



C/2023/1405

8.12.2023

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 14 FEBRUARY 2023

(C/2023/1405)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2022-2023 SESSION

Sittings of 13 to 16 February 2023

STRASBOURG

Contents	Page
1. Opening of the sitting	4
2. Amendment of the agenda	4
3. CO ₂ emission standards for cars and vans (debate)	4
4. Resumption of the sitting	30
5. Formal sitting – Address by Egils Levits, President of the Republic of Latvia	30
6. Tribute	34
7. Request for waiver of immunity	35
8. Voting time	35
8.1. Transitional provisions for certain medical devices and in vitro diagnostic medical devices (C9-0003/2023) (vote)	35
8.2. Amending the decision of 10 March 2022 on setting up a special committee on foreign interference in all democratic processes in the European Union, including disinformation (ING2), and adjusting its title and responsibilities (B9-0119/2023) (vote)	35
8.3. Setting up a subcommittee on Public Health (B9-0120/2023) (vote)	35
8.4. Union's rights in enforcing and implementing the UK Withdrawal Agreement and the EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement (A9-0248/2022 - Seán Kelly, Andreas Schieder, Danuta Maria Hübner) (vote)	36

Contents	Page
8.5. Union Secure Connectivity Programme 2023-2027 (A9-0249/2022 - Christophe Grudler) (vote)	36
8.6. EU/Guyana Voluntary Partnership Agreement: forest law enforcement, governance and trade in timber products to the EU (A9-0008/2023 - Karin Karlsbro) (vote)	36
8.7. EU/Guyana Voluntary Partnership Agreement: forest law enforcement, governance and trade in timber products to the EU (Resolution) (A9-0018/2023 - Karin Karlsbro) (vote)	36
8.8. REPowerEU chapters in recovery and resilience plans (A9-0260/2022 - Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Siegfried Mureşan, Dragoş Pîslaru) (vote)	36
8.9. Electoral rights of mobile Union citizens in European Parliament elections (A9-0297/2022 - Damian Boeselager) (vote)	36
8.10. Electoral rights of mobile Union citizens in municipal elections (A9-0005/2023 - Joachim Stanisław Brudziński) (vote)	36
8.11. CO ₂ emission standards for cars and vans (A9-0150/2022 - Jan Huitema) (vote)	36
9. Resumption of the sitting	36
10. Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence: EU accession (debate)	36
11. Resumption of the sitting	40
12. Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence: EU accession (continuation of debate)	40
13. The EU priorities for the 67th session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women (debate)	57
14. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting	68
15. Question Time (Commission) - Strengthened EU enlargement policy to the Western Balkans	68
16. Establishment of an independent EU Ethics Body (debate)	83
17. Composition of political groups	105
18. Composition of committees and delegations	106
19. Response to the situation in Tunisia (debate)	106
20. Tensions between Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo (debate)	115
21. Amendments to the European Long-Term Investment Funds (ELTIFs) Regulation (debate)	121
22. Explanations of vote	127

Contents	Page
22.1. Union Secure Connectivity Programme 2023-2027 (A9-0249/2022 - Christophe Grudler)	127
22.2. REPowerEU chapters in recovery and resilience plans (A9-0260/2022 - Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Siegfried Mureşan, Dragoş Pîslaru)	127
22.3. Electoral rights of mobile Union citizens in European Parliament elections (A9-0297/2022 - Damian Boeselager)	128
22.4. CO ₂ emission standards for cars and vans (A9-0150/2022 - Jan Huitema)	129
23. Agenda of the next sitting	129
24. Approval of the minutes of the sitting	130
25. Closure of the sitting	130

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 14 FEBRUARY 2023

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

1. Opening of the sitting

(Istunto avattiin klo 9.01.)

2. Amendment of the agenda

Puhemies. – Minulla on aivan aluksi ilmoitus. Työjärjestyksen 158 artiklan 2 kohdan mukaisesti puhemiehen ehdotuksesta ja kaikkien poliittisten ryhmien hyväksynnällä huomisen istuntoa jatketaan kello 23:een.

Jos vastalauseita ei ole, muutos hyväksytään. Se on hyväksytty.

3. CO₂ emission standards for cars and vans (debate)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Jan Huiteman ympäristön, kansanterveyden ja elintarvikkeiden turvallisuuden valiokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö ehdotuksesta henkilö- ja pakettiautojen hiilidioksidipäästönormeiksi (COM(2021)0556 - C9-0322/2021 - 2021/0197(COD)) (A9-0150/2022).

Jan Huitema, rapporteur. – Voorzitter, commissaris, geachte leden. Voor mij was het een enorme eer om deze onderhandelingen namens het Europees Parlement te mogen leiden. Deze verordening is de allereerste uit het “Fit for 55”-pakket waarbij het Europees Parlement een overeenkomst heeft bereikt met de lidstaten en de Europese Commissie. De onderhandelingen zijn geëindigd op 27 oktober 2022 en ondertussen heeft ook de Raad van Ministers de deal goedgekeurd.

Voor het Europees Parlement waren de volgende zaken van enorm belang en die zijn volgens mij ook duidelijk opgenomen in de uitkomst van de dialoog. Voor het Europees Parlement is het belangrijk dat de klimaatdoelen van Parijs en de doelen van de Europese Green Deal worden gehaald. Wegtransport stoot nog altijd een significante hoeveelheid CO₂ uit en deze hoeveelheid stijgt nog altijd. Vandaar dat het Europees Parlement vasthoudt aan de doelstelling om in 2035 alleen nieuwe auto's op de Europese markt toe te laten die geen CO₂ uitstoten. Denk hier bijvoorbeeld aan elektrisch aangedreven auto's op batterijen en waterstofauto's.

Behalve aan het klimaat hecht het Europees Parlement groot belang aan de consument en de werknemers in de automobielsector. Veel mensen hebben nu eenmaal een auto nodig. Fossiele brandstoffen worden duurder door de afhankelijkheid van derde landen en worden meer belast. Daarnaast zullen consumenten een heffing moeten betalen voor de CO₂ die hun auto's uitstoten. Een klimaatvriendelijk en tevens betaalbaar alternatief is dus van groot belang. Nu al zijn de gebruiks- en onderhoudskosten van bijvoorbeeld een elektrische auto lager dan die voor de variant met een verbrandingsmotor. Met deze wetgeving zal de focus voor investeringen en ontwikkeling liggen bij de verdere ontwikkeling van emissieloze auto's. De voorspelling is dan ook dat de aanschafprijs van deze auto's zal dalen en dat er sneller een tweede- en derdehandsmarkt ontstaat.

Elk jaar dient de Europese Commissie een voortgangsrapportage te maken die inzichtelijk maakt hoe de transitie in de automobielsector gestalte krijgt. Waar nodig zal de EU moeten investeren in bijvoorbeeld omscholing en opleiding van werknemers, noodzakelijke laadinfrastructuur en *last but not least* de beschikbaarheid van kritische grondstoffen die nodig zijn voor deze transitie.

Al met al zal deze nieuwe wetgeving een duw in de rug zijn voor de omslag die door de markt al is ingezet. Zij zal consumenten helpen op een betaalbare manier te kunnen blijven autorijden. Zij geeft werknemers nieuwe kansen en brengt fabrikanten investeringszekerheid. Zij is een belangrijke klimaatmaatregel en zal ons minder afhankelijk maken van fossiele brandstoffen uit derde landen.

Frans Timmermans, uitvoerend vicevoorzitter van de Commissie. – Voorzitter, laat ik beginnen met het uitdelen van een welgemeend compliment aan Jan Huitema en zijn schaduwrapporteurs. Zij hebben namens het Parlement een tekst uitonderhandeld waarin een fantastisch evenwicht is gevonden tussen de belangen van de industrie, de belangen van het klimaat en de belangen van vooral werknemers. Dat is knap werk en daarvoor mijn complimenten.

There is not much I can add to what Jan just said. These are the arguments in favour of this legislation. I just want to put a little stress on a number of issues.

First of all, as was already mentioned, we want people to have access to affordable mobility that is clean. And for that, you need to bring electric mobility, especially for passenger cars, up to scale as quickly as possible. So you have to be very, very clear about the choices you made.

By the way, I think the European car industry has made that choice very clearly already, and they went they went a long way in the last three or four years in understanding where the global car industry is heading. Yes, the running costs of electric vehicles are already lower than of combustion engine cars, and, within years, also buying an electric vehicle will be cheaper than buying a combustion-engine car. Then you will help consumers make that choice much easier. So I think that is a very important argument in favour of this legislation.

The second argument, which I want to pay a little attention to, because sometimes it's overlooked. Look at what our competitors are doing globally. We are very proud of the fact that the European car industry is the best and the most innovative in the world. But we have to be very careful that we keep that advantage and that we keep producing cars that can match or even overtake what is produced elsewhere. Just let me remind you that between last year and the end of this year China will bring 80 models of electric cars to the international market. These are good cars. These are cars that will be affordable more and more. And we need to compete with that. We don't want to give up this essential industry to outsiders.

If we want to do that, we have to invest in transforming the European car industry, in making these EVs – electric vehicles – for worldwide consumption. For that, also we need to enhance our efforts to build the charging infrastructure everywhere. This is something the Commission is committed to, and I know this is important to the European Parliament as well.

Finally, the most important part. We need to skill and reskill our workforce to have a sustainable job in the car industry of the future. We don't need less people; we need people with other skills. I need to insist on this because the industrial revolution is happening whether we like it or not. We can choose to lead it. We can choose to do it in a way that is socially compatible with our values. Or we can leave it to other parts of the world to lead it, and then all we can do is follow and deindustrialise.

We need to rebuild our industry on the basis of the future, and the car industry can lead this, if you vote for this proposal today.

Karima Delli, *rapporteuse pour avis de la commission des transports et du tourisme*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, nous sommes arrivés, avec beaucoup de travail et d'intelligence, à un accord historique, qui réconcilie l'automobile et le climat. C'est quand même quelque chose, parce que, normalement, ce sont deux frères ennemis. C'est un accord de transition: il programme la fin de la production des véhicules thermiques et leur remplacement par des voitures «zéro émission».

On est au cœur même des grandes théories écologiques, on fait de la planification écologique. Pas de grande révolution, pas de casse quand il y a des emplois à la clé, mais on a éteint, avec un calendrier intelligent et concerté avec l'industrie, les derniers moteurs à combustion. On les éteint pour 2035. Le signal pour l'industrie est on ne peut plus clair: il faut bouger maintenant, parce que, en 2035, c'est fini. Je le rappelle: les transports, ce sont un quart des émissions de CO₂ de l'Union européenne. Les véhicules légers sont, à eux seuls, responsables d'environ 10 % des émissions sur le Vieux Continent. Donc, pas le choix: l'industrie automobile doit jouer le jeu et prendre sa part pour atteindre la neutralité carbone en 2050.

Mais si l'industrie automobile joue le jeu, cette fois, il faudra l'accompagner. Créons des aides aux entreprises pour aller vers des flottes «zéro émission». Les entreprises sont, notamment, les premiers acheteurs de véhicules neufs en Europe, devant les particuliers. Utilisons, en entreprise, les outils du leasing pour favoriser l'électrique et l'hydrogène, comme cela a été fait pour l'essence et pour le diesel. Créons l'incitation financière pour qu'aucun véhicule électrique ne soit plus cher que son équivalent thermique.

Mais, de grâce, chers collègues, Monsieur le Commissaire, je le vois trop souvent: halte au gigantisme! Pas de SUV électriques à 40 000 euros! Ils n'ont rien d'écologique et ils n'ont rien d'abordable. Après on passe aux poids lourds: mêmes effets sur le climat, même mécanisme. Le Parlement européen va pouvoir se pencher dessus dès aujourd'hui, la Commission s'apprêtant justement à présenter sa feuille de route sur le CO₂ émis par les camions.

Alors, chers collègues, c'est avec beaucoup de fierté que je participe, en tant que présidente de la commission des transports, à cette marche, à cette mesure, à l'inscription dans l'histoire d'une page qui se tourne. Je voudrais donc continuer à vous demander de faire preuve de courage politique, également dans les prochains mois.

C'est le sens de notre lutte pour le climat, c'est ce que nous demandent les scientifiques, c'est notre responsabilité envers les générations futures, qui sont dans la rue, qui marchent et qui nous demandent d'agir.

Jens Gieseke, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Vizepräsident Timmermans, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Heute können wir sie noch nehmen, die letzte Ausfahrt vor dem endgültigen Verbrennerverbot ab 2035. Heute haben wir die letzte Chance, diesen technologiefeindlichen Holzweg zu verlassen, den Grüne, Sozialdemokraten und Liberale eingeschlagen haben. Sie sind es, die hier eine Wette eingehen wollen und dabei alles auf eine Karte setzen. Dabei gibt es doch ganz klare Argumente gegen diesen Irrsinn. Für die notwendige Emissionsreduzierung im Verkehrssektor brauchen wir Innovationen und Platz für kluge Ideen, doch das Verbrennerverbot begrenzt diese so dringend notwendige Freiheit. Unser Vorschlag ist da besser: einen klaren, strikten Rahmen setzen und anschließend den Markt entscheiden lassen, welche Technologien es für die Zielerreichung braucht.

Außerdem erkennt das Verbot die aktuelle Lage. Preisvorteile für die Endkunden war in den Verhandlungen das Lieblingsargument von Sozialdemokraten und Grünen. Aber die aktuelle Realität ist eine andere: hohe Strompreise, Inflation und auslaufende Kaufprämien. Alle Berechnungen zu Preisvorteilen sind nichtig.

Und schließlich: Allein in Deutschland arbeiten 600 000 Menschen an Fahrzeugen mit Verbrennungsmotoren – ihre Jobs sind nun gefährdet. Wir sehen nun schon die ersten Konsequenzen: das Versprechen von Liberalen, Grünen und Sozialdemokraten, neue Jobs werden entstehen – Batteriezellproduktion geht häufig nach Kanada oder nach Amerika.

Und einige in der Europäischen Kommission hätten am liebsten munter weitergemacht. Sie wollten das Aus des Verbrenners bei LKW und Bussen. Auch dort kein Raum für Innovationen, kein Wettbewerb der besten Ideen – stattdessen erneut Verbote, als hätte man nichts gelernt.

Nun scheint man aber auf den letzten Metern zur Vernunft gekommen zu sein, und das ist auch ein Erfolg derer, die sich bisher gegen diese Verbotspolitik gestellt haben. Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, setzen Sie heute noch einmal ein deutliches Zeichen, und stimmen Sie gegen diese Trilog-Einigung.

Sara Cerdas, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, Vice-Presidente, Colegas, o setor dos transportes representa 25% do total das emissões de carbono na Europa e os carros e carrinhas, juntamente com os veículos pesados, são responsáveis por mais de 70% destas emissões.

A ligação entre o ambiente e a nossa saúde é também por demais evidente: um quarto das mortes a nível mundial é causado por problemas ambientais, 10 % dos cancros, na Europa, são causados pela poluição do ar, e por cada grau de aumento da temperatura média, existe 2 % de risco acrescido para acidentes cardiovasculares.

Não há tempo a perder, nem há tempo para meias medidas, como a direita nesta Casa quer fazer crer. A União Europeia tem de atuar agora.

No último ano e meio, este Parlamento trabalhou incansavelmente para produzir um pacote legislativo climático que seja justo, ambicioso e voltado para o futuro. É, daí, extremamente satisfatório que tenhamos acordado em tornar a União Europeia um espaço com ar mais limpo, ao estabelecer que, a partir de 2035, apenas carros com zero emissões possam ser vendidos. Esta medida irá facilitar a evolução do mercado no aumento da oferta de opções sustentáveis, na redução dos preços, no desenvolvimento tecnológico e na criação rápida de um mercado de segunda e terceira mão.

Uma alteração a este nível irá impactar os trabalhadores e as pequenas e médias empresas. Daí que precisemos de mecanismos que monitorizem a situação e permitam que se responda, adequada e atempadamente, aos desafios que surjam, garantindo que esta é uma transição justa que não deixe ninguém para trás.

Colegas, foram negociações difíceis, como já podem ter reparado por estas intervenções, mas a indústria também nos deu sinal de que está preparada. Chegou a altura de a União Europeia se responsabilizar pelas suas emissões e tomar a liderança mundial no combate às alterações climáticas.

A partir de 2035, todos os carros novos na União Europeia serão zero emissões, medida esta que deve ser exemplo para todo o mundo. E esta é uma legislação que cumpre com o Acordo de Paris e com a Lei do Clima e apresenta repercussões positivas inigualáveis para o nosso planeta e para todos os que nele habitam.

Um as palavras finais de agradecimento ao Jan e a toda a equipa de negociadores por termos chegado a este acordo, à Comissão, ao Conselho e, da minha parte, um agradecimento especial à Juliana e à Eliana.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam Chair, first of all, I really would like to congratulate the rapporteur, Jan Huitema, for his great work on this file.

Of course, it started with a proposal by the Commission, and I do know that it was a big fight in the Commission to get it out. But I think after that the institutions worked in a very clear manner to deliver on this file. And this file is crucial; it's crucial to reach climate neutrality. And I just want to remind my colleagues who are now complaining: in 2020 they all signed up to Climate Emergency, in 2021 they all signed up to a climate law where climate neutrality is enshrined in our law now.

And this is the first law, the first law that we are working on a sector, a sector that is innovative, a sector that is moving, a sector that is shifting towards electric cars. And we can put in a law that is helping them. Giving clarity, giving clarity to the market, giving clarity to the supply chain that this is the way to go, and this is where Europe will lead instead of lagging behind.

Because, colleagues, also in California they are going to zero-emission vehicles by 2030, 100%. In China, they are moving there. If we want to maintain leadership on our car manufacturing, then we have to give clarity and a very strong signal to our markets. And those who claim to talk for industry are leaving industry behind, because this kind of talking about not even going to 100% is only undermining the innovation that we want to attract within Europe. And that's at stake for today.

And that is also why we as Greens, who always have shown that competitiveness, innovation and climate action go hand in hand. This is why we are so much in support of this proposal.

I just have to, however, have a little complaint because this is also a fight that we need for the trucks. Also, the trucks should go to zero emissions if we want to take the climate neutrality serious, because trucks are still the easier to abate sector if you look at airplanes and ships. And, therefore, I hope the leaks are wrong that the Commission is not going to propose a 100% reduction by 2040, but that they are going to produce that 100% reduction by 2040 and not the 90%. Because this file on the cars shows we can deliver.

So please, Commission, step up your game on trucks so that we can really deliver on climate neutrality and innovation on this very important sector within Europe.

Sylvia Limmer, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Timmermans, wertete Kollegen! Es ist ganz einfach: Es gibt keine emissionslose Fortbewegung, das wissen selbst die E-Auto-Propagandisten unter uns.

Die Emissionen von E-Autos werden nur verlagert, zum Beispiel in die Kohlekraftwerke, die nun vermehrt in Zukunft nicht nur bei Wind- und/oder Dunkelflaute einspringen müssen, oder die bei der Produktion von Traktionsbatterien freiwerden. Für eine einzige Batterie werden über 1 000 Tonnen Abraum bewegt und bis zu 40 Tonnen CO₂ freigesetzt, bevor das E-Auto auch nur einen einzigen Kilometer fährt, weswegen die HerrInnen der grün-sozialistischen Einheitsfront hier im Europäischen Parlament – selbst gut vom Steuerzahler alimentiert – den Bürgern was erzählen vom Laufen und Fahrradfahren sei gesund. Verlagert werden auch Millionen Arbeitsplätze in Drittländer.

Aber die Argumente sind längst ausgetauscht. Heute heißt es Farbe bekennen bei der Abstimmung. Und hoffen Sie nicht darauf, dass die wie sonst völlig unbemerkt von Bürgern und Wählern über die Bühne gehen wird. Insbesondere, liebe deutsche Kollegen von der CDU, CSU und FDP: Sie können – wie so oft – wieder mit den grün lackierten Wohlstandsvernichtern und Wirtschaftsbestattern stimmen oder jetzt endlich – sozusagen auf den letzten Drücker – gemeinsam mit uns für Technologieoffenheit, für individuelle Mobilität, für den Bürger und gegen ganz offensichtlichen grünen Schwachsinn abstimmen. Wir werden es heute Mittag herausfinden.

Pietro Fiocchi, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, Vice-President Timmermans, as an entrepreneur, I really do believe that we should have left it to the market, to companies, to decide what was the best technological solution to solve the problem.

We are all in favour of reducing emissions, of course, but we, as the ECR Group, have some problems. Number one: the workplace, how many jobs can be cancelled by this? What is Europe doing to do something about these workers? Number two: even more important, the dependence on foreign countries, and specifically China, regarding microchips, lithium, cobalt and so on. If we talk about environmental issues – and again I go back to the measurement on the tailpipe – I've seen mining operations in Africa and in a lot of countries and I can assure you that the impact on the environment is horrible. So we need to look at that.

Now I welcome the input by Commissioner Breton on an impact assessment in 2026, and we are looking at that. I also would like to say to the Vice-President that I hope this is not going to be imposed also on heavy vehicles and agricultural vehicles because that's a different problem.

I conclude again by saying why not give bonuses to scrap all the Euro 0, Euro 1, Euro 2, Euro 3 and Euro 4 vehicles so that we can reduce the output by 40%?

Kateřina Konečná, *za skupinu The Left*. – Paní předsedající, dnes máme hlasovat o nových emisních limitech CO₂ k osobním a užitkovým autům do roku 2035. Široká veřejnost toto nařízení zná pod mediální zkratkou zákazu prodeje nově vyrobených aut se spalovacím motorem po roce 2035.

Ráda bych řekla pár slov k celému procesu projednávání, který považuji za nešťastný, a o to nešťastnější je pak i samotný výsledek. Zejména ze strany českého předsednictví bylo prezentováno, že se o opravdový konec aut se spalovacím motorem nejedná, protože Rada přece prosadila možnost používání syntetických paliv. Není tomu tak. Jediná prosazená zmínka o syntetických palivech je obsažena v pouhém bodu odůvodnění, tedy nezávazné části textu.

Dále při debatách s Komisí zaznívalo a myslím, že to pan komisař i slíbil, že pokud dojde ke konci výroby nových aut se spalovacím motorem v roce 2035, nechají se jejich výrobci dožít se současným emisním standardem Euro 6, aby nemuseli investovat další prostředky do umírající technologie. Ani to se nestalo a Komise ty členské státy, které tomu uvěřily, napálila a přišla s návrhem Euro 7, který dále výrazným způsobem zdrazí nová auta se spalovacím motorem, neboť stanovuje další požadavky nejen na motor, ale i brzdy atd.

Roli užitečných idiotů pak sehrála česká vláda, která zákaz prosadila v zásadě bez jakéhokoliv vzdoru v rozporu s předvolebními sliby v rámci svého předsednictví. A teď jí došlo, že v kombinaci s návrhem Euro 7 si sama sobě dobrovolně zabila průmysl, který tvoří 10 procent hrubého domácího produktu v České republice. Český ministr dopravy Kupka si pak měsíc a půl po konci předsednictví vzpomněl, že Česká republika Euro 7 schválit nemůže, ale to je už samozřejmě pozdě. Vůbec pak nezmiňuje, že se dobrovolně a nepromyšleně zbavujeme konkurenční a technologické výhody, kterou jsme doposud měli. Budeme závislí na surovinách na výrobu baterií z Číny a Afriky. Měsíce tady kolegové slyšíme, jaká byla chyba sázet na fosilní paliva z Ruska. Dnes děláme zase tu samou věc, jen prostě s jinými velmocemi. Bateriový průmysl u nás neexistuje. Navíc je vývojově léta za tím čínským. Sázíme na elektrická auta, ale jak do nich vyrobíme elektřinu a za jakou cenu se zde prostě také neřeší. A přitom ceny elektrické energie drtí v současnosti domácnosti napříč EU. A tak bych mohla pokračovat klidně hodinu.

Kolegové, ráda bych vás tedy ve světle této situace požádala: Zvažte své hlasování o nových emisních limitech CO₂ k osobním a užitkovým autům. Lidé a ekonomika jsou na tom již teď dost zle a tohle by mohlo být fatální. Opravdu je toto cesta, kterou by se měl evropský průmysl vydat? Nestřílíme si náhodou do vlastní nohy? Já o tom přesvědčena nejsem a myslím, že zde nejsem sama.

Edina Tóth (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Az előttünk fekvő javaslat a gyakorlatban azt jelenti, hogy 13 év múlva nem lehet majd új benzines és dízelmotoros autót forgalomba hozni az Unióban. Ez nagyon rövid idő annak tudatában, hogy egyelőre sem megfelelő töltőinfrastruktúra, sem fizetőképes kereslet nincs az új, szén-dioxid-mentes korszak elkezdéséhez.

Ha az alacsonyabb jövedelemmel rendelkező polgárok jelentős része nem tud új autót vásárolni, tovább fog nőni a gépjárművek átlagéletkora. Régi, rossz minőségű autók fogják elárasztani az utakat.

Ki kell azt is mondani, hogy a belső égésű motoroknak igenis vannak további fejlődési lehetőségei, hiszen a fejlett szintetikus üzemanyagok változást hozhatnak ezen a területen.

A Bizottságnak tehát van még feladata, remélem mihamarabb meg is teszi a szükséges lépéseket, ugyanis alternatív lehetőségek nélkül e javaslat megvalósítása csupán vízió marad.

Pascal Arimont (PPE). – Liebe Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Herr Vizepräsident, ich bin nicht Ihrer Meinung. Ich halte diese Entscheidung, den Verbrenner ab 2035 zu verbieten, für einen gewaltigen strategischen Fehler. Niemand bestreitet, dass das E-Auto in Zukunft eine wichtige und zentrale Rolle dabei spielen wird, unsere CO₂-Emissionen in Europa zu senken. Aber jetzt schon alles auf ein einziges Pferd zu setzen, hat nichts mit strategischer Weitsicht zu tun, wie Sie das eben erklärt haben.

Das grundsätzliche Ziel ist richtig: Eine langfristig klimaneutrale Mobilität in Europa müssen wir erreichen, um wichtige klimapolitische Ziele zu erreichen. Allerdings muss dies technologieneutral gestaltet werden und nicht so, dass nur eine einzige technische Lösung erlaubt wird, die von allen umgesetzt werden muss. Einen solchen Ansatz verfolgen wir sonst auch nicht.

Beim Emissionshandel geht es beispielsweise darum, ein bestimmtes Ziel an CO₂-Reduktion zu erreichen und dazu anzuspornen, es einzuhalten. Den Unternehmen werden der Weg und die Technik dorthin nicht vorgeschrieben. Weshalb machen wir es beim Auto genau andersherum? Eine solche Entscheidung tötet Innovation, und sie ist auch dem Klimaschutz insgesamt nicht dienlich, denn dass bei der Entscheidung für das E-Auto komplett aus den Augen verloren wird, dass die CO₂-Bilanz eben nicht vorteilhaft ist, über den Strom bis zur Herstellung, das wird ausgeblendet, und das ist meiner Meinung nach ein Zeichen von gewaltiger Doppelmoral. Auch hilft es nicht, einfach zu ignorieren, dass wir uns in eine neue Abhängigkeit von China begeben – die benötigten Rohstoffe und seltenen Erden werden nämlich dort veredelt.

Auch der Verbrenner hätte mit klimaneutralen E-Fuels zum Beispiel weiterhin eine Zukunft verdient. Vielleicht ist der Einsatz jetzt noch nicht rentabel, aber im Jahre 2030 womöglich schon und vielleicht auch wichtig für Flugzeuge, Lkw und Schiffe.

Die EU-Kommission würgt jedenfalls jede europäische Innovation in diesem Bereich einfach ab. Andere Länder werden diese Lücke für sich zu nutzen wissen. Das halte ich weder für weitsichtig noch für klug, auch im Hinblick auf die vielen Arbeitsplätze. Heute wird in Köln darüber informiert, dass Ford dort Arbeitsplätze wegrationalisiert.

Und dann habe ich noch nicht von der Reichweite, Ladeinfrastruktur, Straßen, Trassenproblematik oder den hohen Anschaffungskosten gesprochen.

Ich bin nicht grundsätzlich gegen E-Autos. Ich bin aber grundsätzlich dagegen, dass man mir verbietet, im Jahre 2035 in einem klimaneutralen Verbrenner (*der Redner spricht bei ausgeschaltetem Mikrofon*). Ich bin nicht der einzige, der so denkt.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar Timmermans! Wir entscheiden heute darüber, ob wir den Verbrennungsmotor in der Europäischen Union für Neuzulassungen ab 2035 abschaffen. Und das ist richtig, dass wir diese Entscheidung treffen – einerseits aus klimapolitischen Erwägungen, denn noch immer wird im Straßenverkehr viel zu viel Treibhausgas ausgestoßen, andererseits aber auch aus industriepolitischen Erwägungen.

Andere Teile der Welt, die USA zum Beispiel, investieren gerade massiv in grüne Technologien. Wenn wir als Europäerinnen und Europäer nicht den Anschluss verlieren wollen, brauchen wir jetzt Planungssicherheit für die Hersteller. Die Hersteller wollen diesen Weg gehen. Sie brauchen den rechtsicheren Rahmen. Den schaffen wir.

Wenn hier von der EVP gesagt wird, es geht um die Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer, dann frage ich mich: Warum versagen Sie den Kolleginnen und Kollegen die Planungssicherheit? Warum haben Sie in den Verhandlungen für weniger Geld bei den Transformationsfonds gestimmt? Und warum tun Sie so, als ob Sie sich für die Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer interessieren? Dabei geht es Ihnen nur um die Lobby für synthetische Kraftstoffe. Aber synthetische Kraftstoffe sind keine Lösung: Wir haben sie nicht, sie sind viel zu teuer, und wir brauchen sie in anderen Sektoren und nicht im Straßenverkehr, wo wir direkt elektrifizieren können.

Und ehrlicherweise wird erst gesagt, wir haben keine Ladeinfrastruktur – dann machen wir eine Regulierung für den Aufbau der Ladeinfrastruktur. Dann wird gesagt, wir haben keine Rohstoffe – dann machen wir das Recycling für die Batterien. Sie erfinden ständig neue Argumente, Sie verschließen die Augen vor der Realität. Wenn wir in den letzten Jahren so Politik gemacht hätten, dann gäbe es keine Industrie mehr in der Europäischen Union.

Und ein letzter Punkt: Der Weg in die Zukunft ist nicht der Blick zurück. Der Weg in die Zukunft ist tatsächlich der Blick auf das, was möglich ist. Für die europäische Automobilindustrie ist das die Elektromobilität und auch der Einsatz von Wasserstoff. Und – das vergessen Sie – das schließen wir ja nicht aus. Und synthetische Kraftstoffe basieren auch auf Wasserstoff, sie sind nur viel ineffizienter. Sie sind schlicht und einfach keine Lösung. Und damit komme ich zum Schluss und hoffe, dass die Vernunft siegt und wir dem Trilog-Ergebnis heute zustimmen werden.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, en castellano hay un refrán que dice: «Lo mejor es enemigo de lo bueno». Convertir una utopía en una obligación legal no suele funcionar.

Una industria totalmente comprometida con la transición climática. Los técnicos de la energía y la automoción, volcados en la innovación, aceptan el reto de quedarnos a 10 % del cero emisiones en 2035, algo realmente ambicioso y objetivamente bueno. Por eso, animo a hacer esta transición con la industria y sus trabajadores; con su capacidad para generar empleo y pagar impuestos; desde la neutralidad tecnológica que garantiza una competencia más abierta; reconociendo y apoyando las fortalezas que tenemos en Europa para seguir liderando la transición hacia el objetivo de la neutralidad climática que todos compartimos.

Por eso, espero que algunos de los contenidos de este informe ayuden a conciliar la utopía con la realidad. Espero con interés el informe anual sobre el progreso de esta transición y su desarrollo social, tecnológico y económico. Servirá para ajustar, mediante la cláusula de revisión, los objetivos que se proponen aquí con los que la realidad aconseje. Seguro que seguirán siendo muy ambiciosos, que mejorarán mucho lo que tenemos hoy, pero serán también más pragmáticos, especialmente si este mismo año tenemos una propuesta sobre los fondos que puedan ayudarnos en esta transición.

La política de las cosas permite avanzar, ayuda a hacer realizable entre todos lo bueno, lo que nos hace progresar. Los titulares pomposos son parte de las cosas de la política.

Michael Bloss (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr verehrte Damen und Herren! Herzlichen Dank an Herrn ersten Vizepräsidenten der Kommission, Timmermans, an diejenigen, die es möglich gemacht haben, dass wir heute dieses Ergebnis abstimmen.

Wir beschließen endgültig das Ende des klimaschädlichen Verbrennermotors. Das ist gut für den Klimaschutz, und das ist auch gut für die Wirtschaft. Wir schaffen damit nämlich Klarheit: Ab 2035 werden keine neuen Verbrenner zugelassen, und die Autoindustrie und die Beschäftigten können sich auf diesen Wandel einstellen – und das tun sie bereits. Die klimafreundliche E-Mobilität ist eben weltweit nicht mehr aufzuhalten. Lassen Sie uns endlich einsteigen in diesen Wettbewerb: Bauen wir die reichweitenstärksten Batterien, die modernsten Autos in Europa und sichern wir damit die Arbeitsplätze und den Automobilstandort Europa für die Zukunft.

Im Verkehrssektor, da haben wir bisher immer die Klimaziele gerissen. Und das ist auch ein Ergebnis der Politik der Konservativen in den letzten 20 Jahren. Und sie versuchen es jetzt schon wieder, im Verkehrsbereich nichts für den Klimaschutz zu tun, und hoffentlich werden sie heute scheitern. Denn 2035 ist zwar gut für den Klimaschutz, aber es ist eigentlich noch viel zu spät. Und viele Automobilhersteller sind auch schon viel früher beim Aussteigen dabei.

Lassen Sie mich noch etwas zum Thema E-Fuels sagen. Mancher, der hier gesprochen hat, der irrlichtert herum in der Vergangenheit. Der ADAC, der ist wirklich keine grüne Vorfeldorganisation, aber er rechnet vor, dass eine Windkraftanlage 160 E-Autos versorgen kann, aber nur 52 E-Fuel-Autos. E-Fuels sind ineffizient. Sie werden immer teurer sein als E-Autos, und sie haben keine Zukunft. Und deswegen schließen wir das hier auch ganz klar in diesem Gesetz aus, auch wenn manche andere etwas anderes behaupten.

Mit dem Verbrenner-Aus ist klar: Die Industrie stellt sich in Richtung E-Mobilität auf – das ist die Garantie, dass sie bleibt. Die Erfolgsgeschichte der Industrie in Europa begründet sich nämlich nicht darauf, dass wir Verbrennungsmotoren bauen, sondern dass jeder und jede jeden Tag daran arbeitet, dass die Produkte besser werden. Der Erfindergeist, die Genauigkeit, die Verlässlichkeit, die Ingenieurskunst – das macht uns aus, und damit sichern wir den Automobilstandort Europa für die Zukunft. Alles andere wäre Deindustrialisierungspolitik.

Aurélia Beigneux (ID). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, ce rapport, qui signe la fin du moteur thermique en 2035, est l'exemple le plus éclatant de la déconnexion totale entre les élites européennes et nos citoyens. Il coupe également toute initiative aux constructeurs automobiles, les enfermant dans une logique du «tout électrique», qui ne sera bénéfique ni aux consommateurs ni à l'environnement.

Ces nouvelles normes, particulièrement lourdes pour nos industries, ne changeront pas le climat et vous le savez très bien. Votre doctrine, qui consiste à mesurer uniquement la pollution à la sortie des pots d'échappement, est une imposture écologique. Cela permet de cacher sous le tapis toute la pollution liée à l'extraction des métaux rares, nécessaires à la conception des batteries, mais, visiblement, cela vous arrange bien.

Pire encore: dans des pays comme le Congo, cette extraction est rendue possible par le recours massif au travail des enfants, beaucoup d'entre eux mourant à cause des éboulements ou encore des conditions sanitaires déplorables. Ce manque d'humanité, Monsieur, est à vomir. Votre projet égoïste consiste donc à déplacer la pollution des centres-villes vers le tiers monde.

Alors, rejetez ce texte, relancez l'innovation sur l'hydrogène et l'essence de synthèse, et cessez de faire constamment de l'automobiliste le bouc émissaire de la transition écologique.

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Paní předsedající, to, co zde máme před sebou, je asi jedno z nejhlupejších řešení, které jsme v tomhle období projednávali. Nic proti elektromobilům. Ve městech mají smysl. Jsou sice drahé, ale zlatá mládež je miluje. Akcelerují jako gepard.

Jenomže sázka na jedno řešení vytváří monopol. A monopol jde vždy proti prosperitě a svobodě. Ožebračíme střední třídu, rozmnožíme řady nezaměstnaných, omezíme lidskou svobodu a nahrajeme Číně, která je v této věci – v bateriích i v softwaru – daleko dál. Vždyť tady je problém se napojit na internet v Bavorsku na dálnici.

Budu proto hlasovat proti také v naději, že ještě dáme šanci technologické neutralitě, že ještě dáme šanci vývoji syntetických paliv a dáme tím pádem šanci i konkurenci, která jediné zaručí inovace a uchová lidskou svobodu.

(Řečník souhlasil s tím, že odpoví na vystoupení na základě zvednutí modré karty).

Sara Cerdas (S&D), blue-card speech. – I would like to ask the colleague if you have gone through the proposal, because what we negotiated, and before you state that you voted against, is tailpipe zero emissions by 2035. This provides technological neutrality at tailpipe and provides the chance not only to have zero-emission vehicles that are electric, but with other technologies that can arise.

Alexandr Vondra (ECR), blue-card answer. – No, no, no, we ask for the inclusion of the synthetic fuels and others and it was not accepted, only in the recital and in the recital it's not legally binding, it's just a proclamation to appease one party in the German coalition. But we wanted the inclusion of the technological neutrality, including the synthetic force, into the legislation, it was not accepted and then we had a promise that Euro 7 would be light in exchange and it is hard.

President. – Thank you for making the debate lively! You can do it again.

Cornelia Ernst (The Left). – Frau Präsidentin! Ganz klar, wir als Linke wollen natürlich auch, dass der Verkauf von Fahrzeugen mit Verbrennermotoren 2035 ausläuft – das ist eine richtige, eine wichtige, eine gute Entscheidung.

Aber ganz ehrlich, die Zwischenziele könnten durchaus ambitionierter sein. Und was mir überhaupt nicht passt und wir unglaublich finden, ist, dass ausgerechnet Luxuskarren à la Koenigsegg mit einem Verkaufswert bis zu über 1 Million EUR ausgenommen sind – de facto alle unter 1000 Stückzahlen gänzlich und bis zu 10 000 bis zu 2035. Das ist gerade so, als würde deren Auspuff statt Abgase Golddukaten furzen. Nein, das finden wir nicht gut, das finden wir nicht gut, das lehnen wir ab und halten wir für eine Politik der Oberen.

Und ja, bei LKWs brauchen wir jetzt eine Lösung. Wir dürfen die Zeit nicht verstreichen lassen, wir brauchen klare Signale.

Und noch etwas: Emissionen im Verkehrssektor senken wir nicht allein durch Antriebswende. Nein, es bedarf auch einer Mobilitätswende. Investitionen in batteriebetriebene Autos, in den ÖPNV, in den Schienenverkehr, polyzentrische Stadtplanung, ein anderes Verständnis von Verkehrspolitik und Landesplanung: Das ist es, was wir brauchen.

Und im Übrigen: Weniger Autos hieße auch weniger Bedarf an kritischen Rohstoffen, weniger Abhängigkeiten der EU und deutlich mehr Lebensqualität.

Maria Angela Danzi (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, con questo accordo sulle emissioni di CO₂ delle automobili e dei furgoni si sta imprimendo una svolta radicale, reale e importante a tutela della salute dei cittadini.

Io sono stata eletta in Lombardia e in Piemonte, una delle aree più inquinate d'Europa. Un'area ricca, ma dove l'aria è irrespirabile. Si stima che 15 000 persone nel 2020 sono morte prematuramente a causa dell'inquinamento e 80 000 persone muoiono all'anno a causa dello smog.

Ma per rendere questo sviluppo uno sviluppo sostenibile occorre incentivare il trasporto pubblico. Le nostre strade sono piene di camion che trasportano beni verso tutta l'Europa. Bisogna sostenere le nostre piccole e medie imprese e tutto l'indotto. Le nostre politiche devono essere politiche coordinate, che tengano conto anche della capacità fiscale del nostro paese.

Massimiliano Salini (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Vicepresidente, io ho la certezza che vinceremo anche questa sfida. Ne abbiamo vinte anche di più complesse in Europa.

Tuttavia, nell'analisi dell'accordo che è stato ottenuto con il trilatero rilevo che il principale problema è proprio di tipo ambientale. Perché? Se consideriamo cosa succede fuori dall'Europa non può non colpire come i paesi, in particolare la Cina, dove spopola la soluzione della mobilità elettrica, sono esattamente i paesi in cui l'energia elettrica non viene prodotta da fonti rinnovabili.

In Europa, dove invece il modello di sviluppo è sempre stato più votato alla prudenza, al mix, al tentativo di armonizzazione delle soluzioni, la produzione di energia è fortemente orientata alle fonti rinnovabili. Il mix europeo è buono, non distruggetelo, non contestatelo acriticamente, e soprattutto abbiate più prudenza linguistica. Non chiamatele «auto pulite», «a zero emissioni», altrimenti vi chiederemo di chiamare anche le centrali nucleari «centrali pulite», «centrali a zero emissioni».

Attenzione, il problema industriale arriva un attimo dopo. Il problema ambientale è il primo problema sul quale siete stati troppo disinvolti ed è la ragione per la quale oggi, nel voto che avremo, molti, anche nella parte sinistra di questo emiciclo, non voteranno questo accordo, perché c'è un problema legato all'armonizzazione puntuale, tipicamente europea, tra le ragioni dell'ambiente e la ragione dello sviluppo.

Mohammed Chahim (S&D). – Voorzitter, wie kent het automerk Stanley nog? Misschien ken je het uit de populaire kinderfilm “Cars” als Stanley Steamer. Zo niet, dan zou ik zeggen: vraag het aan je kinderen. Stanley maakte eind negentiende eeuw een zeer succesvolle auto met een stoommotor. Dat was toen een zeer betrouwbare techniek, zeker in vergelijking met de opkomende verbrandingsmotor. Op een bepaald moment maakte Stanley meer auto's dan welk ander Amerikaans autobedrijf ook.

De parallellen met vandaag zijn echt verbazingwekkend. Om de opkomst van de verbrandingsmotor tegen te gaan, begon Stanley als een van de eersten een campagne om angst, onzekerheid en twijfel te zaaien. De verbrandingsmotor was zagezegd niet betrouwbaar en kon ontploffen. Waar herkennen we dat van? Van de lastercampagne tegen deze verordening en tegen elektrische auto's, ook in dit Parlement. In 1924 sloten ze bij Stanley definitief de deuren omdat ze niet opgewassen waren tegen de concurrentie van de verbrandingsmotor. Ook nu weten we dat het voor de verbrandingsmotor heel moeilijk zal zijn om competitief te blijven. De elektrische auto is in gebruik al goedkoper en de aanschafprijs blijft dalen.

De concurrentie en de ontwikkeling buiten Europa gaan hard. Als we in Europa de automobielsector willen helpen toekomstbestendig te zijn en competitief te blijven, moeten we vandaag deze verordening aannemen. Zo komen we dichterbij onze klimaatdoelen, verbeteren we de luchtkwaliteit en voorkomen we vooral Europese Stanleys.

(De spreker aanvaardt een “blauwe kaart”-reactie)

Radan Kanev (PPE), blue-card speech. – Thank you very much, colleague Chahim, for a strong message and good example. But still, I have a very important question – because you gave perfectly well the example with the steam engine personal car, which existed for a few years and then, of course, ceased to exist in the 20s, so about 100 years ago. My very important question is, was the steam engine for personal cars administratively banned by anyone? Because I don't know that information.

Mohammed Chahim (S&D), antwoord op een “blauwe kaart”-reactie. – Kijk, ik probeer hier argumenten te vinden. Het klimaatargument is meer dan helder omdat het voldoende urgentie heeft dit probleem aan te pakken. Voor andere aspecten probeer ik vanuit economisch oogpunt met argumenten te komen. Als we zien wat er nu in Amerika gebeurt met het steunen van de elektrische auto, als ik zie hoeveel Aziatische merken een technologie naar Europa brengen die mijlenver vooruit is ten opzichte van heel veel van onze eigen Europese merken, dan maak ik me zorgen of we wel snel genoeg zijn met een antwoord en of we nog kans hebben om deze sector in Europa te behouden. Dat kan door heel duidelijke kaders te scheppen. Die kaders moeten we vandaag maken.

Michal Wieszik (Renew). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, cieľ úplnej redukcie emisií z osobnej dopravy je naozaj obrovským prínosom pre klímu a zároveň je to silný modernizačný prúd v autodoprave s prospechom pre kvalitu ovzdušia, hlučnosť a verejné zdravie. Verte mi, obzvlášť pre Slovensko, krajinu, ktorá vyrába najviac automobilov na hlavu, ide o veľmi zásadný posun, no vôbec nie ľahký.

Od začiatku som nástojil na tom, aby sme mali plán a financie na plošnú rekvalifikáciu zamestnancov v tomto odvetví. Som veľmi rád, že táto požiadavka sa do textu finálnej dohody naozaj dostala. Zaručuje, že prechod na elektromobilitu bude nielen zelený, ale aj spravodlivý.

Zostáva vyriešiť vytvorenie robustného systému výroby batérií bez prehnanej závislosti na tretích krajinách. Je kľúčové, aby aj tento kritický priemysel spĺňal prísne normy na ochranu životného prostredia. Výnimka nie je možná. Princíp nevytvárania ujmy na životnom prostredí musí ostať zásadou spravodlivého prechodu.

Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Executive Vice-President Timmermans, I think it was the German playwright Schiller who said that the future comes slowly, the present flies and the past stands still forever. It seems, in this chamber, the past continues to stand still.

But this week we vote on an historic deal that will make the EU the first regional bloc to ban by 2035 the production of the internal combustion engine. This is climate action, but it's also about cleaner air in our cities and towns. Electricity is the cleanest and the most efficient energy source for road transport: for cars and vans, but also for trucks and buses. I hope we will see the same level of ambition in similar upcoming legislation for these vehicles.

E-fuels are a pipe dream in road transport and must be reserved for ships and planes. By promoting electrification in road, the benefits for people in terms of reduced emissions and air pollution are truly enormous. We must accompany this shift with massive investments in public transport and active travel not aimed to simply replace all cars with e-vehicles.

So I look forward to approving this law, which is a profound shift for our road transport sector.

Teuvo Hakkarainen (ID). – Arvoisa puhemies, kun Neuvostoliitto kaatui, koko maailma huokaisi helpotuksesta, että kommunismista päästään eroon. Mutta se on kuin koronavirus, se ottaa uusia muotoja. Käsillä oleva esitys on siitä elävä esimerkki. Puoli maailmaa juoksee nyt olemattoman ongelman eli ilmastouskonnon riivaamana. Yksi osoitus on tämä polttomoottoriautojen vainoaminen. Ei käsitetä, kuinka valtavaa vahinkoa tälläkin kiellolla aiheutetaan koko Euroopan taloudelle, puhumattakaan autoilevista ihmisistä.

Tosiasiat tulevat vielä vastaan sähköautohurmion kanssa. Sähköauto on päästöiltään suurempi kuin polttomoottori, kun koko elinkaari otetaan huomioon. Tarvitaan vielä paljon kehitystä, ennen kuin polttomoottoreista ja öljystä voidaan luopua, jos koskaan. Uusimmat dieselautot ovat muuten lähes päästöttömiä.

Anna Zalewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Wiceprzewodniczący! Koleżanki i Koledzy! To rozporządzenie to gwałt na prywatności i własności, to gwałt na konkurencyjności i gwałt na wolnym rynku. Wreszcie, to rozporządzenie, które będzie pogłębiać kryzys energetyczny i wykluczenie komunikacyjne. I na końcu to zwyczajny *greenwashing*. Bateria cała jest złożona ze śladu węglowego, że nie wspomnę o licie, którego ceny poszybowały tysiącrotnie. Jego wydobycie jest absolutną katastrofą ekologiczną, tona wydobycia litu to kilkanaście ton dwutlenku węgla, że nie wspomnę o ilości potrzebnej wody przy tymże wydobyciu.

Jednocześnie po skandalu w grupie socjalistów, po skandalu, który szykuje się, jeżeli chodzi o Zielonych, bo sprawozdawcy są łapani na nieczystym lobbingu firm zewnętrznych, apeluję do Prezydium Parlamentu Europejskiego, żeby szczególnie przyjrzało się temu rozporządzeniu. Kto ile za to wziął? Kto stoi za tym rozporządzeniem rujnującym europejską gospodarkę?

Marina Mesure (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, au premier coup d'œil, interdire la vente de nouveaux véhicules à moteur thermique d'ici 2035 est une bonne chose. Car les émissions de CO₂ libérées par nos voitures non seulement sont responsables du réchauffement climatique, mais empoisonnent aussi la santé de millions de gens du fait de la pollution de l'air.

Néanmoins, la poursuite de ces objectifs – ambitieux et nécessaires – sans aucune planification est irresponsable, notamment s'il s'agit de miser sur un parc automobile 100 % électrique.

D'abord, ces voitures électriques sont très chères: les gens vont donc se tourner en priorité vers des voitures thermiques, de seconde main, plutôt qu'acheter de nouvelles voitures électriques.

Ensuite, s'il est vrai que les voitures électriques polluent moins l'atmosphère, qu'en est-il du processus de fabrication? Le lithium est extrait au prix d'une pollution environnementale considérable.

De plus, ni le lithium, ni le cobalt, ni les terres rares ne sont aujourd'hui exploités en Europe, ce qui nous rend structurellement dépendants des autres continents quant à l'approvisionnement.

Par ailleurs, faute de protectionnisme, ce sont les véhicules électriques chinois qui arrivent sur notre marché: aujourd'hui 5 % des parts, mais 20 % d'ici deux ans selon les estimations, avec comme première conséquence, pour notre industrie automobile, la fermeture d'usines qui emploient plus de 13 millions d'Européens.

Enfin, plus de voitures électriques signifie plus de besoins en électricité. Or, depuis la libéralisation du secteur de l'énergie, la production électrique stagne en Europe, et nous vivons même cet hiver les premières coupures d'électricité.

Donc, combien de nouvelles centrales nucléaires ou de centrales à charbon faudra-t-il pour faire fonctionner, à terme, un parc automobile européen de plus de 280 millions de voitures électriques? Tout cela n'est pas sérieux.

Aller vers une mobilité moins polluante? Évidemment! Mais en anticipant les besoins et en incluant tout ceci dans une véritable politique publique des transports en commun.

Milan Uhrík (NI). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, chcem sa spýtať, či túto európsku smernicu na znižovanie emisií videl vôbec nejaký technik alebo ju píšú len mimovládni aktivisti a úradníci, pretože ten tlak na nezmyselné znižovanie emisií pod hranicu fyzikálne možných možností by odsúdil každý technicky vzdelaný človek.

Ja len pripomínam, že Európska únia produkuje len 8 % celosvetových emisií CO₂, pričom v týchto 8 % len 13 % pochádza z automobilového priemyslu. To znamená, že ak nezačne emisie znižovať celý svet, priatelia, tak Európa to jednoducho nezachráni.

Hovoríte, že od 2035 by mal byť zakázaný predaj áut so spaľovacím motorom v Európe a že ľudia si majú povinne kupovať len elektromobily. Ale ja sa pýtam, odkiaľ tí ľudia zoberú peniaze na tie drahé elektromobily? Koľko bude stáť elektrina, keď už teraz jej je nedostatok? Hovoríte, že treba znížiť závislosť od ropy. Dobré, ale vzniká nám tu závislosť od lítia, ktoré je potrebné na výrobu batérií pre elektromobily. A už teraz ázijské spoločnosti hovoria, že ak Európa chce lítium, tak nám ho nepredajú a namiesto toho nám predajú celé hotové elektromobily. Čo by znamenalo zánik automobilového priemyslu v Európe.

Ja som za prechod na elektromobilitu, ale musí byť prirodzený, premyslený a hlavne ekonomicky výhodný aj pre samotných ľudí.

Barbara Thaler (PPE). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich muss wirklich sagen: Es war schon mal einfacher, hier zu stehen und zu einem Thema zu sprechen, denn ich glaube, wir stehen heute wirklich vor einer historischen Fehlentscheidung.

Wir verbieten heute den Verbrennungsmotor. Das war falsch, das ist falsch, und das bleibt falsch. Wir begeben uns nur in eine neue Abhängigkeit von China für seltene Erden und Metalle für Autobatterien, für die wir keine einzige Alternative übriglassen. Wir verzichten auf *green jobs* in Europa, wir verzichten auf Wertschöpfung, und wir schwächen unsere Stellung als Industriekontinent. Und das alles, ohne unserem globalen Ziel, dem Klimaschutz, global gesehen auch nur einen kleinen Schritt näher zu kommen.

Bitte nicht falsch verstehen: Die Notwendigkeit, Klimaschutz aktiv zu betreiben, ist in keinsten Weise in Frage gestellt. Aber eine gute Lösung ist selten schwarz oder weiß. Und Technologieneutralität ist die einzige Möglichkeit, zwei Fliegen mit einer Klappe zu schlagen: Klimaschutz zu betreiben und Europa wettbewerbsfähig zu halten.

Ich bin wirklich zutiefst davon überzeugt, dass ein Auto mit einem Motor aus Steyr, betrieben mit E-Fuels aus Dänemark oder Biokraftstoffen aus Österreich, dem Klima mehr hilft als ein E-Auto aus China oder Amerika, betrieben mit Kohlestrom. Ich werde deshalb mit voller Überzeugung gegen dieses Verbot stimmen.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Fru formand! Den sidste satsning vedrørende forbrændingsmotorer i biler er rigtig godt for klimaet, og det er en helt nødvendig beslutning, hvis vi i EU skal nå vores klimamål og overholde Paris klimaaftalen. Men EPP er imod loven, fordi de frygter, at vi taber jobs i bilindustrien. Jeg er for loven. For hvis vi ikke vedtager den, så taber vi jobs i bilindustrien. Den grønne omstilling er vejen frem både for klimaet, men faktisk også for at sikre vækst og sikre arbejdspladser. Fremtiden er altså i den grønne omstilling. Det nytter ikke noget at prøve at holde fast i en forurenende gammeldags teknologi. For med denne her udfasningsdato, så sender vi faktisk et klart signal til industrien: Nu starter en ny konkurrence, hvem kan producere den bedste nulemissionsbil? Det skaber nye muligheder for virksomhederne i EU, men også for klimaet, og så skaber det masser af nye grønne jobs. Kom nu ind i kampen for fremtiden, EPP. Vi har brug for denne her lovgivning for klimaet, men også for at sikre jobs i fremtiden.

Susana Solís Pérez (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, hoy votamos una de las normativas más importantes de esta legislatura: la prohibición de los vehículos de combustión a partir del 2035, con todo lo que ello conlleva para nuestras ciudades, pero también para la industria, una industria estratégica que engloba no solo a las grandes empresas, sino a pequeños productores, y que ha hecho de Europa líder a nivel mundial.

Por eso, para mí, son fundamentales tres puntos de lo que votamos hoy. Primero, tenemos que dar seguridad al sector para que pueda dirigir sus inversiones hacia la electrificación. No hay que cambiar las reglas de juego cada cinco años, ni tampoco ponerles más trabas ni más palos en las ruedas. Me refiero, por ejemplo, a Euro 7.

Segundo, esta ambición no se entiende si no garantizamos los puntos de recarga. Necesitamos objetivos obligatorios por país y no podemos reducir ni un ápice nuestra ambición en AFIR.

Tercero, todo este proceso hay que hacerlo de la mano de la industria y, por eso, para mí era muy importante que este Reglamento incluya una cláusula de revisión en 2027, donde se evalúen las tecnologías disponibles, el progreso anual y la implementación, y asegurar así, junto con el sector, que es factible llegar al 2035.

Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg (Verts/ALE). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Heute feiern wir einen der zentralen Erfolge des *European Green Deal*: Die Antriebswende kommt.

Seit Jahren werden die Emissionen im Verkehrssektor nicht weniger – zum Teil steigen sie sogar. Doch mit dem Verbrenner-Aus für Pkw 2035 ist ein wichtiger Schritt getan und der Übergang zu E-Mobilität gewiss. Und wir trauen uns endlich, der Industrie Technologieklarheit zu signalisieren. Dafür verhandle ich auch auf Hochtouren mit dem Rat für einen schnellen Ausbau der E-Ladesäulen in ganz Europa.

Doch Lkw emittieren fast ein Drittel der CO₂-Emissionen und blockieren nach wie vor unsere Straßen. Höchste Zeit also für ein Verbrenner-Aus ebenso im Güterverkehr und eine drastische Verlagerung auf die Schiene. Wir fordern ein Verbrenner-Aus für alle Lkw bis 2035, spätestens 2040. Ansonsten – und das wissen wir – sind unsere Klimaschutzziele schlicht nicht zu erreichen.

Danke schön für diesen heutigen Schritt. Lassen Sie uns feiern!

Danilo Oscar Lancini (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, è assolutamente condivisibile puntare a una riduzione delle emissioni di CO₂ nel settore dei trasporti, ma tale piano deve avere obiettivi realistici e non produrre aggravii di costi per cittadini e imprese.

L'attuale soluzione in votazione è una sostanziale forzatura verso la sola opzione elettrica, non una scelta del mercato, bensì una imposizione del legislatore e una violazione del principio di neutralità tecnologica. Imposizione che mette sostanzialmente la parola fine a uno dei settori europei di eccellenza a livello mondiale, senza contare l'importanza di tutta la filiera ad esso collegata, dalla componentistica alla manutenzione, e del grande numero di lavoratrici e lavoratori europei impiegati nel settore automotive.

Non ci sono ancora né le infrastrutture né le tecnologie per arrivare ad avviare una simile rivoluzione nel settore dei trasporti. Rischiamo solo di avvantaggiare ulteriormente i nostri *competitor* internazionali che detengono materie prime e brevetti. Vanno inoltre soppesati i costi ambientali a cui andremo incontro, dall'estrazione delle materie prime allo smaltimento delle batterie a fine vita.

Stiamo passando dalla dipendenza russa con il gas metano a quella dalla Cina con le terre rare e come sempre, purtroppo, saranno le classi meno abbienti e più deboli a pagare il vero prezzo di questa scelta con veicoli sempre più costosi.

Robert Roos (ECR). – Voorzitter, “Iedere arbeider zijn eigen auto!” Een mooie uitspraak van Joop den Uyl, mijnheer Timmermans. Uit de tijd dat de sociaaldemocraten nog voor de mensen opkwamen. Uit de tijd dat de gevestigde partijen nog voor vooruitgang stonden.

Die tijd is voorbij. En het ideaal van een eigen auto voor iedereen dreigt te verdwijnen. De VVD is nu zelfs in de EU verantwoordelijk voor het plan om vanaf 2035 alleen nog elektrische auto's toe te staan. Die zullen door hun dure accu's altijd een hoge aankoopprijs hebben. Daardoor kunnen hardwerkende mensen met een laag inkomen straks geen auto meer kopen. Dat zal miljoenen Nederlanders hun vrijheid ontnemen. En laat ik duidelijk zijn. Dat is geen ongelukkig gevolg van het beleid. Nee, dat is het beleid.

Met dit EU-beleid wordt Nederland één grote stad. Vol prefabwoningen, vol migranten en vol windturbines. Zonder boeren, zonder privéauto's en zonder vrijheid. Dat is de kant die het opgaat. Ik wil ons mooie Nederland behouden. Ik wil onze vrijheid behouden. En daarom, mijnheer Timmermans, zal ik mij blijven verzetten tegen deze agenda.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani kolege, dragi građani, čelnici autoindustrije, poglavice Mazde i Toyote govore nam da se kao političari ne bi smjeli miješati u razvoj i forsirati električne automobile jer ćemo time u potpunosti zaustaviti razvoj te industrije.

Ono što ja kažem, a to je da je Edison uspio propisima ili silom ili na bilo koji drugi način zaustaviti Teslu u razvoju izmjenične energije, izmjenične struje, mi bismo i danas bili u 19. stoljeću. Mi danas forsiramo jedan kabel i jednu vrstu autoindustrije. To je nedopustivo! Zaustavljanje razvoja je nemoguće.

