



C/2024/4641

19.7.2024

RESOCONTO INTEGRALE DELLE DISCUSSIONI DEL 14 MAGGIO 2020

(C/2024/4641)

PARLAMENTO EUROPEO

SESSIONE 2020-2021

Sedute dal 13 al 15 maggio 2020

BRUXELLES

Sommario	Pagina
1. Apertura della seduta	3
2. Modifica dell'ordine del giorno: vedasi processo verbale	3
3. Comunicazione dei risultati della votazione	3
4. Legislazione di emergenza in Ungheria e suo impatto sullo Stato di diritto e i diritti fondamentali (discussione)	6
5. Primo turno di votazioni	10
6. Legislazione di emergenza in Ungheria e suo impatto sullo Stato di diritto e i diritti fondamentali (seguito della discussione)	10
7. 70° anniversario della Dichiarazione Schuman (discussione)	24
8. Utilizzo di applicazioni di tracciamento dei contatti nella lotta al coronavirus (discussione)	39
9. Ripresa della seduta	53
10. Comunicazione dei risultati della votazione	53

Sommario	Pagina
11. Secondo turno di votazioni	54
12. Ripresa della seduta	55
13. Vaccini e terapie nel contesto della Covid-19 (discussione)	55
14. Ripresa della seduta	70
15. Rettifica (articolo 241 del regolamento) (seguito dato): vedasi processo verbale	70
16. Composizione delle commissioni e delle delegazioni : vedasi processo verbale	70
17. Comunicazione dei risultati della votazione	70
18. Terzo turno di votazioni	72
19. Ripresa della seduta	72
20. Comunicazione dei risultati della votazione	73
21. Dichiarazioni di voto: vedasi processo verbale	73
22. Correzioni e intenzioni di voto: vedasi processo verbale	73
23. Presentazione di documenti: vedasi processo verbale	73
24. Storni di stanziamenti e decisioni di bilancio: vedasi processo verbale	73
25. Ordine del giorno della prossima seduta: vedasi processo verbale	73
26. Chiusura della seduta	73

RESOCONTO INTEGRALE DELLE DISCUSSIONI DEL 14 MAGGIO 2020

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

1. Apertura della seduta

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.01 Uhr eröffnet.)

2. Modifica dell'ordine del giorno: vedasi processo verbale

3. Comunicazione dei risultati della votazione

Der Präsident. – Wir beginnen mit der Bekanntgabe der Ergebnisse der zweiten Abstimmungsrunde des gestrigen Tages. Zunächst betreffend den Einwand gemäß Artikel 112: Genetisch veränderte Sojabohnen der Sorte MON 87708 × MON 89788 × A5547-127. Die Schlussabstimmung ist angenommen.

Wir haben dann die Entlastung 2018: Gesamthaushaltsplan der EU – Europäisches Parlament.

Änderungsantrag 1: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 13: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 32: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 33: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 42: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 43: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 44: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 34: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 14 – identisch mit Änderungsantrag 35: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 45: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 36: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 46: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 10: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 11 d: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 2: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 15: angenommen.

Ziffer 48 Originaltext: angenommen.

Ziffer 49 Originaltext: angenommen.

Ziffer 50 Originaltext: angenommen.

Ziffer 51 Teil 1 Originaltext: angenommen.

Teil 2 Originaltext: angenommen.

Ziffer 55 Teil 1 Originaltext: angenommen.

Teil 2 Originaltext: angenommen.

Ziffer 57 Teil 1 Originaltext: angenommen.

Teil 2 Originaltext: angenommen.

Ziffer 68 Originaltext: angenommen.

Ziffer 69 Originaltext: angenommen.

Ziffer 70 Teil 1 Originaltext: angenommen.

Teil 2 Originaltext: angenommen.

Ziffer 71 Teil 1 Originaltext: angenommen.

Teil 2 Originaltext: angenommen.

Teil 3 Originaltext: angenommen.

Teil 4 Originaltext: angenommen.

Ziffer 72 Originaltext Teil 1: angenommen.

Teil 2 Originaltext: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 3: abgelehnt.

Ziffer 79 Originaltext Teil 1: angenommen.

Teil 2: angenommen.

Teil 3: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 4: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 5: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 16: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 7: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 37: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 38: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 39: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 40: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 8: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 12: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 29: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 17 und 49 identisch ist damit erledigt.

