C/2024/6171

17.10.2024

ESACTA LITERAL DE LOS DEBATES DE 17 DE OCTUBRE DE 2023

(C/2024/6171)

PARLAMENTO EUROPEO

PERÍODO DE SESIONES 2023-2024

Sesiones del 16 al 19 de octubre de 2023

ESTRASBURGO

Sumario

Página

1. Apertura de la sesión 4

2. Eficacia de las sanciones de la UE contra Rusia (debate) 4

3. Día Internacional para la Erradicación de la Pobreza (debate) 23

4. Reanudación de la sesión 32

5. Sesión solemne – Discurso de Nikol Pashinián, primer ministro de la República de Armenia 32

6. Declaración de la presidenta 40

7. Turno de votaciones 42

7.1. Red de Datos de Sostenibilidad Agrícola (A9-0075/2023 - Jérémy Decerle) (votación) 42

7.2. Mecanismo de Protección Civil de la Unión (A9-0266/2023 - Sara Cerdas) (votación) 42

7.3. Aprobación de la gestión 2021: presupuesto general de la UE – Consejo Europeo y Consejo (A9-0274/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (votación) 42

Sumario Página

7.4. Nombramiento de un miembro del Comité Ejecutivo del Banco Central Europeo (A9-0289/2023 - Irene Tinagli) (votación) 42

7.5. Establecimiento del Mecanismo para Ucrania (A9-0286/2023 - Michael Gahler, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial) (votación) 42

7.6. Creación de la Plataforma de Tecnologías Estratégicas para Europa («STEP») (A9-0290/2023 - José Manuel Fernandes, Christian Ehler) (votación) 42

7.7. Control de la pesca (A9-0016/2021 - Clara Aguilera) (votación) 42

7.8. Repercusiones de las operaciones de pesca chinas en el sector pesquero de la Unión y actuación futura (A9-0282/2023 - Pierre Karleskind) (votación) 43

8. Reanudación de la sesión 43

9. Presupuesto general de la Unión Europea para el ejercicio 2024 - todas las secciones (debate) 43

10. Espacio Schengen: digitalización del procedimiento de visado – Espacio Schengen: modificación del Reglamento sobre la etiqueta adhesiva de visado (Debate conjunto – Espacio Schengen) 63

11. Aprobación del Acta de la sesión anterior 72

12. Programa de trabajo de la Comisión para 2024 (debate) 72

13. Turno de preguntas a los comisarios – Medidas europeas para evitar y combatir el aumento de la delincuencia organizada 91

14. Composición del Comité Consultivo sobre la Conducta de los Diputados 101

15. Correcciones de errores (artículo 241 del Reglamento interno)(curso dado) 102

16. Escasez de agua e inversiones estructurales para el acceso al agua en la Unión (debate) 102

17. Necesidad urgente de una respuesta europea coordinada y de un marco legislativo sobre los programas espía intrusivos, sobre la base de las recomendaciones de la Comisión de Investigación PEGA (debate) 116

18. Situación de las refugiadas ucranianas, en particular su acceso a asistencia en materia de salud sexual y reproductiva y derechos conexos (debate) 130

19. Informe de 2022 sobre Montenegro (debate) 141

20. Explicaciones de voto 147

20.1. Establecimiento del Mecanismo para Ucrania (A9-0286/2023 - Michael Gahler, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial) 147

Sumario Página

20.2. Creación de la Plataforma de Tecnologías Estratégicas para Europa («STEP») (A9-0290/2023 - José Manuel Fernandes, Christian Ehler) 147

20.3. Control de la pesca (A9-0016/2021 - Clara Aguilera) 148

21. Orden del día de la próxima sesión 148

22. Aprobación del Acta de la presente sesión 148

23. Cierre de la sesión 149

ESACTA LITERAL DE LOS DEBATES DE 17 DE OCTUBRE DE 2023

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

1. Apertura de la sesión

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.02 Uhr eröffnet.)

2. Eficacia de las sanciones de la UE contra Rusia (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als erster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu der Wirksamkeit der gegen Russland verhängten EU-Sanktionen (2023/2905(RSP)).

Ich darf dazu den Staatssekretär für die Europäische Union, Herrn Navarro Ríos, recht herzlich bei uns willkommen heißen und ihn um seine Ausführungen bitten.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, je peux vous demander quand même de penser un peu à l'attentat qui s'est passé hier soir à Bruxelles, aux deux Suédois qui ont perdu la vie dans cet attentat. J'aimerais bien que l'on puisse observer une minute de silence ce midi.

Der Präsident. – Ich weiß, dass die Präsidentin, wenn sie den Vorsitz heute übernehmen wird, diese Schweigeminute im vollen Saal durchführen wird.

Danke für die Anregung, und unser Mitleid ist natürlich bei den Toten und ihren Familien.

Pascual Navarro Ríos, *presidente en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, señorías, señor comisario, la guerra de agresión de Rusia contra Ucrania es una violación manifiesta de la Carta de las Naciones Unidas y de los principios fundamentales del Derecho internacional.

Gracias a nuestra unidad hemos podido prestar apoyo político, económico y militar a Ucrania y adoptar un conjunto de sanciones sin precedentes contra el régimen ruso.

El actual régimen de sanciones contra Rusia es el más amplio y contundente jamás aprobado por la Unión Europea. Tal y como manifestaron nuestros dirigentes en la Declaración de Versalles en marzo de 2022, la Unión Europea está dispuesta a aumentar la presión sobre Rusia y Bielorrusia incluso adoptando nuevas medidas restrictivas.

Nuestras sanciones están concebidas para disminuir la capacidad de Rusia de llevar a cabo su guerra ilegal contra Ucrania. Reducen los ingresos del presupuesto estatal e impiden el acceso a tecnologías clave relevantes para el sector de la defensa. Su eficacia queda demostrada por las tendencias actuales de la economía rusa con el declive de las industrias de defensa, aviación y sectores manufactureros y la pérdida de competitividad y productividad prevista a medio y largo plazo.

Pero debemos aplicar nuevas medidas para aumentar la eficacia de nuestras sanciones y atajar las posibles vías de elusión. Los instrumentos antielusión recientemente adoptados en el undécimo paquete de sanciones tienen precisamente ese propósito. Esto reviste importancia para todos los bienes y tecnologías sancionados, pero especialmente para los bienes de combate que pueden ser utilizados con fines militares por Rusia para continuar su agresión contra Ucrania.

Dada la magnitud de las medidas adoptadas es muy importante una aplicación correcta y uniforme. Para ello, debemos empezar predicando con el ejemplo; y la Unión Europea no ceja en sus esfuerzos de aplicación gracias a una buena cooperación entre las autoridades de los Estados miembros y la Comisión.

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear State Secretary, dear Members of Parliament, today we face a grim milestone. It is 600 days since Russia's war of aggression began against Ukraine.

Since day one, we have been clear where we stand. We stand with Ukraine for as long as it takes, and we stand united as a European Union. Together, we have adopted eleven packages of sanctions so far. Together, we have acted to end our energy reliance on Russia within a very short space of time. And together, we have successfully diversified our supplies of energy and raw materials.

Let me now briefly outline the impact of all measures on Russia. First of all, I want to reassure you: sanctions are having a strong impact on the Russian economy. Note that Russia carefully cherry picks the economic data that it publishes. Sanctions have curbed the revenues that Russia can use to finance the war. For instance, budget figures reveal that Russia's income from oil and gas has significantly declined while there are large increases in military spending. This has resulted in an estimated budget deficit of RUB 1.7 trillion – in fact, EUR 15.9 billion – for this year.

We can see that the oil price cap and sanctions more generally are depriving Russia of its usual income sources to finance the war. In addition, immobilising the assets of the Central Bank of Russia of about EUR 300 billion, of which two thirds we know are in the European Union, was effective. It immediately created strong pressure on the ruble and forced the Russian authorities to turn to drastic capital control measures.

And it is important to recognise that Russia is implementing a number of measures to support its economy and counter the effects of sanctions. While these Russian countermeasures may provide some stabilisation, they also tie up resources that would otherwise be available to finance the war. The Russian counter-measures also include the illegal expropriation of foreign assets and forced administration of foreign companies, which undermine prospects for a return to normality.

Russia is going now through a so-called reconstruction process, allegedly rebuilding its economy and really ending its trade flows. But the outcome of this process is a less efficient economy facing higher costs. First and foremost, Russia's war and the strong response from the European Union and all allies compromise the growth potential of the Russian economy.

Inflationary expectations are increasing again. Russia's central bank is pursuing a more restrictive policy, and their fiscal space is not large enough to extend sufficient support to all sectors. Russia's long-term growth is undermined by our sanctions regime too. And let us not forget the kind of growth Russia is experiencing at the moment. Russia is turning its economy into a war economy, but manufacturing weapons and ammunitions will not improve the well-being of Russian citizens.

There is no room for complacency; sanctions need to be implemented in full. We are working closely with the Member States, like-minded partners and third countries to tackle gaps and to address Russia's attempts to circumvent all restrictive measures. In fact, we are doing the same with Russia as a country that what we try to do with the oligarchs and entities on the list of sanctions, whether we are trying to freeze the assets of those oligarchs and entities – and you know that we are in discussion with you and with the Council about a proposal of directive to harmonise the different sanctions and the definition of sanctions – when there is an attempt to circumvent the sanctions regime, and certainly when there is an attempt to circumvent such a possibility to freeze assets, we want to go to a step further in justice with a possible confiscation of such kind of assets. So we are working on that. And we have had again a meeting of the task force with all the Member States yesterday in Brussels about that. And I said, so we are working very closely with the Member States, and Russia is building new physical and financial infrastructures and restructuring trade patterns, logistics and supply chains to circumvent our sanctions. These circumvention efforts show that sanctions are working as intended and cutting of access to many goods.

Of course, sanctions cannot win the war alone, and there will always be profiteers looking to make a quick buck however they can, including by evading sanctions. These actions damage our collective efforts – all the actions to try to circumvent the sanctions, so to take profits in the framework of the sanctions. And we need to work closely again with our partners to prevent circumvention.

We need all Member States to play their part, and the Commission will continue to support them. For example, our sanctions now allow us to list people who facilitate the evasion of sanctions. The Commission is continually revising its guidance and facts. And the Commission regularly convenes, meeting with Member States to discuss implementation and to exchange best practices.

We also need to act with our international partners. This is why we have appointed an EU International Special Envoy for Sanctions Implementation. The envoys work has focused on stopping Russia's attempts to procure key technologies for the battlefield, prohibited by our sanctions that make their way to Russia via a third country. We are also in regular contact with third countries to learn together how to best limit sanctions circumvention.

Honourable Members, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today, because it is not enough to put into place eleven packages of sanctions, the most important part is to be sure that it is possible to enforce those sanctions and again, to fight against all forms of circumvention. And I count on your support to continue to work on this, sometimes also with some legislative proposals. Of course, I know that you are sharing the Commission's commitment towards Ukraine, and I thank you for it. So we will continue to work together, and I will be very pleased to hear your views today.

Andrius Kubilius, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, the fact is that Russia still is able to continue and to finance its war against Ukraine. Russia recently announced that in 2024 its defence budget will be increased by nearly 70% and will reach EUR 107 billion. From the very beginning of the war, we introduced sanctions on Russian oil and gas exports, as the major source of Russian financial income.

First of all, of course we need to see that those sanctions are working: Russia gets two times less income from exports of gas and oil than they were receiving before the war. The most painful sanctions were established last December with the introduction of the oil price cap, since the oil is bringing the biggest amount of income.

Despite the fact that the price cap sanctions hit Russian incomes very heavily, still Russia is able to get around EUR 700 million a day from its fossil fuel exports, and the EU is still sending to Russia around EUR 2 billion per month for the import of oil and gas. It is time for us to look at how we can increase the effectiveness of our sanctions policy, especially on gas and oil.

I would like just to name the next steps what we need to do. First, to further lower the cap on the crude oil price from the current USD 60 per barrel to USD 30 per barrel. Second, to impose an embargo on Russian LNG imports. Third, to introduce restrictions on fuel imports if fuels are produced by third countries using Russian oil. Fourth, to introduce a price cap on Russian ammonium fertiliser exports.

Fifth, to prohibit trans-shipment of Russian oil and LNG through EU territorial waters and exclusive economic zones. Six, to introduce restrictions on European tanker services, on sale of tankers, as well as on European insurance services for tankers, if these are used to export Russian oil. And seventh, to introduce an enforced and centralised EU-level oversight of sanctions implementation.

In addition, let's introduce sanctions on companies which are building the Russian Arctic-2 LNG terminal. Let's introduce sanctions on exports of Russian aluminium and on Rosatom and exports of nuclear fuel. It depends on us if Russia will continue to be able to finance its war.

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, *w imieniu grupy S&D*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Głównym celem sankcji było zmniejszenie zdolności Rosji do kontynuowania agresji przeciw Ukrainie. Czy osiągnęliśmy ten cel? W niewielkim stopniu. Niewątpliwie dochody budżetu Rosji zmalały, produkcja sprzętu wojskowego i amunicji jest trudniejsza, jednak nie ma to wystarczająco dużego wpływu na działania wojenne. W niektórych przypadkach sankcje przyniosły paradoksalnie odwrotne skutki, na przykład zamrożenie majątków niektórych oligarchów spowodowało powrót około 50 miliardów euro do Rosji. Przyczyny znane.

Rosja dość skutecznie reorganizuje gospodarkę. Państwa nieuznające sankcji Unii i innych krajów Zachodu, takie jak Chiny i Indie, korzystają z okazji do nadzwyczajnych korzyści. Dość powszechne jest obchodzenie sankcji technologicznych, także z udziałem firm europejskich. Szereg dużych firm z naszych krajów kontynuuje *business as usual*. Ograniczony import gazu i ropy z Rosji do Unii jest kontynuowany.

Czy ograniczona skuteczność sankcji jest argumentem za ich zniesieniem? Oczywiście nie. Nie wydarzyło się nic, co uzasadniałoby takie posunięcie. Jest wprost przeciwnie. Konsekwentne postępowanie jest miarą wiarygodności naszej polityki. Potrzeba nam jednak większej determinacji i jedności. Wyjątki uczynione dla niektórych państw członkowskich nie mogą mieć charakteru trwałego. Należy poważnie rozważyć stosowanie sankcji wtórnych wobec krajów, które lekceważą nasze wysiłki. Wojna toczy się przy naszej granicy i wspieranie agresora oznacza lekceważenie naszego bezpieczeństwa.

Wreszcie coraz bardziej pilna staje się kwestia zastosowania najpoważniejszej sankcji, jaką powinna być konfiskata zamrożonego majątku państwowego Rosji. Nie jest prawdą, że nie można tego zrobić legalnie. Można. Stanowisko Komisji w tej sprawie, dotychczasowe przynajmniej, jest błędne, zarówno prawnie, jak i politycznie. Pieniądze te powinny trafić do Ukrainy. Wzmacnianie ofiary agresji jest też formą osłabiania agresora.

Bernard Guetta, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, disons l'évidence: aucune sanction économique contre aucun régime n'a jamais mis, à elle seule, une économie à genoux. C'est aujourd'hui vrai de la Russie comme ce le fut de l'Afrique du Sud, mais les sanctions internationales n'en sont pas moins une arme des plus redoutables, car elles essoufflent les industries, multiplient les difficultés financières et obligent leurs cibles à une permanente quête d'aléatoires et très coûteux chemins de traverse.

C'est le cas de la Russie de M. Poutine, et c'est pour cela qu'il est absurde – totalement absurde – de parler d'une inefficacité des coûts économiques que nous lui portons.

Le poutinisme en est blessé. Le poutinisme en souffre, mais il y a bien évidemment des failles dans notre dispositif, de nouvelles mesures à prendre, mieux ciblées et qui fassent plus mal encore à l'agresseur. Nous avons à établir le bilan de ce qui a très bien marché, moins bien marché ou pas marché du tout.

C'est ce que notre Parlement fera le mois prochain en appelant le Conseil et la Commission à faire encore mieux, encore plus et encore plus vite. Car la fin de cette agression en dépend.

Sergey Lagodinsky, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the effectiveness of sanctions is determined by clarity about our sanctions' goals, and effectiveness of sanctions is determined by the professionalism of sanction policies.

This Council and this Commission have lost sight of the main priorities: our priority is to prevent Russian government and Russian machinery from continuing to be able to finance this genocidal war.

The goal of sanctions is not collective punishment of Putin's opponents in the EU. Just recently, the interpretation of sanctions by the Commission – according to which Russian dissidents cannot bring personal items such as shampoo or soap from Russia to the EU – is frankly an embarrassment and is self-ridiculing the sanction instrument, one of the most important instruments of our foreign policy.

Cars with Russian plates should not be allowed in the streets of the EU? Come on, listen to that. Are those our priorities?

At the same time, while EU customs officers were hunting down Russian dissidents and their personal cars, we have heard about lifting sanctions from key actors of the media landscape in Russia, based apparently on two articles in the media. Is that the professionalism that we want in our sanction policies?

We hear reports about sanction lists that are created based on Wikipedia articles. Is that the professionalism that we have? We still do not have a clear understanding of how sanctions are imposed, lifted and implemented.

Dear Commissioner, dear Council, we must increase pressure, we must enact more sanctions, and our colleagues were right about that. We must close the loopholes. But please do it with a clear view of helping Ukraine through restricting the Russian state, and do this by driving a clear, transparent and professional strategy.

Anna Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, Minister, Commissioner, 600 days after the outbreak of the full scale invasion by Russia of Ukraine, we still discuss how to curb the power of Russia to perpetrate atrocities, war crimes, genocide.

No question, the sanctions regime is unprecedented and very important, yet it is neither sufficient nor consequent. We have to broaden it and many items possible to take were already indicated. I would add to this diamonds, once more Rosatom, broadening individual sanctions, and I would add also sanctioning countries that allow so much circumvention of sanctions by Russia and here indicate the necessity to broaden the mini sanctions imposed in July on Belarus. Lukashenko is an accomplice of Russia and his regime should be punished as well.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, vous souvenez-vous des premiers mois qui suivirent le déclenchement de la guerre en Ukraine? Les ministres du gouvernement Macron et les membres de la Commission européenne nous expliquaient que l'on allait mettre la Russie à genoux grâce à l'outil des sanctions. Vous promettiez de renvoyer la Russie à l'âge de pierre, mais ce sont en réalité les ravages de l'inflation qui, désormais, martyrisent nos familles, ainsi que l'explosion du coût de l'énergie.

L'Union européenne prépare donc un douzième paquet de sanctions contre la Russie, alors que 1 800 personnes font déjà l'objet de telles mesures. Même M. Borrell a dû admettre, en mars 2023, que l'Union européenne atteignait ses limites en la matière. En nous accrochant fanatiquement, tous azimuts, à ces sanctions, nous avons multiplié les rancœurs en Afrique, en Asie et jusqu'en Amérique du Sud. Et vous parlez maintenant de lutter contre ceux qui permettraient de contourner les sanctions?

Mais, comme vient de le rappeler M. Kubilius, nous achetons chaque mois environ 2 milliards de produits énergétiques à la Russie. Et je ne parle pas de notre industrie nucléaire, qui en dépend, comme celle des États-Unis.

Bref, dans cette crise, l'Union européenne n'aura réussi qu'une chose: à allonger la liste de nos ennemis en inquiétant nos derniers amis.

Mick Wallace, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Mr President, a year ago, after German people thought the EU sanctions hurt Germany more than Russia, this sentiment can only be stronger now, as Russia's economy overtook Germany's in August.

The Russian sanctions triggered persistent inflation across the EU, higher interest rates, a fall in real wages for workers, a cost of living crisis and the cost of energy crisis. Climate goals were trashed as EU countries fired up coal power stations. Germany's economy entered recession. EUR 742 billion have been spent on energy subsidies, creating unprecedented market fragmentation as richer, more subsidy-capable countries draw investment away from others.

The NATO proxy war has seen Europe sacrificed for US interests. European industry has the pleasure of paying multiples more for US LNG than their competitors in the US. The sanctions have backfired and no one in power is admitting it. What's worse, we're about to put the final nail in the coffin as we gear up to cut off China and de-risk because the US told us to do so. In all of this, one thing is certainly clear: the EU is at the opposite of a meritocracy.

Milan Uhrík (NI). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, keď už je tu téma efektívnosti sankcií, tak treba aj na pôde Európskej únie konečne nahlas povedať, že energetické sankcie Európskej únie proti Ruskej federácii sú fatálnym zlyhaním, pretože poškodzujú viac Európu ako samotné Rusko a všetci, ktorí ich podporujú, sú spoluzodpovední za tú infláciu a za to zdražovanie, ktorému bežní Európania aj bežní ľudia čelia. Inak, rovnakým fiaskom, ako sú energetické sankcie, bol aj ten európsky cenový strop na ruskú ropu, kedy sa Európska únia a G7 dohodli, že Rusi nesmú predávať ropu za viac ako 60 dolárov za barel. Realita je taká, včera som to pozeral na burzách, že ruská ropa sa predáva za 75 dolárov za barel a jednoducho celý svet s prepáčením na európske cenové stropy kašle. Pozrite, ja chápem, že sankcie mali oslabiť Rusko a pomôcť Ukrajine vyhrať, mali pomôcť ukončiť vojnu, ale to sa jednoducho nestalo. A preto je podľa mňa najvyšší čas zrušiť tie sankcie, ktoré poškodzujú Európu, a pomôcť ľuďom ľahšie žiť.

Radosław Sikorski (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for the briefing on the state and impact of sanctions. I fully support the financial measures, the measures to stymie the Russian war effort and measures to tighten up the effectiveness of sanctions.

I would like to focus on just one aspect of them – the personnel sanctions. Patriarch Kirill, in my view, should also be sanctioned. Just because he is a religious figure doesn't give him the right to call for hatred. We sanction various mad mullahs; we should sanction him as well.

Then there is Mr Vasily Nebenzya, the Russian Ambassador to the United Nations, who, of course, enjoys diplomatic immunity in the United States, but not here. It's an important message to send to Russian diplomats that justifying a criminal war of aggression and war crimes may not pass.

Finally, a real viper – Mr Sergei Karaganov, who has been advocating for the use of nukes against Ukraine and against us. He may not have personally harmed anybody, but Julius Streicher at the Nuremberg trials also did not harm anybody. We need to send a message here as well – if you behave like a *muzhik* rather than a gentleman, you do not belong in the gentlemen's club.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, as you mentioned, since February 2022, the EU has an unprecedented sanctions package in place against Russia. And these sanctions, they mean to change Russia's behaviour and into war by undermining Russia's economy. And although there is effect, of course, but we continue to see that the Russian economy is not hit as hard as we would have expected. Our sanctions are not as effective as we thought they would be.

And first of all, and you mentioned that yourself, there is circumvention in place. A lot of products on the sanctions list still go to Russia and into the Russian war economy. So we need to step up our diplomatic efforts, but also pressure towards these countries, neighbouring countries, allies that circumvent, but also EU companies that keep exporting these products.

But we also need to see how to strengthen the sanctions. When the Russian goods that the EU countries still import represent a value that is multiple times higher than the support we give to Ukraine, you can conclude we need to do more. And that brings me to the diamonds: they are still not included in the sanction list, and I do not understand that we still allow Russian diamonds to be sold in the EU. We need to tackle that as soon as possible.

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Gerbiamas pirmininke, Komisijos nary, mieli kolegos, net ir po vienuolikos mėnesių sankcijų, po vienuolikto sankcijų paketo konvertuojama valiuta plaukia į Rusijos biudžetą. Kiekvienas euras įgalino Rusiją tęsti karą prieš Ukrainą, žudyti ir griauti. Graikų tanklaiviai noriai aptarnauja Rusijos naftos eksportą. Lietuvos vežėjai neatsisako krovinių į Rusiją, belgų deimantų apdirbėjai nesikrato rusiškų akmenėlių. Ką daryti? Apie tai galime kalbėti, bet ką iš tiesų daryti? Per pirmuosius aštuonerius šių metų mėnesius Vokietijos eksportas į Kirgiziją išaugo keturiolika kartų. Sunku suprasti, bet tai yra skaičiai, kurie įgalina Rusiją kariauti. Kolegos, aš siūlau vieną paprastą sprendimą. Siūlau nutraukti vystomojo bendradarbiavimo programas su tomis trečiosiomis valstybėmis, kurios dalyvauja

Vakarų sankcijų apėjime. Paprastai – paimti ir padaryti. Humanitarinė pagalba yra viena, vystomojo bendradarbiavimo pagalba yra kita ir padarykime tai dabar.

Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, when we discuss Russia's sanctions circumvention – brushing off the obvious, tax havens and post-Soviet Mafia states – there is a massive elephant in the room: China.

Putin and Xi will meet in Beijing today to celebrate many things. Besides the Belt and Road anniversary, they will undoubtedly toast the successful negation of our anti-war sanctions. Total trade between China and Russia hit a new record high in 2022, up to 30%.

China might have single-handedly neutralised many of our sanctions by keeping Putin's petro-economy afloat and the war in Ukraine going. China replaces suppliers of Western electronic and engineering equipment. Beijing has also helped Russia circumvent the SWIFT sanctions by facilitating more and more trade in Yuan.

It is evident that while we attempt to slow down and stop Putin's mass-murder campaign in Ukraine, China does everything short of direct weapon shipments to help Russia. My question to colleagues from the Council and the Commission is: you know full well that China's involvement has been discussed in the 11th sanction package focussed on circumvention, and I know full well that your institutions took China out of its scope.

How many more pointless sanction packages are you planning to pass, then, while the elephant in the room remains unaddressed? Also, maybe you can pass on the message to Hungarian Council officials, and they could tell us whether Mr Orban's and Hungary's position is now pro-Putin, as he has not only blocked another help to Ukraine, but is also the only EU leader present in Beijing today.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Ministrze! Panie Komisarzu! Myślę, że w tej sprawie jesteśmy w wielu aspektach zgodni, choć jako historyk wolałbym, żebyśmy mówili też o przeszłości, bo za wojnę pełnoskalową Rosji z Ukrainą odpowiadają także politycy po naszej stronie, którzy przez lata woleli być ślepi, gdy chodzi o rosyjski imperializm.

Natomiast mówiąc o dwunastym pakiecie sankcji, przede wszystkim powinniśmy starać się uszczelnić te luki, które powstawały w sposób świadomy przy wcześniejszych pakietach, gdy poszczególne państwa w zamian za głosowanie za sankcjami otrzymywały derogacje. Tak było w przypadku chociażby Belgii czy Włoch. I trzeba o tym mówić wprost i bardzo szczerze.

Myślę, że trzeba też bardzo jednoznacznie mówić o tym, że istnieją na Zachodzie cały czas firmy, które współpracują, a może lepiej powiedzieć kolaborują, z Rosją, które na tym zarabiają pieniądze. I w zasadzie dzieje się to za naszym przyzwoleniem. To pewna schizofrenia, że my z jednej strony słusznie okładamy Rosję sankcjami, ale z drugiej strony jesteśmy zupełnie bierni wobec zachodnich firm z naszych krajów, zwłaszcza z krajów Europy Zachodniej, które cały czas bardzo dobrze zarabiają, robią interesy z Rosją. To niedopuszczalne.

Paolo Borchia (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo è un dibattito che si contestualizza in un conflitto, ci sono persone che stanno soffrendo, per cui non serve né fare polemica né sbandierare risultati che non si sono raggiunti.

L'errore principale è stato quello di non aver tratto insegnamento da quanto successo con gli aggiramenti delle sanzioni del 2014, perché la Russia quest'anno riuscirà ad avere maggiori entrate grazie alle esportazioni di petrolio, nonostante i tetti massimi imposti dall'Unione europea e dal G7. In tanti stanno aiutando la Russia: il commercio con l'India è triplicato, quello con la Cina è aumentato di un terzo e le esportazioni dalla Turchia sono addirittura aumentate del 90 %. Quindi, questo è uno schema già visto, con operatori di paesi terzi che acquistano merci in Europa e poi le rivendono in Russia.

Le sanzioni hanno avuto un impatto forte nella primavera del 2022 – questo è innegabile – poi il rublo si è ripreso e i tassi di interesse sono scesi. Questi sono dati che devono far riflettere sulla obiettivamente limitata capacità dell'Unione europea di influire sulle grandi questioni internazionali e sulle sanzioni sarebbe magari il caso di fare meno filosofia e iniziare a pensare al prezzo che le aziende europee stanno pagando.

Nikolaj Villumsen (The Left). – Mr President, have the EU sanctions on Russia been effective? No, not as much as they could have been. Special economic interests have protected different sectors from sanctions. From luxury handbag exports to imports of caviar, there's always been a bad excuse. The shipping and banking sectors were protected. Even Russian blood diamonds may only be covered by sanctions from next year, maybe. Not to speak of how the Turkish president, Erdogan, is undermining the sanctions by allowing Russian goods to go through Turkey into the EU.

And then there are the fossil fuels. Since the full-scale invasion of Ukraine, the EU has paid the Putin regime more than EUR 165 billion for fossil fuel imports alone – money that Putin has used for the war. How many bombs has he bought for those billions?

We can do better. Let us strengthen solidarity with Ukraine. Let us strengthen the sanctions.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Mr President, loopholes in Russian sanctions are yet another by-product of the EU's double standards and lack of spine.

Just three examples: the illegal issuance of golden visas to Russian investors continues in Spain. Exemptions to Hungary are granted as a response to Orbán's blackmail, and sanctions with close ties to Russia have given Azerbaijan the resources for an ethnic cleansing of the Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh, while the world is not even looking.

Double standards may seem a tempting shortcut to further EU interests, but they reveal weakness, decadence and corruption. Double standards undermine our credibility and influence as international actors. No wonder that Mr Borrell needs to pathetically beg for recognition from the international community when there is a major crisis. If Europe seeks to lead a rules-based international order and a humane and prosperous way of life, our strength lies in our principles. I hope it's not too late to remember that.

Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, a pesar de las prohibiciones a la importación de petróleo crudo y productos derivados, sabemos que la Unión Europea sigue siendo uno de los mayores clientes de combustibles fósiles de Rusia.

Y es que, para empezar, algunos Estados miembros que aseguran estar a favor de las sanciones han aumentado su importación hasta el punto de que en el primer semestre de 2023 las importaciones rusas de GNL a la Unión han sido las más elevadas de los últimos tres años.

La situación exige evaluar dónde se están produciendo las fugas y las carencias que hacen que no haya la eficacia deseada. Por ejemplo, deberíamos valorar prohibir el transporte de petróleo y GNL rusos por las aguas territoriales y zonas económicas exclusivas europeas. No puede ser que los buques con bandera de países de la Unión sean los transportadores de la mayor proporción de petróleo crudo tanto en 2022 como en 2023.

De igual manera, habría que valorar seriamente ampliar la lista de productos cuya importación está prohibida, e incluir en ella el aluminio, los fertilizantes nitrogenados y el amoniaco. Y, sobre todo, la Comisión Europea debería introducir una supervisión reforzada y centralizada para evitar la ineficacia de las sanciones.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Mr President, despite the horrible atrocities happening now in the Middle East, we cannot and must not turn our attention from the ongoing Russian aggression in Ukraine, which entered its 601st day.

We need to continue pressuring Russia by all means possible. We should also continue with further measures on Belarus – a Kremlin puppet regime whom we must also keep accountable. Sanctions are taking place in economically challenging times when our citizens are increasingly anxious, but we have to keep them going as a justified response to brutal aggression.

Sanctions do work, but the efficiency of sanctions needs to be strengthened, including through a shared approach with our allies. There are still too many loopholes that need to be addressed, particularly regarding fossil fuels, energy imports through third countries and price caps.

Finally, I share the view with many others that Russian frozen assets of today can be used to rebuild Ukraine of tomorrow.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, commissaris, we zitten aan het elfde sanctiepakket. Goed dat we sancties nemen, maar elf sanctiepakketten tonen toch duidelijk aan dat we niet streng genoeg geweest zijn.

Nog steeds staan niet alle individuen van de Navalnylijst op de sanctielijst. Nog steeds omzeilt Rusland sancties door derde landen en verdient Rusland miljarden met de export van olie en gas, zelfs aan Europese landen. De sancties werken, maar ze werken toch niet zoals wij het zouden willen. De Russische oorlogsmachine draait nog steeds volop en Poetin zit nog altijd in het zadel. We moeten een tandje bijzetten. We weten welke landen Rusland helpen om de sancties te omzeilen, dus pak die landen aan.

Het kapitaal van de Russische elite is nog steeds verspreid over heel Europa. Volg het voorbeeld van Alexander De Croo. Laten we die tegoeden gebruiken om Oekraïne op te bouwen. Alleen als we ons als de Europese Unie als één blok sterk maken, kunnen we Poetin verslaan.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, Putin, the Chinese and their proxies claim that sanctions do not work. Yet Putin also keeps calling for an end to sanctions. That means that sanctions work and that they hit where it hurts the most, right in Russia's war chest.

Need more evidence? The rouble has repeatedly broken the 100 cent mark, while Russia's central bank has once again hiked interest rates to 13 %. Even according to Russian data, Russia's GDP shrunk by over 2 % in 2022, instead of the expected 4 % growth, this is a 6 % loss. In 2021, foreigners invested 40 billion in Russia; a year later, the FDI fall to almost -20 billion. The G7 oil cap effectively kept Russian oil well below the market price, thus reducing Russian revenues without creating an oil shortage. Russia's budget deficit widened to 30 billion in July. Skilled Russian labourers leaving the sinking ship. Russian assets are still frozen.

Colleagues, it is clear that Putin has dragged his country into a bloody, pointless and expensive war. Russia is doomed to fail. Just because sanctions work does not mean that they cannot work even better.

We should expose and punish sanction evasions. The targeting of war enablers must continue. Lowering the oil cap and countering the Russian shadow tanker fleet is the right way to go. The sooner Ukraine wins, the sooner the sanctions will be lifted.

Hermann Tertsch (ECR). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, estamos muy de acuerdo todos —creo que hay un consenso bastante amplio en esta cámara— en que son necesarias estas sanciones. Es necesario evitar los escapes y las fisuras en estas sanciones y hay que reforzarlas hasta que Rusia ceda y, si realmente se les da las armas necesarias a los ucranianos, que logren recuperar su territorio.

Ahora, aquí se ha hablado mucho de Orbán y de China como compradores de Rusia. Pero yo quiero hablar aquí de la Presidencia actual. El país que más petróleo ha comprado a Rusia en agosto ha sido España, después de China. El 18 % de las ventas de Rusia en petróleo se van a España directamente; el 20 % a China, el mayor comprador.

En ese sentido, vamos a ver si realmente nos dejamos de tanta retórica y vamos a las cuestiones prácticas. España no está dando un ejemplo precisamente en esta Presidencia. Se ha destacado ahora por solidarizarse con Hamás y ahora va y encima bate récords comprándole petróleo a Rusia.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Herr Präsident! Die EU-Sanktionen gegen Russland sollten rasch und schmerzhaft wirken – tatsächlich schaden die Sanktionen uns mehr als Russland. Genau deshalb auch unterläuft die EU ihre eigenen Sanktionen und importiert weiterhin große Mengen russisches Gas zu höheren Preisen über Aserbaidschan. Zum selben Zweck billigte die Kommission gerade ein zinsgünstiges Darlehen von 400 Millionen Euro an den bulgarischen Gaskonzern Bulgargaz, gegen den sie noch 2018 wegen kartellrechtlicher Vergehen Strafen von fast 80 Millionen Euro verhängt hatte, der jetzt aber russisches Gas liefern darf. Um die Herkunft des durch die Südeuropa-Pipeline transportierten Erdgases zu vertuschen, gibt es eine Geheimhaltungsklausel.

Ihre Heuchelei zeigt: Ihre Sanktionen schlagen fehl. Beenden Sie endlich diese Farce und kümmern Sie sich um Frieden und Wohlstand in Europa, denn dafür wurde die EG einst gegründet.

Kateřina Konečná (The Left). – Pane předsedající, vážený pane komisaři, je to více než rok a půl, co Evropská unie uvalila na Ruskou federaci rozsáhlé sankce v návaznosti na události na Ukrajině. I kvůli nim Evropa prochází energetickou krizí. S rekordně rostoucí inflací zaznamenalo mnoho domácností v Evropě obrovské snížení životní úrovně, zatímco energetické společnosti si mohly užívat rekordních výdělků. Závislost na Rusku pak nahrazujeme závislostí na Ázerbájdžánu, Kataru a Saudské Arábii. To se nám opravdu povedlo. Na druhou stranu se Evropě navzdory proklamacím, které jsme tady slyšeli, že Rusko bude do několika týdnů na kolenou a celé se zhroutí, nepodařilo Rusko izolovat od obchodu s třetími zeměmi a skrz tyto třetí země i Evropa neustále získává ruské zboží. Jediní, komu sankce de facto komplikují život, jsou tedy civilisté. Pokud tedy nebylo jediným cílem sankcí zhoršit životní úroveň evropským i ruským civilistům, pak nemůže být pochyb, že žádné sankce nejsou efektivním řešením. Konflikt na Ukrajině může vyřešit pouze dialog. Jestli tedy EU skutečně jde o ukončení války, a nikoli o bič na vlastní občany, musí využít svůj mohutný vliv a požadovat mírové ukončení bojů.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Abban nincs vita közöttünk, hogy az Ukrajna elleni orosz agresszió elfogadhatatlan. A szankciók viszont nem hozták el a megoldást. Sőt, inkább azt látjuk, hogy Európa súlyosabb árat fizet, mint az agresszor. Az ár pedig Európa gazdaságának és versenyképességének kivégzése. Új függések, elszálló energiaárak, infláció, zavar az ellátási láncokban. Hatásvizsgálat csak összuniós szinten készült, az egyes tagállamokra lebontva nem. A Bizottság tehát nem akar szembenézni a tényekkel, hogy kit mennyire sodort súlyos helyzetbe. A Bizottság szerint minimális a negatív hatás Európára, Oroszország pedig romokban. Ezt azzal támasztaná alá, hogy tavaly az orosz gazdaság 2,1 százalékkal csökkent.

Arról azonban hallgat, hogy idén az orosz gazdaság 2,2 százalékkal nőni fog, míg Európa jóformán stagnál. Oroszország is sérül persze, de továbbra is üzletel, csak nem velünk, és a háborúnak sem lett vége. Miközben a cél az volt, hogy az orosz bevételeket lenullázzák, az importált orosz LNG az elmúlt fél évben 40%-kal nőtt. Több tagállam pedig a korábbinál nagyobb arányban Oroszországból szerez olajat. Kevesebb álszentség, több belátás, tisztelt képviselőtársaim! Ne rúgjunk több öngólt az elhibázott szankciós politikával!

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, уважаеми колеги, санкциите срещу Русия, както и борбата с шпионските мрежи на Русия в Европейския съюз, имат различно ниво на ефективност в различните страни членки. Трябва да осигурим минимализиране на паричните потоци, отиващи в руския бюджет. Те се използват за продължаване на войната в Украйна, за унищожаването както на човешки животи, така и на инфраструктурата на тази страна.

Заобикалянето на санкциите чрез трети страни е огромен проблем, както беше казано и от Комисията. Включването на много повече поддръжници на режима и техните семейства, които имат активи в Европейския съюз, също е на дневен ред. Агресорът, чиито бомби са унищожили толкова много болници, училища, детски градини, домове и цивилна инфраструктура, трябва да плати за тяхното възстановяване.

Затова се обръщам още веднъж и към Комисията, и към Съвета. Трябва да се намери правната основа, в която замразените активи на Руската федерация да бъдат използвани за възстановяването на Украйна.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! EU har vedtaget et historisk antal sanktioner imod Rusland, og alligevel fortsætter krigen. Betyder det, at sanktioner så ikke virker? Nej, for sanktioner er ikke en bulldozer, som kører ind og vælter huset over natten. Sanktioner er en forhammer, som du igen og igen banker mod husets betonfundament – sanktionspakke efter sanktionspakke. Du banker hammeren mod fundamentet, og det føles som om, du ikke kommer nogen vegne. Men det er ikke gratis at stå på mål for vores værdier og for vores sikkerhed. Det vidste vi, og det mærker vi nu. Men heldigvis – til sidst – er jeg sikker på, at hammeren alligevel får fundamentet til at slå revner. Til sidst smuldrer fundamentet, og huset er svækket. Vi er ikke i mål med sanktionerne, men det er ikke nu, vi skal lægge hammeren fra os. Vi har brug for at stramme yderligere op med sanktioner og slå endnu hårdere til. Men vi skal tage det med ro forstået på den måde, at det kommer til at virke. Det vil have en effekt. Vi bliver nødt til at gøre det her for vores sikkerhed og for Ukraines sikkerhed. Så hold fast i kursen, Kommission. Der er brug for, at vi arbejder her.

Elsi Katainen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komission edustaja, Venäjä ei halua lopettaa sitä pahuutta, jolla se uhkaa koko Ukrainan olemassaoloa ja myös länttä.

EU:n on pysyttävä vastarinnassa yhtenäisenä, ja jokaisella jäsenvaltiolla on myös oma tehtävänsä. Painetta Venäjää kohtaan on lisättävä. Meidän on heikennettävä Venäjän voimaa.

EU:n on tiukennettava suhtautumistaan kolmansiin maihin, jotka tavalla tai toisella tukevat Venäjän hyökkäystä Ukrainaa vastaan. Tämä vaatii entistä vaikuttavampia pakotteita. Pakotteiden kiertämistä on estettävä, jotta erityisesti öljyn, kaasun ja teknologian kiertoreitit saadaan tukittua.

Pakotteiden kiertäminen on nyt estettävä.

Venäjä käyttää myös nälkää törkeästi aseenaan horjuttaakseen koko maailman ruokajärjestelmää. EU:n onkin kiinnitettävä erityistä huomiota siihen, että vilja saadaan kuljetettua Ukrainasta sujuvasti markkinoille. Se on sekä Ukrainan että muun maailman etu.

Niin aseavun kuin myös humanitaarisen, taloudellisen ja poliittisen avun antamisen Ukrainaan on jatkuttava aina Ukrainan voittoon saakka.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, des sanctions sont efficaces lorsqu'elles sont mises en œuvre. Elles sont alors un élément essentiel de la réponse, non militaire, européenne à l'agression russe. Mais, après onze paquets de sanctions censés affaiblir la Russie de Poutine, les sanctions sont contournées à travers des montages commerciaux ou par l'entremise d'États tiers, avec l'implication honteuse d'États européens. Par le biais d'États tiers, des Européens continuent d'exporter vers la Russie des biens et des matériaux contribuant directement à la guerre.

La directive sur la criminalisation du contournement des sanctions en Europe, en cours de négociation avec le Conseil, doit donc devenir un outil qui rende ces sanctions opérationnelles et prévienne de futures violations. Il s'agit donc bien de mettre un terme aux violations des sanctions par des profiteurs de guerre sans scrupules, et non de criminaliser les personnes et les organisations qui protègent les populations civiles et renforcent les sociétés civiles dans les pays en conflit.

Les acteurs humanitaires doivent donc être exemptés, et le respect des droits fondamentaux doit lui aussi être garanti.

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. We have agreed and we have implemented 11 sets of sanctions against Russia, and by far it is a big success. I do not remember anything similar in the last decades. However, it still has the loopholes, and we need to fix the loopholes. One of the largest loopholes is Iran, which is providing the equipment to Putin, including the drones and other high technology. Iran also has its hidden hand behind what happened in Israel a week ago.

Ladies and gentlemen, one of the most important thing to fill the loophole is to stop Iran. It's to sanction Iran. Please let us move ahead.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Austatud istungi juhataja! Esiteks santsioonide eesmärgist, sanktsioonide eesmärk algusest peale oli see, et nõrgestada Venemaa sõjamasinat, lüpsta see rahast tühjaks, ja et ka Venemaa tavaline kodanik tunneks, kui valus on alustada okupatsiooni ja sõda oma naaberriigi vastu ja tappa seal lapsi ja naisi. Kahjuks tänane fakt on see, et me ostame rohkem LNGd kui enne sõda. Fakt on see, et iga kuu maksab Euroopa üle kahe miljardi euro jätkuvalt Vene nafta eest. Fakt on see, et igal päeval sõidavad jätkuvalt suured rekad Euroopa autodega Venemaa turgudele läbi Ida-Euroopa riikide. Ja fakt on ka see, et paljud Euroopa poliitilised liidrid on olnud seotud sõja ajal Venemaa äritegevusega, nagu näiteks Eesti peaminister läbi oma abikaasa, mis on väga ebamoraalne. Kuid mitte ühtegi sõda kahjuks ei ole võidetud sanktsioonidega, eriti Venemaa puhul, kuna meie arvame, et kui Venemaa kodanik kannatab, siis ta alustab revolutsiooni Kremli vastu, kuid ei. Venemaa kodanik on nõus elama peldikus, kannatama viimse tilgani ja nälgima selle nimel, et ehitada üles Vene impeeriumit. Ja see tähendab seda, et sõda saab ainult võita relvade, tankide ja hävitajatega, mida me pole jätkuvalt andnud piisavalt. See on lahendus, kuidas võita sõda.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, sankcije Rusiji u svrhu zaustavljanja rata u Ukrajini.

Građane Europske unije ne zanima je li BDP u Rusiji pao za jedan ili dva posto. Što zanima građane Europske unije? Je li rat putem tih sankcija zaustavljen i kako se to reflektira na naše živote. Godinu dana sankcija, rat ne da nije zaustavljen, nego ovih dana svjedočimo novoj ruskoj ofenzivi.

Standard građana Europske unije u većini država pao je za 20 do 30 posto, pa što to treba govoriti svakoj iole inteligentnoj osobi da sankcije ne mogu zaustaviti rat. Ali ono što drugo govori, a to je da sankcije uništavaju standard, prvenstveno građana Europske unije. Što mi imamo od toga što nešto pada i standard građana Rusije?

Riho Terras (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, from the very outset of Russian aggression against neighbouring Ukraine, the EU has posed numerous sanctions on Putin's regime and Russia's economic interests. With 11 packages, we have tried to cut Russia from the markets. We have made an effort to stop trading different types of strategic goods with the aggressor.

Sanctions have real influence only if they are followed universally. They are part of the larger strategic effort to force Russia out of Ukraine. Unfortunately, there are still too many loopholes and different ways to circumvent the imposed sanctions. It is our task to make sure everyone, and everyone, follows the same line. And I would like to turn to European companies and businesses. Please stop doing business with Russia. It is immoral to do business with the aggressor. Thank you very much. *Slava Ukraini!*

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente Karas, comisario Reynders, señor presidente en ejercicio del Consejo, ojalá ante otros retos comunes como las migraciones y el asilo, la Unión Europea supiese mostrarse tan unida como se ha mostrado ante la brutal guerra de agresión de Putin contra Ucrania.

Este Parlamento ha adoptado todos los paquetes de medidas que se han ido sucediendo en el tiempo: las humanitarias, con la Directiva de protección temporal; las económicas, con la restricción de importaciones de gas, carbón y petróleo; y las diplomáticas, con la exclusión del Consejo de Europa y hasta del G-8.

Pero, después de once paquetes de medidas y con una guerra cronificada que dura más de dos años, ahora queda centrarse en asegurar la implementación correcta para evitar, en primer lugar, que Rusia pueda circunvalar en la economía globalizada y eludir el impacto de las sanciones, y que no acabemos comprando gas ruso a través de la India o exportando coches a Rusia a través de Kazajistán.

Y queda, además, tomar dos decisiones pendientes. La primera, asegurar que la confiscación de los bienes y activos rusos sirve a la financiación de la reconstrucción de Ucrania; y, la segunda, implementar medidas de reparación para aquellos sectores económicos más perjudicados por el sostenimiento de las sanciones, como son el portuario o el transportista.

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, Mr Minister, 11 sanctions packages have been adopted. They have been adopted to punish the Russian regime for their war crimes and to stop the money behind it.

But what is the reality? The reality is that trade that helps the regime to fund this war is still going on. You can see it in the images of banned goods still on sale in Moscow and beyond in Russia. It is no secret that countries like China, Kazakhstan or Türkiye are being used to bypass the sanctions.

The European Union as a whole must step up its efforts in enforcement even further. We must seek a solution at European level. We must equally question our trading agreement with any country that knowingly allows itself to be a transit point for goods going to Russia. Such nations do not merit our good relations. Those that feed this regime should be shamed. *Slava Ukraini!*

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! To już 600 dni, 600 dni rosyjskiej brutalnej wojny na Ukrainie. Przypomnę, miała trwać według Putina dwa dni, ale dzięki olbrzymiej solidarności Polski, całej Europy oraz Stanów Zjednoczonych udało się uratować Kijów przed pancerną nawałą. Jest to ciężki okres dla europejskiej gospodarki, jednak musimy to wytrzymać. Musimy dalej być solidarni i nie handlować z Rosją. Tylko tak doprowadzimy tę wojnę do końca.

Z Putinem nie wolno paktować. Jego reżim po prostu trzeba pokonać. Sankcje już przynoszą skutek. Rosyjska gospodarka kurczy się dramatycznie. Dlatego trzeba je jeszcze uściślić. Dlatego, że co tydzień niestety samoloty z Rosji przywożą diamenty dla szlifierzy z Antwerpii, rosyjskie pociągi wożą nawozy do Belgii i Niemiec. Czas z tym skończyć.

Komisja Europejska powinna przyjrzeć się również bliżej działalności niemieckich firm w krajach Azji Środkowej i niewytłumaczalnemu wzrostowi niemieckiego eksportu do tych krajów. Czy to nie jest sposób na obchodzenie unijnych sankcji? Z tym musimy skończyć.

Bernhard Zimniok (ID). – Herr Präsident! Durch die Sanktionen wollte man Russland wirtschaftlich in die Knie zwingen, damit es den Krieg nicht mehr finanzieren kann. Der Erfolg ist echt beeindruckend: Die Flüssiggasimporte aus Russland sind auf Rekordniveau, und russisches Öl wird jetzt über Drittstaaten wie Indien bezogen. Geändert hat sich dadurch nur, dass wir deutlich mehr bezahlen und Russland daher dieses Jahr wieder erneut seine Gewinne steigern wird.

Hat es den Kriegsverlauf für die Ukraine zum Positiven verändert? Definitiv nicht! Ganz im Gegenteil. Statt – wie von uns gefordert – frühzeitig Verhandlungen anzustreben, hat die Fokussierung auf Waffenlieferungen zehntausende Ukrainer und Russen das Leben gekostet und die Verhandlungsposition der Ukraine massiv geschwächt.

Die Sanktionen sind krachend gescheitert. Eine Kurskorrektur ist überfällig, und gerade Deutschland sollte Vernunft annehmen und Nord Stream 2 reparieren und unsere dahinsiechende Wirtschaft dadurch wieder ankurbeln. Das unnötige Massensterben von Ukrainern und Russen wird nur durch Verhandlungen beendet.

Francesca Donato (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'obiettivo dichiarato delle sanzioni alla Russia era quello di spezzare le reni al governo russo e costringerlo alla ritirata dai territori ucraini.

A oltre un anno e mezzo dall'inizio della guerra in Ucraina, la Russia è ancora lì ed è avanzata notevolmente. L'economia russa gode di migliore salute di quella europea, che ha risentito pesantemente delle sanzioni UE e delle controsanzioni russe, che hanno prodotto una gravissima crisi energetica e una spirale inflazionistica senza precedenti nell'UE.

La realtà è dunque che le sanzioni alla Russia sono state un completo fallimento. Prenderne atto sarebbe oggi una sconfitta politica per l'Unione, ma perseverare nell'errore avrà un costo ancora più alto per tutti noi, per le famiglie e le imprese europee.

Se vogliamo davvero evitare che la Russia vinca la guerra in Ucraina, dobbiamo promuovere un negoziato che la fermi, e farlo in fretta. Il ritiro delle sanzioni oggi può essere un importante strumento di trattativa per un armistizio che salverebbe la vita di migliaia di ucraini e scongiurerebbe il rischio di una sconfitta totale ucraina. Ricordiamocelo: è meglio perdere che straperdere.

Sandra Kalniete (PPE). – Priekšsēdētāja kungs, komisāra kungs, ministra kungs, kolēģi! Krievija plāno 2024. gadā savu militāro budžetu palielināt par gandrīz 70 procentiem. Sankcijas darbojas, jā, taču ir jāaizver caurumi, caur kuriem Krievija turpina eksportēt enerģijas resursus, pelnot 690 miljonus eiro dienā. Diemžēl Eiropas Savienība ir viens no lielākajiem enerģijas resursu klientiem, ik mēnesi papildinot Krievijas budžetu par diviem miljardiem.

Eiropas Savienības politiķiem sankcijas ir jāpadara efektīgākas, lai samazinātu Krievijas energoresursu ieņēmumus, ar kuriem tiek finansēts karš Ukrainā. Tāpēc ir jāpazemina naftas cenu griestus no pašreizējiem 60 uz 30 ASV dolāriem par barelu. Tāpat jāuzliek embargo Krievijas sašķidrinātās dabasgāzes importam un tādu degvielu importam, ko ražo trešās valstīs, izmantojot Krievijas naftu. Visbeidzot – jāierobežo Eiropas tankkuģu pārdošana, to apkalpošanas un apdrošināšanas pakalpojumi, ja tie tiek izmantoti Krievijas naftas eksportam.

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, nous n'allons pas y arriver comme ça. Je sais tous les efforts que fournit la Commission européenne, mais le problème, ce sont les États membres. Le problème, c'est que la Belgique refuse un embargo sur le diamant. Le problème, c'est que la France refuse un embargo sur le nucléaire. Le problème, c'est que nous avons donc des trous dans nos sanctions, liés à des intérêts défendus par les États membres européens.

Nous avions tous espéré que l'intérêt général de l'Europe – qui est la défaite du régime de Poutine – allait surpasser ces intérêts particuliers et là, nous nous endormons. Les importations de gaz naturel liquéfié battent des records. Nous n'avons pris encore aucune sanction véritable contre les États qui contournent nos sanctions à l'égard du régime de Poutine. Si nous continuons ainsi, nous allons édulcorer l'incidence de nos décisions et nous allons permettre au régime de Poutine de continuer sa guerre criminelle, qui vise non seulement le peuple ukrainien, mais aussi l'ensemble de l'architecture de sécurité européenne.

Il nous faut un embargo sur les hydrocarbures russes maintenant, il faut saisir et confisquer les biens et les avoirs russes en Europe maintenant. Le moment est venu d'être enfin cohérents et efficaces dans notre affrontement avec Vladimir Poutine.

Nils Torvalds (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, tänään on kulunut jo 601 päivää siitä, kun Venäjä aloitti täysimittaisen hyökkäyksensä Ukrainaan.

Sota on kuitenkin jatkunut jo pidempään, vuodesta 2014. Pakotteista riippumatta Venäjälle silti viedään kaksoiskäyttötuotteita ja myös muita kiellettyjä tuotteita. Tämä vienti pitää tukkia.

Niin kauan kuin Venäjä jatkaa hyökkäystään Ukrainassa ja niin kauan kuin Venäjä tavalla tai toisella uhkailee yhteisöämme, meidän pitää jatkaa tätä sinnikkäästi.

Suomi on turvallisuuspolitiikan kartalla saari. Siitä syystä Itämeri ja Itämeren turvallisuus on meille erityisen tärkeä. Siitä syystä tähän puhujapönttöön ei kannata tulla lausumaan tekopyhiä lausuntoja. Niin kauan kuin Unkari jatkaa vastenmielistä yhteistyötään Venäjän kanssa, Itämeri vuotaa.

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Wären Sanktionen ein taugliches Mittel, in diesem Konflikt das Sterben zu beenden, ich wäre der Erste gewesen, der gesagt hätte: Lasst uns mit diesen Sanktionen beginnen! Wären die Sanktionen ein taugliches Mittel gewesen, bei uns Energiesicherheit und Preisstabilität zu gewährleisten, ich wäre der Erste gewesen, der gesagt hätte: Lasst uns mit diesen Sanktionen beginnen!

Ich habe von Anfang an das Gegenteil gesagt, und ich habe leider recht behalten. Wir haben elf Sanktionswellen gegenüber den Russen gesetzt, und bei uns ist die Situation abermals und abermals schlechter geworden. Wir haben heute eine gigantische Entwicklung im Inflationsbereich. Wir haben eine damit verbundene gigantische Entwicklung im Armutsbereich in Europa.

Das Geschäft machen andere. Das Geschäft machen die Amerikaner, wo wir jetzt ihre Energie beziehen, das Geschäft machen die Russen über Umwege, über Indien, über China. Wir kaufen ja die russische Energie trotzdem. Die Situation in Summe ist eine, die absurder nicht sein kann. Daher bleibe ich bei dem, was ich auch von Anfang an gesagt habe: Bitte lassen Sie uns daran arbeiten, hier Friedensverhandlungen zu erzwingen, an den Tisch zu bitten, bei uns Preisstabilität zu garantieren und damit auch das Sterben zu beenden.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, sankcie na ruského agresora nielenže majú zmysel, ale majú aj podstatný vplyv. Dáta ukazujú, že bilaterálny obchod s Ruskom klesol pod dve percentá. Dovoz klesol z 9,6 % na 1,7 % a vývoz na menej ako polovicu. Ak niekto bude tvrdiť, že Rusko sankcie nepoškodili, mali by sme sa opýtať, prečo nakupujú zbrane z takej krajiny, ako je Severná Kórea. Ak niekto bude tvrdiť, že zbrojenie nemá konca kraja, všetci môžeme odpovedať, že obranné operácie Ukrajincov aj za našej pomoci oslobodili už takmer polovicu svojho územia od ruských okupantov. Ak chceme pomôcť čo najúčinnejšie oslabiť ruského agresora, musíme sankcie nielen dôsledne realizovať, ale aj rozšíriť, najmä o plyn, jadrové palivo a diamanty. Úlohou je tiež sledovanie dodržiavania týchto sankcií a nájdenie nástrojov na skoré odhaľovanie ich prípadného obchádzania. Nezabúdajme na to, že financie posielané do Ruska končia v rukách kremeľského agresora, ktorý má na rukách krv nevinných ľudí.

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

Sándor Rónai (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Amikor 2022 februárjában Oroszország megtámadta Ukrajnát, Putyinnak az volt a célja, hogy néhány hónap alatt leigázza Ukrajnát. Ma már látszik, hogy Putyin kudarcot vallott, hogy ezt a háborút Oroszország nem nyerheti meg. Ehhez szükség volt arra, hogy Európa és a nyugati világ egy emberként álljon a megtámadott ország, Ukrajna oldalára. De elsősorban azok a bátor ukránok kellenek hozzá, akiket semmi sem tántoríthat el hazaszeretetüktől. Az Európai Unió döntésének köszönhetően megakadályozta, hogy az agresszor, támadó putyini hadsereg pótolni tudja az elveszített fegyvereit és új, modern fegyverekhez jusson.

Magyarországnak sajnos komoly tapasztalata van arról, milyen az orosz megszállás. Úgy tűnik azonban, hogy a magyar miniszterelnök, Orbán Viktor erről már megfeledkezett, ezért keresi untalan a háborús bűnös, Vlagyimir Putyin kegyeit. Ez megbocsáthatatlan bűn. Nekünk, európai képviselőknek az a feladatunk, hogy megőrizzük Európa szabadságát, békéjét és biztonságát. Folytassuk ezt a munkát, dolgozzunk ezért közösen!

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Madam President, colleagues, I hear the Putin friends from the left and right extremes of this chamber argue against sanctions in great consensus, invoking the economic cost to European citizens.

But they should tell the full story. The cost of war is infinitely higher, both materially and morally, and the cynical reality is that despite the sanctions, trade continues and we see Russians, rich Russians living, holidaying, conducting their business freely in Europe.

The EU law criminalising the violation of sanctions will help tackle the uneven and weak enforcement by the Member States. And yes, more harmonisation and strict enforcement are a key priority for Parliament.

Of course, that means that some countries will have to change their practices, but the whole point of an EU law is to eliminate back doors and forum shopping. Making the sanctions work, however, is more important than petty power struggles between national governments and the EU.

As a rapporteur, I am determined to conclude the file by December at the latest, and I count on the cooperation and the flexibility of the Council and the Member States.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señorías, la economía rusa sufrió el año pasado el impacto de las sanciones con un crecimiento negativo. Pero parece que ha rebotado el 4,9 % en el segundo semestre de 2023 y podría llegar a un crecimiento del 2,3 % al final del año. El año próximo las cifras también serán positivas según todas las previsiones. La realidad es que la economía rusa no está sufriendo tanto como esperábamos. Creo que en enero, el alto representante nos decía en este hemiciclo que las sanciones a Rusia eran un veneno lento, pero ¿están realmente alcanzando todos sus objetivos? Es una pregunta más que legítima.

Me gustaría referirme a tres cuestiones brevemente. En primer lugar, ¿conoce la Comisión Europea si acaso se han reforzado los medios para vigilar el cumplimiento de las sanciones de forma efectiva tanto a nivel de los Estados miembros como incluso a nivel del Consejo y de la propia Comisión? Segundo, tratamos de reducir nuestra dependencia energética de Rusia, pero me preocupa que varios Estados miembros mantengan elevadas compras de gas licuado ruso. Termino: es necesario seguir ejerciendo presión sobre los terceros Estados para que, en la medida de lo posible, se sumen a nuestras sanciones o al menos no ayuden a Rusia eludirlas. Celebro que los viajes del señor O'Sullivan estén produciendo algunos resultados.

Dietmar Köster (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Die Sanktionen haben Russlands Wirtschaft vielleicht geschwächt, aber sie haben ihre grundlegenden Ziele, etwa dass Putin endlich seinen Krieg beendet, verfehlt. So bleiben wirtschaftliche und politische Stabilität in Russland weitgehend erhalten. Nach den Exportverboten westlicher Länder gingen die russischen Importe tatsächlich zunächst um 40 Prozent zurück. Sie erholten sich aber schnell und lagen bereits im November 2022 wieder auf Vorkriegsniveau.

Russland hat zahlreiche Wege gefunden, Sanktionen zu umgehen. Über eine lange Kette von Unternehmen landen beispielsweise sanktionierte Waren wie Mikrochips oder Drohnen auf den Schlachtfeldern. Zwei Drittel der Komponenten in russischen Waffen an der Front enthalten Chips und Mikroprozessoren aus US-amerikanischer Produktion. Das Geld von russischen Oligarchen in Höhe von 100 Milliarden Euro liegt in der Schweiz auf Konten, die nicht beschlagnahmt wurden.

Hier besteht erheblicher Nachholbedarf, um die Sanktionen effektiver zu machen. Sanktionen können darüber hinaus einen wichtigen Zweck erfüllen: Sie sollten im Rahmen von Verhandlungen über einen Waffenstillstand und Frieden als Verhandlungsmasse benutzt werden.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner, we have reacted against the atrocity of Russia and have shown solidarity for Ukraine. We have had financial measures, sanctions, bans on importing energy products and with REPowerEU will be totally independent in the energy sector from Russia.

But we need to accept that some of our sanctions have had limited impact and take action now and further strengthen the measures. We also need new measures in the energy sector. We need to remain firmly dedicated to upholding Ukraine's independence, territorial in terms of energy unity. We need to further support the provision of military, financial and humanitarian aid to Ukraine, including the energy equipment that would help to resist and stop the ongoing attacks and aggression. We need to strengthen the alignment of efforts across coalition countries, as well as mechanisms and measures to enhance the transparency of transactions not involving EU shipping service providers, develop additional administrative capacities and restrictions on Russian LNG and LPG.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Bardzo dobrze, że Unia nakłada kolejne sankcje na Rosję. Zamknięcie unijnych portów dla putinowskich statków, zamrożenie aktywów ruskich oligarchów. Jednak czy wspólna europejska odpowiedź mogłaby być boleśniejsza dla Kremla? Oczywiście mogłaby, gdyby nie główny hamulcowy – premier Węgier Viktor Orban. To on blokuje 500 mln euro unijnej pomocy dla Ukrainy. To on blokował embargo na ropę. I to on ma bardzo mocne narzędzie w ręku – weto! Najwyższy czas pozbawić Orbana prawa do decydowania o najważniejszych dla Unii sprawach – artykuł siódmy!

I na koniec bardzo dobre wieści z Polski. Nie będzie już Budapesztu w Warszawie. 15 października mieszkańcy Polski odsunęli od władzy tych, którzy trzymali z przyjaciółmi Putina. Kończy się toksyczny sojusz rządu Morawieckiego i Orbana. Kończy się dzięki współpracy opozycji i silnemu społeczeństwu obywatelskiemu, które pokonało populistów i całą machinę władzy. Piąty największy kraj w Unii wraca. Wraca i będzie budował wspólną, silniejszą i bezpieczniejszą Europę.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kolegice i kolege, manipulacije i dezinformacije vrlo su opasne, a čuli smo ih danas i ovdje.

Činjenica jest da kada podvučemo crtu, sankcije su dijelom bile učinkovite. Međutim, unatoč sankcijama, Rusija i dalje zarađuje i financira rat. Na nama je da širom otvorimo oči i jasno kažemo što se zapravo događa. Tko su zemlje koje se oglušuju i zaobilaze sankcije?

Sve sankcije – one su simbol naše osude, one su praktična mjera kojom želimo osigurati da agresija na suverenu državu ima stvarne i trajne posljedice. I ja sam za to, kao i brojni moji kolege, da vidimo što možemo učiniti još i koji je sljedeći korak. Činjenica je da su državne financije Rusije pogođene mjerama koje smo donijeli, posebno da se ograniči cijena nafte, protiv uvoza. No, moramo vidjeti što ćemo dalje. Trebamo i dalje ustrajati na vojnoj i financijskoj pomoći Ukrajini.

I dok mi razmatramo ekonomske učinke, budimo još odlučniji, jer povijest će zabilježiti ovaj trenutak, našu odlučnost i našu solidarnost, našu volju da putem ekonomskih, ali i diplomatskih alata koje imamo na raspolaganju učinimo mir na našem teritoriju.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, Council, finding unity on sanctions among 27 Member States is not easy. In the past 19 months, we managed to adopt eleven unprecedented sanction packages against Russia – an accomplishment, but it is not enough.

First, we are too slow. The smaller the steps we take, the more time Putin and his oligarch friends get to adapt. They work their way around bans on tech goods and oil exports. We should be ahead of them in adapting ourselves. Member States have to stop the shameful exchange of interests when negotiating a package at the expense of our effectiveness. If sanctions provide a disproportionate disadvantage to Member States, help them!

Second, we need to enforce our sanctions. If not, we are creating the loopholes to violate restrictive measures ourselves. And thank you, Commissioner, for your personal commitment to adopt also anti-violation legislation. We cannot have more forum shopping by and impunity for Russian criminals. We have to fix this.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Pirmininke, Komisare, kolegos. Sankcijas Rusijai svarstėme 2021-ųjų rudenį, kai ji telkė savo šimtatūkstantinę kariuomenę aplink Ukrainos sienas ir buvome, oi, kokie drąsūs. Jei ji imsis agresijos, mes ir atjungsime Rusiją nuo SWIFT sistemos. Aš ir pats, taip man atrodė, gan švelniai kalbėjau, drąsesnieji regėjo Rusiją ekonomiškai parklupdytą, jos finansinę sistemą suardytą, gatvėse alkanas minias ir Kremliaus režimo krachą. Per tą laiką pritaikėme sankcijų paketus, iš tiesų – draudimus savo pačių verslui. Realybėje tai nesutrukdė Rusijai kasdien ginkluotis, daužyti taikius ukrainiečius, investuoti Afrikoje ir daug kur. Manęs mano rinkėjai klausė, kiek dar rusų veikėjams bus atvira bendroji rinka, o gal ir tas drąsesnysis scenarijus suveiks. Kada? Patarkit. Dėkoju.

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner, sanctions on Russia show us what we can do when we work together. EU money should not fund Putin's illegal war in Ukraine. Europe is a trading superpower, and EU sanctions should show Putin the consequences of breaching international law.

The figures lay out the extent of our actions: 11 sanction passages in under two years; 1 800 individuals and entities targeted, including Russia's leaders; 21.5 billion of assets frozen; 91.2 billion of Russian import sanctions, including in tech, transportation and luxury goods. Our focus should not only be on more sanctions, but also ensuring the effectiveness of those we already have.

Russia has, of course, sought to disguise its exports by selling them through third countries. Colleagues, we need clear rules and sanctions and consequences of a failure, for example, by large companies, to implement sanctions, and of course, countries – we should not accept Russian products passed off under the radar of a different country. Russia must continue to pay the highest economic cost for what it is doing in Ukraine. Let us make sure that they do.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin,* I think the important point now, especially from the Commission's point of view, is not to be telling us about sanctions we have had and how the German economy is retracting, but to tell us where and how the sanctions are being avoided.

And it's quite obvious that it's widespread. Even Member States who have signed up to sanctions are importing Russian products from third countries who are directly importing from Russia. That's not good enough and that has to be stopped.

