



C/2026/2983

4.6.2026

FULDSTÆNDIGT FORHANDLINGSREFERAT DEN 10. SEPTEMBER 2025

(C/2026/2983)

EUROPA-PARLAMENTET

SESSIONEN 2025-2026

Mødeperioden fra den 8. til 11. september 2025

STRASBOURG

Indhold	Side
1. Åbning af mødet	4
2. Unionens tilstand (forhandling)	4
3. Genoptagelse af mødet	51
4. Forhandlinger forud for Parlamentets førstebehandling (forretningsordenens artikel 72) (opfølgning)	52
5. Afstemningstid	53
5.1. Den Europæiske Socialfond Plus (ESF+): særlige foranstaltninger til at adressere strategiske udfordringer (A10-0122/2025 - Marit Majj) (afstemning)	53
5.2. Ændring af EFRU, Samhørighedsfonden og Fonden for Retfærdig Omstilling for så vidt angår særlige foranstaltninger til at adressere strategiske udfordringer i forbindelse med midtvejs gennemgangen (A10-0129/2025 - Dragoș Benea) (afstemning)	53
5.3. Kulstofgrænsetilpasningsmekanismen: forenkling og styrkelse (A10-0085/2025 - Antonio Decaro) (afstemning)	53
5.4. Værdipapirafvikling i EU og værdipapircentraler (CSD'er): kortere afviklingscyklus i Unionen (A10-0095/2025 - Johan Van Overtveldt) (afstemning)	53
5.5. Insolvensbehandling: erstatning af bilag A og B (A10-0127/2025 - Ilhan Kyuchyuk) (afstemning)	54

Indhold	Side
5.6. Forlængelse af fristen for oprettelse af Eurojusts sagsforvaltningssystem (A10-0152/2025 - Javier Zarzalejos) (afstemning)	54
5.7. Den foreløbige partnerskabsaftale mellem Det Europæiske Fællesskab og Stillehavslandene: Vanuatus tiltrædelse (A10-0141/2025 - Dariusz Joński) (afstemning)	54
5.8. Aftalen om videnskabeligt og teknologisk samarbejde mellem Det Europæiske Fællesskab og Indien: forlængelse af aftalen (A10-0145/2025 - Borys Budka) (afstemning)	54
5.9. Samarbejdsaftale mellem EU og Schweiz: de europæiske satellitnavigationsprogrammer (A10-0146/2025 - Borys Budka) (afstemning)	54
5.10. Investeringer og reformer med henblik på at styrke den europæiske konkurrenceevne og skabe en kapitalmarkedsunion (A10-0124/2025 - Aurore Lalucq) (afstemning)	54
5.11. Samhørighedspolitikens rolle med hensyn til at støtte den retfærdige omstilling (A10-0137/2025 - Ciaran Mullooly) (afstemning)	54
5.12. Samhørighedspolitikens investeringers rolle i løsningen af den nuværende boligkrise (A10-0139/2025 - Marcos Ros Sempere) (afstemning)	55
5.13. Muligheder for forenkling af samhørighedsfondene (A10-0138/2025 - Vladimir Prebilič) (afstemning)	55
5.14. Fremtiden for landbruget og den fælles landbrugspolitik efter 2027 (A10-0143/2025 - Carmen Crespo Díaz) (afstemning)	55
5.15. Forvaltning af internettet – fornyelse af mandatet for Internet Governance Forum (RC-B10-0358/2025, B10-0358/2025, B10-0360/2025, B10-0362/2025, B10-0364/2025, B10-0365/2025) (afstemning)	55
5.16. Styrkelse af Moldovas modstandskraft mod Ruslands hybride trusler og ondsindede indblanding (RC-B10-0355/2025, B10-0353/2025, B10-0355/2025, B10-0356/2025, B10-0357/2025, B10-0359/2025, B10-0361/2025, B10-0363/2025) (afstemning)	55
6. Genoptagelse af mødet	55
7. Godkendelse af protokollen fra foregående møde	55
8. Efter 10 års massemigration er det nu tid til at sætte en stopper for den og beskytte vores kvinder og børn (debat om et aktuelt spørgsmål)	56
9. Gennemførelse af handelsaftalen mellem EU og USA og mulighederne for yderligere EU-handelsaftaler (forhandling)	71
10. Kinas uberettigede beslutning om at indføre told på import af svinekødsprodukter fra EU og behovet for at støtte europæiske landbrugere og arbejdstagere (forhandling)	91
11. Ændring af dagsordenen	100
12. Anmodninger om ophævelse af immunitet	100
13. Forelæggelse ved Rådet af dets holdning til forslaget til det almindelige budget for regnskabsåret 2026 (forhandling)	100

Indhold	Side
14. Pakkerejser og sammensatte rejsearrangementer: sikring af en mere effektiv beskyttelse af rejsende og forenkling og præcisering af visse aspekter (forhandling)	105
15. Behov for et stærkt europæisk demokratiskjold for at styrke demokratiet, beskytte EU mod udenlandsk indblanding og hybride trusler og beskytte valgprocesser i EU (forhandling)	113
16. Alvorlige trusler mod luftfart og søtransport på grund af forstyrrelse af det globale satellitnavigationssystem: akut behov for at opbygge resiliens mod spoofing og jamming (forhandling)	127
17. Retsstatsprincippet og forvaltning af EU-midler i Slovakiet (forhandling)	134
18. Beskatning af store digitale platforme i lyset af den internationale udvikling (forhandling)	144
19. Forhandling om tilfælde af krænkelse af menneskerettighederne, demokratiet og retsstatsprincippet (forhandling)	153
19.1. Tilbageholdelse af EU-borgere i de besatte områder af Cypern	153
19.2. Sagen om Victoire Ingabire i Rwanda	156
19.3. Sagen om Abdoul Aziz Gomas, som tilbageholdes vilkårligt i Togo	160
20. Mundtlige stemmeforklaringer (forretningsordenens artikel 201)	162
20.1. Kulstofgrænsetilpasningsmekanismen: forenkling og styrkelse (A10-0085/2025 - Antonio Decaro)	162
20.2. Samhørighedspolitikens investeringers rolle i løsningen af den nuværende boligkrise (A10-0139/2025 - Marcos Ros Sempere)	163
20.3. Styrkelse af Moldovas modstandskraft mod Ruslands hybride trusler og ondsindede indblanding (RC-B10-0355/2025)	163
21. Skriftlige stemmeforklaringer (forretningsordenens artikel 201)	163
22. Dagsorden for næste møde	164
23. Godkendelse af protokollen fra dette møde	164
24. Hævelse af mødet	164

FULDSTÆNDIGT FORHANDLINGSREFERAT DEN 10. SEPTEMBER 2025

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Åbning af mødet

(*Hin tal-ftuh tas-seduta: 9:12*)

2. Unionens tilstand (forhandling)

President. – Good morning, everyone. I am pleased to welcome the President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, to the European Parliament for the annual State of the European Union address. Thank you, dear Ursula, for being with us today and for your engagement with this House.

In these unprecedented times, dear colleagues, we need clarity and we need resolve. We need a Europe that takes responsibility for its security; a Europe that makes it easier for businesses, and that protects jobs by simplifying our processes and cutting unnecessary red tape; a Europe that is fairer for families, workers and women, that ensures safer streets for our children; and a Europe that stands up for the democratic values that define us on the world stage.

When the world too often feels like it is on fire – with Russia's aggression against Ukraine, the horrific situation in Gaza and the Middle East, a redefined transatlantic relationship and more engagement of Europe across the world – this Parliament and the people we represent are very eager to hear how Europe can step up with new and bold ideas.

I know that this has always been a lively and energised debate, and that it will be based on mutual respect, protecting the dignity of this House. So, dear President, dear Ursula, the floor is yours.

Ursula von der Leyen, *President of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister, honourable Members, thank you very much. Europe is in a fight: a fight for a continent that is whole and at peace, for a free and independent Europe; a fight for our values and our democracies; a fight for our liberty and our ability to determine our destiny for ourselves. Make no mistake: this is a fight for our future.

I thought long and hard about whether to start this State of the Union address with such a stark appraisal. After all, we Europeans are not used to – or comfortable with – talking in such terms because our Union is fundamentally a peace project. But the truth is that the world of today is unforgiving, and we cannot varnish over the difficulties that Europeans feel every day. They can feel the ground shift beneath them. They can feel things getting harder just as they are working harder. They can feel the impact of the global crisis, of the higher cost of living. They feel the speed of change affecting their lives and their careers. And they worry about the endless spiral of events they see on the news – from the devastating scenes in Gaza to the relentless Russian barrage on Ukraine. We simply cannot wait for this storm to pass.

This summer showed us that there is simply no room or no time for nostalgia. Battle lines for a new world order based on power are being drawn right now. So yes, Europe must fight – for its place in a world in which many major powers are either ambivalent or openly hostile to Europe, a world of imperial ambitions and imperial wars, a world in which dependencies are ruthlessly weaponised. And it is for all these reasons that a new Europe must emerge.

Honourable Members, this must be Europe's independence moment. I believe this is our Union's mission: to be able to take care of our own defence and security, to take control over the technologies and energies that will fuel our own economies, to decide what kind of society and democracy we want to live in, to be open to the world and choose partnerships with allies, old and new. Ultimately, it is about having the freedom and the power to determine our own destiny.

And we know we can do it – because together we have shown what is possible when we have the same ambition, unity and urgency. I must say, I've lost count of the number of times that I was told that Europe could not do this and could not do that – in the pandemic, on the recovery plan, on defence, on supporting Ukraine, on energy security, and the list goes on. Every time, Europe stood united and made it, and we need to do the same now.

So, honourable Members, the central question for us today is a simple one: does Europe have the stomach to fight? Do we have the unity and the sense of urgency, the political will and the political skill to compromise? Or do we just want to fight between ourselves, be paralysed by our divisions? That is what all of us have to answer – every Member State, every Member of this House, every Commissioner, all of us.

In my eyes, the choice is very clear. So my pitch today is a pitch for unity: unity between Member States, unity between European institutions, unity between the pro-European democratic forces of this House. I'm here – and the entire College is here – ready to make this happen with you, ready to strengthen the pro-European democratic majority, because it is the only one that can deliver for Europe.

Honourable Members, freedom and independence are what the people of Ukraine are fighting for every day – people like Sasha and his grandmother. Sasha was only 11 years old when the Russians attacked. He and his mother sought refuge in a basement in their town of Mariupol. One morning, they went out to get some food, and that's when all hell broke loose – a rain of Russian bombs on a civilian neighbourhood. All became dark and Sasha felt his face burning. He had shrapnel just below his eyes.

In a matter of days, Russian soldiers stormed the city. They took Sasha and his mum to what the Russians called a 'filtration camp'. Then Sasha was taken away. They told him he didn't need his mum. He would go to Russia and have another Russian mother, a Russian passport, a Russian name. They sent him to occupied Donetsk.

But Sasha did not give up. On a stop on the way, he asked to borrow a stranger's phone, and he called his grandma, Liudmyla, who was living in free Ukraine: 'Baba, just take me home.' She didn't hesitate a second. Her friends told her she was crazy to go. But Liudmyla moved mountains to get to him, and with the help of the Ukrainian Government, she travelled to Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Russia and finally into occupied Ukraine. She got Sasha back, and through the same long journey brought him to safety. But their hearts are still broken. Every single day, they keep fighting to find Sasha's mum, stuck somewhere by Russia's brutal war.

I would like to thank Sasha and Liudmyla for allowing me to share their story. I'm honoured that they are here with us today and, honourable Members, please join me in paying tribute to Sasha, to Liudmyla and to Ukraine's relentless fight for freedom.

(The House rose and accorded a standing ovation)

Sadly, Sasha's story is far from unique. There are tens of thousands more Ukrainian children whose fate is unknown: trapped, threatened, forced to deny their identities. We must do everything in our power to support Ukraine's children, and that is why I can announce that, together with Ukraine and other partners, I will host a summit of the International Coalition for the Return of Ukrainian Children. Every abducted child must be returned!

(Applause)

Honourable Members, this war needs to end with a just and lasting peace for Ukraine – because Ukraine's freedom is Europe's freedom. The images in Alaska were not easy to digest but, just a few days later, European leaders came to Washington to support President Zelenskyy and secure commitments. Real progress has been made since then. Just last week, 26 countries in the Coalition of the Willing said they were ready to be part of a reassurance force in Ukraine, or participate financially, in the context of a ceasefire.

We will continue to support all diplomatic efforts to end this war, but we have all seen what Russia means by 'diplomacy'. Putin refuses to meet President Zelenskyy. Last week, Russia launched the largest number of drones and ballistic missiles in a single attack. Yesterday, there was a missile attack on a village in Donetsk targeting people waiting to pick up their pensions. More than 20 were killed.

And just today, we have seen a reckless and unprecedented violation of Poland and Europe's airspace by more than 10 - Russian Shahed drones. Europe stands in full solidarity with Poland!

(The House rose and accorded the President a standing ovation)

Putin's message is clear, and our response must be clear, too. We need more pressure on Russia to come to the negotiating table. We need more sanctions. We are now working on the 19th package in coordination with partners. We are particularly looking at phasing out Russian fossil fuels faster. We are looking at the shadow fleet and at third countries.

At the same time, we need more support for Ukraine. No one has contributed as much as Europe – close to EUR 170 billion of military and financial aid so far. More will be needed, and it should not only be European taxpayers who bear the brunt of this. This is Russia's war and it is Russia that should pay!

This is why we need to work urgently on a new solution to finance Ukraine's war response and effort on the basis of the immobilised Russian assets. With the cash balances associated to these Russian assets, we can provide Ukraine with a reparations loan. The assets themselves will not be touched and the risk will have to be carried collectively. Ukraine will only pay back the loan once Russia pays for the reparations.

The money will help Ukrainians already today, but will also be crucial in the mid and long term for Ukraine safety, for example, funding for strong Ukrainian armed forces as the first line of security guarantees.

So we will propose a new programme. We call it 'qualitative military edge'. It will support investment in the capabilities of the Ukrainian armed forces. Take drones, for example: before the war, Ukraine had no drones; today, it is Ukraine's use of drones that is accounting for over two thirds of Russian equipment losses. It is a reminder of the power of human ingenuity in our open societies.

But we also know that Russia is catching up fast, supported by the Iranian Shahed drones, and it is seizing the advantage of industrial mass production. On Saturday, in one single night, Russia sent 800 drones to Ukraine – in one single night! Ingenuity helped to open a door for Ukraine's defence, but raw industrial might on the other side may threaten to sweep it closed.

So we can use our industrial strength to support Ukraine to counter this drone warfare. We can help transform Ukrainian ingenuity into battlefield advantage – and into joint industrialisation. This is why I can also announce that Europe will front-load EUR 6 billion from the ERA loan and enter into a drone alliance with Ukraine. Ukraine has the ingenuity. What it needs now is scale. Together we can provide it, so that Ukraine keeps its edge and Europe strengthens its own.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, l'économie de guerre de Poutine continuera même si la guerre cesse. Cela signifie que l'Europe doit être prête à assumer la responsabilité de sa propre sécurité. Bien sûr, l'OTAN restera toujours essentielle. Mais seule une posture de défense européenne forte et crédible peut garantir notre sécurité. Et nous avons accompli des progrès historiques, ces dernières années, pour bâtir notre Union européenne de la défense.

Au début de cette année, nous avons lancé le plan 'Readiness 2030', qui pourrait mobiliser jusqu'à 800 milliards d'euros d'investissements dans le domaine de la défense. Cela inclut le programme SAFE, désormais prêt à fournir 150 milliards d'euros pour des achats communs. 19 États membres ont déjà soumis une demande. Le programme est complètement souscrit. Ça, c'est une très bonne nouvelle.

Nous travaillons aussi à accorder une prime à ceux qui soutiennent l'Ukraine ou achètent du matériel ukrainien. C'est une aide financière d'urgence face à un besoin urgent. La semaine dernière, j'ai pu le constater de mes propres yeux, en visitant les États membres en première ligne, ce sont eux qui connaissent le mieux la menace russe. Sans aucun doute, le flanc oriental de l'Europe protège toute l'Europe, de la mer Baltique à la mer Noire. C'est pourquoi nous devons investir pour le soutenir, avec le 'Eastern Flank Watch'. Cela signifie doter l'Europe de moyens stratégiques indépendants.

Nous devons investir dans la surveillance spatiale en temps réel afin qu'aucun mouvement de force ne passe inaperçu. Nous devons répondre à l'appel de nos amis baltes et bâtir ce mur de drones. Ce n'est pas une ambition abstraite. C'est le fondement d'une défense crédible, une capacité européenne développée, déployée et entretenue conjointement, réactive en temps réel, sans aucune ambiguïté sur nos intentions. L'Europe défendra chaque centimètre carré de son territoire, Mesdames et Messieurs.

Dans tous les pays que j'ai visités, j'ai entendu le même message: il n'y a pas de temps à perdre. Donc, lors du prochain Conseil européen, nous présenterons une feuille de route claire pour lancer de nouveaux projets communs en matière de défense, fixer des objectifs précis pour 2030 et créer un semestre européen de défense. Parce que 2030, c'est demain, et c'est aujourd'hui que l'Europe doit se préparer.

Honourable Members, when we talk about independence, we're talking about choosing our destiny. That is what Ukraine is fighting for. And that is what all Europeans deserve – because Europe is an idea: the idea of freedom and mutual strength. This was the idea that drove the post-1989 generation, when East and West came together, and it is as powerful now as it was then. And this is why we are bringing future Member States closer to our Union – investing, supporting reforms, integrating into the single market. We must keep up the speed on this merits-based process because only a united – I would even say a reunited – Europe can be an independent Europe. A larger and stronger Union is a security guarantee for all of us, and because for Ukraine, for Moldova and for the Western Balkans, their future's in our Union, let's make the next reunification of Europe happen together.

Honourable Members, what is happening in Gaza has shaken the conscience of the world. People killed while begging for food, mothers holding lifeless babies: these images are simply catastrophic. So I want to start with a very clear message: man-made famine can never be a weapon of war. For the sake of the children, for the sake of humanity, this must stop.

This is also part of a more systematic shift in the last month that is simply unacceptable. We have seen the financial suffocation of the Palestinian Authority; the plans for settlement project in the so-called E1 area, which would easily cut off the occupied West Bank from East Jerusalem; the actions and statements by the most extremist ministers of the Israeli Government which incite violence – all of this points to a clear attempt to undermine the two-state solution, to undermine the vision of a viable Palestinian state, and we must not let this happen.

Honourable Members, it truly pains me to say these words, and I know that for many citizens, Europe's inability to agree on a common way forward is equally painful. They are asking how much worse things must get before there is unity in response. I understand – because what is happening in Gaza is unacceptable and because Europe must lead the way, just as it has done before. Our financial support and humanitarian aid far outweigh that of any other partner. Our commitment to a viable Palestinian Authority is keeping the two-state solution alive, and we must urge others to urgently step up too – both in the region and beyond.

But, of course, Europe needs to do more. Many Member States have moved ahead on their own. On our side, we proposed to suspend parts of our Horizon funding, but this is stuck without a majority. We must overcome this. We cannot afford to be paralysed. This is why I will propose a package of measures to carve out a way forward.

First, the Commission will do all that it can do on its own. We will put our bilateral support to Israel on hold. We will stop all payments in these areas without affecting our work with Israeli civil society or Yad Vashem. Second, we will make two further proposals to the Council. We will propose sanctions on the extremist ministers and on violent settlers. We will also propose a partial suspension of the Association Agreement on trade-related matters.

(Applause)

I am aware it will be difficult to find majorities, and I know that any action will be too much for one and too little for others, but we must all take our own responsibility – Parliament, Council, Commission. My third point: we will set up a Palestine donor group next month, including a dedicated instrument for Gaza reconstruction. This will be an international effort with regional partners, and it will build on the momentum of the New York conference organised by France and Saudi Arabia.

Honourable Members, I am a long-standing friend of the people of Israel. I know how much the atrocious attacks on 7 October by Hamas terrorists shook the nation to its core. The hostages have now been held captive by Hamas terrorists for more than 700 days since 7 October. That is 700 days of pain and suffering. There can never be any place for Hamas – neither now nor in future – because they are terrorists who want to destroy Israel. They are also inflicting terror on their own people, keeping their future hostage. Europe's goal has always been the same: real security for Israel and a safe present and future for all Palestinians. And that means that the hostages must be released, that there should be unrestrained access to all humanitarian aid, and that there must be an immediate ceasefire. But in the longer term, the only realistic peace plan is based on two states, living side by side in peace and security, with a secure Israel, a viable Palestinian Authority, and the scourge of Hamas removed. That is what Europe has always stood for, and it is time to come together and help make this happen.

Honourable Members, the transition is now hard. I want to speak about competitiveness.

(In response to comments from a Member) I know, but this is a State of the Union, and competitiveness is a central piece of our European Union.

Europe's independence will depend on its ability to compete in today's turbulent times. We have everything it takes to thrive here in Europe, from our single market to our social market economy. But we know the economic and geopolitical headwinds are strong – I just talked about it – and we have seen how dependency can be used against us.

This is why we will massively invest in digital and clean tech, with more to come in our future Competitiveness Fund and a doubled Horizon, our research and innovation programme. And we are tackling the key bottlenecks identified by the Draghi report – that's from energy to capital, from investment to simplification. We have held strategic dialogues with key industries: cars, chemicals, steel, pharmaceuticals, defence, agriculture. In each sector, the message is the same: to protect jobs, we need to make business in Europe easier.

A digital euro, for example, will make it easier for companies and consumers alike, and the omnibuses we have put on the table so far will make a real difference: less paperwork, less overlaps, less complex rules. Our proposal will cut EUR 8 billion per year in bureaucratic costs for European companies, and further omnibuses are on their way, for example on military mobility or on the digital.

For innovative companies, we are preparing the so-called 28th regime and speeding up the work on the savings and investment union – because we have many high potential start-ups in key technologies like quantum, AI and biotech, but as they grow, the limited availability of risk capital forces them to turn to foreign investors. This is wealth and jobs going elsewhere, and it jeopardises our tech sovereignty. This is why the Commission will partner with private investors on a multi-billion-euro Scale-Up Europe Fund. It will help make major investments in young, fast-growing companies in critical tech areas – because we want the best of Europe to choose Europe.

Honourable Members, our greatest asset is the single market, but we all know it remains unfinished. The IMF estimates that the internal barriers within the single market are equivalent to a 45 % tariff on goods, and even a 100 % tariff on services. Just think of what we are missing out on. And, as underscored by the Letta report, the single market remains incomplete, mostly in three domains: finance, energy, and telecommunications. So, we need clear political deadlines. And this is why I will present a single market roadmap to 2028 on capital, services, energy, telecoms, the 28th regime and the fifth freedom for knowledge and innovation – because we all know the old saying 'only what gets measured gets done'.

Honourable Members, this will also support our investment in the technologies that will fuel our economy: clean and digital. Take artificial intelligence. A European AI is essential for our future independence. It will help power our industry and our societies – be it healthcare or be it defence, you name it. So, we will focus on the first key building blocks – that's from the Cloud and AI Development Act to the Quantum Sandbox. We are massively investing in the European AI giga factories because these giga factories support our innovative start-ups, so that these start-ups can train, develop and deploy their next-generation AI models in these giga factories.

And when we called on the private sector to join forces with us, the response was overwhelming. Later today, I will meet CEOs from some of the largest European tech companies. They will hand over their European AI & Tech Declaration, and this is their commitment to invest in Europe's sovereignty, and I am absolutely grateful for that. This is the way it should go in the European Union.

And we must also take the same approach on clean tech – from steel to batteries. Europe's clean tech sector must stay in Europe, and we have to take urgent action. With the Clean Industrial Deal, we have identified the main hurdles that slow down these sectors, so now we need to speed up with the implementation because investors, of course, want to know that if they invest, there will be a demand for clean European products on the other hand. And this is why lead markets must be at the heart of our action – to spark a virtuous cycle where both supply and demand go up and prices go down.

On the supply side, we will launch a battery booster package. This will put EUR 1.8 billion up for equity to boost production in Europe. You know that batteries are key enablers of other clean tech, especially electric vehicles. So this goes to the heart of our economic independence. On the demand side, we must urgently drive demand for European industrial leadership in clean tech. And this is why we will introduce a 'made in Europe' criterion in public procurement. When we invest in the Global Gateway Initiative, for example, we set strong incentives for partners to buy European.

I am convinced the future of clean tech will continue to be made in Europe, but for that, we also need to make sure that our industry has the materials here in Europe. And the only answer here is creating a truly circular economy. So we must move fast on the Circular Economy Act and move ahead in those sectors that are ready. And finally, we need to keep the speed. So the Commission will propose an Industrial Accelerator Act for the key strategic sectors and technologies. In sum, when it comes to digital and clean tech, we have to be faster, smarter, and we have to be more European.

Honourable Members, already today, low-carbon sources account for over 70 % of our electricity. We are global leaders in clean tech patents – better than the United States, racing with China. When it comes to venture capital for clean tech, we are catching up with the United States and way ahead of China. We are firmly on track to achieve our 2030 targets to cut emissions by at least 55 %. This is the power of the European Green Deal, and we must stay the course on our climate and environmental goals. This is a must, honourable Members.

(Applause)

The science is very clear, and the economic and security case is equally compelling. In fact, this transformation is central to our push for independence – because it reduces our energy dependency, because circular production limits our strategic dependencies, and because it creates front-runner industries that can export the solutions to others. When I speak to the Global South, from Africa to India to Central Asia, they are looking for solutions. These are rapidly evolving markets and the jury is still out for who will dominate these markets of the future. We are the ones who can meet the growing demand for solutions, but it's not a given. And this is why the Commission proposed the 2040 targets – 10 years after the Paris Agreement.

I know that many people are concerned about the scale of what is needed and what is ahead. That is why the transition must support people. It must strengthen industry. This also means massive boosting of public and private investment, creating lead markets for circular and clean products to deliver jobs and investments in Europe, ensuring a just transition for all, for example, with the Social Climate Fund, and securing the global level playing field, notably by promoting carbon pricing.

Europe must protect its industries. They are doing the right thing to decarbonise and they should be rewarded and incentivised. We otherwise risk relying again on imports to Europe – imports for the steel that our carmakers need, or imports for the fertiliser that our farmers need. And that means we would be at the mercy of price, volume and quality that others are willing and able to provide.

Take steel and other metals: global overcapacity is squeezing margins and leaving little incentives to pay a clean premium, so this makes it harder for Europe's steel industry to invest in decarbonisation. That is why the Commission will propose a new long-term trade instrument to succeed the expiring steel safeguards. Europe will always remain open. We like competition, but we will always protect our industry from unfair competition.

(Applause)

Honourable Members, when we talk about competitiveness, we talk about jobs, we are talking about people and their livelihood, so the bottom line is that workers must be empowered if we are to have a competitive economy. And that is why we will propose a Quality Jobs Act – to ensure that modern employment keeps pace with the modern economy. And this is important because we know how hard times have been for so many families, how costs have rocketed up, how people are making sacrifices to make ends meet. This is a matter of basic social justice.

This is why we urgently need an ambitious European anti-poverty strategy. We will lay out our plan to help eradicate poverty by 2050, backed by a strong child guarantee to shield our children from poverty. And we will also put forward a series of packages on affordability and the cost of living. Allow me to give you four telling examples.

The first is energy. When the energy costs rise, it is not just a number on the bill; it is every single part of people's life that is affected. So at the height of the energy crisis in the last years, Europe acted. And thanks to that common effort, we quickly managed to stabilise prices and secure supply. We are now on the path to energy independence, but energy bills are still a real source of anxiety for millions of Europeans, and costs are still structurally too high for industry. We know what drove prices up – that was dependency on Russian fossil fuels. So it's time to get rid of dirty Russian fossil fuels completely.

(Applause)

And we know what brings prices down, and that is clean home-grown energy. We need to generate more home-grown renewables, with nuclear as a baseload, but we also need to urgently modernise and invest in our infrastructure and our interconnectors. This is why we will propose a new grids package to strengthen our grid infrastructure and speed up permitting.

And to go with that, I'm presenting today a new initiative called 'energy highways'. We have identified eight critical bottlenecks in our energy infrastructure – that goes from the Øresund Strait to the Sicilian Canal. We will now work to remove these bottlenecks one by one. We will bring governments and utilities together to address all outstanding issues, because Europeans need affordable energy right now.

Honourable Members, a home is not just four walls and the roof; it is safety, it is warmth, it is a place for family and friends, it is belonging. But for too many Europeans today, home has become a source of anxiety. It can mean debt and uncertainty. The numbers tell a painful truth: house prices are up by more than 20 % since 2015; building permits down by over 20 % in five years. This is more than a housing crisis; this is a social crisis. It tears Europe's social fabric, it weakens our cohesion, and it also threatens our competitiveness. Nurses, teachers and firemen cannot afford to live where they serve. Students drop out because they cannot pay the rent. Young people delay starting families.

This is why still this year, after receiving your input, we will present the first ever European affordable housing plan – to make housing more affordable, more sustainable and of better quality. It will be a European effort anchored in local realities. We need a radical overhaul of the way we tackle this issue. We need to revise our State aid rules to enable housing support measures, we need to make it much easier to build new houses and student residences, and we will also propose a legal initiative on short-term rentals to tackle the remaining issues. So we need all of society, all lawmakers, all stakeholders to come together, and in this spirit, we will convene the first European housing summit to ensure it is at the top of our agenda.

Honourable Members, housing is dignity, it is about fairness, it is about Europe's future. Eight years ago, the European pillar of social rights made housing a social right in Europe. So it's time to turn this promise now into a reality.

The third example I would like to highlight is cars. Cars are the pillar of our economy and industry. They are our European pride. Millions of jobs depend on it. Earlier this year, we gave the sector more flexibility to reach their 2025 targets. This is working. And with respect for technology neutrality, we are now preparing the 2035 review. Millions of Europeans want to buy affordable European cars, so we should invest in small, affordable cars, both for the European market, but also to meet the surge that we see in the global demand. And this is why we will propose to work with industry on a new small affordable cars initiative. I believe Europe should have its own e-car: 'e' for environmental – clean, efficient and lightweight; 'e' for economical – affordable for people; 'e' for European – built here in Europe, with European supply chains. Because we cannot let China and others conquer this market. No matter what, we all know, the future will be electric, and Europe will be a part of it. The future of cars – and the cars of the future – must be made here in Europe.

(Mixed reactions)

Honourable Members, the final example I want to highlight is linked to food. In Europe, we have access to high-quality food that our outstanding farmers and fishers produce at affordable prices. They are also the custodians of our lands and oceans, our biodiversity; the key to our food security. But they are facing headwinds, from high input costs to red tape or unfair competition. We are acting on all those fronts.

We have simplified the CAP: less paperwork, more trust. We have ring-fenced income support in the next MFF, and made sure that funding can be topped up by national regional envelopes. But our farmers need fair competition and a level playing field – this is essential, and this is why we have robust safeguards in our trade deal with Mercosur, backed up by funding if compensation is needed.

We also need to strengthen the position of farmers in the food chain. For too long, their hard work has not paid off as it should. Farmers have a right to a fair price for their food – and a fair profit for their families. We will therefore review the implementation of our unfair trading practices legislation and take action wherever it is needed. And I can announce today that we will boost our promotion budget to launch a new 'buy European food' campaign – because we can proudly say that our European food is the best in the world.

Honourable Members, when we talk about competitiveness and independence, we must talk about our relations with the United States. I have heard many things about the deal agreed in summer. I understand the initial reactions, so allow me to be as clear as I can. Our trading relationship with the United States is our most important. We export over EUR 500 billion worth of goods every year. Millions of jobs depend on it, and as President of the Commission, I will never gamble with people's jobs and livelihoods.

This is why we did a deal to keep market access for our industries, and we ensured that Europe got the best possible deal out there. We have put our companies at a relative advantage because some of our direct competitors face much higher tariffs from the US. Yes, their baseline might be lower, but when you account for the exceptions that we secured and the additional rates which others have on top, we have the best agreement without any doubt.

But I want also to be crystal clear on one point: whether on environmental or digital regulation, we set our own standards, we set our own regulations. Europe will always decide for itself.

Honourable Members, I do not believe in tariffs; tariffs are taxes. But the deal provides crucial stability in our relations with the United States at a time of grave global insecurity. Think of the repercussions of a full-fledged trade war with the United States. Picture the chaos, and then put that image next to the one from China just last week: China flanked by the leaders from Russia and North Korea; Putin gloating about how Russia-China relations are at an unprecedented height.

None of this is a great surprise, but it reflects the changing landscape, and it creates two imperatives for Europe's independence push and its place in the world.

The first is that we need to double down on diversification and on partnerships. Eighty per cent of our trade with is with countries other than the United States, so we need to capitalise now on these new opportunities. And at a time where the global trading system is crumbling, we're securing the global rules through bilateral agreements, like with Mexico, like Mercosur, or finalising negotiations on a historic deal with India by the end of the year.

We will also build a coalition of like-minded countries to reform the global trading system, like with the CPTPP countries – because trade allows us to strengthen our supply chains, open our markets, reduce dependencies. Ultimately, it is about enhancing our economic security. The world wants to choose Europe and we need to do business with the world.

My second imperative is for Europe to step up where others have stepped away. Take research: science has no passport, no gender, no ethnicity and no political colour. It is one of the most valuable global goods. And this is why the Commission announced a 'choose Europe' package of EUR 500 million to attract and retain the best scientists and researchers. And Europe must also take the lead on global health. We are on the brink – if not even at the start – of another global health crisis. As a medical doctor by training, I am appalled by the disinformation that threatens global progress on everything from measles to polio.

(Applause)

This is why, today, I can announce that the European Union will head a new global health resilience initiative – because the world is looking to Europe, and Europe is ready to lead.

(Heckling)

Honourable Members, Europe's independence is about protecting our freedoms, and this is very important because these freedoms ...

(Heckling)

This shouting side of the House should listen very carefully.

President. – *(Interruption from the right)*

Can you please stop? Can you please stop?

Ursula von der Leyen, President of the Commission. – Listen very carefully about the freedoms – the freedom to decide, the freedom to speak out, to move around the whole continent, the freedom to vote, to love, to pray, to live in a Union of equality. Our democracy and the rule of law are the guarantors of those freedoms.

(Applause)

This is why we have done so much to strengthen our tools and step up enforcement. We built a new rule of law cycle that ensures that problems are detected early and solved through engagement. We need an integrated annual cycle on the rule of law – a common rhythm, clear milestones and contributions from all institutions.

Our focus must be to close the existing loopholes. We have strengthened the link between funds and respect for the rule of law, and with the next long-term budget we will go even further. Respecting the rule of law is a must for European funds – now and in future.

Honourable Members, the rise in information manipulation and disinformation, as we hear, is dividing our societies. It is not only eroding trust in the truth, but also in democracy itself. This is why we urgently need the European Democracy Shield. We need more capacity to monitor and detect information manipulation and disinformation. So we will set up a new 'European centre for democratic resilience'. This will bring together the expertise and capacity of Member States and neighbouring countries.

(Heckling from the right)

You are obviously fearing this new centre!

(Applause)

President. – (*Interruption from the right*)

Okay, I understand that shouting has become a little bit of a tradition. Can you listen, please, to this discussion and then you'll have the time to speak?

Ursula von der Leyen, President of the Commission. – In some communities across Europe, traditional media are struggling. In many rural areas, the days of going out for a local paper is a nostalgic memory. This has created many news deserts where disinformation thrives. This is so dangerous for our democracy, because informed citizens who can trust what they read and hear are essential to keep those in power accountable. And when independent media are dismantled or neutralised, our ability to monitor corruption and preserve democracy is severely weakened.

This is why the first step – listen carefully – in an autocrat's playbook is always to capture independent media, because this enables backsliding and corruption to happen in the dark. So we need to do more to protect our media and our independent press.

This is why we will launch a new 'media resilience programme'. This 'media resilience programme' will support independent journalism and media literacy. But we also need to invest to address some of the root causes of this threat. This is why in the next budget we have proposed to significantly boost funding for media. We also need to enable private equity. We will therefore use our tools to support independent and local media. A free press is the backbone of any democracy and we will support Europe's press to remain free, despite your shouting!

President. – (*In response to comments from Christine Schneider*) Ms Schneider, please! We have been very fair and understanding, but this is your last warning. Shout again and you will leave the Chamber!

Ursula von der Leyen, President of the Commission. – Let's have a look at social media. It has many, many benefits for connecting people. But I would like to raise one very specific topic: the effects of giving our children unfettered access to social media. As a mother of seven and a grandmother of four, I feel the anxiety of parents who are doing their best to keep their children safe. These parents worry that when their children pick up a phone, they could be exposed to the wide-ranging dangers simply with a scroll: online bullying, adult content, promoting self-harm, and algorithms that prey on children's vulnerabilities with the explicit purpose of creating addictions.

Too often, mums and dads feel powerless and helpless that they are drowning against the tsunami of big tech flooding their family homes. I strongly believe that parents, not algorithms, should be raising our children – and their voice must be heard. This is why today I am here to tell you that I'm listening. In my day, we as a society taught our children that they could not smoke, drink or watch adult content until a certain age. I believe it is time we consider doing the same for social media.

Our friends in Australia are pioneering a social media restriction. I'm watching the implementation of their policy closely to see what next steps we can take here in Europe. I will commission a panel of experts to advise me by the end of this year on the best approach for Europe. We will approach this carefully and listen to everyone. And in all of this work, we will be guided by the need to empower parents and to build a safer Europe for our children. Because when it comes to kids' safety online, Europe believes in parents, not in profits.

Meine Damen und Herren Abgeordnete, unsere Demokratie zu schützen, ist unsere wichtigste Aufgabe. Aber dafür müssen wir auch zeigen, dass die Demokratie Lösungen für die berechtigten Sorgen der Menschen hat. Nirgendwo ist das deutlicher spürbar als bei dem Thema Migration. Deshalb haben wir vorgeschlagen, die Mittel für das Migrations- und Grenzmanagement im nächsten Haushalt zu verdreifachen, damit wir Migration wirksam steuern und unsere Außengrenzen schützen können. Aber es ist klar, dass mehr nötig ist.

Die Menschen in Europa haben bewiesen, dass sie bereit sind, jenen zu helfen, die vor Krieg und Verfolgung flüchten. Aber die Frustration wächst, wenn sie den Eindruck haben, unsere Regeln werden missachtet. Deshalb müssen wir unsere Anstrengungen verstärken. Wir brauchen ein System, das menschlich ist, ohne naiv zu sein.

Wir müssen mit der Rückkehr abgelehnter Asylbewerber in ihre Heimatländer ernst machen. Es kann doch nicht sein, dass nur 20 Prozent derjenigen, die nicht bleiben dürfen, Europa tatsächlich verlassen. Wir brauchen daher eine schnelle Übereinkunft beim Gemeinsamen Europäischen Rückkehrsystem.

Wir dürfen keine Zeit mehr verlieren, und wir müssen auch sicherstellen, dass wir den Migrations- und Asylpakt voll und ganz umsetzen, sobald er in Kraft ist. Er ist streng, aber fair, und er wird nur funktionieren, wenn alle ihren Anteil leisten – Mitgliedstaaten aus Nord wie Süd, aus Ost wie West.

Selbstverständlich werden wir unseren internationalen Verpflichtungen immer nachkommen; wir haben das in der Vergangenheit getan, wir tun das heute, wir werden das in Zukunft tun. Aber es sind wir in Europa, die entscheiden, wer zu uns kommt und unter welchen Umständen, und nicht die Schlepper und Schleuser.

(Beifall)

Die Schlepper und Schleuser machen Millionen und Abermillionen mit ihren zynischen, falschen und oft fatalen Versprechen, deshalb müssen wir ihr Geschäftsmodell zerstören. Die Zahlen gehen zwar insgesamt zurück, aber immer noch versuchen zu viele Schleuser und Schlepper, illegal die Menschen über die Grenzen zu bringen, und oft sterben die Menschen auf dem Weg.

Wir müssen mit Social-Media-Plattformen zusammenarbeiten, um die Online-Werbung für Schleuseroperationen zu beenden. Wir müssen enger mit den Fluggesellschaften kooperieren, gerade auf problematischen Routen wie denen nach Belarus. Nur, wenn wir der Spur des Geldes folgen, können wir die kriminellen Netzwerke aufspüren und ihre Finanzquellen austrocknen. Wir brauchen ein neues Sanktionsregime, das Schleuser und Menschenhändler ins Visier nimmt, um ihre Vermögenswerte einzufrieren, um ihre Bewegungsmöglichkeiten einzuschränken, um ihre Gewinne zu kappen.

Menschenschmuggel ist ein grausames und verbrecherisches Geschäft, und kein Schlepper, kein Schleuser darf in Europa ungestraft davonkommen.

(Beifall)

Honourable Members, the point I want to make is simple: if it matters to Europeans, it matters to Europe. This is our enduring duty to deliver.

This summer we all saw the pictures of Europe's forests and villages on fire. More than a million hectares were burned – an area around a third of the size of Belgium. The scale of the damage is enormous, and we know it is not a one-off. Climate change is making each summer hotter, harsher and more dangerous. This is why we have to radically step up our efforts into climate resilience and adaptations and nature-based solutions.

But we must also give ourselves the tools to respond. This is why we will propose to create a new European firefighting hub based in Cyprus, which could also support our regional neighbours. We know the difference our Civil Protection Mechanism can make. Just over the summer, 760 brave Europeans were sent to all corners of Europe – literally running towards the flames – and I would like to conclude my speech with a tribute to them: the firefighters, the pilots, the crews, everyone who stepped up.

I would like to tell you the story of a group of 20 Greek rangers. They are specialists in taming the fiercest of forest fires. When the fires erupted in the Asturias region, Spain called Europe for help – and Greece answered the call. The flames were so vast the smoke could be seen from space, but for five days, these 20 Greek rangers stood shoulder to shoulder with their Spanish colleagues. As the flames swept closer to the village of Genestoso, they fought day and night to contain the inferno. And in the end, together they tamed the fire and the village was saved.

Honourable Members, it is such an honour to welcome one of these heroes today: the leader of the Greek team, Lieutenant Nikolaos Paisios. Lieutenant, dear Nikolaos, your courage is an inspiration to all of us.

(The House rose and accorded a standing ovation)

Honourable Members, this is Europe as one community. This is the Europe that I love and that you love, that we all love. This is a Europe that we must protect at all costs, and we must do that together. I want to work with this House and with all pro-European democratic forces to deliver for Europe. I am working on legislative packages to empower this pro-European majority.

I'm so delighted, dear Roberta, that we have managed to renew the Framework Agreement between the Commission and Parliament. This will only strengthen our cooperation, and it will be an enabler for us to work on the real reforms that are needed, because I support the right of initiative of the European Parliament and I believe that we need to move to qualified majorities in some areas, for example, in foreign policy. It is time to break free from the shackles of unanimity.

The point is that we need to make sure that our Union is faster and can deliver, because this is how we can win the fight together – to deliver Europe's independence moments. Let's remember that we have always had to fight for our freedoms – from the generation that fought hand in hand across our continent, to the underground press that kept the flame of freedom alive across Central and Eastern Europe during the Cold War, or the Forest Brothers in the Baltics who resisted Soviet oppression at every turn.

This struggle, this fight is deeply engrained in who we are as Europeans. Eighty years ago, our continent was hell on earth. Forty years ago, our continent was divided by a wall. But on each occasion, Europeans decided to fight for a better future – to make itself whole and to make the whole strong. That is what I will strive for every single day with you, honourable Members. Long live Europe!

(Sustained applause)

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President of Parliament, President of the European Commission, dear colleagues, this summer was not an easy summer for Europe. It was Alaska: a missing Europe. It was Gaza: a totally split Europe. It was a US trade deal: not easy. Forest fires. Draghi criticising the economic policy pool. It was really not easy.

And it's now easy to stand here in this plenary and criticise – I think a lot of colleagues after me will do so. They criticise the Commission, the Commission President, the Council. I will not do this.

I believe we can only win trust if we trust in ourselves, and that's why my first message is that people can count on what the EPP promised in the election campaign. We voted in Bucharest for our projects, for our priorities. We won the elections. And the Commission is now delivering: a fleet of omnibuses started; a return regulation is on the table; a safe programme on defence; we have 18 sanctions packages and the Tunisian agreement; defence in Greece and Poland is protecting our external border; we have illegal migration numbers reduced by 80 %.

A lot has happened in the last months. It is not perfect at all, but we are starting to deliver and I want to thank the European Commission for their work.

We are attacked as the EPP: from the left that we are too right; from the extreme right that we are too left. But I tell you, we will seriously and decisively continue to deliver content, content, content. That's what counts for the EPP.

Autumn, dear friends, will be a moment of truth for us now in Parliament. The legislation arrives on our desks, and the guiding principle for us is responsibility. That's why we will support the US trade agreement. I understood that in the INTE Committee, a lot of colleagues criticised it; the EPP was the only group who supported the outcome in Scotland. I don't like to have 50 % tariffs; I would like to talk about 0 %, about TTIP. It was opposed by the left when we discussed it, but what is the alternative to Scotland? A trade war with the US?

Responsibility also means to stand here and say 'yes' to Mercosur, with the proper safeguards for our farmers. We want to have more of these further agreements with Mexico – already presented – India, Indonesia. We have partners who still believe in a rules-based trade order in the world. Mercosur is, for us, an anti-Trump agreement to show that the rules-based approach works. And if we refuse Mercosur, we push South America to China. I know defending Mercosur is not popular, but it is responsible, and it is honest to tell that to the people.

And speaking about jobs: last year we lost around 90 000 jobs in the European car industry – 90 000 families. As the EPP, we speak with trade unions, we speak with the CEOs from the car sector – and everybody tells us that we need an ambitious climate approach, but also a realistic one. In this moment in time, whole industries in Europe are dying. That's the reality on the ground.

We support an ambitious climate approach for 2050, no doubt about this, but we need a technologically neutral approach: nuclear energy, combustion engines. And we have to screen the legislation on practicability. That is what we have to do, and we have to do it fast.

Dear friends: more single market, more flagship projects, more investments, more digital. We all agreed in this House on the Draghi agenda, and now Draghi is asking us: 'What are you waiting for at this moment in time?'

Socialists, I have to say, voted in the EMPL Committee against the omnibus – for the rejection of the omnibus proposals. And I heard also that, Iratxe, you said publicly that socialists call the US trade agreement into question. You don't know whether you will support it or not. I tell you: this behaviour is splitting the platform. This is exactly what is harming the European agenda. We have to deliver now, and that's why we have to be honest in this plenary now.

Prime Minister Frederiksen, a socialist leader, stood here in July and presented the agenda for the Danish Presidency. She spoke about competitiveness, about stopping illegal migration, and about security – key pillars. She asked us to be strong on less bureaucracy on migration.

There are two sides of the socialist reality, I have to say: there are the socialists of Sánchez and there are the socialists of Frederiksen in today's Europe. And I hope that we don't see the Spanish political reality spreading to Europe.

I tell you, nearly all votes this week – the proposed CBAM, the future of agriculture policy, public procurement, the Waste Directive – are based on a platform agreement in the committees. That's a reality in our House. It works. Europe does not need another ideological fight in the centre; what we need now are solutions. And we have to act fast, dear colleagues.

On the return regulation: Frederiksen again asked us to be the partner of the Danish Presidency. On the return regulation: the Commission presented the regulation in the first 100 days in office, and it took another 100 days to nominate a rapporteur in the European Parliament. And now we have foreseen the return regulation vote in December – at the end of the Danish Presidency. Sorry, dear colleagues, that's not the way we should work. We must speed up; people ask for solutions from us at this moment in time.

And allow me to also underline the historic moment we are in. Ukraine confirmed – the Alaska event confirmed – that the red carpet for Putin ends up in the most brutal attacks against civilians that we have ever seen. That's the reality. And on Gaza: enough is enough. Hamas is a terrorist organisation, no doubt about this, but hunger can never be a weapon.

The reality of this summer, dear friends, and these historic issues is that we are, as Europeans, alone in a stormy world order. Nobody on the global stage is currently listening to us. I said it on Gaza: a totally split Europe. So, how can we change this?

Dear colleagues, the idea that national sovereignty exists is a Potemkin village. It is not real. Kohl, Mitterrand and Delors understood this reality on economic terms. They created a single market and the euro. They made us strong and European integration non-revocable. And now Merz, Macron, Tusk and all the others must create the same for foreign affairs and for defence, to bring the European integration another step forward and make it non-revocable, as our Commission President presented today. We cannot allow Orbán and crazy Fico to turn the European Union into a foolish organisation, dear colleagues.

And just a final point, on the nationalists, because we are attacked from both sides. One word to the nationalists at the end: the nationalists here in this House applaud America first. They are friends of American tech billionaires like Musk. They follow the agenda of the tech money. The reality is nationalists are not patriots. They turn Europe into a colony of Silicon Valley and Washington – even worse, of Moscow. And that's why we will never allow this, dear friends. Never allow this.

We love Europe. We love the European way of life. Europe is not weak. Europe is as strong as we make it. And that's why Europe must lead now. We are in front of a European autumn of truth. The EPP is ready.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señora Von der Leyen, lo siento, lo siento mucho. Tengo que decirle que hoy aquí ha quedado claro quién es su mayor enemigo: el señor Weber, el Partido Popular Europeo.

Usted ha hecho todos los esfuerzos posibles hoy por intentar traer aquí un programa de trabajo donde todas las fuerzas políticas proeuropeas nos sintiéramos representadas. Ha hecho ese esfuerzo, pero usted hoy sabe quién es el responsable de que esa alianza proeuropea y esa plataforma no funcionen en este Parlamento. Tiene nombre y apellido, se llama Manfred Weber, se llama Partido Popular Europeo.

Señora presidenta, hoy le hemos escuchado pedir urgencia y unidad. Pero las palabras que resuenan en las calles de Europa son otras: ¿dónde está Europa? Porque la urgencia y la unidad que necesitamos no puede ser a costa de la ambición ni de los intereses de la ciudadanía europea.

¿Dónde estaba Europa cuando se firmó el pacto con Trump, que es injusto? Aceptar un 15 % de los aranceles sin ninguna represalia es inaceptable. Prometer a los Estados Unidos compras de gas y de petróleo por cientos de miles de millones de euros —y también inversión en defensa, sin competencias para hacerlo— es un abuso de poder. Usted fue a Escocia a enterrar en un campo de golf los informes Draghi y Letta y nuestra autonomía estratégica. Le recuerdo dónde debe invertir: aquí, en Europa, 800 000 millones anuales con deuda común para financiar la transición ecológica, la transformación digital, la defensa y el modelo social europeo. Nuestra posición es clara: enmendaremos el acuerdo. Exigiremos que los productores estadounidenses cumplan los mismos estándares que pedimos en la Unión, porque los agricultores no pueden ser los perdedores de su pacto con Trump. Y si Trump continúa con su guerra comercial con respecto a nuestras leyes digitales, debemos activar el instrumento anticoercitivo.

Señora Von der Leyen, ¿dónde está Europa cuando Gaza muere cada día? Más de 64 000 palestinos asesinados, dos millones de desplazados, casas, hospitales y colegios arrasados. La hambruna usada como arma de guerra. Niños ametrallados buscando comida. A mí me hubiera gustado también hoy aquí que pudiéramos haber invitado a Hind Rajab, niña palestina conocida gracias a periodistas — muchos de los cuales han sido asesinados— y al mundo del cine. Una niña que fue asesinada cuando iba a buscar comida. Y detrás de esta niña está Salma, está Brahim, está Mohammed, están miles y miles de niños cuyas voces no volveremos a escuchar, a los que no podremos invitar aquí, que han muerto por la masacre del Gobierno de Israel. Hemos esperado demasiado tiempo. Recibimos sus propuestas y esa presentación de propuestas de romper con el Acuerdo. Nosotros pedimos que sea una ruptura total del Acuerdo, pero aceptamos esos primeros pasos, que llegan demasiado tarde y han costado muchas vidas. Tenemos que seguir trabajando y dando la cara. Y frente a ese resort turístico que Trump y Netanyahu pretenden hacer, hay que poner en marcha el «Gaza Facility». Porque si Gaza muere, muere el alma de Europa. Paremos el genocidio. El genocidio hay que pararlo.

¿Dónde estaba Europa también respecto a Ucrania? Usted ha anunciado, con respecto a Ucrania, que va a pedir unos fondos a Rusia. Active, de una vez por todas, los 200 000 millones de activos rusos congelados para poder contribuir a la reconstrucción de Ucrania.

¿Y dónde estaba Europa en la lucha contra el cambio climático? Este verano, parte de Europa ha ardido. Reforcemos nuestro compromiso con la neutralidad climática. Señor Weber, usted dice que hay que parar para favorecer el empleo. ¿Dónde vamos a poner industrias, dónde vamos a poner empresas, dónde van a trabajar nuestros autónomos, si nuestro territorio está siendo devastado por los efectos de la lucha contra el cambio climático? Necesitamos un plan europeo de vivienda asequible, becas remuneradas para los jóvenes, un paquete de empleo de calidad y conquistas para las mujeres. Y todos estos retos necesitan y exigen un presupuesto suficiente.

Señora Von der Leyen, señor Weber, la responsabilidad no es abdicar de nuestros valores e intereses. La responsabilidad es no pactar y no buscar aliados en la extrema derecha que quiere destruir Europa. La socialdemocracia ha estado siempre construyendo Europa y lo va a seguir haciendo con responsabilidad, pero sin renunciar a formar parte de la toma de decisiones.

Jordan Bardella, *au nom du groupe PjE*. – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, Madame la Présidente von der Leyen, au nom de millions de Français, je vous pose aujourd'hui une question simple: quels intérêts défendez-vous vraiment?

Quels intérêts défendez-vous, Madame, lorsque vous imposez, contre l'avis de la France, deuxième économie européenne, un accord de libre-échange avec le Mercosur qui va aggraver la concurrence déloyale envers nos agriculteurs et entraîner l'importation dans nos assiettes de produits qui ne respectent aucune des normes drastiques que vous imposez à nos agriculteurs?

Quels intérêts défendez-vous, Madame, lorsque vous proposez à l'Europe de diminuer ses droits de douane sur les véhicules chinois et que, dans le même temps, vous interdisez à nos constructeurs la vente de véhicules thermiques et hybrides d'ici 2035, tout en les menaçant régulièrement de pénalités financières?

Quels intérêts défendez-vous, Madame, lorsque vous persévérez à défendre les règles européennes du marché de l'énergie, qui privent la France des coûts de production historiquement bas de sa filière nucléaire, détruisant ainsi la compétitivité de notre industrie et de nos entreprises, et le pouvoir d'achat de nos concitoyens les plus modestes?

Quels intérêts défendez-vous, Madame, lorsque vous signez en notre nom un accord commercial avec les États-Unis qui entérine la reddition et la vassalisation économique de l'Europe? Alors que nos exportations continueront d'être visées par 15 % de droits de douane, les produits industriels américains entreront chez nous sans la moindre entrave tarifaire. Et, comme si cela ne suffisait pas, vous engagez les États membres à verser un tribut massif: 750 milliards de dollars d'importations énergétiques américaines hors de prix, 600 milliards de dollars d'investissements imposés aux dépens de nos pays et de nos propres territoires. Alors que la France dispose, pour l'Europe, d'une industrie militaire d'exception, vous actez la préférence américaine au détriment de la souveraineté et du patriotisme économique. La défense, les vins, les spiritueux, les cosmétiques, le luxe ou les productions pharmaceutiques, nos filières d'excellence sont ainsi sacrifiées.

Pendant ce temps, autour de nous, le Canada, le Royaume-Uni, l'Australie, le Japon ou la Corée du Sud ont conclu de bien meilleurs accords que nous. En d'autres termes, même les plus petits pays défendent bien mieux leurs intérêts que vous ne l'avez fait vous-même aux États-Unis, il y a quelques semaines.

L'Union européenne promettait au peuple que l'union ferait la force. Nous sommes l'une des premières zones économiques du monde et notre marché représente 450 millions de consommateurs, et pourtant vous avez cédé sur tout, ou presque. Quand il s'agit de défendre les intérêts allemands, vous savez défendre l'intérêt national. Aucun chef d'entreprise responsable, aucune femme ni aucun homme d'État soucieux du bien commun n'aurait signé un tel accord. Et pourtant, vous, Madame, vous l'avez fait en notre nom.

Je prends aujourd'hui la parole au nom de millions de Français et au nom de millions d'Européens qui estiment, à juste titre, que l'Union européenne ne défend plus l'Europe. Alors qu'autour de nous le monde renoue avec la puissance, la croissance et la conquête, vous engagez nos peuples sur le chemin de la disparition et du déclin. L'histoire nous montre qu'une autre voie est possible. Et cette histoire vous jugera sévèrement. Et notre peuple aussi.

Nicola Procaccini, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signora Presidente, signora Presidente von der Leyen, onorevoli colleghi, parto da lontano, ma solo geograficamente.

La parata militare del leader cinese vestito come Mao Tse-tung, che tiene per mano Putin e Kim Jong Un, è un'immagine che non fa ridere; ci ricorda che il mondo è un posto pericoloso, in cui prosperano regimi che non nascondono più la loro volontà di rimodellare l'ordine globale anche con la forza.

Prendere coscienza della realtà non significa che dobbiamo assumere atteggiamenti stupidamente muscolari, ma rafforzare i nostri valori, la nostra economia, la nostra difesa, i nostri alleati.

Siamo favorevoli all'intesa che ha raggiunto con l'amministrazione americana sui dazi non perché sia perfetta, ma perché è certamente meglio di una guerra commerciale tra alleati che hanno bisogno l'uno dell'altro.

Noi dobbiamo avere il coraggio, come europei, di fare le scelte giuste nel momento giusto. Il *green deal* è stato pensato e voluto in un'altra era geopolitica, oggi è un ostacolo troppo alto per la competitività europea. E voglio ricordarvi che lo sviluppo economico è la condizione necessaria per poter avere risorse da spendere per la difesa militare, per il welfare, per la difesa dell'ambiente. Mantenere i dazi imposti dall'Unione europea a sé stessa, alla propria industria, addirittura aggiungere nuove tassazioni proprie nel nuovo bilancio pluriennale significa andare nella direzione sbagliata: un errore tragico!

Invece mi pare si stia andando nella direzione giusta per quanto riguarda l'immigrazione, cooperando con le nazioni di origine e transito per fermare il traffico di migranti illegali; ora dobbiamo definire in fretta i paesi terzi sicuri e rendere i rimpatri una pratica effettiva e non una vuota promessa.

Ma lasciatemi dire un'ultima cosa: mentre qui discutiamo di accoglienza, in troppe regioni del mondo viene impedito ai cristiani di professare la loro fede. È ormai un anno che è vacante il posto di inviato speciale dell'Unione europea per la libertà di religione nel mondo. Io lo trovo desolante. Presidente, per favore, fate presto! Per qualcuno sarà poco importante, per noi conservatori lo è, e molto!

Parché se l'Europa non difende i principi e i valori che l'hanno plasmata, non potrà certo difendere i suoi interessi né i suoi confini.

Valérie Hayer, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, Madame la Présidente, nous sommes en train de perdre les Européens. On a beau être parmi les plus riches au monde, avoir les standards sociaux les plus élevés sur la planète, être les champions des libertés individuelles, pourtant, on perd les Européens.

On perd les Européens parce que l'Europe qui devait les protéger leur semble faible. Faible face à Trump. Faible face à Poutine. Faible face à la Chine. Faible sur le climat. Mais, Madame la Présidente, il n'y a pas de fatalité. Avec le groupe Renew, nous refusons la fatalité. La faiblesse est un choix et ce n'est pas le nôtre.

Chers collègues, il est temps de passer à l'Europe d'après: une Europe plus intégrée, une Europe plus souveraine, une Europe plus fédérale, une Europe qui protège. Nous sommes aujourd'hui face à une menace existentielle. Le monde se réorganise devant nos yeux et des puissances mondiales veulent nous marginaliser.

La Russie est aux frontières de l'Union européenne, et la guerre qu'elle mène contre l'Ukraine est un moment de vérité pour l'Europe. Ce moment de vérité, on l'a saisi, notamment sur la question des garanties de sécurité. Mais nous devons faire plus. Donner tous les outils à l'Ukraine pour renforcer son armée et rendre enfin concrète cette Europe de la défense. Ce qui s'est passé ce matin en Pologne avec les drones russes confirme que la sécurité de l'Ukraine, c'est notre sécurité. Protégeons l'espace aérien ukrainien, montrons les muscles, car c'est par notre force que nous dissuaderons nos ennemis de nous attaquer.

Chers collègues, ce nouveau monde, il nous est hostile. C'est une guerre culturelle à laquelle nous devons faire face. Cette guerre culturelle menace notre mode de vie, nos valeurs, nos libertés et notre indépendance. Et cette guerre culturelle ne vient pas seulement de l'Est. Alors, face à l'internationale réactionnaire, nous n'avons pas d'autre choix que d'être le rempart de la démocratie et des libertés, que d'assumer d'avoir une voix forte dans le monde.

En Europe, Madame la Présidente, nous attendons aussi des actions concrètes sur le bouclier démocratique. Nous avons un enjeu majeur. Des élections vont avoir lieu demain en République tchèque, en Irlande, aux Pays-Bas, au Portugal. C'est maintenant qu'on a besoin d'outils solides pour lutter contre les ingérences. C'est un enjeu de souveraineté. À cet égard, Madame la Présidente, c'est très bien que vous ayez réaffirmé que le règlement sur les services numériques et le règlement sur les marchés numériques ne seraient en aucun cas des monnaies d'échange. Vous savez que c'est une ligne rouge absolue de ce Parlement européen. Alors, tenez le bras de fer.

Madame la Présidente, un autre point me paraît absolument essentiel sur la défense de nos valeurs. Personne ici, dans cet hémicycle, n'a oublié les atrocités du 7 octobre. Personne ne doit laisser la moindre place et le moindre espace au Hamas. Mais personne n'est aveugle sur la guerre inhumaine que mène Benyamin Netanyahu à Gaza. Et certainement pas, je vous le dis, notre jeunesse européenne qui vit maintenant un moment d'identification générationnelle. Ce qu'il se passe à Gaza – et notre réponse – déterminera l'adhésion de toute notre jeunesse à notre projet européen.

Aujourd'hui, la désunion de nos États nous empêche d'agir. C'est une honte. Une honte pour les Gazaouis, une honte pour la sécurité d'Israël, une honte pour les valeurs de notre jeunesse. Alors oui, Madame la Présidente, il faut que la Commission agisse. Et nous serons à vos côtés pour les propositions que vous avez mises sur la table ce matin. Nous serons même prêts à aller plus loin pour mettre un terme à cette catastrophe.

Madame la Présidente, la souveraineté de l'Europe passe aussi par notre compétitivité. Et nous, avec le groupe Renew, on a une conviction profonde: 2026 doit être l'année du rapport Draghi. Franchement, je vous le dis, ça m'a fait du bien de vous entendre sur l'économie ce matin, parce que ça fait un an qu'on l'attend. Parce que, mes chers collègues, nous faisons face à une urgence économique. Si nous n'agissons pas, c'est toute notre prospérité qui risque de s'effondrer. Alors mesurons l'urgence. Alors, oui, Madame la Présidente, moins de communication, plus de règlements. Oui au 28^e régime, oui à la préférence européenne, oui à l'union des marchés des capitaux et oui à votre calendrier pour 2028. J'ai envie de vous dire: si on peut aller plus vite, alors allons plus vite. Nous serons à vos côtés là encore.

Chers collègues, nous avons agi sur la simplification, c'est très bien. Mais cela ne peut pas être notre seul agenda législatif, parce que le rapport Draghi, c'est du concret: de l'emploi, de la croissance, une vie meilleure pour tous les Européens. Le rapport Draghi, c'est aussi un espoir, l'espoir d'une Europe qui fait rêver ses citoyens, avec de grands projets industriels et technologiques. On doit retrouver à l'échelle européenne la fierté du Concorde, de l'Airbus, de la fusée Ariane. Alors mettons le paquet sur le spatial et mettons le paquet pour que le prochain géant de l'intelligence artificielle soit européen. On a tous les atouts pour ça. On a l'intelligence, on a la technologie. Ce qui manque, c'est des investissements européens pour les entreprises européennes. Ce qui manque, c'est aussi la vision et, peut-être pire encore, la capacité politique.

De la même manière que l'économie change, que le monde change, nos règles de gouvernance doivent changer. On le voit bien aujourd'hui, on est trop lents, on n'est pas assez efficaces. On a des institutions immatures au service d'un projet politique inabouti. Ce qu'il faut, c'est un big bang institutionnel. Et je vous le dis, les réformes institutionnelles, ce n'est pas pour nous faire plaisir, c'est simplement pour mieux servir les Européens. Ce que le groupe Renew vous demande, Madame la Présidente, c'est une grande convention d'urgence: fin de l'unanimité au Conseil sur les sanctions et les questions fiscales; listes transnationales; plus de pouvoirs pour le Parlement européen, plus de pouvoirs pour vous, Madame la Présidente, plus de pouvoirs pour le ou la président(e) de la Commission européenne élu(e) au suffrage universel direct par les citoyens européens. Mais d'ici là, quand même, qu'on se le dise, que cela ne dédouane personne. Parce qu'à traité constant, on peut faire des choses. On a des outils qui existent. Ce qui manque aujourd'hui, c'est la volonté politique exclusivement.

Un dernier mot, Madame la Présidente. Vos mots ce matin ont été justes, je vous le dis, maintenant il faut des actions. Et je vous le dis aussi, c'est la dernière chance pour cette majorité pro-européenne que vous appelez de vos vœux. Ce plaidoyer pour une Europe plus intégrée, plus fédérale, il dépendra largement de votre leadership. Il va aussi dépendre de la stabilité et de la bonne entente des pro-européens dans cet hémicycle. J'ai déjà eu l'occasion de vous le dire, c'est maintenant que ça se joue. Maintenant. On a besoin de vous. Parce que moi, avec mon groupe, ça fait des semaines, des mois que je m'échine à tenir les deux bouts de votre majorité, pour qu'elle fonctionne. Je pense aux gens qui sont dans les tribunes autour. Je pense aux gens qui nous regardent, qui suivent nos débats et qui voient le spectacle pathétique de nos divisions. Alors, rentrez dans le jeu, Madame la Présidente. C'est la condition sine qua non pour que l'agenda que vous nous avez présenté ce matin devienne réalité.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Commission President, your call for unity has not really landed with your own group leader, I have to say. But we will work on that. And maybe that is also true because the summer was very painful, let's be honest. The EU has to back Trump to be at the peace table and is forced to swallow US tariffs. Putin's drones are flying over Poland and children are bombed and starved in Gaza. And we do nothing.

Europe has entered a world of power, yet we are still playing chess in a boxing match. 'Business as usual' is a recipe for another three years of humiliation. Europe has to stop thinking as a market and start acting as a power. And I have to say: today in your speech, you really changed in your tone. You stepped up, you came up with proposals. Of course, the question is a bit, 'why now, and what will follow?' What will be very important now: all the elements that you put on the table here need to be followed up by action and implementation, and we will work with you to deliver on that. But there are also still inconsistencies that we have to address, because if we are going to step up as a leader and step up in the ring to work on our own independence on security, economy and digital services, we need to be consistent.

On security: you made a lot of proposals for the security of us and Ukraine, and rightfully so, and we will support them. But security is more than weapons alone. This is about moral leadership, and here we have to talk about Gaza. Will we only start acting on Gaza when there is No Gaza left, when all the buildings are razed to the ground and all the people have fled or are being killed? We need action, we need sanctions. And we do welcome the proposals that you made, but we need more: we need to suspend the Association Agreement immediately. We need an arms embargo. We need to stop imports from illegal settlements. Our credibility is at stake. You gave signs to very well understand that, so now we also have to turn to the Council. When is the Council finally going to understand that our credibility is at stake and is undermining our position in the world?

Security also means acting on climate change, and you mentioned the forest fires and you showed the fire fighters. This is really towards the EPP: that you think you can slow down on climate action shows how disconnected you are from reality. We need a thriving economy that stays within our planetary boundaries, and that's what we need to work on.

If we go to economic independence, we have to talk about energy. You said we need to be energy independent, but at the same time you sign a Trump deal that delivers and promises a USD 750 billion investment in American energy, which is dirtier than we have seen before and will replace Russian LNG gas that is only EUR 10 billion per year for now. These numbers don't add up. This is really a crazy part of the deal with the United States and it has to change. Because we should invest this money in European renewables, in European industry, because renewables are the worst enemy of fossil autocrats and are crucial for our competitiveness.

That brings me to competitiveness: it is being framed too much as deregulation and, to the EPP, I ask: do you really want to fight America on their turf of deregulation? We will never win from the United States on deregulation. That's not the fight we should do. We should fight on our own investments – investing in our workforce, our education, our infrastructure, our green innovation. That's what green investments have to mean and, for that, we also still need to change the Stability and Growth Pact to create that room for investments. You took your initiatives. You mentioned the initiatives on how the Commission can work on demand, on circular economy, on clean tech. But I think it is very important to stress – and you did it – that the problem for Europe isn't the Green Deal. The problem is that Europe isn't delivering enough on the Green Deal.

On digital dependence – and I will conclude, Madam President – you are also inconsistent because, on the one hand, you say we will keep to DSA and DMA, but what about the AI Act? You are saying that we want to invest in our own digital sovereignty, but what will this omnibus then do? We will make sure that your omnibus will not undermine our own digital sovereignty, and for that, by the way, we still need a digital services tax proposal.

To conclude, we need to step up our security, economic and digital policies. We do not need deregulation, we need a confident European leadership and ambitious plans and for that, Mr Weber, the shouting showed very clearly that you cannot work with them. So if you want unity, work with the centre.

Martin Schirdewan, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! Wenn man wie Sie, Frau von der Leyen, Politik machen möchte mit einer Koalition, die von Konservativen, Sozialdemokraten, Grünen bis zu Liberalen reicht, dann braucht man eigentlich keine politischen Gegner mehr. Aber den Gefallen politischen Mitleids wird meine Fraktion Ihnen nicht tun, denn der von Ihnen mit den USA geschlossene Handelsdeal ist ein Angriff auf unsere industrielle Basis und auf viele tausende Arbeitsplätze – und das hier auch noch zu loben, das verlangt tatsächlich ein gehöriges Maß an kognitiver Dissonanz.

Während Donald Trump die USA rasant in einen autoritären Staat umbaut, unterwerfen Sie europäische Politik unter die wirtschaftlichen und militärischen Interessen der USA. Sie opfern Energiesouveränität, den digitalen Binnenmarkt, Klimaschutz auf dem Altar der hohlen Phrase transatlantischer Partnerschaft. Dieser Deal, den Sie abgeschlossen haben, ist eine Totalkapitulation!

Sie schließen einen Freihandelsvertrag nach dem anderen ab – Mercosur, Mexiko, jetzt bald Indien – und umgehen dabei die nationalen Parlamente und damit die Basis unserer Demokratie. Aber Überkapazität mit mehr Freihandel bekämpfen zu wollen, ist absolut unlogisch; das ist in etwa so, als würden Sie Brandbeschleuniger in das Feuer der europäischen Wirtschaftskrise schütten.

Jeden Monat gehen 10 000 Arbeitsplätze in der EU beim Stahl verloren. Jeder dritte Europäer lebt in prekären Verhältnissen, muss wegen der Abzocke bei Mieten, Energie und Lebensmitteln jeden einzelnen Cent umdrehen. Armut trotz Arbeit, Altersarmut, Kinderarmut bekämpft man aber nicht mit mehr Freihandel, Frau Kommissionspräsidentin, sondern mit mutigen Investitionen in Industrie, in Infrastruktur und in unsere Daseinsvorsorge. Doch die einzigen Investitionen, die Ihnen anscheinend einfallen, sind 800 Milliarden Euro für Aufrüstung und Militarisierung. Dafür empfiehlt Ihre Behörde dann den Mitgliedstaaten im Gegenzug brutale Kürzungen bei Rente, Gesundheit und Sozialleistungen. Ihre Politik spaltet unsere Gesellschaft.

Wir haben hier heute eine rote Linie gezogen, und wir mussten eine rote Linie ziehen, denn Sie haben angesichts der humanitären Katastrophe und der Kriegsverbrechen der israelischen Armee im Gazastreifen viel zu lange geschwiegen. Ihre Worte reichen nicht. Das Morden muss jetzt sofort enden; das Assoziierungsabkommen mit Israel muss in Gänze ausgesetzt werden, die Waffenlieferungen müssen eingestellt und die rechtsextremen Minister der Regierung Netanjahu müssen sanktioniert werden.

Seit dreieinhalb Jahren spielt die EU keine diplomatische Rolle auf dem Weg zum Frieden in Europa. Auch wenn Sie heute viel über Sanktionen gegen Russland und über Sicherheitsgarantien für die Ukraine gesprochen haben, können Sie nicht über die derzeitige Irrelevanz europäischer Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik hinwegtäuschen.

Ihre Bilanz ist eine des sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Scheiterns, der außenpolitischen Doppelmoral und der Unterwerfung unter Autokraten. 60 Prozent der Europäer wollen, dass Sie zurücktreten – tun Sie ihnen den Gefallen!

René Aust, *im Namen der ESN-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Europa, das war einmal ein Traum: ein Kontinent, auf dem sich Familien ein eigenes Haus erarbeiten konnten; ein Kontinent, der Motor war des weltweiten Fortschritts; ein Europa, in dem Frauen sicher leben konnten, Arme durch gute Sozialgesetzgebung abgesichert waren und junge Menschen die Chance hatten, sich aus ihrem selbst Erarbeiteten ein gutes Leben aufzubauen.

Doch dieser Traum ist zerstört worden durch Politiker wie Angela Merkel und Ursula von der Leyen. Während die Weltwirtschaft wächst und neue Märkte entstehen, fällt Europa zurück. Wer wissen will, warum, der muss sich nur nochmal die Rede von Ursula von der Leyen vorhin antun. Kein einziges Mal erwähnte sie den Kern der Marktwirtschaft – unternehmerische Freiheit –, aber dafür zentral geplante Milliardenprogramme – Bürokratie von oben herab. Aber Wohlstand entsteht durch Arbeit, durch Innovation, durch unternehmerischen Mut, nicht durch Ursula von der Leyens Fünfjahrespläne.

Auch in der Migrationspolitik haben Träumereien Europa schwer geschadet. Versprochen wurde Bereicherung. Die Realität: Messerangriffe, Terrorismus, Vergewaltigungen, Drogenbanden von Spanien, Italien über Deutschland bis Rotherham und Malmö. Und in Brüssel, wo die EU immer noch Diversität predigt, denkt die belgische Regierung ernsthaft über den Einsatz der Armee nach, um die Hauptstadt vor der Gewalt migrantischer Banden überhaupt noch schützen zu können.

Und Frau von der Leyen? Sie redet noch immer in wohlklingenden Marketingphrasen. Sie sprach von Einigkeit auf unserem Kontinent. Die gibt es aber nur, wenn auf diesem Kontinent endlich die Verfolgung der Opposition aufhört: In Rumänien werden Wahlen rückgängig gemacht; in Frankreich und Deutschland Kandidaten von Wahlen ausgeschlossen.

Wenn Sie Einigkeit wollen, dann müssen wir zurückkehren zur Demokratie und zur Meinungsfreiheit. Deswegen sagen wir: Ja zu Industriearbeitsplätzen, auch wenn sie CO₂ ausstoßen; Nein zu Chatkontrolle und Zensur; Ja zu Remigration in ganz Europa und Nein zu Ursula von der Leyen!

Marie Bjerre, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I would like to thank the President of the Commission for her address and her analysis of the challenges and opportunities facing us.

Europe needs a strong leadership in challenging times. Madam President, you provide such strong leadership. On a personal note, I have to say I am proud that Europe has such a strong leader like you. We need a Europe with a strong vision. You said it very clearly and very strong – a new Europe must emerge. This is Europe's independence moment. Europe should take control over its own security, technology and energy and stand up for its values.

Madam President, I note that several of the issues you mentioned today are completely in line with the Danish Presidency's priorities: a secure Europe and a competitive and green Europe. Let me highlight a few.

Our firm solidarity with Ukraine and its people at a crucial time and the need to support more.

Our Rearm Europe investment plan to strengthen the Europe defence industry and production so that we can defend ourselves by 2030 at the latest.

The need for the European Union to continue protecting the rule-based international order, especially in the light of the ongoing conflicts.

The need to find European solutions to fight our irregular migrants, including effective returns.

The need to continue our simplification and burden reduction efforts to make the EU more competitive, while staying true to our green goals.

And as a basis for all this, a multiannual financial framework ready to deliver on future challenges.

I will not go into further details here, but let me promise you that the Council is ready to continue the good work with Parliament and the Commission on the priorities. The Council discussed the Commission's letter of intent already at our meeting on 16 September. This discussion among ministers aims to give input to the upcoming Commission Work programme for 2026.

We also look forward to working with Parliament and the Commission on the Joint Declaration on the EU's Legislative Priorities for 2026, and we will keep in mind the need to deliver resolve for Europe, to make Europe stronger, more secure, more competitive.

We share your vision, Madam President, to give Europe the freedom and power to choose our own destiny.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señora presidenta, gracias, presidenta Von der Leyen, por sus propuestas. Debemos pasar a la acción, porque nuestro mayor aliado nos sube los aranceles y China sigue avanzando para ser el nuevo centro geopolítico del mundo.

Europa no puede dudar. En Ucrania se libra la guerra de la libertad contra la tiranía. Necesitamos una paz justa y duradera, porque la caída de Ucrania sería el comienzo de la caída de Europa. Y dentro de nuestras fronteras, el reto es gigante: ¿competitividad versus irrelevancia? ¿Soberanía o dependencia? ¿Seguridad o vulnerabilidad? ¿Defensa de los agricultores o despoblación?