Drugo što će se dogoditi, uvođenjem desetina milijuna automobila na električni pogon struja će porasti u nebo. Koštat će poput zlata i siromašni građani si ju neće moći više priuštiti. Vratit ćemo se u doba kamina i svijeća. Je li itko u ovom Parlamentu izračunao koliko je potrebno struje za napajanje svih automobila? Hvala. Nije!

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Ich halte es für falsch, Verbrennungsmotoren zu verbieten. Für unseren Industriestandort ist das ein Schlag ins Gesicht.

Ohne Zweifel: Elektroautos haben eine gute Zukunft. Das gilt vor allen Dingen, wenn die Infrastruktur ausgebaut wird. Wenn wir flächendeckende Ladeinfrastruktur haben, dann ist ein Elektroauto ein Selbstläufer. Aber, es war noch nie richtig, nur auf eine Technologie zu setzen. Technologieneutralität ist das Gebot der Stunde: alternative Kraftstoffe, synthetische Kraftstoffe, Wasserstofftechnologie haben auch ein riesiges Potenzial.

Und zum Thema Klimaschutz erlauben Sie mir zu sagen: Wir müssen doch auch das Ziel haben, die Autos, die heute auf der Straße fahren, sauberer zu machen, und das geht eben nur mit alternativen Kraftstoffen. In Deutschland fahren derzeit mehr als 67 Millionen Autos auf den Straßen; hier müssen wir doch ansetzen. Es kann auch nicht sein, dass sich jeder in den nächsten Jahren einfach mal schnell ein neues Elektrofahrzeug anschaffen muss.

Ein Aus für den Verbrenner ist unsozial und hilft dem Klimaschutz auch nicht weiter, denn es braucht doch niemand zu glauben, dass nicht außerhalb Europas weiterhin Autos mit Verbrennungsmotoren produziert werden. Das, was wir machen, ist, dass wir unsere eigene Industrie schwächen, dass wir unsere Unternehmen aus Europa vertreiben. Das ist wirklich eine katastrophale Industriepolitik.

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

Sara Cerdas (S&D), blue-card speech. – I would like some clarification because I fail to understand your political group's perspective when it comes to cancer action. And in this regard, we have that 10% of cancers are caused by air pollution. We also have that these emissions, CO₂ emissions are one of the main causes for air pollution. Here we're talking about technology neutrality at the tailpipe. So reducing those emissions, these will have important gains for the environment and health. So I fail to understand how your political group is on the forefront of cancer action, but then is against this proposal that will have immediate impact for the health of EU citizens. So I would like a clarification on this.

Angelika Niebler (PPE), Antwort auf eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Frau Kollegin, ich hoffe, Sie haben mir gut zugehört; Ihre Frage ist einfach zu beantworten. Die Frage ist: Wie machen wir den Verkehrsbereich sauberer, wie schaffen wir es, dass wir CO₂-Emissionen auch im Verkehr reduzieren? Und da bin ich voll und ganz der Meinung, wenn wir hier auf neue Technologien setzen – und das ist eben nicht nur eine Technologie, das ist eben nicht nur die Elektromobilität; die Produktion eines Elektroautos erfordert ja auch ein Mehr an Energie –, dann haben wir da auf jeden Fall die bessere Lösung.

Es geht darum, den Flächenbestand, den Bestand der Flotten, CO₂-neutraler zu gestalten. Und deshalb können wir eben nicht nur bei der Elektromobilität ansetzen. Deshalb brauchen wir alternative Kraftstoffe, Biokraftstoffe, und müssen auch auf die Wasserstofftechnologie setzen.

Nur auf einem Auge blind zu sein, das geht einfach nicht. Ich bin zutiefst überzeugt, dass wir hier auch die Vielfalt an Technologien brauchen.

Petar Vitanov (S&D). – Madam President, I come from a region where people live two years shorter than the average European citizen because of the polluted air they breathe. Exactly, sir. And we have the oldest cars but many still find it more convenient to drive their personal 20 year old vehicle rather than use the public transportation, for example. Sophia, my capital often gets on top of the world air pollution charts. And I come from a region where the industry, however, considers transport electrification is an opportunity for growth, new jobs and better working conditions in the sector. As a chance to become stronger, more efficient and more competitive on a fast developing market. And I come from a region where people's low income is often a barrier to implementing new technologies, and affordability is a really serious issue.

Strengthening targets and increasing investment in the supply of zero-emission vehicles will reduce the cost and make them more affordable for everyone, including for a second-hand buyers. Whether the market will shift to zero emissions is no longer a question. And it is our job to let that happen in Europe, by providing the legislative framework that is needed. The faster we act, the sooner we will see the benefits of our endeavours.

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Herr talman! Kommissionen, kollegor! Att lämna fossila bränslen bakom oss ger inte bara grönare fordon för klimatets skull, utan handlar också om säkerhet, att inte vara beroende av Putin eller andra oljediktaturer varje gång vi ska tanka bilen.

Fossildrivna bilar tillhör snart eller redan historien. Fordonsindustrin ställer om snabbt och att EU ger industrin tydliga riktlinjer om när omställningen senast måste vara klar är viktigt. Förutsägbarhet är nyckeln för att hålla takten i omställningen. Samtidigt måste vi, när vi går över till elfordon också se till att hela EU har en koldioxidfri elproduktion och att vi använder hållbara batterier. Jag är glad att batteriförordningen gick i hamn före jul.

Och till er på högerkanten som är emot det här förslaget vill jag avsluta med att säga: Stenåldern tog väl inte slut för att det tog slut på stenar.

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner Timmermans, colleagues, we are in a triple planetary crisis of climate change, pollution and unprecedented biodiversity loss. Resolving this will be one of the most difficult challenges we have ever taken on.

One of the tasks we must face head-on is the transformation of our transport sector. Today, we make a significant step forward, with a landmark vote to end the sale of all new petrol and diesel cars by 2035. But this is not enough. We must follow up with massive investment in public transport, in accessible public services, in affordable electricity and rural infrastructure.

Today, we set an entirely new vision for our towns and our rural areas. For a Europe made for people and not for traffic.

Roman Haider (ID). – Herr Präsident! Die EU hat 8 % Anteil am weltweiten CO₂-Ausstoß, und davon hat der betroffene Verkehrssektor innerhalb der EU 15 %. Diese 15 % von 8 % sind gerade mal 1,2 % des weltweiten CO₂-Ausstoßes. Mit dem Verbot des Verbrennungsmotors ab 2035 wird also der weltweite CO₂-Ausstoß gerade einmal um 1,2 % reduziert. Und deswegen ruinieren Sie die europäische Industrie, vernichten Sie hundertausende Arbeitsplätze und zerstören Sie unseren Wohlstand in Europa.

China, Indien, Russland, die USA schütteln den Kopf ob dieses Wahnsinns und reiben sich die Hände. Allein mit den mehr als 200 Kohlekraftwerken, die China jetzt gerade baut, sind diese 1,2 % CO₂-Reduktion binnen einer Woche mehr als kompensiert.

So wird das Klima nicht gerettet. Sie zerstören Europa. Das ist Wahnsinn.

Peter Lundgren (ECR). – Herr talman! 2035 vill man alltså förbjuda bensin och diesel. Det är totalt huvudlöst. Och det är samma misstag som Tyskland och andra länder gjort i energifrågan där man stängde ned ren kärnkraft och nu tvingas man vräka människor från byar för att gräva upp kol som man behöver för att producera elen.

Och elen är nu så dyr att människor tvingas lämna sina hem trots att de sitter och fryser inomhus. Hur tror ni att dessa människor ska kunna köpa en elbil och hur ska de ha råd att ladda den med nuvarande elpriser?

Dessutom har vi ju inte naturresurserna som krävs för att tillverka den mängd batterier som ni elbilsfanatiker tror är lösningen på alla problem. Litium, kobolt och så vidare. Världens kända reserver av dessa mineraler är runt 10 % av det uppskattade behovet. Vad är det för fel på er? Varför tror ni att vi ska klara av att ställa om till eldrivna bilar, när vi inte har naturresurserna för att göra det?

Ljudmila Novak (PPE). – Gospod komisar, kolegice in kolegi. Pred nami so zahtevni okoljski izzivi. Podpiram ciljno zmanjševanje emisij v prihodnjih letih. Promet v veliki meri onesnažuje okolje in negativno prispeva k podnebnim spremembam.

Predlog, ki je pred nami, je zelo ambiciozen, morda celo preveč ambiciozen in težko uresničljiv. Pri reševanju enega problema ne smemo povzročiti deset novih. Poraja se mi vrsta vprašanj o pravilnosti in smiselnosti nekaterih rešitev.

Ali je res potrebna popolna ukinitve motorjev na notranje izgorevanje? Zaradi nenehnega razvoja se izboljšujejo tehnologije tudi pri teh motorjih in alternativnih gorivih. Vedno je boljše, da imamo na razpolago več možnosti, kot da popolnoma zapremo vrata že obstoječim tehnologijam, ki se prav tako nenehno izboljšujejo.

Danes je čas za bolj razumne odločitve, za katere nam bodo naši državljani hvaležni. Zato smo bili izvoljeni. Ali želimo, da si ne bodo mogli več privoščiti svojega avtomobila. Ali pa bodo vozili stare avtomobile, dokler ne obstanejo na cesti.

César Luena (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente, esta mañana tenemos un debate que creo que nos ofrece un conjunto de disyuntivas, de preguntas bien interesantes.

¿Tenemos que reducir las emisiones de CO₂ y, por tanto, el calentamiento, cuando los coches y las furgonetas de combustión emiten una quinta parte de esas emisiones? Parece que la respuesta clara es «sí». Queremos una movilidad sostenible, asequible, limpia. Pero ¿cuántas veces hemos hablado en nuestra Cámara de este tipo de movilidad? ¿Cuántas? Una mayoría de esta Cámara, no solo progresista, una gran mayoría. ¿Queremos transformar nuestra industria para adaptarnos a los cambios tecnológicos, liderarlos incluso, en un sector donde se está diciendo que Estados Unidos y China nos están adelantando? La respuesta es «sí».

Por tanto, si adoptamos la decisión de acabar con la venta de vehículos de combustión en 2035, conseguimos esos tres grandes objetivos: reducimos las emisiones, impulsamos la movilidad sostenible y transformamos el sector para ser competitivos.

Así que espero que el debate sirva para que reforcemos y consolidemos una mayoría que empezamos con el Pacto Verde Europeo, del que hoy no nos podemos descolgar.

José Ramón Bauzá Díaz (Renew). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, muchos de los aquí presentes compartimos un objetivo común: lograr reducir las emisiones en el sector del transporte y alcanzar la neutralidad climática.

Aun así, es evidente que el camino para lograr ese objetivo nos diferencia. Por eso, el acuerdo que votamos hoy aquí en este Parlamento genera numerosas dudas. Lamento personal y profundamente que no se haya mantenido un principio básico que muchos llevamos defendiendo muchos años: la neutralidad tecnológica.

La electrificación del parque móvil es una opción, sí, por supuesto, pero no es la única, porque mientras nosotros nos lanzamos exclusivamente hacia lo eléctrico, el resto del mundo seguirá apostando e invirtiendo para conseguir motores de combustión mucho más eficientes, mucho más sostenibles, o alternativas tecnológicas más allá de lo puramente eléctrico.

Prohibiendo los motores de combustión a partir del 2035, aquí, en Europa, habremos generado unilateralmente nuestra propia desventaja competitiva. Y, lo que es peor, me temo que esta política de emisiones para coches y furgonetas marque el camino a seguir para los vehículos pesados. Este tipo de medidas, señor comisario, todavía tienen un coste social y económico mucho mayor para los ciudadanos.

Jakop G. Dalunde (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Kära kollegor, kommissionären! Bensinbilens tid är förbi. Elbilsrevolutionen är här. Varje bil som vi säljer på marknaden idag kommer i snitt att rulla i 20 år till in i framtiden. Om 20 år då är vi en bra bit inne på 2040-talet. Då ska vi vara nära noll i våra utsläpp.

Det är därför klok konsumentpolitik att se till att vi säljer färre bensinbilar nu och fler elbilar för att människor som köper en bensin- eller dieselbil i framtiden inte ska behöva sluta använda den i förtid.

Det är också klok industripolitik. I dagsläget har de flesta företag som säljer elbilar på marknaden sin hemvist utanför Europa, men med skarp politik här i Europa så säkerställer vi att fler elbilar har en stark hemmamarknad i Europa och industrin kan växa. Bensinbilstiden är förbi, elbilsrevolutionen är här.

Matteo Adinolfi (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'ossessiva ricerca di una neutralità climatica rischia di creare una vera e propria tragedia sociale. Il divieto, da qui a pochi anni, dei motori a combustione voluto dal Green Deal interesserà famiglie, territori, lavoratori e l'industria automobilistica, richiedendo ingenti investimenti pubblici e privati.

Voglio esprimere in quest'Aula tutta la mia preoccupazione per il fatto che, a fronte di valutazioni politiche precoci, i costi economici, industriali, sociali e ambientali della transizione siano stati sottovalutati. Oltre ad avere costi proibitivi per la maggior parte dei cittadini europei, i veicoli a batteria non sono del tutto a zero emissioni. Inoltre, bisognerebbe porsi serie domande sulle nostre reti elettriche e sulle scarse infrastrutture di ricarica attualmente esistenti.

Ancora una volta, se non si inverte la rotta e non si affronta il tema della neutralità climatica con un po' di sano realismo, a pagare il conto della miopia dei burocrati europei saranno le famiglie e le imprese.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, boj proti klimatickej zmene je najväčší projekt ľudstva kofinancovaný z verejných zdrojov. Preto sa aj najviac musíme snažiť a sústrediť sa na jeho efektívnosť. Prispiet' k zníženiu emisií skleníkových plynov je výborný cieľ, cestou elektromobility by však bol dosahovaný dosť drahô v porovnaní s inými alternatívnymi riešeniami. A preto s návrhom zakázať v celej Unii dokonca v krátkom časovom horizonte predaj nových áut so spaľovacím motorom nemôžem súhlasiť.

Kým odstránenie jednej tony CO₂ cez systém kupovania emisných povoleniek stojí necelých 100 EUR, prechodom na bezemisné autá stojí to isté až desaťkrát viac. Emisie znižujeme, ale tam, kde je to najefektívnejšie.

Radan Kanev (PPE). – Mr President, I do believe electric vehicles are the future of mobility. And I am no fan of combustion. Living in a city with detrimental air-quality problems. And furthermore, in my home country, Bulgaria, we produce no internal combustion engines and we have a strong automotive industry which might hugely benefit from a deep transformation of mobility markets. And, however, I will not vote for a total administrative ban of internal combustion engines. I will not do it because I believe administrative bans will not lead to the transformation that we want. And quite on the contrary, I am very much afraid that an administrative ban will lead to a lazy and expensive electric vehicle industry in Europe, exactly the contrary of what we aim.

I must very much remind you that we did not leave the Stone Age because we run out of stones. But also we didn't leave the Stone Age because we administratively banned the use of stone for industrial purposes. It was always technology, initiative and competition that drove us ahead. I believe we will live in the climate-neutral and combustion-neutral society without burning fossil fuels for our mobility, but not through administrative bans.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Herr talman! Herr kommissionär! Vi har en historiskt viktig omröstning idag. Vi har nu chansen att sätta stopp för nya fossildrivna bilar från 2035. För utvecklingen går ju snabbt. De blir både billigare och bättre och bilföretagen vill jobba klimatsmart.

Och det kommer att gå ännu snabbare om politiken också är tydlig med den riktningen. Jag vill ha ett tydligt slutdatum och även om jag gärna sett att biogasen hade blivit bättre inkluderad så måste vi nu ta ansvar för överenskommelsen. Det är djupt oansvarigt av EPP och högerkrafterna att inte stå bakom denna överenskommelse. Det är dags att vi tar ansvar. Det är dags att vi tar ansvar för klimatet, att vi väljer rätt väg för bilen. En väg som är klimatneutral, bullerfri och hälsosam. Det är dags att rösta för detta nu.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Herr Präsident, Kollegen! Wir alle haben das Ziel, die Klimaziele von Paris zu erreichen. Und natürlich muss der Verkehrssektor dazu beitragen und ebenfalls dekarbonisiert werden. Dafür brauchen wir meiner Meinung nach Innovation und Erfindergeist.

Wir haben daher immer dafür gekämpft, dass wir diese Transformation technologieoffen angehen. Denn auch der Verbrenner kann mit alternativen Kraftstoffen klimaneutral fahren. Der Verbrenner ist nicht per se klimaschädlich, sondern es ist die Frage, wie er betankt wird. Und daher haben wir die Kommission aufgefordert, einen neuen Vorschlag zu machen, wie denn der Verbrenner in Zukunft weiter genutzt werden kann mit ausschließlich klimaneutralen alternativen Kraftstoffen. Aber dieser Vorschlag lässt leider auf sich warten.

Es gibt keinen vernünftigen Grund, den Verbrenner per se zu verbieten. Deswegen werde ich diesem Vorschlag auch nicht zustimmen, denn diejenigen, die verbieten wollen, haben nur Angst vor einem: vor Innovation und vor Wettbewerb. Dabei ist es genau das, was uns beim Thema Dekarbonisierung nach vorne bringen wird.

Philippe Olivier (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, en matière d'écologie punitive, l'Union européenne se caractérise par le «toujours plus». La transition écologique ne peut ressembler à la Révolution culturelle chinoise.

S'agissant des automobilistes, c'est d'autant moins justifié que l'on sait que ce ne sont pas les voitures qui sont la cause essentielle de la pollution. En vous acharnant sur eux, vous êtes dans la logique du bouc émissaire. Vous ne pouvez pas agir contre la réalité, contre les gens, souvent modestes, pour qui la voiture n'est pas un luxe, mais une nécessité. Vous ne pouvez pas poursuivre dans le «tout électrique», quand nous n'avons ni les capacités de production, ni la maîtrise des composants indispensables à la filière.

Votre démarche fait preuve, une fois de plus, d'un fond résolument idéologique, le même qui vous a conduit à excommunier le nucléaire, énergie pourtant décarbonée. Cette excommunication a scellé la dépendance énergétique de l'Europe et cet aveuglement conduit aujourd'hui nos pays à une crise dont nous n'avons pas fini de payer le prix.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, Това досие е меко казано скандално. Напълно при това. Като докладчик в сянка на становището на комисията по транспорт и туризъм, държа да отбележа, че едва ли има по-добра метафора от този законодателен доклад за войната срещу обикновените хора, която „зелени“ лобисти в тази зала организират и водят. Едва ли някой от вас може да каже какъв е въглеродният отпечатък, каква е щетата върху околната среда, която струва произвеждането на електромобил? Колко часа детски труд, колко часа робски труд отиват, за да бъдат произведени батериите за електромобилите? Разбира се, никой от вас няма да каже тези неща, защото те не отиват, не се вписват в идеята ви за „зелен“ лобизъм. Приемането на този закон ще доведе до края на персоналната мобилност. Това е доклад, насочен срещу обикновения гражданин, срещу човека, който иска да притежава автомобил, да може да си го позволи, да пътува, да си вози семейството. И въпросът ми към социалистите е: как така сте социалисти, а толкова много потискате и водите война срещу обикновените хора, срещу бедните хора?

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Vážení pán predsedajúci, všetci si uvedomujeme, že transformácia našej ekonomiky na udržateľnú formu je nevyhnutná. Dnes stojíme pred dôležitým hlasovaním. Redukcia emisií je naším samozrejým cieľom a európska transformácia musí ale byť vedená citlivo, najmä vzhľadom na udržateľnosť našich pracovných miest a vývoj nových technológií.

Je dobré, že si dávame pre ochranu nášho životného prostredia ambiciózne ciele. Je ale tiež dôležité, aby sme zachovali technologickú neutralitu. Budúcnosť nevieme presne predpovedať, pretože nevieme, čo sa naučíme zajtra, a nevieme, aké inovácie a vylepšenia nás čakajú. Je preto dôležité dať šancu všetkým technológiám a v automobilovom priemysle to platí nielen pre elektrické, vodíkové či hybridné pohony, ale aj pre vývoj klasických spaľovacích motorov a vývoj ich nových palív podporujúcich naše klimatické ciele.

Potrebujeme sa jasne zamerať na skutočné efektívne riešenie, ktoré prinesie aj želané výsledky. Úplné odstavenie spaľovacích motorov nepovažujem za to jediné možné. Naším cieľom je predsa dekarbonizovať, a nie deindustrializovať Európu. Nie je rozumné úplne odstaviť naše know-how a desaťročie vývoja, v ktorom sme svetoví lídri. Dajme šancu všetkým technológiám a nápadom, ktoré dokážu priniesť rovnaké, niekedy aj lepšie výsledky. Nezanevrime na európske dedičstvo a dôverujeme schopnostiam Európanov prinášať efektívne riešenia a inovácie.

Achille Variati (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, il regolamento che ci apprestiamo a votare oggi rappresenta un passaggio storico per una mobilità sostenibile dell'UE.

Aver fissato l'ambizione per cui le nuove auto e i veicoli leggeri venduti nell'UE non producano più emissioni di CO₂ entro il 2035 rappresenta una sfida senza precedenti. Una sfida che troverà una spinta importante nel nuovo regolamento sulle batterie, che mi auguro potrà essere adottato entro giugno, dove definiamo criteri di sostenibilità per le batterie dei veicoli elettrici che, secondo le stime, rappresenteranno la tecnologia predominante sul mercato.

Per concludere, domani la Commissione presenterà la proposta di revisione dei target di CO₂ sui camion, che mi auguro possa essere adottata entro questa legislatura, in modo da poter ribadire l'obiettivo di neutralità climatica dell'Unione entro il 2050.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a un intervento «cartellino blu»)

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), wystąpienie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Z Pana wypowiedzi wynika, że jest Pan bardzo zachwycony tym rozwiązaniem, które jest proponowane. Moje pytanie jest takie: czy nie ma Pan obaw, że to rozwiązanie o produkcji silników elektrycznych i likwidacji silników spalinowych doprowadzi do powstania góry, hałd toksycznych odpadów?

Dzisiaj w Unii Europejskiej mamy podatek od plastiku. Była kiedyś taka moda, żeby wszystko było plastikowe. Dziś państwa europejskie płacą podatek od nieprzetworzonego plastiku. Czy nie myśli Pan, że będzie tak samo z bateriami, że będzie problem z utylizacją tych baterii? I co Pan wtedy powie ludziom, którzy będą musieli miliony euro płacić nowego podatku od waszego pomysłu, dzisiejszego?

Achille Variati (S&D), risposta «cartellino blu». – Guardi, io vengo da una delle zone più inquinate del mondo, che è la pianura Padana, e quindi tutto ciò che potrà servire a diminuire l'inquinamento, in particolare dell'aria, mi vede d'accordo. Ovvio che nulla qui è scontato, nulla è semplice. Ciò che lei dice certamente produrrà dei problemi, però attenzione, stiamo andando verso un'economia circolare, un'economia del riciclo, un'economia del riuso, un'economia forte che darà lavoro diverso rispetto a quello attuale, e nei momenti come questi occorre avere il coraggio di guardare avanti.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Mr President, the automotive industry is still one of the top industries of the European Union. The European cars were and still are, something to be proud of. With more than 14 million new workers involved in this industry and more than 2.5 direct employees in the EU, this sector needs all our attention. We need to go green. Our planet and our health need to be a priority. There is no doubt about that. But we could have in our auto sector a strong partner to find the best solution so that the European Union will keep the lead in this sector and be much less pollutant than it is at this moment.

We need more support for innovation, a neutral approach to the technologies. We want to be the leader in the green transition. The world beater. And we have to be. But it is much better and much safer to have partners to support the change of the industry, to make clear legislation and achievable targets to make sure we still have a very strong economy while becoming green.

Paolo Borchia (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, vorrete scusarmi, ma sono d'accordo su poco rispetto a quello che ho sentito oggi.

Proviamo a pensare al futuro e immaginiamo due scenari: nel primo, l'auto elettrica sarà un bene di lusso, costoso, a portata di pochi; nell'altro, continuerà a essere un bene di massa, ma le case automobilistiche cinesi avranno soppiantato i poveri produttori europei. È fantascienza? No, non è fantascienza se ci rendiamo conto, se guardiamo i numeri e guardiamo che BYD, colosso cinese dell'auto elettrica, nel 2022 ha raddoppiato la propria quota di mercato.

Intanto, per cercare di mantenere la competitività, l'industria europea si sta guardando attorno, perché qui siamo a rischio delocalizzazioni che significano disoccupazione. Siamo tra quelli che inquinano di meno, ma sembra che tante volte, troppe, in quest'Aula si faccia il possibile per creare sempre più difficoltà agli europei. Lavoriamo, Commissario, per inquinare meno, è giusto farlo, ma non in questo modo.

Johan Nissinen (ECR). – Herr talman! Mitt under rådande energikris vill EU förbjuda förbränningsmotorn för att främja elbilar. Men är det verkligen klimatsmart? Nej, absolut inte. Ukrainakriget har nämligen lett till en renässans av kolkraft som producerar el till Europas elbilar. Eller ska vi kalla dem kolkraftsbilar för det är det rätta namnet? Det kan inte bli mycket smutsigare än så här.

Till det kommer också den dyra och koldioxidsintensiva tillverkningen av batterier med många delar från Kina. Så istället för att behöva olja från Saudiarabien eller gas från Ryssland så går vi in i ett beroende av Kina i stället. Är det verkligen den lärdomen vi ska dra ifrån kriget i Ukraina?

Den klimatalarmism som råder hjälper inte klimatet. Vi behöver inte fler regleringar och vi behöver inte mer rädsla. Det vi behöver är mer forskning, marknadsekonomi och framtidsstro.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Mr President, Vice-President, colleagues, if we want to be climate neutral by 2050, we have to focus on transport. We know that the transport sector is the only sector in the EU where emissions they have increased. That trend cannot continue. Maritime, aviation, road transport all have an important part to play in this regard.

Today we are debating and voting about new CO₂ standards for passenger vehicles and vans. And I have to say that I am not fully satisfied about the trilogue outcome. Yes, indeed, we have to cut emissions from road transport, but we should do it in a technology neutral way. We, as politicians, shouldn't be choosing winners and losers in the industry.

This regulation entails that from 2035 onwards, all new vehicles should be electric or hydrogen vehicles. This regulation would phase out internal combustion engines, and I don't think that this is the right approach.

Technology diversity is needed where all technologies, including electrification, hybridisation, hydrogen, but also sustainable and renewable fuels, can play a role. And we should also encourage those innovations. We should set the targets and industry should find out what is the most efficient and best technology to achieve this target.

And we know also that for too long we have been focusing only on tailpipe emissions. So I think this is a positive step here that the new regulation will now introduce a common EU methodology by 2025 for assessing the full lifecycle of CO₂ emissions of cars and vans placed on the EU market.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Sur President, li titkellem lejn l-ahhar ta' dibattitu bhal dan jista' jkun zvantagg iżda tajjeb ghax tkun smajt il-hsibijiet kollha tal-Kamra. Ejjja ma ninsewx li qeghdin nitkellmu fuq is-sahha taghna lkoll u s-sahha tal-ambjent li jghajjixna. Mhux qed nitkellmu dwar karożzi li diġà jinsabu fit-toroq taghna li qeghdin joqtluna – daww se jkomplu joqtluna iżda daww li johogru godda 12-il sena ohra.

Qed nara gallerija mimlija zghazagh, daww li qeghdin jiggieldu sabiex nikkumbattu t-tibdil fil-klima. U niringrazzjahom talli qeghdin hawnhekk ghaliex dan huwa mument importanti – dan il-mument jimmarka l-ewwel qbil ufficjali fuq ligi minn pakkett fundamentali ghall-futur tal-klima u tal-ambjent taghna, tas-sahha taghna.

Ittamajt illi jkun mument ta' ghaqda, qbilna t-tliet istituzzjonijiet iżda jidher illi l-forzi konservattivi qeghdin jahdmu biex il-progress jieqaf. Anke hawn, in-nazzjonalisti kontra arja nadifa ghalina lkoll f'kull pajjiz Ewropew u kontra sahhitna.

Din hi l-ewwel opportunità li ghandna biex naghtu sinjal lid-dinja fuq l-ambjent. Mhux se naqtghu qalbna, kommessi li nnaqqsu l-impatt ambjentali tal-emissjonijiet tal-karożzi godda, filwaqt li naraw li hadd ma jithalla jaqa' lura ghaliex iva, ahna soċjalisti, u ma rridu lil hadd jaqa' lura. Mhux se niequ nahdmu ghall-ambjent u ghas-sahha taghna lkoll.

Ulrike Müller (Renew). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kollegen! Wer meint, komplexe Herausforderungen mit einfachen Antworten lösen zu können, der liegt meist daneben. Das De-facto-Verbot des Verbrennungsmotors und der einseitige politische Zwang zum Batterie-elektrischen Antrieb sind dafür ein Paradebeispiel.

Die notwendige Transformation des Automobilsektors hin zur Klimaneutralität droht dadurch, unnötig ineffizient und teuer zu werden. Die Effizienzpotenziale alternativer Lösungswege werden ohne Not versenkt. Wenn wir es als Politiker allerdings schon besser wissen als die Ingenieure, dann sollten wir wenigstens konsequent sein. Wir zwingen einerseits die Investitionen der Hersteller in Richtung Batterie-elektrische Antriebe, und gleichzeitig diskutieren wir mit dem Vorschlag zu EURO 7 andererseits eine Maßnahme, die hohe Investitionen in die alte Technologie erfordert, die wir gerade eben verbieten.

Da weiß die rechte Hand nicht, was die linke tut. Die Rechnung fällt damit noch höher aus; und zahlen müssen zum Schluss die Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher der EU.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, kolegice i kolege, raznolikost tehnologije – da, transformacija sektora – da. Međutim, zabrane – ne. Ovo nije dobar način kojim smo krenuli.

Ja dolazim iz Hrvatske odakle je i Rimac Nevera, najbrži električni automobil na svijetu. Za to ste vjerojatno već čuli. Međutim, ako želimo smanjenje emisija ugljikovog dioksida za nove automobile i kombije kako bismo osigurali da automobilski sektor doprinosi klimatskim ciljevima za koje jesmo, tada trebamo pronaći fer igru, a za mene to nije taj trenutak.

Naime, povećavaju se ciljevi smanjenja emisija CO₂ za 2030. i utvrđuje se novi cilj od 100 % za 2035. To znači da svi automobili i kombiji koji se od 2035. stave na tržište trebaju biti vozila s nultim emisijama.

Međutim, moramo imati na umu da je automobilska industrija Europske unije odgovorna za više od 7 % BDP-a, kao i da osigurava gotovo 13 milijuna radnih mjesta. Moramo osigurati da novom regulativom ne ugrozimo radna mjesta i da ne ograničimo potencijal kojim inovacije mogu doprinijeti našem gospodarstvu. U konačnici, fokus mora biti i na našim građanima.

Za pojedina područja koja nisu dobro prometno povezana posjedovanje osobnih automobila nije luksuz, kolegice i kolege, već minimum životnog standarda. Zbog toga bismo trebali razviti široke programe kojima bismo poduprijeli naše građane u kupovini okolišno prihvatljivih vozila. No, moramo uzeti u obzir financijske mogućnosti.

Imamo li infrastrukturu? Imamo li resurse? Bez obzira na optimističnije makroekonomske pokazatelje, ne smijemo ljude suočiti sa siromaštvom.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur Timmermans, lorsque le sage montre les étoiles, l'idiot regarde le doigt.

Pacte vert, stratégie «De la ferme à la table», stratégie en faveur de la biodiversité: autant de projets détestés, aujourd'hui encore, par certains ultraconservateurs, néolibéraux ou climatosceptiques – dans notre siècle! – et craints par d'autres, mais qui n'en restent pas moins des projets européens prioritaires et urgents. Des missions qui, à la lumière de la dégradation de notre environnement et de la biodiversité, sont vitales pour l'avenir de nos citoyens européens.

Dans ce cadre, établir comme objectif 100 % de véhicules à émission zéro en 2035 est une décision historique, ambitieuse et, à mon avis, une vraie décision, prise dans l'intérêt général. Bien sûr, il faudra aller au-delà de l'électrique, mais nous parlons de 2035 et je voudrais dire ici que je pense que nous devrions en effet en profiter pour repenser la place de l'automobile et, plus largement, la question de la mobilité.

Mais aujourd'hui, il s'agit d'une première étape pour 2035 et ce vote est essentiel pour l'avenir de nos citoyens européens.

Claudia Gamon (Renew). – Herr Präsident! Der Verkehr ist eines der großen Emissionsprobleme der Europäischen Union. Wir brauchen eine richtige Verkehrswende in der Europäischen Union. Das bedeutet natürlich auch, dass wir Güter und Menschen auf die Schiene bringen müssen; aber heute reden wir über den Individualverkehr.

Die Menschen sind ja, wie so oft, weiter als die Politik. Während Neuzulassungen für Elektroautos in Deutschland im letzten Jahr schon um 32 % gewachsen sind, sind die für Diesel und Benziner stark zurückgegangen. Und der Herr Vizepräsident Timmermans hat das eigentlich eingangs richtig gesagt: *The industrial revolution is happening if we like it or not.*

Was für Europa entscheidend ist, ist: Wollen wir da dabei sein? Möchten wir das gestalten? Möchten wir auch Wohlstand für unseren Kontinent schaffen, oder werden wir wieder nicht dabei sein? Wir verpassen es; Europa wird zu einem großen Freilichtmuseum für Touristen aus der ganzen Welt.

Dieses Gesetz ist ein wesentlicher Schritt in die richtige Richtung, eine Klarstellung für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger und für unsere Industrie in Richtung nachhaltige Verkehrswende.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Az chce się zadać pytanie, komu zależy na tym, aby uzależnić Europę od Chin, od chińskiej produkcji, aby uzależnić Europę od metali rzadkich, wydobywanych w większości w krajach o bardzo niestabilnej sytuacji politycznej?

Ciśnię się też inne pytanie: czy np. politycy w Stanach Zjednoczonych, czy Szwajcarii mają mniejszą wiedzę i czy mają inny pogląd na ochronę środowiska, bo nie chcą narzucić tak wspaniałych rozwiązań, jakim są elektryczne samochody, swoim firmom i swojemu społeczeństwu?

Proszę Państwa, wszyscy mamy świadomość, jak ważne jest ograniczenie emisji CO₂, jak ważna jest droga do osiągnięcia neutralności klimatycznej. Wszyscy jesteśmy za tym, aby wprowadzać środki, które umożliwią nam przejście tej drogi i osiągnięcie celu, ale też uważam, że powinno się to odbywać w sposób realistyczny, neutralny pod względem technologicznym i odpowiedzialny społecznie.

Dzisiaj mamy pytanie, czy społeczeństwo europejskie stać na samochody elektryczne? No nie, proszę Państwa! Czy mamy wystarczającą sieć stacji ładowania, zasilanych w zieloną energię? No nie, proszę Państwa! I wreszcie ja nigdzie, a pytałam o to także na komisji transportu, czy mamy dane, uczciwe dane, które mówią, jaka jest emisja CO₂ w całym procesie produkcji, utylizacji samochodów elektrycznych?

Nie mamy tej informacji, dlatego proszę Państwa, ja tego sprawozdania nie poprę.

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, *(nepočuteľné slová)* že emisie z dopravy sa od roku 1990 podľa Eurostatu zvýšili takmer o pätinu. Automobilový priemysel dnes závisí na dovoze čipov z Taiwanu, batérií z Číny, kobaltu a lítia z ďalších tretích krajín. Ak chceme byť skutočným lídrom v prechode na elektromobilitu, musíme posilniť svoju odolnosť a strategickú autonómiu. V opačnom prípade prenecháme globálnym hráčom, ako je Čína, Japonsko alebo USA, toto líderstvo a iba jednu závislosť nahradíme inou závislosťou.

Moja rodná krajina Slovensko je dnes v prepočte na jedného obyvateľa najväčším producentom automobilov na svete. Takýto ambiciózný prechod na výrobu iba elektromobilov do roku 2035 bude veľkou výzvou nielen pre veľké automobilky, ale najmä pre oveľa zraniteľnejších dodávateľov, ktorí sú dnes samozrejme naviazaní najmä na výrobu áut so spaľovacím motorom. Tento prechod si bude vyžadovať masívne investície, rekvalifikáciu a udržateľné podnikateľské plány a musí sa uskutočniť už v tomto desaťročí, ktoré je ovplyvnené samozrejme najmä vojnou na Ukrajine a zvyšovaním cien energií.

Verím ale, že v roku 2035 aj vďaka našej práci budeme v situácii, keď vďaka sprievodným opatreniam, vďaka novým technológiám si auto na batériu bude môcť dovoliť naozaj každý, kto ho len potrebuje, a nie len ľudia s vyššími príjmami.

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Mr President, cars and vans will have to reduce their emissions in the next two years in line with European climate law. We are asked to vote on a proposal to ban new cars with combustion engines by 2035. This proposal asks us to decide today based on current knowledge, which technology will be used in the future. This is not the right line of action. The EPP certainly wants to find the best solution to reduce carbon emissions. However, we do not think that imposing a single pass is the best way to reach the goal. Innovation and technology are the essential tools for our sustainable future. It is dangerous to choose certain technology over others for political reasons. This must be an evidence-based process, involving researchers and experts. Technological neutrality is the way to reach climate neutrality.

Javi López (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente Timmermans, hoy la Unión Europea va a dar un importante paso para cumplir con sus objetivos climáticos. Un paso fundamental. Una nueva regulación para las emisiones de CO₂ de los coches y las furgonetas, que nos permite tener el horizonte del año 2035 para nuestra llegada a la Luna en este campo: acabar con los coches de combustión. Además, hay que recordar que es un paso fundamental para cumplir con nuestro objetivo climático de neutralidad en el año 2050. El 20 % de las emisiones provienen de este sector. Es un paso ambicioso, pero, al mismo tiempo, flexible tecnológicamente.

Pero no solo es una ambición climática. Hoy aprobamos una certeza regulatoria para un sector estratégico para nosotros. En la carrera que existe en el mundo, con los grandes bloques compitiendo por tecnología verde, ¿qué hace Europa? ¿Da el paso en esa dirección? Por eso es tan importante la decisión que vamos a tomar hoy, y que, al mismo tiempo, protege la salud pública, porque la polución provoca 300 000 muertes al año en Europa. Es de un enorme cinismo votar en contra de este expediente y luego defender la salud pública de los europeos.

Dennis Radtke (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin doch schon ein Stück weit irritiert, wenn hier pathetisch vorgetragen wird, dass sei heute ein Tag zu feiern. Ich stelle mir schon die Frage, ob den 3800 Menschen, die in Köln bei Ford ihren Arbeitsplatz verlieren werden, heute auch zum Feiern zumute ist angesichts dessen, was wir hier heute beschließen wollen. Das ist mit Blick auf die europäische Industrie ja auch nur der Anfang, denn wir müssen ja auch gleichzeitig sehen, was beim Thema EURO 7 noch in der Pipeline ist.

Aus meiner Sicht werden hier die Weichen in eine völlig falsche Richtung gestellt. Und ich finde die Debatte und die Entscheidung mitunter sogar ziemlich arrogant, denn wir haben hier vorhin aus den Reihen der Sozialisten gehört, dass diejenigen, die sich für Bezahlbarkeit von Mobilität einsetzen, diejenigen, die sich um den Erhalt von Arbeitsplätzen Sorgen machen und sich um dieses Thema kümmern wollen, die werden hier *geframt* als neoliberal oder als dumm. Also wenn es neoliberal und dumm ist, sich für Arbeitsplätze und Bezahlbarkeit von Individualität, von individuellem Verkehr einzusetzen, ja, dann bin ich neoliberal und dann bin ich auch dumm.

Und es hat sich auch heute hier in dieser Debatte, wie auch schon an vielen anderen Stellen gezeigt, dass die Sozialdemokraten nicht nur in diesem Haus, sondern auch an vielen anderen Stellen als Anwalt, als Interessenvertreter sowohl von Industriearbeitern ein Totalausfall geworden sind als auch mit Blick auf Menschen mit kleinen und mittleren Einkommen. Wir sind doch mit unseren Einkommen mit Blick auf Mobilität und Bezahlbarkeit nicht der Maßstab, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, und deswegen die letzte Ausfahrt heute für die Sozialdemokraten zu zeigen, dass sie noch ansatzweise was von der Lebenswirklichkeit der Menschen in Europa verstehen.

Tudor Ciuhodaru (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule vicepreședinte, stimați colegi, sănătatea cetățenilor europeni a fost și este și va fi întotdeauna o prioritate pentru mine. Eu sunt medic, medic la Spitalul Clinic de Urgență Nicolae Oblu din Iași, România, și tratez în fiecare zi pacienți afectați de poluare, de această patologie care reduce speranța de viață și afectează calitatea vieții în toate țările europene.

Din punctul meu de vedere, orice pas făcut pentru reducerea poluării este extrem de important și voi susține oricând, orice măsură care prevede inclusiv stimularea producției și a achiziționării de mașini electrice în statele membre, de multe ori inaccesibile, regândirea, dacă vreți, a clauzei privind vehiculele hibrid, o regândire a pieței secondhand, astfel încât viața noastră să fie protejată.

Dacă aș vrea să îl parafrazez astăzi pe primul om pe Lună, aș putea spune că, din punct de vedere legislativ, astăzi este un pas mic pentru Parlamentul European, un pas mic pentru Comisia Europeană, dar un pas uriaș pentru cetățenii europeni.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Vicepresidente Timmermans, con il regolamento sulle emissioni di CO₂ per le auto e i van, l'Unione si dota di uno strumento essenziale per raggiungere gli obiettivi di decarbonizzazione della legge europea sul clima, un testo di legge strategico che porrà le basi di una politica industriale rivolta al futuro.

Chi si oppone, pensando di rallentare il cambiamento, fa solo un danno all'economia e ai lavoratori. Come la destra italiana, che qua in Parlamento europeo voterà compatta contro, ma poi i rappresentanti del nostro governo in Consiglio hanno votato a favore. Il perché è evidente: confondere le acque e sfuggire alle proprie responsabilità di fronte a una scelta di tale importanza.

L'accordo trovato mantiene un approccio tecnologicamente neutrale e una forte impronta sociale per assicurare investimenti per la transizione equa, due punti chiave per consentire all'industria di restare competitiva rispetto ai produttori americani e asiatici, già molto in avanti nel mercato dei veicoli a zero emissioni.

Votare contro oggi significa far pagare ai cittadini un prezzo altissimo. Impegniamoci invece davvero per una transizione equa e sostenibile socialmente ed ecologicamente.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, sigur, Uniunea Europeană este lider în protecția mediului și trebuie să ne menținem. Orice pas făcut spre sănătatea oamenilor este binevenit. Dar, ascultând dezbaterile de astăzi, m-am gândit la ce spuneau doi oameni importanți din România, demult: Ce poate învăța un istoric de la un inginer? Și răspunsul omului politic de atunci a fost: măsura.

Noi trebuie să ne gândim că aici nu reglementăm pentru noi, ci reglementăm pentru cetățeni și trebuie să înțelegem cum putem să facem acest echilibru, pentru că regulamentul de astăzi nu s-a terminat cu votul pe care îl dăm săptămâna aceasta, ci urmează să avem, domnule comisar, politici, pentru a transforma industria europeană, pentru a implementa politica industrială, reindustrializarea Uniunii Europene și, evident, trebuie să ne gândim cum protejăm cetățenii, nu numai din punct de vedere al mediului, ci și din punct de vedere economic, pentru că este clar, capacitatea financiară a cetățenilor și a statelor membre sunt diferite.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, sometimes I think that this is the place where ambition comes to die.

So in the trilogue agreement we have 55% reduction for cars, 50 for vans. Now, in fairness to Jan, the rapporteur, he fought for 70% at the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, but some of his own Renew members even voted against him.

We need an EU-wide phase-out date for sales of new internal combustion-engine cars and vans as close to 2030 as possible, but surely no later than 2035, to meet the EU's 2050 climate neutrality target. At least that 2035 phase-out date has been retained in the trilogue agreement. But it's also crucial to remember that unless consumption and mobility habits change radically, replacing the world's estimated fleet of two billion cars is going to require an explosive and entirely unsustainable increase in resource extraction.

So cars are not the future of transport. Better public transport and active travel are the future, with targeted support where necessary for EVs in rural areas. Sometimes, Commissioner, I feel sorry for you. It's not easy.

(Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās beigas.)

Frans Timmermans, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me start by saying to Mick, if it were easy work, fun, you know, these things are difficult, but we need also to take responsibility for difficult decisions. And tying our citizens and our industry to the past is not a smart move. We need to provide regulatory clarity. The one advantage we have over other industrial powers in the world is that we are able, thanks to you and thanks to the Council, to give regulatory clarity to industry so that they know in which direction to move and the direction that cars and vans are moving in worldwide. Look what's happening in China. Look what's happening in India. Look what's happening in the United States is to electrification. And let me just really say very clearly what we're saying is zero emission at the tailpipe. So if industry thinks they can build cars with combustion engines, that can lead to zero emission, they're free to do that. But why is industry massively, massively choosing for electrification? Because they know that's the most efficient way of reaching zero emissions for cars and vans. They know this. And I would implore those who've said that they will not vote for this to please reconsider. Listen to the European car manufacturers. The overwhelming majority of them want this, and they'll be even faster than 2035 in electrifying their fleet. Also, listen to all those who are linked to the development of this industry. Listen to the European Battery Alliance. We will be making our own circular batteries quite soon. We will be able to basis on production in Europe and in the supply chains that are linked to friendly countries. And we will reduce our dependency on China and on other parts of the world that are unfriendly to our interests. So please keep all of this in mind when you decide how to vote.

Ik wil ook het volgende zeggen tegen de heer Roos, die terecht Joop den Uyl opvoert, die in Nederland aan een soort revival bezig is. We leven in een tijd van industriële revolutie. Alles zal opnieuw bekeken worden en in deze tijd is de spreiding van kennis, macht en inkomen weer het allerbelangrijkste onderwerp in de politiek. Een industriële revolutie die niet politiek en door regelgeving gestuurd wordt, zal een kleine groep van multimiljardairs opleveren en een hele grote groep mensen die verliezen. Mensen vastketenen aan het verleden is geen perspectief geven op toekomst. Je moet eerlijk en duidelijk zijn over waar de toekomst ligt. In de auto-industrie ligt die in elektrificatie.

I cannot say this enough: look at the future of the European car industry; it is not in combustion engines. Tying them to the past is going to make it more difficult for them to invest in the future. Give them the opportunity to concentrate all their investment potential on the future, which is in electrification. Finally, I would like to say

Ich möchte gerne zu meinen deutschen Kollegen aus der EVP-Fraktion sagen – ich sage das mal aus meiner eigenen Erfahrung als Mitglied einer Volkspartei: Wir haben als Sozialdemokraten in Holland auch viel Opposition erlebt. Wenn man aber in der Opposition glaubt, man kann sich einen Verantwortlichkeitsurlaub erlauben, dann ist man auf dem Holzweg. Man muss wissen, dass die Leute, die Wählerinnen und Wähler, uns vertrauen und wieder zurückkommen, wenn wir auch in der Opposition zeigen, dass wir Verantwortung übernehmen, auch für schwierige Entscheidungen.

Jan Huitema, *rapporteur*. – Voorzitter, allereerst wil ik heel graag de schaduwrapporteurs bedanken die met mij deze onderhandelingen gevoerd hebben. Daarnaast wil ik alle collega's bedanken die hier vandaag gesproken hebben in dit debat.

Ik wil beginnen met het ontkrachten van misschien wel een mythe. Best wel wat collega's hebben namelijk gezegd ruimte te willen maken voor de waterstofauto's. Dat zit in dit voorstel. Ik denk dat het belangrijk is om dat te noemen. Wat me ook opvalt, is dat een overgrote meerderheid wil dat ook wegtransport en het gebruik van auto's en bestelbusjes klimaatneutraal gebeurt en dat er geen fossiele brandstoffen gebruikt worden. Ik denk dat dat een goede zaak is.

Maar waar volgens mij de schoen wringt, is dat heel veel mensen graag de verbrandingsmotor in stand willen houden en zich in allerlei bochten wringen om dat te blijven doen. Het lijkt wel alsof dat een doel op zich geworden is. Daar worden argumenten bij gezocht die ik in eerste instantie begrijp. Zo wordt er gezegd dat stroom duur is (bijvoorbeeld door Jens Gieseke) en dat we afhankelijk worden van grondstoffen.

Het lijkt mij belangrijk te vermelden dat mensen die graag de verbrandingsmotor in stand willen houden, dan juist de optie willen voor het gebruik van synthetische brandstof. Belangrijk te noemen hierbij is dat net bij de productie van synthetische brandstoffen stroom – juist die dure stroom – nodig is, en wel op een heel inefficiënte manier. Voor één eenheid synthetische brandstoffen zijn namelijk vijf eenheden stroom nodig. Wil je klimaatneutraal zijn, dan moet die stroom natuurlijk ook hernieuwbaar opgewekt zijn door bijvoorbeeld windmolens en zonnepanelen.

Dan kom ik bij mijn tweede punt, namelijk de afhankelijkheid van grondstoffen, waarover ik me daadwerkelijk ernstig zorgen maak. Kritische grondstoffen zijn belangrijk voor de hele energietransitie. Niet alleen voor batterijen, maar zeker ook voor windmolens, zonnepanelen, chips en noem maar op. Wil je dus synthetische brandstoffen gaan gebruiken, dan heb je vijf keer zoveel windmolens, zonnepanelen en grondstoffen nodig. Dat is volgens mij dus de verkeerde manier. Ik denk dat juist personenauto's – die hebben laten zien dat ze direct ingeplugd kunnen worden op het stroomnet en direct de stroom kunnen gaan gebruiken – veel interessanter zijn en dat dat een veel efficiëntere manier is.

Een ander punt is dat synthetische brandstoffen volgens mij nodig zijn voor vervoersmiddelen waarbij het transportmiddel niet uitgerust kan worden met bijvoorbeeld een batterij. Te denken valt misschien aan vrachtauto's, trekkers (uit mijn eigen sector), schepen en ook vliegtuigen. En misschien hebben we die synthetische brandstoffen ook nodig voor het bestaande wagenpark dat nog wel uitgerust is met een verbrandingsmotor.

Ik heb veel werkbezoeken afgelegd en wat ik interessant vond, is dat ook autofabrikanten absoluut geen heil zien in synthetische brandstoffen. Dat is ook logisch, want dat zou betekenen dat we een kredietsysteem moeten opzetten en dat autofabrikanten voor elke nieuwe auto met een verbrandingsmotor CO₂-rechten moeten gaan betalen gedurende de hele levensduur van zo'n auto. Ja, geen autofabrikant gaat dat doen.

En dan *last but not least*, wij moeten daarvoor een waterdicht juridisch systeem opzetten om ervoor te zorgen dat dat kredietsysteem en het gebruik van synthetische brandstoffen daadwerkelijk zonder fraude gebeurt. Ik denk dat we met het dieselschandaal geleerd hebben dat we harde, duidelijke Europese wetgeving nodig hebben.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks šodien.

Rakstiskas deklarācijas (171. pants)

Laura Ferrara (NI), per iscritto. – Autovetture e veicoli commerciali leggeri sono responsabili di oltre il 70% delle emissioni inquinanti del trasporto su strada. La transizione verso la neutralità climatica stabilita dal *Green Deal* ci impone di aumentare in maniera sostanziale l'ambizione delle norme in materia di CO₂ di questa tipologia di veicoli.

L'accordo provvisorio raggiunto tra Consiglio e Parlamento segna un passaggio epocale. Viene programmata la fine della produzione dei veicoli a motore termico garantendo un rapido sviluppo e diffusione di quelli a «zero emissioni». È un obiettivo che verrà raggiunto per passi graduali e obbligatori per i costruttori e dovrà tener conto anche della conservazione dei livelli occupazionali del settore, degli aiuti alle PMI operanti nell'indotto e di una mobilità pulita a prezzi accessibili per tutti.

Continuiamo a costruire un'Unione in grado di tutelare la salute e il benessere dei cittadini dai rischi e dagli impatti legati all'ambiente, realizzando un modello di economia più verde e sostenibile, equo e inclusivo.

Benoît Lutgen (PPE), *par écrit*. – La décision dogmatique de ne plus autoriser que les véhicules électriques en 2035 est néfaste pour le développement durable. Cette décision ne prend pas en compte les aspects environnementaux, économiques et sociaux. L'extraction des minerais pour les batteries a des conséquences environnementales et humaines désastreuses en Afrique. De plus, quid de la production d'électricité ? Aujourd'hui, il n'y a pas assez d'électricité, et trop d'électricité produite par charbon ou gaz. Enfin, le calcul des émissions de CO₂ est basé uniquement pour l'usage de la voiture, et pas pour l'entièreté du cycle de production (voiture, batterie, recyclage). Si on regarde tout, le bilan est mauvais. Laisser un seuil de 10% pour d'autres types de voitures aurait permis au secteur automobile de devenir leader dans des marchés novateurs, comme l'e-fuel. La décision prise comportera en outre des difficultés pour les ruraux, en raison du réseau de bornes de recharge, totalement insuffisant, y compris dans les perspectives. Mon pays n'atteint en outre pas les jalons fixés par l'Europe. L'Europe se tire une balle dans le pied, met à mal sa compétitivité, l'emploi, et sa souveraineté, en renforçant sa dépendance à la Chine. Une très mauvaise décision sur laquelle, j'en suis certain, on reviendra.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – Het Europees Parlement stemde over het akkoord over nieuwe doelstellingen inzake CO₂-emissiereductie van auto's en bestelwagens. Dit dossier maakt deel uit van de Europese Green Deal om de groene transitie in Europa mogelijk te maken. Met dit "Fit for 55"-akkoord wordt de weg naar een klimaatneutraal Europa straks tot op onze oprit zichtbaar. Er werd hierover reeds een akkoord gevonden tussen het Europees Parlement, de Europese Commissie en de lidstaten in oktober 2022 en nu werd dit akkoord in de plenaire stemming bevestigd.

Concreet legt de nieuwe wetgeving een reductiedoelstelling van 100 % op tegen 2035. Dat wil zeggen dat nieuwe auto's en bestelwagens die verkocht worden in de EU, vanaf dan niet meer op een fossiele brandstofmotor zullen mogen rijden. Vlaanderen heeft echter nog ambitieuzere doelstellingen. Volgens het Vlaams klimaatplan begint de uitfasering in 2029. Dit is één van onze belangrijkste hefboomen om de CO₂-uitstoot te verminderen en elektrische wagens betaalbaarder te maken. Daarom steunt CD&V deze wetgeving.

(Sēde tika pārtraukta plkst. 11.20.)

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

4. Resumption of the sitting

(The sitting resumed at 11.47)

5. Formal sitting – Address by Egils Levits, President of the Republic of Latvia

President. – Dear colleagues, today it is a pleasure to have with us the President of Latvia, Egils Levits.

President Levits, we are honoured that you will address the House of European democracy shortly before the first anniversary of the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

Since 24 February 2022 — the day Putin's regime launched an illegal and brutal attack on sovereign Ukraine — Latvia has led on shaping EU policy and has demonstrated unwavering support for Ukraine's cause and solidarity with the Ukrainian people.

There is no doubt that the world has changed after 356 days of war on our continent.

Throughout that change, I am glad that the European Union can count on members like Latvia, and Latvia can count on the European Union too. We know that together the European Union will build a real security and defence Union.

President, your country knows – as you also know – what it means to be under political pressure from an oppressive authoritarian regime. Our European Union must remain the guarantee that the past can never again be the future. The last generation broke down walls and tore open curtains in the name of liberty and democracy. That is Europe's legacy and one that it is now up to us to preserve.

Latvia is a symbol of hope, of transformation and of the enduring proof in a people and a nation's ability to overcome the odds, to break free from authoritarianism and join a Union based on shared values of justice, freedom and democracy.

The European Union must prevail and unity must prevail, because it is only together that Europe can rise to meet the challenges of our time.

President Levits, the floor is yours.

Egils Levits, Latvijas Republikas prezidents. – Ļoti cienītā Eiropas Parlamenta prezidentes kundze! Ļoti cienītās deputātes un augsti godātie deputāti! Vispirms es Latvijas tautas vārdā gribētu izteikt mūsu līdzjūtību neseno zemestrīču Turcijā un Sīrijā upuru tuviniekiem. Eiropa ir solidāra ar mūsu kaimiņiem šajā traģēdijā.

Dāmas un kungi! Eiropas Parlaments ir Eiropas politiskā sirds. Šeit satiekas Eiropas Savienības pilsoņu dažādās intereses, domas un viedokļi. Šeit veidojas un kristalizējas 450 miljonu Eiropas pilsoņu sabiedriskā doma.

Eiropai savs ekonomiskais, intelektuālais un kulturālais potenciāls ir jāpielieto tā, lai mēs visi 450 miljoni savu dzīvi varētu veidot atbilstoši mūsu vērtībām un sasniegt mūsu mērķus.

Mesdames et Messieurs, le citoyen d'un pays membre est en même temps citoyen de l'Union européenne.

Cela signifie que, en premier lieu, il est lié à sa nation, à sa société, à sa culture et à sa langue. Il porte la responsabilité de sa démocratie et de sa sauvegarde. Son horizon politique est tout d'abord celui de son État.

Cependant, le citoyen de l'Union européenne ne s'en tient pas là. Être citoyen de l'Union européenne signifie non seulement se préoccuper de son pays, mais aussi de l'Union européenne. C'est un double devoir.

Cela signifie donc aussi que les citoyens européens doivent porter leur regard sur l'ensemble de l'Union européenne. Non pas seulement sur leur pays, mais bien sur toute notre Union européenne.

Il nous revient à nous tous, citoyens européens, et surtout aux responsables politiques, de prendre de la hauteur pour passer d'un point de vue national à une vision supranationale.

Meine Damen und Herren! An dieser gemeinsamen europäischen Sichtweise müssen wir noch arbeiten.

Nach dem Zusammenbruch des Sowjetblocks ist Europa zusammengewachsen. Die künstlich geschaffenen politischen und wirtschaftlichen Grenzen wurden schrittweise abgebaut. Jedoch die Grenze in unserem Bewusstsein, im sozialen Gedächtnis der europäischen Gesellschaft, ist noch nicht völlig überwunden. Die europäische Geschichte wird immer noch weitgehend nur aus der Sicht Westeuropas erzählt.

Dieser enge Provinzialismus beim Verständnis des gesamten Europas hindert uns daran, unsere Ziele zu erreichen.

Die vollständige Geschichte Europas ist eine Geschichte, in der alle europäischen Nationen sich selbst und ihre historischen Erfahrungen wiedererkennen können.

Das heutige Europa hat kein Zentrum und keine Peripherie. Europa wird heute in Riga und Paris, Warschau und Berlin, Bukarest und Brüssel, Prag und Rom geschaffen und gestaltet.

(Beifall)

In allen europäischen Ländern, in allen europäischen Hauptstädten. Auch in Oslo. Auch in Berlin. Auch in London. Und auch in Kiew.

(Beifall)

Honourable Members, we need a common understanding of European history where there is a place for the historical experience of all European nations.

We need to consolidate a common point of view from which the whole of Europe – from North to South, from East to West – can be seen, and from which the world, and Europe's place in it, is clear, so that we can define what Europe wants to achieve globally.

Over 20 years ago, the German political philosopher Jürgen Habermas identified the lack of a common European public opinion (*Europäische Öffentlichkeit*) as one of the European Union's biggest problems.

Since then, I believe that things have somewhat improved. The common European public opinion has acquired greater significance in the minds of citizens. Crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic and Russia's aggression towards Ukraine have also contributed to our common consciousness of us as Europeans. This is the basis of Europe's ability to act.

The European Parliament is a unique, democratically legitimised European forum. I, therefore, call on you, honourable Members, to play a more active role in shaping the common European public opinion.

This does not mean merely advancing national, economic or other interests in a fierce battle for compromise. In parliamentary debates and decisions, you need to achieve a European vision that is qualitatively more advanced than just agreeing on a price.

Your solutions must be truly European. Such solutions must equally incorporate the national and historical experiences and actual equitable interests of all Member States. They must synthesise them into a new quality. That is what European citizens expect from you.

To represent the whole European Union, we need to understand its Member States better. For example, only a very small number of the Members of the European Parliament have ever been to Latvia. Let me therefore today encourage you to visit Latvia and get to know us better.

