funkciju jūsu balsošanas iekārtā pēc tam, kad būsiet tajā ievietojuši savu balsošanas karti.

Jautājumu laikā uzstāšanās notiks no vietas, un aicinu visus runātājus ievērot atvēlēto uzstāšanās laiku.

Kolēģiem, iespējams, vajadzēs dažus brīžus, lai reģistrētu savu pieprasījumu uzdot jautājumu, izmantojot balsošanas iekārtu. Tāpēc vēlreiz aicinu jūs iesniegt savu pieprasījumu tagad, un mēs sāksim ar pirmo jautājumu.

Στέλιος Κυμπουρόπουλος (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Αντιπρόεδρε, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, όπως σας έχω αναφέρω και πάλι με τις συμφωνίες κατάπαυσης του πυρός και τις εκεχειρίες να περιμένουν κενό γράμμα, το Αζερμπαϊτζάν εκμεταλλευόμενο τη θέση της Αρμενίας ανάμεσα στο Ιράν και την Τουρκία, αλλά και τη στρατιωτική υπεροπλία του, επιτέθηκε και πάλι, και η στάση της Ένωσης περιορίστηκε, όπως και σε προγενέστερες εξάρσεις της αζερικής επιθετικότητας, σε απλή λεκτική καταδίκη. Η Ιστορία όμως θα καταγράψει πως αυτό υπήρξε αναποτελεσματικό. Αντιλαμβάνομαι τους οικονομικούς δεσμούς της Ένωσης με το Αζερμπαϊτζάν ως ενεργειακό εταίρο της αλλά και της ίδιας της χώρας από την οποία προέρχομαι, της Ελλάδας. Μπορεί όμως αυτό να είναι αρκετό για να επιτρέψουμε τον χαμό της Αρμενίας και την ανοχή στη βαρβαρότητα; Οφείλουμε ως Ένωση να ξεκαθαρίσουμε στο αζερικό καθεστώς πως δεν είμαστε διατεθειμένοι να εξαγοράσουμε τις αξίες μας. Η Ένωση οφείλει να αναλάβει ενεργό ρόλο ακόμη και με τη συγκρότηση ειρηνευτικής αποστολής που θα αντικαταστήσει τους επιτήδειους Ρώσους, που έχουν αναλάβει αυτόν το ρόλο. Εξετάζει λοιπόν η Ένωση αυτό το ενδεχόμενο;

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, la Unión Europea, desde el principio, ha hecho lo que puede hacer, que es llamar a las partes a la contención y al diálogo y a un alto el fuego, alto el fuego que ha sido ciertamente violado.

Usted ha hecho referencia al papel de Turquía. Es claro, no es un secreto para nadie, que Turquía continúa apoyando a Azerbaiyán.

La paz y la estabilidad en esa región, sin embargo, también redunda en interés de Turquía, ahora en particular, después de la agresión rusa contra Ucrania.

Estamos pidiendo a Turquía que utilice su influencia para contribuir a disminuir las tensiones entre los dos países.

Ciertamente, nos congratulamos por la voluntad expresada por Turquía en relación con Armenia para trabajar en aras de la normalización de sus relaciones mutuas. Es importante que la apertura de fronteras entre Armenia y Turquía se produzca, porque eso contribuirá a disminuir las tensiones.

En cuanto a la continuación de los combates, afortunadamente han disminuido en intensidad.

Desde el principio, como le digo, el presidente Michel y yo mismo, a nuestros respectivos niveles, intervenimos activamente para pedir a los contendientes que cesen las hostilidades y que se restablezca el alto el fuego.

Στέλιος Κυμπουρόπουλος (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να μας διευκρινίσει, αν γίνεται, ο Αντιπρόεδρος τις μελλοντικές ενέργειες που πιστεύει ότι θα μπορούσαν να σταματήσουν τις εχθροπραξίες, ώστε να έρθει ένα ειρηνικό καθεστώς στην περιοχή.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, ya me gustaría a mí tener la capacidad de conseguir que la paz se estableciera en el Cáucaso meridional y en otros muchos sitios donde hace falta.

Pero desgraciadamente solo tenemos los medios que tenemos: la influencia política y el condicionamiento de los países que intervienen en esta región.

Tenemos un representante especial que está en permanente contacto con los dos países contendientes y con los miembros europeos del Grupo de Minsk, y ofrecemos ayuda humanitaria.

Eso es lo que podemos hacer y hacemos.

Si usted tiene alguna otra idea, le agradeceré que la comparta conmigo.

Marina Kaljurand (S&D). – Mr President, honourable High Representative, the EU has recently invested significantly in improving relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan, including several bilateral meetings with the Prime Minister of Armenia and the President of Azerbaijan, hosted by Council President Michel. At the latest such meeting merely a month ago in Brussels, both sides agreed to start working on a draft peace treaty within a month. Two weeks later, Azerbaijan launched a large-scale military attack against Armenian territory. A few days ago, a sickening video emerged on Azerbaijani social media, which seems to show the execution of Armenian prisoners.

High Representative, which consequences will you recommend to draw for the EU's further engagement in the region? What concrete steps should you, your office and the External Action Service take? And finally, how can the EU's new energy partnership with Azerbaijan be put to use for the EU's engagement in favour of a sustainable long-term settlement on the conflict?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. –Señoría, gracias. Evidentemente, el relato que usted hace se corresponde con la realidad.

Estamos seguros de que Azerbaiyán ha bombardeado zonas que están muy adentradas en territorio armenio utilizando artillería y drones y que esto ciertamente no es la continuación de combates por una zona disputada sino la ocupación de una parte del territorio de Armenia.

Los dos países se culpan del inicio de esta ruptura del alto el fuego. Pero lo que me parece evidente es que Azerbaiyán ha bombardeado y ocupado una parte del territorio de Armenia en esta zona.

Su pregunta es la misma que me hace el señor diputado: ¿qué más pueden hacer?

Pues, no podemos hacer mucho más de lo que hacemos. Hacemos lo que podemos con los efectivos, con las posibilidades y las capacidades que tenemos.

Insisto, si usted tiene alguna idea sobre lo que debiera hacer, le agradecería que me la dijese para poder compartirla y discutirla.

Tenemos un enviado especial que trabaja todos los días yendo de un sitio a otro, intentando calmar los ánimos. Tenemos al presidente del Consejo Europeo, que se reúne con los dos representantes al máximo nivel de los dos países contendientes. Facilitamos que haya encuentros entre ellos para que directamente inicien negociaciones de paz. Financiamos el desminado de los territorios donde las minas están causando muchas víctimas civiles.

Desde que empezó el conflicto otra vez iniciamos todos estos contactos, y más. Estamos pidiendo una investigación para que podamos saber qué es lo que ha ocurrido con estos vídeos que muestran a soldados armenios prisioneros de guerra siendo asesinados. Los propios azerbaiyanos han dicho que van a iniciar una investigación al respecto.

Estamos trabajando para que la comisión encargada de delimitar las fronteras se reúna en Bruselas antes del final de este mes. No se crea que es tan fácil conseguir que la comisión que tiene que delimitar las fronteras se reúna y trabaje.

No ahorramos esfuerzos diplomáticos, movilizamos los recursos de los que disponemos.

Hemos propuesto que haya una misión de intermediación de la Unión Europea que se despliegue en la frontera. Armenia está de acuerdo, pero Azerbaiyán no.

¿Qué quiere usted que haga? ¿Que mande a las tropas de la Unión Europea sin el acuerdo de las dos partes en el conflicto?

Seguro que no, ¿verdad?

Marina Kaljurand (S&D). – I'd like to come to the strategic partnership memorandum that was signed with Azerbaijan. Many argue that the gas deal stands in defiance of the EU's climate goals and human rights standards. High Representative, I would be grateful for your assessment of that deal. Thank you.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, se refiere usted al acuerdo con Azerbaiyán para aumentar nuestro suministro de gas.

Sí, en efecto. Azerbaiyán nos está dando…, no, nos está vendiendo —naturalmente, nadie da nada gratis en el mercado del gas hoy en día—, nos está aportando, nos aportó el pasado año, ya antes de estos incidentes, 8 millones de pies cúbicos de gas natural. Y este año, gracias a este acuerdo, vamos a conseguir un aumento sustancial de 8 a 12, es decir, un aumento del 50 %.

Eso no ha sido contrapartida a ninguna cesión política en el conflicto y estoy seguro de que los europeos apreciarán que, en las actuales circunstancias, la presidenta de la Comisión, ella personalmente, se haya desplazado a Azerbaiyán para negociar este acuerdo, que brinda la posibilidad de que este invierno todos los europeos en su conjunto tengan el suministro energético necesario.

Ese gas irá a través del Corredor del Sur. No lo recibirán todos los europeos, pero estoy seguro que los que vayan a recibirlo estarán muy satisfechos.

En todo caso, le puedo asegurar que este acuerdo energético no ha ido en detrimento de ninguna cuestión relativa a los derechos humanos o a los problemas democráticos que se han manifestado en ese país.

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, «mal nommer les choses, c'est ajouter au malheur de ce monde», écrivait Albert Camus. En la matière, Monsieur le Haut-représentant, l'Union européenne s'est illustrée par son incapacité à dire clairement ce qui se passe dans le sud du Caucase. Ce qui se passe, c'est que depuis le 13 septembre l'Azerbaïdjan est entré par la force sur le territoire internationalement reconnu de l'Arménie.

Cette agression militaire a eu lieu quelques jours à peine après une rencontre entre le président Aliyev et le premier ministre Pachinian sous les auspices du président du Conseil, Charles Michel, et alors que l'un et l'autre avaient réaffirmé leur engagement en faveur d'une paix négociée.

Ilham Aliyev n'a pas seulement agressé l'Arménie, il a aussi humilié l'Union européenne, en ne tenant aucun compte des engagements qu'il avait pris devant le président du Conseil.

L'Europe ne se grandit pas quand elle se laisse mépriser. Madame von der Leyen ne s'est pas grandie quand elle a qualifié l'Azerbaïdjan de «partenaire fiable». Votre propre envoyé spécial, Toivo Klaar, n'est pas plus crédible lorsque, face à l'exécution à bout portant de prisonniers arméniens, il hésite à qualifier le crime et tait le nom des agresseurs – les soldats azerbaïdjanais.

Quand allons-nous enfin clarifier notre discours, Monsieur le Haut-représentant?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, en efecto, lo que ha ocurrido allí se puede calificar de muchas maneras y se puede describir de otras muchas.

La realidad que podemos constatar es bien triste; hay aproximadamente 300 soldados muertos, de los cuales 200 (207, para ser exactos) son armenios.

Es un hecho absolutamente evidente, constatable, que la artillería de Azerbaiyán y sus unidades de drones han bombardeado zonas en el territorio de Armenia, destruyendo infraestructuras civiles y militares y que Azerbaiyán está ocupando posiciones en Armenia.

Hemos dicho que esto es completamente inaceptable.

El ejército, las tropas de Azerbaiyán, está ocupando en este momento posiciones en Armenia. No respeta la frontera internacionalmente reconocida.

Las fuerzas de unos y otros se encuentran a una distancia tan cercana que el riesgo de nuevos choques es prácticamente inevitable.

Tiene usted razón: que esto haya ocurrido después de que los dos líderes hubiesen asegurado al presidente del Consejo su voluntad de llegar a acuerdos y de no recurrir a choques armados no es precisamente la mejor forma de inspirar, de inspirarnos, confianza en el marco de los esfuerzos diplomáticos que el presidente Michel está desarrollando.

Supongo que la presidenta de la Comisión no se refería a eso, sino al cumplimiento por parte de Azerbaiyán de los contratos de gas firmados.

Una cosa no quita la otra.

Ciertamente, tenemos un problema en este momento en relación con la fiabilidad de los diálogos políticos iniciados. Nuestro argumentario pasa por pedir el regreso de las tropas que combaten dentro de las fronteras internacionalmente reconocidas. Sabemos que eso no va a ser fácil, porque todavía estamos en un proceso de delimitación y demarcación de la frontera, que, por otra parte, es la causa inmediata de la confrontación entre estos dos países.

Por eso, estamos haciendo todo lo posible para que la comisión encargada de la delimitación de las fronteras reinicie sus trabajos (lo va a hacer aquí, en Bruselas, en las próximas semanas) para evitar futuros incidentes como este.

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, l'agression de l'Arménie par l'Azerbaïdjan ressemble à celle de l'Ukraine par la Russie, et elle en découle. Parce que Moscou bouscule l'ordre international, Bakou ne voit plus de raison de le respecter, et parce que la Russie est affaiblie en Ukraine, elle est incapable de protéger l'Arménie – ce qu'elle faisait déjà bien mal.

Nous ne pouvons pas rester les bras croisés et voir l'Arménie attaquée par son voisin et abandonnée à son sort par la Russie. Nous devons soutenir l'envoi d'observateurs sur place, travailler à un tracé définitif de la frontière, obtenir la restitution immédiate de tous les prisonniers et documenter de manière indépendante les crimes de guerre. Les principes et les valeurs que nous défendons sont les mêmes de Kiev à Erevan. Allez-vous vous mobiliser, Monsieur le Haut-représentant?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vice-président de la Commission/haut représentant de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité*. – Madame la députée, merci pour vos encouragements. Je suis, en fait, mobilisé. Nous le sommes dans tous les domaines que vous avez cités. Vos objectifs sont les nôtres. Tout ce que vous avez dit qu'il faut faire, nous essayons actuellement de le faire, avec plus ou moins bonne fortune.

Vous avez raison, évidemment: si la Russie envahit l'Ukraine et déclenche une guerre d'agression, pourquoi un autre pays ne pourrait-il pas faire la même chose? C'est pour cela que nous nous opposons à l'invasion russe de l'Ukraine et c'est pour cela que nous travaillons avec nos capacités, certes limitées, pour essayer d'atteindre les objectifs que vous avez remarquablement bien résumés.

Andrey Kovatchev (PPE). – Mr President, dear High Representative, peace and stability in the South Caucasus region can be only a result of serious and irreversible confidence-building measures. All prisoners of war must be released and all hostilities must stop immediately. The EU must play a very important role as a mediator.

Russia, we see very clearly, is not interested in solving the issue, but is interested to have a leverage to stay there in the region and to increase their influence. I was shocked by the recently published videos on these atrocities committed against Armenian prisoners of war. A full and impartial investigation must identify those responsible and they must be held accountable.

So my concrete question is: is the European Union ready to participate in this investigation to find out what exactly is happening, who is responsible? And to be very clear also on Azerbaijan, that Azerbaijan must clearly distance itself from these perpetrators and condemn all kind of violence.

A second question one: does the EU have a plan for confidence-building steps between Armenia and Azerbaijan? And this is very concrete what needs to be done – returning of all prisoners of war – that was the resolution of the European Parliament, the goal was to stop all hostilities, achieving a clear demarcation of border and finding a sustainable resolution of the Karabakh conflict.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vice-président de la Commission/haut représentant de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité.* – J'aurais pu faire comme ça, évidemment. Évidemment, c'est tout cela qu'il faut faire. Je suis d'accord avec vous. Et moi comme vous, j'ai été terrifié par la vision de ces vidéos, dont il faut vérifier l'authenticité. L'Azerbaïdjan lui-même a confirmé sa volonté d'ouvrir une enquête. L'Arménie a demandé que soit l'OSCE, soit l'Union européenne envoie une mission d'enquête. Nous sommes prêts à le faire. Certainement, nous sommes prêts à faire, au moins d'une façon intermédiaire jusqu'à ce que l'OSCE soit en mesure de déployer cette mission.

Mais évidemment, pour cela, il faut que les deux parties le veuillent. Et je suis une fois de plus d'accord avec votre analyse et vos requêtes. Il faut que la guerre s'arrête. Il faut que le conflit au Nagorno-Karabakh trouve une solution. La seule chose que je peux vous dire, c'est que à part d'exprimer des *wishful thinkings*, que je partage, on fait tout ce qui est possible pour réussir.

Andrey Kovatchev (PPE). – A concrete question: did you contact President Aliyev and Prime Minister Pashinyan for a possible date of their next meeting? Under EU mediation for sure.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vice-président de la Commission/haut représentant de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité.* – Non, non, non, je n'ai pas dit que j'avais contacté les deux présidents. Je n'ai pas dit cela. Je n'ai pas dit que j'avais contacté les deux présidents, j'ai dit que nous travaillions pour que la commission sur les frontières, qui n'est pas constituée par les deux présidents, puisse se retrouver ici à Bruxelles. J'ai dit que les deux présidents avaient rencontré le président Michel et que, malgré ce contact, les combats avaient recommencé.

Mais moi, à mon niveau, je ne suis pas l'interlocuteur des deux présidents, je parle avec les ministres des affaires étrangères. Et je l'ai fait: je leur ai à tous deux demandé de revenir sur leurs positions afin que les combats s'arrêtent.

Nacho Sánchez Amor (S&D). – Señor alto representante, el grado de compromiso de los factores regionales en el conflicto puede medirse gráficamente con ese horrible vídeo del que hemos hablado, no de ejecuciones, sino de asesinatos, y sea cual sea la fecha de ese vídeo.

La sociedad internacional tuvo que admitir, qué remedio, que Rusia y, en menor medida, Turquía actuarían como fuerzas interpuestas. Pero Rusia está lógicamente en otra cosa y Armenia ha sido abandonada a su suerte por su teórico socio y protector. Rusia envió tropas a Kazajistán por un problema interno, pero no envió ninguna ayuda a Armenia ante una invasión militar. Tampoco Turquía, tan activa y ruidosa en tantas ocasiones en asuntos exteriores, ha dado ninguna muestra de sus recientes y publicitadas capacidades mediadoras, solamente frases belicosas. Los mismos drones que protegen a Ucrania atacan a Armenia; buen ejemplo de esa actitud, difícil de entender, a veces, de nuestros socios turcos, reitero, socios turcos en la OTAN. Y Turquía, además, es candidata a la adhesión a la Unión.

Sobre Turquía, creo, señor Borrell, que tenemos algunas mayores capacidades de presión que sobre otros actores. ¿Se plantea algún tipo de medida en este sentido?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Claro que procedo a contesto a la pregunta del diputado Sánchez de Amor, que está motivada por las mejores intenciones de intentar que la Unión Europea utilice los instrumentos de los que pudiera disponer para modificar la posición de Turquía, que, como todo el mundo sabe, continúa apoyando a Azerbaiyán.

Lo que le pedimos a Turquía es que use su influencia para contribuir a disminuir las tensiones entre los dos países. Turquía puede y debe desempeñar un papel positivo para intentar entablar un diálogo entre esos dos países, en beneficio de la población afectada por la guerra.

Es cierto que Turquía es un país aliado dentro de la OTAN, lo que no le impide asistir en Samarcanda a reuniones en las que participa el presidente Putin, y no le impide tampoco tener en el Cáucaso Meridional el papel que todo el mundo conoce. Yo creo que una cosa no desdice la otra. O, al menos, por el momento nadie ha detectado, ningún miembro de la OTAN ha detectado ninguna incompatibilidad en estas actuaciones.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Señor alto representante, los dos líderes de ambos países se comprometieron varias veces a seguir negociando un posible acuerdo de paz; la última vez fue en agosto. A pesar de ello, hemos visto la última de las agresiones de Azerbaiyán, esta vez ya dentro de territorio armenio. Parece como si Bakú quisiera aprovechar el momento para reforzar su posición negociadora en relación con estas negociaciones para alcanzar un acuerdo, en relación sobre todo con Nagorno Karabaj.

Además, nuestra creciente dependencia energética de Azerbaiyán, con los nuevos contratos de gas, ciertamente otorgan una posición geopolítica más fuerte a Azerbaiyán. Pero, al mismo tiempo, a mí me da la sensación de que estamos erosionando la confianza de Armenia en nuestra capacidad para poder propiciar un acuerdo.

Mi pregunta, señor Borrell, es la siguiente: ¿usted cree que, en estas circunstancias, tenemos todavía una influencia suficiente sobre Azerbaiyán para intentar mediar y conseguir un acuerdo justo, durable y sostenible?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, gracias. Espero que sí, pero no puedo asegurárselo.

Peter van Dalen (PPE). – Voorzitter, meneer Borrell – deze kant op –, we zitten hier in een politieke arena, dus we willen duidelijke politieke daden. Geen woorden, maar daden. Azerbeidzjan is de agressor, en Azerbeidzjan gaat we niet stoppen met een politieke dialoog. Azerbeidzjan is alleen maar gevoelig voor daadkracht.

Dus mijn vraag is: de agressor Azerbeidzjan moeten we stoppen. Dat kan, bijvoorbeeld – u vroeg: kom maar op met je ideeën – dat kan bijvoorbeeld door het gascontract met hen vandaag te verbreken of in ieder geval te bevriezen. Dus mijn vraag is concreet aan u: hoe gaan we die agressor stoppen? Niet met mooie woorden, maar met daden. En ik stel voor: gascontract bevriezen of stoppen.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, no sé cuál es la pregunta porque usted ha anunciado la voluntad de hacer algo. Si lo que me pregunta es si yo considero que tal cosa va a ocurrir, mi respuesta es «no».

Costas Mavrides (S&D). – Mr Borrell, being balanced is like the title I see here: tensions between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Being impartial means that we should be straight on the facts. Around midnight on 12 September this year, the Azerbaijani armed forces launched a large-scale military attack against the Republic of Armenia in several directions from the eastern part of Armenia-Azerbaijan border. In this pre-planned attack, they used heavy artillery against numerous cities and nearby villages. Also, this has been an unprovoked and unjustified aggression against the sovereignty of Armenia. I can go on and on, but I'm going to ask you a few questions.

Are you ready to consider proposing sanctions against Azerbaijan? Second, to ask for Turkey to exert its influence on Azerbaijan is unfortunate, to say the least, for one good reason: Turkey is part of …

(The President cut off the speaker)

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, una pregunta, solo he entendido una pregunta, sobre sanciones, pero no he entendido otra. Quizá en el turno posterior pueda usted intentar formularla otra vez.

Sobre las sanciones, puedo decirle que, en mi conocimiento, ningún Estado miembro ha puesto esa propuesta sobre la mesa. Y, como sabe, las sanciones las aprueban los Estados miembros.

Jordan Bardella (ID). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Haut-représentant, ma question sera simple et très directe: qu'est-ce donc qui compte le plus à vos yeux, le gaz azérbaïdjanais ou le sang arménien? Je crois déjà connaître la réponse puisque Madame von der Leyen, la présidente de la Commission européenne, a signé un accord visant à doubler les quantités de gaz importé d'Azerbaïdjan sans jamais prendre officiellement la défense des Arméniens attaqués sur leurs terres.

Ces derniers jours, des vidéos authentifiées montrent l'exécution sommaire et sauvage de soldats arméniens par des troupes azerbaïdjanaises. Qu'attendez-vous? Qu'attendez-vous pour pointer du doigt cette sale guerre menée par Bakou? Sans consignes américaines, l'Europe est-elle devenue incapable de prendre position dans les affaires du monde? Ou est-ce à cause de la peur de dénoncer la Turquie, membre de l'OTAN qui soutient directement les ambitions de l'Azerbaïdjan?

Je ne vous reproche pas de chercher à réduire la dépendance énergétique de l'Europe à une puissance en particulier. Nous vous reprochons, faute d'anticipation et par aveuglement idéologique, de le faire dans une précipitation qui sacrifie la fraternité européenne avec le peuple d'Arménie. Notre civilisation brûle, mais l'Europe regarde ailleurs.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, no he detectado ninguna pregunta en su intervención que mereciera la pena ser contestada. Porque la comparación entre la sangre y el petróleo me parece completamente fuera de lugar, señoría. Puede usted hacer aquí el discurso que crea oportuno, pero yo creía que estábamos en un debate donde se me hacían preguntas serias que yo pudiera contestar.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Surrounded by Azeri soldiers, you surrender. You drop your weapons to the ground. Place your hands in the air. Suddenly you're thrown to the ground. Your brothers in arms are herded together, lambs to the slaughter. Without provocation, an Azeri soldier fires a hail of bullets at one of your fellow servicemen. These are your final moments. Do you say a prayer? Do you hang on to the memory of your loved ones? This war crime recorded is one among many committed by the Azeri armed forces over the past two years.

High Representative Borrell, you condemn the atrocities committed by Russia against Ukrainians and rightly so. Will you condemn war crimes committed by Azerbaijan against Armenia?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, condeno, naturalmente, todos los crímenes de guerra, ocurran donde ocurran y cualquiera que sea el que los perpetre.

Emmanuel Maurel (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur Borrel veut des questions. Moi je vais vous en poser une Monsieur le Haut-représentant. Pourquoi êtes-vous si timoré, si en retrait sur la question de l'Arménie et de l'Azerbaïdjan, alors qu'on vous connaît très allant, et souvent à la pointe des combats sur d'autres sujets.

Parce que, quand même, il y a des faits. Il y a un agresseur, un agressé. Il y a des crimes de guerre, avec cette vidéo atroce où on voit des soldats azéris tirer à bout portant sur des prisonniers de guerre arméniens. Et moi, ce qui m'embête, c'est pour ça qu'on vous pose la question inlassablement, c'est pourquoi l'Europe ne réagit elle pas avec plus de fermeté?

Je comprends la gêne, parce que, en effet, cela a été dit, M[me] von der Leyen est allée signer en grande pompe un accord avec l'Azerbaïdjan. Mais en même temps, vous voyez bien que les Européens pourraient avoir le sentiment qu'il y a deux poids, deux mesures. Nous arrivons à être à l'unisson, fermes pour condamner l'agression russe face à l'Ukraine, et c'est normal, mais vous êtes timoré, en retrait, quand il s'agit de dire ce qui se passe en Arménie, c'est à dire une agression caractérisée par un agresseur qui doit être condamné fermement et sanctionné, sanctionné parce qu'il y a des conventions internationales dont l'Azerbaïdjan est signataire, et il faudra que ceux qui sont des auteurs des crimes de guerre soient responsables et rendent des comptes.

Voilà pourquoi, inlassablement, nous vous posons la question.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, muchas gracias. Evidentemente, ustedes son libres de formularme todas las cuestiones que quieran y de repetirlas las veces que estimen necesario, y yo puedo darles la respuesta que ya les he dado varias veces.

¿Cómo puede usted imaginar que yo condeno menos que usted cualquier acto que viola los derechos humanos? ¿De dónde saca usted su superioridad moral? Lo condeno tanto como usted. Claro que sí. Y ya les he explicado que condenamos todos los actos que impliquen una violación de derechos humanos y que estamos pidiendo que se investiguen y que se pidan responsabilidades.

Esos videos son tremendos. Habrá que hacer una investigación sobre ello ¿no? Habrá que hacer una investigación. Es lo que el propio Azerbaiyán ha dicho que iba a hacer. Usted puede desconfiar del resultado de esta investigación por interés de parte. Armenia ha pedido que haya misiones que investiguen los hechos por parte de la OSCE y por parte de la Unión Europea. Yo he dicho que estamos dispuestos a hacerlo. Les he dicho que reconocemos la existencia de un ataque dentro del territorio armenio y que, en ese ataque, las tropas de Azerbaiyán han ocupado parte del territorio de Armenia y pedimos su retirada.

Estamos haciendo todo lo que podemos para conseguir que la situación se normalice, para que cesen las hostilidades, para que se retiren las tropas, para que se delimiten las responsabilidades de quienes hayan podido cometer actos contra los derechos humanos.

¿Qué más quiere que le diga, señoría?

Por mucha más indignación que muestre, los hechos y mi capacidad de acción siguen siendo los mismos.

Karen Melchior (Renew). – There is an internet meme which is, 'is the EU concerned?' High Representative, you spoke about the EU's credibility. The EU's credibility is at stake here. Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine: we've seen frozen conflicts and we've seen aggression. But what is the European Union actually doing? How are we responding to Azerbaijan's aggressive invasion of Armenia?

On Thursday in Prague, there is a meeting of the European Political Community. There will be a discussion, I think at 2 o'clock, where we will be discussing peace and security. Why is Azerbaijan invited to this meeting?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, a esta reunión están invitados por el presidente del Consejo los países de nuestro entorno político. Azerbaiyán está invitado como país con el que tenemos un Acuerdo de asociación, que, que yo sepa, este Parlamento no ha pedido que se suspenda.

Cuando usted habla de la Unión Europea, permítame que le diga que usted también es la Unión Europea. Que este Parlamento también es la Unión Europea. Y si ustedes creen que hay alguna iniciativa que tomar, tómenla. Y si no quieren que Azerbaiyán sea invitado, tienen una manera muy fácil de hacerlo: pidan, en esta Cámara, que se suspenda el Acuerdo de asociación.

President. – Thank you, High Representative. I think we have to close our debate here as we are running very late. The High Representative has a schedule and we will not continue like that. We have had 12 speakers according to the D'Hondt system, and 5 minutes, it's the case.

Would you like to say something on procedure, Mr Castaldo?

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io vorrei protestare perché lei ha detto, durante questo dibattito, che avrebbe applicato il metodo D'Hondt e lei ha escluso dal metodo D'Hondt il raggruppamento dei non iscritti.

Io ritengo che questo sia fortemente antidemocratico perché siamo anche noi deputati. In democrazia i voti si contano e non si pesano e credo che anche noi avremmo avuto diritto, come per tutti gli altri gruppi, che infatti hanno avuto almeno un oratore, di poter fare un intervento.

Io ho seguito tutto quanto il dibattito. Mi sono prenotato per tempo e reputo questa scelta fortemente antidemocratica e ingiusta. Abbiamo il diritto di essere deputati come gli altri. Non siamo figli di un Dio minore in questo Parlamento.

President. – Yes, I agree, but with regard to the timing we are way behind schedule. That's why it was my decision. I agree it's not democratic, but it's the situation. Thank you for understanding.

16. Situace v Burkině Faso po státním převratu (rozprava)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Komisijas priekšsēdētājas vietnieka / Savienības Augstā pārstāvja ārlietās un drošības politikas jautājumos paziņojumu par situāciju Burkinafaso pēc valsts apvērsuma (2022/2865(RSP)). Kā jūs redzat, Savienības Augsto pārstāvi ārlietās un drošības politikas jautājumos pārstāvēs komisāre Urpilainena.

Jutta Urpilainen, *on behalf of the VPC/HR*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, as you have been able to follow over the past few days, the situation has been particularly tense in Burkina Faso.

We have witnessed what we can call a *coup de force* by Captain Traoré, who brought together a large part of the army to overthrow the President of the Transition, Damiba. For the record, the latter had already come to power on 24 January 2022, thanks to a military coup overthrowing President Kaboré.

For the European Union, this coup in the coup is particularly regrettable. We had strongly supported ECOWAS in their mediation efforts to find a way forward with the new Burkinabe authorities. We had engaged politically with the Transition Authorities to encourage them on this path, with commitments to reengage. The HR/VP had met President Damiba in New York two weeks ago and we were ready to boost our cooperation with the country, including in the field of defence and security, while continuing our support to the people of Burkina Faso.

Important discussions are taking place between ECOWAS and the new authorities in Burkina Faso as we speak. We look forward to these discussions leading to positive and constructive conclusions, which respect the commitments made at the time of the removal of President Damiba.

If these agreements are respected and there is a clear sense of good will, we will need to grasp it and show in a firm and convincing way that we stand together with the people of Burkina Faso in fighting terrorism, combating the humanitarian crisis and supporting the return to constitutional order.

Certainly, Burkina Faso will need external support. The current challenge is to convince the new junta that, even if the Wagner option is tempting, those mercenaries are objectively ineffective in the fight against terrorism in the Sahel, and we can witness this more and more in Mali every day.

So, colleagues, we will need some time to assess whether Burkina Faso and the European Union can continue as partners. We will work to do our part to sustain our strong support to the people of Burkina Faso.

György Hölvényi, *a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében.* – Tisztelt Elnök Úr, Biztos Asszony! Legutóbb februárban folytattunk itt vitát a Burkina Fasó-i helyzetről, de akkor Dali biztos asszony a Bizottság nevében arról beszélt, hogy az Unió reagálni fog a megváltozott Burkina Fasó-i helyzetre, bátorítja majd a demokratikus rendhez való visszatérést, és prioritásként kezeli a terrorizmussal szembeni fellépést.

Biztos Asszony! Nézzünk szembe a valósággal! Nagyon kevés eredménnyel járt az eddigi Uniós fellépés. A szándék megvolt. Júniusban a vallási szélsőségesek Pansyban száz ember életét követelő támadást hajtottak végre, aminek következtében ezrek menekültek el a térségből. Múlt héten pedig Ibrahim Traoré százados sikeres katonai hatalomátvétele Ouagadougouban megbuktatta az előző puccsistát.

Aggasztó a helyzet. Látnunk kell azonban, hogy nem sajátosan Burkina Faso problémájáról van szó. Nyugat-Afrikában a mostani volt a hetedik sikeres katonai hatalomátvétel 2020 óta. A sorozatos államcsínyek az egész szubszaharai régió stabilitását ingatják meg, ez pedig teret enged a vallási szélsőségek, köztük az Iszlám Állam helyi szervezete térnyerésének. Ismerjük föl: az európai uniós fellépés valódi lehetősége a tagországok és a nemzetközi szervezetek, a helyi partnerek cselekvéseként multiplikátor TTT összehangolása. Még egyszer hangsúlyozom, az összehangolás! Az Európai Unió nem tud a helyzettel magában mit kezdeni.

Tisztelt Főképviselő Asszony! Tisztelt Biztos Asszony! Milyen lehetőséget lát erre az összehangolt cselekvésre? Miként tudja, akarja Ön szerint az Unió hitelesen koordinálni a különböző nemzetközi, uniós szereplők fellépését a mostani Burkina Fasó-i helyzetben ?

Hannes Heide, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Frau Kommissarin! Putins Krieg gegen Demokratie, Freiheit und europäische Werte findet in der Ukraine statt. Ein weiterer Schauplatz ist allerdings auch auf dem afrikanischen Kontinent zu erkennen. Russland spannt sein Desinformationsnetzwerk über Westafrika mit dem Ziel, die europäische Präsenz anzuprangern, den angeblich positiven russischen Einfluss zu betonen und auszuweiten. Militärputsch reiht sich an Militärputsch, regelmäßig diskutieren wir hier an dieser Stelle im Europäischen Parlament die Ursachen, Folgen und Konsequenzen.

Burkina Faso, übersetzt: „das Land des aufrechten Menschen“, hat nun zum zweiten Mal innerhalb von acht Monaten ein Militärputsch erschüttert. Die Europäische Union muss handeln und die Ursachen für diese Entwicklung bekämpfen. Nur dann ist die dramatische Sicherheits- und Versorgungslage in den Griff zu bekommen. Nur dann können die Menschen in ihren Bestrebungen nach Demokratie, Frieden, Stabilität und Rechtsstaatlichkeit unterstützt werden.

Was leider auffällig ist: Das Vertrauen in Europa ist stark gesunken. Die Massenproteste und gewaltsamen Ausschreitungen, die dem Putsch vorausgegangen sind, richteten sich gegen die Übergangsregierung, aber auch gegen französische Einrichtungen und Unternehmen. Die Demonstranten forderten den Abzug Frankreichs und schwenkten russische Fahnen. Der neue Machthaber Traoré kündigte in einer Fernsehansprache an, die Partnerschaft mit Frankreich überdenken zu wollen und andere Partner zu suchen und finden zu wollen, die im Kampf gegen Terrorismus helfen. Der Chef der Söldnertruppe Wagner, Prigoschin, sicherte in einer Erklärung seine Unterstützung zu.

Diese Ereignisse und diese Aussagen sollten ein Weckruf an die Europäische Union sein. Die russische Einflussnahme und Desinformation geht nur dann ins Leere, wenn die Menschen vor Ort spüren, dass Europa ein glaubwürdiger Partner im Kampf für ein besseres Leben und Perspektiven in den Heimatländern ist. Ich bedanke mich für alle Bemühungen.

Nathalie Loiseau, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la commissaire, alors que l'armée russe recule en Ukraine, Moscou s'invente une nouvelle aventure coloniale, en Afrique cette fois, avec la complicité du groupe Wagner.

Le dernier pays victime de l'appétit prédateur insatiable de la Russie est le Burkina Faso. Le pays des hommes intègres est aujourd'hui pris en tenaille entre la violence des groupes djihadistes et les pillards du groupe Wagner. La situation du peuple burkinabé est tragique et l'on comprend qu'il ne sache plus à qui accorder sa confiance. Plus du tiers du territoire est entre les mains des djihadistes. Un Burkinabé sur dix est une personne déplacée. À Djibo, au moins 200 000 habitants sont soumis à la pression djihadiste, privés d'eau, d'énergie, de nourriture et de soins.

On pourrait espérer que l'armée burkinabée se précipite dans le Nord pour leur venir en aide. Eh bien non! Au lieu de cela, c'est un coup d'État militaire qui a eu lieu à Ouagadougou. Les nouvelles autorités, de fait, croient pouvoir faire mieux que leurs prédécesseurs et on leur souhaite d'y parvenir. Hélas, les premiers jours de leur prise de pouvoir se sont traduits par des violences inacceptables contre l'ambassade de France. L'Institut français a été vandalisé sans que les autorités de fait ne réagissent. Il est attendu d'elles autre chose que la recherche insensée de boucs émissaires. Il est attendu d'elle qu'elles protègent les ressortissants européens et qu'elles s'attellent aux maux qui frappent le pays.

Qu'on ne vienne pas nous dire que la Russie aidera à vaincre les groupes armés et à lutter contre la pauvreté. Partout où il est présent, de la Centrafrique au Mali, le groupe Wagner ne fait qu'ajouter de la violence à la violence et pille les ressources. La Russie ne règle pas les crises africaines parce qu'elles en vit, elle ne sert pas l'Afrique, elle se sert de l'Afrique.

Mais ce qui se passe à Ouagadougou est aussi notre échec. Nous avons laissé la désinformation fleurir sans une réaction à la hauteur. Nous aidons le Burkina de manière considérable, sans que ses habitants voient le résultat de nos efforts. Nous offrons à la Russie une victoire facile qui ne résoudra rien des défis auxquels le Sahel est confronté. Il est temps, plus que temps de repenser notre action en profondeur.

François Alfonsi, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, la zone du Sahel est une grande préoccupation pour l'Europe. Ce qui advient en ce moment au Burkina Faso témoigne de l'effondrement politique des États de cette zone.

L'intervention militaire de la France en 2013 au Mali avait permis, alors que l'État islamique régnait déjà sur la Syrie et sur l'Irak, d'empêcher qu'un second foyer de terrorisme ne s'installe au Sahel. Cette intervention était indispensable. La grande erreur qui s'est ensuivie a été commise par l'Union européenne, qui a laissé la France esseulée. Si l'Europe s'était davantage interposée, cela aurait coupé court à une propagande hostile liée au passé colonial de la France.

Les États malien et burkinabé ont été ces dernières années gravement déstabilisés par la montée en puissance des groupes armés islamistes. Chaque coup d'État est un nouveau signal de leur échec dans la lutte contre le terrorisme, et le rythme effréné de ces putschs à répétition indique une fin de cycle. Tout cela pourrait hélas mener à une victoire décisive des islamistes.

Alors, que faire? L'Europe devra être opérationnelle dès l'instant que les apprentis putschistes auront définitivement échoué. Il faut assurer à ceux qui seront prêts à prendre leur relève un cadre de coopération aussitôt opérationnel. Si cet espace immense du Sahel tombe durablement aux mains des islamistes, l'Europe en subira inévitablement les conséquences.

Nous appelons donc le Service d'action extérieure à coordonner l'initiative et les États membres à lui apporter des moyens d'action, y compris militaires, qui ne soient pas réduits à ceux de la seule armée française, vulnérable aux campagnes de dénigrement étant donné son passé colonial.

Assita Kanko, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, geachte collega's, Burkina Faso betekent: het land van de eerlijke mensen. En zo is dat ook.

Et ce n'est pas dans mes habitudes, mais je vais dire quelque chose également en français, parce que nous avons vu, au Burkina Faso, une très bonne collaboration, pendant longtemps, avec la France, et aujourd'hui une nouvelle colonisation, comme ma collègue Nathalie Loiseau l'a dit, qui s'installe: celle de la Russie.

Dat seculier land dat ik gekend heb, bestaat niet meer, want het land is door de islamisten verwoest en nu op drift. Zonder leiderschap zal het niet mogelijk zijn de economie een nieuw leven in te blazen, de jeugd perspectief te bieden en de jihadisten die elke dag een stuk van de Sahel overnemen te stoppen.

De verdere opkomst van jihadisten in de Sahelregio heeft geleid tot de tweede staatsgreep in een jaar tijd in Burkina Faso, waar bijna 40 % van mijn geboorteland nu gecontroleerd wordt door militanten die banden hebben met zowel Al Qaida als Islamitische Staat. Dit is slecht nieuws voor hen, maar ook voor ons.

Ik dank de collega's dat dit debat plaats kan vinden. Ik dank de Europese Commissie om hier ook aandacht aan te besteden. Dit is geen ver-van-ons-bedshow en ik kijk uit naar de onderhandelingen voor de resolutie in oktober II.

Marc Botenga, *au nom du groupe The Left.* – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, 2021: deux coups d'État au Mali; 2022: deux coups d'État au Burkina Faso. Le gouvernement militaire n'est évidemment jamais une solution, mais ces coups d'État dans la région du Sahel ne tombent pas non plus du ciel. Et c'est vraiment, je trouve, trop facile de dire que tout est la faute des Russes. Il faudrait alors expliquer pourquoi cette propagande russe, bien réelle, a autant de succès et séduit.

Ces coups d'État, et cela il faut le dire, surviennent sur fond de colère populaire profonde. Une colère directement liée aux conséquences désastreuses de l'intervention militaire en Libye, qui a déstabilisé toute la région. Une colère qui aussi découle des interventions militaires européennes, qui, de Barkhane à Takuba, ont toutes échoué. Une colère liée au fait d'être pauvre dans des pays qui sont riches, mais qui se font dépouiller par les multinationales européennes. Une colère, enfin, liée à l'impact du franc CFA sur les conditions de vie et sur la dimension sociale de ces pays. En somme, la colère face au néocolonialisme européen.

Après le blocage d'un convoi militaire français il y a de cela quelques mois, un étudiant burkinabé l'expliquait bien – et je lis: «La population burkinabée et la jeunesse ne sont pas contre la France, mais contre le système français. On nous parle d'accords gagnant-gagnant, mais nous, ce qu'on voit, c'est une relation de maître à esclave, même si c'est un langage un peu abusif, en tous cas de patron à prolétaire.»

C'est cette attitude-là que les peuples africains n'acceptent plus, et c'est avec cela que nous devons rompre. Il est vraiment temps d'écouter les Africains eux-mêmes.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, a quem interessa a desestabilização de África e, em particular, da região do Sahel? Aos povos africanos não é certamente.

As notícias que recebemos diariamente sobre a deterioração da situação política, humanitária e dos direitos humanos são muito preocupantes. Não podemos, por isso, deixar de condenar o golpe de estado ocorrido no Burquina Fasso, no dia 30 de setembro, o segundo golpe de estado que ocorre naquele país nos últimos oito meses. Uma condenação clara que foi também já feita pela ONU, pela União Africana e pela Comunidade Económica dos Estados da África Ocidental, a CEDEAO.

A ação militar desenvolvida, sem qualquer enquadramento constitucional, coloca em causa os esforços desenvolvidos, em particular pela CEDEAO, para assegurar uma transição para a ordem constitucional até 2024. Ao mesmo tempo, cria ainda mais dificuldades humanitárias e de sobrevivência num país, no qual, segundo agências internacionais, 25% da população precisa de ajuda urgente.

Por isso, Senhora Comissária, vale a pena voltar a colocar a questão: a quem interessa a desestabilização de África e, em particular, da região do Sahel? E se a resposta for, como tudo indica que seja, que ela interessa aos adversários da democracia e do Estado de Direito, então, é fundamental que a União Europeia e a Comunidade Internacional reforcem a sua cooperação para lutar contra o terrorismo nas suas diversas formas, no Burquina Fasso e no Sahel. Que sejam restabelecidas as condições para que continue a ser elaborada e seja aprovada uma nova Constituição, no quadro do processo de transição que estava em curso, dando resposta às legítimas aspirações do povo deste país para que disponha de fortes e sólidas instituições democráticas.

E, finalmente, que os atores políticos e a sociedade civil sejam encorajados a envolver-se na retoma do processo de transição, através do diálogo e da participação, criando condições para que o país ultrapasse o difícil momento político, económico e social que está a viver.

Karsten Lucke (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Vor einem guten Dreivierteljahr habe ich genau an dieser Stelle gestanden und bei der damaligen Dringlichkeitsentschließung dazu aufgerufen, dass, wenn wir überhaupt Erfolg haben wollen, die Macht wieder auf eine demokratische Basis zurückgeführt werden muss. Das ist nicht geschehen.

Oberstleutnant Damiba putschte damals im Januar und versprach, die Sicherheit bis zum September wiederherzustellen. Stattdessen, wenn wir heute den *crosscheck* machen: weitreichende Menschenrechtsverletzungen, die Extremisten haben noch mehr Zulauf, Flüchtlinge bis zu 10 % – wir haben es gehört –, im eigenen Land eine starke Ernährungsunsicherheit und mangelnde staatliche Strukturen. Mal abgesehen davon, dass der Zeitfaktor natürlich völlig unrealistisch war, um diesen Knoten der Konflikte tatsächlich zu durchschlagen, die Reaktion, die wir jetzt haben, ist natürlich absolut kontraproduktiv. Denn wir haben den Coup im Coup, und Hauptmann Traoré hat sich an die Staatsspitze geputscht, um genau das zu erreichen, was sein Vorgänger erreichen wollte.

Doch noch viel schlimmer, das ist sozusagen die sehr faule Kirsche auf der sehr schlechten Sahne: Traoré sucht sich neue Partner im Kampf gegen den islamistischen Terror und findet sie womöglich in Russland. Prigoschin, der Gründer der blutsäuferischen Gruppe Wagner, hat am Wochenende schon applaudiert. Da ahnen wir, in welche Richtung das Ganze gehen wird.

Militärregierungen sind am Ende des Tages nicht zum Wohle des Landes und schon gar nicht mit der Unterstützung Russlands. Deswegen gilt es jetzt, dass wir kurzfristig vor allen Dingen eine Deeskalation der Gesamtlage erreichen. Und für alle Menschen, Bürgerinnen und Bürger, Soldatinnen und Soldaten müssen wir körperliche Unversehrtheit erreichen und auch die Einhaltung der grundlegenden Menschenrechte.

Das wichtigste Ziel bleibt aber, dass wir zurück zu einer konstitutionellen Ordnung kommen, in der Menschen in freien Wahlen bestimmen, welche Geschicke in ihrem Land von ihnen übernommen werden sollen. Ich bleibe dabei: Wir müssen das nicht für Burkina Faso übernehmen, aber die EU sollte Burkina Faso auf diesem Weg aktiv begleiten und unterstützen. Und dafür plädiere ich.

Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Churchillowi przypisuje się słowa, że Bałkany to miękkie podbrzusze Europy. Dzisiaj możemy z całą pewnością stwierdzić, że tym miękkim podbrzuszem Europy są państwa grupy Sahel.

Dlaczego o tym mówię ? Bo z jednej strony oczywiście olbrzymia tragedia mieszkańców tego biednego kraju, a z drugiej strony, jak mówił polski poeta, widzimy, że inni szatani są tam czynni. Dzisiaj w sposób oczywisty to Rosjanie, destabilizując sytuację polityczną, społeczną, ekonomiczną w takich krajach jak Burkina Faso, jak Mali, jak Sudan, są tymi, którzy – destabilizując tę sytuację – tak naprawdę wykorzystują ją do polityki Putina.

Dlaczego? Dlatego że zdestabilizowany Sahel to zdestabilizowana południowa granica Unii Europejskiej, ale również ci biedni uchodźcy, którzy pojawili się dziwnym trafem na Białorusi. Putin perfekcyjnie wykorzystuje to, co dzisiaj widzimy w Burkina Faso, do tego, aby destabilizować Europę.

I musimy mieć również tutaj, w tej Izbie, świadomość, pochylając się z troską nad tymi biednymi ludźmi, dostrzegając walkę pomiędzy plemionami miejscowymi, pomiędzy pasterzami a rolnikami – musimy widzieć w tle innego szatana, jakim jest Putin.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, instability, coups and French embassies being set on fire in former French colonies are becoming a bit more regular. Existing contradictions are being exacerbated by the sanctions on Russia, by the continuation of the war and by the inflationary spiral; by the climate crisis, by neo-colonial structures of exploitation, such as the French colonial franc system where France still receives a colonial tax from 14 former colonies – to loan them back their own money with high interest rates when ensuring government contracts to French companies.

When not toppling leaders in the region who fought for independence and Pan-Africanism, France and the West are presiding over prolonged neo-colonial theft that has meant governance structures are basically non-existent in the rural areas of these former colonies. Instead of addressing the crisis through debt cancellation or reversing neoliberal restructuring and privatisation, the West responds with militarism that has worsened the security situation.

If the EU won't take its foot off the necks of these people, sooner or later, they will be forced to do so.

(Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās beigas.)

Jutta Urpilainen, *on behalf of the VPC/HR*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I want to thank you for the quality of this debate and also for your analysis at such short notice. I think it was very important to have this debate with you today. As I said in my introduction, we will definitely assess the developments and our relations on this basis.

I can tell that I have myself visited Burkina Faso twice as a Commissioner. I have been following the development of that country very carefully, and I have to say that I feel sad in order to see the latest development what happened in the beginning of this year, but also the latest coup, which took place this this week.

I think these discussions will also continue in parallel with Member States – and it was also highlighted by you – since there will be an exchange on this matter on Thursday 5 October at the Political and Security Committee. I fully agree with you that it is important to try to coordinate with our Member States on our position regarding Burkina, but also what kind of action and support we will provide to Burkina in the future.

So, as mentioned in the introduction and as called for by you this evening, we will do our utmost to maintain our strong support to the people of Burkina Faso. So in any case, we will definitely maintain our strong support to the people of Burkina Faso. This is our very strong commitment.

President. – Thank you very much, Commissioner.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next part-session.

17. Strategické vztahy a partnerství EU s Africkým rohem (rozprava)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Fabio Massimo Castaldo ziņojumu Ārlietu komitejas vārdā par ES stratēģiskajām attiecībām un partnerību ar Āfrikas ragu (2021/2206 (INI)) (A9-0207/2022).

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *relatore*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, carissima Commissaria Urpilainen, vorrei innanzitutto ringraziarvi tutti e in particolare i relatori ombra per questa preziosa cooperazione che ha contraddistinto i nostri lavori, così come tutti i *policy advisors* e gli assistenti. Senza di loro non sarebbe stato possibile presentare una relazione così ambiziosa come quella che voteremo domani.

In un contesto mondiale così complesso, mutevole e instabile come quello odierno, appare indispensabile parlare d'Africa. Ritengo infatti che sia questa la direttrice strategica principale per la nostra Unione e che dal rilancio delle relazioni tra il nostro continente e quello africano passino gran parte delle nostre possibilità di innalzarci al ruolo di *player* geopolitico globale credibile e affidabile.

Il Corno d'Africa è senza dubbio una regione della massima importanza geostrategica. Pensiamo alla rilevanza dello Stretto di Hormuz, il quale rappresenta uno dei quattro snodi di transito più importanti al mondo. Da qui passano infatti circa un sesto del commercio mondiale di petrolio, un terzo di quello di gas, nonché una percentuale considerevole del traffico marittimo globale.

Questa però è anche una regione che si trova al centro di una tempesta perfetta: l'interruzione delle importazioni causata dal conflitto in Ucraina e i prezzi elevati delle materie prime e del grano si combinano a una delle peggiori siccità degli ultimi decenni, portando quindi, in definitiva, a un cambiamento climatico che colpisce molto più che altrove.

Tutti questi fattori oggi ci consegnano un'immagine con circa venti milioni di persone a lottare contro la carestia e l'insicurezza alimentare in una delle più gravi crisi umanitarie degli anni recenti. Ad aggravare ulteriormente la situazione vi sono una serie di conflitti attivi o latenti, nonché ancora una perdurante instabilità sociopolitica, che creano immani sofferenze tra le popolazioni, con un numero sempre crescente di sfollati e rifugiati.

Insomma, abbiamo tutti gli elementi di necessità e opportunità affinché la nostra azione si concentri su questa regione e le dia l'attenzione che merita, anche perché altri attori, che certamente sono lontani dai nostri valori e dal nostro approccio, vi hanno già intessuto profonde relazioni multi-dominio. La Cina in primis, con la sua presenza militare diplomatica e la cooperazione economica che ha con i vari paesi, la Russia, con politiche di disinformazione e di propaganda e con i suoi piani di una base navale in Sudan, per non parlare dell'ingerenza delle compagnie di sicurezza private come il gruppo Wagner, e ancora la Turchia e gli Stati del Golfo Persico.

È indispensabile quindi ripensare il nostro approccio alla regione, facendo valere concretamente i vantaggi comparati e intessendo relazioni reciprocamente vantaggiose, proprio basate su dialogo e consultazioni coerenti e tempestive, superando quindi quell'approccio paternalistico che spesso ha fatto da *leitmotiv* al nostro operato.

Sarà quindi necessario favorire l'*ownership* locale dei programmi lanciati, ambendo a trovare soluzioni africane a problemi africani, come recita il motto appunto dell'Unione Africana con la quale dovremmo cooperare in maniera capillare, e allo stesso tempo favorire un approccio che vada dal basso verso l'alto, supportando il ruolo della società civile.

Dobbiamo essere più presenti. Voglio quindi ringraziare anche i colleghi che sono stati in missione ad Addis Abeba e a Khartum. La transizione ecologica ed energetica che stiamo compiendo come Unione rappresenterebbe un grande valore aggiunto per i paesi della regione, ma non può e non deve essere imposta, bensì deve essere veicolata e supportata con un dialogo costruttivo, basato sulla condivisione delle migliori pratiche del *know how* europeo nei campi di interesse.

Cari colleghi, in presenza di conflitti e di instabilità non può esserci sviluppo. Non solo. È necessario riconoscere come l'insicurezza nel Corno d'Africa rappresenti una serissima minaccia per le prospettive dell'intero continente, nonché per la sicurezza regionale e dell'intera Unione europea.

Per questo è necessario adottare un approccio olistico, un approccio integrato che promuova il concetto di sicurezza umana e il legame tra assistenza umanitaria, cooperazione allo sviluppo e pace, rafforzando il partenariato strategico in materia di prevenzione e risoluzione dei conflitti e supportando tutti quei processi di mediazione e riconciliazione che sono indispensabili nella regione.

Di questo e di molto altro si tratta nella relazione e domani potremo quindi mandare un messaggio forte e chiaro alla Commissione e al Consiglio sulla necessità e sull'urgenza di fare la nostra parte nel Corno d'Africa, perché l'Africa è stata, è e sarà sempre lo specchio della nostra geopolitica. A noi decidere quale immagine vogliamo che vi sia riflessa.

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

Vizepräsidentin

Jutta Urpilainen, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, this debate is a timely opportunity to discuss the Horn of Africa, also on behalf of the HR/VP Borrell.

Two years ago, this region was economically growing and politically rather stable. Unfortunately, today we cannot say the same. As your report rightly points out, the Horn of Africa is a region of strategic importance, where we also face competitors that do not share the same values nor interests. In the current geopolitical context it adds to the difficulties. We must remain engaged, including on global challenges such as the food crisis. I will now focus on four countries that are currently high on the EU's agenda.

With Kenya, we launched this year a strategic dialogue to deepen our relationship along three strands: security, sustainable development, trade and investment. The elections on 9 August were a crucial moment and President Ruto, whom the HR/VP met a few weeks ago, praised the work carried out by the EU's electoral observation mission.

We were also pleased to hear the President's determination to take our bilateral agenda forward, and our teams are already working together in that regard. The European Parliament's role will be essential. The conclusion of the economic partnership agreement is a priority for the new president and we should do everything to deliver on this file.

In Somalia, the election of President Hassan Sheikh Mohamud opens a new page. The HR/VP travelled to Mogadishu to encourage him to deliver on political security and economic reforms. On security, we need to work together to allow the African Union's mission to hand over responsibilities to the Somali security forces. The EU common security and defence policy engagements in Somalia were a major topic of discussion.

In Ethiopia, the resumption of hostilities in northern Ethiopia after a five-month humanitarian truce leave us very concerned. We have been clear in our key demands from the very beginning of the conflict. The EU has denounced a traumatic humanitarian situation and asked for humanitarian access.

We have also been working with like-minded partners and encouraging all parties to immediately end the fighting and engage in peace negotiations. We should keep up our efforts and intensify our response as needs be while we continue our support to the Ethiopian people through special measures.

We must help to strengthen an African solution to this African crisis and prevent a further regionalisation of the conflict. We welcome also the delegation of MEPs who were last month in Addis Ababa to convey similar messages.

And, very briefly, in Sudan, the country is locked in a political impasse. The recent initiatives by civilian forces offer a window of opportunity for the military and political forces to reach an agreement on the way forward. However, we cannot exclude a purely tactical support of the military leaders who pretend they will hand over power immediately if civilians find consensus. The recent visit of the EP's AFET MEPs to Khartoum was important to show that the democratic transition in Sudan remains high on the EU's agenda.

I really look forward to our exchange.

David McAllister, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, Commissioner Urpilainen, as you just mentioned, a delegation of the Foreign Affairs Committee travelled to Ethiopia and Sudan just two weeks ago, and we were able to observe first-hand that insecurity in the Horn of Africa is a serious threat to the prospects of the whole of Africa, as well as to our own security in the European Union.

Coming back from these two countries, I would like to share a number of observations, perhaps six actions which I believe are key.

First, we need to tackle the root causes of conflicts, extremism and radicalisation, such as terrorism, extreme poverty, the consequences of climate change and long-standing border disputes. Second, we need to strengthen the EU-CSDP missions and operations and to support peace processes under African ownership. Third, we need to support all diplomatic efforts towards ending the ongoing conflict within Ethiopia. Fourth, we need to counter Russian influence, such as the activities of the paramilitary Wagner Group in Sudan, as it has the potential to further destabilise the region. Fifth, we need to address the dependency of African states on Chinese investments. And six, we need to monitor very closely the total alignment of Eritrea with the Russian narrative and Russian propaganda.

As Fabio Castaldo pointed out, the Horn of Africa is strategically important, and thus the European Union needs to strengthen its role in the region. Together with international and regional partners, let us integrate the trade, the development, the humanitarian and the conflict-prevention approaches to tackle the enormous challenges in this region.

Maria Arena, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, située au carrefour entre Moyen-Orient et Afrique, la Corne de l'Afrique se trouve au centre d'enjeux géopolitiques variables et est affligée de nombreux maux qui se croisent et s'entremêlent.

Au Soudan, les vagues de manifestations pour le retour à un gouvernement civil à la suite du coup d'État militaire se sont ajoutées à une situation économique dramatique, dans un pays qui déjà compte parmi les plus pauvres du monde, et où le prix du pain a été multiplié par dix depuis le putsch, plongeant les populations dans l'extrême pauvreté. L'Éthiopie, on l'a dit, est en pleine guerre civile, ce qui a donné lieu à une crise humanitaire dans la région du Tigré, mais aussi dans les régions Amhara et Afar. La situation sécuritaire demeure précaire en Somalie, qui fait figure de potentiel déstabilisateur de la région tout entière.

Ce ne sont là que quelques exemples de la situation politique que connaît cette région, qui représente plus de 100 millions d'habitants et qui, de surcroît, est en train de vivre la pire urgence climatique de ces quarante dernières années. Après plusieurs saisons consécutives de sécheresse, de graves pénuries d'eau et de mauvaises récoltes, ce sont aujourd'hui près de 20 millions de personnes qui, en Éthiopie, au Kenya, mais aussi en Somalie et en Érythrée, sont menacées par la faim. Des milliers de familles ont tout perdu: leurs champs et leur bétail, ce qui les laisse sans aucun moyen de subsistance.

Pourtant, la Corne de l'Afrique, c'est aussi l'un des détroits pétroliers les plus importants du monde. Chaque jour, ce sont environ 52 navires et 5 millions de barils de pétrole qui traversent ce détroit.

Enfin, cette partie de l'Afrique se caractérise enfin par un ensemble de trafics lucratifs (armes, drogue, êtres humains) entre l'est et l'ouest du continent.

Nous devons donc nous concentrer sur cette région. C'est une priorité pour nous, Européens. Monsieur Castaldo a défini toutes les actions qui sont dans le rapport, que je vous demande de soutenir intégralement, parce qu'il y va bien entendu des populations africaines, mais il y va aussi de la stabilité de l'Europe vis-à-vis de l'Afrique.

Katrin Langensiepen, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal herzlichen Dank an alle Beteiligten und vor allem an den Berichterstatter für die Arbeit, die in diesen umfangreichen Bericht eingeflossen ist.

Als Parlamentarierinnen und Parlamentarier können wir hier auf einen ziemlich fortschrittlichen Text schauen, der die Position des Rates um eine Reihe wichtiger Aspekte ergänzt und deutlich verbessert. Denn auch mit Blick auf die geopolitischen Dynamiken ist es wichtig, dass zuvorderst die Akteure in der Region jegliche Initiativen verantworten. Mit Blick auf Frieden und Sicherheit und eine verstärkte Zusammenarbeit mit Europäischer und Afrikanischer Union ist es wichtig, das Konzept menschlicher Sicherheit als Basis jeder Initiative zu begreifen.

Lokale Ansätze gilt es, beim Aufbau von Strukturen und Institutionen zu berücksichtigen. Die Klimakrise wird als Risiko-Multiplikator verstanden und strategisch verankert. Unser partnerschaftliches Engagement durch die „Global Gateway"-Initiative braucht auch neue Formen der Responsivität. Beschwerdemechanismen bei Rechtsverletzungen durch die EU müssen neuer Standard werden – proaktiv.

Ich bedanke mich bei dem Berichterstatter und bei den Kolleginnen und Kollegen für die gute Zusammenarbeit, hoffen wir auf das Beste für das Horn von Afrika.

Mick Wallace, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, the Horn of Africa report refuses to acknowledge that the EU was even partially responsible for the problems in the region. It condescendingly assumes that African nations' lack of support for the NATO proxy war with Russia is down to Russian propaganda and not governments making a rational choice not to pick sides in a new Cold War.

The report talks about aid to alleviate potential famines and other disasters when we know full well our sanctions and unwillingness to pursue peace are creating the very humanitarian disasters we say we want to alleviate.

The report suggests that we consider encouraging Member States to look at debt cancellation. 'Consider encouraging' will do nothing for countries crushed with debt obligations that siphons to the north any public money that could be used to shore up climate and famine defences. And we condemn the call for increased border security and militarisation.

Is there any interest in putting a stop to neocolonial extraction and theft? We give them a basket of bread for aid and then we robbed their field of corn.

Kinga Gál (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony, Biztos Asszony! Európa biztonsága Afrika stabilitásától is függ. A súlyos vízhiány, élelmiszerválság, vallási és politikai konfliktusok egyre súlyosabb migrációs hullámokat indítanak el, fokozzák a terrorveszélyt és a biztonsági fenyegetettséget. Pedig Afrikára és a szomáli félsziget országaira akár lehetőségként is tekinthetnénk, ha az Unió érdemben vállalna részt a térség gazdasági és politikai stabilitásának erősítésében, a konfliktusok és a migráció okainak helyben történő kezelésében. Ehelyett az egyoldalú segélyezést, a migrációt és a szexuális és reprodukciós baloldali ideológiai törekvéseket erőlteti.

A migrációt ösztönző brüsszeli politikák nem változnak, noha a nemzeti kompetenciákat tiszteletben tartó migrációs politikára lenne végre szükség. Meg kell állítani az illegális bevándorlást, és meg kell erősíteni az Unió külső határait. Ezt naponta tapasztaljuk az egyik legjobban érintett nyugat balkáni migrációs útvonalon is. Afrika stabilitása, az illegális migráció megállítása Európa biztonságának egyik záloga.

György Hölvényi (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony, Biztos Asszony! Afrika szarva stratégiai fontosságú régió Európa számára. Nemcsak kereskedelmi és gazdasági szempontból, de kontinensünk biztonságának szempontjából is. Éppen ezért a térségben való uniós fellépésnek hatékonynak és célzottnak kell lennie, emellett pedig valós helyi kihívásokra kell reagálnia. A jelenlegi helyzetben az élelmezési és az energiaválság közepén világos prioritásokra van szükség, nem homályos utalgatásokra. Tévedés azt feltételezni, hogy a térség gazdasági növekedése, a migráció megfékezése, a demokratikus folyamatok erősítése megvalósulhat biztonság nélkül. A biztonság a fenntartható fejlődés előfeltétele. Ezt az alapvetést egészen egyszerűen el kell fogadnunk. Hiába a gazdasági befektetések, a klímaváltozás elleni küzdelem, a biztonság hiánya aláássa az állami kormányzatot, kiszámíthatatlan gazdasági környezetet teremt, és végső soron meghiúsítja a várt fejlődést.

Ahogy ezzel a Biztos Asszony is kétségtelenül egyet fog érteni, a biztonság mellett égető szükség van a minőségi oktatás és szakképzés feltételeinek megalapozására. A minőségi oktatás mellett a képzett tanárok megléte is kulcskérdés. A szubszaharai régióban 15 millió új tanárra lesz szükség 2030-ig. Látnunk kell, hogy az oktatásra és különösen a tanárképzésre fordított uniós befektetések többszörösen megtérülnek. Erre építve helyi munkahelyeket teremtő beruházásokkal kínálhatunk valódi lehetőséget a fiataloknak a nyomor leküzdésére. A migráció valós megoldásként való feltüntetése egyszerűen hamis. Fel kell ismernünk a biztonság, az oktatás és a munkahelyteremtés, valamint az elvándorlás közötti összefüggéseket. Mindezeknek a figyelmen kívül hagyása nemcsak az európai biztonságra nézve aggasztó, de egyúttal az afrikai fiatalok hamis ígéretekkel történő félrevezetését jelenti.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, tive a oportunidade de integrar a missão da Comissão dos Assuntos Externos deste Parlamento que se deslocou à Etiópia e ao Sudão, em setembro, na qualidade de presidente da Delegação do Parlamento Europeu à Assembleia Parlamentar Paritária ACP-União Europeia. Foi uma missão intensa de diálogo com as entidades governamentais, com a sociedade civil e com os interlocutores internacionais, em particular com a União Africana, e na qual pude testemunhar a enorme atualidade e sensibilidade da Resolução que hoje aqui debatemos, e saúdo o seu relator.

Uma saudável relação e parceria estratégica entre a União Europeia e o Corno de África é importante para as duas partes. Importa, por isso, criar as condições para que ela seja possível sem mal-entendidos ou frustrações. É fundamental reforçar o compromisso político da União Europeia com o diálogo para a paz, com a resposta às carências de segurança e humanitárias, com o respeito pelas soberanias e com o desenvolvimento de uma parceria estrutural entre iguais, baseada nos valores universais da liberdade e dos direitos humanos.

Em simultâneo, temos de afirmar que, respeitando a soberania, a União Europeia não é indiferente ao sofrimento dos povos, à segurança, à liberdade e ao respeito pelos processos de ajuda humanitária e, por isso, não pode deixar de assinalar e condenar ações que põem em causa esses princípios, qualquer que seja a sua origem.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Voorzitter, collega's, commissaris, ik wil ingaan op het specifieke aanslepende conflict in Ethiopië, ook een belangrijke speler in de Hoorn van Afrika. Onlangs was er een opvallend bericht van het Ethiopische Ministerie van Onderwijs over een donatie aan het Ethiopische leger. Dit heeft vragen doen rijzen over samenwerkingsprojecten tussen onderwijsinstellingen van onze Europese lidstaten aan de ene kant en Ethiopië aan de andere kant, vanuit een bekommernis dat de middelen van deze projecten niet alleen het onderwijs ten goede zouden komen, maar ook het conflict wellicht zouden kunnen voeden.

De projecten zelf waaraan wij steun verlenen, zijn nuttig en noodzakelijk, dat staat buiten kijf. Maar juist daarom, juist daarom dienen we ook als Unie met de juiste mechanismen in het kader van ons partnerschap met de Hoorn scherp te blijven toezien op verantwoord gebruik van middelen voor alle samenwerkingsprojecten waarin de Unie en haar lidstaten betrokken worden.

Janina Ochojska (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Kraje Rogu Afryki borykają się z tymi samymi problemami związanymi z brakiem stabilności rządów, zmianami klimatu oraz z konfliktami na tle etnicznym. Te problemy się nasiliły zwłaszcza po wybuchu konfliktu w rejonie Tigraj, a oprócz przemocy między społeczeństwami lokalnymi, powodziami w Sudanie, suszy w 2002 roku oraz plagi szarańczy sytuacja humanitarna niezwykle się pogorszyła. Trzeba też pamiętać, że skala bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego pogorszyła się na skutek wojny Rosji przeciwko Ukrainie, ponieważ wzrosły ceny żywności i paliw – to jedynie pogłębia problem. Dlatego bardzo ważne jest dalsze zaangażowanie Unii na rzecz wsparcia regionu, a w szczególności jego stabilizacji, a także dalszej współpracy na rzecz rozwoju i pokoju oraz zapobiegania konfliktom cywilnym, szczególnie że kraje Rogu Afryki obejmują niektóre z głównych krajów pochodzenia i tranzytu migrantów w regionie, także do Unii Europejskiej.

Popieram wezwanie do holistycznego podejścia do migracji, które uwzględnia specyfikę konfliktów i ich kontekst.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Karsten Lucke (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Wahrscheinlich ist genau jetzt die Zeit, wegen des völkerrechtswidrigen Angriffskrieges Russlands langfristige strategische Bindungen neu zu definieren bzw. zu stärken, und das Horn von Afrika ist sicherlich eine Region, die von besonderer Bedeutung ist. Wir dürfen Russland und China und anderen die Situation am Horn nicht überlassen. Das ist letztendlich im strategischen und langfristigen Interesse Europas. Wer das nicht versteht, der hat die Lage im Jahr 2022 nicht verstanden.

Wir dürfen als Europäer jetzt nicht schlafen. Wir müssen proaktiv in die Welt hinausgehen und für unsere Überzeugung menschlichen Zusammenlebens wirklich eintreten und streiten. Demokratie, Menschenrechte, Freiheit, Gleichheit, Presse- und Meinungsfreiheit, das alles ist es doch, was Menschen guttut und was sie letztendlich aufblühen lässt. Und Diktatur, Autokratie und Terrorismus, das alles führt am Ende nur zu Leid, Verzweiflung und Hoffnungslosigkeit.

Entscheidend ist aber, dass wir eine echte Partnerschaft auf Augenhöhe mit unseren afrikanischen Partnern über alle Politikbereiche hinweg brauchen, die dieser Bericht auch darstellt. Wir können helfen und unterstützen. Am Ende braucht es aber eine afrikanische Lösung für afrikanische Probleme. Wir dürfen es nicht besser wissen, wir müssen es gemeinsam tun.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Sudan, Erytrea, Etiopia, Somalia, Kenia, Róg Afryki – dziś w tym regionie krzyżują się szlaki żeglugowe o podstawowym znaczeniu strategicznym. Obecnie około 12% światowego ładunku morskiego przepływa przez Morze Czerwone i Zatokę Adeńską.

Fakt, że ponad sześć milionów baryłek ropy naftowej co roku transportowane jest przez te szlaki morskie, powoduje, że dziś Rosja i Chiny konkurują o zwiększenie swego znaczenia w regionie. A tam, gdzie pojawia się Rosja, pojawia się chaos, destabilizacja i wojna. W tym kontekście trzeba mówić głośno, że barbarzyństwo Putina, które dzisiaj widzimy na Ukrainie, skutkuje głodem w tym regionie Afryki. Ponad 90%, około 90% zboża importowanego przez państwa, które wymieniłem, pochodziło właśnie z Ukrainy.

I na końcu, jako były marynarz, chciałbym w tym miejscu zwrócić Państwa uwagę na sytuację właśnie marynarzy na statkach handlowych, codziennie narażonych na utratę życia ze strony somalijskich piratów, dla których ten chaos i wojna są czynnikami umożliwiającymi prowadzenie tego procederu. A w tle inne szatany, również islamiści.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Ponia pirmininke. Iš tikrųjų po mūsų vizito į Sudaną ir Etiopiją praeitą mėnesį mes visi galėjome įsitikinti, kad tai yra karščiuojantis regionas. Ir visų tų etninių įtampų pagrindas yra skurdas, klimato kaita ir išorinių jėgų, tokių kaip Vagnerio privatūs kariai, įtaka tame regione. Ten žvanga rusiški ginklai, pone M. Wallace, kuris čia taip gyrė Rusiją, bandančią ten įsitvirtinti. Ir mūsų pareiga, man atrodo, kas yra apibrėžta pranešime, mūsų strategija turėtų būti pakeisti santykius su šio regiono, Afrikos, šalimis, iš paternalizmo į labai glaudų bendradarbiavimą vystant dvišalius santykius, o taip pat Europos Sąjungos ir Afrikos Sąjungos, kad mes galėtume užtikrinti to regiono taiką, jaunimui suteikti galimybę dirbti, mokytis, lavintis ir tokiu būdu turėti stipresnį mūsų bendrą bendradarbiavimą.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, I don't think you'd have to be a genius to know that the last thing the Horn of Africa needs is more foreign military bases, more weapons, and more European meddling. What we call our 'strategic relationship' isn't about human flourishing; it's about the EU's ambitions as a superpower. There's now a new great game in the Horn of Africa. Greater and lesser powers are pockmarking the place with military bases: France, the US, China, Germany, Japan, Italy, Saudi Arabia all have a presence in the tiny area of Djibouti alone. Mercenaries are swarming in from all quarters. The entire region is being militarised. War is in the air.

And what about the people facing climate and food insecurity? None of this benefits them. We talk about instability, but we only make it worse. We flood the place with weapons, hand over the profits to European arms companies, and charge the bill to our citizens. And then with the carnage, we go back in and we do it all again. It's a racket! 'Strategic relationship'? It's one thing after another, isn't it? Really, it's the same as it ever was. And all I can say is, God save Africa from Europeans offering help.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, ouvi com toda a atenção a sua intervenção e é incontornável a importância da promoção da estabilidade no Corno de África para promover a estabilidade em toda a região e a segurança e a estabilidade também na Europa. Mas não a ouvi falar sobre uma questão muito importante neste momento, que é, exatamente, a liberdade de navegação no mar Vermelho e no golfo de Áden, que é crucial para os fluxos de energia, para a segurança energética europeia e para a estabilidade da segurança na região.

Todos sabemos o tipo de práticas criminosas que existem nesta área e, por isso, gostaria de a ouvir sobre a muito preocupante não renovação da Resolução das Nações Unidas sobre Pirataria e sobre a Operação Atlanta, que teve uma importância crucial na promoção da segurança nesta área.

Gostaria também de a ouvir sobre a estratégia europeia, no sentido de fazer frente à crescente dependência dos Estados africanos quanto ao investimento chinês e também quanto à presença russa, à presença de mercenários russos que cada vez mais criam instabilidade na região. Esta é uma estratégia para a qual temos de contar com a cooperação da União Africana e dos Estados africanos.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Jutta Urpilainen, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for this discussion, and once more, congratulations on the report. I found it very interesting and very important. The Horn of Africa will remain high on the EU's agenda, so cooperation with the AU and other regional and subregional entities in preventing, managing and containing conflict is essential. So is our support for the people of the region, including to address the acute food security crisis.

Actually, I wanted to inform you that in the last weeks, we have redirected an additional EUR 146 million to East Africa to help them to face the food crisis. So we are very much following the situation on the ground and I am happy that we were able to redirect some additional financial support to the region.

Regarding dependencies, as you know very well, we want to strengthen the resilience of the Horn of Africa. The way to do that is, for instance, by supporting their own vaccine-production capacity, which we did during the current or the previous COVID crisis. A similar approach is now on the agenda when it comes to food security. We want to support Africa's capability to produce more food – in Africa, for Africa.

Cooperation with like-minded partners to counter the influence of actors who aim at destabilising the region is also crucial. Many of you actually referred to that. Africa, especially the Horn of Africa, is a geopolitical hotspot. Everybody is there. And that's why it's also so important that we keep on engaging with the countries of the Horn of Africa – because my assessment is that, especially among the citizens of the Horn of Africa, they very much value and give value to our cooperation and also share our values.

Last but not least, the engagement of Team Europe, so with the Member States, and there development finance institutions (DFIs) will be key to strengthening EU political and economic ties with this region. The sooner it materialises, the better. We need to show our partners that we walk the talk and that's why we are working on very specific, concrete projects on the ground.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *relatore*. – Grazie mille cara Vicepresidente Barley, carissima Commissaria, grazie a tutti voi per i preziosi contributi che hanno riaffermato ancora una volta la centralità del Corno d'Africa nello scacchiere internazionale e la rilevanza del nostro rapporto bilaterale.

Grazie Commissaria per aver ricordato alcuni punti specifici anche nei rapporti col Kenya, con l'Etiopia, con il Sudan e con la Somalia, che sono paesi ovviamente centrali, che vengono sviscerati nella relazione, toccando ovviamente anche aspetti specifici di Uganda, Sudan, Gibuti ed Eritrea.

Abbiamo cercato quindi di dare una risposta e questa risposta non può che vedere nel rafforzamento del partenariato strategico tra di noi, tra l'Unione europea e il Corno d'Africa, attraverso un dialogo franco e tempestivo da svolgersi con attenzione, il giusto approccio metodologico e la volontà quindi finalmente di ascoltare, anche con apertura mentale, le richieste e le necessità dei nostri interlocutori.

Solo così potremo giocare un ruolo positivo e indispensabile nel risolvere quelle controversie e quei conflitti che tempestano questa regione. Solo così potremo costruire insieme a loro uno sviluppo economico umano che sia sostenibile e inclusivo, che metta al centro la sicurezza umana e che cambi anche il paradigma delle nostre iniziative, lasciando da parte un approccio paternalistico troppo legato alla concezione donatore-ricettore, che spesso in passato ha accompagnato il nostro operato e che, come è emerso anche dai colloqui che ho avuto con i rappresentanti diplomatici dei singoli paesi, porta spesso a creare muri di diffidenza e di ostilità, finendo quindi con accentuare il modo in cui guardano con maggiore apertura e favore ad altri attori che non giocano secondo le nostre stesse regole, ma soprattutto non giocano per i nostri valori.

Care colleghe e cari colleghi, le congiunture storiche ci impongono di assurgere a un ruolo più incisivo e ci ricordano che la geopolitica ha l'*horror vacui*, se c'è un vuoto verrà sicuramente riempito, ma non è indifferente il modo in cui questo accadrà. Noi abbiamo rapporti storici, rapporti politici, culturali ed economici molto importanti con il Corno d'Africa, ma per essere al centro di questa azione, per essere un *player* decisivo, dobbiamo mettere al centro di questa nostra volontà i nostri tratti distintivi. Anche perché, come è stato ricordato da molti di voi, i cittadini lo vogliono, vogliono una cooperazione che sia capace di fare emergere con forza la volontà di essere coerenti con quei valori ai quali noi ci siamo sempre ispirati.

Tanti sono stati i temi che voi avete toccato in questi interventi. È impossibile ripercorrerli tutti, ma mi preme sottolineare che con il voto di domani avremo la possibilità di rafforzare la nostra azione esterna, ma soprattutto di costruirla con un metodo che sia effettivamente in grado di superare queste incomprensioni, che talvolta hanno contraddistinto il nostro rapporto, e di far emergere un'Unione europea che sia all'altezza della sfida di quello specchio che è l'Africa in termini geopolitici per la nostra volontà di essere un attore credibile, un attore efficace.

Spero di poter contare sul vostro sostegno e ancora vi ringrazio, restando sempre coerenti con l'idea di avere un maggior rafforzamento, di essere effettivamente dalla parte di un'Africa che sappia costruire da sola le sue soluzioni, che sia più resiliente e che sia per noi il partner fondamentale con il quale difendere il multilateralismo del futuro.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 5. Oktober 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Urmas Paet (Renew), *kirjalikult*. – Olukord Aafrika Sarve piirkonnas on jätkuvalt pingeline, ebakindel ja täis vägivalda. Sealne piirkond ja selle stabiilsus on aga oluline ka Euroopa Liidu jaoks, seetõttu on võtmekohal, et EL sellesse omalt poolt ka panustaks. On selge, et Venemaa Ukraina-vastasel agressioonisõjal on Aafrika Sarve jaoks murettekitavad kohesed ja pikaajalised tagajärjed ning et vastuseks sellele peab EL kohandama oma suhteid kõnealuse piirkonnaga. Üheks probleemkohaks on kahtlemata Venemaa tegevus Sudaanis läbi Wagner grupi ning kavandatava sõjaväebaasi. Ka on oluline jätkuvalt kutsuda sealseid riike üles tagama inimõiguste kaitse, näiteks peaks Eritrea vabastama Rootsi-Eritrea kirjaniku ja ajakirjaniku David Isaaki, keda on kinni peetud juba alates 2001. aastast.

18. Vnější rozměr lidského práva na přístup k vodě (rozprava)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Miguel Urbán Crespo im Namen des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten zum Thema „Zugang zu Wasser als Menschenrecht – die externe Dimension" (2021/2187(INI)) (A9-0231/2022).

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, la verdad es que, si el agua es la base de la vida, el acceso al agua es un derecho humano, quizá el más básico, y su disfrute es un requisito para otros derechos fundamentales como la sanidad, la educación o los derechos de las mujeres y de la infancia.

Sin embargo, el derecho humano al agua y al saneamiento está dramáticamente mal repartido entre países, regiones, clases y colectivos sociales. Un par de datos en este sentido: una de cada tres personas en el mundo no tiene acceso a agua potable, es decir, más de 3 000 millones de personas —el 40 % de la población mundial— viven en zonas con una grave escasez de agua.

Hoy el acceso al agua está amenazado por múltiples razones: el extractivismo, el acaparamiento de tierras, la ganadería intensiva, las represas hidroeléctricas, la agroindustria contaminante, los conflictos bélicos y, por supuesto, por la crisis climática, con temperaturas récord e inundaciones y sequías históricas. De hecho, alrededor del 90 % de todas las catástrofes naturales actuales tienen relación con el agua. Su escasez podría desplazar a 700 millones de personas de aquí a 2030 en busca de refugio climático. Una situación que afecta especialmente a las mujeres. Y este informe demanda un enfoque de género que tenga en cuenta estas desigualdades en la gestión de los recursos hídricos.

Y es que los recursos hídricos son, hoy, un bien sobreexplotado y en disputa. La denegación del acceso al agua y la destrucción de las infraestructuras hídricas han sido utilizadas por potencias ocupantes, como Israel o Marruecos, para desplazar a la población palestina o saharaui. Este informe recuerda que todos los pueblos, incluidos los ocupados, disfrutan del derecho soberano a controlar su riqueza natural y a un acceso equitativo al agua.

Este texto también aborda la situación de quienes defienden el derecho humano al agua y al saneamiento: comunidades indígenas, afrodescendientes y campesinas, personas defensoras de derechos ambientales y líderes y lideresas sociales que están siendo atacadas y criminalizada a diario por defender el derecho al agua. Berta Cáceres o los defensores de Guapinol o Lolita Chávez son algunos ejemplos de quienes son perseguidos por defender el acceso a un bien público y común o por enfrentarse a las empresas mineras e hidroeléctricas.

Necesitamos instrumentos vinculantes que aseguren el respeto de los derechos humanos por parte de las empresas transnacionales. En este sentido, este informe pide a la Comisión Europea que los proyectos de infraestructura y energía financiados a través de los distintos instrumentos de cooperación al desarrollo y de la política exterior europea respeten y no pongan en peligro el derecho humano al agua y al saneamiento, y que no contribuyan a la expulsión de los pueblos indígenas de sus tierras y territorios.

La pandemia ha demostrado una vez más la incapacidad del mercado para proveer bienes y derechos básicos para la vida. En lugar de tomarse nota, hace dos años el agua empezó a cotizar en el mercado de futuros de Wall Street, en contra de los criterios del Relator Especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre los derechos humanos al agua y al saneamiento. Frente a quienes la consideran una mercancía, este informe insiste en la defensa del agua como un bien común y público, y exige a los Estados que adopten medidas para evitar que el agua sea objeto de especulación financiera y que promuevan una gobernanza democrática y un enfoque de derechos humanos.

Asegurar un acceso equitativo, universal al agua pasa por aumentar las inversiones públicas en infraestructuras sostenibles, proteger el agua como un bien público y esencial y emprender procesos de exprivatización para mejorar el disfrute efectivo de los derechos humanos al agua y al saneamiento.

Esperemos, sinceramente, que este informe sea un paso más para asegurar el acceso al agua como un derecho humano que permita una vida que merezca la pena ser vivida.

Stéphane Bijoux, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission du développement*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, après la violence de la sécheresse de cet été et face aux effets dévastateurs du dérèglement climatique, l'une des questions fondamentales qui nous sont posées aujourd'hui est de savoir comment l'Europe va affronter les prochaines pénuries d'eau, et, surtout, comment nous pouvons protéger nos citoyens du risque – élevé – d'une guerre de l'eau.

En effet, ce que nous redoutions est déjà là; la guerre de l'eau est là. Pendant qu'ici même nous parlons, dans le monde, du Nil au Mékong, plusieurs milliers d'humains se battent, avec des armes, pour avoir accès à l'eau. D'ici la fin de la décennie, 700 millions de personnes vont être obligés de quitter leur région parce que leur territoire sera devenu invivable, complètement brûlé, dévasté par la sécheresse.

Alors, que pouvons-nous faire? D'abord, l'Europe doit agir, car notre responsabilité collective est engagée dans ce dérèglement climatique. Qu'allons-nous faire? Eh bien, au vu de ce défi mondial, il faut en premier lieu organiser la coopération internationale pour financer des solutions de recherche, de préservation et de distribution de l'eau. Nous disposons également d'outils au niveau européen, tels que la politique de développement, qui doit être mobilisée pour garantir l'accès à l'eau. Enfin, il faut changer nos modes de vie: moins de gaspillage, plus de solidarité.

D'ici 2050, un humain sur deux sera confronté à une pénurie d'eau. Agir est une urgence vitale, mais les mots ne suffisent plus. Il faut agir, et, surtout, agir vite.

Jutta Urpilainen, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, I welcome this debate today on access to water as a human right. As we have all experienced, water is a precondition for life and therefore for the enjoyment of all human rights.

However, access to safe drinking water and sanitation is still a major challenge in many parts of the world. I am glad that the report recognises the importance of the 2019 EU Human Rights Guidelines on Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation. It is a reference framework and working tool for us across EU institutions and around the world with impacts on our policies, programming and public diplomacy.

Equally, the EU's Gender Action Plan III emphasises the interconnectedness between women's and girls' human rights and gender equality on one hand, and the right to water and sanitation on the other. This is also part of the first ever Youth Action Plan, that we have adopted today.

There is a long history of conflicts over water resources, and the modern world has all too commonly witnessed the use of water resources and infrastructure as a weapon of war. This is why the EU and its Member States promote the rights to safe drinking water in multilateral and regional forums. It is why we have projects worldwide. We have dedicated more than EUR 2.5 billion to water cooperation in 62 countries. We fight for SDG 6 and access to water to be on top of every political agenda.

There is a need to strengthen multilateralism and dialogue on water and to ensure that water governance is inclusive. Therefore, EU is actively supporting outreach efforts through EU delegations to call for the establishment of the UN Special Envoy for Water. Equally, we are working hard to create momentum for the 2023 UN Water Conference.

The urgency to act increases every day. So does the need to protect those who stand up for our public good. Human rights defenders are on the front lines to protect their rights and the rights of their communities. The EU greatly contributes to their protection. Last week I signed an additional EUR 30 million to the EU flagship protecting human rights defenders, ProtectDefenders.EU.

Let me underline again that I fully share the concerns and priorities outlined in the report and you can count on us to actively pursue the right to water as a human right.

Janina Ochojska, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dziękuję kontrsprawozdawcom i sprawozdawcy za ponad pół roku negocjacji i prawie rok wytężonej pracy nad tym sprawozdaniem i jednocześnie bardzo żałuję, że debatę przewidziano o tak późnej porze, co niestety uniemożliwia niektórym zainteresowanym stronom wysłuchania jej na żywo. Tym bardziej że temat jest bardzo, bardzo poważny. W związku z nadchodzącymi zmianami klimatycznymi dostęp do wody lub jej brak wywrze ogromny wpływ na miliony ludzi na całym świecie. Coraz częściej pojawiają się i będą się pojawiać konflikty o wodę, ziemię i miejsce do życia, a migracje wywołane katastrofami klimatycznymi w znacznym stopniu się nasilą.

Poprzednie 26 lat życia upłynęły mi na pracy w organizacji humanitarnej. Od drugiej wojny czeczeńskiej po kolejne konflikty, kraje i kontynenty budowaliśmy właśnie dostęp do wody. To dla wielu krajów podstawa pomocy. Byłam w wielu krajach, gdzie ludzie cierpią z powodu braku dostępu do wody pitnej. W dużym stopniu to my poprzez nadmierne zużycie zasobów wodnych oraz zanieczyszczenia spowodowane nadużyciami działalności przemysłowej, a także nieefektywne zarządzanie zasobami, negatywnie wpływamy na korzystanie z praw człowieka do wody i urządzeń sanitarnych.

Dlatego cieszę się, że w sprawozdaniu potwierdzono prawo do bezpiecznej wody pitnej i urządzeń sanitarnych jako prawo człowieka i podkreślono, że oba te prawa są komplementarne i niezbędne dla zdrowia publicznego i rozwoju człowieka. Pomimo przeznaczenia tak znacznych środków, o których wspomniała pani komisarz, jednak apeluję do Unii Europejskiej o zwiększenie środków na budowę dostępu do wody.

Nacho Sánchez Amor, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, sustituyo en este turno a la negociadora de mi grupo en este informe, la colega Bettina Vollath, que ha dejado estos días el Parlamento. Quiero agradecerle su trabajo en este informe y en muchos otros de la Comisión DROIT y desearle mucha suerte en su futuro.

También deseo agradecer su actitud y ambición al colega Urbán. Este podía haber sido un papel más de relleno y previsible en nuestro orden del día y, sin embargo, no lo es gracias a esa ambición que él mismo ha expresado en su informe, no solo en su discurso precedente, no solo por esa bien conectada idea del derecho al saneamiento y el derecho al agua.

Creo que también hay muchas ideas que tenemos que explorar: el acceso no discriminatorio al agua, las acciones anticipatorias y preventivas, el agua en los campos de refugiados —a la que él no se ha referido— o la diligencia debida de las empresas europeas en su manejo del agua en su actividad en el resto del mundo. Este es un problema a escala mundial y, por tanto, los análisis y las soluciones tienen que ser globales.

Samira Rafaela, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, so I think by now a lot of us already had access to a glass of water. We have bottles with water. And for us, it's very easy to access water. For us it's very common to just drink water whenever we want, whenever we feel like it.

But for so many people in the world this is not a guarantee. They do not have access to even this glass of water. And this is why I find it very important, also as an SDG ambassador myself for clean water, for SDG 6, to have this debate and to have this discussion because in the first place we need to have a mentality change on how we treat water and how we are going to work together in the world when it comes to access to water.

Even here in Europe water scarcity is a problem, is an issue – name for example, Italy, Spain, Portugal. It's not something that only happens outside the EU, outside Europe. So we need to be very much aware of how this is going to affect the whole world when it comes to water scarcity.

Access to water is a human right, and that's the new discussion we need to have. And that's something that we don't realise a lot still. And I think that the private and the public sector should work together, should work together on how they can generate and create more innovation technology to make sure that access to water stays a human right.

When it comes to the gender dimension, so many girls and women don't have access to water. And it is very important that we also have this emphasis in a debate making sure that human rights, when it comes to gender, when it comes to women and girls, when it comes to indigenous people, are being discussed and emphasised in this discussion.

Thank you very much, and it's very important that we are going to cooperate in the world, together with our partners, to make sure that access to water is a human right.

Mounir Satouri, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, nous allons bientôt manquer d'eau. Ce présage de l'écologiste René Dumont en 1974 est désormais réalité. Une violente réalité, en grande partie causée par la crise climatique et la pollution. L'inaction est impensable, alors même que la communauté internationale a consacré le droit à l'eau comme un droit humain. L'eau n'est pas un produit de consommation comme les autres dont on peut faire commerce.

Refusons que toute activité industrielle ou agricole compromette l'accès à l'eau dans les États tiers. Aucune entreprise européenne ne doit concourir à ces activités et nous devons être vigilants quant à l'impact de nos accords commerciaux sur l'eau. La reconnaissance internationale de crime d'écocide est un levier de lutte essentiel pour protéger le droit à l'eau. C'est pourquoi j'appelle mes collègues à voter ce rapport qui reconnaît ces éléments en l'état. Chers collègues, l'arrivée de l'eau en bourse en 2020 est une des dernières aberrations d'un système en faillite. Relevons la barre pour la planète et pour le droit.

André Rougé, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la présidente, chers collègues, l'eau, c'est la vie. Hélas, force est de constater que les régions ultrapériphériques françaises Guadeloupe, Martinique et Mayotte subissent des problèmes d'adduction d'eau. Les réseaux de canalisations n'ont pas été entretenus et la distribution d'eau potable ne peut être assurée au quotidien. Le gouvernement français s'est montré incapable d'appréhender cette situation sanitaire catastrophique. Au XXIe siècle, il est aussi inconcevable qu'inadmissible que nos compatriotes antillais et mahorais, citoyens de la cinquième puissance mondiale, ne puissent avoir accès à l'eau courante.

Aujourd'hui encore, un tiers de la population des Antilles n'a pas accès à l'eau potable, particulièrement et cruellement en cette période post-cyclonique du passage de la tempête Fiona. Afin de mettre un terme à ce désastre sanitaire, je demande à la Commission européenne d'appliquer l'article 168 du TFUE pour venir en aide aux populations des régions ultrapériphériques françaises Guadeloupe, Martinique et Mayotte, afin qu'une eau propre et potable coule en permanence au robinet de ces trois départements français.

Beata Kempa, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Woda to życie, a prawo do jej dostępu to podstawowe prawo człowieka – i tu się w pełni zgadzamy. Zasoby wody są relatywnie niewielkie i kruche. Tymczasem ze względu na lokalne braki dzisiaj woda to surowiec absolutnie strategiczny. Jej braki to główny impuls kolejnych kryzysów humanitarnych, jak również kluczowy element bazowy kryzysów uchodźczych.

Prawie dwa miliardy ludzi na całym świecie ma problemy z dostępem do czystej wody, a w samej Europie ta kwestia dotyka prawie 100 milionów osób. 129 krajów świata ma problemy z zapewnieniem zrównoważonych dostaw wody dla swoich mieszkańców. A to wszystko przy analizach między innymi Banku Światowego, wskazujących na wzrost zapotrzebowania na wodę o 50% do 2050 r. Dostęp do źródeł wody to dzisiaj czynnik destabilizacji i napięć w wielu krajach, szczególnie Afryki i Bliskiego Wschodu.

Możemy to zmienić, tylko i wyłącznie zwiększając nakłady na strategiczne inwestycje w oczyszczanie oraz retencję wody. Dzisiaj potrzebny jest strumień inwestycji – i jest jedynym rozwiązaniem zbliżającego się kryzysu wodnego. Dlatego każde euro z Unii Europejskiej słusznie przekazywane na poszukiwania i na wodę to słuszny kierunek.

Ale ja chcę przy tej okazji podziękować też wszystkim organizacjom pozarządowym, które w swojej pracy uwzględniają właśnie element dostępu, szczególnie tych najuboższych, do wody. Chcę im bardzo za to podziękować.

Clare Daly, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, Credit Suisse, the private investment bank, has the following extract on its website: 'Water is a focus for those in the know about global strategic commodities. As with oil, the supply is finite, but demand is going up by leaps and unlike oil there is no alternative.' Water is scarce, but the profits aren't. Of course, this is the root of the problem – the commodification of water for profit rather than for human needs. That's why we've had the huge movements from Bolivia to Detroit, to Greece, Berlin, Madrid, Rome and many others around the issue of water.

That's why we had the heroic struggle in Ireland in the Right2Water campaign, where we forced our government to abandon its privatisation plans. We continue to have a situation of no charge and no water poverty, although that obviously can change at any time. During that campaign, the UN advisor on water, Maude Barlow, made the point that Ireland's system of paying for water through progressive taxation with a user fee for only non-domestic users was an exemplary model of fair, equitable and sustainable service delivery for the world. That is what we stand by, and we will defend that with everything that we have.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, mnohí z nás Európanov si nedokážeme ani predstaviť, čo znamená život bez vody. Všetci však máme skúsenosť s komplikáciou, ak by nám odpojili vodu v našich domovoch, bytoch, čo i len na jeden deň. Žiaľ, situácia vo svete je hrozivá. Miliardy ľudí najmä z krajín tretieho sveta nemajú samozrejmosť, ktorou disponujeme, nemajú jednoducho prístup k pitnej vode. Ak nezmeníme dosahy globálneho otepľovania, klimatických zmien, ktorých dôsledky zažívame už dnes, niektoré časti sveta budú doslova vyschýnať. Pred bránami Európy budú milióny migrantov, ktorí nebudú prosiť o lepší život v Únii, ale o pohár pitnej vody. Problém s prístupom k pitnej vode však máme aj priamo v Európskej únii, kde milióny Rómov žijúcich v chudobných rómskych osadách pijú vodu z potoka. Nemôžeme byť na jednej strane lídrom v oblasti digitalizácie či umelej inteligencie a na druhej strane zatvárať oči pred miliónmi Európanov a miliardami ľudí vo svete, ktorí sa počas celého dňa nevedia dostať k pohára čistej a nezávadnej vody.