Pero la amenaza más grave está dentro: la tentación de acostumbrarnos a lo inaceptable. Europa no puede tolerar que Gobiernos como Eslovaquia, Eslovenia, Hungría o España atenten contra la libertad y el Estado de Derecho, ataquen al poder judicial o censuren a la prensa; no puede mirar más hacia otro lado después de que el Tribunal Supremo de España dictara ayer apertura de juicio contra el fiscal general por trabajar al servicio del Gobierno y revelar secretos para destruir a un rival político.

Esto no tiene precedentes. Europa debe frenar definitivamente la deriva autocrática, también de Sánchez. ¡Llame también a capítulo a Sánchez! Lo que define a Europa no son sus valores, es la forma en la que los protege. El Estado de Derecho no se proclama, se blinda con la misma determinación con la que defendemos nuestras fronteras. Y si permitimos que se pisoteen nuestros principios básicos, Europa habrá fracasado.

Mohammed Chahim (S&D). – Voorzitter, Europa heeft het moeilijk. We hebben het moeilijk op geopolitiek vlak, moeilijk als het gaat om handel en om de energieprijzen voor de industrie. We hebben het moeilijk om mee te gaan met nieuwe technologieën. Waar we een aantal jaren geleden kwamen met mooie vooruitzichten in verband met de *Green Deal*, ons man-op-de-maanmoment, lijkt het erop alsof we die inspiratie zijn kwijtgeraakt. Met de conservatieve agenda van de afgelopen jaren zullen we het niet redden. Er dreigt stilstand en stilstand is achteruitgang.

Neem nu de auto-industrie. In plaats van die echt vooruit te helpen en klaar te stomen om te concurreren met China, hebben we de ambities bijgesteld en daar lijkt geen einde aan te komen. Stel je toch eens voor dat we die sector echt gaan helpen en kruisverbanden zoeken met andere sectoren die het moeilijk hebben. Stel je voor dat we in Europa auto's maken met groen staal en met gerecycled plastic, om op die manier *lead markets* te creëren voor groene producten. Stel je eens voor dat we die auto, via sociale leasing, betaalbaar en toegankelijk maken voor de leraar, de verpleegkundige en de arbeider. Stel je eens voor. Dat vraagt om lef. Dat vraagt om visie. Dat vraagt om creativiteit. Anders eindigen we, zoals Draghi zei: er wacht ons een langzame, maar stille dood.

Klara Dostalova (PřE). – Paní předsedající, tak bohužel nad Evropou se dále drží fronta velkých marketingových frází. Mezitím se ale na byrokratickém pásmu tvoří námraza formulářů, zvedá se vítr odchodů podnikatelů a zvyšuje se nejistota občanů. Jenže občanům je jedno, jaká je předpověď pouhých slov. Oni cítí průvan v peněžence. Třetina z nich očekává, že se jim do pěti let zhorší životní úroveň. To není jen číslo, to je ztráta důvěry. Evropané nejsou bankomat, Jsou to lidé, kteří pracují, platí účty a chtějí bezpečí. Jenže vaše politika zdražila energie, přidala papíry a dotuje neziskovky, které lobbují za další zakázky. Říkáte, že chráníte Evropu, ale v praxi z ní děláte drahou dílnu, odkud odcházejí firmy a mizí pracovní místa. Bezpečí není populismus. Bezpečí je základní povinnost vůči lidem – zajistit, aby se nebáli o práci, o účty, o svoji budoucnost. A právě tuto povinnost paní předsedkyně neplníte. Vaše role není budovat evropský stát a být jeho hlavou. Vaše role je být šéfkou kolegia a šéfkou, která slouží občanům Evropské unie.

Patryk Jaki (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Otóż w jakim stanie jest Unia Europejska? Wy myślicie, że słowami przykryjecie fakty, które wszyscy dzisiaj odczuwają. To wystarczy porównać dane z 2019 r., kiedy Pani zostawała przewodniczącą Unii Europejskiej, do dnia dzisiejszego. Otóż na naszej granicy był pokój, a teraz nie dość, że jest wojna, to jeszcze rosyjskie drony spadają na Polskę. Bo oczywiście Wy chcieliście mieć tanią energię z Rosji i wierzyliście w te wszystkie resety z Putinem. A teraz wszyscy za to płacimy.

Ceny energii, od kiedy Pani została przewodniczącą, wzrosły dwukrotnie w Europie. Wzrosły też ceny żywności. Wzrosły ceny życia. Wzrósł też dług Unii Europejskiej. Od 2019 r. ceny nowych samochodów w Unii Europejskiej wzrosły o 30%. A przemysł staje się cieniem starej potęgi. A Wy jeszcze chcecie zwiększyć cele klimatyczne do 90%. Od tego czasu w Europie spadło też poczucie bezpieczeństwa. Wzrosła przemoc, w tym przemoc seksualna. W lutym 2025 r. w raporcie Biura Analiz Parlamentu Europejskiego przyznaliście, że przemoc gangów rośnie w całej Unii Europejskiej, co jest zjawiskiem związanym z eskalacją konkurencji między rywalizującymi gangami przestępczymi.

Jeszcze w 2008 roku PKB Unii Europejskiej odpowiadało ponad 100% PKB Stanów Zjednoczonych. Dzisiaj jest to prawie ponad 60%. Jak Wy tego dokonaliście? Jeszcze jesteście z siebie dumni. Żle wyglądamy, również jeżeli chodzi o wolności polityczne. To tutaj wymyślono pojęcie „kordon sanitarny”. To tutaj wymyślono anulowanie wyników wyborów, jeżeli wygrywa nie ten, co trzeba, czy prześladowanie konkurencji politycznej w państwach, gdzie nie rządzą Wasi ludzie. Do tego dochodzi zamach na wolność słowa, próby zamachu na wolność w internecie. Do tego Unia Europejska zamiast iść w kierunku integracji gospodarczej, która zawsze przynosiła zyski, wybiera integrację polityczną. Więcej mechanizmów warunkowości, więcej centralizacji, czyli wszystko to, co doprowadziło nas do tego miejsca, w którym dzisiaj jesteśmy.

Jednak nawet nie wszystko to razem wzięte jest największym problemem. Największym problemem jest to, że Europa straciła poczucie swojego sensu. Co jest symbolem miasta, w którym się znajdujemy, miasta, które ma ponad 2000 lat historii? Zielone fanaberie? Tęczowa flaga? Czy może te głupie zakrętki do butelek? Nie. Katedra Najświętszej Maryi Panny, czyli symbol syntezy wiary i rozumu, czyli wszystkiego tego, czego w Europie dzisiaj tak bardzo brakuje. Goethe pisał o niej: „Tutaj w kamieniu zaklęta jest muzyka, strzeliste linie i nieskończone formy prowadzą ducha ku Bogu”. Ja mówię o Bogu. Ja mam nadzieję, że nikogo w tej Izbie nie uraziłem. Bo Wy, pokolenie dekadencji, z jakimś niezrozumiałym zadowoleniem z siebie pchacie nas wszystkich ku przepaści. Dlatego musicie odejść.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (Renew). – Madam President, dear Commissioners, dear colleagues, Europe is not condemned to weakness – far from it. Time and again, Europe has proven to be our best chance. When our people were trapped by a deadly pandemic, it was Europe that produced the vaccines that saved millions. When Russia invaded Ukraine, it was Europe that stood tall, united under the Ukrainian flag. And when the climate crisis threatened our children's future, it was Europe again that set the most ambitious green agenda in the world. And we can rise to these challenges, too.

We have the engineers, the scientists, the soldiers, the farmers, the entrepreneurs. We have the ideas, the values, the creativity. What we lack is not capacity. What we need is confidence to act together. Imagine what this Union can be: a continent that runs on its own clean energy and builds technology others can only dream of; a Europe that speaks with one voice and fights with one army. It can be done if only our Member States could be less afraid to choose compromise over debilitating consensus, to choose unity over their own individual agendas.

Yes, colleagues, we have a very crucial choice ahead of us and let's choose to unite. Let's follow President von der Leyen's speech for unity, as she called it. And to Mr Weber and Ms García Pérez, unity is not looking for differences. Our European citizens need a strong pro-European coalition. Let's take our responsibility and show that we can make Europe together.

Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Présidente von der Leyen, l'Europe va mal et, pardonnez-moi de vous le dire, mais vous y êtes pour beaucoup. Vous venez aujourd'hui rencontrer le Parlement européen, la bouche pleine de promesses, mais vos mots sonnent creux. La réalité, c'est que le libéralisme que vous défendez comme la seule et unique voie possible nous a conduits, et soumis, au néo-impérialisme russe et maintenant chinois et états-unien.

Une heure et trente minutes de discours, Madame von der Leyen, et seulement deux minutes sur l'accord que vous avez signé avec Donald Trump et les 750 milliards honteux que vous lui avez promis pour ses énergies climaticides. Vous avez cédé face à un homme qui veut vassaliser l'Europe. Mais, alors, à quoi sert votre Europe? N'est-elle à vos yeux que la chambre d'enregistrement des violences du monde?

Pourtant non, nous ne sommes pas condamnés, pas condamnés à voir exploser en vol notre modèle social et environnemental, pas condamnés à l'extinction de la voix singulière de l'Europe dans le monde.

Il est temps. Il est tard, mais il est temps. Alors tournez le dos à l'austérité qui fait exploser la précarité, fermer les entreprises et entrave la transition écologique. Faites du climat et de la justice sociale votre boussole, et défendez le droit international en soutenant par exemple les parlementaires sur les flottilles humanitaires comme Benedetta Scuderi et en agissant avec autant de force à Gaza qu'en Ukraine, et alors l'Europe ne sera pas perdue.

Marc Botenga (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Présidente de la Commission européenne, vous avez peur? Vous avez peur? Vous sentez le poids des manifestations dans la rue, la colère populaire?

Parce qu'après des années de politique antisociale, après des années de soutien au génocide en Palestine, après des années de soumission aux États-Unis, tout d'un coup, un discours fleuve. D'ailleurs une heure et demie pour sauver votre peau, pour répondre – oui, je sais bien, mais une heure et demie, je suis déjà content que vous soyez là, la dernière fois, vous êtes partie après une demi-heure – à la pression populaire, à la mobilisation sociale que nous voyons aujourd'hui en France, en Belgique et dans d'autres pays européens.

Je suis content que vous écoutiez. Mais je vois aussi la contradiction, parce que des milliards d'euros, 800 milliards pour les actionnaires de la guerre, pour les multinationales d'armement, ce sera de l'argent qui n'ira pas dans les pensions, qui n'ira pas dans la lutte contre la pauvreté, qui n'ira pas pour le logement des gens, et que, donc, d'un côté, vous souriez aux gens, mais de l'autre côté, vous êtes en train de leur planter un couteau dans le dos. Ça, on ne laissera pas passer, on continuera la mobilisation.

Станислав Стоянов (ESN). – Г-жо Председател, г-жо фон дер Лайен, Европейският съюз е в упадък, демографска криза, икономическа рецесия, неовладяна миграция, загуба на конкурентоспособност, липса на иновации, дипломатическа несъстоятелност. Това са само малка част от проблемите, очакващи своето решение. Комисията не само не предлага решения, а създава нови проблеми – миграционната политика и нейните пагубни ефекти върху националните държави, реакцията по време на Ковид пандемията, експериментите със Зелената сделка. След време ще говорим и за фиаското „план за превъоръжаване“.

Европа не е на лобистите, а на гражданите. Именно те трябва да са в центъра на всяка политика. Вашите сгрешени политики са заплаха за самата европейска цивилизация. Днес и свободата на словото е поставена под въпрос. Всеки, който мисли различно, бива заклеяван като екстремист. Г-жо фон дер Лайен, ние не сме екстремисти. Ние защитаваме нашите държави, нашите избиратели, нашите семейства и нашите народи. Екстремистите сте вие, които водите Европа по пътя на войната и не търсите мира, нито просперитета.

Sibylle Berg (NI). – Frau Präsidentin, guten Morgen, liebe Anwesende! Raunende Menschen könnten raunen, dass die Gründung der Koalition der Willigen – genialer B-Movie-Titel – die erste wegweisende Erfindung des französischen Präsidenten war, mit der er von den Problemen seines hoch verschuldeten, politisch instabilen kleinen Landes ablenken will.

Ablenkung von komplexen Problemen, das wollen wir alle. Und darum, wer te Kommissionspräsidentin, ist Ihr Wunsch nach Nähe zu den Willigen bewundernswert, zumal Sie wissen – wie wir alle –, dass der Krieg für den Frieden nur ein trojanisches Pferd vor dem eigentlichen Coup ist.

Bald werden die Willigen mit immenser Schuldgeldstärke, PR-Begleitung und 5 % des BIP gegen Bildungskürzung kämpfen; weiter geht es dann gegen den Abbau des Gesundheitswesens, gegen die Kriminalisierung und Vollüberwachung der Bürgerinnen und Bürger – was war noch mal mit der Chatkontrolle? –, gegen die Arbeitslosigkeit, gegen die marode Infrastruktur in der EU, gegen Armut, Obdachlosigkeit, Wohnungsnot. Das ist ein großartiger Plan, vielen Dank für diesen Mut! Ein Hoch den Willigen!

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Dzisiejsza noc i poranek to sytuacja, która nie miała do tej pory miejsca – bez precedensu. Po raz pierwszy musieliśmy bronić terytorium państwa należącego do NATO, państwa należącego do Unii Europejskiej. Zestrzelone drony to zdany egzamin z naszej szybkiej, jednoznacznej, solidarnej reakcji.

Dziękuję pilotom włoskim, dziękuję pilotom holenderskim, dziękuję za bardzo stanowczą, szybką reakcję Komisji. Ale w tym momencie musimy się zastanowić – bo to nie przypadek, to nie jeden zabłąkany dron – gdzie jest prawdziwe zło i zagrożenie? Kto nim jest? Bo to Putin testuje naszą jedność. To Putin testuje naszą gotowość do obrony naszego bezpieczeństwa. I obywatele wszystkich państw europejskich oczekują, że będziemy skuteczni.

I apeluję z tego miejsca – bo czas najwyższy nie – szukać wroga tam, gdzie go nie ma. To Putin zabija dzieci i kobiety, bombarduje szpitale i szkoły. Ukraina potrzebuje naszej pomocy i musi ją otrzymać, bo ona broni także naszego bezpieczeństwa.

Czy dalej będziecie mówić – zwracam się do prawej strony – że to nie nasza wojna? Ona dotyczy także bezpieczeństwa waszych obywateli. I nie nazywajcie się patriotami, jak tego nie rozumiecie. I apeluję także do lewej strony: dzisiaj priorytetem jest bezpieczeństwo. Jeżeli chcemy być skuteczni także w innych ważnych celach, musimy mieć pieniądze, gospodarkę silną, gospodarkę konkurencyjną, a razem musimy być jednolicie gotowi do tego, by być solidarnymi. Zjednoczona Europa zwycięży, nikt jej nie pokona.

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

Maria Grapini (S&D), întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”. – Ați vorbit că pentru Uniunea Europeană siguranța este principalul lucru. Sigur, noi astăzi am dezbătut și doamna președintă ne-a prezentat starea Uniunii Europene în care intră mai mult decât securitatea și siguranța.

Considerați că programul prezentat de doamna președintă, între care a spus că vrea o colaborare cu Parlamentul European, este un program solid, prezintă claritate, transparență, coeziune, siguranță și încredere? Asta doresc cetățenii europeni, cetățenii din țara mea, din România. Dau un exemplu: dacă vrea doamna președintă colaborare, considerați că colaborează cu Parlamentul atâta timp cât nu ne prezintă nici rapoarte, nici nu răspunde la întrebări de multe ori și nu a prezentat nici măcar la descărcarea de gestiune situația cerută de raportor?

Andrzej Halicki (PPE), blue-card answer. – I would like to emphasise and say again: we have to be united and strong.

If we split, Putin will be successful. This is the only message I would like to say today after the violation of airspace of our European country. We have to be united.

We are various, we are different, but in this common general goal we have to be together. Otherwise, we can dissolve our common Union.

Γιάννης Μανιάτης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αγαπητή Πρόεδρε Von Der Leyen, επιτρέψτε μου να ξεκινήσω κι εγώ ευχαριστώντας στο πρόσωπο του Έλληνα υποπυραγού όλους τους πυροσβέστες που σε όλη την Ευρώπη παλεύουν με αυταπάρνηση κάθε καλοκαίρι προκειμένου να προστατεύσουν όλους εμάς. Αυτούς τους πυροσβέστες, όμως, πρέπει να τους στηρίξουμε και σε εθνικό και σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο.

Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι γεωπολιτικές εξελίξεις μάς σπρώχνουν στο περιθώριο. Θέλουμε πιο ισχυρή Ευρώπη στη Γάζα, στην Ουκρανία, στη Λιβύη, στη Συρία, στον Καύκασο, απέναντι στην κλιματική αλλαγή. Όσον αφορά τη στρατηγική αυτονομία, το RearmEU των 800 δισ., αντί να αξιοποιηθεί για την ανάπτυξη της ευρωπαϊκής αμυντικής βιομηχανίας, το ανοίγουμε σε τρίτες χώρες που απειλούν και παραβιάζουν τα κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα κρατών μελών στο Αιγαίο και στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο, που τις ξεχάσατε στην ομιλία σας. Για τον νέο προϋπολογισμό της Ένωσης θα επιμένουμε σε μια περιφερειακή πολιτική που ενισχύει την κοινωνική και εδαφική συνοχή με συγκεκριμένο προϋπολογισμό για κάθε περιφέρεια, ώστε να διασφαλίσουμε ότι κανένας δεν θα μείνει πίσω.

Hermann Tertsch (Pfe). – Señora presidente, señora Von der Leyen, lleva seis años presentando planes y gastando cientos de miles de millones de dinero que les quita a los europeos. ¿El resultado? Europa es más débil, más pobre, más insegura, más ineficaz, más vulnerable y muchísimo menos libre.

Usted fracasó en tres ministerios en Alemania y aquí ha logrado ya el apogeo de su fracaso. Solo genera problemas: por su arrogancia, por su incapacidad, por su falta de transparencia —por decirlo suavemente—, por sus amenazas a todos los discrepantes, como ha hecho hoy, anunciando, además, medios de comunicación independientes con dinero de la Comisión, todo el aparato de propaganda que tiene para ocultar las subvenciones que reciben las ONG para toda esta propaganda ideológica.

Nos hunde la losa del Pacto Verde Europeo, nos destruye la invasión musulmana que puso en marcha la señora Merkel y que sigue aquí, continúa y que nos hará, en algún momento, tener que luchar como está luchando Israel. Ojalá —a pesar de todas sus difamaciones contra Israel— encontremos los europeos el coraje y la decisión para defender nuestra civilización y nuestra sociedad como lo está haciendo Israel.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Madam President, President von der Leyen, it's great to see you here. Last year you fled the Chamber after half an hour – much like public trust in your leadership has fled. Now, six in ten Europeans want you to resign. And who can blame them?

You buried Europe under a mountain of regulations and danced to the tune of the Green-Left choir, while industry crumbled and taxpayers bled. You came in promising unity, and delivered debt and division. You claim to defend democracy but side-lined it with centralisation. You spoke of competitiveness while pushing businesses out of Europe.

And don't take my word for it, Frau von der Leyen: ask your own party members revolting against your unrealistic 2040 climate target. They know it would destroy our industry.

Colleagues, you saw a President of the European Commission taking a victory lap on a track she helped burn down. Europe deserves better. It's time to resign!

João Cotrim De Figueiredo (Renew). – Madam President, Frau von der Leyen, allow me to address you directly to remind you of the great wisdom of Spider-Man. With great power comes great responsibility. You have great power, Frau von der Leyen, you lead the executive unit of our Union.

And I had a chance to talk to you, and also to Council President Costa, before your mandate began. Do you remember? So I'll ask you again today what I asked you at the time.

Show leadership. That means decide exactly what needs to be done and then actually doing it, forcing it through.

Show courage by treating what is important better than what it is urgent and not trying to please everybody, as you've seen, it's not going to be possible.

And show speed, please, show speed, because we know we can move faster and we know we are running out of time. I mean, we didn't need Draghi to tell us of this, that we're running out of time and also that we run an existential risk.

So I say again, you have great power. You have the great responsibility to reform the EU before it is too late. And there are four years left in your mandate. Use them to show leadership, to show courage, to show speed.

Renew Europe will be here to help you. But the primary responsibility is yours. For Europe's sake, I wish you success and good luck.

Anna Cavazzini (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Sie sind angetreten mit einem Versprechen: Die EU muss unabhängiger werden und dafür Kurs halten beim *Green Deal*. Sie haben das heute mehrfach wiederholt, und Ihre Rede war gut. Aber ich finde, wir müssen auch schauen: Wie sind wir in der Realität? Wie ist es mit der Umsetzung, und wo sind die Mehrheiten dafür?

Da muss ich sagen: Statt Klimaschutz attackiert Ihre eigene Fraktion hier in diesem Haus immer wieder wichtige Gesetze wie das Verbrenner-Aus. Statt Planungssicherheit für Unternehmen zwingen Sie diese in einen Zickzackkurs, und statt selbstbewusster Verhandlungen mit den USA, statt europäischer Stärke verbiegt und verbeugt sich die EU vor Trump, auch – ich weiß es – weil die Mitgliedstaaten Ihnen in den Rücken fallen.

Wenn Sie wirklich Kurs halten wollen beim *Green Deal*, dann, bitte, öffnen Sie nicht ständig gerade erst verabschiedete Gesetze, sondern zeigen Sie Rückgrat und Führung! Wenn Sie es ernst meinen mit digitaler Souveränität, dann machen Sie bitte keinen Kotau vor Trump, sondern bringen Sie endlich eine Digitalsteuer auf den Weg! Dann schwächen Sie nicht unser europäisches KI-Gesetz, nur weil es ein paar US-Tech-Konzernen nicht gefällt! Wenn es Ihnen ernst ist mit Europa, dann arbeiten Sie mit den Kräften zusammen, die ein starkes Europa wollen, und nicht mit den Nationalisten und Chauvinisten!

(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ zu antworten.)

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Pochodzi pani z grupy zielonych. Prawdopodobnie zna się pani na detalach związanych z ochroną środowiska. Chciałem więc Panią zapytać, bo mamy takie informacje, że Brazylia używa około 4 tysięcy pestycydów do produkcji żywności. Czy wobec tego, wobec takich informacji, popiera pani umowę między Unią Europejską a Mercosurem? Czy pani się podoba to, że firmy, które produkują na rynku europejskim pestycydy i nie mogą ich sprzedawać do Unii Europejskiej, sprzedają do Brazylii? Czy pani popiera taką umowę i taką żywność, która jest produkowana przy pomocy chemikaliów?

Anna Cavazzini (Verts/ALE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Vielen herzlichen Dank für die Frage! Ich glaube, es ist unglaublich wichtig, mit den Staaten Lateinamerikas zusammenzuarbeiten, gerade in Zeiten von Trump. Aber in der Tat: Ein Deal, der schlecht ist für unsere Landwirte in Europa, der aber auch den Amazonas weiter zerstört, das kann kein gutes Handelsabkommen sein, und deswegen werden wir Grüne nicht zustimmen.

Gaetano Pedulla' (The Left). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, faccio una proposta: dovremmo cambiare il titolo di questo dibattito, perché Ursula von der Leyen lo ha trasformato nello stato «comatoso» dell'Unione.

Lei, Presidente della Commissione, è una sciagura. È lungo l'elenco: per gli agricoltori che vengono sacrificati sull'altare degli accordi commerciali, come il Mercosur; è una iattura per le piccole e medie imprese che esportano le loro eccellenze nel mondo – l'accordo sui dazi siglato con Trump è una umiliazione per l'Europa.

Lei qui dentro lo ha difeso, ma è un'umiliazione: le nostre merci costeranno più care negli Stati Uniti, mentre quelle americane non pagano nemmeno le tasse in Europa. Che affarone! Perfino Paperino avrebbe saputo fare meglio.

Von der Leyen, Lei è una minaccia per la sicurezza e la stabilità europea: con il suo piano di riarmo l'Europa entra in guerra con l'Ucraina, mentre noi avremmo solo bisogno di pace.

Le politiche di questa Commissione sono, infine, la condanna a morte per i palestinesi, per i bambini palestinesi. Ma cosa aspetta a interrompere la distribuzione di armi a Israele? Von der Leyen, prima va a casa, meglio è.

Milan Uhrík (ESN). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, pani Leyenová, za to, ako ničíte Európu, ste mali už dávno sedieť pred súdom, a nie tu v Európskom parlamente. Voľť po dvojbiliónovom rozpočte a predstavovať ďalšie, ešte ničivejšie *green-dealové* opatrenia. Európa horí a vy tu blúznite o nejakých úplne nereálnych víziách.

Pritom to kvôli vašej vojrovej a sankčnej politike ľudia trpia a platia rekordné ceny za energie. Kvôli vášmu *Green Dealu* európske firmy a fabriky utekajú preč z Európy. Kvôli vašej imigračnej politike sa v Európe už každý týždeň strieľa a v Bruseli musia proti imigrantom dokonca nasadzovať armádu. Zničili ste Európu a sme len takýto malý kúsoček od totálneho kolapsu. A napriek tomu si nechcete priznať chybu a jediné, s čím sem pridete, je, že žiadate ešte tvrdšie presadzovanie tých politík, ktoré Európu zničili a doteraz nefungovali. Že žiadate ešte tvrdšie trestanie a cenzurovanie všetkých oponentov a kritikov.

Pani Leyenová, urobte, prosím, jednu službu Európe. Odstúpte! Vy nie ste šéfka Európy. Európa patrí ľuďom, a nie vám.

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

Kamila Gasiuk-Pihowicz (PPE), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Dzisiaj wobec zagrożenia my naprawdę nie możemy dzielić europejskiego społeczeństwa i nie możemy powielać rosyjskiej dezinformacji. Nie możemy naprawdę pozwolić na jakiegokolwiek relatywizowanie tego, że to Rosja jest największym śmiertelnym wrogiem całej Europy i naprawdę należą jej się sankcje.

Dzisiaj rano szczątki rosyjskiego drona spadły w polskiej wsi Czosnówka – to jest 30 kilometrów od domu mojej rodziny. I wojna jest bardzo bliska. My poderwaliśmy myśliwce, Polska zastrzeliła rosyjskie drony, obroniła europejskie niebo. I taki jest właśnie stan Europy na wschodniej flance. Dlatego musimy pokazać, że jesteśmy bezwzględnie silni, bezwzględnie zjednoczeni. Bo Moskwa rozumie tylko język siły.

Milan Uhrík (ESN), odpoveď na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty. – Priznám sa, že som nerozumel, lebo toto tlmočenie nefungovalo. Ale čo som pochopil z toho, ako rozumiem po poľsky, tak:

Viete, ja som presvedčený, že Európska únia sa nemá transformovať na vojenskú úniu. Európska únia má byť mierový hospodársky projekt. Projekt hospodárskej spolupráce, férovej spolupráce medzi národmi. A nemá nakupovať zbrane, nemá presmerovávať peniaze z poľnohospodárstva a z regiónov na nákupy rakiet alebo tankov. Nemá sa meniť na vojenský projekt, na vojenskú úniu. Má to zostať mierový projekt a hospodársky projekt. To je všetko, čo chceme.

Елена Йончева (NI). – Г-жо фон дер Лайен, успехът на Европейския съюз се състои в силата и съхраненото достойнство на всяка държава членка.

По време на Вашето посещение в България на 31 август световните информационни агенции излязоха с невярна информация, че Вашият самолет е кръжал 1 час над Пловдив поради вероятно заглушаване на GPS сигнала. Знаете, че тази фалшива информация нанесе сериозен удар по образа на България. До този момент Вие все още не сте коментирали. Вече 10 дни името на България се свързва с тази така наречена „новина“.

В тази сложна геополитическа ситуация всяка грешна информация може да доведе до опасни последици и реакции. България е сред най-сигурните зони за въздухоплаване. Затова Ви моля, от тази трибуна потвърдете, че не е имало пробив в сигурността Ви по време на този полет.

Madame von der Leyen, pouvez-vous vraiment confirmer qu'il n'y a pas eu de faille de sécurité, de problème de sécurité pendant votre vol? Car la sécurité aérienne bulgare fait partie de la sécurité européenne.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Madam President, President von der Leyen, dear colleagues, we are surrounded by autocrats. Autocrats who want to weaken us, who cooperate – look at their picture in Beijing –, who attack our neighbours, our values, our cyberspace and our democracies.

Disinformation, cyber attacks, provocations and electoral interference are their weapons, and they are looking for servants within the 27 Member States of the Union. They challenge us from outside and they challenge us from inside. And looking away will not protect us. Nobody else will protect us unless we protect ourselves.

And it is clear that to live in peace, we need to be strong. This is why setting security and defence, on the one side, and competitiveness, on the other side, is our top priorities for the next years, the right decision, and these two, security and competitiveness, are interlinked. We will only be able to invest more in our security if our economies are strong, and the private sector will only invest more in our economies if they feel safe and to be protected we need even more.

Food security is of essence. There can be no national security without food security. And we need strong and modern infrastructures, energy infrastructure, digital infrastructure, which is innovative, modern and transport infrastructure, large cross-border projects which protect our single market, and smaller infrastructure projects which are deeply rooted at local and regional level.

These shall be the priorities of the Union for the next years, and these should also be reflected in the way in which we spend. This is what the majority of colleagues in this House stand for. And this is why we believe that as we are embarking now on the work for the budget of the Union for the next seven years, we should defend this together in the work that we are going to do. Security, competitiveness, food security and good infrastructure are strongly anchored at a local level.

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

Luis-Vicențiu Lazarus (NI), întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”. – Profit de ocazie că a fost vorba despre autocrație și aș vrea să-l întreb pe domnul Siegfried Mureșan dacă nu cumva face o paralelă între autocrații din Est și felul în care doamna Ursula, aici de față, guvernează Europa prin Comisie. Pentru că am înțeles din *Politico* și celelalte ziare europene că dumneavoastră, doamna Metsola, ați dat în judecată Comisia pentru că s-a prevalat de articolul 122, ca să treacă pachetul SAFE și să-l treacă prin afara Parlamentului și nu știu în ce stadiu este acest proces. Sau e un simulacru între dumneavoastră că vă văd prietenii așa și nu mi-e clar. E un proces, nu e un proces? Vom vota aici, în Parlament, pachetul...

(Președinta a retras cuvântul vorbitorului)

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE), blue-card answer. – We thank Mr Lazarus for mixing up everything with everything in trying to gain some of our attention, but not much of what he said is true. The European Union is a very democratic entity. This very Parliament that we are all together in is directly elected by the citizens of Europe. We have elected together the European Commission and the European Commission is making decisions, checked, controlled by the European Parliament. We have clear procedures here at European level. This is all very democratic.

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D). – Sinjura President, meta niddiskutu l-qaghda tal-Unjoni Ewropea, ma nistghux ninjoraw il-qaghda li fiha tinsab id-dinja madwarna. L-elettorat taghna qed jitlobkom twaqqfu l-qtil f'Gaza. Twaqqfu b'mod totali l-ftehim ta' assoċjazzjoni mal-Gvern Izraeljan kollu kemm hu, mhux partijiet minnu. Ma jistax ikun hemm negozju bhas-soltu ma' pajjiż li jwettaq ġenocidju. Dan imur kontra t-trattati taghna.

Iċ-ċittadini Ewropej huma mhassba wkoll dwar x'jista' jigi, x'jista' johroġ minn President imprevedibbli fil-White House. U llum smajna s-skiet totali dwar dan. Ma nistghux niġu rikattati sabiex indghajfu l-ligijiet digitali taghna minhabba t-tensjonijiet fil-kummerċ trans-Atlantiku. Wara dak li l-amministrazzjoni Amerikana qalet dwar id-DSA, imisskom tattivaw il-mekkaniżmu kontra l-koercizzjoni mill-aktar fis possibbli.

L-Ewropa trid issir aktar reżiljenti u tinvesti fl-infrastruttura pubblika diġitali tagħha. Ninsabu dipendenti tmenin fil-mija fuq teknoloġiji barranin. Għandha tkun prijorità tagħna li tniżżlu din iċ-ċifra 'l isfel sal-2030, ċjoè fi tmiem id-deċennju diġitali. Għandna bżonn ir-right to disconnect, strateġija ta' housing affordabbli ambizzjuża u aktar għajnuna soċjali għaċ-ċittadini tagħna mill-aktar fis possibbli.

Paolo Borchia (PFE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Presidente von der Leyen, non si offenda, ma sono stati 75 minuti di agonia: tanta teoria mista a ipocrisia, perché chi ha creato i problemi adesso ci sta spiegando come risolverli.

Io ho sentito tante contraddizioni, perché parla di auto elettriche e di rispetto della tabella di marcia del *green deal* proprio quando il suo Cancelliere Merz, stesso partito, invoca più flessibilità nei tempi.

Ci parla di programma per la resilienza dei media, ma contestualmente taglia i fondi per l'agricoltura; è superficiale sul Mercosur e soprattutto parla tanto, troppo!, di armi.

Lei si rivolge a una maggioranza europeista perché inventare nemici, specialmente quando si è deboli, fa sempre comodo, ma questa debolezza, si ricordi, che è riflessa nelle divisioni della fragile e variopinta maggioranza che poco convintamente la sostiene.

Gheorghe Piperea (ECR). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă von der Leyen, vă rog, vă cer acum și aici să demisionați, nu doar pentru că vă așteaptă alte două moțiuni de cenzură, ci mai ales pentru că nu mai sunteți credibilă pentru demnitatea de președinte. Sondaje oficiale necontestate arată că 60 % dintre cetățenii europeni vor să demisionați din cauza dezastruosului acord comercial cu SUA, iar 91 % dintre cetățeni vor transparență totală în cheltuirea banilor publici pe care sistematic o refuzați.

Parlamentul a acționat Consiliul în judecată, cerând anularea unui program de finanțare a înarmării statelor membre pentru că ați ocolit ilegal acest Parlament. Minciuna cu devierea traseului avionului dumneavoastră către Plovdiv vă arată inadecvarea și eșecul logic.

Administrația Trump, guvernele Chinei și Indiei și chiar statele Mercosur refuză contactele diplomatice cu dumneavoastră. Prezența dumneavoastră în fruntea Comisiei debilitază Uniunea, falimentează statele membre, ne erodează democrația și ne sărăcește. Faceți-ne și faceți-vă un bine. Plecați!

(Vorbitorul a acceptat să răspundă la o întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru”)

Diana Iovanovici Șoșoacă (NI), *întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”.* – Am apăsat *blue card* și la cei de la PPE și nu mi-ați permis să iau cuvântul la *blue card*, deci numai la noi aveți. Domnule Piperea, cred că ar trebui să o întrebăm pe doamna Ursula von der Leyen de ce nu vorbește de faptul că ieri Qatarul a fost atacat de către Israel și 15 civili au fost omorâți. Deci e un război, în timp ce doamna Ursula von der Leyen cita din Talmud și spunea că religia Israelului este religia...

(Președinta a retras cuvântul vorbitoarei)

President. – Ms Șoșoacă, among other things, you are breaking the rules by filming while you speak.

Mr Piperea, would you like to answer?

Gheorghe Piperea (ECR), *blue-card answer.* – There is not anything to answer, that is not a question for me. I'm sorry.

Mărtiņš Staķis (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, I too dislike the one-sided trade deal with the United States. I too dislike watching Europe quietly accept the shifting world order, or the next sudden decision from the US President.

We can shout in the sky, tear our eyes out, or hold an endless non-confidence vote, but nothing will change if we do not understand one simple truth: any Commission will have its hands tied if Europe depends on others for security. Our values are the strongest in the world, but our muscles are weak, so relying on America's shield comes at a price for Europe.

Only a Europe able to defend itself will be treated as an equal by Washington or by Beijing, so defence must come first, the better trade deals and influence will follow.

Per Clausen (The Left). – Fru formand! Kære kommissionsformand! Du har nogle dygtige taleskrivere, men hvor ville jeg ønske, at der var blevet lagt bare halvt så meget indsats for at sikre et konkret indhold bag de pæne ord.

For Unionens tilstand – det, som du jo skulle tale om i dag – den har masser af ting, som skal ændres. Og hvor meget du end måtte ønske det, så er pæne ord altså ikke nok!

Floskler løser ikke klimakrisen eller omgår den kulsorte politik, du og højrefløjen i stigende grad kæmper for. De gør heller ikke noget for de millioner af europæere, der trues af fattigdom, de, der ikke har råd til mad eller medicin til dem eller deres børn. På samme måde er det svært at forestille sig, at de bøller, der plager verden for tiden, hvad enten vi taler om Putin, Trump eller Netanyahu, lader sig afskrække af ord.

Vi står over for store udfordringer.

Og hvorfor bliver du ved med at undlade at handle på det?

Alexander Sell (ESN). – Frau Präsidentin! Gewinneinbruch bei Mercedes und Porsche; Volkswagen baut 35 000 Stellen ab; thyssenkrupp stellt die Stahlproduktion ein. Vor sechs Jahren haben Sie, Frau von der Leyen, hier an dieser Stelle den *Green Deal* ausgerufen: Europa müsste klimaneutral werden, Verbrennermotoren sollen verboten werden, und heute haben Sie das noch einmal bestätigt. Das Ergebnis sehen wir bereits: Die deutsche Industrie ist nicht mehr wettbewerbsfähig; eine Viertelmillion Arbeitsplätze sind verloren.

Für Ihre zweite Amtszeit haben Sie sich wieder Großes vorgenommen: den Sieg über Russland. 169 Milliarden Euro hat Ihre Kommission schon nach Kyjiw überwiesen, an ein durch und durch korruptes System. In Deutschland sind die Kassen leer; der Einkauf im Supermarkt wird unbezahlbar; immer mehr Familien können sich kein eigenes Haus leisten; Rentner müssen Flaschen sammeln.

Aber Sie, Frau von der Leyen, wollen 2 000 Milliarden Euro für Ihren nächsten Haushalt haben. 500 Milliarden Euro Schulden sollen dazukommen als Notreserve für zukünftige Krisen – und ja, diese Krisen werden mit Sicherheit kommen, denn Ihre Kommission schafft erst die Krisen, die sie dann vorgibt zu lösen.

Donald Trump hat es vorgemacht, wie man mit größenwahnsinnigen Weltenlenkern wie Ursula von der Leyen umgeht: Er hat sie vor die Tür gesetzt, und das sollten wir auch tun.

Daniel Caspary (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Herr Sell, zum Glück hat man bei jedem Ihrer Worte gespürt, dass Sie sich am allerliebsten sofort Putin und Russland unterwerfen wollen.

Meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren, ich bin unserer Kommissionspräsidentin extrem dankbar, dass wir in den letzten zwölf Monaten in der Europäischen Union eine massive Veränderung in der europäischen Politik spüren. Wir haben die Situation, dass wir jetzt klar aussprechen, Frau von der Leyen, worauf es ankommt. Sie haben es ausgesprochen – und ich bin dankbar –, nämlich, dass wir in einem Kampf stehen um die Frage, ob wir unabhängig bleiben, ob wir eigenständig bleiben, ob wir in Frieden, Freiheit und Sicherheit leben können.

Man merkt es auch an der Politik der Europäischen Kommission: Anders als in der letzten Wahlperiode haben wir in dieser Wahlperiode noch keine Vorschläge aus der Kommission bekommen, die unsere Verteidigungsfähigkeit oder unsere Wettbewerbsfähigkeit reduzieren. Das ist eine Riesenveränderung! Sondern ganz im Gegenteil: Wir sehen, dass wir im Bereich Verteidigung endlich vorankommen. Wir sehen, dass wir im Bereich Wettbewerbsfähigkeit endlich vorankommen mit den ambitionierten sogenannten Omnibussen, also den Entlastungspaketen, die Ihre Kommission präsentiert hat.

Aber eine Sache gehört auch dazu: Wer soziale Themen ansprechen möchte, wer mehr Wohnraum möchte, wer soziale Leistungen wie Kindergarantie bezahlen möchte, der braucht eine wettbewerbsfähige Industrie. Wer die Verteidigungsausgaben finanzieren möchte, der braucht eine wettbewerbsfähige Industrie. Deswegen kann ich alle hier im Haus bitten: Bitte helfen Sie gemeinsam mit, dass wir ohne die Absenkung von Standards – darum geht es doch jetzt nicht! –, aber mit massivem Abbau von Bürokratie und Vorgaben und Kosten schnell der Wirtschaft und damit den Menschen neue Freiheiten geben und die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Europäischen Union ...

(Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Fru talman! Ordförande von der Leyen. Under förra mandatperioden ledde ni en framgångsrik kommission, som i kriser och krig tog EU framåt i demokrati, säkerhet, i klimat och jämställdhet. Nu ser vi hur konservativa och högerextrema gemensamt försöker nedmontera inte minst våra klimatambitioner.

Vi socialdemokrater vill samarbeta, och därför är det bra att kommissionen fortsätter agera tydligt mot de högerextrema krafterna. Vi tycker också att det är viktigt att vi håller kursen i den gröna omställningen och en gång för alla förbjuder och fasar ut PFAS.

Men lika viktigt är det att kommissionen prioriterar kvinnors rättigheter. Jag vill se en samtyckeslag och rätten till säker och laglig abort. Jag är besviken, för ordet jämställdhet fanns inte med överhuvudtaget i talet i dag, och det duger inte. Jag vill att mina barnbarn ska leva i ett grönt och jämställt Europa.

Harald Vilimsky (PffE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Darf ich Sie kurz ersuchen, innezuhalten und darüber zu reflektieren, was sich heute hier ereignet hat? Die Europäische Union ist wahrscheinlich in einer ihrer schwierigsten Stunden überhaupt in der Nachkriegszeit: Wir haben Krieg vor unseren Toren und die Situation, dass wir diesen Krieg auch noch befeuern mit 19 Sanktionspaketen und mit Geld und mit Waffen. Wir haben eine Situation, dass wir Hunderttausende Arbeitsplätze bewusst – offenbar – vernichten mit einem *Green Deal* und damit Familien ihre Zukunft rauben. Wir haben eine Situation, dass wir den Menschen ihre Freiheit rauben mit Chatkontrollen und ähnlichen absurden Dingen. Wir haben die Situation, dass wir offene Grenzen haben und illegale Migration diesen Kontinent kulturell völlig verändert, arabisert, afrikanisiert.

Und Sie, Frau Kommissionspräsidentin, kommen allen Ernstes hierher und drohen drei Fraktionen dieses Hauses, dass man etwas gegen uns unternommen wird, den Patriotischen, den Souveränen und den Reformkonservativen!

Ich halte fest – und bitte schreiben Sie sich das in Ihr Stammbuch: Nicht diejenigen sind die Feinde Europas, die für mehr Freiheit und Frieden eintreten, die für mehr Rechte ihrer nationalen Parlamente eintreten, sondern diejenigen, die für Zentralisierung eintreten, die ramponieren den Kontinent ...

(Die Präsidentin unterbricht den Redner.)

(Der Redner lehnt eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ von Petras Gražulis ab.)

Marion Maréchal (ECR). – Madame la Présidente, Madame von der Leyen, l'Union européenne fait face aujourd'hui à un défi existentiel. Les grands États-civilisations s'imposent, pendant que vous vous accrochez à votre vieux logiciel, comme avec le pacte vert, et accompagnez notre sortie de l'histoire. Vous préparez la signature du Mercosur en voulant une fois encore contourner le vote des États. Vous venez d'accepter un traité inique avec les États-Unis, alors que c'était là l'occasion de se montrer à la hauteur du tournant historique en cours.

Les données du nouveau monde sont pourtant claires: nous sommes entrés dans l'ère du césarisme politique et non plus de la techno-bureaucratie. La mondialisation libre-échangiste est derrière nous. Nous ne pouvons plus compter sur des puissances extérieures comme Washington pour assurer notre sécurité. L'ONU et les grandes organisations internationales sont impuissantes face aux conflits en cours. Partout, le rapport de force a remplacé le droit international, et nous sommes à peine au début de la crise migratoire.

Le Nigeria connaît chaque année deux fois plus de naissances que l'ensemble de nos 27 pays réunis. Et pourtant, dans votre discours, vous consacrez seulement une minute à la question de l'immigration. Ce discours est la démonstration que vous n'avez pas pris la pleine conscience de ces données. Alors nous vous appelons encore une fois à poser des actes de rupture, parce que les regrets ne font pas une politique.

(L'oratrice accepte une question carton bleu)

Michał Szczerba (PPE), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Przewodnicząca Komisji! Jako polska reprezentacja bardzo dziękujemy za te wyrazy wsparcia dzisiaj z nami, wtedy kiedy polska przestrzeń powietrzna została naruszona przez rosyjskie drony. I było to działanie celowe. Nie było to działanie przypadkowe. Prosimy o solidarność, ale również chcemy bardzo wyraźnie powiedzieć: to zagrożenie, które mamy dzisiaj, które obserwujemy, jest ze Wschodu, a nie z Zachodu. Unia Europejska stoi po stronie wartości, po stronie naszego bezpieczeństwa. To jest również kwestia funduszy europejskich i funduszu SAFE. Wczoraj bardzo przełomowa decyzja: 44 miliardy euro dla Polski. To także jest ochrona polskich granic i polskiej obrony.

President. – Thank you very much. Unfortunately, the interpretation didn't work. However, your point was made.

Irene Montero (The Left). – Señora presidenta, presidenta Von der Leyen, usted ha dicho que Europa lucha por la libertad. ¿Usted está dispuesta a ir a la guerra por la libertad de Europa y a empuñar una de las armas que está comprando? ¿Usted se imagina, presidenta, que Israel quema vivos a sus hijos, como está haciendo con los niños palestinos, a quienes mata de hambre?

Usted sabe que eso les va a pasar a otros, no a usted, señora presidenta, porque usted es quien ha sometido a Europa a las dos mayores amenazas para la seguridad del mundo. Ha arrodillado a Europa ante los Estados Unidos en el campo de golf privado de su presidente mientras somos, junto a los Estados Unidos, el principal socio del Estado terrorista de Israel, incluso con las medidas que usted ha anunciado hoy, ahogada por la presión social. Con usted, la soberanía de Europa se llama Donald Trump.

Y, por cierto, presidenta, los barcos de la Global Sumud Flotilla —que lleva comida y medicinas a Gaza— han sido atacados dos veces con drones para parar la misión, pero ustedes han dicho que es la Flotilla la que escala el conflicto. Pero ¿a quién defiende usted, señora von der Leyen, a los barcos europeos en misión civil humanitaria atacados o al Estado terrorista de Israel? Protejan a la Flotilla, porque usted es responsable de lo que les pueda pasar.

Le recuerdo, presidenta, que la colaboración con el genocidio debe ser castigada como crimen internacional y que ustedes...

(la presidenta retira la palabra a la oradora)

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Fru talman! Fru ordförande. Kollegor. Vi moderater gick till val på ett fritt och säkert Europa. Det var länge sedan det har känts så viktigt som nu: Rysslands krig mot Ukraina, en oberäknelig Trump och upptrappade handelskonflikter, läget i Mellanöstern, ett Kina på framfart. Vi har stora problem med organiserad brottslighet, illegal migration och global ekonomisk osäkerhet.

Nu är tid för ansvar och leverans, för trygghet och säkerhet, för konkurrenskraft, jobb och välstånd. Vi behöver ett starkt Europa som håller ihop. Alla ni som vill splittra Europa, för vem jobbar ni egentligen? Ett stort ansvar vilar på alla oss nu. Från Moderaternas och EPP:s sida står vi redo. Trappa upp kampen mot de kriminella gängen, kapa mer EU-byråkrati, slutför fler frihandelsavtal och ta tillbaka kontrollen över migrationen.

Vi behöver satsa på vår egen försvarsförmåga och värna ett starkt stöd till Ukraina. Jag kan lova er att jag, EPP och Moderaterna, vi kommer att jobba för ett friare, säkrare och starkare Europa i dag och för framtida generationer.

(Talaren godtog en fråga ("blått kort").)

Petras Gražulis (ESN), *pakėlus mėlynąją kortelę pateiktas klausimas*. – Gerbiamas pranešėjas. Jūs, Liaudies partija, kartu su Von der Leyen, jau antrą kadenciją valdote Europos Parlamentą – esate čia daugumoje – ir Europos Komisiją. Jūs sukūrėte per dešimtmetį šitas problemas, nevaldote migracijos, atsisakėte krikščioniškų vertybių ir propaguojate genderizmą. Jūs! Su jumis nesiskaito nė viena pasaulio šalis – nei Kinija, nei Indija, nei Amerika. Ar jūs sukūrėte begalinį... (*posėdžio pirmininkė iš kalbėtojo atima žodį*)

President. – Mr Tobé, would you care to reply?

Tomas Tobé (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – Colleague, thank you for your question. I disagree: what we see now is a Europe that is taking responsibility. Of course, we do not like tariffs. We never like tariffs; we never like taxes in the EPP. But of course, we're in a situation now where perhaps one of your favourites, President Trump, wants tariffs. He wants these taxes. Can you show me another deal that has been made that is better than the one that Europe has just done?

On migration, I must say, in the last mandate, we took responsibility. We made sure that we got a migration pact in place. And now we are taking back control of migration. That is taking responsibility for Europe!

Nicola Zingaretti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il nemico dell'Europa è tornato ed è tra noi, ed è il nazionalismo.

L'Unione è nata per unire l'Europa, ma le politiche dei governi influenzate dal nazionalismo vogliono dividerla. Questa è la verità, vogliono smantellare i pilastri del processo di integrazione.

La riduzione del bilancio, l'assenza di coraggio sugli investimenti e il debito comune, le divisioni e la subalternità sulla politica estera e commerciale sono tutti segnali di un'inversione di tendenza drammatica. E quando questo è avvenuto in Europa, l'esito nella Storia è sempre stato uno: la guerra.

E allora occorre reagire con l'unità, non a parole, ma costruendo con i territori coesione sociale, politiche comuni e federali, investimenti, integrazione, unità politica.

Lei, Presidente von der Leyen, rappresenti di più una sintesi tra un Consiglio condizionato dalle pulsioni nazionaliste e un Parlamento a maggioranza europeista. Questo impegno, fino a oggi, è stato debole e la Storia le chiede di cambiare, perché difendere la democrazia e difendere la libertà significa ricostruire la speranza in questo meraviglioso progetto.

Tom Vandendriessche (PffE). – Voorzitter, de toestand van Europa is dramatisch en het beleid van deze Commissie is desastreus. Onze boeren worden vermalen door oneerlijke concurrentie. Onze bedrijven worden versmacht door overregulering. Onze gezinnen lijden onder de torenhoge energiekosten. Onze vrouwen en dochters zijn de eerste slachtoffers van de illegale massamigratie. Maar voor mevrouw Von der Leyen is er blijkbaar geen vuiltje aan de lucht. Deze wereldvreemde elite kent het leven van gewone mensen niet.

Maar hoe machtig zij ook lijken, zij kunnen de realiteit niet blijven ontkennen. Het totaal onevenwichtige handelsakkoord met de Verenigde Staten laat de hele wereld zien hoe zwak, afhankelijk en onderdanig de Europese Unie is. Deze Commissie heeft geen strategie, geen plan en geen oplossingen. Daarom moeten wij radicaal van koers veranderen: geen massamigratie, geen *Green Deal* en geen Europese uitverkoop. Daarvoor kunnen wij, nationalisten, zorgen.

(*De spreker stemt ermee in om te antwoorden op een "blauwe kaart"-vraag*)

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE), *otázka položená zvednutím modré karty*. – Pane kolego, rád jsem si poslechl váš projev. Tak nám ukažte konečně to racionální řešení, jak vyřešit třeba dohodu se Spojenými státy. Proč vy sám nám neukážete, jak byste to řešil? Řekněte, že tam pojedete místo pana komisaře Šefčovič a že ukážete, jak se dohodnete s Donaldem Trumpem. Na vašich sociálních sítích vidím velmi často projevy, jak kritizujete Evropskou unii. Ukažte mi něco konstruktivního, co jste za tu dobu, co jste tady v Evropském parlamentu, udělal.

Tom Vandendriessche (Pfe), *“blauwe kaart”-antwoord*. – Ik hoef enkel de voorzitter van de Europese Raad, mijnheer Costa, te citeren die vorige week zei dat deze handelsovereenkomst — die duidelijk onevenwichtig is — tot stand komt, vanwege de focus op de oorlog in Oekraïne, het eindeloze moeras waarin deze Commissie ons wil meesleuren. Daarom denk ik dat we een andere strategie moeten volgen, een strategie die leidt naar vrede en naar een sterk Europa.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Paní předsedající, Evropská unie je v krizi, v krizi, kterou si odmítá připustit. Zaostáváme bohužel jak za našimi partnery ve Spojených státech, tak i za naší konkurencí v Číně. V mnohém již nejsme lídry inovací, nejsme průkopníkem. Často se zdá, že umíme jen regulovat, a to především v náš neprospěch. Pokud chceme v Evropě ochránit naši budoucnost, naši budoucí prosperitu, tak musíme hlavně přestat házet klacky pod nohy firmám i lidem. Musíme výrazně omezit ideologické regulace, jako je *Green Deal*, a přestat si myslet, že jenom my víme nejlépe, jak se mají lidé chovat a firmy podnikat. Pokud to neuděláme, bude z Evropy něco jako obrovský skanzen, kam si Američané a Číňané budou jezdit fotit hrady a zámky.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señora presidenta Von der Leyen, el mundo se ha vuelto anti-europeo, y debemos aceptarlo. Nuestro principal socio nos impone aranceles a la fuerza, nuestra antítesis política — China — aprovecha nuestro mercado para vender sus excedentes industriales, pero nosotros damos pasos atrás. Debemos recuperar el espíritu épico que nos llevó a la compra conjunta de vacunas durante la COVID-19.

Voy a poner un ejemplo con el nuevo marco financiero plurianual. Primero, renacionaliza el presupuesto y las políticas comunes: eso es un paso atrás; segundo, deslegitima las instituciones, porque recorta la cohesión regional y las ayudas que reciben agricultores y pescadores, y, sin políticas europeas, ¿para qué sirve la Unión Europea?, y tercero, ¿no es absurdo que los Estados miembros envíen un sobre con dinero a Bruselas para confeccionar el presupuesto europeo y que, una vez confeccionado, se les devuelva otro sobre con dinero en lugar de políticas comunes?

Señora presidenta, la violación de nuestro espacio aéreo por drones rusos es el verdadero estado de la Unión: no hay otro. Y mañana no se hablará de otro estado de la Unión.

El tiempo de gigantes furiosos en el que estamos entrando, que se avecina, solo permitirá sobrevivir a Europa si se comporta como un país; quiero decir, como un solo país, no hay otra opción.

Felicidades por su discurso. Sabe que cuenta con nosotros. Su suerte será la de Europa.

Javier Moreno Sánchez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora Von der Leyen, la Unión está en un estado delicado y usted está ante una encrucijada: o continúa construyendo Europa con las fuerzas europeístas que apoyaron su candidatura —y espero que el señor Weber siga en ellas—, o se deja llevar por quienes quieren dismantelar las políticas que usted misma propuso y que hemos construido juntos, como el Pacto Verde Europeo, la Directiva contra la violencia de género o el Reglamento de Servicios Digitales.

Los socialistas españoles le pedimos valentía y voluntad política para afrontar los retos que tenemos por delante. La ciudadanía —especialmente los jóvenes— exige que se le garanticen sus derechos, como el acceso a una vivienda digna. Necesitamos ya un pacto europeo por una vivienda asequible.

Señora presidenta, permítame acabar con este mensaje: los ciudadanos queremos la paz. Por eso, pido que actúe y se quede en el lado correcto de la historia, como el Gobierno de Pedro Sánchez ante el genocidio que se está cometiendo contra el pueblo palestino. Suspenamos ya el Acuerdo de Asociación con Israel.

Cuente con la determinación de los socialistas españoles para seguir defendiendo el alma de Europa, como ha dicho la presidenta del Grupo S&D, Iratxe García.

(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»)

Diego Solier (ECR), *pregunta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Señora Von der Leyen, comparto muy poco —o nada— de lo que nos han comentado hoy aquí, pero comparto todo lo que me dicen los agricultores, los ganaderos y la gente por la calle, en general.

¿Qué pasa con los europeos que lo están pasando mal? ¿Los que cada vez se sienten más inseguros en sus propias calles, los que llevan meses esperando ayudas que no llegan, los que son rescatados por sus vecinos en las riadas o los que apagan los fuegos que están quemando su tierra con sus propias manos?

¿Qué pasa cuando el problema lo tenemos dentro de la Unión Europea, cuando un Estado miembro no respeta la separación de poderes o cuando un sistema que se llama democrático se olvida de los ciudadanos y vive de espaldas a la realidad?

¿Qué va a hacer la Unión Europea por ayudarles?

Javier Moreno Sánchez (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – Sorry, I can't answer because I didn't understand what he said.

Diego Solier (ECR). – Señora presidenta, lo puedo repetir si quiere.

President. – We'll have to check the system.

It's okay.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (Pfe). – Señora presidente, señora Von der Leyen, son las 12.22 horas y millones de europeos están ahora trabajando para pagar su suculento sueldo, el mío y el de todos ustedes. Y usted no les ha demostrado ni un solo respeto: inmigración masiva y descontrolada, un pacto verde que devasta la economía, censura en redes sociales, ocultación de contratos, corrupción en los negocios, restricciones climáticas al comercio, sobrerregulación, competencia desleal, deuda pública desorbitada, impuestos más altos, inseguridad en las calles y criminalidad como nunca... esa es la Europa que viven ahí fuera.

La Unión cada vez es más débil y usted preside la peor Comisión de la historia. Usted hizo campaña con el señor Feijóo en España, en favor del Partido Popular Europeo, y les prometió a agricultores, ganaderos y pescadores el oro y el moro, pero les ha traicionado con el Acuerdo del Mercosur, con el acuerdo con los Estados Unidos y con una PAC más pequeña y con más restricciones. Ustedes se llevan el oro y dejan al moro, pero les voy a decir que en Europa ya no cabe ni uno más.

Jaak Madison (ECR). – Madam President, dear colleagues, the situation in the European Union is no better than it was a year ago during the same debate.

Firstly, the EU continues to be the largest importer of gas in the world from Russia, paying billions of euros for it and, at the same time, Russia just this morning attacked Poland, which is a Member State of both NATO and the EU, with drones.

Secondly, there are still attempts to continue with climate extremism, which causes enormous damage to the economies, entrepreneurs and consumers of European countries. We are feeling this especially in Estonia, for example.

Thirdly, the competence of the EU leadership is depressing. Ms von der Leyen clearly does not understand the situation we are in the world.

The situation is even sadder with the European Union's top diplomat – our own foreign representative, Ms Kallas – who only last week made the whole of Europe a laughing stock within the framework of the European Institute of Security Studies, where she showed her infantility by not having basic knowledge of history and not having a basic understanding of geopolitics, and all this in terrible English.

The people of Europe do not deserve this, they deserve much better.

Zoltán Tarr (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Európa nem teher, hanem biztosíték. Védi polgárainkat, elősegíti a jólétet és a tisztességes versenyt. Ezzel szemben Magyarország valaha volt legkorruptabb miniszterelnöke a Nyugat és az EU összeomlásáról beszél, miközben lányát és annak családját a választások előtt nyugatra menekítette. 15 évnyi Fidesz–KDNP uralom után pedig magyar családok százai küzdenek megélhetési gondokkal és több mint hatvan új vagy megnövelt adó terhével.

Mi, a Tisza közössége, versenyképes Magyarországot szeretnénk, ezért a dolgozó emberek adóját csökkenteni fogjuk. A legkisebb keresetűek havonta akár 20 ezer forinttal többet vihetnek majd haza, a minimálbér adója pedig 9%-ra csökken. Így teremtünk Magyarországon élhető, igazságos európai jövőt, és tesszük az országot az EU konstruktív tagjává.

(A felszólaló hajlandó válaszolni egy kékkártyás kérdésre)

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), *pregunta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Señor Tarr, ¿no le parece extraño que, hasta ahora, ningún interviniente en nombre del Grupo PPE —al que pertenece la señora Von der Leyen— haya hecho mención al párrafo de su discurso en el debate sobre el Estado de la Unión dedicado a migración y asilo, que es el asunto seguramente más desafiante y sostenido en el tiempo, desde que entró en vigor el Tratado de Lisboa? Porque ha hecho mención de que sí hace falta una lucha conjunta contra los tráfico ilícitos y su modelo de negocio, pero también el estricto cumplimiento de las obligaciones contenidas en el Pacto Europeo sobre Inmigración y Asilo, que incluyen responsabilidad compartida y solidaridad obligatoria entre los Estados miembros.

¿No le parece extraño que la única mención al asunto haya venido del discurso...

(la presidenta retira la palabra al orador)

Zoltán Tarr (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – Thank you for your question. I think we have heard quite enough about how the Commission and how we the members of the EPP are really trying to do so many things against illegal migration.

Our Chair, Mr Weber, was also talking about it, so I think there is ample evidence that this is a serious issue, and we are fighting against illegal migration as much as we can.

René Repasi (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissionspräsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Kniefall von Schottland hat uns schmerzhaft gezeigt, dass es nicht unsere stärkste Stärke ist, sondern unsere schwächste Schwäche, die unsere Stellung in der Welt definiert. Ich will Ihnen, Frau von der Leyen, das gar nicht zum Vorwurf machen: Man muss mit den Karten spielen, die man bekommt.

Aber ich verlange von Ihnen, dass Sie alles tun, damit wir beim nächsten Mal nicht von den Schulhof-Bullys herumgeschubst werden können; da habe ich heute die richtigen Überschriften gehört, aber die habe ich schon häufiger gehört.

Wir müssen vom Ankündigungs-Europameister zum Handeln kommen. Ich möchte statt Roadmaps hartes Recht sehen, wie wir gute Arbeit in Europa schützen. Ich möchte statt Lippenbekenntnissen zu unserer Digitalgesetzgebung echte Strafen gegen *Big Tech* sehen. Und ich möchte statt altem Wein in neuen Fonds echte neue Investitionen sehen – dann wird das auch was.

Anna Bryłka (PřE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dzisiaj kolejny raz rosyjskie drony wielokrotnie naruszyły polskie niebo i nasze wojska z siłami NATO broniły bezpieczeństwa polskiej przestrzeni powietrznej. Natomiast Komisja Europejska, która jest odpowiedzialna za bezpieczeństwo gospodarcze i ekonomiczne państw członkowskich, nieustannie działa przeciw interesom Europejczyków. Po zniszczeniu europejskiego przemysłu oraz bezpieczeństwa na naszych granicach i ulicach dzisiaj zagrożone jest bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe. Mówię o umowie z Mercosur. Mówię o imporcie artykułów rolnych z Ukrainy. Polska, moja ojczyzna, potrzebuje realnego bezpieczeństwa i w tej chwili okazuje się, że przez wasze szkodliwe polityki – klimatyczną, energetyczną, inwestycyjną, finansową, handlową – jesteście dla nas bardziej ciężarem niż pomocą. Unia Europejska pod przewodnictwem pani von der Leyen jest brzemieniem dla państw europejskich. Jest przeszkodą dla bezpieczeństwa Polski. Ta Komisja Europejska powinna podać się do dymisji.

Paulo Cunha (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, na complexidade geopolítica dos tempos que vivemos, quem esperar soluções fáceis e imediatas ainda não percebeu em que mundo nos encontramos. Os europeus exigem de nós persistência nos propósitos, clareza nas mensagens e eficácia nas ações.

Na Ucrânia, o objetivo é claro: paz, custe o que custar, dure o que durar. No Médio Oriente, tem sido constante a preocupação com a situação humanitária, com a procura da paz e a defesa da solução de dois Estados.

O acordo comercial alcançado com os Estados Unidos é limitado, mas é preferível a não termos acordo nenhum. Devemos persistir, contudo, na procura de uma solução sem taxas.

Em algumas áreas, este primeiro ano de mandato tem sido a arte do possível, mas, em pleno desafio demográfico, climático e digital, precisamos de uma renovada ambição. No contexto da concorrência à escala global, não podemos baixar a guarda nem abdicar do que nos distingue.

Temos uma missão: defender o modelo europeu e assegurar a competitividade da União. Continuaremos a assumir a nossa responsabilidade: contribuir para uma Europa mais competitiva, para que possa ser cada vez mais justa e solidária.

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Présidente von der Leyen, vous êtes venue nous dire ce matin que l'Europe était dans un combat existentiel, et vous avez raison.

Il faut le dire, l'Europe est menacée et doit se battre. Mais est-ce se battre que de se soumettre commercialement à Donald Trump en Écosse? Est-ce se battre que de ne toujours pas saisir les 210 milliards d'avoirs publics russes dans nos banques? Est-ce se battre que de laisser X ou TikTok déstabiliser nos démocraties? Est-ce se battre que de refuser d'appliquer avec fermeté le *Digital Services Act*? Est-ce se battre que de laisser Gaza réduite en cendres sans action européenne? Est-ce se battre que de laisser Orbán et Fico piétiner l'état de droit au sein même de l'Union? Est-ce se battre que de proposer un cadre financier pluriannuel avec aussi peu d'ambition et aussi peu de justice?

«Words, words, words», disait Hamlet dans Shakespeare. Eh bien, il nous faut aujourd'hui plus que des mots. Si vous voulez transformer ces mots en actes, nous serons à vos côtés, y compris contre le Conseil et contre l'extrême droite. Mais s'il ne s'agit que de mots, alors dans ce cas-là, l'Europe est mal partie.

Marieke Ehlers (Pfe). – Voorzitter, de staat van onze Unie laat zich in één woord samenvatten: onhoudbaar. In plaats van de echte problemen aan te pakken, zitten ze bij de Commissie te knutselen aan flesdopjes en papieren rietjes. Onze burgers vragen niet om méér, maar om minder EU. Minder regels, minder bemoeienis en bovenal minder migratie. Zonder effectieve terugkeer is elk migratiebeleid waardeloos. Wie geen recht heeft om te blijven, moet ook daadwerkelijk vertrekken. Dat is het absolute minimum.

En dan de meerjarige begroting van maar liefst 2 biljoen EUR. Terwijl gezinnen elke euro moeten omdraaien, strooit Brussel met geld alsof het confetti is op een carnavalsoptocht. Dat is onverantwoord en volledig losgezongen van de werkelijkheid. Voorzitter, Nederlanders willen hun geld terug, en terecht. Mevrouw Von der Leyen, u pleit voor meer geld, meer EU en meer betutteling. Maar onze burgers willen minder, minder, minder. En daar ligt onze opdracht.

(De spreker weigert in te gaan op “blauwe kaart”-vragen van Hilde Vautmans en Raquel García Hermida-Van der Walle.)

Tom Berendsen (PPE). – Voorzitter, we beleven een geopolitiek kantelmoment. Het recht van de sterkste lijkt steeds meer te gelden ten koste van de internationale rechtsorde. De kwetsbaarheden van Europa worden zichtbaar en worden als wapen tegen ons gebruikt. Mevrouw Von der Leyen, de grote uitdagingen van deze tijd vragen inderdaad om een sterk Europa. Een sterk Europa regelt een aantal basiszaken: voldoende schone energie, sterke defensie, een groter concurrentievermogen en meer controle op migratie.

Een sterk Europa investeert in de economie van morgen, in technologie, onderzoek en innovatie. Een sterk Europa geeft zuurstof aan de samenleving en aan het bedrijfsleven door onnodige regeldruk te verminderen. Bij die drie opdrachten kan de Europese Commissie nog meer daadkracht tonen. De rest van de wereld wacht niet op ons. Collega's, dat vraagt ook inzet van ons. Ondanks al onze verschillen mogen wij ons niet uit elkaar laten spelen. Laten we fatsoenlijk met elkaar omgaan, het compromis zoeken en de eenheid bewaren.

Dan Nica (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă președintă von der Leyen, recente violări ale spațiului aerian al Poloniei de către dronele rusești ne aduc aminte faptul că în România acest lucru se întâmplă cu regularitate de doi ani de zile și este nevoie ca dumneavoastră să reafirmați sprijinul, pentru ca frontierele României să fie inviolabile și protejate.

În al doilea rând, există o mare îngrijorare în România, doamnă președintă von der Leyen, pentru că propunerile privind Fondul de coeziune pun în pericol finalizarea obiectivelor prin politica regională în România, construcția și modernizarea școlilor, spitalelor, alimentărilor cu apă și cred că trebuie să revizuiți acest lucru.

A doua chestiune este propunerea privind politica agricolă comună. O reducere de 25 de euro pe hectar, doamnă președintă von der Leyen, pentru fermieri din România, pentru o fermă mică poate să însemne rata la o bancă, o rată. Deci acest lucru este inacceptabil și conta propunerii dumneavoastră ca să sprijinim consumul de produse agricole europene, consumul de produse agricole românești. Vă rog să revizuiți această propunere.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Madam President, President von der Leyen, your Commission is in office only for half a year, so I guess your speech that was rather analysing the situation and showing the way forward was the proper one, but now time is coming when not speeches, but action will decide if we succeed in the battles that you properly describe.

In months to come here in the House, we will have to show who has courage and who has the wisdom to do the right things. Difficult files will be on the table and we should show who is responsible, who is thinking about the future of Europeans and who is not. We will be voting on the EU-Mercosur Agreement and many others.

The Commission should come with important proposals on how to improve our economy. We still don't have them and we badly need them. And again, the time will come and we will show who is caring about the future of Europeans, about their security and living standards, and who does not.

I know that you are on board, most of our colleagues are on the board. Council should be on board. If we make it, we succeed. If not, we fail.

Marta Temido (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Presidente da Comissão, no seu discurso, referiu que precisávamos de estar unidos, mas temos de estar unidos em torno das prioridades certas, daquelas que respondem às angústias de milhões de cidadãos europeus, e eles têm sido claros em cada Eurobarómetro, e também nas ruas, quanto a Gaza.

Por isso, somos muito claros sobre aquilo que esperamos. Primeiro, os nossos cidadãos elegeram a paz como principal valor e priorizam a defesa na ação europeia — daí a necessidade da nossa autonomia estratégica. Precisamos de poder fazer escolhas e, para isso, precisamos de ser livres. E por isso lhe pergunto: como é possível que o acordo comercial com os Estados Unidos da América inclua os compromissos que inclui em matéria de aquisição de equipamentos militares e de gás?

Segundo, recordamos que melhorar a qualidade de vida pelo resultado do seu trabalho foi sempre a expectativa, a grande promessa que as democracias europeias fizeram às suas classes médias — daí os ganhos que precisamos de alcançar em competitividade para reforçar o Pilar Europeu dos Direitos Sociais e outros.

E por isso a minha pergunta: porquê continuarmos a insistir em que o combate às migrações se faz por muros e não pela regulação dos mercados de trabalho? É a coerência nos valores que nos está a falhar.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, quel est l'état de l'Union? L'Europe est menacée de sortir de l'histoire. Fragilisée, divisée. Tous ceux qui travaillent et qui font vivre nos pays vivent la réalité d'un appauvrissement qui frappe partout, d'un décrochage qui déjà nous fait perdre la maîtrise de notre destin. Il est urgent de réagir.

Ce matin, dans votre discours, vous avez annoncé beaucoup de nouveaux plans, d'initiatives, de textes. Mais l'essentiel reste sans aucun doute de commencer par corriger les erreurs et les dénis qui nous ont conduits jusqu'ici.

Vous avez parlé de sécurité. Commençons d'abord par cesser de financer massivement des armements achetés à l'étranger. Ne plus dépendre militairement des États-Unis sera la condition pour ne plus subir le chantage commercial qu'ils nous imposent aujourd'hui.

Vous parlez des prix de l'énergie, mais continuer de financer massivement les renouvelables ne fera qu'augmenter nos dépendances. Cessons enfin d'exclure des budgets européens le nucléaire, qui, malgré ce qu'en ont dit pendant longtemps les Verts, est souverain et décarboné. La Cour de justice a confirmé ce matin même le combat que nous menons depuis des années pour cela. Nous n'avons pas besoin d'un plan pour rendre les petites voitures abordables. Nous avons besoin d'abandonner d'abord la règle qui impose de n'acheter que des voitures électriques. Et, ensuite, laissons nos constructeurs innover.

Vous voulez faire de la publicité pour les agriculteurs européens. Mais commençons par abandonner les coupes massives prévues par la Commission dans les budgets qui leur sont dus, et par leur garantir qu'ils ne seront pas la variable d'ajustement du Mercosur.

Vous parlez de lutte contre l'immigration illégale. Nous ferons bien sûr le travail au Parlement pour faciliter enfin, par le règlement sur le retour, les expulsions. Mais il faudra aller bien plus loin.

Après des années passées à alerter, pendant la dernière législature, sur une politique largement dictée par la gauche, qui se préoccupait bien peu à l'époque de ce que pensait la majorité centrale dans ce Parlement comme dans nos pays, nous avons fait un choix clair, mais maintenant il faut des résultats.

(L'orateur accepte une question carton bleu)

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR), "blauwe kaart"-vraag. – Ik heb een vraag aan de heer Bellamy. Hij is er ongetwijfeld van op de hoogte dat we nog steeds wachten op de herbenoeming van de speciale EU-gezant voor de godsdienstvrijheid. Mevrouw Von der Leyen talmt en belooft iedere keer dat die speciale EU-gezant voor de godsdienstvrijheid zal worden benoemd, maar het gebeurt maar niet. Wat vindt u daarvan? Bent u het er mee eens dat het Europees Parlement maximale druk moet zetten op deze Europese Commissie om die speciale EU-gezant voor de godsdienstvrijheid per direct te benoemen?

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE), réponse carton bleu. – Cher collègue, je partage entièrement votre point de vue et j'ai été d'ailleurs marqué d'entendre ce matin dans votre discours, Madame la Présidente, que l'Europe devait défendre la liberté de prier.

Je crois que la liberté de conscience est au cœur de l'héritage européen et cette liberté-là, elle suppose d'être défendue à travers la nomination de ce représentant. Nous comptons sur vous pour avancer rapidement sur cette nomination essentielle.

Andreas Schieder (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Eines der größten Probleme, wenn man die Europäerinnen und Europäer fragt, sind die Lebenshaltungskosten, und da sind es vor allem die Wohnungskosten.

Wohnen darf kein Luxus werden, Wohnen ist ein Grundrecht – dieser Satz muss jetzt auch endlich gebaute, erlebbare, bewohnbare Realität für die Europäer werden. Mit dem Plan für erschwinglichen Wohnraum haben wir auch die Möglichkeit, das Leben von Millionen Menschen in Europa zu verbessern – nämlich jenen Menschen wie Familien, die gezwungen werden, ihre Wohnungen zu verlassen, weil sie sich nicht mehr leisten können; Mieter und Mieterinnen, die die Hälfte oder mehr ihres verfügbaren Einkommens für Wohnen ausgeben; junge Menschen, die 30, 35 Jahre alt werden müssen, bevor sie erst ausziehen können von zu Hause; und die 400 000 Kinder und Minderjährigen, die täglich obdachlos sind.

Wir haben es nicht nur in der Hand – es ist auch heute angesprochen worden von Ihnen, Frau Präsidentin –, es ist ein zentrales Thema. Es ist aber höchste Zeit, dass wir auch ins Tun kommen, dass wir diesen Plan für erschwinglichen Wohnraum mit all den wichtigen Maßnahmen ganz rasch umsetzen. Die Europäer können es sich nicht mehr leisten.

Aodhán Ó Riordáin (S&D). – Madam President, like millions of others in our Union, I believe in Europe. Together we believe in a Europe based on social justice, on human rights and on solidarity – a Europe that is a voice for good in the world.

President von der Leyen, we do not believe in you. You bow to Trump's bullying, you roll back on climate commitments and, for all your rhetoric, you cooperate with the far right.

And while a genocide rages in Gaza and Israel rips up international law, your response is pathetic. The partial suspension of the Association Agreement you announced today is an insult. This is not a partial genocide: 20 000 Palestinian children are not partially dead!

This is not the Europe the people of Ireland believe in. This is not the Europe they love. That Europe is one that houses its people, protects our planet, strengthens workers' rights, stands against genocide and defends international law!

President von der Leyen, Europe deserves so much better than your presence.

(The speaker declined to take a blue-card question from Seán Kelly)

Procedura "catch-the-eye"

Bartłomiej Sienkiewicz (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałem bardzo podziękować za solidarność z Polską i za to, co też dzisiaj wyraziła Komisja. To są bardzo ważne chwile. Pierwszy raz w historii NATO państwo członkowskie zostało zaatakowane na swoim terytorium powietrznym przez Rosję. Chcę powiedzieć, że Polacy się nie dają zastraszyć. I wobec tego kryzysu jesteśmy zjednoczeni. Słyszeliście państwo wszyscy o konfliktach wewnątrz Polski. Chcę zapewnić na tej sali wszystkich, że premier i prezydent zgodnie działają wobec tego kryzysu. Koordynują ze sobą działania i jesteśmy wobec tego nie tylko nie do zastraszenia przez Rosję, ale jesteśmy także nie do podzielenia. I tak będzie. Ale też oczekujemy wsparcia i zrozumienia, że tylko i wyłącznie nacisk na Rosję jest w stanie powstrzymać jej agresję.

Thomas Bajada (S&D). – Sinjura President, "l-istess Ewropa li tatni l-Erasmus biex nikber u nohlom, illum titkellem fuq l-armi milli fuq il-futur ta' binti". Din hija l-vuċi ta' omm żagħżuġha Maltija li emmnet fil-proġett Ewropew. Imma llum x'qed naraw? Żgħażaġh li jhossuhom minsija, familji li qed jithallew wehidhom, anzjani li jridu jagħzlu bejn ikla u saqaf fuq rashom u istituzzjonijiet li jdawru wiċċhom quddiem genoċidju u inġustizzja.

