

ESACTA LITERAL DE LOS DEBATES DE 14 DE JUNIO DE 2023

(C/2024/1469)

PARLAMENTO EUROPEO

PERÍODO DE SESIONES 2023-2024

Sesiones del 12 al 15 de junio de 2023

ESTRASBURGO

Sumario	Página
1. Apertura de la sesión	4
2. Modificación del orden del día	4
3. Supplicatorio de suspensión de la inmunidad	4
4. Preparación de la reunión del Consejo Europeo de los días 29 y 30 de junio de 2023, en particular a la luz de los avances recientes hacia la celebración del Pacto sobre Migración (debate)	4
5. Legislación electoral, comisión de investigación y Estado de Derecho en Polonia (debate)	24
6. Reanudación de la sesión	31
7. Sesión solemne – Discurso de Vjosa Osmani, presidenta de la República de Kosovo	32
8. Reanudación de la sesión	39
9. Bienvenida	39
10. Turno de votaciones	39
10.1. Acuerdo de Colaboración y Cooperación UE-Tailandia (A9-0191/2023 - Andrey Kovatchev) (votación)	39
10.2. Acuerdo de Colaboración y Cooperación UE-Tailandia (Resolución) (A9-0193/2023 - Andrey Kovatchev) (votación)	39

Sumario	Página
10.3. Acuerdo de Colaboración y Cooperación UE-Malasia (A9-0190/2023 - Gheorghe-Vlad Nistor) (votación)	39
10.4. Acuerdo de Colaboración y Cooperación UE-Malasia (Resolución) (A9-0194/2023 - Gheorghe-Vlad Nistor) (votación)	39
10.5. Acuerdo de colaboración en el sector pesquero UE-Mauricio: Protocolo de aplicación del Acuerdo (2022-2026) (A9-0196/2023 - François-Xavier Bellamy) (votación)	40
10.6. Ley de Inteligencia Artificial (A9-0188/2023 - Brando Benifei, Dragoş Tudorache) (votación) . . .	40
10.7. Pilas y baterías y sus residuos (A9-0031/2022 - Achille Variati) (votación)	40
10.8. Garantía de la seguridad alimentaria y la resiliencia a largo plazo de la agricultura de la Unión (A9-0185/2023 - Marlene Mortler) (votación)	40
10.9. Períodos de prácticas de calidad en la Unión (A9-0186/2023 - Monica Semedo) (votación)	40
11. Reanudación de la sesión	41
12. Aprobación del Acta de la sesión anterior	41
13. Gestación por sustitución en la Unión: riesgos de explotación y comercialización (debate de actualidad) . .	41
14. Examen del uso del programa espía de vigilancia Pegasus y otros programas equivalentes – Examen del uso del programa espía de vigilancia Pegasus y otros programas equivalentes (proyecto de recomendación) (debate)	52
15. Hacer de Europa el lugar donde invertir (debate)	72
16. Enseñanzas extraídas del escándalo «Papeles de Pandora» y otras revelaciones (debate)	90
17. Implementación y cumplimiento de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible (debate)	103
18. Ampliación del mandato de la Fiscalía Europea para incluir los delitos de vulneración de las medidas restrictivas de la Unión (debate)	116
19. Debates sobre casos de violaciones de los derechos humanos, de la democracia y del Estado de Derecho (debate)	124
19.1. Tortura y enjuiciamiento penal de los menores ucranianos Tihiran Ohannisian y Mykyta Janhanov por la Federación de Rusia	124
19.2. Situación humanitaria en Sudán, en particular la muerte de niños atrapados por los enfrentamientos	127
19.3. Deterioro de las libertades fundamentales en Hong Kong, en particular el caso de Jimmy Lai . .	132
20. Explicaciones de voto	136
20.1. Ley de Inteligencia Artificial (A9-0188/2023 - Brando Benifei, Dragoş Tudorache)	136

Sumario	Página
20.2. Pilas y baterías y sus residuos (A9-0031/2022 - Achille Variati)	137
20.3. Garantía de la seguridad alimentaria y la resiliencia a largo plazo de la agricultura de la Unión (A9-0185/2023 - Marlene Mortler)	138
20.4. Períodos de prácticas de calidad en la Unión (A9-0186/2023 - Monica Semedo)	139
21. Orden del día de la próxima sesión	140
22. Aprobación del Acta de la presente sesión	140
23. Cierre de la sesión	140

ESACTA LITERAL DE LOS DEBATES DE 14 DE JUNIO DE 2023

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

1. Apertura de la sesión

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.00 Uhr eröffnet.)

2. Modificación del orden del día

Der Präsident. – Ich habe zwei Mitteilungen zu machen.

Zum Ersten: Gemäß Artikel 158 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung wird auf Vorschlag der Präsidentin und mit Zustimmung der Fraktionen die Reihenfolge der beiden Aussprachen am Donnerstagmorgen, also morgen, umgekehrt.

Die Sitzung am Donnerstag beginnt daher mit der Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über den Beitritt der Ukraine zum Übereinkommen über die Anerkennung und Vollstreckung ausländischer Entscheidungen in Zivil- und Handelssachen vom 2. Juli 2019 und wird gefolgt von der Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zur Wasserkrise in Europa.

Wenn es keine Einwände gibt, wird diese Änderung angenommen.

3. Supplicatorio de suspensión de la inmunidad

Der Präsident. – Meine zweite Mitteilung am heutigen Morgen ist folgende: Der Präsidentin wurden von den zuständigen lettischen Behörden ein Antrag auf Aufhebung der parlamentarischen Immunität von Andris Ameriks und von Nils Ušakovs und von den griechischen Behörden ein Antrag auf Aufhebung der parlamentarischen Immunität von Ioannis Lagos übermittelt. Diese Anträge werden zur weiteren Behandlung an den Rechtsausschuss des Parlaments überwiesen.

4. Preparación de la reunión del Consejo Europeo de los días 29 y 30 de junio de 2023, en particular a la luz de los avances recientes hacia la celebración del Pacto sobre Migración (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Vorbereitung der Tagung des Europäischen Rates am 29./30. Juni 2023, insbesondere vor dem Hintergrund der jüngsten Schritte hin zum Abschluss des Migrationspakts (2023/2678(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, honourable Members, Vice-President, on 29 and 30 June, the European Council convene to deal with Ukraine, the economy, security and defence, as well as migration. Leaders will also discuss China and prepare the summit in July with Latin America and the Caribbean. The meeting will start with the customary exchange with the President of this House.

Ukraine remains top of our European agenda. Let me begin by expressing my gratitude for the European Parliament's resolute and unwavering support. President Zelenskyy is expected to address the European Council via video link, and leaders will take stock of the latest development in Russia's war of aggression.

Last week we witnessed the destruction of the Nova Kakhovka dam, which has devastating consequences for thousands of Ukrainians and the entire communities. Innocent people have been deprived of their homes and their livelihood. Too many have lost their lives. The disaster would not have happened if Russia had not started this illegal war of aggression against Ukraine.

In spite of all this, the Ukrainian spirit and determination grows stronger each day. It is truly remarkable that Ukraine has been able to move forward on its reform efforts under these extremely difficult circumstances. We have said it before, but we say it again: Ukraine's future is within the European Union.

During this semester, the Union has taken important decisions to accelerate support for Ukraine. We have continued to put pressure on Russia by adopting the 10th sanction package. Let me assure you that the Swedish Presidency is working tirelessly on package number 11. We are progressing on how much to use Russian frozen, immobilised assets, and we do it in close cooperation with our partners and allies in the G7. We are moving towards EU agreement on a judicial solution regarding Russia's crime of aggression. We have provided ammunition to Ukraine and we have decided to procure ammunition together. We are also working on the Act in Support of Ammunition Production to strengthen our industry capacity.

On the economic agenda, leaders will follow up their conclusions on industrial policy and on the single market and Europe's long-term competitiveness and productivity. As you know, European competitiveness is a core priority of the Swedish Council Presidency. Our economic policies have long been decided by short-term crisis management, public interventions and aid packages, such as the reaction of COVID-19 and the US Inflation Reduction Act.

Over the last four decades, our growth rates have been modest compared to the United States. European productivity is lower than other major economies and perhaps, even more, we continue to spend less on research and development. Europe needs a long-term approach, and this spring has marked an important step towards such an approach. The Commission forcefully responded to the European Council's request for a strategy to boost competitiveness and productivity, and the strategy puts the internal market, R&D, skills, access to private capital and better regulation at the core of EU policies. Reversing trends will take dedicated actions overseen by leaders over many years, and we hope that we can count on Parliament's support.

On security and defence, the European Council will take stock of the progress of the implementation of its previous conclusions and give further guidance on the Union's security and defence capacity. Leaders will discuss the reinforcements of our defence industry through the Common Procurement Act (EDIRPA) and the Act in Support of Ammunition Production (ASAP). They are also expected to welcome the approval of civilian Common Security and Defence Policy compact.

In the presence of Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg, the European Council will discuss EU-NATO cooperation ahead of the NATO summit in Vilnius. Moreover, the European Council will hold a strategic discussion on China. Unity and determination will strengthen the effectiveness and credibility of our relations with China. In the EU, we need to formulate our own open but firm approach to global affairs and also rely on strong partnership with the US and other democracies. Our own societies must rest on a solid base in terms of economy and democracy. We need strategic unity in defence, defending openness and cooperation, while addressing vulnerabilities and excessive dependencies with security implications. That is de-risking in practice.

Ladies and gentlemen, the European Council will also once again come back to the issue of migration and not at least the external dimension. President von der Leyen's visit to Tunisia, along with Prime Minister Meloni and Prime Minister Rutte, reaffirms the leaders' commitment to working with partners. The Presidency and the Commission will inform the implementation of the conclusions on migration from February and March. This time it will be in a positive spirit of the new deal of the migration pact in the Council. The Swedish Presidency has worked hard for this and we are proud that the Council is now ready to go into final stages and find a compromise between the co-legislators. We urgently need a deal that can deliver results.

Mr President, if you allow me, since this is my last and final Strasbourg session as Presidency, I also want to take the opportunity to say thank you and express my gratitude to be able to represent the Council in this Chamber. I am convinced, and maybe even more after these six months, that the only way forward is a strong, respectful and sincere cooperation between the Council and Parliament.

The Swedish Presidency has worked very hard on advancing our common political agenda and I do truly thank Parliament for a high level of commitment from your side. With that, I would like to say thank you for your attention and looking forward to the debate.

Der Präsident. – Frau Roswall, der Dank liegt auch bei uns.

Danke für Ihr Engagement, Ihre ständige Präsenz und Ihre Offenheit im Dialog mit dem Europäischen Parlament – nicht nur in diesem Hause, sondern auch bei den Begegnungen, die wir gemeinsam in der Zusammenarbeit mit den nationalen Parlamenten hatten. Herzlichen Dank und alles Gute.

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, Madam Minister, dear Jessika, honourable members of the European Parliament, the last European Council before the summer break comes at an important moment in time. Russia's brutal invasion of Ukraine rages on with the destruction of Kakhovka Dam, leading to an unprecedented human and ecological disaster. The Ukrainian counteroffensive is now under way and leaders will no doubt look at the developments very closely. They will discuss the situation on the ground and all aspects of our continued, unwavering and multifaceted support, including on Ukraine's peace formula, sanctions and sanctions enforcement, frozen assets, military assistance, Russia's accountability, and a brief point on enlargement based on the Commission's oral report to be presented at the informal meeting of the General Affairs Council on 21 and 22 June.

If you allow me to proceed with economic matters, the Commission will put forward a communication on European economic security next week, which will help steer the leaders' discussion. In line with the March European Council conclusions, the Commission will also update the leaders on the progress made since the adoption of the long-term competitiveness communication on 16 March, including on discussions with the US on the effects of the Inflation Reduction Act. As you know, there are a number of concrete proposals on the table to further strengthen the single market and the competitiveness of our industry, and we are very happy to work on all of them with both co-legislators. I am talking about the Critical Raw Materials Act, about Net-zero Industry Act, about the Artificial Intelligence Act and Data Act. All of them are very important for the competitiveness of the European economy and we are very much looking forward to continue progressing on this file with both co-legislators.

Following the review in November 2022, in April the Commission presented proposals to implement the most comprehensive reform of the EU's economic governance rules since the aftermath of the financial crisis. The measures are designed to strengthen public debt sustainability while promoting sustainable and inclusive growth through reforms and investment in all Member States. With a general escape clause set to expire at the end of 2023, we hope leaders will encourage further work on this issue in the Council. Leaders will also endorse integrated country specific recommendations and conclude the 2023 European Semester.

And finally, the Commission's proposals on the review of the Multiannual Financial Framework to be published next week, will feed into the leaders first discussion on the matter with a view to steering the work of the Council.

I think that the external issues have been excellently covered by Minister Jessika Roswall. I would just add that we will also prepare in a great depth the discussion of the leader on the agenda for Latin America and Caribbean, but also on our overall relationship with China, and will also provide the material for the discussions on the relations with partners in Mediterranean, in particular Tunisia.

So if you allow me, Mr. President, I would now proceed to the topic of particular interest of the plenary today and this is migration. The approach we have pursued so far delivers results. On addressing the day to day migration challenges, we have come up with concrete operational actions, actions which started to have an impact in terms of fewer irregular arrivals, more effective returns and the fight against smuggling that risks human lives for profit. At the same time, we are working on increasing legal pathways to support third countries with capacity-building measures. We appreciate the intense work on the legislative track. The political agreement reached by the ministers at the Justice and Home Affairs Council last week on the general approach on the New Pact on Migration and Asylum is indeed a major step. It demonstrated that this is an area where Member States could find a large qualified majority in support for two key pillars of the pact. I am talking about the Asylum and Migration Management Regulation and the Asylum Procedure Regulation. The Commission welcomes the political agreement reached by the Member States because this is a real breakthrough after years of intense negotiations and I would like to thank the Swedish presidency for that wholeheartedly. Trilogues on these two pillars of the pact have started right away this week with a first good trilogue, and it is our joint duty to deliver on the reform of our migration policy. And now we have the momentum to do so. President von der Leyen will send again a letter to the leaders ahead of the European Council outlining the progress on operational measures and taking stock of the work of the co-legislators. The Commission welcomes the important steps taken by the co-legislators under the Joint Roadmap, with a clear goal to adopt the Pact before the end of the mandate. And this comes in addition to the provisional agreements already found on three other pillars of the pact, like the Reception Conditions Directive, Qualification Regulation and the Resettlement Framework Regulations, while trilogues started already on Eurodac and Screening Regulation. And I would like to comment and thank the European Parliament for having adopted its negotiation mandates on key files of the pact already in April. Because we know that this is massive, massive work be it on screening, regulation, asylum and migration management regulation, asylum procedure, regulation and the crisis proposals. But this just proves and shows that a large majority across the political groups supports this reform. The position of co-legislators offers a good foundation for the negotiations and therefore interinstitutional negotiations should now intensify. It is essential that we all remain committed and open to compromise, to create a fairer, more efficient and sustainable system for asylum and migration management, and to show that with trust and cooperation, we can meet and master our common challenges.

So I will stop here, but before I will do that, I also would like to thank Jessika, the team of the Swedish presidency, for excellent co-operation, not only here in the European Parliament, but we are also sitting together in the General Affairs Council. Thank you for great work and your personal commitment.

Paulo Rangel, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Ministra, Senhor Vice-Presidente, antes de mais queria, naturalmente, agradecer e saudar a Presidência sueca pela forma absolutamente impecável como presidiu à União Europeia durante este semestre.

Queria também dizer que, neste Conselho, é fundamental reforçar o apoio à Ucrânia, depois do ataque brutal à barragem no rio Dniepre que levou à catástrofe humana, levou a um crime de guerra e, em particular, a um desastre ecológico.

Temos também de olhar para a revisão do MFF, neste Conselho Europeu, que é crucial no sentido de dotar a União Europeia de meios para enfrentar os problemas que tem por diante nos próximos três ou quatro anos. E, finalmente, a prioridade que se deve dar neste momento à América Latina.

Mas, vindo diretamente ao ponto que consideramos fundamental, depois deste avanço no Pacto das Migrações, importa recordar, a este respeito, aquilo que disse o Papa João XXIII a propósito da dignidade humana: «todo o ser humano é uma pessoa». Portanto, a dignidade humana obriga-nos a defender o tratamento digno dos refugiados, dos requerentes de asilo, dos migrantes, daqueles que procuram trabalho e chegam às nossas fronteiras.

Ao contrário do que defendem certos grupos políticos, isso só é possível garantindo fronteiras seguras, protegendo e controlando adequadamente as nossas fronteiras. Só desse modo se combate o tráfico ilegal de pessoas, que é, esse sim, uma violação dos direitos humanos. Só desse modo se consegue desencorajar e diminuir as travessias perigosas e trágicas no mar e no deserto, que, essas sim, violam os direitos humanos. Só desse modo se pode acabar com o acantonamento de pessoas em apartamentos, seja em Estocolmo, seja em Lisboa, em que há 20 e 30 pessoas por quarto ou por casa. Isto, sim, é violar os direitos humanos.

Portanto, defender os direitos humanos e a dignidade das pessoas exige combater o tráfico ilegal, exige proteção das fronteiras. Só desse modo se porá fim à instrumentalização de migrantes que hoje está em todo o Nordeste europeu, mas que também aflora de tempos em tempos na Turquia.

Tudo isto, como ainda na semana passada demonstrou a presidente da Comissão com a sua visita à Tunísia com dois chefes de governo, só é possível se houver uma cooperação estreita, sistemática, com os países terceiros. Por um lado, para a ajuda ao desenvolvimento que fixará as populações e, por outro lado, para ajudar a lidar com os fluxos migratórios, combater o tráfico ilegal, preparar condições de acolhimento, etc.

Nós temos, na verdade, de nos congratular com este passo que foi dado. Ele, no entanto, não chega. Vamos, agora, para uma fase decisiva de negociação entre o Conselho e o Parlamento, com a mediação da Comissão. Mas creio que demos um passo decisivo para restaurar a confiança dos cidadãos europeus na União Europeia e para garantir que todos os migrantes e os cidadãos europeus vivam em dignidade e em pleno exercício dos seus direitos.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, la destrucción de la presa de Nova Kajovka es un crimen de guerra que muestra el intento desesperado de Putin por ganar una guerra que ya hace mucho tiempo que ha perdido. Son todavía incalculables los efectos destructivos de la presa sobre la economía de Ucrania, sus pueblos, sus ciudades, su agricultura, su población desplazada y su medio ambiente.

Pero lo que sí debemos tener claro es quién debe pagar las reparaciones de guerra. Ha llegado la hora de utilizar los miles de millones de activos rusos congelados y propiedades de oligarcas sancionados para pagar los daños de la invasión. El pago de Putin por los daños causados no es solo un acto de justicia con el pueblo ucraniano, sino también con nuestros ciudadanos. Porque nuestras sociedades también pagan las consecuencias de la guerra con la subida de los precios. Por nuestros ciudadanos y ciudadanas, debemos seguir tomando decisiones valientes.

Nuestra ciudadanía merece una reforma del mercado eléctrico para garantizar precios razonables. Merece que avancemos en la reindustrialización de la Unión Europea para alcanzar la autonomía estratégica y merece una reforma de la gobernanza económica con reglas fiscales más claras y más flexibles que garanticen la estabilidad presupuestaria con el necesario crecimiento de la economía. En definitiva, nuestras sociedades merecen una transición verde y digital sin renunciar a las grandes conquistas sociales.

En plena transformación de nuestra Unión ¿hacia dónde se dirige la derecha? Ahora el Partido Popular Europeo se deja arrastrar por la extrema derecha para declarar la guerra a la Ley de Restauración de la Naturaleza, una ley indispensable para reparar el 80 % de las aguas y las tierras degradadas. Los socialdemócratas nos opondremos a la contrarreforma de la Agenda Verde que intentan instaurar las fuerzas más reaccionarias. Porque la emergencia climática mata a las personas y destruye la prosperidad económica. Más de 300 000 europeos mueren al año de forma prematura por la mala calidad del aire. En momentos en que Italia está padeciendo terribles inundaciones y España sufre graves sequías, el negacionismo de la derecha y la extrema derecha es totalmente inaceptable. Señorías, la ciencia es clara. La protección del medio ambiente aumentará nuestra resistencia ante fenómenos meteorológicos extremos.

Señores del Partido Popular, ahora que han decidido ignorar la memoria histórica para abrazar los valores de la ultraderecha, ¿hasta dónde están dispuestos a llegar? Además de su negacionismo climático, ¿reforzarán la alianza con los Gobiernos ultras de Polonia y Hungría que violan los derechos de las mujeres y las minorías? ¿Abandonarán los derechos humanos con su oposición a la Directiva de diligencia debida para impedir que las multinacionales utilicen como mano de obra a niños y niñas en cualquier lugar del mundo? ¿Seguirán fomentando el sentimiento antiinmigrante incluso ahora que, por fin, empezamos a negociar con el Consejo la conclusión del pacto migratorio?

El principio de solidaridad flexible pero obligatoria, acordado en el Consejo, no es suficiente. Lo que los países receptores en primera línea necesitan son políticas claras comunes de gestión en la llegada y un reparto solidario en cuanto a la acogida.

Señorías, en tiempos de recomposición del tablero geopolítico mundial necesitamos fortalecer alianzas entre países para avanzar en la democracia, la seguridad, la erradicación de la pobreza y las desigualdades. La Cumbre UE-CELAC ofrece una oportunidad única para inaugurar una nueva era en la cooperación a ambos lados del Atlántico. Porque queremos para América Latina y el Caribe lo mismo que hoy está en juego en Europa y que cada día debemos defender: paz, progreso y democracia.

Malik Azmani, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, dear Commissioner Šeřčovič and dear Minister Roswell, let me start by offering my congratulations to you, Minister, last week you achieved something we have asked for a very long time.

Finally, we are witnessing progress on one of the most important policy areas for our citizens. Finally, dear colleagues, the European Union is taking steps to tackle one of the challenges of our time.

Some in this House would like us to believe migration is about numbers. Some in this House would like us to believe that migration is only about them and them, as an abstract threat. Some in this House would like us to believe that we cannot solve the issue of migration and that fear should guide us.

The narrative and fear mongering of the extremes in this House and so many houses of parliament in our Member States is strong. People are receptive to fear and extremists have an interest in not solving the problem. They care only about steering the polls.

Renew Europe says 'no' to this. Migration is about people, real people like you and me, people fleeing a crisis or persecution for trying to uphold the values that we hold dear, people that are looking for a better life, our way of life.

Our values demand of us that we solve problems, that we are part of the solution, not the problems. Populists talk; Renew Europe acts.

But we are realistic as well. We cannot solve a problem we cannot manage. The current migration situation is out of control, but it is also complex.

That is why I call upon all those of goodwill in this House to help us in managing this crisis. We need to invest more in root causes of migration. We need to be generous to those refugees who seek shelter and deserve our decency. And we need to ensure that the first safe harbour is close to conflict zones so people can return to normality once it occurs.

We need to ensure that Europe is not a human trafficking paradise and that human trade routes are cut off. And yes, third countries that have become transit countries need also to take their responsibility. But so do we, by getting this migration pact over the finish line, by showing the citizens that migration is manageable, that the populists prone on problems and that we can deliver.

Dear colleagues, I know we are all united in our horror at the recent actions of Russia in Ukraine. New sanctions? Yes. Tackling sanctions avoidance? Clearly. Real solidarity? Absolutely, and we urge the Council to be ambitious. There must be consequences for Russian war crimes in Europe.

Dear colleagues, one year from now, I'm confident the political centre will prevail. I know that win Renew Europe will be there to build a pro-European majority in this House, but we have to be realistic. Calling the populists and extremists out for what they are is not enough. Flirting with them or trying to copy their behaviour is even worse. Problems are not solved with words, they are solved with actions.

Let's get to work and show the people that democracy, compromise, pragmatism and hard work is still the best guarantee for our common future together...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, yes, it is true, a lot of people are seeking asylum in the European Union right now. They have names, they have stories, and they have hope to find shelter in the European Union. And yes, the current the current asylum system in the European Union is dysfunctional and needs reform. I think almost everybody agrees on that. And yes, finding political agreement in the context of a mostly toxic debate that is driven by fears rather than facts is very difficult.

But colleagues, right now, the whole story that still far too many politicians are selling to people in Europe about migration and asylum is simply not working. And that story is tougher rules, less refugees, more walls, less refugees, more fences, less refugees. I get that this is an easy sell and that a lot of politicians find it easier not to get into the difficult, complex reality of things. But these lines are simply wrong and there will be no breakthroughs, no improvements of the situation, but only frustration and more hardship at our external borders.

Right now, there are a number of reasons why the number of refugees in the European Union is high. Reason number one: Vladimir Putin, and I'm not even talking about Ukraine because Ukraine was not the first country where Putin's bombs led to millions of people having to flee. And if we don't stand up to him, colleagues, it will not be the last.

Reason number two: climate change. The number of climate refugees will increase the more extreme the impact of climate change will become. So instead of falling back into climate denial, let us take the necessary steps of mitigation and adaptation now, because now is the time we have to act.

Reason number three: autocrats that are waging wars against their neighbours and their own citizens, torturing them, imprisoning them, executing them just because they want to live in freedom. Instead of making deals with these autocrats, we should actually support the people in the streets who are fighting for democracy.

The fundamental right to asylum is not only a right but a lesson from our own history. Let us not gamble it away on fake simplistic promises that might work in the next election campaign, but not in the long run. But let us fight and also struggle with the position that the Council has found now for a real, sustainable solution that combines humanity and order. This Parliament, as a beacon of peace and human rights, owes the world at least that.

But let us also talk about crucial decision making that is ongoing on the Green Deal, and especially let us talk about finding compromise with the EPP, who have recently walked out of the democratic negotiation of a crucial piece of legislation, the Nature Restoration Law. This piece of legislation is not only important to meet the Paris goals and to fight against biodiversity loss. Even if you don't care about any of that, it is crucial to act now in order to keep up our economic competitiveness in the future. Because farmers need healthy soils, they need pollinators, they need clean water. Agriculture needs nature. That is why restoring nature is a precondition for a sustainable economic prosperity and for food security.

And if you think it is a Green co-chair who is saying this, don't listen to me, listen to big corporations that have recently intervened in the debate. They say with these actions, like the Nature Restoration Law, the European Union would create a level playing field for all businesses in Europe and ensure forward-thinking companies are rewarded for their actions to hold and reverse nature loss. The EU would become a more competitive, resilient and sustainable economy. This law is about nature ... *(President interrupted speaker)* ... in the future and the EU ... *(President interrupted speaker)* ... EPP should come back to the negotiation table.

Nicola Procaccini, a nome del gruppo ECR. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il prossimo Consiglio europeo si celebrerà ad un anno dalle elezioni. Non è ancora il momento dei bilanci, arriverà. Adesso pensiamo al tempo che rimane, alla definizione di una linea politica che affronti e non sfugga le gravi sfide comuni del nostro tempo.

Penso all'immigrazione, un tema sul quale l'Unione europea ha sprecato troppi anni inseguendo un'ideologia chiamata *No Borders*, impregnata di ambiguità e veterointernazionalismo. Certamente l'ultima riunione dei ministri in Lussemburgo rappresenta un primo passo sulla strada giusta, ma è solo il primo passo e la strada è ancora lunga.

Per noi conservatori europei è fondamentale ribadire il concetto che in Europa si entra solamente in maniera sicura e legale, riconoscendo il diritto di asilo soltanto a chi realmente fugge da guerre e persecuzioni. Lavorare sulla dimensione esterna, cioè sui paesi di origine e transito dei migranti, è cruciale per governare e non subire il fenomeno migratorio, delegandolo ai trafficanti di esseri umani e alle ONG immigrazioniste, come è accaduto finora.

Naturalmente non c'è solo questo tema. Come ECR invitiamo il Consiglio europeo a ricercare un'autonomia strategica aperta, soprattutto in materia di difesa e indipendenza energetica. Per questo accogliamo positivamente lo strumento anticoercizione che dovrebbe consentirci di difendere meglio le aziende europee dalle pratiche commerciali violente e scorrette che talvolta vengono messe in pratica da regimi senza scrupoli come quello cinese.

Infine, dobbiamo essere consapevoli della crisi demografica in atto, aiutando gli Stati europei a promuovere politiche in favore della natalità accompagnate da politiche sociali e sanitarie adeguate. Le risorse sono scarse, è vero, ma quante ne stiamo sprecando inseguendo un ambientalismo radicale che non aiuta l'ambiente, men che meno gli esseri umani che vi abitano dentro.

Marco Zanni, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, tre punti fondamentali su cui ci aspettiamo, in questo Consiglio, risposte concrete dalle istituzioni europee.

Il primo riguarda l'accordo che definirei storico sul tema dell'immigrazione raggiunto in Consiglio, che rappresenta però solo un piccolo passo, finalmente nella direzione giusta, di un processo che sarà più lungo e si deve concentrare oggi molto di più sulla dimensione esterna. Meno partenze vuol dire meno arrivi, vuol dire meno morti in mare, vuol dire più sicurezza per i nostri cittadini, vuol dire fare quello che fa uno Stato civile e uno Stato che rispetta lo Stato di diritto.

Il secondo grande tema è quello della transizione industriale e mi fa piacere che, dopo quattro anni di propaganda ideologica, finalmente tanti in quest'Aula si stanno svegliando – è vero, a un anno dalle elezioni – e stanno capendo quanto sia folle l'ideologia *green* portata avanti dalle istituzioni europee e soprattutto da una maggioranza in questo Parlamento che ha fallito.

I voti di queste settimane sono la dimostrazione che ci può essere una maggioranza in quest'Aula, pragmatica, che porta avanti in maniera pragmatica una transizione verde, che guarda sì al miglioramento dell'ambiente ma anche alle necessità di un'evoluzione economica e industriale contro l'ideologia di chi vuole riportare l'Europa al Medioevo.

L'ultimo punto riguarda l'economia. Ci avviamo verso una stagione di minor crescita o addirittura di stagnazione ed è importante che le politiche dell'Unione europea su questo non siano politiche procicliche – mi riferisco alla revisione del Patto di stabilità e crescita e all'approccio della Banca centrale europea – ma siano politiche di supporto ai cittadini e alle imprese in un momento difficile in cui abbiamo bisogno davvero che vengano iniettati soldi nell'economia per evitare un disastro e per evitare errori del passato che tutti abbiamo riconosciuto.

Martin Schirdewan, im Namen der Fraktion *The Left*. – Herr Präsident! Wenn man sich hier den menschenverachtenden Unsinn der Rechten anhören muss, dann kann einem schon ziemlich übel werden. Aber so richtig schlecht wird einem erst dann, wenn man weiß, dass die europäischen Regierungen dieses Verachten gegenüber Menschen in Not auch noch in Politik umsetzen wollen und sich vor der extremen Rechten und ihrem Fremdenhass in den Staub werfen.

Noch übler wird es, wenn sich dann hier einige von den Regierungsparteien – liebe Terry, auch du – hinstellen und ihr dann so tun, als hättet ihr mit diesem Angriff auf das Asylrecht so gar nichts zu tun. Von Solidarität reden, aber Entsolidarisierung vorantreiben – das ist schon ziemliche Heuchelei.

Nach den fürchterlichen Bildern aus Moria hieß es hier in diesem Haus noch vereint: „Nie wieder Moria.“ Doch jetzt sollen an den Außengrenzen der EU ganz viele neue Morias entstehen. Das Gemeinsame Europäische Asylsystem schafft de facto das Recht auf Asyl ab und ist ein Frontalangriff auf Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Menschenrechte: Schnellverfahren unter haftähnlichen Bedingungen, die auch für Kinder gelten sollen – ich kann mich noch genau daran erinnern, wie groß der Aufschrei in der Europäischen Union war, als Donald Trump veranlasst hat, dass Kinder an der Grenze zwischen Mexiko und den USA eingesperrt und in Lager gesperrt werden. Und jetzt? Jetzt plant die Europäische Union genau das Gleiche, auch mit der Zustimmung Deutschlands. Und die Ampelregierung – SPD, FDP und Grüne – betreibt genau dieselbe Politik.

Da hilft es auch nichts, vor dem Problem die Augen zu verschließen und den Kopf in den Sand zu stecken, indem man die Schutzsuchenden zukünftig einfach in andere Staaten wie Tunesien abschiebt und denen dann natürlich auch noch einen Haufen Geld dafür überweist, dass sie die Probleme lösen. Diese Deals sind schmutzig und machen die EU erpressbar. Wer ein wahres Interesse daran hat, den Menschen zu helfen, beendet die falsche Handelspolitik und die anhaltende Zerstörung des Klimas und lässt nicht zu, dass Rüstungskonzerne fürstlich daran verdienen, dass ihre Waffen in Krisen- und Kriegsregionen zum Einsatz kommen.

Wenigstens mit einer Aussage war die zuständige Kommissarin Johansson, und damit auch die Kommission, ja ehrlich. Es geht ihr einzig und allein darum, die Anzahl der Asylsuchenden zu reduzieren. Es geht ihr nicht darum, ein solidarischeres Asylsystem zu schaffen, Menschenrechte zu schützen und die Mitgliedstaaten und aufnahmewillige Kommunen zu entlasten. Diese Asylreform ist die reinste Bankrotterklärung europäischer Politik.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Mr President, if you're worried about our borders, you need to pay more attention to Morocco and Spain. Last week, two Spanish lawyers from the International Commission of Jurists were prevented by Moroccan authorities to enter Western Sahara to assess the human rights situation in that occupied territory. The Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs had no problem with it. No wonder – this is only one more Moroccan human rights violation with the Spanish seal of approval.

Moroccan spying on Spanish politicians by means of Pegasus has been widely reported, and it seems effective. Since Pedro Sánchez – this beacon of progressive policies, soon to be the President of the Council – took office, we have seen minors mistreated at the borders, forced returns, people assassinated in cold blood for trying to escape to Melilla, and, in a surprising historical reverse, Spain yielding to Morocco's illegal claims over the Sahara. Is this all the result of blackmail from Morocco, thanks to information obtained through Pegasus? Who knows? What we know is that all of this is inconsistent by a mile with anything pertaining to our European values and laws.

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Mr President, Vice-President, Minister, Europe needs migration policy that works, where we have control of the external border, where we can reduce irregular migration, where we can cooperate more with third countries, but also where we cooperate more within the European Union. Only then can we also manage to provide protection to those in need.

We need to move away from the order where only a few Member States have to bear the entire burden. President, we now have a strong majority in this House to move forward with negotiations on the migration pact. And thanks to the leadership of the Swedish presidency, we now also have a strong majority in the Council to move forward. This is historic. It is an historic opportunity, finally, for Europe to create an achieve a migration policy that could work.

And I want to be clear from the European Parliament that for us, the adoption of the whole migration pact is crucial. Every part of this legislation is needed. And I also want to be clear from the EPP Group to all citizens and to all our colleagues in this House, we will be constructive, because there is no time to lose to achieve this. And I also want to be clear to the Council that we will also be constructive with you, because we finally now see an achievement and an historic opportunity and we will not waste it. Europe needs a migration policy that works.

Elisabetta Gualmini (S&D). – Mr President, dear Minister, dear Commissioner, let us give the state. What is the state? So having unblocked the Migration Pact is a positive fact. But we are only at the beginning and we really hope to improve the text.

First, the obsession with repatriations everywhere. It seems that the most important thing is to send the migrants back, to push them back as if they were parcel post packages, even in countries of transit, when we know very well that it is not easy at all to make reliable deals with those states. So this risks to be a bluff.

Second, the idea of outsourcing, again by giving money migration policies to external states. Tunisia, this time, an authoritarian state with an autocratic president who arrests a journalists, who represses the opposition, who carries out violent persecutions of black Africans. This is simply nonsense.

It is clear that we cannot welcome everyone and for this reason we need the mandatory solidarity among Member States, not voluntary relocation or EUR 20 000 for migrants, which is pretty disgusting. Luckily, the money will go to an outside fund. So let us start the negotiations with responsibility and pragmatism. Let us hope to improve the text.

Nicola Danti (Renew). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Ministra, signor Vicepresidente, il prossimo Consiglio europeo sarà una tappa fondamentale per le sfide che l'Europa ha davanti. Ucraina, clima, Cina, riforma della governance economica sono alcuni dei temi imprescindibili della nostra agenda.

Sul tema migrazioni, dopo l'ultimo Consiglio «Affari interni» vediamo finalmente concretizzarsi un accordo che riconosce la necessità di trovare una convergenza europea, ma che lascia ancora irrisolti troppi nodi. Ancora una volta, il dibattito così importante per l'Italia e per i paesi del Mediterraneo si è scontrato contro il muro dell'opposizione e dei governi politicamente affini a quello italiano. Manca un tassello importante, che è quello della previsione di canali legali di immigrazione sui quali serve un ulteriore sforzo, ricordando che i problemi è meglio gestirli che subirli.

Per questo, nell'aprire i negoziati con il Parlamento, ci aspettiamo dal Consiglio un messaggio più chiaro, così come ci auguriamo che si affrontino in modo più sistematico le relazioni con il continente africano. Le visite di qualche capo di governo possono aiutare a rimandare le emergenze, ma non servono ad affrontare i problemi in modo compiuto con la strategia di cooperazione che sappia guardare al lungo periodo.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the Council's recently agreed position on migration and asylum is worrying to say the least. It shows a bias towards the most narrow-minded attitudes regarding asylum and migration. The Council's general approach would significantly lower protection standards for people arriving at EU borders. It would normalise the detention of migrants in close facilities at external borders for months, including families with children.

The much-needed solidarity between Member States translates now into the possibility of paying for not relocating – that is, for not assuming responsibility. The cost of looking away is set at EUR 20 000 – money that can also go to third countries so that they can, and I mean it ironically, do us the favour of stopping migrants and asylum seekers on their own.

Fortress Europe sees its foundations reinforced, while European solidarity faces a resounding failure. In the coming weeks and months, we will need to defend the agreements of this Parliament. They still fall short, but they are far closer to our fundamental values than those coming from the Council.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Herr talman! Fru minister, kollegor! Rådet kom förra veckan överens om en kompromiss om migrationspakten, en kompromiss som hängde på en väldigt, väldigt skör tråd. Rådet pläderar bland annat för snabbavvisningar av migranter som kommer från länder utan krigstillstånd, utan hot mot deras liv, att migranter utan asylskäl ska kunna deporteras till säkra transitländer och att migrantkvoter dikterade av Bryssel är någonting som man helst inte vill se.

När det gäller mitt eget land, Sverige, har vi nyligen haft en masskjutning som till och med vänsterliberala kulturskribenter förknippar med migrationen. Då kan inte Europaparlamentet sitta i elfenbenstornet och tala om "rädslans narrativ" – när tonåringar i Sverige undrar: "Är det min tur nästa gång? Ska du låsa in mig hemma nu, pappa?" Det är väldigt lätt att göra det, som nyliberaler, ni gröna. Går ni in med den attityden i förhandlingarna med rådet kan jag lova er: Det kommer inte att bli någon migrationspakt!

Jean-Paul Garraud (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, dans le concert eurobéat que j'entends ici, ma voix sera totalement dissonante. L'accord trouvé par le Conseil de l'Union européenne est loin de faire l'unanimité, puisque deux pays résistent à l'idéologie immigrationniste de Bruxelles et quatre autres se sont abstenus. Il fallait être courageux pour s'opposer à cette idéologie, car les sanctions peuvent être lourdes de conséquences, surtout au niveau financier. Il fallait l'être encore davantage pour proposer de mettre en place une coalition d'opposition contre ce pacte. Nous saluons et soutenons avec force cette initiative polonaise.

Pendant ce temps, la France approuvait des deux mains cet accord, le jour même de la terrible attaque d'Annecy, où un Syrien qui n'avait rien à faire en France poignardait plusieurs très jeunes enfants. L'horreur absolue. Le ministre français Darmanin, pourtant chargé de protéger les Français, pousse à la répartition des migrants partout sur le territoire français. En la matière, l'Union européenne ainsi que M. Macron et son gouvernement veulent imposer une politique migratoire dont nos peuples ne veulent pas et ils veulent le faire avant les échéances électorales de 2024. Nous ferons tout pour nous opposer à ce funeste projet et, dès que nous serons au pouvoir, nous déclencherons un référendum sur l'immigration. D'abord et avant tout, la parole au peuple.

Sira Rego (The Left). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, por más que lo pienso, no entiendo qué le aporta a la Comisión Europea la foto con Meloni en Túnez. Créanme, sería un error pensar que recortar derechos a las personas migrantes no va con nosotros porque, en el momento en el que se cuestionan los derechos humanos de un solo colectivo, estamos todos y todas en riesgo. Es decir, se empieza con los derechos de las personas migrantes, se sigue con las mujeres, las personas LGBTI y se continúa con la libertad sindical, la de prensa o el control de la justicia. Les suena, ¿no?

Por otra parte, parece que, además de comprarles la idea de que los derechos humanos no son universales e indivisibles, ustedes han decidido entregarle a esta señora el control absoluto de la política migratoria europea. Claro que, teniéndola a ella de jefa, luego les sería mucho más sencillo pactar con Polonia y con Hungría.

El problema es que, con tanto abrazo a la extrema derecha, están normalizando el racismo, el machismo, el negacionismo climático y toda clase de delitos de odio.

Jérôme Rivière (NI). – Monsieur le Président, les débats choisis par la majorité avant la réunion du Conseil entonnent la même lancinante rengaine. Si, doucement, face à la colère grandissante des peuples, vous condescendez à parler d'immigration, cela reste toujours l'occasion de mieux la justifier et d'imaginer des méthodes de répartition contraignantes et brutales des migrants partout sur notre territoire, qui pourtant refuse cette submersion.

Autre obsession: le refus de reconnaître aux peuples européens le choix des politiques qu'ils souhaitent voir appliquer dans leurs pays, dès qu'ils refusent la disparition de leur nation. Hongrie et Pologne sont sans cesse dans vos pensées maniaques. Non, l'état de droit n'est pas plus menacé en Pologne qu'en Hongrie. Balayez devant nos propres institutions: corrompues, elles sont loin d'être exemplaires.

Enfin, vos ingérences dans les affaires des États membres et vos désirs de normes toujours plus contraignantes, au nom d'une idéologie écologiste dogmatique, mettent en péril des pans entiers de l'activité économique et agricole de pays membres. Heureusement, à l'image de ce que Silvio Berlusconi avait entamé en Italie, le refus de vos idéologies par les peuples prépare pour l'année prochaine le grand retour des droites conservatrices en Europe.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, tenemos grandes retos y desafíos europeos por delante, como la unidad por la libertad en Ucrania, la consecución de una política económica de crecimiento con buena ejecución de los fondos NextGenerationEU y la gestión de la crisis migratoria.

Pero, si queremos trabajar por una Europa que defienda también la igualdad, los sectores económicos y el empleo, el fortalecimiento institucional y la lucha contra la corrupción, debemos trabajar también con nuestros Estados miembros. Porque, mientras aquí hablamos de proteger a las mujeres, en España se han rebajado más de 100 penas a agresores sexuales por una ley del Gobierno socialista. Mientras nuestros agricultores hacen malabares para sobrevivir económicamente, aquí la izquierda criminaliza su trabajo y perjudica a sus productos. Mientras nuestras familias sufren la inflación y la subida de la cesta de la compra, no llegan los fondos NextGenerationEU a la economía real. Mientras aquí pedimos no relajar la lucha contra la corrupción, en España se rebaja la pena del delito que la persigue porque los socios del Gobierno lo han pedido. Mientras aquí se defiende que se recuerde la memoria de las víctimas del terrorismo, en España el Gobierno pacta con los que han llevado en sus listas a etarras condenados. Y, mientras aquí se pide que la Presidencia rotatoria sea de todo el país, de toda España, el presidente del Gobierno se niega a comunicarle al líder de la

oposición las principales líneas de trabajo.

Esta manera de hacer política debe cambiar. Hay que dar paso a la responsabilidad, al sentido de Estado y a defender siempre a Europa en todos los rincones de Europa y, por tanto, también en España.

Marek Belka (S&D). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, most of you have been speaking about the Migration Pact. No surprise. However, in order for deep European reforms to be implemented, our citizens need to have confidence in the European project. And the biggest problem for them now is probably the economy. I call on the council to make progress on the reform of the Stability and Growth Pact. We need to find the right balance between flexibility for the southern countries and more assurance for the so-called frugals. We need more ideas how to cooperate with the ECB in order not to fall into stagflation or austerity policy. At the same time, I believe that one of the worst things that might happen to the EU is divergence in gross inflation and indebtedness. It might lead to a deepening of nationalist and Eurosceptic tendencies, bringing us a collapse of the European project as we know it. Hence, if the economy brought EU countries together in the beginning, it would be irresponsible for us and the Council to ignore the topic in the short and long term.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, met een jaar te gaan tot de Europese verkiezingen zegt twee derde van de Europeanen naar de stembus te zullen gaan. Dat is meer dan vijf jaar geleden.

We hebben vastgesteld dat de EU als relevant wordt gezien, maar dat burgers in veel lidstaten evenwel voornemens zijn anti-EU te stemmen. Er moeten op deze top daarom echte doorbraken worden gemaakt om de burgers ervan te overtuigen dat de EU ertoe doet. Zo verwacht ik een streng elfde sanctiepakket tegen het agressieve Rusland, dat niet alleen alle namen, maar tevens diamanten omvat.

Voorts moeten we een nieuwe strategie vaststellen ten aanzien van het dominante China. We moeten een defensie-unie en een Europees leger tot stand brengen.

Ten slotte moeten we het migratiepact afronden. Mensen verwachten immers antwoorden. Laten we daarbij ook kinderen beschermen die op de vlucht zijn, die niet uitdrukkelijk in het migratiepact worden genoemd.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Council, Commissioner, preventing new Morias and push backs and ensuring solidarity, that is how the Commission presented the pact proposals. But look now at the Council agreement. No shared responsibility, but the following message to the border countries: 'Detain asylum seekers at your borders, after a poor procedure, send them to any country willing to take them for a nice amount of money. And you may call that country a safe third country'. This is why Italy said yes. And why von der Leyen promised EUR 1 billion to Tunisia, a country where people are fleeing violence and persecution? Selling responsibility is the new norm inside and outside the EU. And after the sale, why care for people's right to protection, dignity and life? Because, hey, we sold that, didn't we? I urge this House to remind the Council that human rights cannot be paid off. And to firmly reject this toxic deal and to finally take common responsibility.

Patryk Jaki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Otóż kwestionuję cały ten pakt migracyjny. We wszystkich oficjalnych rezolucjach, oświadczeniach piszecie, że przyjmowanie migrantów jest świetne, że ta polityka wzbogaca. Tak? To dłaczego w takim razie chcecie się ich teraz pozbyć, tych wspaniałych ludzi, i wcisnąć ich krajom, które tego wcale nie chcą?

Odpowiedź jest prosta: ponieważ kłamiecie w tej sprawie od rana do wieczora. Wiecie, że to wcale nie jest nic wspaniałego? Ale więcej gwałtów, przestępstw, wydatków na bezpieczeństwo, większe bezrobocie.

Mówicie o prawach człowieka – ponadto słyszymy. A chcecie siłą wywozić ludzi, np. z Niemiec, i przewozić ich do Polski, gdzie oni wcale nie chcą być. I my mamy budować dla nich jakieś więzienia, żeby oni z powrotem nie uciekli do Niemiec. I to są te prawa człowieka – trzymanie ludzi siłą wbrew ich woli?

Dodatkowo, jak Polska nie przyjmie migranta, kaźecie płaćić około 100 tysięcy złotych na kaźdego imigranta z Afryki, a na prawdziwych uchodźców z Ukrainy zapłaćićie Polsce około 100 euro. To jakim cudem wyceniłicie Ukraińców, prawdziwych uchodźców wojennych, mniej od migrantów z Afryki? Przecież co to jest jak nie rasizm? Apeluje o opamiętanie.

IN THE CHAIR: MARC ANGEL

Vice-President

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Herr Präsident! Der Ministerrat hat sich auf einen neuen EU-Migrationspakt geeinigt. Mit welchem Ergebnis? Europa braucht strenge Obergrenzen und externe Aufnahmezentren.

Doch der Rat beschließt Mindestquoten für alle Mitgliedstaaten und Highspeed-Verteilungszentren in der EU. Wir brauchen klare, verschärfte Regeln. Doch der Pakt beschleunigt Verfahren und schafft viele Ausnahmen, die jede Prüfung unmöglich machen.

Wir brauchen Aufnahmestopps für illegale Migranten. Stattdessen wird der Begriff „illegale Migration“ abgeschafft. Dieser Pakt erleichtert weder Abschiebungen noch Remigration, sondern lädt die gesamte Welt nach Europa ein. Denn aufgenommen wird künftig jeder Klimaflüchtling, dem das Wetter daheim nicht gefällt. Sie bringen uns Dutzende Millionen Kostgänger. Nach drei nordeuropäischen Studien kostet uns jeder davon lebenslang 700 000 Euro.

Ihre Migrationspläne sind genauso fantastisch wie Ihre Klimarettung. Denn Ihnen fehlt jeder Bezug zur Wirklichkeit und dafür, was sie bewirken. Sie holen die Dritte Welt. Wir werden zur Dritten Welt.

Kinga Gál (NI). – Elnök Úr! Az Európai Tanács már világosan megfogalmazta két ízben, hogy a migrációt érintő kérdésekben csak konszenzussal lehet dönteni. Ehhez képest a belügyminiszterek múlt heti ülésén minősített többséggel, puccsszerűen nyomták át a migrációs csomagot. Ennek a súlyos kérdésnek feltétlenül szerepelnie kell a következő tanács napirendjén. Az elfogadott csomag tartalmazza a kötelező kvóta szerinti elosztást, amit újra meghívóként értelmeznek majd illegális bevándorlók milliói.

Illegális migránsokat befogadni nem akaró tagállamokra pedig pénzbüntetést rónának ki a szolidaritás jegyében. Ez a csomag így nem jelent megoldást az illegális migráció megállítására, vagy a jogtalanul érkezettek visszafordítására. Arra lenne végre szükség, hogy az Unió kimondja: az illegális migrációt meg kell állítani, meg kell erősíteni és anyagilag támogatni a külső határok védelmét. Az Unió megint nem tanul saját hibáiból. Mindeközben minden jel arra utal, hogy az orosz agresszió miatt kiobbant háború eszkalálódik. A további pusztítás elkerülése, emberéletek megmentése végett fegyverszünetre lenne szükség, hogy béketárgyalások kezdődhessenek, hogy elvezessenek a tartós békéhez.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, first on migration: I highly value the ability of the ministers to find the agreement on solidarity that is respecting the will of as many Member States as possible. I guess this is a good result, but obviously it is not the end. We still have to work on this issue. We have to work on the return policy. We have to work on making sure that people that can stay quickly get the right to stay. But I hope that the spirit of cooperation and solidarity will stay.

Secondly, we must keep momentum on our response to the Russian aggression in Ukraine, especially, I guess, on three points. The first is to keep clear evidence of the crimes and the damages caused by Russia. The second, as soon as possible, is to distribute at least part of the seized funds to Ukraine to cover at least some costs of the Russian aggression. And last but not least, we must keep focusing on the third countries that may be overcoming the sanctions and may be providing Russia with military support.

Last, not least, and it was already mentioned here, we should focus more on competitiveness. I guess the net-zero industry is a good step, but I wonder if we should not take a more comprehensive approach of at looking how far we are, where we are, to make sure that Europe and its economies will stay competitive or will enhance its competition on the global economy.

Pedro Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Ministra, Senhor Vice-Presidente, o Conselho debaterá, como nos foi dito, a Política de Migrações. Precisamos de avanços rápidos nesta Política de Migrações.

Como sempre tem dito a Comissária Ylva Johansson, as migrações são algo de normal na história da Europa, têm é de ser geridas. E podemos estar a um passo de acabar com um estigma de 20 anos que tem perpassado as políticas europeias.

O continente europeu está envelhecido, os migrantes serão parte essencial do nosso processo de desenvolvimento. Precisamos de migrações reguladas, mas também de uma política de refugiados solidária, humana e, Senhores do Partido Popular Europeu, o que não está no Pacto de Migrações é o financiamento europeu de vedações ou muros, o que é certamente uma grande desilusão para a direita e para a extrema-direita europeia.

Mas, Senhor Vice-Presidente Šeřčovič, sobre os passos recentes, existe uma preocupação: a externalização da política migratória para um autocrata na Tunísia é muito preocupante.

O Conselho debaterá, mas a Comissão não escapará ao escrutínio deste Parlamento.

Que regras e condicionalidades para garantir direitos humanos na Política de Migrações? Isso é algo que este Parlamento perguntará e querará esclarecimentos da Comissão.

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, cher Maroš Šeřčovič, Madame la Ministre, chère Jessica Roswall, la semaine dernière, les États ont fait preuve d'une unité forte en adoptant leur position sur les textes phares du pacte européen sur la migration et l'asile. C'est une étape décisive, qui n'aurait pu voir le jour sans la détermination des présidences française, tchèque et suédoise. Merci à eux.

Ainsi, nous défendons une Europe qui maîtrise ses frontières extérieures, avec notamment Frontex; une Europe solidaire vis-à-vis des pays sous pression migratoire; une Europe efficace, qui assure un traitement rapide des demandes d'asile; et une Europe des valeurs, qui respecte pleinement les personnes et le droit à la protection internationale.

Nos citoyens attendent que l'Union européenne et les États répondent aux défis migratoires collectifs en Européens. Mesdames et Messieurs les Chefs d'État, au Parlement européen, nous sommes déterminés à faire aboutir le Pacte européen sur la migration et l'asile début 2024, avant les élections européennes. Nous comptons sur vous pour faire de même, ensemble.

Gerolf Annemans (ID). – Voorzitter, we spreken over de aankomende bijeenkomst van de Europese Raad. Ik citeer uit uw titel: "in het licht van de vooruitgang die onlangs is geboekt met betrekking tot de sluiting van het migratiepact". Het gebruik van het begrip "vooruitgang" is, naar mijn oordeel en naar het oordeel van mijn partij, het Vlaams Belang, een hogere vorm van cynisme te noemen.

Wellicht denkt u in uw droomwereld, deze bubbel van groen-linkse zelfgenoegzaamheid, vooruitgang te boeken in de richting van uw einddoel: een hemel van een migratiepact dat de grenzen onbeperkt openhoudt voor de bevolkingsaanwas uit de hele wereld, terwijl de legale en illegale instroom zonder onderscheid over het hele continent wordt uitgesmeerd en lidstaten die dit spel niet meespelen, worden bestraft. U beseft echter niet dat u niet meer spreekt namens een steeds groter wordende groep mensen uit alle lidstaten die dit spel zo grondig beu is dat honderdduizenden van hen zich van het Europees Parlement afkeren, omdat ze vinden dat u ons continent in sneltempo cultureel laat wegzakken onder migratie. Dit is in hun ogen geen vooruitgang, maar een achteruitgang zonder weerga in onze geschiedenis.

Wij spreken namens deze grote groep en zullen de kiezers vragen hierover een oordeel te vellen.

Sabrina Pignedoli (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo le minacce sull'uso delle armi nucleari, dopo decine di migliaia di morti e feriti, dopo le stragi e i saccheggi subiti dalla popolazione ucraina, ieri il *Wall Street Journal* ha rivelato che gli Stati Uniti, come già la Gran Bretagna, sono pronti a fornire all'Ucraina armi all'uranio impoverito e Putin ha risposto che allora le useranno anche loro.

Nel 2008 quest'Aula ha approvato una risoluzione che chiedeva il divieto globale dell'uso di queste armi pericolosissime per la salute e l'ambiente. Mi chiedo cosa sia cambiato da allora. Mi chiedo perché tutte quelle forze politiche che fino a pochi anni fa facevano battaglie condivisibili, oggi le rinnegano, anzi alimentano una guerra dannosa per tutta l'Europa.

Presidente, non è mai troppo tardi per cambiare la direzione di questo conflitto. Non arrendiamoci a chi getta benzina sull'odio fra i popoli, magari perché è al servizio di qualche lobby di armi. L'Unione europea ha la pace nel suo DNA. Il prossimo Consiglio europeo lanci dunque un messaggio di pace e di speranza e imponga il dialogo ai due contendenti.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, kolegice i kolege, kontinuirani porast ilegalnih prelazaka, nepojmljivi brojevi imigranata i krijumčara i sve snažniji migracijski pritisak na Mediteran, na prostor gdje se stvarala, gdje je nastajala zapadna civilizacija, još jednom zvuči na uzbunu, još jednom ukazuje na alarmantnost situacije na našim zajedničkim vanjskim granicama. Europa još uvijek nema kontrolu.

Europa još uvijek nema mehanizme i nema načine za zaustaviti stvaranje novih, i novih, migracijskih valova. Sustav azila s masovnim zloupotrebama je potpuno disfunkcionalan, a države bliže granici, kao što su Italija, Grčka, Hrvatska, podnose neproporcionalni dio tereta. Ono što je, međutim, jasno, pa i iz ove rasprave, je da je politika stihijskih migracija propala. Dosadašnji pristup jednostavno ne može biti održivi način upravljanja migracijama i to danas razumije, to danas prihvaća većina država članica, jer shvaćaju da je potrebno pronaći dogovor i između država članica, ali pronaći dogovor i ovdje u Europskom parlamentu.

Zato je ohrabrujući korak prošlotjedni dogovor ministara unutarnjih poslova, koji treba pozdraviti, ključni zakonski prijedlozi koji će biti presudni jer je ključno, u konačnici, pronaći taj balans između odgovornosti i solidarnosti. Mislim da to s ovim prijedlogom možemo napraviti i nadam se da će se to dogoditi prije izbora.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Vizepräsident der Kommission Šeřčovič und auch Frau Roswall! Ich möchte mich noch mal bei Ihnen bedanken für Ihre Präsenz hier. Wir wissen das zu schätzen im Hause. Das ist nicht immer so.

Wenn ich hier den Reden aber zuhöre, die ich in diesem Haus hören muss, dann merkt man doch, dass die rechte Seite hier im Haus seit Jahren den Diskurs verseucht, Lügen verbreitet, Ressentiments, Angst schürt und Abschottung propagiert. Und dann wundert man sich, wenn sich das dann auch ein Stück im Ratsmandat widerspiegelt und sich auf der anderen Seite dann trotzdem Polen und Ungarn die Hände reinwaschen, weil sie dem gar nicht zugestimmt haben.

Ich möchte noch einmal unterstreichen, dass dieses Haus einen breiten Konsens hat, dass wir ein ausgewogenes Migrationspaket unterstützen wollen. Aber ich möchte noch mal unterstreichen: Menschenwürde und Völkerrecht muss Rechnung getragen werden. Das ist etwas, was uns die Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Zukunftskonferenz noch einmal ins Stammbuch geschrieben haben.

Deshalb mein Appell an den Rat, auch hier tatsächlich in die Verhandlungen zu gehen, mit dem Parlament auf dieser Basis einen guten, einen viel besseren Kompromiss zu finden.

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

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Wymieniła Pani Polskę jako ten kraj, który niby umywa ręce od uchodźców. Chciałbym zapytać, czy ma Pani świadomość, że w czasie wojny w Ukrainie do Polski napłynęło 12 i pół miliona uchodźców z Ukrainy – matek i dzieci? Czy Pani o tym wie? I bezzelnie Pani zarzuca Polsce odrzucenie problematyki uchodźców. Tak nie jest. Polska i wszyscy Polacy, i nie tylko Polacy, pięknie pomagają matkom i dzieciom z Ukrainy. A Pani nas oskarża o to, że nie chcemy uczestniczyć w polityce migracyjnej. Poprzednio jeszcze w Polsce znaleźli się uchodźcy z Czeczenii - 100 tysięcy Czeczenów. Pani niewiedza prezentowana tutaj w Parlamencie Europejskim po prostu szkodzi Parlamentowi Europejskiemu. Proszę przyjąć do wiadomości, że Polska uczestniczy w problematyce migracyjnej, bo przez Polskę przeszło 12 i pół miliona matek i dzieci z Ukrainy.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Menschenwürde ist unteilbar. Wir haben keine Erste-Klasse-Flüchtlinge oder Zweite-Klasse-Flüchtlinge. Das ist der entscheidende Wert Europas.

Das zweite ist: Polen und Ungarn haben im Rat diesem Kompromiss, den der Rat nach acht Jahren Blockade gefunden hat, nicht zugestimmt. Das sind einfach die Fakten und nichts weiter.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Herr Präsident, Frau Ministerin, Herr Kommissar! Es ist gut, dass sich die Mitgliedsstaaten jetzt geeinigt haben. Das ist ein Zeichen der Handlungsfähigkeit in einer Frage, in der Europa viel zu lange nicht handlungsfähig gewesen ist. Jetzt können wir endlich anfangen mit den Verhandlungen zwischen Rat und Parlament.

Als Freie Demokraten unterstützen wir den Paradigmenwechsel hin zu mehr Ordnung in der Migration und die Einführung von Grenzverfahren, natürlich mit hohen humanitären und rechtsstaatlichen Standards. Neben der Reduzierung der irregulären Migration müssen wir gleichzeitig die Wege der Migration in den Arbeitsmarkt erweitern. Denn wir brauchen Zuwanderung in unseren Arbeitsmarkt, wenn wir den Wohlstand in Europa erhalten wollen. Wir Liberale schlagen dafür einen europäischen Talentpool vor.

Es ist jetzt aber wichtig, dass die Mitgliedstaaten auch eine Position zum Krisenmechanismus finden. Die Regelungen für normale Zeiten sind wichtig, aber entscheidend ist, dass wir als Europäer auch eine Antwort haben für Krisenzeiten. Da müssen die Mitgliedstaaten jetzt nachliefern.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Viele Jahre hat es gedauert, bis endlich am 8. Juni eine Ratseinigung in der Asyl- und Migrationsfrage geschafft wurde.

Für meinen Mitgliedstaat waren die letzten neun Jahre schwierige Zeiten. Denn Österreich gehörte immer zu jenen Ländern, die am meisten von den Flüchtlingsströmen betroffen waren. Und ehrlich gesagt, die europäische Solidarität und Unterstützung hielt sich dabei immer in Grenzen. Asylpolitik bedarf einer europäischen Lösung, und daher ist es wichtig, dass in der EU ein gemeinsames Asylverfahren für alle Mitgliedstaaten eingeführt wird.

Ja, ich bin auch kein Quotenfan. Aber wenn nur wenige Mitgliedstaaten für die Mehrheit der Asylanträge zuständig sind, wie das bisher in Österreich der Fall war, dann wird das auch nicht funktionieren. Eine humanitäre und sichere europäische Migrationspolitik bedarf eines funktionierenden Außengrenzschutzes und schneller Asylverfahren an den Außengrenzen, damit Schleppern endlich die Geschäftsgrundlage entzogen wird und Asylmissbrauch und illegale Migration verhindert wird.

Unglaublich viele Flüchtlinge befinden sich zurzeit auf den Land- und Seerouten bzw. warten in Afrika auf die Ausreise nach Europa. Daher ist es wichtig, dass der Ratseinigung jetzt auch rasch Taten folgen.

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D). – Sur President, ilna snin nappellaw għal mekkaniżmu gust ta' solidarjetà: solidarjetà ma' dawk l-aktar fil-bżonn, solidarjetà ma' ċittadini tagħna u solidarjetà bejn l-Istati Membri.

Wara snin ta' negozjati fil-Kunsill, huwa diżappuntanti illi l-ftehim li ntlahaq il-gimgha li għaddiet ma jilhaqx bilanċ tajjeb bejn ir-responsabbiltajiet u s-solidarjetà. Il-ftehim milhuq fil-Kunsill, ser ikun diffiċli hafna li jiffunzjona bil-volum attwali ta' flussi migratorji lejn l-Unjoni Ewropea. L-impenji konkreti dwar il-qsim tar-responsabbiltà u s-solidarjetà għadhom lura meta mqabbla mal-ambizzjonijiet ta' dan il-Parlament.

Filwaqt li nilqa' l-mekkanizmu ta' solidarjetà obligatorju, nemmen bis-shih li għadha nieqsa mil-livell ta' impenn meh-tieg biex niżguraw li l-bżonnijiet tal-aktar pajjiżi esposti jiġu sodisfatti, speċjalment pajjiżi bħal Malta li huwa tant vulnerabbli minhabba d-daqs u l-partikolaritajiet tiegħu.

Jehtieg li naraw aktar rieda mill-Istati Membri kollha biex nuru solidarjetà, wara kollox dan huwa prinċipju fundamentali stabbilit mit-Trattat tal-istess Unjoni Ewropea.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ενόψει του Συμβουλίου είναι αναγκαίο πλέον να αποφασίσουμε, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι τα κράτη πρώτης υποδοχής αξιώνουν δικαίως αλληλεγγύη στην πράξη, που σε περιόδους κρίσης μπορεί να εκφράζεται με όρους υποχρεωτικής μετεγκατάστασης. Ότι χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα, που φυλάσσουν αποτελεσματικά τα σύνορα της Ευρώπης, πρέπει να αντιμετωπίζονται δίκαια, ότι πρέπει να συμπράττουν όλοι με κάθε τρόπο στους τρόπους φύλαξης και ότι η Τουρκία πρέπει να πιεστεί, ως ασφαλής χώρα και στρατηγικός εταίρος, να τηρεί τους όρους της κοινής δήλωσης του 2016 για τον έλεγχο των διακινητών.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, η κυβέρνηση της χώρας μου, της Ελλάδος, τα τελευταία χρόνια έχει προχωρήσει σε νομοθετικές πρωτοβουλίες και πολιτικές πρακτικές που αντιμετωπίζουν αποτελεσματικά τα θέματα ασύλου και μετανάστευσης, με τον οφειλόμενο σεβασμό στα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα. Όμως αναφερόμαστε σε κοινό ευρωπαϊκό θέμα που αξιώνει ανάληψη ευθύνης από όλα τα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Οι ευρωπαϊκές μας αρχές δεν επιδέχονται εξαιρέσεις.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, Consejo, Comisión, estamos en el año 2023 y pronto hará 14 años que entró en vigor el Tratado de Lisboa, que ordenó que pusieramos en pie no solamente una política común de migración y asilo, sino una legislación común. Y este Parlamento ha trabajado muy duro para cumplir esa promesa con cinco Reglamentos vinculantes para los Estados miembros sobre la base, por fin, de los principios de responsabilidad compartida y solidaridad vinculante.