Maria Noichl (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Keine Hilfe kommt so direkt bei Kindern an wie gute Wasserpolitik. Keine Probleme werden so verdoppelt wie schlechte Wasserpolitik. Das heißt: Wasser ist ganz speziell, wenn wir das als Grundrecht sehen, als Menschenrecht sehen, ein Kinderrecht. Es geht um Gesundheit, es geht um die Ernährung bereits bei Säuglingen, es geht um die körperliche und geistige Entwicklung – all das basiert auf gutem Wasser.

Es geht aber auch um die Würde von Kindern – um die Würde von Kindern, sich waschen zu können, sich reinigen zu können. Ich möchte hier auch ganz speziell die Mädchen erwähnen, wenn sie menstruieren. Es geht auch um die Bildung von Kindern, denn Kinder brauchen Schulen, und Schulen brauchen gutes Wasser. All dies hängt zusammen.

Wasserschutz ist der direkteste Kinderschutz, den wir uns vorstellen können. Und wir haben vier Aufgaben: Wir haben Wasser immer verfügbar zu machen, wir haben Wasser zugänglich zu machen, und zwar so, dass der Preis erschwinglich ist, Wasser muss gute Qualität haben, und Wasser muss stabil und zuverlässig vorhanden sein, auch nach Trockenheiten, auch nach Überschwemmungen, auch dann, wenn andere Problemstellungen da sind. Wasserschutz ist direkter Kinderschutz.

Bernhard Zimniok (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Der Zugang zu sauberem Wasser darf keinesfalls privatisiert werden, was aber vielerorts schon geschehen ist. Korrupte Regierungen sind dafür verantwortlich, dass profitorientierte Firmen Milliardengewinne auf dem Rücken der Einheimischen abschöpfen.

Der hier präsentierte Lösungsansatz ist wie immer der gleiche: Der europäische Steuerzahler soll das Sozialamt für die Welt spielen und durch Milliardenzahlungen den Zugang zu sauberem Wasser sicherstellen. Helfen soll dabei auch ein „intersektioneller geschlechtersensibler Ansatz". Was immer das in dem Kontext bedeuten soll, das ist schlicht ideologischer Nonsens.

Einige Kollegen scheinen sich hier ganz offensichtlich schon weit von der Realität entfernt zu haben. Wir helfen den Entwicklungsländern durch die Förderung von Eigenverantwortung und nicht, indem wir das Versagen ihrer korrupten Regierungen wieder und wieder durch Milliarden von europäischen Steuergeldern ausgleichen und kompensieren, und das auch noch in Zeiten, in denen Abermillionen von Europäern nicht einmal mehr genug Geld für das Essen haben oder um ihre Wohnungen heizen zu können.

Werte Kollegen, Sie alle hier sind verantwortlich für die europäischen Bürger und nicht für den Rest der Welt. Denken Sie daran!

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Ponia pirminike, jau buvo pasakyta, kad vanduo yra gyvybės sąlyga, žmogaus teisė į vandenį. Labiausiai ją kliudo įgyvendinti klimato kaita ir kariniai konfliktai. Ir paprastai nukenčia patys silpniausi, t. y. moterys ir vaikai. Šiomis dienomis galima įsitikinti, kaip, pvz., Rusijos agresijos prieš Ukrainą atveju, griaunama infrastruktūra, sutrikdomas šilumos, elektros ir vandens tiekimas. Todėl turime dėti visas pastangas, kad įgyvendintume savo užsibrėžtą žaliąjį kursą, solidarumą, kad pažabotume karinius konfliktus ir galėtume užtikrinti prieigą prie vandens. Todėl kviečiu remti šį paruoštą pranešimą, nes manau, kad tai yra holistinis apibrėžtas požiūris į tai, kaip reikia iškelti žmogaus teisę į vandenį.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, I welcome many aspects of this report, especially the strong emphasis on environmentalism. But we need to focus more on the problem of privatisation, which is prolific – with over 10% of global freshwater reserves being under private control.

In Ireland, as my colleague pointed out, we fought against water charges for years. It is a neoliberal measure firmly promoted by the Commission as a bailout condition in 2012. We were doing what we were told on a vast basis at the time.

This profit-orientated neoliberal practice severely limited access to water and sanitation services – which, as many of you agree, is a human right, and this will further add to the problem of water shortages, which has already disproportionately affected the global South.

While there have been steps to recognise water as a primary public good within the Union, with the Right2Water initiative, not enough has been done to stop its privatisation in the EU and beyond.

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αρχή και τέλος της έκθεσης η αντίληψη για «νερό εμπόρευμα», προωθώντας την κερδοφορία των επιχειρηματικών ομίλων. Απάτη οι διακηρύξεις όλων των αστικών κομμάτων για το δικαίωμα στο νερό, όπως λένε. Κατεύθυνση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, των κυβερνήσεων, όπως της Νέας Δημοκρατίας στην Ελλάδα, είναι η ώθηση στην επιχειρηματική δράση με κάλυψη του αστικού κράτους και ευρωενωσιακά κονδύλια, στη βάση της αναθεωρημένης ευρωοδηγίας του 2000, με εμπλοκή επιχειρηματικών ομίλων και μέσω ΣΔΙΤ, όπως συμβαίνει σήμερα στην Ελλάδα, με την ιδιωτικοποίηση του εξωτερικού υδροδοτικού δικτύου της Αττικής, που προετοίμασε η κυβέρνηση του ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, εντάσσοντας την ΕΥΔΑΠ και την ΕΥΑΘ στο υπερταμείο ιδιωτικοποιήσεων. Ο λαός να δυναμώσει την πάλη του για καμία αύξηση στην τιμή του νερού, δραστική μείωση των τιμολογίων, καμία διακοπή νερού στα λαϊκά νοικοκυριά, προσλήψεις μόνιμου προσωπικού με δικαιώματα κατάργησης των εργολάβων, διαχείριση του νερού προς όφελος του λαού, Αυτό προϋποθέτει απαλλαγή από τους νόμους της αγοράς και του καπιταλιστικού κέρδους. Το νερό, η επεξεργασία του, τα δίκτυα, η άρδευση, η αποχέτευση να γίνουν κοινωνική ιδιοκτησία και όχι εμπόρευμα, για την ικανοποίηση των λαϊκών αναγκών και την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Jutta Urpilainen, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, the debate today testifies your continued commitment to this very important subject. We greatly appreciate the proposals you made today and we are happy to continue to discuss our actions to increase access to water and sanitation worldwide.

To conclude, water really stands at the heart of human development, but also peace and stability. Without adequate safe and affordable water and sanitation, billions of people, including particularly women, young people and children, around the globe are unable to lead healthy lives and lack the ability to build secure livelihoods.

So yes, the right to water is a human right.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, me gustaría, en primer lugar, aprovechar el final del turno de palabra para pedir que los debates sobre derechos humanos no sean los últimos debates de la noche en este Pleno. Creo que habla mal de este Parlamento y habla mal de la Unión Europea que los debates sobre derechos humanos se releguen justamente a las 22 o 23 h. Creo que se merecen mucho más.

Simplemente deseo dar las gracias a quienes han tomado la palabra durante este debate y a quienes han hecho posible que este informe llegue al Pleno y se vote mañana. Me gustaría hacer una mención especial al Secretariado de la Subcomisión de Derechos Humanos del Parlamento, a las y los ponentes alternativos —o en la sombra— de los distintos grupos parlamentarios, a sus equipos técnicos, que trabajan doblemente en la sombra, y muy particularmente a mis compañeras Ana y Leire, miembros del personal del Grupo The Left. Sin el trabajo invisible de todas estas personas, ninguno de los informes que debatimos y votamos en esta y en otras sesiones plenarias serían posibles.

Para terminar, me gustaría recordar que, aunque este informe se centre en la dimensión exterior del acceso al agua y al saneamiento, como han reconocido otros compañeros que me han precedido, no podemos ignorar que en la Unión Europea también existen serios problemas para gozar de este derecho de acceso al agua. Sin ir más lejos, en la Unión Europea, trece millones —y se dice rápido—, trece millones de personas están en riesgo de exclusión del derecho de acceso al agua. Esperemos que la aprobación de este informe contribuya modestamente a la lucha para que el derecho al agua potable y al saneamiento sea una realidad universal, tanto en Europa como en el resto del mundo.

Porque no podemos olvidar que el disfrute de este y de otros derechos no dejan de ser decisiones políticas. Y mañana tenemos la oportunidad de tomar una buena decisión política.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 5. Oktober 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Bettina Vollath (S&D), *schriftlich*. – Wasserknappheit, Trockenheit und Dürre, Überschwemmungen und Flut prägen in letzter Zeit häufig die weltweite Berichterstattung. Tatsächlich stehen 90 % aller Naturkatastrophen in Zusammenhang mit Wasser. Gleichzeitig ist Wasser eine Grundlage des Lebens. Zugang zu Wasser könnte daher unabdinglicher nicht sein. Drei von zehn Personen auf der Welt haben allerdings keinen Zugang zu Trinkwasser. 40 % der Weltbevölkerung lebt in Regionen wo regelmäßige Wasserknappheit herrscht. Dass der Zugang zu dieser Lebensgrundlage ein Menschenrecht ist, haben wir als Europäisches Parlament nun nochmal klar deutlich gemacht. Im Fokus stehen dabei auch Frauen und Kinder, die durch die unfaire Verteilung von Wasserressourcen große Ungleichheiten erfahren. Weiters muss auch Flüchtenden der Zugang zu Wasser und Sanitäreinrichtungen garantiert werden. Insgesamt muss Wasser als ein öffentliches Gut geschützt werden, da die knappe - und nicht endlose - Ressource bereits überbeansprucht wird. Dazu gehört auch, dass Unternehmen in ihrer gesamten Lieferkette schonend mit Wasser umgehen und Konsument und Konsumentinnen mithilfe eines Wasserfußabdrucks transparent über den Verbrauch von Wasser für ein Produkt informiert werden. Tun wir also alles dafür, dass Zugang zu Wasser nicht nur auf dem Papier ein Menschenrecht ist und schonen diese wertvolle Ressource. Wasser, eine Lebensgrundlage - für alle gleichermaßen!

19. Vysvětlení hlasování

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen Erklärungen zur Abstimmung. Ich habe drei Bitten um Erklärungen zur Abstimmung zu drei verschiedenen Tagesordnungspunkten, allerdings alle von der gleichen Person. Lieber Kollege Seán Kelly, wir machen jetzt ein *one-on-one* für eine Weile.

19.1. Vážné přeshraniční zdravotní hrozby (A9-0247/2021 – Véronique Trillet-Lenoir)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I am pleased to support this report from my colleague, Ms Trillet-Lenoir, for a regulation on serious cross-border threats to health. These new measures aim to strengthen public health in the EU when faced with serious challenges, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic unfortunately revealed how the European Union severely lacked the tools to counter a health crisis, and consequently our national health systems faced extremely dark and challenging times. Public health systems across all Member States were overwhelmed and exhausted. The pandemic also showed us the importance of European solidarity and coordination.

The report recommends strengthening operational coordination at European level and the promotion of solidarity in the European Union. I welcome the regulation and I support it.

19.2. Úsilí o dosažení udržitelnosti a konkurenceschopnosti akvakultury v EU: další postup (A9-0215/2022 – Clara Aguilera)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, I was pleased also to vote in favour of this report. It aims to build resilience and competitiveness within the EU aquaculture sector. The EU imports 70% of all the aquatic food it consumes. In this regard, the EU aquaculture sector has a great potential and it is important that the European Commission and EU Member States provide the legal framework required to develop it further.

EU aquaculture contributes to food supply and food security by providing sustainable and quality food products with a smaller environmental footprint than land-based, thus ensuring that EU aquaculture progresses in accordance with the green transition, while also bringing socio-economic opportunities to coastal regions and rural areas. I think it's a worthwhile initiative and hopefully Member States, including my own, can avail of the opportunity.

19.3. Směrnice o rádiových zařízeních: jednotná nabíječka pro elektronická zařízení (A9-0129/2022 – Alex Agius Saliba)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, *uimhir 3*, I think we were all very happy to support this report and to see it being approved by an overwhelming majority because it establishes a single charging portal for mobile phones, tablets and other portable electronics in the EU. Not before time.

The aim of this proposal is to improve consumer welfare and reduce the environmental footprint that comes from the manufacture and disposal of chargers and is part of a broader effort to make products in the EU more sustainable, reduce e-waste and make consumers' lives easier.

Beyond saving consumers money, there is also an environmental benefit. While electronic waste is the fastest-growing waste in the EU, less than 40% is recycled. This law aims to reduce the volume of such waste. So now, people all over Europe, including myself, can go to our boxes and drawers, which are full of all sorts of chargers, which we will never again need to use and dispose of them properly.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

20. Schválení zápisu z tohoto denního zasedání a pořadu jednání nadcházejícího denního zasedání

Die Präsidentin. – Die nächste Sitzung findet morgen, am 5. Oktober 2022, um 9.00 Uhr statt. Die Tagesordnung wurde veröffentlicht und ist auf der Website des Europäischen Parlaments verfügbar.

21. Ukončení denního zasedání

(Die Sitzung wird um 22.24 Uhr geschlossen.)

Středa 5. října 2022

DOSLOVNÝ ZÁZNAM ZE ZASEDÁNÍ Z 5. ŘÍJNA 2022

(2023/C 147/03)

Obsah Strana

1. Zahájení denního zasedání . . . 198

2. Eskalace ruské válečné agrese proti Ukrajině (rozprava) . . . 198

3. Členství v politických skupinách . . . 233

4. Hlasování . . . 233

4.1. Situace Romů žijících v osadách v EU (B9-0413/2022) (hlasování) . . . 233

4.2. Klíčové cíle pro schůzi CITES CoP19 v Panamě (B9-0414/2022) (hlasování) . . . 233

4.3. Strategické vztahy a partnerství EU s Africkým rohem (A9-0207/2022 – Fabio Massimo Castaldo) (hlasování) . . . 233

4.4. Vnější rozměr lidského práva na přístup k vodě (A9-0231/2022 – Miguel Urbán Crespo) (hlasování) . . . 233

4.5. Reakce EU na zvyšování cen energií v Evropě (RC-B9-0416/2022, B9-0416/2022, B9-0417/2022, B9-0418/2022, B9-0419/2022, B9-0420/2022, B9-0421/2022, B9-0422/2022) (hlasování) . . . 233

5. Schválení zápisu z předchozího denního zasedání . . . 234

6. Boj s protievropskou a protiukrajinskou propagandou evropských spojenců Putina (tematická rozprava) . . . 234

7. Členství ve výborech a delegacích . . . 258

8. Přistoupení Rumunska a Bulharska k schengenskému prostoru (rozprava) . . . 258

9. Výsledek přezkumu patnáctibodového akčního plánu pro obchod a udržitelný rozvoj provedeného Komisí (rozprava) . . . 281

10. Humanitární situace po zničujících záplavách v Pákistánu a klimatická krize (rozprava) . . . 292

11. Rozpravy o případech porušování lidských práv, demokracie a právního státu (rozprava) . . . 301

11.1. Stav lidských práv na Haiti, zejména v souvislosti s násilím páchaným gangy . . . 301

11.2. Zásahy vůči svobodě sdělovacích prostředků v Myanmaru, zejména případy Htet Htet Khineové, Sithua Aunga Myinta a Nyeina Nyeina Ayeho . . . 306

12. Členství ve výborech a delegacích . . . 310

13. Rozpravy o případech porušování lidských práv, demokracie a právního státu (pokračování rozpravy) . . . 310

Obsah Strana

13.1. Aktuální situace v humanitární oblasti a v oblasti lidských práv v etiopském Tigraji, zejména v souvislosti s dětmi 310

14. Nizozemský skandál s přídavky na děti, institucionální rasismus a algoritmy (rozprava) 317

15. Vysvětlení hlasování 324

15.1. Vnější rozměr lidského práva na přístup k vodě (A9-0231/2022 – Miguel Urbán Crespo) 324

15.2. Reakce EU na zvyšování cen energií v Evropě (RC-B9-0416/2022, B9-0416/2022, B9-0417/2022, B9-0418/2022, B9-0419/2022, B9-0420/2022, B9-0421/2022, B9-0422/2022) 324

16. Schválení zápisu z tohoto denního zasedání a pořadu jednání nadcházejícího denního zasedání 325

17. Ukončení zasedání 326

Středa 5. října 2022

DOSLOVNÝ ZÁZNAM ZE ZASEDÁNÍ Z 5. ŘÍJNA 2022

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Zahájení denního zasedání

(The sitting opened at 9.01)

2. Eskalace ruské válečné agrese proti Ukrajině (rozprava)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on Russia's escalation of its war of aggression against Ukraine (2022/2851(RSP)).

Dear colleagues, today's key debate is on Russia's escalation of its war of aggression against Ukraine.

On 30 September, after Russia staged a series of sham referenda, it illegally annexed the occupied territories of Ukraine in what is a blatant violation of Ukraine's sovereignty, territorial integrity and international law.

On behalf of the European Parliament, as we open this debate, let me reiterate: Donetsk, Kherson, Luhansk and Zaporizhzhia, just like Crimea, are – and will remain – part of independent and sovereign Ukraine.

No sham referenda can ever change this.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad, en nombre del Consejo*. – Señora presidenta del Parlamento, señora presidenta de la Comisión, señor vicepresidente, señorías, intervengo en este Pleno representando al Consejo de la Unión Europea, para explicarles que desde que, conjuntamente, el alto representante y la Comisión presentamos un nuevo paquete de sanciones sectoriales y sanciones personales, el Coreper y nuestros embajadores han estado trabajando intensamente ayer por la noche —siguen esta mañana también—, y espero que antes de que acabe este Pleno podamos tener un acuerdo del Consejo por el que se apruebe la propuesta conjunta que ha presentado la Comisión y que, sin duda, la presidenta detallará.

Quiero agradecerle a la señora presidenta de la Comisión y a todos mis colegas el esfuerzo y el liderazgo que han mostrado para seguir preparando, proponiendo, debatiendo propuestas de sanciones sectoriales, junto con las personales. De esta manera se limita todavía más la capacidad de exportación de Rusia y se limitan todavía más las importaciones que puede recibir para seguir manteniendo viva su industria, especialmente en su dimensión tecnológica y alimentar, así, la guerra.

Está claro que nos estamos liberando de la dependencia energética de Rusia. En agosto del año pasado importamos doce mil millones de metros cúbicos. Este año importamos en agosto solo cuatro, una división por tres. En realidad, las importaciones de Rusia han caído en las treinta y seis semanas de este año en cincuenta y cuatro mil millones de metros cúbicos.

Es algo extraordinario que nos va a conducir a liberarnos de la dependencia energética de Rusia, que era un gran condicionante de nuestra política exterior hacia Rusia y, en consecuencia, de nuestra política exterior, que incluía a Ucrania. En realidad, no hemos tenido una política exterior con respecto a Ucrania, porque era subsidiaria de nuestra política con respecto a Rusia y esta era, a su vez, subsidiaria de nuestra dependencia energética —y estaba condicionada por ella—. Ahora sí tendremos una política clara con respecto a Ucrania, que está dominada por la voluntad y el deseo de que Ucrania sea miembro de la Unión Europea. Una política con un objetivo claro, que será posible porque ya no adoleceremos de esta dependencia de Rusia.

La guerra continúa y las noticias del campo de batalla son buenas para Ucrania. Ucrania está retomando la ofensiva. La guerra ha entrado en una nueva fase; una fase sin duda peligrosa, porque estamos ante un escenario temible ante el que no tenemos que cerrar los ojos. Es el escenario de una guerra convencional que envuelve a una potencia nuclear. Una potencia nuclear que en este momento está retrocediendo en el escenario convencional y que amenaza con utilizar el arma nuclear. Es un escenario ciertamente preocupante en el que tenemos que demostrar que nuestro apoyo a Ucrania no flaquea.

Ucrania está avanzando en tres frentes: en el Dombás, después de haber tomado Lyman, en el centro sur, al sur de Zaporiyia, avanzando hacia Mariúpol, y finalmente en Jersón. Rusia sigue teniendo la superioridad numérica y la superioridad armamentística. Y por eso, las fuerzas ucranianas están desarrollando una táctica de combate extraordinariamente ágil, utilizando una inteligencia muy potente, rodeando las plazas fuertes rusas, creando bolsas que acaban siendo destruidas por la propia retirada del ejército ruso. Así, limitan sus pérdidas y avanzan en el terreno de una forma que nadie había podido prever.

La situación del ejército ruso es muy mala, entre otras cosas porque los soldados rusos no saben para qué es esta guerra. Y los trescientos mil que serán sacados de sus casas para ser llevados al frente lo van a entender menos todavía. Por lo tanto, la guerra se puede ganar en el campo de batalla, pero hay que ganarla sobre todo en el campo de las ideas. Porque, además de la guerra en sí, hay otra guerra: la guerra por la supremacía de los valores.

Rusia está desarrollando una intensa campaña en el mundo para explicar que las consecuencias de esta guerra no derivan de la guerra, sino de las sanciones que hemos aplicado contra Rusia. Esa batalla hay que librarla en la discusión con nuestros colegas en todo el mundo para continuar aislando a Rusia —recientemente ha vuelto a ocurrir, un organismo internacional de gran importancia, la Organización de Aviación Civil Internacional—. Y esa batalla hay que librarla de forma continuada y permanente, porque hay mucho sentimiento en el mundo acerca de las causas de esta guerra y, sobre todo, de sus consecuencias. Y las consecuencias para muchos países ciertamente son malas en términos de precios, de energía y de alimentos.

Tenemos que comprometernos mucho con el resto del mundo para ayudarles a superar las consecuencias de esta guerra. Tenemos que hacer un gran esfuerzo diplomático de explicación para que el mundo entienda el porqué de esta guerra y cómo puede acabar. La guerra no puede acabar por cansancio del mundo occidental, que es lo que espera Putin.

Putin cree que las democracias son débiles, que los sistemas de opinión pública no soportarán un invierno frío. Está esperando la llegada del «general Invierno», que siempre ha salvado en última instancia al ejército ruso. Está esperando que el frío, que los cortes en el suministro de gas, que los altos precios y las bajas temperaturas minen nuestra voluntad de seguir apoyando a Ucrania. Y este es el lugar para pedir a los europeos que entiendan lo que está en juego. Porque nuestro apoyo a Ucrania no es solamente una cuestión de generosidad. Nuestro apoyo a Ucrania tiene que ser indefectible, porque la seguridad de Ucrania está intrínsecamente ligada con la nuestra. Lo que allí se decide es también nuestro futuro.

(Aplausos)

Sí, señoras y señores diputados, lo que allí se decide es también nuestro futuro. Por eso es tan importante conseguir que, como hemos hecho otros en Europa renunciando a nuestras viejas ambiciones imperiales Rusia también renuncie a ellas. Esta guerra solo puede acabar de una manera que asegure la paz. Y para que asegure la paz, hace falta que Ucrania recupere su integridad territorial y su plena soberanía; que Rusia asuma sus responsabilidades políticas y morales en la guerra y pague por la reconstrucción; y que se exijan responsabilidades por los crímenes humanos que allí se han producido.

Este, y no otro, tiene que ser nuestro objetivo. Y es la razón de las sanciones, y de la ayuda militar y de la acción diplomática. En esos tres frentes tenemos que seguir trabajando sin desfallecer; no es el momento de dudar. La sociedad europea tiene que ser capaz de continuar esta lucha, apoyando a Ucrania con los procedimientos de que disponemos.

Hoy la presidenta de la Comisión presentará en detalle las sanciones que el Consejo va a aprobar. Pero, por encima de las sanciones concretas, lo que es realmente importante es que los europeos entiendan que, si hay un precio que pagar, ese precio merece la pena, porque si no pagamos este acabaremos pagando uno mucho mayor. Es una batalla por la libertad de los ucranianos y la nuestra; el esfuerzo que tengamos que hacer será inscrito en las páginas de la historia como un momento en que la Unión Europea, unida, fue capaz de resistir la agresión de un modo de vida y de organización política radicalmente distinto y contrapuesto al nuestro.

(Aplausos)

Ursula von der Leyen, *President of the Commission*. – Madam President, dear Roberta, Minister, HR/VP, dear Josep, honourable Members, it's just four weeks ago that we met here in the Hemicycle for the State of the Union. But in those four weeks, the Kremlin has escalated its aggression to a new level.

Putin has launched Russia's first mobilisation since World War II, treating hundreds of thousands of young Russians as cannon fodder. He uses sham referenda in an illegal attempt to change international borders by force. And since many months, he is using energy as a weapon.

Now, of course, we feel that the Russian war causes economic and social hardship and it places a heavy burden on our citizens and on the economy in our single market. We see in particular the rising energy prices and gas and electricity prices that are leading to reduced purchasing power, and they are leading to a loss of competitiveness for our business in the international market. But our resilience in all these difficult times is remarkable. And what we have to do is work steadily on our resilience, mainly on the field of energy. And that's where I want to focus today.

If you look at the course of the last seven months together with our Member States, we have already taken important steps. We have diminished our gas consumption by around 10%. That's good. It's not enough. We have to do more, but it's a big step forward.

I want to give you two figures where the Russian supplies of gas are concerned. At the beginning of the war, if you look at all the imports of gas, the Russian share was 41%. Within seven months we have gone down to 7.5%. That's good. And we have compensated this decrease in Russian supplies by a massive increase by our trusted suppliers, for example, the United States, for example, Norway. Let's look at gas storage. This is almost at 90% by now. This is 15% higher than on the same day last year.

Three weeks ago in this Hemicycle, I announced that we will skim the exceptional profits that electricity producing companies have these days to make them available for Member States to support vulnerable citizens and businesses. Now, last week already we have enshrined that in law, EU law. We achieved that in lightning speed and I really want to thank the Czech Presidency for this outstanding deliverable in really a very, very short time. And yesterday the Council reached agreement on REPowerEU.

So, we will have key instruments in place to make it through the winter – that's storage and saving – to jointly purchase gas. This is our platform to get rid of the grip the Russians have on us through their fossil fuels, these are our agreements with other friends. To redistribute the windfall profits to support those in need and to invest in the future of a sustainable energy supply, and that is REPowerEU.

The measures we have put in place provide us with a first buffer of protection. And, thanks to these, we can and we will now step up to the next level. I will lay out a road map in a letter to leaders in view of our meeting in Prague in two days this week. And I want to discuss with you first-hand the key components of this letter. Of course, it's all about energy prices.

So, we will step up our negotiations with trusted partners, for example, with Norway, to dampen the price we pay for gas imports. The talks have already started. I think as a European Union, we have a considerable market power and many of our suppliers want to conclude deals with us which are beneficial for both sides.

So I really think it is necessary that we come to an agreed corridor of prices to stop this crazy peaks we have partially in the import of gas prices. We will strengthen our energy platform. And let me be very clear: it is in our collective interest.

After the winter, we will have to refill the gas storages and if we then see that we have again a scenario where Member States are outbidding each other on the global market and thus raising the prices here in the European Union, this is not sustainable. So we have to have a joint procurement of all Member States. This is much better than the way we have it.

My next point is on gas prices. As you know, we use gas in three different domains: for industry, for heating and for the production of electricity. Let me start with the electricity. Our market for electricity is built in a way that high gas prices are driving electricity prices. We have now to limit this inflationary impact of gas on electricity, and everywhere in Europe. This is why we are ready to discuss a cap on the price of gas that is used to generate electricity. This cap would also be a first step on the way to a structural reform and overall reform of our electricity market.

But I think we also have to have a look at gas prices beyond the electricity market. So, where industry is concerned, where heating is also concerned, the general approach of gas, and here we will work together with Member States to reduce gas prices and to limit volatility, and thus to limit the impact of price manipulation by Russia. Because if you look at the fever curve of gas and gas prices, the whole gas price, you can see the manipulation that Russia has on the gas prices, and this has to stop.

We have already offered this mechanism in March. At that time, we have said that it can give an important signal that the EU will not pay any price for gas any more. We have qualified such a price cap as having an immediate impact on price levels, but that it entails drawbacks in terms of security of supply. This is still true today. So it's a fine line to walk. It's not trivial to do that. But the situation since March has critically evolved since then.

And today, compared to March, more Member States are open for it and we are better prepared. Such a cap on gas prices must be designed properly to ensure security of supply. And it is a temporary solution to cater for the fact that the TTF, that is our main price benchmark, is no longer representative for our market. This TTF benchmark reflects or mirrors a lot pipeline gas.

But in the last seven months, because we wanted to get rid of the dependency on Russian gas, we have increased a lot the LNG market and this LNG market is not properly reflected in the TTF. So, introducing a cap on gas overall is a temporary solution until we will have a new EU price index developed that ensures a better functioning of the market. And the Commission has already started to work on this.

Honourable Members, these are far-reaching measures and I wholeheartedly agree with you when you say in the resolution you will vote on today that exceptional times require exceptional measures where the Union needs to act as jointly and as united as ever.

In pursuing our action, two things remain paramount: that is action in unity and action in solidarity. If I look at our single market, we really need to protect the fundamentals of our economy and, in particular, our single market. The single market is the strength of our European Union, and this is where the wealth of the European Union comes from.

Without a common European solution we risk fragmentation. If every Member State goes on its own, we have fragmentation we don't want, and we have to do something against it. And, therefore, it is so paramount that we preserve a level playing field within the European Union and our single market. Every Member State is benefiting from it. As I said, the wealth comes from our single market.

Now, what does that mean? With REPowerEU we have developed a crucial instrument to accelerate the transition in the energy independence. That's what we're working on since seven months and REPowerEU will allow, it's the governance structure, it will allow the investment in infrastructure, for example, pipelines, for example, interconnectors, for example, renewables.

But it also allows – and that's important – to support businesses or households to invest in energy efficiency, for example, insulating houses or installing heat pumps or installing new technology for the companies, the businesses that have to do the transition.

Now, here's my proposal: I think we should further boost REPowerEU with additional funding, common European funding. This way, all European states can accelerate the necessary investment, all European Member States. We modernise our infrastructure, the energy infrastructure. We preserve the level playing field and we secure our European competitiveness on the global market. So we have to do this investment. We have to do this funding together as Europeans, jointly, with a common solution.

And, honourable Members, allow me to speak about another pressing issue which we have to address today. The acts of sabotage against Nord Stream pipelines have shown how vulnerable our energy infrastructure is. For the first time in recent history, it has become a target. Pipelines and underwater cables connect European citizens and companies to the world. They are the lifeline of data and energy. It is in the interests of all Europeans to better protect this critical infrastructure.

And for this, I will present a five-point plan. First, we must be better prepared. We have very recently agreed new legislation – that's good – which will strengthen the resilience of critical EU entities. The responsible Parliament committee will be voting on it next week. That's good too. So we are absolutely on time and I think we can, and we should, already now be working on this basis.

Second, we need to stress-test our infrastructure. We don't have to wait till something happens, but we need to make sure that we are prepared and therefore we need those stress tests. We need to identify whether we have weak points and where these weak points are. And of course, we have to prepare our reaction to sudden disruption.

What are we doing then? Are all the information chains in place? Is everybody informed? Does this emergency scenario really work then in our single market? We will work with Member States to ensure effective stress tests in the energy sector. And this then should be followed by other high-risk sectors, such as the offshore digital and the electricity infrastructure.

My third point, we will increase our capacity to respond through our civil protection mechanism well known to you in the European Union. With this, we can support Member States in addressing the disruption of critical infrastructure, for example, with fuel, with generators, with necessary shelter capacity.

My fourth point, we will make best use of our satellite surveillance capacity. We have these satellites in place. We have the capacity to do the surveillance to detect potential threats. So, this is also a matter of prevention and awareness. And finally, we will strengthen our cooperation with NATO and with key partners like the United States on this critical issue.

Honourable Members, this war has entered in a new phase. The Ukrainian army keeps reporting impressive successes in its fight against the aggressor. We all saw the images of deeply relieved people welcoming Ukrainian soldiers. And I could see with my own eyes when I was three weeks ago in Kyiv that life has come back to Kyiv. Of course, it is the bravery of the Ukrainian people that made it possible.

But I think Europe's contribution also has made a huge difference. And now it's the time to keep track to help the Ukrainians to face down the invader. A strong and steadfast Europe, that will be the only way to stop Putin. This is the moment to stay the course and to signal again to our Ukrainian friends, we stay by your side as long as it takes.

Thank you and long live Europe.

(applause)

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Madam President of the Commission, High Representative, Minister, dear colleagues, more than 220 days have passed since Putin started his invasion in Ukraine on 24 February — more than 220 days of tremendous suffering, bloodshed and destruction of Ukraine, people and the whole country. By the end of last month, we have seen 13 million people fleeing Ukraine, crossing the borders to neighbouring countries. Six thousand Ukrainians have died. Three hundred and seventy-nine children have lost their lives in the Russian war.

Putin is a war criminal and, like all war criminals, he doesn't stop. But not weapons or money are winning a war – people, the will of people, the determination of people, and most of all of free people defending their freedom, are winning a war. As Europeans, we can only admire what the Ukraine troops are doing every day in Lyman, in Kherson. Congratulations to President Zelensky and the Ukraine troops – you're great.

Obviously, even among the autocrats of this world, Russia is losing ground. We saw this in Samarkand, where even the Prime Minister of India, Modi, said publicly it's not the right moment to go to war. Fake referenda in occupied Ukraine territories, mobilising now 300 000 Russian reservists and threatening to use nuclear weapons. This is obviously a signal of weakness. So the Ukrainians are doing their job. And Europe?

First of all, the upcoming winter is a big test for us and we have to win it. First of all, we have to be strong against the populists inside the European Union. Just look at Marine Le Pen. In the presidential election race this year, she proposed to seek an alliance with Russia without fear of US sanctions. Back in 2014, the Front National found no better supporter than Russian banks to finance its campaign. Anyone, dear friends, who loves his country would never ask for money from Putin. That is what Le Pen is doing.

Dear colleagues, in Spain, just after the start of the war, Podemos stated that the heart of the Ukraine conflict lies in the NATO policy of enlargement towards Eastern Europe – unbelievable lies! Or in Slovakia, the former president and party leader Robert Fico from the SMER Party described the war as a conflict between the United States and Russia. He called the strengthening of NATO forces in Slovakia by German soldiers 'the welcoming of the Wehrmacht in our country'. That is the wording of leaders in Europe of today. And these populists, dear friends, have only one idea. They have the idea to weaken Europe and we have to stand up to defend Europe.

Now, more than ever, it is time to show that we are standing together, and the EPP will never accept to rewrite the history. Our EPP parties in Finland and Sweden, for example, fought always, argued always, for NATO membership. Only recently, the Socialists changed their mind and also supported the NATO membership of Sweden and Finland. NATO defends freedom and peace and security in Europe and Putin wants to destroy our Europe. That's why, again, we have to show unity.

At the same time, Putin's threats must not determine our actions. That's why we have to support our Ukrainian friends more than ever before. Now, more than ever before, it's time for European leadership. Without weapons from the West, Putin would have won long ago already. Ukraine urgently needs more weapons, including tanks – and dare I ask France and Germany to lead Europe and to present a proposal to deliver all the tanks? We support another action, a package of sanctions and financial assistance to Ukraine. If we want this war to end, we need actions but not any more excuses. Europe needs leadership. Now, more than ever before, it's time for this winter of solidarity.

On Friday, the European Council must find a common understanding on energy solidarity, and Madam Commission President we fully support your initiatives in this field. A continuation of uncertainty costs each and every European currency. Uncertainty is driving speculation on the market. So we need a binding solidarity mechanism. We need common procurement, and we need a price cap as proposed by the Commission, and we need this now, this clarity.

Let me also add that on Thursday we have this first meeting of the political union. President Erdoğan will be there, and let me also underline that we should not forget next to the Ukraine war that we have other challenges in our neighbourhood. I think that someone who is not practising our solidarity with Ukraine in the same way, who is not implementing the same sanctions in a way like we do as Europeans, cannot have candidate status for the European Union, cannot be a reliable partner for us. That's why I hope that we also have a clear wording towards President Erdoğan that he has to show his European commitment.

With Putin escalating the war, it is now, even more, time to firmly stand by Ukraine. We as the EPP always did so, and we always will do so – now more than ever before. Without a free Ukraine, there will be not a fully free Europe.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señora presidenta Von der Leyen, señor alto representante, señor ministro, en los últimos días el mundo ha vuelto a vivir un nuevo episodio de acciones temerarias e insensatas de Putin: la movilización militar rusa, los falsos referendos de anexión y una peligrosa retórica sobre el uso de armas nucleares. Pero, además, por primera vez, serios y preocupantes acontecimientos han ocurrido fuera de territorio ucraniano: me refiero al sabotaje de infraestructuras de energía en el Báltico. El mundo está siguiendo con temor y con preocupación esta escalada. También, la pasada semana, un convoy civil fue atacado por las fuerzas rusas cerca de Zaporiyia con víctimas mortales y heridos.

Señorías, más allá de la puesta en escena diaria de Putin, esta es la realidad de su maquinaria de guerra. Esta es una guerra ilegal y cruel contra la inocente población de Ucrania. Civiles que pierden sus vidas, civiles desplazados, civiles que han dejado sus casas huyendo de la atrocidad.

La anexión de la semana pasada de Putin es ilegítima y una violación clara de la Carta de las Naciones Unidas. Cambiar las fronteras de Ucrania por la fuerza y anexionar territorios que ni tan siquiera controla es pura propaganda. Estas acciones proyectan lo que Putin es: un hombre desesperado, cuyo liderazgo y autoridad está cada día más en duda.

Ante esta peligrosa escalada, debemos apoyar más a Ucrania y a su ciudadanía. Debemos reforzar nuestro apoyo para contener las acciones ilegales de Rusia y debemos aumentar la presión con sanciones adicionales para acabar con esta guerra. ¿Saben también para qué? Para acabar llevando a Putin a donde le toca: al Tribunal de Justicia de La Haya.

Por eso debemos mantener la unidad en nuestra respuesta. Por eso hay que aislar lo máximo posible a aquellos líderes europeos que flirtean con Putin. Porque los hay, claro que los hay. Mi familia política está muy preocupada. Sabemos de la posición aislada de Orbán sobre las sanciones a Rusia. Pero intentar tejer alianzas con Meloni realmente es un problema que nos puede llevar a todos a una deriva preocupante. Conocemos el convenio de colaboración entre la Liga de Salvini y Putin y nos preocupan las alarmantes declaraciones de Berlusconi cuando afirma que Putin intentó reemplazar a Zelenski «por gente buena y decente». Eso ha dicho el señor Berlusconi. ¿Esto es lo que hay que esperar del nuevo Gobierno italiano? ¿Qué van a hacer al respecto nuestros colegas del Partido Popular Europeo? Porque Putin va a continuar con sus intenciones de dividirnos, y a más amenazas necesitamos más unidad en nuestra acción política.

Señor Weber, necesitamos responsabilidad política en estos momentos y entender que la verdadera alianza debe de ser con quienes defendemos los valores europeos. Yo entiendo que, en estos momentos, en esta situación, le cueste entender la realidad. Pero sinceramente, fuera de aquí hay muchísima gente preocupada por lo que está ocurriendo y, por delante de las tácticas electorales de alguno lo que debemos es estar en la senda de quienes defendemos el proyecto europeo.

Hay quienes no nos hemos movido desde el principio. Aquí seguimos: defendiendo Europa, defendiendo los valores europeos. Le tiendo la mano para que vuelva a ese camino.

Petras Auštrevičius, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, President of the Commission, High Representative, ministers, dear colleagues, it's probably time to end our empty insignificant disagreements and to focus on real things, on things which shape the present world and our future.

Putin, who claims to be the ruler of the world, wanted to conquer Ukraine and enslave its people in three days. Not only has this failed, but it has turned into a continuation of the atrocious crimes against humanity and the shameful defeats incurred by the Russian aggressor. Realising his impotence in the face of a heroic Ukraine, its resistance and nationwide mobilisation, Putin has resorted to the tool of annexation of temporarily occupied Ukrainian territories in order to create a situation of permanent war. It is as a state of terrorism acts in today's politics, and that is what I call the Russian State, which supports and implements a policy of terrorism.

The civilized world must respond to Russia's colonial war aggression with even stronger sanctions and increased support for Ukraine. Russian policy also demonstrates a turning point from adherence to the international law-based order. To the outside world, it became opportunistic and unpredictable and, domestically, it resulted in a deep moral and social degradation of the Russian state. It is high time to realise that our trade, Western trade, and our economic relations with the Russian aggressor is not an option. It must discontinue.

In these extraordinary circumstances, Ukraine needs security guarantees now, not in the distant future. Now is the time for Ukraine when its fate is being decided and the well-being of the Ukrainian people is at stake. It is a time when European security is being challenged and to be decided for next decades. NATO membership for Ukraine is the solution and we need to reap its benefits now as soon as possible through additional formats of cooperation and partnerships. Long live Europe and *Slava Ukraini!*

Sergey Lagodinsky, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Wir haben lange genug blumige Solidaritätsbekundungen für die Ukrainerinnen und Ukrainer übermittelt. Die überhasteten Pseudoreferenden in den besetzten ukrainischen Gebieten und die Mobilisierung der russischen Bevölkerung, die Putin nie wollte, zeigen: Putin versteht nicht die blumige Sprache der Reden, sondern die entschlossene Sprache der Taten. Nicht Worte, Finanzhilfen, nicht Bedauern, Tribunale, nicht die unkonventionellen Trauerbekundungen an die ukrainische Bevölkerung, sondern die konventionellen Waffen, die die Ukrainerinnen und Ukrainer brauchen. Daher werde ich hier keine großen Reden schwingen. Das haben die anderen schon getan.

Vielleicht ein paar Punkte aus der Entschließung, die wir beschlossen haben. Erstens, und das Wichtigste: Die Einverleibung der besetzten Gebiete ändert vielleicht etwas für Nordkorea, aber für uns, für die internationale Gemeinschaft, ändert das nichts und gar nichts. Die besetzten Gebiete bleiben die besetzten Gebiete, der Befreiungskrieg bleibt ein Befreiungskrieg, und die Ukraine bleibt Ukraine in den Grenzen, wie sie ihr zustehen, das heißt, einschließlich der östlichen Grenzen in den Gebieten von Saporischschja, von Donezk, von Luhansk, von Cherson und bis zur südlichen Spitze der Krim. Das ist die Realität, und die bleibt so!

Zweitens die personellen Sanktionen, die müssen ausgeweitet werden. Und da appelliere ich an die Mitgliedstaaten und die Kommission: Setzen Sie die Amtsträger und Amtsträgerinnen von der Duma bis über Regionalparlamente und die Bezirksparlamente von Russland auf die Liste. Alle, die den Duma-Parteien angehören, das sind diejenigen, die den Krieg tragen, das sind diejenigen, die den Krieg und Putin mit unterstützen. Die müssen auf die Liste.

Drittens: Die Sicherheit unserer Infrastruktur ist kein Spiel. Es kann nicht sein, dass wir bis zu 100 % unserer Daten, die weltweit unterwegs sind, durch ein paar Schiffe überwachen. Es kann nicht sein, dass wir das als Unternehmensverantwortung auf die Unternehmen abwälzen. Wir sind mitten in einem Angriff auf uns, der stattfindet. Und hier müssen wir vorbereitet sein.

Und schließlich: Unsere Standhaftigkeit für die kommenden Monate wird über den Ausgang dieser Konfrontation entscheiden. Ja, wir sind in einer Konfrontation. Wir ließen uns nicht durch die Aggression entzweien, und wir sollen uns auch nicht durch die wirtschaftlichen Probleme entzweien lassen. Das bedeutet: Manche Mitgliedstaaten gingen schon voran mit wirtschaftlichen Subventionen. Wir brauchen aber eine Europäisierung dieser *efforts*. Wir brauchen eine gemeinsame und eine grün orientierte Lösung, die europäisch wäre. Ja, die einzelnen Staaten können vorangehen, aber wir müssen, wir müssen es europäisch ergänzen. Nur dann gewinnen wir diese Konfrontation.

Marco Zanni, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi spiace che, ancora una volta, debba rubare tempo al mio intervento per rispondere a chi strumentalizza la politica in un momento così delicato. Però vorrei ricordare al gruppo socialista che non accettiamo lezioni di moralità da chi strizza l'occhio in Europa e fuori ai peggiori regimi di estrema sinistra. Non accettiamo lezioni di moralità sulla Russia da chi ancora ospita tra le sue fila il più grande lobbista della Russia, l'ex cancelliere Schröder. E non accettiamo lezioni da chi ancora in Europa chiude gli occhi sulle violazioni di alcuni governi solo perché sono sostenuti da partiti socialisti. Accettate il risultato democratico delle elezioni in Italia e toglietevi dalla testa che l'Italia, anche con questo governo, non sia protagonista della costruzione positiva in Europa e del supporto all'Ucraina.

Passando alle cose concrete, ai problemi di oggi, io ho ascoltato con attenzione gli interventi della Presidente von der Leyen e dell'Alto rappresentante, ma siamo molto preoccupati. Sembra che la lancetta della storia sia tornata indietro. In questi sei-sette mesi, a febbraio, purtroppo ci siamo trovati di nuovo di fronte a una guerra dentro l'Europa che ci ha riportato a quello che è accaduto settant'anni fa, più di settant'anni fa: un disastro della storia. E oggi, di fronte all'escalation, la minaccia nucleare, la minaccia di una guerra fredda tra potenze nucleari, che speravamo di esserci lasciata alle spalle, torna con forza a presentarsi. E l'Europa deve, anche in questo senso, dimostrare unità, come ha fatto in questi mesi, per evitare che questa minaccia si concretizzi.

L'Alto rappresentante ha parlato del nuovo pacchetto di sanzioni e credo che su questo le istituzioni europee, in questi mesi, avevano dimostrato l'unità, la leadership, il pragmatismo e il realismo di cui c'è bisogno, e quindi dobbiamo far sì che si continui ad avere un supporto importante per queste misure.

Ma, come ho già detto, Presidente, nei miei interventi precedenti, in parallelo oggi è necessario che l'Europa concretizzi misure di supporto a imprese e famiglie. Se vogliamo mantenere un supporto forte, anche della nostra gente, al popolo ucraino nel combattere questa guerra, abbiamo bisogno che il peso di queste misure non ricada sui cittadini.

Io purtroppo non condivido l'ottimismo che lei ha delineato sul fatto che passeremo un inverno relativamente tranquillo, che abbiamo tutti gli strumenti per passare indenni questo inverno. Purtroppo, la realtà dei fatti ci appare diversa. Invitiamo davvero a concretizzare misure di sostegno e faccio un appello. Sono felice di sentire che sul *price cap* probabilmente si andrà avanti. Sappiamo quanto è difficile trovare un accordo, sappiamo che non sarà facile imporre un *price cap* alle importazioni dalla Russia, ma in questi mesi i cittadini si fanno una domanda. Come alleati occidentali abbiamo dimostrato grande unità, abbiamo supportato la NATO, l'Unione europea ha supportato la NATO nelle misure, ma non ci pare che gli alleati abbiano condiviso gli oneri di queste misure. Sappiamo che l'Europa sta soffrendo, sappiamo che gli alleati ci hanno supportato nell'aumentare le forniture di gas, le forniture di energia all'Unione europea, però ci aspettiamo che da alleati con cui abbiamo condiviso un percorso forte arrivi anche un sostegno, un aiuto forte all'Europa.

Oggi la Norvegia, gli Stati Uniti, il Canada, paesi tutti appartenenti alla NATO, guadagnano sei-sette volte tanto con le forniture che mandano in Europa. Ecco, sarebbe bello che l'Unione europea spinga questi alleati a considerare loro un *price cap* e a fornire, in questi mesi difficili, in questi mesi critici, tutto il supporto necessario, anche riducendo magari un po' i propri margini di profitto, per far sì che l'Europa possa continuare a sostenere fortemente l'approccio dell'Occidente e della NATO verso l'Ucraina.

Anna Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, High Representative / Vice-President, thanks to the fantastic resistance of the Ukrainian army and people and facing humiliating defeat in his war waged against Ukraine, Vladimir Putin and the Russian institutions committed a series of fatal mistakes, but he also renewed his nuclear threats against the collective West, not only against Ukraine.

My appeal here from this chamber to the Western media and to individual politicians is to refrain from playing Putin's game, from repeating his threat of nuclear war. The proper action to be taken within the collective West is to revise the nuclear deterrence schemes and make Putin and Russian elites sure that any strike against Ukraine, Ukraine's neighbours or any ally and EU Member State as well is to be fatal for him and his country. There is no place in a contemporary world for this kind of state terrorism.

Martin Schirdewan, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! Dieser Krieg muss so schnell wie möglich beendet werden.

Russlands illegale Annexion von Teilen der Ukraine, die Teilmobilmachung und die Drohungen bezüglich des Einsatzes von Atomwaffen haben zu einer massiven Eskalation des Konfliktes beigetragen. Putin zündelt und spielt mit dem Feuer, in dem viele weitere unschuldige Menschen den Tod finden werden, wenn dieser verdammte Krieg nicht schnellstmöglich gestoppt wird. Deshalb fordern wir ein Ende des russischen Angriffskrieges und den Rückzug der russischen Truppen aus der Ukraine.

Und ja, gezielte Sanktionen gegen den Macht- und Militärapparat sind richtig und zeigen Wirkung. Aber, Frau von der Leyen, ich war vor Kurzem in Schwedt, habe dort die Menschen getroffen, habe auf einer Kundgebung vor Hunderten von Leuten gesprochen, und die Menschen in dieser Region haben Angst. Die Menschen in dieser Region sind frustriert, weil hier – in diesem Haus und auch in Ihrem Haus – politische Entscheidungen gefällt wurden, die eben nicht die Zukunft der industriellen Standorte, die nicht die Zukunft der Menschen in der Region bedacht haben, sondern diese vor vollendete Tatsachen stellen und in existenzielle Nöte stürzen.

Wer Zukunft will und wer Frieden will, der muss jetzt auch der Diplomatie das Wort reden. Wenn man so hört, was heute hier wieder in diesem Haus – auch von der Kommission – gekommen ist oder was Vertreter einzelner Regierungen, unter anderem aus Deutschland, so von sich geben, dann frag ich mich, ob hier irgendjemand ernsthaft an Diplomatie und an Verhandlungen, also an einer sofortigen Beendigung dieses Krieges überhaupt interessiert ist. Außer weiteren Waffenlieferungen, außer weiteren Sanktionen fällt hier ja anscheinend niemandem etwas ein.

Auch der Papst hat vor wenigen Tagen die handelnden Politikerinnen und Politiker aufgefordert, sich für Dialog zu engagieren, diesen Krieg zu beenden. Und auch europäische Politik steht in der Pflicht, nicht weiter an der Eskalationsspirale zu drehen, sondern endlich mit starken Friedensinitiativen dazu beizutragen, diesen elenden Krieg zu beenden.

Natürlich gilt unsere Solidarität der Ukraine, und natürlich gilt unsere Solidarität der notleidenden Bevölkerung. Und so schwer dieser Angriff, dieser russische Angriff, auf dem Land lastet, so sollten doch trotzdem alle diplomatischen Kanäle offengehalten werden.

Ja, Putin ist ein fürchterlicher Kriegstreiber. Dafür kann jedoch nicht die russische Bevölkerung in Haft genommen werden. Unsere Solidarität muss auch denjenigen Russen gelten, die sich dem Krieg entgegenstellen. Die Teilmobilmachung hat zu einer Massenflucht junger Russen geführt, die jetzt teilweise vor verschlossenen EU-Grenzen stehen. Diesen Menschen, die sich aktiv gegen den Krieg und für den Frieden einsetzen, darf die EU nicht in den Rücken fallen. Macht die Grenzen für die Deserteure und Kriegsdienstverweigerer auf!

Jérôme Rivière (NI). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, il n'existe aucun doute sur l'origine de la guerre en Ukraine. Si on peut épiloguer sur les causes profondes du conflit, c'est bien la Russie, dirigée par Vladimir Poutine, qui a choisi d'envahir l'Ukraine, de déclencher en Europe un conflit militaire.

Ce préalable important et nécessaire posé, il est indispensable pour ceux qui, dans cet hémicycle, souhaitent une résolution à cette guerre, de reconnaître la responsabilité des nations européennes, de la France et de l'Allemagne en particulier, dans leur incapacité à faire respecter les accords de Minsk et celle de l'Union européenne dans son alignement sans discernement sur les positions excessives des États Unis.

Aujourd'hui, sur proposition de madame von der Leyen, des pays membres de l'Union européenne adoptent des trains de sanctions dont l'efficacité contre la Russie n'est pas démontrée, mais qui servent à justifier des accords avec l'Azerbaïdjan, à la liberté morale inacceptable au regard des crimes odieux perpétrés contre l'Arménie.

Assez de cette morale à double standard. Les citoyens en Europe souffrent. Notre objectif n'est pas de prendre parti dans ce conflit, mais d'amener Ukraine et Russie à un cessez-le-feu et à des négociations de paix. C'est le seul intérêt des citoyens en Europe, citoyens auxquels vous devrez, Madame, rendre des comptes de votre gestion calamiteuse de nos ressources énergétiques.

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! In diesem systemischen Konflikt zwischen unseren friedliebenden Demokratien und einer kriegslüsternen Diktatur haben wir in diesen letzten Wochen eine erneute Eskalation seitens des zutiefst faschistischen Aggressors erlebt: Mobilmachung, insbesondere in Gebieten mit nationalen Minderheiten, und eine Abstimmungsfarce, um den Eindruck zu erwecken, hier warte eine ukrainische Bevölkerung nur darauf, heim ins Reich geholt zu werden. Da stürzt die potemkinsche Fassade von Scheinlegitimität für alle sichtbar ein.

Jetzt muss es darum gehen, die Ukraine winterfest zu machen – wirtschaftlich, humanitär, sozial und vor allem bei der Verstetigung von Waffenlieferungen. Ja, leider ist es erforderlich. Das amerikanische *Lend-Lease Act* würde ich mir in Europa wünschen, zumindest in einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten. Das würde Waffenlieferungen beschleunigen, weil es Einzelgenehmigungen überflüssig macht.

Ich wünsche mir, dass Deutschland und Frankreich endlich ihren Beitrag leisten, Europa über diese Frage zu einen, indem man endlich einen vergleichbaren Beitrag bei Waffenlieferungen leistet, wie ihn viele östliche Mitgliedstaaten auch bereits leisten. Keine Alleingänge. Koordinierte Lieferungen von Schützenpanzern und Leopard-Panzern als Beispiel, wie es unter anderem auch der Vorsitzende des Auswärtigen Ausschusses im Bundestag fordert.

Herr Bundeskanzler Scholz, tun Sie jetzt das Richtige. Nehmen Sie sich als Hamburger ein Beispiel am Hamburger Helmut Schmidt. Der hat das Richtige getan und den NATO-Doppelbeschluss gegen seine eigene Partei durchgesetzt. Das war richtig. Da hat er sich in der Geschichte auch verdient gemacht. Haben Sie keine Angst vor Ihrer Partei. Genehmigen Sie die Waffenlieferungen von Mardern und Leoparden. Die Geschichte wird Ihnen Recht geben.

Pedro Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Alto Representante, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão, Senhor Ministro, colegas, mais um mês passou na guerra de agressão russa à Ucrânia e, como disse a Presidente da Comissão Europeia, este não foi um mês qualquer. Foi um mês de heroica reconquista de território pelas forças ucranianas, mas também de uma anexação fantoche de territórios ucranianos pelo regime de Putin.

O simulacro de referendo é apenas revelador dos padrões democráticos de Putin. Votar com uma arma apontada não é um voto, é um assalto, é uma agressão à democracia. Não há meio termo nesta questão, as anexações de territórios ucranianos são imorais e ilegais à luz do direito internacional. Ninguém poderá apoiar tal ação.

A Ucrânia tem o direito a defender-se, e nós, europeus, temos a obrigação moral de a apoiar. A História julgará severamente quem se põe ao lado de Putin, como muita extrema direita europeia, procurando quebrar a unidade necessária para lhe fazer frente, mas também julgará os que se aliam a essa extrema direita por pura sede de poder.

Temos de ser claros na condenação e decisivos na ação. E a ação faz-se primeiro com o apoio aos ucranianos – apoio político, económico e militar –, mas faz-se também com mais sanções que fragilizam a economia russa e a sua máquina de guerra, parando em definitivo a compra de energia, confiscando os bens dos oligarcas e colocando-os ao serviço da reconstrução da Ucrânia.

E não esqueçamos, faz-se também aqui na Europa, apoiando todos, mas mesmo todos, os europeus que sofrem com as consequências desta guerra, reformando os mercados da eletricidade e do gás para combater a especulação e baixar as contas já, como este Parlamento votará, reclamando a ação imediata das Instituições, e mantendo a coesão entre os europeus no apoio à Ucrânia, numa resposta verdadeiramente europeia, unida e não deixando sofrer os que menos podem. E, Presidente da Comissão, Comissário, não só no *RePowerEU,* mas também no apoio às famílias europeias.

O que precisamos é mesmo de uma resposta solidária europeia para que todos juntos continuemos a apoiar os que travam esta guerra pela liberdade, esta guerra que não procurámos, mas que ajudaremos a vencer.

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, plus personne ne peut ignorer ce que veut le président russe: il a choisi de faire souffrir le peuple ukrainien, de faire souffrir le peuple russe et de nous être hostile. Dorénavant, il est clair que le monde n'a rien à perdre et tout à gagner à une défaite, en Ukraine, de la Russie.

Un Ukrainien me le disait hier: si la Russie perd, il n'y a plus de guerre. Si elle devait gagner, il n'y aurait plus d'Ukraine. Alors je le dis au peuple et à l'armée russes: cessez d'agresser l'Ukraine, vous ne vous en porterez que mieux. L'Ukraine ne souhaite pas agresser la Russie. Volodymyr Zelensky n'a jamais parlé de dénazifier le Kremlin. Vous n'avez rien à gagner et tout à perdre à cette guerre inutile et meurtrière, aucune raison de mourir pour des simulacres de référendums.

Je le dis aux peuples européens: ce n'est pas le moment de flancher, ni dans notre soutien à l'Ukraine – car il donne des résultats –, ni dans nos sanctions vis-à-vis de la Russie, car Vladimir Poutine n'attend que cela. Les menaces nucléaires, les sabotages de gazoducs ne servent qu'à nous intimider.

Nous devons livrer à l'Ukraine plus d'armement, et plus vite, car c'est maintenant que cela se joue. Si nous voulons écourter cette guerre, nous devons tenir. Avec notre soutien, avec notre détermination, l'Ukraine doit gagner, elle peut gagner et elle va gagner.

Slava Ukraïni!

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Putin's regime has continually violated international law since the very beginning of Russia's latest aggression against Ukraine, but actually, since long before that – remember Crimea?

The sham referendums that took place in four Ukrainian regions two weeks ago constitute yet further mockery of international law and democratic principles. These so-called referendums, which happen in military-occupied territories with a brutal war of aggression ongoing and with forced displacements of population, were simply a pretext for the illegal and violent annexation of Ukrainian territories. They were nothing but another of Putin's failed attempts to feign legitimacy for a criminal aggression. Make no mistake: this has got nothing to do with the democratic right to self-determination, which is an honourable right that has to be upheld. These fake referendums are not acts of self-determination. They are an act of external determination. The free will of the people cannot be expressed at gunpoint. Borders should never be changed by the use of force.

We shall continue to stand firmly with the people of Ukraine, imposing more sanctions on those who fuel and sustain the aggression and blatantly disregard basic principles of democracy and international law.

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, vielen Dank! Wir sehen rechtswidrige Annexionen, wir sehen die Mobilmachung, wir hören die Drohung mit dem Einsatz von Atomwaffen.

Der Krieg Russlands gegen die Ukraine ist in eine neue Phase getreten. Wenn die EU weiterhin ernst genommen werden will, muss sie hierauf eine Antwort finden. Und die muss mehr sein als nutzlose Sanktionen, die vor allem die eigenen Länder schädigen.

Aber nicht nur der russisch-ukrainische Krieg bedroht uns. Auch ein beispielloser Akt der Piraterie gegen die Versorgungsinfrastruktur, gegen Nord Stream 1 und 2, hat die Verletzlichkeit Europas gezeigt. Seltsamerweise scheint das aber hier kein Thema zu sein. Alle nehmen es so achselzuckend hin, als sei es egal, dass hier eine der wesentlichen Gasleitungen beschädigt wurde.

Wer war der Täter? Folgende Indizien stehen außer Frage. Erstens: US-Einheiten kreuzen derzeit in der Ostsee. Zweitens: US-Militärhubschrauber aus Danzig waren laut Satellitenaufnahmen kurz vor dem Anschlag dort in der Luft, wo der Anschlag passierte. Der US-Präsident hatte angekündigt, dass er die Inbetriebnahme von Nord Stream 2 in jedem Fall verhindern werde. Nach den Anschlägen verurteilte US-Außenminister Blinken nicht etwa diese Akte der Piraterie, sondern begrüßte sie als großartige Gelegenheit, Flüssiggas an Europa zu verkaufen. Und der frühere polnische Außenminister Sikorski, Mitglied dieses Parlaments, dankte den Amerikanern öffentlich in einem Tweet für die Anschläge.

Wer also können die Täter sein? Für die meisten Medien steht natürlich fest: Es war Putin. Das sagt allerdings nur viel über den Journalismus, ebenso plausibel als Täter sind Nordkorea, Iran oder Greta Thunberg.

Die EU-Kommission sollte hier sehr, sehr genau hinschauen, und wir haben auch bereits einen entsprechenden Antrag auf Aufklärung gestellt, und es wird interessant sein zu sehen, wer von Ihnen diesen Antrag unterstützt.

Dieser Angriff, das muss allen klar sein, hat nicht nur das Potenzial, die NATO zu zerreißen, sondern auch die EU.

Witold Jan Waszczykowski (ECR). – Madam President, Commissioner, 'we should have listened to Poland', Ursula von der Leyen mentioned in the State of the Union address. Poland was warning you not only about the imperial aggressive plans of Russia, we were warning also that your instrument to challenge the threats are inaccurate – the Strategic compass, European autonomy – these are inaccurate to face the Russian threats.

Our recipe was to stick to NATO and transatlantic relations, and who is now helping Ukraine to defend themselves and us Europeans? It's the US, UK and Poland – the country sanctioning and penalising. How will you face the challenge of further escalation?

Cooperation with NATO and US is a good direction. However, how we will have Ukraine back on key terms? Will the EU release funds of EUR 3 billion out of nine promised? Will you force European countries to send more weapons? Will you stop penalising Poland, which is helping Ukraine the most in political, military and humanitarian way?

Manu Pineda (The Left). – Señora presidenta, señora presidenta de la Comisión, vicepresidente, la intervención del señor Weber me obliga a cambiar el inicio de mi intervención. Me parece que el hecho de que el padrino del acuerdo de su partido en Italia con el partido heredero de Mussolini —con el neofascismo italiano— hable aquí de autoritarismo es solamente una mala broma.

Centrándonos en el tema del debate, quiero comenzar condenando, una vez más, la guerra —e invasión— de Rusia contra Ucrania. En un momento en el que la amenaza del uso del armamento nuclear es real, volvemos a insistir en que esta guerra tiene que parar, y nuestra mejor arma sigue siendo la vía diplomática.

Pero no basta con declaraciones de intenciones, y, mucho menos, si vienen de quienes llevan años y años sembrando las condiciones para el enfrentamiento. El señor Putin es el máximo responsable de esta guerra, pero no nos vendan que la OTAN trabaja por la paz, ya que su crecimiento hacia el este durante tantos años evidencia que desea un regreso al mundo bipolar, a una nueva guerra fría. Todo siempre en detrimento del multilateralismo y la soberanía de los pueblos. Tampoco ayuda el autoritarismo del Gobierno ucraniano, que ha ilegalizado once partidos de la oposición y sigue persiguiendo a sindicatos y movimientos sociales del país.

La Unión Europea ha tenido una oportunidad histórica para desarrollar una política exterior autónoma, pero decidió subordinarse de nuevo a los intereses de los Estados Unidos. La ciudadanía europea se encuentra en una situación muy difícil. Son las clases populares quienes tienen que pagar las consecuencias de esta crisis. Nosotros hablamos desde el férreo compromiso por la paz y por la defensa de los derechos de las clases populares, pero la Unión Europea debería repensar lo que está haciendo, aunque sea solo para velar por sus propios intereses. Todavía estamos a tiempo.

Por todo ello, instamos a la diplomacia europea, de nuevo, a reactivar el papel de la OSCE, hoy desaparecida de escena. Este es el mejor camino para alcanzar un acuerdo que ponga fin a la guerra, una necesidad objetiva para la seguridad y la paz en Europa. En vez de mandar armas y hacer llamamientos exaltados, estudiemos la propuesta que ha presentado México en la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas, por ejemplo, en la que proponen conversaciones de paz y mediación tripartita entre la ONU, la India y el Vaticano. Este es el camino adecuado para la desescalada: más diplomacia, no más OTAN.

Miroslav Radačovský (NI). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, som predsedom politickej strany Slovenský patriot. Slovensko sa tu už spomínalo pánom Weberom. Aby som mal ako europoslanec objektívne informácie o situácii na východe Ukrajiny, členovia našej strany sa zúčastnili, resp. boli prítomní v čase, keď sa tam vykonávali referendá. Pokiaľ by som chcel objektívne informovať o situácii na východe Ukrajiny, tak by ma pravdepodobne väčšina z vás ukameňovala a pani von der Leyen by sa musela červenať. Preto nevyužívam daný mi rečnícky čas, za čo sa hlboko ospravedlňujem. Pokiaľ sa týka navrhovanej rezolúcie, hlasovať o návrhu budem objektívne a pravdivo. To znamená ináč ako väčšina europoslancov.

Antonio Tajani (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mai come in questo momento serve un'Europa forte, coesa, unita, che faccia scelte comuni per difendere lo Stato di diritto, per difendere l'indipendenza dell'Ucraina, per impedire che i totalitarismi in tutto il mondo prevalgano sulle democrazie.

Ecco perché serve una Europa credibile anche per quanto riguarda la politica energetica. Ci siamo sempre battuti per avere un tetto al prezzo del gas, non possiamo regalare alla Federazione Russa una divisione che metta in difficoltà famiglie e imprese. Ecco perché dobbiamo anche combattere le speculazioni sul prezzo del gas, controllando quello che succede alla Borsa di Amsterdam. Insomma un'Europa politicamente forte.

Mi permetta, signora Presidente, per questa Europa politicamente forte mi sono battuto negli ultimi ventotto anni della mia vita. Questo è il mio ultimo intervento in quest'Aula e voglio confermare l'impegno per un'Europa politica, per un Parlamento più forte che abbia potere di iniziativa legislativa, perché si possa, nei prossimi anni, tutti quanti noi continuare ad essere fieri cittadini europei.

Ringrazio tutti quanti voi, a cominciare da lei, signora Presidente, ringrazio tutti i colleghi del mio gruppo politico, ma anche quelli degli altri gruppi politici. Ho sempre cercato, anche da Presidente del Parlamento, di essere obiettivo. Mi scuso se ho commesso degli errori, ma ho sempre cercato di rispettare tutti i parlamentari, a qualsiasi forza politica appartenessero.

Grazie ancora. Ringrazio anche tutti i funzionari e gli interpreti per quello che hanno fatto per permetterci di esprimerci nella nostra lingua madre. Grazie a tutti quanti voi. Continuerò, nel Parlamento italiano, a combattere le mie battaglie in favore di un'Europa politica più forte.

Presidente. – Grazie Presidente. In bocca al lupo!

Marek Belka (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Eskalacja działań Rosji, jako odpowiedź na jej kolejne spektakularne porażki, nie jest żadnym zaskoczeniem dla uważnego obserwatora polityki Władimira Putina. Poprzez sfingowane referenda, paniczną mobilizację czy straszenie Europy atakami atomowymi Rosja ma nadzieję na zachowanie resztek specyficznie pojętej potęgi i choć części zagrabionych terytoriów suwerennej Ukrainy. Efekt jest jednak odwrotny od zamierzonego. Nawet najbliżsi sojusznicy zaczynają się od Rosji dystansować, a reszta świata uznaje ją za państwo zbójeckie czy wręcz terrorystyczne.

Jako Europejczycy przeżyliśmy dekady w cieniu zagrożenia atomową apokalipsą. Nie damy się znów wpędzić w życie w wiecznym strachu. Nadal musimy wspierać Ukrainę w jej walce poprzez dostawy broni oraz pomoc ekonomiczną. Konieczne są też dalsze sankcje wobec zbrodniczego reżimu, a także ostateczne przejęcie kontroli nad rosyjskimi aktywami na świecie na poczet odbudowy Ukrainy. Naszą bronią jest tu jedność i współpraca, również ta transatlantycka.

W tym miejscu warto zauważyć, że mimo obrazów z Buczy i Iziumu i wielu innych miejsc są wśród nas w Europie nadal tacy, którzy prawdziwego wroga nie widzą w Moskwie, a w Brukseli czy w Waszyngtonie. Wreszcie musimy trafiać do Rosjan, których codzienność upływa dziś w rytm słynnego utworu *You're in the Army Now* i coraz bardziej pustych półek w sklepach. Marzeń zbrodniarza nie da się podać na obiad. Naprawdę nie ma też sensu ginąć za upadłe imperium. Ukraino, niech moc będzie z tobą.

PRESIDÊNCIA: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA

Vice-Presidente

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, hoge vertegenwoordiger, collega's, na zeven maanden oorlog is de dreiging van een escalatie, zelfs een militaire escalatie, een nucleaire escalatie, groter dan ooit. Uit alles blijkt Poetins wanhoop omdat zijn oorlog mislukt. Maar, collega's, een wanhopige Poetin is een gevaar voor de wereld. Hij zal alle middelen blijven gebruiken om ons te destabiliseren, ons bang te maken en vooral om ons te verdelen. Laten we dat toe? Of blijven we één vastberaden Europees blok zoals bij de start van de oorlog? De koude winter mag onze eensgezindheid niet doen barsten.

Waarom blijft de Commissie weigeren om een Europees prijsplafond op gas in te voeren? Waarom blijft de Raad toelaten dat Hongarije de sterkte van onze sancties bepaalt? En waarom speelt de motor van onze economie nog steeds soloslim in plaats van voor Europese oplossingen te kiezen?

Vrijdag komen de Europese leiders samen op een informele Raad. Informeel of niet, er moeten belangrijke, grote beslissingen genomen worden. Het allerbelangrijkste voor mij is dat Europees antwoord op de energiecrisis. We moeten onze Europese kracht ten volle gebruiken. Of zoals onze Belgische premier Alexander De Croo het zei: we kunnen geen einzelgängers gebruiken nu. Het is tijd om de urgentie van deze crisis in te zien.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, there are clear signs that Putin is in a state of weakness in his war. He also risks to be defeated in Russian society; by the chaotic and arbitrary mobilisation he dismissed the social contract with Russian people.

The vast majority of Russians, who have until now remained indifferent to Putin's war, now have been politicised. Many of them now see that the target of Putin's war is also Russian people. Against all odds, also, the normally obedient media is criticising the failures of Putin.

But, by threatening Ukraine and the whole world with nuclear weapons, a point has been reached where calls for regime change are more than legitimate. They should not be any more a taboo for anyone inside nor outside Russia. Now we must stand by the side of the Russian democratic forces, also those who have had to leave Russia. They never gave up their fight for a democratic future of Russia, even during the ever-growing repression.

So, now is the time when we can make the change, working together with these democratic forces.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Mr President, unfortunately Ursula von der Leyen has left, but at least we have a Commissioner here.

First of all, I can agree with most of you who have said in the last hour that we have to support Ukraine, that Russia is the aggressor. That's absolutely true. There's no doubt about that. But the big question is, how can we go forward? What are the next steps, what can we do for Ukraine? As far as I know, we still import oil from Russia. We are still paying millions of euros every day to Russia. We're still continuing this. We are still waiting for bigger military help for Ukraine. I know exactly, in fact, that there is a deal to give more military support to Ukraine, but there is just one signature missing: that of Mr Scholz, from Germany. Only his signature is missing to give more military support to Ukraine by German companies. OK, we can blame Hungary, yes, also they are pretty much wrong. Sometimes we can blame some other countries, but in the meantime, we are just waiting for German Chancellor to give that one signature to give more military support to Ukraine.

About the blackmailing that the Russians are doing now, of course, now they are losing territories every day in Ukraine and that's amazing. We like this. But now they are blackmailing with nuclear power. And I can see, even in the Western world, that more and more people are getting really afraid, you know, 'maybe they are really so crazy that they would start a nuclear war', 'maybe they will really try to do this'. But the question is, OK, if they're really ready to do this, it will be the suicide of Russia, because finally, at the end of the day, they will lose this war even in a nuclear war. And we are not in a position to say to Russia, 'OK, let's sit down and have diplomacy', because Russia ended diplomacy in the morning of 24 February. In this case today, we have to win in this war in every price.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Pane předsedající, musíme vytrvat v pomoci Ukrajině, samozřejmě kvůli Ukrajině, ale také kvůli míru a bezpečnosti v Evropě. Energetická krize dopadá na různé země různými způsoby, ale nesmíme se nechat Ruskem rozdělit, protože to je jeho cíl. Za žádnou cenu nesmíme podlehnout Putinovým jaderným výhrůžkám a ustoupit mu. Stojíme pevně za Ukrajinou, za její územní integritou a je naší povinností pomáhat v boji proti ruskému agresorovi. Výhružky ruského diktátora, vyhlášení falešných referend a nelegální pokusy začlenit ukrajinské území do Ruské federace jsou totiž jasným důkazem toho, že vojenská pomoc Ukrajině funguje. Když Putin viděl, že se Ukrajincům daří osvobozovat ukrajinská území, přitvrdil ve své rétorice a i v činech. Důkazem je mobilizace, kterou v Rusku provedl, či vojenské přesuny ruských jednotek směrem k místu válečného konfliktu. Putin nemůže válku vyhrát. A my můžeme pomoci k tomu, aby ji prohrál. Právě v tom, že v pomoci Ukrajině vytrváme, nenecháme se vydírat a ukážeme, že jsme silní a jednotní.

Silvia Modig (The Left). – Arvoisa puhemies, Venäjän aggressiot pahenevat. Ydinaseilla uhkailu on itsessään vastoin kansainvälistä oikeutta ja uhkaus, jonka edessä emme peräänny tuestamme Ukrainalle. Nord Stream -kaasuputken räjähtäminen Itämerellä on tutkittava perusteellisesti riippumattoman tahon toimesta, ja meidän on varmistettava, että koko kriittinen infrastruktuurimme voidaan turvata mahdollisilta sabotaaseilta.

Venäjä aloitti energiakriisin rakentamisen jo ennen hyökkäystään Ukrainaan. Kaasuntoimitukset kohtasivat yllättäviä teknisiä ongelmia ja näin kaasun hintaa saatiin keinotekoisesti ylöspäin. Energia on yksi Putinin aseista tässä sodassa, ja se on nyt suunnattu meitä kaikkia kohtaan. Aivan ratkaisevaa EU:n kannalta tulee olemaan ne toimet, joilla me varmistamme, että eurooppalaiset selviävät ensi talvesta. On esitetty paljon hyviä toimia, mutta edelleen peräänkuulutan energiansäästön merkitystä. Sen tulisi olla paljon nykyistä suuremmassa roolissa.

Onnistumisemme edellytys ja vahvin aseemme on yhtenäisyys. Yhtenäisyys niin Venäjään kohdistuvissa pakotteissa kuin yhtenäisyys energiakriisin ratkaisuissa. Yhteinen ratkaisu on meidän kaikkien etu. Venäjä ei myöskään ole järjestänyt mitään kansanäänestyksiä vaan irvokkaan näytelmän, jolla ei ole mitään tekemistä demokratian kanssa vaan jossa pelottelemalla ja uhkailemalla haettiin sumuverhoa laittomille alueliitoksille. Nämä alueet ovat edelleen osa itsenäistä Ukrainaa, emmekä tule koskaan tunnustamaan tätä laitonta yritystä vallata suvereenin valtion alueita.

EU:n tulee jatkaa Ukrainan tukemista, kuunnellen ukrainalaisten toiveita. Tuen pitää olla poliittista, taloudellista, humanitaarista ja tukea Ukrainan mahdollisuuksille puolustaa itseään sotilaallisesti. Meidän on tarjottava pääsy ja turvaa EU:n alueelle, venäläisille toisinajattelijoille ja aseistakieltäytyjille. On myös aika tunnustaa se tosiasia, että meidän on globaalisti päästävä eroon ydinaseista. Ilman ydinaseuhkaa tämäkin tilanne näyttäisi aivan toiselta. Ydinaseuhka ylläpitää ja mahdollistaa konflikteja, ja EU:n tuleekin rauhan synnyttyä ottaa johtajan rooli rakentaaksemme ydinaseeton tulevaisuus.

Márton Gyöngyösi (NI). – Mr President, dear colleagues, the war in the Ukraine has triggered exemplary European unity but it has also shown that Europe is powerless, which is quite remarkable if we consider the aggregate size of our national armies, the aggregate volume of our national defence budgets and the abundance of weapons systems and capacities within the EU.

But now it should be clear to all of us that sanctions are essential to limit Russian aggression, but they are certainly not sufficient to win a war.

The past weeks have shown how dangerous external dependence on energy can become. It is high time to realise the risks inherent in the eternal dependence on the US to guarantee European security. With Trump's four years in office and the dreadful prospect of his return for a second term should be alarming for all of us.

So my question to you, Mr Šefčovič, as the last representative of the Commission in this room today: what are the Commission's plans and proposals for the protection of European citizens from an escalating conflict?

Radosław Sikorski (PPE). – Mr President, I say to Mr Putin: all you have achieved with your bogus annexations is that Ukraine will no longer negotiate with you. Your situation is very precarious. You can no longer win, but you still have some room for manoeuvre.

A previous ruler of Russia, Nicholas II, also attacked what was perceived as a weaker adversary, Japan, in 1904 and also lost both on land and at sea. He concluded a peace, instituted internal reforms and gained himself 12 more years in power.

Mr Putin, you probably won't do it because you're more of an egomaniac than a patriot, and you'll probably end up in some bunker. Steiner will not come and you will go down. The choice is yours.

Sven Mikser (S&D). – Mr President, dear colleagues. Putin's escalation of his war of aggression reveals Russia's strategic failure. By his mobilisation, his illegal annexation and his nuclear sabre-rattling, he is desperately trying to raise the stakes so as to scare Ukrainians and their allies. But Ukrainians are not going to be intimidated by Putin's bluster, and neither should we.

Ukrainians' courage and resolve in defending their homeland has been amazing throughout the conflict, but the recent success on the battlefield also owes to the support they have received and continue to receive from allies in Europe and elsewhere. In order to consolidate their recent gains, Ukraine needs much more of our support. Sure, we all want peace to come to Ukraine as quickly as possible. But, to be durable and sustainable, it will have to be a just peace. In the case of this war, this means the full restoration of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. After Putin's sham referenda and declaration of annexation of Ukraine's sovereign territory, the restoration of Ukraine's territorial integrity effectively means driving the occupiers out by force. The faster this happens, the sooner a just and durable peace returns to Ukraine.

Yes, Europe has done a lot, but now is not the time for self-congratulation, for we have done much, but not enough, whether we compare our performance to that of the Americans or to our own previous commitments. We must not hesitate and we must not be afraid to give Ukraine all the weapons, including tanks, that they need to successfully complete the liberation of their country. Quick and decisive liberation of all Ukraine's territory is the quickest path to a lasting peace and is thus actually de-escalatory.

As to those who aspire to a diplomatic approach, I would say this – yes, when the liberation of all of Ukraine has been made irreversible, then we will indeed have a lot to discuss at the negotiating table, including how to make sure that all those responsible for war crimes are brought to justice, and also the issue of what needs to become of Russia so that it can never again slaughter innocent people and threaten international peace.

Michal Šimečka (Renew). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, Vladimír Putin svoju agresívnu a brutálnu vojnu prehráva. A napadnutá Ukrajina spolu s Európou, ktorá ju vojensky a finančne podporuje, naopak víťazí. A teda sa nesmieme nechať pomýliť ani zastrašiť Putinovými vyhrážkami, použitím jadrových zbraní alebo mobilizáciou, v ktorej viac Rusov ušlo ako nastúpilo. Ani nelegálnou anexiou území, nad ktorými Rusko postupne stráca kontrolu. Lebo to je jediná Putinova taktika. Jediná zbraň je šíriť strach, vydierať všetkých, masakrovať civilistov, páliť územia, manipulovať s cenami energií a ohrozovať kritickú infraštruktúru v Európskej únii. V skutočnosti je slabý. Ak túto vojnu má Ukrajina a Európa po jej boku vyhrať, musíme aj naďalej udržať jednotný postoj Európskej únie. Musíme pritvrdzovať sankcie voči Putinovmu režimu a pokračovať v dodávkach ťažkej vojenskej techniky pre víťazstvo Ukrajiny. Lebo toto víťazstvo bude aj víťazstvom slobodnej a demokratickej Európy.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, iš Europos Sąjungos aukštų pareigūnų lūpų girdime apgailestavimą, kad nebuvo girdimi Baltijos šalių perspėjimai dėl Rusijos planų. Tačiau kokia tų žodžių prasmė, kai iki šiol padėtis mažai kuo pasikeitė. Naujų sankcijų įvedimas vis labiau išsikvepia, kraupūs rusų karių nusikaltimai vis mažiau jaudina. Galiausiai Europa tik reaguoja į Putino žingsnius, vietoj to, kad pirma imtųsi veiksmų nelaukdama dar vieno išpuolio.

Neabejokime, 2014 m. pradėjęs karą Ukrainoje, Kremlius ir toliau sieks savo tikslų. Kalbėjimasis su agresoriumi yra nieko vertas ir skambučių, apeliavimo į sveiką protą diplomatija čia nepadės. Turime suvokti, kad sveiko proto Kremliuje nėra, ir atitinkamai turime elgtis.

Peter Kofod (ID). – Hr. formand! Da Rusland angreb Ukraine, troede mange, at der ville blive tale om en kort krig. Men det blev ikke en kort krig. Nu er situationen fundamentalt forandret. Det går dårligt for Rusland på slagmarken. Rusland fik aldrig en hurtig sejr. Ukrainske styrker er nu ved at presse Rusland tilbage. Den russiske hær har vist sig ineffektiv, og soldaterne ser ud til at være dårligt motiveret. Og nu er Putin så nødt til at indkalde flere soldater, hvilket får russere til at flygte til Vesten i et meget stort tal. Putin må på alle måder have overvurderet sig selv, undervurderet ukrainerne og ignoreret Vestens reaktion. Sanktionerne forsvinder ikke igen. De er kommet for at blive. Jeg støtter dem, og jeg er klar til meget mere.

Før krigen brød ud, var det som om, at mange ledere i Vesten forsømte at lytte til balterne og polakkerne, der længe har advaret om Ruslands og Putins intentioner. Den fejl må vi ikke gentage. Det går ikke, at ledere i Vesten hænger fast i lange og forstående telefonsamtaler med Putin, for Rusland er som land nødt til at lære af de konsekvenser, det medfører, når man umotiveret angriber et fredeligt naboland. Vores opgave må være at gøre Europa mindre afhængigt af Rusland og samtidig holde moralen og kampgejsten oppe hos ukrainerne, så de forhåbentlig kan presse russerne ud af de besatte områder. Europa, Vesten må ikke vige en tomme for Putin. Ikke nu! Aldrig!

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (ECR). – Mr President, Russia's war against Ukraine has started in 2014 and some woke up to it only this year. While we in central-eastern Europe were screaming about the growing danger of Russia's imperial appetite, others in the EU were supporting Russia with generous military and energy contracts. It was a fatal mistake, with heavy repercussions and losses.

Today, many recognise Poland, the Baltics and other countries, frontline countries, were right but not listened to. Today, the same people continue not to listen and not to follow informed advice of central-east European countries. The frontline Central European countries were the only besides the US and UK, to give immediately a big part of the effort and budget to support Ukraine's fight and to receive this time 'true' refugees.

The EU did not help adequately frontline Member States. Many in the EU, even now, are proposing to send military equipment and disburse already promised money; not to mention increase. It is our urgent imperative and duty to give more heavy weapons and more finance and join the US initiative of monthly 1.5 billion transfers to Ukraine's budget, to put to zero and sanction Russia, to enforce payment of reparations to Ukraine and finally, to accept Ukraine in NATO.

Kateřina Konečná (The Left). – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, čas, kdy bylo možné hrát si se slovíčky, pominul. Konflikt na východě Evropy vstoupil do našich domovů a hrozí, že v zimě krutě zaútočí na kvalitu života lidí celé Evropy, a nebezpečí jaderné války dramaticky narostlo. V této chvíli česká vláda, Evropská unie a NATO nedělají nic jiného, než stále přilévají oleje do ohně. Probíhá absurdní soutěž o to, kdo dodá do bratrovražedné války více zbraní, kdo projeví více odvahy bojovat až do posledního Ukrajince. Nedávné teroristické útoky na plynovody z Ruska do Německa nepoškodily zájmy a majetek pouze těchto dvou zemí, bezprostředně ohrozily sociální smír v celé Evropě a také v praxi ukázaly nejednotu Západu, odlišný postoj Washingtonu a Berlína k Ukrajině. A zajisté si pamatujete výhružná slova amerického prezidenta Joe Bidena z počátku února, kdy v přítomnosti německého kancléře vyhrožoval „ukončením" plynovodu Nord Stream. Vyzývám všechny instituce EU, aby využily svého vlivu, chopily se iniciativy a začaly vést mírová a diplomatická jednání. Jedině ta mohou vést k ukončení konfliktu. Čím dříve, tím lépe.

Francesca Donato (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le notizie dal fronte dicono che l'Ucraina sta vincendo la guerra. Ma siamo davvero sicuri che Putin accetterà di perdere senza alzare il livello? La deriva nucleare è una possibilità che diventa ogni giorno più probabile, l'ha detto anche il generale Petraeus, l'ex direttore della CIA, serve evitare la terza guerra mondiale.

Quelli che chiamate i populisti europei chiedono la pace e un negoziato. Però Zelensky, ma anche gli USA e l'Unione europea rispondono di no. Allora quello che io mi chiedo è: l'Unione europea sopravviverà a questa guerra? Io credo proprio di no. Perché dobbiamo chiederci anche se, quando arriveranno le bombe sulle nostre città, faremo come ha fatto il collega Sikorski che, dopo i bombardamenti sui gasdotti, ha detto: «grazie USA». Dovremo dire anche «grazie Unione europea», o almeno questo è quello che diranno i nostri cittadini.

Pensiamo bene a quante vite umane e a quante aziende vogliamo sacrificare. Io vi chiedo: per favore, fermiamo questa follia!

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, the first and most important thing is to observe and recognise the reality on the ground. And the reality is that Ukraine is winning this war, Russia is losing this war and Russia knows it. Russia is answering with aggressiveness and Russia is answering with propaganda.

And our first important duty is to tell the truth to the people of Europe, to make sure that the people of Europe are properly informed. We have to tell to the people that Russia is failing militarily. It is failing politically, economically and it is failing morally.

What do we do? We have to stay united. We have to help each other within the European Union. We have to help our neighbouring countries. We have to help Ukraine and we have to continue sanctioning Russia. Sanctions work, there are no more investments into Russia. Russia has no more access to our top technologies. And next year it will have no more revenues from gas and fossil fuels from us.

We saw last week that Russia is trying to also affect our immediate neighbouring countries. It cut by 30% the gas supplies to the Republic of Moldova, an EU candidate country. We have to help there and, Commissioner Vice-President, amounts which are too small for us, make a big difference and will help keep the Republic of Moldova, an EU candidate country, on the European path.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Mr President, more than seven months since the start of its aggression, things are not going as planned for Russia. What was supposed to be a quick special military operation turned into a long battle, where Ukrainian forces showed exceptional bravery and even started to advance.

The pipeline that was a significant source of financing for Russian aggression is sabotaged. In desperation the Kremlin began to mobilise.

I believe that, once again, this House will confirm a strong-text resolution and this lead the way for future actions. Our demands and suggestions are precise. We want and ask for: another robust package of sanctions targeting anyone involved in these illegal referenda, as we will never recognise their so-called results. Coordinated actions on the visa and asylum applications of the Russian citizens and concrete proposals for advanced military support.

I would also like to reflect on the great sense of unity permanently shown by this House since the start of the Russian aggression on Ukraine. One of the most critical tasks is maintaining unity among our governments and citizens as well. We have to be clear and say: the origin of all the problems that our citizens are dealing with – high energy prices, food supply problems, and security threats – are caused by the actions of the Russian regime.

The firmer we are with our sanctions, the sooner they will end. And the change in Russia should come from within. Therefore, we should increase our support to those in Russia who raise their voices against the Putin regime and can be the drivers of this change.

This war will end Putin's regime. *Slava Ukraini!*

Bernard Guetta (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, la question est aujourd'hui de savoir où nous en sommes.

Côté ukrainien, la contre-offensive constitue un prodigieux succès, puisque après les avancées de l'Est, c'est maintenant vers Kherson que les troupes de libération progressent.

Côté russe, à l'inverse, une débâcle politique s'ajoute à la débâcle militaire. De hauts responsables du régime en sont à s'accuser publiquement les uns les autres d'incurie. C'est du jamais vu dans la Russie poutinienne, et cela nous dit que la chaîne de commandement et le président lui-même ne sont plus intouchables.

C'est le début d'un délitement général également marqué par le rejet de la mobilisation, les premiers signes d'émancipation de l'Asie centrale, le succès de nos sanctions et l'étrange et constante affirmation de M. Prigojine, patron d'une puissante milice nourrissant ses ambitions.

Le crépuscule tombe sur un tsar vieillissant. Il n'en est que plus dangereux, mais il perdra.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, Putin is neither a master strategist nor a geopolitical genius. He is a terrorist who is only capable of bombing children and blackmailing us with doomsday. In these efforts, useful idiots are his main asset, these useful idiots, and they are plenty – from politicians to tech entrepreneurs, should not be allowed to define the narrative.

The chaotic mobilisation of troops and threatening the world with nuclear weapons only prove one thing: Putin is desperate. Desperate because he is losing the war that he vowed to win in three days. Desperate because his sanctions are biting and his propaganda cannot outweigh the empty Russian riches for long. Desperate because he hears the voices of mutiny in the Kremlin corridors getting louder and louder. Putin is Russia's greatest enemy and his end is in sight.

Until then, we will continue standing firmly with Ukraine. Arm them with heavy weapons. Support the EU initiative for tanks so that its brave people finally win this war.

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, face à une guerre, le droit international commande de dénoncer l'agresseur et de prendre la défense de l'agressé. Je condamne donc avec vigueur l'agression contre l'Ukraine ainsi que les annexions décidées par la Russie de quatre régions ukrainiennes. Il s'agit d'une atteinte inadmissible à l'intégrité territoriale d'un État souverain. Le refus du règlement armé des conflits est une règle fondamentale du droit international. De Grotius à Aristide Briand, en passant par Victor Hugo, les défenseurs d'une société des nations pacifiques ont toujours rejeté l'emploi de la force armée.

Ces exigences s'adressent bien sûr en premier lieu à la Russie et à son président, qui a hélas choisi d'en appeler à l'agression armée contre un pays souverain. Mais elles concernent aussi la présidente de la Commission européenne, qui est récemment venue nous dire que seule l'issue militaire devait conclure ce conflit dramatique qui déchire des peuples européens.

Non, l'Union européenne ne doit pas céder à un bellicisme aveugle. Que chacun en ait bien conscience ici. Ce conflit ne pourra être définitivement arrêté que par un cessez-le-feu et une négociation. Les bellicistes qui trônent à Bruxelles doivent cesser cette folle escalade qui obéit au mot d'ordre de Washington visant à l'humiliation de la Russie. À l'exemple du général de Gaulle, je souhaite un monde multipolaire dans lequel la France et l'Europe joueraient leur rôle de puissance de paix plutôt que d'accepter d'être le marchepied de la toute-puissance américaine.

Nicola Procaccini (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa guerra purtroppo ci coinvolge tutti, indirettamente sul piano militare, di sicuro sul piano economico. Due errori non vanno compiuti. Il primo è che non bisogna fare scelte solitarie, soprattutto in materia energetica. Il tetto al prezzo del gas e dell'energia elettrica, se dovesse finalmente arrivare nei prossimi giorni, arriverà comunque troppo tardi per le imprese e le famiglie d'Italia e d'Europa. Bisogna fare presto.

Il secondo errore da non fare è dividere il fronte interno. La campagna politica in atto contro alcuni governi conservatori è una clamorosa ingiustizia che colpisce proprio gli Stati europei che maggiormente stanno sopportando il peso della crisi geopolitica corrente.

Sono italiano e non mi sfugge quale sarà il prossimo governo a finire nel mirino qui dentro. Mi auguro solo che l'odio delle sinistre per la democrazia non superi l'odio di Vladimir Putin per la democrazia, ma consentitemi di essere un po' pessimista in questo senso.

Andrea Bocskor (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! 224 napja tart a háború, mely már több ezer áldozatot, köztük civilek és gyermekek életét követelte, és amely miatt több mint 10 millióan kényszerültek elhagyni otthonaikat. A Fidesz európai parlamenti képviselőcsoportja elítélte és elítéli az orosz agressziót, az ukrán területek annektálását és a háborús bűncselekményeket. A kezdetektől kiállunk Ukrajna mellett, támogatjuk Ukrajna területi integritását, és nem fogadjuk el az orosz látszatnépszavazások eredményét. Magyarország történetének legnagyobb humanitárius segítségnyújtási programjában eddig már több mint egymillió menekültet fogadtunk be Ukrajnából. Mi a mielőbbi békében vagyunk érdekeltek, amely Ukrajna szuverenitásának és területi integritásának tiszteletben tartásán alapul. Csak ez vethet véget a háborús szenvedéseknek. Csak ez állíthatja meg ezt az őrületet.

Méltatlan és elfogadhatatlan azonban összekapcsolni az Ukrajna melletti határozott és egységes politikai kiállást, az ukrán emberek iránti szolidaritást, az azonnali és teljes körű Oroszországgal szembeni energiaszankciók éles vitákat kiváltó, az Uniót megosztó és ellentmondásos hatású gyakorlati kérdésével.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Entschlossenheit, Einigkeit, Solidarität, Sicherheit und Unterstützung sind in diesen Minuten von allen gefragt.

Ich hatte die Möglichkeit, in der letzten Woche für unser Parlament in der ukrainischen Hauptstadt Kiew zu sein und viele Gespräche zu führen. Mein Arbeitsbesuch fiel genau auf jenen Tag, an dem Putin die Annexion weiterer ukrainischer Gebiete verkündete. Mit diesem unakzeptablen historischen Unrecht und seinen unverantwortlichen, beunruhigenden Entscheidungen, den illegalen Scheinreferenden, der Atomwaffendrohung und der Mobilmachung, dreht Putin immer weiter an der Eskalationsschraube.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, mich haben der gemeinsame Wille, die Entschlossenheit und das Durchhaltevermögen der Ukrainerinnen und Ukrainer stark beeindruckt. Aus diesem Grunde unterstütze ich die Verschärfung der Sanktionen. Ich unterstütze das vorgestellte Maßnahmenpaket der Kommission, und ich unterstütze die Maßnahmen, die die Kommissionspräsidentin heute vorgestellt hat, um den Energiemarkt neu zu ordnen und einen neuen Preisfindungsmechanismus in die Wege zu leiten.

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz (S&D). – Mr President, Russia continues its centuries-long tradition of conquering new lands and other nations. It neglects the fact that it is a brutal breach of international law.

Being an economic dwarf feeling that in the future its main sources of wealth will lose much of their present significance, it wants to strengthen its international position with use of force. Having little to say in scientific and technological competition, Russian leaders, supported by many ordinary people, want other nations to feel fear.

Then there is a personal obsession of their leader who would like very much to rebuild something similar to the Soviet Union. Aggression against Ukraine is a step in this direction. This is a major violation of law. Aggressors are responsible for a terrible number of killed people, demolished cities and villages, bombarded infrastructure.

To hide compromising battle failures, they decided to officially steal part of Ukraine and threaten the rest of the world with the use of nuclear arms.

We all, not only Europeans, must understand that this is equal to the final termination of life on Earth. Giving up is not an option. It will not stop Russia. The only thing we can and should do is to support the victim, Ukraine, as much as possible and as much as needed to defeat an aggressor and to show that we are able to defend life, law and liberty.

Dacian Cioloș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, cred că în ultimele luni, atât noi, ca reprezentanți ai cetățenilor, cât și cei care conduc instituțiile Uniunii Europene, am învățat un cuvânt important - curajul. Am fost alături de Ucraina în acest război criminal, nejustificat și neprovocat, pornit de Putin încă de la început. Am ajutat Ucraina să-și exporte cerealele. Am primit refugiați din calea războiului. Am trimis ajutor umanitar și militar fără vreo frică de amenințările Rusiei. Curajul Uniunii este azi răsplătit prin prăbușirea frontului rușilor în mai multe regiuni. Curajul Uniunii, care s-a inspirat din cel al ucrainienilor, trebuie să facă din această Uniune un jucător geopolitic și economic major în lume.

Sprijinul nostru pentru integritatea teritorială, suveranitatea și independența Ucrainei nu trebuie să ia pauză acum. Investiția aceasta în libertate și democrație este parte din valorile pe care s-a creat Uniunea Europeană. Și cât timp vom face asta? Cât timp vom avea curaj? Niciun dictator nu se va putea agăța de putere, nici măcar Putin.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, bien sûr, il nous faut aujourd'hui renforcer les sanctions, renforcer toutes les aides à l'Ukraine pour obtenir la victoire militaire de l'Ukraine et la fin des atrocités. Le Haut-représentant nous disait à quel point ce qui se joue, c'est un conflit de civilisations, un conflit de valeurs déjà mis en scène par Vladimir Poutine.