Din mhijiex Ewropa li tispira, mhijiex l-Ewropa tal-paċi, tal-prosperità u tal-ugwaljanza. Sinjura President, haress madwarek u isma' liż-żgħażaġh tagħna li jridu Ewropa li thaddan lill-popli tagħha u mhux timliehom bil-biża'. Ewropa fejn hadd ma jithalla barra, fejn kull tifel ikollu futur u kull anzjan jgħix haġja denja. Din hija l-Ewropa li jien nemmen fiha. Ewropa ta' paċi, ta' ġustizzja soċjali u ta' tama għal kull wiehed u wahda minna.

Anna Maria Cisint (PřE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi, Presidente von der Leyen, Lei ha dato spettacolo di equilibrio, arrampicandosi sugli specchi nel tentativo di accontentare tutti. Una zuppa di sole intenzioni, ma da sei anni Lei è al timone e le tragiche conseguenze sono sotto gli occhi di tutti.

Parla di conciliare difesa e transizione verde, dovremmo immaginare carri armati a pannelli solari e proiettili biodegradabili? E mentre invoca il riarmo contro la Russia, la minaccia è già qui: quinte colonne islamiste che nelle nostre città gridano «morte all'Occidente!».

La sicurezza strategica non è solo militare, ma è anche industriale: con il meno 90% di emissioni state condannando le nostre imprese e i nostri lavoratori svendendoli alla Cina.

Lo dica chiaramente: vuole difendere l'Europa o farla inginocchiare a Pechino, continuando le folli politiche *green* solo per tenere in piedi questa sua traballante maggioranza?

Γεώργιος Γεώργης (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Πρόεδρε της Επιτροπής, εδώ και έναν χρόνο μετά την εκλογή μου, παρακολουθώ ανελλιπώς όλες τις ομιλίες σας ενώπιον της Ολομέλειας. Στις τοποθετήσεις σας κάνετε αναφορές στην Ουκρανία, τη Λευκορωσία, τη Μολδαβία, την Κίνα, τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες Αμερικής, τη Ρωσία, τα Δυτικά Βαλκάνια, το Ισραήλ, την Παλαιστίνη, τη Συρία, ακόμη και στην Ουγγαρία και την πράσινη πολιτική. Όμως, κυρία Πρόεδρε της Επιτροπής, ξέρετε πόσες φορές έχετε μιλήσει για την τουρκική παράνομη κατοχή της Κύπρου; Ποτέ. Για τους αγνοούμενους και τους εκτοπισμένους; Ποτέ. Για τους εγκλωβισμένους και τον εμποισμό ενός κράτους μέλους; Ποτέ. Για τα εγκλήματα πολέμου που έχουν διαπραχθεί στην Κύπρο; Ποτέ. Για τις παραβιάσεις στην κυπριακή ΑΟΖ; Πάλι ποτέ. Για την Αμμόχωστο και την Κερύνεια; Ποτέ. Για τη βεβήλωση της θρησκευτικής μας κληρονομιάς; Πάλι ποτέ. Ακόμη και σήμερα, για την απαγωγή των πέντε Ελληνοκυπρίων ούτε μία λέξη.

Κυρία Πρόεδρε της Επιτροπής, αν στο λεξιλόγιό σας δεν υπάρχει η Κύπρος και η τουρκική κατοχή, είναι καιρός να τις εντάξετε.

Helmut Brandstätter (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin! Frau Präsidentin von der Leyen, als Österreicher möchte ich Ihnen sagen: Sie sprechen über den Binnenmarkt; der muss endlich ausgebaut werden, ja. Aber da kann es ja nicht möglich sein, dass dieselben Produkte von denselben Ketten in Österreich viel teurer sind als in Deutschland! Also bitte, machen Sie endlich den Binnenmarkt – die Kommission kann das.

Ein wesentliches Thema: Serbien. Ich war öfter in Serbien zuletzt, und ich muss Ihnen sagen: Viele Menschen sind enttäuscht von Ihnen, weil Sie noch immer zu stark bei dem autokratischen Präsidenten Vučić sind, weil Sie sich nicht auf die Seite der Menschen stellen. Marta Kos, die zuständige Kommissarin, macht das jetzt – endlich! Aber die Menschen dort wollen auch von Ihnen, dass klar ist, dass ein derart autokratisches System nichts in der EU verloren hat.

Drittens: Russland. Herzlichen Dank, dass Sie jetzt sagen, dass das russische Vermögen in die Ukraine gehört; als Leihe zunächst, aber bitte tun Sie es endlich! Endlich tun Sie es – wir brauchen das, die Menschen dort brauchen das, und es ist auch gut für Europa.

Vicent Marzà Ibáñez (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, señora Von der Leyen, yo le quiero preguntar si usted se ha hecho hoy una moción de censura a sí misma, porque usted ha anunciado justo lo contrario de lo que ha estado haciendo en muchos ámbitos en este año.

Usted habla de una Europa fuerte y después nos humilla y nos somete a Trump. Usted habla del cambio climático y luego pacta todas las políticas relacionadas con el cambio climático con los negacionistas de la extrema derecha. Usted habla de vivienda y lo que hace es reforzar el presupuesto en armas y no en vivienda. Y lo más grave de todo es que usted, hasta ahora, ha estado callada ante un genocidio. Ha estado callada, hasta ahora, diciendo que no tenía competencias. Y, de repente, hoy ya tenía competencias para anunciar acciones parciales, detrás de las movilizaciones de millones de ciudadanos europeos.

Presidir Europa es liderarla, no ir detrás de sus ciudadanos, como los de la flotilla que debe usted proteger. Presidir Europa es ser coherente y ejercer sus valores, por ejemplo, actuando igual en Ucrania que en Palestina, actuando, defendiendo los derechos universales en toda Europa y ejerciendo la libertad de Europa en todo el mundo.

Estrella Galán (The Left). – Señora presidenta, señora presidenta Von der Leyen, Europa está en la UCI, y usted lo ha demostrado; y lo está por sus políticas, que favorecen a los poderosos y hunden y humillan a los más vulnerables.

Usted hoy ha hablado de la independencia de Europa, y la hemos visto cómo se humillaba en el campo privado de golf del señor Trump, donde —sin mandato democrático— nos ha dejado vendidos. Lo hemos visto con sus planes para destruir el Fondo Social Europeo, que era fundamental para mejorar la vida de la gente, y, sin embargo, lo quiere vaciar para financiar la guerra. Ya se lo hemos dicho muchas veces: la seguridad de la ciudadanía no cabe en un misil, cabe en los derechos sociales.

Lo vemos también con sus necropolíticas migratorias, con la creación de Guantánamos fuera de la Unión Europea con nuestros impuestos, persiguiendo a quienes huyen por poner su vida a salvo. Y, sobre todo, lo vemos con Gaza, un genocidio que usted ni siquiera ha sido capaz de reconocer como tal. Ha puesto encima de la mesa...

(la presidenta retira la palabra a la oradora)

Alexander Jungbluth (ESN). – Frau Präsidentin! Mehr Druck auf Russland, Sanktionen gegen Russland: Es ist immer die gleiche Leier, die wir hören. In diesem Haus, Frau von der Leyen, dürfen Sie immer noch sprechen, im Weißen Haus darf jemand wie Sie maximal noch an den Katzentisch.

Viel Aufrüstung, viel Krieg – wissen Sie, welches Wort Sie nicht benutzt haben? Diplomatie! Vielleicht liegt es daran, dass Sie mal Verteidigungsministerin gewesen sind, wobei keiner Ihrer eigenen Söhne seinem Land gedient hat. Sie stehen dafür, dass der Krieg der Reichen der Kampf der Armen ist. ...

(Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Lukas Sieper (NI). – Madam President, dear people of Europe, let me begin by thanking the Commissioners who work closely on the file ... Madam President, can we repeat my time?

President. – We can hear only you, Mr Sieper. Go ahead.

Lukas Sieper (NI). – Herr Jungbluth, können Sie jetzt mal aufhören, bitte? Also wirklich!

Madam President, dear people of Europe, I would like to thank the Commissioners working closely in my field, especially Commissioner Šefčovič, Commissioner Kos and Commissioner Lahbib, for their constructive and professional cooperation.

Frau Kommissionspräsidentin von der Leyen, vor genau einem Jahr hatte ich zum ersten Mal das Vergnügen, mit Ihnen zu sprechen, und ich sagte Ihnen damals, dass ich Sie aufgrund eines basisdemokratischen Prozesses nicht gewählt habe, aber hoffe, dass Sie mich eines Besseren belehren würden.

Ein Jahr später ist mein Urteil gespalten. Auf technischer Ebene haben Sie mich überzeugt. Ich habe so gut wie allen von der Kommission initiierten Gesetzgebungsvorhaben zugestimmt, aber ich möchte Sie auch ermutigen, sich auf der Ebene der politischen Öffentlichkeitsarbeit noch zu verbessern. Sie müssen transparenter vorgehen, Deals eingehen, die Europa nicht schwach stehen lassen, Menschenrechtsverbrechen klar benennen, egal wo sie stattfinden, und einen stärkeren Auftritt auf Social Media hinlegen. ...

(Tmiem tal-proċedura “catch the eye”)

Ursula von der Leyen, President of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you very much for a very vivid and interesting debate indeed. I was told I spoke for one and a half hours – sorry, that was long. We had a debate now for two hours, but Europe deserves to have such a debate and, as I said, it was a very interesting and lively debate.

We have heard you loud and clear. The college has heard you loud and clear. Very clear, also, was that the challenges that Europe faces are coming in different forms and that they come from different directions. And there can be no doubt about any of that, as we have seen again in the last 24 hours, both here in Europe and across the world.

But what was also very clear in this debate here is Europe has agency. Europe has agency, what it now needs, in many of the topics, is to develop the necessary urgency to deliver. If we stay united, we're the ones who can create the conditions for a more prosperous and more secure future.

I want to reiterate what I said already in my speech over and over: I will always be ready to work with you to strengthen the pro-European democratic majority. In my view, it's the only majority in this House that can deliver for Europeans. I will always be ready to bridge our differences and find common ground because it was excellent that we had the debate here today but democracy is only strong not only if we have debate, but when it decides and when it delivers.

Therefore we can, on one hand, always choose to focus on what sets us apart but we should make our difference, on the contrary, the foundation for a stronger European home. I think it is easy to say that Europe does not do enough here, and does too much there, but what the majority of speeches from the pro-European democratic forces was, the tone was encouraging, the tone was progress-oriented.

You asked – rightly so – for not only words, but deeds. Yes, you are right. The character of a State of the Union is that we do not only look back on what we have done, but we also sketch the way forward and, of course, at the moment, it is words and not yet deeds. But as I know this Parliament, you will hold me accountable. That is good, because this also shows that Europe is not some abstract entity. Europe is you, Europe is us, every one of us and this, therefore, with conviction I say: 'Long live Europe!'

Sarah Knafo, au nom du groupe ESN. – Madame la Présidente, Madame von der Leyen, nous n'attendons désormais plus rien de vous et vous trouvez quand même le moyen de nous décevoir.

Après la crise de l'énergie et le fiasco du renouvelable, nous attendions que vous remettiez en cause votre politique, mais vous allez encore plus loin. Après l'explosion du coût de votre grand emprunt, nous attendions que vous reveniez à la raison, mais vous proposez à l'instant un budget aberrant de 2 000 milliards de dépenses. Après vos leçons de morale sur l'état de droit, nous attendions que vous transmettiez vos SMS avec Pfizer, comme la justice vous l'ordonne, mais l'état de droit, ce n'est pas pour vous, c'est uniquement pour les autres. Après l'élection de Donald Trump, nous attendions que votre anti-trumpisme vous conduise, pour une fois, à défendre nos intérêts, mais vous avez cédé sans combattre et désormais vous signez le Mercosur tout en surréglementant nos propres activités.

Madame von der Leyen, en vous regardant, je ne sais même pas si vous comprenez ce que je suis en train de vous dire. Vous ne changerez jamais. Une idéologue restera une idéologue. Une technocrate restera une technocrate. La seule chose que les peuples européens attendent de vous désormais, c'est votre départ.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame von der Leyen, cela fait déjà un an que vous avez été réélue à la tête de la Commission européenne. Un an de trop, pendant lequel vous avez commis des dégâts irréparables. Franchement, aujourd'hui, votre discours ne suffit pas à masquer la réalité.

Oui, vous vous êtes rendue complice du génocide du peuple palestinien en ne prenant aucune réelle sanction jusqu'alors. Et vos annonces d'aujourd'hui ne changent rien, car, face à un génocide, il ne peut y avoir de demi-mesure.

Oui, vous avez capitulé face au chantage commercial de Trump et signé, avec le Mercosur, le pire accord de libre-échange, le plus néfaste, qui sera un désastre pour nos agriculteurs.

Oui, vous avez persisté avec l'austérité budgétaire, qui prend aux pauvres pour donner aux riches, et avez multiplié les renoncements écologiques.

Et vous voulez que cela dure encore quatre ans de plus? Madame von der Leyen, au terme de cette année, oui, vous devez partir, et vite, avec toute votre Commission. Ce n'est pas seulement notre groupe qui le demande, mais 60 % des députés européens, 60 % des citoyens européens. Et puisque vous refusez, nous déposerons une motion de censure contre vous pour mettre un terme à votre politique de casse sociale et votre inaction coupable dans le génocide à Gaza. Nous vous censurons...

(La Présidente retire la parole à l'oratrice)

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, President von der Leyen, let's just go back one year. The political guidelines that you published in July last year, they were very balanced. But we have to say, over the last year, we have been disappointed in what was implemented of those political guidelines because the focus was very much on defence, Ukraine and deregulation. Especially on the latter one, it was deregulation – what you do to the due diligence proposal is deregulation; it has nothing to do with simplification.

Your tone now in the State of the Union is different again. You promise differences, but now we really want to see that you deliver on that. It boils down to real implementation, real proposals, and then you can find us because we are very well aware, we want to work on security, on competitiveness, but in a broader definition, and we will work with you.

Thank you for making also very clear that you want to work with the pro-Europeans. But I do think you still have one minute, Manfred Weber: use that wisely with whom you want to work.

Valérie Hayer, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, je vous ai exposé tout à l'heure les priorités de mon groupe politique. Je voudrais vous faire part d'une remarque.

Il y a une chose qui m'a frappé, moi, dans ces débats, c'est l'hypocrisie à l'extrême droite de cet hémicycle, à l'extrême droite, qui nous fait aujourd'hui la leçon sur Donald Trump, qui nous tord le bras pour nous imposer des tarifs, qui nous oblige à acheter américain, qui sape notre économie. Mais de qui se moque-t-on?

Vous avez été les premiers supporters de Donald Trump. Vous êtes les premiers à relayer la propagande MAGA ici en Europe. Alors, si vous vous souciez vraiment de vos électeurs et du sort des citoyens européens dans chacun de vos pays, commencez par arrêter d'être les porte-parole de Vladimir Poutine. Commencez par arrêter d'être les porte-parole de Donald Trump. Vous prétendez défendre les peuples, vous les trahissez.

Assita Kanko, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, President von der Leyen, the truth is that the left killed the drug report before your plane even took off and then blamed you for standing by the corpse.

The public remains anxious all over Europe and angry, we see it today here in France. People worry about transparency, security and respect for the European values, a more powerful voice at the international stage, protection for businesses, justice and law enforcement, a realistic migration policy. To address these concerns, we cannot afford to be blindsided, cowards or hypocrites.

So, was your speech an appropriate answer today? I have some doubts. I heard a lot of new initiatives. Some of it sounded like more bureaucracy to me. You smuggled the deregulation agenda in there, but it seemed like you had to hide it from the Socialists. You are afraid to lose their support. You accept their blackmail. Why? A centre-right majority is possible in this House. A majority that will reduce red tape, a majority that will protect our citizens, a majority that will set the innovative powers of our private sector free. The future of Europe cannot be secured with the left, but with the centre-right.

Kinga Gál, a P/E képviselőcsoport nevében. – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Elvárjuk a demokrácia szabályainak, a más vélemények a nemzeti szuverenitás, a szerződések, így az egyhangúság tiszteletben tartását. Ellentétben az Ön felfogásával, ezt jelenti a demokrácia és a „Rule of law”. A Patrióta frakció ma válaszokat várt az embereket érintő súlyos kérdésekre. Miért gyengébb ma Európa, mint eddig bármikor, ennek minden egyes következményével: gazdákra, vállalkozásokra, nők és gyermekeink biztonságára nézve? Válaszok helyett ismét hitvallást hallottunk a hibás brüsszeli politikák, a jövőnk eladósítása mellett egy háborús logika mentén.

Megoldás helyett az Európai Bizottság mára maga lett a probléma. Ezért új vezetésre van szükség, amely az európai emberek valós érdekeit képviseli. Elnök asszony! Itt az ideje, hogy távozzon! Erre szólítjuk fel mi, Patrióták.

Iratxe García Pérez, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señora presidenta, como espero que este debate de alguna manera sea útil para la ciudadanía europea, voy a obviar y no hacer ninguna referencia más a la figura del señor Weber y voy a centrarme en lo que han sido las propuestas de la presidenta Von der Leyen.

He de decirle que, desde el Grupo S&D, vamos a estar vigilantes, críticos y constructivos. Usted hoy ha recogido muchas de las propuestas que este Grupo planteó, pero no pueden quedar simplemente en un anuncio para que hoy este debate termine en un buen clima, sino que tiene que ser la agenda real de la Comisión para los próximos meses: queremos calendario, queremos propuestas legislativas, queremos presupuesto —cosa de la que hoy poco se ha hablado—, queremos realmente voluntad política para construir.

Esta Europa se ha construido con la cooperación de las fuerzas proeuropeas y con el protagonismo de la socialdemocracia. No vamos a excusarnos de nuestra responsabilidad, pero lo vamos a hacer sin ser rehenes de aquellos que quieren robarnos nuestros valores, nuestros ideales y nuestras propuestas. Con responsabilidad, seguiremos trabajando.

Jeroen Lenaers, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Madam President, President von der Leyen, thank you for setting out your clear vision today and also for reminding us that also in this House, sometimes, we are so busy with debating the small print that the world is writing a new chapter without us, and Europe simply cannot afford this. At a time of war on our continent, of increased global competition, we need to respond with unity and with responsibility.

And yes, only the pro-European democratic forces in this House can achieve this together. (*Mixed reactions*) But for all the attacks from the Socialists, the Liberals and the Greens today on this issue, we are still waiting for a real commitment on delivering in this agenda, and for us, this is the autumn of truth. Do you choose a competitive Europe, cutting red tape and driving innovation, or do you choose a Europe drowning in bureaucracy and trade war, putting at risk the livelihoods of millions of people?

Do you choose a Europe ... (*The President cut off the speaker*)

President. – Thank you.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Well, I was interrupted, Madam President.

Do you choose a Europe that properly manages migration, protects our border, or do you keep dragging your feet on the proposals that have already been put on the table by this Commission?

President. – Can you wrap up?

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – I lost at least 20 seconds because of the booing, Madam President.

The EPP chooses ... (*The President cut off the speaker*)

President. – I gave you all the time.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – ... a strong and competitive Europe and we extend an open hand to all pro-European forces to do it together, but we need more than nice words, we need actions to deliver for our citizens.

President. – Thank you, indeed. It was very interesting and very lively.

We have the votes next.

Stqarrijiet bil-miktub (Artikolu 178)

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR), na piśmie. – To, co usłyszeliśmy w wystąpieniu przewodniczącej KE, powinno być nie dzwonkiem, a dzwonem alarmowym dla nas wszystkich. Wprawdzie mówi, że Europa potrzebuje więcej taniej energii, ale to musi być zielona energia, która z definicji jest droga. Mówi, że zasługujemy, by mieć tanie mieszkania, żeby nam się lepiej żyło, że Europa powinna być silna a nie słaba. Co to oznacza i co mówi nam rzeczywiście?

W zasadzie przekaz jest jasny: ani kroku w tył. Niech się nikomu nie marzą w UE żadne zmiany – budujemy scentralizowaną strukturę która dba przede wszystkim o niemieckie interesy, dążymy do szalonej transformacji gospodarczej w imię ideologii opartej na bezemisyjności przy kontynuacji szaleństw zielonego ładu, kolejnych ETS, aż wreszcie wcielamy za wszelką cenę umowę Mercosur, która będzie mieć zabójcze skutki dla rolnictwa i gospodarki zarówno w Polsce, jak i w innych krajach Unii.

A to wszystko w momencie, gdy Putin ostentacyjnie prowokuje kraje NATO, naruszając przestrzeń powietrzną Polski. 21 dronów to prowokacja, która nie jest przypadkiem, tak jak i jej data, szczególnie że trwają właśnie manewry ZAPAD tak blisko granicy Polski i NATO.

To, co się dzieje, to sygnały alarmowe, których nie wolno ignorować. Stop ideologiom. Zajmijmy się odbudową europejskiego bezpieczeństwa, to już ostatni dzwonek by działać!

Maria Grapini (S&D), în scris. – Doamnă președintă, astăzi ne-ați prezentat starea UE și ați prezentat propunerile Comisiei pentru viitor.

Din păcate, ați prezentat doar vise, nu cifre, nu impactul asupra vieții cetățenilor. Încrederea în UE și în proiectul UE scade tocmai din cauza lipsei de transparență, a proastei comunicări, lipsei de echitate, pieței interne fragmentate, crizei sociale, tinerilor fără locuințe și a locurilor de muncă slab plătite. Cu un asemenea management, proiectul european este în pericol.

Suntem la al doilea mandat și fermierii din România sunt mai departe discriminați, prinși cu subvenții mai mici decât alte țări, dar ați vorbit de coeziune și echitate. Nu distrugeți Europa printr-un management autoritar și nedemocratic!

Doamnă președintă, vă cer colaborare reală cu Parlamentul European pentru găsirea celor mai bune măsuri pentru cetățeni.

Alicia Homs Ginel (S&D), por escrito. – La Unión Europea se encuentra en un contexto interno lleno de retos políticos y sociales de mucha envergadura, y en un contexto internacional de gigantes desafiantes por las guerras y las crisis en nuestro entorno.

La encrucijada para la presidenta de la Comisión es o seguir construyendo la Unión en coordinación con las fuerzas europeístas que apoyaron su candidatura o dejarse llevar por quienes quieren dismantlar las políticas que la propia presidenta propuso y que se han construido por la «gran coalición» europeísta, como el Pacto Verde Europeo, la Directiva contra la violencia de género, la Ley de Servicios digitales o el Pacto Migratorio.

Los socialistas españoles pedimos a la Comisión, y especialmente a su presidenta, valentía y voluntad política para afrontar los retos que la sociedad europea tiene por delante. La ciudadanía, especialmente los jóvenes, exige que se garanticen sus derechos, como el acceso a una vivienda digna. Necesitamos ya un pacto europeo por una vivienda asequible.

Los ciudadanos queremos y necesitamos la paz. Por eso le pedimos a la Comisión que actúe y se quede en el lado correcto de la historia, como está haciendo el Gobierno de España, ante el genocidio que se está cometiendo contra el pueblo palestino.

Los socialistas españoles seguimos comprometidos con la construcción de la Unión Europea.

Hana Jalloul Muro (S&D), por escrito. – La Unión Europea se encuentra en un contexto interno lleno de retos políticos y sociales de mucha envergadura, y en un contexto internacional de gigantes desafiantes por las guerras y las crisis en nuestro entorno.

La encrucijada para la presidenta de la Comisión es o seguir construyendo la Unión en coordinación con las fuerzas europeístas que apoyaron su candidatura o dejarse llevar por quienes quieren dismantelar las políticas que la propia presidenta propuso y que se han construido por la «gran coalición» europeísta, como el Pacto Verde Europeo, la Directiva contra la violencia de género, la Ley de Servicios digitales o el Pacto Migratorio.

Los socialistas españoles pedimos a la Comisión, y especialmente a su presidenta, valentía y voluntad política para afrontar los retos que la sociedad europea tiene por delante. La ciudadanía, especialmente los jóvenes, exige que se garanticen sus derechos, como el acceso a una vivienda digna. Necesitamos ya un pacto europeo por una vivienda asequible.

Los ciudadanos queremos y necesitamos la paz. Por eso le pedimos a la Comisión que actúe y se quede en el lado correcto de la historia, como está haciendo el Gobierno de España, ante el genocidio que se está cometiendo contra el pueblo palestino.

Mariusz Kamiński (ECR), na piśmie. – Pani Przewodnicząca! W nocy przestrzeń powietrzna mojego kraju została wielokrotnie naruszona przez rosyjskie drony. Było to celowe działanie, tym razem przy współudziale Białorusi. W sposób zamierzony i zmasowany zagrożono bezpieczeństwu Polski – członka NATO i UE. Rosyjska agresja, prowokacje i ataki hybrydowe nie zakończą się, dopóki Europa nie odrzuci kunktatorstwa i nie podejmie się na odważne decyzje.

Omawiamy właśnie dziewiętnasty pakiet sankcji. Tymczasem, mimo zapowiedzi i deklaracji poszczególnych państw, w 2024 roku import rosyjskich węglowodorów do Unii wzrósł o 18 procent! Odpowiadają za to nie tylko Węgry czy Słowacja, ale w dużym stopniu także Francja czy Belgia. Dostrzega to Waszyngton, widząc hipokryzję w działaniach Brukseli.

Unia musi nałożyć sankcje na wielkie koncerny, takie jak Lukoil. Musi, obłożyć sankcjami krytyczne surowce jak tytan, wspólnie ze Stanami Zjednoczonymi zareagować na skalę wsparcia udzielanego Rosji przez Indie i Chiny.

Europa musi też wzmacniać samą siebie – a nie podejmować decyzje, które służą nielicznym, a osłabiają potencjał całej wspólnoty.

Pani Przewodnicząca, interes Europy nie jest tożsamy z interesem Berlina. W czym interesie forsuje Pani umowę Mercosur? Czy naprawdę nie ma Pani sobie nic do zarzucenia w kwestii kryzysu migracyjnego? Skąd to przeświadczenie o nieomyślności i narzucanie siłą decyzji – w tym tak niedopuszczalnych jak przymusowa relokacja migrantów?

Javi López (S&D), por escrito. – La Unión Europea se encuentra en un contexto interno lleno de retos políticos y sociales de mucha envergadura, y en un contexto internacional de gigantes desafiantes por las guerras y las crisis en nuestro entorno.

La encrucijada para la presidenta de la Comisión es o seguir construyendo la Unión en coordinación con las fuerzas europeístas que apoyaron su candidatura o dejarse llevar por quienes quieren dismantelar las políticas que la propia presidenta propuso y que se han construido por la «gran coalición» europeísta, como el Pacto Verde Europeo, la Directiva contra la violencia de género, la Ley de Servicios digitales o el Pacto Migratorio.

Los socialistas españoles pedimos a la Comisión, y especialmente a su presidenta, valentía y voluntad política para afrontar los retos que la sociedad europea tiene por delante. La ciudadanía, especialmente los jóvenes, exige que se garanticen sus derechos, como el acceso a una vivienda digna. Necesitamos ya un pacto europeo por una vivienda asequible.

Los ciudadanos queremos y necesitamos la paz. Por eso le pedimos a la Comisión que actúe y se quede en el lado correcto de la historia, como está haciendo el Gobierno de España, ante el genocidio que se está cometiendo contra el pueblo palestino.

Idoia Mendia (S&D), *por escrito*. – La Unión Europea se encuentra en un contexto interno lleno de retos políticos y sociales de mucha envergadura, y en un contexto internacional de gigantes desafiantes por las guerras y las crisis en nuestro entorno.

La encrucijada para la presidenta de la Comisión es o seguir construyendo la Unión en coordinación con las fuerzas europeístas que apoyaron su candidatura o dejarse llevar por quienes quieren dismantelar las políticas que la propia presidenta propuso y que se han construido por la «gran coalición» europeísta, como el Pacto Verde Europeo, la Directiva contra la violencia de género, la Ley de Servicios digitales o el Pacto Migratorio.

Los socialistas españoles pedimos a la Comisión, y especialmente a su presidenta, valentía y voluntad política para afrontar los retos que la sociedad europea tiene por delante. La ciudadanía, especialmente los jóvenes, exige que se garanticen sus derechos, como el acceso a una vivienda digna. Necesitamos ya un pacto europeo por una vivienda asequible.

Los ciudadanos queremos y necesitamos la paz. Por eso le pedimos a la Comisión que actúe y se quede en el lado correcto de la historia, como está haciendo el Gobierno de España, ante el genocidio que se está cometiendo contra el pueblo palestino.

Dan-Ștefan Motreanu (PPE), *în scris*. – Stimată doamnă președintă von der Leyen, în contextul propunerilor privind viitorul cadru financiar multianual 2028-2034, există îngrijorări serioase cu privire la direcția politicii de coeziune și a politicii agricole comune. Acestea nu sunt simple mecanisme de finanțare, ci piloni strategici prin care numeroase state membre au reușit să se modernizeze, să reducă decalajele de dezvoltare și să-și consolideze reziliența.

În cadrul PPE, am pledat constant pentru menținerea caracterului distinct al acestor politici, cu bugete separate și baze legale clare. Doar astfel putem garanta transparență, predictibilitate și accesibilitate pentru beneficiari, precum și o guvernare eficientă la toate nivelurile. Comasarea lor riscă să le diminueze impactul și să slăbească încrederea cetățenilor în UE. Trebuie să ne asigurăm că aceste politici nu doar continuă să ofere rezultate, ci sunt îmbunătățite și adaptate noilor provocări – de la tranziția energetică și digitală, până la competitivitate și securitate alimentară.

Politica de coeziune trebuie să rămână fidelă principiilor gestiunii partajate, guvernantei pe mai multe niveluri și abordării teritoriale, pentru a răspunde realist nevoilor locale. În același timp, politica agricolă comună trebuie să avanseze urgent spre convergența plăților directe, întrucât fermierii europeni se confruntă cu aceleași costuri pe piața unică și au dreptul la o finanțare echitabilă.

Mirosława Nykiel (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Dziś na terytorium Polski wleciały rosyjskie drony. To nie jest już odległa wojna ani ostrzeżenia bez pokrycia – to nasza codzienność. Jeszcze wczoraj mówiłam, że Rosja nie zatrzyma się na granicy z Ukrainą. Dziś mamy na to dowód.

Wyrażam ogromną wdzięczność polskim służbom i rządowi za szybką reakcję. Dzięki ich czujności i odpowiedzialności Polki i Polacy mogą czuć się bezpieczniej w tych dramatycznych godzinach. Widzimy, jak kluczowe dla państwa jest skuteczne zabezpieczenie infrastruktury krytycznej.

Muszę jednak powiedzieć jasno: w tej sytuacji nie ma miejsca na dwuznaczność czy polityczne gry. Zwracam się do prawicy, do tych, którzy wczoraj krzyczeli: „nie pomagajcie Ukrainie, to nie nasza wojna”. Jeśli będziecie to powtarzać, będziemy mieli prawo nazywać Was zdrajcami Polski i Europy. Każde działanie przeciwko wsparciu Ukrainy jest działaniem na korzyść Putina.

Apeluję o natychmiastowe i dotkliwe sankcje wobec Rosji, o wyeliminowanie jej z areny międzynarodowej. Apeluję o dozbrojenie Ukrainy i pełne wsparcie techniczne. Tylko w ten sposób zatrzymamy agresję i obronimy bezpieczeństwo Polski oraz całej Europy.

Jüri Ratas (PPE), kirjalikult. – Toetan komisjoni ettepanekut luua rahvusvaheline koalitsioon Venemaa poolt küüditatud Ukraina laste tagasitoomiseks. Samuti toetan kõnes kõlanud vaadet, et Euroopa peab suuremat rolli kandma Gaza ülesehitamisel ja humanitaarabi korraldamisel. Humanitaarabi peab jõudma inimesteni, pantvangid tuleb vabastada ja kahe riigi lahendus on ainus tee püsiva rahuni.

Kindlasti vajame otsustavust kaitses. Venemaa raketi- ja droonirünnakud on oht kogu liidule. On hädavajalik, et Balti riikide ja Poola kaitse oleks tugev ning droonimüür saaks reaalsuseks. Aga sellest üksi ei piisa. Euroopa peab kasutama oma tööstuslikku võimekust ja panustama rohkem julgeolekusse – peame tootma ja ostma relvastust ning tehnoloogiat ka Ukrainalt.

Euroopa tulevik ei sõltu ainult julgeolekust, vaid ka majandusest. Energiakriis on näidanud, kui haavatavad oleme. Vajame kiireid investeeringuid energiatootmisesse ja taristusse. Euroopa peab looma energiaühendusi, mis tagavad taskukohase ja usaldusväärse energia kõigile.

Eluaseme hind on tõusnud viimase kümne aasta jooksul rohkem kui 20 protsenti, ehituslubade arv on aga langenud. Kodust ei tohi saada ärevuse ja võlgade allikat. Euroopa peab seisma taskukohase eluaseme eest, see on osa inimväärikusest.

Euroopa tulevik sõltub ka meie tehnoloogilisest tugevusest. Investeeringud rohetechnoloogiatesse, kodumaine tootmine ja ringmajanduse arendamine on strateegiline valik, mis tagab meie sõltumatuse ja konkurentsivõime.

Ainult koos, ühtselt ja otsustavalt tegutsedes suudame tagada, et Euroopa jääb vabaduse, õiguse ja inimväärikuse majakaks.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D), por escrito. – La Unión Europea se encuentra en un contexto interno lleno de retos políticos y sociales de mucha envergadura, y en un contexto internacional de gigantes desafiantes por las guerras y las crisis en nuestro entorno.

La encrucijada para la presidenta de la Comisión es o seguir construyendo la Unión en coordinación con las fuerzas europeístas que apoyaron su candidatura o dejarse llevar por quienes quieren dismantlar las políticas que la propia presidenta propuso y que se han construido por la «gran coalición» europeísta, como el Pacto Verde Europeo, la Directiva contra la violencia de género, la Ley de Servicios digitales o el Pacto Migratorio.

Los socialistas españoles pedimos a la Comisión, y especialmente a su presidenta, valentía y voluntad política para afrontar los retos que la sociedad europea tiene por delante. La ciudadanía, especialmente los jóvenes, exige que se garanticen sus derechos, como el acceso a una vivienda digna. Necesitamos ya un pacto europeo por una vivienda asequible.

Los ciudadanos queremos y necesitamos la paz. Por eso le pedimos a la Comisión que actúe y se quede en el lado correcto de la historia, como está haciendo el Gobierno de España, ante el genocidio que se está cometiendo contra el pueblo palestino.

Rosa Serrano Sierra (S&D), por escrito. – La Unión Europea se encuentra en un contexto interno lleno de retos políticos y sociales de mucha envergadura, y en un contexto internacional de gigantes desafiantes por las guerras y las crisis en nuestro entorno.

La encrucijada para la presidenta de la Comisión es o seguir construyendo la Unión en coordinación con las fuerzas europeístas que apoyaron su candidatura o dejarse llevar por quienes quieren dismantlar las políticas que la propia presidenta propuso y que se han construido por la «gran coalición» europeísta, como el Pacto Verde Europeo, la Directiva contra la violencia de género, la Ley de Servicios digitales o el Pacto Migratorio.

Los socialistas españoles pedimos a la Comisión, y especialmente a su presidenta, valentía y voluntad política para afrontar los retos que la sociedad europea tiene por delante. La ciudadanía, especialmente los jóvenes, exige que se garanticen sus derechos, como el acceso a una vivienda digna. Necesitamos ya un pacto europeo por una vivienda asequible.

Los ciudadanos queremos y necesitamos la paz. Por eso le pedimos a la Comisión que actúe y se quede en el lado correcto de la historia, como está haciendo el Gobierno de España, ante el genocidio que se está cometiendo contra el pueblo palestino.

Georgiana Teodorescu (ECR), *în scris*. – Politiciana Ursula von der Leyen promite multe, dar cifrele o contrazic:

1. Comisia Europeană vrea să vină în sprijinul IMM-urilor, sau cel puțin așa se laudă. Realitatea se vede clar în modul în care au fost alocate fondurile din viitorul buget multianual. Pactul pentru o industrie curată prevede o alocare de 100 de miliarde EUR pentru marile corporații, în timp ce IMM-urile beneficiază de o alocare de doar 500 de milioane EUR. Matematic, asta înseamnă 1 302 EUR pentru un angajat într-o multinațională și doar 6 EUR pentru un angajat într-o întreprindere mică sau mijlocie.

2. Alt studiu de caz: agricultura europeană. După protestele masive de anul trecut, Comisia a venit cu un set de măsuri pentru fermieri și cu o promisiune fermă: că va transforma agricultura într-un sector strategic. Cum explică Comisia fermierilor faptul că în actualul CFM sectorul primește 0,40 % din bugetul UE, iar în propunerea pentru viitorul CFM, agriculturii i se alocă doar 0,15 %? România, de exemplu, ar pierde 17,4 miliarde EUR, asta în timp ce ni se cere dublarea contribuției naționale la cofinanțare, de la 15 % la 30 %, o povară insuportabilă pentru un sector agricol deja fragil.

Dragă Comisie, e timpul pentru fapte, vorbe am auzit destule!

Ивайло Вълчев (ECR), *в писмена форма*. – Изминаха 10 години от думите на германския канцлер Ангела Меркел - „Wir schaffen das“. За тези 10 години Европа беше залята от нелегална имиграция, въпреки непрестанните опити на държави като България да спрат тази вълна от имигранти.

За съжаление, видяхме че не се справяме. Нелегалните имигранти не са лекарите, инженерите и работниците, които ни обещаваха ляволибералната пропаганда. Политиката на отворените врати за всеки, който иска да дойде в Европа, постави под риск оцеляването на нашите системи и общества, до такава степен, че днес ние да обсъждаме как да защитим жените и децата си. Как да направим така, че те да се разхождат спокойно по нашите улици...

Според мен, Европа трябва да предприеме политика за репатриране на нелегалните имигранти, преследване на всеки, който подпомага трафика на хора, включително различни леви НПО-та, които съдействат на трафикантите, както и политика на нулева миграция. Анклавите на общности от имигранти, които можем да видим в Западна Европа, трябва да бъдат разбити, а нелегалните – моментално репатрирани.

(Is-seduta giet sospiża għal fiit)

IN THE CHAIR: SABINE VERHEYEN

Vice-President

3. Genoptagelse af mødet

(The sitting resumed at 13:11)

4. Forhandlinger forud for Parlamentets førstebehandling (forretningsordenens artikel 72) (opfølgning)

President. – The President has received a request for a vote in Parliament from the EPP Group, reaching at least the medium threshold, on the decision of the AGRI Committee to enter into negotiations on the following file:

'Cooperation among enforcement authorities regarding unfair trading practices in the agri-food supply chain'

The vote will be held tomorrow.

Concerning the decision of the PECH Committee to enter into institutional negotiations pursuant to Rule 72(1), announced at the opening of the session on Monday 8 September, the President has received no request for a vote in Parliament by Members or political groups reaching at least the medium threshold.

The Committee may therefore start negotiations.

I would like to inform the House that I have received a request for a point of order, and will give the floor to Lukas Sieper.

Lukas Sieper (NI). – Madam President, dear colleagues, dear people of Europe, pursuant to Rule 10(3) of our Rules of Procedure, I would like to raise a point of order concerning the behaviour of our colleague Ms Iovanovici Şoşoacă during the address of the honourable Maia Sandu, President of the Republic of Moldova. This House has already shown its dismay through its vocal reaction in the Chamber, but such behaviour deserves a formal objection.

While our President was ensuring the dignified departure of our guests, Ms Şoşoacă shouted that Moldova is part of Romania. To make such a pseudo-historic, imperialistic claim in the presence of a head of state of a sovereign European nation, formally recognised as such by all UN member states, especially Romania, is inappropriate behaviour that is unworthy of this Chamber.

Moldova deserves our respect. Moldova is not Romania. Moldova is Europe, just like Romania.

President. – Thank you very much. The President already took note of this.

I have received another request for a point of order, and will give the floor to Michael Gahler.

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Madam President, I rise on the basis of Rule 194 of the Rules of Procedure.

During yesterday's vote, a widespread human error and irritation in the voting procedure caused a mistake which leads to the international irritation and questions for clarification addressed to our House by other parliaments and diplomatic missions.

An amendment originally tabled by The Left Group was adopted, accusing the European Union of pursuing a militaristic policy towards Ukraine. This is now paragraph 2 of the adopted Ukraine text. I speak on behalf of the 70 % majority having adopted the Ukraine report yesterday, coming mainly from the political groups of EPP, S&D, ECR, Renew and the Greens, and I declare the language of paragraph 2 does not represent the position of the European Parliament as expressed in all other paragraphs of the Ukraine report.

We have not changed our position on Ukraine. We stand with Ukraine and we will continue to do so. The incoming corrections of the votes from the Members of our political groups will clearly show there is no majority support of paragraph 2 in this House. The Ukraine report should, in future, be considered as having been adopted without paragraph 2.

President. – Thank you, Mr Gahler, for this clarification.

Furthermore, I have received a request for a point of order from Patryk Jaki. You have the floor.

Patryk Jaki (ECR). – Madam President, today armed Russian drones fell on Poland. Poland shot them down.

Therefore, as an exception, we are requesting a debate and resolution on this matter tomorrow. This is an unprecedented situation and we are expecting your solidarity.

President. – As the agenda was adopted on Monday with a huge majority, and we have discussed that shortly before, I would recommend that you make it a point for the next agenda in two weeks, in October.

(In response to comments from a Member) There is no paragraph that enables us, at this moment, to do that, and the President was also very clear on this.

5. Afstemningstid

President. – The next item is the vote.

5.1. Den Europæiske Socialfond Plus (ESF+): særlige foranstaltninger til at adressere strategiske udfordringer (A10-0122/2025 - Marit Maij) (afstemning)

President. – First, we have the vote on the report by Marit Maij, on behalf of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs, on the European Social Fund (ESF+): specific measures to address strategic challenges (*see minutes, item 5.1*).

5.2. Ændring af EFRU, Samhørighedsfonden og Fonden for Retfærdig Omstilling for så vidt angår særlige foranstaltninger til at adressere strategiske udfordringer i forbindelse med midtvejs gennemgangen (A10-0129/2025 - Dragoș Benea) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the report by Dragoș Benea, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Development, on amending ERDF, Cohesion Fund and Just Transition Fund as regards specific measures to address strategic challenges in the context of the mid-term review (*see minutes, item 5.2*).

5.3. Kulstofgrænsetilpasningsmekanismen: forenkling og styrkelse (A10-0085/2025 - Antonio Decaro) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the report by Antonio Decaro, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Climate and Food Safety, on the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism: simplification and strengthening (*see minutes, item 5.3*).

5.4. Værdipapirafvikling i EU og værdipapircentraler (CSD'er): kortere afviklingscyklus i Unionen (A10-0095/2025 - Johan Van Overtveldt) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the report by Johan Van Overtveldt, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the securities settlement in the EU and central securities depositories (CSDs): shorter settlement cycle in the Union (*see minutes, item 5.4*).

5.5. Insolvensbehandling: erstatning af bilag A og B (A10-0127/2025 - Ilhan Kyuchyuk) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the report by Ilhan Kyuchyuk, on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs, on insolvency proceedings: replacing Annexes A and B (*see minutes, item 5.5*).

5.6. Forlængelse af fristen for oprettelse af Eurojusts sagsforvaltningssystem (A10-0152/2025 - Javier Zarzalejos) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the report by Javier Zarzalejos, on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the extension of the timeframe for the establishment of the Eurojust case management system (*see minutes, item 5.6*).

5.7. Den foreløbige partnerskabsaftale mellem Det Europæiske Fællesskab og Stillehavslændene: Vanuatus tiltrædelse (A10-0141/2025 - Dariusz Joński) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the recommendation by Dariusz Joński, on behalf of the Committee on International Trade, on the EC-Pacific States Interim Partnership Agreement: accession of Vanuatu (*see minutes, item 5.7*).

5.8. Aftalen om videnskabeligt og teknologisk samarbejde mellem Det Europæiske Fællesskab og Indien: forlængelse af aftalen (A10-0145/2025 - Borys Budka) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the recommendation by Borys Budka, on behalf of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, on the EC-India Agreement for scientific and technological cooperation: renewal of the Agreement (*see minutes, item 5.8*).

5.9. Samarbejdsaftale mellem EU og Schweiz: de europæiske satellitnavigationsprogrammer (A10-0146/2025 - Borys Budka) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the recommendation by Borys Budka, on behalf of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, on the EU-Switzerland Cooperation Agreement: European Satellite Navigation Programmes (*see minutes, item 5.9*).

5.10. Investeringer og reformer med henblik på at styrke den europæiske konkurrenceevne og skabe en kapitalmarkedsunion (A10-0124/2025 - Aurore Lalucq) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the report by Aurore Lalucq, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on investments and reforms for European competitiveness and the creation of a Capital Markets Union (*see minutes, item 5.10*).

5.11. Samhørighedspolitikens rolle med hensyn til at støtte den retfærdige omstilling (A10-0137/2025 - Ciaran Mullooly) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the report by Ciaran Mullooly, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Development, on the role of cohesion policy in supporting the just transition (*see minutes, item 5.11*).

5.12. Samhørighedspolitikken investeringers rolle i løsningen af den nuværende boligkrise (A10-0139/2025 - Marcos Ros Sempere) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the report by Marcos Ros Sempere, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Development, on the role of cohesion policy investment in resolving the current housing crisis (*see minutes, item 5.12*).

5.13. Muligheder for forenkling af samhørighedsfondene (A10-0138/2025 - Vladimir Prebilič) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the report by Vladimir Prebilič, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Development, on the possibilities for simplification of cohesion funds (*see minutes, item 5.13*).

5.14. Fremtiden for landbruget og den fælles landbrugspolitik efter 2027 (A10-0143/2025 - Carmen Crespo Díaz) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the report by Carmen Crespo Díaz, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, on the future of agriculture and the post-2027 common agricultural policy (*see minutes, item 5.14*).

5.15. Forvaltning af internettet – fornyelse af mandatet for Internet Governance Forum (RC-B10-0358/2025, B10-0358/2025, B10-0360/2025, B10-0362/2025, B10-0364/2025, B10-0365/2025) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the joint motion for a resolution, tabled by five groups, on the governance of the internet – renewal of the mandate of the Internet Governance Forum (*see minutes, item 5.15*).

5.16. Styrkelse af Moldovas modstandskraft mod Ruslands hybride trusler og ondsindede indblanding (RC-B10-0355/2025, B10-0353/2025, B10-0355/2025, B10-0356/2025, B10-0357/2025, B10-0359/2025, B10-0361/2025, B10-0363/2025) (afstemning)

President. – The next vote is on the joint motion for a resolution, tabled by five groups, on strengthening Moldova's resilience against Russian hybrid threats and malign interference (*see minutes, item 5.16*).

(The vote closed)

(The sitting was briefly suspended)

6. Genoptagelse af mødet

(The sitting resumed at 13:34)

7. Godkendelse af protokollen fra foregående møde

Die Präsidentin. – Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar. Gibt es Einwände? Das sehe ich hier jetzt nicht. Damit ist das Protokoll genehmigt.

8. Efter 10 års massemigration er det nu tid til at sætte en stopper for den og beskytte vores kvinder og børn (debat om et aktuelt spørgsmål)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die von einer Fraktion (Pfe) beantragte Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema (Artikel 169 GO): „Zeit, 10 Jahren Massenmigration jetzt ein Ende zu setzen – Schützt unsere Frauen und Kinder“.

Jacek Ozdoba (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ja już tu kilka razy próbowałem. Poczekam aż będzie tłumaczenie. Bardzo dziękuję, ponieważ ten głos jest trochę z opóźnieniem, ale pani powiedziała, że plan debaty jest ustalony w poniedziałek. Czy kiedy drony spadną na Berlin, też mamy powiedzieć, że temat został ustalony w poniedziałek? Reakcja Parlamentu Europejskiego powinna być natychmiastowa. Punkt dotyczący rezolucji związanej z sytuacją w Polsce i w Unii Europejskiej powinien być reakcją stanowczą. Chcecie państwo, jako Europejska Partia Ludowa dyskutować o armii europejskiej... (Przewodnicząca przerwała mówcy)

President. – Thank you very much. We had this point of order very clearly.

Jacek Ozdoba (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca, sytuacja jest nagła. W Polsce spadły drony rosyjskie, a Pani mówi, że w poniedziałek ustalono temat debaty. Jutro dyskutujemy o Kongo, a nie o sytuacji w Polsce. To jest skandaliczne, co pani robi. Jeżeli, jeszcze raz powtórzę, drony spadną w Berlinie również mamy mówić, że temat był ustalony w poniedziałek? To się nie mieści w głowie.

President. – Thank you very much for this. We will take the point, as we already did before, and we will discuss it also with the President.

It's not that we are ignoring what happened. The question is: is it possible at the moment? Under these Rules, we have to make an additional agenda point. That's not possible at the moment under the Rules that are mentioned and cited. So we have to check that with the President.

Jean-Paul Garraud, auteur. – Madame la Présidente, Liana. Lisa. Deux prénoms. Deux destins brisés. Deux jeunes filles européennes, l'une Ukrainienne, réfugiée en Allemagne, l'autre Néerlandaise. Toutes deux victimes d'une barbarie que nos sociétés n'auraient jamais dû laisser s'installer. Deux noms que nous devons refuser d'oublier.

Liana avait 16 ans. Elle avait fui la guerre. Elle cherchait la paix. Ce qu'elle a trouvé, c'est la mort. L'été dernier, un migrant irakien, sous le coup d'un ordre d'expulsion jamais exécuté, l'a poussée sous un train. Quelques instants plus tôt, elle appelait son grand-père, apeurée. Le dernier son qu'il a entendu, ce sont les cris déchirants de sa petite-fille.

Lisa avait 17 ans. Il y a quelques jours, elle rentrait d'une soirée à Amsterdam. Inquiète d'être suivie, elle alertait la police. Les forces de l'ordre, arrivées sur place, découvrent le corps sans vie de la jeune fille, gisant dans un fossé, la gorge tranchée. Le meurtrier présumé? Un pensionnaire d'un centre de réfugiés tout proche, déjà soupçonné de viol quelques jours auparavant.

Ces faits atroces ne sont malheureusement pas isolés. Ils ne sont pas des faits divers, comme le prétendent certains. Ces violences aux femmes, devenues le quotidien de nos filles, de nos mères, de nos épouses, ces violences sont le fruit direct d'une politique migratoire irresponsable imposée par l'Union européenne et certains États membres depuis des décennies, et acceptée par une caste déconnectée qui sacrifie nos enfants sur l'autel de l'idéologie.

En 2019, en Île-de-France, 63 % des agressions sexuelles dans les transports ont été commises par des étrangers. Ces chiffres n'incluent même pas ceux qui ont acquis la nationalité française. À Paris, en 2023, sur l'ensemble des viols commis dans la rue, élucidés ou connus, 77 % des personnes interpellées sont des étrangers. En Allemagne, les viols de Cologne en 2016 ont été perpétrés majoritairement par des migrants nord-africains. Au Royaume-Uni, plus de 4 000 enfants ont été abusés par des gangs indo-pakistanaïens pendant plus de 30 ans, avec la complicité du silence médiatique et politique. Un véritable scandale que l'on préfère ignorer.

La situation dans nos prisons en France confirme ce désastre. En mars 2025, le ministre de l'intérieur en exercice indiquait que plus de 19 000 détenus étrangers étaient incarcérés en France, ce qui représente 24,5 % de l'ensemble de la population carcérale, soit une représentation trois fois supérieure à leur poids démographique. Je ne viens de citer que des faits, chiffrés, sourcés, vérifiables.

Le déni face à cette réalité relève désormais de la malhonnêteté intellectuelle. Nous focaliser dans ce débat sur la question migratoire ne signifie pas que nous nions les violences intrafamiliales et conjugales, qui sont un véritable fléau et un déchirement pour de nombreuses familles. Mais se focaliser uniquement dessus en ignorant les violences commises dans la sphère publique est tout autant irresponsable. La situation dans les transports en commun, dans les rues, dans les quartiers entiers sur notre continent, n'est plus tenable. Et pendant ce temps, que fait l'Union européenne?

Elle finance des ONG qui aident toujours plus de migrants à rejoindre l'Europe, même ceux liés à des réseaux islamistes. Elle applique le pacte sur la migration et l'asile, qui veut répartir ces migrants sur le sol européen. Elle subventionne des projets idéologiques, comme celui d'un Coran européen à 10 millions d'euros, oubliant sans doute la place dégradante que les islamistes offrent à la femme. La Commission européenne va jusqu'à financer des campagnes de communication où apparaissent des fillettes voilées, pendant que le régime iranien des mollahs met à mort des jeunes filles parce qu'elles retirent leur hijab.

Le temps presse. Si nous ne changeons pas de cap, nos sociétés basculeront. Ce n'est pas une question de statistiques, mais une urgence vitale pour notre civilisation, nos pays, nos peuples, nos filles. Quelle Europe voulons-nous leur laisser? Une Europe protectrice, sûre, libre, ou bien une Europe soumise au chaos et à la charia?

L'immigration massive, légale comme illégale, en provenance de pays musulmans constitue un danger de mort pour nos libertés et en premier lieu pour celle des femmes. Du côté des Patriotes, le choix est fait. Nous continuerons tant que nécessaire à agir pour mettre fin à cette anarchie migratoire, à l'entrisme islamiste au sein de nos institutions et de nos sociétés. Nous voulons garantir un avenir imprégné de liberté et de sécurité pour nos concitoyens, et en particulier pour les femmes en Europe.

Marie Bjerre, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, Europe has a problem with irregular migration. It is a European challenge that needs a European response. There is a broad agreement in the Council that we must keep building a comprehensive migration policy that protects our borders, gives protection only to those entitled and prevents the loss of migrants' lives.

In recent years, a lot has been done to address these challenges. The Pact on Asylum and Migration was a historic result. It provides clear rules and faster handling of asylum applications and more solidarity between Member States. Thanks to the reformed Eurodac, we can now have the means to better track movements of migrants and asylum seekers, reducing secondary movements between Member States.

The Schengen Borders Code has also been updated. The Schengen area is now more resilient to crises and we have reinforced our external border control. The role of Frontex has been strengthened, especially in the area of returns. This trend will continue. The screening procedure under the new Pact will ensure that vulnerable third-country nationals are identified early. Also, the necessary data will be registered before asylum or return procedures are started. All of this said, the success of the reforms will depend on the correct implementation.

Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, cooperation with countries outside the EU is also essential. The new Pact on Migration and Asylum focuses on cooperation with origin and transit countries. In order to deal with migratory pressure on the European Union, the Heads of State and Government have called for partnerships with those countries. These partnerships address the root causes of migration and counter irregular departures. They should also make returns and readmissions more efficient. Currently, the EU has concluded comprehensive partnerships with key third countries around and near the Mediterranean Sea, such as Tunisia, Jordan, Syria and Egypt, as well as the Joint Declaration on Migration with Mauritania.

The work at EU level and by Member States has shown results, and the number of irregular border crossings in 2024 decreased notably compared to 2023. A final word on the important role of EU agencies in migration management: the support provided by agencies such as Frontex and the EUAA to Member States is essential to address irregular migration to the EU together.

Andrius Kubilius, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister, dear colleagues, I would like to present the Commission position, which was supposed to be presented by Commissioner Brunner, but because of agenda issues, I will do that.

Once the migration crisis of 2015 struck, more than 1 million people arrived in the EU seeking our protection. Our immigration and asylum systems were simply not designed to cope with such a large scale crisis. They were fragmented, not modern enough, and lacked a truly European response. We did not have the structures, the coordination or the solidarity mechanisms in place to cope.

Today we are in a very different situation, not because migration pressure has disappeared, but mainly because we have fundamentally changed the way we respond. Thanks to the twin-track approach followed by the Commission combining operational action on the ground with legislative reform, we are seeing results. The numbers speak for themselves. From January to August this year, illegal border crossings decreased by 23 % compared to the same period last year. Applications for international protection also went down by 23 % in the first half of 2025.

But of course, we cannot control every factor driving migration. But what we can control is our capacity to manage it. And today we are putting in place a stable, predictable and resilient migration management system, one that is able to deal with whatever challenges may come.

Five years ago, the Commission proposed a comprehensive pact on migration and asylum and together with the Council and this Parliament worked to reach a historic agreement. With the pact, we are equipping our Union with a means to act, showing that migration can be properly managed. That we, and not the criminal smuggling networks, decide who enters the EU and on what grounds. Since its adoption last year, we have worked with the Member States for the pact to make a difference on the ground.

Next month, we will launch the first annual migration management cycle. In parallel, with our proposals on safe countries of origin and the safe country concept, we are accelerating the implementation of some aspects of the pact. And to complete the puzzle, we have proposed a new return regulation for a more coherent and efficient return system that respects fundamental rights.

While the pact brings our European House in order, it is equally important to do better in the external dimension. On 10 December, the Commission will host the second conference on the Global Alliance to Counter Migrant Smuggling. We need to enter into a new era of migration diplomacy where the EU combines visas and economic incentives, but also cooperation partnerships that create win-win situations, like our partnerships with Egypt, Mauritania and Tunisia, which have already impacted migration flows.

The crisis of 2015/16 was a wake up call for Europe. It was the biggest demonstration of the need for a proper and common European migration management system. We have woken up putting in place pragmatic solutions that will make our systems more resilient, not just for today, but for the long run.

Tomas Tobé, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Europe needs strong borders and a controlled migration policy. This requires a unified approach with clear and strict rules. Ten years ago, Europe failed to manage the migration crisis. Our laws were ineffective and Europe was fragmented. We cannot keep repeating those mistakes. That is why the adoption of the migration pact in the last mandate was such a crucial step forward, breaking years of political deadlock and enabling us to start taking back control of migration.

But colleagues, let's be honest: if the far right or the far left had had their way, we would not have a common approach. We would still be in the same broken system. I think the citizens can rightfully demand that Europe has a stronger response to migration, and that is why the EPP is committed to protecting our borders, returning those who do not have a right to stay in Europe, and strengthening control.

It is easy to criticise from the sidelines. It is harder to deliver real solutions. But that is what the citizens expect and deserve, and that is what we will keep delivering.

Ana Catarina Mendes, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, caros colegas, a primeira nota que quero dar é que este debate é contrário à construção do projeto europeu, contrário aos valores da União Europeia, porque ele é, em si mesmo, um título e um debate — como aqui ouvimos pela apresentação do proponente — que instiga à divisão, ao ódio e ao preconceito, e isso vai contra todos os valores da União Europeia.

E contra as perceções e perante as perceções, aquilo que o proponente aqui veio fazer foi dizer um conjunto de perceções, generalizar situações. Primeiro, o Estado de direito existe para todos, e quem comete crimes, sejam nacionais ou sejam imigrantes, deve ser punido perante a lei e perante o sistema judicial. Segundo, o Eurostat e a OCDE têm dito, ao longo dos tempos, que não há uma ligação direta entre imigração e criminalidade. Terceiro, está provado que, na esmagadora maioria dos Estados, a violência doméstica ou as violações são praticadas essencialmente por nacionais.

Última nota, Senhora Presidente, a imigração irregular baixou 38 % em 2024, o que significa que, perante as perceções, vamos sempre ter os factos e a verdade.

António Tânger Corrêa, *em nome do Grupo PflE*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, nós, em Portugal, sempre fomos a favor da imigração, sempre tivemos imigração desde a fundação do país, há quase 900 anos.

O que nós queremos é uma imigração regulada e que se integre na vida do país. Não é uma imigração em massa, desregulada, que prejudique Portugal e que prejudique os portugueses — e que prejudique os europeus também, porque também os seus países estão a ser atacados.

Em Portugal, mais de metade dos indivíduos que estão presos são estrangeiros. Em Portugal, mais de metade dos que efetuam violações são estrangeiros. Há muitos lugares no meu país em que as nossas mulheres, as suas filhas não podem andar desacompanhadas. Têm medo, muitas vezes, de sair à rua a partir das 18h00.

Não pode ser assim, isto tem de parar e é já. E tem de parar porque senão não só perdemos as nossas gerações, como perdemos a nossa soberania.

Laurence Trochu, *au nom du groupe ECR*. – Madame la Présidente, Lola Daviet, 12 ans, découpée en morceaux par Dahbia Benkired, Algérienne sous OQTF. Philippine Lenoir, 19 ans, tuée au bois de Boulogne par Taha Oualidat, Marocain sous OQTF. Johanna Blanes, 24 ans, violée et tuée à Mont-de-Marsan par Hussein Ahmed, réfugié syrien. Nadine Devillers, 60 ans, et Simone Barreto Silva, 44 ans, égorgées et poignardées dans la basilique de Nice par un Tunisien arrivé en Europe grâce à une ONG.

Mes chers collègues, ces exemples ne représentent qu'une infime partie des victimes de l'immigration et le refus du réel tue tout autant nos femmes et nos enfants. Cette évidence du lien direct entre immigration et insécurité, plus personne de sensé ne la nie.

Après les viols de Cologne, après les «grooming gangs» du Royaume-Uni, après les attentats de Paris, il se trouve encore des irresponsables politiques, dans cette assemblée notamment, pour fermer les yeux et accuser de racisme ceux qui sonnent le tocsin.

À toutes ces femmes, à toutes ces mères, à toutes ces familles fauchées par la lâcheté, il faudra rendre des comptes. À nos enfants, nous devons dire ce que nous avons fait ou non pour répondre au principal défi du XXI^e siècle.

Fabienne Keller, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire Kubilius, Madame la Ministre des affaires européennes, chère Marie Bjerre, chers collègues, je répète ce que j'ai dit lundi lors de mon rappel au règlement intérieur: ce débat mis à l'agenda par l'extrême droite est un faux débat, qui instrumentalise les peurs et manipule les chiffres.

Débattons des faits. Contrairement aux obsessions de l'extrême droite, les entrées irrégulières dans l'Union ont baissé de 38 % en un an, vous l'avez rappelé, Madame la Ministre. L'Union européenne agit avec fermeté pour réduire l'immigration illégale tout en accueillant avec humanité ceux qui sont persécutés. Le 15 octobre prochain, vous l'avez rappelé, Monsieur le Commissaire, la Commission va présenter pour la première fois un rapport annuel sur l'asile et sur la situation migratoire. C'est une nouvelle étape dans la mise en œuvre du pacte sur la migration et l'asile, qui entrera pleinement en vigueur dans un an.

J'en appelle donc à l'esprit de responsabilité de cet hémicycle, comme l'a proposé Thomas Tobé à l'instant. Travaillons ensemble à appliquer avec rigueur et fermeté les règles communes du pacte sur la migration et l'asile pour gérer, en Européens, la migration, en respectant les droits fondamentaux des demandeurs d'asile.

Mélissa Camara, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, protéger les femmes et les enfants? Oui, de l'extrême droite.

En Pologne, les restrictions du droit à l'avortement par l'extrême droite ont plongé des milliers de femmes dans la détresse. Certaines en sont mortes parce qu'on leur a refusé d'avorter, même quand leur vie était en danger. Dans la Hongrie de Viktor Orbán, la mortalité maternelle atteint 12 à 15 décès pour 100 000 naissances. C'est deux fois plus que la moyenne de l'Union européenne. Voilà donc votre protection des femmes!

Une lesbienne sur sept a été agressée en Europe. Un tiers des personnes trans passées par les thérapies de conversion a tenté de se suicider. Et partout en Europe, ces tortures ont lieu dans le sillage de votre agenda à la fois transphobe et homophobe. Deux tiers des enfants LGBT sont harcelés à l'école. Qui protège les enfants queers?

Alors, qui menace vraiment les femmes et les enfants en Europe? Celles et ceux qui retirent des droits, ferment les yeux sur les violences et instrumentalisent leur vie pour leur immonde propagande raciste.

Protéger, ce n'est pas exclure. Protéger, c'est garantir la santé, l'égalité et la liberté. Quand l'extrême droite avance, ne soyons pas dupes, nos droits reculent. Et nous, féministes, nous serons toujours là pour défendre nos droits face à l'internationale réactionnaire.

President. – *(In response to a Member wearing a t-shirt bearing a political slogan)* That is against our rules. Please respect that the next time.

Irene Montero, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señora presidenta, cuando una mujer denuncia una agresión sexual, ustedes, la extrema derecha, nos llaman locas, mentirosas, putas, «feminazis». Dicen que buscamos fama o dinero, que algo habremos hecho, que vamos provocando y así ningún hombre se puede resistir a violarnos, que la culpa es nuestra por ir borrachas.

Ustedes hablan de denuncias falsas, publican nuestras fotos y la dirección de nuestras casas. Ustedes llaman «divorcio duro» a la violencia de género. Defienden a los maltratadores que ejercen violencia económica, a los que ponen todo su empeño en hacer daño a las madres y darles donde más les duele. Ustedes defienden poner en riesgo a niños y a niñas obligándoles a vivir con sus padres maltratadores.

Ustedes tapan las agresiones sexuales de miles de curas a niños y niñas en España. Ustedes miran para otro lado cuando asesinan a un chico al grito de «maricón». Y ustedes dicen que el problema no es la violencia machista, sino los pobres hombres a los que el feminismo está destrozando la vida con denuncias falsas.

Déjenos en paz: no somos sus mujeres, no somos su propiedad ni un objeto propiedad de nadie. Precisamente, porque se creen que somos su propiedad, nos agreden y nos asesinan diciendo: «La maté porque era mía».

No son las personas migrantes las que nos ponen en peligro. Son ustedes: racistas, machistas y fascistas.

Ewa Zajączkowska-Hernik, *w imieniu grupy ESN*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! W Niemczech ostatnio imigrant wpełznął szesnastolatkę pod płótno. Kilka lat temu inny imigrant zabił w ten sam sposób ośmiolatkę. W styczniu w Bawarii imigrant zaatakował nożem grupę przedszkolaków. Zabił dwulatka i jego obrońcę. W Polsce tylko w jednym regionie w tym roku zginęło dwoje Polaków od ataków nożem przez imigrantów.

Nielegalna imigracja na teren państw Unii Europejskiej utrzymuje się na bardzo wysokim poziomie. Mamy rocznie kilkaset tysięcy nielegalnych przekroczeń granicy. Państwa nie poradziły sobie z efektami rekordowego roku 2015, kiedy ponad milion osiemset tysięcy osób nielegalnie przekroczyło granicę Unii Europejskiej. Przez ostatnie 10 lat nie ma rozliczeń politycznych za tę katastrofę, za rosnące zagrożenia dla strefy Schengen i istotne powiązania przemytników z lewicowymi organizacjami pozarządowymi.

Ile żyć musi jeszcze zostać poświęconych, żeby lewicowy mainstream nie wspierał obecnej patologii? Dlatego czas najwyższy powołać komisję śledczą Parlamentu Europejskiego do spraw nielegalnej imigracji w Unii Europejskiej, by wyjaśnić, dlaczego Unia Europejska nie chce poradzić sobie z masową legalną i nielegalną imigracją.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Voorzitter, op 19 augustus in Nederland werd Lisa, 17 jaar oud, op gruwelijke wijze vermoord. Een verdachte werd gearresteerd in een asielzoekerscentrum. Een jong leven weggerukt, een gezin gebroken. Dit is meer dan een persoonlijke tragedie. Dit raakt aan ons gevoel van veiligheid en aan de fundamenten van onze samenleving.

Maar juist in zulke momenten van groot verdriet en diepe emotie, moeten we oppassen voor al te politieke reflexen. Van de uiterst rechtse zijde klinkt een framing die angst zaait en migratie reduceert tot een bedreiging voor onze vrouwen en kinderen. En daarmee speel je mensen tegen elkaar uit zonder echte oplossingen te bieden. Tegelijkertijd wordt aan de linkerkant te vaak gedaan alsof migratie slechts een opvang is uit solidariteit. Alsof er geen grenzen mogen zijn aan opvang, huisvesting of integratie. Alsof de draagkracht van onze samenleving onbeperkt is. Ook daarmee worden de zorgen van veel burgers te gemakkelijk terzijde geschoven.

Wij nemen veiligheid en draagkracht serieus, maar blijven tegelijkertijd trouw aan die menselijke waardigheid. We willen snelle en rechtvaardige procedures en een integratiebeleid dat echt werkt. Wie in Europa veiligheid zoekt, moet die veiligheid ook respecteren. En wie onveiligheid veroorzaakt, moet daarvoor direct de gevolgen dragen. Ja, we hebben een opdracht om onze vrouwen en kinderen beter te beschermen. Als vrouwen zich niet veilig voelen op onze straten, dan verliezen we als samenleving de kern van onze vrijheid. We kunnen migratie niet reduceren tot enkel angst en we kunnen ook niet wegstijgen waar veiligheid in het geding is.

Lina Gálvez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, la identificación que hace la extrema derecha de la inmigración con la violencia contra las mujeres y las niñas es simplemente falsa. No se basa en ninguna evidencia y hay muchísimos estudios que la desmienten. Piensen solo en Pelicot y sus colegas, si vinieron o no vinieron en patera. Pero claro, la ignorancia es la base del racismo.

Su discurso genera desinformación y es un discurso de odio nauseabundo, que incita al miedo de la violencia contra las mujeres que ustedes mismos niegan. Es que ustedes niegan que exista una violencia estructural contra las mujeres, tapan su propia violencia machista.

Ustedes han sido muy hábiles en atraer una parte del electorado masculino, pero, claro, el femenino se les resiste y de ahí que nos intenten conquistar con estas cosas. Necesitan meternos miedo con el extranjero, porque nos necesitan para alcanzar su plan racista, su plan xenófobo, para agitar la fábula del «gran reemplazo», su plan de ingeniería socioeconómica autoritaria que solo quiere controlar nuestros cuerpos y nuestras vidas.

Dejen de utilizarnos para otros fines y acompañennos para conseguir los derechos de las mujeres en igualdad.

Harald Vilimsky (Pfe). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Vor rund zehn Jahren hat Angela Merkel den wahrscheinlich schicksalsträchtigsten Schlag gegen Europa überhaupt in der letzten Dekade ausgeführt, als sie gesagt hat „Wir schaffen das“ und über 10 Millionen Menschen aus Arabien und Afrika zu uns geströmt sind – Menschen, wo zwei Drittel keinerlei Schutzbedürfnis haben, weder Genfer Konvention noch humanitär, noch subsidiär irgendeine Schutzberechtigung haben. Und mit dieser Welle an illegalen Migranten sind auch wirtschaftliche Probleme, soziale Probleme, kulturelle Probleme einhergegangen, und auch Terror ist einhergegangen: Bataclan-Theater, Flughafen in Brüssel, in Straßburg am Weihnachtsmarkt und, und, und.

Und eines der für mich beeindruckendsten Werke in diesem Zusammenhang ist ein Buch, das jetzt herausgekommen ist, von einem Landsmann von mir, von Gerald Grosz, mit dem Titel „Merkels Werk – Unser Untergang“. Er zitiert viele europäische Staatsmänner, unter anderem den ehemaligen Innenminister und nunmehrigen Parteichef der FPÖ in Österreich, Herbert Kickl, der das sagt – und genau das bringt es auf den Punkt: Man schert sich keinen Deut für die Interessen der Bevölkerung und macht ausschließlich, wofür man von der linken Schickleria Applaus erhält; das ist das, was stattgefunden hat. Und weitere Analysen von Viktor Orbán bis Tino Chrupalla: Ich kann nur jedem empfehlen, lesen Sie dieses Buch, das ist die perfekte Contra-Meinung. ...

(Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Die Präsidentin. – Herr Vilimsky, es ist nach unseren Regeln nicht erlaubt, hier Bücher zu zeigen, genauso wenig wie T-Shirts zu tragen mit politischen Aufdrucken. Ich bitte Sie, das Buch fortzutun, und ich bitte Sie jetzt auch, Ihre Redezeit zu beenden, weil die ist schon lange vorbei. Danke schön!

Herr Vilimsky, wir haben Regeln. Bitte respektieren Sie auch Ihre Redezeit! Sie waren schon eine halbe Minute drüber. Vielen Dank! Sie können gerne zu Ihrem Platz gehen und der Debatte weiter folgen.

Alessandro Ciriani (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, per anni questo Parlamento ha preferito chiudere gli occhi di fronte alla realtà. Si è parlato di accoglienza illimitata, di porte aperte, come se i nostri Stati fossero in grado di assorbire senza conseguenze un flusso continuo di arrivi.

Oggi, però, anche chi negava l'evidenza è costretto a riconoscere la realtà: quel modello è fallito. La migrazione non è più un terreno di scontro ideologico. Con realismo dobbiamo ammettere che i nostri sistemi sociali di accoglienza non possono reggere una pressione di queste dimensioni e che così nessuna integrazione è possibile.

Il risultato è che i diritti di chi fugge davvero da guerre e persecuzioni vengono calpestati, perché il sistema crolla sotto il peso di chi entra senza alcun titolo. E, ovviamente, i risvolti sulla sicurezza dei nostri cittadini sono sotto gli occhi di tutti. I fatti di cronaca parlano da soli: interi quartieri diventati zone rosse, dove degrado e violenze sono purtroppo all'ordine del giorno.

Per questo si apre oggi una delle stagioni più decisive; in quest'Aula discutiamo strumenti concreti come il rafforzamento dei rimpatri, l'applicazione coerente del principio di «paese terzo sicuro» e la lista comune dei paesi sicuri.

Abir Al-Sahlan (Renew). – Madam President, this debate is both factually and morally wrong. Wrong, wrong, wrong. And two factual wrongs you will find already in the name of this debate. There is no mass migration to Europe, but in fact, there is a 66 % drop in the applications of asylum. The second wrong is the EU-wide data shows that sexual violence is committed by EU nationals, by men who are known to the women in their own homes. The common denominator here is spelled M-E-N, men. That is where the wrong is.

The far right are twisting facts into an ignorant, hate-fuelled portrayal of migrants. Correlation does not equal causality. Women's rights organisations are rejecting your cynical weaponisation of our pain for your racist agenda. I have my voice. Don't you dare claim to represent it.

Anna Strolenberg (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, ending mass migration to protect our women and children is the title of this debate, chosen by my colleagues on the far right.

Colleagues, you can do better than this: every opportunity you get to dehumanise migrants, you take it again and again and again, and now you're even exploiting the murder of a Dutch woman for your own political agenda.

It is true: women do get murdered, but not by migrants – mostly by their partners, ex-partners or men close to them. The only thing you do is to spread fear. I have a different fear. In my country, the Netherlands, calls to domestic violence hotlines are at a record high, and every eight days a woman does get murdered.

So if you are truly worried about women, then do what you have failed to do before: fight with us. I would say: build shelters for women, educate men, invest in prevention, train agents at recognising abuse and call all countries to sign the Istanbul Convention.

Colleagues, we will not dehumanise. We will organise to end femicide.

PREDSEDÁ: MARTIN HOJSÍK

Podpredseda

Özlem Demirel (The Left). – Herr Präsident! Unverfroren streuen hier die Rechtspopulisten Hass und Hetze. Sie sprühen ihr Gift und wollen Menschen gegeneinander ausspielen. Das Problem ist aber auch, dass die Politik der Kommission, der Regierenden, und der Kniefall der Konservativen den Rechten immer weiter die Tür öffnen, um weitergehen zu können.

Sie sagen, Sie wollen über Frauenrechte und Kinderrechte reden? Dann lassen Sie uns doch über Femizide reden! Lassen Sie uns doch über häusliche Gewalt reden! Lassen Sie uns doch darüber reden, wie wir Frauenhäuser erweitern können! Das wollen Sie nicht, Sie wollen keine Lösung.

Sie wollen über Kinderrechte reden? Lassen Sie uns über Familienarmut reden! Lassen Sie uns darüber reden, dass wir keine Chancengerechtigkeit in der Bildung haben! Lassen Sie uns über die echten Probleme der Menschen reden, über Rente, über Sozialpolitik! Das wollen Sie nicht, denn die Superreichen spenden Ihnen viel Geld für Ihre Schnittchenfeiern.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Sie wollen Hass und Hetze schüren, Sie wollen keine Lösungen, keine Antworten. Wir wollen endlich die echten Debatten, die die Bürgerinnen und Bürger hier in diesem Lande oder in Europa wirklich interessieren. Tun Sie das! Hören Sie auf mit Ihrer Hass-und-Hetze-Politik!

Zsuzsanna Borvendég (ESN). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Tudják, mi a különbség Budapest és Brüsszel között? Ha otthon durranást hallok az utcán, az jut eszembe, hogy egy autó defektet kapott. Ha Brüsszelben hallok hasonlót, fedezéket keresek. Migrációs háttérű bandák lövöldöznek Európa fővárosában. A város ügyésze halálos fenyegetések miatt rendőri védelem alatt él. A nyugati városokban, a migránsok lakta gettóban már nincs európai jogrend. A bűncselekmények száma az egekbe szökött. A jóléti és biztonságot adó állam a múlté. Elvárják, hogy bűnös politikájuk végzetes következményeit mindenki viselje. Sőt, azokat büntetik, akik kimondják az igazságot itt a Parlamentben is. Magyarországot napi egymillió eurós bírsággal, bírsággal sújtják, amiért kártérítés kerítéssel védi a schengeni határokat.

Bár a vendégmunkások beáramlását is aggasztónak tartom, de a kerítéssel mégis Európa védőbástyája vagyunk. Nem akarunk hősök lenni, csak békében akarunk élni. Fizessék ki végre a határvédelmi költségeinket, és védjék meg Önök is az európai embereket!

Lena Düpont (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister, what have we found last term? We found Member States that were not able to conclude on a common asylum and migration policy. We found a Parliament that had led heavy discussions, intense debate, in order to find a way forward.

What have we done? We are taking stock of the common asylum and migration policy, what was left of it from the previous term before that. And we are taking that stock critically because we saw the Dublin transferees, for example, were and are still dysfunctional. But why so? Because they were not connected to solidarity. Because we did not find the right balance between frontline Member States and Member States of secondary movement.