Änderungsantrag 41: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 25: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 26: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 9: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 18: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 21: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 53: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 54: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 55: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 56: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 57: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 28: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 20: abgelehnt.

Dann kommen wir zur Entlastung 2018: Gesamthaushaltsplan der EU – Kommission und Exekutivagenturen.

Änderungsantrag 20 d: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 38 Teil 1: abgelehnt.

Teil 2: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 1: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 39: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 21: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 24: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 17: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 40: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 41: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 42: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 46: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 25: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 26: angenommen.

Ziffer 293 Originaltext: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 2: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 3: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 4 d, 27 d und 43 d: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 5: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 6: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 28: angenommen.

Änderungsantrag 44 Teil 1: angenommen.

Teil 2: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 7 d: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 8: abgelehnt.

Änderungsantrag 9: abgelehnt.

Meine Damen und Herren! Wir haben es jetzt 9.09 Uhr. Für 9.30 Uhr ist angekündigt, die Abstimmung zu eröffnen. Ich werde mir erlauben, mit der Aussprache bereits zu beginnen, wenn Sie keine Einwände haben. Und zwischen zwei Rednern, zwischen denen dann 9.30 Uhr liegt, werde ich mir erlauben, sie kurz zu unterbrechen, um die Abstimmungsrunde dann wie angekündigt zu eröffnen.

Gibt es Einwände?

Das ist nicht der Fall.

4. Legislazione di emergenza in Ungheria e suo impatto sullo Stato di diritto e i diritti fondamentali (discussione)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu Notstandsgesetzen in Ungarn und ihre Auswirkungen auf Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Grundrechte (2020/2620(RSP)).

Ich weise die Mitglieder darauf hin, dass es bei dieser Aussprache keine spontanen Wortmeldungen gibt und dass keine blauen Karten akzeptiert werden.

Nikolina Brnjac, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, I would like to begin by underlining that the rule of law plays a crucial role in all our democracies.

As recalled by the European Union's strategic agenda for 2019-2024, rule of law is a key guarantee that our common values are well protected and complied with. Croatia's Presidency programme also puts the focus on further establishing the Union as an area of freedom, security and justice, founded on common values, democracy and rule of law.

This is even more essential in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. Unprecedented circumstances have led many Member States to adopt far-reaching measures, which have been key to acting rapidly and effectively to protect the public health of citizens.

However, some of the measures do have a significant impact on fundamental rights, democracy and the rule of law. It is therefore essential that they are necessary, that they are proportionate to the objective, limited in time, subject to regular scrutiny and respects fundamental rights and the rule of law.

The European Commission President reaffirmed these principles in a statement on 31 March, and they were subsequently supported in statements by a significant number of states.

The Article 7 procedure, concerning Hungary, was on the agenda of the General Affairs Council of 25 March 2020. However, due to the COVID-19 emergency, that meeting had to be cancelled. Unfortunately, this is not over for the time being, and it is not possible to hold formal Council meetings. Instead, informal meetings of ministers are arranged through videoconference calls to allow the exchange of information and to discuss urgent information.

The Croatian Presidency believes it is important to facilitate the dialogue and exchange of best practices. In that regard, we organised an informal videoconference of ministers of justice on 6 April 2020, which addressed the impact of extraordinary measures on our justice system. Support was expressed by the Commission's initiative to monitor the extraordinary measures and their application across the Union on an equal basis for all Member States.

We are well aware of the European Parliament's resolution of 17 April 2020, which also echoed these essential elements. On 22 April, emergency measures adopted during the COVID-19 crisis were discussed at an informal meeting through a videoconference of European Affairs Ministers. Once more, a broad majority of Member States supported that approach that I've just highlighted.

The European Commission is closely monitoring the measures adopted by the Member States, including Hungary, and their compatibility with all the mentioned principles. We welcome the Commission's extensive and continued monitoring of the application of emergency measures adopted by all Member States.

We are also confident that all governments will withdraw emergency measures as soon as positive developments in the COVID-19 pandemic makes this possible.