El último Consejo de Ministros de Justicia e Interior en Luxemburgo supuso un paso adelante en la dirección correcta — un principio de solidaridad vinculante—, bajo la Presidencia sueca y con el liderazgo de España, que asume la Presidencia del 1 de julio. A pesar de las insidias, los ataques incesantes, injustos y, desde luego, poco patrióticos del Partido Popular español, que no pierde ni una ocasión ni un turno de palabra para hablar mal de su país, la Presidencia española puede producir resultados. Y no producirlo en esta legislatura sería un gran fracaso. Pero, para conseguir el éxito, es necesario que el sistema sea europeo en sus valores, en su legislación y en la escala de sus respuestas.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! W polityce największym grzechem jest naiwność. Jeżeli jest tak, że od lat jednak nie potraficie Państwo zatrzymać nielegalnych uchodźców, nie potraficie zaradzić nielegalnym przerzutom, zamiast twardo walczyć z przemytem, walczycie niestety z państwami członkowskimi.

Dlaczego nie konfiskuje się łodzi przemytników, kiedy dokują w portach? Atakujecie kraje członkowskie, które nie podzielają szalonej wizji transformacji społeczeństw. Mówicie o liczbach przymusowych relokacji, ukrywając przepisy o łączeniu rodzin, które to przepisy w kilka lat potrafią wysadzić każdy zdrowy naród nadprogramową imigracją.

Moja ojczyzna, Polska, przyjęła ponad półtora miliona uchodźców, 12 milionów przetoczyło się przez nasze granice. A wy zamiast pomóc, chcecie karać nas dwudziestoma tysiącami euro za nieprzyjęcie migrantów ekonomicznych z Afryki.

Dlatego chcę dzisiaj powiedzieć jasno i wyraźnie, że ta polityka po prostu cieszy przemytników. Jeśli będziecie nas karać, oni będą właśnie przysyłać tych przemytników do Europy.

Özlem Demirel (The Left). – Herr Präsident! Die von den Innenministern gefundene Lösung für das gemeinsame Asylsystem der EU ist keine Lösung, und es verschärft im Kern das Elend. Das bereits jetzt bestehende Falsche wird verstetigt, und mit Solidarität hat dieses System nichts zu tun.

Kolleginnen, weltweit müssen immer mehr Menschen fliehen und ihre Heimat verlassen. Sie müssen es wegen bewaffneter Konflikte, die auch mit Waffen *made in EU* geführt werden. Sie müssen es, weil ihre Lebensgrundlagen zerstört werden, auch von großen Konzernen aus der EU, die ihre Länder ausbeuten, ihre Ressourcen plündern und ihre Märkte mit ihrem Müll vollschwemmen. Sie müssen es, weil ihre Landwirtschaft kaputt ist, weil sie ihre Fischerei nicht mehr betreiben können, weil es auch EU-Quoten gibt, die eben ihre Meere leerfischen.

Die EU ist in der Verantwortung dafür, diesen Menschen natürlich auch eine Zukunftsperspektive zu geben. Ja, Kolleginnen, Flucht ist keine Lösung, aber für viele Menschen scheint es akut die einzige Aussicht zu sein. Deshalb sagen wir ganz klar: Wir verteidigen das Recht auf Asyl, aber wir stellen auch die Ordnung, die Sie geschaffen haben, mit der globalen Ungerechtigkeit infrage. Wir stellen uns der rechten Hetze ...

(Der Präsident unterbricht die Rednerin.)

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señor presidente Marc Angel, aprovecho la ocasión de este debate para dirigirme de nuevo a la ministra Roswall de la Presidencia sueca porque, hace un año, el Consejo Europeo de finales de junio cometió un error que igual ustedes pueden corregir.

Cuando se dio la bienvenida a Ucrania y se la declaró candidata, el presidente Macron se olvidó de su compromiso de avanzar en la profundización política de Europa y propuso la Comunidad Política Europea, y todo el mundo se despidió. Esa era la ocasión, a la vez que se daba esa señal hacia la ampliación, de dar una señal hacia la profundización, es decir, hacia la reforma de los Tratados. Porque evidentemente nadie se puede creer que vamos a ir a un Consejo con 30, 33 o 35 miembros y seguir como hasta ahora, con el derecho de veto y otras cosas que no tienen sentido.

Así que, por favor, ministra Roswall, aproveche la oportunidad de este Consejo Europeo para decir algo muy simple: que la ampliación y la profundización tienen que ir de la mano.

Anna Zalewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Jako podsumowanie trzy nieprawdy i sprostowania do tych nieprawd.

Po pierwsze, nieprawdą jest, że jest porozumienie w sprawie paktu migracyjnego, z prostego powodu, że gdyby było, nie trzeba by było uciekać się do oszustwa traktatowego, dlatego że takie decyzje mają zapadać nie na Radzie Unii Europejskiej, ale w Radzie Europejskiej.

Druga nieprawda – oszukujecie Europejczyków, mówiąc, że mówimy o migracji i uchodźcach. Nie, my mówimy o nielegalnej imigracji, z szacunkiem odnosząc się do migrantów zarobkowych, z szacunkiem przyjmując uchodźców wojennych.

Po trzecie, nieprawdą jest, że chcecie pomagać. Komisja Europejska, Unia Europejska, socjaliści przede wszystkim, chcą zalegalizować nielegalny handel ludźmi i nielegalną imigrację.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, fomos surpreendidos com a ida da presidente da Comissão Europeia à Tunísia propor um acordo em cinco pilares, entre eles o Pilar Migrações.

A Tunísia é um parceiro precioso para a União Europeia? Sim. A União Europeia tem apoiado o percurso democrático desde 2011? Sim. Combater o tráfico de seres humanos na região? Sim. Reforçar as relações com a Tunísia, investindo na estabilidade e prosperidade? Sim, mas é pouco.

Mas propor à Tunísia, hoje, uma parceria operacional de luta contra o tráfico de migrantes e apoiar a Tunísia na gestão das fronteiras? Estamos a falar de pessoas e falar de pessoas é falar de direitos humanos.

Que garantias teve a presidente Von der Leyen em matéria de direitos humanos? Que exigências colocou em matéria de democracia e Estado de direito? Num país onde a democracia se esvaziou, onde não há liberdade sindical (sindicalistas detidos), onde não há liberdade de expressão (oposicionistas e jornalistas detidos), é isso que precisamos de saber: que garantias?

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, I really would like to thank you for this very intense and open and frank debate. I would like to start by expressing my gratitude for your overwhelming support for Ukraine and clear words on war crimes committed by Russia, so clearly expressed by Mr Rangel, Ms García Pérez, Mr Azmani and many others. I also would like to react to the words of Ms Vautmans and Mr Niedermayer about the importance to tackle circumvention of sanctions. I would like to reassure you that we are fully aware of this issue and the European Union Sanctions Envoy, David O'Sullivan is working on this in close cooperation with his colleagues from the US and UK on really a 24/7 basis.

I also would like to reassure many other honourable Members that we will continue also to provide the support for Ukrainian refugees, who received remarkable reception in our Member States. I think that it was the true expression of European solidarity, for which we have to express gratitude to all Member States and to all our citizens who opened their households, municipalities who opened their schools and provided shelter, especially to women and children who are fleeing the horrors of war in Ukraine.

Mr Belka and several other honourable Members referred to the importance of strengthening the competitiveness of our industry and deepening of the single market. And he was also highlighting the importance of external relations with China and the United States and the need also, in this respect, to review the multiannual financial framework. As I was indicating in my introductory remarks, we are working on that. We know that one of the priorities for the review of MFF would be to make sure that we will be able to support financially Ukraine. But of course there will be other priorities which will be reflected in that review and of course we will come and present it in great detail to this House.

Of course, most of the discussion was focused on very important issues linked with migration. Mr Rangel, Mr Schirdewan, Ms Reintke, Ms Strik have been asking very pertinent questions concerning border procedures, what kind of safeguards we are putting in place, how we want to take better care of minors and how we want to avoid a new Moria. And I would like to reassure you that the agreement of the Member States to introduce the Asylum Procedure Regulation and the mandatory border procedure comes with a purpose to quickly assess, at the EU's external border, whether applications are unfounded or inadmissible. The procedure is mandatory for Member States if the applicant is in danger of national security or public order, he or she has misled the authorities with false information or by withholding information, and if the applicant has a nationality with a recognition rate of 20% or below. We want to do it much faster than before, and the total duration of the asylum and return border procedure should not exceed six months.

We are fully aware of your of your comments and insistence that, in order to carry out the border procedures in full respect of human rights of migrants, we need to establish adequate capacity in terms of reception and human resources to examine, at any given moment, an identified number of applications to enforce the return decisions. We are working on this and, at Union level, this adequate capacity is established at the level of 30 000.

Several of you highlighted the importance of Asylum Procedure Regulation, and I would like to reassure all of you that this proposal does not foresee the automatic use of detention. It is always used as a last resort, when necessary and proportionate, on the basis of individual assessment and subject to the judicial review. Especially if it comes to minors: as a rule, minors should not be detained. Again, only under very special circumstances, circumstances which are very precisely described in this proposal.

If you allow me on the on the last point, because it was raised by honourable Members, Mr Marques, Ms Marques, Ms Rego and Ms Strik as well. It concerns the trip of President von der Leyen, which she took together with Prime Minister Rutte and Prime Minister Meloni, to Tunisia. I think we have to look at it as a Team Europe spirit and approach. What was proposed there was a comprehensive package to invest in stability, prosperity, but also to further support Tunisia's journey of democracy. Therefore, if you look at what was proposed to our Tunisian partners, it was not only the support for anti-smuggling operational partnership and better border management, but also investment in the economic development, macro-financial assistance and also investment in trade, which will be done by the European Investment Bank. We also see the opportunities to work with Tunisia in the field of energy and the improvement of peoples-to-peoples contact. So, we want to approach this issue in the comprehensive manner which we believe would have positive impact on all other issues we have been discussing today.

If you allow me to conclude, because my time is up, I really would like to thank you for the fervour, dynamism and in-depth knowledge of this very important issue, which is on the table of the European Union for many, many years. I believe that this energy, this collegial spirit, would allow us to proceed quickly with trilateral negotiations to make sure that all important elements of this package will be improved. I really would like to thank you for this discussion and to thank you for all the compliments which you addressed to my colleague Commissioner Ylva Johansson and the Swedish Presidency and Jessika Roswall for indeed being able to conclude the file which was in the discussion for many, many years, because I believe it opens the opportunity for the rapid conclusion on this very important issue.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Vice-President, I thank you for this debate and for your valuable remarks and contributions. One and a half years ago, very few would have predicted where we would be today. The agenda of the European Council is a reflection of the new geopolitical, political and economic realities that Europe is facing.

I am very grateful for the European unity on the Ukraine policy, which once again has been clearly manifested in this debate here today. As Europeans, supporting the Ukrainians in their efforts is our biggest task and responsibility.

As for the economic agenda, as many of you have underlined, we must boost Europe's long-term competitiveness and increase our productivity. To this end, the European single market is a key asset.

Let me also say on the very important topic of migration: we are heading towards peak season for arrivals along the Mediterranean routes. This will, however tragic, put pressure on Member States. In the first five months of this year, 2023, almost 65 000 irregular arrivals were recorded – two and a half times more than the same period last year. This underlines the importance of the measures that the Commission and the Member States are taking, which the Vice-President mentioned. And as several of you also have said, the recent agreement in the Council is, indeed, historic.

This also underlines the importance of moving forward with the Pact, and the Council will work hard to continue to make progress in the coming week. It's clear from this debate also that we share the same sense of urgency and I thank Parliament for your commitment. Given the importance of the topics on the agenda, there is no doubt that the European Council will be decisive in many respects.

The preparatory work will now continue in the Council. I will share a discussion on the draft conclusions of the General Council on 27 June and, as usual, the President of the European Council will report back to Parliament after the European Council.

To Mr Devesa, who raised a question to me directly, I just want to inform him that next week we are having an informal meeting in the General Affairs Council in Stockholm and we are having a discussion on policy orientation in view of the future enlargement. And I share that is very important that we are ready for the future. With that, I will say thank you for your attention.

President. – Thank you very much, Minister, including for reacting to our colleagues' comments.

The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Chociaż mówimy w tej debacie o przygotowaniach do posiedzenia Rady Europejskiej w dniach 29-30 czerwca, dyskusja toczy się przede wszystkim wokół kwestii migracji. Ale chcielibyśmy bardzo, by dyskusja objęła też podnoszony przez wiele państw członkowskich problem zbyt niskiej liczby wydeń nielegalnych migrantów w UE do państw pochodzenia lub tranzytu. Od dawna oczekujemy też informacji na temat kroków podjętych przez KE w celu realizacji konkluzji z lutego br. na rzecz zwiększenia pomocy ukraińskim uchodźcom wojennym, w tym poprzez adekwatne wsparcie państw członkowskich ponoszących największe koszty ich utrzymania, leczenia i kształcenia.

Straszy się tu Polskę karami finansowymi. Za odmowę przyjęcia jednego migranta – będzie miała płacić około 100 tys. zł. To szokujące, że w tym samym czasie na każdego uchodźcę z Ukrainy Unia zapłaciła Polsce około 100 euro! To dyskryminacja i kpina z Polski. Polska przyjęła około 1,5-2 mln uchodźców po napaści Rosji na Ukrainę. Bez żadnego przymusu. Przymusowa relokacja migrantów jest sprzeczna z traktatami i godzi w suwerenność tak Polski, jak i innych Państw Członkowskich. Dlatego Polska będzie bronić swojej suwerenności. Kwestia relokacji została już negatywnie rozstrzygnięta w 2018 roku. Tym samym podważa się stabilizację decyzji, również tych, które w świetle traktatów powinny być niezmiennie.

Benoît Lutgen (PPE), *par écrit*. – Mesdames, Messieurs, le Conseil européen de juin abordera l'importante question de l'immigration. Je me réjouis que le Conseil ait enfin pu se mettre d'accord sur une position de négociation. Elle permettra de lancer le trilogue.

En outre, le 20 juin prochain, la Commission présentera sa stratégie de sécurité économique. Elle sera discutée lors du Conseil européen, en même temps que nos rapports avec la Chine. Je ne peux que souligner l'importance d'avoir une discussion approfondie des aspects stratégiques de nos relations économiques extérieures. La Chine a une stratégie délibérée d'appropriation de nos industries, de notre propriété intellectuelle et de nos infrastructures stratégiques, comme les ports.

La stratégie de sécurité économique doit comprendre à la fois un contrôle plus approfondi des investissements entrants, permettant à la Commission de bloquer certaines opérations, mais également un contrôle des investissements européens à l'étranger quand ils risquent de transférer certaines technologies essentielles à notre souveraineté ou à notre compétitivité internationale. Certains secteurs chinois comme les trains à grande vitesse sont maintenant nos plus grands concurrents, presque uniquement grâce à l'appropriation de nos technologies par les partenaires locaux de nos investisseurs. Le temps de la défense sans concession de nos intérêts est venu!

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. – Viime viikolla EU-maita vuosia hiertäneessä maahanmuuttopolitiikassa tapahtui läpimurto, kun jäsenmaat pääsivät viimein keskenään sopuun yhteisen turvapaikkapolitiikan muutoksista. Tämä on erittäin tervetullut askel. Nyt trilogissa on syytä edetä nopeasti, sillä tilanne turvapaikanhakijoiden osalta on erittäin kriisiytynyt kovimman paineen alla olevissa maissa. On tärkeää, että kaikki jäsenmaat ovat nyt hyväksyneet sen, että kaikkien pitää ottaa vastuuta turvapaikanhakijoista. Turvapaikanhakuun liittyvien vastuiden on jakauduttava oikeudenmukaisesti jäsenmaiden kesken.

Tämä tarkoittaa, että jäsenmaiden on osallistuttava solidaarisesti vastuun jakamiseen sekä turvapaikanhakijoiden että siirtolaisten vastaanottamisessa. Se ei voi olla vain ulkorajamaiden asia. Lisäksi kanavoimalla maahanmuuttoa laillisia reittejä pitkin voimme torjua salakuljetusta ja ihmiskauppaa sekä varmistaa, että maahanmuuttajat saavat asianmukaiset oikeudet ja turvapaikanhakijat tarvittavaa suojelua. Kaikkein tärkeintä kuitenkin edelleen on kohdistaa apua lähtömaihin ja parantaa alueiden rauhaa ja vakautta sekä ihmisten elinolosuhteita omissa kotimaissaan.

5. Legislación electoral, comisión de investigación y Estado de Derecho en Polonia (debate)

President. – The next item on the agenda is the Council and Commission statements on the electoral law, the investigative committee and the rule of law in Poland(2023/2747(RSP)).

I should like to inform Members that there will be only one round of political group speakers, and therefore there is no catch-the-eye procedure and no blue-cards will be accepted.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, in a democracy, free and fair elections are the cornerstone and must be safeguarded. But the preconditions for democracy do not end there. A democratic society demands free speech, fair conditions for political parties, an active civil society, independent judiciaries and much more.

In short, there is no democracy without fundamental rights and the rule of law. They are elements of a functioning democracy as well as the foundation of the European project. That is why fundamental rights and the rule of law is one of the Swedish presidency's priorities. I am therefore grateful to have been invited to contribute to this debate.

We all know that the EU and the Member States have a shared responsibility to uphold these values. Therefore, the EU institutions must act in accordance with this responsibility. And today's debate on the recent legislation introduced in Poland on the state committee for the examination of Russian influence puts this issue on the agenda.

To have this debate is in line with this responsibility. Russia's war in Ukraine has clearly shown that we must stand up for democratic principles as a clear alternative to authoritarian states that violate international law and human rights. That is one of the reasons that we are taking this so seriously.

At this point in time, it is a natural reaction to review Russian influence. It is a legitimate objective, but it must be done in accordance with the principle of the rule of law. It is for the Commission to regularly monitor the rule of law situation in the Member States, carrying out its analysis and signalling any new developments that, in this view, deserve the attention of the Council.

We have also taken note that the infringement procedures launched by the Commission, and this is the Commission's role as guardian of the Treaties. I am convinced that the Commission will elaborate on this in their work to monitor rule of law situation in the Member States, including the Article 7 procedure.

Finally, I just want to inform, as had already been informed in the Parliament during the last hearing of Poland in the General Affairs Council in May, it was clear that the procedure process under Article 7 will remain on the Council's agenda and the Presidency remains ready to engage with the European Parliament on rule of law issues as is the case with today's debate.

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear Minister and honourable members, thank you for this debate on electoral law and the rule of law situation in Poland. Allow me to start with the new law on the State committee for the examination of Russian interference in the internal security of Poland in the period 2007 to 2022. As I mentioned two weeks ago in plenary, this is a development that the Commission is following with great concern. On 26 May, this law was adopted by the Polish Parliament and has then been signed by the President of the Republic and entered into force. The new law creates a special committee to investigate Russian influence on, amongst others, senior public officials in the period 2007 to 2022, to the detriment of the public interest. It grants significant powers to this administrative body, in particular to start investigations, to organise public hearings, to codify certain persons as having taken decisions under Russian influence and to take so-called remedial measures against those persons. This could be used to unduly interfere with the democratic process.

Following a third assessment, the Commission decided at the end of June to open an infringement procedure against Poland. Among others, the Commission considers that the new law violates the principle of democracy, as well as the principles of legality and non-retroactivity of sanctions.

Poland has been given 21 calendar days to reply to the letter of formal notice, and since our last debate last Monday in LIBE, I have continued to exchange with the Polish Government, with the Minister of European Affairs, and I want to inform you that I have received different comments about the fact that now there is a series of amendments tabled to the Polish Parliament to change such a law and with an important decision to not select members of the Commission until the new laws or the new amendment will enter into force. But of course, we have sent a letter, formal notice to Poland and we will await a formal answer before to consider the next step. But with all reaction, we have seen already some moves in Poland about the legislation. We will see, of course, the results of those moves in the near future.

En ce qui concerne la loi électorale polonaise, la Commission suit également la situation de près. Le 31 mars, des modifications de cette loi sont entrées en vigueur. Les nouvelles dispositions visent notamment à introduire un registre central des électeurs, à assurer le transport de certains électeurs le jour des élections, à permettre de filmer les opérations de vote et à renforcer les règles sur le dépouillement des votes.

L'organisation d'élections libres et équitables relève de la responsabilité des États membres, dans le respect des normes internationales. La Commission soutient l'échange de bonnes pratiques en matière électorale entre États membres, dans le cadre du réseau européen de coopération électorale.

La Commission prend également acte de l'initiative de plusieurs groupes parlementaires de demander à l'OSCE d'effectuer une mission d'observation lors des prochaines élections en Pologne. Je rappelle que la Commission de Venise considère que l'observation des élections joue un rôle important et permet de constater si le processus électoral s'est déroulé dans les règles. Je crois que c'est l'un des points qu'il convient particulièrement de vérifier lorsque la mission d'observation se met en route. La Commission de Venise souligne aussi qu'il est préférable que l'observation soit ouverte le plus largement possible, à la fois sur le plan national et sur le plan international. Nous serons donc très attentifs à l'évolution de la situation en la matière.

More broadly, when it comes to the situation of the rule of law in Poland, I had the occasion to update ministers on 30 May in the General Affairs Council, in the framework of the Article 7 hearing on Poland.

The day after, I presented the position of the Commission on this issue in this Parliament. Allow me to recall that on that occasion, I concluded that overall, despite a number of important positive changes, serious concerns remain.

In addition, let me note that on 5 June, the Court of Justice, in its grand chamber formation, delivered a final ruling in one of the infringement cases launched by the Commission concerning Poland. The Court of Justice held that all the provisions contested by the Commission of the law on the judiciary, adopted in December 2019, infringed EU law, in particular the principles of judicial independence and effective judicial protection.

You may recall that prior to the Court of Justice judgment, Poland has failed to fully comply with the interim measures set out in this case in an order of the Court of July 2021. For this reason, Poland was ordered by the Court, upon request of the Commission, to pay penalty payments of EUR 1 million a day. On 21 April, the Vice-President of the Court lowered this amount to EUR 500 000 per day in view of notable progress in the implementation of the court order. This order came to an end with the final judgment of the Court. As Poland has not paid these penalty payments, the Commission has organised an offsetting concerning European funds due to this Member State.

It is now for Poland to take the necessary measures to fully implement the final judgment of the Court. The Commission will carefully monitor the implementation of this judgment and the Commission recalls that compliance with rulings of the Court of Justice and with the primacy of the EU law are cornerstones of our shared commitment to the rule of law.

As a Court of Justice underlined in its judgment of 5 June, the value of the rule of law is an integral part of the very identity of the European Union as a common legal order, and it is given concrete expression in principles containing legally binding obligations for the Member States.

Let me reiterate that the rulings of the Court of Justice are binding and must be implemented. The Commission therefore expects that the Polish authorities will swiftly and fully implement the judgment in question as required under EU law.

As regards the situation on the ground, I will limit myself to summarising what I set out in my intervention in this Parliament two weeks ago. So far, the Polish authorities have taken no steps to address the serious concerns in relation to the independence of the National Council for the Judiciary. As regards the Supreme Court, there are serious doubts whether a number of its judges appointed in 2018 and 2019, including its first president, comply with the requirements of independence stemming from Article 19 of the Treaty on European Union.

Finally, as regards the Constitutional Tribunal serious concerns persist, as the Polish authorities have not taken any action to address the concerns of the Commission and in February, the Commission decided to refer Poland to the Court of Justice for violations of EU law by the concerned tribunal and its true rulings issued in 2021 that challenge, among others, the primacy of EU law.

Of course, we will continue to follow the different procedures. We will continue to use all the different tools at our disposal to be sure that it will be possible to restore a real independence of the judiciary in Poland and to protect democracy like we have started to organise the procedure about the new law in organising the state committee.

So I thank you for this debate and I am looking forward to your intervention. But first of all, I want to thank you for your attention.

Jeroen Lenaers, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, last Sunday, over half a million people took to the streets in Warsaw in the biggest political gathering since communism. They were waving Polish and European flags because they passionately love Poland. They are committed to its European future. And they look at the European Union for help, for help to stop the current ruling party completely destroying what's left of democracy and rule of law in Poland and jeopardising Poland's place in the European Union along the way, because that is what is happening here. We see a regime in Poland that is so afraid of the opposition, so afraid of elections, so afraid of checks and balances that they need to resort to more and more extreme measures in an attempt to cling on to power at all costs. These are classic autocratic tactics.

We have seen and discussed many of those here in the past. But the latest and most extreme example is the so-called Lex Tusk, clearly designed to remove the opposition from the playing field altogether. It's the culmination of eight years of authoritarian system developed in Poland for those eight years, and it may officially be called a committee on Russian influence, but it should be called a committee on Russian inspiration. Because trying to remove, trying to make your political opponents disappear, that is exactly what Putin does in Russia. And if we want to prevent European Navalys in the future, we need to act now. And I thank the Commission, Commissioner Reynders, for acting swiftly and determinedly, because we must stand shoulder to shoulder with those in Poland that are fighting for democracy and rule of law, often at great personal expense. And we fully support the infringement procedure that the Commission initiated. And we welcome the sense of urgency with which you have done so, because we cannot overstate the urgency of this issue. Whatever smokescreen is being put up in Warsaw, the law is signed and enforced. And if we don't act strong enough, if we don't act quick enough, the damage will be done and it will be too late for repairs. We must do everything in our power to prevent that from happening, and we call on the Commission, therefore, to also strongly consider to take interim measures in parallel to the infringement procedures because there is simply no time to lose.

Marek Belka, w imieniu grupy S&D. – Panie Przewodniczący! Praworządność, a właściwie jej brak, w Polsce to temat rzeka. Miałem nadzieję, że już podczas tej kadencji Parlamentu nie będziemy musieli do tego tematu wracać. No ale polska władza dostarcza materiałów coraz to bardziej absurdalnych.

Komisja badająca rosyjskie wpływy w latach 2007–2022 to okrutny żart z Polaków, bo powołuje ją partia, która tuż przed wybuchem wojny w Ukrainie organizuje w Warszawie zlot europejskich popleczników Putina i która do dzisiaj nie wytłumaczyła rozlicznych rosyjskich powiązań swojego ministra obrony narodowej.

Komisja ta łamie konstytucję w kilkunastu punktach, rodem z czasów stalinizmu. Sąd kapturowy, który właściwie odbiera możliwości obrony tak zwanym podsądnym i zapewnia – uwaga! – bezkarność członkom tej komisji, tak jakby oni mieli z góry się czegośkolwiek obawiać. Jaki jest cel? Oczywiście zwiększenie marniejących w oczach szans wyborczych PiS-u.

Opinię na jej temat wydało już polskie społeczeństwo. W zeszłą niedzielę odbył się w Warszawie największy chyba w ostatnich dekadach zlot polityczny w obronie demokracji.

Słyszeliśmy, co na ten temat mówi Komisja Europejska. Można wspomnieć o tym, co mówi Departament Stanu USA. Ale najgłośniejsza jest cisza ze strony Kremla. Oni się cieszą. Bo ta komisja trywializuje poważny w istocie problem rosyjskich ingerencji w procesy demokratyczne w krajach Zachodu – brexit, wybory w Stanach Zjednoczonych. A poza tym daje możliwość rosyjskim trollom do wpuszczania w przestrzeń publiczną dowolnych materiałów. Jeden troll już się uaktywnił, i to w Warszawie, i nawołuje do likwidacji Komisji Europejskiej. To skala absurdu.

Powołanie tej komisji jest niebezpiecznym precedensem. To zaraźliwa gangrena, której trzeba się jak najmocniej przeciwstawić.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein, w imieniu grupy *Renew*. – Panie Przewodniczący! W październiku będziemy mieć w Polsce wybory parlamentarne i bardzo wszyscy chcemy, żeby były uczciwe, ale będzie trudno, bo mamy ordynację wyborczą skrojoną pod partię rządzącą. Członkowie Państwowej Komisji Wyborczej są z nominacji partii rządzącej. Mamy komisję specjalną w Sejmie w pełni polityczną, która może usuwać z funkcji publicznych i z list wyborczych każdego, kto się jej nie podoba. Mamy nierówny dostęp do mediów, które nazywają się publiczne, ale już dawno rząd Kaczyńskiego przemienił je w swoją tubę propagandową, a paliwowa spółka skarbu państwa Orlen wykupiła większość gazet regionalnych i lokalnych i również w nich uprawia prorządową propagandę.

Mamy doświadczenia z poprzednich wyborów, podczas których wykorzystywany był system inwigilacji Pegasus w celu skompromitowania członków opozycji zaangażowanych w kampanię wyborczą.

Wolność, równość i demokracja, proszę Państwa, to jest nasza wspólna sprawa. I tak, Panie Komisarzu, w Polsce podczas tych najbliższych wyborów powinna działać pełna misja obserwacyjna OBWE. Wszyscy musimy pilnie obserwować, czy te wybory są wolne, uczciwe i równe. Powinien powstać europejski Tech Lab, tak jak to rekomendowaliśmy we wnioskach z komisji Pegasus, aby każdy zaangażowany w kampanię wyborczą mógł sprawdzić swój telefon i inne urządzenie, czy nie jest obiektem nielegalnej inwigilacji przez rząd.

Ja dziękuję, Panie komisarzu, za wszystko co Pan robi. Dziękuję Wam wszystkim Koleżanki i Koledzy, za waszą solidarność, bo wolne i uczciwe wybory w krajach członkowskich to jest warunek funkcjonowania Unii Europejskiej.

Terry Reintke, on behalf of the *Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, Dorota was 33 years old. She died three weeks ago of a septic shock after being denied abortion care in a Polish hospital. She is not the first woman who has died since the introduction of the brutal anti-abortion legislation. Tragic stories, you could say, but what does this have to do with the debate on rule of law in Poland? Actually, it has to do a lot with the rule of law, because what we are experiencing right now is just another step to tighten the grip of authoritarian rule in Poland. After the politicisation of the judiciary, the takeover of public media, attacking minorities, restriction of fundamental rights, including access to life-saving abortion care.

Now the next attacks on the rule of law and democratic standards are underway in Poland. By meddling with electoral law and trying to intimidate the democratic opposition with an investigative committee that can even prevent candidates from taking up office. Colleagues, when we look around the world right now, we witness a more and more autocratic backlash against democracy, against freedom, and against a rules-based world order. Let us make sure that the European Union, with united effort stands up to this. And with half a million people in the streets of Warsaw last Sunday, I am confident that Polish citizens are at our side in this struggle, not only in Poland but across the European Union, led us, as all democratic parties work together to prevent an authoritarian shift. This is not about left or right. This is about protecting our democracy together. So let us stand up for rule of law and democracy in Poland and all over the European Union together.

Beata Szydło, w imieniu grupy *ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! W Polsce praworządność nie jest łamana. Nie ma takiego problemu. W Polsce sama ze sobą problem ma opozycja, która nie mogąc się pogodzić z demokratycznym wyborem Polaków, którzy w 2015 roku powierzyli władzę Prawu i Sprawiedliwości, a w 2019 roku przedłużyli ten mandat, cały czas atakuje i wszczyna awantury, niestety wykorzystując również instytucje europejskie.

Więc nie ma sensu ta dyskusja, ale skoro już zebraliśmy się, żeby porozmawiać o praworządności, to porozmawiajmy o praworządności w Unii Europejskiej. Czy tutaj nie dochodzi do łamania traktatów i omijania ich? Miesiąc temu z tego miejsca niemiecki kanclerz Olaf Scholz przedstawił niemiecką wizję Unii Europejskiej. Zabranie prawa weta w kluczowych kwestiach, wprowadzenie nowych, pozatraktatowych metod zarządzania Unią Europejską. I to nie były tylko rozważania teoretyczne, bo przecież to się już dzieje, a debata o pakcie migracyjnym jest tego najlepszym przykładem. Następuje przebudowa i próba pozatraktatowej zmiany ustroju Unii Europejskiej. Komisja Europejska potrzebuje zasłony dymnej, żeby rozmawiać na przykład o rzekomym łamaniu praworządności w Polsce, zamiast tłumaczyć się z tego, dlaczego omija traktaty europejskie.

Jako były polski premier, eurodeputowana z Polski, która otrzymała poparcie ponad pół miliona polskich obywateli, chcę jasno Komisji powiedzieć Panie Komisarzu, Polska nie jest i nie będzie chłopcem do bicia. Nie da się Polska sterroryzować poprzez wasze ataki i kary. My stoimy dzisiaj na straży traktatów europejskich i chcemy, żeby Unia Europejska właśnie zgodnie z traktatami się rozwijała. A polskiej opozycji, która tutaj siedzi na tej sali, proponuję reset.

Jean-Paul Garraud, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, ainsi donc, vous considérez la Pologne comme une menace pour l'état de droit. Mais de quel droit pouvez-vous prétendre cela? L'Union européenne n'est ni un État, ni, à plus forte raison, un supra-État susceptible d'envoyer des diktats à des États subalternes. La souveraineté des États ne se discute pas. L'état de droit ne peut servir de prétexte à des règlements de comptes d'ordre politique.

Vous redoutez que le pouvoir en place en Pologne ne sorte encore plus renforcé des élections prochaines. Cela vous effraie au point de faire n'importe quoi. Vous voulez une mission d'observation électorale en Pologne pour faire rapport sur de prétendues violations de l'état de droit. Mais de quoi s'agit-il? Il s'agit d'une simple loi sur l'organisation des bureaux de vote, destinée à faciliter l'accès à ses bureaux, prévoyant notamment la gratuité des transports pour les personnes âgées et les handicapés le jour du scrutin.

Il s'agit de faciliter l'exercice de la démocratie. Nul ne peut s'y opposer. Il ne s'agit pas de violation de l'état de droit, mais bien plutôt de faciliter l'un des droits fondamentaux: le droit de vote. C'est la Commission européenne, composée de personnes nommées, qui se permet de porter atteinte à ce droit fondamental. C'est le monde à l'envers. L'état de droit, ce n'est pas votre droit, c'est celui des peuples, et vous vous devez de les respecter.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, χαιρετίζουμε τα γρήγορα αντανakλαστικά και τις κινήσεις σας σχετικά με τις τελευταίες εξελίξεις στην Πολωνία.

Η δημιουργία της ειδικής επιτροπής για έρευνα της ρωσικής «επιρροής» και η αναθεώρηση των εκλογικών κανόνων κάποιους μήνες πριν τις εκλογές δεν αφήνουν σε καμία περίπτωση ερωτηματικά για τον στόχο της πολωνικής κυβέρνησης. Και αυτός δεν είναι άλλος από την προσπάθεια ελέγχου των ιδεών και των αντίπαλων πολιτικών φρονημάτων.

Δυστυχώς αυτό το παράδειγμα το ακολουθούν σιγά σιγά και άλλες χώρες προς τον Νότο. Πρόκειται για προσπάθεια και τακτική που δυστυχώς έχει καταστήσει πάγια σε πολλές δεξιές συντηρητικές κυβερνήσεις και πηγάζει από το αίσθημα «το κράτος είμαι εγώ, είμαι ο νόμιμος ιδιοκτήτης του κράτους, το κράτος μου ανήκει». Και βεβαίως ζητούνται πατριωτικά διαπιστευτήρια, όπου όλος ο κρατικός μηχανισμός, με όλα τα μέσα που διαθέτει, παίζει το παιχνίδι της αμύρωσης, της φήμωσης, της εξόντωσης της άλλης άποψης.

Κύριε Ρέιντερς, σε αυτά τα θέματα που αφορούν τον πυρήνα της δημοκρατίας θα είμαστε δίπλα σας. Σας ζητάμε να είστε ακόμα πιο κάθετος, γιατί όσο αφήνουμε χώρο για παραβιάσεις του κράτους δικαίου, τόσο η απολυταρχία εξαπλώνεται και στο τέλος καταλήγει ανεξέλεγκτη, σαν γάγγραινα.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowne Koleżanki i Szanowni Koledzy! Polacy są dumnym narodem, pewnym siebie, który odnosi sukcesy i jest w stanie podążać własną drogą bez ciągłych lekcji ze strony Zachodu. Sprzeciwiam się ciągłym atakom na Polskę i domagam się więcej szacunku dla polskich wyborców.

Mr President, I continue in English now and a word to my colleagues in the EPP, the PO who are behind this latest attack, you are mistaken to think that if you fail to win elections at home then the thing to do is to come here to Strasbourg or Brussels, get together with all kind of radical left wingers and attack your own country and your own countrymen here. It's not going to produce a majority for you because the Polish people don't like this attitude. Just like the Hungarians also reject this attitude. You should win elections based on your own merit. Stop attacking your countrymen here in Strasbourg in a European Parliament. It's the wrong thing to do. Long live Poland.

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear Minister, members of Parliament, thank you for this debate and for your support to our action.

To conclude, apart from certain positive developments on some aspects, the situation of the rule of law in Poland continues to raise serious concerns. Compliance with the primacy of EU law and the rulings of the Court of Justice interpreting the Treaties are cornerstones of the rule of law, enshrined in the Treaties approved by all Member States.

The Commission has taken swift action with regard to the creation of the new special committee, by the way of an infringement procedure, and the installation of this committee is now suspended.

We will also continue to monitor changes in the electoral law, and the Commission will continue its dialogue with the Polish authorities in order to resolve the existing concerns. But we are ready to continue to take decisive actions when it will be needed.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you very much for this debate and for your comments and remarks. Against a background of unprecedented challenges, let me strongly reaffirm the importance of our common values and our commitment to uphold them. This debate highlights the interplay between the rule of law and democracy, both fundamental values according to Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union. Democracy and the rule of law cannot be separated.

The Stockholm Symposium on Democracy and Rule of Law that will take place next week will be an opportunity for further examining the interdependence between democracy and the rule of law, but also fundamental rights. The European Parliament will be represented at the symposium as well as other EU institutions, Member States, civil society, media and others, and I really look forward to continuing the important discussion there.

The European Union is based on democratic values, paving the way for cohesion, individual freedom, non-discrimination, increased economic output and global influence. Upholding the principle of the rule of fundamental rights are therefore essential for elements for Sweden and indeed every presidency of the Council. And I know from having been present in this Chamber during the past six months that the European Parliament have a strong voice for our shared European values and democratic principles. And I thank you, this Parliament for that, for that commitment. And with that, I thank you for your attention on the debate.

President. – Thank you very much, Minister Roswall. Let me, as a Vice-President, also thank you for commitment, over the last six months, to this Parliament, for your constant presence and for listening to, and also for answering and reacting to our colleagues' questions and comments. This has contributed to the lively debates. So thank you very much to you, and to your colleagues at the Swedish Foreign Ministry.

The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Gunnar Beck (ID), *in writing*. – The Council, the Commission and the Parliament criticize the lack of independence of the judiciary and the electoral law in Poland. The executive allegedly has too much power of the judiciary, and opposition parties are allegedly victim of institutionalised bullying. May I remind you that the previous vice-president of the Christian-democrat CDU in the German federal parliament has been appointed as president of the German federal constitutional court? May I point out that my party, which currently polls at 20%, is at risk of being banned? May I recall that state prosecutors can receive instructions by the Justice Ministers? It is very commendable that the European Parliament has an ongoing debate on the theory and the practice of the rule of law. However, one cannot deny that some Member States are scrutinized much more thoroughly and passionately than others are.

Leszek Miller (S&D), *na piśmie*. – Jeśli Parlament Europejski musi zajmować się zmianami w ordynacji wyborczej kraju członkowskiego, która faworyzuje partię rządzącą, i jednocześnie zajmować się w tym kraju komisją, której celem jest eliminacja z życia publicznego przeciwników politycznych obecnej władzy, a do tego wszystkiego wyrokiem TSUE, potwierdzającym, że reforma wymiaru sprawiedliwości w kraju członkowskim narusza prawo UE i upolitycznia sądownictwo, to nie można mówić tylko o kryzysie.

Trzeba mówić o zagrożeniu dla podstawowych wartości Unii Europejskiej. Polska demokracja toczona jest przez raka autorytaryzmu. Dotychczasowe terapie proponowane przez Parlament i Komisję Europejską nie przynoszą żadnego efektu. Ten rak autorytaryzmu jest oporny i na rezolucje PE, i na wyroki TSUE, i na nakładane na niego przez Komisję kary. W walce z demokracją używa wszystkich metod, aby osiągnąć swój cel. Tym celem jest zamordowanie polskiej demokracji, co ma umożliwić obecnej władzy PiS wieloletnie rządy oparte na kulcie jednej partii i jednego wodza. Ma im też pozwolić na bezkarność w obliczu karygodnych przykładów rozkradania majątku publicznego oraz uwłaszczania się na tym majątku przez polityków PiS i ich rodziny. Finałem tej walki będzie wyprowadzenie Polski ze struktur wspólnoty europejskiej, bo trudno sobie wyobrazić, żeby państwem członkowskim UE był kraj systemowo łamiący wartości UE, lekceważący Traktaty i nieuznający wyroków TSUE.

Sylwia Spurek (Verts/ALE), na piśmie. – Tak zwana komisja rosyjska i trwający od lat maraton naruszania Konstytucji w Polsce, to tylko część, a może nawet wierzchołek łamania praworządności przez polski rząd. Nadal musimy przypominać koleżankom i kolegom z prawej strony tej sali, że Unia Europejska opiera się na wolności, demokracji, praworządności i prawach człowieka. Te wartości wynikają z traktatu i stanowią marzenie większości obywateli i obywaterek naszej Wspólnoty.

Ale o jakiej praworządności mogą mówić kobiety w Polsce, gdzie i prawo, i praktyka jego stosowania odbiera im prawo do aborcji? Co z prawem człowieka 33-letniej Doroty z Bochni – prawem do zdrowia i życia? O jakiej praworządności mogą mówić osoby LGBTIQ, które nadal są w Polsce obywatelami i obywatelkami drugiej kategorii? Co z ich prawem człowieka do życia rodzinnego? O jakiej praworządności mogą mówić osoby transpłciowe w Polsce, które zmuszane są do pozwywania swoich rodziców do sądu? Co z ich prawem człowieka do godności? Co z prawami człowieka osób z niepełnosprawnościami, osób starszych, uchodźczyń i migrantów?

Naszym obowiązkiem, obowiązkiem tej izby jest przypomnienie, że nie ma praworządności bez praw człowieka. Obowiązkiem Komisji Europejskiej jest stanie na straży unijnych wartości, i to nie wybranych wartości, ale każdej, którą zapisaliśmy w unijnym traktacie.

Monika Vana (Verts/ALE), schriftlich. – Entgegen des Arguments der polnischen Regierung, dass die Überarbeitung des Wahlgesetzes die Demokratie stärkt und die Teilnahme benachteiligter Bürger erleichtern würde, teilen wir die Bedenken der Opposition: Die Änderungen sind ein gezielter Eingriff, der die Teilnahme von Wählerinnen und Wählern begünstigen soll, die traditionell die Regierungspartei unterstützen. Gleichzeitig soll der Zugang für Wählerinnen und Wählern, die eher der Opposition zuzurechnen sind, erschwert werden. Auch die von der polnischen Regierung für den Zeitraum 2007-2022 eingesetzte „Staatliche Kommission zur Untersuchung der russischen Einflussnahme in die innere Sicherheit Polens“ sehen wir Grünen/EFA höchst kritisch. Es zeichnet sich eindeutig ab, dass es hier nicht um echte Aufarbeitung geht, sondern die PiS Partei der Opposition schaden will und die rechtlichen Möglichkeiten schaffen will, diese strafrechtlich zu verfolgen.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.14)

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

6. Reanudación de la sesión

(The sitting resumed at 11.43)

7. Sesión solemne – Discurso de Vjosa Osmani, presidenta de la República de Kosovo

President. – Dear colleagues, today we are joined by President Vjosa Osmani-Sadriu of Kosovo. President Osmani, thank you for accepting our invitation to address the European Parliament.

Dear President, we know full well of Kosovo's commitment to a European path and I know your commitment to ensure the necessary conditions to advance down this path continue to be implemented in earnest.

Let me say at the outset that we are grateful for your support in providing shelter to Ukrainians fleeing Russia's illegal invasion and your support in aligning with us on sanctions. We must keep standing with Ukraine.

This House stood with you when it seemed impossible, and I think we can all recognise just how far Kosovo has come. The journey towards visa-free travel has been an arduous one. But together we can be proud now, that by 1 January next year, Kosovo citizens will be granted this freedom too.

Democracy, freedom of expression and the rule of law are all fundamental values that this House of Parliament stands by, vociferously. We are well aware of the challenges and consequences that recent events in your country can have on stability in the region, and the continuous need for the European Union to keep underlining the benefits of de-escalation and cooperation over confrontation.

Kosovo's journey continues and this House welcomes your country's endeavour to tackle challenges head on, by the need for resolute and immediate steps to calm tensions, to cooperate with international partners, with our Member States, and investing in cross-border projects and partnerships.

This Parliament wants to hear from the people of Kosovo on how best to create economic prosperity, opportunity, long-term stability and progress in your region.

Let us continue our constructive dialogue, to ensure tangible results for us all.

Madam President, dear Vjosa, you have the floor.

Vjosa Osmani, President of the Republic of Kosovo. – Madam President, *liri, pavarësi, demokraci*; freedom, independence, democracy; *liberté, indépendance, démocratie*. Dear President Metsola, honourable Members of the European Parliament, those three powerful words were not just words passionately and repeatedly uttered by Kosovo's founding father, Dr Ibrahim Rugova. They were indeed the vision of the people of Kosovo. Today, that vision of Rugova, of our heroes and of our people is a reality. Kosovo today is free. Kosovo today is independent. And Kosovo today is a beacon of democracy.

(Applause)

It was 25 years ago that here in Strasbourg, our visionary leader, President Rugova, was awarded the Sakharov Prize by the European Parliament. That day, he was introduced by the then President of Parliament as 'a man who is the voice of his people, a people who can rarely make themselves heard'. President Rugova viewed the prize as a recognition of the sacrifice of the people of Kosovo and their struggle for freedom. But crucially, he used this very platform to ask for the support of the Members of Parliament to come together on the name of the very values that this union stood for. He asked for Europe to come together in defence of an oppressed people.

In the midst of war, as tanks were rolling into my hometown, Mitrovica – I was just 15 years old at that time – I remember how that moment, that speech gave us so much hope. We were finally being heard. Europe had not just opened its doors for President Rugova, but it had opened its hearts and minds for a systematically oppressed people.

Today, also standing here in Strasbourg, I am honoured to be the very first President of the independent Republic of Kosovo to speak before the European Parliament and, most importantly, to say thank you.

(Applause)

Thank you for the immeasurable support and for your continued contribution that this institution has made for our freedom, our democracy and our independence. As President Rugova closed his remarks, he spoke of the old Albanian proverb, saying 'A house cannot be kept without friends'. This was true for us during the 1990s, but it is equally so today as we look to strengthen our alliances and one day join you here in this family of nations.

Today I am here to extend the deepest gratitude of the people of Kosovo for your unwavering support and, at this critical juncture, to urge you to remain steadfast by our side – not just because we are part of the family of nations that make up our continent, but because the values this institution represents are a fundamental part of our history. European values are woven deep within the tapestry of our society.

We, the people of Kosovo, have walked side by side with European institutions, bound by a rich heritage. We continue to walk side by side as we fight to protect our shared values, and we will remain side by side as we guide our continent towards the full attainment of a Europe whole, free and at peace.

(Applause)

Today, I stand before you not only as the President of a resolute European nation and an EU-bound country, but also as the leader of the youngest Europeans. Our country is bursting with energy, immense talent and fervent European enthusiasm. Kosovo is Europe, and to be Kosovar is to be European.

Our young Republic was born to the beat and sound of Europe. When Kosovo declared independence on 17 February 2008, in the absence of our national anthem, it was the European anthem that echoed in our institutions, in our squares and in the streets of my country. Just like the fearless spirit of a new-born Republic, the *Ode to Joy* resonated with the feelings we carried in our hearts and souls, admiring and embracing the ideals of freedom, peace and solidarity. Determined to join the European family of nations – and inspired by the European Union – we found solace and unity in the universal language of music.

But this act went beyond symbolism: it was our declaration to the world that the European Union was our rightful destination and a plea for European institutions to embrace these unwavering aspirations.

At 15 years old, the Republic of Kosovo remains the most pro-EU country in the region and beyond. More than 95% of our people express their uncompromised yearning to join these institutions, encapsulating our historic strategic orientation. Enshrined in our Constitution, Euro-Atlantic integration remains our one and only destination. Euro-Atlantic integration is not just an ambition for us; I am confident it will soon be our future.

In our DNA. European values and the EU spirit are deeply ingrained. It is these values that shaped our past, inspire us in the present and guide us towards a future where Kosovo flourishes as a beacon of European ideals.

Ladies and gentlemen, honourable Members of the European Parliament, the Republic of Kosovo stands as a testament to the resilience, determination and unwavering spirit of its people, to the strength of our liberation struggle, but also – and importantly – the support of our allies, the support of partners like this great institution. The very existence of our country demonstrates what democracies can achieve when they stand together, when they stand by the oppressed, when you all stand by those who fight for justice and equality.

(Applause)

And when we all stand together against tyranny, dictatorship and genocide. When we stand together as Europeans, freedom flourishes, democracies strengthen, equality is instilled, prosperity grows and unbreakable alliances are formed. I am confident that this same Euro-Atlantic unity and resolve will continue to support Ukraine all the way through to victory.

In times of great uncertainty and turmoil in Europe, the actions we take now, together, will determine our future in so many fundamental ways. Perhaps even more important than the challenge itself is the way we're going to respond to it.

But ladies and gentlemen, moral challenges like the one we face on European soil today with Russia's aggression against Ukraine, shouldn't need long philosophical or political debates, because the answer should be immediately clear. There's no halfway house to democracy and freedom. There should be no grey zone as to where we stand against autocracies and against tyrannies. European unity thus far has been unprecedented and perhaps historic, but we must go one step further to secure Ukraine's victory and its just peace.

(Applause)

This moment, right now, for Europe and the world requires leaders to come together to envision a brighter world and to take even bolder decisions. This will not be easy. It will require courage, vision and, most importantly, even greater cooperation among us. No matter how big or small, we should be united by the values we believe in. Every country, every one of you, every one of us can and must play a part.

The words 'never again' were not just a slogan for the people of Kosovo. These words, in fact, shouldn't be a slogan for anyone. But just two decades on, we see utter devastation on European soil once again as Putin wages his illegal and indiscriminate war against Ukraine.

The people of Kosovo don't have to imagine the pain and suffering of Ukraine. We have already lived through it. We don't have to imagine their loss because to this day our hearts ache for the friends and family members we lost during the war, many of whom are still missing because of enforced disappearance. We don't have to imagine their sorrow and frustration in the face of grave injustices. We feel it, too. So when we, the people of Kosovo, say 'we stand with Ukraine', we don't just say it – we feel it with every fibre of our being.

(Applause)

24 February 2022 was a dark day for Europe and an unimaginable, painful day for the people of Ukraine. For us, it was a memory relived, one we hoped to never witness again. In our darkest days, you stood by us. Today, as we stand shoulder to shoulder with Ukraine, we are jointly fortifying the very foundations of Europe. It is a testament to our unyielding unity, our unbreakable solidarity and our unequivocal commitment to peace and democracy.

We owe it to Ukraine and we owe it to Europe. This is our time to exemplify the unity, solidarity and support that you so graciously bestowed upon my people in our hour of need. Kosovo may be a small country but we are willing to do whatever it takes to support our Ukrainian friends.

(Applause)

We were the very first country in our region to impose sanctions against Russia and have continuously been seeking effective and impactful ways in which we can help. From training Ukrainians in demining – so that we can ensure as many lives are saved from the horrendous traces of war that Russia is leaving behind – to working to support survivors of sexual violence, as well as a dedicated programme to support Ukrainian journalists to continue to report the truth: we stand ready to do more.

Madam President, Members of the European Parliament, dear friends, throughout our history we have faced countless challenges and overcome insurmountable odds to stand proudly as an independent country. Indeed, our very journey to freedom and independence and our struggle for self-determination resonate with the very foundation upon which the European Union was built – a Union founded on the principles of peace, democracy, human rights and recognising each other's sovereignty, but also on the important principles of transitional justice and dealing with the past.

Since declaring independence in 2008, the people and institutions of Kosovo have embarked on a remarkable journey of transformation, growth and increasing prosperity. We have worked tirelessly to strengthen our institutions, foster economic growth and consolidate our democracy. Our young and dynamic population, coupled with a well-educated workforce, doesn't just serve to make it one of the most vibrant places in Europe. It also forms a solid foundation for sustainable growth and prosperity.

The rule of law stands as the bedrock of any functioning democracy, including as the bedrock of my country. And our commitment to justice is unwavering. We remain steadfast in our commitment to combat crime and corruption, and enhance transparency. And we are absolutely determined in our efforts to ensure that justice is served and that all individuals, regardless of their position or influence, are held accountable for their actions.

As people that have experienced first-hand atrocities and gross violations of basic human rights, we have emerged stronger, more resilient and deeply committed to the cause of justice and equality. Today, we don't just speak about human rights – we act upon them. We stand as unwavering champions determined to safeguard and promote these rights for every citizen of our young Republic, no matter their ethnicity, religion or other background.

In this spirit of inclusivity, I call on all Serbs living in Kosovo to utilise their advanced rights afforded to them in Kosovo's Constitution. The Republic of Kosovo is your home, and we will do everything in our power to make sure that you feel included, equal and heard.

(Applause)

Building an ever more diverse society remains our everyday commitment. These efforts stand at the very foundation of our Constitution, which is one of the most progressive constitutions on European soil.

But our efforts in this regard would go in vain if they were not also centred on advancing gender equality and promoting women's empowerment in all walks of life. It is my lifetime conviction – and even more since I entered this office – to create equal opportunities for girls and women, and to cultivate a more equal and better place for all. Unstoppable in their fight to pursue justice, determined to create a better future for all, firm in their engagement to bring our societies to new heights and committed to breaking historically stubborn glass ceilings: the girls and women of Kosovo are a strong reminder and a daily motivation to never stop fighting for what is right.

(Applause)

And as we navigate these turbulent times and modern chapters of history, characterised by great uncertainties, we have to be reminded of the determinant role of women in processes of peace and security. We must be reminded that sustainable peace requires inclusivity, and that peace and security thrive on the foundations of inclusive democracies.

Dear Members of this esteemed institution, you will all know the story of Kosovo. Some of you will have visited, some of you will have studied it and some of you will have even played your own part in our journey of freedom and independence. But the true story of Kosovo, as I always say, is the story of its people. A country and a democracy is not stronger because of any one individual or leader or any single reform. A country's strength comes from the collective strength of its people. The individual stories of almost 2 million people make Kosovo the success it is today.

With me today, I have a delegation that is a true representation of our beloved Republic. It represents our tough and challenging history, as well as the spirit of resilience, persistence and determination. That is a promise for a great future. Today with me is Vafije Krasniqi Goodman. She was only 16 years old, 16 years old, when Milošević's forces ripped her away from the arms of her mother in her very own house to take her to a place that would mark the darkest hour and day of her lifetime. That day, for hours, she was held at gunpoint and raped. And then raped over and over again.

But it was Vafije who recognised that it is in silence that wounds deepen. So she decided to speak up. She spoke for justice, against stigma, and managed to rally an entire people behind her.

(Applause)

She didn't just dedicate her life to justice. Today, she is the voice of thousands of survivors of wartime sexual violence during the war in Kosovo. She is a real-life hero, you would say, and I couldn't agree more. But then I want to tell you that we are surrounded by countless everyday heroes in my country, including Fahrije Hoti, who is also joining me today in the delegation. She comes from the village of Krusha, where almost all the men were killed during the war, including many who remain forcibly disappeared. Among them, to this day, is Fahrije's husband.

Left alone, helpless and searching for her beloved husband, Fahrije could have chosen to give up, but she chose to fight. She turned grief into motivation. She turned pain into determination. Today, Fahrije Hoti owns Kooperativa Krusha, a powerhouse that kick-started economic development and women's empowerment through their active engagement in the labour force in a village in Kosovo. But, most importantly, Kooperativa Krusha turned into a place of hope – now exporting its famous pepper spread and other products all around Europe, which I of course invite you to try.

(Applause)

Her actions didn't just save the lives of hundreds of women in her village, but her story also inspired the début feature of our brilliant film director Blerta Basholli, the film *Hive*. Blerta, who is also with me today, became an all-time favourite artist in 2021 at the Sundance Festival. The movie that depicts masterfully the life of Fahrije and the women of Krusha became the first film to win all three main awards in one of the most renowned world cinematic competitions. She has perfectly captured how the darkest parts of history can be turned into an eternal source of resilience, strength and hope for the future.

And as I speak of a better future, I can't help but think of Hana Qerimi, who is also accompanying me on this visit. She is the co-founder of Digital School and StarLabs, which started as two small companies in our capital, Pristina, initially with just two people – her and her husband. Today, their start-ups have grown into global brand names with 500 locations around the world. Like so many other businesses in this sector, they are making Kosovo a leader in the region as a tech hub.

As the company's success started to cross borders and oceans, Hana has had to overcome near-impossible challenges along the way. Due to onerous and bureaucratic processes, she would often miss the taste of her success and landing her next big opportunity, as her EU-issued visas would expire before she could even travel, and she'd have to apply and reapply multiple times per year.

For years it was you, this Parliament, that has been fighting together with the people of Kosovo for the cause of visa liberalisation. I want to thank each and every one of you for your vocal support and for the most recent vote that gave Hana and other brilliant and ambitious young people in my country the chance to thrive, just like their peers in the Union. I am sure, like all of us, you will be glad to never hear the words 'visa liberalisation' and 'Kosovo' in the same sentence again.

(Applause)

Indeed, the stories of these people are the embodiment of what we call resilience. They embraced the past and turned it into a driving force to help our country and our society thrive. But in doing so, they always remember the importance of giving back. That is our humble way of saying 'thank you' to our allies and friends who stood by us in the darkest times and supported us all the way as we are building back.

Egzon Sylá – who is joining me today as well – is from the search and rescue contingent of the Kosovo security force. He knows best what it means to give back. Egzon has led our team in the rescue efforts during the aftermath of the devastating earthquake in Turkey. Today, a 2-year-old baby, her mother and many others are alive because of Egzon and his team. Their dedication and professionalism show the true spirit of the people of Kosovo – one that never gives up and always gives back.

As I speak of the importance of giving back, I look at Liudmyla. Liudmyla Makei was the first Ukrainian journalist to be hosted in Kosovo as part of the Journalists-in-Residence Kosovo Programme launched by our institutions and civil society in support of their cause to defend the truth. When she first arrived, Liudmyla said she chose Kosovo as a destination because she wanted to see life in a post-war country with her own eyes. She realised that the people of Kosovo would understand her best because of our shared experiences. But my people also know the unmatched feeling of freedom, liberty and peace. And I hope the people of Ukraine will soon experience these feelings as they prevail over Russia's war of aggression.

(Applause)

When you have known utter devastation, victory is precious, peace is invaluable, life is dear and opportunities are seized to their fullest. That perhaps goes some way in explaining why, as two-time summer Olympic partakers, our judokas Majlinda, Distria and Nora have given us the immense privilege of being a country with three gold medals. Or perhaps why Dua Lipa and Rita Ora are not just household names in Kosovo but also around the world, topping global music charts. Or why incredibly talented Kosovar football players – both men and women – shine as outstanding players for many of the clubs and national teams of your countries. And why our young mathematicians and other brilliant young scientists continue to make us proud with their successes worldwide.

Every time our people are given an equal opportunity, they don't just exceed expectations – they make history and set world records. Remember this, dear friends: we are not just a country of believers; we are a country of achievers.

And to all members of my delegation, I want to say thank you. Thank you for who you are and for making Kosovo a better place to this day – a better place for its people, a better place for our friends, a better ally and partner for all. It is because of these incredible individuals and many more in my country that I am so confident that in the near future we will be part of these institutions.

And as I was coming in, I was also reminded that here with us today is a delegation from the Preševo Valley. To them, I want to say this: 'We will stand with you'.

(Applause)

'You are not alone while facing gross violations of human rights', as recognised by this respectable institution in its latest resolution.

Dear Members of Parliament, despite the lack of justice and immense suffering over the years, the Republic of Kosovo and its people continue to look to the future – a European future. We have extended our hand of cooperation to all our neighbours and we have done so, in large part, because our people deserve a brighter future, which also means more robust cooperation with our region.

And as long as it is down to us, I can confidently say that the people and the institutions of Kosovo simply want peace and stability: sustainable peace with justice as a foundation; stability with respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity and good neighbourly relations at its heart.

But, of course, in this process we need strong European leadership that we so often witness in this Parliament and across every institution. This will require a proactive, credible and straightforward roadmap for our region's future as part of the European family. Our advancement for membership in the European Union would serve as a catalyst for peace and reconciliation in a region where malign forces have historically and continue to sow divisions.

And even as nowadays my country faces ongoing security challenges because of these malign forces, I am certain that the only way to overcome them is through partnerships and alliances. The very existence of the EU and the values that it represents are irreplaceable. But these values in our region – without a clear perspective of membership – risk being diminished. The lack of integration of democratic countries of the Western Balkans into the EU poses a major security threat to the entire European continent as it leaves the region vulnerable to malign actors and threats.

The integration of our region is not just of paramount importance; it is also of strategic significance. I am sure you will all agree that the membership of Slovenia and Croatia in the EU has only strengthened the EU position. It did not weaken it. The membership of Albania, North Macedonia and Montenegro in NATO only strengthened regional peace and stability. It did not weaken it.

I know that, for many of you, I am already preaching to the converted. But as the truly democratic body of these institutions, as the guardians of the will of Europeans across the Union, I know you continue to have a vital role to play in pushing for our integration.

Kosovo is not some faraway country; it is an integral part of Europe. The Western Balkans is not simply a neighbourhood; it is a natural part of Europe and a strategic interest for the lasting peace and stability of this continent. That is why last year we applied for EU membership, and we hope that the EU institutions and Member States will support our application.

We count on the leadership and determination that this Parliament so often shows and, in return, I want to reassure each and every one of you that our patience will not wane. We will never stray from our Euro-Atlantic path. We have never looked the other way, and we will never do so.

(Applause)

Indeed, we are not just with Europe in words, but also in action, with 100% alignment on all foreign and security decisions of the European Union.

The time has come for Kosovo to make meaningful steps towards the European path. Our journey has been marked by sacrifice, determination and an unwavering belief in the values that bind our nations together. It is time for bold decisions and not half steps in terms of integration.

Kosovo and the democratic countries of the Western Balkans deserve better. We are here by your side and we are part of this family because the Europe whole, free and at peace is only possible when we are all here in this Parliament as equals, collectively promoting, defending and protecting Europe.

We recognise the challenges that lie ahead on our path towards EU membership. But Kosovo has never – and will never – ask for shortcuts. We believe in a merit-based process for countries that truly respect and act upon what the EU stands for. Because we cannot have European unity without European values. We cannot have peace, stability and prosperity without Member States that are willing to promote these values within their own countries and collectively defend them when they are under attack.

We are ready to join hands with you to contribute to a stronger, more prosperous and united Europe. Let us have the opportunity to showcase what we have achieved. Let us have the opportunity to enrich the lives of our citizens as we make reforms on our EU path. Let us give back to this family of nations that has given us so much.

Let us all seize this historic opportunity together and, in doing so, reaffirm the European Union's commitment to justice, equality and solidarity. Kosovo's rightful place within the European Union family will not only enrich our nation, but it will also strengthen the very foundations upon which the EU was built and strengthen our continent through even greater unity.

Dear President Metsola, dear Members of Parliament, dear friends of Kosovo, I started my speech today with President Rugova and I want to conclude with another winner of the Sakharov Prize from Kosovo, Adem Demaci, who spent almost three decades of his life in prison because of his fight for a free Kosovo, where human rights are respected for all. When speaking upon receiving the prize in 1991, he said: 'By honouring me, you are honouring the people of Kosovo, a peace-loving people, a freedom-loving people, who are undergoing great suffering'.

Today, Madam President, esteemed Members of Parliament, I want to thank you for giving me the honour to be the voice of the people of Kosovo before this valued institution. I hope this plenary has served as a meeting of minds, as a reunion of friends and a testament to what we strive to become. As we aim for a better and a brighter future for all, we must never forget where we have come from. We must always be reminded of how we got here and who stood by us in times of joy and in times of sorrow.

I chose to also speak of our past because it has shaped our present, and it remains vital as we frame our future. I chose to speak about the EU values because it is these values that serve as our moral compass and guide us and our people to the highest peaks of human achievement.

I have spoken today about how much we share with the EU – each and every one of us – how much both Kosovo and Ukraine share with each and every one of you. Because our two countries, Kosovo and Ukraine, no matter the distance, share a history of sorrow on common European soil, yet a future of great potential and opportunity in the common European family.

Nothing illustrates this more powerfully than the shared colours of our flags: blue and yellow, two colours that tell a story. The blue sky and the yellow sun: together these colours represent hope for a new dawn. For Ukraine and for Kosovo, that new dawn is a just peace and membership in the European Union. For Europe, it is strength in new alliances and unity. Blue and yellow: the colours of Kosovo, the colours of Ukraine, the colours of Europe and the colours of freedom.

(The House accorded the speaker a standing ovation)

President. – Thank you very much to President Osmani.

(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)

8. Reanudación de la sesión

(The sitting resumed at 12.26)

9. Bienvenida

La Présidente. – Avant de procéder aux votes, j'aimerais adresser les salutations de notre assemblée à Émilie et à Baptiste, qui sont parmi nous grâce à deux robots de téléprésence, ainsi qu'à M^{me} Brigitte Macron, qui les accompagne en tant que marraine du programme français TED-i.

Ce programme permet aux enfants atteints d'une maladie de longue durée de continuer à aller à l'école et de rester en lien avec leurs professeurs et leurs camarades de classe, grâce à des robots interactifs de téléprésence.