We added safeguards against secondary movement. We added an efficient procedure with the border procedure, and we added the Eurodac in order to prevent double and triple applications. We are also taking stock of the geopolitical situation because it had changed in the meantime. So we added something on instrumentalisation in order to defend the Member States that were faced with that, and we are still doing that.

Are we done yet? No, we are not. We see that the numbers are going down, but there are still deficiencies in the system. There are still loopholes that can be exploited. And make no mistake, this system is exploited by criminal gangs, by networks, by smugglers, and, of course, also by third-country actors. We should not let that out of mind.

So we focus now on the missing pieces to the pack, which is the return policy, which is the safe third country concept and the safe country of origins. And we will continue with that, with a strengthened Europol, with a strengthened Frontex, and a stronger answer when it comes to a sanctions regime on organised crime and smuggling business.

Anders Vistisen (PfE). – Mr President, in 2020, a 15-year-old German girl was gang-raped by nine different migrants in a Hamburg city park. In October last year, a 12-year-old girl was murdered in Paris by a Nigerian migrant who had already been ordered to leave the country. And just eight weeks ago, a 16-year-old Ukrainian refugee was pushed in front of a train in Germany and killed by an Iraqi migrant under deportation orders.

These are not individual examples. In Denmark alone, over the last 10 years, 1 in 3 women killed were killed by a migrant. Without mass migration, countless European women and children would still be alive today, spared from violence, abuse and exploitation.

When will the Commission and the majority in this Parliament begin to take the side of the victims instead of the side of the perpetrators? When will you put the safety of our mothers, sisters and daughters above your failed ideology? I fear never, but already now it's too late.

Kristoffer Storm (ECR). – Hr. formand! De sidste 10 år har været en katastrofe for Europa. Migrationen mod Europa har alt for længe været totalt ude af kontrol, så vi står nu over for en udfordring, der ikke bare kræver vores opmærksomhed, den kræver handling – rigtig handling, ikke bare snak!

Den massive migration fra muslimske lande har medført en kultur, hvor voldtægter og kriminalitet er dagligdag. Og det, kære kollegaer, er konsekvensen af venstrefløjens naive og landsskadelige politik. Og dem, som betaler den største pris, det er vores kvinder, og det er vores børn, men alle kvinder og alle børn fortjener at føle sig trygge.

Derfor skal vi tage et opgør med de regler, der i øjeblikket forhindrer os i at afvise og udvise uønskede indvandrere. Vi skal have mulighed for at træffe beslutninger, der gavner vores samfund og beskytter vores borgere mod migrationen. Derfor er det på tide, at vi får vendt udviklingen og genoprettet Europa oven på de massive ødelæggelser, som Socialdemokraterne og deres venner på venstrefløjen har skabt.

Raquel García Hermida-Van Der Walle (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister, I actually came here to have a serious debate on root causes of criminality and violence against women, but I'm not going to do that because I'm not going to legitimise this intention of this debate after what we have heard today from the extreme right to demonise entire groups of people and put them aside and put groups of people against one another.

Because if the extreme right was interested in fixing the problems which might come with migration, they would be working constructively to implement a good migration pact and everything which comes with it.

If the extreme right was interested in the rights of women, my own daughters, they would not be voting as they do in the Netherlands against more money to combat femicide.

And if the extreme right was interested in building a healthy society where we can live with one another, they would not have put this debate forward. I refuse.

Mary Khan (ESN). – Herr Präsident! So, vielleicht an die Vorrednerin: Die AfD hat schon vor zehn Jahren gesagt: „Wir schaffen es nicht“. Und deshalb bin ich auch dieser Partei beigetreten, weil sie damals schon vorhergesehen hat, dass wir es nicht schaffen werden, Tür und Tor für jeden zu öffnen.

Und sie hatte auch recht damit. Denn heute, zehn Jahre später, liegen uns die blutigen Zahlen vor: Alle 30 Minuten verübt ein Ausländer eine Messerattacke in Deutschland, jeden Tag zwei Gruppenvergewaltigungen und unzählige islamistische Anschläge. Das Blut dieser Opfer klebt genau an Ihren Händen. Und das Widerliche ist: keine Reue, keine Entschuldigung, kein Rücktritt. Stattdessen will man weitermachen.

Aber warum auch? Sie fahren mit Ihrem Dienstwagen. Ihre Kinder müssen nicht auf Brennpunktschulen gehen, und Sie können jederzeit umziehen, wenn in Ihrer Wohngegend ein Flüchtlingslager platziert wird. Die Leidtragenden, gerade bei mir in Deutschland, sind die Schwächsten der Gesellschaft: die Mutter, die ihr Kind nicht auf eine Privatschule schicken kann; das Mädchen, das nicht von seinen Eltern abgeholt werden kann. Und ich werde Ihnen versprechen, wir werden die Verantwortlichen ...

(Der Präsident entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, pour essayer de revenir à la raison, revenons aussi aux faits. Certains contestent depuis tout à l'heure le titre même de ce débat. Mais le lien entre l'immigration et la délinquance, si nous regardons les faits, ne fait aucun doute.

Prenez quelques grandes villes de France. À Paris, 14 % de la population est d'origine étrangère, 48 % des mis en cause dans les faits de délinquance sont d'origine étrangère. À Marseille, 11 % d'étrangers, 55 % d'étrangers parmi ceux qui sont mis en cause pour des faits de délinquance. Et c'est vrai en particulier quand on parle des violences sexuelles: en Île-de-France, 63 % des agressions sexuelles dans les transports sont le fait d'étrangers.

Depuis tout à l'heure, j'entends des collègues qui disent que c'est un scandale que de faire ce lien et qui ont préféré même expliquer que, pour ce qui concerne les violences sexuelles, tous les hommes étaient coupables, plutôt que de regarder la réalité en face. Je crois qu'il faut revenir à la raison.

Le sujet n'est pas seulement le constat. Le sujet c'est d'apporter une réponse à cette situation que les citoyens dans nos pays vivent tous les jours dans leur chair. Pour cela, nous avons devant nous l'opportunité de la révision du règlement sur les retours qui permettra enfin d'expulser, en dehors d'Europe, les étrangers en situation irrégulière.

J'espère que tous les groupes politiques ici seront capables de se saisir de cette occasion déterminante.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (PSE). – Señor presidente, hace diez años, Merkel dijo que cabían todos, y ustedes aplaudieron y ejecutaron la orden, pero ahora una violencia brutal se ha apoderado de nuestras calles.

Por supuesto que alzamos la voz por todas esas mujeres y niñas a las que la izquierda desprecia, porque sus agresores son extranjeros. Por Lisa, 17 años, asesinada en Holanda, por todas las niñas agredidas sexualmente este verano en España: en Alcalá, en Hortaleza, en Galdácano, en La Laguna o en Olot. Por todas esas a las que despreciáis. La civilización se pone a prueba todas las noches, en todos nuestros barrios, en todas las ciudades de Europa.

Si importas millones de personas que no respetan a la mujer, tendrás violaciones y agresiones sexuales. Y no es la pobreza ni es la necesidad. Los pobres no violan niñas, los pobres no violan mujeres, los pobres trabajan. Ustedes son responsables: los que les llaman, les excusan.

Miren, Merkel les mintió. Yo les digo una verdad: no cabe ni uno más. La «remigración» protegerá a las mujeres.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Kryzys migracyjny wywołany przez Merkel niszczy europejską tożsamość. Prowadzi do islamizacji Europy. Skutki widzimy dziś w zachodniej Europie: gwałty, napady, kradzieże, wojny gangów. Nielegalna migracja jest też elementem wojny hybrydowej, jaką toczą z Unią Putin i Łukaszenko. Widzimy to szczególnie na granicy polsko-białoruskiej, gdzie lewicowi aktywiści, wspierając nielegalnych migrantów, de facto stali się użytecznymi idiotami Putina. Nie ma przypadków. To zaplanowane i skoordynowane działania. Dziś mamy do czynienia z bezpośrednim atakiem na Polskę. Putin wie, że Europa jest bezsilna, bo na czele Komisji stoi von der Leyen, która była najgorszym ministrem obrony Niemiec. Co więc należy zrobić? Trzeba natychmiast wprowadzić przymusowe deportacje, uszczelnić zewnętrzne granice Unii, a pakt migracyjny wyrzucić do kosza. I na koniec powiem otwarcie: ręce precz od Polski! Polska nie będzie płacić za błędy migracyjne Berlina i Brukseli.

Alma Ezcurra Almansa (PPE). – Señor presidente, señorías, yo les quiero hacer una pregunta: ¿a alguien aquí le parece patriota que se utilice la legítima preocupación de millones europeos para inyectar el odio y no impulsar soluciones?

Aquí lo que vemos es que hay una izquierda que fabrica víctimas y multiplica el problema y una extrema derecha que nos dice que todos los inmigrantes son verdugos, con independencia de lo que hagan. Y todos —de una forma u otra— llaman a incumplir la ley. Lo que tienen que hacer es reconocer, abiertamente, que no les mueve ni la solidaridad ni la seguridad, sino agitar la pena y el miedo por puro rédito electoral; y, entre tanto, abandonan a los europeos.

Claro que hay un problema de seguridad y claro que está vinculado, muchas veces, con la inmigración ilegal, pero la respuesta no son las colectivizaciones comunistas ni las deshumanizaciones fascistas: la respuesta es expulsar al que no se quiere integrar, integrar al que cumple y proteger, de verdad, la identidad europea, la democracia y la libertad. Eso sí es ser un patriota: no calentar la calle escondido detrás de un escaño, sino anteponer el bien común a los intereses partidistas por respeto a la gente que nos da de comer.

Αφροδίτη Λατινοπούλου (PfE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πριν δέκα χρόνια η Angela Merkel μιλώντας για τη λαθρομετανάστευση δήλωνε «Θα τα καταφέρουμε». Είχε απόλυτο δίκιο. Αυτή και οι συνοδοιπόροι της σχεδόν τα κατάφεραν. Άλωσαν την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με φανατικούς ισλαμιστές. Γκετοποίησαν τις μισές χώρες της Ευρώπης, μεταξύ αυτών και την Ελλάδα. Αύξησαν στον Θεό τους βιασμούς, τη βία, τις δολοφονίες και τις ληστείες. Όμως, να είστε βέβαιοι πως οι ιστορικοί του μέλλοντος θα κατηγορήσουν για εσχάτη προδοσία όλους εσάς τους δήθεν ηγέτες, κεντροαριστερούς και κεντροδεξιούς για την άλωση της Ευρώπης εκ των έσω. Μια Ευρώπη που ενώ ήταν περήφανη και κυρίαρχη, σήμερα τη δολοφονούν οι ισλαμιστές, που ηλιθιωδώς έβαλε στα σπλάχνα της. Δεν υπακούν στους νόμους μας, δεν σέβονται τη θρησκεία μας, ούτε καν το χρώμα μας, πόσω μάλλον τον πολιτισμό μας και τα ήθη μας. Ζουν με επιδόματα σε βάρος μας για να μας βιάζουν, να μας κλέβουν και να μας δολοφονούν. Ντροπή στο EPP, ντροπή στην Αριστερά, ντροπή σε όλους όσοι βάλανε την ισλαμική ατομική βόμβα στα σπλάχνα της χριστιανικής μας Ευρώπης. Και αφού τους θέλετε τόσο πολύ, να τους πάρτε σπίτι σας.

Georgiana Teodorescu (ECR). – Domnule președinte, acesta este un mesaj pentru toți moralisții care ne țin lecții despre generozitate, acuzându-ne că suntem extremiști pentru că nu deschidem larg brațele Europei pentru migranți.

Suntem aleși de cetățeni europeni din state membre ale UE. Avem misiunea de a prioritiza interesele lor, ale celor care ne-au ales. Asta înseamnă să punem pe primul loc dreptul lor de a ocupa locurile de muncă existente, siguranța lor pe străzi, accesul lor la servicii medicale, dreptul lor de a-și manifesta apartenența la o religie.

În lupta de a demonstra public cât de *politically correct* sunteți, ajungeți să îl sacrificați fix pe cetățeanul european pentru a-l ajuta pe altul. Poate nu știți, dar Comisia Europeană însăși a adoptat o propunere de regulament pentru întoarcerea migranților ilegali în țările de origine. Ba mai mult, noi atribuim Frontex pentru combaterea acestui fenomen copleșitor, suplimentarea trupelor la graniță cu 10 000 de oameni și triplarea personalului de coastă.

Dacă și Comisia Europeană e extremistă pentru voi, vă provoc să vă demonstrați așa-zisa generozitate cu fapte, nu cu vorbe. Toți cei care îndrăzniți să ne atacați, deschideți-vă casele și primiți să locuiască alături de copiii voștri câte o familie de migranți. Abia după ce faceți asta aveți dreptul să ne dați nouă lecții.

Arno Bausemer (ESN). – Herr Präsident! Zehn Jahre Massenmigration, zehn Jahre Leid und Elend für die Bürger Europas. Als die damalige Kanzlerin Angela Merkel 2015 die deutschen Grenzen öffnete, da wurde ganz Europa mit teilweise gewaltbereiten und asozialen Flüchtlingen geflutet. Dublin-Abkommen und Grundgesetz – für Angela Merkel und ihr Kabinett der willkommensverblödeten, kulturell verblödeten Flüchtlingsfreunde gab es kein Recht mehr. Es gab nur noch den Willen, die ganze Welt nach Deutschland zu holen.

Aber diese moralische Überheblichkeit nach dem Motto „Am deutschen Wesen soll die Welt genesen“ war doch in der Geschichte schon einmal gescheitert.

Massenvergewaltigungen, Terror, schwere Körperverletzung, Mord und Totschlag – kein Tag vergeht seit zehn Jahren ohne derartige Meldungen, und dennoch ist bis heute kein ernsthaftes Umdenken in den Reihen der verantwortlichen Altparteien zu erkennen – in Ihren Reihen. Statt Abschiebungen nach Afghanistan kommen weitere zweifelhafte Afghanen nach Deutschland. Statt geschlossener Abschiebehaft werden neue offene Asylbewerberheime gebaut. Statt Vermittlung in Arbeit werden Flüchtlinge mit Geldleistungen noch belohnt. Statt notwendiger Anreize zur Ausreise bieten CDU und SPD weiter fragwürdige Anreize zur Einreise. Sie hier in den Altparteien haben es auch nach zehn Jahren nicht verstanden.

Lukas Sieper (NI). – Mr President, I am referring to Rule 10(4), which prohibits hate speech.

Der Herr Kollege Bausemer äußert sich über die Ängste und Sorgen der Bevölkerung im Hinblick auf Migration. Er äußert sich über die Probleme, die mit der Migration zusammenhängen. Er bekommt es aber nicht hin, dies zu äußern, ohne die damit zusammenhängenden Menschen als Asoziale zu bezeichnen. Das ist wissenschaftlich nachgewiesenermaßen eine Sprache, die sich bereits die Nationalsozialisten, also das ideologische Vorbild des Kollegen Bausemer und seiner Kameraden, zunutze gemacht haben.

Auch werden hier Repräsentanten der Europäischen Union in den Schmutz gezogen, und das ist nicht nur unanständig, sondern widerspricht eben auch den Regeln unserer Geschäftsordnung. Es wäre also sehr zu wünschen, wenn Sie es in Zukunft schaffen, Ihren politischen Punkt klarzumachen, ohne andere Menschen unnötig zu beleidigen. Ich hoffe, das Präsidium wird die entsprechenden Maßnahmen ergreifen.

Der Präsident. – Danke vielmals! Ich habe die Rede im deutschen Original gehört, weil ich Deutsch verstehe.

But it's easier for me to speak in English.

Yes, we will look at it, but also I have to respect the freedom of speech – it's a really fine balance. Thank you for raising the historical consequences, the context that might have broken the Rules of Procedure. Please also submit it in writing.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, επί δέκα χρόνια ως ευρωβουλευτής και μέλος της Επιτροπής Πολιτικών Ελευθεριών, παρακολουθώ στενά την εξέλιξη της μετανάστευσης στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Σήμερα ελέγχουμε πλέον το φαινόμενο με οργανωμένη φύλαξη των εξωτερικών συνόρων, ενισχυμένο Frontex, συνεργασία των κρατών μελών και εκσυγχρονισμό της νομοθεσίας μας για το άσυλο και τη μετανάστευση. Όμως και κάθε κράτος μέλος έχει τη δική του ευθύνη. Η χώρα μου, η Ελλάδα, βασική πύλη εισόδου, πέτυχε τα τελευταία έξι χρόνια να περιορίσει την παράνομη μετανάστευση με στοχευμένες δράσεις. Πρόσφατα, μάλιστα, η κυβέρνηση με νέο νόμο έστειλε αυστηρό μήνυμα μηδενικής ανοχής στην παραβίαση των συνόρων προς πάσα κατεύθυνση και ιδίως προς τους διακινητές που εργαλειοποιούν εγκληματικά ανθρώπους για να πλουτίζουν παράνομα. Συνάδελφοι, να αποφασίσουμε επιτέλους ενωμένοι ότι μία είναι σήμερα η υποχρέωσή μας: η φύλαξη των συνόρων μας. Είναι πρόκληση, καθήκον και ιερή αποστολή. Και είναι βέβαιο ότι μπορούμε να την εκπληρώσουμε.

Filip Turek (PSE). – Mr President, you have launched a self-destructive strategy on Europe's energy economy and industry, with CBAM, ETS, ELV, ESG and other absurd acronyms. And now you take it to an extreme. You want central and eastern Europe to carry the bad karma of your colonial past and your failed social policies: 'Wir schaffen das.' In this way, you will break the very soul of Europe.

As Gabriel Attal said about the migration pact, the West had convinced eastern countries to accept migrants or to contribute financially to the management of migration. But believe me, the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia, Hungary and others without colonial guilt or the burden of World War II will never accept the relocation of your migrants to our lands.

Paolo Inselvini (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'immigrazionismo e l'ideologia globalista rappresentano una sciagura per l'Europa e per il mondo intero. Il desiderio di eliminare le nazioni, le identità e le differenze rappresenta una distopia distruttiva: lo è in teoria e si sta purtroppo dimostrando nella pratica.

Per troppi anni speculatori senza scrupoli, come Soros, e trafficanti di esseri umani si sono arricchiti senza badare a chi muore in mare, fregandosene degli scontri sociali, del disordine e della perdita di radici.

Questa visione danneggia i popoli che subiscono l'immigrazione, ma anche le persone che si spostano e i paesi di partenza stessi. L'Italia, infatti, sta facendo tanto nonostante gli indegni tentativi di boicottaggio della sinistra e di una certa parte di magistratura. E dobbiamo fare, e faremo, ancora di più per quanto riguarda i rimpatri, l'opposizione all'immigrazione clandestina e gli accordi bilaterali.

L'Europa ci segua, perché, se vogliamo preservare ciò che siamo, dobbiamo garantire a tutti – come ha detto papa Benedetto XVI – il diritto a non emigrare, il diritto a vivere in pace nella propria terra.

András László (PfE). – Mr President, the EU has been harassing Hungary for ten years now because we built a big, long and beautiful border fence to stop illegal migrants.

Ten years ago, Germany and the EU adopted the open borders policy of George Soros. Rapists, extremists and violent criminals have flooded Europe. It has ruined the lives of millions.

Hungary did the exact opposite. We stopped more than 1 million illegal immigrants. Europe, you are welcome. But instead of a reward, we got a fine of EUR 200 million plus a fine of EUR 1 million per day until we don't allow illegals into Europe. This is pure madness.

At the same time, Ursula von der Leyen visits the Polish border and announces more EU funding for it. Denmark is allowed to detain illegals indefinitely: the double standards and hypocrisy is massive. The damage you have done to Europe is irreversible. Hungary is showing however the way.

We won't give in. We won't pay. We will defend our borders. We will defend our women and we will defend our identity, and this is the way to make Europe great again.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Mr President, a parent's worst nightmare: your little girl never arrives home. You search the streets. Your fear turns to panic. You see the police blockade. Your worst fears are confirmed. She's found in the woods, brutally raped, bound and strangled with her own shoelaces.

Luna, a beautiful nine-year-old girl, lived through this nightmare. Now she has irreversible brain damage and is unable to care for herself. She is a victim of mass migration. And why? The predator that attacked her, a teenage migrant, had already assaulted a woman and groped classmates. The authorities knew, yet did nothing.

As a father of four young daughters, my duty is to protect my wife and my children. As legislators, our solemn duty is to protect Europeans. And to those of you that deny the link between migration and safety for women: how many more? Luna, Lola, Liana, Elin, Lisa, Alexandra, Saga, Philippine, Mia and Adriana. How many more will there have to be before you at least care?

Nikola Bartůšek (PfE). – Herr Präsident, Kollegen! 2015, als Bundeskanzlerin Merkel ihre Politik der offenen Tür verkündete, begann ich, an vorderster Front der Migration in Österreich zu arbeiten, direkt in den Asylzentren. Ich sah Tausende von illegalen Migranten ankommen. Mit eigenen Augen habe ich erlebt, wie einige von ihnen sich radikalisierten, und oft endete dies mit tragischen Konsequenzen.

Zehn Jahre später müssen wir ehrlich sagen: Die Masseneinwanderung löste Europas Probleme nicht; sie hat neue geschaffen. Die Integration scheiterte, Parallelgesellschaften sind gewachsen, und die Sicherheit hat sich verschlechtert. Unsere Bürger, insbesondere Frauen, zahlen den Preis, wenn Messerangriffe und Übergriffe europäische Städte unsicher machen.

Das ist nicht die Zukunft, die wir für unseren Kontinent wollen. Deshalb bin ich im Europäischen Parlament – um Europa zu schützen, die Sicherheit und Würde unserer Bürger wiederherzustellen und klar zu sagen: Illegale Migration muss gestoppt werden.

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το κυρίαρχο πολιτικό σύστημα αδιαφορεί για το λαθρομεταναστευτικό. Οι ζάμπλουτες ΜΚΟ δεν θέλουν καθόλου τέτοιες συζητήσεις και, βεβαίως, οι ζάμπλουτες ΜΚΟ δεν αφήνουν έτσι όσους αναπαράγουν το αφήγημά τους. Η αλήθεια είναι πως ουσιαστικά έχουν πετύχει. Οι ευρωπαϊκές κοινωνίες μέσα σε 30 χρόνια έγιναν αγνώριστες. Βρυξέλλες, Αθήνα, Άμστερνταμ, Βερολίνο· περπατώντας τις ξεχνάς που ήθελες να πας και που βρίσκεσαι, δεν είναι πια οι πόλεις μας. Στη Γαλλία και στη Βρετανία το πράγμα έχει πλέον τελειώσει. Ό,τι δεν επιτεύχθηκε με πολέμους έγινε με ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα. Η λύση είναι μία: αναγκαστικές επιστροφές. Τα διάφορα ευρωπαϊκά δικαστήρια να μας κάνουν τη χάρη και να ασχοληθούν με τη διαφθορά που σπαράσσει τα κράτη μας. Για μεταναστευτικά θέματα κάθε είδους, φτάνει πια! Απελάσεις τώρα και με κάθε τρόπο. Ούτε λεπτό για καθυστέρηση, απελάσεις, απελάσεις, απελάσεις! Και δεν μας πειράζει καθόλου ο φημολογούμενος αντίκτυπος στην οικονομία. Για εμάς, «την Ελλάδα θέλουμε και ας τρώγωμεν πέτρες».

Jaroslav Bžoch (PřE). – Pane předsedající, deset let potom, co Angela Merkelová řekla to její slavné, nebo spíše neslavné „*Wir schaffen das!*“, víme, kde jsme. Dnes už jsme slyšeli o tom, že tlak na naše hranice je nižší. To může být sice pravda, ale za posledních deset let, co jsme tady, zde máme velký problém. Máme zde problém s tím, že migranti, kteří k nám přišli, a Ursula von der Leyenová o nich dnes také mluvila, o kterých jsme si mysleli, že zaplní naše pracovní místa, tak se tak nestalo. Neintegrovali se, nechťejí se integrovat a místo toho si sem nosí a vozí svoje návyky, které náš způsob života bortí.

Evropská unie deset let přešlapuje na místě. Systémy, které měly chránit hranice a měly nám pomáhat řídit migraci, stále nefungují. Návrhová politika vůbec žádná není. Vidíme rostoucí útoky nožem. Vidíme největší hrozbu, kterou jsou stále teroristické útoky a především džihádistické útoky, ruku v ruce s rostoucím vlivem Muslimského bratrstva. Po džihádistických teroristických útocích je zde další problém. A to je levicový terorismus, který jde ruku v ruce právě s tím džihádistickým. Tohle není otázka čísel, tohle není otázka statistiky. Jde o naši vnitřní bezpečnost. Jde o bezpečnost našich rodin, dětí. Nestačí na to pouze hesla, musí být odvaha a různé kroky.

Adrian-George Axinia (ECR). – Domnule președinte, încurajarea migrației legale și ilegale a fost o greșeală uriașă. A generat costuri economice și sociale mari, dar și o slăbire semnificativă a încrederii în proiectul european.

Există un sentiment acut de cetate asediată. La 10 minute de mers cu mașina de la sediul Parlamentului European, oricine poate vedea realitatea. Modul nostru de viață și valorile ne sunt amenințate. Este timpul ca Europa să înțeleagă că ne trebuie un gard mai înalt și sigur, nu doar fizic, ci și legislativ. Spre exemplu, din 2020 și până acum, țara mea a oferit permise de muncă pentru peste 500 000 de lucrători din Asia, peste 120 000 se află fizic în România, alții au plecat spre vest, de aceea avem nevoie de o legislație unitară și restrictivă.

Problema Uniunii Europene este sporul natural negativ. Ne trebuie un *baby boom* care să fie încurajat și finanțat de la Bruxelles și nu vom mai avea nevoie de migranți incompatibili cu valorile noastre. Liderii politici ar trebui să o lase mai moale cu falsele virtuți. Nu așa se obține Premiul Nobel pentru Pace, cum voia „Mutti” Merkel.

Conducerea Uniunii Europene trebuie să acționeze rațional pentru rezolvarea problemelor reale, economice, sociale și de securitate ale Europei.

Susanna Ceccardi (PřE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo dieci anni di flussi migratori incontrollati, i dati ufficiali ci dimostrano un quadro incontrovertibile.

Per esempio, in Italia gli immigrati rappresentano il 9 % della popolazione, ma commettono oltre il 40 % delle violenze sessuali. Pochi giorni fa, vicino Catania, due turiste ungheresi sono state violentate da tre cittadini nordafricani e questi numeri ci obbligano a riconoscere la realtà: l'immigrazione incontrollata mette a rischio le persone più fragili, specialmente le donne e i bambini.

Queste verità, spesso, sono ignorate dai media nazionali. Andate in giro per le nostre città e guardate le stazioni e i luoghi degradati, è pieno di immigrati che spacciano, si ubriacano, delinquono, ed è questa l'accoglienza della sinistra.

Per questo oggi dobbiamo dire con fermezza che l'Europa non può più subire l'immigrazione di massa: bisogna cambiare le regole, le convenzioni, i regolamenti, perché questa è la vera emergenza!

Abbiamo speso 88 miliardi di euro per la guerra in Ucraina, ci basterebbe un decimo per fare i rimpatri di massa degli immigrati irregolari in Europa.

Ruggero Razza (ECR). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, il 17 settembre – la prossima settimana – saranno due anni dalla visita a Lampedusa, frontiera dell'Europa a Sud, del primo ministro italiano Giorgia Meloni e della Presidente Ursula von der Leyen.

Dopo quell'incontro, dopo quella prima volta in cui l'Europa ha preso atto della situazione in cui versa il Sud del proprio confine, è arrivato il protocollo d'intesa con la Tunisia, grazie al quale, nei mesi e negli anni successivi, vi è stato un evidente crollo degli sbarchi su quella rotta.

Siamo però preoccupati, Commissario, siamo molto preoccupati, perché avvertiamo una forte disattenzione da parte dell'Unione nel contesto nordafricano, con riferimento alla Libia, dove c'è la Russia che – per dirla con la Presidente von der Leyen, questa mattina – è il primo promotore dei trafficanti di uomini.

L'Europa non può rimanere silente di fronte a quello che accade in Libia.

Sebastian Kruis (PfE). – Voorzitter, in Nederland is vorige maand een meisje van 17 vermoord door een asielzoeker. Dat is helaas geen incident, maar het gevolg van jarenlange massa-immigratie. Links huilt krokodillentranen om Gaza, maar in onze eigen straten worden vrouwen belaagd door de beesten die zij zelf binnenhalen. Terwijl vrouwen, homo's en joden in Amsterdam niet meer veilig over straat kunnen, loopt de burgemeester van die stad wel voorop in Boedapest om te protesteren voor homorechten.

Wegkijken in eigen land, deugen in het buitenland. Zo gaat het er bij links aan toe. En nu willen ze ons laten geloven dat we een mannenprobleem hebben. We hebben geen mannenprobleem. We hebben een migrantenprobleem. Een probleem van massa's mannen uit vrouwonvriendelijke culturen. Een probleem van misbruik, moord, messteken, verkrachtingen, vernederingen en geweld. Want wie onze vrouwen wil beschermen, sluit onze grenzen. En wie onze grenzen niet sluit, offert onze vrouwen op. En dat kunnen wij als Partij voor de Vrijheid nooit aanvaarden.

Barbara Bonte (PfE). – Voorzitter, Lisa was 17 jaar. Ze is brutaal vermoord door een asielzoeker. Niet door toeval, niet door slechte straatlampen, niet door *toxic masculinity*, maar wel door iets wat onze media en linkse politici angstvallig doodzwijgen: het beleid van open grenzen. De waarheid is simpel: massamigratie maakt onze samenleving onveilig.

Hoeveel Lisa's moeten er nog volgen? Hoeveel vrouwen? Hoeveel dochters? Het kan mij echt niet schelen dat asielzoekers zich onveilig voelen in hun landen als onze vrouwen zich onveilig voelen in onze landen. Het is tijd om te kiezen: massamigratie of remigratie. Als wij, vrouwen, ons opnieuw veilig willen voelen, dan is er maar één antwoord: remigratie.

Tomasz Buczek (PfE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Po 10 latach najwyższy czas zatrzymać masową imigrację, zacząć chronić europejskie granice, a nielegalnych imigrantów – deportować. Dopuszczenie do inwazji imigrantów na Europę jest największą porażką europejskiej klasy politycznej od czasów II wojny światowej. Winnych trzeba nazwać po imieniu. To Europejska Partia Ludowa, socjaliści, Renew, zieloni, lewica. To wy odpowiadacie za ten chaos. To wy odpowiadacie za zbrodnie i przestępstwa szturmujących nasze granice.

Na szczęście obywatele Europy zaczynają rozumieć, że w tym parlamencie, w Komisji Europejskiej i w Radzie są politycy będący sojusznikami NGO-sów, które czerpią korzyści finansowe z przerzucania nielegalnych imigrantów w głąb Europy. Europejczykom otwierają się oczy.

Kto odpowiada za sprowadzone na nich niebezpieczeństwo? Hiszpania lokuje imigrantów w hotelach z widokiem na morze. Niemcy i Francja rozdają im paszporty. Nie idźmy dalej tą drogą. Efekty takiej polityki widać chociażby w Brukseli, gdzie zagraniczne gangi zarządzają sobie strzelaniny w białą dzień. Rodowici Belgowie masowo wynoszą się ze stolicy, a porządku musi pilnować belgijska armia. Nie chcemy takiej przyszłości dla europejskich miast. Chcemy bezpiecznej Europy.

Andrius Kubilius, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, I would like to thank you very much for your contributions. The successful adoption of the pact shows that the EU is committed to solving the migration challenge. The pact and the newly proposed measures will re-establish credibility in a functioning system that balances responsibility and solidarity, whilst ensuring that those in need receive protection and that those that do not are effectively returned.

Our focus now must be on making these legislative acts an operational reality. We count on your support to make sure that the pending proposals are adopted soon, and these policies get appropriate funding.

Marie Bjerre, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, the President knows that the effectiveness of our migration policy depends on progress on all fronts. On the internal front, those who seek protection should receive a fair procession of their asylum claims, and those who do not qualify for protection should be returned. On the external front, we should address the root causes of migration, and cooperate on return and readmission to fight the smuggling of migrants.

The support of Parliament in these areas is very important, because one country cannot solve the problems alone. Like Mr Tobé from the EPP rightly said, migration requires 'a unified approach'. We need European solutions. Migration is a European problem. More work needs to be done, but the EU and Member States have made big progress in reducing the flows of irregular migrants.

Predseda júci . – Rozprava k tomuto bodu sa týmto skončila.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 178)

César Luena (S&D), *por escrito*. – Este debate de actualidad propuesto por el Grupo Patriotas por Europa se enmarca en el contexto general de legislatura en curso y del panorama político actual marcado por un viraje significativo hacia la derecha y la extrema derecha, que ha influido profundamente en la configuración del espectro político y en las prioridades parlamentarias.

La extrema derecha ha aprovechado este debate para, una vez más, difundir su discurso antimigratorio y xenófobo, empleando información totalmente falsa y recurriendo a la desinformación, como acostumbra. Asimismo, los grupos de extrema derecha endurecen cada vez más su discurso en materia migratoria, promoviendo políticas restrictivas contra la migración y asociando a los migrantes con la criminalidad, lo que plantea importantes debates sobre el futuro de la solidaridad europea.

Desde el grupo S&D, hemos resaltado de nuevo la necesidad de adoptar un enfoque migratorio basado en los derechos humanos, más humanitario y haciendo hincapié en la integración, en consonancia con el recientemente adoptado Nuevo Pacto de Migraciones y Asilo. Del mismo modo, el Grupo socialista reclama el fortalecimiento de los instrumentos que permiten una migración legal, segura y ordenada en aras a hacer frente al reto demográfico que sufrirá la UE en los próximos años.

9. Gennemførelse af handelsaftalen mellem EU og USA og mulighederne for yderligere EU-handelsaftaler (forhandling)

Predseda júci . – Ďalším bodom programu sú vyhlásenia Rady a Komisie o vykonávaní obchodnej dohody medzi EÚ a USA a perspektíve širších obchodných dohôd EÚ (2025/2853(RSP)).

Marie Bjerre, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, since our previous debate in July, the EU has continued its efforts to establish a transatlantic trade. Our basic aim remains to create fair, clear and predictable conditions for transatlantic trade and supply chains.

The joint statement sets a framework for our future work. It defines concrete steps for both sides. Notably, it gives EU companies a better position than other US trading partners.

As you know, the Commission has proposed two legal measures concerning market access for US products. These measures are the first steps in the EU implementation of the July political deal. The Council has started the examination of the two proposals. We hope we can reach an agreement with the European Parliament that will benefit our businesses, workers and citizens.

While working for a predictable framework for transatlantic trade, the Council will continue its efforts to deepen existing partnerships around the world. We have received the decisions on the signing and the conclusion of two landmark agreements: the EU-Mercosur Partnership Agreement and the EU-Mexico Modernised Global Agreement.

We count on your constructive cooperation so we can achieve our common objectives: to diversify trade and to fully deliver on European competitiveness and innovation.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, on 27 July at Turnberry, Europe faced a stark choice: risk possible economic catastrophe or act to protect our economy. And we chose the latter: the only responsible option for our businesses and jobs.

So this was not, as some have claimed, a capitulation or a sell-out or no negotiations. Far from it: it was a choice of stability and predictability over uncertainty, escalation and, ultimately, a trade war that would have benefited no one in Europe. And throughout these tough and demanding negotiations, our commitment to the EU values and its unique economic and social model has been unwavering. This model, including our regulatory autonomy, is not for sale, ever. And we stand ready to defend it, if need be also with our trade instruments. So the choice we have made was, and still is, in our best interests.

After spending hundreds of hours talking to my counterparts, I can tell you with clarity: the US is convinced that it needs to change the terms of its trade with the rest of the world. Our vision is different, but the world as we knew it will not come back, and nostalgia will not help us adapt to new reality. Making this deal is the right move for the European Union for four reasons.

First, by reaching an agreement with the United States, Europe avoided tariffs on our exports of 30 % to 50 %. This would have had a severe impact on our farmers, our carmakers, our manufacturers and our citizens. It would have severely damaged our political partnership and economic relations with the US, affecting EUR 1.7 trillion of trade every year, EUR 5 trillion in investment on both sides of the Atlantic, and 5.7 million jobs that depend on EU-US trade. To be honest, I did not hear many in politics – maybe until this morning – and no one in the industry arguing that we should put this at risk, particularly not with the war still raging on the European continent. And ultimately, we secured the best deal possible.

Second, this agreement provides more stability and predictability – vital for EU businesses suffering from volatility and uncertainty.

Third, the deal helps ensure access for European products to the US market on competitive terms, in particular compared to imports from other countries. Finally, the deal provides the opportunity to move beyond recent tensions. It creates a platform for more positive engagement with the US, with the roadmap for expanding market access and deepening our trade and investment relationship.

Given these factors, I believe that when we ask ourselves whether the EU is better off with this deal than without it, there is only one answer, and I am convinced that it is the right political decision for the EU now to follow through and implement this deal.

Honourable Members, I was doing my best to keep you abreast of all key developments over the past month. As for the next steps, the Commission has already followed through on our commitment to introduce legislation allowing for lowering of tariffs on certain products, in line with the joint statement.

We have presented to you two legislative proposals: one covering bilateral reductions of tariffs for all industrial products and some non-sensitive agriculture and fisheries products; the other relating to prolonging the so-called EU-US 'lobster deal'. They are now in the hands of this House and the Council.

We therefore stand at a crucial democratic moment. I have heard the criticism that some of you have expressed, but we now need to make the politically responsible choice and take the necessary steps to move our relationship with the US forward. I ask you for your support and assure you that the Commission stands ready to assist and find constructive solutions.

At the same time, we have to ensure that the US honours its obligation under the deal as well. As a first step, on 31 July, the US issued an executive order confirming the implementation on 7 August of a single, all-inclusive 15 % tariff on imports of goods from the EU. On 5 September, another executive order was signed, enabling Secretary of Commerce Howard Ludwig and US Trade Representative Jamieson Greer to implement the tariff reductions and exemptions in the deal.

I welcome the confirmation by Secretary Ludwig on Monday that the US will implement these commitments by reducing tariffs on car and car parts from 27.5 % to 15 % retroactively from 1 August – crucial for the competitiveness of our car sector. It means savings of more than EUR 500 million each month in duties.

Similarly, I welcome the confirmation that the US will apply, retroactively as of 1 September, exemptions from duties for various sectors, including aircraft and components, generic pharmaceuticals, active ingredients, some chemical and agricultural products, natural resources and other key inputs.

We have also worked with the US to expand the number of sectors that are exempted from the 15 % tariff, including wines, spirits, medical devices and more. We are seeking to kick-start work with the US on ring-fencing our economies from overcapacity, and ensuring that EU exports of steel and aluminium to the US benefit from the tariff rate quota.

I have heard your concerns regarding the expansion of the derivative list. I have raised this with my US counterparts and I will continue doing so until we resolve this issue. Let me emphasise, however, that our draft legislation includes safeguards to ensure that we can suspend our tariff liberalisation in part or in full should the US not respect the terms of the deal. I want to assure you that I will continue our established practice and keep this House fully informed about, and involved in, the work to implement the joint statement.

I want to finish, Mr President, by considering the broader context of our global trade relations. After all, the US is not the only game in town. In 2024, the US was very important but represented 17 % of our total trade. But we also need to take care of the other 83 %. That means continuing our efforts to diversify our trade relations, so we are pushing an ambitious and pragmatic free trade agreement agenda to expand our trade, diversify our supply chains and offer our companies new export markets.

A week ago, I was proud to present the final text for the deals with Mercosur and Mexico. The EU-Mercosur partnership will create a market of over 700 million people, with the tariffs saving over EUR 4 billion a year. And EU exports to Mercosur countries are expected to surge by 39 % by 2040. Mexico is our second-largest trading partner in Latin America, a net food importer and one of our top suppliers of critical raw materials.

Elsewhere, President von der Leyen and Indonesian President Prabowo announced in July a political agreement to conclude an FTA this September. I will be travelling to Indonesia later this month with a view to doing just that. Before that, I will also visit India, where we aim to conclude negotiations on our FTA in 2025.

We will also move ahead with our other ongoing negotiations, such as those with the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, the United Arab Emirates and Australia. We are also working towards structured collaboration with our partners in the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, known under the abbreviation CPTPP. Last, but not least, our support for the multilateral trading system and the WTO remains unwavering and we want to work together with the like-minded partners to reform it.

So we need to proceed with determination, courage and strong political will to protect our interests in a volatile global environment. The deal with the US restores stability and predictability with our number one trade and investment partner and a key ally, ensuring a platform from which we can take discussions forward.

As we progress with our global FTA agenda, we will be working with you very, very closely on all these negotiations. At this stage, I would like to thank you for your kind attention, and I am very much looking forward to your questions and interventions.

Jürgen Warborn, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Minister, Commissioner, we are indeed living in very uncertain times. We have war on our continent and, unfortunately, we still need the US for security reasons. Therefore, I think it would be very irresponsible to also enter into a trade war with the US at this time.

This deal is not perfect. I do not particularly like the outcome of this deal, but I think the most responsible thing to do at this moment is to go through with the deal and then continue to negotiate. I know there are groups or MEPs in this Chamber that would like to escalate the situation and then continue to negotiate. I do not think that will have the best outcomes for Europeans.

So it is not a perfect deal, but it is the deal that we have on the table, and we have security reasons for adopting the deal. We have to change it a bit, though. Of course we are not voting on the deal as such. We will be voting on the two legislative proposals that the Commissioner mentioned, and we will certainly have to amend it in order to make sure, not least, that it is fully compatible with WTO rules. And I have mentioned several times in this Chamber and to the Commission that I am not certain it does. I am rather quite certain that it does not. But I think, colleagues, that we, in this House, could fix that by amending the legislation.

In the meantime, we also, of course, have to continue to negotiate and, not least, ratify the agreements we have on the table. The Mercosur Agreement is really important from us at this point of stage. When we have problems doing business in one part of the world – the US right now – then we have to open business in other parts of the world. Mercosur is one. Mexico is another. Indonesia. India. Thailand. Malaysia. Philippines. Australia. There is a lot of possibilities, and I think possibilities to negotiate are better now than ever.

So I urge you, colleagues, please do not create this trade war with Trump. We do not need it. We need security in Europe and we need these deals.

IN THE CHAIR: JAVI LÓPEZ

Vice-President

Bernd Lange, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Frau Ministerin! Wir machen keinen *trade war*. Das ist wirklich der Ausgangspunkt in den USA. Wir sehen, dass wir in eine Situation gekommen sind, wo wir quasi erpresst worden sind, auch mit der Frage unserer Sicherheitspartnerschaft. Glücklicherweise ist die Zeit der Könige vorbei, wo Könige Verträge machen, ohne die Bevölkerung zu befragen. Jetzt ist die Zeit des Parlamentes.

Und Maroš: Sicherheit und Stabilität bringt dieser Deal nicht. 14 Tage, nachdem der Deal geschlossen worden ist, hat der USTR 407 Produkte aus den 15 Prozent herausgenommen und unter 50 Prozent Stahl und Aluminium gesetzt. Und damit werden auch keine Arbeitsplätze gesichert, sondern ich kann dir die Fabriken zeigen, die Kompressoren, Pumpen herstellen, die jetzt 40 Prozent Zoll zahlen müssen und noch selbst nachweisen müssen, wie viel Stahl und Aluminium in den Produkten ist – und die sind in Existenznot.

Also insofern müssen wir hier im Parlament agieren und die Möglichkeiten nutzen, auch den Legislativvorschlag zu ändern. Solange diese Situation besteht, dass europäische Firmen durch die Zollpolitik der USA infrage gestellt werden, bin ich nicht bereit, eins zu eins den Vorschlag der Kommission durchzuwinken. Hier brauchen wir Änderungsanträge.

Und wir brauchen auch Änderungsanträge zu einem klaren Link zwischen Veränderungen der USA und dem, wie wir uns verändern – sehr schnell und eindeutig, weil es da keine Stillhalteklausele gibt. Die haben es abgelehnt zu sagen: Das ist das Ende der Fahnenstange.

Und das dritte: Ja, ich möchte auch, dass das WTO-kompatibel ist. Und was Ursula von der Leyen heute Morgen im Plenum gesagt hat, dass sie froh ist, dass wir einen besseren Deal haben als andere, und damit die ausstechen können, die im Wettbewerb mit uns stehen, widerspricht doch total der WTO. Wir müssen sehen, dass wir unseren Deal in einen Rahmen bringen, wo auch die Länder des Globalen Südens eine Chance haben, gemeinsam mit uns weiter Handel zu treiben, nicht nur in Handelsabkommen, die wir schließen, sondern auch hinsichtlich des US-Deals.

Christophe Bay, *au nom du groupe PjE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'accord signé par Ursula von der Leyen et Donald Trump est un marché de dupes. L'Europe a tout donné: suppression des droits sur les produits industriels américains, ouverture de notre marché européen aux produits agricoles américains bourrés de produits interdits en Europe.

Monsieur le Commissaire, vous parlez de stabilité. Mais alors comment expliquer que l'Europe accepte de renoncer à 3,6 milliards d'euros de recettes? Que gagne la France dans cet accord? Rien. Ni le vin, ni les spiritueux n'ont obtenu la moindre ouverture. Nos viticulteurs sont les grands sacrifiés, tandis que, il faut le reconnaître, l'industrie automobile allemande est la grande bénéficiaire.

Comme l'a rappelé M. Warborn, comme l'a rappelé le président Lange, en outre, cet accord viole les règles de l'OMC. Il est le symbole d'une Europe qui cède sous la pression au lieu de défendre ses intérêts. Nous avons besoin d'accords commerciaux équilibrés et respectueux de nos filières, pas d'une capitulation face aux diktats allemands. Cet accord est gagnant pour les États-Unis, perdant pour l'Europe et humiliant pour la France. Sachez que le Rassemblement national s'opposera fermement à cet accord.

Daniele Polato, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'accordo con gli Stati Uniti è un punto fermo da cui ripartire, dà stabilità e chiarezza, come chiesto da categorie ed imprenditori.

Nella dichiarazione comune sottoscritta ai punti 9, 10, 11 e 12, la Commissione europea si impegna ad adoperarsi per fornire modifiche e flessibilità nell'attuazione di direttive e regolamenti come deforestazione, CBAM, *due diligence*, al fine di ridurre gli oneri alle imprese americane: questo è quello che da sempre chiediamo per il rilancio della competitività europea.

Dobbiamo, parallelamente all'accordo commerciale con gli Stati Uniti, procedere con i tagli di quelle normative che bloccano l'economia europea e aprire a nuovi mercati, accelerando negoziati che, ad oggi, non sono stati conclusi, come il GSP.

Gli Emirati Arabi, il Messico, l'India, i paesi ASEAN sono partner con cui dobbiamo concludere ed intensificare la cooperazione.

Da ultimo permettetemi di ringraziare il Commissario Šefčovič e le direzioni interessate per aver chiuso il miglior accordo possibile date le circostanze, preferendo la via del dialogo negoziale ai «bazooka commerciali».

Karin Karlsbro, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, Council, colleagues, there is no reason to put lipstick on a pig. The deal with the United States is not good. It's not good for the EU, nor for the US or for shared security interests. It's because of Trump, who has taken the United States out of rules-based international order and into an era of disorder and chaos.

In this situation, a stronger EU is needed more than ever. But I hear colleagues from the extremes, from the left and from the right, complain that we did not get a better deal, while at the same time doing everything they can to weaken the EU. This is not serious. Our best response is now to strengthen the single market, to say yes to more free trade agreements, to support Ukraine and to impose tougher sanctions on Russia.

We must also draw a hard line when Trump attempts to interfere with legislation that is ours to decide. We can't have a situation where Donald Trump dictates the rules for the biggest tech companies operating in Europe, or how we shall protect children from addictive use and endless scrolling of social media. That is up to us to decide. No one else.

When the EU speaks, it does so with the voice of 27 countries, 450 million Europeans, and the world's second-largest economy. Let's use that.

Saskia Bricmont, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, quelle stupeur cet été de découvrir le deal, la capitulation de la Commission européenne face à Trump en acceptant des droits de douane à 0 % pour les produits américains, à 15 % pour les produits européens.

Prétendre que c'est facile, évidemment on ne le fera pas. On a eu plusieurs échanges ici, au Parlement européen, et il me semble que le Parlement européen a été très clair. Nous voulons une unité européenne face à Trump; il ne sera pas facile de négocier avec ce personnage, mais l'Union européenne a entre ses mains des instruments qu'elle doit actionner: l'instrument anti-coercition, qui est là exactement pour ce genre de cas de figure, mais aussi cibler – la possibilité, en tout cas, de le faire – les services américains ou encore imposer les grandes entreprises technologiques américaines. Mais non! Le choix de la Commission européenne a été de donner raison à Trump dans un deal totalement asymétrique à l'avantage des États-Unis.

Alors, que vaut la promesse de M^{me} von der Leyen, entendue ce matin, que l'Union européenne décidera toujours pour elle-même de ses propres standards et réglementations environnementales et digitales? Que vaut cette promesse face à un Trump que le deal asymétrique n'a apparemment pas rassasié, vu qu'il veut revoir nos législations, qu'il critique l'Union européenne qui entend imposer Google et qu'il entend aussi bénéficier de flexibilité.

Que vaut la promesse aussi de M^{me} von der Leyen que l'Union européenne doit atteindre son indépendance énergétique quand, dans ce deal, elle promet aux États-Unis d'investir 750 milliards de dollars pour les énergies fossiles et l'énergie nucléaire, alors que cet argent doit impérativement être investi en Europe?

Le manque de vision pour l'avenir et pour l'autonomie européenne est profondément préoccupant. Nous n'accepterons pas ce deal en l'état. Nous n'avons pas à nous prononcer sur les autres aspects du deal, et pourtant c'est l'avenir démocratique de l'Union européenne qui en dépend. Nous craignons que ce soit l'extrême droite le fossoyeur de l'Europe, mais depuis un an, depuis les différentes dérégulations, les paquets Omnibus, la capitulation face à Trump, mais aussi face à la Chine, les différentes décisions de renationalisation, on ne peut que constater que pour l'instant le PPE est en train de détricoter l'Europe et de nous rendre extrêmement vulnérables.

Martin Schirdewan, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, ich finde, Sie haben wirklich eine sehr spezielle positive Lesart dieses Handelsdeals. Ich glaube, es täte uns gut, wenn Sie uns hier nicht in die Tasche lügen würden. Zölle auf europäische Industriegüter von 15 Prozent, 50 Prozent auf Stahl und Aluminium, und im Gegenzug können amerikanische Industrieprodukte zum Nulltarif in die Europäische Union exportiert bzw. dann aus unserer Perspektive importiert werden: Das ist natürlich ein Angriff auf unsere industrielle Basis und wird viele tausend Arbeitsplätze vernichten. Kollegen haben darauf hingewiesen, und Sie wissen das auch.

Und dieser Deal ist nicht, wie einige dargestellt haben, vonseiten der Europäer losgetreten, dieser Krieg, dieser Handelskrieg, ist nicht vonseiten der Europäer losgetreten worden, sondern von der Regierung Trump. Sie haben sich aber in diesem Handelskrieg nicht gewehrt, und deshalb kann man durchaus sagen, dass dieser Deal eine totale Niederlage in diesem Handelskrieg ist.

Und zusätzlich werden 750 Milliarden Euro in US-Fracking-Gas und -Öl investiert; 600 Milliarden Euro sollen vor allem in die US-Militärindustrie fließen. Während die EU versucht, ihre digitale Souveränität mit Gesetzen wie DMA und DSA zu stärken, und zu Recht gegen Unternehmen wie Google vorgeht, droht die Trump-Administration mit massiven Zollerhöhungen gegen Länder, die angeblich US-Tech-Firmen diskriminieren. Das ist der Ausverkauf der digitalen Zukunft, europäischer Energiesouveränität, der Sicherheit und des Klimaschutzes.

Herr Kommissar, Sie zementieren dauerhafte Abhängigkeiten von den USA. Alles, was von dieser Kommission von einer strategisch unabhängigen Europäischen Union erzählt wird, ist mit diesem Deal hinfällig. Meine Fraktion wird diesen Deal nicht mittragen.

Arno Bausemer, *im Namen der ESN-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Die USA können sich glücklich schätzen: Man muss Donald Trump ja nicht mögen, aber der US-Präsident erfüllt zu 100 Prozent seine Aufgabe. Er handelt im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes im Interesse seiner Mitbürger.

Auf der anderen Seite des Tisches hingegen sitzt Ursula von der Leyen, eine Frau, die bei der Europawahl auf keinem einzigen Stimmzettel gestanden hat, die bereits mit fragwürdigen Impfdeals negativ in Erscheinung getreten ist, die mit dem *Green Deal* seit Jahren die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit unserer Industrie gefährdet und die erst vor einigen Wochen mit Ach und Krach hier im Hause ein Misstrauensvotum überstanden hat.

Derart geschwächt hat Frau von der Leyen nun also einen Deal präsentiert, der unsere europäische Wirtschaft weiter in Bedrängnis bringt. Bei Zöllen auf Stahl und Aluminium von 50 Prozent sind ja auch alle Endprodukte betroffen, und genau das macht diese Endprodukte wie Maschinen derart teuer, dass unsere deutschen Exporteure die Hände über dem Kopf zusammenschlagen. Die Deutsche Industrie- und Handelskammer hat ermittelt, dass mehr als die Hälfte der Unternehmen diesen Deal für eine Belastung halten. Es wird Zeit, dass die Mehrheit dieses EU-Parlaments erkennt, dass die Kommissionspräsidentin selbst mittlerweile die größte Belastung für die Zukunft der europäischen Wirtschaft ist.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, before our eyes, a new world order is emerging. Authoritarian leaders are watching closely, waiting for the Western alliance to show weakness. This is why I welcome this trade agreement as a clear sign of renewed transatlantic cooperation – something that is urgently needed at this critical moment.

The European Union cannot afford to find itself on the wrong side of history. To those colleagues who reject this agreement and call for harsher measures, I must say such positions are deeply irresponsible in these challenging times. Yes, this agreement is not perfect, but it provides stability and predictability – qualities our workers and businesses desperately need right now – and not demagogic talk.

This deal must be seen as the only first step towards building a stable, balanced and fair transatlantic economy. We must strengthen our coordination to develop a unified strategy for ensuring economic security and preventing unfair competition. Only in a strong, competitive and prosperous European Union, supported by powerful partners, can we continue to safeguard security, stability and our shared values.

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

Jussi Saramo (The Left), blue-card question. – Thank you for your speech. You are the second one to say that it's not perfect. So I would like to ask: what are the good things in this Trump–von der Leyen deal?

Željana Zovko (PPE), blue-card answer. – The good things are that our jobs now have predictability and stability: 15 % is better than 39 % or 50 % or 100 %, or whatever. If you didn't do the maths, that's a good thing. If you are measuring high blood pressure, going over that would be a really bad thing for our businesses.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Mr President, colleagues, can I start by saying that nobody – I guess nobody – is asking for an escalation in the trade war, especially not the S&D. But that doesn't matter that this is a good deal or that the response of Europe is sufficient. And yes, I do talk to industries and workers in the industry as well; they feel the impact of these tariffs every single day.

From the very beginning, we, as the S&D, were crystal clear: Trump's tariff war is illegal, it is unfair and it is unacceptable. And on top of that, I have to say to our EPP colleagues, unfortunately – and I really say unfortunately – it does not give our people and businesses the certainty and the stability that they need. Just look at the 407 products that were added to the 50 % tariff after the deal was struck.

Dear colleagues, we can never allow for the rule of international law to be replaced by the law of the jungle. So we need solutions – and they will not come from the US, they need to come from Europe, and that requires a strong, broad and united response that we will have to work on in this Parliament.

Therefore, we urge you, Commissioner, first to look to activate the anti-coercion instrument. It will make us ready to take countermeasures when necessary in the face of Trump's threats. We need to implement a sunset clause, take measures to protect our industries and strengthen the internal markets. And third, we need to unite with our partners around the globe – like-minded partners – to coordinate our response to the US and to China. President von der Leyen said this morning a new Europe must emerge, and that requires leadership and courage. It does – for our workers, our businesses and in our future. And I count on your support to do that.

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

Jörgen Warborn (PPE), *blue-card question*. – Thank you for accepting the blue card. Well, you said that you don't want to initiate a trade war, and let's say, it is difficult times for Europe and the situation is not pleasant for any one of us. But you also say that you would like to use the ACI – the 'trade bazooka'. Isn't that as close as you would come to respond? That will lead to a trade war.

And don't you think that that will make it even harder to negotiate a better deal after you initiate the ACI? And still we know that the Member States, they do not have any appetite for this.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – Well, fortunately, I am not part of the Member States. Well, I am part of a Member State, but not from the Council. And I understand your question. We said from the start, in many debates we had in the INTA Committee that we wanted to activate the Anti-Coercion Instrument. It doesn't mean that you have to use it, but then you stand ready to take much broader countermeasures than only on tariffs.

You know, one of the reasons why the countermeasures on tariffs were not so effective in making sure that it makes some impression to Trump is because in the Council there were so many exceptions. And we already, from the start, said we also have to look at services. And the Anti-Coercion Instrument will give us the opportunity to have much more broader measures and we can take them into account.

You saw what happened exactly after this deal. Immediately, Trump started to threaten us when it came to the DSA and the DMA. So we need to stand ready. And that's why we want to activate the Anti-Coercion Instrument.

Enikő Győri (PFE). – Tisztelt Elnök úr, tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Ez a megállapodás Európa gyengeségének és zsarolhatóságának bizonyítéka. Az Unió egyre betegebb. 2008-ban a világgazdaság negyedét adta, ma 17%-át. Tegnap óta azt is tudjuk, hogy a javallott recept, a Draghi-jelentés, 11%-át sikerült csak végrehajtani egy év alatt. Ne csodálkozzunk tehát, ha az Uniót lekezelik és megalázzák a nemzetközi szintén, ahogy az a turnberry-i golfpályán történt. De tudjuk az okát. A Bizottság nem titkolta: ez egy politikai alku volt azért, hogy az USA továbbra is finanszírozza Ukrajnát. Tehát von der Leyennek fontosabb Ukrajna, mint a saját polgárai és vállalkozásai. Én nem tudok tapsolni annak, hogy az exportok után eddig 2-3%-ot fizettünk, most 15-öt kell, miközben az amerikai ipari termékek vámmentesen jönnek be. Ez távol van a tisztességes, kölcsönös és kiegyensúlyozott megállapodástól.

Ráadásul nem esett szó arról, miként kívánja a Bizottság kompenzálni a vesztes szektorokat, például az európai borászatot. A Bizottság túltejeszkedett a hatáskörén, ígért Amerikának „cheap” energiavásárlást – felhatalmazás nélkül – és beruházásokat. A történelemlönyvekbe július 28-a Európa megaláztatásának napjaként fog bevonulni.

Rihards Kols (ECR). – Mr President, dear colleagues, I guess there is a confusion. We are not talking about the EU-US trade agreement. We are talking about a political deal. So there is a long way ahead to actually reach the trade deal. But trade in general is good and freer trade is even better. So this principle really has underpinned decades of the EU-US cooperation. And while this new arrangement is imperfect, a deal, even a political one, is better than no deal.

But we need to be serious. Tariffs are back and they are not balanced: 15 % of the most EU goods, while US exports enjoy broad exemptions. That is not a sustainable model for the world's two largest democratic economies.

We welcome the political will to avoid escalation, but political will must now be followed by structure, transparency and enforcement. Our businesses are still operating in a grey zone. Legal ambiguity, regulatory inconsistency. That is not how to strengthen transatlantic supply chains, especially not in a global environment where authoritarian regimes are aggressively consolidating influence.

So three things must be pushed for. First, a formal review mechanism with a fixed deadline. Second, a clear legal framework that gives EU exporters predictability. And third, but not least, a roadmap, ambitious but realistic towards a barrier-free transatlantic trade area. That is what will keep the EU-US partnership competitive, resilient and strategic.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, ce deal n'est pas un deal. Il incarne une idéologie et une stratégie, celle du protectionnisme, celle de l'unilatéralisme, celle de l'autoritarisme: tout ce que je rejette en tant que femme politique, tout ce que je combats en tant que libérale, tout ce que je méprise en tant que démocrate.

Monsieur le Commissaire, je mesure votre difficulté et votre engagement pour vous aussi résister. Mais le jour d'après – car soyons certains que Donald Trump ne s'arrêtera pas là – souhaitons-nous donner aux Européens, une nouvelle fois, l'image de responsables faibles et cédant au narratif de la Maison blanche? Ce jour d'après, il doit être anticipé, car ni l'espoir ni la nostalgie ne nous aideront face au chantage permanent; ce jour d'après, il doit correspondre au renforcement de l'unité européenne, à l'accélération de la sortie de nos dépendances et à l'utilisation de l'instrument sur la coercition économique. Car ici, en Europe, ni l'intimidation ni les menaces n'ont leur place. C'est à nous de retrouver nos propres choix, notre propre destin.

Kira Marie Peter-Hansen (Verts/ALE). – Hr. Formand! Når Trump truer Europa, så er svaret ikke at bøje nakken. Derfor gør det mig urolig at læse i den her handelsaftale, at EU-Kommissionen lover, at vores regler for bæredygtighed og menneskerettigheder ikke må blive en hindring for amerikansk handel. For EU's bæredygtighedsregler er sat i verden for at sikre, at virksomheder ikke tjener penge på tvangsarbejde, på forurening eller på børnearbejde. Det er grundlæggende europæiske værdier, som har gjort Europa stærkt og rigt. Og nu er det tid til, at Europa ranker ryggen og står vagt om de værdier, for hvis vi først begynder at lade vores politik diktere af et USA, der fører handelskrig mod Europa med den ene hånd og forsøger at afpresse os med den anden, ja så svigter vi ikke bare vores virksomheder, så svigter vi vores europæiske værdier, og vi svigter den styrkeposition, som Europa har opbygget over årtier. Nemlig et Europa med de højeste standarder inden for forbrugerrettigheder, grønne ambitioner og ligestilling, et Europa, der er ambitiøst og nægter at være en del af ræset mod bunden. Så derfor, kære Kommission: Drop fedteriet for Trump og tro på Europa!

Jussi Saramo (The Left). – Arvoisa puhemies, Euroopan antautumissopimus. Siitä on kyse Trumpin ja Von der Leyenin sopimuksessa. Yhdysvalloilla ei ole mitään moraalista oikeutta vaatia EU:lta tukea heidän teollisuudelleen, eikä komissiolla ollut mitään laillista oikeutta sellaista luvata.

Trump perustelee tullessa sillä, että Yhdysvallat ostaa Euroopasta enemmän tavaroita kuin myy, mutta palvelukaupassa tilanne on täysin päinvastainen. Silti Trump kielsi EU:ta verottamasta vastapainoksi yhdysvaltalaisen digijättien täältä keräämiä voittoja, ja oikeisto tottelee nöyrästi.

Trump on koulupihan pahin öykkäri, joka kiusaa muita yksi kerrallaan. Orbán, Meloni ja muu naurettavaa kulttuurisotaansa käyvä oikeisto taputtaa vieressä, vaikka Trump vie heidänkin taskurahansa. Tähän ei pidä suostua. Kiristykseen ei koskaan pidä suostua. Mitä enemmän rahaa ja tukea lupaamme Yhdysvaltoihin kaataa, sitä enemmän meiltä aina vaaditaan lisää.

Fabio De Masi (NI). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Der Deal von Frau von der Leyen ist eine Kapitulation und hat die Lebensdauer einer Eintagsfliege: 15 Prozent auf europäische Waren in die USA, 0 Prozent auf US-Ausfuhren nach Europa, und nach wenigen Tagen hieß es: 50 Prozent auf unseren Stahl- und Aluminiumsektor. Das ist ein ökonomischer Genickschuss, und die EU-Kommission hat sich eben in eine völlig einseitige Abhängigkeit von den USA manövriert. Während uns Donald Trump mit Strafzöllen überzieht, hauen wir ihm bei schmutzigem Fracking-Gas und bei der Rüstungsbeschaffung die Auftragsbücher voll – das ist ja eine völlig schizophrene Herangehensweise!

Wir haben unsere Daumenschrauben gar nicht ausgepackt. Wir sind der größte Binnenmarkt der Erde: Wir könnten zum Beispiel Strafsteuern auf US-Big-Tech-Konzerne verhängen, die hier nicht ordentlich Steuern zahlen. Nichts hört man dazu! Wir könnten zum Beispiel die Vermögen von US-Milliardären ins Visier nehmen, wie es zum Beispiel renommierte Ökonomen wie Gabriel Zucman vom *EU Tax Observatory* fordern. Nichts davon wurde auf den Tisch gepackt, und gleichzeitig hat Frau von der Leyen noch zugesagt, für 750 Milliarden US-Dollar Fracking-Gas und andere Energieerzeugnisse aus den USA einzukaufen. Wie will sie das überhaupt versprechen, sie trifft doch nicht die Investitionsentscheidungen der Unternehmen!

Das ist eine Vereinbarung zulasten Dritter, deswegen gibt es nur eine Konsequenz: Frau von der Leyen sollte für diesen Deal zurücktreten.

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señor presidente, creo que se está poniendo de manifiesto que el acuerdo con los Estados Unidos no es el que habríamos deseado los europeos, pero, como decía Bismarck: «La política es el arte de lo posible, no de lo deseable».

El acuerdo alcanzado es, probablemente, el mejor de los posibles con la actual Administración Trump: con él se evita un choque mayor con nuestro principal socio comercial y ganamos certidumbre para nuestros productores. Por todo ello, valoramos el trabajo del equipo negociador en un contexto claramente adverso.

Sin embargo, quedan problemas de fondo que tenemos que procurar resolver: los aranceles al acero y al aluminio siguen amenazando nuestra industria y sectores como el agroalimentario podrían perder competitividad si flexibilizamos las normas para la entrada de productos estadounidenses.

Si la certidumbre es el argumento a favor de este acuerdo, la necesitamos para todos los sectores y que sea prolongada en el tiempo. Europa no puede conformarse con soluciones a medias: si este es el acuerdo elegido para defender nuestros intereses no podemos dejar a ningún sector atrás.

(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»)

Jonas Sjöstedt (The Left), blue-card question. – When we were kids, we sometimes met the schoolyard bullies, those who threaten us with violence. Those who asked to have our money. They might even steal your phone. You can take two approaches to the bullies. You can give them what they want and humiliate yourself. And they will most likely be back the day after asking for your money again. Or you can take a stand together with others and say, 'No, this is not fair.'

What makes you think that the bully Donald Trump won't come back asking for more?

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – No voy a entrar en las descalificaciones que hacen hacia quien ha sido elegido democráticamente presidente de un Estado. Esa experiencia que usted tuvo cuando era joven quizá yo la he podido tener también, pero hay algo que está muy claro: se ha podido alcanzar un acuerdo en condiciones muy difíciles —como acabo de decir en mi intervención— y tenemos que hacer un esfuerzo para no dejar absolutamente a nadie atrás.

¿Qué era lo que teníamos? Yo creo que se gana en previsibilidad —no cabe la menor duda de que esto es así—, las empresas saben a qué atenerse, y vamos a tener un tratamiento mejor que otras naciones. Pero hay algo que también me preocupa mucho: las circunstancias que podríamos tener de no haberse alcanzado este acuerdo. Hay cosas que son todavía mucho peores, por eso vamos a intentar hacer todo lo posible y no aquello que no se puede alcanzar, porque tenemos que ser razonables.

Y le voy a garantizar una cosa: siempre he defendido que la humillación no es el camino para andar por la vida, así que tampoco en política. Humillaciones, ninguna.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Trump minaccia sanzioni all'Europa perché non gli piacciono le nostre leggi e von der Leyen sorvola su tutto questo nel discorso odierno, ma non possiamo farci ricattare e nessun accordo può basarsi sulla coercizione e le minacce.

Il presidente del PPE, Manfred Weber, ha detto che l'accordo UE-USA non lo convince, ma va sostenuto per senso di responsabilità.

Io credo, invece, che abbiamo la responsabilità politica di dire la verità ai nostri concittadini, è cioè che non possiamo accettare l'accordo così com'è oggi se vogliamo fare il bene e gli interessi degli europei.

Il Parlamento europeo lavorerà sul regolamento sui dazi presentato dalla Commissione: dobbiamo inserire una data di scadenza all'accordo per poterlo rinegoziare entro un tempo definito; dobbiamo proteggere acciaio e alluminio e i prodotti che li contengono, fondamentali per la nostra industria, dai dazi ultra punitivi del 50 %; dobbiamo tutelare la nostra agricoltura e la produzione vitivinicola, con esenzioni da negoziare subito.

La Commissione europea ha portato avanti un lavoro molto difficile. Alcuni governi, come quello italiano, hanno da subito boicottato questo sforzo, prostrandosi all'amministrazione americana, ma ora dobbiamo reagire.

Per questo dobbiamo aprire nuove rotte commerciali per l'Europa, rafforzare la nostra economia internamente e ricostruire un rapporto transatlantico equilibrato e basato sul rispetto.

Il lavoro continuerà in modo costruttivo, ma fermo e con un unico obiettivo: gli interessi dei nostri cittadini, dei nostri lavoratori e delle nostre imprese, difendendo i principi senza i quali il mondo diventa una pericolosa arena senza regole, anche in questo campo. Non possiamo permettercelo.

Vilis Krištopans (PSE). – Priekšsēdētāja kungs, kolēģi! Mūsu rūpnīcas ir apdraudētas, mūsu zemnieki ir atstāti vieni, un mēs maksāsim cenu par vienošanos, kas tika slepus noslēgta. Urzula fon der Leiena darījumu starp Eiropas Savienību un Ameriku sauc par panākumu, bet patiesībā tas ir kompromiss bez taisnīguma un Eiropas nodošana bez mandāta.

Tagad uzņēmējiem ir izdevīgāk atvērt rūpnīcas ASV nevis šeit, Eiropā, un tas nozīmē zaudētas darbavietas, nodokļu ieņēmumus un mūsu nākotni. Pret šo vienošanos iebilst ne tikai opozīcija. To kritizē valdību pārstāvji, rūpniecības līderi un arī daļa no lielākajām frakcijām šajā parlamentā. Eiropa ir spēcīga, mūsu tirgus ir milzīgs, un tomēr mēs saņemam tikai drupačas. Tā nav stratēģija, tā ir kapitulācija.

Urzula fon der Leienas kundze! Jūsu laiks ir beidzies! Atkāpieties, lūdzu!

Dominik Tarczyński (ECR). – Mr President, thank you. Dear leftists, you have been attacking President Trump for years. Now you are whining about tariffs. You are not happy that he doesn't want to be your private bodyguard. But it's not Trump's decision to spend money on illegal migrants instead of the army or industry. It's not Trump's fault that you restricted European industry because of your green god and because of your sick ideology. It's not his fault!

It's time to be a man. It's time to take care of yourself. It's time to stop wearing dresses and be a man. Put on armour, not a dress. Your laughter will not change the fact that this is your fault. This is your fault: you destroy and make Europe weak.

So be a man; be strong; be brave; be like Poland. You're not going to laugh in a minute. Russian drones are flying over Poland and what are you doing? You're having another discussion about helping migrants. And you're laughing. You're not going to laugh for long!

That is the problem: you do not understand your position. So stop attacking us, because we are the first in Europe to save Europe, to restore Europe. We are the brave ones!

And you have laughter only because you are safe here in this building, in this Parliament. Over a million people will take to the streets of London this Saturday and you will see the unity. You will see the strength of the Patriots. Be brave. Be like Poland.

President. – I would like to remind the speaker that he has to respect the European values here, and we will discuss another day about what it is to be a man, here in the European Parliament.

Svenja Hahn (Renew). – Mr President, dear colleagues, sometimes you think: how do you counter this misogyny? And then you think: maybe just continue and show them how strong women are in this House.

Liebe Kollegen! Der Deal mit den USA ist ein schlechter Deal. Frau von der Leyen hat sich nicht getraut, härter zu verhandeln, weil wir wirtschaftspolitisch und sicherheitspolitisch abhängig sind von den USA. Europa hat die Wahl: kein Deal oder ein schlechter Deal.

Vor allem muss Europa sich zusammenreißen, um endlich vom Katzentisch an die Verhandlungstische der Welt zu kommen. Geopolitische Relevanz können wir uns nicht herbeireden, die müssen wir in Handelsabkommen und mit Wirtschaftskraft erkämpfen. Frau von der Leyen müsste alle Weichen auf Wirtschaftswachstum stellen. Stattdessen hat sie heute in der Rede zur Lage der Union die Marktwirtschaft begraben. Politische Leitmärkte, *Buy European*, Subventionen sollen kommen, aber zur Stärkung des Binnenmarkts und zu Bürokratieabbau gab es leider nur hohle Phrasen statt Taten.

Wer unsere Wirtschaft schwächt, schwächt Europa. Ohne Wachstum werden wir keine Weltmacht, wir bleiben Spielball. Wer das Mercosur-Abkommen blockiert, blockiert Wachstum und vernichtet Arbeitsplätze. Stark in der Welt werden wir nur mit mehr Handel und mehr Partnern.

Nutzen wir den Moment! Ministerin Bjerre, ich baue auf Sie und die dänische Ratspräsidentschaft. Ratifizieren Sie so viele Handelsabkommen wie möglich!

Vicent Marzà Ibáñez (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, traen un mal acuerdo, y no se lo tenemos que decir aquellos que estamos desde el inicio en contra, también lo están diciendo aquellos que intentan salir a defender su acuerdo.

De hecho, deberían reflexionar sobre si los únicos que están contentos en este Parlamento con este acuerdo —y lo defienden con mucha intensidad— son los que están al servicio de Trump. Lo acabamos de ver. Los únicos contentos son los socios de Trump en Europa y, por lo tanto, deberían hacer una reflexión, no solo porque es humillante y porque es desigual, sino también porque no genera absolutamente ninguna estabilidad.

Los únicos que están defendiendo este acuerdo dicen que va a generar más estabilidad. 14 días después, ya teníamos una subida de aranceles en el aluminio. Un mes después, ya tenemos al señor Trump diciendo que nos va a subir otra vez los aranceles, porque empresas norteamericanas que no cumplen la legislación que nos hemos dado soberanamente los europeos han sido multadas. ¿Qué estabilidad está dando este acuerdo, si tan solo un mes después ya se dice que se va a romper?

Por lo tanto, necesitamos avanzar en el cumplimiento de la normativa internacional de la Organización Mundial del Comercio y hacerlo como referentes, porque es nuestro momento. Es el momento de Europa, si seguimos anclados en nuestros valores y en aquellos que compartimos con el conjunto del mundo y dejamos de hacer negocios con aquellos que nos chantajea y no los cumplen.

Pernando Barrena Arza (The Left). – Señor presidente, señora Von der Leyen, las ciudadanas y los ciudadanos europeos seguimos avergonzados por las imágenes y el contenido de su reunión con Donald Trump el pasado 27 de julio.

Usted ha aceptado aranceles del 15 % sobre los productos europeos y se ha comprometido a compras e inversiones millonarias en favor de los Estados Unidos.

La imagen que usted dejó para la posteridad es la de una gobernadora de una colonia rindiendo pleitesía al todopoderoso presidente de la metrópoli. Su encuentro con el presidente de los Estados Unidos es la imagen gráfica del fin de la autonomía estratégica europea y pone en grave riesgo de inviabilidad el proceso de integración europeo.

Su apuesta es la supeditación económica y militar a los Estados Unidos, recortes sociales para poder seguir comprando armamento. ¿A quién? A esos Estados Unidos. Y, en consecuencia, convertir a Europa en cómplice necesaria del genocidio contra Palestina. Básicamente, porque Europa ni está ni se la espera y porque su capacidad de influencia política como actor global es tendente a cero.

Está usted resultando ser una presidenta de la Comisión abiertamente antieuropea. Probablemente, la próxima vez tengamos que interpelar a Donald Trump, quien, tras su encuentro, ya se jacta de ser el presidente de Europa.

Fernand Kartheiser (NI). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, ce sujet serait mieux dénommé «le diktat tarifaire américain», alors que la Commission n'a même pas négocié pour défendre les intérêts commerciaux européens. Obnubilée par sa volonté de prolonger encore la guerre en Ukraine avec l'aide américaine, elle a cédé à toutes les exigences, et ce dans un domaine clé de sa compétence. Pourquoi avons-nous alors besoin d'une Commission européenne?

Il faut mettre un terme à la politisation des tarifs douaniers pour en refaire de simples instruments de politique commerciale. Toute tentative d'imposer des sanctions politiques par le biais des tarifs douaniers doit être écartée. De même, la Commission ne doit pas essayer d'inclure la censure des médias sociaux à effet extraterritorial dans des accords commerciaux conclus avec des tiers. Au contraire, la censure des services et des marchés digitaux doit être abolie.

La Commission a fait le contraire du raisonnable. Elle aurait dû rester ferme sur les tarifs douaniers et accéder aux arguments américains pour garantir la liberté d'expression.

Michał Szczerba (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzy! Porozumienie handlowe z USA jest trudne, nie jest idealne, ale w obecnych warunkach jest najlepsze z możliwych. Ale dzisiejszy dzień pokazuje, że fundamentem relacji transatlantycznych jest bezpieczeństwo.

Polska przestrzeń powietrzna została 19 razy naruszona i nie było to zdarzenie przypadkowe. Odpowiada za nie kraj terrorystyczny, jakim jest Rosja Putina. To bezprecedensowy atak na Polskę, na terytorium Unii Europejskiej i NATO. Siły NATO w Polsce zostały uruchomione.