We trust that all Hungarian institutions will fully and rapidly cooperate with the EU institutions, and we all have a joint responsibility to ensure that the rule of law and fundamental rights remain the cornerstones of our common project. This is even more true during these difficult times if the Union is to emerge from the COVID-19 crisis even stronger.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, in these challenging times, the Commission stands in solidarity with all the citizens of Europe and fully supports all the Member States in their fight against the pandemic. As President von der Leyen said, we need to ensure that Europe does everything it can to save every life it can.

At the same time, the Commission has made clear from the outset that the response to this crisis must fully respect our fundamental principles and values as set out in our treaties. The commitment of all EU institutions and Member States to upholding the rule of law and fundamental rights is essential.

Emergency measures adopted and implemented by Member States must be limited to what is necessary and strictly proportionate. They must not last indefinitely. Moreover, governments must make sure that such measures are subject to regular scrutiny, fully respecting democratic checks and balances. The emergency measures cannot mean switching off constitutions or EU law.

This is why the Commission is proactively monitoring the emergency measures for all Member States, including Hungary. We are looking in particular at how the emergency measures are being used in practice and what their impact is, in particular on the rule of law, on fundamental rights and on EU law.

Firstly, as regards the impact on the rule of law, situations which require close attention are those where the state of emergency does not have a predefined duration, where its duration is considerably long, where parliaments do not have the possibility to terminate such state of emergency, where the powers granted to the government are open-ended or where judicial review or other national checks and balances are restricted.

Secondly, the impact on fundamental rights. The angle here is to closely scrutinise the impact of limitations in practice, whether the standards imposed by international obligations and relevant guidance are being maintained, and what limitations might go beyond what is strictly proportionate.

And thirdly, the impact on EU law. We are checking whether the measures adopted under the emergency arrangements comply with EU law or whether they lead to possible disapplication of national laws implementing EU law.

As stressed by Commission President von der Leyen in her letter of 7 April to President Sassoli in this context, the case of Hungary raises particular concerns. In the case of Hungary, the emergency powers granted appear more extensive than in other Member States, considering the combined effect of broadly defined powers and the absence of a clear time limit.

The criminalisation of stating or spreading false information related to the crisis is not clearly defined and is accompanied by strict sanctions. This raises potential concerns as regards legal certainty and may have a chilling effect on freedom of expression. These particular concerns come in a well-known context in Hungary as regards rule of law and respect for EU values. The Commission is, therefore, monitoring very closely the use of emergency powers in Hungary.

Allow me to be more specific as regards the situation of media. Now it is more important than ever to pursue measures that are effective in curbing the spread of disinformation but do not limit free speech. The fight against disinformation should not and may not reduce our democratic values, including the possibility to have a fair democratic debate where different voices can be heard.

In Hungary, the environment in which media and journalists operate has been deteriorating for a number of years. Organisations and associations representing civil society and journalists have been sounding warnings about the situation. These warnings grew louder following the adoption by Hungary of the provision criminalising the spreading of disinformation relating to COVID-19.

Especially in moments like this, we need reliable journalism, employing professional standards to provide accurate information and to scrutinise the measures taken in response to the global health threat. Journalists should be able to work freely, have access to information, ask questions. Their job is to hold us politicians to account for our actions.

In the EU, we are now entering a new phase where certain measures taken to protect public health will be gradually relaxed. This new phase means that the general states of emergency, with exceptional powers granted to governments, should gradually be removed or replaced by more targeted and less intrusive measures. For that reason, the Commission will be very vigilant on how emergency measures, which affect the rule of law, fundamental rights and democratic values, are phased out in the Member States.

This is even more important for Hungary, given the lack of a clear time limit for the state of danger. I expect, first of all, that the Hungarian people will be the ones who will want to return to enjoying their rights in full. I also expect the Hungarian national parliament to exercise its scrutiny role. Civil society, free and independent media, regular scrutiny and national checks and balances are essential for overseeing the government's exercise of power. We can only face up to the challenges stemming from this crisis by bringing our societies and democracies together in a spirit of understanding and good cooperation.

The Commission is considering how to reflect as relevant the situation of the emergency measures in Member States in upcoming policy documents such as the rule of law report, the European democracy action plan and the renewed fundamental rights strategy, all due for adoption by the end of this year. Honourable Members, I look forward to hearing your views on this matter.

Der Präsident. – Ich möchte den Hinweis des Präsidenten von gestern wiederholen, dass auch hier im Plenum eine Maskenpflicht gilt und dass Sie die Maske für Ihre Redezeit abnehmen können. Dann ersparen Sie den Saaldienern, jeden Einzelnen aufzusuchen.