Émilie, Baptiste, Madame Macron, je vous souhaite la bienvenue.

10. Turno de votaciones

President. – The next item is the vote.

10.1. Acuerdo de Colaboración y Cooperación UE-Tailandia (A9-0191/2023 - Andrey Kovatchev) (votación)

10.2. Acuerdo de Colaboración y Cooperación UE-Tailandia (Resolución) (A9-0193/2023 - Andrey Kovatchev) (votación)

10.3. Acuerdo de Colaboración y Cooperación UE-Malasia (A9-0190/2023 - Gheorghe-Vlad Nistor) (votación)

10.4. Acuerdo de Colaboración y Cooperación UE-Malasia (Resolución) (A9-0194/2023 - Gheorghe-Vlad Nistor) (votación)

10.5. Acuerdo de colaboración en el sector pesquero UE-Mauricio: Protocolo de aplicación del Acuerdo (2022-2026) (A9-0196/2023 - François-Xavier Bellamy) (votación)

10.6. Ley de Inteligencia Artificial (A9-0188/2023 - Brando Benifei, Dragoş Tudorache) (votación)

— *Before the vote:*

Brando Benifei, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, myself and Dragoş are very proud to present you this compromise text. It will be an historical vote where we not only address the most pressing issues with AI, but we also give a clear message to the rest of the world on how we think it should be done; how we can preserve our democracies and support innovation at the same time. I want to thank all of you who participated in this work. It's been a collective effort. Let's deliver together now. Let's vote.

Dragoş Tudorache, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, this institution, our Parliament, has been the political trailblazer on AI for the last three years. When we voted in Committee three weeks ago, 300 media outlets around the world reported on that vote, and 99.6% of those reports were positive, laudative of the address of what we are doing here in this Parliament. So let's live up to this expectation when we vote today. Give Brando and myself a powerful mandate with which we can go through dialogues and then come back to you again with a text that meets everyone's ambitions.

— *After the vote on the Commission proposal:*

Dragoş Tudorache, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, thank you very much for the vote today, for all of you, no matter how you voted. And now, dear President, according to Rule 59(4) I ask that the file is sent back to the interinstitutional negotiations. In fact, we start tonight.

(Parliament approved the request)

10.7. Pilas y baterías y sus residuos (A9-0031/2022 - Achille Variati) (votación)

10.8. Garantía de la seguridad alimentaria y la resiliencia a largo plazo de la agricultura de la Unión (A9-0185/2023 - Marlene Mortler) (votación)

10.9. Períodos de prácticas de calidad en la Unión (A9-0186/2023 - Monica Semedo) (votación)

President. – That concludes the vote.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.50)

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY*Vizepräsidentin***11. Reanudación de la sesión***(The sitting resumed at 12.56)***12. Aprobación del Acta de la sesión anterior**

Die Präsidentin. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar. Gibt es Einwände gegen das Protokoll?

Das ist nicht der Fall. Damit ist das Protokoll genehmigt.

13. Gestación por sustitución en la Unión: riesgos de explotación y comercialización (debate de actualidad)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema (Artikel 162 der Geschäftsordnung) über Leihmutterschaft in der EU – Gefahren der Ausbeutung und Kommerzialisierung.

Ich möchte, bevor wir in die Diskussion eintreten, kurz noch sagen, dass es von Kolleginnen und Kollegen Beschwerden gegeben hat über die Debattenkultur in unserem Haus, dass es immer stärker auch zu persönlichen Angriffen kommt. Da das ein besonders sensibles Thema ist, würde ich alle um eine respektvolle Debatte zu diesem wichtigen Thema bitten.

Nicola Procaccini, autore. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario Reynders, ci sono temi che non dovrebbero avere colore politico, poiché vanno ben oltre l'appartenenza a un partito o a uno schieramento ideologico, poiché riguardano dei principi naturali che vanno oltre lo spazio e il tempo, oltre ognuno di noi. La lotta contro la maternità surrogata è uno di questi.

Parliamo di un contratto tramite il quale uno o più committenti si accordano con una donna affinché porti alla nascita un bambino e lo consegna a loro dopo il parto. Purtroppo, in alcune nazioni del mondo e d'Europa questa pratica abominevole è legalizzata o consapevolmente sottaciuta. Talvolta occultata dietro l'ipocrisia di un presunto altruismo, di un mero rimborso spese da corrispondere alla madre. Talvolta esplicitamente definita attraverso un lauto pagamento per l'affitto dell'utero materno e l'acquisto del neonato.

Parliamo di una mercificazione dei corpi e della vita incompatibile con la Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, che all'articolo 3 vieta di fare del corpo umano e delle sue parti in quanto tali una fonte di lucro. Nello stesso senso sono andati vari pronunciamenti delle Nazioni Unite, molte associazioni femministe, giuristi, filosofi e medici di tutto il mondo, come quelli riunitisi recentemente a Casablanca per chiedere l'abolizione universale della maternità surrogata, come avvenne per le mine antiuomo o per la schiavitù.

E non conta la religione, colleghi. Così come non conta nulla l'orientamento sessuale di chi, forte della propria superiorità economica, si sente legittimato a comprare un bambino da una donna approfittando del suo disagio economico o psicologico. Dovremmo essere tutti d'accordo nel condannare e vietare questo abisso dell'umanità, ma non è così. C'è una parte della politica e della società che considera libertà la scelta di partorire un bambino a pagamento per poi cederlo a chi può permettersi di comprarlo. Purtroppo, c'è chi ritiene che al giusto prezzo qualunque desiderio possa trasformarsi in un diritto.

Per questo serve affrontare qui ed oggi il tema della maternità surrogata, o dell'utero in affitto, o della gestazione per altri, come subdolamente viene chiamata tale pratica in alcuni ambienti culturali. In Europa e nel mondo vi sono ancora troppi paesi in cui questa è consentita, in modalità diverse: Stati Uniti, Canada, Sudafrica, Russia, Ucraina, Regno Unito, ma anche Belgio, Grecia, Paesi Bassi, Danimarca, Cipro. Appena lo scorso marzo il governo tedesco ha presentato una commissione che esaminerà la possibilità di legalizzare la maternità surrogata in Germania.

Ad onor del vero, più volte quest'Aula ha ribadito la propria contrarietà a tale attività, considerandola giustamente una violazione della dignità umana e dei diritti umani. Ma i fatti stanno camminando con le proprie gambe, sostenuti da evidenti interessi economici, indifferenti ai giudizi politici di condanna.

Per questo mi auguro che al dibattito di oggi, fortemente voluto dal gruppo ECR che ho l'onore di copresiedere, faccia seguito una risoluzione definitiva, in grado di affermare la maternità surrogata come reato universale, prendendoci la responsabilità di fare la cosa giusta. Se non vi riusciremo in questa legislatura, sono fiducioso che accadrà nella prossima.

In conclusione, lasciatemi citare un grande conservatore del secolo scorso, Robert Maynard Hawkins: «I diritti umani si basano sulla dignità umana. La dignità dell'uomo è un ideale per cui vale la pena battersi e morire.»

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, according to the EU treaties, substantive family law falls within the competence of the Member States. Member States thus decide if and how surrogacy should be regulated in their territory.

In a few Member States, surrogacy is expressly authorised for non-commercial purposes. Some other Member States have made the choice to ban this practice, while others do not regulate this area at all. It is also important to stress that No Member State has so far legally authorised surrogacy for commercial purposes.

The Commission cannot intervene in those national decisions and has no competence to make proposals in this regard. The Commission is aware of problems that may arise as the conditions under which surrogacy can be conducted in certain third countries. Women from poverty-stricken populations may be particularly vulnerable in this regard.

The Commission remains committed to upholding women's rights and to combat any form of trafficking of human beings in the framework of its competences. And Member States are also bound to comply with the international obligations on the protection of human rights, notably those stemming from the European Convention of Human Rights, as interpreted by the case Law of the European Court of Human Rights.

I thank you for your attention, but I would follow, with attention too, your debates to see what conclusion is possible to take after such a debate.

Nathalie Colin-Oesterlé, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, peu de pays autorisent la gestation pour autrui en Europe, et ceux qui l'autorisent l'encadrent très strictement. Quoi qu'il en soit, la décision d'interdire ou d'autoriser la GPA est une compétence nationale, qui relève de la souveraineté nationale, et en aucun cas une compétence européenne.

En revanche, l'Union européenne doit intervenir lorsque la gestation pour autrui devient un instrument d'exploitation des femmes. Peut-on accepter qu'une femme marchande son corps pour tenter de mettre fin à sa précarité? Peut-on accepter qu'une femme soit exploitée contre de l'argent, parfois par des réseaux criminels, pour que son corps soit réduit à un simple instrument de reproduction? Non. Alors que cette institution lutte à la fois contre la traite des êtres humains et contre les violences faites aux femmes, il est de notre devoir de veiller à lutter contre ces dérives.

Chers collègues, marchander le corps d'une femme est incompatible avec le respect de la dignité du corps de la femme. Louer l'utérus d'une femme pendant neuf mois durant est éthiquement inconcevable. Les femmes ne doivent pas devenir une simple capacité reproductive, dont les bébés deviendraient des produits à acheter ou à vendre. Les femmes doivent être libres de disposer de leur corps. Certes, la GPA peut soulever des questions juridiques au niveau européen, notamment lorsque, après la naissance d'un enfant, se pose la question de sa filiation. C'est alors l'intérêt de l'enfant uniquement qui doit primer. L'Union européenne doit rester fidèle à ses valeurs, en luttant contre toute forme d'exploitation des êtres humains, sans empiéter sur les compétences des États membres.

Vera Tax, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, so here we are in the European Parliament discussing the topic of surrogacy. We talk about the uterus of fertile women and of couples who would like to have a child.

I can tell you one thing: the people of ECR who asked for this debate are not really interested in helping couples with a wish for a child or women who voluntarily want to help others. They have an opposite goal: polarisation. And they just stated that in the Netherlands, my country, commercial surrogacy is allowed. That is a lie. That is untrue. But did you know we all already know that the business model of clickbait advertisement is polarisation, but that you also know that also the clickbait model for right-wing politicians is polarisation.

The ECR will do anything to hold on to the idea of a family in its purest form, and now they have the newest balloon, and that is to criminalise surrogacy. And while such legislation can have enormous consequences for all children already involved, the ECR does not care for those children and what they really care about is their own political agenda.

Polarisation does not bring solutions. It only makes the world a bigger mess. So today I stand here as a woman, as a mother, as a European, and I ask you politely, stop discussing about the uterus of European women and stop putting minority groups in the centre of your politics to scare others in the hope of winning their votes.

Adrián Vázquez Lázara, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, no puedo empezar esta intervención sin expresar mi profunda decepción y rechazo al título que el Grupo ECR, el grupo de VOX, ha querido darle a este debate.

Asociar la gestación subrogada a la explotación y al tráfico no solo es un insulto a miles de menores y familias, sino que también es una manipulación interesada de aquellos que solo quieren esconder su radicalismo moral. Pero, por suerte, son siempre los ciudadanos europeos los que, generación tras generación, avanzan y progresan, y dejan atrás viejos tabúes sobre cómo poder vivir una vida plena y feliz hoy.

En la Unión Europea, hay muchos tipos distintos de familias —con ese—, que comparten y mantienen lo verdaderamente esencial: el amor y el compromiso de impulsar un proyecto común, a menudo a través de la maternidad o la paternidad.

Para muchas de estas familias, la gestación subrogada, altruista y garantista es la única manera de formar una familia. Se trata de un hecho que, como sociedad y ante el invierno demográfico al que nos enfrentamos como continente, deberíamos siempre apoyar, impulsar y celebrar.

No podemos permitir que se discrimine a menores europeos simplemente por cómo han sido gestados. Los niños son niños. Tampoco que los nuevos moralistas a izquierda y a derecha nos marquen el paso a todos los ciudadanos europeos. A mí nadie me tiene que dar ninguna clase de moralidad.

Por eso, pido hoy aquí de nuevo, como reivindicé en el debate sobre los derechos de reconocimiento de paternidad, que la Unión Europea sea valiente y dé cobertura a aquellos países también valientes que quieran afrontar el debate de la maternidad mirando al futuro. Pero, sobre todo, que dé cobertura y no deje tiradas a miles de familias y a miles de niños, que son los verdaderamente perjudicados por debates tan lamentables como el que, por desgracia, estamos aquí celebrando hoy.

Karima Delli, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, je vais vous le dire comme je le pense: le Parlement européen est le lieu des droits. C'est ici, par notre travail, qu'on assure que personne n'est discriminé pour ce qu'il est. Je n'accepterai pas que des sujets sociétaux aussi fondamentaux que l'aide à fonder une famille, que ce soit l'aide à la procréation ou à porter pour autrui, soient détournés ou instrumentalisés contre les familles LGBT.

Je m'adresse à vous, l'ECR, parce que c'est vous qui avez demandé ce débat. La vérité, c'est que dans les pays où vous êtes au gouvernement, la GPA n'est pas un sujet. Vous savez pourquoi? Parce que vous n'en êtes même pas encore là. En Pologne, vous venez nous parler de GPA. Vous n'avez même pas ouvert l'union civile aux couples homosexuels. Vous continuez à passer des lois anti-LGBT et à créer des zones sans LGBT. Année après année, les ONG nous le disent, la Pologne est devenue le pays le plus hostile aux LGBT en Europe. Alors, ne venez pas nous apporter votre haine ici, au Parlement européen.

De même, en Italie, on a vu votre chef, M^{me} Meloni, couper les droits à la filiation des enfants issus d'une GPA à l'étranger. Rappelez-vous, le maire de Milan, dans cet hémicycle, est venu tirer la sonnette d'alarme pour nous dire que des enfants n'étaient plus enregistrés à l'état civil, que leurs parents seraient criminalisés. Il est où, l'intérêt de l'enfant? Elle est où, votre humanité?

Je vous le dis très clairement, l'ECR: ne vous faites pas passer pour les défenseurs des femmes auprès de nous, alors que vous enfrez, là où vous êtes au gouvernement, les droits des familles homoparentales européennes à y recourir pour ce qu'ils sont, c'est à dire des familles. Je vous le dis: ce tort sera corrigé grâce au règlement sur la reconnaissance mutuelle de la filiation.

Si vous voulez vraiment un débat sur la GPA, il faudra d'abord prendre du temps. Ce n'est pas en débattant, notamment dans ce Parlement, qu'on arrive à la solution. Ce n'est pas vrai. Regardez du côté de nos amis belges. Un comité de bioéthique a rendu son rapport il y a une semaine. Un rapport mesuré et équilibré, loin des passions tristes qui vous déchaînent, et qui a pris du temps. Il apporte des réponses favorables sur les conditions de la solidarité reproductive, de l'autonomie, du consentement et de l'altruisme des femmes qui portent pour autrui – tout cela est encadré. Nous ferions bien tous ensemble de nous en inspirer et de consulter nous aussi nos organes éthiques européens, et non de faire de l'instrumentalisation.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, nuestras constituciones, los Tratados de la Unión Europea y el Estado de Derecho occidental tienen como base la protección de la dignidad de la persona. La Declaración Universal de los Derechos del Hombre es la máxima expresión en este sentido.

En el caso de la filiación, siempre se han buscado herramientas jurídicas que defiendan el derecho del niño a conocer a sus padres y ser cuidado por ellos. Evitar el riesgo de que a una madre puedan arrebatárle a su bebé. Todo eso está en riesgo hoy.

La tecnología ha dado pie a ciertas prácticas en reproducción, sin la oportuna reflexión. La gestación subrogada está repleta de innegables dilemas éticos y legales. Existen casos de niños encargados para abusar de ellos o abandonados por ser considerados —perdón por la expresión— defectuosos. Mujeres privadas de libertad, contratos nulos porque el bien de la persona es indisponible.

La persona es sujeto de derechos, nunca puede considerarse un objeto de transacción. Esta mercantilización de las relaciones, la cosificación de las personas, verlas como un objeto de mero deseo, es inasumible porque transforma el tratamiento que merece toda persona, pretendiendo acabar con el valor inherente e infinito que confiere nuestra existencia.

Señores, tengan en cuenta el impacto que tiene en nuestra sociedad una mirada de este tipo. La persona humana adquiere su estatus desde su génesis, con una carga genética única e irrepetible, herencia de su padre y de su madre, de generación en generación. No se puede disociar la expresión de la vida de la dimensión afectiva y familiar. Busquemos un sistema legal robusto que evite el riesgo de la ruptura de los vínculos que de forma natural unen a padres y a hijos. La propuesta de regulación de la Comisión va en esta preocupante dirección.

Mathilde Androuët, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, l'article 4 de la Convention du Conseil de l'Europe sur la lutte contre la traite des êtres humains précise que la traite des personnes «désigne le recrutement, le transport, le transfert, l'hébergement ou l'accueil de personnes, par la menace ou le recours à la force» ou toute autre contrainte telle que l'enlèvement, l'abus d'une situation de vulnérabilité ou par l'offre ou l'acceptation de paiements ou d'avantages. L'exploitation comprend l'exploitation de la prostitution d'autrui ou d'autres formes d'exploitation sexuelle, le travail ou les services forcés, l'esclavage ou les pratiques analogues à l'esclavage. Le consentement d'une victime de la traite des personnes n'importe pas lorsque l'un des moyens énoncés a été utilisé.

Or, qu'est-ce que la grossesse pour autrui? La GPA est la contractualisation d'une vie humaine, ici d'un bébé, pour un coût variant de 10 000 à 100 000 dollars, après un processus de tri qui n'est autre que de l'eugénisme. La femme est-elle réduite à un incubateur, à un objet, qui est souvent stocké, notamment en Asie, dans des fermes à bébés, le temps de la gestation, après qu'on a promis des indemnités équivalentes à trois à dix ans de salaire? À la lumière des textes et de notre éthique, il est clair que la GPA relève du trafic humain.

Ceux qui y recourent sont donc des trafiquants, au même titre que les proxénètes ou les marchands d'esclaves. Tous ceux qui opèrent sur le marché de la GPA rompent avec toute valeur humaniste ou féministe. Ils exploitent le corps des femmes, leur misère économique ou psychique, pour faire d'un enfant un bien commercialisable. Notre système juridique ne peut avaliser ce commerce ignoble et ne peut faciliter la vie de ceux qui ne sont rien d'autre que des trafiquants. Car oui, imaginer un certificat de parentalité européen, en plus d'être un hold-up législatif sur les droits nationaux, est le moyen d'organiser ces trafics d'enfants issus de GPA.

Ce n'est pas parce que certains prennent en otage le droit européen, et évidemment notre empathie naturelle à l'égard de bébés, que nous devons céder sur nos principes fondamentaux du respect de la femme et de l'enfant. L'avenir du monde réside ici, dans nos ventres de femmes. C'est la raison pour laquelle, au nom de notre humanité, ni le marché, ni les emprises, ni les trafics n'ont leur place dans nos corps – ni dans les faits, ni dans le droit, jamais.

La Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant proclamée par l'Assemblée générale des Nations unies édicte dans son article 35 que les États parties prennent toutes les mesures appropriées sur les plans nationaux, bilatéraux et multilatéraux pour empêcher l'enlèvement, la vente ou la traite d'enfants, à quelque fin que ce soit ou sous quelque forme que ce soit. Alors, l'Union européenne doit désormais prendre une décision ferme: est-elle du côté de la dignité humaine, ici de femmes et d'enfants, ou est-elle du côté des trafiquants?

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señora presidenta, niños a la carta. La gestación subrogada es una práctica eugenésica que consiste en dividir el papel de la madre en tres —adoptiva, gestante y donante—, y en buscar óvulos con una carga genética determinada y senos maternos de mujeres con una personalidad concreta.

En algunos países incluso se puede obligar a la gestante a abortar o no abortar, en ciertos casos, a alimentarse de tal o cual manera, o a hacer o no ejercicio, porque el que llaman «servicio de gestación» se ha de desarrollar con todas las garantías para que no resulte defectuoso el producto resultante. A esto se suman las condiciones de desigualdad económica en las que suelen darse estas transacciones, agravadas por la incorporación de un sinfín de intermediarios.

Finalmente, no deja de resultar curioso que con la gestación subrogada se apele muchas veces a la transgresión de la familia tradicional, cuando esa transgresión acaba derivando en un núcleo familiar también convencional, solo que articulado a partir del exclusivo vínculo biogenético de un padre, sin madre.

No nos engañemos, la gestación subrogada no dota de agencia a las mujeres, más bien las invisibiliza y las explota, especialmente si son vulnerables.

Tiziana Beghin (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mutui alle stelle, lavori precari, paghe da fame, imprese sempre più in difficoltà, pace in Ucraina sempre più lontana. No, per questo dibattito la destra capitanata da Fratelli d'Italia non ha proposto uno di questi temi urgenti per i cittadini. La loro priorità è alimentare l'ennesima caccia alle streghe contro le donne e le famiglie omogenitoriali.

La gestazione per altri è qualcosa di molto lontano dalla nostra cultura, soprattutto quella mediterranea, che ruota attorno alla famiglia. Ma il fatto che sia diversa non significa che sia giusta o sbagliata. Chi sono io per giudicare chi fa delle scelte diverse dalla mia? Se vogliamo essere seri e non fare propaganda becera, oggi dovremmo tutti insieme condannare lo sfruttamento a fini riproduttivi, ma non la libera e consapevole scelta di molte donne ad aiutare altre coppie a realizzare il sogno di essere genitori.

Ecco la differenza fra noi e loro. Noi rispettiamo il prossimo, la destra vuole imporre il proprio stile di vita. Per noi tutti i bambini, a prescindere da come siano stati procreati, e tutte le famiglie, etero, gay, con un solo genitore, dovrebbero avere gli stessi diritti, per la destra invece no. Ma non vincerete nemmeno nella prossima legislatura, perché l'amore è sempre più forte di odio e pregiudizi.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, debatujeme dnes o citlivé otázce náhradního mateřství, a to v souvislosti s obavou o jeho zneužívání zejména pro komerční účely. Je zřejmé, že členské státy hledají dobré řešení a nejsou zdaleka jednotné. Zatímco některé členské státy umožňují náhradní mateřství pro nekomerční, altruistické účely, jako například Řecko, Belgie, Nizozemsko, Portugalsko, jiné členské státy je zcela zakazují, jako například Francie, Německo, Itálie, Španělsko. Právě proto, aby se s náhradním mateřstvím prostě neobchodovalo. Jsou země, kde regulace není. Ale je důležité, že žádná země Evropské unie neumožňuje náhradní mateřství pro komerční účely. Ačkoliv lidsky chápu touhu po rodičovství, touhu rodičů po dítěti, zásadně nesouhlasím s legalizací náhradního rodi-

čovství, náhradního mateřství. Tím hlavním důvodem je právo dítěte. Každé dítě má právo se narodit a mít rodiče, ale neexistuje právo na to mít dítě. A pokud se stane, že dítě nemá rodiče nebo o rodiče přijde, pak je zde právě náhradní rodinná péče, adopce nebo pěstounství tak, aby dítě mělo rodičovskou péči, aby mělo náhradní rodiče. Dnešní společnost si myslí, že se všechno dá koupit. Nedá. Nesmíme připustit, aby se život stal zbožím. Život je dar. Je to zázrak, pro někoho zázrak přírody, ale život dítěte se nesmí stát zbožím.

Carina Ohlsson (S&D). – Fru talman! Som feminist och socialdemokrat är jämställdhet och kvinnors rättigheter självklara prioriteringar för mig. I årtionden har jag arbetat för att bekämpa mäns våld mot kvinnor och för att varje kvinnas och flickas grundläggande rättigheter fullt ut ska respekteras. I det arbetet är det självklart för mig att kvinnors kroppar måste skyddas från alla former av exploatering och kommersialisering.

Arbetet för ett jämställt EU går alldeles för långsamt, och runt om i vår union finns rörelser som till och med arbetar hårt för att ett jämställt EU aldrig ska bli verklighet. I debatt efter debatt står högljudda högerkonservativa ledamöter i den här salen och motarbetar förslag och åtgärder som försvarar både kvinnors och hbtqi-personers mänskliga rättigheter. När de väl tar till orda under temat kvinnors rättigheter är det underliggande syftet något helt annat.

Jag vill därför betona att förutom att EU måste säkerställa barns och kvinnors rättigheter och arbeta för ett jämställt och jämlikt samhälle måste EU också stärka och garantera hbtqi-personers och regnbågsfamiljers grundläggande rättigheter.

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Fru formand! At stifte familie og bære sit eget barn, det er to af de ting, som er mest fundamentale for os som mennesker, samt at føre generationer videre og skabe en fremtid på denne jord for børn i ens familie. Det som surrogatmødre gør, det er, at de hjælper mennesker og familier til at fuldføre denne drøm. Vi skal lade kvinder bestemme over deres egen krop. Vi skal lade kvinder selv træffe et valg, om de ønsker at hjælpe familier med at fuldføre denne drøm. Det skal vi ikke som politikere gøre. Vi opnår ikke ligestilling i Europa ved at umyndiggøre kvinder. Vi bliver nødt til at tro på, at de kvinder, som ønsker at være surrogatmødre, har truffet et frit valg, og at de ved, hvad de ønsker at gøre ved deres egen krop. Der er mange medicinske og andre grunde til at bruge surrogatmødre, og det skal vi ikke som politikere stille os i vejen for. Alle børn har ret til deres forældre og til deres familier. Og vi bliver nødt til at sørge for, at europæernes drømme om familier og børn kan udledes og ikke forhindres af politiske ønsker.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Surogacja podważa godność ludzką kobiety, ponieważ jej ciało i funkcje reprodukcyjne wykorzystywane są jako towar. Surogacja to de facto podpisywanie kontraktu na ludzkie życie. Kobieta staje się inkubatorem, a dziecko towarem. Wykorzystuje się ciało kobiety będącej w trudnych warunkach życiowych, najczęściej żyjącej w biedzie, do celów komercyjnych. To nic innego niż handel ludźmi.

Chciałabym zwrócić uwagę na to, że surogacja jest niezgodna z wartościami zapisanymi w art. 2 Traktatu. Również w rezolucji Parlamentu Europejskiego z 2015 roku potępiliśmy tę praktykę, stanowiąc że praktyka surogacji podważa godność kobiety, ponieważ jej ciało i funkcje reprodukcyjne są wykorzystywane jako towar. A dzisiejsza dyskusja, szczególnie z lewej strony, idzie w takim kierunku, że dziecko można sobie zamówić, dziecko można sobie kupić. Stać mnie. Dlaczego nie można tego robić? Dlatego, proszę Państwa, że to jest nieludzkie, nieetyczne i niehumanitarne. Nie można w ten sposób traktować zarówno kobiet, jak i dzieci.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, não somos insensíveis perante o legítimo desejo de ser mãe, mas há preocupações que não podem ser subestimadas ou ignoradas, como a instrumentalização da vida e do corpo humano, neste caso, do corpo da mulher e dos seus órgãos reprodutores.

A exploração económica do sistema reprodutivo das mulheres é bem evidente no negócio das barrigas de aluguer, convenientemente designado de gestação de substituição. É um negócio sórdido que procura esconder a gritante exploração de classe que o envolve, a especulação que lhe é inerente e os sérios riscos para a saúde e a integridade física e psicológica das mulheres que vendem os seus óvulos ou alugam o corpo como substitutos da gravidez de outra mulher.

Consideramos que os direitos não se constroem à custa da exploração de uns sobre outros. É preciso combater estas conceções assentes na mercantilização do corpo da mulher, seja por via das barrigas de aluguer, seja por via da prostituição. É preciso combater todas as formas de exploração e violência contra as mulheres e é nesse combate que estamos empenhadas.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Madam President, dear colleagues, let me first underline that family law belongs to the national competence of Member States. Therefore, Italy and its government has the exclusive right to decide on marriage, on adoption and all other family law issues. It is more than right also that when such laws are enacted, certain higher moral considerations prevail.

Our European culture is based upon Christianity and Christian values, which entail certain moral obligations and restrictions on human action. We must not attempt to create a world where the laws of nature and life are completely disregarded. We must not allow humans to become objects, and we must not let children become products or goods to buy for a certain price.

It is cynical that those on the left of this House who regularly pose as warriors of human rights now simply call for the legalisation of practices that trample on human dignity. We should all accept that life and birth are sacred and humans are not the masters of life and death.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kolegice i kolege, zasnivanje obitelji, stvaranje novog života i želja za roditeljstvom jedna su od temeljnih, najintimnijih, ali ujedno i najosjetljivijih područja ljudskog života.

Čuli smo i u ovoj raspravi pokušaje opravdavanja komercijalnog ugovaranja trudnoće, komercijalnog ugovaranja rađanja djece s nekakvim navodnim plemenitim ciljevima. Nažalost, bez obzira na moguće plemenite ciljeve u nekim situacijama, s tim se nikako ne mogu složiti. Surogat majčinstvo grubo narušava dostojanstvo svih uključenih. Najviše vrijeda ljudski integritet zamjenske majke, čije se tijelo iskorištava za nečije tuđe ciljeve, čije se tijelo eksploatira – često s komercijalnom pozadinom. Čak i kada postoji pristanak, kao i kod trgovanja ljudima, on je često uvjetovan kompleksnim životnim okolnostima gdje se upravo ta financijska dimenzija, nažalost, ponekad čini kao jedini mogući izlaz iz životnih problema.

U suštini, trudnoća ni u kojem slučaju ne može biti usluga koja se može kupiti. Rađanje djeteta ne može biti nekakva pravna činidba koja se može ugovoriti ugovorom, a niti dijete, niti tijelo žene, ne mogu biti objekt za ispunjenje želja drugih. Moramo biti iznimno oprezni i spriječiti bilo kakvu instrumentalizaciju, spriječiti eksploataciju, spriječiti ideološko eksperimentiranje i pretvaranje i žena i djeteta u produkt industrije.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la pratica per la gestazione per altri è una pratica che calpesta i diritti delle donne e dei bambini, sfrutta e mercifica il corpo della donna, commercializza la gestazione e contraddice anche con tutto il percorso del femminismo basato sulla dignità e sulla libertà della donna.

Per questo il nostro è un no chiaro e netto a tale pratica, che in Italia, come in molti paesi, la maggior parte dei paesi europei, è già vietata ed è reato. Voglio dire in modo chiaro a chi vuole, anche su questi temi così sensibili e intimi, fare della strumentalizzazione politica, che il Partito Democratico non intende modificare tale legge. Punto.

Naturalmente quando noi legiferiamo pensiamo ai principi e ai valori, ma pensiamo anche alle persone in carne ed ossa, alle persone che ci sono. E per questo ribadisco che i bambini, i diritti dei bambini sono in primo piano. Vanno tutelati tutti i diritti dei bambini che sono nati, che ci sono, a prescindere dalle scelte degli adulti, e ciò è un fatto, a mio avviso, di umanità e di civiltà. Lo è per noi, ma penso che dovrebbe esserlo per tutti. Penso a percorsi di adozione, a soluzioni legislative che ci sono e si possono trovare e rendere più rapide e più appropriate a tutte le situazioni. Questo è un punto imprescindibile.

Infine, sul cosiddetto ipotetico e molto labile, anche giuridicamente, reato universale, io penso che se vogliamo davvero in buona fede estendere il divieto in sede internazionale, si parte dalle sedi internazionali, dagli organismi internazionali, e non provocatoriamente dai parlamenti nazionali con proposte illusorie, di bandiera, che anche in questo caso hanno un intento provocatorio e strumentale.

Pierre Karleskind (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le rapporteur, s'il y a bien une chose sur laquelle je suis d'accord avec vous, c'est que, si la GPA c'est un couple qui achète un ovocyte et qui loue un ventre pour fabriquer un enfant, c'est effectivement une horreur, c'est une exploitation et c'est inacceptable.

Pourtant, dans votre discours, ce qui m'a particulièrement choqué, c'est que vous n'avez même pas été capable d'imaginer que certaines femmes puissent avoir le désir sincère de mettre leur ventre au service, généreusement et de façon altruiste, de certains couples qui ne peuvent avoir un enfant. Vous avez même eu ces propos méprisants pour les femmes, en les renvoyant à l'aspect pécuniaire. C'est scandaleux, parce que vous prenez les femmes pour des mineures. Dans les pays qui sont gouvernés par vos partis, c'est toujours la même chose – prenez le recul des droits à l'avortement. De la même façon, le ventre des femmes, c'est quelque chose dont vous dissertez, mais le ventre d'une femme n'appartient qu'à celle-ci.

Par conséquent, si la GPA met autour de la table non pas deux personnes qui achètent des prestations à deux autres, mais bien des personnes qui expriment simplement le désir de prêter ce ventre, qui va permettre de mettre au monde un enfant, et de donner cet ovocyte et deux personnes qui auront le désir de faire grandir l'enfant, eh bien, peut-être avon-nous là un modèle de GPA éthique.

Vincenzo Sofo (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la condanna unanime di una pratica disumana come l'utero in affitto dovrebbe essere cosa scontata e non oggetto di dibattito. Ma quando questa maggioranza ha deciso di bocciare un nostro emendamento che introduceva il reato di utero in affitto in tutta l'Unione europea, ci è nato un sospetto. Il sospetto che per voi adescare donne in difficoltà economica offrendo loro quattro soldi per ingravidarle per conto terzi e poi sequestrarne il figlio non sia una barbarie, ma normale attività mercantile da legalizzare. Un sospetto orrendo, lo ammetto, ma tutte le volte che vi chiediamo di fugare ogni dubbio, definendolo reato, fuggite.

Ora, non conosco il motivo della vostra paura a prendere una posizione chiara, ma quest'Aula non può più fuggire dall'esprimere un'inequivocabile condanna a questa pratica infame. E deve farlo anche perché si avvicinano all'ingresso in Unione europea paesi, pensiamo all'Ucraina, dove vi ricordo che l'utero in affitto è legale e che sono usati da fabbrica di bambini surrogati per tutta Europa, e anche certi Stati membri dell'UE lo stanno legalizzando.

Urge dunque che l'Europa ristabilisca i suoi principi civilizzazionali non negoziabili e il rispetto della dignità e della vita umana è e deve essere il fondamento basilare, e ripeto basilare, della nostra civiltà.

Malin Björk (The Left). – Madam President, first of all, let me be clear, there are many ways to make a family and have kids: with a lover, with a friend, within a couple or outside a couple. You can be heterosexual. You can be homosexual. You can be two parents, three parents, you can be multi-parenting. There is truly a rainbow of families in Europe and they should have the protection to move freely around in Europe. There is a particular gap in legal protection also for families and children in situations where there are multiple parents, more than two.

But when it comes to surrogacy and the surrogacy industry, this is a commodification of women and children. It is economically privileged people, couples, paying non-privileged less privileged women for carrying a baby and giving them away.

And this is how Ukrainian women are exploited in their thousands today. It's a kind of merchandising and commercialisation of women's bodies that we should say no to. So I wish rainbow families to flourish, but I don't wish the surrogacy industry to flourish.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, dieťa nie je tovar, myslím si, že na tomto sa všetci zhodneme. Dôstojnosť každého človeka musí byť chránená. Aj to je všeobecne prijímaný a podporovaný fakt. Prečo potom máme problém odsúdiť niečo, čo robí z detí komoditu a zneužíva chudobu žien, a to najmä tých z rozvojových krajín, a robí z nich predmet komerčných vzťahov? Surogátne alebo tzv. náhradné materstvo porušuje medzinárodne uznané práva žien a detí a zasahuje do ich dôstojnosti, a to hneď viacsobne. Ignoruje prirodzený vzťah medzi matkou a dieťaťom. Vystavuje ženy a deti na milosť a nemilosť objednávateľov, pretože neexistujú žiadne pravidlá pre prípady, keď je dieťa napríklad kvôli tomu, že sa narodí s postihnutím, odmietnuté. A napriek tomu, že aj tento parlament niekoľkokrát odsúdil prax surogátneho materstva, nedokážeme otvorene pomenovať, že ide o fenomén, ktorý vždy prinesie negatívne dôsledky pre niekoho. Ženy, ktoré najčastejšie v dôsledku svojej zraniteľnej situácii poskytli právne veľmi otázný súhlas s dohodou. Deti, ktoré boli počas pandémie odložené do skladov alebo ich budúcnosť je absolútne otázná, lebo si ich objednávateľia nechceli alebo nemohli vyzdvihnúť. V konečnom dôsledku sa to týka aj nás všetkých, pretože upúšťame od základných hodnôt, na ktorých je postavená naša slobodná demokratická spoločnosť a nechráňme tých najzraniteľnejších.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Madam President, a few years ago, my male partner's sister spoke to us, telling us that should we want to build a family, she would be willing to help us to do so. She did so unprompted, unasked for, but she wanted to be there to help, should we want to. Therefore, I really much agree with what Pierre Karleskind said earlier with regards to people wanting to help others.

This debate has been asked by the Italian far right of Meloni not because of the interest in fighting for women's rights, because in all your votes in this Chamber, you have always voted against even the most basic of women's rights in our journey towards gender equality. You simply wanted this debate because you thought you could divide us, because we might have different opinions on this matter. However, as a House, we are truly committed, and very strongly, towards freedom and we are very committed towards human rights for every single individual living in our European Union.

Unlike the Italian far right of Meloni, this House stands for women's rights and the right to their bodily autonomy. Unlike to the Italian far right of Meloni, this House stands for Europe being an LGBTIQ freedom zone, which you have voted against. We stand in this House with all Italians who have to wake up every day, seeing their rights being taken away, by this new government that has been formed, every day.

But ultimately, irrespective of our personal beliefs on this matter, I want to thank all of the women in this House who have for years worked for gender equality. We have written history together in these five years in this House, where for the first time we did agree about the right to autonomy in the Matic report. Thank you to all those who have always worked for women's rights, and I am really sorry to see this very cheap way of fighting against equality by the ECR.

Cristian Terheş (ECR). – Madam President, dear colleagues, surrogacy is one of the biggest threats to the dignity and safety of a woman and her child. And I restate 'of her child' – a man cannot give birth regardless of how many absurd resolutions the European Parliament adopts.

The natural desire and destiny that only a woman has is to carry and give birth to another human person. This is an undeniable natural fact. Surrogacy laws deny and disregard the natural, biological, physical and emotional bond between the mother and her child during both pregnancy and after birth.

Laws permitting surrogacy look at both the mother and her child as commodities which can be rented, exploited or sold as many rich people wish. It takes a male and a female to procreate, and it takes the natural family of a man and a woman to normally raise a child. No sane society can allow the woman to be transformed into womb for sale or hire, nor children into goods for sale. Surrogacy is violating the natural law as well as the emotional and natural bond between the mother and her child, and the child that she carries, which must be banned.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, merci pour ce débat. Je crois qu'il aura été essentiel, notamment parce qu'il a permis de montrer que de tous bords viennent des voix qui tentent d'alerter sur cette mise en cause très grave de la dignité humaine que constitue la GPA.

Certains collègues ont parlé, je ne doute pas de leur sincérité, de la possibilité d'une gestation pour autrui éthique. Cependant, la réalité cruelle de la GPA aujourd'hui, chers collègues, ce sont des milliers de femmes – c'est à elles que je pense – exploitées aujourd'hui par des entreprises sans scrupule, qui viennent démarcher les plus riches dans de grands hôtels à Paris et dans toutes les capitales occidentales. Ce sont des enfants achetés sur catalogue, devenus objet d'un contrat et même abandonnés parfois à l'aberration d'une situation commerciale, comme ces enfants d'Ukraine bloqués pendant la crise de la COVID-19, parce que leurs commanditaires ne pouvaient pas venir les chercher.

C'est la réalité, chers collègues, et cette réalité, quel que soit le degré de consentement exprimé, correspond à une situation de traite d'êtres humains. Oui, dans notre droit, aujourd'hui, un adulte consentant peut se trouver victime d'une situation de traite d'êtres humains, lorsqu'il est manifeste que c'est d'abord une situation de vulnérabilité exploitée par des plus forts qui est en train de se jouer.

Nous avons la possibilité d'interdire la gestation pour autrui, et ce Parlement européen doit le faire dans le cadre de notre directive contre la traite d'êtres humains. J'espère que nous serons unis et je voudrais remercier tous les collègues de gauche et tous les collègues écologistes qui, fidèles à leur combat, sont aujourd'hui capables de dénoncer le faux progrès que constitue cette technique.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario de Justicia Reynders, en ejercicio de su derecho, un grupo ultraconservador de este Parlamento Europeo que copreside Giorgia Meloni, primera ministra de Italia, trae a este debate su propuesta de criminalizar la gestación subrogada y el reconocimiento de la filiación. Al comisario de Justicia le hemos escuchado decir que la Unión Europea no tiene competencia al respecto, que la tienen los Estados miembros.

Procedo de un Estado miembro que prohíbe la gestación subrogada. Es una solución que defiendo porque cosifica el cuerpo de la mujer y, por tanto, considero nulo de pleno derecho cualquier contrato que pretenda comercializar esa transacción, además de abusar y explotar a personas vulnerables. Normalmente es una situación insoportable de desigualdad económica.

Pero la propuesta en Italia de Giorgia Meloni se acompaña, además, de un señalamiento de las familias de personas del mismo sexo, haciendo como si esa fuera la única situación causal de la gestación subrogada. No solamente es falso, sino que eso es contrario también al Derecho europeo.

Es cierto que la Carta de Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea prohíbe comercializar con partes del cuerpo, del mismo modo que prohíbe la clonación, pero también prohíbe la discriminación por cualquier razón de género u orientación sexual, además de prohibir, por tanto, cualquier discriminación de menores, cuyo interés superior debe prevalecer independientemente de su origen. Porque la discriminación por origen, aunque el origen de la filiación sea ilegal, también es contrario al Derecho europeo.

Por tanto, tenemos que decir que no contará con el apoyo de la mayoría de este Parlamento Europeo para sacar adelante una propuesta para la que no tiene competencia y que no se explica por lo que afirma, sino más bien por lo que oculta.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Prawo musi być stanowione na fundamencie norm moralnych. Prawo i stanowione prawo nie może łamać norm moralnych. Dzisiaj dużo mówi się o wolności, ale każda wolność jest ograniczona odpowiedzialnością, szczególnie za drugiego człowieka. Dlatego trzeba powiedzieć głośno dzisiaj, tu w Parlamencie Europejskim, że surogacja to nie jest macierzyństwo, surogacja to jest handel dziećmi. Przecież już odnotowujemy ten niebezpieczny precedens, który jest stworzony i rozwinięty przez dziesiątki firm dostarczających małe pociechy dla wielu par. Mało powiedzieć, że surogacja jest reklamowana na specjalnych targach odbywających się cyklicznie w jednym z największych państw europejskich. Tam kupuje się i sprzedaje pewną ofertę. A ja pytam czym to się różni od targów dla niewolników z XVIII czy XIX wieku?

Każde dziecko ma przyznane w Konwencji o ochronie praw dzieci możliwość poznania swoich biologicznych rodziców. Surogacja uniemożliwi ten proces. Zatem uważam, że nie ma i nie powinno być nigdy na ten proceder naszej zgody.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, we kunnen het erover eens zijn dat kinderen geen handelswaar zijn. Er is echter een wereldwijde industrie voor draagmoederschap ontstaan, die gepaard gaat met moderne slavernij en uitbuiting van kwetsbare vrouwen.

Kinderloosheid kan zeer moeilijk zijn. Het inzetten van draagmoederschap als oplossing roept echter belangrijke ethische vragen op. Zo worden er soms afspraken gemaakt over het aborteren van kinderen, bijvoorbeeld bij een meerlingzwangerschap of vanwege een handicap. Dit komt ook voor bij altruïstisch draagmoederschap.

In maart jongstleden heeft een groep van honderd deskundigen opgeroepen tot een universeel verbod op draagmoederschap: de verklaring van Casablanca. Ik ondersteun deze oproep van harte; niet om te polariseren, maar in het belang van moeder en kind. Kinderen zijn immers geen producten.

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, as explained in my introduction, the possible regulation or even prohibition of surrogacy as well as the establishment of the parenthood of the child born out of surrogacy, remains a competence of each Member State.

Since several of you mentioned the proposal put forward by the Commission on the recognition of parenthood, I want to be clear that its objective it is not to legalise surrogacy throughout the European Union. Our proposal only aims to ensure that the parenthood of a child established by one Member State is recognised in the other Member States. This is to ensure that when a link of parenthood exists in a Member State, children are not deprived of certain rights deriving from parenthood under national law such as succession or maintenance rights when they find themselves in a cross-border situation in the Union, for example, when they exercise their right to free movement.

All children are treated equally under the proposal, whatever the way they are conceived or born, and whatever the type of family. The proposal has the best interests of the child as a primary consideration. This is also an obligation under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child to which all Member States are parties.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Ich bedanke mich für diese – wie ich finde – sehr respektvolle Debatte.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D), *por escrito*. – Debate de actualidad planteado por ECR, poco después de que la primera ministra de Italia, Georgia Meloni, haya atentado contra los derechos de las familias homosexuales (de mujeres) indicando al Ministerio del Interior que no registren (o borren) a la madre no gestante de la inscripción en los ayuntamientos de los menores nacidos por gestación subrogada o inseminación artificial.

La extrema derecha ataca los derechos LGTBIQI+ en un caso de discriminación que está yendo en contra de los derechos de los niños y niñas, oculta detrás de los supuestos «familia tradicional» y «derechos de las mujeres».

Los y las socialistas sí que estamos con los derechos de las mujeres, tanto a no ser explotadas sexualmente como a poder ejercer su derecho al aborto. Estamos, siempre, a favor de la libertad de las mujeres, también a favor de los derechos LGTBIQI+ y también a favor de esos menores que Meloni no quiere en Italia por sus familias diferentes. Todos son Europa, la Europa diversa, tolerante, más justa y fuerte que queremos y en la que la derecha no cree.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial (S&D), *por escrito*. – Debate de actualidad planteado por ECR, poco después de que la primera ministra de Italia, Georgia Meloni, haya atentado contra los derechos de las familias homosexuales (de mujeres) indicando al Ministerio del Interior que no registren (o borren) a la madre no gestante de la inscripción en los ayuntamientos de los menores nacidos por gestación subrogada o inseminación artificial.

La extrema derecha ataca los derechos LGTBIQI+ en un caso de discriminación que está yendo en contra de los derechos de los niños y niñas, oculta detrás de los supuestos «familia tradicional» y «derechos de las mujeres».

Los y las socialistas sí que estamos con los derechos de las mujeres, tanto a no ser explotadas sexualmente como a poder ejercer su derecho al aborto. Estamos, siempre, a favor de la libertad de las mujeres, también a favor de los derechos LGTBIQI+ y también a favor de esos menores que Meloni no quiere en Italia por sus familias diferentes. Todos son Europa, la Europa diversa, tolerante, más justa y fuerte que queremos y en la que la derecha no cree.

Cristina Maestre Martín De Almagro (S&D), *por escrito*. – Debate de actualidad planteado por ECR, poco después de que la primera ministra de Italia, Georgia Meloni, haya atentado contra los derechos de las familias homosexuales (de mujeres) indicando al Ministerio del Interior que no registren (o borren) a la madre no gestante de la inscripción en los ayuntamientos de los menores nacidos por gestación subrogada o inseminación artificial.

La extrema derecha ataca los derechos LGTBIQI+ en un caso de discriminación que está yendo en contra de los derechos de los niños y niñas, oculta detrás de los supuestos «familia tradicional» y «derechos de las mujeres».

Los y las socialistas sí que estamos con los derechos de las mujeres, tanto a no ser explotadas sexualmente como a poder ejercer su derecho al aborto. Estamos, siempre, a favor de la libertad de las mujeres, también a favor de los derechos LGTBIQI+ y también a favor de esos menores que Meloni no quiere en Italia por sus familias diferentes. Todos son Europa, la Europa diversa, tolerante, más justa y fuerte que queremos y en la que la derecha no cree.

Adriana Maldonado López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Debate de actualidad planteado por ECR, poco después de que la primera ministra de Italia, Georgia Meloni, haya atentado contra los derechos de las familias homosexuales (de mujeres) indicando al Ministerio del Interior que no registren (o borren) a la madre no gestante de la inscripción en los ayuntamientos de los menores nacidos por gestación subrogada o inseminación artificial.

La extrema derecha ataca los derechos LGTBIQI+ en un caso de discriminación que está yendo en contra de los derechos de los niños y niñas, oculta detrás de los supuestos «familia tradicional» y «derechos de las mujeres».

Los y las socialistas sí que estamos con los derechos de las mujeres, tanto a no ser explotadas sexualmente como a poder ejercer su derecho al aborto. Estamos, siempre, a favor de la libertad de las mujeres, también a favor de los derechos LGTBIQI+ y también a favor de esos menores que Meloni no quiere en Italia por sus familias diferentes. Todos son Europa, la Europa diversa, tolerante, más justa y fuerte que queremos y en la que la derecha no cree.

14. Examen del uso del programa espía de vigilancia Pegasus y otros programas equivalentes – Examen del uso del programa espía de vigilancia Pegasus y otros programas equivalentes (proyecto de recomendación) (debate)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die gemeinsame Aussprache über

— den Bericht von Sophia in 't Veld im Namen des Untersuchungsausschusses zum Einsatz von Pegasus und ähnlicher Überwachungs- und Spähsoftware über die Prüfung von behaupteten Verstößen gegen das Unionsrecht und Missständen bei der Anwendung desselben im Zusammenhang mit dem Einsatz von Pegasus und ähnlicher Überwachungs- und Spähsoftware (2022/2077(INI)) (A9-0189/2023) und

— den Entwurf einer Empfehlung des Europäischen Parlaments an den Rat und die Kommission, ingereicht gemäß Artikel 208 Absatz 12 GO, nach der Prüfung von behaupteten Verstößen gegen das Unionsrecht und Missständen bei der Anwendung desselben im Zusammenhang mit dem Einsatz von Pegasus und ähnlicher Überwachungs- und Spähsoftware (2023/2500(RSP)) (B9-0260/2023)

Sophia in 't Veld, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, today we are going to have the debate and tomorrow the vote on the recommendations put forward by the PEGA Committee, which is the conclusion of the work that we have been doing for 14 or 15 months.

And let us go back a little bit to what it is that we are talking about: spyware. You know, this stuff that creeps into your mobile phone and takes over your life without you even noticing it. And of course, we have been focusing a lot on what this means to the individual whose privacy is violated in the most horrible way.

But I think what may be even more important is what this means for democracy, because spyware is not just a technology. It is a tool in a broader toolkit, the toolkit of the authoritarian. It is a grave threat to democracy because spyware is not being used against just any citizen – and this is also why many people think, 'oh, it doesn't concern me. It concerns only a handful of people that I have nothing to do with.' No, it concerns the very people who are the custodians of our democracy, the people who hold power to account, the people who scrutinise, the people who exercise oversight, journalists, oversight bodies, lawyers, NGOs, researchers, opposition politicians.

And, you know, I firmly believe that democracy is about checks and balances and accountability and scrutiny. Take those away and democracy is dead. If you have no more countervailing powers, then democracy is dead. And that is the very purpose of the regimes that are using spyware against some of their own citizens.

And this is not only happening in Saudi Arabia or Mexico. No, it's happening right here on our doorstep within the European Union by EU governments. It is a democracy crisis, you might say.

But let us see a little bit what happened since the news of this broke, which is now almost two years ago, July 2021, when the Pegasus Project presented its report. Justice has not been done in a single case. Not a single case. No inquiry – be it parliamentary or judicial or a police inquiry – has been concluded in a meaningful way. In not a single Member State has light been shed on the situation. Not a single case of illicit exports has been investigated and not a single license has been repealed.

Colleagues, nothing has been done. Some countries have taken measures, but in most of the cases they are meaningless, or they even make matters worse. And I have to say the European Union has also been pretty much absent, with the exception of this House and maybe the European Public Prosecutor's Office. Letters have been written to the Member States asking them for explanations, but in a very friendly way.

Now I find the contrast with the response of the European Union to other crises quite stark. You know, we've had we've had a war, we've had a pandemic, we had inflation, we had an energy crisis, a bit longer ago, we had the banking crisis. And every time, you know, the European Union was there with a crisis response. In this case, the crisis is a democratic crisis. Democracy is the core of what the European Union is about, and yet the European Union is absent.

Now, tomorrow, dear Commissioner, we are adopting a comprehensive set of recommendations, and I would really ask the Commission to follow up as much as you can, really seek the limits of your powers. And in any case, report back in great detail to the European Parliament, preferably even before the summer break, about how you intend to give a follow-up to our recommendations, because this is not the end of our work, friends. This is where it starts. Tomorrow we're going to adopt the big sledgehammer that we will be fighting authoritarianism with and we will make sure that every single recommendation is implemented, no matter how long it takes.

Didier Reynders, *Membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Messieurs les députés, la Commission européenne tient à remercier la commission PEGA pour son rapport sur l'utilisation présumée de Pegasus et d'autres logiciels de surveillance dans l'Union européenne.

Nous étudierons avec soin les recommandations adoptées par votre Parlement et nous nous tenons prêts à y donner les suites opportunes. Je suppose qu'il en va de même pour le Conseil, même si celui-ci n'a pas été invité pour ce débat. La Commission a suivi avec une grande attention les travaux de la commission PEGA. Entretemps, nous avons déjà pris des mesures.

The Commission has already made clear that it condemns any illegal interference in personal communications as it goes against democratic values and undermines fundamental rights. We expect that national competent authorities and courts make full use of their powers to totally investigate the allegations regarding any unlawful surveillance activities and to restore citizens trust. Spyware is a particularly intrusive technology. It is paramount that the fundamental rights to privacy and data protection, as enshrined in EU law, are fully respected all over the Union. The legal framework governing the use of spyware can differ depending on whether its use falls under EU law or national law.

Comme je l'ai déjà évoqué, dans les cas où le droit de l'Union s'applique à l'utilisation d'un logiciel espion, la confidentialité des communications et des données personnelles est protégée par le règlement général sur la protection des données, la directive «police-justice» et la directive vie privée et communications électroniques. Les autorités de surveillance et les juridictions nationales sont compétentes en vertu de ces instruments pour garantir le respect effectif de ce cadre législatif.

Le droit de l'Union relatif à la protection des données continue à s'appliquer en ce qui concerne le traitement des données à caractère personnel par des entités privées, même lorsque ce traitement est requis par la loi à des fins de sécurité nationale. De même, le droit de l'Union est aussi applicable lorsque les autorités publiques traitent des données à caractère personnel à des fins répressives et pénales.

Ainsi, lorsque les services répressifs utilisent des logiciels espions pour de tels objectifs, la directive «police-justice» s'applique. Dans ces situations, les personnes physiques doivent être en mesure d'exercer leur droit à la protection des données, tel que prévu par le droit de l'Union, ce qui inclut le droit à l'information et celui à un recours juridictionnel effectif.

La Commission insiste sur l'importance, pour les autorités de contrôle et les autorités judiciaires nationales, de disposer de compétences suffisantes et des moyens nécessaires pour les exercer. Il est essentiel que ces autorités fassent pleinement usage de l'ensemble de leurs pouvoirs pour examiner de manière approfondie toute allégation de violation de droits en ce domaine.

However, as you know, EU law does not apply to cases where public authorities directly access the data, so not via a telecom operator and process them for genuine national security purposes, which is a different issue than law enforcement. An important question in this debate is therefore the delineation between the application of EU law and national rules on national security, as the PEGA Committee has also underlined. It is for the Member States to define their national security interests and to adopt appropriate measures to ensure their national and external security. Nevertheless, the European Court of Justice made clear that Member States must be able to demonstrate that national security would be compromised in the case at issue. The Court of Justice also held that threats relating to national security are the ones that are capable of seriously destabilising the fundamental constitutional, political, economic and social structures of a country such as terrorist activities. Based on the Court case-law. Therefore, Member States cannot merely refer to national security in a general way to exclude the application of EU law. In cases reported by the press, the real issue seems to be whether the use of such spyware is generally justified by national security in the individual cases at hand. When such a restriction to the right to privacy and personal data protection cannot be justified as falling under national security, EU law must apply with all the requirements it provides. It is also important to bear in mind that where EU law is not applicable, the European Convention on Human Rights still applies as well as national constitutional-law safeguards.

Honourable Members, the Commission has been gathering information from all the Member States about the national legal frameworks governing the use of spyware in order to examine the interplay with EU data protection law. Most Member States have replied except the Netherlands and Hungary, and we are following up with Member States whose replies are still outstanding. We are carefully analysing the responses received. This exercise requires putting Member States responses in the context of their relevant national framework. It is important to consider the following points where Member States have in place national legislation framing the use of tools such as spyware for national security purposes: whether the national legislation provides for specific and sufficient safeguards, given the high level of intrusiveness of the use of surveillance tools. The report of the committee highlights the alleged use of spyware against journalists in several Member States. As you may recall, this led the Commission to introduce specific safeguards in the proposal for European Media Freedom Act. We propose a special provision to further restrict the use of spyware against media service providers and journalists beyond the restrictions applying to other forms of surveillance. The discussions on this file are ongoing in the European Parliament and in the Council. The proposal for a Cyber Resilience Act tabled by the Commission in September last year, also aims to address some of the challenges of supply chain security and to ensure that digital products present on the European market are sufficiently secure. We also acknowledge the concerns regarding media reports about certain Member States exporting spyware to third countries with authoritarian regimes leading to possible human rights violations.

The new Dual-Use Regulation in force since 2021 reinforced the reporting on export of cybersecurity items, including spyware. Still, Member States are in charge of granting export authorisations. According to the Dual-Use Regulation, Member States are obliged to report individual denials, but not authorisations. Having said that, the Commission continues working with the Member States to obtain their assurance of a proper implementation of EU legislation. Furthermore, in line with the current Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy, the EU committed to uphold and advance human rights around the world, online and offline. The European Union's position regarding unlawful online surveillance is firm. States should implement legislation and safeguards to protect people from unlawful surveillance, including any arbitrary or mass surveillance that may be carried out by State actors in cyberspace as well as in the physical world. Any such policies have to be fully in line with international human rights law. So, of course, I am now

looking forward to your debate. And again, the Commission will try to see how it's possible to implement the recommendations that you will vote at the end of such a debate.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Jeroen Lenaers, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, as Chair of the Committee, I'm standing here with mixed feelings today. On the one hand, I'm proud of the work that we have done: all these meetings, all these missions, speaking to over 200 interlocutors. It really has been a thorough investigation. I also congratulate the rapporteur and all the shadows on the excellent result.

On the other hand, the findings of our committee, the facts that we've uncovered, paint a very troubling picture about the abuse of spyware in our European Union. And this spyware is a very invasive, very problematic piece of technology that can be a powerful tool to fight criminals, to fight terrorists. But if it's used in the wrong way by governments with different intentions, it is a huge risk for rule of law and democracy, both at the national and the European level. And this is why we need to address this and regulate this urgently. And some of the recommendations in the report I would like to highlight.

First, spyware should always be subject to an effective judicial authorisation and independent supervision. Instead of banning spyware, we should really make sure that Member States adhere to certain requirements in using it, like investigating and resolving all cases where alleged abuse of spyware is relevant; prove that the spyware framework, the regulatory framework, is in line with the standards of the Venice Commission and the case law of the European Court of Justice; cooperate with Europol during these investigations and repeal all export licences that breached the dual-use regulation.

In addition, when invoking national security grounds, as you also mentioned, Commissioner, there must be a justification. Member States should demonstrate compliance with EU law, including the principles of proportionality, necessity, legality and legitimacy.

Now, Commissioner, dear empty chair of the Council, I am convinced that we have done our job and we look to you now to take this further and we will be closely watching you while you do so.

One last point, President, if you allow me a personal note. I was informed that last weekend I featured prominently on Polish state television, and it is even insinuated that I had direct links with Putin. Now, this is outrageous. And it shows two things: the Polish Government will stop at nothing to divert attention from its attempt to abolish rule of law in Poland, and it means that our work has effect, our measures that we propose are so scary for the Polish Government that they resort to these kind of poisonous tactics. So let us make sure this only emboldens us to keep our work of scrutiny even stronger in the future.

Hannes Heide, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Als der PEGA-Untersuchungsausschuss vor 14 Monaten seine Arbeit aufgenommen hat, wer hätte gedacht, in welchem Ausmaß ohne rechtliche Grundlagen in Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union Politikerinnen und Politiker, Journalistinnen und Journalisten, Juristinnen und Juristen als auch politisch Engagierte abgehört und überwacht werden!

Das Ziel der Verwendung von Pegasus und vergleichbarer Spionagesoftware war in all diesen Fällen, kritische Akteure aus Politik und Zivilgesellschaft auszuspionieren, einzuschüchtern und mundtot machen zu können.

Nicht alle diese inakzeptablen Vorgänge, die eine existenzielle Gefahr für die Demokratie in der Europäischen Union darstellen, wurden überhaupt aufgeklärt.

Mit unseren Empfehlungen an die Kommission und an die Mitgliedstaaten wollen wir die Grundlage schaffen, den unrechtmäßigen Einsatz von Spionagesoftware in Europa zu beenden und zu verhindern. Solche Software darf ausschließlich zur Bekämpfung schwerster Verbrechen und nur nach richterlicher Anordnung eingesetzt werden.

Die Kommission muss umgehend handeln und einen Rechtsakt für die legale Nutzung, den Verkauf, den Erwerb und die Weitergabe von Spionagesoftware inklusive gemeinsamer Mindeststandards vorlegen. Unser ehemaliger Kollege Nikos Androulakis wurde von der griechischen Regierung unter dem Deckmantel nationaler Sicherheit ausspioniert. Dieser Fall zeigt eindringlich, dass es eine einheitliche Definition des Begriffs der nationalen Sicherheit braucht, damit jedwede willkürliche Auslegung ausgeschlossen ist. Notwendig sind Schutzvorschriften für besonders exponierte Berufsgruppen wie Journalistinnen und Journalisten, Transparenz, Rechtshilfe für Zielpersonen und eine verpflichtende Dokumentation zur Rückverfolgung des Einsatzes von Spyware.

Angelegenheiten der nationalen Sicherheit fallen in den Zuständigkeitsbereich der Mitgliedstaaten – ja, das stimmt. Es ist aber Aufgabe der Europäischen Union, Grundrechte, zu deren Einhaltung sich alle Mitgliedstaaten im Rahmen der Verträge verpflichtet haben, zu sichern und zu verteidigen. Die Umsetzung unserer Empfehlungen ist ein alternativerer Schritt, um das Vertrauen der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger in Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit wiederherzustellen.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein, *w imieniu grupy Renew*. – Panie Przewodniczący! To sprawozdanie i zalecenia komisji śledczej mają ponad 200 stron. Powołana została z inicjatywy Renew Europe i to jest podsumowanie kilkunastu miesięcy ciężkiej pracy, podczas której odbyliśmy ponad 30 oficjalnych spotkań komisji, misje obserwacyjne do sześciu krajów, wysłuchaliśmy blisko 250 osób. Sophia in 't Veld wykonała niewiarygodną pracę razem z całą komisją. To analiza, plan działań, ale również oskarżenie wobec rządów kilku krajów, w tym niestety Polski, o to, że łamali prawo, używając de facto broni cybernetycznej przeciwko własnym obywatelom. Robili to, by zdobyć władzę, by tę władzę utrzymać. Stworzyli sobie mechanizmy, które miały uczynić ich bezkarnymi, ale nie będą bezkarni.

Dziękuję dziennikarzom, aktywistom i wszystkim innym, którzy przyczynili się do ujawnienia tego gigantycznego skandalu. W zaleceniach proponujemy zestaw działań, aby podobny skandal w przyszłości był wykluczony, nie był możliwy. Panie Komisarzu, w tym roku w Polsce odbędą się wybory parlamentarne i apeluję do Pana o wcielenie w życie zwłaszcza jednego z zaleceń – Europejskiego Laboratorium Technologicznego do sprawdzania czy w urządzeniach elektronicznych polityków, dziennikarzy, prawników, sygnalistów nie ma programów służących do inwigilacji, bo musimy być pewni, że podczas kolejnej kampanii wyborczej w Polsce Pegasus lub podobne programy nie będą używane przeciwko oponentom politycznym.

Hannah Neumann, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner Reynders, dear colleagues, and too bad the Council isn't here once more because my speech actually primarily addresses Member States, but I am sure they will receive the message.

If one of your best journalists is spied upon while investigating a major story, if one of your state prosecutors is spied upon while preparing court cases, if your defence minister is spied upon while attending NATO meetings, if one of your companies is exporting spyware to a war zone, if any of this happens and you are only a halfway-decent government with some responsibility, you would investigate. You would turn everything upside down, find the loopholes that make this possible, bring perpetrators to justice, apologise to victims, right?

I don't get why none of this happens. So basically, we, the PEGA Inquiry Committee, did your job in the last 12 months. Yet rather than working with us, Member States' governments ignored or obstructed our work, the approach was *omertà*, not cooperation.

Looking at this mess, I am quite amazed by what we have achieved here. And I want to thank the rapporteur, the shadows, all Members for that, because we managed to come forward with an accurate description of the abuse that is happening and with very solid and reasonable recommendations on how to fix it, supported across party lines by Members, by colleagues from 27 EU Member States.

And if you ever wondered what the European Parliament is good for, for this. Europe has been a pioneer in protecting the privacy of its citizens and has set standards that have become global ones by now. We bent the entire Internet ecosystem towards better protection and respect of individuals' data rights. Yet on something as horribly destructive as spyware, it looks as if we are lagging behind.

But dear colleagues, if we want to see European – and yes, universal – values reflected in the regulation of these invasive technologies, it is time to stand up to the shady practices of secret services and to companies and their CEOs gone wrong. Because otherwise the next chapter of surveillance and manipulation, then involving AI and other powerful technologies, will be very, very dark.

We have done our job, Commissioner. Now it's time that you do yours, the Commission and the Council. And believe me, we will follow up, and follow up, and follow up until our recommendations are put in place.

Dominik Tarczyński, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Myślałem, że będzie to debata na temat użycia narzędzi deszyfrujących przez państwa członkowskie w Unii Europejskiej, ale okazuje się, że kolejny raz jest to debata o Polsce.