W 32. bazie lotnictwa w Łasku stacjonuje jedna z jednostek wojsk amerykańskich w Polsce. Dron spadł 60 kilometrów od tej bazy. To pokazuje, w jakim momencie się znajdujemy. Dzisiaj liczą się mocne sojusze. Potrzebne jest wzmocnienie sojuszniczej obrony przeciwlotniczej i potrzebujemy jako Polska, jako kraj graniczny, również systemów Patriot. Prosimy o solidarność.

Lina Gálvez (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, hoy la presidenta de la Comisión Europea ha dicho que la Unión Europea tiene que seguir siendo libre e independiente, pero este acuerdo comercial con los Estados Unidos no parece facilitarlo.

Los socialistas somos muy conscientes de la importancia de evitar una guerra comercial y trabajaremos para mejorar, sin duda, este acuerdo, pero no estamos seguros de que aceptar condiciones asimétricas lo evite, como tampoco garantiza estabilidad o seguridad, como se demostró solamente unos días después, cuando se subieron los aranceles a 407 artículos europeos.

Además, este acuerdo puede traer una contracción económica que puede provocar una ola política reaccionaria, desestabilizando a las democracias liberales de Europa y a la propia Unión Europea, que, tal vez, es lo que quiere el trumpismo.

Por eso, su aplicación no puede debilitar la legislación europea clave para nuestra autonomía. La Unión Europea tiene que preservar la unidad mientras se defiende ante coacciones desmedidas y protege sectores clave como la seguridad, la industria, la energía, la tecnología o la agricultura.

Tenemos los recursos para hacerlo, tenemos peso económico, influencia regulatoria y herramientas comerciales por usar: hagámoslo y sigamos defendiendo el sistema multilateral basado en reglas, nuestra soberanía, nuestros empleos y fortaleciendo los acuerdos comerciales con nuestros socios.

Gerolf Annemans (Pfe). – Voorzitter, er kan geen enkele twijfel over bestaan: buiten de beschermde bubbel van dit Europees Parlement en buiten de elitaire club van mensen die belang hebben bij haar politieke voortbestaan, zou Von der Leyen al lang verjaagd zijn. Haar Commissie is het grote conglomeraat van het eigenbelang en de *trade deal* met Trump is ongetwijfeld een kers op de taart van onbekwaamheid die door haar gebakken is de afgelopen vijf jaar.

Het uit handen geven van ons internationaal handelsbeleid aan een multilaterale instelling als de EU heeft ons geen voordelen opgeleverd. Het houdt geen rekening met de verschillende belangen. De stabiliteit die als reden wordt opgegeven voor de ongehoorde toegevingen, is een drogreden. Trump heeft, zoals het hoort, aan de eigenbelangen van zijn land gedacht. Von der Leyen niet. Daar zit het probleem, Europa's probleem.

Dick Erixon (ECR). – Herr talman! Vi måste komma ihåg att vid årets början var det EU som hade högre tullar mot USA på viktiga områden som bilar och jordbruksprodukter. Detta har fått den nya amerikanska administrationen att reagera med sin egen protektionism.

I det här läget så innebär detta för mig att det blir nödvändigt att berömma kommissionen för att man kommit överens med USA om ett avtal, även om jag personligen hellre hade sett noll – zero – tullar åt båda hållen. Kommissionen sjönk inte ner i barnsliga attacker på USA med krav på hämndtullar på whisky, jeans och Harley Davidson.

Våra handelsförbindelser är alldeles för viktiga för prestigefullt posering. Låt oss fortsätta jobba för sänkta tullar med en ansvarsfull realism.

Bart Groothuis (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, Council, as markets outside Europe are increasingly closing for our entrepreneurs, I would like to ask the Commission to open up new markets for our businesses, to finish new trade deals fast. But trade negotiations with the Gulf region have dragged on for 34 years; India, 18 years; Latin America, 26 years and counting; Malaysia, 15 years, etc. It's too slow for this geopolitical storm.

The problem is that by overloading trade agreements with additional demands on human rights, environmental or political conditions, we are stopping crucial trade deals from ever reaching the finish line. As an extra result, ratification is too slow. And let's just stop the translation of each concept trade agreement into 24 different languages. It's used as an excuse for delay.

Commissioner, your excellent team in Brussels should become a lean, mean fighting machine. We need to reform faster than markets around us are closing. Reform starts here at home and you have our support in doing so.

Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, colleagues, the Commission promised to President Trump more than EUR 1 trillion in purchases and investments into the US without any binding nature, any way to measure them, and without even distinguishing them from plans already in place.

What happened on 27 July was presented to the public as necessary damage control and to me, as an MEP, as a hidden win for European industry because we supposedly avoided 30 % tariffs.

In truth, it was little more than performative politics. It was a petty shakedown by a hostile American administration, and the costs should haunt the US for years. We can play the same game. We can fairly tax US digital monopolies and support our own digital champions. We can stop relying on US weapons and build our own military capacity. When the US undermines its global trade and monetary role we should be ready to step in when the dollar falters.

Otherwise, what are we really expecting from giving the bully our lunch every day?

Jonas Sjöstedt (The Left). – Herr talman! Det här avtalet är ett svek. Det är ett svek mot Europas arbetare. Det är ett svek mot Europas företag. USA får alla fördelar. Europa får alla nackdelar. Det är en kapitulation.

Men det är också ett svek mot det globala klimatarbetet. EU ska köpa bränslen från USA till ett värde av 750 miljarder dollar. Det kommer att handla om olja och gas. Mycket av det tas fram med fracking. Det är en av de mest miljöfarliga metoder som finns för att utvinna fossila bränslen med stora lokala föroreningar men också extra utsläpp av växthusgaserna som metan.

Det här är en enorm ökning av importen av smutsig fossil energi, en sorts belöning till Donald Trump som har lämnat Parisavtalet. Det ska inte vi göra. Vi ska stärka det globala miljösamarbetet, och vi ska säga nej till den här typen av smutsiga avtal.

Thomas Geisel (NI). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es wurde schon mehrfach darauf hingewiesen, dass der Zoll-Deal von Ursula von der Leyen und Donald Trump unausgewogen ist und europäische Interessen verletzt. Gravierender aber finde ich, dass die Kommissionspräsidentin dabei Versprechungen gemacht hat, die nicht nur inhaltlich absurd sind, sondern die sie auch gar nicht einhalten kann.

Wenn sie dem amerikanischen Präsidenten verspricht, die Europäische Union werde in den nächsten drei Jahren in den USA Öl und Gas im Wert von 750 Milliarden Dollar kaufen, dann würde das bedeuten, dass wir uns beim Gas vollständig von teurem amerikanischem Fracking-LNG abhängig machen. Aber versprechen konnte sie das ohnehin nicht, denn es wird ja nicht aus dem Budget der Europäischen Union bezahlt. Und dass europäische Energieunternehmen so beschuert sind, nur noch in Amerika Erdgas zu kaufen, kann ich mir kaum vorstellen. Insofern ist der Vertragsbruch vorprogrammiert, den Donald Trump zum Anlass nehmen wird, uns erneut zu erpressen.

Frau von der Leyen sollte ihren Hut nehmen; sie ist einfach nicht fit für den Job.

Borja Giménez Larraz (PPE). – Señor presidente, la fuerza de Europa ante este desafío reside en la unión comercial, y hoy está llamada a tomar decisiones. El pacto con los Estados Unidos ha evitado una guerra comercial que no beneficiaría a nadie, pero no podemos ser complacientes: el acuerdo suscita dudas, y esto no podemos ignorarlo. Estados Unidos es un aliado primordial, pero ahora es impredecible, lo que nos pone en riesgo.

Tenemos que abrir nuevos mercados: ya no es una opción, es una obligación, una necesidad estratégica. Y hoy, entre todas las regiones, hay una que nos interpela de manera singular: Iberoamérica, por la historia, por los lazos culturales y lingüísticos, por la convergencia de intereses que nos proyecta hacia el futuro...

Los acuerdos de México y Mercosur deben ser una realidad lo antes posible. Frente al repliegue nacional y al proteccionismo, la Unión Europea debe abanderar la defensa del libre comercio; por nuestros principios, sí, pero fundamentalmente por la prosperidad de nuestras empresas y del conjunto de los europeos.

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, soyons directs: vous avez accepté cet accord profondément injuste contre une promesse illusoire de stabilité et de sécurité qui sera malheureusement battue en brèche très rapidement. La présidente de la Commission est allée en Écosse comme on va à Canossa et Trump a pris un malin plaisir à l'humilier, et nous à travers elle, entre deux parties de golf.

Alors, n'oublions jamais: nous sommes le premier marché du monde. Nous avons les moyens d'engager un rapport de force avec les États-Unis. Et si personne n'a intérêt à une guerre commerciale, en refusant d'engager ce rapport de force, nous avons préparé les futurs chantages de Trump et nous avons incité les divers prédateurs de ce monde à mépriser nos principes comme nos intérêts.

Réveillons-nous! Trump ne nous aidera pas. Ni sur l'Ukraine, ni sur rien. Il nous marchera dessus si nous le laissons faire. Alors la seule façon de se faire respecter et de construire enfin notre puissance est de croire en notre propre force. Quand on cherche à amadouer un adversaire, généralement il prend ça pour de la faiblesse et Trump ne tolère aucune faiblesse.

Benoît Cassart (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'Union européenne s'est agenouillée face à Donald Trump, c'est incontestable, mais il ne sert à rien de pleurer sur le lait renversé. Demandons-nous plutôt pourquoi. Et, surtout, retenons la leçon.

Comment négocier d'égal à égal avec Washington ou Pékin quand nous avons besoin d'eux pour protéger nos frontières, chauffer nos foyers ou faire tourner nos usines? Alors que nos dépendances stratégiques nous transforment en oiseau pour le chat, vous continuez en signant l'accord avec le Mercosur sans clause miroir, menaçant ainsi notre souveraineté alimentaire. Or, la nourriture est une arme géopolitique. L'Ukraine nous l'a montré, Gaza nous le rappelle tous les jours cruellement. Continuer à signer des accords de libre-échange déséquilibrés sur le dos de notre agriculture est une faute politique grave et irréversible.

Catarina Vieira (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, you and our colleagues from the EPP called for political responsibility in supporting this deal. But I think it's very far-fetched to claim that it is responsible for us to spend USD 750 billion on natural gas, oil and nuclear energy from the US.

If Russia has taught us something, it is that Europe must become independent in its energy production through a green transition by no longer depending on others – and especially not on unpredictable populists and dictators.

But looking at this deal with the US, it seems perhaps we have not learned our lesson. Let's face it, Commissioner Šefčovič, these billions are needed here in Europe, to benefit European consumers and companies, not to fill the coffers of ExxonMobil and Chevron – the same corporations that have blocked ambitious climate action for decades.

Instead of pouring money into fossil fuels, we must invest in renewable energy production, in batteries, in the circular economy. Our regulation, our climate goals, our values are not for sale. And we cannot – ever – trade them away.

Céline Imart (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, le 27 juillet dernier, la présidente de la Commission européenne a, au détour d'un parcours de golf, entériné un accord complètement déséquilibré: accès libre et sans taxes pour les importations américaines contre 15 % pour nos exportations européennes.

Je mesure la complexité du sujet. Je connais le caractère imprévisible du partenaire américain. Je suis consciente que nos entreprises et nos secteurs ont besoin de clarté et de stabilité, mais l'Europe a été piétinée, le Parlement européen écarté, l'accord conclu dans l'opacité. Ce n'est pas un compromis, c'est une capitulation.

Ajoutons à cela la promesse de 1 200 milliards d'euros d'investissements européens sur le sol américain: énergie, secteur stratégique, plus intelligence artificielle, sans oublier les promesses d'achats militaires. Nous finançons avec l'argent de nos contribuables la réindustrialisation des États-Unis et, ce faisant, sacrifions notre souveraineté.

Monsieur le Commissaire, poursuivez ces négociations, défendez la dignité de nos États et les intérêts de nos filières et, si la renégociation s'avère impossible, servez-vous des outils de défense commerciale comme l'outil anti-coercition que ce Parlement vous a donné. Car si l'Europe est un géant économique, cette négociation désastreuse nous rappelle que nous restons un nain politique.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, ovo je, nažalost, za Europu bilo ljeto neiskorištenih prilika kada je riječ o odnosu prema Washingtonu.

U Ameriku izvozimo više robe, ali uvozimo više usluga na koje se ne plaća porez. Trgovinski odnos s Amerikom je bio balansirani i prije ovog sporazuma u kojemu nema ni pravnih ni političkih garancija. Trump dosljedno nameće svoj program selektivnog povećavanja poreza, opće deregulacije i nametanja carina.

Kao Europska unija, blokirani internim neslaganjima, pokušavamo postići najmanje loš sporazum. Slijedimo, ne vodimo, a posljedice propuštenog djelovanja mogu biti dugoročne.

Preuzimanjem odgovornosti za vlastitu sigurnost i obranu, ulaganjem u proizvodnju vlastite energije itekako bi ojačali globalnu pregovaračku poziciju.

Prioritet mora biti zaštita radnih mjesta i konkurentnost kroz investicije, ali u Europi, jačanje europske autonomije i obrana vladavine prava, pogotovo našeg europskog zakonodavstva.

Europska unija je globalni simbol demokratskih vrijednosti i ekoloških standarda. Europska unija je najveće jedinstveno tržište na svijetu.

Zato iskoristimo svoja postignuća i hrabrije ispravljajmo svoje nedostatke. Zajedno.

Mika Aaltola (PPE). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, at first glance, the new US-EU trade deal seems to be absurd. But it buys us something urgently needed – predictability. Without it, Europe faced tariffs up to 30 % and loss of millions of jobs. Now, with average rate below 15 %, we bought time. Not comfort, but breathing space and transatlantic economic stability that has also important political ramifications.

Yet let us be clear. The deal is a fragile one. President Trump's unpredictability makes it temporary at best. This means acting now. Times are difficult. We must turn today's instability in tomorrow's power. It is about Europe's place in a world where power, not rules, unfortunately, increasingly sets the terms.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, the EU needs the friendship and democratic influence of the US as much as the United States needs a powerful and united Europe.

The recent summit of authoritarian leaders has shown us that we have countries seeking to change the current global status quo, to threaten our way of life and to challenge our democratic model.

Divided, we are clearly weaker. But united we can protect our citizens. And in order to do so, we need to be fair partners and respect our democratic rules. I support the need for a deal and the work done by the EU Commissioner. I can even accept the request for Europe to invest more in defence, but I have difficulties in accepting some of the imbalances in the agreement, in particular related to agriculture and our industry, but also the lack of consultation of Parliament and of the business sector.

This is Europe. We are not perfect, but we love our democratic imperfections and stand strong for our values. It is normal for the Parliament to scrutinise the agreement, but we stand strong and firm in supporting anything that can help us improve the text without jeopardising the deal.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Nina Carberry (PPE). – Mr President, this week, the Irish Fiscal Advisory Council warned that our drinks and spirits sector is uniquely exposed to tariffs.

Boann Distillery, in the Boyne Valley, only entered the US market in February of this year. The Shed Distillery in Leitrim is another example of an Irish SME that has rooted itself in the US market. For them, the long-term threats are the hardest to measure. With the future of Trump's tariffs now before the US Supreme Court, we must be ready to re-engage.

Commissioner, this threat also means new EU supports must be made available for exporters – supports that open new markets, help SMEs diversify and help funding in the next EU budget. We must also recognise the knock-on effect tariffs in the whisky sector have on the agri-food supply chain, in tillage especially.

And finally, as Parliament's rapporteur on the UK relations, a word of caution: tariff divergence on the island of Ireland risks complicating the Windsor Framework. We cannot allow that to happen.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, rezultatul unei negocieri, fie acord politic, fie comercial, depinde de puterea de negociere. Sigur, și de curaj, și de competență. Haideți să fim realiști, asta a fost puterea Uniunii Europene. A scăzut an de an și atunci nu putem să spunem că e vinovat cel care are putere mai mare de negociere.

Avem nevoie de acordul cu Statele Unite. Nu putem să ignorăm o piață atât de mare. Industria noastră are nevoie, agricultura noastră are nevoie. Sigur că nu suntem mulțumiți, poate niciunul de aici, dar totdeauna trebuie să ne gândim la varianta cealaltă. Ce ar fi fost sau ce este, dacă nu vom avea un acord cu Statele Unite? Să fie foarte clar, dacă nu ați negociat niciun contract, poate vă este greu să înțelegeți. Niciodată unul mai mic în puterea de negociere nu va câștiga în fața celui alt. Da, dar avem pârghii prin care putem să-l determinăm pe Trump să cedeze și să fie un acord pe principiul câștig-câștig.

Am făcut un prim pas, trebuie continuat și eu am încredere, domnule comisar, că vom putea în timp să corectăm acest acord. Avem nevoie de el și trebuie să vedem cum îl putem îmbunătăți. Trebuie fermierii noștri, agricultura noastră, producătorii de vin, industria să poată să aibă acces la acea piață în condiții, așa cum v-am mai spus, similare, aceleași standarde, același acces reciproc pe piață. Asta înseamnă un acord etic.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, el reciente acuerdo comercial alcanzado entre la Unión Europea y los Estados Unidos —aunque imperfecto— representa un avance y resulta preferible a la ausencia de un marco común o a una guerra comercial. Pensemos en los aranceles del 50 % de la India o del 39 % de Suiza.

No es fácil negociar con la Administración Trump, pero debemos tener también presente la dimensión de seguridad y defensa que nos une, de forma imprescindible, con los Estados Unidos en estos momentos tan difíciles.

Es innegable que el acuerdo acordado está lejos de nuestras expectativas. Es, además, muy limitado, pero creo que puede aportar alguna certidumbre a nuestras empresas frente a la volatilidad.

La Comisión debe seguir negociando para conseguir un trato arancelario más favorable para otros sectores muy afectados como, por ejemplo, el vino y el aceite de oliva. En estas negociaciones pendientes, ¿de qué plazos hablamos, señor comisario?

No olvidemos, además, que nuestras exportaciones ahora se ven también muy perjudicadas por la actual devaluación del dólar. Lamentablemente, tenemos unos aranceles elevadísimos a nuestro acero y a nuestro aluminio: el doble, por ejemplo, de los del Reino Unido. ¿Qué está pasando? ¿A qué obedece esto? ¿Qué pasa con los productos que tienen estos componentes?

En paralelo, necesitamos diversificar nuestras relaciones económicas y comerciales —pienso en el Mercosur y en México— y también reforzar el mercado interior.

Lukas Sieper (NI). – Mr President, Mr Vice-President, this is our situation that we have to deal with. This House has said it already, no one is happy. And I don't think that we can change anything with that now. But we have to learn something for the future, while we now have to stand together implementing this.

I think the very first lesson is how to deal with bullies – not to give in to them. And if I may suggest this for the next time that we find ourselves in a situation like this, Mr Commissioner, we should impose countermeasures already while negotiating this deal.

And the second lesson that we take is that we are not seen as weak in that sense. The European Commission should make more effort to actually communicate the efforts that have been made with the public to convince them that this was not just the best that we could get, but actually something good for Europe. Thank you very much for your work and thank you very much for your cooperation.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, ovaj takozvani sporazum je generalno jednostran, neuravnotežen i čini europsku industriju manje konkurentnom u odnosu na SAD.

Postoje pozitivni elementi poput oslobođenja za generičke lijekove, ali to su, nažalost, iznimke.

Europska unija je tržište s više od 450 milijuna potrošača. Imamo suficit sa SAD-om u trgovini robom, a deficit u trgovini uslugama, što znači da imamo jake alate da odgovorimo na bilo kakve ucjene iz Washingtona.

Nažalost, ništa od toga nismo napravili, već smo popustili kako bismo dobili sigurnosne garancije koje su vrlo upitne pouzdanosti.

Što je najgore, nismo dobili ni izvjesnost, budući da Amerikanci već vrše pritiske kako bi dobili povlašteni status za svoje *big tech* kompanije, što je, nažalost, bilo i za očekivati.

Uvođenje carina od strane SAD-a predstavlja poraz, ali EU ima snagu i mogućnost razvijati nova partnerstva, bilo s Japanom, Australijom, Kanadom ili državama Latinske Amerike.

Diverzifikacija trgovinskih odnosa ključ je za ublažavanje negativnih učinaka i zaštitu naših interesa. Budućnost trgovinskih odnosa Europske unije leži u kombinaciji trgovinskih mjera zasnovanih na reciprocitetu, diverzifikaciji partnerstava i jačanju europske industrije. Samo tako ćemo osigurati jaku Europu i prosperitet za europske građane.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Maroš Šefčovič, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, I was listening to you very, very carefully this morning and also of course, now, this afternoon. I was just trying to imagine what our debate would look like if it would take place in a full trade war. I am sure I would not get any praise from you for hundreds of jobs lost, billions of euros of investment disappeared and thousands of SMEs gone bust.

I know that many of you would criticise me for failed negotiations and economic catastrophe brought to Europe. Therefore, allow me a personal remark; I am always surprised how, in Europe, we always manage to talk ourselves and Europe down. We got the best deal in the world with the US, which was extremely difficult, and we got this harsh treatment. Ask the countries who got the agreement with the US and ask those who didn't if they would trade places with us. Show me one who wouldn't – show me one who wouldn't! Therefore, if you allow me, I would like to just run through some of the figures which have been quoted so widely this afternoon.

Our estimation after this deal was reached and we compared it to the situation with other countries having or not having the deal – the fact is that impact on trade, because of our relative stronger position than other partners, would be negligible. I would be very happy – and I did it already with many of you – to share these figures. So, please, let's talk figures and not only emotions.

Our agri-food industry is and will remain competitive. We export EUR 30 billion to the United States. We import EUR 11 billion from the United States. Our concessions have been given on non-sensitive products. Again: compare these results with some other deals which have been achieved. On top of this, we export high-value products and we import the products we need like soybeans, animal feed and so on and so forth. So I am absolutely convinced that our agri-food sector will also stay competitive with this deal.

In many meetings I had yesterday with the honourable Members of the Parliament who are interested in trade and in the US, I gave the comparison with the tariffs on cheese. The MFN before the deal was 14.9 %. After the deal, because we have an all-inclusive shield of 15 %, it's 15%. What is it in other countries who do not have this non-stacking rule? It's 49% plus reciprocal tariffs. So in the case of some of our neighbours it's much much higher. I do not want to compare our advantages with other countries because it's not fair and I know that they've been doing their best in negotiations and we are partners and friends with them. But I just want to tell you this reality: please compare the figures.

Then I hear a lot of criticism about industrial products. Again: let's look at the numbers. Already now 67 % of US industrial exports to the EU were tariff free. So what we are talking about here is 33 %. We are talking a nominal value in billions of euros – billions: much less than ten. And exports to the EU are around EUR 360 billion. Again: look at the figures, compare the facts and please, please, please be fair to us.

The EU has the best tariff compared to everyone else and, therefore, as I said, this is faring very favourably with others. On top of it, we got the exemptions, we got the key sectors capped at 15 % and, most importantly, we secured also some agenda for the future. I totally agree with Mr Lange and with all of you who are unhappy about the derivatives. I totally agree with Mr Benifei that we need to work on steel – and we will. This is reflected in the joint statement that we will be working on a 'ring of partners' to protect our steel industry. We didn't make it on 27 July, but it's on the agenda and you have it reflected as one of the things which we will be working on together.

Of course I'm in touch with Secretary Lutnick on derivatives. Of course we are highlighting which customs codes should be looked at and upon which we should negotiate. The same goes for wine, the same goes for beer, the same goes for spirits. But do you think that we would be better off in a full trade war with the US to get these negotiations going? Do you think that we would have such constructive discussions as we have with them on many geopolitical issues? We've been discussing this morning what happened yesterday in Poland. Just imagine what the alternative would be.

Now, if I may give some concrete suggestions. As I said, and I think this was raised by my dear colleagues Mr Lange and Mr Benifei on the process ahead, the Commission is ready to work with you and support Parliament in the legislative process. I am sure that we can work together on constructive solutions. But I just have one plea: let's be reasonable, let's be responsible. Let's work in a way that will not unravel the deal, which, as I said, is best in the world even though I know many of you do not like it – and I agree it could be improved – but let's do it in a way which would help European businesses, European citizens and the European economy.

To my dear colleague, Mr Warborn – we have been discussing this already together, but I think it has to also be said here, publicly and officially: we believe that the agreement and the joint statement as it was struck is compatible with the WTO, because we look at it as a 'first phase' agreement, and we want to proceed our negotiations to further expand trade. If you look at it from our perspective, the EU already covers substantially all trade and, of course, we would work with the US to further expand.

On top of that, I am in almost daily contact with Doctor Okonjo-Iweala, Director-General of the WTO. She knows, and you know it as well, that we want to reform the WTO, that we need to reform the WTO for the sake of the WTO. For the sake of trade multilateralism we have to reform the WTO, otherwise the future of this organisation would be very, very dire. We are working with her and we are working with our partners to achieve that.

I would like to thank all of you who support the point of diversification of our free-trade agenda, because, if we achieved everything that I described to you in my introductory remarks, this would already replace around three-quarters of current trade with the EU.

Let me also conclude, Mr President, by addressing some of the repeated claims which have also been voiced here and which I categorically reject. The first one is that there were no negotiations. Only a person who was not in the room could say something like that, because there have been hundreds of hours of negotiations from the first moment until the last minute in Scotland, and then after that to make sure that the joint statement was properly drafted, properly formulated, and we discuss every single executive order all the annexes which are being published there with our American partners. So it's continuous work. So if anybody says there was no negotiation: that's simply not true.

Then we've been discussing the anti-coercion instrument and the countermeasures a lot. I know that several of you have been calling for it. Of course we discussed it with Member States! Formally as 27, but especially very confidentially where we've been talking to each Member State one-by-one. And I can tell you there was no appetite for this at all, because the Member States, knowing what kind of situations we are in, prefer agreement, prefer jobs, prefer economic development and prefer as much stability as we can get at this very difficult stage.

To questions on energy and energy security. You would recall that 2 or 3 years ago I was asked to organise the common purchase of gas, because at that time we paid more than EUR 1 000 per megawatt/hour in some parts of Europe. I can tell you it was a pretty difficult job – I was crisscrossing the world looking for the gas to make sure that our lights and our electricity would be kept on. Now we are completely phasing out Russian supplies; so we need gas, we need oil, we need nuclear fuel, which is new, we need AI chips. What we put on the table was based on a thorough analysis of DG ENER. So, again, I think that here we have been behaving responsibly. Of course, this would be private contracts but I think we are creating a framework for much stronger energy security than what we would otherwise have.

If you would allow me a last remark and to conclude by referring to Mr Groothuis, because I totally agree with him: we need to be faster in negotiating and ratifying our free-trade agreements. We have to focus much more on new market access for our businesses and for our economy. Just this year, we brought Mercosur and Mexico to your table, and I hope that very soon we will bring Indonesia. This is on top of making sure that we resolve our issues with Switzerland and that we resolve our issues with our UK friends, and that it works very well.

Now, I believe that we managed to de-escalate with the US, we managed to stabilise the relationship and I think, to be honest, let us be confident enough that we can push our trade agenda with the US further, that we can defend our values, we can defend our laws. I'm pretty sure that we can do it and I believe that to have it in the atmosphere of partnership and trade cooperation is much better than if you do it otherwise.

Mr President, thank you very much for being generous with my time, but we had a long day and this was a topic which was heavily discussed in the morning and in the afternoon. I understand the passion, I understand the interest – I know that all of us want to do the best for Europe, for European citizens and for our economy. I appreciate all the remarks. I am ready to work, as I was until now, with every single Member of this Chamber, to make sure that we deliver the best possible results for Europe and its citizens. Thank you very much.

Marie Bjerre, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members and Commissioner, I have now, as a representative of the Council, followed quite a number of debates in here, and I have noticed strong opinions. But I have to say, this is the first time that I have heard complete consensus from left to centre to right.

And I agree with you: yes, the trade agreement is unbalanced. As both Mr Warborn and Mr Lange, from the S&D, said, it is not perfect. But it is the best result. The alternative would be worse, as Ms Grapini from the S&D just said. We need the agreement.

I also agree with Ms Karlsbro from Renew, who said the best response is to strengthen Europe. We should improve our internal market, make Europe more competitive and capable of defending itself.

Also, there is a point made by Commissioner Šešćovič that I want to echo: trade with the US is only 17 % of the world's trade; now it is time to embrace the other 83 % of the world's trade, making new partnership trade agreements.

We, in the Council, remain committed to making the best of the understanding reached with the US. We want to continue the work to help our industry improve competitiveness and support economic growth in the EU. The Danish Presidency will support the work on the two proposals in the Council. We hope to reach an outcome that brings benefits to our businesses and to our citizens.

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētāja vietnieks

President. – Thank you very much, Minister, colleagues.

The debate is closed.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (178. pants)

Cristina Maestre (S&D), por escrito. – Teniendo en cuenta todos los elementos conexos sobre la declaración conjunta presentada por la UE y los EE. UU. de América, varias conclusiones pueden extraerse hasta el momento: el acuerdo es defectuoso y plantea serias preocupaciones de que sea compatible con la OMC; no es ni equilibrado ni justo, y no es bueno para Europa —puede llegar a socavar el empleo, debilitar nuestras industrias, el sector agrario y la economía en general y erosionar el sistema comercial multilateral basado en normas—; podría poner en peligro la autonomía estratégica de la UE en sectores clave como la energía y la defensa, y aumentar nuestra dependencia de los Estados Unidos; el acuerdo podría tener un impacto y debilitar legislación clave y nuestra autonomía y soberanía en el ámbito de los impuestos, la legislación, las normas y los reglamentos digitales; aumenta la dependencia europea de Estados Unidos para la energía, la defensa y el acceso al mercado, en lugar de reforzar nuestra autonomía; y, además, la Comisión promete concesiones que difícilmente van a poder convertirse en instrumentos legales que pueda procesarse por parte del Parlamento Europeo en materia de concesiones, inversión corporativa europea en los Estados Unidos y compras de gas GNL, petróleo y energía nuclear.

10. Kinas uberettigede beslutning om at indføre told på import af svinekødsprodukter fra EU og behovet for at støtte europæiske landbrugere og arbejdstagere (forhandling)

Priekšsēdētājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Komisijas paziņojumu par Ķīnas nepamatoto lēmumu noteikt ievērmu cūkgaļas produkcijas importam no ES un nepieciešamību atbalstīt Eiropas lauksaimniekus un darba ņēmējus (2025/2869(RSP)).

Andrius Kubilius, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, dear colleagues, again, I would like to present the Commission position on this very important issue. It was supposed that the position would be presented by Commissioner Hansen or Commissioner Šefčovič, but they are at an important destination now going to develop other relations. So I will try to present in a very short way the Commission position on this topic.

On 5 September, China's Ministry of Commerce, MOFCOM, announced the imposition of provisional duties on imports of pork and pork by-products originating in the European Union. These measures will apply as of today, 10 September. Announced provisional duties are in the range between 15.6 % and 32.7 % for the three sampled EU companies and their affiliates. For other cooperating companies, duties are set at 20 % and for all other companies at 62.4 %.

The Commission takes note with great concern of MOFCOM's announcement, as according to our assessments, the investigation itself is based on highly questionable allegations and insufficient evidence. We are in close cooperation with the EU pork producers concerned.

I recall that China is a key market for EU pork exports. It's a primary destination, accounting in 2024 for 1.1 million tonnes of EU pigmeat worth EUR 2.2 billion. Its importance is twofold. China imports meat, but its main importance lies in the country's import of offal that would otherwise not find a market that would offer the same high prices as China.

It should be noted that EU exports to China have decreased by more than 50 % in 2024 compared to 2023, and we hold a continuously shrinking market share of less than 2 %. A drop in exports to China has disturbing effects not only for exporting Member States, but indeed for the whole Union, due to a potential significant oversupply of the EU domestic market, especially for offal and correlated economic losses in agriculture and related sectors.

The Commission has engaged with MOFCOM in the course of the investigation, meeting all deadlines for submitting comments and pointing out the flaws of this investigation. Among other actions, on 3 September 2024, the Commission filed a submission highlighting the fatal shortcomings of the investigation and urging MOFCOM to terminate this unwarranted investigation.

Together with the sector, the Commission will further examine the facts underlying the imposition of these provisional duties and will carefully assess all the information available against compliance with WTO rules. The Commission will also consider all options to protect EU industry and economic interests.

To conclude, the European Union has been doing everything it takes to defend European Union farmers and exporters when confronted with the abusive use of trade defence instruments. The Commission had already taken action at the WTO against Chinese initiation of the earlier anti-subsidy investigation on dairy and China's and EU imposition of provisional measures on brandy, and will continue taking all the necessary steps to defend the rights of EU producers.

Jessika Van Leeuwen, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, I called for this debate, as I am shocked by the unjust and outrageous decision of China to impose extra import duties on EU pork. It is a clear retaliation for our anti-dumping claim on electrical vehicles. And I remember clearly that when we decided to go ahead with this claim, I warned the Commission that retaliation on EU pork was a risk, and now we are faced with extra import duties varying between 15 % and 62 %.

These tariffs will hit our swine producers and the processing industry very hard. It will affect our export possibilities and reduce the circularity of the sector, as we export cuts that were not, or very rarely, consumed in the EU. And it will lead to unfair competition on the internal market, as the tariffs vary between companies.

Commissioner, the European swine industry is the best in the world. It has made great efforts to reduce antibiotics, has the lowest environmental impact and complies with the best animal welfare standards. Our farmers already faced threats as a result of our policies, reducing CAP support and upcoming trade deals, and now they are used as a bargaining chip in a trade conflict about electric vehicles. The Dutch Farmer–Citizen Movement is not willing to let this happen.

We therefore insist, Commissioner, that the Commission challenges these duties at the WTO, launches a diplomatic initiative to resolve this dispute quickly and, if necessary, establishes a crisis fund to stabilise incomes and prevent job losses. Above all, the Commission should make it clear that farmers are not left behind in this geopolitical crossfire. It should send a strong message to show that we stand behind our farmers. I say let's reform Europe.

Kathleen Van Brempt, *namens de S&D-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, wat ik daarnet nog vergeten was te zeggen: als je toelaat dat de internationale rechtsregels opzij worden gezet en toegeeft aan chantage, zoals bij Trump, dan krijg je copycat-gedrag. En dat is wat er nu gebeurt met China. De ene bruut inspireert de andere. China gaat genadeloos de Trump-methode achterna, legt illegale tarieven op en kopieert economische dwang. Dat heeft uiteraard niks te maken met eerlijke concurrentie of op regels gebaseerde handel. Het is puur machtsvertoon. Onze boeren, maar ook onze werknemers in de sector betalen de prijs. Daarom heb ik gevraagd om de titel aan te passen, want het is een breder probleem. Het gaat niet alleen om de boeren, maar om alle werknemers in de hele sector.

Dus moeten er snel acties komen. Wij roepen op om snel en doortastend te werk te gaan met legale tegenmaatregelen, met instrumenten die we zelf in de hand hebben. Bijvoorbeeld door een zaak aan te spannen bij de WTO, ook al geeft dit vandaag de dag niet de garantie dat er ook effectief actie wordt ondernomen. Het is belangrijk dat we steun verlenen aan onze getroffen bedrijven, de boeren en de werknemers.

Gilles Pennelle, *au nom du groupe PjE*. – Monsieur le Président, effondrement du budget de la PAC, funeste traité du Mercosur, capitulation sur les taxes américaines sur les vins et spiritueux, inflation de normes et de contraintes sur nos agriculteurs et maintenant une mollesse – on vient de le voir à l'instant – de réaction sur les taxes chinoises sur nos exportations de porc.

Je suis originaire de Bretagne, où je vis, la principale région française d'élevage porcin, et nos éleveurs sont excessivement inquiets. Ils sont inquiets parce que le marché chinois est pour eux indispensable.

Alors que fait la Commission? Rien. Elle abandonne une fois de plus nos agriculteurs et nos éleveurs. Pourquoi les abandonne-t-elle? Parce que l'agriculture est devenue une variable d'ajustement sur d'autres dossiers. On préfère défendre les intérêts allemands. On préfère défendre les intérêts industriels et automobiles allemands, y compris avec la Chine, que de défendre notre agriculture. Nos éleveurs, nos agriculteurs ont compris que la Commission européenne les abandonnait. Nous aussi.

Veronika Vrecionová, *za skupinu ECR*. – Pane předsedající, pane komisaři, je potřeba si přiznat, že Čína proti nám dlouhodobě vede různé formy útoků, od průmyslové špionáže přes kyberútoky až po stále častější ekonomické útoky. Snaží se zničit naše tradiční průmyslová odvětví, jako je ocelářství nebo automobilový průmysl, například skrze dumpingové ceny. Nyní dalším takovým pokusem je i snaha o podkopání stability našeho zemědělství prostřednictvím cel na výrobky z vepřového masa. Kromě samotných zemědělců to může mít závažné dopady i na zpracovatelský řetězec a spotřebitele. Čína je náš systémový konkurent a často se chová jako náš nepřítel. A tak ji musíme vnímat.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, le commerce devrait rester un espace de coopération et de prospérité partagée, non un champ de bataille géopolitique et de conflits économiques. Mais il faut être clair: ce monde rêvé est une illusion à l'heure du retour des impérialismes belliqueux.

Pékin, je le regrette, vient de faire un choix. Un choix dommageable, celui de cibler l'Union européenne par des mesures de rétorsion injustes. Une réaction consécutive au simple fait que les Européens souhaitent faire respecter les règles, des règles que la Chine dit elle-même accepter.

Après avoir ciblé le cognac, l'augmentation des droits de douane en représailles sur nos exportations de porc repose sur des fondements fragiles. Une logique de pression politique plutôt que de justice commerciale ne doit pas être la base des discussions et de notre relation. Ce n'est pas seulement une question de commerce. C'est une question de justice, de solidarité, d'équité. Ces mesures auront des conséquences concrètes: des milliers d'emplois menacés, des exploitations mises en péril, dans des territoires comme ma région, la Bretagne.

Nous demandons à la Chine de reconsidérer cette décision, de dialoguer dans un esprit de coopération et de respect mutuel. Les différends commerciaux ne se règlent pas à coups de sanctions ciblées, mais par la négociation, l'équilibre et la transparence.

Sebastian Everding, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Herr Präsident! Der Export von Schweinefleisch nach China betrug im Jahr 2024 1,15 Millionen Tonnen – Tonnen! Wir reden hier nicht über Handelsgüter wie Kohle, Stahl oder Weizen. Wir reden über ehemals fühlende Lebewesen. Schweine fühlen wie wir Menschen Schmerz, Leid, Freude und Trauer und empfinden auch Empathie untereinander. Und diese intelligenten Lebewesen verbringen ihr kurzes Leben von meist nur 6 bis 8 Monaten eingepfercht auf Spaltenböden in Kastenständen und sind entgegen ihres Instinktes gezwungen, an derselben Stelle zu schlafen, zu essen, zu koten und zu urinieren. Schweine haben unterschiedliche Charaktere. Sie erkennen sich selber im Spiegel. Schweinemütter singen während der Stillzeit ihren Kindern etwas vor.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, sehen Sie diese Tiere nicht als Handelsware, sondern als das, was sie sind: fühlende Lebewesen. Allein in dieser Minute meiner Redezeit wurden innerhalb der EU 421 Schweine getötet – die unzähligen Ferkel, die auf dem Weg zur Schlachtreife verstorben sind, natürlich nicht mitgezählt.

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, la imposición de aranceles chinos a las exportaciones europeas de porcino supone un desafío adicional para un sector que ya venía afrontando dificultades.

En 2020, el 50 % de las exportaciones españolas de porcino tenían China como destino por un valor de más de 3 000 millones de euros. Cuatro años más tarde —y con presiones comerciales de por medio— esta cuota se ha desplomado hasta el 20 %.

Con estos datos resulta evidente que los nuevos aranceles no responden a criterios técnicos, sino que se enmarcan en un clima de instrumentalización del comercio. No es casualidad que se adopten después de que la Unión Europea impusiera aranceles a los coches eléctricos chinos, una medida que ya ha reducido su cuota de mercado en Europa en un 4 %.

Por eso pido a la Comisión que siga defendiendo a nuestros productores —como ya hizo en los casos de los lácteos y el brandy— y que, para ello, refuerce el diálogo comercial con China y pacte una solución que garantice la estabilidad del sector.

Stefano Bonaccini (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo i dazi di Trump i nostri agricoltori rischiano di pagare il prezzo di una disputa commerciale con cui nulla hanno a che fare, quella sulle auto elettriche cinesi.

L'indagine antidumping di Pechino sul nostro *export* di carne suina è una rappresaglia che colpirebbe un settore già messo a dura prova dalla peste suina africana e porterebbe al crollo dei prezzi per tutti gli allevatori europei.

Commissario, serve un'azione diplomatica urgente per evitare ulteriori chiusure dei mercati, dimostrando l'infondatezza delle accuse cinesi, e serve un imponente piano di promozione delle nostre eccellenze agroalimentari sui mercati esteri, come chiediamo da mesi e che anche la Presidente von der Leyen ha riconosciuto questa mattina necessario in Aula.

Di fronte a colossi che lavorano per un'Europa più debole non possiamo isolarci. Al contrario, occorre rafforzare il nostro peso geopolitico con accordi, ad esempio con aree strategiche dal Mercosur all'India; solo così potremo passare da gigante economico a vero gigante politico globale.

Csaba Dömötör (PFE). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Fontos, hogy beszéljünk arról, amikor harmadik országok, így Kína az európai gazdák számára káros döntéseket hoznak. De arról miért nem lehet vitatkozni, hogy az Európai Bizottság tervei milyen károkat okozhatnak? Júliusban, az utolsó ülésézési napon mutatták be az új költségvetési terveket, azért, hogy ne lehessen vitát rendezni róluk. Azóta már tudjuk, hogy több mint 20%-kal megvágják az agrárkasszát, ami sok százezer családi gazdaságot is sújtana. Közben elkezdik megnyitni a piacokat keletről és a Dél-Amerikából érkező termékek előtt. Azt reméltük, hogy vagy a múlt heti bizottsági ülésen, vagy a mostani plenárison erről majd lesz vita, de nem lett. Beszélnek ehelyett Kínáról.

Azért nem akarnak vitát, mert nagyon is jól tudják az igazságot. Azt, hogy mindent alárendelnek a háborús és a bővítési kiadásoknak. Ezért csökkentenék 33 ezer milliárd forintnak megfelelő összeggel az agrárkasszát. Ez lehet a legnagyobb csapásmérés a közös agrárpolitikára, amióta létrejött. A Patrióta frakció ezért bizalmatlansági indítványt nyújt be Ursula von der Leyen ellen. Ez is ott van az okok mögött.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, commissaris, vorige week kondigde China aan vanaf vandaag invoerheffingen in te voeren op varkensvlees uit de Europese Unie. De heffingen zullen ernstige gevolgen hebben voor de Europese varkensproducenten en de interne markt. Ik maak me met name zorgen over de coöperaties die met extra hoge heffingen te maken lijken te krijgen.

Ik wil daarom een dringende oproep doen aan de Europese Commissie om alle mogelijke diplomatieke instrumenten in te zetten en China ervan te overtuigen de invoering van de heffing op zijn minst uit te stellen en tot een oplossing te komen. Daarbij moet ook naar de WHO-afspraken worden gekeken. Benut de mogelijkheden om deze heffingen daar aan te vechten. En als China deze maatregelen niet terugdraait, dan moeten we, wat ons betreft, zeker ook kijken hoe we de verstorende effecten op de interne markt kunnen mitigeren.

Benoit Cassart (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, pour le conflit entre Airbus et Boeing, c'étaient déjà les vins et les fromages européens qui avaient payé l'addition. L'Union européenne taxe les voitures électriques chinoises, Pékin riposte en ciblant le porc, le cognac et les produits laitiers européens.

Pour limiter les dégâts des droits de douane américains sur nos voitures, l'Union européenne accepte d'ouvrir son marché au porc américain, produit avec des additifs interdits chez nous. Pour ouvrir le marché du Mercosur, certains sont prêts à sacrifier les filières viande de l'Union européenne. On marche sur la tête! Stop!

L'agriculture européenne doit cesser d'être la variable d'ajustement de toutes les querelles commerciales. Je ne cesserai de le répéter, l'Europe doit défendre son agriculture comme un secteur stratégique à part entière, au même titre que son industrie.

Céline Imart (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, tout est bon dans le cochon et surtout dans le cochon européen. Ce n'est malheureusement pas l'avis des Chinois, qui se vengent sur ses pieds, ses oreilles, ses abats, en représailles des mesures européennes sur les véhicules électriques. Encore une fois, les Chinois tapent là où ça fait mal. Avec des droits de douane élevés, c'est tout le commerce avec la Chine qui est en péril pour la filière. Or, ce sont ces parties du porc que nous ne consommons pas en Europe et qui trouvent leurs débouchés là-bas. C'est vital pour l'équilibre de la filière et ce blocage chinois aura des conséquences concrètes pour les consommateurs, l'envol des prix.

Après l'accord avec les États-Unis, les droits chinois sur le cognac, l'heure n'est plus au laisser-faire. L'Europe doit montrer les muscles. Nous avons des instruments anti-coercition efficaces qui permettent aussi de riposter avec force lorsque nos producteurs sont attaqués. Ce sont des outils que nous pouvons mobiliser pour faire plier les autorités chinoises. Leurs mesures sont parfaitement illégales. Pékin sort le bazooka, sortons le char d'assaut, sinon nous perdrons toute crédibilité aux yeux de nos producteurs, de nos citoyens. C'est la nouvelle réalité du commerce international. Les règles du jeu ont changé et l'Europe doit être forte pour défendre nos intérêts sans trembler.

Cristina Maestre (S&D). – Señor presidente, alguien debería mirar eso de que sea el campo el que pague siempre la factura de los conflictos ajenos. Ahora, el *boomerang* por la disputa de los coches eléctricos le llega al sector porcino.

El sector porcino europeo no compite con dumping, sino ofreciendo productos de calidad, con trazabilidad y transparencia. Es un sector que ha sabido ganarse la confianza de los consumidores chinos, no solo con sus carnes frescas y transformadas, sino también con los despojos y subproductos, muy apreciados en medicina, biotecnología o alimentación animal.

En 2023, las exportaciones de carne de cerdo a China superaron los 2 500 millones de euros, generando decenas de miles de empleos en el medio rural. Esta fortaleza no nace de prácticas desleales, sino del esfuerzo en competitividad e innovación de nuestros productores y de sus trabajadores.

Es fundamental explicar a las autoridades chinas que jugamos limpio, y lo hacemos con transparencia. Por eso, señor comisario, apostamos por la vía del diálogo y la negociación. Queremos que los alimentos sigan siendo puentes de confianza y de prosperidad, y no moneda de cambio en disputas comerciales que nada tienen que ver con ellos.

Mireia Borrás Pabón (Pfe). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, una vez más, nuestros agricultores y ganaderos vuelven a ser la diana de disputas geopolíticas que no han provocado.

Es lo que ha ocurrido, por ejemplo, con Estados Unidos, donde han aceptado un arancel del 15 % a nuestras exportaciones mientras la Comisión abría el mercado, de par en par, a sectores vulnerables, como el de los frutos secos.

Pero también están padeciendo actualmente con la negociación de Mercosur, donde la Comisión —con premeditación y alevosía— está intentando cerrar un acuerdo comercial que sabe, de antemano, va a ser letal para nuestro campo y para nuestras zonas rurales.

Y ahora, además, China, pues nuestros ganaderos son rehenes de una investigación infundada como represalia por los aranceles europeos al coche eléctrico chino.

Y todo esto se lo debemos a la señora Von der Leyen, todo un éxito negociador de la Comisión Europea que es incapaz de defender, de manera firme, a quienes producen, hoy en día, la mejor carne de porcino del mundo. Y es que cada negociación de Bruselas acaba con el mismo resultado: el campo europeo es el que paga la factura, y cada factura es un paso más a la ruina de nuestros agricultores y ganaderos.

Por eso mismo decimos, señor comisario, que ustedes no están construyendo Europa: la están cavando.

Georgiana Teodorescu (ECR). – Domnule președinte, fermierii europeni nu sunt doar producători de carne, lapte sau cereale. Ei sunt cei care dau viață satelor, păstrează tradițiile și se asigură că fiecare familie din Europa are hrană sănătoasă pe masă, la prețuri accesibile. Ei muncesc în frig, în arșiță, în vremuri de incertitudine, pentru 450 de milioane de consumatori europeni și pentru dreptul lor fundamental la hrană.

Nu putem rămâne indiferenți atunci când decizii politice riscă să le șubrezească munca; bugete reduse, acorduri comerciale nefavorabile, condiții dure și legislații contraproductive, toate tăvălug în ultimii ani. Solidaritatea europeană trebuie să însemne mai mult decât vorbe, trebuie să fie un scut real pentru cei care ne hrănesc.

În același timp, știm că relația noastră cu China este strategică și de mare valoare. Nu căutăm conflict, ci cooperare. Credem că orice provocare poate fi depășită prin dialog sincer și respect reciproc. Europa și China pot găsi soluții echilibrate, care să protejeze interesele ambelor părți. Într-un context mondial tot mai complicat, este vital ca UE și China să găsească o cale diplomatică să își facă reciproc concesii, astfel încât relațiile să poată evolua în bine. E nevoie de înțelepciune și flexibilitate.

Fermierii europeni se trezesc zilnic înaintea de răsărit pentru a hrăni milioane de oameni. Este obligația noastră să ne trezim și noi ca lideri și să-i apărăm cu aceeași dăruire.

Barry Cowen (Renew). – Mr President, colleagues, China's recent decision to impose tariffs on European pork is unjustified and it demands a response that is firm, fair and strategic.

China's market is vital for Europe's pig sector, as has been said, especially for by-products, where no other market offers the same return.

Just last year, pork exports to China were worth over EUR 2.4 billion. In Ireland's case, that is 61 000 tonnes of pigmeat worth nearly EUR 100 million. Losing that income would be a serious blow to farm families and rural communities.

The Commission has pledged to defend foreign producers and now it must follow through on that pledge. Farmers cannot be collateral damage in bigger trade disputes driven by other sectors.

Now is the time to be firm without being reckless. A trade war with China benefits no one, and protecting farmers must remain central to the EU's strategy going forward.

Carmen Crespo Díaz (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, los aranceles vienen en un momento dificultoso del sector, que ha pasado de 2 700 millones en 2023 a 1 000 millones en 2024.

Por tanto, es un momento difícil y tenemos que hacer una defensa firme y proactiva desde la Unión Europea. No puede ser que el sector agroalimentario vuelva a ser moneda de cambio, que pague las consecuencias de otras guerras comerciales y, además, hay que luchar porque este sector agrario no tiene colchón, realmente no puede aguantar.

En cuanto a los Estados Unidos, tenemos que negociar, seguir negociando por el vino, los espírituosos, el aceite y la aceituna de mesa.

Y, en cuanto al porcino, que es fundamental para las zonas rurales, también hay que luchar y poner encima de la mesa todas y cada una de las posibilidades de la Unión Europea. En este caso, creo que es fundamental que la Unión Europea solicite una investigación a la Organización Mundial del Comercio sobre lo que está haciendo China, que no tiene base en la investigación.

Claro que hay que abrir nuevos mercados y claro que hay que abrir nuevos acuerdos comerciales, pero con reciprocidad y con esa oficina de control de importaciones.

Marko Vešligaj (S&D). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, u vremenima kada trgovinski sukobi bujaju diljem svijeta poljoprivreda se našla na najvećem udaru, od Mercosura, preko novog sporazuma sa Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama pa evo sada i kinesko uvođenje carina na svinjetinu i svinjske prerađevine. Situacija je sve alarmantnija za naše poljoprivrednike.

Odluka koja dolazi iz Kine imat će teške posljedice za sektor svinjogojstva u Europskoj uniji, obzirom da je Kina posljednjih godina bila jedno od ključnih izvoznih odredišta za europsku svinjetinu. Gomilat će se viškovi, cijene će padati, a sektor će patiti.

A važno je reći da ova odluka iz Kine je potpuno neopravdana jer proizvođači svinjskog mesa iz Unije ne sudjeluju u antidampinškim praksama te su u potpunosti surađivali s istragama i sa svim zahtjevima kineskih vlasti.

Hitno trebamo mjere koje će suzbiti negativne posljedice ovih najnovijih carina, kao i trgovinsku strategiju koja u centar stavlja poljoprivrednu proizvodnju jer bez poljoprivrednika nema hrane, a bez hrane nema sigurnosti te nam stoga zaštita domaće poljoprivredne proizvodnje mora biti prioritet.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, fermierii europeni sunt din nou puși în dificultate în cadrul unor dispute comerciale. China impune tarife antidumping de până la 62 % pentru carnea de porc europeană, care este o reacție la presiunile legitime pe care Europa le exercită în sectorul auto. Dar cei care plătesc prețul sunt agricultorii noștri, fermele de familie, procesatorii și comunitățile rurale.

Fermierii europeni devin astfel o monedă de schimb într-un conflict care nu are legătură cu munca lor, dar care le amenință direct veniturile și stabilitatea. Consecințele se vor resimți în întreaga Uniunea Europeană, scăderi de prețuri pe piețele interne, astfel încât, domnule comisar – am rugămintea să mă și urmăriți, domnule comisar – vă cer ca executivul european să adopte o poziție fermă și să vină imediat cu măsuri concrete de sprijin pentru acest sector, dar și cu o strategie comercială unitară, care să reducă vulnerabilitatea Uniunii Europene în fața presiunilor externe. Europa trebuie să-și apere fermierii și să transmită un mesaj clar: nu vom ceda niciodată șantajului comercial.

Elisabetta Gualmini (S&D). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, China's decision to impose anti-dumping duties of up to 62 % on the importation of European pork products is an act of profound economic injustice that damages our farmers a lot, with estimated costs of around USD 2 billion. It just happens when China itself is facing a significant domestic overcapacity of pork products, so there are no real and legitimate reasons for such tariffs.

Beijing's decision is nothing more than a retaliation to the principle of multilateralism and to a system of shared rules which is now more than ever under attack. So if we also consider Trump's duties by 15 % on European food products, it is crystal clear that Europe is more and more squeezed between two powerful autocrats using trade as a weapon.

But the problem is bigger today. The problem is that the strategic autonomy of the European Union is not enough. We must work for a stronger, united, powerful political union, not only a market, which makes a difference in the world, and not be a hostage of lunatic superpowers.

Maria Walsh (PPE). – Mr President, why should Irish pigmeat producers have to bear the brunt of political trade disputes, with a market as crucial as China? Just a few years ago, China accounted for 40 % of Ireland's total pork exports. But recent trade tensions have seen this figure drop to only 19 % last year. Hardworking producers are now slapped with import duties ranging from 15 % to a staggering 62 %.

Commissioner, I ask why these measures that have been proposed, which are weakening Ireland's pork sector at a time when our farmers are striving to compete fairly on the world stage, while at the same time working hard to maintain the food standards we have set here in this House for them.

The Commission must urgently rethink its trade approach to ensure that Irish farmers, and indeed the wider farming community, are not treated as a bargaining chip in political negotiations, but rather supported as vital contributors to our economy and food security.

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

Lukas Sieper (NI), *blue-card question*. – Mr Vice-President, in accordance with Rule 178(10), I would also like to react to the answer that Ms Walsh will give.

Thank you, colleague, for accepting this blue card.

My question goes like this: we know that China watches really closely what we are doing, and they will also watch when we impose legislation that while it brings our continent forward, it also is hard for our farmers sometimes – do you think that in this climate where we ask a lot from our farmers, they do this intentionally at this very precise moment to hurt us?

Maria Walsh (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – That's a good question, colleague, and I appreciate the opportunity to reply.

I mean, in many ways, yes, this is where politics – and bad politics – impacts the pockets and the tables of every EU citizen right now, and indeed international person. Because tariffs – as we heard from the President of the Commission today and we've heard repeatedly – only impact those at the end of the food supply chain, which is farmers and those that eat it.

For me, I think it's a really important, regardless of whatever happens outside of the EU Member State bloc, that we're really clear, concise, and we're working forward and protecting those that are impacted the most, which, for me and my constituency, are farmers.

Σάκης Αρναούτογλου (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η απόφαση της Κίνας, το έχουμε ακούσει σήμερα πάρα, πάρα πολλές φορές να επιβάλει υψηλούς δασμούς στο ευρωπαϊκό χοιρινό, είναι πραγματικά άδικη. Ας δούμε, όμως, και την άλλη πλευρά. Αυτοί οι δασμοί δεν ήρθαν από το πουθενά. Θα έλεγα ότι είναι αποτέλεσμα και των επιλογών της Επιτροπής και της κ. von der Leyen που άνοιξαν έναν φαύλο κύκλο εμπορικών συγκρούσεων χωρίς σχέδιο και χωρίς πρακτική στρατηγική. Καταδικάζουμε απερίφραστα τα κινεζικά μέτρα αλλά δηλώνουμε καθαρά ότι οι αγρότες και οι κτηνοτρόφοι μας δεν θα πληρώσουν τα λάθη άλλων. Ως σοσιαλιστές και δημοκράτες λέμε «όχι» σε λευκή επιταγή στην Κίνα και «όχι» σε κούρσα δασμών που καταστρέφει την ύπαιθρο και τους αγρότες μας. Στόχος μας είναι να σταθεί ο παραγωγός μας όρθιος, να ανοίξει νέες αγορές και να μην είναι όμηρος μίας μόνο χώρας. Καλούμε την Επιτροπή, αλλά και την Κίνα να αφήσουν τα παιχνίδια ισχύος και να επενδύσουν στην διπλωματία. Ο δρόμος είναι ο διάλογος, ο ΠΟΕ και η αποκλιμάκωση. Όχι άλλοι εμπορικοί πόλεμοι στις πλάτες των αγροτών μας που ζουν σε μόνιμη αβεβαιότητα.

Wouter Beke (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, de nieuwe Chinese invoerheffingen van 60 % op varkensvlees zijn een harde klap voor onze landbouwers. België dreigt het hoogste tarief te krijgen, terwijl onze boeren in de onderzochte periode amper toegang hadden tot de Chinese markt. Dat is niet zomaar een oneerlijke handelspraktijk. Dat is pure geopolitieke druk en een poging om lidstaten uit elkaar te spelen. Boeren mogen niet de dupe worden van Europese plannen om extra heffingen in te voeren op elektrische auto's uit China. We mogen ons niet laten chanteren.

Commissaris, u bent commissaris voor Defensie. Onze landbouwers hebben ook iemand nodig die hun belangen verdedigt. Te meer omdat de invoerheffingen niet het enige probleem zijn. De heffingen komen bovenop de Europese milieuregels, minder landbouwbudget en angst bij de boeren voor Mercosur enzovoort. Dat alles terwijl we er allemaal van overtuigd zijn dat strategische autonomie zo belangrijk is. Onze landbouwers verdienen zekerheid, zodat we competitief kunnen blijven op die wereldmarkt en onze voedselzekerheid kunnen garanderen. Daarom hoop ik dat u deze bezorgdheden meeneemt en dat er maatregelen worden genomen tegen deze heffingen en ook maatregelen om de landbouwsector te ondersteunen.

Brīvais mikrofons

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis (S&D). – Gerbiamas pirmininke, aš kalbėsiu lietuviškai. Juo labiau, kad Kinijos ir Europos Sąjungos santykiuose muitų ir tarifų problemos buvo visą laiką ant darbo stalo. Tenka prisiminti, kada buvo afrikinio kiaulių maro problema, sudėtinga, ir šiuo atveju, kada tas maras po to persikėlė į Kiniją, Kinija taip pat pradėjo gynėsi, gynėsi nepagrįstais tarifais, bet po to, kada jos ūkį ištiko katastrofa, ji labai smarkiai atvėrė mums kiaulienos rinkas. Aš tikrai sveikinu Komisiją ir Komisiją raginu dabar viena – kuo greičiau imtis priemonių, išsiaiškinant iki galo ir keliant klausimą dėl Kinijos įvedamų nesąžiningų muitų, jų perkelti į Pasaulinės prekybos organizacijos ginčus, nes tai leistų padėti greičiau priversti Kiniją vėl, galbūt, sėsti prie derybų stalo ir taip pat kitų rinkų atvėrimas irgi yra numeris vienas.

Diana Iovanovici Șoșoacă (NI). – Domnule președinte, da, vă supărați că acum China instituie taxe foarte mari, nu numai pe carnea de porc, ci pe foarte multe alte produse. Însă, din păcate, nu ați folosit diplomația cu China și nu îi cunoașteți și nu i-ați tratat cum se cuvine. China, la acest moment deține cea mai înaltă putere, este cea mai înaltă putere a lumii. Europa a căzut. Din păcate, vom merge din ce în ce mai rău.

Vă deranjează acum și vreți să ajutați fermierii. Păi, în România, dumneavoastră, de aici, dar și de la Comisia Europeană, ați acționat împotriva fermierilor români. Ne-ați adus pestă porcina, deși nu a existat niciodată și ne-ați interzis exporturile – și acum sunt blocate – pentru ca celelalte țări, Franța, Germania, Spania, Italia, puterile Europei să aibă câștig.

Când v-am rugat să ne ajutați fermierii, nu v-a interesat și ați falimentat. Acum pe cine o să ajutați? Tot ai marilor puteri europene? Sau vă gândiți și la noi, cei din Europa de Est?

Ondřej Dostál (NI). – Pane předsedající, rád bych se zdvořile zeptal pana komisaře, proč jste neval kolegů Šefčoviče a taky pana Síkelu od *Global Gateway* a nedoprovodili jste minulý týden slovenského premiéra Fica do Pekingu? Obchodní diplomacie v následujícím století bude vyžadovat vzájemnou úctu. Kdybyste Číně, klíčovému obchodnímu partnerovi, přijeli popřát k výročí, tak byste tam třeba vyřešili i vepřové nebo elektroauta nebo třeba kriticky důležité léky. A třeba byste zlepšili vyjednávací postavení Evropské unie vůči Spojeným státům, takže byste na golfu nemuseli podepisovat nevyvážené dohody. V Číně má Evropa otevřeno. Je to průmyslová velmoc. Potřebuje, aby globální obchod fungoval. Nemáme žádný skutečný důvod ke konfliktu, zato spoustu možných synergií. Té spolupráci stačí jít naproti.

Nebo je také můžete urážet jako Kaja Kallasová, ale pak holt neprodáte to vepřové a farmáři utrpí škodu. Milí komisaři, podle mého názoru jste úředníci. Měli byste vést kvalitní obchodní diplomacii a prospívat prosperitě členských států. Opravdu to nejde lépe?

(Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās beigas.)

Andrius Kubilius, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, dear colleagues, honourable Members, let me start by really thanking all of you for your thoughtful contributions during today's debate. I understand and share many of your concerns raised.

Let me start from one general remark: as to EU relations with China, let me recall President von der Leyen's message from this morning's State of the Union address, which points to the significant challenges. She made clear that unless these challenges are adequately addressed by China, the European Union would not hesitate to use all instruments at its disposal to safeguard fair competition and defend its legitimate interests. The European Union's relationship with China is important, both trade and investment aspects. For the European Union, it will be crucial to rebalance this relationship around transparency, predictability and reciprocity.

Also, I want to underline that the Commission will continue to do everything possible to defend EU farmers and exporters when confronted with such abusive use of trade defence instruments. We consider the three investigations launched by China as retaliatory and unjustified, and a clear violation of the international trade rules. I recall that China is a key market for EU pork exports. Together with the sector, the Commission will examine the facts underlying the imposition of the provisional duties and will carefully assess all the information available in order to decide next steps. The Commission will consider all options to protect EU industry and economic interests.

President. – The debate is closed.

IN THE CHAIR: ROBERTA METSOLA*President***11. Ændring af dagsordenen**

President. – Pursuant to Rule 164(2), and in agreement with the political groups, I wish to make the following proposal for a change to the agenda:

Parliament's statements on 'Solidarity with Poland following the deliberate violation of Polish airspace by Russian drones' are added as the fourth item of tomorrow morning's sitting.

As a consequence, the sitting will start tomorrow at 8:30.

If there are no objections, then this change is approved.

12. Anmodninger om ophævelse af immunitet

President. – The European Public Prosecutor's Office has addressed a request to me for the parliamentary immunity of Angelika Niebler to be waived.

This request is referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE*Priekšsēdētāja vietnieks***13. Forelæggelse ved Rådet af dets holdning til forslaget til det almindelige budget for regnskabsåret 2026 (forhandling)**

Priekšsēdētājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Padomes nostājas izklāstu attiecībā uz 2026. finanšu gada vispārējā budžeta projektu (2025/2767 (RSP)).

Nicolai Wammen, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, honourable Members, rapporteurs, Commissioner, I am honoured to present in today's plenary the Council's position on the draft budget of the European Union for 2026.

We have worked on the Commission's proposal since it was presented on 4 June, and following a thorough examination I am pleased to report that the Council adopted its position with the support of all Member States on 5 September.

The Council's position aimed to safeguard key EU priorities by ensuring an appropriate level of funding. This includes enhancing Europe's defence readiness and preparedness, as well as managing migration pressures.

At the same time, the Council finds it important to ensure that the EU budget can cope with crises and challenges. Unfolding crises, notably Ukraine and the Middle East, as well as unforeseen crises, which we have seen only too many of in recent years. This means leaving flexibility and room for manoeuvre in 2026 and beyond.

To ensure this, the Council position provides for EUR 186.2 billion in commitment appropriations and EUR 186.5 billion in payment appropriations and additional funding for special instruments outside the MFF.

Guided by these priorities that are endorsed by this Parliament, the Council position has been carefully calibrated to enable the Union to continue delivering on its commitments, all while retaining the flexibility to deal with unforeseen challenges in the coming year.

Let me now point out the main lines of our position.

The first block concerns programmes where the Council thinks we should do more than proposed by the Commission. In today's geopolitical context, we cannot overlook the needs for humanitarian aid, our common security, nor other issues that migration still poses, in particular for frontline Member States. The Council has consequently increased the Commission's proposed allocation in three Hs, namely Heading 4, Migration and Border Management, Heading 5, Security and Defence, and Heading 6, Neighbourhood and the World.

The second block concerns moderation of some of the Commission's proposed increases. We cannot ignore the difficult fiscal situation in the Member States, nor the unexpected crises and challenges we have been facing in recent years. Therefore, we proposed some adjustments in Heading 1, Single Market, Innovation and Digital, sub-Heading 2b, Resilience and Values, and Heading 3, Natural Resources and Environment. These adjustments aim to preserve resources and safeguard the Union's ability to deal with unforeseen circumstances. At the same time, it will contribute to reducing pressure on national budgets.

I want to stress that the adjustments still allow for significant increases compared to the 2025 budget, and will enable us to provide significant funding for key EU policies. The third plug concerns financing costs of the Next Generation EU. We honour the agreement reached during the conciliation last year with regard to the 50/50 approach to be applied on an annual basis.

However, we have taken a more prudent stance on the forecasted disbursements related to Next Generation EU. We look forward to the Commission's amending letter to see whether the original estimate was indeed too high. As for administration, the Council position applies the stable staffing principle to the Commission and its executive agencies. It also adjusts the budgets of the translation centre for the bodies of the EU, which is expected to benefit from efficiency gains, particularly through the use of artificial intelligence.

However, administration expenditure is not only a matter for Heading 7. It is an effort to prioritise operational expenditure. The Council's position also includes adjustments to some support lines, maintaining them at the 2025 level, as well as more moderate increases for some agencies.

Now turning to the payments where we have made proportionate changes to the adjustments made in the commitments.

To conclude, the priorities of the Council for the 2026 budgets is to ensure an appropriate level of funding for EU priorities, to respond to ongoing crises and to maintain the flexibility to address the unforeseen ones.

I look forward to your comments and to a constructive discussion, and to constructive negotiations in the weeks and months ahead.

Piotr Serafin, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, dear Minister, let me first congratulate you and the Danish Presidency on the agreement reached in the Council on the draft budget for 2026 – the position of the Council. As you have mentioned, the agreement was unanimous, which gives you a strong mandate in this process. I also would like to thank you for being here today in the European Parliament. I know that, together with our rapporteurs and this House, we will spend a lot of time together until the end of the year.

Let me share a few remarks on the position of the Council. The draft budget for 2026 presented by the Commission is, in our view, prudent, and it has as its main objective to meet the commitments made by the European Union. Therefore, you will not be surprised that, in our view, the cuts proposed by the Council – the cuts of EUR 1.3 billion in commitments – is neither necessary nor justified.

The proposed cut of EUR 488 million to Heading 1 targets initiatives like Horizon Europe and digital strands of the Connecting Europe Facility. In our view, it sends a bad message. Competitiveness and security are our priorities and we should not put it into question, and that should be reflected in the annual budgets.

Concerning ITER, the proposed cut is undermining, in our view, the agreement reached by the ITER Council last year on the costs and timeline of implementation of this project. And the technical difficulties of the implementation of the project have been overcome, and we have to recognise that.

The Council also proposes cuts in Heading 2b: Erasmus+, EU4Health, rights and values; but there are also cuts in Creative Europe. We believe that these cuts would diminish opportunities for young people and undermine programmes that strengthen the unity and resilience of European societies.

Concerning the proposed cut of EUR 303 million for NGEU financing costs, let me underline that the draft budget delivers on the benchmark for EURI cascade mechanism – 50/50, that you have mentioned, as agreed last year between the two co-legislators. Indeed, the application of the EURI cascade will be reviewed in the amending letter in October. This is when we will have a final view on the needs for the EURI interest line, based on the actual disbursements by the third quarter of 2025. But based on what we know so far, the cut is not justified in our view.

As regards Heading 7, I appreciate that the compromise does not include major changes to our proposal that recognises the efforts made by the Commission and all other institutions. We will continue these efforts, even if it is clear that the administration will remain under substantial pressure.

Honourable Members, thinking about the progress in these negotiations, we should also maintain some room for manoeuvre for the financing of the EURI cascade in 2027. We, in the Commission, have already identified savings, ensuring that the 50 % benchmark will be respected also in 2027. Cuts proposed by the Council are not justified, but we should remain prudent at this stage. And if further reinforcements in this year's budget mean the loss of the EURI cascade in 2027, as it will decrease our availability in margins and special instruments, we should bear it in mind.

On the next steps, the amending letter will revise our proposals for the EURI interest line, Heading 7, as well as the payment needs related to the cohesion mid-term review. It will also include the usual update to agricultural expenditure.

Following the Parliament's reading, we will send, as usual, the executability letter as an input to the conciliation. As always, we will do our best to facilitate the process and reach a successful outcome for the budget for 2026.

Andrzej Halicki, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, Minister, dear Commissioner, I hope that the number of our meetings will not only be obligatory cooperation but with good will. We will go to the final good result because this is what voters and citizens are expecting.

Today representing Parliament – I have to emphasise this because it is not only my opinion but an opinion agreed at parliamentary level – I would like to present the position on the draft budget presented for 2026.

Unfortunately, it does not come as a great surprise to the European Parliament that the Council cuts the Commission's proposal. This happens every year but the scope and the reasoning behind the cuts this year give rise to questions, and I would like to say several words on that.

The most worrying for us, Members of this Parliament representing our citizens, are the Council's cuts to flagship EU programmes like Horizon Europe, Connecting Europe Facility, Digital Europe, EU4Health, Erasmus, Creative Europe, Citizens Equality, Rights and Values Programme and Frontex. Some others also are questionable.

It shows that you do not listen to the expectations of the people, of the citizens, people who want to live in a safe Europe with protected borders, students having access to Erasmus scholarships, European researchers and others. Also civil society organisations fighting for the rule of law and protecting democracy.

It will not surprise you, but we have to restore – and this is our proposal – the draft budget, to restore the Council's cuts as a first hour point of the presentation.

Let me raise an additional important issue, which is repayment of the NextGenerationEU debt, in respect of which there was a proposal to cut by EUR 303 million. You describe this as prudent budgeting, as was mentioned, but I don't like to open the discussion of what prudent means and this is also debatable because the real figures we will have in October, so we will have to look at that issue again when we have the real figures.

Parliament takes a responsible stance when it comes to servicing our debts and paying the interest in time to investors. These are costs we must pay. We all want them to be lower, but we can simply hope that they are budgeted for. We will be waiting for the Commission updated figures in its amending letter.

Finally, let me say something that we welcome in the Council position, namely the reinforcement of humanitarian aid, important military mobility and border management. I look forward to defending Parliament's priorities and to having constructive negotiations over the coming weeks.

We as the European Parliament are looking forward to an efficient and impactful budget of the European Union for the next year. We have to be together, we have to deliver as the EU's institutions for the people of Europe because we have to also ensure that Europe is united, successful and strong. And this is our goal for the year 2026.

Matjaž Nemec, *Poročevalec*. – Gospod predsednik. Spoštovani komisar Serafin. Spoštovani reporter Halicki ter seveda minister Wammen. Dobrodošli v Evropskem parlamentu.

Hvala za predstavitev stališča Sveta glede predloga splošnega proračuna Unije za leto 2026. Z današnjo razpravo vstopamo v naporno obdobje iskanja evropskega proračunskega kompromisa, a imamo odgovornost do predvsem evropskih državljanov in državljanov, da dogovor na koncu tudi dosežemo. Proračun Evropske unije je namreč pod izjemnimi pritiski, še posebej poglavje 7 za financiranje evropskih institucij.

Visok primanjkljaj ni posledica kakšne naravne nesreče, pač pa zavestne politične odločitve, in sicer, ker v postopku revizije kljub potrebam in obveznostim večletni finančni okvir ni bil ustrezno okrepljen. To je bila seveda napaka. V naslednjem letu bo zato samo v poglavju 7 primanjkljaj težak skoraj milijardo evrov, za krpanje vrzeli pa bomo seveda morali znova aktivirati poseben fleksibilen mehanizem.

Spoštovani! Dopolnjeni predlog osnutka proračuna s strani Komisije sledi načelu omejevanja povečanja porabe na največ dva procenta ter seveda stabilne kadrovske politike. Kljub omenjenim finančnim virom nas odlašanje lahko predrago stane. Tega si seveda ne moremo niti ne smemo privoščiti, zato se bomo v Parlamentu zavzeli za odpravo nekaterih predlaganih rezov Komisije, da bodo lahko institucije opravljale svoje temeljno poslanstvo v dobrobit Unije in vseh državljanov.

Zaradi izjemno težkih geopolitičnih razmer, novih izzivov ter obširnega nabora novih zakonodajnih pobud Unije predlogi rezov s strani Komisije že ogrožajo učinkovito delo institucij, kot tudi zmožnost izpolnjevanja njihovih zakonskih obveznosti.

Pozdravljam pristop Sveta do predloga Komisije, ki se ni odločil za dodatne reze. Ta namreč za nekatere evropske institucije pomeni resnično finančno dno. Pozitiven je tudi pristop držav članic do proračunskega okvira za Evropski parlament, kar ocenjujem za zelo konstruktivno.

Naša ambicija, spoštovani, je bila vselej osredotočena na temeljno poslanstvo obeh zakonodajnih teles. Zato tudi moramo v luči geopolitičnih razmer doseči dogovor o zmernem proračunu za prihodnje leto za Evropski parlament.

Kot poročevalec za ostale oddelke si bom prizadeval, da bodo tudi ostale institucije Evropske unije finančno ustrezno podkrepljene, da lahko učinkovito opravljajo svoje delo in poslanstvo.

Moj osebni temelj in temeljni cilj je, da so vse varne pred kibernetскими napadi, vključno z zaposlenimi, ki tam delajo. Nova varnostna tveganja in izjemno hiter razvoj umetne inteligence terjajo seveda ukrepanje vseh nas.

Torej, želim si, da bi dosegli dogovor, kako se lahko institucije najbolj učinkovito, tudi z ustreznimi finančnimi viri, s temi izzivi tudi spopadejo. Tu imam predvsem v mislih: Sodišče Evropske unije, Računsko sodišče, Evropski varuh podatkov, kot tudi Evropska služba za zunanje delovanje, če omenim zgolj nekatere.

Prepričan sem, da si bomo skupaj prizadevali za uresničitev teh prioritet in da bomo na koncu, seveda s pomočjo danskega predsedstva Svetu v spravnih pogajanjih uspeli najti zadovoljivo rešitev za vse nas tri.

Monika Hohlmeier, *Chair of the BUDG Committee*. – Dear President, Commissioner, Minister, dear colleagues, first, I would like to present the best regards, the best greetings of Johan Van Overtveldt, who will join us again when he can be back in Strasbourg and in Brussels, but he is on a good way of recovering.

First, I would like to thank the Minister that he is coming personally because we are not always used to the Ministers doing like this, so thank you very much for your presence.

Secondly, the Council suffers under a situation that the Council produced: the MFF until 2027 is too small. The problem is that the challenges have changed a lot. First we had COVID-19 and suddenly then we were facing a war, we were facing trade problems, we were facing totally new geostrategic constellations. So this means that this MFF has to fulfil duties that were not foreseen in 2020.

This gives to me one question that the Commission already has raised. The Council is talking about competitiveness, about innovation, about boosting industry for more taxes, for more possibilities, for better competitiveness and then you are cutting horizon. This is contradictory. The Council is taking decisions in the area of security, border control – explicitly migration, stopping illegal migration or regular migration. But then we need Frontex and then we need the growing up – as the Council has decided it. This is a decision of the Council, together with the Parliament, on the proposal of the Commission.

So I think we are facing huge challenges in the area of defence. The Parliament was very flexible in this area in the help to Ukraine, so we were accepting Article 122, we were accepting everything, but I don't see the quick reaction of the Council in the area of defence. What is with our future common missile defence shield? If we start with this in 2029, Putin perhaps is already here. So – I am saying it in a sarcastic way – we need to be quicker, and I hope that our Member States will remember that the MFF is too small to tackle all these challenges.