The same with companies who are not abiding by sanctions. And I think we need a discussion on the sanctions that are there, how they are working and what the Commission are going to do immediately to ensure that those who are trying to avoid them are going to be stopped. Then we can talk about another package of sanctions. I think that's the key.

Georgios Kyrtsos (Renew). – Madam President, sanctions are important and rather effective, but they produce results mainly in the medium and long term. They are not going to solve the problem of Russia's war against Ukraine. Russia is in a position, and will remain so, to finance its aggressive war.

First, we created a huge energy dependency. We decreased this dependency, but Russia was able to cover its financial needs in 2022 and 2023. Second, there has been a global shift in favour of major economies like China and India that have increased their collaboration with Russia. Third, the Russian private sector, the oligarchs, was able to react rather effectively to the challenge of sanctions.

Sanctions are important and should become more effective. But the only way to move forward decisively is by helping Ukraine to win the war and not just survive the Russian aggression.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, those who told us eleven times that sanctions would bring Russia to its knees, that they were a necessary gesture of solidarity with Ukraine, part of the toolbox to end the war, are still clinging to the lunacy that maybe the next round will work.

We've heard colleagues say, 'Ah well sure look it, we know they never fully work.' Or, 'Well, we need to add a load of named people to the list. We need to include diamonds. We need to tighten up beyond a WikiLeaks leak. We need to blame China.' All of it, nonsense!

The truth is sanctions don't work. Everyone, the US, the countries which contain a majority of the world's population, continue to trade with Russia. Our LNG imports from Russia increased 40% since the war.

The Commissioner says the Russian economy is less efficient, it has higher costs, and it's a war economy. I don't know if that's true, but I do know that the European Union economy, which he was very silent about, has certainly got higher costs, is less efficient, and Commissioner Breton tells us it's a war economy. And with the amount of money we're shovelling into arms, it seems like it.

The Eurozone is in recession. The cost of living crisis is hitting. Ordinary people are paying, while ordinary people in Ukraine pay with their lives. We need peace and diplomacy and an end to this nonsense.

Costas Mavrides (S&D). – Madam President, those of us who seek for the effectiveness of the EU sanctions on Russia, we also agree that the problem is loopholes and practices that circumvent them. Some blame it on China, on Iran or Kazakhstan, but these are not EU Members, nor members of NATO, and certainly they are not our strategic partners.

Turkey is in accession process, a NATO member, and some still call it a strategic partner. The figures after the war are astonishing. Turkish exports to Russia increased by 50% and Russia's exports to Turkey by almost 200%, while the EU citizens absorb huge costs, rightly so, due to sanctions.

And the final point, while all this is going on, Russia and Turkey are still in strategic cooperation to develop the Akkuyu nuclear power plant, with significant risks for the EU citizens, especially those in the Mediterranean. So the problem is not just loopholes – it is double standards.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Didier Reynders, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Secrétaire d'État, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires, je voudrais tout d'abord, à nouveau, vous assurer que les sanctions fonctionnent. Ce n'est évidemment pas la seule méthode pour arriver à la fin d'une guerre, mais les sanctions fonctionnent à l'égard de la Russie, comme elles ont fonctionné dans d'autres situations.

Toutefois nous devons – vous avez raison – poursuivre nos efforts. Tout d'abord, j'ai pris bonne note de la liste des propositions d'extension des différents régimes de sanctions que vous proposez. Vous le savez, nous travaillons, à la Commission, avec les États membres pour avancer à l'unanimité au sein de l'Union européenne, tant à l'égard de la Russie que de la Biélorussie – comme certains l'ont rappelé. C'est donc un travail, au quotidien, que de faire en sorte que l'on puisse couvrir le plus largement possible le panel des activités que l'on veut limiter ou empêcher à l'égard de la Russie ou de la Biélorussie, mais nous devons le faire – et nous l'avons fait – dans les onze paquets, décidés jusqu'à présent à l'unanimité.

Vous avez bien compris que, au-delà de la définition des sanctions, ce qui est probablement au moins aussi important, c'est d'en assurer la mise en œuvre effective et de lutter contre toute forme de contournement. Je prendrai tout d'abord l'exemple du gel des avoirs: nous avons gelé les avoirs de plus de 1 500 personnes et de 270 entités. Cela signifie 28 milliards d'euros gelés dans l'Union européenne, pour les entités et les personnes – en ce compris les oligarques –, et plus de 200 milliards d'euros immobilisés dans l'Union européenne en ce qui concerne les avoirs des autorités, en particulier les réserves de la Banque centrale de Russie.

Ce sur quoi nous travaillons maintenant, avec vous, c'est faire en sorte que l'on puisse lutter contre le contournement de ces mesures de gel, et même aller plus loin – comme plusieurs l'ont rappelé –, en allant vers la confiscation de ces avoirs. Pour cela, nous avons besoin de finaliser les travaux que nous menons pour l'instant, en trilogue, sur la proposition de directive concernant ce contournement des sanctions. Cela nous permettrait de demander en justice non plus de geler les procédures administratives, mais de confisquer des avoirs en cas de tentative de contournement. Ces avoirs pourraient dès lors servir à la reconstruction de l'Ukraine comme à la compensation des dommages subis par un certain nombre de victimes.

Nous devons donc continuer à travailler sur ces contournements de sanctions, mais aussi sur le contournement de toutes les autres sanctions, exportations ou importations de produits – comme vous l'avez rappelé. Comme je l'ai signalé tout à l'heure, nous avons maintenant désigné un envoyé spécial, qui prend contact avec un certain nombre d'États ou d'entités pour mener à bien cette lutte contre les contournements de sanctions. C'est là un travail que nous devons mener avec les États membres comme avec nos partenaires internationaux.

J'ai aussi pris bonne note d'un certain nombre de remarques sur des cas individuels, concernant notamment des dissidents russes. Nous allons évidemment examiner ces cas individuels, tels qu'ils ont été mentionnés. Je vous rappelle que nous devons, dans le cadre de tous nos régimes de sanctions, respecter aussi les règles de l'état de droit. Nous devons motiver les décisions que nous prenons, en particulier en ce qui concerne les listes de personnes sanctionnées pour lesquelles nous voulons un gel des avoirs. Nous avons déjà eu des contestations devant la Cour de justice, mais, si certains insistent sur – parfois – les décisions négatives que nous avons dû enregistrer, nous avons aussi enregistré des décisions positives. Je dois saluer, malgré tout, le professionnalisme de celles et de ceux qui tentent de mettre en place des mécanismes de sanctions comme ceux-là, où la motivation, notamment, est un élément particulièrement important.

Je vous remercie en tout cas de nous avoir permis de participer à ce débat, qui montre bien qu'il y a encore du travail pour compléter la liste des régimes de sanctions, mais qu'il y a surtout un travail au jour le jour pour faire en sorte que ces sanctions soient effectivement mises en œuvre et que l'on puisse lutter efficacement contre tout contournement.

Pascual Navarro Ríos, *presidente en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, querría reiterar que la Unión Europea ha adoptado el conjunto de sanciones más grande y ambicioso para responder a la agresión rusa contra Ucrania, y que la Unión continúa trabajando en más sanciones si es necesario y está dispuesta a mantener esta política de sanciones todo el tiempo que sea necesario.

Como ha dicho la Comisión, las sanciones son un instrumento de la Unión Europea para apoyar a Ucrania, pero existen otros instrumentos que la Unión también pone a disposición de esta política de apoyo a Ucrania.

También querría señalar que las sanciones están diseñadas de manera que impidan la capacidad de Rusia de llevar a cabo su guerra de agresión contra Ucrania. Han sido adoptadas de manera unánime por el Consejo sabiendo que pueden causar efectos en la Unión Europea.

Como han manifestado algunas de sus señorías, es cierto que hay que trabajar para paliar esos efectos dentro de la Unión Europea, pero, en todo caso, ciertamente la Unión Europea está convencida de que causan un efecto mucho mayor en Rusia.

Sobre la posibilidad que ha mencionado la Comisión de que haya nuevas iniciativas, por supuesto el Consejo las analizará de manera diligente.

En definitiva, muchas gracias por este debate, señorías. Tengo la certeza de que preservaremos nuestra unidad y seremos capaces de ejercer presión sobre Rusia y Bielorrusia también en el futuro adoptando nuevas sanciones cuando sea necesario hasta que se encuentre y prevalezca finalmente una fórmula para una paz justa, con pleno respeto de la independencia, la soberanía y la integridad territorial de Ucrania dentro de sus fronteras internacionalmente reconocidas.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will be held at the next part-session.

Written Statements (Rule 171)

András Gyürk (NI), *írásban*. – A magyar álláspont a háború kezdetétől egyértelmű. A nemzetközi jog talaján állva teljes mértékben elítéljük Oroszország katonai agresszióját és erőnkön felül támogatjuk Ukrajnát. Azonban, mintegy húsz hónappal a háború kitörését követően célszerű megvizsgálni az eredetileg a konfliktus mihamarabbi lezárását és az orosz gazdaság térdre kényszerítését célzó uniós szankciók hatékonyságát.

Tizenegy szankciós csomagot követően mondjuk ki – a szankciós politika megbukott. Az IMF előrejelzése szerint az Unió gazdaságának növekedése idén harmadát fogja kitenni az oroszénak. A szankciók miatt megugró energiaárak súlyosan megkárosították az európai gazdaság versenyképességét – vállalataink hétszer annyit fizetnek a földgázért, mint az amerikaiak. Emellett Nyugat-Európában rekordmagasra nőtt az ázsiai, orosz nyersolajból finomított olajtermékek és az orosz LNG importja is.

Itt az idő, hogy Brüsszel és a baloldal végre kilábaljon a szankciós pszichózisból. Ha valami tizenegyszer nem sikerült, valószínűleg tizenkettedjére sem fog. Ehelyett a békére és az európai gazdaságot károsító szankciók megszüntetésére kell törekedni.

Edina Tóth (NI), *írásban*. – Az Oroszország elleni szankciók számos gazdasági és társadalmi kérdést érintenek. Az eltelt időszakban azt látjuk, hogy a szankciók nem érték el a kívánt hatást: a háborús infláció és a gazdasági bizonytalanság az európai fogyasztókra és munkavállalókra rendkívül negatív hatással van. Óriási mértéket öltött az agrárszektor, az élelmiszeripar kárai és a szállítási ágazat vesztesége. Emellett a szankciók kihatnak az európai vállalatokra, akik piacokat veszítenek, bevételeik pedig jelentősen csökkentek. Nem kérdéses, hogy az Ukrajna elleni orosz agresszió elfogadhatatlan. Itt az idő azonban, hogy Brüsszel és a baloldal végre kilábaljon a szankciós pszichózisból. Brüsszelnek szankciók helyett saját feladataival kell foglalkoznia: gazdasági, kereskedelmi és klímasemlegességgel kapcsolatos kötelezettségeinek teljesítésével! Újragondolásra van szükség a módszerek tekintetében, ki kell dolgozni olyan stratégiákat, amelyek nem károsítják az európai gazdaságot és polgárokat!

3. Día Internacional para la Erradicación de la Pobreza (debate)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on the International Day for the Eradication of Poverty (2023/2900(RSP))

Nicolas Schmit, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members. Indeed, today we mark the International Day for the Eradication of Poverty. It is therefore important that the European Parliament organise a debate on where we stand in the EU, but also at a global level, and more particularly, how we should increase our efforts to be successful in eradicating poverty.

The world is going, through violent times, with a lot of crises, wars, armed conflicts and terrorist attacks. They cause death, destruction and deep poverty. They have a detrimental impact on poverty reduction. Moreover, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic reversed three decades of steady progress, with the number of people living in extreme poverty in the world increasing for the first time in a generation.

We were successful at mitigating the impact from COVID-19 in the EU, thanks to our strong national social safety nets and the common European response to the pandemic, including notably through SURE. However, as many as 670 million people – 8.4% of the world population – were still living in extreme poverty globally by the end of 2022.

Improving the living and working conditions of the most vulnerable across the world remains a major global challenge. While our circumstances are very different to other areas of the world, there is still work to do to eradicate poverty in the EU. I just want to recall that the number one priority of the Sustainable Development Goals is no poverty – poverty in all its forms everywhere. Unfortunately, this promise is in peril.

In 2022, more than one in five people remain at risk of poverty and exclusion in the EU – 21.6%. Child poverty is actually higher than for the general population, with nearly one child in four impacted by poverty or by the risk of poverty – nearly 25%.

The number of homeless people is on the rise. This year, he International Day for the Eradication of Poverty, calls for universal access to decent work and social protection, and to emphasise that decent work must empower people, provide fair wages and safe working conditions. These objectives echo two priorities of this Commission that President von der Leyen recalled in her state of the Union speech – decent jobs and ensuring that no one is left behind. These are also two strands of the European Pillar of Social Rights, which has remained the common compass of the EU institutions and Member States in the employment and social policy areas throughout these challenging years. This is also our contribution to the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

The Social Action Plan has turned the principles of the pillar into concrete actions, and we set ambitious targets by 2030 in the action plan in the wake of the COVID-19 crisis. This includes a poverty-reduction target at least 50 million fewer people at risk of poverty or social exclusion in the EU, including at least five million children.

Concerning the various measures that we have delivered over the past few years, I will mention those that are most relevant here: the Minimum Wage Directive is important for tackling in-work poverty; the Directive on Pay Transparency, to set up measures for effective enforcement of the equal pay principle between women and men; the proposed Platform Work Directive, addressing the issue of social protection in a world of work affected by digitalisation; the European Child Guarantee recommendation to address child poverty and exclusion; the European Platform on Combating Homelessness; the recommendation on minimum income, ensuring active inclusion; our guidance on distributional impact assessments to support Member States in quantifying the effect their policies have on household incomes.

The efforts to deploy the measures under the Social Pillar Action Plan need to be assessed against the background of the broader economic and geopolitical situation in the EU and around the world. The overall economic prospects are challenging following the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, the energy crisis, the inflation hikes, Russia's war in Ukraine and, most recently, the attacks by Hamas on Israel, which risks leading to wider escalation in the region with severe humanitarian consequences from which all parties should refrain.

In general terms, indicators on risk of poverty and social exclusion in the EU have remained overall stable over the past few years, which is a considerable achievement against the situations that I have described. However, as I recently stated in this Hemicycle on the occasion of the debate on the increasing precariousness, overall statistics are good, but they do not tell the whole story. We cannot, and we do not want to neglect signs of deterioration, such as increases in material and social deprivation rates and child poverty remaining higher than poverty for the general population.

A rising number of families across Europe have begun to fall into food poverty and are increasingly reliant on food banks and similar systems to meet basic needs. Increasing housing costs are substantially reducing the available income for many households. At the same time, inflation hits particularly vulnerable households and lower medium-income families. It is true that income support measures have mitigated the impact of high energy prices and inflation, but they were not sufficiently targeted to those in need.

Poverty, and in particular child poverty, remains acute in Europe, and citizens are quite rightly concerned. In-work poverty is also a persistent challenge in the EU, especially for people in non-standard forms of employment like bogus self-employment or zero-hour contracts, among them many young people, many women and many non-EU citizens.

To effectively tackle the root causes of poverty. We need a structural approach, both in the EU and worldwide. We need fairness in the global economy worldwide. We need to support fair trade and uphold national, regional and global governance to improve economic and social outcomes, and eradicate corruption to ensure fairer distribution of wealth.

In the EU, we must continue to pursue an integrated approach to break the intergenerational cycle of inequality and eradicate poverty. Social policies need to go hand in hand with inclusive and fairer labour markets and economic and fiscal policies.

We mark this International Day for the Eradication of Poverty by fully sharing its goals. Our steadfast commitment to eradicating precariousness, poverty and social exclusion. We will relentlessly continue working together with the Member States, the European Parliament and all the stakeholders active on the ground to fight all forms of poverty.

Dennis Radtke, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Eigentlich ist es traurig, dass es für einige notwendig ist, dass wir internationale Tage für dies, das und jenes brauchen, um die Sinne für das zu schärfen, was sich direkt vor unseren Augen abspielt. Wenn wir das Beispiel Obdachlosigkeit nehmen, dafür brauchen wir eigentlich keinen Internationalen Tag zur Armutsbekämpfung, sondern Obdachlosigkeit, da stolpern wir fast drüber, wenn wir in Brüssel aus dem Europäischen Parlament gehen, weil die Obdachlosen rund um das Parlament ihr karges Dasein fristen. Wenn wir Kinder in Armut sehen wollen, Kinder, die keinen Zugang zu sauberem Trinkwasser, zu guter Bildung und zu vernünftigen Lebensmitteln haben, da brauchen wir nicht in südamerikanische Slums zu fahren oder nach Afrika, dann reicht ein Besuch in einer Roma-Community in Rumänien, Bulgarien oder in der Slowakei. All das findet vor unserer Haustür statt.

Deswegen ist es gut und richtig, dass sich die Europäische Union engagierte Ziele gesetzt hat bei der Reduktion von Armut. Der Kommissar hat gerade noch einmal auf die Zahlen hingewiesen: Mindestens 15 Millionen Menschen sollen aus Armut bzw. Armutsgefährdung herausgeführt werden. Diese Ziele sind sehr ambitioniert, weil natürlich Armutsgefährdung durch die Inflationskrise, durch den Druck, durch die Entwicklung bei allgemeinen Lebenshaltungskosten noch einmal zunimmt. Aber es ist wichtig, dass wir uns diese Ziele gesetzt haben. Ich finde, bei allen Debatten über Subsidiarität und bei der Frage, wer für was zuständig ist: Natürlich ist die Europäische Union an vielen Stellen nicht originär für diese Themen zuständig. Aber wir sind der Motor in einer Entwicklung, und wir müssen auch dafür Sorge tragen und die Mitgliedstaaten antreiben, dass die Ziele, die wir uns gemeinsam gesetzt haben, zu denen sich alle Staats- und Regierungschefs bekannt haben in der Europäischen Union, dass diese Ziele auch Stück für Stück umgesetzt werden.

Pedro Marques, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner Schmit, dear colleagues, the rightful attention we dedicate to the world around us, particularly given the outbreak of another war, cannot be a pretext to forget what is happening in Europe.

In this moment, one of the biggest concerns of our citizens, of our families is the cost of living crisis, followed by the risk of poverty and social exclusion that comes with it.

It may come as a surprise to some, but the reality is hard to digest. In 2022, our developed and prosperous Union still had one out of five people living at the risk of poverty. That is 95 million people.

And the reality is, unfortunately, even worse for children. Almost a quarter of our children live at the risk of poverty: we fail to help 20 million children in Europe. This is shocking and painful because this represents a risk of losing the lives and the future of these children.

Behind these numbers, there are concrete lives: tables where food should not be missing, studies that should not be sacrificed to the need to start working to help the family, houses where cold is the norm through the winter, and that's when the house is not lost to job loss or high interest rates.

Our group, the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats, has been a leading force in supporting a strong social Europe by the side of Commissioner Schmit. We will continue to fight for a Europe as a better place and with well-being for all.

At a time when political priorities seem to multiply around us, is there even a nobler cause than declaring a relentless fight against poverty?

Now is the time to act, the time to build upon the goals of the Porto Summit and to start walking the talk, the time to approve and implement a European anti-poverty strategy. It is time to establish an adequate minimum income scheme all over Europe, to implement a joint housing programme and to find the money to eradicate extreme child poverty once and for all.

This is how we can truly make a difference in the Europe of today, but also of tomorrow.

Dragoș Pîslaru, *în numele grupului Renew.* – Doamna președintă, stimate domnule comisar Nicolas Schmit, dragi colegi, azi este Ziua Internațională pentru Eradicarea Sărăciei și da, astăzi trebuie să ne reiterăm angajamentul pentru a face ca această situație să fie schimbată, să nu mai lăsăm oamenii în sărăcie. Sărăcia hrănește extremismul. Cu toții știm acest lucru.

Nu este întâmplător că astăzi avem un val al acestui curent extremist în Europa. Acest lucru vine din cauza polarizării societății noastre, din cauza faptului că lumea este lăsată să moară de foame. Extremismul se hrănește cu frică, cu neputință, cu suferință. Sărăcia lasă oamenii în suferință, sărăcia compromite ambițiile de a performa. Sărăcia stigmatizează, sărăcia condamnă generațiile viitoare la o viață uneori mai proastă decât au avut-o părinții noștri care au prins războaie, fascism și comunism.

Uniunea Europeană se confruntă în acest moment cu un nivel inacceptabil de sărăcie în rândul copiilor, tinerilor, persoanelor vârstnice. Unul din patru copii din Uniunea Europeană trăiesc în risc de sărăcie și excluziune socială, 20 de milioane de copii. În România, țara cu cel mai mare nivel de sărăcie din Uniunea Europeană, aproape jumătate dintre copii au acces limitat la educație, la servicii medicale, au o nutriție deficitară. Nu mai puțin de un milion de copii se duc la culcare flămânzi, fac temele la lumina lumânării, nu au cu ce să se încalțe, să se îmbrace, să meargă la școală, nu au apă curentă sau căldură. Acești copii devin tineri care rămân abandonați de societate, cu probleme de sănătate mintală, izolați.

În România, una din patru tinere femei sunt în categoria NEETs. Nu au loc de muncă, nu fac parte dintr-un sistem educațional sau de formare. Eradicarea sărăciei nu este o luptă politică, e o datorie morală, este despre a respecta drepturile omului, de a respecta pilonul european al drepturilor sociale. Este o responsabilitate pe care grupul Renew și-a asumat-o și am depus eforturi considerabile în a sprijini investițiile sociale în locuire, educație, servicii publice, sănătate și piața muncii.

Katrin Langensiepen, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin! Weltarmutstag ist heute. Vor 14 Tagen haben wir über die Grundsicherung hier in diesem Hohen Haus gesprochen. Hurra! Innerhalb kürzester Zeit sprechen wir über Armut in der Europäischen Union. Ich wende mich hier an unsere Gäste auf dem Podium, ich wende mich an diejenigen, die vielleicht jetzt zu Hause sitzen und die Debatte mitverfolgen – Menschen, die von Armut betroffen sind. Und da möchte ich gerne, dass wir aufhören, von sozial schwachen Menschen zu sprechen. Diese Menschen sind nicht sozial schwach, sie sind finanzschwach, teilweise schon seit Generationen. Und das ist ein Umstand, den wir nicht hinnehmen dürfen.

Über wen reden wir? Wir reden über Frauenarmut, wir reden über Altersarmut, wir reden auch über sogenannte Behindertenarmut – Menschen mit Behinderungen, mit Erkrankungen, die aus unterschiedlichen Gründen in Armut leben. Wer arm ist, ist selber schuld. Das ist häufig der Gedanke. Wenn wir in die Bekämpfung von Armut und in Sozialstandards investieren, dann ist es ein Goodie, dann ist es ein *Social Benefit*. Nein, das ist eine Investition in unsere Demokratie! Das ist eine Investition in unseren Staat, in die Europäische Union. Wer immer noch glaubt, dass Menschen, die in Armut leben, ein nerviger, ein unangenehmer Faktor sind, der hat die Zeichen der Zeit – und das hat mein Kollege Dragoș Pîslaru richtig gesagt – nicht erkannt, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, auch da draußen am Bildschirm.

Die Kindergrundsicherung haben wir hier im Europäischen Parlament verabschiedet. *In-work poverty* – Armut trotz Erwerbstätigkeit – war eine Debatte im Sozialausschuss. Ich möchte, dass wir diese Debatten nicht mehr führen und dass wir einfach Gesetzesvorschläge bekommen, dass Sozialpolitik in der Europäischen Union kein Goodwill ist, sondern ein Must-have, dass wir über die Sozialunion nicht mehr sprechen, sondern sie einführen. Ich will kein Mimimi mehr hören, dass man irgendwem etwas wegnimmt. Nein, wir bekommen etwas dazu, nämlich nur so funktioniert die Europäische Union.

Michiel Hoogeveen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, in 1990 leefde 36 % van de wereldbevolking nog in extreme armoede. Nog geen dertig jaar later was dit aantal gedaald tot 9 %. Hoe hebben wij dat voor elkaar gekregen?

Economische groei.

Economische groei is de stuwende kracht in de strijd tegen armoede. Hoe zorgen wij voor economische groei?

Lage lasten voor burgers en bedrijven.

Bezuinigen op bureaucratie en voorkomen van roekeloze uitgaven.

Dereguleren en versterken van de vrije markt en zorgen voor prijsstabiliteit.

Je hoeft daarvoor geen raketgeleerde te zijn. Als we zien waar armoede is gedaald, is dat precies in de Aziatische en Afrikaanse landen die deze zaken op orde kregen en integreerden in de globale vrijemarkteconomie.

De vragen die wij ons dan moeten stellen zijn: Waarom drijft de EU daarvan weg? Waarom wordt er geluisterd naar de lokroep van socialistische sirenen waarvan we weten dat hun resultaten meetbaar tot meer armoede leiden?

Om armoede te bestrijden moeten wij ons niet richten op herverdeling, ontgroeiing of klimaatfondsen. De bewezen beste manier om armoede te bestrijden, maar ook om klimaat, biodiversiteit en luchtkwaliteit te verbeteren, is het verhogen van de welvaart. Waar vrijhandel komt, ontstaan vrijheid en kansen voor iedereen. Het is ons beste exportproduct en de beste kans op een beter leven voor iedereen.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, tout d'abord, je remercie les groupes politiques d'avoir accepté la proposition de notre groupe, Identité et Démocratie, de tenir ce débat aujourd'hui.

Je voulais citer l'abbé Pierre, qui était un député de ma région, en France, et qui a été l'un des premiers à prendre à bras-le-corps ce problème. Mais le leitmotiv du 17 octobre est celui du père Joseph: «Là où les hommes sont condamnés à vivre dans la misère, les droits de l'homme sont violés. S'unir pour les faire respecter est un devoir sacré.».

On ne saurait rester de marbre face à la pression de la précarité, que l'on croyait d'un autre temps. L'inflation touche désormais jusqu'à l'alimentation des ménages, obligés de réduire cette dépense pourtant vitale. Même parmi les travailleurs, la misère progresse à une vitesse folle. Comment pourrait-il en être autrement, quand Bruxelles s'acharne à détricoter nos modèles sociaux et à nous imposer une concurrence déloyale avec des pays plus pauvres?

Cette semaine, un sommet abordera à nouveau le projet d'élargissement aux Balkans, région où les bas salaires et le SMIC à 300 euros poussent les travailleurs qualifiés sur les routes de l'exil. Au-delà de ce constat, soyons donc lucides sur la responsabilité des politiques européennes dans la paupérisation dramatique de nos sociétés.

José Gusmão, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, de acordo com dados de 2022, há 21,6 % de pessoas em risco de pobreza ou exclusão social na União Europeia.

Neste contexto, com mais de 100 milhões de pessoas afetadas por este flagelo, a meta da Comissão de 15 milhões de redução no número de pobres até 2030 chega a ser embaraçosa, mas mais embaraçoso ainda é que estes números não têm descido no curto prazo. Usa-se esta estratégia de fixar objetivos para o fim da década, porque sabemos que os responsáveis já não estarão cá para quando for necessário avaliar essa estratégia.

O que sabemos é que os números não descem e, com esta política monetária que fez disparar os preços da habitação, com a desregulação dos direitos do trabalho, que foi promovida por várias comissões e por vários governos nacionais, com a promessa de que a prazo iriam aumentar os salários e com os efeitos da política orçamental que se anuncia – se for aprovada a proposta da Comissão para as novas regras de governação económica, temos, pelo contrário, todas as razões para pensar que o problema da pobreza se irá agravar.

A tudo isto, a Comissão respondeu com um pilar dos direitos sociais que não tem praticamente nada de vinculativo, apenas declarações de intenções, deixando todas as responsabilidades para os Estados-Membros, nomeadamente a responsabilidade de impedir uma corrida para o fundo nos direitos laborais e direitos sociais. A Comissão, aliás, opôs-se à proposta de um rendimento mínimo – de uma diretiva sobre rendimento mínimo – que felizmente mereceu o apoio deste Parlamento, mas, também aqui, sem consequências práticas.

Se queremos falar a sério do combate à pobreza, temos que falar de políticas a sério, temos que falar de financiamento às políticas sociais e aos serviços públicos e temos que falar de alterações às regras de governação económica, que façam do combate à pobreza o objetivo central não apenas de políticas sociais de nicho, mas do conjunto das políticas económicas e sociais da União Europeia. Senão, é só conversa.

Tiziana Beghin (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in questa legislatura abbiamo approvato la direttiva sul salario minimo e una raccomandazione sul reddito minimo: sono dei primi, ma purtroppo insufficienti, passi in avanti. Bisogna fare di più perché oggi la povertà colpisce anziani, studenti, bambini, famiglie e persino i lavoratori. Tutto il ceto medio è a rischio a causa dell'inflazione alle stelle.

Commissario Schmit, esprimiamo preoccupazione perché il governo italiano intende aggirare e non applicare correttamente i criteri previsti dalla direttiva sul salario minimo. La Commissione deve vigilare e fermare questa presa in giro perché in Italia oltre 3 milioni di lavoratori hanno paghe da fame, e per loro questo Parlamento ha votato la direttiva.

Infine una proposta: la lotta alla povertà non deve essere lasciata ai soli Stati membri, istituiamo il reddito di cittadinanza europeo e finanziamolo con il bilancio comune.

Abbiamo fatto l'Unione economica e monetaria, facciamo adesso l'Europa dei cittadini.

Nicolas Schmit, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, first, I want to thank you for the comments and for this debate. In the State of the Union speech, President von der Leyen recalled that over 90% of the political guidelines presented in 2019 have been achieved.

I can also proudly confirm that out of the 75 actions that the Commission committed to take during the current mandate planned by the Pillar Action Plan, almost all have been either adopted or launched by the Commission, and the others will follow as according to the action plan.

Still, challenges remain as we set and want to achieve ambitious targets on employment, skills and poverty reduction by 2030. As regards the latter, out of at least 15 million people to lift out of poverty or social exclusion, at least 5 million should be children. We must live up to our commitments: strong and efficient welfare systems, good jobs with decent wages, adequate social services.

Equal opportunities concerning education are necessary to fight poverty and ensure social cohesion. We must address the root causes of poverty, break the cycle of disadvantage, foster participation in inclusive labour markets, support social investments and address the challenges linked to the cost of living crisis.

Many of you have mentioned the dramatic situation of children in our society and obviously also around the world. That's why in the European Union we really have to make efforts to implement the Child Guarantee.

We like to assess the broad impact of our policies, measures or legislation –rightly so. But the first impact assessment should be on the level of inequality and poverty. Because this is about the cohesion of our societies, but it is also about the unfulfilled dreams of generations, of broken lives, of children and young people that never will get the opportunity to deploy their talents. This is a loss for them, but it is above all, also a loss for our societies.

Fighting poverty in the EU and worldwide does require joint efforts at both the EU and Member State level. We need to step up our work towards this goal. Because it is a moral obligation for all of us. But it is also an absolute political one.

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Clara Aguilera (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los socialistas la lucha para la erradicación de la pobreza, es una prioridad moral y política.

La Comisión Europea hace una valoración optimista de los objetivos logrados durante esta legislatura. El 90 % de las iniciativas políticas presentadas en 2019 dentro del plan de acción del pilar europeo de derechos sociales, se han logrado. De las 75 medidas específicas a las que se había comprometido la Comisión, prácticamente todas se han lanzado.

Entre ellas se han destacado: Directiva sobre transparencia salarial, Directiva de Salarios mínimos, Directiva trabajo plataformas, Directiva sobre trabajo y digitalización, Garantía infantil, Plataforma europea de lucha contra el sinhogarismo, Recomendación del Consejo sobre una renta mínima, Recomendaciones Estados miembros para cuantificar ingresos de los hogares.

Seguiremos luchando para que la Comisión tome conciencia de los numerosos desafíos causados por la inflación, el aumento de los costos de la vivienda, los precios de la energía, la precariedad laboral etc. Para ello las políticas sociales deben ir de la mano de un sistema de supervisión fiscal mucho más transparente, simple e integrado y un marco de gobernanza global.

Laura Ballarín Cereza (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los socialistas la lucha para la erradicación de la pobreza es una prioridad moral y política.

La Comisión Europea hace una valoración optimista de los objetivos logrados durante esta legislatura. El 90 % de las iniciativas políticas presentadas en 2019 dentro del plan de acción del pilar europeo de derechos sociales, se han logrado.

De las 75 medidas específicas a las que se había comprometido la Comisión, prácticamente todas se han lanzado. Entre ellas se han destacado: Directiva sobre transparencia salarial, Directiva de Salarios mínimos, Directiva trabajo plataformas, Directiva sobre trabajo y digitalización, Garantía infantil, Plataforma europea de lucha contra el sinhogarismo, Recomendación del Consejo sobre una renta mínima, Recomendaciones Estados miembros para cuantificar ingresos de los hogares.

Seguiremos luchando para que la Comisión tome conciencia de los numerosos desafíos causados por la inflación, el aumento de los costos de la vivienda, los precios de la energía, la precariedad laboral etc. Para ello las políticas sociales deben ir de la mano de un sistema de supervisión fiscal mucho más transparente, simple e integrado y un marco de gobernanza global.

Milan Brglez (S&D), *pisno*. – Dostojanstvo v praksi za vse. S tem vsem razumljivim geslom obeležujemo tokratni mednarodni dan za izkoreninjenje revščine. Združeni narodi z njim pozivajo politične odločevalce, da vselej postavimo človekove pravice ter socialno pravičnost pred dobičke podjetij.

Nezaslišano je, da so tudi v Evropski uniji tisoči ljudi ujeti v primež revščine. Med njimi so številni revni zaposleni, ki delajo v težkih, nedostojnih in nevarnih delovnih pogojih, a s svojim zaslužkom ne zmorejo preživljati sebe ter svojih družin. Najbolj tragične posledice pa tudi v primeru revščine žal nosijo otroci.

Brez dodatnih vlaganj držav članic ter Evropske unije v boj proti revščini otrok bo spričo aktualnih kriz številnim otrokom onemogočen dostop do izobraževanja, zdravja, ustrezne prehrane, stanovanj ter drugih temeljnih dobrin zanje.

Besede, ki jih bodo Komisija, Svet ter poslanke in poslanci namenili temi dokončne odprave revščine, moramo zato končno spraviti v prakso, za vse. Še posebej takrat, ko sprejemamo proračunske akte EU ter politične pozive državam glede načrtovanja njihovih politik. Zato bom tokrat in vsakič znova gledal pod prste in trkal na vest kolegov, ki s svojimi pritiski na gumbe pri glasovanju o vlaganjih v boj proti revščini otrok zanikajo svojo zavezanost spopadanju z revščino ter temeljni dobrobiti otrok.

Estrella Durá Ferrandis (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los socialistas la lucha para la erradicación de la pobreza, es una prioridad moral y política.

La Comisión Europea hace una valoración optimista de los objetivos logrados durante esta legislatura. El 90 % de las iniciativas políticas presentadas en 2019 dentro del plan de acción del pilar europeo de derechos sociales, se han logrado. De las 75 medidas específicas a las que se había comprometido la Comisión, prácticamente todas se han lanzado.

Entre ellas se han destacado: Directiva sobre transparencia salarial, Directiva de Salarios mínimos, Directiva trabajo plataformas, Directiva sobre trabajo y digitalización, Garantía infantil, Plataforma europea de lucha contra el sinhogarismo, Recomendación del Consejo sobre una renta mínima, Recomendaciones Estados miembros para cuantificar ingresos de los hogares.

Seguiremos luchando para que la Comisión tome conciencia de los numerosos desafíos causados por la inflación, el aumento de los costos de la vivienda, los precios de la energía, la precariedad laboral etc. Para ello las políticas sociales deben ir de la mano de un sistema de supervisión fiscal mucho más transparente, simple e integrado y un marco de gobernanza global.

Ibán García Del Blanco (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los socialistas la lucha para la erradicación de la pobreza, es una prioridad moral y política.

La Comisión Europea hace una valoración optimista de los objetivos logrados durante esta legislatura. El 90 % de las iniciativas políticas presentadas en 2019 dentro del plan de acción del pilar europeo de derechos sociales, se han logrado. De las 75 medidas específicas a las que se había comprometido la Comisión, prácticamente todas se han lanzado.

Entre ellas se han destacado: Directiva sobre transparencia salarial, Directiva de Salarios mínimos, Directiva trabajo plataformas, Directiva sobre trabajo y digitalización, Garantía infantil, Plataforma europea de lucha contra el sinhogarismo, Recomendación del Consejo sobre una renta mínima, Recomendaciones Estados miembros para cuantificar ingresos de los hogares.

Seguiremos luchando para que la Comisión tome conciencia de los numerosos desafíos causados por la inflación, el aumento de los costos de la vivienda, los precios de la energía, la precariedad laboral etc. Para ello las políticas sociales deben ir de la mano de un sistema de supervisión fiscal mucho más transparente, simple e integrado y un marco de gobernanza global.

Lívia Járóka (NI), *írásban*. – A legszegényebb régiókat különösen hátrányosan érintette az elmúlt évek válságainak sorozata. A szegény telepeken és szegregátumokban élő közösségek földrajzi egyenlőtlensége és elkülönülése egyre inkább elmélyülni látszik. Ezeken a területeken az alapvető közüzemek kiépítése és közszolgáltatáshoz való hozzáférés hiányos. Elfogadhatatlan, hogy 2023-ban az Európai Unióban a vízhez, az élelmiszerhez, az áramhoz, a higiéniához és a fűtéshez való hozzáférés terén akadály legyen.

A szegénység elleni küzdelem világnapjának alkalmából fontosnak tartom felhívni arra a figyelmet, hogy a legszegényebbeket, köztük a romákat sem kerülik el az európai uniós források megvonásával járó nehézségek. Több tagállam, köztük Magyarország is kiemelkedő eredményeket ért el ezen a téren, modellértékű intézkedésekkel és programokkal segítve a szegénységből való kilépést. Ezek közül kiemelném a kötelező óvodai nevelést 3 éves kortól, különböző felzárkóztató, államilag finanszírozott ösztöndíj-programokat, a nagycsaládosoknak járó különböző adókedvezményeket és -mentességeket, illetve államilag támogatott lakásvásárlási programokat és kedvezményes hiteleket.

Azonban van sajnos sok tagállami felzárkóztatási program, különösen a legszegényebb régiókban, melyek teljesen leállnak a források befagyasztásának köszönhetően és megdöbbentő azt tapasztalni, hogy az Unió nem tesz semmit. Megengedhetetlen, hogy bizonyos tagállamokat politikai indíttatás miatt büntessenek a szociális források megvonásával, hiszen így csak a leginkább kitett, legszegényebb társadalmi csoportokat büntetik, a kívánt hatás ellenkezőjét elérve.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los socialistas la lucha para la erradicación de la pobreza, es una prioridad moral y política.

La Comisión Europea hace una valoración optimista de los objetivos logrados durante esta legislatura. El 90 % de las iniciativas políticas presentadas en 2019 dentro del plan de acción del pilar europeo de derechos sociales, se han logrado. De las 75 medidas específicas a las que se había comprometido la Comisión, prácticamente todas se han lanzado.

Entre ellas se han destacado: Directiva sobre transparencia salarial, Directiva de Salarios mínimos, Directiva trabajo plataformas, Directiva sobre trabajo y digitalización, Garantía infantil, Plataforma europea de lucha contra el sinhogarismo, Recomendación del Consejo sobre una renta mínima, Recomendaciones Estados miembros para cuantificar ingresos de los hogares.

Seguiremos luchando para que la Comisión tome conciencia de los numerosos desafíos causados por la inflación, el aumento de los costos de la vivienda, los precios de la energía, la precariedad laboral etc. Para ello las políticas sociales deben ir de la mano de un sistema de supervisión fiscal mucho más transparente, simple e integrado y un marco de gobernanza global.

César Luena (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los socialistas la lucha para la erradicación de la pobreza, es una prioridad moral y política.

La Comisión Europea hace una valoración optimista de los objetivos logrados durante esta legislatura. El 90 % de las iniciativas políticas presentadas en 2019 dentro del plan de acción del pilar europeo de derechos sociales, se han logrado. De las 75 medidas específicas a las que se había comprometido la Comisión, prácticamente todas se han lanzado.

Entre ellas se han destacado: Directiva sobre transparencia salarial, Directiva de Salarios mínimos, Directiva trabajo plataformas, Directiva sobre trabajo y digitalización, Garantía infantil, Plataforma europea de lucha contra el sinhogarismo, Recomendación del Consejo sobre una renta mínima, Recomendaciones Estados miembros para cuantificar ingresos de los hogares.

Seguiremos luchando para que la Comisión tome conciencia de los numerosos desafíos causados por la inflación, el aumento de los costos de la vivienda, los precios de la energía, la precariedad laboral etc. Para ello las políticas sociales deben ir de la mano de un sistema de supervisión fiscal mucho más transparente, simple e integrado y un marco de gobernanza global.

Cristina Maestre Martín De Almagro (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los socialistas la lucha para la erradicación de la pobreza, es una prioridad moral y política.

La Comisión Europea hace una valoración optimista de los objetivos logrados durante esta legislatura. El 90 % de las iniciativas políticas presentadas en 2019 dentro del plan de acción del pilar europeo de derechos sociales, se han logrado. De las 75 medidas específicas a las que se había comprometido la Comisión, prácticamente todas se han lanzado.

Entre ellas se han destacado: Directiva sobre transparencia salarial, Directiva de Salarios mínimos, Directiva trabajo plataformas, Directiva sobre trabajo y digitalización, Garantía infantil, Plataforma europea de lucha contra el sinhogarismo, Recomendación del Consejo sobre una renta mínima, Recomendaciones Estados miembros para cuantificar ingresos de los hogares.

Seguiremos luchando para que la Comisión tome conciencia de los numerosos desafíos causados por la inflación, el aumento de los costos de la vivienda, los precios de la energía, la precariedad laboral etc. Para ello las políticas sociales deben ir de la mano de un sistema de supervisión fiscal mucho más transparente, simple e integrado y un marco de gobernanza global.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los socialistas la lucha para la erradicación de la pobreza, es una prioridad moral y política.

La Comisión Europea hace una valoración optimista de los objetivos logrados durante esta legislatura. El 90 % de las iniciativas políticas presentadas en 2019 dentro del plan de acción del pilar europeo de derechos sociales, se han logrado. De las 75 medidas específicas a las que se había comprometido la Comisión, prácticamente todas se han lanzado.

Entre ellas se han destacado: Directiva sobre transparencia salarial, Directiva de Salarios mínimos, Directiva trabajo plataformas, Directiva sobre trabajo y digitalización, Garantía infantil, Plataforma europea de lucha contra el sinhogarismo, Recomendación del Consejo sobre una renta mínima, Recomendaciones Estados miembros para cuantificar ingresos de los hogares.

Seguiremos luchando para que la Comisión tome conciencia de los numerosos desafíos causados por la inflación, el aumento de los costos de la vivienda, los precios de la energía, la precariedad laboral etc. Para ello las políticas sociales deben ir de la mano de un sistema de supervisión fiscal mucho más transparente, simple e integrado y un marco de gobernanza global.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los socialistas la lucha para la erradicación de la pobreza, es una prioridad moral y política.

La Comisión Europea hace una valoración optimista de los objetivos logrados durante esta legislatura. El 90 % de las iniciativas políticas presentadas en 2019 dentro del plan de acción del pilar europeo de derechos sociales, se han logrado. De las 75 medidas específicas a las que se había comprometido la Comisión, prácticamente todas se han lanzado.

Entre ellas se han destacado: Directiva sobre transparencia salarial, Directiva de Salarios mínimos, Directiva trabajo plataformas, Directiva sobre trabajo y digitalización, Garantía infantil, Plataforma europea de lucha contra el sinhogarismo, Recomendación del Consejo sobre una renta mínima, Recomendaciones Estados miembros para cuantificar ingresos de los hogares.

Seguiremos luchando para que la Comisión tome conciencia de los numerosos desafíos causados por la inflación, el aumento de los costos de la vivienda, los precios de la energía, la precariedad laboral etc. Para ello las políticas sociales deben ir de la mano de un sistema de supervisión fiscal mucho más transparente, simple e integrado y un marco de gobernanza global.

(The sitting was suspended at 11h15)

IN THE CHAIR: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

4. Reanudación de la sesión

(The sitting resumed at 11.42)

President. – Dear colleagues, just before we welcome the Prime Minister, I want to take a moment to express the horror of the European Parliament at the terror attack in Brussels yesterday. At noon today I will make a short statement on this, with a round of speakers. I invite you all to be in the Chamber with us.

5. Sesión solemne – Discurso de Nikol Pashinián, primer ministro de la República de Armenia

President. – Dear colleagues, today we have Nikol Pashinyan, Prime Minister of Armenia, with us. Prime Minister, dear Nikol, welcome to the European Parliament. We are in the context of the events of 19 September in Nagorno-Karabakh.

In our last plenary, we voted on a resolution that deplored the attack on Nagorno-Karabakh and called for the respect of Armenians' rights and security. Our focus now must be on honest and fair talks to resume. Prime Minister, since then, your country, your people, have welcomed, housed and fed over 100 000 refugees. It is a testament to your country's commitment. Europe will continue to support Armenia's efforts in dealing with the influx of people from Nagorno-Karabakh. Many Member States have also donated much-needed shelter, equipment, food and medical supplies to the EU Civil Protection Mechanism.

Prime Minister, let me also assure you of our support to your country's democratic reforms, the strengthening of our bilateral relations and stronger cooperation with the European Union, active participation of the international community, as well as international assurances for Armenians who continue to live in Nagorno-Karabakh, can help achieve peace and reconciliation.

We remain committed to all efforts directed towards the normalisation of relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan based on mutual recognition of sovereignty, inviolability of borders and territorial integrity. Dear Prime Minister, dear Nikol, let me assure you that Armenia remains a vital partner for us in the EU's Eastern neighbourhood. The EU stands ready to further support the democratically elected authorities of Armenia, the resilience, security and continuation of democratic reforms in the country.

Prime Minister, the floor is yours.

Nikol Pashinyan, *Prime Minister of the Republic of Armenia*. – Madam President, thank you very much. I will speak in Armenian.

(The following is a transcription of the original speech in Armenian, based on the English interpretation)

Esteemed President of the European Parliament, dear Members of Parliament, dear guests, it's a great honour for me to speak from this high rostrum and I'm grateful for this opportunity.

Our government and the people of the Republic of Armenia know the European Parliament as an entity which at all times of challenges faced by the Republic of Armenia and the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh has been vocal and has been vocal in the language of the truth. I thank all of you for this, among other things, because there is power in the truth, and that power you generated each time has benefited us, too.

The common narrative these days is that democratic Armenia is experiencing dire challenges, and it is the truth. Another truth is that Armenia's democracy is experiencing dire challenges. The greatest truth, nonetheless, is that democracy in Armenia is experiencing dire challenges. And not just Armenia's democracy, but democracy overall. Because various events unfolding in Armenia and around the world are raising the following question: is democracy capable of providing peace, security, solidarity, prosperity and happiness?

But I have not come here to ask questions. I have come here to answer, and my answer is 'yes', unequivocally. Many say that Armenia today is suffering because of democracy. But I must underline my belief. With the largely inevitable challenges faced by Armenia in recent years, the Republic of Armenia would have simply become paralysed, lost her independence and sovereignty, had it not been democratic.

This is evidenced by the events of 2020 and 2021. After signing the trilateral ceasefire statement at the end of the 44-day war – when Armenia's State institutions were targeted by attacks of extremist groups, when the public was divided and inflamed – democratically-formed institutions stood strong in their positions of defending statehood, whilst not breaching any principles of democracy.

The freedom of expression and the freedom of assembly were not restricted in Armenia in that difficult situation. There were no cases of disproportionate use of force and the rule of law was not undermined. And even though we continue to enjoy a majority in the parliament, in order to overcome the social-psychological crisis that was caused by the aftermath of the war, the ruling power – the Civil Contract Party – decided to call a snap parliamentary election. For that purpose, I stepped down from my position as Prime Minister and then, in accordance with the legal procedure, the parliament and the government were dissolved.

Two days after the *de jure* entry into force of the dissolution of the parliament on 12 May 2021, the Azerbaijani troops violated the border with Armenia at a border stretch of about 100 km. They invaded Armenia's sovereign territory at depths of up to four kilometres. In this situation, the Collective Security Treaty Organisation, considered to be Armenia's security system, and countries that had security obligations bilaterally towards Armenia did nothing to help us. They left us all alone.

The purpose of this provocation ahead of the upcoming parliamentary election was to cause that election to fail and to paralyse Armenian statehood or, as a minimum, to install a puppet government. But in this environment, Armenia's people were able to stand strong to defend Armenia's independence, sovereignty and democracy. And we held a parliamentary election that was internationally recognised as free, democratic, transparent and competitive.

For the first time in the history of the Republic of Armenia, elections became a means for overcoming a domestic crisis, and not vice versa. This was the main difference between the Armenia that existed before the 2018 non-violent Velvet Revolution of the people and the one that came after the revolution. Before the revolution, elections would normally trigger internal crises due to the lack of public trust in the outcome. After the revolution, elections have helped to prevent or overcome crises because citizens now have not only a theoretical, but also a practical, opportunity to carry out decisions and to have these decisions respected.

After the 2018 non-violent Velvet Revolution of the people, no election in Armenia at any level and no election results have been rigged. Six years ago, people would have laughed at references to the right to form a government through elections. And now they would not understand what falsification or rigging of election results could mean. This is what has changed in Armenia in the last five years.

But democracy in Armenia has continued to suffer from heavy blows, which operate on an almost exactly repeatable formula. External aggression, followed by the inactivity of Armenia's security allies, followed by attempts to capitalise on the war or the humanitarian situation or the external security threats to overthrow Armenia's democracy and sovereignty, or attempts which are manifested in the form of incitement of domestic instability via hybrid technologies steered by external actors.

Since 2020, we've had several of these situations, the largest of which was Azerbaijan's wholesale attack on Armenia on 13 December 2022, which resulted in the occupation of Armenia's sovereign territories.

The latest and most tragic of such events unfolded quite recently, when Azerbaijan – in furtherance of its years-long policy of ethnic cleansing – unleashed a wholesale attack on Nagorno-Karabakh. When 100 000 Armenians were fleeing from Nagorno-Karabakh to the Republic of Armenia, our security allies were not only not helping us, but were publicly appealing for a change of power and overthrowing of the democratic government in Armenia.

But the people of the Republic of Armenia came together for our own independence, sovereignty and democracy. And yet another plot conspired against our state failed. The government and the people of the Republic of Armenia came together to host and provide shelter to over 100 000 Armenians that were victimised by the ethnic cleansing in Nagorno-Karabakh.

We have done this honourably – to the extent that our international partners confess that they have never seen a situation in which a country would receive 100 000 refugees and would be able to accommodate all of them without setting up refugee camps or tent towns. We were able to do this thanks to Armenia's people and democracy.

(Applause)

At times the people would not even wait for the government to do anything. They would provide essential supplies to the forcibly displaced and they would even provide temporary shelter. Many of them received these people in their homes.

Thanks to democracy, after the 2018 revolution all obstacles to doing business freely and all artificial monopolies were eliminated in Armenia. Government transparency and accountability have improved. There have been uncompromising, principled and institutional efforts against corruption. The rule of law has been achieved.

And with all of this – in spite of the tragedies and the threats – Armenia continues to enjoy strong economic growth. Since 2018, my country's fiscal revenues have grown by about 70%. With decisions that have already been taken, we will be allocating around USD 100 million in support to those displaced from Nagorno-Karabakh. And we do need international support, including in the form of budget support.

Needless to say, we have created a mechanism for supporting the forcibly displaced. Under this mechanism, the resources allocated to them are transferred in non-cash form. Thus, the distribution of resources is transparent, verifiable and traceable. And the system will continue to operate in this manner.

And we're grateful to our international partners, to the EU and to the Member States for having already made allocations or having continued to make allocations to cope with the humanitarian crisis caused by the forced displacement of Armenians from Nagorno-Karabakh.

Esteemed President of the European Parliament, honourable Members of Parliament, dear guests, it is extremely unfortunate that – in spite of hundreds of reports, the orders of the International Court of Justice, resolutions of the European Parliament, resolutions of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and resolutions of national parliaments, as well as the appeals of the executive government – we, the international community, have been unable to prevent the ethnic cleansing of Armenians from Nagorno-Karabakh.

The Armenian Government and the European Parliament have many times alerted to the threat of ethnic cleansing in Nagorno-Karabakh. The Armenian Government repeatedly invited the UN, the OSCE and the EU to send a fact-finding mission to the blockaded Lachin corridor or to Nagorno-Karabakh. However, none of them adopted such decisions. We initiated three UN Security Council discussions on this topic, but the discussions produced no practical results.

And now Nagorno-Karabakh has been cleansed of Armenians. With the inactivity of the peacekeeping mission of the Russian Federation, over 100 000 Armenians left their homes and their native land of Nagorno-Karabakh in a matter of one week. Another 20 000 had been forced out of Nagorno-Karabakh immediately after the 44-day war in 2020. Many others had been unable to return to Nagorno-Karabakh because of the illegal blockade of the Lachin corridor that had started in December 2022.

And now some are pretending not to understand why the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh left their homes en masse. Posing such a question is cynicism per se, because the answer is glaringly obvious. Azerbaijan had clearly and unequivocally demonstrated its decision to render life for Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh impossible.

From December 2022, during the illegal blockade of the Lachin corridor, the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh were deprived of natural gas, electricity, fuel, food, baby formula, medication, hygiene supplies as well as other essential supplies. Civilians performing agriculture works were targeted by Azerbaijan's armed forces.

From December 2022, we made dozens of alerts about Azerbaijan's plan to push people into hunger, to increase the military propaganda and psychological pressure, and then to open the Lachin corridor, thus forcing all Armenians to leave. We described this scenario in January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August of 2023. We described it loudly and publicly, and I do not understand the surprised faces of certain international officials about the cleansing of Nagorno-Karabakh of Armenians in September.

Yet I would like to thank the European Parliament for calling what happened in Nagorno-Karabakh by its name. This is important for the future protection of the rights of people deprived of their homeland.

Esteemed President, honourable Members of Parliament, dear attendees, in spite of all the wars and difficulties and crises, I have come to the European Parliament with the following key message: our region, the South Caucasus, is in need of peace, in need of a condition where all the countries of the region live with open borders, tied by active economic, political and cultural bonds, with experience and tradition of resolving all differences by diplomatic means and by dialogue.

I want to highlight: our vision of peace is not in any way opposed to the interests of our region, because our country can be peaceful if the region is in peace. And supporting the construction of peace is my core political undertaking.

Assuming such an undertaking is not easy given the long-standing conflict with Azerbaijan and the fact that there have been numerous casualties, missing persons, prisoners, suffering and despair. But is peace possible? And if so, how?

In early October, ahead of the Third European Political Community Summit in Granada, we had a major opportunity to achieve a breakthrough in the peace process, but unfortunately the President of Azerbaijan refused to attend the summit and to adopt a joint statement with the EU Council President, the President of France, the Chancellor of Germany and myself – a statement that would contain the principles of achieving peace and normalising relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan. However, those principles and content were not elaborated in Granada.

As a result of the quadrilateral meeting in Prague on 6 October 2022, they were elaborated back then, and that meeting in Prague was attended by the French President, the EU Council President, the President of Azerbaijan and myself. These principles were fleshed out in 2023 during meetings between the EU Council President, the President of Azerbaijan and myself in Brussels, and there have been public statements about these principles.

The first principle is contained in the Granada quadrilateral statement in the following way. The French President, the EU Council President, the German Chancellor and myself 'remain committed to all efforts directed towards the normalisation of relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan, based on mutual recognition of sovereignty, inviolability of borders and territorial integrity of Armenia (29 800 km^2) and Azerbaijan (86 600 km^2), as mentioned in President Michel's statements of 14 May and 15 July 2023. They called for the strict adherence to the principle of non-use of force and threat of use of force.'

As a result of the trilateral meeting held in Brussels on 14 May this year between the EU Council President, the President of Azerbaijan and myself, EU Council President Charles Michel published a statement that reads as follows: 'The leaders', meaning the President of Azerbaijan and myself, 'confirm their unequivocal commitment to the 1991 Almaty Declaration and the respective territorial integrity of Armenia (29 800 km^2) and Azerbaijan (86 600 km^2)'.

As a result of the 15 July meeting in Brussels between the EU Council President, the President of Azerbaijan and myself, another statement was published by Council President Michel, which reads as follows: 'The Armenian and Azerbaijani leaders once again fully reconfirmed their respect for the other country's territorial integrity and sovereignty, based on the understanding that Armenia's territory covers 29 800 km^2 and Azerbaijan's 86 600 km^2'.

Ladies and gentlemen, what you need to know in addition about this is the following. After these understandings, I made several public statements reconfirming that the Republic of Armenia recognises Azerbaijan's 86 600 km^2 territorial integrity, but the Azerbaijan President has not reciprocated. He recently stated that he recognises Armenia's territorial integrity, but he did not specify the 29 800 km^2, which has caused some analysts concern that he is intentionally leaving ambiguities for making territorial claims on Armenia.

The understanding to recognise territorial integrity with specific numbers was achieved for that very purpose – so that neither Armenia nor Azerbaijan would afford any ambiguity in recognising each other's territorial integrity, by saying, for instance, that a part of the country's territory does not really belong to that country.

The next principle of normalising relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan is contained in the Granada statement in the following manner: 'They stressed the urgent need to work towards border delimitation based on the most recent USSR General Staff maps that have been provided to the sides, which should also be a basis for distancing of forces, and for finalising the peace treaty and addressing all humanitarian issues'.

As a result of the 15 July meeting held in Brussels with the EU Council President, the President of Azerbaijan and myself, Council President Charles Michel made the following statement: 'Both leaders reconfirmed their unequivocal commitment to the 1991 Almaty Declaration as a political framework for the delimitation'.

As a result of the 6 October 2022 quadrilateral meeting in Prague, the same principle was defined as follows: 'Armenia and Azerbaijan confirmed their commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and to the 1991 Almaty Declaration, through which both recognise each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty. They confirmed it would be a basis for the work of the border delimitation commissions.'

What you need to know additionally about this principle is the following. The Almaty Declaration was signed by the 12 Republics of the Soviet Union on 21 December 1991. In this context, there were two important clauses in that declaration. Firstly, the Soviet Union shall cease to exist, and secondly, the Republics shall recognise each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty. The inviolability of the existing administrative borders and, therefore, the administrative borders between the ex-Soviet Republics would turn into state borders.

Azerbaijan has claimed that there is no border between Armenia and Azerbaijan, but this contradicts the Almaty Declaration and the aforementioned understandings. Azerbaijan also maintains ambiguity in accepting the most recent Soviet Union maps as a basis for delimitation. Some experts have assumed, based on this, that Azerbaijan is creating a foundation for territorial claims and a new military aggression against Armenia.

Ladies and gentlemen, the next principle for normalising relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan and for peace is contained in the Granada statement as follows: 'They called for the opening of regional connectivity links based on full respect of countries' sovereignty and jurisdiction as well as on the principles of equality and reciprocity'.

In his statements on 15 July, after the meeting held in Brussels between the EU Council President, the President of Azerbaijan and myself, Council President Charles Michel stated the following: 'We', meaning the EU Council President, the President of Azerbaijan and myself, 'discussed modalities of future transport arrangements which will respect the principles of sovereignty, jurisdiction and reciprocity'.

What you should know about this principle, in addition, is the following. Azerbaijan has continued to claim that Armenia must provide a corridor to Azerbaijan via Armenia's own territory. In common international talk, we understand a corridor as a simple interstate road, but in our region there's a specificity.

In the 9 November 2020 trilateral statement, the word 'corridor' is used only in reference to the Lachin corridor, which was supposed to ensure a link between Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia. The specificity is that, under the 9 November 2020 statement, the Lachin corridor would not just be a road; it would be a five-kilometre-wide territorial layer that would lie outside of Azerbaijan's control and would be under the control of the peacekeepers. So in this context, the word 'corridor' has that connotation of an extraterritorial layer.

Armenia has never, under any circumstances, agreed or promised to accept any restriction of its sovereignty or jurisdiction. Armenia has not made such a promise. So what does the aforementioned principle mean? It simply means that Armenia and Azerbaijan agreed on the basis of their sovereignty and jurisdiction – and without any reference to corridors – to open their roads for each other. At the checkpoints of these roads, there would be border control and other control services under the jurisdiction of the respective countries, and based on their sovereignty and legislation. This would be done according to the principle of reciprocity and equality.

We are ready for such solutions as soon as possible. We are ready to restore the Meghri railway linking, via the south of Armenia, not just Armenia and Azerbaijan, but also Armenia's southern regions with the north-western regions; Azerbaijan's south-western regions with the Autonomous Republic of Nakhchivan; Armenia subsequently with Turkey; Azerbaijan with Turkey; Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia with the Islamic Republic of Iran; the east with the west, from the Caspian to the Mediterranean; the north to the south, from the Gulf to the Black Sea.

In Armenia we call this project the 'Armenian Crossroads' but I think the time has come for further regionalising and rebranding this project. And here, in this important House, the time has come to call it the 'Crossroads of Peace', a name that would be just as important and acceptable for us.

Along the same logic, we are ready for the roads to be opened. The Republic of Armenia is committed to securing the movement of goods, vehicles, people, pipelines and electricity lines, because a crossroads of peace implies also the passage of pipelines and electricity lines. These solutions are very important for the Republic of Armenia as well, because for 30 years now our country has been in a blockade by Azerbaijan and Turkey.

As you can see, there is no basis for accusing Armenia of obstructing the opening of regional transport communications. Some analysis indicates that official Baku is misrepresenting the international narrative in order to incite a new war in the region, occupy further territories of Armenia or keep Armenia in a blockade. This cannot be allowed.

As you saw, all of the aforementioned principles were fleshed out and agreed upon with the participation of the EU Council President and the President of Azerbaijan. We are ready to implement these understandings as far as transport communications are concerned.

In accordance with the aforementioned principle, including the principle of reciprocity, we are ready to simplify the procedures. We're ready to ensure the safe passage of Azerbaijanis and Azerbaijani goods via our territory, hoping for reciprocity.

We're ready for the mirrored withdrawal of the troops from the 1991 border line, which would mean that Azerbaijan would not have armed forces in the territory of Armenia and vice versa. We're also ready, on the basis of reciprocity, to address the question of the so-called enclaves, as declared in my interview with Armenia's public television on- 10 October.

And, finally, we're ready by the end of this year to sign an agreement on peace and normalisation of relations with Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan refused to take part in the Granada meeting, which had actually been agreed upon in Brussels on 15 July and that agreement, too, was contained in President Michel's statements made after the meeting. Clearly, that failure to come to the meeting did not make the process any easier.

But in the course of this year, as the President of Parliament has said, we've agreed that we will have a meeting in Brussels during this month, and if the aforementioned principles are officially reconfirmed, then the signing of a peace and normalisation agreement between Armenia and Azerbaijan will become highly realistic by the end of this year.

We are also ready to have an overall exchange of prisoners of war, detainees and arrested persons. We're ready to closely cooperate to determine the fate of the missing persons. At the moment, 1 016 citizens of Armenia are considered to be missing.

We stand ready to cooperate on de-mining. I wish to emphasise that, back in 2021, Armenia received from Nagorno-Karabakh, and passed to Azerbaijan, all of the maps of minefields that were available to the Armenian side. We did so without preconditions, as an expression of goodwill, but unfortunately Azerbaijan did not perceive it as a step aimed at peace, but rather as a trigger for escalating its aggressive rhetoric against Armenia.

In spite of this, we must resolutely move towards peace. Doing so requires political will. I and the government and the parliamentary majority of Armenia have this political will. On the other hand, the international community and the European Union and the countries of our region need to support us to the best of their ability to use this opportunity to make it realistic for us, Armenia and Azerbaijan.

This is where I seek your continued support and attention, especially for the realisation of the principles that I discussed. As I said already, these principles were agreed upon with the participation of Council President Charles Michel and the President of Azerbaijan.

Esteemed President, honourable Members of Parliament, dear attendees, turning to the EU-Armenia relationship, in recent years the EU has been a key partner supporting the fundamental reforms of the Armenian Government. The Armenia-EU Comprehensive and Enhanced Partnership Agreement is crucial. It is one of the pillars of our reform agenda, which is now in the phase of active implementation.

Since February, Armenia has had a long-term civilian mission of the European Union, which monitors the security situation alongside Armenia's state border with Azerbaijan. This is an important milestone. For the first time, the European Union has become engaged in Armenia's security agenda. The foundation for this was laid during the quadrilateral meeting in Prague on 6 October 2022.

As for reforms to strengthen democracy, we receive EU support in our police reform. This month, in a matter of just a few days – two weeks, in fact – we will finalise the formation of an all-new patrol police in Armenia. We expect to continue cooperating on the reforms of the police, the rescue service, the judiciary – to have an independent judiciary – education and public administration.

Our agenda with the EU is indeed very extensive. It's important to reinvigorate the projects implemented under the economic and investment plan of the EU. Important objectives include: sustainable economic development, modernisation of infrastructure, digitalisation and technological development, and strengthening the resilience of Armenia's southern regions. The latter is important not only for the country's development but also for building durable peace in the region.

Projects worth more than EUR 400 million have already launched under this programme. About EUR 270 million are for facilitating SME access to finance. About EUR 34 million are for technological development. Another EUR 43 million are for strengthening the resilience of the Syunik region, and about EUR 62 million are for the green development of the city of Yerevan.

And this is not all: on 5 October, in Granada, two very important documents for the EU-Armenia relationship were adopted. One is the quadrilateral statement between President Michel, President Macron, Chancellor Scholz and myself. The other one is the bilateral statement between President von der Leyen and myself.

Both statements express support for strengthening the EU-Armenia relationship on all levels in view of the needs of the Republic of Armenia. We have undertaken to further strengthen the EU-Armenia relationship. In the long run, the European Union and Armenia are committed to strengthening economic ties by unleashing the full potential of the Armenia-EU Comprehensive and Enhanced Partnership Agreement.

Based on all of this, ladies and gentlemen, I can announce clearly and with confidence: Armenia is ready to be closer to the European Union, as far as the European Union would consider possible. Our joint statements with President von der Leyen reads: 'In these difficult times, the EU and Armenia stand shoulder to shoulder'.

Let us continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with a commitment to make these times better. As I said, I am convinced that democracy can provide peace, security, solidarity, prosperity and happiness. Let us prove this together. Long live democracy!

(Applause)

President. – Thank you to the Prime Minister of Armenia.

6. Declaración de la presidenta

President. – Dear colleagues, yesterday evening, a terrorist attack happened in the heart of Brussels, resulting in the murder of two Swedish nationals. On behalf of the European Parliament, I express my deepest condolences to the victims' families.

Terror and extremism cannot infiltrate our societies. We have the right to feel safe and to live in safety. We cannot let hate win.

After consultation with national authorities, and in coordination with the other EU Institutions, the European Parliament has decided to raise the alert level to orange, for now, for our buildings in Brussels. Instructions have been communicated to Members and staff.

We are also in contact with the Belgian Federal Security Services, assessing the situation on the ground for any further developments, but the death of the perpetrator of the attack has been confirmed.

Our thoughts are with the victims and their relatives, and I wish a speedy recovery to those injured.

We will now have a round of political group speakers, followed by a moment of silence.

Tomas Tobé, *on behalf of the PPE Group.* – President, colleagues! I will speak in Swedish, with a heavy heart.

Vi kommer aldrig glömma det som hände i Bryssel igår. Svenskar som väljs ut som terrormål bara på grund av att de är svenskar. Mina tankar idag är med dem som har dödats och skadats och deras familjer.

Detta är en attack mot Sverige, Belgien och Europa. Det är ett fegt försök att ge sig på vårt fria och öppna samhälle, men vi kommer aldrig att ge efter för islamistisk terror. Ni kommer aldrig att lyckas. Tvärtom ska vi ännu starkare stå upp för frihet, demokrati och våra värderingar.

Stort tack till belgisk polis för ert arbete. Jag älskar Sverige! Jag älskar Europa! Kollegor, idag och framåt behöver vi ert stöd.

Heléne Fritzon, *för S&D-gruppen.* – Fru talman! Kollegor! Att gå på fotboll, det är fest, glädje och gemenskap. Att klä sig i sitt eget lands färger, det är att visa stolthet över sitt lag och där man kommer ifrån. I min familj har vi varit på många matcher och på flera av Europas arenor. Och varje gång Sverige spelar bär jag min blågula fotbollsströja.

Denna terrorattack, denna skjutning där två svenska supportrar i sina blågula tröjor får plikta med livet, det är ett angrepp på vårt öppna, fria och demokratiska samhälle. Det är ett angrepp på Sverige, men det är också ett angrepp på Europa. Mina tankar, tillsammans med er, går idag till offrens anhöriga.

Jag vill också tacka för allt det stöd som vi har fått till Sverige, från arenan i stadion i Bryssel, här i Europaparlamentet och runt om i Europa. Vi är inte ensamma och vi låter oss inte besegras.