Już w pierwszym wystąpieniu przewodniczący komisji do spraw Pegasusa zaatakował Polskę, moją ojczyznę, i demokratycznie wybrany w Polsce rząd. A więc z dumą i obowiązkiem będę bronił mojej ojczyzny i demokratycznie wybranego rządu.

Powiedział pan, Panie komisarzu, że sprzedaż takich urządzeń deszyfrujących przez państwa członkowskie Unii Europejskiej do państw trzecich to jest skandal, że taka praktyka nie może mieć miejsca. I co się dzieje? FinFisher – polecam Państwu oprogramowanie o nazwie FinFisher. Gdzie było produkowane i przez kogo? Przez Niemcy, pod Monachium. I uwaga! Mój wniosek o misję do Niemiec zostaje przez Komisję odrzucony. Natomiast misja wyjeżdża dokąd? Do Polski.

Polska nie produkowała takiego oprogramowania. Polska nie sprzedawała, tak jak Niemcy, do Maroka takiego oprogramowania. Maroko podsłuchiwało prezydenta Francji, a nas się oskarża. Wicie dlaczego? Dlatego że mamy najniższe bezrobocie w Unii Europejskiej, najwyższe PKB (wy jesteście na minusie), najmniejszy wskaźnik, jeżeli chodzi o przestępczość, bo nie przyjmujemy nielegalnych imigrantów.

Mamy najniższe bezrobocie, najwyższe PKB i najbezpieczniejszy kraj wśród państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Jesteśmy najbezpieczniejsi, stąd ataki. Nie plujcie na Polskę, ale bądźcie jak Polska, uczcie się od Polski.

Gilles Lebreton, au nom du groupe ID. – Chers collègues, la décision de créer une commission d'enquête parlementaire sur l'utilisation des logiciels espions en Europe était une bonne idée. Je l'ai soutenue car j'estime que les Européens ont le droit de savoir dans quelle mesure ils ont été espionnés, où et par qui. J'étais donc plein d'espoir dans le succès de cette commission quand je me suis porté volontaire pour en faire partie, et même pour en devenir le coordinateur au nom de mon groupe. Force m'est aujourd'hui de vous avouer que je juge son résultat décevant. Certes, le rapport qui est issu de son travail a le mérite de recenser les différents cas d'espionnage constatés en Europe, et ce n'est pas rien. Je souhaite cependant attirer votre attention sur plusieurs problèmes.

D'abord, sur un problème d'organisation des missions. Le système de D'Hondt a été appliqué pour déterminer la composition des missions à l'étranger. Cela m'a empêché, ainsi que tout autre membre du groupe Identité et Démocratie, de participer à la mission en Grèce et à Chypre. C'est extrêmement fâcheux, car le respect du pluralisme est à mon avis une condition indispensable de la crédibilité d'une commission d'enquête.

Ensuite, la recommandation finale cède trop à la tentation de régler des comptes politiques avec certains gouvernements, notamment ceux de Hongrie et de Pologne. Un tel manque d'impartialité sème le doute sur la réalité des constats effectués, dont certains sont pourtant exacts.

En troisième lieu, la recommandation attaque à fleur de mouche le concept de «sécurité nationale», qui justifie le recours à l'espionnage par les États européens, notamment pour lutter contre le terrorisme. Or, j'estime que la sécurité nationale doit rester un domaine réservé aux États. Je ne souhaite pas la voir passer sous la tutelle de l'Union européenne.

Enfin, la recommandation a trop tendance à sous-estimer la nécessité pour les États européens de recourir aux logiciels espions, notamment pour lutter contre le terrorisme et la criminalité organisée. Leur utilisation peut permettre d'éviter demain d'autres «affaires Samuel Paty», il ne faut jamais l'oublier. En proposant un moratoire qui ne dit pas son nom, la recommandation commet donc une grave erreur.

Je suis bien sûr d'accord avec l'objectif de la commission d'enquête, qui est de persuader les États membres de l'Union de voter des lois nationales pour apporter des garanties juridiques contre les abus de l'utilisation des logiciels espions. Certains États, comme la France, l'ont d'ailleurs déjà fait. Mais cet objectif ne justifie nullement un moratoire.

En conclusion, la commission d'enquête déçoit par son manque d'objectivité et de prudence.

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Herr Präsident! Zunächst herzlichen Glückwunsch an die Berichterstatterin, die eine gute Arbeit geleistet hat. Denn trotz der Blockade der Mitgliedstaaten konnte der U-Ausschuss klar feststellen, dass Polen, Ungarn, Spanien, Griechenland solche Spyware eingesetzt haben und Zypern am Handel für den EU-Binnenmarkt beteiligt ist. Und ja, wir wissen, dass 14 EU-Mitgliedstaaten Pegasus unter dem Deckmantel der nationalen Sicherheit und der Terrorismusbekämpfung erworben haben. Eine Schande für die Demokratie.

Die Ergebnisse sind ein wichtiges Signal für alle Opfer von Überwachung, deren Rechtsverletzungen erstmals auf EU-Ebene anerkannt werden. Überwachungssoftware wie Pegasus ist nicht mit den Grundrechten vereinbar und daher auch nicht reformierbar. Deshalb wäre die Forderung nach einem Verbot solch einer Spyware eine starke Botschaft an die Opfer, an alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger.

Liebe Freundinnen und Freunde, es geht darum, dass die Kommission endlich Konsequenzen für die Mitgliedstaaten, die diese Spyware nutzen, zieht und dass es einen Gesetzesvorschlag zur strikten Regulierung von Spyware gibt, so wie es der U-Ausschuss gefordert hat. Ich bitte Sie, endlich zu handeln.

Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó (NI). – Mr President, dear colleagues, I want to start by thanking the great work of the rapporteur, Sophie in 't Veld, and the Chairman of the committee, Jeroen Lenaers, for taking on an extremely difficult responsibility. The Pegasus scandal is not about IT, nor security, nor regulation of the radioactive space, it is a scandal that strikes at the heart of our democracy, and the measures we will pass will not guarantee its protection for two fundamental reasons. First, States are the main responsible of this scandal, and one needs to have a very good faith to assume that the violators of fundamental rights, themselves, will be the ones responsible for preventing future violations. And second, Pegasus technology is incompatible with the rule of law, a technology that is designed to escape all reliable and independent control opens Pandora's box. And what is to come will not be pleasant. All of you should get ready to see how this technology will be used to influence your political decisions. If this has not happened already in cases such as the Spanish position on the Western Sahara.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, it was a privilege to work on this report, which I believe is already becoming an important reference document when it comes to dealing with gross misuse of spyware.

We must strike a healthy balance between security, on the one hand, and protection of fundamental rights, on the other hand. Sophisticated spyware industry is a relatively new phenomenon, and Europe must adapt to it. We need clear rules and safeguards to protect our citizens, journalists, politicians and activists.

We also must be aware that this technology can help us fight serious crime and enhance our safety. We cannot simply stop technological progress. Instead, we must keep up and deal with technological vulnerabilities and expose those who do not play fair.

We need clear rules for legitimate use of spyware, and we have to improve fundamentally our existing checks and balances and judicial practice in line with new technology. This is the main conclusion of our recommendation.

And when it comes to the misuse of spyware, colleagues, the rule of law and legitimate use of modern technology must always go hand in hand. We must, for instance, learn real lessons from the last elections in Poland, and ensure free and fair campaign without misuse of invasive spyware this year.

We must stand by all victims of misuse of spyware in Europe, especially in countries with weakening democratic institutions and lacking checks and balances.

And Mr Commissioner, we count on the Commission to really work with us on this.

Katarina Barley (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! „Vielen Dank für Ihre Anfrage. Aber aus Gründen der nationalen Sicherheit können wir Ihnen leider keine Auskunft geben.“ Das war quasi die Standardantwort der Regierungen Ihrer Mitgliedstaaten auf unsere Fragen zum Einsatz von Spähsoftware.

Wir haben natürlich trotzdem gegraben, und wir haben Informationen bekommen von anderen, insbesondere von Journalistinnen und NGOs. Und was wir herausgefunden haben, war erschreckend. Mehrere Regierungen haben mit dieser Software verschiedene Personen ausgespäht: Journalistinnen, Oppositionelle, Justizangehörige, die Zivilgesellschaft.

Ich war selbst auf einer Informationsreise in Polen. Da saßen uns gegenüber eine Staatsanwältin, die in einer Korruptionsaffäre ermittelte, ein Gewerkschafter, ein Arbeitgeberpräsident, ein Rechtsanwalt, eine Rechtsanwältin, ein Politiker. In Griechenland haben wir darüber mit dem Vorsitzenden der größten Oppositionspartei und Journalistinnen und Journalisten zu tun gehabt, die ebenfalls investigativ recherchierten. Diese Menschen sollen alle die nationale Sicherheit bedroht haben. Was sie in Wirklichkeit getan haben, war, kritisch zu recherchieren.

Dieser Bericht zeigt alle unsere Erkenntnisse und gibt Empfehlungen. Denn was wir vor allen Dingen brauchen, ist ein Rechtsrahmen. Es kann ja nicht sein, dass wir für alles eine Regel haben, auch dafür, welcher Stecker, welches Kabel in dieses Gerät kommt, aber keinerlei Regeln dafür, wie man dieses Gerät umfassend ausspäht. Es ist ja nicht nur die Person selbst, sondern es ist ihre Familie, es sind ihre Kolleginnen und Kollegen, es ist das komplette Umfeld, das auch mit ausgespäht wird – alle, mit denen sie Kontakt haben über dieses Gerät.

Wir haben keine Regeln dafür, wir haben keine Definition der nationalen Sicherheit, und das müssen wir dringend ändern.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Was wir auf unserem Handy haben, was wir uns da anschauen, welche Daten wir haben, welche privaten Nachrichten wir schreiben, das sind ganz, ganz persönliche Daten.

Was für ein gruselige Gedanke ist es, wenn dieses Handy durch eine Spähsoftware wie Pegasus gehackt ist und zu jeder Zeit alles mitgelesen werden kann, da man zu jeder Zeit das Handy bei sich hat! Doch genau das ist Oppositionspolitikern, Journalistinnen und Journalisten in Europa passiert. Dieser Überwachungsskandal ist eine Schande für Europa, und wir haben im Untersuchungsausschuss in den letzten Monaten intensiv daran gearbeitet, das auch entsprechend aufzuklären.

Viel Arbeit, viel Aufklärung, viele Seiten Untersuchungsausschuss, wenig nein, eigentlich gar keine Zusammenarbeit mit den Mitgliedstaaten in diesem Fall. Das war tatsächlich unerträglich. Es muss klar sein: Wir brauchen endlich – und das sind unsere Empfehlungen – klare Regeln für Spähsoftware in Europa, ein Moratorium. Das muss jetzt endlich die Konsequenz sein. Wir rufen die Mitgliedstaaten und die Kommission auf, hier endlich zu handeln.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, il y a presque deux ans, les révélations de Forbidden Stories, d'Amnesty International et de Citizen Lab sur l'utilisation illégale des logiciels espions Pegasus et autres déclenchaient les travaux de notre commission d'enquête. Après des centaines d'heures d'auditions d'experts et de victimes, de missions et de négociations techniques et politiques, notre commission d'enquête émet un ensemble de recommandations solides pour éviter qu'un tel scandale ne se reproduise.

Certes, nos recommandations ne sont pas contraignantes et je le déplore. Elles s'inscrivent toutefois dans la continuité de ce que les journalistes ont dénoncé et constituent une étape clé pour établir les responsabilités. Nous posons des conditions strictes à l'utilisation de ces technologies de surveillance intrusive et un cadre précis, respectueux des principes de proportionnalité et de nécessité, préservant les droits fondamentaux, excluant de fait certains usages, situations et fonctionnalités, protégeant aussi des professions et prévoyant des droits pour les victimes, ainsi que la création d'un centre d'expertise technologique européen. Ce cadre devrait conduire à un moratoire de fait sur l'utilisation des logiciels espions en Europe.

Laissez-moi rappeler l'évidence: tout n'est pas permis en matière de surveillance, même au nom de la sécurité nationale. Nous voyons les dérives auxquelles l'utilisation des logiciels espions en dehors de toute balise a mené pour ce qui est des droits fondamentaux, de la démocratie et de l'état de droit. Des vies ont été brisées. Il revient maintenant à la Commission européenne et aux États membres de se saisir de nos recommandations. J'enjoins aussi les parlements nationaux à faire leurs ces recommandations. Ce Parlement ne vous lâchera pas. Nous attendons des actes, nous attendons des textes forts et nous serons là pour en contrôler la mise en œuvre.

Avant de clore nos travaux et avant le vote en plénière de demain, je tiens à rendre hommage aux victimes de Pegasus et des logiciels équivalents, dont la vie est changée à jamais et qui continuent à être poursuivies et harcelées pour avoir dénoncé cet espionnage. Les torts qui leur ont été causés doivent être réparés. Je tiens aussi à saluer le travail des journalistes et des défenseurs des droits de l'homme qui ont révélé ces faits, qui nous ont permis de mener ces investigations, et qui doivent toujours, à l'heure où je vous parle, se défendre, même en Europe. Vous êtes de véritables vigies pour la défense des droits humains et nous nous devons de poursuivre ce travail avec vous.

Assita Kanko (ECR). – Mr President, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner, they say 'dance like nobody is watching, but text and email like it will be displayed on Instagram someday'. Perhaps we should not only see this as a joke, it is serious.

Today, not only Big Brother is watching you, but also Little Brother – to censor or to feed disinformation, to influence or to destroy. How can our democracy survive and human rights prevail if the press has lost freedom on the one hand and the critical reflex to question things on the other hand. 'The ideal subject of totalitarian rule is not the convinced Nazi or the dedicated Communist, but the people for whom the distinction between fact and fiction, true or false, no longer exist.' Hannah Arendt wrote this, a long time ago. In modern Europe, I would call that the perfect recipe to kill a democracy from the inside.

Big Brother is not what I worry the most about. French philosopher Raphaël Enthoven calls the new threat 'Little Brother'. Little Brother is watching you, so literally anyone can. We can make laws to tackle official espionage. We cannot make laws to create respect in society. To do that, we need to have stronger minds.

Georg Mayer (ID). – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kollegen! Der Mensch ist ein neugieriges Wesen. Das liegt schon einmal in der Natur des Menschen. Und die technische Entwicklung, wie wir sie derzeit erleben, ist natürlich auch ein zweiseitiges Schwert.

Wir haben heute über die künstliche Intelligenz abgestimmt. Das nimmt eine Entwicklung und eine Fahrt auf, wo wir auch noch nicht wissen, wohin die Reise gehen wird. Ich denke, es liegt auch bald nicht mehr im menschlichen Ermessen, in welchem Ausmaß uns Überwachung treffen wird.

Im Bericht ist zum Beispiel, ich glaube, 60-mal Ungarn und 90-mal Polen genannt, aber auch in Deutschland haben ja das BKA und der Bundesnachrichtendienst diese Software verwendet. Also vielleicht hätte man auf diesem Auge nicht so blind sein sollen. Aber es nimmt neue Dimensionen an, und ich glaube, darüber sollten wir uns klar werden. Und der gläserne Bürger, der ist schon längst Realität. Nur zugeben tut dies keiner. Aufklärung ist wohl auch nicht gewünscht – in der gesamten Union, wie wir sehen. Und das, was wir hier sehen, ist ja auch nur der Gipfel der Staatstrojaner, die im Umlauf sind.

Aber wir müssen gar nicht so weit gehen, denn auch hier im Haus gab es ja diese Geschichte, wo Abgeordnete Druckaufträge auf den Druckern hier im Haus gehabt haben, die 18 Monate von der Verwaltung im Haus rechtswidrig gespeichert wurden. Da fragt man sich natürlich auch: Was passiert mit dieser Information?

Weiter geht es damit, dass auch hier im Wifi im Haus Daten von Abgeordneten gespeichert wurden. Ein Schelm natürlich, der Böses dabei denkt – und ich denke nicht, dass es um EVP- oder S&D-Abgeordnete geht, die da ausspioniert werden.

Die Datenkrake ist überall, geschätzte Kollegen, und wir müssen sehr wachsam sein.

Γιώργος Γεωργίου (The Left). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω θερμά τους δημοσιογράφους, μεταξύ αυτών και τους Κύπριους, τους μάρτυρες δημοσίου συμφέροντος και τους μη κυβερνητικούς οργανισμούς, γιατί αυτοί ανέδειξαν τα Pegasus και τα Predator για να ξεκινήσει αυτή η τεράστια προσπάθεια εξυγίανσης και διαφάνειας. Ευχαριστώ επίσης πάρα πολύ την εισηγήτρια αλλά και τον πρόεδρο της επιτροπής. Το ζήτημα έχει πανευρωπαϊκή διάσταση. Αφορά τη δημοκρατία και τη διαφύλαξη της ιδιωτικότητας των συμπολιτών μας.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, τυπικά έχουμε μπροστά μας ένα ευρωπαϊκό πλαίσιο το οποίο καλύπτει τα δικαιώματά μας. Όμως, την ώρα που στην πράξη πρέπει να εφαρμοστούν οι νομοθεσίες, αρχίζει η αποδόμησή τους, με επίκληση είτε της εθνικής ασφάλειας είτε της προστασίας του δημοσίου συμφέροντος. Η χρυσοφόρα βιομηχανία παραγωγής και εξαγωγής λογισμικών παρακολούθησης συνεχίζει το έργο της ανεξέλεγκτα. Το μέλλον μάλλον προβλέπεται δυσόιο, αν λάβει κανείς υπόψη την αδιάφορη, μέχρι και αρνητική στάση, που επέδειξαν προς την επιτροπή μας η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και το Συμβούλιο.

Το σκάνδαλο δυστυχώς αφορά και τη χώρα μου, την Κύπρο. Οι συστάσεις είναι αυστηρές και θα πρέπει να ληφθούν σοβαρά υπόψη και από τους ευρωπαϊκούς θεσμούς και από τα κράτη μέλη. Μετά από δεκαπέντε μήνες σκληρής δουλειάς, το ζήτημα των παρακολούθησεων δεν τελειώνει με την αυριανή μας ψήφο. Αντίθετα, μόλις τώρα αρχίζει.

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señor presidente, si algo hemos aprendido a lo largo de este año es que programas espías como Pegasus son herramientas enormemente poderosas, herramientas que nuestras fuerzas y cuerpos de seguridad deben poder emplear para hacer frente a amenazas como el terrorismo, el narcotráfico, el crimen organizado o los intentos de subvertir el orden constitucional. Pero también son herramientas que deben usarse siempre respetando los preceptos del Estado de Derecho.

Esto es algo que no ocurre, lamentablemente, en países como Polonia y Hungría, donde hemos sido testigos de abusos contra periodistas, abogados y miembros de la oposición, que han sido espiados por motivos partidistas. Por el contrario, hemos comprobado los grandes esfuerzos que se han hecho por parte del Gobierno griego para reforzar su marco legal y evitar que casos similares puedan ocurrir en el futuro.

En el apartado español, hemos desmontado el relato secesionista catalán y su campaña propagandística contra las instituciones españolas. El informe reconoce que, lejos de los bulos independentistas, España cumple todos los estándares europeos y los adecuados controles judiciales, y cuenta con un sólido Estado de Derecho. También hemos señalado los vínculos entre el secesionismo y el entorno de Putin, unidos en su intento de debilitar la unidad europea.

Por último, hemos exigido al Gobierno de Sánchez que dé explicaciones sobre el jaeo de su teléfono móvil y el espionaje a sus ministros. Los ciudadanos europeos seguimos sin saber qué sustrajeron del móvil del presidente del Gobierno, quién lo hizo y por qué motivo. Y hoy, desde el Parlamento Europeo, le exigimos oficialmente que esclarezca lo sucedido y responda a estas preguntas.

(El orador se niega a que Diana Riba I Giner realice una intervención con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»)

Sándor Rónai (S&D). – Elnök Úr! Az Orbán-kormány ismét egy elkeserítő bizonyítványt állított ki magáról. Orbánéknak a kormányzás nem szól másról, mint hogy hogyan tudnak ellopni milliárdokat. Ebben az ügyben, a Pegasus-ügyben is azt bizonyították, hogy képtelenek a jogállami normák szerint dolgozni, képtelenek ezeket a szabályokat betartani. Ennek eredménye, hogy Orbán miatt nem jött támogatás Európából. Európai források helyett Európa-rekorder orbáni infláció jut a magyaroknak.

Kormányozni nem tudnak, így nem csoda, hogy az élelmiszerek áremelkedése Magyarországon négyszerese az európai átlagnak, a magyar emberek pedig a sosem látott megélhetési válságtól szenvednek. Orbán ebben a helyzetben is csak arra koncentrál, hogy a magyarok hiteles tájékoztatás helyett propagandát hallgassanak, ne kaphassanak valós tájékoztatást valós helyzetükről. Célba veszi a maradék független sajtót, kémszoftverek segítségével hallgatja le és félemlíti meg a magyar újságírókat, magyar üzletembereket. Tisztelt Parlament, tisztelt Képviselőtársaim, tisztelt Bizottság, ez a Pegasus-ügy szomorú tanulsága Magyarországra nézve.

Salima Yenbou (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, il y a un message clé que je veux faire passer aujourd'hui: sécurité, oui, mais pas à n'importe quel prix. Les logiciels d'espionnage sont nécessaires, notamment dans la lutte contre le terrorisme et la grande criminalité, mais il faut aussi lutter contre leur dévoiement par certains États, qui se cachent derrière l'excuse de la sécurité nationale pour espionner illicitement les opposants politiques, les journalistes et les militants des droits de l'homme.

Cette enquête en commission PEGA nous a montré que nous avons besoin de deux choses: d'une part, une meilleure connaissance et un meilleur développement de ces technologies au niveau européen, pour pouvoir les maîtriser et mieux protéger nos citoyens, notamment dans le cadre d'une détérioration grave de l'état de droit dans le monde et de menaces extérieures; d'autre part, un cadre juridique et des systèmes judiciaires solides, pour maintenir le respect des droits fondamentaux au cœur de la sécurité, et non en opposition à celle-ci.

Ces recommandations ne doivent pas être la fin d'un travail de commission spéciale, mais le début d'un travail en vue d'atteindre ce double objectif, dans l'intérêt de notre projet européen.

Diana Riba i Giner (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, déjenme empezar porque quería pedir una tarjeta azul al señor Zoido, que no ha aceptado. Le recuerdo que Pegasus solo se puede utilizar contra la lucha contra el crimen organizado y el terrorismo, y en sus declaraciones ha mencionado una amplia gama que creo que no está dentro de los acuerdos sobre el programa Pegasus.

Como miembro de esta comisión de investigación, pero también como ciudadana que ha sido espiada, me siento razonablemente satisfecha con las recomendaciones que votaremos mañana. Desde aquí quiero poner en valor el ingente trabajo realizado por la ponente In' t Veld y por la mayoría de los miembros de la comisión de investigación. No nos lo han puesto fácil. Los juegos políticos, la protección de los intereses nacionales y los dobles estándares han sido una constante en estos meses de investigación.

Lo hemos visto con el bochornoso espectáculo de la misión de España. El país donde se ha producido el mayor caso de espionaje en Europa casi queda fuera del escrutinio de esta comisión, gracias a las maniobras del frente común formado por el PSOE, el PP, VOX y Ciudadanos. Lo han intentado todo, pero gracias a nuestra y vuestra perseverancia y firmeza, el «Catalangate» es central en este informe. Se realizó la misión que algunos tanto temían y España ha quedado señalada, junto con Polonia, Hungría, Grecia y Chipre, como campeona en el abuso y vulneración de los derechos.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Komisja do spraw Pegasusa nie może de facto nazywać się komisją śledczą, dlatego żeby nazywać się komisją śledczą, musiałaby mieć specjalne uprawnienia, tak jak dostęp do informacji niejawnych. Brak tego dostępu, brak możliwości obejrzenia dokumentów powoduje to, że wnioski mogą być bardzo mocno zniekształcone, delikatnie mówiąc. Dlatego została nam tutaj pełne przeświadczenie, że została ona utworzona w jednym celu, mianowicie wzmocnienia ataków politycznych na Polskę i na Węgry. Zresztą tego nie ukrywali nasi koledzy z opozycji, polscy koledzy z opozycji.

Celem tej komisji nigdy nie było sformułowanie jakichś obiektywnych celów i sugestii legislacyjnych, dlatego że w kwestii bezpieczeństwa narodowego Unia Europejska nie ma żadnych prerogatyw traktatowych. Cel był wyłącznie polityczny – uderzyć w Polskę, uderzyć w Węgry. Aby udowodnić swój cel, ściągnięto świadków, często bardzo kontrowersyjnych, którzy w swoich państwach członkowskich byli poszukiwani przez służbę, prokuraturę, a którzy powinni wyjaśnić najpierw swoją sytuację procesową. Bezpieczeństwo narodowe i bezpieczeństwo rodzin obywateli naszych państw w czasach wojny na Ukrainie jest dobrem nadrzędnym i tego się trzymajmy.

Thierry Mariani (ID). – Monsieur le Président, les peuples européens ne supportent plus la multiplication des intrusions dans la vie privée. Dans des sociétés où l'on promet toujours davantage de liberté, les libertés concrètes sont trop souvent bafouées. La liste des États utilisant le logiciel Pegasus est édifiante, et le rapport décrit bien le fait que plus de 75 États ont acheté ce type de programme informatique.

Vous souvenez-vous des révélations d'un journal danois, le 30 mai 2021, sur les écoutes des plus grands dirigeants européens par la NSA américaine? Angela Merkel et des figures de l'opposition socialiste allemande étaient espionnées par les États-Unis depuis le Danemark. L'Union européenne a-t-elle pris des mesures pour protéger les dirigeants de nos États membres contre l'espionnage américain? Jamais. L'Union européenne a-t-elle travaillé à un mécanisme de protection de ses intérêts économiques contre la prédation américaine? Jamais.

Mais pourquoi aurait-elle fait en 2021 ce qu'elle n'a pas fait après les révélations fracassantes d'Edward Snowden en 2013? Je vous rappelle que, en 2013, Snowden avait dévoilé le fait que Washington espionnait plus de 35 dirigeants internationaux sur la planète. Une pratique confirmée récemment encore par l'ancien Premier ministre français, François Fillon, qui témoignait devant une commission d'enquête à l'Assemblée nationale: «J'ai été écouté avec le président Nicolas Sarkozy pendant cinq ans par la NSA américaine.»

L'Union européenne préférera toujours s'attaquer à la Hongrie, à la Pologne ou au Maroc plutôt que de défier les États-Unis. Dans un Parlement qui a réussi à ne jamais aborder la question des ingérences américaines dans sa commission spéciale sur le sujet, j'avoue que plus rien ne m'étonne. Oui, il faut que les États membres s'investissent pour mieux réguler les acteurs privés qui proposent des services toujours plus performants pour contrôler. Cependant, il y aura toujours quelque part dans le monde des entreprises pour fournir ce genre de services.

Je regrette que les solutions envisagées visent à renforcer encore le pouvoir de contrôle de la Commission européenne sur les États membres. Il est temps que les États s'investissent directement pour protéger eux-mêmes leur sûreté nationale.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une intervention «carton bleu»)

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew), *blue-card question*. – Mr Mariani, you were frustrated that after the revelations of the NSA spying etc. nothing has been done by the European Union. You said, 'Why doesn't the European Union act?'

But then my question is, why are you – your party and your group – opposed to giving the powers to the European Union to act? Because you've tabled amendments and during the debates you've opposed action by the European Union. So are you now reproaching the European Union for being too weak or too strong?

Thierry Mariani (ID), *blue-card answer*. – I wasn't in your committee. Sorry. But I think the problem for the European Union is just the weak. Because we are strong with the weak people and weak with the strong State. You have a new example. We accuse Poland, Hungary, Morocco, but excuse me, what did we do in the past with United States when they listened in on the people of Europe? Nothing.

Stelios Kouloglou (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous sommes très contents de vous voir ici, pour une fois, parce que, pendant un an et demi, tandis qu'il y avait des scandales à répétition, la Commission était complètement absente, sans aucune déclaration. Pendant ce temps-là, nous étions attaqués.

The Chair of the Committee was attacked like a spy of Russia, as an enemy of the people. The Catalans, we have heard now, are the enemy of the people. Ms Sophie in 't Veld, the rapporteur, was daily attacked in Greece by the Greek pro-government media as «Madam Sophie» – attack after attack, and we had done nothing. Now, it's time for the Commission to do its job and take the recommendations seriously and follow whether the Member States implement the recommendations.

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Oprogramowania takie jak Pegasus do walki z terroryzmem mogą być używane i są bardzo ważne. Ale nie mogą być używane do walki z politycznymi oponentami i z opozycją. To musi być wyeliminowane, zakazane i egzekwowane także przez Komisję Europejską, bo inaczej nie ma demokratycznych procesów, nie ma demokratycznych wyborów.

Największym udokumentowanym skandalem jest fakt shakowania telefonu komórkowego szefa komitetu wyborczego w Polsce, senatora Krzysztofa Brejzy, w czasie kampanii wyborczej do parlamentu polskiego w 2019 roku i Parlamentu Europejskiego. To się nie może powtórzyć.

Sprawozdanie jest bardzo ważne, szczegółowo obejmuje wszystkie państwa członkowskie. Teraz krok dalszy: powinna być egzekwowana dyrektywa policyjna (w Polsce nie została wdrożona), europejskie Citizen Lab, musi być gwarantowane bezpieczeństwo, także obserwacja wyborów.

Ale mam na koniec jedną informację. W czasach komunistycznych w Polsce, kiedy rządowa telewizja poświęcała komuś materiał, to znaczyło, że to jest ważna osoba, dobra osoba, osoba, którą należy szanować i robi bardzo ważne rzeczy. Taki materiał ukazał się w polskiej rządowej TVP na temat Jeroena Lenaersa, przewodniczącego tej komisji, z dużą planszą, szkalujący go.

I would like to thank you, Jereon, you can be proud. You've done a very good job. This is a kind of award.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario Reynders, durante un largo año la Comisión de Investigación Encargada de Examinar el Uso del Programa Espía de Vigilancia Pegasus y Otros Programas Equivalentes ha trabajado duramente y ha sacado conclusiones. ¿Cuál es el sentido de las conclusiones? Que la Comisión tome la iniciativa y pongamos en vigor el Derecho europeo para que algunos hechos investigados no puedan volver a ocurrir.

En primer lugar, es necesario condenar cualquier utilización de un programa espía para intimidar o chantajear a la oposición, los activistas de derechos humanos, los abogados, los jueces, los fiscales y los periodistas y, por supuesto, a la prensa libre.

En segundo lugar, hay que prohibir la exportación de programas espía a regímenes represivos y solicitar una moratoria de hecho para la exportación de esos programas o la revocación de las licencias mientras establecemos algunos estándares comunes que aseguren, primeramente, el recurso judicial efectivo y el control judicial de cualquier utilización de programas espías que viole los derechos fundamentales para cualquier causa que no sea la investigación de delitos muy graves.

Por supuesto, un estándar europeo de seguridad nacional para que esta no pueda ser invocada para reprimir los derechos fundamentales sin los principios de necesidad y proporcionalidad que establece la Carta de Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea para cualquier medida intrusiva en cuanto a los derechos fundamentales.

Klemen Grošelj (Renew). – Gospod predsednik. Spoštovani! Ugotovitve odbora PEGA so pokazale, da kljub demokratični tradiciji Evropske unije nihče ni imun na zlorabe novih tehnologij.

Če gre slediti poročilu organizacije Citizen Lab, niti Slovenija ni izjema. Nove tehnologije, ko so uporabljene zakonito in skladno z demokratičnimi vrednotami, normami in načeli, seveda lahko prispevajo k naši varnosti v boju tako proti terorizmu, organiziranemu kriminalu in drugim varnostnim grožnjam.

A ne glede na te dobrobiti moramo nedvoumno in pravno trdno zagotoviti, da se nove tehnologije ne zlorabljajo niti s strani državnih struktur, še manj s strani zasebnih podjetij, ki to delajo za znanega ali neznanega kupca.

Podatki o nas, najbolj intimni podatki o nas, ki jih pridobivajo s temi tehnologijami, niso in ne smejo biti tržno blago politike ali kogar koli drugega. Ker te tehnologije ne poznajo državnih meja, potrebujemo najmanj enotna najvišja demokratična pravila in standarde njihove uporabe znotraj EU, kakor tudi potrebujemo enotne norme in standarde pri kaznovanju njihove zlorabe, saj če tega ne naredimo, bodo ogroženi temelji naše demokracije in naše prihodnosti. Nihče si ne želi živeti v družbi iz romana 1984.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, de cette commission d'enquête PEGA nous pouvons tirer trois leçons importantes. La première: nous avons urgemment besoin d'un moratoire et de régulation pour ces nouvelles technologies, comme nous en avons pour les armes. Ce sont des outils intrusifs, répressifs, aux mains de ceux qui ont le pouvoir, et n'importe quelle citoyenne ou n'importe quel citoyen peut un jour être considéré comme suspect et devenir l'objet d'une surveillance constante, secrète et terrifiante.

Deuxième conclusion alarmante: dans l'Union européenne, des États aux finances fragiles et aux tendances autoritaires ont massivement surveillé leurs opposants, des journalistes, des militants pour les réduire au silence. Aucune transparence, aucun recours ni aucune réparation pour les victimes – Hongrie, Pologne, Grèce, Chypre et même Espagne.

Enfin, dernière alerte: les États les plus riches comme la France ou l'Allemagne, n'ont pas besoin d'acheter des logiciels à des sociétés israéliennes. Ils ont la capacité de créer leurs propres systèmes de surveillance, et sur ceux-là, nous ne savons rien.

Anne-Sophie Pelletier (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, merci à Sophia in 't Veld pour son rapport. Un an après, l'histoire voudrait que nous ayons des réponses à apporter aux victimes, mais ce sont mythes et légendes. Légende de croire que les États nous offriraient des réponses, légende de croire que nos démocraties n'auraient plus à subir cet affront.

Si Pégase était créateur de sources, Pegasus, lui, les détourne à des fins de surveillance, donnant des idées au Sénat français, avec l'adoption de l'article 3 du projet de loi sur l'activation à distance des téléphones portables. Le piétinement de nos droits fondamentaux est devenu leur dogme. Les défendre est devenu notre devoir. Est-ce vraiment cela que nous voulons pour nos enfants?

Nous sommes – vous êtes – leur muse. Nos vies et vos vies sont leurs intérêts pour mieux nous criminaliser et vous criminaliser. Les contre-pouvoirs deviennent des menaces. Ils sont pourtant les piliers de notre démocratie. Ainsi, je nous mets en garde: ces pratiques sont une mort annoncée de nos sociétés. Parce que, si la mythologie est douce à lire, sa transposition réelle relève de la folie autoritaire de quelques-uns.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, it's an extremely worrying development that illegal surveillance has taken place in the EU Member States. Certain Member States have used Pegasus and equivalent spyware against journalists, politicians, diplomats, lawyers, civil society actors. That is totally unacceptable.

That Pegasus Committee has been investigating during last year. Unfortunately, it has been often very challenging because it has been very difficult to collect data for the report from all Member States in appropriate manner. Clear rules are needed here. Spyware surveillance should remain the exception and always require effective, binding and meaningful prior juridical authorisation by an impartial and independent juridical authority. It must be ensured that the measure is necessary, proportionate and strictly limited to cases affecting national security or involving terrorism or serious crime.

We know that technology enables access to all data, also retroactively. Therefore, appropriate limitations and safeguards must be in place. All Member State governments and Member State parliaments have not provided the European Parliament with meaningful information about their legal frameworks governing the use of spyware. It is imperative that Member States now resolve these unclaritys that have been discovered during this investigation.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Voorzitter, journalisten in Hongarije, advocaten in Polen, een lid van het Europees Parlement uit Griekenland: een waslijst aan getuigenissen van spywareslachtoffers die gewoon hun werk doen en opkomen voor hun idealen. Dit heeft indruk op mij gemaakt.

Wie nog ontkent dat dit een Europees probleem is, heeft niet opgelet. Het web van spionagepraktijken en handel in spyware overschrijdt namelijk grenzen en verspreidt zich door de hele EU. Dit web is een gevaar voor onze rechtsstaat en democratie. Veel lidstaten halen er echter de schouders voor op of hebben het onderzoek zelfs tegengewerkt onder het mom van "nationale veiligheid", alsof dat een toverwoord is dat altijd boven de individuele vrijheden van de inwoners van de EU staat.

Onze aanbevelingen zijn helder. Het is nu aan de Commissie en de lidstaten om er werk van te maken. Europese overheden moeten inwoners niet bespioneren maar beschermen.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Domnule președinte, fosta securitate comunistă din România se ocupa cu spionarea fiecărei voci libere și a vieții private, inclusiv în locuințele oamenilor. Aveam pereți subțiri și vecini care ascultau conversațiile din apartamentul de alături. Astăzi, în Uniunea Europeană avem, din nefericire, cazuri în care, cu mijloace mult mai moderne, autoritățile fac același lucru.

Este cea mai antidemocratică acțiune a unui guvern. O felicit pe colega mea, Sophia In 't Veld, pentru munca excelentă pe care a depus-o în raportul PEGA. Știm astăzi exact cum a funcționat și funcționează, dar avem și recomandări clare ale Comisiei și Parlamentului pentru a pune capăt acestor practici.

Pegasus Project a arătat că în lume cel puțin 180 de jurnaliști au fost spionați cu acest program. Europa poate aluneca pe o parte periculoasă și fără căi de întoarcere prea curând, dacă tocmai pe cei aflați în slujba adevărului și interesului public îi punem în pericol. Avem acum pe masă Actul european pentru libertatea presei, care ne permite să acționăm și să punem în practică aceste recomandări.

Acolo, negru pe alb, trebuie să spunem că este interzis să spionăm jurnaliști, că le respectăm independența editorială și că nu-i obligăm să își dezvăluie sursele. Este pasul esențial pe care putem și trebuie să-l facem acum, pentru siguranța jurnaliștilor, pentru că este și siguranța democrațiilor noastre.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, dejen de espionarnos. Dejen de hacerlo de manera ilícita, ilegal, intrusiva y antidemocrática. Cada vez que Gobiernos o agencias de Estados europeos han intervenido teléfonos móviles de políticos, activistas, periodistas y abogados, cada vez han erosionado la democracia y el Estado de Derecho. Cada ataque a nuestros móviles es un ataque a los derechos fundamentales de todos.

Ahora me dirijo directamente al Estado español. Dejen de espionarnos y colaboren con las investigaciones. Las víctimas de su espionaje ilegal tenemos el derecho a saber cuándo y por qué se nos espió y que se depuren responsabilidades.

Esto no solo lo pido yo. Hoy lo exige también este Parlamento Europeo, que le pide a España que coopere con los tribunales, que entregue las autorizaciones judiciales —si las hay— y que dé respuestas a todas las víctimas del «Catalangate».

No vale esconderse detrás de la excusa de la seguridad nacional. No somos una amenaza. Somos demócratas, señor Zoido. Si nos consideran una amenaza es porque su concepto de democracia es muy, pero que muy frágil.

Un mensaje también para la extrema derecha de VOX, que está ausente como toda la extrema derecha porque no le interesa este debate. Dejen de intoxicar con su retórica conspiranoica. Su nacional populismo predemocrático ya no engaña en esta casa. El constante bloqueo y sabotaje de su grupo no impedirá que exijamos al Estado español, y a todos los Estados implicados en este escándalo, verdad, reparación, justicia y no repetición.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, velmi pozorně jsem poslouchal tu debatu a i jsem se před tím seznámil s činností výboru. Chci poděkovat kolegům za velmi dobrou odvedenou práci. Chci poděkovat paní zpravodajce, panu předsedovi, protože ne vždycky bývá zvykem, že vyšetřovací kolektivní orgán dojde k takto jasným závěrům a opravdu se snaží najít řešení a odhalit podstatu problému. Je zcela zřejmé, že poté, co tedy budou tato doporučení výboru přijata, je třeba, aby na evropské úrovni byla jasná reakce. Je zřejmé a jasné, že jednotlivé členské státy, zvláště ty, ve kterých je podezření anebo dokonce důkazy, že Pegasus byl zneužíván, těžko budou samy přijímat regulaci anebo že budou regulaci, která je přijata, vymáhat. Toto je přesně téma, kdy musíme vyžadovat jasnou evropskou akci a chtít po Radě, chtít po Komisi, aby to téma neskončilo pouze doporučeními našeho Parlamentu.

Jsem stejně jako ostatní přesvědčen, že musí být jasná striktní pravidla justičního přezkumu užití takového špionážního softwaru a musí být jasně vymezen velmi úzký okruh té nejzávažnější trestné činnosti, kde může být takovýto software nasazen. Pokud toto podceníme, necháme to být, ustoupíme z nějakých politických důvodů, pak se nám to dlouhodobě velmi vymstí a toto v debatě také vyznělo. Takže děkuji všem kolegům, kteří se tomu věnovali, a podporuji závěry jejich zkoumání.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Kaczyński obiecywał w Polsce drugą Bawarię. Tymczasem robi nam NRD bis. Ten człowiek o mentalności Honeckera dał zielone światło swoim, by inwigilowali polskich patriotów: senatora Brejzę, prokuratora Wrzosek, prezydenta Karnowskiego i wielu, wielu innych. Oni zostali potraktowani przez PiS bronią do walki z Al-Kaidą. Dziś ci sami hipokryci z tej neobolszewickiej partii będą opowiadać bajki, że używają Pegasusa dla bezpieczeństwa. O jakim wy bezpieczeństwie mówicie, jak sami przez pół roku nie potrafiliście znaleźć ruskiej rakiety? O jakim bezpieczeństwie, gdy wasz minister zaatakował polskich generałów? O czym wy mówicie? Tu jest Unia, tu jest Polska, a nie Staasiland. Tu są zasady. Nie zakrzyczycie prawdy. Podsluchcy są sednem sowieckiego ładu. Tam na Kremlu władza też myśli, że wolno jej wszystko. Macie się czego bać. Zostaniecie pogonieni i rozliczeni już na jesieni, bo Polska to nie PiS.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señor presidente, desde Ciudadanos denunciamos desde el primer día que los trabajos de la Comisión de Investigación Encargada de Examinar el Uso del Programa Espía de Vigilancia Pegasus y Otros Programas Equivalentes podrían ser instrumentalizados por delincuentes condenados o por fugados de la justicia por violar la democracia y el Estado de Derecho o por peones del Kremlin en su estrategia para debilitar las democracias europeas.

En resumen, decíamos que coríamos el riesgo de que Pegasus se convirtiese en el caballo de Troya y que algunos le abrieran las puertas. Desgraciadamente, no lo evitamos en el informe votado en comisión, que es un texto que voluntariamente presenta sospechas, conjeturas o especulaciones como si fueran certezas, y suposiciones e inferencias como si fueran hechos probados. Afortunadamente sí se ha conseguido en esta Resolución, que sí que será votada en este Pleno y que va a proponer medidas concretas para garantizar los derechos y libertades de los ciudadanos europeos frente a intromisiones ilegales en su intimidad.

Sin embargo, es necesario destacar que hay que garantizar que todos los Estados miembros utilicen todos los mecanismos, todos los instrumentos y toda la tecnología para defender nuestras democracias. Un Estado de Derecho tiene el derecho a defender a sus ciudadanos utilizando programas de seguimiento, que solo son espías cuando se utilizan sin mandamiento judicial, algo que esta Resolución puede contribuir a evitar.

Marcel Kolaja (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, absent Council, abuses of spyware to break into mobile phones of opposition politicians, journalists, activists, but also ordinary citizens, recording everything the victims do, what they say, who they meet, gaining access to their videos and photos, email, anything stored on their devices. Dear colleagues, were speaking about the European Union. We know for sure that there are multiple governments in Europe who acquired these technologies. But where the shock starts is the undeniable evidence that some governments abused spyware to spy on their opponents and seriously undermine the rule of law and the trust of citizens in democracy in their countries. That must stop now, even though I believe that we need a ban on the use of such technologies, the compromise we reached is a good start and going into a good direction. But our work is not done. The ball is now in the hands of the Commission and the national governments. Please act.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, în mai puțin de un an, cetățenii europeni vor fi invitați să-și aleagă reprezentanții în Parlamentul European. Întrebarea este, poate Uniunea Europeană garantează cetățenilor europeni corectitudinea și legitimitatea acestora, în condițiile în care programele spion și-au dovedit eficiența în manipularea proceselor electorale?

Utilizarea abuzivă a programelor spion înseamnă mai mult decât intruziune în viața privată, este o amenințare reală pentru stabilitatea și securitatea statelor. Să ne amintim cât au făcut și continuă să facă dezinformarea și propaganda rusă. Acestea, la fel ca programele spion, sunt arme extrem de puternice, folosite pe scară largă de cei care urmăresc să reducă la tăcere opoziția, jurnaliștii incomozi, criticii, să calce în picioare libertatea și democrația.

Este evident că instituțiile europene trebuie să facă mai mult, trebuie să aibă o poziție mult mai curajoasă și mai fermă pentru a se asigura că aceste arme nu sunt livrate direct în mâinile inamicilor democrației și libertății de exprimare. Cetățenii europeni vor merge la urne cu încrederea că vocea lor va fi auzită, iar rezultatul votului lor va fi corect, fără posibilitatea de a fi manipulat sau alterat în orice fel.

De aceea avem nevoie de mai multă transparență și siguranță pentru a câștiga încrederea cetățenilor.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, demain, nous allons voter la recommandation de la commission - PEGA, dont les travaux vont nous permettre de lutter contre l'utilisation abusive des logiciels espions en Europe. Je veux remercier singulièrement Sophia et Hannes de ce travail réalisé ces derniers mois, puisque ces quatorze mois d'enquête, ce sont des missions et des auditions parfois extrêmement techniques et souvent tellement édifiantes, et cela aboutit enfin.

Cela fait d'autant plus regretter l'absence des mots «moratoire immédiat», bien que ce texte constitue une base cruciale pour la protection des droits des citoyens européens. Les nombreuses recommandations formulées devront être suivies d'effets et de propositions législatives, car, quotidiennement, de nouvelles révélations d'abus apparaissent quand, dans le même temps, ces technologies se déploient à une vitesse vertigineuse. La Commission, mais surtout les États membres, ne doivent donc pas prendre ces recommandations à la légère. Il faut des mesures concrètes pour protéger l'état de droit et la démocratie en Europe.

Grâce notamment au groupe S&D, le texte appelle à une définition claire de «sécurité nationale», termes fort utiles pour justifier l'utilisation de logiciels espions, même quand ils sont utilisés à des fins non légitimes contre des défenseurs des droits de l'homme, des avocats, des journalistes et des opposants politiques. J'insiste sur ce point: de tels outils ne devraient pas être utilisés, ou comme dernier recours, avec des garanties très sévères.

Katalin Cseh (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, well, the Pegasus scandal broke two years ago, and unfortunately this parliament is still among the very, very few political voices who refuse to let it be swept under the rug.

But we have to confront the reality. EU governments are using military-grade spyware against journalists and critics. Just imagine a reporter trying to work to hold the government accountable.

In Hungary, ministers are literally cordoning themselves off and do everything to avoid answering critical questions. And as a thank you, yet again, for the public service the journalists are doing, well, they have their life invaded and their phones tapped. Every intimate detail, every family photo, every private conversation is now subject to the prying eyes and ears of those in power.

Colleagues, this is totalitarianism, and we can never, ever accept that this is happening today in the European Union.

And I thank the rapporteur, Sophie in 't Velt, for her relentless fight for EU-level action. With this resolution, we demand common standards, clear limitations on targets and robust legal remedies for the victims. It is the bare minimum for a functioning democracy.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Mr President, colleagues, it is unbelievable how spyware programs are being used against innocent people. Imagine a spyware program that, in secrecy, reads your messages, listens to your phone calls, collects your passwords, follows your every move, has access to your microphone – and camera for that sake – and steals information from your phone. Well, since some time back, we know that we do not need to imagine it. The spyware from the Israeli cyber-intelligence firm Pegasus is here and has been used, and that is what the recommendations in the report are very, very clearly stating.

But on what grounds the license access is given, to whom it's given and who it is being used against we have less knowledge on. Illegal and totally groundless surveillance is one of the biggest threats against our democratic European Union. It is therefore unacceptable that Pegasus and other equivalent systems are being used against civil society organisations, opposition journalists and dissidents so, unfortunately, I am not surprised that the situation is worse in Hungary and Poland.

The situation is alarming to the extent that all of us MEPs were encouraged to check our phones. We need to take total control over these systems to ensure integrity and privacy.

Bart Groothuis (Renew). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, it makes perfect sense that some EU Member States use commercial spyware to fulfil legitimate law enforcement requirements.

That's not the problem. The real problem, of course, is, like the rapporteur said, that some EU Member States use this spyware to discredit the democratic opposition and kill democracy in Europe. Poland, Hungary, Greece – shame on them.

And I have a triple call to action to the Commission. First, since it is often the Israeli Government signing export licences for the spyware used to kill democracy in Europe, the EU should exert significant pressure on Jerusalem to halt such exports.

Secondly, together with our American friends, the EU should put forward primary and secondary sanctions to entities who sell to the rule of law violators. Put these companies out of business.

And, last but not least, let me remind the Commissioner that it was the brilliant Canadian NGO Citizens Lab who disclosed the Pegasus spyware scandal here in Europe in the first place. Where, dear Commissioner, is the European equivalent to investigate such technical operations? My amendment to the European budget has already created a budget line to create such an institution. It's now up to you to follow up and make it happen.

Δημήτρης Παπαδάκης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το σκάνδαλο Pegasus, Predator και τα συναφή λογισμικά έφεραν στην επιφάνεια την υπαναχώρηση της δημοκρατίας, καθώς και την παραβίαση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και της προσωπικής ζωής των πολιτών στην Ευρώπη. Δυστυχώς, αυτού του είδους τα συστήματα δεν χρησιμοποιήθηκαν μόνο για λόγους εθνικής ασφαλείας ή για την καταπολέμηση της τρομοκρατίας, αλλά για παρακολούθηση πολιτικών αντιπάλων, όπως στην περίπτωση του προέδρου του ΠΑΣΟΚ, Νίκου Ανδρουλάκη, καθώς και δημοσιογράφων που απλά έκαναν καλά τη δουλειά τους.

Στην Κύπρο ακόμη αναμένουμε συγκεκριμένες απαντήσεις από τις αρμόδιες αρχές του κράτους. Ποιοι κατείχαν αυτού του είδους τα λογισμικά και ποιους παρακολουθούσαν; Από το 2019 αναμένουμε απαντήσεις και δυστυχώς επικρατεί μια ύποπτη σιωπή. Είναι γνωστό πλέον ότι αυτά τα λογισμικά κυκλοφορούσαν στην αγορά λες και ήταν απλά καταναλωτικά αγαθά. Αυτό το οποίο πρέπει να γίνει, πέραν των αυστηρών διαδικασιών κυκλοφορίας τους, είναι τα κράτη μέλη να επιβάλλουν αυστηρές και εξοντωτικές ποινές σε αυτούς που αυθαιρετούν και βιάζουν τη δημοκρατία.

Иво Христов (S&D). – Г-н Председател, аферата „Пегас“ показа как технологиите корумпират морала, отваряйки възможности за злоупотреби, на които човешката природа не може да устои. Шпионският софтуер прави все по-условна разликата между демокрациите и диктатурите, защото психологията на властимащия е една и съща, независимо от политическата система. „Пегас“ взломява личното пространство на всеки от нас и зачерква правата и свободите, които законите ни прокламират.

Нашите закони бранят личността, а „Пегас“ взривява самото понятие за личност и я превръща в прозрачен масив от данни, с които властта и заинтересовани лица могат да злоупотребят. В редица страни от Европейския съюз протичат ерозиращи демокрацията процеси, ограничаващи свободите ни. Случаите на незаконна употреба на шпионския софтуер растат главоломно. Затова приветствам препоръката на Парламента за политически и институционални реформи, които да осигурят надеждни гаранции на правата ни. Те са част от битката за бъдещето на нашите демокрации.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Ljudmila Novak (PPE). – Gospod predsednik. Spoštovani gospod komisar, kolegice in kolegi. Politiki vseh barv iz vseh držav so v veliki skušnjavi, da bi prišli na oblast oziroma ostali na oblasti tudi s pomočjo nedovoljenih sredstev.

Med zaslišanji v odboru Pegasus pa se je pokazalo, da so demokratično izvoljene vlade v demokratičnih državah Evropske unije delovale povsem nedemokratično, ko so nezakonito prisluškovale svojim državljanom. Med obravnavo posameznih držav je prihajalo tudi do napetosti in obtoževanj med poslanci iz različnih držav, iz različnih strank iz iste države.

Vse to kaže, da potrebujemo evropski zakonodajni okvir in evropski nadzor nad državami članicami pri spoštovanju demokratičnih vrednot in spoštovanju človekovih pravic.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner and colleagues, I would like to congratulate the rapporteur for the extremely thorough work done on revealing the extent and methods of the use of commercial spyware. The report concludes that many of these companies are registered in Ireland, without any substantial presence, such as office space or employees.

One such spyware company is registered to a company formation specialist at an office in the centre of Dublin. According to *The Currency*, an online publication, this company sold its spyware to the rapid support forces in Sudan, the successor to the genocidal Janjaweed.

The Irish Parliament's justice committee has agreed to my request that hearings take place on whether it is appropriate that such companies are registered in Ireland. I say this to illustrate that if the Council won't act, national parliaments have a critical role to play, to call out the failure to regulate, to protect and safeguard our citizens and our democracy.

Beata Mazurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Komisja PEGA zamiast skupiać się na zagrożeniach płynących z zewnątrz, narażających na niebezpieczeństwo kraje i urzędników unijnych, woli atakować te, które według Unii są niedostatecznie praworządne, robiąc z nich chłopców do bicia. Warto podkreślić, że oprogramowania Pegasus używa większość krajów Unii Europejskiej, choć dla opinii publicznej rysuje się obraz, że czynią to tylko Węgry i Polska i posługują się nim w sposób nielegalny, używając go do ograniczenia swobód obywatelskich i walki z opozycją, co jest oczywistą bzdurą.

W Polsce, wbrew narracji autorów raportu, istnieją silne zabezpieczenia i w przeciwieństwie do niektórych innych państw istnieje sądowa kontrola wszelkich podsłuchów zakładanych przez służby. Nie ma więc mowy o nadużyciach. Państwa muszą posiadać nowoczesne systemy, gdyż w epoce hybrydowych zagrożeń oraz zaawansowanych technologii używanych przez terrorystów niekorzystanie z takich urządzeń byłoby naiwne i czyniłoby nas bezbronniymi. Jednak może Unii nie zależy na bezpieczeństwie państw członkowskich, ale na poszerzeniu własnych kompetencji. A na to nie ma naszej zgody.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, we welcome the report on the use of Pegasus. It makes for shocking, but not surprising, reading on the actions of the apartheid state of Israel and the use of Pegasus software as a matter of diplomacy, with the report highlighting how the sale of Pegasus software is used as a diplomatic bargaining chip, with countries turning a blind eye to Israel's actions domestically.

The report also highlights how numerous EU Member States fully engaged in the industry. On my own country, Ireland, the report states, 'Ireland offers favourable fiscal arrangements to a large spyware vendor'. If we're serious about strictly regulating the use and trade of spyware, we must first start in our own backyard and ensure that EU Member States are prevented from promoting and profiteering from a product that essentially amounts to mass surveillance.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Didier Reynders, membre de la Commission. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les Députés, je voudrais d'abord vous remercier pour ce débat, au cours duquel vous avez eu l'occasion de soulever un certain nombre de questions importantes. En entendant vos demandes aux États membres et au Conseil, je m'étonne des informations me précisant que le Conseil n'a pas été invité pour ce débat. La Commission a toujours été très claire sur le fait que toute tentative des autorités nationales d'accéder illégalement aux données des citoyens, y compris des journalistes et des opposants politiques, est inacceptable si elle est confirmée.

Concernant le comportement de la Commission européenne, je veux rappeler que, pour ma part, j'ai eu l'occasion de répondre à plusieurs invitations de votre commission, mais j'ai également soulevé le problème de l'utilisation de Pegasus en Espagne ou de Predator en Grèce, par exemple, lors de mes visites sur place et de mes rencontres avec les gouvernements. J'ai également transmis une demande d'information auprès des États membres, qui doivent superviser et contrôler leurs services de sécurité, afin de s'assurer qu'ils respectent pleinement les droits fondamentaux, en ce compris la protection des données à caractère personnel, la sécurité des journalistes et la liberté d'expression.

The Commission sent letters to all the Member States about the legal framework governing the use of spyware in order to examine the interplay with EU data protection law.

We ask a series of questions, including the purposes under which spyware is permitted for law enforcement purposes, for national security or other purposes, the relevant safeguards that are applicable when a spyware is used for law enforcement and for national security purposes with full respect for the principles of proportionality and necessity.

It is not a straightforward exercise given the diversity of the response received. It also requires putting Member States' responses in the context of their relevant national framework.

We continue to analyse the responses based on the report and recommendation of the PEGA Committee, as well as our own fact-gathering exercise, the Commission will decide on the most appropriate way forward to better protect the citizens.

Sophia in 't Veld, rapporteur. – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, thank you for this debate. We have often referred to this scandal as Watergate. The European or Greek or Spanish or Hungarian equivalent of Watergate. Actually, it isn't. It's like this movie called 'The Lives of Others', which is about the former Eastern European Stasi spying on its citizens, a repressive regime. That is what this is about. And colleagues, do we actually learn from history or are we doomed to make the same mistakes over and over again? Do we close our eyes and ears until it's too late and then we have to start all over again with rebuilding democracy, because we are not immune to authoritarian tendencies simply because we're European. We have to fight for it. And here, Commissioner, I would like to appeal to you: the European Union has to act and it has to give itself the powers to act, because, quite frankly, relying on national authorities for upholding the law, when those very same national authorities are the actual perpetrators, makes absolutely no sense. You know. *[Applause in the Chamber]* Thank you. I got a bit choked up here. The thing is that you very often put the burden on the shoulders of the individuals. Yes, but people, you know, victims can go to court, but then you're putting the burden on the individual, the burden of upholding EU laws. That is not a replacement for enforcement by the EU Commission and the other EU bodies.

Then on national security. National security is very important, but it has become a blanket exemption to the democratic rule of law. It is very important that we get a clear demarcation where there is a unified European definition or the obligation for Member States to define, but there has to be a definition of national security. Commissioner, this is a full-blown democratic crisis and therefore we need a crisis response, not a technocratic, legalistic and timid reaction. We need to act as we did in the other crises, as I have said before, because Commissioner – this is my last sentence, Mr President – not a thousand democracy action plans can save our democracy if we just stand by and watch how it is being destroyed. There is a broad majority for the recommendations. Please, Commissioner, act on this with all the strengths that you have.

Der Präsident. – Die gemeinsame Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 15. Juni 2023, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Christine Anderson (ID), *schriftlich*. – Der Abschlussbericht enthält Vorwürfe, wonach es „präventives Abhören“ von Anführern und Organisatoren von Straßenprotesten gab. Man ist davon überzeugt, dass Rechtsstaatlichkeit und demokratische Grundstandards ernsthaft verletzt wurden. Leider stellt er dies nur für Mitgliedstaaten wie Polen und Ungarn fest. Deutschland kommt mit gerade mal 8 von 531 Absätzen kaum im Bericht vor. Dabei hat es ein Vertreter der Bundesregierung nicht für nötig gehalten, trotz mehrfacher Einladung, im Ausschuss zu erscheinen. Der Ausschussvorsitzende selbst erklärte, dass er sich nicht sicher sei, ob ein Vertreter der Bundesregierung keine Zeit habe oder ob es ihm nicht von der Bundesinnenministerin verboten wurde, vor dem Ausschuss auszusagen. So konnte ich im Ausschuss keine Frage an einen Vertreter Deutschlands stellen. Niemand konnte mir die Frage beantworten, wieso eine Partei wie die Alternative für Deutschland vom Inlandsgeheimdienst, der sich zwar Verfassungsschutz nennt, aber hier Regierungsschutz betreibt, mit geheimdienstlichen Mitteln überwacht werden muss. Das bedeutet, der Einsatz solcher Software wie Pegasus und der Umgang mit ihren Mitgliedern auf dem Niveau von Schwerverbrechern und Terroristen. Da der Bericht die Situation im Umgang mit der Opposition in Deutschland komplett ausblendet und ich als deutsche Abgeordnete in erster Linie meinem Heimatland verpflichtet bin, kann ich einem solchen Bericht unmöglich zustimmen.

Laura Ferrara (NI), *per iscritto*. – La Commissione d'inchiesta PEGA, nel corso dei suoi lavori, ha fatto emergere un quadro fosco in merito agli abusi perpetrati in UE attraverso *spyware* nei confronti di giornalisti, magistrati, esponenti politici e della società civile.

È inconcepibile consentire tutto questo senza individuare responsabilità e senza distinguere con chiarezza le attività lecite da quelle illecite. I sistemi di sorveglianza informatica si sono rivelati strumenti il cui uso illegale rappresenta un enorme rischio per lo stato di diritto, la democrazia e la tutela dei diritti fondamentali, sia a livello nazionale che europeo.

Il problema va affrontato con urgenza e sono necessari mirati interventi, soprattutto legislativi, per tentare di porre un argine a un mercato di software-spia e pratiche carenti di regole comuni. Le raccomandazioni contenute nella relazione della commissione PEGA vanno nella giusta direzione. La Commissione europea e il Consiglio facciano ora la loro parte nel metterle in atto.

Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE), *γραπτώς*. – Είμαι υπέρ της σύστασης που ενέκρινε το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο σχετικά με τη Διερεύνηση της χρήσης του λογισμικού Pegasus και αντίστοιχου κατασκοπευτικού λογισμικού παρακολούθησης, όπως άλλωστε και η πλειονότητα των συναδέλφων της Κοινοβουλευτικής ομάδας του ΕΛΚ. Δυστυχώς, λόγω ανωτέρας βίας δεν δύναμαι να παραστώ στη συγκεκριμένη ψηφοφορία.

Urmas Paet (Renew), kirjalikult. – Nuhkvara, nagu Pegasuse ja Predatori, kuritarvitamine mitme Euroopa valitsuse poolt opositsioonipoliitikute, ajakirjanike, juristide, valitsusväliste organisatsioonide ja riigiametnike alusetuks jälgimiseks on ELi demokraatia jaoks tagasilöökk. Nuhkvara ebaseaduslik kasutamine ohustab Euroopa demokraatiat. Seetõttu on vaja tõsiselt uurida kõiki rikkumisi, muuta õigusakte ja jõustada paremini juba kehtestatud reegleid. Nuhkvara kasutamine peaks olema lubatud üksnes erijuhtudel ja piiratud aega. Luua tuleks ka ELi tehnoloogialabor, mis aitaks teadusuuringute, kohtuekspertiisi ja uurimistegevusega. Kuna on selgeid märke, et Maroko ja Ruanda on kasutanud nuhkvara ELi kodanike ja mõjuisikute, sealhulgas riigijuhtide jälgimiseks, tuleks nuhkvara ekspordilitsentsid põhjalikult läbi vaadata. Samuti on vaja parandada ELi ekspordikontrollireeglite jõustamist, töötada koos USAga välja ühine nuhkvarastrateegia ning arutada nuhkvara turustamise ja ekspordimise reegleid selliste riikidega nagu Iisrael. Lisaks tuleb tagada, et ELi arenguabi ei kasutata nuhkvara ostmiseks ega kasutamiseks.

Ελένη Σταύρου (PPE), γραπτώς. – Είμαι υπέρ της σύστασης του Ευρωκοινοβουλίου σχετικά με τη Διερεύνηση της χρήσης του λογισμικού Pegasus και αντίστοιχου κατασκοπευτικού λογισμικού παρακολούθησης, όπως άλλωστε και η πλειονότητα των συναδέλφων της Κοινοβουλευτικής Ομάδας του ΕΑΚ. Δυστυχώς, λόγω ανωτέρας βίας δεν δύναμαι να παραστώ στη συγκεκριμένη ψηφοφορία.

15. Hacer de Europa el lugar donde invertir (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zum Thema „Europa zum Investitionsstandort machen“ (2023/2706(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, President-in-Office of the Council. – President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for convening this timely and important debate. As most of us know by now, European competitiveness is a subject that lies close to my heart. It is at the core of the Swedish Presidency.

The problem description is familiar. Europe has, in economic terms, lagged behind peers for a long time before the current crisis. Over the last four decades, our growth rates have been sluggish compared to the US and many other OECD countries. Our productivity is lower than other important players and maybe even more worryingly, we continue to spend less on R&D.

This is not explained by a lack of short-term public intervention or aid packages. Instead, it is about our basic policies and the general directions we are moving in. Indeed, making sure that European regulations are conducive to growth determines our attractiveness to the world.

Businesses have long-term perspectives and therefore need predictable and competitive framework conditions for their investments. Ultimately, our future economic growth, to a large extent, depends on our ability in this regard. And that is also why the Swedish Presidency emphasises long-term competitiveness and has worked hard to anchor this at the top of the EU agenda.

Ladies and gentlemen, a lot has happened over the last couple of months. I recall the discussions that we had here in January and in March, as well as the resolution adopted by the European Parliament. All of this appears to have inspired the Commission when preparing its initiative in views of the March European Council. Its strategy on long-term competitiveness and productivity puts the single market, R&D, skills, access to private capital and better regulation at the core. Importantly, it suggests a work method that includes the use of key performance indicators for efficient implementations and follow-up.

This initiative, together with the 'single market at 30' communication was an excellent basis for the discussion on economic issues at the Spring European Council. Leaders then made it clear that they share the view that we need to work in this way and that these policy areas are crucial. The recognition at the highest political level provides a powerful message to the guide of the policy-making.

It marked the start of the agenda of strategic importance and that the EU needs to pursue over a long period of time. Leaders will come back to these issues at the June summit, as we discussed here this morning.