Malheureusement, ce conflit de civilisations, ce conflit de valeurs, il est aussi au sein des sociétés européennes et cela joue sur l'unité indispensable de l'Union européenne. Regardez toute l'extrême droite essayant aujourd'hui de reconstruire leurs accommodements, leur complaisance avec Poutine en utilisant la hausse des prix alimentaires, la hausse des prix de l'énergie et les injustices sociales au service de leur vision sur les valeurs.

Alors la Commission européenne, pardonnez-moi, mais sur la question du découplage entre le prix du gaz et le prix de l'électricité, vous avez trop tardé. Il faut agir plus vite aussi sur la taxation des superprofits. Un exemple? Total a déjà reversé, en acompte, en avance, 2,6 milliards d'euros à ses actionnaires. C'est plus que ce que met le budget de la France sur la rénovation thermique.

S'il n'y a pas de justice sociale dans la transition énergétique pour le climat, s'il n'y a pas de justice sociale face à la guerre en Ukraine, à ce moment-là, nous perdrons l'unité européenne, et le conflit de valeurs, il y a peu de chances que nous le gagnions aussi.

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Mit dem Sanktionenwahnsinn, der heute erneut von einer links-konservativen Mehrheit hier im Haus und der Kommission, bestehend aus Grünen, aus Sozialdemokraten, aus Konservativen, heraufbeschworen wird, wird auch dieser Kontinent Zug um Zug an die Wand gefahren.

Machen Sie doch die Augen auf, wie es den Menschen draußen geht mit Rekordinflation, mit Konkursen, mit Pleiten, mit Armut. Die Menschen wissen nicht, wie sie durch den Winter kommen. Der Ratschlag an diese Menschen heißt: Hört doch auf zu heizen, duscht nicht mehr und friert doch durchaus den Winter hindurch. Ich halte das für einen abgrundfalschen Weg, und zwar nicht nur aus der ökonomischen, sondern auch aus der menschlichen Sichtweise heraus.

Es gibt in diesen schweren Zeiten hier Stimmen, die sich für Frieden aussprechen – und es sind nicht die bösen Rechten, wie Sie hier meinen. Es sind durchaus illustre Stimmen wie die des aktuell wahrscheinlich erfolgreichsten Unternehmers, Elon Musk. Es gibt Stimmen, die sich für den Frieden aussprechen, wie etwa den Papst, der hier mahnt, dazu an den Tisch zu kehren und endlich einen Weg zu finden, damit das Sterben endet, damit auch in Europa der Wohlstand gesichert bleibt, damit wir diesen Winter hindurch eine Energieversorgung haben, dass die Menschen nicht frieren müssen oder Angst haben, ihre Jobs zu verlieren, ihren Wohlstand in den Sand zu setzen, ihre Sparguthaben durch eine Rekordinflation zu verlieren und diesen Kontinent in immer größere Probleme hineinzumanövrieren.

Ich kann daher erneut nur an Sie appellieren, hier mit einer starken europäischen Stimme dafür zu plädieren, die Kriegsparteien an einen Tisch zu zwingen und gemeinsam an einer Lösung zu arbeiten, mit der alle leben können.

Středa 5. října 2022

PREDSEDÁ: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podpredseda

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, today I will be positive because we have a quality resolution ahead of us, which contains all important elements – our reminders that Russia bears the full responsibility for the war, our reiteration of the full support for Ukraine, including our call to increase the massive military assistance, and also calling to explore the possibility for lend-lease military assistance; something what I have already proposed during the last plenary. Also, we are rightly condemning the so-called referenda to annex the four Ukrainian regions as illegal and illegitimate.

And, last but not least, we are also condemning the recent Russian threats to use nuclear weapons as irresponsible and dangerous, and calling that we would not be deterred in our further assistance to Ukraine and self-defence. That's all good.

Maybe one thing is missing here, and that's to designate that threatening the use of nuclear force should be labelled or designed as a threat against peace and humanity. So let's work on that because it's unprecedented rhetoric by Putin.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η προσάρτηση ουκρανικών εδαφών, που ανακοίνωσε ο πρόεδρος Πούτιν, ρίχνει κι άλλο λάδι στη φωτιά του ιμπεριαλιστικού πολέμου, όπως και η αμερικανο-νατοϊκή στήριξη βέβαια στην αντιδραστική κυβέρνηση Ζελένσκι με βαρύ οπλισμό και άλλα μέσα. Σηματοδοτείται νέα ένταση αντιπαράθεσης μεταξύ του ευρωατλαντισμού και του υπό διαμόρφωση ευρασιατικού μπλοκ με επικεφαλής την Κίνα και τη Ρωσία, αλλά και των ανταγωνισμών εντός της Ευρωζώνης μεταξύ Γερμανίας, Γαλλίας, Ιταλίας στο φόντο ενεργειακών οικονομικών προβλημάτων. Οι εκατέρωθεν απειλές για χρήση πυρηνικών όπλων, οι δολιοφθορές σε αγωγούς και κρίσιμες υποδομές οδηγούν σε ανυπολόγιστες συνέπειες για τους λαούς της Ρωσίας και της Ουκρανίας, αλλά και όλου του κόσμου, που ήδη πληρώνει το κόστος της ακρίβειας της ενεργειακής φτώχειας.

Σε αυτές τις συνθήκες είναι άμεση ανάγκη η απεμπλοκή της Ελλάδας από τον πόλεμο, τους αμερικανο-νατοϊκούς σχεδιασμούς, που πολλαπλασιάζουν τους κινδύνους για τον λαό μας. Να σταματήσει τώρα η αποστολή στρατιωτικού υλικού στην Ουκρανία, η χρησιμοποίηση της ελληνικής επικράτειας και των υποδομών της χώρας ως ορμητηρίου πολέμου. Και βεβαίως η ανάπτυξη της αυτοτελούς πάλης των λαών σε κάθε χώρα είναι επομένως σήμερα επιτακτικά αναγκαία.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señor presidente, Putin continúa con su escalada bélica: la llamada a los reservistas, las amenazas nucleares, los referéndums ilegítimos.

Europa debe responder firmemente con las sanciones a Rusia, sin ambages ante este criminal de guerra. Ante la tiranía, no se retrocede ni un paso.

Pero también nos enfrentamos a la batalla económica de la guerra, contra la inflación y los precios de la cesta de la compra y de la energía. Hay que dar una respuesta urgente a las familias y a las pymes. No llegan a fin de mes.

En España la cesta de la compra ha pasado de ser de las más baratas de la Unión a una de las más caras. Las empresas están triplicando sus costes por la subida de la energía. Los ciudadanos y las empresas ya ahorran energía, no porque se lo pidamos nosotros: es que no pueden pagarla.

En España, mientras las familias se asfixian económicamente, el Estado recaudará 30 000 millones más por la inflación que el año anterior. Hay que devolver ese dinero a los bolsillos de los ciudadanos. Hay que bajar impuestos y no arruinar a millones de familias y empresas.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Herr talman! Kommissionen, rådet! Rysslands hänsynslösa krig drabbar Ukrainas befolkning varje dag, och det hotar Europas fred och säkerhet. När Ryssland nu trappar upp, anser vi socialdemokrater att kommissionens uppmaning om enighet och solidaritet är avgörande och att kommissionär Johanssons riktlinjer kring visum är rimliga.

I detta säkerhetspolitiska läge är det kritiskt att de läckor som har uppdagats vid gasledningarna Nord Stream 1 och 2 i Östersjön nu utreds ordentligt. Detta troliga sabotage har skett i de svenska och danska ekonomiska zonerna och är mycket allvarligt. Det är bara några sjömil från där jag bor.

Putins kallblodiga agerande i Ukraina och de illegala annekteringarna måste få ett stopp. Vi, vi i EU, måste fortsätta vårt starka samarbete. En sak är nämligen säker: Putin ska inte gå segrande ur detta.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (Renew). – Mr President, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, Europe has done a tremendous job. Europe has done a lot of things, including military support, financial support, but it is not a time for self-celebration. We must continue our support for the brave Ukrainians who are fighting not only for their designation, for their identity and belonging, but they are fighting for us, for Europeans, for European values. They deserve our admiration and great support under the leadership of President Zelensky and certainly the brave Ukrainians.

Secondly, we have to resist. Every time Europe is tested, tested by foreign actors, by big powers, by invaders. This time I think there is a greater test of our unity. We have to resist and put together the European Union because only if we are able to come together will we be able to overcome the crisis. Indeed, there are many – starting with energy and ending with the social consequences of the crisis.

But one thing is clear: unity is the key – unity within the Council, but also unity within the European institutions. So let's unite Europe as never before.

Jakop G. Dalunde (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Putin påstår att befolkningen i Donetsk, Luhansk, Cherson och Zaporizjzja har gjort sitt val i så kallade folkomröstningar, men de är folkrättsvidriga. Det är en lögn, precis som annekteringen av Krim har varit ända sedan detta krigs början 2014.

Rysslands annektering av ukrainska regioner är ett brott mot folkrätten. Listan över de krigsbrott som Putin står anklagad för har blivit ofattbart lång. Massakrer mot Ukrainas befolkning når knappt tidningarnas förstasidor längre.

Vi får inte låta detta krig bli ett bakgrundsbrus. Vi får inte tro att energikrisen är det värsta som drabbar Europa denna vinter. Det är kriget. Och våra systrar och bröder i Ukraina betalar det högsta priset varje dag som vi i Europa inte tar steget att sluta finansiera detta krig. Vi måste sluta köpa fossil energi från Ryssland.

Dominik Tarczyński (ECR). – Mr President, 'we should have listened to Poland', Ursula von der Leyen said during her State of the Union speech. She says we should listen to Poland. We should have listened to Poland. But you didn't want to listen. You didn't want to listen about Nord Stream. You didn't want to listen about illegal migration. You didn't want to listen about Putin. And you didn't want to listen about sanctions. Sanctions?

What about Russian diamonds? Why there is no embargo on Russian diamonds? Why? Because the capital of the diamond industry, Antwerp, in Belgium, would be unhappy, isn't it? Why there is no sanctions on Russian diamonds? Nord Stream is destroyed, but the diamonds are making money for Russia.

So stop lecturing Poland. Stop pointing us with your finger. Stop lecturing us about democracy. Do not be a hypocrite. Take actions, not beautiful words. Be like Poland. Be brave. Believe in your own nations instead of being dependent on Russian roubles. Be brave. Be like Poland.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovani kolege, poštovani građani, objektivnije sagledavanje političkih odnosa supersila Rusije i Sjedinjenih Američkih Država, moglo je dovesti do sprječavanja rata.

Zamislimo i zapitajmo se: da je Meksiko odlučio pristupiti Ruskoj Federaciji i postaviti nuklearne i druge projektile na granicu sa SAD om, kakva bi bila reakcija Sjedinjenih Američkih Država? Sankcije. Imali smo sedamdeset godina povijesnog iskustva u tome kako utječu sankcije na pokušaj svrgavanja izabranih predstavnika te vlasti. Nakon sedamdeset godina uvođenja ekonomskih sankcija, i to najviše razine, Kubi i Sjevernoj Koreji, i dan danas, sedam desetljeća kasnije, na vlasti su iste dinastije.

Pa zar nismo ništa naučili? Moramo se okrenuti diplomaciji. Rat će dovesti do nuklearnog rata i pogibije stotina milijuna ljudi. Moramo koristiti iskustva povijesti i okrenuti se miru.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, Украйна се сражава храбро срещу руската агресия от началото на войната през 2014 година. Украинските граждани, независимо от техния етнически произход, защитават самоотвержено своята страна. Всички очаквания на агресора в Кремъл, че тяхната победа ще се случи бързо, не се сбъдват.

Контраофанзивата на Украйна принуди Путин да прибегне до безумни стъпки, потъпквайки елементарни международни и морални норми, да анексира незаконно територии на съседна държава – суверенна и независима, призната от ООН в границите, в които съществува, призната и от самата Руска федерация с гаранциите, които тя дава с Будапещенския меморандум. Играта с атомната карта представлява поредна безотговорна ескалация на напрежение и шантаж.

Европейският съюз и страните членки са длъжни да продължат с масивна подкрепа за Украйна – военна, финансова, разузнавателна, икономическа, инфраструктурна, медицинска, хуманитарна.

Желанието на Украйна за членство в НАТО трябва да бъде уважено. Срамно беше поведението на предишното българско правителство на Петков, което не подкрепи изпращането на военна техника за Украйна. Колеги от ляво, това беше направено в полза на вашата партия.

Тъжно е, че България не се присъедини и към позицията на централно- и източноевропейските държави по темата „Украйна и НАТО“, въпреки че огромното мнозинство от българите гласуваха за проевропейски партии на изборите в неделя. България има нужда сега от стабилно проевропейско управление. ГЕРБ ще гарантира това и ще направи всичко възможно това да се случи.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, eina jau aštuntas Rusijos atnaujinto karo prieš Ukrainą mėnuo. Per juos buvo daug netekčių, liūdesio, baimės, bet kartu jie buvo pilni Ukrainos žmonių ir jų sąjungininkų susitelkimo ir ryžto nepasiduoti agresijai ir prievartai.

Agresoriaus praėjusią savaitę vykdyti priverstiniai suklastoti pseudoreferendumai parodo tik tai, kad Rusija nesiruošė ir nesiruošia elgtis pagal civilizuoto pasaulio taisykles. Kolegos, išgirskite, V. Putinas ir jo aplinka supranta tik jėgos kalbą. Todėl vienintelis būdas išspręsti šį konfliktą – išlaisvinti Ukrainos okupuotas žemes, tam reikia dar gausesnio ir geresnio ginklų tiekimo Ukrainai dabar. Paskutiniu metu V. Putinas kaip pasiutęs bulius mojuoja branduolinio ginklo korta. Turime nedviprasmiškai pabrėžti, kad tokiu atveju Rusija panaikintų visus tabu ir visi Rusijos kariniai objektai tiek okupuotoje Ukrainoje, tiek Rusijos teritorijoje, įskaitant požeminius V. Putino bunkerius, atsidurtų atsakomojo smūgio taikinyje. Derybos ir taika galimi tik nugalėjus agresorių. Išlikime vieningi ir solidarūs. *Slava Ukraini*.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein (Renew). – Mr President, colleagues, Putin, in fact, is what we witness in this very room. We were never as united as during this debate. And this unity from one debate to another is more and more visible. Even Alexandr Vondra was positive this time.

There are, of course, some shameful exceptions, but they are not even worth mentioning them. The determination of our leaders to support Ukraine is also more clear from day to day, week to week, month to month than what we heard from Roberta Metsola, Josep Borrell, Ursula von der Leyen is one voice or the voices that complete each other. Member States, citizens, we all must follow.

It is not even those words. It is not only words because they became facts, actions or very clear plans for the future and of such a European Union, I am really proud. Only so, by strengthening our policies, we strengthen also our sovereignty. Not only we need to be sovereign, but also Ukraine needs a strong, united, sovereign ready to pay the price, because we know that otherwise the price will be much higher.

Piernicola Pedicini (Verts/ALE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissario, io credo che questa volta le persone abbiano davvero molta paura. Hanno paura perché vedono che questa escalation non è voluta soltanto da una parte, ma è voluta da entrambe le parti. Non hanno quindi paura soltanto di Putin e delle sue minacce. Hanno paura anche di noi occidentali.

Io voglio rileggere una dichiarazione di Biden rilasciata a febbraio prima dell'invasione russa: «Se la Russia invaderà l'Ucraina, abbatteremo il Nord Stream e faremo in modo che non esista più». Ecco, queste dichiarazioni fanno paura e creano confusione, perché non si capisce bene dove ci vogliono portare. E non si capisce bene neanche che cosa vuole fare davvero l'Unione europea, visto che nessun capo di Stato e nessun capo di governo ha fatto davvero un passo nella direzione della pace.

Io credo che l'Unione europea deve assumere un ruolo terzo per fermare questa guerra nell'interesse di tutti. L'unico capo di Stato che ha avuto il coraggio di dire qualcosa in questa direzione è stato il Papa: Putin fermi la guerra e Zelensky sia aperto a serie proposte di pace. Perciò, colleghi, vi esorto, ascoltiamo almeno le parole del Papa.

Assita Kanko (ECR). – Voorzitter, geachte collega's, de EU en de NAVO dreigen meegezogen te worden in een spiraal van escalatie door de houding van Rusland in Oekraïne. Illegale annexatie, sabotage van pijpleidingen, gebruik van energie als wapen tegen onze burgers en ons industrieel weefsel. En nu de dreiging met een kernwapen.

West-Europa had zich in slaap laten wiegen, terwijl Poetin al lang een hybride oorlog voerde. Nu beseffen wij ten volle dat in zijn regime de leugen regeert, dat hij de randen opzoekt en dat hij niet maalt om het internationale recht. Dat schendt hij nu dagelijks in Oekraïne door doelbewust burgers en civiele infrastructuur zonder militair belang te treffen.

De Europese Unie dient over haar eigen schaduw te stappen en Poetin duidelijk te maken dat wij niet zullen toegeven aan zijn chantage. Dat wij deze crisis zullen aangrijpen om de energietransitie versneld door te voeren en onze energieonafhankelijkheid te verzekeren. Dat wij onze cruciale infrastructuur zullen beveiligen. Dat wij Oekraïne zullen blijven steunen tegen zijn onwettige aanvalsoorlog. Dat wij zijn oorlogsmisdaden zullen berechten. Dat wij hem aanraden niet over te gaan tot de inzet van een kernwapen, maar dat wij daar desgevallend gepast tegen zullen reageren. Dat wij niet tegen zijn volk maar tegen zijn regime gekant zijn. Dat wij na deze oorlog één op regels gebaseerde Europese en internationale orde zullen herstellen.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, a escalada da guerra de Putin, com a mobilização de reservistas, anexações ilegítimas, ameaças nucleares, impõe que a União Europeia esteja mais unida do que nunca e que o apoio à Ucrânia seja sistemático.

É por isso que temos de perguntar ao Grupo S&D, aos Verdes, aos Liberais que posição é que têm sobre a ação unilateral do governo Scholz, do governo socialista liberal verde, de dar 200 mil milhões de euros sem nenhuma coordenação, sem nenhuma articulação com a União Europeia e com os seus parceiros para subsídios à energia, destruindo a confiança entre os Estados e fragmentando o mercado único.

Sim, eu quero perguntar à Senhora Iraxte Pérez:

What is the position of S&D Group on Scholz's decision to take action alone giving EUR 200 billion of subsidies against all the coordination with our partners?

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D). – Mr President, Europe has a common and share a common understanding and it's very clear we stand with Ukraine to help it defend its territory, each square meter, and to stay a sovereign state.

We need to make the world see that any threat to Russians is from their own president. It's not from NATO, the EU or Europe, it's their president who will threaten their morality, economical stand, and sending men to Ukraine to kill Ukrainians.

But in this war we have on our continent, we also need to protect the rest of Europe. Security is the highest priority – whether it's an energy crisis or is it unbearable prices, the lack of energy because of so much reducing energy from Russia. It is a cold winter to manage if we don't succeed with the savings too.

I welcome the word from the Commission President to raise the protection of all the critical infrastructure. And also I welcome the words and general guidelines for visa issue, the Commission statement that every Member State should take into account the security when issuing visas to Russians.

Elsi Katainen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvä komissaari, ministeri, sabotaasi Itämeren kaasuputkessa, laittomat kansanäänestykset ja alueliitokset Euroopassa, toistuvat siviilien joukkomurhat ja ydinaseilla uhittelu – jokainen tietää tekijän näiden kauheuksien takana.

Meidän Euroopassa on sisäisen syyttelyn sijaan keskityttävä ratkaisemaan tätä kriisiä. Mitä pikemmin, sen enemmän on voittajia.

Jos tämä julma sota jotain opettaa niin sen, että meidän ei enää pidä rakentaa uusia riippuvuuksia diktatuureihin. Eurooppalaisessa omavaraisuudessa vihreä siirtymä on keskeisen tärkeää, mutta se ei saa olla ainoa pyhä totuutemme. Meidän on pidettävä huolta meidän omasta huoltovarmuudestamme. Se tarkoittaa laajaa energiapalettia, mihin komission yritykset rajoittaa bioenergian tuotantoa eivät sovi.

Ennen kaikkea meidän on jatkettava Ukrainan tukea. Mitä alhaisempia tekoja Venäjä tekee, sen korkeammalle Euroopan yhtenäisyys nousee. Kun kuvaan tulevat erilaiset näkemykset energiasta tai vaikkapa viisumeista, EU:n rivit horjuvat. Siihen meillä ei ole varaa, ja siksi meidän on pystyttävä yhtenäisempiin päätöksiin.

Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, a cold winter lies ahead for Putin and his cronies. Russia's attempts this week to illegally annex four regions in Ukraine have been rightfully condemned. This is an age of hybrid warfare, and the Nord Stream attacks reminds us that we are vulnerable.

I am encouraged by the plan presented by the Commission President this morning to protect our critical infrastructure. But I am concerned about the security of our infrastructure, our underground cables, particularly off the coast of my own country, Ireland. These cables are crucial to the functioning of Europe's digital services. And a recent report found that the Irish Defence Forces cannot adequately protect them.

So we need to urgently invest in our defence capacity, in cybersecurity and in defending our crucial infrastructure at this perilous time.

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Mr President, first of all, of course, congratulations to the victorious Ukrainians. It is clear that the end of the war depends only on how much weapons the West delivers to Ukraine. In some way it's a shame for the EU that the United States delivered EUR 25 billion value of weapons and the whole European Union support, together with all the Member States, is only less than EUR 6 billion.

The same is true with financial aid. The European Union is heavily behind the United States' assistance. It's not enough, our solidarity statements. Real EU money is needed. Sanctions are working. But the most special next sanction on Putin would be the immediate creation of a special tribunal on crimes of aggression, which would target directly Putin.

Ukrainian military performance is above all the NATO standards. Not Ukraine should ask for NATO membership, but NATO should ask Ukraine to join, because Ukraine is implementing NATO mission to stop Russia's imperial expansion to the West. We can help Russians to bury their imperial dreams with immediate Ukraine NATO membership and negotiations on EU membership starting early next year.

We shall show to Russia that Ukraine is gone from an imperial grey zone.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono passati più di sette mesi da quando l'esercito russo, su ordine di Vladimir Putin, iniziava a invadere l'Ucraina. Messo ora di fronte ai fatti e al fallimento del suo piano, il regime russo sta agendo sempre più in modo criminale e ricattatorio.

L'Unione europea deve essere unita nel condannare le annessioni illegali avvenute con dei referendum farsa e deve invece sforzarsi di portare al tavolo tutti i principali attori mondiali per lavorare per una pace giusta. Giovedì si riunirà per la prima volta la Comunità politica europea, un progetto nato per dare subito un ancoraggio stabile all'integrazione europea e alla sicurezza dell'Ucraina. Andiamo avanti in questa direzione.

Il ruolo autonomo e una voce forte dell'Europa possono essere decisivi per evitare un'escalation che veda Russia e Stati Uniti impiantare un nuovo bipolarismo da guerra fredda. Non ne abbiamo bisogno. Serve invece coraggio e ambizione. Il mondo è cambiato. Cambi anche l'Unione europea, superando le divisioni e lavorando per costruire una pace duratura.

Asger Christensen (Renew). – Hr. formand! Jeg har en grundlæggende tro på nationalstaternes frihed til selv at bestemme og vælge, hvor man vil høre til. Derfor er det helt uacceptabelt med den annektering, som Rusland har foretaget med start den 24. februar, og nu senest med den sabotage, vi har set tæt på Danmark og Sverige i Østersøen. Så i kølvandet på krigen ser vi krigsforbrydelser, som er 2022 helt, helt uværdige. Den russiske aggression sætter en stopper for eksport af fødevarer fra Ukraine, med de store konsekvenser det har for tredjelande. Krigen har også ført en alvorlig energikrisen med sig, som får energipriserne til at stige til himlen, og som har store konsekvenser for de europæiske husholdninger og virksomheder. Vi ser ind i en lang og kold vinter. Derfor skal vi handle nu. Når Putin tvinger os til at skrue ned for varmen, så må vi øge vores energiproduktion af vedvarende energi, kul, olie og skifergas. Sådan beskytter vi en europæisk suverænitet.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident der Europäischen Kommission, Herr Ratsvertreter, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Russische Teilmobilisierung, nukleares Säbelrasseln, unrechtmäßige Annexion der besetzten Gebiete: Putin führt einen immer aggressiveren Angriffskrieg. Die Ukraine verteidigt sich tapfer, kämpft für sich selbst, aber auch für unsere Interessen und braucht weiter unsere volle Unterstützung. Ich begrüße, dass an einem achten Sanktionspaket jetzt gearbeitet wird.

Der Krieg trifft aber auch uns in der Europäischen Union massiv. Wir müssen alles unternehmen, um die explodierenden Energiepreise in den Griff zu bekommen. Haushalte können ihre Rechnungen nicht mehr bezahlen, die horrenden Strom- und Gaspreise treiben unsere Betriebe in die Insolvenz. Ich begrüße die beschlossenen Notmaßnahmen der Energieminister. Sie sind ein wichtiger erster Schritt, aber sie müssen jetzt auch schnell und unbürokratisch umgesetzt werden, und es müssen noch weitere Maßnahmen folgen.

Wir brauchen erstens eine Gaspreisbremse, ohne die Versorgungssicherheit zu gefährden. Die Gaspreisbremse löst nicht alle Probleme, aber sie schafft Luft, um das Angebot hier etwas hochzufahren. Wir brauchen zweitens einen gemeinsamen Einkauf von Gas und Flüssiggas, und wir müssen unser Strompreisindex-System überarbeiten, wie die aktuelle Situation gezeigt hat.

Marina Kaljurand (S&D). – Austatud istungi juhataja! Head kolleegid! Viimased nädalad on olnud murrangulised ja võib tunduda, et sõda on jõudmas lõppstaadiumisse. Ukraina võit on vääramatu ja Putini häving on vaid aja küsimus. Kuid küsimus on, millal see juhtub ja kui palju halba jõuab Putini režiim veel teha. Selles olukorras on Ukraina igakülgne toetamine olulisem kui kunagi varem: üheskoos, solidaarselt ja jõuliselt. Ka siis, kui see tähendab majandusraskusi meie inimestele – need ei ole võrreldavad sõjapõrguga. Kõhklejatele on mul üks soovitus. Minge Ukrainasse ja rääkige ukrainlastega!

Me ei tohi väsida ja me ei tohi järele anda neile, kes räägivad „rahust iga hinnaga". Rahu saab tulla ainult Ukraina poolt määratud tingimustel ja need sõnastas president Zelenskõi väga selgelt oma kõnes ÜRO Peaassambleel. Ta nimetas viit tingimust, alustades Ukraina territoriaalse terviklikkuse taastamisest ning lõpetades Kremli kurjategijate toomisega Rahvusvahelise Kohtu ette. Elagu Ukraina! *Slava Ukraini!*

Nils Torvalds (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister, we actually know how the Russian war against Ukraine will end. It will end in a total moral, societal, economical collapse of Russia, and we already see the first sign of it. But this road to collapse is long and it's lined with untold sufferings and human deaths.

Along this Via Dolorosa marches the Ukrainian army and peoples of Ukraine. In comparison with them, we have a fairly easy walk, but we already complain, sometimes in a unduly manner. Now it's time for us to make some small sacrifices. But making these small sacrifices, we should also be able to open up a perspective for Europe in the future.

Forty-seven years ago the Conference of Security and Cooperation opened in Helsinki. The principles of the final act have then been torn into pieces by Vladimir Putin and Russia.

We need a new Conference. We need to get Europe on a new path away from the mortal path Russia under Putin has chosen.

Sandra Kalniete (PPE). – *Mr. President, Commissioner, colleagues*! Putins draud ar kodoltriecienu. NATO brīdina Putinu par katastrofālām sekām. Ukraina gatavojas kodoltriecienam. Šie ziņu virsraksti atspoguļo eskalāciju, kuras avots ir Kremlis. Putins grib iebiedēt tos, kas atbalsta Ukrainu tās taisnīgajā cīņā. Tas nedrīkst notikt. Eiropā neviens nedrīkst ļauties ilūzijai, ka ar Putinu var sarunāt, un viņš — ak, brīnums — atjaunos gāzes plūsmu un novērsīs ziemas aukstumu. Tieši otrādi — Eiropas Savienībai ir jāpalielina ieroču piegādes Ukrainai, jo katra nākamā uzvara tuvina Putina režīma beigas, jo Krievijā zaudētājus nemīl. Eiropas Savienībai jākoncentrē ekonomiskais spiediens, nosakot cenu griestus naftai un gāzei, bloķējot kodoldegvielas eksportu. Nespēja vienoties par sankcijām ir kauns, kas parāda, ka Putina Eiropas draugi šeit strādā. Tāpat nav saprotams, kāpēc Ukraina ir saņēmusi tikai vienu miljardu no solītajiem deviņiem. Cerams, ka tie pieci miljardi, par kuriem tikko parakstīta vienošanās, Kijevu sasniegs ātrāk. Slava Ukrainai ! Varoņiem slava !

Javier Moreno Sánchez (S&D). – Señor presidente, Putin está perdiendo la guerra en términos morales y políticos. A su demencia guerrera sus propios valientes jóvenes le dicen «no» y huyen del país. A su pantomima de referéndum la comunidad internacional le dice «no». Le queda la baza económica, con la energía como arma de guerra, y la amenaza nuclear como arma psicológica.

Ante este chantaje la Unión Europea debe seguir con la misma firmeza, unidad y solidaridad mostradas hasta ahora.

Señorías, obviamente esto conlleva un coste para los ciudadanos y las ciudadanas, a los que debemos proteger ante la crisis energética y la inseguridad alimentaria. Sigamos diversificando nuestras fuentes de suministro, las compras conjuntas de gas y las reservas estratégicas. Apostemos por la energía verde y pongamos en práctica el Acuerdo de seguridad alimentaria alcanzado en la OMC el pasado mes de junio.

Por alusiones, le diría a la señora Montserrat que los impuestos sirven para garantizar los servicios públicos que su partido quiere privatizar. Le recuerdo que este verano los incendios no los han apagado empresas privadas.

Bart Groothuis (Renew). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear Minister, dear colleagues, for the past ten years, Russia has invested significantly in its capability for deep-sea water research, or the sabotage capability, as we know it. For the past three years, Russia deliberately disconnected itself from the internet twice without severe consequences for its own economy or society. In the end of this year, internet cables were cut in Norway, Svalbard, where EU Galileo ground stations are present. All this time, this House asked for action, swift action.

Last week, two, not three, four times Nord Stream 1 and Nord Stream 2 were sabotaged. This morning only, President von der Leyen announced a new plan to protect our critical infrastructure below sea. She announced satellite surveillance, stress tests and more cooperation.

Well, dear colleagues, that's not even close to what is needed. This House has the ideas what is needed, we will put them forward in the next couple of months and we hope to cooperate with you, dear Commissioner. Boost the Maritime Safety Agency in Lisbon that connects European coast guards, navies. Make it into a new paramilitary venue. Place sensors in our water, use industry data. Create PESCO projects to technically update our submarines for this task.

And last but not least, attribute – make sure that every incident is reported, investigated towards the culprit together with NATO and neighbouring countries. Thank you, *Slava Ukraini!*

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, dear guests, it was great to see such a strong sense of unity here of all, except of a very, very few. I guess it's clear what should be our reaction to escalation of the situation and increase of the risks.

First, this is political support, at least as strong as was shown today, this morning. The second, economic support, I mean, economic sanctions and as well, obviously the financial support of Ukraine. We also should not forget the humanitarian part of the problem. There are millions of people in Ukraine that have lost their homes and they can suffer in winter, and they count on our support.

I also very much appreciate statements of the Commission on the energy. Very good proposals from the Commission can help us to avoid huge economic risks this winter and later, this is very important, and also keep the social stability that is needed for continuation of current right course of our policy.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Voorzitter, collega's, Oekraïne is een vrij en een onafhankelijk land. Het is een democratie en het is Poetin, en Poetin alleen, die met zijn illegale aanval op Oekraïne terug oorlog op het Europese continent heeft gebracht.

Het antwoord daarop, collega's, en daar zijn we het over eens, moet zijn: eenheid, samenwerking en solidariteit. En ja, die hebben we getoond. Enerzijds met de uitgebreide steun aan Oekraïne, maar ook opeenvolgende sanctiepakketten die ervoor moeten zorgen dat de geldkraan wordt dichtgedraaid voor de oorlog die Poetin voert. Het is om die reden dat ik er wél voorstander van ben om ook diamant in die sanctiepakketten op te nemen, en ik zeg dat als Antwerpse.

Diezelfde eenheid, samenwerking en solidariteit hebben we nodig in het aanpakken van de energiecrisis. En daar, beste collega's, schort het vandaag toch een beetje aan die eenheid en solidariteit in de Raad – die is ver zoek – maar ook in de daadkracht van de Commissie. Beste commissaris, alstublieft, ik heb goede dingen gehoord van Ursula von der Leyen deze ochtend. Het is nu tijd voor acties. Zet een plafond op die prijs. Zorg ervoor dat er een ontkoppeling is van de elektriciteit en de gasprijs. Dat zal ervoor zorgen dat de steun onder de Europese bevolking voor de steun aan Oekraïne blijft.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, au Parlement européen, cœur de la démocratie européenne, nous affirmons une nouvelle fois notre soutien sans faille aux Ukrainiens. Nous condamnons fermement l'escalade, comme nous avons condamné toutes les actions de Vladimir Poutine. Celle de faire revenir la guerre en Europe, celle d'organiser des élections fantoches, celle d'oppresser des millions d'Ukrainiens qui ne se battent pas seulement pour leur liberté, mais qui se battent bien aussi pour la démocratie, la démocratie européenne.

Après tous ces mois, l'Ukraine reste forte et déterminée. Aujourd'hui, nous nous devons de continuer d'être à la hauteur du courage du peuple ukrainien. Ne cédons pas aux sirènes des populistes qui diffusent la propagande du Kremlin. Le huitième paquet de sanctions est une nécessité, un levier fondamental pour asphyxier l'économie russe. Le courage des Ukrainiens, leur soif de liberté rappellent la mesure des défis qui nous attendent.

Il est nécessaire de continuer, avec les autres démocraties, de travailler pour consolider notre autonomie stratégique, consolider nos approvisionnements. Et pour cela, nous devons être unis et forts.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, uz brutalno kršenje međunarodnog poretka, otvorene prijetnje nuklearnim napadom, ruski režim počeo je i energetiku koristiti kao instrument rata protiv Europe, kao sredstvo političke i gospodarske ucjene.

Suprotno onome što smo mogli čuti od zastupnika Kolakušića, povijest nam pokazuje da popuštanje ili razjedinjenost pred tiranijom ili pred imperijalizmom ne može pomoći. Upravo suprotno. Povijest nam također pokazuje da ne doprinosi niti relativiziranje agresije, a posebno je neshvatljivo kada to dolazi iz usta kolege koji također dolazi iz države koja je prije samo 30 godina bila žrtva slične agresije. Kolegice i kolege, ishod rata u Ukrajini oblikovat će budućnost cijele Europe. Zato je ovo civilizacijski test za Europu. Zato je nužno zajedništvo i jedinstvo u podršci ukrajinskom narodu. Zato je nužan povratak temeljnim europskim politikama, politikama zdravoga razuma, osobito u području obrane, sigurnosti i energetike.

Zato je to, u konačnici, i pitanje opstanka u novoj nemilosrdnoj eri globalne neizvjesnosti.

Dietmar Köster (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Dieser völkerrechtswidrige Krieg Russlands gegen die Ukraine muss so schnell wie möglich beendet werden. Die neuesten Maßnahmen des russischen Regimes wie die illegalen Referenden, die erneute Annexion und die Drohung, Atomwaffen einzusetzen, sind strikt zurückzuweisen.

Ein Atomkrieg wird zur vollkommenen Vernichtung aller Seiten führen. Er muss auf jeden Fall mit allen Anstrengungen verhindert werden. Daher muss jetzt endlich die Diplomatie zu ihrem Recht kommen, was übrigens die Auffassung von 77 % der Deutschen ist. Es müssen auf allen politischen Ebenen Verhandlungsangebote gemacht werden, um einen Waffenstillstand zu erreichen.

Leider ist die Kommission in dieser Hinsicht vollkommen untätig. Der einseitige Ansatz, Bellizistinnen und Bellizisten zuvörderst auf Waffen zu setzen und die Entscheidung auf dem Schlachtfeld zu suchen, ist ein sehr gefährlicher und riskanter Weg. Wir brauchen eine duale Strategie. Ja, wir müssen die Ukraine ökonomisch, politisch und auch militärisch unterstützen, aber wir brauchen zugleich auch diplomatische Anstrengungen. Und hier passiert einfach zu wenig.

Zudem sollten wir den Widerstand der Russen gegen den Krieg unterstützen. Kriegsdienstverweigerer und Deserteure widersetzen sich dem völkerrechtswidrigen Krieg Russlands, und wir sollten hier in Europa viel mehr tun, um denen die Möglichkeit zu geben, in die Europäische Union zu kommen.

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Mr President, colleagues, the war has entered a critical new stage, with new victories from our brave and fighting Ukrainians every day. Ukrainian forces are advancing and regaining strategically important cities. Yet, as Ukraine advance, Putin ups his brinkmanship. The annexation by Russia of four Ukrainian regions last week further signified a deepening of his war efforts. His ruthlessness is exemplified by harrowing images of Ukrainians forced to vote at gunpoint and, of course, the shocking images of recently released prisoners of war. So too, the explosion within the Nord Stream 2 pipeline and the threat of the use of nuclear weapons.

We too in Ireland must defend our crucial infrastructure off the coast. The threat draws closer. Democracy can prevail in Ukraine, but only with united support and I mean united – right across Europe, on all fronts. Absolute support on sanctions. Ukrainians are fighting for our values, our democracies. They fight for us.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, ante esta nueva escalada, quiero destacar hoy aquí la importancia de que la Unión Europea comunique de forma eficaz su posición.

Hay que mantener la mayoría de 141 países que en marzo condenaron la agresión rusa en la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas y conseguir que esa condena se traduzca también en hechos.

En efecto, muy pocos terceros países aplican todavía nuestras sanciones y me preocupa, además, el cambio del sentido del voto de Brasil y de Gabón en la reciente votación en el Consejo de Seguridad (ambos se han abstenido).

Lavrov desarrolló una amplia agenda diplomática también en África en estos meses. El presidente de la Unión Africana pidió recientemente en Moscú el levantamiento de las sanciones europeas. Hace pocos días hemos visto a Putin en Samarcanda con los máximos dirigentes de la India y de China.

Putin no está todavía plenamente aislado. Tenemos que intensificar nuestra ofensiva diplomática, en la que debe implicarse más, por ejemplo, el presidente del Consejo Europeo.

Señorías, no es momento de ambigüedades ni de equidistancias. Este es un conflicto entre Rusia y la comunidad internacional. No es una mera guerra entre europeos. Su alcance es mucho mayor.

Y el resto del mundo, señor comisario, señor vicepresidente, debería ser consciente y actuar en consecuencia.

Traian Băsescu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, Europa trece printr-o criză majoră de securitate și o criză majoră energetică. De ce am ajuns aici? Pentru că în schimbul gazelor, țițeiului și cărbunelui din Rusia am acceptat situația din Transnistria, masacrul de la Groznâi, anexarea provinciilor Osetia și Abhazia din Georgia, anexarea Crimeei. Ne-am limitat la sancțiuni fără niciun efect pentru Rusia.

Mai mult, în 2008, un stat european a blocat accesul Ucrainei în NATO. Azi, Putin amenință Ucraina și Europa cu arma nucleară, motivând că și Statele Unite au utilizat-o în '45. Da, în 1945 s-a pus capăt celui de al Doilea Război Mondial, pe când utilizarea armei nucleare azi, în Ucraina, înseamnă începerea unui război nuclear. Ucraina trebuie sprijinită cu armament pentru a-și elibera propriul teritoriu. Abia apoi pot să înceapă negocierile.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, bezprecedentný útok, agresia, vojnové zločiny, jadrová hrozba, mobilizácia, referendá, anexia. Slová o tom, čo eskalácia znamená v praxi. Rusko postupne prekračuje pomyselnú čiaru, ničí Ukrajinu, ohrozuje európsku bezpečnosť a šliape na medzinárodný poriadok. Európska odpoveď, dámy a páni, musí byť jednoznačná. Musíme byť jednotní, rozhodní, spájať sily aj so spojencami vo svete, podporovať Ukrajinu ešte viac a ukázať, že sa Moskvou nenecháme vydierať. Rusko sa pustilo cestou, z ktorej niet návratu. Opustilo spoločnosť vyspelých krajín a pridalo sa medzi vyvrheľov globálnej politiky. Každá investícia do víťazstva Ukrajiny je investícia do našej európskej slobody a bezpečnosti. Je investíciou do európskej demokracie, do lepšej budúcnosti, v ktorej Ukrajina uspeje. Ako kandidátska krajina sa stane súčasťou nášho politického priestoru. Stojme pri Ukrajine. Je v zápase o svoje územie, svoje hodnoty, svojich ľudí. Ukrajinci vedia najlepšie, ako túto vojnu vyhrať. Počúvajme ich a poskytujme im, čo potrebujú. Sláva Ukrajiny.

President. – Dear colleagues, just to apologise, but blue cards will not be issued as we are running out of time and we need to start voting soon.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, kolegice i kolege, osuđujući rusku nasilnu aneksiju teritorija suverene države, potvrdili smo našu zajedničku odlučnost u potpori slobodi i očuvanju teritorijalne cjelovitosti Ukrajine, ali i dobili onu potvrdu političkog i ekonomskog što treba stajati iza jedne zemlje.

Okupacija i nastojanje nasilnog oduzimanja i nezakonitog prisvajanja tuđeg teritorija, najflagrantniji su primjeri kršenja zakonitog sustava na kojemu je zasnovan europski i svjetski poredak, a posljedice osjećamo svi - preko špekulativnih cijena energenata i namjera onih koji žele iskoristiti rat za druge interese.

Ukrajinu nećemo napustiti bez obzira na prijetnje i zastrašivanja koja dolaze iz Kremlja jer, posebno mi iz Hrvatske, koji smo ne tako davno bili izloženi agresiji i podnijeli velike žrtve, znamo cijeniti slobodu za koju smo se izborili kako bismo uživali vrijednosti na kojima počiva Europska unija.

Jasna je razlika između nas koji govorimo jezikom mira i onih koji govore jezikom rata. Moramo ustrajati u svojim politikama i svojim vrijednostima, no biti svjesni ruske strategije u geopolitičkom smislu i imperijalističkih težnji. U obrani demokratskih vrijednosti, trebamo poduprijeti mjere.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, cred că nu mai e un secret pentru nimeni că Putin s-a compromis pentru totdeauna și încearcă să compromită definitiv orice relație pe care o putem construi după încheierea păcii cu Rusia. Cred că a sosit momentul să rămânem mult mai uniți, mult mai fermi în orice direcție ce ține de Ucraina, pentru că Putin n-a reușit să își atingă obiectivul de a anexa Ucraina doar în câteva săptămâni, pentru că am fost uniți.

Astăzi, armata Ucrainei este mult mai determinată, mult mai bine organizată, mult mai mobilizată, tocmai pentru că simte sprijinul nostru, iar Putin este tot mai derutat și amenință continuu cu arma nucleară. Cred că sosește timpul în care acest tiran va înțelege că nu mai poate continua cu această politică a terorii și a șantajului. Este momentul să rămânem și mai uniți, și mai solidari, și mai determinați în a-l înfrunta pe acest tiran.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, vreau să vă adresez o întrebare legat de ce a declarat doamna președintă a Comisiei Europene. Sigur, conflictul din Ucraina accentuează criza energetică. A afirmat aici, doamna președintă, că e nevoie de plafonarea prețurilor la gaze și cred că toată lumea este de acord. Dar vreau să vă întreb ce a înțeles doamna președintă prin „un nivel omogen" în piața Uniunii Europene? Ce înseamnă un nivel omogen ?

Sunt țări în care consumul pe cap de locuitor este de patru ori mai mic decât media din Uniunea Europeană, așa cum este consumul din țara mea. Cel care consumă cel mai puțin, mai poate să suporte o reducere? Eu cred că aici trebuie să fim atenți și Comisia trebuie să propună un mecanism care să nu dezavantajeze pe cetățenii europeni care au în acest moment consumul cel mai mic, și acești cetățeni sunt cei din țara mea.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο πόλεμος που διεξάγει η Ρωσία στην Ουκρανία έχει μπει σε νέα φάση και αυτό μας επιβάλλει νέες υποχρεώσεις. Οι Ουκρανοί αποδεικνύονται γενναίοι και αποτελεσματικοί, και πρέπει να αυξήσουμε την ευρωπαϊκή στρατιωτική βοήθεια. Εξαρτώνται υπερβολικά από την αμερικανική στρατιωτική βοήθεια και αυτό μπορεί να επηρεάσει τις επιλογές τους στο μέλλον. Κερδίζουμε τη μάχη των ιδεών και της πληροφόρησης έναντι του Πούτιν, ο οποίος για πρώτη φορά έχει εσωτερικά προβλήματα. Πρέπει όμως να κλιμακώσουμε την προσπάθεια και να μην επιτρέψουμε σε διάφορα είδη λαϊκιστών να περιορίσουν την αποτελεσματικότητά της. Τέλος, εξακολουθούν δυστυχώς να υπάρχουν ευρωπαϊκά μεγάλα συμφέροντα που βγάζουν πολλά λεφτά χρηματοδοτώντας τον επιθετικό πόλεμο του Πούτιν. Πρέπει να επιβάλουμε πρόσθετους περιορισμούς. Δεν επιτρέπεται οι θυσίες των πολλών να συνδυάζονται με την κερδοσκοπία των λίγων.

(Koniec rozpravy podľa postupu „catch the eye")

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, Mr President of the Council of the European Union, dear Minister Bek, today's debate focuses on the most important challenges of today's Europe. You all mentioned war on our continent, and rightly pointed out the serious concerns of the people in Europe over high inflation, high energy prices, overall social cohesion, and over the future of our businesses and industry.

I really would like to thank all the honourable Members for what I felt was truly overwhelming support and solidarity with the Ukrainian people. I think that we can also state that every day, we see that our support is crucial, that it works and that it brings tangible results. No sham referendums are going to change that.

I agree with Mr Auštrevičius and with Mr Millán Mon that the decisions we are taking today will frame the European and, I would say, global security for many decades.

Almost all of you honourable Members highlighted how important the unity and solidarity are to deal with current energy prices and high inflation. As Ms Vautmans has said, this is a time for truly European solutions because only that approach will bring the results we need.

You know that, together with your support, we already did a lot. We reduced gas consumption, we decreased the gas supplies coming from Russia in a significant manner and we filled up our gas storages. But we all know that more is needed and therefore, we are going to skim off the exceptional profits of the energy companies to support vulnerable citizens and businesses. Thanks to the excellent work of the Czech Presidency, we already found an agreement on REPowerEU to provide additional resources in those efforts.

It is clear that the next days will be of crucial importance for pushing our actions to the next level. President von der Leyen will send a roadmap in a letter to prepare the ground for the meeting of EU leaders in Prague. We will complement it with our negotiations with trusted partners, such as, for example, Norway, to dampen the price we pay for energy. And we are going to use much more our strong market power as a big economy and very important energy importer.

I am sure that our suppliers, especially our friends and allies, want not only to conclude the deals which are beneficial for both sides, but they also want to support us in our principled positions to help Ukraine and further increase pressure on the Russian aggressors. We want to make sure that we will take advantage of our big internal market and we will strengthen our energy platform to avoid a situation where Member States are competing with each other, but rather we would work with them to support a common approach.

To take on the inflationary impact of gas on electricity, today, the President of the Commission was very clear in sending clear signals on our readiness to discuss a cap on price for gas for generating electricity. We see it as another step not only to develop the new post-TTF price benchmark, but also to structurally reform our electricity market as called for by Mr Jadot or Ms Van Brempt, and to do it in a way that will not only decouple gas from its unproportional impact on electricity price, but to forge a new framework which will correspond to our goals to be a climate-neutral continent by 2050.

On top of this, we are working on the adaptation of a temporary state aid framework to the current energy situation. I want to assure you that we hear very loud and clear your calls to look for additional ways on how to tackle high inflation, reduce energy prices and preserve our competitiveness and, most importantly, for our citizens to uphold social standards in Europe.

There have been concrete questions by Mr Mureșan on Moldova. Just to be very brief, on top of our budgetary support and our macro financial assistance in more than EUR 225 million together, we are also helping through the EIB and we are helping by sending out Frontex officers to deal with the migratory flows.

I also want to acknowledge the very clear questions and points by Ms Fritzon and Ms Kumpula-Natri concerning the visas for Russians. Here, I think the very concrete guidelines proposed by my colleague Ylva Johansson are the best way forward.

To Mr Bart Groothuis, I want to reassure him that we are ready to explore all possibilities, to look for additional avenues on how to better protect our critical infrastructure. I will be looking forward to our cooperation in that regard.

So to conclude, honourable Members, I would really like to thank you for today's debate, for bringing also new ideas to the table, and to really make sure that, as we always do, we will prevail through this crisis and we will emerge stronger from this very challenging experience.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner. By the way, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to a full House for a change. The views expressed here today bear witness to this Parliament's overwhelming and continued support for the EU's course of action towards Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine.

Listening to you, I reiterate the words expressed by the High Representative. Our efforts must continue. Our strategy to counter Russia's offensive has worked until now and must be sustained: support Ukraine in all terms, pressure Russia and engage with the rest of the world.

We will continue to provide military assistance to the Ukrainian Government to ensure that recent military gains are sustainable in the long run. We also need to continue supporting Ukraine financially in a predictable way. In working with our international partners, we will make sure that Russia is held accountable for the crimes it has committed and we will develop stronger tools to counter Russia's parallel war of disinformation.

High Representative Borrell spoke at the beginning about the eighth sanctions package, and here I am pleased to inform you that the EU ambassadors, Coreper, confirmed agreement on this package a couple of minutes ago. We see this package as a further step to isolate the Russian regime and weaken its capacity to pursue this war of aggression. The new sanctions package also represents a strong condemnation of the recent sham referenda and of Russia's illegal annexation of Ukrainian territories.

President, Vice-President of the Commission, honourable Members, as you know, the motto of our Presidency is 'Europe as a Task', inspired by an essay by Czech President Václav Havel. It is symbolically today, the day of Václav Havel's birthday, that we are discussing one of the most important tasks that lie ahead of us. Many thanks for your attention.

Predsedajúci. – Bolo mi predložených päť návrhov uznesení na ukončenie rozpravy. Rozprava sa týmto skončila. Hlasovanie o rezolúcii sa uskutoční zajtra.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), *raštu*. – Visas pasaulis žavisi nepalaužiama Ukrainos žmonių, kurie rodo didžiulį pasiaukojimą gindami savo šalį, drąsa. Tačiau su didžiuliu nerimu ir įtampa stebime vis blogėjančią situaciją ir vis agresyvesnius Rusijos veiksmus ir jos siekį išdraskyti suverenią ir nepriklausomą valstybę. Vienareikšmiškai ir griežtai smerkiame Rusijos agresijos karą ir jos bandymus jėga ir prisidengiant fiktyviais referendumais užimti teritorijas bei masinius ir šiurkščius žmogaus teisių pažeidimus ir karo nusikaltimus, kuriuos Ukrainoje įvykdė Rusijos ginkluotosios pajėgos, jų įgaliotiniai ir okupacinės Rusijos paskirtos valdžios institucijos. Visos Ukrainą remiančios šalys privalo skubiai ir solidžiai padidinti savo karinę pagalbą, ypač tose srityse, kuriose jos prašo Ukrainos vyriausybė, kad Ukraina galėtų susigrąžinti visos savo tarptautiniu mastu pripažintos teritorijos kontrolę ir sėkmingai apsiginti nuo bet kokios tolesnės Rusijos agresijos. Gerbiami kolegos, į Europą grįžo karas. Mūsų pareiga yra užtikrinti mūsų kontinento taiką ateinančioms kartoms, todėl privalome susitelkti ir būti vieningi padėdami Ukrainai jos ir visų mūsų kovoje su Rusija.

Marc Botenga (The Left), *par écrit*. – Par l'annexion illégale de territoires ukrainiens et la menace nucléaire, Vladimir Poutine continue sur la voie de l'escalade. La fuite en avant. Mais, paradoxalement, la situation sur le terrain offre une fenêtre d'opportunité pour la diplomatie. Le président russe sait qu'aucun décret d'annexion illégale n'arrivera à cacher l'impasse militaire dans laquelle se trouve actuellement l'offensive russe. Ce n'est pas une coïncidence si Poutine a appelé à la diplomatie même dans son discours d'annexion. Une impasse sur le champ de bataille offre souvent une opportunité importante pour relancer les négociations. En plus, des pays importants comme l'Inde ou la Chine, qui ne soutiennent ni l'invasion russe, ni la politique européenne de sanctions et de livraisons d'armes, poussent Poutine à la négociation. Depuis le début de la guerre, l'Union européenne n'a pas pris une seule initiative diplomatique sérieuse. C'est irresponsable. Dans un contexte où une guerre nucléaire et l'escalade du conflit bien au-delà des frontières de la région semblent des risques toujours plus tangibles, nous avons le devoir d'essayer une grande initiative diplomatique. Certes, la diplomatie peut échouer, mais la seule façon de le savoir, c'est de tenter. Les classes travailleuses n'ont rien à gagner à une escalade de guerre.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Polska od wielu lat ostrzegała Unię Europejską i świat przed rosnącym zagrożeniem ze strony Rosji. Zwracała uwagę na to, jak tragiczne w skutkach będzie uzależnianie się od dostaw strategicznych surowców z tego kraju. Nie słuchano tego głosu, gdy budowano gazociąg Nord Stream, później Nord Stream 2. Niestety nadal nie słucha się głosu narodu, który boleśnie przekonał się do czego zdolny jest rosyjski imperializm. Co więcej, penalizuje się Polskę przy każdej możliwej okazji, chociaż ta wspiera walczącą Ukrainę od pierwszego dnia tej zbrodniczej agresji.

Kraje Europy powinny jak najszybciej wyciągnąć wnioski ze swoich dotychczasowych działań. Skończyć robienie interesów z agresorem, który sieje terror i morduje cywilów. Im więcej niepowodzeń militarnych Rosji, tym bardziej eskaluje ona zbrodnicze ataki na ludność cywilną. Najwyższy czas, by kraje Europy Zachodniej przejrzały na oczy, by były przynajmniej mądre po szkodzie, jeśli nie wykazały się tą przezornością wcześniej. Żadnego przyzwolenia na zbrodnie Rosji. Żadnych interesów ze zbrodniarzami!

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), *písomne*. – V súlade s Chartou OSN a s medzinárodným právom majú všetky štáty rovnaké právo na zvrchovanosť a územnú celistvosť. V rámci medzinárodných vzťahov sú štáty povinné zdržať sa použitia hrozby alebo sily proti územnej celistvosti alebo politickej nezávislosti iného štátu. Akákoľvek anexia územia jedného štátu iným štátom v dôsledku hrozby alebo použitia sily je v jednoznačnom rozpore s Chartou OSN a s medzinárodným právom. Rusko však posledné mesiace naďalej pokračuje v nezákonnej, nevyprovokovanej a neodôvodnenej útočnej vojne proti Ukrajine a jej obyvateľom. Aby to nestačilo, Rusko sa dopúšťa rozsiahleho a závažného porušovania ľudských práv, vojenských zločinov a zločinov proti ľudskosti. Preto je pre EÚ nesmierne dôležité opätovne vyjadriť svoju podporu pre Ukrajinu, jej zvrchovanosť, nezávislosť a územnú celistvosť v rámci medzinárodne uznávaných hraníc a trvať na tom, aby boli páchatelia vyššie zmienených zločinov spravodlivo potrestaní. Zároveň je dôležité ruskú agresiu čo najdôraznejšie odsúdiť. Rusko za vojnu nesie plnú zodpovednosť, a preto EÚ agresora vyzýva, aby útočnú vojnu okamžite zastavil a stiahol všetky svoje a spojenecké sily zo všetkých medzinárodne uznaných ukrajinských území, vrátane Krymu. V neposlednom rade je taktiež nevyhnutné oceniť obrovskú odvahu ukrajinského ľudu, ktorý pri obrane

nielen svojej krajiny, ale aj európskych hodnôt prináša obrovské obete. Sláva Ukrajine!

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. – Venäjä on muutamassa viikossa eskaloinut Ukrainassa käynnistämänsä hyökkäyssodan uudelle, entistä vaarallisemmalle tasolle. Liikekannallepano, tekaistut kansanäänestykset, laittomat alueliitokset, kaasuputkien räjäytykset ja ydinaseilla uhkailu ovat kaikki tuomittavia tekoja, joihin EU:n on vastattava uusilla kovilla pakotteilla ja lisäämällä aseapua Ukrainalle. Uudet pakotteet ovat hyvä askel, mutta ne eivät yksinään riitä. Seuraavaksi olisi laajennettava henkilöpakotteita ulottumaan myös Venäjän keskijohtoon ja heidän perheisiinsä. Samoin EU:n isojen jäsenmaiden olisi syytä nyt nopeasti tehdä uusia päätöksiä aseavusta Ukrainalle. Tässä Yhdysvallat näyttää hienoa esimerkkiä. Sen aseavun ansiosta Ukraina on viime päivinä saavuttanut merkittäviä voittoja.

3. Členství v politických skupinách

President. – I would inform you that Dace Melbārde is no longer sitting with the non-attached Members. She joins the PPE Group as of today, 5 October 2022.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

4. Hlasování

Der Präsident. – Wir kommen nun zur Abstimmung. Wir haben eine längere Abstimmung, und ich bitte Sie daher, mich dabei zu unterstützen, indem Sie mir deutliche Zeichen setzen. Dann können wir das möglichst rasch und zügig durchführen.

(Abstimmungsergebnisse und sonstige Einzelheiten der Abstimmung: siehe Protokoll.)

4.1. Situace Romů žijících v osadách v EU (B9-0413/2022) (hlasování)

4.2. Klíčové cíle pro schůzi CITES CoP19 v Panamě (B9-0414/2022) (hlasování)

4.3. Strategické vztahy a partnerství EU s Africkým rohem (A9-0207/2022 – Fabio Massimo Castaldo) (hlasování)

4.4. Vnější rozměr lidského práva na přístup k vodě (A9-0231/2022 – Miguel Urbán Crespo) (hlasování)

4.5. Reakce EU na zvyšování cen energií v Evropě (RC-B9-0416/2022, B9-0416/2022, B9-0417/2022, B9-0418/2022, B9-0419/2022, B9-0420/2022, B9-0421/2022, B9-0422/2022) (hlasování)

Der Präsident. – Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

Středa 5. října 2022

5. Schválení zápisu z předchozího denního zasedání

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar. Gibt es zu diesem vorliegenden Protokoll Einwände? Das ist nicht der Fall, daher ist das Protokoll damit genehmigt.

6. Boj s protievropskou a protiukrajinskou propagandou evropských spojenců Putina (tematická rozprava)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Bekämpfung der von Putins europäischen Freunden lancierten antieuropäischen und antiukrainischen Propaganda (2022/2862(RSP)).

Ich möchte alle Mitglieder darauf hinweisen, dass es bei dieser Aussprache keine spontanten Wortmeldungen gibt und dass keine blauen Karten akzeptiert werden.

Stéphane Séjourné, *auteur.* – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, ce week-end, le président d'une puissance nucléaire nous a désignés comme ennemis. Le président de Russie unie, le parti de Poutine, a directement menacé d'utiliser des armes contre les villes européennes. Des députés de ce même parti, membres du parlement russe, ont appelé à des génocides, à des viols, à des enlèvements d'enfants ukrainiens. Vladimir Poutine, ses alliés et son parti veulent nous détruire, détruire nos valeurs, détruire notre modèle européen, détruire notre démocratie et détruire nos droits – les droits des minorités, celui des enfants, celui des femmes. Ils le disent, ils l'assument: ils détestent ce que nous sommes – une société d'hommes et de femmes libres et en sécurité.

Vladimir Poutine n'a pas déclaré la guerre qu'à l'Ukraine, il a aussi déclaré la guerre à la démocratie. Pourtant, en Europe, il y a des hommes et des femmes politiques qui continuent à le soutenir. L'extrême gauche et l'extrême droite européennes répètent les éléments de langage du Kremlin depuis maintenant quelques mois. Un jour l'OTAN est l'agresseur, un autre jour la Crimée a toujours été russe. En ce moment, la ritournelle, c'est: les sanctions ne marchent pas. Je le dis à l'extrême droite de l'hémicycle: comment osez-vous aujourd'hui demander la fin des sanctions? Comment osez-vous servir les arguments que nous entendons à la télévision d'État russe toute la journée? À l'heure actuelle la Russie ne produit plus de technologies de pointe, et son PIB est en chute libre – il s'agit de la plus importante baisse qu'il ait connue depuis la fin de l'Union soviétique.

Vous préférez souvent surfer sur la souffrance sociale et économique des Européens, mais cette souffrance, elle est causée par la guerre de Poutine, pas par les sanctions. Et nous, nous y répondons, d'ailleurs, ici, dans cet hémicycle, et nous y répondons en Européens: en réduisant nos dépendances, en abaissant les factures des Européens, mais également en partageant, dans cet hémicycle, nos votes – ce que, par vos votes, ici même vous rejetez.

La question que je me pose, chers collègues, est la question centrale que chacun et chacune d'entre vous devrait d'ailleurs se poser: pourquoi faites-vous cela? Mesdames et Messieurs les membres du Rassemblement national, de la Lega, du Fidesz: pourquoi vouloir lever les sanctions contre la Russie? Cela n'a aucun sens; nous devrions plutôt tous, en Européens, être derrière les Ukrainiens, derrière le peuple ukrainien, qui, d'ailleurs, a fait le choix souverain d'avancer vers l'Europe. Quand on se réclame souverainiste et que la souveraineté est une valeur du parti que l'on représente, on soutient le peuple ukrainien.

Je n'ai que deux hypothèses, chers collègues: la première – la seule, potentiellement –, c'est – peut-être – les valises de billets, la seconde étant le soutien plein et entier au projet politique de Poutine. La première hypothèse mérite d'être creusée. Nous l'avons déjà évoquée dans cet hémicycle: plus de 300 millions d'euros auraient été investis par l'État russe et par des partis politiques russes dans des partis politiques européens. Certains, d'ailleurs, tels que la Lega, ont encore des accords avec le parti de Vladimir Poutine. Quant à Viktor Orban, il visite plus Moscou que Bruxelles. En tout cas, si vous êtes cohérents, vous qui revendiquez être les patriotes et les souverainistes, vous qui revendiquez parfois être les défenseurs d'une civilisation et d'un mode de vie européens, sachez que vous avez fait le choix inverse. L'Europe ou Poutine? Vous avez choisi Poutine…

Chers collègues, je me tourne aussi, malheureusement, vers l'extrême gauche de cet hémicycle: pourquoi refuser les armes à l'Ukraine? Quand on est pour l'émancipation des peuples, quand on est pour l'indépendance et l'autonomie des peuples, on est avec l'Ukraine. Mais, souvent, l'antiaméricanisme de l'extrême gauche se révèle être plus fort que la défense des opprimés.

Je m'adresse même au centre de cet hémicycle, Monsieur le Commissaire, à notre propre camp, celui des pro-Européens: pourquoi Silvio Berlusconi est-il encore membre du PPE, après ses déclarations hallucinantes sur l'Ukraine? Pourquoi tant de dirigeants bulgares et slovaques aux propositions prorusses se disent-ils encore socialistes? Et pourquoi nos institutions, Monsieur le Commissaire, continuent-elles de donner de l'argent à la Serbie de Vučić, lui aussi membre du PPE?

Alors, chers collègues, je n'irai pas plus loin: il faudra une enquête internationale sur les 300 millions d'euros. Je conclus, Monsieur le Président: nous, citoyens, devons savoir mettre une barrière en travers des liens qui existent entre ces partis politiques. C'est pour cela que mon groupe politique a voulu ce débat, pour clarifier la position et les propositions des uns et des autres dans cet hémicycle.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, the issue of a healthy information ecosystem in Europe, free from intentional and concerted attempts to distort it, is always an important topic. Given the current international events surrounding our daily lives, today's debate is even more relevant, and I would like to thank you for inviting the Council to take part.

In short, any false narratives and foreign information manipulation and interference in our democracies and our democratic discourses cannot and should not be tolerated. Our societies deserve to be free from any hostile influence and be able to make their own properly informed decisions, whether it is on health matters, political parties they choose to vote for, or on global events that directly or indirectly impact their lives.

Since the beginning of the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine, we see that there are active attempts to manipulate the hearts and minds of European citizens. Sometimes these attempts are broader in scale. Sometimes they are more focused on certain European countries and vulnerable minorities within them. But they are undoubtedly present, and they are only getting more and more daring and audacious.

Russian disinformation outlets aim at polarising our societies. They do that by combining pro-Kremlin narratives with content on the divisive subjects that fringe movements in Europe focus on: migration, anti-vaccine sentiment and climate change scepticism, for instance.

Such narratives are designed to misinform, mislead and, most importantly, to be divisive. This is why the Council has clearly stated from the outset of the war that such hostile, opportunistic and dangerous activities will not be tolerated, that our people must be protected from attempts to distort reality.

As a result, we introduced restrictive measures against Russia-associated outlets conducting disinformation and information manipulation actions. And yet, despite our early actions, we must prepare for the long and difficult road ahead of us.

There is no silver bullet from complex attempts to interfere in our democracies and we must work on multiple fronts to continue to defend our values and principles.

The Council closely follows new initiatives by the Commission in this area and is actively involved in the implementation of existing ones, such as the strengthened code of practice against disinformation.

We look forward to even more ambitious actions based on the 'whole of society' approach, as we have to be all together in this fight against propaganda and information manipulation.

I want to repeat again that any interference in our political and democratic processes is unacceptable, particularly in the current geopolitical climate and also in the run-up to the 2024 European Parliament elections.

Therefore, the Council and the Czech Presidency are fully committed to the development of the EU hybrid toolbox, as well as in establishing the toolbox to counter foreign information and manipulation that will make our European response stronger and more coordinated. That will make us more resilient and the hostile powers less successful in their actions.

At the same time, the Czech Presidency is actively engaged in the implementation of the European Democracy Action Plan, which aims at building a more resilient public sphere in our societies.

I would like to underline in particular, the negotiations we launched last week with the European Parliament on the regulation on the statute and financing of political parties and foundations. We hope to conclude these negotiations successfully by the end of the year and thus adopt EU legislation that will increase the transparency of political parties while reinforcing our capacity to counter foreign interference. I count on your support and engagement towards this objective. Thank you very much once again for your attention.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, Minister, there can be a no more timely and more important debate than the one we're having today. And I would like to congratulate President Séjourné of the Renew Group for making sure this debate happens.

I think the vast majority of all of us feel very strongly that we need to say loudly no to war propaganda and disinformation, to say no to bullies blackmailing households, to those who use energy as a gunshot.

Dear friends, honourable Members, disinformation and war propaganda was used to pave the way for Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine and continues to fuel Russia's military aggression. Various disinformation actors are looking now for a transition from the gains of the pandemic to the lies and myths around the war in Ukraine.

The spectacles of the so-called referenda, accompanied by a large volume of disinformation, is a method straight from the Kremlin's playbook, used to illegally annex the territories of its neighbours. This is exactly the same pattern we have seen in Crimea back in 2014.

We have also seen the same pattern consecutively within the European Union, where we find numerous indications on opportunists and wannabes in several of our Member States, national politicians, members of parliaments, and clearly journalists and media are columnists. We have seen it all. Russian diplomats expelled from Athens some years ago, in Sofia a few months ago. Media tycoons clearly trying to impose gonzo networks and muppet journalism in our capitals.

We read reports about Kyiv allegedly falling in the first three days of the war. We saw TV reports of dead bodies in the Bucha massacre allegedly moving. And we saw lies published on bombing innocent pregnant women in a maternity hospital, which apparently did not exist. There are no riddles or enigmas on all of this. Russian propaganda penetrates our societies through chancers and oligarch rubles on our screens, on our newspapers, and in our public space.

Let's put it in a rather simple way: Russian disinformation and propaganda is targeting both European and international audiences in order to undermine the democratic West's support to Ukraine and vilify our Ukrainian partners. And this is crucial within our Union and our closest friends and allies as, for instance, in the Western Balkans, where I am visiting these days.

This is our moment now as Europeans to refute this propaganda, to defend and stand for the truth and strike back. As seen by our recent reports on EU DisinfoLab and from Facebook, by impersonating European media outlets using proxies online and using other manipulative behaviour, Russia is targeting now Europeans directly with apocalyptic messages about impending the winter without heating and accusing EU sanctions of growing inflation and energy bills.

Fighting online disinformation and foreign information manipulation and interference is now a key priority not only for the Commission but, I think, for our institutions as a whole. We now have the code of practice of disinformation, which we strengthened this year, and this is the centrepiece of our efforts.

Since the beginning of the war, the Commission has been monitoring through regular meetings the platform's actions to address directly Russian propaganda. The tech companies, signatories of the code of practice, are implementing our sanctions and are taking important steps together with us to curb the spread of propaganda and harmful disinformation, including the closing of many accounts, demotion of this information, or stepping up cooperation with fact-checkers.

The European Digital Media Observatory and its national hubs have also been instrumental in this fight. By focusing our activities on Ukraine over the last few months, the collaboration of EU fact-checkers and academic researchers has decreased the capacity of our attackers and has increased our ability of detecting, analysing and exposing disinformation and war-related campaigns.

The Observatory's specific task force on the war has identified more than 1 600 disinformation instances related to the war through fact checks and issued reports and investigations on both emerging and trending narratives. We will continue to build on this valuable expertise, expanding the coverage of the Observatory activities to 100% of the EU population, as well as in the context of the code's monitoring and exchange with technology platforms.

Honourable Members, we have imposed as a Union the biggest and deepest sanctions packages in our history, including against notorious figures directly involved in disinformation. We have even sanctioned for the first time ever the broadcasting of Russian media such as Russia Today and Sputnik, as they were clearly propaganda machines. We have curbed the activity of the Kremlin's weapons of mass deception, not only with full respect with fundamental rights and freedoms, but in order precisely to protect these fundamental rights and freedoms.

We are also very actively raising awareness about pro-Kremlin disinformation via our EUvsDisinfo website and with the help of our delegations around the world. We cooperate closely with the StratCom Centre, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, supporting civil society and media in this country. And when the war is over, believe me, there will be many pilgrimages in Kyiv to see precisely how successful this collaboration has been.

And building on the action plan against disinformation and the European democracy action plan, as confirmed lately by the strategic compass, we have put in place very tangible, specific measures to address foreign information and manipulation. We have even a dedicated toolbox, the FIMI toolbox, to deal with this challenge. And we have just announced a defence of democracy package to further broaden our appeal, our capacity to resist against foreign interference.

Finally, in this, as the minister just said, we need to complete the picture of fighting disinformation and foreign hostile interference with the approval of our proposals on political advertising and on the funding of European political parties and foundations. We need to work in earnest and swiftly to have agreements on this emblematic and meaningful piece of legislation.

And the final point. We have indeed seen reports on the United States' findings concerning the 300 million illegal financing by Russia within the European Union. Let me assure you that we are looking forward to receive this information and we will get to the bottom of it.

Vladimír Bilčík, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Mr Vice-President, Minister, colleagues, Russia deliberately sparks the worst in us and amplifies it for political gain. It weaponises our differences, undermines free discourse and seeks to destroy our democracy. While we still do have physical borders, with the rise of social platforms and hostile domestic actors readily willing to spread foreign state propaganda from both extreme left and extreme right, European information space is more exposed than ever. Fabricated lies and political propaganda that we tolerated for years, and that have eaten away at our democratic institutions such as quality public media, are no longer acceptable. We must take concrete measures to fight back.

I am proud that this House has created a body with precisely this in mind – our special ING2 committee, which diligently listens to world-renowned experts and formulates concrete proposals for action against disinformation. We know exactly what to do.

We stand against an enemy who uses manipulation as a strategic tool. We need to defend our institutions, our own pillars of security, our allies. We must cooperate better and faster than any time before. We need more resources. We cannot be dependent only on a few dozen experts – not against the enemy who uses the whole state apparatus to attack us and our values. We must support strong independent media, and demand from social platforms not to amplify lies. We need to support our reliable allies through EU enlargement and strong cooperation with like-minded partners.

We must not only free Ukrainian land from Putin. We must also free people's minds and protect our citizens.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Pierfrancesco Majorino, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la guerra di Putin non è combattuta solo sul campo. Esiste infatti anche una guerra giocata sul terreno della comunicazione e della propaganda, che passa evidentemente attraverso una massiccia disinformazione e si nutre di complicità politiche più o meno evidenti, complicità che dobbiamo avere il coraggio di indicare e smascherare.

La scorsa settimana – lo cito anch'io solo a titolo di esempio – Meta ha annunciato di aver scoperto e bloccato una rete di 1 600 account che alimentavano notizie false attraverso 60 siti, copia di alcuni tra i più prestigiosi quotidiani occidentali. Probabilmente la rete più grande e complessa collegata alla Russia mai identificata dall'inizio dell'invasione dell'Ucraina.

Questo è purtroppo solo un frammento di quello che è effettivamente oggi in campo. Già da tempo questo Parlamento ha maturato la consapevolezza rispetto ai tanti tentativi di potenze straniere di interferire e destabilizzare la nostra democrazia. La nostra commissione speciale sulle interferenze straniere nei processi democratici dell'Unione ha indicato con chiarezza il problema e con la sua relazione dello scorso 9 marzo ha chiesto di mettere in campo azioni e strumenti forti, in particolare sulla trasparenza e il controllo dei fondi provenienti dall'estero, sul ruolo di lobby più o meno occulte, sull'uso delle piattaforme come veicolo privilegiato per disinformazione e interferenze.

È stato particolarmente significativo che in quest'Aula la Presidente von der Leyen, nel suo ultimo discorso sullo Stato dell'Unione, abbia sottolineato tutto ciò, abbia sottolineato l'importanza delle azioni che si possono mettere in campo sulle minacce e i pericoli che viviamo. Un elemento importante di consapevolezza politica al quale però devono tuttavia far seguito adesso misure nette, chiare, perché non c'è davvero altro tempo da perdere sul terreno della lotta alle interferenze.

Per combattere la guerra alla disinformazione ovviamente non dobbiamo mettere in campo un Ministero della verità o sperare di sopprimere il dissenso, che fa parte della normale dialettica democratica – grazie al cielo non siamo come gli altri –, ma abbiamo bisogno di strumenti che garantiscano un'informazione libera, indipendente e professionale, che è un elemento essenziale per la nostra democrazia.

Dobbiamo anche dirci che chi sa deve parlare e che vengano resi pubblici gli elenchi emersi da fonti statunitensi di quei politici europei che hanno preso denaro russo o hanno alimentato una complicità fatta di scambi e favori con l'entourage di Putin. Cito anch'io – lo ha già fatto l'onorevole Séjourné – le frasi incredibili di Berlusconi, il caso Salvini, i casi della destra più radicale in Francia e Germania. Tutte cose rispetto a cui servono verità e risposte nette.

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, I think that we can be very honest about this: the Russians are losing the war on the battlefield, but the Russians are not losing the propaganda war. They are winning the propaganda war.

If you look to our social media for the moment, what you see is more and more posts echoing the narrative of the Kremlin. And the narrative of the Kremlin is that this is a war that was started by us to punish Russia. And that everything that is happening with the energy crisis today is not the consequence of the war, but the consequence of the sanctions and the measures we are taking.

And I know that there is an aid package – Mr Schinas, you have said here everything that needs to be done, but in the aid package, there is nothing about that. In the aid package is a package where we increase the sanctions against Russian individuals from 1232 to 1262, 30 more, mainly people who are involved in the referenda in eastern and south Ukraine. But nearly nothing about the celebrities, the influencers, the opinion leaders, the propagandists.

Already on 29 June we sent, together with the Navalny Foundation, a list of 135 people that are the core of the propaganda machine of Putin to the External Action Service. And you know how many have been sanctioned? Two of them! And since the aid package, four more. We are at six now of this 135. One is Dugin, for evident reasons, and three musicians, three singers. That is what we have done, six in total.

So my question is: if it is all true, what you are saying, why are the Commission and the Council not going after the core of the propaganda machine, tackling the 135 people in Russia?

And secondly, if we talk about countering Putin, and the Putin propaganda machine inside our own European Union, let us not make agreements, government agreements and government coalitions with the cheerleaders of Putin like Mr Salvini or Mr Berlusconi even. But Mr Salvini was even better with his T-shirt on the Kremlin showing his support for Putin.

Well, you are from the PPE I think, Mr Schinas, maybe it's a good moment now to say to your friends in the PPE, not to make a coalition agreement with these cheerleaders of Putin in Italy.

Markéta Gregorová, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, Commissioner, Minister, two interesting reports came out recently. One is from a Europe-based NGO, another one is from the company Meta, and they are together painting quite an ominous picture of how we are not tackling Russia's propaganda.

First, let's talk about Google and Twitter. There are thousands of tweets, YouTube videos and posts flagged as Russian propaganda, and the companies have grown really less responsive to the requests to remove such content. According to Ukraine's StratCom, they are avoiding even taking their calls or responding to emails for several months.

Meta's report reveals quite horrifying numbers: USD 105 000 spent on anti-Ukraine propaganda, 60-plus websites impersonating European news organisations and a network of amplifying fake social media accounts.

We know there are technical ways to limit the impacts of this online war. But let's understand one thing: this hydra has more heads than we can cut off only by depending on technical solutions and, therefore, these companies. We see now that if we leave the sole responsibility on these private companies, they might start lacking the will to fight or, of course, the means to fight.

They are also not democratically elected. We are the ones who bear the responsibility over the security of our citizens. We don't need any more hybrid tools, voluntary codes and vague promises. We need a proper legislation with a sanctions system right now. You have the basics in our INGE report, and I trust you can build on it quickly.

Gunnar Beck, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Dieses Parlament will die angeblich russische, sogenannte antieuropäische und antiukrainische Propaganda bekämpfen. Dies wirft unter anderem folgende Frage auf: Wann ist Kritik an der EU und der ukrainischen Regierung antieuropäische und antiukrainische Propaganda?

Hier drei Fakten und drei Fragen für Sie. Erstens: Radek Sikorski, ehemaliger polnischer Außen- und Verteidigungsminister und derzeit Mitglied dieses Hauses, hat per Twitter den USA für die Sabotage der Nord-Stream-Pipelines ausdrücklich gedankt. Er und seine Frau haben engste Verbindungen zum Weißen Haus und zur Biden-Administration. Glauben Sie wirklich, Herr Sikorski verbreite antiukrainische Propaganda oder sei von Russland bezahlt worden? Und was wäre denn, hätte er andere Geldgeber?

Zweitens: Das Europäische Parlament will zu Recht Geldwäsche und Steuerhinterziehung eindämmen. Doch der ukrainische Präsident Selenskyj hat vom Oligarchen Kolomojskyj 41 Millionen USD auf Offshore-Konten erhalten. Das wissen wir aus den „Pandora Papers", die geheime Offshore-Konten von 35 Regierungschefs offenlegen. Sind die *Pandora Papers* deshalb antiukrainische Propaganda?

Drittens: Laut dem Korruptionswahrnehmungsindex von Transparency International ist die Ukraine mit Abstand das korrupteste Land in Europa. Ist dies antiukrainische russische Propaganda?

All diese Fakten werden von westlichen Regierungen und staatsnahen Medien verschwiegen. Mir scheint, unser Problem ist eher staatsfinanzierte Pro-EU-Meinungsmache als russische EU-Kritik oder antiukrainische Propaganda.

Beata Szydło, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowny Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! To jest bardzo ważna debata, jak już tutaj zostało powiedziane, i mam nadzieję, że ona jest szczera i że rzeczywiście chcemy skutecznie walczyć z propagandą Putina i niszczeniem tego, co jest najcenniejsze: jedności i solidarności Unii Europejskiej. Bo dzisiaj w obliczu wojny na Ukrainie powinniśmy być właśnie zjednoczeni i powinniśmy być solidarni. Jednym z elementów tego jest właśnie walka z dezinformacją i propagandą.

Ale, Szanowni Państwo, żebyśmy to mogli zrobić skutecznie i rzeczywiście szczerze, to trzeba odpowiedzieć sobie, również tutaj w tej Izbie, na kilka pytań – ponieważ Putin destabilizował sytuację w Unii Europejskiej już od dawna i było na to przyzwolenie. I były decyzje, które tutaj również zapadały, które pozwalały mu na takie działania dotyczące chociażby polityki energetycznej, przyzwalające na budowę Nord Stream 1, potem Nord Stream 2, przyzwalające na destabilizowanie całego systemu energetyki i gospodarki Unii Europejskiej. Te decyzje zapadały również tutaj i to kraje Unii Europejskiej, rządy Unii Europejskiej popierały takie działania.

Nie mówię tego po to, żeby Państwu to wyrzucać, ale mówię po to, żeby była wreszcie refleksja i żebyśmy szczerze ze sobą rozmawiali. Bo jak rozumieć słowa prominentnego polityka Platformy Obywatelskiej, członka PPE, który był też kiedyś ministrem spraw zagranicznych w polskim rządzie – była tu przed momentem również o tym mowa – jeżeli on wypisuje na Twitterze takie rzeczy, które są właśnie elementem działającym na rzecz Putina i nie ma żadnej reakcji ze strony jego grupy politycznej? Jak rozumieć telefony prezydenta Francji, który w czasie, kiedy Ukraina krwawiła i krwawi, cały czas podtrzymywał dialog z Putinem? Jak rozumieć wiele innych decyzji polityków, którzy nie chcieli wspierać od razu bardzo zdecydowanie i mocno – mimo apeli na przykład rządu Polski – Ukrainy, wysyłać broni na Ukrainę? A więc jeżeli rozmawiamy o tym, że czas skończyć z tą polityką wspierającą Putina, to bądźmy naprawdę szczerzy i skuteczni.

Manu Pineda, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señor presidente, hoy, rescatando una propuesta del Partido Popular Europeo, debatimos aquí sobre la propaganda rusa y antieuropea.

Pero, permítanme que antes de entrar a poner en valor la libertad de expresión y la pluralidad les aclare algo: no hay mayor fuente de propaganda rusa que la que el Partido Popular Europeo posibilita al blanquear a los partidos de extrema derecha y ponerles la alfombra roja para que gobiernen.

Y no hay mejor caja de resonancia para la propaganda antieuropea que el empobrecimiento al que se enfrentan las clases populares europeas, que ven cómo sus necesidades básicas, como la energía o los alimentos, tienen ahora precio de productos de lujo.

Cerrar los medios de comunicación; encarcelar a periodista; intentar imponer el belicismo como discurso único; acallar, perseguir políticamente o tachar de pro-Putin o de antieuropeos a quienes no apoyan la escalada de la guerra o defienden la diplomacia y el diálogo… Todo esto, créanme, no tiene nada que ver con luchar contra la propaganda, sino con coartar peligrosamente la libertad de expresión y la pluralidad.

Pablo González es un periodista vasco que estaba cubriendo el conflicto para varios medios españoles cuando fue detenido en Polonia. No hacía propaganda rusa, pero tampoco pro-OTAN. Quizá ahí reside parte del problema. Lleva más de siete meses encarcelado. Sin juicio, sin acusación formalizada, incomunicado, bajo un régimen de encarcelamiento propio de un Estado totalitario, y prorrogándose sin fecha definitiva una «prisión preventiva».

En guerra o en paz encarcelar preventivamente al periodismo y la libertad informativa no es luchar contra la propaganda, sino, más bien, abonar el terreno para que esta haga su efecto.

Aprovecho para exigir desde aquí, desde el Parlamento Europeo, la inmediata puesta en libertad de Pablo González y el respeto al derecho a la información y a la libertad de prensa.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dal 2014 la Russia ha trasferito segretamente fiumi di denaro a partiti, associazioni e soggetti di diversi paesi per creare una rete di influenza e consenso. Anche il Parlamento europeo si è occupato dei rapporti tra il Cremlino e forze politiche europee, su cui pretendiamo maggiore approfondimento e chiarezza. Questo quadro fa comprendere le minacce rappresentate dalle attività di coloro che in Europa amplificano il sistema propagandistico di regimi autoritari come quello di Putin.

Fake news e disinformazione online sono pericolosi strumenti funzionali alle politiche di guerra per minare il sostegno all'Ucraina, orientare l'opinione pubblica e interferire nei processi democratici. Occorrono maggiori sforzi per contrastare le forme di finanziamento occulte provenienti da regimi stranieri, per rafforzare le pratiche di *fact-checking* e la cooperazione delle piattaforme dei social media con le autorità.

La sicurezza dell'Europa dipende dalla capacità di difendersi dalle ingerenze straniere, ma soprattutto da un inevitabile processo di pace a cui tutta l'Unione deve tendere senza se e senza ma.

Sandra Kalniete (PPE). – Godātais sēdes vadītāj! Kolēģi! Krievijas iebrukums Ukrainā nav tikai militāro spēku sadursme. Tas ir arī informācijas karš. Nesen dezinformācijas laboratorija publicēja pētījumu par Kremļa ietekmes operāciju tīklu, kas kopš maija izplata prokrievisku un pret Ukrainu vērstu informāciju Vācijā, Francijā, Itālijā, Ukrainā, Latvijā un Apvienotajā Karalistē.

Nesenais Valsts departamenta ziņojums atklāj, ka kopš 2014. gada Kremlis ir ieguldījis 300 miljonus dolāru politisko partiju un politiķu finansēšanā vairāk nekā 20 valstīs. Maskava velta arvien lielākus resursus Eiropas valstu demokrātisko sistēmu graušanai un nacionālās politikas ietekmēšanai, atbalstot sev labvēlīgus kandidātus vēlēšanās un iegūstot ietekmi politisko partiju iekšienē.

Abi šie ziņojumi apstiprina, ka Krievija izvērš pret mums masīvu informācijas karu. Putina sabiedroto ekonomiskā un politiskā ietekme Eiropā saindē mūsu demokrātiju, šķeļ sabiedrību un attālina uzvaru karā.

Kolēģi, mums ir jāizveido spēcīga Eiropas Savienības struktūra hibrīddraudu novēršanai, kā arī jāstiprina mūsu institūciju kapacitāte un jāpaplašina to pilnvaras, lai identificētu un sauktu pie atbildības Putina sabiedrotos pašu mājās. Eiropas Savienības digitālā ekosistēma ir jāuzlabo, tajā iekļaujot sankcijas pret ļaunprātīgu dezinformācijas operāciju autoriem un izpildītājiem. To es sagaidu no solītā Eiropas Demokrātijas aizsardzības pakta.

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, Monsieur le Ministre, chers collègues, ils se disent patriotes et servent un tyran étranger. Ils s'appellent les chercheurs de la vérité et relaient les *fake news* les plus grossières. Ils se réclament d'Orwell et vident les mots de leur substance, abolissent le principe de non-contradiction. Ils, ce sont les supplétifs numériques, politiques, médiatiques de Poutine. Ils ne sont pas à Kherson ou à Donetsk. Non, ils sont dans leur salon ou sur nos plateaux de télévision. Mais ils participent eux aussi à l'effort de guerre russe en niant ses crimes et en relayant ses mensonges. Ils sont souvent d'extrême droite, comme Matteo Salvini ou Marine Le Pen, mais pas toujours. Ils viennent parfois aussi de la gauche, comme Ségolène Royal, ou de la droite comme Silvio Berlusconi. En temps de paix, ce sont des menteurs ou des idiots utiles. En temps de guerre, ce sont des complices de l'ennemi.

Chers collègues, disons-le enfin clairement, cette guerre n'a pas commencé le 24 février 2022 et elle ne se limite pas aux frontières de l'Ukraine. Cette guerre ne vise pas simplement Kiev, Kharkiv ou Kherson. Cette guerre dite hybride vise nos démocraties. Depuis de longues années, le régime russe mène une guerre hybride contre nos démocraties en jouant sur leur vulnérabilité, en cherchant d'un côté à affaiblir leurs défenses immunitaires via la corruption de leurs élites et de l'autre à les plonger dans le chaos en soutenant populistes et complotistes.

Au sein de la commission spéciale sur les ingérences étrangères que j'ai l'honneur de présider, nous avons analysé, disséqué cette guerre que nos dirigeants n'ont longtemps pas voulu voir. Cette guerre abolit les différences entre le virtuel et le réel, le dedans et le dehors, la politique étrangère et la politique intérieure. Il est temps de se hisser au niveau du péril qui nous fait face.

Alors que l'UE estimait, avant l'invasion de l'Ukraine, le financement russe de la désinformation à 1 milliard d'euros et les ressources humaines mobilisées à plus d'un millier de pleins temps, l'Union, elle, ne dispose actuellement que d'un budget de 11 millions d'euros et de 41 agents pour répondre à cette menace. Nous devons investir massivement dans la veille, la détection, la riposte aux attaques venant de Russie. Prenons au mot la présidente de la Commission devant le Parlement. Nous ne laisserons aucun cheval de Troie lancé par une autocratie attaquer nos démocraties de l'intérieur.

Il faut agir maintenant. Nous n'avons pas le choix. Nous n'avons pas le droit d'offrir à Poutine la victoire chez nous que les Ukrainiens lui refusent chez eux. L'enjeu n'est pas simplement la liberté de l'Ukraine, c'est la nôtre.

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, on a déjà beaucoup parlé des collaborateurs qui, en Europe et jusque dans ce Parlement – on en a eu un exemple tout à l'heure – déroulent la propagande d'un président russe qui nous est ouvertement hostile. Je voudrais aujourd'hui, non pas me répéter, mais émettre des propositions. Commençons par ceux des Européens, car il y en a, qui ont servi de caution au simulacre de référendum en s'improvisant observateurs d'une mascarade. Je propose qu'ils fassent l'objet de sanctions européennes, tout comme les organisateurs de ces parodies électorales.

Deuxièmement, on s'est réjoui de la suspension de RT et de Spoutnik en Europe, mais nombre de faux experts inondent nos plateaux sans dire leurs liens avec la Russie. L'information est un bien trop précieux pour qu'on ignore ce qu'elle contient. Je voudrais encourager les médias à afficher de façon systématique pour qui travaillent ceux qu'ils invitent, anciens militaires, anciens diplomates, pseudo-journalistes mais vrai businessmen de l'influence.

Je m'étonne enfin qu'Eutelsat continue à disséminer de la propagande russe en diffusant, via quatre satellites, plus de 300 chaînes russes de télévision et une cinquantaine de radios à 15 millions de foyers russes. Il n'est plus le temps de…

(Le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, let me start with a call. We all know what happens if Conservatives help fascists into power. I urge you, Conservatives, to learn from history, do not enable a post-fascist and Putin-friendly government in Italy. Yes, it's the extreme right party, several extreme right parties, where we know that they have ties to Russia, where we know there were financial implications, loans and so on with Russia.

But the polarisation through fake news and ads on social media, the polarisation of our society serves all far right parties and are distracting our elections – our democratic election systems – in the European Union. We have to be aware of that. But we also have to acknowledge that many of our politicians, from the Conservatives, from the Social Democrats, even from the Liberals, were driving us into this dangerous dependency on Russian gas. Some of them even profited personally by serving as employees of Russian companies.

Okay, this was the past. But I think after 24 February, after the invasion of Russia into Ukraine, we should all be very clear – Putin is using disinformation and fake news for polarisation. Putin is using the extreme right, and Putin is also using some of our prominent political figures for his asymmetric war. EPP, you have nothing to win by supporting post-fascists. Come back to the *cordon sanitaire* and please start with not supporting a post-fascist and pro-Putin government in Italy.

Ivan David (ID). – Pane předsedající, je pravda, že ruská válečná agrese na Ukrajině eskaluje, ale tím končí pravda. Dále v oficiálním narativu pokračují lži, které mají zakrýt reálnou skutečnost. Lež nás vždycky spolehlivě dovede jen k chybným závěrům. Nejsem úředník Evropské komise nebo nějakého ministerstva zahraničí, abych musel opakovat oficiální lži. A je mi úplně lhostejné, co píší v Rusku nebo jinde. Téměř všechna média jsou nástrojem propagandy. Tak to prostě je. Pokud se jedná o dezinformace, tak například premiér České republiky pan Fiala řekl, že weby, které nechal zablokovat, byly placeny z Ruska. Řekl to veřejně, nijak to nedoložil. Je to lež a ani se neomluvil. Není nic lehčího, než cokoli označit za dezinformaci.

Jak se blokování různých zdrojů liší od cenzury? Samozřejmě, že pokud někdo financuje dezinformační média, a to mohou být všechna, nejenom ta, která jsou financována z Ruska, mohou být financována z Ukrajiny, ze Spojených států, z různých zemí EU, tak jsou financována samozřejmě proto, aby uváděla věci tak, aby se to jaksi hodilo. Jak se to tedy liší od cenzury? Já se obávám, že ti, kteří tady bojují proti cenzuře, tak bojují proto, že se často dostávají do argumentační nouze. Bohužel Evropa se v poslední době dostává do krize a všichni se snaží najít nějaké jiné příčiny, než které ve skutečné skutečnosti jsou. Představitelé EU, zradili jste občany svých zemí a ženete je stále do nebezpečnější … *(předsedající odebral řečníkovi slovo)*

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Herr talman! Propaganda bemöts bäst med fakta. Västvärlden kan och får aldrig underskatta Kremls propaganda. Den är överallt, och den är effektiv. Den avser att undergräva europeisk motståndskraft med falska påståenden om att Kiev faller inom tre dagar, att ryska militärmakten är näst starkast i världen, och än i dag hör vi från olika håll att Ukraina inte kan vinna.

Lögner bemöts bäst med fakta. Ukrainska hjältar visar i detta nu att Ukraina faktiskt kan vinna, med svenskt och europeiskt stöd.

Den ryska propagandamaskinen har också varit väldigt effektiv i energipolitiken. Vi vet att Gazprom har finansierat miljöorganisationer i syfte att stänga ner europeisk energiproduktion och öka beroendet av rysk gas. Vi vet att Belgiens miljöpartistiska energiminister, som tidigare som advokat har avlönats av Gazprom, nu vill stänga ner landets kärnkraft. Miljöorganisationer i Tyskland fick tiotals miljoner av Ryssland för att motverka energiutvinning.

För att Europa ska motstå ryska påtryckningar krävs självrannsakan. Mitt parti har gjort rent hus med Putinapologeter. Men hur är det med den politiska mitten som sa att Nord Stream var ett strikt kommersiellt projekt och att energivapnet inte skulle användas av Putin – finns det självrannsakan där? Och när kommer självkritiken och viljan till förbättring från en klimatrörelse som tagit emot ryska pengar? När kommer miljövänstern att erkänna att deras kamp mot kärnkraften har försvagat Europa och möjliggjort Putins aggression?

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, the war in Ukraine is quickly escalating into a wider horror. And from what I can see, practically nobody in this Chamber is doing anything to prevent it. In fact most people seem to get off on the fact that it's escalating. And at this precise moment, of course, as usual, the voices challenging the rush to war are attacked and silenced, smeared as traitors, cronies, Putin puppets, Kremlin stooges, Russian agents.

Frankly, it's pathetic. And I don't make the comparison lightly, but the crudeness and cynicism of these slurs coming from mainstream EU parties might as well have been written by Hermann Göring, who infamously said that even though people never want war, they can be brought to war with threats and smears. He said all you have to do is tell them they're being attacked, denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing their country to danger – it works the same every way. Where he led, you are following.

This House should be ashamed of this debate. Words are being twisted, meanings subverted, and the truth turned on its head. Opposing the horrible madness of war is not anti-European, it's not anti-Ukrainian, it's not pro-Russian: it's common sense. The working class of Europe have nothing to gain from this war and everything to lose. And I find it laughable that those calling for arms to Ukraine never call for arms for the people of Palestine, or for the people of Yemen. Unlike you, I oppose all war. I want it stopped. I make no apology for that. And I am not going to be scapegoated and labelled for it either.

Rasa Juknevičienė (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, for 20 years, corruption have been the biggest export of Putin's regime. The public friends of Putin we just heard, who speak regularly in this House, his open cronies in Member States, are an important part of Russia's war today. But there is another side to the Putinisation of Europe: the Kremlin has developed sophisticated methods where the openness of democracy is used to influence the emotions of people and politicians.

The Kremlin has become adept at easily achieving goals. Their manipulations and lies are on the front pages of the media, presented as alternative or second opinions. Their lies are presented through some NGOs, cultural, business, sports or even religious organisations that are penetrated and funded by the Kremlin. We have not yet fully identified this.

Today, our biggest challenge is to counter blackmail with gas and nuclear weapons. The Kremlin needs fear-inspiring headlines and speeches. Our response must be our refusal to be afraid. Let's de-Putinise our fears. The moment of truth, the Kyiv moment, is our chance to evaluate the past and to clean up our political system.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, it's really hard to say what is worse, Russian war of aggression or Kremlin long-term propaganda. There is a clear political agenda to boost disinformation, propaganda, stimulate regional tensions to destabilise, while supporting radical and populist political options all over Europe.

Pro-Russian political options come from the extremes, from populist backgrounds, and they serve as Putin's 'useful idiots', often as well-paid 'useful idiots'. However, sadly one can find them even among some former and current EU prime ministers. I would also say that the EU was keeping its eyes shut on this matter for years, hence the consequences.

Putin's cronies are using dangerous, cynical and manipulative misinterpretations. They are trying to strengthen pro-Russian sentiment by undermining our cohesion, our unity, and by speaking against the sanctions. They are using the rising costs of living, the energy crisis and inflation to speak favourably of Russia and to advocate for the return to business as usual.

We cannot return to business as usual and we cannot overlook the vicious Russian war of aggression and their war crimes. Russian attempts to weaponise energy is just a final confirmation of this.