When thinking about European solutions, we need to be clear about the European foundations. Our shared values and our common European legal system are precisely what distinguish the European Union from all other international organisations, from all other regional platforms.

Our values and legal system make Europe and our common European way of life attractive for us and attractive to others. Values such as democracy, the rule of law, and fundamental human rights. They are a source of strength for the European Union.

The Member States of the European Union are, in principle, stable, consolidated democracies. However, we face serious challenges. The most obvious challenge is the desire to limit the rule of law on the basis of populist arguments about the will of the people.

A modern constitutional democracy is based on a carefully balanced system. On the one hand, you have a democratically legitimised parliament and government. On the other, an independent, professionally legitimised judiciary. The democratic process itself, free elections and political freedoms – the very core of the European Union's political identity – can only be guaranteed by such a system of checks and balances. I say this with my 24 years of experience as a judge at the European Court of Human Rights and the Court of Justice of the European Union. The upsetting of this balance, which the proponents of constitutional populism are seeking to achieve, may ultimately lead to the weakening or even the complete loss of democracy itself.

Europe is united in its diversity. Member States are diverse in issues of national identity, culture, language, traditions and social sphere – and so it should remain. Here Europe must not interfere. Here diversity is Europe's strength.

However, the principles of the rule of law must be the same everywhere. Here, diversity is permissible only in the concrete manifestations of these principles.

The European legal system is based on mutual trust that the same principles apply in all Member States in the same way, without exception. If there is a problem with the rule of law in one Member State, it affects the entire European Union. In some cases, these populist tendencies have already led to disputes that are now difficult to unravel in a purely legal way. In order to avoid an impasse, I think that here we could find a political solution that would cut this “Gordian knot”. This would give the involved parties an opportunity to start afresh.

In any case, the rule of law in Europe must not be weakened!

Honourable members, democracy and the rule of law are under threat not only from within. Today, it is also threatened by Russia’s aggressive ideology, which is behind their attack on Ukraine – a sovereign, democratic European country.

The authoritarian Russian regime has gone back 200 years in its thinking. It has regressed back to the imperialist, colonialist and racist ideology of the 19th century. As the German example shows, renouncing an aggressive, toxic ideology requires a huge collective effort (*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*). And it takes a long time. But it can be done.

Until Russian society evaluates, overcomes, condemns and clearly renounces this ideology, we have to reckon with Russia as an aggressive state.

Let the romantic notions of the broad Russian soul remain for the lovers of literature. This cannot be a leitmotif for politicians who are responsible for Europe’s security, for Europe’s future.

We must also acknowledge the enormous mistake and naivety of moving purposefully towards dependence on Russian energy sources. It would also be good to reflect on how such a mistake was even possible, despite our warnings. Certainly, the *Putinversteh*er in think-tanks and policy-making circles had a role, as did business interests. In future, Europe and the West, as a whole, must no longer make such strategic mistakes.

Therefore, we need to be realistic about Russia. Without false sentiments. The effective strategy is deterrence through credible defence capacities. In all areas.

If we do not want to betray the values on which the European Union is founded, if we do not want to lose our credibility in the eyes of future generations, then Europe must be on the right side of history. That means on the side of Ukraine.

This war must end with the victory of Ukraine. Russia started the war. Russia must end it now and withdraw from Ukraine!

The European Union and its Member States have provided significant support to Ukraine. I am proud that Latvia is currently among the top providers of aid to Ukraine in terms of GDP per capita. Not only the government, but also local authorities and a vast number of individuals send what help they can.

Certainly, what Ukraine needs most urgently now is military equipment to win the war. But it also needs justice, and it needs a future in Europe. And what Ukraine needs, we all need.

First, some words about law and justice. The Charter of the United Nations prohibits aggressive war. Without this prohibition, the world would fall back into belligerent anarchy. Therefore, the waging of a war of aggression against another sovereign state is the gravest possible crime in modern international law.

For the first time since the Second World War, we are experiencing a war of aggression in Europe. International law must therefore respond. There must be a special tribunal to try this crime of aggression. This is not only necessary for the sake of justice for Ukraine. It is necessary in order not to undermine the standard of international law that has been achieved since the Second World War, and to make it absolutely clear that waging a war of aggression is a crime and those responsible will be brought to justice.

None of us wants to live in a world where aggressive war is the norm. However, at the moment, neither the International Criminal Court nor any other international mechanism can exercise jurisdiction over this crime of aggressive war.

Therefore, it is necessary to create a special tribunal to try Russia's aggression against Ukraine. This has been done in the cases of Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Cambodia and others. Each case has been different. However, the international community has been creative and has found a way to set up such tribunals.

This is all the more necessary in the case of Russia because, as I said, we are talking about the most serious international crime. In any case, it is legally possible. All that is needed is political will.

Latvia was one of the first countries to encourage the creation of such a tribunal last year, shortly after the outbreak of the war. Now, this proposal has already received quite broad support.

I would particularly like to thank you, honourable Members, for your resolution of 19 January this year, where you expressed your firm support for the creation of such a tribunal by an overwhelming majority.

At the EU–Ukraine Summit on 3 February, the President of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, announced that the European Union would establish an International Centre for the Prosecution of the Crime of Aggression in Ukraine, which would begin to collect evidence.

This is already the first practical step towards the creation of such a tribunal. The further political and legal roadmap and details remain to be worked out.

In any case, Europe must be consistent and ensure that this crime of aggression can be tried in an international court.

The use of frozen Russian assets for the reconstruction of Ukraine must also be ensured. This applies not only to the assets of the oligarchs close to the regime, but in particular to the assets of the Central Bank of Russia. The US, Canada and the United Kingdom have already made some preliminary work here. Again, although complicated, it is legally possible. What is needed is political will. I am confident that the European Union will find this political will.

In conclusion, Madam President, last Thursday you rightly said to President Zelenskyy here in the European Parliament: "Ukraine is Europe, and your nation's future is in the European Union". Of course, we see how difficult this path will be for Ukraine. But we also see the determination and courage of Ukrainians.

For us, it is much more less demanding to be courageous. We have to make the right decision, and this is a historical decision that we might have only one chance to make. The Ukrainian people have decided. Now it is our turn.

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

6. Tribute

President. – Dear colleagues, before we start the vote it is my sad duty to inform you of the death yesterday of José María Gil-Robles y Gil-Delgado, who was President of the European Parliament from 1997 to 1999 and who was an eminent Member of this House for 15 years.

He served in many capacities during his parliamentary terms and was a rapporteur for a number of institutional reforms. He will be remembered for having ensured that Parliament was directly involved in the negotiations on the Treaty of Amsterdam, including the inclusion of the legal basis for the adoption of the Members' Statute, thanks to which Parliament became more independent.

It was during his presidency that Parliament contributed to the decisions relating to the entry into force of the euro and the start of accession negotiations for ten new Member States. He also led this House during the difficult months preceding the resignation of the European Commission, a crisis from which this institution emerged stronger.

This House mourns him and pays tributes to his legacy. I would ask you now, please, to observe a minute of silence in his memory.

(The House rose and observed a minute's silence)

*
* * *

We now proceed to the vote. I see there is a point of order.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-Président de la Commission, la presse s'est fait l'écho, ces derniers jours, d'une rencontre organisée entre le Service européen pour l'action extérieure et le gouverneur du Xinjiang, M. Tuniyaz. On a appris il y a quelques minutes que, à l'initiative du gouverneur du Xinjiang, ce rendez-vous était – seulement – reporté.

Comment un organisme des institutions européennes peut-il rencontrer le gouverneur du Xinjiang, qui est complice de crimes contre l'humanité, qui est acteur d'un génocide contre le peuple ouïghour?

Je vous demande donc, Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-Président, de faire en sorte que l'on respecte le peuple ouïghour et que l'on respecte le Parlement européen, qui a dit que les complices de crimes contre l'humanité et les génocidaires du peuple ouïghour ne pourront pas avoir de rendez-vous avec les institutions européennes.

7. Request for waiver of immunity

President. — I have received a request from the competent authorities in Greece for the parliamentary immunity of Mr Georgios Kyrtos to be waived.

This request is referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

8. Voting time

President. – The next item is the vote.

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

8.1. Transitional provisions for certain medical devices and in vitro diagnostic medical devices (C9-0003/2023) (vote)

8.2. Amending the decision of 10 March 2022 on setting up a special committee on foreign interference in all democratic processes in the European Union, including disinformation (ING2), and adjusting its title and responsibilities (B9-0119/2023) (vote)

8.3. Setting up a subcommittee on Public Health (B9-0120/2023) (vote)

- 8.4. Union's rights in enforcing and implementing the UK Withdrawal Agreement and the EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement (A9-0248/2022 - Seán Kelly, Andreas Schieder, Danuta Maria Hübner) (vote)**
- 8.5. Union Secure Connectivity Programme 2023-2027 (A9-0249/2022 - Christophe Grudler) (vote)**
- 8.6. EU/Guyana Voluntary Partnership Agreement: forest law enforcement, governance and trade in timber products to the EU (A9-0008/2023 - Karin Karlsbro) (vote)**
- 8.7. EU/Guyana Voluntary Partnership Agreement: forest law enforcement, governance and trade in timber products to the EU (Resolution) (A9-0018/2023 - Karin Karlsbro) (vote)**
- 8.8. REPowerEU chapters in recovery and resilience plans (A9-0260/2022 - Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Siegfried Mureşan, Dragoş Pîslaru) (vote)**
- 8.9. Electoral rights of mobile Union citizens in European Parliament elections (A9-0297/2022 - Damian Boeselager) (vote)**
- 8.10. Electoral rights of mobile Union citizens in municipal elections (A9-0005/2023 - Joachim Stanisław Brudziński) (vote)**
- 8.11. CO₂ emission standards for cars and vans (A9-0150/2022 - Jan Huitema) (vote)**

President. – That concludes the vote.

(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ

Wiceprzewodnicząca

9. Resumption of the sitting

(Posiedzenie zostało wznowione o godz. 12.25)

10. Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence: EU accession (debate)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest wstępne sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Łukasza Kohuta i Arbę Kokalari w imieniu Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych oraz Komisji Praw Kobiet i Równouprawnienia w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego decyzji Rady w sprawie zawarcia, w imieniu Unii Europejskiej, Konwencji Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej (2016/0062R(NLE)) (A9-0021/2023).

Łukasz Kohut, Sprawozdawca. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Panie Ministrze! Co trzecia kobieta w Unii doświadczyła przemocy seksualnej bądź fizycznej. Co trzecia. Sześćdziesiąt dwa miliony Europejsek!

Przemoc dzieje się w domach, w taksówkach i na ulicach. Przemoc dzieje się offline i online. Przemoc dzieje się, ale naszą rolą jest stworzyć prawo, które zapewni bezpieczeństwo. Konwencja Stambulska właśnie temu służy. Służy bezpieczeństwu. Konwencja to najefektywniejsze narzędzie do zwalczania i zapobiegania przemocy wobec kobiet. Nakłada ona konkretne zobowiązania na państwa w tym obszarze. Tworzy parasol ochronny.

W naszym raporcie, który napisaliśmy wspólnie ze szwedzką europosłanką Arbą Kokalari, wzywamy do przyjęcia Konwencji Stambulskiej przez całą Unię. Wysyłamy tym dokumentem mocny sygnał do Rady Europejskiej, do której teraz należy ostateczna decyzja o jej ratyfikacji. Rado, nie lękaj się! Chodzi o życie i zdrowie milionów Europejsek i Europejczyków.

Przyjęcie konwencji przez całą Unię zapewni lepszą ochronę dla uchodźczyń z Ukrainy. Uciekają one ze swojej ojczyzny przez Słowację czy Węgry, gdzie konwencja Stambulska nie obowiązuje. Rozciągnijmy nad nimi unijny parasol antyprzemocowy. To właśnie dzięki Konwencji Stambulskiej nie może obowiązywać kremlowski, putinowski standard, zgodnie z którym pierwsze pobicie w rodzinie nie jest uznawane za przemoc.

Sprawa jest niezwykle ważna również dla mieszanek Polski, ponieważ dajemy im gwarancję, bezpiecznik, że dopóki Polska jest w Unii Europejskiej prawo antyprzemocowe będzie obowiązywać.

W obronie Konwencji Stambulskiej odbyły się demonstracje w całej Polsce, nie tylko w Warszawie, ale i na katowickim rynku, w Sosnowcu czy też na alejach w Częstochowie. Głos tych kobiet musi tutaj, w Europie być mocniej słyszalny. Kobiety i wspierający ich mężczyźni protestowali tygodniami, gdy nielegalny Trybunał Konstytucyjny zakazał w praktyce mieszkańcom Polski aborcji. Należy przywrócić dostęp do bezpiecznej i legalnej aborcji. O to apelujemy w naszym raporcie. Wybór po stronie kobiet. O to apelujemy w naszym raporcie.

Kolejna ważna sprawa to dostęp do edukacji seksualnej. Coś oczywistego z perspektywy Skandynawii czy Francji, ale w wielu krajach bardzo często temat tabu. Zupełnie niepotrzebnie. W czasach, gdy pornografia jest wszechobecna, a seksistowskie reklamy krzyczą na ulicach, rzetelna i powszechna edukacja seksualna jest absolutnie konieczna i to w całej Unii. Systemowa rzetelna edukacja seksualna, a nie ploteczki od influencerów z Instagrama czy porno punkt widzenia. Wzywamy do tego w naszym raporcie!

Kolejny punkt to system wsparcia ofiar. Wzywamy do zapewnienia wsparcia finansowego, psychologicznego, do zapewnienia dostępu do mieszkań socjalnych dla osób doświadczonych przemocą. Zamiast „Willi plus” dla pisowców „Schronienie plus” dla ofiar przemocy domowej.

Pieniądze powinny trafiać do organizacji pozarządowych faktycznie pomagających ludziom, a nie do kolegów Premiera Orbana czy Ministra Czarńka. Efektywne i długoletnie wsparcie dla NGO zajmujących się prawami kobiet, w tym poprzez istniejący program „Obywatele, Prawa i Wartości”, który miałem zaszczyt negocjować. Dzięki temu pieniądze będą trafiać bezpośrednio, prosto z Brukseli. To był mój priorytet, który także został zawarty w naszym raporcie.

Konwencja Stambulska dla całej Unii to krok w dobrą stronę, krok w stronę bezpiecznej Europy. Krok w stronę bardziej zintegrowanej wspólnoty europejskiej i równouprawnienia. Putin i inni autokracji na pewno nie będą zadowoleni.

Arba Kokalari, rapporteur. – Madam President, I want to thank my co-rapporteur, Łukasz Kohut, and all our advisers and shadow rapporteurs for this hard work in this historic moment, which is very important to fight violence against women. I will make my speech in Swedish.

Varje dag utsätts kvinnor och flickor i Europa för misshandel, sexuella övergrepp, våldtäkter och mord. Så mycket som en tredjedel av alla kvinnor i Europa har utsatts för fysiskt eller sexuellt våld någon gång i sitt liv. Fler än 50 kvinnor mördas i sitt eget hem varje vecka och 85 % av alla vålds- och sexualbrott anmäls aldrig till polisen. Våldsutsatta kvinnor i Europa upplever att det är ingen idé att anmäla. De tas inte på allvar av myndigheter. Rättsväsendet utreder inte och utsatta offer får inte det stöd och skydd som de behöver.

Det är 2023 och fortfarande tas inte dessa grova brott på allvar. Hur länge ska detta pågå? Det är vår tids stora frihetsfråga att säkra rätten till ett liv utan våld. Att bekämpa våld mot kvinnor är det viktigaste vi kan göra för kvinnors rätt till grundläggande frihet och för jämställdheten i hela Europa.

Vårt viktigaste europeiska verktyg för att bekämpa våld mot kvinnor är just Istanbulkonventionen och som föredragande för Istanbulkonventionen har jag sett och jag vet att vi har rätt verktygslåda för att bekämpa våldet som drabbar miljontals kvinnor. Det enda som nu krävs är den politiska viljan.

Europaparlamentet kommer denna vecka att ta ett viktigt beslut. Det viktigaste vi kommer att ta på över fem år i kampen mot våld mot kvinnor. Europaparlamentet står bakom att stärka arbetet för att bekämpa våldet. EU-domstolen har redan gett grönt ljus och det svenska ordförandeskapet i EU har ambitionen att få till en verklig förändring och en ratificering också i rådet.

Därför riktar jag mig nu direkt till alla medlemsländer i EU. Det är dags att ni ratificerar Istanbulkonventionen i EU. Det är dags att ni tar kampen mot våld mot kvinnor på allvar. Det är dags att Europa går från ord till handling, för det handlar om de grundläggande rättigheterna i Europa, vilken union vi vill ha. Det här är en frihetsfråga, att säkra rätten till liv utan våld. Så låt oss göra det nu.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, thank you, honourable Members, for your continuous engagement and support to the common objective of eradicating violence against women and domestic violence.

This Parliament kept the EU's accession to the Council of Europe's Istanbul Convention high on the European political agenda for many years. Almost six years have passed since the EU signed this convention. Meanwhile, the situation for women has not improved. Violence against women and domestic violence remain a widespread pan-European phenomenon and a manifestation of discrimination against women.

In order to address the data collection requirements of the Istanbul Convention, Eurostat is currently running an EU-wide survey on violence against women. The data collection spans four years and results are published in groups of countries depending on reported data. The recently published results from the first seven Member States show high prevalence. The proportion of women who have experienced unwanted behaviour of a sexual nature at the workplace in these seven EU countries ranges from 11% to 41%. These figures show why we need to step up our efforts, and this includes through the EU's accession to the Istanbul Convention.

I appreciate that there is a strong support in this House and across Member States towards this goal. I welcome the Swedish Presidency's engagement and the prioritisation of the EU's accession to the Istanbul Convention, as well as the ambition to progress the negotiations towards an EU directive combating violence against women and domestic violence. Let us use the momentum and move towards the ratification of the Istanbul Convention at a Union level now.

The Commission stands ready to support. We have taken concrete actions beyond the legislative framework. The Commission learnt from years of implementation of the Istanbul Convention, as well as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women in several EU Member States that this complex phenomenon requires a comprehensive approach. In this regard, your call for enhanced support to civil society organisations working with the women victims of violence has been addressed.

Under the EUR 1.55 billion Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values funding programme, the Daphne strand is dedicated to preventing and combating – at all levels – all forms of gender-based violence against women and girls, including online violence, and to supporting and protecting all direct and indirect victims of such violence. The Daphne strand was substantially increased in comparison to its predecessor, the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme, with an expected EUR 200 million specifically dedicated to combating gender-based violence throughout the course of the programme.

Currently a call for proposals is published with an envelope of nearly EUR 25 million, which aims to select intermediaries to re-grant funding to civil society organisations active at local, regional and national level to prevent and combat gender-based violence. This re-granting mechanism will make EU funding on gender-based violence more accessible for grassroots civil society organisations.

By the end of the year, Eurostat will publish further data from its EU-wide survey on violence against women in 18 Member States. This means we will have up-to-date, comparable data across the 27 Member States, thanks to your persistent and longstanding call for it. We know that a substantial number of violent experiences are not reported or officially recorded. It is therefore key to conduct population surveys in addition to administrative data to get the full picture. A comprehensive set of data will enable the Commission and the co-legislators to design and implement evidence-based policy and legal measures targeted to the needs of those exposed to violence.

I thank this Assembly for its ambitious vision to achieve gender equality, eradicate all forms of discrimination against women, and with that, gender-based violence.

Frances Fitzgerald, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, gender-based violence damages our societies, our very social fabric. It ends women's lives, but it also damages our economies to the tune of 366 billion per year. And yet we have so much to do to eradicate it.

If it was any other issue, colleagues, we would be here jumping up and down with outrage at this wasteful cost to our economies and to the very lives of women. We have to be the first continent to eradicate this horrendous phenomenon. And the time is now.

And I thank the rapporteurs for the work and the Swedish Presidency, because I hope they ensure that we now ratify this global gold standard in combating violence against women: the Istanbul Convention. But let me also call on the Council here to actually support the directive on violence against women and domestic violence. No more excuses, no more legal arguments that say 'we cannot pass this directive'.

There is a golden opportunity now for the Parliament, the Commission and the Council to actually make sure we make a quantum leap forward by adopting a strong directive before the end of the year to deal with this exceptionally traumatic, disturbing issue, irrespective of the fact, for example, that rape is not a eurocrime. It should be, but it's not.

Surely public policy, public safety demands that at this very point we get unanimous support across the three institutions to have the strongest directive possible by the end of this year.

Pina Picierno, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie ai relatori intanto per l'ottimo lavoro svolto, grazie anche alla Commissaria Dalli, perché su questo tema sta lavorando tanto e bene, penso al lavoro che stiamo facendo anche sulla direttiva contro la violenza.

Però oggi siamo qui a discutere, ancora una volta, fatemi dire colleghe e colleghi, di qualcosa che non è avvenuto. Sono passati sei anni, lo ricordava la Commissaria, dalla firma dell'Unione europea alla Convenzione di Istanbul. E in sei anni, lo sappiamo perché ne abbiamo parlato tante volte, anche in quest'Aula, in sei anni sono state migliaia le donne vittime di violenza. Lo avete detto, l'hanno detto i relatori. Una donna su tre nel nostro territorio, nell'Unione europea, è vittima di violenza, ogni sei ore. Non smettiamo di ripeterlo, non smettiamo di ricordarlo, ogni sei ore nel nostro territorio una donna è vittima di violenza. E queste donne parlano di ciascuna di noi, perché tutte noi, in maniera diretta o indiretta, abbiamo avuto esperienza di quella violenza.

Eppure, in sei anni non si vede la fine di questa ratifica e ci si appiglia, fatemelo dire, ad ogni cavillo. E nel mentre i femminicidi, le molestie, le violenze continuano in maniera inesorabile. E allora, ancora una volta, per l'ennesima volta, siamo qui a chiedere ad alta voce, con questa risoluzione, che le cose avanzino, senza perder tempo, senza timori, perché non c'è più tempo, perché non c'è più tempo. Non ne abbiamo più. Le donne muoiono a causa non di una tragedia naturale, anche questo io non smetto di ripeterlo, non si tratta di un terremoto, non è un'alluvione, le donne muoiono perché vengono ammazzate e vengono ammazzate da criminali, da criminali che vanno fermati, che prevaricano le vittime. E allora noi possiamo utilizzare... Credo che non funzioni la traduzione.

(La Presidente interrompe l'oratrice a causa di problemi tecnici)

(Posiedzenie zostało na chwilę zawieszone z powodów technicznych.)

11. Resumption of the sitting

(Posiedzenie zostało wznowione o godz. 12.56)

12. Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence: EU accession (continuation of debate)

Przewodnicząca. – Kontynuujemy naszą debatę nad wstępnym sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Łukasza Kohuta i Arbę Kokalari w imieniu Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych oraz Komisji Praw Kobiet i Równouprawnienia w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego decyzji Rady w sprawie zawarcia, w imieniu Unii Europejskiej, Konwencji Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej (2016/0062R(NLE)) (A9-0021/2023).

Pina Picierno, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Spero che ora sia risolto il problema tecnico e quindi ricomincio daccapo il mio intervento.

Ci tenevo molto a ringraziare i relatori per l'ottimo lavoro svolto e la Commissaria Dalli per il lavoro importante che stiamo svolgendo insieme nella commissione FEMM. C'è un altro dossier importante che riguarda la violenza, la direttiva tanto attesa su cui stiamo lavorando molto.

Questo dibattito ha un po' il sapore di qualcosa che doveva accadere un po' di tempo fa e che non è stato realizzato perché – lo hanno ricordato i relatori e lo voglio dire anch'io – sono passati sei anni, quasi sei anni, dalla firma dell'Unione europea alla Convenzione di Istanbul e in sei anni sono state davvero migliaia, migliaia le donne vittime di violenza.

Lo avete ricordato, lo abbiamo ricordato tante volte in quest'Aula: una donna su tre nel nostro territorio dell'Unione è vittima di violenza ogni sei ore, ogni sei ore nel nostro territorio dell'Unione una donna è vittima di violenza. Così come abbiamo ricordato tantissime volte in quest'Aula che queste storie, che queste donne parlano di ciascuna di noi, perché ognuna di noi, direttamente o indirettamente, ha avuto esperienza di che cos'è la violenza e di come si riconosce la violenza.

Eppure in sei anni, nonostante tutto quello che è accaduto, noi non siamo ancora riusciti ad arrivare a questa ratifica e ci si appiglia ad ogni cavillo, ad ogni cavillo, legale e non. E nel mentre i femminicidi continuano, le molestie continuano e le violenze continuano sotto gli occhi di tutti.

E allora quello che voglio ancora una volta qui dire è che non si tratta di un'alluvione, non è una tragedia naturale, non è un terremoto, le donne non muoiono a causa di una tragedia naturale, muoiono a causa di crimini, perché sono ammazate da criminali e sono prevaricate da criminali.

E allora, rispetto a tutto questo, noi abbiamo il dovere di reagire. Quest'Aula, questo Parlamento c'è, ma ognuno deve fare la sua parte e la ratifica della Convenzione di Istanbul è uno degli strumenti di cui noi possiamo e dobbiamo disporre per eliminare questa forma così ignobile di prevaricazione.

Yana Toom, on behalf of the Renew Group. – Madam Chair, dear Colleagues. Commissioner. Today we again call on the Member States to ratify the Istanbul Convention.

It is shameful that six Member States have not ratified it: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovakia. Even more worrying are the declarations from governments to withdraw from the convention, like in Poland.

It is therefore important that the Council proceed with the EU accession so that we can be part of the convention as a whole. This process has been ongoing since 2015 and many of the children who suffered under domestic violence back then are now adult people. Do they still have faith in Europe? Not so sure.

I welcome the initiative of the Commission and the proposal for a directive on combating violence against women and domestic violence. But it is not enough. There is so much more which needs to be done.

We need preventive measures such as education, support services and protection measures, financial assistance, psychological support, helplines, shelters, access to social housing, support for children, assisting the victims to continue living safely in their home through easy access to restraining orders, especially support for children. And visitation rights for children and needs to be addressed, as do the civil issues such as consequences of forced marriage. The list goes on.

We need to start addressing these issues and accession to the Istanbul Convention is of utmost importance.

Sylwia Spurek, w imieniu grupy Verts/ALE. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jestem z Polski, kraju, który podpisał tę konwencję w 2012 roku, a ratyfikował w 2015. Wiele miesięcy konwencja leżała w rządowej zamrażarce, a nie była to kadencja rządów PiS. Dlaczego? Trudno to zrozumieć. W 2014 roku zaczęłam koordynować rządowy proces ratyfikacji konwencji przez Polskę z ramienia pełnomocniczki rządu ds. równego traktowania, za rządów pani premier Ewy Kopacz. Wtedy pojawiły się ataki na konwencję ze strony prawicy. Konwencja została nazwana ideologią gender. Dlaczego? Trudno to zrozumieć. Mamy XXI wiek. Kobiety są bite, gwałcone, atakowane. Doświadczają przemocy we własnym domu, w miejscu pracy, na ulicy, w internecie. Kiedy szukają sprawiedliwości, są przez organy ścigania i wymiaru sprawiedliwości obwiniane i zawstydzane, chociaż za stosowaną przemoc odpowiada wyłącznie sprawca.

Konwencja to konstytucja praw kobiet doświadczających przemocy. Daje jasne wytyczne, jak powinno wyglądać wsparcie dla ofiar, jak powinni być karani sprawcy, jak eliminować szkodliwe stereotypy. Konwencja trzyma stronę kobiet, stronę ofiar. Dlaczego zatem kilka państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej nie ratyfikowało jej? Dlaczego Polska, która ratyfikowała konwencję, chce ją teraz wypowiedzieć? Trudno to zrozumieć. Ale jeszcze trudniej zrozumieć, dlaczego Unia Europejska nie ratyfikowała do tej pory konwencji. Powinna być liderką w sprawie praw kobiet. Brak działań to akceptacja przemocy. Milczenie oznacza bycie po stronie sprawcy.

Mamy XXI wiek i najwyższy czas, żeby zakończyć erę pod tytułem trzymamy stronę sprawcy. Czas na erę trzymamy stronę ofiar, trzymamy stronę kobiet.

Jordan Bardella, au nom du groupe ID. – Madame la Présidente, la convention d'Istanbul est un texte important dans la lutte contre les violences faites aux femmes et nous en épousons bien évidemment la cause.

Tout au long de son histoire récente, l'Europe a été cette civilisation qui aura permis aux femmes de prendre toute leur place dans la société, en sanctuarisant leurs droits, en sacralisant leurs libertés, en tendant à offrir aux femmes et aux hommes les mêmes chances de s'élever en société.

Nous ne devons avoir de cesse de rappeler que nos valeurs, les valeurs de notre histoire, de l'Europe, qui mettent les hommes et les femmes sur un pied d'égalité, seront toujours éminemment supérieures à celles de cultures qui asservissent la femme, qui l'emprisonnent derrière un voile, qui la soumettent aux mutilations génitales, qui lui interdisent d'aller à l'école, d'avoir un emploi, de conduire ou de sortir seule dans la rue.

C'est là, entre autres, la position de l'ONG Yavuz Sultan Selim, confrérie islamo-nationaliste turque financée à hauteur de 31 000 euros par la Commission européenne et, donc, par l'impôt du contribuable.

Comment ces obscurantistes, pour qui la liberté des femmes est synonyme d'offense, coutumiers de propos violemment antisémites et homophobes, qui justifiaient hier les attentats du Bataclan, ont-ils pu recevoir un seul centime d'argent public? Comment pouvez-vous parler de protection des droits des femmes, mais en même temps soutenir avec l'argent du contribuable les ennemis de la femme et les ennemis de l'Europe? Comment pouvez-vous tolérer à ce point ceux qui veulent aujourd'hui notre destruction?

En réglant l'Europe sur l'heure islamique, vous préparez nos nations à un inévitable recul des droits des femmes et de leurs libertés. Pour faire échec à ce projet, vous nous trouverez toujours sur votre route.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señora presidenta, compañeros, les pregunto: ¿podemos permitir que se utilicen convenios de carácter ideológico para crear instrumentos legales internacionales que socaven las propias leyes nacionales?

La Unión Europea no debería posicionarse ni adherirse a un convenio internacional que insta a sus partes a incluir un enfoque determinado, en este caso el de género. Tampoco debería forzar a ratificar a los Estados miembros, porque en muchos casos contraviene sus propias constituciones.

El Convenio de Estambul pretende un alcance legislativo en el orden penal que conculca el derecho de acto frente al de autor. Es decir, está basado en prejuicios más que en hechos delictivos en sí.

La pretensión de luchar y prevenir la violencia contra las mujeres y la violencia doméstica no debería entrar en contradicción con el respeto al derecho a la igualdad y no discriminación.

Es una pena todo el tiempo perdido, recursos malgastados y esfuerzos baldíos en seguir documentos basados en teorías retorcidas contra natura que se centran en generar división social, desconfianza y enfrentamiento entre sexos.

Hagamos lo contrario. Fomentemos contextos donde el hombre y la mujer construyan una sociedad juntos, integrando sus vidas en paz y armonía. La familia tiene un papel esencial. Es el lugar racional donde compartimos y recibimos afecto, donde la educación en virtudes permite que las personas decidan hacer el bien.

Como dijo Dostoyevski, la belleza salvará al mundo. En un mundo sin belleza no puede resplandecer el amor que nos hace libres y nos permite vivir en paz. Legislamos, por favor, en esta dirección.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, en estos casi cuatro años de legislatura han sido innumerables las veces que hemos hablado de la importancia de que la Unión Europea ratifique de una vez por todas el Convenio de Estambul. Innumerables las veces que hemos condenado los bulos, las mentiras y las campañas de desinformación de una extrema derecha nostálgica del medievo. Hemos asistido atónitas a la salida de Turquía del Convenio y a las amenazas de Polonia, un Estado de Derecho fallido que se sienta en el Consejo. Hemos visto cómo se ha rechazado la calificación de la violencia de género como eurodelito, a pesar de la pelea y la posición del Parlamento y el modo en que eso ha lastrado la propuesta de Directiva en la que trabajamos ahora, porque nos ha dejado sin base legal para ser más ambiciosas y ha sacrificado así la vida de miles de mujeres en Europa.

Dicho esto, la buena noticia es que no se necesita unanimidad para ratificar el Convenio de Estambul. La mala es que los gobiernos progresistas no han luchado lo suficiente y ahora nos podemos encontrar con la paradoja de que sea la presidencia sueca quien protagonice su ratificación. *Purplewashing: marketing* para un Gobierno condicionado por la extrema derecha que está a cinco minutos de robarnos la cartera.

Porque no solo es importante que se ratifique el Convenio de Estambul, sino que ha de hacerse desde un enfoque feminista que aborde con seriedad las violencias machistas. Ya que llega tarde, al menos que se haga bien.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'adesione dell'Unione europea alla Convenzione di Istanbul rappresenta un passaggio necessario per realizzare efficaci misure giuridiche e politiche dirette alla prevenzione e alla lotta contro la violenza di genere.

Non possiamo rimanere ostaggio di quegli Stati membri che mettono in discussione la Convenzione, ritardandone la ratifica e l'attuazione o manifestando la volontà di recedere. Questi paesi dimostrano di non voler aiutare le donne a beneficiare nell'Unione dello stesso livello di protezione contro le varie forme di violenza e discriminazione. Compromettono gli sforzi comuni per migliorare l'assistenza delle vittime, per denunciare e perseguire gli autori dei reati, nonché per tutelare il godimento dei diritti e delle libertà fondamentali delle donne, la loro piena partecipazione alla vita sociale, politica e lavorativa.

Sulla base del parere della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea, il Consiglio proceda allora a concludere in tempi rapidi i lavori per la ratifica della Convenzione. Rendiamo possibili tutte le condizioni per consentire alle donne di vivere libere dalla violenza.

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η βία κατά των γυναικών αποτελεί παγκόσμιο φαινόμενο, το οποίο δεν γνωρίζει σύνορα και αποτελεί όνειδο για την ανθρωπότητα. Σε επίπεδο Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, μία στις τρεις γυναίκες έχει υποστεί σωματική ή σεξουαλική βία, ενώ κάθε χρόνο τα θύματα ανέρχονται στα 17 εκατομμύρια. Οι διαπιστώσεις και οι στατιστικές είναι χρήσιμες, όμως ως προς την πρόοδο υστερούμε. Έχουμε εξαντλήσει όλα τα διαθέσιμα ευρωπαϊκά εργαλεία, όπως οφείλουμε για την καταπολέμηση της έμφυλης βίας και τη στήριξη και προστασία των θυμάτων; Η διακρατική συνεργασία των κρατών μελών και η εξέλιξη της νομοθεσίας έχουν συμβάλει, όπως επίσης και το γεγονός ότι αυξάνονται οι καταγγελίες των πράξεων βίας από τα θύματα, επιτέλους. Όμως, για να αντιμετωπιστεί αποτελεσματικά το κορυφαίο αυτό πρόβλημα απαιτείται μηδενική ανοχή, αφενός, και, αφετέρου, η άμεση κύρωση της Σύμβασης της Κωνσταντινούπολης από όλα τα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, διότι ως το πλέον άρτιο νομοθέτημα, αποτελεί το κλειδί για τη διασφάλιση μιας ζωής χωρίς βία για όλες τις γυναίκες και τα κορίτσια σε όλη την Ευρώπη και πέραν από αυτήν.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Madam President, 50 women per week. 2600 women per year are murdered in domestic violence. While this horrific violence takes place in Europe, we are discussing whether or not we should ratify the most important regional legislation to combat violence against women and domestic violence: The Istanbul Convention. For a union that claims to stand up for all peoples fundamental rights. This is a shame. It shouldn't be whether or not we should ratify it. It should be how fast we can ratify it. Women and girls in the Union do not have time for our indecisiveness. The upcoming weeks will be crucial on the decision on which side of history the Council will be standing: the right or the wrong side.

Let's send a clear message to them from the Parliament. No one is free before all women and girls are also free in our Union. I also finally want to thank the rapporteurs for the great job and the Commissioner for the leadership in order to ensure that the Council ratifies the convention.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR), blue-card speech. – Dear colleague, any kind of violence against women is really something awful and completely unacceptable. But the Istanbul Convention is not a new document: 12 years ago the Council of Europe adopted this document. My very clear question for you is, if you can tell me: is there one single state which ratified the Istanbul Convention and that in this country the violence against women decreased? So, we are listening every few months here to your poetry about this whole document. But we are not here because of the poetry. We are here because of results. We need a result concerning this violence. So please, I asked a simple question ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Evin Incir (S&D), blue-card reply. – To combat gender-based violence is not any kind of poetry or anything. It is real. Women and girls are being deprived of their lives. Either we can send a clear message that we take the situation seriously or we can just play that we live on another planet and not do anything.

We know that, unfortunately, there are too many countries within the European Union that don't have sufficient legislation in place. When refusing to ratify the most important regional legislation, then you send a very clear message to women and girls all around the Union that their problems, that their lives don't matter. So if you really want to stand up for women and girls all across the Union, you should every day, during the whole year, be prepared to say 'ratify the Istanbul Convention now'.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew). – Señora presidenta, llevamos seis años esperando a que el Consejo ratifique el Convenio de Estambul para que pueda hacerlo la Unión Europea como parte del mismo. Seis años son, sin ninguna duda, demasiados años, pero cuando cincuenta mujeres son asesinadas cada semana en la Unión Europea, es una verdadera vergüenza. Es inaceptable.

Primero, el Consejo nos dijo que había problemas jurídicos, que se necesitaba la unanimidad, permitiendo que durante estos seis años los países más reaccionarios en materia de igualdad, como Polonia —que anunció hace tres años que retiraría su firma del Convenio—, Bulgaria, Chequia, Letonia, Lituania, Hungría o Eslovaquia, que aún no han ratificado el Convenio, marcaran la agenda política de todos: la del Parlamento y la de la Comisión.

Por eso, ahora, tras la sentencia del 6 de octubre de 2021, cuando sabemos, según el Tribunal de Justicia, que no hay ningún problema jurídico, que el Convenio se puede ratificar por parte del Consejo con mayoría cualificada, es el momento de hacerlo. Se lo debemos a todas las víctimas de violencia de la Unión Europea; a ellas, a sus familias, a los huérfanos que están sin madre, víctimas de esta violencia brutal contra las mujeres.

Marcel Kolaja (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, dear colleagues, today is Valentine's Day, the day of love. Too many women have been forced to learn that love is control, that love is jealousy, that love is to having to text your whereabouts, that love is an imminent threat.

Unfortunately, there are political parties and politicians – including in my country, Czechia – that on the one hand claim that they are against violence against women but on the other hand have been delaying, weakening and stopping measures that should give women the protection they need.

As a matter of fact, every third woman in Czechia and in the EU experiences physical or sexual violence, often by their partners.

As a matter of fact, the Istanbul Convention is a complex list of solutions to eradicate violence, to enhance prevention, to strengthen law enforcement. It is a tool to upgrade the safety net for victims of violence, meaning medical centres, psychological support, shelters for victims and so on.

We need to act. I call on the Council and the Member States who have not done so yet to ratify the Convention , immediately. Act for a future in which violence against women has no place in our society. Thank you, and I hope that someone can pass on the message to the Council that is not present.

Silvia Sardone (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parlare di violenza sulle donne è sempre importantissimo, ma oggi vorrei portare all'attenzione dell'Aula il caso di Saman Abbas.

Saman Abbas era una ragazza di 18 anni, di origine pakistana, uccisa in Italia dalla sua famiglia. La motivazione? Voleva essere una donna libera. Voleva scegliere l'uomo da amare e non essere costretta a un matrimonio combinato. Voleva vivere vestendosi come meglio credeva, magari anche senza portare il velo islamico. È stata ammazzata dalla sua famiglia. Eppure, l'estradizione del padre dal Pakistan viene continuamente rinviata, con numerose udienze che saltano costantemente. È una vergogna.

Vogliamo giustizia per Saman. Il Pakistan deve consegnare questo assassino alla giustizia e l'Europa deve intervenire, e non solo per il caso della povera Saman, deve intervenire per tutte quelle donne di fede islamica che scelgono la libertà, che vogliono vivere senza magari il velo islamico. Tra l'altro, il velo che troppo spesso la Commissione europea porta avanti anche nelle pubblicizzazioni e nelle locandine delle attività della Commissione stessa. Quindi chiedo all'Europa di intervenire urgentemente in memoria di Saman e per i diritti delle donne.

Assita Kanko (ECR). – Voorzitter, Saman Abbas was een tiener in Italië. Haar lichaam werd eind vorig jaar gevonden in een toestand waardoor men haar enkel aan de hand van haar gebit kon identificeren, omdat zij vrij wou zijn en wilde liefhebben wie ze wou. Dit gebeurde hier, op Europese bodem, binnen haar eigen familie. Dit is een vorm van extreem geweld waar vrouwen vandaag de dag nog mee te maken krijgen.

Maar ook op andere niveaus hebben vrouwen te lijden. Niet enkel door fysiek geweld, maar ook verbaal, economisch of psychologisch. Daar moet een einde aan komen en dit Parlement moet alles doen wat binnen zijn bevoegdheden valt om daaraan bij te dragen.

Daarom is dit interimverslag een gemiste kans, want het is niet constructief. Er wordt langs alle kanten met modder gegooid. We zijn met 27 en we hebben allemaal onze eigen gedachten, onze eigen gevoeligheden. Ik doe een oproep om die te overstijgen en ons te focussen op de kern van de zaak: alle vrouwen beschermen tegen alle vormen van geweld. Alleen zo krijgen we iedereen op één lijn. Vrouwen die lijden, hebben geen boodschap aan een rondje moddergooien en vingerwijzen. Zij willen een oplossing en dit verslag gaat hiertoe kunnen bijdragen.

Έλενα Κουντουρά (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η πρόοδος στον αγώνα ενάντια στη βία κατά των γυναικών είναι ανεπαρκής, ενώ η έμφυλη βία παραμένει μια παγκόσμια πληγή με εκρηκτικές διαστάσεις που συχνά αποσιωπάται και το πραγματικό της μέγεθος δεν αποτυπώνεται. Θρηνούμε θύματα από εγκλήματα που θα μπορούσαν να είχαν έγκαιρα αποτραπεί και αυτό συνιστά αποτυχία όλων μας. Τα περιστατικά κακοποίησης πληθαίνουν και η θλιβερή λίστα των γυναικοκτονιών διαρκώς μεγαλώνει. Η Σύμβαση της Κωνσταντινούπολης αποτελεί το πιο ουσιαστικό, ισχυρό και ολοκληρωμένο εργαλείο για την πρόληψη της καταπολέμησης της έμφυλης βίας κατά των γυναικών και της ενδοοικογενειακής βίας. Η κύρωση της έχει καθυστερήσει δραματικά. Κυρία Επίτροπε, χρειάζεται πολιτική βούληση από το Συμβούλιο, διότι το Δικαστήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης γνωμοδότησε ότι, ακόμα και χωρίς την επικύρωσή της από όλα τα κράτη μέλη, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μπορεί να κυρώσει τη Σύμβαση της Κωνσταντινούπολης και οφείλει να το κάνει άμεσα. Έτσι, όλα τα κράτη μέλη θα οφείλουν να εφαρμόζουν πλήρως το σύνολο των μέτρων που απορρέουν από τη Σύμβαση στις εθνικές νομοθεσίες αλλά και στις πολιτικές τους.

Milan Uhrík (NI). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, Národná rada Slovenskej republiky odmietla pristúpenie k Istanbulskému dohovoru obsahujúcemu gender ideológiu 25. februára 2020.

Teraz chcete, aby Európska únia pristúpila k tomuto dohovoru ako celok, a že vlastne takéto uznesenie národných parlamentov, slovenskej vlády, neznamená nič, že to tu nikoho nezaujíma. Viete, každý normálny človek samozrejme je proti násiliu na ženách, ale samozrejme každý normálny človek takisto odmieta prepašovanie gender ideológie, aká je v tomto dokumente.

My sme vstupovali do Európskej únie na to, aby sme mohli slobodne obchodovať a slobodne cestovať, nie na to, aby nám Brusel alebo Štrasburg určoval, že neexistuje mama alebo otec, ale existuje rodič jedna alebo dva a že to isté dieťa môžu porodiť oficiálne dve ženy alebo dokonca dvaja chlapi. Veď ja sa tu niekedy cítim ako v blázinci.

Istanbulský dohovor určite má svoje pozitíva, ale nemôže byť jediným svätým grálom a dokumentom, ktorý hovorí o boji proti násiliu na ženách. To sa dá dosiahnuť aj inými, normálnejšími spôsobmi.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señora presidenta, la lucha contra la violencia que se ejerce sobre las mujeres debe tener una respuesta nacional y europea. Debemos trabajar juntos para acabar con el maltrato y la desigualdad.

En España hemos ratificado el Convenio de Estambul. Siendo yo ministra, logramos un pacto de Estado histórico contra la violencia de género y ahora reclamamos que el Consejo lo ratifique de forma inmediata. Porque ese es el camino, porque tenemos que trabajar y pensar en las mujeres víctimas, y también en sus hijos.

Pero déjenme decirles una cosa: es inadmisibile que hoy se den pasos atrás en la protección de las mujeres. Es lo que está ocurriendo en España por culpa de un gobierno de izquierdas que ha aprobado una ley que ya ha provocado que se rebaje la pena a quinientos agresores sexuales y que se excarcele a más de cuarenta. Y nadie asume su responsabilidad política. Para agitar pancartas y gritar a los cuatro vientos que son feministas, les sobran fuerzas. Pero, para pedir disculpas y corregir los errores al momento, ni están, ni se les espera. Necesitamos rigor, seriedad y menos propaganda cuando se trata de defender a las mujeres y a sus hijos.

Carina Ohlsson (S&D). – Fru talman! Jag har tagit del av otaliga vittnesmål om mäns våld mot kvinnor, mammor som brutalt mördas av sina barns pappa och barnen som då blir föräldralösa.

Jonathan uttryckte det att han ville ha en trappa upp till himlen så han skulle kunna träffa sin mamma igen. Kvinnor och barn som lever gömda, inte kan leva ett fritt liv på grund av psykiskt och ekonomiskt våld. Ett brott mot mänskliga rättigheter. Ett av våra mest utbredda samhällsproblem. Och här är Istanbulkonventionen ett mycket viktigt instrument och det borde vara självklart att EU och alla medlemsstater ratificerar denna konvention.

Jag har mycket höga förväntningar på att det svenska ordförandeskapet nu sätter press på att alla ska ratificera. Mäns våld mot kvinnor måste få ett omedelbart stopp och då krävs politisk vilja, handlingskraft och att kvinnors mänskliga rättigheter prioriteras.

Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová (Renew). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, lietame na Mesiac a z Marsu si o chvíľu urobíme dovolenkovú destináciu. Za študentov dnes píše diplomovú prácu umelá inteligencia. A predsa naďalej narastá počet prípadov násilia páchaného na ženách. A predsa máme ešte stále krajiny, ktoré sa boja definície rodu a rodovo podmieneného násilia. Dokonca tu máme europoslancov zo Slovenska, ktorí strašia gender ideológiou.

V krajinách, ktoré odmietli Istanbulský dohovor, zastal čas. Tam ani len nezbierajú štatistiky a dáta o násilí páchanom na ženách. Proti takémuto spiatočníctvu sa Európska únia musí postaviť, Rada musí prijať rozhodnutie o rodovo podmienenom násilí ako o trestnom čine podľa článku 83 a spoločne musíme skoncovať s násilím na ženách.

Kim Van Sparrentak (Verts/ALE). – Voorzitter, een op de drie vrouwen in de Europese Unie is slachtoffer van gendergerelateerd geweld. In Nederland wordt elke acht dagen een vrouw vermoord, simpelweg omdat ze een vrouw is. Ondertussen wacht de Europese Raad al zes lange jaren om het Verdrag van Istanbul te ratificeren. Ook voor de richtlijn tegen gendergerelateerd geweld lijkt de Raad nog niet klaar te zijn.

Alle excuses vanuit onze regeringen om dit onderwerp niet door te zetten geven ons vrouwen maar één boodschap. Of we veilig thuis zijn? Niet belangrijk voor jullie. Of we veilig over straat kunnen zonder sleutels tussen onze knokkels? Het is niet belangrijk voor jullie. Of we elkaar moeten waarschuwen voor die ene collega op de werkvloer? Het is niet belangrijk voor jullie. En alle slachtoffers van femicide? Ook daar sluiten jullie de ogen voor.

Acties zijn sterker dan woorden. Ratificeer de het Verdrag van Istanbul en werk aan een sterke richtlijn tegen gendergerelateerd geweld.

(De spreker aanvaardt een "blauwe kaart"-reactie)

Ladislav Ilčič (ECR), blue-card speech. – Madam President, the Netherlands, as you mentioned, was one of the first countries which ratified the Istanbul Convention in 2014, if I'm not mistaken. So it's nine years that the Istanbul Convention is ratified and implemented in the Netherlands. And now you are speaking about the increase of violence. So can you tell me if you care about effectiveness, if you care about the results or just the papers? Now you want that Poland, Hungary and other countries ratify the same convention, which didn't decrease the violence in your country, but increased it. Where is the logic in it? Please, tell me.

Kim Van Sparrentak (Verts/ALE), blue-card reply. – First of all, I never said there was an increase in violence, but there was violence all over the place. What the fact that the Istanbul Convention is not ratified by these other Member States says is that they don't care.

And also, I have said that we need also on top of that, a directive against violence against women. We need to work on every level that we can to ensure that women can be safe in our streets, at home and at work.

As long as governments refuse to say even that they want to work on that, that they want to ratify something as crucial for us women as the Istanbul Convention, we cannot say that we are doing everything we can to reduce violence.

Guido Reil (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen! Wir reden heute über den Beitritt der EU zur Istanbul-Konvention; dabei geht es um den Schutz von Frauen gegen Gewalt. Das ist ein wichtiges Thema, denn es wird immer schlimmer und schlimmer: Gewalt, Mord, Vergewaltigung, Gruppenvergewaltigungen, Genitalverstümmelung – alles wird ständig schlimmer. Und wir reden darüber. Wir reden über die Opfer – vollkommen zu Recht. Aber wir müssen endlich auch über die Täter reden. Wer sind die Männer, die das tun? Und vor allen Dingen – wo kommen die her?

Und nun wollen einige Länder nicht mitmachen. Und da fragt man sich, warum? Denn jeder will doch Frauen schützen. Polen, Ungarn, Slowenien, Bulgarien, Litauen, Lettland wollen nicht mitmachen, weil sie vollkommen zu Recht glauben, es geht hier eigentlich nicht wirklich um den Schutz der Frauen, sondern es geht hier wieder mal um Genderideologien.

Und diese Ideologie ist grundsätzlich abzulehnen, denn das Geschlecht nicht biologisch zu definieren, sondern ideologisch – wie der Mensch sich fühlt oder was er sich gerne wünscht –, da halte ich gar nichts von. Frühsexualisierung – auch da halten viele Länder nichts von, und ich auch nicht. Und auch die Ehe für alle – davon halten viele Länder nichts. Es steht in der Verfassung auch anders, im deutschen Grundgesetz übrigens auch, aber das interessiert niemand. Und in der Bibel ist das auch ganz fest definiert, aber auch das interessiert so niemanden hier wirklich mehr in Europa.

Also, wer Frauen schützen will, der muss die Massenmigration beenden, und er muss Straftäter endlich abschieben. Und ich halte es nicht mit Ideologie, ich halte es mit Biologie, und ich stehe zur Bibel.

Vincenzo Sofo (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, trovo francamente inammissibile il tentativo costante da parte di quest'Aula di utilizzare qualsiasi tema possibile e immaginabile per imporre, con il sotterfugio, agli europei l'agenda LGBT, infiltrandola di nascosto tra le righe di ogni documento che ci capita sottomano.

L'obiettivo oggi è strumentalizzare un tema serio e sacrosanto come la lotta alla violenza sulle donne per trasformare una convenzione importante come quella di Istanbul in un DDL Zan mascherato, storpiandone la natura per affermare l'ideologia gender come principio inderogabile, imporne la diffusione nelle scuole, censurare ogni opinione dissidente, marchiare con l'accusa di omofobia le forze politiche conservatrici, scavalcare le legittime sovranità nazionali per obbligare gli Stati ad allinearsi a quei dictat.

Sappiamo bene però quali siano le conseguenze di tutto ciò: distruggere le fondamenta della nostra identità, distogliendo l'attenzione da ciò di cui avremmo davvero bisogno, vale a dire porre fine alle guerre tra sessi e valorizzare la complementarità tra l'uomo e la donna.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a un intervento «cartellino blu»)

Evin Incir (S&D), blue-card speech. – I'm not going to say I'm shocked because I'm not shocked about what is coming from the far right, but I'm getting a bit tired of the constant demonisation of migrants and people of certain colours. Well, when you are standing up there, the only thing that you are doing is trying to undermine constantly the work against gender-based violence, against the violence that is occurring against women and girls. So I don't really understand, on the one hand, the hypocrisy of demonising certain people, who don't have anything to do with this, and on the other hand, how you refuse to take responsibility for the crimes that are taking place against women and girls all over the European Union. What is your purpose here? What do you want with all of this demonisation?

Vincenzo Sofo (ECR), risposta «cartellino blu». – Credo che non ci sia tanto da rispondere. Avete permesso a una collega di fare un ulteriore comizio senza alcuna reale domanda da farmi, soprattutto andando totalmente fuori tema. Ha parlato persino di migranti, soggetto che non è stato tema e che non è stato assolutamente toccato, quindi non lo so, insomma, la ringraziate per aver fatto questo ennesimo comizio, ma non ho nulla da rispondere sinceramente.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Madam President, dear colleagues, the need to take action against any kind of violence against women is beyond dispute. There's no debate about that.

Today's debate, and the debate about the Istanbul Convention, however, is really not about this. It's about instrumentalising the fight against violence to push a radically left-wing political agenda. It's about imposing the concept of gender on Member States and forcing, for instance, the absurd idea that it is a human choice to be a man or a woman instead of a biological fact.

The reality is that the Istanbul Convention, as an international agreement, has spectacularly failed. It has failed because more than half a dozen Member States rejected certification exactly because of its radical ideological content.

And still the European Parliament and others fail to accept the sovereign decision of these Member States. And, unbelievably, they now want to force the convention on them by pushing the EU's accession above their heads. That is unacceptable. The European Union cannot make decisions against the explicit will of several of its own Member States.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! To wstyd, że tak wiele środowisk przymyka oczy na przemoc wobec kobiet. To wstyd, że tak wiele krajów członkowskich sobie z nią nie radzi, a policja, prokuratura i sądy często ignorują problem, wykazując się nie tylko brakiem empatii, ale i nieznajomością przepisów, które mają chronić kobiety przed oprawcami. I może gdy uświadomimy sobie, że sprawcami większości aktów przemocy domowej nie są mężczyźni z marginesu, ale ci cieszący się nienaganną opinią swojego środowiska, często politycy, prezesi, lekarze, sędziowie, policjanci, to może wtedy zrozumiemy, dlaczego jesteśmy w tym miejscu, dlaczego tak trudno walczyć z przemocą i dlaczego tak wielu jest przeciwko ratyfikacji konwencji.

Z tego miejsca chciałabym podziękować sprawozdawcom, ale przede wszystkim organizacjom pozarządowym w Polsce, w moim kraju, a także w Europie, które uświadamiają, edukują i walczą z przemocą. I mam nadzieję, że Parlament Europejski, że my wszyscy, którzy zasiadamy w tej izbie, damy silny sygnał: zero tolerancji dla sprawców przemocy.

Radka Maxová (S&D). – Paní předsedající, paní komisařko, polovina naší společnosti nemůže žít beze strachu. Jsou to ženy a mohou být napadeny. V Evropské unii každý rok kolem šesti set žen přijde o život rukou svého partnera či příbuzného. Každá třetí žena zažila sexuální násilí. Jedna z dvaceti byla znásilněna. Téměř polovina žen zažila psychické násilí ze strany svých partnerů. A tato čísla se nesnižují. Náklady na řešení genderově podmíněného násilí představují výdaje ve výši 366 miliard eur ročně. A téměř 80 procent z této částky jsou výdaje na pomoc ženám.

Istanbulská úmluva poskytuje komplexní rámec pro prevenci, ochranu obětí a stíhání pachatelů. Uznává genderově podmíněné násilí jako porušení lidských práv, jako systémový problém, který vyžaduje koordinovanou reakci všech částí společnosti.

Když vidíme týrání psa či jiného zvířete, řešíme to správně, není to pro nás přijatelné. Když jsme svědky násilí na člověku, často děláme, že ho nevidíme, že se nás to netýká, že je to pouze soukromá záležitost. Z osobní zkušenosti mohu říct, že násilí opravdu není soukromá záležitost. Je to naše společná zodpovědnost a náš společný zájem. Ratifikujme Istanbulskou úmluvu v Evropské unii.

Abir Al-Sahlani (Renew). – Fru talman! Kära kollegor och fru kommissionär! Idag är kärlekens dag. Då vi ska fira kärleken. Men en av tre kvinnor i EU fruktar för sitt liv. De är rädda för att bli våldtagna. De är rädda för att bli slagna. De är rädda för att bli kontrollerade av en man i sin närhet, kanske i sitt hem.

Samtidigt har vi hört här en hel del om hur det här är oviktigt, om hur det här inte spelar någon roll, när det är ett av våra viktigaste verktyg som först belyser de våldsnära relationerna som finns. Det försöker förhindra och kriminalisera, det försöker också skydda. Så det finns en rad verktyg. Jag skulle vilja veta vad tokhögern har för idéer för att skydda kvinnor?

Nej, dessa sex länder som inte har ratificerat Istanbulkonventionen än, de måste göra det nu. Så det här är en stark uppmaning till er: Bulgarien, Tjeckien, Ungern, Lettland – vars president var här idag och talade om EU:s grundläggande värderingar, men har misslyckats med att få sitt land att ratificera Istanbulkonventionen – Litauen och Slovakien. Ratificera konventionen nu.

Przewodnicząca. – Informuję Pana Posła, że ze względu na bardzo duże opóźnienie nie dopuszczamy już do końca tej debaty niebieskich kart.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! To musi zabrzmieć bardzo głośno i wyraźnie. Nie ma zgody na przemoc wobec kobiet. Nic jej nie uzasadnia i nie ma żadnego dla niej usprawiedliwienia. Taka przemoc nie ma tylko charakteru fizycznego, to także dzisiaj przemoc o naturze psychologicznej. Oparta na wyszydzaniu, wyśmiewaniu np. za wygląd, poglądy czy każdą słabość, która jest zwykłą naszą ludzką, naturalną cechą.

Europejska lewica wpadła we własne ideologiczne pułapki. Dlaczego? Dlatego, że przyjrzyjmy się statystykom. Czy w państwach rządzących przez lewicę, stało się coś, co spowodowałoby, że kwestia ochrony ofiar przemocy jest wyższa? Nie.

Tymczasem w kraju, który tak bardzo atakujecie w Polsce, od 2020 r. wprowadziliśmy rewolucyjne narzędzia do walki z przemocą domową. Dziś Polska według niezależnych rankingów znajduje się w gronie państw o najwyższym standardzie ochrony kobiet, a przemocowcy w ciągu jednej godziny są usuwani z domu. Jest przygotowywana nowelizacja, która zagwarantuje kompletny pakiet ochrony kobiet, ofiar nękania w miejscach publicznych i w sieci. Uwolniliśmy od przemocy od czasów działania tych przepisów około dziesięciu tysięcy rodzin.

Tak działa konserwatywny rząd.

Miroslav Radačovský (NI). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, chcem sa úprimne a bez emócií opýtať, prečo niekto chce nanútiť Slovenskej republike Istanbulský dohovor? Veď predsa jurisdikcia Slovenskej republiky upravuje dôslednejšie a precíznejšie ochranu práv žien pred domácim násilím. A ja viem, o čom hovorím.