So this is the reason why I would ask the Member States to guarantee not future outside funds, new funds, like the COVID-19 fund. We have an MFF, we have here Parliament, we have here democratic scrutiny, we have here codecision, we have a treaty. Please guarantee that we take the decisions together because the Parliament is ready to do so.

Nicolai Wammen, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, rapporteurs, Chair, Commissioner, thank you for this valuable and constructive exchange. Today's debate has shown that, despite differing views on specific points, we all share a common goal and that is to establish a robust and effective EU budget for 2026.

I have noticed your comments on the Council position as regards specific EU programmes, and the Council acknowledges the European Parliament's position and the benefits of EU spending programmes. At the same time, dear colleagues, we also need to safeguard the Union's ability to deal with unforeseen circumstances. We need to create room to react when new crises emerge.

I also want to address some of your specific concerns. The allocation for interest cost has indeed been reduced. This is because the Council expects a lower disbursement than originally forecasted for the third quarter of 2025. As mentioned earlier, we now look forward to the Commission's amending letter to see whether the original estimates were indeed too high or not. The proposed modification for Erasmus+ takes into account the arrival of additional funds from recoveries – that is important to say here today. And the moderation of expenditure under Horizon Europe is intended to maintain the programme's funding at the same level as last year's budget. For EU4Health, the Council proposes to moderate the significant increase to the programme proposed by the Commission, and the Council's position still results in budgetary increases compared to 2025.

Summing up, I believe the Council position is a balanced one – a position that ensures an appropriate level of funding for EU priorities, allows us to respond to ongoing crises and maintain the flexibility to address the unforeseen ones.

I now look forward to the European Parliament's position on the budget for 2026 and I remain optimistic that our respective positions will eventually converge, allowing us to reach a final agreement in November. We trust that the Commission will continue to act as an honest broker, to bridge the gap between our positions and to help develop a balanced compromise.

A smooth and successful negotiation would demonstrate to our citizens that the Union functions well and can deliver a budget that meets the needs and expectations, especially in these challenging times. Such a budget must also strike the right balance among competing political priorities, acknowledging that not everything can be equally important.

I am confident that, working together, we can deliver this outcome in a timely manner and I look forward to working with all of you. I am very pleased and honoured to be here in person today. And thank you all for the kind remarks in that regard. You should see that as a sign of our commitment, of the Danish Presidency, to reach an agreement with you. We may have different points of departures, but I am sure we will find common ground, for the good of our citizens, for good of Europe.

President. – The debate is closed.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (178. pants)

Tamás Deutsch (PFE), írásban. – Az Európai Bizottság 2026-os költségvetési javaslata elfogadhatatlan. Milliárdokat költené az illegális migrációra, állampolgári, külföldi érdekeket szolgáló, politikai nyomásgyakorló szervezetekre, a tagállami szuverenitást támadó balliberális médiára, a woke propagandára, a háborúra. Ezzel szemben a Patrióták frakciója egy olyan uniós költségvetést szeretne, amely megakadályozza az illegális migrációt, büntetés helyett támogatja a tagállamokat az EU külső határainak megvédésében, védi a tagállamok szuverenitását, a béke oldalán áll és támogatja az európai gazdálkodást. Követeljük, hogy a Bizottság hagyjon fel a tagállamok szuverenitásának ideológiai alapú támadásával! A politikai zsarolást be kell szüntetni! Brüsszel ne akarja uniós pénzből megváltoztatni a neki nem tetsző választópolgári döntéseket!

A Patrióták csökkentenék az EU migrációs politikájára szánt forrásokat, amely ahelyett hogy megállítaná az illegális migrációt, valójában elősegíti azt. 5,7 milliárd euróval emelnék a kohéziós forrásokat 2026-ban, ugyanakkor követeljük, hogy a hazánknak járó forrásokat azonnal fizessék ki, ne költhessék más országokra, ne költhessék a háborúra. 2 milliárd eurót kérünk a magyar határvédelem költségeire, az EU ismerje el Magyarország erőfeszítéseit az illegális migrációval szembeni küzdelemben és büntetés helyett fizessék ki hazánknak a határvédelmi kerítés költségeit. A Patrióták jelentősen, 2,5 milliárd euróval emelnék 2026-ban a közös agrárpolitika költségvetését, több pénzt adnának az európai mezőgazdasági válságkezelésre, a méhészetre, az iskolatej/iskolagyümölcs programra, a fiatal gazdák támogatására.

14. Pakkerejser og sammensatte rejsearrangementer: sikring af en mere effektiv beskyttelse af rejsende og forenkling og præcisering af visse aspekter (forhandling)

Priekšsēdētājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Alex Agius Saliba ziņojumu Iekšējā tirgus un patērētāju aizsardzības komitejas vārdā par priekšlikumu Eiropas Parlamenta un Padomes direktīvai, ar ko groza Direktīvu (ES) 2015/2302, lai uzlabotu ceļotāju aizsardzības efektivitāti un vienkāršotu un skaidrotu dažus direktīvas aspektus (COM(2023)0905 – C9-0436/2023 – 2023/0435(COD)) (A10-0140/2025).

Alex Agius Saliba, rapporteur. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, it is the worst possible holiday experience being stranded in a far-off place as a traveller because your travel organiser went bankrupt. Luckily, we have strong EU consumer protection in place that makes sure that travel organisers and their consumers are insured. Still, we as Parliament asked for an update to the rules for package travel.

We need to learn from the experiences from the default of Thomas Cook, which affected hundreds of thousands of European holidaymakers. In addition, the consequences of travel restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic made it necessary to update our rules on what will happen in extraordinary circumstances and also to regulate the use of vouchers.

We have to thank, first and foremost, the European Commission for a very ambitious proposal, which I took as a firm basis in my work as rapporteur. For me personally, and also for my political family, the interests of our citizens, of our consumers and strengthening their protection is the starting point and number one priority. Coming from Malta, one of Europe's finest holiday destinations, the tourism industry is something which is very close to home. Many travel agencies that organise these packages are small, privately owned businesses and we want to support them and therefore we needed to find a very balanced approach. It is my conviction that we achieved such a balance in the report that we will be voting on tomorrow.

One aspect that received quite some attention was the definition of 'package travel'. This, in the end, decides whether or not a consumer will receive protection from the Directive. We kept a special eye out for potential circumvention and made sure that if a travel organiser directly retargets a traveller with additional services within 24 hours, this will still constitute a package. In exchange, we removed the concept of linked travel arrangements that was very unclear for organisers and not useful either for consumers. This was an important request coming directly from the travel industry.

Another important element are the rights of consumers to terminate a package without paying a fee in the case of extraordinary circumstances at the place of departure, destination and journey. If such a circumstance prohibits you from travelling in the 28 days before your travel you have the right to terminate. When deciding if the consumer can cancel the travel warnings of national authorities, like the ones during the COVID-19 pandemic, are also taken into account. The right to a refund must happen within 14 days, and the right to a refund will become a right that each and every traveller can enjoy.

For the first time, we are regulating the use of vouchers and we make it clear that they should remain voluntary for consumers to accept. After a validity of 12 months, travellers that did not use a voucher should get a refund of the original value of the amount that they paid for the travel package.

For all these rules enforcement, like everything, will always remain key. This is why we introduced two new aspects: harmonisation of fines and, very importantly, a complaint handling mechanism. Those companies that infringe the Package Travel Directive can face a minimum fine of 4 % of annual turnover, which we introduce. In addition, to make sure that you get an answer in case of issues, we created a complaint handling mechanism with mandatory deadlines to keep. You need to get a first answer within 7 working days and a reasoned reply within 30 working days. Consumer protection on paper looks nice, but this mandatory complaint mechanism will help you to get your rights respected as a traveller.

I know that there is a growing political divide in this House on many different political issues, but I am happy to see that we can come together in a broad majority on issues that really matter for our voters: to book and enjoy a holiday with peace of mind and get help or protection if something goes wrong, or if they are faced with unexpected circumstances. If you support this report, we will deliver on a good piece of legislation for holidaymakers. This is close to the people we try to serve in this very House.

Michael McGrath, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, can I, at the outset, thank the rapporteur, Alex Saliba, and all of the shadow rapporteurs for your work on this important file. The EU's core tourism industry consists of 3.5 million businesses, mainly small- and medium-sized enterprises, and corresponds to up to 10 % of the EU's GDP. It is therefore of vital importance for the European economy.

In particular, the package travel sector is an area where the EU is dedicated to safeguarding consumers' rights. Since 1990, EU rules on package travel have served as a cornerstone of the European Union's consumer policy. In 2015, a first review of the Package Travel Directive modernised these rules to guarantee a high level of consumer protection. While these rules have generally been effective, the COVID-19 pandemic has brought certain application challenges to light. Therefore, in November 2023, the Commission proposed to revise the directive to make it more effective both for European citizens but also for businesses. The Commission introduced this proposal alongside initiatives concerning passenger rights.

Regarding package travel, the Commission put forward a series of measures designed to enhance consumer protection and boost the competitiveness of package organisers, many of which are indeed small or micro-enterprises throughout the EU. To lessen consumer detriment, the Commission proposed measures such as implementing a flexible cap on prepayments and clarifying that any outstanding refunds are safeguarded by insolvency protection. The Commission proposed to introduce new rules on vouchers to give more flexibility to package organisers, while providing solid guarantees for travellers.

The Commission also proposed clarifications on the termination of package travel contracts due to unavoidable and extraordinary circumstances, as requested at the time by many stakeholders. In addition, responding to criticism on the complexity of the current setup and the lack of effectiveness of the concept of linked travel arrangements (or LTAs), the Commission sought to reform the definition of 'package' and the concept of linked travel arrangements. Furthermore, our proposal entails clearer information for travellers but fewer information forms.

I would like to sincerely thank the rapporteur, Alex Saliba, for building broad support on a text to start negotiations with the Council and to those Members from all political groups who have contributed to finding the necessary compromises – thank you all for your work.

The report on which you will vote generally aligns with the objectives of the Commission's proposal. It further strengthens consumer rights in some respects; for instance, it adds further options and guarantees for travellers in relation to vouchers and proposes measures to strengthen the enforcement of consumer rights.

Nonetheless, there are also varying perspectives on a number of points. The Commission notes, for example, that the proposal to establish common rules to limit prepayments received limited support. While this would leave an existing area of consumer detriment unaddressed, the Commission also acknowledges the reasoning of those advocating for greater flexibility for the parties involved, especially traders.

The definition of 'package' and the future of linked travel arrangements is not an easy question. The deletion of linked travel arrangements, as proposed in Parliament's report, would simplify the overall framework considerably. At the same time, the Commission appreciates that, through a broader definition of 'package', the Parliament's draft would guarantee the protection of travellers in situations of combined travel services. It is also important that where bookings of different services resemble a package but do not in fact constitute a package under the Directive travellers receive a clear warning that they will not be protected by these rules, so that they can then make an informed choice.

While, at this stage, the Commission has to reserve its position on different amendments contained in the Parliament's draft, the report on which you are asked to vote reflects the discussions in this Parliament in a balanced manner. I would thus encourage the Members of this House to give the rapporteur a clear mandate, so that the legislative process can continue, paving the way for a more effective legal framework for package travel in the European Union. I now look forward to hearing the views of the Members of the House on this issue.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des TRAN-Ausschusses*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Als Verfasser der Stellungnahme des Ausschusses für Verkehr und Tourismus zur Pauschalreiserichtlinie möchte ich zunächst einmal sagen, dass für uns das Thema Verbraucherschutz das höchste Ziel war. Es muss für den Verbraucher klar sein, wann er eine Pauschalreise bucht und wann er eben auch keine Pauschalreise bucht. Das ist extrem wichtig, denn manchmal haben Kunden den Eindruck, dass sie ein Recht, eine Absicherung haben, die aber eigentlich gar nicht da ist. Von daher ist das Thema Klarheit und Information für den Verbraucher für uns im Zentrum. Die Pauschalreise ist ein tolles Produkt und bietet zusätzliche Absicherung für Verbraucher, die eben nicht alle möglichen einzelnen Dienstleistungen buchen, und insofern wollen wir die Pauschalreise stärken.

Gleichzeitig denken viele bei der Pauschalreise an den Flug in die Sonne, aber Pauschalreise ist viel, viel mehr als das. Viele Pauschalreisen sind mit dem Bus, beispielsweise in den Schwarzwald. Das ist eine Pauschalreise, die häufig von kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen angeboten wird. Dazu gibt es gerade in Deutschland bei uns Reisebüros, die eine super Arbeit machen, die die Kunden dahin gehend beraten, wie es gehen kann, wie sie abgesichert sind. Und unser Ziel ist es nicht, diese Arbeit zu behindern oder sie gar auf Umwegen zu Reiseveranstaltern zu machen. Das sollten wir auf jeden Fall in den Beratungen immer im Hinterkopf behalten. Ich freue mich auf diese Beratungen und auf das Fortgehen der Beratungen mit dem Rat.

Arba Kokalari, för PPE gruppen. – Herr talman! Kollegor. EU-kommissionen. De flesta av oss känner någon som har tvingats ställa in en charterresa, särskilt under pandemin. För en vanlig barnfamilj kan det handla om väldigt mycket pengar. Som konsument vet man inte alltid vilka rättigheter man har.

Men inställda paketresor ska inte innebära inställda rättigheter. Därför gör vi det nu enklare för svenskar att få tillbaka pengarna om man tvingas ställa in charterresan på grund av en pandemi eller att resebyrå går i konkurs. Vi gör värdebevisen mycket mer attraktiva. Vi inför tydligare informationskrav gentemot konsumenterna, och jag har drivit på för tydliga regler: att stärka skyddet för resenärerna utan att lägga alltför mycket tung byråkrati på små resebyråer.

För det är trots allt små företag som utgör kärnan av turismnäringen i Europa. Därför vill vi här i Europaparlamentet att resebyråer ska fortsätta kunna ta betalt i förskott. I år firar svensk charter 70 år, och med ett ännu starkare skydd för konsumenter finns det nu ännu fler anledningar att välja en paketresa på jullovet eller sommarlovet.

Laura Ballarín Cereza, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, cada año más de 200 millones de europeos contratan viajes combinados. Y, sin embargo, cuando algo falla —un vuelo cancelado, una maleta que nunca aparece o una pandemia—, demasiados consumidores siguen quedando solos frente a las grandes compañías. El 60 % de las reclamaciones por incidencias en los viajes no se resuelven satisfactoriamente.

Por eso, este texto —por el cual felicito al ponente— es un gran paso adelante para proteger más y mejor a los viajeros europeos frente a estos abusos, pero hay que ir más allá: no podemos aceptar que algunas compañías aéreas conviertan la maleta de cabina en un negocio encubierto. Y tampoco podemos permitir que los retrasos y las cancelaciones se conviertan en una lotería en la que siempre pierde el viajero.

Europa no puede mirar hacia otro lado mientras las compañías abusan de la paciencia y del bolsillo de los viajeros. Viajar debería ser sinónimo de libertad y seguridad, no de incertidumbre ni de abuso. Porque no solo hablamos de vacaciones, hablamos de familias que visitan a sus hijos, que estudian fuera, o incluso se va a funerales.

Por eso, avancemos en los derechos de los consumidores y reforcemos esta Directiva. Detrás de cada billete hay una familia, un sueño y una promesa de confianza. Señorías, no podemos romper esta promesa.

IN THE CHAIR: CHRISTEL SCHALDEMOSE

Vice-President

Elisabeth Dieringer, im Namen der P/E-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Die geplante Neuregelung der Pauschalreiserichtlinie mag auf den ersten Blick Verbesserungen beim Verbraucherschutz bringen. Doch ihre Tücken für Bürger und Unternehmen sind da: Obwohl die Erfahrungen aus der Thomas-Cook-Pleite und der Coronakrise wichtige Lehren bereithalten, droht die Praxis durch neue Bürokratie, starre Zahlungsgrenzen und ein Übermaß an Informationspflichten gerade unsere kleinen und mittelständischen Reiseveranstalter unverhältnismäßig zu belasten.

Die Streichung der verbundenen Reiseleistungen nimmt Reisenden flexible Gestaltung abseits starrer Pauschalen und sorgt für Unsicherheit statt Klarheit. Anstatt die Reisefreiheit zu stärken, riskieren wir, Angebote zu verteuern und die Auswahl in Österreich und Europa zu beschneiden.

Es braucht praxistauglichen Verbraucherschutz, der Mittelstand fördert, statt ihn abzuwürgen, und der dem Recht auf freie Gestaltung der Reise Rechnung trägt – nicht eine weitere Vorschrift aus Brüssel, die unsere Bürger zu bloßen Konsumenten und Unternehmen zu reinen Erfüllungsgehilfen degradiert. Unsere Tourismuswirtschaft verdient Vertrauen statt immer neuer Ketten und Formulare.

Denis Nesci, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, il turismo non è soltanto un settore economico; è entità, cultura, tradizione; è la ricchezza dei nostri territori, e in Italia lo sappiamo bene.

Milioni di viaggiatori scelgono le nostre città d'arte, i nostri borghi e le nostre coste e dietro ogni viaggio ci sono famiglie, piccole imprese e lavoratori che, con impegno quotidiano, tengono viva questa ricchezza.

La pandemia e il fallimento di grandi operatori hanno messo in evidenza tutte le fragilità del settore: viaggiatori lasciati senza rimborsi, imprese in ginocchio. Per questo era necessaria una revisione seria di questa direttiva.

Oggi diamo ai consumatori regole più chiare, maggiore tutela e soprattutto rimborsi rapidi e sicuri in caso di crisi o insolvenza.

Al tempo stesso abbiamo difeso le nostre imprese, in particolare le più piccole, da regole che avrebbero significato solo burocrazia e costi insostenibili.

Non accettiamo proposte come i conti fiduciari, che penalizzano i più deboli senza portare reali benefici. Ciò che serve è equilibrio: proteggere i viaggiatori, sì, ma senza condannare chi lavora onestamente e tiene in piedi l'economia reale.

Il testo che voteremo domani va in questa direzione, rafforza la fiducia dei cittadini e permette alle imprese di continuare a crescere e competere.

Cynthia Ní Mhurchú, *thar ceann an Ghrúpa Renew*. – A Chathaoirligh, a Choimisinéir, Nuair a theip ar ghnólachtaí taistil is comhlachtaí saoire 5 bliana ó shin, d'fhág sé go leor daoine ar an dtrá bhán agus d'fhulaing an t-uafás daoine pionóis. D'fhág Thomas Cook na mílte daoine, mar a dúirt mé, ar an dtrá bhán agus i rith COVID-19 agus na dianghlasála, chaill go leor teaghlach a gcoigilteas. Bhí an t-airgead imithe, gan aon chúiteamh, agus an muinín briste. Tá deireadh leis sin anois. D'oibrigh mé go crua agus go díreach ar an vótáil reachtúil seo, ag comhoibriú le Feisirí eile ar fud an tí, agus táim sásta a rá agus bródúil a rá, leis na cosaintí nua seo, má theipeann ar chomhlachtaí taistil amach anseo, tá do chuid airgid sábháilte. Tá sé chomh simplí leis sin. Aisíocaíochtaí laistigh de 14 lá, dearbháin fhadéarmacha agus sho-aistrithe, duine amháin freagrach as fadhbanna a réiteach i gcás tinnis nó bás gan choinne. Labhair mé go díreach leis na comhlachtaí turasóireachta agus d'inis siad dom cad a bhí tábhachtach dóibh siúd – reachtaíocht riachtanach agus réamhíocaíochtaí riachtanacha chun dul tríd na míonna ciúine, agus chuirfeadh rialacha troma iad i mbaol. D'éist mé, ghlac mé páirt, throid mé chun iad a chosaint sna cainteanna seo. Sin é an fáth a gcuirim fáilte roimh an reachtaíocht nua seo. Cosnaíonn siad tomhaltóirí agus tugann sé spás do chomhlachtaí agus do ghnólachtaí séasúracha maireachtáil.

Katrin Langensiepen, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Erstmal möchte ich mich bei dem Berichterstatter bedanken für die gute Kooperation und Zusammenarbeit – ich glaube, das sollte auch mal erwähnt werden – und dass wir jetzt gut geschlossen in die Verhandlungen gehen.

Ich habe mal in meinem vorigen Leben als Callcenter-Mitarbeiterin für ein größeres Unternehmen in Hannover – das mit den drei Buchstaben; ich mache keine Werbung – gearbeitet, und dann hat man natürlich Menschen am Telefon, die spontan anrufen und sich natürlich freuen, dass da ein echter Mensch, eine Telefonnummer ist, die man anrufen kann, und da antwortet auch ein echter Mensch und nicht irgendeine Computerstimme. Dann ist da jemand in Tränen aufgelöst mit drei Kindern, steht irgendwo und sagt: Boah, ich komme nicht weiter. Kriege ich jetzt mein Geld zurück? Wie ist die Situation für mich?

Man spart das ganze Jahr auf seinen Urlaub. Wir kommen gerade aus der Sommerpause; wir können es uns hier vielleicht mit unserem Budget noch leisten. Aber wer unterstützt mich? Wer beantwortet meine Fragen? Was tut Brüssel für mich?

Wir schützen euren Urlaub, liebe Bürgerinnen und Bürger, vielleicht kann man das so klar sagen; sei es der Auslandsurlaub oder halt auch in unseren Mitgliedstaaten. Aber wir schützen Verbraucherrechte und gehen damit in hoffentlich gute Verhandlungen.

Hanna Gedin, för The Left gruppen. – Fru talman! Tänk dig att stå ensam, strandad på en perrong med packade väskor i händerna och ingen som tar ansvar för situationen. Du kontaktar resebyrå som hänvisar till tågbolaget som hänvisar tillbaka till resebyrå. Det här är verkligheten för många resenärer. För ofta har företagen alltför stor makt och människan alldeles för liten.

Det finns delar av det här förslaget som är bra. Det är till exempel bra att resenären ska ha rätt att välja pengar istället för värdecheckar, och det är något som jag har drivit på för. Men mycket kvarstår innan du som resenär faktiskt kan känna dig helt trygg. Alldeles för ofta går företagens vinst före människans rätt till trygghet, och det är politikens ansvar att se till att ingen lämnas ensam på perrongen.

Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, las situaciones extraordinarias como la COVID-19, la quiebra de Thomas Cook o la erupción de un volcán, paralizando el espacio aéreo europeo, nos obligan a reaccionar adaptando nuestras normas: es fundamental para las empresas y para los consumidores garantizar la viabilidad del sector turístico.

Se trata de encontrar un equilibrio entre la protección de los derechos de los consumidores y la viabilidad de nuestras empresas, especialmente las pymes. Lo primero es compatible con lo segundo, pero difícilmente podremos garantizar los derechos de los ciudadanos si no garantizamos la viabilidad del sector. La revisión de la Directiva de viajes combinados recoge este equilibrio: frente a inseguridad jurídica y excesiva complejidad y burocracia, necesitamos respuestas claras, como la del texto enmendado por este Parlamento.

Además, la experiencia demuestra que los acontecimientos excepcionales ocurren, y sus consecuencias son devastadoras: pérdida de empleos, cancelaciones masivas e inversiones perdidas. Debemos estar preparados con normas y mecanismos adaptados, pero sin perder de vista lo cotidiano y sin cargar a nuestras empresas con obligaciones inasumibles.

La clave de este equilibrio está en insuflar confianza a través de la seguridad jurídica para nuestras empresas y de garantías para los pasajeros, tanto para su seguridad como para el gasto que hacen al contratar servicios de viaje. Esta debe ser nuestra prioridad: un sector turístico fuerte con pymes y empresas competitivas que proteja los derechos de los ciudadanos, así seguiremos consolidando nuestro mercado único.

François Kalfon (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, en 2019, l'agence Thomas Cook fait faillite et c'est 140 000 Européens qui sont coincés à l'étranger et qui ont dû être rapatriés en catastrophe. Annulations, événements imprévus riment trop souvent avec bon d'achat imposé ou remboursement interminable.

Le Parlement votera demain la loi encadrant les voyages à forfait, ces packages qui rassemblent l'hôtel, le billet d'avion et pourquoi pas la location de voiture. Grâce à la mobilisation des socialistes, nous avons obtenu pour vous des avancées majeures.

Demain, en cas de faillite, les acomptes seront remboursés et les voyageurs rapatriés gratuitement. En cas de nouvelle pandémie ou de catastrophe naturelle, les clients pourront annuler sans frais leur voyage. Remboursement ou bon d'achat? Malgré les efforts de la droite européenne liés aux lobbies pour l'empêcher, demain, c'est le consommateur qui choisira et le remboursement en espèces devra arriver sous quatorze jours.

Ma détermination est totale pour faire progresser vos droits pour un voyage serein. Alors je le dis à mes collègues des différents groupes politiques: soyez du côté des consommateurs et votez avec nous ces avancées.

Kamila Gasiuk-Pihowicz (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Urlopy są po to, aby odpoczywać, ale co się dzieje, jeżeli trzeba je odwołać z powodu wyjątkowych okoliczności, takich jak pandemia czy wojna? Dzięki nowej dyrektywie będzie można zrezygnować z wyjazdu z wyprzedzeniem, nie ponosząc żadnych kosztów. Podczas pandemii masowe odwoływanie urlopów doprowadziło do ogromnych opóźnień w zwrotach pieniędzy, ale także spowodowało utratę płynności finansowej w małych biurach podróży. I aby temu zaradzić, dyrektywa wprowadza bardziej elastyczne rozwiązanie – vouchery. Nadal będzie można otrzymać zwrot pieniędzy, ale będzie można także wybrać voucher, który może być wart więcej niż pierwotnie zapłacona kwota. Ostatecznie jeżeli z vouchera nie skorzystamy, konsument i tak otrzyma zwrot. A co jeśli biuro podróży zbankrutuje? Dyrektywa chroni konsumentów. Wprowadza gwarancje, które zapewniają, że zwroty dla konsumentów będą traktowane priorytetowo. Wreszcie informacje o prawach konsumentów będą jasne i dostępne z wyprzedzeniem. Proste, przejrzyste, praktyczne przepisy, by mieć spokojne wakacje.

Sérgio Gonçalves (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, caro Comissário, o Parlamento Europeu dá esta semana um passo importante para reforçar a proteção dos turistas quando compram viagens organizadas, por exemplo através de uma agência de viagens. Queremos garantir regras mais claras para reembolsos rápidos, proteção em caso de insolvência e maior transparência sobre os direitos dos consumidores.

Os turistas terão também mais segurança através da harmonização de regras sobre os *vouchers*, direito a cancelar a viagem sem custos em circunstâncias extraordinárias e um sistema de reclamações mais eficaz.

Para as empresas, especialmente as pequenas e médias, asseguramos regras proporcionais e clareza contratual. É essencial que todas estas medidas possam gerar confiança — essa confiança é o que sustenta, impulsiona e beneficia todo o setor do turismo europeu.

Quero terminar agradecendo à Comissão Europeia pelo trabalho na preparação desta proposta. Este é um exemplo do que deve ser o foco da União: colocar as pessoas e os seus direitos no centro das políticas e trabalhar em estreita cooperação para obter resultados concretos.

Regina Doherty (PPE). – Madam President, I think we all know how stressful it can be to book a holiday; you're trying to juggle your flights, your hotels, your transfers, and you're keeping your fingers crossed in the hopes that nothing goes wrong. But now, the new EU Package Travel Directive is designed to help make that process clearer, easier and much safer. It's going to cut down on red tape so that small businesses and local travel agents can do what they do best: offering great value and choice to their customers. But at the same time, it keeps the cost of travel low by making sure the rules are simple and fair.

I think most importantly, it is going to protect you, the consumer, whether you book, online, in person or as part of a package. You will have clear rights and stronger guarantees when plans change. We are going to have a better definition of what constitutes a package. We are going to have new standardised information rules so that it's very clear that you know what you're dealing with. You're going to have new cancellation rights, so you won't necessarily need a reason from now on. And things will be faster and fairer, particularly when it comes to our refunds. So the new proposal is a win for businesses, it's a win for consumers, and it's a real win for Europe's travel industry as a whole and I'm very proud to welcome it.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Magdalena Adamowicz (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! 1 200 000 Europejczyków rocznie podróżuje. To jest 100 tysięcy miesięcznie. W tej skali pojedynczy pasażer, który czeka trzy godziny na opóźniony lot, tygodniami na zwrot pieniędzy, czy traci bagaż, dla przewoźnika pozostaje anonimowym klientem – choć dla niego to często życiowy problem.

Chcę także poinformować, że do Parlamentu wpłynęła petycja mieszkańca mojego regionu, lekarza Andrzeja Katafiasa, w sprawie pilnej potrzeby wprowadzenia minimalnych standardów odległości foteli samolotowych. Upychanie pasażerów to zagrożenie dla bezpieczeństwa i zdrowia. Na samoregulację branży nie możemy liczyć.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, ha mencionado usted en su intervención que el turismo es una industria que genera millones de empleos en la Unión Europea y representa el 10 % de su producto interior bruto (PIB). En algunas regiones especialmente dependientes de esa industria —como es el caso de Canarias— representa el 35 % del PIB y el 36 % del empleo, y el hundimiento de Thomas Cook significó una catástrofe para los derechos de los consumidores, pero también para el conjunto de la economía regional.

Un marco europeo de protección de los consumidores que refuerce la seguridad jurídica y el atenuamiento de las grandes compañías turísticas a las reglas europeas es esencial también para prevenir que haya empresarios que impongan condiciones abusivas, que tienen que ser enfrentadas no solamente con el coraje de determinados Gobiernos —como es el caso del español— sino con el respaldo del Derecho europeo.

Y una última recomendación: una campaña de información que expanda el conocimiento de sus derechos por parte de todos los que están expuestos a las nuevas reglas de refuerzo de protección de los derechos de los consumidores ante la industria turística y los viajes combinados.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, sigur, era nevoie să corectăm sau să îmbunătățim directiva existentă legată de pachetele de călătorii și protecția consumatorilor. Eu privesc din dublu sens și ca vicepreședinta Comisiei pentru piața internă și protecția consumatorilor, dar și ca fost întreprinzător. Eu mă bucur că s-a ajuns la un echilibru în această modificare de directivă, pentru că da, avem nevoie să dezvoltăm turismul, avem nevoie de agențiile de turism. Nu putem să le supraîncărcăm nici birocratic, nici cu costuri.

Pe de altă parte, sigur că trebuie să existe această protecție a consumatorilor, a celor care fac turism și până la urmă, se întrepătrund. Dacă turiștii, dacă pasagerii sunt mulțumiți, turismul se va dezvolta, vor mai merge într-o călătorie. Eu sper ca această modificare de directivă să fie votată și sper mai ales să fie implementată, pentru că este foarte important nu numai să reglementăm, ci și să implementăm și aici este de competența statelor membre să o asimileze în legislațiile naționale. Oricum, cred foarte mult în dezvoltare...

(Președinta a retras cuvântul vorbitoarei)

Lukas Sieper (NI). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Menschen Europas! Diese Reform klingt vielleicht technisch, aber ich kann Ihnen sagen, die ist praktisch hochrelevant. Im Rahmen meines Referendariats habe ich mehrere Fälle bearbeitet, in denen es um Reisestornierungen, Rückzahlungen und Insolvenzprobleme ging. Ich kann Ihnen aus der Erfahrung sagen: Das aktuelle System versagt in der Krise.

Deshalb begrüße ich diesen Vorschlag ausdrücklich. Er stärkt Verbraucherrechte, schließt digitale Schlupflöcher und sichert Vorauszahlungen endlich besser ab, ohne dabei Unternehmen zu erdrücken.

Besonders wichtig: Reisende haben künftig ein klares Anrecht auf Rückerstattung – und das innerhalb von 14 Tagen. Gutscheine dürfen nur mit ausdrücklicher Zustimmung ausgegeben werden, und sie müssen durch Insolvenzschutz gedeckt sein. Ich unterstütze auch die Forderung des Parlaments, die Frist zur Rückzahlung im Insolvenzfall auf sechs Monate zu verlängern und klare Sanktionen für Verstöße festzulegen.

Diese Reform ist ein kluges, ausgewogenes Update. Sie stärkt das Vertrauen in den europäischen Reisemarkt.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Michael McGrath, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I'd like to thank all of the honourable Members for their contributions to the debate this evening. And I think it was a very balanced debate and set of contributions from Members. I think there is broad recognition of the need for strong consumer rights in this area, but also to do so in a fair and balanced way that recognises the need to keep this sector alive and well in the European Union, and particularly given that many of the businesses that are operating in the package travel sector are small, medium and some are micro-enterprises, and we do need to keep them going as well.

Looking at the process ahead, the fact that the Parliament's draft position and the position of the Council converge in many respects, it makes me hopeful that an agreement could be reached before the end of this year. In addition to the points where there is already full alignment between the co-legislators, an agreement on questions, such as the new provision on vouchers or certain aspects of insolvency protection, should not be difficult.

Other points are likely to require further discussions during the trilogues, and that is natural. These issues include, for instance, the definition of 'package' following the deletion of linked travel arrangements, on which both legislators seem to agree in principle; the information provided to travellers when a combination of travel services does not constitute a package; and certain aspects of determination of package travel contracts due to unavoidable and extraordinary circumstances, such as the relevance of official travel warnings. I think we can expect all of those issues to feature over the course of the trilogues.

Discussions can also be expected on aspects where the Parliament's report proposes amendments in addition to what the Commission proposed, for example, on complaint handling and fines, but also elements that would reduce the scope of the directive. In the trilogues the Commission will do its utmost to facilitate a final text that will add value to the existing directive, and that will contain appropriate solutions for the identified problems. I am optimistic that this can be achieved to the benefit of both European consumers and also travel businesses.

Therefore, the Commission is looking forward to the completion of this stage of the deliberations within the European Parliament. I would like to reiterate its thanks to the rapporteur and to the Members of this House for their work on the text on which I know you will be voting tomorrow.

Alex Agius Saliba, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, before I conclude, I would like to thank first and foremost to all the shadows that have collaborated to find consensus on this very important file. We have different political opinions; a different political background; we come from different Member States with very different realities, with specific interests, specific practices, also in the tourism industry; but still we came together and struck a balance between what we have heard from travel agents and also what we have heard from consumer associations, and directly from consumers, to find the right balance between these different interests.

And in this delicate exercise, which we will take forward towards the Member States in the trilogue negotiations, we are hoping to ultimately find the right balance to increase consumer protection, but at the same time also strengthen our tourist operators. Therefore we want to keep vouchers voluntary – and this is an important line for my political group. We want to keep the protection and insurance of travel organisers in case of bankruptcy in place.

Let us see the positive in this file that can make the difference for holidaymakers around Europe. And I count on your support in the vote that we have tomorrow.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will be held tomorrow.

15. Behov for et stærkt europæisk demokratiskjold for at styrke demokratiet, beskytte EU mod udenlandsk indblanding og hybride trusler og beskytte valgprocesser i EU (forhandling)

President. – The next item on the agenda is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on the need for a strong European Democracy Shield to enhance democracy, protect the EU from foreign interference and hybrid threats, and protect electoral processes in the EU (2025/2857(RSP)).

Marie Bjerre, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, the European Union is built on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights. Threats to our values are threats to the Union and our values go hand in hand.

Democracy needs freedom of expression to grow and develop, and democracy must be based on the rule of law and fundamental rights.

However, actors from outside and within the European Union continue to attack our democracies. Hybrid threats, information manipulation and polarisation are serious challenges to our democracies. This includes more and more the use of social media for spreading disinformation.

Fighting these threats and protecting our election is an absolute priority. We must use all our available tools and consider new ones, as President Ursula von der Leyen underlined this morning. At the same time, we also need to strengthen democratic resilience at all levels.

Therefore, the Council is looking forward to the European Democracy Shield that the Commission will soon propose. As an input to this shield, the General Affairs Council discussed conclusions on strengthened democratic resilience and invited Commissioner McGrath.

It is clear that we are not starting from scratch in our efforts. Let me recall some recent important actions. The Defence of Democracy packets presented by the Commission in December 2023 and the 2020 European Democracy Action Plan are toolboxes to address hybrid threats and foreign information manipulation and interference. All the rulebook introduced by ground-breaking legislation like the Digital Market Act, the Digital Services Act or the European Media Freedom Act.

Looking ahead, we must continue to fight disinformation and foreign interference. In particular, when looking at the threat from Russia. That is essential to protect our democracies and ensure the fairness and integrity of our elections.

But we must also empower our citizens with a focus on young people. Media literacy, especially social media literacy and access to reliable media, are key for democracy, for democratic societies.

Civil society organisations also contribute to an effective system of checks and balances. Our general aim must be to ensure freedom of expression and promote the engagement of our citizens in our societies.

Last but not least, let me also mention the role of the European Parliament's Special Committee on the European Democracy Shield. We are looking forward to its final report and recommendations.

Only together can we protect and strengthen our democracies.

Michael McGrath, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister Bjerre, honourable Members, thank you for this exchange on the upcoming European Democracy Shield. As President von der Leyen confirmed this morning, in the State of the Union speech, this is a key priority for this Commission's mandate. The European Parliament has an important role to play in strengthening European democracy. We welcome the work of the Special Committee on the European Democracy Shield. We will continue our dialogue in the preparation of this initiative.

Democracy is not some abstract concept. It is the soul of our Union and of our people. And all democracies need nurturing, and we need to do this with full strength, given the challenges democracies are facing. Our democracy and fundamental values are under pressure. We see attempts to undermine the rule of law and media freedom, disinformation, information manipulation, and attempts at electoral interference. We are also witnessing the increasing promotion of anti-democratic narratives and attitudes, including among young people.

All this has one goal: to undermine citizens' trust in democracy and our democratic institutions. Many feel disillusioned with the status quo. As stated in the Strategic Foresight Report, which the Commission adopted only yesterday, we need to strengthen the foundations of democracy as a common good. And the foundations of democracy reside in its free people, free elections, and strong democratic institutions, including free media. Protecting these freedoms and strengthening the resilience of our democracies is what the European Democracy Shield will strive to do.

Preparations are well underway. We have collected a wealth of input from the European Parliament, other EU institutions and bodies, Member States, various stakeholders and the citizens of Europe, and we will continue to engage broadly as we pin down concrete actions. And one thing is clear: we need to improve our collective capacity to act against threats. As the President said today, with the European Democracy Shield, we will step up our collective capacity to monitor and detect information manipulation and disinformation, to strengthen the level of protection of our media and the resilience of our electoral processes.

For that, the Commission will set up a European centre for democratic resilience. This centre will bring together a community of experts to support the capacity of our Member States and neighbouring countries to monitor, detect and coordinate responses to combat information manipulation and disinformation.

The online space is part of our everyday life, as we extensively use very large online platforms to get informed or exchange with friends or families, or to do our shopping, make payments, investments and even our work. And in doing so, we need to be able to access and engage with reliable, accurate and impartial information, safe from abuse, scams and harm.

The Commission continues to closely monitor very large online platforms' compliance with the Digital Services Act, and is diligently proceeding with the open investigations. Transparency is essential for evaluating the risks stemming from online platform use. In July, the Commission published a delegated act for data access, which will provide non-public data access to vetted researchers when relevant to the study of systemic risks under the DSA.

Science is a key pillar for democracy and evidence-based policymaking. Under the European network of fact-checkers, we will help independent fact-checkers to enhance their capacity to detect, analyse and counter information manipulation in all EU languages. In addition, we are continuing to support the European Digital Media Observatory, whose multidisciplinary network is monitoring and fighting disinformation across the EU.

But the best defenders of our democracies are free citizens. Building societal resilience and boosting citizens' own engagement in democratic life will be a vital pillar of the European Democracy Shield. To further encourage the active participation of citizens in elections and in democratic debates and public policymaking, we consider consultative and participatory tools, as well as broader civic engagement. Involving young people and local communities must be high on our agenda.

To empower our citizens with the right skills and the options to exercise their democratic rights and duties, the Commission will further support civic or democratic education in schools and beyond for all age and socioeconomic categories. To give citizens the tools that they need to navigate safely and skilfully the increasingly digital information space, we will scale up the work on media and digital literacy. We will build on best practices in Member States, and we will provide innovative approaches to foster critical thinking and community-led societal resilience, including against FIMI, because we see more and more polarisation, information manipulation and disinformation amplified by social media and AI algorithms.

Since the existence of humanity, facts, lies, and misleading information have all co-existed in the public space. But the challenge of today's information space is not one's own views or errors in facts. It is what, in the EU framework, we call false or misleading content that is spread with an intention to deceive or secure economic or, indeed, political gain, and which may cause harm to the general public. Such large-scale disinformation campaigns can have a range of harmful consequences, polarising debates, putting the health and security of EU citizens at risk and overall threatening our democracies.

This brings me to another aim of the European Democracy Shield: to strengthen democratic institutions and protect free and fair elections. And we will continue to support Member States, including through a reinforced and more operational European cooperation network on elections, the ECNE, to ensure the integrity of electoral processes and to fend off efforts to interfere.

Another area of work is the safety of political candidates and elected representatives, with a particular focus on most targeted categories, including female politicians. We are also looking into the growing importance of influencers and the increasing role of AI in an electoral context.

Our aim for the shield is also to ensure an online space where reliable, accurate and impartial information thrives, and this implies reinforcing our free media as a key pillar of our democracy. The hollowing out of traditional media in some communities across Europe is dangerous for our democracy and allowing disinformation to thrive. The President announced this morning that we will launch a new media resilience programme to support independent journalism and media literacy. Trusted and independent information ecosystems that help create shared deliberation spaces, transcending information bubbles, are crucial for societal engagement and resilience.

Finally, it is crucial to further support free media and quality journalism to have prominence of their content in the overall information environment and reinforce the economic viability of the sector through our budget tools, but also by enabling private equity. Journalists should be protected against the undue pressure and threats to preserve their independence. And we are looking into all of these angles at the moment.

A bright, vibrant civil society is also essential to our democratic resilience. The Commission will be coming forward with a dedicated EU civil society strategy, together with the European Democracy Shield, to support civil society actors in their day-to-day work, with the aim to strengthen dialogue and to further protect and, indeed, support them.

In the context of EU enlargement, Honourable Members, and considering the EU role in the world, we need to proactively promote the strength of European democracy, its values and institutions. And today, I set out several important elements that we envisage for the European Democracy Shield that we will bring forward later this year, but I'm now looking forward to hearing your views and thank you for your patience.

Tomas Tobé, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, democracy is the promise that every voice matters, that every citizen can shape their own future. Today, that promise, our European democracy, is under attack – from foreign interference, from disinformation, from cyberthreats.

The enemies who want to destabilise Europe are many – it is not only Russia – and they are determined, but Europe is not powerless. With the European Democracy Shield, we can rise to defend what is most precious to us. The shield must be something more than a protection. It should be a pledge that elections in Europe will remain free and fair, that truth is stronger than lies, and that no voice of our citizens will be silenced – and also that we can stand up for our values around the world.

Colleagues, for me, I see the Democracy Shield as a symbol that should give a clear message: that your vote counts, your freedom is safe, your future belongs to you. So I hope that we, together, can deliver the Democracy Shield not in fear but in confidence, so that Europe is tall, strong and free.

Now we call on the Commission to, of course, deliver, but I would say even more important: be bold and be courageous, because this is about protecting European democracy.

Ana Catarina Mendes, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Ministra, Senhor Comissário, caros colegas, não tenhamos dúvidas de que a nossa democracia está sob ataque. E está sob ataque pelo crescimento preocupante dos ataques híbridos contra a União Europeia, pela desinformação *online*, que tem atingido níveis alarmantes em praticamente todos os Estados-Membros, que fragiliza a confiança dos cidadãos, mas também porque, muitas vezes, os cidadãos deixam de acreditar naquilo que o Estado Social lhes pode dar e naquilo que são as respostas aos seus problemas.

Mas é absolutamente essencial que a Comissão Europeia atue. Hoje, a senhora presidente da Comissão fez um bom discurso sobre a necessidade de defendermos a democracia, mas eu tenho duas perguntas muito concretas, Senhor Comissário.

A primeira: não há democracia sem um Estado de Direito forte e sem o respeito escrupuloso pelo Estado de Direito. Em que ponto está a monitorização das recomendações do relatório sobre o Estado de direito que foi feito para os Estados-Membros, para que possamos avaliar a saúde das nossas democracias?

E, em segundo lugar, Senhor Comissário: como é que nós podemos trabalhar em conjunto — o Parlamento, que tem a Comissão da Defesa da Democracia, com a Comissão — e tornar as nossas instituições mais fortes e mais suscetíveis da confiança dos nossos cidadãos?

Hermann Tertsch, *en nombre del Grupo P/E*. – Señora presidente, George Orwell estaría estupefacto... superan ustedes todo lo imaginado en hipocresía, eufemismos y manipulaciones de un régimen totalitario.

Hablan de proteger la democracia, cuando solo quieren proteger sus privilegios y su senda fracasada frente a la voluntad democrática, que cada día es mayor frente a su mayoría menguante, cada vez más pequeña y cada vez más asustada. Por eso quieren censura y censura e imponer su narrativa.

¿Nos están hablando de que quieren fomentar prensa independiente, pagándola ustedes, como a las ONG esas que pagan ustedes para que suelten su narrativa por ahí? Supuestas ONG que están a sueldo de ustedes y están subvencionadas por el dinero público de todos los europeos para callar la boca a los europeos en general.

Cuanto más débiles están ustedes, más métodos antidemocráticos están dispuestos a usar. Ustedes no quieren un escudo democrático, sino un búnker para su poder despótico amenazado y una jaula para los europeos, que cada día tienen más información y cada día saben mejor que ustedes les engañan.

Beata Szydło, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowny Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! Bardzo uważnie słuchałam tego, o czym mówił pan komisarz. I to są rzeczy fundamentalne dla demokracji i – chcę w to wierzyć – również dla Unii Europejskiej. Wolność słowa, obrona przed obcymi wpływami to są dzisiaj rzeczywiście te sprawy, te wartości, które są zagrożone w Unii Europejskiej. Wiemy o tym doskonale i – obserwując również działania, chociażby dzisiejsze, to, co wydarzyło się w Polsce związane z wojną na Ukrainie, ataki Putina, różnego rodzaju dezinformacja – przeżywamy to na co dzień. I staje się to coraz bardziej naszą rzeczywistością.

Ale mówimy też oczywiście o praworządności. Panie komisarzu, problem polega na tym, że te ważne rzeczy, o których Pan mówił, te wartości, które powinny stanowić fundament naszej wspólnoty, muszą być mierzone równą miarą dla wszystkich bez względu na to, czy w danym państwie Unii Europejskiej jest rząd konserwatywny czy też inny. Każdy musi być sądzony równą miarą. A do tej pory, i mówię to z doświadczeń również moich jako premiera rządu Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej, tak nie było, ale chcę wierzyć...

(Przewodnicząca odebrała mówczyni głos)

Helmut Brandstätter, im Namen der Renew-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Ministerin, Herr Kommissar! Ich möchte auf Deutsch sprechen, weil mich die Menschen in Österreich oft fragen: Was machst du da überhaupt in Brüssel? Was machst du für uns in Österreich? Und ich sage: Ich möchte euch beschützen. Ich möchte euch vor giftigen Lebensmitteln beschützen, vor betrügerischen Finanzanlagen. Da beschließen wir vieles, aber ich möchte euch auch vor falschen, vor gefälschten Informationen schützen, wie sie etwa aus Putins Lügenfabriken kommen.

Und dafür haben wir diesen *Democracy Shield*; den müssen wir allerdings noch recht ordentlich aufbauen, gemeinsam mit der Kommission. Wogegen? Gegen gefälschte Medien – das wissen wir, diese „Doppelgänger“-Geschichte von Russland –, gegen gelenkte Migrationsströme – das haben wir in dem Ausschuss auch gelernt, wie stark die sind –, Cyberattacken, Sabotage. Es gibt einen hybriden Krieg auch gegen uns, auch gegen uns in Österreich und natürlich gegen Europa.

Und dagegen wehren wir uns, aber wir müssen uns auch gegen die digitalen Plattformen in den USA wehren, denn einer der Sätze einer Expertin, die ich mir gemerkt habe, lautet: Das Geschäftsmodell mancher dieser Plattformen ist Hass. Über Hass verdienen die Geld. Und so darf unser Europa nicht ausschauen. Das hat nichts mit Zensur zu tun, mein lieber Freund, das hat nichts mit Zensur zu tun, sondern es hat mit Schutz der Menschen zu tun, genauso wie wir sie schützen vor giftigen Lebensmitteln.

Und noch etwas: Die Republik Moldau wird besonders angegriffen, ein kleines Land, und Russland will dort Wahlen fälschen, hat 350 Millionen Dollar ausgegeben, um die Menschen dort zu verunsichern, um sie falsch zu informieren. Und die Patrioten, die haben heute dagegen gestimmt. Wir sagen, wir müssen die Menschen in Moldau unterstützen; die Patrioten haben dagegen gestimmt, die sind Verräter, die wollen die Moldauer den Russen ausliefern. Wir wollen sie beschützen, gemeinsam in Europa und genauso wie die Menschen in Österreich.

Alexandra Geese, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Angriff auf die europäische Demokratie ist in vollem Gange, und deswegen muss der Europäische Schutzschild groß angelegt sein. Die Europäische Kommission darf sich nicht von Präsident Trump und den Tech-Unternehmen einschüchtern lassen, die Verschwörungsfantasien von mangelnder Freiheit in Europa verbreiten, während Trump in den USA Universitäten, Medien und Anwaltskanzleien zum Schweigen bringt und Krieg gegen eine Stadt des eigenen Landes erklärt.

Die Kommission muss jetzt handeln – mutig – und endlich diese Algorithmen ändern. Und zwar so, dass Nutzerinnen und Nutzer endlich wieder das sehen, was sie sich selbst aussuchen. Es muss Schluss sein mit der Meinungsdictatur von Musk und Zuckerberg, die uns Desinformation und Hass aufzwingen. Neue soziale Netzwerke müssen eine echte Chance in Europa bekommen, denn dort können alle eine Stimme bekommen, und das ist Demokratie, wie der Berichterstatter heute schon gesagt hat.

Und noch eines: Aktuell ist der größte Angriff auf die Pressefreiheit in Europa das Google-Monopol im Online-Werbebereich. Keine öffentliche Finanzierung von Medien kann die enormen Verluste ausgleichen, die den Verlegerinnen und Verlegern durch diesen Rechtsbruch entstehen. Deswegen ist das von Vizepräsidentin Ribera angestoßene Verfahren gegen Google der beste Schutz für freien Journalismus und Demokratie. Danke dafür!

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, η προστασία της ευρωπαϊκής δημοκρατίας από εξωθεν παρεμβάσεις και πληροφοριακή χειραγώγηση είναι αναγκαία, αναντίρρητη και επείγουσα. Στις συνεδριάσεις της ειδικής μας επιτροπής έχουμε ακούσει τη Δεξιά με όλες τις εκφάνσεις της να προσπαθεί να στρέψει την κουβέντα αλλού. Υπάρχει θέμα. Όμως, δεν είναι μονόπλευρο θέμα. Υπάρχει θέμα με τη Ρωσία, σαφές. Μόνο η Ρωσία, όμως, δημιουργεί προβλήματα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση; Δηλαδή, για τις παρεμβάσεις Musk, για τις παρεμβάσεις των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών της Αμερικής στις εκλογές στη Γερμανία, δεν ακούσαμε κάτι; Σε ό, τι αφορά τη δική μας αντίληψη, η Ευρώπη είναι το σπίτι μας και την προστατεύουμε από όλους. Δηλαδή, δεν υπάρχουν καλοί εισβολείς και κακοί εισβολείς. Υπάρχουν κακόβουλοι εισβολείς και εδώ προστατεύουμε τα δικαιώματα. Και ένα τελευταίο, κύριε Επίτροπε, γιατί όπως άκουσα και από τους συναδέλφους, το κράτος δικαίου, είναι και η αρμοδιότητά σας, είναι κορυφαίο ζήτημα για τη δημοκρατία. Οι απαντήσεις που λαμβάνουμε από το γραφείο σας στις συγκεκριμένες ερωτήσεις για το κράτος δικαίου, δυστυχώς, είναι αόριστες και ασαφείς. Με στενοχωρεί αυτό, και κλείνω με απόλυτο και αδιαπραγμάτευτο τρόπο για τη δημοκρατία, λέμε ότι η ασπίδα προστασίας περνάει αποκλειστικά από τη δημοκρατία.

Christine Anderson, *on behalf of the ESN Group*. – Madam President, yes, there is foreign propaganda from Russia and elsewhere, but the Commission's so-called Democracy Shield does not defend our democracy against outside threats. Your shield protects your narrative from internal opposition. You want to control and steer public debate. And for that purpose, you fund fact-checking networks, you pressure platforms through the DSA by threatening them with fines in the billions.

You smear the opposition, dismiss legitimate questions as conspiracy theories and brand descending views as hate speech or disinformation. What you call protection of democracy is, in fact, protection of your illegitimate power grab.

Citizens are sick of this, so you jail them for speaking their mind. Your idea of defending democracy destroys democracy. Without free speech there is no democracy. Without free speech, there is only tyranny and totalitarianism.

Well, congratulations, you are well on your way to totalitarianism. But the good news is you will fail. The people will stop you, and the day they do is the day that I will rejoice.

Mika Aaltola (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komission jäsen, demokratian kilvestä: demokratia – avoin sellainen – on Euroopan perusta. Sen täytyy hengittää, mutta sillä on ulkoisia uhkia: Venäjän, Kiinan, Pohjois-Korean ja Iranin kaltaisia toimijoita, jotka aktiivisesti käyttävät suunnattomia resursseja meidän demokraattisen tilamme ja sananvapauden kaventamiseen Euroopassa.

Venäjän tiedustelupalvelujen budjetista 80 prosenttia menee epävakauttamisoperaatioihin, ja ne suuntautuvat pääosin tänne Eurooppaan. Meidän täytyy olla siis hyvin tarkkana asioiden suhteen. Meillä on myös demokratiassa ongelmia sisällä – myös Suomessa, joka on vahva demokratia. Mediatila kaventuu. Suomen Tietotoimiston mahdollinen rapauttaminen ei auta asiaa yhtään. Demokratia elää, jos me estämme sen ulkoisia uhkia ja annamme sen uusiutua.

Vasile Dîncu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, un *European Democracy Shield* nu este un lux instituțional, ci o necesitate strategică. Astăzi, democrațiile nu mai sunt atacate doar cu arme, ci prin manipularea informației, prin distorsionarea proceselor electorale și prin subminarea încrederii cetățenilor. Avem nevoie de acțiuni urgente și rapide. – Propun trei direcții urgente.

Prima, m-am bucurat să o aud din partea domnului comisar, un centru european pentru reziliență democratică, conectat cu serviciile naționale, capabil să monitorizeze și să reacționeze la ingerințe și atacuri hibride în timp real.

A doua ar fi un cadru comun de protecție a proceselor electorale, standarde minime pentru securizarea bazelor de date, transparență în finanțarea campaniilor și control asupra *microtargeting*-ului electoral.

A treia, un mecanism de alertă rapidă și contra narațiune publică pentru ca cetățenii să primească informații verificate înainte ca propaganda să umple întreg spațiul public.

Dragi colegi, dacă nu vom construi aceste mecanisme, următoarele alegeri vor deveni țintă pentru actorii ostili și sper, domnule comisar, ca ReArm și SAFE, mecanismele noastre să...

(Președinta a retras cuvântul vorbitorului)

(Vorbitorul a acceptat să răspundă la o întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru”)

Diana Iovanovici Șoșoacă (NI), întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”. – Domnule Dîncu, ați vorbit despre manipulare și despre alegeri care au fost fraudate și vreau să vă amintesc că dumneavoastră, cu trei zile înainte de data de 5 octombrie, ziua în care Curtea Constituțională mi-a interzis să candidez pentru opinii și declarații politice ca senator – pentru care aveam imunitate parlamentară – ați anunțat la Antena 3, televiziune pe care o plătește PSD, că eu nu voi mai fi candidat, pentru că PSD-ul și PNL-ul îmi pregătesc ieșirea de la prezidențiale. Cum vedeți manipularea când chiar dumneavoastră sunteți artizanii manipulării și dumneavoastră sunteți cei care ați fraudat alegerile în România?

Vasile Dîncu (S&D), răspuns la o întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru”. – De obicei nu dau interviuri, nu îmi aduc aminte și nu am dat interviuri la Antena 3. Poate altcineva o fi spus asta. Stimată doamnă, sigur că avem unele situații în care poate că instituțiile nu au comunicat exact așa cum trebuia în cazul democrației și viziunea aceasta a dumneavoastră este una, sigur, ideologică și partinică.

Jaroslav Bžoch (PřE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem dnes velmi pečlivě poslouchal projev Ursuly von der Leyenové – a speciálně v momentě, kdy hovořila o demokratickém štítu. A já s tím souhlasím. My potřebujeme mít nástroje a potřebujeme vědět, jak máme bojovat proti vnějšmu vměšování do našeho demokratického systému i jak máme bojovat proti dezinformacím. Je to pro nás důležité. Ale po tom důkladném poslechu jsem přesvědčen o tom, že budeme potřebovat ještě jeden štít, a to bude štít proti vměšování Evropské komise do vnitřních záležitostí členských států.

Speciálně když paní předsedkyně Komise mluvila o tom, že budou nová centra a že najdeme ta správná nezávislá média, která budeme financovat. Tak to ve mně tak vyvstalo. Zároveň v tu chvíli říkala, že v sále zde se snad někdo toho bojí. No, já si nemyslím, že by se tady někdo bál. Já si myslím, že to je Evropská komise, která se bojí silícího tlaku opozice a občanů Evropské unie, kteří toho mají už plné zuby. Zároveň mi přišel na mysl Orwellův román 1984 a jeho ministerstvo pravdy. Jako by v tom Evropská komise hledala nějaké zalíbení, nějakou inspiraci. Ale já jsem přesvědčen, že Orwell to jako návod rozhodně nemyslel.

(Řečník souhlasil s tím, že odpoví na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty)

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Pane kolego, děkuji za to, co jste řekl. Mám pro vás jednu otázku. Myslíte si, že by měla být diskuse na sociálních sítích anonymní? Že by měly trollí farmy generovanými obsahy zahlcovat síť politiků? Nebo si myslíte, že by se ten, kdo je na sociálních sítích, měl prokázat ID kartou?

Jaroslav Bžoch (PřE), odpověď na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty. – Jak jsem říkal na začátku, já jsem přesvědčen o tom, že musíme mít nástroje a musíme vědět, jak bojovat proti vměšování do našich demokratických systémů. Zároveň musíme mít diskusi. Bohužel tento dům a tato instituce mi připomíná že tak, jak říkal náš první prezident Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, že demokracie je diskuse, tak ta se bohužel z této instituce vytrácí. Samozřejmě já jsem toho názoru, že pokud máme sociální síť a využíváme je, tak bychom se měli samozřejmě k tomu legitimovat.

Stefano Cavedagna (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sappiamo bene che le ingerenze straniere, la manipolazione delle informazioni, le minacce ibride mettono in pericolo la libertà dei nostri cittadini, ed è proprio per questo che lo scudo per la democrazia può essere utile.

Ma noi conservatori vigileremo fino all'ultimo giorno perché questo non diventi un pretesto per tappare la bocca ai cittadini o per zittire le persone di cui non si condividono le opinioni. Siamo per la libertà.

Lo dimostra lo scandalo del *green gate*, che ha mostrato come, purtroppo, alcune interferenze esistano ma siano più interne all'Unione che esterne alla stessa. Ed è per questo che, come gruppo ECR, abbiamo ottenuto un gruppo di lavoro per chiedere la trasparenza delle ONG, che purtroppo sono state un problema negli ultimi anni piuttosto che una risorsa.

E infine, il cosiddetto *chat control*: noi conservatori siamo contrari a qualsiasi sistema di sorveglianza di massa. La protezione dei minori dagli abusi è una responsabilità che ci chiama tutti, ma deve essere esercitata con buon senso. Una ferma risposta anche a tutela dei diritti fondamentali.

Sandro Gozi (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, nous sommes confrontés à des attaques inédites contre nos démocraties.

Oui, les annonces de la présidente de la Commission ce matin sur la résilience des médias et les fonds pour le pluralisme vont dans le bon sens. Nous devons pleinement exploiter les moyens dont on dispose et en introduire de nouveaux. La démocratie européenne n'est pas à vendre à Poutine et à ses idiots utiles en Europe. Elle ne sera jamais une monnaie d'échange dans un accord commercial avec Donald Trump.

Nous avons déjà des outils pour protéger nos processus électoraux et lutter contre la désinformation: le règlement sur les services numériques (DSA) et le règlement sur la transparence et le ciblage de la publicité à caractère politique. Appliquons-les pleinement, Monsieur le Commissaire, sans faire aucune concession, et comblons aussi les lacunes existantes.

Les attaques des puissances étrangères envers notre liberté démocratique sont de plus en plus sérieuses. Avançons donc enfin, chers collègues, vers un accord solide sur la directive sur la transparence de la représentation d'intérêts pour le compte de pays tiers comme la Chine. Nous n'avons pas le luxe du temps. Il faut agir maintenant.

Kim Van Sparrentak (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, did you know that Chancellor Merz went to Canada this summer to shoot polar bear cubs? No? Good – because that means the Kremlin's latest disinformation campaign did not reach you. Why would Russia spread such a ridiculous story, you might ask? Well, it's easier to sway an election than to win a war. So undermining democratic European leaders is part of their playbook.

I'm happy that the Commission will work on mapping these kinds of disinformation campaigns more efficiently, but when is the Commission finally taking action against the spread of disinformation? When is the Commission finally putting an end to the fact that we are all carrying addictive manipulation machines in our pockets?

We need to ban addictive design features and divisive recommender systems to make the internet safe for everyone, minors and adults alike. After their latest updates, generative AI models only produce more disinformation and, meanwhile, the Commission is flirting with the idea of reopening the AI Act – the only protection we have. Commissioner, only ambitious and decisive action will protect both our citizens and our democracies.

Danilo Della Valle (The Left). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, una discussione seria e profonda su quali siano le minacce per la democrazia e su quale sia lo stato della democrazia andrebbe fatta seriamente nel Parlamento europeo, credo. Non solo per difendersi dalle minacce esterne.

A tal proposito potremmo chiedere una *masterclass* ai nostri alleati statunitensi, che hanno una lunga storia di tentativi di condizionamento non troppo democratico dei paesi non in linea con la loro politica estera.

Quello che davvero mi preoccupa, però, è lo stato di salute del grado di democrazia nei nostri paesi, cosa che vedo non preoccupa affatto questa maggioranza: basta aprire uno smartphone, ogni giorno, per vedere le immagini di arresti e violenze contro le centinaia di migliaia di manifestanti pacifici che protestano contro il genocidio in corso a Gaza.

A Berlino, Roma, Parigi stiamo assistendo al proliferare di misure restrittive e leggi repressive che limitano in modo sempre più marcato il diritto di protesta nei diversi paesi europei.

Così come mi preoccupa la censura nei confronti delle voci di dissenso che si occupano del genocidio in corso a Gaza, contro i palestinesi.

O la messa al bando di tutto quello che rappresenta la cultura russa...

(La Presidente toglie la parola all'oratore)

Milan Mazurek (ESN). – Madam President, please don't tell us about democracy, because actually you, the unelected bureaucrats, hate democracy the most. What kind of democracy do you even talk about in Europe? The one where if you criticise migrants for killing or raping women and children, you can end up in prison for something like 'racism' or hate speech? Or the one where if you are against the sex transition of young children, you can be prosecuted? Or maybe the one where if you vote for a candidate who wins the election but you don't like him, you just cancel the whole election like you did in Romania?

How many people in the European Union are in prison because they said or wrote something on social networks? Just their opinions. How many independent journalists are prosecuted and persecuted because they openly expose the truth about you and the consequences of your own actions? Yes, I agree, we need to defend democracy. We need to protect democracy, we need to protect it from you, because you are the biggest threat for democracy in the European Union! And if we want to restore democracy in the European Union, at first, we need to defeat you.

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

Lukas Sieper (NI), blue-card question. – Madam Vice-President, in accordance with the last sentence of Rule 178(10), I would also like to have the opportunity, please, to react to the answer that Mr Mazurek will give me.

Mr Mazurek, you talked about the not so democratically elected people in this room. So I was just wondering, as the Members of this Parliament are directly democratically elected and the Commission is indirectly, through this Parliament, democratically elected, how much time have you spent in your life studying the institutions of the European Union?

Milan Mazurek (ESN), blue-card answer. – Thank you very much, Mr Sieper. I would wish for you to be more educated, because I was speaking to the Commissioners, which are not directly elected by the people of the European Union, but indirectly – and this is the biggest difference. That's all.

President. – Mr Sieper, in the Rules of Procedure, it says that you 'may' speak again, and I have decided that, since you already have had a lot of speaking time here today, you will not be allowed to speak again.

Kateřina Konečná (NI). – Paní předsedající, pokud se máme bavit o ochraně demokratických volebních procesů v rámci Evropské unie, tak se pojďme konečně bavit o dotáhnutí směrnice o transparentnosti zastupování zájmů ze zahraničí, tedy lidově o registraci zahraničních agentů. Transparentnost, to je totiž nejlepší zbraň proti cizímu vměšování, nikoli cenzura cizích názorů a jejich označování za dezinformace, k čemuž Evropský štít pro demokracii a nově plánované Evropské středisko pro odolnost demokracii, které nám tu Ursula von der Leyenová dnes oznámila, bude sloužit a slouží.

Demokracie není zrušení voleb, pokud jedno kolo vyhraje kandidát opozice a jeho vítězství je sváděno na vměšování ze zahraničí, jako tomu bylo v Rumunsku. Ukažme spíš konečně, za kým stojí cí peníze, a nechme rozhodnutí na občanech. Naše demokratické volební procesy jsou ohroženy již dlouhou dobou penězi oligarchů, korporací, neziskových organizací a zájmových skupin v Evropě i mimo ni, nikoli videi na síti TikTok. Žádám vás, ať demokracii skutečně chráníme, ne dusíme.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, demokracie v Evropě je dnes ohrožena jako nikdy předtím, a to fyzicky i online. Rusko v Evropě financuje extremistické strany, které nám říkají, kdo je agent a kdo není, šíří ruskou propagandu, provádí kyberútoky, ale také zneužívají migraci, aby oslabovaly Evropskou unii.

Čína mezitím dodává levné technologie k masovému sledování, investuje do médií a infrastruktury a ovlivňuje tím volby i veřejnou debatu. A to přímo ohrožuje férové volby a svobodu médií. V říjnu nás čekají v České republice volby. Sociální sítě strategicky zahltily trollí farmy a spamové kampaně. Řešením není cenzura ani kontrola internetu. Řešením je informovaná demokracie. Musíme lidem dávat pravdivé a ověřené informace a chránit je před lží a propagandou.

(Řečník souhlasil s tím, že odpoví na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty)

Kateřina Konečná (NI), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Pane kolego, mám dva dotazy. Jeden je, zda tedy podpoříte, když víte, že někdo cizí financuje, náš zákon FARA. Podpoříte ho i tady v Evropském parlamentu, aby konečně bylo jasné, kdo koho financuje? A za druhé, když tady říkáte, kdo je kým financován: Kolik jste podal trestních oznámení a kolikrát jste nahlásil to, že opravdu někdo financován je? Protože jinak jste opět jen tlachal pro vaše média, místo toho, abyste říkal fakta. A toho si myslím poslanec Evropského parlamentu opravdu hoden není.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE), odpověď na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty. – Paní Konečná, moje babička vždycky říkala, že potrefená husa se vždycky ozve. Myslela to ve spojitosti s myslivostí mé rodiny, která měla u nás tradici. Takže když byla husa střelena, vždycky začala vydávat zvuk. Myslím, že je hodně důkazů o vašich aktivitách a vašich setkáních s různými čínskými firmami, o vašich aktivitách na iránské ambasádě a o vašich setkáních s ruskými diplomaty. Myslím, že je na policii a na tajných službách, aby vám tu činnost prokázaly.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Fru talman! Kollegor. Våra öppna, demokratiska och fria samhällen utsätts gång på gång för cyberangrepp. Mitt land, Sverige, är inget undantag. Bara den senaste månaden har Stockholm, Göteborg och Skåne drabbats. Över hundra tusen anställda i skola, vård och omsorg har fått sina personuppgifter läckta.

Det är ett direkt angrepp på både människors integritet och vår gemensamma säkerhet. Vi kan inte stå passiva. Vi måste bygga motståndskraft lokalt, nationellt och europeiskt. När svenska och europeiska myndigheter i somras slog ut ett pro-ryskt cybernätverk visade vi vad samarbete kan åstadkomma. Men det räcker inte. Vi behöver bland annat mer resurser till Europeiska centret mot it-brottslighet inom Europol. Vi behöver stärka EU:s cybersäkerhetsbyrå. Och framför allt behöver vi enad kraft.

Jag hade önskat att även extremhögern i det här parlamentet tog denna debatt på allvar, istället för att göra sig själv till offer. Offerkoftan börjar bli gammal.

Csaba Dömötör (PFE). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! A demokráciapajzs kezdeményezés papíron szereplő célja elviekben támogatható a demokrácia védelme, fellépés a külső beavatkozások ellen. Csak hát mindannyian tudjuk, hogy itt egészen másról van szó. Arról, hogy mivel a liberális mainstream politikának fogyatkozik a támogatottsága, így szépen kiépítnek egy intézményrendszert, amivel el akarják fojtani a kritikus hangokat. Ez látszik az új költségvetési tervből is. Még több aktivista csoportot és még több cenzor szervezetet akarnak támogatni, és még több liberális médiumot, amint ma azt megtudtuk.

Egyébként meg mindent elmond a demokráciafelfogásukról, hogy a baloldali kormányok jogsértéseit még csak észre sem veszik. A lengyel kormány felülírja az igazságszolgáltatást, konzervatív tévéket akarnak megszüntetni, az uniós pénzek swinger klubokba mennek, Németországban pedig az történik, hogy ki akarják szorítani a legnépszerűbb pártot, Franciaországban meg eltöltik a legnépszerűbb jelöltet az indulástól, máshol meg eltörlik a választás eredményét, ha az nem tetszik. Ilyenkor hol van a híres pajzsuk? Ha tényleg akarnak pajzsot a demokráciának, akkor legelőször ezeknél az ügyeknél kezdik. Minden más csak a szokásos...

(Az elnök megvonja a szót a felszólalótól)

Mario Mantovani (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, signor Presidente del Consiglio regionale lombardo, amici di Monza e Brianza, rafforzare la democrazia difendendola da ingerenze o minacce straniere non è solo una necessità, ma un dovere nei confronti delle future generazioni.

Tuttavia, non saranno le cybersecurity, il controllo dei social o la cancellazione delle elezioni a far la differenza, anzi, queste misure saranno vissute come autoritarie.

Contro i condizionamenti delle autocrazie, peraltro comuniste, c'è un solo scudo, il più forte: è il rafforzamento della democrazia europea dall'interno. Riforme istituzionali che avvicinino l'Europa ai cittadini, che la liberino dalla tecnocrazia, che affermino i valori occidentali europei e le comuni radici culturali e religiose; una difesa comune; una sola voce in politica estera.

Il Parlamento europeo è uno dei pochi al mondo privo di iniziativa legislativa, non può andare. Bisogna ridare ai cittadini la guida di un'Europa di cui si sentano parte, un'Europa che non sia protetta solo da un algoritmo ma dal senso di appartenenza di tutto il popolo europeo.

Viva la democrazia!

Nela Riehl (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, have you noticed how military language has become very common these days? You just heard it again this morning, I guess, and you may like that or even dislike that but the truth is, our daily lives are being weaponised.

Across Europe we see how hybrid warfare undermines our societies. Russia's disinformation tries to destroy our trust in democracy itself. If we want to defend Europe, we must strengthen the foundations of our democracy. Culture is one of these foundations – it's how we express free thought, the way we connect and our source of identity and belonging. Independent media is another foundation. Reliability and stability in times of disinformation is how we actually grow – and that is not a given. And, of course, education. For active citizenship and critical thinking, basic and civic education are a must. There is No Democracy Shield without these foundations. Defending Europe means more than stopping military attacks – it means strengthening and protecting democracy from within and investing in people.

Ondřej Dostál (NI). – Paní předsedající, mnohé projevy Evropské komise ukazují, že skutečně musíme chránit demokracii. Šedesát procent občanů nechce Ursulu von der Leyenovou. Je šest z deseti občanů Evropské unie ruskými agenty nebo hlupáky pod vlivem hybridních hrozeb, jak tady dneska znělo? Ne, chtějí někoho, kdo nepovede Evropskou unii k úpadku. Odstoupí tato neoblíbená politička? Ne a ještě si chce zakládat nějaké ministerstvo pravdy, aby potlačila kritiku.

Poslanci, kteří kvůli korupční kauze *Pfizergate* vyvolali hlasování o nedůvěře Komisi, byli při projednávání označeni za proruskou hybridní hrozbu. Ne, nejsou hybridní hrozbou, naopak dělají svoji práci. A k ovlivňování voleb: nečíní druhým to, co nechceš, aby druhí činili tobě. Proti gruzínské vládě platíme pučisty, jednu ze stran moldavských voleb tady necháte agitovat v Parlamentu a pomlouvat konkurenci. Do Slovenska premiéra Fica se navážíte soustavně. A když byly volby ve Spojených státech, projevíli jste úctu americkým voličům? Řekli jste: Budeme spolupracovat s tím, koho si zvolíte? Ne, vedli jste kampaň proti Trumpovi a teď se vám to vymstilo. Takže prosím, chraňte demokracii, super, ale začněte u sebe.

Lena Düpont (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner, dear Minister, we also created that committee to protect ourselves and to better prepare ourselves for hybrid threats. But what actually makes hybrid threats so successful? They usually go into the grey zones of society. They go into discussions and values that we actually need to balance, where we need to find not an easy balance between them. They tackle and address unclear competences. They address the lack of protocols, especially the lack of emergency protocols. And, of course, they are running on the lack of attribution.

So as a day like today, where we have seen an attack on Poland and immediately a disinformation campaign starting next to it, let me be loud and clear here: that wasn't an accident, that was deliberate. And we can and we should do whatever we can to stand aside Poland and really defend not our democracies but as well the European Union and each and every Member State of that European Union, because we are in it together and we will face it together.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, sí, cada vez son más frecuentes, intensos y perturbadores los ataques contra el modelo europeo de democracia que protege su Derecho, provenientes de interferencias extranjeras, pero no solo de actores estatales —notoriamente Rusia—, sino también de actores no estatales, como esas plataformas digitales con redes sociales, cuyo modelo de negocio son algoritmos adictivos que estragan los valores europeos y causan un daño incuantificable en las nuevas generaciones —como sabemos bien los que tenemos hijos e hijas—, polarizando, confrontando y generando odio.

Y para eso hace falta no solamente alfabetización digital, sino sobre todo un Derecho europeo. La Comisión Especial sobre el Escudo Europeo de la Democracia, que se puso en marcha en este Parlamento Europeo el 18 de diciembre de 2024, acaba de renovar su mandato un año más, pero arrojará conclusiones, y lo importante es que la Comisión convierta esas conclusiones en nueva legislación para reforzar no solamente la capacidad disuasoria frente a Rusia y sus interferencias, sino también frente a las plataformas digitales, con multas tan contundentes como la que ha tenido el coraje de sacar adelante esta Comisión —la comisaria Teresa Ribera— contra Google.

Marieke Ehlers (PFE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, de Europese Unie presenteert zich als het morele kompas van de wereld. Maar voor onze ogen ontvouwt zich schandaal na schandaal binnen de EU. Denk aan hoe de Commissie onder leiding van Timmermans belastinggeld gebruikte om ngo's te betalen die de klimaatagenda van diezelfde Commissie verkondigden. Denk aan de Commissie die weigert de Pfizer-sms'jes van Von der Leyen openbaar te maken. Denk aan Qatargate, waarbij zakken met geld werden gevonden bij linkse europarlementariërs. Steeds hetzelfde patroon: geen transparantie, geen verantwoording.

Dan zou je verwachten dat wij als Parlement de verantwoordelijkheid zouden nemen om dit tot op de bodem uit te zoeken. Maar keer op keer worden voorstellen zoals die van de *Patriots* om een onderzoekscommissie in te stellen, weggestemd. Niet alleen door links, maar ook met steun van de EVP. Het beschermen van onze democratie vraagt moed. De moed om op te treden tegen inmenging van buitenaf. Maar vooral de moed om in de spiegel te kijken.

Eszter Lakos (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! A demokrácia nem ajándék, minden nap meg kell védenünk. Magyarország helyzete világosan megmutatja a veszélyt. Nemrég az orosz külföldi hírszerzés megvádolta az Európai Bizottságot, hogy rezsimváltást készít elő Budapesten, és hogy ellenzéki pártot, a Tiszát támogatja. Több száz hamis internetes profil terjesztette a dezinformációt, amit a magyar állami hírügynökség is átvett. Ami ma Budapesten, holnap bárhol Európában előfordulhat. Ezért az EU-ban közös és határozott fellépésre van szükség a külső beavatkozási kísérletekkel szemben: megerősíteni a dezinformáció elleni szervezeteket, átláthatóan és gyorsan megcáfolni a hamis narratívákat, betartatni az online platformok kötelezettségét és támogatni a független médiát.

A külső beavatkozás mellett Magyarországon az emberekre más veszélyek is leselkednek. A kormány közpénzen óriási propagandagépezetet működtet a hatalom megtartásáért, egyfajta információs hadviselést folytat, ami komoly károkat okoz a társadalmunkban. Ezt nevezhetnénk kognitív túlterhelésnek is. Céljuk, hogy ellehetetlenítsék az értelmes és őszinte párbeszédet a közéleti témákban. Bár a többség átlát a szitán, sokan politikai apátiába süllyednek. Éppen ezért fontos, hogy segítsünk minden európai polgárt abban, hogy ne a propaganda és az álhírek, hanem az elérhető tények vezesse döntéseiket.