We would also add that no one in Europe can now sit on two chairs. Serbia, for example, remains the only European country besides Belarus that has not imposed sanctions on Russia. The recent signing of the agreement with Russia in the UN is a slap in the face for their enlargement perspective, but primarily to their citizens that want to join the EU.

We need to continue countering this propaganda, by giving strong support to civil society and fact checkers, not only in the EU, but also in our immediate neighbourhood.

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister, dear colleagues, the Kremlin's long-term, systematic and very poisonous disinformation and propaganda war against the West has been aimed at weakening our value orientation and our adequate perception of reality.

Let's admit, Russia's state information policy has imposed influence on us and our partners' – such as Ukraine in particular – societies for decades and has managed to create confusion in people's minds, attempting to weaken critical thinking and trust in state institutions and democratic processes.

We must end the presence of the Kremlin and Russia's state-sponsored propaganda and disinformation channels in our information space – though it's nothing to do with information – because it is unjustifiable.

The Kremlin's empire of lies cannot be accepted in the West and our societies. We must curb the cases in which Russian-funded European NGOs, political, scientific and cultural institutions become agents of influence on our side.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, before Russia used tanks, Russian propaganda took aim at Ukraine and the EU. They unleashed their trolls, paid bloggers and corrupt politicians. They infiltrated European governments. They bought up radio frequencies and other critical infrastructure. All this while we stood idly by.

It is high time to grow a spine and stand up to the Russian aggression, not only on the battlefield but also in the information field. Putin will use all our weaknesses if we allow him to. The upcoming winter will not be easy. We need and we must introduce a sanctions regime for disinformation. This should be a warning to anyone who dares to interfere in our democracies.

Lastly, the EU delegation should become the stronghold of fighting the anti-EU propaganda abroad, particularly in the Balkans and the South Caucasus. The Delegation needs to be bolstered with facts and effective strategies. They should be more vocal in defending the truth and refuting the shameless lies that Russia spreads every day.

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Herr Präsident! Heute geht es um den Einfluss von Putins westlichen Helfershelfern und darum, wie dieser Einfluss gestoppt werden kann. Das ist sicherlich sinnvoll. Putin war schon vor dem Einmarsch in die Ukraine ein Verbrecher. Die Morde an Boris Nemzow, Anna Politkowskaja oder Stanislaw Markelow sprechen eine überdeutliche Sprache, wie auch der seit Jahren unerklärliche Hang vieler russischer Oppositioneller, sich aus großer Höhe in den Tod zu stürzen.

Aber wer sind die Helfershelfer Putins in Europa? Die in diesem Hause viel bejubelte Angela Merkel, die Deutschland mit der Unterstützung all ihrer Parteigänger hier im Parlament und im Deutschen Bundestag in die Abhängigkeit von russischem Erdgas brachte? Exkanzler Gerhard Schröder, der die Gasgeschäfte einfädelte und Putin einen lupenreinen Demokraten nannte? Die gesamte Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, die den Kurs von Gerhard Schröder jahrelang aktiv mittrug? Oder gehört die Partei Die Linke zu Putins Helfershelfern? Immerhin wurden Die Linke und ihre Vorgängerparteien schon immer von Moskau bezahlt, und noch kürzlich richtete Die Linke Ergebenheitsadressen an den Kreml.

Höchstwahrscheinlich ist auch Greenpeace einer von Putins Helfershelfern. Das behauptet die NATO. Die NATO ist sicher, dass Greenpeace Gelder von Russland für die Bekämpfung von Fracking erhalten hat. Und wer den extrem prorussischen antiukrainischen Artikel gelesen hat, den Greenpeace kürzlich nach scharfen Protesten löschen musste, kann tatsächlich auf den Gedanken kommen, dass auch Greenpeace zu den Helfershelfern Putins gehört.

Vielleicht werden auch Fridays for Future und Greta Thunberg von Putin finanziert. Das meinte zumindest Hillary Clinton vor einiger Zeit, und Clinton ist nun wahrlich niemand aus dem rechten Spektrum. Auch die schon erwähnte Angela Merkel hat diese Vermutung geäußert. Merkel sagte, es sei völlig ausgeschlossen, dass aus dem Nichts heraus und ohne massive finanzielle Unterstützung eine große antiwestliche Bewegung entstehen könne. Hat das Europäische Parlament, als es Greta Thunberg einlud, mithin eine Helfershelferin von Putin hofiert?

Sie sehen, ich wüsste wirklich gerne, wer die Helfershelfer von Putin sind. Das Thema ist zu wichtig, als dass man es für parteipolitische Zwecke missbrauchen sollte. Also lassen Sie uns genau hinsehen, aber bitte objektiv und in alle Richtungen.

Hermann Tertsch (ECR). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, la desinformación por parte de la maquinaria de agitación y propaganda de la Rusia de Putin viene realizándose desde hace muchos años y se ha agravado, por supuesto, con la criminal agresión a Ucrania. Hay que combatirla con verdad, no con censura. Y aquí hay muchas tentaciones de hacer lo segundo.

El Kremlin lleva muchos años pagando a grupos y partidos en Europa, de extrema derecha, de extrema izquierda y también, señores, de los partidos convencionales, que son ustedes. Porque los *euro Putins* o los acólitos europeos de Putin son fundamentalmente los grandes partidos en Alemania, que nos han llevado en Europa a esta situación de postración general frente a Putin. No sabemos si Putin se hubiera atrevido a una serie de cosas si no hubiera tenido estas garantías que se le han ido otorgando durante quince años, quince años de ayudarle a conseguir la dependencia total por parte de Europa, por parte del señor Schröder, por parte del señor Steinmeier, por parte del señor Scholz, de todo el Partido Socialdemócrata de Alemania en general.

Pero también tenemos esa desinformación y esa propaganda en el Partido Socialista Obrero Español, que es el socio de todos esos países que votan en contra de la condena de Rusia en América, en Iberoamérica, en la Alianza del Foro de São Paulo y Grupo de Puebla, donde está el PSOE, donde está Podemos y donde tienen a *Russia Today* haciendo propaganda antieuropea, antiucraniana, prorrusa, siempre con el apoyo, como digo, de un Gobierno español. Ahí están el *mainstream*, ahí están los acólitos del señor Putin; están aquí, en los partidos grandes.

Javier Zarzalejos (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente, señor presidente del Consejo, la guerra de agresión contra Ucrania nos permite ver en toda su gravedad lo que significa la estrategia de desinformación y de injerencia. Y la primera conclusión es que la desinformación y la injerencia son también una guerra.

Cuando nos enfrentamos a Estados que no ocultan sus ambiciones, ya sean económicas, territoriales o nucleares, la desinformación que practican es la forma de preparar el terreno para el uso de la fuerza.

Antes de que Putin bombardeara Ucrania, había bombardeado las mentes y las opiniones con una campaña permanente de odio y de demonización contra los ucranianos y sus autoridades. La fuerza militar vino después. Por tanto, sepamos que la desinformación es el canario en la mina: siempre anuncia peligro.

Después de sus fracasos militares Putin solo puede confiar en que funcione alguna de estas tres hipótesis. En primer lugar, la amenaza del uso del arma nuclear. En segundo lugar, un cambio político de algún aliado de la OTAN, con la esperanza de que ponga en cuestión la ayuda que recibe Ucrania. Y, en tercer lugar, el desistimiento de Occidente por cansancio.

Pues bien, en cualquiera de estas hipótesis, y para que estas funcionen, es esencial para Rusia la utilización masiva de la desinformación, de la injerencia, de la manipulación, de la actuación a través de personalidades y organizaciones políticas, sociales y mediáticas aliadas de Rusia y afines a su narrativa antioccidental.

Estemos, pues, alerta todos —instituciones, políticos, medios de comunicación, organizaciones sociales— para no dejar que, en este momento crucial, la opinión pública de nuestros países se vea contaminada por la mentira, la amenaza y la manipulación.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non possiamo più sottovalutare gli effetti della propaganda di Putin, perché si tratta di un'arma, di una vera e propria arma che è volta a fiaccare la nostra unità, la nostra resilienza, minare i nostri valori, intaccare quella che è la nostra sicurezza collettiva.

Già durante la pandemia abbiamo visto come la Russia ha sfruttato la crisi sanitaria per diffondere caos e disinformazione e l'aggressione in Ucraina ha poi definitivamente fatto toccare con mano al mondo intero il peso della propaganda nel contesto della guerra ibrida. Un'arma usata per dividerci, attraverso la quale il Cremlino cerca di manipolare le atrocità commesse, negare i principi su cui si fonda la nostra comunità internazionale e strumentalizzare, per esempio, la crisi energetica.

E allora voltarsi dall'altra parte non è un'opzione. Non lo farà questo Parlamento, che più volte ha sottolineato la necessità di intervenire. Lo ha fatto attraverso il lavoro prezioso dei colleghi che è stato svolto nella commissione INGE, ma dobbiamo fare di più. Dobbiamo delineare una strategia comune e all'altezza delle sfide attuali. Dobbiamo avviare un programma di informazione, effettuare un monitoraggio più efficace, per esempio dei contenuti che vengono diffusi online.

Bart Groothuis (Renew). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear Ministers, President Putin is not just slowly militarily losing on the battlefield in Europe, he's also losing the information war against the EU.

The EU has put forward, to his disadvantage, the Digital Services Act, the Code of Practice, dozens of initiatives on media literacy, on free journalism, and we're even tackling the political party financing, which is a huge problem, as we've just seen on the far right and far left side of this House. Mouthpieces of Beijing and Moscow speak freely here. But I'm glad that the reasonable part of this House has put forward the initiatives to tackle just that.

We shouldn't underestimate, however, how Russian disinformation and propaganda is playing out in the rest of the world. Out there, populous countries in the global South – in Asia, Africa, Latin America – are slowly gaining sympathy for a tyrant murdering, raping, stealing.

Troll farms are enabling that thinking. Russia – and others like China – are aiming at two thirds of the world's population, and so should the EU, by countering those efforts. The next phase of our joint and evolving effort against disinformation, dear colleagues, should be exactly that: countering disinformation, extending our efforts to the rest of the world in the global South.

Alexandra Geese (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Putin führt seinen Krieg gegen die Demokratie an mehreren Fronten: in der Ukraine mit Verbrechen gegen Menschen in Fleisch und Blut, im Rest der Welt mit Propaganda und Lügen. Und während Putin an der Ukrainefront eine Niederlage nach der anderen einstecken muss, ist sein Propagandakrieg im Internet sehr erfolgreich, denn da hat er zwei große Verbündete.

Der erste sind rechtsextreme Politikerinnen und Politiker und Netzwerke in Europa, in den USA, die systematisch die Propagandalügen aus russischen Trollfabriken aufgreifen und bei uns verbreiten. Und der zweite Verbündete sind die sozialen Netzwerke selbst, ein Nährboden für Lügen und Propaganda. Ihre Gier nach unserer Aufmerksamkeit, an der sie mit Werbung viel Geld verdienen – denn das steckt dahinter –, geht auf Kosten der Wahrheit. Ihre Algorithmen verbreiten reißerische Inhalte schneller als jeden Fakt und dank der umfassenden Datenprofile mit chirurgischer Präzision.

Diese versteckten Feinde der Demokratie müssen wir aufdecken und abschaffen. Dafür ist das Gesetz über digitale Dienste ein sehr scharfes Schwert, das die Europäische Kommission und die Mitgliedstaaten jetzt nutzen müssen.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Rosja wydała od 2014 r. ponad 300 milionów dolarów, by wpływać na polityków i władzę w ponad 20 państwach. Chciałbym zwrócić Państwa uwagę na jedno z tych państw i bulwersujący przykład czerpania z kremlowskiej kasy. Mam na myśli niemieckie władze landu Meklemburgia – Pomorze Przednie, które uruchomiły Fundację Klimatu i Ochrony Środowiska na początku 2021 r. Organizacja miała za zadanie wykonać zmierzające już wtedy ku końcowi prace nad finalizacją projektu budowy gazociągu Nord Stream 2. W tym celu otrzymała od Gazpromu w sumie 192 miliony euro. Ostatnie transfery były realizowane zaledwie cztery miesiące przed inwazją Rosji na Ukrainę. Trafiły one do 80 usługodawców. Fundacja kupowała i przechowywała komponenty dla gazociągu, chroniąc dostawców przed amerykańskimi sankcjami. Finansowana była przez władze landu i Nord Stream 2. Dlatego, gdy z tego miejsca pan Verhofstadt mówi o rzekomych cheerleaderach we Włoszech i wzywa do obalenia demokratycznie wybranego włoskiego rządu, to chciałbym zapytać, dlaczego Pan nie wspomina o innych cheerleaderach, takich jak kanclerz Angela Merkel, kanclerz Schröder, kanclerz Austrii, premier Francji… *(Przewodniczący odebrał mówcy głos)*

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Αντιπρόεδρε, κύριε Σχοινά, κύριε υπουργέ. Η εισβολή του Πούτιν δεν ήρθε ως κεραυνός εν αιθρία. Ο Πούτιν προετοιμαζόταν εδώ και καιρό, και η προπαγάνδα ήταν ένα μεγάλο μέρος της προετοιμασίας του. Πρέπει να παραδεχτούμε ότι δεν αντιμετωπίσαμε επαρκώς ούτε την προπαγάνδα ούτε τα ψέματα του Πούτιν, που συνεχίζεται μέχρι σήμερα και είναι εξόχως επικίνδυνη, εκτός των άλλων, γιατί ανοίγει την όρεξη και τον δρόμο και σε άλλους που σκέφτονται και πράττουν όπως ο Πούτιν, όπως είναι ο Ερντογάν, ο οποίος επίσης χρησιμοποιεί την προπαγάνδα και τα ψεύδη πριν και μετά από οποιαδήποτε παράνομη και προκλητική ενέργεια (casus belli, γαλάζια πατρίδα, αποστρατικοποίηση νησιών, απειλές «μια νύχτα θα έρθουμε ξαφνικά», εκατοντάδες πτήσεις πάνω από τα νησιά του Αιγαίου, αμφισβήτηση διεθνών συνθηκών, αδιαφορία για το διεθνές δίκαιο), και τώρα μας προέκυψε και ένα ακόμα παράνομο μνημόνιο με τη Λιβύη για την εκμετάλλευση υδρογονανθράκων στην περιοχή της νόμιμης ΑΟΖ Ελλάδας-Αιγύπτου. Και πάντα αυτά συνοδεύονται από προπαγάνδα του Ερντογάν κατά της Ελλάδας· η ιστορία του Ερντογάν, που λέει ότι η Ελλάδα είναι το χαϊδεμένο παιδί της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, που εξοπλίζει τα νησιά, που κάνει παράνομα push backs, που πνίγει πρόσφυγες στο Αιγαίο, που αφήνει νεκρά παιδιά στη νησίδα του Έβρου. Και αυτή την προπαγάνδα την αναπαράγουν όχι μόνο εχθροί της Ελλάδας, αλλά τολμούν να την αναπαράξουν για μικροκομματικό όφελος ακόμα και μέλη της ελληνικής αντιπολιτευτικής σκηνής. Κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, όταν πρόκειται για την προπαγάνδα του Ερντογάν κατά της Ελλάδας, ας μην ξεχνάμε το σκληρό μάθημα που πήραμε από τον Πούτιν. Γιατί όταν ανεχόμαστε την προπαγάνδα, τα χειρότερα έρχονται.

Marek Belka (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Putin już przed 24 lutego prowadził wojnę. Nie tylko krymską, ale także informacyjną. Atakował Unię. Tłumaczył, że Ukraińcy nie są prawdziwym narodem. A jego armia internetowych trolli zniechęcała do nas i naszych demokratycznych wartości.

Niestety są osoby w Europie, czasami nawet i na tej sali, które tę wojnę współtworzyły. Atak Rosji na Ukrainę nie przyniósł pełnego otrzeźwienia dla tych pożytecznych dla Kremla idiotów. Pozująca do zdjęć z Putinem Marine Le Pen krytykuje Unię Europejską za zbyt ambitne sankcje. Antyukraińskie wypowiedzi polskiego polityka Grzegorza Brauna były wykorzystywane w propagandowym programie rosyjskiej telewizji. Często radykałowie organizują marsze, gdzie wspierającymi Rosję hasłami zapewnili sobie prime time w rosyjskiej propagandówce. To tylko przykłady.

Każdy idiotyczny atak na Unię, sankcje czy Ukrainę powinien być traktowany jako wsparcie Putina. Czas, by Komisja zaproponowała pakiet konkretnych rozwiązań, jak tę internetową wojnę wygrać.

Nawiązując do albumu jednego z aktualnych popleczników Putina, Rogera Watersa z legendarnego zespołu Pink Floyd, nie wiem, czy tacy jak on, polska Konfederacja, czy Marine Le Pen są po ciemnej stronie Księżyca. Z pewnością zapisują się jednak na najciemniejszych kartach europejskiej historii.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, ahora está más claro que la segunda llegada al poder de Putin en 2012 estaba cargada de un identitarismo tóxico y resentido.

El nacional-populismo ha trabajado dentro y fuera de Rusia con su industria de la desinformación (lo hemos dicho). En las últimas décadas ha captado y financiado ideas conspiracionistas y también movimientos políticos antieuropeos e ideologías ultras, tanto conservadoras en la nueva derecha extrema o radical, como en el eje de izquierdas pro venezolano, cubano e iraní.

También ha alimentado el independentismo por si revientan la Unión en algún punto.

Tras la ocupación de Ucrania, sin embargo, necesitan desesperadamente generar dudas y miedo en la opinión pública para que se acobarde, para que acepte, con todas las capas de autoengaño, el diálogo, el llevarse bien, el que hay que ceder ante Putin.

Ceder un poco ante alguien así, ante un régimen así, es pan para hoy y hambre para mañana. O, mejor dicho, gas para hoy y desastre para mañana.

Señorías, en la Comisión Especial sobre Injerencias Extranjeras en Todos los Procesos Democráticos de la Unión Europea, en particular la Desinformación debemos seguir recabando información y entendiendo los mecanismos de la injerencia directa y difusa.

La batalla clave es una dialéctica de voluntades. No la podemos perder.

Kim Van Sparrentak (Verts/ALE). – Voorzitter, antidemocratische partijen verspreiden online bewust desinformatie: in Oekraïne om verwarring te zaaien en de moraal te breken, maar ook in de rest van Europa om onze maatschappij te verdelen en democratieën uit te hollen.

De algoritmen en verdienmodellen van big tech gaan goed op extreme content zoals haat en desinformatie. Dit gebruiken pro-Russische krachten tegen ons. Vorige week nog onthulde EU DisinfoLab een gigantische pro-Russische desinformatieoperatie via bots en betaalde advertenties waar Facebook meer dan een ton aan verdiende. Zo worden wij dus steeds verder in een bubbel van extremisme gesleurd, met gevaar voor onze veiligheid, en ondertussen wordt big tech lachend rijk.

De oplossing is simpel: we moeten big tech aanpakken en af van persoonlijke, polariserende algoritmen. Maar ieder daadkrachtig optreden om ze te stoppen gaat de Europese Commissie en rechtse partijen te ver. We kunnen niet langer toekijken hoe dit systeem Poetin en de uitholling van onze democratie faciliteert. Hoog tijd om in te grijpen.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, руска агресия срещу Украйна има, руска пропаганда има. Само че тази руска пропаганда е на американски платформи. Най-големите лъжи на тази пропаганда се разпространяват от американски платформи и те не ги свалят. Защо това е така? Защото очевидно не желаят и защото ви помагат в една лъжа, а именно в лъжата, че десните били съюзници на Путин.

Не, не е вярно. Истинските съюзници на Путин са в Брюксел – тези, които унищожаваха европейската енергетика; тези, които унищожаваха въглищните мини; тези, които унищожаваха нашата независимост; тези, които направиха Европейския съюз зависим от руските въглеводороди; и тези, които финансират руската икономика. Това са приятелите на Путин. Не ние десните, не ние националистите.

Национализмът е единствената съпротива, истинска изворна съпротива на болшевизма, а комунизмът е на Кремъл. Както ние се съпротивлявахме с оръжие в ръка след 45-та година в Източна Европа, а вие ни изоставихте и предадохте в Ялта, така и днес продължавате да бъдете истинските съюзници на Путин. Помислете за това.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Ministro, Senhor Comissário, Senhor Vice-Presidente, não é só desde 24 de fevereiro deste ano, mas desde a invasão da Crimeia e, até antes disso, que certos atores políticos europeus tomam o partido da Rússia e que muitos outros são influenciados pela propaganda e pela desinformação russa.

Não podemos esquecer-nos do que aconteceu nas eleições americanas em que foi eleito Donald Trump, ou no referendo do Brexit, ou no referendo apócrifo da Catalunha. Não podemos esquecer-nos do financiamento de muitos partidos da direita radical, mas também do lançamento e financiamento de muitos partidos da esquerda radical. Em todos eles, esteve sempre a Rússia, esteve sempre a central de *hacking* mundial que é a Rússia.

Putin transformou a Rússia numa espécie de KGB global, à qual estamos todos sujeitos, a cujas ações estamos todos expostos. E, por isso mesmo, é fundamental que a União Europeia tome medidas claras, medidas com capacidade de influência nos *media* e, essencialmente, nas redes sociais.

Num momento em que temos um novo panorama do ponto de vista comunicacional, que não é apenas o dos *media* tradicionais, mas é o das redes sociais, nós temos de ser capazes de descobrir as formas de contrariar a propaganda e a desinformação que podem minar as nossas opiniões públicas e, especialmente neste muito difícil contexto geopolítico, pô-las ao lado de Putin, do Kremlin e das suas violações do direito internacional.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la propaganda antieuropea e anti-Ucraina serpeggia un po' ovunque tra gli Stati membri e l'Italia non fa eccezione. Il tempo passa, ma una certa destra compare di Putin, sedicente guardiana dell'interesse nazionale, ma in realtà con lo sguardo rivolto al Cremlino, continua a strizzare l'occhio verso gli autoritarismi, ignorando persecuzioni delle minoranze e dimenticando il bavaglio alla libera espressione.

Silvio Berlusconi, leader importante del PPE, ha affermato in diretta TV che Putin ha invaso l'Ucraina per «sostituire con un governo di persone per bene il governo di Zelensky». La Lega continua a non denunciare l'accordo di collaborazione firmato col partito di Putin, Russia Unita, e mantiene un velo di ambiguità rispetto ai rapporti che sono stati oggetto anche di indagine con mondi russi, così come riguardo alle visite segrete di Matteo Salvini presso l'ambasciata russa a Roma, a poche ore dall'invasione dell'Ucraina.

Ricordo poi come il regime di Mosca si sia servito scientificamente di mezzi di informazione anti-ucraini in tutta Europa, diffondendo *fake news*, additando i profughi ucraini come pericolosi criminali o presentandoli come uomini benestanti giunti qui senza un reale bisogno. Questa non è una caccia alle streghe, ma una questione di sicurezza nazionale ed europea e anche una questione di umanità.

Di fronte a un regime che viola il diritto internazionale e minaccia di utilizzare armi atomiche non possono esserci ambiguità. Servono una condanna unanime e azioni forti come quelle annunciate dalla Commissione europea a difesa dell'integrità della nostra democrazia e che noi sosteniamo con tutta la nostra forza.

Valérie Hayer (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, chers collègues, octobre 2011, Marine Le Pen déclare, je cite: «J'admire Vladimir Poutine». Février 2014, Poutine envahit la Crimée. Marine Le Pen déclare, je cite encore: «La Crimée a toujours été russe». Septembre 2014, sept mois plus tard, Marine Le Pen reçoit un prêt de 9 millions d'euros d'une banque russe. Elle mange dans la main de Poutine. Février 2022, Poutine envahit le reste de l'Ukraine, Marine Le Pen milite contre les sanctions.

Je parle ici de Marine Le Pen, mais malheureusement, je pourrais en citer d'autres. Matteo Salvini, Viktor Orban, encore lui, des femmes et des hommes qui relaient mensonges et propagande, que ce soit dans leurs discours ou sur les réseaux sociaux. Des femmes et des hommes qui agit dans l'intérêt de la Russie bien avant l'intérêt de leur patrie. Bref, disons-le des faux patriotes. Ces faux patriotes, ils portent la responsabilité de notre insécurité, une insécurité qu'ils alimentent en tentant de diviser les Européens face à l'envahisseur. Il est donc de notre devoir, chers collègues, en tant que démocrates, de défendre nos valeurs. Aucune compromission avec les pro-Poutine, aucune alliance, aucune excuse.

Niklas Nienaß (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the first victim in war is the truth – you all know the saying. But I would say that if you want to start a war, you first have to kill the truth. Putin has been doing this for decades now – and also in Europe, like supporting La Lega, Rassemblement National, FPÖ and the AfD. By the way, those colleagues all fled this debate like the Russians flee from the Ukrainian forces.

But also, the biggest target group for Russia is in Russia. Russians have been brainwashed for ages, have been fed that the world hates them, that only Putin can save them, that every war is justified for Russia to free the world from … from what? From freedom? From liberty?

This we must tackle urgently, and this means we need to be active also in Russia. Please Commissioner, we cannot expect old people to go to the internet, get a VPN and get the information themselves. We have to address them through the radio, through TV, and we have to make sure that they are informed with the truth and that they know one thing – we are not the enemies of the Russian people. The enemies of the Russian people, the thieves of Russian money, the murders of Russian sons and husbands … sit in the Kremlin!

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja nie będę wymieniał nazwisk, tylko wzywam kolegów do zrobienia rachunku sumienia. Nie będę wymieniał tutaj socjaldemokratów czy chadeków, ale mógłbym mówić o Manueli Schwesig, jak mówił mój kolega, o Larsie Klingbeilu, o Sarze Wagenknecht naturalnie i wielu innych politykach. Więc proszę zrobić rachunek sumienia i się zastanowić, socjaldemokraci, chadecy, kto wspierał, kto uczynił Putina silnym.

Chciałbym powiedzieć o czymś innym, bo uważam, że najbardziej niebezpieczni są ci, którzy powtarzają rosyjską propagandę o tym nie wiedząc, nie w pełni świadomie. Ostatnio w dyskursie politycznym w Europie padają często zarzuty o faszyzm, post faszyzm. Każdy, kto się nie zgadza z mainstreamem, jest faszystą itd. Jest to powtórzenie oczywiście retoryki Frontu Narodowego lat 30tych XX wieku. Jeżeli Państwo sięgną do historii, to będą wiedzieli, że to było inspirowane przez Stalina. Więc powtarzamy język sowiecki czy postsowiecki. Nie mogę już konkludować, ale bardzo proszę o refleksję.

Traian Băsescu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, cu certitudine propaganda rusă este extrem de eficientă. Pe de altă parte, trebuie să observăm că în ultima perioadă și combaterea acestei propagande mincinoase a devenit tot mai puternică în statele membre ale Uniunii Europene și este făcută chiar de foarte mulți oameni politici și oameni simpli, oameni politici nu de prim rang, dar care se implică, și simplii cetățeni, tineri, ONG-uri.

Cred că din acest punct de vedere suntem pe un drum bun. Avem însă o altă mare problemă, problema consolidării lui Putin de către demnitari ai Uniunii Europene. Și aici o să vă dau, o să enumăr câțiva premieri ai Uniunii Europene care s-au pus în slujba lui Putin după terminarea mandatelor: Schroeder e pe buzele tuturor, Matteo Renzi, fost premier italian, angajat la firmă rusească, Christian Kern, fost cancelar austriac, François Fillon, fost premier al Franței, Esko Aho, fost premier finlandez, Paavo Lipponen, fost premier finlandez, Karin Kneissl, fost ministru de externe austriac, Hans Schelling, fost ministru de finanțe austriac și sigur, nu putea să lipsească, Dominique Strauss-Kahn.

Cu astfel de oameni în jurul său și … *(Președintele a retras cuvântul vorbitorului).*

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Minister Bek, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wenn in diesem Hohen Hause die AfD von der Notwendigkeit objektiver Debatten spricht, kann ich nur sagen: Obacht! Herr Beck ist leider nicht mehr da. Aber ich möchte hier noch einmal sagen: Es war in der Tat ein Fehler von vielen Parteien, Putin so lange zu vertrauen. Aber es ist seine Partei, und es ist sein Landesvorsitzender Höcke, der im August in diesem Jahr gefordert hat, Nord Stream 2 zu öffnen. Nur mal so viel zu den Fakten hier im Haus.

Und welche Parteien sind es denn, die jetzt die Ängste und Sorgen der Menschen instrumentalisieren, sie auf die Straße treiben, versuchen, die Demokratien zu destabilisieren? Das sind genau diese Rechtspopulisten. Das sind genau diese Postfaschisten, und sie erledigen Putins Geschäft damit. Der kann sich doch die Hände reiben, denn das ist es, was er versucht. Und er hat eine Armee von Bots, die ihn dabei unterstützen, und jede Menge nützliche Idioten, die das dann auch noch weiterverbreiten.

Und es war doch der US-Geheimdienst, der unlängst darauf hingewiesen hat, dass rechtspopulistische Parteien und Kandidaten 2014 nach der Annexion der Krim über 300 Millionen Franken erhalten haben, um unsere Demokratie zu destabilisieren, und da müssen wir einen Riegel vorschieben. Das darf nicht möglich sein.

Deshalb legen aber auch die, die jetzt davon sprechen, dass ukrainische Flüchtlinge Wohlfahrtstouristen seien oder Sozialtouristen, hier in einer solchen Situation die Zündschnur an. Lassen Sie uns gemeinsam dagegen vorgehen, damit Putin nicht gewinnt!

Dragoș Tudorache (Renew). – Mr President, dear colleagues, this is what history will remember of this war: a mad dictator invaded his neighbour, caused death and destruction, but failed in the face of bravery and solidarity. Ukraine wins, Putin loses and Europe grows more united.

There is but one problem, and it remains horrible: Putin's lackeys are still here around us. They continue to poison our societal debates. They continue to undermine our democracies. They spread disinformation and turn citizens against each other.

We must therefore build tools to stop them from winning elections through lies and manipulation, from feeding on the fears and insecurity of all citizens. We must therefore bring to light, and then forbid, any funding of our politics from Russia. You cannot run for office in Europe on Russian money. Full stop.

Second, we need to secure our ability to act as a Union. We need to move away from the blackmail of unanimity and maintain our ability to push back against Putin and others like him. Let us bring down Putin's cronies wherever they are in our governments, in our parliaments, in our democracies!

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Pane předsedající, ano, ruská propaganda jede na plné obrátky. A čím je Putinova pátá kolona početnější, tím je silnější. Musíme se bránit, ale řešení nemohou být jenom zákazy a náš pláč. Musíme si také sáhnout do svědomí. Ten výčet těch *cronies* tady jde napříč zleva doprava. Ano, kdo nás dostal víc do té Putinovy oprátky? Angela Merkelová a její *Energiewende*, Gerhard Schröder, holandští politici a jejich Gazprom nebo Matteo Salvini, madam Le Penová a další, kteří tam hledají financování a zastání? Myslím si, že to jde bohužel tady napříč a že dokud si nesáhneme my sami do svědomí, dokud nepřestaneme nahánět tady tou dominancí progresivismu konzervativce do ruského náručí, tak pak budeme teprve silnější a více schopni se propagandě bránit.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, destabilizacija demokratskih procesa putem dezinformacija ozbiljno je bojište. Pripremajući vojnu agresiju, Rusija se angažirala u propagandnom i medijskom smislu kako bi prikazala Ukrajinu kao državu u kojoj su na vlasti nacisti koji ugrožavaju rusku manjinu. Iako je ukrajinski narod, slobodnom voljom na demokratski provedenim izborima, nekoliko puta jasno izabrao put prema euroatlantskim integracijama, ruska propaganda nastojala je prikazati, ne samo vlast u Kijevu kao pučističku i time nelegitimnu, nego je išla tako daleko da je cijeli jedan narod optužila za pokušaj provođenja genocida.

Te laži, koje su se čule i s pozornice najvećeg svjetskog foruma Opće skupštine Ujedinjenih naroda, godinama se nastoje plasirati i u europski medijski, nažalost, akademski, prostor, iako je jasno da se radi, prvo o pripremi za agresiju, a poslije i opravdanju nezakonite i neizazvane vojne invazije susjedne suverene države. Optuživanje Europske unije i Sjevernoatlantskog saveza, da su svojim političkim prihvaćanjem u članstvo svih onih koji dijele iste vrijednosti ugrozili samu opstojnost Ruske Federacije te da su svojim ponašanjem izazvali Kremlj na vojnu intervenciju, može se čuti u nekim medijima, u političkom prostoru i u izbornim kampanjama pa i tijekom prosvjeda u nekim državama članicama zbog ozbiljno narušenog gospodarskog stanja, koje je upravo posljedica razarajućeg djelovanja ruskog političkog vodstva, a ne odgovora iz država i institucija Europske unije.

Marina Kaljurand (S&D). – Austatud isungi juhataja! Desinformatsioon ei ole uus nähtus ja on kahetsusväärne, et Venemaa on jätkuvalt edukas oma propagandas, mille eesmärk on õõnestada demokraatiat, lõhestada Euroopa Liitu ja õigustada kuritegelikku sõda Ukrainas. Sellele saab ja tuleb vastata kõigil võimalikel tasanditel. Euroopa Liit on astunud mitmeid väga õigeid samme võitluses Vene väärinformatsiooniga. Meil on idasuunalise strateegilise kommunikatsiooni rakkerühm, uus väärinformatsiooni vastu võitlemise koodeks ja digiteenuste akt. Aga ka liikmesriikidel tuleb teha oma osa, kaitsta demokraatiat ja kaitsta oma ühiskondi. Eesti puhul tähendab see ka palju aktiivsemat suhtlemist venekeelse elanikkonnaga: kuulamist, selgitamist, veenmist. Ees ootavad raske sügis ja raske talv, kus lisaks Ukraina sõjale hakkavad inimesi mõjutama kõrged elektri- ja toiduhinnad. Kreml ainult ootab, et kasutada seda keerulist olukorda ja poliitilisi kasulikke idioote ka Euroopa Liidu poliitikute seas. Ärgem laskem Kremlil propagandasõda võita!

Katalin Cseh (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister, colleagues, let me start with a quote from the Hungarian public broadcaster: 'the United States trains the pro-Russian government in Ukraine to a pro-American regime, reprogramming Ukrainian politics, driving it further away from Russia, which resulted in the current situation.'

So this is how the Hungarian state media explains geopolitics to its viewers in the centre of the European Union, funded by the tax money of European Union citizens. Ukrainians are repeatedly being compared to Nazi Germany, their right to exist is repeatedly called into question and Putin's war crimes are regularly whitewashed as self-defence. This is so prevalent in the Hungarian state-sponsored media that the Russian channels often even quote them directly to justify their own position.

The results are staggering. Three per cent of Hungarian government sympathisers believe that Russia is responsible for beginning the war. Three per cent, colleagues – think about it. We have to have the tools to fight this. The East StratCom Task Force has to adapt to debunk Russian propaganda, even when it is coming from a Member State. Not every country is a benevolent actor. Putin's mouthpieces have no business spreading lies as a full-time job in our Union.

Patryk Jaki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo, szukacie przyjaciół Putina jak zwykle w prawicy. Ja jednak proponuję, żeby najpierw spojrzeć w lustro. Jak Putin w swoim ostatnim wystąpieniu uzasadniał możliwość użycia broni jądrowej? Wiecie jak? Otóż powiedział, że Stany Zjednoczone zaatakowały Nord Stream. A skąd to wiedział? Wiedział od waszego posła Radosława Sikorskiego. Co zrobiliście w tej sprawie?

Co więcej, najśmieszniejsze jest to, jak lewica szuka wszędzie współpracowników Putina, a sama w swoim składzie ma Gerharda Schrödera i trzech polskich komunistycznych kacyków, którzy na zlecenie Moskwy organizowali w naszym kraju aparat represji wobec obywateli.

Wy sami powinniście zrobić rachunek sumienia, dlatego że całkiem niedawno większość Parlamentu przegłosowała, w sporze Polska przeciwko Łukaszence i Putinowi, rezolucję, w której staliście wprost po stronie Łukaszenki i Putina, kiedy atakowano polskie granice.

Co więcej, mówicie, że do kryzysu, wojny i inflacji doprowadziła pycha i brak wysłuchania Polski i państw bałtyckich. No piękne. Tylko jaką receptę w tej chwili proponujecie? Otóż proponujecie więcej tego, co było, to znaczy likwidację weta, więcej kompetencji dla Niemiec i eurokratów. To się musi źle skończyć.

Co więcej, zastanówcie się, komu teraz sprzyja to, że na Polskę nałożyliście więcej sankcji niż na Rosję? Bo odliczając te pieniądze, które się Polsce należą, tak właśnie jest. Komu to sprzyja ?

Co więcej, chcecie uchodzić za imperium moralne. To ja mam dla Was propozycję. To niech najpierw Niemcy rozliczą się za swoje zbrodnie i zapłacą reparacje Polsce. Bo Putin Was bardzo dokładnie obserwuje i myśli sobie tak: mogę zrównać Ukrainę z ziemią i tak nigdy za to nie zapłacę. A dlaczego? A dlatego, że jak ktoś o to zapyta, to ja powiem, że postępuję dokładnie tak samo, jak Niemcy. Że przeszłość nie ma już znaczenia. Rozmawiajmy o przyszłości. To się dzisiaj tylko liczy.

I co? I kto jest rosyjską onucą?

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, esminis „kontrpropagandos“ bruožas yra atsakymas tiesa į propagandinį melą. O tas Kremliaus ir jo sekėjų – pavienių veikėjų, interesų grupių ir kraštutinių politinių judėjimų Europoje – melas yra įmantrus, ilgai ir kruopščiai ruošiamas, dosniai finansuojamas ir visa savo esme nusikalstamas, taigi gali ir privalo būti baudžiamas. Melagingų teiginių klišės darosi atpažįstamos: abejonės dėl Kremliaus nusikaltimų, dėl karo priežasčių, o Ukrainai perlaužus situaciją frontuose, jau siūloma tą stabdyti diplomatinėmis priemonėmis.

Mechanizmai tai propagandai užkardyti egzistuoja, bet turi būti kur kas griežčiau taikomi. Draudimas transliuoti Rusijos valstybinę žiniasklaidą buvo teisingas, bet to nepakanka. Sąmoningumo didinimas, visuomenės švietimas, parama ekspertams, organizacijoms, dirbančioms propagandos ir dezinformacijos klausimais, – veiksmai, kurių prašome jau ne vienerius metus.

Atidavę eterį Kremliaus veikėjams, išgirstame tik smurto, propagandos kurstymą, betgi to kaip tik neleidžia ES skaitmeninių paslaugų aktas, taigi to ir laikykimės. 300 milijonų, Rusijos išleistų politiniams judėjimams finansuoti užsienyje, tai yra pas mus, – tiesiogiai prieštarauja Kovos su terorizmu finansavimo direktyvai. Taigi asmenys, aktyviai siekiantys paveikti paramą Ukrainai, turi būti patraukti atsakomybėn, turi būti išviešintos jų užmaskuotos finansinės sąsajos su kilmės šalimi Rusija.

Nils Ušakovs (S&D). – Mr President, dear colleagues, there are roughly five to seven million Russians or Russian speakers who live right now in Europe. In countries like Latvia, absolute majority of them are Latvian citizens, that is citizens of the European Union. And that's exactly why, stronger than ever, we must support enhancing, or in some cases establishing, European identity of Russian-speaking residents of our Union.

European Union has to think outside the box, demonstrate strong leadership and provide support for European media in Russian language. Moreover, we have to support cultural and educational activities in Russian, various integration programmes.

We should not rely at this moment on national governments in their capacities only. Support must come from the European Union and must be provided across the continent. Millions of pro-European-minded Russians can certainly become another powerful tool to cope with propaganda from Russia and probably to cope with propaganda in Russia itself.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θεωρώ μεγάλη επιτυχία την ευρωπαϊκή αντεπίθεση έναντι του Πούτιν στο θέμα των ιδεών και της πληροφόρησης. Ο Πούτιν εξαπέλυσε έναν υβριδικό πόλεμο για να διχάσει την ευρωπαϊκή κοινή γνώμη και να προετοιμάσει τις επιθετικές του ενέργειες. Στην αρχή σημείωσε επιτυχίες, αλλά τώρα το τοπίο έχει αλλάξει δραστικά σε βάρος του. Οι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες που του έχουν εμπιστοσύνη έχουν περιοριστεί σε μονοψήφια ποσοστά σχεδόν σε όλες τις χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, ενώ η ρωσική κοινή γνώμη έχει αρχίσει να προβληματίζεται με τις επιλογές του και το κόστος που έχουν για τη ρωσική οικονομία και κοινωνία. Αποδεικνύεται έτσι στην πράξη ότι η ελευθερία στον χώρο των μέσων ενημέρωσης οδηγεί σε σωστά αποτελέσματα σε ότι αφορά την κοινή γνώμη όταν περιορίζουμε τις δυνατότητες διείσδυσης και υπονόμευσης από αυταρχικά καθεστώτα και δικτάτορες. Είμαστε σε καλό δρόμο.

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Na wojnie walka z dezinformacją jest równie ważna jak niszczenie czołgów czy samolotów przeciwnika. Rosjanie od lat wykorzystują możliwości oferowane im przez internet do wpływania na europejską opinię publiczną. Niestety wielu dziennikarzy, polityków czy artystów w państwach członkowskich mniej lub bardziej świadomie wspiera narrację Moskwy. Nadal nie umiemy skutecznie temu przeciwdziałać. Mogliśmy się o tym przekonać także w Polsce podczas sztucznego kryzysu migracyjnego, gdy próbowano sabotować stanowcze działania naszego rządu w obronie granic Unii Europejskiej. Krytyka takich przedsięwzięć jak kanał przez Mierzeję Wiślaną, gazociąg Baltic Pipe, czy rozbudowa polskiej armii to także służy wyłącznie interesom Putina. W wojnie informacyjnej każdy z nas jest żołnierzem, ale jak mogliśmy się ostatnio przekonać, jeden nieprzemyślany wpis na Twitterze może mieć siłę rażenia bomby atomowej.

Geoffroy Didier (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, le gouvernement de Vladimir Poutine n'a aucune valeur et n'a aucune limite, ses armes sont illégitimes de toutes natures. Face au silence d'une Europe longtemps endormie, prostrée et brouillonne, Vladimir Poutine a avancé méthodiquement ses pions durant plusieurs années.

Selon de nombreuses sources concordantes, 300 millions de dollars auraient permis à la Russie de financer des partis politiques étrangers européens depuis près de dix ans. Il y a bien sûr l'extrême droite, mais cela, nous le savions déjà et nous n'avions rien à espérer d'eux. Mais le plus édifiant, et devrais-je dire, le plus écœurant, est que des ONG européennes qui se prétendent pourtant porteuses de combats salutaires comme l'écologie et qui ont même fourni certains ministres à des pays d'Europe, auraient elles aussi été financées par des intérêts et entreprises russes telles que Gazprom. De soi-disant écologistes, littéralement achetés pour défendre la sortie du nucléaire et maintenir ainsi la dépendance européenne vis-à-vis du gaz russe.

Qui parmi eux se sont fait les complices de Vladimir Poutine? Cette question mérite d'être posée dans cette enceinte, dans cet hémicycle. Cette question mérite d'être posée par les peuples européens, qui ont le droit de connaître la vérité. Parce que, mes amis, nous le savons désormais, derrière le paravent de l'écologie politique se cachent parfois des intérêts bien sombres et parfois même le pire qui soit.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, propaganda antieuropeană a început deja de câțiva ani și unele discursuri de acum câteva minute ne arată acest lucru chiar și în această instituție. Campaniile antieuropene nu sunt duse doar de partidele susținute de Putin, ci și de acele partide care nu știu să vină cu soluții și au nevoie de un țap ispășitor. Libertatea de opinie a fost distorsionată în libertatea de a minți, de a manipula oamenii.

Toate aceste discursuri pot fi trecute cu vederea în timp de pace, dar sunt extrem de greu de acceptat în perioada războiului, când vedem în fiecare săptămână alte și alte dovezi ale masacrelor comise în Ucraina, în teritoriile ocupate, când avem printre noi atâția oameni, copii, femei, bătrâni, ucraineni, care au fost nevoiți să își lase în urmă soții, frații, tații, copiii, fără a ști când se pot întoarce și când îi vor mai vedea, să-și lase în urmă viața normală pe care o aveau.

Este nevoie de acțiuni concrete și coordonate pentru a opri această propagandă mincinoasă. Este nevoie de măsuri rapide și clare pentru a demasca legăturile directe sau indirecte dintre cei care susțin campaniile antieuropene.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovani povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, sastavni dio ruskog velikodržavnog koncepta je širenje kontrole i dominacije izvan svojih granica. Propagandom, hibridnim djelovanjem, dezinformacijama i krivotvorenjem povijesti, a od 24. veljače, nažalost i vojnom agresijom na ukrajinski narod.

Sličnim takvim pokušajima Hrvatska je svjedočila prije 30 godina, kao žrtva agresije velikosrpskog Miloševićevog režima, ali nažalost i danas srbijanske vlasti već standardno perfidno provode hibridnu verziju politike Srbije iz devedesetih godina prema susjednim državama. Zloupotrebom pravosuđa, svojatanjem kulturne baštine, manipulacijom povijesti i kršenjem prava manjina.

Takvi otrovni refleksi, koji svoj uzor i danas pronalaze u Rusiji i povlaštenim političkim energetskim i ekonomskim vezama u odnosima s Moskvom, štete Srbiji, štete i cijeloj Europi. I dok je god tome tako, kolegice i kolege, mislim da je potpuno jasno da Srbiji nije mjesto u Europskoj uniji i da će se Srbija, ne samo formalno udaljavati od pregovora s Europskom unijom, nego da će se i temeljno, dubinski, nažalost, udaljavati od cijele europske civilizacije.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein (Renew). – Mr President, it's good that at last we are starting to treat this aspect of the war completely seriously. It's encouraging to see the determination of Minister Bek and of Commissioner Schinas and the activities presented, but we need them not as words – we really need them as facts.

I would like to quote the numbers evoked here already by Guy Verhofstadt. Out of 6 676 names identified by the Navalny Foundation as a propaganda machine, 135 were proposed for sanctions and only six were sanctioned – only six were sanctioned.

Facebook identified 60 disinformation sites. They hid under the names and visualisation of well-known media like *The Guardian, Der Spiegel, Bild*. They used false profiles, false accounts in seven languages.

I remember when Barack Obama, proud about the US IT companies, declared 'the internet is ours'. But it is Putin who successfully uses it as a war tool…

(The President cut off the speaker)

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, we've entered a new phase in the unnecessary and callous war waged by Vladimir Putin. His shambolic and illegal referendums have served as a fickle means for Russia to try to absorb thousands of square kilometres of Ukrainian territory in what will be the largest forced annexation of land in Europe since 1945. Like the heinous war crimes that are part of Russian standard military tactics, disinformation has now become a fundamental element of Russia's international relations.

Last week, within hours of the Nord Stream pipeline explosion, disinformation, fitting the pattern of Russian information warfare was immediately circulated on social media platforms. This is a very sophisticated and covert operation, which at this stage is a well-oiled machine that has proven to be effective in many circumstances. It's amplified to social media algorithms.

The aim is to flood social media with false information, to blur the lines of fact and deter public opinion from supporting Ukraine, depicting it as a failed, corrupt, Nazi state. Disinformation has been so effective that many so-called 'free thinkers' have been reduced to unwitting Kremlin spokespersons. It is time to strongly counter this disinformation in the EU.

Engin Eroglu (Renew). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wegen Putin sterben seit Februar täglich Menschen in der Ukraine. Und natürlich schauen wir als EU dort nicht tatenlos zu. Wir sind das globale Friedens- und Freiheitsprojekt und werden niemals tatenlos zuschauen.

Sanktionen sind das Mindestmaß, was wir machen können, müssen, um diesen Kriegstreiber nicht mehr zu finanzieren. Diese Sanktionen werden jedoch in Frage gestellt. Uns ist klar, dass Putin seit Jahren Geld in der EU in seine Propagandamaschine investiert. Putins Helfer, die sich hier offen ordinär an seine Seite stellen – ob jetzt hier bei uns im Parlament oder in nationalen Parlamenten –, sind nicht unser primäres Problem.

Unser primäres Problem ist die Desinformationskampagne von Putin in den sozialen Netzwerken und in den Medien. Dies müssen wir ganz klar aufdecken und dagegen vorgehen. Deshalb sind diese versteckten Kanäle aufzudecken und zu bekämpfen. Wir müssen besser sein als die russische Propaganda. Wir müssen besser sein darin, die Menschen in der Europäischen Union aufzuklären, und – das ist das Allerwichtigste – Putin darf diesen Krieg nicht gewinnen, weder in der Ukraine noch in unserem Informationsraum.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, for many years, Russia has continued to use information warfare and other hybrid threats to weaken our democracies. Russian aggression against Ukraine has only deepened this, from spreading lies about the brave people of Ukraine, to cynically claiming that Putin's Russia is a defender of traditional values. We must fight Putin's propaganda, and there are concrete measures we can take.

First, we must strengthen our StratCom units on both national and EU level, including the under-funded and understaffed East StratCom unit. We must actively expose the Kremlin's lies and, at the same time, actively communicate to our citizens our policies and actions.

Second, although propaganda is not a new phenomenon, it has been exacerbated by social media. We can only successfully fight Russian propaganda if social media are part of the solution.

Third, we must defend freedom of speech, and that's why we mustn't allow 'cancel culture' or any similar trends. At the same time, we must understand that freedom of speech belongs to individuals, and not to bots or any anonymous social media accounts.

Dear colleagues, just as the Ukrainian people are bravely fighting Putin's aggression, so must we not be afraid to give them all our support, and to fight Putin's propaganda and lies. Truth will conquer, and it will win over lies.

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Herr talman! Kommissionär, minister, kollegor! Ingen kan blunda för vad Ryssland har gjort och gör när det gäller att göra lögnen till sanning för att nå sina syften. Vi kan inte säga att vi inte visste, att vi inte såg det komma. Rysslands annektering av Krim och kriget i östra Ukraina var ju nämligen inget annat än en smäll på käften på den europeiska säkerhetsordningen. Att gasledningarna på Östersjöns botten hade fler syften än ren business – det var uppenbart.

Sedan invasionen av Ukraina har nu desinformationen nått nya höjder. När ukrainska trupper är på väg att ta tillbaka sitt eget land, fortsätter en desperat Putin att göra lögn till sanning.

I fredags annekterade Ryssland fyra nya ukrainska regioner med uppbackning av så kallade folkomröstningar. Det värsta med desinformation är ju att den fungerar. Se bara vad Elon Musk twittrade häromdagen! Nej, ett oprovocerat anfallskrig är inte en fråga om två parter som ska komma överens, utan Ryssland måste lämna tillbaka varenda kvadratmeter.

Vi måste sluta spela med i Putins teater. Det är slut på lögnerna. Sanningen måste vinna.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, vážený pane ministře, kolegyně a kolegové, dnes a denně cítíme, jak silnou zbraní je ruská dezinformační kampaň. Šiřitelé dezinformací využívají také strachu ze zvyšování cen energií a provokují nenávist mezi lidmi. Proto jsou tak velmi důležitá opatření proti zdražování na evropské i národní úrovni. Proti dezinformační válce musíme bojovat vyvracením lží a polopravd. A protože dnes při této debatě nemáme možnost položit modrou kartu, chci požádat pana kolegu Davida, aby mi písemně odpověděl. Kdo tedy financuje zablokované dezinformační weby, když tvrdí, že to není Rusko a jeho spojenci? Pokud nezná skutečného investora, pak ať nešíří tyto dezinformace. Komisi a českému předsednictví děkuji za jeho úsilí a vyzývám k ještě větší finanční podpoře účinných nástrojů, jako je StratCom a Evropská digitální observatoř. Dámy a pánové, naší největší zbraní je přesvědčení, že pravda je na naší straně.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, Ucrania está en guerra contra Rusia y Europa lleva años inmersa en una guerra híbrida contra Rusia. Una guerra híbrida de desinformación, propaganda e injerencia política que ha apoyado a la extrema derecha, a la extrema izquierda y a los partidos separatistas.

Aquí hemos oído hablar de Salvini. Sí. Hemos oído hablar de Berlusconi. Sí. Hemos oído hablar de Le Pen. Sí. Pero ¿saben de quién no hemos oído hablar hoy? ¿Saben quién se reunió tres veces en Moscú, una vez en Ginebra y una vez en Barcelona para pedir ayuda a Rusia, a sus servicios secretos, para la independencia de Cataluña, ayuda económica, política y militar, con el envío de diez mil soldados para apoyar la independencia de Cataluña? Carles Puigdemont, expresidente de la Generalitat de Cataluña y su núcleo duro político.

Esto es una realidad. Son hechos. Hechos, no insinuaciones, hechos reales: comunicaciones con servicios secretos, con el entorno directo de Putin, para pedir ayuda para la independencia de una parte del territorio europeo.

Los ucranianos ganarán la guerra, pero ¿vamos a ganar la nuestra nosotros contra los rusos?

Inese Vaidere (PPE). – Godātais sēdes vadītāj! Dārgie kolēģi! Kremlis ir gadiem ilgi indējis Eiropu ar propagandu. Tādēļ nebija stingras Eiropas atbildes Krievijas agresijai Gruzijā un Krimā, kas, iespējams, būtu novērsis karu Ukrainā.

Putins nespēj uzlabot vienkāršo krievu dzīves līmeni. Tā vietā kultivē mītu par labajiem Eiropas atbrīvotājiem no fašisma. Šo atbrīvotāju toreizējo zvērību nesodīšana iedrošināja Krieviju uz pilnīgu necilvēcību Ukrainā. Patiesībā tieši Krievijā šobrīd valda fašistisks režīms.

Eiropas Savienības budžetā jau iekļauts manis izstrādātais pilotprojekts cīņai pret Krievijas dezinformāciju, taču tam jānovirza vēl nopietnāki līdzekļi. Dezinformācija padarījusi Krievijas nāciju slimu, par ko liecina plašais atbalsts baismīgajam karam Ukrainā. Jābloķē pieeja visiem Kremļa medijiem. Nav runas par vārda brīvību, jo Krievija nepārtraukti melo.

Jāatbrīvojas no Kremļa ideoloģijas pārstāvjiem Eiropā un jāpalielina ieroču piegādes Ukrainai. Cīņā pret Krievijas propagandu mums jābūt tikpat apņēmīgiem kā ukraiņiem karalaukā. Paldies!

Claudia Gamon (Renew). – Herr Präsident! Eine russische Zeitung hat heute eine Kolumne der ehemaligen österreichischen Außenministerin der FPÖ, Karin Kneissl, veröffentlicht. Europa brauche das russische Gas, versicherte sie ihren russischen Leserinnen und Lesern. Die Putin-Versteher in Österreich und der Europäischen Union stehen nicht nur für den buchstäblichen Kniefall, wie im Fall der Karin Kneissl, sondern für den vollkommenen moralischen Verfall.

Ein steirischer Abgeordneter der Kommunistischen Partei bezeichnete die Ukraine als verkrüppelten Staat und wiederholte bekannte Lügen, zum Beispiel in dem Sinne, die Sanktionen seien völkerrechtswidrig. Was macht das offizielle Österreich? Kanzler Nehammer trifft ein paar der einflussreichsten Putin-Versteher: Viktor Orbán und Aleksandar Vučić.

Russland hat den Lügenkrieg perfektioniert, aber die Wahrheit bleibt: Russland ist der Aggressor, Wladimir Putin ist ein Kriegsverbrecher, und die Ukraine muss diesen Krieg gewinnen.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, Evropská unie je pod tlakem dezinformací zvnitřku i zvnějšku, nejen z Ruska, již dlouhodobě. Když se podíváte na ruský rozpočet, tak zjistíte, že právě to příslušné oddělení, které má dezinformace na starosti, roste rozpočtově každý rok. Ne, že bychom v této věci nic neudělali, ale myslím si, že je nutné udělat v boji proti zejména ruským dezinformacím více. A musím připomenout návrh, který jsme zde projednávali již v minulém období, já jsem ho podával, o nepřípustnosti financování národních politických stran třetími zeměmi. Tento návrh neprošel. A čeho jsme svědky dlouhodobě? Bohužel ve většině členských států EU najdete jednu, dokonce více stran, které mají nepochybné ruské financování. Takovýto stav je nepřípustný a musíme se vypořádat s ruskou propagandou jednou provždy, vyhnat ji z našich vlád, vyhnat ji z našich politických stran, z našich kanceláří a být jednotní.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for this rich and at times passionate debate. The only real security concern that Russia is facing is our model society, our democracy, and our way of life. This is what they fear, and this is what they're fighting against in Ukraine.

Defending our democracies includes defending the foundations on which they stand: media freedom, open discourse, and informed decisions by voters. We are acting on all these fronts. We are fighting disinformation with everything we've got, but more is yet to come. We shall come forward before next summer with a Defence of Democracy package, which will address the problem of foreign agents and review the European Democracy Action Plan, notably ensuring it is still fit for purpose regarding the fight against disinformation.

But we should also ask ourselves collectively a question: why is disinformation so easily possible in Europe? Why is it so easy to seduce Europeans with toxicity, with ideas that are spread through propaganda campaigns using decades old manipulation tools, and to disseminate lies so quickly? Why are we so lacking in resilience? Where is the immunity we should collectively have as a Union of democracies?

I think that these are real questions we should be asking ourselves these days, and we should try to seek remedies and solutions. The quest for a more resilient European society is more pressing than ever before, and we can indeed look around and take examples from countries like Finland, for example, where a robust democratic education system helps people not to become victims of propaganda and to acquire resilience, defence and immunity.

I agree with Guy Verhofstadt when he says that we should also do more with our partners, that our partners should and can do more – especially some of them who are EU candidate countries. They cannot be at the same time with us and with those who are aiming to harm us.

The moment of truth is coming. Our people will not understand that in these difficult times, some of our EU countries that aspire to be members of the family can act on both boats. If they forget it, let me assure you that we shall remind them of this obligation.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, Vice-President of the Commission, honourable Members, today's debate shows once again the complexity of the interference in our democratic life. We must continue to work on strengthening our resilience while also clearly showing that we will not accept actions against our right to have an information space free from manipulation.

We will continue to take active and determined actions against it. The Council as a whole attaches particular importance to protecting our democratic processes, institutions and societies from any foreign interference, be it information manipulation or other means.

Let me recall some of our actions from past month. On 2 March 2022, the Council suspended the broadcasting activities of Sputnik and Russia Today in the EU or directed at the EU until the aggression to Ukraine is put to an end and until Russia ceases to conduct disinformation and information manipulation actions against the EU and its Member States. As you may remember, this decision has been confirmed by the European Court of Justice.

In June 2022, the Council adopted the conclusions in which it introduced a framework for a coordinated response to hybrid threats and campaigns affecting the EU Member States and partners. The next step is the development of the EU hybrid toolbox, and here the work is actively ongoing under the Czech Presidency. It demonstrates the new level of ambition at EU level to counter hybrid threats, including foreign interference and manipulation and the war in Ukraine was one of the accelerators pushing the political agenda further.

In July 2022, the Council adopted conclusions in which it reiterated that the EU and Member States will step up their efforts to reach out to third countries in order to support Ukraine in agreed dimensions and to counter the false Russian narrative and manipulation of information. And concerning the sanction regime in this area, the Council is, of course, willing to examine any proposal from the Commission on possible extension of sanctions lists.

Honourable Members, rest assured that the Council will continue to support the joint efforts with the Parliament to make progress on devising ambitious and firm European responses to the issues we have been debating today. Thank you very much for your attention.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

7. Členství ve výborech a delegacích

Puhemies. – ECR-ryhmä on ilmoittanut puhemiehelle päätöksestä, jolla muutetaan valiokunnan nimityksiä.

Kyseinen päätös merkitään tämän päivän istunnon pöytäkirjaan ja se tulee voimaan päivänä, jona siitä on ilmoitettu.

8. Přistoupení Rumunska a Bulharska k schengenskému prostoru (rozprava)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana neuvoston ja komission julkilausumat Romanian ja Bulgarian liittymisestä Schengen-alueeseen (2022/2852(RSP)).

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, the Schengen area is one of the greatest achievements of our Union. In recent years, it has been under considerable strain.

Successive crises such as the 2015 migration wave, COVID-19 pandemics, or the impact of the current Russian war of aggression against Ukraine have tested our response capacity. Therefore, considerable efforts were, and continue to be, required to ensure the resilience of the Schengen area. Inter alia, adoption of the Schengen Borders Code would be an important step in that direction, and the Council is ready to start a trialogue as soon as possible.

Furthermore, the Presidency considers the pending completion of the enlargement of the Schengen area as a key missing element. As you are well aware, Bulgaria and Romania have completed the necessary conditions for the Council to be able to discuss the lifting of controls at internal borders. In this context, the Czech Presidency is committed to making progress so as to enable Bulgaria and Romania to be fully part of the Schengen area.

More concretely, the Presidency is working towards the adoption of the required Council decision by unanimity at the December Council. In this regard, we are engaging with Member States to prepare the ground for a substantive discussion on the lifting of controls at internal borders with Bulgaria and Romania.

In our effort to secure the necessary unanimity in the Council, the Presidency facilitated the expert visits in Bulgaria and Romania next week, as conducted by the Commission. The visits, which are hosted by both Member States on a voluntary basis and in the spirit of mutual trust, will ascertain the implementation of the fundamental elements of the Schengen acquis.

In parallel, the Presidency fully supports the full Schengen accession of Croatia. We trust that the European Parliament will issue its opinion on the matter in due time. The Council will be informed about the state of play regarding the Schengen enlargement process in mid-October.

The completion of the Schengen enlargement would constitute another milestone in the functioning of the Schengen area, and the Presidency remains committed to that effect, in full cooperation with the European Parliament, as well as with the Commission.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, dear Minister, honourable Members, Schengen together with the euro, the single market and Erasmus is one of the most emblematic achievements of the European Union. Schengen is the jewel in our crown.

It is the largest area of borderless travel in the world, including 26 countries so far, and benefiting 420 million people. It is part of our way of life and an important element for making us feel not only nationals but also Europeans. It is also one of the most travelled regions in the world. Today, Schengen travellers make 1.25 billion journeys in the Schengen area every year.

One third of our population lives in border regions and there are 3.5 million people crossing a border every day. We also count 24 million business trips per year. These are not numbers. This is the fuel of our economy. This is what fertilises our society.

For the last 35 years, we have built an entire Schengen architecture to better protect this borderless area without controls. We must continue to build and improve the architecture of Schengen, because no system can bear the test of time without renewal. To reflect this, this year we have started an annual cycle of Schengen governance, kicked off by a new 'state of Schengen' report.

The idea is to give Schengen strong political direction from the Commission, Parliament, the Council, to boost our important efforts on the ground, on border control, police cooperation, returns, visa, data protection. We will continue delivering on parts of these strategies for the next two years, strengthening them and the management of our external borders, ensuring that internal border checks are measures of last resort and strengthening internal security through reinforced police cooperation.

It is key that we advance on both the operational and the legislative track. Our proposal for the Schengen Borders Code put forward in December last year will make us better prepared to handle any future crisis, ensuring free movement and incorporating the lessons that we learned during the pandemic.

The new online Schengen Information System, complemented by other IT systems, will also allow us to achieve full interoperability in Europe by the end of the next year. This will be, at the time, the most advanced border protection system in the world, politically, operationally and legislatively.

Honourable Members, it is also true that Schengen has faced repeated challenges. First, the refugee crisis of 2015/2016, the pandemic, persistent terrorist threats, the instrumentalisation of migrants from authoritarian leaders at our external border, and now the war of aggression against Ukraine.

In spite of all these challenges, we have consistently succeeded in preserving this crown jewel of European integration thanks to the unwavering commitment amongst Member States, but also of the Members of this House, whom I would like to profoundly thank for their commitment to our collective Schengen achievements. According to last year's Eurobarometer, our people understand this. The overwhelming support of Europeans across our continent fully support Schengen.

Honourable Members, for the best part of more than four decades now, and despite these problems and challenges, the Schengen area has continued growing and deepening. It is now high time it grew further. Already, since 2011, the Commission has been actively advocating for the completion of Schengen, urging Member States to rapidly take the necessary steps to allow those Member States that are not yet fully part of the area to join. This will increase not only our security but also broaden our cohesion.

We have made tremendous progress in the last months, with important political steps that have been taken. In December, the Council recognised that Croatia fulfilled all the necessary conditions for the application of all parts of the Schengen acquis, and the European Parliament is now to give its opinion.

A lot of progress has also been made for the accession of Romania and Bulgaria. Both countries are waiting for the decision of the Council for more than 11 years now, when the Commission confirmed that they fully fulfil the necessary conditions to join. In the meantime, both countries continue to actively apply the Schengen acquis and contribute to our common security at the EU external border.

I wish to highlight and praise both our Romanian and our Bulgarian partners for the manner in which they have managed the external borders in the face of the large number of refugees from Ukraine. Their stance was exemplary and made us all proud. It is therefore excellent news that the Czech Presidency here present took Schengen enlargement on board as one of their main priorities.

Bulgaria and Romania remain fully committed to continue correctly applying the Schengen rules and to contributing to the proper functioning of the area as a whole. Schengen is a success built on mutual trust and the proper implementation of the acquis.

The new Schengen Evaluation and Monitoring Mechanism Regulation is clear. The verification, in accordance with the applicable evaluation procedures concerning Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia had already been completed. Despite this, and with a truly cooperative attitude, although such verification should already have been relaunched, Bulgaria and Romania have invited a team coordinated by the Commission to assess the application of the latest developments.

This upcoming voluntary reassessment of Bulgaria and Romania, by means of a fact-finding mission of Commission and Member State experts, will take place later this month. It is a very important gesture of transparency that I salute. This is not – and I want to be very clear on this point – this is not about re-evaluating Bulgaria and Romania. It is rather about allowing Member States to get the latest updates and reassurances that the Schengen acquis is still fully applied.

This team of experts will look into external border management, police cooperation, including returns, Schengen and visa information systems and visa policy developments in general. But they will look equally into the fundamental rights and data protection frameworks as horizontal topics.

Let me conclude by reiterating the Commission's full support to the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to Schengen. This can only strengthen our collective resilience and deepen our cohesion. We now have a real opportunity in December to make at last this historic decision and let the citizens of Romania, Bulgaria and Croatia benefit fully from our cherished Schengen success, making us stronger and safer together.

I remain convinced that by working together we can fortify and expand this so emblematic European success story for the benefit of our citizens, the internal market and our economies.

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Schengen is a great success story for Europe. It has broken down barriers, brought European citizens closer together and strengthened our European economy.

With Bulgaria and Romania, we have two EU Member States who fulfil all conditions to join this area. They are ready for Schengen, but they are still waiting for the Council's green light. Since 2011 — 11 years — there has been no progress. This is simply unacceptable.

We in the EPP, like all parties in this House, strongly support Romania and Bulgaria becoming members of the Schengen area, and we have always fought as the EPP for this endeavour. Romania and Bulgaria's place is within Schengen, especially now when we face many humanitarian and security challenges at the EU borders. For us, there is no first and second-class European; there are no objective reasons to deny Bulgaria and Romania this success. They have made all the necessary steps. Let me assure our friends in Sofia and Bucharest that you have the full support of us in the EPP. Your place is within Schengen.

We call now on the Council to finally grant Bulgaria and Romania the access they deserve. The war, in particular, is again a test for us on whether we can reinforce the unity. This Schengen enlargement is a test case for this. The years of waiting must come to an end. We need no more excuses, but actions. With these two countries joining Schengen, we can better protect our external borders and strengthen the whole Schengen area. Let us continue the Schengen success story with Bulgaria and Romania on board, and let's do it now.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, once años. Once años llevan esperando Bulgaria y Rumanía sin que exista ninguna razón objetiva para bloquear su entrada en Schengen.

La libertad de movimiento, como ya hemos escuchado aquí, es uno de los pilares fundamentales de nuestra Unión. Y los ciudadanos de Bulgaria y de Rumanía tienen el mismo derecho que los de otros Estados miembros. No tienen más derechos, pero tampoco menos. Es una cuestión de justicia. No puede ser que un ciudadano búlgaro que vive en otro Estado miembro de la Unión y quiere viajar a su país en coche, tenga que estar pasando controles en las fronteras. Es discriminatorio. Es discriminatorio que tengan que pasar por colas diferentes en algunos aeropuertos. Es discriminatorio y, además, tiene un coste económico que los camiones rumanos tengan que esperar colas para pasar controles fronterizos dentro de la Unión Europea.

Este bloqueo en el Consejo tiene que acabar. Porque si no acaba, a quienes se les va a acabar la paciencia es a los ciudadanos y ciudadanas de esos países.

Hablamos mucho de solidaridad en estos días, pero la solidaridad tiene que aplicarse a todos. No se puede pedir solidaridad a Rumanía y a Bulgaria cuando la Unión Europea no está cumpliendo con sus propias normas. Es la mejor receta para alimentar la desafección hacia Europa y el apoyo a mensajes populistas antieuropeos.

Espero que este Parlamento adopte una Resolución con un mensaje muy claro dirigido al Consejo y que el Consejo lo escuche y actúe.

Me parece que ya es hora.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues. As we have heard, the assessment that Bulgaria and Romania are ready for accession to Schengen has been made a long time ago by the experts and by the Commission already back in 2011.

It is now 2022, 11 years later and, colleagues, I feel ashamed. I feel ashamed towards the Bulgarian and the Romanian citizens who rightly feel that they are not treated equally and that they didn't get the same right to borderless travel. I feel ashamed for the Council to have stalled this long for not honouring its commitment.

We have established common procedures and evaluation mechanisms, and we should respect the outcome. No moving goalposts, and the Schengen process should not become a proxy battlefield for other political issues.

And last but not least, colleagues, I am ashamed for the Dutch Government because it's the Dutch Government that has been one of the main obstacles here, and largely for political reasons, domestic political reasons.

Respect for European rules is not a one-way street. There cannot be double standards. So from this position, I would like to call on Prime Minister Rutte to respect the rules and support the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the Schengen zone. Because I think in these times we have to put European unity before national politics. Bulgaria and Romania belong in Schengen.

Tineke Strik, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, it is in the common interest of the EU to have all Member States be the Schengen area. And, therefore, we welcome today's discussion to overcome the current two-tier system and bring in Member States that are still in the waiting room and, thus, lift the unequal treatment of citizens of the EU.

Yet, accession to the Schengen area is not a right, it's a responsibility as well. It means carrying out the Schengen acquis in full compliance with fundamental rights. And this is where we still have some serious concerns. In the past years there has been mounting evidence of systematic pushbacks and border violence in Bulgaria as well as Romania. Human Rights Watch reports that Bulgarian authorities were beating, robbing, stripping and using police dogs on asylum seekers and migrants as they pushed them back to Turkey. In Romania, uniformed border guards were seen pushing back people to Serbia.

Allowing Schengen accession in the face of such reports de facto also means condoning these grave violations of the rights of migrants and refugees. But my group, let me be clear, my group urges for a merit-based, objective decision on a Schengen accession for both countries. So I call upon all Member States to do the same: assess the merits, take the Schengen standards seriously, but don't mix it up with other more political considerations just only because you can, because you have a veto.

And if Bulgaria agrees with this position, it has to act consistently and stop using its veto during the accession process of North Macedonia to the EU. So, President, Schengen can only remain the jewel in the crown if we all live up to the standards of Schengen before, but also after the accession.

Guido Reil, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir reden heute über den Beitritt von Rumänien und Bulgarien in den Schengen-Raum, und viele in Deutschland denken sich doch jetzt: Ja, das ist doch schon so! Deswegen leben doch in Deutschland jetzt circa zehnmal so viele Rumänen und Bulgaren wie vor zehn Jahren. Und diese Menschen beziehen oftmals Sozialleistungen, beziehen oftmals Kindergeld für Kinder in der Heimat, und sie arbeiten oftmals im Niedriglohnsektor, gerne in der Fleischindustrie, wo sie unter sklavenähnlichen Bedingungen ausgebeutet werden und zum Lohndumping beitragen. Also alles nichts wirklich Positives.

Etwa vor einem halben Jahr bin ich auf meiner Reise in die Ukraine durch Rumänien gefahren, und ich habe Rumänien kennengelernt. Ich möchte Rumänien mal freundlich so beschreiben: Rumänien ist der Wilde Westen von Europa. Also Wilder Westen mitten in Europa! In der Ukraine habe ich eine deutlich bessere Infrastruktur gesehen und deutlich mehr Ordnung.

Die Frage ist: Wie konnte es das passieren? Wie konnte ein Land mit solcher Infrastruktur, ein Land, das so korrupt und so kriminell ist, Mitglied der Europäischen Union werden? War da keiner mal gucken, habe ich mich da gefragt, als ich so durch dieses Land gefahren bin, war da keiner mal gucken? Anscheinend nicht.

So, und nun ist viel Geld geflossen in den letzten Jahren. Man meint ja immer, wenn man in korrupte Länder Geld investiert, dann wird alles besser. Nein! Diese korrupten Strukturen nutzen dieses Geld. So stellt zum Beispiel eine Studie des Zentrums der Demokratie fest: Der Betrag an EU-Geldern ist vergleichbar mit den größten Märkten der organisierten Kriminalität wie Menschenhandel – damit meinen die Prostitution und Schlepperei –, Drogenhandel und illegalem Kraftstoff. So viel Geld bringt das Geld der EU. Circa knapp 2 Milliarden sind da verpufft in kriminelle Strukturen. Die bulgarisch-türkische Grenze war jahrelang in der Hand der Mafia. Jetzt wurde sie zurückerobert, munkelt man. Das heißt, die Mafia trägt da jetzt Uniform. Das sind unerträgliche Zustände! Damit muss Schluss sein. Wir brauchen Rumänien und Bulgarien nicht im Schengenraum und auch nicht in der EU.

President. – Dear colleague, I have to remind you about Rule 10, which says that improper behaviour is not acceptable in this Chamber, and I would interpret your words about a Member State, calling the Member State 'the Wild West' in a very degrading way, is not acceptable. I will convey this message to the President to take potential measures.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-жо Председател, надявам се наистина да вземете мерки, както заявихте. Уважаеми колеги, неприсъединяването на България и Румъния към Шенген е истински политически позор за ръководството на Европейския съюз. Истински политически позор, защото всички вие в тази зала, за което между другото ви поздравявам, потвърждавате факта, че и България, и Румъния са изпълнили всички критерии и трябва да бъдат част от Шенгенското пространство.

Обаче не става. Защо не става, колеги? Защото една държава официално – това е Нидерландия, правителството на Нидерландия, не цялата Нидерландия, и останалите държави са се запънали и пречат на това по вътрешнополитически причини, за да не си причинят някаква вреда вътре в къщи. Ето това е двоен стандарт. Вие тук ни показвате, че има повече европейци и по-малко европейци. Показвате, че има европейци първа ръка и европейци втора ръка. Ето това е лицемерие, това е двуличие и това е неприемливо за нас. И това е срам и позор за тези държави, които го правят.

Точно те, които нас ни учат как да се държим с държавите, които да бъдат кандидати за членство, как трябва да разширяваме Европейския съюз, как трябва да сме едно голямо, весело, щастливо семейство. Какво правят? Оставят България, Румъния и Хърватска отстрани и това е лицемерие, и това е двуличие, и това е изключително, изключително непочтено.

Ние всички знаем защо е така. Основната причина не е дори политиката, а икономиката. Когато ние и румънците сме извън Шенген, ние не можем да возим. Ние сме едни от най-големите превозвачи. Нашите камиони чакат по границите, нашите шофьори се бавят, нашият бизнес загива. Взема се хляб от ръцете на българските предприемачи и на румънските предприемачи. И това е позор. Вземете мерки и си накарайте правителствата да свършат работа.

Clare Daly, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, I want to welcome and support the accession of new countries to Schengen. I firmly believe in the free movement of absolutely everybody, but I find it very hard to separate Schengen expansion from the violence that is going on at the edges of Europe.

The grotesque and spectacular violence and abuse against refugees trying to enter Croatia and, to a lesser extent, Bulgaria and Romania makes it very hard to shake the impression that the EU is demanding that these countries prove that they'll stop at nothing to keep migrants out as a price for free movement.

The EU seems to have developed a habit of rewarding appalling behaviour with free movement. Qatar murders thousands of migrant workers – we reward them with visa-free travel. Croatian border guards beat, torture, rape, imprison and push back migrants – and we reward them by fast tracking their Schengen accession application.

This is the same Croatia which tried to suppress a report of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture into horrifying abuse. It is the same Croatia that lied to this Parliament about what's going on at its borders, and the same Croatia whose sham monitoring mechanism could not find any evidence of push-backs.

We can only hope that Bulgaria and Romania don't look at Croatia's reward and decide to escalate their violence against migrants in the hope of impressing the psychopathic EU establishment with their commitment.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Thank you, President, dear colleagues, free movement between Member States without internal border controls is one of the most tangible achievements of EU cooperation. If one has to summarise why it's a good thing to have the European Union despite all its failings and imperfections, then the provision of this fundamental human freedom to our peoples is certainly one of them.

So it is ever more important then to ensure that this freedom is granted to all who fulfil the necessary criteria. Now, Romania and Bulgaria fulfilled the necessary conditions more than 10 years ago. Four Member States, however – the Netherlands, Germany, France and Finland – have blocked their accession, citing mainly rule-of-law concerns.

Now, those concerns, if they were real, should have been addressed directly and immediately. The more than 10-year-long delay, however, does give one the impression that perhaps other reasons played a part. Reasons related to commercial interests, internal political matters, or perhaps just double standards so often applied by the West against eastern Europeans.

We haven't really heard any convincing argument yet of why to keep Romania and Bulgaria out and excluded. It is high time to pay this old debt and allow these countries to join the Schengen area immediately.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Madam President, Minister, Vice-President, first, I would like to say to Mr Reil that there are only two countries that are the far west. One is Portugal and the other is Ireland, because they are geographically the far west of Europe. Nothing more.

Let me tell you that, 11 years after stating that Romania and Bulgaria are ready to be full members of Schengen, the Council has not been able to issue the decision that we – the European Parliament, the European Commission, Romanians and Bulgarians and all European citizens that love freedom – are expecting and are impatiently waiting for.

Romania and Bulgaria have passed all the stress tests. They had the migration crisis of 2015; they had the pandemic, which was a challenge for Schengen; and now they have the Ukrainian refugees, which was a huge challenge. They were really impeccable in the way they implemented all the rules and principles of the Schengen area. Therefore, they deserve that now, this time, before 2023, we are able to decide that they are full members of the Schengen area. This was always an EPP flagship, and we want this to be the reality in the next months.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Minister Bek, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! In der Tat, elf lange Jahre warten Rumänen und Bulgaren hier darauf, dass die Tür zum Schengen-Raum endlich aufgeht und dass sie dieses Privileg, das alle Europäerinnen genießen wollen, auch bekommen. Es ist gesagt worden: Es sind 27 Millionen Menschen, die das betrifft, zigtausende Unternehmen, und beide Mitgliedstaaten erfüllen alle Kriterien.

Jetzt fragt man sich: Okay, das Parlament hat längst grünes Licht gegeben. Die Kommission hat auch noch einmal betont, dass sie grünes Licht gegeben hat. Aber es ist der Rat, der kein grünes Licht gegeben hat. Und ich will noch einmal einen Punkt sagen zu Ländern, die das blockieren: Es sind genau die geistigen Brandstifter wie dieser Schreier hier in diesem Raum, der den Regierungen Angst macht, die das verhindern. Und die müssen dagegen vorgehen, denn es zu dulden, zu übernehmen, schafft noch viel mehr Spaltung in Europa.

Aber ich wünsche mir vom Rat: Ich finde, es ist eine große Chance für die tschechische Präsidentschaft, nach elf Jahren diese Tür mit aufzustoßen. Deshalb ist es wichtig, dass wir hier nicht nur beschwören, was für eine Errungenschaft das ist, sondern es tun.

Aber erlauben Sie mir auch eine Bemerkung: Es ist mal wieder die Einstimmigkeit, die es möglich macht, dass ein einziges Land elf Jahre verhindern kann, dass, wenn alle Kriterien erfüllt sind, trotzdem das Recht nicht zum Recht kommt und dass man das verhindern kann. Auch das müssen wir ändern. Es ist hier wirklich betont worden: Wenn wir auf Dauer weiter eine Freizügigkeit erster Klasse und eine Freizügigkeit zweiter Klasse haben, erschüttert das das Vertrauen in europäisches Recht und auch in die Institutionen. Deshalb mein Appell, Herr Bek, schaffen Sie als tschechische Präsidentschaft hier den Wandel, machen Sie Mut, damit der Rat auch wirklich diese Entscheidung fällen kann. Es ist seit elf Jahren überfällig. 22 ist das Jahr dafür.

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-Président – cher Margaritis Schinas –, Monsieur le Ministre – cher Monsieur Bek –, la Roumanie et la Bulgarie font partie de la famille européenne. Il est temps, il est grand temps de les associer pleinement à notre espace de libre circulation et d'offrir à tous leurs citoyens les mêmes droits. Ce n'est pas qu'un symbole, c'est une nouvelle étape clé, après l'entrée de la Roumanie et de la Bulgarie dans l'Union, il y a déjà quinze ans, en 2007.

Toutefois, Monsieur le Commissaire, le renforcement de Schengen est aussi un impératif sécuritaire, pour garantir une protection efficace à tous les citoyens européens contre les menaces qui pointent aux portes de l'Europe – la guerre russe en Ukraine en est un triste exemple.

Dans le cadre de la présidence française, le président Macron a impulsé l'instauration d'une nouvelle gouvernance politique de l'espace Schengen. Avec mon groupe, Renew Europe, nous sommes pleinement engagés dans la mise en œuvre de ce projet de renforcement de l'espace Schengen, avec la Roumanie et la Bulgarie.

Jean-Paul Garraud (ID). – Madame la Présidente, alors que l'existence d'un espace de libre-circulation devait avoir pour contrepartie la création de frontières extérieures européennes infranchissables – ce qui n'a pas été le cas –, alors que l'Europe a été envahie par 2 millions de personnes en 2015, alors que la Commission européenne refuse de financer des barrières physiques – pourtant demandées par douze États membres –, alors que la Grèce a bloqué l'entrée d'au moins 150 000 migrants à ses frontières – terrestres et maritimes – depuis le début de l'année, alors que Bruxelles vient d'obliger le directeur exécutif de Frontex à démissionner car il a voulu faire son travail de protection des frontières extérieures de l'Union, alors que cette même Union n'entend pas interrompre le versement de fonds européens aux pays qui refusent de reprendre leurs ressortissants clandestins ou déchus du droit d'asile, alors que les auteurs des attentats survenus au sein de l'Union européenne en 2021 sont tous d'origine extra-européenne – ce qui confirme ainsi l'existence d'un lien entre immigration et terrorisme –, alors que l'actualité quotidienne en Europe démontre le lien majeur entre immigration et insécurité, alors que le pacte pour l'asile et la migration, négocié en ce moment à Bruxelles, pourrait entraîner l'arrivée de 50 à 60 millions d'individus en quelques années, le débat qui a lieu ici aujourd'hui a pour but l'élargissement de l'espace Schengen, afin qu'un nombre toujours plus élevé de personnes puissent circuler sans contrôle en Europe.

Quel décalage entre ce qui se passe dans cet hémicycle et les aspirations de nos peuples! La victoire éclatante des forces souverainistes en Hongrie, en Suède ou en Italie marque le refus de ces peuples de poursuivre dans cette voie. Tout élargissement de l'espace Schengen, alors que les frontières extérieures de l'Europe sont inexistantes, est pour nous exclu. Tout élargissement de l'espace Schengen, alors que Frontex n'a pas pour mission de refouler les migrants illégaux, est pour nous exclu.

La protection des Européens est une priorité absolue. Élargir Schengen les exposerait encore davantage. Il ne peut donc en être question.

Cristian Terheș (ECR). – Doamna președintă, dragi colegi, stimată reprezentantă a Comisiei, a Consiliului, vorbesc din perspectiva unui cetățean european, cetățean al României, și am stat și am ascultat cu foarte mare atenție ceea ce s-a spus în acest plen și nu pot să nu-mi ascund stupoarea și șocul la ceea ce am auzit. S-a confirmat și s-a agreat de către toți că de 11 ani România și Bulgaria îndeplinesc toate condițiile pentru a intra în Schengen și, cu toate acestea, în 2022 noi încă mai avem această discuție.

Avem colegi în acest plen care vin și spun că poate România și Bulgaria nu ar fi bine să fie primite în Schengen, ba, dacă se poate, și să fie excluse din UE. Vin alții care spun și oferă scuze că o țară profită și își folosește dreptul de veto pentru a opri integrarea României și a Bulgariei în Schengen. Avem însă reprezentanții Comisiei care vedem că au pârghii la îndemână să își folosească persuasiunea pentru a convinge țări. Și mă gândesc la Polonia și Ungaria pentru a acționa într-o anumită direcție.

Vă întreb: cetățenii din România și din Bulgaria care aud această discuție - că de 11 ani, deși și-au îndeplinit toate condițiile, nu sunt primiți încă în Schengen - ce pot crede? Ce pot crede despre Uniunea Europeană? Ce pot crede despre Parlament și, nu în ultimul rând, despre Comisia Europeană? Vă invit, de aceea, să întreprindeți toate demersurile pentru ca aceste țări, care de 11 ani și-au îndeplinit condițiile, să intre în Schengen.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, domnule ministru, stimați colegi, anul acesta, de la începutul invaziei forțelor armate ruse în Ucraina, România a găzduit peste un milion de refugiați ucraineni. Am dovedit că putem securiza frontiera de est a Uniunii Europene în cele mai dificile condiții și spun, clar și răspicat, România poate securiza o frontieră a zonei Schengen în orice condiții.

Munca efectuată în acest an de polițiștii de frontieră din România, de autoritățile din România, deschiderea, implicarea cetățenilor români, a miilor de voluntari, toate acestea au ajutat la stabilizarea situației la frontiera de est a Uniunii Europene. Am făcut acest lucru în interesul și în folosul întregii Uniuni Europene. Includerea României și Bulgariei în zona Schengen va face toată Uniunea Europeană mai sigură, va face toată zona Schengen mai sigură.

Așa cum anul acesta am acceptat Finlanda și Suedia în NATO pentru a deveni cu toții mai siguri, la fel cerem ca România și Bulgaria să fie incluse în zona Schengen, pentru ca toată Uniunea Europeană să fie mai sigură. Vor avea de câștigat în primul rând, da, cetățenii din România și Bulgaria, companiile din România și Bulgaria, dar vor avea de câștigat oamenii și întreprinderile din toată Uniunea Europeană, pentru că toți cetățenii europeni vor putea călători mai repede, mai simplu, mai sigur.

Toate companiile europene se vor putea mișca mai rapid, fără întârzierile de la frontieră. Comisia Europeană confirmă, din anul 2011, că România și Bulgaria îndeplinesc toate condițiile. De aceea, cerem Consiliului Uniunii Europene să își îndeplinească obligația să accepte fără întârziere Bulgaria și România în spațiul Schengen. Uniunea Europeană este puternică atunci când este unită. Vă cer și acum să dăm dovadă de unitate și să întărim Uniunea Europeană.

Dan Nica (S&D). – Doamna președintă, în primul rând vreau să vă încurajez să cereți de urgență președintei Parlamentului European să ia măsuri în privința acelui domn care a vorbit mai devreme în această sală și a folosit un limbaj jignitor, suburban și sub demnitatea acestei instituții, sub demnitatea prestigiului pe care noi trebuie să îl avem în Uniunea Europeană.

Domnule vicepreședinte, și dumneavoastră vă mulțumesc pentru corectitudinea pe care ați arătat-o clar, spunând: Comisia Europeană a verificat, de 11 ani România îndeplinește toate criteriile, de 11 ani aplică acquis-ul comunitar în domeniul spațiului Schengen. Suntem printre primii care, de fiecare dată când apare o modificare, o punem în practică și faptul că a salutat că în mod voluntar am cerut: mai veniți o dată și vă mai convingeți încă o dată, dumneavoastră, Comisia și statele membre, că suntem în regulă din punct de vedere al protecției frontierelor Uniunii Europene.

Este un lucru pe care vreau să îl salut și vă mulțumesc. Vreau să salut și președinția cehă pentru corectitudinea de care a dat dovadă și faptul că a stabilit că este o prioritate ca această nedreptate care durează de 11 ani să fie terminată în perioada președinției cehe. Vă mulțumesc, domnule ministru și stimați colegi, trebuie să spunem un lucru foarte clar: nu putem accepta ca o țară cum este România și o populație cum este România să fie umilită în permanență. Te duci într-un aeroport: cetățenii europeni într-o parte, românii în altă parte; te duci la frontierele Uniunii Europene, vrei să traversezi cu mașina: cozi, kilometri, ore, zile - aceeași umilință; vrei să transporți mărfuri: cozi de tiruri nesfârșite. Este o situație absolut umilitoare și intolerabilă și care, cu atât mai mult, nu are nici măcar o singură sau un singur motiv, sau o singură motivație, care să poată să fie spusă.

Această situație trebuie să înceteze, pentru că România este printre națiunile europene cele mai pro-europene. Nu trebuie să aruncăm nicio umbră de îndoială că spiritul european, solidaritatea europeană este un lucru și o valoare la care ținem cu toții și acest lucru trebuie să îl demonstrăm în acest an, prin ridicarea acelei obiecții care a fost impusă de un stat membru și accesul României și a Bulgariei în spațiul Schengen.

Илхан Кючюк (Renew). – Г-жо Председател, уважаеми колеги, години наред слушаме различни аргументи. На първо място, границата трябва да се охранява добре. Времето показа, че границите се охраняват добре. На второ място, Шенгенското пространство трябва да се реформира. Да, и там се направи огромен напредък. На трето място, трябва да има геополитическа ситуация. Нова, фундаментална. Има фундаментално нова геополитическа ситуация.

Какво трябва да се случи още, за да може България и Румъния да бъдат част от Шенгенското пространство? Трябват сериозни политически решения от отговорни политици. Не може едни да бъдат държани до вратата, въпреки че са част от Европейския съюз, а други да се ползват с големите блага и възможностите на Европейския съюз. Този двоен стандарт създава двойно качество на гражданите. Едни са повече граждани на Европейския съюз от други. Това е неприемливо. Нито е европейско, нито е цивилизационно, нито трябва да бъде изпълнявано от различни правителства.

Така че моят призив е: силна позиция на Европейския парламент, силна позиция на Европейската комисия и е време Съветът да бъде на висотата на очакванията на европейските граждани България и Румъния да бъдат част от Шенген, защото по този начин ще допринесем за това да бъдем единни в рамките на един Европейски съюз. Посоката е вярна и трябва да продължим напред.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Als Bulgarien und Rumänien 2011 die Mitgliedschaft im Schengen-Raum beantragten, lehnte der EU-Ministerrat ab. Unter anderem Deutschland und Frankreich äußerten sich besorgt über Mängel bei Korruptionsbekämpfung und Rechtsstaatlichkeit. Plötzlich nun unterstützen Macron und Scholz den Beitritt beider Staaten als auch Kroatiens, obwohl laut dem Korruptionsindex von Transparency International Bulgarien, Kroatien und Rumänien in den letzten zehn Jahren keine Fort-, sondern Rückschritte bei der Korruptions- und Kriminalitätsbekämpfung gemacht haben. Wieso also jetzt grünes Licht?

Der Grund scheint klar: Mit ihrem neuen EU-Migrationspakt plant von der Leyen für Migranten neue, sogenannte sichere Zugangswege in die EU zu schaffen, die ihnen den gefahrvollen Seeweg ersparen. Der bulgarisch-türkische Grenzzaun war bislang ein effektives Hindernis. Doch künftig sollen Migranten an der EU-Außengrenze direkt nach Nord- und Mitteleuropa umverteilt werden. Durch Bulgariens Beitritt zum Schengen-Raum können Nicht EU-Bürger – sprich: Migranten – dort in Bulgarien zudem Schengen-Visa erhalten, um sich nach Ablauf ihres Visums illegal in abschiebungssicheren Staaten wie Deutschland öffentlich alimentiert niederzulassen.

Statt Schengen um drei korrupte Mitgliedstaaten zu erweitern, sollten wir Schengen schleunigst überdenken. Wir brauchen zwei große Reformen. Erstens die Erweiterung der Schengen-Binnengrenzkontrollen. Die Coronakrise hat gezeigt: Dies ist rechtlich unbedenklich. Und zweitens einen effektiven Schutz der EU-Außengrenze. Denn was Sie hier planen, sind keineswegs Reiseerleichterungen, sondern neue bequeme Zugangswege für die Masseneinwanderung des Bevölkerungsüberschusses des Orients und Afrikas.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte" zu beantworten.)

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew), *Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte".* — Herr Beck, ich werde sie auf Deutsch fragen, weil ich Ihre Sprache kenne – ich weiß nicht, ob Sie meine Sprache kennen –, und ich will, dass Sie und Ihr Kollege Reil sich bei uns, beim rumänischen Volk, ein bisschen … –, weil Sie uns mit Ihren Worten beleidigt haben. Es ist unglaublich, was Sie und Ihr Kollege Reil heute uns, dem rumänischen Volk, gesagt haben. Es ist eine Unverschämtheit! So etwas kann ich nicht von einem Deutschen hinnehmen. Ich bin in der deutschen Kultur aufgewachsen, und solche Töne gab es nicht in meiner Erziehung.

(Beifall)

Gunnar Beck (ID), *Antwort auf eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte".* – Ich weiß nicht, was hier beklatscht wird, denn mir war die Frage nicht ganz klar. Hier war von Beleidigung die Rede.

Soweit ich mich erinnere und hier meine Notizen überblicke, habe ich im Wesentlichen zwei Dinge gesagt: Erstens dass der Beitritt Rumäniens und Bulgariens die Masseneinwanderung begünstigen könnte. Das scheint mir außer Frage.

Zweitens habe ich gesagt, dass Rumänien und Bulgarien weiterhin korruptionsanfällig sind. Ich berufe mich dabei auf Transparency International. Ich wünschte, es wäre anders, und ich würde dieselbe Kritik gegenüber jedem anderen Staate üben.

Ich hatte also nicht ganz besonders Bulgarien und Rumänien im Sinn, aber die Informationen, die ich fand, scheinen leider meine Aussage zu unterstützen. Ich wollte nicht beleidigen, und es tut mir sehr leid, wenn Sie das so auffassen.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Była tutaj mowa o tym, że tej naszej debacie przysłuchują się dzisiaj obywatele pięknych europejskich państw, takich jak Rumunia i Bułgaria. Ja chciałbym się zwrócić do właśnie tych obywateli. Szanowni Państwo! Jesteście Europejczykami i prędzej czy później będziecie w strefie Schengen. Naprawdę nie przejmujcie się takimi durnymi, niemądrymi, obrażającymi wystąpieniami jak te, które miały miejsce w tej Izbie. Rumunia, Bułgaria, Chorwacja to dumne, piękne europejskie państwa, a mój kraj Polska jest Wam wdzięczny za to, jak dzisiaj chronicie zewnętrzne granice Unii Europejskiej, jak pomagacie ukraińskim uchodźcom. Jesteśmy Wam wdzięczni również za to, że pomimo tych utrudnień, które od 15 lat dotykają wasze państwa, wasze kraje, bo wstąpiliście do Unii Europejskiej w 2007 roku, to jednak jesteście solidarnym i lojalnym partnerem Wspólnoty Europejskiej.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, г-н вицепрезидент на Комисията, г-н министър Бек, наистина от 11 години обсъждаме тази тема в пленарната зала. Искам да изразя моята огромна благодарност към огромната част от колегите, които винаги са защитавали справедливостта и приемането на България и на Румъния в Шенгенското пространство, което е записано още в предприсъединителните договори. То не е поискано от България и Румъния през 2011 година, както каза преждеговорящият, то е записано в предприсъединителните договори, че това ще бъде факт и този факт не се случи от 2011 година не по вина на България и Румъния.

И Комисията, и Европейският парламент, и на експертно техническо ниво винаги са давали оценката, че България и Румъния са абсолютно готови. Ние сме част от Шенгенската информационна система, захранваме с информация от нашите служби информационната система, допринасяме за сигурността на Европейския съюз, на всички европейски граждани, като защитаваме и външните граници на Европейския съюз, разбира се, солидарно с всички инструменти на Съюза, с Frontex и т.н.

Но гражданите са изморени от този дебат. Българските граждани са изморени всеки път да чуват едно и също нещо, че една или друга страна в Съвета не взема решението поради техни вътрешни проблеми.

Уважаеми г-н министър Бек, благодаря на чешкото председателство, че се е заело с тази тема и наистина този път Ви желая успех, успех на всички нас през декември тази година това да се случи, тази справедливост да бъде извършена и да няма различни категории европейски граждани. Българите и румънците заслужават да бъдат пълноправни граждани не само в Европейския съюз, но и в Шенгенското пространство. Българската икономика, а и всички справедливо мислещи хора смятат, че решението трябва да бъде взето.

Петър Витанов (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Комисар, г-н Министър, знаете ли каква е за българите най-голямата полза от членството ни в Европейския съюз? Това е правото на свободно движение, а свободата да прекосиш континента без визи за нас хората, израснали зад Желязната завеса, е може би най-видимата и ценна придобивка от членството ни в Европейския съюз. Тази свобода обаче за българските и румънските граждани идва под условие.

Вече 11 години Съветът не успява да вземе решение за пълното прилагане на правото от Шенген в България и Румъния. Повече от 11 години един проект събира прах – проект за решение, след всички проверки, препоръки, оценки на различни работни групи. 11 години Комисията и Парламентът признават редовно готовността на България и Румъния и в същото време 11 години българските и румънските граждани са заложници на политически игри, при които все нови и нови критерии се поставят пред двете държави, в пълен разрез с правото от Шенген. И тук изобщо няма да говоря за икономическата цена на това бездействие на Съвета. Всякакви оперативни и инвестиционни разходи за трансгранични работници, туристи, автомобилни превозвачи, товари, опашки по границите, пътни инциденти, включително и замърсен въздух.