And with a view to that, the Swedish Presidency is arranging discussion in key Council formations. An important step was at the Competitiveness Council in May, when ministers endorsed the work methods set out by the Commission.

All deliberations in combination with efficient negotiations on key legislative acts such as the Critical Raw Material Act, the Chips Act, and the Directive on Ecodesign will feed into the Presidency's report on the European Council in the end of June, and also was asked for at the March meeting.

In parallel, we need to ensure a smart implementation of the strategies. The Commission has initiated work on this. In the next phase, it needs to be explored how to create synergies with other policy instruments, for example, the European Semester. And we need to monitor that the policies are in line with the priorities and objectives set out in the strategy.

This work is in progress. And it will be challenged to make sure that this competitiveness agenda becomes truly influential, because this is how we make Europe the place to invest.

We need to continue strong engagement from the European Parliament also to achieve this, to make sure that we focus on the right thing and that I hope that it will keep this debate alive. Let me also stress the firm commitment of the Swedish Presidency to move forward with this agenda, and I am looking forward to the debate.

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear Minister, honourable Members, thank you for this debate where I am intervening, replacing Commissioner Gentiloni, who could not attend to this today's debate.

The European Union is one of the most open places to invest in the world. We are a top global destination of foreign investment, and that is something we can be proud of.

But the ground is shifting beneath our feet, especially when it comes to the green transition and the development of green technologies. Other countries around the world are leaping forward.

The European Union cannot afford to fall behind in this race to attract the investments, jobs and growth that will define our future prosperity. For that, we need to boost the resilience and competitiveness of our economies.

So today's debate is especially timely. The good news is that we do not start from scratch. Three years ago, we set up NextGenerationEU. It is sparking a wave of investment in the digital and green transition across Europe. And the reforms accompanying these investments are addressing long-standing bottlenecks to investment and improving the business climate in all Member States.

We have InvestEU, which has already mobilised investment for more than EUR 40 billion, with more to follow. Together with the RRF, it has helped lift the ratio of public investment to GDP to its highest level in years.

We have REPowerEU, with its focus not just on diversifying supplies but also on making it easier to invest in everything from renewable energy projects to heat pumps by cutting red tape and speeding up permitting procedures.

And, as part of our Green Deal Industrial Plan, we have put forward ambitious proposals under the Net Zero Industry Act and the Critical Raw Materials Act. Delivering on these ambitious proposals is key to strengthen Europe's position as a place to invest.

Looking ahead, it will be important to preserve the positive trend in public investment and reforms, also after the expiry of the RRF in 2026. For that, we need a framework of fiscal rules that encourages growth-enhancing investments and reforms while maintaining debt sustainability. As you know, this is very much at the centre of our proposals to reform our economic governance. We will work tirelessly with Parliament and the Council to reach an agreement on this crucial file by the end of the year.

Maintaining high levels of nationally financed public investment is one part of the answer. But if we want to remain competitive, we need European added value and scale. We need to better leverage public funds to crown in private investment. InvestEU is a key instrument to create such synergies between public and private financing.

And although the single market is our greatest asset, there is still some way to go to develop a true single market for capital. Over the past three years, the Capital Markets Union has made major progress. By this summer, all 16 actions in our CMU action plan from 2020 will have been completed, some of them still requiring approval by co-legislators.

Two more proposals will be coming in the next couple of weeks, including a legislative proposal to make withholding tax procedures simpler and faster – one of the topics that investors have flagged for years as a major obstacle to cross-border investment.

A number of CMU proposals are still being negotiated. I encourage Parliament and the Council to conclude these files before the end of this institutional cycle.

Honourable Members, there is no single recipe to strengthen Europe's position as a place to invest, but I believe three ingredients are necessary. The first is to have vision, to set ambitious goals and indicate the direction of travel. Ambition is something this Commission has not lacked, nor has this Parliament.

The second is to put our money where our mouth is. We need to match our ambition with the necessary instruments and by focusing our resources on the key priorities.

The third is to provide predictability – investors want clarity. They want certainty, especially in times of change. The climate law is a good example of where we provided this predictability. And on key parts of the 'Fit for 55' package, we reached a clear political agreement.

So I thank you for this debate and I look forward to hearing your interventions to enrich our capacity to attract investment in Europe.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Andreas Schwab, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist gut, dass die schwedische Ratspräsidentschaft sich heute der Debatte im Europäischen Parlament stellt und mit uns gemeinsam der Frage nachgeht, was wir noch mehr tun können, damit Europa tatsächlich zum Platz für weitere Investitionen wird.

Wir waren mit dem Binnenmarktausschuss vor wenigen Wochen in Singapur, und große Staatsfonds investieren seit vielen Jahren – und auch heute – lieber in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika als in der Europäischen Union. Deshalb müssen wir darüber nachdenken, was wir verbessern können, um derartige Investitionsentscheidungen noch stärker nach Europa zu lenken.

Herr Kommissar Reynders, ich habe Ihnen natürlich sehr aufmerksam zugehört, aber es hat mich ein Stück weit an meine Zeit in Frankreich erinnert, wo ich mal studiert habe und wo sich die Presse sehr stark über „*la pensée unique*“ geärgert hat. Ich glaube, dass wir zu wenig selbstkritisch mit unseren eigenen Politiken in Europa umgehen.

Zu Recht wurde deshalb ganz am Anfang erwähnt, dass wir mehr in Resilienz investieren müssen. Dafür gibt es natürlich eine ganze Reihe von Märkten, wo wir mehr tun können. Wir brauchen mehr Resilienz im europäischen Energiebinnenmarkt. Dafür brauchen wir einen Vorschlag für einen voll integrierten europäischen Energiebinnenmarkt. Wir brauchen mehr Resilienz in den europäischen Telekommunikationsmärkten. Deswegen freue ich mich, dass zumindest Herr Kommissar Breton diese Idee aufgegriffen hat. Ich hoffe, dass wir das in den kommenden Monaten auch bereits vorbereiten können.

Das Thema Investment habe ich schon angesprochen. Aber es gibt natürlich ein drittes Thema, das beide Dinge miteinander verbindet, und das ist mir als Vertreter des Ausschusses für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz besonders wichtig: Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass wir tatsächlich dahin kommen, dass unsere europäischen Regeln, soweit sie den Binnenmarkt betreffen, auch überall gleich gelten und gleich angewendet werden. Es kann nicht angehen, dass wir bei Gesetzen, die bestimmten Kolleginnen und Kollegen halt besonders gut gefallen, dann wieder auf das Prinzip der Mindestharmonisierung zurückfallen.

Globale Lieferketten, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, werden sich nicht an der Mindestharmonisierung orientieren zwischen Luxemburg und Zypern, sondern sie werden nur unsere Werte und unsere Vorstellungen akzeptieren und durchsetzen, wenn wir sie in Europa einheitlich vorsehen. Deswegen gilt es, noch mehr Einheitlichkeit im Binnenmarkt herzustellen.

Alex Agius Saliba, *fisem il-grupp S&D*. – Sur President, sakemm l-Ewropa ma tlahhaqx ma' regjuni ewlenin ohra, f'teknoloġġi diġitali, ser tkun vulnerabbli fis-setturi kollha għat-tkabbir u anke l-kompettività.

Minhabba l-kriżijiet u l-avvenimenti kollha, f'dawn l-aħhar ftit snin, fil-kontinent tagħna, neħtieġu, aktar minn qatt qabel, Ewropa robusta li tiżviluppa l-kapaċitajiet u anke l-awtonomija diġitali tagħha. Bhalissa kemm iċ-Ċina kif ukoll l-Istati Uniti qegħdin jinvestu hafna fejn tidhol l-intelliġenza artifiċjali, il-konnettività u anke t-teknoloġġi diġitali ohrajn u allura m'għandniex nibqgħu lura aħna. L-Ewropa għandha tinvesti wkoll fil-kapaċità tar-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni f'setturi strateġiċi, bhall-intelliġenza artifiċjali u kompjuters ta' prestazzjoni għolja, cloud computing, teknoloġġi li jsahhu l-privatezza u teknoloġġi nodfa illi jikkontribwixxu għat-tnaqqis fl-emissjonijiet tal-karbonju. Neħtieġu aktar attenzjoni, aktar investiment fir-riċerka u l-iżvilupp li hija l-forza tal-iżvilupp teknoloġiku. L-intraprendituri Ewropej m'għandux iħossuhom imġieghla jirrikolaw lejn Silicon Valley sabiex isibu l-finanzjament meħtieġ biex ikabbru n-negozji tagħhom.

Programmi tal-Unjoni Ewropea, bħal dak iddedikat lejn teknoloġġi futuri u emergenti kif ukoll il-Kunsill tal-Ewropa tar-Riċerka, għandhom ir-rwol deċiżiv sabiex nilhqu dawn it-tragwardji tant importanti.

Dita Charanzová, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, the best way to make Europe the place to invest is to complete the four freedoms and the single market.

Today, the best places to invest are the United States and Canada. This is because they have regulatory predictability, skilled workers, fully functioning internal markets, and especially single capital markets.

We must do the same in Europe. We must think before we regulate. More rules is not always the best way. We must reform our education and workforce to make sure we have qualified workers. We must build digital and physical infrastructure to support investments. This is how we should use European funds and this is how we should use also NextGenerationEU.

We must make sure a company in one Member State can truly work in all Member States, from funding and development to the finished product. A Czech company should be able to easily get funding from France, to buy a factory in Bulgaria and know that the infrastructure will be there to support them. This is not the case today and we need to fix it.

Rasmus Andresen, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Europa ist ein Kontinent voller Chancen. Mit dem Grünen Deal haben wir die Chance, unsere Infrastruktur zu modernisieren und neuen Wohlstand für alle zu schaffen. Starke Gesetze reichen dafür allerdings nicht aus. Wir brauchen Investitionen, um erfolgreich zu sein. Der Grüne Deal darf nicht an unzureichenden Investitionen scheitern. Die Konsequenz daraus wäre verheerend. Die Alternative sind Naturkatastrophen, Dürre, Kriege, massive Armut und extrem hohe Folgekosten für die Wirtschaft.

Aufgrund einer falschen Wirtschafts- und Finanzpolitik der letzten 20 Jahre fahren wir Europa auf Verschleiß. Und diese Politik droht sich zu verschlimmern. Gerade jetzt, am Beginn einer Rezession, sind Haushaltskürzungen und ausbleibende Investitionen Gift. Arbeitslosigkeit und Armut werden steigen, und die Infrastruktur wird weiter verschlissen. Es ist deshalb falsch, wenn Finanzministerinnen und Finanzminister auf Kürzungen setzen und wichtige Investitionen in der EU blockieren. Allein für die Klimamodernisierung, so die EU-Kommission, brauchen wir jährlich bis zu 540 Milliarden Euro an Investitionen. Und private Investitionen wird es in dem Bereich nur geben, wenn wir auch starke öffentliche Investitionen tätigen. Dass es anders geht, das zeigen aktuell die USA. Bidens *Inflation Reduction Act* führt zu massiven, auch privaten, Investitionen von Unternehmen.

Wir brauchen ein europäisches Investitionsprogramm, das die Wirtschaft ankurbelt und die öffentliche Infrastruktur stärkt. Alle können Gewinnerinnen und Gewinner werden. Durch innovative Forschung, Digitalisierung und öffentliche grüne Infrastruktur werden wir wettbewerbsfähig und steigern die Lebensqualität aller Menschen in Europa. Statt Arbeitslosigkeit entstehen gut bezahlte Industriejobs, wie es zum Beispiel mit der Batteriefabrik Northvolt in meiner Heimat in Schleswig-Holstein gerade der Fall ist. Dazu brauchen wir eine investitionsfreundliche Reform der EU-Fiskalregeln, einen Investitionsfonds im EU-Budget und für Unternehmen bezahlbare grüne Energie.

Johan Van Overtveldt, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, zorgen voor een aantrekkelijk investeringsklimaat is een van de kerntaken waarin de EU wel degelijk het verschil kan maken. Het rendement op investeringen voor burgers en bedrijven, maar ook voor de Unie in haar geheel, is hierin vele malen groter dan wat men met versnipperde subsidies en gedateerde programma's kan bereiken. Een hoog investeringsrisico is inherent aan innovatie. Overheden kunnen dit risico verlagen door de toegang tot financiering te vergemakkelijken. Daarom is de kapitaalmarktunie op dit moment van wezenlijk belang.

Een andere belangrijke stimulans voor investeerders is duidelijke maar slanke regelgeving en beperking van administratieve kosten. Deze zaken kosten de overheden niets. De EU kan en moet op dit vlak beter presteren. Wie innovatie en investeringen zegt, komt automatisch terecht bij de duurzame transitie. Als deze transitie doordacht en realistisch wordt aangepakt, kunnen en zullen er massaal investeringen door worden aangetrokken. Torenhoge, blind ideologische klimaatambities daarentegen bereiken juist het tegenovergestelde. Instabiliteit en onzekerheid remmen investeringen en innovatie af.

Ik merk de laatste tijd dat dit besef bij sommige leden van de Commissie daadwerkelijk is doorgedrongen. Dit inzicht zou echter niet alleen geïnspireerd mogen zijn door de aankomende verkiezingen, maar ook door het algemeen belang van de EU en de lidstaten.

Marco Campomenosi, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, un saluto anche alla Presidenza svedese. Purtroppo, probabilmente in questi quattro anni c'è stato un eccesso di retorica da parte di tutti. Da parte della Commissione nell'annunciare certi strumenti e da parte anche di noi parlamentari, sia chi è a favore sia chi è critico nei confronti dell'attività della Commissione.

Una voglia di annunciare strumenti che poi nei fatti non hanno creato ciò di cui stiamo parlando, ovvero di una situazione, di un ambiente favorevole agli investimenti. È dal famoso piano Juncker che forse avremmo dovuto imparare che certi strumenti necessitano di tutta una serie di circostanze. Quando la Presidente von der Leyen parla poi di un fondo sovrano io corro al vocabolario anche per comprendere che cosa è un fondo sovrano rispetto a ciò che la stessa propone.

Abbiamo passato delle crisi incredibilmente gravi, ma non ne abbiamo approfittato in alcuni ambiti importanti. Non abbiamo migliorato e reso più moderne le norme sugli aiuti di Stato, non abbiamo aggiornato le regole sulla concorrenza e non abbiamo superato in campo economico l'austerità. Ci stiamo lavorando, ma è un processo molto, molto difficile.

A mio avviso, le politiche *green* del «Fit for 55» creano ulteriori difficoltà per fare sì che l'Europa sia un luogo dove gli investimenti arrivino. La scelta di non favorire la neutralità tecnologica e l'aumento a dismisura della dipendenza che in futuro avremo dai grandi *player* asiatici rendono tutto veramente complicato.

Purtroppo sulle materie prime la Commissione europea arriva tardi. Avremmo dovuto avere un piano prima di queste norme. E allora perché dico questo? Dico questo perché gli Stati Uniti contemporaneamente con l'IRA attivano uno straordinario strumento che sta spostando interessi e investimenti in maniera decisiva e importante. Bene fa la Commissione a negoziare con gli americani perché il rapporto transatlantico sarà importante, ma come è stato valutato inizialmente quello strumento era esageratamente negativo, mentre invece dovremmo prendere spunto.

Sulle politiche commerciali dovremmo essere un po' più attivi e purtroppo secondo me abbiamo perso molto tempo e il *nearshoring* deve diventare veramente, nell'interpretazione della globalizzazione, uno strumento importante.

Poi ci sono cose positive: la Banca europea degli investimenti, le politiche sull'innovazione, la revisione del Quadro finanziario pluriennale che deve essere un momento in cui possiamo indirizzare meglio certi strumenti perché il rischio è che il nostro continente nei prossimi decenni sia irrilevante a causa della mancata capacità di essere competitivi sugli scenari globali, e questo è quello che vorrei scongiurare.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Ρόσβαλ, κύριε Ρεντέρς, χρειάζεται να κάνουμε περισσότερα πράγματα για να προσελκύσουμε περισσότερες επενδύσεις στην Ευρώπη. Και αυτό γιατί τα τελευταία χρόνια χάνουμε έδαφος και έναντι των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών και έναντι της Κίνας και στον παγκόσμιο ανταγωνισμό. Αλλά για να πετύχουμε αυτόν τον στόχο πρέπει να κάνουμε περισσότερα σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο. Χρειαζόμαστε καινούρια εργαλεία και χρηματοδότηση αυτών των εργαλείων.

Τι θα γίνει, κύριε Ρεντέρς, με την υλοποίηση της εξαγγελίας της κυρίας φον ντερ Λάιεν για το περίφημο Ταμείο Κυριαρχίας; Με ποιους πόρους θα χρηματοδοτηθεί όταν, κυρία Ρόσβαλ, το Συμβούλιο επιμένει σε έναν προϋπολογισμό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στο ύψος του 1 % του ευρωπαϊκού ΑΕΠ; Τι θα γίνει, κυρία Ρόσβαλ και κύριε Ρεντέρς, σε τρία χρόνια που θα τελειώσει το Ταμείο Ανάκαμψης; Φτάνουν οι πόροι του Invest EU; Μήπως πρέπει να επενδύσουμε οι 27 από κοινού περισσότερα για την υλοποίηση της Πράσινης Συμφωνίας, της ψηφιακής μετάβασης, και να μην αντιμετωπίζουν αυτές τις πολιτικές οι συνάδελφοι που βρίσκονται στα άκρα δεξιά έδρανα του Κοινοβουλίου ως εμπόδιο για τις επενδύσεις; Μήπως πρέπει να γίνουμε πιο ισχυροί και ενωμένοι ως Ευρώπη, καθώς η Γερμανία, η μεγαλύτερη οικονομία στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, είναι πολύ μικρή πια για το πλανητικό επίπεδο;

Χρειαζόμαστε, λοιπόν, περισσότερη Ευρώπη, ισχυρότερο προϋπολογισμό, και το λέω σε εσάς, κυρία Ρόσβαλ, διότι η χώρα σας, όποτε συζητούμε τον προϋπολογισμό, θέλει να κόβει και όχι να προσθέτει, και αυξημένους ιδίους πόρους, για να υποστηρίξουμε και την Πράσινη Συμφωνία και την ψηφιακή μετάβαση και το ευρωπαϊκό κοινωνικό μοντέλο.

Mario Furore (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da anni l'Europa vive in una situazione di stagnazione negli investimenti legati all'innovazione. La necessità di migliorare l'efficienza energetica continua a svolgere il ruolo di propulsore chiave. Il sistema bancario però deve supportare le aziende europee e dobbiamo semplificare le regole per le nostre aziende, in primis per le PMI, che sono il cuore pulsante della nostra economia.

Dobbiamo poi tutelare le eccellenze europee dall'infiltrazione di investitori di paesi terzi che rischiano di svalORIZZARE i nostri asset. Elaborare poi piani di aiuti per le imprese nei settori chiave e dobbiamo anche garantire la tutela per i nostri lavoratori. Occorre un approccio coordinato per incentivare le nostre aziende ad investire affinché l'Europa possa poi mantenere e incrementare il suo ruolo a livello mondiale nella politica ambientale e soprattutto per costruire un livello principale nel comparto tecnologico, nell'eccellenza dei suoi prodotti industriali e anche artigianali.

Markus Ferber (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Frau Ratspräsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Europa hat viel vor in den nächsten Jahren. Dazu brauchen wir Firmen, die auch bereit sind, zu investieren.

Denn wir müssen uns von einem Credo hier im Haus mal verabschieden: Die öffentlichen Hände werden nicht alleine in der Lage sein, das große Investitionsvolumen, das notwendig ist, hervorzubringen. Die Staaten können Anschubfinanzierung geben, sie können Garantien geben, aber sie werden nicht – wenn ich hier die Zahl der Europäischen Investitionsbank nennen darf - 350 Milliarden Euro pro Jahr nur an Investitionen zur Verfügung stellen können.

Was wir auf der anderen Seite brauchen, ist, die Anforderungen, die unsere Zeit mit sich bringt, auch wirklich anzunehmen. Wir brauchen nicht wie in der Vergangenheit nachfragepolitische Instrumente; wir brauchen eine neue Angebotspolitik. Dazu gehört: Stopp von neuen regulatorischen Belastungen, Abbau von Bürokratie und Berichtspflichten, Beschleunigung von Genehmigungsverfahren, Vollendung des Binnenmarktes und eine Industriepolitik, die unsere Wettbewerbsfähigkeit stärkt. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass Investoren auf der ganzen Welt an Europa glauben und in Europa investieren. Heute machen sie einen Bogen um uns.

Im Jahr 2000 hat sich die Europäische Union mit der Lissabon-Strategie einmal das Ziel gesetzt, zum wettbewerbsfähigsten und dynamischsten Wirtschaftsraum der Welt zu werden. Davon sind wir heute weit entfernt, und das führt leider dazu, dass Investitionen an Europa vorbeigeführt werden. Wir sollten uns wieder an diese Strategie erinnern.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Voorzitter, wie kijkt er naar buiten – de langste periode zonder regen ooit, de Atlantische Oceaan op recordwarmte – en denkt: ja, ik wil meer van dit? Blijkbaar zijn er sommigen in dit huis die dat denken, want investeringen zijn hard nodig – 500 miljard euro per jaar voor onze klimaat- en milieudoelen alleen al.

Maar pogingen om dat geld te mobiliseren, privaat en publiek, de taxonomie, de natuurherstelwet, een verbod op benzinemotoren worden door rechts afgezwakt of geblokkeerd. Zo blijven we hangen in een achterhaald model waar varkens op elkaar leven in gigastallen en boeren amper rondkomen. Waar de auto-industrie geld verspilde aan dieselinvesteringen en frauduleuze software en nu haar markt verliest aan elektrische auto's uit de VS en China. Waar Shell, de oliemaatschappij, aandeelhouders vertroetelt met extra dividend, en investeringen in duurzaamheid schrapt. Is dit een aantrekkelijk investeringsklimaat? Winst ten koste van mens en milieu? Ik heb een andere visie.

We leiden investeringen in goede banen en investeren in onze economie, maar zeker in onze mensen en in onze planeet. We zetten de transitie voorop. Dus niet de doodlopende weg van olie en gasboringen, maar de snelweg naar duurzaamheid voor alle bedrijven: groot-, midden- en kleinbedrijf, industrieel of agrarisch.

In een goed Europees investeringsklimaat hebben alle bedrijven die de transitie willen en kunnen maken toegang tot geld. De Commissie maakt hier gelukkig werk van met aanbevelingen vandaag, deze week, om die transitie te financieren. Want duurzaam beleggen, duurzaam investeren gaat niet over groen zijn, maar over groen worden. We zijn op de goede weg. Maar in plaats van mee te helpen aan dit bouwwerk, zetten mijn christendemocratische collega's hun hakken in het zand. Mijn advies aan hen is dan ook: stop met het voeren van een naar binnen gekeerd oppositiebeleid en kijk naar buiten. Willen jullie een gezonde Europese economie, een Europa dat ook voor onze kinderen natuur, banen en eten heeft? Help ons dan van Europa een plek te maken om te investeren in een duurzame toekomst.

Valérie Hayer (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, 80 % de notre production de principes actifs est aujourd'hui assurée en Asie. Résultat: des pénuries de paracétamol, d'amoxicilline, d'antidiabétiques, d'antidouleurs même, pour nos bébés européens. Aujourd'hui, 70 % des puces électroniques sont produites à Taïwan et aux États-Unis et 80 % de nos panneaux solaires viennent de Chine. Résultat: notre développement technologique dépend de la stabilité dans le reste du monde.

Alors, une fois que l'on a rappelé cela, quel constat devons-nous en tirer? Le constat, c'est qu'il y a une nécessité absolue à réindustrialiser notre continent. Cela requiert une volonté politique pour ouvrir des usines, pour recréer des emplois perdus, pour former et pour assurer un retour du savoir-faire en Europe. Cette volonté politique européenne, Monsieur le Commissaire, devra donc se traduire par un fonds de souveraineté crédible. Il en va de notre prospérité et de l'avenir de nos territoires.

Henrike Hahn (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, green industrial policy is now finally on the European agenda. And this shift to an active industrial policy, including corresponding investments, is a real chance to meet the economy needs, to be sustainable and competitive.

We need strong European answers on production and energy costs, on supply chains, security issues and the Inflation Reduction Act. And the old ways of industrial policy-making are finally over driving nature and climate destruction and attacking the foundations on which Europe's economy relies on.

And dear EPP, dear Manfred Weber, we have no time for industrial dinosaur politics attacking the Green Deal, attacking and delaying important industry initiatives in the European Parliament and the EU Nature Restoration Law because of private election power games to please the far right.

We need fact-based oriented policy and very precise industrial initiatives and corresponding Green Deal investments. We need fresh funding for a strong EU sovereignty fund, and own resources have to be key on that. Let us fight for a competitive and green industry and for Europe as an investment location for the future.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, als wij een land vertellen hoe te zorgen voor economische groei, zeggen wij het volgende: lage lasten voor burgers en bedrijven, bezuinig op bureaucratie en voorkom roekeloze uitgaven, dereguleer en versterk de vrije markt, en zorg voor prijsstabiliteit.

Punt. Dat is het.

Waarom? Waarom doen we dat zelf dan niet hier, hier in Europa? De Commissie en onze regeringen zijn vooral bezig met randzaken zoals maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen, klimaat- en natuurwetten en nodeloze debatten over gender en woke. De mensen thuis zien hun loon verdampen door inflatie, en een dogmatische klimaatagenda maakt ons investeringsklimaat kapot – een soort “groene planeconomie”.

Het is simpel: minder uitgaven, minder belasten, minder regulering én prijsstabiliteit betekent méér investeringen in Europa, dus economische groei. Het is spijtig dat deze Commissie het tegenovergestelde blijft doen.

Paolo Borchia (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, arrivo subito al punto. Con queste condizioni l'Europa non è il contesto dove investire. Problema numero uno: i tassi di interesse. Mutui e finanziamenti per le famiglie e per le imprese stanno diventando sempre più cari con la Banca centrale europea pronta ad alzare di altri 25 punti base i tassi di interesse, mentre gli Stati Uniti li stanno bloccando, mentre la Cina addirittura li sta tagliando.

Secondo problema: la transizione ecologica. Siamo quelli che inquinano di meno, ma con un certo gusto per il masochismo ci dotiamo della normativa più restrittiva a livello globale. Con queste condizioni chi credete venga ad investire in Europa? Volete arrivare alla rivoluzione industriale verde più importante della storia, ma pretendete di farlo con politiche monetarie restrittive, improntando all'austerità il futuro del Patto di stabilità.

Rientro dal debito e taglio della spesa pubblica: ricette già utilizzate in passato, ricette che non hanno funzionato. E qui emerge un limite, non so dire se culturale o ideologico. Tante, troppe capitali stanno privilegiando il pareggio di bilancio rispetto ai miglioramenti strutturali dell'economia. Manca attenzione per l'industria manifatturiera perché, anziché incentivarla, l'Unione si sta inventando nuovi ostacoli per la competitività con le sue politiche sul clima e sull'energia eccessivamente zelanti e cervelotiche.

Attenzione perché l'allentamento delle regole sugli aiuti di Stato, se da un lato può essere utile, dall'altro lato può diventare un boomerang, visto che i paesi con maggior spazio fiscale andranno ad investire e ad aiutare le proprie imprese, mentre le imprese degli altri paesi, quelli con meno spazio fiscale, resteranno a guardare un divario che andrà sempre più allargandosi.

Infine, colleghi, nessuno ne parla, ma io farei una riflessione anche sui problemi sul collocamento dei titoli per il finanziamento dei programmi dell'Unione, ad iniziare da *Next Generation*. Infatti, pur avendo un *rating* con la tripla AAA, la Commissione paga tassi più alti di Germania e Francia e sulle scadenze a breve addirittura l'Unione paga di più rispetto alla Spagna. Quindi gli investitori percepiscono un rischio più alto e chiedono un rendimento più alto.

Concludo, Presidente, perché questi sono numeri che smontano una certa propaganda portata avanti a Bruxelles come emittente di successo. E non è certo un bello spettacolo.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Elnök Asszony! A járvány, a háború és a szankciók okozta gazdasági válság, az infláció, valamint Amerika tudatos politikája azt eredményezte, hogy Európába kevesebb külföldi befektetés érkezett az elmúlt években a stratégiai szektorokba. Nem is csoda, hiszen a tengerentúli paradicsomi feltételek helyett mi mit kínálunk? Eget verő energiaárakat, nyersanyagfüggőséget, sokasodó adminisztratív terhet és magatartási szabályokat. Az európai cégeknek lassan nincs idejük termelni vagy szolgáltatni, ha minden kívánalomnak meg akarnak felelni. Zöld átállást sürgetünk, de neveljük Kínát, miközben egy napelem és elektromos autóba akkumulátor sem nagyon készül nélkülük a világban.

Értékes éveket vesztegetünk el a kitárgyalt szabadkereskedelmi megállapodások aláírásáig. Ez a helyzet a Mercosur- és a Mexikói egyezményrel, amelyek pedig komoly üzleti lehetőséget nyújtanának mindkét fél vállalatának. Különösen fájdalmas, hogy a Bizottság csak szavakban kkv-párti. Szeptember óta nincs előrelépés a számukra könnyítést előírányzó csomaggal. A „gondolkodj először kicsiben” vagy „a minden új szabály bevezetése esetén egy régit kivezetünk” elv csak papíron létezik. Engedje végre Brüsszel levegőhöz jutni a vállalkozásokat, különben ez a Bizottság úgy vonul be az Unió történelmébe, mint amely kivégezte Európa versenyképességét!

Lídia Pereira (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, os europeus merecem transparência, clareza e verdade no discurso político.

A zona euro entrou em recessão técnica no último trimestre, a inflação continua em valores in comportáveis para os orçamentos familiares e a incerteza ainda paira, infelizmente, sobre o desfecho da guerra que ceifa vidas às portas da Europa.

Este é o cenário que mostra que a promoção do investimento já deixou de ser uma prioridade para a União, é hoje uma emergência. Apenas com um ambiente favorável ao investimento, podemos criar empregos, subir salários e relançar a economia.

Tornar a Europa num local para investir é um objetivo que só será alcançado com melhor regulação, simplificação e coordenação. E o que é que isto significa? Evitar o excesso legislativo, que impõe custos de contexto cada vez maiores às empresas, reduzir drasticamente a burocracia que sufoca sobretudo as pequenas e médias empresas, apoiar o ecossistema das *startups* e coordenar a política fiscal para que a concorrência seja leal, justa, transparente e geradora de condições de competitividade.

Entre querer mais investimento e torná-lo realidade, vai a distância das decisões, e está na hora de as tomar.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Fru formand! Vi har brug for, at virksomhederne investerer i Europa. Vi skal producere mere selv i Europa. Det er afgørende vigtigt. Og det er det særligt i en tid, hvor USA mod vest forsøger at lokke europæiske virksomheder til sig, og Kina og Rusland mod øst rasler med sablerne. Der skal vi klare os bedre selv. Vi skal stå i vores egen ret, men det kan vi også. Men derfor er investeringer i Europa også nøglen til fortsat vækst og til at forbedre vores konkurrenceevne og sikre en grøn og bæredygtig omstilling af vores samfund.

Men jeg vil også gerne understrege, at vores marked er mere attraktivt, end det lyder til her i dag. Vi har veluddannede medarbejdere, og vi har et velfungerende samfund. Vi har et stærkt indre marked med mange millioner – 100 millioner – forbrugere, og vi har masser af støttekroner. Og så har vi også politisk forudsigelighed. Men selvfølgelig skal vi blive bedre til at bruge vores indre marked til at fremme den grønne omstilling, og det skal gøres på en social og ansvarlig måde. Vi skal også turde stille krav til de virksomheder, der vil være med. De skal være bæredygtige, de skal være modstandsdygtige, de skal sørge for, at medarbejderne har et godt liv og et godt arbejdsliv også. Men til gengæld for det, så får de jo faktisk gode forskere, god økonomi og god forudsigelighed. Jeg tror, at vi skal være bedre til at fortælle, hvor godt det rent faktisk er at investere i Europa, og så lige fintune vores indre marked, for det er der selvfølgelig brug for. Men vi gør det langt, langt bedre, end det lyder til her i dag. Men den grønne omstilling har vi brug for, og derfor har vi brug for, at investeringerne også kommer til Europa.

Susana Solís Pérez (Renew). – Señora presidenta, hoy abordamos una cuestión crítica: cómo hacer que la Unión Europea sea más atractiva para empresas e inversores en un mundo globalizado donde Estados Unidos y China nos llevan la delantera. No podemos limitarnos a ser meros espectadores, ni tampoco se trata de competir en ayudas y subvenciones.

Europa ha sido siempre referente en innovación y en tecnología, con empresas punteras en automoción, industria farmacéutica y renovables. No podemos perder esta fortaleza. Tenemos que invertir más en I+D, en mano de obra cualificada y en infraestructuras digitales. También tenemos que abordar todos los desafíos pendientes, como la excesiva burocracia y la fragmentación del mercado único, y concluir de una vez la unión de los mercados de capitales.

Es fundamental crear un entorno regulatorio que no asfixie a las empresas y que todas las decisiones que se tomen vayan acompañadas de una evaluación de impacto rigurosa. Porque me preocupa que muchas veces la legislación que aprobamos aquí se concibe como ajena a la realidad que sufren las pymes y las empresas en nuestros países. Tenemos que darle la vuelta con políticas sensatas y procesos sencillos porque de eso también depende la competitividad de Europa.

Michael Bloss (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Sie werden mir zustimmen: Wir wollen eine starke Wirtschaft und eine starke Industrie.

Weltweit hat hier der Wettlauf begonnen. Die USA investieren 400 Milliarden Dollar für die Ansiedlung von neuen Klimaindustrien, China macht das Gleiche – und was macht Europa? Wir streiten uns über Klimaschutz. Sie, die Konservativen, wollen eine Pause einlegen.

Und was ist das Ergebnis? Das einzige Unternehmen, das wieder Solaranlagen in Europa herstellt, hat gestern gesagt, dass es in die USA gehen möchte. Das ist fatal. Das zerstört die Arbeitsplätze von morgen. Wenn wir so weitermachen, dann muss die Frage, wo in der Zukunft Solaranlagen, Windkraftanlagen, Elektrolyseure und Wärmepumpen produziert werden, leider so beantwortet werden: nicht in Europa.

Dorien Rookmaker (ECR). – Voorzitter, meneer Reynders, mevrouw Roswall, een stabiel Europa heeft de toekomst en daarom pleit ik voor meer investeringen in digitale infrastructuur, hogesnelheidslijnen en energietransportsystemen, want infrastructuur is de motor van de economie. Zorg voor voldoende kapitaal, vooral voor het midden- en kleinbedrijf. Het moet lonen om te werken, te sparen en te investeren. Beperk de belastingdruk en de regeldruk. De Commissie moet zelfbeheersing betrachten. Crisismanagement is nu tot norm verheven. Een stortvloed van regels volgt elkaar in hoog tempo op.

De IRA en China zijn niet Europa's grootste bedreiging. Het is de EU zelf die zich zo in de voet schiet. De stortvloed aan regels jaagt iedereen op kosten en creëert een samenleving van wantrouwen. We moeten wegblijven bij dat wantrouwen. Onderlinge verschillen kunnen juist een bron van inspiratie en kennis zijn. Investeerders lok je niet met een stortvloed aan regels, maar met een langetermijnvisie waar niet paniekvoetbal de norm is, maar rationeel beleid.

Markus Buchheit (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! *Make Europe the place to invest!* Ich hatte das ursprünglich für eine kleine humoristische Einlage an diesem Nachmittag gehalten, insbesondere wenn ich mir die jüngsten Aussagen unseres deutschen Wirtschaftsministers, Herrn Habeck, in Bezug auf mögliche Gasengpässe anschauere, der da meinte, bevor die Leute fröhen, würden wir unsere Industrie drosseln oder gar abschalten. Er bezog sich dabei auf eine europäische Verabredung; das wäre auch interessant zu wissen, um was es da genau ging.

Meine Frage, die ich mir stelle, ist: Wie wollen Sie denn künftigen Unternehmen klarmachen, was für ein toller Ort die EU für Investitionen ist, wenn die auch nur ein einziges Mal mit denjenigen reden, die hier schon investiert haben? Sie haben unseren Unternehmen doch ein Korsett an Strafzahlungen und Subventionen übergestülpt, das ihnen doch gar keinen Raum zum Atmen lässt! Sie sind mit Ihrem Grünen Deal nicht nur für Flatterstrom, sondern auch für die Flatterpolitik der letzten Monate verantwortlich. Und Sie haben sich von der Technologieneutralität schon lange verabschiedet. Abschottungspolitik und Protektionismus sind keine Tabuthemen mehr. Dann seien Sie doch so ehrlich und streichen Sie endlich auch Marktwirtschaft aus Ihrem Phrasenvokabular.

Sie wollen gar keine Investoren im Sinne freier Unternehmer. Sie wollen Erfüllungsgehilfen für den Plan – sagen Sie es doch, Kombinate und Staatsunternehmen böten sich an! Die Kommissionsvertreter hier zu meiner Rechten sitzen deswegen auch völlig falsch. Sie wären hier auf der Linken weitaus besser aufgehoben, und zwar ganz weit links.

Meine Damen und Herren, „die Ursula in ihrem Lauf hält weder Ochs noch Esel auf.“ So könnte es bald schon wieder tönen, außer vielleicht bei einem, und das ist der Wähler. Wenn ich mir heute die Umfrageergebnisse in Deutschland anschauere, insbesondere auch zu meiner Partei, dann könnte sich bald der Wind wieder drehen. Dann könnten wir in absehbarer Zeit wieder mündige Verbraucher und mutige Unternehmer sehen, die die Zügel an sich nehmen. Macher und Schaffer und nicht die Gemachten und Geschafften vom Klimawahn und von der Besserwisserie, wie sie gerade im Berlaymont zu Hause sind.

Nicolas Bay (NI). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, pour attirer des investissements en Europe, il faut cesser d'être l'espace économique le plus imposé, le plus normé et, dans le même temps, le moins protégé au monde. Il ne faut pas seulement attirer des capitaux étrangers, il faut d'abord faire en sorte que les acteurs économiques européens investissent sur notre continent au lieu de le fuir.

Alors, cessez donc la réglementation, l'empilement sans fin de normes que le reste du monde ne respecte absolument pas. Mettez un terme à la surenchère administrative et fiscale, qui fait vivre un enfer aux entrepreneurs et pousse bien souvent à la délocalisation. Protégez notre marché face à la concurrence déloyale, qui est une conséquence directe des accords de libre-échange. Arrêtez la pseudo-écologie punitive, aux objectifs souvent irréalisables, et qui asphyxie totalement notre économie.

Enfin, pour stimuler l'investissement en Europe, il faut une énergie abondante et abordable, c'est-à-dire faire le choix assumé du nucléaire. Mais ces mesures pour réindustrialiser et pour assurer notre prospérité et donc notre souveraineté sont malheureusement inacceptables pour une bonne partie de cet hémicycle, de la vraie gauche à la fausse droite. Ils n'ont en effet qu'une seule obsession: tout contrôler, tout réguler, tout taxer et finalement tout ruiner.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Madam President, I firmly believe that competitiveness, growth and investments must go back to the top of our agenda. We have good stories to tell, but not only good ones.

Starting with the good: during COVID, we proved that we have top world-class research and we are able to deliver. On a climate front, we created, I guess, the most transparent framework for decarbonisation of the economy that should help firms to form their investment strategies. Also, a lot of European countries are on the very top of the competitive rankings.

Still, it's not enough at all. We are not using sufficiently the potential of the single market. Our policies are fragmented. We don't use the EU budget to motivate EU policies because the EU budget is basically nationalised. We have too much red tape, not only on EU level and on the Member State level and we are not progressing. Last but not least, it seems that we are losing ground in some research and our education is not always up to the level.

During the energy crisis we proved that we can deliver very quickly, very effectively, in an innovative way. We should make it the norm. We should also understand that in most cases it is not the regulation and public money that makes the growth. This is private money and this is where we should be focusing. I guess we must do better and we must deliver, not just have a debate, the policies and the papers, but the real actions that trigger the change. We need the change.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Ministra, Senhor Comissário, Colegas, as empresas são peças-chave para atingirmos os objetivos estratégicos da União Europeia: crescimento sustentável, inclusivo, assente na transição digital e climática, mais e melhores empregos, resiliência e inovação.

Como espaço de investimento no mercado global, a União Europeia tem trunfos que devem ser mais valorizados: segurança, estabilidade laboral e regulatória, mão-de-obra altamente qualificada, verdadeiro respeito pelo Estado de direito e níveis de inovação e empreendedorismo relevantes. Todos estes fatores são cruciais para atingirmos empresas e investimentos sustentáveis e duradouros.

Mas, para além de um quadro regulatório que assegura um *level playing field* no mercado interno, ou um sistema fiscal que seja justo e equilibrado, precisamos de dotar a União Europeia dos instrumentos necessários para criar um clima de negócios e de investimento que dê confiança aos investidores.

Precisamos de dar passos para, numa maior integração económica e financeira, completar a união bancária ou a união do mercado de capitais e avançar para a criação de uma capacidade permanente de investimento pós-NextGenerationEU. Só assim teremos não só instrumentos, mas também recursos para tornar a União Europeia um verdadeiro espaço de investimento.

Finalmente, tal como para a reforma da governação económica, também os planos e incentivos ao investimento na União Europeia devem ser simplificados, com flexibilidade para lidar com a diversidade dos Estados-Membros, dos investidores e das empresas.

Nicola Danti (Renew). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Ministra, signor Commissario, può oggi l'Europa essere un continente attrattivo per gli investimenti e tornare ad essere un volano di crescita e prosperità? Io penso di sì. Dopo la prima globalizzazione, durante la quale si è puntato su *deregulation*, abbassamento dei costi del lavoro, assenza di regole sociali e ambientali, oggi la competizione globale si giocherà sul capitale umano, sull'innovazione e la ricerca, su standard di sviluppo sostenibile.

Ma per renderci attrattivi dobbiamo fare di più. Abbiamo bisogno di un'Europa semplice e globale, che fissi regole ambiziose ma chiare, che investa su settori innovativi e tecnologie a basse emissioni, che metta al centro l'istruzione e le competenze. Ma abbiamo bisogno soprattutto di tornare a scommettere su una classe media, che ritrovi la voglia di guardare al futuro con fiducia e ambizione e senza la quale saremmo condannati a un lungo inverno. Un inverno anche demografico, che rischia di infrangere i sogni della nostra Europa, di fronte a una popolazione sempre più anziana, sempre meno giovani che credono in un domani migliore.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani kolege, do prije 35 godina, gospodarstva istočnoeuropskih zemalja bila su opterećena komunistima i socijalistima koji su svoje viđenje socijalne pravde provodili kroz gospodarstvo – i ta su gospodarstva propala, a izgleda da tim putem ide danas europski *mainstream*.

Govor o gospodarstvu u ovom parlamentu svodi se uglavnom na to kako natjerati firme na zelenu proizvodnju i na to da imaju dovoljno žena i LGBT osoba u upravnim odborima. Dakle, učinili smo gospodarstvo ovisnim o subvencijama, o europskim projektima, ukratko – o političarima.

Mislite da investitori žele baš doći u takve uvjete i to promjenjive uvjete jer, primjerice, prije 10 godina EU je jako promovirala plin kao najekološkije gorivo, danas bi ga praktički zabranila. Dakle, nužan preduvjet za više investicija je slobodnije tržište – dakle, manje regulative i pravna stabilnost. I svakako zaustavite sve glasine o novom europskom porezu.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzy! Szanowni Państwo! Pandemia COVID-19, rosyjska agresja w Ukrainie, rosnące ceny energii i ogólna inflacja – wydaje się, że w Europie żyjemy ostatnio w stanie permanentnego zarządzania kryzysowego. Ciężko w takiej sytuacji prowadzić biznes i posiadać przewidywalną przyszłość.

Dlatego uważam, że także w debacie na temat tego, jak uczynić Europę najlepszym miejscem do inwestowania, nie możemy się ograniczyć do powtarzania na okrągło zdań na temat tworzenia środowiska przyjaznego biznesowi, ograniczania biurokracji i wspierania badań i rozwoju. To wszystko oczywiście jest niezwykle ważne, ale nie jest już wystarczające.

Dlatego musimy wsłuchać się w głos przedsiębiorców, a ci coraz częściej proszą po prostu o chwilę oddechu i czasu na wdrożenie zmian. Dlatego jestem zdania, że w chwili obecnej pożądane jest pewne spowolnienie legislacyjne, tak aby uniknąć duszącego przedsiębiorczość przeregulowania.

Zamiast tego należy skupić się natomiast na zapewnieniu, by istniejące regulacje były maksymalnie proste w zrozumieniu i wdrożeniu i nie powodowały zagubienia po stronie firm. Potrzebujemy nauczyć się funkcjonować w nowej rzeczywistości.

Z jednej strony, potrzebujemy oczywiście nastawionego na przyszłość prawodawstwa, które będzie odpowiadać na nowe wyzwania, jak chociażby kryzys klimatyczny czy gwałtowny rozwój sztucznej inteligencji. Z drugiej, nie możemy zapominać, że wszystkie nasze działania muszą mieć za główny cel dobrobyt i ochronę naszych obywateli.

René Repasi (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir diskutieren hier, wie man Europa zu einem Ort für Investitionen machen soll. Und wir stellen uns eigentlich die Frage: Wie schön ist die Braut? – die Frage, die wir uns gestellt haben, als die Amerikaner mit ihrem *Inflation Reduction Act* angekommen sind.

Meines Erachtens stellen wir unser Licht hier zu sehr unter den Scheffel. Die Antwort schien nämlich so zu sein: einfach mehr Beihilfen. Aber, meine Damen und Herren, wir brauchen keinen Beihilfenwettbewerb mit der anderen Seite des Atlantiks, sondern wir brauchen einen funktionierenden Binnenmarkt. Das Herz unseres Binnenmarktes ist ein Wettbewerb auf Leistung. Und wenn die Leistung stimmt, dann investiert man auch gerne.

Was wir nicht brauchen, ist ein Wettbewerb zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten, die die größte Fiskalkapazität haben. Deutsche Unternehmen sind schön zu investieren, aber wenn man Europa zu einem Ort für Investitionen machen muss, dann ist das in ganz Europa zu tun. Dafür brauchen wir ordentliche öffentliche Infrastruktur, die sich einige Staaten nicht mehr leisten können.

Wenn wir Investitionen attraktiv machen wollen, dann müssen wir das bei der Reform der Stabilitätsregeln, aber auch bei der Reform des Haushalts zentral stellen. Ganz zentral steht deswegen: Bildung, Bildung, Forschung, Forschung. Keine Kürzungen im Haushalt von Horizont Europa, nur um in irgendwelche Sachen zu investieren, die tote Steine darstellen.

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

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Mam do Pana pytanie, dlatego że w ubiegłym tygodniu w Komisji Budżetowej Parlamentu Europejskiego byli goście z Bundestagu, parlamentarzyści niemieccy i mówili o ogromnych kosztach życia w Niemczech i o tym, że dopiero teraz przeciętny mieszkaniec Niemiec, jak patrzy na rachunek za prąd, za gaz, za energię, dowiadyuje się, w jak trudnej sytuacji znaleźli się Niemcy i przemysł niemiecki. I powiedzieli też, że w życiu nie dołożą do Unii Europejskiej już ani grosza. Pytanie jest takie: czy Pan byłby gotów jako członek bardzo ważnej frakcji w Parlamencie Europejskim spowolnić proces pakietów Fit for 55?

René Repasi (S&D), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Also, in Teilen der Analyse habe ich gedacht: Ja, jetzt wird es interessant. Als ich dann die Frage gehört habe, dass man „Fit für 55“ verlangsamen soll, um Investitionen attraktiver zu machen, da konnte ich dann wahrlich nicht mehr mitgehen.

Es ist schon häufiger heute in der Debatte gesagt worden: Stillstand ist Rückschritt. Wir müssen die Pariser Klimaziele erreichen; das ist keine Pseudowissenschaft, das ist ein Fakt. Wenn wir unsere Wirtschaft zukunftssicher gestalten wollen, dann indem wir „Fit für 55“ verschnellern und nicht indem wir es verlangsamen. So haben wir die Arbeitsplätze für die Zukunft und werden nicht lediglich ein Verbraucherinnen- und Verbrauchermarkt für andere Märkte.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Madam President, Council, Commission, we simply can't just legislate and regulate ourselves to be an attractive place. We need to invest and create the right conditions, both in terms of infrastructure, but also a key area where we are far behind any global comparative index in terms of education, universities, research and innovation.

And it is a key failing of policies for many, many years that we simply don't have universities and academia research working together in a collaborative approach. And if you do an assessment, since the UK left this Union, we have no university in the top 20, top 30, top 40 when you do a comparative index. So we do need to address that very specific issue.

The other area of concern I have is when we talk about strategic autonomy. Strategic autonomy should not make Europe into a fortress. While we must not be dependent on others, we simply must play on the global stage rather than building walls around Europe to try and protect from within rather than being competitive on the international stage.

Our laws need to be clear, proportionate, predictable, and they should be underpinned by our law making. And sometimes we seem to be consistently reacting rather than having policies that set out a clear pathway in terms of competitiveness, innovation in the single market, the Capital Markets Union and the banking union.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, why should anyone do business/create jobs in Europe? Seriously? Regulations: the EU is suffocating businesses; 6000 legal acts from this mandate alone. Energy: unpredictable, impractical, expensive green energy is your solution. Overregulated, ageing, indebted, uncompetitive economies without access to cheap energy, inevitably deindustrialised.

While we're debating investments, companies are forced to spend less resources on things that matter and more on compliance. Today, you voted to strangle an emerging industry with EU red tape and you red Greens want a partial ban on forestry and farming, well aware of the massive economic damage it would do to my country and to Finland.

Investments will come when start-ups are not constrained, industries can focus on production and electricity prices are low. If the EU repeals two laws for every law it passes, mark my words, investments will come.

Barbara Thaler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Europa zu einem Investitionsstandort zu machen, das sollte eigentlich nicht nur Thema dieser Debatte heute sein, sondern das sollte eigentlich im Herzen von unser aller Politik liegen.

Leider muss ich nach genauerer Betrachtung der letzten paar Jahre sagen, dass vor allem die Kommission und auch einige Teile dieses Hauses einige Ziele verfolgen, aber den Investitionsstandort Europa zu festigen und auszubauen, ist keines davon.

Wir haben uns als EU mehr denn je dem Klimaschutz verschrieben – und das ist gut so. Schritt für Schritt setzen wir den Grünen Deal um. Vieles davon habe ich selbst auch gerne und aus Überzeugung mitgetragen. Ich finde zum Beispiel, dass wir bei dem Thema Ausweitung des Emissionshandels etwas richtig Gutes gemacht haben. Auch in der Digitalpolitik machen wir als Europäische Union eine gute Figur: zielgerichtete Gesetze, verhältnismäßige Gesetze und zukunftsfähige Gesetze.

Aber die Liste an Gesetzen, die den Standort schwächen, anstatt ihn zu stärken, ist leider immer länger geworden: Ökodesign-Richtlinie, Wiederherstellung der Natur, Taxonomie, um nur ein paar davon zu nennen; und ich habe immer öfter das Gefühl, dass Technologieneutralität nur in die Überschrift gepackt wird – in der Hoffnung, dass schon niemand so genau hinschaut.

Ich glaube, wir machen langfristig einen Fehler, wenn wir so weitermachen, und es ist an der Zeit, das auch lauter zu sagen: Wir brauchen Klimapolitik, die auch echte Investitionspolitik ist.

Katarína Roth Nevedálová (S&D). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, ako urobíť Európu miestom atraktívnym pre investície? Myslím si, že potrebujeme tri komponenty. Európa musí byť dobré miesto pre život. Európa musí mať istotu dobrých zákonov a práva. A Európa musí podporovať inovácie a nápady. Dobré miesto na život pre mňa znamená, že ľudia, ktorí pracujú, sú usmíati. Sú to dobrí zamestnanci. Sú to ľudia, ktorí vedia, aké majú práva, aké majú povinnosti, majú dostatočné vzdelanie, vedia svoju prácu vykonávať, majú dobré pracovné podmienky, majú ochranu a tým pádom vzniká menej problémov, tým pádom vzniká menej zranení a menšia fluktuácia zamestnancov. Čiže je to tá istota, ktorú práve investori hľadajú. Istota dobrých zákonov a práva znamená, že naše zákony a právo budú predvídateľné. To, že otvorená diskusia k právnym zmenám, ktoré pripravujeme aj my v Európskom parlamente, v Európskej únii ako takej, trvá nejakú dobu, znamená, že sa na ňu vedia všetci pripraviť. Zapojenie obyvateľov a občianskej spoločnosti do takejto diskusie je takisto veľmi dôležité, aby sa na to vedela celá spoločnosť pripraviť.

Odbornosť a jasne stanovené ciele do budúca je takisto to, čo definuje Európsku úniu ako dobré miesto pre investície a takisto naše strategické myslenie a to, že si pripravujeme tieto veci veľmi dopredu. Podpora inovácií a nápadov znamená investície do ľudí, do ich vzdelania, napríklad aj spôsobom, ako je Erasmus, investíciou do škôl. To znamená podmienky pre školy, aby dobre vzdelávali, aby mohli robiť výmeny medzi svojimi zamestnancami a študentmi. Investície do výskumu a vzdelania, investície do vytvorenia podporného prostredia pre startupy a nové spoločnosti, podpora digitalizácie a technológií. Myslím si, že naši investori majú byť prevažne naši občania, naše členské štáty. Až potom môžeme hľadať investorov zo zahraničia. A práve na týchto by sme sa mali zamerať, pretože Európa je dobrým miestom na investovanie.

Ondřej Kovařík (Renew). – Paní predsedající, vážený pane komisaři, kolegyně, kolegové, jedním z úspěchů Evropské unie je silné hospodářství, které stojí na základech jednotného vnitřního trhu. Je zdrojem prosperity dovnitř Evropské unie a ekonomické síly navenek. Je ale Evropa v současném světě plném rychlých změn stále atraktivní místo pro investice? Data posledních let říkají, že tomu tak zcela není. Zatímco zahraniční investice do Asie a do Severní Ameriky rostou, investice do Evropy stagnují anebo rostou jen minimálně. A to je trend, který se musíme pokusit změnit. Neřešit pouze nová nařízení a ambiciózní cíle v různých oblastech, ale mít stále na mysli, co můžeme udělat pro to, abychom posílili naši konkurenceschopnost. Bohužel někdy i naším společným přičiněním tady působíme naprosto opačně. Vytváříme nové překážky, omezující pravidla. Ta mimo jiné znamenají vysoké náklady. Rekordní inflace a nestabilní ceny energií to jen zhoršují. Měli bychom se tedy zaměřit na kultivaci evropského podnikatelského prostředí, na snížení administrativní zátěže, na podporu inovací, na soustředění kritické výroby do Evropy a na stabilní podmínky pro firmy včetně dostupného financování. Bez toho totiž bude velmi těžké dále držet Evropu na špici mezi globálními hráči.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, когато се говори за инвестиции, е ключово да видим какво предлагаме. Значи в момента в Европейския съюз ние предлагаме следното: най-скъпата работна ръка, най-високите данъци, най-високата цена на енергията, най-тежката бюрокрация с чудовишни зелени рестрикции и разбира се, предлагаме абсолютен недостиг на суровини. Това са доста примамливи предложения за всеки инвеститор, предполагам.

На практика това, което обаче наистина можем да предложим, това е едно изключително богато културно наследство, което много скоро ще бъде закопано от използвани батерии и соларни панели, които не могат да се рециклират. Това предлагаме в момента. Това е резултат от Зелената сделка и Европейският съюз вече не е конкурентноспособен. Все пак в инвестиции трябва да има някаква възвращаемост. Според мен само луд би инвестирал в Европейския съюз. Налага се да имаме чувство за мярка и да проявим здрав разум, докато е време. Имаме още много малко време.

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Madam President, when it comes to investment in Europe the figures tell an interesting story: only one EU country is ranked in the US News list of the best countries to invest in; foreign direct investment in Europe was up just 1% last year; while the number of jobs created by FDI dropped 16%, according to EY.

But European private equity and venture capital fundraising was up 30% last year compared to 2021, according to Invest Europe. So clearly there is work to do, but also progress underway.

Private companies, particularly SMEs, are the lifeblood of our economies and investment is their beating heart. Without pro-investment policies, there can be no job creation, no improved living standards, no funding for our key priorities, such as infrastructure and tackling climate change.

While states can play a role, we also need a strong culture of private investment and openness to global markets. Investment also means empowering retail investors to access the markets, gain financial literacy and have more openness and transparency in relation to the workings of financial markets.

Europe must also show we are open for business. Extremist politics damage confidence and make people poorer. We should also remember that talk of strategic autonomy should not be a code for more trade barriers, more protectionism and less economic growth.

As Minister for Business in the Irish Government, I travelled the world meeting businesses and promoting investment. The EU needs to do the same.

Leszek Miller (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Koleżanki i Koledzy! Po pandemii COVID-19 oraz w wyniku agresji Rosji na Ukrainę doszło do zatrzymania tempa wzrostu inwestycji zagranicznych w Europie. W 2022 roku bezpośrednie inwestycje zagraniczne w Europie wzrosły zaledwie o 1%, ale co gorsza, liczba miejsc pracy, które powstały w wyniku tych inwestycji, spadła o 16%.

Wydaje się, że obecny rok może być kluczowy dla europejskiej gospodarki, bowiem stłumiony kryzysami i wojną popyt oraz odroczone plany inwestycyjne z ostatnich lat mogą wzbudzić nową falę wzrostu inwestycji. Unia Europejska musi być na tę falę gotowa i w obliczu konkurencji ze strony USA i Chin tworzyć takie warunki ekonomiczne i prawne, które przekonują inwestorów do lokowania swoich środków na Starym Kontynencie.

Mam na myśli klimat inwestycyjny, mniej przepisów, więcej swobody i przedsiębiorczości. Trzeba budować taki klimat, zwiększać nakłady na badania i rozwój, przyciągać inwestycje cyfrowe i ekologiczne, stawać się miejscem, w którym powstają nowoczesne zielone zakłady produkcyjne. Powinniśmy pamiętać, że tylko aktywna i konkurencyjna postawa wobec inwestorów pozwoli stworzyć nowe miejsca pracy dla Europejczyków.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, attirer les investissements, c'est bien, mais attirer des investissements sécurisés et durables, c'est beaucoup mieux. Aujourd'hui, la question n'est plus seulement celle de l'accroissement des investissements, mais bien celle de la maîtrise et de la finalité de ces derniers. Alors que nous voyons des pays tiers utiliser l'investissement pour nous faire du chantage, il nous faut désormais définir notre doctrine européenne en matière de sécurité économique.

Nous ne pouvons plus accepter une mainmise par certains pays sur nos aéroports, nos ports et nos chaînes d'approvisionnement. Le mécanisme de filtrage des investissements directs étrangers doit être profondément réformé, et l'instrument ciblant les investissements étrangers évoqué par la présidente de la Commission, qui doit contribuer à notre sécurité économique en protégeant les technologies dites sensibles, doit être présenté. Nous devons en débattre ensemble.

Monsieur le Commissaire, pour l'avenir des Européens et de l'Europe, c'est d'investissements qui protègent et garantissent l'enjeu du changement climatique et qui renforcent notre autonomie européenne que nous avons besoin. Nous comptons sur vous.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, tržišna neizvjesnost zbog rata u Ukrajini, ograničena dostupnost sirovina, inflacija i porast troškova energenata učinili su Europsku uniju manje atraktivnom za ulaganja od njenih globalnih konkurenata.

Veleprodajna cijena plina u EU-u porasla je za više od 1000% između 2019. i 2022., dok je porast u SAD-u bio 200%, a u Japanu 100%. Posebno zabrinjava podatak da su u 2021. priljevi izravnih stranih ulaganja u EU pali za 68% u usporedbi s 2019., za razliku od povećanja od 63% u SAD-u tijekom istog razdoblja. Između 2021. i 2022. broj *greenfield* investicija u EU pao je za 15%, u usporedbi s povećanjem od 18% u SAD-u.

U takvim okolnostima, opasnost od deindustrijalizacije Europe postala je stvarnost. EU je itekako tome sama doprinijela. Samo u ovoj godini Europska komisija planira predložiti 43 nove inicijative koje stvaraju dodatni administrativni teret za poduzetnike. Osim toga, implementacija ovakvog Europskog zelenog plana učinit će Europu još manje konkurentnom i prvenstveno doprinijeti otvaranju novih radnih mjesta u Kini, a ne u Europskoj uniji. Europu je potrebno ponovno učiniti atraktivnom za ulaganja tako što ćemo napokon dovršiti stvaranje jedinstvenog tržišta, a naše poduzetnike lišiti niza nepotrebnih birokratskih zahtjeva koji se vrlo često preklapaju.

Dalje, moramo jačati sustav poticaja u strateškim sektorima poput proizvodnje lijekova te stvoriti bolji okvir za investicije u istraživanje i razvoj novih tehnologija. Na kraju, nužno je više ulagati u obrazovni sustav kako bismo naša sveučilišta učinili konkurentnim u odnosu na američka što danas apsolutno nije slučaj.

Antonius Manders (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, minister, bedankt voor jullie uithoudingsvermogen. Het is een hele run.

Hoe trekken we meer investeerders aan in Europa? Stop met de versnippering van de interne markt, zou ik zeggen, want door de richtlijnen die in elk land anders worden geïmplementeerd, is het een warboel voor ondernemers. Dus zorg ervoor dat we met name focussen op maximale harmonisatie. Stop met ideeën die van binnenuit komen en die achter de computer worden bedacht, maar ga vaker naar buiten – dat moeten we allemaal doen, ook als politici, dus laat ook de ambtenaar van de Commissie dat doen. Van buitenaf komen namelijk vaak nieuwe ideeën en die kun je dan van binnenuit optimaliseren.

De Green Deal is een hele grote stap naar een nieuwe economie. Maar overdrijf alsjeblieft niet. We moeten het wel kunnen absorberen. Jaag de bedrijven niet weg, maar faciliteer ze om binnen de EU te blijven. Niet subsidies, maar verdien capaciteit zorgt voor investeringen. Subsidies moeten betaald worden door de burgers en maakt de burgers armer, maar als er verdien capaciteit is, zullen bedrijven makkelijker gaan investeren. Maak de toegang tot de rechter eenvoudiger en goedkoper voor bedrijven die problemen hebben. Zorg voor een snelle procedure bij het Europees Hof van Justitie bij grensoverschrijdende problemen om protectionisme tegen te gaan en laat dat niet plaatsvinden in de lidstaten zelf. Maak Europa zo aantrekkelijk dat iedereen trots op Europa kan zijn. Want waar je je thuis voelt, daar wil je zijn en daar wil je ook investeren.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner, the issue we are discussing today is how to maximise the EU's potential of financing the real economy, generating growth and responding to future challenges. And the scale of the challenge is clear. The Commission estimates that only to realise the green and digital transition, Europe will need additional investments of EUR 645 billion every year for the next decade.

This capital can only come from private investment channelled to the best use through efficient capital markets, which Union is lacking. They remain fragmented and small. This reduces market liquidity and the efficiency of capital allocation. It affects as well European SMEs, undermining their efforts to scale up and become competitive in the internal market and internationally.

That is why, in shaping the European capital market, we should spare no effort to simplify the legal framework, reduce the administrative burden that companies face and make them grow and be more competitive. The introduction of consolidated tape will increase the visibility of smaller firms, boost their attractiveness for investors and facilitate the development of local exchanges.

It is therefore rather frustrating to see that some Member States do not support the efforts to accelerate the creation of deep and liquid capital markets, boost growth, drive innovation and ensure a level playing field for all markets participants.

We should continue our efforts to complete the European banking and capital market unions and our political calendar should be an incentive to speed things up.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Frau Minister! Der Binnenmarkt ist das größte Kapital und der wichtigste Erfolgsfaktor für die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der EU. Aber was machen wir daraus? Unsere Unternehmen und KMU werden mit überbordenden Regelungen konfrontiert. Trotz des Versprechens der Kommission, Bürokratie zu reduzieren, kommen mit jedem neuen legislativen Akt zusätzliche Belastungen für die europäische Wirtschaft. Und neben der enormen Bürokratie kämpfen unsere Unternehmerinnen und Unternehmer jetzt natürlich auch mit den hohen Energiekosten.

Die USA haben leider mit dem *Inflation Reduction Act* wieder einmal gezeigt, dass sie auch für Investitionen unserer Unternehmen sehr attraktiv sind. Und auch wenn ich den *Net Zero Act* begrüße, ist er doch nur ein Tropfen auf den heißen Stein.

Was müssen wir tun, um auch in Zukunft ein attraktiver Wirtschaftsstandort zu sein? Erstens eine mutige und nachhaltige Deregulierung, zweitens die Reduktion unserer Energieabhängigkeiten, drittens einfacher Zugang zu Kapital und -last, *but not least* - enorme Investitionen in Forschung und Digitalisierung.

Herr Kommissar, ich bitte Sie, hier die notwendigen Schritte zu setzen, damit wir auch künftig wieder im Konzert der Weltmächte mitspielen können.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Caras e Caros Colegas, para termos na União Europeia um ambiente favorável à atração de investimentos não podemos ter medo das palavras empreendedorismo, mérito, produtividade, competitividade. É com estas palavras que atraímos investimento, é com o amor às pequenas e médias empresas e o gostarmos da iniciativa privada que nós podemos avançar.

Estão nas mãos dos Estados-Membros competências fulcrais. Não basta ter muitos recursos financeiros como têm com o NextGenerationEU e o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual. A burocracia está nas mãos de cada Estado-Membro. Quanto tempo é que demora o licenciamento de uma indústria? Se um processo administrativo no meu país cai em tribunal, pode estar dezenas de anos à espera de uma decisão.

Além disso, é necessária previsibilidade fiscal e também, além desta previsibilidade, é essencial a redução da carga fiscal.