Abir Al-Sahlani, *för Renew-gruppen.* – Fru talman! När tusentals människor samlas i en stad för en fotbollsmatch – det är en tid av glädje. Igår blev det en tid av sorg. Två av de svenska fansen som var i Bryssel för att titta på fotbollsmatchen mot Belgien kommer inte att komma hem. En terrorist tog deras liv bara för att de hade svenska landslagströjor på sig. Exakt samma tröjor som jag brukar köpa i barnstorlek till mina fotbollsälskande barn, när de med ändlös glädje och entusiasm hurrar för sitt favoritlandslag – det svenska landslaget.

Jag vill från hela Sverige rikta ett stort tack till Belgiens regering och folk som tog hand om våra medborgare, skyddade dem och tröstade dem igår.

Ensam är inte stark. Vi står tillsammans. Terrorismen kan inte ta vår frihet, vår trygghet, vår rätt att tala, att tycka, sjunga fotbollssånger, gå tillsammans på gatorna iklädda våra blågula färger. Våra tankar går till de drabbade och deras familjer.

Alice Kuhnke, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Hatet från dem som avskyr våra friheter och våra öppna samhällen har ännu en gång konkretiserats och tagit liv. Vi sörjer med dem som förlorat sina nära och kära, och vi delar den oro, den rädsla och den sorg som många känner.

Samtidigt är det hur vi reagerar som definierar oss, som definierar vilka vi är. Extremisternas mål är att skrämma oss, att splittra oss. Vittnesmålen inifrån arenan igår berättade om det motsatta. Tusentals belgiska fans visade sin kärlek och sin solidaritet med de svenska supportrarna som var fast inne på arenan. De visade i handling vad EU är, vad som ska definiera oss – förenade i mångfalden, United in Diversity. Det är vad som definierar oss, vad som är vårt Bryssel, vad som är vårt Europa. Låt oss fortsatt – övertygat och kompromisslöst – försvara våra friheter och våra öppna samhällen. Att ge upp det som definierar oss, det är att låta hatet och terrorn vinna.

Charlie Weimers, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, yesterday, two of my compatriots were murdered on the streets of Brussels simply for being Swedish. Our thoughts and our prayers go to the victims and their families.

But, dear colleagues, condolences are not enough. The terrorist, a Tunisian national, was a convicted criminal, an illegal resident and had his asylum application rejected three years ago. For our citizens' sake, illegal migration to Europe must end.

The terrorist shared Islamist disinformation, claiming that Sweden kidnaps Muslim children – a campaign ongoing since 2019, a claim amplified by Islamist organisations here in Europe. For our citizens' sake, financing of Islamist organisations must end. Jews in Europe are being asked to hide their Jewishness. Now, Swedes, we are recommended to hide our nationality in Europe, our home.

Madam President, European complacency in the face of Islamism must end right here, right now.

Gerolf Annemans, *namens de ID-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, collega's, met een grote droefheid en treurnis vernamen wij dat in de Belgische hoofdstad Brussel Zweden werden vermoord omwille van hun Zweedse afkomst. En het is met grote schaamte dat ik hier als Belgisch staatsburger moet wijzen op een falend beleid inzake immigratie.

België is een land waar je, als je er mag blijven, mag blijven, en als je er niet mag blijven, ook. Dus een land waarbij een radicale, levensgevaarlijke IS-strijder wiens asielaanvraag werd afgewezen, vervolgens zogenaamd ondergedoken toch ongestoord in België kon blijven, uitgerust met een woning en een geregistreerd motorvoertuig en uiteindelijk ook een oorlogswapen.

Een grote schaamte dus voor België en een oproep hier aan Europa: Alstublieft, word wakker voordat dit allemaal in een grote chaos eindigt!

Malin Björk, *för The Left-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Attacken igår är fruktansvärd. Två stycken döda och en allvarligt skadad. Det är svårt att finna ord, tycker jag. Men våra tankar och våra känslor går till dem som har förlorat någon, som inte längre kommer att finna de sina.

Belgiska myndigheter, i samarbete med andra, kommer att göra allt för att utreda detta och komma tillbaka med mer information. Jag tackar för det arbete som redan har gjorts.

Gårdagens attack får naturligtvis många av oss att minnas 2016 och attackerna då. Vissa av oss var där på plats, på flygplatsen, där jag själv var, och kände hur bomberna smällde och byggnaden skakade. Andra var i metrosystemet och kände likadant.

Precis som då vill de som begår de här dåden skapa rädsla och splittring, och, inte minst, de vill skapa mer våld. Attacken kommer från hat, och den vill ge upphov till ytterligare hat, där grupper och nationaliteter ställs mot varandra. Och där kommer vårt arbete in. Vårt ansvar är att göra allt vi kan för att bygga demokratiska samhällen, öppna samhällen, fria samhällen, inkluderande samhällen som står emot och befriar oss från detta hat. Samhällen där alla ska kunna bära inte bara sin landslagströja, så klart, utan också religiösa symboler, vare sig de är muslimska, judiska eller kristna. Det är det samhället, och det är vårt ansvar att bygga det tillsammans.

Mina tankar går igen till offren och deras anhöriga.

(Parliament observed a minute's silence)

7. Turno de votaciones

President. – The next item is the vote.

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

7.1. Red de Datos de Sostenibilidad Agrícola (A9-0075/2023 - Jérémy Decerle) (votación)

7.2. Mecanismo de Protección Civil de la Unión (A9-0266/2023 - Sara Cerdas) (votación)

7.3. Aprobación de la gestión 2021: presupuesto general de la UE – Consejo Europeo y Consejo (A9-0274/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (votación)

7.4. Nombramiento de un miembro del Comité Ejecutivo del Banco Central Europeo (A9-0289/2023 - Irene Tinagli) (votación)

7.5. Establecimiento del Mecanismo para Ucrania (A9-0286/2023 - Michael Gahler, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial) (votación)

– *After the vote on the Commission proposal*

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Madam President, thank you, colleagues, for the broad support as usual, and I ask the referral back to the Committee for Interinstitutional Negotiations according to Rule 59(4) of our Rules of Procedure.

– *The request for referral back to committee was approved*

7.6. Creación de la Plataforma de Tecnologías Estratégicas para Europa («STEP») (A9-0290/2023 - José Manuel Fernandes, Christian Ehler) (votación)

– *After the vote on the Commission proposal*

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Madam President, we would like to request a plenary vote on the referral back to committee for interinstitutional negotiations in accordance with Rule 59(4).

– *The request for referral back to committee was approved*

7.7. Control de la pesca (A9-0016/2021 - Clara Aguilera) (votación)

– *Before the vote on putting the amendments to the vote, rather than on the provisional agreement*

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo The Left.* – Senhora Presidente, há dez meses, aprovámos um relatório por ampla maioria sobre a situação da pesca de pequena escala, confirmando as dificuldades crescentes com que este segmento de pesca se confronta, propondo recomendações que estão ainda por implementar.

Hoje, o Parlamento é chamado a aprovar um regulamento que acentua medidas de natureza técnica, burocrática e punitiva, que poderão ter impactos significativos sobre a pequena pesca.

O correto objetivo de recolher elementos precisos de tudo o que é capturado em mar não pode ser feito em prejuízo da pequena pesca. Por essa razão, apresentámos várias alterações que visam manter importantes derrogações atualmente em vigor, que visam salvaguardar a pesca de pequena escala costeira e artesanal.

Apelamos, por isso, a que estas alterações sejam votadas e posteriormente aprovadas, para que este Parlamento não contribua, mais uma vez, para o declínio deste segmento, que representa 75 % das embarcações na União Europeia.

(Parliament rejected the request)

7.8. Repercusiones de las operaciones de pesca chinas en el sector pesquero de la Unión y actuación futura (A9-0282/2023 - Pierre Karleskind) (votación)

President. – That concludes the vote.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.56)

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

8. Reanudación de la sesión

(The sitting resumed at 13.00)

9. Presupuesto general de la Unión Europea para el ejercicio 2024 - todas las secciones - (debate)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Siegfried Mureșan, Nila Ušakova ziņojumu Budžeta komitejas vārdā par Padomes nostāju attiecībā uz Eiropas Savienības 2024. finanšu gada vispārējā budžeta projektu (11565/2023 – C9-0336/2023 – 2023/0264(BUD)) (A9-0288/2023).

Siegfried Mureșan, *rapporteur.* – Mr President, good afternoon, dear colleagues, and welcome to this important debate on the position of Parliament on the budget of the European Union for 2024.

Dear colleagues, the budget of the European Union is one of the most important tools that we have to do good for the people of Europe, for enterprises, for regions, to help people, to be in solidarity with them when they need support, to respect and finance properly the traditional policies of the European Union, to make sure that farmers, enterprises, regions have enough funding, to make sure that we finance properly the newer priorities of the European Union: the transition to the green economy, the digital transition, managing migration, managing our external borders.

But we also have to make sure that whenever an unexpected development occurs, the European Union can act, can support people in need. And we have seen, since 2020, when we together adopted the Multiannual Financial Framework, two wars starting in our proximity: the war in Ukraine and the terrorist attack of Hamas upon Israel. Both military conflicts are in our neighbourhood. In both situations, it is important that the budget of the European Union is capable of acting. Security, defence, military mobility, migration, the support for Ukraine, humanitarian aid where needed – all of these are important and they need to be provided with the support of the European Union.

The European Commission has put forward a draft budget for next year. The Council of the European Union proposes to make cuts. We as the Parliament, reject all cuts made by the by the Council of the European Union on the grounds that we cannot ask the European Union to do more, but in the same time to cut the funding of the European Union where it is needed.

We support the draft budget of the European Commission, and we have looked, as a Parliament, in a very responsible way to areas where funding has proven insufficient, where more is needed.

And I am convinced that tomorrow, with a large majority, we as a Parliament will adopt the position of the Parliament and our mandate for the negotiations with the Council and Commission with the following priorities: firstly, research and innovation. We have to invest more in Horizon Europe, in research and innovation. This makes Europe strong. Here we have concrete benefits for the people of Europe, including medical research. We have concrete benefits for our enterprises, to make sure that they remain innovative, strong, competitive.

Secondly, invest in infrastructure, in transport infrastructure. Particularly since the war in Ukraine, we have seen how important it is that we connect ourselves between countries, between regions, that we facilitate transport towards Ukraine, from Ukraine, where needed.

Thirdly, we as a Parliament together want more Erasmus scholarships for the young people of Europe. We want this because this gives visibility to the European Union, and this is also for young people one of the concrete benefits of Europe.

We as a Parliament also want to stand by the side of young farmers. We want to make agriculture attractive for young farmers. This is why we are proposing an increase of allocations there. And in parallel with that, we are proposing an increase of allocation to the LIFE programme, the important programme for environment and biodiversity, supported by Parliament as a whole.

Creative industries, health programmes – these have been priorities. Here we are asking for moderate responsible reinforcements where justified and also we want to strengthen the European Public Prosecutor to make sure that European money is well spent and to make sure that if any regularities and frauds appear, these are tackled. This is important for European taxpayers' money.

This is the position of Parliament on the budget for next year. This will be adopted tomorrow, I am convinced, by a large majority. We are looking forward to negotiations with the Council and the Commission, with the expectation to successfully give a budget to the Union before the end of the year.

I would like to thank all shadow rapporteurs of political groups who have worked with us in a very constructive manner and their constructive manner, their work will enable the Parliament to adopt our position with a large majority and have a strong voice in the upcoming negotiations, with a key objective to give a budget to the European Union before the end of this year.

Nils Ušakovs, *rapporteur.* – Mr President, Commissioner Hahn, Secretary of State Samblás, dear colleagues, there was a clear purpose why the European institutions were established: to help and protect the common interests of the European people.

All of these establishments have specific roles, from developing EU laws and policy-making, to implementing policies and working in areas like health, medicine, transport or environment. The Union's institutions are crucial in areas like protecting citizens' rights, personal data and fighting fraud.

It doesn't matter whether you come from Portugal, Sweden, Greece or Latvia, but your fundamental values and fundamental rights will be defended by the European Court of Justice and the EU Ombudsman. The ECJ alone resolved 1 666 cases in 2022. In the same time the European Ombudsman opened 344 inquiries and provided advice on 811 complaints.

Privacy will be ensured by the European Data Protection Service, and we have to bear in mind that new technologies such as artificial intelligence will add up to new challenges that we will have to face in near future.

I invite you to reflect: how highly effective can we be in the fight against fraud, or in defending our fundamental rights and wellness, or in dealing with artificial intelligence if there are no sufficient funds to pay, for instance, for institutions, heating bills or for buying adequate equipment or to have the high profile experts to do the job?

We don't request anything special or inadequate: the approach to the estimates is very modest. The money is for contractual obligations — that is primarily salaries and utility bills – not for new posts, with certain justified exemptions: the Committee of Regions for cyber security, the EDPS should get the requested experts because of new tasks connected to artificial intelligence, and the European External Action Service, because our Union is facing already two wars at our borders and needs to be reinforced.

Our House, the European Parliament, has been highly frugal in its own estimates as well, and we must consider that 2024 is a crucial and an extraordinary year for Parliament due to the European elections. Moreover, the Member States decided to add 15 new members to join the House after the elections, which corresponds to additional expenses. We didn't request any new posts and stayed strictly below the three-percent threshold for the non-salary and non-contractual obligations, showing responsibility and readiness to share the financial burden.

With our estimates, this plenary will send a clear message about the limits of what is possible and the respect we all need vis-à-vis the way the European taxpayers' money should be spent. I believe this year's approach by Parliament, when we talk about EP estimates, will serve as a very good basis for further trilogues and conciliation.

Esperanza Samblás, *presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, comisario Hahn, señorías, señoras y señores, es para mí un honor asistir hoy al debate del Parlamento Europeo sobre su posición para el presupuesto de la Unión Europea para 2024.

Ya tuvimos ocasión de tener un primer intercambio de puntos de vista el pasado 13 de septiembre cuando vine a presentarles la posición aprobada por el Consejo. No obstante, la presentación por la Comisión de su nota rectificativa relativa al proyecto de presupuesto la semana pasada supondrá una modificación sobre nuestras respectivas posiciones.

Vivimos tiempos muy difíciles y creo que compartimos la opinión de que, en este momento, dar una respuesta a las consecuencias de la guerra de agresión de Rusia contra Ucrania es una de las prioridades de la Unión. Esta agresión ha afectado profundamente a nuestras economías aumentando la inseguridad energética y la inflación, haciendo subir los precios de los alimentos y provocando una crisis mundial del coste de la vida.

Esta situación nos lleva, además, a identificar nuevas necesidades como la ayuda humanitaria, el apoyo a los refugiados y medidas para hacer frente a la crisis energética y al aumento de la inflación. En este contexto, los Estados miembros están luchando con sus finanzas públicas para poder dar una respuesta a muchas necesidades con muy poco margen de maniobra.

Todos sabemos que los grandes aumentos del gasto público, ya sea a nivel nacional o europeo, conllevan el riesgo de más inflación. Por eso, más que nunca, la aproximación del Consejo, tratando de mantener márgenes suficientes en el presupuesto, es clave para permitir que la Unión actúe de forma responsable y pueda hacer frente a cualquier imprevisto que, como estamos comprobando ahora mismo, surja. Por ello, es también muy importante limitar el recurso a instrumentos especiales que nos permitan hacer frente a esos gastos imprevistos que surgen cuando menos lo esperamos.

Señor presidente, señor comisario Hahn, señorías, permítanme ahora hacer algunas observaciones preliminares sobre las enmiendas del Parlamento Europeo a la posición del Consejo que se someten a votación aquí mañana.

Ante todo, quisiera volver a subrayar que el Consejo ha examinado el proyecto de presupuesto para 2024 únicamente en el marco del procedimiento presupuestario anual y ajustado al marco financiero plurianual vigente. En ese sentido, quiere destacar que el Consejo está abordando la revisión del marco financiero plurianual con un enfoque sistemático al margen del procedimiento presupuestario anual.

En esencia, la Unión no puede detenerse y esperar a que se tome una decisión política muy difícil, sino que debe actuar con los recursos de que disponemos y asegurar que somos capaces de esperar 2024 con un presupuesto sólido que garantice la utilidad de nuestros recursos y su utilización con sensatez.

En este punto, sin embargo, existe una diferencia crucial entre las posiciones del Consejo y del Parlamento Europeo, dado que el Parlamento Europeo está formulando su posición sobre la base de un marco financiero plurianual revisado y, como resultado de ello, nuestras posiciones resultan en términos numéricos —en términos cuantitativos— muy difícilmente conciliables.

Permítanme ahora abordar algunos puntos con más detalle.

En primer lugar, el Consejo no puede aceptar los aumentos del Parlamento Europeo basados en un marco financiero plurianual revisado y que prevé refuerzos de los techos mediante ajustes técnicos y nuevas propuestas como STEP y el Mecanismo para Ucrania, cuyos procedimientos legislativos deben mantenerse separados del procedimiento presupuestario anual.

En la rúbrica 1 se han introducido algunos cambios que suponen unos aumentos también por encima de los techos previstos —como los propuestos para el Mecanismo «Conectar Europa» en el ámbito del transporte, o en algunos otros financiados con liberalizaciones de crédito sobre las que todavía no hemos alcanzado un acuerdo. En la rúbrica 2, en los costes de financiación del IRUE, diverge la propuesta del Parlamento Europeo respecto a la que mantenemos el Consejo y la Comisión Europea. En la rúbrica 5 se proponen algunas medidas adicionales como el aumento para la movilidad militar, que no tiene cabida dentro del marco financiero plurianual actual sin revisión. Y también tenemos diferencias en la rúbrica 7.

No les ocultaré que me temo que en los próximos meses vamos a tener que tener una discusión importante en el marco del Comité de Conciliación para conseguir lograr un acuerdo. Creo que tenemos trabajo por hacer, pero que en muchas de las propuestas ambas instituciones compartimos las prioridades.

Creo que es verdad que una de las mayores complicaciones que nos encontramos es precisamente la interpretación sobre la revisión del marco financiero plurianual. Y, a pesar de todo ello, quiero reafirmar la voluntad del Consejo de alcanzar un acuerdo equilibrado sobre el presupuesto de 2024 y de contar con el apoyo de la Comisión, del comisario Hahn y de su equipo como intermediarios honestos de cara al acuerdo.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, dear rapporteurs, dear Chair Van Overtveldt, dear State Secretary. We are only one week away from the start of the draft budget 2024 conciliation, and I would like to thank the European Parliament, especially the Committee on Budgets and all specialised committees, for the intensive work on the Commission's proposal for the draft budget 2024 in the last couple of weeks.

I would like to thank the rapporteurs, Mr Mureşan and Mr Ušakovs, for reaching, finally, a compromise on almost 1 200 budgetary amendments amongst political groups and committees presenting a united Parliament position.

Firstly, I appreciate the amendments proposed by the Parliament to reinstate the expenditure at the level proposed by the Commission in the draft budget, as I emphasised in September. To the honourable Members, I regret the Council's cuts, which are not accompanied by adequate justifications and which do not respect the Council's own priorities. I therefore share the rapporteurs' assessment in this regard and agree that the draft budget is a bare minimum for the next year.

Secondly, Parliament proposes reinforcements in several programmes for 2024 to include a mid-term revision of the MFF. While I appreciate Parliament's support for the mid-term revision, we will need to integrate the mid-term revision elements at the right moment in time, hopefully during the Conciliation Committee already. We depend on the progress of the Council, where the leaders – I very much hope – will provide clear guidance next week at the European Council.

It is important to reach an agreement on the revised MFF soon in order to include it in the budget for 2024. Otherwise, we would have a budget with limited means for the large challenges the Union faces, like the war in Ukraine and all the other crises in the European neighbourhood.

Since more than one week ago, we have been confronted with a new situation in the Middle East, and I am sure that this will also have a budgetary impact very soon. This is only one of the many examples where we could not have foreseen these events when we not only adopted the MFF in 2020, but even when we drafted the mid-term review in June this year. Therefore, this cannot be done within the existing ceilings and with the notable limited remaining availability. Therefore, I hope the progress of the mid-term review negotiations will allow the 2024 budget to be based on a revised MFF.

If we take one step back in our annual budget negotiations, both the Parliament and the Council will have set the framework of their respective mandates. As usual, at this point, the positions diverge, although considerably less than in previous years. Inevitably, a clear prioritisation of tabled amendments, as well as concessions on both sides, will be necessary so that we can focus our discussions on a limited number of programmes where meaningful adjustments can be made.

The amending letter, which the Commission adopted on 9 October, addresses some elements included both in the Council position and in Parliament's amendments. Therefore, I would like to ask Parliament and the Council to consider this amending letter as a starting point in the negotiating process.

I am confident that the negotiations will continue in the positive spirit we had until now, and that Parliament and the Council will manage to reconcile their positions. State secondary, rapporteurs, I can reassure you that we will do everything to play the honest broker in order to get an agreement in deed, not only on the basis of what we presented in June, but also taking into account a positive forthcoming outcome of the mid-term review.

Carina Ohlsson, *föredragande av yttrande från utrikesutskottet*. – Herr talman! En mer osäker värld präglad av krig, konflikter och terror kräver att EU är en stark röst för fred, demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter, vilket också inbegriper kvinnors rättigheter.

Vi ser att allt fler flickor gifts bort mot sin vilja. När kvinnor och flickor i Afghanistan förlorar möjligheten att utbilda sig, när kvinnor i Iran förföljs av moralpolisen, när kvinnors kroppar används som vapen av Ryssland i kriget mot Ukraina – ja, då behövs en feministisk utrikespolitik mer än någonsin.

Insatserna som främjar flickors och kvinnors rättigheter i konfliktområden behöver prioriteras. EU måste jobba strategiskt för att bekämpa det könsbaserade våldet, inkludera kvinnor i konfliktförebyggande och fredsfrämjande arbete och stärka kvinnors egenmakt.

Det humanitära biståndet är en viktig del av EU:s arbete för att främja fred och demokrati. Neddragningar och frysning av bistånd skulle ha motsatt effekt. Det skulle bara skada civila och spä på extremism och konflikt.

Dessa oroliga tider med krig i vår närhet har plågsamt påmint oss om att fred och säkerhet är förutsättningar för en hållbar utveckling och ett jämlikt och jämställt Europa.

Ilan De Basso, *föredragande av yttrande från utskottet för utveckling*. – Herr talman! [*inledningen ohörbar, utan mikrofon*] EU:s budget som verkligen kan göra skillnad för vanligt folk. Men det förutsätter att vi orkar prioritera. EU-budgeten kan och ska aldrig kompensera medlemsländerna för lågskattepolitik.

Vi måste använda EU-budgeten för de kriser och satsningar som inget enskilt medlemsland kan göra självt. Det är då vi gör skillnad på riktigt. Det är då vi kan skapa utveckling och skapa fler jobb i hela Europa.

Så om EU också ska bli en trovärdig partner, får vi inte skära ner på det internationella engagemanget när det behövs som mest. Vi vet att det är barn och kvinnor som får ta de största konsekvenserna av en begränsad tillgång till humanitärt bistånd, och att humanitära insatser faktiskt räddar liv. Att prioritera detta är inte en fråga om välgörenhet, utan det handlar om vår gemensamma framtid och vår gemensamma säkerhet.

Herr talman! EU behöver en budget som står på vanligt folks sida. Det är vår uppgift att se till att den bidrar till ett mer jämlikt och jämställt Europa.

Dragoș Pîslaru, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs*. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, we are currently living in a context of multiple crises, which has exacerbated the cost of living for millions of Europeans, and it's pushing the most vulnerable into poverty.

What is deeply concerning is that in light of this dire situation, the Council appears to disregard the urgent calls for revising the Multiannual Financial Framework and, in fact, proposing budget cuts for 2024. In my capacity as the chair of the Employment and Social Affairs Committee, together with my colleagues, I would like to relay our committee's call for a strong budgetary response, to contribute to developing resilient social systems, to reduce poverty, and to increasing upward social convergence across the Union so that no one is left behind. And I especially want to do that today, when it's the International Day for Eradicating Poverty.

We are fully aware of the budgetary constraints, especially this year. But let's not forget that behind the figures we are dealing with people. In our committee, one of the pressing priorities is to combat child poverty, and for that, we would like to have an increased allocation for the future.

Christian Ehler, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy*. – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on March 23, the European Council adopted the following text: 'The European Union is building a robust, future-proof economy that secures long-term prosperity. This requires an integrated approach across all policy areas to increase productivity and growth throughout the whole economic base of our continent.'

And ladies and gentlemen, that is all based on competitiveness, productivity, growth and innovation. And we are going to ruin our future. I mean these lofty words from the Council, this is unbelievable. The cuts are either ritual – then it's shameful – or they are meant. And then the Council lost their mind. The Council cut EUR 20 million from the European Research Council that is producing the Nobel Prize winners you show yourself in public. You cut EUR 35 million from the health crisis, after the COVID crisis, which brought our collective public life to a collapse. You cut EUR 10 million from security research after the disturbing events yesterday evening in Brussels. I mean, this is mad, nothing else!

And you have to restore a solid budget for innovation. Otherwise we are going to fail. We are going to fail on climate. We are going to fail on digital. You are going to fail on modern societies. Not just to restore that. Get to terms, we want our budget back.

Ciarán Cuffe, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Transport and Tourism*. – Mr President, Commissioner Hahn, Vice-President Zīle, regarding the 2024 budget, the decisions we make are crucial ones.

Our annual budget of almost EUR 200 billion shapes the lives of almost half a billion citizens, and as lead negotiator for the Transport Committee, I am glad that we will invest in transport solutions that work for all.

We are increasing the budget for transport projects by EUR 100 million. This will make rail travel easier for goods and for people. Better train connections to and from our ports will help to make goods travel much more seamlessly between shipping and rail.

We now have a sustainable aviation fuels law that starts the slow process of reducing the climate impacts of flying. And I am happy that funding for a greener jet fuel project that I proposed will continue for a second year.

I regret that there is no real increase in funding for transport agencies, which are vital for transport safety for roads, rail and sea, and funding for the rail agency should match that of funding for the aviation and maritime agencies.

In conclusion, now is the time for action, not delay.

Andreas Schwab, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz.* – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Durch die Pandemie, den Angriffskrieg Russlands gegen die Ukraine und die Inflation und nun die Eskalation im Nahost-Konflikt erfahren wir große Belastungen für den EU-Haushalt für das kommende Jahr. Und deswegen, Herr Kommissar Hahn, ist es richtig, dass die Kommission vorschlägt, diesen Haushalt zu erhöhen.

Ich bin sehr froh, dass die spanische Ratspräsidentschaft hier auch zuhört, weil wir natürlich in den vergangenen Jahren eine ganze Reihe von neuen Aufgaben für die Europäische Union geschaffen haben, die früher die Mitgliedstaaten übernommen haben, und die Mitgliedstaaten dafür aber keine neuen Beträge auf die europäische Ebene übertragen wollen. Das wird auf Dauer nicht gut gehen, denn die Aufgaben müssen natürlich das eine sein, aber die Finanzierung dieser Aufgaben das andere. Wenn die Europäische Union in der Digitalpolitik beispielsweise neue Aufgaben übernimmt, müssen die Mitgliedstaaten dann dafür entweder eigene Personalstellen nach Brüssel oder nach Straßburg schicken oder eben entsprechend höhere Beiträge leisten. Das ist ein Stück weit die Grundüberzeugung im europäischen Binnenmarkt. Und deswegen danke ich natürlich den Kollegen, dass ich mich mit diesem Thema beschäftigen darf.

Aber ich möchte gerne aus aktuellem Anlass auch noch einen Satz zum Thema Investitionen in innovative Forschung und Entwicklung loswerden. Wir betonen ja, dass wir gerade kleine und mittlere Unternehmen stark von der hohen Inflation und den hohen Energiepreisen betroffen sehen. Auch hier müssen wir etwas machen, und deswegen ist der Anstieg um 1,375 Milliarden Euro sehr zu begrüßen.

Juozas Olekas, *Žemės ūkio komiteto nuomonės referentas.* – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, Komisijos nary, Tarybos atstovai, gerbiami kolegos. Europos Sąjungos ūkininkai išgyvena ypač sunkų laikotarpį, pateikiantį daug naujų iššūkių. Rusijos agresijos karas prieš Ukrainą, energetinė krizė, didėjančios palūkanų normos ir augančios gamybos sąnaudos apsunkina ūkininkų, ypač smulkiųjų ir jaunųjų ūkininkų, galimybes užtikrinti mūsų aprūpinimą sveiku, kokybišku maistu. Todėl džiaugiuosi rezoliucijoje matydamas raginimus didinti finansavimą jauniems ir naujiems ūkininkams. Kartų kaitos užtikrinimas kaime turi būti svarbus mūsų visų prioritetas. Taip pat svarbu skirti didesnį finansavimą mokyklų schemoms, suteikti vaikams galimybę gauti sveiko ir maistingo maisto. Deja, viena problema, į kurią dėmesį atkreipėme AGRI komitete, rezoliucijoje liko neatspindėta, – tiesioginių išmokų skirtumai vis dar daro didelę įtaką ūkininkų gebėjimui atlaikyti infliacijos spaudimą ir užtikrinti aprūpinimą maistu. Dar 2004 metais Rytų Europos ūkininkams buvo pažadėtos išmokos, siekiančios Europos Sąjungos vidurkį. Pats laikas šį pažadą įvykdyti.

Pierre Karleskind, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission de la pêche.* – Monsieur le Président, depuis l'invasion de l'Ukraine par la Russie et la hausse des prix du gasoil, la pêche est confrontée à la hausse, forte, de ses charges. Elle a pris de plein fouet cette hausse des coûts de l'énergie et elle a été accompagnée. Elle a été accompagnée largement, dans toute l'Union européenne, et alors que l'on arrive bientôt en 2024, il est temps que cet accompagnement puisse permettre la transition vers des modèles qui la mettront en état de faire face aux enjeux de demain, notamment le coût de l'énergie, mais aussi la décarbonation.

La décarbonation est justement l'élément clé, l'élément fort que la commission de la pêche a voulu mettre en avant dans son avis concernant le budget. Plus concrètement, nous nous proposons – ce dont, au nom de la commission de la pêche, je suis fier – de mettre en place le démonstrateur d'un bateau de pêche, lequel pourra expérimenter, concrètement, différentes techniques de pêche, mais aussi une nouvelle motorisation, et permettra d'avancer – avec un peu plus de 2 millions d'euros – de plain-pied vers le long terme. Cela est nécessaire pour que notre secteur de la pêche, tout comme celui de l'aquaculture, continue d'être durable.

Morten Løkkegaard, *ordfører for udtalelse fra Kultur- og Uddannelsesudvalget*. – Hr. formand! Kommissær Hahn, minister, kolleger. Når man er i krig, så er det sidste, man skal spare på, jo fremtiden, de unge og kulturen. Det vidste allerede Winston Churchill under Anden Verdenskrig, og det gælder stadigvæk i dag. Unge er selvfølgelig vores fremtid. Kulturen binder os sammen som europæere på tværs af landegrænser. Derfor er det vigtigt at investere i både ungdommen og kulturen, ja faktisk er det afgørende. Det ved jeg som chefforhandler for vores kulturudvalg, og det præger mine ønsker til budgettet. Netop i krisetider med krig i Europas baghave og i cyberspace er vi nødt til at dyrke vores fællesskaber ekstra. Kulturudvalget har derfor foreslået at øge støtten til Erasmus+ udvekslingsprogrammet, som er en stor succes blandt unge og alle andre. Vi foreslår også at hæve støtten til Creative Europe, som hjælper filmproducenter, musikere, kunstnere og journalister, der dagligt bekæmper russiske forsøg på desinformation. Vi må ikke glemme i Europa, at vi har de unge, at vi har kulturen, selv når kriserne rammer mest.

Salvatore De Meo, *relatore per parere della commissione per gli affari costituzionali*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 2024 sarà l'anno delle elezioni europee e per questo motivo il nostro budget deve rispecchiare le sfide che dobbiamo affrontare.

Tra queste, c'è sicuramente la necessità di comunicare di più e meglio con i cittadini per sensibilizzarli relativamente alle attività dell'Unione europea, contrastando la disinformazione e abbattendo quella barriera che ancora oggi esiste tra cittadini e istituzioni. L'Unione europea è spesso percepita come una realtà astratta e lontana, nonostante in questa sede prendiamo decisioni che impattano ogni giorno sulla vita dei nostri cittadini.

C'è bisogno di avere risorse destinate ad aumentare la consapevolezza dei cittadini sull'importanza di avere un'Europa forte e coesa quale unica soluzione per affrontare un presente complesso e un futuro ambizioso. E servono risorse per dare attuazione alla Conferenza sul futuro dell'Europa, dove i cittadini ci hanno chiesto espressamente un'Europa diversa e più concreta, un'Europa che non abbia paura di mettersi in discussione e avviare anche il delicato processo riformatore dei nostri trattati.

José Manuel Fernandes, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhor Presidente, Caras e Caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário, Presidência, os cidadãos europeus merecem um orçamento que esteja à sua altura, à altura das suas expetativas e que responda às necessidades e aos desafios que vivemos.

E, para isso, é necessário um orçamento suficiente, um orçamento capaz, um orçamento que apoie a investigação, os agricultores – e aqui um realce para uma proposta que temos de um aumento de 40 milhões de euros para os jovens agricultores, os jovens com o Erasmus+, a Europa Criativa, a coesão social e territorial que é absolutamente necessária.

E, para termos este orçamento capaz e suficiente, também precisamos da ajuda humanitária, do apoio à Ucrânia.

Mas também, para termos este orçamento suficiente e capaz, precisamos da revisão do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual e espero que a Presidência espanhola tenha este sucesso de, no seu mandato até ao fim deste ano, nós termos esta revisão. A revisão do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual é absolutamente essencial para nós termos o orçamento que os europeus esperam e que os europeus também merecem. Tenho essa confiança e também faço aqui este desafio e espero que a Comissão colabore também.

Mas, agora, tudo isto está nas mãos do Conselho. Nós estamos, como sempre, prontos a negociar e estamos à espera do Conselho para que se possa resolver.

Victor Negrescu, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear representatives of the Council, dear colleagues, the European Parliament, in particular the Social Democrats in this House, are clear in saying that we need an urgent revision of the Multiannual Financial Framework. The European Union needs a budget that can provide adequate answers to the current needs and challenges, while preparing us for the future.

We need a budget that protects EU citizens, allows us to deal with global competition from non-democratic countries, win the war in Ukraine and face the challenges in the Middle East, maintain world peace, fight terrorism and hate speech, and protect our way of life. This is not just a statement. With only 1% of our combined national budgets, the European Union, including Member States, will become irrelevant, fragile in front of the Russian Federation, incapable of dealing with the impact of the inflation and of the war, of achieving a fair digital and green transition, or increasing the standard of living for our people.

The Social Democrats in the European Parliament are not going to accept peanuts from the Council, and would use all means available to push for a citizens-oriented budget. That is why we asked for more funds for key policies in the field of health and education, for the Civil Protection Mechanism essential in dealing with disasters for agriculture and energy – in order to keep prices low, help young farmers and protect vulnerable consumers – for international actions, in particular the Republic of Moldova or Ukraine, or for border protection and the Schengen enlargement with Romania and Bulgaria.

We also were clear in saying that we need to tackle the impact of inflation on EU programmes, in particular on our youth and educational Erasmus projects. Unfortunately, Europe is paying more for interest rates to the banks than for our flagship programme. Contrary to what populists would say, the Parliament is not asking for more money, but sufficient funds for what Member States and the Commission have already pledged without even consulting us. Member States already received a reduction of 22% of their contribution to the EU budget, due to the success of the European own resources.

What we are saying is that for 2024, we need a budget that brings hope in Europe and convinces our citizens that the European election can offer them the possibility to build a better, united European Union.

Fabienne Keller, *au nom du groupe Renew.* –Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire Johannes Hahn, Madame la Ministre Esperanza Samblás, chers collègues, le budget annuel pour l'année 2024 est le budget avec les marges les plus faibles depuis le début de ce cadre financier pluriannuel.

Nous n'imaginions pas, au début de cette mandature, que nous devrions – chers collègues – faire face à une pandémie, une crise économique, une guerre et toutes les conséquences qui découlent de ces événements.

Et pourtant, l'Union européenne a fait face, en redoublant d'ingéniosité et de réactivité. Tout cela n'aurait pas été possible sans le budget européen – et le plan de relance, bien sûr.

Ce budget 2024, en dépit de ses faibles marges, doit être flexible et réactif pour pouvoir faire face aux crises et aux imprévus. Cela est crucial, et je voudrais remercier Siegfried Mureşan ainsi que Nils Ušakovs pour leur travail.

Nous l'avons constaté, la capacité d'action et de réaction de l'Union européenne est nécessaire pour répondre à des événements ponctuels comme les catastrophes naturelles, ou à des crises comme la guerre en Ukraine.

Dans la position du Parlement, nous augmentons aussi le budget des agences, dont le mandat a été élargi, pour la sécurité – cruellement d'actualité – ainsi que les programmes phares: Erasmus+, LIFE, le Fonds européen de la défense, l'aide humanitaire, le mécanisme européen de protection civile et encore d'autres lignes essentielles.

Ce budget vise à être aux côtés des citoyens, sans oublier les grands défis, pour lesquels il nous faut investir dans la durée: la transition climatique, les programmes pour la jeunesse, le soutien à travers les crises.

Nous avons besoin d'une révision du CFP ambitieuse. Madame la Ministre, le Conseil doit suivre le Parlement et être volontariste dans ce domaine de manière à permettre une révision très proche du budget 2024, de manière à ce qu'il soit plus réaliste et plus adapté aux défis face auxquels nous nous trouvons . Mesdames et Messieurs, donnons-nous les moyens de nos ambitions!

Rasmus Andresen, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich weiß nicht, wie es Ihnen geht, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich bin immer noch schockiert darüber, mit welcher Brutalität palästinensische Terroristen vor ungefähr einer Woche Israel angegriffen haben. Die Grünen verurteilen den fürchterlichen Terror der Hamas – unsere Solidarität gehört dem Staat Israel und allen Menschen, die unter der Terrororganisation Hamas leiden.

Vor diesem Hintergrund werde ich heute keine gewöhnliche Haushaltsrede halten. Jedes Jahr wiederholen sich hier viele Rituale, und es bleibt natürlich auch wichtig, für ein starkes Budget zu kämpfen. Ich möchte darüber sprechen, dass in Israel Krieg herrscht und dass auch bei uns unsere jüdischen Freundinnen und Freunde immer wieder Angst davor haben müssen, Opfer von antisemitischer Gewalt zu werden. Es ist unerträglich, wenn Menschen auch auf deutschen Straßen beispielsweise den brutalen Terror der Hamas feiern. Und es läuft mir eiskalt den Rücken runter, wenn ich lese, dass inzwischen an deutsche Häuserwände wieder Davidsterne geschmiert werden.

Das Existenzrecht Israels und sein Recht auf Verteidigung sind nicht verhandelbar, und die EU muss alles dafür tun, Antisemitismus zu stoppen – aus unserer historischen, aber auch unserer politischen Verantwortung heraus. Und genau da kommt dann auch wieder der Haushalt ins Spiel. Denn wir müssen darauf pochen, dass Gelder nicht nur einfach nicht an die Hamas gezahlt werden, sondern dass wir auch weitere Mittel im Rahmen des Jahreshaushalts überprüfen und ganz genau schauen, wo Finanzströme eigentlich in diesen Jahren und Monaten in Israel und in den palästinensischen Gebieten hingehen. Deshalb ist es wichtig, dass wir dazu für morgen einen gemeinsamen Antrag auf den Weg gebracht haben. Wir sollten hier keine politischen Schnellschüsse machen. Wir sollten keinen Aktionismus betreiben. Wir sollten gemeinsam genau überlegen, wie wir mit diesem Thema weiter umgehen.

Bogdan Rzońca, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Grupa ECR popiera wiele poprawek, tym bardziej, że nasze poprawki częściowo zostały uznane. Między innymi chodzi o poprawki dotyczące młodych rolników, zwiększenia budżetu, a także zwiększenia kwot na finansowanie mobilności wojskowej i badania w zakresie obronności. Ale źle się stało, że nie zostały zwiększone środki dla krajów frontowych, które przyjmują matki i dzieci z Ukrainy. Tak jest między innymi w Polsce. W polskim systemie zdrowotnym, w polskim systemie szkolnym są dzieci ukraińskie i nie ma dla nich wystarczającej pomocy.

Nie jesteśmy też entuzjastami tych nadzwyczajnych zasobów własnych, świeżych pieniędzy, które mają być dostarczone do budżetu Unii. Nie uważamy, że dobrym pomysłem jest zwiększenie budżetu na Prokuraturę Europejską i na Instytut ds. Równości Kobiet i Mężczyzn. Wciąż uważamy, że bardzo podstawowym instrumentem, przy pomocy którego Unia Europejska może równolegle i równomiernie się rozwijać, jest fundusz spójności. Ten fundusz powinien być jak najbardziej utrzymany i zwiększany po to, żeby wszystkie kraje w Unii Europejskiej, jeśli mówimy o solidarności europejskiej, mogły po prostu równomiernie się rozwijać.

We wszystkich krajach mieszkają ludzie z innego rodzaju deficytami, potrzebami, a po Covidzie i w wyniku wojny po putininflacji mamy z tym ogromny problem. Zatem będziemy tutaj popierać dobre rzeczy, krytykować złe. No i zobaczymy, co zrobi Rada z naszą propozycją. Trzymamy kciuki.

Joachim Kuhs, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, werte Kollegen! Dieser Haushalt treibt mir die Schamesröte ins Gesicht. Nicht nur, weil er sich unfassbar aufgebläht hat. Inzwischen erreichen wir die 200-Milliarden-Euro-Marke. Und, meine Damen und Herren, machen wir uns doch ehrlich: Das ist ja nur die Hälfte des gesamten Geldes, das wir planen, im nächsten Haushaltsjahr auszugeben. Da kommen ja noch die ganzen Gelder der schön klingenden Fazilitäten dazu, wie der Wiederaufbaufazilität oder der Ukraine-Fazilität, die wir heute verabschiedet haben. Inzwischen sprechen wir von einer ganzen Galaxie von Fonds und – in Deutschland würden wir sagen – von Sondervermögen, die jedoch nur Schulden sind, mit denen wir unsere Kinder auf Jahrzehnte hinaus belasten. Aber ich schäme mich auch dafür, dass dieser Haushalt Programme und Zahlungen für das UNRWA und die Palästinensische Autonomiebehörde enthält, bei denen nicht ganz transparent ist, ob dieses Geld nicht auch an Terrororganisationen wie Hamas fließt.

Liebe Kollegen, es muss uns klar sein: Bevor wir nicht alle diese Gelder stoppen, werden die Bilder, die uns dieser Tage aus Israel, aus Arras, aus Brüssel oder auch aus dem Sudan oder aus Bergkarabach erreichen, nicht aufhören, uns unseren Schlaf zu rauben. Deshalb schließe ich jetzt mit der letzten Strophe des Kriegsliedes von Matthias Claudius, einem deutschen Dichter: „'s ist Krieg! 's ist Krieg! O Gottes Engel wehre, und rede Du darein! 's ist leider Krieg – und ich begehre, nicht schuld daran zu sein!" Kyrie eleison.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left.* – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όσα ζητάει το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο με μια εντυπωσιακή συναίνεση των πολιτικών ομάδων, από το Ευρωπαϊκό Λαϊκό Κόμμα μέχρι και την Ευρωομάδα της Αριστεράς, είναι τα ελάχιστα που απαιτούνται για να υλοποιηθούν οι στόχοι που έχει θέσει όχι μόνο το Κοινοβούλιο, αλλά και η Επιτροπή και το Συμβούλιο. Κυρία εκπρόσωπε της ισπανικής Προεδρίας του Συμβουλίου, οι περικοπές του Συμβουλίου, όπως σας είπε και ο κύριος Hahn, δεν έχουν καμία τεκμηρίωση και υπονομεύουν και τους στόχους που το ίδιο το Συμβούλιο έχει θέσει. Γιατί καθυστερείτε επί μήνες, όχι εσείς, αλλά ο κύριος Michel, να συζητήσετε τις προτάσεις για την αναθεώρηση του πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου; Αυτή η καθυστέρηση υπονομεύει την ευρωπαϊκή προοπτική και εκθέτει το Συμβούλιο στα μάτια των πολιτών που σε λίγο καιρό θα κληθούν να ψηφίσουν στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Αν θέλετε περισσότερη και καλύτερη Ευρώπη, κυρία Υπουργέ, φροντίστε στη διάρκεια της ισπανικής Προεδρίας να εγκριθεί η αναθεώρηση του πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου, μην «κλωτσάτε το τενεκεδάκι παρακάτω» και υιοθετήστε όσα ελάχιστα και πολύ ρεαλιστικά σας ζητούμε ως Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Οι διαδοχικές κρίσεις, ο πόλεμος στην Ουκρανία, ο νέος πόλεμος που είναι σε εξέλιξη στη Μέση Ανατολή, απαιτούν μια ισχυρότερη Ενωμένη Ευρώπη. Με 1% του ευρωπαϊκού ΑΕΠ ως προϋπολογισμό αυτό είναι αδύνατο να πραγματοποιηθεί.

Andor Deli (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A 2024-es költségvetés jelen formájában valóban önmagában az egyik legrövidebb életű uniós költségvetés lesz, és teljes egészében a többéves keretköltségvetés felülvizsgálatának sikerétől függ. Ugyanakkor nagyon kétséges, hogy miként sikerül majd a tagállamokat újból többmilliárdos befizetésekre rávenni. Itt nem csak az Ukrajnának szánt 50 milliárdos csomagról van szó, hanem az EURI-ról, vagyis a helyreállítási alap megnövekedett kamat költségeinek fedezéséről. De beszélhetnénk a migrációhoz kapcsolódó kiadásokról, vagy a bürokrácia költségeinek növeléséről is. Magyarország idáig egyáltalán nem részesedett a helyreállítási alapból, felfüggesztették a kohéziós kifizetéseket, és csupán 1-2 százalékát térítették meg annak a majdnem 2 milliárd eurónak, amit az ország eddig a külső határok védelmére költött.

Ilyen körülmények között sem politikailag, sem gazdaságilag nem várható el Magyarországtól, hogy újabb befizetéseket tegyen az uniós költségvetésbe. Magyarország gazdaságpolitikai célkitűzése, hogy az uniós költségvetés nettó befizető tagállamává váljon, de ez nem történhet ilyen feltételek mellett, nem történhet kényszerből.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Mr President, negotiations between the European institutions on the annual budget are an ordinary exercise, but this is no ordinary year: we're in the midst of a major revision of the MFF to deal with the challenges of migration, climate change, competitiveness and a war in Ukraine.

Today's compromise package is an effective and balanced way to tackle these challenges. We have included additional funding for key climate change mitigation tools like the EU Solidarity Fund, and having just seen my own country, Greece, ravaged by some of the worst wildfires on record and then battered by horrific floods, I can testify to the urgent need for this.

So congratulations to my EPP colleague, Mr Siegfried Mureșan, and thank you to Mr Ušakovs, whom I've worked with as the EPP shadow for the other sections of the budget.

We propose a deal that is fair for all of the institutions and ensures that an adequate and balanced budget is included for this House in an election year. So I call upon all colleagues to support the compromise package on the table for the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2024.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señora presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo, hoy traemos a debate la posición de este Parlamento para el presupuesto de 2024. Proponemos aumentos para fortalecer las transiciones verde y digital, para mejorar la competitividad de la economía, para apoyar a las pequeñas y medianas empresas, para desarrollar la autonomía estratégica de la Unión, para incrementar el programa Erasmus, para seguir apoyando a la industria cultural o también para que nuestros jóvenes agricultores puedan paliar el impacto de la pandemia, de la guerra y de la subida de precios.

Es decir, que con este presupuesto tenemos y queremos proteger nuestros sectores y a nuestros ciudadanos. Y esa solidaridad es también más necesaria que nunca fuera de nuestras fronteras, por la guerra contra Ucrania, por la situación en Oriente Próximo y por los millones de personas que, por motivos económicos, políticos o por catástrofes naturales lo han perdido todo. Y, aunque parezca mucho, yo diría que nuestra posición es casi una posición de mínimos. Estamos pidiendo un aumento de 6 300 millones de euros, que respecto al total del presupuesto europeo es un aumento muy moderado. Y respecto al PIB de la Unión es un aumento irrisorio. Pero ese aumento puede cambiar la vida de muchas personas dentro y fuera de nuestras fronteras.

Pero con el actual marco financiero no podemos ni empezar a hablar de necesidades ni de prioridades y ni siquiera de urgencias vitales, porque no tenemos margen de maniobra. Y hasta la Comisión lo ha dicho.

Así que lo primero es lo primero: negociemos una revisión del marco financiero que nos permita incluir todas estas propuestas en nuestro presupuesto para el año que viene.

Valérie Hayer (Renew). –Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Secrétaire d'État, chers collègues, alors que nous votons sur le budget de l'Europe destiné à financer Erasmus, la santé, la gestion de nos frontières, la production de munitions, certains veulent nous embarquer sur la voie de l'abandon humanitaire.

Le Hamas, groupe terroriste armé, a commis des crimes atroces contre Israël, contre les Juifs. Cette barbarie ne mérite que fermeté. Le Hamas, c'est aussi ce groupe qui participe au maintien de la population gazaouie dans la misère la plus totale, rendant les civils ultra-dépendants de l'aide internationale et européenne.

Alors non, suspendre l'aide européenne à la population civile ne réglera rien. Bien au contraire: ce sera condamner la population à la double peine. Cette aide, elle est destinée à fournir de l'eau potable, de l'électricité, de la nourriture, du matériel médical.

Chers collègues, couper cette aide, c'est en réalité jeter la population dans les bras des terroristes islamistes du Hamas, qui recrutent là où la misère fait rage et où plus aucune issue n'est envisageable.

Je nous enjoins, collectivement, à rester responsables.

Francisco Guerreiro (Verts/ALE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Presidência Espanhola, vou dar um exemplo da importância do orçamento que nós aqui debatemos e que será, se tudo correr bem e assim o esperamos, aprovado brevemente.

Hoje, recebemos alguns estudantes de Erasmus aqui, no Parlamento Europeu, e foi possível compreender a dificuldade que os mesmos têm, com o período inflacionário, em gerir a verba de que usufruíram para experimentar a experiência europeia. Foram estudantes portugueses que estão na Bélgica e essa perceção é clara. Portanto, existe um esforço adicional destes estudantes em garantir que estas verbas sirvam o propósito de experimentar a Europa, de ganhar conhecimentos e de reforçar o espírito europeu.

Portanto, as verbas que aqui se negoceiam também se direcionam para esta população e a inflação comeu parte desta margem. Portanto, o reforço que aqui será feito será muito importante para garantirmos que haja essa capacidade de os jovens experimentarem a experiência europeia – salvo a redundância – e também para questões tão fundamentais como a transição ambiental, que parece estar um pouco esquecida, quando debatemos o orçamento de 2024.

Continuamos numa crise climática. Precisamos de regenerar a biodiversidade. Precisamos de fundos não só nacionais, mas europeus, para garantir essa transição e, portanto, programas, como o programa *Life*, são fundamentais para garantir que conseguimos combater estes fenómenos, não só do aumento das emissões de gases com efeito de estufa, mas também da destruição maciça de biodiversidade, que vivemos.

Johan Van Overtveldt (ECR). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, dit verslag over het budget voor 2024 is in goede handen van de rapporteurs, die hebben gedaan en nog altijd doen wat ze kunnen, rekening houdend met de noodzakelijke tussentijdse MFK-herziening die door de Commissie op touw werd gezet.

Met al die commotie en onzekerheid die ons vandaag bedelven, is een ernstige begroting voor 2024 nauwelijks mogelijk zonder vastlegging van de grote lijnen in die MFK-herziening.

Europese burgers verwachten sterke actie inzake diverse nijpende problemen.

De wereld aan de grenzen van de Unie staat nu al een aantal jaren in brand en nog altijd sleept de Commissie met de voeten wanneer het gaat over de beveiliging van die grenzen. Iets waar sommige landen – om Finland en Polen niet te noemen – nu op eigen houtje aan begonnen zijn. Maar dat zou een Europese prioriteit moeten zijn.

We moeten ook stoppen met die gratuite aankondigingspolitiek die al te vaak ontgoochelt. We verliezen op die manier het vertrouwen van de burgers.

Een kerntakendebat dringt zich op met de focus op de toekomst van de Unie in plaats van een focus op het verleden, en uiteraard meer expliciet rekening houdend met de verzuchtingen van de burgers.

Tot slot nog dit:

De EU verleende in 2022 meer dan 300 miljoen EUR steun aan de Palestijnse gebieden. Voortaan moet er, meer dan nu het geval is, strak gecontroleerd worden dat er daarvan geen eurocent in de schoot van Hamas valt. Hamas is een jihadistisch orkest dat gedirigeerd wordt door Iraanse fanatici die de vernietiging van een staat – in casu Israël – willen. Het lot van de gewone Palestijnse bevolking is voor hen van geen belang.

Eric Minardi (ID). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Présidente du Parlement, Mesdames et Messieurs les représentants de la Commission européenne, vous n'avez pas honte?

Par le communiqué du 9 octobre 2023, vous avez annoncé que vous alliez enfin procéder au contrôle des bénéficiaires des fonds de l'aide humanitaire à la Palestine. Rappelons que l'université de Gaza a bénéficié de 1,7 million d'euros du programme Erasmus, cette université dans laquelle a été formé l'un des chefs terroristes qui a perpétré des crimes odieux contre Israël le 7 octobre 2023.

Vous nous demandez, aujourd'hui, de voter en faveur du projet de budget pour l'année 2024, mais cette proposition est supérieure de 24 milliards d'euros à la prévision de 2020. Dans quel but? Pour financer votre complaisance avec les associations islamistes ou pour compenser votre laxisme dans l'allocation des fonds européens?

Ce budget ne servira pas à soulager les peuples européens, qui font face à la crise migratoire et économique, et qui sont submergés, aujourd'hui, par toutes ces vagues migratoires. Il ne servira pas non plus à mettre un terme à l'insécurité sur notre continent. Nous disons «non» à ce budget et «non» à la politique de la Commission européenne, qui dilapide l'argent des Européens. L'Union européenne n'est pas une ONG!

Younous Omarjee (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, les crises sont multiples, se combinent et deviennent une donne permanente, ce qui rend particulièrement difficile l'élaboration du budget: crise géopolitique, crise climatique (avec la multiplication des catastrophes naturelles), crise énergétique, inflation, explosion de la pauvreté.

À toutes ces crises, nous devons répondre, alors que notre budget n'est pas suffisamment doté pour y faire face. Monsieur le Commissaire Hahn, il y a urgence à réviser le CFP à la hauteur de ces défis, et nous vous demandons d'entendre le Parlement européen.

Je veux aussi dire que, dans ces moments tragiques – en particulier à Gaza –, nous avons un devoir: un devoir d'aide humanitaire. Le Parlement européen a toujours été à la hauteur de ce devoir et j'espère que nous continuerons à l'être.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, čemu služi ovaj budžet?

Nakon što ste nametnutim zajedničkim zdravstvenim, poljoprivrednim i monetarnim politikama osiromašili zemlje članice, dajete sada milostinju u vidu pomoći, novac koji nikada, nikada ne dođe u ruke građana, koji dajete vladama država redovno i dokazano korumpiranima. U Hrvatskoj je to Vlada HDZ-a.

I ne zanima vas što kradu u Hrvatskoj, što preko 44 posto Hrvata nema dovoljno novaca za hranu, što se na najobičnije zdravstvene preglede čeka godinama. Zanima vas isključivo da taj i takav HDZ ostane na vlasti da provodi vašu briselsku politiku. Sa svojim milijunima koje ste široke ruke dijelili beskorisnim udrugama, koje su na kraju kao politička stranka zasjele na čelo našega glavnog grada Zagreba, pretvarate Zagreb u ono u što ste već pretvorili Slavoniju. Grad iz kojeg se bježi jer je zatrpan smećem, uništen je javni prijevoz, oduzima se djeci, oduzima se starijima, a daje se kome – migrantima kojih je sve više. Daju im se stanovi, dijeli im se novac, dok našim građanima koji imaju sve manje prava u svom vlastitom gradu u svojoj vlastitoj državi to nema.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, kolegice i kolege, iz godine u godinu postaje sve kompleksnije osigurati odgovarajuća sredstva za sigurnost europskih građana, kao i za gospodarsku i tehnološku konkurentnost Europe.

Teške odluke, a lociranja ograničenih resursa su osobito očita sada u vrijeme rata i u vrijeme izraženih strateških previranja u globalnom okruženju. Imamo odgovornost da te odluke u konačnici pruže snažnu podršku osnaživanju europskog gospodarstva, razvoju digitalnih i zelenih tehnologija, inovacijama, našim poduzetnicima i poljoprivrednicima.

Danas, nakon novih žrtava terorističkih napada u središtu Europe, ali i kontinuiranog pritiska koji vidimo i na naše granice, ali i ono što se događa izvan, i najnaivnijima mora postati jasno da sigurnost europskih građana zahtijeva snažniju financijsku podršku za upravljanje granicama, za povratak onih koji nemaju pravo na azil, kao i za borbu protiv terorizma i radikalizacije. Jasno, uz to ne smijemo dozvoliti ni da se europskim sredstvima podržavaju aktivnosti terorističkih organizacija i promocija antisemitizma.

„*I congratulate to our repporteur Siegfried Mureșan for the successful position of the European Parliament and I wish him all the best in the upcoming negotiations with the Council.*"

I congratulate our rapporteur, Siegfried Mureșan, for the successful position of the European Parliament, and I wish him all the best in the upcoming negotiations with the Council.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Secretária de Estado, Senhor Comissário, sabemos, há muito, que o atual orçamento plurianual 2021—2027 não é suficiente.

Isso é bem evidente no debate que estamos a ter aqui hoje: relançar as economias europeias no pós-COVID, apoio à Ucrânia e às consequências da guerra na União Europeia, inflação, crise energética, subida das taxas de juro, cadeias de abastecimento disruptivas ou até escassez de cereais, reforço da autonomia estratégica da União Europeia… E assistimos, agora, ao aumento da conflitualidade global com o recrudescimento do conflito no Médio Oriente, que vai trazer seguramente responsabilidades acrescidas à União Europeia.

Tudo isto esgotou linhas orçamentais, flexibilidade, margens no QFP já em 2023 e traz novos desafios. Temos, portanto, uma reduzidíssima margem de manobra para reforçar programas ou responder a imprevistos em 2024.

Por isso, é preciso uma revisão urgente do QFP e não podemos nem perverter o orçamento plurianual 2021—2027 para termos o orçamento apropriado para 2024, nem votar um orçamento que não sirva a União Europeia e fruste os cidadãos. E isso leva-nos a afirmar que nem podemos adiar a revisão do QFP, nem fazer uma revisão parcial.

Cara Secretária de Estado, sem revisão do QFP é impossível avançarmos no orçamento de 2024. Não há margens para progresso, para as tomadas de decisão.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Enge des Haushalts und die Zinslasten zwingen uns eigentlich dazu, noch stärkere Prioritäten zu setzen. Wir müssen uns fragen, wo wir im Haushalt wirklich investieren wollen, und wir müssen uns auch mal anschauen, welche Gelder nicht abfließen, z. B. die Kohäsionsmittel. Auch hier sind wir immer noch nicht bereit, genug Prioritäten zu setzen – beim Rat, bei den Mitgliedstaaten nicht, aber auch im Europäischen Parlament müssen wir noch stärker darauf achten, wie wir tatsächlich auch mit den uns zur Verfügung gestellten Mitteln auskommen.

Ich will aber auch zu den aktuellen Ereignissen hier etwas sagen. Uns haben alle die Bilder aus Israel schockiert, und ich hätte mir gewünscht, dass die Nachricht vom Montag, die die Kommission in die Welt gesetzt hatte, Wirklichkeit geworden wäre. Dass wir wirklich gesagt hätten: Wir stoppen erst einmal die Gelder und stellen dann sicher, dass wirklich kein Cent Richtung Hamas fließen kann. Aber genau das tun wir leider jetzt viel zu wenig. Natürlich muss es dann wieder humanitäre Hilfe geben. Aber wir müssen doch heute feststellen: Nie wieder darf auch nur ein Cent indirekt in die Nähe dieser Terroristen gelangen, nie wieder darf nur ein Cent in antisemitische Schulbücher fließen. Nie wieder ist jetzt – das muss auch im europäischen Haushalt ankommen!

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I am sometimes thankful for the speeches from the far right, because then when I think of the exact opposite, I know what I have to say. This is true for the budget as it is for everything else.

A colleague from the far right in this debate said that we should cut funds because we give too much money to Ukraine. The opposite is obviously true, and it makes me absolutely sick to see a Prime Minister of an EU country currently shaking hands with Putin, who is at the same time attacking and killing Ukrainians.

Another one said that we need to cut funds because the corona recovery money is flowing at the same time. That reminds me of the beautiful fact that we had Polish elections, and hopefully soon the justice system will be reinstated in Poland, and then EUR 35 billion can actually flow to the Polish citizens in the dual transition – the green and digital transition.

Another one said that we should increase cohesion funds. We should not fall into this trap. We need common investment in Europe for the big strategic priorities of the European Union. For that, I will support the rapporteur in his negotiations with the Council so that we get a strong Europe, a strong budget to fight for our future.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, dlhodobým problémom eurorozpočtu je pravidelné, politicky marketingové zvyšovanie výdavkov. Rozpočtové problémy boli v posledných rokoch prekryté vysokou mierou inflácie, ktorá aj Únii pomáha znižovať relatívnu ťarchu jej dlhu. Na začiatku inflácia pomáha rozpočtu, na konci mu škodí. Navyše, väčšina členských štátov má stredné až veľké problémy s udržateľnosťou verejných financií už teraz. Stále tiež čelíme dôsledkom multikrízy. Parlament v tejto situácii kritizuje rozpočtové škrty Rady a navrhuje navýšiť výdavky o miliardy eur. Lenže aby rozpočet Európskej únie zostal udržateľný, je načase hospodáriť úspornejšie a efektívnejšie, bez podstatného navyšovania výdavkov. Únia totiž nezanikne s koncom tohto volebného obdobia.

Jean-Paul Garraud (ID). – Monsieur le Président, alors qu'Israël, la France et la Belgique viennent de subir des attaques terroristes islamistes d'une violence inouïe, alors que nous alertons depuis le début de notre mandat, en 2019, sur les dangers et les ravages de l'islamisme, je souhaite ici crier notre indignation quant au financement que l'université islamique de Gaza – c'est-à-dire le campus du Hamas – a reçu de la Commission européenne. Plus de 1,8 million d'euros a été vers é depuis 2014 par l'Union européenne à cette université fondée par les Frères musulmans, et où a notamment étudié le cerveau des attentats du 7 octobre.

Je laisse aux députés d'extrême gauche et de gauche et à ceux, amis de Monsieur Macron, le soin de s'expliquer sur ce soutien qu'ils ont accordé à cette structure antisémite. Je leur laisse aussi le soin d'expliquer aux citoyens européens et à mes compatriotes français pourquoi, le 12 juillet dernier, eux-mêmes se sont opposés à nos amendements, affirmant qu'Israël avait le droit de se défendre contre le terrorisme et demandant d'empêcher que les financements de l'Union soient détournés au profit d'organisations terroristes.

Une fois de plus, nous avions raison avant tout le monde. Il est vraiment urgent de changer radicalement de politique.

Sira Rego (The Left). – Señor presidente, el presupuesto es un instrumento político: puede servir para promover políticas de paz o políticas de muerte. Pero hacer las dos cosas a la vez es un ejercicio de cinismo.

No se puede patrocinar la limpieza étnica y el genocidio del pueblo palestino, señora Metsola y señora Von der Leyen, pero luego prometer triplicar la ayuda humanitaria a Gaza. ¿Por dónde? ¿Por dónde van a llegar esas ayudas si el único corredor disponible acaba de ser destruido por Israel?

No se puede financiar con cientos de millones a la industria militar israelí y luego financiar escuelas de las Naciones Unidas que son destruidas por las bombas y los misiles que nosotras financiamos. Aunque ahora parece que el Grupo popular también quiere eliminar las ayudas al UNRWA.

Por eso nosotras proponemos que este presupuesto sirva para las políticas de paz. Sugerimos que se suspenda el Acuerdo de asociación con Israel hasta que este país respete las Resoluciones de las Naciones Unidas y el Derecho internacional. Pedimos que se acabe con el comercio de armas con esta potencia ocupante.

Sugerimos que el dinero de los europeos sirva para reforzar derechos y vidas libres.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Die Pandemie, der Angriffskrieg Russlands und die damit verbundene Inflation, der schreckliche Nahost-Terror sowie 800 000 Personen auf den Flüchtlingsrouten – all diese Krisen, Kriege und Spannungen haben natürlich auch finanzielle Auswirkungen auf unser Budget. Deshalb nimmt das Europäische Parlament in der vorliegenden Position zum Budget 2024 bereits die Revision und Aufstockung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens vorweg.

Aufgrund der angespannten Haushaltssituation in den Mitgliedstaaten wird es aber immer schwieriger, den Ruf nach frischem Geld zu decken. Ich wage es zu bezweifeln, dass wir in großem Umfang mit zusätzlichen Mitteln aus den Ländern rechnen können. Aus diesem Grund sollten wir nach dieser Budgetdebatte einmal ernsthaft und ideologiefrei überlegen, welche Einsparungspotenziale wir haben. Denn ich möchte nicht dafür verantwortlich sein, dass die nächste Generation als Mitgift einen Schuldenrucksack von uns tragen muss und keinen Handlungsspielraum mehr hat.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, participo neste debate sobre o orçamento da União Europeia para 2024 também como Vice-Presidente responsável pelo orçamento do Parlamento Europeu. E, nessa qualidade, tenho de dizer que é tempo de a Comissão Europeia entender que o Parlamento é colegislador e autoridade orçamental e que devemos preservar as condições de respeito e boa cooperação entre as instituições europeias. É por isso que devemos apoiar a posição firme dos relatores que recusam os cortes orçamentais propostos pela Comissão para o orçamento do Parlamento e repõem as dotações orçamentais inicialmente previstas.

O orçamento do Parlamento evolui de forma contida e responsável, de modo a assegurar o seu regular funcionamento e a responder aos custos acrescidos provocados pela inflação, pelos desafios da cibersegurança e pela necessidade de melhorar a comunicação com os cidadãos, tendo em vista as próximas eleições europeias.

Numa altura de enormes desafios para a União Europeia, precisamos de uma revisão ambiciosa do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual e de um orçamento para 2024 à altura das circunstâncias e dos desafios do projeto europeu.

Mauri Pekkarinen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, mietintö korostaa, että toimivat sisämarkkinat ovat ratkaisevan tärkeä asia EU:n kilpailukyvyn ja erityisesti pk-yritysten kannalta. Juuri näin.

Komission sallimat tuhansien miljardien eurojen poikkeukset valtiontukisääntöihin ovat kuitenkin loukanneet tätä periaatetta karulla tavalla. Poikkeukset on suljettava, ja uudet säännöt on kohdistettava vain kriittisiin strategisiin aloihin.

Mietinnössä esitetään elvytyksen korkomenojen, jotka voivat nousta pariin-kolmeenkymmeneen miljardiin euroon, kattamista kehysten ulkopuolelta korotetuilla jäsenmaksuilla. Niin kuin jäsenvaltioissa, niin myös EU:ssa tällaiset lisämenot tulisi mielestäni rahoittaa menokehysten sisällä.

Kiinnitän erityisesti komission huomiota siihen, että käyttämättömiä koheesiovaroja edelliseltä kaudelta, joka päättyi kohta jo kolme vuotta sitten, on poikkeuksellisen paljon vielä jäljellä. Lisäksi vuoden 2021 alusta alkoi uusi koheesiokausi tai elvytyspaketti, joiden rahojen liikkeelle saanti on ollut tavattoman hidasta.

Rahaa on paljon. Toivon, että komissiolla on rohkeutta arvioida uudestaan näiden varojen käyttöä ja mahdollisuutta kohdistaa niitä erityisesti tutkimukseen ja innovaatioihin, mikä on Euroopan taloudellisen menestyksen kannalta tavattoman tärkeä asia.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Verts/ALE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, domnule raportor, vreau în primul rând să faceți un lucru pentru noi, pentru Uniunea Europeană, să-i spuneți domnului Kuhs, care ne-a mințit chiar acum „că banii europeni finanțează terorismul”, așa spus, și nu a dat niciun singur exemplu. Vreau să apărați mândria Uniunii Europene și să nu lăsați minciuna să circule de două ori în jurul planetei până când adevărul își pune încălțările.