Sandro Ruotolo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, oggi la Presidente von der Leyen ha affermato che la disinformazione sta dividendo le nostre società, erodendo la democrazia, e allora possiamo dire che uno scudo democratico efficace deve basarsi su due pilastri.

Il primo è la libertà di stampa: un'informazione indipendente e la protezione delle fonti sono l'unico antidoto contro la disinformazione. Se i giornalisti vengono spiati con *spyware*, ed è illegale!, e se i media non sono indipendenti dalla politica, la democrazia diventa fragile.

Il secondo pilastro dello scudo è la difesa del voto dalle interferenze straniere e dalle grandi piattaforme digitali; non possiamo permettere che gli Elon Musk di turno manipolino i nostri processi democratici. Non è possibile che siano passati quasi due anni dall'apertura dell'indagine su X e ancora non sappiamo nulla.

Libertà di stampa e trasparenza digitale sono la spina dorsale della democrazia.

Pascale Piera (PFE). – Madame la Présidente, le bouclier démocratique est un leurre. Il est présenté comme un rempart contre les ingérences et les menaces hybrides, mais ne nous y trompons pas. Derrière cette façade protectrice se cache une menace bien plus insidieuse pour nos libertés fondamentales.

Qui décidera de ce qui constitue une ingérence? Qu'est-ce qu'une menace hybride? Ce bouclier est en réalité un outil de censure massive qui musellera les voix dissidentes sous prétexte de désinformation. En Roumanie, ce sont des élections qui ont été annulées sur la base de rapports biaisés. Ce bouclier est un prétexte pour imposer une hypocrisie flagrante et totalitaire.

Défendre la démocratie au prix d'une surveillance orwellienne promet d'étouffer la liberté d'expression et l'espace civique. Il s'agit là de légitimer une ingérence interne en la déguisant en protection. Ce bouclier ne nous défendra de rien. Il est un instrument de contrôle qui transformera l'Europe en une dictature numérique à grande échelle. Réveillons-nous, défendons une vraie démocratie libre, souveraine contre ces bâillons invisibles.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Magdalena Adamowicz (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dziesiątki dronów nad Polską to dowód na to, że Rosja coraz bezczelniej testuje naszą odporność. Ale co mają wspólnego ruskie drony z obroną demokracji w Europie? Otóż zarówno drony, jak i ataki na naszą demokrację, kłamstwa, podsycanie nienawiści, tajne finansowanie skrajnych polityków – to wszystko służy temu samemu i ten sam dyktator za tym stoi. Celem jest destrukcja Europy, a stoi za nim od 25 lat ten sam bandyta, były agent KGB, Putin.

Wielkim wysiłkiem wydajemy setki miliardów na zbrojenia. Ale te wszystkie pieniądze będą na nic, jeżeli pozwolimy zniszczyć się od wewnątrz. Sama tarcza wojskowa bez tarczy demokratycznej nie obroni nas przed Rosją, bo wróg panoszący się w sercu państwa jest groźniejszy niż jego armia na froncie.

Chwała polskim żołnierzom i naszym sojusznikom za pokazaną dziś odwagę i męstwo.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, platforma EUvsDisinfo do danas je dokumentirala gotovo 20 000 slučajeva dezinformacijskih kampanja usmjerenih na naše izbore, naše medije i na naše zdravstvene sustave.

Svakog dana izloženi smo pet novih dezinformacija. Bojim se da neki kolege koji su danas govorili ovdje u Parlamentu doprinose ovim dezinformacijama.

Alarmantno je i moramo se složiti s time da je poziv na uspostavu europskog demokratskog štita hitan i nužan. To znači obranu neovisnih medija, jačanje civilnog društva i osiguravanje da građani mogu vjerovati informacijskom prostoru u kojem žive.

Demokratski štit mora biti europski, sveobuhvatan i trajan, mora objединiti razmjenu obavještajnih podataka, sankcije prema zlonamjernim akterima, potporu neovisnom novinarstvu i koordinirano praćenje izbornih ... (*predsjedavajuća je govornici oduzela riječ*)

Sebastian Tynkynen (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, eikö tämän talon pitäisi kunnioittaa demokratiaa? Kun kausi alkoi, ensi töikseen muut puolueryhmät eristivät ison joukon kansallismielisiä meppejä päätöksentekoprosessista. Se on demokratian polkemista.

Huomenna tässä samassa salissa äänestetään EU-vaaleja käsittelevästä paperista, jonka lukeminen nostatti itselläni jälleen karvoja pystyyn. Tässä Euroopan eduskunnan päätöslauselmaesityksessä todetaan seuraavaa: Euroopan eduskunta on hyvin huolestunut järjestelmän vastaisten ja avoimesti EU:n vastaisten puolueiden noususta ja vaalimenestyksestä vuoden 2024 vaaleissa. Ymmärrän, että vasemmistopoliitikko laukoiisi tällaisia kommentteja, mutta nyt puhumme koko Euroopan eduskunnan tekstistä.

Hyvät kollegat, jos EU-kriittiset, kansallismieliset tai maahanmuuttokriittiset puolueet saavat kannatusta, se on demokratiaa. Se, että niitä suljetaan ulos päätöksenteosta, ei ole demokratiaa.

Cynthia Ní Mhurchú (Renew). – A Uachtaráin, Tá an Eoraip ag dul i ngleic le méadú mór bagairtí ó chur isteach eachtrach agus ó fheachtais bhréagaisnéise. Tá muinín inár n-institiúidí Eorpacha faoi ionsaí agus deighiltí á gcothú inár bpobail. Tá an domhan ag crosbhóthar: tá an daonlathas faoi bhrú ollmhór agus baineann réimis uathlathacha ar fud an domhain úsáid as an mbréagaisnéis mar uirlis faobhair fuatha. I Renew Europe, creidimid go bhfuil géarghá le gníomhú agus muid ag dul i ngleic le feachtais shofaisticiúla agus le grúpaí eagraithe atá dírithe ar ionramháil mhí-ionraic eolais is faisnéise. Baineann na feachtais seo leas as leochaileachtaí digiteacha chun an bonn a bhaint den daonlathas san Eoraip. Táimid ag caint faoi mheascán de chibirionsaithe, ionramháil na meán sóisialta agus bréagaisnéis. Conas is féidir troid ar ais? Infheistíocht in iriseoireacht d'ardchaighdeán neamhspleách, mar atá molta ag mo ghrúpa, Renew Europe. Molaim do mo chomhghleacaithe anseo sa teach tacú lenár n-iarratas agus Ciste Eorpach den sórt seo a bhunú.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Marie Bjerre, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, honourable Members and Commissioner, this debate has shown the importance of strengthening democratic resilience. Many of you have today mentioned the real risk that our democracies face. We hope that these issues will be addressed by the Commission in its upcoming European Democracy Shield, and we are looking forward to the cooperation with Parliament.

Michael McGrath, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I'd like to thank all of the honourable Members who spoke in this debate – a very interesting debate, quite polarised, which has been the experience whenever we discuss issues around democracy. But I do want to thank everybody for their contribution, and I want to reaffirm that the European Parliament is an essential partner for the Commission in designing this important initiative: the European Democracy Shield.

We have already a solid EU digital and democratic rulebook. Its implementation and enforcement will be part and parcel of our work on democracy. Under this mandate, the Commission aims to move to a more operational phase of our work, empowering the actors who are key to democracy, from national authorities to the media, from citizens to civil society organisations.

Our democracies have to ultimately improve people's daily lives, defend them in the face of threats and strengthen their say in democracy. And this is exactly what the European Democracy Shield will be about. It will be a statement of what we, a Union of democracies respecting fundamental rights and the rule of law, represent in the world. It is conceived in our European way, following a whole-of-society approach and promoting our common democratic values and fundamental rights, such as freedom of expression and the exercise of electoral rights.

We will adopt actions to empower citizens to play a more active role in democratic life. We will protect the integrity of the information space and of the electoral process against interference from hostile actors. And we will further support free media and civil society actors.

I can assure those who were highly critical of this project before they even see the output of our work, that the Democracy Shield will certainly not be about censorship. Where we see censorship, it's where we see the voice of the free and independent media being shot down, where we see the voice of civil society being restricted. Censorship is where we see control of the information space for political purposes, and it can be where we see interference in the courts of Member States of the European Union.

I want to assure all of the Members of this House that this Democracy Shield will be in full respect, and will actually strengthen and uphold, the right to freedom of expression of the people of the European Union. This is about democracy, which is enshrined in Article 2 of our Treaty, which is a legal foundation of the European Union.

Many of those who are critical of our proposal are not here to hear the answers to their questions. In criticising the European Commission for decisions of national courts, that is not a function or a decision of the European Commission in any way. In fact, the European Commission steadfastly respects and upholds the independence of national courts and their decisions, provided they are acting in line with EU law. Democratically elected Members of this House should know that. And in referring to the Commission in a derogatory manner as being unelected, Members, of course, should recognise that the Commission has been elected by this House, so elected by the democratically elected Members of the European Parliament, which, of course, is the same way that prime ministers and governments all over Europe are elected year in, year out.

I want to assure people that the purpose of the Democracy Shield is to ensure that there is a safe space for people to make up their own mind when it comes to casting their vote. It is not about influencing how they vote; it is the sovereign, independent right of each individual citizen of the European Union to make a decision as to who to provide their support to in a democratic election, but they deserve to do so in a safe environment, free from interference by people and actors who have a political motivation for seeking to influence the outcome of our elections. What we need is more democracy: we need democracy at a local level, at a community level; we need more young people to become engaged in European democracy.

When people accuse us of being unelected, I would also make the point that many of us come from electoral backgrounds. I myself contested public elections in Ireland, where my name and my face was on the ballot paper, since the age of 22. Therefore I am very, very proud to be the European Commissioner for Democracy, and I will do all that I can working with the directly elected Members of this House, irrespective of their views, to ensure that we preserve and indeed strengthen the integrity of European democracy in the European Union. That is the purpose of what we will bring forward in the coming months in the European Democracy Shield. And I do not see how anybody could object to what I think is a noble and laudable objective.

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

Vizepräsidentin

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

16. Alvorlige trusler mod luftfart og søtransport på grund af forstyrrelse af det globale satellitnavigationssystem: akut behov for at opbygge resiliens mod spoofing og jamming (forhandling)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zu dem dringend notwendigen Aufbau von Widerstandsfähigkeit gegen Spoofing und Jamming angesichts der schwerwiegenden Gefahren für den Luft- und Seeverkehr durch Störungen des globalen Satellitennavigationssystems (2025/2858(RSP)).

Andrius Kubilius, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, I start my statement on behalf of the Commission by saying very simple words: thank you. Thank you to the pilots of the aircraft that landed us safely when we, together with President von der Leyen, were travelling to Bulgaria during a very successful tour of seven frontline Member States, and when our satellite navigation on board was jammed.

These pilots are not the only ones who deal with this kind of threat. As President von der Leyen said today: 'Europe is in a fight. A fight for a continent that is whole and at peace.' We are being tested, we are being challenged and we are under attack. The military build-up on our borders is constantly being supplemented by hybrid threats and it has become a new normal. But we will never accept this as normal. So, honourable Members, I thank you for the opportunity to discuss this important topic today.

Our space-based services, including satellite navigation, are world class: Galileo, Copernicus and, soon, IRIS². Positioning, navigation and timing (PNT) services have long been an engine for economic growth and are now routinely integrated into modern infrastructure. They support a wide array of sectors including aviation, maritime, land-based applications and critical infrastructure.

Global satellite navigation systems (GNSS), such as the European Union's Galileo and EGNOS, or the American GPS, are the backbone of existing PNT services. They provide highly accurate, reliable, worldwide and free PNT services unmatched today by any other technology. But they're not immune to radio frequency interference. Neither the European Galileo nor the United States GPS are immune. Deliberate international interference into navigation systems most commonly occurs as jamming, which aims to blind satellite navigation signal receivers and prevent them from receiving navigation signals, thus preventing determination of position or timing and rendering the service unavailable.

More concerning is spoofing, which aims to deceive navigation signal receivers with counterfeit satellite signals. They appear as a normal service to most GNSS signal receivers. Spoofing is extremely dangerous, especially in safety applications such as aircraft navigation. Jamming and spoofing attacks on our satellite navigation systems severely affect transport by air, sea and by road. They also impact farming and other sectors.

Today, 40 % of European air traffic operates in regions strongly affected by radio frequency interference. 40 % – four, zero. Since the start of Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, interference has worsened, a shift not only in quantity but also in quality, with sophistication of jamming and spoofing attacks increasing, posing big risks both in the air and at sea.

The situation is especially grim on the EU's eastern flank. Just over the past year in the Baltic, there has been a five-fold increase in flights affected by radio frequency interference. Just in August this year, the authorities of the country which I know the best (Lithuania) registered 1 000 jamming disruptions of navigation signals for aircrafts.

But this daily interference goes well beyond the Baltic – it affects all Member States in the east, especially areas close to the Ukrainian border and the Black Sea and our neighbours close to the war: the eastern Mediterranean, Black Sea, Middle East and Arctic. Against this growing danger, the European Commission has taken three main lines of action.

Firstly, at the international political level, to address and condemn such acts, the Commission supports the Member States in key international fora: the International Maritime Organisation, the International Telecommunications Union and the International Civil Aviation Organisation. Radio frequency interference of our space systems will be one of the most important topics later this month at the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organisation.

But defending ourselves in international fora is not enough – we need a coordinated EU action plan to protect our interests. This was high on the agenda of the June Transport and Telecommunications Council and several Member States sent a letter to the Commission calling for common action against jamming and spoofing threats.

That is why our second line of action is reinforcing the resilience and robustness of our EU space infrastructure. The first item which I want to stress is that since July this year, our Galileo satellite system protects millions of people who receive messages with a new and unique capability. Galileo Open Service Navigation Message Authentication is the first such service offered worldwide, which detects spoofing attacks and alerts users. It protects against spoofing attacks by certifying the authenticity of the Galileo signal.

Second, from 2027, we shall offer even better protection against an even broader set of spoofing threats with the Galileo Signal Authentication Service. Third, now more than ever, providing an encrypted and secure positioning, navigation and timing service is critical for our governmental users and is a real game changer in modern warfare. That is why, by the end of this year, Galileo will feature a Public Regulated Service with encrypted navigation signals to protect the signals for governmental entities. It will be far more robust than the standard open satellite navigation signals.

Fourth, in the short term, starting from 2026–2027, the European Commission is preparing a radio frequency interference monitoring service capable of detecting and localising GNSS interference that targets aircraft, ships and critical infrastructure. Future satellites will carry auxiliary payloads, allowing continuous monitoring and early detection of interference.

At the same time, we are anticipating future threats. We aim to increase the availability, resilience and robustness of Galileo services. That is why in the mid-term, a set of complementary measures will be undertaken in close coordination with Member States, including a constellation of satellites in low Earth orbit (LEO PNT) which, together with the existing Galileo infrastructure, 27 satellites in medium Earth orbit, will create a multi-orbit constellation capable of offering increased resilience along with additional fallback capabilities for continuous time and position determination.

Thirdly, we are addressing interference operationally. Our EU Aviation Safety Agency has published recommendations. If the situation deteriorates, the agency will take further actions to ensure safety. The EUROCONTROL network manager is defining the infrastructure needed for safety and service continuity – both civilian and military – and they organised a crisis exercise with national authorities to help prepare for the event of a wide-scale attack on the European Union.

We are working also on alternative systems and on components like active antennas and receivers that increase aviation robustness and strengthen resilience to jamming. We also welcome further development of national terrestrial capabilities as backup in case services are disrupted.

The Commission is preparing an action plan for aviation together with Member States, EUROCONTROL, the European Aviation Safety Agency and industry, and to address interference at sea the Commission has set up an expert group, together with Member States and the European Maritime Safety Agency, to work out reporting and sharing of incidents via EU-wide maritime surveillance systems. Our main goal at sea and in the air: to ensure safety and limit impact on travel and the economy.

Honourable Members – we are engaged in a difficult struggle against a dangerous threat. To win the battle for resilience we need full interinstitutional cooperation, cooperation with the Member States and full support for the European Competitiveness Fund and the new space systems and services in the next Multiannual Financial Framework. We count on the European Parliament to support an ambitious agenda so that technical, operational and legislative tools, including ambitious funding, are fully in place as soon as possible to end this rising threat to our economy and way of life.

Dariusz Joński, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Panie Komisarzu! To miało być wystąpienie o nawigacji satelitarnej, ale 10 września 2025 r. około północy do Polski wleciało 19 rosyjskich dronów. I nie tylko znalazły się przy wschodniej granicy, ale również doleciały do Polski centralnej. I dzisiaj muszę mówić o solidarności i o wspólnej obronie, której nowoczesna nawigacja jest, ale też będzie, integralną częścią.

Tak jak powiedziałem, kilkanaście rosyjskich dronów naruszyło dziś w nocy polską przestrzeń powietrzną. I wszyscy, absolutnie wszyscy wiemy, że nie był to przypadek, ale to była po prostu prowokacja. Polska zareagowała stanowczo i adekwatnie. Nie była to reakcja jednego państwa. Odpowiedzieliśmy w imieniu solidarnej Europy, bo nasze granice, NATO i Unii Europejskiej, to są właśnie nasze granice. A jeśli one są testowane, to testowani jesteśmy wszyscy.

I dlatego z tego miejsca chciałbym podziękować Europie, Unii Europejskiej, Komisji Europejskiej za prawie 180 mld złotych, 44 mld euro, które zostaną zainwestowane z programu SAFE w Polsce na obronę Polski i na obronę Europy. Te środki oczywiście wzmocnią naszą obronę powietrzną i cyfrową, ale bezpieczeństwo to nie tylko rakiety i radary. To także odporność satelitarna i precyzyjna nawigacja. Chcę dziś bardzo jasno powiedzieć, że ta noc, która minęła, to był jasny sygnał dla Europy. I tylko jedność może nas obronić w Europie. Polska granica to granica Europy. Bezpieczna Polska to bezpieczna Europa.

Johan Danielsson, för S&D gruppen. – Fru talman! Kommissionären. Under den senaste tiden har antalet allvarliga GPS-störningar ökat lavinartat. Oavsett om det handlar om ambulanshelikoptrar på Gotland eller kommissionsordförandens plan. Ett hundra tjugotre tusen flyg har störts av signaler bara i Östersjöområdet under årets fyra första månader. Det här är inte planlöst. Det är en tydlig del av rysk hybridkrigföring riktad mot Europa, och varje störning för oss närmare en allvarlig olycka.

EU måste ta detta på största allvar och införa samlade åtgärder för att motverka dessa angrepp. Vi behöver stärka vår tekniska kapacitet. Vi behöver införa hårdare sanktioner mot de aktörer som står bakom detta och strypa deras tillgång till våra satellit- och navigeringstjänster. Det handlar om vår säkerhet. Det handlar om vår frihet. Kommissionen kan förvänta sig ett brett stöd från parlamentet med de åtgärder vi behöver ta tillsammans i Europa.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Polska od miesięcy alarmuje o zakłóceniach sygnału GPS nad Morzem Bałtyckim, o rosnącym zagrożeniu dla żeglugi i lotnictwa cywilnego – także w okolicach mojego miasta, Bydgoszczy – i o konieczności rozwoju systemów monitoringu i obrony.

Dzisiejsze wydarzenia to kolejna forma rosyjskiej agresji. Moskwa naruszyła przestrzeń powietrzną mojego kraju. Kilkadziesiąt dronów dotarło nad terytorium Polski. Część została zestrzelona przez wojsko. Gratuluję naszemu dowództwu i żołnierzom zdecydowania oraz skuteczności.

Rosja staje się coraz bardziej bezczelna i agresywna i przekracza kolejne granice. To już nie tylko cyberataki, dezinformacja czy zakłócanie sygnału. To otwarte, fizyczne zagrożenie dla bezpieczeństwa Unii i NATO. Bądźmy solidarni, nie lekceważmy zagrożenia, wzmacniajmy odporność i odpowiadajmy stanowczo. Rosja rozumie tylko taki język, jakim sama do świata przemawia.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, *im Namen der Renew-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Luftfahrt ist ein strategischer Sektor in Europa, ist eines der Rückgrate unserer Wirtschaft. Viele Menschen fliegen, verbinden Städte in Europa miteinander, und seit 2018/2019 kommt es immer häufiger dazu, dass Navigationsdaten gestört werden – Navigationsdaten gestört werden durch einfache Versuche, die Radiosignale zu stören.

Aber jetzt wird es immer schlimmer, denn insbesondere Russland versucht, in hybrider Kriegsführung gezielt Flugzeuge vom Kurs abzubringen; versucht gezielt, Flugzeugen eine andere Navigationsposition vorzugaukeln. Das nennt man Spoofing.

Ich finde es sehr gut, Herr Kommissar, dass Sie anerkennen, dass das ein wachsendes Problem ist und dass wir etwas tun müssen, dass wir als Europäer investieren müssen darin, uns zu verteidigen, um die Luftfahrt als strategischen Sektor zu schützen, aber auch, weil viele Menschen davon betroffen sind. Das ist versuchter gezielter Massenmord von Russland an europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern, und dem etwas entgegenzuhalten, ist wichtig!

Da müssen wir in Forschung investieren. Ich finde es gut, dass Sie es angesprochen haben: Nächste Woche ist die Versammlung der ICAO in Montreal, da gibt es eine Delegation aus dem Europäischen Parlament. Wir müssen dieses Thema dort ansprechen, damit wir internationale Regeln bekommen und Russland deutlich machen: Diese hybride Kriegsführung dürfen wir nicht zulassen.

Sergey Lagodinsky, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, just weeks ago, when this incident happened, we must be very clear, this is not an isolated incident. And some of the numbers were already mentioned. In Estonia, 85 % of flights have been affected. Lithuania, in your country, as you mentioned, saw a 22-fold increase in jamming. Latvia recorded 820 disruptions last year, whereas the year before it was just 26.

And according to my information, the drones that were in the sky above Poland were manipulated with SIM cards from European countries. Those were the SIM cards from Lithuania and Poland, so that they can use the European system in order to fly.

So let's see clearly, Russia is behind much of this – GNSS jamming and spoofing are what they are. It's weapons of hybrid war, and they strike into the heart of our Europe's infrastructure.

That's why we must act. And we will act the Space Act with secure, binding security, cybersecurity rules, and also the Quantum Act with 97 % accurate quality detection systems that will allow us to build a digital defence shield.

So this is about resilience. This is about responsibility. This is about us acting urgently. And yes, we can also in this Parliament.

Merja Kyllönen, *The Left-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komission jäsen, GPS-häirintä tappaa turvallisuu-den. Turvallisuus on lento- ja meriliikenteen kriittistä ydintä.

Ongelma on ollut edessämme jo vuosia. Me olemme valitettavasti aivan liian hitaita ja sinisilmäisiä reagoinnissamme ulkoisten valtojen vaikuttamiseen. Olen huolissani siitä, että siinä missä moninainen eurooppalainen järjestelmämme turvaa kyllä demokratian toteutumisen, osassa asioita me tarvitsisimme vähemmän byrokratiaa ja komiteoita ja enemmän nopeampaa toimintaa. Meidän on kyettävä vahvempiin ja nopeampiin muutoksiin kaikkien jäsenvaltioiden kanssa. Se on ehdoton elinehto koko Euroopalle, jotta me selviydymme tästä taistelusta.

Kiitoksia komissiolle toimista, mutta toivon, että me pystymme koordinoimaan jatkossa paremmin, jotta me saamme nopeammin asiat liikkeelle.

Paulius Saudargas (PPE). – Madam President, dear Commissioner Andrius Kubilius, dear colleagues, countries bordering Russia have been facing hybrid warfare, including GPS disruptions, for years. A major incident such as the spoofing of the plane carrying Madam President Ursula von der Leyen and you, dear Commissioner, was unfortunately only a matter of time.

Russia is developing technologies not only to target specific regions of the European Union, but to threaten Europe as a whole. The number of spoofing and jamming sources continues to rise. For example, in 2025, the number of spoofing sources in the Kaliningrad region alone, bordering Lithuania, increased from 5 to 29.

This phenomenon increasingly extends beyond the aviation sector. The maritime sector is affected, with ships forced to bypass seaports because their signals are jammed. Farmers near the border struggle to cultivate their land due to interference that disrupts connected tools such as drainage systems. Even private devices and civilian applications are being impacted.

Most importantly, Russia remains largely unaccountable before the international community. Actors who disregard international rules and pose a direct threat to the safety of international transport must be sanctioned. Our response must be firm and coordinated: strong sanctions and investment in resilient technologies.

François Kalfon (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, cette nuit, ce sont 19 drones qui ont touché le territoire de l'Union européenne en Pologne. Fin août, l'avion d'Ursula von der Leyen a été la cible d'un brouillage GPS au-dessus de la Bulgarie, le forçant à atterrir en urgence. Ces attaques s'inscrivent dans la guerre que mène la Russie contre l'Europe. Dans cette guerre, les fantassins sont des hackers, les chars d'assaut sont des drones et les bombes sont informatiques. En 2024, les cas de brouillages du système de navigation par satellite GNSS ont augmenté de 500 % à l'échelle mondiale. Ce sont 46 000 vols commerciaux qui ont été touchés, faisant courir un risque à 4 millions de passagers.

Mais l'Europe est capable de se défendre. D'abord, avec le bouclier numérique autour de Galileo, qui garantit la fiabilité des signaux GPS. Ensuite, avec le gardien EGNOS, qui alerte les cibles, en quelques secondes, d'une attaque. Enfin, grâce à la constellation européenne IRIS², nous disposerons de signaux chiffrés et protégés réellement de manière souveraine.

Alors je le dis, Vladimir Poutine doit savoir que l'Europe est déjà en mesure d'apporter les bonnes réponses face à ces agressions devenues incessantes.

Elena Donazzan (ECR). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, credo che sia molto opportuno che, al di là dei fatti che accadono oggi per cui va la nostra vicinanza alla Polonia, ma può accadere dappertutto, noi si stia iniziando da qualche giorno a discutere lo *Space Act*.

Ha molto a che fare con il tema della sicurezza; ha molto a che fare con la sovranità dell'Europa nella gestione dei propri dati e dei propri sistemi di controllo, della produzione, che deve vederci capaci di recuperare un divario che c'è tra i maggiori produttori al mondo.

Perché senza il controllo anche della produzione, senza il rafforzamento delle nostre grandi industrie di Stato – e ce ne sono e di grande valore – insieme a una *supply chain* che deve essere costruita e rafforzata anche con l'aiuto dei fondi europei, la nostra capacità di avere il controllo della componentistica, il controllo dei dati e il controllo dei sistemi sarebbe inadeguata.

Oggi il tema della sicurezza riguarda la componente civile e militare, ma forse un unico grande ambiente: è quello che noi dobbiamo provare a difendere e tutelare, comprendendo che la prima questione dello spazio è riconoscerlo come dominio.

Christophe Grudler (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, chaque jour, des dizaines d'avions subissent des brouillages de la part de la Russie. De la Finlande à la France en passant par la Bulgarie, c'est une guerre des ondes, invisible, mais bien réelle. Une tentative d'intimidation qui vise à nous aveugler dans notre propre ciel.

Ce n'est pas seulement le GPS américain qui est brouillé, c'est aussi notre GPS européen Galileo, plus performant encore. Mais l'Europe ne pliera pas, tout comme elle ne doit pas plier face aux intimidations des drones russes, ce matin, en Pologne. Nous avons une solution pour nous protéger, c'est le service public réglementé (PRS) de Galileo, conçu pour résister aux brouillages.

Monsieur le Commissaire, il est regrettable que ce service par satellite, plus résistant, ne soit pas encore totalement déployé, alors que le système initial du PRS est en place depuis 2016. Je compte sur votre engagement pour accélérer ce PRS. Accélérons pour garantir notre indépendance sur les ondes et notre souveraineté dans les airs.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtarán, Commissioner, the number of jamming and spoofing incidents targeting global navigation satellite systems has risen at an alarming rate, with an estimated 140 000 flights affected in 2024 alone.*

This is a real threat and it is one that has already cost lives: tragically, 38 people perished on an Azerbaijani Airlines flight in December, and there have been several near misses since. Sadly, these incidents are likely to continue, particularly with the increase in the use of hybrid warfare tactics deployed by Russia and other hostile actors. This is a direct attack on Europe's safety, on our connectivity and our strategic autonomy.

The satellite constellations underpinning the GNSS are essential to aviation, shipping, energy, agriculture and the smooth functioning of our entire economy. That is why Europe must act to resolve. And I welcome the Commission's statement of intent in this regard this evening, particularly investing in our Galileo system.

José Cepeda (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisario Kubilius, mis primeras palabras quieren ser de apoyo, de solidaridad y de fuerza. Y también, por qué no decirlo, de un sentimiento de resiliencia que Europa tiene que tener, justo en este momento, con todo el pueblo polaco. Me parece que es muy importante que sepan que no nos van a doblegar y que no nos van a faltar esfuerzos, recursos ni ganas para defender la paz en el territorio europeo, y desde luego en Polonia, porque está sufriendo estos devaneos por parte de algunos que piensan que los van a desestabilizar.

Buena parte del discurso de esta tarde tiene mucho que ver con el trabajo que se está desarrollando; el señor Kubilius ya ha puesto encima de la mesa algunas medidas, pero creo que es muy importante remarcar que nos hacen falta, fundamentalmente, dos elementos: primero, tener infraestructuras propias —por ejemplo, no tenemos un plan satelital militar propio europeo y sería muy importante desarrollarlo— y, segundo, tener un sistema de inteligencia robusto, netamente europeo, para proteger a los Veintisiete. Y en eso vamos a seguir trabajando intensamente durante los próximos meses.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, смущенията в глобалната навигационна система нараснаха лавинообразно след началото на войната в Украйна. Данните от България ясно доказват тенденцията. От един през 2021 г., случаите са се увеличили до 183 през 2022 г., 199 - през 2022 г., 312 - през 2024 г., а до септември тази година те са 128. В тази статистика попада и случаят с полета на председателя на Европейската комисия от 31-ви август.

Част от руските системи като Оптима 2:2, Полет 21, Мурманск БН и други за смущаване и нарушаване на сигналите са разгърнати на полуостров Крим. Черноморският регион е особено уязвим и Европа трябва да се запита: може ли да се защитим от хибридни атаки? Да, самолетите и корабите могат да се справят и без сателити, но заплахите растат, а Европа не може да си позволи да бъде парализирана при атака. Пред нас стоят три неотложни задачи: да гарантираме безопасността на гражданите, да защитим инфраструктурата, да укрепим стратегическата автономност на Европейския съюз.

Sérgio Humberto (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, caro Comissário, caros colegas, a rede transeuropeia de transportes só será credível se estiver preparada para resistir a este tipo de novos ataques. Para isso, claro que sim, precisamos de sistemas de navegação alternativos e de protocolos de resposta mais rápida.

Mas não chega agir apenas dentro das fronteiras da União — os céus e os mares não conhecem fronteiras políticas. Devemos cooperar com os nossos vizinhos e parceiros, sobretudo no Mediterrâneo, no Atlântico e no mar Negro, para manter as rotas internacionais seguras e abertas.

A União Europeia tem aqui uma oportunidade clara de liderar na proteção da aviação e do transporte marítimo e de reforçar a credibilidade, a competitividade e a proteção. É nossa responsabilidade garantir que voar e navegar na Europa continua a ser sinónimo de confiança e segurança.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisario Kubilius, esta mañana, al conocer la noticia de la flagrante violación del espacio aéreo polaco —ergo europeo— por parte de drones rusos, escuchamos a la presidenta Von der Leyen en el debate del Estado de la Unión hacer una apuesta muy concreta por la industria de defensa europea.

Sí, sabemos que no ha existido en la historia un motor más eficaz de unidad federal que la defensa, porque la enseñanza es clara; en ningún caso vamos a ser más fuertes sumando los esfuerzos fragmentados de los 27 Estados miembros, pero tampoco detrayendo recursos de las políticas distintivas de la Unión Europea: cohesión, solidaridad y política regional.

Lo que se quiere decir, en este debate, es que claro que hay que apoyar ese refuerzo frente a las interferencias en la navegación aérea —el sistema Galileo—, pero, fundamentalmente, hay que apoyar que —para que tengamos una unidad de fuerza común— es imprescindible tener inteligencia común que conduzca a la acción común, no solamente de los Estados miembros, sino del conjunto de la Unión, con valor añadido europeo.

Sebastian Tynkynen (ECR). – Madam President, the recent news of GPS jamming along our eastern borders is extremely alarming, but it is not a surprise. The recent suspected targeting of the aircraft of the President of the Commission demonstrates that Putin does not care who is on the receiving end.

While Russia has been conducting its barbaric war in Ukraine, hybrid operations have also been detected across Europe. Anyone can be a target, and the message is clear: we must be prepared for every possible scenario. It is imperative that we work together with our allies to guarantee safe passage for both civilian and military air traffic. Failure to do so could have catastrophic consequences, and I urge Europe to act decisively.

Helmut Brandstätter (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin! Wir sprechen hier oft über die verschiedenen Formen des hybriden Krieges. Heute haben wir über eine besonders gefährliche Form des hybriden Krieges, die Putin gegen uns in Europa führt, gesprochen. Ich sage das deswegen so deutlich, weil mir viele Menschen in Österreich sagen: Wir sind neutral; wenn wir uns nur ruhig verhalten, dann kann uns nichts passieren.

Die heutige Debatte hat gezeigt, dass auch allen Menschen in Österreich, die in ein Flugzeug einsteigen, natürlich etwas passieren kann, weil diese Beeinflussung der Flugdaten jederzeit so gefährlich werden kann, dass es zu einem Flugzeugabsturz kommen kann – und ich möchte, dass das auch meine Landsleute verstehen. Und das in der Kombination: Das Flugzeug von Frau von der Leyen wurde gestört, und nachher ging auch die Desinformationskampagne los, dass alle, die das sagen, dass das natürlich überhaupt nicht stimmen kann.

Umso wichtiger – darüber bin ich sehr froh –, dass wir einen Verteidigungs-Kommissar haben – Herr Kommissar Kubilius, danke schön – und dass wir jetzt und dass Sie auch dafür sorgen, dass dieses Galileo-Navigationssystem so sicher wird, dass wir die Menschen in Europa beschützen können – auch die Menschen in Österreich.

Magdalena Adamowicz (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dziś w cieniu naruszenia polskiej granicy, naszej europejskiej granicy przez dziesiątki rosyjskich dronów zajmujemy się kolejną odsłoną wojny hybrydowej, jaką Rosja toczy przeciwko Europie. Globalny system nawigacji satelitarnej jest kręgosłupem naszej logistyki, naszego lotnictwa i naszej żeglugi. Bez niego będziemy ślepi. Zagłuszanie GPS-u przez Rosję to agresja w czystej postaci, zagrażająca życiu milionów Europejczyków, których bezpieczeństwo w każdym momencie zależy od tego systemu. Zastanówmy się, co jeszcze bandyta z Kremła ma zrobić, zanim wszyscy jednoznacznie zrozumiemy, że tylko wybicie mu zębów i totalne zbankrutowanie tego terrorystycznego reżimu przywróci nam spokój i bezpieczeństwo.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Andrius Kubilius, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, colleagues, again, thanks a lot for this debate, and thank you very much for your determination, and unity in that determination, to defend our security. Today's debate and your contributions are an encouragement to take forward our EU response to the problems and challenges and threats of jamming and spoofing.

Our exchange of views calls for implementing operational and contingency measures in the short term and developing a strong and ambitious space programme to enhance the resilience of our space systems, the protection of transport services in the Member States, and help to face interference to our space systems, also at the International Civil Aviation Organization.

We really have solid EU space systems. The Commission will continue to deploy and operate them, for the benefit of all Member States and our economic operators. We shall adapt them to new threats and risks affecting the EU economy and the security and safety of our citizens. I count on your continued support.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

17. Retsstatsprincippet og forvaltning af EU-midler i Slovakiet (forhandling)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu der Rechtsstaatlichkeit und der Verwaltung von EU-Mitteln in der Slowakei (2025/2863(RSP)).

Marie Bjerre, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, let me stress that our Union is a community of values with the rule of law at its heart. The respect for the rule of law is vital when implementing the EU budgets, and when respecting the principle of sound financial management.

The defence of our common values and the rule of law go hand in hand with the good management of EU funds. The Rule of Law Conditionality Regulation protects the EU budget: it allows us to take measures if the EU's financial interests are put at risk by a Member State.

We welcome the dialogue between the Commission and Slovakia. We hope these exchanges will soon bear fruit, together with the reforms already undertaken by Slovakia. Should the Commission decide to propose further action, the Council will carefully examine them.

At the same time, the Council is working to address challenges before they become actual problems. This takes place in the framework of the Council's rule of law dialogue, a key preventive tool. Let me give you concrete examples of upcoming discussions: next week, ministers will meet at the General Affairs Council for discussion on the general trends of the rule of law in the EU. The discussion will be based on the Commission report from July. Then, in November, we will continue with our review of the rule of law situation in the individual Member States, focusing this time on Bulgaria, Czechia, Ireland and Germany.

Let me assure you that the Council remains committed to the promotion of the rule of law. We will continue to pay close attention to the developments in this area.

Michael McGrath, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister, honourable Members, thank you very much for this evening's debate in relation to Slovakia. Let me start off by saying that, in the last two years, Slovakia has engaged in an intensive dialogue with the Commission to resolve issues identified in the 2024 Rule of Law report, and important efforts continue in this regard.

Engagement and constructive dialogue have allowed us to engage with Slovakia on significant reforms where important issues of compliance with EU law are discussed – from criminal law reforms to current draft constitutional amendments, to name just a few. As one result of this dialogue, and as noted in this year's Rule of Law report, Slovakia realigned its 2024 criminal law reform to ensure consistency with the EU's legal framework and the protection of the Union's financial interests. This is a positive step.

However, the 2025 report also flags concerns regarding the reform's implications on addressing high-level corruption. Regarding Slovakia's institutional set-up to fight corruption, for instance, the closure of its specialised anti-corruption entities, the National Crime Agency (NACA) and the Special Prosecutor's Office (SPO), resulted in delays in investigations transferred to other bodies and in a drop in the number of corruption cases. For this reason, in July this year, the Commission concluded that no progress was made in the past year on its recommendation to ensure effective and independent investigation and prosecution of high-level corruption cases made in previous Rule of Law reports.

In relation to the prevention of corruption, the Commission considered there has been some progress to strengthen the legislation on conflicts of interest. At the same time, we also noted that lobbying and asset declarations have yet to be regulated in Slovakia.

As concerns the Recovery and Resilience Plan, Slovakia continues its implementation as planned. The country has so far received 61 % of its envelope. With less than one year and a half left to bring the Recovery and Resilience Facility to a successful conclusion, it is important for Slovakia – as it is for all Member States – to deliver the remaining reforms and investments that have been agreed under that facility.

In relation to cohesion funds, programme implementation has gained speed while gradually remedying deficiencies that were originally identified. At the same time, some challenges in the area of the partnership principle – one of the cornerstones of the cohesion policy – do still remain. For the Commission, it is important that essential guarantees for civil society organisations are not weakened in the implementation of EU funds, both at national and regional levels. The Commission remains in contact with the Slovak authorities in this regard.

Concerning the implementation of EU funds in agriculture and rural development, the Commission is aware of recent media reports about alleged irregularities in the way common agricultural policy funds have been disbursed in Slovakia. The Commission is in contact with the Slovak authorities that put in place actions to address any irregularities.

The Commission has performed several audits in relation to the agricultural funds, resulting in an overall financial correction of EUR 27.7 million for the detected irregularities, which was accepted by Slovakia while collaborating effectively during the process. Any allegations of fraud or other irregularities of a criminal nature are in the hands of OLAF and the EPPO as independent bodies. The Commission continues to monitor issues reported by the certification body.

Finally, as regards the general regime of conditionality, the Commission continuously monitors the situation in all Member States, including Slovakia. The Commission assesses every situation on an individual basis and will act if the criteria set out in the Conditionality Regulation weren't to be met.

Honourable Members, our commitment is clear: to support Slovakia in upholding the rule of law, to safeguard public trust and to protect the Union's financial interests at all times. Our democracy, security and economy rely on the rule of law, and respect for the rule of law will continue to be a must for EU funds.

I know that this commitment is also widely shared in this House, as demonstrated by the fact-finding mission of the Democracy, Rule of Law and Fundamental Rights Monitoring Group of the Committee on Civil Liberties that took place on 2 and 3 June in Bratislava. I know we have quite a number of MEPs, and indeed members of that delegation, here this evening. I look forward now to hearing your contributions to this debate.

Javier Zarzalejos, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, el Estado de Derecho no es un asunto interno. En la Unión Europea el Estado de Derecho puede y debe ser objeto de preocupación común y de actuación correctiva.

Por eso, al afirmar la legitimidad de la acción del Parlamento, quiero empezar condenando el acoso sufrido por nuestro colega Tomáš Zdechovský durante su misión en Bratislava como miembro de la Comisión de Control Presupuestario.

Proteger la integridad del Estado de Derecho no es una injerencia, es una obligación. Y los Tratados nos habilitan y nos obligan a ello. El Parlamento está cumpliendo con su deber.

Señora presidenta, estamos hablando de deslegitimación de los jueces, de ataques a periodistas y medios de comunicación, de presión sobre las organizaciones de la sociedad civil. Estamos hablando del desmantelamiento de unidades especializadas en la lucha contra la corrupción. Estamos hablando de reformas legislativas para favorecer a allegados políticos y personales, especialmente en el terreno de la corrupción. Estamos hablando del recurso sistemático a procedimientos parlamentarios de urgencia, sin participación de los sectores y sujetos interesados.

Sí, tal vez a alguno todo esto le suene familiar. No, estamos hablando, en este caso, de Eslovaquia, pero no creamos que esos son los únicos desafíos y que ese catálogo de amenazas se restringe a un solo país. Por eso, tenemos que ampliar nuestro radar y elevar nuestras exigencias para que otras violaciones, otras amenazas y otros riesgos no escapen a los imperativos democráticos que nos obligan a todos.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, este Parlamento, lo saben bien, ha hecho cuanto ha estado en su mano para establecer un ciclo político con un marco vinculante de Estado de Derecho, democracia y derechos fundamentales que prevenga —y no solamente corrija cuando ya es tarde— las desviaciones con respecto del estándar europeo, que es vinculante para todos los Estados miembros.

La Unión Europea no es solamente un mercado ni un club de intereses, sino también valores y un modelo europeo de Estado de Derecho y de democracia que todos los Estados miembros tienen la obligación de cumplir.

En un momento dado tuvimos que enfrentarnos con la deriva autocrática del Gobierno de Orbán en Hungría y luego vinieron los «urbanitas», que es como llamamos a los imitadores de Orbán: durante un tiempo tuvimos la cuestión polaca —también sujeta al procedimiento del artículo 7 del Tratado de la Unión Europea— y ahora tenemos un desafío con Eslovaquia.

El Gobierno de Eslovaquia se desvía notoriamente del estándar europeo y lo desafía, con un primer ministro que estrecha la mano de Putin y acude solícito a entrevistarse con él y con Xi, sin ninguna cobertura europea, sin representar ni los valores ni el estándar europeo: desmantela la Fiscalía Anticorrupción, ataca a la prensa independiente, hace retroceder pavorosamente las libertades en Eslovaquia...

Es una cuestión en la que no solo tenemos la obligación de velar, de vigilar, sino también de advertir de que la condicionalidad del Estado de Derecho se ideó exactamente para prevenir y bloquear el acceso a los fondos europeos y al presupuesto europeo a los Gobiernos que no cumplan con sus obligaciones, con los valores consagrados en el artículo 2 del Tratado de la Unión Europea.

Este es el momento de fijar la vista en Eslovaquia y de apoyar la misión que llevó a cabo en ese país la Comisión de Libertades, Justicia e Interior, que sufrió, una vez más —lo recuerdo bien porque yo fui parte de esas misiones en más de una ocasión— un trato indigno para el Parlamento Europeo, que no es un ovni ni una injerencia exterior en un Estado miembro, sino una representación democrática directa de la ciudadanía eslovaca en la medida en que esa ciudadanía es también europea.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe PfE*. – Madame la Présidente, le respect de l'état de droit, c'est génial, franchement, parce que ça permet, dès qu'il y a un problème avec un gouvernement qui déplaît à l'Union européenne, de s'ingérer dans ses affaires. Ça a été le cas de la Pologne, ça a été le cas de la Hongrie, et c'est maintenant le tour de la Slovaquie d'être le souffre-douleur de Bruxelles.

En réalité, la Commission harcèle ce pays, car ce gouvernement vous déplaît. Selon toute logique, il faudrait, pour bénéficier des passe-droits européens, que les Slovaques fassent un peu comme les Polonais qui, depuis l'arrivée des libéraux au pouvoir, détournent allègrement, comme on l'apprend dans le journal *Politico*, les fonds européens consacrés à la relance post-Covid pour acheter des yachts, des voitures de luxe et même un club échangiste, sans aucune remarque de Bruxelles pour le moment.

Que dire de ce parlement qui a lui-même été éclaboussé par le scandale du Qatargate en matière de corruption? Où en est l'enquête? Où en sont les condamnations? N'en déplaise à l'Union européenne, le social-démocrate Robert Fico est un Premier ministre démocratiquement élu. Son parti a remporté les élections en 2023 et il conduit dans son pays une politique souverainiste.

Que Bruxelles remette de l'ordre dans ses propres dérives avant de donner des leçons aux États.

Paolo Inselvini, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, siamo consapevoli quanto sia importante lo Stato di diritto e il rispetto dei nostri valori fondamentali, ma questo solo quando non viene utilizzato come clava politica per colpire governi indigesti alla sinistra e al pensiero unico.

Questo è accaduto prima con la Polonia, poi con l'Ungheria, a volte addirittura con la mia Italia, perché spesso vengono criticati coloro che non si allineano al pensiero unico.

Noi, invece, vogliamo un'Europa di popoli liberi, che si possano autodeterminare; vogliamo un'Europa nel quale i popoli e i governi siano liberi di difendere valori tradizionali e normali senza essere ricattati.

Perché noi vogliamo davvero un'Europa nel quale i governi siano eletti dalle persone, a differenza di una sinistra che spesso si riempie la bocca di democrazia ma non la rispetta per nulla.

Michal Wiezik, *za skupinu Renew*. – Vážená pani predsedajúca, dva príklady využitia eurofondov na Slovensku:

Národný ústav srdcových a cievnych ochorení za 1,6 milióna eur z plánu obnovy vybavil dve operačné sály. Skrátil tým zásadne dĺžku operácie fibrilácie srdcových chorôb. Máme špičково vybavené pracovisko, ktoré zachraňuje desiatky a stovky ľudských životov.

Na druhej strane, za tú istú sumu si ľudia spriaznení s vládou stranou Smer postavili opulentný zámoček, v ktorom nikdy nikoho neubytovali a za pár rokov sa stal ich súkromným majetkom.

Cítite ten rozdiel? Je zásadný. Ten prvý prístup je prospešný, posúva Slovensko vpred a pomáha ľuďom zlepšiť život na Slovensku. Ten druhý je zneužitím európskych financií. Oberá nás o príležitosť napredovať.

Slovensko má byť úspešnou krajinou. Európska únia nám v tom pomáha a žiadna vláda, žiadna vláda nemá právo nás o túto príležitosť oberať.

Preto je dnešná debata, preto bola kontrolná misia, preto tu stojíme, kričíme a upozorňujeme na tento problém. Robíme tak v najlepšom záujme Slovenska. Bojujeme a budeme bojovať za to, aby sa peniaze dostali k ľuďom a do regiónov na Slovensku, aby Slovensko mohlo ďalej napredovať.

Daniel Freund, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, what a picture: the dictators of the world together in China. You have Putin, you have Xi Jinping, you have Kim Jong Un, and you have Robert Fico hanging out with them, and I think it tells you something about where he wants to go with Slovakia. And indeed, we have seen the attacks on media freedom, on the rule of law, the corruption. I was part of both missions that went to Slovakia in June. We learned that the anti-corruption prosecutor abolished the national crime agency – abolished. We heard on the ground what this does. Hundreds of people that have been convicted for corruption have been let out of prison, dozens of investigations have been interrupted or stopped. We have seen that since the new criminal code entered into force, the number of indictments for corruption cases has dropped by 95%.

So, Commissioner, I fail to understand how we are not using the conditionality. EU funds are clearly at risk. There are dozens upon dozens of examples of villas for Fico's friends and allies. Why are we not doing something before it becomes too late, before we see a second Hungary? Let's not make the same mistakes. Let's act on this now.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, η κατάσταση στη Σλοβακία έρχεται να συναντήσει την αρνητική πορεία για το κράτος δικαίου στην Ουγγαρία, στην Πολωνία, στη Βουλγαρία, στην Ελλάδα. Αυτό μας ανησυχεί βαθύτατα. Υπάρχει μία λέξη που νομίζω θα συμφωνήσουμε: διαφθορά. Η διαφθορά απειλεί τη δημοκρατία. Η πρόσφατη συνταγματική αναθεώρηση της σλοβακικής κυβέρνησης είναι φανερό ότι απειλεί την ισότητα, την ακεραιότητα της απονομής δικαιοσύνης, ενώ παράλληλα υπονομεύει την έννομη προστασία των οικονομικών συμφερόντων της Ένωσής μας από εγκληματικές ενέργειες. Αυτές οι μεταρρυθμίσεις βάλλουν ευθέως κατά του κράτους δικαίου, της δημοκρατίας και της προστασίας των θεμελιωδών ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στη Σλοβακία. Περιορίζουν την εφαρμογή του ευρωπαϊκού κεκτημένου και των διεθνών συνθηκών, πλήττοντας την ιδιωτική και οικογενειακή ζωή. Είμαι ιδιαίτερα ανήσυχος για τις επιπτώσεις στα παιδιά, τις

γυναίκες, τους δημοσιογράφους, τη ΛΟΑΤΚΙ κοινότητα, των οποίων τα δικαιώματα απειλούνται υπό το πρόσχημα της προστασίας της εθνικής ταυτότητας, παλιό σάπιο ιδεολογικό προϊόν. Κύριε Επίτροπε, το εργαλείο της αιρεσιμότητας με βρίσκει σύμφωνο. Πρέπει να σας πω ότι η Αριστερά θα είναι πλάι σας όσο εσείς δεν κάνετε πίσω.

Milan Uhrík, za skupinu ESN. – Vážená pani predsedajúca, milí progresívci, chcete v europarlamente opäť na Slovensko kydať a rozprávať sa o porušovaní právneho štátu? Dobre, poďme sa na to pozrieť.

V prvom rade sa nie je s kým rozprávať, lebo tu nikto nesedí a tieto vaše vymyslené témy nikoho v Európskom parlamente reálne nezaujímajú. Je to tu prázdne.

Po druhé, povedzte mi, kde ste boli, keď sa za minulej vlády porušovali na Slovensku ľudské práva, keď sa strieľalo po ľuďoch s gumovými projektilmi? Povedzte mi, kde ste boli, keď sa zakazovali médiá? Nikoho to nezaujíma. Samozrejme, že tu nikto nesedí, lebo je to hlúposť a nezmysel.

Keď sa zakazovali médiá a keď sa vypínali webstránky, vtedy ste boli ticho. Vtedy vám nevadilo ani rozkrádanie eurofondov, ani to, že šimečka tuneluje s celou rodinou dotácie. Vtedy ste boli ticho. Zrazu ste sa prebudili a hovoríte, že na Slovensku je porušovaný právny štát len preto, že vy nie ste na Slovensku pri moci.

Ja by som si želal len dve veci: keby ste konečne prestali na Slovensko v Európe kydať a keby sa do slovenských záležitostí prestali starať ľudia ako pán Zdechovský.

President. – I will be a bit stricter now, after the round of speakers for the groups.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Madam President, I will be also strict.

Paní predsedajúcí, dovoľte mi začít trochu osobne. *Moje korene vedú aj na Slovensko. Starý otec* pochádzal z Trenčína a časť mojej rodiny dodnes žije na Slovensku. Každý rok se sem vracím a cítim se tady doma. Proto to, co vám chci dnes říci, není jen politický projev poslance EP, ale vyznání člověka, kterému na Slovensku záleží. Pamatuji si dobu, kdy my Češi jsme vzhlíželi ke Slovensku s obdivem, když jste přijali euro, když vaše ekonomika rostla a když jste ukazovali, že i menší země může být příkladem moderní a ekonomicky vyspělé otevřené společnosti. O to bolestnější je dnes sledovat, kam se Slovensko posouvá.

Miliardy z evropských fondů mizí v projektech, které neslouží slovenským lidem, ale nezodpovědným politikům a jejich kámošům. Kontrolní orgány, které mají stát na straně poctivých, jsou paralyzovány. Tam, kde kdysi padaly stovky žalob, dnes padají sotva dvě ročně. Během kontrolní mise jsme si vyslechli příběhy farmářů, kteří byli vydírání, oznamovatelů, kteří čelí zastrašování, i novinářů, kteří riskují život, protože píšou pravdu. I já osobně jsem čelil zastrašování a moje rodina výhrůžkám smrti. To jen potvrzuje, že problém je skutečně vážný a systémový. Po návštěvě jsme předali přes tři sta podnětů Evropské komisi a pevně věřím, že tyto podněty budou vyšetřeny.

Erik Kaliňák (NI), otázka položená zdvihnutím modrej karty. – Pán Zdechovský, boli ste súčasťou tzv. *fact-finding mission*, preto sa vás musím opýtať: prečo vaša správa je plná lží?

A vyberiem si jednu konkrétnu, ktorá je za mňa absolútne závažná: prečo tvrdíte, že Slovensko nevyužíva systém kontroly Arachne, napriek tomu, že veľmi dobre viete, že Slovensko je jedným z prvých štátov, ktorý túto službu využíval naplno? Na rozdiel od vlády, ktorej ste vy súčasťou a za ktorú teraz robíte politickú kampaň na úkor Slovenska.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE), odpověď na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty. – Pane Kaliňáku, děkuji za otázku. Tuto otázku byste měl směřovat sekretariátu výboru CONT, který tu zprávu zpracovával. Jinak, myslím si, že vy jste zmíněn docela často u nás v bezpečnostních službách. Myslím si, že vaše návštěvy ruské ambasády a utíkání zadním vchodem nebo vaše spolupráce s *Voice of Europe*, který patří k proruské dezinformační scéně, a mnozí politici za tuto spolupráci byli placeni, jsou velmi dobře známy a ukazuje to na úpadek určité demokracie a kultury u člověka, který by měl radit premiérovi.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der politischen Rechten gehen in diesen Rechtsstaatsdiskussionen die Argumente aus. Jetzt musste man sogar zu dem Argument greifen, dass niemand da ist – wenn man der einzige seiner Fraktion ist, der überhaupt da ist, aber hier Leute sitzen; das ist wirklich ganz interessant.

Dann kommt immer das Argument in diesen Rechtsstaatsdiskussionen, wir reden immer nur über Ungarn. Jetzt reden wir nicht über Ungarn, das zeigt ja eigentlich, dass wir uns um alle Mitgliedstaaten kümmern – jetzt kann man das Argument auch nicht benutzen.

Und dann kommt das dritte Argument, was immer kommt in diesen Rechtsstaatsdiskussionen: Brüssel will eigentlich nur Regierungen bestrafen, die ihnen politisch nicht gefallen, rechte Regierungen. Ja, aber Fico – als ich das letzte Mal geguckt habe, sie sitzen jetzt bei den fraktionslosen Mitgliedern, aber eigentlich ist das eine sozialdemokratische Partei! Alle Argumente, die sie immer haben, fallen in Luft zusammen.

Worum geht es? Es geht uns darum, den Rechtsstaat zu schützen, weil es uns darum geht, dass Steuergelder, unsere Steuerzahler – deutsche Steuerzahler, slowakische Steuerzahler, ungarische Steuerzahler: Alle haben verdient, dass anständig mit dem Geld umgegangen wird. Und das kann nur ein Rechtsstaat sicherstellen, und deswegen schauen wir überall in der Europäischen Union genau darauf hin.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Commissioner, Council – Putin, Orbán, Fico. Sadly, Slovakia is following in the footsteps of Hungary and Russia. Prime Minister Fico is cracking down at the moment on fundamental rights, NGOs and free media in a rapid rule of law 'race to the bottom'. A new constitution would deny gender diversity and restrict rainbow families and sex education. This is yet another blow for the Slovakian LGBTI+ community and women whose hopes for future progress are being squashed.

Once again, the pretence of protecting national sovereignty is used to oppress citizens and negate the primacy of EU law. Fico's anti-NGO law uses allegations of foreign influence to silence critical voices. Council, Commissioner – in Hungary we have seen that the typical EU strategy of acting too little, too late fails to protect citizens. The impunity of Orbán has now emboldened Fico to follow suit. So Commission, Council – do not make the same mistake again.

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

Katarína Roth Nevedálová (NI), blue-card question. – Ms Strik, thank you very much for your words. I don't know how many times you have visited Slovakia or how much do you know about Slovakia, but I don't want to be disrespectful about this. But I would like to ask, you very much mentioned several times the rule of law. So can you please quote or tell me where the rule of law definition is in the European law? If you are so much sure about that, thank you very much.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE), blue-card answer. – Well, if you don't know, it's good that you ask the question, of course. And I think if you read the Rule of Law reports of the Commission, you can see very clearly that it's a constellation of different values and guarantees that all Member States need to ensure to protect citizens. And maybe the most important rule of law principle you can find in Article 2 of our Treaty on European Union, where our values are anchored and where every Member State needs to obey this principle.

Hanna Gedin (The Left). – Fru talman! I Slovakien försöker man nu kringgå EU-lag, Europakonventionen, barnkonventionen och internationella fördrag. Låt oss se till att de inte kommer undan med det.

Rätten att bestämma över sin egen kropp är inte förhandlingsbar. Kvinnors rätt till abort måste vara en grundsten i varje demokrati. Att försäkra för HBTQ-personer, att vägra samkönade par rätten att bilda familj – det är institutionaliserad diskriminering, och det får aldrig normaliseras. Att skapa ett samhällsklimat som misstänkliggör på grund av kön, sexuell läggning eller bakgrund är farligt. Att vika sig för reaktionära krafter som gör skillnad på människor och människor är farligt. Det är riktigt farligt.

Till Slovaikiens folk vill jag säga: Er kamp för frihet och värdighet är också vår kamp. Vi ser er, vi hör er och vi är med er.

(Talaren godtog en fråga ("blått kort").)

Ľuboš Blaha (NI), otázka položená zdvihnutím modrej karty. – Vážená pani kolegyňa, vy nenávidíte Roberta Fica, pretože on chce mier a vy chcete vojnu. Nenávidíte Roberta Fica, lebo odmieta tú vašu extrémistickú progresívnu ideológiu.

Ale možno neviete, že celá táto zbytočná a účelová diskusia je tu len preto, lebo to chce opozičná strana na Slovensku Progresívne Slovensko, ktorej europoslancov vypláca britská vláda, aby zasahovala do demokratických volieb na Slovensku.

Na Slovensku to považujeme za vlastizradu a ja som presvedčený, že aj vy by ste sa mali spýtať vašich kolegov z Renew, či páchajú vlastizradu alebo či sú len tak presvedčení o svojej nenávisti voči vlastnej vlasti. Je to hanba.

Hanna Gedin (The Left), svar ("blått kort"). – Jag uppfattar att kollegan här påstår att jag är från Renew, men det är jag inte. Jag är från The Left. Jag är också jurist i grund och botten, och det innebär att jag är extremt bekymrad. Jag är extremt bekymrad över alla försök som jag ser när man försöker kringgå grundläggande mänskliga rättigheter, när man genom att föreslå den här nya grundlagen och förändringen, genom det försöker kringgå inte bara EU-lag utan Europakonventionen, barnkonventionen och internationella fördrag. Det tycker jag borde oroa alla i denna kammaren, oavsett vilken partigrupp man tillhör.

Monika Beňová (NI). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, pán komisár, chcem sa poďakovať za vaše vystúpenie a som veľmi rada, že ste našej slovenskej opozícii zdôraznili, že dialóg medzi Európskou komisiou a vládou Slovenskej republiky prebieha veľmi dobre, že nerobí vláda Slovenskej republiky vôbec žiadne komplikácie a že hľadáme riešenia pre problémy, ktoré ešte sú otvorené.

Takisto chcem zdôrazniť, a to zaznelo aj na misiách a mrzí ma, že to tu neodznalo od pánov spravodajcov z týchto misií, že vláda Slovenskej republiky dopredu avizovala, že nakoľko ani slovenské, ani európske mechanizmy nezaregistrovali nejaké nezrovnalosti, máme tu OLAF a máme tu Európsku prokuratúru, ktorá takéto nezrovnalosti zaeviduje. Vláda je pripravená spolupracovať.

S pánom Freuendom tu dlhé roky vedieme diskusiu o Robertovi Ficovi a všetci dobre vieme, že nie je priateľom Roberta Fica. Rešpektujem to. Čo sa týka, a teraz si požičiam výraz pána Webera, „crazy“ pána Zdechovského, to snáď netreba ani komentovať.

Ale budem teraz hovoriť tuto ku kolegom z Progresívneho Slovenska. Ja neviem, kolegyne a kolegovia, kde vy beriete v sebe tú ničím neopodstatnenú a bezbrehú pýchu, ktorou tu stále útočíte na vládu Slovenskej republiky. Chcem vám ale poradiť. Reprezentujete tu Slovenskú republiku a máte stáť za záujmami Slovenskej republiky. Nemyslite si, že oni všetci vás budú mať radšej, keď vy tu budete na Slovensko nadávať len preto, že nemáte žiadnu inú agendu, ktorú by ste ponúkli.

(Rečníčka odmietla otázku, ktorú zdvihnutím modrej karty položila Lucia Yar)

Niclas Herbst (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich sage gleich vorweg: Ich akzeptiere die blaue Karte, die gleich kommt, das ist in Ordnung.

Der Haushaltskontrollausschuss und seine Mission wurden schon mehrfach erwähnt. Wir waren in der Slowakei. Sie haben den Bericht vielleicht gar nicht gelesen, aber er ist durchaus ausgewogen. Die Position der slowakischen Behörden wird dort, glaube ich, völlig korrekt wiedergegeben. Wir gehen auch gar nicht ein auf die aktuelle Skandal-Berichterstattung über die Gasthäuser und andere Dinge, sondern es geht um strukturelle Probleme; das ist die Aufgabe des Haushaltskontrollausschusses – dem sind wir nachgegangen.

Es gibt in der Tat Probleme. Die Sorgen nach dieser Fact-Finding-Mission sind nicht geringer geworden. Es geht insbesondere auch um die Ausstattung der slowakischen Behörden. Wenn dort die personelle Ausstattung und auch die Befugnisse nicht ausreichend gegeben sind, dann ist das ein Problem für uns, weil wir dann nur noch die EUSTa haben, und die EUSTa will das auch gar nicht alleine machen. Wir brauchen die slowakischen Behörden vor Ort, und wenn die nicht unabhängig sind und nicht ausreichend ausgestattet, dann haben wir ein strukturelles Problem. Das muss angesprochen werden.

Es geht um zwei Dinge: Es geht darum, dass die Slowakische Republik ein ganz wichtiger Bestandteil unserer Europäischen Union ist. Und das Geld, das zur Verfügung gestellt wird, gehört den Menschen dort, und nicht einigen wenigen, sondern allen – auch im Bereich der Agrarpolitik. Darum geht es. Und das ist eine strukturelle Aufgabe, der wir als Parlament nachgehen müssen, und zwar in jedem europäischen Mitgliedstaat.

Und das Zweite ist natürlich auch: Wir müssen die finanziellen Interessen der Europäischen Union wahren, die Interessen der steuerzahlenden Menschen in Europa. Und es verwundert mich, dass gerade selbsternannte Patrioten sich nicht sozusagen dafür engagieren, dass diese Interessen der hart arbeitenden Menschen wahrgenommen werden, dass das Geld nicht an Oligarchen oder Einzelne geht, sondern an die Menschen, die es wirklich verdient haben.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ zu antworten.)

Lukas Sieper (NI), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege, dass Sie die blaue Karte akzeptiert haben. Sie haben in meinen Augen relativ gut ausgeführt, warum eben das, was hier gefordert wird, nicht eine Einschränkung der Souveränität der Mitgliedstaaten bedeutet, sondern ein Ausschluss dieser Souveränität der Mitgliedstaaten ist. Könnten Sie für mich und vielleicht für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Europäischen Union noch einmal erläutern, warum gerade deshalb die Argumentation der selbsternannten Patrioten keinen Sinn macht?

Niclas Herbst (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Sie haben ja die Antwort im Grunde schon selber gegeben: weil es um die Menschen geht und weil wir Standards haben, die für alle gelten sollen; das gilt im Auditbereich, das gilt bei der Rechnungsprüfung. Und wenn wir die Regeln für alle haben, dann ist das nicht nur gerecht, sondern es dient auch dem Ziel. Wir wollen etwas erreichen, zum Beispiel mit der Agrarpolitik, mit der Kohäsionspolitik; und diese europäischen Ziele zu erreichen, das ist im Interesse der Menschen.

Und deshalb ist gerade die Argumentationsweise der selbsternannten Patrioten auch nicht richtig, weil wir ja zum Beispiel im Bereich der Kohäsionspolitik soziale Unterschiede abbauen wollen – das ist gut für die Menschen. Das schafft nicht nur Sicherheit für die Menschen, sondern das ist das, was wir europäisch erreichen wollen. Wir unterstützen – das haben Sie richtig gesagt – die Souveränität der Menschen dort vor Ort und eigentlich auch der Nationalstaaten.

Abir Al-Sahlani (Renew). – Madam President, Robert Fico – you are following the schoolbook of the crackdown on democracy and human rights. We've seen it before; you go after the LGBTQI+ persons, you go after the right of safe, legal abortion. You then go after the next group and the next group. You incite corruption.

The freedom that you are enjoying, the democracy that brought you to power, the rule of law that is protecting your rights as much as anyone else's rights; these are principles and values that were fought for by the Slovak people long before you came to power. They were fought for with sweat, tears and blood. These are not for you to be used for your own agenda.

You are turning your own country into Putin's Trojan horse, inside the very Union that contributed to the prosperity of your country. Not as a favour to you, but because the Slovak people belong in Europe. I am convinced that with the Slovak people, and because of our colleagues in progressive Slovakia, democracy will prevail and your attempt to turn your country into an autocracy will fail.

Krzysztof Brejza (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Dziś na mój kraj, na Polskę, spadły drony rosyjskie. My jesteśmy we wspólnocie europejskiej, w Unii Europejskiej. Tworzona była wspólnie przez państwa miłujące wartości i zasady. To wspólnota demokratycznych państw. Dziś widzimy, jak przywódca Słowacji, pan Fico, leci na Kreml, by oddać hołd Putinowi na Kremlu. Drodzy Słowacy, my razem przez 45 lat byliśmy pod butem rosyjskim, ruskim. To jest znak dla nas wszystkich, że przywódca państwa europejskiego sprzeniewierza się wartościom europejskim, demokracji, praworządności, atakując wolne media, oligarchizując państwo, niszcząc wolne sądy, wolną prokuraturę. Robi to po to, by trafić do orbity Kremla, by znaleźć się w strefie Kremla. Ale praworządność to coś więcej. Praworządność jest oznaką wolności. I czym się różni kraj z praworządnością od kraju bez praworządności? Różni się tym, że kraj z praworządnością jest krajem wolnych obywateli. A tam, gdzie nie ma praworządności, tak jak w tej Rosji, tak jak na Kremlu, jak na Białorusi, tam nie ma wolności. Dlatego drodzy bracia Słowacy, walczyć o swoją praworządność, walczyć o wartości europejskie. S.

Bojujte za právny štát. Sme s vami.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Helmut Brandstätter (Renew). – Madam President, one of the first memories of my life was the Iron Curtain, you know, as a little boy, and I saw the Iron Curtain to Hungary and to Czechoslovakia, as it was called, and I couldn't believe it, you know – the towers with the soldiers and their guns. And then I was so happy, like all the others, when it was open, and we had our friends and we could live together. And it's still, by the way, a beautiful trip from Vienna to Bratislava on the Danube. And now we're working together, and we have the same rules. Together, we live with the rule of law, and that's really good.

But then I hear the recent findings of the EP Budgetary Control Committee's findings, and they reveal troubling cracks in Slovakia's management of EU funds, especially the misappropriation by the agricultural payments agency. And I really have to tell you: it's the money of the Europeans. We live together. We should have the same rights and the same duties and our money for everybody, but not for the corrupt people.

Branislav Ondruš (NI). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, kolegyne a kolegovia, vystúpenia, ktoré sme si tu vypočuli, sú najlepším dôkazom, že tu nejde a od začiatku nešlo o právny štát na Slovensku, pretože neexistujú žiadne argumenty, že situácia u nás je horšia než inde. V skutočnosti je toto fanatický a bezohľadný útok proti Slovensku opakovaným zneužívaním európskych inštitúcií zo strany Progresívneho Slovenska.

Spomeňte si, prosím, ako sa po eurovoľbách stranický kolega Progresívneho Slovenska, komisár Didier Reynders opakovane pokúšal dostať Slovensko na súd kvôli právnemu štátu. Ten Didier Reynders, ktorý vzápätí po skončení výkonu svojej funkcie sa stal predmetom vyšetrovania belgickej polície pre pranie špinavých peňazí a vtrhla mu polícia domov aj do jeho kancelárie, aby zaistila dôkazy. Takže ešte vy sa tu oháňate právnym štátom?

Dámy a páni, ale mne ste neumožnili zúčastniť sa na kontrolnej misii, hoci to bolo porušenie, hrubé porušenie oficiálnych parlamentných pravidiel, a vylúčili ste jediného slovenského poslanca, ktorý mal záujem zúčastniť sa na tejto kontrolnej komisii a porušili ste rokovací poriadok tohto Európskeho parlamentu. Hanba! Pretože v skutočnosti to, čo robíte, je plné netransparentnosti, zatajovania, vylučovania europoslancu, ktorý má legitímny mandát, z toho, aby sa zúčastnil na kontrolnej činnosti tohto Európskeho parlamentu.

Toto nie je kontrolná činnosť Európskeho parlamentu. Toto je hrubé zneužívanie Európskeho parlamentu na vnútropolitický boj frustrovanej slovenskej opozície, ktorá nie je schopná v legitímnej politickej súťaži na Slovensku uspieť.

Raquel García Hermida-Van Der Walle (Renew). – Madam President, we have heard a lot of good things tonight, and the rest, because it will be about the people, I will say it in Dutch for also the people at home.

Want ik wil het hebben over de mensen, de mensen over wie dit gaat. Dat zijn de Slowaakse mensen. Ik was daar, in Slowakije, deze zomer nog. Ik sprak daar met mensen die het corrupte wanbeleid van premier Fico helemaal zat zijn. Helemaal zat. Net als andere Europeanen. Die hebben er ook genoeg van dat hun belastinggeld naar zo'n corrupte bende gaat.

Daarom moeten we naast het Slowaakse volk staan. Daarom moeten we de mensen daar steunen. De mensen willen ziekenhuizen. Ze willen wegen. Ze willen scholen. De mensen willen een einde maken aan de corruptie van deze regering.

Er is hoop, want in Slowakije hoorde ik dat mensen iets anders willen. Een regering die corruptie aanpakt en het anders doet. Een regering die de rechten van lhbtq+-mensen respecteert. Dat hebben we gezien vanavond. Het is mogelijk. Er is hoop.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Michael McGrath, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, thank you, and thank you, Commissioner McGrath. Thanks also to all of the honourable Members who contributed to the debate this evening.

Let me recall that the Commission welcomes Slovakia's engagement in intensive dialogues – this openness to dialogue is valued, and it has brought tangible results. At the same time, concerns do remain. The 2025 Rule of Law report provides the Commission's latest assessment of the situation. It showed the progress made on last year's recommendations and issued new ones.

I want to assure everyone in the House, irrespective of their view, that the Rule of Law report represents the Commission's objective assessment of the situation in every Member State, based on the facts. Indeed, as a Commissioner, I would have taken an oath to the effect that I would act independently, and that is given effect in the Rule of Law report, which the Commission has adopted.

Let me also underline a simple but fundamental truth. The effective management of EU funds depends on the strength of the rule of law. Without independent institutions, without accountability and without public trust, no funding system can function properly. EU funds must serve their purpose to support growth, resilience and cohesion, and not be diverted or undermined by corruption or weak oversight.

This is why the Commission continuously monitors the use of EU funds in all Member States, and why we insist that sound financial management and the rule of law go hand in hand. There was a question raised over the course of the debate about the rule of law. What is it? Does it have any legal basis? As was correctly pointed out, it is set out in Article 2 of the Treaty. I would also make the point that the Court of Justice, in its case law, recognises the rule of law as one of the fundamental values of the EU, alongside democracy and fundamental rights, and the rule of law is legally binding on all Member States of the European Union. I would also draw attention to the definition in the Conditionality Regulation, which is the law of the European Union. This defines the rule of law. It refers to the Union value enshrined in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union. It includes the principles of legality, implying a transparent, accountable, democratic and pluralistic law-making process, legal certainty, prohibition of arbitrariness of the executive powers, effective judicial protection – including access to justice by independent and impartial courts. Also, as regards fundamental rights, separation of powers, and non-discrimination and equality before the law. The rule of law shall be understood, having regard to the other Union values and principles enshrined in Article 2 of the TEU. So any Member is entitled to their own opinion, their own view, but they are not entitled to their own facts. The rule of law is clearly set out in the context of the legal code of the European Union, as interpreted and applied by the Court of Justice as well.

The Commission will continuously monitor the use of all EU funds, as I said, in all Member States, because protecting the Union's financial interests is not only a legal obligation, but also a moral duty towards European citizens and taxpayers.

As evidenced in July's Rule of Law report, more work is necessary in Slovakia to address the report's recommendations. Dialogue with the Commission is a very important part of the process, but it must be matched by concrete results on the ground. Reforms in Member States should strengthen, not weaken, the ability of institutions to fight corruption and to uphold the rule of law. The Commission will continue to follow developments closely in the spirit of cooperation, but also with the necessary rigour and the necessary vigilance and readiness to make use of our instruments as appropriate.

Let me conclude by assuring you that the Commission shares the commitment of this House to uphold the rule of law and the sound financial management of EU funds in all EU Member States, including Slovakia.

I would remind the House that, in the context of the MFF proposal that the Commission has brought forward, we are proposing to strengthen that link between rule of law and access to EU funds.

The Conditionality Regulation, which I have quoted, will remain in place if our proposals are adopted alongside in the national and regional partnership plans. There will be a direct link to the rule of law, respect for the rule of law and also respect for the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights as well.

So thanks to all of the colleagues for their attention and for their contribution this evening. All of the contributions will be carefully reflected on, and I will continue to give these issues my close personal attention.

Marie Bjerre, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for your comments and remarks. We all – EU institutions and Member States together – share a common responsibility to protect the rule of law and to address problematic situations that may emerge on the ground. I want to say thank you very much once again.

PRESIDE: ESTEBAN GONZÁLEZ PONS

Vicepresidente

President. – The debate is closed.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 178 del Reglamento interno)

Katarína Roth Neveďalová (NI), *písomne*. – Celá táto debata je opäť zbytočná, plná klamstiev a je zneužívaná na vnútropolitický boj na Slovensku zo strany našej opozície. Aj z vystúpenia komisára je jasné, že slovenská vláda plne spolupracuje s Európskou komisiou, odpovedá na otázky o rôznych typoch prijímanej legislatívy, ktorú naša opozícia neustále vyťahuje, a potvrdzuje sa ním, že táto spolupráca Komisie a vlády je na štandardne vysokej úrovni.

Kolegovia z iných štátov, ktorí vystupujú v tejto debate, vlastne ani netušia, že iba slúžia protivládny politikom z Progresívneho Slovenska ako užitoční blázni. Napríklad také obvinenie, že delegácie výborov europarlamentu, ktoré boli na Slovensku v lete, sa stretli s neadekvátnymi úrovňami zástupcov slovenských inštitúcií, je totálny nezmysel. Delegácie boli prijaté na najvyššej úrovni, ministrami, vedúcimi úradov, ale aj premiérom Slovenska. Takáto úroveň je vysoko nadštandardná. Aj z toho vyplýva, že vôbec netušia, do akej debaty sa zapojili, a vlastne o situácii nič nevedia, iba naleteli naratívom našich kolegov z opozície, ktorých úlohou je iba škodiť Slovensku.

18. Beskatning af store digitale platforme i lyset af den internationale udvikling (forhandling)

President. – The next item on the agenda is the Oral Question to the Commission on Taxation of large digital platforms in the light of international developments (B10-0008/2025) (2025/2756(RSP)).

Regina Doherty, author. – Mr President, thank you Commissioner for joining us here this evening. I think we can all recall the scene from Scotland during the summer, where President von der Leyen painfully shook the hand of President Trump on a deal that only makes things harder and trade harder between the EU and the US. And I think it's in that context that we are discussing the principles that should govern global digitalised economy, particularly the taxation of digital services, this evening.

Taxation is all about fairness, dynamism, efficiency. It's how we raise the revenue to fund goods and services. It's about investing in the future, creating opportunities for growth and for security. Taxation should support competitiveness, investment and job creation. And if it does not do this, then it's not serving the common good. When it comes to the taxation of large digital platforms, as with all elements of tax policy, it's all about making sure that neither goal is undermined. And that's why we seek to discuss this matter today.