Има и по-страшна цена и тя е подкопаването на доверието в Европейския съюз и неговите институции, усещането, че гражданите ни са втора ръка, че има едни правила за богатите и други - за бедните. Аз вярвам, че нашият Съюз може повече и трябва да бъде по-справедлив. Време е Съветът да вземе незабавно решение относно пълното прилагане на разпоредбите на достиженията на правото от Шенген в България и Румъния за премахването на проверките по всички, подчертавам всички вътрешни, сухопътни, морски и въздушни граници.

I would like to address some of our colleagues in the room who might be sceptical about our goal. If you care about the future of our Union, support us, vote with us on a strong resolution during the next plenary.

Dragoș Tudorache (Renew). – Doamna președintă, dragi colegi, mă alătur fără rezerve celor care susțin aici, în această casă, integrarea României și Bulgariei în Schengen și, de altfel, acest Parlament a fost mereu consecvent pe acest dosar. Salut, de asemenea, declarațiile Comisiei Europene, declarațiile Consiliului, dar să nu uităm că am mai avut astfel de dezbateri.

Au mai fost astfel de momente, am mai avut ferestre de oportunitate politică, am mai auzit astfel de declarații și, cu toate acestea, cetățenii noștri, firmele noastre, stau în continuare la cozi pe care nu le merită. Vreau să fiu foarte clar, responsabilitatea pentru aceste ratări repetate nu e doar în Consiliu.

Ea trebuie căutată și în parlamentele și guvernele noastre și de aceea fac un apel astăzi aici, către colegii mei: haideți, dacă suntem consensuali și aliniați aici, haideți să fim consensuali și aliniați și acasă, haideți să lucrăm împreună, să facem acel kilometru în plus, să nu mai lăsăm niciun alibi niciunui … din Consiliu pentru a rupe unanimitatea, haideți să lucrăm împreună la pachetul de legi pentru justiție, să facem un pact în Parlamentul național pentru Schengen și atunci putem împreună să cerem socoteală oricărui lider european care va rupe sau care ar încerca să rupă solidaritatea europeană.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, аз ще се опитам да бъда максимално кратък. Фактът, че България и Румъния все още не са приети в Шенген, може да бъде определен само по един-единствен начин. Това е срам и позор за Европейския съюз и за неговите двойни стандарти.

Вероятно ще повторя неща, които са казали колегите. Колко пъти трябва да се потвърждава нашата техническа готовност и политическа воля? Преди повече от десет години доказахме, че сме изпълнили абсолютно всички критерии – и България, и Румъния. И оттогава всички аргументи, които се използват за блокирането на двете държави, са само политически.

Истината е проста, но е трудна за преглъщане – принципите за солидарност и равноправие всъщност са абсолютна илюзия и не съществуват в Европейския съюз. Това е изключително голям проблем и веднага биват забравени нашите две държави. Не знам по какъв принцип. Вместо равноправие получаваме неуважение, а вместо солидарност биваме игнорирани, все едно не съществуваме. Все едно нашите граждани са хора маргинали и втора ръка.

Не се заблуждавайте, колкото повече се демонстрира пренебрежението към нашите граждани, мога да ви кажа, че толкова повече ще ги отблъсквате от Европейския съюз. Вие какво искате – да се създаде вътрешен конфликт ли? Това ли е целта на Европейския съюз? Вместо обединение, да има конфликт между различните народи. Време е да прекратим тази дискриминация и да присъединим България и Румъния към Шенген.

А на колегата от Германия мога да кажа, че всички коридори, които вървят към Европа с нелегални имигранти, са немски.

Ioan-Rareș Bogdan (PPE). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar Schinas, domnule ministru Bek, de 11 ani, două țări europene pe care românii le tratează cu respect, îi umilesc sistematic, blocând aderarea la Schengen. Și asta, deși companiile lor au afaceri uriașe în România și dețin o bună parte din sistemul bancar și de asigurări.

Mereu, România și-a tratat partenerii cu respect. Ce trebuie să mai facem pentru a fi tratați de la egal la egal și respectați de către toți membrii UE? Să provocăm o criză alimentară la nivel european, să blocăm la graniță trenurile și sutele de camioane cu cereale care traversează zilnic România pentru a ajunge pe piețele occidentale? În Olanda, Belgia, Franța, Austria, Germania, Italia. Nu ne obligați să jucăm și noi dur.

Am fost mult prea eleganți și mult prea tăcuți până acum. Nu suntem mai puțin europeni decât cei din Vest. Nu-i trimiteți pe alegătorii români către populiști și eurosceptici. Blocarea României și Bulgariei în afara Schengen este o nedreptate față de un popor profund european. Acum 500 de ani, un român a fost primul european care l-a înfrânt și blocat pe cuceritorul Constantinopolului, Mehmed al II-lea. Se numea Iancu de Hunedoara. În onoarea lui, și astăzi toate bisericile catolice din lume trag clopotele la ora 12.

Vă avertizez că acum Mehmed al II-lea se numește Putin. A atacat Ucraina cu tancurile, dar a atacat și eurosistemul. Are două arme: minciuna și politicieni cărora le oferă sprijin. Are oameni care deja le spun românilor că eurosistemul i-a abandonat. Pentru a anula orice demers antieuropean și pentru a anula discursul eurosceptic în interiorul granițelor României și Bulgariei, țările noastre trebuie să fie obligatoriu în Schengen.

Nu vă bateți joc încă o dată de România și Bulgaria. Ajunge! 11 ani au fost de ajuns!

Rovana Plumb (S&D). – Doamna președintă, domnule vicepreședinte, domnule ministru Bek, nu de puține ori am auzit că România, alături de Bulgaria, îndeplinește criteriile tehnice de aderare la spațiul Schengen. Criteriile tehnice le îndeplinim de 11 ani, iar acest lucru a fost confirmat în repetate rânduri atât de către Parlamentul European, cât și de către Comisia Europeană. România continuă să implementeze și să se adapteze evoluțiilor acquis-ului Schengen cu consecvență, beneficiind de accesul la Sistemul de informații Schengen și la Sistemul de informații privind vizele.

Am demonstrat și demonstrăm cu consecvență modul responsabil în care am înțeles să gestionăm frontiera externă a Uniunii, fiind garantul securității pentru 2 070 de kilometri de frontieră. Ultimele luni ne-au adus în situația nedorită de a dovedi că putem chiar gestiona în mod adecvat o situație de criză cu peste un milion de refugiați care au intrat deja în România, respectând în același timp toate normele Schengen în vigoare.

Trebuie să fim sinceri și să recunoaștem, amânările repetate au fost din motive politice și decizia care trebuie luată este una politică. Credem că suntem într-un moment în care Uniunea trebuie să înțeleagă că sunt necesare gesturi politice clare, care elimină orice ambiguități, gesturi care să arate soliditatea proiectului nostru comun, credibilitatea sa și care să recunoască meritele și eforturile acolo unde sunt făcute, în acord cu prevederile asumate prin tratate.

Ce dorim? Dorim ca până la sfârșitul acestui an să se decidă, evident, în mod pozitiv în Consiliu, asupra ridicării controlului la frontiere între România și Bulgaria și restul spațiului Schengen, iar asta nu este decât o respectare a prevederilor tratatelor, prevederi pe care noi ni le asumăm și le respectăm.

România merită, românii merită să fie tratați în mod egal ca toți ceilalți cetățeni europeni. România trebuie să intre în spațiul Schengen! Dorim ca și românii să circule liber în spațiul Schengen, ca toți ceilalți cetățeni europeni.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamna vicepreședintă, stimați colegi, domnule comisar Schinas, domnule ministru Bek, aderarea României și a Bulgariei la spațiul Schengen este importantă pentru că ne aduce cu adevărat la același statut de cetățeni europeni pe care îl au toți ceilalți cetățeni din statele membre. Este un pas firesc și necesar, care a devenit după mai bine de 15 ani de la aderarea noastră în Uniunea Europeană.

Indiferent de conducerea țării, de regimurile mai mult sau mai puțin adecvate, cetățenii europeni ar trebui să aibă aceleași drepturi, iar dreptul de a călători liber în Uniunea Europeană nu ar trebui nici îngrădit, nici îngreunat. De asemenea, trebuie să urmărim și să ne asigurăm că, la nivel european, dreptul oamenilor de a călători nu va fi îngreunat de proceduri vamale învechite și neconforme cu statutul de cetățean european. Și asta nu v-o spun doar din auzite, vă spun ca un cetățean european din județul Arad și văd cozile de tiruri la mine acasă zi de zi.

Propaganda antieuropeană, și am văzut și în această sală, este din ce în ce mai dură, iar faptul că românii și bulgarii sunt ținuți ore în șir la granița spațiului Schengen pentru a putea circula în Uniunea Europeană nu ajută cu nimic spiritul european pe care cu toții ne dorim să îl vedem la cât mai mulți cetățeni europeni.

Андрей Новаков (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Вицепрезидент и особено г-н Министър, „Желязната завеса“ не беше просто израз. Тя беше разделителна линия между два свята – един на бариери и бодлива тел и друг – на свободен личен избор. Това беше толкова силна разделителна линия, че превърна Берлинската стена в символ на Студената война. Толкова силна разделителна линия, че най-голямата победа в Студената война беше събарянето на Берлинската стена.

Но особено ценен урок ни преподадоха хората от двете страни на стената. Можеш да копаеш тунели, можеш да проектираш балони, можеш да плуваш в студените ледени води, но желанието за достоен живот побеждава, желанието да пътуваш спокойно побеждава. Тридесет и три години по-късно ние сме изправени пред същия урок, но изглежда не сме го научили. Шенген, от символ на единството и падането на границите, се превърна в нова желязна завеса и повод едни държави да сочат други с пръст.

Защо толкова години, след като България и Румъния са изпълнили всички изисквания, те не се допускат в Шенген? Защо повтаряме същата грешка? Уважаеми, България е част от Европа от хиляда и триста години. И българите, и румънците са европейци точно толкова, колкото и всички останали и заслужават достойно и справедливо отношение, а не чакане пред бариери и пред гишета.

Тридесет и три години по-късно Европа е поставена пред същия избор. Въпросът е този път от коя страна на стената ще застане – на европейското единство или на националните рейтинги? Не забравяйте обаче, че политиката вече съществува не за да строи стени, а за да ги събаря.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor ministro Bek, me alegra verlo de nuevo en la Cámara. También al vicepresidente Schinas.

Lo primero que quiero expresar sobre este tema es mi agradecimiento, especialmente a Victor Negrescu, por su trabajo, ya en su época de ministro, encaminado a lograr la adhesión al espacio Schengen, y también por haber propuesto el debate que estamos teniendo hoy en el seno del Grupo Socialista, ya que ha sido él quien lo ha llevado adelante.

El espacio sin fronteras interiores de Schengen se ha visto tensionado, lo sabemos, por la cuestión de la pandemia y la agresión de Rusia a Ucrania. La Comisión ha reiterado que Bulgaria y Rumanía cumplen desde 2011 los requisitos necesarios para formar parte del espacio Schengen con plenos derechos. Lo sabe bien el vicepresidente Schinas.

Por tanto, ministro Bek, es hora de que el Consejo adopte una decisión positiva y dé un paso al frente, y reconozca que Rumanía y Bulgaria han cumplido. Y, además, que reconozca la ingente labor que están realizando a la Unión como países vecinos de Ucrania ante la crisis provocada por la guerra.

También, por cierto, hay que cumplir con Croacia.

No podemos hablar de una Europa unida cuando hay ciudadanos de Estados miembros que, habiendo cumplido sus obligaciones, son apartados de sus derechos a la movilidad.

Dacian Cioloș (Renew). – Doamna președintă, aș vrea să-i transmit domnului Reil, care văd că nu mai e în sală, că dacă România nu și-ar fi făcut treaba la frontiera Uniunii Europene, ar fi văzut dânsul ce înseamnă Far West-ul cu adevărat! Pentru că, iată, la 15 ani de la aderarea la Uniunea Europeană, România este încă în afara spațiului Schengen. Cetățenii români contribuie la PIB-ul altor state membre și totuși nu au aceleași drepturi și aceeași libertate de circulație pe care au cetățenii țărilor respective.

Este profund regretabil și inacceptabil că, din motive politice și datorită unor jocuri politice interne în câteva state membre, românii sunt privați, românii, și cetățenii români, și mediul de afaceri sunt privați de un drept conferit de tratatele Uniunii Europene. Și aș vrea să transmit liderilor europeni care ne ascultă și care pot să nu aibă încredere în unele partide politice, vreau să le spun doar atât: aveți încredere în societatea românească și în anticorpii politici pe care și i-a dezvoltat! Aveți încredere în sutele de mii de români care au apărat în stradă independența justiției și democrația în România! Și orice amânare a aderării României la Schengen este o mână de ajutor pe care o dați partidelor extremiste și antieuropene din România. Cu România în Schengen și Schengen-ul, și Uniunea Europeană va fi mai puternică!

Vasile Blaga (PPE). – Doamna președintă, stimați reprezentanți ai Consiliului, ai Comisiei, dragi colegi, vă vorbesc în calitate de europarlamentar român, dar și fost Ministru de Interne al României, ministru direct responsabil pentru îndeplinirea condiționalităților în vederea integrării României, atât în Uniunea Europeană, cât și în spațiul Schengen.

Din acest motiv, integrarea României în spațiul Schengen este un subiect care mă preocupă și pe care îl tratez foarte personal și sunt trei argumente care trebuie să conducă la o decizie rapidă privind integrarea României și a Bulgariei în Schengen.

În primul rând, primul argument este tehnic și ar trebui să fie suficient, cum a fost pentru toate statele care sunt membre în spațiul Schengen. România îndeplinește toate condițiile tehnice pentru Schengen, mai mult, războiul din Ucraina a fost și un test pentru frontiera externă a Uniunii Europene, iar România l-a trecut cu brio.

Al doilea argument este cel moral. Europa ne-a predat și ne predă de ani de zile lecția solidarității. Solidaritate în fața războiului pentru refugiați și migranți, solidaritate în fața crizei energetice. România și-a făcut temele fără comentarii. A manifestat solidaritate fără rezerve, și nu pentru că ne-a obligat cineva. Am făcut-o pentru că cetățenii români cred în aceste valori. Întrebarea este: Europa este capabilă să pună în practică până la capăt lecția pe care o predă?

Al treilea argument este unul mai degrabă practic și se referă la viitorul Uniunii Europene. Viitorul Uniunii Europene este amenințat de euroscepticism și vedem asta din ce în ce mai des la voturile naționale. Viitorul Uniunii Europene depinde și de modul în care Uniunea înțelege să îi trateze pe cetățenii fiecărui stat membru. Oare refuzul de a lua o decizie legitimă de integrare a României și Bulgariei în Schengen nu creează premisele unui val de euroscepticism în aceste două țări?

Sunteți pregătiți pentru acest lucru? Oare lecția Brexitului nu este suficient? Cred că România și Bulgaria trebuie să devină rapid membri ai Uniunii Europene.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Na początku dobre nowiny z Polski: 79% obywateli Polski uważa, że polski rząd powinien zgodzić się na powrót do praworządności i cofnięcie deformy systemu sprawiedliwości oraz sięgnąć po pieniądze z KPO. 79%, droga Europo! Polska to nie PiS. Poparcie dla członkostwa Polski w Unii Europejskiej ciągle utrzymuje się na poziomie 80% polskiego społeczeństwa pomimo siedmiu lat twardej, antyeuropejskiej propagandy w tak zwanych mediach narodowych.

Strefa Schengen jest symbolem udanego projektu europejskiego, podobnie jak Erasmus, waluta euro czy Europejska Stolica Kultury. Ale chyba jednak to właśnie Europa bez granic to nasze największe osiągnięcie w historii. I miejsce dla Bułgarii i Rumunii w strefie Schengen to absolutny symbol jedności Europy. Europa to będzie kontynent, gdzie z Bukaresztu czy Burgas będzie można przejechać do Madrytu czy Lizbony bez kontroli granicznej. To jest nasz obowiązek i nasza przyszłość. Odwagi, Europo! Tak dla Bułgarii i Rumunii w strefie Schengen. Jedenaście lat oczekiwania to stanowczo za długo.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Renew). – Doamna președintă, azi, mulți colegi români și bulgari vă conving că merită să intre în Schengen și așa și este. Dar astăzi nu e numai ziua lor, este ziua Europei unite. Nu este patriotism european să continui integrarea europeană a lui Schuman? Nu este patriotism european să lași Dacia să ducă mașinile produse la Mioveni mai repede către clientul din Marseille? Nu câștigă francezul, nu câștigă și românul din asta?

La ce bun să dăm bani cu o mână și să taxăm aceste întreprinderi în ora cea mai grea a economiei europene ? Nu este patriotism european să-l respecți pe domnul Popa, cel care ți-a construit casa în Berlin, dar care trebuie să stea la graniță cu zilele atunci când se întoarce acasă de Crăciun sau de Paști? Atunci nu mai suntem o familie? Atunci nu mai suntem frați?

Vorgestern vor 33 Jahren ist in Berlin die Mauer gefallen.

Il y a 233 ans, c'était le tour de la Bastille.

Iar acum 33 de ani, românii au dat jos comunismul și au strigat: Libertate! Ceea ce nu au mai strigat românii și ceea ce uită de multe ori europenii este acea solidaritate, acea fraternitate, acea egalitate. Să le arătăm că Europa este despre asta, să le arătăm că Europa este unită!

Асим Адемов (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, уважаеми колеги, това не е първият дебат по този проблем, но се надявам искрено да е последният, защото отдавна е време България и Румъния, а вече и Хърватска, да бъдат приети в Шенгенското пространство.

България и Румъния свършиха достатъчно работа, за да отговорят на изискванията за присъединяване, но повече от десетилетие те все още чакат. Година след година двете държави се игнорират без обективни причини. Причините са изцяло политически.

Единадесет години откакто някои правителства в Съюза наложиха вето на присъединяването на България и Румъния към Шенгенската зона. Време е тези правителства, начело с нидерландското, да се откажат от двойните стандарти и да демонстрират европейския дух на солидарност. Крайно време е да отпадне тази несправедливост. Не е справедливо да не се признават усилията и резултатите на двете страни. Не е справедливо да не се признава фактът, че при сполетялата ни бежанска криза България се представи най-добре.

Бъдещето на Европейския съюз зависи от това доколко страните ще бъдат единни и солидарни една с друга. Именно тази солидарност изисква България, Румъния и Хърватска да бъдат приети незабавно в Шенген. Време е мечтата да се превърне в реалност.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, domnule ministru, este suficient! În ultimii 11 ani am insistat în repetate rânduri pentru aderarea României la Schengen. Întrebarea reală este cine se opune și de ce ? Toți liderii europeni social-democrați au declarat că susțin aderarea României. Nu am auzit acest lucru de la toate guvernele de centru-dreapta și îi rog pe reprezentanții lor nu doar să vorbească aici, ci să meargă să discute cu colegii lor politici, spre exemplu, din Olanda.

Dar dacă toți din sală suntem pentru aderare, atunci insist ca cei din Consiliu, domnule ministru, să ne spună clar dacă în decembrie va exista un vot pentru aderarea României la Schengen începând de anul viitor. Iar dacă nu se va întâmpla, ce facem? De aceea, vă propun ca noi, eurodeputații, să solicităm sprijinul chiar al Curții de Justiție a Uniunii Europene. Și sunt convins că mulți europeni ne vor susține.

Într-unul din zecile de mii de mesaje transmise de români liderilor europeni pe care le voi depune la sediul Consiliului, Irina, o tânără de 22 de ani din Alba Iulia, scrie că aderarea la Schengen înseamnă pentru ea că românii devin cetățeni europeni cu drepturi depline. Așa că realitatea este simplă: românii merită în Schengen!

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Doamna președintă, România merită să fie în Schengen! Fiecare șofer de TIR care trece prin acest iad tot timpul, fiecare om care stă ore întregi la coadă! Chiar merităm asta! Sunt aici colegii din coaliția de guvernare, i-am auzit vorbind, au avut mesaje foarte puternice PNL, PSD și UDMR au avut post-aderare toate guvernele României, cu o singură excepție.

Cred că niciunul dintre aceste guverne nu s-a bătut destul, eficient și real pentru Schengen și nu am dat semnale de încredere când am vulnerabilizat justiția sau am cumpărat presa. E momentul să depășim asta. Așa că-i rog tare mult de data asta să ne batem real și eficient pentru Schengen. Împreună să reparăm legile justiției, să ne rezolvăm problemele de acasă și cred că asta va ajuta foarte mult, pentru că România merită în Schengen. Poate reușim de data asta împreună.

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, mulțumesc tuturor colegilor pentru sprijinirea procesului de aderare a României și Bulgariei la spațiul Schengen. Mulțumesc, domnule comisar și, de asemenea, mulțumesc, domnule ministru. Din 2011, România îndeplinește toate condițiile tehnice. A făcut investițiile necesare în sistemele de securitate, a consolidat legislația și a pregătit constant funcționarii din domeniu.

Războiul din Ucraina a demonstrat încă o dată în plus că autoritățile din România au capacitatea de a gestiona mari fluxuri migratorii. Am asigurat un tranzit constant de cereale din Ucraina către toate zonele lumii, prevenind foametea. Am fost și suntem parte integrantă a eforturilor comunității internaționale de a pune capăt acestui război dus de Putin. Ne-am exprimat, așadar, solidaritatea în momente dificile pentru Uniunea Europeană. Am fost și suntem furnizori de securitate și stabilitate în regiune.

Nu cerem altceva decât un drept pe care l-am câștigat. Cerem să fim primiți acolo unde ne este locul. În caz contrar, riscul apariției unor curente extremiste este imens, iar prețul plătit de proiectul european va fi unul mult prea mare. Un lucru să fie clar, domnule comisar, un lucru să fie clar, domnule ministru, putem să oferim mai departe solidaritate în vremuri de război, să garantăm stabilitatea în vremuri greu încercate.

Dar nu vom mai tolera să fim umiliți. Astăzi, românii și bulgarii, firmele din România și din Bulgaria, nici nu concep ca Uniunea să nu fie solidară cu ei și să le acorde ceea ce, în mod profund și nedrept, le-a fost refuzat atât de mult timp: accesul în spațiul Schengen.

Matjaž Nemec (S&D). – Gospod predsednik, dober dan! Zadnji širitvi schengna smo bili priča v letu 2007, ko so v območje brez notranjih meja vstopile nove države članice, med njimi tudi Slovenija, ter leta 2008 Švica. Nato je ta proces zastal in je v slepi ulici.

Romunija in Bolgarija sta že leta 2011 izpolnili vse pogoje, a so ju države članice vse do tedaj pustile v čakalnici. V skupini S&D odločno podpiramo širitev schengna in zahtevamo, da Svet odpravi blokado ter za Romunijo in Bolgarijo nemudoma sprejme odločitev o priključitvi.

Schengen je namreč eden izmed najbolj otipljivih dosežkov Evropske unije. A je že vrsto let v krizi. Danes tako še vedno šest držav nezakonito izvaja nadzor na notranjih mejah. Tudi Avstrija s Slovenijo. In to kljub temu, da je Sodišče Evropske unije, ki je odločalo o tem, v primeru iste grožnje te nadzore od leta 2017 deklariralo kot nezakonite. Če želimo zaščititi in ohraniti schengen, ne smemo pristati na tako nedopustno in grobo kršenje sodb sodišč.

Spoštovani, Komisija zato mora nemudoma ukrepati in z vsemi sredstvi zaščititi Schengen, preden bo za to prepozno.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovane kolegice i kolege, jasno je da puni smisao Europska unija, za građanke, za građane, za gospodarstvo, dobiva ulaskom te države članice u schengenski prostor.

Naravno, preduvjet je jasno ispunjenje svih strogih tehničkih uvjeta i, naravno, politička volja ostalih država članica u Vijeću da to i podrže. Želim od srca Bugarskoj i Rumunjskoj da to čim prije i ostvare. A danas, ovdje, želim izraziti veliku sreću jer sam uvjeren da će moja Hrvatska 1. 1. 2023. postati članica schengenskog prostora.

Hvala, drage kolegice i kolege, svima vama koji ste iskazali jednu takvu jasnu volju i siguran sam da će takva odluka biti donesena u nadležnom odboru, a i ovdje na plenarnoj sjednici, kako bi građanke i građani Hrvatske i gospodarstvo Hrvatske dobili toliko željeni, ali i zasluženi poklon za novu '23. godinu. I sve one, koji su danas ovdje iznosili paušalne i netočne informacije o Hrvatskoj, molim da se smire, molim da se ispričaju, da ne viču u ovom prostoru i da ne dijele građanke i građane Europe na građane prvog i drugog reda radi svojih internih političkih bodova.

Радан Кънев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, г-н Министър, нашата позиция в този Парламент е отдавна ясна по въпроса за присъединяването на България и Румъния към Шенген. Също отдавна е ясна позицията на Европейската комисия. Още по-ясен е интересът на българските и румънските граждани, на бизнеса в двете страни, но и на целия Европейски съюз принципите на свободното движение да важат на цялата територия на Съюза.

И тук възниква проблемът: Каква всъщност е пречката? Защо не се случи? Правителствата, които блокират приемането на България и Румъния в Шенген, дължат честен и ясен отговор. Искам да подчертая, че те не го дават. А това вече не отговаря на стандартите ни като Съюз, на принципите, по които работят институциите.

Често, макар и неофициално, се споменава корупцията и тук поставям въпроса: По какъв начин изолирането на България и Румъния помага за борбата с корупцията? По какъв начин затварянето на нашия бизнес в тесни рамки помага на това да бъде освободен той от корупционната хватка? Напротив, принципът тук е точно обратният. Не може гражданите и бизнесът да бъдат наказвани заради корупцията на своите управляващи. Гражданите и бизнесът трябва да бъдат подпомогнати. България и Румъния трябва да влязат в Шенген незабавно и трябва да получат по-голяма помощ при реформирането на службите си и на правосъдната си система, а не да бъдат изолирани.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, domnule ministru, stimați colegi, nu știu dacă puteți să mă înțelegeți, dar am un sentiment de frustrare. Și asta nu numai eu, ci toți cetățenii din țara mea. A câta oară, să mai dezbatem? A câta oară, să mai votăm în Parlamentul European? A câta oară să mai scrie Comisia Consiliului, celor 27 de șefi de stat și de guverne, care, iată, ce democrație ne învață: un președinte de stat sau șef de guvern contează mai mult decât zecile de milioane de cetățeni!

Asta este democrația europeană? Ar putea să ne spună - și mă adresez acum celor 27 de șefi de stat și de guverne, inclusiv președintelui din țara mea - ar putea să ne spună ce punct din tratat, ce punct din Regulamentul Schengen nu-l îndeplinește România sau Bulgaria? Și nu știu dacă acești domni șefi de stat au fost vreodată într-o afacere concretă, nu de celelalte tipuri, să înțeleagă ce înseamnă să pierzi timp dacă ai avea o firmă de transport, ca cetățean. Nu știu dacă ar înțelege, dar îi întreb ca fost om de afaceri: dacă ar fi să calculăm, daunele morale și financiare de 11 ani create milioanelor de cetățeni din țara mea, cum ar putea să plătească? Cer imperativ să intre România și cetățenii din țara mea să se bucure de același … *(Președinta a retras cuvântul vorbitoarei).*

Lena Düpont (PPE). – Mr President, I was three when the Berlin Wall fell; I was 13 when Schengen became an integral part of the Amsterdam Treaties; I was about to finish school when 10 new Member States joined the European family, so Schengen and Europe have always been a part of my life. I have experienced it as an open, as a free, as a promising continent, and it has become even more so in recent times.

I would have been 24 when new Member States could have joined the Schengen Area: some 30 million citizens eagerly awaiting to experience that freedom as well, if the Council had acted. The steps needed had been taken, criteria had been met, cooperation and consultation was not only signalled but brought to life.

After all, Schengen remains one of the most important achievements of the European Union. It is more than a political showcase; it is a fundamental right of all EU citizens; it is lived by the people of the European Union; it's part of our European DNA. Can we do more to preserve it and to strengthen it? Yes, of course. It's an achievement. It must be cherished; it must be nurtured; it must be guarded. Would it be an enormous step, an important step ahead in welcoming new members to the Schengen Area? Of course, yes. It would foster our internal security, strengthen our union, and ease the burden for European citizens.

I'm 36 now and I would be more than happy to see these accessions before another birthday passes by.

Цветелина Пенкова (S&D). – Г-н Председател, г-н Вицепрезидент, министър Бек, Европейският парламент винаги е подкрепял пълноправното членство на България и Румъния в Шенген и днес отново препотвърждаваме тази позиция.

Всички технически изисквания са изпълнени и това е потвърдено от вътрешните министри на Съюза, но въпреки това вече повече от десетилетие двете страни са на вратата на Шенген. Равни сме по изисквания и задължения, но не и по постигнати резултати. Това не е ли двоен стандарт?

Българското членство се блокира заради политически възражения на определени държави членки в Съвета. Възражения, които нямат нищо общо с Шенген, и това е разочароващо за всички европейски граждани.

Насред толкова кризи България разходва оскъден публичен ресурс, за да поддържа вътрешен граничен контрол с Румъния и Гърция, вместо да пренасочи този ресурс към натоварената външна европейска граница с Турция.

Съветът трябва да преосмисли позицията си и да даде незабавно зелена светлина за членството на България и Румъния в Шенген, с всички граници едновременно – въздушни, водни и сухопътни.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Mr President, dear Vice-President Schinas, dear colleagues, Romanian and Bulgarian citizens have been waiting now for 11 years to enjoy all the advantages of free movement and to enter into the Schengen area.

Parliament has repeatedly emphasised its support for the Schengen enlargement, as we do today, because it is crucial for the equality of citizens within the EU. Stronger economic cooperation, enhanced connectivity, but also better protection of the external borders is in the interests of the whole European Union and not only in the interests of those two countries. This is especially true at a time of great uncertainty and damaged security architecture across the entire continent.

Ladies and gentlemen, soon we will discuss and vote here in the European Parliament on the report on Croatia's accession to the Schengen area. Let me be clear, in December it is high time for the Council to act not only for Croatia, but also for Romania and Bulgaria, because this is in the interests of these countries, but this is also in the interests of all Europe and of fostered security on the European continent.

Leszek Miller (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Brak granic w Europie zjednoczył nasz kontynent. Jest symbolem europejskich wartości i europejskiego stylu życia. Bułgaria i Rumunia, które weszły do Unii w 2007 roku, 15 lat temu, wciąż są poza Schengen. Chorwacja czeka sześć lat, a przecież dopiero wejście do Schengen jest dopełnieniem procesu integracji rozumianego jako prawa, ale i poważne obowiązki. Co roku Bruksela szczegółowo bada przystosowanie Rumunii i Bułgarii do wymogów strefy i ogłasza rekomendacje. Jeśli zatem Komisja uznaje, że kraje aspirujące spełniają wszystkie kluczowe warunki, nie ma na co czekać. Trzeba podjąć decyzję. Unia musi dowieść, że nawet w trudnych warunkach wywołanych agresją Rosji na Ukrainę potrafi chronić swoje największe osiągnięcia, czyli swobodny przepływ osób – jedną z czterech podstawowych swobód, na których została zbudowana.

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Г-н Председател, имам усещането за дежавю, за една пиеса на абсурда. Всичко това, което днес говорим, се говори от десет години. Техническите критерии са изпълнени, приети са резолюции, Европейската комисия е казала своето „да“. И абсурдният въпрос е: Какво още очакваме да се случи, за да бъдат приети България и Румъния в Шенгенското пространство?

Обръщам внимание – разширяването на Шенген с България и Румъния ще бъде успех за Европейския съюз, а ново отлагане ще работи единствено в полза на хибридната война, която Кремъл води срещу Европа. Настоявам от тази висока трибуна Съветът да вземе единственото правилно решение – незабавно приемане на България и Румъния в Шенген. И нека това да стане на Съвета през месец декември и да посрещнем всички заедно като едно семейство Рождество Христово.

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Domnule președinte, de 11 ani, România stă în anticamera Schengen, așteptând să i se deschidă ușa. De 11 ani, țara mea nu e doar pregătită să intre, dar a dat dovadă de solidaritate și de acțiuni exemplare în situații de criză, a respectat legislația și pregătește acum implementarea noilor sisteme de securitate europene. Cu toate acestea, după 11 ani, încă ni se opun niște mari parteneri comerciali, pe care România i-a primit cu brațele deschise, tratându-i cu respect.

Și-i întreb astăzi de ce ne țin captivi într-o buclă de interese naționale și pretexte reinventate, afectându-i nu doar pe români, dar și pe proprii cetățeni și pe companiile lor? Oamenii țării mele vor să știe de ce, după toate sacrificiile mari, multe, dureroase, nu au dreptul să fie în Schengen, de care beneficiază chiar și state non-membre UE.

Acestea nu sunt vremuri de alienat prieteni. Valul eurosceptic din UE crește inclusiv din cauza unor astfel de greșeli. Încetați cu discriminarea României! Nu ne mai țineți în anticameră! E dreptul nostru câștigat cu greu, iar Europa, vă asigur, va avea doar beneficii.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, domnule ministru, pun această întrebare: cui îi servește menținerea în afara frontierelor Uniunii Europene, a României și Bulgariei? Servește oare asta Comisiei Europene? Este în interesul Parlamentului European? Este în interesul cetățenilor Uniunii Europene?

Cred că se greșește fundamental atunci când, din rațiuni politice mărunte, două națiuni sunt ținute în mod nejustificat, incorect, la porțile Uniunii Europene. Suntem cetățeni europeni și am confirmat acest lucru. Peste un milion de cetățeni ai Ucrainei au trecut prin frontierele României în această invazie absurdă declanșată de Putin. Peste patru mii de copii fără părinți au fost primiți de polițiștii români în punctele de frontieră ale Uniunii Europene.

Avem dreptul să fim tratați în mod corect! Și fac încă o dată acest apel, încheind cu expresia: cui îi servește menținerea Bulgariei și României în afara frontierelor Uniunii Europene?

Иво Христов (S&D). – Г-н Председател, през юни България сне ветото си върху амбициите на Скопие да се присъедини към Съюза. Сторихме го въпреки откритите въпроси, за да не спъваме разширяването.

През последните месеци над 100 000 украински бежанци намериха покрив и прехрана в България, с което поехме своето бреме от войната. Междувременно стотици хиляди българи, които работят в страните от Шенген и допринасят с труда си за тяхното благосъстояние, все още подлежат на граничен контрол.

Критериите са изпълнени. Време е Европейският съюз да спази собствените си правила и да приеме България и Румъния в Шенген. Време е да надраснем икономическия егоизъм на някои членове на Съвета, който държи три държави членки на прага на зоната под фалшиви предлози.

В тези много трудни месеци за Европейския съюз разширяването на Шенген е една от малкото възможности да докажем, че динамиката на Съюза не е изчерпана. Че солидарност, общо пространство и доверие между партньорите не са празни думи.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, vážený pane komisaři, vážený pane ministře, chci se vás na začátku zeptat, jestli si v demokracii můžeme vybírat pravidla pouze tehdy, pokud se nám to hodí. Pokud ne, tak tahle debata je zbytečná, protože my už jsme Bulharsku a Rumunsku v roce 2018 jako Evropský parlament jednoznačně řekli, že patří do schengenského prostoru. Evropská komise to tady znovu zopakovala, že splňují všechna kritéria. Tak proč jim zavíráme dveře? Proč zavíráme dveře také Chorvatsku, které splňuje všechna kritéria? Protože se to některým státům hodí? Protože některé státy mají demokracii jako supermarket, kde si vyzobávají ty věci, které jsou pro ně podstatné, a jiné, které jsou nepodstatné, se snaží zdržovat? Já si myslím, že je potřeba v prosinci na summitu, který bude pod českým předsednictvím, říci jednoznačně ne. A říct ano, přijmeme Rumunsko, Bulharsko i Chorvatsko do schengenského prostoru.

Tudor Ciuhodaru (S&D). – Domnule președinte, acum este momentul deciziei finale. Vreau ca românii să nu mai fie considerați cetățeni europeni de mâna a doua. Și pentru asta România trebuie să intre cât mai rapid în Schengen. Onorată Comisie, onorat Consiliu, v-am spus de nenumărate ori în plenul acestui Parlament, mai spun și astăz,i că îndeplinim demult toate condițiile de aderare.

Este incorect ca unii să fie mai egali ca alții și acest lucru trebuie să înceteze. Vreau, de fapt, drepturi egale pentru români, aceleași drepturi ca cele pentru olandezi, germani și francezi. Orice amânare de acum nu mai este justificată. Sper să susțineți toți demersul meu.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, povjereniče, hvala vam na strpljenju danas, kolegice i kolege. Kao jedno od najvećih postignuća Europske unije, Schengen utjelovljuje načelo slobode kretanja, s više od 400 milijuna ljudi, i predstavlja onu najopipljiviju prednost članstva u Europskoj uniji.

U vremenima kada je europski projekt integracija nagrižen uslijed kriza s kojima se suočavamo, a pogotovo sukoba u Ukrajini, moramo dati jasnu političku potporu državama članicama, kroz primanje u schengenski prostor. Trebalo bi poduzeti mjere kako bi i Rumunjska i Bugarska, koje su ispunile sve tehničke uvjete 2011., mogle imati koristi od svog statusa. Vjerujem da će moja zemlja Hrvatska 1. siječnja iduće godine, u desetoj godini članstva u Europskoj uniji, istodobno ući u schengenski prostor i europodručje: dvije najuže integracije u središtu Europske unije.

Vanjske granice Europske unije moraju biti snažno zaštićene zbog brojnih izazova s kojima smo suočeni i na taj način moramo oblikovati zajedničku sigurnosnu politiku, a onima koji ne znaju ništa o mojoj zemlji i nazivaju je različitim kvalifikacijama, poručujem: nemojte se služiti *fake newsom*.

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Mr President, the Schengen area is undoubtedly one of the core pillars and privileges of the European Union. I fully recognise the need to be extremely careful while judging the preparedness of the countries to fulfil the criteria, especially when it comes to the necessity to protect external borders.

Here we have to say that Romania and Bulgaria have since 11 years met all the technical conditions and passed all the stress tests, even the massive arrival of the Ukrainian refugees. But they have still not been granted membership of the Schengen area. On the contrary, they have been held hostage to the political games of some Member States.

Already last year, when voting on the annual report on the functioning of the Schengen area, I supported the accession of both countries to Schengen and once again I appeal to the Council to grant the entry to Romania and Bulgaria immediately. The Romanians and Bulgarians deserve the privilege to use all the benefits that EU membership provides us with, including the genuine free movement of people without border controls.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Loránt Vincze (PPE). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, vorbim deseori de solidaritate europeană. Unele state sunt extrem de susținătoare când este vorba de terțe țări, dar mai reticente când trebuie să își dea acordul pentru desăvârșirea parcursului european al României, adică aderarea la zona Schengen. Nu este corect. Noi ne-am făcut temele, criteriile tehnice de acces sunt îndeplinite de mai bine de zece ani.

În ultimele luni, autoritățile românești au gestionat peste două milioane de refugiați ucraineni. România a arătat solidaritate deplină în contextul războiului din Ucraina și a demonstrat încă o dată că este pregătită să controleze eficient granițele externe ale Uniunii Europene. Întârzierea aderării la zona Schengen costă bani companiilor, transportatorilor și este o pierdere inutilă de timp pentru cetățeni. Plus un cost pentru mediul înconjurător din cauza miilor de camioane care stau zeci de ore în trafic.

Mesajul cetățenilor din România și Bulgaria este unul fără echivoc: nu mai acceptăm să fim considerați cetățeni europeni de rangul 2. Iată, Comisia Europeană și Parlamentul își reafirmă sprijinul ferm pentru aderare, iar Consiliul trebuie să urmeze această abordare justă, fără întârziere și fără condiții suplimentare.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, schengenski prostor jedno je od najvažnijih postignuća Europske unije. Važno je, stoga, sačuvati njegov integritet, naročito od sve češćih nezakonitih migracija i zloupotreba prava na azil od strane ekonomskih migranata koji na njega nemaju pravo.

Bugarska i Rumunjska obavljaju taj rudarski posao, čuvaju granicu EU. Odavno su zadovoljile sve uvjete i zato zaslužuju biti dio Schengena. Osim toga, moram se osvrnuti na ponovljene laži izrečene u ovoj dvorani na račun Hrvatske. Višegodišnji napori koje je hrvatska vlada provodila rezultirali su ispunjenjem tehničkih kriterija za ulazak u schengenski prostor 2019. Time je potvrđeno da Hrvatska na najbolji mogući način štiti najdulju vanjsku granicu EU od ilegalnih migracija, sukladno europskom i međunarodnom pravu. Oni koji tvrde suprotno, uporno obmanjuju javnost zbog vlastitih sitnih politikantskih interesa.

Ulazak Hrvatske u Schengen u interesu je cijele Europske unije i to se ovdje još jednom mora istaknuti.

Iuliu Winkler (PPE). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, voi repeta un adevăr pe care l-ați auzit în dezbaterea de astăzi de cel puțin 100 de ori: de 11 ani, România îndeplinește toate cerințele tehnice pentru aderarea la spațiul european de liberă circulație. Doar din rațiuni politicianiste, accesul nostru în spațiul Schengen a fost blocat. Așteptăm să fim tratați în mod egal cu ceilalți cetățeni europeni și să circulăm liber.

Mediul de afaceri, de asemeni, așteaptă ca Uniunea Europeană să își respecte angajamentele politice și să ridice povara administrativă și financiară generată de faptul că am fost lăsați în afara spațiului Schengen. La toate nivelurile de reprezentare, partidul meu, formațiunea mea politică, Uniunea Democrată Maghiară din România, militează și lucrează pentru aderarea României la spațiul Schengen. Sper că vom avea în decembrie o decizie pozitivă a statelor membre în privința aderării noastre.

(Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās beigas.)

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you all for this converging and cross-party support. What I take out of this debate are three very simple messages that you would allow me to share.

Message number one is that the Schengen area is only possible because we have agreed to share responsibility, and to share responsibility means to be able to share sovereignty. There is no first class sovereignty and second class sovereignty. We are all responsible collectively for having decided to share our sovereignty together in managing our borders.

Message number two is that Schengen does not belong to politicians, to ministers, to prime ministers, to the Commissioner, or to my humble self. Schengen belongs to Europeans, to all Europeans.

I take this opportunity to publicly salute Sophia in 't Veld for finding the right words to remind her prime minister, the Dutch Prime Minister, that he is not the owner – as nobody else is the owner – of Schengen freedoms.

Message number three is that Schengen is a fundamental project that we will constantly always adapt and bring forward. But there is no going back for Schengen. Schengen will go deeper, Schengen will grow larger and will include Bulgaria and Romania.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, Vice-President of the Commission, honourable Members, thank you for this timely debate. I have well noted all views expressed here. I will be very brief now and simply reiterate what I said at the beginning.

Achieving progress to enable Bulgaria and Romania to be fully part of the Schengen area is among the priorities of the Czech Presidency. The Presidency believes that there is a historical momentum to achieve a breakthrough in the completion of the Schengen enlargement process.

Allow me just one empirical observation on the popular topic of unanimity, which has been mentioned in this debate. It has been suggested that, had the Schengen enlargement been subject to the qualified majority voting, the problem would not be there. Well, recalling the number and voting power of those Member States who have been opposing it at particular stages of the debate over the past 11 years, I am not entirely sure about it.

But as I said, the Presidency is committed to an open and constructive discussion with all stakeholders in order to advance as much as possible to that substantive and hopefully decisive discussion at the December Council.

With regard to Croatia, the Presidency considers that Croatia fulfils the criteria for the lifting of controls at internal borders. In this regard, the Council sent its draft decision to the European Parliament last June. We trust that the Council will receive the opinion of the Parliament in due course. Thank you for your attention.

President. – The debate is closed. The vote will take place during the next part-session.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Karol Karski (ECR), *na piśmie.* – Zdecydowanie wspieram starania Bułgarii, Rumunii i Chorwacji o pełne członkostwo w strefie Schengen. Procedura formalnej oceny gotowości Bułgarii, Rumunii i Chorwacji do wejścia do strefy Schengen zakończyła się z pozytywnym wynikiem, więc proces ten powinien być najszybciej jak to możliwe sfinalizowany.

Już w ubiegłym roku Rada stwierdziła, że Chorwacja spełniła wszystkie wymagania, aby stać się członkiem Schengen, jednak kraj ten wciąż czeka na zakończenie tego procesu. Bułgaria i Rumunia wstąpiły do Unii Europejskiej w 2007 r., Chorwacja w 2013 r. Przez te wszystkie lata kraje te wypełniły zobowiązania, aby umożliwić swoim obywatelom korzystanie z przysługujących im praw wynikających z pełnoprawnego członkostwa w strefie Schengen.

Kraje te, w wyniku podjętych przez siebie starań, dysponują obecnie nowoczesnymi rozwiązaniami i technologią, które przyczyniają się do odpowiedniego wdrażania przepisów Schengen. Możemy być też pewni co do podejmowanych przez te kraje środków bezpieczeństwa, dzięki skutecznemu zarządzaniu przez nie przepływami migracyjnymi, i działań na rzecz walki z przestępczością. Są to ważne przesłanki, które pozwalają na bezpieczne zniesienie kontroli granicznych przez te kraje. Znacznie ułatwiłoby to podróżowanie i rozwinęłoby współpracę transgraniczną. Nic nie usprawiedliwia niezrozumiałej opieszałości w przyjęciu tych krajów do strefy Schengen. W mojej opinii już dawno te kraje powinny były się w niej znaleźć.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), *în scris*. – România trebuie să intre în Schengen la 1 ianuarie 2023, împreună cu Croația și Bulgaria. Cer Consiliului pentru Justiție și Afaceri Interne ca la reuniunea din 9 decembrie să ia decizia de admitere a României în Schengen.

Granița externă a UE din România este una dintre cele mai sigure, iar din punct de vedere tehnic suntem puși la punct de multă vreme.

Nu există niciun motiv pentru ca România și Bulgaria, țări membre UE din 2007, să intre în Schengen după Croația, devenită membră 6 ani mai târziu.

UE este un spațiu al bunăstării, iar circulația liberă a mărfurilor și persoanelor este un element esențial în construirea și menținerea acestei bunăstări. Or, situarea în afara Schengen a adus prejudicii majore mediului de afaceri, nu doar din România, din toate statele care fac afaceri în România, inclusiv Olanda, țara care s-a opus până acum intrării în Schengen a țării mele, dar care, pe de altă parte, este în topul investitorilor străini din România.

1 ianuarie 2023 trebuie să rămână în istorie ca data la care România, alături de Bulgaria și Croația, au aderat la zona Schengen.

Dan-Ștefan Motreanu (PPE), *în scris*. – După cum bine știm cu toții, România îndeplinește criteriile tehnice de aderare la Spațiul Schengen de 11 ani și și-a demonstrat, în mod suplimentar, capacitatea de a proteja frontierele UE, prin modul în care a gestionat situația refugiaților ucraineni. Este de neacceptat ca cetățenii români, printre cei mai proeuropeni, să aștepte în continuare la cozi interminabile la controalele frontierelor terestre și aeriene, la fel cum este de neacceptat ca firmele românești să piardă miliarde de euro anual din cauza unor bariere birocratice inutile pe piața unică europeană.

Salut sprijinul exprimat astăzi din partea tuturor partidelor politice din Parlamentul European pentru aderarea României la Spațiul Schengen, precum și sprijinul Comisiei Europene, și solicit pe această cale minorității din Consiliu care s-a opus aderării României de-a lungul anilor să dea dovadă de discernământ și să se alăture majorității covârșitoare la votul care va avea loc în reunirea Consiliului de Justiție și Afaceri Interne din luna decembrie.

Gheorghe-Vlad Nistor (PPE), *în scris*. – Chestiunea Schengen reprezintă, pentru România și Bulgaria, nu doar un deziderat, parte a integrării continue în UE, însă și o obligație statutară pe care celelalte state membre au datoria de a o pune în aplicare. De 11 ani România îndeplinește toate criteriile tehnice pentru aderare, însă, alături de Bulgaria, este captivă obsesiei, marotei aș spune, unor state europene (din fericire, din ce in ce mai puține), cu privire la magnitudinea corupției din cele două țări.

Nimeni nu contestă acea realitate, dar a fost cazul cu ani în urmă; în prezent, instituțiile anti-corupție din România sunt printre cele mai funcționale și unanim lăudate din Europa. Ca membri egali ai Uniunii Europene, cu obligații și beneficii, nu putem accepta șantajul sau abuzul din partea unor colegi ce se cred mai îndreptățiți în casa noastră comună. În aceste momente dificile pentru continent, România își îndeplinește cu sârguință și cu bună-credință toate obligațiile, și chiar mai mult. Dacă vom fi blocați, și pe mai departe, de la drepturile noastre, se va pune în discuție viabilitatea proiectului European și se vor deschide, și mai larg, porțile populismului anti-UE, în special în două state eminamente proeuropene și pro-euro-atlantice.

Емил Радев (PPE), *в писмена форма*. – Крайно време е България да получи правото да се възползва от пълното прилагане на разпоредбите на достиженията на правото от Шенген, в това число премахването на проверките по вътрешните граници. Единадесет години по-късно ние все още сме третирани като държава - втора ръка, по отношение на която се прилагат поредните двойни стандарти. Време е това да приключи! Време е Съветът на ЕС да вземе решение, което не е изцяло политическо, а основано на изпълнението на обективни критерии. Решение, което не поставя европейската интеграция в задънена улица, а напротив - дава ѝ ново начало.

Дойде времето Европа да спре да се крие зад бюрократични хватки, като изтъква причини, които не са пряко свързани с управлението на границите, а да изпълни своите ангажименти. Позволете ми в тази връзка да припомня, че техническата готовност за опазването на външните граници от страна на България бе многократно потвърдена от различни институции на ниво ЕС - Комисия, Парламент, дори и отделни държави членки. Крайно време е обаче всички да разберат, че разширяването на Шенгенското пространство не е просто каприз на някои държави, то би било победа за целия ЕС и ще направи външните ни граници по-силни и по-устойчиви на кризи, каквито в последно време не липсват!

Mihai Tudose (S&D), *în scris*. – Parlamentul European a adoptat numeroase cereri ca România și Bulgaria să devină membre cu drepturi depline ale zonei de liberă circulație. Cele mai recente rezoluții pe această temă au fost votate în decembrie 2018, iunie 2020 și iulie 2021. Această dezbatere și rezoluția pe care o vom vota în sesiunea următoare sunt utile cu atât mai mult cu cât evidențiază lipsa de temei a poziției Consiliului UE.

Atât Comisia Europeană, cât și Parlamentul European consideră că, încă din 2011, România îndeplinește criteriile de aderare la Schengen. Mai mult, în actualul context geopolitic, țara mea este garantul unei frontiere de maximă importanță și calea de acces în UE a exporturilor de cereale ale Ucrainei. Cu toate acestea, cetățenii și companiile din România suferă o discriminare umilitoare și costisitoare, dar și rușinoasă tocmai pentru cei care pretind că o impun în numele – câtă ipocrizie! – unor pretinse valori europene.

Noi, românii, ne-am îndeplinit obligațiile prevăzute în acquis-ul Schengen. De aceea, cer Consiliului UE ca, la reuniunea din decembrie, să ia decizia corectă, în conformitate cu valorile ce stau la baza construcției europene: România, membră a Spațiului Schengen! În caz contrar, mai târziu s-ar putea să fie prea târziu…

9. Výsledek přezkumu patnáctibodového akčního plánu pro obchod a udržitelný rozvoj provedeného Komisí (rozprava)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par jautājumu, uz kuru jāatbild mutiski un kuru uzdeva *Bernd Lange* Starptautiskās tirdzniecības komitejas vārdā Komisijai, par Komisijas īstenotās 15 punktu tirdzniecības un ilgtspējīgas attīstības rīcības plāna pārskatīšanas rezultātiem (O-000029/0022 - B9-0021/2022) (2022/2692(RSP)).

Bernd Lange, *Verfasser*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich glaube, es ist inzwischen jedem klar, dass Handelspolitik in sich kein Selbstzweck ist. Handel ist kein *end in itself*. Handelspolitik hat zur Stärkung der nachhaltigen Entwicklung beizutragen. Handelspolitik hat dazu beizutragen, dass die Menschen vor Ort einen Mehrwert durch Handelspolitik haben.

Klar: Handel stimuliert Wachstum, aber wenn die Regeln nicht stimmen, dann verfehlt dieses Wachstum das Ziel, und mitunter leiden Menschen. Mitunter leidet die Natur, und auch die Ziele des Pariser Klimaschutzübereinkommens werden nicht erreicht. Deswegen ist es so wichtig, dass wir die Handelspolitik in das richtige Korsett setzen, damit wir klarstellen: Handel ist kein Selbstzweck, Handel hat Nachhaltigkeit zu fördern. Diese Erkenntnis, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ist ja im letzten Jahrzehnt gewachsen.

Wir haben das erste Handelsabkommen mit einem ausgewiesenen Nachhaltigkeitskapitel 2011 abgeschlossen – das Abkommen mit Südkorea. Seitdem haben wir zwölf weitere Abkommen abgeschlossen – mit Kanada und vielen anderen Ländern –, in denen auch Nachhaltigkeitskapitel enthalten sind, mit Stärken und eben auch Schwächen. Wir haben in diesen Kapiteln vereinbart, dass internationale Normen zu akzeptieren sind – die Umweltstandards der UN, die ILO-Kernarbeitsnormen –, dass es kein Unterlaufen von diesen Normen aus Wettbewerbsvorteilsgründen geben darf. Wir haben festgelegt, dass es Promotion von besonderen Handel wie fairem Handel gibt. Wir haben festgelegt, dass es eine Beteiligung der Zivilgesellschaft gibt, und auch, dass es einen Schlichtungsmechanismus gibt. Aber, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wir haben gesehen, dass diese Zielsetzungen dieser Fünf nicht immer auch wirklich umgesetzt worden sind.

Noch einmal zu Südkorea: Südkorea hat massiv Arbeitnehmerrechte verletzt. Auch während der Wirksamkeit des Abkommens sind Gesetzgebungen beschlossen worden, die dem Abkommen widersprechen. Wir haben einen Streitschlichtungsmechanismus genutzt, der sechs Jahre gedauert hat, 2019 dann in einem Verfahren, in dem dann dieses Gremium, dieses *Panel of Experts*, zu entscheiden hat, das dann auch 2021 entschieden hat, aber bisher ist nichts passiert.

Also da gibt es so eine Schwäche. Es gibt noch ein paar andere Punkte. Deswegen begrüßen wir sehr, dass die Kommission am 22. Juni endlich einen neuen Ansatz zur Verbesserung und zur Vermeidung dieser Schwächen auf den Weg gebracht hat. Das Parlament hat übrigens lange dafür gekämpft und gestritten. Ich selbst habe 2017 mal ein *model chapter* für einen anderen Ansatz in dem Nachhaltigkeitskapitel vorgelegt. Also jetzt sind wir auf dem richtigen Weg mit einer vernünftigen Herangehensweise an die Implementierung von Nachhaltigkeitszielen über eine Roadmap mit klaren Zwischenzielen. Wir stärken das Monitoring der Nachhaltigkeitsziele und von deren Umsetzung gerade durch die Stärkung der Zivilgesellschaft durch die *domestic advisory groups*, die jetzt auch Möglichkeiten haben, in das Verfahren einzugreifen und Klagen loszutreten. Und wir haben in der Tat Durchsetzungsmechanismen eingebaut, sodass letztendlich ein Fehlverhalten auch sanktioniert werden kann.

Allerdings sind noch ein paar Fragen offen. Wir haben kein *model chapter* bekommen, sondern nur die Prinzipien. Im Moment ist, glaube ich, das *model chapter* das Abkommen mit Neuseeland, wo wir in der Tat die Prinzipien das erste Mal vereinbart haben. Aber was passiert mit den alten Abkommen, mit den zwölf, die ich genannt habe, und den ganz alten? Klar ist, dass neue Abkommen, die hier auf den Tisch des Hauses kommen, diesen Ansprüchen zu genügen haben. Kann man nicht einige Elemente schon jetzt umsetzen, die *domestic advisory groups* stärken? Und wie sieht es eigentlich aus mit den Prinzipien für alle Länder, weil von *case* zu *case* kann man vielleicht in bestimmten Bereichen diskutieren, aber das Grundprinzip muss das gleiche sein. Und wir brauchen auch Nachhaltigkeit über den originären Bereich hinaus, gerade wenn es um Rohstoffe geht.

Handelspolitik ohne Nachhaltigkeit ist wie ein Auto ohne ein Lenkrad, und das kann ganz gefährlich in eine falsche Richtung gehen. Deswegen brauchen wir klare und strenge Nachhaltigkeitsziele.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, the Commission promised that trade policy would play a greater role in supporting our sustainability agenda, and we delivered on that promise in June by adopting our new approach to enhance the contribution of EU trade agreements to trade sustainable development (TSD).

We gave this approach a big boost three years ago, when we published the 15-point TSD review action plan. But we need to do more. The Commission believes the outcome strikes the right balance between our sustainability ambitions and the new geopolitical reality between supporting economic growth and promoting values.

I would like to commend the European Parliament and Bernd Lange, author of the report, for their strong contribution and support. I would also like to take the opportunity here, also on behalf of my colleague Valdis Dombrovskis, to address the questions that you cover in your resolution.

The biggest focus of the review is on implementation and enforcement. While our approach should remain centred on cooperation and engagement, there may be circumstances where sanctions are warranted as the last resort for serious violation of core labour standards and material breaches of the Paris Agreement. Concerning the methodology to determine the appropriate sanctions, the Commission intends to apply the same approach to TSD as to other breaches of FTA obligations.

The outcome of the TSD review will be reflected in future negotiations and in ongoing negotiations as appropriate. We already delivered in our agreement with New Zealand, concluded in June, including on sanctions.

As regards your interest in a draft modal chapter, the Commission believes that we should not necessarily follow one single template. This does not mean that we will lower our level of ambition, but that we will take account and prioritize specific needs with specific partners.

Implementation roadmaps will also play a key role. We can agree on roadmaps tailored to the needs of our partner countries, with clear timelines and milestones. We also want to increase coordination at EU level. We need to overcome silos when it comes to implementation. We are in all this together – all Commission services, EU institutions and Member States.

The Commission welcomes, in particular, the active role of this House in implementing the new TSD approach. The process of negotiation and of implementation of the trade agreements will also allow for the contribution of civil society. The majority of the actions can be deployed right away, including in our existing agreements. These would include identifying country-specific sustainability priorities and strengthening EU domestic advisory groups (DAGs).

Beyond TSD chapters, it is important to mainstream sustainability in every section of trade deals. For example, we need to look at opening new markets for the import and export of green goods and services, raw materials and the avoidance of trade barriers. We should also identify sustainability priorities, even before negotiations begin, including through our sustainability impact assessments.

I would also like to mention the concerns you raised regarding possible violations of human and environmental rights in relation to access to raw materials. The Commission believes that access to raw materials and energy can be done in a way that respects human rights, labour rights and the protection of the environment, but also benefits local communities in third countries, to ensure that we have specific commitments in our FTAs on the respect of multilateral labour and environmental standards, but also dispute settlement mechanisms which will address and include sanctions in a satisfactory way.

Iuliu Winkler, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, distinguished Commissioner, I welcome the Commission's review of the 15-point TSD action plan in this new global geo-economic context, and in this EU trade policy is more important than ever. International trade is an engine for growth, for jobs, and the promoter for sustainability. Rooted in international commitments, the EU TSD chapters seek to keep borders open for trade, while pushing for high sustainability standards in third countries. Most important for us in the EPP Group, the TSD review maintains the strategic balance between the future negotiability of EU FTAs and the ambition of TSD clauses.

Ambitious agreements are very important. Their efficient implementation is even more important. The INTA Committee of this House will play its part in monitoring the implementation of EU FTAs and the uptake of TSD commitments.

The European Parliament pushed for strengthening the EU's trade policy. As we have now comprehensively boosted our trade toolbox, the EPP Group considers it is high time that we start ratifying new free trade agreements.

Inma Rodríguez-Piñero, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, quiero, en primer lugar, felicitar al presidente Lange y demás compañeros de mi Grupo por el liderazgo ejercido en el desarrollo de este instrumento y agradecer al resto de los grupos el consenso alcanzado en esta Resolución. El consenso, que siempre merece destacarse, especialmente en estos tiempos tan convulsos, es más importante que nunca.

Pocos instrumentos pueden representar mejor los principios y valores de la política comercial de la Unión Europea que esta revisión de 15 puntos del Plan de Acción sobre Comercio y Desarrollo Sostenible.

La Comisión ha hecho un trabajo notable y así lo hemos reconocido. Pero queremos más. Queremos que este Plan se materialice efectivamente. Para que se cumplan nuestras prioridades y aspiraciones y, sobre todo, para que el acceso a nuestro potente mercado sea útil, para conseguir un desarrollo más justo y sostenible, particularmente en los países menos desarrollados. De ahí la importancia de las hojas de ruta específicas para cada país.

Por ello, queremos una implementación y un cumplimiento más estrictos que garanticen la eficacia de la estrategia y, en consecuencia, abogamos por una mayor participación y capacidad de denuncia de la sociedad civil y de los grupos de asesoramiento, así como un mayor control parlamentario, sobre todo en lo que se refiere al modo en que evolucionan los acuerdos comerciales y en relación con la aplicación de las cláusulas de desarrollo sostenible.

El incumplimiento de estas cláusulas debe ser sancionado, como mi Grupo ha venido defendiendo durante mucho tiempo. Pero las buenas prácticas y el cumplimiento también deben ser reconocidos. Todo ello ayudará a que nuestra acción contra el cambio climático y la pérdida de biodiversidad, contra la deforestación, en favor de la diligencia debida y de garantizar un trabajo decente y para avanzar en la economía circular y la transición energética sea más eficaz.

Por último, y muy importante para mi Grupo y para mí, significativamente: esta estrategia ha de servir, señor comisario, y servirá, para que la perspectiva de género, finalmente, esté íntegramente presente en los acuerdos y redunde en una mayor igualdad entre hombres y mujeres.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne, *au nom du groupe Renew.* – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, enfin, l'Union Européenne va, avec la réforme des chapitres développement durable, utiliser le potentiel des accords de commerce. Trois ans au moins que le Parlement européen n'a de cesse de défendre cette réforme, un pas essentiel pour un commerce plus juste, équitable, basé sur des règles, mais surtout sur l'engagement réciproque.

Ce ne sont pas ni des principes en l'air, ni une jolie formule. Avec cette réforme, une violation de l'accord de Paris ou de nos standards sociaux pourra être sanctionnée. C'est une avancée pour façonner de nouveaux accords, mais surtout promouvoir des changements profonds. Mais nous avons beaucoup entendu et nous continuons d'entendre que des sanctions auraient mis à mal la capacité de l'Union européenne à conclure de nouveaux accords. Je crois au contraire que cela donne du poids à un commerce fondé sur des règles. Et je crois au contraire, par ailleurs, que cette réforme correspond à un enjeu de crédibilité pour nous et en dehors de l'Union européenne.

Ainsi, l'accord avec la Nouvelle-Zélande constitue un début puisqu'il inclurait ces chapitres, ce nouveau modèle. Mais il est à présent nécessaire que cette partie sur les chapitres développement durable devienne une référence. Quant aux accords existants ou ceux conclus, il faut engager des discussions avec nos partenaires pour les moderniser. Monsieur le Commissaire, cette réforme, nous la saluons tous. Mais nous le savons, c'est dans la mise en œuvre que nous serons au rendez-vous.

Saskia Bricmont, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE.* – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, la révision des chapitres consacrés au développement durable dans les traités commerciaux représente une avancée considérable, il faut le reconnaître, vers un commerce international plus durable, qui implique davantage la société civile et le Parlement et fait état de mécanismes de mise en œuvre et de suivi ainsi que de sanctions en cas de non-respect des dispositions qui y sont énoncées.

Mais, il y a quand même des «mais». Avec tout le respect que je vous dois, Monsieur le Commissaire, j'espère que ce Parlement n'a pas à douter du sérieux avec lequel la Commission et la DG TRADE considèrent cette question. En effet, je m'attendais à un échange avec le commissaire au commerce car, si le plan d'action en quinze points est, je le répète, une avancée, des problèmes demeurent, et vos réponses aux questions adressées par notre président, M. Lange, sont à mon sens loin d'être satisfaisantes, notamment dans le cadre de l'application des *implementation roadmaps* – les feuilles de route de mise en œuvre. J'aimerais comprendre comment la Commission compte aller jusqu'au bout de la logique si jamais un partenaire commercial, par exemple, ne respecte pas ses engagements. Quelles seront les sanctions mises en œuvre? Quel sera le mécanisme appliqué? Est-ce que l'on passera par un mécanisme de règlement des différends?

Une autre dimension que l'on a pointée pendant les différents échanges, c'est la question des droits de l'homme, qui ne fait pas partie des chapitres consacrés au développement durable. Il s'agit là, à notre sens, d'un manque fondamental, puisque l'on sait que, dans le cadre commercial, de nombreuses violations des droits de l'homme ont, malheureusement, encore lieu. La médiatrice a récemment soulevé ce problème, et elle propose de mettre en place un mécanisme à part entière et parallèle, qui serait également ouvert aux parties prenantes de nos partenaires commerciaux. Là aussi, j'ai une demande très concrète à l'égard de la Commission: comment la Commission compte-t-elle donner suite à cette proposition de la médiatrice? Je pense que ce serait là un complément réel et substantiel à cette révision des chapitres consacrés au développement durable au sein de nos accords commerciaux.

Maximilian Krah, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren! Handel ist der wesentliche Schlüssel, um in der ganzen Welt Wohlstand und Frieden zu erreichen. Die Europäische Union ist entstanden aus der Europäischen Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft, um eben einen großen Handelsblock zu bilden, und wir sind heute der größte Handelsblock der Welt.

Das ist etwas, was zwingend vergemeinschaftet gehört, und es ist eine Erfolgsgeschichte. Die Fragen, die wir hier heute behandeln, spiegeln aber genau die Zwiespältigkeit wider, dass wir einerseits den Handel fördern wollen, andererseits aber anfangen, diesen Handel auch sehr stark zu politisieren – mit negativen Folgen sowohl für den Handel als auch für die Handelspartner.

Das beginnt leider bereits mit der allerersten Frage, wo es eben um Sanktionen geht. Das ist eine erstaunliche Schwerpunktsetzung, und es mag zwar sein, dass es Sanktionen geben muss, aber wenn dies schon als erste Frage gestellt wird, dann zeigt es, dass sich der Schwerpunkt unserer Handelspolitik von der Ermöglichung von Handel weg hin zu Regeln zur Durchsetzung politischer Vorgaben gewandelt hat. Und hier haben wir unsere Probleme.

Denn wie ist es denn? Wir alle wollen Entwicklung, wir wollen nachhaltige Entwicklung und das weltweit. Aber diese nachhaltige Entwicklung ist doch in beiderseitigem Interesse für alle Handelspartner, sodass es in der Regel nicht darauf ankommen wird, sofort mit Sanktionen zu drohen, sondern dass dies auf Gegenseitigkeit beruht.

Wenn wir anfangen müssen, Sanktionen durchzusetzen, stellt sich doch die Frage, ob die Vorgaben von nachhaltiger Entwicklung, die wir stellen, wirklich für alle so überzeugend sind oder ob hier nicht eine neue Form des Eurozentrismus Raum greift, dass wir unseren in der Regel ärmeren und schwächeren Handelspartnern politische Vorgaben aus Europa machen, ohne dass die diese inhaltlich mittragen, und dass sie dann durch Sanktionen dazu gezwungen werden müssen.

Insofern meinen wir: Jawohl, wir wollen Handel, wir wollen nachhaltige Entwicklung, aber wir müssen aufpassen, dass wir nicht übers Ziel hinausschießen und dass wir den Handel missbrauchen zu einer neuen Form eines Neokolonialismus, der letztlich uns und unseren Handelspartnern schadet.

Geert Bourgeois, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, geachte collega's, op regels gebaseerde handel zorgt voor welvaart, zorgt voor open strategische autonomie met toeleveringsketens die divers zijn en zorgt ook voor stabiliteit. De jobcijfers in de Europese Unie zijn indrukwekkend. Uit de studie van de Commissie van 2021 blijkt dat in de EU maar liefst 38 miljoen jobs afhangen van onze export. Dat is 11 miljoen euro meer dan tien jaar eerder. Op dat vlak, commissaris, wil ik mijn teleurstelling uitspreken: er is geen genoegzame vooruitgang geboekt in deze periode inzake nieuwe handelsverdragen. Ik roep dan ook op om snel nieuwe handelsverdragen te sluiten.

Ten tweede zijn handelsverdragen, onze handelsverdragen, een hefboom voor mensenrechten, een hefboom voor menswaardige arbeidsomstandigheden, een hefboom voor duurzaamheid. Op vlak van duurzaamheid – inderdaad – moeten we er ons voor hoeden om met één aanpak te werken ten opzichte van onze diverse partnerlanden. We moeten rekening houden met de uitdagingen van dat partnerland, we moeten rekening houden met de mogelijkheden van dat partnerland. Bijvoorbeeld met Nieuw-Zeeland leggen we de normen zeer, zeer hoog en snel, maar niet alle landen beschikken over dezelfde mogelijkheden, beschikken over dezelfde middelen.

Tot slot: inderdaad, als er problemen zijn, in dialoog gaan, in bemiddeling gaan, maar sancties als ultieme remedie.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Die Chefin der WTO, Dr. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, hat uns und auch der EU erst letzte Woche noch einmal ins Stammbuch geschrieben, dass es unsere vordringliche, aktuellste Aufgabe ist, allen Menschen Zugang zu Ernährung und zu Energie zu sichern. Deshalb ist das Erreichen der UN-Nachhaltigkeitsziele bis 2030 alleroberste Priorität, auch durch die EU-Außenhandelspolitik.

Manche in der Kommission haben durchaus verstanden, und ihre Auswertung, was am 15-Punkte-Plan bisher nicht funktioniert hat, ist durchaus gut. Dennoch mangelt es der Kommission an der Umsetzung und an Tempo. Beeilen Sie sich, aber laufen Sie nicht in die falsche Richtung – das wurde heute schon gesagt. Wir müssen jetzt nicht hastig lauter neue Handelsabkommen abschließen. Was wir brauchen, sind vielmehr Kooperationsabkommen und gemeinsam entwickelte Standards und Roadmaps. Denn nicht nur der Krieg in der Ukraine und anderswo, sondern auch die Klimaerhitzung und die Unterversorgung der Mehrheit der Weltbevölkerung sind bedrückend reale Bedrohungen der Menschen – überall.

Handeln Sie und überlassen Sie die Preise für Nahrung und Energie nicht länger den gestörten Märkten und Lieferketten. Wer heute lediglich Rohstoffzugang und Absatzmärkte für Unternehmen der EU im Auge hat, hat nicht verstanden, wie ernst die Lage in Wirklichkeit ist. Blicken wir nach Pakistan und Somalia, und lassen Sie sich einmal ausrechnen, wie teuer die Katastrophen die Welt zu stehen kommen, wenn solche veralteten Handelsabkommen mit dem Mercosur als Brandbeschleuniger im Amazonasgebiet wirken. Wir müssen Nachhaltigkeit zum zentralen Benchmarking machen, mit verbindlichen rechtlichen Durchsetzungsinstrumenten.

Ernő Schaller-Baross (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Az Európai Unió magas minőséget képviselő termékei és szolgáltatásai miatt népszerű kereskedelmi partner a globális piacokon. Az energiaválság, a háborús infláció és az általános gazdasági visszaesés hatásaira, a nemzetközi környezet változásaira való reakció azonban ennek a cselekvési tervnek elsősorban az Unió versenyképességét kellene biztosítania, és nem olyan ideológiai elképzelések érvényesülését, amelyek egyébként is kívül esnek a kereskedelempolitika hatályán.

Magyarország elkötelezett a fenntarthatósági célok, a környezetvédelem, emberi jogok fontossága mellett. Ugyanakkor tudomásul kell venni, hogy a nemzetközi kereskedelempolitika nem arra való, és nem is alkalmas arra, hogy egyéb politikai célokat orvosoljon. Minden lehetséges eszközzel segíteni kell a külpiacokon aktív magyar és európai vállalatok terjeszkedését. Magyarország és az Európai Unió érdeke a nyitott és szabályalapú kereskedelem.

Jörgen Warborn (PPE). – Herr talman! Herr kommissionär! EU går nu igenom den värsta krisen i modern tid: det gäller energi, inflation, tillväxt, konkurrenskraft, klimat- och hållbarhetsutmaningar och Rysslands illegala invasion av Ukraina.

Den multilaterala världsordningen är hotad av allt aggressivare maktspel. Den svåra situationen i omvärlden belyser vikten av den europeiska gemenskapen och gränsöverskridande utmaningar som kräver gränsöverskridande lösningar. Nu måste EU slå vakt om frihandel och genom internationellt samarbete arbeta med EU:s ambitiösa hållbarhetsagenda och bygga motståndskraft för att hantera framtida kriser.

Öppenhet lönar sig – även i en orolig värld. Vi behöver handla med länder från världens alla hörn. EU och Nya Zeeland har nu slutit ett frihandelsavtal, och vi måste trycka på förhandlingarna med till exempel Australien, Chile och Mexiko.

Det är också dags att lyfta upp avtalet mellan EU och Mercosur från frysboxen och öppna upp en marknad för över 260 miljoner konsumenter – ett avtal som är värt att kämpa för. Det innehåller också ett ambitiöst kapitel om hållbar utveckling och ett tydligt åtagande om att effektivt genomföra Parisavtalet.

Hållbarhetskapitel ska främja slutförandet av frihandelsavtal, inte skapa fler hinder som försvårar redan komplexa förhandlingar. EU ska inte riva upp befintliga frihandelsavtal. Vi ska teckna nya.

Udo Bullmann (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wenn wir uns heute fragen, wie wir diese Welt besser machen wollen, dann müssen wir erkennen, wie viel Macht in der Gestaltung der Handelsbeziehungen liegt.

Um diesen Schatz zu bergen, um das auch wirklich in die Realität zu bringen – was brauchen wir dafür? Fair Trade, anständige Bezahlung, nachhaltige Produkte, die dem Planeten eine Chance geben zu überleben, und gute Arbeitsbedingungen für jede Frau und für jeden Mann. Das braucht Mut. Das braucht Mut, verbindliche Regeln – ich sage, verbindliche Regeln – zu verabreden, die Kraft, diese Regeln auch in die Realität umzusetzen. Und das ist mir besonders wichtig, denn Implementierung ist heute oft angesprochen worden.

Wir brauchen die Solidarität, den Menschen, die guten Willens sind, unseren Partnerinnen und Partnern, den örtlichen Produzentinnen und Produzenten die Chance zu geben, das auch zu machen, ihre Geschicke in die eigene Hand zu nehmen, und das braucht uns vor Ort! Das braucht nicht nur die abstrakte Regel, sondern unsere Einmischung und unsere Präsenz dort, wo es gilt.

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Herr talman! Herr kommissionär, kollegor! När förra handelskommissionären Cecilia Malmström sjösatte förhandlingarna om ett frihandelsavtal med Nya Zeeland var ambitionen hög. Många kanske tvivlade. Några höll emot. Går det att förhandla fram ett frihandelsavtal som har både långtgående handelsliberaliseringar och samtidigt höga hållbarhetskrav?

Den här debatten handlar inte om avtalet med Nya Zeeland, men det är viktigt att lyfta fram vad som kan åstadkommas. Nu när vi har avtalet på bordet kan vi konstatera att det genomsyras av Parisavtalets mål, och att det främjar handel med klimatsmarta produkter. Det innehåller en gemensam överenskommelse om att få bort subventioner till fossila bränslen, och det inkluderar jämställdhet och sociala hänsyn.

Vi kan inte gå tillbaka till den tid då handel bara handlade om volymer. Handelspolitiken är ett verktyg för hållbarhet, och utan handel får vi ingen hållbar utveckling. Slutenhet och protektionism gör bara världen fattigare och mindre hållbar. Därför är också den strategi som vi diskuterar här så viktig.

Sara Matthieu (Verts/ALE). – Voorzitter, collega's, commissaris, na jarenlange druk van onder meer de groenen moeten alle handelsakkoorden eindelijk afdwingbare regels bevatten voor sociale en milieuvoorwaarden. Als ze het Klimaatakkoord van Parijs niet respecteren, of de arbeidsrechten, dan komen er sancties. Dat zien we nu voor het eerst in de deal met Nieuw-Zeeland, en dat is goed.

Maar de vraag is: wil de Commissie voor andere landen wél nog onder die lat? En wil zij wél nog slechte handelsdeals voor mens en milieu sluiten? Kijk naar India, waar die gesprekken volop lopen, maar er nog niet eens een duurzaamheidsstudie is gemaakt. Voor Australië is er voorlopig nog geen sprake van echt sterke bescherming van mens en milieu, met name als we het hebben over kritische grondstoffen of het klimaat. Mercosur is een ramp voor het regenwoud, voor kleine boeren, voor de inheemse volkeren, en ook Mexico is bijzonder problematisch.

Die onderhandelingen met Mercosur en Mexico moeten we heropenen om ervoor te zorgen dat er echt bindende duurzaamheidshoofdstukken komen. Maar het lijkt erop dat de Commissie hier eerder een shortcut wil en die deals wil gaan splitsen om op die manier het democratisch debat in de nationale en regionale parlementen buiten spel te zetten.

Mijn boodschap is duidelijk: fix die inhoud, want anders zal dat soort van manoeuvres het verzet alleen nog maar groter maken. Beste Commissie, wees consequent. Handelsakkoorden kunnen wij alleen aanvaarden met respect voor mens en milieu, en minder dan dat zullen we niet aanvaarden.

Roman Haider (ID). – Herr Präsident! Vorweg zwei Punkte zum generellen Wesen von Handelsabkommen.

Erstens: Handelsabkommen dienen vorrangig dem freien Handel zum gegenseitigen Vorteil. Handelsabkommen sollen nicht dazu dienen, um einseitig dem Handelspartner die eigene Weltsicht aufzuzwingen. Diese völlige Überfrachtung von Handelsabkommen mit ideologischen Wunschvorstellungen ist eine Sackgasse und treibt die EU immer weiter in die Isolation.

Zweitens: Sanktionen bei Handelsabkommen: Sanktionen gegenüber Handelspartnern und das Aussetzen von Handelsabkommen sollen und müssen immer nur die Ultima Ratio, die letzte Möglichkeit sein, wenn wesentliche Interessen der EU-Mitgliedstaaten bedroht sind. Die geforderte Sanktionierung bei Nichteinhaltung der Pariser Klimaziele ist daher abzulehnen. Angesichts des enormen Energiebedarfs aufstrebender Staaten würden überzogene Ansprüche diese Staaten nur weiter in die Arme von China treiben, anstatt sie zu verlässlichen Partnern für die EU zu machen.

Wir müssen der Tatsache leider ins Auge sehen, dass das Gewicht Europas im Vergleich zu anderen globalen Akteuren immer weiter abnimmt. Und die EU-Kommission beschleunigt diese Entwicklung leider auch noch. Deswegen werden zukünftig Realitätssinn und viel Fingerspitzengefühl notwendig sein, um wirklich auch gute Handelsverträge abschließen zu können. Beides vermisse ich leider im 15-Punkte-Aktionsplan für Handel und nachhaltige Entwicklung der Kommission.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! W poniedziałek odbyła się bardzo ważna debata dotycząca wolności wyznania i praktykowania wiary. Potępiono w niej istotną kwestię prześladowań, m.in. chrześcijan, na całym świecie. Dlaczego o tym mówię? Dlatego, że te prześladowania zdarzają się w krajach, które są ważnymi partnerami handlowymi Unii Europejskiej i z którymi Unia Europejska ma wiążące porozumienia handlowe. Pakistan, Egipt, Chiny, Indie to kraje, gdzie dziś wierzący nie czują się bezpiecznie. Dlatego czas na nasze działania, czas na powiązanie klauzul chroniących prześladowanych chrześcijan z umowami handlowymi podpisywanymi przez Unię Europejską. Jeżeli Egipt czy Pakistan nie potrafią spełnić naszych prostych warunków dotyczących ochrony wierzących i miejsc kultu, to nie powinny liczyć na umowy handlowe z Unią Europejską. Myślę, że czas zrewidować te zgniłe kompromisy. Przypadek Rosji, której Unia ufała i ustępowała przez lata, pokazuje ile w przyszłości mogą nas kosztować właśnie takie kompromisy.

Emmanuel Maurel (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, en matière commerciale, nous sommes instruits par l'expérience. Il y a loin de la parole aux actes et malgré un volontarisme de façade, malgré quelques avancées, je pense que la Commission ne répond pas pleinement aux critiques sur l'inefficacité des clauses sur le commerce et le développement durable.

D'abord, il y a un premier point, c'est que l'impact du commerce mondial, de l'intensification des échanges sur le climat reste quand même un impensé dans nos débats. C'est près d'un quart des émissions de gaz à effet de serre. En fait, l'activisme mercantile l'emporte toujours sur les considérations sociales et environnementales, ce qui explique l'enthousiasme pour l'accord avec la Nouvelle-Zélande, alors que c'est un pays aux antipodes de l'Europe, l'enthousiasme pour le Mercosur, alors que ça encourage la destruction de la forêt amazonienne.

Et moi, ce qui me gêne dans le texte de la Commission, c'est que c'est quand même très flou sur la nature et la portée des sanctions en cas de violation des clauses. Où est le caractère contraignant? Quels sont les mécanismes? On reste sur notre faim.

Dernier point, attention au double discours. On ne peut pas dire qu'on va défendre les droits humains, les libertés fondamentales et en même temps aller faire un accord gazier en Azerbaïdjan au moment où ils massacrent les Arméniens et passer un pacte avec le Qatar et l'Arabie Saoudite. Franchement, là, il y a une contradiction qui est insupportable, et il faut la régler.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A mostani válságos időkben Európának egyértelműen az az érdeke, hogy új piacokhoz jusson, minél több beszállítója legyen, azaz minél több kereskedelmi partnerre tegyen szert. Ezáltal tudnánk csökkenteni a kiszolgáltatottságunkat egy harmadik ország irányába. Ehhez pedig szabadkereskedelmi megállapodások minél szélesebb körére van szükség. Így jutnának az európai cégek több lehetőséghez, s teremthetnének több munkahelyet.

Ehhez képest ez a ház újabb és újabb akadályokat gördít annak elébe, hogy az uniós gazdaság minél több lábon álljon. Mert az EP-nek soha semmi nem elég, a már kitárgyalt megállapodásokat sem vagyunk képesek tető alá hozni, mert az EP fokozza elvárásait a partnerek felé. A szankciókkal való fenyegetés helyett hatásosabb a párbeszéd, többet érünk el vele, mint a kioktatással. Mindegy, hogy környezetvédelemről vagy szociális és emberi jogokról van szó. Fel kellene ébredni, Európa már nem a világ közepe. Ha továbbra is hittérítőként lépünk fel, globális súlyunk tovább csökken, romlik a versenyképességünk.

Így arra kérem a Bizottságot, hogy ne hagyja zsarolni magát az EP által, és hagyjon fel olyan, ideológiával terhelt jogszabályok létrehozásával, mint amilyen a „due diligence".

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Mr President, I would say to Vice-President Schinas that trade deals are about delivering jobs and investment, but they're also about setting rules and about promoting our values. The global race for a new era of rules and values is well underway. Recent years have seen our drive for free trade agreements stall, and political division over trade and sustainable development chapters have been one of the major reasons.

Now, having recently achieved a mutually-agreeable solution on trade and sustainable development chapters, we can now focus on making up for lost time. We're fortunate because the timing is very good to make up for lost time. We've survived a pandemic, we are tackling the energy crisis – or at least we're trying to – and our trade strategy is aimed at future-proofing ourselves in a multipolar world.

President von der Leyen set out an ambitious agenda in her State of the Union address, name checking free trade agreements with Chile, with Mexico, with New Zealand, with Australia and with India – and I would also mention Indonesia and Mercosur. So as the race to shape the New World Order gathers pace, free trade agreements will play a key role.

Our partners see the European Union as a beacon of stability, of predictability and opportunity. So with faith in our values, with like-minded teammates and fair rules, we stand a good chance to remain a front runner on the global stage.

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

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), *wystąpienie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Bardzo dziękuję Pani Przewodniczącej i również Pani Poseł za przyjęcie pytania. Oczywiście podobają mi się te wszystkie wypowiedzi, które mówią o uczciwych umowach handlowych między Unią Europejską a poszczególnymi państwami czy kontynentami, czy organizacjami międzynarodowymi. Wiemy o tym, że są umowy handlowe z krajami, w których do pracy wykorzystywane są dzieci. Chciałabym poznać Pani zdanie w tej materii. Co Pani o tym myśli? Czy Pani zna takie kraje, i takie kraje, które mają umowy z tymi krajami, gdzie dzieci pracują po prostu od wczesnych lat i są do tej pracy wykorzystywane?

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE), *blue-card reply.* – Thank you very much for the question. I think that our zero-tolerance policy for child labour trumps anything that has to do with trade, even though trade is about trade and investment and well-being, we have to have red lines. Child labour is a red line, and I think that's why we've reflected it very well in our mutually acceptable across political families compromise with respect to trade and sustainable development chapters.

I think that being respectful of the conventions is a way to do this. We may have our disagreements as to the enforceability and the extent and the clarity of how this is going to be enforced, but in principle I think that nobody in this House disagrees on this.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Voorzitter, collega's, ik zie vandaag een brede steun voor de hervormingen en de voorstellen van de Commissie. Dat lijkt logisch, want het zijn logische voorstellen. Maar dat is niet zo, want vijf jaar geleden, toen de S&D-Fractie die voorstellen op tafel legde, was er nog hoongelach. We gaan toch geen sancties invoeren? Blij dat die consensus nu wel groeit, want dat is gewoon niet meer dan normaal.

Handel is het krachtigste instrument dat we hebben in ons buitenlands beleid en het is toch niet meer dan evident dat we de inspanningen die we van onszelf vragen, en van onze industrie en onze mensen vragen – op het vlak van klimaat, maar uiteraard ook mensenrechten, arbeidsrechten – dat we die ook afdwingen in ons handelsbeleid. Het zou bijzonder hypocriet zijn als we de toegang tot onze markt blijven verlenen aan landen en handelspartners die niet optreden tegen kinderarbeid.

Laat me ook heel erg duidelijk zijn: dat gaat uiteraard over de handelsakkoorden waar de onderhandelingen nu over bezig zijn, over toekomstige handelsakkoorden, maar ook nog over akkoorden waar de onderhandelingen van bezig zijn en ook diegene waarvan het ratificatieproces nog moet starten. We hebben dus ook nog wat werk met Mercosur.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, ¿el comercio es un fin en sí mismo? El comercio es un objetivo. Entre otras cosas, porque somos la principal región exportadora del mundo y millones de empleos dependen de nuestras exportaciones. Hay que hablar también de los empleos cuando hablamos de desarrollo sostenible. De los nuestros, del empleo de nuestros trabajadores, también, que algunos se olvidan. Hablan del comercio como si fuera un concepto vago y etéreo. No, es una realidad de nuestras empresas. Pero ¿nosotros solo queremos comerciar? No, queremos que este comercio contribuye al desarrollo sostenible. En este contexto, damos la bienvenida a esta revisión del plan y a estas 15 medidas.

Pero cuidado, señorías; para que el desarrollo sea sostenible tiene que ser desarrollo y tiene que ser sostenible. Pero desarrollo también. Y si queremos socios y aliados que converjan con nosotros en nuestros objetivos, tenemos no solo que amenazar con sanciones, sino ofrecer cooperación, colaboración y confianza. Porque entre socios y aliados la confianza es un principio y es un objetivo.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I need to thank Executive Vice-President Valdis Dombrovskis for really bringing this new approach to sustainable development in free trade agreements. It is a big step further, and I believe that we have all understood that, with the EU's new trade policy review, trade is not as it used to be; trade is not business as usual. Trade is to be connected, integrated and incorporated into the requirements of sustainable development.

Now, one of the deficiencies of the Commission's approach seems to be that human rights are quite absent, with the exception of labour rights, which of course are very, very important and very directly related to free trade. But, on the other hand, we cannot neglect that there are many other human rights issues that need to be incorporated, and this would be my question to the Commission: is that going to be taken into account?

The delegations of the European Union will have a very big responsibility over how this all will be put into practice. An important element there is that the EU delegations must be very open to civil society and other stakeholders in order to get them on board with discussing how free trade agreements are actually implemented and the new requirements on more enforceable, sustainable development.

Lastly, I have to ask the Commission: what is your methodology with the existing free trade agreements, which has not been revealed so far? What are the pathways to include the new sustainable development approach in existing free trade agreements?

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, the war in Ukraine and the COVID-19 pandemic have caused huge disruptions to global supply chains, exposed European vulnerabilities, and shown that, now more than ever, the EU needs to diversify our trading routes and develop new partners.

However, diversification should not come at the expense of other EU policy goals that ensure that producers and trading countries abide by environmental and labour standards similar to those standards, that producers within the EU follow progressive labour and social rights globally, and that protect the commercial activity of businesses within the EU.

As the world's largest trading bloc, we are in a position to use our trade policy to engage partners on important issues. For this reason, I welcome the Commission's additional sanctions, using its trade toolbox for enforcing labour, environmental and human rights standards. It is essential that these sanctions are used in a responsible way, namely only as a measure of last resort. Sustainability objectives should not undermine the negotiability of our trade agreements. It would be an own goal for the Commission to impose sanctions haphazardly. Doing so would undermine the negotiability of our trade agreements and indeed drive away prospective trading partners. The Commission's proposal, I think, strikes this delicate balance between negotiability and ambition.

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, enfin, enfin, nous commençons à remettre les choses à l'endroit et à cesser de confondre la fin et les moyens. Car oui, le commerce est un moyen et non une fin. Il doit servir un but plus grand que lui, à commencer par le développement durable.

La Commission semble avoir partiellement entendu le message que nous essayons de porter et nous pourrons donc demain sanctionner la violation de l'accord de Paris ou des droits sociaux par nos partenaires commerciaux. Vous ne respectez pas vos engagements de réduction d'émissions, vous violez les libertés syndicales, nous rétablissons les droits de douane. Mettre notre puissance commerciale au service de nos principes et de nos intérêts stratégiques, voilà la voie à suivre. Cette approche doit désormais prévaloir dans toutes les négociations en cours et dans tous les accords déjà négociés.

Mais nous devons aller plus loin, insérer par exemple les clauses miroirs dans tous nos accords pour favoriser l'adoption de nos standards en matière agricole, pour mettre fin à la concurrence déloyale et ancrer nos professions de foi écologique dans les faits. Une rupture avec 40 années de laisser-faire, laisser-passer s'esquisse. Ce n'est qu'un début, chers collègues, à nous de transformer l'Union et son marché en puissance normative globale.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Presidente, Comissão, finalmente, a Comissão fez o seu trabalho. Reforçar o desenvolvimento sustentável nos acordos comerciais da União Europeia é uma velha ambição dos socialistas e democratas no Parlamento Europeu.

Hoje, com este debate, queremos incentivar vivamente a Comissão a generalizar este princípio nos novos acordos, mas também nos acordos existentes. A União Europeia tem que ter uma estratégia sem falha na luta contra o trabalho forçado e do o trabalho infantil, na defesa dos direitos humanos universais, incluindo a igualdade de género, e dos direitos sociais, laborais e ambientais. A implementação e aplicação, incluindo agora a possibilidade de atribuir sanções comerciais por violação do Acordo de Paris ou de convenções da OIT, são essenciais para a promoção de uma política de comércio internacional justa e coerente com todas as políticas e valores europeus.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Maria Arena (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, nous ne pouvons plus, et on l'a dit, continuer à considérer l'instrument commercial de l'Union européenne dans une relation purement inscrite dans un contrat qui favorise la maximisation des profits des plus forts au détriment des plus faibles. On l'a vu, le commerce a des effets adverses en matière d'environnement, en matière de droits humains et parfois en matière de droits des travailleurs. La médiatrice l'a dit, la politique commerciale, aujourd'hui, de l'Union européenne n'a que faire des droits humains.

Et donc, on accueille avec beaucoup d'intérêt la question du TSD, du chapitre développement durable, mais malheureusement, la question des droits humains n'est pas dans ce TSD. Et donc je demande que ce TSD puisse être corrigé avec les propositions qui ont été formulées par la médiatrice. Je pense que cette médiatrice sert à quelque chose et qu'elle n'a pas d'intérêt à droite, à gauche ou au centre, mais qu'elle a l'intérêt des citoyens européens à cœur, et je pense qu'il est important que vous puissiez corriger le tir dans cet objectif précis.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, I welcome the outcome of the Commission's review on the 15-point action plan on trade and sustainable development. There is no doubt, as the strongest economic trading bloc in the globe, we have obligations both to ourselves, but also to the broader world itself, in ensuring that standards are maintained and lifted.

So we can't have a situation where there is exploitation in third countries, third world countries and trading blocs for the benefit of the European Union alone. In future, trade agreements have to do a serious, tangible assessment of the impact, not only in the context of the impact on Europe, but also how will it impact on the countries and the partnerships we are drafting agreements with. That is of fundamental critical importance to the adherence of decency in world trade.

If you take, for example, environmental standards, labour standards, social employment standards and other human rights obligations, it is imperative that we start to shift and nudge not just Europe, but also, more importantly, the people that we are trading with whose standards are not ours. We have to encourage and nudge them as well. So, I welcome the publication, but we have a lot of work to do to ensure that our trade agreements are consistent with basic decency across the globe.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Margaritis Schinas, *vice-président de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, je remercie tout le monde pour ce débat très riche. Il est clair que la tonalité et le contenu de ce débat prouvent que nos échanges de ces dix-huit derniers mois ont beaucoup contribué à alimenter la réflexion qui se cristallise aujourd'hui.

Let me conclude with two remarks on two families of issues that have been raised by some of you, many of you. First, on implementation and enforcement, and then on human rights.

Let us reiterate our commitment to a stronger focus on implementation and enforcement. We will extend the standard state-to-state dispute settlement compliance phase to the TSD chapter of our agreements, meaning that the party found in violation of any of the TSD commitments will have to promptly inform on how it will implement the panel report and comply within a certain period of time.

We will also include the possibility to apply, as a last resort, trade sanctions for material breaches of the Paris Climate Agreement and the ILO fundamental labour principles.

Now, on the issue of human rights, TSD chapters cover, amongst other violations, the violations of labour rights such as child labour or forced labour. The violations of human rights are covered by the essential element clauses in our agreements. But what is important is that both of the sanctions and the essential element clauses ensure that our trade partners will respect the most important values in our relations, which constitute the basis on which we can enlarge and engage in our trade relationships.

So thank you very much for this exchange. The Commission looks forward to further discussions with you on this important subject.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Esmu saņēmis 1 rezolūcijas priekšlikumu, kas iesniegts saskaņā ar Reglamenta 136. panta 5. punktu.

Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

10. Humanitární situace po zničujících záplavách v Pákistánu a klimatická krize (rozprava)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Padomes un Komisijas paziņojumiem par humanitāro situāciju pēc katastrofālajiem plūdiem Pakistānā un klimata krīzi (2022/2837(RSP)).

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, on behalf of the Presidency and the Council, I would like to express my sincere condolences to the people of Pakistan, who were hit with the worst flooding in the country's history.

In this tragic context, we should be proud of the fact that the EU and its Member States were one of the first responders to this disaster. The EU's emergency humanitarian aid targeted primarily the provision of emergency shelter, food and clean water, as well as cash transfers and primary health care services. The Commissioner will certainly elaborate further on the current needs assessment, but I should say that the EU is ready to consider further assistance to the Pakistani people.

Furthermore, we have successfully used the EU civil protection mechanism to provide in-kind assistance from Member States, and we have also mobilised an EU civil protection team, with experts from several Member States that were dispatched to Pakistan immediately after the flooding. This immediate response was facilitated by the long-standing cooperation between the EU and Pakistan on disaster risk reduction, especially since the previous devastating floods in 2010.

The tragic events in Pakistan should remind us of the fact that 90% of all major natural disasters in the world today are connected to climate change. According to the latest IPCC assessment report, 40% of the world population, notably in developing countries, is highly vulnerable because of climate change, with an increased risk of cyclones, droughts, floods, heat waves, infectious diseases, sea level rises and wildfires.

This is why we need to work more on prevention and aim towards an integrated climate and disaster risk reduction governance. We support the work of the United Nations in this regard, particularly its Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. Its call to action towards zero climate disasters by 2050 aims at reducing vulnerability, increasing risk management and early warning systems, and strengthening the resilience of communities. This undertaking will require a 'whole of society' approach, where governments are in the driving seat, but they must bring together all the different stakeholders. The EU is ready to contribute its share to this work.

The sooner we deal with disaster reduction, the more prepared we will be to save lives and livelihoods in future climate disasters. This is why the Czech Presidency has decided to place this issue at the heart of its programme, especially from the perspective of humanitarian assistance, development, cooperation and civil protection.

The Council is presently discussing draft Council conclusions on disaster risk reduction in EU external action that we intend to adopt at the Foreign Affairs Council in November, focusing particularly on natural and human-induced disasters across the crisis management cycle. We expect these conclusions to strengthen the EU's global role as a promoter of disaster risk reduction, so that situations such as the one faced by Pakistan will, in the future, result in less suffering for those affected. Thank you very much for your attention. I look forward to listening to the debate.