Ale je tu aj iný problém, okrem fyzického násillia existuje aj psychické násillie. Tak sa pýtam: je žena, dôchodkyňa, Slovenka, občiankou Európskej únie? No je. Patrí Slovensko do Európskej únie? No patrí. Európska únia má voľné hranice Schengenom? No má. Ako je možné, že naše slovenské ženy, dôchodkyne, ktoré ťažko vyžijú z príjmu, musia chodiť robiť slúžky, opatrovať do Nemecka, opatrovať do Rakúska, trápiť sa. Ale ja som ešte nevidel, aby na Slovensku bola Švédka, Francúzka, Talianka, aby opatrovala našich dôchodcov, aby sa o nich teda starala. Toto je problém na Slovensku. Toto je problém pre ženy na Slovensku. Toto je diskriminácia. Príďte, západoeurópske dámy, na Slovensko, na Oravu, na Gemer, na Spiš, a uvidíte, ako sa tam žije ženám. Príďte opatrovať, príďte do našich hotelov a podobne. Alebo vy ste *Übermensch*, vy nemôžete? A tu chcete nanútiť Slovensku nejaký Istanbulský... (*predsedajúca prerušila rečníka*)... my si na Slovensku ženy vážime. My to nepotrebujeme... (*predsedajúca prerušila rečníka*)... my nemáme stratenú ideológiu.

Isabella Adinolfi (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, alcuni di noi chiedono a gran voce da anni di ratificare la Convenzione di Istanbul. Dopo il via libera della Corte di giustizia, non esistono più scuse per non procedere all'immediata ratifica da parte del Consiglio.

Le critiche mosse a questa Convenzione sono ridicole, come lo è la richiesta di esame della costituzionalità da parte del Primo ministro polacco. La Convenzione stabilisce semplicemente gli standard minimi per i governi nella prevenzione, protezione e condanna della violenza contro le donne e della violenza domestica. Tutte cose che ritengo più che normali.

La mancata ratifica da parte di alcuni paesi è uno schiaffo a tutte le donne maltrattate, a questa Unione europea e ai valori che rappresentiamo. Non intervenire significa essere complici. La violenza di genere è una piaga che, se non curata, continuerà a incancrenire le nostre società.

Come Unione europea oggi abbiamo due scelte: quella di ratificare la Convenzione di Istanbul e avere tutti gli strumenti per combattere la violenza contro le donne, salvando migliaia di vite, oppure quella di girarci dall'altra parte, nascondendoci dietro un po' di burocrazia. Io non posso girarmi.

Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, a violência contra as mulheres é uma peste persistente para a qual ainda não temos vacina.

Estima-se que, na União Europeia, uma em cada três mulheres tenha sido vítima de alguma forma de violência física ou sexual desde os 15 anos de idade, o que afeta não apenas a sua saúde mental e física, mas também a saúde dos que lhe são próximos, como os seus filhos.

A adesão da União Europeia à Convenção de Istambul proporcionaria uma abordagem sistemática e à escala da União Europeia para combater esta violência. Pode não resolver tudo, mas será mais um passo para resolver um problema do qual não podemos desistir.

Contribuiria, designadamente, para assegurar que os incidentes de violência doméstica fossem tidos em conta na determinação dos direitos de guarda e de visita das crianças.

A Convenção de Istambul tem mais de dez anos e as mulheres húngaras, checas, búlgaras, eslovacas, lituanas e letãs – os países que ainda não ratificaram – não deviam esperar mais.

Sylvie Brunet (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, vous souvenez-vous de cette phrase célèbre de Hillary Clinton, aux Nations unies: «Les droits des femmes sont des droits de l'homme»?

Eh bien, six États membres n'ont toujours pas ratifié la convention d'Istanbul, dont la Lettonie, dont nous accueillons le président tout à l'heure, qui a rappelé l'importance de l'état de droit. Or, les droits des femmes font partie de l'état de droit.

Alors, à l'heure où nous travaillons activement sur la directive pour lutter contre les violences faites aux femmes, notamment dans le monde du travail – Madame la Commissaire, vous l'avez rappelé –, nous sommes passés de 11 à 31 % de violences au travail.

À l'heure où nous réaffirmons l'importance des droits sexuels et reproductifs, auxquels nous sommes très attachés, particulièrement dans le groupe Renew Europe, nous comptons sur la présidence suédoise pour avoir le courage de proposer enfin la ratification par l'Union européenne de la convention d'Istanbul.

Dorien Rookmaker (ECR). – Voorzitter, elke acht dagen wordt er in Nederland een vrouw of meisje vermoord door haar partner of ex-partner. Elke acht dagen. Enige jaren geleden was dit nog elke tien dagen. Het probleem is dus verergerd. Maar daar gaat dit debat niet over. Dit debat gaat over de aansluiting van de EU bij het Verdrag van Istanbul, niet over de verbetering van de bescherming van vrouwen in de EU. En daar zou het wel over moeten gaan.

Het verdrag lijkt een instrument om aandacht te vragen voor de onveiligheid van vrouwen. Dat is goed, want het is een serieus probleem. Maar is het instrument ook de oplossing ervan? Dat waag ik te betwijfelen. De cijfers laten zien dat onveiligheid van vrouwen toeneemt, en dat moeten we aanpakken. Kijken in de richting waar we heen willen: nul vrouwenmoorden in de EU. Nul! Iedereen in de EU draagt hiervoor een verantwoordelijkheid, in het bijzonder de regeringsleiders van de lidstaten. Ik roep hen op actief beleid te maken om de veiligheid van vrouwen te kunnen garanderen.

Ik hoop uit de grond van mijn hart – en eigenlijk eis ik het gewoon – dat we over een aantal jaren kunnen vaststellen dat vrouwen in de EU veilig zijn. Want daar gaat het om.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, dnes máme sviatok zaľúbených, no pre množstvo žien nie je partnerský vzťah romantikou, ale je to zápas o život či fyzické a psychické zdravie.

Len v posledných mesiacoch prišli na Slovensku o život v dôsledku partnerského vzťahu a násilia ženy v Krompachoch, v Plevníku, Drienove, v Zákamennom, vo Veľkom Bieli. 66-ročný muž v Galante utopil svoju o tri roky mladšiu manželku len deň po tom, ako sa mu skončila trojročná podmienka za jej týranie.

Dámy a páni, násilie páchané na ženách sa týka každého z nás, rovnako žien, ako aj mužov. Som rád, že na Slovensku systematicky riešime financovanie bezpečných ženských domov, budujeme intervenčné centrá, ktoré spolupracujú s políciou a ponúkajú komplexnú pomoc. Musíme však robiť viac.

Istanbulský dohovor potrebujeme, pretože pôsobí preventívne proti predsudkom, aby boli ženy menej zraniteľné. Odmietnutie ratifikácie súvisí so strašením a dezinformačnými kampaňami. Všade tam, kde dohovor platí, sú ženy lepšie chránené. Aj na Slovensku si ženy zaslúžia lepšiu ochranu. Aj vďaka Európskemu dohovoru, ktorý násiliu na ženách predchádza.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Madam President, yesterday Ordo Iuris contacted me to speak in this debate, so speak I shall. Dear Ordo Iuris, you and the far right here called this convention defective. The only defective thing in all of this is your view on women, the misogyny and sexism with which you drive your policies. The idea that women's sexual and reproductive health and rights should be driven by your disrespectful agenda is what I call defective, as is the way you speak on same sex couples and their children. On Valentine's Day, Ordo Iuris and those on the right of this chamber chose to love their women less because they let misogyny drive their principles. Such love is defective. This goes beyond the principles we are discussing the protection and safety of women and girls, our mothers, our daughters, autonomous human beings. This conversation should be the essence of what our union is able to do for all women. Hence, the only defective thing in all the six-year saga is the ideology which encourages anything but this convention.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Doamna președintă, în ultimii opt ani, 426 de femei au fost ucise în România de parteneri sau membri ai familiei. În 2022, aproape 40 000 de femei au fost victimele violenței domestice. Barometrul violenței de gen 2022, care a fost publicat de Centrul FILIA, ne arată că prejudecățile care încurajează violența împotriva femeilor persistă.

19 % dintre români consideră deloc sau puțin grav faptul că o femeie este violată după ce a acceptat să meargă acasă la un bărbat. 12 % cred că violul este justificat, dacă o femeie este îmbrăcată provocator. Și astăzi avem în România politicieni, parlamentari care-și lovesc soțiile, își bat soțiile fără să existe consecințe politice majore.

Avem instrumente pentru a schimba lucrurile, ne trebuie curaj. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să ratifice Convenția de la Istanbul, iar statele membre trebuie să fie decise și coerente în aplicarea ei. Violența bazată pe gen împiedică exercitarea drepturilor fundamentale. Democrație, fără asigurarea drepturilor tuturor persoanelor, indiferent de gen, nu se numește democrație.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, beste collega's, slavernij klinkt als iets uit een ver verleden, maar het is spring-levend. Ik heb het over moderne slavernij die prostitutie heet. Dat landen dit als een normaal beroep zijn gaan beschouwen, vind ik onbegrijpelijk.

Herbezinning is hier echt broodnodig, maar ook meer inspanningen van de EU om mensenhandel tegen te gaan. Strafbbaarstelling door de lidstaten van prostitutiebezoek conform het Zweedse model zou ook zeker kunnen helpen.

Helaas roeren de rapporteurs dit thema niet of nauwelijks aan. Ik vind dat een gemiste kans. Ze verwachten veel van toetreding van de Unie tot het Verdrag van Istanbul. Ik heb daar mijn twijfels bij, vooral ook omdat het verdrag bepalingen bevat die ronduit discutabel zijn, bijvoorbeeld over de rolverdeling tussen man en vrouw, en over gender.

Ik stel daarom voor dat we onze pijlen richten op het aanpakken van de echte misstanden. Dat is effectiever dan landen een verdrag op te leggen waar ze terechte principiële bezwaren tegen hebben.

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Colegas, a violência contra as mulheres é uma forma de violação de direitos humanos que persiste em toda a parte, incluindo na União Europeia.

Uma em cada três mulheres na UE já foi vítima de violência física, sexual ou ambas. Mais de metade das mulheres foram alvo de assédio sexual pelo uma vez desde os 15 anos.

É fundamental que falemos a uma só voz contra este flagelo, que não conhece fronteiras. Está na hora de passarmos das palavras à ação, ratificando a Convenção de Istambul. Com este instrumento teremos as condições para criar um quadro jurídico europeu coerente, que proteja as vítimas e puna os agressores, afirmando que na Europa temos tolerância zero à violência de género.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, não posso deixar de começar por manifestar o meu choque diante de algumas intervenções hoje aqui feitas.

Não há beleza na violência, na humilhação e no sofrimento seja de quem for, seja sob que forma for. Não podemos normalizar a violência de género. Temos de a criminalizar na União Europeia e esse será o nosso próximo passo. Mas, até lá, temos a Convenção de Istambul, que se apresenta como uma ferramenta legal fundamental no combate à violência contra as mulheres e à violência doméstica. A sua ratificação constitui, por isso, uma obrigação, não só para os países que ainda não o fizeram – sendo Estados-Membros da União Europeia – como para a própria União Europeia, sendo intoleráveis casos como o da Polónia que, depois de proibir o aborto, imediatamente anunciou a saída desta Convenção.

Senhora Comissária, temos de sair daqui com sinais políticos inequívocos. O progresso que a maioria deseja não pode, de forma alguma, ser travado pela inércia e pela incúria de alguns. Devemos isto a todas as vítimas.

Samira Rafaela (Renew). – Voorzitter, dit debat verontwaardigt mij. Ik ben echt enorm verbaasd. Het hele debat gaat over de vraag of het Verdrag van Istanbul wel het juiste instrument is, en of de Europese Unie dit wel kan opleggen aan de lidstaten. Dan denk ik bij mezelf: “Waarom zit je hier? Waarom ben je lid van de Europese Unie?” Begrijpen wij wel wat ons taak is? Onze taak is als wetgever de rechten van inwoners te beschermen en in dit geval op te komen voor vrouwen, voor slachtoffers.

En al het zielige gedoe de hele tijd in dit debat! Weet je wat echt zielig is? Al die vrouwen die slachtoffer zijn, kinderen die hun moeders verliezen door geweld. Dat is pas echt zielig. Dat is waarom we ervoor moeten zorgen dat de Europese Unie zich aansluit bij dit verdrag en het zo snel mogelijk ratificeert. Want we hebben de verantwoordelijkheid om een nieuwe generatie vrouwen en meisjes in Europa te beschermen. Een groot deel van hen loopt immers elke dag gevaar en is slachtoffer van geweld, dag in dag uit.

Vinden we dat normaal? Nee, dat is niet normaal. Dus hou op met het gedoe over de vraag of dit wel het juiste instrument is. Ja, dit is het juiste instrument. Dit is onze taak. Dit is het werk dat wij moeten verrichten in Europa: de fundamentele rechten van vrouwen en meisjes beschermen.

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, la convention d'Istanbul est un outil phare pour lutter contre les violences faites aux femmes et aux filles, et contre la violence domestique.

Il s'agit en premier lieu de prévenir ces violences, mais aussi d'éliminer l'impunité qui, trop souvent, renforce les agresseurs. Il y a un énorme travail à accomplir pour qu'il y ait une prise de conscience de la part des personnes qui sont en mesure d'aider. Il faut que l'écoute de la victime soit empathique, que, dès qu'elle aura parlé, sa protection soit efficace et, enfin, que les poursuites contre l'agresseur soient effectives.

Car, quand la victime craint de ne pas être prise au sérieux, quand elle craint de ne pas être protégée, alors que souvent elle a peur pour sa vie, quand elle craint que les seules conséquences de sa dénonciation sont qu'elle sera punie par son bourreau, jamais le cercle vicieux n'est interrompu.

L'Union européenne a signé la convention d'Istanbul, mais ne l'a pas ratifiée. Vingt et un pays de l'Union européenne ont signé et ratifié la convention d'Istanbul. Les six pays restants l'ont également signée, mais pas ratifiée, et ils s'opposent à la ratification au niveau européen.

L'article 2 de notre traité nous oblige, au-delà même de considérations morales évidentes, à signer cette convention. Un vote à la majorité qualifiée au Conseil est suffisant, et il permet à l'Union européenne d'avancer. Ratifions donc la convention d'Istanbul!

PREDSEDÁ: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podpredseda

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire Dalli, chers collègues, aujourd'hui, dans l'Union européenne, une femme sur trois subit des violences sexistes ou sexuelles. Alors, chers collègues, qu'attendons-nous pour ratifier la convention d'Istanbul?

Le processus de ratification est bloqué depuis 2017 car six États membres ne se sont toujours pas exécutés. Pourtant, le dernier arrêt de la Cour de justice de l'Union atteste qu'une majorité qualifiée des États membres – Madame la Commissaire – est suffisante pour procéder à la ratification de la convention. Cela pourrait permettre de sortir de l'impasse.

Avec mon groupe, Renew Europe, avec Ramona Strugariu – qui s'est exprimée tout à l'heure –, tout comme Sylvie Brunet ou Samira Rafaela, nous voulons que l'Union européenne soit une référence, au niveau international, sur le respect des droits des femmes et la protection contre les violences.

Comme nous le savons tous, il est nécessaire d'agir rapidement au vu de l'augmentation des violences pendant la COVID-19, laquelle n'a pas cessé depuis. C'est pourquoi j'appelle le Conseil à ratifier au plus vite cette convention d'Istanbul. Les citoyennes européennes et les femmes du monde nous regardent. Soyons à la hauteur de leurs espérances.

Marion Walsmann (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Übereinkommen von Istanbul ist von immenser Bedeutung, weil jede einzelne Person – ob größtenteils Frauen oder in einigen Fällen auch Männer, die zu Hause von einem Partner misshandelt werden – ein Opfer zu viel ist. Und weil jedes Kind, welches selbst Opfer dieser häuslichen Gewalt oder Zeuge dieser Misshandlung ist, eines zu viel ist. Unermessliches Leid, lebenslange körperliche und seelische Schäden resultieren aus dieser häuslichen Gewalt.

Mit dem Übereinkommen setzen wir Standards für die ungemein wichtige Prävention, den Opferschutz und die Strafverfolgung. Die EU hat das Übereinkommen von Istanbul bereits vor sieben Jahren unterzeichnet. Wie kann es sein, dass es immer noch nicht in allen Mitgliedstaaten ratifiziert wurde?

Liebe Mitgliedstaaten, es wird allerhöchste Zeit, sich im Rat zu einigen. Denn sonst würde ich vorschlagen, dass Sie der nächsten Frau, die zu Hause vergewaltigt oder verprügelt wird, in die Augen schauen und ihr erklären, dass sie als Opfer nicht ausreichend geschützt wird und ihr nicht angemessene Hilfen zur Verfügung stehen, weil Sie im Rat Unsicherheiten bezüglich der Rechtsgrundlage der Ratifizierung haben.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist wirklich traurig, dass wir im 21. Jahrhundert noch über das Thema Gewalt gegen Frauen diskutieren müssen. Leider zeigen aber die Zahlen, dass es noch Handlungsbedarf gibt. Gewalt gegen Frauen ist kein Kavaliersdelikt; das ist kriminell, und die Täter gehören verurteilt.

Die Istanbul-Konvention ist das erste rechtsverbindliche Instrument zur Verhütung und Bekämpfung von Gewalt gegen Frauen auf internationaler Ebene. Daher bin ich froh, dass mein Heimatland Österreich eines der ersten Länder war, das die Istanbul-Konvention 2013 ratifiziert hat. Darüber hinaus begrüßt die GREVIO anlässlich der Evaluierung auch Österreichs Führungsrolle in den letzten Jahrzehnten bei der Einführung eines Systems von einstweiligen Verfügungen wie Wegweisungen und Schutzanordnungen für Opfer von häuslicher Gewalt.

Da zwar alle Mitgliedstaaten die Istanbul-Konvention unterzeichnet, aber einige EU-Länder sie noch immer nicht ratifiziert haben, erachte ich es als starkes Signal unserer Kommissionspräsidentin, dass wir als Europäische Union beitreten wollen. Denn nur schwache Männer schlagen Frauen; starke stehen gleichberechtigt an ihrer Seite.

Gheorghe Falcă (PPE). – Domnule președinte, dragi colegi, vă vorbesc în calitate de tată a unei fiice minunate, căreia, la fel ca și la fiicele dumneavoastră, îi doresc să trăiască într-o lume în care să fie respectată ca om, în care să fie tratată egal și în care să nu fie niciodată discriminată pentru genul cu care s-a născut și în care să nu cadă victimă a violenței de orice fel.

În acest spirit și cu aceste gânduri o spun ferm: Comisia Uniunii Europene trebuie să asigure cât mai rapid ratificarea Convenției de la Istanbul. În timp ce bunele noastre intenții se limitează la demersurile evident necesare pe care le facem în Parlamentul European, victimele suferă uneori cu consecințe pentru toată viața.

De aceea, vă solicit, vă rog, să urgentăm aceste demersuri, iar noi, în țările noastre, în fiecare zi, să vorbim și să luptăm pentru a fi alături de victime.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Радан Кънев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, ако в тази зала бъде поставен въпросът за гласуване на влизане на Европейския съюз като страна по Истанбулската конвенция, аз със сигурност ще гласувам „за“. Ще гласувам „за“, защото правата на жертвите на домашно насилие са много по-важни от интересите на политици популисти. Но съм длъжен да предупредя, че това може би няма да е вярното решение, защото то ще предизвика вълна от дългогодишни юридически спорове между държави като моята, които имат решение на Конституционния съд против Истанбулската конвенция, а освен това ще предизвика със сигурност вълна от антиевропейски политически пропагандни кампании.

Затова далеч по-важно е ние да се съсредоточим върху много силна, категорична Директива за защита на жертвите от домашното насилие. Директива, която да дава всички юридически защиты и гаранции по една, които Истанбулската конвенция дава, и да бъде основата за едно силно национално законодателство в защита на жертвите на домашно насилие, защото държави като моята България не успяват през последните години да приемат дори адекватен сериозен закон.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, queria começar por agradecer aos relatores terem trazido aqui este tema. Um tema que tem de estar na agenda política europeia permanente, porque a violência contra as mulheres é também ela permanente na vida de muitas mulheres. Agradeço à Senhora Comissária Dalli. Estou certa de que terá sempre o apoio deste Parlamento.

Estamos a falar de uma Convenção adotada em 2011. A sua ratificação pela União Europeia tem estado Comissão, após Comissão, nos respetivos planos de ação. Figura nas prioridades 2020-2025 para a Igualdade de Género. Temos a opinião do Tribunal de Justiça: os direitos das mulheres são direitos humanos. A defesa e a promoção dos direitos humanos é uma tarefa de todos, em todas as suas dimensões.

A União Europeia não pode protelar a sua adesão à Convenção de Istambul e continuar refém de posições de Estados-Membros, posições inaceitáveis na União Europeia.

Katrin Langensiepen (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear colleagues here in the room, I just checked the numbers. When it comes to women with disabilities and how they are affected by gender-based violence, we are talking about 26.1% of women with disabilities living in the European Union. And the numbers are not really clear because we don't have the numbers and that is a problem.

When you listen to women with disabilities about their sexual lives, you have women, they tell you: 'Yeah, he in my institution or in my family, he came to me in my bed and we had something like sex together.' And in the end it came out: 'He raped me.' They don't have a name for it. They are not educated and they don't know or they don't have the info and the empowerment of 'what happened to me, that was violence'. Women and girls with disabilities are more affected than we know. Here I would like to see that come to an end in our political fight for women's rights and for girls' rights.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Уважаеми г-н Председател, Истанбулската конвенция не решава проблемите с насилието над жените. Насилието над жените е престъпление и то трябва да бъде преследвано по силата на националните законодателства. Истанбулската конвенция обаче, която вие много упорито пробутвате тук, всъщност има други цели. Тя прикрива пропаганда и политика, които са в разрез с интересите на жените. Така например, тя подкрепя идеология, която би позволила на биологични мъже да се състезават в женски спортове, би позволила на биологични мъже да влизат в женските съблекални. А това според мен е насилие срещу жени и над жени. Истанбулската конвенция е пропаганден инструмент на ЛГБТ и пропаганда на джендър политики. По тази причина България не я е приела. По тази причина ние с нашата Конституция вярваме, че този документ противоречи на семейните ни ценности, противоречи на основанията на нашето общество, противоречи на начина, по който ние сме подредили начина, по който живеем.

И да, насилието над жени е тежък проблем и престъпление, което трябва да бъде наказвано, но то продължава и е силно дори в държави, които са я ратифицирали, което показва колко безсмислен е този документ.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, as violências contra as mulheres continuam a ser um flagelo inegável.

Aumentam as queixas por violência no namoro. As mulheres continuam a ser vítimas de agressão física ou psicológica e muitas acabam por morrer tragicamente às mãos dos seus companheiros. Continua a haver raparigas e mulheres vítimas de exploração sexual e de prostituição. Continua a existir assédio e violência laboral.

Se olharmos para o acesso aos direitos sexuais e reprodutivos, vemos que, mesmo estando consagrados, há muitas dificuldades para que seja uma realidade na vida das mulheres, violentando-as e violando os seus direitos.

São necessárias medidas concretas, desde logo na prevenção, incluindo a dotação de maior eficácia dos instrumentos de proteção contra a violência, valorizando o trabalho e os salários, investindo em meios humanos e materiais nos diversos serviços públicos, garantindo o direito à habitação, mais e melhores direitos na saúde, segurança social e educação, justiça e forças de segurança.

Precisamos de um compromisso sério por parte dos Estados-Membros para pôr fim a todas as formas de violência contra as mulheres, na lei e na vida. Não pode haver mais desculpas.

(Ukončenie vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, violence impacts women's general well-being and prevents us women from fully participating in society.

But this is not only about us women: it impacts our families, our communities, our societies; it has a tremendous cost, from greater strains on health care to legal expenses and losses in productivity. We will not live in a truly fair and equal union until women and girls live free of fear of aggression or violence.

Twelve years after its adoption, the Istanbul Convention continues to constitute the international gold standard guiding our actions against this form of violence. You can count on the full commitment of the Commission to continue taking comprehensive action to eradicate violence against women and support the conclusion of the EU's accession to the Istanbul Convention.

Łukasz Kohut, *sprawozdawca*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Dziękuję za bardzo dobrą debatę. Konwencja stambulska to także wybór kierunku cywilizacyjnego. Rządy blokujące decyzje w Radzie muszą sobie odpowiedzieć na pytanie, gdzie jest im bliżej? Czy do zamordystów z Turcji, którzy wypowiedzieli niedawno konwencję, czy do Ukrainy, która ostrzeliwana, podpisała to prawo antyprzemocowe.

Rado odwagi! Demokratyczni liderzy nie mogą być zakładnikami populistów, którzy są głośni, ale są w mniejszości. Czas ratyfikować konwencję stambulską. Gdy państwa członkowskie zawodzą, to Unia musi działać, to Unia musi chronić swoich obywateli.

Pani posłanko Kempa, te narzędzia, o których Pani wspomniała, to dzięki konwencji stambulskiej. Proszę się douczyć, a nie polegać na kremlowskiej propagandzie z Ordo Iuris.

Chciałbym podziękować Arbie Kokalari i wszystkim sprawozdawcom, a także doradcom za konstruktywną i ciężką pracę. Udowodniliśmy, że prawa kobiet mogą być poza sporem politycznym demokratycznych partii w Europie. Historia dzieje się na naszych oczach. Jednocześnie chciałbym zadedykować ten moment w historii, ten raport wszystkim osobom, które tak dzielnie walczą o prawa kobiet i demokrację w Polsce od ośmiu lat. To wielka duma was tutaj reprezentować.

Dziękuję także dwóm kobietom, których już nie ma: mojej mamie Grażynie i mojej babci Irenie, bez których nigdy by mnie tutaj nie było. A one dwie, śląskie siłaczki, całym swoim życiem udowodniły, że kobieta może bardzo, bardzo wiele. I pomimo ciężkich doświadczeń może osiągnąć szczyt.

Arba Kokalari, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, I think the debate here today shows such great engagement that we have on the fight against women, the fight against violence against women. And this engagement and this fight unite us from the left to the right, because we are still living now in 2023 and still one third of women across Europe have faced violence. Fifty women are killed in their homes every week and over 85% of victims of sexual violence do not report it to the police. I mean, we've had enough of this.

This is one of the biggest fights for freedom that we have in Europe today. The fight to live a life free from violence. And I think we can expect much more from Europe. The European Parliament is ready. We want the Istanbul Convention to be ratified. Now it's up to the Member States and the Council, and I'm glad for the engagement from the Commission and Commissioner Dalli. And I'm also glad for the commitment from the Swedish Presidency, because it's about gender equality. It's about freedom.

Now it's the moment. So let's do this.

Predseda júci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

Hlasovanie sa uskutoční v stredu 15. februára 2023.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Europos Sąjungoje kas trečia moteris yra patyrusi fizinį ir (arba) seksualinį smurtą, o daugiau kaip pusė moterų (55 proc.) ES nuo 15 metų amžiaus bent kartą patyrė seksualinį priekabiavimą. Tai rodo, kad moterys ir mergaitės nėra veiksmingai apsaugotos nuo smurto ir ši problema mūsų visuomenėje išlieka itin skaudi, o smurtas prieš moteris reglamentuojamas labai skirtingai valstybėse narėse. Mums yra reikalingas visapusiškas ir suderintas požiūris į smurtą prieš moteris, todėl Stambulo konvencija yra labai svarbus tarptautinis dokumentas, kuriuo siekiama spręsti įsisenėjusias smurto prieš moteris problemas. Labai gaila, kad ne visos ES valstybės narės yra ratifikavusios šią tarptautinę konvenciją ir toks delsimas yra nesuvokiamas ir nepriimtinas. Mums yra būtini ES lygio veiksmai, todėl labai džiaugiuosi dėl Europos Sąjungos Teisingumo Teismo išaiškinimo dėl ES galimybės prisijungti prie šios Konvencijos ir labai raginu Tarybą imtis skubių veiksmų, kad ES kuo greičiau prisijungtų prie šios konvencijos. Gerbiami kolegos, Stambulo konvencija iki šiol yra veiksmingiausia, galingiausia ir išsamiausia kovos su įvairiomis smurto prieš moteris ir smurto šeimoje formomis ir jo prevencijos priemonė Europoje ir už jos ribų, todėl turime rodyti iniciatyvą, prisijungti prie šios konvencijos bei įgyvendinti joje numatytas rekomendacijas, kad mūsų moterys ir mergaitės būtų labiau apsaugotos nuo smurto.

Milan Brglez (S&D), pismo. – Razprava o vmesnem poročilu glede pridružitve Konvenciji Sveta Evrope o preprečevanju nasilja nad ženskami in nasilja v družini ter o boju proti njima (Istanbulska konvencija) poteka v času, ko se na globalni ravni, pa tudi v EU, povečuje število primerov hudih oblik nasilja nad ženskami.

Žensk ne ogrožajo zgolj avtoritarni režimi, temveč se je še posebej v obdobju od začetka pandemije povečalo število primerov nasilja v domačem in spletnem okolju. Prav na tem področju mora tudi EU storiti več, da bi lahko preprečila nasilje na svojih tleh ter prevzela vodilno vlogo v svetu.

Pozdravljam predlog direktive o boju proti nasilju nad ženskami in nasilju v družini, ki bo na ravni EU poenotila načela in skupna pravila pri preprečevanju nasilja ter zaščiti žrtev. Ta direktiva lahko dopolni, ne more pa nadomestiti Istanbulske konvencije, ki ostaja najbolj celovit in najmočnejši instrument za preprečevanje nasilja ter zaščito žrtev.

Komisija in Svet morata najti način za odpravo blokade pristopa EU k Istanbulski konvenciji, skladno z mnenjem Sodišča EU 1/19 iz oktobra 2021, ter se zoperstaviti lažem in zlonamernim interpretacijam te Konvencije v posameznih državah članicah, ki se množijo z vsakim dnevom odlašanja z ratifikacijo.

Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE), γραπτώς. – Δυστυχώς, η βία κατά των γυναικών και ιδίως η ενδοοικογενειακή βία παραμένουν συχνό φαινόμενο στην ΕΕ και αποτελούν όνειδο. Η έμφυλη βία εξακολουθεί να αποτελεί μία από τις μεγαλύτερες απειλές για την πλήρη άσκηση των ανθρωπίνων και θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων στον κόσμο. Τα στοιχεία είναι σοκαριστικά. 137 γυναίκες δολοφονούνται καθημερινά από τον σύντροφό τους ή από μέλος της οικογένειάς τους. Μία στις τρεις γυναίκες παγκοσμίως έχει υποστεί σωματική ή/και σεξουαλική βία κατά τη διάρκεια της ζωής της. Κάθε χρόνο 150 εκατομμύρια κορίτσια πέφτουν θύματα βιασμού ή σεξουαλικής βίας παγκοσμίως, συχνά από πρόσωπο που ανήκει στον άμεσο κύκλο τους. Οφείλουμε να θέσουμε ένα τέλος. Η Ευρώπη και η ΕΕ οφείλουν να πρωτοστατήσουν σε αυτήν την προσπάθεια. Καμία ανοχή στην έμφυλη βία. Απαιτούμε διακρατική συνεργασία αλλά και άμεση κύρωση της Σύμβασης της Κωνσταντινούπολης από όλα τα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Elżbieta Kruk (ECR), na piśmie. – Konwencja Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej, tzw. konwencja stambulska, budzi liczne kontrowersje. Są to zastrzeżenia natury prawnej, jak i wątpliwości co do ich zgodności z prawem pierwotnym UE, oraz metodologicznej. Badania wykazują nieskuteczność Konwencji w zwalczaniu przemocy chociażby z powodu ignorowania jej rzeczywistych źródeł, takich jak patologie społeczne, indywidualne problemy czy uzależnienia. Zjawisko przemocy traktuje się natomiast strukturalnie, opierając się na fałszywym założeniu przemocy ze względu na płeć. Konwencja upatruje źródło przemocy w kulturze i tradycji. Tymczasem doświadczenie pokazuje, że to właśnie tradycyjne instytucje społeczne są czynnikiem chroniącym przed przemocą. I tak na przykład dzieci, których matki żyją w konkubinacie, są 33 razy bardziej narażone na doznanie przemocy niż dzieci rodziców pozostających w związku małżeńskim. Z badań Agencji Praw Podstawowych (FRA) wynika, że najniższy poziom przemocy wobec kobiet odnotowano w Polsce – 19% (dla porównania – w Danii 52%, w Holandii 45%), a to Polsce zarzuca się niewdrożenie postanowień Konwencji. Przemoc wobec kobiet i przemoc domowa to zbyt poważny problem, by wykorzystywać go do narzucenia społeczeństwu jakiegokolwiek ideologii. Ideologiczne podłoże Konwencji powoduje, że jest ona przeciwnie skuteczna. Zwracam też uwagę, że realizacja celów wskazanych w Konwencji nie leży w kompetencjach Unii Europejskiej.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), kirjallinen. – EU:n on ratifioitava Istanbulin sopimus viipymättä. Tämä ensimmäinen laillisesti sitova kansainvälinen sopimus naisiin kohdistuvaa väkivaltaa vastaan on äärimmäisen tärkeä kansainvälinen teksti. EU:n pitäisi kansainvälisenä instituutiona ratifioida Istanbulin sopimus kiireellisesti.

Unioni allekirjoitti sopimuksen jo vuonna 2017, mutta jäsenmaiden päätöstä ratifioinnista ei ole kuulunut. Tämä on surullista, sillä Istanbulin sopimuksen ratifiointi ja kunnioittaminen lähettäisivät vahvan ja tarpeellisen viestin naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan hävittämiseen sitoutumisesta. Moni EU-maa, myös oma kotimaani Suomi, on edelleen naisille vaarallinen paikka elää. Naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan esiintyvyys on korkea. Istanbulin sopimus ei ole tärkeä ainoastaan symbolisesti. Se sisältää laajan määritelmän naisiin kohdistuvasta väkivallasta ja määrittelee naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan naisiin kohdistuvaksi rakenteelliseksi syrjinnäksi sekä velvoittaa toimimaan pitkäjänteisesti, koordinoidusti ja suunnitellusti naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan torjumiseksi ja sukupuolten tasa-arvon edistämiseksi yhteiskunnan eri sektoreilla. Sopimuksen määritelmä pitää mielestäni ottaa kaiken lainsäädännön ja sen tulkinnan pohjaksi.

EU-tuomioistuimen antaman lausunnon, jonka mukaan EU-neuvosto eli jäsenmaat voivat edetä Istanbulin yleissopimuksen ratifioinnissa Euroopan unionissa ilman mitään lakitekniisiä esteitä, pitäisi viimeistään kirittää vihdoin ratifioimaan Istanbulin sopimus, ja mahdollisimman pian. Unohtamatta kaikkia EU:n jäsenvaltioita, joiden tulisi myös liittyä sopimukseen - myös niiden kuuden, jotka eivät sopimusta ole ratifioineet. Jokaisen EU-maan pitäisi olla sitoutunut naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan poistamiseen.

13. The EU priorities for the 67th session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women (debate)

Predseda júci. – Ďalším bodom programu je rozprava o týchto bodoch:

— otázka na ústne zodpovedanie pre Radu o Prioritách EÚ na 67. zasadnutie Komisie OSN pre postavenie žien, ktorú predkladá Robert Biedroń v mene Výboru pre práva žien a rodovú rovnosť (O-000004/2023 – B9-0011/2023) (2022/2839(RSP)), a

— otázka na ústne zodpovedanie pre Komisiu o Prioritách EÚ na 67. zasadnutie Komisie OSN pre postavenie žien, ktorú predkladá Robert Biedroń v mene Výboru pre práva žien a rodovú rovnosť (O-000005/2023 – B9-0012/2023) (2022/2839(RSP)).

Robert Biedroń, author. – Mr President, Commissioner, minister, dear colleagues, as you are aware, in March, a delegation of the European Parliament's Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality, which I have an honour to chair, will attend the 67th session of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women called CSW.

This year's CSW will focus on innovation and technological change and on education in the digital age for achieving gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls.

The gender gap in digital access and skills persists, with women remaining digitally marginalised. Growing gender inequalities exist in terms of access to connectivity, digital education and skills, as well as access to technologies, preventing women's economic independence and empowerment.

However, when women and girls do have access to Internet, they also face online violence and experience different forms of cyber harassment. This is why it's of the utmost importance that the European Union shows strong leadership and takes a unified position on the importance of empowering women and girls in all their diversity and achieving gender equality in the digital transformation.

In light of the current backlash against gender equality happening across the EU and worldwide, we must take strong action to unequivocally denounce attacks on women and girls and support calls for the standardisation of women's rights. We need to ensure that all women and girls can finally enjoy equal rights.

But this can only be achieved if all EU institutions – I stress, all EU institutions – cooperate and speak with one voice.

Therefore, I want to use this opportunity to call on my colleagues from the Commission and from the Council to ensure the full involvement of Parliament and the FEMM Committee in the decision-making process concerning the EU's position at the 67th session of the CSW, and to guarantee that we are properly represented, which was not always the case at the events and high-level meetings organised during the session.

We also repeat our constant calls, which have not been always heard, for this Parliament to receive adequate information and access to the EU position document ahead of the negotiations.

Given this, on behalf of the FEMM Committee, I would like to ask whether first the Commission can provide details of the main points in the European Union position for the UN CSW 67 and on how Parliament's priorities will be incorporated.

Will the Commission grant Parliament access to the EU position paper on the preparation for the 67th session? How will the Commission ensure a stronger coordinated EU approach and ambitious and robust commitments, including specific measures to promote real, real progress towards gender equality? How can we adjust our policies to improve widespread access to science, technology, engineering and mathematics?

Secondly, what can be done to accelerate the implementation of the international commitments already made? What new measures are planned against the effects of digital marginalisation and against their disproportionate impacts on women and girls? Taking into account all forms of discrimination with specific attention to gender-based violence, including online violence, of course. What concrete actions through the relevant future EU strategies and policy processes, including budgetary policies and collection of relevant gender desegregated data, are planned? Specifically, what steps will be taken to mainstream – really mainstream – the gender perspective in all real regular prevalent EU policies and programmes?

Thank you for your time and I count on your fruitful cooperation in this regard, finally, and for the future.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, we meet at a crucial time for gender equality. As we approach the 67th annual session of the Commission on the Status of Women, we witness a worldwide backlash against women's and girls' full, equal enjoyment of human rights.

Across the world, from the streets of Tehran to the university campus in Kabul, women and girls are standing up for human rights and gender equality, often against all odds. The EU continues to stand by them in their struggle. We are their allies.

The priority theme of this year's session of the Commission on the Status of Women reminds us that in an age marked by technological innovation and digitalisation, we have to continue the work achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls. We know that the potential of digitalisation, including the education and innovation, is not equally distributed. As a matter of fact, the digital gender gap is especially pronounced in many developing countries.

The Council continues to actively address gender equality and women's rights across different policy areas. For instance, there are numerous EU programmes and initiatives that aim to boost the share of women graduates in science, technology, engineering and mathematics to combat gender stereotypes. The EU's ambition is to stay a frontrunner on gender equality and women's empowerment globally.

Moreover, promoting gender equality is a central issue in Sweden, regardless of the government in charge. While not perfect, we have achieved a high level of equality between men and women and during our presidency, gender equality is, of course, an area of focus.

The Council is aware that the pursuit of gender equality and technological innovation and education are mutually reinforcing. In this context, the Council has identified five core principles ahead of the forthcoming session of the Commission on the Status of Women. First, to accelerate the implementation of existing international commitments that strengthen the regulatory frameworks. Second, to take measures addressing all aspects of gender, digital and technology divide. Third, to leverage current and emerging technologies to accelerate gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls – with a particular focus on women and girls in vulnerable and marginalised situations. Fourth, to support a strong multilateral system and to give support to the civil society and human rights defenders. Fifth, to strengthen the availability and the funding to reliable data and research to promote legislation.

I can assure you that the EU will take part in the 67th session of the Commission on the Status of Women with a high level of ambition and will engage with all stakeholders in an open and constructive spirit. Our ultimate goal is the adoption of a consensual and action-orientated text.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the yearly meeting of the Commission on the Advance on the Status of Women is an opportunity to reflect on the key global challenges for gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls, and how we as a European Union contribute and progress on these issues this year.

This year's W addresses one of the main challenges of our times: how to ensure that the digital transition, innovation and science, technology, engineering and mathematics – the STEM sectors – are an opportunity for all and that obstacles or abuses are tackled in particular from a gender perspective. This is in line with the EU's priorities and objective of the twin transition. The gender equality strategy in particular underlined the importance of gender mainstreaming of the digital transition. I therefore welcome your questions. The gender equality strategy and the third edition of the gender action plan underlined the importance of gender mainstreaming in all policy areas and priorities, including the digital transition, innovation and research and STEM area. The European Commission's digital strategy, in particular, aims to make the digital transformation work for people and businesses while helping to achieve its target of a climate neutral Europe by 2050.

The strategy sets a target of 80% of the population having basic digital skills and 20 million ICT specialists by 2030. In achieving this target, we need to tackle the gender digital gap as we know that only 19% of ICT specialists are women. Women working in ICT earn almost 20% less than men. One in three STEM graduates are women and 93% of capital invested in European companies this year went to all male-founded teams. We promote an increased participation and representation in STEM, in particular in engineering, ICT and advanced digital skills, all crucial for the development and future of our societies. This is also one of the eight key competencies of the European Education Area Strategic Framework.

We have also raised the need to attract more women and girls in STEM in our structured dialogues on digital education and skills with the Member States. We are funding a series of actions to attract girls to STEM and to bridge the digital gender gap under our horizon Europe and Erasmus programmes. Examples of projects are training programmes in digital and sustainable entrepreneurship, competencies for girls and the European researchers' night and researchers at schools which want to gauge the interest of girls and women in research careers. Our projects also support women-led deep tech start-ups through a pilot scheme called Women TechEU. Moreover, we introduce a new condition in the Horizon Europe programme, which has the potential to become a game changer for gender equality in research and innovation. Organisations that want to apply for Horizon Europe must have a gender equality plan in place to be eligible for EU funding.

Encouraging women's participation in STEM also allows us to tackle the digital gap. We have set our concrete actions to this end in our schools agenda and digital education action plan for 2021-2027. We monitored the gender digital divide through the women and digital scoreboard. Also to cyber violence, our proposal for a directive to combat violence against women and domestic violence includes a focus on this form of violence. We proposed decriminalisation of common forms of gender-based violence and measures that allow to quickly remove illegal gender-based online content. The specificities of cyber violence, are also reflected and provisions on the protection and support to victims, as well as in prevention measures and access to justice. Moreover, in the Digital Services Act, we set out a comprehensive approach towards all forms of illegal content and look at online platforms' liability.

With all these actions, we hope to substantially contribute to making the digital transition an opportunity for all, especially for women and girls.

Frances Fitzgerald, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister. Really, it is very depressing, Commissioner, to hear the statistics that you've just quoted. I'm sure all of us are getting tired of coming in here and hearing such depressing statistics. I know there is much on the implementation table that potentially gives us hope, but it really does reinforce the enormous job that we have to do in this particular area of technological change and digitalisation, as well as other areas.

Yet another statistic to add to what we've heard already: only 7% of women work in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. And if we are to ensure that the green and digital revolution are going to apply equally to women and men, we have to make sure that women are at the table – because we know that if women are not at the table, their voices, their perspectives are missing from research. I do hope Horizon will make a difference. We know, for example, in medical research that the particular needs of women have been ignored for generations, and it was not seen that you needed to have that different perspective.

As we go to the UN next month in New York, the theme is, of course, 'innovation and technological change, and education in the digital age for achieving gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls'. It's really important that we discuss this at a global level because, as we've heard, there is so much work to be done in this area, and this is the future, and we are at risk of inequalities continuing, despite this technological change, if we don't make sure that women get these opportunities. So I know our delegation, led by Robert, will do everything we can to ensure that it is ambitious, so that we can build that future for women and girls that you spoke about, Commissioner. And I want to thank both the Commissioner and the Minister for your ambition in relation to this at the UN.

Heléne Fritzon, för S&D-gruppen. – Herr talman! Kommissionsär, minister! Snart samlas kvinnokommissionen i New York och jag är glad över att vara en del av parlamentets delegation. Jag var där 2016 för Sveriges räkning och jag vet att kvinnokommissionen är ett utmärkt och viktigt tillfälle att kraftsamla för att höja våra globala ambitioner och sätta fokus på jämställdhet och kvinnors rättigheter.

Nu vet vi att Rysslands invasion av Ukraina har drabbat kvinnor och barn på ett fruktansvärt sätt. Vi ser effekterna av pandemin, klimatkrisen, sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa och rättigheter. Vi har sett en backlash rörande kvinnors rättigheter och vi har viktiga frågor att diskutera på konferensen.

Med temat digitalisering är det precis som med klimatomställningen. Det måste gå hand i hand med jämställdhet. Vi måste ha ett jämställt beslutsfattande och flickor och kvinnors fulla tillgång till såväl utbildning som jobb. Det måste gå tillsammans med den digitala utvecklingen. Det är bara så vi kan öka jämställdheten i samhället i stort, men också stärka våra ekonomier.

EU måste ta ett tydligt ledarskap i New York och driva på för ambitiösa mål och åtgärder. Det var inte så 2016 när jag var där. Då hade EU inte ens en jämställdhetsstrategi. Vi måste därför visa att vi inom vår union gör vårt på hemmaplan. Vi kan inte vänta i flera generationer på att världen ska bli mer jämställd. Den blir inte det av sig själv.

New York blir ett tillfälle att sätta jämställdhetsfrågorna på dagordningen. Jämställdhet är inte bara moraliskt rätt, det är smartare, det är mer hållbart och det skapar tillväxt. Det är den enda rätta vägen för ett starkare samhälle.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, en nombre del Grupo Renew. – Señor presidente, señorías, el pasado 11 de febrero celebramos el Día de la Mujer y la Niña en la Ciencia y, lamentablemente, no había mucho que celebrar, porque según la UNESCO, solo el 35 % de los estudiantes en carreras STEM son mujeres.

Necesitamos también ver que el acceso a la tecnología en países en desarrollo apenas alcanza el 30 % de usuarias mujeres y, en países menos adelantados, apenas el 20 % de las mujeres tienen acceso a Internet.

Por otra parte, estamos viendo también cómo los nuevos soportes digitales son el nuevo escenario en el que se desarrolla la violencia contra las mujeres. Una de cada diez mujeres europeas ha experimentado algún tipo de ciberviolencia desde los 15 años y el 20 % de las mujeres europeas han sido víctimas de ciberacoso.

Por eso, necesitamos erradicar todas las barreras existentes para que las niñas se puedan incorporar plenamente a la ciencia. La ciencia necesita a las mujeres y las mujeres necesitan a la ciencia para diseñar un nuevo futuro, un futuro en igualdad.

Monika Vana, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister, in a few weeks, we as the European Parliament go to the 67th UN Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), i.e. the COP for gender equality, the most important event to fight for women's rights, with representatives from 189 countries.

We will meet stakeholders and advocates from all over the world to prove that we as the EU are a reliable partner on empowering women and girls in all their diversity, and support progressive alliances and policies. We as the European Parliament must be loud and clear against the worldwide backlash that was already mentioned, for example, on SRH or on gender-based violence. We have to stand up clearly for peace and security, fight against inequalities and against the feminisation of poverty.

To ensure that the EU shows strong leadership on these issues at the CSW and takes a unified position, the delegation of the European Parliament has to increase its formal role during the negotiations and ensure its full involvement in the decision-making process as well as adequate information. As I was already part of the delegation many, many times, I can fully support the words of Robert Biedroń on the involvement of the European Parliament in the process. We have been fighting for this for years now and I think the strong resolution we vote on this week underlines our deep commitment.

This year's focus lies on the digital gender gap that was already said: innovation and technological change. Girls worldwide face massive gender specific barriers in access to education, as well as a huge gender digital divide. So we have to strengthen our fight for a gender-responsive digital transformation at the CSW, especially equal access for women and girls to the STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) sector and fight against cyber violence. Only through education and inclusion, social inclusion and inclusion in decision-making will gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls be achieved.

Alessandra Basso, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, per raggiungere la parità, e non mi piace chiamarla di genere, non servono quote rosa o leggi che ci riservino qualche posto, quasi come fosse un'elemosina.

Per l'Unione europea la priorità deve essere quella dell'istruzione, e istruzione anche digitale. Invece, nei paesi evoluti spesso assistiamo a battaglie per arrivare a un linguaggio inclusivo: «partner» invece che «marito» e «moglie», «staff» invece di «lavoratori». Invece di preoccuparci di far evolvere il linguaggio verso il genere neutro, preoccupiamoci delle oltre 700 milioni di persone che al mondo non sanno leggere e scrivere, perché di questi 700 milioni due terzi sono donne.

Quindi che cosa è importante? Solo dall'istruzione di base si potranno dare alle donne, alle giovani donne, le stesse opportunità degli uomini, in tutti i campi, anche in quello digitale, perché tante volte l'istruzione vuol dire libertà.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, colegas, un año más, la Comisión de la Condición Jurídica y Social de la Mujer cierra los ojos ante la realidad de la mujer y sigue como una apisonadora con su agenda establecida. El año pasado: cambio climático e igualdad de género. Este año: digitalización e igualdad de género. El próximo: logros de la igualdad de género.

Existe un permanente empeño en la promoción de la ideología de género. Mientras, hay mujeres en el mundo que todavía no tienen reconocida la dignidad como personas y se les prohíbe ocupar su espacio en la vida pública. Está pasando hoy en Irán. A las mujeres se les mata por mostrar un mechón de pelo.

Esto no parece interesar a la Comisión de la Condición Jurídica y Social de la Mujer de las Naciones Unidas, o por lo menos no es su prioridad. Sí lo es, en cambio, tratar lo que sea con perspectiva de género, cuando este enfoque sobre cualquier tema desvirtúa el sentido objetivo. Muchas mujeres –las que quieren– ya desempeñan un papel indispensable en el campo de la ciencia, la tecnología y la innovación.

Garanticemos la igualdad de oportunidades, asegurando el derecho a una educación de calidad que permita a nuestros hijos elegir su camino.

Sandra Pereira, em nome do Grupo *The Left*. – Senhor Presidente, as condições de vida de muitas mulheres continuam difíceis. São elas que, em média, trabalham mais horas, seja nas tarefas profissionais, seja nas tarefas de casa. Bem sabemos que as mulheres trabalhadoras estão confrontadas com uma difícil articulação entre as exigências profissionais, o acompanhamento dos filhos e a organização da vida doméstica. Preocupa-nos que o teletrabalho, ao invés de ajudar, possa gerar uma acrescida sobrecarga diária.

Para se efetivar na vida uma verdadeira igualdade entre homens e mulheres são necessárias políticas que ponham fim à precarização da mão de obra feminina, porque são as mulheres que mais têm vínculos precários e que maioritariamente têm baixos salários, assim como cargas horárias excessivas e desreguladas que as privam do direito à vida familiar e pessoal e ao lazer. Também são as mulheres que estão em maior risco de pobreza.

A 67.^a Sessão da Comissão das Nações Unidas sobre o Estatuto da Mulher é uma oportunidade para exigirmos, uma vez mais, políticas que representem avanços nas condições de vida e nos direitos das mulheres, assegurando o direito ao trabalho com direitos, à valorização dos salários e ao reforço de serviços públicos, rompendo com soluções que agravem a exploração, as desigualdades, as discriminações e as violências sobre as mulheres e que as políticas sejam, efetivamente, implementadas.

Se a digitalização, a inovação e a tecnologia contribuírem para estes avanços na vida de todas as mulheres, melhor. Da nossa parte, não desistimos e continuaremos a bater-nos pela efetivação dos direitos das mulheres na lei e na vida.

Livia Járóka (NI). – Elnök Úr! A nők, és kiemelten a hátrányos helyzetű nők esélyének előmozdítása az egyik legfontosabb közös ügyünk. Törekednünk kell mindenfajta diszkrimináció és megkülönböztetés felszámolására, és nagyon üdvözlendő, amiről a Biztos Asszony is beszámolt, hogy a digitalizáció területén, a startupok területén a nők és a lányok társadalmi befogadását és részvételét ezzel az európai stratégiával tovább tudjuk lendíteni.

Nagyon fontos az információszerzés és az ahhoz való hozzájárás, főleg a legszegényebb környezetekben. Azonban nagyon fontos kiemelni, és ez a gyengesége ennek a jelentésnek, hogy számos pontján tagállami hatáskör alá tartozó elemeket is egységes cselekvési kör alá kíván vonni, és ezzel sérti vagy sértheti a tagállami hatáskörbe tartozó ügyekben való döntés jogának az elsőbbségét. Ezen hatásköröknek a tiszteletben tartása, azt gondolom, mindennél fontosabb. Egységes lépéseket kell tennünk a nők és a lányok esélyegyenlőségének előmozdítása érdekében.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući i poštovana povjerenice Dalli, kolegice i kolege, vratimo se u prošlu godinu 2022. i izvješće UN-a. Uz trenutnu stopu napretka trebat će do 286 godina da se zatvore praznine u pravnoj zaštiti žena, 140 godina da se postigne ravnopravna zastupljenost žena na tkz. pozicijama moći u politici i gospodarstvu te najmanje 40 godina da se postigne jednaka zastupljenost žena i muškaraca u nacionalnim parlamentima.

Ovi podaci pokazuju da je potrebno pojačati naše napore promicanjem inicijativa koje podržavaju usklađivanje radnog i obiteljskog života kako bi se prepoznalo i preraspodijelilo nesrazmjeran udio neplaćenog rada žena koji obuhvaća neformalan rad, neplaćenu skrb i kućanske poslove. Posebno se to odnosi na žene u ruralnim područjima.

Razlike u mogućnostima učinkovite uporabe informacijsko-komunikacijske tehnologije dovele su do digitalnog jaza i do digitalne marginalizacije žena.

Kakva će biti budućnost žena ovisi o nama, stoga je vrijeme da djelujemo jer mi smo ti koji donose odluke. Politika u tome mora pomoći.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Ich starte meine heutige Rede mit einer simplen Frage: Warum ist Siri weiblich? Warum ist Alexa weiblich? Meine provokante Antwort ist: Weil wir es gewöhnt sind, dass Frauen uns zuarbeiten, gute Ideen haben, irrsinnig effizient arbeiten, aber doch irgendwie immer nur Assistentinnen – in dem Fall Sprachassistentinnen – sind, und es dann vor allem die Männer im Silicon Valley sind, die die digitale Welt vor sich hin entwickeln – überwiegend.

Frauen können alles, was Männer können. Frauen können IT, Frauen können Digitales – das wissen wir alle. Und dennoch müssen wir es ständig wiederholen, damit es auch diejenigen hören, die es nicht hören wollen, damit es auch die hören, die uns Frauen kleinhalten wollen. Und genau deshalb ist es so extrem wichtig, dass sich die UN-Frauenrechtskonvention trifft und wir Jahr für Jahr die Gleichstellung noch weiter vorantreiben – gemeinsam und weltweit –, damit es nicht mehr noch drei weitere Generationen braucht – bis zu meiner Ururenkelin –, bis Frauen endlich gleichgestellt sind. Ein Mädchen, das heute aufwächst, muss wissen, dass es alles sein darf, dass es alles sein kann: Astronautin, Dachdeckerin, Bauleiterin, Cyber-Security-Expertin – was auch immer sie will.

Und deshalb ist es natürlich auch wichtig, dass wir, das Europäische Parlament, oftmals Vorreiterinnen bei so vielen Gleichstellungsthemen, auch eine entsprechend gewichtige Rolle in New York bei der UN-Frauenrechtskonvention bekommen, dass wir das Gehör haben, dass wir auch entsprechend auftreten können. Wir haben mit der Politik einen Hebel in der Hand, mit dem wir sicherstellen können, dass Frauen, egal wo sie geboren sind, gleiche Möglichkeiten haben wie Männer.

Um abzuschließen mit den Worten der großen Feministin Johanna Dohnal, die heute 84 Jahre alt geworden wäre: „Auf Goodwill warten wir lange. Die Frauen haben immer nur das erreicht, was sie sich selbst erkämpft haben.“ Und das machen wir global gemeinsam, weltweit.

Irène Tolleret (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, Madame la Ministre, chers collègues, l'égalité des femmes et des hommes relève des droits de l'homme, et c'est une condition de la justice sociale. Ceci, ce sont les mots du premier point de la déclaration de Pékin. Pourtant, en 2023, nous sommes loin d'avoir atteint les objectifs de cette déclaration.

La résolution que nous votons demain est donc particulièrement importante pour adresser au Conseil nos recommandations en vue de la session annuelle de la Commission des Nations unies sur la condition de la femme. Nos demandes sont ambitieuses – sur l'autonomisation des femmes, sur la lutte contre les violences, sur le droit à disposer de son corps –, et elles devraient faire l'unanimité dans notre Parlement. Pourtant, ce n'est pas le cas. Je regrette qu'un groupe politique ait raté l'énième occasion de défendre les droits des femmes concrètement et qu'il ait présenté un texte alternatif plutôt moyenâgeux.

Je vous invite donc, chers collègues, à voter massivement pour le texte que nous avons négocié en commission FEMM. Pas une seule voix ne doit manquer pour défendre notre droit à l'avortement, notre corps, nos choix, nos droits.

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, en ces temps de crise, les femmes et les filles sont particulièrement exposées à de nombreux dangers. Elles font face à des situations de vulnérabilité, parfois même dans leur propre foyer. Une femme sur trois a ainsi été victime de violences et d'abus dans le cadre d'une relation intime avec un partenaire proche. Mais le risque ne s'arrête pas là.

Nombreuses sont les femmes victimes de harcèlement en ligne, de messages haineux et de menaces de viol, surtout lorsqu'elles appartiennent à une minorité ethnique ou religieuse. La plupart d'entre elles préfèrent se retirer de l'espace médiatique, de l'espace public et de tous les réseaux sociaux.

La dépendance financière est souvent un élément clé pour les femmes qui vivent des situations de violence. L'autonomisation des femmes dans le domaine de la technologie pourrait être l'une des solutions à un ce problème. En effet, l'accès aux moyens de communication modernes pourrait influencer la situation des femmes qui fuient, par exemple, leur foyer – c'est-à-dire une sorte d'alphabétisation numérique qu'il faudrait développer pour les femmes.

Nous devons donc garantir l'égalité des genres dans le domaine des sciences et, actuellement, surtout, l'éducation numérique, qui pourrait les avantager.

Ma question au Conseil est dès lors la suivante: comment pouvez-vous assurer que la vulnérabilité des femmes qui fuient leur pays est prise en compte parmi les priorités de l'Union européenne, surtout lorsqu'il s'agit des femmes d'ascendance africaine ou qui vivent avec un handicap? Quelles sont les mesures prises pour combler la fracture numérique et lutter contre les discriminations? La perspective intersectionnelle est-elle une priorité de l'Union européenne en ce qui concerne l'égalité des genres?

Annika Bruna (ID). – Monsieur le Président, dans cette résolution je suis navrée de constater que vous avez occulté certaines priorités pour les femmes.

Le texte que nous allons voter est en partie déconnecté du quotidien que vivent désormais les femmes et les jeunes filles. En effet, pas un mot sur l'accroissement de l'insécurité en Europe, le harcèlement de rue ou l'islam radical, des facteurs aggravés par une immigration massive et incontrôlée.

La résolution n'évoque pas non plus les conditions de travail difficiles des professions à forte proportion féminine dans certains secteurs, comme ceux des soins ou de l'éducation, la précarité de certaines mères ou l'équilibre complexe entre le travail et la vie de famille.

Au moment où, en France, Emmanuel Macron, sous pression de l'Union européenne, tente de réformer le régime des retraites, aucune solution n'est proposée pour relancer la natalité des Européennes. Avec le groupe ID, nous avons déposé une résolution alternative, qui reprend les enjeux majeurs pour les femmes. Mais, comme chaque année, celle-ci ne sera certainement pas mise aux votes.

Force est de constater que vous vous attachez souvent peut-être plus à mettre la perspective de genre dans toutes les politiques de l'Union européenne plutôt que de vous attaquer à certains enjeux cruciaux.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, la apuesta de la CSW por la innovación y el cambio tecnológico está muy bien, pero no hay que olvidar el uso violento que puede hacerse de ciertas tecnologías, que sufren mayoritariamente las mujeres y niñas.

Una de cada diez europeas ha experimentado alguna forma de ciberviolencia desde los 15 años de edad. El 52 % de las jóvenes y las niñas de este mundo ha sufrido abusos en línea, una de cada cinco niñas ha abandonado o reducido significativamente el uso de plataformas de redes sociales tras ser acosadas, una de cada diez ha modificado la manera de expresarse. Esas cifras se incrementan exponencialmente cuando son objeto de ataques por razón de raza, etnia, identidad de género y orientación sexual. Y en Europa las parlamentarias tampoco se salvan.