În al doilea rând, vreau să transmit un mesaj de aici, de la pupitrul Parlamentului European, Guvernului României și le spun așa: nu vă jucați cu destinul românilor! Ei merită o viață mai bună. Ei merită spitale moderne, școli echipate, drumuri fără gropi, spații verzi. De aceea, bugetul UE, banii pe care îi dă UE, care sunt mulți, sunt 80 de miliarde de euro din PNRR, din fonduri europene, subvenții pentru agricultură, să nu fie irosiți.

Eu nu-mi doresc să se termine acest exercițiu financiar și să văd spitale, spitale regionale, încă în stadiul de machetă, cum e la mine acasă la Sibiu. Vreau ca banii ăștia europeni să nu ajungă la firme de politicieni, să ajungă în proiecte, să ajungă la oameni. Suntem deja în 2023 și nu se vede nimic. Începeți construcția de spitale, domnilor politicieni! Bani există. Acum, hai cu toții la treabă!

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, de roep om meer fondsen galmt opnieuw door de plenaire zaal. Naar goede EU-traditie wordt er weer gevraagd om meer geld. Na het overbodige NextGenerationEU van meer dan 800 miljard EUR en de onvoorziene gestegen rentekosten, die niet waren begroot, moeten er weer nieuwe fondsen komen. Het kan niet op.

De roep om nieuwe eigen middelen, een codewoord voor EU-belastingen, is in onze ogen niet de weg die dit huis moet bewandelen.

Als je geld te kort komt, is prudent financieel beleid noodzakelijk voor een gezonde staatshuishouding. Wij stellen voor dat er eens gesneden gaat worden in eigen vlees, zoals de landbouwsubsidies of fondsen voor sociale cohesie. Alle uitgaven, inclusief klimaatprojecten, moeten binnen de overigens al veel te ruime bestaande meerjarenbegroting vallen.

Nederland is sinds de eeuwwisseling de hoogste nettobetaler per hoofd van de bevolking aan de EU. Het is genoeg geweest. Tijd om de tering naar de nering te zetten.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, para fazer face às dificuldades com que os trabalhadores, os povos e países como Portugal atravessam, que resposta encontramos neste orçamento?

Um orçamento exíguo, com um aumento nominal de pouco mais de 1 %. De forma mais clara, para o desenvolvimento regional e coesão, investimento social, para o ambiente e recursos naturais, e considerada a inflação, aí está um corte real nas possibilidades de investimento. Em contraste, para a militarização, prevê-se um aumento nominal e real das verbas, com um aumento de 8,9 % nos compromissos.

Para a União Europeia, a prioridade é a guerra, os lucros dos grandes grupos económicos, os interesses das grandes potências. Para nós, as prioridades são as pessoas, os trabalhadores, o direito ao desenvolvimento soberano de cada país.

O orçamento deveria ser aumentado, mobilizando mais recursos para o financiamento dos serviços públicos, o combate à pobreza, à desigualdade e às assimetrias, o apoio às micro, pequenas e médias empresas, o desenvolvimento da produção nacional, a defesa da cooperação e da paz.

Monika Hohlmeier (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Der Haushalt 2024 steht ganz schön unter Druck und unter schwierigen Vorzeichen. Und weil sich die Kollegin vorhin darüber beschwert hat, die EVP sei angeblich gegen humanitäre Zahlungen: Die Aussage ist schlicht und einfach falsch – aber offen gestanden, von der Linken erwarte ich auch nichts anderes. Das, was wir fordern, und das, was ich auch in meinem Antrag fordere, ist, dass wir anerkennen bzw. verurteilen, was an Schwerstverbrechen gegen Babys, gegen Kinder, gegen Familien, gegen alte und gegen behinderte Menschen begangen worden ist. Das ist Ihnen zu hart, und deshalb wollen Sie eine Grundsatzabstimmung draufsetzen. Ich bin gespannt und wünsche Ihnen viel Freude damit, weil das auch öffentlich sehr klar aussagt, wie Sie mit Terrorismus umgehen.

Als zweites ist unser Verlangen, dass die Zahlungen überprüft werden – so wie die Kommission das selbst vorgeschlagen hat –, dass sie tatsächlich unter keinen Umständen an die Hamas gehen können. Dies ist notwendig und wichtig, und wir unterstützen ausdrücklich die humanitäre Hilfe, allerdings in der Form, dass es tatsächlich keine Möglichkeit gibt, sie zu missbrauchen, sondern dass sie wirklich der Zivilbevölkerung in Krankenhäusern, in den Altenheimen und den Menschen zugutekommt, die sie wirklich brauchen.

Hannes Heide (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Es ist notwendig, in der Budgetdebatte der Union auch über Kultur und Bildung zu sprechen. COVID-19, hohe Inflation, Kaufkraftverlust – multiple Krisen treffen den Kultur- und Kreativsektor besonders massiv. Der Vorschlag des Rates, das Budget von Kreatives Europa, dem einzigen direkten Kulturförderprogramm der EU, weiter zu kürzen, ist ignorant. Kultur ist ein beträchtlicher Wirtschaftsfaktor, der 4,2 - Prozent der Gesamtwirtschaftsleistung der EU ausmacht.

Kreatives Europa ist im Zeitraum von 2021 bis 2027 mit einem vergleichsweise minimalen Budget von etwa 2,5 - Milliarden Euro ausgestattet, und der Aktionsbereich Kultur benötigt dringend eine Soforthilfe von 15 Millionen Euro. Auch Erasmus+ und das Europäische Solidaritätskorps benötigen Aufstockungen für das kommende Jahr. Mit vergleichsweise geringen Budgets machen diese Programme nämlich vor allem für junge Menschen vieles möglich, lassen die Europäische Union spürbar werden und stehen für ein Europa der Menschen. Wer in Bildung, Kultur und Jugend investiert, investiert in die Zukunft Europas.

Ελένη Σταύρου (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, κατ' αρχάς θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω τον συνάδελφο εισηγητή Siegfried Mureșan και την Επιτροπή Προϋπολογισμών για την προσπάθεια κατάρτισης του προϋπολογισμού 2024. Οφείλουμε στους πολίτες μας να διεκδικούμε μια Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πιο αναπτυξιακή, πιο καινοτόμο, πιο κοινωνική, έτοιμη να λύσει τα συνεχιζόμενα προβλήματα που αντιμετωπίζει η ανθρωπότητα.

Τα γεγονότα που εκτυλίσσονται τον τελευταίο καιρό διαμορφώνουν το πλαίσιο στο οποίο πρέπει να κινηθούμε, αν θέλουμε η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να συνεχίσει να αντιμετωπίζει τις προκλήσεις με τις οποίες τα κράτη μέλη έρχονται αντιμέτωπες. Η άμυνα των χωρών μας και η ασφάλεια των πολιτών μας δεν μπορεί να είναι εγγυημένη χωρίς την κοινή μας επένδυση σε αμυντική θωράκιση. Αυτό είναι σαφές, από την εισβολή στην Ουκρανία μέχρι τις πολεμικές συγκρούσεις στον Καύκασο και τον κτηνώδη πόλεμο που εξαπέλυσε η Χαμάς.

Επιπρόσθετα, οι φυσικές καταστροφές εντείνονται ως αποτέλεσμα της κλιματικής αλλαγής, επιφέροντας δυσμενείς επιπτώσεις στον τρόπο ζωής των πολιτών μας. Χαιρετίζω τις προτεινόμενες αυξήσεις στα αντίστοιχα ταμεία τα οποία διαθέτουμε και μας επιτρέπουν να αντεπεξέλθουμε σε κάθε κρίση.

Διαδικασία «catch the eye»

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, peço-lhe só alguma solidariedade para com um ponto prévio que quero focar diante deste Parlamento – o meu voto público, também de solidariedade e valorização, pela coragem de todos os madeirenses, em particular os concidadãos da Calheta, do Porto Moniz e de Câmara de Lobos, pelos momentos que viveram de angústia e de perda contra os fogos que assolaram a ilha da Madeira nestes últimos dias.

Um agradecimento público a todos os bombeiros, os agentes de proteção civil, equipas médicas e de enfermagem e também o apoio nacional que foi prestado no reforço ao contingente regional. E se for necessário acionar o Fundo de Solidariedade da União, cá estaremos para o aprovar de forma célere e inequívoca.

Dois pontos relativamente a este orçamento: uma omissão e uma necessidade. Os recursos da União devem ser focados e investidos de forma justa na economia. Lamento a omissão de um orçamento para a indústria do turismo. E, no ponto da necessidade, focar a necessidade de reforçarmos a Agência Europeia de Segurança Marítima. A Comissão quer, de facto, ver mais funções atribuídas à AESM, mas, para isso, é necessário maior financiamento.

Λήξη διαδικασίας «catch the eye»

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, indeed, there are not many left. So nevertheless, I would like to thank all of you for this constructive debate today, because there was a huge majority understanding that there are budgetary needs, which cannot be compensated in any other way than having necessary reinforcements.

And we have, of course, taken note of the position of the different Members and also, of course, by the Council. The Commission services will indeed be examining thoroughly all the amendments proposed by the Parliament together, of course, with those proposed by the Council.

To facilitate the upcoming negotiations, the Commission will present a detailed assessment of the amendments proposed by the Parliament and that of the Council's position in the already well-known, usually annual, letter of executability. We will send this letter shortly after tomorrow's vote on Parliament's amendments, and of course, we will have then the opportunity to debate again on the 26 October, this during the first Conciliation Committee and I hope that we have already at that time a better view on the midterm revision process, and the timing of the Council and thus on its impact on our proceedings.

But again, I would like to stress that from a planning and political point of view, it's important that the MFF revision is already appropriately reflected in the budget 24. Otherwise, the Union would only have limited means for the challenges we are facing. Therefore, it would be crucial to take the necessary time to reflect and to negotiate. At the end of the day, we have the best solution for European citizens.

But of course, all this has to be done within this year; otherwise we will face serious problems. Our three institutions have succeeded over the past years to agree on many ground-breaking files that have changed the Union's budgetary and financial landscape, and therefore, I am again confident that at the end of the day, we will have successful negotiations.

Of course, this means that all the institutions set their clear priorities so we can focus our discussions on the limited number of programmes, where, of course, meaningful adjustments could be made.

Again, let me reassure you that the Commission will act as an honest broker. My services are at your disposal and, of course, I am looking forward to constructive negotiations and indeed to find a good solution for a qualitative budget – of course, with some quantitative elements – for 2024. And I am grateful already today for your engagement and encouragement, and I am talking here to the Parliament and thank you for this kind of tailwind.

Esperanza Samblás, *presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, señorías, señor comisario, ha sido realmente interesante asistir hoy a este debate y escuchar las prioridades del Parlamento Europeo y los argumentos que se esconden detrás de cada una de esas prioridades. Informaré a mis colegas del Consejo de los puntos puestos hoy sobre la mesa con el objetivo de que consigamos alcanzar un acuerdo y haremos todo lo posible por entablar un diálogo constructivo que nos permita llegar a un acuerdo sobre el presupuesto para 2024 dentro de los plazos previstos por el Tratado.

Todos querríamos tener un marco financiero enorme que nos diera posibilidades de atender todas las prioridades que se han puesto encima de la mesa. Pero lo cierto es que tenemos un presupuesto con unos recursos limitados, con muchas necesidades también dentro de los Estados miembros que es necesario atender, y tendremos que tratar de ver — dentro de lo que hay— qué es lo máximo que podemos hacer por los ciudadanos europeos.

Siegfried Mureșan, *rapporteur.* – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister, dear colleagues, thank you very much for this constructive and very positive debate – first point from my side.

Second point, we have seen today a united European Parliament, a Parliament which is ready to adopt tomorrow a position on an ambitious budget for the Union, a budget which is capable of providing solutions to the problems that people are facing all over Europe. Commissioner, I would like to thank you for defending the draft budget of the Commission as the bare minimum in all areas and being ready to work with us on enforcement, on strengthening of the budget in those areas where it is needed.

We in Parliament have done three things. Firstly, in those lines where we saw that there is big demand, lines which were oversubscribed – the research, innovation, Erasmus scholarships, transport as a consequence of the war in Ukraine – we are demanding some reinforcements. Money for young farmers as well, as I said in my introductory remarks, will be very important to increase again the attractiveness of farming.

The second thing that the Parliament is doing in its position is aligning the yearly budget with our position on the revision of the Multiannual Financial Framework, because the European Commission has rightly put forward a revision of the Multiannual Financial Framework, and it has rightly identified the areas in the context of that revision which need to be strengthened: security, defence, migration, plus the EUR 50 billion for Ukraine to provide stable financing for Ukraine for the next years.

Minister, we call upon you, upon the Spanish Presidency of the Council, but also upon President of the European Council, Charles Michel, to discuss the matter urgently, to put it on the agenda of the European Council at the end of the month, to provide us with this revision of the Multiannual Financial Framework so that we can incorporate it into the budget of next year.

And the third thing that we did was to align the position on the budget with our position as Parliament on STEP, to be able to make sure that we strengthen our economy, our competitiveness, our industries, including our defence industry. A consistent position by Parliament, adopted, I am sure, tomorrow by a large majority already adopted in the Budgets Committee, by a large majority. We are looking forward to working with the Commission and the Council to finally reach an agreement on the budget, of course, before the end of this year.

Nils Ušakovs, *rapporteur.* – Mr President, Commissioner Hahn, Secretary of State Samblás, we all do understand in this House perfectly the magnitude of the pressure on Heading 7.

The fact that we will have to use special flexibility instruments, like SMI for instance, is definitely the bad news for all of us. We can only deal with the pressure in the medium term if we revise the MFF, considering pressure created by the COVID pandemic and the war in Ukraine. And we must look truth in the eye: pre-war and pre-crisis financial planning will not work anymore these days.

What we cannot do under any circumstances is to ignore the problem, continue expecting high-standard performance, but provide institutions with money for 10 months to pay for electricity. There are 12 months in a year, not 10, and this is not the way public administration of the largest union in the world should work and serve its citizens.

In my home country, Latvia, public administration has a controversial image: sometimes the reasons for it are bad decisions by Latvian politicians. What we do not want to see is Latvian mistakes being brought to Brussels. When Latvia was joining the European Union, one of our hopes was to see our own public administration be more effective, citizen-oriented and European, not the other way round.

It is our duty to keep European administration as a flagship example for all Member States. That is why Parliament ensures that they have the necessary resources to be able to meet their legal and contractual obligations and fulfil their mandate.

I would like to express gratitude to rapporteur Mureșan, to the shadow rapporteurs for their support and collaboration, even though it is sometimes challenging to find an agreement in our ranks. I admit this was not the case on the estimates of Parliament. We were quick to achieve agreement and unity through a broad majority.

Dear Commissioner, Secretary of State, I am confident that the same spirit will inspire the forthcoming trilogues and conciliation, and that we will be able to find compromises on the estimates of our institutions in a fair and constructive way, and will be able to deal with the financial burden or, if needed, to reshape this burden.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Τετάρτη 18 Οκτωβρίου 2023.

10. Espacio Schengen: digitalización del procedimiento de visado – Espacio Schengen: modificación del Reglamento sobre la etiqueta adhesiva de visado (Debate conjunto – Espacio Schengen)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη αφορά την κοινή συζήτηση σχετικά με τον χώρο Σένγκεν, επί:

— της έκθεσης του Matjaž Nemec, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Πολιτικών Ελευθεριών, Δικαιοσύνης και Εσωτερικών Υποθέσεων, σχετικά με την πρόταση κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για την τροποποίηση των κανονισμών (ΕΚ) αριθ. 767/2008, (ΕΚ) αριθ. 810/2009 και (ΕΕ) 2017/2226 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, των κανονισμών (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1683/95, (ΕΚ) αριθ. 333/2002, (ΕΚ) αριθ. 693/2003 και (ΕΚ) αριθ. 694/2003 του Συμβουλίου και της σύμβασης εφαρμογής της συμφωνίας του Σένγκεν, όσον αφορά την ψηφιοποίηση της διαδικασίας χορήγησης θεωρήσεων (COM(2022)0658 - C9-0165/2022 - 2022/0132A(COD)) (A9-0025/2023), και

— της έκθεσης του Matjaž Nemec, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Πολιτικών Ελευθεριών, Δικαιοσύνης και Εσωτερικών Υποθέσεων, σχετικά με την πρόταση κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1683/95 του Συμβουλίου, όσον αφορά την ψηφιοποίηση της διαδικασίας χορήγησης θεωρήσεων (COM(2022)0658 - C9-0307/2023 - 2022/0132B(COD)) (A9-0268/2023)

Matjaž Nemec, *poročevalec.* – Gospod predsednik! Spoštovani komisar, spoštovano predsedstvo, kolegice in kolegi. Danes je pred nami zaključek ene pozitivne zgodbe. In v teh težkih časih za svet in za človeštvo so takšne zgodbe še posebej dobrodošle.

Od predloga Komisije nam je dogovor s švedskim predsedstvom uspelo v pogajanjih doseči v dobrem letu dni. Tako po vsebini kot po hitrosti ocenjujem, da smo opravili odlično nalogo.

Digitalizacija pomeni svojevrsten napredek in je ključna za dosego zelenega prehoda Unije. Zato projekt Komisije glede prenove vizumske politike zelo pozdravljam. Na področju digitalizacije Evropa namreč zaostaja za ostalim svetom. S tem dogovorom Evropska unija odpravlja velik razkorak z državami, kot sta Avstralija ali Nova Zelandija, ki sta svoje vizume že povsem digitalizirali.

Obravnava vizumskih vlog v EU je že sedaj sicer deloma digitalizirana. Vloge za schengenski vizum in odločitve so danes že elektronsko evidentirane v vizumskem informacijskem sistemu, a dva pomembna koraka še vedno obstajata zgolj v papirni obliki. Prvič, prošnja za pridobitev vizuma, ter drugič, sama vizumska nalepka v potnem listu.

Po novem pa bo celoten postopek digitaliziran: posameznik bo zaprosil za vizum preko enotne spletne platforme. Vizum bo nato prosilcu izdan v digitalni obliki, ki si ga bo lahko naložil na svoj pametni telefon. Novi EU e-vizumski postopek bo za prosilca veliko bolj enostaven in cenejši. V večini primerov bo potreben zgolj en obisk konzulata ali vizumskega centra. Prav tako veljavnost vizuma ne bo več vezana na veljavnost potnega lista. Prosilec bo veljavni vizum lahko enostavno podaljšal v novem potnem listu. To je izjemno pomembna in dobrodošla sprememba, zlasti za pogoste potnike, ki so imetniki daljših vizumov.

Z digitalizacijo se bo močno zmanjšalo tudi tveganje za zlorabo, s čimer bo novi postopek varnejši za države članice. Postopek obravnave prošenj pa bo tudi veliko bolj harmoniziran med državami članicami. Danes, spoštovani, obstaja namreč velika razdrobljenost nacionalnih praks v upravljanju vizumskega postopka, in ta negativno vpliva na delovanje vizumske politike celotne Evropske unije. Države članice ostajajo sicer edine pristojne za obravnavo prošenj in sprejemanje odločitev o vizumih, a bo ta vrzel po novem bistveno manjša.

Nova enotna vstopna točka predstavlja tudi nov pomemben gradnik skupne evropske identitete napram ostalemu svetu, in to je pomembno, spoštovani. Namesto za belgijski ali nemški ali slovenski vizum bo nosilec zaprosil za svoj EU-vizum na spletni strani EU-platforme. Novi sistem bo imel tako pozitivne učinke na prepoznavnost in na dojemanje Evropske unije v svetu kot enotnega geografskega subjekta. Zahvaljujoč Evropskemu parlamentu smo uspeli v novi sistem vgraditi tudi izjemno pomembno varovalko glede digitalne in jezikovne dostopnosti do platforme, vključno za osebe z invalidnostjo.

S povsem novim členom pa smo močno okrepili tudi določbe glede varovanja osebnih podatkov. Pomembna točka razhajanja med pogajalci je bila vprašanje zbiranja podatkov o IP-naslovu prosilca. Ker je v nekaterih državah ali območjih dostop do interneta še močno omejen, je bilo potrebno zagotoviti, da z alarmom označeni IP-naslov ne bo pomenil avtomatične izločitve vloge za izdajo vizuma.

V pogajanjih smo, spoštovani, kljub velikim pritiskom po zvišanju uspeli ohraniti raven vizumske pristojbine, kar ocenjujemo kot pomembno simbolno zmago za potnike. Novost tega projekta bo tudi pomoč informacijske tehnologije, saj bo platforma vključevala funkcijo *chatbot*.

Ta projekt orje svojevrstno digitalno ledino, kar potrjuje tudi dejstvo, da bomo v Evropskem parlamentu o pravnem redu v tej uredbi prvič definirali pojem *chatbot*. Digitalizacija in evropski e-vizum pomenita torej svetlo prihodnost za EU-vizumsko politiko. Veselim se današnje razprave. Hvala za zaupanje.

Μαργαρίτης Σχοινάς, *Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής.* – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αν ήξερα ότι θα προεδρεύατε εσείς, θα μιλούσα στη γλώσσα του Ομήρου, αλλά το κείμενό μου είναι στα αγγλικά, οπότε θα μου επιτρέψετε να μιλήσω στα αγγλικά.

Mr President, honourable Members, the Schengen Area is the largest area of borderless travel in the world. It includes 27 participating countries and benefits 425 million people. Last year, the Schengen Area was the most visited destination in the world, with 585 million tourists, 65% of the world's tourist movements.

Visa policy is one of the fundamental pillars of our Schengen system, and at the same time, one of the most relevant and powerful tools our European Union has. In 2019, the last pre-COVID travel year, around 19 million Schengen visas were issued throughout the world by Member States. Visa policy must be implemented in a harmonised and effective way, but also has to benefit from technological developments and adapt to the new digital era, like so many other services in the public domain.

The application for a visa lodged at a Member State consulate is the very first contact that a third-country national from 100 countries around the world has with the European Union. Unfortunately, today, visa applicants still have to go through cumbersome processes that may differ from Member State to the other. Very few Member States have digitised their visa procedures. The visa application remains very much a paper-based process.

These procedures not only are outdated, but can be also very costly for applicants and Member States, and quite often visa applicants need to travel to the nearest consulate or visa applications centre to lodge a Schengen visa application. For as long the application is being processed, visa applicants are left without a passport, which are submitted as part of the application file. So the cost, as you can imagine, both for the applicants but also for the Member States in the handling of this paper trail, can be very significant.

So it was high time to modernise our visa procedures, to put them in line with international developments and with the digitalisation of visa procedures. We are now modernising our systems whilst preserving the high level of security at our external borders, and at the same time complying with fundamental rights of the applicants.

In spite of the length and of the very technical nature of the legislative texts, I would like to take this opportunity to praise the excellent and effective cooperation between the European Commission and Parliament and the Council on this file, and I particularly want to thank the rapporteur, Mr Nemec, but also the Czech and Swedish Council Presidencies for having worked intensively on these reports.

This effective cooperation has allowed us to reach this agreement three months since we started the trilogues. The text agreed will set up a single application platform that all Member States will have to use after a transition period, whatever the Member State to which the visa applicant wishes to travel.

Applying for a Schengen visa under these rules will be done using the same tool and following the same procedures. This will not only help us with simplification, but will also significantly reduce the administrative burden. The current visa sticker, as you probably have seen it, will be replaced by a digital visa, which will include state of the art technology to ensure a maximum level of security. This will help the European Union to rule out abuse and visa fraud.

The new rules will also cater for those not in a position to apply through digital means and set clear responsibilities regarding data protection. I know that especially these two points were particularly important for this House, and I'm very happy to see that the final text now includes clear provisions on both issues.

Honourable Members, a lot of work still remains to be done to make all this a tangible reality on the ground. There is indeed a substantial number of implementing acts and delegated acts to be adopted before this platform can be set up and the digital visa emerges as a reality. But today, we are taking a solid, clear path for the coming years to ultimately modernise and Europeanise our visa procedures.

Емил Радев, *от името на групата PPE.* – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, колеги, работих по досието като докладчик в сянка и смятам, че успяхме да структурираме добре текста и да постигнем един добър резултат.

С новите дигитални процедури за издаване на виза процесът ще се ускори и ще стане по-удобен и евтин както за кандидатите за виза, така и за държавите членки, които проверяват и обработват молбите. Нещо повече – новата дигитална виза ще е много по-сигурна, тъй като ще намали риска от измами и фалшификации. Чрез нея проверките по границите ще се улеснят многократно. Заедно с това ще бъде създадена и изцяло нова единна електронна визова платформа за кандидатстване. По този начин ще се избегнат дълги и скъпи пътувания до съседни държави за подаване на документи. Ще се спестят време и пари, ще се облекчи и работата на служителите в консулствата.

Вече 12 години България и Румъния чакат да бъдат приети в Шенген. Цели два мандата и половина на Европейския парламент и ние, българските евродепутати, и румънските ни колеги сме доказвали многократно, че покриваме всички технически критерии. Настоятелните ни призиви за присъединяване стъпват върху безспорни факти, върху проверки и мисии на място, приключени доклади по мониторинг и оценка. И макар че днес все още не сме пълноправни членове на Шенген, то благодарение на това досие ние също ще можем да издаваме електронни шенгенски визи. Приемам това като поредното доказателство, че мястото на България и Румъния е в клуба на държавите без вътрешни гранични проверки.

Живеем в много турбулентни времена. През последните дни сме свидетели на ужасяващ военен конфликт в Близкия изток, а снощи стрелба разтърси и Брюксел. Затова повече от всякога се нуждаем от сигурност и стабилност, от затегнат контрол по външните ни граници. Сега повече от всякога трябва да бъдем единни в усилията си за опазване на външните граници на Европейския съюз и това досие ще помогне това да стане и да пазим по-добре границите си.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *en nombre del Grupo S&D.* – Señor presidente, vicepresidente Schinas, nos ha gustado mucho oírle comenzar su intervención poniendo en valor Schengen, equivalente a libre circulación, que fue durante mucho tiempo el dominio distintivo de los Estados miembros de la Unión. Pero dejó de serlo cuando pusimos en pie el que resulta ser ahora el activo más preciado de la experiencia europea: la libre circulación, derecho fundamental consagrado por la Carta.

Y ahora estamos conectando nada menos que el acervo de Schengen, que integra a 500 millones de personas que se mueven libremente en un espacio sin fronteras interiores, con una competencia que también fue durante mucho tiempo distintiva de los Estados miembros y que dejó de serlo cuando entró en vigor el Tratado de Lisboa con la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales la Unión Europea: la competencia sobre visados; es decir, la autorización para entrar en ese espacio de libre circulación.

Resulta que, del mismo modo que hemos puesto en vigor desde el Parlamento Europeo un Código de Fronteras Schengen y un Código de Gobernanza Schengen, actualizándolo recientemente, también hay un Código Europeo de Visados — para el que por cierto fui ponente— con un anexo que señala aquellos terceros Estados que están exentos del requisito de visado sobre condiciones de reciprocidad para que sus ciudadanos puedan entrar en la Unión Europea de la misma manera que los nuestros circulan libremente por el mundo.

Ahora estamos dándole a la política y a la legislación europea sobre visados una herramienta decisiva porque estamos simplificando, modernizando, unificando y armonizando las condiciones para la expedición de visados. Y, al mismo tiempo, estamos reduciendo los niveles de fraude posible porque los estamos digitalizando, porque estamos poniendo una herramienta digital avanzada, cuya base de datos gestionará la agencia europea especializada, la eu-LISA, con sede en Tallin.

Por tanto, es un gran paso —incluso de gigante— en esa armonización europea de la política de visados, de modo que podamos compartir la identificación biométrica actualizada y digitalizada de todas las personas que entran por las fronteras de la Unión, para así reducir los niveles de fraude e incrementar los niveles de seguridad jurídica.

No hemos hecho el trabajo completo porque queríamos aprovechar la ocasión para, por fin, mandatar a los Estados miembros a incorporar el visado humanitario que reduzca la inmigración irregular, *legal and safe pathways*, incluido el visado humanitario.

Hemos perdido la ocasión porque el Consejo lo impide, pero no cejaremos en nuestro empeño porque tiene que ver también, efectivamente, con el cambio de mirada que se requiere por parte de toda la Unión Europea hacia la migración regular. Las personas que desean ingresar en la Unión Europea por propósitos legítimos de trabajo deben poder disfrutar también de la libre circulación.

Morten Petersen, *for Renew-Gruppen*. – Hr. formand! En rejse gennem Europa, der starter i Lissabon og slutter i Tallinn, tager cirka 44 timer i bil tværs over det europæiske kontinent. Sådan en rejse er mulig uden stop og fremvisning pas ved en eneste grænse på grund af vores Schengensamarbejde. Det har skabt en følelse af frihed og samhørighed, som jo er kernen i vores europæiske projekt. Men den øgede frihed betyder også, at vi skal være gode til at beskytte vores ydre grænser, og bl.a. derfor er det også godt med denne nye forordning, der gør det sværere at forfalske Schengenvisa. Det burde gøre det lettere for Danmark – og Østrig i øvrigt – at stoppe deres grænsekontroller, og det burde gøre det nemmere for Rådet at stoppe for blokeringen af Rumænien og Bulgariens optagelse i Schengensamarbejdet. Schengensamarbejdet giver os frihed, det giver os sikkerhed, det giver os velstand, men det kan kun bevares, hvis der arbejdes aktivt netop for at bevare det. Så jeg glæder mig over den nye forordning, der er på bordet her, og vil også gerne samtidig opfordre Kommissionen til, at den sørger for at opretholde EU-lovgivningen på området.

Erik Marquardt, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! In letzter Zeit wird ja immer wieder das Ende von Schengen an die Wand gemalt. Die Leute reden quasi herbei, dass Schengen eigentlich gar keine Zukunft hat. Aber wenn wir uns die Realität anschauen, dann sehen wir doch eigentlich, dass wir mit der Reform des Schengener Grenzkodex jetzt Schengen fit für die Zukunft machen, dass wir mit der Einführung des Einreise-/Ausreisesystems eine bessere Übersicht haben, wer eigentlich mit Schengen-Visa nach Europa kommt, wer gerade in Europa ist. Und man würde sich, glaube ich, wünschen, dass sich die Mitgliedstaaten, die teilweise auch sehr leichtfertig in letzter Zeit Binnengrenzkontrollen einführen, dieses Privileg, Teil der Schengen-Familie zu sein, mehr bewusst machen.

Ich hoffe auch, dass sich die Mitgliedstaaten, die da noch zögerlich sind, darauf besinnen, dass Bulgarien und Rumänien schon längst Teil der Schengen-Familie sind. Und besonders, wenn man einen besseren rechtsstaatlichen Schutz der Außengrenzen will, dann ist es doch völlig absurd, dass Bulgarien und Rumänien noch Grenzbeamte brauchen, die die Binnengrenzen kontrollieren, anstatt dass sie da rechtsstaatlich und menschenrechtskonform an den Außengrenzen aktiv werden können.

Ich glaube, die Visa-Digitalisierung, über die wir heute reden, ist ein riesiger Schritt. Sie spart den Menschen aus 104 Ländern – und das muss man sich bewusst machen: 104 Länder haben nicht das Privileg, das wir haben, einfach visumfrei durch den Schengen-Raum zu reisen – Zeit und Geld, sie entlastet die Auslandsvertretungen und sorgt dafür, dass Engpässe bei den Auslandsvertretungen dann eben nicht mehr auftreten. Ich glaube, das ist ein sehr, sehr wichtiger Schritt. Wir sollten diesen Erfolg wirklich gemeinsam feiern, dass wir den Schengen-Raum so fit für die Zukunft machen.

Auf der anderen Seite glaube ich auch, dass es wichtig ist, die Mitgliedstaaten daran zu erinnern – und das war bei den Verhandlungen wieder sichtbar –, dass sie nicht immer versprechen dürfen, legale Fluchtwege zu schaffen. Mit der Einführung eines humanitären Visums hätten sie die Möglichkeit, besonders Gefährdete legal und sicher nach Europa zu bringen. Leider haben sie sich dem verweigert. Und ich hoffe, dass wir in der Zukunft bei der Schaffung legaler Migrationswege erfolgreicher sind, die dann auch irreguläre Migration beseitigen können. Ich danke noch mal den Schattenberichterstattern und auch dem Berichterstatter für die gute Zusammenarbeit und freue mich, dass wir das so gut hinbekommen haben.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, колеги, тези работи са много хубави, които си ги говорите, но ще ме прощавате, са малко чесане на езиците. Съжалявам за страданията, които причинявам на преводачите. Дигитални визи и прекрасни хубави неща, приказки велики, а България и Румъния продължават да стоят извън Шенгенското пространство, след като са изпълнили всички условия да бъдат там.

И повечето колеги го споменават, но само като констатация и само като факт. Значи българските и румънските шофьори продължават да висят по границите – апропо те Ви плащат заплатите, г-н Комисар, както и вашите, умно гледащи ме колеги. А всеки един нелегал, който няма право да бъде в Европейския съюз и е трябвало да бъде екстрадиран, спокойно се разхожда в Брюксел и чака момента, в който ще хване автомата и ще избива европейски граждани. Как така се случва, че България и Румъния стоят отвън, въпреки че са изпълнени всички условия, а нелегалите с подкрепата на левицата тук са в Европейския съюз и правят каквото си искат.

За да се случи това нещо, г-н Комисар, трябва да стане следното нещо: трябва да има здрава външна граница и България и Румъния да бъдат вътре. Иначе приказки за визи, за електронни, по есемеси, по каквото искате – това са хубави неща. Само че са малко „Приказки от шипковия храст“. А реалният живот е тук в момента и в този реален живот България и Румъния плащат заради икономическите интереси на Холандия. А пък нелегалите, както казах, не са екстрадирани, седят си в Европейския съюз, чакат си да им дойде времето и да направят някоя голяма беля.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, numériser les visas Schengen est une bonne idée, mais de toutes les révisions apportées à ce système, c'est sûrement la moins urgente.

À l'heure où la France vient, une fois de plus, d'être frappée par la barbarie islamiste, j'ai en mémoire les attentats de 2015, perpétrés par des tueurs venus de Belgique qui avaient pleinement profité de l'idéologie des frontières ouvertes. Quant aux frontières extérieures de l'Union européenne, censées compenser la suppression des frontières intérieures, le principe qui y règne est le droit d'entrée, et les expulsions ne sont même plus l'exception, elles sont l'exemption.

À tout cela la seule réponse de l'Union européenne est la fuite en avant et la légalisation hâtive de flux d'immigration toujours plus énormes, sans souci des conséquences. Combien de tueurs islamistes dans les vagues de clandestins accueillies à bras ouverts à Lampedusa et ailleurs, avec le soutien des ONG complices des passeurs? Combien de victimes parmi ces prétendus demandeurs d'asile, dont les demandes sont infondées à 75 %, comme celle du Tunisien Abdesalem Lassoued, qui vient d'assassiner hier soir deux personnes à Bruxelles?

Voilà les défaillances du système de Schengen, et l'Union européenne ne veut pas les combler, mais seulement défendre la logique immigrationniste qui les inspire.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Mr President, dear colleagues, every proposal that makes the Schengen Zone function better, like the visa system now, should be supported, of course, but this technical detail will not solve the real problem that we should be talking about in this Parliament today. And that is the deadly danger for Europeans posed by illegal mass migration.

Just during the past few days, we heard from France that a teacher was stabbed to death by an illegal migrant in front of the students. And yesterday, in Brussels, another migrant massacred two people using a Kalashnikov. Now, both acts were committed by Islamist migrants. Both should never have entered Europe in the first place, or should have left Europe already. And in both cases, the authorities were unable to protect Europeans from these men.

Now, how many more innocent Europeans have to die for you to wake up? How many more deaths are necessary for the migration fanatics in this House to finally understand that Europe is being destroyed in front of our eyes right now? Europe should say an absolute no to migration, and European politicians should defend the European people and the European way of life instead of creating this nightmare for our continent.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Vice-Presidente, uma vez mais, temos uma reforma de Schengen que visa, com a digitalização e a modernização, tornar mais seguro e menos vulnerável o nosso sistema de vistos. Como relator anterior para o sistema de informação sobre vistos, só posso congratular-me com isto e, essencialmente, ver que há aqui já passos para tentar evitar aquilo que, recentemente, aconteceu na Polónia.

Este novo regime permite um processo mais eficiente, menos custoso, evitando longas esperas por falta de recursos administrativos. Mas atenção! É necessário que não aconteça a esta legislação aquilo que aconteceu ao ETIAS e ao sistema de entradas e saídas, que ainda está à espera de entrar em vigor.

Devo dizer que, para termos um espaço Schengen verdadeiramente coeso, precisamos também de reformas políticas: acabar o *Migration Pact*, porque, sem concluirmos o *Migration Pact*, não teremos um espaço Schengen verdadeiramente a funcionar. Precisamos de trazer a Roménia e a Bulgária para o espaço Schengen, porque elas já estão em condições de entrar. Precisamos também que os Estados-Membros deixem de controlar as fronteiras com recurso a argumentos que são argumentos que estão já ultrapassados. Uma coisa é uma situação de emergência, outra coisa é uma situação de normalidade.

E, finalmente, temos que criar condições – e estou a trabalhar nisso, por exemplo, no relatório Prüm – para que as polícias possam trocar informação e nós, cidadãos do espaço Schengen, desse amplo espaço, possamos circular em segurança, possamos circular com liberdade.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu ! Suweren przemówił: w wyborach o najwyższej frekwencji od 30 lat mieszkańcy Polski opowiedzieli się przeciwko handlowaniu wizami i przeciwko pisowskim przekrętom. Teraz nadchodzi czas rozliczeń i z tego miejsca obiecuję każdemu obywatelowi i każdej obywatelce, że winni zostaną ukarani. PiS odpowie za zło. PiS poniesie odpowiedzialność za ostatnie 8 lat. Każdy, kto był umoczony w aferę wizową, zostanie rozliczony. Święte krowy i nadzwyczajne kasty się skończyły. Wawrzyk, Rau i wielu, wielu, wielu innych. Nadchodzi czas Polski, w której będą obowiązywać europejskie standardy i transparentne procedury, w szczególności w polityce wizowej, w której profesjonalizacja i cyfryzacja są absolutnie niezbędne.

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire – cher Margarítis Schinás, l'espace Schengen est un bien précieux de la construction européenne. Il représente ce que l'Europe peut faire de meilleur: le développement d'une société prospère dans un espace de libre circulation des personnes, des biens et des services. Aujourd'hui, nous voulons consolider cet acquis – chers collègues – pour l'adapter à la révolution numérique et l'ancrer dans l'avenir.

Cet accord sur la numérisation des visas constitue une avancée importante vers une gestion plus sécurisée de nos frontières extérieures communes et vers une Europe plus attrayante, aussi, pour les ressortissants étrangers. L'accès à une demande en ligne d'un visa Schengen facilitera le travail des autorités pour les opérations de contrôle et permettra une meilleure identification de tout document falsifié ou frauduleux. C'est un atout indéniable pour la sécurité interne de l'espace Schengen. Cela permettra aussi de réduire la charge administrative pour les ressortissants des pays tiers et pour les États membres.

Avec mon groupe, Renew Europe, nous soutenons pleinement la modernisation des visas Schengen.

Anders Vistisen (ID). – Hr. Formand! Schengensystemet er brudt sammen! Visa bliver solgt ud af bagdøren af kriminelle embedsmænd fra Polen, Malta og sikkert også andre steder. Vi har set, at mere end 1 million ulovlige migranter kom sidste år. Vi forventer det samme i år. I denne uge oplevede vi igen, igen et terrorangreb fra en af disse ulovlige migranter. En person, der aldrig skulle have været i Europa. En person, der har fået frataget eller fået nægtet sin asylstatus. Men en person, der alligevel har lov til at gå frit rundt iblandt europæiske borgere, udsprede sin islamistiske propaganda og slå sagesløse borgere ihjel. Vi taler ikke om et enkeltstående tilfælde, men vi taler om et system, hvor fire ud af fem afviste asylansøgere ikke bliver sendt hjem til det land, de kommer fra, men får lov at blive her i Europa.

Schengen hjælper kun de kriminelle menneskesmuglere. Islamisterne, der ønsker at ødelægge vores samfund, og den masseindvandring, der ødelægger os med kriminalitet, sociale og økonomiske byrder. Lad os komme ud af Schengen. Lad os få vores grænsekontrol tilbage.

IN THE CHAIR: KATARINA BARLEY

Vice-President

Ralf Seekatz (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Herr Kommissar! Ja, die Digitalisierung des Visaverfahrens ist überfällig, und deshalb finden wir es sicherlich sehr, sehr gut – viele Kolleginnen und Kollegen –, dass wir in dieser Woche hier im Parlament die richtigen Weichen für diese digitale Zukunft stellen. Das digitale Visaverfahren wird die Antragsverfahren für nichteuropäische Reisende erleichtern, den Verwaltungsapparat entlasten, den Diebstahl von Visa auf jeden Fall weiterhin erschweren und verhindern und die Fälschung von Visa sicherlich auch ein Stück weit zurückdrängen.

Wichtig wird es sein, eine einfache digitale Plattform zu etablieren, die eine Visumsstellung ohne Hürden ermöglicht. Hier sollten wir als EU Vorreiter sein und uns kein Beispiel an den teils sehr komplizierten Antragsverfahren anderer Staaten nehmen.

Ich bin froh, dass es uns als EVP gelungen ist, festzuhalten, dass der Antrag eines Drittstaatenangehörigen auf ein Visum zur Einreise, wenn dieser unmittelbar einen Antrag auf internationalen Schutz stellt, weiterhin nicht in den Geltungsbereich des Visakodex fällt. Insgesamt wurde im Trilog ein gutes Ergebnis verhandelt. Diesem sollten wir auch entsprechend in den Plenarabstimmungen zustimmen.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, spațiul Schengen cunoaște evoluții permanente pentru a răspunde exigențelor de securitate necesare statelor membre. Digitalizarea procesului și actualizarea legislației reprezintă pași normali în procesul de adaptare la noile cerințe.

În calitate de responsabil al Grupului social democrat pentru bugetul european, am solicitat și obținut în ultimii trei ani alocarea de fonduri suplimentare pentru mecanismele de protecție ale frontierei externe a Uniunii Europene și implementarea acquis-ului Schengen. O solicitare recurentă și specifică a fost legată de aderarea imediată a României și Bulgariei la spațiul Schengen, element inclus explicit în bugetele europene aprobate în ultimii ani ca urmare a negocierilor dintre Parlamentul European și Consiliu.

Chiar dacă bugetul alocat spațiului Schengen a crescut, chiar dacă au existat fonduri și proiecte dedicate pentru România și Bulgaria, chiar dacă cele două state implementează la cele mai înalte standarde cerințele zonei de liberă circulație, în continuare aderarea la spațiul Schengen este refuzată pe nedrept. Aceste lucruri se văd inclusiv în implementarea regulamentelor dezbătute astăzi. Concluzia o știți: extindeți spațiul Schengen cu România și Bulgaria.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Herr Vizepräsident! Zunächst einmal möchte ich sagen, dass der Schengen-Raum sicherlich eine der größten Errungenschaften dieser Europäischen Union ist, und wir sollten ihn verteidigen und schützen dafür, dass Menschen weiter in Europa sich frei bewegen können. Da viele der rumänischen und bulgarischen Kollegen hier zum Ausdruck gebracht haben, dass sie es bedauern, noch nicht Teil des Schengen-Raums zu sein, möchte ich an dieser Stelle – gerade auch als Deutscher – sagen: Wir wünschen uns, dass Bulgarien und Rumänien möglichst bald in den Schengen-Raum aufgenommen werden.

Der Vorschlag, der jetzt heute abgestimmt wird zum Thema Digitalisierung der Visaprozeduren, ist sicherlich ein guter, denn es ist wichtig, dass die Digitalisierung in diesem Bereich Einzug hält. Vor allen Dingen aber macht er die Prozeduren besser, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Menschen, die einen Visaantrag stellen, brauchen ihren Pass nicht mehr abzugeben, Fälschungen von Visa wird vorgebeugt und unsere Konsulate werden entlastet, und damit wird hoffentlich die häufig viel zu lange Dauer von Visaverfahren verkürzt.

Insgesamt ein sehr, sehr guter Vorschlag, der den Missbrauch für Visaverfahren schwerer macht und die Prozeduren vereinfacht und standardisiert. Damit rückt Europa noch enger zusammen, und das findet daher unsere Zustimmung.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, în urmă cu două săptămâni, dezbăteam în plen cazurile de corupție privind gestionarea spațiului Schengen. Se pare că le-am rezolvat pentru că trecem la un alt nivel. Însă dincolo de ironie, vreau să vă întreb, domnule comisar, pentru că Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene, la articolul 265, obligă Comisia, ca gardian al tratatelor, să acționeze la Curtea de Justiție a Uniunii Europene în cazul în care una dintre instituțiile europene nu respectă tratatul.

Având în vedere că România și Bulgaria de 12 ani îndeplinesc toate criteriile pentru a fi primite în Spațiul Schengen și Consiliul JAI blochează acest drept, vă întreb și vă rog să-mi răspundeți. De ce Comisia nu a acționat până acum la Curtea de Justiție a Uniunii Europene acest abuz de putere al Consiliului Uniunii Europene?

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – . Poštovana potpredsjednice Europskog parlamenta, poštovani potpredsjedniče Europske komisije, kolegice i kolege, Europskoj uniji potreban je jedinstveni pristup kada je u pitanju podnošenje zahtjeva i uvođenje digitalne vize.

Time će se povećati sigurnost schengenskog područja jer će se smanjiti rizik od prijevare i krivotvorenja viza te olakšati postupak njihove provjere na granicama. S obzirom na sigurnosne izazove s kojima se Europa suočava, snažno podržavam modernizaciju i daljnju digitalizaciju u postupku izdavanja viza kako bismo bolje kontrolirali tko ulazi na teritorij Europske unije.

Koliko je važno znati koga puštamo na područje EU vidimo, nažalost, svakog dana. Broj zabilježenih nezakonitih pokušaja ulaska na rekordnoj je razini, migranti u kampu u Grčkoj kliču Hamasu, a migracije se sve više pokazuju kao potencijalni izvor terorizma. Samo posljednjih nekoliko dana bili smo svjedoci dva teroristička napada u Belgiji i Francuskoj povezanih s islamizmom.

Zato nam je potreban sveobuhvatan europski odgovor na migracije kroz konačan dogovor o paktu o migracijama i azilu, koji će sadržavati instrumente sprječavanja nekontroliranih i masovnih ulazaka u Europsku uniju, kao i mehanizam ubrzane deportacije onih koji nezakonito borave na teritoriju Unije. Samo ćemo tako moći zaštititi europski način života.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Doamna președintă, a devenit o tradiție ca aproape în fiecare ședință plenară să discutăm câte ceva despre spațiul Schengen, ceea ce poate fi de înțeles în contextul actual vizând migrația. De neînțeles este însă menținerea României și Bulgariei în afara acestuia, în condițiile în care România a gestionat doar din Ucraina peste 5 milioane de migranți și peste 60 % din tranzitul de cereale, prevenind foametea la nivel global. Este, de asemenea, o ipocrizie fără margini să vorbim de unitatea Uniunii Europene, după cum este imposibil să vorbim de instituții europene puternice care însă aplică dubla măsură pentru România și Bulgaria.

Stimați colegi, este cinic pentru poporul român și bulgar să accepte explicațiile Austriei potrivit cărora nu pot intra în spațiul Schengen din cauza migrației ilegale. Dar, în același timp, în Croația, țară admisă, existau la acel moment peste 54 000 de migranți ilegali.

Dragă Roberta, dragă Ursula și domnule Charles Michel, vă mulțumim pentru sprijinul declarativ dat în diferite ocazii, dar astăzi avem nevoie de fapte, nu de vorbe, iar acest lucru înseamnă România în spațiul Schengen. În caz contrar, vom avea de-a face cu o creștere a extremismului la nivelul Uniunii Europene.

Vlad Gheorghe (Renew). – Doamna președintă, putem să facem și să desfacem sistemul de vize Schengen, că tot nu va funcționa. Nu va funcționa pentru un motiv foarte simplu și vi-l spun că nu e niciun secret. Cât timp solicităm românilor și bulgarilor, popoarelor care sunt la granița Uniunii Europene să păzească granița Uniunii, dar în același timp le spunem „o păziți numai după ce stați la coadă la vamă", nu o să funcționeze nimic.

Cât timp discriminăm aceste popoare care au grijă de o graniță extrem de importantă acum. Vedem, avem un război acolo. Cea mai lungă granița României este cu Ucraina. Cât timp le spunem „azi vă discriminăm, dar mâine trebuie să vă apucați de treabă, să ne păziți frontiera", degeaba facem toate regulile posibile pe vizele Schengen. Și cât timp lăsăm o țară precum Austria să ne țină la coadă la vamă doar pentru că poate, nu va funcționa nimic. Și vă mai spun un lucru ca să nu spuneți că vorbesc doar despre români că sunt eu român. Italia, care duce greul migranților acum din Marea Mediterană, ce-a primit de la Austria? A primit granițele închise pentru că pot.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission.* – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for your contribution to this rich debate.

I had the chance many times to say that together with euro, Erasmus and the single market, Schengen is the jewel on our EU crown. And the cornerstone of Schengen is our visa policy. So the need to continuously adapt our system is vital, is paramount, and thank you for the many suggestions to that effect. And also thank you for approving and agreeing on these digitalisation and simplification reports that we are discussing today.

Allow me a few comments on some of the issues raised in the debate. Starting by, of course, Bulgaria and Romania and their accession to the Schengen zone. Let me once again, on behalf of the Commission, reiterate the fact that the accession of both countries to the Schengen area would actually mean more and better controls, not less, because it will effectively move resources at the external border where we need them, instead of deploying resources in unnecessary internal border procedures that are cumbersome and do not actually add any added value.

Secondly, both countries' accession will greatly simplify and optimise our supply chains that have proved vital during the pandemic and in the aftermath of Russia's invasion of Ukraine. The integration of supply chains into an integrated Schengen zone adds to the European Union.

And finally, as you know, we have now completely rendered our databases interoperable. That is emerging now as a reality throughout the Schengen zone. It allows us to control and distinguish the bad guys from the rest, and it will be a great asset for the Schengen zone to be able to offer this possibility of interoperable bases to Bulgaria and Romania.

And all this is not just words; this is a commitment on behalf of the Commission that I am confident that will translate soon into a decision from the Council.

Second point in this constant drive for improvement, the Commission will tomorrow present a new proposal that will improve the existing rules on the visa suspension mechanism. This is yet another tool in our toolbox to manage migration, but we need to sharpen a bit the edge of these rules with new definitions and new procedures, which will be communicated to you tomorrow.

Thirdly, on humanitarian visas, raised by colleagues in this debate, we do sympathise with the European Parliament's affinity for this idea. Nevertheless, it would not be possible to address this under the visa code legal base. We do have other tools which we can deploy to reach similar objectives through the hopefully soon to be a great pact for migration and asylum – our work on legal pathways and on future initiatives, on talent pools and organised labour mobility.

Finally, in the debate in the last plenary session, I had the chance to inform this House that when the Commission assesses the application of EU law, we are colour blind. We do not check who is in government. We simply make sure that the rules that we all collectively and democratically agree on are properly implemented. And this certainly covers the issue of the alleged fraud on visas in Poland. We said this before the election, we are saying it after the election, on this issue of visa fraud, the Commission will do our duty. We will not let it pass.

Matjaž Nemec, *poročevalec*. – Gospa predsednica! Cenjeni komisar, spoštovane kolegice in kolegi. Hvala za spodbudne besede in vse komentarje. Razprava je pokazala, o kako pomembni temi danes govorimo.

Z zadnjim korakom v Evropskem parlamentu, torej jutri z glasovanjem, zaključujemo projekt digitalizacije evropskih vizumov. Zatem bodo morali o dogovoru glasovati še ministri na Svetu.

A dovolite mi, da se na koncu dotaknem še vprašanja humanitarnih vizumov, ki so bili danes večkrat omenjeni. To je bil zagotovo najtrši oreh v pogajanjih. Evropski parlament se je že večkrat jasno zavzel, da bi morala Evropska unija sprejeti okvir, ki bi omogočal varen in legalen način do evropskega azilnega sistema. Zavedamo se, da bi ta korak lahko rešil številna življenja v trenutku. Trenutno v Evropi predvsem primanjkuje politične volje za to. Vseeno smo v Evropskem parlamentu večinsko trdno prepričani, da je to smer, v katero bi se morala evropska vizumska politika pomikati.

Številni tragični dogodki v Sredozemlju so vse prepogosto boleč opomin, kako zlasti tihotapci na plečih človeških življenj izkoriščajo stiske ljudi v zameno za masten zaslužek. Ker v času največjih stisk ljudi ne potrebujemo več zidov, pač pa več solidarnosti, več humanosti, več dostojanstva in več strpnosti, spoštovani.

Torej, prihodnost evropske vizumske politike je digitalna, je bolj zelena, varnejša, bolj prijazna in dostopna do uporabnikov in bolj harmonizirana. Dosegli smo dober rezultat, na katerega smo lahko ponosni tudi evropski državljani. Verjamem, da lahko jutri na glasovanju računam na široko podporo. Hvala vsem akterjem. Spoštovani komisar, hvala lepa tudi vam. Srečno in na svidenje!

Die Präsidentin. – Die gemeinsame Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 18. Oktober 2023, statt.

11. Aprobación del Acta de la sesión anterior

Die Präsidentin. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind jetzt verfügbar.

Gibt es Einwände? Das ist nicht der Fall. Damit ist das Protokoll genehmigt.

12. Programa de trabajo de la Comisión para 2024 (debate)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zum Arbeitsprogramm der Kommission für 2024 (2023/2862(RSP)).

Maroš Šefčovič, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, I am pleased to present to you the Commission's work programme for 2024, the last of this mandate.

It comes at an important moment with the European elections just eight months away, and we can look back at the unprecedented challenges and opportunities Europe has experienced over the past four years: from the climate and biodiversity crisis to the digital revolution and artificial intelligence; from Russia's brutal invasion of Ukraine to the ensuing energy price and cost of living crisis; from migration to ensuring economic growth and competitiveness; and, of course, the situation in Israel and in Gaza following the attacks by Hamas terrorists on 7 October.

In response to all these challenges and all these crises, our Union has repeatedly demonstrated its solidarity and unity: from the EUR 800 billion NextGenerationEU plan to modernise our economies, to the joint purchase of vaccines, gas and ammunition. Our rescue missions are helping those affected by wildfires, floods and other disasters in the EU and beyond, and our far-reaching support for Ukraine and its people continues, amounting to a total of EUR 82 billion to date.

Amidst all this, we have never lost focus on our overall ambitions. This Commission has so far delivered over 90% of the initiatives President von der Leyen announced in the political guidelines in this House. In doing so, we have demonstrated that we can achieve a lot when we act together, but our work is far from done.

When President von der Leyen delivered the State of the Union address one month ago in this Parliament, she made it clear that we need to continue delivering today to build the future of Europe for tomorrow. To that end, in 2024, we will put a strong focus on supporting the co-legislators in reaching agreement on pending proposals. Only a very limited number of new initiatives will be put forward in order to deliver on existing commitments or respond to emerging challenges.

Reducing burdens for the benefit of businesses and citizens will be another main priority. One key task for Europe is to make sure that our businesses remain competitive in current global and economic context. This is particularly true for our small and medium-sized enterprises, so we will continue our work to reduce report requirement burdens by 25%.

The potential cost savings of the proposals already adopted in this area underline the tangible benefits these measures can bring. For example, the reform of the Union Customs Code could bring EUR 2 billion in savings and the revision of the Regulation on European statistics, another EUR 450 million.

Today, we have put forward additional proposals, including to postpone the deadline for the adoption of the sector-specific European sustainability reporting standards. This will provide additional time for stakeholders to adapt. We have also proposed to adjust the threshold of the Accounting Directive so more than a million companies can benefit from reduced reporting requirements.

We will need to work together with other EU institutions and the Member States to make this ambition for 25% reduction in reporting requirement burdens a reality. To help ensure we stay on track, the progress we make will be reflected in the annual burden surveys starting next year, with the survey for 2023.

We will continue our efforts to ensure that the green transition is done in a fair, smart and inclusive way. To this end, we will initiate the series of the Green Dialogues in order to fully and directly engage with citizens, as well as the Clean Transition Dialogues with industry and social partners. We are also setting up a strategic dialogue on the future of agriculture in the EU.

Under the European Green Deal, we will launch the process to establish a 2040 climate target to keep the EU on course towards climate neutrality by 2050. We will soon present our wind power package to boost the wind industry and accelerate energy independence. An initiative on water resilience will seek to ensure access to water for people, nature and the economy.

For Europe to boost its world leading innovation, we will open our high-performance computers to start-ups working on artificial intelligence. We will also propose a digital network strategy that will safeguard EU industry leadership and facilitate the emergence of secure pan-European networks. Under the Critical Raw Materials Club, we will work with our partners around the world to strengthen global supply chains of raw materials.

Together with the Belgian Council Presidency, we will convene a social summit at Val Duchesse to discuss, among other things, the challenges facing our labour market. Based on the demand of this House, we will also present an initiative on European Works Councils.

To continue our efforts towards a stronger Europe in the world, we will push forward with our trade agenda and continue our work on the anti-subsidy investigation into electric vehicles from China. Under promoting the European way of life, our concerted efforts need to be directed towards securing an agreement on the pact on asylum and migration, and I welcome the progress made in the past weeks. To strengthen these efforts, we will also present a proposal to update the framework to fight smuggling of migrants.

With a Conference on the Future of Europe, the reinforced follow-up to Parliament's own initiative reports, and with our substantive work on the rule of law, we have given a new push to European democracy. While the focus in this headline ambition should be on agreeing the key pending proposals ahead of the elections, we will also propose a Council recommendation on the development and strengthening of child protection systems.

Honourable Members, Madam President, good policymaking is a team effort. In the short time we have before June- 2024, constructive negotiations in good faith on important pieces of legislation will be paramount. Thank you and I look forward to your interventions.

Siegfried Mureșan, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, welcome back to the European Parliament, and thank you on behalf of the EPP Group, for the good cooperation that exists between the Parliament and the European Commission in the context of the interinstitutional agreement and interinstitutional relations.

Of course, the context today in Europe is uncertain. In addition to the one war that we have been facing in Ukraine for more than one and a half years now, we saw the terrorist attacks of Hamas against Israel that have to unite us, that have to be condemned with all toughness, and which for sure will require us to do more in the area of security, defence, migration. We will have to do more than planned. We will have to do it earlier, and we will have to do it for a longer period of time.

Inflation, energy crisis, the situation in Armenia, the migration challenge and of course the food tensions; our agenda remains busy. Nevertheless, I believe that the approach that you have presented now to focus on delivering, on providing concrete solutions which work in reality to the people of Europe, is correct – not to come up with new initiatives which we cannot conclude, which we cannot solve before the European elections, but to deliver on what we have promised.

In that sense, we count on the Commission respecting the democratic calendar. We are looking forward to working with you over the course of the first four months of next year before the European elections, focusing on the top priorities and on making sure that we can still conclude and we can still deliver on some files.

What do we expect as the EPP Group? Firstly, I would like to welcome the approach that you have put forward on reducing bureaucracy, reducing red tape, supporting small and medium-sized enterprises and supporting competitiveness only through strengthening our economy, making it more competitive, research-oriented, more innovative can we secure the high social standards that we have here in Europe. So this competitiveness agenda is not something abstract, but it is something that profoundly benefits enterprises and people in Europe.

We have to work together on this. We have to make sure that whenever the Commission puts legislation forward, it does not negatively affect the competitiveness of our economy. We should implement what we have all together agreed in the Conference on the Future of Europe: the competitiveness check – the European Commission should please control that whenever it wants to put legislation forward it does not negatively affect competitiveness.

Likewise, we also expect the Draghi report on competitiveness to be concluded before June 2024. And we expect the appointment of an SME envoy to take place. This SME envoy should be equipped with proper staff, with proper competences, responsibilities, and powers to also safeguard for good SME policy.

For our group, of course, trade policy is important. Only an economy that is open, that trades with other parts of the world, is a strong economy. Please make progress and bring towards the ratification of Parliament the agreement with Chile, already finalised, with Australia, which good progress is being made on, and we need to make progress on Mexico as well.

Last point, of course, Executive Vice-President, one of the key tools that the European Union has to deliver on its agenda is the budget. Please work with us to put pressure on the Presidency of the Council, and especially on the European Council President, to deliver this revision of the Multiannual Financial Framework, which would allow us to better protect our borders, to support refugees when they come to tackle the migration crisis, to do more on security, defence and to help Ukraine in a predictable manner, and from our side also the action plan on cyber bullying. Cyber bullying is bullying. This needs to be addressed as well. Thank you very much and we are looking forward to working with the Commission for the first part of next year.

Alex Agius Saliba, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, first of all I would like to thank the Executive Vice President, Šefčovič for presenting the work programme for our plenary this afternoon.

The main priority for the remaining months of this legislature will be to deliver on the outstanding legislation on the table and reach an agreement with the co-legislators.

The S&D Group stands ready to play its part and fully engage on all files and negotiate in a constructive and energetic manner. We are very pleased that the commitment made during the recent hearing for a minimum target of at least 90% on net greenhouse gas reductions by 2040 will be proposed in early 2024.

We would also like to specifically ask about the timeline on the action to accelerate the phase-out of fossil fuels, on the revision of the REACH Regulation to tackle harmful chemicals, and on the animal welfare package. We know the proposal for a more limited proposal on the protection of animals during transport, but it is less clear about a wider animal welfare package.

We are still concerned at the EPP-inspired backsliding, which has been happening on the Green Deal, and we are concerned that despite your best efforts, this is a coordinated effort to push to water down or even abandon some key elements of the non-climate-related Green Deal measures.

On the economic front, my group will continue to insist on our long-running battles concerning the need for a permanent eurozone fiscal capacity, based on the success of SURE and RRF, and at the very least, we would have liked to see a communication on the permanent fiscal capacity still during this term, and the regulation on a permanent SURE mechanism.

Europe has to move on from temporary ad-hoc instruments towards permanent structures for efficient management of any future crisis.

While we recognise that much has been achieved on social policy, in particular at the Porto Summit and the action plan, there still remains a lot to be done and we are still missing proposals on a comprehensive European anti-poverty strategy, legislation on minimum income schemes and directives on artificial intelligence in workplaces, traineeships, and also on the right to disconnect.

We need resilient citizens along a resilient economy and a healthy planet. We also reiterate our call for a comprehensive, permanent and evidence-based EU-wide mechanism for the protection of democracy, the rule of law, and fundamental rights.

We also expect the Commission to continue to play a leading role in promoting and preparing accession candidates to become countries in the EU, the Union's enlargement policy in general and the necessary internal reforms to make the Union prepared for future enlargement.

Finally, we encourage the Commission to continue its efforts aimed at exploring solutions that would make the confiscation of frozen Russian public assets possible for the reconstruction of Ukraine.

Malik Azmani, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, Executive Vice-President Šefčovič, dear colleagues. 233 days remain until the European elections – 233 opportunities to address the many challenges we face, the dangers we face, the world we face, because the world is changing rapidly. Our citizens wants to see a Europe that remains calm, united and strong. Wars in Ukraine, the Caucasus and the Middle East, coups in Africa, and terrorist attacks abroad, and even back at home. Europe needs to play its role. We notice the effects of climate change, and it is still not too late to use technology, like nuclear power or offshore wind, to our benefit. And the rise of illiberalism. Well, the election results in Poland give us hope.

233 days remain to the European elections, and in that time, we need to lay the groundwork for a stronger reformed geopolitical Europe with more focus on defence. The Renew Group therefore welcomes the commitment of the Commission on a Defence Industrial Strategy. We need to reduce our vulnerabilities and dependencies, and we need to reinforce our strength on industry, innovation, SMEs and – as you already mentioned – cutting red tape.

On migration, as I have said many, many times, we need to deliver not only on a serious package, but also on strengthening mutually beneficial partnerships with Africa, which is important in order to tackle the illegal smuggling of migrants. We must work with countries such as Egypt to prepare now and prevent the risk of a new flow of migrants and refugees from the Middle East.

Only by addressing these challenges can Europe stand strong in a volatile world. In 233 days. The voters will judge us on our performance as they trusted us to deal with the many challenges we face. Well, let us deliver for our citizens.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President. First of all, congratulations to the Executive Vice-President on the extension of his portfolio to include the Green Deal. So let's start with the Green Deal. First of all, we are very happy to read about some of the proposals that will be forthcoming on micro-plastics, on the forest monitoring law and on animal transport. However, the S&D also raised the question of what will happen with all the other elements of the animal welfare package. That of course is they not going to be presented now, but how will that be proceeding?

I am also very happy with the 2040 target and your personal commitment to fight for at least -90% in the hearings. That is very welcome. However, it's very clear that the Green Deal has only started. This is a transition for decades to come and much more needs to be done. Let's be very honest, if we look at the Farm to Fork Strategy or the Sustainable Chemical Strategy, not much has happened this term, which can be a conclusion. However, we would like to hear from about you how these files will be put forward and prepared for the next term. Especially on sustainable food systems and REACH, it would be good if you could just tell us how the progress on that is being maintained, so that when we have a new College in June 2024, we can expect a REACH revision and also proposals on a sustainable food system.

We understand very clearly that now there is more time for implementation and that you go more into dialogues. On the dialogue for the future of agriculture in the EU, I do not really recognise the feeling that that there are no dialogues with the agriculture lobby. COPA COGECA even has a fixed position at the AGRIFISH Council, so they are the best connected lobby we have.

How will this dialogue look in order to reach other parties than only the Brussels-based COPA COGECA lobby? It should be about the future of food, not the future of agriculture. And that is, to be very honest, lacking a bit in the framing that we read in the work programme.

On social matters, let's be honest – up until now, people have been regarded as an input to the economy. That's somewhat how people are regarded, but that's not what social policy is from a green perspective. So we would like to hear from you a bit. Also, how are you going to do address the social and economic inequalities in our societies in social summits and social dialogues, because that is most important.

Last point on the industrial strategy and the industrial policy. If there is one issue where Europe really needs to prepare for the next term, it's the future of our industry and our future industrial policy, with a massive investment package linked to that. We don't see that in a sovereignty fund; we don't see that in own-resource proposals; we don't see that very much in the current SGP revision. So how is this Commission going to prepare the massive investment needs that are required for our industrial transition? That is something that this Commission can at least prepare, and then in 2024 we will talk later with the new Commission on how to implement.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señora presidente, señor comisario, colegas, Europa está en guerra y ustedes nos presentan un programa para 2024 como si el problema se resolviese con una hoja de Excel. Proponen legislar mejor, pero su comisión ha presentado 633 propuestas legislativas en cuatro años. Nos han declarado la guerra y ustedes insisten en que la Agenda 2030 esté en el corazón de la agenda europea. Insisten en promover restricciones, limitaciones y prohibiciones que hoy, antes que mañana, acabarán con cualquier sector productivo: la agricultura, la ganadería, la pesca artesanal, la industria del automóvil o el transporte marítimo por carretera. Incluso anuncian objetivos más ambiciosos para el 2040. Perdonen, pero sus ambiciones están costando muy caras a las clases medias y populares.

En las calles de Bruselas, de París, de Londres, de Estocolmo, de Barcelona o de Algeciras, nuestros compatriotas no mueren por el cambio climático. Mueren porque les cortan el cuello o porque les disparan con una AK-47. El terrorista islámico de ayer era un inmigrante ilegal con antecedentes por terrorismo. Pero la Comisión y el Parlamento Europeo han parado durante tres años el Reglamento Eurodac porque le están echando un pulso al Consejo.

Al grito de «*Allahu Akbar*», Europa se desmorona y ustedes siguen con el Pacto verde, los impuestos al plástico y su perversa distinción entre empresas éticas y no éticas. Nuestras familias no quieren que les reconozcan más derechos vacíos, quieren seguridad en las calles. Nuestras empresas no quieren ser agentes de inclusión y resiliencia, quieren crear empleo y prosperidad.

Miles de inmigrantes ilegales procedentes de países islámicos, traídos por mafias de países islámicos, entran por Lampedusa, Grecia, las Islas Canarias o Almería. Pero ustedes insisten en este Pacto sobre Migración y Asilo que consiste en hacer ver que son refugiados, dejarles entrar, pagarles la manutención, la vivienda, el colegio, reubicarles, darles la residencia y, si es preciso, la nacionalidad para que puedan votar. A ustedes eso lo llaman solidaridad. Yo lo llamo complicidad y cobardía.

Hace décadas derogaron el principio de autoridad, la jerarquía, la disciplina, el orden, el honor. Han creado una sociedad débil a la que tienen entretenida con idioteces y, cuando se quieran dar cuenta, se proclamará el Estado Islámico en el corazón de Europa. En España, en el año 711 también hubo políticos cobardes, cómplices y traidores. Les dejaron entrar y tardamos 800 años en recuperar la tierra y la libertad.