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, the Pakistani people are enduring the unimaginable. On behalf of the European Commission, I wish to convey our deepest condolences to those who lost their lives, homes and livelihoods during the historic monsoon rains in Pakistan and the catastrophic flash floods which followed.

The devastation has been what United Nations Secretary General Guterres called 'climate carnage'. Over 33 million people have been affected by the floods. Almost 1 700 people have lost their lives. At least 8 million have been displaced from their homes. Millions of houses have been completely destroyed or ruined. Almost 4 million acres of crops and arable land impacted. Over one third of the country is submerged by the floods. The floods have also triggered outbreaks of disease and thrown people into food insecurity, literally overnight.

The European Union has been the very first immediate responder on the ground among donors. We initially mobilised over EUR 2 million in humanitarian aid to assist flood-affected communities in the hardest hit regions. This support has included emergency shelter, food, water and sanitation, cash and primary health care. Through our Union Civil Protection Mechanism, we have also coordinated and financially supported the delivery of assistance from seven EU Member States so far – Belgium, Sweden, France, Greece, Austria, Denmark and Slovenia. They have provided tents and water purification systems and sent doctors and many other types of support urgently requested by the Pakistani authorities. I sincerely thank them for their support.

We also activated the European Union's emergency satellite service, Copernicus, to provide satellite images to help monitor the situation. We have our European Union humanitarian expert on the ground in the hardest hit regions. Commissioner Lenarčič is himself visiting the most affected regions across Pakistan this week, where he has announced the proposals for an additional EUR 30 million in humanitarian aid. With this funding, we will be able to maintain support for their response over the coming months.

The European Commission is also mobilising experts to carry out the post-disaster needs assessment jointly with the UN and the World Bank. Also, from the European Union Development Corporation side, there is already short-term support under way for the adaptation of ongoing development programmes in the worst-hit provinces to support nutrition, agriculture, water and sanitation.

Beyond the immediate response, the European Union is also supporting the Pakistani authorities in the area of disaster preparedness, anticipatory action, early warning system and more. Because preventing is better than only responding.

This flood has shown we need to do more to tackle climate change, not only respond to its humanitarian consequences. Just as stability in Pakistan is in our own interests, so Pakistan has an interest to work closely with the European Union. The European Union is Pakistan's second most important trading partner over the last ten years, and especially since 2014, when the Generalised Scheme of Preference, a trade preferential assistance scheme, was awarded. Since then, imports of the EU 27 from Pakistan have almost doubled.

Trade and economy are key pillars of our cooperation, but beyond that there is a lot of unexploited potential for further cooperation under the Strategic Engagement Plan, notably in security, given the important position of Pakistan in the region.

I look forward to hearing your views in the course of our debate.

Tomas Tobé, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Minister, Commissioner, and not least Pakistan Ambassador Khan, the heavy monsoon rains have triggered the most severe flooding in Pakistan's recent history, washing away lives and livelihoods and causing unprecedented damage to the infrastructure. The destruction could set the country back many years. Pakistan is an important partner to the European Union, and we must support them.

Firstly, to meet the enormous needs, we must work together with the international community to come forward with new aid and ensure an immense humanitarian response. Secondly, we need to commit to long-term support and increase the impact of our development assistance in Pakistan to speed up the colossal reconstruction that lies ahead. Thirdly, we need to work together to tackle the climate change challenge and support Pakistan in creating climate resilient infrastructure to prevent future disasters.

This should be a global effort, but it is clear that the European Union needs to take the lead. I know that many of my colleagues are at group meetings now, but I must be very clear: there is a broad support from the European Parliament and we will be there for Pakistan.

Středa 5. října 2022

Maria Arena, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, la commission des droits de l'homme était il y a deux semaines au Pakistan, et nous avons eu l'occasion de rencontrer l'équipe de l'Autorité nationale de gestion des catastrophes ainsi que des communautés affectées par les inondations. Ce qu'ils nous ont montré était tout simplement terrible, terrible quant à l'intensité des phénomènes survenus.

En avril, les plus hautes températures jamais relevées au Pakistan – 51 °C dans le Sindh – ont provoqué une diminution de 65 % du débit de l'Indus, d'où la population pakistanaise tire 90 % de son eau. Se sont ensuivies des pénuries alimentaires, des décès, mais aussi une perte importante de l'élevage destiné à la production de viande.

En septembre, des pluies diluviennes ont englouti un tiers du territoire, entraînant tout sur leur passage: ponts, écoles, hôpitaux, maisons, vies humaines… Comme l'a dit M. Guterres, il s'agit là d'un «carnage climatique». Alors que le Pakistan émet 1 % des gaz à effet de serre, le G 20 en émet, lui, 80 %. Pourtant, c'est bien le Pakistan qui, le premier, est victime de ces changements climatiques. Nous devons aider le Pakistan. Ce n'est pas de la générosité, c'est de la justice.

IN THE CHAIR: OTHMAR KARAS

Vice-President

Petras Auštrevičius, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, Minister, dear colleagues, allow me, first of all, to begin by expressing the condolences of the Renew Europe Group to all the people of Pakistan, and in particular to those affected by the catastrophic flooding caused by monsoon rains this summer. Special condolences to the people of Balochistan and Sindh provinces.

In September, we, as a delegation, visited Pakistan and saw first-hand the gravity of the humanitarian situation. Life has become difficult too for over 30 million people in Pakistan, with almost 1 million houses uninhabitable. The consequences of the floods are severe for all and have spared no one. I witnessed it at the Afghan refugee camp, where already modest houses have turned into piles of clay. Pakistan needs our immediate support and humanitarian aid.

Dear colleagues, climate change is turning into an invincible disaster that is punishing humanity more and more severely. We need to recognise this and take the necessary steps. Let us ensure that the EU budget is adequately prepared to meet awaiting challenges and allows us to properly respond to all the humanitarian needs of the people of Pakistan.

Caroline Roose, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, «pourquoi mon peuple paie-t-il le prix de ce réchauffement climatique?» Tels sont les mots du premier ministre pakistanais. Alors que le Pakistan compte pour 0,3 % des émissions mondiales cumulées de CO_2, il est l'un des États les plus touchés par les effets du changement climatique. Les inondations qui ont frappé le pays sont un carnage climatique: 1 500 morts, 33 millions de personnes touchées – sans abri, sans accès à l'eau ou à la nourriture –, 7,6 millions de personnes déplacées et un risque élevé d'épidémies et de maladies transmises par l'eau telles que le choléra, la diarrhée, la dengue et le paludisme.

La situation pourrait encore empirer en cas d'effondrement du barrage de Sukkur, qui contient la plus grande réserve d'eau douce du pays. La quasi-totalité du système agricole pakistanais dépend de ce barrage pour son approvisionnement en eau. La Commission a débloqué une aide de 30 millions d'euros: c'est bien, mais c'est trop peu – moins de 1 euro par personne touchée. Les dégâts se chiffrent à 10 milliards de dollars. Nous sommes responsables du réchauffement climatique, et donc de ses conséquences. On ne peut pas se contenter d'un soutien si faible.

Alors cette catastrophe, elle doit aussi nous interroger quant à la mise en place d'actions globales sur le long terme: massifier notre aide à l'adaptation et aux politiques de prévention, mettre en place un cadre protecteur pour les déplacés climatiques, adopter au niveau international un mécanisme efficace pour les pertes et les préjudices, comme le demandent les États du Sud lors des négociations pour le climat. Nous serons confrontés à d'autres catastrophes dans les années à venir. Si nécessaires soient-elles, des réponses ponctuelles, au cas par cas, ne sont pas à la hauteur. Agissons vraiment.

Hervé Juvin, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, chers collègues, je m'associe naturellement aux condoléances qui ont été exprimées à l'endroit du peuple pakistanais et des victimes d'un des sinistres climatiques qui, hélas, se produisent à répétition.

M'étant associé à cet hommage et à ces condoléances, je voudrais souligner deux ou trois points qui me paraissent importants. Nous devons aider le Pakistan pour nos nations européennes. C'est un partenaire important, qui de surcroît tient un rôle majeur pour le retour de la paix et de la prospérité dans une région où se joue probablement l'avenir du monde. Le Pakistan était présent à la conférence de Samarcande, il est un membre important de l'Organisation de coopération de Shanghaï, et l'Union européenne comme les nations européennes doivent approfondir leurs relations avec ce pays.

Les circonstances dramatiques que vit le Pakistan sont naturellement l'occasion de constater qui sont les amis, qui sont les proches. Et à cet égard je ne peux que saluer l'effort consenti par le ministre indien des affaires étrangères, qui m'a affirmé que son pays avait octroyé plus de 25 millions de dollars d'aides à un État traditionnellement considéré comme un ennemi.

Je voudrais ensuite souligner que, si le changement climatique est naturellement l'objet d'une lutte urgente, ses effets ne se feront sentir qu'à moyen et à long terme. Nous devons travailler à prévenir les grands risques climatiques. Nous devons remettre en cause des modèles d'infrastructures qui ne sont pas adaptés au relief ni aux habitudes des populations locales. Nous devons réviser des modes de construction qui font fi des traditions et qui font fi de l'expérience de plusieurs siècles de populations confrontées à des environnements sévères et à des conditions difficiles. Tout ceci touche naturellement aux conditions du commerce, mais tout ceci touche aussi aux conditions d'un modèle économique manifestement insoutenable. Je souhaite que l'Union européenne fasse, dans ses priorités, place à l'expertise écologique en regard des grands risques environnementaux.

Nicola Procaccini, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, prima di tutto desidero esprimere solidarietà e vicinanza nei confronti del popolo pakistano, anche a nome della delegazione per le relazioni con i paesi dell'Asia meridionale di cui sono presidente.

Proprio ieri ho incontrato l'ambasciatore e abbiamo fatto il punto sul dramma che si sta consumando in Pakistan, oltre che sugli aiuti che l'Europa sta portando in queste settimane. Un aiuto concreto che si è tradotto subito in circa 2,5 milioni di EUR a sostegno delle famiglie colpite dalle inondazioni. Certamente è poco, considerata la mole dei danni, ma questo finanziamento si aggiunge a due preziosi strumenti che rappresentano forse il meglio che possiamo offrire come europei sotto l'aspetto umanitario e tecnologico. Mi riferisco all'attivazione del nostro meccanismo di protezione civile e all'utilizzo del servizio satellitare europeo Copernicus per avere informazioni utili sulle aree più colpite del paese.

Alla risposta immediata bisognerà aggiungere una efficace strategia di medio e lungo periodo. L'emergenza climatica ha mostrato in Pakistan il suo volto più crudele. Noi sappiamo che combatterla è difficile, ma se ne possono contenere le conseguenze peggiori con un'attenta politica di contrasto al dissesto idrogeologico. Facciamolo insieme, come ricorda un proverbio arabo: «L'amicizia è un tesoro che non finisce mai».

Younous Omarjee, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, cet été la saison de la mousson a tourné à la catastrophe absolue au Pakistan. Le Pakistan, cela a été dit, n'émet que 0,3 % des gaz à effet de serre. Et pourtant, il paie aujourd'hui un lourd tribut au dérèglement climatique qui, combiné à l'ordre inégalitaire du monde, est une véritable double peine pour les pays pauvres et sera encore plus, demain, facteur de déstabilisation à l'échelle de la planète.

Ici comme là-bas, j'invite donc l'Union européenne à honorer ses engagements vis-à-vis des pays en voie de développement et à intensifier ses efforts pour que l'adaptation au réchauffement climatique devienne une priorité à l'échelle globale et en particulier lors de la prochaine COP en Égypte.

Peter van Dalen (PPE). – Voorzitter, Pakistan is helaas al vaker getroffen door overstromingen, maar dit jaar smolten de gletsjers heel snel en kwamen de moessons ook in grote hoeveelheden. Getroffen zijn onder andere de boeren. Het is wel jammer dat de grootgrondbezitters desondanks eisen van de boeren dat ze – hoewel de oogsten zijn mislukt – toch alle leningen moeten terugbetalen. Ik vind dat jammer.

Ik was onlangs in Pakistan, en de Pakistaanse regering zei ons: ja, dit komt allemaal door de klimaatverandering en we willen graag compensatie. Wij hebben gezegd: oké, dat snappen we, maar begin dan eerst de compensatie te vragen aan China en aan India. Dat zijn jullie buren en bovendien de grootste vervuilers.

Voorzitter, Pakistan zal bij de Europese Unie, denk ik, een nieuwe aanvraag gaan indienen voor het handelsbegunstigingprogramma SAP plus. Wat mij betreft kijken we daar kritisch naar. Niet alleen zijn het de grootgrondbezitters in Pakistan die erg belangrijk zijn, maar we zien ook een grote invloed van extremisten, waardoor velen onterecht gevangen zitten vanwege valse beschuldigingen en vanwege godslastering. Ook vrouwen, journalisten en werknemers zitten in Pakistan in de hoek waar de klappen vallen.

Dus ja, we moeten Pakistan helpen vanwege deze vloed. Maar Pakistan moet ook concreet zelf de goede richting inslaan om de vloed van ongelijkheid in dit land te keren.

(De spreker aanvaardt een "blauwe kaart"-reactie)

Mick Wallace (The Left), *blue-card speech*. – I'd like to ask the MEP a question about climate justice. You say that Pakistan should ask India and China, the big polluters, for compensation for climate change. We know for a fact that climate change has been predominantly caused by the developed world – ours. The West has been predominantly responsible for the impact of climate change, but they're not the ones that feel the impact of it. Pakistan emits less than 1% of the world emissions. Tell me, why should the people responsible for climate change not give them reparations?

Peter van Dalen (PPE), *"blauwe kaart"-antwoord*. – Ja, ik hoop dat u goed geluisterd heeft naar wat ik gezegd heb. Ik heb gezegd: Pakistan vroeg ons een compensatie. En wij hebben gezegd: gaat u dan zeker ook naar de buren, China en India. Want China is de grootste vervuiler ter wereld. Kijk maar naar de stikstofbelasting die China maakt. En dat komt allemaal doordat veel mensen, ook hier in Europa, Chinese producten kopen. Ik doe dus zelf mijn best om geen Chinese producten meer te kopen, want ik wil niet indirect meewerken aan de vervuiling die dat land veroorzaakt. En natuurlijk moeten wij Pakistan bijstaan, helemaal, maar China en India moeten niet vergeten worden.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, a dimensão da tragédia que se abateu sobre o Paquistão é inquestionável e apela à nossa total solidariedade e ao reforço da ajuda humanitária por parte da União Europeia.

Sabemos muito bem que isto que aconteceu é fruto das alterações climáticas que atravessamos e da importância de combater essas alterações climáticas. Mas na emergência é preciso fazer mais. Face aos inúmeros exemplos de situações extremas que as alterações climáticas colocam às sociedades, com resultados cada vez mais catastróficos, como é o caso do Paquistão, é preciso que a União Europeia lidere o movimento mundial para adaptar as nossas estruturas urbanas e planos de prevenção a este tipo de ameaças.

A União Europeia deve incentivar este projeto, para o qual devem ser convocados todos os especialistas, de forma a tentar estar um passo à frente dos problemas, em vez de estarmos sempre a reagir diante da tragédia.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the scale of the floods in Pakistan isn't easy to grasp: 1 600 deaths, 33 million inhabitants affected, around one third of the landmass under water and more than 10 million people in need.

As floodwaters slowly recede, the sheer scale of damage becomes even more evident. This catastrophe is yet another demonstration of the terrible effects that climate change can bring. It's a country where the socioeconomic situation was already very fragile. Despite massive relief efforts from Pakistani authorities to alleviate the devastating impacts of the floods – and beyond, the immediate response from the international community, there are still many pressing needs to be covered and many health threats to be countered.

Therefore, we should step up our efforts to help Pakistan in facing not only the immediate but also the long-term consequences of such a huge disaster and in building resilience against climate change. We welcome the new EUR 30 million humanitarian aid package, but we ask to go beyond that.

Maximilian Krah (ID). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren Kollegen! Die Naturkatastrophe in Pakistan ist in der Tat erschreckend. Ein Monsun, der normalerweise im August endet und im September noch nicht zu Ende ist – das ist einzigartig, Temperaturen von über 50 Grad.

Und wenn wir etwas politisch Positives erkennen können, dann ist das doch die große globale Hilfe, dass hier nämlich Länder, die ansonsten politisch Gegner sind, ja sogar verfeindet sind, helfen. Die Vereinigten Staaten, China und die Europäische Union ziehen an einem Strang. Wann hat es das schon gegeben?

Genau das ist die Botschaft für Pakistan in die Zukunft. Wir wollen als Europäer in dieser Region an Bord bleiben. Genau deshalb freue ich mich auch, dass Botschafter Khan heute bei uns ist, weil es zeigt, dass auch Pakistan uns dabeihaben möchte. Wir wollen als Europa eine große globale Friedensmacht des Handels, des Ausgleichs und der Partnerschaft sein. Und ich denke, dass wir es hier zeigen können.

Die Zukunft kann aber nicht darin liegen, dass wir nur die Helfer und großzügigen Geber sind, sondern es geht um Partnerschaft, die auch Unterschiedlichkeit respektiert. Genau deshalb bin ich anders als Sie, Herr Kollege van Dalen, der Meinung, dass Pakistan im APS+ bleiben muss, weil wir nur dadurch erreichen, dass wir in dieser zentralasiatischen Region eben dabeibleiben. Wenn wir uns herausziehen, sind wir draußen. Aber wenn wir draußen sind, können wir gar nichts mehr beeinflussen – beeinflussen nicht im Sinne der Diktatur eines Vorschreibens, sondern beeinflussen im Sinne einer Partnerschaft, eines Gebens und Nehmens.

Ich glaube, dass wir jetzt die Chance nutzen sollten, wenn diese Flutkatastrophe einigermaßen überwunden sein wird – worauf ich hoffe –, daran zu arbeiten, dass wir in Zentralasien unsere Position stärken – stärken als Partner, stärken mit Respekt für andere Wege und auch als Partner mit anderen Mitspielern, selbst wenn diese uns teilweise nicht gefallen.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (The Left). – Señor presidente, Pakistán produce menos del 1 % de las emisiones mundiales. Sin embargo, es uno de los países que más sufre las consecuencias del cambio climático. Lleva veinte años en la lista de los diez países más vulnerables por riesgos climáticos.

Veinte años en los que también ha estado sufriendo otra crisis: la trampa de la deuda externa. Las recientes inundaciones han provocado pérdidas de 10 000 millones de dólares. Pero en lo que llevamos de año, Pakistán ha pagado más de 15 000 millones de dólares en devolver deudas. Unas deudas que siguen aumentando gracias al acuerdo firmado con el FMI, que obliga a Pakistán a recortar su gasto social y a aumentar los precios de los bienes de primera necesidad.

Es ilegítimo enriquecerse con el empobrecimiento y las desgracias ajenas.

Si la Unión Europea quiere contribuir a paliar la emergencia humanitaria en Pakistán, que empiece cancelando la parte de la deuda ilegítima de la Unión Europea con Pakistán.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, the climate crisis is increasingly affecting the lives of millions of people across the world. This year, Pakistan endured extreme weather conditions: from its heat wave in March and April, to the devastating floods in June.

Pakistan was one of the country's worst affected by climate change in the first years of this century. This climate-induced crisis has come on top of an ongoing political and economic crisis. After the heaviest monsoons in over a century, 1 600 people lost their lives and approximately 13 000 people were injured, in addition to the millions of homes lost. The floods have also had a devastating effect on Pakistan's agriculture, which plays a central role in the country's economy.

It is essential that the EU stand with the people of Pakistan, a country with which we have strong bilateral relations for over 60 years. I welcome the funding and supports that have been provided already. Europe has offered humanitarian funding, provided medical aid and exported essential equipment, such as water pumps and hygiene kits.

I would like to make a broader point. In Europe our primary focus is on the unjust war in Ukraine and the resulting energy crisis, which poses immediate and acute dangers. Climate change, on the other hand, has not gone away. It poses an existential problem for the human race, and the effects are plain to see.

Mónica Silvana González (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor embajador de Pakistán, el cambio climático ha provocado una nueva crisis humanitaria con dimensiones sin precedentes —más de treinta millones de personas afectadas—. Sin embargo, desde la Unión Europea seguimos sin tener definido cómo vamos a proteger a las personas desplazadas por el clima y sin definir la figura del refugiado climático.

¿Cómo sería la respuesta europea si la diseñáramos pensando en una niña pakistaní que lo ha perdido todo en estos últimos meses? Esta niña, además de agua potable, además de no enfermar, además de comer, sueña con volver a la escuela. Por ello, la respuesta europea a Pakistán debe hacerse aplicando el enfoque del triple nexo. No se puede dar una respuesta solo humanitaria, no solo desde la Dirección General de Protección Civil y Operaciones de Ayuda Humanitaria Europeas (ECHO), sino que necesita un desarrollo a medio y a largo plazo. Esto no puede ser una actuación netamente humanitaria.

Somos el mayor donante de cooperación y tenemos una responsabilidad añadida. Necesitamos no solo reforzar la adaptación y la mitigación al cambio climático, sino adelantarnos a las crisis y reforzar el mecanismo de pérdidas y daños.

No olvidemos la apuesta de Pakistán hace unos meses acogiendo a refugiados afganos. Nuestras ONG están allí. Debemos involucrar también al sector privado para hacer más fuerza y dar una respuesta, para que esta niña tenga un futuro y pueda seguir yendo a la escuela en Pakistán.

Pär Holmgren (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! De fruktansvärda översvämningarna i Pakistan är givetvis ett tydligt exempel på en extrem väderhändelse i ett varmare klimat. Det är emellertid också, tyvärr, ett tydligt exempel på en händelse där vi inte längre bara kan prata om klimatanpassning.

Tittar vi framåt i detta århundrade, kommer vi att se allt fler områden som vi faktiskt inte längre kommer att kunna rädda och återställa. Det som vi ser nu är en effekt av alla utsläpp av växthusgaser ända sedan industrialiseringen. Tittar vi på den mängden, vet vi att det är vi här i Europa, tillsammans med USA, som har stått för ganska exakt 50 procent. Vi måste nu stå upp och ta ett ansvar för dessa historiska utsläpp.

Det humanitära stöd som EU hittills har bidragit med till Pakistan räcker inte. Då är Pakistan bara *ett* exempel. EU måste nu, under och inför COP 27, stå upp för mer finansiering för klimatanpassning, men också tydligt för finansiering av förluster och skador, *loss and damage*. Vi måste tyvärr inse att det har gått så pass långt.

Marina Mesure (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, le chaos règne au Pakistan suite aux terribles inondations qui ont frappé le pays. Plus de 1 600 personnes ont perdu la vie, des millions de logements détruits, des terres agricoles ravagées et des centaines d'écoles rayées de la carte. Au moins 8 millions de personnes ont été forcées de tout quitter pour trouver ailleurs les ressources nécessaires à leur survie.

Dans ce contexte, la nouvelle aide humanitaire de 30 millions d'euros proposée par l'UE pour répondre aux besoins vitaux du peuple pakistanais est une bonne chose. Nous nous félicitons aussi que le mécanisme européen de protection civile ait pu être mobilisé afin d'envoyer des équipes sur place pour soutenir les opérations de secours. Un mécanisme qu'il conviendra par ailleurs de renforcer dans ses moyens humains et financiers afin de faire face aux prochaines crises et appels à l'aide tant en Europe que dans le reste du monde.

Je conclurai néanmoins en rappelant que la solidarité, bien qu'irremplaçable pour celles et ceux qui la reçoivent, ne règle pas tout. Il faudra s'attaquer aux causes de ces catastrophes climatiques qui se multiplient et s'intensifient, hier au Pakistan, demain sur notre continent. Elles sont incontestablement le fait du dérèglement climatique dont il est de notre responsabilité collective d'atténuer les effets, notamment pour les plus vulnérables.

Janina Ochojska (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wyrażam kondolencje dla rodzin ofiar powodzi oraz żal z powodu zniszczenia tak wielu domów, utraty tego co cenne, co najbliższe, i ogromnych strat w infrastrukturze. Cóż mogę więcej powiedzieć po tych wszystkich słowach, które tutaj padły?

Dzisiaj zagłosowaliśmy za przyjęciem sprawozdania dotyczącego dostępu do wody jako prawa przynależnego każdemu człowiekowi. W czasie powodzi, chociaż wszędzie jest dużo wody, potrzebna jest woda pitna. Solidarność to nie tylko pomaganie w tej czy innej kwestii, to też walka ze zmianami klimatycznymi, dbanie o swoje środowisko tak, żeby nie wpływało negatywnie na środowisko sąsiadów. Nie możemy przewidzieć, który kraj będzie następny i ucierpi w związku z następstwami zmian klimatu, takimi jak susza, trzęsienie ziemi, erupcja czy, tak jak w przypadku Pakistanu, powódź.

Oczekuję, że nie tylko będziemy wspierać ludność Pakistanu, ale znajdziemy sposoby na ograniczenie tych katastrof w przyszłości. Teraz Pakistan, a jutro to może być kraj każdego z nas.

Leszek Miller (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Zmiany klimatu nie wzięły się znikąd. Kraje Zachodu i Północy ponoszą za ten stan rzeczy największą odpowiedzialność. Bogactwo naszej części świata jest okupione degradacją środowiska naturalnego, co w sposób drastyczny i jaskrawy uprzytamnia kataklizm w Pakistanie, który dotknął ponad 30 mln ludzi. Żywioł pochłonął 18 milionów kilometrów kwadratowych, 2 miliony domostw znalazło się pod wodą, uprawy i infrastruktura zostały doszczętnie zniszczone. Śmierć poniosły zwierzęta. Straty liczone są w miliardach dolarów, a nie jest to końcowy bilans. Choć każdego dnia podejmujemy starania, aby zaciągnięty od naszej planety kredyt spłacić osiągnięciem klimatycznej neutralności, to tragedia Pakistanu boleśnie uświadamia, że działamy zbyt wolno i późno, czego konsekwencje ponoszą państwa niemal bezbronne wobec kataklizmu, jaki na nie spadł.

Władze Pakistanu apelują do całego świata o wsparcie. Unia Europejska musi na ten cel odpowiedzieć pomocą humanitarną, instytucjonalną, finansową i wszelką inną.

Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE). – A Uachtaráin, tá níos mó ná seacht milliún duine easáitithe. Cailleadh míle sé chéad duine, cúig chéad leanbh ina measc. Chaill na milliúin leanaí sa Phacastáin a dtithe, a gclanna, agus a gcuid scoileanna. Agus anois, tá siad i mbaol go leor galar atá ag scriosadh na tíre. Tá na Náisiúin Aontaithe ag iarraidh níos mó cabhrach daonnúla agus ba cheart dúinn cabhrú leo.

Caithfidh an tAontas Eorpach a chúnamh a mhéadú. Seo tubaiste aeráide atá ag tarlú os comhair ár súl. Is léir go gcaithfimid dícharbónú a bhrostú i ngach earnáil. Léiríonn an tragóid sa Phacastáin praghas an bhogáis.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, the scale of this disaster is incredible. One million homes have disappeared, and 33 million Pakistanis have been displaced. More than ever, this is a time for climate justice. Real climate justice means loss and damage payments. It means climate reparations from those who are most responsible for climate change – the developed West – to those who are the least responsible and the most affected.

The 2021 Glasgow Climate Pact was a failure in terms of agreeing loss and damages for the most vulnerable nations. The EU is forever telling us about its climate leadership, despite the fact that the Green Deal targets are well below what is required from the Global North.

Will the EU and the Member States take responsibility and provide reparations on this occasion, or is Pakistan not part of our geopolitical plans? Climate change, not the war in Ukraine, is by far the biggest crisis facing this planet.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Mr President, Commissioner, torrential monsoon rains triggered the most severe flooding in Pakistan's recent history, washing away entire villages, killing over 1 600 people and displacing more than 33 million. This climate-induced disaster is leaving behind a trail of destruction, starvation and diseases. With a vast area of Pakistan likely to take months to dry out, waterborne diseases are spiking, as well as malnutrition, especially among children.

Despite all the efforts of the international community, volunteers and the government, the unprecedented nature of the floods has resulted in a huge resource gap and Pakistan's already overwhelmed health-care system lacks the resources to help all those who need treatment now. The lives of 100 000 more people are under threat as a second disaster looms within the first one.

It's imperative, under our principle of international solidarity, commitment and burden sharing, to answer the demands to increase cooperation and mobilise much more funds. But it will not be enough to increase humanitarian aid in an attempt to curb the possible risk of epidemics. To support the country at this dramatic time, action will have to be taken to support Pakistan's reconstruction, rehabilitation and resilience, including through debt relief measures. It is not a time for fine words, but for immediate and effective action.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, what happened in Pakistan is devastation beyond belief and there is no question but that it is climate induced. 53 degrees, glacial melts, a monsoon going into October, one third of the country under water, 33 million affected. We've even heard about schools being shut down because they're needed for shelters, so all of the young people are being denied an education.

Pakistan's Climate Change Minister, Sherry Rehman, blames the inefficiency of the North-South climate deal. She says there is so much loss and damage with so little reparations to countries that contributed so little to the world's carbon footprint that obviously the bargain made between the global North and the global South is not working. She is totally right. Pakistan has contributed so little and is paying the most. It's the world's 50th most populous country. It's host to so many Afghan refugees to whom we shut up our borders. The international community has an obligation to assist and yet we condition our relief or give them a pittance. It's just not good enough! It's time to act!

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for your valuable comments and insights. This debate has highlighted how humanitarian needs and climate change are connected.

Extreme weather events are also creating new humanitarian crises across the globe, like the one unfolding in Pakistan today. Investments in building resilience are paramount, and this message resonated strongly at the recent UN General Assembly in New York.

Access to finance is equally important. The European Union is the world's biggest donor of climate finance to developing countries, and we will continue to scale up our support.

The European Union and Member States support many activities to avert, minimise and address loss and damage via development cooperation, disaster risk reduction and humanitarian aid, as well as for dedicated climate finance organisations and initiatives inside and outside the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change regime.

We will continue to rally the international community to join forces and to strengthen international cooperation in pursuit of the goals of the Paris Agreement. We need more donors to contribute to climate action.

The European Union alone will not solve the climate crisis. The European Parliament is a very important partner in these efforts, and I wish to thank you again for this debate.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you very much for this debate, which once again shows the importance of disaster risk reduction. I would like to stress once more that disaster risk reduction is high on the agenda of the Czech Presidency, especially from the perspective of humanitarian assistance, development, cooperation and civil protection.

As already mentioned, we aim at adopting Council conclusions on disaster risk reduction by the Foreign Affairs Council in November. These conclusions will not only reaffirm our commitments within the Sendai framework, in particular as regards international cooperation in the context of fragility of climate, but also will set an agenda for the future.

The views expressed here today are certainly useful for the debate we are currently having in the Council. Thank you very much once again for your attention and for this fruitful debate.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

11. Rozpravy o případech porušování lidských práv, demokracie a právního státu (rozprava)

11.1. Stav lidských práv na Haiti, zejména v souvislosti s násilím páchaným gangy

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über sechs Entschließungsanträge zur Menschenrechtslage in Haiti insbesondere in Bezug auf Bandengewalt (2022/2856(RSP)).

Antonio López-Istúriz White, *autor.* – Señor presidente, señorías, la situación humanitaria en Haití se ha deteriorado debido a la inestabilidad política y la persistente inseguridad. Desde el asesinato del presidente Jovenel Moïse, en julio de 2021, varias bandas organizadas han ido adquiriendo cada vez mayor poder, creando una sensación de peligro para la población.

El aumento de la violencia y la escalada de abusos contra los derechos humanos debilita el gobierno y su actuación, lo que afecta ya a más de 1 millón y medio de personas en una situación de auténtica catástrofe humanitaria.

Con esta Resolución llamamos de nuevo la atención de la comunidad internacional sobre este drama. Pedimos a las partes involucradas un enfoque que permita la aplicación de la ley, la lucha contra esas organizaciones violentas y su conexión con actores políticos, la mejora del control de las armas ilegales y, a la par, la inversión de recursos en proyectos socioeconómicos que generen prosperidad.

Finalmente, insistimos en que se realicen elecciones transparentes, libres y justas de conformidad con las normas internacionales.

Nacho Sánchez Amor, *autor.* – Señor presidente, este es un buen ejemplo de lo que podrían llegar a ser las urgencias de derechos humanos en esta Cámara. Una llamada de atención y no un campo de batalla para estériles batallas partidistas. Nos arrojamos, a veces, las urgencias de derechos humanos unos grupos a otros, y eso no ayuda mucho a la situación que tratamos.

Agradezco el tono de la negociación, siempre constructivo, con el objetivo de poner a Haití en la agenda. Es un asunto del que se habla poquísimo porque en muchas partes del mundo algún país tiene bandas violentas. En Haití son las bandas las que tienen un país: la sucesiva desaparición de las instituciones públicas y el vacío de poder ha empoderado a unas bandas que comenzaron al servicio de las élites políticas y ahora tienen a estas élites a su servicio.

En Haití hablar de crisis económica es un eufemismo. Es la pobreza más absoluta, y no la enmascaremos.

Por tanto, vacío de poder político. Pobreza. Y las bandas dirigiendo el país.

La tormenta perfecta. Al menos, creemos conciencia.

Petras Auštrevičius, *author.* – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, dear colleagues, Haitians have become hostages to widespread organised gang crime. Their future is determined by criminals seeking only personal gain.

The deterioration of the humanitarian situation in the country is devastating. Insecurity and lawlessness have taken over. The COVID pandemic, the economic crisis, the conspiracy against the President and the earthquake are the road to the humanitarian abyss. All this coincides with a crisis of governance and corruption that is deeply rooted in Haiti.

The main hostages of this situation are the Haitian people, who are deprived of jobs, security, public services and even daily food. We as the European Union must provide at least minimum guarantees for the physical security of the people, for their food security and access to medical services. I also call on the responsible EU institutions to focus on providing assistance to women victims of violence and sexual abuse and on reducing illiteracy in Haiti.

Caroline Roose, *auteur.* – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, il y a un an et demi, notre Parlement a adopté une résolution sur Haïti. Que s'est-il passé depuis? La situation s'est encore aggravée. Assassinat du président Moïse, séisme, violence, Haïti sombre tous les jours un peu plus dans le chaos. Les meurtres, les viols, les enlèvements sont quotidiens. La terreur règne à Port-au-Prince. Les gangs contrôlent la capitale, agissent en complicité avec des politiciens corrompus. Le gouvernement actuel opère sans aucune légitimité démocratique depuis des mois. Ces dernières semaines, les pénuries de carburant et d'eau potable ont provoqué des manifestations et des émeutes.

Le pays s'effondre sous le regard de la communauté internationale. Quel prétexte va-t-on encore invoquer pour justifier notre immobilisme? Les États-Unis jouent un double jeu, violent le droit international en expulsant les Haïtiens qui demandent l'asile. Les Haïtiens et Haïtiennes ne croient plus aux promesses de la communauté internationale et je les comprends.

Je suis témoin depuis plusieurs mois de leurs efforts pour améliorer leur sort en dépit de toutes les difficultés. Leur courage est immense. Nous ne devons pas les décevoir. Nous devons soutenir les propositions de solution à la crise présentées dans le cadre de l'accord Montana, fruit du consensus entre de nombreuses organisations de la société civile. Écoutons la voix du peuple haïtien, celles et ceux qui demandent une transition de rupture.

Marisa Matias, *Autora.* – Senhor Presidente, no Haiti vive-se uma situação social, política e de direitos humanos catastrófica, que se deteriorou ainda mais nos últimos anos. O aumento alarmante da violência levou ao deslocamento de dezenas de milhares de famílias em áreas urbanas e periurbanas da capital.

Devido à violência de gangues, milhares de pessoas tiveram de fugir de suas casas e estão a ser diretamente afetadas nas suas liberdades e no acesso a serviços básicos. Desde janeiro até ao final de junho deste ano, ocorreram 934 assassinatos, 684 pessoas foram feridas e houve 680 sequestros em toda a capital.

Vários casos de repetidos estupros coletivos foram cometidos contra mulheres e meninas, confirmando o uso sistemático da violência de género. A tudo isto junta-se a crise económica e a inflação galopante e junta-se, ainda, uma política de deportação em massa de migrantes e refugiados haitianos por parte dos Estados Unidos ou detenções arbitrárias e discriminatórias.

Não podemos continuar a falhar ao povo no Haiti. Temos de ser ativamente solidários e recusar todas as formas de ingerência e de neocolonialismo. Precisamos de soluções diplomáticas e de garantir que os apoios e a ajuda social chegam a quem precisa e com transparência. Precisamos, ainda, de apoiar todos aqueles que no país resistem, incluindo sindicatos, organizações de jovens e de direitos humanos, organizações religiosas, e de apoiar a restauração do poder e da legitimidade das instituições públicas.

Seán Kelly, *thar ceann an Ghrúpa PPE.* – A Uachtaráin, tá cúrsaí reatha i Háití imithe go huile agus go hiomlán as smacht agus as ord. Níl fonn ar thuismitheoirí a leanaí a sheoladh ar scoil. Tá ganntanas fuinnimh agus uisce ghlain. Mar bharr ar an donas, tá na hospidéil, bainc agus síopaí ag streachailt chun a ndoirse a choimeád oscailte. Tá an mhíshocracht pholaitiúil imithe in olcas ó rinneadh feallmharú ar Uachtarán Háití anuraidh. Anuas air sin, tá boilsciú de bheagnach 30% tar éis an fhadhb a dhéanamh níos measa. Tá dronganna coireachta i bhfeighil ar thuairim is 40% de Port-au-Prince agus tá siad ag marú na céadta Háitígh agus níl na póilíní in ann smacht a chur ar na dronganna. Impím ar údarás Háití maoirseacht aireach a dhéanamh ar thoghchán ionraic agus cothrom. Ní mór dóibh ionracas daonlathach a chinntiú agus críoch a chur leis bpolasaí anordúil seo.

Hannes Heide, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Ich hätte mir nie gedacht, dass ich als österreichischer Abgeordneter dreimal eine Rede zu einer Notlage der Menschen in Haiti halten werde. Es ist allerdings absolut notwendig.

In den letzten Monaten hat sich die ohnehin ausweglos erscheinende Situation noch zu einem dramatischen Höhepunkt gesteigert. Die haitianischen Behörden stehen der Dimension der Bandenkriminalität machtlos gegenüber.

Allein heuer wurden im ersten Halbjahr etwa 800 Menschen getötet und 540 Menschen entführt. Die Leiterin eines Kinderheims in Port-au-Prince berichtet von 14-, 15-jährigen Jungen, die mit Maschinengewehren um den Hals bereit sind, jeden zu erschießen.

Mehr als ein Drittel der Bevölkerung leidet unter Ernährungsunsicherheit, rund 220 000 Kinder an akuter Mangelernährung.

Die Blockade des wichtigsten Ölterminals der Hauptstadt führt zu Treibstoffengpässen, sodass Krankenhäuser die medizinische Grundversorgung auch für Schwangere und Kinder nicht mehr aufrechterhalten können.

Die Europäische Union muss wirksame Maßnahmen setzen: die Behörden mit Mitteln und Knowhow ausstatten, um sie auch beim Aufbau von Rechtsstaat, Demokratie und Infrastruktur zu unterstützen.

Stéphane Bijoux, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chaque jour qui passe, Haïti sombre un peu plus dans le chaos. Au mois de juillet, plus de 230 personnes à Port-au-Prince ont été tuées par des gangs ultraviolents. Même les ONG sont attaquées et les stocks d'aide humanitaire sont pillés par des bandits qui font régner la terreur.

En tant que président de la délégation parlementaire Cariforum, j'ai toujours travaillé pour que l'Europe reste un partenaire fort et solidaire du peuple haïtien. Mais l'extrême violence qui ravage actuellement Haïti exige que le gouvernement haïtien prenne des mesures pour la sécurité et contre la corruption. Nous, ici, nous devons renforcer notre solidarité avec le peuple haïtien. L'Europe ne doit pas abandonner le peuple haïtien, mais l'Europe doit aussi protéger les citoyens européens de la région, les Antillais, les Guyanais qui sont aussi fortement impactés par les conséquences migratoires de ce chaos.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, kolegice i kolege, na početku ću samo konstatirati da, nažalost, ova rezolucija o Haitiju nema prijevod na hrvatski jezik pa da barem u jeziku budemo ravnopravni.

Danas u Europskom parlamentu govori se o ljudskim pravima na Haitiju, u Mjanmaru i Etiopiji. Hrvatsku su, naime, 2020. godine pogodila dva potresa. Dvije i pol godine prošle su od zagrebačkog potresa i gotovo dvije godine od potresa na Banovini. Do današnjeg dana, Zagrebu, Europska unija, hrvatska Vlada ili Grad Zagreb nisu obnovili niti jednu kuću.

Skupljajući dokumentaciju, ljudi su potrošili preko deset tisuća kuna ili preko tri hrvatske minimalne plaće. Do današnjeg dana, na Banovini na trošak države, obnovljena je samo jedna kuća. Europska unija i Vlada Republike Hrvatske nisu osigurali minimum za početak obnove. Cijele obitelji spavaju po kontejnerima zimi i ljeti. Treću zimu Banovina će spavati u ledenim kontejnerima od 15 kvadrata. U njima spava petero, šestero ljudi. U njima se kuha, pod uvjetom da se ima što kuhati, u njima djeca pišu zadaće.

O kakvim ljudskim pravima se usuđujete danas govoriti kada se Hrvatska, članica Europske unije, dvije i pol godine od razornih potresa guši u ruševinama, bez osnovnih uvjeta za život.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Między 8 a 17 lipca w stolicy Haiti w wyniku walk gangów zamordowano 209 osób. To oznacza, że co 68 minut ginął tam człowiek. Prawie połowa z nich to osoby, które nie miały żadnego powiązania z organizacjami przestępczymi. Dochodzi do porwań dla okupu, gwałtów, napadów z bronią w ręku. Mieszkańcy Haiti są po prostu całkowicie sterroryzowani. Jednocześnie są oni także pozbawieni dostępu do pożywienia, wody i leków. Społeczność międzynarodowa musi zareagować. Należy monitorować sytuację humanitarną w kraju i zapewnić, że pomoc będzie docierała do najbardziej potrzebujących. Konieczne jest przywrócenie rządów prawa w Haiti i przeprowadzenie wolnych wyborów. Należy wspierać wszelkie wysiłki zmierzające do tego celu.

Wreszcie musimy się zastanowić nad wsparciem dla Haiti w perspektywie długoterminowej. Około połowa obywateli kraju w wieku do 15 lat nie potrafi czytać ani pisać. System edukacji odzwierciedla nierówności społeczne. Niestety wielu młodych ludzi bez odpowiedniego wykształcenia bieda i brak perspektyw mogą popychać do działalności przestępczej. W ten sposób, jeśli będziemy inwestować w edukację, będziemy mogli naprawdę zmienić sytuację w tym kraju.

Andrea Cozzolino (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Haiti è in preda a una spirale di violenza che non ha cessato di peggiorare sin dall'uccisione del Presidente Moïse. L'instabilità politica e le condizioni economiche e sociali, gravemente peggiorate dalla pandemia e dal violento terremoto dell'agosto 2021, fanno di Haiti in questo momento uno degli scenari di crisi più gravi per i diritti umani e sociali nel mondo.

Il paese è in preda a una spirale di violenza, come hanno ricordato tanti colleghi, in cui si intravedono preoccupanti legami tra criminalità, gruppi violenti e politica corrotta, impegnata in una lotta incessante senza quartiere per il potere. Lo scorso anno sono avvenuti più di 1 000 omicidi. La maggior parte della popolazione vive in condizioni di assoluta povertà.

La comunità internazionale ha adottato nei confronti di Haiti comportamenti altalenanti, con esiti a volte disastrosi, a cominciare dai comportamenti ambigui degli stessi Stati Uniti. Per questo motivo chiediamo all'Alto rappresentante e alla Commissione di intraprendere tutte le iniziative in sede internazionale per rafforzare le istituzioni di Haiti, al fine di arrestare la spirale di violenza e offrire una prospettiva meno sofferente al popolo di Haiti.

Max Orville (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Haïti est confronté depuis trop longtemps à de nombreux fléaux, tant climatiques que sanitaires. Outre la COVID, il y a eu l'arrivée récente d'une recrudescence du choléra. À cela s'ajoutent l'insécurité et la corruption qui sont les marqueurs avérés d'une démocratie déliquescente.

L'Union européenne accompagne Haïti, notamment avec le Fonds européen de développement, pour réduire ces fléaux. Pourtant, la population reste soumise à l'insécurité et à la violence qui dictent la vie de millions d'habitants apeurés, sans ressources et désormais sans espoir. La faillite morale et matérielle des institutions haïtiennes, gangrenées par la corruption et la mainmise des gangs, empêche tout exercice de la démocratie.

L'heure est donc venue de faire un bilan sur la manière dont sont utilisés les fonds européens. Monsieur le commissaire, qu'envisagez-vous pour donner les moyens à l'Union européenne de poursuivre une action humanitaire effective au bénéfice de la population et ainsi qu'Haïti redevienne la perle des Antilles?

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, dovolte mi, abych úvodem vyjádřil své rozhořčení nad tím, že pan kolega Sinčić si dovolil svoji minutu věnovat Chorvatsku, nikoli nouzi milionů lidí na Haiti. Tolik vražd, tolik násilí a zločinných gangů, kterých jsme svědky na Haiti – jako by to snad nemělo ani konce. Rada bezpečnosti OSN vyjádřila naději na zlepšení současné humanitární krize na Haiti, ale situace se vůbec nelepší. Jako by ta situace zamrzla a k tomu se bohužel navíc přidal spor o mandát prozatímního prezidenta. Je nepochybné, že Evropská unie nemůže opustit lidi v nouzi. Bavíme se o tomto tématu už poněkolikáté jenom v tomto volebním období. Musíme pomáhat poskytnout naše zkušenosti, naše zdroje, naše know-how. Haiti si nepochybně zaslouží lepší budoucnost.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, Haiti is the site of the first and only successful slave revolution in history. Haitians won their independence from France in 1804 and immediately abolished slavery, becoming the first place in the world to do so. It was also the first state to outlaw racism in its constitution. Haiti was a beacon of light for the world, and it was punished for it. It was punished over and over again by France, by the US, through a series of coups, invasions, occupations, assassinations, through relentless meddling and crushing debt.

They were determined that this beacon of freedom would be extinguished because it presented a bold challenge to the logic of capital and empire. But the Haitian people kept fighting through. Theirs is a light that never goes out, and so it's still being punished. The meddling goes on. If Haiti is a mess – and it is – then Europe and the US are to blame. If we want to support the Haitian people – and we should – we'll stand up to the US, the world's bully, tell them to get out of Haiti and get out of it ourselves.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, iš tikrųjų visi sutinkame, kad Haityje vyrauja smurtas ir skurdas, įsivyravus gaujų valdžiai, kurios oficialiai faktiškai valdo infrastruktūrą, turi didžiausią įtaką šalies sprendimams. Mes turime surasti jėgų ir padėti paprastiems Haičio žmonėms. Sveikinu Europos Komisijos skiriamus 17 mln. Haičio paramai, tačiau kreipiuosi į komisarą, kad ši parama iš tikrųjų pasiektų tuos pačius silpniausius žmones, kuriems ji yra reikalinga, o ne užstrigtų kažkur gaujų ir korumpuotos valdžios koridoriuose. Nes šioje situacijoje labiausiai kenčia silpniausi – moterys, vaikai, kurie dėl to negauna maisto ir negauna medicininės pagalbos, kenčia badą ir skurdą. Manau, kad mes turime sutelkti savo pastangas suteikiant humanitarinę pagalbą, taip pat užtikrinant, kad įvyktų teisingi ir skaidrūs rinkimai ir kad galiausiai į Haitį sugrįžtų tvarka ir pasitikėjimas.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, Western imperialism has never stopped punishing Haiti for the crime of being the first black majority nation to successfully carry out an anti-colonial revolution, when they kicked out the French in 1804. Since then, the US and France have colluded to kill at least five sitting presidents and engineered countless coups.

The reversal of the Aristide coup by the Haitian people was met with crushing neoliberal reforms forced by the Clinton regime. A second coup against Aristide in '04 by the French and Americans ushered in pro-West leadership that ensured no nation-building would be carried out, no investment in infrastructure that might help Haiti to prepare for earthquakes and the ravages of global warming.

The successful defiance of the Haitian people has been met with 200 years of imperialists attempting to keep them on their knees and then shedding crocodile tears at the resulting instability. I'd like to know, what right have we got to be interfering in this sovereign nation?

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, for over three weeks now social unrest and popular protests have continued to affect the streets of Port-au-Prince, as well as several urban centres in the country.

While the initial aim of these protests was to show legitimate dissent against the decisions of the government on domestic policies, the violence and the looting which have followed are largely the work of armed gangs that have infiltrated the protests and taken advantage of the situation.

Banks, schools, food depots, including the World Food Programme, Caritas and other NGOs have been vandalised and looted in the course of these events. The violence has hampered relief and humanitarian efforts in the response to the 2021 earthquake.

The European Union regrets that once more the principal victims of this violence are the most vulnerable groups. The growing number of kidnappings and killings, often involving children, either as victims or as perpetrators, and high rates of sexual and gender-based violence are signs of the further degradation of human rights, democracy and the rule of law in the country.

What is happening reminds us that when political leaders in Haiti do not manage to offer reliable solutions, armed gangs take control and it is the people who suffer the consequences. United Nations Secretary-General Guterres has rightly highlighted that the current crisis requires drastic measures, particularly when it comes to restoring security and the fight against armed gangs.

The Haitians cannot be left alone. The European Union is actively considering a contribution to the European Union-administrated basket fund to strengthen the national police of Haiti.

Ultimately, however, a political solution must be found within Haiti and by the Haitians. It is high time for the country's political forces to show responsibility and put the well-being of the country and its long-suffering people before their own factional interests. Otherwise, it is hard to see an exit from the current crisis.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 6. Oktober 2022, statt.

11.2. Zásahy vůči svobodě sdělovacích prostředků v Myanmaru, zejména případy Htet Htet Khineové, Sithua Aunga Myinta a Nyeina Nyeina Ayeho

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über sechs Entschließungsanträge zur massiven Beschneidung der Medienfreiheit in Myanmar, insbesondere den Fällen von Htet Htet Khine, Sithu Aung Myint und Nyein Nyein Aye (2022/2857(RSP)).

Loránt Vincze, *author.* – Mr President, the situation in Myanmar is getting worse by the day. The military regime is doing everything possible to prevent the press from reporting on the atrocities happening in the country.

Compared to our last October's debate on Myanmar, the total number of people killed and arrested has almost doubled. Journalism has become a very dangerous profession in Myanmar. Media outlets are shut down and reports indicate serious violations of human rights, including torture and other abuses. Ethnic and religious communities continue to the be subject of direct attacks by the army and the media, so women, men and children are forced to flee to seek refuge.

We need a better and stronger international coordination on sanctions that directly targets the military junta, in order to avoid the loss of innocent lives, to be sure that sanctions do not provoke further suffering on the populations and workers.

We must continue the support together with our regional partners of the National Unity government in Myanmar to ensure a transition to democracy and a tolerant society, and to make sure that everyone can enjoy their right of expression and belief without fear of persecution.

Karsten Lucke, *Verfasser.* – Herr Präsident! Die Washington Post hat sich die Unterzeile gegeben: „*Democracy Dies in Darkness*". Und das trifft es im Kern. Da, wo keine Meinung mehr geäußert werden kann, und da, wo Journalisten nicht mehr offen arbeiten können, weil sie Angst haben müssen, verhaftet zu werden, da können sich Menschen nicht mehr frei entfalten, da stirbt der Pluralismus und damit die Demokratie und die freiheitliche Gesellschaft.

Das ist auch unser europäisches Kernanliegen heute mit dieser Entschließung gegenüber Myanmar, wo es unhaltbare Zustände bei der Presse- und Meinungsfreiheit gibt. Aber wir gehen auch noch ein Stück weiter. Man muss es sich auf der Zunge zergehen lassen: Reporterinnen und Reporter können einfach verhaftet und ins Gefängnis gesteckt werden, weil Machthabern eine Story nicht gefällt. Das ist unfassbar. Europa positioniert sich mit dieser Entschließung unmissverständlich für die Presse- und Meinungsfreiheit.

Wir fordern aber auch die sofortige Freilassung aller betroffenen Journalistinnen und Journalisten und auch der Regierungschefin Aung San Suu Kyi und weiterer Betroffener. Gleichzeitig rufen wir zu einer konzertierten internationalen Zusammenarbeit gegenüber Myanmar auf, unter anderem auch mit weiteren Sanktionen.

Wenn die Demokratie tatsächlich in der Dunkelheit stirbt, dann können und wollen und werden wir das nicht akzeptieren und tolerieren.

Georgios Kyrtsos, *author.* – Mr President, I took the initiative for a joint motion for a resolution on the media freedom crackdown in Myanmar for three reasons. First, there is a constant degradation of the situation in Myanmar, with the military dictatorship taking extreme measures against the population, its political adversaries and journalists and media workers.

Second, after the Russian invasion of Ukraine, there has been a general tendency among authoritarian regimes to strictly control the media and neutralise one way or the other all dissenting voices. Third, there are also negative dynamics in the European Union concerning media freedom. The situation is, of course, completely different in the democratic European environment, but the negative trend provides an additional incentive to promote media freedom and the protection of journalists and media workers all over the world.

I welcome the consensus achieved by all political groups on the matter and I expect that, along with the strong political message we send, all the possible necessary measures will be taken in order to assure the freedom and protect the lives of all those that have been jailed, tortured, persecuted in Myanmar.

Heidi Hautala, *author.* – Mr President, Commissioner, indeed the European Parliament calls for the unconditional release of these three journalists and other political prisoners, including the state leaders, in this resolution. But, very importantly, it places this question of the persecution of the free media in the context of the military coup that has spread terror and killed civilians since 1 February 2021. Now is the time to bring the issue of Myanmar back to the international arenas, because it has been largely forgotten.

We have seen that the people of Myanmar have united in an unprecedented way against the military junta and its army. Indeed, now is the time when the democratic countries – including of course the European Union at the spearhead – must give their unconditional and explicit support to the democratic forces, as represented mainly by the National Unity Government.

ASEAN, of course, is a big player in the region, but the five-point consensus that ASEAN adopted in May 2021 has been a total failure. It has not been able to have an impact on the situation. One of the reasons is that one of the parties to negotiate this consensus was the junta, and I very much encourage the European Union to call for ASEAN to draft a new consensus on the Myanmar issue towards peace and democracy. The National Unity Government should be recognised as a legitimate partner to this negotiation.

Now we also have to see that the sanctions that we have in place are gradually strengthened, and that there is proper international coordination of the sanctions with the United States and other like-minded partners. Otherwise, we will be failing in our efforts.

Anna Fotyga, *author.* – Mr President, Commissioner, since the military coup d'état in Myanmar of 1 February 2021, we see the accompanying crackdown on opposition leaders and even ordinary activists, public figures, that are detained and also massive crackdown on media as well as telecommunications. Also a variety of social media outlets are curbing the access to internet and to uncensored information within Myanmar.

Four rounds of our sanctions and numerous resolutions of the European Parliament may be in vain without strict international broader coordination with like-minded partners, in particular transatlantic ones and countries like UK. Within the Global Press Freedom Index of Article 19, Myanmar holds now the fifth lowest position among 180 in terms of media freedom.

We have to push and exert pressure for immediate release of detained journalists and for stopping the violence.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *autor.* – Señor presidente, año y medio después del golpe de Estado, la situación sigue siendo crítica en Myanmar. Los mismos militares responsables del genocidio rohinyá ahora siguen perpetrando abusos generalizados y sistemáticos contra el pueblo birmano y, por supuesto, intentan acallar a las y los periodistas que lo cuentan. Esto es posible gracias, en parte, a la financiación que la Junta Militar obtiene de su entramado empresarial.

Tenemos que reforzar las sanciones contra todas las empresas vinculadas a la Junta y eliminar la excepción que permite, por ejemplo, que cuando las empresas europeas salen del país puedan transferir sus acciones a la Junta, tal y como pasó con la salida de Total, que transfirió sus acciones a una empresa controlada por los militares.

Además, hay que promover la congelación de activos específicos y la prohibición de las transferencias financieras internacionales a los dos bancos estatales controlados por la Junta.

El apoyo incondicional a las fuerzas prodemocráticas debe pasar por reconocer al Gobierno de unidad nacional, al que aprovecho la ocasión para solicitarle que exprese claramente su posición sobre el estatuto de los rohinyá y en particular, sobre su derecho a la ciudadanía y al reconocimiento como grupo étnico de Myanmar y su derecho a regresar al país.

Una vez más, el pueblo birmano nos está dando un ejemplo de lucha y dignidad. No podemos seguir limitándonos a observar mientras lo masacran.

Hay que actuar.

Stanislav Polčák, *za skupinu PPE*. – Pane předsedající, myanmarská vláda pokračuje v brutálním potlačování práv mírumilovných lidí této krásné země. Omezuje přístup na sociální sítě, zavírá novináře, brutálně potlačuje demonstrace, vlastně to, co se dlouhá léta zjevně učí v Číně, to také praktikuje ve své zemi. Jsme svědky toho, kdy novináři jsou odsuzováni – a teď budu citovat: „za šíření strachu ve své zemi, za *fake news* a agitaci proti státnímu zřízení." Myslím, že musíme toto jednání vojenské junty důrazně odsoudit. Také důrazně odsoudit veškeré násilí a odsuzování politických vězňů. Chci zmínit i výslovně paní Su Ťij, která vyhrála poslední volby. Myslím si, že musíme prohloubit naši spolupráci s regionálními partnery proto, abychom dokázali vyvolat společný tlak na myanmarskou vojenskou juntu.

PREDSEDÁ: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podpredseda

Marianne Vind, *for S&D-Gruppen*. – Hr. Formand! Siden juntaen i Myanmar overtog magten i februar 2021, har der været et stigende antal angreb og drab på civile, på religiøse minoriteter, på fredelige demokratiske demonstranter, på menneskerettighedsforkæmpere og journalister. Listen er lang, og det er forfærdelig læsning. Juntaen kæmper voldeligt imod enhver form for modstand og fortsætter med at underminere pressefriheden. Det er uacceptabelt. Pressefrihed er afgørende for det frie og demokratiske samfund. Journalister må ikke behandles som kriminelle og skal ikke frygte for deres liv, bare fordi de udfører deres arbejde. Det er afgørende, at vi i EU gør alt, hvad der står i vores magt for at standse de systematiske menneskerettighedskrænkelser, der finder sted i Myanmar. Jeg opfordrer kraftigt til, at EU styrker sanktionerne mod Myanmars junta. Det demokratiske valg for 2020 må og skal respekteres.

Svenja Hahn, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, colleagues, today we once again want to be a voice for the democracy activists, human rights activists, journalists and so many more that are oppressed by the Tatmadaw.

Human rights and democracy in Myanmar have eroded in a landslide since the military coup. In fact, Myanmar is now the world's second largest jailer of journalists. This is seriously a list you don't want to be so high on.

Colleagues, the conflict of our time is autocracy versus democracy. The autocrats and despots of the world terrorise and murder in their fear of freedom and democracy. And that is why, to be very frank, it's so unbearable to me that the Commission has done so little to support Myanmar. In fact, we're discussing it the fourth time, and Mr Borrell is not even here for the fourth time.

But, nevertheless, I'm going to call on the Commission for a fourth time – hopefully the last time – to ensure that none of the military companies are benefiting from the preferential access to our single market. Suspend the trade benefits because as the European Union, we must live up to our responsibilities as an economic and democratic power.

We need to stay strong and united by the side of freedom and democracy in Europe and the world.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, 'the only security of all is in a free press'. These were the words of Thomas Jefferson, and they are more appropriate than ever to describe the appalling situation in Myanmar. Indeed, abolishing media freedom the military junta has razed whatever level of security for the people of Myanmar, granting itself liberty and impunity for committing barbarian acts such as those described in the resolution presented today.

What is even more impressive, yet very far from surprising, is that this brutal junta enjoys support from those authoritarian states we constantly criticise from this House, namely Russia and China, who are blocking every action potentially taken by the UN Security Council.

From this House, we must be absolutely firm in condemning the behaviour of the Tatmadaw and those who stand on their side. We should suspend the preferential status for commerce and every privilege they have and encourage the EU delegation and the diplomatic missions of the Member States to offer all practical support to those who risk their lives every day.

We call for an immediate arms embargo on Myanmar. The people of Myanmar have been forced to silence. We must be their spokespersons. Otherwise, also our freedom will result void and useless.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, la dramática situación de los periodistas en Myanmar no es más que el reflejo de la sistemática violación de los derechos humanos en este país. Torturas, asesinatos, desapariciones.

Ante esto, ¿qué hacemos, aparte de resoluciones y bla, bla, bla? ¿Qué podemos hacer? ¿Qué instrumento tenemos para impulsar y, yo diría, forzar a este gobierno dictatorial a asumir sus compromisos en materia de respeto de los derechos humanos?

Tenemos un instrumento: «Todo menos armas». ¿Les suena? «Todo menos armas». ¿A cambio de qué? Del respeto de los derechos humanos fundamentales. Entonces, teniendo este instrumento, ¿por qué no lo utilizamos? Esa es la pregunta: ¿por qué no utilizamos ese instrumento para forzar a ese gobierno a respetar las normas mínima de derechos humanos?

Conseguir este esquema y formar parte de «Todo menos armas» tiene una condición. Y si la condición no se cumple podemos hacer una cosa, y no solo podemos, sino que debemos: suspenderlo.

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, the situation in Myanmar is appalling. Mass arrests, detention of critics, beatings and deaths in custody, the use of the death penalty – all indefensible – and, in particular, attacks on freedom of expression, with journalists and activists charged with incitement and sedition for criticising the military; with the crime of causing fear and spreading fake news. This is an abomination, and we are right to condemn them, but they also hold up a mirror for us to see ourselves.

This Parliament voted in March for the Kalniete report, which calls for the use of sanctions against so-called disinformation, including targeted individuals. We had calls this morning for sanctioning journalists, and even musicians. This report was against the advice we heard from expert lawyers, who made clear that sanctions have too low a burden of proof, no trial, no defence, no due process, no way to appeal and none of the rights to a normal defence. This has a chilling effect on freedom of expression.

So see Myanmar and learn the lessons. Policing political speech is incompatible with democratic freedoms. The idea of using sanctions to combat disinformation disgraces us. It should be abandoned.

(Ukončenie vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, the European Union maintains its efforts to ensure the gross violence of human rights in Myanmar remain high on the agenda of the international community.

Shrinking media freedom is, amongst others, an issue of serious concern given the systematic and sustained crackdown on journalists since the coup. Nyein Nyein Aye and Htet Htet Khine were the 24th and 25th journalists to receive a prison sentence. This sentencings have the potential to deter other journalists and bloggers and this is another step towards restricting media freedom and freedom of expression in Myanmar.

To date, 67 journalists have been imprisoned in Myanmar, according to the Reporters Sans Frontières Press Freedom Index. Other sources, such as Detained Journalists Information Myanmar mention 142 journalists.

This said, the regime has also targeted civil society organisations and human rights activities. Many have had to flee or have seen their bank accounts frozen and office offices raided. Overall, the situation on human rights in Myanmar is in freefall since the coup. However, the recent executions of the four civil society activists in August and the further verdicts against former state counsellor Aung San Suu Kyi, as well as three former ministers, are further signs of the escalation of violence and the deterioration of the situation in Myanmar since the coup.

The European Union has stepped up its diplomatic engagement with key regional countries and organisations – for example ASEAN and the United Nations – and continued supporting ASEAN's Five Points consensus. However, we are concerned about the lack of progress in working towards a solution to the crisis in Myanmar.

At the multilateral level, in coordination with like-minded partners, we regularly present resolutions at the UN Human Rights Council and the UN G8 Committee.

Following the recent executions, which constitute another escalation of violence in Myanmar, we stepped up monitoring the situation together with the European Union and the Member States, and are maintaining our sanctions regime under constant review.

We will continue to support Myanmar human rights activities, journalists and civil society, as we do worldwide. As a fundamental principle of the European Union, we hear from those activists and opponents that consider our support important – be it public statements, financial support or meeting with them. It all matters.

We will keep monitoring developments in Myanmar, calling the authorities to account when they do not respect fundamental rights.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa týmto skončila a hlasovanie k tomuto bodu sa uskutoční zajtra.

12. Členství ve výborech a delegacích

President. – The EPP group has notified the President of a decision relating to changes to appointments within a committee.

This decision will be set out in the minutes of today's sitting and shall take effect on the date of this announcement.

13. Rozpravy o případech porušování lidských práv, demokracie a právního státu (pokračování rozpravy)

13.1. Aktuální situace v humanitární oblasti a v oblasti lidských práv v etiopském Tigraji, zejména v souvislosti s dětmi

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je rozprava o šiestich návrhoch uznesenia na tému Nedávna humanitárna situácia a situácia v oblasti ľudských práv v etiópskom Tigraji, najmä situácia detí (2022/2858(RSP)).

Michaela Šojdrová, *author.* – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, on behalf of the EPP Group author, Željana Zovko, let me thank all the co-rapporteurs for their cooperation.

The civil war in Ethiopia between the Federal Government and the Tigray People's Liberation Front has been going on for two years. The recent deterioration of human rights is of utmost concern. On 24 August, the truce was broken and hostilities in the region culminated. As a result, one of the federal air raids hit a kindergarten in Mekelle, killing several children. We want to emphasise the alarming situation of children. One out of three Tigrayan children under the age of five is malnourished. We are shocked by news about the killing of children based on ethnicity. We are concerned about children being used as child soldiers. These actions constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity. We should act.

We call on the Commission to step up its effort to ensure the safety of children. Besides the danger of war, Ethiopia is expecting the worst drought, and millions of people will suffer from hunger, including children. That's why we call for an immediate ceasefire and condemn the invasion of Eritrean forces into the region of Tigray.

This week, a promising step might be the peace talks between Ethiopia and Tigray leaders in South Africa. Parliament welcomes the renewal of the mandate of Olusegun Obasanjo as the African Union's High Representative for the Horn of Africa. His role is crucial for facilitating peace talks.

Parliament urges the EU and its Member States to request the UN Security Council to hold regular public meetings on Ethiopia, to ensure humanitarian aid access, and to protect civilians. Dear colleagues, thank you for your support on this resolution.

Maria Arena, *auteur.* – Monsieur le Président, nous condamnons avec force la reprise des combats, le 24 août dernier, entre les forces gouvernementales éthiopiennes et le TPLF dans la région du Tigré. Après cinq mois de trêve, la guerre civile en Éthiopie a repris. Le conflit dure depuis plus de deux ans déjà et il a causé la mort de milliers de personnes et le déplacement de millions d'autres à l'intérieur du pays. Les populations civiles, et plus particulièrement les femmes et les enfants du Tigré, de l'Amhara et de l'Afar, sont les principales victimes de ce conflit.

Les annonces du gouvernement éthiopien relatives à l'ouverture d'un passage pour les convois humanitaires doivent être concrétisées et renforcées, à l'heure où plus de 5 millions de personnes n'ont plus accès aux services de base, pas plus qu'aux soins de santé ou aux médicaments.

Les experts des Nations unies ont, dans un rapport d'abus, fait état de violations des droits de l'homme commises par toutes les parties au conflit, lesquelles pourraient être qualifiées de crimes de guerre et de crimes contre l'humanité. Ces violations doivent immédiatement cesser. Dans les deux camps les auteurs de ces crimes doivent être tenus responsables de leurs actes, par la mise en place de mécanismes d'enquête et de justice indépendants.

L'Union européenne doit soutenir avec force les efforts de l'Union africaine pour l'ouverture des négociations de paix et saluer l'engagement du gouvernement éthiopien, qui a déjà accepté cette invitation. Le TPLF doit lui aussi s'engager dans ces négociations, qui sont fondamentales: elles doivent conduire, à très court terme, à une nouvelle trêve, qui ouvre l'accès aux convois humanitaires et le renforce, en soutien à toutes les populations. Mais elles sont également nécessaires à l'instauration d'un dialogue inclusif, qui doit pouvoir conduire à une solution politique durable à ce conflit.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, *Verfasser.* – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Seit über zwei Jahren schwelt der Konflikt in Äthiopien, insbesondere in Tigray, und hat auch auf die Nachbarregionen übergegriffen. Aber es gibt Licht am Ende des Tunnels, denn die beiden Kriegsparteien haben sich darauf geeinigt, dass sie endlich Friedensgespräche führen wollen, Friedensgespräche, die in Südafrika aufgenommen werden. Wir können als Europäisches Parlament nur unterstützen, dass diese Friedensgespräche auch zu einem wirklichen Ergebnis führen.

Denn das Ergebnis von zwei Jahren Krieg in Tigray und den angrenzenden Regionen ist verheerend für die Bevölkerung. Es sind die Schwächsten, die am stärksten darunter leiden, insbesondere Kinder. In einer Situation, in der der Krieg dazu geführt hat, dass humanitäre Hilfe nicht ausgeliefert werden konnte, leiden Kinder am stärksten. Kinder werden missbraucht als Kindersoldaten, um in diesem Krieg zu kämpfen, als Jugendliche, als Kleine mit der Waffe in der Hand. Es ist eine schreckliche Vorstellung, dass so etwas zugelassen wird.

Frauen werden systematisch vergewaltigt, und sexuelle Gewalt wird als Kriegswaffe eingesetzt – etwas, was wir nicht dulden dürfen. Und wir müssen hier klar sagen: Das sind Kriegsverbrechen, das sind Verbrechen gegen die Menschheit, die auf jeden Fall geahndet werden müssen. Deswegen ist es sehr, sehr wichtig, dass wir hier in dieser Entschließung auch deutlich machen, dass eben diese Kriegsverbrechen aufgearbeitet werden müssen. Es ist richtig, dass jetzt ein Friedensprozess auf den Weg gebracht wird. Aber zu jedem Friedensprozess muss auch gehören, dass diejenigen, die sich auf beiden Seiten des Konfliktes menschenverachtend verhalten haben, auch zur Rechenschaft gezogen werden. Und wir wünschen den Äthiopierinnen und Äthiopiern, dass sie diesen Weg als ein Land gemeinsam gehen können.

Katrin Langensiepen, *Verfasserin*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kommissarinnen und Komissare, werte Gäste da oben auf dem Podium! Zuerst, wie gesagt, die gute Nachricht: Es gibt Licht am Ende des Tunnels. Es soll Friedensgespräche geben, die wohl am 8. Oktober stattfinden werden und die, so meine Hoffnung, der Auftakt für einen Dialog sein werden, an dessen Ende ein nachhaltiger Frieden im Land zum Wohle aller Bürgerinnen und Bürger steht. Auch wenn natürlich die Verantwortung für den Prozess und den Erfolg in den Händen unserer afrikanischen Partnerinnen und Partner liegt, bleibt richtig und wichtig, die Situation in Äthiopien immer wieder im Auge zu behalten – gerade auch in den Momenten, in denen die europäische Aufmerksamkeit zuvorderst auf die Union selber und auf einen anderen Krieg im Osten des Kontinents gerichtet ist.

Die vorliegende Entschließung greift natürlich viele Punkte, die auch schon in den letzten Entschließungen angesprochen wurden, auf. Der Fokus auf das Wohlergehen von Kindern bleibt aber natürlich mehr als richtig. Denn sie sind in hohem Maße die Leidtragenden und Opfer.

Fakt bleibt auch, dass dieser Krieg auf medialem Weg geführt wird, um Deutungshoheit über die Entwicklungen zu erlangen. Gerade deswegen ist es gut, dass wir am Ende auf einen ausbalancierten Text schauen können, der alle Parteien dieses Krieges angemessen adressiert und entsprechend verurteilt.

Die Rekrutierung von Kindern als Soldaten ist und bleibt ein Kriegsverbrechen. Kriegsverbrechen gegen Frauen und Kinder als mittlerweile gängige Mittel sind und bleiben verachtenswert. Die Unterstützung von Notfall-Rehazentren für Frauen und Kinder, einschließlich der Kinder, die nach einer Vergewaltigung geboren wurden, ist das Mindeste, was Europa leisten muss.

Die schweren Fälle geschlechtsspezifischer Gewalt, die von allen Krieg führenden Parteien begangen wurden, müssen vollständig aufgeklärt werden. Auch deswegen muss das Mandat der UN-Kommission von Menschenrechtssachverständigen verlängert werden, und zwar ohne zeitliche und geografische Begrenzung. Außerdem zeigt die Praxis, dass es nicht nur darum gehen kann, Hilfsgelder zu suspendieren, sondern die Kommission muss ihre Begrenzung der Budgethilfe überdenken, um die Durchführung von Entwicklungsprojekten außerhalb der Konfliktzone weiterhin zu ermöglichen. Auch davon hängt der Erfolg eines nachhaltigen Friedens im Lande und in der Region ab, eines Friedens, den wir uns alle so inständig wünschen.

Mick Wallace, *author*. – Mr President, in Tigray, as in every war, it would appear that all sides have reasons to distort the truth as to what's happening on the ground. We've had conflicting narratives about the break-out of the war, denials of Eritrean involvement. We've had the Ethiopian ambassador come before our committee and tell us that the European government were doing everything in their power to facilitate aid to Tigray, when we knew it wasn't true.

What is clear is that one of the worst humanitarian crises on earth is unfolding in Ethiopia because of the war. Yet, sadly, we couldn't get agreement from the main groups here for action on humanitarian visas for those at risk. Nor would they agree to an arms embargo on weapons to Ethiopia and Eritrea. Why?

What they could agree on was calls for sanctions on an area where millions are facing starvation. Sanctions that will hit the poorest and the weakest on both sides the most, as usual. It is good that we do agree on the need to work for peace and to call for peace. And it's a pity that we don't call for peace in Ukraine as well.

Stanislav Polčák, *za skupinu PPE*. – Pane předsedající, tyto etnické spory, jichž jsme svědky v Etiopii, ukazují historické křivdy, historické napětí, ale ukazují také, jak decimují celou zemi a region a prohlubují současnou humanitární a potravinovou krizi v dané oblasti. Ahmarové jsou v regionech, jako je Oromia, terčem opakovaných útoků, kdy jsme svědky desetitisíců vražd, statisíců, dokonce milionů vyhnaných. Na jedné straně vidíme vraždy dětí a na druhé straně vidíme děti, které jsou povolávány do zbraně. To jsou naprosto hrůzostrašné případy, které jsou páchány zejména Oromskou osvobozeneckou armádou. Je důležité, abychom tyto válečné zločiny pojmenovali, abychom zločiny proti lidskosti jednoznačně odsoudili a všechny pachatele volali k odpovědnosti. Nezůstanou nikde schováni, budou voláni k odpovědnosti a obětem bude příslušet příslušná spravedlnost.

Carlos Zorrinho, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, inocentes na situação humanitária que se vive no Tigré e Etiópia, só mesmo as vítimas.

Uma situação que não se resume àquela região, tendo em conta que o conflito se tem vindo a alastrar e a criar bolsas de risco humanitário e de direitos em toda a Etiópia. Lamento, profundamente, que em final de agosto o cessar-fogo tenha sido quebrado. As consequências humanitárias da quebra do cessar-fogo estão à vista nos números brutais que vão sendo divulgados pelas agências internacionais e, em particular, pelos relatórios das Nações Unidas.

Os crimes de guerra têm que ser denunciados, julgados e punidos à luz do Direito Internacional. Apelo a um cessar-fogo permanente. É fundamental que a comunidade internacional incentive o diálogo para a paz que decorre sob os auspícios da União Africana. É fundamental que, em particular, todos os esforços sejam feitos para proteger as crianças dos riscos de violência e separação das suas famílias.

Enquanto União Europeia, o nosso lugar é ao lado do povo etíope, na procura de uma solução pacífica para o conflito.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, este Parlamento estuvo hace dos semanas en Etiopía y pudimos efectivamente constatar la terrible situación que la guerra del norte ha provocado en este país.

No solamente Tigré, sino Afar, Amhara tienen una situación donde más de 20 millones de personas necesitan ayuda humanitaria, una ayuda que no llega porque ha sido utilizada como un arma de guerra.

También la violencia contra las mujeres. Sí, pero permítanme que les diga que es una especial violencia. Hay objetos lacerantes que se introducen en la vagina de las mujeres para causar un daño permanente y causar la infertilidad del enemigo. Terrible.

Pero Etiopía tiene 110 millones de habitantes. La Unión Europea ha acortado su ayuda al desarrollo, su apoyo presupuestario, para, efectivamente, condicionar lo que está sucediendo ahí con la violación de los derechos humanos.

Pero tenemos que saber que el 40 % del presupuesto de educación en Etiopía son fondos comunitarios y en el ministerio de Salud representa también un 40 %.

En un país de 110 millones de personas, hay una situación de extrema gravedad, sobre todo entre las niñas que, si no van al colegio, tendrán posiblemente un 90 % de posibilidades de ser mutiladas.

Muchas gracias.

Hay que hacer un esfuerzo por la paz.

Malte Gallée, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, just some days ago, I asked on my social media whether people knew about what is going on in Tigray in northern Ethiopia. I think like 83% answered that they had no clue at all what is going on there. I think this is really important that we talk about this today again.

What is going on there? I think it's one of the biggest humanitarian crisis on this planet at the moment. There are some experts who talk about 500 000 deaths in the last two years already due to the war, but also because of famine and stuff like this. The Tigray region is completely isolated, like there's no way to get humanitarian aid there. There are reports of rape, of torture, of children being recruited for the army, and I think we cannot watch this.

But the conflict parties had already declared a ceasefire. So a ceasefire is possible, and I think this is something we really have to push for also as the European Union – push for a ceasefire for all the parties and also offer all the support to the African Union for the peace talks.

Patricia Chagnon, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, crise après crise, guerre après guerre, nous sommes témoins de la misère humaine et de la souffrance d'autrui. Alors que le nombre des personnes déplacées ne cesse d'être alimenté par de nouveaux conflits et que les trafiquants continuent à profiter financièrement de la misère humaine en faisant miroiter un eldorado européen et en organisant des filières lucratives d'émigration, nous savons que, pour la très grande majorité, le rêve européen ne se réalisera jamais et qu'il se termine régulièrement en cauchemar.

Une fois en Europe, les exilés se retrouvent souvent à vivre dans des conditions déplorables et inhumaines, sans travail, sans perspective d'avenir et totalement déracinés. Alors que nous sommes confrontés à la guerre au Tigré et aux ravages de cette guerre sur des enfants, force est de constater que les politiques de gestion des crises d'hier doivent être réécrites pour faire face aux crises d'aujourd'hui.

La construction de villes d'accueil – les «Asilia», comme les appelait Pacasse – près des zones touchées permettrait un déploiement rapide et efficace des moyens de secours aux populations. La santé, l'école et la formation des adultes y seraient prioritaires. La vie quotidienne dans une ville Asilia, gérée dans le cadre de partenariats internationaux, offrirait à tous la possibilité d'anticiper l'avenir: en préparant, pour la grande majorité, le retour sur les terres de leurs ancêtres; en formulant, pour d'autres, une demande d'asile ailleurs.

Alors que le nombre d'enfants déplacés et se trouvant sur la route de l'immigration fait froid dans le dos, le funeste pacte d'immigration et d'asile, que la Commission a présenté au mois de septembre 2021, fait justement de l'immigration vers l'Union européenne le cœur de son projet. Mais quelle erreur! Force est de constater que la solution des crises sur le continent africain ne se trouve pas en Europe, elle se trouve en Afrique. Une gestion de proximité intracontinentale ou intrarégionale permettrait d'éviter aux familles et aux enfants des traumatismes inutiles et les préserverait des dangers liés à l'émigration, qui dépend souvent de réseaux mafieux.

Cette effroyable crise au Tigré offre à l'Union européenne l'occasion de rompre avec sa sacralisation de l'émigration vers la distante Union européenne en mettant la proximité au cœur d'un projet politique d'aide aux populations.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, in less than a month, the conflict in Ethiopia will enter its third year. Thousands of people have lost their lives and children and women, as usual, are the first victims. We have discussed this topic dozens of times, and I believe it is time to scale up our efforts, acting in three main ways.

In the immediate term, we must guarantee humanitarian support to those in need, making sure that this aid reaches the local population. Then we must exploit this momentum, which seems favourable for the reopening negotiations. Indeed, our Union should provide all diplomatic support to the African Union without the intention to guide the process but assisting the negotiators in finding African solutions for two African problems.

And afterwards, in the medium term, we need to be on the forefront for ensuring that any peace agreement can last, providing financial and practical expertise for the retrieval of weapons that are currently in possession of combatants, especially civilians forced to embrace the arms.

Our African counterparts have created an ambitious agenda for silencing the guns. Let us show that we are on their side, not only when tragedies happen, but every day until the guns will leave space for real human development.

Udo Bullmann (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Menschen am Horn von Afrika brauchen alles, aber nicht diesen Krieg. Wir haben die Zahlen gehört. Tausende Tote sind zu beklagen, mehr als zwei Millionen Menschen haben ihre Heimat verloren. Über eine Million Kinder können nicht in die Schule gehen, werden zwangsweise zu Soldatinnen und Soldaten gemacht, haben ihre Eltern verloren. Es wird vergewaltigt, Menschen leiden, insbesondere Frauen und Kinder.

Es handelt sich um klare Verstöße gegen die Menschenrechte, die geahndet werden müssen. Und es muss dafür gesorgt werden, dass eine der schwersten Hungerkatastrophen dieser Welt gestoppt wird. Wir brauchen Frieden, der Krieg muss ein Ende finden. Und ja, die Europäische Kommission muss eine globale Kommission werden, so wie am Anfang dieses Mandats angekündigt, den Vereinten Nationen helfen, der Afrikanischen Union helfen, ihre Rolle wahrzunehmen. Wir müssen ein Faktor des Friedens und der Stabilität werden.

Samira Rafaela (Renew). – Mr President, *(off-mic)* … Ethiopia, and it was terrible, terrible to see how women are being used as a weapon of war. You often hear about it, but now we could really hear about it, see it, and we could really speak to these women. And the situation is so bad. And often we see in war and in conflict that women and girls are being used as a weapon of war. And this is why this situation needs to stop right away. And it's very important that the European Union assist and help also the women that are in danger. Their lives are at stake and we need to make sure how we can offer them essential services, how we can make sure that they have access to contraception and SOHR because their lives are at risk and this is about the perspective of many women living in Ethiopia.

So please make sure that we have services available, that we have assistance available, so that we have shelters for these vulnerable women and so that we have access to health care for these women. This is where we can now right away help women and girls in danger in Ethiopia. And this is what it really needs to be about right now, because this is about a future generation that will grow up with so many traumas, with so many problems. And I just hope that the European Union can assist in it right away.

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, prieš dvi savaites su AFET komiteto kolegomis lankėmės Etiopijoje ir savo akimis galėjome įsitikinti, kokia trapi ir įkaitusi situacija yra šioje šalyje, ypatingai Tigrėjaus, Afarijos ir Amharos regionuose. Kolegos minėjo apie tą prievartavimą, badą, skurdą, sugriautą infrastruktūrą, mokyklas, ligonines ir negalėjimą pavalgyti, lankyti mokyklos, ypač vaikams, apie vaikų įtraukimą į karinį konfliktą. Tai ką galime padaryti, kad sustabdytume šią situaciją ir ją pakeistume? Pirma, turime tiesiogiai kalbėdami su Etiopijos vadovybe, taip pat su Afrikos Sąjunga, padaryti viską, kad pasibaigtų karinė intervencija iš išorės. Antra, kad Etiopijos konfliktuojančios šalys rastų būdą susėsti ir derybų keliu išspręsti konfliktą. Ir trečia, kad humanitarinė pagalba, kurią mes teikiame, pasiektų tuos, kuriems jos labiausiai reikia, tai yra vaikus ir moteris. Ir ketvirta, kad tie, kurie atsakingi už karo nusikaltimus, būtų nubausti.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, this is undoubtedly a human catastrophe of proportions that we don't actually really know. Thirteen million people, at least, in need of humanitarian assistance in northern Ethiopia, according to the World Food Programme. Estimates of maybe 100 000 through direct killings; deaths from hunger – maybe 200 000; maybe half a million from lack of healthcare.

But what we do know is that the Tigray region is witnessing a complete weaponisation by the Ethiopian Government of all basic services such as water, electricity, communication, and even access to bank accounts. This is collective punishment. We know that for two years the region has been under siege by the Ethiopian army, aligned with the Eritrean forces to settle scores against the Tigrayans, who in their time were pretty violent themselves as well.

But it's the ordinary people of Tigray, Afar and Amhara who are bearing the brunt of this military engagement. I agree with colleagues that now the entire Ethiopian population is affected. We must concentrate on a peace agreement, the ceasefire and the restoration of living conditions in the affected areas in this noble country that was never fully colonised.

(Ukončenie vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, thank you for bringing the situation in Ethiopia back to the agenda. The situation in Tigray is one of the worst man-made humanitarian crises in the world. According the World Food Programme 13 million people across the Tigray, Afar and Amhara regions are in need of food assistance as a direct result of the conflict. At the same time, Ethiopia is experiencing the most severe drought recorded since 1981, leaving an estimated 7.4 million people facing grave food insecurity.

The European Union has so far allocated around EUR 66 million in humanitarian aid to Ethiopia in 2022. The resumption of fighting severely hampers even more humanitarian aid delivery in northern Ethiopia. The supply of humanitarian commodities and fuel, as well as cash availability and public services, are still totally blocked for Tigray and greatly impeded in all affected areas in Amhara and Afar.

Humanitarian organisations had to suspend their operations and withdraw some staff from conflict-affected areas. This is a serious blow to humanitarian operations and to millions of highly vulnerable people in Tigray, Afar and Amhara that depend on humanitarian aid for their survival.

There is only one solution to improve this situation, and this solution is political, not military. This is why the European Union calls on all warring parties to stop fighting and engage in negotiations. We cannot impose from the outside and we will continue engaging with like-minded partners to support an African solution to this African crisis so as to prevent further human suffering and further regionalisation of the conflict.

The European Union recalls that granting unhindered access to humanitarian organisations so that they can reach all people in need, in line with the principles of impartiality, neutrality and independence is an obligation under international humanitarian law. It is not an option. It is an obligation. So it is the duty of all parties to the conflict to ensure the safety and security of civilians, humanitarian workers and humanitarian assets, notably by strict application of the principles of precaution and distinction in the conduct of hostilities.

The European Union is also appalled by the gravity and scale of human rights violations and abuses perpetrated by all parties to the conflict since its beginning. Those allegations must be investigated and accountability ensured. There will be no durable peace, no reconciliation without justice for the victims.

The European Union will present a resolution at the Human Rights Council renewing the mandate of the International Commission of Human Rights Experts on Ethiopia to allow for further comprehensive, independent and transparent investigations and an accountability mechanism to complement national efforts.

The European Union does not forget the people of Tigray and those suffering from this man-made crisis. Two years have passed since the start of the conflict. There is no more time to lose.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa týmto skončila. Hlasovanie sa uskutoční zajtra.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Caterina Chinnici (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Parallelamente alla drammatica guerra in corso ormai da sette mesi in Ucraina, in questi giorni, in Etiopia, nel silenzio della stampa internazionale, si sta consumando un'altra drammatica guerra, le cui prime vittime sono, come sempre, i più fragili, i bambini!

Una guerra dimenticata che da quando è scoppiata, nel novembre 2020, ha provocato 2,2 milioni di follati e la morte di quasi un milione di persone, trasformando la regione del Corno d'Africa in teatro di crimini atroci. Massacri, stupri, bombardamenti, unitamente alla siccità e al blocco imposto dal governo di Addis Abeba agli aiuti umanitari internazionali, cibo e medicinali, che non riescono ad arrivare alla popolazione ormai stremata, stanno provocando una terribile carestia!

Secondo l'ONU, nella regione etiope del Tigrai, un bambino su tre sotto i cinque anni è malnutrito, il che comporta una probabilità di morte di 12 volte superiore rispetto a bambini ben nutriti! L'Unione europea, con la Strategia dell'UE sui diritti dei minori, ha chiaramente riaffermato il suo impegno a tutelare i diritti umani dei bambini, in tutto il mondo, non solo all'interno dei propri confini! Necessario ed urgente, pertanto, moltiplicare gli sforzi diplomatici ed umanitari per garantire il primario diritto alla vita dei bambini del Tigrai!

György Hölvényi (PPE), *írásban*. – Majdnem két éve annak, hogy Etiópia szövetségi kormánya háborút indított Tigrében. Mindezt alig egy évvel azután, hogy Abij miniszterelnököt béke Nobel-díjjal tüntették ki. Azóta a háború következtében a térség mély humanitárius válságba süllyedt. A Világélelmezési Program becslései szerint Etiópia északi részén több mint 13 millió ember szorul humanitárius segítségre. A Bizottság erőfeszítéseinek eredményeként sikerült ugyan korlátozott keretek között segélyszállítmányokat célba juttatni, azonban továbbra is ötmillió embert fenyeget éhezés. A konfliktusban aktív részt vállaló eritreai csapatok kivonásáról szóló nyilatkozatok sem találtak meghallgatásra.

Brutális háború zajlik, amelyet kezdettől fogva tömegmészárlások, vallási helyszínek elleni támadások, nők és gyermekek elleni erőszak, valamint a kulturális örökség elpusztítása jellemez. A harcok és az éhínség eddig mintegy félmillió ember halálát követelték, köztük hétszáz civil életét is, akiket az összecsapások első hónapjában, 2020 november az akszúmi Sioni Mária-templomnál mészároltak le. Ismerjük fel, hogy az eddigi uniós erőfeszítések nem jártak sikerrel. Helyi egyházi tisztviselők jelentései szerint „a polgári lakosság helyzete Tigrében drámai, és a konfliktus kezdete óta most a legrosszabb".

Mit tehetünk? Az unió egymagában nem lesz képes elérni, hogy a szembenálló felek tárgyalóasztalhoz üljenek, éppen ezért szorosabb és jobban összehangolt együttműködésre van szükség, nemcsak a nemzetközi szervezetekkel, hanem a regionális partnerekkel, így az Afrikai Unióval és a térség államaival is.

14. Nizozemský skandál s přídavky na děti, institucionální rasismus a algoritmy (rozprava)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je otázka na ústne zodpovedanie Komisii Holandský škandál s príspevkom na starostlivosť o dieťa, inštitucionálny rasizmus a algoritmy (O-000028/2022 - B9-0025/22).

Samira Rafaela, *Auteur.* – Voorzitter, "Kijk!" zegt mijn vriendin, en ze laat mij dit certificaat zien. Er staat: "U bent geen fraudeur" en er worden excuses aangeboden. Haar dromen heeft ze moeten bijstellen, omdat ze in gevecht raakte met een systeem dat haar menselijke waardigheid ontnam. En nu een certificaat, maar het herstelproces loopt vast. Ik ben opgelucht dat we nu eindelijk de impact van de toeslagenaffaire bespreken hier.

Commissaris, ik weet dat u zich ongemakkelijk gaat voelen bij de vragen die ik nu ga presenteren, maar ik vraag u vanuit uw Europese zorgplicht een waardig antwoord te geven. Wat heeft de Commissie gedaan aan deze duidelijke schending van de grondrechten van EU-burgers die het inleiden van de inbreukprocedure rechtvaardigen? Hoe heeft de Commissie deze kwestie aangepakt, gezien het EU-actieplan voor racismebestrijding en aangezien zij structureel racisme erkent? Hoe zal de Commissie toezicht houden op het proces van schadevergoeding en juridische bijstand voor de slachtoffers? Nu weet ik dat de Commissie wellicht zal stellen dat dit de competentie van de lidstaat is, maar deze wijze van het schenden van fundamentele rechten raakt ook het internationale recht, vooral gezien het feit dat de Nederlandse Belastingdienst zich niet aan wetten hield. Hoe past dit in een rechtsstaat en hoe kan dat zonder consequenties blijven, commissaris?

De Belastingdienst van Nederland maakte gebruik van algoritmes als onderdeel van risicoprofilering om fraude te detecteren. Maar dit systeem sloeg door. Tienduizenden ouders verloren hun werk, eigendommen en toekomstperspectief en belandden in de schulden. En die ouders werd de mogelijkheid ontnomen om volwaardige en toegewijde zorg te geven aan hun kinderen. Duizenden kinderen. Hier moeten we Europa bewust van maken. Als systemen het overnemen, is de menselijke maat verloren. Het algoritme koos vooral ouders met een niet-westerse achtergrond. Dit is institutioneel racisme en is voor een deel ook volmondig door de Nederlandse regering erkend. Daarom roep ik op tot een moratorium op het gebruik van deze wijze van profileren.

Commissaris, zorg ervoor dat deze praktijk per direct stopt, want anders kan ik u garanderen dat de Nederlandse toeslagenaffaire niet op zichzelf staat in Europa. Neem dus uw verantwoordelijkheid hierin, voor een nieuwe generatie in Europa.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, honourable Members, discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin is prohibited in the European Union. Yet the European Agency for Fundamental Rights' second EU minorities and discrimination survey indicates that one in four respondents felt discriminated against because of their minority racial or ethnic background. To address this, in September 2020, the Commission adopted a new anti-racism action plan. This action plan includes concrete measures to prevent and tackle racial discrimination, enforce EU equality legislation and improve data collection.

Importantly, the anti-racism action plan acknowledges the structural dimension of racial discrimination. Racism is indeed not only perpetrated by individuals, but can also be perpetrated by society's institutions. Structural racism can be embedded in social, financial and political structures and processes, affecting the levers of power and policymaking. We must therefore prevent racism through legislative means, as well as policy measures, addressing social attitudes, stereotypes and economic concerns.

Following the EU anti-racism action plan, Member States are invited to develop national action plans against racism and racial discrimination by the end of this year. A group of anti-racism experts nominated by Member States has already drafted the guiding principles for national action plans against racism and racial discrimination with the support of the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights. This development is important, as the guidelines elaborate ways in which anti-racism measures can be implemented successfully in different areas of life.

The next task of the subgroup includes drafting a monitoring checklist for the implementation of the Common Guiding Principles, as well as the creation of a compendium of good practices by the end of this year.

A workshop on structural racism with the participation of national anti-racism experts is planned for this coming November. It will deliver a conclusions paper on structural racism, including recommendations for national authorities. Moreover, the report on the application of the Racial Equality Directive of March 2021 concluded that Member States must provide greater attention to the implementation of the directive in relation to protection against victimisation and the application of effective, proportionate and dissuasive sanctions. National equality bodies across Europe are essential for ensuring that individuals and groups facing discrimination can enjoy their rights in full.

We are currently preparing new legislation to strengthen equality bodies, to be presented before the end of this year. The new standards will cover, amongst others, the equality bodies' mandate, their powers, independence and their resources.

The events that happened in the Netherlands, and any institutional racism or discrimination by the Dutch authorities in this context should be pursued in national courts and before the national authorities which are competent to assess all facts and circumstances, considering domestic law, including national legislation transposing EU law. The scandal revealed the risk of ethnic profiling following the gathering, storing and use of data on personal characteristics and background.

Therefore, it is critical that such data is protected against misuse and is used exclusively for equality outcomes with fundamental rights and data protection legislation informing the process of its gathering and storing.

The Commission services understand from the exchanges and from the information received that the racial profiling in question has ceased and that national reflection is currently ongoing. We understand that the investigations are also ongoing and compensation is being granted. However, the Commission will continue to monitor the development of the Dutch childcare benefit scandal closely.

The issue has been raised in the rule of law report of both 2021 and 2022. And in the 2022 edition the Commission recommended to continue efforts to ensure a comprehensive follow-up to the childcare allowances affair to address the potential structural issues involving all relevant state authorities.

Following the adoption of the EU anti-racism action plan, the Netherlands appointed a national coordinator on anti-racism and non-discrimination in October 2021. I hope that this appointment, as well as the preparation of the Dutch action plan against racism and racial discrimination, will step up efforts in the fight against any institutional racism in the Netherlands, not least with regard to the gathering, storing and use of personal data.

Peter Pollák, *za skupinu PPE.* – Vážený pán predsedajúci, v časoch pandémie, ktorá najviac postihla práve zraniteľné skupiny, akými sú deti najmä zo sociálne slabších rodín, holandské daňové úrady neprávom obvinili rodičov s takzvaným rizikovým profilom z neoprávneného poberania prídavkov na deti. Nešlo o malý počet ľudí, ale o 20 tisíc nespravodlivo obvinených rodičov, ktorí sa vinou bezohľadného a nezodpovedného prístupu zo strany štátu dostali na pokraj bankrotu. Vážení priatelia, bol to inštitucionálny rasizmus. Áno, vážení kolegovia. Škandál v Holandsku je porušením právneho štátu a inštitucionálnym rasizmom. Čo však mňa osobne zaráža, inštitucionálny rasizmus v dnešnej dobe nemusí mať žiadne spoločenské ani politické dôsledky. Príkladom toho je práve tento prípad. Napríklad v mojej krajine na Slovensku sa napriek mnohým upozorneniam a medializácii stretávam s prípadmi, kde sú rómske deti neoprávnene zaraďované do tzv. špeciálnych škôl, resp. škôl pre mentálne postihnutých, a to napriek tomu, že sú zdravé. Áno, rovnako ide o inštutucionálny rasizmus. Nestačí, vážení priatelia, len konštatovať, ale treba naozaj v týchto prípadoch konať. Preto vyzývam v podstate Európsku komisiu, ale aj členské štáty, aby sme urýchlene našli dostatok prostriedkov, aby sa obdobné prípady nikdy nemohli opakovať. Obeťami sú nevinní ľudia, ktorí len vďaka farbe pleti a príslušnosti k nejakej etnickej menšine trpia kvôli tomu, že niekomu sa nepáči, že sú inej farby pleti alebo iní ako majoritní obyvatelia.