En fin, en los avances tecnológicos no podemos subestimar estos datos, porque tan importante es garantizar el acceso a la tecnología como su uso adecuado. Por eso, estoy contenta del esfuerzo que se está haciendo en el marco de la actual propuesta de Directiva sobre violencia contra las mujeres para acabar con la ciberviolencia. Lo que sí lamento es no poder acudir a la reunión de la CSW porque mi Grupo no está representado, a pesar del esfuerzo del señor Biedroń y del ingente trabajo que hago y he hecho siempre por y para las mujeres.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es freut mich, dass Innovation und digitale Bildung heute auch im Mittelpunkt unserer Debatte stehen. Als Unternehmerin ist es seit langem mein politisches Anliegen, Frauen zu motivieren, den Schritt in die Selbstständigkeit zu wagen bzw. sich verstärkt für MINT-Jobs und Digitalisierung zu interessieren.

Um Frauen für die Selbstständigkeit zu rüsten, braucht es natürlich leichteren Zugang zu Startkapital sowie eine einfache Partizipation an EU-Programmen. Vor allem auch für Arbeitnehmerinnen ist eine stärkere Sensibilisierung für mathematisch-technische Bereiche wichtig.

Da Frauen häufig in schlechter bezahlten Branchen bzw. innerhalb von Unternehmen in schlechter bezahlten Abteilungen arbeiten, wirkt sich das natürlich für den Gender-Pay-Gap negativ aus. Daher muss es uns gelingen, deutlich mehr Frauen in MINT- und digitalen Berufen zu beschäftigen. Das bringt nicht nur Vorteile für die Wirtschaft, sondern vor allem auch für den Arbeitsmarkt.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, señora ministra, en un mundo que se transforma digitalmente, lo digital resulta muchas veces hostil para las mujeres y para las niñas. Pensemos en la ciberviolencia o en las culturas laborales sexistas de sectores tecnológicos que, además, son los de más futuro. Solo el 19 % de los especialistas en TIC son mujeres. Solo el 1 % del capital riesgo disponible para innovación, muy centrado en este presente y futuro digital, se destina a mujeres. Y, obviamente, esto se refleja en las elecciones de las mujeres y las niñas, que no se decantan por estos estudios.

Pero ojo, no podemos solo insistir en que las chicas elijan estos estudios mientras las socializamos en otros valores diferentes. Por eso tenemos que actuar conjuntamente, integralmente, y también prestigiar las profesiones feminizadas y los cuidados, para que los niños también las elijan y rompamos de una vez estereotipos sin, con ello, minusvalorar todo lo que nuestras sociedades asocian con las mujeres.

Por ello, ante la próxima sesión de la Comisión de la Condición Jurídica y Social de la Mujer de las Naciones Unidas, este Parlamento exige una respuesta política coordinada para el empoderamiento de las mujeres y las niñas a través de la tecnología. Debemos hacerlo sin exigirles a las niñas una cosa y, al mismo tiempo, la contraria.

Katrin Langensiepen (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, it's great to see that we women take the room, even if we are running out of time, because it's so necessary and important, because 'women who don't ask for anything are taken at their word: they don't get anything.' Who said it? You can write an email. It was an important woman.

One of the priority themes of the UN Commission on the Status of Woman is gender equality in a digital age. But when we ask ourselves how to empower women in the digital world, we first need to make sure that the internet is a safe place and accessible for us. Online harassment, hate speech, trolling, disinformation, image-based sexual abuse is a daily reality for women and girls, and it prevents them from fully participating in politics and civic action. A recent study showed how disinformation and online abuse hinder women of colour to run as political candidates. So searches for prominent women and politics on Instagram and TikTok ahead of the 2020 mid-terms produced abusive hashtags.

As European Parliament, we need to be strong and act across national lines on this topic, also at a global level, because women who don't ask for anything are taken at their word: they don't get anything!

PRESIDÊNCIA: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA

Vice-Presidente

Maria Walsh (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, this year I welcome the UN's focus on utilising digital education to achieve gender equality and empower women and girls.

Eighty-five per cent of our jobs today won't exist in seven years due to digital growth. Over half of our Member States include digital skills in their primary education curriculum, and it's welcomed. But while we push to excel our digital footprints, we must ensure the safety of women and girls online. Research shows 1 in 10 women over the age of 15 in our European Union have experienced online violence.

Therefore, online safety is urgently required and needs to play a central part in the teaching of digital skills. In order to truly and fully empower our young people, we must create a safe space to work, study and connect through online platforms. If we are ever to achieve gender equality for our young women, which they so richly deserve, we must eradicate gender-based violence online also.

Alessandra Moretti (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la transizione verde, la ripresa della pandemia e la rivoluzione digitale delineano un mondo che cambia velocemente ed è nostro compito garantire che nessuno sia lasciato indietro.

Serve un'economia digitale inclusiva, che consideri le esigenze specifiche di genere, affinché le donne e le ragazze, in tutta la loro diversità, non ne siano danneggiate o escluse. Sostenere l'accesso delle donne al mondo STEM, imprenditoriale e tecnologico, non solo garantisce l'uguaglianza, ma assicura un contributo determinante che le donne possono dare alle nostre economie.

Il lavoro, che genera indipendenza ed emancipazione economica delle donne, è fondamentale per liberarle dalla violenza in ogni sua forma. Per questo sostengo la collaborazione con le Nazioni Unite, per garantire che il Patto digitale globale sia sensibile alla dimensione di genere.

Chiudo rivolgendomi alle colleghe, soprattutto del gruppo ID e quindi della Lega. Ho parlato di donne in tutta la loro diversità perché ricordo che ogni donna deve essere libera di determinarsi e di decidere chi essere. Quando la Lega parla dell'effetto negativo che l'autoidentificazione di genere ha sui diritti delle donne, forse dimentica che ogni individuo è libero di scegliere come gestire il proprio corpo, senza che i diritti delle donne debbano essere difesi a discapito di altri diritti.

Luisa Regimenti (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria Dalli, signor Ministro, il divario di genere nelle competenze e opportunità digitali è ancora troppo alto in tantissimi paesi.

La maggior parte delle donne, e non solo nelle nazioni in via di sviluppo, non ha accesso alle informazioni, ai servizi e alla corretta educazione digitale. Queste circostanze costituiscono un ostacolo sulla strada della parità di genere, del tipo più antico, più bieco e più diffuso: l'esclusione o l'emarginazione dal mercato del lavoro e quindi, di conseguenza, dall'indipendenza economica.

Lo sviluppo digitale può essere uno strumento indispensabile per permettere alle donne di non essere costrette a scegliere tra lavoro e famiglia, per migliorare la qualità della loro vita e per promuovere l'avanzamento nelle professioni in campo scientifico, tecnologico, ingegneristico e matematico. Eliminare gli ostacoli, dunque, non è un'opzione, è un dovere e una responsabilità politica.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Isabella Adinolfi (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo nel 2023, ma siamo ancora lontani dal raggiungere la parità di genere. Condivido che il divario di genere in alcuni settori è predominante e che bisogna intervenire con forza e lungimiranza.

L'accesso all'istruzione e le competenze digitali devono essere la priorità. Sono strumenti, infatti, indispensabili alle donne per raggiungere anche un'indipendenza economica o creare una propria attività imprenditoriale. Non esiste libertà se non si ha la propria indipendenza economica.

Il divario digitale si traduce spesso anche in una minore consapevolezza dei pericoli che si possono incontrare in rete. Deve essere priorità combattere le violenze e i soprusi che si consumano online e le armi che abbiamo a disposizione spesso sono troppo poche.

Tuttavia, nel campo dell'istruzione e della formazione non dobbiamo concentrarci solo sulle politiche che migliorano l'accesso alla scienza, alla tecnologia, all'ingegneria e alla matematica, ma dobbiamo anche investire sui settori dell'arte e della creatività. Solo la sinergia tra i vari campi del sapere permette uno sviluppo appagante della persona. Oltre il corpo e la mente deve essere nutrita anche l'anima.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisaria Dalli, la Comisión de Libertades, Justicia e Interior ha legislado penalmente esta legislatura contra la ciberdelincuencia y el ciberacoso contra las mujeres. Esa es una prioridad de la Unión Europea en todos los foros internacionales, también en las Naciones Unidas.

Pero hay que decir, además, que ninguna resolución de las Naciones Unidas puede tener la fuerza de obligar de la legalidad internacional si no la asumen como tal la Unión Europea y sus Estados miembros.

En su momento hablamos del Convenio de Estambul, en el que el Parlamento Europeo mandató a la Comisión que, con el Consejo, ratificarse con personalidad jurídica única y, sin embargo, la tarea no está completa. A pesar de que el mandato fue de 2017, todavía la Presidencia sueca no ha conseguido arrancar la ratificación por seis de los Estados miembros. Y eso que el Tribunal de Justicia ha dicho que puede hacerse sin unanimidad.

Por tanto, para que tenga fuerza de obligar el mandato de la Unión Europea en la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas, lo importante es hablar con una voz propia y que todos los Estados cumplan con sus obligaciones de protección de las mujeres.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, hvala što ste mi ovaj put dali riječ. Vezano je uz Istanbulsku konvenciju i vladavinu prava.

Htio bih samo citirati Sud Europske unije u Luxembourg od prije 16 mjeseci koji je rekao da trebate poštivati načelo supsidijarnosti i pravo država članica da same odluče o Istanbulskoj konvenciji, a izvjestitelji ponovno, protivno odluci Suda, požuruju Vijeće da donese tu odluku. Dakle, trebalo bi poštivati vladavinu prava i kad vam odluke suda ne odgovaraju. A vi, dakle, očito ugrožavate tu vladavinu prava.

Drugo, promotori Istanbulske konvencije imali su prilike u svojim brojnim govorima navesti bar jedan pozitivan rezultat Istanbulske konvencije koja je potpisana prije dvanaest godina. Nisu citirali niti jedan. Znači, ta je konvencija dokazano neučinkovita.

No vi ste stvorili narativ da mi koji se protivimo Istanbulskoj konvenciji, valjda da mrzimo žene i da promičemo nasilje nad ženama, što je težak nonsens. Zapravo, ja bih čak rekao da je upravo suprotno.

S obzirom da je taj dokument neučinkovit, vi koji promičete taj dokument, vi promičete nasilje nad ženama jer promičete neučinkovit dokument. Dakle, jako me zanima koliko će ta dogma dugo trajati, u kojoj ćete se oglašavati na dokaze koji pokazuju da je taj dokument neučinkovit?

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, Minister, honourable Members, the upcoming session of the Commission on the Status of Women provides an excellent opportunity to reflect on key actions to ensure that all women and girls benefit equally with men and boys from the digital transition and have the necessary safeguards to protect us from potential exclusion or gender-based violence.

The European Commission drove many initiatives that are in line with the European Parliament's Women's Rights Committee's motion for a resolution on CSW67. However, rapid technological and digital development will require further focus on both empowering women's and girls' potential, as well as protection against gender-based violence and silencing.

We promote the collection of data disaggregated by gender and other relevant breakdowns in all policy areas. This is key to the design of effective evidence-based policy-making. With this in mind, last September, the Commission launched a Commission-wide gender-relevant data mapping exercise as part of the pilot project on gender mainstreaming in the budget. The results of this exercise will serve to further strengthen the Commission's annual reporting on the EU Budget's contribution to gender equality, as well as to inform the preparation of the Commission's proposals for the coming MFF.

For our external action, we have committed that by 2025, 85% of all new external actions must promote gender equality and women's empowerment as principal or significant objective. Furthermore, the Commission developed a methodology to track all EU spending programmes' contributions to gender equality under the 2021-2027 multiannual framework. This methodology was applied for the first time in the pilot in the context of the draft budget of 2023 and will be repeated in the draft budget of 2024.

I thank you for your commitment and support to advance gender equality and to build a Union of equality together.

Jessika Roswall, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, this year we celebrate the 70th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The declaration reflects the principle of human rights, yet these principles are called into question every time women and girls are denied the dignity and rights to which they are entitled. The EU is committed to the full enjoyment of all human rights by all women and girls, as well as their empowerment. This commitment is crucial also in the view of the challenges and opportunities women and girls face in the digital area.

As mentioned in my introductory speech, working towards increased gender equality is a priority for the Swedish presidency, including bridging the digital gender divide. During the 67th session of the Commission on the Status of Women, the Swedish presidency will, together with the Commission, organise the EU high-level side event on the theme a gender-equal world with technologies, digitalisation and AI, which is a roadmap. If you are in New York, you are most welcome. Today's debate, alongside your resolution, represents an important contribution in the view of discussions that will be held in New York next month. I look forward to working with you to advance our shared commitment to gender equality together with our international partners.

President. – The debate is closed. I would like to inform you that we have received two motions for resolutions. The vote will take place tomorrow.

14. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting

Presidente. – A ata da sessão de ontem e os textos aprovados já se encontram disponíveis.

Há alguma observação?

A ata é aprovada.

15. Question Time (Commission) - Strengthened EU enlargement policy to the Western Balkans

Presidente. – Segue-se o período de perguntas à Comissão ao abrigo do artigo 137.º do Regimento sobre Política reforçada de alargamento da União Europeia para os Balcãs Ocidentais.

Dou, por isso, as boas-vindas ao Comissário Várhelyi para este período de perguntas.

Como sabem, este período de perguntas durará cerca de 90 minutos. Haverá um minuto para fazer a pergunta, dois minutos para a resposta, 30 segundos para uma pergunta suplementar e, ainda, dois minutos para a resposta.

Quero recordar aos colegas que a eventual pergunta suplementar só será atribuída se estiver estritamente relacionada com a pergunta principal e não consistir numa nova pergunta.

Se desejar fazer uma pergunta, convidamo-lo a registar o seu pedido agora, utilizando a função «catch-the-eye» na respetiva máquina de voto, depois de ter inserido o seu cartão de voto.

Durante o período de perguntas, as intervenções serão efetuadas a partir do vosso lugar e convido todos os oradores a respeitarem o tempo de uso da palavra atribuído.

Os colegas podem precisar de alguns momentos para registar o pedido de pergunta através do dispositivo de votação. Por conseguinte, solicito que apresentem o vosso pedido agora para que possamos iniciar o nosso debate.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, драги Оливер. Първо искам да започна с благодарност към Вашите усилия по процеса на присъединяване на страните от Западните Балкани, въпреки всички многопластови проблеми, свързани със страните кандидатки, исторически свързани с идентичност, регионални и религиозни въпроси, както и влиянието на Русия. Македонските българи, както и всички други граждани, трябва да живеят в сигурност и спокойствие за себе си и своите семейства. Те трябва да имат еднакви възможности за образование и кариерно развитие, както и да живеят в среда без дискриминация и омраза към тях. Това е основата на нашия Европейски съюз и не е никакъв банален билатерален спор.

Печеленето на популистки, псевдонационалистически гласове с тази тема работи срещу интересите на гражданите на Македония. Това е, което искам да Ви попитам. Какво още Комисията и Вие лично можете да направите за преодоляването на тази инерция от миналото, за преодоляването на омразата в общественото говорене, в академичния свят, в политическите среди в Република Северна Македония? За да може да подпомогнем по-бързото присъединяване на тази държава към Европейския съюз, което е в интерес на всички нас.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, I think it was very important that, in the case of North Macedonia, we have very clear rules set out not only in the negotiating framework itself, that has led for the first IGC to be convened, but also in the Council conclusion adopting this common framework for the negotiations. And in there the criteria is very clear. Good neighbourly relations and treaties that are there to provide for this are to be implemented fully. And this is part of, of course, the accession process and the Commission is going to monitor this. This year we will again look into the progress.

Yes, I have seen developments, and I have received also representatives of citizens of North Macedonia identifying themselves as Bulgarians and they have also explained recent developments, but I take comfort in the fact that the government in Skopje is not only aware, but also acting to eradicate any violence or any hatred against Bulgarians. You have seen an immediate reaction from the government itself and the perpetrators have been arrested. There are ongoing police, and then – I hope – judiciary, procedures going on and I think that this should also give us a very clear guidance in terms of the level of commitment of the government of North Macedonia in this regard.

Andrey Kovatchev (PPE). – Thank you very much, dear Olivér, for what you said. And I followed very closely also the negotiation framework and the implementation of this prerequisite for the starting of the second governmental conference. But can you please confirm that this is not only the change of the constitution but also the respect of the treaty from 2017, which – it is very important to mention and to emphasise the treaty – which, with the two protocols, are also something which the Commission is monitoring for the starting of the negotiations? Thank you very much.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, yes, I can confirm it is in the negotiating framework. It is part and parcel together with the Prespa Agreement, and the Commission has to monitor this. This is part of the general political criteria under the negotiating framework, part of the general principles. This is why, as I told you, this year we will again give full reporting on this, coming up in the autumn.

Matjaž Nemec (S&D). – Hvala lepa za besedo. Spoštovani komisar! Znana so vam prizadevanja evropskih poslancev za podelitev statusa kandidatke Bosni in Hercegovini za članstvo v Evropski uniji. Tudi sam sem bil eden od bolj izpostavljenih evropskih poslancev v tem postopku.

Evropska komisija je v zadnjem širitvenem paketu napovedala realizacijo političnega foruma na visoki ravni z Bosno in Hercegovino in s tem so se strinjale tudi države članice. Kako in kdaj bi lahko takšno srečanje organizirali?

Znano je, da se je prav moja država Republika Slovenija ponudila za organizatoriko tovrstnega dogodka. Kajti Republika Slovenija se je zelo izpostavila pri podelitvi statusa kandidatke Bosni in Hercegovini. In, se vam zdi smiselno organizirati takšno srečanje skupaj z državami članicami, kot je bilo dogovorjeno? Hvala lepa.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Yes, we are waiting for the institutions to be set up in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Actually, it is going ahead quite steadily. And once we see clearly that the institutions are there, of course, we will reach out to the government and the presidency and also to the federation level and the Republika Srpska Government to set up this high-level political dialogue.

The purpose back then, when we proposed this to the Council and the Council followed it, was to set up a forum where those actors of the institutions are present who are there to deliver on the 8 priorities and then all the 14 key priorities. So we will need the institutions to be not only up and running, but also to engage with us and amongst themselves to be able to deliver on that. This is the idea behind the whole setting-up of such a forum.

Now, when it comes to the actual work, of course we will need the help of the Member States with the most knowledge. One could be, of course, Slovenia. And what I can tell you is that, yes, we have been approached by the Government of Slovenia and we are in contact with the government how to best use their potential help, for example, when it comes to technical support, because these are reforms that are quite complex and reforms where it's not only the legislation that matters, but also the implementation. Slovenia should be in a position to help us to deliver also in terms of enforcement and also in terms of creating a track record in Bosnia and Herzegovina when it comes to the implementation of these reforms.

Klemen Grošelj (Renew). – Spoštovani komisar. Po dodelitvi statusa kandidatke Bosni in Hercegovini ter začetku pogajanj z Albanijo in Severno Makedonijo se ponovno zdi, da je prišel proces širitve na Zahodni Balkan spet v neki prosti tek.

Zato vas sprašujem, ali bo Komisija glede na dogajanja na terenu, kjer dejansko vidimo popolno stagnacijo v nekaterih državah kandidatkah. Celo v tistih, ki se pogajajo za pristop, pa vidimo celo nazadovanje pri nekaterih najbolj temeljnih in ključnih področjih pogajanj.

Ali Komisija namerava spremeniti svoj relativno pasiven pristop do teh držav in začeti konkreten proaktivni odnos in spodbujanje doseganja teh držav – ne samo, da napredujejo v procesu pogajanj in dosegajo tiste cilje, katere so si zastavili, ampak da ohranijo svojo evropsko ambicijo.

V mnogih državah kandidatkah je jasen trend nazadovanja podpore članstvu v Evropski uniji in mislim, da določen del te odgovornosti za to nazadovanje imamo tudi na naši strani. Zato sprašujem, ali bo Komisija spremenila svoj pristop, ali bo bolj aktivno pristopila h kandidatkam, da bi te lažje napredovale na svoji evropski poti. Hvala lepa.

Olivér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission. – I think that last year has been quite a remarkable year when it comes to enlargement. We have welcomed three new candidate countries, one potential candidate country, and we have been able to have the first IGCs with Albania and North Macedonia.

I think that there's a very clear engagement now also at the leaders level. We have seen the Tirana Summit, which was a summit we have been waiting for, where very clear commitments have been made also at the level of the European Council towards the Western Balkans to accelerate the accession process. And in that, of course, we can talk about the institutional process, the accession negotiations as such, but I do not think that it is only the institutional processes that we should be looking at.

We should also be looking at the real integration: how fast the economies and the societies of these countries can be part of our markets, our societies, and there, there is much work to be done. This has been also a request from our Western Balkan partners.

On how to maintain their commitment and how to maintain their interest in joining the European Union, of course, it is very difficult to convince them to join if there is no progress on our side. This is why the Commission has been pushing for decisions to be made by the Council. Every decision which brings us further and closer to enlargement is a very precious one. And this is why we have been pushing the agenda very hard. And this is why what you see also at leaders level is based on the work that we have put on the table.

I think that it is going to be very important also from this House to bring further positive messages that we want to welcome them here and there is a place for them here. Of course, it comes with a lot of criteria that needs meeting and, of course, there cannot be shortcuts on any of the criteria. So there is, we already see, quite a competition, and not only in the Western Balkans but now in other regions very close to Europe, for becoming an EU Member State. So my hope is that this year will further accelerate the enlargement process

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, В Северна Македония от език на омразата се премина вече към нова фаза, а именно към действия, породени от омраза. И ви припомням основното при копенхагенските критерии: спазването на правата на човека. Абсолютно сте наясно, че от десетилетия правата на българите в Северна Македония се нарушават. Фрапантно се нарушават, убийствено се нарушават. Последните инциденти са ви известни: опит за убийство, спиране на свободното преминаване на българите през границата и други. Конкретният ми въпрос е: Ще предприемете ли действия относно последния инцидент на границата? И второ, ще промени ли Северна Македония и кога своята конституция, така че да даде в нея права на българите?

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – I think what we have seen around 4 February, which happens to be the birthday of the common leader, the two countries, Gotse Delchev, were not encouraging. I was hoping for something much more, something the leaders of the two countries have agreed, which is a common celebration of that day. And this is why I reached out over the phone to both of them. But unfortunately, this year I was not successful. But I do hope that next year there will be a common celebration. We have seen a government delegation from Sofia arriving in Skopje for the common celebration. Maybe we can do next year without these events that took place in the in the border.

But I must also confess that it is no easy task for the authorities in Skopje to maintain calm and peace if there are provocations on their borders. So this is why I think we, together as European Union, also this House, we should bring the message that history is common and they should celebrate the history as common as it was agreed between the two. And we need to do everything to bring down these tensions. And this is why it was so important that we have a very clear frame and set of criteria also embedded in the accession process that needs delivering. And this is why I think that with this set of tools that we have at hand, we should be able to avoid any escalation or any worsening of these tensions between the two countries.

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Г-н Комисар, доволен съм от Вашия отговор, но в тази връзка последното, което казахте за общата история, ме кара да Ви задам за пореден път въпроса: Имате ли информация, Вие конкретно, от правителството на Северна Македония дали е започнал процес на промяна на съдържанието на учебниците в образователната система? И в тях за българите вече да не се учи като за врагове, фашисти, варвари, татари и прочие лъжи, които се насаждат, повтарям, от десетилетия от властите, медиите и заинтересовани кръгове в тази страна. Променят ли македонците своите учебници по история, съответно с научната, общоприетата научна истина от цяла Европа?

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – I think it is clear what two countries have agreed. So we hope that everything that has been agreed will be delivered. This issue that you have mentioned is also part of the agreement.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Mr Commissioner, I reflect on two subjects from your portfolio: Montenegro and the rule of law.

As the former leader in accession progress, Montenegro, alongside Serbia, is the only country that did not progress on the EU accession path in the last year. We have witnessed almost two years of political instability and we still do not have a new government in place. Nor is there any decision on the extraordinary elections.

What does the Commission plan to do to get the country back on track with progress on EU-related reforms? Another source of political tensions there is the 'Open Balkan' initiative. What is the view of the Commission regarding the initiative?

Finally, the rule of law should be a crucial precondition for progress in accession, and the main feature of the new methodology. Is this provision formally confirmed in practice? Is the rule of law really a key provision that sets the tone for overall progress of the accession countries?

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. –Yes, the statement that you made in your question in the first part, I couldn't agree more. Unfortunately, Montenegro has been missing over three years now, without much progress in the accession negotiations. Montenegro is the one which had most chapters opened in the institutional part, and they have been a front runner in the accession negotiations. Unfortunately, due to election results, internal divisions, political divisions, the country has not been able to get a clear government majority and the country has not been able to deliver on what is required as the next stage of moving forward in the accession negotiations. Now we see that amendments are put forward in the Parliament, which are going against the Venice Commission recommendations, and it seems that we are not getting any closer to delivering on the key priorities.

Because it is very clear that the next step for Montenegro, and this answers also the second part of your question, to be able to move forward, the country will need to deliver on the so-called interim benchmarks related to the rule of law area, basically cluster number one. Montenegro has opted into this new methodology, so therefore any progress is conditional on delivering these priorities.

I do hope that, the latest news I got while coming here, was that it seems that there is political agreement now in the parliament for the nomination of the four new members of the constitutional court. And I do hope that this will also create the political possibility to convene the elections as early as this spring. And this election should bring a strong government with a strong majority in the parliament who can finally pick up the work and work for the country to make progress. But the country clearly needs elections and we need everybody in the country to work for that and stabilise also the political situation in the country.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – I would like to remind the Commissioner that I also asked about the ‘Open Balkan’ initiative, about your stance on it – what’s your take on the ‘Open Balkan’ initiative?

Olívér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission. – The Open Balkan initiative is an initiative which is coming from the region, and this is why it is so precious. It is coming from the region and it is supposed to create European conditions within the region, among the region. This is why it was so important to go ahead with it. Our original plan was the Common Regional Market, and this is what we have proposed together with the Economic and Investment Plan.

Well, unfortunately, we ran into difficulties. And with these difficulties, we had to let those who would like to go ahead and implement the four freedoms in the Western Balkans amongst themselves and support them – at least those who are willing – to go ahead and implement it. And we see already results coming in. And we have also seen that the Open Balkan had a positive impact on the Common Regional Market, because those who have been having second thoughts, let me put it this way, have come back to the table when it comes to the Common Regional Market. And now we have progress in the Common Regional Market with three agreements, very important agreements, being implemented. And this should bring European standards and values even before accession, implemented among the members of the Western Balkans.

So I think that the Open Balkans has a positive role to play and a positive contribution, but it has to be based on our rules, on our standards that would have to be implemented anyhow, if the region wants to become a member of this family.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – The Russian aggression has woken us up. A credible enlargement policy is not only key for our neighbouring citizens, but also for protecting our security and European values.

But as my colleagues already said, granting the candidate status is only one step. It needs to be followed by a more active engagement – increased economic cooperation and support to countries with the necessary reforms. But support must go hand in hand with strict conditions on the rule of law, democracy, fundamental rights and anti-corruption measures.

And for Bosnia, this requires that we strongly denounce the ethno-nationalistic rhetoric in support of Putin and secessionist plans.

Are you ready to be very clear towards Mr Dodik and to keep the EU funding frozen? And in which way do you pressure the new government to swiftly implement the key priorities for accession?

A credible enlargement process also requires that EU Member States do not abuse their vetoes, also not in interim decisions during the enlargement process. And Bulgaria should get this message from the Council and Commission for the further process. Are you ready to convey this message? You just said I was very clear to the Council that they should not and that they should finally take positive decisions. But it also regards, of course, Bulgaria who put high demands and used the veto towards North Macedonia. Are you ready to convey this message? And how will you prevent further hurdles and requirements that are not part of the accession process?

Olívér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, I think I can only confirm what you have stated in your question. Yes, of course. Once candidate status is provided, it comes with a higher level of responsibility on the side of the candidate country. But it also comes with a higher level of responsibility from us, meaning that if there is progress on their side, there has to be progress on our side. Now, when it comes to Bosnia-Herzegovina, I think that the positive impact is already there. We have never seen that governments are formed in such a fast and based on wide political agreement, and we have not seen either that agreements also in the Federation are in the making. We could be seeing a government in the Federation after five long years coming forward quite fast.

So I think that the offer that we have put on the table for Bosnia Herzegovina has been taken very seriously by the entire country, and that includes the Republika Srpska as well, because they have been also part of this formation of the government. Now, of course, it doesn't mean that from here on conditions are going to be lighter, no, on the contrary. Now that they are candidate status, they have candidate status. The criteria for making the next step is even clearer than ever. We have eight priorities plus one that needs delivering, and we have the 14 key priorities. Which have to be met to move to the next stage, which is the starting of the accession negotiations.

I think that it is clear in Bosnia and Herzegovina last time I went there before the Council took the decision, it is very clear that the country has lost five years, at least five years, and it has no more five years to lose. The youth is leaving the country. The economic basis of the country is weak and it has not been improved. And this is why Bosnia-Herzegovina needs Europe. And this is why I was very pleased to see the coalition agreement starts with the European perspective. But it also means that if they want Europe, they have to come on our side and they have to choose our values and they have to choose our rules. And this is a constant message that I am always bringing to Bosnia-Herzegovina. And this is a message which is for everybody in the country. Now, when it comes to messages towards Bulgaria – I think I have quite a number of members of this House who are coming from Bulgaria – so I'm speaking under their control, but they may have seen me more in their press visiting, Bulgaria than any commissioner ever before. And that was because I have tried to convince them to come around and to agree. But these decisions are hard to make. And as you have heard from the comments, they are still very sensitive. So I think we need to work to bring the agreement into implementation that we have managed to strike. Because that is the credibility of Europe, not only towards the candidate country in question in North Macedonia, but also in relation to the Member State, which is a member of this organisation.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – It's good to hear that you keep the pressure on Bulgaria. I think it's important to protect North Macedonia. Of course, what has been agreed should be implemented, but that they can be safeguarded, that the EU responds in a credible and consistent way afterwards.

Now, one question you did not answer yet, and that's about what's happening in the Republika Srpska – Mr Dodik. You talk about the hopeful new government, but what is happening there is still a huge threat of secession, of foreign influence from Russia, the clear and blatant support and honouring of Mr Putin. That should be very clearly denounced because it's really a threat for the ethnic division, but also, of course, for the stability and getting closer to the EU. So what do you do against Mr Dodik and these threats? And are you ready to indeed keep the money suspended to 600 billion that you suspended because of the secessionist plans?

Olívér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, I can only quote our statement that we have made on that day. Siding with Putin in these circumstances isolates the Republika Srpska and its leadership internationally. There is no place in the EU for honouring and rewarding politicians who order the destruction of a neighbouring country and the killing of its people. This must be very clear to everyone. That decision of the Republika Srpska leadership is regrettable and wrong. This is the statement that we have made and it is still valid today.

Now, when it comes to the funding, the funding has been suspended for another reason. The funding has been suspended because of the secessionist movements from the Republika or the representatives of the Republika Srpska, leaving the common institutions of Bosnia Herzegovina. Our condition for putting back any financial arrangements for Bosnia Herzegovina was that the representatives of the Republika Srpska should return to the institutions so that we have functioning institutions and this is the criteria still in force.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Thank you very much. Dear Commissioner, thank you once again for your really good and compassionate behaviour when we were negotiating IPA III.

In my last legislature, I was really worried why all this money that was used for migration waves was taken away from Bosnia and Herzegovina, because Bosnia and Herzegovina, at that time, I got the answer, didn't have the absorption capacity to use the money. Bosnia and Herzegovina got candidate status. Thank you for that. But I recently had a meeting with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina; he's a good guy, who will side with European affairs, with European policies, and not with Iran, like the last minister. So I want you to support the new government. I want you to help Bosnia and Herzegovina get this absorption capacity and not lag behind all the other countries in the Western Balkans. Because now we have Ukraine, we have Georgia, we have Moldova, but we do not have a bigger IPA. So until that time, Bosnia and Herzegovina will be like an orphan left alone and be a political tool in this Parliament for the people who do not have a clue what people need in Bosnia and Herzegovina. They need the young people to use this money and to get the country away from the interference of third countries and into the European Union.

Olivér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission. – Well, yes, candidate status is an offer and it's an offer not for the administration or the establishment of the country. We have made it very clear. This is an offer for the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

I have also met the new Foreign Minister. I must admit that I appreciated very much the new approach that he presented, which is that Europe is priority number one for this government. And for that reason, I have also offered our support to accelerate the reforms in Bosnia Herzegovina. And it's not an empty promise; it is a promise also to help them with technical expertise, by sending them people with knowledge who can advise them, and also to help them to get better access to funding.

But it is not enough to have goodwill. We also need the government of Bosnia Herzegovina to deliver on key issues, key issues that would help us also to de-block funding. And this is why we are now at a very important juncture, and this is why we need the whole institutions of the country to work as one. This is why now is the moment for this new administration to use this opportunity and come forward with deliveries.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Yes, could I just ask Mr Commissioner, are you aware of the knowledge of the constitutional framework of the people who are representing citizens here in this building? And that without cutting the funds – if we cut funds for one part of the country, Bosnia Herzegovina will not receive anything.

So can you just let us know is there any pedagogy that the Commission will try to use in the future?

Olivér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission. – You are putting your finger on the most difficult topic, which is that, yes, one looks at what is happening on one side of the country, but it means that it will have an impact on the other part. If you look at the actual projects that we are talking about, the highways and the railways that have been constructed in Herzegovina will not connect that part of the country with Europe without the other part being built.

So this is the big dilemma but, as I said, we have a new government in place and we need this new government to change the course of politics in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

And I'm hopeful – judging from my first meetings with them – that they can do it and I'm hopeful that they also have the political will and backing of all three constitutive people in the country.

Alessandra Moretti (S&D). – Grazie Presidente. Gentilissimo Commissario, sono felice di vederla qui oggi. Sono convinta che questi momenti di scambio siano fondamentali per proseguire il percorso che porta la nostra Unione e i paesi balcanici sugli stessi binari.

Si è parlato molto della questione dell'allineamento della Serbia alla politica estera e di sicurezza europea, in particolare per quanto riguarda le sanzioni applicate alla Russia. Questo è senz'altro un tema di primaria importanza, ma ci sono altre questioni che riguardano lo Stato di diritto che meritano di essere approfondite.

Recentemente la Serbia ha adottato riforme costituzionali nel campo della giustizia. Le chiedo, Commissario, come giudica queste riforme. Sono passi in avanti sufficienti per il paese? E poi, riguardo la libertà di stampa e la scarsissima rappresentazione delle opposizioni nei media serbi, come può l'Unione europea agevolare una narrativa equilibrata, libera dalla disinformazione e dalla propaganda russa, spesso proprio antieuropea?

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – On the judicial reforms taking place in Serbia, this has been an outstanding reform for quite a while, and it took quite heavy political investment to get it rolling, but we have it now. Just to illustrate the magnitude of this reform, it took a national referendum to get it approved. And now it is there. It is not only there, but it was only very recently, I think, a couple of days ago that the parliament has passed now to the next stage, which is adopting the laws, implementing this reform, and it is going to be still a long way. And if Serbia delivers on all the elements of it, it should be sufficient when it comes to the judiciary.

In relation to the media freedom and the media balance, yes, Serbia has still a long list to do and there for that reason we have managed to agree with them on a roadmap for all the reforms. And this roadmap is, I think, directly implemented and supervised by the Prime Minister herself. And of course it is very clear also in Belgrade that this is part and parcel of the fundamentals cluster. So any progress in that cluster will be measured also in relation to the delivery on the media freedom.

On media balance, well, we are also helping local independent media. We are providing funding for that. But I think that it should be this roadmap that should bring about the media balance on the Serbian media landscape.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle (ID). – Monsieur le Commissaire, les résolutions et déclarations de l'Union ne cessent d'appeler de leurs vœux l'adhésion de pays des Balkans à l'Union européenne, y compris le territoire du Kosovo. Dans la continuité de ce souhait, le Conseil européen a accordé à la Bosnie-Herzégovine, le 15 décembre 2022, le statut officiel de pays candidat à l'adhésion.

Cela pose un double problème. D'une part, concernant la Bosnie-Herzégovine, l'une de ses deux composantes, la République serbe de Bosnie – dont on parle très peu – témoigne toujours de son hostilité catégorique au principe de l'adhésion. Quelle place la République serbe de Bosnie occupe-t-elle dans les discussions entre la Bosnie et l'Union européenne comme dans le processus d'adhésion? Entendez-vous prendre l'avis de ses dirigeants?

D'autre part, concernant le Kosovo, cinq États membres de l'Union européenne lui refusent une reconnaissance officielle. Êtes-vous d'accord que cela s'oppose absolument à toute adhésion de ce territoire à l'Union européenne? Quel est le statut juridique du Kosovo aux yeux de l'Union européenne? Sur quel fondement juridique le lui attribuez-vous?

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, I think that we all know what is the legal opinion about the status of Kosovo. Five of our Member States have not recognised Kosovo as a country. And this, of course, has an impact on our approach. Kosovo, nevertheless, has applied for membership – last year – and this is on the table of the Council. The Swedish presidency, although not here and not present at the debate, is considering the options and the possible decisions it might take. On our side, we are ready to do the work that is normally done in these cases, which is delivering an opinion, but it is not the Commission deciding on this, it is going to be for the Council to decide on Bosnia Herzegovina. I think the country has applied for EU membership. So for me it is very clear that that implies the entire country. So there are not no bits and pieces of the country who would want to become an EU Member State and parts which do not. And as I just quoted, the government program of the newest government, in which also representatives of the Republika Srpska are part of the government, it is clear that their first priority is EU accession, and this is why I think that we cannot call into question the European aspirations of Bosnia Herzegovina.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Dzisiaj cywilizowany świat obchodzi święto Świętego Walentego, ale zapominamy, że dla chrześcijańskiej Europy 14 lutego to przede wszystkim święto Cyryla i Metodego. Tych, którzy ponieśli chrześcijaństwo właśnie na Bałkany Zachodnie, ponieśli chrześcijaństwo do Słowian. To ci święci po raz pierwszy przetłumaczyli Pismo Święte na język staroцерквинословіанський, ustanowili cyrylicę.

Dlaczego o tym wspominam? Bo dzisiaj współczesna Europa zastanawia się, czy dołączyć do Wspólnoty Europejskiej państwa Bałkanów Zachodnich. A jaka jest alternatywa? Jeżeli tych państw nie dołączymy, to będzie tak jak w dziewiątym wieku, wtedy, kiedy Cyryl i Metody podążali właśnie w kierunku Słowian, czyli oddamy Bałkany Zachodnie wpływom Rosji, wpływom Putina, ale również islamskich wahabitów. Dlaczego jest to tak ważne? Bo dzisiaj pojawia się pytanie, czy wniosek o szybką akcesję do Unii Europejskiej Ukrainy, Mołdawii, Gruzji nie spowoduje akcesu do Unii Europejskiej państw Bałkanów Zachodnich. Dlatego chciałbym zapytać, czy Komisja dostrzega ten problem?

Olívér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – It might require a bit more time to elaborate on all the implications. But I can for sure agree with you in the implied statement you made. Yes, if we cannot include the Western Balkans in the European Union, then the European Union is going to be challenged. The European Union is going to be geopolitically challenged. This region is surrounded by EU Member States and this region has always been – you have also quoted Cyril and Methodius, but we can go even further back in history – has always been part and parcel of European history, European culture, European society and the European economy. And we have to build it back, and we have to stabilise and help to stabilise the Western Balkans itself. They long for this as well. Of course, it takes two to tango, so they also have to deliver their part. But, as we discussed today, I think we now have a golden opportunity to accelerate the accession process for the Western Balkans, which will also help Europe to create stability and security around itself long term.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Bardzo dziękuję Panie Komisarzu za tę odpowiedź, ale mimo wszystko chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na pewną dysproporcję. Otóż pełna zgoda, że Europa to dwa płuca, to płuco wschodnie i płuco zachodnie. Ale czy Komisja nie dostrzega przypadkiem, że pod pretekstem kryteriów, które stawiamy dzisiaj państwom z regionu Bałkanów Zachodnich, tak naprawdę niektóre państwa starej Unii Europejskiej, dbając o swoje partykularne, narodowe interesy, mnożą tego różnego rodzaju wymogi po to tylko, aby te dwa płuca jednak nie oddychały równomiernie, to znaczy kosztem płuca wschodniego, rozszerzamy zdolności płuca zachodniego.

Olívér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – This was a dilemma I have inherited. You are right about this. This is a dilemma that this Commission has inherited. And, if I want to paraphrase it, I wouldn't say that some of our Member States wanted to prevent accession through the inflation of criteria.

I think that when we received the mandate, also in this House, it was very clear that the credibility of the whole enlargement process needs strengthening – the credibility and the predictability.

The credibility means for our Member States that they also feel involved. They also feel in charge. And this is not just a mechanical, administrative exercise at the end of which they will have just the automatic 'yes' to say.

On the contrary, they also want to be part of this process. This is why it was very important to put this new balance on the table, which means credibility for our Member States and predictability for our candidate countries, meaning that one has to see the reforms are delivered and the other side has to see that if reforms are delivered, then decisions are made here in Europe.

In that, of course, it was also very important that these decisions are coming faster and coming to a Commission which is pro-enlargement, inherited from another Commission, which was not.

So, this is why it takes a bit of time. But now, as I said, last year was a very important development and this year could be even a bigger one.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, hvala vam na riječi baš danas kada slavimo sv. Valentina, Valentinovo, kada slavimo ljubav i 33. rođendan mog IDS-a. Poštovani povjereniče, prošlo je već skoro deset godina otkad je Hrvatska kao posljednja zemlja ušla u Europsku uniju. I kada danas pogledamo tu Europsku uniju, ona zbilja izgleda kao jedna velika američka krafna s velikom rupom u sredini.

U tih deset godina svašta se desilo, naravno. Bilo je tu različitih izbora, došle su različite proeuropske vlade, one druge u Europskoj uniji. Isto tako, svašta se desilo - od nove metodologije do, ja bih rekao, jednog usporavanja cijelog tog procesa.

Ali u životu treba biti iskren i pošten pa vas molim iskreno i pošteno da pogledate tih deset godina. Da li ste vi zadovoljni kao povjerenik za proširenje s učinjenim u deset godina? Jer moj je *feeling*, moj je dojam da od jedne primarno geostrateške politike, jedne od ključnih politika Europske unije - politike proširenja, dolazimo na sekundarno važnu ili tercijarnu, što nikako nije dobro, politiku proširenja. Koje je vaše mišljenje? Molim vas o tome.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – You asked me about the last ten years, right? On the last ten years, no, I'm not happy. And this is what this Commission wants to change, this is what this Commission has been investing, investing, investing in from day number one.

If I look at the agenda of the European Council as of 2019, you see that this topic is back on the agenda of the leaders. It means to me that this is a priority. This is a priority again. And interestingly enough, the Russian aggression against Ukraine only increased the importance of the enlargement towards the Western Balkans.

If you look at the summits, the latest one just a couple of days ago, it is there. If you look at December's summit, it's there. So this is now a priority for the European Union. But it's not enough to say it. It means that we have to translate this into action. And this is why it is very important that the European Union not only focuses on taking all the institutional decisions that it can take because the criteria are met, so to bring further the accession process, but also that we accelerate the real integration of the region into the European Union.

This is why at the beginning of the mandate, we have put a substantial economic and investment plan on the table to not only accelerate this, but also to help the Balkans transform itself much faster, pretty much to the European standards.

This is why it was also very important in the economic and investment plan that we are addressing the key challenges and the key bottlenecks of the region. One of the biggest vulnerabilities of the region is, of course, energy and this is why in the economic investment plan, for us, it was a key priority to find alternative routes, alternative suppliers, and help them to get it in the Western Balkans. This is why from day number one, we're working very, very hard so that at the end of the mandate of this Commission, you will see that the Western Balkans is developing much faster than ever before.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, vrlo kratko. Dakle, drago mi je da sam čuo, ovoga, vaše planove, ambiciozne planove za zapadni Balkan.

Ali, htio bih čuti konkretno, budući da je i vama i nama ostalo oko godinu i pol mandata, s čime biste bili konkretno zadovoljni da u tih godinu i pol dana učinite odnosno s čime da se možete nakon godine i po dana od današnjeg dana pohvaliti da je konkretno učinjeno vezano za napredak tih država prema Europskoj uniji?

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, my life is much grimmer than being able to think about something like this. But, of course, the best would be to deliver on everything we have designed when it comes to the economic and investment plan for the Balkans, meaning that we should have the gas interconnectors built and functioning, bringing Azeri gas to the region, meaning that we can build railways and highways, and outcompeting our competitors in the Western Balkans – we're getting there, very close. And to see that the region is rediscovered also by investors.

But, of course, this is one element. The other element is that we should see at least one country at the end of the mandate that is ready to join. It might look like a tall order at this point but, still, I think now we really need to put all efforts into that so that we have at least one country who has a clear opportunity to join.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Spoštovani komisar, ob širitvenem procesu zelo veliko govorimo o teh političnih problemih, kot so spori med državami, po drugi strani tudi spoštovanje vladavine prava.

Sam osebno pa ocenjujem, da je na Zahodnem Balkanu največji problem vedno večji zaostanek v različnih politikah, tudi v infrastrukturi, velik zaostanek v okoljski infrastrukturi, širokopasovni infrastrukturi.

Po drugi strani imamo tudi probleme z energetiko. Zelo veliko premoga, ki se uporablja za proizvodnjo elektrike, gretje in temu primerno tudi onesnažuje zrak. [...] In tretji velik problem je slaba perspektiva mladih in odhod mladih iz tega dela širom po svetu.

Ali mislite, da bi bilo povečanje teh vlaganj v to območje po eni strani tudi približevanje tega dela Evrope evropskim standardom, ki jih bodo tako ali tako morali spoštovati, ko bodo člani Evropske unije, po drugi strani pa tudi dvig podpore vstopu teh držav v Evropsko unijo.

Olívér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, I couldn't agree more, and what you're looking for is called the Economic and Investment plan. These are the clear bottlenecks that we have analysed and discovered together with the region. So when we have designed the economic and investment plan, yes, we have seen that there's a tremendous problem of connectivity. Be it transport or trade routes, be it energy. There's clearly a lack of energy sources. There's clearly a lack of clean energy sources. The single biggest polluter region, almost globally, is the Western Balkans. If you look at the coal use and the public health implications related to that, the picture is horrendous. This is why phasing out coal, for example, has been a very important priority of the economic and investment plan. Only through replacing coal with gas we would reduce by 65 % the emissions of the region. It's a tremendous decrease, not to mention the public health benefits of this. And yes, I agree with you, we have to help them to create an investor's climate that will attract foreign direct investment. And it's not only infrastructure but also the rule of law and the predictability of the legal system, the judicial system that should provide an opportunity for investors to come.

We see now that European investors are looking for new places. So this is the opportunity also for the Western Balkans. But for that, as you have also said, they need their youth to work for their economy. This is why we have also introduced the youth guarantee scheme for the Western Balkans, which is exactly the same way as it is for our European Member States. So we are doing a lot and I do hope that, at the end of the mandate, the Balkans is going to be a much more attractive region. But there are things that need more time than just one mandate. For example, the brain drain, getting back the youth. Judging from experience from Central and Eastern Europe, it takes at least ten years to start to really attract the youth. But we have to put the basics there, meaning that there are jobs. There are economic perspectives, not only short term but long term for the youth and for the whole population of the Western Balkans.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Ali lahko približno rečemo, da bo potem preko tega invest programa toliko vlaganj, kot smo jih bile deležne države, ki smo se pridružile Evropski uniji v zadnjih ... po letu 2004? To je tam med pet in osem tisoč evrov po glavi.

In ali bo ta denar tudi deljen na neki način bolj po principih kohezijske politike, kjer je veliko ljudi vključenih v te projekte, ne zgolj veliki nacionalni projekti, ki so vezani na vlade in na ministrstva.

Mislim, da je decentralizacija teh držav in pa to, da s projekti pridemo do konkretnih ljudi na terenu, pomembna zato, da bodo ljudje [...] izrazili večjo pripravljenost in zanesenost k vstopu v Evropsko unijo.

Olívér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, I'm not sure about this EUR 5 000 per capita – that's a very high number. I don't think it was EUR 5 000 per capita. But what you could see coming out of this, together with the common regional market is this: the Economic and Investment Plan is capable of delivering one third of the GDP of the entire region, EUR 30 billion. If you multiply also the effect it has on private investors, I think it would be a much higher number. But the EUR 30 billion investment is achievable.

According to the figures from the World Bank, if the Common Regional Market Project goes ahead, meaning that the countries in the Western Balkans introduce the exact same treatment as we have amongst our Member States in the Single Market and the 'four freedoms', they could also raise their GDPs by another third. So, the European contribution could be an increase of the GDP of the entire region by two thirds.

We are here to help and if we have some additional investments coming in from European private investors, this could really make a big difference.

Andor Deli (NI). – Well, at this moment, I think that the biggest enemy of enlargement is the lack of trust of certain Member States. But also, unfortunately, this House is lately manifesting it, too, in its recent country reports in the enlargement strategy, but also in the reports on foreign and security policy.

If you read these texts of the EP, it is clear that there is no confidence in the official assessment reports, there is criticism against the Commissioner and there is a big deficit of trust concerning the candidate countries, especially those which have conservative governments. And this lack of trust is sensed by the citizens of the candidate countries too.

This is not the way to do enlargement policy, especially in times of war and geopolitical battles. These countries need support and need positive messages.

In order to rebuild confidence and speed up the process, does the Commission think that setting an accession date for the Western Balkans would be helpful in this situation?

Olivér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission. – Setting accession dates is an evergreen topic. I think it's not about dates. It's about being able to act fast if there is fast delivery. This is what we need to make sure that Europe is capable of delivering. So if we have a Western Balkan partner or several Western Balkan partners who are able to move ahead faster, then we should also be able to move ahead faster. Because, of course, setting accession dates could be a very good tool to create an incentive. But if there is no delivery, the negative impact of a missed accession date is going to be even more terrible.

So what is necessary here is to work and to deliver on all the criteria. And, on our side, is to work and deliver all the decisions and to base our work on facts and figures that we see on the ground and try to keep up the pace, or even accelerate the pace, of enlargement.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, Sie haben vorhin auf die Frage einer Kollegin gesagt, dass Bosnien und Herzegowina Europa braucht, und dem stimme ich auch sehr zu. Bosnien und Herzegowina braucht aber auch die EU-Kommission als Hüterin der Verträge, die sie auf dem Weg unterstützt, aber auch klar anspricht, wenn das Land vom Weg abkommt.

Ich möchte Sie deswegen zur Wahlrechtsreform des Hohen Repräsentanten Christian Schmidt befragen. Das Vorgehen, am Wahltag die Spielregeln des Wählens zu ändern, hat in der bosnischen Gesellschaft zu großer Sorge und aber auch zu großen Vertrauensverlusten in die internationale Gemeinschaft, insbesondere in die Institution des Hohen Repräsentanten geführt. Und da die EU ja zu 54 % auch den Hohen Repräsentanten finanziert, wirft das die Frage auf, wie wir uns dazu verhalten.

Ich würde gerne von Ihnen wissen: Wie bewerten Sie die Wahlrechtsänderung gerade mit Blick auf die Notwendigkeit, Diskriminierung von Minderheiten im Wahlrecht zu beseitigen und Bosnien und Herzegowina den Weg in die EU zu eröffnen?

Olivér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission. – Well, yes, there have been last minute changes in the electorate law, and that is never a good idea. But we have seen quite difficult discussions on the electoral reform preceding the election. And it is for that reason that we consider this to be not only an issue, but the major reform element that needs delivery before we can move on in the accession negotiations. If you look at our opinion, it is clear that an electoral reform will have to take place. It is part of the criteria that we have put forward and it is endorsed also by the Council. So, it is part and parcel of the criteria set out for the candidate status.

When it comes to the financing of the candidates, I'm not sure I understand your question. I'm happy to look into it. If there were any cases or other news, we are ready to look into it. But I think a major overhaul of the electoral law is on the cards anyhow. And I hear also from the political actors in the country that this is considered as part and parcel of the criteria.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Something has been lost in translation, so I will try to do it in English now because there is the question I was asking about the reform proposed by the High Representative Christian Schmidt on 2 October, which is a white flag, which is also now in front of the constitutional court. And I think it's a pity and it's a shame that the High Representative is proposing an electoral reform that needs to be put in front of the court in the first place. So this is a problematic thing. And I was asking you how you react as the guardian of the Treaties.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – I'm not the guardian of the constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Treaties don't regulate election laws, not even in our Member States. But what we have made very clear is that, of course, the general principles related to electoral law and related to the Venice Commission opinions and also the jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina have to be respected.

But, politically speaking, one also has to acknowledge that that last-minute amendment carried out by the High Representative allowed for a result and also for an election that we could consider a success. So it did have a contribution in that regard. But, as I said, the solution is an electoral reform done in the parliament by the institutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Two questions. One, I absolutely share your assessment that after months of a caretaking government in Montenegro, elections are long overdue. You know that there were several tries to get a majority in the parliament for the Constitutional Court members.

My question is, are you also in contact with the current opposition, that at least rhetorically, also supports the path towards accession to gear up their attention and readiness to support the compromise? I also heard the news that they are coming close to it, but it has not yet been decided in parliament. I think we need to back them and put a little bit of pressure there.

And second question, towards North Macedonia. We have a government there that is very pro-European, but only rhetoric will not save the government through the next elections. The government is perceived in the country to not really deliver to citizens. Do you have plans of support – how we can make it more visible that European funds are actually delivering to citizens to back the pro-European notion that we still hope has a majority in North Macedonia?

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – First of all, these days it's difficult to know who is in opposition or in government in Montenegro. But yes, I am reaching out to everybody and trying to convince everybody to have elections.

But I think by now the message is there, in Podgorica, and the message is very clear: that the country is losing very precious time. I have the latest news, as I told you, getting here was that they are supposed to have a vote on 27 February. So basically, that is next week. And I'm very hopeful that this time, this will unblock also the elections, because the country badly needs a strong government and the country badly needs now work to go ahead swiftly.

In North Macedonia, we have just put on the table a proposal, for this House and also for the Council, for a new macro financial assistance of EUR 100 million, because, yes, North Macedonia is suffering very heavily the consequences of Russia's war against Ukraine. They have been aligning themselves fully with the sanctions and this has a major economic impact in the country and we try to help them. This is why we have also come forward with the economic rescue package for the entire Western Balkans to help to mitigate the impact of this war. And that is just about to be released also.

Of course, in North Macedonia, it is also the government's job to deliver on the EU reforms and to not only deliver on the EU reforms but also to deliver on the funds and implement the funds. And there, yes, we see some slowing down, but I do hope that we can accelerate there as well this year.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (Renew). – Dear Commissioner, I want to thank you once again for putting in place an economic and investment plan; I think it is the right medicine for political, but also for other, reasons in the Western Balkans.

You took the approach for being more optimistic about the future of the region, and rightly so, because you represent the European Commission, which is called geopolitical, the European Commission – I reiterated several times that we have to have a political European Commission before becoming a geopolitical European Commission. And if I look at the Western Balkans, it's a very much inter-governmental European Union, it very much represents of the European Union of today.

We have special representatives – Germany, Slovenia, Austria and many more. How is this helping you, Commissioner, to do your job in a proper European way? We have several initiatives – Berlin Process, other initiatives, the Americans came with an initiative. How you are going to combine efforts in order to bring the European Union as strong as possible if the citizens of the Western Balkans are looking at us from an angle of criticism? They should see a European Union united.

So, two questions on special representatives and initiatives coming from different sides of Europe, but also from across the Atlantic.

Olívér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, I think that there's a very big potential in complementarity and this is what we have tried to build during this mandate, meaning to reach out to our Member States who are active on the Western Balkans and try to complement the work that we're doing.

I'll give you one example: the common regional market, which is complementary to the Berlin process. I would say this is the substance of the Berlin process by now – to bring the four freedoms much faster to the Western Balkans and to help them to overcome also the common history, because this is also a way to do away with all these bad memories in the Western Balkans.

So I think that there's ample opportunity for complementarity but it means also that we need to work closer. On our side, the Commission has always been ready, and we have always been reaching out to the Member States, and we will continue to do so. And, to be frank with you, I think it is also appreciated by the Member States. It may not have been the case before but now we see a much higher level of impact.

You have asked me about special representatives in the plural. We have one special representative in Bosnia-Herzegovina, which is part and parcel of the Dayton Agreement and, of course, as you know, on our side, our plan would be that it should be the European Union taking over all these responsibilities. And we do hope that Bosnia-Herzegovina advances so much in its constitutional reforms and in its reforms for democracy, the rule of law, that there won't be a need for a special representative because the country and its institutions should be strong enough to actually exercise these functions.

But until we get there, of course, we are working together with the special representative, and we are in very close contact and dialogue with him, on how to bring forward also the European agenda together for Bosnia and Herzegovina. We have, of course, our own special representatives also in the bag with the Pristina dialogue and there again, I think the work of the Commission is to help and also to complement the work. So we try to have the additional elements, arguments, but also additional tools offered to the High Representative to actually have a breakthrough, I do hope this year in the bag with the Pristina dialogue.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, prostor jugoistočne Europe pod sve većim je obavještajnim, medijskim i gospodarskim utjecajem stranih autoritarnih režima, što može destabilizirati i samu Europsku uniju. Zbog toga je snažna prisutnost EU-a kroz politiku proširenja ključna za stabilnost jugoistoka Europe.

Međutim, poseban problem za stabilnost tog prostora predstavlja politika Srbije koja uporno pokušava sjediti na dvije stolice održavajući vojno-gospodarsku suradnju s Rusijom te odbijajući uvesti sankcije Moskvi. Srpska hegemonistička politika, nažalost, također doprinosi destabilizaciji susjednih država.

To se najjasnije vidi u Crnoj Gori gdje je nedavno, protivno preporukama Venecijanske komisije, od strane prosrpske većine u Skupštini izmijenjen Zakon o predsjedniku, čime je ova zemlja zapala u ustavnu krizu bez presedana.

Imajući to na umu, a u kontekstu politike proširenja, što Europska unija namjerava učiniti da bi spriječila uplitanje Srbije u unutarnje stvari Crne Gore, a naročito širenje hegemonističkog koncepta „srpskog sveta” u toj državi?

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – I think it is very clear that Serbia is also a candidate country and it is bound by the exact same conditions and in that, of course, good neighbourly relations is part and parcel of the conditions. And this is why we are also, of course having these criteria taken very seriously when it comes to Serbia.

In Montenegro, I think that the problems are more deeply rooted. This polarisation of the political life has now shown a complete deadlock in the country, a complete deadlock from which only the country can bring itself out of and this is why we are supporting the holding of elections both for parliament and president as fast as possible and to get the necessary political support from the people of Montenegro – because it is for the people of Montenegro to take the lead and to exercise their will for the future of the country.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, dok je čitava Europska unija ujedinjena u osudi ruske invazije na Ukrajinu, Srbija uporno odbija uskladiti svoju vanjsku politiku s europskom.

Dakle, moje pitanje je koje mehanizme Europska unija ima na raspolaganju da bi prisilila Srbiju da uskladi svoju politiku prema Rusiji s politikom Europske unije i je li Unija zbog toga spremna eventualno zaustaviti pristupne pregovore sa Srbijom dok Srbija ne ispuní ono što je potrebno?

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – I think that we have made it very clear, also in our report, that CFSP alignment is part and parcel of the accession criteria. We have asked Serbia, also as an ally – as a candidate country, we consider it to be an ally – to be on our side and also help us with aligning itself to our CFSP policy, including the measures in it.

I think it is also very clear, politically speaking, for anybody who is observing the accession process of Serbia, that for many of our Member States, this is now maybe the most important criterion against which progress can be made. However, I need to recall that, according to the rules which we are all bound by (i.e. the negotiating framework and the new methodology), CFSP alignment is not a criterion on the basis of which you can suspend accession negotiations. And, as you know, suspending accession negotiations is only the last resort. We have seen one case where the negotiations have been put on hold and you have seen how such a decision can come about. But I'm still hopeful that Serbia understands the importance of helping us in this fight against the impact of the war Russia has instigated against Ukraine. And we are hopeful that Serbia will also come around in the end.