Europa necesita líderes fuertes que asuman el reto y que digan: «Ni uno más ilegalmente. Si entráis ilegalmente, seréis deportados. No os vamos a mantener. Estamos dispuestos a defender nuestra ley y nuestro modo de vida con todos los medios a nuestro alcance. Y si nos atacáis, os abatiremos». Líderes verdaderamente europeos que repitan aquello de que jamás ningún europeo estuvo dispuesto a dejarse matar para permitir que sus ciudades fueran tomadas por el islam. En junio de 2024, tenemos una oportunidad.

Die Präsidentin. – Sehr geehrter Herr Kollege, ich bin nicht sicher, ob ich das in der Übersetzung richtig verstanden habe, aber falls Sie Kollegen hier als Verräter bezeichnet haben sollten, dann – glaube ich – ist das etwas, womit das Präsidium sich zumindest befassen sollte. Aber wie gesagt, das werden wir nachhören und noch einmal überprüfen.

Jean-Paul Garraud, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, à l'heure où Israël, la France et la Belgique viennent de subir des attaques terroristes islamistes de grande ampleur, à l'heure où des risques majeurs de voir ces attaques se reproduire existent, le premier devoir de nos institutions devrait être consacré à combattre, par tous les moyens, cette idéologie islamiste, nazisme du xxie siècle.

Alors, commencez par cesser tout financement aux associations et aux organismes en lien avec les fous d'Allah, comme par exemple l'université de Gaza, véritable campus du Hamas, qui a reçu depuis 2014 plus de 1,8 million d'euros de votre part. Arrêtez de recevoir ici même des individus qui prônent la supériorité de la charia sur toutes les lois de nos démocraties, et qui, pour certains, sont passés par Guantanamo. Arrêtez d'organiser et de financer des campagnes de communication promouvant le hidjab, dont les femmes iraniennes, musulmanes, tentent de se débarrasser en ce moment même au péril de leur vie. Arrêtez de favoriser une immigration de masse, incontrôlée, dont on sait bien qu'elle entraîne insécurité, délinquance et même terrorisme.

Renforcez nos frontières extérieures, financez les murs demandés par une dizaine de nos États, renforcez Frontex pour en faire de véritables gardes-frontières et ainsi mettre un terme à tout ce trafic d'êtres humains, dont sont victimes des centaines de milliers de personnes. Supprimez toutes ces pompes aspirantes de l'immigration, qui provoquent des drames en série et qui condamnent à court terme l'Europe. Créez enfin une commission spéciale chargée de la lutte contre le terrorisme, que je réclame en vain depuis le début de mon mandat, en 2019.

Voilà quelques pistes de travail que vous devriez suivre dès à présent. Ce sont, à mon sens, des urgences absolues.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left.* – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, je voudrais dire à Monsieur le Commissaire qu'il manque une priorité claire dans son programme de travail pour l'année 2024, une réalité que, sans doute, il ne connaît pas avec ses 27 000 euros de salaire mensuel: la pauvreté.

Monsieur le Commissaire, la lutte contre la pauvreté et l'explosion des prix doit être l'objectif prioritaire qui devrait vous occuper, plutôt que la compétitivité à toutes les sauces. Car, aux dernières nouvelles, la compétitivité ne se mange pas. Qu'allez-vous faire pour le tiers des Européens qui ne mangent pas à leur faim, ces Européens qui ne peuvent pas faire face à l'explosion des prix? La compétitivité ne permet pas non plus de se chauffer en hiver. Qu'allez-vous faire pour cette moitié des Européens qui renoncent à augmenter le chauffage quand ils ont froid? La compétitivité ne met pas non plus de toit au-dessus des têtes. Qu'allez-vous faire pour les sans-abri en Europe, dont le nombre atteint l'équivalent de la population de Marseille? Rien dans votre plan de travail à ce sujet.

Votre inaction est d'autant plus coupable que vous connaissez pertinemment l'origine de la hausse des prix, car même la BCE et le FMI le disent: ce sont les profits des grandes entreprises. Alors, sachant cela, où est l'action de l'Union européenne pour bloquer les marges et taxer les superprofits? Nulle part… Nulle part! Vous êtes trop occupé à déréguler et à alléger les supposées contraintes sur les entreprises. Où est l'action de l'Union européenne pour garantir que nos concitoyens puissent manger à leur faim, se loger, se chauffer, se soigner? Nulle part! Vous êtes trop occupé à planifier le retour de l'austérité, qui affaiblira encore plus nos écoles, nos universités, nos hôpitaux. Où est l'action de l'Union européenne pour mettre en place une industrie européenne qui protège nos emplois et soit au service de la bifurcation écologique? Nulle part! Vous êtes trop occupé à signer à tout va des accords de libre-échange pour faire venir du bœuf du Brésil ou du lait de Nouvelle-Zélande. Vous êtes trop occupé à programmer votre pause environnementale, à mettre au placard un règlement d'une importance capitale sur les substances chimiques dangereuses et à réautoriser le glyphosate.

Alors en clair, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous êtes très occupé, mais bien moins préoccupé par nos vies que par les lobbys et par leurs profits. Nous continuerons de proposer un autre monde, celui dans lequel nous partageons les fruits des richesses incroyables que comporte notre continent.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony, Képviselőtársaim! Ha a Bizottság a mai veszélyes időkben nem vált irányt, a válságok akár maguk alá is temethetik az Uniót. Mit kellene tehát tenni? Először is, széles körű összefogás kell a terrorizmus ellen, megismerve ennek migrációs összefüggéseit. Zéró tolerancia a terrorizmussal és a terrorizmussal szimpatizálókkal szemben. Másodszor, ne erőltesse a Bizottság a migrációs csomagot. Annak egyik eleme, a kötelező áttelepítés amúgy is megbukott már. Állítsuk meg a külső határokon az illegális migrációt, a segítséget vigyük helybe célzott, ellenőrzött fejlesztéspolitikával. Harmadszor, segítsük Ukrajnát, de ne hagyjuk tovább, ne folytassuk tovább a kudarcos szankciós politikát. Mielőbbi béketárgyalásokat sürgetek. Negyedszer, az ideológiai alapú gazdaságpolitika helyett szerezzük vissza Európa versenyképességét, az energiapolitikát, a zöld átállást és a kereskedelempolitikát így kell átszabni.

A kkv-kat szabadítsuk meg a bürokratikus terhektől. A Bizottság továbbá ne diszkrimináljon a tagállamok között az egységes piacon. A helyreállítási és kohéziós pénzeket ne tartsa vissza politikai megfontolásból. Elfogadhatatlan, hogy öt tagállam még mindig nem jutott hozzá. Végezetül a Bizottságot kérem, ne harmadik országok akaratát szolgálja ki, hanem az európai emberek és cégek érdekét keresse, tartsa szem előtt. Nyolc hónap sincs, hogy a helyes vágányra állítsuk át Európát. Ne ez legyen az elvesztegetett lehetőségek mandátuma!

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Der Abbau der Bürokratie, der überbordenden Regulatorik, unter der unsere Betriebe, unsere Unternehmen leiden, muss ein zentrales Anliegen der Kommission bis zum Ende ihres Mandats sein. Ich begrüße, dass nun konkrete Vorschläge auf dem Tisch liegen. Bei der Umsetzung der Richtlinie zur Nachhaltigkeitsberichterstattung werden die Regeln für die einzelnen Sektoren jetzt erst zwei Jahre später kommen. Das ist gut. Endlich wird auch die Digitalisierung genutzt, um bei der Entsendung von Arbeitnehmern in andere Mitgliedstaaten eine Erleichterung zu schaffen. Vielleicht werden wir dann endlich auch mal diese leidige A1-Bescheinigung los. Auch das, glaube ich, ist ein guter Vorschlag.

Aber, meine lieben Kolleginnen und Kollegen, es muss noch viel, viel mehr passieren. Die Kommission hat ja nur jetzt mit Blick auf Entbürokratisierung die Gesetzgebung aus dem Jahre 2023 und die kommenden Vorschläge für das Jahr 2024 unter die Lupe genommen. Aber was ist eigentlich mit der ganzen Gesetzgebung und Regulatorik, die die Jahre vorher aufgebaut wurde? Allein in den Jahren 2020 bis 2022 wurden von der Kommission 129 Vorhaben angestoßen. Auch daraus ergeben sich viele Auflagen, viele Dokumentations- und Registrierpflichten für die Unternehmen. Auch da muss man rangehen.

Der Mittelstand leidet unter hohen Energiepreisen und der Inflation und dem Fachkräftemangel und muss dringend entlastet werden. Allein wenn die ESG-Standards einmal harmonisiert werden würden, dann würde das einen Riesenfortschritt, eine Riesenerleichterung bedeuten. Taxonomie, Nachhaltigkeitsberichterstattung, Entwaldungsverordnung. Lieferkettensorgfaltspflichtengesetz, Regeln zur Kreislaufwirtschaft, Ökodesignverordnung, und, und, und. Selbst der Unternehmer, der alles erfüllen will, hat kaum eine Chance, bei diesem Dickicht an Regulatorik noch durchzusteigen. Ich bitte Sie wirklich dringend um Entlastung unserer Betriebe.

Udo Bullmann (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Exekutiv-Vizepräsident! Auch von mir meinen herzlichen Glückwunsch! Ich habe eine Bitte an die Kommission, wenn es dazu kommt, das Arbeitsprogramm 2024 zu diskutieren. Frau von der Leyen ist gestartet mit dem Versprechen, eine globale Kommission, eine Kommission der internationalen Verantwortung zu etablieren. Lassen Sie uns damit anfangen!

Ja, wir wollen sie darin unterstützen. Wir müssen zeigen, wie das geht. Das machen wir gerne gemeinsam, und es gibt ein Fundament: Artikel 21 – Menschenrechte. Die Europäische Union ist verpflichtet, Menschenrechte zu unterstützen und durchzusetzen, wo immer sie kann, mit allen Mitteln. Wo war das in dem sogenannten Tunesien-Deal? Wo lesen wir da etwas von Menschenrechten? Er wird nicht funktionieren. Das Gleiche gilt für die Afrika-Debatte. Ja, wir machen gerne eine neue Mitteilung, eine neue Erklärung, aber lassen Sie uns Taten sprechen. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass die jungen Nationen unseres Nachbarkontinents Luft zum Atmen haben.

Ein Wort an die Rechte in diesem Haus, die sich ja auch heute wieder so lautstark zu Wort meldet: Nein, wir werden Ihnen nicht gestatten, die Politik der Europäischen Union, der Solidarität zu entkleiden und zu entmenschlichen. Dieses Haus wird um Solidarität und Menschenrechte zusammenstehen!

Morten Løkkegaard (Renew). – Fru formand! Hr. næstformand! Det var selvfølgelig en valgtale, som kommissionsformand von der Leyen kom med for nylig. Lad os være ærlige om det. Men lad os alligevel tage hende på ordet, når hun sagde, at man skal gøre meget mere for små og mellemstore virksomheder i Europa. For lad os nu være ærlige. Trods talrige skåltaler om hjælp til de små, så er det jo en kendsgerning, at vi bliver ved med at vælte nye love og regler – og med reglerne masser af bureaukrati – i hovedet på dem. Byrder, som forringer mulighederne for at konkurrere med resten af verden. Lad os derfor tage von der Leyen på ordet, når hun lover et konkurrencetjek af alt ny lovgivning. Et forslag, som vi har luftet, men gladeligt giver Kommissionen æren for, hvis det altså sker. Vi forventer faktisk, at formanden præsenterer et lovforslag hurtigst muligt, ligesom vi ser frem til de 25% mindre byrder og dokumentationskrav, som også har været på tale. Og vi ser også frem til at nye konkurrencezar, Mario Draghi, vil aflevere sin analyse af Europas konkurrenceevne. Det kan kun gå for langsomt. Vi skal som liberale og borgerlige levere et erhvervsliv, der kan konkurrere, så det kan skabe den velstand, der er livsnødvendig for vores fremtid. Så lad os komme i gang!

David Cormand (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, votre programme de travail pour 2024 ressemble à une capitulation en rase campagne sur le terrain de l'écologie et de la justice sociale.

Aujourd'hui, vous décidez de renoncer à REACH, le règlement sur l'enregistrement, l'évaluation et l'autorisation des produits chimiques, et vous abandonnez aussi la loi-cadre sur les systèmes alimentaires durables. Malgré les demandes des Européennes et des Européens, vous négligez la directive sur la condition animale, pourtant promise il y a longtemps. Votre programme de travail pour 2024 n'a plus qu'un objectif: simplifier les contraintes de transparence imposées à l'industrie et en finir avec le pacte vert.

Depuis 2019, la ligne des écologistes est claire, elle est constante: réparer les destructions environnementales, protéger les Européennes et les Européens, préparer l'avenir avec la transition écologique. La vôtre, votre ligne, est désormais le tournant de la rigueur sociale combiné avec le renoncement écologique.

Anna Zalewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Przed nami tak naprawdę sześć miesięcy pracy. W związku z tym to, czym powinna zająć się Komisja Europejska, to przede wszystkim weryfikacja dokumentów. Nie można chwalić się, że jest ich coraz więcej, będzie coraz więcej, dlatego że to jest gwarancja absolutnego chaosu i bardzo powierzchownego traktowania dokumentów. Więc chciałabym, aby Komisja wybrała te najważniejsze, te, które jest w stanie razem z Parlamentem Europejskim skończyć.

Poza tym trzeba poszukać pieniędzy. W budżecie brakuje 65 mld euro. Bez tego realizacja jakichkolwiek pomysłów absolutnie nie będzie możliwa.

Po trzecie, trzeba myśleć o bezpieczeństwie. Naprawdę my nie możemy przed Europejczykami stawać i mówić, że oto jesteśmy w jakiejś bańce i nie dotyczy nas świat zewnętrzny. Wojna jak trwała, tak trwa. Nie ma pomysłu na jej zakończenie. Jest niespokojnie w Izraelu. A dzisiaj, kiedy rozpoczynaliśmy minutą ciszy – by uczcić pamięć zabitych kibiców szwedzkich – zero refleksji, w jaki sposób zadbamy o bezpieczeństwo Europejczyków. W jaki sposób będziemy postępować z nielegalną migracją. Chcemy popełniać te wszystkie błędy, które popełnialiśmy w 2014, w 2015 r.

Bezpieczeństwo to również bezpieczeństwo energetyczne. Ono musi tutaj wybrzmiewać. Trochę ucichły ceny energii, ale dobrze Państwo wiedzą, że znowu eksplodują, tym bardziej że Komisja Europejska chce, żeby wszystkie tarcze i wsparcie dla tych zagrożonych ubóstwem energetycznym zniknęły. To jest wyzwanie dla Komisji Europejskiej i Europejczycy muszą o tym słyszeć, bo to my w wyborach do Parlamentu Europejskiego będziemy się bezwzględnie z tego spowiadać.

No i oczywiście należy przypilnować na poważnie Zielonego Ładu. Nie wiem, czy Państwo słyszą dowcipy o tym, jak pakiet *Fit for 55* jest pakietem służącym do bogacenia się Chin, o czym zresztą mówiła pani komisarz von der Leyen, pokazując swoim sprawozdaniem, że właśnie kończymy uniezależniać się od Rosji, a bezwzględnie uzależniamy się od Chin. To wydarzenia najważniejsze, to priorytety, o których musi myśleć Komisja.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Seit 2010 fällt die EU wirtschaftlich immer weiter hinter Nordamerika, Australien und den Fernen Osten zurück. Offensichtlich reagiert die EU auf jede Krise – sei es COVID, Ukraine, Energie oder die sogenannte Weltklimakrise – mit mehr Erregung, aber weniger Erfolg als der Rest der Welt.

Wo liegen Ihre Prioritäten bis zur Europawahl? Erstens: Bis Ende 2023 werden in der EU bereits fast eine Million Asylanträge gestellt worden sein. Dennoch planen Sie einen neuen EU-Migrationspakt, der noch mehr unqualifizierte Migranten aus Afrika und dem Orient hierhin holen soll. Zweitens: Der Ukrainekrieg und unsere Sanktionen haben die EU in die Stagflation gestürzt. Dennoch wollen Sie weiterhin dutzende Milliarden in ausländische Konflikte stecken, während Millionen Europäer ihre Heiz- und Haushaltskosten nicht mehr zahlen können. Drittens: Ihre experimentelle Energiepolitik, die unsere Wirtschaft wettbewerbsunfähig macht und unsere Bürger ruiniert. Dennoch wollen Sie die grüne Transformation beschleunigen. All das kostet mehr Geld, das Sie nicht haben und unsere Bürger erst erarbeiten müssen mit Arbeitsplätzen, die Ihre Politik aufs Spiel setzt.

Stattdessen: Konzentrieren Sie sich bitte endlich auf das Wesentliche! Wir brauchen mehr Wettbewerbsfähigkeit für mehr Wohlstand, denn im Vergleich zur Weltspitze spielt die EU wirtschaftlich zurzeit allenfalls im oberen Drittel der zweiten Liga.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, Επίτροπε Šefčovič, ξέρετε τι ώρα έστειλε η Επιτροπή το πρόγραμμα εργασίας της για το 2024 στους ευρωβουλευτές; Τρία τέταρτα προτού αρχίσει η συζήτηση, 45 λεπτά πριν. Αυτό το θεωρώ προσβλητικό, απαράδεκτο για το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και περιμένω στη δευτερολογία σας να ζητήσετε συγγνώμη για αυτή την αντιμετώπιση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, γιατί δεν χωρούν δικαιολογίες. Η Επιτροπή έχει πολλαπλάσιο διοικητικό μηχανισμό από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Σταματήστε επιτέλους τους εξωραϊσμούς και να αυτοσυγχαίρεστε. Τα καταφέρατε καλά στην αντιμετώπιση του πληθωρισμού; Τα καταφέρατε καλά στην αντιμετώπιση της ενεργειακής κρίσης; Είστε υπερήφανοι στην Επιτροπή για τον σεβασμό του κράτους δικαίου μέσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση; Δεν μας είπατε τίποτα για τις αυξανόμενες κοινωνικές ανισότητες. Η ατζέντα «κοινωνική Ευρώπη» δεν υπήρξε καθόλου στην ομιλία σας και κυρίως δεν υπήρξε στο έργο της Επιτροπής. Για την αστοχία της Προέδρου της Επιτροπής, Ursula von der Leyen, που πήγε στο Ισραήλ και βρέθηκε σε άλλη γραμμή από το Συμβούλιο, χωρίς συνεννόηση με τον Πρόεδρο του Συμβουλίου, Charles Michel, και χωρίς συνεννόηση με τον ΥΕ/ΑΠ, Josep Borrell Fontelles, έχετε να μας πείτε κάτι; Σε λίγους μήνες θα γίνουν ευρωεκλογές και οι πολίτες θέλουν από εσάς περισσότερα έργα, λιγότερα λόγια και να μην αλληλοσυγχαίρεστε μεταξύ σας, διότι αυτό τροφοδοτεί την αντιευρωπαϊκή, λαϊκίστικη άκρα δεξιά, που δεν θέλει μια ενωμένη, ισχυρή Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, protekle četiri godine Europske komisije i gospođe Von der Leyen najbolje je opisati s dvije riječi – beskorisni populizam.

Nažalost, Europska komisija i Von der Leyen nisu bile samo beskorisne, nego i velike štetočine. Reakcija na Covid je dovela do ekstremnog gušenja građanskih prava, ogromnog broja umrlih. Reakcija na rat u Ukrajini dovela je do stotina tisuća umrlih i do današnjih ofenziva Rusije. Rat u Izraelu i Palestini doveo je u samo nekoliko dana do tisuća ubijenih žena i djece i ponovnog terorizma u srcu Europske unije. Poljoprivredna tranzicija dovodi do gašenja poljoprivrede u Nizozemskoj, do ubojstva stočnog fonda u Hrvatskoj.

Pa što je to? Pa je li vi uopće razmišljate svojom glavom? Umjesto da štitite standard i živote građana, vi ih dovodite konstantno u opasnost.

Benoît Lutgen (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-Président, chers collègues, M. le Vice-Président a parlé de la crise du COVID-19, de la réponse que l'Union européenne a pu apporter à l'époque, de la crise ukrainienne aussi, certainement. Mais, malheureusement, je n'ai pas entendu la force de l'Europe s'exprimer pour dire comment, dans des domaines aussi importants que la santé, la défense, l'énergie ou l'alimentation – pour ne prendre que ces quatre exemples –, renforcer encore davantage, dans les six mois qu'il reste, l'autonomie stratégique de l'Union européenne, ce qui permet de protéger les Européens, de nous donner une force beaucoup plus grande, d'être moins dépendants de pays tiers comme la Chine – ou la Russie, hier –, qui n'ont pas tout à fait les mêmes valeurs démocratiques que les nôtres.

Cette autonomie stratégique est essentielle, tout comme il est essentiel de protéger nos frontières par des clauses miroirs, pour faire en sorte que ce qui rentre comme produits sur le sol de l'Union européenne connaisse les mêmes valeurs en matière environnementale, sociale ou encore sanitaire. J'espère – ou j'ose espérer – que, dans le cadre de l'accord conclu avec le Mercosur notamment, il y aura enfin cette volonté de faire appliquer à nos frontières la réalité de ces clauses miroirs, et dans d'autres domaines également.

Protéger les Européens, c'est aussi soutenir 150 millions d'Européens qui vivent en milieu rural, leur donner, à proximité de chez eux, de l'emploi, des services publics, des hôpitaux et faire en sorte que leur mobilité soit assurée. C'est un enjeu économique, mais c'est aussi, assurément, un enjeu démocratique, pour ne pas que la colère de certains Européens – qui se sentent oubliés – ne s'exprime lors des élections du mois de juin.

Je compte sur vous et sur la Commission pour avoir cette réaction à l'égard des chantiers européens, et pour que l'Europe soit une chance pour chacune et pour chacun.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Vice-Presidente da Comissão Europeia, o programa de trabalho da Comissão Europeia para 2024 será o último desta Comissão antes das eleições europeias de junho.

Perante desafios crescentes, é tempo de responder às urgências, sem deixar de preparar o futuro. É inadiável rever o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual, dotar a União Europeia com novos recursos próprios, mas também aprender com as crises anteriores e completar a União Bancária, instituindo um sistema europeu de garantia de depósitos, e criar um mecanismo permanente de estabilização contracíclica, em vez de andar sempre à procura de soluções de última hora.

Mas a Comissão Europeia deve, sobretudo, reforçar o seu compromisso com o Pilar Europeu dos Direitos Sociais, para responder aos problemas concretos das pessoas. E duas prioridades não deviam faltar: o reforço do investimento na formação profissional, para preparar os trabalhadores para as mudanças decorrentes das transições verde e digital; e uma iniciativa europeia para habitação acessível, de modo a enfrentar um dos mais sérios problemas sociais de muitas cidades europeias, agora agravado pela inflação e pelo aumento das taxas de juro.

A Comissão Europeia será julgada pela ambição da sua agenda social.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, à quelques mois des élections européennes, M. le Commissaire présente le dernier programme de travail de son mandat. Depuis notre élection, nous avons vu le monde changer, et avec lui, notre façon de nous percevoir en tant qu'Européens.

Prenons le pacte vert: nous accompagnons notre continent vers la neutralité écologique et environnementale, nous investissons là où c'est nécessaire, nous défendons les filières de demain et nous veillons à ce que personne ne soit laissé de côté. Nous avons relancé notre industrie pour faire de l'Europe de demain une puissance à laquelle les Européens seront fiers d'appartenir.

Ce dernier programme doit s'inscrire dans cette continuité: une Europe qui protège ses citoyens, une Europe qui consolide ses liens avec les autres continents – notamment l'Afrique –, une Europe qui renforce ses instruments commerciaux.

En quatre ans et demi, nous avons considérablement changé. Il nous faut continuer et ne pas perdre de vue nos ambitions, sinon nous abandonnerons la promesse des Européens.

Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Gestern machte das Parlament mal wieder Schlagzeilen mit einem Detail: Ein Zug voller EU-Beschäftigter fuhr fälschlicherweise statt nach Straßburg erst einmal nach Disneyland. Eigentlich ist es recht lustig.

Leider passt der Vorfall auch in einigen Zügen zum Arbeitsprogramm der Kommission, dem letzten Arbeitsprogramm vor der Europawahl 2024. Von wegen Weichen falsch gestellt. Seit Langem verspricht die Kommission einen Gesetzesvorschlag, um Bahnfahren in Europa zu erleichtern. Mit dem multimodalen Ticket durften Millionen Reisende auf ein Ende des Tarifwirrwarrs hoffen. Sie durften von durchgehenden Tickets auch für komplizierte Verbindungen träumen und davon, mit dem besten Tarif über mehrere Grenzen hinweg sicher am Ziel anzukommen. Nun fällt die europäische Buchungsplattform völlig aus dem Programm. Dabei ist das Interesse am klimafreundlichen Reisen riesig. Ein verpasster Elfmeter für die Kommission.

Herr Šefčovič, etwas ernster: Wie sollen wir unsere Klimaziele im Verkehr erreichen, wenn Sie es nicht einmal schaffen, dieses Gesetz über die Torlinie zu bringen? Willkommen in Disneyland!

Antonio Maria Rinaldi (ID). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, il Green Deal comporterà enormi problemi, soprattutto nell'ambito dell'*execution*.

Passare infatti da un sistema energetico basato sulle fonti fossili a uno basato sull'elettrificazione determinerà non solo la ristrutturazione dell'intera infrastruttura energetica, ma la revisione totale delle catene dell'approvvigionamento.

La transizione energetica, così come voluta dalla Commissione europea, produrrà poi un aumento della domanda di metalli critici, fra i quali rame, litio, nichel, manganese, cobalto, grafite, molibdeno, zinco, terre rare e silicio, la cui offerta è saldamente nelle mani della Cina. Di contro, l'Europa non ha un'adeguata capacità di estrazione e raffinazione di minerali, pertanto siamo condannati a essere dipendenti dalle importazioni da pochi paesi leader del settore, i quali potrebbero applicare restrizioni all'esportazione.

Il governo di Pechino continua a stoccare materie prime, detenendo ad oggi il 93 % delle scorte mondiali di rame, il 74 % di quelle di alluminio e tante altre, esponendoci a ricatti in termini economici e geopolitici. Inoltre, la Cina stessa è anche leader indiscussa nella raffinazione di una vasta gamma di minerali, che la fanno essere il principale produttore mondiale di veicoli elettrici a costi competitivi.

Ma il più grosso errore compiuto dalla Commissione è stato quello di aver affidato la transazione energetica esclusivamente all'elettrico e di non aver accettato il principio della neutralità tecnologica, facendo pagare ai cittadini e alle imprese i costi di questa scelta sbagliata. Qualche membro della Commissione, non pervaso da fanatismo ideologico, è a conoscenza di quanto costa una vettura elettrica? Per un'utilitaria ci vogliono non meno di 35 000 euro: praticamente, una transizione energetica per soli ricchi.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, as prioridades aqui identificadas traduzem a mobilização de recursos necessários para a confrontação e a guerra e para a indústria do armamento. Os povos não querem mais guerra, querem a paz.

Procuram iludir os povos com uma chamada soberania europeia, que mais não é que a soberania das principais potências europeias sobre os demais Estados. Os milhões e milhões para a guerra e para garantir os interesses e lucros dos grandes grupos económicos faltam para o investimento nos serviços públicos, na saúde, na habitação, nos transportes, no combate à pobreza, na promoção da coesão económica e social.

Somam-se o brutal aumento do custo de vida e a política de baixos salários às pesadas consequências do aumento das taxas de juro.

Estes são os problemas concretos, que se agravam, com que os trabalhadores e os povos se confrontam e que a vossa política promove – por mais verde que a pintem – e para os quais, mais uma vez, não têm uma palavra.

Este caminho não é inevitável. Há outras políticas urgentes, necessárias e possíveis de progresso e justiça social, de desenvolvimento soberano e independência dos Estados, políticas sobre as quais se poderá erguer uma outra Europa dos trabalhadores e dos povos.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, the ITRE Committee that I chair ranks high in terms of legislative activity in the field of energy, industry, digital or research. Our goal is that, until the elections, we will proactively show our continued support to Ukraine in the war against Russia, will make all efforts to decarbonise Europe's industry while ensuring it remains competitive and boosting economic recovery after the pandemics.

I very much welcome, dear Vice-President, the proposals in the area of digitalisation, the access of start-ups in the artificial intelligence field to our supercomputers, existing 10, 12 soon, the EU Space Law and space economy and the wind power package.

Therefore, dear Vice-President, while I support that the Commission will prioritise to ongoing legislative work, I also see the need to further provide an enabling system for the required growth of the manufacturing capacities for technologies which Europe needs to achieve its climate ambitions defined by Green Deal Industrial Plan. We expect that maybe the Commission will present a financial envelope that will fit this challenge.

We are also looking forward to rapidly scaling up the development and deployment of hydrogen. Yes, we are looking forward to the creation of the new European Hydrogen Bank, and we very much hope that we will be able to find the proper mechanism for it in this legislature. Thank you so much and a lot of success.

Ibán García Del Blanco (S&D). – Señor presidenta, señor comisario, en Europa, como es evidente, además, por el desarrollo de nuestras últimas piezas legislativas y de nuestras últimas estrategias, no tenemos petróleo, no tenemos materiales raros, no tenemos silicio. Lo que tenemos fundamentalmente es creatividad y tenemos también propiedad intelectual y no se puede entender cómo en un plan estratégico de trabajo para 2024 no hay ni una sola referencia a la propiedad intelectual.

La mayoría de las empresas en Europa son pequeñas y medianas empresas. La mayoría de ellas son las que emplean a la mayoría de los trabajadores y, sin embargo, la mayoría no utilizan ningún tipo de herramienta de patente de propiedad intelectual, siendo esto un gran empoderador, pues eleva los salarios y eleva la productividad. Necesitamos una estrategia específica para las pequeñas y medianas empresas.

Al mismo tiempo necesitamos protegerla. Más del 15 % de los titulares denunciaron algún tipo de irrupción en su propiedad intelectual en los pasados años. Y, además, tenemos que afrontar los retos que convienen a los sistemas generativos de inteligencia artificial y a la utilización masiva de datos protegidos para el entrenamiento de estos modelos. Para todo eso necesitamos una respuesta, para compensar también a los titulares de esos derechos.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte heute nicht über ein Dossier sprechen, das im Arbeitsprogramm 2024 steht, sondern über eines, das im Arbeitsprogramm 2022 Erwähnung findet. Es geht dabei um MDMS – multimodale digitale Mobilitätsdienstleistungen –, ein Dossier, das eigentlich in der Lage wäre, den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern in Europa endlich mehr Informationen darüber zu geben, wenn sie über Grenzen reisen, wenn sie verschiedene Transportmodi nutzen. Aber offenbar ist die Kommission unfähig, einen Vorschlag vorzulegen.

Dabei würde ich mir – manchmal – wünschen, dass, anstatt ständig neue Regulierungen vorzuschlagen, die keiner braucht, sich endlich auf das fokussiert würde, wo tatsächlich den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern ein echter Vorteil, ein echter europäischer Mehrwert geboten werden könnte. Denn auch heute noch haben Reisende in einem freien Europa weiterhin Probleme beim Buchen, bei Anschlusszügen, wenn etwas ausfällt. Hier tatsächlich einzugreifen, wäre ein echter Fortschritt, den wir von der europäischen Seite auf den Weg bringen würden. Leider ist die Kommission offenbar unfähig, einen Vorschlag vorzulegen.

Philippe Olivier (ID). – Madame la Présidente, la présentation du programme de la Commission pour 2024 devrait être l'occasion pour M. le Commissaire de faire un bilan de sa trajectoire. Il y a pour vous, la Commission, deux priorités: l'approfondissement et l'élargissement. Il y a deux projets majeurs: le pacte vert et le pacte sur la migration. Or, sur tous ces sujets, de même qu'il existe dans les affaires un *profit warning* – un «avertissement sur les résultats» –, vous avez vu passer des avertissements sur les politiques, mais vous n'en avez pas tenu compte.

Sur l'approfondissement, vous avez subi le divorce houleux du Brexit, qui fut pour l'Union européenne non seulement un échec, mais une humiliation.

Sur l'élargissement, vous constatez, chaque jour, les difficultés de fonctionner à 27. Et malgré tout, l'empire de l'Union européenne de Madame von der Leyen est pris dans sa logique d'extension sans limite.

Sur le pacte vert, qui procède d'une idéologie totalement déraisonnable de décroissance, vous êtes arrivés au bout de la patience de vos propres troupes. Vous commencez à voir les signes de la rébellion.

Enfin, sur le pacte sur la migration, vous savez mieux que quiconque que votre logique immigrationniste est rejetée par les peuples, c'est pourquoi vous cherchez à la faire passer en catimini. Dans mon pays, l'immigration est refusée à 70 %. Vous êtes obligés de menacer l'Italie pour l'y faire adhérer. Et même l'Allemagne commence à douter de votre modèle «hall de gare», qui ne convient à personne.

Puisque vous nous parlez sans cesse de valeurs démocratiques, permettez-moi de vous rappeler que la démocratie consiste à admettre les désaccords – surtout lorsqu'ils émanent des peuples et des élus –, à être capable de les écouter et à savoir en tirer toutes les conséquences.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Vice-Presidente, Caros Colegas, do programa de trabalho da Comissão Europeia para 2024, agora apresentado, gostaria de destacar três pontos.

Em matéria orçamental, a revisão do QFP. A estratégia política da Comissão até às eleições inclui o apoio contínuo a Ucrânia, com a aprovação da Facilidade para a Ucrânia. Para isso, impõe-se rever o QFP. A promoção de uma indústria europeia inovadora, descarbonizada e competitiva: temos de garantir a aprovação do STEP e que seja dotado dos meios financeiros adequados. Mais uma vez, rever o QFP.

Em matéria de governação económica: rever as regras de governação económica da União Europeia. Voltar às regras antigas não é opção, temos de olhar para o futuro e não para o passado. Um forte compromisso político e uma clara consciência da urgência são necessários. Precisamos de regras equilibradas que assegurem sustentabilidade da dívida e investimentos sustentáveis.

Finalmente, não podemos falar em novos alargamentos sem falarmos em reforma institucional e em revisão da arquitetura do orçamento da União Europeia.

Georg Mayer (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, geschätzte Kollegen! Ein Handeln für die Bürger und für die Wirtschaft, hat der Vizepräsident der Kommission gesagt, wird dieses Programm. Allein da frage ich mich: Für welche Bürger und für welche Wirtschaft wird dieses Programm etwas bringen? Vielleicht den ukrainischen Bürgern, denen Sie ja, wie gesagt, schon 82 Milliarden Euro an europäischen Steuergeldern zugeschoben haben, was dort in einem hoch korrupten System versickern wird. Das sind Steuergelder, die wir gut in Europa brauchen könnten, wo die Menschen nicht mehr wissen, wie sie ihre Lebenshaltungskosten bezahlen werden. Und alleine das Gegenteil tun Sie in Europa seit mittlerweile Jahren. Das ist geradezu existenzbedrohend für Menschen und Unternehmen, was hier von der Kommission vorgenommen wird.

Die Inflation galoppiert in Europa, die Lebenshaltungskosten sind so hoch wie noch nie nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Die Energiepolitik der Union ist gerade am Scheitern, und statt Sonne und Wind wird es wohl Atom- und Kohlekraft werden – das ist auch schon absehbar. Die Vernichtung von Millionen von Arbeitsplätzen geht Hand in Hand mit der Abschaffung des Verbrennungsmotors. Die Industrien wandern bereits seit 2017 massiv ab. Dafür gibt es Gründe, und von diesen Gründen wurden die meisten von Ihnen gesetzt. Der *Green Deal* entwickelt sich zum *Green Disaster* für Europa und die Europäer.

Und weniger Bürokratie hört sich aus Ihrem Mund für mich an wie ein billiger Treppenwitz der Geschichte, denn das Gegenteil ist ja bereits seit Jahrzehnten der Fall, geschätzter Herr Kommissar. Genau in diesen politischen Zustand haben Sie Europa und die europäische Wirtschaft damit versetzt. Wenn diese Politik so weitergemacht wird, dann wird Europa in 20 Jahren zu einem Disneyland werden für Asiaten und Amerikaner, die sich gerne hier umsehen.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Voorzitter, mijnheer de eerste vicevoorzitter, het is het laatste jaar van de Commissie-Von der Leyen en vandaag presenteert men het laatste werkprogramma. Wat mij betreft moeten er vóór het eind van het mandaat nog een aantal belangrijke wetsvoorstellen op tafel komen.

Laat ik beginnen te zeggen dat ik blij ben met de vermelding van de wijziging van de Europese Ondernemingsraad. Dat is belangrijk. Maar het beloofde wetsvoorstel om een eind te maken aan onbetaalde stages ontbreekt. En dat is teleurstellend voor al die jongeren die hun hoop op dit wetsvoorstel gevestigd hadden.

Dat brengt mij op een meer algemeen punt. Volgend jaar juni gaan de burgers naar de stembus en ik vraag mij daadwerkelijk af waarom er zoveel voorstellen op tafel gelegd worden om bedrijven uit de wind te houden en er amper voorstellen zijn om de zorgen van burgers weg te nemen. Dat lijkt mij strategisch onverstandig en eigenlijk vind ik het ook een beetje schandalig.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señora presidenta, muchas gracias al vicepresidente ejecutivo, Maroš Šefčovič, por su exposición, que ha estado bien. Yo la comparto, pero es verdad que he echado en falta mayor contenido en la parte de democracia. Ha hablado de Estado de Derecho, pero no de la parte de democracia. Y no digo que no esté en la propuesta, pero en el discurso no está.

Tenemos las elecciones europeas el próximo año, en junio de 2024, y creo que debemos introducir ideas en ese programa de trabajo para el año que viene para reforzar el proceso democrático europeo, incluso sin cambiar las normas del Tratado, sin cambiar la ley electoral. Por ejemplo, la Comisión puede tomar posición para que los partidos políticos nacionales, que son los que paradójicamente presentan las papeletas, incorporen en ellas los logos de los partidos políticos europeos. Y también la Comisión puede tomar posiciones y estimular que el año que viene se aplique de manera más efectiva que en el año 2019 el principio de cabeza de lista, de candidatos a presidente de la Comisión.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Vicepresidente, questa legislatura così straordinaria si avvia a concludersi e penso che questi mesi che ci separano dalla conclusione richiedano uno sforzo aggiuntivo, un impegno per realizzare quegli impegni che abbiamo preso con i cittadini all'inizio della legislatura e che hanno attraversato tutte le fasi difficili in termini di politiche climatiche, ambientali, digitali e sociali, voglio aggiungere, oltre che istituzionali, come è stato detto or ora.

Penso che sia importante implementare quella politica industriale che ha visto adesso dei primi abbozzi, dei primi capitoli nella Commissione europea e nel Parlamento, ma ha bisogno davvero di un salto di qualità e di un salto anche verso le tecnologie più avanzate per realizzare gli obiettivi del Green Deal.

È importante quello che Lei ha detto sulle PMI. Se vogliamo che le PMI ci accompagnino in tutta la trasformazione ambientale, in tutti gli impegni del Green Deal, dobbiamo avere un'attenzione particolare a sfoltire la burocrazia, a ridurre molti impegni e ad accompagnarle.

Infine, nei pochi secondi che mi restano, voglio fare un richiamo alla tassonomia sociale. Purtroppo non vedrà la luce in questa legislatura della Commissione, ma la tassonomia sociale deve vedere passi avanti adesso. Abbiamo fatto una tassonomia verde, ma quanti investimenti in più potremmo fare in infrastrutture sociali, se la accompagnassimo anche con strumenti finanziari, come quelli della tassonomia, adeguati?

PRESIDÊNCIA: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA

Vice-Presidente

Andreas Schieder (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission! Zum Abschluss vielleicht noch ein paar wichtige Themen in der Nachbarschafts-, Erweiterungs— und Außenpolitik, denn ich erwarte mir schon, dass wir mit unserer aktiven Führungsrolle, die wir als Europäische Union gerade bei der Förderung und Vorbereitung des Beitritts von Kandidatenländern einnehmen und die besonders für die Erweiterungspolitik wichtig ist, noch einen Zahn zulegen, auch wenn sich die Kommissionsperiode jetzt dem Ende zuneigt. Denn gerade der Gipfel der letzten Tage hat gezeigt, wie zentral dieses Thema ist und wie zentral es auch für Europa ist, dass europäische Werte – sowohl was Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Korruptionsbekämpfung betrifft, aber auch für die Heranführung dieser gesamten Region wie des Westbalkans an die Europäische Union – ganz, ganz wichtig sind.

Der zweite Punkt, der immer wieder fehlt – und das will ich mir noch wünschen zum Abschluss im Zusammenhang mit diesem unsäglichen russischen Krieg –, ist, dass man eingefrorene russische Besitztümer endlich auch heranzieht für die Finanzierung des Wiederaufbaus der Kriegsfolgen in der Ukraine. Als letzter Punkt, dass auch alles in der Macht Stehende getan wird, um die Verhandlungen über die Regelungen zur Sorgfaltspflicht und zum Verbot von Zwangsarbeit weltweit so schnell wie möglich abzuschließen.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Martin Hojsík (Renew). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, vážený pán výkonný viceprezident Šefčovič, táto Komisia sa na začiatku mandátu zaviazala počúvať ľudí. Žiaľ, európske občianske iniciatívy, ktoré sú za zákaz klietkového chovu zvierat vrátane klietkového chovu zvierat kožušinových, neboli vypočuté. Je to niečo, kde by sme očakávali, že táto Komisia skutočne bude počúvať hlas miliónov Európaniek a Európanov. Podobne sa to týka hlasu z Parlamentu, ktorý volá po poriadnej regulácii obchodu s domácimi zvieratami, kde Slovensko, žiaľ, je veľkým zdrojom problémov.

Verím, že sa ešte stále podarí predložiť tieto návrhy. Táto Komisia hovorila, že bude počúvať priemysel a vedcov, a veľa sa podarilo. Ale, žiaľ, nepočúva európsky chemický priemysel, ktorý volá po tom, aby bola predložená novela REACH-u, aby bola predložená novela zakladajúceho nariadenia k Európskej chemickej agentúre. Na tom stoja stovky miliónov eur investícií. Prosím vás, vypočujte ich.

Francisco Guerreiro (Verts/ALE). – Senhor Presidente, não deixa de ser surpreendente a omissão da Comissão neste plano de trabalhos para 2024: tudo o que tem a ver com o bem-estar animal. Portanto, tudo o que era a revisão de matérias em bem-estar animal está omissa. Tem, efetivamente, uma proposta para rever parte do que se considera o transporte de animais vivos, mas é, basicamente, atirar pó e areia para os olhos dos cidadãos.

Temos as iniciativas europeias de cidadania que reúnem milhões de assinaturas, mobilizam a sociedade civil e depois chegam aqui, são validadas, há uma audição e nada! E nada! E, nós sabemos que, desde o início do programa da Comissão, Ursula von der Leyen disse que as questões de bem-estar animal eram fundamentais e que iriam apresentar essa revisão de propostas em torno do bem-estar animal e essas propostas estão na gaveta.

O que eu pergunto é: o que é que vos limita a apresentar essas propostas para começarmos a debater? Têm medo de quê? Têm medo de quem? Precisam de mais debate? Temos debates durante anos sobre estas matérias, temos relatórios de impacto económico. Do que é que precisam mais para apresentar estas propostas?

Annika Bruna (ID). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, comme il a été dit – et souligné – à l'instant, le programme de travail de M. le Commissaire pour 2024 écarte une nouvelle fois toute réforme sur le bien-être animal, hormis en ce qui concerne le transport des animaux vivants.

La plupart des révisions des législations sur le bien-être animal sont donc abandonnées. Pourtant, la Commission s'était engagée à proposer ces mêmes révisions. Elle s'était également engagée à prendre en compte les études d'impact qu'elle avait elle-même commandées. Elle s'était, enfin, engagée à œuvrer à l'abandon progressif des cages à la suite de l'initiative citoyenne européenne «End the Cage Age». Ces initiatives, si elles ne remplacent pas le référendum, n'en sont pas moins le seul instrument de démocratie directe en droit européen.

Je souhaite donc que la Commission européenne se reprenne et qu'elle n'affaiblisse pas cet outil d'expression démocratique que sont les initiatives citoyennes européennes. À défaut, les citoyens se sentiront floués, et la parole de la Commission sera irrémédiablement discréditée.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, Commissioner, your programme speaks as if everything is very rosy in the garden in Europe. And just to take a couple of your lines from it, you say we acted together in responding decisively in support of a Europe of freedom, prosperity and peace.

Never in my lifetime have I seen Europe so less interested in peace. We've fuelled and promoted a war. We have refused to promote dialogue and diplomacy at the expense of so many citizens in Europe, who are looking at about a 17% increase in food prices and, in some cases, a 50% increase in energy prices.

You say we will continue to defend and promote democracy, human rights, the rule of law and effective multilateralism. You're killing multilateralism, allowing the US to divide you from China.

You say that we will continue our efforts to protect children affected by armed conflict. What in God's name are you doing with the thousand children that have been killed in Gaza by the Israelis? You're protecting the Israelis and you're promoting their apartheid system.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signor Presidente, signor Vicepresidente Šefčovič, onorevoli colleghi, due anni fa questo Parlamento ha espresso pieno sostegno all'iniziativa dei cittadini europei «End the Cage Age», che ha raccolto ben 1,4 milioni di firme certificate.

La Commissione si era impegnata a presentare entro la fine di quest'anno una proposta legislativa volta a vietare l'uso delle gabbie per una serie di animali d'allevamento. Ciò non sta avvenendo. Cittadine e cittadini europei hanno chiesto chiaramente un cambio di rotta e noi dobbiamo ascoltarli. Dobbiamo puntare a metodi di allevamento che siano rispettosi degli animali e veramente sostenibili, così come vuole la strategia «Farm to Fork».

Non è sufficiente parlare solo del trasporto di animali, bisogna avere il coraggio di affrontare il tema degli allevamenti intensivi. Rischiamo di perdere un'occasione importantissima, irripetibile, per fare la differenza sia nella vita degli animali che in quella della nostra Europa.

Chiedo quindi alla Commissione di rispettare l'impegno con i cittadini europei e presentare finalmente la proposta legislativa per eliminare gradualmente l'uso delle gabbie negli allevamenti in Europa. Diciamo chiaramente che rispettiamo la voce di chi non ha voce, quella dei nostri amici animali.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Maroš Šefčovič, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission.* – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, I really would like to thank you for this very intense and passionate debate for underscoring what we have accomplished together, but also for highlighting what we need to focus on in the remaining time of our mandate.

One thing I would like to clarify, because those who work with me already for quite some time, you know that the European Parliament always comes first for me. Therefore, the Commission work programme, which was adopted this afternoon at 3 p.m., was firstly presenting to you. Straight from the college room, I went over here to the Hemicycle to share it with you.

I think that when the State of the Union address was presented by the President of the Commission, it was also very clear when the date for the adoption of the Commission work programme will be announced, and we respected the schedule of the European Parliament proceedings. Of course, with all this, I think it is also very important to go into your very substantial remarks. I appreciate the calls of several honourable Members – Mr Mureșan, Mr Agius Saliba, Mr Azmani – with clear calls on focusing on delivery.

We need to use every single day, every single week, every single trilogue to make sure that we will deliver to our citizens. I can assure you that on our side in the European Commission, we will do our utmost to achieve as much progress as possible. Ms Niebler was referring to the importance on reducing administrative burden, as was Mr García del Blanco.

Just to give you two additional figures – the fact that we are focusing on this one-in, one-out approach, it allowed us for 2022 to reduce administrative burden by EUR 7.3 billion. I think it is quite a significant sum, and since the announcement that we are going to focus more on reducing reporting obligations since March of this year, we already reduced the cost related to these obligations by EUR 3 billion.

The same we are doing with focusing on the SMEs. Now, SME test competitiveness checks are regular and obligatory parts of any impact assessment we do, and we are working very closely with the SME network across Europe and before the end of this year we will also have the new SME envoys. So I believe that here the promise, the political undertaking and commitment to be presented to you are respecting and I think in concrete numbers we are also delivering.

If it comes to several points on what you are missing in the Commission work programme for 2024, I just would like to recall that if a proposal was already announced in a previous Commission work programme, it is not re-announced in the current one. Once it is there, it is planned and we are working on it. So indeed the pending proposals, which we have already announced in the Commission work programme in previous years, they are all planning, work in progress and we are working on all of them.

Mr Eickhout and others have been asking about our ambitions if it comes to the Green Deal. I think that we had rather sort of debate on that during the hearing of Commissioner Hoekstra and myself and I believe that we reassured this House that there will be relentless effort to keep the Green Deal ambitions at the highest possible level.

We are working on this in very concrete terms, be it on policy side, but be it also in delivering, talking to our citizens in the form of the Green Dialogues, but also talking to our industry through the Clean Transition Dialogues.

Several of you – Mr Guerreiro, Mr Hojsík, Mr Cormand, Mr Castaldo – have been referring to the animal welfare. As you know, the Commission has been acting to improve animal welfare for over 40 years, progressively improving the lives of animals and adopting welfare standards in legislation that are amongst the highest in the world.

I would like to reassure you that we respect the voice of citizens, we respect the European Citizens' Initiative, and that the animal welfare is and will remain a priority for the Commission. An example of that is the adoption in early 2023 of new rules on transport of animals by sea.

The farm to fork strategy also foresees the revision of the EU's animal welfare legislation, and the preparatory work is ongoing, covering the legislation for the welfare of animals at farm level, during transport, at the time of killing, and to establish a voluntary European label for animal welfare.

We are now reflecting and carefully assessing the important aspects, including the related costs and the appropriate length of the transition period, because it is important to have support of all involved to make this proposal success. As I said, the proposal on the protection of animals during transport is the most advanced and will be presented already in December of this year.

The same level of interest and concern was voiced on the legislation on REACH. As again, all of you know, REACH is the most comprehensive legislation of chemicals in the world, and you also know that amending REACH is a complex undertaking.

Changes to the legislative framework would need to achieve a complex balance, significantly reduce health hazards and environmental damage from chemical pollution, but also address the chemicals of very high concern while ensuring the availability of chemicals that are essential for the key green transition technologies, guaranteeing the level playing field vis-à-vis our international competitors.

We are discussing all these issues in great detail – how to find the balance we need to make sure that we would be leaders in the future-oriented technologies, in wind power, in battery storage, in chip making, in all these very important technologies important for the green transition. Given the complexity of the file, indeed, it is possible that the REACH amendment will have to be taken forward in the next mandate.

What we want to do is to prepare this file in great detail, to make sure that we would complete all the necessary preparatory work, and also to find the best possible timing for this proposal so this proposal – which would take several years, I am sure, to approve – that it would be supported by the proper momentum, and I would like to reassure the honourable Members that we will discuss all this in great details with you, but also with the chemical industry, as it was suggested by Mr Hojsík.

If you allow me the questions which were linked with migration before our session started, there was quite comprehensive discussion with my colleague Vice-President Schinas. So I would just underline one very important element that we will continue to support the work of both legislative and operational strands of managing migration.

What is indeed essential is to finalise a new pact on migration, and an asylum pact, but it is also indispensable to continue taking operational action to advance the EU collective response to the migration challenges. I can assure you that we are working on that very, very hard.

There have been a few, quite a few remarks on the social aspects of the Commission work programme for the next year. So all the initiatives in that regards, of course, will continue.

But as a novelty, we are going to work very closely with the Belgian Presidency on the Val Duchesse Summit, where we want to make sure that we would discuss with social partners, in particular the challenges facing the EU labour market, workers and businesses, including the skills and labour shortages stemming exactly from what these new future-oriented technologies, including artificial intelligence, are bringing to Europe.

What we can do together as Europeans, where we can streamline our processes and collaborate more on the European, national and regional level. I believe that it would be important for the future of the European labour market.

If you allow me just two last remarks, and thank you very much, Mr President, for being so generous with my speaking time. Several of you referred to the importance of the Green Dialogues and the Clean Transition Dialogues, and we are going to work on all of them.

We already had the first one on hydrogen, and I think that if you look at the pattern of what is the challenge in front of our advanced, future-oriented industries, first and foremost, these are energy prices. We need to push them down.

Second one is the lack of proper skills: we have to boost them.

Third is the massive investment which is needed, and we have to look at every single euro we have in the European budget. How can we cumulate our funds? How can we leverage these investments with our promotional banks like the EIB, KfW and others? And how can we make sure that also private investment will be flowing into this sector much more than in the past and we will be working in that regard with you, but also with the industry.

To conclude, honourable Members, I really would like to thank you for very close collaboration, very intense interactions with the UN. I know that also the next month we will be working with our intense commitment because it is eight months to go before the European elections.

So I can assure you that we will really do our utmost to use the remaining time to deliver on as many files as we can, that we will be pushing all the key files to be completed if possible under this mandate, if not to prepare them in the best possible way for the next European Parliament and for the next European Commission. But until we get there, I am very much looking forward to the close cooperation with all of you.

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Ádám Kósa (NI), *írásban.* – Aggódom, hogy a Bizottság nem feltétlenül maradéktalanul reális célkitűzéseket fogalmazott meg az európai fogyatékossági kártya és parkolókártya kapcsán. Félő, hogy a tagállamoknál beindul egy fékhatás. A jelenlegi kedvezmények felülvizsgálata és mérséklése, vagy a jogosultságok más jogcímen biztosítása várható.

A tagállamoknál komoly anyagi kérdés, hogy a kedvezményeket meg tudják-e adni nagyobb jogosulti körnek: ami „ingyen" van, azt valójában a tagállam fizeti fogyatékkal élő polgára helyett. A hatástanulmányban is világos: a hivatkozott megtakarítás az egyén szintjén, a kiadás a tagállam szintjén jelentkezik.

Aggályos, ha a különböző fokú fogyatékosságot ismerő tagállamokba utazó külföldi automatikusan a legmagasabb kedvezményre jogosult: igazságtalanság érzését keltheti és alááshatja az ilyen jellegű tagállami rendszert.

A harmadik országbeli jogosultak kártyája esetén ragaszkodnék ahhoz, hogy csak a legális tartózkodást igazoló okmánnyal együtt legyen érvényes! Az EU állampolgárok esetén is kívánatos, hogy ne váltsa fel a személyi igazolványt, hanem azzal együtt legyen érvényes a névre szóló fogyatékossági kártya.

Sok tagállamban a kísérő személy is kap kedvezményt, mégpedig kártya nélkül. Ez dupla kiadást jelent, ezért félő, hogy sok helyen megszűnik a kísérő jogosultsága.

A parkolási kártya legfőbb problémája a csalások kiszűrése: ennek hamisíthatósága egyszerűbb, mert a szélvédő mögött lehetetlen megfogni és a jogosult sem tudja magát okmánnyal igazolni, mert nincs jelen az ellenőrzéskor.

13. Turno de preguntas a los comisarios – Medidas europeas para evitar y combatir el aumento de la delincuencia organizada

President. – The next item is Question Time with the Commission. The topic for today is European measures to prevent and to fight the rise of organised crime. I very much welcome Vice-President Schinas. You know the rules. I have a note with all the explanations, but will just recall that we will have follow-up questions in the first round only, with the second question linked to the first one. I would ask you, of course, to stick to the allocated times.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor vicepresidente, celebro mucho que usted esté hoy con nosotros. La delincuencia organizada constituye un problema de seguridad muy grave en la Unión Europea.

Es evidente su carácter transnacional, que, además, aprovecha el mercado único y Schengen. La cooperación y el intercambio de información entre los Estados miembros deben incrementarse.

Quiero detenerme en la amenaza del narcotráfico, que plantea muchos problemas de seguridad que sufre América Latina. Regularmente, leemos en la prensa noticias sobre importantes alijos de cocaína procedentes de América Latina que se interceptan en Algeciras, Hamburgo, Amberes o Róterdam. Por ello, los europeos y los latinoamericanos debemos dar un salto cualitativo conjunto en la lucha contra el narcotráfico e incrementar, por ejemplo, los controles en los puertos.

Resulta imprescindible también aumentar la cooperación triangular con los Estados Unidos en materia de droga. Desgraciadamente, me parece que el lenguaje del comunicado conjunto de la cumbre UE-CELAC era muy continuista en materia de delincuencia organizada. Veo que hace un par de semanas hubo una reunión entre ministros del Interior de la Unión Europea y catorce de sus homólogos latinoamericanos, el llamado Comité Latinoamericano de Seguridad Interior.

¿Qué opina, señor vicepresidente, sobre la necesidad de incrementar la cooperación entre ambas orillas del Atlántico en materia de lucha contra la delincuencia organizada y, en especial, el narcotráfico?

Margaritis Schinas, *vicepresidente de la Comisión*. – Señor Millán Mon, le agradezco su pregunta. Efectivamente, la delincuencia relacionada con la droga es una plaga en nuestras calles. Y, desgraciadamente, la Unión Europea ha logrado un récord negativo, porque desde el año 2020 nos hemos convertido en el mayor mercado de consumo de cocaína del mundo, dejando atrás a los Estados Unidos.

Y tenemos otro problema en Europa: tenemos una oferta grande de droga, lo que hace que baje el precio en el mercado e induce al consumo, sobre todo en nuestros puertos del mar del Norte, aunque no exclusivamente. Esto ya se está convirtiendo en una amenaza de seguridad nacional y social.

Nuestra respuesta se basa en esta estrategia preparada hace un par de años y que completaremos con una nueva iniciativa que anunciaremos mañana por la mañana: una hoja de ruta, o *roadmap*, que planteará nuevas iniciativas como, por ejemplo, la creación de una alianza de puertos y la cooperación entre los puertos europeos; trabajar más en la prevención; luchar más contra las redes y no los individuos que están relacionados con la droga; y, por último, como bien señala, trabajar con nuestros socios de América Latina de manera mucho más enérgica, mucho más implicada.

La presidenta Von der Leyen y la comisaria Ylva Johansson ya visitaron estos países de América Latina. Yo anuncio a esta Casa que a finales de este mes visitaré Colombia, México, Perú y Brasil, precisamente para seguir trabajando para asegurarnos de que esta es una lucha europea, pero también una lucha global.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor Schinas, un comentario adicional: celebro mucho esta iniciativa en materia de puertos. Creo que es muy útil. Mucha de esta cocaína está viniendo por ahí. Siempre he hablado de la necesidad de una gran cooperación de las fachadas atlánticas, incluidos también los Estados Unidos e incluso, por qué no, los países del golfo de Guinea. Una alianza cuadrangular que implicaría también a países africanos.

Y me parece que el tema de los puertos es vital, y creo que tenemos que incrementar el número de contenedores. No puede ser que solo se chequeen o controlen el 5 % o el 3 % de los contenedores. Hay que chequear bastante más.

Margaritis Schinas, *vicepresidente de la Comisión*. –Señor Millán Mon, quiero celebrar esta iniciativa de la alianza europea de los puertos y quiero dar las gracias públicamente al comisario Paolo Gentiloni, que trabajó mucho conmigo para elaborar los detalles de esta nueva herramienta que ponemos en marcha a partir de mañana.

Efectivamente, la idea de esta alianza entre los puertos es precisamente obligar a las autoridades portuarias y aduaneras, que se enfrentan al mismo tipo de problemas, a organizar el mismo tipo de respuestas a través del intercambio de información, de procedimientos estandarizados y de una presencia informática y digital mucho más importante.

Por lo que se refiere al tema geográfico, efectivamente, las rutas son las conocidas. Trabajaremos como Unión Europea con todos. Con todos. No dejaremos a nadie fuera de este esfuerzo.

Acabo de completar una visita a cinco países de África occidental en la que precisamente se han abordado temas no solo de cooperación en el sector de la inmigración, sino también de seguridad. Y he encontrado interlocutores muy receptivos dispuestos a trabajar con nosotros. Esta es una lucha que se va a identificar a partir de mañana, pero no es una lucha que vaya a terminar pronto. Tenemos mucho que hacer todavía.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Herr talman! Kommissionär! Tack för det viktiga arbete som kommissionen gör i kampen mot terrorn, och nu är det viktigare än någonsin i Europa. I Sverige har vi en situation där barn skjuter barn, och den organiserade brottsligheten gör att Sverige befinner sig i ett nationellt nödläge.

Som socialdemokrat vet jag att den nationella välfärden med skola och föreningsliv är det starkaste verktyget för att vaccinera våra lokalsamhällen mot våld och gängkriminalitet. Men jag vet också att det krävs politisk samling, polisiärt arbete och ett europeiskt samarbete, för vapen, droger, brottslingar och pengar rör sig hela tiden över gränserna.

Så min fråga blir: Vad ser kommissionen att ni kan göra här och nu för att stötta Sverige i den mycket akuta kamp som vi för mot gängkriminalitet?

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I thank Ms Fritzon for her remarks. For us, organised crime increasingly looks like a multinational business, with global supply chains and increased technological capabilities that allow them to hide their crimes.

The bigger the threat of organised crime, the stronger our response should be at all levels: European, national and regional. At European level, we're fighting organised crime by exchanging information across borders, namely using our valuable Schengen Information System, which now includes biometric data.

As you rightly said, we are also fighting organised crime by engaging with local communities and we will host a major crime prevention conference next year. We are fighting drug trafficking very much along the lines I mentioned in my reply to your colleague Millán Mon a second ago.

We are infiltrating criminal communication networks like gaining lawful, I repeat, lawful police access to EncroChat and Sky ECC. We are fighting organised crime by reinforcing international law enforcement and judicial cooperation through our law enforcement agencies, Europol and Frontex, and working closely with Interpol.

And we are fighting international crime by following the money. Following the money is the safest way to fight the criminals. The new anti-money laundering legislation and the call has already been on the table, and I take this opportunity to call for the swift adoption of these proposals by this House.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Herr talman! Jag vill tacka kommissionären för svaret. Det är otroligt viktigt för oss i Sverige med det stöd som vi har från kommissionen när det gäller insatser, men också att vi har lagar, regler och verktyg på plats.

Jag ser gärna att vår kommissionär gör ett besök i Sverige. Det är ett mycket akut läge med våld och skjutningar. Jag vet att jag kan tala för alla föräldrar; man har en klump i magen varje dag när man vaknar upp till nyheter om att man har skjutit en tonåring, ett barn, igen.

Så jag ser fram emot just konferensen, men också att de här åtgärderna kommer på plats, och att vi kan inleda ett väldigt snabbt samarbete direkt med Sverige, och naturligtvis med de medlemsstater som är i samma situation eller en liknande situation.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission.* – Mr President, Ms Fritzon, let me assure you that Sweden is not alone in fighting these organised criminal gangs and in fighting organised crime.

Let me also assure you and welcome your invitation to visit: this is something indeed that I have also discussed with the government and I would be delighted to come.

I think by now it is becoming very clear that the fight against organised crime is a multidimensional equation, a multifactorial equation. I understand that there is a tendency at times to simplify the complexity around fighting organised crime. I understand that there are voices that like to project very simple solutions to very complex realities.

I have never followed this school of populism. I have always engaged in solutions, and solutions do not come through declaratory politics, through hate, through tensions and through friction, but by working together at all levels amongst ourselves, with our Member States, with national and regional communities.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, I want to ask a question about the possibility of an EU extradition treaty with the United Arab Emirates. As you know, a number of EU countries have already bilaterally signed extradition treaties with the UAE: Belgium, Netherlands and Denmark. A lot of these countries have in common that many of the leaders of organised crime gangs are currently in Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates.

In Ireland, the Kinahan crime gang are a global drugs and arms cartel and their activities have contributed to a cocaine epidemic in Ireland. As I am sure you aware, the ministers from the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Spain and France met in Antwerp in June for a discussion on organised crime and they co-signed a declaration supporting an EU extradition agreement with the United Arab Emirates.

So I would be keen to hear your views about whether or not you think this is appropriate. I'm aware of the safeguards that are necessary from human rights and the reciprocal demands from the UAE. But already Member States are doing this and it would be of tremendous help.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission.* – Today with some countries, clearly there is still less law enforcement and judicial cooperation, and criminals are aware of this and therefore use those countries as safe havens to escape investigations. The Commission will therefore work with these non-EU countries – I mentioned some of them earlier – to jointly reinforce international law enforcement and judicial cooperation, notably regarding financial investigation, recovery of criminal assets outside the EU, liaison officers from our Member States deployed in non-EU countries.

We furthermore explore the possibility of launching negotiations for the conclusion of specific EU extradition agreements and promote the universal signing and ratification of the Council of Europe Convention in the area of mutual legal assistance, extradition, freezing and compensation.

The honourable Member would clearly factor into his analysis that extraditing people to countries where the death penalty applies creates an additional complication.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President. I am aware of that, but as I mentioned, a number of Member States have already signed bilateral extradition treaties that would have the same anxiety that you've just underlined. According to the Belgian Justice Minister, and I quote: 'if I talk to my colleagues in Italy, Spain, Germany and France, they all have a wish list of the people that are hiding in Dubai, and they are not able to move on them to see them extradited to Europe'. I do accept points you've made, but I just want to add that by way of clarification.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to reiterate that we at the Commission stand ready to explore all options. But under the condition that the conditions for the respect of the fundamental rights would also have to be fulfilled.

Piernicola Pedicini (Verts/ALE). – Abbiamo certamente bisogno di una risposta europea al crimine organizzato, perché è un crimine che supera i confini nazionali.

Io provengo da un territorio nel quale si sono organizzate la mafia, la camorra, la 'ndrangheta, la Sacra corona unita e posso perciò dire con certezza che le mafie si nutrono di due ingredienti che però non figurano tutti in quelli elencati nel programma EMPACT.

Il primo è la povertà dei territori di provenienza e perciò i complici delle mafie sono i responsabili di quella povertà. Sono responsabili tutti quei governi che sottraggono risorse umane ed economiche, che tagliano sull'istruzione, che tagliano sulla sanità, che tagliano sul lavoro.

Il secondo ingrediente è costituito da tutti quei governi che usano il crimine organizzato per fare il lavoro sporco. Sto parlando di traffico delle armi con l'obiettivo di destabilizzare i governi in giro per il mondo. Se davvero l'Unione europea vuole combattere le mafie, deve essere pronta a denunciare quei governi amici che sono dietro le guerre, che armano le guerre, che finanziano le guerre e che provocano le guerre perché lo fanno con lo strumento del crimine organizzato.

Mi chiedo se la Commissione è al corrente di tutto questo.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Well, if I understood the question right, corruption is endemic and feeds the organised crime network. This is like a sequence, a closed cycle where corruption feeds illegal activities. Illegal activities generate a certain volume of revenues, which then feeds other activities by the organised crime. And this is the spiral of evil that we would like to undo.

May I repeat what I said to Ms Fritzon earlier that this is a holistic, global war on crime. But this global war, as all wars that have to be won, have to be won intelligently. And this would require very specific interventions along very specific lines of action.

Judging from your angle, that has to do with the Mafia-type operations, there I think our safest bet is to follow the money. And indeed, some of the most successful anti-Mafia operations have been through the intelligent use of following the money.

This takes me again to the point that I made earlier, if you allow me to repeat it, that we now have on the table robust proposals for a new generation of instruments for anti-money laundering. I plead for a speedy, swift adoption of this legislation by this House. That would be an additional tool in our toolbox.

Piernicola Pedicini (Verts/ALE). – Solo per una precisazione. Io ho un fatto riferimento preciso al traffico di armi.

Faccio un esempio per essere più chiaro: quando è nata al-Qaeda, al tempo della dissoluzione della ex Jugoslavia, la mafia gli ha fornito le armi. Lo stesso è avvenuto con l'Isis e lo stesso sta avvenendo adesso in Ucraina. È questo che sto dicendo. È di questo che vorrei avere risposta.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission.* – Yes, this is a more specific question compared to the original one, which was linked to the Mafia.

If your angle is only on arms trafficking, arms trafficking is illegal under all possible definitions of law, national and European. We have rules in place. We have consistently pursued this and we have very specific rules also for importing arms into the European Union.

This arsenal of legislation is there. I'm sorry to abuse of the term 'arsenal'. You can call it a 'toolkit' or 'rulebook'. We have the rules, but we need to make sure that they are uniformly adopted across the European Union.

Let me also take this opportunity to tell you that in the security union report, which we will also be presenting tomorrow, this rule of uniform application of existing legislation in the area of security would be at the top of our agenda. We will have infringement procedures against those Member States that are not adopting or implementing the rules that we have agreed, and this covers the issue of arms trafficking, arms imports and arms circulation.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Mr President, Commissioner Schinas. One of the countries in which organised crime has been on a steep rise since the onset of the millennium is Sweden. 20 years ago, Sweden used to have the least amount of deadly shootings in Europe; now it's at the top. The only country not at war with more bombings than Sweden is Mexico. Europe would do itself a favour by asking how this was allowed to happen.

For many years, Sweden was in a state of denial. The size of the migration had nothing to do with failed integration, they said. Now, to prevent and to fight organised crime, we must recognise the connection between mass migration and the steep rise in organised crime and violence. The fight against illegal migration must take priority over the universal right to apply for asylum, and illegal residents must be expelled.