Também as competências na área da educação estão nas mãos dos Estados-Membros. A União Europeia deve fazer a sua parte, reforçando programas como a investigação e inovação.

E necessitamos de projetos comuns para estarmos mais ligados. Precisamos da união da energia, a união do digital, a união da saúde, da proteção civil, da segurança e, com menos recursos, se estivermos juntos, unidos e a atuar de uma forma coordenada, nós podemos fazer mais.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtarán*, the EU needs to focus now on swift action to improve the business environment for European companies. Global competition for investments, employment, growth and technological innovation is decided by framework conditions, not by subsidies only.

The reality is that energy prices in Europe will remain higher than for our main competitors. At a time when global competition for investment is fierce, it is imperative that we take decisive action to ensure Europe remains a preferred destination for both domestic and foreign investments.

We need to focus on enhancing the ease of doing business across the continent. By creating a business friendly environment, we can attract investment and encourage entrepreneurship, thus driving economic growth. Reducing red tape is pivotal. Recently, President von der Leyen said that she is committed to reducing red tape by 25 %. This is laudable and necessary, but if she succeeds in doing so, she will be a better miracle worker than our Lord.

In addition, we must invest in infrastructure development, investments in transportation networks, digital connectivity, energy grids and research facilities. This will not only attract domestic and foreign investment, but will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. Creating a sustainable business environment creates a sustainable Europe. The answer is in our hands if we have the wit and the will to do so.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Mauri Pekkarinen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, kun Covid tuli, komissio alkoi helpottamaan holtittomasti valtiontukisääntöjä. Valtiot ovat hakeneet 3 500 miljardin euron edestä poikkeuksia. Komissio on myöntänyt niitä, ja yli 1 000 miljardia näistä rahoista on kiinnitetty ties minkälaisiin hankkeisiin.

Tätä rahaa, mitä valtiot ovat valtiontukina käyttäneet, olisi totisesti tarvittu osaamisen, teknologian ja innovaatioiden rahoittamiseen. Nyt Euroopan unioni yrittää Net-Zero Industry Actillä parantaa tilannetta. Hyvä näin. Tähän tarvitaan niitä valtiontukia, mutta tähänkin rajoitetusti. Me olemme ensinnäkin pahasti myöhässä.

Kun me käytimme runsaskätisesti valtiontukea, Yhdysvallat rakensi IRA-paketin. Se julkisti suunnitelmat viime elokuussa ja sai lainsäädännön voimaan tammikuun ensimmäinen päivä. Meillä työ on vielä kesken. Voimaantulo näiden lakien osalta vie vielä kuukausikaupalla aikaa. En katso, että olisimme onnistuneet kovin hyvin tässä mielessä kilpailukykyimme parantamisessa.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, thank you. Commissioner, you spoke of the need to invest well to strengthen our economies. In Ireland, a lot of companies can't find enough workers because the workers can't get accommodation because we have a housing crisis, because successive governments have refused to invest in public housing. Now, to fix the housing crisis in Ireland, we do need direct provision of public housing by the state using public lands with rents and public housing linked to income. We've been subsidising landlords, developers and investors to provide housing for decades, and the results are spiralling rents and housing costs, chronic homelessness and ageing and crumbling housing stock, land banking and a gaping housing shortage. Now to put the rights of people before the profits of capitalist elites, we'd need a change to European State aid rules because they don't allow states to increase investment in the delivery of public housing. What good is the EU to the people of Europe when it provides protections for profiteers and actively blocks states from providing housing for their own people?

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, attracting investment is something which Irish people have a lot of experience in. Irish Government policy since the 1960s has been to bend over backwards to facilitate foreign direct investment. They can pay no tax. They can build what they want, when they want, wherever they want. Ireland can't build a hospital or a metro line or enough houses, but for businesses, let me tell you, it's a great place to invest.

The effect of this runs right through our economy and our society. We see it in our schools. Schoolbooks ditched in favour of Apple iPads, and only Apple iPads, which parents have to fork out hundreds of euros for or take out high interest loans to access the school curriculum. Teachers have to buy their own devices. The schools have to pay for privatised training. And if they can't pay for the training, it doesn't get done – tough luck.

This is what happens when you surrender your state wholesale to private investment; public services, public goods, equality of opportunity all gets junked. Keep the corporations happy. Keep grease in the wheels. Tell everyone it's the best small country to do business. And hope no one notices.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, dear Minister, honourable Members, thank you for this debate with references to resilience, sovereignty, economic security, energy, strong transition skills, reforms and innovation.

The experience of the last three years should have convinced us all by now that Europe has everything it takes to succeed, provided we remain united and ambitious. We have now less than a year within this mandate to continue to strengthen our economy, to put the right incentives in place, to fix our framework of rules and to make sure, in short, that Europe remains the place to invest.

Thank you for your proposals. Thank you for your remarks. Now we will continue to work together.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for this debate. And as I said in my first intervention, a very timely and important one. I think that we all can agree that Europe needs to step up its game when it comes to competitiveness and productivity and accelerating the green transition through innovation and investment regulation is also key. And I am glad that the European Parliament is engaged in this common strife. Many of you have raised the issue of better regulation, and I agree this is absolutely crucial. I would even say that some sometimes we also need less regulation, because when you add layers of regulation, even though the intention of each case is very good, the result can be too much. The Commission's competitiveness strategy, supported by the Single Market at 30 Communication, are welcome initiatives in this regard. The European Council in March marked the start of making it happen, but making this agenda truly influential will require dedicated work over many years. We need to continue strong engagement from everyone to achieve this. And I appreciate the European Parliament's forward looking position and I hope that we can count on your support on the way going forward. We will continue putting this issue high on the political agenda for the remaining time of the Swedish presidency and beyond.

Puhemies. — Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Josianne Cutajar (S&D), *in writing*. – Some months ago, we were in this same Parliament celebrating the 30th anniversary of the Single Market and today, against the backdrop of the COVID-19 pandemic, the energy and inflation crises, we are here again, discussing how to make Europe the place to invest. For this important goal to be successful, Europe must be home to companies and investors, who can prevent us from yet another shortage of medicine. It must also incentivise investment and skills to ensure that we have the resources and capabilities to achieve our green and digital targets. We must continue with our efforts to diversify supplies, reduce the duration of, and simplify permit-granting procedures. However, we must also ensure collaboration with private actors guaranteeing they remain a strong partner in achieving our ambition and in choosing Europe. Upcoming legislation must increase its efforts towards achieving growth and attractiveness of our Market, as well as towards simplifying rules, especially for SMEs. Furthermore, a competitive European market must be able to provide the necessary skilled workforce, for which considerable efforts must be made, starting from aligning school curricula with the twin agenda, giving every worker the chance to gain new capabilities and contribute towards our collective aims.

16. Enseñanzas extraídas del escándalo «Papeles de Pandora» y otras revelaciones (debate)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Niels Fuglsangin talous- ja raha-asioiden valiokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö Pandoran papereista ja muista paljastuksista saaduista kokemuksista (2022/2080(INI)) (A9-0095/2023).

Niels Fuglsang, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, colleagues, dear Commissioner, thank you for being here today, and I look forward to this hopefully fruitful debate on a very important issue, namely the Pandora Papers and the lessons learned from the Pandora Papers.

So the obvious question is what have we learned from the Pandora Papers? Well, the way I see it, we have learned that some people simply refuse to play by the rules, some people at the very top of our society when it comes to wealth and fortune.

Colleagues, I have to ask you, did anyone on this floor count on the extent to which this system is rigged? Absolutely rigged. If you look at the Pandora Papers, well you have two systems, not one system but two systems, one applying to the 99 % of people going to work every day, contributing to society, paying their fair share of taxes and another system applying to the top 1 %, those who can, if they wish to, refuse to pay their taxes, refuse to contribute to society because they hire tax advisers to create offshore shell companies and fake trusts where they hide their wealth and hide their fortunes so they don't contribute and they don't pay taxes. That has to change. That is what we see in the Pandora Papers that these two systems of rules are applying, that the system is basically rigged.

That is why we have proposed, in this report that we are voting on tomorrow, a number of proposals on how to fix the system. And I hope that we can stand together. I am very proud of the result that we achieved in the committee, where not a single member voted against these proposals. It was a broad majority from left to right, agreeing that we need to do more, and we need some new rules to fix this system.

I would like to highlight three basic proposals that we have. We have a lot of proposals, but among those are, well, one, we need to look at the possibility of having a minimum tax on capital gains. We know that those who have capital gains, those who have stocks, those who have real estate, those who have other forms of capital and earn money from that, that is the people at the very top of our society. And they should also contribute. And they are not always doing that, according to the Pandora Papers, these are the people who are moving this kind of wealth, this kind of capital offshore in shell companies and avoiding contributing. That is why we need a minimum level of capital gains. We need to look at that. We need to have that analysis to see if that's feasible, because that would be something which would make sure that no country would have 0 % tax on capital gains.

Second, we need to look at the advisory companies, the audit companies that make this show go on. Those who advise on how you can create shell companies and move fortunes overseas. Those companies are often both audit companies and financial advisers, and obviously that's a conflict of interest. If you first give financial advice on how you can move wealth offshore and then next you ordered the companies or the person's accounts, you're not going to find any trouble because you have a conflict of interest, so we propose in this report to separate the audit departments from the financial advice departments.

Third, we need to look at the shell companies and have rules against empty shell companies. That has been proposed by the European Commission, that is being negotiated here in Parliament, we have agreed that we should have these rules, but in the Council among the Member States, they are stuck, they cannot agree on it and we urge the Council to continue the work and agree on rules that will ban the shell companies. That's what we want in the European Parliament.

I look forward to this debate. We have a lot of proposals and I look forward to hearing from you what we can do and what we have learned from the Pandora Papers.

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I am taking the floor during this debate with the blessing, again, of Commissioner Gentiloni. First, let me thank the European Parliament for its relentless commitment to tax fairness and strong reaction to the Pandora Papers.

As you rightly note, such revelations demonstrate the crucial role investigative journalists play in exposing tax evasion, corruption, organised crime and money laundering. They also illustrate that fighting tax evasion and tax avoidance is a constant struggle. We need to keep on improving the legislation and tighten our net. Rest assured that it is a top priority for the Commission.

As you know, we proposed at the end of 2022 a new amendment to the Directive on Administrative Cooperation to include the reporting and automatic exchange of tax information on transactions in crypto-assets and e-money, strengthening the current Directive and covering aspects that are necessary to ensure its correct functioning.

Moreover, we are currently working towards agreement in Council on the key initiative to fight the misuse of shell entities for improper tax purposes. The 'unshell' proposal will ensure that entities in the EU without a minimum degree of economic substance are unable to benefit from any tax advantages and do not place any financial burden on taxpayers. The Commission would like to thank you once again for your strong support and constructive suggestions on this proposal.

This Commission and Parliament are allies in promoting standards of tax fairness and transparency further, within the European Union and beyond. Your continuous support on 'unshell' is precious, and the Commission hopes you will continue to push for an agreement on an ambitious compromise by the Council. Of course, the use of shell companies also has an external dimension, one we have committed to tackling as well.

We want to offer to Member States additional tools to tackle tax arrangements or schemes in non-EU countries that lead to tax evasion or aggressive tax planning. In order to take these further steps, it is therefore even more important that the Member States prove themselves capable of reaching an agreement on the proposed directive on preventing shell companies with the European Union.

Your report points to the growing challenges in the area of non-corporate tax regime. The Code of Conduct Group has been working intensively to strengthen the EU listing process over the last few months, and we have a common interest to advance certain areas of work. In particular, the Group focuses on the revision of the EU listing criteria and is considering a more robust approach to zero-tax jurisdictions. However, more remains to be done regarding information on beneficial ownership or the extension of the geographical scope of the EU list.

We also agree with your suggestion to expand the mandate of the Code of Conduct to personal and capital income taxation. Now we need to convince the Member States to support a further strengthening of the EU listing process.

But our actions do not stop here. In your report, you rightfully discuss the role that intermediaries play in facilitating tax avoidance and evasion. The Commission is adopting an additional proposal which will reinforce our arsenal against fraudulent tax practices. Our objective with it is two-fold: making withholding tax procedures more efficient and ensuring that the current initiative includes all necessary safeguards to prevent fraudulent refunds and abusive tax schemes.

Finally, as you know, the Commission is working on BEFIT, Business in Europe: Framework for Income Taxation, a new corporate tax system for the European Union. This is a flagship of our new ambitious business tax agenda, reflecting some of the very priorities included in the report we are discussing here today.

I want to thank the rapporteur and all the members involved for their valuable work. And now, of course, I will listen to your interventions and proposals.

Udo Bullmann, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Entwicklungsausschusses*. – Frau Präsidentin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Herr Kommissar! Wir kennen die Zahlen. Ein Kontinent wie Afrika verliert jährlich rund 80 Milliarden US-Dollar allein durch illegale Kapitalflucht. Das ist ungefähr der Betrag, den Afrika braucht für seine jährlichen Modernisierungsinvestitionen, für Schulen, für Krankenhäuser und für Verkehrswege. Wann werden wir endlich wach und ziehen daraus die nötigen Konsequenzen?

Ja, wir wollen globale Mindeststeuern, wie der Berichterstatter Fuglsang es zu Recht fordert. Ja, wir wollen effektive Steuersysteme, unseren Partnerländern helfen – für anständige Behörden, die ihre Arbeit machen. Aber zuvorderst: Wir müssen unsere eigenen Steueroasen trockenlegen, dafür sorgen, dass wir nicht selber den Briefkastenfirmen und den Steuerhinterziehern Vorschub leisten. Das ist die Tagesaufgabe, wenn wir die Probleme bewältigen wollen und international dafür sorgen wollen, dass es eine bessere Zusammenarbeit bei der Steuerpolitik gibt.

Damien Carême, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission des libertés civiles, de la justice et des affaires intérieures*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, 11 300 milliards de dollars, ce serait la somme astronomique dissimulée dans des paradis fiscaux, selon les révélations du Consortium international des journalistes d'investigation. Ces 11 300 milliards d'évasion fiscale et de blanchiment sont à mettre en parallèle avec les 17 000 milliards de PIB de l'Union européenne en 2021. Les chiffres donnent le vertige.

La liste des bénéficiaires de ces montages financiers génère un profond sentiment de malaise. Des dirigeants européens anciens comme actuels, d'autres en poste au moment des Pandora Papers, et donc en mesure d'empêcher toute avancée fiscale pour leur seul intérêt personnel. Pourtant, aucun nom dans cette résolution, pas de *naming and shaming*: c'est la règle dans certains groupes politiques, ici, au Parlement. Pourquoi donc mentionner Wopke Hoekstra, actuel ministre néerlandais, Andrej Babiš, alors Premier ministre tchèque, ou John Dalli, ancien ministre maltais et ancien commissaire européen?

Récemment, PwC a fait fuiter des documents confidentiels sur les projets de lutte contre l'évasion fiscale des multinationales du gouvernement australien. Un scandale fiscal de plus pour PwC, déjà au cœur des LuxLeaks, en 2014, et, jamais très loin, ses acolytes du Big Four, ces quatre grands cabinets qui se partagent 87 % du marché mondial du conseil fiscal. Les Pandora Papers l'ont confirmé: c'est grâce à ce type d'intermédiaires que les 0,01 % les plus riches échappent à environ 25 % de leurs obligations fiscales. Pourtant, que de négociations pour citer PwC, Ernst & Young, Deloitte et KPMG dans cette résolution! Pas de *naming and shaming*, vous vous souvenez?

Des États membres proposent des taxations avantageuses pour attirer les nomades numériques, au risque d'aggraver les inégalités sociales et économiques. Mais, là encore, pas de *naming and shaming*. Pourquoi rappeler que Chypre, la Croatie, l'Espagne, la Grèce, l'Italie et le Portugal offrent des régimes possiblement nocifs pour le marché unique et les recettes fiscales? Pourquoi? Parce que «mal nommer les choses, c'est ajouter au malheur de ce monde». À cette citation d'Albert Camus j'ajouterai que ne pas les nommer du tout, c'est refuser de mettre fin au malheur du monde.

Tirons les leçons des Pandora Papers: nommons, blâmons, soyons ambitieux. En s'exprimant pour la première fois sur une meilleure taxation du capital des personnes fortunées et des plus-values sur les nomades numériques et la financiarisation du logement, notre Parlement ouvre la voie à des systèmes fiscaux plus justes.

Chers collègues, adoptons ce texte, renforçons-le grâce aux amendements du rapporteur, dont certains suggérés par mon groupe des Verts/ALE, et rejetons toute tentative, lamentable, de l'affaiblir.

Herbert Dorfmann, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Pandora Papers haben ein Konstrukt von über 29 000 Steuervermeidungs- und Steuerhinterziehungskonten offengelegt. Und das Ziel ist klar: Es geht darum, Steuern zu vermeiden, sich auf Kosten der Staaten und damit der Allgemeinheit zu bereichern und damit schlicht und ergreifend Geld zu stehlen, das den Menschen in Europa zustehen würde. Das kann man nur verurteilen, und das tun wir mit diesem Bericht auch.

Aber es geht nicht unbedingt darum, mit den Fingern auf Einzelne zu zeigen, sondern einfach zu analysieren, was passiert ist, und zu schauen, wo wir in Zukunft ansetzen können. Insofern geht es meiner Meinung nach viel mehr um die Zukunft als um die Vergangenheit. Natürlich müssen wir da auch unsere eigenen Regeln kritisch hinterfragen und unsere eigenen Regeln dort, wo es notwendig ist, verschärfen. Steueroasen, Systeme am Rande der Legalität – und auch des ethisch Vertretbaren – gibt es leider nicht nur irgendwo in der Welt, sie gibt es leider auch innerhalb der Europäischen Union.

Wir sind für einen fairen Steuerwettbewerb, der auf den Prinzipien der Transparenz, der Gerechtigkeit, der Zusammenarbeit basiert und der mit dem europäischen Binnenmarkt auch vereinbar ist. Deshalb braucht es eine ehrliche und faire Zusammenarbeit zwischen den nationalen Steuerbehörden in der Europäischen Union, aber auch eine stärkere internationale Zusammenarbeit, mehr Informationsaustausch, umfassende Mechanismen, um Steuerhinterziehung zu bekämpfen.

Wir beleuchten im Bericht auch die Rolle der Intermediäre bei der Erleichterung von Steuerhinterziehung. Es bedarf konsequenter Maßnahmen gegen Steuerberater, die Systeme der Hinterziehung und aggressive Steuerplanung entwickeln und verkaufen. Aber es ergibt keinen Sinn, große Beratungsfirmen einfach pauschal zu verurteilen oder ihre Zerschlagung zu fordern.

Ich denke, wir brauchen auch einen Rahmen für Quellensteuern. Die signifikant unterschiedlichen Steuersätze in den Mitgliedstaaten und in Drittstaaten werden immer eine Kapitalverschiebung dorthin begünstigen, wo gerade geringe oder keine Steuern zu bezahlen sind. Dies ist in Angriff zu nehmen. Kapitalgewinne sollen zumindest einmal besteuert werden. Es liegt nun an uns – hier im Europäischen Parlament, aber vor allem auch in den Mitgliedstaaten –, endlich eigene Egoismen hintanzustellen, wirksame Regeln zu implementieren, die zu mehr Gerechtigkeit in der Besteuerung führen und die endlich den Schlaumeiern den Wind aus den Segeln nehmen.

Evelyn Regner, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Die *Pandora Papers*: Was ist das? Das sind knapp 12 Millionen geheime Dokumente, die die Steuergeheimnisse von Königen, von Präsidenten, von Stars, von Geldwäschern, von Betrügern lüften. Vergeblich sucht man hier Pflegepersonal, Handwerker, Handwerkerinnen, Verkäuferinnen. Damit ist klar: Die Offshore-Welt ist eine Welt der Reichen und Superreichen.

Bis zu 32 Billionen Dollar sollen weltweit in Steuersümpfen versteckt sein. Das ist übrigens mehr als das BIP der USA, und das zu einer Zeit, in der wir händeringend nach neuen Einnahmequellen suchen. Also was tun? Die Antwort: Wir brauchen mehr Transparenz, ein koordiniertes Vorgehen, um Steuersümpfe auszutrocknen, außerhalb wie innerhalb Europas. *Public CbCR*, die öffentliche Konzernsteuertransparenz-Richtlinie, die wir 2021 erfolgreich beschlossen haben, ist ein Anfang. Aber natürlich brauchen wir noch viel mehr. Es muss noch viel weiter gehen.

Holen wir uns das Geld zurück, das den Menschen zusteht. Denn es gibt genug Geld auf dieser Welt. Man muss es nur gerecht verteilen.

And to all those Members that might hesitate still, I can really just say: this report is excellent. Vote for it!

Billy Kelleher, on behalf of the Renew Group. – Madam President, I want to commend the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists who exposed the Pandora Papers, and many other areas of tax evasion and aggressive tax planning that have taken place over the last ten years.

Multiple billions are not going to where they should be in terms of investment in public services right across the globe, and particularly in countries that have very challenging budgetary positions already.

But these particular papers showed that at the heart of Governments, at the heart of Parliaments, at the heart of the highest end of businesses, we have aggressive tax evasion and tax planning.

And, in large part, it is being facilitated. It is being facilitated by our lack of creativity in terms of funding revenue commissioners across the European Union, in terms of ensuring that we have cross-border investigative supports, but also our auditing companies, our legal firms are involved in promoting and facilitating tax evasion.

And that is something that we have to accept. There has to be serious sanction. This is a criminal offence, but there seems to be a view that while 'white collar' crime is very often spoken about, very little is done in terms of putting in place the legislation, the supports to investigate and to deter but more importantly in the event of a being discovered that there is genuine sanction.

We cannot continue to depend on journalists to be the ones that should be exposing this. If we had the legislation and if we had investigative capabilities and tools, it is the authorities should be exposing this and punishing those that are found guilty of tax evasion and aggressive tax planning.

Rasmus Andresen, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin! 11,9 Millionen Dokumente, 29 000 Konten, 330 Politikerinnen und Politiker, aber auch sehr viele Geschäftsleute und Prominente wie Elton John oder der Trainer von Real Madrid, Ancelotti. Die *Pandora Papers* sind die größte Recherche zu Steuerhinterziehung und –vermeidung. Und es ist dem Mut von Journalistinnen und Journalisten zu verdanken, dass dieser Betrug – zum Glück, will ich hinzufügen – aufgeflogen ist.

Jetzt ist es Zeit für Konsequenzen. Das Geschäftsmodell von Steueroasen muss durch Mindeststeuersätze, beispielsweise auf Kapitalerträge, zerstört werden. Seitenwechsel von Steuerverwaltungen zu Consultingagenturen müssen stärker kontrolliert werden. Deshalb brauchen wir schärfere Karenzzeiten. Die Macht der großen Beraterfirmen wie PricewaterhouseCoopers, EY, Deloitte oder aber auch KPMG muss eingeschränkt werden.

Wir Steuern hinterzieht, begeht ein Verbrechen an unserer Gesellschaft. Steuerhinterziehung ist kein Kavaliersdelikt. Kleine Menschen können sich Steuerhinterziehung gar nicht leisten; es sind die Großen, die Superreichen, die sich nicht an unserer Gesellschaft beteiligen. Es wird Zeit, dass wir handeln.

Andżelika Anna Możdżanowska, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Blisko 8 bilionów euro, co stanowi 8% światowego Produktu Krajowego Brutto, to wartość majątku finansowego znajdującego się w rajach podatkowych. Krótko mówiąc, jest to uszczuplenie światowych dochodów podatkowych o około 155 miliardów euro rocznie. Często doświadczamy, jak bogate osoby na wysokich stanowiskach, a często nawet przestępcy, wykorzystując nowoczesne techniki, systemy i możliwości, kreatywnie wykorzystując bankowość i optymalizację prawnopodatkowo-fiskalną, tworzą złożone struktury w celu ochrony swoich dochodów i aktywów przed opodatkowaniem, sankcjami i prawnymi zobowiązaniami, umożliwiając pranie pieniędzy czy finansowanie terroryzmu.

Dziś to mały krok, ale ważny krok w walce o przejrzystość i jasne zasady funkcjonowania. Nie mogę jednak zgodzić się z propozycją większej centralizacji, w tym odejścia od zasady jednoosobnego podejmowania decyzji. Kluczem do sukcesu jest skuteczna koordynacja, a nie tylko harmonizacja i ujednoczenie. System podatkowy jest istotnym elementem kształtowania całego systemu polityki gospodarczej. Szanowanie suwerenności podatkowej państw członkowskich powinno być dla nas szczególnie ważnym priorytetem.

Polska od lat skutecznie walczy z oszustwami podatkowymi i uchylaniem się od opodatkowania. Jednak sukces ten, jak również sukces każdego z państw członkowskich, powinien być impulsem do solidarnej współpracy wszystkich pozostałych. Dzisiaj przede wszystkim potrzebna jest zdecydowana i twarda polityka wobec każdego z rajów podatkowych. Konkurencja podatkowa jest zdrowa, o ile reguły są przejrzyste. Podobnie przejrzyste powinny być reguły dotyczące braku konfliktu interesów, zatrudnienia i działalności lobbingskiej we wszystkich europejskich instytucjach.

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

France Jamet, au nom du groupe ID. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur Reynders, mes chers collègues, si les scandales fiscaux se multiplient et dépouillent nos concitoyens de centaines de milliards d'euros, c'est que vous avez rendu tout cela possible avec la suppression des frontières et la promotion de la libre circulation des biens, des capitaux et des personnes. On pourrait même y ajouter une étrange dépendance consentie aux investisseurs nomades, aux sociétés écrans et aux fiducies, contre lesquels les gouvernements concernés ne font pour ainsi dire rien.

Pandora Papers, Panama Papers, LuxLeaks: tous ces noms symbolisent ni plus ni moins que la réussite d'une oligarchie mondiale toujours prompte à imposer l'austérité et les sacrifices uniquement au peuple. Car, chaque fois, les bénéficiaires sont privés et les dettes deviennent publiques, et ce sont nos citoyens qui en font les frais, les criminels qui s'enrichissent et nos nations qui s'appauvrissent, selon le Consortium international des journalistes d'investigation.

Hélas, la liste de vœux pieux consignés dans ce rapport ne fera pas grand mal. Rien ne contribuera ou ne sera de nature à régler la source du problème tant que la représentation publique et nos institutions seront obsessionnellement monopolisées par le souci de servir le financiarisme. Le capitalisme de connivence et nos démocraties sont incompatibles.

Parce qu'un État qui se respecte doit être en mesure de poursuivre, de défendre et de promouvoir les intérêts de la société qu'il représente, nous en appelons à un retour aux frontières. Pour lutter contre le blanchiment et la fraude fiscale, il faut restaurer la souveraineté des nations et surtout exprimer une volonté claire, politique, assumée et de portée internationale, une souveraineté qui refuse et combatte réellement le brigandage des peuples auquel se livrent ces prédateurs.

José Gusmão, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, quem ouve estes debates poderá sempre ficar a pensar que toda a gente neste Parlamento está muito preocupada com a evasão, a elisão e a fraude fiscais, mas na realidade não é bem assim. Este é um debate que divide este Parlamento e basta ver as posições que os grupos de direita sistematicamente assumem nas questões de evasão fiscal.

Primeiro, nunca dizer os nomes dos governantes, das empresas, dos governos, dos países que promovem a evasão e o *dumping* fiscal, fazendo o contrário do que os «Pandora Papers» fizeram, escondendo aquilo que os «Pandora Papers» revelaram.

Segundo, como aliás se está neste momento a ver nas negociações do relatório sobre a DAC 8, impedir – e há anos que impedem –, a partilha de informação sobre os detentores de informação, os detentores de rendimento, de imobiliário ou de ativos financeiros, para podermos seguir o rasto do dinheiro. Medida que registo é indispensável para conseguirmos combater eficazmente a evasão fiscal e também, como vimos recentemente nos relatórios sobre a regulação das criptomoedas, criar alças para não conseguirmos detetar as transações que são feitas em criptomoeda, dessa forma viabilizando um dos principais instrumentos de evasão fiscal nos momentos atuais.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι αποκαλύψεις των Pandora Papers και άλλων λιστών και papers, όπως η λίστα Λαγκάρντ, φέρνουν στο προσκήνιο την εμπλοκή κρατικών κυβερνητικών στελεχών, πολιτικών, μεγαλοεπιχειρηματιών σε φοροδιαφυγή και φοροαπάτη. Όμως ποιος κατέχει πάνω από το 50 % των καταθέσεων στους φορολογικούς παραδείσους; Το πλουσιότερο 0,01 του πληθυσμού. Είναι η ολιγαρχία του πλούτου δηλαδή, που παντού απολαμβάνει συντριπτικές φοροαπαλλαγές, προνόμια, εθελοντική φορολογία, συνεισφέροντας ελάχιστα στα έσοδα των κρατικών προϋπολογισμών και παίρνοντας από αυτούς δισεκατομμύρια, ενώ ο εργαζόμενος λαός ξεζουμίζεται διαρκώς με υψηλούς φόρους και άθλιους μισθούς.

Δεν πρόκειται για κακές επιλογές κάποιων προσώπων. Αυτές οι πρακτικές είναι η άλλη όψη της νόμιμης φοροαπαλλαγής και φοροασυλίας του κεφαλαίου που Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και αστικές κυβερνήσεις υλοποιούν. Στα πλαίσια αυτού του συστήματος, του αντιλαϊκού φορολογικού, οποιαδήποτε μέτρα θα έχουν την ίδια κατάληξη: να πληρώνει ο λαός και να φοροδιαφεύγουν νόμιμα ή παράνομα τα μονοπώλια.

Με πιο δυνατό ΚΚΕ, ο λαός πρέπει να απαιτήσει ανατροπή της φορομνηχτικής πολιτικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των αστικών κυβερνήσεων σε βάρος του. Φορολόγηση των μονοπωλιακών ομίλων, 45 % στα κέρδη, καθώς και κατάργηση όλων των φοροαπαλλαγών για εκείνους τους ομίλους που συσσωρεύουν αμύθητο πλούτο.

Lídia Pereira (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, as revelações dos «Pandora Papers» provam que o combate à fraude e evasão fiscais está a falhar.

Todos os milhões perdidos nestes esquemas são milhões retirados aos orçamentos nacionais, retirados à saúde, à educação, à justiça ou a serviços públicos de qualidade e criam uma injustiça fiscal clara entre aqueles que beneficiam destes esquemas e os contribuintes que cumprem. Contribuintes esses que estão cada vez mais sobrecarregados com impostos altos em muitos países da Europa, como o meu.

Este Parlamento fez o que lhe compete, discutiu as revelações e está a apresentar propostas concretas. A pergunta que se impõe é, por isso, o que é que está a falhar?

Falha a Comissão Europeia quando se atrasa em rever legislação como a diretiva antievasão fiscal ou quando fica aquém nas propostas para modernizar a cooperação entre autoridades fiscais nacionais.

Mas falham também os governos nacionais. No Conselho, não conseguem decidir acerca da diretiva sobre empresas de fachada e, nos seus países, e isto é particularmente evidente em Portugal, alimentam monstros burocráticos que sufocam os contribuintes e que continuam a deixar janelas abertas de oportunidade para a evasão.

Basta, por isso, de lamentar estes escândalos entre Bruxelas e Estrasburgo. É hora de as capitais nacionais apresentarem as soluções que tardam.

Aurore Lalucq (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, aujourd'hui tout se passe comme s'il y avait deux systèmes fiscaux, et donc deux systèmes démocratiques parallèles. D'un côté le citoyen lambda, la PME du coin, qui payent leurs impôts là où ils vivent et là où ils travaillent, et, de l'autre, certaines personnalités ultra-riches qui, disons-le clairement, à travers leur comportement, refusent le consentement à l'impôt et font sécession. En ayant recours à des sociétés offshore et à des paradis fiscaux, ils préfèrent mettre leur argent à côté de la grande criminalité, de la mafia et des trafiquants, plutôt qu'au côté des citoyens lambda, aussi imparfaits soient-ils.

Pourtant, ces personnes ont de quoi payer dix fois, cent fois leurs impôts. Pourtant, ces personnes n'auraient pas à payer grand-chose, d'ailleurs, si elles étaient restées et avaient déclaré leur argent sur leur territoire. En effet, les ultrariches ne paient quasiment plus rien aujourd'hui. Pourquoi? Parce que le revenu et le capital ne sont plus assez taxés, tant et si bien qu'aujourd'hui, mieux vaut hériter que travailler.

Aussi, nous soutenons ce rapport, la taxation du capital et un impôt sur la grande fortune au niveau européen.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Madam President, the Pandora Papers scandal with over 11.9 million documents, was exposing the hidden wealth and offshore activities of individuals and entities across the globe, involving more than 330 politicians and public officials, including 35 current and former leaders. Almost two years later we're negotiating the AML package and moving very cautiously. This House has already committed to fighting for greater transparency, accountability and fairness in our financial system, for closing the loopholes that enable tax evasion and money laundering. But I am asking the Council to be as committed as we are, and I am counting on the Commission to be an ally. I'm assuming that we all want stronger rules in place. We all want the new AMLA to be a powerful game changer with clear tasks and proper resources. These are the messages that this package must send in the end, just like the lessons we all learned from the Pandora Papers revelations. No one is above the law. The era of impunity for financial non-compliance is coming to an end and we are done with closing our eyes to washing up Putinist, illiberal and criminal money here in this Union. This is the public expectation on our mandate. This builds credibility and proves commitment, nothing less.

Claude Gruffat (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, les Pandora Papers ont confirmé une fois de plus – une fois de trop – que les 1 % de personnes les plus riches se considèrent au-dessus des règles et que leur cupidité passe avant la vie des 99 % qui restent. Ce rapport que nous allons voter ouvre la voie à une société plus juste, qui respecte les citoyennes et les citoyens. Une fois de plus, nous demandons à la Commission et aux États membres – ils ne sont même pas là, ce soir! – de mesurer la richesse créée par la plus-value et d'imposer cette dernière.

Nous sommes en pleine crise économique, et il semble que nous n'ayons rien appris des erreurs du passé, comme en 2008. Face aux faillites bancaires, à la volatilité des marchés financiers, à l'inflation et à l'augmentation des marges des multinationales, des familles peinent à joindre les deux bouts. Pourtant, certains continuent de profiter d'un système qui leur est avantageux et dans lequel ils peuvent s'enrichir à bas coût, au mépris d'une société plus juste et plus équitable.

Aujourd'hui, je vous en conjure, prenez la mesure de la crise que nous traversons. Prenez la mesure de la volonté de justice que nos citoyens revendiquent et celle du vent de colère qui nous reviendra en pleine figure si nous ne sommes pas capables d'imposer aux 1 % ce que font déjà les 99 %.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, Pandoran papereista ja muista paljastuksista saadut kokemukset on tärkeää käydä huolella läpi, jotta tulevaisuudessa osataan keskittyä parhaiten vaikuttaviin ja tehokkaisiin menetelmiin veronkierron vastaisessa taistelussa.

Kun maailman rikkaimmat tahot eivät halua maksaa veroja, löytävät ne helposti asiantuntijoita, jotka auttavat verovältelyssä. Neljä suurta tilintarkastusyhtiötä hallitsee veroneuvontamarkkinoista lähes 90 prosenttia. Yleisen edun kannalta on olennaista, että näiden yritysten asiantuntijoita ei käytetä julkisen sektorin konsultteina silloin, kun luodaan uutta verosääntelyä.

Pyörövi-ilmiossä siirrytään usein julkiselta sektorilta yksityiselle sektorille. Esimerkiksi OECD:n entinen verojohtaja ja entisiä komissaareja on siirtynyt yksityisen sektorin rahakkaisiin tehtäviin. En lainkaan usko, että eripituiset palkalliset karenssiajat estävät julkista etua edustavan tiedon valumista yrityksille.

Veronkierto siirtää verotaakkaa suurilta yrityksiltä pienille yrityksille ja henkilöverotuksen puolelle. Veronkiertoon liittyy suurta epäoikeudenmukaisuutta, minkä takia kansalaisten luottamus yhteiskunnan oikeudenmukaisuuteen horjuu.

Veronkiertoa voisi tehokkaasti ehkäistä jäsenvaltioissa, jos korkoja, rojalteja ja palvelumaksuja määrättäisiin verotuksessa kokonaan tai osittain vähennyskelvottomiksi. Myös lähdeverotuksen laajentaminen olisi tehokas tapa kerätä nykyistä enemmän verotuloja.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Die Pandora Papers sind durchgesickerte Dokumente, die geheime Offshore-Konten von 35 führenden Politikern offenlegen – Präsidenten, Premierministern und Monarchen – sowie gewaltige Offshore-Vermögen von mehr als 100 Milliardären, Prominenten und Wirtschaftsführern.

Das EU-Parlament nimmt jetzt, zwei Jahre nach Veröffentlichung, erstmals Stellung dazu. Dem dänischen Berichterstat-ter, meinem fairen Kollegen Niels Fuglsang, gebührt Dank, aus dem Bericht vielerlei Unsinn herausgehalten, aber auch wichtige Mängel im europäischen Steuerrecht betont zu haben.

Einige heikle Themen aber durfte er wohl nicht ansprechen: Denn die Europäische Volkspartei und die Renew-Fraktion verweigerten, in den Pandora Papers erwähnte EU-Kommissare und europäische Politiker öffentlich zu rügen. Gleiches gilt für Mitgliedstaaten mit großen Defiziten bei Steuer- und Anti-Geldwäschegesetzgebung wie Portugal, Griechenland, Kroatien, Malta, Zypern und Italien.

Noch bemerkenswerter aber ist der Fall eines besonderen EU-Lieblings, des ukrainischen Präsidenten Selenskyj, der in der Karibik und Zypern ein Spinnennetz von Offshore-Firmen angelegt hat. Dort bunkert er mindestens 41 Millionen Dollar, die er vom Oligarchen Ihor Kolomojskyj erhalten hat, zusammen mit EU-Hilfsgeldern, die er vor den Behörden in Sicherheit gebracht hat. Bis heute zahlt die in den Virgin Islands registrierte Maltex Multicapital Corporation unvers-teuerte Dividenden an Olena Selenska, Selenskyjs Ehefrau.

Der französische Moralist La Rochefoucauld sagte: „*L'hypocrisie est l'hommage que le vice rend à la vertu*“ - „Heuchelei ist der Tribut, den das Laster der Tugend zollen muss“. Dieses zeitlose Wort gilt insbesondere für die EU und ihren angeblichen Kampf für Steuergerechtigkeit.

Manon Aubry (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, les Pandora Papers, c'était il y a presque deux ans. Une éternité, vous allez me dire, au rythme où se succèdent les scandales d'évasion fiscale. Mais quand même, 11 300 milliards de dollars dissimulés. Et après, on va nous dire au passage que les caisses sont vides et qu'on va faire les poches des citoyens?

Et puis, ce n'est pas n'importe qui d'impliqué: 35 chefs d'État, anciens ou actuels, et 300 responsables publics, dont certains encore en poste, comme Sylvain Maillard, le vice-président du groupe macroniste à l'Assemblée nationale en France, ou le vice-Premier ministre néerlandais. Dans un monde normal, ils auraient dû voir la police débarquer chez eux, leurs avoirs saisis et les condamnations pleuvoir. Mais non, rien. Sous l'influence de la droite, ils ne sont même pas cités dans le rapport dont on débat aujourd'hui. Pas étonnant que l'évasion fiscale tarde autant à être réprimée et les paradis fiscaux sanctionnés. Dans ces conditions, les fraudeurs, après tout, ne vont pas mordre la main qui les nourrit.

Bref, deux ans après, chers collègues, on a quand même un peu le sentiment que la chanson *Je n'ai pas changé*, de Julio Iglesias – lui aussi impliqué dans les Pandora Papers –, est devenue le refrain de l'Union européenne. Alors, je vous propose un autre morceau, une autre musique pour le remplacer: taxer les riches. Et on pourrait bien commencer par un impôt sur la fortune des milliardaires.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, a distanza di due anni dalle scioccanti rivelazioni del Consorzio internazionale dei giornalisti investigativi, che hanno implicato uomini politici, uomini d'affari, personaggi pubblici, sinceramente fin troppo poco è stato fatto. Ma noi non dobbiamo smettere di lottare affinché scandali di questa portata non accadano nuovamente. Ne va soprattutto della tenuta della nostra democrazia, vista la costante erosione della fiducia dei cittadini verso lo Stato di diritto, e del nostro sistema economico.

Domani voteremo in favore della relazione, in quanto è stato fatto davvero un ottimo lavoro dal relatore e lo ringrazio. Tuttavia, ahimè, senza impegni più vincolanti per i nostri Stati membri rischiamo che questi buoni propositi diventino semplicemente delle parole al vento. La difesa degli informatori dei giornalisti è una questione di vitale importanza, cui si contribuirebbe anche attraverso l'istituzione di un fondo per il giornalismo d'inchiesta, come ipotizzato nella relazione stessa.

L'evasione e l'elusione fiscale, compresa la pratica dei regimi preferenziali messa in campo da alcuni Stati membri, che possiamo definire quindi complici, che non fanno altro che sottrarre risorse necessarie agli altri Stati, sono invece patologie da debellare a qualunque costo. Lo dobbiamo ai nostri cittadini, lo dobbiamo agli onesti contribuenti, lo dobbiamo agli ultimi che puntualmente diventano i primi quando si tratta di compiere sacrifici, specialmente economici.

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Madam President, citizens across the world were appalled at the revelations contained in the Pandora Papers and similar exposures, I remember it all too well.

Structures across the world that have the purpose of facilitating illegal practices, such as tax evasion and money laundering, undermine confidence in the benefits of a globally interconnected financial system for raising living standards globally, particularly in developing countries. They also undermine trust in our societies and in our democracies. It is vital that this confidence be restored. This is why we must redouble our efforts internationally.

The key word here, I believe, is transparency. Free and fair tax competition is important, but it is crucial that the countries with which we do business are clear and transparent about all their tax structures and corporate rules. As a union, we must be serious about having an effective EU list of non-cooperative jurisdictions for tax purposes with appropriate recourses to action if needed. We need ongoing global cooperation with all our partner countries.

We already have vital structures for tax compliance, such as the automatic exchange of information, the OECD Common Reporting Standards, the OECD's Joint International Taskforce on Shared Intelligence and Collaboration Network, in which 19 EU Member States currently participate.

I believe that we should build on this to achieve greater and more efficient international exchange of information between fiscal authorities to tackle financial crime. And I would say that our democracies depend on it.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Voorzitter, over de doden niets dan goeds. Silvio Berlusconi heeft veel gedaan om belastingontwijking te agenderen. Corruptie, valsheid in geschrifte, witwassen en belastingfraude zijn maar een paar gedragingen die hij uitstekend onder de aandacht wist te brengen. Hij kan daarmee op een indrukwekkende lijst van royals, bekendheden en criminelen uit de Pandora Papers worden geplaatst.

De Pandora Papers waren de grootste in een reeks onthullingen die een internationaal web van belastingconstructies lieten zien met als doel het bezit van de allerrijksten te verbergen en daarmee belasting te ontwijken.

Terwijl de bakker op de hoek bakken geld kwijt is aan energiekosten, liggen de allerrijksten ter wereld te bakken in de zon.

De Pandora Papers waren de grootste onthulling in de geschiedenis op het gebied van belasting, maar hadden geen consequenties. Commissievoorzitter Von der Leyen en premier Rutte reizen met miljarden af naar Tunesië om vluchtelingen te stoppen, maar doen niets aan de miljarden die vluchten naar belastingparadijzen. Hoe kunnen we dit accepteren?

De woede van de mensen vindt duidelijk geen weerklank bij de lidstaten. Brievenbusfirma's vormen een groot onderdeel van het probleem, maar een wet om hun rol in te perken wordt geblokkeerd. Voorts stuit het voorstel om louche belastingadviseurs aan te pakken nog voordat het gepubliceerd is op verzet. Tegelijkertijd houden EU-landen belastingparadijzen nog steeds de hand boven het hoofd. We moeten de achterkamertjes waar commissaris Gentiloni's initiatieven sneuvelen, openbreken. Als landen niet bereid zijn belastingontwijking aan te pakken, moeten we dit hardop en publiekelijk zeggen.

Het verslag van Niels Fuglsang biedt oplossingen door de rijksten te belasten, ongelijkheid recht te trekken en rechtvaardigheid te herstellen. Kortom, het ontbreekt niet aan oplossingen om een eind te maken aan belastingontwijking, maar simpelweg aan de politieke wil om deze kwestie samen op te lossen.

Vandaag is de begrafenis van Silvio Berlusconi. Laat het ook de begrafenis van belastingontwijking zijn.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, μια μικρή υπέρβαση, σήμερα είναι μια πολύ δύσκολη μέρα για την Ευρώπη και για τη χώρα μου. Εκτός θέματος, έχουμε δεκάδες νεκρούς εκεί έξω, στα ελληνικά και στα ευρωπαϊκά νερά. Πρόκειται για μετανάστες.

Επιστρέφω στο θέμα μας. Από τη λίστα Λαγκάρντ, στα Panama Papers, στα Paradise Papers, τώρα στα Pandora papers, στον εξαιρετικό ρόλο της ερευνητικής δημοσιογραφίας και στον ενοχικό και συγκαταβατικό ρόλο του πολιτικού υποκειμένου. Μιλάμε για τουλάχιστον 2,3 τρισεκατομμύρια ευρώ ενωσιακών κεφαλαίων που καταλήγουν σε φορολογικούς παραδείσους. Δηλαδή αφενός οι πολίτες ή οι απλοί άνθρωποι να φορολογούνται και να ελέγχονται – αφετέρου η επιχειρηματική και πολιτική ελίτ και το διεθνές οργανωμένο έγκλημα να πολλαπλασιάζουν τα κεφάλαιά τους και οι δημοσιογράφοι να καταδιώκονται.

Είναι απαράδεκτο η Ένωση να ανέχεται αυτές τις ύποπτες δωρεές κεφαλαίου. Ας μιλήσουμε καθαρά. Βλέπουμε τη Δεξιά και το Λαϊκό Κόμμα να αρνούνται τη δημοσιοποίηση στοιχείων και να επιμένουν να μην κατονομαστούν τα κράτη μέλη που πρωδοτούν τέτοιες πρακτικές. Ούτε ακούμε κριτική για το ανεπαρκές 15 % του ελάχιστου συντελεστή φορολόγησης εταιρειών. Εδώ λοιπόν, ενώπιος ενώπιω, όλες οι πολιτικές ομάδες να πάρουν θέση. Ξεκάθαρη θέση.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, si stima che i paradisi fiscali facciano perdere ai governi del mondo quasi 500 miliardi di dollari all'anno. Sì, un cinque e undici zeri. I *Pandora Papers* ci ricordano che l'evasione fiscale è uno dei problemi più importanti che il mondo debba oggi affrontare. Mina le basi fiscali del *Welfare State* nei paesi del Nord e le risorse che si perdono a causa dell'evasione fiscale permetterebbero l'eradicamento abbastanza immediato della povertà estrema nei paesi del Sud globale.

Nell'Unione europea dobbiamo essere molto più energici nella lotta contro i paradisi fiscali. Primo: dobbiamo aggiornare la nostra lista nera di giurisdizioni fiscali non cooperative perché ci siano i dodici paesi in cui l'imposta sulle società è dello 0 %, oggi non c'è nessuno, e perché ci siano anche paesi che non hanno criteri di trasparenza per quanto riguarda la proprietà delle società registrate.

Secondo: nella lista di monitoraggio dovrebbero esserci pure i paesi con un'imposta sulle società inferiore al 15 % stabilito dall'accordo OCSE. Inoltre, è urgente accelerare la creazione dell'Autorità europea antiriciclaggio. L'evasione fiscale è un attacco contro ogni idea di giustizia su scala globale. Per questo motivo la lotta contro i paradisi fiscali dovrebbe essere una priorità assoluta nella nostra agenda politica.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, vážený pane komisaři, co nám odkryla kauza Pandora Papers? Tajné účty králů, premiérů, miliardářů, zapojených privilegovaných lidí. Něco bylo legální, něco už možná na hranici legality a něco bylo zjevně nelegální. Vytvářely se složité struktury, využívaly se *offshore* společnosti a samozřejmě cílem bylo buď optimalizovat daně, nebo dokonce páchat daňové úniky. Mezinárodní spolupráce v daňových věcech je tak zcela zjevně nadále prioritou a musí být prioritou i pro mezinárodní společenství jako takové. Protože ten, kdo na daňovém úniku především trátí, tak je stát. A řekl bych, že daňový únik je nejhorší právový zločin proti státu jako takovému. Myslím si, že musíme budovat dále společný postup našich států v daňových věcech. Trochu mě mrzí, že právě dnes zde není zastoupena Rada, protože po dvou letech od odhalení kauzy Pandora Papers bychom měli již očekávat i aktivitu Rady v této věci. A je důležité, abychom také zaplnili mezery v našem vlastním právu, v právu EU. Byl jsem vždy proti tomu, abychom omezovali daňovou autonomii členských států, ale je jednoznačné, že musíme sjednotit administrativní postupy právě v daňových věcech, a to s cílem právě zamezení těmto daňovým únikům, a musíme tento tlak vyvinout i na mezinárodní úrovni.

Marek Belka (S&D). – Madam President, when many Member States are struggling to make ends meet to support Ukrainian refugees or fight climate change, according to recent data, in 2015, more than USD 200 billion were shifted from the EU to tax havens. I'm sick of underlining this. This is a warning call for us. Before the Pandora Papers, we already had LuxLeaks, Paradise Papers, Panama Papers and many more. Is that not enough? We have to act.

First, we need better sanctions against the tax havens that are on the EU blacklist. Just naming and shaming won't do the job: there's too much money involved. Second, it is high time to cooperate with the US on the two pillars of OECD reform. Otherwise, we'll be stuck in between giving tax havens a space to flourish. Third, Parliament has to have a say on tax issues. Stalling tax reforms with the unanimity principle is a joke, with all the tax leaks popping up virtually every year.

Colleagues. Elton John – another celebrity after Silvio Berlusconi mentioned here – who is amongst many of the tax-avoiding politicians and celebrities revealed by the journalists in the Pandora Papers, might still be standing. But I hope that the unfair system of tax havens soon won't.

Malin Björk (The Left). – Fru talman! Högerregeringarna i Europa fortsätter att utforma skatteregler som är direkt anpassade för de rika. I mitt land, Sverige, sänks skatten för dem som tjänar mest, medan skola, vård, omsorg dras ner på. I Sverige har vi avskaffat förmögenhetsskatten, fastighetsskatten och vi subventionerar rika hushåll med hushållstjänster.

Konsten att slakta ett välfärdssamhälle skulle vi kunna kalla högerens orättvisa skattepolitik. Som om detta inte räckte har vi dessutom i Europa regelverk som underlättar ett utbrett skattefiffel. Något som återigen bara gynnar de rikaste och storföretagen och allsköns fiffelare.

Bara genom läckor som Pandoradokumentet kan vi få en bild av det här samhällsfientliga fiffleriet. Vi måste se till att få ett rättvisare skattesystem, och vi måste öka transparensen och skärpa regelverket så att vi kan sätta stopp för skattefiffleriet – både för företag och för privatpersoner. Vi behöver skatterättvisa nu.

Marcel de Graaff (NI). – Voorzitter, de Pandora Papers zijn een eindeloze reeks van belastingontwijking door vermogende personen en bedrijven in belastingparadijzen.

De huidige torenhoge belastingen zijn diefstal door de overheid om de armen arm te houden en de rijken rijker te maken. De rijken omzeilen belastingen vervolgens ook nog eens via ondoorzichtige constructies.

De overheid wil contant geld voor de gewone man uitbannen, maar laat de miljoenen op onvindbare bankrekeningen ongemoeid. Dit is bevestigd in de Pandora Papers. De overheid wordt geleid door een vriendsjesnetwerk van graaiers die zichzelf verrijken, zoals Ursula von der Leyen, die de deal met Pfizer nog altijd niet heeft bekendgemaakt.

De oplossing is niet een verbod op contant geld en streng toezicht op de gewone man, maar een kleine, controleerbare overheid en een lage, eerlijke en simpele belasting voor iedereen. Op deze manier zijn belastingontwijkende constructies niet mogelijk en bovendien niet nodig.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario Reynders, está usted echando muchas horas en este pleno del Parlamento Europeo. Más horas echamos aún los que fuimos miembros de la Comisión de Investigación sobre los Papeles de Pandora, que arrojó algunas lecciones conclusivas, algunas de las cuales voy a subrayar.

La primera es la necesidad de transparencia y, por tanto, de evitar que se produzcan conflictos de intereses y que, bajo la rúbrica de empresas de contabilidad financiera, se escondan verdaderos chiringuitos de evasión de capitales.

La segunda es la necesidad de acabar con las prácticas predatorias de fiscalidad competitiva entre los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea, particularmente en el ámbito de la fiscalidad del patrimonio y de sociedades. Esto incluye también poner fin a los programas de residencia para inversores y a los programas de ciudadanía para inversores, como tantas veces hemos requerido en este Parlamento Europeo.

Y la tercera es la necesidad de combatir los paraísos fiscales. La única forma de que la Unión Europea sea relevante en ese combate es que lo haga de forma unida, consistente, persistente en el tiempo y en todas las organizaciones de la gobernanza de la globalización, con el fin de acabar con esa práctica sencillamente inaceptable que tanto se manifestó durante nuestra investigación de los Papeles de Pandora.

Marc Botenga (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, planquer son fric sur une île paradisiaque, soyons clairs: c'est du vol. C'est du vol à la collectivité, ce que font ces milliardaires et ces millionnaires. Ils évitent que cet argent soit utilisé pour finalement investir dans des crèches. Ce sont eux qui sont responsables, si l'on n'a pas assez de crèches; ce sont eux qui sont responsables, si le matin vous attendez le bus, mais que vous ne le voyez pas arriver, quand vous voyez «5 minutes», puis «4 minutes», «3 minutes» et le bus disparaît; ce sont eux qui sont responsables, lorsque les trains sont en retard; eux toujours qui sont responsables, quand il n'y a pas assez de médecins et d'infirmiers dans nos hôpitaux.

Comment se fait-il qu'ils ne finissent pas en taule? Parce que, évidemment, il y a des politiciens qui sont à leur service, parce que nous avons des lois qui ont été écrites sur mesure pour les riches, pour les millionnaires. Aujourd'hui, tout le monde vient pleurer: «Ah, ils évitent l'impôt! Ils payent pas l'impôt, les riches, les multimilliardaires!» Eh bien, prenons les mesures qui s'imposent! Levons le secret bancaire, imposons une taxe pour les millionnaires – il y a toujours une majorité, ici, pour voter contre – et arrêtons les transactions économiques avec les paradis fiscaux, parce que, sinon, c'est de l'hypocrisie avec des larmes de crocodile.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists should be commended for their work on the Pandora Papers. On their website on the Papers, the ICIJ lists who they consider the power players of the Pandora Papers. They include, unsurprisingly, President Putin and his inner circle, but they also include the current Ukrainian President, Zelenskyy. The ICIJ describes Zelenskyy's activities as follows: 'Zelenskyy owned shares in an anonymous offshore entity, as did some of his business partners who are now close political allies.'

The report recommends that investigations into the assets and investments of Russian oligarchs should be a top priority, as they are strategically important for the EU's security. Maybe the report should also consider investigations into the powers that be in Ukraine in order to ascertain how they attained their vast wealth and power.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Didier Reynders, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, I know that this Parliament is committed to increasing tax transparency and fairness and to the fight against tax avoidance, tax evasion and aggressive tax planning.

This report proves this once again. The Commission is working to deliver on this. We must not lose time. The proposals currently discussed must be agreed swiftly, and the upcoming proposals must advance fast. That way, we will have a robust arsenal to fight against tax evasion avoidance and aggressive tax planning.

The Commission knows it can count on you and your help and support for this. This is of crucial importance. EU citizens are placing their expectations on us. Thank you once again for our discussions today, for your support and let us stay united on this issue to make some progress on the different files that we have in discussion for the moment.

Niels Fuglsang, rapporteur. – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, thank you. I think we had a fruitful debate today. I think it shows that, of course, we have ideological differences in this House. We are from the left to the right, and we might disagree on how the tax levels should be. Should the tax be higher or lower? We disagree, probably. But I think it also shows the debate today that we agree that no matter what the decision will be on how the tax level should be, we must agree that it should be the same rules for everybody. The tax rules that democracy decides should apply to everybody. And as it has been said from this floor today, that's not the case today.

We have seen in the Pandora Papers that we have two systems. We have two sets of rules, one for the 99 % of those who go to work and pay their taxes, and one for the top 1 % who are able to use offshore accounts, hire tax advisers, hire lawyers that help them create shell companies and fake trusts so that they can avoid paying their taxes. And that is basically what we need to do away with. As Udo Bullmann, the DEVE rapporteur, said, this is something which harms, in particular, the developing countries, those who are poorest, those who have less than the rest, they are not the ones who are benefiting. They're the ones who are being harmed. And those on the top are the ones who are benefiting.

So why are we not doing more? Mr Botenga asked. We cannot just complain. We need to act. I think he is absolutely right. And I think in this report we have a number of proposals. We have discussed them here today. So let us just agree that we have talked sufficiently. Now it is time to act and to do away with these tax schemes.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 15. Juni 2023, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Alfred Sant (S&D), in writing. – The Report on lessons learnt from the Pandora Papers refers back to the large-scale leak of financial documents of October 2021, revealing offshore assets and financial transactions of numerous individuals and entities worldwide. I am in favour of this report, which aims to follow up on the recommendations made in the past regarding how to control illicit state and corporate practices that enable firms and wealthy or well-connected individuals to abusively amass wealth and avoid paying taxes. Nevertheless, I strongly disagree with the bias in the report that considers tax competition as an inherently bad thing.

Tax competition measures are an essential tool for some Member States to compensate for a lack of endowments and/or economic handicaps that place them at a competitive disadvantage. Secondly, I disagree strongly as well with the report's reference to so-called golden passports as 'objectionable from an ethical, legal and economic point of view'. While myself having reservations about their use, this is not on the grounds mentioned. Such measures are totally legitimate and have been applied – still are – by countries, including major EU Member States and the US under one guise or another. It was only when smaller states also adopted the practice that objections began to be raised.

17. Implementación y cumplimiento de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible (debate)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Udo Bullmann und Petros Kokkalis im Namen des Entwicklungsausschusses und des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über die Umsetzung und Verwirklichung der Ziele für nachhaltige Entwicklung (SDG) (2023/2010(INI)) (A9-0213/2023).

Udo Bullmann, Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, mein lieber Ko-Berichterstatter Petros Kokkalis! Ich danke auch den Schattenberichterstatterinnen und Schattenberichterstattern, die so konstruktiv an dem Bericht mitgearbeitet haben.

2015 hat sich die Weltgemeinschaft verständigt auf ein großes Reformprogramm: die Agenda 2030 - das Konzept für eine nachhaltige, für eine soziale, für eine bessere Welt. Wenn wir heute, acht Jahre später, Halbzeitbilanz ziehen, dann müssen wir uns mit massiven Problemen auseinandersetzen. Die Anzahl der Flüchtlinge weltweit ist auf über 110 - Millionen Menschen gestiegen. Wir könnten alleine in 2050 140 Millionen Klimaflüchtlinge haben. Hunger ist zurück auf dem Globus. Über 830 Millionen Menschen sind davon akut bedroht.

Was ist die Antwort? Aufgeben mit der Agenda 2030? Das kann nicht die Lösung sein. Ganz im Gegenteil. Wir brauchen dieses ganzheitliche Konzept mehr als jemals zuvor als Kompass, um die Krisen zu bewältigen, und als Richtschnur für unsere internationale Politik, für die Weltgemeinschaft, aber insbesondere für die Europäische Union, die eine Vorreiterrolle wahrnehmen muss im internationalen Konzert.

Über welche Mittel verfügen wir? Das Instrument „NDICI/Europa in der Welt“, unser internationales Portfolio, hat 80 - Milliarden Euro bis 2027. Team Europa und Global Gateway wollen das aufstocken auf 300 Milliarden. Alleine 150 Milliarden sollen in Afrika investiert werden. Die Kommission verspricht uns, dass diese Konzeption von Global Gateway von Anfang bis zum Schluss den Nachhaltigkeitszielen dienen muss – und das wollen wir in der Tat unterstützen, das, Herr Kommissar, wollen wir mit Ihnen zusammen umsetzen. Aber wir wollen es auch überprüfen. Wir wollen es auch messen können.

Warum ist das so wichtig? Was bedeutet das, dass wir uns engagieren für die Nachhaltigkeitskonzeption für unsere Partnerländer? Wir werden eine Situation erleben in wenigen Jahren, bis 2030, wo jeder vierte Jugendliche auf dieser Welt, jede vierte Jugendliche aus Afrika kommt – nur um ein Beispiel zu nennen. Diese Jugendlichen – und das wollen wir – sollen Ingenieurinnen und Ingenieure werden können, weil sie es sein müssen, die die nachhaltigen, die erneuerbaren Energiesysteme in Namibia entwickeln und andernorts, weil sie es sein müssen, die das Schicksal ihrer Länder in die eigenen Hände nehmen.

Ja, und es sollen die Jugendlichen von heute sein, die morgen als IT-Expertinnen und -Experten den Ausbau der digitalen Infrastruktur in Mauretanien voranbringen. Wir wollen, dass unsere Partnerländer *empowered*, ermächtigt werden, ihre Gesellschaften sozial und zukunftsgerecht zu gestalten. Deswegen brauchen wir das Konzept der Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie. Es muss unsere Außenpolitik bestimmen wie unsere Innenpolitik.

Petros Kokkalis, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, Commissioner, President-in-Office, dear colleagues, it is very pleasing to see what started as a dialogue among a small group of MEPs – the SDG Alliance led by Barry Andrews – to have grown into a collective cross-party effort to place the SDGs at the heart of our institution and policy-making, debating today in plenary the Annual Report on the state of implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals in the European Union.

This debate could not have been more timely. The shattered geopolitical landscape following the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the twin climate and biodiversity crisis, the Corona pandemic, the ever-growing levels of debt and cost of living and the resulting widely widening inequalities demonstrate that business-as-usual delivers fragility and insecurity instead of resilience and progress.

It is in this context, in this era of perma and poly crisis that the Global Goals become an invaluable universal language of global solidarity. The Global Goals are the only universally agreed and universally applicable, transparent and evidence-based policy framework for a world that ensures the safety and well-being of everyone within the planetary boundaries.

We are now less than seven years away from the goal. This September, the UN Global Goal Summit will be a major opportunity to build momentum and deliver the urgent, transformative action required to put our societies firmly on the path of social, environmental and economic sustainability. If we fail, it will be the most vulnerable that will bear the heaviest burden first, but make no mistake, in our common home, no one will be safe until we are all safe.

With multilateralism under threat, EU leadership is critical and must be credibly demonstrated; that is, we must lead by example. We must mainstream the SDGs in all policy areas, ensure policy coherence and strengthen the relevant governance structures. To this end, we reiterate our demand for a new overarching implementation strategy with measurable and time-bound commitments, with a chain of accountability and a roadmap of concrete actions.

The integration of the SDGs into the European Semester must be further developed towards a thorough review of the EU fiscal rules that would afford Member States the flexibility and the tools to deliver the necessary investment for the green transition and social cohesion – ideally, a Resilience Pact to replace the Stability Pact that would go beyond GDP and guarantee both the European Climate Law and the European Pillar of Social Rights.

The Global Goals can only be reached if we bring them closer to people. This is the very essence of the pledge to leave no one behind that lies at the heart of the Goals and, of course, our own European Green Deal. We must re-establish permanent structured dialogue with all stakeholders, including via the European Economic and Social Committee, and encourage local governments to use the work done by the Joint Research Centre on Local and Regional Voluntary Reviews.

To make significant strides towards the SDGs, it is imperative that we address the increasing financing gap both within the EU and globally. This is crucial to fulfil our commitments regarding climate action and official development assistance. But we also need a dedicated EU financing plan and methodology to track and make the most out of the EU budget spending contributing to the goals.

Finally, the EU must proactively push for a comprehensive overhaul of the global financial architecture towards full alignment with the Global Goals and the Paris Agreement and, more specifically, the proposed UN SDG Fiscal Stimulus.

Dear colleagues, dear Commissioner, the deadline for 2030 is rapidly approaching. We need to step up our efforts. We need a paradigm shift from the current economic model that we are implementing and that perpetuates inequalities, unequal distribution of wealth and the unsustainable exploitation of Earth's natural but finite resources. I am convinced that the SDGs show the way.

I would really like to extend my gratitude to my dear colleague and co-rapporteur Udo Bullmann, as well as all the shadow rapporteurs and colleagues who over the years have contributed constructively in advancing the SDGs' implementation in the European Union.

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, let me first thank the rapporteurs for this report. We are at the halfway mark of the 2030 Agenda, and we are heading to a very important UN High-Level Political Forum next month, where Commissioners Gentiloni and Urpilainen will present the EU-level Voluntary Review of the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Today, let me reiterate the Commission's commitment to the 2030 Agenda and the achievement of all the SDGs. Since the beginning of our mandate, this Commission has put the focus not on growth for the sake of it, but on sustainable growth, not on the level of growth, but on its quality, in alignment with the SDGs.

We have launched deeply transformative initiatives, such as the European Green Deal, the Climate Law and the European Pillar of Social Rights Action Plan. The SDGs have been progressively integrated into the European Semester, our annual cycle of economic policy coordination.

The Country Reports for 2023, published in May, summarise the progress made by each Member State and include a detailed annex based on the monitoring carried out by Eurostat. We have maintained the cause even as we face up to the two major crises of the last few years.

Both NextGeneration EU – adopted in response to the pandemic – and the REPowerEU plan put forward in the wake of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, aim to accelerate our shift to a more sustainable and inclusive economic model. At the global level, we have launched the Global Gateway Strategy to boost sustainable connections to lead the fair, digital and green transition.

However, as the United Nations Secretary-General's latest report on the SDGs confirms, these crises have hindered global progress towards the 2030 goals at EU level. We have made progress across a large majority of the 2030 agenda. Nonetheless, on some SDGs, we need to do more.