Dominique Bilde (ID). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, la visite récente de l'envoyé spécial de l'Union européenne pour le dialogue serbo-kosovar a rappelé le refus acharné de Pristina d'appliquer une disposition de l'accord de Bruxelles de 2013, à savoir la création de l'Association des municipalités à majorité serbe. Cette obstination, qui persiste depuis près de dix ans, est symptomatique de l'ostracisme subi par les Serbes du Kosovo. Quelle solution proposez-vous pour sortir de l'impasse?

Deuxièmement, on a dénoncé, à juste titre, certains accords en matière de visas, qui sont une des causes de la crise migratoire dans la région. Un autre aspect de cette crise a trait au nombre important de ressortissants des Balkans eux-mêmes dans les flux migratoires. Je pense en l'occurrence aux migrants albanais, qui se ruent vers le Royaume-Uni ou vers l'Union européenne pour y demander l'asile.

Dans le cadre des négociations, je pense qu'il est urgent de trouver une solution à cette situation, qui est incompatible avec le statut de pays candidat de l'Albanie. C'est aussi une question de crédibilité.

Olívér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – On the first question, I think the best would be to respond by quoting the conclusions of the European Council from last week and there, in point 30 of it, the European Council made a very clear statement, and not only a statement but a very clear condition for the progress on the European path. I quote, 'The European Council urges both parties to implement, fully and without conditions, the obligations they committed to in the framework of the dialogue, including agreements from the years 2013 and 2015 to create an association/community of Serb majority municipalities'. I think the EU line is very clear.

It is also very clear that the European path for Kosovo goes through – as it is the case for Serbia – a successful dialogue. This is why we need now the next round of negotiations to take place. Our High Representative has a plan. Our High Representative has negotiated this plan also with both sides. Both sides have agreed, in principle, that it can be a basis for further discussions and hopefully agreements in the future. And this is why I hope that with this very clear messaging from the European Council, it is clear what needs doing.

Now, on your second question, the issue of bogus asylum claims. Yes, this is not new. This is something that has been also an important element in the run-up to the decision back in 2020 for agreeing in the Council to start the accession negotiations with Albania and North Macedonia.

And there the Council has been able to come to an agreement because the Albanian authorities have engaged even more with our Member States, meaning that every time there is a bogus asylum claim, meaning that an asylum claim that has been put there by somebody who is falling under the visa-free regime, and it is an Albanian citizen, Albania is ready to take back that citizen. The cooperation is ongoing at that level and Albania is taking back its citizens who are abusing our social system through bogus asylum claims.

So, I think that it is clear that the situation is completely different compared to what it was a couple of years ago. Not only that, but we see that what we have put there as arrangements in practice are working and we have very few numbers still in the European Union waiting to be returned to Albania.

Der Präsident. – Die Fragestunde ist damit geschlossen.

16. Establishment of an independent EU Ethics Body (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Einrichtung eines unabhängigen Ethikgremiums der EU (2023/2555(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, Honourable Members, Commissioner, the Council is in favour of a transparent, efficient and accountable European Union. These principles should underpin the work carried out by all EU institutions, with no exceptions. It was in this spirit that all 27 Member States signed the Transparency Register launched in September 2021. The Council remains committed to these principles and will engage with this Parliament to discuss how we can better ensure the highest ethics and transparency standards across EU institutions.

Regarding the creation of an EU ethics body, the Council applied in June of last year to the letter of the Commission President on this subject. As stated then, the Council stands ready to examine any proposal the Commission may submit on an EU ethics body. Without pre-empting the discussion on future proposals, there are a number of elements that that the letter from June outlines that should be taken into account. We believe that an EU ethics body should fully respect the institution equality decision making powers, though the roles and particularities of each institution granted by the Treaties. It should also avoid any duplication with the work already carried out by existing bodies dealing with this with ethics issues. Furthermore, it should take into account the fact that the Member States of the Council are subjected to national rules and that its staff are subjected to staff regulations, like in every other EU institution.

I look forward to hearing from you and your views on what a future ethics body for all institutions should entail.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, Madam Minister, honourable Members, the European institutions and we as their members need the trust of European citizens. And as I said here yesterday at the debate on the strengthening of integrity of the European institutions, citizens can only keep faith in the EU if the principles of ethics, integrity and transparency are fully upheld by the European institutions and by their members.

The Commission has been uncompromising in delivering the highest standards of transparency and ethics. The Treaties and the Code of Conduct for the Members of the European Commission require us to observe the highest standards of integrity and ethical conduct during but also after the end of the mandate. Most institutions of the EU have a framework which regulates the individual ethical obligations applicable to their Members. They are based on general institutional principles and on provisions of the Treaties, and they are set out in more detail, either in the Rules of Procedure or in codes of conduct of the institutions.

There are, however, differences in the applicable rules across the institutions. While some differences can be explained by the autonomous role of each institution under the Treaties and by the different risks inherent in performing the duties of Members, it has become clear that a common set of strong ethical standards is needed. Our institutions must work together and join their efforts to develop a common culture of ethics and transparency.

In the field of transparency, the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission reached a major milestone with the adoption of the Interinstitutional Agreement on the Transparency Register in 2021. The register is the recognition of the importance of a common framework to coordinate the approach to transparency amongst the participating institutions.

President von der Leyen mentioned already in her political guidelines of 2019 that the Commission is also supporting the creation of an independent ethics body common to all EU institutions. The European Parliament has been working between 2019 and 2021 on its position in this regard, and I would like to thank you for your impulses and ideas.

The adoption of the Parliament's resolution in September 2021 on the establishment of an interinstitutional ethics body was an important contribution to the discussions between the institutions, as clarity and an overall agreement on the scope, role and competences of the body are needed. The resolution was also the opportunity for the Commission to share its views that the method for setting up a joint ethical body has to be respectful of the particularities of each institution, including their respective institutional and democratic roles as set out in the Treaties. I am happy to announce that based on this extensive work and on the results of the contacts with the other institutions, the Commission will, in the next weeks, table a proposal for a joint agreement between the institutions to establish an interinstitutional ethics body. To be truly interinstitutional, this body should be common to all institutions and advisory bodies mentioned in Article 13 of the Treaty of the European Union.

While work on drafting the proposal is ongoing, the contacts with all institutions continue to ensure that we propose something meaningful and feasible.

The Commission believes that the interinstitutional body should serve to ensure, first, that we have common, clear and high standards of integrity and independence in all European institutions; second, that we all have similar control mechanisms in all institutions; and third, that differences between the institutions and the institutional balance established by the founding Treaties remain respected.

The establishment of the body would demonstrate the importance that all institutions attach to high ethical standards for their Members and will thereby contribute to strengthening trust in the institutions and in their Members. The interinstitutional body will allow the institutions to benefit from their mutual experiences, to learn from each other, and to reduce discrepancies where those are not necessary or justified by their different institutional roles.

The general benefit would be better public understanding of the ethical framework, a common culture for Members of our institutions and more clarity on what is acceptable and what is not, for everyone inside and outside the institutions. Hence, it would also serve as an important preventive measure aimed at up-front respect of clear rules.

Ethics and integrity are not something someone else can do for us. Ethics and integrity are a daily task for everyone. But what an EU ethics body can do is to help us to live up collectively to the high standards that the citizens and we ourselves should expect from us. This is a common responsibility for all of us. Thank you for your attention.

Seán Kelly, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – A Uachtaráin, maintaining a high level of confidence among citizens in European Union institutions is imperative, and anyone who holds public office should meet high ethical standards. Unfortunately, the scandals that have emerged in recent months have diminished the confidence and trust that EU citizens have in the EU institutions and in the EU project. While ethics standards already exist within the institutions. Recent events have revealed shortcomings and suggest that we need a broader framework to ensure compliance and adherence to ethics.

There must be clearer rules for lobbyists, for lobbyists becoming politicians, or vice versa, to avoid conflicts of interest. An independent ethics body could indeed provide important guidance in this regard and help ensure that EU institutions are better able to efficiently respond to breaches of ethics rules.

Indeed, we need high ethical standards with effective measures to ensure citizens' trust in our institutions. However, an inter-institutional ethics body must respect the defined competences of each institution and advisory body and their corresponding role in the framework of the system of checks and balances laid out in the Treaties.

An EU ethics body could greatly assist in harmonising ethics rules in the institutions, providing tools and improving the system in general. However, to be sustainable, it needs to ensure it sticks to the task at hand and remains non-political and has broad support across this House. It is also important that the approval process of the European Commission remains a duty of the European Parliament as it is legitimated by the citizens.

Gabriele Bischoff, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin Jourová, Frau Ministerin Roswall! Es ist gut, dass dieses Parlament seit 2021 darauf drängt, dass es eine unabhängige Ethikbehörde gibt, und dass dies auch unterstützt ist – hier im Haus – von einer breiten Mehrheit. Und ich freue mich, dass das Signal nicht weiter unerhört bleibt, sondern dass wir wirklich Signale bekommen jetzt, dass ein entsprechender Vorschlag vorgelegt wird.

Warum ist das so notwendig? Wenn wir uns noch einmal angucken, wie die Regeln im Moment aussehen, dann können wir sehen, wir als Parlament, wir haben unsere eigenen Transparenzanforderungen, einen eigenen Verhaltenskodex und eigene Ethikregeln. Die Kommission hat ihre eigenen Verfahren und Gremien für Ethikregeln, auch zum Beispiel für ehemalige Kommissare, und andere Institutionen – wir haben es gehört – haben andere Regeln.

Um es in aller Deutlichkeit hier noch einmal zu sagen: Diese Regeln, die in der Regel nur hausintern funktionieren, wo oft auch ehemalige Kolleginnen und Kollegen bei Entscheidungen involviert sind, können dem nicht wirklich genügen.

Und wenn wir gucken, wie sieht es in anderen Ländern aus; wir schauen zum Beispiel nach Kanada, da haben wir einen unabhängigen *Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner* mit entsprechendem Personal. In den USA haben wir seit 2008 eine unabhängige Ethikbehörde. Warum? Weil es Korruptionsfälle gab. Drei Kongressabgeordnete landeten damals im Gefängnis, und es war noch Trump, der versucht hat, tatsächlich hier vor seiner Amtszeit die Regeln abzuschwächen, aber es ist ihm Gott sei Dank nicht gelungen. *Katar-gate* bringt jetzt auch bei uns wieder Schub in die Debatte, damit wirklich auch in diesem Jahr diese Ethikbehörde auf den Weg gebracht werden kann.

Und ich will auch noch mal in Erinnerung rufen, dass es nicht nur das Parlament war, das hier gedrängelt hat, sondern die Europäische Bürgerbeauftragte wie auch der Europäische Rechnungshof. Die haben uns darauf hingewiesen, dass wir – oder die Institutionen – es versäumt haben, wirklich funktionierende Strategien zu entwickeln, gerade auch um Interessenkonflikten vorzubeugen, damit es erst überhaupt nicht dazu kommt.

Und die beiden haben uns auch darauf hingewiesen und kritisiert, dass es eben keinen gemeinsamen ethischen Rahmen für die EU-Institutionen mit ganz klaren Verfahren gibt. Wir brauchen auch eine Überwachung und Durchsetzung von Ethikregeln, denn die besten Regeln nützen nichts, wenn sie nicht entsprechend auch durchgesetzt und sanktioniert werden.

Deshalb bin ich sehr froh – wie man im Fußball sagt, nach einer etwas längeren Aufwärmphase –, dass es jetzt dazu kommt. Und ich würde gerne noch einmal nachhaken, Frau Jourová. Ich habe gehört, dass Sie gesagt haben, dass Sie demnächst etwas vorlegen. Das hatte uns Frau Kommissionspräsidentin im Dezember auch gesagt. Ich würde gerne schon etwas konkreter wissen: Wann genau wird die Kommission hier einen Vorschlag für eine interinstitutionelle Vereinbarung vorlegen? Ich glaube, das wäre jetzt genau das richtige Signal, damit wir da Gewissheit haben.

Stéphane Séjourné, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Vice-présidente, chers collègues, mon groupe, Renew Europe, a souhaité, avec d'autres groupes politiques, ce débat et cette résolution car nous estimions urgent de commencer les négociations sur l'organe éthique interinstitutionnel.

Mon groupe porte, depuis 2019, le sujet, et le «Qatargate» nous a donné raison: l'autocontrôle ne suffit pas et sa politisation nous décrédibilise collectivement. Seule l'indépendance du contrôle est capable de dissiper définitivement les doutes. Seule la professionnalisation du contrôle apportera la sérénité à nos institutions. Je voudrais partager avec vous quelques convictions que nous avons collectivement, au sein de Renew.

D'abord, l'organe éthique est le meilleur moyen de restaurer la confiance et l'intégrité dans les institutions européennes. Il est le meilleur moyen de prévenir les conflits d'intérêts et d'y remédier. Ces derniers sont nombreux et nous les analysons au cours de différents processus: au niveau de la commission JURI, au moment de la désignation des candidats commissaires, au moment, notamment, du départ des parlementaires qui feront autre chose de leur vie.

L'organe éthique est également le meilleur moyen de contrôler toutes les déclarations financières, y compris celles sur le patrimoine. Il est le meilleur moyen pour l'Europe de rattraper son retard sur la transparence, sur l'éthique.

J'espère donc que la Commission voudra avancer sur ce sujet. En 2019, Ursula von der Leyen s'y était engagée, en 2021, ce Parlement a voté, en 2022, nous avons confirmé ce vote. Cette autorité est, pour moi, réellement la clé de voûte de notre transparence et de notre éthique collective dans ces institutions.

Mon groupe veut une solution d'ici l'été. Ma collègue socialiste vous posait la question, Madame la Vice-présidente: quand la Commission pourra-t-elle nous faire une proposition?

Je pense que tout cela doit arriver le plus vite possible car les forces populistes, anti-Parlement et anti-Europe, joueront beaucoup de la défiance qu'a suscitée cette affaire au sein du Parlement pour nos concitoyens, vis-à-vis notamment des élections de 2024.

C'est une réforme de bon sens. Cet organe est la garantie de l'efficacité de notre réforme interne. Il est temps de créer l'organe éthique européen.

Daniel Freund, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Als dieses Parlament 2019 zwei Kommissare wegen Interessenkonflikten abgelehnt hat, haben wir vorgeschlagen, eine unabhängige Ethikbehörde einzurichten. Vier Jahre später gibt es sie noch nicht. Als dann Kommissare wie zum Beispiel Günther Oettinger Dutzende Lobbyjobs in der Abkühlzeit angenommen haben, da haben wir hier im Parlament wieder die Einrichtung einer Ethikbehörde gefordert, aber es gibt sie weiter nicht. Und jetzt, wo das Parlament vom größten Korruptionsskandal seiner Geschichte erschüttert wird, da fragen sich viele hier: Warum gibt es eigentlich immer noch keine unabhängige Ethikbehörde?

Ich habe vor zwei Jahren diesem Parlament einen Vorschlag gemacht. Wir haben vor anderthalb Jahren mit großer Mehrheit hier im Plenum dem Bericht zugestimmt, und seitdem ist nicht so richtig was passiert. Die Regelverstöße gehen weiter. Jedes nicht gemeldete Geschenk, jede Luxusreise, die nicht gemeldet wird, zerstört weiter Vertrauen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger in die europäische Demokratie.

Und es ist trauriger Fakt, dass die Verhaltensregeln in den EU-Institutionen nicht oder unzureichend durchgesetzt werden. Wenn aber bei Verstößen keine Strafe folgt, dann wird Straflosigkeit zur Kultur. Dann brauchen wir uns nicht wundern, wenn viele sich erst gar nicht an die Regeln halten.

Und was passiert eigentlich, wenn es Regelverstöße von Ursula von der Leyen gibt? Was passiert, wenn es Regelverstöße von der Parlamentspräsidentin hier gibt? Sollen die sich dann selber sanktionieren, sich selber bestrafen für die eigenen Regelverstöße?

Dieses System der Selbstkontrolle kann ja gar nicht funktionieren. Und wenn sich EU-Politiker eben selbst oder gegenseitig kontrollieren, dann ist es kein Wunder, dass bei 25 Verstößen, die wir hier im Haus in den letzten zehn Jahren hatten, eben keine einzige Sanktion je verhängt wurde. Schöne Regeln auf dem Papier reichen nicht aus, sondern wir brauchen diese unabhängige Kontrolle dringend.

Nun ist ein unabhängiges Ethikgremium natürlich keine Garantie dafür, dass niemand mehr Koffer voller Geld annimmt. Aber eine ordentliche Anwendung der bestehenden Regeln hätte viel früher gezeigt, dass Panzeris Organisation „Fight Impunity“ von Marokko und von Katar finanziert wird. Der Ex-Kommissar Avramopoulos hätte gar nicht 60 000 EUR von „Fight Impunity“ bekommen dürfen. „Fight Impunity“ hätte nie im Europäischen Parlament im Ausschuss aussagen dürfen, weil sie ja gar nicht im Lobbyregister standen. Bei all dem hätte eine unabhängige Kontrolle und Durchsetzung der Regeln viel früher aufgezeigt, was es für Netzwerke hier im Europäischen Parlament gibt.

Deswegen, liebe Frau Jourová: Ein unabhängiges Ethikgremium war das zentrale Versprechen von Ursula von der Leyen. Sie haben es in Ihrem *mission letter* stehen. 17 Monate ist die Entschließung hier im Parlament nun her. Können Sie heute sagen, wann genau wir in die Verhandlungen gehen? Können Sie uns zusagen, dass die Forderung, dass das für alle Institutionen gilt, nicht nur eine Ausrede ist, dass wir am Ende nichts machen? Und können Sie uns zusagen, dass wir auf jeden Fall dieses Gremium noch vor der Europawahl funktionsfähig haben, damit die nächste Riege der Kommissare und Abgeordneten ordentlich kontrolliert werden kann?

Jean-Paul Garraud, *au nom du groupe ID.* – Monsieur le Président, le Parlement européen, empêtré dans le scandale dit du «Qatargate» – révéla grâce à une enquête pour association de malfaiteurs, corruption et blanchiment d'argent visant des membres anciens ou actuels du Parlement européen, principalement socialistes –, tente aujourd'hui de faire diversion. Il réclame en effet la création d'un organe d'éthique indépendant qui s'occuperait de toutes les institutions, agences et organismes de l'Union européenne, avec des pouvoirs d'enquête ou de conseil.

Or, contrairement à ce qui est annoncé, sa mise en œuvre serait tout d'abord complexe. En effet, comment l'Union européenne pourrait-elle créer une structure indépendante d'elle-même? Il s'agit aussi de la négation de structures déjà existantes au sein, notamment, de la Commission et du Parlement. Ce dernier a, par exemple, en plus de son code de conduite en matière d'intérêts financiers et de conflits d'intérêts, mis en place une commission sur les ingérences extérieures.

Ironie de l'histoire, le président de cette commission, un socialiste français, passait son temps à accuser le Rassemblement national de tous les maux, pendant que ses propres amis socialistes prenaient part au plus grand scandale que le Parlement européen ait connu.

Toutes ces structures n'ont rien vu ou rien voulu voir du «Qatargate» et des autres suspicions que celui-ci fait apparaître. Il n'est nul besoin d'une structure généraliste de plus, laquelle déboucherait à coup sûr sur la même absence de résultat. Cette demande d'un nouvel organe d'éthique est surtout un prétexte permettant de s'opposer à la création d'une commission d'enquête parlementaire immédiate, que je réclame avec insistance depuis le début de cette affaire.

En voulant noyer le poisson et faire croire que le «Qatargate» ne concerne que quelques personnes corrompues, le Parlement européen veut éviter de se remettre en question. Le problème majeur est pourtant d'ordre structurel. C'est le système mis en place par les européistes qui est en cause, et c'est bien celui-là qu'il faut transformer.

Mais une majorité d'eurodéputés feront tout pour éviter cette indispensable mutation, raison pour laquelle ils ont voté contre notre demande de commission d'enquête et tenté d'allumer des contre-feux. Cet organe d'éthique en est le dernier en date. Nous dénonçons ce nouveau stratagème et nous nous opposons résolument à sa création.

Geert Bourgeois, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, collega's, ik was lid van drie parlementen vooraleer ik dit huis binnentrad. Welnu, geen enkel van deze parlementen heeft zoveel regels inzake integriteit als dit Europees Parlement. Terecht. Noblesse oblige. En het kan nog beter. We moeten onze regels aanscherpen en we moeten nog transparanter zijn.

Maar let wel, dit zal helaas criminelen niet tegenhouden. Criminele activiteiten worden niet gemeld en gebeuren onder de waterlijn. In onze terechte verontwaardiging over "Qatargate" mogen we echter fundamentele verworvenheden niet overboord gooien. Een interinstitutioneel orgaan, samengesteld uit externen, bovendien mede aangeduid door de Europese Commissie, is in strijd met de scheiding der machten. Commissie en Parlement moeten natuurlijk dezelfde ethische basisprincipes hanteren, maar er gelden andere regels voor de leden van het Parlement dan voor die van de uitvoerende macht.

Meer nog, er is lang gestreden voor de driemachtenleer, voor een onafhankelijk parlement, niet gecontroleerd door de monarch. Het omgekeerde moet waar zijn, collega's. Het Parlement hoort de executieve te controleren. En onze vrijheid van meningsuiting is gewaarborgd door het Verdrag. We kunnen niet aan een extern onderzoek onderworpen worden naar aanleiding van een mening of een stem uitgebracht in de uitoefening van onze functie.

We zijn uiteraard wel onderworpen aan onze interne tuchtsancties overeenkomstig ons Reglement. Maar parlementaire onverantwoordelijkheid verdraagt geen enkele externe controle. Een Parlements lid moet vrijuit kunnen spreken in de uitoefening van zijn functie. Dat is geen persoonlijk voorrecht van ons, maar een garantie voor de onafhankelijkheid van het Parlement en van zijn leden. De executieve mag op geen enkele wijze rechtstreeks of onrechtstreeks betrokken zijn bij het beoordelen van onze vrije meningsuiting.

Dus, collega's, ja aan de versterking van ons interne adviescomité, dat meer bevoegdheden moet krijgen. Maar, ik bezweer u, geen enkele externe beoordeling.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, il aura donc fallu le pire scandale de l'histoire de corruption du Parlement européen pour que cet hémicycle se souvienne de la nécessité de créer de toute urgence une autorité éthique indépendante.

Nous avons pourtant lancé l'alerte dès le début de ce mandat, il y a trois ans, en dénonçant les conflits d'intérêts, multiples, de plusieurs candidats commissaires européens et en obtenant que plusieurs d'entre eux soient retoqués. Alors, certes, la présidente de la Commission européenne l'avait bien mis sur son plan de travail, mais depuis, pouf, disparu, aux oubliettes. Alors on attend encore, encore et encore.

En France, l'affaire de fraude du ministre du budget Cahuzac avait permis de débloquent les choses avec la création de la Haute Autorité pour la transparence de la vie publique. Le symbole dévastateur du «Qatargate» et ses images, désastreuses, de valises de billets semblant sortir d'un film de gangsters, doivent aboutir à la même réponse politique. Si on ne le fait pas maintenant, chers collègues, alors, quand est-ce qu'on va le faire?

Les règles éthiques actuelles sont insuffisantes, on le sait. C'est presque une blague entre nous, même, mais le cadre de leur mise en œuvre est encore plus absurde. Comment espérer mettre fin aux conflits d'intérêt des eurodéputés si ce sont les eurodéputés eux-mêmes qui sont censés s'autoréguler? Au point où l'on en est, autant demander à Monsanto de réglementer et de mettre fin aux OGM. Résultat: les affaires sont enterrées, et, on le voit, notre seul objectif ici doit donc être de mettre en place cet organe indépendant. Tout le monde le sait et personne n'ose le contester en public.

Mais la Commission nous mène en bateau depuis quatre ans en repoussant ad vitam aeternam la mise en place de l'autorité éthique. Et vous savez quoi? Ça ne m'étonne pas. L'ancien commissaire européen Avramópoulos a reçu 60 000 euros de la fausse ONG Fight Impunity, au cœur du Qatargate, mais la présidente de la Commission, M^{me} von der Leyen, n'y trouve rien à redire. Le commissaire Schinas a fait pas moins de 3 voyages, 26 tweets, 9 interviews, 3 discours complaisants envers les autorités du Qatar, mais M^{me} von der Leyen n'y trouve rien à redire.

Le moment que nous vivons est une honte, il atteint la crédibilité même des institutions. Le minimum que nous devons aux citoyens qui nous ont élus...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

President. – No, it is not true. I deal everybody the same. I knocked after five seconds Mr Freund and the following speaker Mr Garraud ten seconds and you were far more than ten seconds more. And we are talking about rules.

Mir wurde gesagt, dass keine finnische Verdolmetschung da ist. Frau Kollegin Hautala hat sich beschwert.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Arvoisa puhemies, halusin vain sanoa, että suomen kielen tulkkaus puuttui sekä kollega Séjournén että Aubryn puheista. Kannattaa varmaan nyt suomen kielen tulkkauksessa huolehtia siitä, että jokainen puheenvuoro tulkataan.

Jérôme Rivière (NI). – Monsieur le Président, un organisme d'éthique indépendant en réponse aux scandales de corruption au Parlement, des élus intègres, libres, au service du bien commun des peuples qui les ont élus: qui pourrait s'y opposer? Je me félicite de cette initiative. Notre institution n'a qu'à y gagner.

L'éthique, synonyme d'intégrité et de liberté, nécessite le strict respect de la loi, et ce qui vaut pour les parlementaires vaut aussi pour nos institutions. Pas plus que les élus la Commission ne peut ignorer la loi issue des textes qui régissent son organisation. En s'affranchissant sans vergogne de l'esprit et de la lettre des traités pour critiquer le choix libre et démocratique de certaines nations, en s'arrogeant des compétences hors du champ de celles qui lui ont été confiées – la santé hier, la défense demain –, la Commission corrompt profondément sa légitimité. C'est cette corruption profonde de nos institutions qui a conduit au Brexit.

Si rien n'est fait, cette corruption systémique conduira à la disparition de l'Union européenne. L'Europe des nations qui coopèrent librement mérite que nous nous attelions à ce large chantier. Je forme le vœu – mais sans y croire un instant – que ce désir d'éthique soit sincère et qu'il améliore nos institutions. Je crois malheureusement la corruption bien profonde.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Colegas, temos de ter consciência de que a corrupção é um dos maiores inimigos das democracias. A corrupção não mina apenas os alicerces do regime, favorece igualmente o crescimento dos partidos extremistas que ganham votos explorando sentimentos de revolta, com o objetivo de destruírem as democracias, num paradoxo que é importante que consigamos explicar aos povos.

As democracias são um bem maior que temos de saber proteger. Combater a corrupção tem de ser uma das primeiras preocupações dos verdadeiros democratas.

Sejamos claros: cada vez que políticos ascendem ao poder na base de promessas que não cumprem, não resistem à tentação do peculato, apropriam-se de dinheiro dos contribuintes, favorecem ilegalmente pessoas e empresas ou são corrompidos, cometem pecados sem perdão. É por causa de políticos assim que, um pouco por toda a Europa, assistimos ao crescimento de partidos de extrema esquerda e de extrema direita, que se unem em votações contra a União Europeia, contra o Euro, contra a NATO e que, em muitos casos, apoiam a agressão russa na Ucrânia.

Isso leva-me a uma conclusão fundamental: os verdadeiros democratas têm de ser capazes de combater com eficácia a corrupção para fortalecerem as democracias e enfraquecerem os extremismos. Este combate tem de acontecer no Parlamento Europeu e em cada um dos nossos países.

O CDS-PP, que é o único partido de centro-direita democrata-cristão existente em Portugal, tem o combate à corrupção no topo da sua agenda política. O que separa o CDS-PP dos partidos extremistas é a democracia, é a liberdade. Exatamente por isso, o crescimento futuro do CDS-PP é fundamental para Portugal e é fundamental para a União Europeia.

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji! Półtora roku temu Parlament Europejski zakończył prace nad projektem *Ethics Body* i przyjął stosowną rezolucję. Została ona przesłana do Komisji, w intencji rozpoczęcia negocjacji międzyinstytucjonalnych, których efektem byłoby powołanie tego organu.

W ramach naszej pracy nad projektem omówiliśmy szereg kwestii dotyczących kompetencji i sposobu działania, a także składu *Ethics Body*. Musieliśmy sobie poradzić z wieloma różnicami zdań, ale ostatecznie zdefiniowaliśmy rozsądny kompromis. Była to nasza odpowiedź na płynące z Komisji deklaracje o potrzebie utworzenia skutecznego mechanizmu weryfikacji, czy wszyscy zatrudnieni i działający w ramach instytucji europejskich, przestrzegają zasad i standardów etycznego zachowania.

Na odpowiedź czekaliśmy długo, wiele miesięcy. Wreszcie Komisja udzieliła tej odpowiedzi. Była uprzejma, ale w gruncie rzeczy negatywna. Uwagi do projektu Parlamentu Europejskiego były równoznaczne z pozbawieniem *Ethics Body* zdolności do skutecznego działania. Przyznam, że ostatnio z pewnym zażenowaniem odnotowuję deklaracje ze strony Komisji o potrzebie energicznego działania w tym zakresie.

Dzisiaj Pani Komisarz Jourová zapowiedziała, że w niedługim czasie otrzymamy, poznamy projekt Komisji. Czekaliśmy rok. Oczywiście możemy poczekać jeszcze kilka tygodni. Pani wymieniła pewne zasady, jakie muszą być spełnione przez *Ethics Body*. Ja bym dodał jeszcze co najmniej dwie.

Warunkiem rzeczywistego sukcesu musi być gotowość do utworzenia organu niezależnego i wyposażonego w realne uprawnienia do badania i wyjaśnienia uzasadnionych wątpliwości dotyczących postępowania wszystkich osób pracujących w instytucjach Unii Europejskiej. Wynikiem tych badań muszą być albo decyzje, albo publicznie prezentowane propozycje takich decyzji.

W obecnej sytuacji, gdy nad nami wszystkimi unosi się cień skandalu korupcyjnego z udziałem kilku europosłów, jest naszym politycznym i etycznym obowiązkiem zademonstrowanie obywatelom Unii, że nie mamy niczego do ukrycia, że nasze deklaracje o walce z korupcją i konfliktem interesów, a także nieetycznym postępowaniem są poważne, i że nie jest naszą intencją utopienie skandalu w morzu słów bez znaczenia.

Problemem jest między innymi to, że istniejące dotychczas procedury i gremia zajmujące się kwestiami etyki w poszczególnych instytucjach, okazały się mało skuteczne lub całkowicie nieskuteczne. Zmiana tej sytuacji jeszcze w tej kadencji jest warunkiem naszej wiarygodności. Oczywiście opinii publicznej w Europie są zwrócone nie tylko na Parlament Europejski, ale na wszystkie instytucje Unii. I to jest nasza wspólna odpowiedzialność.

Gilles Boyer (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, la confiance que nous accordent des citoyens européens a été gravement mise à mal par les récentes révélations de corruption au sein de notre Parlement.

Alors, bien sûr, aucune procédure ne pourra empêcher les quelques corrompus de l'être. Mais nous devons reconnaître que notre système a montré ses limites: il repose uniquement sur une approche d'autorégulation qui n'est pas suffisante. Nos institutions ont besoin d'une appréciation indépendante, plus efficace et plus juste, des conflits d'intérêts et des règles d'éthique.

Nous avons porté cette idée en France lors de la campagne européenne de 2019, la Commission européenne l'a reprise dans ses orientations politiques au début de son mandat, et notre Parlement s'est prononcé en faveur de cette idée dès septembre 2021. Toutes les conditions sont donc réunies pour avancer.

Alors, externaliser le contrôle de notre institution n'est pas une question à prendre à la légère. Tous les parlements du monde se la posent. Nous l'avons fait, en France: c'est un exemple dont nous pouvons nous inspirer, avec les bonnes pratiques et les améliorations possibles que révèlent quelques années de fonctionnement.

Il ne s'agit pas de bannir le lobbying, ni d'exhiber, ni de mettre en cause, ni d'entraver la liberté de mandat des députés, ni d'attenter à la séparation des pouvoirs, mais d'avoir une appréciation claire de ce qui est interdit, de ce qui est autorisé et de ce qui doit être déclaré. Il s'agit aussi surtout de diffuser une culture de l'intégrité, du contrôle et de la transparence.

L'enjeu pour nous est de taille: replacer nos institutions européennes au rang des institutions les plus avancées en matière de prévention des conflits d'intérêts et restaurer la confiance des citoyens. La balle est désormais dans le camp de la Commission, et la proposition votée par notre Parlement il y a dix-huit mois pourrait constituer une base utile pour la discussion.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the current ethics framework, the Code of Conduct for Members and its advisory committee were created in the aftermath of the cash-for—amendments scandal of 2011. Now, these rules are being revised because of the biggest corruption scandal in the European Parliament's history. The EU needs an independent EU ethics body, but we should not just sit and wait for the Commission's proposal and its further destiny in the institutions. We can already start the work in the European Parliament.

The Parliament needs to redefine conflict of interest beyond financial interests. It needs sanctions with teeth and it needs strong scrutiny. All this is now lacking. As a member of the Advisory Committee on the Code of Conduct, I believe that with new strengthened powers, the advisory committee can be the starting point for the future European Parliament's ethics body. What it needs is first, it should not anymore be dependent on the decisions by the President. Transparency should apply both to internal reforms in progress as well as transparency to the future work of the advisory committee. Second, the advisory committee should be given powers to monitor, investigate and ensure compliance with ethics rules, also on its own initiative. This is also recommended by Ms Emily O'Reilly, the European Ombudsman, who is constantly watching how this Parliament manages its work and its ethics.

So colleagues, we can start today. We don't have to wait. We are, of course, eager for the promise that the Commissioner, Vice-President Jourová, has now given to us. But let's see if it really happens. We need to act now.

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

Sven Simon (PPE), blue-card speech. – Daniel Freund mentioned that we had within the last 10 years 25 cases and you mentioned in your speech that you are a member of this committee which is in charge.

Could you perhaps elaborate a little bit? What's the reason that the enforcement mechanism is not functioning in the moment and why this committee did not or is not allowed to put sanctions on colleagues who infringed the internal rules?

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE), blue-card reply. – Thank you for your question. Firstly, the Code of Conduct of Members, which is now over 10 years old, it does not allow the committee on its own to sanction anyone. It's the President who refers cases to the committee and then it is up to the President to decide if or if not she or he acts on the recommendations by the committee. So you see that there's a structural failure in this whole construction, and now it's time that we can correct this so that the committee could be independent vis-à-vis the President, because it's not healthy that there's no accountability.

Virginie Joron (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Madame le Commissaire, certains députés vendent l'Europe avec des sacs de billets, d'autres avec des conférences surpayées: c'est vieux comme le monde.

Comment expliquer que MM. Barroso et Monti, deux anciens membres de la Commission européenne, vendent des conférences à plus de 100 000 euros? L'affaire du Qatar, c'est l'arbre qui cache la forêt des scandales de McKinsey à Pfizer, et vous le savez bien.

Alors, pour laver plus blanc que blanc, vous annoncez aujourd'hui la création d'un organe d'éthique indépendant. De qui se moque-t-on? Que la Commission von der Leyen fasse le ménage chez elle et donne l'exemple. Madame, les SMS sont des documents officiels de l'Union européenne.

Je suis membre de la commission spéciale sur la pandémie de COVID-19, et nous ne sommes même pas fichus d'obtenir qu'Albert Bourla, PDG de Pfizer, nous parle dix minutes à distance. Nous voulons qu'il nous explique ses SMS avec M^{me} von der Leyen et son contrat, grisé, de 2,4 milliards de doses.

Avec mes collègues, c'est par la presse que nous apprenons que Pfizer-BioNTech renégocie une livraison de 500 millions de doses jusqu'en 2024, avec des prix cachés et contre l'avis d'États membres qui veulent arrêter les frais. Au total, la Commission a conclu pour 71 milliards d'euros de contrats de vaccins qui n'empêchent ni de transmettre, ni d'attraper la COVID-19.

Avec, en prime, une police de la pensée pro-Pfizer, imposée au sein des plateformes numériques à travers un code de conduite excluant les opinions divergentes des médecins et des scientifiques. Et vous parlez ici d'éthique et d'indépendance? Si vous voulez l'indépendance de ce comité d'éthique, nommez à sa tête un député de notre groupe politique, par exemple un député RN.

Raffaele Stancanelli (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, signora rappresentante del Consiglio, la questione etica in questo periodo è al centro di moltissimi dibattiti e merita riflessioni approfondite.

Una decisione politica, se presa nel rispetto degli interessi e del volere dei propri rappresentanti, è in tutto e per tutto una decisione etica. Purtroppo, di recente abbiamo visto come e con che facilità e leggerezza si possa sacrificare il vincolo etico alla base del processo democratico tra cittadini e rappresentanti politici per meri interessi personali.

In questo contesto, bisogna garantire la piena autonomia delle istituzioni nell'attività di controllo, nonché sul monitoraggio della condotta dei parlamentari e del personale, ma un nuovo organismo interistituzionale potrebbe essere facilmente influenzabile o potrebbe svolgere un'azione coercitiva illegittima.

Le criticità emerse durante il dibattito tenutosi nel 2021 sono ancora attuali, in quanto una delle funzioni primarie del Parlamento, come previsto espressamente dal trattato sull'Unione europea, è quella di esercitare il controllo politico, e di conseguenza questo ruolo non può mai essere delegato a un'autorità esterna.

Nel contempo, una solida base giuridica per la costituzione dell'organismo in oggetto non esiste. Quindi anche la definizione delle competenze per l'organismo stesso risulta alquanto approssimativa. Infatti, avviare indagini di propria iniziativa è in contrasto assoluto con la separazione dei poteri e dei ruoli delle varie istituzioni e comporta situazioni di ingerenza politica.

Migliorare la trasparenza e l'integrità è assolutamente necessario, certamente, ma questo non deve avvenire attraverso l'istituzione di un nuovo e ulteriore organismo, ma responsabilizzando maggiormente le istituzioni esistenti e potenziando le autorità preposte.

Leila Chaïbi (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, combien de mallettes de billets vous faudra-t-il, combien de valises, pour que vous vous décidiez enfin à publier une proposition législative?

Il y a quatre ans, Ursula von der Leyen a annoncé la création d'un organisme chargé de contrôler les conflits d'intérêts et la corruption. Il y a un an et demi, un rapport du Parlement vous a demandé de créer cet organisme d'éthique, et vous n'avez rien fait. Il y a deux mois, le scandale du «Qatargate» nous a couverts de honte, tous! Le plus gros scandale de corruption de l'histoire de l'Union européenne: des valises de billets retrouvées sous les lits des députés. On pensait que ça n'arrivait que dans les films.

On imagine la réaction des citoyens quand ils en ont reçu la notification sur leur téléphone, ces mêmes citoyens que l'on a tant de mal à intéresser à l'Europe. Sous l'effet d'un tel électrochoc, on s'est dit: tiens, la Commission européenne va se réveiller. Deux mois plus tard, toujours rien.

Si le Parlement avait le droit d'initiative législative, cet organisme d'éthique serait déjà sur pied. Tout à l'heure, nous nous réunissons avec les représentants des différents groupes politiques pour nous mettre d'accord sur une résolution d'urgence commune. Et on va insister, encore une fois, et on peut vous le dire dans toutes les langues – étant donné que l'on a la chance ici, au Parlement européen, d'avoir des interprètes dans 24 langues: activez-vous, s'il vous plaît! Présentez votre proposition d'organisme d'éthique indépendant!

En ce jour de Saint-Valentin, je vous rappelle qu'il n'y a pas d'amour sans preuve d'amour, et qu'il n'y aura pas d'éthique sans organisme d'éthique.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovana povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, možda trebamo staviti sve ovo u jasan kontekst. S jedne strane, profesionalni moralni kodeks trebao bi imati moralne refleksije i prosudbe. Neki su ipak potonuli u aferi „Katargate” koja nije samo moralna dilema već je kriminalna radnja i tu trebamo napraviti razliku.

Neupitno je da trebamo raditi na poboljšanju transparentnosti i integriteta u donošenju odluka na razini Europske unije. Međutim, svjedoci smo i stalnih pokušaja uplitanja u demokratske procese koji su posebno intenzivirali predizborne cikluse. Imajući to na umu, važno je uspostaviti mehanizme kako bismo osigurali poštivanje najviših standarda transparentnosti i univerzalnih pravila za političko djelovanje.

Međutim, Parlament nije policija. Parlament ne procesuirá i moramo jasno znati što je čija nadležnost. Uspostavljanje neovisnog etičkog tijela može biti korak naprijed, ali u kojem smislu? Važno je da uspostavimo sustav koji će osigurati provjere razina u našim institucijama, voditi računa o ravnoteži nadležnosti.

U duhu demokracije i demokratske rasprave ipak ne smijemo zatvarati naša vrata, ali moramo uspostaviti filtere kojima ćemo zaštititi interese Europske unije i naših građana jer ne zaboravite: postoje partikularni interesi, postoje interesi demokratskih uplitanja u naše sustave i često destabilizirajući faktori koji se na različite načine upliću u naše europske vrijednosti.

Kolegice i kolege, trebamo uspostaviti i jasna pravila, primjerice za lobiste, ali kao što sam rekla, nikome ne zatvarati vrata. Naši građani imaju širom otvorene oči i imali su povjerenje u ovu instituciju. Prema tome, uzvratimo im tim povjerenjem i nemojmo više da se dogodi „Katagate“, ali vodimo računa o tome što, tko i gdje radi.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, era il 2019 quando a lei, Vicepresidente Jourová, veniva affidata la responsabilità di istituire un organismo etico indipendente, comune a tutte le istituzioni dell'Unione europea. Come Socialisti e Democratici abbiamo sempre lavorato in tal senso con altri gruppi, mentre altre forze politiche hanno mantenuto posizioni equivocate o hanno addirittura esplicitamente remato contro.

Sono passati anni e di questo organismo non c'è traccia. Il tempo dei rinvii ora è finito. Bisogna garantire la piena attuazione delle attuali norme in materia di trasparenza ed etica, soprattutto potenziando il codice di condotta per gli eurodeputati. Occorre poi istituire urgentemente, entro fine legislatura, questo organismo etico con un mandato di controllo per le istituzioni e le agenzie dell'Unione europea, con mezzi finanziari e personale adeguato. L'organismo dovrà valutare eventuali incompatibilità e presentare proposte per migliorare la trasparenza e la responsabilità in merito a secondi incarichi dei deputati, al fine di prevenire eventuali conflitti di interesse.

Infine, vogliamo che siano anche previste sanzioni chiare, laddove fossero provate incongruenze o violazioni. Non ci devono essere fraintendimenti. Non è infatti questo il tempo del disimpegno, delle deleghe a soggetti terzi o di un catalogo di regole che potrebbe essere visto solo come una sorta di camicia di forza da eludere da qualcuno.

La corruzione è un nemico interno del buon funzionamento delle istituzioni. Le risorse per combatterla possono e devono quindi venire da dentro le istituzioni prima di tutto, attraverso un'azione sostenuta da un'etica istituzionale responsabile, volta al sostegno reciproco delle migliori pratiche per alimentare trasparenza, controllo e maggiore capacità di azione, per evitare conflitti di interessi anche rispetto a chi esce dalle istituzioni.

Lo scandalo che ha minato le fondamenta della nostra casa europea ci ha mostrato che non si può più aspettare. Abbiamo insieme adesso, perché ne va del futuro dell'Europa.

Morten Løkkegaard (Renew). – Hr. formand! Korruption er en gift, en dødbringende gift, som truer tilliden til vore demokratiske institutioner både nationalt og i EU. Qatargate har på mange måder afsløret et skræmmende problem med korruption lige her i dette hus, lige her i Europa-Parlamentet. Det har været vigtige afsløringer, og det kræver politisk handling. Vi står med et akut behov i det hele taget for at bekæmpe udenlandsk indflydelse gennem korruption. Siden 2020 har jeg arbejdet med russiske og kinesiske desinformationer og cyberangreb. Men det er jo helt tydeligt, at vi ikke har haft nok fokus på, hvad man kunne kalde simpel korruption. Altså kontanter i plastikpose, så at sige. Det skal vi selvfølgelig lave om på, og derfor er et nyt europæisk organ som det, vi foreslår, blandt andet, som skal tage sig af korruption, et vigtigt første skridt. Det er langtfra det eneste, vi skal gøre. Vi skal også passe på, at vi ikke i vores iver efter at gøre noget peger våbnene den forkerte vej, bl.a. med hensyn til lobbyister. Vi skal selvfølgelig kunne tillade lobbyister, vi skal kunne tillade, at folk har adgang til dette hus, men vi skal sørge for at gøre noget, og vi skal gøre noget nu.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, transparency and accountability are easy and simple requirements to put in place and so it remains a mystery why it is taking us so much time to make it happen. We have been cowardly and weak, because at the same time we were very eager to ask for transparency and accountability from others – from businesses, corporations, lobbyists, democracies, countries, institutions and now NGOs.

Of course, when you don't want to take action and when you don't want to be scrutinised, the best thing to do is to find a scapegoat. Some now are using a narrative which criminalised NGOs in the same way that liberal democracies do in order to avoid dealing with our own lack of rules and implementation.

There is another argument preventing us from concrete measures – the famous 'additional burden'. But it is not that complicated to give straightforward information about assets; how wealthy we were at the start of the political term, and how wealthy we are at the end – because no enrichment should be considered normal in our Parliament duty. Maybe, it is time to discuss what a public mandate is and what the general interest is.

We have very good conditions of work. They make us efficient parliamentarians. We can commission studies, we can travel using our own expenses, we can meet different stakeholders, we can organise hearings. We should be informed members, but independent in the way we take our legislative decision.

And such an independence, in such good conditions, demands high integrity. This level of integrity is possible if we have an ethics body, which monitors the three European institutions in a serious way. When such an authority was created in France, it dramatically increased awareness and morality in political life. It is an indispensable tool to fight corruption.

Let's stop finding excuses, looking for the guilty party elsewhere. Let's stop these stories and scandals around Commissioners and MEPs. Let's be a 21st century democracy, healthy and secure, one in which policies are made for the common good and not in the interest of a few people.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Ogromny skandal, głęboka patologia i to w organie, który wydawałoby się powinien być najbardziej transparentny. Dzisiaj musimy się rzeczywiście pochylić bardzo szybko i skutecznie nad tym, jak ten proces ograniczyć, jak go zniwelować do zera. To 14 punktów Pani Przewodniczącej Metsoli, które idą w bardzo dobrym kierunku i warto się nad nimi pochylić, warto je przyjąć, przedyskutować. Należy też powołać oddzielny niezależny organ. To są bardzo dobre propozycje. Chcę jednak zwrócić uwagę na fakt, że PPE proponuje uzdrowienie Parlamentu Europejskiego, ale to samo PPE ma na pokładzie Radosława Sikorskiego, który nie potrafi dzisiaj w Polsce wyjaśnić, w czym doradzał szejkom ze Zjednoczonych Emiratów Arabskich, za co inkasował astronomiczne środki.

A może warto dzisiaj głośno powiedzieć: zakaz dorabiania do pensji europosła? To powinna być dzisiaj naczelną zasadą naszego procedowania i tego, abyśmy się zastanowili nad tym, w jaki sposób ten proceder po prostu ograniczyć. Dzisiaj skandal uderzył również w grupę socjalistów. To jej posłowie w notatniku Evely Kailii, byłego posła Panzeriego, byli na porządku dziennym. Grupa europejskiej lewicy przoduje jednak w atakach na państwa członkowskie, oskarżając je o brak praworządności, między innymi mój kraj, Polskę. A dzisiaj wiemy, że wszystkie te debaty mogły być po prostu zasłoną dymną, a prawdziwa afera kielkowała właśnie tu, w tych strukturach. Szanowni Państwo, wszelkie działania, które mogłyby mieć wymiar antykorupcyjny nie tylko w Parlamencie, ale we wszystkich instytucjach Unii Europejskiej, jeśli będą wprowadzone, życzyłabym, żeby były... *(Przewodniczący odebrał mównicę)*

Nikolaj Villumsen (The Left). – Mr President, does the EU need an independent ethics body? Yes, of course it does. In fact, we should ask ourselves why we don't already have one, especially given the scandals we have seen, even before Qatar— and Morocogate. Given the size and the regulatory power of the EU, it is clear that we do need an entity that can advise, monitor and act on potential misuse, fraud and corruption facing us now and in future.

But what does such an entity need in order to actually make a difference? It needs three clear things. First, it needs to be truly independent. It cannot bow to pressure from, for instance, the European Commission or EU countries. Second, it needs to have real power for investigations and sufficient resources to carry them out. It should not have to ask permission to use them. And third, it needs to ensure that implementation actually happens and that sanctions are applied. Rules that are not enforced are no good. That is what we have been calling for, from The Left, for a long time, as have many others. Sadly, the right and their friends have managed to avoid this. Now, Commissioner, there is no more time for bad excuses. Now it is time for action.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Mr President, Madam Commissioner, the creation of an independent EU ethics body is a crucial first step in restoring public trust in the European Union after the Qatargate scandal.

However, given its nature of interinstitutional agreement, with the timelines needed for such an act, there is an important necessity to use all our means to prevent such cases of corruption or misconduct from being repeated.

President Metsola's package is a good start but we can and we must do more. I am thinking, for example, about the need to clearly define conflict of interest and strictly regulate the phenomenon of the revolving doors to ensure transparency on the decision-making for our Parliament in the Bureau as well as in the CoP.

There is an issue that I believe we must immediately fix to build a more democratic and accountable Europe. In 2019, the EU finally adopted a dedicated and comprehensive directive on whistle-blower protection, which does not include the staff members of the EU institutions, agencies and bodies. Speaking up is one of the hardest acts a person can do. It requires immense courage and sacrifice. We must encourage our whistle-blowers and we must protect them in the moment in which they will denounce.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, paní komisařko, já bych chtěl na úvod svého vystoupení přivítat tuto iniciativu Komise a její předsedkyně a také podpořit ten návrh tak, jak zde jej představila paní komisařka. Podle mého názoru je velmi důležité návrh dobře promyslet, protože není jednoduché vytvořit vlastně nový meziinstitucionální orgán. Na druhou stranu je evidentní, že Evropská unie má pravidla v jednotlivých institucích. Mnohdy jsou lepší než pravidla v jednotlivých členských státech, ale individuální selhání prostě občas nezachytí, respektive vytvoří předpoklady pro to, že k tomuto selhání dojde.

Kauza Qatargate ukazuje potřebnost toto téma dále tedy rozvíjet a skutečně takový orgán připravit, protože jistě nezávislé vnější posouzení právě pravidel platných v jednotlivých evropských institucích, ale i v konkrétních případech si myslím, že je důležité. Podle mě je důležité také nastavení právě pravidel v jednotlivých institucích, a to vnější posouzení, jak jsem již řekl, si myslím, že prostě dává i těm orgánům a institucím tu důležitou zpětnou vazbu. Mělo by se týkat jak etických pravidel, tak finančních pravidel, nepochybně spolupráce – možné a přípustné – s neziskovými organizacemi, ale také se třetími stranami.

Kam všude by měla tato organizace, respektive tento útvar, orgán, zasáhnout? Podle mě není vyloučeno ani zkoumání jednotlivých konkrétních případů. Nepochybně musí zahrnovat oblasti střetu zájmů, finančních pravidel, nevhodného chování. Myslím, že toto jsou všechna témata, která je třeba otevírat. A pokud někdo namítá, že svoboda výkonu našeho mandátu je stanovena, tak já musím říci, že nemůže být bezbřehá.

Lara Wolters (S&D). – Mr President, today's context is frustrating, embarrassing even. But I'm glad that we're finally working on a number of reforms to do with transparency and accountability in this House. Self-regulation on ethics in the Parliament has failed, and it's time for tighter controls on lobbyists, stricter rules against influence of dubious regimes and more financial transparency. All of this is long overdue and I hope we can move on all of this quickly. But without the enforcement of new rules we will be back at square one.

And so I find it very difficult to take our colleagues from the EPP and ECR seriously when they say we need to draw lessons from Qatar- or Moroccogate. Why? Because the very solution to our problem of self-policing and enforcement is being obstructed under the guise of the freedom of mandate and the rule of law. And under that guise, they voted against proposals on this independent ethics body. To be clear, that's a body that would enforce ethical rules, ensure more consistency between the European institutions, investigate things like side jobs and side incomes, check conflicts of interests, including of Commissioners, verify financial declarations, and be able to act against revolving doors. Apart from a handful of courageous members in the EPP, the EPP said no to those kinds of powers. And that's a problem.

And it's a problem, too, because of the promises of our President of the European Commission, who proposed that there would be an ethics body. And we're still waiting on that proposals four years into the mandate. And that's important because problems go beyond the European Parliament. We all know former Commissioner Neelie Kroes actively lobbied for Uber despite a cooling-off period that prohibited that. Former Commissioner Oettinger has 14, was it 15, side jobs as a lobbyist in a clear example of revolving doors. And the Council continues to allow sponsorships by companies of their presidencies despite running the risk of conflicts of interest.

What's at stake here is trust in democracy and in institutions, in public institutions. We have to make sure that political processes are not captured by private interests. I really hope we can expect the Commission proposal soon now, because the time for action is now.

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, l'Europe n'avance que dans les crises. Comme cette petite phrase a un goût amer, quand elle vient à décrire ce que nous vivons. Il aura fallu un scandale de corruption au sein même de notre Parlement pour que l'on songe enfin à fixer des règles éthiques de bon sens.

Je salue les propositions faites par la Présidente de notre assemblée et j'appelle à ce qu'elles soient mises en œuvre sans délai. Mais je m'étonne – et c'est le moins que je puisse dire – qu'elles n'aillent pas plus loin. Quand lancerons-nous enfin le chantier d'une autorité d'éthique indépendante pour toutes les institutions européennes, comme nous le proposons depuis 2019?

Il paraît que le groupe le plus important – au moins en nombre – de ce Parlement n'y est pas favorable, au prétexte de préserver la liberté de mandat. Mais enfin, de quelle liberté parle-t-on quand il s'agit de lutter contre la corruption? En tant qu'élue française, je ne me sens pas moins libre dans l'exercice de mon mandat au motif que je déclare mon patrimoine et mes revenus à une autorité française indépendante, qui les vérifie.

Pendant des années, ce Parlement a vécu à l'ombre de la cogestion imposée par deux groupes politiques, PPE et S&D, à l'ensemble de leurs collègues. Nominations, règlements, bonnes et mauvaises pratiques: tout passait par eux! Au vu du naufrage que le «Qatargate» représente, il est temps que notre Parlement dispose d'une administration professionnelle non politisée et que son fonctionnement soit audité de manière indépendante.

C'est de cette façon que nous retrouverons la confiance de nos électeurs, que des années de négligence ont entamée.

IN THE CHAIR: OTHMAR KARAS

Vice-President

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, as long as there is someone tempted by corruption and others willing to corrupt, our institutions will be exposed to corruption. Therefore, we must adopt rules and mechanisms that minimise and possibly eradicate the chances for corrupt practices and corrupt individuals to make their way into our institutions.

The Qatargate and Moroccogate scandals have made it clear that our rules on transparency, integrity, anti-corruption and the use of public money must be improved, and we are working on that. But what is particularly needed are mechanisms to ensure that the rules we already have and the ones we will have in the near future are enforced. Where we dramatically fail is in oversight, in supervising and controlling the compliance with the rules and in sanctioning when such rules are broken.

In 2021, this Parliament already proposed establishing an independent ethics body to oversee them and the maintenance of standards of integrity with the same rules for at least the Commission and Parliament, taking into account their different powers and competences. And despite the fact that President von der Leyen promised to do so, thus far, the Commission has not presented any proposal in this regard.

Now, with a corruption scandal seriously affecting our credibility more than ever, it is time to move forward with this proposal and therefore I welcome the announcement made by Vice-President Jourová in the sense that the Commission will table a concrete proposal in the coming weeks. I hope it will come really in a short time and we are looking very much forward to that proposal.

Hermann Tertsch (ECR). – Señor presidente, ha sido necesario que esté en la cárcel hoy una vicepresidenta de este Parlamento, una socialista, para que sepamos del Qatargate, del Moroccogate y de una corrupción, por cierto, que puede haber sido clave en una política de privilegio a Marruecos que ha dañado gravemente los intereses de España.

Pero también han sido necesarias estas detenciones para que sepamos de la ONG Fight Impunity, una de las cientos de ONG izquierdistas que pululan por esta Cámara. Lo hacen con plena libertad, como sabemos, con el señor Panzeri, con el socialista Cazeneuve, con la filocomunista Mogherini y con Emma Bonino, que fue miembro de aquella Comisión de Santer que tuvo que dimitir en bloque en 1999.

Esto no solo pasa en el Parlamento, lo que vemos aquí y tanto nos duele. Borrell, con el Grupo Socialista, coordina con la Embajada de Cuba —una dictadura— sus actuaciones. Borrell justificó que Delcy Rodríguez, violando las sanciones de la Unión Europea, llegara a España y dejara allí cuarenta maletas, que no sabemos a dónde han ido. Una narcotraficante sancionada por la Unión Europea y miembro de un gobierno criminal. Tampoco sabemos nada de los apologistas de Huawei. ¿Por qué lo hacen? ¿Lo hacen gratis? Y ¿qué pasa con el Pfizergate? ¿Dónde están los mensajes intercambiados por Von der Leyen con el CEO de Pfizer, Bourla? Se dijo que los iban a traer. No han aparecido, como bien sabemos.

Aquí no hacen falta nuevos códigos éticos, ni tampoco nuevas comisiones que cobren nuevas dietas. Aquí hace falta honradez y amor a la verdad. Eso, a muchos aquí, se lo impide su ideología.

Αλέξης Γεωργιάδης (The Left). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συζήτηση για έναν ανεξάρτητο φορέα δεοντολογίας στην Ένωση κρατά από την προηγούμενη θητεία και, δυστυχώς, μας πρόλαβαν τα γεγονότα όσον αφορά την αναγκαιότητα του φορέα αυτού. Ο φορέας θα πρέπει να έχει όχι μόνο δυνατότητες έρευνας αλλά και δυνατότητες επιβολής κυρώσεων. Επίσης, η πληροφόρηση από τρίτα μέρη, όπως δημοσιογράφοι, ΜΚΟ και καταγγέλλοντες δυσλειτουργίες θα πρέπει να προστατεύεται. Θα πρέπει, επιπλέον, να συμπεριλαμβάνει και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και την Επιτροπή, αλλά και όλα τα όργανα των ευρωπαϊκών θεσμών, ακόμα και το Συμβούλιο, αν θέλουμε να μιλάμε για πραγματική Ένωση. Και, φυσικά, επιμένουμε για το υψηλότερο δυνατό επίπεδο διαφάνειας. Η πλήρης διαφάνεια και η λογοδοσία στον πυρήνα της Ευρώπης, ώστε να μη διαβρώνεται από κανένα εσωτερικό ή εξωτερικό παράγοντα ή συμφέρον, για να έχουμε ακλόνητη την εμπιστοσύνη των πολιτών μας.

Ernő Schaller-Baross (NI). – Elnök Úr! A politikai és gazdasági érdekek összefonódását, ha az európai intézmények magukról beszélnek, akkor lobbinak hívják, és nem korrupciónak. Korrupcióval csak a tagállamokat vádolják.

A cél mindig is az uniós kompetenciák további bővítése és politikai-gazdasági nyomásgyakorlás. Az EU intézményei sorra elhárítják a tagállamok irányából származó külső ellenőrzés lehetőségét annak érdekében, hogy ez véletlenül se fenyegethesse hatásköreiket, céljaikat. Éppen ezért egy új, független etikai testület létrehozása két feltétel esetén támogatható. Ha maradéktalanul tisztteletben tartják a Szerződéseinket, a közös Szerződéseinket, és megfelelő hatáskört biztosítanak a tagállamok számára.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já se také chci k tomuto tématu vyjádřit. Osobně vítám úvahu, že už konečně vznikne konkrétní návrh, jak by takový nezávislý etický orgán Evropské unie měl vypadat. Protože debata, kterou tady vedeme, je sice důležitá, ale strašně obecná. A zvláště u těchto orgánů platí to, co my říkáme v Čechách, že ďábel je zakopán v detailu. Paní Jourová mně rozumí, co to znamená. To znamená, důležité bude, jak ten konkrétní návrh bude vypadat. To znamená, jak by takový orgán fungoval, jaké by měl pravomoci a jaké by měl možnosti při stanovování, ale i vymáhání etických pravidel.