This won't solve anything, Commissioner. It won't solve everything, but it would give some breathing room in a situation where the criminal organisations have 30 000 members in Sweden, while there are only 11 000 police officers. My question to you, Commissioner, is: are you ready to commit yourself to anything of this?

President. – Just before giving the floor to Commissioner Schinas, I would like to make reminder that the showing of pictures is not allowed, according to our Rules.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission.* – Let me say not only to Mr Weimers, but also to this House that radicalisation does not happen in the carpeted halls of the European Parliament. It happens in our schools. It happens in our streets, in our prisons, and it happens online. So radicalisation is also a threat that we need to be able to address effectively and intelligently.

Our first line of defence is local practitioners. This is what the Radicalisation Awareness Network that we have established has done in training teachers, workers, community police officers, child protection workers, and mental health care professionals. This is how you fight radicalisation.

I understand that there is a temptation in the minds of a certain school of thought to simplify and project all this as Europe's fault, but that begs the question: what Europe are we talking about? Because if Mr Weimers has in mind criminals, radicalised terrorists, and tries to construct the argument that this is Brussels, then the counterargument is: why did the terrorist who shot two Swedish citizens and killed them yesterday not returned, as he should have been for years, under the rules that we have not yet been able to enact? Why? Because the Returns Directive is the only element of the Pact on Migration and Asylum that you don't like, for which the European Parliament has not yet adopted a common position. So you cannot denounce Europe for failing to enact the rules that we propose because the Returns Directive is not yet adopted.

I'm saying this to call again for some cool, sober analysis of a very complex situation. I can simplify too, but I will resist this temptation. Let's stick to the facts; let's change our rules; let's work together; and let's fight the radicals and the terrorists head-on without simplification.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Mr President, I am not simplifying anything here. I'm just stating the facts that failed migration policies to Sweden have led to a very urgent situation in which, as I said, there are 30 000 members of these gangs, not Islamist gangs, but violent drug-trafficking, weapons-trafficking gangs. And they are killing each other, and people –innocent people – are suffering. And I am asking you to focus on this in your future work.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Yes. We have proposed as part of our proposal for a Return Directive to have mandatory forced return for people with security backgrounds like convictions, threat to public order and security. Do it quickly and do it without period of voluntary return notice. These rules have not yet been enacted. It is Europe that wants them to enact, it's Europe that pushes this legislation, so Europe cannot be responsible for the problem, because we are responsible for the remedy. And I take again this opportunity to ask for this House, from all wings of this House, that we move quickly with a common position on the Return Directive. We need the Return Directive as part of our overall migration policy, and I would very much hope, very much hope, that in the light of the brutal terrorist attacks in Belgium yesterday and in France a few days ago, we do not lose more time on the need and the urgency to have them adopted. This would be the least we can do to complete the overall security puzzle around terrorism.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, I wasn't going to ask this originally, but given the sense that you raise this point yourself now with the Return Directive, I share your need for having a Return Directive, an upgraded Return Directive. But how do you feel about the direction that this Return Directive is heading in in the Parliament? Do you see a need for a Return Directive if there is actually nothing in there of the original proposal by the European Commission, if the mandatory forced return of people with security background is actually deleted, if the possibility for detention is diminished, if the possibility for determining risk of absconding is less flexible than it should be? How do you feel about a Return Directive that goes into that direction?

Secondly, my original question: crime is cross-border. Crime is by definition cross-border and it needs a European answer. We see that the police is doing great work and the possibilities are there to cooperate. What we also see is that local authorities – and you mentioned local communities – are trying to play their part, but are hampered in their cross-border cooperation because of the lack of a legal base. Do you agree that we should help local authorities' cross-border cooperation and can you do anything from your side to facilitate that?

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr Lenaers, dear Jeroen, as you know, I have been a Member of this House. I was a Member of the European Parliament, and I have the fullest respect to the proceedings of this House. And one thing that I learned from experience is that I never comment intentions of this House. I comment positions of this House. And this is the moment now to have a common position on the Returns Directive.

It matters a lot because, as your colleagues will tell you, Tomas Tobé, Fabienne Keller, who are building now a new asylum and migration pact, this will never be convincing unless we have a Returns Directive, a returns culture developing alongside.

So how this would look? Well, I know what we have proposed. I may repeat it. Swift returns for people with security background. People with convictions. People we have proof of being aggressive to public order security without period of voluntary return. We know what kind of people we are talking about. This is the kind of person that killed the two Swedish nationals. These are the people that we need to be able to send back, to avoid having them absconded, to avoid having them fall through the cracks.

So this is an urgency. It's a priority. And this would solidify; this will bring equilibrium into our migration and asylum pact house that we are building.

On the other part of your question: yes, I fully agree that local authorities have a role to play in security, and there is a success story that we would like very much to emulate, which is the city of Nice.

The city of Nice, immediately after the terrible terrorist attack of 14 July 2016, with our help, has built up a great security-proof design of public space. They have completely redesigned the public spaces of the city. They have set up effective control systems for crowd management, security equipment, with our help. And I would very much suggest and recommend that all local authorities that need to get a security check could visit Nice. The Commission is ready to help.

President. – Follow-up questions are only in the first round, I'm sorry, and you had the chance to ask two questions in the first round. Those are the rules of the debate.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Thank you very much, Mr President, and thank you for this timely discussion against the backdrop of the action plan against drugs and the European Port Alliance. And it's about ports that I want to raise my question. As you know, ports are key access for high-volume illicit drug imports. And they target mostly the bigger ports like Antwerp, Rotterdam, Hamburg. Can I give you an example? In 2022, nearly 110 tonnes of cocaine was seized in the port of Antwerp, making it the biggest entry point of cocaine in the world, taking over from Amsterdam the year before. And as you know, the consequences in our society are huge, but also in the cities that are linked to this because we see increased violence, bombings and shootings in my own town are a sad example. I have two questions: You mentioned already the importance of working together between customs authorities, can you be a little bit more specific how you see that? Because already today Rotterdam and Antwerp are working closely together. And from the Europol reports, we know that these gangs and these criminal organisations, they rely very much on insiders in the ports. And how will the support strategy help to combat corruption there?

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission.* – Thank you, Ms Van Brempt. Indeed, three points on your very pertinent question.

First of all, why ports matter. Well, because as logistic hubs, our ports contribute to around 75 % of our external trade and 31 % of internal trade volumes. Because of these numbers, they are particularly vulnerable to drug smuggling and exploitation by high-risk, high-technology-driven criminal networks.

This is why, with Paolo Gentiloni, we wanted to bring in this Ports Alliance element into our roadmap that you will see tomorrow, and in particular within this mobilise the customs community.

The customs community needs to strengthen risk management and target more effectively the controls in the ports to account for the fact that 70 % of all drug seizures happen in the ports.

So we will continue to use the so-called CCEI, the customs control equipment instrument, a programme that we support from the EU, and we will be allocating more than EUR 200 million to fund state-of-the-art equipment that can help customs officers to scan containers and check imports for hidden consignments of illicit drugs in a more systematic and big scale.

As to the more specific issue of Belgium and the Netherlands, you will certainly know that both countries have joined efforts with the leading multinational shipping companies to improve controls and exchange information on drug trafficking in the ports of Antwerp and Rotterdam. It is important that in this fight we also involve the private sector and one of the key actions of our European Ports Alliance is precisely not only the link with the international partners, but also the effective link with the private sector operators in the shipping sector that they can do more to help.

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Herr talman! I går slog terrorn återigen till med full kraft. Svenskar valdes ut i ett islamistiskt terrordåd. Sverige, Belgien och Europa behöver nu höja säkerheten för att öka tryggheten.

Men något som också terroriserar Europas medborgare är den organiserade brottsligheten. I Sverige lever vi i dag med skjutningar, sprängningar, barn som skjuter barn, oskyldiga som drabbas. Men gängkriminaliteten finns överallt. De kriminella nätverken, 70 procent av de kriminella nätverken, opererar i minst tre medlemsländer samtidigt.

Kommissionär Schinas, behöver vi inte ett mer kraftfullt Europol? Behöver vi inte ett Europol som är mer operativt för att kunna stoppa droger och vapen från att komma in i Europa och som verkligen ser till att vi jagar de kriminella så att de inte har makten över våra samhällen?

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission.* – First of all, Mr Tomas, dear Tobé, let me reiterate my deepest condolences for the loss of your compatriots yesterday in Brussels. I think all Europeans, not only Belgians and Swedes, feel the same outrage against this senseless, barbaric terrorist attack that some intend to dress with ideology. For us, it is clear that this is pure and simple brutal murder.

There is, of course, a correlation between drug trafficking and increased violence, as there is clearly a correlation with the broader geopolitical developments happening in the Middle East. Our role as the European Union is to work at all levels. There is no security button to push in Brussels that would automatically improve the situation at all levels. This is a very complex, multi-level and multi-computational story. Europol is already doing a lot, both in terms of following very closely the organised transborder criminals, but also on prevention with a very improved technological means that they now have in place as a result of the new mandate that we have approved some years ago, and with an estimated number of 35 million illicit firearms in civilian hands in the EU, you understand what I was telling your colleague earlier, that we need to prioritise the new rules on firearms that we have proposed last October. Now is the time to prioritise these proposals. Same applies to the argument that I made with regard to the Return Directive. We have proposals, we have tools on the table that we now need to enact into legislation and make sure that they apply in a uniform way across the European Union.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). –Mr President, thank you Commissioner for being here. As you know, the ruthlessness of international criminal networks has a huge impact on our societies. And the brutal murders of, for example, Dutch lawyer Derk Wiersum, innocent people killed by mistake and the tragic death, of course, of Peter de Vries are prime examples.

Cross-border crime needs cross-border solutions. So the ports of Rotterdam and Antwerp have been already mentioned. But I want to ask you, should we not try to prevent the drugs from arriving in these ports? If we wait until the drugs arrive in the ports, we might be late. So we should also address this at the roots – 'upstream disruption', as it's called.

What are the Commission's plans on assisting in the fight against the production of drugs in countries such as Colombia and also inside the European Union? Because, for example, the production of synthetic drugs in the Netherlands is a root cause of streams inside the European Union. So to what extent are you also facilitating and improving the exchange of experiences and best practices between Member States with this regard?

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission.* – I had the chance already to reply to a previous question on the importance of engaging with Latin American countries, precisely to engage on the upstream prevention track, which is equally important as is the work we do with ports at the import moment.

The Belgian Minister for Interior, Annelies Verlinden, together with Ylva Johansson, they already visited Latin America and President von der Leyen did the same a few months later. And I am going end of October to four Latin American countries, not only to discuss issues that pertain to my portfolio, but also, more particularly, to continue engaging on the upstream cooperation on drugs.

We are doing a lot in these countries, helping the law enforcement agencies, supporting projects that help us. We now hope that the engagement of the shipping companies will add value to our work among states. This is clearly an element, where without the cooperation of our shipping companies, it's not easy to work. And I have already asked our EU Drugs Agency, which is located in Lisbon, to also get themselves involved in projects and sign cooperation agreements. They will be signing one in a few weeks' time, before my arrival, with Peru. So in a way, this is the track. The work stream that you indicated is very much in line with what we design and what we try to achieve in practice.

Caterina Chinnici (PPE). – La criminalità organizzata in tutte le sue forme, lo abbiamo detto, così come il terrorismo, purtroppo lo abbiamo appena visto, minaccia la sicurezza, la libertà, i diritti dei cittadini, i valori dell'Unione, di tutta l'Unione, non di singoli Stati perché i gruppi criminali organizzati non conoscono confini.

E allora serve una risposta che sia autenticamente comune e che, come nell'esperienza maturata nel mio paese, l'Italia, sia fondata su scambio di informazioni, cooperazione, coordinamento e contrasto patrimoniale, il «Follow the money» da Lei stesso citato.

E allora bene la strategia del 2021, i provvedimenti sin qui adottati fino alle più recenti direttive su confisca e corruzione, ma non basta. Di tutti gli «EU crimes» la criminalità organizzata è forse l'unica ancora regolata da un atto pre-Lisbona.

E allora io ho due domande per Lei: Le vorrei chiedere qual è l'esito dello studio avviato dalla Commissione per valutare se la decisione quadro 841 del 2008 sia ancora adeguata allo scopo o non sia piuttosto un'arma spuntata contro la criminalità organizzata, come molti sostengono.

E poi, se intende la Commissione, finalmente direi, proporre una direttiva organica come è stato fatto per il terrorismo nella passata legislatura, che sia proprio indirizzata a contrastare le attuali organizzazioni criminali, vere e proprie imprese spesso a vocazione globale.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – We have taken the decision under this Commission to work in the area of security by building an EU security union under a single roof. We did that precisely to harmonise the very fragmented and silo-type approach that many of our actions in the past used to have.

This single EU security union house precisely allows us to help to fight organised crime by activating everything we have across the policy board. So, it's not a question of fighting organised crime only with regulatory options that are tailored to organised crime. We fight with everything we have in our disposal. Everything: anti-money laundering legislation, proposals for sanctions, external relations, international relations. And, of course, we have proposals, as part of our strategy against our organised crime, as I was saying earlier: the 'follow the money' proposals for asset recovery and confiscation package. Unfortunately, these proposals have not yet been adopted.

Before engaging in other, new types of initiatives under this EU security union house, we need – especially as we are approaching the last stretch of the current political cycle – to have all these pending proposals adopted and complete our toolbox.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, mi u Hrvatskoj imamo velikih problema s organiziranim kriminalom. On je na svim razinama, pa tako i na političkoj razini.

Naša vladajuća stranka pravomoćno je osuđena, ponavljam, pravomoćno je osuđena od strane Vrhovnog suda Republike Hrvatske da je kriminalna organizacija. Dakle, govorimo o organiziranom kriminalu. Zato što su organizirali sistemsku pljačku svega – javnih poduzeća, naftne kompanije, pošte, željeznice, čega god hoćete. Ti isti ljudi dolaze u Bruxelles, dolaze u Strasbourg, druže se s Komisijom, kao da su vaši najveći prijatelji. Teško je uvjeriti građane Hrvatske da nekakva borba protiv korupcije ili europske vrijednosti doista postoje ako nema apsolutno nikakvih mjera protiv ogromne sistemske političke korupcije u Republici Hrvatskoj.

Dakle, moje pitanje je ima li Komisija ikakve mjere ili namjere stati na kraj korupciji, političkoj, u Hrvatskoj, Bugarskoj i raznim drugim zemljama?

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Okay, probably Mr Sinčić would have liked, would have preferred to take this argument in the national parliamentary debate. This is the House of European Democracy. This is the European Parliament. And in the European Parliament, as is the case in the European Union, the rule of law applies. Democracy applies. The fight against corruption applies. And all this is not declaratory. This is rule based and not only rule based, but also linked to our economic governance. Because many of these policy objectives are now being embedded into the so-called semester, the European Semester process, which links the economic policy mix with the reforms that are necessary to sustain it. So, yes, the European Union is a force of good. And if things go wrong, the European Union has the tools, the structures and the instruments to correct any wrongdoings. OLAF, EPPO, the Ombudsman, we have structures and also this House controls the proper implementation of the EU budget. So this is the European way of looking at, what seems to me, a very national approach to the issues we are discussing today.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-Président, les causes et les conséquences de la criminalité organisée liée au trafic de drogue en Europe sont multiples et elles doivent trouver – vous l'avez dit, Monsieur Schinás – des réponses systémiques.

Certaines ont déjà été évoquées dans la séance de questions-réponses, mais, outre la nécessaire approche répressive contre les criminels, il faut aussi d'urgence des mesures d'ordre économique, social, culturel, mais aussi des politiques destinées à la jeunesse pour prévenir le développement des activités criminelles, notamment dans des quartiers précarisés et au sein des populations déjà précarisées. La criminalité organisée ne peut plus être une voie profitable pour des enfants en déshérence.

D'autre part, les populations des quartiers affectés par les règlements de compte et la violence généralisée doivent aussi pouvoir bénéficier de notre soutien. Utilisons les profits de ces crimes – qui sont confisqués – pour la prévention et pour le soutien aux communautés affectées.

Et donc quelles sont ces mesures de prévention que vous apportez et qui sont mises en place? Quelles sont les mesures d'accompagnement qui sont prévues, pour les communautés affectées, mais aussi pour les jeunes, qui sont forcés de collaborer à la criminalité organisée? Enfin, que penser de la volonté d'Europol de mettre fin à ce chiffrage de bout en bout, dans le cadre de ses missions de lutte contre la criminalité organisée? La surveillance généralisée est-elle vraiment la solution? Le respect de la vie privée et la confidentialité des échanges ne sont-ils pas des prérequis dans un État de droit?

Margaritis Schinas, *vice-président de la Commission*. – Oui, Madame Bricmont, je suis d'accord avec vous: quand on aborde des questions sociétales d'une telle complexité, comme les drogues, la criminalité, effectivement, les réponses que nous devons apporter doivent être des réponses holistiques.

Et en effet, l'angle qui prévaut, ici, cet après-midi, est l'angle sécuritaire. Mais vous soulignez, à juste titre, que, en amont, il faut œuvrer pour construire des sociétés cohésives, résilientes, justes, où il n'y a pas de marginalisation, où tout le monde peut avoir sa chance, où il y a une économie compétitive qui offre des possibilités à tout le monde, et non seulement aux élites.

Tout cela s'inscrit dans ce que nous faisons dans l'Union européenne. J'utilise ici la première personne du pluriel car c'est un combat partagé. Vous connaissez les dépenses du budget de l'Union pour la cohésion, pour l'inclusion sociale, pour la lutte contre le chômage, pour la lutte contre la marginalisation. Vous connaissez les projets nationaux de notre plan de relance: dans chaque projet national du plan de relance, il y a une enveloppe centrée sur les personnes, qui porte sur les compétences, sur le développement du capital humain.

Et puis il y a un volet qui fait aussi partie de mon portefeuille: le domaine des vecteurs d'intégration, comme l'éducation, le sport, la jeunesse. Tout cela représente un peu ce que nous appelons le «mode de vie européen», expression que vous n'avez pas beaucoup aimée au début de ce mandat. Mais je pense que, quatre ans plus tard, tout le monde se rend compte que ce «mode de vie européen» est une réalité tangible, qui nous entoure et qu'il faut promouvoir et défendre à la fois.

Dernier point, sur la surveillance: je connais et je respecte la sensibilité que vous avez à l'égard de cette question. Je connais aussi votre travail. La surveillance n'est admise, selon la loi de l'Union, que si elle est autorisée par les instances judiciaires et uniquement quand elle cible les «méchants» – *the bad guys*. Les autres n'ont rien à craindre.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Mr President, Commissioner, the fight against organised crime is obviously an area where European cooperation is a welcome thing. We all agree about that; it is very important.

However, these efforts are completely undermined by the EU-conceived Brussels policy on migration, in my view. We are at a situation right now where criminal organisations or human smugglers are the ones who really decide who can come to Europe in the end. There are NGOs who tacitly cooperate with them and they transport these people into Europe instead of returning them to where they came from.

Now it is certainly not a European interest to allow people in great numbers to come to Europe who really don't belong here, who don't share our values, who don't share our culture and our way of thinking, people who have really nothing to do with Europe and who pose a danger to Europeans, very often a deadly danger, as we have sadly seen over the past few days.

Now, Commissioner, would you agree with me that the only way to avoid this situation and to have a new chapter would be to make sure that the decision on who can enter Europe and who cannot is made outside of the European Union? And, related to that, strong border protection is reinstated with the …

(The President cut off the speaker)

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission.* – Mr President, thank you all, honourable Members, for the quality of this question time. I really appreciate it.

On the questions posed, let me distinguish between one, which is the overall framework for migration and asylum. I said the other time, in the last plenary, that everything that we do not like about migration in Europe nowadays is the direct consequence of the fact that we still do not have the agreement on an EU Pact on Migration and Asylum. The lack of agreement is the major pull factor that the smugglers exploit to organise the type of activities that you don't like.

If you want to correct what we don't like, I would very much appreciate that you personally and your group and others like-minded help us to get this deal through. After decades of failure, we are now nearing a historic agreement that, for the first time, will enable the European Union to have a cohesive, holistic, global framework for migration and asylum anchored in EU law, financed by EU resources, applicable by EU institutions.

Let us see if, when we have it, the situation will be the same as the one that you are denouncing. I take the opportunity and I salute the presence of the Secretary of State for the Spanish Presidency, who has been one of the key architects of this historic deal that we are now nearing.

Last point on extraterritorial options, solutions: this is a debate that refuses to go away. But having it does not mean that we're coming closer to a feasible outcome. These are ideas that have been floated, tested, proven and failed. So I'm not a fan of extra-territoriality. I believe that the European Union should live up to its name as a Union and find solutions with ourselves. We cannot subcontract to others our legal, moral and political obligations.

President. – That concludes Question Time.

IN THE CHAIR: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

14. Composición del Comité Consultivo sobre la Conducta de los Diputados

President. – This is an announcement to state that, in accordance with Article 7 of the Code of Conduct for Members of the European Parliament regarding integrity and transparency, the amended version of which will enter into force on 1 November 2023, I have decided to appoint the following Members to the newly-established Advisory committee on the conduct of Members, with effect from 1 November 2023: Danuta Maria Hübner, Giuliano Pisapia, Gilles Boyer, Heidi Hautala, Geert Bourgeois, Gerolf Annemans, Helmut Scholz and Monika Hohlmeier.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

15. Correcciones de errores (artículo 241 del Reglamento interno)(curso dado)

Der Präsident. – Gemäß Artikel 241 Absatz 4 der Geschäftsordnung möchte ich Ihnen mitteilen, dass zu den drei Berichtigungen des IMCO-Ausschusses, die dem Plenum gestern bei der Eröffnung der Sitzung bekannt gegeben wurden, kein Antrag auf Abstimmung gestellt wurde. Die Berichtigungen gelten damit als angenommen.

16. Escasez de agua e inversiones estructurales para el acceso al agua en la Unión (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu Wasserknappheit und zu strukturellen Investitionen in den Zugang zu Wasser in der EU (2023/2894(RSP)).

Pascual Navarro Ríos, *presidente en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, garantizar el acceso a un agua limpia y asequible es esencial para las personas, para la naturaleza y para regular el clima, tal y como se subrayó en la Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Agua el pasado mes de marzo. Efectivamente, el agua es un aliado vital para proteger la salud humana, fomentar la diversidad biológica y garantizar la seguridad alimentaria. El agua es crucial para la economía, la producción de energía y la agricultura.

En Europa y en todo el mundo numerosos retos relacionados entre sí están llevando al límite los recursos hídricos. El cambio climático está agravando rápidamente el riesgo de escasez de agua. El aumento de la temperatura a escala mundial está incrementando la frecuencia y la intensidad de sequías e inundaciones también en Europa. Los cambios en los patrones meteorológicos y los modelos de precipitaciones tienen repercusiones en suministros de agua que antes eran previsibles. De acuerdo con la Agencia Europea de Medio Ambiente, el estrés hídrico ya es una realidad en varias partes de Europa. El 20 % del territorio europeo y el 30 % de la ciudadanía europea se enfrenta a problemas de escasez de agua durante un año y medio. Mi propio país, España, es uno de los más afectados por la situación actual de escasez.

Señorías, las señales son claras y debemos actuar. En primer lugar, a escala mundial, debemos cumplir las promesas del Acuerdo de París y del Pacto Verde Europeo. En segundo lugar, a escala europea, debemos continuar aplicando una política de aguas sostenible y seguir mejorando la calidad de las aguas de nuestros ríos para que nuestras masas de agua alcancen el objetivo de buen estado, a más tardar en 2027 como se estipula en la Directiva Marco sobre el Agua. También debemos aplicar íntegramente la nueva Directiva sobre el agua potable que ha dotado a la Unión de una de las normas más estrictas del mundo en materia de agua potable. No obstante, los Estados miembros tendrán que seguir invirtiendo para aumentar la disponibilidad de agua potable y su seguridad.

La innovación y la tecnología son cruciales para guiar estas inversiones y para que resulten rentables. Las inversiones deben también cubrir el tratamiento de los contaminantes emergentes como las hormonas, los productos farmacéuticos y los residuos de productos cosméticos. A este respecto permítanme subrayar algunas de las propuestas legislativas clave para hacer frente a la escasez de agua y garantizar su calidad, en las que el Consejo está trabajando bajo presidencia española.

Las negociaciones interinstitucionales se están llevando a buen ritmo con el fin de alcanzar un texto transaccional definitivo para la Directiva de emisiones industriales, cuyo objetivo será reducir las emisiones perjudiciales de las instalaciones industriales y la ganadería intensiva.

En segundo lugar, como saben, ayer, el Consejo de Medio Ambiente adoptó una orientación general acerca de la Directiva sobre el tratamiento de aguas residuales y urbanas —es una buena noticia – y todo está listo para comenzar las negociaciones con el Parlamento. Es importante que obtengamos un resultado que permita seguir mejorando la calidad del agua y fomentar su reutilización.

También estamos avanzando satisfactoriamente en la actualización de la lista de contaminantes y las normas de calidad de la Directiva marco sobre el agua, la Directiva sobre las aguas subterráneas y la Directiva sobre las normas de calidad medioambiental en el ámbito de la política de aguas. Y esperamos disponer de un texto transaccional antes de que finalice el año.

Como ven estamos actuando desde distintos frentes y puedo garantizarles que el Consejo seguirá trabajando sobre todas estas cuestiones.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Secretary of State. Let me start by thanking you for adding this important point to today's agenda. It shows once more the strong interest of this House in securing sustainable water management and access to clean water for all citizens.

Water has been high on our political agenda since the beginning of this mandate, and your support in raising further awareness is crucial. The early signs of water stress in Europe are already visible today. The global water cycle is changing. The new normal already includes prolonged droughts followed by floods in the same region, and the EU put robust rules in place to protect water and aquatic ecosystems.

If those rules were respected in full, many elements of the current crisis would be less pressing, but a large number of ongoing infringement cases related to water shows that this is simply not happening yet. Drought and climate change exacerbate the problem. The first ever European Climate Risk Assessment, due in spring 2024, will surely remind us again of this reality and the need to take action in line with the EU adaptation strategy.

All in all, this means we need a different approach. We need a systemic transformation of the way water is managed, used and valued, while always bearing in mind the need to protect nature and ecosystems. This is one reason why president von der Leyen, in her letter of intent to the European Parliament and the Council a few weeks ago, announced a water resilience initiative as one of the priorities for 2024.

While we have already made progress, we know there is still a lot to do. Despite our efforts to improve water efficiency, demand is still growing in some sectors, and leakage levels in drinking water supply systems are unacceptably high. Over-abstraction and the over-allocation of water resources must come down. Major water users like industry, energy, transport and agriculture must do more to integrate water efficiency and water protection into their everyday practice.

It took a major crisis to teach us how precious our energy is. It is time to apply a different mind-set to water as well. Rather than waiting for a crisis to happen, we need to prepare by taking comprehensive action. The 'efficiency first' principle must from now on apply to water, while also ensuring it remains affordable for all. Also, 20 years after adoption of the Water Framework Directive, we find that its pricing instrument is not used enough to promote a more efficient use – far from it. We need to address this as well.

The truth is that in 2023, we still have not reduced pollution as much as we should. Only 31% of surface waters in Europe reach good chemical status. The result is an enormous reduction in the quantity of water that is fit for use. The fastest route to reducing pollution is set out in two proposals still pending before Council and Parliament. So your support for a revised list of water pollutants and the recast of the Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive is therefore fundamental.

Council adopted a general approach on the revisions of the Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive yesterday. We are ready to start trilogues as soon as possible. We also need more action to ensure that the human right to safe and clean drinking water and sanitation is a reality throughout the EU. This is why the recast Drinking Water Directive and our proposed recast of the Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive introduced new obligations on access to water for human consumption and sanitation, in particular for vulnerable and marginalised people.

Special attention should be given to the outermost regions. For example, Mayotte is facing an unprecedented water and humanitarian crisis due to a major drought and the resulting lack of drinking water, and this is why the commission is providing EUR 47.5 million to Mayotte for investments in water infrastructure.

The engine of the water cycle is our planet. We have to look after this engine. If we want adequate supplies of clean water, we need to nurture and restore the ecosystems that purify water and hold it in store – our soils, our forests, our rivers and our wetlands, plus our marine waters where our fisheries and coastal communities depend on unpolluted water for fisheries, aquaculture and tourism. This is why the Commission's proposal on the Nature Restoration Law and the Soil Monitoring Law are both so important. They are key for protecting our natural systems that provide us freshwater.

However, legislation alone will not solve these problems. An exit from the crisis will require firm action on many sides. For that, we also need to scale up and upgrade our investments in water. According to the OECD, current EU spending on water supply and sanitation amounts to around EUR 86 billion per year. By the year 2030, that need will grow by a huge amount, by up to EUR 255 billion.

When we speak of investments in water infrastructure, we speak of 'must' investments, including research and innovation, to protecting river basins, the premier natural barrier against drought. Ground zero for resilience to droughts is healthy river basins that can absorb rainwater, replenish our ground waters and slowly release it over time.

Between 2021 and 2027, some EUR 13 billion of Cohesion Policy funds will be invested in water services, water reuse and wastewater collection and treatment. One result of that will be clean water supplies to 16.5 million people. In addition to that, in their National Recovery and Resilience Plans, Member States allocate EUR 12 billion for water. This is significant, but modest in scale.

To improve water resilience, the available EU resources should be used to the fullest, and we should also ensure full exploitation of potential support provided by the Common Agricultural Policy. Farmers need help in the transition to a more sustainable water use, increasing water efficiency, lowering pollution and switching to drought-resilient crops. The Commission, through the Technical Support Instrument, is providing expertise to increase water efficiency and restructure the water sector.

Honourable Members, let me conclude by highlighting once again the importance of sustainable, resilient water management and of protecting the quality and quantity of fresh water by increasing the resilience of the water system and of sectors that rely on it. We move away from crisis management and we move towards the proactive management of risk. That is what we need for citizens today and for the water-stressed citizens of tomorrow.

Pernille Weiss, *for PPE-Gruppen.* – Hr. Formand! Så debatterer vi vand igen her i Europa-Parlamentet. Det gjorde vi også for to uger siden, og vi gjorde det også sidste måned. Men det er som om, vi ikke rigtig kommer til bunds med de udfordringer og de muligheder, vi har med vand i Europa. Udfordringer, der handler om, at nogle steder er der for meget af det, og andre steder er der for lidt. Udfordringer, der handler om, at vandets ressourcer ikke udnyttes godt nok, mens det cirkulerer rundt i vores samfund. Udfordringer, der handler om, at vandet nogle steder ikke er rent nok til mennesker på land eller sundt nok til fisk i havet. Der er masser at tale om, når vi taler om vandet, problemet er bare, at vi plasker lidt rundt imellem emnerne og kommer som sagt ikke rigtig til bunds og op igen til overfladen med en struktureret plan for, hvad vi gør, når debatten er slut. Derfor er det velkomment, at Kommissionen for sit nyeste arbejdsprogram skriver, at den vil tage et vandinitiativ for modstandsdygtighed i det første kvartal af 2024. Spørgsmålet til denne debat i dag er derfor: Hvad bør Kommissionens vandinitiativ så indeholde? Lad mig komme med et par bud: Lad det blive startskuddet for, at vi snarest får en EU »blue deal«, som vi har en EU »green deal«. Kom gerne med skitsen til en ægte holistisk, ambitiøs, struktureret og evidensbaseret deal, som kan aktivere alle relevante politiske tematikker angående vand. Vand handler jo ikke kun om kvaliteten af det, men også om energi, kritiske råmaterialer, fødevareproduktion, biodiversitet, infrastruktur, vandøkosystemer, forskning og meget mere. Giv os et forslag til en EU »blue deal«, som får det hele med – både i bredden og i dybden – så EU kan blive ægte vandsmart, samtidig med at vi styrker vores økonomi og globale konkurrencedygtighed.

Nora Mebarek, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, le Conseil et la Commission viennent de rappeler que l'accès à l'eau est vital pour le vivant. Pour autant, l'archipel de Mayotte, qui traverse une sécheresse exceptionnelle, est confronté depuis plusieurs mois à de graves pénuries d'eau. Boire, se laver, laver son linge: tout est compliqué lorsque l'eau n'est disponible que dix-huit heures tous les trois jours.

Je voudrais exprimer ici toute ma compassion envers la population mahoraise, qui est malheureusement trop souvent confrontée aux manquements coupables de l'État français. Car, si l'Union européenne, grâce à ses fonds structurels, apporte un concours vital au soutien de la région la plus pauvre d'Europe, elle ne saurait masquer la cruelle faillite des autorités françaises, qui n'envisagent plus Mayotte qu'à travers un prisme sécuritaire et délaissent ainsi l'accès aux biens communs que sont l'eau et la santé.

Pour répondre à l'urgence, la Commission a indiqué que les reliquats du Fonds européen d'aide aux plus démunis pouvaient être mobilisés pour permettre la distribution gratuite d'eau dans le département. Parce que tout citoyen européen, où qu'il se trouve, devrait avoir accès à l'eau potable, les Mahorais ont besoin avant tout d'un choc d'investissement humain et financier de l'État français.

Stéphane Bijoux, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Secrétaire général, chers collègues, bien évidemment les humains ne peuvent pas vivre sans eau. Pour mille raisons – biologiques, sanitaires, économiques, humanitaires – nous avons impérativement besoin d'eau.

Cette crise de l'eau frappe le monde et est devenue une urgence. C'est même une urgence vitale pour les Européens à Mayotte. En ce moment même, près de 300 000 personnes, 300 000 Européens n'ont plus d'eau. Des hommes, des femmes, des milliers d'enfants sont dans une grande souffrance. Bien évidemment, le gouvernement français intervient et organise la solidarité nationale.

On peut certes polémiquer, on peut tomber dans la facilité de la polémique populiste, mais les Mahorais attendent surtout des solutions durables. Comme chacun de nous, ils savent que le monde entier va être frappé par cette crise de l'eau. Et à cet égard, Mayotte envoie en quelque sorte un signal d'alarme mondial.

Nous devons nous organiser, nous devons accompagner et favoriser le changement de nos modes de vie, comme nous devons – surtout – investir dans des infrastructures et dans des technologies innovantes. Ce combat pour l'eau doit devenir un grand combat européen. C'est un devoir de solidarité. C'est surtout un impératif d'avenir.

Benoît Biteau, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, sur fond de changement climatique, l'accès à l'eau, sur le plan quantitatif comme sur le plan qualitatif, va être absolument central. C'est d'ailleurs dans ce sens-là que, il y a déjà un an maintenant, j'avais sollicité l'émergence d'une conférence européenne.

L'eau est un bien commun vital que nous devons réapprendre à partager afin de sortir des logiques d'accaparement au profit de certaines activités économiques. L'agriculture, premier consommateur de ce bien commun vital, est au cœur de cet enjeu de partage. Or, si nous devons engager des politiques publiques d'investissement en faveur de la gestion de l'eau, elles ne peuvent absolument pas s'inscrire dans des fuites en avant – comme les mégabassines, par exemple – et doivent, au contraire, soutenir un changement de pratiques au lieu d'exiger des réponses qui prolongent l'enfermement de l'agriculture dans des modèles éculés.

Notre salut passe par une restauration efficace du grand cycle de l'eau, afin de ralentir les écoulements. Il faut retenir l'eau dans les zones humides et permettre son infiltration dans les nappes souterraines, seuls stockages permettant de préserver l'espoir de la satisfaction de tous les usages.

Soyons au rendez-vous de l'histoire et ne gaspillons ni l'eau ni les deniers publics dans de fausses bonnes solutions.

Veronika Vrecionová, *za skupinu ECR*. – Pane předsedající, jsem velmi ráda za dnešní debatu o vodě a směřování potřebných investic s cílem zajistit přístup k vodě v celé EU. Bez vody nepřežijeme. Zatímco většímu množství oxidu uhličitého se jako lidstvo dokážeme přizpůsobit, bez vody nepřežijeme. Pocházím z Česka, ze země, které se přezdívá střecha Evropy, protože spadá hned do tří úmoří, a všechna voda, která u nás naprší, od nás také ihned odteče. Pokud chceme zajistit dostatek vody ve všech členských státech, musíme činit taková opatření, která odpovídají jejich geografickým podmínkám. Základem je zadržování vody v krajině a obnovování podzemních vod. Jejich úbytek a drancování považuji za neuvěřitelnou zhůvěřilost. Dalším krokem je investice do vodní infrastruktury. Ztráty v ní jsou obrovské. No a nakonec je tu nákladově efektivní čištění odpadních vod a využívání přečištěné odpadní vody, kde je to jen možné. My

v Evropském parlamentu nesmíme podlehnout pokušení regulovat každý detail, ale zaměřit se jen na to podstatné. Jedině tak pomůžeme členským státům činit opatření, která jsou potřebná.

Mathilde Androuët, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, dans un monde où l'eau douce ne représente que 3 % du stock mondial, où les prévisions les moins optimistes estiment que le débit des cours d'eau en région parisienne ou dans le Sud-Ouest français, par exemple, pourrait baisser de 50 %, il devient nécessaire de nous préoccuper de cet élément indispensable à toute vie sur Terre.

À ce titre, l'Europe, dans son intégralité, doit reconnaître le caractère universel de l'eau afin de l'extraire des logiques spéculatives de préemption par les ONG ou de privatisation. Cela signifie qu'il faut aussi lutter contre le gaspillage.

Premièrement, il est urgent de réparer les avaries des structures d'adduction, qui, pour certaines, peuvent perdre 40 % de leur eau, comme c'est le cas à la Martinique. Le travail est colossal mais nécessaire: on ne peut contraindre la population à la sobriété si les tuyaux fuient.

Il est également temps d'associer l'agriculture et l'industrie, sans amende ni contrainte: intégrer automatiquement des systèmes de récupération d'eau de pluie dans les chantiers de BTP, développer des systèmes de retraitement des eaux usées, prévoir des robinets mousseurs dans la plomberie et se saisir de la PAC, enfin, pour y ouvrir une ligne consacrée à la protection de nos ressources hydriques.

En effet, nous devons encourager, y compris financièrement, le reboisement et la replantation des haies afin de lutter contre l'assèchement et l'imperméabilisation des sols. «À l'échelle cosmique, l'eau liquide est plus rare que l'or», disait le regretté Hubert Reeves. Charge à nous de garantir, aujourd'hui et demain, cet or bleu à toutes les nations européennes.

Younous Omarjee, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, qui accepterait, ici, en Europe, de se voir priver d'eau deux jours sur trois et, dans les maigres heures où l'eau coule du robinet, d'utiliser une eau marron impropre à la consommation? Qui accepterait cela? Cette réalité, absolument incroyable, est celle de Mayotte, la région ultrapériphérique la plus pauvre de l'Union européenne, mais aussi un territoire d'un pays, la France, qui est la deuxième puissance économique la plus riche de toute l'Union européenne.

Cette réalité – chers collègues – résulte certes des conditions climatiques nées d'une sécheresse historique, c'est indéniable. Mais elle dit aussi l'imprévoyance et la mauvaise gestion des fonds européens par l'État, car des investissements sur le long terme auraient dû être réalisés et terminés; ils ne le sont pas.

À présent, pour répondre à l'urgence et à la souffrance des Mahorais, notre commission REGI a mis sur la table une proposition: l'utilisation des reliquats du FEAD pour l'acquisition massive et la distribution gratuite de bouteilles d'eau à la population. La Commission peut-elle nous dire si la France a retenu cette piste?

Partout en Europe – et il en va de même pour les populations roms –, les citoyens européens doivent avoir un accès à l'eau potable, sans quoi ils vont continuer à être traités comme des populations marginalisées.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Monsieur le Président, il n'y a aucun doute quant au lien entre le changement climatique et les épisodes de sécheresse que nous vivons. Une sécheresse qui en est une conséquence dramatique – et qui nécessite des mesures immédiates – et qui persiste dans presque toute l'Union.

Mais dans les pays du Sud comme le mien, la Catalogne, la sécheresse exige une action plus urgente. L'idée principale est qu'il faut donner une seconde vie à l'eau: aucune goutte ne peut être gaspillée. Pour ce faire, il faut optimiser la consommation, réduire les pertes qui se produisent dans nos réseaux de distribution, réutiliser l'eau, appliquer les principes de l'économie circulaire et du pollueur-payeur. La lutte contre la sécheresse est la responsabilité de tous, certes, mais les coûts doivent être supportés par ceux qui provoquent et alimentent le changement climatique.

Nous ne pouvons pas faire peser le fardeau économique de ce problème sur la facture d'eau des citoyens européens. La lutte contre le changement climatique est aussi une lutte contre les inégalités et la fracture sociale. Ceux qui polluent doivent investir pour que nous puissions purifier les eaux, préserver les écoulements écologiques des rivières et créer des systèmes en circuit fermé, où aucune goutte n'est perdue. Il s'agit là d'une action urgente.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, uplynulo 78 rokov od skončenia druhej svetovej vojny, kedy sme vďaka Európskemu spoločenstvu vybudovali bohatú a hrdú Úniu, vďaka ktorej tu dnes môžeme rozprávať o umelej inteligencii či zelenej transformácii.

No na druhej strane stále existujú milióny Európanov, ktorí nemajú prístup k pitnej vode, a to aj napriek existujúcej legislatíve, ktorá vodu definuje ako základné ľudské právo. Bez vody nie je život. Voda je naším bohatstvom. Žiaľ, nie každý je bohatý v Európe. V Rumunsku žije bez vody z vodovodu 21 % obyvateľov. Bez pitnej tečúcej vody žije v Európe aj každý piaty Róm. Milióny chudobných Rómov, dokonca aj rómskych detí, pijú vodu dnes v Európe z potoka.

Vážení kolegovia, som presvedčený, že prístup k vode v prípade Rómov súvisí aj s diskrimináciou. V Európe sú dnes obce a mestá, ktoré namiesto toho, aby investovali eurofondy do budovania vodovodu, radšej do rómskej osady namontujú výdajník vody, takzvaný dispenzer, na čipovú kartu. Nedostatočný prístup k pitnej vode má za následok výskyt vážnych infekčných chorôb, ako aj skorých úmrtí. Klimatické zmeny, vysoké horúčavy a vysychanie prameňov celú situáciu ešte zhoršujú. Európa musí klásť oveľa väčší tlak na členské krajiny, aby vybudovali potrebnú ekologickú udržateľnú infraštruktúru na zásobovanie pitnou vodou, a to v prospech všetkých svojich občanov vrátane chudobných Rómov či ľudí žijúcich v odľahlých chudobných regiónoch Európskej únie.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Herr talman! Kommissionen! Rent vatten är en mänsklig rättighet, en *mänsklig* rättighet, och samtidigt ser vi hur föroreningar och torka gör rent vatten till en lyxvara för allt fler. Detta är helt oacceptabelt. Vi behöver investera ordentligt i vatten- och avloppsnät för en framtid där rent vatten på riktigt blir en rättighet och inte en lyx.

För två veckor sedan röstade vi i denna kammare om att öka investeringarna i Europas vatten och avlopp. Högerpartierna vill att en större del av kostnaderna ska bäras av vanligt folk, inte företagen som förorenar. Om detta är vi inte överens. Jag hoppas att kommissionen och rådet inser allvaret och förklarar hur de ser på risken att kostnaderna för rent vatten ökar när företagen inte tar sitt fulla ansvar. Jag vill se ett starkt producentansvar så att det är förorenaren som betalar, inte vanligt folk.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, domnule secretar de stat, *no one is left behind*. Să nu lăsăm pe nimeni în urmă. Acesta este mottoul pe care îl folosim în Comisia pentru dezvoltare regională (REGI) din Parlamentul European, însă mulți cetățeni europeni se simt lăsați în urmă când se confruntă cu realitățile de zi cu zi. Avem regiuni unde, deși sunt la câțiva kilometri de râuri, oamenii au apă la robinet doar câteva ore pe zi sau folosesc tot fântâni proprii. Infrastructura care trebuie să le aducă apă în case este mult învechită sau chiar nu există.

Clima se schimbă și multe regiuni simt aceasta în fiecare vară, când fântânile seacă și vechile canale de irigații nu mai aduc apa de care au nevoie pentru culturi. Este nevoie de soluții la nivel european, pentru că lipsa apei este o problemă care privește întreaga Uniune Europeană. Este o problemă de siguranță alimentară și sanitară. Statele membre nu pot fi lăsate să se descurce fiecare cum pot și cum știu. Avem nevoie de o strategie și de proiecte la nivel european pentru soluții sustenabile.

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wasser ist Leben. Unser blauer Planet ist zu 70 Prozent von Wasser bedeckt, aber nur ein Bruchteil davon, ein winziger Bruchteil ist Süßwasser – und diese elementare Ressource müssen wir endlich adäquat schützen. Denn ohne sauberes Wasser haben wir nichts zu trinken. Wir können keine Nahrungsmittel anbauen, wir können auch keine funktionierende Wirtschaft aufbauen.

Aber seit Jahrzehnten gehen wir mit dem kostbaren Nass um, als gäbe es kein Morgen. Wir pumpen mehr Grundwasser aus dem Boden, als sich nachbilden kann, wir leiten giftige Abwässer unzureichend geklärt in unsere Flüsse, wir zerstören Moore und Feuchtgebiete, die die Nieren unserer Landschaft sind, die Wasser speichern, die Schadstoffe abbauen und die uns vor Starkregen-Ereignissen schützen können, weil sie Wasser eben nur verlangsamt wieder abgeben können.

Und noch immer werden unfassbare Mengen Wasser verschwendet in Industrie und Landwirtschaft, anstatt dass wir endlich in sparsamere Prozesse investieren. Es ist kurz vor zwölf, denn der Klimawandel wird die Wasserkrise noch verschärfen. Abwarten bis zum letzten Tropfen ist keine Option.

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, za dnešní debatu o vodě jsem rád. Je ale bohužel příznačné, že je doslova utopena mezi dalšími body, ačkoliv všichni víme, že bez vody není život. A také to tady všichni říkáme. Stejně tak je na tom i voda v celém *Green Deal*. Vždycky si na ni vzpomeneme až poté, co vyčerpáme jiná témata, nebo když se potýkáme se suchem či povodněmi. To je špatně. Voda si zasluhuje naši soustavnou pozornost. Já osobně v mé zemi třeba usiluji o to, aby voda byla explicitně chráněna v ústavě. Stávající unijní legislativa je sice robustní, ale objevují se i neblahé tendence. Třeba směrnice o čištění městských odpadních vod, návrh, o kterém jsme zde minule hlasovali, má samozřejmě opodstatnění, ovšem může také omezit přístup k vodě, bude-li příliš přísný. V citlivých oblastech se může stát, že poplatek za stočné vzroste o desítky procent. Proto zde chci ještě jednou apelovat, abychom zvažovali všechny důsledky našich rozhodnutí včetně sociálních. Volby se blíží a budeme-li lidem neuváženě sahat i na vodu, vrátí se nám to jako bumerang.

Angelo Ciocca (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, follie europee.

Questa Europa si occupa più degli insetti che dell'emergenza idrica, più del genitore uno e del genitore due che delle famiglie, più dei rom che rubano rispetto ai lavoratori veri, più dei clandestini rispetto ai cittadini, più dell'estremismo islamico rispetto alla difesa dei simboli cristiani.

Questa Europa raccoglie purtroppo quello che semina e a farne le spese sono i cittadini, i cittadini innocenti, innocenti come i due ragazzi svedesi uccisi ingiustamente ieri, nella capitale di questa Europa, nel nome di una non-religione.

Questi terribili e inaccettabili fatti hanno delle responsabilità dirette nell'estremismo islamico, indirette in questa Europa che finanzia l'estremismo islamico, che tifa per l'accoglienza indiscriminata e che consente a un tunisino pregiudicato di uccidere innocenti. La Tunisia li libera, l'Europa li ospita: pazzesco!

E poi vi chiedete cosa dicono fuori di qui di questa Europa? «Ma questa Europa a che *caz* … serve?»

Maxette Pirbakas (NI). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, la crise de l'eau atteint des sommets dans nos cinq départements de l'outre-mer français. À la Martinique et, surtout, à la Guadeloupe – moi, Guadeloupéenne, je vous le dis –, depuis des années, on estime que plus d'un quart des habitants n'a pas accès à l'eau potable. Ce n'est pas acceptable. Nous sommes en 2023. À Mayotte, c'est encore pire, puisqu'il n'y a pas d'eau du tout.

Dans cet hémicycle, j'ai l'impression que peu de gens s'inquiètent de ce problème grave, Monsieur le commissaire. Pourtant, je le rappelle, nous parlons de territoires européens, qui doivent bénéficier de la solidarité européenne comme n'importe quelle région de l'Union. Nous payons aujourd'hui le prix de décennies de sous-investissement dans les infrastructures des RUP françaises en matière d'eau. Les fonds de cohésion n'ont rien changé à cette situation; ils n'ont constitué qu'un saupoudrage.

C'est pourquoi j'en appelle à la mise en place d'un vrai plan d'ensemble piloté par la Commission, à la Martinique, à la Guadeloupe et à Mayotte, parce qu'il y va de la santé humaine et du caractère vivable de ces territoires. Rénover les infrastructures d'assainissement et de distribution, créer de nouvelles stations d'épuration, en finir avec les tuyaux percés, amiantés, rafistolés, ça doit…

(le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, de *Financial Times* noemde België deze zomer nog de lidstaat met de meeste waterproblemen vanwege de hoge bevolkingsdichtheid aan de ene kant en de beperkte infrastructuur aan de andere kant. Specifiek bij ons voelen de landbouwers het als eerste aan. Ja, de voorbije zomers was er in mijn thuisregio telkens een onttrekkingsverbod voor water, waardoor het beregenen van gewassen meteen een grote uitdaging werd. Als de boeren in mijn regio het al voelen, laat zich natuurlijk raden hoe de situatie in Zuid-Europa is. Landbouw is duidelijk heel erg kwetsbaar bij droogte.

Ik zie steeds meer op landbouwbedrijven zelf aangelegde waterbassins, vaak voor een deel betaald met geld uit het gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid. Maar dat gebeurt vandaag ook nog te sporadisch, te willekeurig en eigenlijk zonder overkoepelend plan vanuit het beleid. Daarom ben ik zo blij dat het Parlement deze politieke oproep lanceert, want we hebben inderdaad echt behoefte aan structurele oplossingen en investeringen die de toegang tot water garanderen op lange termijn.

Het is ook om die reden dat ik onlangs de oproep tot een Europese "Blue Deal" heb ondertekend.

Het is de verantwoordelijkheid van deze – maar ook van de volgende Europese Commissie – om van water een echte prioriteit te maken met stimulerende regels in plaats van onnodig hoge eisen. Laat ons daarin bijzondere aandacht besteden aan de kwetsbaarheid van landbouw. Infiltreren, bufferen, hergebruiken en sluiten van kringlopen is de boodschap. De technieken en de kennis zijn voorhanden. Nu is het tijd om een prioriteit te maken van Europese oplossingen.

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señor presidente en ejercicio del Consejo, yo, que vengo de un país como España, y de una comunidad autónoma como Andalucía, donde los ciclos de sequía no son nuevos —es verdad que ahora son mucho más cortos, evidentemente, porque lo del cambio climático no es ninguna broma—, sé muy bien dónde hay algunos errores importantes que habría que corregir.

Yo creo que la normativa de la Comisión está bien, pero es insuficiente, señor comisario. Hay que ser más valientes. Por supuesto, hay que tomar medidas que ya están en el Pacto Verde Europeo. Pero hay que definir una estrategia europea sobre el agua. Requiere la globalidad a nivel de Europa, y los Estados miembros pueden hacer mucho más.

Priorizar las inversiones en agua es imprescindible. Hemos hecho muchos AVE, hemos construido colegios, hemos construido muchas instalaciones públicas. Pero necesitamos hacer más aportaciones públicas en infraestructuras hidráulicas. Ahí no se ha hecho lo suficiente. Hay que hacer algunos cambios. Ahora es el momento.

Max Orville (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Ministre, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, l'ONU estime qu'au moins 2 milliards de personnes sont privées d'accès à l'eau et à l'assainissement. Certains de nos territoires européens sont également touchés: c'est le cas de la plupart de nos régions ultrapériphériques. Ces citoyens européens supportent des retards structurels dans le renouvellement des infrastructures, mais aussi les conséquences du changement climatique. À Mayotte, la quasi-totalité des habitants n'a accès à l'eau qu'un jour sur trois. C'est insupportable.

Cette situation entraîne des fermetures d'écoles et de graves risques sanitaires, notamment. La France a mis en œuvre les moyens nécessaires pour parer au plus urgent. Cependant, l'ampleur des mesures à mettre en œuvre nécessite une meilleure prise en compte des réalités dans les régions ultrapériphériques.

Il convient de mettre en place un accompagnement adapté, avec des stratégies d'accès à l'eau efficaces, un renforcement des investissements, davantage de soutien au niveau technique pour moderniser les réseaux d'eau, grâce au FEDER notamment. Si Mayotte est certes la plus touchée, plusieurs autres RUP nécessitent elles aussi une mobilisation générale.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhor Presidente, a Galiza, o meu país, sofre as consequências da má gestão de água por parte do Estado espanhol, ao não cumprir a regulamentação europeia, nomeadamente a Diretiva-Quadro da Água, especialmente por não atualizar os seus planos de bacias hidrológicas, bem como os planos de gestão do risco de inundação.

É por isso que a Comissão Europeia iniciou um processo de infração, em fevereiro do ano passado, e que também, no dia 28 de setembro, apresentou um ultimato ao Estado espanhol para concluir as revisões dos seus planos hidrológicos, antes de levar o caso a tribunal, Senhor Comissário.

Secas, inundações, problemas de abastecimento são consequências de uma mudança climática que exige ações de governos responsáveis e um programa coordenado. Cada ano, a seca é mais drástica, é mais dramática, porque no meu país a disponibilidade de água está condicionada pela rede de abastecimento, dimensionada em função das suas condições húmidas.

É por isso que as secas em vários territórios demonstraram que a Europa enfrenta desafios crescentes relacionados com a escassez de água, que exigem um programa coordenado.

Krzysztof Jurgiel (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Polska jest jednym z krajów Unii Europejskiej z najuboższymi zasobami wody. Jedną z najważniejszych kwestii jest retencja, czyli ilość wody, która pozostaje w środowisku. W moim kraju, w Polsce, jest ona na poziomie 6,5%, podczas gdy w Hiszpanii jest to około 40%. W naszym regionie Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej do lat 90-tych mieliśmy suszę co 5 lat, na początku tego stulecia co 2,5 roku, a ostatnio co roku począwszy od 2018 r. W Polsce są już obszary, gdzie wody pitnej brakuje.

Poprawę sytuacji może przynieść lepsze zarządzanie wodą, zarówno w perspektywie mikro, jak i makro. Dlatego jest tak istotna inicjatywa Federacji Pracodawców Polskich, sprawa wprowadzenia komitetu czy inicjatywy europejskie. Polska aktywnie włączy się do prac nad *Blue Deal,* strategią na rzecz wody, inicjatywą Europejskiego Komitetu Społeczno-Ekonomicznego. Polska wnosi na forum europejskie ideę tworzenia lokalnych partnerstw dostaw wody. Głównym celem tworzenia lokalnych partnerstw jest inicjowanie współpracy oraz stworzenie sieci …

(Przewodniczący odebrał mówcy głos)

André Rougé (ID). –Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, ce débat aurait-il lieu si je n'avais tiré la sonnette d'alarme, lors de notre dernière plénière, sur la situation désastreuse des départements français de Mayotte et des Antilles, sur la situation de plusieurs centaines de milliers de citoyens de l'Union européenne qui ont soif et manquent d'eau potable?

Le gouvernement français aurait-il pris la décision de payer les factures d'eau à Mayotte pendant plusieurs mois si je ne l'avais publiquement culpabilisé, si je n'avais dénoncé son inaction en soulevant le problème du manque de cette ressource vitale: l'eau? Une eau que les contribuables français de Mayotte doivent cependant continuer à payer.

Deux semaines après ma dernière intervention, dans cet hémicycle, sur cette question, rien n'a changé, et la désillusion des Mahorais, des Guadeloupéens et des Martiniquais ne fait qu'augmenter. À mes collègues députés français de The Left et de Renew, qui représentent ici LFI et leurs collègues de la majorité gouvernementale en France – ceux-là même qui ont décidé de voter contre ma résolution concernant l'urgence vitale en eau de nos compatriotes ultramarins –, je veux dire que l'eau n'a pas de couleur politique. La seule couleur qu'elle ait, à Mayotte et aux Antilles, est une couleur marron, lorsqu'elle coule au robinet.

Alors terminons-en avec la tambouille politique pour enfin privilégier l'intérêt général, en votant l'amendement budgétaire que nous proposons. Les Français d'outre-mer ont l'impression que l'Union européenne ne s'intéresse à eux que lorsqu'une crise les met en lumière. L'Union européenne préfère malheureusement verser des subventions à la bande de Gaza pour des canalisations dont se sert ensuite le Hamas pour fabriquer des lance-roquettes artisanaux. Elle serait mieux inspirée de financer les canalisations des RUP de Mayotte et des Antilles, plutôt que d'armer – même indirectement – des terroristes.

Ce n'est pas parce que les Français de Mayotte et des Antilles ne sont pas nos voisins qu'ils n'en sont pas moins nos concitoyens. Alors aidez-moi à faire en sorte que les ultramarins d'Europe ne soient pas des citoyens…

(le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)

Maria Angela Danzì (NI). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, secondo l'UNESCO, l'acqua è il nostro futuro comune ed è essenziale agire insieme per condividerla equamente e gestirla in modo sostenibile.

C'è un urgente bisogno di istituire meccanismi internazionali per impedire che la crisi idrica globale vada fuori controllo. L'accesso all'acqua è diventato fonte e strumento di guerra: il blocco a Gaza ne è la dimostrazione.

La salvaguardia della sicurezza idrica, alimentare ed energetica, la fornitura universale di acqua e di servizi igienici, la riduzione dell'impatto climatico e il ripristino degli ecosistemi sono tessere di un mosaico complesso e inscindibile. È possibile comporlo solo se ciascuno di noi, nessuno escluso, agisce tenendo presente questo quadro.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Mayotte a soif. Dans un département français, un département d'Europe, il y a, aujourd'hui, des habitants qui ne peuvent pas ouvrir le robinet plusieurs heures par jour, ni plusieurs jours par semaine. Des habitants qui ne peuvent pas boire l'eau qui coule du robinet sans craindre pour leur santé. Il y a, aujourd'hui, un département français où les enfants doivent être soignés parce qu'ils sont tombés malades pour avoir bu de l'eau supposée potable. C'est la réalité de la situation que vivent aujourd'hui nos concitoyens.

Chers collègues, ce ne sont pas seulement les Mahorais qui sont dans cette situation, mais ce sont aussi les habitants de la Guadeloupe, de la Martinique, de nos outre-mer. C'est aujourd'hui, dans de nombreux territoires de nos pays, un véritable défi que celui qui consiste à faire en sorte que tous les citoyens aient accès à ce qui n'est pas un bien parmi d'autres, mais le bien le plus essentiel: l'eau, le bien plus nécessaire à la vie.

L'Union européenne verse des aides au développement qui sont massives, y compris dans cette région du monde. Mais où sont passés les fonds européens qui étaient supposés offrir à Mayotte les moyens de désaliniser l'eau? À la fin du mois d'octobre, les réserves en eau de Mayotte pourraient être complètement vides, et les habitants doivent payer une eau hors de prix en s'acquittant simultanément de leurs factures, plutôt que de pouvoir compter sur l'eau qu'ils pourraient produire.

Cher collègue Rougé, nous n'avons pas attendu pour nous saisir de cette question. Depuis plusieurs semaines, le Parlement alerte sur ce sujet, mais nous attendons maintenant des actes de nos gouvernements, de l'Union européenne, pour sortir de cette situation intenable.

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário, a falta de água não é só um problema dos países do Sul, é um problema europeu!

Saúdo, por isso, o anúncio feito pela Presidente von der Leyen de que será em breve lançada uma iniciativa da Comissão Europeia dedicada à resiliência hídrica.

Espero que não se trate apenas de um documento de reflexão, porque o tempo para refletir já passou. Este é o tempo de agir: de avançar para uma verdadeira estratégia integrada para a gestão hídrica, que aposte fortemente na gestão circular da água, e devo dizer que Portugal, o meu país, já tem em marcha medidas no sentido de avançar para a gestão hídrica circular, seja em contextos urbanos, industriais ou agrícolas.

Senhor Comissário, precisamos de uma verdadeira estratégia europeia e de um correspondente plano de ação que garanta que todos os cidadãos europeus terão acesso à água no futuro. Isto, ou então corremos o risco de estarmos daqui a poucos anos a lamentar os desertos populacionais e ambientais que se espalharam pela Europa. O tempo, caros colegas, foi ontem.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, el agua es un bien escaso, pero suficiente. Donde hay agua, hay vida y hay desarrollo. No es posible la contradicción en esta materia. Porque no podemos decir que combatimos la sequía y aprobar un Reglamento de restauración de la naturaleza que obliga a los Estados miembros a eliminar presas y azudes para que el agua fluya libremente a los océanos.

No son barreras. Son el fruto centenario del esfuerzo del hombre por almacenar y canalizar el agua para el consumo personal y animal, para la industria, para combatir incendios o para asegurar la producción agrícola.

En España, el llamado Plan Badajoz transformó una región como era Extremadura, que pasó de la miseria a la prosperidad, con presas y canalizaciones. Es un sinsentido tener una política europea del agua. No hay que ser muy listo para ver las diferencias entre Finlandia y el sur de España.

La Unión debe dotar de un marco estable y dar incentivos a los Estados para animar a aprobar planes hídricos nacionales que garanticen el acceso al agua en igualdad de condiciones, con todas las infraestructuras y conexiones que sean necesarias. Sin excusas ambientales, pues, si no hay agua, no hay naturaleza. Y debe asimismo incentivar el buen uso para la mejora de los regadíos y el desarrollo de energía hidráulica, día y noche, en un ciclo permanente y limpio.

Ádám Kósa (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Folyóink, tavaink, felszín alatti vízkészleteink megőrzése alapvető érdekünk, hiszen a következő generáció számára is biztosítani kell a tiszta és egészséges vízkészletet. A vízbiztonság elsődleges érdekünk. Európában számos ország küzd a vízhiánnyal, Magyarországnak viszont más kihívással kell szembesülnie. A felszíni vizeink 96 százaléka külföldi vízgyűjtő területekről érkezik hozzánk, ezért az ide érkező víz teljes körű hasznosítását okos megoldásokkal lehet elősegíteni, és szükség esetén a vízfelesleget más országokkal együttműködve megfelelően hasznosítani. Magyarország emiatt élen jár a globális fenntartható vízgazdálkodásban, és számos megoldással, innovatív megoldással segíti azokat az országokat, amelyek ezt igénylik.

Európának elemi érdeke, hogy ezt hasznosítsa az Európai Unió tagállamaiban annak érdekében, hogy minden európai polgár és gazdasági szereplő számára a víz bármikor hozzáférhető legyen.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsednik! Danes govorimo o pomanjkanju vode v oddaljenih francoskih regijah. Lahko bi spregovorili o pomanjkanju dostopa do pitne vode v vodovodnem omrežju v Romuniji ali tudi o romskih naseljih v moji Sloveniji, ki še nimajo dostopa do pitne vode. Zato mislim, da moramo resnično narediti vse, da tudi s kohezijskimi sredstvi nadaljujemo in oskrbimo tam, kjer še ni dostopa do kvalitetne pitne vode za slehernega Evropejca. Izredno pomembni so ukrepi tudi v čistilne naprave. Zopet lahko govorim iz moje Slovenije, kjer so reke danes bistveno bolj čiste, kot so bile desetletja nazaj in se vrača življenje tudi v reke. Veliko je potrebno narediti tudi za učinkovito rabo vode v kmetijstvu. Poznamo kapljične sisteme namakanja, ki z malimi količinami vode rešujejo trajne nasade in podobno, tako da imamo rešitve. Ampak potrebna so permanentna vlaganja. Imamo tudi vedno več na eni strani suš ali pa poplav. V Sloveniji smo imeli lansko leto največjo sušo. Letošnje leto smo imeli avgusta poplave. V Grčiji se je to zgodilo v enem tednu, zato ne smemo pozabiti na to, da je potrebno vlaganje v zaščito vodnih virov v infrastrukturne ukrepe kot permanentnem proces, ne zgolj takrat, ko je suša ali pa se zgodijo poplave. Zato podpiram pobudo Komisije za odpornost z vodo in verjamem, da bomo v prihodnje še več vlagali v vodooskrbo in pa v čiste vode.

Cristina Maestre Martín de Almagro (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señor secretario de Estado, yo les hablaré de España, donde el 70 % de las demarcaciones geográficas presentan estrés hídrico y riesgo de desertificación. Esto afecta a la agricultura pero, ante todo, afecta también al abastecimiento humano. Por tanto, urge desarrollar a la mayor velocidad posible las infraestructuras necesarias para una adecuada planificación y gestión del agua.

Ante todo, hay que cambiar el enfoque. No sirven algunas prácticas que sobreexplotan los acuíferos, deterioran nuestros ríos y contaminan las masas de agua. Estas prácticas nos llevan a situaciones como las que sufren Doñana, las Tablas de Daimiel o el río Tajo en España. Cuando hablamos de infraestructuras adecuadas para Europa, no hablamos de las que enumeraba el señor Buxadé. Tampoco de aquellas que promueven los trasvases que salen de zonas secas, a veces abastecidas por camiones cisternas, hacia otras que tienen alternativas al uso del agua, como pueden ser las desalinizadoras.

Por lo tanto, lo que hay que hacer es aumentar la inversión para hacer posible ese cambio en el modelo de gestión, avanzando en eficiencia, en reutilización, en desalinización y en digitalización del ciclo del agua. Contamos con el apoyo de la Comisión Europea y también de la Presidencia del Consejo, que en este caso ostenta la Presidencia española.

Dan-Ștefan Motreanu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, utilizarea responsabilă a apei rămâne o provocare, o datorie și un deziderat pentru noi toți. Seceta provoacă deja daune de 9 miliarde de euro anual în Uniunea Europeană, 19 state membre raportând deja o tendință în creștere a deficitului de apă în ultimii ani. Acest fenomen pune în primejdie inclusiv asigurarea securității alimentare a Uniunii.

Iată de ce este absolut necesar să consolidăm finanțarea oferită statelor membre pentru utilizarea în agricultură a surselor alternative de apă, ca folosirea apelor urbane reziduale tratate, a apelor subterane și desalinizarea apei marine, precum și investițiile în construirea de rezervoare și de sisteme de captare a apei. În final, îmi reiterez apelul către Comisie de a institui un program specific pentru a sprijini statele membre în dezvoltarea de noi sisteme de irigații eficiente, circulare și inteligente, precum și în modernizarea instalațiilor existente.

Günther Sidl (S&D). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Angesichts der aktuellen Klimaprobleme, der zunehmenden Verschmutzung, der drohenden Austrocknung unserer Ökosysteme können wir Wasser nicht als selbstverständliche und unbegrenzte Ressource ansehen. Wir müssen uns auf die langfristigen Vorteile von Investitionen in diese natürliche Ressource konzentrieren und nicht auf schnelle Lösungen bei der Wasserkrise.

Es geht darum, den Wert des Wassers neu zu denken. Unsere Gemeinden, Städte und Regionen können diese große Herausforderung nicht alleine meistern. Auch die Landwirtschaft, die Industrie und auch wir Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten und Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher müssen einen deutlichen Beitrag leisten. Ich mache mir Sorgen wegen der zunehmenden Blockade in diesem Parlament, was Natur und Klimaschutz betrifft. Hier geht es nicht um Detailfragen, sondern im Wesentlichen auch um eine Totalverweigerung. Scheinbar ist es noch immer nicht deutlich genug in den Köpfen angekommen, dass jeder Cent, den wir in den Schutz von Umwelt, Klima und unseres Wassers investieren, immer eine positive Investition in unsere Gesundheit, unsere Lebensqualität, unsere Gesellschaft und in unsere Volkswirtschaft ist.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o Sul da Europa e Portugal em particular vivem já as consequências do aquecimento global. Não são previsões, é a realidade.

Somos confrontados com ondas de calor extremas, com frios extremos, erosão de zonas costeiras, redução dos lençóis freáticos, aumento de incêndios.

Em 2022, Portugal viveu a pior situação de seca hidrológica dos últimos 100 anos, com 55 % do território em seca severa e 45 % em seca extrema.

Temos de conciliar as preocupações ambientais com as necessidades das pessoas e devemos encarar a tecnologia e a ciência como aliados no futuro.

Precisamos de charcas, minibarragens, novas barragens, alteamento de barragens, centrais de dessalinização. Precisamos de muito mais financiamento da União Europeia.