The EU voluntary review that the Commission will present at the High Level Political Forum in July and the SDG summit in September is an opportunity to redouble our efforts and to build global momentum. This is the first EU voluntary review. Your report called for it. The Commission answered your call.

The voluntary review aims to connect the dots. It underlines the need for coherence between our internal and external action in support of the SDGs. Both our domestic policies and our international partnerships must be oriented towards these goals. Achieving the SDGs requires not just a whole of government approach, but a whole of society approach, working together with civil society organisations, national and local governments, the European institutions, and not least the European Parliament.

So let me thank you once again for this report, and now I will listen to your intervention proposals and remarks.

Frances Fitzgerald, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, we find ourselves at the halfway point in our journey towards achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals. We have so much more to do, so much unfinished work on the SDGs. Can we really say we are even close to halfway to gender equality? Have we truly promoted peace, justice and strong, inclusive institutions?

Over the last three years, our progress was stalled by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Russian invasion of Ukraine and other global shocks, as colleagues have said. These unprecedented crisis forced us to focus our energies and efforts elsewhere. Now, I think, we must really redouble our efforts to meet our commitments. This is the right framework, no doubt about that.

It is also imperative that we focus on preventing our progress from grinding to a halt or, worse yet, backsliding even more. Rather, the challenges we have faced can provide an opportunity to reshape our societies. Part of that, as we've learned here, is putting sustainable development at the heart of our policy responses.

We need to redouble our efforts to show our citizens, as the Commissioner has said, that the SDGs present real value for them and are worthwhile investing in and integrating into all of the policies, budgets, all policies across the EU, as my Irish colleague MEP Andrews has repeatedly said.

We in Europe can lead the way on delivering the SDGs. The future of our planet, and our future prosperity I would say, depends on it. We should not be found wanting when it comes to prioritising the SDGs, making sure, as I have said, that we integrate them into all our policies here in the EU, and we work with the Commission, we all work together to ensure that this happens and that we will not be found wanting.

Marc Angel, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, a girl unable to get education in Myanmar, a family suffering from hunger in South Sudan, a father unable to find decent work in Europe – for all these people the Sustainable Development Goals provide a promise for a better life on a healthier planet.

However, as the UN Secretary General remarks in his upcoming report, in view of the SDG summit in September, this promise is in peril. Implementation throughout the world, Europe included, is dangerously behind schedule.

We have a responsibility towards all these people to deliver, and the European Union should lead these efforts. We should lead by example here at home. And in this regard, the S&D Group reiterates its call to the Commission to present a comprehensive strategy for achieving the 2030 Agenda.

The European Union should also be in the driver's seat when it comes to championing and promoting international cooperation and partnerships as espoused by SDG 17. With Africa, we must develop a mutually beneficial partnership and support them in reaching their objectives. Equally, the ACP-EU partnership is crucial to fostering sustainable development in ACP countries and building stronger alliances to tackle global challenge. Latin America has become even more crucial partner for our union, and we must strengthen our mutual cooperation.

Finally, there can be no sustainable development without peace, justice and strong institutions. We can witness this from up close with Russia's thuggish war in Ukraine.

Dear colleagues, we owe it especially to those already left behind, to be ambitious and we must take bold action.

Barry Andrews, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, no one disagrees with the principles of the Sustainable Development Goals. They represent an idyllic, almost utopian vision for the future where economic, environmental and social priorities are on an equal footing. You'll find the SDGs littered throughout countless EU policy documents and Parliament resolutions. But how many of us here are actually willing to fight for these causes? What are we actually doing to address the fact that progress on the SDGs is not just stalled but declining?

Quite frankly, I am shocked and disappointed that so few people take any real action when the moment arrives. We saw it last summer with the European Parliament vote on the sustainable taxonomy, where a majority voted to label gas and nuclear energy as green. We have seen it over the years both here and the European Council, where leaders chose not to rescue migrants in the Mediterranean Sea. We have seen countless efforts to water down the farm to fork strategy.

Most recently, two committees voted to bin the nature restoration law. Until we had an EU climate law, the majority of our commitments amounted to nothing more than greenwashing. It is my strong belief that the same applies to the SDGs. We are living through an era of SDG-washing and until we have binding targets for each SDG globally, but at the very least at EU level, we will simply not make any progress.

I am now convinced that it is the time we came forward with a proposal for an EU SDG law. The time for wishful thinking and self-congratulation is over. If we want to save Agenda 2030, we need SDGs with teeth!

Malte Gällée, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Sechs Jahre, sechs Monate, zwei Wochen und vier Tage – genau das ist die Zeit, die wir uns selbst gegeben haben, um letztendlich eine gerechte Welt zu schaffen – denn nichts weniger sind die nachhaltigen Entwicklungsziele. Das ist unser Fahrplan, den wir uns global abgestimmt haben, um dafür zu sorgen, die Armut zu bekämpfen, um Hunger zu bekämpfen, um sauberes Trinkwasser für alle zu schaffen und saubere Energie für alle zu schaffen. Und wir könnten nicht weiter davon entfernt sein – wir sind verdammt weit davon entfernt.

Gerade mal 12 % der Ziele sind *on track*. 26 Personen auf diesem Planeten besitzen so viel wie 50 % der ärmeren Weltbevölkerung. Das ist die Ungleichheit – so hoch wie noch nie. Genau deswegen ist es so wahnsinnig wichtig, dass wir als Europa gemeinsam sagen: Ja, wir schaffen diesen Bericht, wir schauen uns an: Wo stehen wir denn überhaupt? Nur so können wir auch wirklich wieder *on track* kommen.

Wir brauchen in Europa eine kohärente Politik, denn daran fehlt es. Wir sind weit davon entfernt – auch hier in diesem Parlament –, wirklich mit all den Gesetzen, an denen wir arbeiten, dazu beizutragen, dass die nachhaltigen Entwicklungsziele erreicht werden. Wir müssen die umweltschädlichen Subventionen beenden. Und wir müssen endlich dafür sorgen, dass gerade die Länder, die am weitesten zurückliegen, eben nicht immer weiter in die Schuldenfallen fallen. Genau dort müssen wir doch investieren. Genau deshalb brauchen wir eine Reform des IWF, eine Reform der Weltbank. Dort muss das Geld hin – zu den Leuten, die es am dringendsten benötigen!

Wir sind verdammt weit weg. Wir haben noch einen verdammt weiten Weg zu gehen. Es ist noch verdammt lang hin, bis wir wirklich Politik machen, die jeden Menschen schätzt, die jeden Menschen gleichwertig behandelt. Aber wir müssen ihn gehen.

Beata Kempa, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Na wstępie chciałabym podziękować wszystkim zaangażowanym sprawozdawcom oraz posłom za pracę nad sprawozdaniem. Agenda 2030 jest bez wątpienia bardzo ambitna. Nie ze wszystkimi jej celami się zgadzam, ale jednak trzeba doceniać wielki plan oraz niesamowite zaangażowanie milionów osób i setek organizacji, żeby ją wypełnić. Moja ojczyzna, Polska, znajduje się na dwunastym miejscu na 195 krajów w jej realizacji.

Wśród wszystkich jej celów najważniejsza wydaje się jednak walka z głodem. Mamy narzędzia pozwalające nam już dziś pokonać symbol hańby XXI wieku, czyli głód. Unia Europejska w ostatnich latach jest bardzo ważnym partnerem w tym zakresie, a nasza pomoc humanitarna jest kluczowa dla milionów ludzi na całym świecie.

Warto tutaj przytoczyć to, że Unia Europejska jest największym donatorem i trzeba to wszędzie powtarzać. Najlepszym tego przykładem jest zaangażowanie Unii w porozumienie zbożowe umożliwiające transport do krajów potrzebujących zbóż z Ukrainy.

Wypełnienie tego celu wiąże się z dwoma kolejnymi, to znaczy z pokojem i dostępem do czystej wody. Tu także mamy już narzędzia i środki finansowe i nie tylko pomoc humanitarną, ale przede wszystkim niesiemy też pomoc rozwojową. Zatem twarde projekty infrastrukturalne oraz hydrotechniczne to jest nasz klucz do sukcesu.

Dziękuję bardzo za sprawozdanie i jeszcze raz dziękuję za ciężką pracę.

Dominique Bilde, au nom du groupe ID. – Madame la Présidente, les objectifs de développement durable sont vraisemblablement voués à connaître un succès aussi relatif que ceux du millénaire, et on peut le déplorer. Au moins, la première mouture se cantonnait à des défis primordiaux, comme la lutte contre la mortalité infantile ou encore la santé maternelle. Les ODD couvrent, eux, 17 grands domaines et pas moins de 169 cibles, dont la migration. À cela l'inventaire à la Prévert de nos deux rapporteurs mêle des considérations variées, portant sur la performance énergétique des bâtiments ou encore sur les transports publics.

«Vaste programme», selon le mot fameux du général de Gaulle, mais qui n'est guère à l'unisson des aspirations de mes compatriotes en France. Plus avant, il faut le dire et le répéter, l'Europe ne saurait endosser éternellement la responsabilité du développement mondial. Les membres du Club de Paris ne détenaient plus en 2020 que 11 % environ de la dette des 73 pays les plus pauvres, contre 29 % en 2006. Pendant ce temps, la Chine en détient environ 21 % pour ce qui est du continent africain – et c'est sans compter l'endettement caché, qui échappe à la comptabilisation officielle. Je passe sur la pertinence et la qualité de certains projets d'infrastructures soutenus dans le cadre des «nouvelles routes de la soie» ou encore sur la question des taux d'intérêt abusifs.

Cessons donc de battre notre coulpe au travers d'une évocation obsessionnelle d'un supposé déficit de financement. De nouvelles ressources sont à portée de main, au-delà d'une seule aide publique occidentale, dépensée à fonds perdus depuis des années. Les contribuables européens vous en sauront gré.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, en nombre del Grupo The Left. – Señora presidenta, la urgencia climática existe ahora y sus consecuencias se viven ya hoy, especialmente en el Sur Global, pero no únicamente. El año 2030 es tarde porque hoy ya vamos tarde.

La aceleración de la agenda de implementación de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible que propone este informe es bienvenida, pero el cambio climático no se soluciona, señorías, con palabras bonitas. Necesitamos acciones contundentes a la altura de la emergencia que vivimos y acciones coherentes con el desafío que enfrentamos. No basta con pintar de verde el capitalismo. No basta con añadir una etiqueta de sostenible a modelos de desarrollo basados en el crecimiento infinito.

La supuesta transición energética en el norte está aumentando el extractivismo depredador en el sur. Porque, para que haya coches eléctricos en Bruselas, en París o en Berlín, se necesitan minas que destruyen el territorio en Perú, Bolivia o Chile.

El capitalismo verde es inviable. La crisis climática solo puede enfrentarse desde la planificación ecosocialista de la economía, porque nuestras vidas valen mucho más que el puñado de beneficios de unas pocas empresas.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Fru talman! Kommissionär! Nu är det bara sju år kvar tills världens länder ska nå FN:s globala hållbarhetsmål. Det var 2015 som vi kom överens om att skapa en bättre värld för varandra och för kommande generationer. Men i stället går utvecklingen åt fel håll. Utsläppen fortsätter öka. Ojämligheten har blivit större, inte minst mellan kvinnor och män. Vi har krig i Europa och demokratin hotas i allt fler länder.

Vi måste kräva mer insatser från EU för att nå FN:s hållbarhetsmål. Vi måste öka takten i klimatomställningen, ta ett större ansvar för freden och demokratin och minska samhällsklyftorna och ojämlikheten.

För mig som socialdemokrat är det samma prioritering hemma i Sverige, i EU och ute i världen. Jag kommer att fortsätta mitt arbete för att vi ska nå FN:s hållbarhetsmål. Hoppas att du gör detsamma.

Max Orville (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, je souhaite féliciter la Commission européenne pour le premier examen volontaire de l'Union européenne sur les progrès réalisés dans la mise en œuvre des objectifs de développement durable. Nous mesurons tout le chemin accompli. Cependant, nous pouvons aller plus loin et nous devons faire mieux.

Atteindre les ODD, c'est améliorer la qualité des sols, de l'eau et de l'air, et prévenir les aléas climatiques. C'est garantir l'accès à une eau potable, par le renouvellement des réseaux de distribution. Atteindre les ODD, c'est aussi augmenter la production agricole locale par la diversification des cultures et par la création de nouvelles unités de transformation. Atteindre les ODD, c'est, enfin, accélérer le déploiement des énergies renouvelables, par la multiplication des éoliennes, des panneaux solaires ou encore des centrales géothermiques, en fonction des atouts des territoires.

Par notre vote demain, nous témoignerons de l'engagement politique de l'Union européenne et nous demanderons à la Commission d'élaborer une stratégie politique pragmatique et un plan de financement adapté.

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, colleagues, this could be the most significant week in our time as political leaders. We decide whether to pursue sustainable development and nature restoration or continue down the path of exploiting nature without considering the consequences for food safety, for climate, for biodiversity, for our health and well-being.

This report on the Sustainable Development Goals that we discussed today clearly states that continued biodiversity loss will undermine progress on 80 % of all Sustainable Development Goal targets.

Nature is the foundation of our wellbeing. This report calls for action, now. Citizens are calling for action, now. Businesses are calling for action, now. To implement nature restoration and halt biodiversity loss once and for all. In doing so, we make progress on 80 % of all other issues we face as a society and a parliament.

Well, this week we have the legislation on the table to do that. The Nature Restoration Law is a unique opportunity for the European Parliament to show leadership and ambition, and stop once and for all the disastrous decline of our natural world.

In doing so, we give ourselves a chance not just to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, but to change our relationship with nature for the better.

Robert Roos (ECR). – Voorzitter, geen armoede, geen honger, schoon water: daar kun je toch niet tegen zijn? Dat is de marketing achter de 17 SDG's die de Verenigde Naties aan landen en bedrijven willen opleggen.

De doelstellingen klinken op zichzelf inderdaad goed. Het beleid dat daar echter aan wordt gekoppeld, is omstreden. Zo leidt SDG 13 betreffende klimaatactie tot radicaal klimaatbeleid, verankert SDG 10 betreffende minder ongelijkheid de massale immigratie naar Europa en maakt SDG 5 betreffende gendergelijkheid genderideologie tot overheidsbeleid.

Of je daar nu voor of tegen bent; in een democratie hoort er een echt debat over plaats te vinden. Dit mag niet worden ingevoerd via een schimmig circuit van internationale organisaties, ngo's, grote bedrijven en filantropen.

Dit is echter precies wat er gebeurt en dit ondermijnt de democratie. De invoering verloopt weliswaar via het normale democratische proces, maar het beleid komt niet voort uit de wens van de bevolking. Het komt voort uit de machinerie van de macht. Ik vraag u daarom dit te verwerpen. Wie de belangen van de bevolking vertegenwoordigt, stemt tegen de SDG's.

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Madam President, let me start as chair of the Development Committee to thank our co-rapporteurs for a work well done. And also point out that we are halfway to 2030 and we are seriously off track to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. This is extremely concerning. In my view, I think it is crucial that the European Union now works together, especially with developing countries, our partner countries, to get back on track.

I would like to highlight three points to consider. Firstly, we need to improve the effectiveness and maximise the impact of our development cooperation. And secondly, we need to recognise that the private sector will play a critical role in achieving the SDGs. In this regard, the Global Gateway Initiative is a step in the right direction. And thirdly, and lastly, we need to strengthen partnership for the goals. The EU is uniquely placed to do this, given its proven record as a champion of multilateralism. Thereby, we also protect and strengthen the reputation as a credible and reliable partner, which is of crucial importance in the current year political context.

I hope that plenary will approve this important report because we need to step up our game.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Sinjura President, fadlilna inqas minn seba' snin sabiex nimplementaw l-Agenda 2030. Ghandna deċiżjoni ċara quddiemna: nistghu jew nużaw is- snin li għad fadal biex nuru lill- bqija tad- dinja illi m'ahniex lesti li nippratikaw dak li nippratikaw jew inkella nisfidaw l-istatus quo u npattu għaż- żmien mitluf b'azzjonijiet konkreti, speċjalment fuq l-ambjent u l-klima.

L-adozzjoni tar-reviżjoni volontarja fl-Unjoni Ewropea biex jitqabbel dak illi weghidna ma fejn attwalment wasalna kien pass fid-direzzjoni t-tajba. Madankollu, huwa tassew dizappuntanti illi dan jonqos milli jinkludi pjan konkret ta' azzjoni, sostnut minn finanzjament adegwat biex nindirizzaw l-istaġnar li qeghdin nesperjenzaw foqhma kruċjali, bhat-telf tal-bijodiversità li qiegħed jimmina l-progress f'madwar 80 % tal-miri għal Għanijiet ta' Żvilupp Sostenibbli. Minkejja dan il-pass pożittiv li sar bir-reviżjoni volontarja, iċ-ċittadini jistennew hafna iktar minn sempliċiment eżercizzju ta' rappurtar dwar kif il-gvernijiet qegħdin ifalluhom.

Dan huwa ż-żmien biex nuru li lesti nxammru l-kniem u nagħtu t-tama lura liċ-ċittadini permezz ta' azzjonijiet b'sahhithom illi jwassluna biex nilhqu l-miri ambjentali illi huma mistennija miċ-ċittadini.

Charles Goerens (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, il nous faut 4 200 milliards de dollars de plus pour réaliser les objectifs de développement durable, selon les Nations unies. L'aide publique au développement représente à peine 10 % de ce montant. C'est une tâche titanesque. L'Union européenne et ses États membres, le G7, le G20 et les Nations unies: tout le monde est interpellé, tout le monde doit assumer ses responsabilités.

Tous ces acteurs institutionnels, cependant, restent condamnés à échouer, à moins de pouvoir mobiliser des ressources indispensables. Les ressources qui vont devoir être mobilisées par le secteur privé représentent plus ou moins 4 % du produit intérieur brut mondial. Est-ce que c'est faisable? Oui, c'est faisable, mais il faut faire des choix, réorienter les politiques et réallouer les ressources.

Nous disposons d'un cadre politique, mais avons-nous aussi les instruments et les moyens de nos ambitions? Nous avons une boîte à outils qui est assez bien fournie, avec le «Global Gateway», la Banque européenne de reconstruction et de développement, la Banque européenne d'investissement, la KfW allemande, l'AFD française... Tout ça pour ça!

Si tous les autres continents étaient outillés de la même façon, je crois que l'espoir de pouvoir réaliser les objectifs de développement durable ne resterait pas illusoire.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, les objectifs de développement durable – les ODD – sont des objectifs qui sont largement partagés, tant par notre assemblée, nous venons de l'entendre, que par la Commission européenne. D'ailleurs, chaque commissaire a, dans sa lettre de mission, leur bonne exécution.

Pourtant, d'année en année, ici, alors que l'échéance de 2030 approche, les objectifs s'éloignent. C'est le même constat: l'absence de cohérence des politiques – alimentaires, énergétiques, mais aussi commerciales. J'ai demandé à des experts d'objectiver ces incohérences et d'évaluer la contribution de nos flux commerciaux à la réalisation des ODD. Tenez-vous bien: 80 % des flux commerciaux constituent des obstacles, je dis bien des obstacles, à leur réalisation.

Malheureusement, la Commission européenne, la DG TRADE, préfère se détourner de ces constats amers et poursuivre la logique de libre-échange, de croissance des flux commerciaux et d'exploitation des ressources des pays du Sud, aux antipodes de la durabilité. La tournée de M^{me} la présidente de la Commission européenne en Amérique latine pour vanter les mérites d'un accord commercial entre l'Europe et le Mercosur, dont les conséquences sociales et environnementales sont sans appel, confirme malheureusement que la politique commerciale n'est pas prête de contribuer positivement aux ODD. Il est donc grand temps d'assurer la cohérence des politiques.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señora presidente, la Agenda 2030 es el programa de las élites para apropiarse de todo. 500 000 millones de euros cada año de aquí a 2030. ¿Pero no han esquilado suficiente a las familias, empresas, agricultores, ganaderos, autónomos y pequeños empresarios? Ustedes no quieren transformar el mundo; quieren expropiarlo. Sin pudor, afirman que los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible son el único marco mundial compartido, y piden su imposición coactiva y totalitaria. Para ustedes, nada fuera de los ODS y nada contra los ODS. Como sigan así, a los que disentimos nos pondrán un brazalete de color.

No hay desarrollo sostenible sin crecimiento, familias fuertes, propiedad privada, libertad individual, arraigo a la nación, empleos estables, beneficios empresariales, y soberanía energética, alimentaria y sanitaria. No hay desarrollo sostenible si los ricos de Davos se imponen a las democracias parlamentarias.

Miren, yo no quiero un mundo en el que unos pocos toman decisiones en nombre de todos y se hacen dueños de la tierra, del capital financiero, de la información y de los datos, y el resto vive en la esclavitud bajo un régimen de terror ideológico y de servidumbre moral a cambio de unas pocas migajas. Abren paso a la libertad, que nosotros vamos para allá.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, the Sustainable Development Goals provide a roadmap for global development encompassing a broad range of interconnected issues, from poverty eradication to climate action, from gender equality to responsible consumption and production. The most effective way to deliver on the SDGs is by ensuring that the goals are fully embedded in planned activity of each government department in each Member State.

Major challenges exist in this respect. Interlinkages between the goals mean that progress in one area can have repercussions on another. This therefore requires the holistic and integrated approach to implementation.

As the EU presents its first voluntary review this year, the EU must stand up and show real leadership in the implementation of the SDGs to deliver the 2030 Agenda. The details of such leadership will require additional debate, particularly when we speak of the portfolios of the next College of Commissioners, but more importantly, we should ensure that an adequate monitoring system is in place, backed up by the resources needed to keep us on track to meet our targets.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è chiaro che quest'anno sarà assolutamente decisivo per la realizzazione degli obiettivi di sviluppo sostenibile e che noi dobbiamo, con la dovuta franchezza e con una buona dose di realismo, analizzare le carenze e affrontarne le contraddizioni.

Oggi, a poco più di sei anni dalla scadenza fissata del 2030, realizziamo di essere, purtroppo, lontani dalla meta, e che su alcuni punti, penso in particolare a povertà e disuguaglianze, il quadro si è ulteriormente aggravato.

A questo si aggiunge il drammatico incrocio tra guerra e cambiamenti climatici, che rischia di peggiorare la situazione colpendo in particolare territori e popolazioni già più vulnerabili. Serve tenere insieme lotta alla povertà, politiche di sviluppo, politiche di contrasto ai cambiamenti climatici, e farlo attraverso un impegno rinnovato e più forte.

L'Unione europea deve essere in prima linea su questa sfida, integrando maggiormente gli obiettivi di sviluppo sostenibile nelle sue politiche e, soprattutto, riportando queste priorità concretamente nella costruzione dei partenariati internazionali.

Stéphane Bijoux (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, les sept dernières années ont été les plus chaudes jamais enregistrées sur la planète, et cette urgence climatique réduit fortement notre capacité à réaliser les objectifs de développement durable, d'autant plus que le rouleau compresseur climatique déferle absolument partout.

Il faut agir beaucoup plus vite; il faut surtout agir différemment. C'est d'ailleurs l'esprit du grand sommet international organisé à Paris dans quelques jours, à l'initiative du président Emmanuel Macron et de l'État caribéen de la Barbade.

L'objectif de ce nouveau pacte financier mondial est de trouver de nouveaux fonds pour aider les pays en développement à réaliser ces objectifs de développement durable. Dans ce combat commun pour la planète, nous devons justement mettre en commun ce que nous avons de meilleur: l'innovation, le partage de solutions et la coopération. Cette intelligence collective est un impératif et nous en avons absolument besoin.

Pär Holmgren (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman! Det ser verkligen inte bra ut. Det är inte ett enda land i världen som är på väg att nå de hållbara utvecklingsmålen. Och vad beror det på? För det första har vi så klart alldeles för låga ambitioner i klimatomställningen. För det andra ser vi inte till att rädda den biologiska mångfalden. Och för det tredje förstår vi inte helheten – att vi måste arbeta både med ekologisk hållbarhet och social hållbarhet.

Här inom EU skulle vi kunna arbeta fullt ut med den gröna given. Men då har vi högergruppen, framför allt, som motarbetar och försvagar den när vi skulle behöva förbättra den.

Det enda jag kan se som positivt är att jag vet att det finns många företag, många i näringslivet, som arbetar aktivt med de hållbara utvecklingsmålen, men tyvärr ofta med ett eller två eller tre av dem utan att se helheten. Och vad beror det på då? Ja, återigen, så klart, att vi politiskt inte har tillräckligt höga ambitioner och inte förmår att se helheten. Vi måste bli mycket duktigare på det.

Jessica Polfjärd (PPE). – Fru talman! Målen för hållbar utveckling är och ska vara vägledande för vårt politiska arbete. Mycket har redan gjorts, men mycket mer behöver göras. Dessvärre ser vi nu att utvecklingen går åt helt fel håll på flera områden, inte minst i svallvågorna efter den globala pandemin och Rysslands brutala och olagliga krig i Ukraina.

Den här utvecklingen måste vändas. Vi måste hamna på rätt kurs igen. Då behövs det tydliga och effektiva åtgärder och samarbete och engagemang från samhällets alla olika aktörer.

Kärnan i hållbarhetsmålen måste vara det som vi fokuserar på. Annars kommer vi att missa målen. Det håller inte att, som vissa politiska grupper i det här huset, prioriterar att plocka inhemska politiska poänger i frågor som inte har med hållbarhetsmålen att göra. Därför måste vi samarbeta. Näringslivet måste hjälpa till. Och vi vet att vi i politiken måste göra det vi kan.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, os Objetivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável das Nações Unidas têm de continuar a ser o guia, apesar do atual contexto de incerteza.

E se a guerra na Ucrânia e a pandemia afetaram o nosso progresso, também importa mencionarmos os êxitos. E, aqui, tenho a destacar o bom desempenho de Portugal, que, desde 2015, com o Governo socialista e sob os olhares do mundo, cumpre com a maior parte dos indicadores, muitos deles já atingidos.

Falamos de objetivos concretos: na área da saúde, com medidas inovadoras na saúde materna infantil; no combate ao tabaco; na qualidade da água; nas energias renováveis e na redução das emissões dos gases com efeito de estufa. E o compromisso dos socialistas em Portugal com os Objetivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável reflète-se, também, aqui no Parlamento Europeu, ao assumirmos as lideranças das lutas mais importantes.

Porque faltam só sete anos – faltam sete anos apenas –, e não há tempo a perder. Não há espaço para hesitações quando falamos de melhorar a vida das pessoas, quando falamos de melhorar o bem-estar das pessoas.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospa predsednica. Vse od podpisa agende za trajnostni razvoj želi Unija postati vodilna sila doseganja zastavljenih ciljev. Do leta 2030 jih želimo doseči, kajne?

In v tem mandatu smo z zelenim dogovorom začeli s koraki v pravo smer. Pa se je zgodila pandemija. In vzpostavili smo skupno reševanje zdravstvenih problematik, pa je na kontinent vstopila vojna in z njo energetska in finančna kriza.

Na težave, ki se vrstijo, nismo pripravljeni, medtem ko se večajo neenakosti in poglabljajo okoljski, zdravstveni, finančni, prehranski, socialni izzivi.

Morali bi se naučiti, da takšnih vsevključujočih izzivov ne moremo rešiti z majhnimi, razdrobljenimi sektorskimi rešitvami. Ampak očitno se nismo. Leto 2030 je namreč za vogoalom in strategije in finančnega načrta za implementacijo agende še vedno ni, četudi smo Komisijo k pripravi obojega pozvali v enakem poročilu že lani.

Naj bo tokratni poziv bolj uspešen, ker je čas za akcijo, za ljudi, planet, blaginjo in nenazadnje za mir in svobodo.

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ*Wiceprzewodnicząca*

Francisco Guerreiro (Verts/ALE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, creio que os Objetivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável estão em risco, mas estão em risco não porque temos falta de ferramentas ou da quantificação de onde é que temos que chegar, mas, sobretudo, porque temos grupos políticos que negam, efetivamente, que existem desafios a serem cumpridos por esses objetivos.

E falo do grupo da extrema-direita – que não está aqui representado por ninguém, atualmente –, que nega factos evidentes como as alterações climáticas e o impacto da perda de biodiversidade. Mas, pior do que este negacionismo claro que temos neste Parlamento Europeu, e em vários parlamentos nacionais, nós temos um fator acrescido, que é o centro democrático de direita que está a cair na armadilha da extrema-direita.

Portanto, esta semana, temos uma das grandes leis que vai ser debatida e votada, a Lei do Restauro da Natureza, e vamos ver de que lado é que estão os democratas-cristãos e alguns liberais. Se estão, efetivamente, do lado dos Objetivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável ou se estão do lado do radicalismo e do negacionismo da extrema-direita.

Dace Melbārde (PPE). – Priekšsēdētāja! Es vēlos runāt par ziņojumā izteikto atziņu, ka, ja visi pasaules iedzīvotāji patērētu dabas resursu tikpat daudz, cik Eiropas Savienības iedzīvotāji, tad vajadzētu divas astoņas zemeslodes, lai uzturētu šo pieprasījumu. Šajā kontekstā vēlos vaicāt, kolēģi, vai mums nebūtu kritiskāk jāparaugās uz eiropiešu dzīvesveida ēnas pusēm. Acīmredzot, ne viss, kas cauri gadsimtiem ir veidojies Rietumeiropas kultūrā, ir aizsargājams un veicināms, un es šeit tieši domāju — patēriņa kultūru.

Diemžēl ziņojums nerunā par, vai es pat teiktu, ignorē kultūras dimensiju, bet tieši kultūra kā vērtību kopums, dzīvesveids un līdzāspastāvēšanas formas vistiešāk ietekmē mūsu izvēles un rīcības ikdienā. Nenovērtējama loma šeit, protams, ir izglītībai. 2030. gadā sagaidāmais rezultāts ir jaunas kvalitātes laikmets, bet tāds nav iespējams ar vecā domāšanas veida sabiedrību. Tāpēc izglītībai patiesi ir jāklūst par ilgtspējīgas attīstības dienaskārtības prioritāti, un sava loma ir jāspēlē arī kultūrai kā vērtību nesējai.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, vivemos um tempo de turbulência global. Um tempo em que as referências, os valores e a lucidez na visão podem e devem fazer a diferença.

A União Europeia, tendo em conta a parceria pela liberdade, pela paz e pela dignidade que a sustenta, o foco numa adequada implementação e entrega do cumprimento dos Objetivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável tem de ser uma prioridade distintiva.

As pessoas não são números. O sucesso das políticas não pode ser medido apenas pelos indicadores económicos tradicionais. Impactos transversais necessitam de indicadores transversais. Quando nos propomos desenvolver parcerias entre iguais, são os Objetivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável que nos devem inspirar, para assegurar práticas de diligência devida, justiça climática e mútua capacitação.

Saúdo os relatores por terem conseguido expressar neste relatório esta perspetiva, que tem de ser aplicada nas avaliações do Semestre Europeu, mas também na formulação e na concretização dos acordos de parceria global da União Europeia.

Christophe Clergeau (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, après la crise de la COVID-19, la question de la santé doit redevenir une priorité au cœur des objectifs de développement durable. Quelle sera la prochaine épidémie, et donc la prochaine crise? Nous ne le savons pas, mais croire qu'il n'y en aura pas serait une grave erreur. Puisque les épidémies viennent de l'extérieur, l'intérêt de l'Europe est de se mobiliser pour des progrès rapides en matière de santé partout dans le monde.

D'abord, pousser l'approche «Une seule santé», qui combine santé environnementale, santé alimentaire, santé animale et santé humaine. Ensuite, structurer des mécanismes de réaction rapide face à l'émergence des épidémies, ces mécanismes étant aujourd'hui inexistantes dans de nombreux pays. Il faut renforcer également la résilience des systèmes de santé, aussi bien pour déployer des campagnes de vaccination que pour faire face à un afflux de malades. Rendre accessibles, enfin, les médicaments essentiels. L'ouverture de la propriété intellectuelle des vaccins n'est pas la seule réponse; il faut aussi permettre la production sur place à des prix adaptés des vaccins, des médicaments et du matériel médical.

Si nous voulons être au rendez-vous des ODD, nous devons ouvrir deux chemins: d'une part, préparer les sociétés aux crises et les rendre capables d'y faire face dans la solidarité et la cohésion; d'autre part, développer partout une souveraineté sanitaire pour permettre des réponses locales efficaces et éviter le chaos mondial.

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Madam President, renewable energies, decent jobs, sustainable industry, reducing inequalities and fighting climate change, these sustainable development goals are key topics for the EU. Sustainability is also about changing the EU economy and initiatives such as Fit for 55. On this aspect, ambitions and objectives are good, maybe, but implementation is even more important. But we need to accelerate our efforts. We should decarbonise, recycle, build more renewable energy and renewable hydrogen instead of using fossil fuels. With the Net-Zero Industry Act, the Critical Raw Materials Act and the Hydrogen Bank, we fight climate change and create conditions for a more sustainable and innovative industry. But we also have to create quality jobs. If not eradicate, then at least decrease the poverty. Now, we are less than seven years before deadline, and from a global point of view, we are a bit off track. These goals are not a revolution that can poor people in the world make richer. We need less think about us and them and we have to work together and strengthen international partnerships to achieve our goals.

Ilan De Basso (S&D). – Fru talman! De globala målen ger vägledning för hur vi gemensamt ska ta oss an framtiden. Trots att vissa framsteg har gjorts är vi långt ifrån färdiga. Fattigdom och ojämlikhet ökar i vår värld. Hundratals miljoner barn och unga vuxna har exempelvis inte tillgång till utbildning. Antalet människor som befinner sig i modernt slaveri ökar, och i mängd och mycket är det de rika länderna som har bidragit till denna negativa utveckling.

Det är inte bara oroväckande – det är oacceptabelt. Att EU lever upp till våra löften och globala åtaganden är en fråga om legitimitet och trovärdighet. Det är också en förutsättning för vår säkerhet. Därför blir jag oroad när medlemsstater, däribland mitt eget hemland Sverige, skär ner på biståndet och det internationella arbetet i en tid när vi faktiskt behöver det som allra mest.

Men det finns hopp. Riktningen är utstakad och vi behöver leverera. Vi kan och måste göra mer för en hållbar utveckling i vår omvärld, för det är också bra för Europa.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, there is a lot that is positive in this report – fair play to Petros and Udo. Paragraph 77 demands reforms in the methodology of measuring economic performance so that progress is based on the well-being of people and of the planet. Paragraph 78 calls on the Commission to develop beyond-GDP indicators that incorporate societal and environmental factors.

It is heartening to see a growing interest in alternative measures of economic progress. However, the report ignores the fundamental problem with the SDGs themselves. Goal eight of this of the Sustainable Development Goals calls for continued global economic growth equivalent to 3% per year to achieve the human development objectives. Of course, regional development in the Global South needs to continue, but surely not in the developed north. Global economic growth is incompatible with environmental protection targets. We need to reject the endless growth imperative for the good of the people and the planet.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, talking about the Sustainable Development Goals is a bit like the discussion on child labour the other night. We all wring our hands and say 'Oh God, isn't it desperate'. But we never joined the dots. We never ask enough about why are people poor and hungry, and what role did we play in making them so. Because it's not a random act of God. These are the consequences of our actions. Sustainable development is an impossibility against the backdrop of unfettered growth, against the backdrop of an economic system which puts profit before people.

We talk about peace as being a goal. Well, let's look at Afghanistan – a country where 47% of the 42 million population is under 15 years old, 15.2 million children are in need of humanitarian assistance and 2.3 million face acute malnutrition. And this after 40 years of conflict, a third year of drought and sanctions. If we want sustainable development, we could start by butting out of these countries!

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for your interventions.

To be very concrete, at the High-level Political Forum and the SDG Summit we can expect to be in the spotlight. The European Union unity and clear messages in support of the SDGs will therefore be key. Thank you for your remarks, observations to give some ideas, maybe to the preparation of those events.

In an increasingly fragmented geopolitical landscape, it will be crucial for the European Union to present the voluntary review as a collective EU effort, a testament to our commitment to the SDGs both in our international and internal policies and as part of our global gateway strategy. I am very pleased that with your remarks – and the rapporteurs have explained the details of the proposal contained in the report – maybe we will have the possibility to have an effective role in those events and to show the leadership of the European Union in the way to implement the SDGs.

Udo Bullmann, *Berichterstatter*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Ich möchte mich bei allen Kolleginnen und Kollegen bedanken, die sich an der Aussprache so rege beteiligt haben. Die Debatte, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, hat die Dringlichkeit unterstrichen, mit der wir zum Handeln aufgerufen sind, und dafür gibt es Gelegenheiten.

Es ist erwähnt worden: Wir gehen im Juli zum *High-level Political Forum* der Vereinten Nationen in New York. Es gibt im September ein Treffen der Vereinten Nationen, das sich dezidiert der Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie und ihrer Halbzeitbilanz widmen wird – da müssen wir präsent sein, da müssen wir sprechen. Aber es gibt auch schon eine Gelegenheit nächste Woche in Paris: bei der Internationalen Konferenz zur Entwicklungsfinanzierung.

Bitte lassen Sie uns nicht vergessen, dass die Hälfte der Länder mit niedrigem und mittlerem Einkommen unter einer unermesslichen Schuldenlast leidet und dass es die konkrete Gefahr gibt, dass der Globale Süden ausgebremst wird, von Schulden erdrückt. Hier müssen wir handeln. Es muss eine Beteiligung auch der privaten Geldgeber an der Schuldenerleichterung geben. Und wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass diejenigen Länder belohnt werden, die in die Nachhaltigkeitsziele investieren, in die Bildung ihrer Kinder, in die Chancen ihrer Jugendlichen, in die Nachhaltigkeit ihrer Arbeitsplätze der Zukunft.

Lassen Sie uns mit einem starken Votum morgen mit einer Stimme sprechen und damit auch mit einem starken Bericht nach New York gehen. Lassen Sie uns die Kommission unterstützen in dem Versuch, eine Führungsrolle zu übernehmen. Wir müssen zusammenarbeiten. Das ist das Gebot der Stunde. Die Welt braucht das, und wir können sie dabei unterstützen.

Petros Kokkalis, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, colleagues, thank you very much for this lively conversation and this great participation in today's debate. It really goes to show that the Sustainable Development Goals are a holistic system to address the general problems in our societies, in our economy, and there is a platform of unity where colleagues from all the political parties, except those from the extreme right, can discuss, can find common space, can look for measurable and evidence-based progress criteria, progress proof or non-progress proof, or lack thereof.

I think that we are united in our respect for fundamental human rights, not only in Europe, across the world, for all the billions of people that are alive today and I'm sorry to say that quite a few have again died and drowned – an unknown number drowned just outside the borders or just inside the borders of Greece today. In these coming years of crisis, we really have to pull together and make sure that we have no one to spare, that all the people on this planet have the same, equal fundamental rights, and it is our job to make sure that we can make this work, within the planetary boundaries and with proper social cohesion and humanity from one to the other.

I'm sure we will do a good job supporting the Commission and representing this House in New York in the high-level political forum in the next week, in the next month, in July, and we have an opportunity, using the European Union voluntary review, to express our leadership and bring the world forward with us in this great endeavour and difficult years ahead.

I would like to thank you and close by recognising the work of Anastasia Panayiotou in bringing the Sustainable Development Goals to the Greek language five years ago.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 15 czerwca 2023 r.

18. Ampliación del mandato de la Fiscalía Europea para incluir los delitos de vulneración de las medidas restrictivas de la Unión (debate)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad:

— pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Rady przez Juana Fernando Lópeza Aguilara w imieniu Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych w sprawie rozszerzenia mandatu Prokuratury Europejskiej w odniesieniu do przestępstwa naruszenia unijnych środków ograniczających (O-000022/2023 – B9-0023/23) (2023/2671(RSP)),

— pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Komisji przez Juana Fernando Lópeza Aguilara w imieniu Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych w sprawie rozszerzenia mandatu Prokuratury Europejskiej w odniesieniu do przestępstwa naruszenia unijnych środków ograniczających (O-000023/2023 – B9-0024/23) (2023/2671(RSP)).

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, author. – Madam President, Commissioner Reynders, yet again it is my honour to submit on behalf of the Committee for Justice and Home Affairs this oral question to the Council and the Commission as to the extension of the mandate of the European Public Prosecutor regarding the criminal offence of the violation of EU restrictive measures.

You know how it's like: ever since Putin's regime – Russian President Vladimir Putin – launched his war of aggression against neighbouring Ukraine, we from the European Parliament, the European Union, have done everything in our hands in order to show not only solidarity but also active support to Ukraine and Ukrainians. As to the military dimension, which is beyond our jurisdiction, there is little to say, but as to the humanitarian dimension, of course, we've supported all the way the final activation of Temporary Protection Directive, we've supported the solidarity effort, we've called for action, for the European Commission to coordinate that solidarity in order to prevent human trafficking on the borders of the neighbouring countries. We have supported, under the legal and criminal dimension of the conflict, every effort to put in place joint investigating teams to cooperate with the public prosecutor of the International Criminal Court in The Hague.

Finally, we agreed to set in motion an urgent procedure as to a new piece of legislation initiated by yourself, Commissioner Reynders, to put in place the extension, within the ambit of Article 83 of the Treaty of Functioning of European Union, defining the so-called 'EU crimes', the crimes which are listed as relevant EU crimes, the violation of EU restrictive measures, that is to add that violation to the list of EU crimes.

The first step allowed the Commission to draw on the directive's proposal to harmonise across the European Union the definition – that is the purpose – and the common penalties, definition and penalties regarding this new EU crime. We are currently working on this proposal in the European Parliament, and we are going to adopt swiftly, that's for sure, a mandate in order to allow as soon as possible that the prosecution and conviction of the violation of restrictive measures is finally set forth throughout the EU.

Nevertheless, we are also aware that investigation and prosecution of such crimes will mostly remain the responsibility of Member States and their national laws. Very few violators of EU restrictive measures are actually held accountable. The reason is that many Member States do not show sufficient priority to list those crimes. That inconsistent enforcement of restrictive measures undermines its effectiveness. It is really regretful, actually, a shame that the European Public Prosecutor cannot prosecute such crimes so far.

Indeed, they are related to the protection of financial interests of the EU. That is the jurisdiction of the European Public Prosecutor. By now, under the so-called PIF, the Protection of Financial Interests of the European Union Directive, of which I was rapporteur and for which the European Public Prosecutor is competent, the European Public Prosecutor has already proven its efficacy in investigating and prosecuting crimes falling under its mandate. It's there. It's in action. It's been there for almost two years now. This new so-called Union Agency for Law Enforcement. A great success! We are proud of its delivery. So it is time for the European Union to act in this regard. That is why this European Parliament is resolved to act, but the institutional set-up so far has limited that role of the European Public Prosecutor in this field of action. We therefore ask the Commission and the Council the following questions.

First, do you agree that extending the competence of the European Public Prosecutor to include the crime of violation of Union restrictive measures would help ensure that crimes are investigated and prosecuted in a homogeneous and more efficient way across the European Union?

Second, do the Council and the Commission support the initiative of several Member States, numbering nine by now, to this effect?

Third, what actions will the Commission and the Council take to this end?

I am looking forward to your responses and reactions – Council, the Swedish Presidency, the Commission and Commissioner Reynders.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, the Presidency's top priority is security and Ukraine. The sanctions against Russia are proving effective as they are weakening Russia's economic base, depriving its critical technologies and markets, and impeding its ability to wage war.

The Council rapidly agreed in November 2022 to add the violation of the Union restrictive measures to the list of EU crimes laid down in Article 83(1) of the Treaty on the Function of the European Union. This rapid agreement reflects the Council's commitment to counter the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine.

Last week, the Justice and Home Affairs Council reached a position on two key legislative proposals which will greatly enhance the effectiveness of actions at both EU and national level on this matter. The first one concerns the criminalisation of violation of sanctions. The second one concerns extended powers of confiscation, including violation of EU sanctions.

We look forward to the interinstitutional negotiations with Parliament to finalise these instruments as soon as possible. Your support for these files is of utmost importance to ensuring a robust prosecution of violations of EU sanctions. The Council welcomes the activities developed by the European Public Prosecutor's Office during the first two years of operation, which reflects the investigation and prosecution capacities of EPPO.

The Council attaches great importance to the fact that EPPO will be able to further develop its activities and perform its important tasks in the most efficient way. Having a strong and well-functioning office is important to protect the financial interests of the EU, which currently constitutes the scope of EPPO's activities.

The idea of extending EPPO's competence to violation of restrictive measures has been mentioned during several ministerial debates on the response to Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine last week. The proposal to extend EPPO's competence was raised by several Member States during the discussion on investigation and prosecution of EU restrictive measures in the Justice and Home Affairs Council. Several Member States have also sent a joint paper to the Commission raising the issue mentioned just now.

At this stage, it is too early to indicate whether there is a sufficient support for such a proposal amongst Member States. As you are already aware, a decision to extend EPPO's competence would require a unanimous decision by the European Council.

In order to get a clearer view of the situation, the Presidency will put this issue on the agenda of a meeting at a technical level before the end of this month. After that meeting, we will consider possible next steps. Irrespective of any developments on this issue, it is pertinent to point out that the Council, in any case, is very committed to ensuring compliance with EU sanctions together with a robust criminal law approach.

At the same Council meeting last week, Ministers of Justice held a discussion and shared experience and best practices on measures taken on a national level to ensure efficient and investigations and prosecutions. Eurojust and Europol also participated in the debate. This was a very useful discussion and one I hope that will contribute to further strengthening of the efforts of investigation and prosecution of EU restrictive measures.

I am looking forward to the debate and thank you for your attention.

Didier Reynders, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Ministre, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je vous remercie pour ce débat sur l'extension des compétences du Parquet européen aux violations des sanctions européennes. Dans le contexte de l'agression de la Russie contre l'Ukraine, ces sanctions constituent l'un des outils les plus essentiels dont nous disposons. Comme vous le savez, des mesures restrictives sont également adoptées par l'Union dans une série d'autres contextes. À ce jour, l'Union a adopté dix paquets de sanctions à l'encontre de la Russie. La Commission et le Haut Représentant ont présenté une proposition de onzième paquet, actuellement en discussion.

La mise en œuvre efficace de ces sanctions est une priorité, y compris avec le concours de la justice pénale. À cet effet, la Commission a déjà pris plusieurs initiatives pour soutenir les États membres dans cette mission cruciale. Il s'agit notamment de la mise en place, dès mars 2022, du groupe de travail «Gel et saisie».

Par ailleurs, je me réjouis d'entamer bientôt avec le Parlement et le Conseil des négociations interinstitutionnelles sur la proposition de directive relative à la violation des sanctions de l'Union. Cette proposition contribuera de manière cruciale à renforcer la mise en œuvre des sanctions européennes et à assurer une harmonisation des définitions des infractions et des niveaux de sanctions dans l'ensemble de l'Union. Le Conseil a adopté une orientation générale la semaine dernière, et je remercie votre Parlement, notamment la commission LIBE et la rapporteure Sophia in 't Veld, pour leur engagement dans ce dossier.

La question que nous sommes appelés à discuter aujourd'hui concerne le rôle que le Parquet européen pourrait jouer dans ce contexte. Nous venons de célébrer les deux années d'activité opérationnelle du Parquet européen, marquées par des résultats impressionnants, en particulier le nombre d'enquêtes ouvertes et le montant des saisies.

First, let me stress that the Commission is fully committed to ensuring that the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) can perform its current tasks effectively. To some extent, this task already concerns the enforcement of EU sanctions.

As recalled by the European Chief Prosecutor on various occasions, the EPPO is already competent to investigate and prosecute certain cases of violations of sanctions when they are inextricably linked to crimes affecting the EU budget. For example, customs fraud concerning the import of certain goods prohibited under EU sanctions. This role is acknowledged by the proposed directive on sanctions violations. The proposal, in fact, provides that Member States' competent authorities, the Commission, Eurojust, Europol and the EPPO should cooperate with each other within their respective mandates.

A possible extension of the EPPO's competence to the violation of EU sanctions would make its role much more prominent. We are open to supporting such an evolution. In accordance with Article 86 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the competence of the EPPO can be extended to areas of serious crime with a cross-border dimension other than those areas already listed in this article.

In terms of procedure, such a possible extension of the EPPO's competence would require a decision of the European Council by unanimity of all the 27 Member States, after having obtained the consent of the European Parliament and having consulted the Commission. The feasibility of this avenue depends, therefore, on the position of the Member States.

I am aware that at least 10 Member States would support a limited extension of the EPPO's mandate to the violations of sanctions. We have discussed this issue again recently in the Justice Council last Friday. As I explained, a clear position of all the Member States is very important, because we need to have the support of all, including the Member States that are not participating in the enhanced cooperation on which the EPPO relies. That is needed in order to extend the competence.

From the Commission's side, we are open to work on it and to assess the feasibility of extending the EPPO's competence to these offences in the context and within the timelines of existing reporting activities. In April 2022, the Commission launched an in-depth study to assess the implementation of the EPPO Regulation by the Member States, as well as additional issues on the effectiveness and efficiency of the EPPO and its working practices. The study will be concluded in the summer. It could provide the right context subsequently to have a first substantial discussion on a possible extension of the EPPO's competence to violation of sanctions and the potential financial, technical and human resource implications for the EPPO.

It is therefore very important to continue to work urgently on the proposal for a directive on the violation of sanctions. Through such discussions, it will be possible to continue the preparation of a possible extension of the competence of the EPPO, if we have the capacity to convince the Member States to support such an extension.

I said last Friday that we have seen that at least 10 Member States would support such an extension. We will continue to work to see if it is possible to reach to reach unanimity. I thank you for your questions. I thank you for your attention and of course, I am looking forward to further debate.

Leopoldo López Gil, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, como ponente alternativo del Grupo PPE del informe relativo a la propuesta de Directiva por la que se definen las infracciones y sanciones penales por la vulneración de las medidas restrictivas de la Unión, acojo de manera favorable esta pregunta sobre la extensión del mandato de la Fiscalía Europea.

Las medidas restrictivas de la Unión Europea que se imponen a los violadores de derechos humanos y a aquellos que socavan la democracia en sus países son una herramienta fundamental de la política exterior y de seguridad de la Unión para castigar a los criminales. Pero, de todas formas, la potestad de imponer y asegurarse de que estas sanciones se cumplan es de los Estados miembros.

Desde el Parlamento Europeo, consideramos lamentable la falta de voluntad de algunos a la hora de aplicarlas. La extensión de las competencias de la Fiscalía Europea al nuevo delito al que se refiere esta Directiva, el de la violación de las medidas restrictivas en la Unión, es una buena propuesta debido al carácter transnacional de estos delitos, ya que supondría una mejora significativa en el enjuiciamiento y en la aplicación efectiva de las sanciones penales a los criminales.

Por último, termino pidiendo también mucha cautela. No queremos sobrecargar a una institución que acaba de entrar en funcionamiento y todavía no cuenta con plena participación de los veintisiete Estados miembros. Lo pedimos.

Thijs Reuten, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear Minister, sometimes I wonder how a Russian oligarch or a human rights violator experiences being under sanctions, under restrictive measures – as a mere nuisance, I guess, and as something to work around.

With 27 Member States implementing EU sanctions at their own discretion we facilitate circumvention in a way, and criminals on our sanction list eagerly take advantage of it. In addition, they hire the best lawyers and the best advisors. I think expanding EPPOs competencies can be an important building block to increase the effectiveness of our restrictive measures.

But as you explained, Minister, we need the political will. My question is not to elaborate on the details of alternative routes, but do you see alternatives besides muddling through and accepting that the sanctions remain ineffective? We need to establish at least, first and foremost, that we need a solution. If we want our restrictive measures to hit their target then we only have one option: to show unity in adopting them, but also in enforcing them.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, Minister, as the rapporteur for the Directive on 'VURM', as we call it – the violation of Union restrictive measures – I am very committed to working fast and concluding the file as quickly as possible, and I am glad to say that all the groups have committed to that because everybody understands the importance of this piece of legislation. But we also know that in practice European law tends to be applied very unevenly, and in this case that would be of benefit for the perpetrators, for the persons who have been put under sanctions, and we do not, of course, want to give them any opportunity to go shopping around for places where they can escape the sanctions.

Therefore, in addition to the national competence for the application, we call – and you can hear that there is broad consensus here – for the extension of the mandate of EPPO to include all types of violations of Union restrictive measures in order to really strongly enhance the uniform enforcement of the directive.

Finally, I would like to say that eventually EPPO will be subject to an evaluation, but I think that even before doing the evaluation we can say that EPPO is doing a fantastic job. I'm already convinced that if they are put in charge of this, then they would really greatly contribute to the effective application of this measure.

Saskia Bricmont, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, ces derniers mois, l'Union européenne a adopté de nombreux régimes de sanctions à l'encontre de personnes, mais aussi d'entités, dans le contexte notamment de la guerre menée par la Russie en Ukraine.

Deux dimensions préoccupent mon groupe. D'abord, les conséquences de ces sanctions pour les acteurs humanitaires et les droits fondamentaux. Ce sont des priorités dans le cadre de nos travaux en cours sur la directive relative aux sanctions.

Une deuxième dimension concerne l'efficacité de ces régimes de sanctions. Ils sont devenus un outil privilégié de la politique étrangère européenne, mais, avec leur multiplication, le contournement de ces mesures s'est également intensifié, au profit d'intermédiaires peu scrupuleux, d'autocrates et de criminels financiers qui sévissent sans devoir répondre de leurs actes. Pourquoi? Eh bien, parce que nos États n'accordent pas la priorité à ce sujet et ne mettent pas les moyens nécessaires pour assurer les enquêtes et la mise en œuvre effective de ces sanctions. Cette absence de priorisation se reflète d'ailleurs dans l'attitude du Conseil.

Face à ces constats, nous demandons un mécanisme de mise en œuvre européen. Cette mission revient pour nous au Parquet européen, dont le bilan dans la lutte contre les crimes financiers est, vous l'avez dit, Monsieur le Commissaire, impressionnant. Le Parquet européen a non seulement les compétences requises, mais certaines des infractions concernées sont déjà couvertes par les infractions douanières qu'il traite. Nous estimons que le savoir-faire du Parquet européen représente une grande valeur ajoutée dans ce contexte, de nature à pallier ces contournements de sanctions.

Vous l'avez aussi dit, dix États membres se sont déjà positionnés en faveur de l'extension du mandat du Parquet européen, et je m'en réjouis. Nous comptons donc réellement sur la présidence du Conseil pour embarquer les 17 autres dans leur sillage. Je suis aussi contente d'entendre que la Commission européenne est disposée à poursuivre les travaux. Seriez-vous aussi prêts à déposer une proposition sur la table du Parlement?

Clare Daly, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, I think the real question here isn't who should enforce the directive, but whether we should be passing it at all. What we're doing here is creating a new EU crime – violation of sanctions – rushed through without an impact assessment, with almost zero opportunity for stakeholders or rights bodies to have an impulse. But we're on a crusade and to hell with the consequences!

And there will be consequences. Recently, the UN Special Rapporteur on sanctions published a letter about this directive. She raised a laundry list of rights concerns: due process rights; access to justice; freedom of expression; arbitrariness; fair trials rights; the privilege against self-incrimination. It's all there.

Not to mention the devastating impact that the directive will have on humanitarian work and the people who rely on it. There are 361 million people in need of humanitarian aid right now – 60% of them in countries under sanction. We're killing people with sanctions, but nobody seems to care. But mass murder, even if you think you're doing it for the right reasons, is still mass murder. We shouldn't be passing this directive at all!

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, protiv sam trenda prebacivanja ovlasti sa zemalja članica na Uniju i miješanja Bruxellesa u sve i svašta. Sustavu Ureda europskog javnog tužitelja pristupile su tek 22 od 27 zemalja članica, a njegov mandat ograničen je na kaznena djela koja utječu na financijske interese Unije.

Tužna je istina da postoje zemlje koje se sporo obračunavaju s korupcijom, čije je pravosuđe paralizirano i čiji tužitelji nemaju hrabrosti podignuti optužnice protiv svojih moćnika. Kad hrvatski EPPO i podigne neku optužnicu, čekaju ga opet hrvatski sudovi, sudovi hrvatskog pravosuđa, poslovično neučinkoviti i spori. To u kompletu nije ozbiljna borba protiv korupcije.

Tužna je također istina da je i Bruxelles mnogo godina ignorirao zloupotrebu novca iz fondova jer se time kupovala poslušnost vlasti i s njima povezanih ljudi u državama članicama. Građani žele vidjeti ozbiljnu borbu protiv korupcije u Europi, a posebno u Hrvatskoj. Dajmo tom EPPO-u u šansu da pokaže koliko je ozbiljan. EPPO u Hrvatskoj mora optužiti još mnogo kriminalaca i mora se dokazati, dokazati prije nego bi mu se možda dale neke šire ovlasti. Proširenje ovlasti o kojem se ovdje govori, nekakva kaznena djela uslijed kršenja međunarodnih sankcija je kontraproduktivno, kao i same sankcije, a dodatne ovlasti i dodatan posao samo bi preopteretili ionako skromne ljudske i financijske resurse i maknuli fokus s pljačke sredstava iz europskih fondova.

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Bardzo ważna rzecz rozszerzenie tego mandatu o ściganie przestępstw, które związane są z naruszaniem sankcji, bo mamy dziesięć pakietów sankcyjnych. Musimy być skuteczni i oczywistym jest, że europejska prokuratura musi mieć te narzędzia jak najszybciej.

Ale w tym momencie chciałem przypomnieć, że żeby być skutecznym, muszą być jednolite standardy, które wszyscy honorujemy i wszyscy wdramy. Ciągłe mamy pięć krajów poza formalnym uczestnictwem w europejskiej prokuraturze. Rząd pani premier Kopacz w 2015 roku podjął taką decyzję i Polska formalnie przystąpiła, ale dzisiejszy rząd nie realizuje tej współpracy. Liczę, że szwedzka prezydencja formalnie zakończy się uczestnictwem – to będzie dobry przykład dla innych. A polski rząd po zmianie jesienią również ten błąd naprawi.

Trzeba ścigać przestępców VAT-owskich, trzeba ścigać przestępców, którzy próbują robić majątki na budżecie europejskim, niezgodnie z prawem. Silna europejska prokuratura jest w interesie naszych obywateli i naszych gospodarek.

Isabel García Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la Fiscalía Europea ha supuesto un antes y un después en la persecución de los delitos de fraude, corrupción y blanqueo de dinero que afectan al presupuesto europeo.

Las cifras de 2022 son contundentes: 1 117 investigaciones y 359 millones de euros incautados, siete veces el presupuesto de la propia Fiscalía Europea. Su éxito se basa en que sus competencias no se detienen en las fronteras nacionales, sino que actúa en un espacio europeo en el que todos estos delitos son investigados y perseguidos de forma eficaz e independiente.

Pero las organizaciones criminales buscan cualquier oportunidad para desviar fondos europeos o para introducir mercancías ilegales que no cumplen con la normativa de consumo o medioambiental y que afectan a la competitividad de nuestras empresas europeas. Por eso, es importante que, tanto la violación de las medidas restrictivas que impone la Unión como el fraude medioambiental, sean también competencia de la Fiscalía Europea.

Y, para terminar, hago un llamamiento al Consejo, porque no puede ser que todavía haya cinco países que no participan en la Fiscalía Europea: debe tomar medidas para incorporarlos y conseguir así que se pueda proteger de forma más eficaz el dinero de los contribuyentes.

Vlad Gheorghe (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, observ că Putin are în continuare tovarăși, și pe aici pe la Bruxelles, mai știm pe unii pe la Budapesta, câteodată și pe aici, prin Parlamentul European. După ce că am dat sancțiunile cu târâita, după ce că ne-a luat foarte mult timp să decidem în legătură cu ele, acum mai vrem să-i mai și lăsăm să scape?

Bineînțeles că trebuie să facem astfel încât Parchetul European să se ocupe de chestia asta, astfel încât Parchetul European să sancționeze și să cerceteze încercarea de a scăpa de sancțiuni. De ce ne mai punem întrebarea asta? Trebuia să facem de mult încă. De ce mai avem această dezbatere? Trebuia să fi votat de mult. Cui îi e frică de procurorii europeni? Cui îi e frică de Laura Codruța Kovesi?

Eu știu pe câțiva pe la București, cărora le era frică. Dar acum văd că există unii și pe aici, știm că există unul pe la Budapesta, bineînțeles, dar tot descoperim oameni cărora le e frică de procurori, care vor să lucreze în continuare cu oligarhii, ca până acum. Nu se mai poate! Asta este mesajul pe care noi trebuie să îl dăm. DNA-ul a băgat spaima în corupți la București, în penali. Asta face și Parchetul European în Uniunea Europeană.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, vážený pane komisaři, myslím si, že to musíme říct naprosto jasně. Ten, kdo toleruje porušování určitých principů, je spolupachatel, a proto my nesmíme v současné době tolerovat to, že někdo v Rusku obchází sankce nebo s Ruskem obchoduje na území Evropské unie a podporuje tak válku. Ten, kdo podporuje válku, je spolupachatel této oblundné války a podílí se na tom, co se na Ukrajině v současné době děje. Je potřeba vyzvat Radu a členské státy, policii, státní zástupce, ať se nebojí proti těmto lidem razantně zakročit. Nesouhlasím s rozšířením mandátu evropského veřejného žalobce. Podle mě už ten mandát je dostatečně veliký. Musíme jenom ten mandát umět naplnit a musíme být důslední v tom, co vlastně je zájmem Evropské unie, a v tom, jakým způsobem ho budeme naplňovat.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, las medidas restrictivas se han convertido en uno de los instrumentos más relevantes de la política exterior de la Unión. Lo vemos ahora en el caso de Rusia y Bielorrusia. Lo vemos también con Irán, Nicaragua y Venezuela.

Las sanciones, desde luego, no están solo para ser adoptadas, sino también —y sobre todo— para ser implementadas. Los Estados miembros tienen que monitorear más de cerca el cumplimiento de las sanciones y reforzar los servicios encargados de ello. La Comisión también debería hacerlo.

Yo quiero recordar los lamentables hechos ocurridos en mi país, en enero de 2020, cuando el Gobierno español ignoró la prohibición de entrada y tránsito en territorio europeo que pesaba —y que pesa— sobre Delcy Rodríguez, vicepresidenta del régimen de Nicolás Maduro. También se ignoró el deber de inmovilizar cualquier activo o bien en su poder. Estos hechos no han sido suficientemente aclarados, ni se han depurado responsabilidades.

Por todo ello, yo celebro que tengamos hoy este debate y que se estén dando pasos para reforzar el cumplimiento de las sanciones como, por ejemplo, añadir la vulneración de medidas restrictivas a la lista de delitos de la Unión.

Para terminar, creo que es conveniente también que se amplíe el papel que pueda desempeñar la Fiscalía Europea.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, *(start of speech off mic)* ... EU Council when they decide to inflict sanctions on an entity does not adhere to basic standards of due process. No evidence is presented. The accused body does not get a defence and it all happens in secret. At least Ireland had its show trials in public.

There's nothing in customary international law that allows for a legal basis for the way our EU sanctions mechanism functions, our unilateral coercive measures regime. High Representative Josep Borrell is clear on this: he said our sanctions are a means of coercive capacity. The illegal nature of unilateral coercive measures has been repeatedly affirmed in numerous resolutions of the UN Human Rights Council and the UN General Assembly. The rule of law has been thrown out the window and is being replaced with the law of the jungle. What is more, sanctions are a weapon of mass murder.

The Council should not be extending the mandate of the European Public Prosecutor's Office to enforce their illegitimate pronouncements.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, otázce evropského veřejného žalobce se věnuji léta. Považuji to za důležité téma. Ve chvíli, kdy jsme zřídili tento úřad, aniž by měl působnost pro celou sedmadvacítku, si myslím, že bychom primárně měli tlačit na to, aby tento úřad nepracoval pouze pro 22 států Evropské unie, ale aby pracoval pro celou Evropskou unii. To by obrovsky posílilo efektivitu. Protože vymáhání sankcí a obcházení sankcí je velkým problémem ve vztahu k Rusku, tak bych se nebránil variantě, abychom v tuto chvíli uvažovali, že i pro 22 států by tento úřad měl působnost v oblasti vyhledávání a vyšetřování této trestné činnosti. Ale opakují, primární problém evropského prokurátora či evropského veřejného žalobce je to, že se nevztahuje na celou Evropskou unii, ale pouze na čtyři pětiny členských států. Prosím, pane komisaři, toto projednávejme. Tlačme na to, abychom efektivitu úřadu zvýšili tím, že pod něj bude spadat celá Evropská unie.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Didier Reynders, membre de la Commission. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Ministre, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je vous remercie pour ce débat. La Commission continuera à soutenir le Parquet européen et à s'assurer qu'il peut mener à bien ses activités, afin de continuer à protéger les intérêts financiers de l'Union. En outre, permettez-moi de rappeler une nouvelle fois l'engagement sans faille de la Commission à garantir que les sanctions de l'Union sont correctement mises en œuvre et que la poursuite pénale de leur violation est effectivement assurée. La proposition de directive sur la violation des sanctions est dès lors prioritaire et urgente.

En parallèle des discussions sur cette proposition de directive, il est évidemment possible de poursuivre le débat sur l'extension des compétences du Parquet européen. Je rappelle que, pour ce qui est de la procédure, cette extension nécessite une décision du Conseil européen à l'unanimité des 27 États membres, après avoir obtenu l'accord du Parlement et après avoir consulté la Commission. La Commission est évidemment prête à accompagner les échanges entre États membres pour envisager le rôle accru que le Parquet européen pourrait jouer en matière de lutte contre la violation des sanctions.

Je prends bonne note des diverses positions exprimées lors de ce débat. En fonction du soutien exprimé par les États membres en faveur d'une possible extension du mandat du Parquet européen, je le répète, la Commission continuera à jouer son rôle. Elle se tient notamment prête à présenter des implications juridiques et budgétaires à prendre en compte pour faire aboutir une telle réforme.