When capital is mobile and crosses international borders, how do we uphold the common good and also promote opportunity and investment? I think it's clear that global challenges like these require global solutions. And that's why it's right and proper that Europe has been such a leader in the negotiations of the OECD Pillar Two agreement. The agreement is a compromise that meets the realities of a digitalised economy. First, it sets out a minimum level of taxation on large companies, second, it introduces new rules for taxing the profits of large companies where they don't have that physical presence.

Our commitment to multilateralism is unwavering. At a time when international institutions are being undermined as never before, it is right that the EU continues to strongly support the OECD process, but clearly we can't make any progress if everybody is not at the table. Regions of the world that act on their own or depart from global standards create fragmentation and perverse incentives.

However, the return of Donald Trump as US President saw an executive order to withdraw his country from the agreement. That agreement was the result of so many years of hard work, so it's vital, I think, that that work and this agreement be protected by us as an absolute priority. We have seen the change of approach and temperament from the US President, and it sees the agreement as an attack on American businesses, and he is loudly promising retaliatory actions. However, that's not a reason for us to give up on the agreement. Walking away would not help to resolve them, indeed, it probably would exacerbate the problem.

So we ask, where to now for the OECD negotiations, particularly in respect of Pillar One? How can the EU show leadership to keep this agreement on the table? We've seen proposals from the G7 for US-specific exemptions and allowances and they do require careful scrutiny, and I know the Members of this House will do so. But in the midst of this geopolitical discussion, we've also asked the Commission's views of calls to take unilateral action. I know that the question of new own resources is a separate matter, but it does remain part of the discussion. Does the Commission foresee unilateral action as a serious probability, and what would the threshold of this be?

Multinational investment is an important part of the European economy. It provides jobs, opportunities, vital government revenues across the EU, both directly and indirectly. And millions of our citizens rely on this investment to earn their livelihoods. That's why departing from multilateral processes presents huge risks and will not yield the benefits that some people say it will.

It's not about threats of retaliation, it's about showing that Europe is the place to do business and not creating imbalances that will drive our investment away. Is the Commission still committed to international engagement? Does it still recognise the economic hurdles that would exist if we departed from that engagement?

I think we are living currently in a period of huge economic uncertainty. There is regular turmoil on international markets and jobs announcements are being reassessed. So when it comes to tax policies, Europe does face big challenges. And while tax is rightly a Member State competence, the growth of divergent sectoral taxes creates internal trade barriers and undermines our EU economy. So instead of calling for new taxes, we should be looking at ways to better calibrate the ones that we already have – and we have plenty – so that they do not create additional burdens or barriers for investment.

Finally, Commissioner, specifically in relation to the digital services tax, I think it's crucial that we take an evidence-based approach. If the Commission is looking at this option, will it commit to a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis to reduce unforeseen consequences? Everyday, people, as normal, are using digital tools and services. The digital economy is at the heart of every single one of our lives, and there is almost no way that a tax does not ultimately impact consumers in some way. It's extremely unlikely that any DST would similarly be passed on in higher charges of subscriptions to the people that were served.

It's commonly said that there are only two certainties in life: death and taxes. And I think when it comes to the latter, we need to be responsible, forward-thinking and results orientated.

Michael McGrath, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, good evening honourable Members, I would like to thank Regina Doherty MEP for this oral question. Fair taxation of the digital economy has been a top priority for the European Commission for many years. Digitalisation of our economy challenges one of the fundamental principles of traditional tax systems: that profits should follow presence. This is why we have been leading efforts to redesign our tax framework. We need to ensure everyone pays their fair share; this is essential for good public finances.

We have been proactive in different ways. In 2018, for instance, we put forward two significant proposals: a digital services tax and a framework for a significant digital presence. Our leadership has driven global engagement and led to groundwork for the OECD's ambitious two-pillar discussion. While these discussions initially gained traction, achieving consensus has been challenging due to sensitivities with the United States. Currently, OECD discussions on Pillar 1 are on hold. The United States has expressed readiness to resume discussions on Pillar 1 once a solution for Pillar 2 is found. We saw recent progress with the G7 statement, which suggests possible coexistence between Pillar 2 and a US minimum tax regime. This is a major step forward – it shows a shared commitment to tackling multinational tax avoidance and building a more stable international tax landscape. This alignment contributed to the USA's decision to remove Section 899 from the One Big Beautiful Bill. It also paved the way for a more stable environment for international tax discussions.

Honourable Members, the OECD/G20 Inclusive Framework continues its work to develop a system acceptable and implementable for all. The Commission expects that discussions on Pillar 1 could resume later this year. A multilateral solution remains the Commission's preferred approach to taxing the digital economy. Specific outcomes are yet uncertain, but all parties have shown willingness to engage constructively, and this is important.

While work on Pillar 1 is ongoing, it is too early to comment on possible alternatives to the OECD-led process. For now, our focus is on giving the OECD process sufficient space and time to deliver. Pillar 1 means the most substantial change in taxing rights in over a century. Careful discussions and deliberations are therefore crucial. Considering these ongoing discussions, we do not intend to present a new proposal for an EU digital tax at this stage, so no impact assessment has been prepared for a proposal that does not exist. Assessing the impact on consumers, for instance, would be impossible to predict in advance and in abstract.

As for the latest investigations under Section 301 of the US Trade Act, we will continue to monitor its conclusions. The EU is unwavering in its commitment to multilateralism. This is a principle upon which it was founded. But multilateralism cannot be one sided – we will continue to engage constructively with third countries to foster a multilateral solution. This also includes the United States, but if such a solution cannot be reached the Commission will remain in close dialogue with the European Parliament and Member States to chart the best course forward. The EU and its Member States have the sovereign right to put in place tax policies that ensure fair and equitable taxation of all economic players, including in the area of digital taxation. And again, I thank Regina Doherty MEP for the question and I look forward to the contributions of the Members of the House.

Fernando Navarrete Rojas, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, President von der Leyen said this very morning that our imperative is for Europe to 'step up where others have stepped away'.

Well, this imperative applies particularly to international taxation: resisting the temptation of unilateral action is not a sign of weakness. It is responsibility and leadership. But what should we do if others do act unilaterally? Some may argue that it gives us free rein to retaliate. I disagree: unilateral action, either by them or by us, is always an invitation to conflict.

If Europe truly wants to be a global standard-setter in the new world order, we need to rethink our strategy. Sovereignty is not about the power to do everything we can do, it is about the responsibility to do what we should do. The world is watching and Europe must lead by example. Europe must remain open to the world and abide to globally agreed rules to be credible partners. We must first do our homework, simplify, innovate and create the conditions for businesses to grow here in Europe.

A unilateral EU digital service tax will not get us there. Digital service companies are currently taxed according to the same principles to any other sector, based on profits and on the location where these services are provided. Some may consider this is flawed, but that only calls for a stronger global engagement for an alternative, not for unilateral short-cuts.

Therefore, I'm really glad the Commission has decided to put aside the digital service tax as own resources. It is an important step in showing real leadership in a contested world.

Bruno Gonçalves, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, big tech companies are not paying their fair share of taxes today. And we know that this is no longer a controversial stance, only a fact. All evidence points to workers and small businesses paying higher rates than Meta, Amazon and other digital giants. Unfortunately, when we were close to an international deal with more than 130 countries, President Trump stepped in to protect the interests of his corporate friends. With the threat of tariffs and other retaliation, this US administration is now trying to prevent us from reaching a European solution, and it is very curious that the far right that claims to be sovereigntist didn't even show up to the debate today.

But colleagues, this is not the time to backtrack. The debate today is not only about tax justice, but also about our sovereignty. We must remain and stand united and remind everyone that the EU remains a democracy. The question is therefore simple. Are you siding with the President Trump and forfeiting the mandate given by your citizens, by our citizens, to legislate on their behalf, or are you ready to stand for our values and to ensure that big tech cannot avoid their fair share of taxes and their fair share of responsibilities? We chose the second option. The S&D Group chose tax justice and, more importantly, we choose democracy.

Francesco Torselli, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, possiamo dire di essere tutti d'accordo sul fatto di dover regolamentare l'economia digitale e la sua fiscalità.

Permettetemi però di sottolineare come, di pari passo, vada affrontato il tema del *base erosion and profit shifting*, ovvero del fenomeno per le quali le grandi multinazionali sfruttano le disparità fiscali dei singoli Stati nazionali per poter spostare i propri profitti laddove vi sia una tassazione a loro più favorevole.

Detto questo, non è una tassazione unilaterale europea sui servizi digitali la scelta ottimale da fare, a nostro modo di vedere.

Spettabile Commissione, a voi il compito di perseguire la via del multilateralismo e della giustizia fiscale ma, vi prego, evitiamo le scelte autolesioniste come quelle che abbiamo visto in altri settori – penso al manifatturiero, all'industria dell'auto, all'agroalimentare – perché finiremo col danneggiare nuovamente i consumatori, anziché percorrere la via dell'equità fiscale e della giustizia fiscale che, ogni tanto, sarebbe bene scegliere.

Katri Kulmuni, *Renew-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, suurten digialustojen verotusta kehitetään kansainvälisesti vastaamaan myös suuren digitalouden kasvua. Tässä on pyrkimyksenä löytää tapoja verottaa sellaisten yritysten toimintaa, jotka sijoittuisivat maihin, joissa niillä ei ole fyysistä läsnäoloa. OECD ja G20-maat pyrkivät luomaan verotusnormeja digitaalisille yrityksille ja varmistamaan, että ne maksaisivat asianmukaiset verot maissa, joissa niiden tulot syntyvät, sen sijaan, että tuloja siirrettäisiin veroparatiiseihin.

Myös EU:n täytyy edistää suurten digitaalisten alustojen verotusta monin tavoin, totta kai globaaleilla sopimuksilla verotuksesta, mutta myös kansallisilla verotuskäytännöillä digitaalisten palveluiden verotukseen, sekä edistää digitalisaatiota yleisemmin vahvistaen samalla digitaalista itsenäisyyttä ja myös normittamalla tätä alaa. Koska tämä on rajatylittävää, myös ratkaisujen täytyy olla verojen osalta kansainvälisiä. On itsestään selvää, että pitää toimia siellä, missä käyttäjät ja kuluttajat sijaitsevat riippumatta yrityksen fyysisestä läsnäolosta. Tämä on myös itse asiassa yksi harvoja keinoja, joilla EU voi tällä hetkellä pelata kovaa USA:ta vastaan, kuten myös he tekevät meille.

Rasmus Andresen, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Über 90 Milliarden Euro – so viele Gewinne haben Meta, Amazon, Alphabet und Microsoft allein in den letzten drei Monaten gemacht. Sie verschieben die Gewinne so, dass sie eigentlich nirgendwo richtig Steuern zahlen und bei uns in Europa schon gar nicht. Während kleine Betriebe in der EU ehrlich Steuern zahlen, tricksen die Tech-Milliardäre, wo sie nur können. Niemand in der Bevölkerung findet das gut, und auch viele Abgeordnete hier im Haus wehren sich dagegen, aber trotzdem handelt die EU-Kommission nicht. Sie handelt nicht, weil sie Angst vor Trump hat, weil sie Angst davor hat, dass Trump Zölle erhöht oder Sicherheitsgarantien aufkündigt.

Aber ich sage Ihnen, im Umgang mit Donald Trump und den Tech-Konzernen ist Angst kein guter Ratgeber. Im Gegenteil: Mit Trump kann man keine verlässlichen Deals machen. Deshalb müssen wir uns unabhängig von den USA aufstellen und dafür sorgen, dass wir den Einfluss der großen Tech-Konzerne beschränken, und dazu gehört aus unserer Sicht auch eine faire Besteuerung der großen Digitalkonzerne. Sie machen Milliarden Gewinne – jetzt ist Zeit, dass sie dafür Steuern zahlen.

Jussi Saramo, The Left-ryhmän puolesta. – Arvoisa puhemies, meidän verojärjestelmämme ei vastaa 2000-luvun todellisuutta. Se on rakennettu fyysiselle läsnäololle, jolla on yhä pienenevä merkitys taloudessa. Kaikkein suurimmat ja rikkaimmat yritykset eivät usein maksa lainkaan veroja maihin, joissa ne tekevät voittonsa. Tämän seurauksena rahaa ei riitä kouluille eikä sairaaloille, valtiot velkaantuvat, eriarvoisuus kasvaa ja markkinoilla voittavat epäreilusti kilpailevat jättiyritykset. Siksi jo seitsemän vuotta sitten alettiin rakentaa digijättien verotusta Euroopan komission toimesta, mutta tämä digivero jäädytettiin, kun alettiin rakentaa vielä parempaa OECD:n sopimusta kaikkien suuryritysten tasapuolisesta verottamisesta.

Sitten tuli Trump. Ensi töikseen hän heitti uudet verosopimukset roskakoriin. Trumpin miljardöörikaverit naureskelevat nyt tyytyväisenä – ja nyt piti palata alkuperäiseen suunnitelmaan, josta voimme päättää itse, mutta oikeistolainen komissio totteleekin nöyrästi Trumpin käskyjä. Aikana, jolloin digiverojen tulisi olla Trumpin meille asettamien tullien vastapainona vielä suunniteltujakin isompia, on korkea aika laittaa Muskit, Zuckerbergit ja heidän kaverinsa tasapuolisesti verolle – samalle viivalle eurooppalaisten yritysten kanssa.

Rada Laykova, on behalf of the ESN Group. – Mr President, today we are discussing the taxation of large digital platforms. But actually, no one in this Chamber addressed the elephant in the room: why does the EU so desperately need new fiscal resources?

The answer is very simple: the common NextGenerationEU debt. Yes, this is in fact forbidden by the Treaties, and Brussels assumed that low interest rates would go on forever, which was wrong. Now, 15 % and up to 20 % of the annual EU budget will be consumed just to pay interest. Not to pay back the debt but, every single year, only to refinance it again and again.

This means the EU is building a second household that exists only to serve big investors. Here we are not discussing fairness or innovation, but addressing this trap, this debt trap, imposed on today's and tomorrow's Europeans. NextGeneration EU is in fact in the debt of the next generation.

Markus Ferber (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Unsere Steuerregeln stammen aus einer Zeit, in der wirtschaftliche Aktivität an Fabrikhallen, an Lagern, an Bürogebäuden festzumachen war. Heute jedoch entstehen Werte in Datenströmen, auf Plattformen, in digitalen Geschäftsmodellen, und das muss sich natürlich auch in unserem Steuerrecht widerspiegeln. Wir brauchen eine zeitgemäße Definition der steuerlichen Betriebsstätte, die nicht mehr nur aus Gebäuden, aus Backstein oder Mörtel bestehen kann.

Das Prinzip ist klar und – ich glaube – auch gerecht. Gewinne müssen dort besteuert werden, wo die Wertschöpfung stattfindet. Digitale Konzerne dürfen sich nicht länger der Verantwortung entziehen, indem sie Gewinne in Niedrigsteuermärkte verschieben, während sie ihre Umsätze mitten im europäischen Binnenmarkt erzielen.

Und der Binnenmarkt ist auch das entscheidende Stichwort. Ein Flickenteppich nationaler Digitalsteuern wird uns nicht weiterbringen. Nur ein einheitlicher europäischer Ansatz kann Fairness und Rechtssicherheit im Binnenmarkt gewährleisten und zugleich dafür sorgen, dass alle Unternehmen nach den gleichen Regeln zu spielen haben.

Dabei sollten wir uns nicht von den Widerständen aus den USA abhalten lassen. Es ist eine Frage unserer eigenen Souveränität, dass Europa seine eigenen Entscheidungen trifft, wenn es um die Steuergerechtigkeit im Bereich der digitalen Welt geht. Unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger erwarten zu Recht, dass auch die digitalen Giganten ihren fairen Beitrag leisten. Deswegen, Herr Kommissar, brauchen wir einen neuen Anlauf für eine europäische Digitalsteuer.

Aurore Lalucq (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, le débat d'aujourd'hui ne porte pas tant sur la fiscalité que sur notre courage, notre souveraineté et notre capacité à admettre la réalité. Quelle est-elle aujourd'hui?

Nous avons accepté que Trump se retire de l'accord sur la taxation mondiale, sur les multinationales, pensant ainsi le calmer pour obtenir un bon deal avec les États-Unis. Est-ce que notre accord commercial est bon? Est-ce qu'il s'est calmé? La réponse est non. Mais on a vendu ça en se disant que ça a apporté de la certitude, un horizon stable, aux entreprises. Est-ce que leur horizon est stable? La réponse est non, puisque le lendemain même il attaquait Ørsted, puis Novo Nordisk, puis il nous mettait au défi d'oser mettre en place une taxation sur le numérique. Qu'avons-nous fait alors? Toujours rien, pensant là aussi le calmer. Et maintenant c'est son soutien même à l'OCDE qu'il est en train de remettre en cause.

Quand allons-nous donc comprendre? Quand allons-nous comprendre que Donald Trump ne s'arrêtera jamais et que, oui, évidemment, il faut mettre en place une taxation sur le numérique puisque les GAFAM, les grandes entreprises technologiques américaines, ne vivent pas sur le marché européen? Mais il faut même aller plus loin. Il faut défendre nos entreprises en défendant notre réglementation, en mettant en place une politique de souveraineté numérique, une vraie. Pas uniquement des mots, comme on l'a dit aujourd'hui d'Ursula von der Leyen, car ce qu'elle a dit, c'était des mots jusqu'à présent. Il nous faut privilégier, à travers des achats, nos acteurs du numérique européen. Et cela commence aujourd'hui.

Donc l'amour c'est bien, les preuves d'amour c'est mieux. On va maintenant demander à la Commission européenne des preuves d'amour, et notamment pour les acteurs du numérique qui se sentent aujourd'hui, au niveau européen, totalement délaissés. Et un conseil à M^{me} Ursula von der Leyen: relire le rapport Draghi, parce qu'elle l'a trahi aujourd'hui, et plus d'une fois.

Stéphanie Yon-Courtin (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire McGrath, chers collègues, le dernier deal de l'OCDE était clair, pourtant: les multinationales doivent payer là où elles font leurs profits. C'est une question de justice fiscale. Mais, depuis le retour de Donald Trump, l'équilibre mondial vacille et les négociations multilatérales sont à l'arrêt. L'Europe ne peut pas continuer à baisser la tête chaque fois que Trump hausse le ton.

Le temps n'est plus à la peur, mais au courage et à l'action. Taxer les géants du numérique, ce n'est pas juste collecter de l'argent, c'est aussi une question de souveraineté numérique. Les collègues l'ont déjà rappelé, mais il faut le redire. Mais cela ne s'arrête pas à la taxation des grandes entreprises technologiques.

Trump défie toutes nos règles numériques. Des règles qui protègent 450 millions d'Européens, et toutes les entreprises, tous les citoyens, sans exception. Donc, les États-Unis de Donald Trump voient nos réglementations et nos valeurs comme des attaques et répondent par le chantage tarifaire.

Cela ne peut plus durer. Les grandes entreprises technologiques ne peuvent pas continuer à défier nos lois, à fragiliser nos entreprises et à mettre nos citoyens en danger. Si Trump veut jouer au cowboy, l'Europe doit rappeler qu'ici c'est elle qui est le shérif.

Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, nous devons faire payer les géants du numérique: Google, Amazon, TikTok, Meta et d'autres. Ces entreprises pillent nos données, nous espionnent, piétinent la nature et les droits humains et sociaux, puis partent se cacher dans des paradis fiscaux, parfois même au cœur de l'Europe, Monsieur le Commissaire.

Pendant que les Européens peinent à rassembler de quoi vivre dignement à la sueur de leur front, les «tech bros», Musk, Bezos ou Zuckerberg, continuent à engranger des milliards, et cela en ne payant quasiment aucun impôt. Cela est-il juste? Non. Et cela doit cesser.

Nous, Parlement européen, avons, de façon répétée, demandé à ce que ces géants du numérique soient taxés au niveau international, c'est vrai, mais déjà, oui, déjà au niveau européen. Et le tout sans plus tarder. Une taxe européenne à 5 % sur les services numériques, c'est simple, ce serait 37 milliards par an dès 2026. Pouvons-nous sérieusement, raisonnablement nous permettre de nous passer de cet argent précieux?

Mais voilà qu'apparaît M. Trump, leur chevalier servant. Et quand M. Trump aboie, la Commission s'efface. Notre question aujourd'hui est donc plus urgente que jamais: comptez-vous, Monsieur le Commissaire, tenir tête à Donald Trump? Comptez-vous défendre la souveraineté européenne face aux États-Unis? Que proposez-vous de concret pour tenir tête face aux géants du numérique?

Danuše Nerudová (PPE). – Mr President, for too long, digital giants have profited from our European market without contributing fairly to our public finances or moderating hateful content.

'You deserve to die – you and your son.' This is what I sometimes receive on my social media. I use social platforms every day. My children do too. I always believed that they should connect people and inspire creativity, but today, too often, they do the opposite. Instead of dialogue, we see hate; instead of facts, we see disinformation, Russian trolls, anti-Semitism, homophobia. This is not the digital European space we stand for. We must recreate this space – a space for people with values, a space for respect, a space for democracy. And platforms must take responsibility for moderation, while at the same time paying their fair share in taxes. These are the sides of the same coin. Social platforms must go back to what they promised us: to connect people, not divide them; to inform, not to poison; to serve democracy, not to undermine it. Let's make sure they do.

Matthias Ecke (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Unser Steuersystem funktioniert nicht mehr. Früher galt: Je erfolgreicher ein Unternehmen, desto mehr Steuern zahlt es. Aber heute entziehen sich gerade die erfolgreichsten ihrer Verantwortung. 2021 war der Tiefpunkt: Amazon, damals das zweitgrößte Unternehmen der Welt, bekam in der EU-Geld zurück, statt Steuern zu zahlen. Das versteht niemand mehr.

Die effektive Besteuerung digitaler Plattformen in Europa liegt heute bei unter 10 Prozent, bei klassischen Unternehmen bei rund 20 Prozent; vor 30 Jahren haben die größten Konzerne noch etwa 30 Prozent Steuern gezahlt. Das ist nichts anderes als ein Schlag ins Gesicht der Menschen hier in Europa. Wenn Amazon, Google, Meta kaum Steuern zahlen, dann verlieren wir alle.

Und dass wir heute überhaupt über die Digitalsteuern der EU sprechen müssen, liegt ja daran, dass Donald Trump und die US-Administration das OECD-Abkommen boykottieren. Klar, eine globale Lösung wäre viel besser gegen diese Art der Gewinnverschiebung, aber wir dürfen uns in der EU auch nicht von Trump abhängig machen; wir müssen auch selber agieren. Und deswegen ist es richtig, dass wir sagen: Ja, wir müssen einen eigenen Vorschlag vorlegen, wenn es nicht weitergeht mit der OECD. Und nein, wir lassen uns das nicht von Donald Trump und den Tech-Oligarchen, die aufs Engste zusammenarbeiten, verbieten.

Deswegen: Europäische Steuern werden hier in Europa entschieden, und wir wollen, dass digitale Plattformen endlich ihren fairen Anteil beitragen.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, you should not have caved to Trump's bullying. You should not have stripped the digital tax just because of the looming US-UK trade deal. Let's be clear: a fair tax on big tech should not be a negotiation chip in any trade negotiation.

Nobody likes to pay taxes, but employees pay them and small business owners pay their fair share as well. Why? Because they understand that we need them to afford our pensions, subsidise trains and for high-quality health care systems.

But tech giants don't pay their fair share. In general, they pay around 9 % of taxes in Europe, while traditional businesses pay 23 %. So, since they are creative, we should be creative as well. First, how about we introduce an Amazon tax, a tax that is basically put on every product sold on large online platforms to equal the competition with local shops?

Second, how about a social media tax? We could make Meta, YouTube and TikTok pay for every user that they have in Europe, for example EUR 1 per user.

Third, how about a network usage tax, so that big tech actually pay for the networks and the infrastructure that they use?

Commissioner, every company that profits from Europe should also profit Europe.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Ja, es ist höchst an der Zeit für eine europäische Digitalsteuer. Ich bin eine österreichische Unternehmerin und zahle wie viele Klein- und Mittelbetriebe und auch Großbetriebe meine Steuern dort, wo auch mein Gewinn anfällt. Ich kann mir genauso wie diese Unternehmer auch nicht aussuchen, wo ich meinen Gewinn hin verschieben möchte.

Digitale Großkonzerne haben aber da ganz andere Möglichkeiten – und vor allem auch in unseren Mitgliedstaaten –, nämlich von Steuerbegünstigungen. Das Ziel muss sein, Gewinne dort zu versteuern, wo sie auch anfallen.

Ja, und wie gesagt: Zu Tode gefürchtet ist auch gestorben. Wir sollten uns nicht an Trump orientieren, sondern an einer richtig guten europäischen Digitalsteuer.

Eero Heinäluoma (S&D). – Mr President, dear colleagues, with an effective paid tax much below 15 %, digital platforms do not pay their fair share in the European Union, despite the profits being made here. This is totally unacceptable. Try to explain this to your local bakery, entrepreneur or teacher. People and companies who pay much more than the big technical giants.

We have tried to tackle this multilaterally. However, multilateral solutions seem to be only dreams these days. Therefore, in today's new geopolitical reality, the European Commission should step up and push again for a European Union digital service tax. In a world where our main trade partner threatens the Union, its citizens, its farmers, its workers and its factories with 50 % tariffs on goods, this is the only fair response from our side. The Union and its citizens should stop being the financial milk cow of foreign digital platforms. It's time to act.

Sandra Gómez López (S&D). – Señor presidente, ayer Trump volvió a amenazar a Europa con reabrir la guerra comercial, porque sancionamos a Google, una gran empresa tecnológica norteamericana que bloquea la legítima competencia de nuestros buscadores europeos.

Y todo eso, además, en el marco de una cena, donde los dueños de las grandes plataformas cenaban con Trump mientras se jactaban de que aprietan, subyugan y someten a Europa a sus propios intereses.

Por eso, comisario, la tasa digital no solo es justicia fiscal, es también soberanía europea. Es dignidad democrática y es decirle a Trump que él puede ponerle el mantel y servirle la cena a una mesa de millonarios, pero que a los europeos lo único que nos importa es que, cuando se levanten de la mesa, antes paguen la cuenta.

Claire Fita (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, plus de 90 milliards d'euros: ce sont les bénéfices de Google en 2024. En seulement seize secondes, Google encaisse ce que la moyenne des ménages européens met une année à gagner. Les profits des géants du numérique s'envolent tandis que les revenus des citoyens stagnent. Ce n'est pas un simple déséquilibre, c'est une injustice fiscale à corriger absolument. Alors allons-y et allons-y maintenant.

Les États-Unis se retirent de l'accord fiscal de l'OCDE? Eh bien, l'Europe doit montrer l'exemple. Elle doit faire payer aux multinationales ce qu'elles doivent là où elles font leurs profits. Oui à une taxe européenne sur les services numériques. Il s'agit de justice. Parce que chaque euro que Google, Amazon ou Meta ne paient pas, ce sont nos PME, nos agriculteurs, nos citoyens, nos services publics qui en supportent le coût.

La justice fiscale, c'est choisir une Europe souveraine contre l'Europe de l'impuissance.

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

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisario McGrath, ¿se da usted cuenta de cuántas veces se ha hablado en este Pleno del Parlamento Europeo —también en el debate del Estado de la Unión— de las plataformas digitales y su modelo de negocio como problema europeo? Porque solo desde Europa puede hincársele el diente a esa oligarquía que ha recibido el nombre de «tecnofeudalismo», que escapa al Derecho europeo si puede.

Por tanto, hay un problema no solamente de equidad fiscal, como se ha dicho, de justicia tributaria, que paguen la parte que les corresponda y lo hagan como pagamos todos los demás contribuyentes: donde generan sus beneficios. No, hay un problema también de lo que se ha denominado —no sé si con un léxico muy acertado— «soberanía europea», el «Brussels Effect», la capacidad de la Unión Europea de imponer sus derechos a los gigantes de la red.

Pero, en tercer lugar, es un problema de credibilidad de la Unión Europea, máxime cuando después de haber hecho el ridículo en la cita del campo de golf escocés, estrechando la mano de Trump para intentar aplacar, amenaza todavía con sanciones a quien se atreva a imponer fiscalidad justa a los gigantes tecnológicos de Silicon Valley.

Es completamente intolerable: la fiscalidad justa es una necesidad europea.

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

Michael McGrath, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank all of the honourable Members for their contribution to the debate this evening. It covered a number of issues that I am very familiar with, given my previous role as a finance minister in a Member State, Ireland, where I brought through the legislation to give effect to the EU Minimum Tax Directive, in effect giving expression to pillar two. So it is very interesting to hear all of the contributions this evening and I want to reiterate that the Commission remains a strong supporter of multilateralism. This is not a slogan, but a strategic imperative, and that is why we will continue to work constructively through the OECD and other fora to reach a balanced global agreement.

Our goal is to successfully conclude the pillar one discussions, and we are fully committed to making this happen. And as I said in my introductory remarks, the Commission expects that discussions on pillar one could resume later this year. If global consensus remains out of reach, we will collaborate closely with the European Parliament and Member States to determine next steps, and while work on pillar one is ongoing, it is too early to comment on possible alternatives to the OECD-led process. Our focus, as I said, is on giving that process sufficient space and time to deliver. The digital economy is a very important part of our economy, and we will ensure that the principles of fair taxation prevail here as well, and thank you all for your contributions to this important debate this evening.

President. – Thank you very much, Commissioner. The debate is closed.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 178 del Reglamento interno)

Kinga Kollár (PPE), írásban. – A globális minimumadóról szóló mai vita lehetőséget nyújt arra, hogy konkrét példán keresztül mutassam meg, hogyan lett a FIDESZ az adóemelések kormánya Magyarországon az elmúlt 15 évben.

A globális nagyvállalkozásokra kivetett minimumadót az Orbán-kormány minden eszközzel hátráltatni próbálta, ám végül két szék között a pad alá estek.

2022-ben ugyanis éppen amiatt mondta fel az amerikai vezetés a Magyarország és az USA közötti kettős adóztatás elkerülését célzó egyezményt, mert Magyarország akadályozta a globális minimumadó bevezetését. Így van ma minimum 15%-os adó a vállalkozásoknak és 30%-os adó a befektetőknek.

Az adóegyezmény hiánya rendkívül káros a magyar és az amerikai befektetők számára a nagyobb adóteher miatt, mindez pedig versenyhátrányt jelent a magyar vállalkozásoknak. Emlékeztetőül: Magyarországon az elmúlt három évben nem nőtt a gazdaság – az ipar 12%-kal esett vissza, a beruházások több mint 30%-kal. Vagyis Orbán utólag mindenképpen feleslegesnek tekinthető harca jelentős gazdasági hátrányt okozott hazánknak.

A gazdaság növekedésének egyik kulcsa a kiszámítható és vállalkozásokat támogató adózási környezet. Ezért a TISZA le fogja csökkenteni az adók számát és ennek része lesz a magyar-amerikai kettős adóztatást elkerülő egyezmény helyreállításához szükséges tárgyalások mielőbbi megkezdése is.

19. Forhandling om tilfælde af krænkelse af menneskerettighederne, demokratiet og retstatsprincippet (forhandling)

19.1. Tilbageholdelse af EU-borgere i de besatte områder af Cypern

President. – The next item is the debate on six motions for resolutions on the detention of EU citizens in the occupied areas of Cyprus (2025/2860(RSP)).

Λουκάς Φουρλάς, συντάκτης. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, σας μιλώ με οργή και αγανάκτηση γιατί πέντε Ελληνοκύπριοι, πέντε Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες συνελήφθησαν και κρατούνται εδώ και δύο μήνες παράνομα από τον τουρκικό κατοχικό στρατό. Πρόκειται για μια πράξη πειρατείας, για μια απαγωγή ως αντίποινα απέναντι στη νόμιμη Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία που συνέλαβε σφετεριστές, αυτούς που πωλούν τις δικές μας περιουσίες στα κατεχόμενα, τα σπίτια όπου γεννηθήκαμε και μεγαλώσαμε. Κάθε παράνομη σύλληψη είναι πλήγμα στη δημοκρατία, κάθε πράξη αντιποίνων είναι προσβολή στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Κάθε ανοχή απέναντι στην Τουρκία είναι συνενοχή. Φτάνει πια. Δεν μπορούμε να σιωπούμε. Δεν μπορούμε να κλείνουμε τα μάτια. Η αλληλεγγύη δεν μπορεί να είναι επιλεκτική. Όταν πολίτες ενός κράτους μέλους σύρονται σε παράνομα δικαστήρια κατοχικού καθεστώτος, η Ευρώπη οφείλει να αντιδράσει. Σας ζητώ ξεκάθαρα και χωρίς μισόλογα να καταδικαστεί αυτή η απαράδεκτη ενέργεια. Να απαιτηθεί η άμεση απελευθέρωση των πέντε Ελληνοκυπρίων Ευρωπαίων πολιτών. Να σταλεί ένα ισχυρό μήνυμα στην Τουρκία ότι δεν θα ανεχθούμε ακόμα έναν εκβιασμό.

Αναρωτιέμαι: αυτός είναι ο στρατηγικός μας εταίρος; αυτός ο πειρατής, ο απαγωγέας, ο θρασύς παραβάτης του διεθνούς δικαίου και των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων; Άκουσα τα όσα είπε η Πρόεδρος της Επιτροπής για τον πόλεμο της Ρωσίας στην Ουκρανία, για τη δραματική κατάσταση στη Γάζα. Ούτε λέξη για την Κύπρο. Για την Κύπρο που εδώ και 51 χρόνια ζει στην κατοχή. Απαθής, λες και αυτά δεν συμβαίνουν. Λες και είναι φυσιολογικό ένα κράτος μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να είναι μισό ελεύθερο και μισό κατεχόμενο. Αυτή δεν είναι η Ευρώπη που οραματιζόμαστε, αυτή είναι η Ευρώπη των συμφερόντων. Θέλουμε την Ευρώπη να σταθεί στο πλευρό μας, όπως μια οικογένεια στέκεται δίπλα στα παιδιά της. Γιατί η Κύπρος είναι Ευρώπη.

Costas Mavrides, author. – Mr President, this resolution is about five European citizens, Cypriot nationals that, while visiting their properties in the occupied area of Cyprus, were illegally detained and subjected to inhumane treatment by the occupying regime established and ruled by Turkey. I would like to thank my colleagues for their support in drafting this strong resolution, particularly with two references specifically.

First, in condemning the deliberate intimidation tactics by the occupying regime, such as this illegal detention aiming to terminate the criminal action by the Republic of Cyprus against usurpers of occupied Greek-Cypriot properties. We extend our full support to the Republic of Cyprus to enforce the EU rule of law. Second, we urge the European Commission and the External Service to take all necessary measures, including punitive ones, against Turkey, in order to secure their release. This morning, the Commission President talked about EU defence and security, but said nothing about Turkey and the occupation of EU territory in Cyprus. The credibility of EU defence and security is tested in Cyprus, and the Commission President failed in the eyes of many European citizens, including myself.

Γεάδης Γεάδης, συντάκτης. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, καταδικάζουμε με τον πιο έντονο και κατηγορηματικό τρόπο τις απαγωγές των Ελληνοκυπρίων από τις κατοχικές αρχές. Για να φτάσουμε, όμως, εδώ υπάρχουν σοβαρές ευθύνες. Κύριε Επίτροπε, θυμάστε πότε μίλησε η Πρόεδρος της Επιτροπής για το Κυπριακό τον τελευταίο έναν χρόνο; Μη σας δυσκολεύω, ποτέ. Η αδιαφορία είναι αυτό που ταΐζει το αδηφάγο τέρας, την Τουρκία και τη μαριονέτα της στα κατεχόμενα. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει ευθύνη τόσο για την απάθεια που επιδεικνύει όσο και για τις συνέπειες του κανονισμού της Πράσινης Γραμμής. Επειδή, όμως, είναι εύκολο να κατακρίνουμε την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, ευθύνες έχουν και όλα τα πολιτικά κόμματα που κυβέρνησαν στην Κύπρο, που όχι μόνο αποδέχτηκαν τον κανονισμό, αλλά προχώρησαν και σε διάνοιξη περισσότερων οδοφραγμάτων, δίνοντας νομιμοποίηση στην παρανομία, κανονικοποιώντας την κατοχή, αφήνοντας τους πολίτες έρμαιο στις ορέξεις της Άγκυρας. Ζητούμε, λοιπόν, επανα-εξιολόγηση του κανονισμού, κλείσιμο των οδοφραγμάτων και τιμωρητικά μέτρα, όπως η αναστολή κάθε κονδυλίου έως ότου αφεθύνουν όλοι ελεύθεροι.

Sandro Gozi, author. – Mr President, five EU citizens visited their own properties and, just for that, they were detained without credible evidence, denied medical care and even their lawyer was arrested. Three of them now have been released, but two are still held in unacceptable conditions, and we demand their immediate and unconditional release.

And where is this happening? In the territory of our Union, in northern Cyprus. Türkiye still owns 37 % of Cyprus under military occupation and has sole responsibility for the situation in the occupied areas.

As Renew Europe, we strongly condemn these arbitrary detentions and the appalling conditions imposed on our citizens. Fifty-one years after the Turkish invasion, intimidation and injustice continue and, the more democracy declines in Türkiye – where elected mayors are jailed – the worse the situation becomes in Cyprus too. This is a blatant violation of international law and EU principles. We have a duty to protect our citizens and uphold our values.

We must therefore be absolutely clear: we will never accept intimidation and injustice on European soil.

Γιώργος Γεωργίου, συντάκτης. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, πέντε Ελληνοκύπριοι τους τελευταίους δύο μήνες σαπίζουν μέσα στα μπουντρούμια των φυλακών του παράνομου καθεστώτος Tatar στην κατεχόμενη Κύπρο. Μόλις σήμερα απελευθερώθηκαν υπό όρους τρεις από τους πέντε. Εμείς ζητάμε την απελευθέρωση χωρίς όρους και των πέντε. Η αμαρτία τους; Επισκέφθηκαν τις κατεχόμενες περιουσίες τους. Δικάζονται με ψεύτικες κατηγορίες ως αντίποινα για τη σύλληψη των καταχραστών, των σφετεριστών των κατεχόμενων περιουσιών μας. Στόχος; Η εξυπηρέτηση των προεκλογικών σκοπιμοτήτων του Tatar, η έξαψη του εθνικισμού ανάμεσα στις δύο κοινότητες, η υπόσκαψη των προσπαθειών του Γενικού Γραμματέα του ΟΗΕ για λύση στο Κυπριακό. Θέλω να σημειώσω ότι πρώην Τουρκοκύπριοι ηγέτες, νομικοί, πολιτικοί, ακαδημαϊκοί και συνδικαλιστές στα κατεχόμενα αντιδρούν έντονα σε αυτό το κυνηγητό. Στείλαμε δύο επιστολές στους ευρωπαϊκούς θεσμούς για άσκηση πίεσης για την απελευθέρωση αυτών των ανθρώπων που είναι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες. Ουδεμία αντίδραση. Καταλαβαίνω βέβαια, η Τουρκία σας είναι χρήσιμη, σας μάθαμε πια ανάμεσα στο δίκαιο και στα συμφέροντα, επιλέγετε ψυχρά το δεύτερο: απλά δεν το ομολογείτε.

Αφροδίτη Λατινοπούλου, συντάκτρια. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στις 19 Ιουλίου πέντε Ελληνοκύπριοι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες συνελήφθησαν παράνομα στα κατεχόμενα. Δύο ηλικιωμένα ζευγάρια πήγαν να δουν τα σπίτια τους, κλεμμένα από την τουρκική εισβολή του '74. Η Τουρκία τους κρατάει όμηρους με φτιαχτές κατηγορίες. Ζητάμε άμεσα την απελευθέρωσή τους. Σκεφτείτε μόνο τι θα γινόταν αν εμείς κρατούσαμε Τούρκους ομήρους. Αυτή είναι η Τουρκία που θέλετε να βάλετε στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Όμως, όπως λέει και η σοφή παροιμία «ο λύκος κι αν εγέρασε και άσπρισε το μαλλί του, μήτε τη γνώμη άλλαξε, μήτε την κεφαλή του». Κι ενώ έχουμε ψήφισμα, τα κόμματα Left, Renew, S&D, Greens, PPE και ECR απέκλεισαν τους Patriots for Europe, την πιο ανερχόμενη ευρωπαϊκή δύναμη όπου ανήκω, για να μη φανεί το όνομά μας. Πάγια τακτική σας. Να μάθει ο κόσμος, λοιπόν, ότι αυτή είναι η δημοκρατία σας: να μας αποκλείετε από παντού με το «cordon sanitaire» σας σαν να είμαστε λεπροί. Όμως, έχει ο καιρός γυρίσματα. Ντροπή σε εσάς που το κάνετε, ντροπή και σε εσάς που το ανέχεστε.

Μιχάλης Χατζηπαντέλα, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, φανταστείτε να συλλαμβάνεστε στην ίδια σας τη χώρα από αρχές που κανείς δεν αναγνωρίζει, την ώρα που πηγαίνετε στο πατρικό σας σπίτι. Αυτή είναι αδιανόητη πραγματικότητα σε ευρωπαϊκό έδαφος το 2025. Από τις 19 Ιουλίου μέχρι και σήμερα, 5 Ελληνοκύπριοι βρίσκονται όμηροι επειδή τόλμησαν να επισκεφθούν την ίδια τους την περιουσία στα κατεχόμενα. Σήμερα, ενημερωθήκαμε για την προσωρινή αποφυλάκιση των τριών υπό όρους μέχρι τη λεγόμενη δίκη, ενώ οι άλλοι δύο παραμένουν υπό κράτηση. Η νομική ευθύνη γι' αυτήν την παρανομία βαρύνει την Τουρκία. Οι συλλήψεις αυτές δεν είναι τυχαίες. Αποτελούν στοχευμένο εκφοβισμό για να παρεμποδιστούν οι νόμιμες διαδικασίες κατά της παράνομης εκμετάλλευσης ελληνοκυπριακών περιουσιών και να αποθαρρυνθεί κάθε διεκδίκηση δικαιωμάτων. Δεν μπορεί να περάσει.

Ζητούμε άμεση απελευθέρωση και στοχευμένα μέτρα κατά της Τουρκίας σε ευρωπαϊκό και διεθνές επίπεδο. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν μπορεί να μένει ουδέτερη απέναντι σε παράνομες συλλήψεις Ευρωπαίων πολιτών σε ευρωπαϊκό έδαφος. Οι Κύπριοι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες χρειάζονται πράξεις ενάντια στην Τουρκία, και όχι λόγια.

Νίκος Παπανδρέου, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας S&D. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, δεν αρκεί που ο Erdogan έχει αναλάβει τη μισή Λιβύη. Δεν αρκεί που έχει πάρει τη Συρία και την ελέγχει. Δεν αρκεί που πριν από μερικά χρόνια βομβάρδισε την Αρμενία. Δεν αρκεί ότι προσπαθεί να αλλάξει την ιστορία και να ονομάσει το Αιγαίο «Τουρκαιγαίο». Δεν αρκεί που έχει φυλακίσει πολλούς Κούρδους και τους δημάρχους στην Κωνσταντινούπολη και αλλού. Τώρα θέλει να φυλακίσει και Έλληνες και Ευρωπαίους πολίτες. Ποιο είναι το έγκλημά τους; Ότι θέλουν να επισκεφθούν τα πάτρια εδάφη. Αυτό είναι το έγκλημά τους. Με την ψήφο μας αύριο –η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μας στηρίζει στην ψήφο τουλάχιστον– θα καταγγείλουμε την ενέργεια αυτή και θα ζητήσουμε την απελευθέρωσή τους. Επίσης, εμείς οι Έλληνες, εδώ, σήμερα, ζητάμε αυξημένη προσοχή όσον αφορά την αρχιτεκτονική του SAFE, και μέχρι να εκδημοκρατιστεί η Τουρκία, να μην είναι μέλος αυτής της καινούργιας αρχιτεκτονικής άμυνας της Ευρώπης.

Νίκος Παππάς, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εγώ κατάγομαι από την Κύπρο, η μητέρα μου έζησε και μεγάλωσε στο Βαρώνι της Αμμοχώστου έως τα 12 της χρόνια, μέχρι να αναγκαστεί να εγκαταλείψει το σπίτι της για να σώσει τη ζωή της ύστερα από την παράνομη εισβολή των Τούρκων. Δεν σταμάτησαν ούτε η γιαγιά μου ούτε ο παππούς μου να μου μιλάνε για τον πόνο του ξεριζωμού και την αδικία που βίωσαν. Πείτε μου και εσείς, αν σας έπαιρναν παράνομα το σπίτι, πώς θα νιώθατε; Αυτός ο πόνος αναζωπυρώθηκε τώρα με την παράνομη σύλληψη των πέντε Ελληνοκυπρίων. Αυτοί οι άνθρωποι δεν είναι εγκληματίες, αυτοί οι άνθρωποι είναι θύματα, είναι όμηροι ενός παιχνιδιού που παραβιάζει κάθε αρχή του διεθνούς δικαίου και της ανθρώπινης αξιοπρέπειας. Ας μην σιωπήσουμε. Η αυθαίρετη κράτησή τους δεν αποτελεί πληγή μόνο για την Κύπρο, αλλά για όλη την Ένωση. Καλώ, λοιπόν, αυτό το Σώμα, την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, τη διεθνή κοινότητα, να απαιτήσουν την άμεση και χωρίς όρους απελευθέρωσή τους.

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

Fidias Panayiotou (NI). – Mr President, a shameful injustice is happening in my country, Cyprus. Five of my Greek Cypriot compatriots have been illegally detained in the occupied areas for the apparent crime of visiting their own property, which they were forced to abandon after the Turkish invasion in 1974. With no credible evidence, an unrecognised military court is accusing them of illegal entry and espionage. But, guys, let's be clear: this is not only a violation of their fundamental rights; this is also a direct attack on the efforts for unification – because how can we have peace when people are treated like criminals for visiting what is rightfully theirs? Several weeks later, three of them have now been released, only under strict conditions, but this is not enough.

As Europe, we must act. We have to demand the immediate and unconditional release of all five, and made it clear that human rights are not negotiable.

I love you all.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A *Uachtarán*, just to rise in solidarity with our colleagues in Cyprus in this unfortunate and unacceptable situation.

Coming from Ireland, where our country is not fully united yet – although we aspire to achieve unification sometime, hopefully in the near future – I can understand how Cyprus feels in relation to the occupation and also the arbitrary detention of people in that area. So I think Commissioner McGrath and his colleagues will use everything they can to ensure that justice is done.

Normally, when we speak in this Chamber in relation to emergencies, they are usually outside the European Union. This is within the European Union, so we should be able to act much stronger, in solidarity, in cooperation and in unity to ensure that justice is done in this particular case.

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

Michael McGrath, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you very much, and thanks to all of the honourable Members for their contributions this evening.

For 51 years now, the Republic of Cyprus, an EU Member State, remains divided. This has far-reaching implications, first and foremost for the people of Cyprus. The case we have debated this evening is another example of the cost of disunity: the case of Antonis Louka, Andreas Kyprianou, Annie Kyprianou, Niki Gregoriou and Gregoris Gregoriou in the areas where the Republic of Cyprus does not exercise effective control is of great concern.

The EU has been actively engaging with multiple actors and is in constant contact with the United Nations. Commission services on the ground are following the case and cooperating closely with the Government of the Republic of Cyprus in order to find a successful resolution to the situation.

As a number of colleagues in the House have referenced this evening in the debate, we have received the news this afternoon that three of them have been released on bail. Nevertheless, the situation still involves that they are not free to go back to their home. We will remain attentive to the well-being of the detainees and expect the swift, unconditional and safe release of all.

Honourable Members, a forced division of Cyprus can never be a solution – all the more against the background of serious geopolitical developments in our neighbourhood. Hope for a better future – a unified Cyprus – exists and must be pursued.

In the context of the UN-led efforts for creating a suitable environment, which could lead to the resumption of settlement talks, a genuine commitment is urgently needed by all concerned parties. This includes the two Cypriot communities as well as Türkiye, to work towards a peaceful settlement on the basis of all relevant UN Security Council resolutions and the values on which the EU is founded.

The EU remains ready to play an active role: all relevant EU services, including the Commission's special envoy, support the UN efforts to advance the long-term settlement process. We need a fair, comprehensive and viable settlement of the Cyprus problem within the UN framework for all people of Cyprus and for stability and security in the Eastern Mediterranean. This would be beneficial to all, and first and foremost, the people of Cyprus.

President. – Thank you very much, Mr Commissioner.

I see someone would like to speak. Please turn on the microphone.

Costas Mavrides (S&D). – Mr President, of course, I'd like to thank the Commissioner for what he has already said about the Cyprus and Turkish responsibility towards EU. However, I want everyone to note that the appropriate person for tonight's discussion and debate was supposed to be the High Representative, and I have noticed that since the inception of her term, she never attended and never participated in any debate about Cyprus. I leave everyone to answer the question: why?

President. – We take note of that. The debate is closed. The vote will take place tomorrow.

19.2. Sagen om Victoire Ingabire i Rwanda

President. – The next item is the debate on seven motions for resolutions on the case of Victoire Ingabire in Rwanda (2025/2861(RSP)).

Reinhold Lopatka, author. – Mr President, the case of Victoire Ingabire is a prime example of the ongoing challenges to freedom of expression and political participation in Rwanda. As a member of the Delegation to the Africa-EU Parliamentary Assembly, I am aware of how important it is to strengthen democratic principles and human rights in Africa. The EU has a responsibility to share its values and standards by supporting not only development but also human rights and democratic principles in civil society across Africa. We do it next week, observing the elections in Malawi. And we cannot accept that political opposition in Rwanda is systematically persecuted.

The repeated imprisonment of Madam Ingabire, despite clear rulings by the African Court, is an alarming signal. The government of Rwanda must end political persecution and guarantee the safety of all political actors. Victoire Ingabire deserves and needs our support.

Marit Majj, auteur. – Voorzitter, commissaris, in Rwanda is het veilig op straat, maar is het niet veilig om je uit te spreken. Er zijn toonaangevende sportevenementen, er is economische vooruitgang en veiligheid, maar die vormen in Rwanda een schril contrast met de politieke situatie.

Victoire Ingabire is een van de vele politieke tegenstanders van het regime die vastzit om haar politieke mening. En dat nu voor de tweede keer. Na haar eerste arrestatie kreeg zij na acht jaar amnestie. Maar nu zit zij weer vast en haar kinderen zijn hier ook om te pleiten voor haar, want zij kunnen ook geen contact met haar hebben.

Het is een trend van onderdrukking en van bedreiging van politieke tegenstanders die we zien in Rwanda. En daarom vragen wij ook aan de Europese Unie en aan de lidstaten om ervoor te zorgen dat Victoire, en ook de negen andere leiders van haar partij, vrij worden gelaten en dat zij in vrijheid een eerlijk proces kunnen hebben, dat politici zich kunnen uiten, kunnen deelnemen aan verkiezingen en dat iedereen, journalisten en maatschappelijk middenveld, vrijheid van meningsuiting heeft in Rwanda.

Hilde Vautmans, auteur. – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, vandaag hebben we hier twee heel bijzondere gasten en ik zou heel graag willen dat u hun een groot applaus geeft: Rémy en Raïssa, de kinderen van Victoire Ingabire. Daar zitten ze. Zij voeren haar strijd. Een strijd voor vrijheid, voor gerechtigheid, voor een democratisch Rwanda. En terwijl Victoire onschuldig gevangen zit, staan zij hier. Jonge mensen, maar sterk, getekend door pijn, maar vervuld van moed.

Hun aanwezigheid herinnert ons eraan: achter elke politieke gevangene staat een gezin, achter elke politieke beslissing gaan echte levens schuil. Zij zijn het levende bewijs dat hoop nooit kan worden opgesloten.

Wij eisen hier vandaag de onmiddellijke en onvoorwaardelijke vrijlating van Victoire Ingabire en van al haar collega's, activisten, journalisten die vastzitten omdat zij vreedzaam die droom najagen. Rémy, Raïssa, jullie kunnen op ons, op dit huis, rekenen. Wij blijven strijden voor de vrijlating van jullie mama.

Catarina Vieira, author. – Mr President, dear Colleagues – and now, as well, dear children of Victoire – this Parliament calls today for the immediate and unconditional release of Victoire Ingabire Umuhoza and other opposition figures who are on trial for politically motivated grounds.

She is a courageous opposition leader, jailed not for any crime but for daring to challenge the status quo and, sadly, her case is not unique. It is part of a broader pattern: in Rwanda, opposition voices, independent media and civil society are being silenced systematically, deliberately and with impunity. Those who speak out face intimidation, surveillance, detention or worse.

The European Union cannot be a silent partner to repression. Our credibility depends on speaking up – not just when it's easy, but also when it's necessary. I call on the EU and the Member States to confront the Rwandan Government on its crackdown against political opposition and violation of human rights. Our cooperation with Rwanda must be consistent with the promotion of human rights and democracy, including fair trial standards.

If we stay silent, we legitimise oppression. If we speak with courage, we give hope to those who risk everything for democracy. Let us please choose courage.

Thierry Mariani, auteur. – Monsieur le Président, jour après jour, la façade idéale du régime rwandais se fissure et M. Kagame apparaît finalement pour ce qu'il est: un dictateur sanguinaire et autoritaire. Commanditaire des massacres, des persécutions de civils et du pillage des ressources minières dans l'est de la République démocratique du Congo, le président du Rwanda est très longtemps resté pourtant le protégé et le favori de Bruxelles. Personne n'avait rien trouvé à redire à sa quatrième réélection, avec un score soviétique de 99,18 %. Les choses semblent changer avec cette nouvelle Commission. Mais cette complaisance passée à l'égard de Kigali est intolérable, tant elle contredit tous les principes moraux que l'Union européenne impose au reste du monde.

Le cas de l'opposante Victoire Ingabire est un symbole. Face aux bourreaux de la région des Grands Lacs, cette femme courageuse représente l'espoir démocratique de son pays, espoir que Kagame tente d'étouffer depuis qu'il a prononcé son arrestation et son emprisonnement arbitraires. Aujourd'hui, effectivement, l'Union européenne a le devoir de ressusciter cet espoir et de faire libérer M^{me} Ingabire en annulant immédiatement toute forme de coopération financière et commerciale avec le Rwanda pour que l'Europe cesse enfin d'être la complice de Kigali.

Tomasz Froelich, *Verfasser*. – Herr Präsident! Die Verhaftung von Victoire Ingabire gibt Anlass zur Sorge. Ingabire steht in Opposition zu Präsident Kagame; dass ihre Verhaftung politisch motiviert ist, kann kaum bezweifelt werden. Wir sollten im Rahmen unserer Möglichkeiten darauf hinwirken, dass staatliche Institutionen in Ruanda nicht für politische Schauprozesse missbraucht werden – wir können so etwas nicht unterstützen.

Gleichzeitig müssen wir – und das sagt Phil Clark, Professor für Internationale Politik an der *University of London* – unseren Zugang zu Ruanda überdenken, wenn wir die Lage vor Ort verbessern wollen. Uns fehlt oft ein Verständnis für die gesellschaftlichen Dynamiken in Ruanda nach dem brutalen Genozid in den 90er-Jahren. Es ist schwierig, Ruanda nach unseren Maßstäben zu messen. Natürlich ist Ruanda keine Demokratie, das steht auch nicht in Kagames Fokus. Im Fokus stehen ökonomische Entwicklung und eine gewisse Stabilität im Inneren. Und – das steht im Bericht der Kommission – Ruanda verzeichnet durchaus Erfolge bei *Good Governance*, insbesondere im Vergleich mit anderen afrikanischen Staaten.

Das sollten wir bei aller berechtigten Kritik an Ruanda, die ich hier teile, in der Entschließung berücksichtigen, denn uns verbinden immer noch gemeinsame Interessen, etwa bei Rohstoffen oder im Bereich der Migration.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, Victoire Ingabire es una política ruandesa con una sólida formación técnica e intelectual —la conozco personalmente, conozco a su madre, a sus hijos y a su familia— que, en el año 2010, regresó a Ruanda para poder presentarse a las elecciones presidenciales.

Fue arrestada, detenida y encarcelada porque decían que había conspirado contra el régimen. Fue un juicio sin garantías y plagado de irregularidades, según destacaron Amnistía Internacional, multitud de ONG y también el Tribunal Africano de Derechos Humanos y de los Pueblos.

La propusimos para el Premio Sájarov en el año 2012 y las intimidaciones han sido constantes: fue condenada a ocho años, luego a quince años y ahora, en el mes de junio, ha vuelto a ser encarcelada.

No tiene comunicación con su familia, está en una celda con una persona condenada por asesinato, no se puede comunicar con sus abogados y su abogada keniana no la puede representar por indicaciones del Colegio de Abogados bajo las instrucciones de Kagame.

Tenemos que hacer un llamamiento para que todos juntos podamos pedir la liberación inmediata de Victoire Ingabire. Hace mucho tiempo que no ve a su familia y a sus hijos.

Hay que condenar enérgicamente el ataque a la libertad de expresión. En el partido que ella preside hay muchos fallecidos y muchos desaparecidos, y hay un ataque constante a la libertad de expresión y persecución política.

Hago un llamamiento a la comunidad internacional para que no ceje en el intento de que ninguna relación con Ruanda pueda ser posible si no vuelve a la senda de los derechos humanos.

Marta Temido, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caras e caros colegas, gostaria de levantar a minha voz pela libertação de Victoire Ingabire, líder da oposição no Ruanda, que continua a ser alvo de perseguição e prisão por exercer um direito fundamental: o direito à participação política.

Na União Europeia, não podemos fechar os olhos a este caso e a muitos outros que se vêm sucedendo naquele país. O nosso compromisso com a democracia, com os direitos humanos e com o Estado de direito exige que pressionemos as autoridades ruandesas a respeitar as suas obrigações internacionais, a garantir a libertação de Victoire Ingabire e a abrir espaço para uma verdadeira vida democrática.

O caso da senhora Ingabire simboliza a realidade preocupante dos direitos humanos no Ruanda, onde a repressão das vozes dissidentes, as restrições à liberdade de expressão e à liberdade de imprensa continuam demasiado frequentes. O fim da repressão pelo governo ruandês contra todas as vozes críticas representa também a liberdade do povo ruandês de escolher o seu futuro.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, today we must speak for Victoire Ingabire, a woman whose only crime is demanding peaceful democracy in Rwanda. She is the opposition leader and a laureate of the 2024 Liberal International Prize for Freedom.

On 19 June, Victoire was unlawfully re-arrested in Kigali. She is now held in solitary confinement, denied contact with her family and international lawyers and exposed to dangerous and inhumane detention conditions.

These abuses come on top of a history of persecution: Victoire has already endured years in prison, an unfair trial and repeated threats. Yet she continues to stand for freedom and justice.

Her case shows the true face of Rwanda's repression: a judiciary weaponised to silence one courageous woman and, through her, an entire democratic opposition.

We must be clear. Victoire Ingabire must be released immediately and unconditionally. Her safety is non-negotiable and the world is watching. This House stands firm with those who risk everything for democracy and freedom, and so we stand with Victoire.

Wouter Beke (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, beste Rémy en Raïssa, Victoire Ingabire is een Rwandese politica die 15 jaar in Nederland verbleef als politiek vluchteling.

En ze is niet de enige. Het is voor de derde keer in een paar maanden tijd dat we hier staan. De eerste keer was voor Jean-Jacques Wondo in Congo, toen voor Joseph Figueira Martin in de Centraal-Afrikaanse Republiek. En nu gaat het dus om het lot van Victoire Ingabire, en ook van haar collega's in Rwanda. Want samen met haar collega's wilde ze een redelijk tegengeluid laten horen in de Rwandese politiek, juist met als doel om de rechtsstaat te herstellen en de mensenrechten opnieuw te vrijwaren, en dit in de nasleep van de Rwandese genocide.

Cynisch genoeg wordt juist zij, samen met haar collega's, onderworpen aan willekeur en onterechte detentie. Intussen zien we *Visit Rwanda* op vele voetbaltruitjes verschijnen en wordt het WK wielrennen in Kigali georganiseerd. Dat staat toch in schril contrast met de repressie van de politieke oppositie, van andersdenkenden? Dat mogen wij niet toestaan. De onmiddellijke vrijlating van Victoire Ingabire en haar collega's is een eerste, maar ook noodzakelijke stap in de juiste richting voor Rwanda.

Michael McGrath, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to say thank you to all of the honourable Members for their contributions to this debate. We share your concerns regarding the case of Victoire Ingabire, a Rwandan opposition member arrested in June and currently under trial in Kigali. We want to also extend a welcome to her children here this evening.

The High Representative and the European External Action Service have been closely monitoring developments in this renewed judicial persecution. In coordination with the Member States, the EU delegation in Kigali has raised the case with the Rwandan authorities repeatedly and in various settings. EU Ambassador Calvo Uyarra has personally engaged the Minister of Justice and the Chair of Rwanda's Human Rights Commission. The EU delegation and the Kingdom of the Netherlands have also been present at the court hearings.

We call on Rwanda to fully respect due process and the rule of law. This includes ensuring access to legal counsel, the presumption of innocence and the right to a fair trial. As a state party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Rwanda has an obligation to uphold freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly.

I would like to stress that the EU incorporates a rights-based approach throughout all support to Rwanda, including in its development cooperation, ensuring that respect for human rights is central to planning, implementation and assessment. This ensures that our interventions consistently support human rights principles, such as universality, inclusion, participation, non-discrimination and accountability. In addition to this integrated approach, the EU allocates specific funding through instruments like the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, which directly supports human rights defenders, civil society and initiatives that promote fundamental freedoms. The EU maintains continuous oversight of all projects and the broader situation in Rwanda through regular monitoring and reporting mechanisms.

The European External Action Service and the EU delegation in Kigali, in coordination with Member States, will continue to follow with great attention to developments of Ms Ingabire's legal case, but also the conditions of her detention. We hope for justice to prevail and we extend our sympathy and our support to her family.

President. – The debate is closed. The vote will take place tomorrow.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 178 del Reglamento interno)

Sebastian Tynkkynen (ECR), kirjallinen. – 99 prosenttia.

Sillä ääniosuudella Ruandan viimevuotisten presidentinvaalien ilmoitettiin ratkenneen presidentti Paul Kagamen hyväksi.

Mutta kertooko tämä todellisesta kansansuosioista?

Ei kerro.

Se kertoo siitä, että Ruandan demokratia on täysin rikki.

Valtaapitävät pyrkivät vaientamaan uhaksi kokemansa opposition edustajat keinoja kaihtamatta.

Tämän sai kokea myös Victoire Ingabire, joka ilmoitti haastavansa Kagamen jo 2010.

Hänen ehdokkuutensa evättiin, ja hänet passitettiin vankilaan.

Viiteentoista vuoteen hän ei ole saanut matkustaa perheensä luo Alankomaihin.

Ja nyt, jälleen kerran, Ingabire on pidätettynä tekaistujen syytteiden perusteella.

Nyt on viimeistään aika vetää johtopäätökset.

Mitään eurooppalaista rahoitusta ei saa valua Ruandan kaltaisille roistohallinnoille.

19.3. Sagen om Abdoul Aziz Gomas, som tilbageholdes vilkårligt i Togo

President. – The next item is the debate on four motions for resolutions on the case of Abdoul Aziz Goma, arbitrarily detained in Togo (2025/2862(RSP)).

Seán Kelly, author. – A Uachtaráin, a Choimisinéir, 'I sacrifice my body to alert the world to the injustice we are experiencing. This fight is not just mine. It is that of all those who refuse arbitrariness. I urge you not to look away.' I open with the words of Abdoul Aziz Goma, an Irish citizen currently arbitrarily detained in Lomé in Togo. His crime? Hosting peaceful protesters calling for democratic reforms in Togo.

After six years in pre-trial detention, Abdoul was sentenced to ten years in prison in a one-day trial that made a mockery of justice. Years of torture have left their mark on Abdoul's body to the point that he has lost the use of his legs. Prisoners in Lomé prison are beaten, electrocuted and denied medical care. They must sleep sitting up due to the severe overcrowding. Many die in silence.

But Abdoul Aziz Goma will not be silenced. His hunger strike, which began on 27 August, is a message to us, to Europe, and to all who believe in justice, democracy and human rights, to not let him down.

We will not let him down. We will not look away. We call on the Togolese authorities to immediately and unconditionally release Abdoul Aziz Goma and all arbitrarily detained political prisoners in Togo.

Hannes Heide, *Verfasser*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Wir fordern die sofortige und bedingungslose Freilassung von Abdoul Aziz Goma, einem irisch-togolesischen Staatsbürger. Sein Fall zeigt mit aller Brutalität, wie Menschenrechte und Rechtsstaatlichkeit in Togo mit Füßen getreten werden. Über sechs Jahre bereits befindet er sich in unmenschlicher Haft, wurde gefoltert, isoliert und in einem unfairen Verfahren verurteilt.

Folter und politische Verfolgung dürfen niemals toleriert werden. Alle politischen Gefangenen sind daher sofort freizulassen. Damit solche Fälle ein für alle Mal ausgeschlossen werden können, muss das Justizsystem in Togo reformiert werden.

Und die Europäische Union hat klar Haltung zu zeigen. Wir stehen an der Seite der Zivilgesellschaft, wir stehen an der Seite von Menschenrechten. Meinungs- und Versammlungsfreiheit sind zu garantieren, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und demokratische Prinzipien zu respektieren.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, *auteur*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, aujourd'hui, nous parlons du cas d'Abdoul Aziz Goma, citoyen irlandais arbitrairement détenu au Togo depuis 2018.

Après six années de détention provisoire inhumaine, il a été condamné lors d'un procès expéditif, qui n'a duré qu'une journée, à dix ans de prison: une violation flagrante du droit international. C'est aussi l'avis du groupe de travail des Nations unies sur la détention arbitraire.

M. Goma a subi la torture, des mauvais traitements et s'est vu refuser des soins médicaux. Sa santé s'est gravement détériorée et, le 27 août, il a entamé une grève de la faim pour protester contre ces conditions insupportables.

Son cas n'est pas isolé. Il reflète une régression démocratique plus large au Togo et le recours à la détention arbitraire pour faire taire l'opposition. Nous, au sein de ce Parlement, envoyons un message clair: M. Goma doit être libéré immédiatement et sans condition. Sa condamnation doit être annulée et son évacuation médicale doit être mise en place d'urgence.

J'appelle la Commission européenne et les États membres à utiliser tous les canaux diplomatiques pour obtenir sa libération et défendre la démocratie, l'état de droit et la dignité humaine au Togo.

Catarina Vieira, *author*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, the arbitrary imprisonment of Abdoul Aziz Goma for over seven years in Togo is not just concerning, it's outrageous. His case exposes a system that punishes peaceful advocates with torture and sham trials. Aziz was arrested simply for helping protesters who were calling for democratic reforms. At the request of a friend he gave shelter to these protesters from rural areas at his home in Lomé. For this act of solidarity, he was accused of crimes against state security and thrown in prison. The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention has confirmed what is obvious – Aziz's detention violates international law. His basic rights to liberty, health-care and a fair trial have all been denied.

Recently, in desperation, he began a hunger strike to protest against his inhumane treatment. His doctor warns that, without urgent medical care and release, he may not survive. The EU must act with urgency, demand his immediate release, press the Togolese authorities to end sham trials and prolonged pre-trial detention, and urge the government to respect freedom of assembly and expression, and protect the civil space for civil society and human rights defenders. Our voice here in Europe must be a voice for Aziz's freedom and for all of those who dare to stand for democracy.

Michael McGrath, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you, and thanks to the honourable Members for raising this issue and for their contributions to the debate this evening.

I thank you for expressing your concerns, which we share as a Commission, regarding the situation of Mr Abdoul Aziz Goma, an Irish-Togolese citizen currently imprisoned in Togo.

Since his arrest in December 2018, the High Representative and the European External Action Service have been closely monitoring the case in coordination with the Irish authorities and their resident EU Member State.

While the European External Action Service and EU delegations support coordination and information-sharing regarding consular assistance to unrepresented EU citizens, they do not provide direct consular services themselves – that remains within the competence of the Member States.

The Irish authorities have come to Lomé and visited Mr Goma in prison, providing him with regular consular assistance in accordance with their obligations under national law. Another visit, supported by the EU delegation in Togo, is planned for the autumn.

It is important to note that the EU citizen at stake has dual nationality. The Vienna Convention on Consular Relations therefore does not apply to these cases where the citizen has the nationality of one of the countries involved in a dispute.

We remain concerned about the human rights situation in Togo. Both in Lomé and Brussels, we consistently call on the Togolese authorities to uphold their international human rights obligations, including the right to a fair trial and due process guarantees.

The EU has stressed the need to improve prison conditions as part of its political dialogue. Previous cooperation programmes have focussed on promoting compliance with international human rights standards in the justice sector. A number of EU programmes address more broadly the promotion and protection of fundamental freedoms, including through support to civil society actors.

The EU will continue to engage with national authorities, opposition parties and civil society to promote democratic governance, foster inclusive political dialogue and the protection of human rights in line with Togo's international obligations.

The External Action Service and the EU delegation in Lomé, in coordination with EU Member States, will continue to closely monitor the case of Mr Goma and indeed his health, notably since he started a hunger strike on 27 August.

We hope for a positive outcome. We extend our sympathy and we extend our support to his family. Thank you, honourable Members.

President. – That concludes the debate. The vote will take place tomorrow.

20. Mundtlige stemmeforklaringer (forretningsordenens artikel 201)

President. – The next item is the explanations of vote.

20.1. Kulstofgrænsetilpasningsmekanismen: forenkling og styrkelse (A10-0085/2025 - Antonio Decaro)

President. – We now move to the explanations of vote on 'Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism: simplification and strengthening'.

Cristian Terheş (ECR). – Domnule preşedinte, stimaţi colegi, am votat în favoarea raportului pentru simplificarea mecanismului de ajustare a carbonului la frontieră, nu pentru că susţin aberaţiile *Green Deal* împotriva căruia am votat constant, ci pentru că prin acest raport se încearcă acum îndreptarea multor erori din acest pact, despre nocivitatea căruia inclusiv eu am atras atenţia încă din 2020, să fie clar.

Agenda decarbonizării, cu atât mai mult că se spune că e ambiţioasă, continuă să reprezinte o ameninţare iminentă pentru bunăstarea europenilor, pentru piaţa internă europeană în ansamblu şi pentru competitivitatea produselor europene pe piaţa globală. Prin acest raport, majoritatea a realizat acum, cam târziu ce e drept, că agenda climatică pe care până ieri au susţinut-o loveşte direct în industria Uniunii Europene, sărăceşte populaţia şi complică relaţiile strategice cu partenerii comerciali. Răul a fost făcut deja, însă, deoarece aberanta şi costisitoarea tranziţie verde a fost impusă brutal de sus în jos, în toate domeniile economice şi sociale. În prezent, se încearcă corectarea acestor greşeli prin mijloace birocratice lente şi complicate.

Soluţia trebuie să fie rapidă şi directă. Această abominaţie trebuie oprită odată pentru totdeauna prin revenirea la normalitate şi prin respingerea ambiţiilor verzi absurde, pentru ca populaţia să nu mai sărăcească, iar Europa să nu-şi piardă ireversibil puterea comercială.

20.2. Samhørighedspolitikken investerings rolle i løsningen af den nuværende boligkrise (A10-0139/2025 - Marcos Ros Sempere)

President. – We now move to the explanations of vote on 'Role of cohesion policy investment in resolving the current housing crisis'.

Kathleen Funchion (The Left). – A Uachtaráin, vótáil mé i bhfabhar na tuairisce seo. In Éirinn, tá géarchéim thi-thíochta inár nGaeltachtaí. Tá méadú sa mhéid lóistín atá ar fáil ar Airbnb agus ardú i dtithe saoire atá mar dara teach agus tá fadhbanna a bhaineann le cead pleanála a fháil freisin. De bharr na bhfadhbanna seo uilig, tá sé deacair do mhuintir na Gaeltachta fanacht sa Ghaeltacht. Níl sé seo sách maith i 2025 agus caithfidh mós mó a dhéanamh chun todhchaí gheal a chinntiú don Ghaeltacht agus dár dteanga.

Günther Sidl (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Die Wohnungsnot in Europa hat sich längst zu einer sozialen Krise ausgewachsen. Sprunghaft angestiegene Mieten und Baukosten für das eigene Heim sind nur einer von vielen Auswüchsen, die durch die hohe Inflation der letzten Jahre befeuert wurden.

Die Menschen in Europa sehen sich in nahezu allen Lebensbereichen mit gestiegenen Kosten konfrontiert, und darauf muss die Europäische Union endlich reagieren. Deshalb habe ich heute für diese Entschließung gestimmt, aber ich sage gleichzeitig: Das reicht noch lange nicht.

Kommissionspräsidentin von der Leyen hat heute in ihrer Rede zur Lage der EU anerkannt, dass Europa mitten in einer sozialen Krise steht. Wir müssen entschlossen mit den Mitteln der Kohäsionspolitik handeln, um diese Probleme in den Griff zu bekommen und den Menschen wieder ein leistbares Leben und ein positives Zukunftsbild zu ermöglichen.

20.3. Styrkelse af Moldovas modstandskraft mod Ruslands hybride trusler og ondsindede indblanding (RC-B10-0355/2025)

President. – We now move to the explanations of vote on 'Strengthening Moldova's resilience against Russian hybrid threats and malign interference'.

Cristian Terheş (ECR). – Domnule preşedinte, dragi colegi, marcăm astăzi un moment istoric cu adevărat remarcabil. Pentru prima oară în istorie, Parlamentul European recunoaște oficial Mitropolia Ortodoxă a Basarabiei, aflată sub jurisdicția Patriarhiei Române, drept victimă a opresiunii sovietice. După anexarea în 1940 de către URSS a Basarabiei, ce era parte componentă a României, Mitropolia Basarabiei a fost abolită de către autoritățile sovietice pe motiv că aceasta reprezintă o amenințare la adresa controlului ideologic și politic sovietic asupra Basarabiei.

Asuprirea Mitropoliei Basarabiei, ce a mers de la persecutarea preoților ortodocși până la confiscarea proprietăților Mitropoliei, a durat pe tot parcursul ocupației sovietice. Persecuția a continuat însă și după independența Republicii Moldova, Mitropolia Basarabiei reușind a fi recunoscută abia în 2002, în urma unei decizii a Curții Europene a Drepturilor Omului.

Recunoștința prin această rezoluție pe Republica Moldova a Mitropoliei Basarabiei ca victimă a opresiunii sovietice, este nu doar un gest simbolic, ci un act de justiție care redă demnitatea și memoria unei comunități care a îndurat abuzuri nerecunoscute pe deplin până acum.

Doresc să-mi exprim profunda mea recunoștință colegilor care au susținut acest amendament, care au înțeles prin aceasta importanța recunoașterii Mitropoliei Basarabiei ca victimă a opresiunii sovietice.

21. Skriftlige stemmeforklaringer (forretningsordenens artikel 201)

(Las explicaciones de voto presentadas por escrito figuran en las páginas del sitio web del Parlamento reservadas a los diputados.)

22. Dagsorden for næste møde

President. – The next sitting is tomorrow, Thursday 11 September 2025, starting at 08:30. The agenda has been published and is available on the European Parliament's website.

23. Godkendelse af protokollen fra dette møde

President. – The minutes of this sitting will be submitted to Parliament for its approval at the beginning of the afternoon tomorrow.

24. Hævelse af mødet

(Se levanta la sesión a las 22:41 horas).

Tegnforklaring

*	Høringsprocedure
***	Godkendelsesprocedure
***I	Almindelig lovgivningsprocedure (førstebehandling)
***II	Almindelig lovgivningsprocedure (andenbehandling)
***III	Almindelig lovgivningsprocedure (tredjebehandling)

(Proceduren afhænger af det retsgrundlag, der er valgt i udkastet til retsakt)

Forkortelser af udvalgenes navne

AFET	Udenrigsudvalget
SEDE	Udvalget for Sikkerhed og Forsvar
DEVE	Udviklingsudvalget
INTA	Udvalget om International Handel
BUDG	Budgetudvalget
CONT	Budgetkontroludvalget
ECON	Økonomi- og Valutaudvalget
EMPL	Udvalget om Beskæftigelse og Sociale Anliggender
ENVI	Udvalget om Miljø, Folkesundhed og Fødevaresikkerhed
SANT	Udvalget om Folkesundhed
ITRE	Udvalget om Industri, Forskning og Energi
IMCO	Udvalget om det Indre Marked og Forbrugerbeskyttelse
TRAN	Transport- og Turismeudvalget
REGI	Regionaludviklingsudvalget
AGRI	Udvalget om Landbrug og Udvikling af Landdistrikter
PECH	Fiskeriudvalget
CULT	Kultur- og Uddannelsesudvalget
JURI	Retsudvalget
LIBE	Udvalget om Borgernes Rettigheder og Retlige og Indre Anliggender
AFCO	Udvalget om Konstitutionelle Anliggender
FEMM	Udvalget om Kvinders Rettigheder og Ligestilling
PETI	Udvalget for Andragender
EUDS	Det Særlige Udvalg om Det Europæiske Demokratiskjold
HOUS	Det Særlige Udvalg om Boligkrisen i Den Europæiske Union
DROI	Underudvalget for Menneskerettigheder
FISC	Underudvalget om Skatteinliggender

Forkortelser for de politiske grupper

PPE	Det Europæiske Folkepartis Gruppe (Kristelige demokrater)
S&D	Gruppen for det Progressive Forbund af Socialdemokrater i Europa-Parlamentet
PfE	Gruppen Patrioter for Europa
ECR	Gruppen De Europæiske Konservative og Reformister
Renew	Gruppen Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Gruppen De Grønne/Den Europæiske Fri Alliance
The Left	Venstrefløjsgruppen i Europa-Parlamentet — GUE/NGL
ESN	Gruppen Europa af Suveræne Nationer
NI	Løsgængere