Termino com um exemplo: quando o meu partido esteve no governo, foi responsável pela antecipação em 10 anos da barragem do Alqueva, que fez um milagre no interior do país, transformando uma zona de sequeiro em regadio. Inspire isso a União Europeia para que se faça muito mais.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señor presidente en ejercicio del Consejo, la escasez de agua se está agravando en Europa, especialmente en el sur. Más de un tercio de la población europea sufre ya una cierta falta de agua. Y, al tiempo que ese recurso escasea, continuamos desarrollando actividades económicas que son intensivas en el uso del agua, pero de las que dependen muchos empleos y comarcas enteras.

Por ello, es muy importante desarrollar inversiones extraordinarias y avanzar en innovación para una utilización más eficiente del agua. Pero esto no es suficiente. Necesitamos considerar el agua como un bien público, poner el interés general por encima del beneficio de unos pocos y trabajar en un enfoque redistributivo del agua que garantice una transición ecológica que es necesaria, pero que sea justo al mismo tiempo, desde y para todos los territorios.

Las y los socialistas europeos, que impulsamos este debate, también queremos que se deje de hacer populismo con el agua, como está haciendo el presidente Moreno Bonilla en Andalucía con Doñana; e instamos a las instituciones europeas a redoblar esfuerzos y aportar soluciones que eviten la sobreexplotación de un acuífero tan importante como Doñana, que está en grave riesgo.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, os períodos de seca são cada vez mais intensos e provocam, inevitavelmente, efeitos muito negativos sobre as atividades económicas e a vida das comunidades, causando diversas dificuldades no acesso das populações à água e no que respeita à atividade agrícola e pecuária.

As consequências da falta de estratégia e de soluções para resolver as questões da seca traduzem-se, designadamente, na falta de capacidade de armazenamento de água para responder às necessidades, na deficiente utilização sustentável da água nos diferentes domínios e no comprometimento do exercício de algumas importantes atividades económicas.

Defendemos o desenvolvimento e a implementação de um plano integrado em que se correlacionem as necessidades de utilização da água para múltiplos fins com as adequadas e possíveis capacidades de armazenamento, promovendo a utilização racional e eficiente da água como fator de desenvolvimento económico e social, assente na universalidade de acesso a este recurso, na sua gestão pública, em detrimento da sua utilização massiva e da sua exploração numa base privada monopolista.

Ljudmila Novak (PPE). – Gospod predsednik! V Evropi še vedno imamo dovolj vode, velikokrat celo preveč. Ne znamo pa je dobro in učinkovito uporabljati in z njo gospodariti. Če bi jo morali nekaj kilometrov nositi peš v plastenkah, na glavi, z rokami, potem bi z njo ravnali drugače.

Strategija za zaščito vode in gospodarno porabo vode je nujno potrebna. Zato podpiram modri dogovor. Ko rešujemo probleme s poplavami, moramo misliti tudi na možnost suše. Še vedno porabimo preveč pitne vode za sanitarne namene. V Evropi smo razvajeni in se še ne zavedamo dovolj, kako slabo gospodarimo z vodo.

Voda vpliva na življenje, vpliva na poseljenost, konkurenčnost, blagostanje državljanov. Voda lahko tudi odloča o miru in vojni.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, Article 16 of the Drinking Water Directive is the EU's response to the European citizens' initiative on the right to water. And I think, read it and you'll see that there's no way that this article can be considered a sufficient response to the demands of the first successful European citizens' initiative in this area.

I mean, Article 16 is essentially the bare minimum obligation to maintain access to water – a suggestion to Member States to maybe try and do their best, maybe put in a few more fountains, and do what you can to promote the consumption of drinking water.

Come on! After years of epic campaigning, we can surely do better than this. We need meaningful obligations to enshrine the right to water and the right to sanitation in our laws. In Bulgaria, only 66% of households are connected to a wastewater collection network. There's a lot more work to be done. We need no cost barriers to accessing drinking water or sanitation and no liberalisation of services.

Milan Brglez (S&D). – Gospod predsednik! Veseli me današnja razprava, ker dajemo vse večjo pozornost vodni politiki EU in varni preskrbi z vodo. Mislim pa, da bi moral biti osrednji del te razprave tudi vprašanje onesnaževanja evropskih rek, jezer in podzemnih voda, kjer imamo z revizijo okvirne direktive o vodi priložnost, da okrepimo predpise EU za nadzor nad tem onesnaževanjem in da zaščitimo zdravje ljudi in ekosistemov pred novodobnimi onesnaževali, kot je mikroplastika in pa večne kemikalije.

Zato bodo morale države članice okrepiti in prilagoditi svoje nadzorne mehanizme, kar bo seveda stalo. Zato pričakujem, da bodo tudi načrtovana namenska sredstva znotraj evropskih strukturnih in investicijskih skladov namenjena nadzoru nad onesnaževanjem. Ker vsaka investicija v preprečevanje onesnaževanja bistveno prispeva k zmanjšanju stroškov čiščenja odpadnih voda in pa zdravstvenih sistemov.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, the latest drinking water quality report by the Environmental Protection Agency in Ireland says nearly half a million people in Ireland get their water from 'at-risk' supplies. The report is hugely critical of the fact that Irish Water has no upgrade or improvement plan, with completion dates for 18 of the 58 water supplies on its remedial action list.

There was a total of 79 boil water notices and 10 water restrictions in place in Ireland in 2022, affecting over 190 000 people. The report also highlights serious concerns over the pace of progress in removing lead piping from the public drinking water network. The EPA says that, at the current pace, it will take another 10 years to get rid of all the lead piping.

Water infrastructure in Ireland has suffered dramatically from massive underfunding for decades. Greater investment is required and the cost burden should not fall on households. We should never forget that water is a human right and not something for profit.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Honourable Members, this lively debate shows the importance of this topic. It also clearly reflects the complexity and there are no easy solutions. But if we truly want to progress towards SDG 6 and clean water for all, we must be decisive and we must be bold.

I would like to address one matter in particular about Mayotte. I think what is very clear, is that we must ensure access to water throughout the EU and in its most remote places. For example, the outermost regions of Mayotte is facing an unprecedented water crisis that has triggered a humanitarian crisis caused by the drought and the resulting lack of drinkable water.

The Commission provides significant support to Mayotte for investment in water infrastructure under the European Regional Development Fund: in 2014-2020, EUR 20 million to reinforce drinking water networks, equipment, reservoirs and work on a dam. In 2021-2027, our investment in water will more than double to EUR 47.5 million.

Dear colleagues, the approach that we recommend is proactive. It is based around preparedness, adaptation and keeping ecosystems healthy. We also need wider recognition that water is a public good. More must be done to deliver on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation. And success will depend on our shared commitment to scale up action and funding.

While it is our responsibility in the European Commission to establish the right framework conditions, Member States, regional and local authorities are at the forefront of implementation. It is through their actions that water is preserved as a precious resource and their willingness to act is essential – how willing they are to involve all stakeholders; how willing they are to support the Commission proposals for new legislation; how willing they are to direct investments in this key priority area, and how willing they are to improve the implementation of the existing rules.

Member States are implementing integrated river basin management through the Water Framework Directive, and some have adopted drought management plans for vulnerable river basins. These practices must be promoted and improved in agriculture.

This means more efficient use of water, wastewater reuse, soil management and vegetation cover, drought-resistant crops, and restoration of damaged areas. In energy and transport, it means preparing for disruptions to hydropower, power plant cooling and waterborne transport. And for drinking water, it means promoting leakage reductions or additional supply infrastructure at as a last resort.

Adaptation solutions will be required in every aspect of life, in every sector and in the short, medium and longer term. Nature-based solutions are particularly well suited for climate resilience to water impact, and they must be upscaled.

In the words of the proposed recast of the Urban Wastewater Directive, let us think nature-based first, and where that is not feasible, let us opt for hybrid green-grey solutions.

But adaptation is only one part of this story. We must also be committed to climate mitigation. It is still possible to avoid the worst predictions for climate change. The Commission will continue contributing to research, guidance, promotion and support for good practices with a view to preventing and reducing the possible impacts of water scarcity and drought.

Our investments should be based on a comprehensive strategic vision, not on responding to one crisis after another in a piecemeal manner, and hence the need for a water resilience agenda. So your support for this agenda is fundamental.

Pascual Navarro Ríos, *presidente en ejercicio del Consejo.* – Señor presidente, señorías, muchas gracias por sus aportaciones. Muchos de ustedes han manifestado su preocupación legítima por los retos que plantea la escasez de agua y han subrayado la necesidad de contar con un enfoque global.

Permítanme aprovechar esta oportunidad para reiterar el compromiso del Consejo con una política de inversiones en infraestructuras hídricas a fin de garantizar la disponibilidad de agua potable y su seguridad. He tomado nota de muchas intervenciones en este sentido.

Como ha señalado el comisario, la transposición de la nueva Directiva sobre el agua potable finalizó en enero de este año y los Estados miembros están trabajando intensamente para cumplir sus nuevas obligaciones. Abordar los retos actuales requiere una planificación estratégica a largo plazo y una elección de inversiones que permitan reducir los riesgos relacionados con el agua y que puedan adaptarse para responder a la evolución de la situación con el paso del tiempo. El diálogo y la cooperación entre los distintos agentes y partes interesadas a escala nacional y a escala europea es esencial para dar una respuesta eficaz a estos retos.

Recuerdo que el Consejo está trabajando en los expedientes legislativos en curso y confiamos en el diálogo con el Parlamento para finalizarlos lo antes posible.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Rovana Plumb (S&D), *în scris.* – Securitatea resurselor de apă este un concept amplu care cuprinde asigurarea utilizării durabile a resurselor de apă, furnizarea de servicii accesibile pentru toți și atenuarea riscurilor referitoare la apă în contextul schimbărilor globale continue, obiectivul fiind acela de a construi un viitor mai bun din punctul de vedere al siguranței resurselor de apă pentru cetățeni, economie și mediu.

Consider că accesul la apă sigură, curată și de calitate, precum și la servicii de salubritate, este un drept fundamental și este absolut inacceptabil să mai existe în UE persoane fără acces la apă sau canalizare. De aceea, nevoia de investiții pentru conservarea resurselor de apă prin îmbunătățirea soluțiilor de tratare, precum și pentru asigurarea de sisteme de colectare și epurare a apelor uzate din aglomerări este încă mare.

Investițiile insuficiente și cheltuielile ineficiente în proiectele din domeniul apei reprezintă principalul motiv pentru care UE și restul lumii nu înregistrează progrese semnificative în realizarea ODD 6 privind apa și salubritatea. Europa are însă oportunitatea de a transforma provocările legate de apă în noi perspective de dezvoltare tehnologică, de creștere a întreprinderilor, astfel încât „economia albastră” să devină sigură și rezilientă, asigurând oportunități de locuri de muncă decente tuturor.

17. Necesidad urgente de una respuesta europea coordinada y de un marco legislativo sobre los programas espía intrusivos, sobre la base de las recomendaciones de la Comisión de Investigación PEGA (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu dem dringenden Erfordernis einer abgestimmten europäischen Reaktion und eines Rechtsrahmens zu in hohem Maße in die Privatsphäre eindringender Spähsoftware auf der Grundlage der Empfehlungen des PEGA-Untersuchungsausschusses (2023/2910(RSP)).

Pascual Navarro Ríos, *presidente en ejercicio del Consejo.* –

Señor presidente, señorías, permítanme que empiece recordándoles que, más allá del tema que está hoy sobre la mesa, las instituciones de la Unión y los Estados miembros tienen la responsabilidad conjunta de defender los valores consagrados en nuestros Tratados. Este es el espíritu con el que la Presidencia española pretende contribuir al debate de hoy siguiendo las recomendaciones formuladas el pasado mes de junio por la Comisión de Investigación PEGA.

En lo que respecta al uso de los programas espía, el Derecho primario y la jurisprudencia de la Unión dejan claro que las interferencias injustificadas y desproporcionadas en los derechos fundamentales de las personas no son aceptables. Solo en condiciones estrictas y por causas debidamente justificadas pueden limitarse los derechos fundamentales. Debemos asegurarnos de que estas normas se respeten para evitar cualquier abuso hacia las personas.

Desde el punto de vista del Consejo, en el contexto de nuestro debate de hoy, deberían destacarse los tres elementos siguientes.

En primer lugar, en virtud de los Tratados, es responsabilidad de la Comisión supervisar y evaluar la aplicación del Derecho de la Unión por parte de los Estados miembros. Como saben, la Comisión ha puesto en marcha un ejercicio de cartografía con relación al despliegue de programas espía en los Estados miembros; entiendo que la vicepresidenta, la comisaria Jourová, nos lo explicará.

En segundo lugar, corresponde a cada Estado miembro llevar a cabo las investigaciones necesarias con relación a posibles casos de vigilancia ilegal de conformidad con el Derecho nacional y el Derecho de la Unión. La información sobre el uso ilegal de programas espía ha conducido a la puesta en marcha de procedimientos por parte de autoridades judiciales y organismos independientes en varios Estados miembros. Es importante que estos procedimientos puedan proseguir y concluir para poner fin a cualquier hipotética infracción del Derecho nacional o del Derecho de la Unión.

En tercer lugar, el uso ilegal de programas espía pone también de manifiesto la importancia de las medidas destinadas a proteger nuestra ciberseguridad. Debemos responder a este reto de manera colectiva mediante el desarrollo de nuestro marco legislativo y de la capacidad a escala de la Unión, algo a lo que la Presidencia española está plenamente dispuesta y para lo que está trabajando en diversos expedientes.

Permítanme que insista en las negociaciones en curso sobre el Reglamento de Ciberresiliencia, que espero que puedan concluir antes de que acabe el año. Pero también debemos garantizar la protección de las personas fomentando entre ellas la toma de conciencia sobre los riesgos y las medidas de prevención.

Nuestra democracia se basa en la libertad de opinión, de expresión y de información, tanto en línea como fuera de línea. Este es un elemento fundamental de la profesión periodística y debe acompañarse de un entorno capaz de proporcionar protección y seguridad a los periodistas y a los profesionales de los medios de comunicación.

Tendremos ocasión de seguir desarrollando este aspecto en el debate de mañana sobre desinformación y libertad de prensa. Reitero una vez más la adhesión del Consejo a los valores democráticos de la Unión y nuestra condena de cualquier interferencia ilegal en los derechos fundamentales de las personas. Agradezco al Parlamento el debate de hoy, que es importante para mantener la confianza de la ciudadanía, y aguardo con interés sus intervenciones.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, the Commission would like to thank this House for the resolution on the use of Pegasus and equivalent spyware. We have analysed it carefully, and I am pleased to announce that our reply to your resolution has already been adopted and soon will be formally transmitted.

Unfortunately, we continue getting media reports on the intrusive use of spyware by foreign, but also by some European, authorities. So let me be very clear, the Commission strongly condemns any illegal access to interpersonal communications. Any attempts by national security services to illegally access the data of citizens, including journalists and political opponents, if confirmed, is unacceptable. 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. There is already an EU legal framework that applies to the use of spyware in a number of situations.

It is, first of all, EU data protection law, which is fully applicable to the processing of personal data by private entities, even where such processing is required by law for national security purposes. In this case, the supervision of the necessity and proportionality of such processing falls under the remit of the Court of Justice of the European Union. EU data protection law is also applicable when public authorities process personal data for law enforcement and criminal justice purposes. When law enforcement authorities use spyware for these purposes, the Data Protection Law Enforcement Directive fully applies.

It is the Member States responsibility to define and protect their national security interests. However, national security is not a blank check excuse for all use cases of spyware. The Court of Justice made clear that Member States must be able to demonstrate that their national security would be compromised in the case at issue. Member States cannot refer to national security in a general way to exclude the application of EU law, and the Member States responsibility for national security cannot lead to departing from EU standards and basic safeguards. Following the work of the PEGA Committee, the Commission also collected information from the Member States about the legal framework governing the use of spyware. So now we are analysing this input, and we are currently looking at the ways to clarify the boundaries of national security and interplay between EU law, in particular the data protection and privacy *acquis*.

As the Commission will explain in its reply to the Parliament's resolution, we are exploring the possibility of a non-legislative initiative and we fully agree with you that clarity on this issue is needed.

Honourable Members, data protection and privacy is not the only means by which the Commission is addressing the use of spyware. The 2023 Rule of Law report underlines that even where the use of surveillance software is linked to national security, there is a need for national checks and balances to ensure that safeguards are in place. In this regard, where relevant, the country chapters have included the functioning of national checks and balances for concerns over investigations into the use of spyware. This happened also in previous editions of the report on the Rule of Law.

The Commission also introduced specific safeguards in the proposal for a European Media Freedom Act. We proposed a special provision to further restrict the use of spyware against media-services providers and journalists, beyond the restrictions applying to other forms of surveillance. The discussions on this file are ongoing and I count on the support of this House on this issue.

The ePrivacy Directive prohibits the interception of communications and the storage of, and access to, information in the terminal equipment without the prior consent of the user concerned. And where Union law is not applicable, Member States are bound by the guarantees laid down in the European Convention on Human Rights. The Commission agrees with Parliament that the ePrivacy Regulation is urgently needed, and is supporting the co-legislators in the legislative negotiations on the ePrivacy Regulation.

Next, the proposal for a Cyber Resilience Act aims to establish cybersecurity requirements for hardware and software accessing the European market, and sets out corresponding obligations for the manufacturers of these products. It will therefore – I got lost. No, I am missing a page, but I am beyond the time anyway, so I will complete it at the end – Can I complete it at the end, Mr President? Okay. Thank you very much. This has happened for the first time in nine years.

Jeroen Lenaers, *on behalf of the PPE Group.* – Mr President, luckily we are so restricted in our time that we have to bring less pages, Madam Commissioner.

Four months ago, our inquiry committee came to an end, after a year of intensive negotiations. And we said already back then, this might be the end of the PEGA Committee. It is not the end of our work because we need results. The Commission must urgently propose measures to regulate the use of spyware, and Member States must investigate and resolve all cases of alleged abuse of spyware and prove that their spyware framework is in line with rule of law standards. This is what should happen, but it is not. We have not yet received an official response from the Commission, and Member States are not exactly active either.

In the meantime, the situation has further developed. A Russian Kremlin-critical journalist has been targeted with spyware while residing in the EU. There have been reports of European-origin spyware being sold to countries like Vietnam and being used to target EU officials, including President Metsola. Spyware developers like Intellexa and Cytrox have been blacklisted by the US. The Spanish magisterial inquiry was closed due to lack of cooperation by the Israeli authorities, and the Polish Senate concluded its investigation on the use of Pegasus in Poland. And we count on the new government in Poland to follow up on the recommendations and on all cases of spyware abuse. But the clock is

ticking, because I would not be surprised if Minister Ziobro's shredder is already working overtime at the moment. So a lot of developments in recent months.

The only thing that does not seem to be developing any further is the interest of the European Commission. After two years of scandals and abuses, the Commission still seems to be quite satisfied with the way things are organised, and still seems to believe that victims should put their faith in the very authorities that perpetrated the crimes in the first place.

After two years and after all our investigations, now the Commission is, and I am quoting, I think, 'exploring the possibility of a non-legislative initiative'. I mean, that is simply not enough, Madam Commissioner. And if the Commission is not willing to step up its game, and I say this in the friendliest way possible, we will have to find ways to force you to do so.

Hannes Heide, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Herr Staatssekretär! Gerade einmal vier Monate sind vergangen, seitdem hier in diesem Haus der Abschlussbericht und die Entschließung mit den Empfehlungen des PEGA-Untersuchungsausschusses verabschiedet wurden. 15 Monate lang haben wir intensiv den Missbrauch von Spyware in den Mitgliedstaaten aufgearbeitet und auch konkrete Lösungsvorschläge vorgelegt, wie die Europäische Union Bürgerinnen und Bürger vor illegaler Ausspähung persönlicher Daten und massiven Eingriffen in Grundrechte schützen kann.

Der Abschlussbericht zeichnet zudem ein erschreckendes Bild, wie rechtsstaatliche Grundsätze von nationalen Regierungen und außereuropäischen Einflüssen untergraben wurden. Und nach wie vor tauchen neue Fälle auf: Laut eines Berichts von Amnesty International verkaufte das französische Softwareunternehmen Nexa die Spionagesoftware Predator an autoritäre Regime, darunter die Regierung Vietnams. Hochrangige Vertreterinnen und Vertreter europäischer Institutionen wie Präsidentin Metsola oder Kollege Karleskind fielen der vietnamesischen Spionagekampagne zum Opfer. Server der Europäischen Kommission und wissenschaftlicher Dienste sollen ausgerechnet mit jener Software angegriffen worden sein, die auch das Mobiltelefon unseres ehemaligen Kollegen Nikos Androulakis ausspioniert hat.

Der Handlungsbedarf ist offensichtlich, auch wenn die Vorwürfe überprüft werden müssen. Die Kommission ist verpflichtet, nach Verabschiedung einer Entschließung des Parlaments über konkrete Maßnahmen schriftlich zu antworten. Diese Frist dafür ist vor zwei Tagen abgelaufen. Eine Stellungnahme muss umgehend vorgelegt werden und nicht bald. Ich erwarte konkrete Vorschläge für einen Rechtsakt, der alle rechtlichen Möglichkeiten innerhalb der EU-Kompetenzen ausschöpft. Die Vielzahl der Fälle verdeutlicht, dass der bestehende Rechtsrahmen einfach nicht ausreichend ist. Das Vertrauen der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger in Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Demokratie steht auf dem Spiel!

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, Minister, Madam Commissioner, I'm a bit sad that the not all the responsible Commissioners are here.

Honestly, looking at the reply of the Commission, which took you four months to draft, it is a complete and utter waste of paper. it is worse, it is a provocation, it is a slap in the face of those people who have been targeted with spyware and a slap in the face for the victims of brutal regimes, which have bought spyware from Europe right under the nose of the Commission.

'The European Commission strongly condemns', oh, do I hear champagne corks popping in Casa de Leon? Because I don't think that anybody will be very impressed.

The sentence that shocks most in the report of the Commission is 'we expect that national competent authorities and courts make full use of their powers to thoroughly investigate allegations regarding any unlawful surveillance activities.'

Well, here's news for the Commission: the unlawful surveillance was actually carried out by those same competent authorities! It is like asking a burglar, 'Please investigate the burglary.' So why does the Commission continue with the pretence of compliance? It is like a fiction, like a myth.

So to date, unsurprisingly, colleagues, in not a single case justice has been done. Not a single case. So what does the Commission have to offer to them? What do you say to the journalists who, at peril, have been continuously investigating this case? What do you have to say to independent authorities, to Mr Rammos in Greece, who is facing a lot of grief from the national authorities because he is investigating bravely?

Now the Commission will present a non-legislative initiative. Don't bother. Don't bother. I think the interventions of my colleagues have also made it very clear that it is unacceptable. It is not a failure to act by the Commission, it is a refusal to act.

IN THE CHAIR: MARC ANGEL

Vice-President

Hannah Neumann, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, we heard it right now. You know it and we all know it: how widespread the abuse of spyware is. This Parliament has worked hard to develop recommendations on how to fix it that have been carried by a broad majority. Yet, so far nothing happened, although the Commission had promised to pick them up. In the meantime, we keep learning about new revelations. Members of Parliament targeted again, including President Metsola, European companies illegally circumventing export regulations and European stakeholders making money by sending spyware to dictators, who use them to target human rights defenders. Frankly said, it is only a matter of time before military-grade spyware ends up in the hands of terrorists. So what more do you need to finally act?

Commissioner, the European Union has one superpower. The superpower is to set standards and regulations that then become global ones. We have managed to regulate the use of 'ABC' – atomic, biological and chemical weapons – globally. The EU must now take the lead to also regulate the use of these digital weapons and ban its most intrusive forms. Frankly said, exploring options for a non-legislative proposal is not going to be good enough. So, I have only one question: when is the Commission putting forward a legislative proposal to fix this highly dangerous mess?

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, българската конституция каза ясно, че тайната на кореспонденцията е неприкосновена. Въпреки всичко, въпреки всички резолюции и приказки – някои от тях доста празни в този парламент, незаконното подслушване и добиването на информация продължава.

В България има един независим журналист блогър, казва се Станислав Цанов. Той разкри и извади информация за това как е подслушван и как е заплашван от предполагаемо лице, свързано с българската организирана престъпност. Лице, което е направило днешното българско правителство, организирайки машините за гласуване. Г-жо ин'т Велд, виждам, че водите задушевен разговор. Дали би било удобно да си сложите слушалките, защото имам въпрос към Вас? Г-жо ин'т Велд, нищо ще Ви преведат след малко, явно няма да чуете.

А това, което се случва в момента в България, е следното нещо. Има доказателства за това, че човек е подслушван и машините за гласуване са направили това правителство. Комисията LIBE отказва да изслуша този човек или все още не е поканила този човек тук в Европейския парламент. Ако искате да чуете и Вие, г-жо Комисар, Вие също сте много гласна по тези теми, извикайте г-н Цанов в комисията LIBE и го чуйте. Той казва, че е бил подслушван, и казва, че е бил заплашван, и казва, че машините, с които се гласува в България – това са венецуелски машини, не знам дали знаете какво е това нещо – машини за гласуване от Венецуела. Знаете кой е на власт във Венецуела. Само в България и Венецуела се гласува така. Съгласни ли сте Вие следващите избори за Европейски парламент да бъдат проведени по този начин? Абсолютно таен, абсолютно фалшив. И това е на основата на подслушване и на заплашване.

Ето ви конкретен сигнал – човекът стои с името си, казва се Станислав Цанов. Може да го поканите, може да го изслушате. Някой може да обвини г-жа ин'т Велд, която през цялото време стои с гръб към мен, докато говоря. Не знам дали това е много любезно, не мисля, че е много любезно, но все пак, както се казва, въпрос на възпитание. Завършвам след една секунда, не съм завършил. Затова този човек трябва да бъде повикан, да бъде изслушан и тогава ще разберете как се формират правителствата в България. Много е важно и интересно.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, les logiciels espions sont utiles pour protéger la sécurité nationale, notamment contre le terrorisme. Mais ils représentent aussi un grand danger pour le respect de la vie privée des citoyens. C'est pourquoi il ne faut les utiliser que dans un cadre légal clairement identifié.

Ce n'est, hélas, pas encore le cas à l'heure actuelle en Europe. La commission d'enquête du Parlement européen a révélé que 14 États membres de l'Union européenne sur 27 avaient utilisé le logiciel espion Pegasus, parfois en dehors de tout cadre légal. Se pose aussi le problème de l'exportation des logiciels espions dans des États hors de l'Union, qui les utilisent pour surveiller et réprimer leur population. On vient, par exemple, d'apprendre que l'entreprise française Nexa aurait vendu en 2020, en toute illégalité, le logiciel espion Predator à Madagascar. C'est d'autant plus inquiétant que la justice française a déjà ouvert une enquête contre les dirigeants de cette entreprise pour des faits similaires concernant l'Égypte et la Libye.

Il faut bien sûr dénoncer ces dérives, mais, dans la mesure où l'utilisation des logiciels espions met en jeu la sécurité nationale, j'estime que les États sont seuls compétents pour trouver les solutions adéquates. L'Union européenne n'a pas à s'ingérer dans leur domaine réservé.

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Herr Präsident! Wieder einmal mussten uns erst Journalistinnen und Journalisten das Problem auf den Tisch legen. Wieder einmal zeigt sich, wie in der EU ansässige Unternehmen ungehindert Diktatoren und Despoten mit ihrer Spyware beliefern, die nicht nur zur Unterdrückung im Inland benutzt wird – nein, auch außerhalb des Landes. Und zu den Angriffszielen gehören diesmal nicht nur EU-Abgeordnete, die Kommission, Journalistinnen und Journalisten, Forscherinnen und Forscher, nein, sogar unsere Parlamentspräsidentin.

Und Fakt ist, EU und Mitgliedstaaten haben auf ganzer Linie bei der Regulierung von Spyware-Technologie versagt. Und mehr noch: Sie sind gar nicht gewillt, wirkliche Lösungen zu finden. Sie sind deshalb mitverantwortlich für Menschenrechtsverletzungen in der ganzen Welt aufgrund dieser Sache.

Ich frage Sie: Wozu haben wir vor vier Monaten als PEGA-Ausschuss klare Handlungsempfehlungen an Kommission und Mitgliedstaaten vorgelegt? Der Sumpf der Spionagesoftwareindustrie muss endlich trockengelegt werden. Denn sonst können Überwachungsfirmen wie Intellexa und Cytrox weiter Millionenprofite auf Kosten der Menschenrechte einfahren – mit der Duldung der EU. Damit muss endlich Schluss sein!

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Mr President, this Parliament's recommendations to Spain were crystal clear: conduct a full, fair and effective investigation into all spyware cases. These include spying on Catalan MEPs and our teams and many other Catalan politicians and activists. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe recently urged similar demands to Spain. To date, no one, no one in the Spanish Government has been held accountable for the Catalan Gate and no one has even given a reasonable explanation for it, because there is none, aside from the authoritarian control of political rivals. Spain cannot get away with this violation of the rights of Catalans, especially not with the Union's acquiescence. It is therefore paramount that serious accountability measures and sanctions are immediately put in place. Or are you normalising authoritarianism in the EU?

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora vicepresidenta, señor presidente en ejercicio del Consejo, me gustaría comenzar agradeciéndole su presencia hoy aquí, vicepresidenta, pero le queda mucho camino por recorrer a la Comisión para atender las recomendaciones recogidas en el informe de la Comisión de Investigación PEGA. Así que mi recomendación es: pónganse manos a la obra.

A pesar de las circunstancias que están sucediendo en esta semana, me gustaría destacar el tema de los atentados yihadistas que acaban de golpear Europa. Tras el asesinato a sangre fría de un profesor en Francia, ayer dos ciudadanos suecos fueron tiroteados por otro terrorista islámico en Bruselas. Este retorno de una amenaza que algunos parecían haber olvidado nos recuerda una vez más la necesidad de que nuestros policías y nuestras fuerzas de seguridad cuenten con los recursos y las herramientas tecnológicas que son necesarias para hacerles frente.

En una época de radicalización exprés de lobos solitarios que cometen atentados sin estar en contacto con otros terroristas, es más importante que nunca poder acceder a la información en sus dispositivos. Herramientas de *spyware* como Pegasus son indispensables para poder adelantarse a los atentados y para frenar de raíz los procesos de radicalización.

Pero los países democráticos, los países en los que rige el Estado de Derecho, los países en los que existe una supervisión judicial efectiva, como es el caso —salvo alguna excepción, como Polonia o Hungría— de la Unión Europea, deben poder enfrentarse al terrorismo con todas sus capacidades.

Termino diciendo que tenemos que seguir trabajando en reforzar el Estado de Derecho allí donde corre el riesgo de fracturarse, por supuesto, pero no privando a nuestras fuerzas de policía de los recursos necesarios para seguir garantizando la libertad y la seguridad de todos.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente Angel, señora vicepresidenta Jourová, Presidencia española, durante más de un año, este Parlamento Europeo constituyó una comisión de investigación de la que tuve el honor de ser miembro, y trabajamos muy duramente para dar cuenta de los reportados abusos de una tecnología intrusiva de espionaje, en principio incompatible con la Carta de Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea.

Establecimos conclusiones y la Comisión está tardando en cumplir nuestro mandato. La primera conclusión fue, por supuesto, una condena sin paliativos de cualquier abuso de esa técnica de espionaje dirigida a intimidar, chantajear o silenciar no ya a periodistas y libertad de prensa, sino a profesionales del Derecho u oponentes políticos, algo indiscriminadamente incompatible, por tanto, con el Derecho europeo.

Pero, además, exigimos que se regulase el uso, venta o adquisición de estos programas de espionaje, y que se reglamentase por la Unión Europea la necesaria autorización judicial con protección de datos, confidencialidad de las comunicaciones personales y también protección especial para aquellas personas que gocen de inmunidad o secreto profesional porque son periodistas.

Además, queremos que haya una cláusula de seguridad nacional establecida por el Derecho europeo y que exista también un laboratorio de referencia independiente de la Unión Europea para dar cuenta de cuándo un dispositivo de comunicaciones personales ha sido intervenido de manera intrusiva por esos programas de espionaje de los que disponen numerosos Estados miembros de la Unión Europea.

Salima Yenbou (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, en juin dernier, nous étions déjà ici pour montrer les résultats de l'enquête de notre commission PEGA et demander d'urgence des réformes pour mieux contrôler les logiciels espions. Pourquoi cette urgence? Eh bien voilà, après Pegasus, on a Predator, qui a au moins le mérite d'être beaucoup plus clair dans sa dénomination.

Il existe encore bien trop de failles, et l'industrie de la cybersurveillance sait les exploiter en contournant la réglementation existante; elle trouvera toujours des clients parmi les pays pour qui les droits de l'homme ne sont clairement pas la priorité. De Pegasus à Predator, les députés – dont mon collègue Pierre Karleskind –, les opposants politiques, les journalistes et les ONG continuent d'être pris pour cible. Nos droits fondamentaux sont bafoués et nous restons passifs, donc impuissants.

En manquant de réactivité et d'efficacité pour construire un cadre législatif et réglementaire solide, nous avons présenté à la face du monde notre inefficacité. Cela doit nous servir de leçon. Il est temps d'agir; c'est notre devoir et c'est de notre compétence. J'espère que je n'aurai pas à répéter la même chose, une fois encore, dans quatre mois, car, je vous l'avoue, j'ai vraiment horreur de jeter du sel dans la mer.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, vous nous dites, Madame Jourová, que les réponses de la Commission européenne aux recommandations de notre commission d'enquête Pegasus sont prêtes à être envoyées et que vous explorez la possibilité d'une initiative non législative. Cela sonne un peu comme une blague.

Face aux dernières révélations, alors qu'il y a plus de six mois que nous avons adopté nos recommandations législatives, la Commission et le Conseil ne bougent pas. De quoi s'agit-il cette fois? D'une société française de surveillance qui a violé la loi sur les biens à double usage en vendant, en toute impunité, un logiciel espion à des États autoritaires, qui, de toute évidence, allaient s'en servir contre des militants des droits de l'homme et l'opposition politique. Le Viêt Nam en fait partie.

Cette pratique nous revient aujourd'hui comme un boomerang, avec un flagrant délit d'ingérence étrangère du Viêt Nam dans les affaires européennes. La Présidente de cette assemblée a été espionnée, et nos institutions restent silencieuses!

Une réponse ferme doit être donnée aux États tiers qui nous espionnent. Le Viêt Nam a rompu le pacte de confiance qui nous lie depuis 2020. Cessons enfin d'être naïfs! Suspendons l'accord le temps qu'une enquête soit menée et fasse la lumière sur la situation. Il faut que le Viêt Nam montre des gages de transparence et de bonne coopération.

Par ailleurs, nous avons un tout nouvel instrument anticoercition, qui a été créé pour répondre à ce type de situation. J'aimerais aussi entendre la Commission à ce sujet.

Stelios Kouloglou (The Left). – Mr President, you know, sometimes there are very ironic historical coincidences. One hour ago, a Greek journalist, Stavros Malichudis, was awarded, among other journalists, the Daphne Caruana award we give in Parliament. The same person – Stavros Malichudis – was a victim of the spyware scandal in Greece one year ago. And you know, the pretext was that he was spied on because of national security protection.

Now the Council wants to introduce the exemption for states to spy on journalists for national security. The Council must answer: how can you prevent ruthless governments – like the Orbán government or the Greek Government – from using the exception to spy on honest journalists like the one who just received the Caruana Prize. How can you exclude that? Can you prevent that?

What about the recommendations of the PEGA Committee? One of the recommendations was to reinforce the independent authorities. And now in Greece, we have exactly the opposite: the violation of the independent authority concerning spyware.

Tatjana Ždanoka (NI). – Mr President, a lot could have already been done since the adoption in June of European Parliament recommendations based on the proposals of the Committee of Inquiry to investigate the use of Pegasus and equivalent surveillance spyware (PEGA), but this was not the case. For example, there is a call on national parliaments to set up meaningful oversight bodies of intelligence services and foster better cooperation among them to increase accountability and control, but there are no signals of any intention to implement them.

For example, in my country, Latvia, a small country with two different intelligence services, nothing has been done. Another example is the proposals to integrate the spyware use monitoring in the Commission's Rule of Law Report. I have already expressed my critical remarks on the Rule of Law Reports for previous years. For this year, 2023, the same thing. It is too general, nothing concrete.

My question, Commissioner, is: do you think that the implementation of spyware use monitoring in Rule of Law Reports can have an effect?

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Chciałem z tego miejsca zapewnić, że nowy polski rząd nie tylko wyjaśni aferę związaną z nielegalnym używaniem nielegalnych oprogramowań szpiegowskich Pegasus w Polsce, ale także ukarze winnych, bo tak powinno być, jeżeli ma działać sprawiedliwość, prawo i sprawiedliwość.

Chciałem z tego miejsca jednak podkreślić ten apel, który jest niezbędny, bo naprawdę europejskie bezpieczeństwo jest zagrożone. Już nie tylko nasza prywatność, ale europejskie bezpieczeństwo, skoro systemy – już nie tylko Pegasus, ale także Predator – używane przez prywatne już firmy powiązane ze służbami, gdzie mamy rosyjskie ślady czy ślady związane z wrogami, działalnością wrogów Europy, Europy demokratycznej i wolnej, dotyczą instytucji europejskiej i dotyczą komisarza, dotyczą przewodniczącej Parlamentu. Sprawozdanie komisji Pegasusa, specjalnej komisji, której przewodniczył pan przewodniczący Lenners, zawiera bardzo dokładne rekomendacje. One są do wdrożenia natychmiast.

Mamy przed sobą także wybory, które być może będą również z tego tytułu zagrożone, bo jest ogromny handel i czarny rynek handlu danymi. Te systemy potrafią zmieniać zawartość, ale również wysyłać fałszywe informacje. Nie możemy być bezbronni i trzeba karać tych, którzy działają nielegalnie, ale także tworzyć własny system bezpieczeństwa europejskiego. I potrzebna jest współpraca także służb specjalnych europejskich, by uchronić nas, Europę przed działaniami wrogów Europy wykorzystującymi tę najnowocześniejszą technologię.

Katarina Barley (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es sind noch weniger als acht Monate bis zur Europawahl, einer Wahl, in der die Bürgerinnen und Bürger Europas die Chance haben, ihr demokratisches Mitspracherecht zur Geltung zu bringen. Das alles wird stattfinden in einer Zeit der Desinformationskampagnen autokratischer Regierungen und Diktatoren, die mit allen Mitteln versuchen, unsere Rechtsstaatlichkeit anzugreifen. Wir wissen, dass das in früheren Wahlen und Abstimmungen schon geschehen ist, so zum Beispiel beim Brexit. Demokraten kämpfen nicht mit den gleichen Mitteln: Desinformation, Betrügereien, Rechtsbrüche, Bedrohungen. Das verbietet sich für uns. Und das ist gut und richtig so.

Aber in genau diesen Zeiten dürfen wir dann nicht dem Angriff auf unsere Demokratie auch noch durch mangelhafte Regulierung im Bereich von Spähsoftware ein Einfallstor bieten. Schon vier Monate ist es her, dass wir klare Regeln für diese undurchsichtigen Netzwerke gefordert haben. Ordnungsgemäße gerichtliche Kontrolle, effektive parlamentarische Aufsicht, eine erfolgreiche Durchsetzung von Exportkontrolle gehören dazu. Die Kommission ist bisher untätig geblieben. Dabei unterstreichen die jüngsten Enthüllungen unter dem Namen *Predator Files* einmal mehr den dringenden Handlungsbedarf. Wir haben es hier heute bei dieser Debatte auch wieder gehört. Es sind diejenigen, die am meisten beitragen zu unserem demokratischen Gemeinwesen. Es sind NGOs, Zivilgesellschaft, es sind kritische Journalistinnen und Journalisten, es sind Politikerinnen und Politiker, die Ziel dieser Angriffe von Autokraten werden.

Umso wichtiger ist es, dass wir uns wehren gegen solche Monster wie diese Spähsoftware. Denn die allermeisten Menschen machen sie sich ja gar nicht bewusst. Es geht nicht darum, dass man irgendwo einmal die Kamera oder das Mikrofon anschaltet. Wer diese Spähsoftware besitzt, der hat quasi Ihr Handy in der Hand. Das ist Ihre gesamte Privatsphäre, die diesen Menschen in die Hände fällt. Also eine Bitte an die Kommission: Geben Sie uns, den Demokratinnen und Demokraten, den Demokratien, die Mittel an die Hand, sich gegen die Antidemokraten zu wehren.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señor presidente, ¿necesitamos una estrategia europea contra los programas espía? Sí, pero cuidado que no se convierta en un caballo de Troya en manos del separatismo, la delincuencia organizada para amenazar la democracia y el Estado de Derecho en Europa. Un ejemplo: hoy hemos conocido la imputación de la exdirectora de los servicios secretos españoles utilizando como fundamento el informe Catalangate de Citizen Lab. Un medio de comunicación titulaba así la noticia: «La desidia del Gobierno español en desmontar la mentira del Catalangate coloca al CNI ante su peor crisis». Y decide así por vagos irresponsables, pero también por cómplices, por no desmontar las mentiras de ese informe como pago por los apoyos políticos del separatismo catalán del Gobierno español.

Así, mientras un servidor público fue injustamente cesado y ahora es imputado, los que dieron un golpe de Estado en Cataluña mientras negociaban con Putin su apoyo a la independencia de Cataluña se ríen en sus escaños.

Hoy, desgraciadamente, podemos afirmar que en España los delincuentes imponen su relato y son amnistiados. Y, mientras, los defensores del Estado de Derecho son perseguidos e imputados. Y esto tiene un responsable, el presidente del Consejo de la Unión Europea, Pedro Sánchez.

Cuidado con los que esconden tras Pegasus un caballo de Troya contra las democracias.

Diana Riba i Giner (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, qué difícil, después de esta intervención de su señoría Cañas diciendo las barbaridades que acaba de decir aquí en esta Cámara. Pero iré directa al grano.

Las recientes revelaciones de Amnistía Internacional sobre nuevos casos de ciberespionaje mediante Predator no hacen nada más que confirmar lo que ya concluimos en el marco de la Comisión de Investigación de esta Cámara.

Hay que regular de forma estricta y urgente el comercio y uso de programas espía tanto dentro como fuera de la Unión Europea, y es básico que estos no estén exentos de la aplicación de la Directiva de diligencia debida sobre sostenibilidad corporativa.

Hasta que no tengamos este marco y estas garantías, se debe detener de inmediato el uso abusivo de estas tecnologías. Debemos recordar a los Estados miembros que tienen hasta final de año para cumplir con los requerimientos contenidos en el informe aprobado por esta Cámara. No podemos permitir que se siga atacando a los ciudadanos con esta impunidad.

Señores de la Comisión, señores del Consejo, en esta casa hicimos nuestro trabajo. Los estamos esperando. No tarden, porque están en juego nuestros derechos.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señor presidente, Polonia, Hungría, Grecia, Chipre y España somos los campeones de Pegasus según el informe del Parlamento Europeo. ¿Podemos, por tanto, confiar en los Estados miembros para que defiendan los derechos de los ciudadanos? ¿Podemos seguir creyendo que, simplemente con regulaciones estatales, las libertades políticas de las minorías disidentes serán protegidas? La respuesta es que no.

En España los independentistas catalanes víctimas de Pegasus no pueden hacer valer sus derechos ante los tribunales; Hungría y Polonia siguen sin cumplir con las sentencias del Tribunal de Estrasburgo; el Consejo de Europa ha puesto a Estados de la Unión Europea al nivel de autocracias tan consolidadas como Azerbaiyán.

No solo hace falta que las instituciones europeas supervisen el uso de Pegasus, sino que lo prohíban. Programas como este violan nuestros derechos de forma estructural y quebrantan los propios fundamentos de la Unión Europea. No podemos permitir que en la casa de la democracia europea se lleven a cabo de forma impune estas maniobras de espionaje masivo, porque quienes realizan estos ataques no se comportan como demócratas europeos. Por ello, es una vergüenza que la Comisión haya ignorado el ciberespionaje masivo en sus informes sobre el Estado de Derecho.

Reclamamos con urgencia *(palabra inaudible)* una respuesta sólida por parte de las instituciones. La inacción europea es cómplice del autoritarismo de Estado. Los catalanes lo sabemos muy bien.

Y con relación a la intervención del señor Cañas, a palabras necias, oídos sordos *(el presidente retira la palabra al orador).*

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, πριν από έναν χρόνο η χρήση παράνομων λογισμικών από κράτη μέλη έγινε αντικείμενο έρευνας από την επιτροπή μας Pega, η οποία κατέληξε στο πόρισμά της. Καλούμε σήμερα την Επιτροπή να εξετάσει υπεύθυνα νομοθετικό πλαίσιο που να εγγυάται την ασφάλεια των πολιτών με σεβασμό στα δικαιώματά τους, το απόρρητο των επικοινωνιών και τα προσωπικά δεδομένα.

Η χώρα μου, η Ελλάδα, βρέθηκε στο επίκεντρο λόγω νόμιμων επισυνδέσεων πολιτών, για λόγους εθνικής ασφάλειας από την Εθνική Υπηρεσία Πληροφοριών. Δυστυχώς, όμως, κάποιοι σε αυτή την αίθουσα συκοφάντησαν την Ελλάδα με fake news για δήθεν χρήση από την κυβέρνηση παράνομου λογισμικού. Όμως, χάρη σε αυτήν την κυβέρνηση και σε νομοθετικές πρωτοβουλίες της, η Ελλάδα είναι η πρώτη χώρα στην Ένωση που θεσμοθέτησε οριζόντια καθολική απαγόρευση πώλησης, χρήσης, κατοχής, διανομής και εισαγωγής κακόβουλου λογισμικού. Η χρήση τέτοιων προϊόντων αναβαθμίστηκε από πλημμέλημα σε κακούργημα, ενώ καθιερώθηκε ειδική διαδικασία για την άρση απορρήτου με πολύ αυστηρές προϋποθέσεις που εγγυώνται την προστασία των θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων. Δεν είναι τυχαίο ότι η πατρίδα μου ανέβηκε την τελευταία τετραετία εννέα θέσεις στον Δείκτη Δημοκρατίας και 16 στον Δείκτη Διαφάνειας, σύμφωνα με την έκθεση της Διεθνούς Διαφάνειας.

Κυρία Επίτροπε, γνωρίζετε ότι έχουμε ευθύνη για την ασφάλεια των πολιτών που εκπροσωπούμε. Οφείλετε να επισπεύσετε τη νομοθετική σας πρόταση, ενόψει μάλιστα πολύ σοβαρών προκλήσεων που αντιμετωπίζουμε, όπως είναι η τρομοκρατία και το οργανωμένο έγκλημα.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! PiS popełnił wiele ciężkich przestępstw przeciwko polskiej demokracji. Afera Pegasusa, czyli zwalczanie opozycji przy pomocy broni antyterrorystycznej, to jest jeden z najmroczniejszych przykładów. Prawa konkretnych ludzi zostały zdeptane, senatora Brejzy, prokurator Wrzosek, ich rodzin i wielu innych. Nie wolno nam tego odpuścić. Tego oczekują mieszkańcy Polski. Oni powiedzieli wyraźnie w wyborach „Nie chcemy ruskich standardów, nie chcemy patologii u władzy". PiS musi za to odpowiedzieć. Dopilnujemy tego. Konieczna jest także odbudowa państwa. Należy wdrożyć zapisy opracowane przez naszą europejską komisję śledczą PEGA. Po pierwsze, w polskim Sejmie musi powstać komisja śledcza w tej sprawie. Po drugie, potrzebujemy europejskiej definicji bezpieczeństwa narodowego. I po trzecie, wspólne unijne standardy używania programów szpiegowskich.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Domnule președinte, au trecut deja câteva luni de când am votat aici, în plen, recomandările în urma scandalului Pegasus, în care guverne din state ca Ungaria sau Polonia au folosit acest program pentru a spiona jurnaliști, politicieni, diplomați, avocați, oameni de afaceri în scopuri politice și chiar infracționale. Nu avem încă nicio măsură ca urmare a votului dat de Parlament. Săptămâna trecută, un alt scandal a fost scos la iveală tot cu ajutorul jurnaliștilor de investigație, care au dezvăluit cum companiile europene finanțează și vând dictatorilor programe de supraveghere cibernetică. Cu ajutorul software-ului Predator, vizați au fost chiar colegi ai noștri, în frunte cu Roberta Metsola, președinta Parlamentului European, dar și președinta Taiwanului și mulți alți activiști, jurnaliști și cadre universitare.

Întrebările mele sunt: 1. Ce trebuie să se mai întâmple ca să avem reguli la nivel european care să prevină astfel de situații? Și 2. Cea mai curajoasă abordare privind spionajul de până acum este în Actul european pentru libertatea presei. Comisia a avut curaj, Parlamentul a avut curaj. Întrebarea este: suntem în stare să o păstrăm? Vă spun că o voi apăra cu orice preț, pentru că poate să fie primul pas spre o Europă în care încălcarea flagrantă a unor drepturi devine istorie.

Marcel Kolaja (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, spying on journalists, opposition politicians or activists has become, thanks to conservative governments in Hungary, Spain, Poland and Greece, a sad reality in Europe. Everyone's privacy is under attack by governments who want to break into people's phones, but also by legislative proposals aiming to drill holes in encrypted communication. This must stop. The Commission needs to prove that they want to respect citizens' right for privacy, and the moment is now. We, Members of the European Parliament, did our homework. We gave you, Madam Vice-President, a comprehensive manual outlining what needs to be done in order to prevent abuses of Pegasus or any other spyware. The ball is in the Commission's court. Do not leave it to rot away among faded roses and dry grass. Please pick it up and act. You weren't able to finish your speech, Madam Vice-President, and I don't know how you wanted to continue. However, I believe that many Members, as you can hear, expect that it was supposed to be an announcement of a legislative proposal.

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Mr President, the unregulated, unsupervised use of spyware is a threat to our democracies and to our way of life. Software that was originally developed for reasons of national security and law enforcement is falling into the hands of bad faith actors and governments that use it illegally to access people's personal data.

Spyware such as Pegasus and Predator can effectively turn your phone into a listening device. We have also heard reports of its use, including against journalists and activists, in Poland and Hungary, as well as against government bodies in countries like the UK. I want to thank groups like Forbidden Stories for their work in raising awareness of the threats our governments need to ensure a robust response, and indeed to exchange best practice.

There is a risk to personal privacy, and indeed to national security, that we need to take seriously. We must invest in strong cybersecurity protections. We need better training and resources for staff in our national cybersecurity agencies to spot the threats and to take effective actions early.

Ireland is a global leader in the technology sector, but we have previously been slow to invest in cybersecurity the way that we need to. So I welcome increased funding for the Irish National Cyber Security Centre in the recent budget, and I hope this will continue in the years ahead.

We have also seen a whole series of recommendations that need to be invested in and taken seriously, that are in the report and need now to be implemented. Security is multifaceted, but it is as important in the cyber domain as in any other field.

Nikos Papandreou (S&D). –Mr President. I'll speak in Greek, but first I would like to say to my colleague, Ms Vozemberg-Vrionidi from EPP New Democracy, that I hope that Greece never does this again. She says her government has stopped with PEGA, with the following, and with the spyware. I hope that's true. However, there are some unsettling things still going on. Now I'll switch to Greek.

Είναι εξαιρετικά ανησυχητικό ότι η νέα ελληνική κυβέρνηση δεν ακολούθησε τις προτάσεις της επιτροπής PEGA, εκείνες που αφορούσαν τη λειτουργία της ΑΔΑΕ.

The Hellenic Authority for Communication Security and Privacy. Maybe that's ironic.

Σας θυμίζω ότι γνωστό θύμα των υποκλοπών ήταν και ο σημερινός πρόεδρος του ΠΑΣΟΚ Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης. Η κυβέρνηση 'κίνησε γη και ουρανό' έτσι ώστε μαζί με το μικρό δεξιό κόμμα να αλλάξει τα μέλη της επιτροπής, ακριβώς μια μέρα πριν από τη συνεδρίαση της ΑΔΑΕ για το θέμα των υποκλοπών. Μια μέρα πριν. Αυτό λέγεται συγκάλυψη. Με αυτόν τον αμφίβολο τρόπο η κυβέρνηση προστατεύεται από τις συνέπειες των πράξεών της. Κάνω έκκληση στο Συμβούλιο και την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να θεσπίσει μια πανευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία με ισχύ, ώστε να μπορέσουν τα θύματα των υποκλοπών να μάθουν επιτέλους αν παρακολουθούνταν, από ποιους και γιατί παρακολουθούνταν, και να αναζητήσουν δικαίωση.

Pierre Karleskind (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Vice-Présidente, je viens de vous donner mon téléphone pour la simple et bonne raison que, depuis que j'ai appris que j'avais été la cible d'une cyberattaque et que j'ai prévenu la Commission européenne – à plusieurs niveaux –, personne, à la Commission européenne, ne s'est soucié de savoir si mon téléphone avait été infecté.

Peut-être mon téléphone est-il, à l'heure où je vous parle, en train d'écouter ce que nous disons, peut-être le gouvernement vietnamien sait-il exactement ce que nous faisons. Personne ne s'en est soucié; et pourtant, de qui tirons-nous notre légitimité ici, en tant que Parlement et en tant qu'élus de ce Parlement? Eh bien des traités. Et qui est la gardienne des traités? C'est la Commission européenne! Autrement dit, l'intégrité des élus de ce Parlement, des législateurs, devrait être votre souci. Cela ne l'a pas été!

J'ai écrit au haut représentant pour lui demander quelle était sa réaction face au gouvernement vietnamien, pour au moins qu'il convoque l'ambassadeur vietnamien auprès de l'Union européenne. Aucune réponse, aucune réaction! Ce silence assourdissant est plus que choquant.

Peut-être trouverez-vous sympathique que mes petites conversations privées se retrouvent sur le web. Peut-être trouverez-vous cela sympathique. Mais à l'approche des élections européennes, je crains le pire.

J'ai été ciblé, sachez-le, parce que je lutte, depuis le début de mon mandat, contre la pêche illégale, alors que le Viêt Nam est ciblé à cet égard et a reçu un carton jaune. Nous avons voté, aujourd'hui même, un rapport sur la Chine qui dénonce ces pratiques de pêche illégale. Eh bien, sachez-le, je continuerai. Mais, Madame la Vice-Présidente, je demande enfin que la Commission européenne sorte de son silence assourdissant.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ποιότητα της δημοκρατίας μας απειλείται από την κατάχρηση κακόβουλων λογισμικών. Κυβερνήσεις κρατών μελών διαστρέφουν την έννοια της εθνικής ασφάλειας και στρέφονται κατά πολιτικών αντιπάλων τους. Στην Ελλάδα είχαμε παρακολούθηση του σοσιαλιστή ευρωβουλευτή Νίκου Ανδρουλάκη, ο οποίος ηγείται σήμερα των σοσιαλιστών στην Ελλάδα, με ένα μείγμα κακόβουλου λογισμικού τύπου Predator και παραδοσιακών υποκλοπών από την Εθνική Υπηρεσία Πληροφοριών. Στη δική μου περίπτωση, είχαμε παρακολούθηση για 18 μήνες με παραδοσιακές υποκλοπές από την Εθνική Υπηρεσία Πληροφοριών. Θεωρήθηκα, όπως ο Ανδρουλάκης, επικίνδυνος για την εθνική ασφάλεια. Η κυβέρνηση κουκούλωσε την υπόθεση με τη βοήθεια της ανεξάρτητης, υποτίθεται, δικαιοσύνης. Φρόντισε μάλιστα να εξουδετερώσει την Ανεξάρτητη Αρχή που προστατεύει το απόρρητο των τηλεπικοινωνιών. Στους ευρωπαϊκούς θεσμούς πολλοί κάνουν ότι δεν είδαν, ότι δεν άκουσαν, για να στηρίξουν το κυβερνών κόμμα στην Ελλάδα. Αυτή η συμπεριφορά υπονομεύει το ευρωπαϊκό κράτος δικαίου που όλοι επικαλούμαστε. Τέλος, δεν έχω λόγια για τον Έλληνα Επίτροπο, υπεύθυνο, υποτίθεται, για τον ευρωπαϊκό τρόπο ζωής. Φαίνεται ότι θεωρεί ότι οι υποκλοπές είναι μέρος του ευρωπαϊκού τρόπου ζωής. Ή για τη συνάδελφό του ΕΛΚ κυρία Βόζεμπεργκ, η οποία ειρωνεύεται τον Ανδρουλάκη και εμένα με την ανύπαρκτη συμβολή της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης στην ενίσχυση των δημοκρατικών δικαιωμάτων μας. Θα μας παρακολουθούν και θα τους ευχαριστούμε επιπλέον.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, Presidency and colleagues, Intellexa is the proprietor of Predator and it is a company that's registered in Ireland. The Irish Government says it doesn't have a substantial presence there and there's nothing to worry about. But it books EUR 30 million in revenue through its Irish accounts and a lot of company formation specialists provide the support for Intellexa to be present in Ireland.

I put pressure on them. Journalists – including *The Currency*, an online publication – put pressure on them. And I'm happy to say that, over the summer, Intellexa's directors resigned, and just last week its company secretary registered its resignation in the companies office.

And my message to company formation specialists is: do your due diligence because this industry is toxic. And I'm very concerned that Member States are using spyware for detection, but not for prosecution of crime, because they know it will not survive a challenge under the European Convention on Human Rights. So we need a European Framework, Commissioner, and we need it very, very urgently.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, it's a fact that Pegasus spyware was battle-tested on civilians and human rights activists in Palestine. The Occupied Territories are some of the most surveilled places on earth. For Israeli companies engaged in developing spyware, the Occupied Territories have always been a laboratory where their products can be tested before being marketed and exported around the world for profit.

Spyware is a tool of control, and the NSO Group is an arm of the Israeli State. You said, Commissioner, that even where spyware is used in connection with national security, there have to be checks and balances. But we know that will always be abused, and this is abuse of spyware.

All of the intelligence and data scraped from this surveillance will – now more than ever – be used to punish innocent Palestinians. Israel is right now committing war crimes against Palestinian civilians. It's engaging in collective punishment of an innocent people.

And I have to say, it is still shocking that our President von der Leyen went there to say that she stood by what Israel was doing. It's a bad reflection on the EU. It brings it into disrepute that she still has her job.

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Hr. formand! Vi taler om spionagemateriale, spyware. Vi taler om intrusive spyware, men alt spionagesoftware er noget, som er invasivt i vores privatliv. I går var det årsdagen for Daphne Caruana Galizias død i Malta. I dag har flere kollegaer talt om, at de har været udsat for spionage ved brug af spyware, ved brug af Pegasus – og vi er glade for, at de er her i dag. Der er journalister, der er aktivister, der er oppositionsmedlemmer på tværs af verden, som ikke er her længere i dag, fordi deres regeringer, kriminelle netværk har udspioneret dem. Der er et kæmpe behov for, at vi endelig får europæisk lovgivning på dette spørgsmål. Under tidligere mandatperioder har kollegaer kæmpet for, at vi nu har eksportkontrol på det her. At vi har eksportkontrol på spyware. Det har vi fået. Men har vi kontrol med, hvad der foregår inden for vores grænser i EU? Sørger vi for at beskytte vores aktivister, som kæmper for arbejdstagerrettigheder, for miljø, for klima? Sørger vi for at beskytte vores journalister bare i vores egen Europæiske Union?

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you very much for this very useful and interesting debate. At the beginning, I enumerated the list of pieces of legislation which we already have in place, be it data protection, ePrivacy, which is still pending, the Law Enforcement Directive, Cybersecurity Act, and several others. This is what we can and must do to legislate where we have legal competence. Indeed. I agree with you, Mr Karleskind, we are guardians of the Treaty, and that's why we have to also respect the limits of our competence. When it comes to national security, we dont have the competence and we have to be able to impose a sufficient and strong enough push on the Member States to respect the case-law of the European Court of Justice and also the Charter of Fundamental Rights, which speaks clear language. For intercepting people for usage of spyware there must be legal justification, it has to be authorised by the courts, and it can be used only in case of necessity and proportionality. This is the more or less the text of the of the main legal conditions. And this cannot be a blank cheque. The Member States have to respect these rules. And when I was in Greece, I had a very long discussion with Prime Minister Mitsotakis about that. And I asked him, could you please update your law, which relates to national security, in the way that the people who will be intercepted will be informed afterwards, so that they are aware that they were listened to for national security reasons? And the answer was, yes, we will do that. But I cannot do anything else than to have a discussion with the Member States and impose the pressure to push them to comply with the rules given by the European Court of Justice.

I propose the Media Freedom Act, because I do believe that the spyware being used against political opponents and journalists is threatening democracy. And in the Media Freedom Act, you know where we are. We are in an advanced stage of the negotiations. I proposed the ban of the usage of spyware against journalists, with very narrow space for exceptions. And now we are entering the phase of trilogue, and I hope I will be able to convince the Member States that what should remain narrow has to remain narrow. And that's why I also want to thank this House for sustained support on that.

You said many times that you expect the Commission to take action. The Commission can do two things: either to legislate – and here we can consider, of course, an update of, for instance, the Cybersecurity Act, which should be updated in 2026, or urgent updates of some other pieces of legislation. But again, within the competences we have been given by the Treaty. The second thing we can do is the infringement. Here again, we cannot address individual cases which you mentioned here. This is not the role for the Commission. We are not judges. We don't have any investigative powers to go into individual cases. I am glad it is set up that way. This is the work for the Member States and the Court's scrutiny, and I think that we have to leave it like that. Again, I hear I speak about individual cases.

So just to give you a more concrete idea about our mapping, which we did to understand how the conditions are being fulfilled from a data protection perspective. We sent letters to all the Member States at the end of December 22nd, about the legal framework governing the use of spyware to examine the interplay with EU data protection law from a data-protection perspective. 24 Member States have replied up to now, except Denmark, Hungary and the Netherlands. Due to the varying quality and content of their replies, this mapping exercise constitutes a first step in the reflection, and the Commission will continue working on that. We will keep asking and here is the sentence which provoked negative reactions. Here we are going to explore further the possibility of presenting a non-legislative initiative, clarifying the boundaries and the interplay between EU law, in particular the data protection and privacy *acquis* and national security. So this is what we are working on.

You also mentioned the dual use and trade aspect. Let me clarify that intrusion software such as Pegasus is already subject to control under the Dual-Use Regulation. This means that any exports of Pegasus or related software must be subject to an authorisation granted by competent authorities of the Member States. We will continue to engage with Member States to clarify their consistent application of the regulation, and are also discussing with Member States the additional information they should report on authorisations for cyber surveillance items in view of the preparation of the 2023 Annual Report and enhanced transparency requirements of the new regulation. I have some more things to say, but I think I am beyond time.

Pascual Navarro Ríos, *presidente en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, señora vicepresidenta, señorías, gracias por este debate que demuestra, una vez más, la necesidad de colaborar conjuntamente en la protección de nuestros principios democráticos y, también, ha puesto de manifiesto la importancia de mantener la confianza de la ciudadanía en nuestras instituciones y de velar por la aplicación efectiva de la protección que el Derecho de la Unión ya contempla.

No me corresponde responder en nombre de Estados miembros sino del Consejo. Por ello, recuerdo en primer lugar que el Reglamento General de Protección de Datos y la Directiva sobre protección de datos aplicables a las fuerzas y cuerpos de seguridad proporcionan salvaguardias y protección frente a las injerencias ilícitas en los derechos fundamentales de las personas y su aplicación efectiva es también una respuesta ante el uso ilegal de programas espía en la Unión Europea.

Algunas de sus señorías se han referido a la European Media Freedom Act y en este sentido quiero recordar que, como saben, el Consejo ha adoptado su posición, que incluye medidas de protección a los periodistas y que las negociaciones interinstitucionales —como ha recordado la comisaria Jourová— están a punto de comenzar.

El Consejo considera que los Estados miembros no deben desplegar herramientas intrusivas de vigilancia en instrumentos usados por los periodistas, a menos que esté justificado por un requerimiento de interés público claro y que tales investigaciones deben ser por una cuestión de crímenes serios. Estas medidas no deben ser intrusivas y deben ser adecuadas y suficientes. Esperamos —como ha dicho también la comisaria— que se pueda alcanzar un acuerdo en los trílogos en torno a estos parámetros.

En tercer lugar, tomo nota de las peticiones formuladas y reiteradas hoy de posibles iniciativas de seguimiento que —como ha señalado la Comisión— se pueden tomar más adelante. Pero recuerdo que el Consejo está trabajando en el Reglamento de Ciberresiliencia y que esperamos encontrar una solución lo antes posible.

Y para concluir diré que la Presidencia española preside, junto a la Comisión Europea, el Grupo de Alto Nivel sobre el Acceso a los Datos para una aplicación eficaz de la ley y que el debate que hoy hemos tenido en esta Cámara puede contribuir a la próxima reflexión en este grupo.

President. – The debate is closed.

18. Situación de las refugiadas ucranianas, en particular su acceso a asistencia en materia de salud sexual y reproductiva y derechos conexos (debate)

President. – The next item is the statements by the Council and the Commission on the Situation of Ukrainian women refugees, including access to SRHR support (2023/2907(RSP))

Pascual Navarro Ríos, *presidente en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, señorías, a finales de agosto de 2023, más de cuatro millones de ucranianos —de los que alrededor del 63 % eran mujeres— se estaban beneficiando de la protección temporal de la Unión Europea. Hablamos, pues, de dos millones y medio de personas. Es más, alrededor de un tercio son personas menores de dieciocho años.

Por lo tanto, en estos momentos, numerosas mujeres ucranianas que se han visto obligadas a abandonar su país para huir de la agresión a Ucrania se encuentran en territorio de la Unión Europea cuidando de niños pequeños, personas mayores o familiares enfermos, mientras sus maridos están en Ucrania.

Los Estados de la Unión Europea, en especial aquellos que han acogido a un gran número de refugiadas y refugiados ucranianos han realizado grandes esfuerzos para facilitar su inserción en el mercado laboral. Afrontar esta situación ha supuesto y sigue suponiendo un gran reto para las autoridades nacionales.

A escala nacional y local han surgido varias iniciativas que, con el apoyo de la Unión, están destinadas a abordar la situación concreta de las mujeres ucranianas, como son los servicios de atención a la infancia y los cuidados de larga duración que permiten a las mujeres entrar en el mercado laboral. En esta línea, la iniciativa Garantía Infantil Europea de la Unión es un magnífico ejemplo.

Además, la protección proporcionada a las refugiadas y los refugiados ucranianos en virtud de la Directiva de protección temporal incluye el acceso automático a la asistencia médica en los Estados miembros de la Unión. Este acceso incluye, por supuesto, los servicios relacionados con la salud y derechos sexuales y reproductivos prestados por los sistemas sanitarios nacionales.

Nuestro compromiso a largo plazo con Ucrania y la población ucraniana significa que los Estados miembros han actuado con rapidez no solo para acoger a las personas desplazadas de Ucrania, sino también para apoyarlas y protegerlas. Nuestro deber común consiste en asegurarnos de que quienes han acudido a la Unión en busca de protección se sientan como en casa.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Minister, we are, of course, very concerned about reports that Russian armed forces use sexual violence, including rape against women and children, as a weapon of war in the context of the unprovoked and illegal Russian war of aggression against Ukraine.

We strongly condemn such atrocities. There must be no impunity for the war crimes committed. By standing up for women's rights and gender equality, we are defending and upholding a core value of the EU and a cross-cutting priority in its policy-making, both in internal and external action.

The EU remains committed to promote global sexual and reproductive health and rights as an essential part of realising human rights. Our ambition is clearly set out in EU Gender Action Plan III and in the European Consensus on Development.

Following the outbreak of the war last year, the Commission has taken immediate action to provide urgent support to survivors of sexual violence in Ukraine. A contract of EUR 1.5 million with the United Nations Population Fund was signed for a countrywide 12-month intervention to provide emergency assistance to women and girls in Ukraine, including survivors of gender-based violence with access to sexual and reproductive health response services.

The EU is also working closely with Ukrainian authorities to guarantee the medical evacuation, when necessary, of women and girls, and to provide them with medical treatment. Moreover, the EU signed an agreement with the International Federation of the Red Cross to provide mental health and psychosocial support for Ukrainians, including in cases of-gender based violence.

We supported Eurojust and the European Judicial Training Network to help prosecute war crimes committed in Ukraine, including rape and sexual violence. Support is also provided to mobile justice teams that support the work of the Office of the Prosecutor General of Ukraine.

The EU furthermore supports the work of women's NGOs serving as first responders to victims of conflict-related sexual violence, including to prevent burnout and provide psychological assistance to their staff.

Regarding the internal dimension, with the gender equality strategy we have committed to achieve a gender-equal Europe, where all women and girls are free from gender-based violence, sex discrimination and structural inequalities, and can lead and thrive.