Przewodnicząca. – Zanim udzielę głosu pani minister, która wystąpi w imieniu Rady, chciałabym zwrócić uwagę, że jest to ostatnie wystąpienie szwedzkiej prezydencji i na ręce pani minister chciałabym złożyć podziękowania za pracę w ciągu ostatnich 6 miesięcy.

Jessika Roswall, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for the debate and interesting arguments put forward. This debate proves that there is a strong commitment in both the Council and Parliament to weakening Russia's economic base and impeding its ability to wage war.

In the short perspective, reaching an interinstitutional agreement on the Directive on criminalisation of violation of sanctions and on extended powers of confiscation should be our first priority. Let me also mention that in combination with the work we are doing with Russian frozen assets, this provides for a forceful economic response to the Russian aggression.

As regards the debate tonight, I believe that you have raised a very important question or questions on how to further develop EPPO's means to also cover violations of sanctions. As I said in my first intervention, the Presidency intends to provide appropriate follow-up within the Council on the issue of a possible extension of competence.

Madam President, let me also say that this is my last intervention in this House representing the Council. It's been an honour and a pleasure to engage with you in Parliament on all the very important EU issues: Ukraine; migration; the rule of law – I cannot mention all of them that we have discussed in this plenary! Thank you for having me and thank you for all the good support and the dialogue that we have had.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

19. Debates sobre casos de violaciones de los derechos humanos, de la democracia y del Estado de Derecho (debate)

19.1. Tortura y enjuiciamiento penal de los menores ucranianos Tihran Ohannisian y Mykyta Janhanov por la Federación de Rusia

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad pięcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie torturowania i ścigania przez Federację Rosyjską ukraińskich nastolatków Tihrana Ohannisiana i Mykyty Chanhanowa (2023/2735(RSP))¹.

¹ Patrz protokół posiedzenia.

Michaela Šojdrová, author. – Madam President, dear colleagues, I would like to first thank all Shadow Rapporteurs and advisors for their excellent cooperation and for reaching a strong resolution on the victims of Russia's war crimes. On 24 May 2023, two teenage boys, Tihran and Mykyta, were charged by the investigative committee of the Russian Federation with allegedly planning sabotage on the railway in Berdyansk.

Even though Mykyta managed to avoid arrest, Tihran was not so lucky. He was abducted, interrogated and tortured by beating and electric shocks. This particular case shows the full scale of the atrocities and human rights violations perpetrated by the Russian Federation. So far, 19 500 abduction cases have been confirmed, but the true number is much higher.

The Russian machinery of re-education, illegal adoption and filtration camps was captured in the recent mission of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. We demand an immediate end to the trial and the dismissal of charges against Tihran and Mykyta. To this end, the Commission and Vice-President of the Commission need to intensify their efforts to end this grave violation of the rights of children affected by armed conflict.

During my visit to Ukraine, I personally met with several NGOs, which are doing a tremendous job of locating abducted children and providing them with much needed legal services. They, however, feel that the international community should be more active and brave enough to intervene. This applies especially to the International Committee of the Red Cross, which has a unique mandate provided for by the Geneva Convention. It should use the mandate to facilitate the return of these minors to Ukraine.

Dear colleagues, we will continue defending freedom and children's rights for as long as it takes. We cannot abandon the most vulnerable victims of the war.

Thijs Reuten, Auteur. – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, maand zestien van de Russische agressie-oorlog tegen Oekraïne met voortdurende en bewuste aanvallen op burgerdoelen. Pure terreur. De raketregens van Poetin treffen ook ziekenhuizen, woontorens, bruggen, scholen.

Iedereen wordt geraakt, ook kinderen. Opzettelijk. Nu al kunnen we zeker zijn van 488 kinderen die door Russisch geweld zijn omgekomen. Maar de ongeremde wreedheid toont zich ook in het geval van de twee tieners Tihran en Mykyta, die nu vervolgd worden na maanden van intimidatie, brute ondervraging en zelfs marteling.

Deze twee tieners hangt nu een celstraf van twintig jaar boven het hoofd op basis van valse verdenkingen. Twintig jaar. Aan dit soort waanzin moet een einde komen en ik ben blij met onze resolutie. Maar er is meer.

Duizenden ontvoeringen naar Rusland, naar tijdelijk bezet gebied, naar Belarus. We mogen niet rusten voordat we het lot van deze kinderen helpen te verbeteren. Niet vergeten hun rechten te verdedigen in Europa en in Oekraïne. Er moet meer vaart worden gemaakt met het elfde sanctiepakket en we moeten Oekraïne de wapens geven om zichzelf, de kinderen en toekomstige generaties te bevrijden van de Russische agressie en terreur.

Petras Auštrevičius, *author*. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, the Russian occupiers in Ukraine do not feel safe, for understandable reasons. Their suspicion and aggression overshadow everything and encourage reckless repression against innocent civilians, including children. In the Russian occupied city of Berdyansk, two Ukrainian minors, Tihran Ohannisian and Mykyta Khanhanov, were detained, interrogated and tortured in order to extract alleged confessions of sabotage against the Russian military authorities. Now they face a risk of arrest and imprisonment of up to 20 years.

The fate of these two minors and other prosecution and torture victims is important to all of us. By supporting Ukraine's efforts to liberate its occupied territories, we are helping to extinguish the environment of impunity and lawlessness that allows the Russian occupiers to use moral, psychological and physical violence against Tihran and Mykyta.

Putin's regime has returned Russia – and subsequently the occupied territories of Ukraine – to a time of violence and totalitarian oppression. But it will not last. An hour of justice for war crimes will come, and it will therefore be important to record all the human rights violations committed by the Russian occupiers in Ukraine.

I would like to thank and express my solidarity with Tihran and Mykyta and their families and to convey my sincere gratitude to all human rights defenders who act in Ukraine.

Sergey Lagodinsky, *author*. – Madam President, names matter. Just today, we had the ceremony of reading names of many victims of those who were persecuted, who were tortured, who were expelled by the Soviet regime from the Baltic states, from Eastern Europe.

Names matter, and that's why when I'm asked why we're mentioning these two names, I know why. Because by mentioning them, we do not just remember that they exist. We give them a sign of hope. We give them a sign of solidarity. And that's why I'm mentioning these two names: Tihran Ohannisian and Mykyta Khanhanov. Two kids, who are treated not just like kids, not even like humans, they are mistreated by a regime that occupied their motherland and who does not give them even a right of being treated like humans.

And this is just one more crime in this endless chain of crimes committed by the Russian and pro-Russian forces on the Ukrainian territory. And we promise you, Tihran, and we promise you, Mykyta, we will do everything to stand on the side of your country, and to try our best to help you and many millions like you to win this war.

Liudas Mažylis, *PPE frakcijos vardu*. – Pirmininke, kolegos, kalbame apie dviejų Ukrainos paauglių, rusų okupantų apkaltintų „sabotažo planavimu“, kankinimą ir kriminalinį persekiojimą. Tokiais veiksmais Rusija pažeidžia Jungtinių Tautų Vaikų teisių konvenciją taip pat ir Konvenciją dėl kankinimų. Tokie veiksmai nėra atsitiktiniai, tai yra Rusijos įvaldytos sisteminio niekinimo, bauginimo strategijos tam tikras apgalvotas komponentas. Tad pagrįstai reikalaujame ne tik nedelsiant paleisti šiuos du suimtuosius, bet ir nutraukti kitų nepilnamečių asmenų vadinamąjį „perauklėjimą“, taip pat ir nelegalius įvaikinimus. Visa tai yra aiškiai planuojami bei sistemingai organizuojami valstybinės politikos veiksmai. Tarp kita ko, į tokius veiksmus yra įsitraukęs ne tik Rusijos, bet ir šiandieninis, dabartinis Baltarusijos režimas. Tad ir europinės institucijos, ir pasaulinės organizacijos turi imtis visų prieinamų teisinių priemonių, kad tų režimų nusikaltami veiksmai būtų užkardyti.

Evin Incir, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, colleagues, it is horrible how someone can prosecute and torture minors. No one with a right mind would even think of committing such a crime. But then again, Putin is a tyrant and doesn't see any limits.

Two innocent Ukrainian minors – Tihran and Mykyta – are facing charges under the Russian regime. Born in 2006, these young boys are now confronted with up to 20 years in prison without even proper legal assistance or any kind of support. Their place is not in imprisonment; their place is in freedom.

Their situation is not an isolated incident. Russia's invasion of Ukraine has caused the death of at least 488 Ukrainian children, more than 1 016 injured, over 19 500 deported to Russia and 3 924 reported missing.

Children must never be targets. Only a barbarian treats and uses children in such a way.

Karin Karlsbro, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, Commission, colleagues, this could be a wonderful summer for Tihran Ohannisian and Mykyta Khanhanov, who were both born in 2006, but instead they are in prison, tortured by the Russians.

I believe some of you have children of the same age yourself. So do I. It's with a heavy heart that I read the reports of brutal interrogations, beatings and electric shock torture that the teenagers are facing.

The crime the teenagers are charged with is fighting for their freedom. As a mother, as a politician, as a human being, I can't find the right words to express my disgust against these acts.

Today, we strongly condemn Russia and demand for the immediate release and return of Tihran and Mykyta. Those involved in this cruel proceedings in Zaporizhzhia in Ukraine must, without delay, be added to the EU sanctions list.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamna președintă, doamna comisar, stimați colegi, Europa trece prin cea mai mare provocare pe care o are de înfruntat de la înființarea Uniunii Europene. Însăși motivul pentru care a fost creată Uniunea Europeană este astăzi amenințat de Rusia. Rusia disprețuiește pacea, libertatea, democrația și atacă state. Dar nu doar cu statele se luptă, ci, iată, nu are niciun fel de scrupule și milă în a pedepsi oameni nevinovați, prin tortură, prin deportare, lucru inacceptabil.

Este obligația noastră să îi aducem în fața justiției pe acești criminali, în frunte cu Putin, pentru că numele acestor copii, Tihran Ohannisian și Mikita Hanhanov sunt încă doi eroi care se sacrifică, din nefericire, pentru că orgoliul diabolic al lui Putin nu este în stare să oprească acest război nedrept împotriva unor cetățeni nevinovați. Astăzi în Parlament am comemorat victimele deportărilor staliniste și au fost citite peste 2 700 de nume ale victimelor torturii și deportărilor din epoca sovietică.

Iată că, la aproape un secol distanță, oameni nevinovați, copii nevinovați sunt supuși aceluiași practici diabolice. Tocmai de aceea, este important ca parlamentul nostru să dezbată, să sancționeze și să nu lase uitării aceste crime împotriva umanității. Trebuie să fim alături de poporul ucrainean în acest război nedrept.

Ivars Ijabs (Renew). – Prezidentes kundze! Komisāri! Kolēgi ! Es nezinu, vai Tihrans un Mikita plānoja aizstāvēt savu dzimteni pret okupantiem ar partizānu metodēm. Es nezinu, vai viņiem tas būtu izdevies, bet es zinu, ka aizstāvēt savu tautu pret genocīdu ir gods un lepnums. Es zinu, ka nolaupīt, deportēt un pārkrievot ukraiņu bērnu ir kara noziegums, par kuru Starptautiskā tribunāla priekšā būs jāatbild Putinam un viņa rokaspuišiem.

Es ļoti ceru, ka Tihrans un Mikita drīz būs brīvībā. Es ceru arī, ka mūsu šodienas rezolūcija tam kaut vai nedaudz palīdzēs. Bet labākais, ko mēs šobrīd varam darīt, ir atbalstīt ukraiņu pretuzbrukumu ar ieročiem, ar informāciju, ar savu balsi un vērsties ar sankcijām pret Tihrana, Mikitas un visu ukraiņu bērnu spīdzinātājiem un deportētājiem.

Diemžēl par deportācijām mums šajā 14. jūnija dienā ir jārunā jau otrreiz. Mēs pieminējam tās padomju noziegumu upuru — latviešu, lietuviešu un igauņu — atceres brīdī un tagad paužam savu gatavību nosodīt deportāciju īstenotājus arī šajā rezolūcijā.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, only three months ago the European Parliament was debating the violation of international law on human rights of children from Ukraine forcibly transferred or deported to Russia. Today we are alarmed with the situation of two teenagers from the city of Berdiansk who face 10 to 20 years in prison for having reportedly tried to sabotage the railway to prevent the Russian armed forces from receiving material supplies.

The reports of them being arbitrarily detained and tortured are appalling. We know that the chance for a fair trial in a territory that is temporarily occupied by Russia is next to zero. For us it is clear: charges against these teenage boys must be dropped. Those who need to be brought to justice are those responsible for the war crimes committed against Ukrainians by the Russian forces and so-called authorities that Russia has imposed in territories it occupies.

We will continue to push for accountability for human rights violations and violations against international law. In a mind in this context, that Russia and Ukraine, for that matter, have ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the rights of these two boys are thus blatantly violated.

As the honourable Members of this Parliament have already discussed, there have been other blatant violations with the forced transfer or deportation of Ukrainian children to Russia.

The EU has imposed sanctions against 16 individuals responsible for the deportation and forced adoption of Ukrainian children, including the Russian Commissioner for Children's Rights, Madam Lvova-Belova, and is ready to continue imposing sanctions. The EU strongly supports measures to ensure accountability, including the investigations of the International Criminal Court and the Ukrainian Prosecutor General.

The EU is committed to strengthening human rights and promoting democracy around the world. The EU continues to urge Russia to stop its war of aggression against Ukraine and immediately, completely and unconditionally withdraw all its troops and military equipment from the entire territory of Ukraine within its internationally recognised borders. The EU will continue its steadfast support to Ukraine to ensure Ukraine wins the war, wins the peace and wins in court.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 15 czerwca 2023 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

— Tortury, brutalne przesłuchania, nękanie, porwania – w taki sposób przedstawiciele rosyjskich służb śledczych na terenie okupowanego Berdanska próbowali od września ubiegłego roku wymusić zeznania na Tihranie i Mykycie – dwóch nastoletnich ukraińskich chłopcach. Oskarżani przez agresorów o próbę sabotażu, wraz z rodzinami byli poddawani nieustannym naciskom i prześladowaniom, by tylko przyznali się do winy.

Czy są jeszcze jakieś granice i zasady cywilizowanego świata, których rosyjskie władze nie przekroczyły w swoich działaniach wobec ukraińskich dzieci? Od ponad półtora roku ukraińskie dzieci giną z rąk rosyjskich żołnierzy, padają ofiarami brutalnych zbrodni, są wywożone tysiącami do Rosji i na Białoruś. Czy są jeszcze jakieś zbrodnie, których rosyjski agresor nie popełnił wobec ukraińskich dzieci?

Przypadki takie jak Tihrana i Mykyty nadają twarz tym tysiącom dzieci i młodych ludzi niszczonej przez Rosjan, o których być może świat nigdy nie usłyszy lub o których zapomni w natłoku zbrodni popełnianych przez agresora.

Dziś wzywamy władze rosyjskie do natychmiastowego oddalenia wszelkich zarzutów wobec tych dwóch chłopców i zaprzestania tych najgorszych nieludzkich praktyk wobec dzieci w Ukrainie. I podkreślimy jeszcze raz: będziemy się upominać o każde skrzywdzone przez rosyjskiego agresora ukraińskie dziecko i nie spoczniemy, póki wszystkich odpowiedzialnych za zbrodnie nie postawimy przed sądem.

19.2. Situación humanitaria en Sudán, en particular la muerte de niños atrapados por los enfrentamientos

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad pięcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie sytuacji humanitarnej w Sudanie, w szczególności śmierci dzieci, które znalazły się w ogniu walki(2023/2736(RSP))1.

1 Patrz protokół posiedzenia.

Tomáš Zdechovský, autor. – Paní předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, dámy a pánové, situace v Súdánu je velmi vážná. Povinnost Evropské unie je tedy naléhat na znesvářené strany konfliktu a snažit se o prosazení mírového řešení. Konflikt negativně dopadá na civilní obyvatelstvo, především pak na ty nejzranitelnější, a to jsou děti. Budoucnost Súdánu a v širším smyslu i budoucnost Afriky závisí právě na mladé generaci. Afrika má totiž veškerý potenciál stát se klíčovým kontinentem jednadvacátého století. Konflikt tvrdě dopadá na děti, které jsou často mezi oběťmi nebo jsou verbovány jako dětská vojska. Evropská unie musí udělat vše, co je v jejich silách, aby mladé generaci zajistila bezpečné podmínky, ve kterých vyroste vzdělaná a sebevědomá generace. Jestli se podaří zajistit bezpečné prostředí, tak v Súdánu vyroste generace, která bude schopna vzít osud své země do vlastních rukou. To bude přínosné i pro Evropskou unii, na kterou se sníží migrační tlak, který právě v současné době pochází z Afriky i částečně ze Súdánu. Děti jsou naše

budoucnost, proto je musíme ochraňovat. Děkuji všem, kteří se podíleli na vyváženém textu tohoto usnesení. Ukazuje se, že Evropský parlament dokáže konstruktivním jednáním dosáhnout velmi vyváženého textu, za který se nemusí nikdo stydět a může jej kdykoliv všem znepráteným stranám svobodně prezentovat.

Carlos Zorrinho, *Autor*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, voltamos hoje, infelizmente, a falar do Sudão neste Parlamento.

Condenamos o que de mais abjeto e ignóbil se pode esperar de uma guerra.

A morte de dezenas de crianças num orfanato, no meio de uma guerra cruzada sem tréguas ou corredores humanitários que permitissem aceder a comida ou a cuidados básicos de saúde capazes de lhes garantir a sobrevivência, junta-se ao sofrimento de milhares de civis sudaneses que vivem reféns das duas partes do conflito, muitos deles idosos, mulheres, doentes, crianças ou adolescentes que, sem acesso a comida ou a cuidados médicos, tentam sobreviver e sair das zonas de combate, engrossando os números de refugiados.

A nossa veemente denúncia não serve apenas para honrar os mortos e condenar os autores destes crimes de guerra. Temos de ir mais longe.

Por isso, nesta resolução, apelamos a um cessar-fogo imediato com o retorno à mesa de negociações, com vista a alcançar um acordo de paz, e à criação de um roteiro para uma reforma democrática no país.

Apelamos à criação de corredores humanitários que permitam a entrada de agentes humanitários, alimentos, cuidados médicos e a saída do país de quem assim o entender.

Apelamos à aplicação de sanções aos responsáveis por crimes de guerra e violação dos direitos humanos.

Apelamos ao apoio imediato em matéria de ajuda humanitária às vítimas civis deste conflito por parte da União Europeia e dos Estados-Membros.

Temos de agir para que não voltemos a ser confrontados com notícias como as do orfanato Migona, em Cartum, e para que o povo do Sudão possa viver com segurança e dignidade.

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana, *auteur*. – Madame la Présidente, la guerre qui sévit au Soudan a des répercussions néfastes sur les populations les plus vulnérables, notamment les enfants. Depuis le 15 avril, le conflit au Soudan a fait des milliers de victimes. Selon les dernières estimations, sept enfants sont tués ou blessés chaque heure qui passe depuis le début des affrontements.

Plus de 13,6 millions d'enfants ont besoin d'aide humanitaire dans le domaine de la santé. En effet, on note une recrudescence de maladies qui avaient presque disparu, comme la rougeole. Compte tenu des nombreuses coupures de courant, les vaccins périssent vite et les enfants ne peuvent plus être vaccinés. Ainsi, le taux de décès est en augmentation constante. Environ 3 millions d'enfants souffrent de malnutrition ou de déshydratation. Avec la guerre, la situation a empiré.

La question de l'éducation pose un problème majeur. Le fait de ne pas aller à l'école a des conséquences sur la santé physique et mentale des enfants. En outre, 64 % des filles subissent de nombreuses violences sexuelles, et les garçons sont impliqués de force dans le conflit armé. Cette violence est désastreuse pour tous ces enfants, qui n'ont rien à voir avec les causes de la guerre.

L'armée soudanaise et les Forces de soutien rapide restent engagées dans une lutte mortelle pour le pouvoir, tuant ainsi des milliers de civils innocents, déplaçant plus d'un million de personnes et forçant un demi-million d'entre elles à fuir vers les pays voisins. Nous saluons tous les efforts des organismes régionaux et internationaux en faveur d'une solution pacifique. Nous invitons l'Union européenne et ses États membres à augmenter l'aide humanitaire pour les personnes touchées par le conflit. Cette aide doit aussi aller vers les personnes déplacées et toutes celles qui ont trouvé refuge dans les pays frontaliers. Nous appelons à un cessez-le-feu, à un retour des belligérants à la table des négociations en vue de la paix, et au rétablissement du processus démocratique. Protégeons les enfants d'une région dont la culture est l'une des plus anciennes du monde.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *autor*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! To jest taka chwila, w której ja się cieszę i którą się bardzo martwię. Martwię się, bo oczywiście widzę pewną naszą taką jednak bezsilność w obliczu tego dramatu, tej tragedii, która odbywa się w Sudanie. I zresztą mówię to jako człowiek, który w przyszłym tygodniu udaje się do swojego 22. afrykańskiego państwa z misją Parlamentu. Wydaje mi się, że trochę znam ten kontynent i mam poczucie, że rzeczywiście Unia Europejska ma instrumenty w ręku, aby wpływać na sytuację w tym kraju.

Ale też wydaje się, że nie robimy wszystkiego, aby egzekwować od tamtej strony, od władz państwowych, także Sudanu, aby robiły to, co do nich należy. Na przykład takie bezwarunkowe dawanie wszelkiej pomocy gospodarczej jest błędem. I to trzeba powiedzieć bardzo wyraźnie.

Ale też cieszę się z takiej dyskusji, bo ona – to się rzadko zdarza w Europarlamentie – pokazuje, że są sprawy, w których jesteśmy razem. Także w sprawie Sudanu. Także w sprawie dzieci z Sudanu.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *Autor*. – Señora presidenta, en el 2019 el pueblo sudanés derrocó al dictador y exigió democracia, pero sus movilizaciones y sueños fueron traicionados.

Hoy, de nuevo, asistimos a una guerra que, desgraciadamente, puede derivar en una catástrofe humanitaria en el continente africano y, mientras, la Unión Europea permanece impasible, como si la situación no fuera con ella, como si nuestra necropolítica fronteriza no tuviera nada que ver con lo que está pasando.

Les recuerdo que la Unión Europea fue acusada de financiar directa o indirectamente a las Fuerzas de Apoyo Rápido, el principal grupo paramilitar de Sudán, para que ejercieran de guardianes fronterizos. Les financiaron y lavaron su imagen. Como mínimo, se deberían de avergonzar.

La Unión Europea debe exigir un cese inmediato de las hostilidades para poder impulsar una transición democrática hacia un Gobierno civil en Sudán, pero no nos olvidemos de las consecuencias que tienen nuestras políticas de pagar a señores de la guerra para proteger nuestras fronteras de quien huye de la guerra.

Si cambiamos esa política, quizás el pueblo sudanés podrá tener una oportunidad de cambiar su destino.

Stanislav Polčák, *za skupinu PPE*. – Paní předsedající, paní komisařko, dlouhodobě se zde zabýváme situací v Súdánu. Již v roce 2007 se tento Parlament zabýval situací v Chartúmu při bojích mezi Jižním a Severním Súdánem, mezi milicemi, které působí na území Súdánu. A nyní se dotýkáme tématu, které je hodně i citové a snižuje samozřejmě hodnotu těch jiných probíraných témat. Ale pokud jde o děti, měli bychom být opravdu rázní. Nemůžeme být v této souvislosti bezmocní. Potřebujeme humanitární koridory, potřebujeme léky, potraviny, zdravotní péči. Lidé nemohou odejít z těchto bojových zón a my můžeme volat jen po příměří. Použijme prosím všechny možnosti pro dopravu potravin, léků – jak jsem řekl –, pro zajištění humanitárních koridorů. Nemůžeme být bezmocní. Doufám, že ani nejsme bezmocní. Volám po ochraně dětí v Súdánu.

Hannes Heide, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, according to Unicef, at least 13.6 million children in Sudan are in need of vital humanitarian aid. Newly born babies and infants are dying through malnutrition, dehydration, lack of medical care and the consequences of power failures. Hundreds of children have been killed and thousands seriously injured and abused. Humanitarian aid organisations report that basic medical care is limited due to the security situation, and food shortages have caused that half of all children suffer from hunger.

The European Commission must do everything in its power to ensure that the people of Sudan have access to food, essential goods and medical care. The EU must implement targeted sanctions against General Burhan and General Hemedti and other individuals responsible for human rights violations, including the freezing of personal bank accounts under the EU's global human rights sanctions regime.

A permanent ceasefire agreement has to be the first step. A return to peace talks and democratic reforms have to follow. We must act quickly to resolve the inhuman situation, especially for the affected children of Sudan.

Assita Kanko, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, raped, starved, barred from education, forced off the land during the planting season. Their future is stolen. Millions of Sudanese civilians, including their children, are internally displaced or are trapped in their homes, without food, medical care and other essential services, while humanitarian workers are unable to deliver them supplies.

According to UNICEF, more than 13.6 million children in Sudan are in urgent need of humanitarian assistance. We must step up cooperation with regional and international partners to ensure that a permanent ceasefire agreement is followed by credible political process in Sudan that respects people's desire for democratic reform.

The EU must provide support and humanitarian assistance to those impacted by the conflict, in particular women and children. We must make sure that all parties to the conflict allow and facilitate rapid and unimpeded humanitarian access, as well as protect civilians and civilian infrastructure and prioritise the protection of children.

We must support efforts to establish an independent investigation and accountability mechanism, addressing all alleged human rights violations in Sudan since the coup of October 2021. The people and children of Sudan need our attention and action now.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, la guerre civile qui ravage le Soudan est une catastrophe humanitaire qui ne peut que soulever notre émotion. Aucune des résolutions votées sur le Soudan dans ce Parlement européen n'a eu la moindre incidence, parce que nous nous concentrons sur des désirs idéologiques, plutôt que sur l'intérêt commun du peuple soudanais, de son voisinage et de l'Union européenne. Cet intérêt commun, c'est la stabilité et la sécurité.

Nous devons de toute urgence aider les pays voisins du Soudan qui accueillent les réfugiés. Le Tchad et la République centrafricaine doivent bénéficier de tout notre soutien, afin de prêter assistance aux réfugiés en détresse et de prévenir l'immigration illégale. L'Égypte demande un renforcement massif de l'aide européenne pour l'aider à faire face au flux des Soudanais qui fuient la guerre. D'après le Haut-Commissariat des Nations unies pour les réfugiés, près de 200 000 ressortissants auraient déjà rejoint la communauté soudanaise réfugiée en Égypte.

L'horreur qui frappe les enfants soudanais doit cesser. Si l'Union européenne veut réellement y contribuer, elle doit travailler avec tous les acteurs du conflit et tous les voisins du Soudan, notamment le Tchad, la République centrafricaine et l'Égypte. Il n'y a pas d'autre solution face à la crise humanitaire et migratoire soudanaise. Si nous voulons éviter une nouvelle vague migratoire en Europe, c'est aussi notre intérêt.

Pietro Bartolo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, lasciar morire i bambini sotto le bombe è disumano tanto quanto lasciarli morire di stenti e di fame. Nelle zone di conflitto sono proprio loro le vittime innocenti del delirio degli uomini. È solo che in alcune parti del mondo, come il Sudan, le guerre si consumano nella totale indifferenza e nel completo disinteresse politico e mediatico.

Sono pochissimi i canali di informazione che ci riportano gli orrori di questa guerra e ancora meno le iniziative prese per cercare di porvi fine. Riportiamo l'attenzione su questo paese martoriato, che l'Occidente ha dominato e sfruttato in passato. Dobbiamo certamente condannare le violenze e chiedere a tutte le parti l'immediata interruzione del conflitto, ma dobbiamo soprattutto aprire canali umanitari subito per permettere a chi è in pericolo di ricevere aiuto e assistenza. Il nostro impegno può fare la differenza. Dobbiamo agire insieme per porre fine alla sofferenza nel Sudan. Nessun bambino dovrebbe morire a causa dei conflitti, nessuno.

Patricia Chagnon (ID). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, j'ai vécu plusieurs années au Soudan dans les années 1980. Depuis, la vie des Soudanais a été rythmée par des conflits, des guerres et la terrifiante misère humaine qui en résulte et qui affecte surtout les enfants. Les Soudanais, victimes directes des combats ou victimes indirectes des famines qui viennent aggraver ces conflits armés, ont tenté, hier comme aujourd'hui, de fuir pour se mettre à l'abri et mettre à l'abri leurs enfants des balles qui sifflent et de la famine qui guette.

L'aide alimentaire d'organismes internationaux se retrouve régulièrement sur le marché noir et est revendue à prix d'or par des réseaux mafieux ou au profit de responsables locaux corrompus. Comment parler de l'état de droit dans un pays qui, depuis son indépendance, a connu tant de coups d'État militaires, qui n'a jamais connu ni la paix durable ni le fonctionnement démocratique, et qui est rongé par une corruption endémique? Comment parler des droits fondamentaux à un peuple qui a faim et qui voit ses enfants mourir? Les droits fondamentaux, pour eux, c'est de pouvoir survivre à la guerre et à la famine, et de voir le bout d'un tunnel de longues souffrances.

Comme je l'ai proposé à maintes reprises, il est urgent de mettre en place des couloirs humanitaires vers des villes d'asile, des villes sous protection internationale, à proximité des centres de crise humanitaires, qui ont pour vocation d'offrir protection, soins, éducation et nourriture aux populations menacées. Aucun Soudanais ne sera rassuré par des paroles venant d'un Parlement européen et par des promesses de meilleur respect de ses droits fondamentaux. Aucun discours, aucun constat, aucune description des horreurs ou incantation, ici, au Parlement, ne va lui apporter la sécurité qu'il recherche et ne va sérieusement le dissuader de partir sur les dangereux chemins de l'émigration. En revanche, il pourrait trouver une réponse rapide et concrète aux menaces qui pèsent sur lui et sur sa famille dans une ville d'asile.

Pour avoir vécu au Soudan, je peux affirmer que le désert que les migrants vont traverser est une étendue de sable avec des températures suffocantes. Le désert, c'est un monstre qui tue. L'humanisme de l'Union européenne, c'est d'agir vite sur le terrain, de prêter main forte pour stabiliser, bien sûr, le pays et son peuple en désarroi, et d'engager le Soudan sur la voie de la reconstruction. C'est de préparer l'avenir des Soudanais, qui n'est pas ici en Europe, mais chez eux, sur la terre de leurs ancêtres.

Carina Ohlsson (S&D). – Fru talman! Den humanitära situationen i Sudan är extremt allvarlig, särskilt för kvinnor och barn. Läget riskerar att förvärras ytterligare. Tusentals människor har flytt sina hem. Barn dör på grund av mat- och vattenbrist och bristande sjukvård. Barnavården står närmast stilla.

Som så ofta används också våldtäkter som ett vapen i konflikten. Kvinnor hade en ledande roll i den sudanesiska revolutionen 2019. Några av oss minns den ikoniska bilden av den unga studenten, Alaa Salah, som klädd i vitt fångade världens uppmärksamhet.

EU och det internationella samfundet måste öka sina ansträngningar för att säkerställa ett permanent eldupphör. Det ligger ett särskilt ansvar på EU att stödja civilsamhällesorganisationer och kvinnoorganisationer i Sudan som kan bidra till långsiktig fred och demokrati.

Efter den arabiska vårens misslyckande med att infria sina löften och motgångarna i Afghanistan har ett slags resignation infunnit sig i västvärlden. Uppgivenhet är dock vår värsta fiende för en fredligare värld.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, vždy jsem velmi pozorně poslouchal naše debaty o aktuálních problémech lidských práv. Vždycky se jedná o velké lidské tragédie, ale ve chvíli, kdy se tragédie určité země stane tragédií dětí, tak mě to obzvlášť dojíhá. A chci poprosit – a využívám té šance, že jsem tady –, zástupce Komise, abychom udělali co nejrychleji maximum pro to, abychom humanitárně podpořili Súdán. Je to země, kde asi nemá smysl hovořit o nějakých sankcích, o tlaku na vládu nebo o nějakém jiném způsobu vyjednávání s veřejnou autoritou této země. Protože to asi nepomůže. Ale můžeme nyní pomoci humanitární pomocí, humanitárními koridory. A o to chci požádat. Protože opravdu pokud někde umírají hlady děti a jsou to desítky, stovky dětí, které umírají, byť zde je konkrétní příklad jednoho sirotčince na okraji Chartúmu, tak si myslím, že s tím něco zkrátka musíme dělat a musíme pomoci.

(Konec zgłoszeń z sali)

Kadri Simson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, the European Union strongly condemns the ongoing fighting between the Sudanese Armed Forces and the Rapid Support Forces, which threatens the safety and security of the people of Sudan, as well as the unity and stability of the country and of the whole region.

The EU deplores the loss of lives and the violations of international law, including international human rights law and international humanitarian law, calling on all actors to comply with international humanitarian law and implement an immediate cessation of hostilities without preconditions.

Over two months into the fighting, at least 865 civilians have been killed, including 18 humanitarian workers and over 190 children. More than 6 000 people have been injured. 2 000 people may also have died in fighting in Darfur. Latest figures from the UN show that nearly 1.4 million people have been displaced by the conflict, 330 000 of whom have crossed into neighbouring countries. The humanitarian situation in Sudan has reached breaking point, with around 25 million people in Sudan – almost half of its total population – in urgent need of support, including 450 000 children already displaced.

The EU is working with international partners to provide life-saving support to the most vulnerable, including women and children. Such is the case of about 300 infants, toddlers and older children rescued from an orphanage in Sudan's capital after being trapped amidst fighting. The evacuation, carried out by the International Committee of the Red Cross and Unicef, came after 71 children died from hunger and illness in the facility since mid-April.

Procurement of traditional vaccines remains a critical gap in Sudan to ensuring the continuity of routine immunisation services and avoiding the outbreak of vaccine-preventable diseases.

I would like to commend the efforts to increase flexible humanitarian funding for partners who are maintaining their operations in Sudan. In 2023, the EU has already scaled up its support with EUR 73 million allocated in humanitarian assistance for Sudan. Following the outbreak of violence, the EU has mobilised EUR 200 000 for immediate relief and first-aid assistance to those injured or exposed to high risk.

This EU emergency funding supports the Sudanese Red Crescent Society with first-aid evacuation services and psycho-social support, helping around 70 000 people in Khartoum, Northern State, North Kordofan, South Darfur and North Darfur. The EU is also supporting the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies in Sudan, Egypt, Ethiopia and South Sudan.

The EU has launched a humanitarian air bridge to facilitate the transport of life-saving supplies to our humanitarian partners. As of 1 June, three flights transporting 90 tonnes of essential supplies have arrived at Port Sudan from Dubai. These flights were organised with the support of the UN Humanitarian Response Depot, managed by the World Food Programme. The support provided by the humanitarian air bridge includes water, sanitation, hygiene and shelter items. The operation will allow our humanitarian partners on the ground to deliver immediate assistance to those in need.

Moreover, another EU humanitarian air bridge is connecting Europe and Chad. A first flight from Munich to N'Djamena arrived on 31 May with 90 tonnes of supplies. This operation helps support the displaced population in Chad. More work is naturally being undertaken with neighbouring countries.

Lastly, the EU calls on all actors to allow and facilitate rapid and unimpeded humanitarian access, as well as to protect civilians and ensure the safety of humanitarian personnel. The fighting must end to guarantee their protection and allow space for dialogue and mediation. In this context, the EU supports efforts for an immediate cessation of hostilities, which will lead to a permanent ceasefire agreement, to be negotiated urgently.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 15 czerwca 2023 r.

19.3. Deterioro de las libertades fundamentales en Hong Kong, en particular el caso de Jimmy Lai

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad czterema projektami rezolucji w sprawie pogorszenia się sytuacji w zakresie podstawowych wolności w Hongkongu, w szczególności sprawy Jimmy'ego Laia (2023/2737(RSP))¹.

¹ Patrz protokół posiedzenia.

Miriam Lexmann, author. – Madam President, dear colleagues, Jimmy Lai faces a life in prison based on trumped up charges. His case is a strong example of how Beijing and the Hong Kong authorities are using the so-called national security law to undermine the rule of law and fundamental rights and freedoms in the city. What are they afraid of? The answer is simple. They are afraid of freedom loving people like Jimmy Lai because they are the biggest threat to the lies and oppression of the CCP. The European Union must stand with Jimmy Lai and it must stand with Hong Kong. After all, the deterioration of the freedoms and rule of law in Hong Kong also implies us as the growing evidence of sanction evasion through the city continues to show. That's why our response must be principled and clear. We must strengthen the EU office to intensify trial observation. The EU must finally impose targeted sanctions against John Lee and all other Hong Kong and PRC officials responsible for the ongoing human rights crackdown in the city.

And finally, it is time for the EU to review Hong Kong's international status, seen since the loss of its autonomy is in a clear breach of international law. It is only as a result of the autonomy laws that the growing repression and deterioration of the rule of law takes place.

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

Isabel Santos, Autora. – Senhor Presidente, o rolo compressor de Xi Jinping não abranda no esmagamento de todas as formas de liberdade e dos direitos humanos.

Partidos pró-democracia, jornalistas, ativistas, órgãos de comunicação social como o *Apple Daily* e o *Stand News*, organizações da sociedade civil, nada nem ninguém, em Hong Kong, fica incólume à sanha repressiva de Pequim.

A Lei de Segurança Nacional tem sido um instrumento útil na mão do regime para a produção das maiores arbitrariedades, pondo termo ao princípio «um país, dois sistemas» e violando a Declaração Conjunta Sino-Britânica, processo que está a ser replicado também em Macau, numa clara violação da Declaração Conjunta Sino-Portuguesa.

Jimmy Lai arrisca a condenação perpétua num processo judicial, sem garantias de imparcialidade. Pedimos a sua libertação imediata e incondicional, bem como de Chow Hang-tung, Albert Ho e de todas as vítimas de detenções arbitrárias.

A União Europeia não pode ficar em silêncio ou fechar os olhos, como também não pode ficar em silêncio ou fechar os olhos no caso de Joseph John, com dupla nacionalidade, portuguesa e chinesa, e o primeiro cidadão da União Europeia vítima da teia persecutória que a Lei de Segurança Nacional ajuda a tecer.

Exigimos a revogação da Lei de Segurança Nacional em Hong Kong e também em Macau e reiteramos o apelo ao Conselho para que acione o Regime Europeu de Sanções por violações de direitos humanos contra John Lee e outros responsáveis de Hong Kong e da República Popular da China.

Georgios Kyrtzos, author. – Mr President, the Hong Kong authorities and the Chinese regime must understand that the European Parliament will make the case of publisher and press freedom symbol Jimmy Lai a basic criterion for the evolution of our relations and cooperation. 75 years old, Jimmy Lai, the founder of the now defunct pro-democracy media outlet *Apple Daily*, in 2020 the Reporters Without Borders Press Freedom Prize laureate has already been sentenced to a total of seven years and five months in prison and still faces a life in prison for supposedly colluding with foreign forces under the national security law adopted by the Chinese regime to suppress dissent in Hong Kong. We demand the immediate release of Jimmy Lai from prison, dropping all charges against him and the repeal of the national security law that suppresses media freedom. We attribute the deterioration of fundamental freedoms in Hong Kong to China's authoritarian strategy that does not recognise the special status of Hong Kong, despite the international obligations that Beijing has assumed. We also note that China even aspires to impose that authoritarian model to independent and sovereign Taiwan. Free Jimmy Lai, thus improving the prospects for our relations and cooperation.

Jordi Solé, author. – Mr President, Madam Commissioner, since the Chinese authorities imposed the national security law three years ago, fundamental freedoms, rule of law and judiciary independence in Hong Kong have alarmingly deteriorated. Around 250 people have been arrested. Some media outlets have been forced to close, while labour unions and civil society groups have been disbanded. The case of Jimmy Lai, founder of *Apple Daily*, detained in February 2021 on trumped-up charges and facing a possible life sentence is probably amongst the ones that best represent the curtailing of freedoms in Hong Kong and the crackdown on the pro-democracy movement and on independent media outlets, their owners and their journalists.

But the list of people persecuted under the national security law is a long one. Let's not forget other activists facing trial later this year, like Chow Hang-tung, placed in solitary confinement during her 34-hour hunger strike, or Albert Ho, whose bail was lifted on futile legal grounds and who suffers from cancer, or Benny Tai, Lee Cheuk-yan, Cyd HO, Joshua Wong and all the other members of the group Hong Kong 47. We urge the government of Hong Kong to immediately release and drop all charges against Jimmy Lai and all the other pro-democracy representatives and activists who have been suffering from state repression due to their commitment to the right to freedom of expression.

Anna Fotyga, author. – Mr President, there are areas like commercial trade policy, freedom of internet or freedom of religion that under basic law and the Sino-British Joint Declaration were to clearly differ Hong Kong from mainland China, ruled by the Communist Party.

After the imposing of the national security law on Hong Kong, the fate of freedom-loving people like Jimmy Lai, his co-workers, in particular journalists of media outlets like *Apple Daily* and *Stand News*, were constant examples of harassment, intimidation and prosecution.

Six executives of *Apple Daily* arrested under possibly very harsh conditions plead guilty. Jimmy Lai refused to do so. His court proceedings start in September. We have to stand by people like Jimmy Lai, a very prominent pro-democracy activist and businessman of Hong Kong, fighting there for freedom of his people that are all over the world nowadays.

We should stand by them. We should follow the example of many other actions and impose targeted sanctions on those responsible for intimidating and prosecuting people of Hong Kong.

Jiří Pospíšil, za skupinu PPE. – Pane předsedající, chci se připojit ke svým předřečníkům a také zde podpořit politického vězně Jimmyho Laie, který je v zásadě obětí tlaku komunistické Číny na Hongkong. Nesmíme zapomínat, že tento konkrétní případ nespravedlivého stíhání, politického stíhání je důsledkem toho, že Čína porušila své mezinárodní závazky, porušila to, co tvrdila při přebírání Hongkongu, že zachová tamní politický systém, že zachová systém svobody, plurality politických stran, že zachová svobodu projevu a lidská práva pro občany Hongkongu. A tady to je konkrétní případ, který jasně ukazuje, jak se Čína chová. Protlačila právní úpravu, která v zásadě má „chránit“ národní bezpečnost a přitom je používána proti osobám, které mají jiné politické názory než komunistická Čína. Mějme se na pozoru a dělejme vše pro to, abychom osvobodili toho politického vězně. Ale základní problém je u komunistické Číny.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne, au nom du groupe Renew. – Monsieur le Président, un peuple résiste et montre que la démocratie, l'état de droit et les droits de l'homme doivent être défendus au péril de sa propre liberté et de sa propre vie. Ce peuple, c'est le peuple de Hong Kong. Il nous montre que les valeurs universelles et la démocratie sont un idéal qui doit être défendu partout dans le monde. Des citoyens sont traqués, enfermés et réprimés. Aujourd'hui, c'est Jimmy Lai que nous mettons en lumière, mais en février dernier, ils étaient 50 à être jugés. Qui peut donner un chiffre exact de toutes ces condamnations et répressions?

Le Parlement européen a le devoir de les soutenir, car, à travers eux, c'est aussi nous, ce que nous sommes et ce que nous portons que les autorités chinoises attaquent. Il est temps de montrer à la Chine que l'Europe ne restera jamais silencieuse, que l'Europe ne se laissera jamais intimider et que l'Europe doit réellement créer les conditions de son autonomie par une unité renforcée, pour ne pas être silencieuse et pour ne pas être intimidée. À l'heure où les autoritarismes s'affirment, montrons toujours au monde, et au peuple de Hong Kong spécifiquement, que l'Europe est avec eux et que nous ne les abandonnerons jamais.

Engin Eroglu (Renew). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin. Jimmy Lai steht hier stellvertretend nicht nur für eine zwei- oder dreistellige Anzahl von Menschen, die in China wahrscheinlich lebenslang inhaftiert bleiben werden, weil sie für Grundrechte, für die Grundrechte von Freiheit, gekämpft haben. Wir sehen, dass in Hongkong innerhalb von wenigen Jahren eine komplette Vernichtung von jeglicher Art von Grundrechten vollzogen worden ist. Menschen, die in Freiheit mit westlichen Werten aufgewachsen sind, sind über Nacht aufgestanden und sind in wenigen Jahren jeglicher Freiheit beraubt.

Ich warne uns alle davor – und das ist die große Gefahr –, dass China zum Lehrstuhl gegen unser Wertesystem wird. Ich fordere auch die Kommission auf, alles zu tun, dass das keine Mode macht und dass das nicht exportiert wird, denn da sehe ich die große Gefahr.

Apple Daily war eine ganz normale Zeitung, und für das Herausbringen einer ganz normalen Zeitung wird man inhaftiert, lebenslänglich. Das können wir als Europäische Union, das kann aber auch die Europäische Kommission und das können auch die Mitgliedstaaten nicht einfach nur hinnehmen. Es reicht nicht, nur nach China zu reisen und das immer zu predigen. Ich bin der festen Überzeugung, dass wir dieses menschenverachtende System endlich in seine Schranken verweisen müssen und den Chinesen zeigen müssen, dass das System, das sie aufgebaut haben, nicht in die westliche Welt exportierfähig ist. Ich glaube, das geht nur mit viel Leidenschaft und nicht nur mit Sonntagsreden, denn es gefährdet unser aller Freiheit.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, na úvod tohoto bodu takový povzdech. Kdyby se v předminulém století Pekingská smlouva podepisovala nikoli na 99 let, ale na 199 let, tak by ještě občany Hongkongu čekalo minimálně skoro jedno století svobody. A právě o svobodu lidí v Hongkongu nám jde. Nejen o Jimmyho Laie, ale také o svobodu všech lidí v Hongkongu, kteří jsou součástí naší širší rodiny. Volám po zacílení sankcí. Porušování lidských práv v Hongkongu je skutečně velmi citlivá záležitost a myslím si, že to musíme dávat patřičně najevo našim kolegům v Číně při našich rozhovorech. A jsem přesvědčen, že musíme přezkoumat mezinárodní status Hongkongu. To je prostě klíčová otázka v kontextu mezinárodního práva. A tento zákon o národní bezpečnosti, který je zaměřen na Hongkong a Macao, musí být součástí našich rozhovorů s čínskými představiteli. Toto je náš dluh, který dlužíme obyvatelům Hongkongu.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, I've lost count of the number of times that we've discussed Hong Kong and here. I'm surprised that you're still not giving out about the protests in the place and the treatment of the protesters. Maybe it's because only one protester was killed in two years and he wasn't killed by the Chinese police.

China got Hong Kong back from the Brits in 1997. Hong Kong had never known anything remotely close to democracy under the Brits. It was an empire. There was a colonial empire and a fairly brutal one.

And the idea that we have the right to lecture China about what's going on in Hong Kong. Who, in God's name, are we to be lecturing anybody? Why don't we actually sort out things in our own place? We are so fond of interfering in other people's business.

We were in China for ten days and we didn't go on an official mission in April, you know what, and it was such an impressive country and such an impressive people. You know what? We should learn to be a bit more tolerant of other cultures and other nations and stop being judgmental and thinking that we are the only ones with values.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Kadri Simson, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, since the last urgency debate on Hong Kong, the situation has continued to deteriorate. The revised ordinance and lawyers now requiring courts to obtain the chief executive's approval before a foreign-based lawyer can represent a client in a case related to national security is of concern.

It is worrying that two days after the adoption of the revised ordinance, the Court of First Instance upheld a government decision to bar the British King's Counsel from representing Jimmy Lai.

Moreover, the ongoing electoral overhaul of the district councils reduces drastically the number of directly elected members to less than one fifth, weakening the ability for people of Hong Kong to choose representatives overlooking district affairs and weakening a distinctive democratic feature of Hong Kong's political system under the one country, two systems principle.

The EU has continued and will continue to raise the situation in Hong Kong, both publicly and privately. Serious concerns for the deterioration of the situation in Hong Kong were raised during the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue in February, as well as in all of the last EU statements made in the UN Human Rights Council.

The UN Human Rights Committee's recommendation to immediately repeal the current national security law and the sedition provisions of the crime ordinance and stop implementing them was echoed in the strongest words at the Human Rights Dialogue with China.

Our work on trial observation continues, focusing on a series of emblematic individual cases, including *Stand News*, the national security law case of the 47 and the case of Jimmy Lai.

We are also committed to following closely the deterioration of the situation of fundamental freedoms in Macau and the alignment of the national security legislation on the drastic one from Hong Kong. Allow me to reassure you that the EU will not lose focus and will continue to stand by the people of Hong Kong.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

20. Explicaciones de voto

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir mutiski balsojumu skaidrojumi.

20.1. Ley de Inteligencia Artificial (A9-0188/2023 - Brando Benifei, Dragoş Tudorache)

Mutiski balsojumu skaidrojumi

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule preşedinte, doamna comisar, vorbim despre un vot care face istorie. Legea privind inteligenţa artificială, care a primit astăzi aprobarea Parlamentului European, constituie prima reglementare de acest fel din lume. Nu putem ignora faptul că suntem deja ancoraţi într-o realitate care utilizează din ce în ce mai mult inteligenţa artificială.

Este aşadar esenţial să ne asigurăm că evoluţia ei rapidă garantează o protecţie solidă a drepturilor fundamentale, a sănătăţii, a siguranţei fiecăruia, precum şi a democraţiei şi a statului de drept. Prin urmare, furnizorii de modele de inteligenţă artificială trebuie să fie responsabilizaţi, să țină cont de un set de obligaţii care garantează că sistemele lor sunt supravegheate de oameni, că sunt sigure, transparente, urmăribile şi nediscriminatorii.

De aceea am votat în favoarea creării unor mecanisme de protecţie a cetăţenilor pentru ca inteligenţa artificială să nu fie utilizată în mod abuziv şi nedemocratic de către actori statali şi entităţi private care urmăresc să submineze discernământul societăţilor noastre.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kolegové, dovolu, abych vysvětlila, proč jsem hlasovala pro nařízení, kterým se stanoví harmonizovaná pravidla pro umělou inteligenci. Tento přijatý akt stanoví harmonizovaná pravidla pro vývoj, uvádění na trh a používání systémů umělé inteligence v Evropské unii na základě přiměřeného přístupu založeného na riziku. Podle nařízení jsou v Evropské unii zakázány některé systémy umělé inteligence, jako je sociální skórování, prediktivní policejní práce nebo biometrická kategorizace. Bohužel pozměňovací návrhy naší frakce týkající se biometrické identifikace v reálném čase pro cílené účely, jako je vyhledávání pohřešovaných osob včetně dětí nebo boj proti teroristickým útokům a závažné trestné činnosti, prostě nebyly přijaty. V tomto případě zvítězila ideologie nad bezpečností. Přesto jsem nakonec hlasovala pro usnesení Evropského parlamentu a věřím, že v dialogu bude dosaženo dobrého výsledku.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, také jsem podpořil právní úpravu umělé inteligence, ale přihlásil jsem se do možnosti vysvětlit své hlasování, abych zde uvedl právě tu námitku, kterou sdělila i má vzácná kolegyně, poslankyně Šojdrová. Chci sdělit, že mě velmi mrzí, že neprošly pozměňovací návrhy naší frakce PPE, které umožňovaly mnohem efektivnější využití umělé inteligence při identifikaci v rámci biometrické identifikace. Protože jsem přesvědčený, že postup, který prošel, kdy bude nutné čekat na rozhodování soudu atd. v tak stěžejních případech, jako jsou únosy dětí nebo v případech té nejzávažnější trestné činnosti, jako je terorismus, povede k tomu, že efektivita využití umělé inteligence bude výrazně snížena. Říkám to nerad, říkám to tady veřejně. Bylo to zde řečeno, zvítězila ideologie. A moc prosím, abychom se ještě zamysleli, jestli případy únosů dětí, terorismu atd. nezaslouží rychlejší a okamžité nasazení prostředků umělé inteligence.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, without proper regulation, AI systems will further increase mass surveillance, structural discrimination, the centralised power of Big Tech and unaccountable public decision-making. The regulation should be governed by a precautionary principle, but the text we voted on today did not include this. It does not ban the use of AI in migration management. The understanding of what is considered high risk was severely watered down. The committee bans discriminatory biometric categorisation, predictive policing, emotive recognition and the mass scraping of images. But the regulation should also ban the automated surveillance of behaviour in public spaces. France is about to introduce this kind of behavioural surveillance in order to alert police to so-called abnormal behaviour at sports events. For decades, football fans have had to live with political policing and inhumane treatment by police simply because they are working class, especially the fans who either sit or stand behind the goals. They deserve better.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem tento návrh nařízení podpořil. Je to první regulace tohoto typu na světě, na což můžeme být samozřejmě do jisté míry hrdí. Já jen doufám, že také dokážeme zkrotit obavy, které jsou spojeny s tímto nařízením a hlavně s tímto mechanismem umělé inteligence, že stále ještě dokážeme regulovat tento mechanismus, že je to v naší moci, že tzv. nedržíme pomyslné tlačítko na spuštění. Možná, že planeta Země by si oddechla, kdyby zmizel lidský druh, ale já pevně věřím, že to je pořád ještě v naší moci, že kontrolujeme i tento mechanismus, který se obávám nazvat živočišným druhem. Podle mého názoru je velmi špatně, že jsme nepřijali některé pozměňovací návrhy, které podala skupina PPE. Byly tam i další návrhy, které jsem podpořil svým hlasováním. Ve výsledku jsem ale rád, že byla přijata alespoň nějaká míra regulace, protože právní otázky mechanismu fungování umělé inteligence nebyly uspokojivě vysvětleny, ale alespoň byly tyto návrhy projednány.

20.2. Pilas y baterías y sus residuos (A9-0031/2022 - Achille Variati)

Mutiski balsojumu skaidrojumi

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, dnes jsem podpořila nařízení o bateriích a odpadních bateriích. Jde především o aktualizaci pravidel pro design, výrobu a nakládání s odpady všech typů baterií prodávaných v Evropské unii. Toto stanovisko jsem podpořila právě proto, že jde o další krok v posilování evropské konkurenceschopnosti. Mezi hlavní body tohoto nařízení patří například přísnější požadavky na udržitelnost, výkonnost, označování. Ty vstoupí v platnost přibližně za čtyři roky tak, aby výrobci měli čas se přizpůsobit. Dále je to politika náležité péče neboli *due diligence*, která se bude vztahovat na všechny baterie, ale s pozdější účinností pro průmyslové a přenosné baterie. Bylo také pamatováno na malé a střední podniky, pro které platí výjimka. Platí zde také nová metodika pro sběr, která se mění tak, že nyní bude založena na zohlednění delšího životního cyklu baterií a spotřebičů. Věřím, že celé nařízení bude mít pozitivní dopad pro občany.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, nejsem moc příznivcem nových evropských regulací, ale nakonec jsem tedy po určitém váhání podpořil tento návrh, protože je faktem, pokud od roku 2035 přecházíme k plné elektromobilitě a obecně v rámci *Green Deal* posiluje význam baterií, tak asi je třeba určitá právní regulace. To je důvod, proč jsem nakonec po určitém váhání tento návrh podpořil. To, co je důležité, v Evropě vznikají velké gigatovárny, které mají v rámci (*nesrozumitelné slovo*) vyrábět baterie. Vede se velká debata, zda v České republice podobný podnik zřídít či nikoliv. A ve chvíli, kdy takové podniky budou vznikat, budou vyrábět miliony baterií, budou recyklovat miliony baterií, tak asi určitá právní úprava je zde namísto a je vhodná. Takže uvidíme, podívejme se na to s určitým ohledem jistě skepse k další regulaci. Ale asi není možné jinak než takovou regulaci přijmout, protože význam baterie se do budoucna zkrátka pro naše hospodářství a mobilitu výrazně zvýší.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, vypadá to, že problematiku baterií mají potřebu vysvětlovat pouze čeští poslanci, ale snad tomu tak úplně není. Mám za to, že baterie jsou z hlediska transformace evropské energetiky skutečně klíčovou technologií. Mají zásadní význam pro udržitelnou mobilitu a také pro skladování energie z obnovitelných zdrojů. Mimo to jsou nedílnou součástí každodenního života evropských občanů. Také význam těchto baterií lze doložit na číslech. Ze současných 0,7 milionu tun poroste množství baterií na 4,4 milionu tun v roce 2035, takže je potřeba toto téma řešit. Já jsem toto nařízení podpořil, nemám o tom pochybnost a pevně doufám, že se osvědčí tato technologie do budoucna jako udržitelná a i klimaticky příhodná technologie pro naši budoucnost.

20.3. Garantía de la seguridad alimentaria y la resiliencia a largo plazo de la agricultura de la Unión (A9-0185/2023 - Marlene Mortler)

Mutiski balsojumu skaidrojumi

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, stimăți colegi, este un subiect care mă interesează în mod deosebit, pentru că eu vin dintr-o țară cu resurse agricole importante, însă nu suficient valorificate. România are aproape 15 milioane de hectare de teren agricol pe care agricultorii români îl pot transforma în hrană pentru zeci de milioane de cetățeni europeni.

Pentru a reuși să facă acest lucru, ei au nevoie însă de sprijin. Vreau să subliniez că prin țara mea au trecut în ultimele 12 luni peste 60 % din cerealele exportate de Ucraina, iar fermierii români continuă să se confrunte cu foarte mari dificultăți din cauza liberalizării importurilor de produse agricole din Ucraina.

Am votat pentru acest raport în speranța unei repartizări echitabile a resurselor Uniunii Europene. Nivelul plăților directe trebuie ajustat astfel încât acesta să corespundă nevoilor fermierilor. Agricultorii din țara mea se simt în mod cert și pe bună dreptate, nedreptățiți din acest punct de vedere.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, usnesení o potravinové bezpečnosti a dlouhodobé odolnosti zemědělství v Evropské unii není důležité jen pro zemědělce, ale určitě také pro spotřebitele, protože každý občan chce mít jistotu, že si může koupit cenově dostupné a kvalitní potraviny. A to mu nezajistí nikdo jiný než zemědělci. Nakonec toto usnesení získalo poměrně velkou většinu a dovoluňte mi zdůraznit jen několik bodů. Především Evropský parlament upozorňuje na to, že nové právní předpisy, které souvisejí se Zelenou dohodou pro Evropu, nesmí vést k poklesu produkce potravin v Evropské unii tak, aby nebyla ohrožena právě potravinová bezpečnost. Evropský parlament vyzývá Komisi, aby přijala nezbytná opatření, která zemědělcům poskytnou jistotu plánování a záruky, které umožní zachovat, případně zvýšit produkci potravin. A také vyzývá Komisi, aby urychlila přijetí právních předpisů týkajících se používání nových šlechtitelských technik s cílem zvýšit výnosy a zvýšit odolnost plodin vůči změnám klimatu a novým patogenům. Proto jsem také toto usnesení podpořila.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, the biggest risk to food security and to the long-term resilience of EU agriculture are climate change and the biodiversity crisis. Never has our food system be so industrialised, so chemically intensive, and so global. This is the primary driver of the biodiversity crisis and a massive contributor to the climate crisis.

We are approaching the sixth mass extinction. Global greenhouse gas emissions are at an all-time high. Yet the EPP walked out of negotiations on the Nature Restoration Law and are actively engaging in disinformation about the content of the regulation.

The EPP has repeatedly lied that the regulation would force farmers to abandon 10 % of their farmland. This is not true. Nowhere in the Commission proposal or in Parliament's text is this stated and it is pretty irresponsible to suggest otherwise. History will not be kind to those who vote against the Nature Restoration Law.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I voted against this report for a number of reasons, but one of them was the complete failure to recognise the responsibility we bear for food insecurity because of illegal sanctions that we impose.

Reports from even the World Trade Organization and the World Bank have pinpointed the impact that this has had on the fertiliser market and the consequential exacerbation of food insecurity. Soaring prices and export restrictions have driven potash fertiliser prices to their least affordable level in 15 years.

This year, the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in their Third Periodic Report on Lithuania, pointed out that they were concerned at the measures taken by Lithuania that prevented the transportation of potash from Belarus for third countries in Africa and Latin America, leading to a shortage of fertiliser affecting food security in those countries. They asked Lithuania to change it.

The UN Secretary-General said that we must have a solution to the problem of global food security by looking at the reintegration of food and fertiliser production from Russia and Belarus. If you're giving out about food insecurity, you've got to deal with this.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, budu vysvětlovat bod, kde jsem po dlouhé době nepodpořil tento návrh zprávy z mnoha důvodů. Myslím, že se v této zprávě nenašla dostatečná rovnováha mezi zájmy zemědělců a ochranou přírodních zdrojů a v zásadě i respektuji vyjádření, které k tomuto bodu dal kolega Wallace. Myslím si, že musíme udělat pro ochranu přírodních zdrojů daleko více. Souhlasím s tím, že musíme snižovat administrativní zátěž zemědělců. Samozřejmě také musíme motivovat mladé zemědělce, aby se tomuto oboru věnovali. Ale nesmíme zapomínat na důležitá témata, jako je ochrana biodiverzity, zákaz nebo velmi výrazná regulace profylaktického užití antibiotik, samozřejmě také užívání pesticidů. V těchto tématech si myslím, že tato zpráva spíše respektuje zájmy výboru AGRI a neodráží úplně zájmy naší budoucnosti. Proto jsem také tuto zprávu nepodpořil.

20.4. Períodos de prácticas de calidad en la Unión (A9-0186/2023 - Monica Semedo)

Mutiski balsojumu skaidrojumi

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, într-o Europă competitivă, este esențial să le oferim tinerilor oportunitățile reale de a dobândi experiență practică de muncă, iar educația joacă un rol vital în modelarea viitoarelor forțe de muncă. Ea trebuie să evolueze în tandem cu nevoile și cerințele pieței. În acest sens, stagiile de practică sunt cele care contribuie la reducerea decalajului dintre educație și angajare.

Prin urmare, legislația și normele privind stagiile de bună calitate trebuie să faciliteze cooperarea dintre instituțiile de învățământ și angajatori, asigurându-se că tinerii dobândesc abilitățile practice și cunoștințele efective cerute de industrie, având șanse echitabile la a contribui la prosperitatea societăților noastre.

Împreună cu stagiile de practică, educația și formarea vocațională pot fi parte din soluția la criza competențelor și a șomajului. Trebuie să încurajăm tinerii să îmbrățișeze și educația vocațională.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, nakonec jsem tento materiál podpořil, a to hlavně z toho důvodu, že jsem přesvědčen o důležitosti stáží jak v Evropské unii u našich orgánů, tak obecně u kteréhokoliv jiného zaměstnavatele. Samozřejmě vidím tu rovinu evropskou, vidím, jak roste zájem mladých lidí o to seznámit se s činností Evropského parlamentu, Evropské komise. Vidím, jak roste zájem mladých Čechů. Českou republiku tady zastupuji a mám z toho radost. Na druhou stranu, nejsem si tak úplně jistý, že je třeba přijímat nějaký rozsáhlý regulační materiál, nějakou speciální právní úpravu. Takže jsem chtěl využít toho, že zde vystupuji, a obhajuji, že jsem pozitivně naladěn a podpořil jsem materiál o stážích, aby na druhou stranu případná právní regulace, která bude, byla co možná nejobecnější, nejschůdnější a nevedla k tomu, že se potom zaměstnavatelé budou obávat dávat mladým lidem šanci v rámci stáží.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Slēdzam šo darba kārtības punktu. Tas ir arī pēdējais šodienas darba kārtībā.

21. Orden del día de la próxima sesión

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamā sēde sāksies rītdien, proti, ceturtdien, 2023. gada 15. jūnijā, plkst. 9.00.

22. Aprobación del Acta de la presente sesión

Sēdes vadītājs. – Darba kārtība ir publicēta un ir pieejama Eiropas Parlamenta tīmekļa vietnē.

Šis sēdes protokolu iesniegs Parlamentam apstiprināšanai rītdien pēcpusdienas sākumā.

23. Cierre de la sesión

(Sēde tika slēgta plkst. 21.27.)

—

Explicación de los signos utilizados

*	Procedimiento de consulta
***	Procedimiento de aprobación
***I	Procedimiento legislativo ordinario (primera lectura)
***II	Procedimiento legislativo ordinario (segunda lectura)
***III	Procedimiento legislativo ordinario (tercera lectura)

(El procedimiento indicado se basa en el fundamento jurídico propuesto en el proyecto de acto.)

Abreviaturas utilizadas para las comisiones parlamentarias

AFET	Comisión de Asuntos Exteriores
DEVE	Comisión de Desarrollo
INTA	Comisión de Comercio Internacional
BUDG	Comisión de Presupuestos
CONT	Comisión de Control Presupuestario
ECON	Comisión de Asuntos Económicos y Monetarios
EMPL	Comisión de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales
ENVI	Comisión de Medio Ambiente, Salud Pública y Seguridad Alimentaria
ITRE	Comisión de Industria, Investigación y Energía
IMCO	Comisión de Mercado Interior y Protección del Consumidor
TRAN	Comisión de Transportes y Turismo
REGI	Comisión de Desarrollo Regional
AGRI	Comisión de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural
PECH	Comisión de Pesca
CULT	Comisión de Cultura y Educación
JURI	Comisión de Asuntos Jurídicos
LIBE	Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior
AFCO	Comisión de Asuntos Constitucionales
FEMM	Comisión de Derechos de la Mujer e Igualdad de Género
PETI	Comisión de Peticiones
DROI	Subcomisión de Derechos Humanos
SEDE	Subcomisión de Seguridad y Defensa
FISC	Subcomisión de Asuntos Fiscales
SANT	Subcomisión de Salud Pública

Abreviaturas utilizadas para los grupos políticos

PPE	Grupo del Partido Popular Europeo (Demócrata-Cristianos)
S&D	Grupo de la Alianza Progresista de Socialistas y Demócratas en el Parlamento Europeo
Renew	Grupo Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Grupo de los Verdes/Alianza Libre Europea
ID	Grupo Identidad y Democracia
ECR	Grupo de los Conservadores y Reformistas Europeos
The Left	Grupo de la Izquierda en el Parlamento Europeo - GUE/NGL
NI	No inscritos