Agnes Jongerius, *namens de S&D-Fractie.* – Voorzitter, verscheurde gezinnen en uit huis geplaatste kinderen. Er zijn meer dan 25 000 slachtoffers en de teller loopt nog steeds op. "Zo hadden we het niet bedoeld" heet een boek over het toeslagenschandaal, maar eigenlijk blijkt uit alles dat dit precies was wat bedoeld was. Terwijl we weten dat de rechtsstaat er is om de zwakkeren te beschermen, niet om wantrouwen te voeden. Terwijl we vinden dat er voor racisme geen enkele ruimte mag zijn. We moeten daar altijd tegen opstaan – ik zal daar altijd tegen opstaan. Maar de oorzaak van dit schandaal is duidelijk: het gaat over discriminatie op basis van nationaliteit. We mogen deze ongemakkelijke waarheid niet onder het tapijt schuiven. Daarom, mevrouw de commissaris, denk ik dat u ook op Europees niveau meer kan doen dan dat er nu gebeurt.

Mijn eerste vraag is: bent u het met mij eens dat we het gebruik door overheden van algoritmes die de dubbele nationaliteit verwerken, moeten verbieden? Dat kan bijvoorbeeld via de Europese AI-verordening waar op dit moment aan gewerkt wordt. Het lijkt mij iets waar de commissaris een uitspraak over zou kunnen doen.

Ten tweede: de compensatie laat nog veel te lang op zich wachten voor heel veel slachtoffers. Wat deze ouders en kinderen is overkomen, is ook in strijd met punt 11 van de Europese pijler van sociale rechten. Het is mooi dat het toeslagenschandaal genoemd wordt in het rechtsstaatverslag, maar ik zou willen dat u zich ook uitspreekt voor snellere compensatie voor ouders en kinderen, nu.

Salima Yenbou, *au nom du groupe Renew.* – Monsieur le Président, deux points. Premièrement, le racisme, ce fléau laissé à l'exploitation des extrêmes droites. En septembre 2021, la Commission a dévoilé un plan d'action pour lutter contre le racisme. On a vu le plan, pas les actions. Madame Dalli, c'est pour quand les vraies actions? Deuxièmement, le racisme institutionnel et systématique causé ou renforcé par des algorithmes et le profilage ethnique. J'ai alerté avec des collègues, en vain, sur ces risques. La dignité humaine est-telle ce que nous sacrifions sur l'autel du progrès technologique?

Aux Pays-Bas, nos craintes et votre inaction se sont concrétisées. Un profilage ethnique basé sur les noms d'origine étrangère a provoqué de fausses accusations de fraude aux allocations familiales contre des milliers de familles qui se sont endettées, sont tombées dans la pauvreté ou ont perdu leur emploi, leur maison, sans compter les 1 000 enfants retirés à leur famille.

Que va faire la Commission pour que les Pays-Bas réparent vite ce qui peut l'être encore et compensent l'irréparable et que ça ne se reproduise plus? Je demande ici simplement le respect de l'état de droit en Europe pour tous, indépendamment de l'origine de leur nom, la couleur de leur peau ou leur croyance affichée ou supposée.

Kim Van Sparrentak, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie.* – Voorzitter, algoritmen doen precies wat ze moeten doen, en dat is gevaarlijk. Stel je voor: een belastingdienst krijgt van de regering de opdracht om fraude keihard aan te pakken en dit moet zo efficiënt mogelijk door middel van automatisering. Volgens de belastingdienst is het het meest efficiënt om mensen met een laag inkomen of migratieachtergrond aan te pakken. Op basis daarvan besluit de dienst zo'n algoritme te bouwen. En dit algoritme doet precies wat het moet doen. Het vindt zogenaamde fraudeurs, met name met een migratieachtergrond of een laag inkomen.

Zo verwoestte de Nederlandse regering de levens van 70 000 kinderen en hun ouders. Niemand kon hun ouders uitleggen wat er aan de hand was of waarom er bepaalde beslissingen gemaakt werden. Ambtenaren volgden blind de computers, want algoritmen zullen wel gelijk hebben.

Een belangrijke les uit het toeslagenschandaal is dat digitalisering zonder normen en regels levensverwoestende gevolgen kan hebben. Gelukkig zien wij dit in Europa in. Met de eerste AI-wet ter wereld wil ik ervoor zorgen dat er nooit meer een nieuwe toeslagenaffaire kan gebeuren, maar dan moeten we wel door durven pakken.

Als onderhandelaar voor de AI-verordening zet ik me in voor het versterken van mensenrechten bij het gebruik van algoritmen. We moeten het gebruik van algoritmen om mensen aan te merken als crimineel of fraudeur op basis van hun persoonsgegevens verbieden. We moeten ervoor zorgen dat systemen niet discrimineren. We moeten een mensenrechtentoets invoeren, zodat er verplicht gekeken moet worden naar hoe we algoritmen inzetten. Mensen verdienen transparantie en de systemen moeten zo ontworpen worden dat we kunnen zien wat er misgaat. En mensen mogen nooit, nooit meer met lege handen staan tegenover een computer, met een sterk recht op uitleg en verplicht menselijk toezicht. Laten we uit dit vreselijke schandaal lessen trekken en nu met ambitieuze regels ingrijpen.

Patricia Chagnon, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, une fois encore le gouvernement d'un État membre de l'Union européenne est au cœur d'un scandale. La prise illégale d'intérêts semble devenue pratique courante chez une vaste caste des dirigeants politiques qui se croient au-dessus des lois et investis par une idéologie quasi religieuse.

Le mépris des peuples s'accentue, en parallèle. Les hommes sont réduits à être des variables interchangeables de production et de consommation. Alors que l'Union est si prompte à critiquer, voire à condamner les récalcitrants à son idéologie «immigrationniste» ou de son impérialisme «woke». Bizarrement, quand cela concerne l'un des siens, un silence assourdissant règne dans les couloirs et les salles de presse de ces pompeuses institutions.

Quand les droits fondamentaux sont interprétés selon la qualité des personnes, quand la fonction des institutions élues et des représentants légitimes des peuples se limite à commenter les décisions prises dans des bureaux feutrés aux portes insonorisées, la démocratie est menacée.

Les peuples ne sont pas dupes de cette démocratie de façade. La Hongrie, la Suède, l'Italie: autant d'exemples récents, autour de nous, de peuples qui ont entamé le sursaut démocratique contre la caste impérialiste bruxelloise et leurs représentants complices dans les parlements nationaux.

L'Europe de demain sera l'Europe des peuples libres et des nations souveraines. Nous sommes en train de vivre le changement de cette époque, si enthousiasmant qu'aucune tentation totalitaire ne saurait l'arrêter.

Michiel Hoogeveen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, in het Europees Parlement gaat het regelmatig over *rule of law*, het functioneren van de rechtsstaat. Volgens zelfverklaard EU-bekeerling en VVD-premier Mark Rutte is de EU niet alleen een markt, maar ook een waardengemeenschap. De premier staat met zijn kritiek op Polen en Hongarije dan ook vaak vooraan. Maar vandaag gaat het over zijn rechtsstaat, over Nederland, over de toeslagenaffaire. Wij van JA21 feliciteren D66 als regeringspartij en de Partij van de Arbeid als verantwoordelijk oud-regeringspartij dat zij het in het Europees Parlement aandurven om hun eigen bewindvoerders en partijgenoten op hun verantwoordelijkheid aan te spreken.

De toeslagenaffaire is een schandvlek in de geschiedenis van de Nederlandse rechtsstaat. Op een kafkaëske wijze zijn Nederlandse gezinnen door de eigen Belastingdienst financieel kapotgemaakt. En het erge is: al in 2017 werd dit binnen de Belastingdienst opgemerkt. En na lang ontkennen werd duidelijk dat topambtenaren op het ministerie al lang van deze misstanden wisten. In plaats van te kiezen voor openheid, koos de Nederlandse overheid ervoor om deze zaak te doen verdwijnen in de doofpot.

Premier Rutte neemt graag andere EU-lidstaten de maat over het functioneren van hun rechtsstaat. In plaats van de splinter in het oog van andere landen te zien, kan hij beter kijken naar de balk in het oog van hemzelf.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de The Left-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, een kerntaak van de overheid is het beschermen van het individu tegen de macht van de meerderheid. De Nederlandse overheid heeft daarin gefaald. Dat is hartverscheurend voor al die duizenden ouders en kinderen die geconfronteerd werden met zware financiële en emotionele schade. Het resulteert er ook in dat burgers de overheid niet meer vertrouwen.

Dit vertrouwen kan alleen terugkeren wanneer de overheid haar eigen fouten erkent en de gevolgen van deze fouten ruimhartig en snel herstelt. Maar dat gaat over meer dan schadeherstel. De overheid moet ook de principes van *restorative justice* toepassen. Dat betekent: het daderschap erkennen en voelen wat je hebt aangericht. Pas dan kan gezamenlijk en in gelijkwaardigheid met de slachtoffers aan herstel worden gewerkt.

Dit hele schandaal is het gevolg van een verzakelijkte neoliberale overheid die zichzelf kapot heeft bezuinigd. Het resultaat was een ambtelijk apparaat dat moest bezuinigen en tegelijkertijd zwaar moest focussen op de aanpak van fraude. Het is ook het gevolg van de "metaversering" van deze overheid. Het overal toepassen van algoritmes en kunstmatige intelligentie brengt grote risico's met zich mee. Computers passen geen mensenrechten toe. Zij nemen het institutioneel racisme, dat helaas nog sterk aanwezig is in Europa, gewoon over in hun algoritmes.

Ik wil graag weten: wat gaat de Commissie met deze belangrijke lessen doen? Hoe voorkomt zij een toeslagenaffaire in haar eigen huis? Want ik zie daar geen enkele waarborg voor.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, nizozemská vláda poprvé v květnu letošního roku veřejně přiznala, že hlavní příčinou skandálu s přídavky na děti byl právě institucionální rasismus. A v důsledku skandálu podala nizozemská vláda demisi. Nizozemská daňová a celní správa sestavovala rizikové profily osob žádajících o přídavky na děti pomocí algoritmů na cize znějící jména a dvojí občanství. A tato praxe vedla k tomu, že byly tisíce rodin s nízkými a středními příjmy podrobeny kontrole, neprávem obviněny z podvodu a vyzvány, aby vrátily zcela zákonně získané přídavky. Já chápu boj proti podvodům, proti neoprávněnému čerpání a zneužívání sociálního systému, ale aby se v 21. století používaly algoritmy, které vedou k rasovému profilování, to je zcela nepřijatelná praxe.

Jsem rád za vystoupení paní komisařky v této věci. Jednoznačné volání po odškodnění obětí je nepochybné. Myslím si, že by bylo dobré, aby paní komisařka ještě přesně řekla, jak hodlá monitorovat Komise proces odškodnění a zjednání nápravy v případě občanů, kteří na skandálu s přídavky utrpěli konkrétní újmu. A je důležité sdělit rovněž, že za posledních šest let bylo sociálními pracovníky odebráno z domova 1 675 dětí. To představuje nárůst o 520 dětí a doposud se 555 dětí na konci loňského roku ještě nevrátilo, jsou nadále v náhradní ústavní péči. Takový skandál je ve 21. století skutečně nepřijatelný.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Mr President, this was racism embodied – racist when it goes from words to actions not by one person or a group, but structural and institutionalised. The Dutch childcare benefit scandal is a frightening example that reveals deep-rooted prejudice in our Union. The enormous consequence that the Dutch tax authority's illegal, artificial intelligence-driven racial profiling had on them and how it impacted their lives is terrifying. Families ended up in poverty. Some lost their homes and some lost their jobs because of prejudice.

This is not George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, even though one may think so since some seem to be more equal than others in our Union. But some of the affected are not any more with us to witness today, as this scandal has led to suicides. Racism deprives people of their possibility to live a decent life, and society of the possibility to take good advantage of every and each citizen's competence. In its worst form, racism kills.

I am standing here today as the rapporteur for the report on racial justice, non-discrimination and anti-racism in the EU, which will be voted on in the LIBE Committee on Monday. In the report, we call on the EU to urgently move from words to actions in the fight against racism. We also highlight the importance of ensuring that necessary safeguards for fundamental rights and freedoms of data are in place for the use of AI tools.

Every corner in our Union must be a safe space for all our people. The colour of our skin, our birthplace, our name, our hair colour – none of it should ever shape our possibility to fulfil our dreams and should never, ever deprive us of becoming full and respected citizens in our Member States and of our Union.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, un algorithme – oui, un algorithme! – a décidé que des aides sociales destinées à des enfants défavorisés devaient être retirées à des foyers précaires puis remboursées. Cette décision touche des personnes racisées, suspectées de fraude sur la base de leur couleur de peau – non blanche. Il ne s'agit pas là du régime des scores sociaux chinois, il s'agit de l'œuvre du gouvernement néerlandais, qui a essayé d'étouffer l'affaire durant des mois.

Combien de fois faudra-t-il répéter que les algorithmes et les décisions automatisées présentent des risques pour les droits fondamentaux, particulièrement pour les personnes racisées et pour les personnes précaires? Mes collègues ont parlé de ces risques et du racisme institutionnel, mais nous devons aussi parler du contrôle et de la régulation des autorités publiques nationales et européennes, qui violent délibérément la protection des données dans une forme d'apathie générale. Des aides retirées à des personnes de couleur aux Pays-Bas, des données sur l'orientation sexuelle ou la religion des personnes qui se présentent à nos frontières collectées par Frontex, la collecte massive et indiscriminée de données de police par Europol: mais où cela s'arrêtera-t-il?

Les autorités publiques ont un rôle d'exemplarité à assurer, et la Commission doit réagir en cas de violation des droits fondamentaux et du droit européen. Chers collègues, les négociations en cours sur l'intelligence artificielle nous donnent la possibilité de mettre les nécessaires lignes rouges en place dès maintenant.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left). – Señor presidente, en las últimas décadas se ha pasado de la promesa de futuro que suponía la emancipación digital a una especie de nueva civilización basada en la organización algorítmica de la sociedad. Empresas y administraciones de todo el mundo se esconden tras una mente tecnológica para que sus decisiones sean más objetivas y eficientes. Pero en esa mente anidan los prejuicios y las aberraciones que pretenden ocultar.

Las máquinas que nosotros mismos creamos no son mejores que nosotros, porque la mayoría de los datos de los que disponen están sesgados y reproducen patrones discriminatorios de los que nadie suele hacerse responsable. La policía predictiva, la asignación de ayudas sociales o la recogida de datos biométricos, por ejemplo, están racializadas y la discriminación estructural que generan obstaculiza el acceso de ciertas personas a derechos, bienes y servicios. La inteligencia artificial refuerza el lugar privilegiado de los blancos y margina a negros y gitanos, por ejemplo, de manera que desempeña un papel clave en las relaciones de poder. Tras una apariencia de neutralidad desde el punto de vista de las máquinas, hay personas a las que se persigue por lo que son y no por lo que hacen, aunque buena parte de ellas ni lo sabe ni sabría señalar a un culpable.

Es evidente que de todo esto podría hacerse un buen uso, pero en Europa no tenemos los instrumentos para exigirlo. Desde el Parlamento hemos pedido muchas medidas: incorporar el enfoque interseccional en los algoritmos, recopilar datos desglosados por origen racial y étnico, prohibir los perfiles raciales, realizar estudios de impacto de derechos humanos, implementar controles de conformidad y supervisión humana o rendir cuentas.

Con todo, seguimos corriendo todavía detrás de nuestra propia sombra.

Alexandra Geese (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, the Dutch childcare benefit scandal epitomises what the former UN Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Philip Alston, calls a digital welfare dystopia. It specifically targets poorer citizens rather than rich people evading taxes, where in case of fraud, the sums to recover would be much higher. The system is racist. There is no simple redress and the system targets people who can't afford to – or are unlikely to – go to court. The principle of innocent until proven guilty is overturned. Innocent people are treated like criminals. Fundamental principles of the rule of law are overturned.

Artificial intelligence systems targeting people need very, very strong safeguards and these safeguards are currently not provided by the AI Act. And here we need to change, we need to improve the AI Act. And furthermore, public administrations should support low-income citizens rather than harassing them and giving millions to big-tech companies to build what Virginia Eubanks calls The Digital Poorhouse.

Romeo Franz (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Tausende Familien wurden in den Niederlanden zwischen 2013 und 2019 zu Unrecht des Betrugs bezichtigt. Viele Familien verschuldeten sich, und Kinder wurden ihren Eltern weggenommen.

Der Grund dafür sind ein tief sitzender Rassismus und Vorurteile, mit denen man ganz bewusst die Algorithmen gefüttert hat. Ich kann mit den Betroffenen sehr gut mitfühlen, da Menschen mit Romanes-Hintergrund zu den am meisten marginalisierten Gruppen in Europa gehören und der Antiziganismus wieder auf dem Vormarsch ist.

Es ist wichtig, dass wir im Nachgang zu solchen Stigmatisierungen auch Antworten haben, die in die Zeit passen. Daher habe ich mich im Rassismusbericht, den wir im Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres bearbeiten, auch dafür stark gemacht, dass die Gefahren von künstlicher Intelligenz und Algorithmen zwingend berücksichtigt werden müssen.

Rassismus lässt sich nicht mit Empfehlungen bekämpfen. Wir brauchen dazu die Kraft des Gesetzes, um Menschen vor Rassismus zu schützen.

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire Dalli, l'affaire des allocations familiales est, par son ampleur, un scandale raciste sans précédent. Des milliers de familles ont été accusées de fraude par l'administration fiscale. Les familles migrantes, africaines ou noires, ont été poursuivies par les autorités, qui ont exigé le remboursement immédiat des allocations que ces familles avaient perçues en toute légalité. De nombreuses familles n'ont pas pu supporter d'être taxées de fraudeuses par l'État et se sont suicidées de désespoir au vu de l'ampleur de leur dette, d'autres familles ont éclaté, et plus de 1000 enfants ont été placés sous la garde de l'État.

Le gouvernement néerlandais a accepté d'utiliser des algorithmes racistes, qui indiquaient des noms à consonance étrangère ou une double nationalité comme indicateur de fraude. Il a dû admettre que ce qui était déclaré comme une politique stricte de lutte contre la fraude n'était rien d'autre que du racisme institutionnel, de la discrimination au profilage racial.

Cela est inacceptable. Les valeurs fondamentales de l'Union européenne, des droits de l'homme, des droits de nos concitoyens ont été violées, et la cause en est: le racisme. Que va faire l'Union européenne? Va-t-elle en tirer les conséquences et tenir sa promesse, celle de lutter contre le racisme institutionnel sur l'ensemble de son territoire? Qu'en est-il du plan d'action que nous avons voté? Qu'a fait le gouvernement néerlandais et que va faire la Commission afin que l'état de droit s'applique à tous, indépendamment de la couleur de peau?

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Malik Azmani (Renew). – Voorzitter, laat me helder en duidelijk zijn: dit is een grote zaak die in Nederland heeft plaatsgevonden, iets wat betreurenswaardig is, wat dieptriest is, en waar de regering ook zijn verantwoordelijkheid voor heeft genomen door op te stappen. De Nederlandse regering probeerde lessen te trekken, en inderdaad, de compensatie moet zo snel mogelijk gedaan worden voor hen die hierdoor zijn geslachtofferd.

Maar de vraag die is gesteld aan de commissaris: we kunnen wachten op een AI-wet en het een en ander daarin regelen, maar wat doet deze commissaris op dit moment om te voorkomen – iets waar Nederland al de lessen uit heeft getrokken – dat in de andere lidstaten op dit moment ook gebruik wordt gemaakt van systemen waarin risicoprofilering plaatsvindt op basis van etniciteit, op basis van afkomst? Wat doet de Commissie op dit moment om dat te voorkomen?

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, het is goed dat we ook hier in het Europees Parlement aandacht besteden aan de toeslagenaffaire, want wat er gebeurd is, is natuurlijk schandalig. De overheid moet een schild der zwakken zijn, maar de overheid – de Nederlandse overheid – deed precies het tegenovergestelde. Burgers werden in grote financiële problemen gebracht, gediscrimineerd. Kinderen werden uit huis geplaatst. En de ellende duurt nog steeds voort.

De functie van dit debat is wat mij betreft vooral om aan andere landen te laten zien hoe het niet moet, en vooral ook om bij te dragen aan een stuk bewustwording. Bewustwording over hoe het ook bij overheidsorganen heel gemakkelijk, heel fout, fundamenteel fout kan gaan. De overheid moet betrouwbaar zijn, en dat vraagt een blijvende investering van ons allen.

(Ukončenie vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, as mentioned in the chapter on the Netherlands of the 2021 rule of law report, the parliamentary investigation report into the childcare allowance affair called on all state powers to reflect on how to prevent such situations for the future.

Meanwhile, the Venice Commission has issued its opinion on the request of the Dutch Parliament, making a number of recommendations and finding that it appears that, eventually, the rule of law mechanisms in the Netherlands did work. We note, furthermore, that a full parliamentary inquiry will further investigate the affair, with hearings planned in early 2023. The Commission will continue to closely monitor the developments, including in the context of its annual rule of law report, and the next edition of the report is scheduled for adoption.

With regard to compensation, we note that efforts by government to provide financial compensation to the victims of the affair are ongoing and that a comprehensive mapping is being conducted of areas in which legislation may cause undue results for citizens.

Furthermore, the judicial branch is also contributing to the follow-up to the childcare allowances affair. For instance, through the self-reflection process of the Council of State and the active role taken by the Council for the Judiciary, calling for a permanent dialogue between the different state powers.

We note, furthermore, that a full parliamentary inquiry will further investigate the affair, and of course, the Commission will continue to monitor all these developments, including, of course, the context of its annual rule of law report.

I reiterate that the European Commission and myself, as Commissioner for Equality, will continue to follow these developments in the Netherlands and will continue supporting the efforts of all Member States to deliver an anti-racist European Union. Any form of structural discrimination and racism, be it through algorithms or not, is plain wrong and not acceptable for us.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa týmto skončila.

15. Vysvětlení hlasování

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je vysvetlenie hlasovaní.

15.1. Vnější rozměr lidského práva na přístup k vodě (A9-0231/2022 – Miguel Urbán Crespo)

Chris MacManus (The Left). – A Uachtaráin, votáil mé i bhfabhar na tuairisce seo mar gheall go gcreidim gur ábhar chearta an duine é an t-uisce. Chuir an tuairisc seo béim ar an bhfíric gur leas poiblí atá fíorthábhachtach do shaol an duine é an t-uisce, agus ní earra é atá ann chun brabús a dhéanamh. Is cuma cén áit sa domhain a bhfuil tú. Ba cheart go mbeadh uisce glan agus sábháilte ar fáil do gach duine.

15.2. Reakce EU na zvyšování cen energií v Evropě (RC-B9-0416/2022, B9-0416/2022, B9-0417/2022, B9-0418/2022, B9-0419/2022, B9-0420/2022, B9-0421/2022, B9-0422/2022)

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, this is a very important file, and it has real, tangible repercussions for citizens across Europe. I voted in favour of the potential cap on gas without being prescriptive. And I think it's very important that the Commission comes forward with deep, meaningful proposals that make an assessment on the risks and the opportunities around the price cap.

The first thing we have to do is to ensure that we have certainty going forward in terms of energy security and the cost of electricity across the entirety of the European Union. But equally, we have to be conscious that as we speak here and as we face a winter, across Ukraine people are dying because the real oppressor in all of this, the real person who's causing the difficulties with regard to citizens, the cost of fuel, the cost of living, the cost electricity is Vladimir Putin himself.

So whatever we do, we must ensure that we have strong unity of purpose, sanctions hit Russia, and that we try to alleviate the pressures on European citizens by ensuring that we have a cap on gas that reduces the cost of electricity and energy across the European Union.

Manon Aubry (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, avec cette résolution un nouveau mot fait son entrée dans le dictionnaire européen: *superprofit*. J'ai envie de dire: enfin! *Enfin*, car nous avons des ministres, comme Bruno Le Maire, qui refusent toujours d'admettre que des multinationales profitent de la crise. Enfin une victoire culturelle majeure, alors que notre groupe était bien seul à se battre pour mettre ces dernières à contribution.

Mais, je vous le dis, nous ne sommes pas dupes. Rien ne sert de reprendre nos mots si vous les videz de leur contenu. Non, ce n'est pas une taxe sur les superprofits si elle ne couvre pas tous les profiteurs, tels que LVMH, la BNP ou CMA CGM. Et non, ce n'est pas non plus une taxe sur les superprofits si elle ne s'applique pas dès 2022, année où les bénéfices battent tous les records.

Alors comment accepter, par exemple, que Total y échappe, alors que le groupe a réalisé le bénéfice le plus élevé de son histoire et qu'il a déjà versé plus de 2,6 milliards d'euros de dividendes? Preuve s'il en est que, si nous n'agissons pas, les superprofits finiront tout droit dans les poches des actionnaires – qui sont déjà pleines – plutôt que d'être redistribués à celles et ceux qui en ont vraiment besoin.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, chcela by som upozorniť, že náš prístup k tejto správe, žiaľ, opomína niektoré dôležité aspekty, ktorými sa na pôde Európskeho parlamentu musíme urgentne zaoberať. Dohoda z minulotýždňovej Rady nie je odpoveďou pre mnohé krajiny a medzi najviac postihnuté patrí aj Slovensko. Považujem za nevyhnutné hľadať nové riešenia a to také, ktoré budú založené na solidarite. Práve naša dnešná solidarita a jednota sú totiž rozhodujúce pre budúcnosť celej Európskej únie. Ďalej dnes apelujem na ústretovosť a zrýchlený proces schvaľovania žiadosti Slovenska, aby sa na boj proti drahým energiám mohli využiť aj nevyčerpané eurofondy. Nech je pre nás súčasná energetická kríza lekciou, aby sme viac neustupovali od našich hodnôt a princípov a už nikdy nepripustili takúto závislosť od nedemokratických a totalitných režimov, ktorá je vždy ohrozením.

Chris MacManus (The Left). – Mr President, today the Parliament endorsed the Council's measures to tackle rising energy prices and the misery they are causing so many households. These measures are a step in the right direction, but we all know that much more is needed to tackle this crisis while decarbonising our energy system and eliminating energy poverty. The broken energy market needs to be reformed so that the price we pay for energy reflects the real price of production.

We need more effective price caps so that energy companies can no longer exploit this crisis at the expense of workers and families. We need public control of an energy system that has people's basic right to energy at its core. It should be the role of this Parliament to push the other institutions towards stronger policies. This resolution merely echoed the inadequate measures already agreed by the Council. Now, more than ever, we must do better for our citizens.

Predsedajúci. – Tento bod programu je ukončený.

16. Schválení zápisu z tohoto denního zasedání a pořadu jednání nadcházejícího denního zasedání

Predsedajúci. – Nasledujúce rokovanie sa uskutoční zajtra vo štvrtok 6. októbra 2022 o 9.00 h.

Program schôdze bol uverejnený a je k dispozícii na webovom sídle Európskeho parlamentu.

17. Ukončení zasedání

(Rokovanie sa skončilo o 21.06 h)

DOSLOVNÝ ZÁZNAM ZE ZASEDÁNÍ Z 6. ŘÍJNA 2022

(2023/C 147/04)

Obsah Strana

1. Zahájení denního zasedání . . . 329

2. Přístup EU k řízení kosmického provozu – Příspěvek EU k řešení globální výzvy (rozprava) . . . 329

3. Naléhavá nutnost vypracovat strategii EU týkající se hnojiv k zajištění potravinové bezpečnosti v Evropě (rozprava) . . . 335

4. Pokračování denního zasedání . . . 356

5. Hlasování . . . 356

5.1. Pravidla využívání letištních časů na letištích Unie: dočasná úleva (C9-0225/2022 – Dominique Riquet) (hlasování) . . . 356

5.2. Stav lidských práv na Haiti, zejména v souvislosti s násilím páchaným gangy (RC-B9-0427/2022, B9-0427/2022, B9-0449/2022, B9-0450/2022, B9-0451/2022, B9-0452/2022, B9-0453/2022) (hlasování) . . . 356

5.3. Zásahy vůči svobodě sdělovacích prostředků v Myanmaru, zejména případy Htet Htet Khineové, Sithua Aunga Myinta a Nyeina Nyeina Ayeho (B9-0428/2022, RC-B9-0431/2022, B9-0431/2022, B9-0447/2022, B9-0448/2022, B9-0456/2022, B9-0457/2022) (hlasování) . . . 356

5.4. Aktuální situace v humanitární oblasti a v oblasti lidských práv v etiopském Tigraji, zejména v souvislosti s dětmi (B9-0424/2022, RC-B9-0429/2022, B9-0429/2022, B9-0437/2022, B9-0441/2022, B9-0444/2022, B9-0445/2022) (hlasování) . . . 356

5.5. Smrt Mahsy Amíniové a represe vůči účastníkům demonstrací za práva žen v Íránu (B9-0425/2022, RC-B9-0434/2022, B9-0434/2022, B9-0435/2022, B9-0436/2022, B9-0439/2022, B9-0442/2022, B9-0455/2022) (hlasování) . . . 356

5.6. Eskalace ruské válečné agrese proti Ukrajině (RC-B9-0430/2022/REV, B9-0430/2022, B9-0432/2022, B9-0433/2022, B9-0438/2022, B9-0446/2022) (hlasování) . . . 357

5.7. Výsledek přezkumu patnáctibodového akčního plánu pro obchod a udržitelný rozvoj provedeného Komisí (B9-0415/2022) (hlasování) . . . 357

5.8. Přístup EU k řízení kosmického provozu – Příspěvek EU k řešení globální výzvy (B9-0423/2022) (hlasování) . . . 357

5.9. Impulz pro oceán: posílení správy oceánů a biologické rozmanitosti (B9-0426/2022) (hlasování) 357

6. Pokračování denního zasedání . . . 357

7. Schválení zápisu z předchozího denního zasedání . . . 358

8. COVID-19 – zachování připravenosti a reakce EU: výhled do budoucna (rozprava) . . . 358

9. Vysvětlení hlasování . . . 368

9.1. Smrt Mahsy Amíniové a represe vůči účastníkům demonstrací za práva žen v Íránu (B9-0425/2022, RC-B9-0434/2022, B9-0434/2022, B9-0435/2022, B9-0436/2022, B9-0439/2022, B9-0442/2022, B9-0455/2022) . . . 368

10. Schválení zápisu z tohoto denního zasedání a předání přijatých textů . . . 370

Čtvrtek 6. října 2022

Obsah Strana

11. Termíny příštích zasedání: viz zápis 370

12. Ukončení denního zasedání 370

13. Přerušení zasedání 370

DOSLOVNÝ ZÁZNAM ZE ZASEDÁNÍ Z 6. ŘÍJNA 2022

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

1. Zahájení denního zasedání

(Η συνεδρίαση αρχίζει στις 9.00)

2. Přístup EU k řízení kosmického provozu – Příspěvek EU k řešení globální výzvy (rozprava)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί της ερώτησης με αίτημα προφορικής απάντησης προς την Επιτροπή με τίτλο «Μια προσέγγιση της ΕΕ για τη διαχείριση της κυκλοφορίας στο διάστημα – Μια συνεισφορά της ΕΕ για την αντιμετώπιση μιας παγκόσμιας πρόκλησης», που κατέθεσε ο Cristian-Silviu Buşoi, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Βιομηχανίας, Έρευνας και Ενέργειας (O-000035/2022 - B9-0022/22) (2022/2641(RSP)).

Marian-Jean Marinescu, *autor.* – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, Agenția Spațială Europeană estimează existența în spațiu a aproximativ un milion de deșeuri mai mari de un centimetru. Aceasta înseamnă că 2 700 sateliți funcționali împart orbitele cu 8 800 tone de deșeuri spațiale. Riscul ca sateliții operaționali să fie distruși prin coliziunea cu resturi care plutesc în derivă este foarte mare.

În aprilie anul acesta a fost necesară o corecție a orbitei satelitului Sentinel 1A din programul Copernicus pentru a evita coliziunea cu un fragment al unei rachete lansate acum 30 de ani. Este nevoie urgentă de managementul traficului spațial pentru a securiza infrastructura europeană lansată în spațiu și a putea beneficia în continuare de serviciile programelor spațiale ale Uniunii.

Orbitele spațiale pe care le putem folosi sunt o resursă finită. Trebuie să ținem cont că în ultimii 10 ani a avut loc o creștere fără precedent a traficului în spațiu. Avem mult mai multe mari constelații. Avem mai mulți actori spațiali. Pentru a dezvolta programe spațiale noi, este nevoie de o abordare sustenabilă, iar managementul traficului spațial este unul dintre instrumentele necesare.

Salutăm inițiativa Comisiei privind STM și setul de acțiuni propuse, însă considerăm că este doar un prim pas. Având în vedere importanța STM pentru politica spațială a Uniunii, cerem Comisiei ca până la finalul anului 2023 să avanseze și legislația aferentă, incluzând guvernanța sistemului, responsabilitățile, setul de norme și standarde necesare.

Și, la fel de important, este necesar un buget pentru STM. Fără un buget propriu, managementul traficului spațial va rămâne doar un concept. Mă bucur că moțiunea este pe agenda plenului Parlamentului European, chiar în perioada în care la Praga are loc EU Space Week. Vă invit să votăm în favoarea acestei moțiuni pentru a transmite Comisiei că Parlamentul European susține politica spațială a Uniunii, însă solicită acțiuni rapide și concrete.

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, honourable Members, the implementation of a European Union approach to space traffic management is necessary to protect our space assets and access to space for future generations. Indeed, space is recognised as a strategic domain in its own right, but also as a catalyst for key economic sectors for the European Union. Today, it is estimated that 10% of the European Union's GNP is based on the use of space services. Europe is a great space power. We have some of the best players in the world in the field of launchers, satellites and services. Space is, therefore, an area of sovereignty and autonomy, but it is also an increasingly crowded and congested area.

Crowded because the volume of debris and the number of satellites have been increasingly exponentially, and with them the risk of in-orbit collisions and the direct risk to the safety of orbital traffic and the sustainability of space. If nothing is done within the next few years, we run the risk of seeing collisions multiply and with them an exponential increase in the number of debris to such a level that any activity in lower Earth orbit and beyond will become almost impossible.

This will impact our current activities – Copernicus, Galileo – but may also affect the development of our new constellation on secure connectivity. Space traffic management is clearly becoming a necessity if we want to continue to benefit from the advantages of a robust EU space policy. Therefore, the Commission proposed on 15 February, together with the High Representative, a joint communication for a European Union approach to space traffic management.

Firstly, we will establish civilian and military needs with the Member States. Secondly, we will develop our operational capabilities, relying on synergies with EU industry. Thirdly, we will establish a progressive and adapted regulatory framework at the European Union level. Fourthly, we will engage internationally to promote cooperation with partners, including the US.

The Commission and High Representative, therefore, welcome today's oral questions and the related motion for a resolution. In terms of legislation on STM, the Commission is indeed planning to make legislative proposals. The scope of such legislative action will need to be carefully discussed. An obligation developed at European Union level will need to be imposed on all satellite operators providing services within the EU to avoid imposing additional costs to EU operators only.

In terms of budget for STM, we will be making best use of the budget allocated by the Space Regulation to space surveillance and tracking, which is a cornerstone for the development of STM. This will be implemented in synergy with the budget under Horizon Europe. In terms of research and innovation for STM, the Commission has been carrying out a range of activities – be it through Horizon, be it via the EU space surveillance and tracking consultation. In terms of action at international level, we recognise that an international regulatory framework is a long-term ambition.

In the meantime, the Commission and the High Representative proposed to engage with key partners with existing and emerging STM capabilities to promote cooperation across regions in view of contributing to a global effort.

Angelika Niebler, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Die Zeitenwende in Europa ist auch eine besondere Zeitenwende für die europäische Raumfahrt.

Russland hat bekanntermaßen Ende Februar 2022 die Zusammenarbeit in der Raumfahrt mit Europa aufgekündigt. Dies hat natürlich auch für uns in Europa gravierende Auswirkungen. Ich denke, es ist jetzt wirklich an der Zeit, dass wir uns in diesem Bereich resilient und zukunftsfähig aufstellen.

Es gibt immer mehr Unternehmen im Bereich des *New Space*, die großes Potenzial haben. Viele junge und noch kleine Unternehmen sind in Deutschland, aber auch in allen anderen europäischen Ländern dabei, sich auch auf internationaler Ebene einen Namen zu machen. Allein im *New Space*-Bereich wird geschätzt, dass der Markt bis zum Jahre 2040 auf bis zu 2 700 Millionen wachsen wird. Ich denke, es ist daher dringend notwendig, dass wir hier diese kleinen mittelständischen Unternehmen auch auf europäischer Ebene massiv unterstützen.

Als Europäische Union sollte es unser Anspruch sein, im globalen Wettbewerb eine zentrale Rolle einzunehmen und vor allen Dingen einen sicheren, autonomen Zugang zum Weltraum und zur Nutzung des Weltraums zu gewährleisten.

Ich würde daher gerne die Kommission heute fragen – und Herr Kommissar hat ja hierzu schon einiges ausgeführt: Wie wird die Kommission im Hinblick auf die Ausarbeitung des *Space Traffic Management* vor allen Dingen bürokratische Hürden, gerade für kleine und mittelständische Unternehmen, abbauen, damit in Zukunft die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit gerade dieser Unternehmen und auch der großen Player hier in diesem Markt, die in Europa ihren Sitz haben, gegeben bleibt?

Carlos Zorrinho, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a questão oral que aqui hoje debatemos, sobre a forma como a Comissão Europeia pretende colocar no terreno as medidas preconizadas na Comunicação, de 15 de fevereiro deste ano, sobre a abordagem da União Europeia em matéria de gestão e tráfico espacial e do contributo da União para superar o desafio mundial, não podia ser mais oportuna e atual.

Como representante dos Socialistas e Democratas nas negociações do Programa Espacial Europeu, testemunho o esforço que o Parlamento Europeu fez para garantir um financiamento adequado para iniciativas que são determinantes na autonomia estratégica da União. Iniciativas e programas em domínios como a conectividade, o rastreio e o posicionamento, que são fundamentais para a sustentabilidade, a segurança e a gestão partilhada do território geoespacial.

A gestão do tráfego espacial contribui para garantir a segurança, o acesso fiável e autónomo e a sustentabilidade a longo prazo do espaço exterior e para promover e garantir a continuidade e a competitividade da indústria espacial na União Europeia.

É, por isso, fundamental investir em novas tecnologias que forneçam soluções seguras no que diz respeito ao tráfego espacial, ao congestionamento e aos riscos de colisão. Tudo isto é reconhecido na Comunicação conjunta de 15 de fevereiro.

Entretanto, passaram quase oito meses, e ocorreu uma invasão de um país soberano na Europa. O contexto de economia de guerra em que vivemos não se compadece com adiamentos ou mecanismos de concretização lenta nas políticas cruciais, como as políticas para o espaço.

Por isso, é tão importante pedir à Comissão respostas concretas às questões formuladas nesta pergunta oral. Perguntas quanto ao quadro regulamentar europeu, às opções técnicas, designadamente na prevenção automatizada de colisões, às prioridades na investigação e na inovação, aos compromissos orçamentais e à eventual adoção de um quadro regulamentar internacional. Aguardamos respostas claras e mobilizadoras. É isso que é decisivo.

Susana Solís Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, el espacio es un sector de futuro para Europa y para nuestra industria.

Esta Resolución, junto con la legislación sobre conectividad segura, suponen un antes y un después para la política espacial europea.

Más de 7 000 satélites y más de un millón de desechos orbitan alrededor de la Tierra y su número aumenta constantemente. Se espera que en los próximos años se lancen más de 30 000 satélites adicionales, con un riesgo cada vez mayor de colisión.

Por lo tanto, la gestión del tráfico espacial es fundamental para garantizar la seguridad de las infraestructuras y las operaciones espaciales, y también la sostenibilidad.

Necesitamos reforzar nuestras capacidades de vigilancia y seguimiento existentes para preservar la autonomía estratégica y la competitividad de la industria europea, a la vez que impulsamos la cooperación internacional.

Por eso, pedimos a la Comisión que proponga legislación vinculante antes de 2024 para gestionar el tráfico espacial y facilitar la gobernanza del sector.

No es ciencia ficción. La economía espacial es una realidad con un potencial tremendo. La dimensión de seguridad y defensa del espacio es, tal y como nos ha enseñado la guerra de Ucrania, una prioridad para Europa.

Apostar, por tanto, por un sector espacial europeo fuerte y viable es apostar por la industria europea del mañana, por la seguridad de nuestras sociedades y por el desarrollo de un ecosistema científico de excelencia.

Čtvrtek 6. října 2022

Niklas Nienaß, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, while space might seem infinite, the usable space in Earth's proximity is not. In the past decades, we only had a few satellites in orbit, but now we add several hundred new satellites every year. This extensive use of outer space means more possibilities to benefit all humans on Earth. But it also means that this increase of objects – be it functional satellites or useless trash – increases the threat of collision. We and not just Europeans, but humanity as a whole needs to avoid this by all means.

Any collision can result in a cascading destruction known as the Kessler Syndrome. The implication of this is that all our space-based infrastructure would be destroyed, and the worldwide society would fall back to the technological status of the 1970s. All supply chains would be heavily interrupted because ships cannot navigate without GPS and Galileo. Worldwide communication would be cut, and this would interrupt everything from football game transmissions to renewable energy production, and the fight against climate change would be unwinnable without data from Copernicus. This is what's at stake.

And because the stakes are so high, I am thankful that finally, Parliament and Commission see the imminent need to build up a system for space traffic management. I would have liked to see this happen much earlier because we have to do so much more and we have to be so much faster.

We need binding sustainability standards for all missions. These should be 'leave no trace behind', reduce the greenhouse gas emissions, no light pollution, and active debris removal.

I have been pushing the Commission as well as the Member States. And to let you know, I will continue to do so to forge European space law, one common comprehensive European law to regulate all space activities in all fields necessary, so that Europe extends its activities in space to bring more benefits to all Europeans and all humans, but that's also sustainable.

And I'm advocating for an international space law because we have to treat outer space for what it is – not a junkyard, not a playground for billionaires, not the Wild West, but a common heritage of all mankind.

Paolo Borchia, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissario, il tema delle regole sulla gestione del traffico spaziale diventa fondamentale in un momento delicato per lo spazio che vede, oltre alla Stazione spaziale internazionale, anche la presenza della Stazione spaziale cinese e nei prossimi anni la diffusione delle stazioni spaziali commerciali. Già dal 2023 verrà inviato in orbita il primo modulo della futura stazione privata di Axiom Space.

Entrando nei dettagli, il tema detriti ricopre una grandissima importanza per la sicurezza dei mezzi, ma soprattutto per la sicurezza degli equipaggi, visto che mediamente la Stazione spaziale internazionale effettua almeno quattro cambi rapidi di orbita per evitare sciami di detriti spaziali ogni anno. Questi sono numeri che devono far riflettere chi sarà chiamato a legiferare.

Contestualmente la mappatura dei detriti sta diventando sempre più complicata, sempre più complessa, visto che finora la comunità internazionale si è dotata di buone pratiche, prevedendo motori per il rientro nell'atmosfera e riducendo al minimo quelle parti che poi potrebbero diventare detriti.

Purtroppo però negli ultimi anni alcuni paesi, vedasi gli ultimi lanci della Stazione spaziale cinese, non hanno rispettato queste buone prassi, spesso non monitorando nemmeno il rientro dei propri vettori in atmosfera. Quindi abbiamo bisogno di accordi internazionali che siano chiari e vincolanti in merito alla riduzione dei detriti, ma soprattutto di progetti per raccogliere e bruciare nell'atmosfera i detriti di maggiori dimensioni.

Quindi, in conclusione, è essenziale che Commissione europea e questo Parlamento trovino la sinergia più adatta per fare sintesi sulle regole europee, anche in ottica della colonizzazione della Luna, che con la missione Artemis prevederà l'utilizzo di una stazione orbitante lunare come base di supporto per gli allunaggi e le future missioni su Marte.

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caros colegas, acima de um milhão de detritos com mais de um centímetro estão, neste momento, à deriva sobre a Terra. Prevê-se que, na próxima década, sejam lançados mais de 20 000 novos satélites. Além disso, a corrida espacial está a alargar-se a outros atores e a outras frentes.

Calcula-se que a inovação tecnológica tornará viáveis, e já hoje e muito em breve, o turismo, a mineração espacial. Com esta proliferação da atividade espacial, sem dúvida promissora, crescem também os desafios a enfrentar. Entre estes, os riscos de colisões e de sobreposições de órbitas.

A União Europeia tem, por isso, de atuar – e na minha opinião – em quatro frentes. Primeiro, estabelecendo um quadro regulamentar abrangente de regras nestas matérias. Segundo, cooperando e articulando com outras regiões e nações envolvidas na área espacial. Em terceiro lugar, aumentando o financiamento de um programa muito útil, mas até agora subfinanciado, o EU SST, responsável pela vigilância e rastreamento espacial. Finalmente, reforçando os investimentos e dando prioridade à investigação científica e à inovação na área do espaço, diversificando as fontes de financiamento e apostando em sinergias dos programas de espaço com o Programa de Ciência e Inovação Horizonte Europa.

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, ak sa chce Európska únia stať skutočným lídrom, musí naozaj ďalej zvyšovať svoje investície tak do vedy, ako aj výskumu, aj do oblasti vesmíru, ktorý potrebujeme využívať v spolupráci aj s inými veľmocami a zachovať ho pre budúce generácie. Služby spojené s využívaním vesmíru už dnes predstavujú 10 % HDP Európskej únie. Vesmírna prevádzka, ktorá v posledných rokoch prudko narástla kvôli znižujúcim sa nákladom potrebným na vypustenie satelitov na obežnú dráhu, komplikuje túto situáciu. V súčasnosti sa odhaduje, že na obežnej dráhe Zeme sa nachádza až 1 milión objektov väčších ako 1 centimeter, ktoré sa pohybujú rýchlosťou 56 tisíc km/h. V prípade ich zrážky môže naozaj dôjsť k veľkým škodám a aj k zväčšovaniu sa vesmírneho odpadu. Európska únia ako aktér vo vesmírnej politike, ktorý chce byť lídrom, musí viac tlačiť aj na ostatné štáty, aby súhlasili so spoluprácou pri využívaní vesmírneho priestoru a aby zaujali aj šetrnejší a udržateľnejší postoj. V tejto súvislosti je preto veľmi poľutovaniahodné a je to v podstate veľká tragédia, že pokračuje táto vojna a agresívna vojna Ruskej federácie na Ukrajine. Preto plne podporujem túto iniciatívu Európskej komisie a spoločný prístup Európskej únie k riadeniu vesmírnej prevádzky.

Christophe Grudler (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, cher Commissaire, notre ciel se remplit de débris spatiaux, et nous ne faisons rien. Chaque année, de nouveaux satellites sont lancés dans l'espace, tandis que d'autres, trop anciens, arrivent en fin de vie et deviennent des débris spatiaux. Par ailleurs, la gestion du trafic n'existe pas vraiment, faute d'identification de tous les satellites, alors que cela devrait être aussi naturel que le contrôle aérien.

Avec ce texte, nous exigeons que la Commission européenne propose une loi sur le trafic spatial, et ce avant 2024, tant au niveau réglementaire qu'au niveau capacitaire. Il faut également que l'Union européenne prenne le leadership mondial sur ce sujet au niveau des Nations unies, car, sans coopération internationale, nos efforts pour éviter, entre autres, les débris spatiaux seront vains. Les solutions sont là pour rendre l'espace plus durable. Il est temps de les mettre en œuvre maintenant, sous la direction de l'Europe.

Henrike Hahn (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Im Weltraum herrscht der Wilde Westen. Was wir dort nicht haben, ist Weltraumverkehrsmanagement, obwohl das naheliegend ist.

Der Krieg in Europa zeigt, wie wichtig ein starkes Satellitensystem für globalen Austausch ist. Wir haben gleichzeitig neue industrielle Trends und eine starke kommerzielle Nutzung des Weltraums. Damit sind die Herausforderungen für Management und für Nachhaltigkeit enorm gestiegen.

Ein EU-Weltraumrecht mit Blick auf eine einheitliche globale Regelung muss sich diesen Herausforderungen jetzt stellen. Und da stellt sich auch die Frage: Welche Maßnahmen in welchem Zeitraum plant hier die Kommission?

Seit vielen Jahren sammeln sich Satelliten und Trümmer in der Umlaufbahn, wir verschicken Hochtechnologie in den Weltraum, ins Weltall, die nach Funktionsende verglüht oder dort verbleibt. Nachhaltigkeit im Raumfahrtsektor ist aber möglich, siehe Hubble-Teleskop.

Deshalb ist es jetzt so wichtig, dass ganz konkrete Maßnahmen von der Kommission vorgelegt werden zum Thema Nachhaltigkeit im Industriesektor Luft- und Raumfahrttechnik, zu den Themen Wiederinstandsetzung und Lebenszeitverlängerung durch Design plus Forschungsförderung. Denn auf diese offenen Fragen braucht die europäische Industrie jetzt Antworten zu ihrer Wettbewerbsfähigkeit.

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, grâce à la France, l'Union européenne est une grande puissance spatiale. Cela lui donne des responsabilités, celle notamment de participer à la gestion internationale du trafic spatial. Je salue donc ces efforts pour tenter de régler le problème des débris spatiaux, dont l'augmentation met en péril la sécurité des opérations spatiales. L'exigence de durabilité ne doit pas se borner à l'espace terrestre. Elle doit aussi s'étendre à l'espace extra-atmosphérique.

C'est pourquoi j'approuve les deux orientations fixées par la résolution du Parlement européen: d'une part éviter de générer de nouveaux débris spatiaux, d'autre part nettoyer les débris déjà existants. Ces efforts honoreront l'Union, si l'on accepte de les mettre en œuvre malgré leur coût financier. Grâce à eux, j'espère vivement que l'espace cessera d'être transformé en poubelle. La conquête spatiale est un défi technologique, mais aussi une formidable aventure humaine. Sachons la mener de manière exemplaire.

Πρόεδρος. – Υπάρχει μόνο ένα αίτημα από τον κύριο Nienaß, ο οποίος έχει όμως μιλήσει και ως ομιλητής. Μου λένε οι συνεργάτες μου εδώ ότι ο Κανονισμός δεν απαγορεύει να δοθεί ο λόγος κατά το «catch the eye» σε κάποιον που έχει συμμετάσχει στη συζήτηση. Κατόπιν αυτού κάνω δεκτό το αίτημα του κυρίου Nienaß, γιατί μετείχε συνεχώς, ενεργά και με ενθουσιασμό στη συζήτηση. Κύριε Nienaß έχετε τον λόγο για ένα λεπτό.

Διαδικασία «catch the eye»

Niklas Nienaß (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I want to use the time because there's another imminent problem that we need to talk about when we're talking about space debris, and that is, of course, anti-satellite missile testing.

We know that last year the Russians tested missiles in order to destroy their own satellites. We know that the Chinese and the Americans have done the same. And we know that this is very dangerous for peace in outer space, but also for the question of the debris, of space traffic management, as previous speakers have mentioned.

Therefore, I want to ask the Commission what it plans to do about this situation.

We have the proposal from Vice President Kamala Harris for a memorandum of understanding on anti-satellite missile tests. We should now support this initiative and bring it to the international stage to make sure that we never again use anti-satellite missiles, in order to not destroy or threaten our space-based infrastructure.

Can the Commission please comment on whether it wants to support the initiative and be a driving force in this question for the international stage?

Λήξη της διαδικασίας «catch the eye»

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to thank you for sharing the Commission's view that it is an absolutely necessity for the European Union to work on space traffic management, and to implement the approach we have outlined in our joint communication together with the High Representative.

I have carefully listened to the emphasis that several of you put on the need to develop the Union's space law. As I mentioned in my introductory remarks, we are working on the legislative proposals. What is important in this respect, are three elements.

Firstly, we need to ensure that we get the scope right. This requires consultation with Member States who have so far been the primary actors when it comes to space law and exercising their sovereign rights over their airspace.

Secondly, we need to ensure that such law does not put our industry at a disadvantage to industry in third countries. The way to this to do this is to ensure that obligations developed at the European Union level are imposed to all satellite operators providing services within the European Union. Otherwise, EU legislation will imply additional costs only for EU operators.

Thirdly, we need a holistic approach in this respect. I can already indicate to you that we aim at complementing legislation in the area of STM by further proposals in the field of air traffic management to ensure that there is good coordination between space traffic management on the one side, and air traffic management on the other side.

Honourable Members, let me conclude with a more general remark. STM is not just a technical matter that needs to be addressed to avoid, so that we can also in the future make a safe and sustainable use of space, STM also has a clear strategic and geopolitical dimension. It is as such that we have to deal with STM, which is why I particularly applaud the interest of the European Parliament in this matter.

After today's debate, I know that the Commission and the High Representative can count on your continued support on implementing a European Union approach on STM.

Πρόεδρος. – Έχω λάβει, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 136 παράγραφος 2 του Κανονισμού, μία προτάση ψηφίσματος (*).

Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί σήμερα.

_____

(*) Βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.

3. Naléhavá nutnost vypracovat strategii EU týkající se hnojiv k zajištění potravinové bezpečnosti v Evropě (rozprava)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί της δήλωσης της Επιτροπής σχετικά με την επείγουσα ανάγκη στρατηγικής της ΕΕ για τα λιπάσματα προκειμένου να διασφαλιστεί η επισιτιστική ασφάλεια στην Ευρώπη (2022/2855(RSP)).

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I very much welcome the debate on fertilisers here in plenary today. A huge increase of fertiliser prices is now the main problem for our farmers. This is also a risk for food security. This situation is the direct consequence of the Russian illegal aggression – illegal and unprovoked aggression – against Ukraine and the huge gas prices, which affects the fertiliser prices.

Maintaining appropriate supply and affordability of fertilisers is absolutely crucial. In Europe, nitrogen fertiliser prices increased 149% in one year between September 2021 and September 2022. The price of mined fertilisers also increased by 59% and 90% respectively over the same period.

Nitrogen fertilisers are a particular concern. Simply put, as gas constitutes the main input for the production of nitrogen fertiliser, the high cost of gas has forced fertiliser companies to reduce their ammonia-based production by shutting it down or reducing it by up to 70%. This has not yet resulted in a significant shortfall in supply, as this has been compensated by higher imports, mostly from more reliable trade partners: Morocco, Canada, Egypt.

We clearly have to be sensitive to the risk of replacing one dependency with another. At the same time, in the current situation, these higher imports are easing supply pressure, but unfortunately are not solving the actual cause of the problem: the gas prices crisis.

High and unstable fertiliser prices are a challenge not only for producers but also for farmers – and first of all for farmers. There are indications that European Union farmers have ordered less fertilisers than usual this summer. The magnitude of the reduction may be around 20%. Farmers are also concerned that output prices might not keep up with their input prices, squeezing their incomes.

Given all this, we will need to remain very attentive to the risk of lower yields and its influence on prices of food affecting the budgets of European families. In short, lower yields would result in further food inflation. We therefore need to strengthen our domestic fertiliser sector to make it more autonomous and reliable. We also need to strategically reduce our dependence on imports in this sector. It is not ideal that we continue to depend on Russian imports of urea, for example.

The Commission has already taken measures to help ease the pressure on farmers. Some of these measures do also have beneficial effects on the fertiliser industry. To name the most relevant, there was the exceptional support package of March 2022, mobilising the crisis reserve, of over EUR 500 million, and enabling farmers to face the higher input costs, including for fertilisers. A special measure similar to the COVID one was created under the second pillar of the CAP, where up to 5% of the Rural Development Fund uncommitted in the year 2021-2022 could be mobilised to aid farmers and rural businesses. This has a firepower of about EUR 1.5 billion.

There is another ad hoc temporary crisis framework for state aid which the Commission also adopted in March 2022, reinforced in July, and which provides that farmers are eligible for support to EUR 62 000. Fertiliser producers are eligible for support too under this temporary framework. President von der Leyen has announced the prolongation of this framework, and the maximum amount of support under the state aid ad hoc framework will be reviewed in the coming days.

The winter preparedness package provides for Member States to give priority as regards energy gas availability to relevant sectors, including fertilisers. Moreover, as part of package of emergency measures in the energy sector, the Commission has proposed a temporary solidarity contribution on surplus profits generated from activities in the main energy segments. These funds of up to EUR 114 billion could mitigate the high energy prices to households and energy intensive industries, including the fertiliser sector.

On the trade policy side, the Commission has proposed to the Council a temporary suspension of the custom tariffs for two key intermediate goods used in the production of nitrogen fertilisers, namely ammonia and urea. This is now being discussed in the Council formations.

The Member States' CAP strategic plans are, and will be in the future, the key tools to support sustainable farming and incentivise reduced use of fertilisers. In the observation letters regarding the CAP strategic plans, we promoted incentives for Member States to prioritise the uptake of precision farming, to optimise the efficiency of plant nutrition and to enhance the use of alternatives to mineral fertilisers, including organic fertilisers, without sacrificing yields. We have encouraged our Member States both in the observation letters and in their CAP strategic plans to focus on fertiliser-saving measures that should not result in lower yields.

In the draft plans, we have recorded 28 interventions in 17 Member States whose main practice is nutrient management using either eco-schemes or agro-environmental climate payments. As regards precision farming, we have recorded nine interventions in the CAP plans in eight Member States, mostly supported under eco-schemes.

We will also step up our agricultural knowledge and innovation system to help farmers with their uptake, their measures in their CAP strategic plans. The CAP farm advisory system will be useful in this regard. Advisors could support farmers to adopt less fertiliser-demanding varieties and crops, and manage better the use of inputs.

Our fertiliser industry is itself well under way in its efforts to switch to the production of low carbon ammonia and other circular nutrient sources. We must support its efforts, as it is crucial for food security to have a viable and sustainable fertiliser industry in our Member States.

At the same time, we have to consider the international context. Fertilisers are globally traded, which provides benefits to our farmers in case of need, but requires that our regulation ensure the competitiveness of our own domestic industry. This will be particularly important during the transition to green fertilisers in Europe.

Honourable Members, there are also concerns over global fertiliser availability and affordability. Russia hinted at European Union responsibility in such risks, notably through our sanctions. We have to be very clear on this. Nothing in our sanctions is aimed at preventing Russia to export fertilisers. There is clear evidence that Russian exports of fertiliser to third countries have not decreased a lot and can still be exported to the EU.

The Commission is also engaged in international cooperation actions such as a global fertiliser challenge. In conclusion there is a potential in the new common agricultural policy and the toolbox it provides. We need well-functioning and autonomous domestic production of fertilising products. It is in the agricultural sector's own interests. In fact, the fertiliser sector forms an important part of our food system, and we need to work towards its independence and resilience to outside disturbances.

On our way to a sustainable future, we will ensure that food security is maintained, including in the global context. Honourable Members, I have a direct answer to your question about the future strategy. The Commission is ready to put forward a communication on fertilisers. It will cover both internal and external dimensions, food security and greening aspects. It will *inter alia* tackle questions on how to make our fertiliser industry less externally dependent, but also how to make our farmers less dependent on fertilisers. It will also be a chance to review the effectiveness of the CAP strategic plans in providing solutions to the fertiliser problem in general. This would include assessing whether proper attention has been paid to the uptake of precision farming, proper rational planning of fertiliser use and incentivising biological and other alternatives to traditional fertilisers.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you again for your inspiration. We need a clear vision of how to ensure, in this crisis situation, the economic security of our farmers and, first of all, food security for our society.

Herbert Dorfmann, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! In der Tat, Düngerpreise sind derzeit extrem hoch, und das nicht erst seit der Invasion Russlands in die Ukraine. Der Anstieg der Preise hatte bereits vor ungefähr einem Jahr begonnen. Der hat auch damit zu tun, dass Lieferketten nach der COVID-19-Pandemie nicht vollkommen funktioniert haben. Aber natürlich hat er auch, so wie Sie, Herr Kommissar, gesagt haben, mit explodierenden Gaspreisen und explodierenden Energiepreisen zu tun.

Die Auswirkungen sind fatal – auf der einen Seite auf der Ebene der landwirtschaftlichen Betriebe, wo die Kosten sehr schnell ansteigen und wo es eine Kombination von hohen Kosten von Düngern kombiniert mit hohen Kosten von Energie gibt, aber auch auf der Verbraucherseite. Wir haben jetzt ein Jahr hinter uns, wo wir sehr hohe Kosten in landwirtschaftlichen Betrieben hatten, hohe Düngerpreise und noch dazu ein sehr trockenes Jahr. Das hat zum Beispiel dazu geführt, dass wir in der Europäischen Union 25 % weniger Mais produziert haben als im Jahr vorher. Die Auswirkungen auf die Lebensmittelsicherheit werden wir in den nächsten Monaten sehen.

Natürlich muss das Problem auch langfristig gelöst werden. Wir müssen zur Kenntnis nehmen, dass wir eine hohe Konzentration von Tieren in einigen Teilen Europas haben und dass in anderen Teilen Europas die Tiere sozusagen ausgestorben sind, dass uns also auch ganz normale Kreislaufwirtschaft fehlt.

Aber ich denke, es braucht – und da bin ich sehr froh, Herr Kommissar, dass Sie das angesprochen haben – eine Kommunikation. Es braucht eine Strategie und ich hoffe, dass es nicht nur bei der Kommunikation bleibt, sondern dass es auch Geld dafür gibt, dass wir also investieren in Wissen, in Forschung, in Systeme, um die Düngerproduktion wieder nach Europa zu bringen, um vor allem Wissen wieder nach Europa zu bringen, wie wir eine verbesserte Kreislaufwirtschaft von Dünger machen, denn ich denke, dass wir jetzt gelernt haben, dass diese Abhängigkeit, die wir von der weltweiten Produktion haben, in dieser Form nicht funktioniert.

Clara Aguilera, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, el precio del gas en Europa, como todos ustedes saben, ha aumentado un 800 % en comparación con marzo del año pasado.

Las causas acumuladas en cuanto al precio de los fertilizantes no solo derivan de la guerra, sino que son anteriores a esta: la situación pos-COVID-19, las bajas reservas, el incremento del precio del gas, la gran demanda internacional —y, evidentemente, la guerra de Ucrania—.

Desde el inicio de la guerra, el precio del gas ha llegado a duplicarse.

Esta situación está repercutiendo de forma grave en la viabilidad de las fábricas de producción de fertilizantes y, de manera especial, en las que producen fertilizantes nitrogenados, debido a su dependencia del gas.

Estos factores han provocado que algunas empresas europeas se hayan visto forzadas a cerrar varias plantas productivas, lo que ha reducido la producción de fertilizantes en torno a un 70 % en el último año. Un recorte en la oferta de fertilizantes que se suma al descenso en las importaciones procedentes de Rusia.

El 60 % de los nutrientes que se aplican a nuestro suelo proviene de fertilizantes minerales. Si no se toman medidas a tiempo, puede haber consecuencias muy negativas, tanto para las empresas como para el sector y toda la cadena de valor, ya que la reducción drástica de la producción de fertilizantes en Europa tiene consecuencias directas en el sistema alimentario mundial y en la seguridad alimentaria global.

Las previsiones económicas apuntan a que este problema se va a agravar en los próximos meses. Por lo tanto, las medidas no son aplicables solo a este momento, sino que hay que mantenerlas durante cierto tiempo, teniendo en cuenta los nuevos aumentos de los costes para los agricultores en medio de una elevada inflación.

Para evitar las presiones inflacionistas se necesita inmediatamente una estrategia que dé confianza a la seguridad del mercado. Una estrategia no tan a corto plazo, no para este año, quizá para finales de 2024.

La suspensión de los derechos de aduana para las importaciones de amoníaco y urea utilizados para la producción de abonos nitrogenados debería durar probablemente hasta finales del próximo año. Hay que facilitar el uso de abonos orgánicos y estiércol y el transporte desde regiones excedentarias a las más deficitarias, y hay que conseguir que los avances de la ciencia encaminados a que este tipo de abono ofrezcan todas las garantías. Hace falta un plan de gestión de nutrientes, comisario, anunciado por la Comisión, pero que ponga el acento en el incremento de la eficiencia en su uso de estos, más que en la reducción lineal sin tener en cuenta las necesidades de cada cultivo.

Por último, pido que esa estrategia nos permita la independencia de una industria europea potente en este sector, pero, sobre todo, que ponga a disposición de los agricultores unos precios razonables y asequibles para los fertilizantes, porque su incidencia en el precio de los alimentos y en la inflación es muy importante, y está en riesgo la seguridad alimentaria.

Dacian Cioloș, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, it is urgent that we relaunch the production of nitrogen plants with priority access to gas and at a price that avoids a dramatic rise in food costs. This is a key measure to keep fertilizers accessible and affordable for farmers and to help European companies to maintain their production in Europe – this is key to maintaining production at home. We call on the Commission, more specifically, to put forward a fertilizer strategy in order to reduce dependency and increase resilience, and to come up with short, medium and long-term measures, such as diversifying the source of import of raw materials for the production of fertilizers to support a more efficient and targeted usage of fertilizers, to promote alternatives to non-organic fertilizers and to invest in innovation. This and perhaps other measures could be the subject of the communication you mentioned here.

We also have to work with international partners, in particular with Africa, and to help them with systemic agroecology approaches that allow us to shape the low-import system. However, the fertilizer crisis is just another symptom demonstrating the fragility of the system on which our food security is based. For this reason, the EU must urgently come forward with an integrated approach on food security, looking at it not only from an agricultural production perspective, but also from an economic, environmental, trade, regional and international partnership perspective. Food security goes far beyond food production, and we have to understand that food production is key, but food security means more than that. If we want to avert the destabilisation of other countries – food, poverty, famine, social and political unrest – we have to act now.

In my opinion, developing and investing in a coherent and comprehensive EU food security strategy is the only response. Therefore, I call on the political groups here in Parliament and the leadership of the European Parliament to create a framework in which this integrated discussion can take place, similar to, for example, the task force that we created in Renew Europe. We need such an approach at Parliament level in order to come up with our vision in this regard.

Benoît Biteau, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, l'essor de l'agriculture contemporaine a construit sa réussite sur trois piliers: la mécanisation, les pesticides et les engrais de synthèse, négligeant totalement l'impact de ces pratiques sur le climat, la biodiversité et la santé.

Ces pratiques, les connaissances actuelles montrent pourtant à quel point elles sont néfastes vis-à-vis de ces enjeux fondamentaux, de même qu'elles nuisent à la fertilité des sols – pourtant garants de la souveraineté alimentaire. Voilà qui convoque aussi bien approche globale que vision sur le long terme.

La guerre en Ukraine exacerbe ce constat, sur fond de spéculation sur les denrées alimentaires de première nécessité, mais aussi de flambée des cours de l'énergie, tant les prix de ces pesticides et de ces engrais de synthèse sont intimement corrélés à ceux de l'énergie – dont ils sont des dérivés directs.

Au constat de vulnérabilité de ce modèle nous devons ajouter les difficultés économiques des agriculteurs, trop dépendants de ces intrants devenus rares et hors de prix. Cela montre aussi la dépendance de l'agriculture à Poutine et aux puissances détentrices des ressources fossiles.

Nous devons donc, pour l'ensemble de ces raisons, sortir de ces dépendances, imaginer et bâtir l'agriculture de l'après-pétrole et retrouver les vertus d'une agriculture autonome, dont le socle stratégique sera la fertilité des sols garantie non plus par les dérivés du pétrole, mais par les réponses robustes que propose l'agronomie.

C'est la raison pour laquelle les écologistes considèrent – à l'inverse des conservateurs, qui refusent de regarder en face l'impasse, bien réelle, dans laquelle se trouvent ces logiques d'un autre temps – qu'il est urgent de ne surtout pas différer les objectifs, les ambitions et la trajectoire de la stratégie «De la ferme à la table», notamment pour ce qui concerne le dosage des engrais, bifurcation nécessaire si l'on souhaite relever les défis du climat, de la biodiversité et de la santé, mais aussi assurer des revenus dignes pour les paysans et une souveraineté alimentaire durable.

Dans cette Europe bâtie pour garantir la paix, l'agroécologie, mes chers collègues, c'est aussi la paix.

Alexandr Vondra, *za skupinu ECR*. – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, jsme v situaci, kdy otázka potravinové bezpečnosti je aktuálnější více než jindy. Zvětšující se světová populace, *Green Deal*, válka na Ukrajině, to vše přináší prudký nárůst cen potravin, plynu, a tím i průmyslových hnojiv. Cena plynu činí 40 % variabilních nákladů na výrobu průmyslových hnojiv. Do Evropy dovážíme 60 % průmyslových hnojiv z Ruska a Běloruska. Naše další závislost na Rusku ohrožuje naši existenci. S válkou na Ukrajině vzrostla cena hnojiv a snížil se jejich dovoz.

Evropská unie musí v této věci konat rychle, a to tím, že zaprvé odmítneme nebo alespoň odložíme revizi nařízení o pesticidech a podpoříme výzkum v oblasti biopesticidů. Zadruhé odhodíme předsudky a urychleně umožníme používání nových genomických technik v zemědělství tak, jak to normálně dělá zbytek světa. A konečně zatřetí podpoříme používání alternativních možností hnojení, především kompostovaných čistírenských kalů.

Zemědělci se snaží snižovat chemické znečištění půdy. Nikdo přeci nechce mít znečištěnou, nezdravou půdu, ale zároveň potřebují vhodné alternativy. Pokud nebudou živiny a minerály v poli, nebudeme mít dostatek zemědělských plodin s dostatečným výnosem a s dostatečnou výživovou hodnotou. Bude ohrožena naše potravinová bezpečnost, a tím i naše existence. To v žádném případě nesmíme dopustit.

Πέτρος Κόκκαλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η ρωσική εισβολή στην Ουκρανία έχει αναστατώσει σημαντικά τις παγκόσμιες γεωργικές αγορές και έχει προκαλέσει μεγάλη αύξηση στο κόστος παραγωγής του πρωτογενούς τομέα σε όλη την ευρωπαϊκή ήπειρο. Στη χώρα μου, στην Ελλάδα, οι τιμές που καταβάλλουν οι αγρότες για την αγορά προϊόντων και υπηρεσιών για τις γεωργικές τους εκμεταλλεύσεις έχουν αυξηθεί κατά 25% σε σχέση με την περσινή χρονιά σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία της ΕΛΣΤΑΤ. Για να συνεχίσουν την παραγωγή οι Ευρωπαίοι αγρότες, είναι βασικό να διασφαλιστούν προσιτές τιμές στις γεωργικές εισροές.

Οι εθνικές κυβερνήσεις λαμβάνουν μέτρα, αλλά αυτά δεν είναι αρκετά και σε καμία περίπτωση δεν μπορούν να λειτουργήσουν μακροπρόθεσμα. Για παράδειγμα, στην Κρήτη αυτή τη στιγμή, οι τιμές των λιπασμάτων για τις ελιές είναι ήδη υπερδιπλάσιες και σχεδόν τριπλάσιες σε σχέση με πέρσι. Συχνά θεωρείται ότι η χρήση λιπασμάτων, παράλληλα με τη ρύπανση που αυτή δημιουργεί, και οι αποδόσεις των καλλιεργειών αποτελούν αναπόφευκτο συμβιβασμό. Σύμφωνα με διεθνείς μελέτες όμως έχει αποδειχθεί ότι είναι εφικτό να αυξηθούν οι αποδόσεις των καλλιεργειών, μειώνοντας ταυτόχρονα τις περιβαλλοντικές επιπτώσεις της αλόγιστης χρήσης λιπασμάτων. Καλούμε λοιπόν την Επιτροπή να λάβει άμεσα μέτρα, ώστε να αντιμετωπιστεί το κόστος των εισροών, στηρίζοντας παράλληλα τους αγρότες στη μετάβαση σε φυσικές μεθόδους, ενισχύοντας ένα βιώσιμο αγροδιατροφικό σύστημα.

Ταυτόχρονα, πρέπει να προτείνει επιτέλους μια ευρωπαϊκή στρατηγική για τα λιπάσματα. Βασικός άξονας της στρατηγικής αυτής πρέπει να είναι η εξισορρόπηση των αποδόσεων και της ανάγκης για εισροές θρεπτικών συστατικών, δηλαδή η αποδοτικότητα της χρήσης του αζώτου. Παράλληλα με την εξασφάλιση του εφοδιασμού πρέπει να προστατεύσουμε το περιβάλλον και τη δημόσια υγεία. Έχουμε στη διάθεσή μας τις απαραίτητες τεχνολογικές καινοτομίες, όπως γεωργία ακριβείας, και δεν πρέπει να υποτιμούμε ποτέ το ρόλο της εκπαίδευσης των αγροτών, προκειμένου να υιοθετήσουμε πρακτικές βιώσιμης γεωργίας. Ήδη έχει γίνει ένα βήμα προς τη σωστή κατεύθυνση με την πρόσφατη αναθεώρηση της νομοθεσίας για τα προϊόντα λίπανσης, με σκοπό να προωθηθεί η χρήση λιπασμάτων που παράγονται από οργανικά ή ανακυκλωμένα υλικά. Ακόμα, στον κανονισμό για τις γεωργικές στατιστικές που ψηφίσαμε χτες και στον οποίο είχα την τιμή να είμαι εισηγητής, συμπεριλάβαμε το διευρυμένο πεδίο των προϊόντων λίπανσης.

Τέλος, θα ήθελα να βάλω στη συζήτηση και τον Διεθνή Κώδικα Δεοντολογίας για τη Βιώσιμη Χρήση και Διαχείριση των Λιπασμάτων, ο οποίος εγκρίθηκε από τον FAO το 2019. Ο Κώδικας ουσιαστικά παρέχει ένα πλαίσιο και διάφορες εθελοντικές πρακτικές, καλές πρακτικές, οι οποίες μπορούν να υιοθετηθούν στη διαχείριση των λιπασμάτων. Όλα αυτά πρέπει να λάβουμε υπόψη μας, αγαπητέ κύριε Επίτροπε και αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, για να εξασφαλίσουμε ότι οι γεωργοί μας έχουν και θα έχουν πρόσβαση στα απαραίτητα προϊόντα λίπανσης σε ανταγωνιστικές τιμές, προστατεύοντας παράλληλα και το περιβάλλον και τη δημόσια υγεία.

Maxette Pirbakas (NI). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, la flambée du prix des engrais nous montre à quel point nous sommes vulnérables. L'Union européenne pensait maîtriser la mondialisation? Elle croyait que l'immense système global allait irrémédiablement apporter paix et prospérité? C'en est fini du rêve! L'interdépendance que vous célébriez, c'est avant tout l'«intervulnérabilité».

Le retour à la réalité est douloureux: les coûts de production et la crise énergétique maintiennent le prix des engrais à un niveau très élevé. La traduction de cela, ce sont des prix alimentaires qui flambent et qui font basculer des millions d'Européens dans la précarité, voire dans la pauvreté. Moi qui suis guadeloupéenne, issue d'une région ultrapériphérique, déjà défavorisée, je peux en témoigner plus que quiconque aujourd'hui.

Quant à nos industriels et à nos agriculteurs, ils sont désemparés, épuisés par autant d'incertitudes. Tous nous le disent: comment avons-nous pu nous mettre dans une telle dépendance vis-à-vis des marchés internationaux et de certains pays tiers? Comment l'Union européenne a-t-elle pu laisser faire cela?

La solution, nous la connaissons: c'est recréer des capacités de production ici, en Europe – un constat que nous avions déjà fait lors de la crise sanitaire –, c'est arrêter de promouvoir une liberté totale des marchés sans considération pour les lieux de production, c'est limiter les excès de la mondialisation, revenir à une vision locale et enracinée, réindustrialiser notre continent dans les secteurs stratégiques et retrouver la maîtrise de notre destin.

Il s'agit là d'une nécessité vitale, et c'est ce que mes compatriotes des cinq départements d'outre-mer attendent des institutions européennes.

Norbert Lins (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte am Anfang vielleicht sagen, da wir ein bisschen die Analyse bekommen: Und sie bewegt sich doch, die Kommission. Mit den Worten von Galileo Galilei muss man wohl erkennen, dass seitens der Kommission lange Zeit wenig unternommen worden ist, was das Thema Düngemittel betrifft. Aber ich begrüße ausdrücklich, Herr Kommissar, dass Sie für Ende Oktober eine Mitteilung angekündigt haben, dass sich die Kommission des Themas Düngemittel annimmt.

Selbstverständlich hängt es mit der Energiepreissituation zusammen, aber man muss doch auch die Systemrelevanz nicht nur des Landwirtschaftssektors anerkennen, sondern auch der vor- und nachgelagerten Bereiche.

Wenn ich mir anschaue – was auch schon vorher der Kollege Herbert Dorfmann gesagt hat –, dass es natürlich vielfältige Möglichkeiten gibt, auch zu schauen, wie wir Erträge in der Europäischen Union aufrechterhalten oder auch Erträge wieder steigern können, dann spielen natürlich neben den Düngemitteln, und zwar Ammoniak, Harnstoffe und Stickstoffe eine Rolle. Da braucht man ein paar konkrete Maßnahmen, von denen ich mir natürlich wünsche, dass sie dann in der Mitteilung der Kommission stehen, zum Beispiel alle Antidumping-Maßnahmen auszusetzen, auch konkrete Maßnahmen, wie wir der europäischen Düngemittelindustrie helfen, aber dass wir mittelfristig auch erkennen, dass wir in Europa zwar in manchen Regionen ein bisschen zu viele Tiere haben, dass wir aber in vielen Regionen in Europa zu wenige Tiere haben, dass genau organischer Dünger uns unabhängiger macht, auch in der landwirtschaftlichen Produktion, und dass die Politik der Tierreduzierung in Europa ein Ende haben muss und dass wir eben erkennen müssen, dass Bio nicht immer die Lösung ist. In meiner Region haben wir 15 % Bio, die sorgt für 5 % der Versorgung der Menschen mit Nahrungsmitteln.

Das heißt: Da ist noch ein großer Weg in Richtung mehr Produktivität zu gehen. Und …

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner/der Rednerin das Wort)

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissario, l'escalation dei prezzi delle materie prime e dei costi energetici, a cui assistiamo ormai da mesi, sta generando conseguenze irreversibili di cui i nostri agricoltori rischiano, ancora una volta, di essere le prime vittime. Di fronte a questa emergenza, l'Unione deve mettere in campo al più presto una risposta ambiziosa e concreta per bloccare la corsa dei prezzi dei fertilizzanti e garantire una disponibilità adeguata al fabbisogno delle nostre aziende agricole.

Il 50 % del nostro cibo, infatti, si basa sull'utilizzo di fertilizzanti di qualità che negli ultimi decenni hanno avuto un ruolo fondamentale nella rivoluzione verde del nostro sistema agricolo, aumentando le rese e garantendo sempre maggiore sicurezza alimentare a livello globale.

Ora, caro Commissario, non possiamo permetterci passi indietro. La situazione dell'industria dei fertilizzanti, spesso costretta a interrompere le proprie linee produttive a causa degli aumenti insostenibili dei prezzi, ci obbliga a decisioni non più rinviabili. A partire, per esempio, dal tetto europeo al prezzo del gas, come chiesto ieri dalla quasi totalità di questo Parlamento, che avrebbe risvolti immediati su settori fondamentali come questo.

Al contempo, per garantire la competitività e la capacità produttiva agroalimentare dell'Unione, dobbiamo investire su tutte le alternative disponibili ed eliminare quei vincoli, come la soglia dei 170 kg di azoto per ettaro all'anno, che ancora oggi limitano l'utilizzo di fertilizzanti organici e lo sviluppo di veri sistemi di economia circolare basati sullo sfruttamento del digestato.

Di fronte a questa emergenza, che colpisce in modo diseguale i paesi, le imprese e le famiglie europei, serve dunque una risposta europea, capace di supportare il nostro sistema produttivo e accompagnarlo verso una sempre maggiore sostenibilità e indipendenza delle produzioni più critiche, dal gas all'ammoniaca, necessari per la produzione di fertilizzanti, fino alle materie prime agricole che garantiscono la nostra sicurezza alimentare.

Asger Christensen (Renew). – Hr. Formand! Tak til kommissærerne og Formanden for, at vi kan få den her debat. Jeg er landmand, og første gang jeg trådte ind i plenarsalen for tre år siden, var det iført gummistøvler. Jeg lovede dengang, at hvis det blev svære tider for landbruget, så ville jeg gøre det igen. Og det er det nu, så derfor har jeg gummistøvlerne på i dag. Problemerne skyldes, at vi mangler gødning i Europa. Uden gødning, ingen afgrøde og ingen mad. Hele 60-70 procent af den europæiske gødningsproduktion ligger ned, og det får dramatiske konsekvenser for den kommende høst i 2023. Og det er svært for landmændene at drive en rentabel forretning. Vi, der sidder her nu, har et kæmpe ansvar for, at vi får det her løst. Vi står midt i en alvorlig fødevarekrise. Det bliver sværere dag for dag for vores europæiske landmænd at producere nok til verdens befolkning. Og det bliver endnu værre i 2023. Derfor skal vi producere vores egen gødning i EU. Vores landbrugsproduktion skal ikke tages som gidsel. Det kræver, at vi prioriterer energien til gødningsproduktion, og samtidig at landmændene kan købe gødning til en rentabel pris. Vi skal samtidigt sikre, at tallerkenen er fyldt overalt i verden. Derfor skal vi støtte gødningsproduktionen med vores solidaritetsfond og genopretningsplaner, som kan kompensere for de høje gødningspriser. Og selvfølgelig skal vi støtte alle former for ny teknologi. Det er på tide, at vi tager arbejdshandskerne på og gummistøvlerne på.

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich wundere mich über diese Debatte. Jahrelang haben wir es akzeptiert, dass die Düngemittel aus Russland kommen, aus Belarus, jahrelang haben wir nichts getan gegen die fossile Abhängigkeit in der Landwirtschaft, gerade auch von Russland. Und jetzt gibt es Leute hier im Parlament, die eine Subventionierung der Düngemittelindustrie fordern.

Herr Lins, ich sage Ihnen mal: Yara, der größte Stickstoffhersteller, hat einen Sprung gemacht von 775 Millionen auf 1,5 Milliarden Gewinn. Warum sollen wir diese Firma unterstützen? Kali + Salz hat einen Gewinnsprung gemacht. Das ist also der völlig falsche Weg. Wir müssen wegkommen von diesen fossilen Strukturen und sie nicht noch nachträglich subventionieren.

Die Kommission hat ja selber in ihrer Strategie „Vom Hof auf den Tisch" stehen: 20 % Düngemittelreduktion. Warum? Weil wir in vielen Regionen ein Problem haben mit Überdüngung und nicht mit zu wenig Dünger – zu viel Dünger in vielen Gewässern und zu viel Stickstoff in der Landwirtschaft. Deshalb ist die Strategie 20 % weniger Dünger ja richtig.

Wir müssen auch anerkennen, dass allein die Stickstoffindustrie zu 2,4 % der globalen Treibhausgasemissionen beiträgt, auch die Lachgasemissionen steigen davon. Deshalb müssen wir umsteigen auf agrarökologische Systeme. Jeder Bauer kann Leguminosen anbauen, jeder! Ich verstehe nicht, warum die Kommission dann die Fruchtfolge aussetzt, warum man diese Möglichkeit nicht nutzt, dass jeder Landwirt auch Leguminosen anbaut.

Wir müssen vernünftige Fruchtfolgen haben, wir müssen aber auch mit organischem Dünger besser umgehen. Wir haben in vielen Regionen ein Problem mit zu viel Dünger. Deshalb kann unsere Antwort eigentlich nicht sein: mehr Subventionierung von Chemie, sondern: Hinwendung zu agrarökologischen Systemen. Die sind zukunftssicher, und die machen uns unabhängig, sowohl von russischem Gas als auch von großen Chemiefirmen.

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je suis d'accord avec la Commission quant au besoin impérieux d'une stratégie européenne sur les engrais. Il est en effet urgent d'aider nos agriculteurs à se les procurer à un prix abordable. C'est important pour eux, mais aussi pour assurer notre sécurité alimentaire et celle de pays tiers.

Je regrette toutefois les erreurs commises par la Commission sur ce dossier. Le 10 août, elle a en effet publié des lignes directrices par lesquelles elle a décidé de bloquer l'exportation des engrais agricoles russes. Or, cet embargo était en contradiction avec un accord international signé le 22 juillet sous l'égide de l'ONU. Cette situation a amené le secrétaire général de l'ONU à protester auprès de M[me] von der Leyen. Il a néanmoins fallu attendre le 19 septembre et les pressions de plusieurs États membres de l'Union pour que la Commission lève l'embargo sur les engrais. Moralité: nous avons perdu cinq semaines, au cours desquelles nous avons aggravé la crise des engrais au lieu d'essayer de la résoudre.

La stratégie que l'on nous présente aujourd'hui est donc la bienvenue, mais elle arrive bien tard. Ce constat me renforce dans ma conviction que la Commission est inapte à affronter les crises, quelle que soit leur nature.

Quoi qu'il en soit, allons de l'avant: je prends acte des propos que le commissaire à l'agriculture vient de tenir, je partage le constat lucide de la gravité de la crise des engrais qu'il a dressé, mais j'estime que les aides financières aux agriculteurs qu'il a présentées ne suffisent pas à y répondre. J'attends une vraie stratégie, qui permettra notamment de rapatrier chez nous la fabrication des engrais dont nous avons besoin.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, meststoffen zijn cruciaal voor onze voedselvoorziening. Zonder nutriënten geen groei en dus ook geen oogst. Nu de prijzen voor kunstmest escaleren, moet er dus wel gehandeld worden. Niet alleen de toekomst van heel veel bedrijven staat op het spel, maar ook de wereldwijde voedselproductie is in het geding.

Een belangrijke oplossing is echter voorhanden. Ik doel op het hergebruik van nutriënten via dierlijke mest en verwerkte mest. De RENURE-producten op basis van verwerkte mest voldoen aan strikte criteria en dienen daarom per direct erkend te worden als kunstmestvervangers. Het Europees Parlement heeft daarover in zijn resolutie van maart nog een zeer duidelijke oproep gedaan.

Beseft de Commissie wel hoe strategisch onze voedselproductie is, net als de grondstoffen die daarvoor nodig zijn? We zien nu welke problemen het geeft om afhankelijk te zijn van derde landen voor onze energievoorziening. We moeten ervoor zorgen dat we voor onze meststoffen en voedselvoorziening niet ook afhankelijk worden van invoer uit derde landen. Ik roep de Commissie daarom met klem op om de genoemde kunstmestvervangers per direct toe te staan. Dat past trouwens ook heel goed in het streven naar een circulaire economie. Daarnaast moet ook alles erop gericht zijn om de productie van kunstmest in Europa betaalbaar te houden.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, nos tempos recentes os produtores agrícolas em Portugal têm estado expostos e vulneráveis a muitos fenómenos e catástrofes naturais, mas há muito que são confrontados com as imposições de uma PAC que despreza a pequena e média agricultura, que promove e financia o agronegócio, a agricultura intensiva e superintensiva, mais consumidora de água, de fertilizantes e de fitofármacos, mais destruidora dos solos, sem uma valorização económica e social que favoreça o território e as populações, antes ao serviço dos interesses e do lucro dos grupos económicos que aí operam.

Recentemente, as consequências da guerra, da sua instigação, das sanções e das ações especulativas e dos aproveitamentos por parte dos grandes grupos económicos, arrastam as pequenas e médias produções agrícolas para a rua da amargura e não há quem lhes queira valer. É imoral que os mesmos que, durante a pandemia, viram os seus lucros crescer à custa do sofrimento de milhares de pessoas usem agora o pretexto da guerra para satisfazer a sua gula insaciável.

Sabemos bem que, desde o ano passado, os fertilizantes subiram até 300 %. A pretexto da guerra, agravou-se a tendência de aumento especulativo dos preços, com a consequente subida dos custos de produção.

É urgente questionar o modelo de produção e mudar a lógica de produção em função do lucro para a produção em função da necessidade, garantir o direito à produção nacional, nomeadamente no plano da produção de fertilizantes, assegurar o direito à soberania alimentar e à aplicação do princípio da preferência nacional, substituindo importações por produção nacional, garantir aos pequenos e médios agricultores preços justos à produção, encurtar circuitos comerciais, intervindo e regulando a cadeia de valor.

Daniela Rondinelli (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli, colleghi, Commissario, il conflitto in Ucraina sta generando una guerra mondiale del cibo che minaccia la nostra sicurezza alimentare e la possibilità di garantire cibo nei paesi più poveri.

I fertilizzanti, il cui prezzo è aumentato del 200 %, sono diventati merce rara per gli agricoltori, mentre le aziende produttrici faticano a restare sul mercato o chiudono a causa del caro bolletta e della penuria di materie prime.

Per abbassare il prezzo e aumentare la disponibilità di fertilizzanti è necessario fissare un tetto al prezzo del gas per stroncare questa speculazione ai danni di famiglie e imprese. Bisogna promuovere le alternative naturali come le leguminose o i fertilizzanti organici. È necessario sospendere i dazi antidumping all'importazione dei fertilizzanti e derogare fino alla fine del 2023 al regolamento europeo sulla commercializzazione dei fertilizzanti, perché i criteri di conformità fissati nel 2019 oggi bloccano le nostre imprese produttrici.

Per questo la strategia europea dovrà essere ambiziosa, in grado di dare risposte ai nostri agricoltori e anche per scongiurare nuove carestie, guerre e povertà.

Colm Markey (PPE). – Mr President, I'd like to thank the Commissioner for taking the time to be here today and indeed, for his comments as regards coming forward with a proposal.

It's estimated that fertiliser is responsible for 40 to 60% of world food production. And prior to the war, 60% of fertiliser imports came from Belarus or Russia. In Ireland, for example, fertiliser prices prior to the war were EUR 280 a tonne and have gone to EUR 1 000 a tonne. This is quite simply unsustainable, and we need measures to address this situation.

The anti-dumping measures need to be removed to allow product to come in from abroad. But we also need to build our own capacity here, in Europe, to be able to produce our own fertiliser. And we need to source gas from elsewhere, or alternatively, products from other parts of the world to ensure that we can supply the need that's there.

Equally, as regards trading in fertilisers, there is a major issue where people don't have the confidence to go out into the market at the moment for fear the price will be dropped and they'll be left exposed. So traders are afraid of being exposed, and they also need finance to ensure that they can go into that market and secure that, because you're talking about three times the amount of money that was previously needed.

As others have said, we need to move away from our dependency on synthetic fertilisers. In Ireland, we're looking at things like clover and the development of other types of organic fertilisers. But this will take time. This will take a number of years. And frankly, I wanted this to be brought forward today – I asked for this to be brought forward today – because I believe in the short term, we need emergency measures, we need to act now for next spring. Quite simply, next spring will be too late.

It's as simple as this: expensive fertiliser means expensive food. Expensive food means it's just not affordable for some people. And that, in its own way can lead to, we'll say, the likes of famine in parts of the world or here, in Europe, people are under pressure to afford that food.

So we need to act. We need to act now. And I'd just like to thank my colleagues Mr Dorfmann and Mr Lins for their support in bringing this forward here today.

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, într-o criză energetică al cărei sfârșit e greu de anticipat și în preajma unui sezon rece care ne-ar putea crea noi și mari probleme, Europa trebuie să învețe cum să facă economie la căldură, la curent electric și la apă. E prețul pe care îl plătește, pentru că de mai bine de un an, în pofida avertismentelor și a solicitărilor repetate, Uniunea a ezitat să intervină ferm pentru a combate anomalii de pe piața energetică.

Și așa am ajuns în această situație care ne-ar putea arunca într-un haos fără precedent. Dependenți de gaz, producătorii de îngrășăminte, substanțe vitale pentru agricultură, sunt în colaps. Fabrici din România, Spania, Lituania, Ungaria și Croația și-au închis porțile, altele au redus drastic producția, iar din cauza războiului din Ucraina, alternativele s-au împuținat. În ultimul an, doar în cazul amoniacului, 70 % din piața europeană a dispărut.

Estimările pentru 2023 sunt crunte. În lipsa îngrășămintelor, producția agricolă europeană ar scădea cu până la 45 %, aproape la jumătate. Afectate vor fi atât fermele vegetale, dar și cele zootehnice, care nu vor mai avea mâncare pentru animale. Dacă nu se găsesc soluții urgente și eficiente, dezastrul din sector nu va mai putea fi evitat.

Primele semne se văd deja. În țara mea au început să se vândă sau să se sacrifice animale din ferme. În Europa, fermierii riscă falimente pe bandă rulantă, iar consumatorul va avea în față rafturi goale. Acel consumator pe care Comisia a promis să îl protejeze, acel european pe care Comisia a promis că nu îl va lăsa în urmă.

Solicit deci Comisiei Europene să rezolve rapid această criză prin câteva acțiuni simultane, cum ar fi găsirea unor piețe noi de unde să poată fi cumpărate îngrășăminte necesare fără taxe de import și identificarea urgentă a unui sprijin financiar suficient care să le permită producătorilor europeni să țină deschise fabricile de fertilizanți, iar pe termen mediu să grăbească legislația privind noile tehnici de ameliorare a plantelor. La securitatea alimentară nu se face economie. Dacă azi nu intervii, mâine Europa nu mănâncă.

Атидже Алиева-Вели (Renew). – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, европейското селско стопанство е изправено пред поредната криза. Посегателството на Русия върху Украйна днес все повече се отразява върху ежедневните нужди на европейските граждани. Европа е най-тежко засегната от намаленото производство на торове в резултат на растящите цени на газа, а цените на торовете са на рекордни нива.

Намалената употреба на торове може да доведе до свиване на добивите от някои култури наполовина. По-ниските добиви и по-високите цени на храните притискат потребителите и допринасят за по-бързата инфлация. Това са още лоши новини за продоволствената сигурност. Рискуваме да се сблъскаме с криза на достъпността на храните, а през следващите месеци - и с криза на наличността.

Г-н Комисар, тази стратегия е необходима. За да се намали зависимостта ни от торове и да се постигнат „зелените“ цели, Европейският съюз следва да подкрепя разработването на безопасни, ефективни и достъпни алтернативни продукти за растителна защита и биоторове, както и да насърчава по-широката им употреба.

За да се осигури продоволствието, са нужни координирани действия и интегриран подход на ниво Европейски съюз, които да гарантират производство на торове на достъпни цени, които да гарантират достатъчно количество и високо качество на храните, които да гарантират справедливи доходи за фермерите.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Gerbiamas pirmininke, gerbiamas komisare, mieli kolegos. Norint išspręsti kylančias maisto kainas ir apsirūpinimą, turime aiškiai įvardinti problemą, kodėl tai vyksta. Trąšų kaina yra tik viena medalio pusė. Žemdirbiai yra priklausomi nuo energetikos pramonės gaminamos produkcijos, mokslo ir technologijų. Iki šiol nesudarėme galimybės kiekvienam ūkiui diegti naujoves. Jei jomis gali pasinaudoti tik didieji, natūralu, kad maži nyksta ir mažėja konkurencija. Kita neišmokta pamoka: perdirbėjų ir mažmeninės prekybos tinklų viršpelniai. Kviečiu Komisiją atlikti detalią analizę ir, jeigu reikia, kaip ir elektros tiekėjo atveju, apmokestinti šių įmonių viršpelnius. Maisto perkamumas yra daugelio europiečių išgyvenimo reikalas. Nepalikime žemdirbių ir vartotojų vienų šioje sudėtingoje situacijoje.

Paolo Borchia (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siccità, esplosione dei costi. Il 2022 nel settore agricolo vede un netto peggioramento rispetto a quanto successo l'anno scorso. Pensate che in Italia il 34 % delle aziende agricole si trova costretta a lavorare in una condizione di reddito negativo, mentre oltre il 13 % rischia addirittura di chiudere.

Le misure proposte dalla Commissione lo scorso luglio sulla riduzione delle tariffe per l'importazione delle materie prime necessarie a produrre fertilizzanti sono sicuramente positive, ma se da un lato si tolgono le tariffe per abbassare gli altissimi costi di produzione, dall'altro lato con una strategia più forte, stiamo creando le basi per aggravare ulteriormente la dipendenza dalle importazioni. Ci si illude infatti di poter superare la crisi del settore agricolo con azioni restrittive come questa, ma il rischio è quello di aumentare la dipendenza dalle importazioni che si è riconosciuto essere la causa prima dell'esplosione dei costi.

Quindi io non vorrei che ripetessimo lo stesso errore, lo stesso passo falso che stiamo già facendo in materia di energia, affidandoci ai piani di razionamento e al pacchetto *Fit for 55*. Quindi io, signor Commissario, le chiedo, le propongo, pensiamo seriamente a una nuova valutazione che finalmente tenga conto del mutato contesto internazionale e che sia pronta per la tabella di marcia del *Farm to Fork*.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Rynek surowców energetycznych, w szczególności gazu, został zdestabilizowany jeszcze jesienią ubiegłego roku, na długo przed napaścią Rosji na Ukrainę. Już wtedy ceny gazu wzrosły dziesięciokrotnie. Prawie natychmiast przełożyło się to w oczywisty sposób na ceny nawozów sztucznych, bo przecież koszty gazu to, w zależności od rodzaju nawozu, 70-80% kosztu jego wytworzenia. W tej sytuacji brakuje już około 70% zdolności produkcyjnej nawozów w całej Europie, w tym także w Polsce.

Jak Pan Komisarz doskonale wie, akurat nasz kraj zareagował na to dotacjami do cen nawozów dla rolników – programem za blisko 0,8 miliarda euro. Ale oczywiście może to być działanie tylko jednorazowe.

Potrzebne są więc działania unijne, które spowodowałyby obniżkę cen gazu – i jest to możliwe. 17 krajów unijnych zaproponowało właśnie wprowadzenie maksymalnych cen gazu importowanego do Unii Europejskiej. Dziwnym trafem przeciwniczką tego rozwiązania jest pani przewodnicząca von der Leyen.

Mam nadzieję, że w połowie października takie rozporządzenie jednak zostanie przygotowane na wniosek tych siedemnastu krajów i przynajmniej jednorazowo spowoduje to obniżkę cen surowca, a tym samym przełoży się korzystnie na ceny nawozów. Oczywiście zapowiadana przez pana komisarza strategia w tym zakresie jest potrzebna, no ale ona przyniesie pozytywne rezultaty pewnie trochę później.