Já tedy tu myšlenku vítám, ale na druhou stranu varuji před tím, aby vznikl nějaký nový orgán, který bude placen z peněz evropských daňových poplatníků a který bude fakticky bezzubý a nebude fungovat. Takže doufám, že platí to, co bylo řečeno. A za to moc děkuji paní Jourové, že se brzy budeme bavit nad konkrétním návrhem, abychom našli řešení, které bude efektivní, které opravdu přispěje ke snížení nebezpečí sedého lobbingu bývalých úředníků a politiků Evropské unie, ale i těch současných.

A na druhé straně najdeme řešení, které bude cítit autonomii evropských institucí a které nebude suplovat případně roli orgánů činných v trestním řízení, protože kauzy, jako je Qatargate, zkrátka a dobře má, a je to tak správně, vyšetřovat policie, státní zastupitelství a o vině má rozhodovat soud.

My zde můžeme stanovit orgány, které v rámci prevence takového možného nezákonného jednání sníží riziko, že to dojde až do stadia kauzy, kterou tady řešíme a debatujeme. Takže já myšlenku velmi vítám, ale opravdu je třeba vidět, jak takový orgán konkrétně bude fungovat, a těším se na takovouto debatu.

Isabel García Muñoz (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, la creación de un organismo ético europeo independiente fue uno de los compromisos de la presidenta von der Leyen ya en 2019, y este Parlamento se lo recordó y lo pidió en septiembre de 2021.

Estamos en 2023. Después de haberse detectado uno de los mayores casos de corrupción ocurrido en el seno de las instituciones europeas y comprendiendo que es sin duda una cuestión compleja, es innegable que el momento para hacerlo es ahora.

Las instituciones europeas cuentan ya con reglas estrictas y estamos trabajando para reforzarlas, pero no sirven de mucho si no garantizamos un cumplimiento riguroso por parte de todos los miembros y del personal de las instituciones. No debemos olvidar que la corrupción, el fraude y otros comportamientos poco éticos no solo dañan gravemente la credibilidad de toda la Unión, sino que acarrearán importantes consecuencias financieras para el presupuesto europeo.

Este Parlamento ha demostrado una gran capacidad de reacción frente a los casos de corrupción, pero ahora debemos demostrar voluntad política para ir más allá y crear ese organismo ético europeo que asegure una total implementación de los más altos estándares éticos en todas las instituciones europeas y que garantice que las decisiones se toman buscando el interés común de la ciudadanía. Debemos crear un organismo que tenga una función preventiva mediante la sensibilización y la orientación, que pueda emitir recomendaciones sobre cuestiones éticas, incluidos los conflictos de intereses, que controle el cumplimiento de las reglas vigentes, que tenga capacidad para investigar por iniciativa propia y de forma independiente, todo esto en colaboración y complementando su acción con la de la Oficina Antifraude, la Fiscalía Europea, el Tribunal de Cuentas, el Defensor del Pueblo y Europol, y, sobre todo, que ayude a recuperar la confianza de los ciudadanos en la Unión Europea. Solo así reforzaremos la legitimidad democrática de la Unión.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Domnule președinte, la începutul acestei legislaturi, Comisia a promis că va pune pe masă o propunere privind înființarea unui organism european de etică independent. A fost însă nevoie de un scandal de corupție care a zdruncinat încrederea cetățenilor pentru a repune pe masă acest subiect.

De ce ne-ar fi teamă să asumăm clar integritatea? De ce ar trebui ca populiștii antieuropeni să aibă unde arăta cu degetul? Avem modele în Uniunea Europeană. România, de exemplu, are o Agenție Națională pentru Integritate care evaluează independent posibile conflicte de interese și posibile cazuri de *revolving doors*. Are cineva ceva de ascuns în spatele ușilor de la birouri? Atunci să le deschidem larg.

Nu pentru banii Rusiei sau ai Qatarului. Ci pentru verificări de integritate. Altfel, sigur, putem să lucrăm în industrie sau să facem lobby, dar mă tem, doamnelor și domnilor, că nu prea avem ce căuta într-un mandat public.

Mikuláš Peksa (Verts/ALE). – Pane předsedající, v Evropském parlamentu velmi často mluvím o tom, jak být transparentní, jak bojovat proti podvodům a korupci a jak chránit oznamovatele korupce. Jenže místo toho, co Parlament vlastně by měl dělat, tak nic moc nedělá.

Naši kolegové tady plní novinové titulky rozsáhlou korupční aférou a my přitom nedovolíme našemu vlastnímu úřadu pro boj proti podvodům, aby vyšetřoval obviněné europoslance. Nezveřejňujeme, alespoň tedy ne všichni, jak a na co jsou využívány kancelářské náhrady a nechráníme vlastní zaměstnance, když na nějaké pochybení poukáží.

Toto se musí změnit. Máme dobrá etická pravidla, kterými se ale vlastně nikdo neřídí, protože jejich dodržování nikdo nekontroluje. Takže toto jsou všechno důvody, proč potřebujeme nezávislý etický orgán, který zajistí, že budeme důsledně dbát na základní pravidla hry napříč všemi evropskými institucemi. A fakt je, že Evropský parlament mluví o zřízení etického orgánu už zhruba od doby, kdy jsem byl zvolen europoslancem, ale to bylo před čtyřmi lety, takže je načase tedy konečně dostát slibům, které jsme dali našim voličům.

Heléne Fritzson (S&D). – Herr talman! Kommissionär och minister! Ja, när förtroendet för politiker och EU-institutioner skadas, då skadas vår demokrati. De offentliga institutionerna och alla folkvalda måste på ett föredömligt sätt efterleva oberoende, transparens och ansvar. Det är en förutsättning för att främja både förtroendet och demokratin. Det är en förutsättning för att våra institutioner ska fungera.

Att korruption har uppdagats i detta parlament är mycket allvarligt och det visar på brister som är helt oacceptabla. Vi ska ha nolltolerans och jag välkomnar de åtgärder som parlamentet har antagit så här långt. Och jag kräver ett fortsatt arbete som påbörjas för att vi ska säkerställa att vi lever upp till de allra högsta standarder som kan finnas för etiskt beteende.

Det ska inte råda några tvivel om vilka etiska regler som gäller inom EU:s institutioner. En förbättrad integritet, transparens och ansvarsskyldighet gynnar inte bara våra institutioner – det är en förutsättning för vår demokrati. Och det är vi skyldiga alla EU:s medborgare att kunna leva upp till.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein (Renew). – Pani Komisarz! Pani Przewodnicząca! Drogie koleżanki i koledzy! Już naprawdę od ponad godziny wszyscy deklarujemy, jak bardzo nas szokuje korupcja i że absolutnie trzeba powołać niezależne *Ethics Body*. No niemal wszyscy, bo nie liczę tutaj prawej strony sali. Zresztą i tak już wszyscy wyszli.

Korupcja ma różne twarze i to nie tylko są te słynne torby pełne pieniędzy wynoszone skądś tam, również z hotelu w Brukseli. Każdy rodzaj korupcji to jest robak niszczący demokrację. Tak, wiemy o tym. W różnych krajach różne mamy *Ethics Bodies*. I wielu z nas wypełnia co roku tony papieru i sprawozdań do tych *bodies* właśnie. Czy dojdzie jeszcze jedno takie *body* na poziomie europejskim i jeszcze kolejne papiery? A może powinniśmy się lepiej zharmonizować. Wypracować europejski standard. Europejską współpracę w tej dziedzinie. Standardy i praktyki obowiązujące nie tylko instytucje europejskie, ale i wszystkie instytucje w krajach członkowskich.

I w tym życzę powodzenia nam wszystkim.

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, Madame la Ministre, chers collègues, il faut toujours attendre des scandales pour que l'on se demande si nos institutions fonctionnent. Et là, on peut faire l'état des lieux: elles ne fonctionnent pas. Alors, pourquoi ne fonctionnent-elles pas?

Nous avons des comités d'éthique. Mais au niveau du Parlement le comité d'éthique est constitué de cinq députés, qui sont juges et parties, à la Commission le comité d'éthique est constitué de fonctionnaires, qui sont juges et parties. Qui plus est, on s'aperçoit que ces comités ne sont que consultatifs, qu'ils ne sont pas contraignants, qu'ils n'ont pas la possibilité de prendre des sanctions. Donc, ça ne marche pas, et en plus ce n'est pas transparent!

Je vais vous donner deux chiffres: ces trois dernières années, il y a eu 52 enquêtes portant sur les députés. Savez-vous ce qu'elles ont donné? Personne ne le sait. À la Commission européenne, selon Corporate Europe Observatory, il y a eu 360 cas de pantouflage autorisés et seulement 3 demandes rejetées. Savez-vous dans quels dossiers? Non.

Quand vous demandez ce que l'on peut faire, je vais vous dire, effectivement, qu'il faut un organe d'éthique indépendant – juste une minute –, il faut un budget, il faut du personnel. Il faut qu'il puisse mener une enquête, qu'il puisse prendre des sanctions et, surtout, il faut que cet organe soit transparent. Il faut que les données soient publiques.

Sinon, l'opacité va entraîner l'impunité.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, este debate sobre a criação de uma entidade independente para a ética nas instituições europeias não deveria ser necessário. A Presidente da Comissão Europeia fez essa proposta logo no início do seu mandato e o Parlamento Europeu fez uma proposta concreta já há mais de ano e meio.

Não deveria ser preciso recordar tudo isto, hoje, à Comissão e ao Conselho, no seguimento de um escândalo de corrupção que torna tudo mais urgente. Mas a verdade é que, entretanto, pouco ou nada aconteceu e as declarações de simpatia pela ideia, como as que foram feitas pela Comissão, vêm sempre acompanhadas de uma longa lista de objeções conceptuais, dificuldades jurídicas, divergências de modelo, discussão de competências e dúvidas, até, sobre os recursos a afetar à nova entidade. Algumas dessas questões merecerão, sem dúvida, consideração séria e precisam de um compromisso razoável, mas não podem tornar-se barreiras intransponíveis, porque isso seria dar um sinal de falta de vontade política para avançar e fazer o que deve ser feito.

A verdade é que precisamos, hoje, ainda com mais urgência, de um acordo interinstitucional, que conduza à criação desta entidade única e independente para a ética, com meios para avaliar conflitos de interesse, verificar o cumprimento das regras de transparência e de códigos de conduta, e com competência para emitir recomendações fundamentadas.

Isto faz parte da resposta necessária para recuperar a confiança dos cidadãos e para dar resposta aos problemas de falta de transparência nas instituições europeias. Não pode continuar uma promessa adiada.

Klemen Grošelj (Renew). – Kolegi, neodvisno etično telo Evropske unije bi pravzaprav moralo že obstajati. A kaj, ko kaže, da gre za neke vrste povest o jari kači.

Je morda primerneje, da pometemo pred lastnim pragom in poskrbimo za okrepitev naših lastnih etičnih meril in standardov, predvsem z njihovim uveljavljanjem in nadgradnjo, predvsem glede nadzora, kako bivši člani parlamenta dostopajo do [...] te hiše in pa z registrom premoženja, torej premoženje katerega posedujemo in o katerem že poročamo v lastnih državah.

To ne bo vplivalo na izvajanje in svobodo našega mandata kot poslancev, bo pa verjetno – vsaj upam tako – okrepilo, če ne povrnilo, raven zaupanja v Evropski parlament. Zakaj edino zaupanje je tisto, na čemer lahko gradi Evropski parlament in uveljavlja svojo politično moč v odnosu do drugih institucij Evropske unije. Hvala lepa.

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Vice-présidente, chers collègues, il aura donc fallu des valises de liquide et des liasses de billets cachées sous des couches-culottes pour que les choses bougent enfin. Pourquoi avoir autant attendu?

La création de cet organe indépendant de surveillance de la vie publique européenne a été votée, ici même, en 2021. Aujourd'hui il est temps d'agir et il sera d'autant plus temps d'agir quand l'attention des médias sera partie sur autre chose.

Créons, tout de suite, sans plus attendre, cette autorité éthique capable de s'attaquer aux conflits d'intérêts, au pantouflage, à la colonisation de l'espace public par les intérêts particuliers.

Étendons l'autorité de cet organe aux commissaires, aux députés européens, à l'ensemble des agents travaillant pour les institutions, avant, après et pendant – évidemment – leur mandat ou leur service.

Dotons-le de fonctions de surveillance et d'un droit d'enquête, dont les décisions seront contraignantes. Et n'ayons pas peur: confions-lui aussi un pouvoir de sanction. Il en va de la crédibilité de nos institutions.

La lutte contre la corruption n'est pas une affaire de morale: c'est une question de survie pour nos démocraties, une question de souveraineté pour l'Union européenne.

Aujourd'hui, comment sommes-nous vu à Doha, à Moscou, à Pékin? Nous sommes vus comme des gens à acheter, à corrompre. Ce n'est donc pas simplement parce que nous voulons moraliser la vie publique que nous voulons cet organe. C'est parce que nous voulons défendre la souveraineté des citoyens européens et affirmer que l'Europe, en défendant ses principes, est aussi fidèle à ses intérêts vitaux.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une intervention «carton bleu»)

Sven Simon (PPE), blue-card speech. – I think you said something which is very right, and I absolutely agree. And that is why I'm wondering why we are talking about an ethics body. You said that we don't want to moralise public life, but that is why I don't understand. Why are we talking about an ethics body which has to do with moral standards? I agree with most things which have been said, even if I think the scandal wouldn't have been prevented with a body like that because they were intentionally breaking criminal law and they took the risk to go to jail. But why do we call it ethics body?

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D), blue-card reply. – Well actually that's not the name I would have picked, because in France, if I'm quoting my country – sometimes it does things right – it's called the high authority on the transparency of public life, which I think is better because we should not put it on the moral ground. It's a question of the survival of democracy. It's a political issue, and it's a legal issue. It's not a moral issue. I don't care if you are not moral. What I care is that you respect the rules and you respect the trust of the people who voted for you and sent you in these institutions. So if I were to write it, I would call it the high authority on the transparency of public life.

Dacian Ciolos (Renew). – Domnule președinte, doamnă vicepreședintă, inițiativa de a înființa o autoritate etică pentru europarlamentari, comisari și alți oficiali europeni, care să asigure reguli clare pentru conflicte de interese, vine târziu, dar este indispensabilă. Nu mai merge cu jumătăți de măsură, cu interpretări diferite ale unor fapte pe care cetățenii le percep ca privilegii nejustificate sau conflict de interese.

După scandalul de corupție în care colegi de-ai noștri au fost prinși de procurori cu banii în saci, este în joc credibilitatea întreagă a Uniunii Europene. Ne plângem de lipsă de credibilitate în fața cetățenilor. Iată că acum avem ocazia să le demonstrăm că vom respecta cu toții reguli clare de transparență și că faptele noastre au un singur interes: interesul colectiv și nu cel individual.

Mă bucur că textul rezoluției face trimitere și la autoritățile de investigație naționale - e nevoie să le implicăm și pe acestea - dar și la procurorul european, pentru că cu cât mai multe metode de curățenie etică avem în instituțiile europene, cu atât Europa va fi mai puternică.

René Repasi (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin, Frau Ministerin! Ja, Personen, denen die eigenen Überzeugungen so wenig bedeuten, dass sie sie zum Verkauf stellen, tun dies, ganz gleich, wie scharf die Regeln sind und wie scharf sie durchgesetzt werden. Es gibt sie, und ja, es wird sie immer geben; machen wir uns nichts vor.

Aber wir können – ja, wir müssen alles daransetzen, dass es für solche Personen so unattraktiv, so schwierig wie möglich wird, sich von Dritten beeinflussen zu lassen. Idealerweise so, dass sie gar nicht erst kandidieren möchten. Hier gilt, was Mario Draghi in einem anderen Zusammenhang sagte: *whatever it takes*.

Dazu gehört es, dass wir eine unabhängige Einrichtung brauchen, mit eigenen Befugnissen, mit eigenen Kompetenzen. Und der Maßstab muss wie bei Draghi sein: Wir müssen etwas schaffen, das idealerweise nie tätig werden muss.

Neben einer Durchsetzung der Regeln, die wir hier verschärfen müssen, müssen wir aber auch Hausaufgaben bei uns machen. Wir müssen Parteiverfahren so haben, dass solche Gestalten, die das Licht der Transparenz meiden, gar nicht erst in unser Haus hineinkommen. Wir müssen auch den Journalistinnen und Journalisten sagen: volles Spotlight auf das, was hier passiert! Wir brauchen mehr, die schauen, was in diesem Hause passiert und uns kontrollieren.

Und so können wir zusammen ein System bauen, in dem derartige Gestalten, die ihre eigenen Überzeugungen zum Verkauf stellen, sich beeinflussen lassen, hier nicht mehr ihr schlechtes Werk tun können.

Abir Al-Sahlani (Renew). – Herr talman! Fru kommissionär, minister Roswall! Jag brukar kalla Europaparlamentet för demokratins högborg. Vi är trots allt den enda direkt folkvalda institutionen i hela EU. Vi ska alla vara stolta över det förtroende som våra väljare har gett oss.

Jag är stolt varje dag att få representera Centerpartiet, Sverige och våra väljare. Men med det förtroendet kommer också ett tungt ansvar. Ett ansvar att hålla politiken ren från fusk, ett ansvar att hålla politiken ren från korruption och självklart från påverkan av främmande makt.

De senaste månaderna har våra väljare tyvärr fått se oss misslyckas med detta ansvar. Vi har fått se Viktor Orbán vifta bort vår kritik mot hans rättsvidriga agerande. Det är politikerna i Bryssel som är korrupta. Inga uppförandekoder kan förhindra den som är redo att begå brott från att begå brott.

Men det ska vara lätt att göra rätt och det ska vara svårt att förstöra det som är vårt. Korruption ska bekämpas, fusk bör straffas och påverkan måste försvåras. Världen behöver en stark röst för demokrati och vi kan vara den rösten. Men först måste vi sopa framför egen dörr.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, the European Parliament is rightly under the spotlight. Members of this House have brought shame to this institution. Their actions have diminished our standing in front of those we seek to represent.

While those who engage in disgraceful behaviour are few in number, they have left a trail of destruction and suspicion in their wake. We collectively as a body must act. It is essential that an independent EU ethics body is established as quickly as possible to help restore confidence.

However, it is only the actions of an EU ethics body, and not simply its establishment, that can help to restore trust that has been lost. There must be a common, uniform definition of what constitutes a conflict of interest in the European Union and how we hold to account if there is going to be ambiguity across Member States.

The EU ethics body must be completely independent. It must not require approval to start investigation. It needs to have teeth and not be worried about seeking approval from the powers that be.

The time of self-regulation must come to an end in the European Parliament and we have seen that there are those who are willing to use this office and have been elected to advance themselves. It is time that we stand firm against such activities.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospod predsednik! Integriteta, transparentnost, odgovornost. Ničelna toleranca do korupcije. Brez tega zaupanja v naše delo ni in ne bo. Določena pravila že obstajajo, to drži. Ampak po institucijah imamo različne kodekse ravnanja, zaradi česar so potem standardi neenotni, preiskovalna pooblastila nezadostna, da o pomanjkljivih, marsikdaj tudi neprepričljivih sankcijah sploh ne govorim.

Resda na koncu vse stoji in pade na integriteti človeka samega, a vseeno je prav, da dobimo evropski etični organ s poenotenimi, jasnimi pravili ravnanja znotraj vseh institucij. S strogimi pravili, upam, seveda, najstrožjimi možnimi.

Neuspešno nas je večina v tej hiši k temu pozvala že pred dvema letoma. Po vseh zadnjih škandalih pa zdaj res upam, da bo Komisija tokrat to našo zahtevo in njihovo takratno zavezo uresničila. Zdaj pa je menda ja vsem jasno, da drugače ne bo šlo. Tistim, ki s pravili in etiko tako ali tako nimamo težav, to zagotovo je.

Vlad Gheorghe (Renew). – Domnule președinte, corupția ucide. Și asta nu e o lozincă, e realitatea. Corupția ne costă enorm: 1 000 de miliarde de euro anual în Uniune, da, 1 000 de miliarde, ați auzit bine. Corupția ne face mai slabi și mai vulnerabili la atacurile dușmanilor noștri. Corupția duce la tragedii.

Ce s-a întâmplat în Turcia și Siria nu e doar un dezastru natural, ci urmarea corupției din construcții, din administrație, din politică. Credeți că în Uniune suntem păziți? Cazul Eva Kaili e cea mai recentă dovadă că nu. Timpul vorbelor a trecut demult. E nevoie urgent de fapte. Am cerut încă din decembrie o agenție de integritate. Nu vreau încă o instituție care să pară că facem ceva. Agenția de integritate trebuie neapărat să fie reală și să colaboreze cu Parchetul European.

Corupții dovediți trebuie excluși din orice funcție publică. Trebuie să dea înapoi toată averea făcută din funcția publică și să știe absolut cu toții ce vor păți. Să nu mai aibă tupeul să se atingă de banii Uniunii Europene sau de banii noștri, din țările noastre.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Sven Simon (PPE). – Mr President, I have already mentioned that we have one problem in this debate. We talk the whole debate about 'ethics'. But this is not the case. This is not our problem. We have a problem with the rule of law and the enforcement of the rule of law. For that reason, we have to have a clear distinction between criminal actions, breaches of institutional rules. That is what we are talking about here: breaches of institutional rules and legal but unethical behaviour. The Qatargate case was a case where four Members were charged with committing criminal acts and, of course, an ethics body would not have prevented that because they intentionally violated criminal law.

What we need to do first is our institutional rules need to be enforced. And we have to ask our colleagues in this committee, why don't you enforce the rules we already have and why don't you put sanctions on those Members who infringe our own rules? This is at stake here, and this is important.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisar, doamna ministru, stimați colegi, discutăm aproape de patru ani în Parlamentul European despre nevoia de a avea un organism care să analizeze, etic, comportament, implicații. Dar, doamna comisar, credeți că e o coincidență că doamna președintă a Comisiei, după ce a promis, la preluarea mandatului, că va veni cu o propunere, s-a oprit, pentru că chiar sau din cauză că asupra dumneaei planează o suspiciune de conflict de interese?

Iată, astăzi am aflat că o publicație americană a dat-o în judecată pe doamna comisară pentru că refuză să dea conversația cu contractele cu Pfizer. Poate de aceea Comisia nu a venit cu propunerea și poate de aceea trebuie să urgentăm, să modificăm regulamentul, încât Parlamentul să poată să aibă drept de inițiativă legislativă.

Nu se poate ca niște oameni nealeși să fie superiori Parlamentului, cu persoane alese de către noi. Și mai spun un singur lucru: dacă nu definim uniform conflictul de interese - în țara mea am fost și ministru, și parlamentar, există acea agenție de integritate și facem declarații și de avere, nu numai de interese - dacă vom avea 27 de modele de conflict de interese, nu va exista nimic aici, în Parlamentul European.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, the idea of an independent EU ethics body is, of course, something to be welcomed. But I have to say we run the very real risk of fiddling while Rome burns if the ethics body focuses only on individual behaviour and doesn't address systemic issues such as the wholesale institutionalisation of lobbying in EU bodies.

We have to address in a really serious way the stranglehold of economic and corporate power, which has taken its grip on decision making in here. And that does of course mean closing revolving doors for sure. But the problems go much deeper than that, and any ethics body worthy of its name can't shirk from that. Corporate power calls the shots in here.

I think we have to be careful as well that any ethics body is scrupulously independent, because if it isn't, we run the risk of creating more problems than we solve. It would be disturbing indeed, if the push to do better is weaponised, to cast suspicion on people for political reasons. So we have an opportunity to do something worthwhile. Let's not waste it.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente Karas, señora comisaria Jourová, señora presidenta del Consejo, en septiembre de 2021, este Parlamento Europeo adoptó una Resolución requiriendo un acuerdo interinstitucional que ponga en marcha un organismo ético que dé transparencia y accesibilidad a las declaraciones de intereses económicos y de incompatibilidades de los miembros del Parlamento Europeo.

Pero ahora pide más. Pide un acto legislativo: una ley europea que garantice que, de la falta de veracidad de esas declaraciones de intereses, se deduzcan consecuencias; que establezca la protección de los denunciantes que denuncien cualquier acto irregular o de corrupción que pueda tener lugar en alguna institución europea; que coordine ese organismo con la OLAF, la Fiscalía, Europol, el Tribunal de Justicia y el Tribunal de Cuentas, y, sobre todo, que refuerce el principio de confianza de la ciudadanía en el Parlamento Europeo y que diga con toda claridad que, si hay en las instituciones europeas alguien que asuma la responsabilidad penal individual de cometer un delito, un acto de corrupción, en ningún caso podrá señalarse que los mecanismos de transparencia, verificación de autenticidad y sanciones de un organismo independiente son los que han fallado, porque ahora ha sido así.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Věra Jourová, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you very much for today's debate and thank you all who stayed here because I have several papers of notes and only four minutes to speak – maybe I will be a little bit longer if the President will allow me. I wanted to react on the many different comments and proposals which I heard here.

But to start, when Mr López Aguilar finished and many of you said it here today, we speak about a serious matter, something which is connected with the need to strengthen democracy and increase the trust of people, of the citizens. There are three main reasons why the trust of citizens is declining: abuse of power, corruption and lack of transparency and lack of honest communication. And we discussed here about how to increase the trust of the citizens, especially after the scandal which is now resonating in our Member States and in the minds of the citizens.

I will come with concrete comments on the ethics body in a minute. Allow me just to say that we are working on the very concrete proposal which will also take lessons from indeed two years of consultations which we went through – because we were not passive, as some of you indicated, we were consulting, we were addressing the institutions under Article 13. I will come back to that. The response was that there is no appetite to join the ethics body in case we establish it. At some moments it looked like a plan to establish the ethics body, which would be just a bilateral agreement between the Parliament and the Commission. And Mr Freund was speaking to me many times about that and I was really frustrated that we are not able to, sorry to say it, sell this idea to other institutions. Now we will do again better because I think that what the institutions need to see is the concrete proposal, which the Commission will come with the parameters, and I will speak about it.

This ethics body and its establishment falls under the broader scope of a list of actions, which the Commission is planning. One is the anti-corruption strategy and harmonisation of the sanctions for corruption. Another one is the defence of democracy, which should deal with the transparency of financing from the third countries. The transparency register – I will ask the Parliament to come back to the negotiating table and speak about how to upgrade the system which we achieved between 2020 and 2021. And indeed some of you spoke about the need to upgrade the rules for lobbying. I fully agree and this is what we will try to focus on.

The Commission will upgrade the rules for the access to documents, to reflect on the new communication ways – because on access to documents, I didn't manage to convince the Parliament to withdraw the directives.

But coming back to the ethics body, I said clearly that we need the ethics body and the Commission will propose the first draft during March and we will invite the institutions which in our view should participate. It's the European Parliament, it's the European Council, it's the Council, of course the Commission, the European Central Bank, then the European Court of Auditors, the European Court of Justice, the Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee. These are the institutions listed under Article 13.

So we will consult in March for the first time on the basis of a very concrete proposal, which will contain the information or the idea of the Commission regarding the scope, competences, composition of the body, the administrative matters – probably also finance, because we should be aware of how much the model will cost. We all know that we need the money for many, many things now we are in deep crisis.

I want to propose something which will be politically feasible, but also meaningful, which will solve the issues which we discussed here. We heard from several Members of the Parliament that this model has to be well thought through because this might be about investigation and probably also sanctioning. Well, we need to be aware of that, that to create the new body and give it the competences we have to have a sufficiently legally sound proposal. And we need to consult very intensively. So this will come in March — for you who asked about the time frame.

But let me also react on what I heard here, because I think the expectations are very high and I believe that we should be aware of what the ethics body will not be, in my view. And again, I said clearly that we need it and I agree with all of you who said it.

The impression from the debate was for me that we do not have sufficiently functioning structures and enforcement of the rules at the level of individual institutions and it's not true. Ms Hautala said 'let's focus on our rules and let's improve the rules and enforcement of the rules per institution'. And I very much appreciate what President Metsola came with – those 12 points which are an important step forward. We are doing our homework in the Commission. Simply the rules of each institution will be as important as ever because the ethics body is not replacing them, cannot replace them. This is the extra layer. So please, let's not say we don't have rules, we don't have structures. Each institution is equipped and can and should do what's necessary to be done.

The second thing, sorry, those images of the Members of the Parliament or the Commission just travelling with the suitcase full of cash. We have measures in case the cash is the proceeds of criminal activity. We have OLAF, we have EPPO, and we have national prosecution. So an ethics body will not replace the investigatory powers which we already have for the cases of criminal activities.

And last but not least, I have to say I was shocked when – who was it? I want to be concrete – I think Madame Chaibi – she is not here anymore – said, 'there is no ethics without an ethics body'. Sorry, I am offended by that, because we all have our responsibility. We have high functions and we should have some moral compass without having the ethics body. Sorry, an ethics body will not replace our individual responsibilities.

So I just want us to be aware what the body will not be. I will propose what we think it should be and I believe that by creating the body, which will harmonise the standards so that there are common sets of rules for everybody who works in the institutions, it will be a very important step forward. And I will not go into details how we want to propose the composition, but I would really like to propose something which will be practically usable, which will deliver the results.

Some of you spoke about the investigatory powers. We have to think it over because just an illustration – in 2020 we had 4 500 disciplinary cases in the Commission. And they were investigated by our structure, our internal body. That's why I was referring to internal bodies of each of the institutions, which have to deal with the cases. So for the ethics body, definitely the setting of standards, declaration of assets, with this question mark of how to do it, conflicts of interest. Let's work together on something which will be, as I said, meaningful and legally sound. This is my dear wish that we together produce and bring to life something which will be well functioning already, hopefully this year. But referring to the debate about the transparency register, which was the interinstitutional negotiation of three institutions, I remember how difficult it was. So here the ambition is to have eight institutions and we will see how it works.

I didn't want to come with any excuses why the Commission didn't act. I just wanted to explain that this is a heavy task and that we were not passive but now I agree with all of you who said now is the momentum and the expectations are rightly very high.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, many thanks for this timely and topical debate and for the different views expressed on what an EU ethics body should look like. Let me also say that the Council shares the concern of all the other institutions, including Parliament, about the rise of foreign interference and its impact on democratic processes in the EU and elsewhere. For a number of years, the Council has been steadily working on strengthening our common instruments and addressing these threats.

As I said in my first intervention, we stand ready to consider the work on the coming proposal, which the Commission will submit for the set-up of an EU ethics body. As many of you have pointed out, we all need to live up to the high expectations and standards when it comes to ethics and transparency. Otherwise, there is a risk that citizens will lose their belief in European institutions and democracy.

Once again, thank you very much for the debate and your attention.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 16. Februar 2023, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Anna Zalewska (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Utworzenie niezależnego organu etycznego Unii Europejskiej (UE) ma kluczowe znaczenie dla zapewnienia spójności i przejrzystości w działaniach instytucji UE, w procesach decyzyjnych UE oraz zwiększy zaufanie obywateli do instytucji UE. Szczególnie teraz, gdy instytucjami Unii wstrząsają skandale korupcyjne, aresztowani są europosłowie, a w tle podejmowanych rozstrzygnięć prawnych Parlamentu pojawiają się informacje o ogromnych kwotach, mających wpływać na procedury prawne. Najważniejsze powody, dla których konieczne jest utworzenie niezależnego organu etycznego UE, to: 1. Ustanowienie jednolitych standardów etycznych i zasad dla instytucji UE: wspólne standardy etyczne i zasady dla instytucji UE zapewnią spójność w podejmowaniu decyzji przez instytucje UE. 2. Zapobieganie konfliktom interesów i korupcji: niezależne ciało etyczne pomoże w zapobieganiu konfliktom interesów i korupcji, co jest kluczowe dla zachowania zaufania obywateli do instytucji UE. 3. Zwiększenie przejrzystości procesów decyzyjnych UE: ciało takie pozwoli zwiększyć przejrzystość procesów decyzyjnych UE i ułatwi obywatelom zrozumienie i zaangażowanie się w procesy podejmowania decyzji. 4. Ochrona wartości UE: wspólne wartości UE, takie jak poszanowanie praw człowieka i demokracji, powinny być chronione i promowane przez instytucje UE. Niezależne ciało etyczne zagwarantuje, że instytucje UE przestrzegają tych wartości.

17. Composition of political groups

Der Präsident. – Ich muss Ihnen zwei Mitteilungen machen, bevor wir zum nächsten Tagesordnungspunkt kommen.

Die eine ist, dass Frau Chiara Gemma die Fraktion der Fraktionslosen (NI—Fraktion) verlässt und mit Wirkung vom 15. Februar 2023 der ECR-Fraktion beitritt.

18. Composition of committees and delegations

Der Präsident. – Die S&D-Fraktion und die fraktionslosen Mitglieder haben der Präsidentin Beschlüsse über die Änderung von Ernennungen in Ausschüssen und Delegationen übermittelt. Diese Beschlüsse werden in das Protokoll der heutigen Sitzung aufgenommen und treten am Tag dieser Ankündigung in Kraft.

19. Response to the situation in Tunisia (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Reaktion auf die Lage in Tunesien (2023/2556(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, thank you for this exchange on a significant topic concerning our important partner and neighbour. The basic elements of the European Union's policy regarding Tunisia remain the same following the Tunisian constitutional referendum. The EU continues to support the Tunisian people in times of major socio-economic challenges, aggravated by the impact of the Russian aggression against Ukraine. There is a need for urgent structural economic reforms.

We believe it is essential to achieve a broad consensus among the various political forces in Tunisia for a process to preserve the democratic acquis. Following parliamentary elections, the country should return to the normal functioning of its institutions. There should be full respect for democratic principles, in particular the separation of powers, the rule of law, pluralism and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The European Union and Tunisia have a shared interest in cooperation on a large number of issues, including security, trade and migration. We should make the best of our association agreement to make progress in these and other areas.

Finally, let me reassure you that the Council will continue to closely monitor the situation on the ground and work with all the relevant stakeholders, including civil society. I am sure that this Parliament shares our main objectives and will also contribute to the EU's overall effort to support Tunisian democratic process.

Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, minister, honourable Members. I want to thank you for this exchange today. Tunisia finds itself at a difficult juncture, both politically and economically.

Our partner, and neighbour, is undergoing a delicate transitional period. We witnessed many changes in the country in the past year and a half. The EU is worried about some of the measures adopted in Tunisia in the past few months.

What today adds to our concerns is indeed the worsening economic situation in Tunisia. A country that was already suffering structural fragilities was then further hit by the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic and now by the damaging impact of the Russian aggression against Ukraine.

Since the 2011 revolution, the EU has provided more than EUR 3 billion in support of the Tunisian democratic transition. In addition, we supported the Tunisian people during the pandemic, as Team Europe and via our contributions to the COVAX platform. We will keep standing by the Tunisian people now that their situation is even more challenging.

The EU is well aware of the complexities of the current socioeconomic context in Tunisia. The important reforms it needs to accomplish in order to ensure long term prosperity can be painful. This is why the EU welcomes the agreement reached at technical level between the Tunisian administration and the International Monetary Fund. It is now urgent that the agreement is signed. We need to see a clear commitment from the Tunisian Government to carry out the structural reforms that they have proposed to the fund. The EU remains committed to accompanying Tunisia and the implementation of these important measures.

Under the current political circumstances in Tunisia, an inclusive dialogue with all relevant political and civil society actors remains crucial. Ensuring the largest consensus possible is fundamental to ensuring successful reforms and sustainable growth. This is a message we have been passing to our Tunisian partners in the past months and we reconfirm today.

Michael Gahler, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Was wir hier gesehen und gehört haben, das ist ja eine Realitätsverweigerung vonseiten des Rates und der Kommission.

Tunesien war mal ein Hoffnungsträger nach dem Arabischen Frühling, und wir sind wieder *back to square one*, was die Situation betrifft. Wir sind viel näher an Ben Ali als an allen anderen demokratischen Politikern seit 2011. Und wir haben hier einen Staatsstreich von oben, von Präsident Saied, erlebt. Er hat die Regierung abgesetzt, das Parlament abgesetzt und den *High Judicial Council* abgeschafft und 57 Richter abgesetzt. Und wir haben eine Situation, wo wir die Delegitimierung durch das tunesische Volk erleben: 11 % Wahlbeteiligung bei diesen Wahlen.

Ich habe mich gefragt: Warum fangen Sie bei dem Referendum an? Sie müssen bei dem Staatsstreich von oben anfangen. Was die Venedig-Kommission zum Verhalten dieses Präsidenten gesagt hat, das war ein vernichtendes Urteil. Und auch der Gerichtshof der Afrikanischen Union hat sich im letzten September eindeutig politisch geäußert. Die Wahlen sind boykottiert worden von allen relevanten Parteien, vom Gewerkschaftsdachverband, von der Zivilgesellschaft – und das ignorieren Sie hier.

Es muss doch einen Unterschied machen in unserer Politik, ob wir hier jemand haben, der sich an die Verfassung hält, oder ob er sie bricht. Es muss einen Unterschied machen, ob er ein gewähltes Parlament achtet oder ob er es abschafft. Die Tunesier haben ihre Antwort gegeben. Und ich finde, die Europäische Union kann hier nicht *business as usual* machen, sonst können wir alle unsere Werte, die wir in Sonntagsreden immer halten, tatsächlich abschaffen.

Ich finde es unerhört, was ich hier heute nicht gehört habe. Sie machen hier eine Politik, die die Realität dieses Landes verweigert. Wahrscheinlich müssen erst wieder tatsächlich noch zehntausende Tunesier in die Boote steigen, dass hier die Realität anerkannt wird. Dieser Präsident, das, was dort in Tunesien derzeit geschieht, das darf unsere Unterstützung nicht erhalten. Wir müssen hier Konsequenzen ziehen und andere Saiten aufziehen.

Matjaž Nemec, *v imenu skupine S&D*. – Gospod Predsednik! Spoštovani, dober večer. Tako, kot je moj predhodnik že bil dejal, demokracija je v Tuniziji že več kot desetletje pod velikimi pritiski. Nedavne volitve niso okrepile zaupanja v demokracijo in institucije, pač pa so jo dodatno zamajale.

V skupini socialistov in demokratov smo zelo zaskrbljeni glede izjemno nizke volilne udeležbe ter tudi nad izjemno nizko zastopanostjo žensk na volitvah. Vse to pa odraža izjemno nezaupanje ljudi v predsednika in v njegove reforme. In te volitve, spoštovani, so jasen simptom nevarnega drsenja države v temne čase.

Priča smo nazadovanju demokracije. Aretacije sodnikov, sindikalnih voditeljev, predstavnikov opozicije. To dodatno načenja vero in zaupanje Tunizijcev v predstavnike oblasti in v politiko. Največjo ceno te krize plačujejo tako ljudje. Številni, kot je bilo že rečeno, že zapuščajo državo.

Brez resnih sprememb bomo priča izgubi celih generacij ljudi. Država brez nujnih gospodarskih in političnih reform ne more do nujnih novih posojil Mednarodnega denarnega sklada. Na tem mestu zato pozivamo predsednika Saida, da spremeni smer in državo popelje nazaj v demokracijo, da zagotovi polno zastopanost vseh državljanov ter zagotovi delovanje institucij.

Prav tako pozivamo države članice in Komisijo, da pazljivo spremljajo razmere v južnem Mediteranu, da Evropska unija vzpostavi dialog z oblastmi in ponudi ljudem pomoč.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, *im Namen der Renew-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin erschüttert darüber, was für eine schwache Vorstellung die Kommission und der Rat an dieser Stelle abgeben. Ich weiß nicht, wer Ihnen Ihre *speaking points* vorbereitet hat, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, aber das spiegelt nicht die Realität wider, die gerade in Tunesien herrscht.

In Tunesien gibt es einen Präsidenten, der heißt Saïed, der hat die Demokratie ausgehöhlt, das Parlament abgeschafft, der hat Wahlen neu angesetzt dann später, an denen nicht jeder frei teilnehmen konnte, an denen die meisten Parteien nicht teilgenommen haben, mit einer Wahlbeteiligung von 11,4 %.

Und Sie sprechen hier davon, dass wir zur Tagesordnung übergehen sollten, dass wir das anerkennen sollten, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen? Das kann doch wirklich nicht Ihr Ernst sein, dass Sie das von uns hier einfordern.

Das Gegenteil müssen wir tun, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Denn was jetzt gerade in Tunesien passiert, ist doch, dass neben dem Staatsstreich der demokratischen Institutionen als nächstes die Justiz drankommt. Und wir haben – das hat der Kollege schon gesagt – 57 Richter, die ja ihres Amtes enthoben wurden, und jetzt ist die Presse dann dran.

Il faut le dire très clairement, chers collègues, à cet instant: le Parlement européen se tient aux côtés du peuple tunisien. Nous luttons avec vous pour la démocratie, nous luttons avec vous pour l'état de droit et nous luttons avec vous pour la liberté de la presse. Aujourd'hui, le directeur d'une station de radio, Noureddine Boutar, a été arrêté. Cette arrestation est inacceptable: il faut une réaction ferme et forte de l'Union européenne contre ce régime tunisien.

Mounir Satouri, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, mes collègues l'ont dit, mais je vais rappeler ce chiffre: 11 %. Seulement 11 % de la population tunisienne est allée voter. Qu'exprime ce chiffre?

La lassitude, d'abord, face à une loi électorale si peu inclusive, des femmes, des jeunes et de la diversité de la société. L'échec, ensuite, de la politique hyperprésidentielle de Kaïs Saïed: 89 % de la population est donc restée silencieuse. Et pourtant, ce n'est pas assez. Saïed continue de faire le vide pour régner seul en maître: révision constitutionnelle, pleins pouvoirs, parlement fantoche. Il ne manquait plus que la vague d'arrestations d'aujourd'hui pour basculer d'un régime autoritaire à un régime répressif.

Combien de temps l'Union européenne va-t-elle encore se voiler la face sur l'état de la démocratie en Tunisie? Qu'attendons-nous pour nous réveiller, nous qui placions tant d'espoirs dans la démocratie tunisienne, l'exception tunisienne au cœur d'un printemps arabe décevant? L'espoir fait place à la désillusion et appelle à l'action. Il y a un an que l'on observe la Tunisie s'enfoncer, sur les plans démocratique, politique, économique, social. Un an que l'on se répète, de réunion en réunion, que la situation est inquiétante, mais que l'on ne bouge pas.

On affiche des mines consternées, mais pas de stratégie politique. Condamnons publiquement le régime de Saïed, soutenons le dialogue national proposé par le Quartet de la société civile. Les Tunisiennes et les Tunisiens réclament une stabilité politique pour redresser l'économie de leur pays. Ne les abandonnons pas, exprimons-leur notre soutien sans faille.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, les partis liés aux Frères musulmans et qui ont participé au saccage institutionnel et économique de leur nation ont eu pendant des années les faveurs de notre institution.

On croyait ici que les printemps arabes apporteraient paix et prospérité – bref, de nouvelles démocraties à l'occidentale. Quels furent les résultats de cette politique? En Égypte, nous avons soutenu l'islamisme, avec Mohamed Morsi. En Libye, nous avons soutenu des milices liées à l'islamisme et jeté toute l'Afrique de l'Ouest dans le chaos pour une décennie. En Syrie, nos illusions et nos chimères ont transformé douze années de guerre civile en tremplin pour une rébellion vite passée sous la bannière des islamistes.

Aucun des pays où l'Union européenne et les démocrates américains ont soutenu les lieutenants des Frères musulmans n'a été épargné par le chaos. Notre politique étrangère et nos résolutions sur les droits de l'homme avaient pourtant une boussole: les intérêts du Qatar.

Alors que notre Parlement refuse toujours une commission d'enquête immédiate sur son alignement avec Doha, nous décidons donc de revenir sur le sujet de la Tunisie. Les efforts du président Kaïs Saïed pour restaurer l'autorité de l'État et lutter contre les dérives islamistes d'une partie du champ politique tunisien doivent être salués.

Pourtant, force est de constater qu'il fait face à une situation économique et politique complexe, dont nul ne sait s'il arrivera à la résoudre, et dont le peuple tunisien fait aujourd'hui les frais.

Nous entendons ici les pires accusations contre le président Saïed, comme s'il revenait au Parlement européen d'instaurer et de démettre les dirigeants des pays du Machrek. Or, c'est bien au peuple tunisien de décider de son avenir, sans souffrir des ingérences et des institutions européennes.

Bien sûr, personne ne peut se réjouir du taux de participation extrêmement faible aux dernières élections législatives en Tunisie. Il indique bien davantage, à mon avis, une désespérance qu'un désaveu, et nécessite des solutions plutôt que des condamnations.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Tunezja to kraj, który musi budzić szczególną uwagę w Parlamencie Europejskim, w Unii, ponieważ od lat kraje Maghrebu, kraje Afryki Północnej to cel istotnych dotacji. To przecież kwestia pewnego partnerstwa z tymi krajami ze strony naszej Unii Europejskiej. I oczywiście możemy tutaj krytykować, jak usłyszeliśmy, Komisję Europejską za to, co tutaj usłyszeliśmy. Myślę jednak, że trzeba poddać pod pewną rewizję całą politykę Unii wobec tego regionu i wobec innych krajów tej bliskiej Afryki, ponieważ mam wrażenie, że byliśmy orędownikami arabskiej wiosny, byliśmy tymi, którzy starali się tam wspierać określone siły polityczne, i prawdę mówiąc, doprowadziło to do pewnego chaosu.

Jeżeli dzisiaj mówimy krytycznie o tym, że raptem co dziewiąty Tunezyjczyk poszedł do wyborów, co rzeczywiście jest sytuacją niebywałą, gdy chodzi o demokrację, to może zastanówmy się, na ile możemy wspierać ten kraj bezwarunkowo, że pieniądze, które idą od nas bez warunków do spełnienia przez Tunezję są akceptowalne?

Emmanuel Maurel, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, il est vrai que la Tunisie est un partenaire stratégique pour l'Union européenne, mais je trouve que la Commission et le Conseil n'ont pas pris la mesure de ce qui se passait dans ce pays.

Parce que le processus engagé par Kaïs Saïed aboutit quand même à un résultat très préoccupant. La nouvelle constitution présente des reculs inquiétants. Il y a quand même eu une utilisation abusive des décrets-lois, qui a conduit à des atteintes graves au pluralisme et à la liberté d'expression. Des syndicalistes ont été emprisonnés, et les élections législatives ont été boycottées par la plupart des partis. Les Tunisiens ont d'ailleurs boudé eux-mêmes les urnes, avec 10 % de participation, et tout cela montre que la démocratie tunisienne ne s'est pas revitalisée mais, au contraire, affaiblie.

Alors que doit-on faire? Bien sûr, on doit dénoncer cette situation. On doit aussi essayer de comprendre, parce qu'il y a quand même une contradiction – et je m'adresse à mes collègues –, c'est que Kaïs Saïed reste populaire. Il caracole en tête des sondages, et il n'y a pas d'alternative qui se construit. Il faut donc essayer de comprendre ce qui se passe dans le pays, et le facteur principal, évidemment, c'est la crise économique et sociale. À mesure que cette crise se prolonge, les citoyens perdent confiance dans l'efficacité politique, et la situation est très grave: les médecins, les techniciens, les ingénieurs fuient massivement ce pays, qui en a tant besoin.

Il faut donc que l'on soutienne toutes les initiatives de la société civile qui vont dans le bon sens. Et j'en signale une: celle du syndicat UGTT, qui relance le Quartet avec l'espoir d'une réappropriation par la population des enjeux très importants auxquels la Tunisie est confrontée. Il faut que l'Europe continue à soutenir la Tunisie, qu'elle la soutienne financièrement, qu'elle soutienne politiquement le peuple tunisien, évidemment, et non un pouvoir, qui mérite tout de même d'être largement critiqué aujourd'hui.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, Túnez es un país que, tras la primavera árabe hace diez años, suscitó grandes esperanzas. Aparentemente era uno de los pocos éxitos de este movimiento, pero después la situación política, social y económica se deterioró.

A mí me preocupan los acontecimientos de los últimos meses. El proceso político puesto en marcha hace un año y medio está produciendo unos resultados sorprendentes; los llamaría decepcionantes. El referéndum constitucional tuvo un índice de participación muy bajo y las recientes elecciones legislativas apenas han superado el 10 % de votantes. Parece evidente y es preocupante que existe un gran distanciamiento de la sociedad respecto del proceso puesto en marcha por el presidente Saïed. Es una situación de desencanto.

Tras las elecciones surge ahora un nuevo actor político institucional, la Asamblea de Representantes. Señora comisaria, Consejo, ¿qué esperan de la nueva Asamblea? ¿Cuál creen que será su línea de actuación? Para mí no es fácil prever lo que va a ocurrir en Túnez en los próximos meses. Por eso, yo les agradecería que fueran un poco más precisos y nos explicaran cómo piensan actuar en estos momentos un tanto desconcertantes.

A mí me gustaría que esta nueva Asamblea tunecina pudiera ayudar a que el país avance en el plano político y que se incorporen a este proceso más sectores de la sociedad. Además, espero —me gustaría, repito— que sirva para impulsar las reformas económicas y sociales que tanto necesita el país.

Túnez es un vecino muy importante, socio avanzado de la Unión. Lógicamente, en el estado actual de la injusta guerra contra Ucrania lanzada por Rusia, nosotros estamos muy focalizados en lo que pasa en el este de Europa. Pero la orilla sur del Mediterráneo es también clave para los países europeos.

Tenemos que acompañar al pueblo tunecino, ayudarle en esta situación, caracterizada por una larga crisis económica también, y la ausencia de reformas estructurales en este plano, el económico y social. En la última década se ha hecho muy poco. La situación de los vecinos de Túnez en la ribera sur del Mediterráneo no contribuye a mejorar el estado de cosas; ni de Argelia ni de Libia pueden esperar mucha ayuda para que Túnez pueda salir de esta crisis. Por tanto, nosotros, los europeos, no podemos abandonarles en estos momentos tan difíciles y tan complejos.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Ministra, Senhora Comissária, no final de janeiro, na segunda volta das eleições legislativas da Tunísia, 90 % dos eleitores não votaram. Uma abstenção recorde no país que, há 12 anos, foi o berço das primaveras árabes. Mas, aquilo que, aparentemente, pode parecer um paradoxo tem, na realidade, uma explicação: os tunisinos deixaram de acreditar no país.

A dissolução do governo e do parlamento pelo presidente, sob o pretexto do combate à corrupção, e a realização de um referendo que alterou a Constituição para concentrar o poder no presidente lançaram o país numa profunda crise política. Os partidos políticos deixaram de ter força. A sociedade civil não é ouvida. Os tunisinos dizem que falta independência e legitimidade ao novo parlamento. Não há liberdade de expressão. À crise política junta-se uma economia em declínio progressivo e uma inflação crescente.

A União Europeia é o principal parceiro comercial da Tunísia. Este país é um importante beneficiário do Instrumento de Vizinhança, de Cooperação para o Desenvolvimento e de Cooperação Internacional, do Instrumento Europeu para a Democracia e os Direitos Humanos, do Programa Erasmus+, de operações de assistência macrofinanceira.

A Tunísia é um ator demasiado importante na região do Mediterrâneo. O povo da Tunísia e a sociedade civil têm de ter o apoio da União Europeia para assegurar uma vida democrática e o Estado de direito neste país.

José Ramón Bauzá Díaz (Renew). – Señor presidente, la cuna de la esperanza democrática en el norte de África en 2011 ahora no es más que cenizas de lo que pudo haber sido. Aunque muchos países habían fracasado en su intento, Túnez vislumbró la esperanza y el progreso en su Constitución del 2014. Hoy las primaveras árabes han muerto.

El presidente saliente es el máximo responsable de la crítica situación tunecina. Anuló la Constitución de 2014, suspendió los poderes del Parlamento y su política agravó la precaria situación económica del país. Lo más curioso de todo es que Saïed juró una Constitución que nunca respetó. La Unión Europea no puede cerrar los ojos ante este dictador. La Unión Europea no puede tolerar una farsa electoral como la que se produjo en diciembre.

La cuestión en Túnez no es si habrá o no una revolución. La cuestión es cuándo y cómo se va a llevar a cabo. La Unión Europea tiene que tomar partido y estar más cerca que nunca de los tunecinos.

Hoy, con una guerra en nuestras fronteras, demostramos de nuevo que mantener una vecindad estable es absolutamente vital para el progreso de nuestra Europa y de nuestros vecinos. Por eso mismo, la Unión Europea debe volver a mirar al Mediterráneo. Debe exigir el diálogo político en Túnez, al tiempo que ofrece estabilidad y oportunidad al país. Porque, queridos colegas, del éxito de Túnez —un país que está justo enfrente de nosotros— también depende nuestro progreso y nuestra seguridad.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, quelle est la légitimité d'un Parlement élu par 11 % des électeurs, alors que 89 % des citoyens restent chez eux? Ils envoient un message de rejet.

Rejet de la feuille de route du président Saïed et de la façon dont il l'a mise en œuvre, de manière trop autoritaire, comme on le voit d'ailleurs avec la vague d'arrestations de ces derniers jours. Rejet d'un parlement autrefois trop corrompu, avec des majorités fragiles, mais rejet, aussi, d'un parlement désormais sans pouvoir.

La Tunisie souffre d'une grave crise économique et sociale, à laquelle les décisions controversées du président Saïed ne parviennent pas à remédier. Il n'est parvenu, bien au contraire, qu'à exacerber les divisions politiques et à générer une dangereuse apathie au sein de la population, dont les conditions de vie continuent pourtant à se dégrader malgré toutes les promesses.

La société tunisienne doit parvenir à un nouveau consensus sur la manière de sauver la transition démocratique et de restaurer les piliers d'un système de gouvernance démocratique propre, inclusive et efficace. Ni l'hyperprésidentialisme polarisant d'aujourd'hui ni un retour au système de la stagnation d'avant juillet 2021 ne sont une option.

Pour nous, pour l'Union européenne, que convient-il de faire? Apporter un soutien à l'économie? Oui, bien sûr, mais aussi un soutien résolu à la démocratie en Tunisie.

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la révolution de 2011 a apporté à la Tunisie l'espoir de devenir une démocratie prospère. Ces espoirs ont, hélas, été déçus avec l'arrivée au pouvoir des islamistes d'Ennahdha.

C'est dans ce contexte que le président Saïed a décidé, le 25 juillet 2021, de prendre les pleins pouvoirs et de suspendre le Parlement tunisien. Le Parlement européen s'en est inquiété dans sa résolution du 21 octobre 2021. Par la suite, le président Saïed a organisé un référendum le 25 juillet 2022 pour changer la constitution tunisienne, mais 30 % seulement des Tunisiens y ont participé.

Les élections législatives qui viennent de se dérouler, en décembre et janvier derniers, ont connu un taux de participation encore plus mauvais: 11 % seulement des électeurs se sont déplacés. C'est presque un record du monde pour un pays démocratique. La légitimité du nouveau régime semble donc fragile. Malgré tout, la popularité du président Saïed reste importante, et l'opposition est incapable d'incarner une solution crédible.

C'est pourquoi je pense que l'Union européenne doit continuer à soutenir la Tunisie, dont elle est le premier partenaire commercial, en faisant le pari que la situation s'y améliorera progressivement. Ce n'est pas de sanctions que la Tunisie a besoin, mais de notre aide pour retrouver le chemin de la stabilité et de la prospérité.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Mr President, Madam Commissioner, over the last year and a half, the political-economic situation to Tunisia has deteriorated. After shutting down the parliament in 2021, the president has changed the constitution, seized control of the independent electoral commission and the judiciary, and held elections with a historically low turnout of only 11 %.

Tunisia is a key country for the European Union in the southern neighbourhood, especially in terms of cooperation in the area of migration. We are committed to supporting the people in Tunisia in overcoming the financial and economic crisis, but stand firm on the need to improve the respect for the rule of law, democracy and human rights.

I call on President Saïed to start an inclusive national dialogue to overcome the crisis and return to the path Tunisians set in 2011.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, fino a pochi anni fa, parlando di Tunisia, avremmo pensato immediatamente alla Rivoluzione dei gelsomini, alle Primavere arabe, al primo vero esempio di Costituzione democratica nel mondo arabo. Oggi, invece, vediamo solo caos, una gravissima crisi economica e un'inquietante situazione politico-istituzionale, dovuta a una lunga serie di decisioni politiche prese dal presidente Saïed, che riportano alla mente il periodo più buio di Ben Ali.

La transizione democratica del paese, che io ho vissuto da vicino come osservatore elettorale per le elezioni locali, oggi subisce una pesante battuta d'arresto e la Tunisia sta di fatto regredendo già da luglio 2021, quando il Presidente congelò il parlamento e iniziò un cammino all'insegna della repressione nei confronti di oppositori politici, sindacati e attivisti.

Il controverso referendum costituzionale dello scorso luglio ha visto un'affluenza del 27 % e le recenti elezioni legislative, boicottate in massa, del solo 11 %. Lo scenario è quindi quello di un uomo solo al comando, con pieni poteri, e un parlamento estremamente delegittimato.

La situazione è insostenibile. Come Parlamento europeo chiediamo subito riforme economiche perché il paese ottenga i prestiti necessari e un cambio di passo sulla difesa dello Stato di diritto. Il popolo tunisino, al quale l'Unione europea è sempre stata accanto nelle sue ambizioni democratiche, merita senza dubbio condizioni migliori. L'Europa non si deve voltare dall'altra parte.

Bernard Guetta (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, la Tunisie ne nous est pas étrangère: elle est si intimement liée à l'histoire de la France, de l'Italie et de toute l'Europe que nous avons vis-à-vis d'elle les mêmes devoirs que vis-à-vis d'une sœur ou d'un frère.

Avant d'avoir ouvert la voie au printemps arabe de 2011, la Tunisie avait su négocier son indépendance sans ressentiment ni violence. Habib Bourguiba, son libérateur, s'était ensuite obligé à doter les femmes tunisiennes du statut le plus libéral du monde arabe et à permettre l'enracinement d'une puissante centrale syndicale, qui fut toujours un facteur d'équilibre social et politique.

Si proche de nos côtes, si proche de nos cœurs, la Tunisie pourrait être l'une des nôtres, et c'est pourquoi nous devons parler fort et vrai à l'homme qui l'a fait si vite revenir en arrière. Nous devons dire à M. Saïed que notre budget d'assistance n'est pas fait pour briser l'indépendance de la justice, mais, au contraire, pour la renforcer. Nous devons lui dire qu'il y a trop de dictatures sur Terre pour qu'il en crée une nouvelle et que nous aimons trop la Tunisie pour nous y résigner.

Madame la Commissaire, Madame la Ministre, chers collègues, nous avons à appeler un chat un chat, et M. Saïed un homme avec lequel nous ne traiterons pas, car il conduit son peuple au malheur et déstabilise plus encore les deux rives de la *Mare Nostrum*.

Jakop G. Dalunde (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Den 17 december 2010 inleddes den arabiska våren efter Mohammed Bouazizis protest mot korruption, bristen på demokrati och matpriserna.

Tunisien blev en symbol för den demokratiska revolutionen i hela denna region. Men ett decennium senare är landets demokrati på väg att utraderas. Att fängsla oppositionsledare, journalister och företrädare för civilsamhället går emot de allra mest grundläggande värdena i en demokrati.

President Saïeds agerande är helt oacceptabelt. Jag träffade honom i våras med en delegation från detta parlament och redan då var det uppenbart att respekten för rättsstaten och den grundläggande demokratin saknades hos denna president.

Och förra årets valdeltagande talar sitt tydliga språk. Om nio av tio medborgare i ett land väljer att inte rösta är det en symbol för att något inte står helt rätt till. Att förlora förtroendet för sitt lands politiska institutioner är att förlora hoppet om en bättre framtid.

Det är dags att omvärlden höjer sina röster i solidaritet med det tunisiska folket. Det är dags att vi krokar arm med dem som glömts bort och visa att vi finns. Att Tunisien kan vara symbol för en demokratisk strävan. Vi måste öka pressen på den tunisiska regimen och visa att vi står upp för det tunisiska folket.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Mr President, the revolutions in the Middle East and North Africa brought light into the tunnel for the people that were suffering under dictatorships. However, the light went out as quickly as it appeared, but in one place it remained, Tunisia. I remember it very well when walking around in the streets of Tunis, after the regime of the dictator Ben Ali fell. I remember it also very well in the discussions with Mustapha Ben Jaafar, the former speaker of the Constituent Assembly of Tunisia. The light in the tunnel was there. It is therefore regrettable the path that current regime has decided to take. Many hope Tunisia will deepen its democratic transition, but unfortunately it not only remains, it also regresses.