Andor Deli, *a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében.* – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Tisztelt alelnök asszony, kedves kollégák! A koronavírusos helyzet végéhez közelítve egyértelmű: most kell igazán egységesen kiállnunk az emberek egészségének megőrzése és a gazdaság fellendítésének ügyében. Ebben van szükség tényleges európai összefogásra annak érdekében, hogy Európa releváns tudjon maradni a globális szintén. Az Európai Parlamentnek elsősorban ebben kellene segédkeznie. De úgy látszik, vannak frakciók a balliberális oldalon, amelyek egyszerűen nem engedhetik meg maguknak, hogy ne támadják újra meg újra immár havi rendszerességgel Magyarországot. Sokkal könnyebb üres ideológiai vitákat szervezni, mint a lényegről és a tényekről beszélni és azzal foglalkozni, ami ténylegesen érinti és érdekli az embereket a tagállamokban.

Ezért van ma újra Magyarország a napirenden egy olyan vitában, amelynél a szervezők előre tudták, hogy az európai parlamenti képviselők kilencven százaléka nem tud részt venni és nem tudja elmondani a véleményét. A magyar kormány részvételét az Európai Parlament elnöke nem segítette annak ellenére, hogy az ügyrendi szabályok ebben nem akadályozták, az online részvételt pedig teljesen kizárták, miközben az áprilisi plenáris ülésen a szocialista és liberális frakciók vezetői a kivetítőkön szólalhattak fel. Most ez miért nem lehetséges a magyar kormány számára? A Bizottság pedig nem állapított meg semmilyen jogsértést a felhatalmazási törvény kapcsán, ezért ez a vita számomra egyszerűen az európai értékek és az alapvető jogi elvek megcsúfolása és a régi koncepciók perék idejét idézi. Sajnos itt az érvek és a tények senkit sem érdekelnek.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, la semana pasada la ONG Freedom House concluyó que Hungría no puede ser calificada como una democracia. Señorías, esto es un hecho sin precedente: que un país de la Unión Europea haya dejado de ser una democracia completa. Tristemente, en 2005, esta misma ONG colocaba a Hungría como una de las nuevas democracias más prometedoras de Europa.

Y, a pesar de la gravedad, la Unión no ha tomado medidas concretas que sancionen al Gobierno de Orbán por sus acciones. Y así, él, pues se va creciendo en una escalada sin fin para centralizar el poder, interferir en el sistema electoral, controlar los medios de comunicación, la educación, la cultura, acosar a la sociedad civil organizada. Señorías, esto es vergonzante: un ataque a los valores fundamentales de nuestra Unión y un ataque demoledor a nuestra reputación internacional.

Además, durante la pandemia, los casos de violencia de género han aumentado de forma alarmante en Hungría y, lejos de ayudar, Fidesz presenta una declaración en el Parlamento para no ratificar el Convenio de Estambul, para que los acosadores, para que los que están ejerciendo esa violencia no se vean castigados. Esto no puede seguir así. ¿A qué espera el Consejo? ¿A qué espera la Comisión? Es hora de despertar y de reaccionar contra lo que está pasando.

Hemos construido esta Unión para preservar la democracia, para preservar los valores fundamentales, y es totalmente inaceptable que esto esté ocurriendo. Señorías, el silencio es complicidad y, por eso, insto al Consejo a iniciar inmediatamente las conversaciones para activar el artículo 7 del TUE.

Y, por último, insto también a nuestros colegas del Partido Popular Europeo a que dejen de proteger a Orbán y a que expulsen a Fidesz de su familia política. ¿Cuántas cartas, cuántas excusas más necesitan recibir de Orbán para ver que se está burlando de ustedes? ¡Se está burlando de ustedes! Y no se confundan: no atacamos a Hungría, atacamos a quienes están haciendo desaparecer la democracia en un país europeo. Tengan en cuenta que estas amistades no les convienen para nada. Denles la espalda.