Anja Hazekamp (The Left). – Voorzitter, de huidige energiecrisis maakt pijnlijk duidelijk hoe ontzettend vervuilend de productie van kunstmest is. Alleen al de kunstmestfabriek van Yara in Nederland jaagt er elk jaar 2 miljard kubieke meter gas doorheen. Dat leidt tot een aanzienlijke bijdrage aan de opwarming van de aarde en een recordelektriciteitsprijs.

Maar er zijn meer desastreuze gevolgen van de fossiele verslaving van de landbouw. Ook de uitputting van onze bodems, het uitspoelen van voedingsstoffen en de vermesting en vervuiling van onze rivieren, meren en oceanen maken duidelijk dat we niet meer kunstmest nodig hebben, maar minder. En dat kan. De natuur en de biologische boeren hebben de oplossing al lang in huis. Erwten, lupinen en andere vlinderbloemigen binden stikstof, verrijken de bodem. Groenbemesters, wisselteelten en een echt circulaire landbouw waarin we voedingsstoffen niet alleen onttrekken aan de akkers, maar ze er ook weer op terugbrengen, zijn effectief, goedkoop en toekomstbestendig.

We moeten zo snel mogelijk af van de fossiele vorm van landbouw, en natuurlijk ook van de landbouwsubsidies.

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caros colegas, os nossos agricultores vivem tempos muito difíceis, enfrentando sucessivas crises, desde uma das maiores secas de que há memória, com efeitos particularmente devastadores no sul da Europa, até aos impactos da guerra russa contra a Ucrânia, com destaque para a escassez e o aumento brutal do preço dos fertilizantes.

Estas e outras disrupções recentes impactam fortemente sobre a agricultura, sobre a produção alimentar e, como não poderia deixar de ser, também sobre o custo dos produtos agrícolas alimentares e também aumentam o risco da insegurança alimentar para milhões de cidadãos na Europa.

Os sistemas, bem sabemos, não se mudam de um dia para o outro, e não podemos deixar de proteger os mais vulneráveis, por conseguinte, serão sempre úteis todas as medidas de curto prazo que apoiem os agricultores e a produção alimentar, facilitando a oferta de fertilizantes no mercado doméstico no curto prazo.

Mas esta crise também tem de ser entendida como uma oportunidade para repensar todo o sistema de produção e avançarmos para ações em múltiplas frentes. É preciso, por exemplo, diversificar a fonte de matérias primas, é preciso apostar numa descarbonização do setor de produção de fertilizantes europeu e é preciso fazê-lo através de uma clara aposta de investimento em energias renováveis.

Mas, em paralelo, importa, acima de tudo, que saibamos fazer a transição para sistemas de gestão de nutrientes mais eficientes e mais circulares, que nos permitam reduzir de forma sustentada a necessidade de fertilizantes químicos como, aliás, preconizado na estratégia do Prado ao Prato, com benefícios claros para os nossos agricultores, a sociedade e o ambiente.

É preciso uma aposta clara na otimização da reciclagem de nutrientes, nomeadamente de resíduos e nas práticas agroecológicas e, por isso, eu registo, Senhor Comissário, com agrado, o facto de aqui ter anunciado uma futura comunicação sobre fertilizantes e gestão de nutrientes. Mas eu espero é que a comunicação não venha apenas com um foco essencialmente punitivo e que sirva, efetivamente, para nós pensarmos a gestão de nutrientes e pensarmos esta questão de um ponto de vista da autonomia estratégica dos fertilizantes para a Europa. Não podemos num dia anunciar uma comunicação e noutro dia anunciarmos um plano de gestão de nutrientes. Temos de ter um foco, temos de ter um caminho e cá estaremos para auxiliar nessa construção.

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, tras la invasión de Ucrania, el precio del gas en Europa ha aumentado un 800 % en comparación con marzo del año pasado. Esta subida ha llevado a muchas plantas de producción de fertilizantes europeas a cerrar, lo que ha supuesto una reducción de la producción en un 70 %. Esto, sumado a la reducción de importaciones de Rusia y Ucrania, ha eliminado prácticamente la oferta de fertilizantes en el mercado europeo.

Con una crisis de seguridad alimentaria acechándonos, es indispensable salvaguardar nuestra producción y, para ello, necesitamos fertilizantes asequibles y accesibles. Si no se toman medidas a tiempo, la falta de disponibilidad de fertilizantes tendrá consecuencias muy negativas en el sector agrario y en toda la cadena de valor.

Por eso, necesitamos tomar medidas para abaratar los costes de producción de fertilizantes, como han solicitado las Naciones Unidas. Necesitamos reducir la carga impositiva a los agricultores para que puedan cubrir sus costes y seguir siendo competitivos en el mercado internacional.

Y, por último, necesitamos facilitar la importación de materias activas en todas sus formas, y así evitar que nuestra producción sufra una desventaja frente a terceros países.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Jan Huitema (Renew). – Voorzitter, collega's, commissaris, kunstmest is essentieel voor onze voedselproductie. De hoge kunstmestprijzen hebben ook geleid tot hoge voedselprijzen. Tegelijkertijd is de kunstmestindustrie een van de grootste uitstoters van CO_2 in Europa, en voor één ton kunstmest is meer dan duizend kubieke meter aardgas nodig. Het is tijd dus om te kijken naar alternatieven. Wat mij betreft zit de sleutel in de mestkringloop, en die is nog lang niet gesloten.

Wij vragen de kunstmestindustrie om kunstmest te maken, terwijl er nog steeds waardevolle nutriënten verloren gaan in het milieu. Een belangrijk lek zijn de nutriënten in menselijke uitwerpselen, maar ook de nutriënten in dierlijke mest of digestaat kunnen niet gebruikt worden als een vervanger van kunstmest. Ik roep de Europese Commissie dan ook op om werk te maken van een circulaire landbouw, want dit is beter voor mens, boer, klimaat en milieu.

Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, sehr verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die nächsten Generationen werden sich umdrehen auf unsere Zeit. Sie werden entweder von der großen Transformation sprechen oder vom großen Scheitern. Ob wir es wollen oder nicht, wir stecken mittendrin mit jedem unserer Gedanken und jeder unserer Handlungen.

Und ja, das Öl ist knapp. Es ist das Ende des fossilen Zeitalters, und es ist das Ende der petrochemischen Dünger. Wir wollten das jetzt nicht so schnell, aber durch die Krise, die wir erleben, wird es noch schneller kommen, als wir dachten.

Im Ernst: Was gibt es jetzt zu tun? Die Fruchtbarkeit des Bodens auf natürliche Art und Weise wieder zu verbessern! Das Durchdeklinieren der Fruchtfolge und natürlich nicht deren Aussetzen! Was nicht sein kann, ist, dass wir jetzt die Menge der tierischen Dünger, die wir auf dem Feld ausfahren wollen, wieder erhöhen wollen, die Angst vor Lebensmittelknappheit einzutauschen gegen die Verpestung unseres Trinkwassers. Ist es dieses kurzfristige Denken, das uns helfen wird?

Nein, meine Damen und Herren, wir müssen uns gemeinsam ermutigen, neue Wege zu gehen und langfristig zu denken. Wir haben genug Wissen.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, el aumento del coste de los fertilizantes, agravado por la guerra de Ucrania y el eventual cierre de muchas de sus plantas de fabricación, amenaza las cosechas de las próximas campañas agrícolas, y la fuerte dependencia externa que tiene Europa tampoco ayuda.

A corto plazo, lo más importante es proteger a nuestros agricultores, que siguen siendo el eslabón más débil de la cadena alimentaria. Hay que distribuir el aumento de costes a lo largo de toda esa cadena para que los distribuidores con beneficios astronómicos asuman también las consecuencias. Hay que diversificar los mercados y, si es necesario, levantar temporalmente las medidas *antidumping* para satisfacer las necesidades de abastecimiento.

A medio plazo, deberíamos utilizar más fertilizantes orgánicos, porque son más cercanos y ofrecen una alternativa frente a la dependencia del gas.

Finalmente, a largo plazo, hay que aplicar la Estrategia «De la Granja a la Mesa», que es el único marco que nos garantiza soberanía alimentaria y resiliencia frente a las crisis, porque impide, entre otras cosas, la sobreutilización de fertilizantes.

El campo exige creatividad, paciencia y sensibilidad, y, para acertar, hemos de diseñar nuestras políticas adaptándonos a las circunstancias concretas y al paso del tiempo.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, aujourd'hui plus que jamais le monde agricole a besoin que nous agissions au niveau européen pour lui venir en aide. Outre la détresse immense de certains producteurs, qui font face, qui ont fait face à la sécheresse, nous voici au cœur d'une crise majeure.

Les prix de l'énergie flambent, entraînant dans leur sillage le prix des engrais. Alors que certains agriculteurs, contraints et forcés, limitent leur recours aux fertilisants et que des industriels réduisent, voire arrêtent leur production d'engrais, des conséquences désastreuses sur la sécurité et l'autonomie alimentaire de l'Europe sont à redouter.

Nous voyons désormais une vraie volonté politique émerger pour protéger les Européens sur les questions énergétiques. Nous devons faire preuve du même courage sur la question des engrais. L'inaction européenne en la matière serait une erreur gravissime.

Je propose ainsi qu'à court terme la Commission lève les droits antidumping sur les engrais produits dans des pays tiers, et qu'à long terme nous investissions massivement dans la recherche, pour soutenir une fabrication européenne et innovante. Vous avez déjà levé les droits de douane sur l'ammoniac et l'urée afin de faire baisser la pression à laquelle sont soumis les agriculteurs; il faut à présent aller beaucoup plus loin et changer d'ambition.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, il n'aura échappé à personne que la Russie, en agressant l'Ukraine, a perturbé profondément la fourniture d'engrais à l'Europe et fait exploser leur prix. Notre objectif doit être clair: il nous faut sécuriser les quantités d'engrais disponibles, afin que nos agriculteurs puissent survivre à cette hausse de prix, mais aussi pour garantir l'approvisionnement alimentaire au sein de l'Europe.

Il y a sept mois, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous vous interpellions déjà à ce propos: dans la résolution que nous avons votée en mars dernier et qui avait précisément pour objet la sécurité alimentaire, nous, le Parlement européen, avions tiré la sonnette d'alarme en vous expliquant que notre dépendance aux exportations d'engrais – d'autant plus s'ils proviennent d'une poignée de producteurs seulement – était excessive et qu'elle risquait de nous mettre dans une position délicate, pour ne pas dire dangereuse. À cette occasion, nous vous demandions d'étudier la possibilité de lever les droits antidumping sur les engrais produits dans des pays tiers et de soutenir une transition vers les engrais organiques, ainsi que la recherche et l'innovation en la matière au sein de l'Union.

Mais rien n'a été fait. En sept mois, la situation s'est encore aggravée, l'inflation galope, l'insécurité alimentaire prévaut. Je veux rappeler ici, une fois encore, qu'il est urgent, selon moi, que vous mettiez en œuvre le concept d'autonomie stratégique pour l'agriculture et l'alimentation. Il est temps, il est grand temps de mettre en œuvre une planification alimentaire et environnementale sur la base d'une vision systémique. C'est aujourd'hui devenu un impératif.

Il est évident que vous avez en face de vous des députés impatients et très intéressés par votre annonce d'une stratégie européenne sur les engrais. Il faudra néanmoins éviter de confondre vitesse et précipitation, ne pas déstabiliser nos entreprises, ne pas non plus accroître notre dépendance. Si une levée des droits antidumping est décidée, elle doit être temporaire et avoir comme contrepartie des aides financières, abondées par la contribution sur les superprofits. Il s'agit là d'un enjeu important. Le secteur doit bénéficier prioritairement de l'approvisionnement en gaz. Ce que nous demandions jadis reste toujours tristement d'actualité aujourd'hui.

Irène Tolleret (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, depuis que l'homme est homme, il maîtrise la nature et produit son alimentation avec des gestes agricoles, en utilisant des engrais. L'utilisation des engrais n'est pas liée à l'agriculture industrielle, elle est inhérente au développement de l'agriculture, et ce depuis des dizaines de milliers d'années. Les engrais s'avèrent donc essentiels, car sans eux il n'y a pas de chaîne alimentaire viable et durable dans notre Union.

Je vous rappelle que, avant même que n'éclate la guerre en Ukraine, plus de 16 millions d'Européens bénéficiaient d'aides alimentaires. Pour notre souveraineté alimentaire, pour que chaque Européen ait accès à une alimentation de qualité, nous devons donc nous doter d'une solide stratégie européenne concernant les engrais. Je voudrais remercier le président Macron pour son opération de sauvetage des engrais au sein des Nations unies, y compris pour les pays les plus défavorisés.

En Europe, nous devons agir vite. À court terme, par la diversification des sources d'approvisionnement et par le versement d'une partie des surprofits des compagnies d'électricité au secteur industriel européen des engrais afin de l'aider à affronter le hausse du prix du gaz; à long terme…

(Le président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Was ist das für eine Panikmache hier? Wir haben ein Problem mit Lebensmittelversorgung in der EU? Mitnichten! 60 % des Getreides, das wir produzieren, geht ins Viehfutter, weitere 20 % gehen in die Erzeugung von Treibstoffen. Wir haben kein Problem mit Lebensmittelsicherheit in der Europäischen Union.

Übrigens produzieren wir mit agrarökologischen und biologischen Methoden wunderbar Lebensmittel, ohne abhängig zu sein von Kunstdünger und von Preissteigerungen beim Kunstdünger. Die Biobauern können wunderbar weiterhin produzieren, und wir halten unsere Böden fruchtbar, indem wir den Humus anreichern – den Humus, der übrigens dazu führt, dass die Böden eine hohe Wasserspeicherfähigkeit haben und durch die Wasserspeicherfähigkeit auch bei Dürre noch Lebensmittel produzieren können – ja, der klimabedingten Dürre, die wir heuer wieder in ganz Europa gesehen haben. So sieht Lebensmittelsicherheit aus.

Nutzen wir diese Gelegenheit, um die Wende in der Agrarpolitik einzuleiten, und führen wir hier nicht die zerstörerischen Methoden der letzten Jahrtausende weiter fort.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Rosja od wielu lat wykorzystuje swoje surowce, m.in. gaz ziemny, do prowadzenia wojny przeciwko Unii Europejskiej, przeciwko jej bezpieczeństwu żywnościowemu oraz przeciwko europejskiemu przemysłowi.

W ogólnym koszcie produkcji nawozów azotowych 90% to koszt gazu ziemnego. Tolerując wpuszczenie rosyjskich nawozów azotowych do Unii, tak naprawdę Komisja Europejska wspiera dalsze uzależnienie Europy od rosyjskiego gazu. Dysponując tanimi surowcami, Rosja dysponuje potęgą nawozową i od lat dąży do zdominowania światowego rynku nawozów, co zagraża przyszłości Unii i europejskiego przemysłu. Agresja na Ukrainę dobitnie pokazała, że Rosji nie można ufać. Polski rząd, rząd Prawa i Sprawiedliwości, od lat przed tym przestrzegał. Rosja każdą swoją przewagę wykorzystuje, by szantażować i wymuszać ustępstwa polityczne. To też dotyczy rynku produkcji nawozów. My w Polsce ustawowo zablokowaliśmy Rosjanom możliwość wrogiego przejmowania naszych narodowych czempionów gospodarczych. Inne kraje Unii niestety nie mają takiego mechanizmu.

Za rosyjskimi firmami nawozowymi stoją oligarchowie w służbie Putina. Mimo że ich właściciele są objęci sankcjami, to firmy, które oni kontrolują, nadal działają w Europie i na świecie, uzależniając Europejczyków od dostaw z Rosji. Komisja Europejska niestety niewiele zrobiła, by temu przeciwdziałać.

Marlene Mortler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Kollegen! Herr Waitz, träumen Sie weiter, wir brauchen jetzt Lösungen. Die Vielfalt wichtiger Nährstoffe ist essenziell für gute Erträge und hochwertige Nahrungsmittel. Eine ausgewogene Ernährung ist das A und O für unsere Ackerböden, für unsere Ackerkulturen, aber auch für uns Menschen.

Putins Krieg hat uns mehr Leid, mehr Hunger, mehr Inflation, höhere Preise gebracht. Und eine globale Lebensmittelkrise sehe ich auf dem Weg, denn Düngemittelhersteller drosseln die Produktion, sie schließen ganz. Die Marktmacht weniger Anbieter wird langsam zur Monopolmacht. Ob Gärtner, Weinbauern, Tierhalter und Futtermittelerzeuger – alle sind zutiefst besorgt und blicken mit großer Hoffnung auf uns, auf Europa.

Mineralischer Stickstoffdünger ist zum Beispiel mittelfristig nicht durch andere Stoffe ersetzbar, aber es braucht Alternativen. Der Stickstoff aus Gülle und Mist wird weniger, weil die EU-Kommission die Tierhaltung pauschal vertreiben will. Und die EU-Kommission muss alles unternehmen, um die Düngerquellen für Europa zu diversifizieren, zu identifizieren und den Düngernachschub zu sichern.

Bauern brauchen praxisnahe Angebote statt Verbote. Holen wir Forschung und Wissenschaft ins Boot, denn Ernährungssicherheit bedeutet gleichzeitig Wohlstand und Frieden. Machen wir unser Europa und unsere Bauern nicht durch einen falsch verstandenen Green Deal kaputt.

Lieber Herr Kommissar, setzen Sie sich jetzt für eine europäische Düngemittel-Strategie ein. Gesunde Lebensmittel brauchen hochwertige, effiziente Düngung.

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, najväčší výrobca hnojív na Slovensku a zároveň jeden z najväčších v Európe Duslo Šaľa odstavil v auguste svoju prevádzku. Oficiálnym dôvodom bola revízia a prípadné opravy, ale výrobu podnik doteraz neobnovil. V dôsledku vysokých cien plynu a elektriny, ale najmä chýbajúcej pomoci zo strany Únie a našej vlády, a aj zlých zákonov je totiž výrobu obnoviť naozaj ťažké. Takých chemických podnikov, ktoré odstavili svoju výrobu, je ale v Európe veľa kvôli pokračujúcej vojne na Ukrajine, našim sankciám a ruským protiopatreniam. Veľká časť výroby čpavku a minerálnych hnojív v Európe prakticky zastala. V niektorých štátoch únie prestali farmári nakupovať hnojivá. V iných ešte síce nakupujú, ale za obrovské ceny, ktoré majú devastačný vplyv na ich konkurencieschopnosť. Táto situácia si od nás naozaj vyžaduje zodpovedný prístup, inak ohrozíme našu potravinovú, ale aj celosvetovú potravinovú bezpečnosť. Musíme nájsť účinné riešenia na zabezpečenie zníženia cien hnojív a podniknúť kroky na diverzifikáciu ich dodávok. Európska únia potrebuje preto novú stratégiu, ktorá našu výrobu hnojív a následne aj naše poľnohospodárstvo urobí menej závislou od vonkajších faktorov a dodávateľov a našich farmárov menej závislých od využívania minerálnych hnojív.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, commissaris, het inkomen van onze boeren staat op een absoluut dieptepunt en een sector die al in crisis was, zakt nog dieper in het rood. De prijsstijgingen, collega's, moet ik u eerlijk zeggen, zijn niet normaal. De kunstmeststofprijzen zijn verdubbeld, verdrievoudigd, de energieprijzen meer dan verdubbeld en ook de voederkosten stegen enorm. En de opbrengsten? De opbrengsten blijven gelijk.

Deze week, mijnheer de commissaris, werden de Vlaamse cijfers bekendgemaakt, van onze Vlaamse boeren. Daaruit blijkt dat de werkingskosten met 25 % gestegen zijn over alle sectoren van de boerenstiel en dat 93 % van de omzet eigenlijk gaat naar de kosten.

U heeft mij een tijd geleden, mijnheer de commissaris, bekendgemaakt hoeveel boeren er per dag in Europa verdwijnen. Weet u dat cijfer nog? Dat waren er toen duizend per dag, collega's, duizend boeren per dag die verdwijnen in Europa. Ik vraag u nu, mijnheer de commissaris, kent u de huidige cijfers? Voorzitter, ik rond af, want het is een belangrijk thema hier. Ik wil hier een oproep doen. Laten we … *(de Voorzitter ontneemt de spreker het woord)*

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Rosja wciąż niestety ma wiele narzędzi ataku na Ukrainę, Europę i cały świat. Dzisiaj bardzo ważna jest ta debata, dlatego że jednym z tych narzędzi jest wywołanie, świadome i celowe, kryzysu żywnościowego.

To Rosja przez miesiące blokowała transport żywności i ziarna z Ukrainy, napędzając kryzys głodu i niedożywienia w krajach trzecich. Jaki był tego cel? Zmusić Europę do ustępstw w Ukrainie. Dzisiaj wojna spowodowała również gigantyczny wzrost cen nawozów, co zagraża pozycji również Wspólnoty Europejskiej jako eksportera żywności. 70 proc. produkcji nawozów w Europie zostało ograniczone albo wstrzymane. Problemy na rynku nawozów są krytyczne i wymagają natychmiastowej reakcji. Nasi rolnicy czekają na finansowe wsparcie.

Dlatego myślę, że Komisja Europejska powinna rozważyć poluzowanie reguł dotyczących pomocy publicznej, tak aby państwa Wspólnoty mogły w końcu pomagać rolnikom w akomodacji wobec cen nawozów na rynku. Musimy zrobić wszystko, aby powstrzymać spadek produkcji plonów w 2023 r. i zapewnić bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe.

Salvatore De Meo (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'agricoltura europea e i nostri agricoltori sono in difficoltà. Da mesi il Partito popolare denuncia come l'aumento dei costi delle materie prime e il prezzo del gas abbiano generato una situazione che rischia di bloccare l'intera filiera agroalimentare.

Questo dibattito, permettetemi, rischia di far passare gli agricoltori europei o alcuni di noi come quelli che non hanno una sensibilità ambientale, quando in realtà è tutto l'opposto considerati l'impegno e i risultati raggiunti dagli agricoltori europei e la loro piena disponibilità a condividere una strategia pragmatica dove l'ambiente possa essere tutelato unitamente alla produttività. Perché ricordiamo che nessun risultato sostenibile ambientalmente potrà essere raggiunto se indeboliamo il nostro sistema produttivo.

La strategia prevede il divieto di uso e non di produzione dei fertilizzanti. Considerato che l'Europa è il leader mondiale della loro produzione, significa che esporta nel mondo quello che è vietato nel suo interno. Fate questa riflessione: se la strategia determinerà una riduzione di produzione, aumenteranno le importazioni da paesi terzi e quindi l'Europa reputa nocivo ciò che viene esportato per poi ritrovarcelo nel piatto.

Bisogna fare in modo che ci sia il principio di reciprocità, altrimenti significa che i consumatori europei più ricchi potranno permettersi di acquistare prodotti europei più costosi per i relativi costi di produzione, mentre quelli meno ricchi saranno dirottati ad acquisti di prodotti importati meno cari ma anche meno sicuri e meno sostenibili.

Günther Sidl (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Das größte Problem für unseren Wohlstand und Zusammenhalt in Europa ist die Abhängigkeit von Importen. Das sehen wir in vielen Bereichen: bei der Energieversorgung, bei den Problemen der globalen Lieferketten, aber auch im landwirtschaftlichen Bereich. Russland – es wurde heute schon angesprochen – ist der weltweit größte Exporteur von Düngemitteln. Bis zu 60 % der in der EU verwendeten Düngemittel kommen aus Russland oder aus Weißrussland. Wir wissen alle um die Belastungen für die landwirtschaftlichen Betriebe. Die Teuerungen, das Problem Produkte zu halten, machen auch hiervor nicht halt. Und es muss eine gemeinsame Kraftanstrengung von uns allen sein, dass wir hier unterstützend eingreifen. Es geht schließlich um die Versorgung der Bürgerinnen und Bürger mit Lebensmitteln, aber auch um die Existenz vieler Betriebe.

So weit zur aktuellen Situation, und ich denke, wir sind uns hier alle einig. Auf der anderen Seite ist es Fakt, dass der unbedachte Einsatz von Pestiziden und Düngemitteln eine massive Belastung unserer Böden, unseres Wassers und unserer Luft mit sich bringt. Und als Schattenberichterstatter im Umweltausschuss zur Verordnung über die Reduktion der Methangas-Emissionen ist zu erwähnen, dass der unbedarfte Einsatz synthetischer Düngemittel und Mineraldünger auch zu einem Anstieg von Methanemissionen führt.

Wir können natürlich so weitermachen wie bisher, aber es geht wirklich darum, hier Dinge zu verändern. Wir müssen uns die selbstgesteckten Ziele, die wir haben, 50 % weniger Pestizide und 20 % weniger Düngemittel, schneller voranbringen. Es ist nachgewiesen, dass Pestizideinsatz und Überdüngung hier bei den Böden im Bereich der Nährstoffversorgung und auch bei der Bodenfruchtbarkeit Probleme verursachen. Daher braucht es eine tiefgehende Veränderung.

Wir haben auch bei der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik mit Sicherheit eine Chance vertan. Denn dass wir die Verpflichtung, Leguminosen anzubauen, in der Fruchtfolge aufgegeben haben, das können wir heute mit Sicherheit als Fehler bezeichnen. Daher nutzen wir diese Herausforderung als Chance, um Veränderungen voranzutreiben!

Martin Hojsík (Renew). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, naši farmári volajú o pomoc. Ceny umelých hnojív rastú do neba a naša potravinová bezpečnosť je v ohrození. Prečo? Prečo sme dopustili túto priam narkomanskú závislosť od umelých hnojív a ďalej ju prehlbovali? Závislosť, ktorá nielen zabíja život v našej pôde, našich riekach, ale ohrozuje aj našu bezpečnosť. Pretože závislosť od umelých hnojív je aj závislosťou od fosílneho plynu a Putinovho režimu. Cestou von nie je prosíkanie Putina o lacný plyn. Cestou je zbavenie sa závislosti. Príroda je to najlepšie riešenie. Podporme napríklad využitie pôdnych baktérií, ktoré vedia priniesť nielen masívnu úsporu umelých hnojív, ale aj nižšie náklady a vyššiu úrodu. Áno, dá sa to aj v konvenčnom poľnohospodárstve. Reči o lacnejších umelých hnojivách nie sú o pomoci poľnohospodárom, ale agrochemickému priemyslu. Našu podporu si zaslúžia inovatívne firmy z celej Európy a, áno, aj zo Slovenska, ktoré prinášajú skutočné, prírode blízke riešenia. Je načase vrátiť život pôde, aby nám ona ďalej prinášala svoje dary. Dá sa to.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, zemědělci nás žádají o pomoc, aby mohli zajistit potraviny, a my je musíme podpořit. Je dobré si připomenout důvody, proč jsou umělá hnojiva nedostatečná a jejich ceny jsou až třikrát vyšší než před rokem. Je to především válečná agrese Ruska proti Ukrajině, tedy Putin, zastavení dovozu a nárůst cen. Naše závislost na dovozu dusičnanů, především fosfátových hnojiv z Ruska a Běloruska, je dalším velmi negativním rysem. Setrvačnost převažuje také v průmyslovém hnojení a je tady velký tlak na snižování živočišné výroby a velká nerovnoměrnost v rozložení živočišné výroby. A dodávám také absurdní zákaz využívání inovací ve šlechtění a nových genomických technik.

Zemědělci čekají naši odpověď a ta musí být i okamžitá. Já vítám návrh na sdělení, které bude strategické, ale očekávám od Komise, že i finančně podpoří dostupnost průmyslových hnojiv proto, aby i v příštím roce 2023 mohli zemědělci produkovat dostatečné množství základních plodin, samozřejmě zvyšovat využití organických hnojiv a začít využívat nové genomické technologie pro větší efektivnost zemědělské výroby.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, the true cost of the problem for consumers and farmers has not been fully evolved yet due to the fact that a lot of the crops this year were sown by input costs from last year. But now, as we unwind all of that into the marketplace, we're going to see huge pressures on farm profitability, but more importantly, the pressures that will be on consumers through food inflation.

This is going to have profound implications across the globe. But from a perspective of Europe, we have to ensure that we take immediate steps to address the cost of artificial fertilizer, and that means unwinding natural gas and decoupling the cost of electricity from gas itself to ensure that we can manufacture fertilizer.

Obviously, 60% of our fertilizer is now cut off due to Russia's illegal war in Ukraine. But we do have to do things immediately, Commissioner. Obviously, there are longer term issues with regard to the reduction of artificial fertilizers, but in the here and now, every effort must be made to sustain our food supply and our food security through cheaper cost efforts.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, volgens schattingen boeken de Vlaamse landbouwers dit jaar een recordomzet van 7,2 miljard euro. Maar helaas zien ze die extra omzet integraal in rook opgaan door uitzonderlijk hoge facturen voor voeders, energie en inderdaad kunstmest. Beperkte beschikbaarheid en recordprijzen drijven niet enkel de productiekost naar ongeziene hoogtes, maar zullen ook leiden tot lagere gewasopbrengsten.

Nochtans ligt een deel van de oplossing letterlijk voor het grijpen. We mogen ons niet blindstaren op die chemische kunstmest alleen en moeten durven gebruikmaken van kunstmest van dierlijke oorsprong als alternatief. Innovatie laat vandaag al toe dat we de mineralenkringloop op landbouwbedrijven kunnen sluiten. Laten we toch die realiteit onder ogen zien. Laten we toch daarnaar handelen als wetgever.

Ik wil daarom nogmaals de oproep doen aan de Commissie om de RENURE-criteria ernstig te nemen en dringend met een voorstel te komen. De studie van het Joint Research Center in 2020 was duidelijk, was erg duidelijk dat dit ten goede zou komen aan meer circulaire bedrijven en een effectiever gebruik van hulpbronnen in de landbouw. Voor de zomer hebben 19 Europarlementsleden uit de EVP-, de Renew-, S&D- en ECR-Fractie een brief naar u gestuurd, commissaris. Dit voorstel niet opnemen in de EU-strategie voor kunstmest zou schuldig verzuim zijn op kap van de boeren in tijden van crisis.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsedujoči, spoštovani komisar, kolegice in kolegi. Vojna v Ukrajini je dokončno razgalila, kako je Evropa odvisna od uvoza gnojil iz Rusije, Belorusije, Ukrajine.

Po drugi strani pa, kakšen vpliv ima na ceno gnojil cena plina. Tu, v Evropskem parlamentu in na Evropski komisiji, se zavedamo problemov pri oskrbi z energijo in sprejemamo številne ukrepe, da bi bili ljudje na toplem, da bi lahko kolikor toliko normalno živeli.

Mislim pa, da podcenjujemo problem v kmetijstvu. In če smo v energetiki spoznali, da veter in sonce ne moreta zadostiti vseh potreb, in sedaj celo uporabljamo premog, lignit, zato da zadostimo te potrebe. Imam občutek, da v Evropski komisiji še vedno verjamete, da je možno brez gnojil, brez pesticidov proizvesti dovolj hrane.

Predvsem je to v paketu „od vil do vilic" jasno zapisano, in sam sem prepričan, da tako kot pri energetiki, tudi na področju kmetijstva rabimo vse tipe kmetijstva, tako organsko kakor tudi integrirano pridelavo, kot klasično, in zato rabimo gnojila.

Zato mislim, da rabimo nujno sprejeti ukrepe, s katerimi bomo zagotovili dovolj gnojil, zagotovili, da bodo ta gnojila dostopna kmetom. In tu ne gre za pomoč kmetom, tu gre za pomoč evropskemu potrošniku, kajti v nasprotnem primeru bo prehranski varnosti, kjer bo hrana predraga in je na koncu tudi ne bo, če bomo nadaljevali po tej poti. Ukrepi so nujni, zato vas pozivam, da čim prej sprejmete ukrepe.

Alexander Bernhuber (PPE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die europäische Landwirtschaft steht vor großen Herausforderungen. In diesem Jahr hat sich besonders die knappe Verfügbarkeit von Düngemitteln in der Europäischen Union gezeigt, was eine ernsthafte Bedrohung für die Lebensmittelproduktion darstellt. Es gibt eine Gasknappheit, und 60 % der Düngemittel werden aus Russland und Weißrussland importiert.

Aber wir müssen auch einen Blick auf die Düngerlieferanten in der EU werfen. Derzeit droht eine Fusion des tschechischen Babiš-Konzerns Agrofert mit dem österreichischen Düngerhersteller Borealis zum zweitgrößten Stickstoffproduzenten innerhalb der EU. Wir dürfen nicht wegschauen, wenn hier ein Großindustrieller noch mehr Marktmacht auf sich zieht, wenn es ohnehin schon fast keine Düngemittelproduzenten mehr in der Europäischen Union in eigener Hand gibt. Das ist ein zusätzlicher Preistreiber und bringt zusätzliche Unruhe auf den europäischen Markt.

Sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, ich bitte Sie, auch diese Umstände zu betrachten. Die Europäische Kommission hat hier die Möglichkeit einzuschreiten, und ich bitte Sie, da genau darauf zu achten, wenn es dazu kommt. Helfen Sie uns, gemeinsam einen Ausverkauf der europäischen Düngemittelproduktion zu verhindern.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, Comisia Europeană trebuie să înțeleagă că ne aflăm în ceasul al 12-lea în ceea ce privește securitatea alimentară - poate mă și ascultați - iar strategia privind îngrășămintele trebuie pusă pe masă de îndată. Sectorul agricol s-a confruntat de-a lungul timpului cu provocări majore, fie că vorbim de lipsa de forță de muncă, ori pandemia Covid.

Mai mult decât atât, anul acesta sectorul a avut de înfruntat trei provocări majore: creșterea prețului la îngrășăminte și energie, seceta severă și războiul din Ucraina. Din păcate, Comisia Europeană, până în momentul de față, nu a venit cu măsuri suficiente pentru sectorul agricol, iar propunerile privind reducerea consumului de îngrășăminte sau a emisiilor de carbon nu fac altceva decât să afecteze fermierii.

Problema fertilizanților este una complexă, deoarece cea mai mare parte era importată din Ucraina și Belarus, iar prețul extrem de ridicat le face greu accesibile pentru fermieri. Potrivit unor studii, nu putem hrăni în prezent populația lumii fără fertilizanți. Se estimează că cel puțin … între 30 până la 50 % din recoltele culturilor la nivel global sunt atribuite aplicării îngrășămintelor.

Atrag atenția, la modul cât se poate de serios, că este necesar să ne păstrăm mai departe capacitatea Uniunii Europene de a fi furnizor de alimente pentru zonele sărace ale lumii, deoarece, în caz contrar, vom fi martorii unor valuri de refugiați dinspre țările africane spre Uniunea Europeană.

Comisia Europeană trebuie să înțeleagă că este nevoie să se vină urgent cu măsuri, iar asta înseamnă bani, nu povești, astfel încât fermierii Uniunii Europene să aibă acces la cantitățile necesare și suficiente de îngrășăminte pentru a putea produce hrană de calitate și la prețuri accesibile pentru consumatori.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Antonius Manders (PPE). – Mr President, fertilizers are not only used to produce food. At this moment, the European Commission is the fertilizer for UEFA by signing a new cooperation agreement while there is a case ongoing at the ECJ against UEFA. How can the Commission enforce the Treaty after the ruling in December? Is this a case of sports washing?

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, gerbiamas Komisijos nary. Mes išgyvename Rusijos sukeltą energijos karą. Vakar kalbėjome apie badaujančius žmones Afrikos kontinente, šiandien – apie tai, kad Europos ūkininkams trąšos tampa neįperkamos.

Pagrindinis žemės ūkio tikslas – aprūpinti europiečius sveiku maistu. Be maistinių medžiagų nebus reikiamo derliaus. Mes matome trąšų vartojimo netolygumus Europos Sąjungos valstybės narėse, todėl trąšų vartojimo mažinimas turėtų būti ne procentais valstybėms narėms, bet absoliučiais skaičiais, kur vartojama per daug.

Ką galime padaryti? Pirma, paremti prestižinę žemdirbystę. Antra, didinti organinių trąšų naudojimą. Trečia, panaudoti mokslo pasiekimus, kuriuos šiandien siūlo Europos mokslininkai, įskaitant naujas veisimo technologijas. Ketvirta, remti Europos trąšų gamybos pajėgumus. Ir penkta, bendras dujų įsigijimas trąšų gamybai, įskaitant dujų kainų ribojimus. Gerbiamas Komisijos nary, laukiame aktyvesnio Komisijos veikimo ir glaudesnio bendradarbiavimo su ūkininkais bei įsiklausymo į jų poreikius.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Herr Präsident! Mit Essen, so sagt man Kindern, spielt man nicht. Doch die EU-Düngemittelverordnung macht ausreichende Ernten zum Glücksspiel. Denn ohne Dünger kann unsere Landwirtschaft Lebensmittel weder in ausreichender Quantität noch in der gewollten Qualität herstellen. Grüne Politik ist der Angriff auf unsere Lebensgrundlagen. Grüne wenden sich gegen Erzeugung und Verbrauch von Energie, die Grundlage unserer Zivilisation. Grüne wenden sich gegen Mobilität, ohne die unsere Wirtschaft nicht existieren kann. Nun wenden sich Grüne gegen Lebensmittel und Landwirte. Lebensmittel sind genau das Mittel zum Leben.

Über die Grünen sagt man, sie seien wie Wassermelonen: außen grün und innen rot. Frau von der Leyen dagegen gleicht einer Avocado: außen schwarz und innen grün. Es gibt sogar Hass Avocados – unter Grünen im Übrigen die begehrteste Sorte.

Anna Zalewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący, przepraszam za spóźnienie. Jestem wdzięczna, że mogę zabrać głos. Ceny energii, ceny gazu, wyprowadzenie produkcji nawozów poza Unię Europejską, uzależnienie się od importu, wreszcie wojna, która przerwała wszystkie łańcuchy dostaw – wszystko to doprowadziło do dramatycznej sytuacji na rynku nawozów. Tak, trzeba działać tu i teraz. Nie myśleć o tym, co za rok, co za dwa lata, dlatego że rolnicy i obywatele potrzebują pomocy. Dlatego sugestie: ETS to rynek spekulacyjny, który powoduje, że wszyscy stracili już kontrolę nad cenami energii. Trzeba go zawiesić, tak jak prace nad pakietem Fit for 55.

Proszę, Panie Komisarzu, przekazać pani przewodniczącej von der Leyen, że bardzo potrzebujemy ograniczenia cen gazu, zamrożenia cen gazu, a właśnie ona jest tego przeciwniczką. Wreszcie, pozwólmy na pomoc finansową dla rolników. Dajmy im tę pomoc.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, decades of policies designed to promote the use of artificial fertilizers, instead of more resilient farming methods, have exacerbated farmers' vulnerability to this crisis. A chronic over-dependence on livestock farming has compounded the problem. Grassland makes up more than 80% of the utilised agricultural area on farms in Ireland. We don't use fertilizer to grow food for humans; we use it to grow food for animals.

One of the first grain ships to leave Odessa in August, after the lifting of the blockade, went not to Africa but to Ireland. It got a heroic welcome. It had 33 tonnes of grain on it for animals. Of course, Russia can take action to resolve the fertilizer crisis, but what's the EU doing to stop the war? We continue to support the US-NATO proxy war, irrespective of what it costs the people of Europe and the world.

Peter Jahr (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Vielleicht noch ein Hinweis an die linke Seite des Hauses: Wer das heute nicht meistert, braucht sich um die Zukunft nicht zu kümmern. Oder, staatsmännisch formuliert: Wir brauchen natürlich beides.

Preise an sich anorganischer Stickstoffe hängen direkt vom Gaspreis ab, und in meiner Heimatregion waren dann die Gaspreise so hoch, dass das Düngemittelwerk Piesteritz die Produktion eingestellt hat, nicht weil kein Gas da war, nicht weil irgendwas nicht funktioniert hat, sondern ganz einfach weil die Düngemittel so teuer geworden wären, dass sie kein Landwirt mehr gekauft hätte.

Deshalb zwei Bitten oder Forderungen an die an die Kommission: Erstens wäre die Lösung natürlich, die Werke im Gaspreis zu unterstützen, also eine Gaspreisstützung zu machen, weil dann das Düngemittel im Preis wieder erträglich würde. Zweitens – was schon mehrfach genannt wurde – bitte ich Sie darum, die sogenannten Antidumping-Zölle auszusetzen, weil bei dem Preisniveau, das jetzt besteht, auch keine Lenkungswirkung mehr besteht. Auch das wäre ein wichtiges Marktsignal.

Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Członek Komisji.* – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Dziękuję za bardzo interesującą, ważną, inspirującą debatę. Cieszę się, że zapowiedź komunikatu Komisji została przyjęta pozytywnie przez Wysoką Izbę. Będziemy starali się przygotować ten komunikat możliwie jak najszybciej, żeby przedstawić kompleksową wizję tego, co zamierzamy zrobić, żeby poprawić sytuację, żeby ten kryzys przestał zagrażać bezpieczeństwu żywnościowemu.

Bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe – to słowo padało wielokrotnie w debacie. Oczywiście nie odniosę się do wszystkich wypowiedzi, ale w tych klubowych wystąpieniach, w imieniu grup politycznych, pan Dorfmann, pan Cioloş, pan Vondra podkreślali znaczenie tego szczególnie. A drugi problem, też podkreślamy, to potrzeba poszukiwania alternatyw dla nawozów chemicznych, zrównoważenia produkcji rolniczej. To w wystąpieniach w imieniu grup politycznych podkreślali bardzo mocno pani Aguilera, pan Biteau, pan Kokkalis.

I obie te kwestie chcemy bardzo mocno włączyć w nasz komunikat. Bardzo poważnie traktujemy zagrożenie dla bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego. Brak nawozów, redukcja nawozów, nie taka jakiej chcieliśmy, bo Unia Europejska planowała, czy planuje nadal redukcję zużycia nawozów: jest to dwudziestoprocentowy cel. Natomiast dzisiaj już są prognozy, że zużycie nawozów może się obniżyć już w tym roku o 20 %. Nie chcieliśmy, żeby to się działo na skutek takiej właśnie sytuacji, która stawia rolników w obliczu zagrożenia dla ich produkcji rolnej, dla ich bezpieczeństwa ekonomicznego. Z całą powagą traktujemy tę sytuację.

Musimy wesprzeć sektor produkcji nawozów i dziś już są możliwości pomocy publicznej. Mówiliśmy o tym, ja osobiście zabiegałem o to, żeby np. w ramach opłat solidarnościowych, transferów z sektorów osiągających nadzwyczajne zyski można było wesprzeć producentów nawozów. I my w ogóle powinniśmy ten sektor zacząć traktować, i zamierzam to proponować w tym komunikacie, jako ważną część całego systemu bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego. My patrzymy na bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe, na ten system, widząc rolników, najważniejszy oczywiście fundament bezpieczeństwa, przemysł przetwórczy i dystrybucję żywności. Musimy jednak dostrzec również znaczenie produkcji nawozów, pamiętając o tym, że chcemy redukować to zużycie, ale nikt nigdy nie planował i nie wyobrażamy sobie tego, żeby rolnictwo mogło się obywać bez nawozów chemicznych. Dlatego to musi być część naszych działań związanych z zapewnieniem bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego.

Jeśli chodzi o ten drugi aspekt – tu jeszcze może dokończę tylko, że oczywiście musimy zapewnić własną produkcję. Nie możemy budować bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego, jeśli w produkcji nawozów będziemy zależni od zewnętrznych dostawców, a już zwłaszcza od Rosji. To jest absolutnie wykluczone, bo tak jak tutaj trafnie było podnoszone w dyskusji, Rosja każdą taką zależność wykorzysta do szantażu, do swoich politycznych, imperialnych celów. Więc musi być wsparcie produkcji bezpośrednio w Unii Europejskiej. I to strategiczne podejście będzie ważną częścią tego komunikatu.

Zwiększenie niezależności rolników od nawozów. Tu myślę, że to będzie okazja do przejrzenia planów strategicznych. Jesteśmy w trakcie oceny i przyjmowania kolejnych planów strategicznych. Ten proces w najbliższych tygodniach będzie finalizowany. Niektóre kraje już mają przyjęte plany strategiczne. Mam wrażenie, że chyba nie do końca te możliwości uniezależnienia rolników od nawozów chemicznych zostały wykorzystane. Bo choćby rolnictwo precyzyjne – szkoda, że tylko 9 krajów wprowadziło to do swoich planów strategicznych, a to jest przecież bardzo dobry instrument, żeby zredukować, zracjonalizować użycie nawozów, precyzyjnie stosując je tam, gdzie są potrzebne, nie nadużywając ich. Więc tu będziemy zachęcać do korzystania z tych instrumentów. Plan nawożenia, rolnictwo precyzyjne, stosowanie nawozów naturalnych, zwłaszcza obornika przy produkcji zwierzęcej to są rzeczy, które powinny w szerszym zakresie tworzyć alternatywę dla konieczności używania nawozów chemicznych. To będzie również ważna część tego komunikatu – pewien przegląd i wskazanie potencjalnych możliwości, które się kryją w planach strategicznych – tych planach, które przecież mogą być nowelizowane, zmieniane w trakcie funkcjonowania przyszłej Wspólnej Polityki Rolnej.

Szanowni Państwo, jeszcze raz bardzo dziękuję za wszystkie głosy. Uważnie je tutaj notowaliśmy i wykorzystamy je przy opracowaniu strategii. Jedna jeszcze może kwestia – kwestia ceł. Mówiłem o tym, że zawieszenie taryf celnych zostało zaproponowane przez Komisję, natomiast ostrożnie podchodziłbym do kwestii zawieszenia restrykcji antydumpingowych. Dumping jest zawsze niebezpieczny w gospodarce, nie można go tolerować, a jeśli byłby dopuszczony w przemyśle nawozowym, to skutek będzie taki, że sytuacja się pogorszy, nie polepszy, więc to trzeba do tego podchodzić z dużą ostrożnością. Będziemy pracować nad komunikatem. Dziękuję bardzo Państwu za inspirację przede wszystkim do tego komunikatu. Myśleliśmy o tym, ale ten sygnał z Parlamentu, ta mocna, mocna zachęta ze strony Parlamentu miała wpływ na to, że dokładnie wczoraj uzyskałem akceptację Komisji, żeby taki komunikat ze strategicznym podejściem do tego problemu przygotować.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Laura Ferrara (NI), *per iscritto*. – Lo scenario internazionale caratterizzato dall'aumento dei prezzi delle materie prime e dei costi energetici sta duramente colpendo i nostri agricoltori. Ad aggravare la situazione vi è l'emergenza fertilizzanti, il cui processo di produzione, essendo ad alta intensità energetica, solleva questioni di approvvigionamento e sicurezza alimentare a livello europeo e su scala globale.

Ancora una volta veniamo posti dinanzi al problema della dipendenza da Stati terzi per sopperire alle carenze dei nostri sistemi produttivi. Oltre a risposte immediate per frenare le spinte inflattive e soddisfare i fabbisogni dei nostri imprenditori, abbiamo bisogno di una strategia europea a lungo termine che vada nella direzione del minor impatto ambientale e una maggiore sostenibilità.

Abbiamo bisogno di rendere la nostra agricoltura meno dipendente dai fertilizzanti e dall'industria estera di settore, mantenendo dignitosa la redditività delle imprese agricole. In questo contesto sarà prioritario valorizzare tutte le soluzioni tecnologiche e agronomiche che consentano la riduzione dei fertilizzanti, pratiche agricole innovative e la preservazione e ottimizzazione del suolo.

Čtvrtek 6. října 2022

(Die Sitzung wird um 11.25 Uhr bis zur Abstimmung unterbrochen)

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

Vizepräsidentin

4. Pokračování denního zasedání

(Die Sitzung wird um 11.59 Uhr wieder aufgenommen)

5. Hlasování

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Abstimmung.

(Abstimmungsergebnisse und sonstige Einzelheiten der Abstimmung: siehe Protokoll.)

5.1. Pravidla využívání letištních časů na letištích Unie: dočasná úleva (C9-0225/2022 – Dominique Riquet) (hlasování)

5.2. Stav lidských práv na Haiti, zejména v souvislosti s násilím páchaným gangy (RC-B9-0427/2022, B9-0427/2022, B9-0449/2022, B9-0450/2022, B9-0451/2022, B9-0452/2022, B9-0453/2022) (hlasování)

5.3. Zásahy vůči svobodě sdělovacích prostředků v Myanmaru, zejména případy Htet Htet Khineové, Sithua Aunga Myinta a Nyeina Nyeina Ayeho (B9-0428/2022, RC-B9-0431/2022, B9-0431/2022, B9-0447/2022, B9-0448/2022, B9-0456/2022, B9-0457/2022) (hlasování)

5.4. Aktuální situace v humanitární oblasti a v oblasti lidských práv v etiopském Tigraji, zejména v souvislosti s dětmi (B9-0424/2022, RC-B9-0429/2022, B9-0429/2022, B9-0437/2022, B9-0441/2022, B9-0444/2022, B9-0445/2022) (hlasování)

5.5. Smrt Mahsy Amíníové a represe vůči účastníkům demonstrací za práva žen v Íránu (B9-0425/2022, RC-B9-0434/2022, B9-0434/2022, B9-0435/2022, B9-0436/2022, B9-0439/2022, B9-0442/2022, B9-0455/2022) (hlasování)

— *Nach der Abstimmung über Änderungsantrag 6:*

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, en 2021 la Commission européenne a financé une campagne de communication sur le voile islamique, qui affirmait notamment que, je cite, «la liberté est dans le hijab».

Ces mots sont injustifiables à l'heure où tant de femmes, en Iran et dans le monde, risquent leur vie, sont tuées parce qu'elles résistent à l'oppression qui leur est imposée. Le message de l'Europe ne peut consister à leur répondre – c'était un autre des slogans de la campagne de la Commission: «Apportez de la joie. Acceptez le hijab.»

Notre Parlement doit exiger la fin immédiate de toute communication de ce type. Nous le devons à la mémoire de Mahsa Amini, de toutes les femmes qui ont été tuées et de celles qui risquent leur vie aujourd'hui, au nom – justement – de la liberté.

Avec de nombreux collègues de notre groupe, nous souhaitons vous proposer cet amendement:

(Applaudissements)

«exprime sa profonde préoccupation quant au fait que la Commission a récemment financé ou cofinancé des campagnes promouvant le voile islamique, affirmant par exemple que, je cite, "la liberté est dans le hijab"; souligne que les institutions européennes ne doivent financer aucune future campagne qui pourrait promouvoir le hijab;»

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird nicht übernommen)

5.6. Eskalace ruské válečné agrese proti Ukrajině (RC-B9-0430/2022/REV, B9-0430/2022, B9-0432/2022, B9-0433/2022, B9-0438/2022, B9-0446/2022) (hlasování)

— *Vor der Abstimmung über Ziffer 15:*

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Madam President, as the war of aggression of Russia against Ukraine goes on and on, it gets more complicated, in various forms of intimidation and annexation. Just recently, Putin announced about the confiscation of Zaporizhzhia nuclear power station, the far biggest in Europe, and it happens just days before the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency visits Moscow and Kyiv.

So, colleagues, with your permission and understanding, I want to move an amendment which would go as 'denounces the Russian presidential decree of 5 October 2022 designating the Zaporizhzhia NPP "federal property" and instructing the Russian government to take over its control'. It can't happen unpunished.

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen)

5.7. Výsledek přezkumu patnáctibodového akčního plánu pro obchod a udržitelný rozvoj provedeného Komisí (B9-0415/2022) (hlasování)

5.8. Přístup EU k řízení kosmického provozu – Příspěvek EU k řešení globální výzvy (B9-0423/2022) (hlasování)

5.9. Impulz pro oceán: posílení správy oceánů a biologické rozmanitosti (B9-0426/2022) (hlasování)

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

(Die Sitzung wird um 12.23 Uhr unterbrochen)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

6. Pokračování denního zasedání

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.01 Uhr wieder aufgenommen)

Čtvrtek 6. října 2022

7. Schválení zápisu z předchozího denního zasedání

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar. Ich sehe, dass es keine Einwände gibt. Das Protokoll ist damit genehmigt.

8. COVID-19 – zachování připravenosti a reakce EU: výhled do budoucna (rozprava)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über COVID-19 – Gewährleistung von Vorsorge und einer wirksamen Reaktion der EU: ein Ausblick – von Kathleen Van Brempt im Namen des Sonderausschusses zu den Erkenntnissen aus der COVID-19-Pandemie und Empfehlungen für die Zukunft und Pascal Canfin im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit (O-000024/2022 – B9-0020/2022) (2022/2735(RSP)).

Stelios Kympouropoulos, *on behalf of the Special Committee on the COVID-19 pandemic.* – Mr President, colleagues, over the last year we have entered a new stage in our pandemic response, from emergency to a more sustainable mode of preparedness and reaction. Nevertheless, the number of cases is rising again. Having this in mind, we are calling on the EU and the Member States to do what is necessary to protect public health in a manner that keeps society and the economy open and resilient. Effective and safe vaccines is obviously a significant element in this endeavour and we are keen to hear from the Commission on how to address the current vaccine surplus, how we can ensure that the Member States with all their different needs and specificities will integrate COVID-19 vaccines into the national vaccination programmes, as well as how they can ensure continuity of healthcare delivery with a strong focus on the needs of vulnerable groups.

But at a crucial time and again during this pandemic, trust in science is key. Policymakers and citizens will need to be mindful of all those actors who will attempt to undermine such trust through disinformation and misinformation about vaccine safety and effectiveness. Because this assertion undermines our collective effort against the virus.

In this regard, we need an update on the measures the EU has taken against these phenomena and towards improving our preparedness ahead of possible future cases. And of course, we will continue drawing the right lessons on this, but also on other crucial issues such as the role of HERA, coordination among Member States, the resilience of our supply chains and the One Health approach.

Colleagues, this oral question is primarily an opportunity to remind ourselves that the pandemic is not yet over. We may have been through its toughest part but we need to remain vigilant, and we should absolutely not lose all the resolve gained from our joint response over the past two years. Instead, let's do our best to stop the virus for the benefit of our society and economy.

Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, *au nom de la commission ENVI.* – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, il y a moins d'une semaine, lundi dernier, dans ce même hémicycle, le Parlement européen s'est prononcé à une très large majorité en faveur de mon rapport «Menaces transfrontières graves pour la santé». Il s'agit d'un véritable plan d'urgence sanitaire: nous y avons tiré les leçons de la crise en matière de santé et nous avons ainsi décidé de nous doter d'une Europe de la santé qui soit solidaire, coordonnée, indépendante et durable. Il est désormais du devoir de la commission COVI, de l'ensemble de ce Parlement, de la Commission européenne et du Conseil non pas de reposer les mêmes questions, mais de s'assurer que les dispositions législatives de ce règlement seront rapidement et complètement mises en œuvre.

En matière de solidarité, unissons nos efforts pour que se mette rapidement en place le traité international sur les pandémies, afin qu'une menace pandémique soit prise en compte à l'échelle mondiale.

En matière de coordination, le mandat révisé du Centre européen de prévention et de contrôle des maladies, chère Joanna, lui confère des compétences supplémentaires pour ce qui est de la collecte et du partage de données numérisées ainsi qu'une protection renforcée contre la désinformation. Nous devrons nous assurer de cette évolution.

Pour garantir une meilleure préparation à de futures crises, nous devrons mettre en œuvre le principe de santé globale ainsi que la prévention et l'éducation à la santé.

En matière d'indépendance, nous souhaitons collectivement plus de transparence dans les achats conjoints, et cette règle devra être appliquée, de même que la clause d'exclusivité, afin que les États membres ne mènent plus de négociations parallèles avec l'industrie. Nous veillerons à ce que l'Autorité de préparation et de réaction en cas d'urgence sanitaire se coordonne avec les autres agences.

Enfin, en matière de durabilité, l'implication des autorités régionales devra favoriser la coopération dans les régions transfrontalières.

Pour finir, nous serons très attentifs à la mise en place du conseil scientifique indépendant, à l'absence de conflits d'intérêts des experts et à la consultation de toutes les parties prenantes – à commencer, bien sûr, par ce Parlement.

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I am happy to update this House on the next steps in dealing with COVID-19.

Ever since the pandemic first hit, the European Union and its Member States have worked tirelessly to counter its impact and protect our citizens. We've been learning lessons as well. Together, we revamped our health security framework, with stronger mandates for our health agencies; we created the Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Authority (HERA) and the new regulation on serious health threats to enhance our cycle of prevention, preparedness and response. We have also encouraged Member States to invest in stronger health systems. Now in their recovery and resilience plans. Member States have earmarked over EUR 40 billion in investments for better health care.

Honourable Members, the pandemic has reminded us that we are stronger when we share unity of purpose. That unity led to an historic achievement for our Union: the European Union vaccine strategy. We created and deployed a strategy giving all Member States equitable access to vaccines at the scale needed, as a recent European Court of Auditors report recognised. Importantly, the strategy also enabled us to make a major contribution to the global response to COVID-19. We've now donated nearly 500 million doses, on top of the many hundreds of millions we've exported. Global supply now outstrips demand. We must work with manufacturers to better align supply and demand.

At the same time, the COVID-19 pandemic is not yet over, so we will pursue our valiant efforts to support Member States. First, we should keep striving to improve on the vaccines we have. We are boosting Member States' vaccination programmes. We've adopted vaccines and are supporting the research and development of vaccines that elicit broader, stronger, longer-lasting immune responses.

I am glad that some Member States have started integrating COVID-19 vaccines into their programmes. We are inviting others to follow suit. We will work with Member States to strengthen capacity to face the coming months. We must keep closing vaccination gaps and protecting those at highest risk of severe disease with further boosters. We can put in place joint procurement arrangements for promising COVID vaccines that come on the market. Our ongoing COVID-19 strategy encompasses therapeutics and diagnostics as well. Member States also need resilient surveillance systems to monitor respiratory viruses, including COVID-19. The health agencies you've helped to strengthen have a key role, too. We will also keep supporting Member States with expertise through the Health Security Committee. Continued coordination on health preparedness and response will be key.

Honourable members, beyond COVID, the Commission is focusing on various surveillance actions. Also, HERA's prioritisation exercise has identified three high-impact cross-border health threat categories. Our EU4Health Programme is funding several actions for integrated surveillance. One explores the integration of human and animal health surveillance data; another seeks to improve coordinated surveillance in animals and the environment.

Before I conclude, let me come back to vigilance, this time as regards the mis— and disinformation that threaten public health, European values and democratic systems. We work with the European Parliament, other EU institutions and Member States to promote reliable information and empower citizens while monitoring, analysing and responding to threats. The strengthened code of practice and proposal under the European democracy action plan are additional tools we have. Our quick reaction to the monkeypox emergency for tracing vaccines and therapeutics shows how we can emulate our achievements against COVID in tackling future health crisis. Our growing capacity to deal with emerging threats stems from the unity of purpose I mentioned at the start. Long may it continue to the benefit of all European citizens.

Čtvrtek 6. října 2022

Tomislav Sokol, *u ime kluba PPE*. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, pandemija covid- 19 je osim javnozdravstvene ugroze neviđenih razmjera, pokazala i svu krhkost zdravstvenih sustava država članica, uzrokovala lančano zatvaranje granica te pad gospodarskih aktivnosti u Europskoj uniji.

Treba jasno reći da je na početku pandemije bilo grešaka te osuditi ponašanje pojedinih država koje su uvele ograničenja na izvoz medicinske opreme u druge države članice kada im je ona bila najpotrebnija. Upravo to nam pokazuje koliko je potreban zajednički europski odgovor na buduće zdravstvene krize. Države članice, posebno one manje koje nemaju vlastitu farmaceutsku industriju, ne mogu se samostalno boriti protiv pandemije ovakvih razmjera, bez zajedničke nabave cjepiva i medicinske opreme. Uz sve poteškoće, zajednička nabava cjepiva predstavlja uspjeh jer je manjim i gospodarski slabije razvijenim državama članicama koje nemaju proizvodnju na svojem teritoriju omogućen pristup cjepivu u isto vrijeme kao i onim većim i bogatijim državama članicama. Na taj je način još jednom dokazano koliko je europska solidarnost važna.

Svi građani EU-a moraju imati jednaku zaštitu od svih zdravstvenih prijetnji te pristup istoj skrbi i liječenju bez obzira na zemlju u kojoj žive. Iskustvo pandemije pokazalo nam je da je ključno: osigurati praćenje, znanstvenu analizu i koordinaciju djelovanja država članica, imati u rezervi i pravedno distribuirati medicinske protumjere te osigurati slobodu kretanja ključnih proizvoda u vrijeme krize, kao i omogućiti kvalitetnije i otpornije zdravstvene sustave.

Moramo nastaviti graditi snažnu europsku zdravstvenu uniju u kojoj se sve države članice međusobno koordiniraju, pripremaju zajedno, odgovaraju na ovu i buduće javno zdravstvene krize.

Sara Cerdas, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, dois anos e meio desde a declaração de pandemia, e a verdade é que já conseguimos retirar muitas lições do que se passou e é algo que estamos a escrutinar atentamente na Comissão COVI.

Olhando para aqui, para esta sala, agora, parece que estamos a falar de um assunto do passado, mas a verdade é que isto é um assunto bem do presente.

O inverno está a chegar, já não estamos em posição de preparar, mas, sim, de atuar. Importa aqui não cometermos os mesmos erros do passado. Importa aqui garantir as imunizações necessárias para todos e que estas cheguem juntamente com a vacinação sazonal contra a gripe. Importa aqui também a transparência e a informação dirigida aos cidadãos para combater a desinformação, pois apenas com mais educação para a saúde garantiremos a eficácia das medidas de proteção em vigor.

Para finalizar, a COVID-19 é uma ameaça transfronteiriça e já esta semana fizemos história, aprovámos os novos regulamentos para uma União Europeia para a Saúde. Agora, chegou a altura de atuarmos e de concretizarmos a União Europeia para a Saúde.

Billy Kelleher, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, the COVID-19 pandemic showed our vulnerabilities as a collective in terms of Europe's first response. But let's be very honest, we did get our act together very, very quickly in terms of dealing with what was unknown at the time in terms of the pandemic. Certainly from now on, I believe that a collective effort is required by Member States when we want, first of all, to have vigilance in terms of assessing potential variants and outbreaks, and then the preparedness that follows from that.

Certainly when we look at the vaccine side of it, again it showed that when we collectively work together in terms of procurement, Europe did exceptionally well. So we do need to ensure that continues and that we put in place now coordination and surveillance systems across Europe, and indeed cooperating with others across the globe, to ensure that we can assess respiratory illnesses, the potential variant changes not only in COVID itself but also in other acute inflammatory diseases as well, and respiratory illnesses. Certainly that will be one area where I believe we could make a meaningful impact.

I just want to say to this House as well, there was a lot of misinformation throughout the COVID pandemic. There was a lot of scaremongering and fearmongering put out there – even by Members in this particular house. The science showed that vaccines worked. The science showed that it saves lives, and we should always try and advocate on the side of science and dismiss those that continue to scaremonger the facts that are before us. So I would like a full assessment as well about the impact that the vaccines had on the saving of lives and on the reduction of people attending hospitals, because those that spread misinformation should hear the truth.

Katrin Langensiepen, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, COVID isn't over. COVID, Corona is here in the room, it is outside, it's in the European Union. I am standing here as an MEP, but I'm standing here for Milena Hermisson, a German, a young woman who is sitting in the dark. She can't go outside. She's sitting in the dark because she's sick. Or Faraz Fallahi, he's sitting in the dark, separated from family because he can't bear it anymore being around people.

Corona is not a flu. Corona is not a *grippe*, as you are affecting. On Monday, the beer tents at the Octoberfest closed in Munich – one of the hugest parties in in the world. People want to join because they are free. They want to join. It's my freedom. But please be honest, the freedom of the few must be the freedom of me as well – otherwise, we are not free in the European Union.

The Corona preventative measures proposed by the Commission in April were necessary to prepare Europe for new outbreaks this winter and to prevent the spread of the virus. We are talking about a virus. But there is a clear need to look beyond COVID-19, learn from the hard-learned lessons the world has thrown at us over the past two years and develop long-term strategies – COVID isn't over – to become crisis-proof for future pandemics.

My question, and the question of all the people with ME/CFS, long COVID, is what about the children when we are talking about education for all? How will the Commission develop a coordinated strategy for the next generation of COVID-19 vaccines across the whole value chain? How will the health emergency preparedness and response authority work? How will the Commission ensure the Member States successfully integrate COVID-19? What is the strategy for the future?

Because COVID isn't over. Today we call it COVID, when the next day we call it Omicron, Delta, Alpha, Beta, Omicron – it has a name. We are in a period of pandemic and we need answers from a social perspective, from the labour perspective and from the perspective of our citizens in the European Union. Thank you for your answers.

Virginie Joron, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'avenir, avec vous, c'est «pandémie» et «vaccin». Vous le répétez d'ailleurs sept fois: «vaccin», «vaccin», «vaccin», «vaccin», «vaccin», «vaccin»… et «vaccination». J'avais préparé une intervention technique qui se fondait sur vos annexes, mais étant donné vous ne répondez jamais aux questions, je vais parler pour nos concitoyens, qui sont nombreux à critiquer l'action de cette Commission sourde et autoritaire, qui passe son temps à sanctionner les États membres qui sortent des clous – de ses clous.

Nous savons tous ici que vos feuilles de route, vos petites communications à destination des 27 États membres, vous les prenez chez Pfizer BioNTech et auprès de la fondation de Bill et Melinda Gates. Il n'y a qu'à voir le prix remis la semaine dernière à M[me] von der Leyen, présidente de la Commission européenne, par Bill Gates pour ses bons et loyaux services. Il y a un an, c'était cette même présidente qui remettait le prix du meilleur dirigeant commercial à M. Bourla, patron de Pfizer, qui a négocié par SMS et obtenu le plus gros contrat d'achat – 2,4 milliards de doses – par le truchement de la Commission européenne. Avec un prix unitaire de la dose entre 15 et 20 euros, on atteint des sommets! Même notre Cour des comptes se montre critique, dans son dernier rapport.

Dès lors, je n'ai aucune question à vous poser puisque vous ne décidez de rien. Mais avez-vous vu que votre mentor, le président des États-Unis, Joe Biden, avait déclaré qu'il n'y a plus de pandémie, plus de COVID-19? Comment allez-vous faire? Allez-vous le poursuivre pour désinformation? Comment allez-vous le censurer?

Par ailleurs, comment va M. Barroso, cet ancien président de la Commission, désormais à la tête de GAVI, cette organisation mondiale de vaccins partenaire de COVAX et ayant Bill et Melinda Gates comme sponsors? Qui va le remplacer à la fin de l'année? Quel autre membre de la Commission européenne est prévu?

Joanna Kopcińska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! W konkluzjach z komunikatu z 27 kwietnia bieżącego roku Komisja zauważa, że pandemia COVID-19 będzie miała szeroko zakrojone skutki dla zdrowia publicznego, niekwestionowany wpływ na systemy opieki zdrowotnej, spowolnienie procesów gospodarczych, a nawet dotychczasowy styl życia. Zachęca się państwa członkowskie do opracowania kluczowych działań na rzecz ochrony zdrowia publicznego, przy jednoczesnym utrzymaniu otwartości i odporności społeczeństwa i gospodarek. Niezbędne staje się zatem wypracowanie nowego *modus operandi*, które w nadchodzących miesiącach przedstawi nową definicję odpowiedzi na pandemię, polegającą na przejściu od stanu wyjątkowego do bardziej zrównoważonego trybu.

W opinii i w oparciu o zdobyte doświadczenia wynikające z pandemii COVID-19, przy pomocy jakich narzędzi i instrumentów ewaluacyjnych Komisja będzie starała się dokonać przeglądu dotychczasowego sposobu działania, przeglądu polityki bezpieczeństwa w odpowiedzi na kryzys oraz oceny zainicjowanych planów i uruchomionych procedur? W jaki sposób Urząd ds. Gotowości i Reagowania na Stany Zagrożenia Zdrowia zaangażuje się w proces oceny oraz w jakim stopniu będą podlegać ewaluacji działania średnio i długoterminowe, tak aby wyciągnięcie lekcji z pandemii pomogło wyznaczyć skuteczną strategię przyszłych prac w okresie nadchodzących miesięcy?

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, trovo positivo un approccio alla gestione della pandemia che va gradualmente dallo stato di emergenza a una modalità più sostenibile, che può proteggere la salute pubblica ma che nel contempo possa mantenere aperte e resilienti la società e l'economia.

Non è ancora chiaro, invece, come si intende promuovere la ricerca pubblica europea e quella privata, né come si terrà conto degli studi finanziati dall'UE e di quelli indipendenti. Per questo trovo necessario che la Commissione indichi la strada affinché tutti gli Stati membri dispongano delle capacità finanziarie e organizzative e delle forniture necessarie per gestire sia gli aumenti dei casi di COVID-19 sia quelli di potenziali altre malattie che metterebbero a dura prova la tenuta dei sistemi sanitari nazionali.

Dobbiamo garantire e assicurare la salute ma nel contempo la libertà dei cittadini, adottando un protocollo unico, standard, anche riguardo ad eventuali limitazioni che ci auguriamo non avvengano mai più. Io avevo chiesto questo nel febbraio 2020 con un'interrogazione urgente. Non è arrivata e mi auguro arrivi e che arrivi subito.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Mr President, in the light of the lessons learned from COVID, one of those is prevention. Prevention is at the heart of fighting health threats. But to ensure this, we must continue to strengthen our European Health Union. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, national health systems were fragile and unprepared for the crisis such as the one we have faced. Now we have an opportunity to look at what we did and what we did not do in the face of the pandemic, and put in place measures to strengthen EU-level protection, prevention, preparedness and response to health emergencies.

The extended European Centre for Disease Control mandate approved this week reflects a very positive step towards a more resilient, safer EU. So too the strengthened European Medicines Agency and the revised mandate for the relationship with WHO. Perhaps most importantly, the pandemic shows us that when we must tackle these crises, when we do that, we must do it together. Health hazards are not restricted by borders, and coordination and collaboration among Member States was key to rolling out vaccine programmes and, in turn, saving lives.

Indeed, we must continue to support our neighbours by further strengthening the framework for joint procurement. We must not let the crisis that we are currently facing take away from our mission to learn from COVID-19, particularly as we enter the winter months. We must not be complacent. COVID has not gone away and in my country, Ireland, we have had reports this week of increased levels of hospitalisation due to COVID-19.

Karsten Lucke (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Mit Verlaub, Sie haben viele richtige und wichtige Dinge gesagt, aber natürlich hat die Kommission bei Weitem hier nicht alles getan, und auch schon in Ihrer Mitteilung bleibt ein Gedanke viel zu vage: Wir müssen auch die schützen, die nicht unbeschadet durch diese Pandemie gekommen sind. „Leave no one behind" darf kein Lippenbekenntnis sein! Wir brauchen dringend konkretere Pläne für die Zukunft, für die Menschen, die an einer Infektionskrankheit leiden und chronische Folgeschäden haben.

Was heißt das denn konkret? Die WHO hat uns das vorgerechnet: Wir haben über 17 Millionen Menschen in Europa, die an Long-COVID, Post-COVID und ME/CFS zu leiden haben, und sie brauchen dringend und schnell Zugang zu Behandlung und auch zu Medikamenten. Da reicht es nicht, auf eine fehlende Datenlage zu verweisen. Die Menschen möchten ihr normales Leben zurückbekommen, und jeder Tag ist eine neue Tortur für sie. Das dürfen wir einfach nicht hinnehmen!

Ich fordere die Kommission und auch die Mitgliedstaaten dringend dazu auf, jetzt entsprechendes Geld für klinische Studien und für Zulassungen von Medikamenten in die Hand zu nehmen. Wir sprechen hier über sehr konkrete, teils sehr dramatische Patientenschicksale, und da müssen wir dringend handeln.

Max Orville (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, une partie des populations de l'Union européenne et de l'outre-mer français s'est démarquée par son hostilité à la vaccination. Aujourd'hui encore, certains de nos concitoyens n'ont pas reçu leur première dose, par choix. La pandémie de COVID-19 que nous connaissons n'est donc pas seulement une problématique sanitaire, il s'agit bien d'une défiance envers nos institutions de santé.

Ainsi, la question de la désinformation, particulièrement prégnante sur les réseaux sociaux, a-t-elle conduit à des situations dramatiques. Il est donc temps de prendre la juste mesure de ce problème, avec la mise en œuvre d'une campagne européenne de sensibilisation réellement efficace.

Monsieur le Commissaire, la Commission pourrait-elle proposer une stratégie du choix éclairé du citoyen pour lutter de manière optimale contre la désinformation, qui rime encore trop souvent avec la non-vaccination?

Marco Campomenosi (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie Commissario per essere qui con noi, in questi due anni e mezzo nelle nostre società ci siamo divisi e lacerati all'interno dei nostri partiti e all'interno dei nostri governi. I cittadini hanno subito restrizioni, spesso a mio avviso ingiuste. Alcuni errori sono stati commessi, lo ammetto, in buona fede, altri probabilmente in malafede.

Io credo che sia venuto il momento, perché, se abbiamo una commissione che si occupa di COVID abbia un mandato pieno, che possa domandarsi e domandare che cosa è successo a Wuhan per fare in modo tale che la stessa Commissione europea sia più trasparente, perché non esiste che noi scopriamo che la Commissione europea aveva finanziato il centro di Wuhan solo grazie a Wikileaks di Assange.

Non esiste che noi non possiamo vedere i contratti se non con tante parti cancellate. Non esiste che alle nostre interrogazioni von der Leyen risponde che sugli SMS all'amministratore di Pfizer non ha nulla da dire, quando invece il Mediatore europeo e la Corte dei conti hanno criticato e censurato fortemente la Commissione europea. Siamo un Parlamento, esprimiamo la rappresentanza dei cittadini, esigiamo risposte e trasparenza.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-н Председател, в подхода ви да поддържате високо ниво на готовност и възможност за реагиране има нещо тотално сбъркано и това е очевидно за всеки, който не разглежда всеки въпрос от перспективата на някакъв нов вид европейски Съветски съюз. Вие го наричате федерация.

Безспорно има нужда от бърза реакция. Отговорът обаче не е да централизираме всичко в ръцете на Европейската комисия. Това е моето мнение. Аз имам изключително тежки притеснения, че това създава невероятен потенциал за корупция в един подобен вид система.

Политици, които не са избрани от абсолютно никой, не могат да вземат решения за цяла Европа. Вече видяхме какво се случи с Ковид-19. Вече някои колеги говорят за това нещо. Логично е решенията от този тип да се вземат на експертно ниво, с участието на всички 27 държави. Логично е самите лекарски гилдии да излъчат тези експерти, които да направят един Съвет и да бъдат номинирани от самите тях. Това ми изглежда напълно логично.

Извинявайте, но не е разумно да разчитаме на Комисията, която „щяла да гарантира“ всички дейности. Извинявайте, нóмерът със Съветския съюз вече мина, дайте да минем на някакво друго ниво. Това ми изглежда като прекален контрол в най-добрия случай.

Petar Vitanov (S&D). – Mr President, Commissioner, I share the Commission's own assessment that among the many unpredictabilities of this pandemic, one thing is certain: COVID-19 is here to stay. Scientists shows that the virus will continue to evolve, and the emergence of new variants is highly likely. That's why we have to maintain a high level of readiness and to step up vaccination coverage with targeted efforts to reach those who are still not vaccinated.

Over 90 million eligible people in the EU are still unvaccinated, including approximately 9 million aged 60 and above, thereby increasing the risk of mortality and emergence of new variants. Sadly, my home country, Bulgaria, is at the bottom of this ranking. Only 30% of all adults in Bulgaria have received the vaccines. What is worse is that the reason for this is not the lack of vaccines, it is the hesitancy among the population fuelled by the disinformation campaign.

So my question to the Commission is, what concrete actions will you be taking to counter this? The real threat to the health and security of our citizens is in the social media and not some biolabs. It turns out that there was no need for any fancy weapons – millions of people have died just because of Facebook!

Der Präsident. – Ich weise darauf hin, dass wir jetzt schon sehr knapp in der Zeit sind. Dies ist ein wichtiges Thema. Der Kommissar hat auch umfänglich darin eingeführt. Vermutlich wird er auch umfänglich antworten. Deshalb kommen wir an gewisse Zeitlimits. Wir haben nachher 21 Erklärungen zur Abstimmung, und von den sieben Kollegen, die ich hier habe, sind allein fünf zum Teil umfänglich an den Erklärungen zur Abstimmung beteiligt. Ich bin eigentlich entschlossen, alle sieben spontanen Wortmeldungen zu nehmen, weise aber darauf hin, dass ich hinterher bei den Erklärungen zur Abstimmung einige Kolleginnen und Kollegen darauf hinweisen muss, dass sie diese dann schriftlich abgeben.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, cred că trebuie să învățăm o lecție extrem de importantă în urma acestei crize de sănătate, și anume, prevenția. Uniunea Europeană, toate statele membre, au fost luate prin surprindere de pandemie și cred că este esențial să înțelegem că, uniți, am putut face față acestor provocări și pe viitor avem nevoie de o politică comună europeană în ceea ce privește gestionarea acestor crize, însă nu știu dacă am câștiga bătălia cu propaganda, pentru că, în continuare, statele noastre sunt divizate, iar cetățenii, cu foarte multă ușurință, sunt duși în eroare.

Tocmai de aceea cred că avem nevoie de instrumente prin care să eliminăm această propagandă sau să nu o facem atât de vizibilă și puternic influențabilă în ceea ce privește percepția publică în statele membre. Asta este ceea ce cred că trebuie să facem în următoarea perioadă.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Pirmininke, gerbiamas Komisijos nary. Kaip girdėjome, kovidas nesitraukia, nors galbūt virusas keičia savo formą. Mes, reaguodami į kovidą, įsteigėme HERA – specifinę instituciją, kuri galėtų pateikti rekomendacijas ir perspėjimus dėl pandemijos krypčių. Noriu paklausti jūsų, ar pati HERA yra pilnai suformuota ir mes galime tikėtis, kad ji dirba pilnu pajėgumu, ir galėsime sulaukti labai aiškių prioritetų skiepijimo tvarkai ir gydymo metodikų diegimui. Kadangi lėtinis kovidas, kuris pasilieka, iš tikrųjų daro savo, todėl, kaip kolegos sakė, mes norėtume pakviesti Komisiją veikti efektyviau, skatinant skleisti teisingą informaciją tiek apie apsirūpinimą vakcinomis, tiek apie skaidrų jų įsigijimą. Taip pat aktyviai raginame bendrų pastangų, didesnę Europos sveikatos sąjungą ir bendrus įsigijimus tiek vakcinų, tiek medicinos prietaisų. Noriu paklausti, kaip Komisija ruošiasi pilnai išnaudoti jai suteiktas galimybes kovojant su kovidu.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, благодаря Ви и за разбирането с даването на думата.

Уважаеми г-н Комисар, тук се казаха много неща и повечето от тях са верни. Но борбата с пандемията е въпрос на медицинските власти, г-н Комисар. Въпросът към Вас обаче е друг. Въпросът ми е колко струваше организацията на Европейската комисия? Кой проведе обществените поръчки? Колко плати Европейската комисия, Европейският парламент за тестове, за маски, за материали, за санитарни материали, за организиране на тестовете, за поставянето на тестовете? Как избрахте фирмите, кои фирми чистиха, кои фирми правиха тестовете отвън, как ги избрахте, каква е процедурата, колко пари похарчихте и колко струва това на европейските данъкоплатци?

Това са важни неща и трябва да се знаят, за да няма съмнения в почтеността на дейността на Европейската комисия, тъй като по време на пандемията се похарчиха много пари и Вие дължите тези отговори и аз ги очаквам.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, neoliberal reforms have weakened public healthcare systems all over Europe. These reforms have disastrous impacts on the ability of healthcare systems to handle the pandemic. Democratisation of health and long-term care, the push for public-private partnerships and the public spending cuts encouraged by EU economic governance processes like the European Semester have all contributed to the increased commercialisation, privatisation and reduction of health and long-term care services.

A UN Development Programme report examined the effects of healthcare privatisation on COVID-19. It found that a 10% increase in private health expenditure corresponds to a 4.3% increase in COVID cases and a 4.9% increase in COVID-related mortality. The EU needs to end its neoliberal policies, and this is particularly true in the current context of the development of the European Health Union.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, ní fheadar an bhfuil ateangaireacht ar siúl go Gaeilge don seisiún seo nó nach bhfuil, dá bhrí sin, ar eagla na heagla nach bhfuil, cuirfidh mé mo cheist ar an gCoimisiún as Béarla ag an deireadh.

I léir gur thaispeáin an phaindéim dúinn go bhfuil sé i bhfad níos fearr comhoibriú ar leibhéal na hEorpa ná gach aon tír a bheith ag dul a mbóthar féin agus is maith an rud é go bhfeicimid an comhoibriú sin a chonaiceamar ag tús na paindéime, maidir le seasamh a thógáil i gcoinne Putin agus an chogaidh mhídhleathaigh atá ar siúl aige san Úcráin.

Freisin, cé go ndúirt Joe Biden, go bhfuil COVID-19 thart, níl sé thart, agus tá sé tábhachtach go ngríosaímid ár saoránaigh chun bheith ar an airdeall, go háirithe agus an geimhreadh ag teacht, mar go mbíonn an COVID i bhfad níos measa sa gheimhreadh ná sa samhradh.

Agus mo cheist anois.

MEP Trillet-Lenoir said we need an international treaty on pandemics. I would like to ask the Commission, do they believe in that and, if so, what progress is being made to ensure that comes about?

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I think we definitely should look at preparedness in terms of a new pandemic. I certainly never want to see the horrific images of Italy being abandoned as it was at the start of the outbreak. But one of the major lessons that we have learned is that infectious disease surveillance and research has declined. Another lesson is, of course, the commodification of health care, which actually poses a real risk to the ability of our systems to cope with a new pandemic. Unless we address these, the path we're on will not help to deal with future outbreaks.

We've got to get to a situation where we fund science and allow research to be independent of any private or commercial interests, and we have to improve transparency in the activities of the EU administration. So, to date, the fact that the Ombudsman's request remains unanswered concerning Ursula von der Leyen's text messages with the head of Pfizer is not acceptable. It's not acceptable that these messages haven't been maintained and it's not acceptable, as the Ombudswoman has said, that there is maladministration. So the amount and quality of information in contracts has to be improved.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, toto je velmi důležité téma, tak trochu lituji, že je na pořadu jednání až ve čtvrtek odpoledne. Každopádně je důležité se poučit. Já jsem s velkou pozorností vyslechl slova pana komisaře a v zásadě s ním opravdu mohu souhlasit. Je důležité si uvědomit, že naše připravenost je podstatná pro ujištění občanů, že víme, že jsme se poučili z této pandemie. Je důležité si uvědomit, že samozřejmě viry a nemoci neznají hranic. A je trochu zvláštní, že posílení kompetencí a integrace v Unii právě ve zdravotní oblasti u členských států naráží. To je myslím nešťastný přístup, zvláště ve světle právě takové pandemie. Udělali jsme toho mnoho – zřídili jsme nový úřad HERA, upravili jsme mandáty agentur. Já bych postrádal přeci jenom vyšší míru konkrétnějších plánů pro aplikaci toho poučení, kterého se nám dostalo z této pandemie.

Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you very much for a very interesting, inspiring discussion. Based on the lessons learned from the COVID pandemic, we have been able to put in place the legislation, structures and capacities to prevent, prepare for and respond to health crises together in a sustained manner, now and in the future.

Based on those lessons we are investing in pandemic preparedness, research and innovation based on the needs and gaps we have identified. We are also looking at the mapping of emerging health technologies and biotechnologies leading to innovative solutions for pandemic preparedness.

On the transparency of the vaccine contracts, transparency is a key principle in the way we work. From the beginning, we asked vaccine developers to agree to full publication of contracts and to facilitate access for Members of the European Parliament to them. We are now working in close engagement with you to prepare the response to the request from the COVI Committee for access to Commission documents, and we are doing our utmost to ensure that this will reach the Committee within the best possible timeframe.

The fruitful exchange we have had this afternoon clearly shows that our joint efforts to tackle COVID-19 has borne fruit. Those efforts must continue as we head into the autumn and winter months. Beyond that, I know that your constructive cooperation and support will fuel our drive together to keep our citizens safe from COVID-19, monkeypox, and any other threats to our health that may emerge in the future.

Together, we must carry out our duty always to protect the health of our citizens, our economy and our environment.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Estrella Durá Ferrandis (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialistas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo consideramos necesario mantener y reforzar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE ante nuevas olas de COVID y futuras pandemias. Consideramos adecuada la comunicación de la Comisión de 27 de abril «COVID-19: Respaldar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE con vistas al futuro» aunque creemos que es necesario reforzar varios aspectos.

En primer lugar, la Comisión debe asegurar que haya una estrategia de vacunación y terapéutica coordinada ante futuras olas de COVID, así como una perspectiva a largo plazo en relación a la investigación sobre vacunas.

En segundo lugar, la Comisión debe apoyar y garantizar que los Estados miembros tengan suficientes capacidades de atención sanitaria durante la próxima ola de COVID-19, incluida la protección de los grupos vulnerables, de manera que no haya de nuevo el riego de sobrecargar los sectores sanitarios nacionales.

En tercer lugar, la Comisión debe igualmente apoyar a los Estados miembros a reducir y prevenir la desinformación durante esta pandemia y posibles pandemias futuras.

Por último, la Comisión debe abordar los patógenos transfronterizos en el marco del concepto «Una sola salud» (One Health Approach) y de los sistemas de vigilancia disponibles.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialistas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo consideramos necesario mantener y reforzar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE ante nuevas olas de COVID y futuras pandemias. Consideramos adecuada la comunicación de la Comisión de 27 de abril «COVID-19: Respaldar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE con vistas al futuro» aunque creemos que es necesario reforzar varios aspectos.

En primer lugar, la Comisión debe asegurar que haya una estrategia de vacunación y terapéutica coordinada ante futuras olas de COVID, así como una perspectiva a largo plazo en relación a la investigación sobre vacunas.

En segundo lugar, la Comisión debe apoyar y garantizar que los Estados miembros tengan suficientes capacidades de atención sanitaria durante la próxima ola de COVID-19, incluida la protección de los grupos vulnerables, de manera que no haya de nuevo el riego de sobrecargar los sectores sanitarios nacionales.

En tercer lugar, la Comisión debe igualmente apoyar a los Estados miembros a reducir y prevenir la desinformación durante esta pandemia y posibles pandemias futuras.

Por último, la Comisión debe abordar los patógenos transfronterizos en el marco del concepto «Una sola salud» (One Health Approach) y de los sistemas de vigilancia disponibles.

César Luena (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialistas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo consideramos necesario mantener y reforzar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE ante nuevas olas de COVID y futuras pandemias. Consideramos adecuada la comunicación de la Comisión de 27 de abril «COVID-19: Respaldar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE con vistas al futuro» aunque creemos que es necesario reforzar varios aspectos.

En primer lugar, la Comisión debe asegurar que haya una estrategia de vacunación y terapéutica coordinada ante futuras olas de COVID, así como una perspectiva a largo plazo en relación a la investigación sobre vacunas.

En segundo lugar, la Comisión debe apoyar y garantizar que los Estados miembros tengan suficientes capacidades de atención sanitaria durante la próxima ola de COVID-19, incluida la protección de los grupos vulnerables, de manera que no haya de nuevo el riego de sobrecargar los sectores sanitarios nacionales.

En tercer lugar, la Comisión debe igualmente apoyar a los Estados miembros a reducir y prevenir la desinformación durante esta pandemia y posibles pandemias futuras.

Por último, la Comisión debe abordar los patógenos transfronterizos en el marco del concepto «Una sola salud» (One Health Approach) y de los sistemas de vigilancia disponibles.

Adriana Maldonado López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialistas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo consideramos necesario mantener y reforzar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE ante nuevas olas de COVID y futuras pandemias. Consideramos adecuada la comunicación de la Comisión de 27 de abril «COVID-19: Respaldar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE con vistas al futuro» aunque creemos que es necesario reforzar varios aspectos.

En primer lugar, la Comisión debe asegurar que haya una estrategia de vacunación y terapéutica coordinada ante futuras olas de COVID, así como una perspectiva a largo plazo en relación a la investigación sobre vacunas.

En segundo lugar, la Comisión debe apoyar y garantizar que los Estados miembros tengan suficientes capacidades de atención sanitaria durante la próxima ola de COVID-19, incluida la protección de los grupos vulnerables, de manera que no haya de nuevo el riego de sobrecargar los sectores sanitarios nacionales.

En tercer lugar, la Comisión debe igualmente apoyar a los Estados miembros a reducir y prevenir la desinformación durante esta pandemia y posibles pandemias futuras.

Por último, la Comisión debe abordar los patógenos transfronterizos en el marco del concepto «Una sola salud» (One Health Approach) y de los sistemas de vigilancia disponibles.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialistas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo consideramos necesario mantener y reforzar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE ante nuevas olas de COVID y futuras pandemias. Consideramos adecuada la comunicación de la Comisión de 27 de abril «COVID-19: Respaldar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE con vistas al futuro» aunque creemos que es necesario reforzar varios aspectos.

En primer lugar, la Comisión debe asegurar que haya una estrategia de vacunación y terapéutica coordinada ante futuras olas de COVID, así como una perspectiva a largo plazo en relación a la investigación sobre vacunas.

En segundo lugar, la Comisión debe apoyar y garantizar que los Estados miembros tengan suficientes capacidades de atención sanitaria durante la próxima ola de COVID-19, incluida la protección de los grupos vulnerables, de manera que no haya de nuevo el riego de sobrecargar los sectores sanitarios nacionales.

En tercer lugar, la Comisión debe igualmente apoyar a los Estados miembros a reducir y prevenir la desinformación durante esta pandemia y posibles pandemias futuras.

Por último, la Comisión debe abordar los patógenos transfronterizos en el marco del concepto «Una sola salud» (One Health Approach) y de los sistemas de vigilancia disponibles.

Nacho Sánchez Amor (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialistas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo consideramos necesario mantener y reforzar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE ante nuevas olas de COVID y futuras pandemias. Consideramos adecuada la comunicación de la Comisión de 27 de abril «COVID-19: Respaldar la preparación y la respuesta de la UE con vistas al futuro» aunque creemos que es necesario reforzar varios aspectos.

En primer lugar, la Comisión debe asegurar que haya una estrategia de vacunación y terapéutica coordinada ante futuras olas de COVID, así como una perspectiva a largo plazo en relación a la investigación sobre vacunas.

En segundo lugar, la Comisión debe apoyar y garantizar que los Estados miembros tengan suficientes capacidades de atención sanitaria durante la próxima ola de COVID-19, incluida la protección de los grupos vulnerables, de manera que no haya de nuevo el riego de sobrecargar los sectores sanitarios nacionales.

En tercer lugar, la Comisión debe igualmente apoyar a los Estados miembros a reducir y prevenir la desinformación durante esta pandemia y posibles pandemias futuras.

Por último, la Comisión debe abordar los patógenos transfronterizos en el marco del concepto «Una sola salud» (One Health Approach) y de los sistemas de vigilancia disponibles.

9. Vysvětlení hlasování

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung.

9.1. Smrt Mahsy Amíníové a represe vůči účastníkům demonstrací za práva žen v Íránu (B9-0425/2022, RC-B9-0434/2022, B9-0434/2022, B9-0435/2022, B9-0436/2022, B9-0439/2022, B9-0442/2022, B9-0455/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, on 16 September, Mahsa Amini, a 22 year old, died while in custody, detained by the morality police in Tehran. Now, I want to say at the very outset and what I say for the next number of seconds has nothing to do with being opposed to religions: it is about fundamental human rights. It's about the right of women in any part of this globe to go about their lawful business without being hindered by what they have to wear or by why they can't wear what they want to wear. They should have the fundamental freedoms in any country, either in the European Union or in the Islamic Republic of Iran or anywhere else. Women should be free to wear what they want.

It is an absolute disgrace that we are talking about a woman of 22 years of age who died simply because her headscarf was too loose. That is a fundamental breach of any human right. It's a fundamental breach of basic decency. I ask the Islamic Republic of Iran to loosen the restrictions on individuals so they can go about their business in the manner that they feel fit, not in the manner that the mullahs and Ayatollah Khamenei feel they should.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, if the political class of the EU cared about human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, they wouldn't be clamouring to impose new unilateral sanctions. If we cared about the protection of human rights in a consistent, principled manner, we would condemn the relentless murder of Palestinian men, women and children by Israeli forces – every single plenary. We would address the tens of thousands of ordinary working class Syrians, Lebanese, Venezuelans, Yemenis, Zimbabweans, Cubans and Iranians that are being killed by US and EU unilateral sanctions and embargoes.

On 12 September, the UN Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights, Alena Douhan, published her report on secondary sanctions and sanctions over-compliance. It describes how over-compliance with even so-called targeted sanctions is killing masses of women, children, the sick and the old, in particular in these targeted countries.

US and EU sanctions are killing Iranians, and you don't care. You want more sanctions, and more dead Iranians – in the name of human rights, no less. It's sickening!

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, cred că o țară de 84 de milioane de cetățeni trăiește momente istorice și cred că moartea, mult prea devreme, a Mahsei Amini reprezintă, de fapt, un protest inițiat din convingere pentru câștigarea dreptului la viață în această țară unde se comit crime, unde se comit atrocități, unde, în numele unor idei închipuite, statul reprimă propria populație.

Avem obligația să le transmitem un mesaj de solidaritate, de susținere, pentru toți cei care își doresc ca această stare prin care trece Iranul să se încheie. Sunt oameni care și-au asumat, cu riscul pierderii propriei vieți, să lupte pentru valori pe care noi le prețuim și care reprezintă temelia lumii libere. Pentru acest lucru trebuie să luptăm, pentru acest lucru am votat.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, Mahsa Amini's death in police custody is very concerning. There should be a full and transparent inquiry, and the people of Iran have every right to protest and push their government for women's rights and civil and social reforms. They should be able to do that without shocking violence and repression from the authorities. But they should equally be able to do it without the EU trying to capitalise from their struggle.

While many in Iran push – and rightly so – for much-needed social progress, it's for them to decide what happens in Iran, not us. Most of them don't want to see their government overthrown or their country thrown open to the predatory whims of foreign capital as it was before. But unfortunately, that was the sentiment of many in this Chamber. The resolution itself is level-headed and does call on Iran to see to its own house, but unfortunately, it also calls for maintaining coercive measures and sanctions, which is going to damage the very people we seek to protect. That's why I regretfully abstained on the motion.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, with the murder of Mahsa Jina Amini, she became the angel of women who are fighting against patriarchal state violence over the world. Women in Iran, Turkey, Palestine, Western Sahara, Kurdistan, Yemen, Afghanistan and other countries. Since they are women, they are subject to violence. They are murdered. The only solution against this organised violence is women's solidarity that knows no borders in our common struggle for liberation.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Mr President, I of course supported this resolution. What we have seen in Iran is a clear desire for freedom, for the destruction of a disgusting totalitarian regime, a regime that has already killed hundreds of thousands of people and maimed many more. The death of Mahsa Amini shows the brutality of the regime, and the protests show the true face of the Iranian people – of people who want to live in freedom, where human life has value and where the law applies to everyone. The Iranian people need to hear that Europe supports not only Iranian women, but everyone in Iran who shares the values of democracy and protection of human rights.

Der Präsident. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich bedaure sehr, dass wir jetzt am Ende unserer Tagungsmöglichkeiten angekommen sind und dass die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung dadurch jetzt leiden. Ich mag die Stimmerklärungen sehr, deshalb wenden Sie sich bitte auch an Ihre Fraktionsvorsitzenden. Denn zum einen macht letztlich die Konferenz der Präsidenten die Tagesordnung. Zum Zweiten erlaube ich mir schon die persönliche Anmerkung, dass die Stimmerklärungen eigentlich dafür da sind, zu sagen, warum man entgegen öffentlichen Zusagen nun eben doch ein bisschen anders, als man es erwarten könnte, abgestimmt hat.

Heute waren hier alle dafür bis auf die Kollegin Daly, die eigentlich dem Sinn der Stimmerklärungen entsprechend gesagt hat, warum sie eigentlich für die ganze Sache ist, sich aber trotzdem enthalten hat. Das ist der eigentliche Sinn der Stimmerklärungen und nicht Ersatzredezeit, die man vielleicht bei der Aussprache über die eigentliche Geschichte nicht bekommen hat.

Ich bitte jetzt also die Kollegen, die betreffend die Entschließungsanträge zu Russlands Eskalation seines Angriffskriegs gegen die Ukraine, zu dem Ergebnis der Überprüfung des 15-Punkte-Aktionsplans für Handel und nachhaltige Entwicklung durch die Kommission und zum Thema „Neue Impulse für eine gestärkte Meerespolitik und den Erhalt der biologischen Vielfalt“ nicht mehr zu Wort kommen, um Verständnis und möchte sie darauf hinweisen, dass es die Möglichkeit gibt, diese Stimmerklärungen schriftlich abzugeben.

10. Schválení zápisu z tohoto denního zasedání a předání přijatých textů

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll dieser Sitzung wird dem Parlament zu Beginn der nächsten Sitzung zur Genehmigung vorgelegt.

Wenn es keine Einwände gibt, werde ich die in der heutigen Sitzung angenommenen Entschließungen den in diesen Entschließungen genannten Personen und Gremien übermitteln.

11. Termíny příštích zasedání: viz zápis

12. Ukončení denního zasedání

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.58 Uhr geschlossen)

13. Přerušení zasedání

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die Sitzungsperiode des Europäischen Parlaments für unterbrochen.

ISSN 1977-0863 (elektronické vydání)
ISSN 1725-5163 (papírové vydání)

Úřad pro publikace Evropské unie
L-2985 Lucemburk
LUCEMBURSKO

CS