I met the current President Kais Saied myself once in 2021. Back then it was many nice words expressed by him, but today we know that the words seem to have been only words. Opposition and dissidents are under attack to the extent that civilians are being put before military courts. Freedom of expression is not anything in sight anymore. It remains today as a dream that could have been, but never was because of President Kais Saied. European Union has a bilateral assistance that is supposed to go to promoting good governance and rule of law, but the reality speaks for itself. Deterioration on the ground is a fact.

My question to the Commission and to the Council is how are we ensuring that no single cent of our money goes to human rights violations in Tunisia?

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, cumprem-se 12 anos sobre o fim da Revolução de Jasmim. A força do povo fez da Tunísia, nesse período, sinónimo de esperança para todos nós. No entanto, de há ano e meio a esta parte, a desilusão é clara. As manobras políticas do presidente Saïed, arrogando-se plenos poderes e demitindo o Parlamento, colocaram um termo ao sonho tunisino.

A insatisfação popular refletiu-se claramente na participação das últimas eleições parlamentares, boicotada por boa margem dos partidos políticos. Apenas 11 % do eleitorado votou. Não restam dúvidas sobre o desalento dos tunisinos. A falta de respeito pelos valores democráticos e a ausência de sentido de Estado juntaram-se à debilidade económica do país e colocaram definitivamente em causa o seu futuro. O futuro, que, outrora, se adivinhava auspicioso, torna-se cada vez mais distante.

Por isso, cabe-nos, aqui, Senhora Comissária, perguntar-lhe muito claramente: como é que a União Europeia se pensa posicionar em relação ao futuro do país, colocando, bem claro, que qualquer apoio da União Europeia tem condições? E que essas condições são de respeito pelos valores democráticos e de respeito pelos direitos humanos.

Carina Ohlsson (S&D). – Herr talman! Jag har flera gånger varit i Tunisien för att vara med och stärka arbetet med demokrati, jämställdhet och respekt för mänskliga rättigheter. Att nu bevittna landets utveckling är mycket oroande, eftersom Tunisien inte längre kan agera demokratiskt föredöme i Mellanöstern och Nordafrika.

I januari marscherade tusentals människor i protest mot president Saïed som anklagas för att återinföra autokrati samtidigt som den ekonomiska krisen tilltar. Till en början stöddes president Saïeds maktövertagande, men det har blivit allt mer tydligt för befolkningen att landets ekonomiska och sociala kris inte kan lösas av ett centraliserat presidentämbete där parlamentets roll sätts ur spel.

Jag förväntar mig att kommissionen mycket tydligare sätter press på Tunisiens regering. En nedmontering av den sköra tunisiska demokratin måste få tydliga konsekvenser när det gäller EU:s budgetstöd. EU måste ta fram en ny Tunisienstrategi som omlokaliserar budgetstöd till demokratifrämjande åtgärder, det civila samhället, kvinnoorganisationer och fackföreningsrörelse. Bara så kan Tunisien återgå till andan av dialog som präglade landet efter Jasminrevolutionen.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisar, doamna ministru, sigur, am văzut acum cu toții că, de fapt, Tunisia a făcut pași înapoi, prin tot ce s-a întâmplat acolo, dar asta nu înseamnă că trebuie să abandonăm. Aici intervine diplomația, doamna comisar, doamna ministru, să vedem cum nu abandonăm cetățenii, că nu dictatorii sunt interesați pentru noi și importanți, ci cetățenii.

Și da, Tunisia este un partener, avem un acord cu Tunisia, nu o putem abandona. Problema importantă este să găsim mecanismele prin care, într-adevăr, drepturile omului să se restabilească, Constituția să funcționeze în favoarea cetățenilor și nu în favoarea unui dictator.

Și da, sigur că trebuie să continuăm, prin pârgăile pe care le avem, pentru că nu putem să facem orice într-o țară terță, dar prin pârgăile pe care le avem, să mergem să fim aproape de tunisieni și să întoarcem Tunisia pe calea democrației, așa cum începuse foarte bine și, iată, a trebuit să suporte cetățenii asemenea măsuri luate, din punctul meu de vedere, de un dictator.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, 12 years ago, Tunisians overthrew Ben Ali and many Europeans thought that this was all about democracy and Tunisians wanting to be more like us.

But the truth is that, yes, it was a reaction to brutal repression, but also to the wider regime of global inequality, shocking unemployment, food inflation and intolerable living conditions because the country was being run for foreign interests rather than in the interests of the people who live there.

And now here we go again: Tunisia battered under structural assault, the IMF and World Bank neoliberal reforms gutting the state, food and fuel crises only deepened by the war in Ukraine, and again, arrests, imprisonments and real repression against the opposition.

But let us not condemn the effects and ignore the causes. Don't pretend that this has nothing got to do with us. There's no justice without social justice and our assistance always comes with strings attached. And it's these strings which bind societies in debt servitude, a pattern repeated across Africa and across the world. This isn't just Tunisia's repression and chaos, it's ours too.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Mr President, in our latest discussion on the situation on Tunisia, we sent a very clear appeal to President Saied for bringing back Tunisia on the right path, saying that it was not too late for taking such an essential step. However, this is time, I think, that it is too late. Despite the civil protests and our calls, President Saied went on with these arbitrary detentions and he did not show any sign of consideration for the recent decision of the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights that defined his rise to power as an unconstitutional coup against democracy. Being a founding member of the African Court, Tunisia has a binding obligation to respect the verdict, thus repealing all those decrees that represent clear violations of human rights and individual liberties, President Saied, cannot act as if nothing happened. And our union must strongly support and back our African counterparts and partners in their efforts to restore democracy and the rule of law in the country that used to be the lighthouse of democracy in North Africa.

We owe this to the Tunisian people that fought hard for a better future. Here there is no middle ground: either we stand firmly on the side of democracy or our international credibility will be lost forever.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, the continuation of the war in Ukraine is expected to drive Tunisia's inflation rate above 10% this year. A potential USD 1.9 billion rescue package with the IMF will mean drastic economic reforms that will increase inequality. The EU's meagre assistance is also dependent on neoliberal economic reforms, like freezing public sector hiring and wages, while inflation runs out of control.

President Saied's recent crackdown on the opposition and monopolisation of power has passed without an awful lot of comment. He's been performing his tasks obediently enough, ripping up the social safety net for Tunisians in exchange for funds that will service existing debts, clamping down on migration to the EU and helping to increase the transit of Algerian gas to the EU.

The political West using the war to put the neocolonial squeeze on countries like this is a gamble with a big potential for backfire. You can understand Tunisians thinking the 2011 revolution remains unfinished.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, minister, honourable Members, Tunisia, of course, is a very important partner for the EU and we are following attentively and with concern the latest arrests that have been taking place in the past few days.

Our values are clear and we have been vocal about them. We believe that respect for the right to a fair trial and due process requirements, including judicial transparency, are crucial. And I recall that our partnership with Tunisia is rooted in shared values such as democracy, the rule of law and human rights, including fundamental freedoms.

We remain determined to continue supporting the Tunisian population against the very difficult socioeconomic backdrop, while taking into account the evolution of the deteriorating political situation.

We exchanged with our Member States and we all think it would be a mistake to discontinue our assistance now, which would impose the highest price to pay on the Tunisian people. We maintain the annual level of bilateral assistance and we adapt it to propose meaningful tailor-made programmes according to the current context. We expect the new Tunisian Government to respond to their own commitments. The EU will stand by the Tunisian people and support reform efforts in today's complex context.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I have listened to your interventions attentively and we share your concerns regarding the electoral law, which presented some clear shortcomings.

The recent elections have been marked by the absence of political parties and extremely low turnout. Our hope is that President Saïed pursues the political roadmap he announced in December 2021.

Let me also recall that the EU's aim is indeed to support the Tunisian people who are facing major socio-economic and financial challenges, and as the Commissioner said, we are determined to continue supporting the population against a very difficult socio-economic backdrop due to the economic impact of COVID and also the Russian aggression of war in Ukraine, while also taking into account the evolution of the political situation.

But our values are very clear: the EU has not shied away from the expression of our worries and has continued to pass important and clear messages at all levels, including meeting the Tunisian authorities.

But I have listened to your interventions very closely, and I thank you for your attention.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir slēgtas.

20. Tensions between Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo (debate)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Komisijas paziņojumu par saspīlējumu starp Ruandu un Kongo Demokrātisko Republiku (2023/2557(RSP)).

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Minister, honourable Members, the EU is extremely concerned by the worsening security landscape in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the mounting bilateral tensions between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda.

Notwithstanding multiple summits and meetings under the aegis of the regional initiatives launched to secure a peace deal – the Luanda and Nairobi processes – the situation has not improved. The reciprocally hostile rhetoric of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda has not abated. The level of hate speech and ethnic violence is raising alarming levels. Several cross-border incidents, including recently, remind us that the threat to regional security is all too real.

The EU has repeatedly and insistently expressed its full, unequivocal support to the Luanda and Nairobi processes, and it does so once again. It is imperative that the decisions reached and confirmed under the frame of these processes be comprehensively respected and fully implemented by all parties.

This includes stopping any collusion and support – direct or indirect – to non-state armed groups that operate in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the broader region.

The EU urges the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda to exercise maximum restraint and restore an atmosphere of bilateral dialogue and mutual trust. A conflict between these two countries, directly or by proxy, would be an unmitigated disaster for both and the region as a whole, and one that would affect the most vulnerable the hardest.

The region's tragic history and the aggravating humanitarian situation in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as a consequence of the recent cycle of violence, bear powerful witness to the enormous suffering and damage this can cause.

The EU will continue to closely monitor developments on the ground and look towards peace and security in the Great Lakes in close consultation with Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, but also with all our other partners in the region and beyond. I thank you very much and I look forward to the debate.

György Hölvényi, *a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében.* – Elnök Úr! A folyamatosan növekvő feszültség aláássa a Nagy-tavak régiójának országai közötti bizalmat, és ellehetetleníti az egyébként is nagyon szükséges együttműködést. Mi, európaiak pontosan tudjuk, milyen véres következményekkel járnak a nyersanyagokért folytatott háborúk. Az alapító atyák az Európai Uniót éppen ezeknek a konfliktusoknak a felszámolására hozták létre. Ez a tanulság, amit meg kell osztanunk afrikai partnereinkkel is.

Látnunk kell, a Kongó és a Ruanda határán kibontakozó konfliktus nem más, mint a kelet-kongói régióban kialakult évtizedes, a nemzetközi közösség által kezeletlen biztonsági vákuum eredménye. A kinshasai kormány egyszerűen képtelen az ország egészében biztosítani az állami jelenlétet. Ez különösen igaz a konfliktusok által sújtott területen. Ez teszi lehetővé, hogy fegyveres milíciák a legkülönbözőbb, ellenőrizhetetlen külföldi támogatásokkal küzdjenek az olyan nélkülözhetetlen fémek kitermelésének jogaiért, mint a kobalt, a lítium és a tantál.

A regionális béke és a stabilitás megteremtését akadályozza a Kongóban élő tuszikkal szembeni gyűlöletbeszéd és erőszak is. Láttuk már pontosan a szomszédos országgal, hogy az ilyen uszításnak milyen következményei lehetnek. Nem szabad újra erre az útra tévedni.

Az Európai Uniónak a tagállamokkal együttműködve technikai segítséget kell nyújtania Kongónak és Ruandának, ahogy azt a Biztos Asszony is említette, többek között az állami intézmények megerősítéséhez, a korrupció leküzdéséhez, egyezményekkel a stabil kormányzás megteremtéséhez. Emellett pedig minden diplomácia eszközzel elő kell segíteni a helyzet rendezését. A térség vezetőinek bevonásával regionális szinten meg kell találni a kiegyezéspolitikai és gazdasági lehetőségeit, azonban mindenekelőtt fel kell mérni, hogy az Európai Unió valóban lehet-e a megbékélést segítő valós tényező.

Ezzel őszintén szembe kell néznünk. Az Európai Uniónak dönteni kell, a megbékélést mozdítja elő, vagy csak ideológiai harcot vív Afrikában.

Carlos Zorrinho, *em nome do Grupo S&D.* – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, há um vazio de segurança na região leste da República Democrática do Congo e esse vazio tem criado um contexto favorável ao escalar das tensões entre este país e o Ruanda. Um contexto que criou espaço para a ação cada vez mais agressiva do movimento rebelde M23, que relatórios independentes assinalam beneficiar do apoio logístico do exército ruandês.

O Ruanda, que noutros pontos da África tem estado empenhado em missões de estabilização e de segurança, tem, segundo os relatórios internacionais, pisado linhas vermelhas do respeito pela soberania, a integridade de fronteiras e a exploração de recursos sediados no território da República Democrática do Congo. É fundamental que cesse de o fazer, de forma direta ou através do apoio a grupos que põem em causa a soberania do Congo. Esse é o primeiro passo para pôr fim às tensões entre os dois países.

Feito isto, é fundamental que as instituições da República Democrática do Congo e a comunidade internacional trabalhem em conjunto para que o país tenha a capacidade de colmatar o vazio de segurança que, como antes referi, está na raiz das tensões identificadas.

A reforma da polícia congoleza, projeto que tem tido o apoio da MONUSCO (Missão de Estabilização da Organização das Nações Unidas na República Democrática), deve prosseguir. Esse apoio deve também centrar-se na oportunidade de reforço da capacidade institucional que podem representar as eleições presidenciais agendadas para o final deste ano.

Em articulação com a União Africana e com as comunidades regionais, a União Europeia deve continuar a apoiar o processo de Nairóbi e a mediação do Quênia, que não pode ser mais uma operação falhada ou sem consequências no terreno, sob pena de a conflitualidade entre o Ruanda e a República Democrática do Congo se expandir a toda a região dos Grandes Lagos, criando terreno fértil para a ação de grupos rebeldes e provocando danos intoleráveis do ponto de vista político, económico e social.

A grave crise humanitária, numa zona particularmente sensível, tem de ser combatida e não agravada. Em última análise, são as pessoas que, indiretamente, sofrem no seu quotidiano as consequências das tensões políticas e militares. É para elas e em nome delas, que apelo ao diálogo, ao bom senso e ao compromisso entre os povos, ao fim da violência ao serviço de interesses obscuros e à sua substituição por um processo de desenvolvimento sustentável, que tire partido do enorme potencial da região.

Hilde Vautmans, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la guerre que mène le groupe armé M23, soutenu par le Rwanda, dans l'est de la RDC demande notre attention.

En effet, la situation humanitaire est alarmante. Nous sommes témoins d'une foule de maux qui accompagnent cette guerre: insécurité, recrutement forcé et déplacement des civils, exécutions sommaires et massacres font désormais partie du décor de l'est de la RDC. Ces informations découlent des rapports de Human Rights Watch et des Nations unies pour les droits de l'homme, qui en témoignent clairement.

Comme nous venons de le mentionner, ces problèmes sont connus, de même que les solutions. Malheureusement, à la différence des problèmes, les solutions demeurent sur papier. L'Europe, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Commissaire, l'Europe doit peser de tout son poids pour faciliter la mise en place de ces solutions, telles que l'application de la feuille de route de Luanda ou le processus de Nairobi.

La souffrance a assez duré dans cette poudrière, qui risque de provoquer l'embrasement de toute la région si rien n'est fait. Martin Luther King a dit: «Je n'ai pas peur de la méchanceté des mauvais, mais du silence des gens honnêtes.» Alors brisons ce silence et dénonçons cette barbarie afin d'y mettre fin.

Et au peuple congolais, je dis: vous êtes sur les rails de la démocratie, avec un grand défi, celui d'organiser les élections. Ne laissez pas les ennemis de la démocratie vous faire dévier de cette route, car ils ne l'ont jamais goûtée. *Amani tuenu!*

Malte Gallée, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Wo kommen denn unsere ganzen Rohstoffe her, die in unseren Handys stecken, die in unseren Autos stecken, in unseren Zügen stecken, in unseren Laptops stecken? Das beantworten wir uns viel zu selten, und viel zu oft ist die Antwort: aus einem Kriegsgebiet. Und der Osten des Kongo ist genau so ein Kriegsgebiet. 70 % des Kobalts kommt von da. Das brauchen wir alles – für die Energiewende beispielsweise. Das sind alles Rohstoffe, die wir brauchen, um unsere grüne Transformation voranzutreiben.

Und trotzdem herrscht dort Krieg, herrschen dort Rebellengruppen wie M23, FDLR usw. 6 Millionen intern Vertriebene im Kongo – das ist die höchste Rate weltweit.

Und das bedeutet, wir können nicht über den Kongo sprechen, ohne über Rohstoffe zu sprechen. Und wenn wir über Rohstoffe sprechen, müssen wir natürlich über die kommende Rohstoffverordnung der Kommission sprechen.

Und das hat eine Riesenchance, denn wir können mit dieser Verordnung dazu beitragen, dass wir wirklich vor Ort eine Industrialisierung vorantreiben. Und das hat riesengroße Vorteile, denn nur so können wir sicherstellen, dass diese Länder unsere Partnerschaft wollen und sich nicht nach China oder nach Russland wenden. Das ist essenziell für unsere strategische Aufstellung auf diesem Planeten in unserem Kampf gegen die Diktaturen, gegen die Autokraten, für eine offenere Gesellschaft – weil wir den Leuten vor Ort die besseren Alternativen anbieten, mit starkem Umweltschutz, mit starken Menschenrechtsvoraussetzungen, damit die Leute vor Ort wirklich auch teilweise selbst zum Beispiel eine Batterieproduktion aufbauen können. Nur so können wir dazu beitragen, dass in diesen Regionen langfristig Frieden herrscht.

Anna Bonfrisco, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, parlare di Congo e del confine con il Ruanda apre una ferita per noi italiani particolarmente dolorosa: la tragica morte, il 22 febbraio di due anni fa, dell'ambasciatore italiano Luca Attanasio. Assieme a lui, sul convoglio del Programma alimentare mondiale, hanno perso la vita il carabiniere Vittorio Iacovacci e l'autista Mustapha Milambo. Essi erano lì per dare una possibilità alla pace di porre fine ai conflitti che mettono a repentaglio la vita, il futuro, il progresso globale. E nel loro nome dobbiamo interrogarci sulla sicurezza del personale civile e militare impiegato nelle missioni.

Colleghi, le violenze nelle regioni di Kivu Nord e Kivu Sud sono tragicamente aumentate. L'Unione europea, quindi, sostenga gli sforzi della Comunità dell'Africa orientale, di Kenya, Etiopia, Sud Sudan, Uganda, Burundi e Tanzania, per fermare le ostilità tra Congo, Ruanda e i ribelli di M23. E lo faccia ricordandosi del ruolo imprescindibile che hanno le donne nel conseguimento della pace. È la nostra missione di fronte alle molteplici crisi che alimentano l'insicurezza globale e nuove guerre. Tra le più pericolose crisi penso alle ingerenze di Russia e Cina.

Oltre alla crisi umanitaria, vorrei anche ricordare quella della biodiversità. Infatti, nonostante sia patrimonio dell'Unesco, il Parco Virunga è costantemente minacciato da bracconaggio e barbarie, attività illegali, compresa l'uccisione e il ferimento dei *rangers* del parco allo scopo di finanziare le attività criminali e violente che ammorzano quella regione.

Anna Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, during the previous legislature, the sudden admission to eastern province of Kivu and the city of Goma of the DRC was able to put to the report findings about extremely fragile security and humanitarian situation in the region. We were able to see with our own eyes the border violence between Rwanda and the DRC. The findings of you and a group of experts mandated by the UN Sanctions Committee just magnifies this picture.

I welcome this statement by the Vice-President/High Representative on behalf of the EU in this respect. We urge all actors to immediately dispatch to proceed along the Nairobi and Luanda processes. In particular, the Rwandan authorities to stop supporting the UN sanctioned March 23 movement and all regional actors, in particular, DRC, Rwanda, Burundi and Uganda, to further engage in supporting the peace process. The situation is of utmost concern. Rapes, murders, captured peoples and slavery. These are seen on a daily basis in eastern Congo. It has to be stopped!

Marc Botenga, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Kitchanga, Bambo, Rutshuru, Kishishe, Nyiragongo: combien de territoires de la République démocratique du Congo doivent encore être frappés, occupés ou asphyxiés – comme Goma, actuellement – avant que l'Union européenne ne réagisse?

Quand la Russie a envahi l'Ukraine, l'Union européenne et les États-Unis se sont mobilisés. L'Ukraine reçoit des armes, des chars, bientôt des avions de chasse sans doute, et la Russie est gravement sanctionnée, avec comme objectif l'effondrement total de son économie.

Mais quand la République démocratique du Congo se fait agresser – depuis des années – par le mouvement M23, rien. Quelques belles paroles pour tromper, pour enfumer, mais aucune sanction réelle contre le Rwanda, qui soutient ce mouvement. Alors la vie d'un Congolais, chers collègues, vaut-elle moins que la vie d'un Ukrainien?

Pire: le Rwanda reste un partenaire de la facilité européenne pour la paix, cet instrument qui sert en réalité à livrer des armes. Vingt millions pour le Rwanda! Mais quelle hypocrisie! Quel décalage entre les paroles et les actes, ici!

Pourquoi l'Europe agit-elle de la sorte? Clairement, il y a des intérêts derrière: l'Europe a besoin du cobalt, du coltan, des ressources, des richesses, des matières premières que l'on trouve en République démocratique du Congo. Dès lors, un Congo affaibli, voire balkanisé, convient très bien à certains gouvernements européens.

Le Rwanda fait ainsi le jeu des Occidentaux en facilitant le pillage du Congo, notamment dans l'Est. Il faut que cela cesse maintenant.

Karsten Lucke (S&D). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Wenn wir über die Situation im Ostkongo sprechen, dann sprechen wir über einen extrem komplexen Gordischen Knoten. Und die Konfliktlage hat ganz zahlreiche Dynamiken. Und im Ergebnis haben wir was? Ein unsägliches Durcheinander an Rebellengruppen und Akteuren, so gut wie keine Infrastruktur, die soziale und ökonomische Situation ist desolat, es gibt massive Menschenrechtsverletzungen usw.

Das heißt, dieser Konflikt brodelte, und er flammt auch immer wieder auf, wie wir in den letzten Wochen und Monaten gesehen haben. Und wir haben überhaupt gar kein Vertrauen in der Region. Es gibt überhaupt gar keine Bereitschaft zu Kooperation. Und dieser Teufelskreis aus diesen Partikularinteressen, der führt eben dazu, dass es über das Wohl der Menschen hinausgeht.

Deswegen glaube ich, für uns Europäerinnen und Europäer muss klar sein, dass wir natürlich die Versorgung mit humanitärer Hilfe auf jeden Fall voranstellen müssen, um die Feuer zu löschen, die auch wirklich am schmerzhaftesten brennen.

Aber – und das ist genauso wichtig – fernab von dieser akuten Linderung des menschlichen Leids müssen wir eben auch in diesen *Nexus approach* reingehen und nicht nur in humanitäre Hilfe, sondern eben auch in gute Entwicklungszusammenarbeit einsteigen und auch in Konfliktreduzierung und die Schaffung eines nachhaltigen Friedens.

Die betroffenen Staaten vor Ort sind natürlich wichtige Akteure und haben auch eine eigenständige Verantwortung. Es gibt den Luanda-Prozess, wir haben die Ostafrikanische Gemeinschaft und weitere institutionelle Rahmen. Aber am Ende sollten wir, wenn wir den Nexus erfolgreich implementieren und realisieren wollen, uns als Europäerinnen und Europäer auch fragen: Möchten wir ein echtes Angebot für Hilfe und Unterstützung machen, und möchten wir das vor allen Dingen auf einer Augenhöhe machen, die auch wirklich Augenhöhe bedeutet?

Europa muss meiner Überzeugung nach im globalen Süden viel mehr seine *soft power* einsetzen, wenn wir langfristig über eine gemeinsame demokratische, freiheitliche und menschliche Zukunft auf diesem Planeten sprechen wollen – gerade vor dem Hintergrund der geostrategischen Herausforderungen, die im Rahmen des russischen Angriffskrieges auf die Ukraine damit einhergehen.

Max Orville (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, les tensions entre le Rwanda et la République démocratique du Congo ne sont malheureusement pas récentes. Les rivalités entre les deux pays n'ont, au fond, jamais cessé.

L'heure est venue pour l'Union européenne, au regard de son histoire commune avec l'Afrique – surtout dans le contexte actuel, où la Russie et la Chine veulent exercer une influence toujours plus importante –, de rappeler nos valeurs de démocratie et d'humanisme et nos idéaux de paix.

Certes, n'est pas Nelson Mandela qui veut, qui a mis un terme au conflit fratricide et ethnique au Burundi, avec l'accord d'Arusha pour la paix et la réconciliation.

Cependant, l'Union européenne devrait prendre l'initiative de ramener à la table des négociations tous les protagonistes avec pour objectif de construire ensemble une paix durable, de prendre avec le concours de tous des initiatives telles que des comités locaux de réconciliation et vérité, sous le regard d'observateurs africains et européens, dans toutes les régions de ces territoires affectées par la guerre, pour renouer un dialogue aujourd'hui rompu.

La raison première de l'Union européenne, c'est la volonté de préserver la paix. Soyons ces éclaireurs de paix.

Thierry Mariani (ID). – Monsieur le Président, la France et l'Union européenne ont régulièrement cédé à la propagande de Paul Kagamé. Il n'est donc pas étonnant que ce dernier se sente aujourd'hui tout permis. Il l'a prouvé en continuant à armer une milice qui terrorise la région du Kivu: le M23.

Tout le monde est désormais convaincu de l'ingérence militaire du Rwanda dans les affaires de la République démocratique du Congo. L'Union européenne, la France et d'autres puissances ont exigé que M. Kagamé cesse enfin sa politique hostile. La terreur devant le groupe M23 provoque des déplacements de population massifs: 5 millions de Congolais ont déjà quitté la zone depuis dix ans.

Le M23, bras armé du Rwanda, participe donc à une nouvelle déstabilisation en République démocratique du Congo, un pays qui n'a pas besoin de difficultés supplémentaires. L'Organisation des Nations unies est présente dans le pays depuis des dizaines d'années; la guerre à l'est de la République démocratique du Congo n'a pourtant jamais cessé.

Les paroles du pape François, qui était en visite dans le pays il y a quelques jours, résonnent tout particulièrement. Il nous disait: «Retirez vos mains de la République démocratique du Congo, retirez vos mains de l'Afrique, cessez d'étouffer l'Afrique, elle n'est pas une mine à exploiter ni une terre à dévaliser!»

Tout le monde sait bien que le Rwanda s'enrichit, notamment, grâce au commerce illégal de ressources exploitées illégalement en République démocratique du Congo, et notamment dans la région du Kivu. Ainsi nous voyons bien que sans une pression internationale forte exercée sur le Rwanda, celui-ci ne cessera absolument pas de participer à la déstabilisation de l'est de la République démocratique du Congo.

Alors que, session après session, nous nous indignons des ingérences étrangères en Afrique, il est temps de nous interroger sur nos erreurs, qui précipitent les États africains dans les bras d'autres puissances.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, the situation in the DRC is horror without end for the civilian population. In November, we talked about displacement and violence but now, if anything, the situation is even worse. We know that the UN have reported the active engagement of Rwandan armed forces on Congolese territory and the M23 zone of influence expanding.

And vicious and all as the violence is being perpetrated in that area, the truth is that the only way and the only solution is diplomatic dialogue. But it would seem that many in the international community couldn't care less what happens as long as their own interests are being looked after.

What can we expect from President Macron's forthcoming visit in March, when France is the one who pushed the European Union to grant EUR 20 million in support to the Rwandan military in Mozambique to protect French interests there? What can we expect from London, who organised a summit in Kigali to conclude an agreement to deport asylum seekers back to Rwanda?

The truth is the curse of the DRC continues, with rich natural resources been robbed by others. God help them to help themselves because certainly the EU isn't going to do it.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, two weeks ago, Pope Francis, on his first visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, denounced the internal and external organisations that orchestrate war in the country to plunder its resources. It is, he said, above all, a war unleashed by an insatiable greed for raw materials and money that fuels a weaponised economy and requires instability and corruption.

Little has changed since King Leopold looted Congo's resources to enrich himself and Belgium, killing over 10 million Congolese people while he was at it. The yearlong conflict between the DRC Government and the M23 rebels, which Rwanda's Kagame is reportedly fuelling by providing support to the armed group, has caused widespread hunger and displaced more than 2 million.

Meanwhile, France and TotalEnergies are looking to enrich themselves at the expense of the Congolese and looking to clear areas away so they can make money out of robbing the place of resources as ever.

How come there's no one talking about establishing any kind of peace talks? How come no one gives a damn about sorting out the things there? We have a lot of influence there, but we very seldom used it in a positive way.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, Honourable Members, I want to thank you for this debate, which shows the importance that you attach to the situation in the Great Lakes. And I reassure you that the EU is continuously monitoring the situation. The EU calls on all its partners to redouble our common efforts to secure peace, and the Great Lakes region is ready to offer its renewed contribution to this joint endeavour and will do so by way of a new Great Lakes strategy foreseen for adoption in the coming weeks.

Through the deployment of its tools and policies under the frame of this new strategy and following an integrated approach, the EU will aim to help the region put an end to the continuous cycle of violence in the region and move from insecurity to trust. The people of Rwanda and the DRC and the region as a whole deserve, of course, to live in peace with themselves and their neighbours.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir slēgtas.

21. Amendments to the European Long-Term Investment Funds (ELTIFs) Regulation (debate)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Michiel Hoogeveen ziņojumu Ekonomikas un monetārās komitejas vārdā par priekšlikumu Eiropas Parlamenta un Padomes regulai, ar ko Regulu (ES) 2015/760 groza attiecībā uz atbilstīgo aktīvu un ieguldījumu tvērumu, portfeļa sastāvu un diversifikācijas prasībām, naudas aizņemšanos un citiem fondu noteikumiem un attiecībā uz prasībām, kas attiecas uz atļauju piešķiršanu Eiropas ilgtermiņa ieguldījumu fondiem, to ieguldījumu politiku un darbības nosacījumiem (COM(2021)0722 - C9-0435/2021 - 2021/0377(COD)) (A9-0196/2022).

Michiel Hoogeveen, rapporteur. – Mr President, tomorrow, I hope and trust the European Parliament will vote for the regulatory reform of the European long-term investments funds, commonly known as ELTIFs. The European Parliament has been working on the ELTIF reform for over a year now and, as rapporteur, I am delighted that the result of the negotiations is a reason for celebration: celebration for our common efforts and joint success, celebration for Europe's economy, for small and medium-sized businesses, for job creation and, ultimately, celebration for investors and our citizens.

Introduced in 2015, ELTIFs were an important building block for the Capital Markets Union to diversify funding of the economy. However, ELTIFs failed to take off successfully; too much red tape and stringent regulations restricted the true potential of the ELTIF framework. We addressed this underdevelopment of the ELTIF regime. Excitingly, we are now hearing from EU asset managers and investor representatives that there is much appetite for new ELTIFs. As a result, this fund segment will grow by tens and, hopefully, hundreds of billions of euros over the next 3 to 5 years and ultimately be invested in the real economy.

Let me briefly summarise the five most important achievements of this ELTIF reform.

First, we have broadened the scope of the investment universe. We ensured that long-term investments can be channelled to more diverse uses and projects: real estate, infrastructure projects, SMEs, listed companies, equity and debt instruments, loans, and specific asset classes such as securitisations. On balance, we have broadened the investment choices of retail investors and made financial products more accessible. Up to this day, this was mostly reserved for institutional investors and privileged high-net-worth individuals.

Second, we have allowed ELTIFs to pursue a broader international investment mandate and, very importantly, enabled broad fund-to-fund investment strategies, which must be combined with an effective look-through approach.

Third, we have allowed ELTIFs to become more concentrated and permitted more structuring and co-investment flexibility, as well as using higher but still safe levels of borrowing.

Fourth, we have allowed ELTIFs not only to be closed-ended, but also to pursue redemptions before the end-of-life cycle. This creates flexibility in terms of both open-endedness and evergreen structures. As an optional feature, we have allowed ELTIFs to put in place the liquidity-matching mechanism. All these features should clearly benefit ELTIF investors.

Fifth, and finally, we have put in place a strong framework for the protection of retail investors and reinforced it with a suitability assessment that is mandatory for all retail investors. This safeguard is essential to prevent mis-selling and to ensure that retail investors can only invest in ELTIFs suitable for them.

The co-legislators went further and introduced an extra requirement for express investor consent, as well as an investor alert to bring to the attention of retail investors the potential risk of investing.

On balance, we delivered a solid and comprehensive reform. We must now carefully monitor the uptake of this fund segment and ensure that the reform delivers on its objectives. I call on market participants to ensure that the new ELTIFs are of high quality and designed with the interests of investors in mind.

Let me conclude by thanking the shadow rapporteurs, the ECON Chair, and the colleagues in the European Parliament who have worked on, or otherwise contributed to, this reform. I also want to thank and recognise the work of the Council, particularly the French and Czech presidencies. Lastly, I thank the European Commission for its proposal, which was a strong starting point and should be an inspiration for future initiatives.

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, indeed, can I just say – as you walk back towards your seat, Michiel – that you didn't thank yourself, but you should, because you did an excellent job on behalf of this Parliament. And the results will speak for themselves. So I want to join in my appreciation for the work of both the rapporteur and all of the shadows, because this reform is very significant. I also want to acknowledge the work and role of the ECON Chair, Ms Tinagli, as well as the French and the Czech Presidencies, because all of you worked hard to finalise this reform and within a very short period of time.

This reform is the first of our November 2021 Capital Markets Union package to actually get through the process, so I think it leads the way. And it is very timely because we know that the capital markets are important. We need to develop them and we know, indeed, that the Council conclusions of last week endorse our work on the Capital Markets Union.

Both the net-zero transition and the digital transition will require hundreds of billions of euros, and public financing cannot meet these investment needs alone. So we do need private financing for our long-term competitiveness and prosperity, and that relies on well-functioning and well-developed capital markets.

We need many measures to make the Capital Markets Union a reality, and the ELTIF reform is one of those measures. In fact, ELTIF, if you like, embodies what we want to achieve with the Capital Markets Union. These long-term investment funds and the CMU are about long-term investment in the green and digital transition, and these are vital to our future.

This reform will help channel tens of billions of euro into our economy – as I said, in the green and digital. This will help our SMEs. It will also be invested in social, transport, energy and green infrastructure projects and in digital projects. The CMU is about enabling EU citizens to invest for their future, and this reform will unlock new investment opportunities for all citizens. It will open up new types of investment currently reserved for large institutions and high net worth individuals. And it will do this in a safe and regulated manner.

So I want to thank the co-legislators for the changes you made to our proposal, especially for making the rules simpler and more flexible. On fund rules, ELTIFs get more flexibility in terms of fund-of-fund strategies and diversification limits. That will help them compete with other products that have similar investment objectives. On investor protection, the co-legislators struck the right balance between ensuring effective safeguards and removing unnecessary hurdles for retail investors. On sustainability, the co-legislators recognised green bonds as a category of investment assets eligible for ELTIFs.

And finally, I would like to note that this reform – as the rapporteur has already mentioned – is a success. We have early indications from market participants that dozens of ELTIFs are due to be launched in the near future, and this would not have been possible without your work to revise this regulation. So my sincere thanks to the European Parliament, to Mr Hoogeveen, for keeping a high level of ambition for this reform. And I look forward to an exchange of views, because very often the debates in this House are difficult but this one – I think – unites us.

And if I may say – as I wear the green – I've just come from a reception marking 50 years of my Member State's membership of the European Union. And while not many will be here to listen to this debate, all of the components that I talk about – that you have worked on – are important for European citizens. And I think we need to reflect on that and to thank you very sincerely for that work.

Jessica Polfjärd, för PPE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Fru kommissionär McGuinness! Jag skulle vilja börja med att tacka förhandlingsteamet under föredragande Michiel Hoogeveens ledning för ett gott samarbete under arbetet med det här betänkandet. Det gjorde arbetet lättare att vi var överens om de grundläggande principerna att långsiktiga investeringsfonder har en roll att spela och att de behöver bli mer attraktiva.

Det innebar att vi kunde göra ett förslag från kommissionen som redan var bra, ännu bättre. En av de viktigaste och bästa principerna i nästintill all lagstiftning är att låta marknaden bestämma vad som fungerar och vad som inte fungerar. Vi lyckades komma överens om en text som definitivt åstadkommer detta.

Överenskommelsen vi i den här kammaran röstar om i morgon är ett viktigt steg på vägen för att göra det mer attraktivt att investera långsiktigt i Europa. Och det är onekligen så att Europa behöver investeringar, inte minst i dessa tider. Det är därför väldigt välkommet att vi lyckats ta bort flera onödiga restriktioner vad gäller vilken typ av företag och projekt Eltif kan investera i.

Såväl större som mindre projekt kommer att behöva kapital framöver. Våra ändringar möjliggör detta, inte minst för den gröna omställningen och små och medelstora företag. Överenskommelsen visar också förståelse för hur den moderna ekonomin fungerar i praktiken. Våra ändringar för att underlätta för investerare i så kallade fintechbolag visar inte minst på detta.

Detta arbete är någonting som fyller mig med hopp. När vi i EU faktiskt vill underlätta för investeringar med privatkapital så kan vi göra det. Det är någonting som vi också behöver ta med oss i vårt övriga arbete.

Jonás Fernández, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, está bien llegar a un debate en este Parlamento con un acuerdo con el Consejo basado en la propuesta de la Comisión Europea, que sin duda tiene que ayudar a abordar esas transiciones que tiene la economía europea por delante: la transición digital y la transición verde. También tiene que cubrir la necesidad de inversión a largo plazo; Europa adolece de una inversión aún reducida para enfrentar los retos que tenemos por delante y, sin duda, la inversión privada es necesaria para abordar ese camino.

Mi Grupo tenía algunas dudas con la propuesta y con algunas enmiendas durante el proceso de negociación, porque, sin duda, compartiendo el objetivo de canalizar la inversión de los ahorradores en proyectos a largo plazo, no queríamos que este texto, que esta reforma, supusiera una desregulación por la vía de atrás o que redujera los controles, los requisitos, que sobre estos u otros productos tenemos que discutir y que están encima de la mesa en el marco de la unión de los mercados de capitales.

Sin duda, ha habido intentos de reducir la regulación, de reducir la protección de los consumidores minoristas. Sin embargo, como digo, creo que el texto final es equilibrado y permite proteger adecuadamente fundamentalmente a los inversores minoristas que decidan conducir sus ahorros hacia estos productos.

Mi Grupo también se congratula de haber ampliado el control sobre aquellos países donde pueden invertir estos productos, no solamente incorporando los países de la lista negra de la Unión Europea en la lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales, sino también a aquellos países en el anexo 1 de jurisdicciones no cooperativas. Yo creo que es un buen paso que también ayuda en la lucha contra el blanqueo y los comportamientos tributarios ilícitos de terceras jurisdicciones.

Y, sin duda, quizá la parte más débil del texto ha sido el capítulo de sostenibilidad, que esperamos y confiamos que en esa futura revisión se refuerce, si realmente queremos que este instrumento sea útil para avanzar también en la transición verde.

Ondřej Kovařík, on behalf of the Renew Group. – Mr President, Madam Commissioner. First of all, I would like to thank the Rapporteur, my colleagues and the Czech Presidency for their constructive work on this ELTIF Regulation.

The updated Regulation takes us one step closer to having genuine capital markets in Europe, and it actually removes a number of hurdles that, until now, had made it quite difficult for existing funds to grow and to be offered to investors. Specifically, it will help our citizens to channel their savings – and this is one of the key goals that we were trying to achieve – into more secure long-term investments with opportunities for higher returns than traditional savings accounts. It does this by encouraging fund managers and citizens to invest in creating and buying into long-term funds.

On the other hand, we are strengthening consumer protection with the suitability test for investors by leaving them the final decision on investing or not. There will be a lower minimum investment for consumers, which is a very important addition, allowing more retail investors to invest in relatively stable types of funds. We have also agreed to loosen the fund management rules to encourage more European long-term investment funds to be created. This will help investment managers to offer a wider range of options for investors, including investments in digital and green transition projects.

The goal is to feed long-term capital into our economy for productive purposes. With a well-designed framework for investments in capital markets, as well as increased financial literacy, we are able to further support investments in long-term projects, and particularly in growing SMEs in this tough economic environment. I believe that the framework that we have agreed on for ELTIF will bring positive effects to Europe's capital markets, and I will fully support it and so will our group.

Claude Gruffat, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, quand on parle d'ELTIF, on parle de fonds européen d'investissement à long terme. Et c'est amusant parce que, depuis la pandémie et depuis le pacte vert, on parle d'investissements nécessaires à la transition, les fameux investissements verts et sociaux. Ce qui est encore plus frappant, c'est que sur le long terme, pour ce genre d'investissement, c'est important.

Alors, on aurait pu se dire que la révision de ce règlement était une formidable occasion pour que ces fonds contribuent à un avenir meilleur, en investissant prioritairement dans les énergies renouvelables, dans l'économie circulaire, dans les hôpitaux, les services, etc.

Parce que, sans la mobilisation de ces capitaux privés, la transition écologique n'aura pas lieu. Mais la Commission a réussi le double exploit de ne pas insérer – ce qui est nécessaire pour une disposition – la soutenabilité dans les propositions et de faire obstruction à toutes les propositions qui étaient pourtant de bon sens: publication de la part des actifs dans nos activités respectant la taxonomie, création de fonds verts, prohibition, pour ces fonds, d'investir dans des activités qui portent atteinte à l'un des objectifs environnementaux que s'est fixés l'Union européenne. En gros, on dérégule.

Et plus on dérégule, moins on supervise, et moins on comprend ce qui passe dans les banques parallèles. Moins on supervise les banques parallèles, plus les investissements deviennent risqués. Au final, c'est la crise financière qui nous pend au nez. Et la transition écologique, elle, reste en panne. Dommage, on a raté une occasion.

Gunnar Beck, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Erleben wir den Anfang vom Ende des grünen Terrors? Die neuen EU-Vorschriften für langfristige Investmentfonds könnte man so deuten.

Die Position des EU-Parlaments war klar und wurde mit großer Mehrheit gegen die Stimmen meiner Fraktion, der ID-Fraktion, angenommen. Das Parlament wollte langfristige Investitionen möglichst in die grüne Wirtschaft lenken. Dadurch wird die Grundlage für grüne Vermögensblasen gelegt und die Stabilität der Finanzmärkte in der EU bedroht. Wir haben dies immer abgelehnt und wehren uns weiterhin gegen Fehlallokationen von Ressourcen zugunsten grüner Fantasieprojekte, die unsere Wettbewerbsfähigkeit in Europa bedrohen.

Obwohl wir mit unserer Position im Europäischen Parlament isoliert waren, schlossen sich die Mitgliedstaaten, einschließlich der damaligen französischen Ratspräsidentschaft, und die Europäische Kommission überraschend der Position der Alternative für Deutschland und der ID-Fraktion an: Langfristige Investmentfonds seien kein geeignetes Vehikel, um verdeckt und zum Schaden der Investoren von der Leyens *Green Deal* zu finanzieren.

Die politische Einigung, die der Rat und die Kommission jetzt erzielt haben, hat die Position des Europäischen Parlaments entgrünt. Dies ist ein kleiner, aber hoffentlich wegweisender Sieg für die politische Vernunft und für all jene politischen Kräfte, die den grünen Totalitarismus ablehnen und unsere Bürger nicht zu einem Leben in einer Art grünen DDR verdammen wollen.

Die Einigung ist zudem eine herbe Niederlage für die Grünen und ihre Freunde bei der politischen Linken und inmitten dieses Parlaments.

Es scheint, dass sich das politische Gleichgewicht verschiebt. In Zeiten von Rekordinflation, hemmungsloser öffentlicher und steigender privater Verschuldung bei Null-Wachstum schwindet die Unterstützung für grüne Abenteuer. Und Abenteuer sind es! Wie sagte doch der deutsche Grünen-Chef Habeck vor einem Jahr? Er habe keinen – wörtlich – Bock auf eine Regierung, die keine großen Risiken eingehen wolle. Und vielleicht gehe es ja auch gut. Dann – so Habeck – könnten wir alle ein wenig stolz auf uns sein.

Das ist die Politik von Hasardeuren und 21 hysterischen deutschen Grünen in diesem Parlament – leider ist hier keiner anwesend. Hoffen wir, dass die Anderen – ich sagte ja Deutschen –, hoffen wir, dass die Anderen alsbald aus dieser Massenpsychose erwachen. Dann werden wir weitere grüne Niederlagen erleben.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Mr President, you have heard the position eloquently put by Jonás Fernández, and that is all true, but I would like to make a critical remark as well. Financial markets, and probably politicians too, frequently suffer from the same illness: short-sightedness. We don't look ten or 20 years ahead, but only two or three. And this means we forego long term growth to get a quick win. And I'm reminded of this especially now while discussing the Regulation for European Long-Term Investment Funds.

These funds are meant to incentivise a long-term view and increase investments to firms and projects that need time to grow. But they have struggled so far, right. Interest for financial markets from investors has been limited, because they care about the quick win. And ELTIFs by themselves will not square the circle of short-termism in the financial markets. Luckily enough, they are helped by the EU's sustainable finance agenda.

Like a pair of glasses, the taxonomy and disclosure regulations can counter short-sightedness. They help to clarify the important long-term sustainability risks faced by the funds and they provide direction of travel for the long term. It's therefore unfortunate that an ELTIF update did so little to take these elements on board. If I invest in a long-term fund I expect to care about the long-term risks, such as climate risks, and work towards the long-term climate transition. And sadly, this will not be true. Instead, the regulation creates an environmentally sustainable ELTIF. This way, all green aspects have been grouped together and put in a new standard that I suspect will not gather much interest and will not be used. It's a problem of short-sightedness. Put the green bit in a far corner and you can't see it anymore.

Still, I would like to thank the shadow rapporteur, Elisabetta Gualmini, for the good cooperation on this file and for the successful damage control. Sadly, on this file, the vision needed to really ingrain the long-termism in the financial markets was short in supply.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, děkuji paní komisařce za to, že představila ten návrh. Reforma finančních trhů je, řekněme, základním cílem, který sleduje tento návrh. Je to cíl, který máme dlouhodobý, a vyplývá to z již představených návrhů v dřívějším období.

Já se domnívám, že bohužel ta dlouhodobost, kterou tady deklarujeme v této zprávě, není úplně dostatečná. Výzvy, kterým čelíme, jsou skutečně obrovské. Právě plánování a systematický přístup, odstranění byrokracie, vlastně udržitelná schémata, to jsou všechno výzvy, se kterými jsme počítali, že přinese tato reforma a vyrovná se s nimi.

A zatím si myslím, že jsme zůstali tak trochu na půli cesty. Takže já bych také chtěl volat po tom, aby výzvy, kterým chtějí investoři čelit v těchto fondech, byly vyslyšeny, a aby reforma byla skutečně důkladnější, myslím si, že je možné se inspirovat v naší euroatlantické vazbě, v našem okruhu.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you again colleagues, President, I'll be brief and I just want to pick up a comment of Mr Kovařík about financial literacy and say that this Parliament, I believe, has an important role to play here because we do need to talk about knowledge, about money, and to make sure that citizens have the skills to invest and are aware of what's happening.

My second observation — and Paul, thank you, as always, for being very straight and provocative — is that, in fact, we do need to invest in the transition. And I think there is an awareness today because of the horrors of what's happening in Ukraine and the energy crisis, that we do have to actually invest faster into the green and digital way. But we will track these funds and we will see whether they achieve their objectives.

For me, the big point is that we need to connect savers with investing. During COVID-19, we saw a lot of money on deposit, people not earning on it — we need that to channel it into the projects we've just discussed. And you know, long term, life is not long enough, so we all know that we need to see results on these projects for citizens, for those that are here and those that have yet to come.

It also marks, in my view, a step forward, a big step forward, on the capital markets union (CMU). Bit by bit, with your cooperation here in Parliament and with the Council, we are making CMU happen and I really would like to thank you for that, but also to ask you to push us and to push as far as you can because we do not have a single market for capital and, you know, we're marking 30 years of the single market, in one area we have not completed the circle.

But I look forward to tomorrow's vote. I think it will be strong because I think there was a great spirit of cooperation amongst you as negotiators. And again, I want to acknowledge and appreciate that. Have a nice evening.

Michiel Hoogeveen, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, the European Common Market has shown that free peoples and free countries can work together, freely and voluntarily, in areas of trade and economic development to improve the lives of our citizens. Tomorrow is an important day that will mark a new milestone for that Common Market – a new building block for a genuine capital markets Union.

European long-term investment funds, ELTIFs, provide a stable and predictable source of financing for long-term projects. I am talking about investments in transport, energy, telecoms infrastructure, bridges, tunnels, electricity transmission lines, gas storage facilities, power plants and fibre optic cables, but also social infrastructure, such as hospitals, retirement homes and social housing. All of these are examples of projects that are the direct beneficiaries of the ELTIF reform, and hundreds of billions of euros can now flow into these objectives.

ELTIFs promote economic growth and job creation by financing small and medium-sized businesses, which are a vital source of innovation and employment, but which too often struggle to access the financing they need in order to grow. Over the past month, the European Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has taken ambitious efforts to improve ELTIFs. We delivered on this reform within record time.

When I took on the role of ELTIF rapporteur at the end of 2021, there were only 51 ELTIFs, and the total net size of the segment was only about EUR 2 billion. Today, we already have 84 ELTIFs, with the total net size exceeding EUR 7.5 billion. This already demonstrates the market's confidence in our reforms.

Now, I would like to address the sustainable ELTIFs and green investments, and I would like to recall that ELTIFs are already subject to the Sustainable Financial Disclosure Regulation, and the new ELTIF Regulation makes that explicitly clear. It has now been clarified that ELTIFs may also invest in green bonds. However, the requirement to only invest in SFDR-compliant products was rejected because it would unduly narrow the universe of eligible assets. Creating an extra category of sustainable ELTIFs will be weighed up during the evaluation mandated by the accelerated review clause only two years after the entry of the revised ELTIF regulation into force.

Finally, the creation of sustainable ELTIFs was deemed untimely and unwarranted at this stage, given the economic and legal assessment. Mr President, I conclude that the ELTIF reform has shown that the Common Market is open to financial innovation by building a stronger capital markets union. We jointly stand for the interests of our small and medium-sized businesses, jobs, investors and, ultimately, the prosperity and interest of our people.

President. – The debate is closed. The vote will be taken tomorrow.

22. Explanations of vote

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par balsojumu skaidrojumiem.

22.1. Union Secure Connectivity Programme 2023-2027 (A9-0249/2022 - Christophe Grudler)

Rakstiski balsojumu skaidrojumi

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, satellite infrastructure plays a vital role in ensuring seamless communication in a digital society. Under this proposal, the Union Secure Connectivity Programme provides for a satellite communication infrastructure that is secure, flexible and resilient for EU Member States and citizens.

This proposal will also ensure EU citizens receive a fit-for-purpose mobile and broadband satellite service, including improved internet connection for remote and rural areas. To do this, this proposal establishes an EU satellite constellation of an estimated 200 satellites and will serve as the EU's first dedicated infrastructure to offer satellite communication services to governments, the economy and civil society: a fair achievement.

This is a key step in ensuring an EU space-based secure communication system that seeks to meet the needs of modern society. These changes will be based on the latest innovative technologies in creating a new space ecosystem, and this proposal forms a key part of the EU's space package.

22.2. REPowerEU chapters in recovery and resilience plans (A9-0260/2022 - Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Siegfried Mureşan, Dragoş Pîslaru)

Rakstiski balsojumu skaidrojumi

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, mar fhreagairt ar an gcruatan agus ar an suaitheadh sa mhargadh domhanda fuinnimh mar thoradh ar ionradh na Rúise ar an Úcráin, thug an tAontas Eorpach an Plean REPowerEU isteach. Is plean é REPowerEU chun an méid seo a leanas a dhéanamh: fuinneamh a choigilt, fuinneamh glan a ghiniúint, agus ár soláthairtí fuinnimh a éagsúlú.

Tá sé mar aidhm ag an bplean seo soláthairtí reatha fuinnimh an Aontais a neartú agus a éagsúlú chun an Eoraip a dhéanamh neamhspleách ar bhreoslaí iontaise na Rúise i bhfad roimh 2030. Le himeacht ama, cabhróidh an t-aistriú chuig fuinneamh glan chun praghsanna fuinnimh a ísliú agus chun an spleáchas ar iompórtálacha a laghdú chomh maith.

Tacaítear leis trí bhearta airgeadais agus dlíthiúla chun an bonneagar nua fuinnimh agus an córas nua fuinnimh atá de dhíth ar an Eoraip a thógáil.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Herr Präsident! REPowerEU stellt 20 Milliarden EU-Gelder bereit, um EU-Staaten dabei zu helfen, sich unabhängiger von russischen Energieimporten zu machen. Doch der Europäische Rechnungshof kritisiert die zweckfremde Mittelverwendung zur Vergrünung der Wirtschaft.

Angedacht waren Soforthilfen für Bürger und energieintensive Unternehmen. Bevorteilt werden stattdessen Länder mit hohem fossilen Brennstoffverbrauch. Größtes Opfer der Zweckentfremdung ist Deutschland, das besonders vom russischen Gas abhängig ist. Außerdem können Gelder, die für deutsche Landwirte, die ostdeutsche Wirtschaft oder Schulen in Nordrhein-Westfalen bestimmt sind, jetzt in die Taschen der Windbarone und Solargiganten fließen.

Dies ist kein Schritt in Richtung Energieautarkie. Wir werden abhängiger von Helios und Aiolos – von Sonnen- und Windgott. Das ist nicht im Interesse der Bürger. Ich stimme daher gegen diesen Vorschlag.

Míriam Lexmann (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, vítam dnešné hlasovanie o legislatívnom balíku REPowerEU, ktorý je kľúčový pre riešenie súčasnej energetickej krízy prostredníctvom podpory projektov infraštruktúry alebo zvyšovania energetickej účinnosti budov.

Oceňujem, že súčasťou balíka je jedna z požiadaviek Slovenska, ktorú od začiatku presadzovalo KDH, a je to využitie nevyčerpaných kohéznych fondov na podporu zraniteľných domácností, ako aj podnikov najviac postihnutých energetickou krízou. Slovensko bude môcť presunúť až 10 % z nevyčerpaných kohéznych fondov, čo by malo znamenať približne jeden a pol miliardy EUR, a ďalšiu jednu miliardu EUR by malo mať možnosť využiť z nových dostupných kohéznych fondov na podporu cieľov balíka REPowerEU.

Je rozhodujúce, aby slovenská vláda použila tieto prostriedky strategicky a spolupracovala s regiónmi na pomoci tým, ktorí sú najviac zasiahnutí energetickou krízou.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem také tento návrh zprávy podpořil. Je to vlastně uzavření celého procesu a vítám to, protože 20 miliard EUR je již poměrně významná částka a má sloužit ke snížení závislosti evropských zemí na fosilních zdrojích, především těch ruských. Je to reakce na bezprecedentní nezákonný akt ruské agrese na Ukrajině.

My potřebujeme diverzifikovat naše energetické zdroje, zajistit bezpečnost dodávek, investovat do úložišť energií, také podporovat rychlejší rozvoj obnovitelných zdrojů energie a podporovat také stabilitu dodávek. Má být poskytnuta jistota pro občany i pro firmy ve velmi rychlém měřítku. Tyto investice mají proběhnout vlastně do tří let. Státy teď mají ukázat, jak jsou připravené, jak rychle jsou schopny předložit kvalitní projekty a oznámit vlastně už do jednoho měsíce od přijetí tohoto nařízení svá schémata, své projekty. A toto je myslím velmi dobrý nápad.

22.3. Electoral rights of mobile Union citizens in European Parliament elections (A9-0297/2022 - Damian Boeselager)

Rakstiski balsojumu skaidrojumi

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A *Uachtarán*, there are nearly 13.7 million EU citizens residing in a Member State other than that of their own nationality. The right of those EU citizens to vote in European Parliament elections has been enshrined in EU treaties for decades. Nevertheless, these citizens face a number of barriers in exercising this important EU right.

This proposal will ensure EU citizens are able to exercise their EU right to vote and stand as a candidate in European elections in the EU country they are residing in under the same conditions as nationals of that country. This includes accessible information, a straightforward registration process and the effective exchange of information between Member States with the aim of preventing multiple voting. And of course it also requires that information on registration and voting is provided in all official languages, including in *Gaeilge*.

This proposal will also ensure unnecessary obstacles to accessing voting booths and polling stations are addressed. A good proposal.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem tento návrh zprávy také podpořil, i když se stavím k možnosti jednotných celounijních kandidátek poměrně skepticky. Tento postoj jsem už zde vysvětloval, ale tento návrh mří poněkud ještě jiným směrem, a to ke snaze přivést co největší počet voličů k volebním urnám a umožnit jim hlasování.

Je třeba zdůraznit, že Evropský parlament je jedinou přímo volenou institucí v Evropské unii, a je samozřejmě zájmem jak členských států, tak i nás volených představitelů, abychom umožnili co největšímu počtu osob volit a ty možnosti, které tato zpráva předjímá, například volba v předstihu, korespondenční volba či volba v zastoupení, to všechno jsou možnosti, které rozhodně vítám, a je důležité s těmito tématy přicházet, protože například v České republice není vůbec možné volit do Evropského parlamentu v zahraničí. To je zásadní slabina českého volebního systému a myslím, že právě popostrčení ze strany evropských institucí je velmi dobré.

22.4. CO₂ emission standards for cars and vans (A9-0150/2022 - Jan Huitema)

Virginie Joron (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Paris interdit le diesel l'année prochaine. Rouen, Lyon, Strasbourg vont suivre.

Le prix d'achat des voitures explose, mais les alliés de M. Macron veulent aussi exclure les Français qui roulent en voiture à essence. Pourquoi cet acharnement, alors que ces mêmes personnes vont faire du yoga à Bali en avion ou se font mousser à Davos en jet privé?

Vous voulez punir toute une génération de conducteurs avec des arguments fallacieux et à coups de matraque: des radars tous les 20 mètres, des contrôles techniques tous les deux jours, des vignettes d'exclusion, le litre d'essence à 3 euros. Les Français qui se lèvent tôt ont besoin de leur voiture pour aller travailler, pour aller chercher leurs enfants, pour faire des courses, pour éviter des transports en commun peu sûrs et bondés.

Cette société de surveillance et de l'obéissance, ce n'est pas l'Europe que j'aime. Il faut arrêter avec la politique de la peur, de la culpabilité et de la punition imposée par votre programme 2030. Le «tout électrique», c'est ce que nous ne voulons pas. C'est une excuse de bobos colonialistes, car la voiture électrique ne pollue pas ici, mais en Afrique, dans les mines de cobalt, loin de vos lofts et de vos résidences secondaires.

Avec vous, pour une partie de la population, c'est la douche froide et la bougie en mangeant des pizzas aux grillons domestiques.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem se u tohoto nařízení zdržel a chtěl bych vysvětlit z jakého důvodu. Oceňuji výsledek českého předsednictví, že se podařilo u takto složitěho spisu dojednat většinu jak na půdě členských států, tak vlastně i zde na půdě Evropského parlamentu. Je důležité, aby tento sektor věděl, s čím může nepochybně počítat. A je nepochybné, že doprava se podílí na rostoucích emisích CO₂. Toto jsou všechno skutečná fakta.

Já jsem přesvědčen, že ovšem není možné bez dalšího diktovat úplný zákaz této technologie spalovacích motorů, protože ty emise mohou být velmi nízké. A myslím si, že bylo možné zachovat přípustnost této technologie. Také je velkým problémem nedostatek infrastruktury, dobíjecích soustav nebo i přenosu nových energetických soustav. Toto vyvolává velké otázky a myslím si, že to je trochu uspěchaný krok.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Līdz ar to balsojumu skaidrojumi dienaskārtībā ir izsmelti.

23. Agenda of the next sitting

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamā sēde ir rītdien, proti, trešdien, 2023. gada 15. februārī, plkst. 9.00.

Darba kārtība ir publicēta, un tā ir pieejama Eiropas Parlamenta tīmekļa vietnē.

24. Approval of the minutes of the sitting

Sēdes vadītājs. – Šis sēdes protokols tiks iesniegts Parlamentam apstiprināšanai rītdien pēc balsošanas.

25. Closure of the sitting

(Sēde tika slēgta plkst. 20.56.)

Key to symbols used

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

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

Abbreviations used for Parliamentary Committees

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

Abbreviations used for Political Groups

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