Ramona Strugariu, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, what is happening right now in Hungary and what Orbán is doing is not only grounds, dear Commissioner, for concern; it is a reason for starting infringement procedures. It is literally about Hungary's exit, in law, from the European Union and from European values. It is happening right now. This is not only my opinion, it is the opinion of 57% of Hungarian citizens, who in a recent poll said that what Orbán is doing is finishing off basically what he started. Mr Orbán should have been here in the room to answer some questions today, but he said he was busy fighting the pandemic.

Well, may I ask him, what is the connection between pandemics and rejection of the Istanbul Convention? Does violence against women help him fight pandemics? Are there any special fighting tactics that we have to learn? What is the connection between this and the indefinite state of emergency and fully silencing civil society and the independent media and criminalising independent journalists. And how about arresting people? How is he fighting the pandemic by arresting people who criticise the Hungarian Government?

I'm really sorry, Commissioner and dear colleagues, but this government should not receive one single cent, not one penny, from the EU, any longer – not today, not in the future MFF, not ever – until they follow rules and values. Yes, the Hungarian people should receive this money – civil society, businesses, communities – but directly from the Commission and directly managed by the Commission, not this government and not Orbán, until they leave and until they let Hungary breathe.

Nicolas Bay, au nom du groupe ID. – Monsieur le Président, imaginez le gouvernement d'un État membre de l'Union européenne qui restreindrait les libertés fondamentales avec une nouvelle loi d'état d'urgence sanitaire aux contours très nébuleux. Imaginez un gouvernement qui essaierait de contrôler l'information par une plateforme officielle qui traquerait les prétendues *fake news*. Imaginez que, dans ce pays, les juges constitutionnels seraient désignés unilatéralement par le pouvoir politique, sans voie de recours possible. Imaginez que, dans cet État membre, pas plus tard qu'hier, une nouvelle loi aurait restreint dramatiquement la liberté d'expression en instaurant une censure sur Internet, sans possibilité de faire appel.

Un tel gouvernement, il existe, mais pas en Hongrie. C'est celui de la France d'Emmanuel Macron. Et il n'y a personne ici pour s'en émouvoir. Alors, certains, dans les institutions européennes, enragent et trépignent quand ils voient Viktor Orban disposer de la plus forte légitimité électorale lors des dernières élections européennes. Ils enragent et ils trépignent parce qu'un pays ne plie pas face aux injonctions de la gauche morale. Ils enragent et ils trépignent, alors ils nous imposent, une fois de plus, un énième débat en pleine crise sanitaire, un énième débat sur la Hongrie, qui sera tout aussi stérile, tout aussi inutile, tout aussi inopérant que les précédents.

L'État de danger prévu par la Constitution est mis en œuvre, sous une forme analogue d'ailleurs, dans les autres pays européens, il a été approuvé par le parlement hongrois, aucun abus n'a été constaté. Les raisons réelles de cet acharnement, nous le savons, c'est le refus de la Hongrie de la folle politique migratoire de l'Union européenne. Cet état de droit, il est aujourd'hui instrumentalisé, il est utilisé pour imposer le gouvernement des juges contre la volonté des peuples.

(Die Aussprache wird unterbrochen.)

5. Primo turno di votazioni

Der Präsident. – Wie bereits angekündigt, möchte ich, bevor ich Frau Kollegin Delbos-Corfield das Wort gebe, die erste Abstimmungsrunde eröffnen. Wir werden über das zweite Paket der Änderungsanträge zu Entlastungsentschlösungen abstimmen. Die Abstimmung erfolgt nach demselben Verfahren wie gestern. Die erste Abstimmungsrunde wird von 9.30 Uhr, also jetzt, bis 10.45 Uhr geöffnet sein. Alle Abstimmungen heute sind namentlich. Die Mitglieder können ihre Stimmabgabe und die Ergebnisse der Abstimmungen in dem Dokument einsehen, das heute auf der Website der Plenartagung veröffentlicht wird. Die Ergebnisse werden um 13.15 Uhr bekanntgegeben. Die Abstimmung ist eröffnet.

6. Legislazione di emergenza in Ungheria e suo impatto sullo Stato di diritto e i diritti fondamentali (seguito della discussione)

Der Präsident. – Wir setzen nun unsere Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu Notstandsgesetzen in Ungarn und ihren Auswirkungen auf Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Grundrechte (2020/2620(RSP)) fort.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Ms Jourová, the Commission, the Parliament has been scrutinising the different exceptional rules put in place by many Member States during this crisis, and they all have in common that they have frozen, for a short period, some of our fundamental rights and liberties – one of them being the essence of this European Union, freedom of movement. But one government, and only one, in Hungary, has framed its state of urgency with no 'sunset' clause.