Under the Temporary Protection Directive, Member States shall provide necessary medical or other assistance to persons who have special needs, including victims of rape or other serious forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence. This assistance must include at least emergency care and essential treatment of illness.

Member States are free to extend assistance and give the same coverage as to their nationals. But the coverage can differ among Member States, as according to the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU, Union action shall respect the responsibilities of the Member States for the definition of their health policy and for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care.

So the Member States have the legislative powers to decide the extension of the national package of health benefits to their citizens. More broadly, when exercising their competences, Member States must respect fundamental rights, which bind them by virtue of their national constitutions and commitments under international law.

I recall that when Member States implement Union law, they must fully respect the provisions of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, including Article 7 of the Charter on respect for private life.

Within the sphere of its competence, the Commission is supporting civil society organisations working on gender-based violence and sexual and reproductive health and rights under the Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values programme.

In particular, the Commission has launched a dedicated call to the networks with which it has signed partnership agreements to provide support to victims of gender-based violence in the context of the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine. Support to Ukrainian victims of conflict-related sexual violence is also a focus under the 2023 call for proposals under the Daphne Strand of the CERV.

We also support regular exchanges of good practices between Member States and stakeholders on gender equality and health, including on sexual and reproductive health and rights.

The proposal for a directive on combating violence against women and domestic violence foresees specific support for women at an increased risk of violence, including women fleeing from armed conflict.

Frances Fitzgerald, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner – thank you for all you've outlined there – since Russia's outrageous and illegal invasion of Ukraine, millions of refugees have come to Europe. Currently, there are 4.1 million people benefiting with protection and rights under the Temporary Protection Directive. A huge percentage of these are women and children, as we have heard.

So many citizens, so many Member States are doing so much to help Ukrainians fleeing the war. We do need to acknowledge that. And there is huge support from the EU institutions. But of course we must be particularly conscious of the vulnerabilities that women face as they flee war, particularly when it comes to SRHR support. For Ukrainian women, access to contraception, prenatal care and safe childbirth services have been disrupted due to their displacement, and this is often forgotten.

Shamefully, in some Member States, Ukrainian women now face barriers in accessing adequate health care. In Poland, abortion is illegal or practically impossible to access, with cases of rape or risk to the mother's life not guaranteeing treatment. Yet so many Ukrainian women have been raped or have suffered sexual violence.

I would particularly call on the Spanish presidency to do everything possible to ensure that we have a very strong European directive on violence against women and gender based violence that includes rape and the issue of consent. Clearly there is work still to be done on this with the Member States. Something as basic as emergency contraception requires prescriptions from a doctor in Hungary and Poland – unacceptable.

The Temporary Protection Directive obliges access to medical care. The European Union has a responsibility to meet those needs, including for sexual and reproductive health care and empowering women with proper information and accurate information. We need to pool our expertise across the Union to deliver the kind of training to medical and healthcare staff, and how to identify and support women who are at risk of sexual exploitation through intervention at a very early stage, whether it's at borders, customs, wherever is absolutely essential. We need to support the women seeking urgent health care and they must be treated with the dignity that they deserve. It is our responsibility to stand by Ukraine in every way.

Heléne Fritzon, *för S&D-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Kommissionär Dalli! Sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa är en förutsättning för kvinnors hälsa och en rättighet som måste prioriteras även i kris och konflikt.

Med anledning av Rysslands anfallskrig mot Ukraina har tillgången till sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa och rättigheter begränsats. Det handlar om kliniker i Ukraina som tvingas stänga ner, men också om allvarliga begränsningar av SRHR i länder som kvinnor och flickor flyr till.

Låt mig vara tydlig: Rätten till sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa måste alltid respekteras. Tillgången till SRHR handlar om preventivmedel, mödravård, säkra förlossningar och abort. Det räddar liv och det lindrar lidande.

Det finns många viktiga frågor kopplade till situationen i Ukraina, men kvinnors situation och sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa och rättigheter är precis sådana frågor, och jag förväntar mig att både kommissionen och medlemsländerna agerar därefter.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, hoy se cumplen 601 días del inicio de la criminal guerra de Putin en Ucrania y la situación de los refugiados ucranianos no puede ser olvidada. En particular, la realidad que viven mujeres y niñas refugiadas.

Como sabemos, los desplazamientos incrementan los riesgos para ellas. Una de cada veintidós mujeres refugiadas ucranianas ha sido víctimas de acoso sexual, una de cada cincuenta de violencia física. Y los datos que tenemos sobre violencia sexual son tremendos.

Sabemos que no se están haciendo las cosas muy bien en la Unión Europea cuando estas mujeres refugiadas no tienen acceso a los servicios de salud sexual y reproductiva. En Ucrania, el aborto es legal. Si lo solicitan tienen derecho a ello durante las doce primeras semanas de embarazo. Pero la realidad es que muchas mujeres ucranianas no tienen acceso a estos servicios en Polonia, en Hungría, y tienen que volver al país en guerra para poder acceder a estos servicios.

Tenemos que hacer más, señora comisaria. Tenemos que hacer una revisión para una adecuada implementación del artículo 13, apartados 2 y 4, de la Directiva de protección temporal para una atención médica adecuada. Tenemos que revisar nuestras estrategias con los Estados miembros y, desde luego, tenemos que impedir que una mujer ucraniana que haya sido objeto de violencia sexual como arma de guerra se vea obligada a volver al campo de batalla para poder recibir asistencia.

Alice Kuhnke, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Bortom Putins bomber, missiler och granatanfall pågår ett tyst krig. Det är våldet, övergreppen och våldtäkterna som ukrainska kvinnor och barn utsätts för. Det handlar inte om enstaka offer, det handlar om tiotusentals ukrainska kvinnor och barn. Många av dem befinner sig i EU-länder, däribland Polen, som förvägrat dem den medicinska hjälp de behöver.

Vi – EU – vi säger att vi vill hjälpa och göra allt vi kan för Ukraina, men sen hjälper vi inte dem som utsatts för sexuellt våld. Det är en skam för både EU-kommissionen och hela EU.

Tillgång till sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa är ukrainska kvinnors och flickors rättighet. Att se till att de får sina rättigheter tillgodosedda, det är EU:s skyldighet.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, señorías, un conflicto bélico sacude los cimientos de cualquier sociedad. Ciudadanos que se ven expuestos a una crueldad cuyos límites, desgraciadamente, no dejan de sorprendernos; situaciones dramáticas contra la vida y la dignidad de la persona; mujeres expuestas a violencia sexual, a tener que huir con sus hijos dejando atrás sus vidas.

Claro que merecen todo nuestro apoyo y consideración, pero ¿creen que les ayudamos con este tipo de proclamas? Es una tremenda irresponsabilidad tratar con manipulación emocional asuntos de tal envergadura, porque así no se les hace frente. La respuesta de la Unión Europea debe obedecer a unos criterios morales que marquen límites infranqueables en nuestras relaciones internacionales.

No hacerlo, es decir, la ingenuidad y la falta de firmeza de la Comisión y de algunos diputados de esta Cámara, expone a esas personas —de hecho, nos expone a todos— a regímenes criminales que aprovechan la confusión para expandir su mal.

Recuperemos la brújula que nos orienta hacia la verdad, que entiende la vida como un bien que se debe custodiar.

Christine Anderson, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Inmitten der Debatte über die Versorgung von Flüchtlingen und deren grundlegende Bedürfnisse identifiziert dieses Haus nicht etwa Nahrung, Kleidung und Unterbringung, sondern Abtreibung als eines der elementarsten Bedürfnisse überhaupt. Geht es Ihnen eigentlich noch ganz gut?

Es sei denn, Sie nehmen hier endlich mal einen Punkt in den Blick, den dieses Haus bisher geflissentlich ignoriert hat: Vor dem Ausbruch des Konflikts in der Ukraine war die Ukraine das Paradies des illegalen Kinderhandels. Paare aus der ganzen Welt, insbesondere der westlichen Demokratien, konnten Kinder über ukrainische Leihmütter bestellen, und zwar wesentlich günstiger als in ihren jeweiligen Heimatländern. Nach ukrainischem Recht hatte die Leihmutter keinerlei Rechte an dem von ihr ausgetragenen leiblichen Kind. Die Geburtsurkunde wies ausschließlich die zahlenden Besteller als Eltern aus. Juristische Auseinandersetzungen für den Fall, dass das bestellte Kind nicht den Vorstellungen entsprach, waren vorprogrammiert.

Sind das die europäischen Werte, von denen Sie hier unentwegt sprechen und zu deren Verteidigung Sie die europäischen Völker auf deren Kosten verpflichten? Aber was heißt das für die biologischen Mütter? Ganz einfach: Unter Applaus der EU werden diese Frauen Opfer Ihrer menschenverachtenden Abtreibungskampagne, unter welcher Sie die Frauen unter Ausnutzung ihrer finanziellen Not zu Gebärmaschinen degradieren und ausbeuten. Dieses Haus unterstützt damit systematischen Kinderhandel unter Missachtung der Würde dieser Kinder und der Würde und der Rechte ihrer Mütter. Ja, wenn die Linken „Slawa Ukrajini“ rufen, dann bedeutet das eben auch die Ausbeutung und Rechtlosstellung dieser ukrainischen Frauen. Dagegen müssten Sie vorgehen, aber das tun Sie nicht.

Malin Björk, *on behalf of the The Left Group*. – Mr President, when Ukrainian people started to flee from Putin's bombs and tanks, we activated the Temporary Protection Directive. We promised to receive and protect all the civilians that need to leave, and they left everything behind. But the reality is that women fleeing Putin's bombs are being deprived of the very basic care that they are entitled to, sexual and reproductive care. And this has been highlighted by civil society organisations that need to carry out the job in their place, in the place of the states that fail women and they are at the receiving end. And some of them are here and watching this debate today. We are speaking about basic things like prenatal care, postnatal care, about giving birth in dignified conditions. It is about health care for victims of gender based violence, but not only. It's about access to contraception, it's also about access to abortion care. It is very basic in all women's lives. And it also goes for Ukrainian refugee women. But women cannot afford it because it is too expensive. They cannot access it because there is no information, or they cannot access it because it's forbidden or the law is against them. We cannot have a situation like this in Europe and at the receiving of Ukrainian refugees. It is actually a shameful situation. And I'm asking again, the Commission and the Council, what are you going to do about it? We just prolonged the Temporary Protection Directive and we did good to do so. But if this kind of care, sexual and reproductive health care, part of the essential treatment? If it is so, say it loud and tell it to the Member States that are today depriving and putting women in danger in our very Union.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, le conseguenze umanitarie della brutalità di Putin vanno ben oltre i già inenarrabili crimini che sono stati commessi su tutto il territorio ucraino. Sono almeno 20 000 i bambini forzatamente deportati in Russia, mentre i rifugiati sono ben più di 6 milioni nella nostra Europa, fuggiti nella speranza di lasciarsi alle spalle la violenza. Purtroppo però per molti di loro l'incubo non è ancora finito.

Ciò che la ricerca «Not a single safe place» dell'Università di Birmingham ha riportato è terribile e non può che scuotere le nostre coscienze. Nelle testimonianze delle donne in fuga dal conflitto sono stati riportati episodi di violenze sessuali atroci, prima da parte delle truppe russe, accusate di aver abusato indiscriminatamente, senza alcuna pietà, di bambini di quattro anni come di anziane di settant'anni, poi da individui che si spacciano per volontari, approfittando del sistema di accoglienza per compiere i propri rivoltanti abusi. Non possiamo e non dobbiamo tollerarlo.

Il milione e mezzo di euro già stanziato non basta. Serve di più per supportare veramente le donne ucraine. Serve molto di più per dar loro le cure e il sostegno psicologico di cui hanno bisogno. Serve molto di più per dare concretamente seguito al meccanismo di supporto integrato, messo in piedi dal servizio degli strumenti di politica estera e ancora, per garantire una lotta senza quartiere all'impunità dei perpetratori di questi crimini inaccettabili.

L'Europa deve essere un luogo sicuro per i fratelli e le sorelle ucraini che fuggono dal conflitto, non un altro teatro di orrori e barbarie. È nostro dovere garantirlo.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Rund 4,1 Millionen Kriegsflüchtlinge aus der Ukraine haben in der Europäischen Union temporären Schutz erhalten. Zudem sind aber 5,1 - Millionen Menschen innerhalb der Ukraine geflüchtet. Es ist wirklich unvorstellbar – 9 Millionen Menschen auf der Flucht.

Die Richtlinie für temporären Schutz sorgt dafür, dass Flüchtlinge Unterkunft – auch Zugang zu Bildung und Beschäftigung – in allen Mitgliedstaaten haben. Bei der medizinischen Versorgung, glaube ich, haben wir noch alle Aufholbedarf in allen Bereichen, im psychischen Bereich, aber auch im Bereich sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit. Wir müssen aber auch eines weiterdenken: Da der Großteil der Flüchtlinge Frauen mit Kindern sind, müssen wir strategische Optionen für mögliche Aufenthaltstitel nach dem Auslaufen der Richtlinie andenken. Wir benötigen eine koordinierte Lösung, um unterschiedliche nationale Alleingänge und einen europäischen Flickenteppich zu vermeiden. Im Rahmen der Verhandlungen zum Migrationspakt sollte dies auch Berücksichtigung finden, ansonsten steuern wir wieder auf ein dramatisches Kapitel in der Migrationskrise hin.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente Angel, señora comisaria Dalli, Presidencia española, ustedes mismos han descrito la cuestión. A partir de la brutal guerra de agresión de Putin contra Ucrania, once millones de personas desplazadas han huido del conflicto y han entrado en territorio de la Unión Europea. El 90 % de estas personas son mujeres, niñas y niños en situación de gran vulnerabilidad.

Están protegidas por la Directiva de protección temporal, que significa libre circulación, elección de residencia y acceso a los servicios públicos que garantizan derechos fundamentales. Este Parlamento Europeo aprobó una resolución contundente en mayo de 2022 afirmando que entre esos derechos fundamentales están los derechos de salud sexual y reproductiva, incluida la obstetricia —la interrupción del embarazo no deseado de las mujeres ucranianas en cualquier territorio de la Unión.

Sucede que el 60 % de esas mujeres están en Polonia, Hungría o Eslovaquia. No por casualidad —son países fronterizos con la zona del conflicto, pero que no garantizan esa obstetricia e interrupción del embarazo y, particularmente, ni siquiera la atención necesaria en el embarazo, en el parto y en el posparto cuando finalmente el embarazo se consuma.

Por tanto, este Parlamento hace lo correcto llamando la atención de la opinión pública europea y de la ciudadanía a la que representa diciendo que es necesario garantizar los derechos de las mujeres en situación de vulnerabilidad en cualquier rincón de la Unión Europea con igualdad. Y, por supuesto, también es necesario garantizar los derechos de salud sexual y reproductiva.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, Presidency and colleagues, it is a year since the Russian invasion and, according to the OECD, 70% of adult Ukrainian refugees are women, and the war is having a very severe impact, as we know, on women and girls and marginalised populations, particularly in the area of SRHR.

The EU has promised to provide refugees from Ukraine with sanctuary and care. This isn't the case, of course, in every Member State, where they face a range of pre-existing legal and policy barriers as well as cost barriers. In a 2023 report, the Center for Reproductive Rights found that many refugees feel they have no choice but to return to Ukraine temporarily if they require SRHR. Another concerning finding is that, because of the abortion ban in Poland, some Ukrainian women refugees are forced to seek abortion care outside of legal pathways.

Clearly, some of these barriers require action at Member State level. However, the Temporary Protection Directive specifies clear Member State obligations in respect of emergency and essential health care provision, and support for survivors of gender-based violence. There has been an outpouring of solidarity for Ukraine since the war began, but Ukrainian women require continued access to SRHR.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, Council, the bar is on the floor, but somehow we are still reaching for it. I should not need to remind you about the importance of sexual and reproductive health and rights.

Last May, we here – 462 of us – voted in favour of a resolution strongly condemning sexual and gender-based violence as a weapon of war in Ukraine. Still, women refugees face extremely restrictive legal and political context for SRHR in our own European Member States. Human trafficking, sexual violence, exploitation, rape – women fleeing Ukraine face these horrors every day. And they will, as long as Ukrainians are forced out of their home, as long as Putin's soldiers commit this horrendous war crimes.

Without action to renew reproductive healthcare commitments in all Member States, we will have broken our promise of safety and sanctuary for Ukrainian refugees. This means ensuring access to abortion and obstetric care and making sure refugees everywhere have access to menstrual products and contraception. Let us show them that we will not break our promise and finally meet the bare minimum standard of care.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, hay aquí dos hechos que están claros y son incontestables. Uno, la situación de las mujeres refugiadas procedentes de Ucrania es preocupante en lo que respecta a su salud y a sus derechos sexuales y reproductivos. Dos, la Unión Europea tiene margen de maniobra para abordar muchas de las barreras a las que se están enfrentando estas mujeres.

La lista de agravios es larga: incumplimiento del derecho a recibir atención médica en el marco de la Directiva de protección temporal, retrasos en el acceso a la atención sanitaria, atención deficiente con consecuencias directas para su salud y bienestar, cargas financieras, falta de acceso a la información en idiomas que sean comprensibles para ellas, racismo institucional y discriminación interseccional.

Toda una carrera de obstáculos para acceder a la anticoncepción, la atención prenatal y el aborto. Es intolerable que la única salida para estas mujeres sea la de volverse al mismo lugar del que vienen huyendo, la de verse abocadas a continuar con un embarazo no deseado o asumir una maternidad forzada.

¿De qué sirven nuestras Directivas? Actuemos de una vez y tomémonos en serio a nosotros mismos. Y, sobre todo, dejemos de jugar con la vida de la gente.

Geoffroy Didier (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, l'actualité chasse l'actualité, et chaque nouvel événement tragique dans le monde, comme celui touchant Israël depuis le 7 octobre, constitue une occasion de plus pour Vladimir Poutine d'avancer ses pions.

En soutenant cyniquement le Hamas, le Président russe tente d'envenimer la situation au Proche-Orient pour mieux détourner notre regard de l'Ukraine. Au mieux imprudents ou au pire complices, certains dirigeants européens – notamment hongrois et slovaques – deviennent les tristes relais de la propagande russe: «Plus une seule arme pour l'Ukraine», à les entendre. Quelle folie!

Je le dis ici, solennellement, au Parlement européen: n'oublions pas l'Ukraine. Si nous commençons à tergiverser, à reculer ou à nous diviser sur notre soutien résolu, qu'il soit politique, logistique ou militaire, demain, c'est toute l'Europe qui le regrettera. Ce qui se joue, désormais à bas bruit, aux frontières orientales de l'Europe, va au-delà de la survie même de l'Ukraine et de son peuple: ce ne sont pas seulement nos valeurs, c'est aussi la sécurité de l'ensemble de notre continent.

L'histoire l'a souvent démontré: quand les regards se détournent, les monstres se déchaînent. N'oublions pas l'Ukraine. N'oublions pas l'Ukraine!

Predrag Fred Matić (S&D). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, kao ratni veteran, prognanik i bivši zatočenik konclogora dobro znam što znači rat.

U situaciji kada morate bježati iz vlastite zemlje i dođete u zemlju za koju smatrate da ćete biti sigurni, suočit ćete se s nasiljem, silovanjima i ograničenim sustavom potpore i zdravstvene skrbi. Žene izbjeglice iz Ukrajine koje sada žive u Europskoj uniji vraćaju se u ratom razorenu domovinu kako bi mogle pristupiti zdravstvenoj skrbi i dobiti kontracepciju, obaviti prekid trudnoće i preglede reproduktivnog zdravlja, a neke su se u Ukrajinu vratile čak i kako bi rodile.

Stručnjakinje i kolegice na terenu stalno nas upozoravaju na ove strahote i na prepreke s kojima se Ukrajinke suočavaju. I svaki put odgovor je isti: kompetencije države članice. Ako danas vlade država članica, kao i Komisija i Vijeće, mogu mirno sjediti i slušati da se žene izbjeglice iz Ukrajine zbog nemogućnosti ostvarenja svojih temeljnih ljudskih prava vraćaju u ratno područje, razorene gradove i porušene bolnice i pritom ne učiniti ništa, onda se trebamo pitati kakav život nudimo u Europi. Kakvu potporu osiguravamo i što jamčimo najtežim žrtvama rata?

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Hr. Formand! Fru kommissær! Ruslands aggressionskrig i Ukraine har mange uskyldige ofre. Vi kan ikke være bekendt at øge deres lidelser. Millioner af kvinder og børn er flygtet og bor i Polen, Slovakiet, Rumænien og Ungarn. Her får de ikke adgang til den nødvendige sundhedsbehandling, særligt i forhold til graviditet og fødsel. I visse lande, for eksempel Ungarn og Polen, er der decideret livsfarlig lovgivning. Vi kender alle navnene på de mange kvinder i Polen, som allerede er døde. De ukrainske kvinder møder i stedet for manglende muligheder og information, forhindringer og udskamning, og de får heller ikke den nødvendige behandling i tide. Medlemslandene burde sikre, at alle kvinder i Europa får den nødvendige sundhedsbehandling, men i hvert fald skal vi sikre de ukrainske kvinder, som er flygtet fra krig, får den. Og Kommissionen har kompetence til at sikre ukrainske flygtninge. De har ret til akut pleje og livsvigtig behandling. Det står sort på hvidt i det midlertidige beskyttelsesdirektiv. Ukrainske kvinder i Polen, Slovakiet, Rumænien og Ungarn kan dø som følge af vores svigt. Det er fuldstændig uhyrlige perspektiver i Europa i 2023. Det kan vi simpelt hen ikke være bekendt.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, most refugees from Ukraine are women. Women to whom we promised immediate protection and access to rights and services in the EU. Yet, in Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia, the barriers to sexual and reproductive health care and gender-based violence support services forced them to live either without this support or to return to a war zone in order to get the help that they need. And this is exactly the opposite of what temporary protection is meant to achieve. More generally, access to medical care, social welfare, housing, labour markets and education is impeded in these and other Member States.

I urge the Commission to enforce the key rights of these refugees. Civil society and municipalities hosting Ukrainian refugees still struggle to access funding. The Commission must finally ensure proper EU funding to those actors that do the actual work on the ground.

The swift activation of temporary protection to refugees from Ukraine was a true sign of solidarity. We must live up to this spirit and to the obligations that come with it, and start thinking of their future protection, as the refugees deserve a long-term perspective also beyond March 2025. If and hopefully not, but if they are still forcefully displaced.

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

Karen Melchior (Renew), *blue-card question.* – Madam Strik, you were mentioning the obligations that we have towards the Ukrainian women. I think we have an obligation to all women in Europe to ensure that they get the necessary healthcare that they need, especially the Ukrainian women. How do you see that our Member States could ensure that everybody within the European Union gets the necessary life-saving healthcare that they need? What more could Member States do, because they are clearly not doing enough?

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE), *blue-card answer.* – Thank you for this question. I refer to the Temporary Protection Directive that these Ukrainian refugees can invoke, these rights that they have. I think to start with, there should be sufficient capacity in the Member States, and the rules should be very clearly disseminated so that people know that they have these rights. And I think it is up to the Member States, first and foremost, to make sure that they offer this support.

But it is the Commission, as a guardian of the Treaty, that needs to monitor if these rules are complied with and otherwise intervene. Because until now, there is this solidarity platform, it is all behind the scenes that people discuss this – the Commission with the Member States. But this seems to be a quite persistent violation. And I think at that moment the Commission should start to act and enforce compliance.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, they say timing is everything, so here we go. Since the start of the war in Ukraine, more than 5.5 million people have fled its borders – a staggering 90% of them women and children. The war continues to take a heavy toll on the lives of millions of women and girls: from increased risks of gender-based violence, sexual exploitation and abuse, to the loss of crucial livelihoods and rising poverty levels. The large-scale destruction of infrastructure has also left services for survivors of violence, healthcare and other critical forms of support out of reach for many.

I am extremely concerned at the horrendous reports of women experiencing gender-based violence and rape in Ukraine. The plight of women and girls is, unfortunately, not unique to Ukraine. Since the Taliban took over in Afghanistan last year, they have effectively created a society ruled by gender segregation and discrimination, with women's freedom of movement, freedom of thought and freedom of expression stripped away.

We are also witnessing an already dire and worsening humanitarian crisis in the Middle East. The terrorist organisation Hamas still has many hostages that are women and girls, but also there are 50 000 pregnant women in Gaza who are unable to obtain basic health services.

We, as the EU, need to recognise the plight of the vulnerable in Ukraine, in the Middle East and elsewhere, and do everything we can to help them.

Carina Ohlsson (S&D). – Herr talman! Ryska soldater utrustas med Viagra. Kan det bli mer uppenbart att det är en militär strategi för att våldta ukrainska kvinnor?

I uppehållen mellan utegångsförbud och bombningar letar ukrainska kvinnor efter dagen efter-piller, istället för att leta efter första hjälpen-kit. För i krigszonen Ukraina är det nästintill omöjligt att få tag i preventivmedel, än mindre säker abort.

Nio av tio av de ukrainska flyktingar som i dag befinner sig i Polen och Ungern är kvinnor och barn. I Ungern finns flera abortrestriktioner reglerade i lag. I Polen är det närmast totalförbud, och där hoppas vi verkligen att det blir en förändring nu med en ny regering.

Kvinnorna kommer från ett krigsdrabbat land där möjligheterna till vård och stöd är minimala, för att sedan möta en fruktansvärd lagstiftning som än en gång vänder utsatta kvinnor ryggen. Rätten att skyddas mot sexuellt och könsbaserat våld och rätten till säker abort måste ingå i alla humanitära insatser som görs i Ukraina och grannländerna, dit framför allt kvinnor och barn flyr. Så är inte fallet i dag. Förändring bör ske.

Lydie Massard (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, l'invasion russe a poussé des millions de personnes à chercher refuge en Europe, et parmi les pays membres de l'Union européenne, c'est la Pologne qui a ouvert ses portes au plus grand nombre de réfugiés.

Mais la Pologne est devenue un environnement particulièrement restrictif en matière de santé sexuelle et reproductive. Des femmes, réfugiées en Pologne, en Hongrie, en Slovaquie, déjà fragilisées par un exil forcé, ont été contraintes de retourner temporairement en Ukraine pour accéder aux soins médicaux fondamentaux. Les conséquences en sont graves: anxiété, peur, difficultés financières, racisme institutionnel et soins de santé inadéquats, qui, une fois encore, touchent plus durement les femmes.

Ces femmes font face à des menaces sérieuses, au harcèlement, à l'intimidation… tout cela, dans un contexte où leurs droits sont négligés. Les victimes de violences sexistes se retrouvent sans services essentiels, tandis que les Roms et les réfugiés LGBTQI+ font face à une discrimination intersectionnelle. Nous ne pouvons pas rester indifférents à la détresse de ces femmes, qui supportent un poids plus lourd, et nous devons prendre des mesures pour les soutenir et garantir leur dignité, leur bien-être et leur vie.

Maria Walsh (PPE). – Mr President, colleagues, Commissioner, a report by the United Nations outlined that Russian forces have committed an array of war crimes, including torture, rape and other acts of sexual violence against Ukrainian civilians. And in the face of this extremism, this barbarism, millions of Ukrainian women and girls are forced to face the aftermath of this violence and make impossible decisions.

For refugees who have experienced this violence, a lack of health care, a removal of inclusive reproductive care, forces them to return to Ukraine and return to their war-torn country to access essential reproductive health care, including maternal health and abortion care – all of this because they cannot get access legally in all European countries.

These women are victims and survivors of violence, dealing with compounding trauma, health scares and concerns, mental health damages and supports – the slew of endless mental and physical health conditions, all without the basic services and support they deserve from us in the EU.

The provision of sexual reproductive health care saves women's and girls' lives, and we cannot leave anyone behind.

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

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Karen Melchior (Renew), *blue-card question.* – Ms Walsh, you were explaining the horrific consequences that the lack of access to healthcare for Ukrainian women fleeing from war could have. For most of us, fortunately, this is an abstract idea. For many millions of women in Ireland, it was their daily risk, their daily lives. Could you perhaps elaborate a little bit more on the experience in Ireland of not having sufficient access to healthcare?

Maria Walsh (PPE), *blue-card answer.* – Thank you very much, colleague, and thank you for giving me an opportunity to highlight, even within the EU, our EU citizens – again disproportionately affecting women – in my country of Ireland have been underserved at a national, local and an EU level in terms of access to sexual reproductive healthcare.

Many are still fleeing to the United Kingdom or further afield, many are not seeking and getting the support they need in their local GP or hospital. And unfortunately, we have a very darkened history of such. When you look at the clerical abuses and the institutional abuses of the Magdalene Laundries, of the mother and baby homes of other institutions where we've swept the support around sexual abuse, sexual violence, the requirement for abortions, and the decision by women to have a choice over their bodies further afield. So we know too well what many of these women are going through.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, a situação das mulheres refugiadas ucranianas tornou ainda mais visível a regressão dos direitos das mulheres a cuidados de saúde sexual e reprodutiva, incluindo o aborto, em diversos Estados-Membros, como é o caso da Polónia, da Hungria e da Roménia.

A negação da possibilidade de acesso a cuidados de saúde sexual e reprodutiva a mulheres que experienciaram – muitas delas no seu território, no seu país – a violência sexual, a violência de género e, muitas vezes, a violação é um tratamento desumano e absolutamente degradante, que não pode ser tolerado de forma nenhuma entre nós.

As mulheres e raparigas em fuga da guerra têm de ser protegidas em todas as dimensões da sua vida – no acesso à habitação, ao emprego, ao trabalho, à educação, mas também numa dimensão essencial da sua existência, que tem a ver com a saúde sexual e reprodutiva e o direito a um aborto em condições que protejam a sua vida.

A Comissão não pode encolher os ombros e deixar esta tarefa somente aos Estados-Membros. É necessário verificar que cumprem as suas obrigações.

Leszek Miller (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Koleżanki i koledzy! Inwazja Rosji na Ukrainę przyniosła niszczące skutki, prowadząc do licznych naruszeń prawa człowieka, w tym przestępstw ze względu na płeć i do przemocy seksualnej. W wyniku tego konfliktu 4 miliony Ukraińców, w tym głównie kobiety i dzieci, szukały schronienia w krajach Unii Europejskich takich jak Polska, Rumunia, Słowacja i Węgry. Chociaż społeczności lokalne i wolontariusze w tych krajach zareagowali z niezwykłą solidarnością, to jednak istnieją poważne obawy dotyczące dostępu uchodźczyń do opieki zdrowotnej w zakresie zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego oraz wsparcia związanego z przemocą ze względu na płeć. Wieloletnie zaniedbania i restrykcyjne przepisy w niektórych z tych krajów, w tym niestety w mojej ojczyźnie Polsce, stanowią poważne przeszkody w dostępie do takiej opieki. Musimy zatem zwrócić uwagę na istniejące wyzwania i podjąć konkretne kroki w celu zapewnienia pełnego dostępu do opieki zdrowotnej i wsparcia dla uchodźców z Ukrainy.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister, honourable Members, thank you for your interventions. The Commission, of course, is fully aware of the challenges faced by Ukrainian women refugees, and I personally had the opportunity during several missions in different Member States to meet Ukrainian women, refugees and civil society organisations working with them. And our main objective is to ensure migrant women are well informed about their rights, especially those who face language barriers.

With regards to temporary protection persons fleeing from Ukraine covered by the scope of the Council decision activating the Temporary Protection Directive of 4 March 2022 avail themselves of temporary protection in the Union, and they have the right to access medical care in accordance with the directive, which indicates that Member States shall provide necessary medical or other assistance to persons enjoying temporary protection who have special needs, including victims of rape or other serious forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence. Women or children who have been victims of sexual violence and who are in need of special physical and mental assistance, could be eligible for medical transfers. This assistance must include at least emergency care and essential treatment of illness. However, Member States are free to extend the assistance and give the same coverage as to their nationals. The European Commission has recommended that Member States provide broad access to sickness benefits and affiliate them to the public health care system of the host Member State in the communication: Welcoming those fleeing war in Ukraine – readying Europe to meet the needs. And this was of March of last March of last year. So the Commission is working closely with, as you can see, with Member States, local and regional authorities, agencies, NGOs and other essential support services to coordinate an effective response to ensure that essential services are readily available and that no victim of sexual violence is left unattended. The Commission has exchanged with Member States and will continue to do so concerning the implementation of the Temporary Protection Directive, including in the solidarity platform with dedicated thematic meetings. In our most recent communication of last March, reflecting on the implementation of temporary protection one year after the activation of this directive, we highlighted again that since the majority of those fleeing the war in Ukraine are women and children, their protection remains a critical priority. We also collect information about the different healthcare access dimensions and areas of potential gaps in cooperation with the European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies.

Beyond this, the Commission has carried out and published two studies pertaining to the access to health care under the Temporary Protection Directive, in order to monitor the main practical obstacles to effective access to healthcare, such as language and cultural barriers, and, importantly, lack of information.

Now, I want to take this opportunity to also call on the co-legislators, to move swiftly on agreeing on the proposed directive combating violence against women. I thank this House. For its commitment to a European definition of rape. Any form of sex without consent is rape. And we must call it for what it is. So again, I call on you to continue working on this, as violence against women is a scourge, which we need to address, with urgency, jointly.

Pascual Navarro Ríos, *presidente en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, señorías, resulta tranquilizador ver el alto grado de consenso que existe para mantener nuestro apoyo a Ucrania y a los refugiados ucranianos en Europa, en particular a las mujeres. Sus intervenciones, señorías, han puesto de relieve los importantes desafíos a que debe enfrentarse la población refugiada.

Ciertamente, existen problemas y la población más vulnerable como las mujeres y los niños requiere que se le preste una atención especial y se apliquen medidas específicas que no siempre están disponibles cuando son necesarias.

Como he señalado en el debate anterior, como presidente en ejercicio del Consejo no puedo hacer comentarios sobre la situación en un particular Estado miembro, pero estoy convencido de que las autoridades de todos los Estados miembros están haciendo todo lo que está en sus manos dentro de sus respectivos marcos jurídicos nacionales para abordar estas dificultades y asegurarse de que quienes han acudido a la Unión en busca de refugio seguro sientan que se les da una buena acogida y que se integran plenamente, de acuerdo con la Directiva de protección temporal.

Por último, algunas de sus señorías han mencionado la cuestión de la Directiva de lucha contra la violencia de género y, al igual que la comisaria, pueden tener toda la seguridad de que el Consejo, su Presidencia en ejercicio, considera que este expediente es absolutamente prioritario y hará todo cuanto esté en su mano por una aprobación lo más rápida posible.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Andrea Bocskor (NI), *írásban*. – Az orosz–ukrán háború következtében többmillió ukrajnai ember kényszerült elhagyni otthonát és keresett menedéket az ország nyugati részében, vagy határain túl, sokan az EU országaiban, így Magyarországon is. A menekültek nagy része a legkiszolgáltatottabb csoporthoz tartozik: nő, gyermek és időskorú, általában családanyák, akik családfői szerepbe kényszerülve próbálnak gondoskodni gyermekeikről, idős hozzátartozóikról.

Számtalan esetről hallottunk a híradásokból, hogy nyugat-európai országokban a menedéket kereső ukrajnai nők szexuális kizsákmányolás, bántalmazás áldozatai lettek. Ezért nem szabad, hogy az Ukrajnából valós veszély elől menekülő gyerekeket és nőket együtt szállásoljanak el olyan, más kulturális értékeket és elveket valló férfi illegális bevándorlókkal, akik személyazonosítás nélkül, jogtalanul léptek az Unió területére, és az erőszak alkalmazása sem áll távol tőlük. Ezzel is védve a már így is óriási traumákat átélt nőket és gyermekeket a további megrázkódtatásoktól.

A Magyarországra érkező nőket és gyermekeket nem érheti ilyen trauma, ők biztonságban vannak! Az ország kormánya, az egyházi és karitatív szervezetek, továbbá az önkéntesek mindent megtesznek annak érdekében, hogy a nehéz sorsú nők életét segítsék, valós védelmet nyújtsanak számukra. Az ide érkezők anyagi és lakhatási támogatásban részesülnek, biztosítják számukra az egészségügyi és pszichoszociális ellátást, információszolgáltatást, jogi tanácsadást is igényelhetnek, továbbá a gyerekek beiskoláztatására és jólétére is óriási figyelmet szentelnek. Magyarország példásan segít!

19. Informe de 2022 sobre Montenegro (debate)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Tonino Piculan ulkoasiainvaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö Montenegroa koskevasta vuoden 2022 kertomuksesta (2022/2202(INI)) (A9-0277/2023).

Tonino Picula, *izvjestitelj.* – Poštovana predsjednice, poštovani predstavnici europskih institucija, kolegice i kolege, preuzimanjem dužnosti stalnog izvjestitelja za Crnu Goru prije četiri godine očekivao sam i nadao se da će moj posljednji govor o situaciji u zemlji u ovom mandatu započeti čestitkama Podgorici na privođenju kraju dugih, zahtjevnih i iscrpnih pregovora o članstvu te da ćemo zajedno proslaviti zatvaranje svih pregovaračkih poglavlja. Nažalost, stvarna situacija kakva je danas u velikoj je mjeri demantirala moja, ali i ne samo moja očekivanja.

Crna Gora je, doduše, otvorila sva pregovaračka poglavlja, ali nijedno od njih nije zatvoreno u posljednjih šest godina. Formalno je i dalje predvodnica procesa europske politike proširenja. U praksi je proširenje Europske unije dobilo novu političku relevantnost. Nakon ruske agresije na Ukrajinu lista država kandidatkinja se proširila, ali gotovo su sve druge zemlje napredovale u odnosu na ranije pozicije, dok Crna Gora propušta svoje prilike. U međuvremenu, politička situacija u Crnoj Gori kontinuirano je opterećena blokadama, a političkom scenom dominiraju pretežno unutarnja sukobljavanja i političke turbulencije.

Potpora napretku prema članstvu često se zadržavala samo na formalnim deklaracijama, dok su neki izabrani politički predstavnici bili glasnogovornici politika vanjskog uplitanja. Ovdje želim jasno reći kako je Europski parlament pozdravio rezultate svih izbora koji su se u međuvremenu održali u Crnoj Gori te smo poštovali legitimitet svih izabranih dužnosnika koji su im povjerili građani Crne Gore. Jednako tako, poštujemo i volju gotovo 80 posto građana Crne Gore koji nedvosmisleno podržavaju pristupanje svoje zemlje Europskoj uniji. Taj podatak trebao bi obvezivati sve političke aktere u Crnoj Gori i mogao bi služiti kao kohezivni faktor u visoko polariziranom društvu. Posebno želim to naglasiti u kontekstu formiranja nove vlade i očekivanog glasovanja u Skupštini sljedeći tjedan. Pritom ističem i ulogu Srpske pravoslavne crkve, koja je, nažalost, aktivan politički faktor u Crnoj Gori te se često koristi kao sredstvo vanjskog uplitanja u domaće političke procese.

Što se tiče sadržaja samog izvješća, valja pohvaliti pozitivne stvari. Crna Gora je potpuno usklađena sa zajedničkom vanjskom politikom Europske unije, pa i u pogledu sankcija Rusiji, i to svakako cijenimo. Pozdravljamo i imenovanje troje novih sudaca Ustavnog suda kao korak prema rješavanju ustavne krize. Primamo na znanje poboljšanje u sprečavanju korupcije i pozitivan trend u radu Agencije za sprečavanje korupcije. Pozdravljamo i donošenje nove strategije za reformu javne uprave za razdoblje od 2022. do 2026., ali žalimo zbog nedostatka napretka u njezinoj provedbi. Pozdravljamo određene pozitivne korake, kao što su uvođenje strožih kazni za napade i prijetnje novinarima te osnivanje *ad hoc* povjerenstva za praćenje nasilja nad novinarima. Primamo na znanje potpisivanje žurnog sporazuma između Europske unije i Crne Gore o operativnoj suradnji u upravljanju granicama s Agencijom za europsku graničnu i obalnu stražu. Podržavamo poboljšanje ekonomskih parametara i posebno pozdravljam odluku o prestanku programa stjecanja državljanstva na temelju ulaganja.

Svi ovi pozitivni koraci značili bi puno više kada bi se paralelno radilo i na otklanjanju sistemskih problema, prije svega detektiranih u mjerilima u poglavljima 23 i 24. Kako bi se otklonile bilo kakve nedoumice oko cenzusa, ne govorimo o njegovom bojkotiranju, već podržavamo provođenje popisa kao doprinosa razvojnoj politici svake zemlje. Ono što predlažemo je da se popis ne koristi kao još jedan politički alat za dodatnu polarizaciju društva. Otklanjanje političkih blokada bio bi konstruktivan preduvjet za njegovo održavanje na otvoren i transparentan način, bez ikakvog političkog uplitanja.

Za kraj, unatoč tome što smo velika većina nas iskreno željeli čuti bolje vijesti iz Crne Gore u ovom mandatu, naglašavam kako mi je bila izuzetna čast obavljati dužnost stalnog izvjestitelja Europskog parlamenta za Crnu Goru u protekle četiri godine. Želim zahvaliti svim kolegama na kontinuiranoj i nedvosmislenoj podršci europskoj Crnoj Gori i mom radu. Moj glavni cilj bio je pomoći Crnoj Gori i vlastitim iskustvom kako bi što prije ostvarila uvjerljivu želju većine svojih građana za punopravnim članstvom u Europskoj uniji.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Montenegro was considered by many to be the most advanced negotiating country. However, it has lost focus in recent years and opportunities have been missed. Precious time is being lost.

We agree with the House that Montenegro needs to move forward. This is only possible if the prolonged period of political unpredictability ends. We are particularly concerned that Montenegro's institutions are not functioning properly. It is worrying that the parliament has not yet become functional after the June parliamentary elections.

What is needed is a stable and strong majority in the parliament – a majority which can, and will, deliver on key judiciary appointments and long-overdue EU reforms. We are also looking forward to the formation of a new, strong government that is capable and committed to take forward the EU-related reforms in the shortest possible time frame.

It is also important to underline that the longer Montenegro's institutions are non-functioning, the more they are vulnerable to external influence, disinformation and cyberattacks. Therefore, we encourage Montenegro's political leaders to build consensus and advance on its EU path.

It is in our common interest to speed up the enlargement process. The process continues to be built on strict, but fair, conditionality and the principle of own merits. This means that the pace of negotiations depends, first and foremost, on the progress on fundamental reforms. There is a window of opportunity for those countries willing to speed up the pace of their reforms and clearly demonstrate their commitment to EU values, not only in words but also in deeds.

The Commission will continue to support Montenegro's economic and social development. The EU is the largest provider of financial assistance, and Montenegro's main trading partner and investor. To fully grasp the benefits, we are supporting Montenegro in preparing mature and strategic long-term programmes. Let me also add that Montenegro's 100% alignment on CFSP, including on restrictive measures against Russia, is very much appreciated.

Dear Members, clearly, the next milestone is meeting the interim benchmarks for the rule of law chapters 23 and 24. Before this, no other chapters will be closed.

In conclusion, our priority now is to work with Montenegro to speed up the progress on the ground. The work ahead is well known and it is now time for Montenegro to deliver.

Vladimír Bilčík, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, Russia's brutal aggression against Ukraine has put enlargement of the European Union among our top priorities once again, and Montenegro has been the natural frontrunner for EU accession in the Western Balkans. So today, more than ever, politicians in Podgorica have an historic opportunity to move forward decisively on the European path.

I would like to thank the rapporteur for a well-balanced report and for an excellent cooperation over the past four years. The report underlines the key tasks ahead: to continue the support to Ukraine, to deliver on rule of law reforms, as well as electoral changes, to fight corruption and organised crime, to safeguard free and independent media, to protect minorities and women's rights.

As we are all eagerly waiting for the full-fledged establishment of new democratic institutions based on Montenegro's latest parliamentary elections, the winner, Europe Now, has a one-time opportunity to turn its name into a reality. However, in order to do so, a new government must be unquestionably pro-European.

Dear colleagues anti-EU, anti-NATO, pro-Russian and revisionist political forces in decisive positions of power and influence could bury their long-term hopes for Europe, shared by an overwhelming majority of Montenegro's citizens, for many years to come. Anti-Western politicians could never bring Montenegro closer to the European Union.

This is why I want to call on all truly pro-European politicians to act responsibly and in the interests of the people of Montenegro. Please keep your country on the EU path. Only if you do so can we engage and deliver on EU membership for Montenegro in the very near future.

Matjaž Nemec, *v imenu skupine S&D*. – Gospa predsednica! V Črni gori, ki je do nedavnega veljala za vodilno državo na Zahodnem Balkanu, v pristopanju k Evropski uniji, smo priča globoki politični in institucionalni krizi. Visoke politične napetosti in polarizacija skozi leta počasi, a kontinuirano šibijo črnogorski motor, ki poganja državo na poti napredka pri ključnih reformah.

Poleg tega je potrebno priznati, da je država postala poligon za neprikrito izražanje zunanjih interesov in se bori z vplivi drugih držav iz regije in širše, kar je Črno goro še dodatno pahnilo v stagnacijo pri izvajanju ključnih reform. In to je nedopustno. Ne glede na trenutno situacijo ostajam optimist. Optimizem mi dajejo državljanke in državljani Črne gore, ki so članstvu v Evropski uniji še vedno izjemno naklonjeni.

Optimizem mi daje vseh 33 odprtih poglavij in ne nazadnje politični preobrat na poletnih volitvah. Zdaj Črna gora čim prej potrebuje stabilno proevropsko vlado in v EU usmerjeno večino. Mi v Evropski uniji pa potrebujemo konstruktivnega partnerja, da skupaj dosežemo napredek države na poti k Evropski uniji.

Klemen Grošelj, *v imenu skupine Renew*. – Gospa predsednica! Četudi je bilo poročilo o Črni gori relativno hitro in uspešno usklajeno, pa podobno kot druga v regiji prikrivajo dejstvo, da pričakovanega napredka ni – ne v Črni gori ne drugje.

Najhuje pri tem pa je, da medtem ko se retorika v EU glede širitve spreminja, da se sprejemajo odločitve, ki naj bi spodbudile države v regiji k izvedbi potrebnih reform, pa, razen kozmetičnih popravkov, potrebnega napredka zopet ni. Vsega niso krive države regije. Veliko je pogojenega s tem, da EU pravzaprav ne ve, kaj naj s širitvijo. Nismo prepričani, ali je širitev priložnost, tveganje, celo grožnja ali kaj.

Če k temu dodamo še nasprotujoča si sporočila iz Komisije in držav članic ter bilateralne ekscese nekaterih držav članic, dobimo kakofonijo stališč in zmedo, v kateri se države regije težko znajdejo. A pomemben del krivde nosijo tudi same države regije, med katerimi Črna gora žal ni izjema.

Zakaj? Dovolila je, da je zaradi notranjepolitičnih in drugih polarizaciji iz zveze Zahodnega Balkana zdrsnila med še eno izmed držav v regiji. Kljub temu ima Črna gora priložnost biti kandidatka, ki bi lahko vstopila v EU celo pred čarobnim letom 2030.

A da bi to dosegla, mora črnogorska politika preseči ideološke, politične in druge zamere ter se bolj kot s strahovi in blodnjami preteklosti ter preštevanjem prebivalstva začeti ukvarjati z evropsko prihodnostjo države. Odločitev je preprosta, a hkrati usodna. Gre za izbiro med prihodnostjo ali vrnitvijo v preteklost.

Thomas Waitz, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, we are talking about a country that has still one of the highest positive attempts towards joining the European Union. We're talking about a country where actually a vast majority of politically elected parties claim to be or are actually in favour of EU accession. And I think we also need to acknowledge that the country has had some progress in the fight against organised crime. It has had some progress when it came to fulfilling chapter 23 and chapter 24 requirements when it comes to judges. But we also see a country where the obvious common willingness to join the European Union has not really shaped the political decision making. And I really call on Montenegro that is still the frontrunner in the negotiations. I call on Montenegrin politicians when it comes to the questions of accession, of fulfilling chapters 23 and 24, to leave aside their disputes and look into the actual future of their country and deliver on the future of their country and the will of their populations, to bring Montenegro closer to entering the European Union. And it's the country that has the best chances to enter European Union within a few years. This has to be the main driving interest of the political elite in the country, and I think we should do everything that we can do to support them on this way. I want to thank the rapporteur and all my colleagues. These were exceptionally constructive negotiations. As you see, we mainly came with all amendments compromised – okay, two splits and two amendments to be voted – but thank you for the very constructive work in this shows we are speaking with one voice as the European Parliament when it comes to Montenegro's accession to the European Union.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Госпожо Председател, г-н комисар, похвални усилия, за съжаление в погрешна посока и с много малък резултат. Уважаеми колеги, докато продължавате да се правите, че не виждате вредното влияние на Сърбия в региона, докато се правите, че не виждате връзките между Белград и Кремъл, проруската политика, постюгославските бивши комунистически и после социалистически, и после някакви други партии, наследени от Кремъл и от Белград, и влиянието им в този регион, нищо няма да се промени и ще се пишат доклади след доклади, ще се прави мимикрия след мимикрия и ще се правите, че не разбирате за какво става дума. Става дума за влиянието на Белград и оттам за влиянието на Кремъл. Би трябвало да го знаете. Големи хора сте.

Иначе доклади могат да се пишат, но те не отчитат спецификата на региона. А тя е, че югославското наследство, комунистическото наследство, болшевишкото наследство, кремълското руско наследство пречи на хората в този регион да продължат своя заслужен за тях и нормален проевропейски път, който може и трябва да бъде насърчаван. Без елиминация на Белград, без елиминация на Кремъл това много трудно ще се случи и вие го знаете отлично. Просто трябва да посмеете да го напишете и да го кажете. Докато си играете на двойна игра с Белград, значи играете с Кремъл. Не стават така нещата.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedateljice, poštovani povjereniče, zahvaljujem izvjestitelju Toninu Piculi zato što je uključio moje amandmane u svoje izvješće i na sveobuhvatnom izvješću koje je napravio.

Ovaj tekst pokazuje veliku potporu europskim integracijama zemlje. U tekstu se također dotičemo i, kao što sam naglasila u svojim amandmanima, hrvatske zajednice i njezine tradicije u Kotoru. Također, s onim što je za hrvatsku sveto, a to je njezino kulturno naslijeđe i ono što je Jadran, što znači za Dalmaciju. Povratak Jadrana znači dobre odnose, povratak Jadrana znači povratak povijesti i mislim da je krajnje vrijeme da Crna Gora učini taj jedan prijateljski čin i da završimo više s tom pričom.

Također, zahvaljujem za uvrštavanje amandmana i izglasavanje na AFET-u, i vjerujem da ćemo to i sutra izglasati, za otvaranje arhiva tajnih dosjea bivše Jugoslavije UDBA i KOS. Bez toga ne možemo riješiti ni priču o povijesti ni o povijesnom nasljeđu, kriminalnim mrežama i svemu onome što nas potiče da idemo dalje. Ja potičem Crnu Goru da radi na dobrosusjedskim odnosima, da rješava pogranične probleme, radi na rasvjetljavanju ratnih zločina i istraživanju sudbine nestalih.

Ova zemlja treba proeuropsku vladu. Nemojte da vam se desi da se opet vratimo na onaj vrtuljak gdje se neki koji su bili najnapredniji vraćaju na početak. Crnogorci će znati to norirati i isto tako nadam se da ćemo i popis ostaviti za neka buduća vremena kada se strasti u Crnoj Gori budu smirile.

Nikos Papandreou (S&D). – Madam President, rapporteur Picula's report is very strong and congratulations for being honest, for not cutting any corners. And I agree with the colleague from the Greens that Montenegro has come so far and it has to go the extra mile.

And I agree with the colleague Dzhambazki that there is an influence, as the report points out, from other countries, both Serbia and China, and the effort should be to encourage Montenegro to use the EU Investment Fund so it doesn't depend on this largesse of China to enter in the Balkans. It's one of the tricks, and Greece as well has fallen into that trap.

President Milatović has shown keen interest in coming closer to Europe. He visited here many times. He's very pro-Europe, but as pointed out by some of the speakers, it's an unstable government. And the very nice title of Europe Now expresses the need, but it has to bring it to delivery. I was actually, in the last elections, an observer and it was peaceful and fair. But then we also discovered the problems about the influence of the foreign countries.

If we are to bring the Western Balkans in by 2030, all these matters have to be resolved. And one small matter – nothing to do with Montenegro – we need to resolve the problems in other countries like Albania and to free mayors like Fredi Beleri.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, παρά τις δυσκολίες που αναφέρει η πολύ καλή έκθεση, με τις οποίες συμφωνώ, το Μαυροβούνιο είναι από τις λιγότερο δύσκολες περιπτώσεις όσον αφορά τη διεύρυνση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης προς τα Δυτικά Βαλκάνια. Σκεφτείτε τη Σερβία με τον Vučić, τον θαυμαστή του Putin, ή τη δυσλειτουργική Βοσνία-Ερζεγοβίνη. Έχω επισκεφθεί τη χώρα δύο φορές σε αποστολές παρατήρησης των προεδρικών εκλογών. Η κοινή γνώμη είναι φιλοευρωπαϊκή. Η οικονομία λειτουργεί με το ευρώ, παρότι, προφανώς, η χώρα δεν συμμετέχει στην ευρωζώνη. Το επίπεδο ελευθερίας των ΜΜΕ είναι, σύμφωνα με διεθνείς εκθέσεις, πολύ καλύτερο από το επίπεδο ορισμένων κρατών μελών. Επίσης, το Μαυροβούνιο είναι ευθυγραμμισμένο στην εξωτερική του πολιτική με την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Ωστόσο, η παρατεινόμενη πολιτική ασυνεννοησία που εμποδίζει τον σχηματισμό σταθερής φιλοευρωπαϊκής κυβέρνησης για να ληφθούν αποφάσεις, να γίνουν θεσμικές αλλαγές, μεταρρυθμίσεις, να προχωρήσουν οι διαπραγματεύσεις, είναι το μεγάλο πρόβλημα. Το Μαυροβούνιο πρέπει να ξεπεράσει αυτό το εμπόδιο γιατί αλλιώς θα κινδυνεύσει να χάσει τη μεγάλη ευρωπαϊκή ευκαιρία. Υποτίθεται ότι θα έχουμε νέα στο άμεσο μέλλον. Ας ελπίσουμε ότι θα είναι θετικά.

Hildegard Bentele (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Gut, dass wir heute über Montenegro reden, denn Montenegro befindet sich in diesen Tagen – endlich, muss man sagen – in der entscheidenden Phase der Regierungsbildung und der Parlamentsneukonstituierung. Ich persönlich will meine Sorge über die Beteiligung offen proserbischer und prorussischer Kräfte nicht verhehlen.

Daraus ergibt sich aus meiner Sicht für den designierten Regierungschef Spajić noch größere Verantwortung, wirklich Europa jetzt – so wie seine Partei heißt und wie viele Bürger in Montenegro hoffen – auch anzugehen und keinen Zweifel an der Souveränität der Entscheidungen Montenegros aufkommen zu lassen. Die neue Regierung hätte sogar eine Dreifünftelmehrheit. Damit gibt es dann wirklich keine Ausreden mehr für interne Blockaden und die Nichtumsetzung des EU-Recht-Besitzstandes.

Wir müssen mit dem Erweiterungsprozess weiter vorankommen. Die Menschen, die Ungerechtigkeit und wenig wirtschaftliche Perspektiven sehen, sind anfälliger für Propaganda und Hetze, und Länder, die nicht fest im europäischen Lager verankert sind, die keinen gefestigten Rechtsstaat haben und keine überzeugten Demokraten, laufen Gefahr, von außen destabilisiert zu werden. Insofern, sehr geehrter Herr Kollege Picula, herzlichen Dank für Ihren Bericht und lassen Sie uns in Zukunft gegenüber Montenegro weiter gemeinsam wachsam und unterstützend sein.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani povjereniče, poštovani izvjestitelju kolega Picula, prije svega hvala što ste usvojili moje amandmane u ovoj zadnjoj verziji izvješća.

Identificirani su, naravno, pozitivni pomaci, međutim dosta toga ostalo je otvoreno. Upravo kao što je izvjestitelj rekao, ovaj mandat nije bio dovoljan da bismo došli do kraja onog europskog puta Crne Gore. Jasno su identificirani izazovi s kojima se Crna Gora suočava. To uključuje potrebu za daljnjim unapređenjem neovisnosti pravosuđa, jačanjem medijske slobode te intenzivnijim naporima u borbi protiv diskriminacije i zaštiti, primjerice, nacionalnih manjina.

Osamdeset posto crnogorskih građana želi perspektivu u Europskoj uniji. Međutim, politika nije slijedila njihove želje. Stalna politička nestabilnost usporila je napredak Crne Gore u pregovorima s Europskom unijom, a sadašnji politički akteri imaju prigodu prekinuti tu stagnaciju.

Međutim, moramo posebno pohvaliti pozitivne pomake, a to je usklađivanje s vanjskom i sigurnosnom politikom Europske unije. Nitko osim političkih aktera Crne Gore ne može povući pravi EU potez, a oni se moraju osloboditi svih onih vanjskih uplitanja Srpske pravoslavne crkve, Rusije i Kine i jednako tako dozvoliti medijima da budu slobodni i dopustiti demokraciju u Crnoj Gori.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana potpredsjednice, povjereniče, izvjestitelju, kolegice i kolege, politička kriza u Crnoj Gori uzrokovana od strane antieuropskih snaga koje pokušavaju formirati prosrpsku i prorusku vlast zapravo je samo slijed političkog kaosa koji traje od izbora 2020. do danas.

Od tada zapadne sile, uključujući Europsku uniju, uglavnom podršku daju onima koji su privrženi europskim vrijednostima samo na riječima, ali ne i u stvarnosti. U stvarnosti, pak, svjedoci smo sve brže i brže srbizacije crnogorskih institucija s posljedicom postupnog zatiranja identiteta Crnogoraca kao zasebne nacije. Izvjesno formiranje vlasti u koju bi izravno ušle radikalne prosrpske i otvoreno proruske političke snage predstavljalo bi cementiranje tog procesa. S krunom u sljedećem popisu stanovništva kao posljednjem koraku u dekonstruiranju samostalne Crne Gore. Bojim se da gospodin Spajić nema snage sam se tome oduprijeti i zato mu trebamo pomoći.

Ukoliko bi, pak, doista došlo do ovakvog razvoja događaja, glavni uzrok toga bio bi u nizu promašenih poteza Europske unije i drugih zapadnih sila od 2020. do danas. To svakome treba biti jasno. Budimo otvoreni, na korak smo do stvaranja mini Bjelorusije u srcu Europe pod kontrolom Vučića i Rusije. Molim vas, osvijestite se i spriječite to dok još nije kasno.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem chtěl podpořit tu zprávu. Je podle mě velmi dobře napsána. Mě zajímají zvláště pasáže v oblasti justice. Upozornění na to, že ústavní soudnictví v Černé Hoře nefunguje, soud není naplněn atd. považuji za velmi precizně zpracovanou část této zprávy. Zpráva je věcná, správná, přiměřeně kritická. Na druhou stranu chci tady zdůraznit to, co říkali kolegové ve vystoupeních. Potřebujeme do budoucna Černou Horu v Evropské unii. Je to náš geopolitický zájem. Není možné, jak říkal kolega, mít malé Bělorusko v centru Balkánu a vytvořit zde základnu pro ruský vliv. To znamená, podporujme snahu Černé Hory, aby se dále přibližovala Evropské unii. Nabídněme konkrétní další pomoc, ale je zřejmé, že Černohorci budou muset ten proces nakonec zvládnout sami a určitá svornost, po které volá ta zpráva, aby moc zákonodárná a moc výkonná spolu více komunikovaly a aby společně táhly tzv. za jeden provaz v zájmu přibližování k Evropské unii, to v té zprávě také je a já to vítám.

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Madam President, I thank my colleagues and especially the rapporteur for this report. I trust your dedication and your words here in the room and also when you communicate on social media.

But, Commissioner, I wish I could say the same about you. I'm not sure if I can trust the words that you've said in the room today. I'm not sure if you would find it politically convenient to set fire to the commitments of the Commission and of the European Union when it would be politically convenient for you.

In three tweets, you undermine the European foreign policy. Would you do it again with our enlargement policy? So therefore, Commissioner Várhelyi, I'm sorry, but I do not have faith nor trust in you.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, as it is outlined in your report, the pro-European government, which will clearly and unequivocally support European policies and values, is of paramount importance.

To move forward decisively, progress in the area of the rule of law is essential and long overdue. We are ready to work faster with Montenegro. But we need delivery on the reforms. Montenegro has a unique chance to move to the next phase of the accession process to start closing the chapters.

Tonino Picula, *izvjestitelj*. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, nekoliko završnih rečenica.

Doista, kao stalni izvjestitelj Europskog parlamenta za odnose s Crnom Gorom zaista sam zadovoljan vrlo visokom razinom usuglašavanja od strane svih političkih grupa zastupljenih u Parlamentu, naravno relevantnih, proeuropskih, a čiji su predstavnici sudjelovali ne samo u pregovorima o ovom izvještaju, nego i ranijih godina. Hvala još jednom.

Mislim da smo ovim izvještajem uspjeli svojim stajalištima pokriti jednu dinamičnu godinu, koja je za Crnu Goru, nažalost, nasuprot silnim unutarnjim političkim previranjima bila ipak godina stagnacije na europskom putu. Ja se nadam da će Crna Gora u idućem periodu razviti sve svoje kapacitete i uspjeti prevladati interne podjele i u praksi, a ne samo deklarativno te se istinski posvetiti ostvarenju svega onoga što želi. Ne zbog Europske unije, nego prije svega građana Crne Gore.

Zemlje kandidati za članstvo u Europskoj uniji, a Crna Gora pogotovo zbog svoje uloge predvodnika u procesu, ne smiju se prije svega naći u raskoraku između ambicija i kapaciteta da ih ostvare. Jer postoji samo jedan povijesno važan datum kada govorimo o putu prema članstvu. To je datum ulaska u Europsku uniju. Radi se o procesu u kojemu je put jednako važan kao i cilj, a Crnoj Gori treba poželjeti sve najbolje na tom putu.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan keskiviikkona 18. lokakuuta 2023.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Dominique Bilde (ID), *par écrit*. – Ce rapport plaide, en dépit du bon sens, pour une adhésion du Monténégro à l'Union européenne, dans une conjoncture qui laisse pourtant à désirer – bien que le pays puisse se targuer d'un PIB par habitant supérieur à celui de la Serbie, ou encore de la Macédoine du Nord.

La corruption reste, en effet, un défi. Sur le plan budgétaire, j'avais dénoncé à de multiples reprises les difficultés occasionnées par un projet autoroutier et le prêt souscrit pour le mener à bien auprès d'une entité chinoise.

Sur le plan intérieur, les relations entre l'État et l'Église orthodoxe serbe demeurent fragiles.

Par ailleurs, il est irresponsable d'appeler de ses vœux une implication accrue de l'OTAN dans les Balkans, à l'heure où les tensions sont à nouveau à vif – en témoignent les dissensions entre la Serbie et le Kosovo.

D'une manière générale, ce projet d'élargissement de l'Union européenne est une aberration et il importe d'y mettre un terme.

20. Explicaciones de voto

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavaksi äänestysselitykset.

20.1. Establecimiento del Mecanismo para Ucrania (A9-0286/2023 - Michael Gahler, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial)

Suulliset äänestysselitykset

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamna președintă, războiul de la granițele Europei reprezintă și astăzi o realitate iminentă, departe de a fi luat sfârșit. Agresivitatea Rusiei și ambițiile ei imperialiste continuă să afecteze viețile cetățenilor europeni, economia și securitatea continentului, iar pentru a oferi un răspuns pe măsură, coordonarea și solidaritatea europeană nu trebuie să înceteze.

De aceea, este deosebit de important faptul că Parlamentul European și-a reafirmat astăzi solidaritatea cu Ucraina. Mecanismul aprobat de către o majoritate covârșitoare de deputați europeni, prin care vom aloca 50 de miliarde de euro pentru redresarea, reconstrucția și modernizarea Ucrainei începând cu 2024. Acest sprijin european ar trebui să ajute Ucraina să implementeze reformele necesare alinierii la cerințele de aderare la Uniunea Europeană, pentru că doar așa, prin mai multă integrare în spiritul statului de drept și al transparenței, putem opri avântul abuziv și autoritar al Rusiei în Europa.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Madam President, I welcome today's vote on the Ukraine facility, and I would like to thank the rapporteur, Michael Gahler, for his work. Europe must continue to support Ukraine in the face of Russian aggression.

At the same time, our support for Ukraine needs to be predictable and strategic. Furthermore, we need to ensure that our support to Ukraine focuses on immediate needs, but has in view the future reconstruction of Ukraine and its European aspiration.

Finally, we need to ensure adequate checks and mechanisms are in place to safeguard the accountability of our funds.

20.2. Creación de la Plataforma de Tecnologías Estratégicas para Europa («STEP») (A9-0290/2023 - José Manuel Fernandes, Christian Ehler)

Suulliset äänestysselitykset

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamna președintă, am votat astăzi o inițiativă istorică care poate să redefinească viitorul Europei. Platforma tehnologiilor strategice pentru Europa este un pas curajos pentru o Europă mai competitivă, mai rezilientă și mai suverană. În aceste vremuri tulburi, marcate de conflicte globale și instabilitate politică, trebuie să investim mai mult în sectoarele noastre strategice.

Prin această inițiativă consolidăm puterea noastră tehnologică, asigurându-ne rezistența în fața celor care vor să doboare democrația europeană. Cu atât mai mult pentru statele membre noi, precum România, aceste investiții reprezintă cheia pentru deblocarea întregului lor potențial, pentru a stimula creșterea și a îmbunătăți prosperitatea noastră comună. Doar astfel vom putea garanta că rămânem pe traiectoria noastră europeană și nu cădem pradă populismului și interferențelor externe. Acest efort remarcabil poate aduce investiții de peste 150 de miliarde de euro, deschizând calea către o Europă mai puternică, mai autonomă. Împreună putem fi lideri în ceea ce privește tehnologiile critice și putem apăra valorile noastre pe scena globală.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, zriadenie platformy strategických technológií vítam a podporujem. Ide o správny krok smerom k väčším investíciám do našich strategických technológií. Tým napĺňame aj cieľ väčšej konkurencieschopnosti a menšej závislosti na tretích krajinách, najmä čo sa týka nedemokratických režimov, ako je Čína.

Mrzí ma, že návrh nakoniec nebol až taký ambiciózny, ako bolo predpokladané. Neprináša totiž samotný balík peňazí pre strategické projekty. Bude však zatiaľ pôsobiť ako záruka, že projekty podporené z existujúcich fondov EÚ smerujú k naplneniu cieľov našej strategickej autonómie v oblasti kritických technológií. Keďže som bola spravodajkyňou aktu o kritických surovinách, oceňujem tiež, že Európsky parlament prepojil tieto dve legislatívy a ich ciele.

20.3. Control de la pesca (A9-0016/2021 - Clara Aguilera)

Suulliset äänestysselitykset

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamna președintă, accesul la fluviul Dunărea, la Delta Dunării, precum și accesul la Marea Neagră sunt esențiale pentru pescuitul românesc. Cu o flotă limitată, dar vitală pentru activitățile locale și regionale de pescuit, România se confruntă cu provocări în sectorul pescuitul. Printre acestea se numără inclusiv nevoia de îmbunătățirea infrastructurii și a facilităților de pescuit din porturi, precum și gestionarea durabilă a pescuitului și a protejării biodiversității.

Ca în toate celelalte sectoare, trebuie să maximizăm utilizarea fondurilor europene pentru a putea aloca mai multe resurse pentru modernizarea și extinderea porturilor de pescuit, multiplicarea fabricilor de procesare a peștelui, precum și încurajarea reînnoirii și modernizării flotei de pescuit. De asemenea, pescuitul la scară mică trebuie mai bine sprijinit, de exemplu, prin implementarea de stimulente financiare și programe de consolidare a capacităților pentru a ajuta pescuitul românesc să funcționeze în mod durabil și profitabil. De aceea, propunerea de modificare a Regulamentului privind pescuitul votată astăzi este binevenită.

Puhemies. – Seuraava istunto pidetään huomenna keskiviikkona 18. lokakuuta 2023 klo 8.30 alkaen.

21. Orden del día de la próxima sesión

Puhemies. – Esityslista on julkaistu, ja se on saatavilla Euroopan parlamentin verkkosivustolla.

22. Aprobación del Acta de la presente sesión

Puhemies. – Tämän istunnon pöytäkirja toimitetaan parlamentille hyväksyttäväksi huomenna äänestysten jälkeen.

23. Cierre de la sesión

Puhemies. – Istunto on päättynyt. Hyvää yötä.

(Istunto päättyi klo 22.00)

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
ECR	Grupo de los Conservadores y Reformistas Europeos
ID	Grupo Identidad y Democracia
The Left	Grupo de la Izquierda en el Parlamento Europeo - GUE/NGL
NI	No inscritos