Today, in Hungary, the government has extensive powers with no clear definition and for an indefinite time. Let us not be mistaken. This has no necessity efficiency-wise. This has no sanitary basis. And this is turning its back on democracy.

We all know what has happened in Hungary for 10 years. Even more this last year and even more these last weeks. We are fully documented. Files are piling up on your desk, on my desk, as a rapporteur, on the desks of many people in this Parliament, of civil servants, in each of our institutions, in permanent representations. They are all aware; time of awareness has gone. We have our eyes wide open. We know about the attacks against freedom of the media. We know about the continuous judicial reform. We know about the discriminatory measures.

We know that today in Hungary you can have five years of imprisonment because the government considers you have spread fake news. We all know that yesterday one man was taken into custody for an opinion he posted on Facebook. Freedom of thinking is under threat now in Hungary. We know that it is easier to live in Hungary if you are male, if you're white and if you don't question the government.

Why, then, do your legal services in the Commission feel, guess, that there is no legal ground for infringement? Why then do Member States make a very clear statement without spelling out loudly the name we are talking about. There are gradual, very clear rules that can help us for a resolution under Article 7. These tools exist. Why are we not using them enough?

We want Hungarian citizens to stay European citizens, but we do not want them to be second-rate citizens with not exactly the same rights as the other European citizens.

Nicola Procaccini, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i decreti emessi dal governo sono frutto di poteri illegittimi. I decreti del premier senza termini di durata sono incostituzionali. Limitare le libertà con un decreto governativo è un atto in tutto contrario alla Costituzione. Sono le parole di Sabino Cassese, Annibale Marini e Antonio Baldassarre, tre dei tanti giudici costituzionali – alcuni anche presidenti della Corte costituzionale – che in Italia hanno condannato pubblicamente la violazione dello Stato di diritto.

In Ungheria un parlamento democraticamente eletto ha attribuito, con una votazione nel parlamento, poteri straordinari al suo governo per fronteggiare l'emergenza sanitaria.

Ora io vi chiedo, colleghi, in quale delle due nazioni si sta violando lo Stato di diritto? La verità la conoscete meglio di me: volete sottomettere due popoli, l'Ungheria e la Polonia, perché dovete, dopo aver provato a sopprimerli con l'oppressione....

(Il Presidente toglie la parola all'oratore)

Malin Björk, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, this is not the first time we are debating the situation in Hungary, but the thing is that the Fidesz regime, they happen to go all the time a little bit further. When you think that now it will stop, they manage to trample on democracy and rule of law and fundamental rights just a little bit more. And I think they also deliberately do this to get other countries and other governments to follow suit. And that's why we have to react in this House. And we have, this time, using the COVID-19 crisis as an excuse, ruling by decree without a sunset clause, threatening journalists and whistle-blowers, passing laws and policies that have nothing to do with the public health crisis, such as rejecting the Istanbul Convention or attacking trans people's rights.

So, some say it's not our business, let them dismantle democracy in Hungary if that's what they want to do. Well, no, because we stand in solidarity, as was said here before, with all those Hungarians that fight for democracy, for rights every day. They are not alone. And secondly, we make laws together here. And the authoritarian regime in Hungary will make laws that all of us will have to respect. And that's not acceptable. So standing up for law and democracy and fundamental rights in Hungary is standing up for rule of law and democracy for all of us. Luckily in this House, there are many of us that will not let Hungary dismantle democracy. And it's all about our business.

So the question is then, what is the Commission doing? What is the Council doing? When will the EPP expel and actually break up with Fidesz? It's a shame on you to have them there. The Commission, the infringement procedures, we are waiting for them and the Council, you are so weak in your statement, it is not enough. We need you to come up with a conditionality clause in the new MFF, you have to be extremely strict on that. And no recovery funds to Member States that don't respect the rule of law and democracy. It is time for the Commission and the Council to get into the game. This House will stand up for democracy and human rights.

Márton Gyöngyösi (NI). – Mr President, Orbán did not avail of the opportunity to speak up in this House, but I am equally disappointed that Judit Varga, Minister for Justice, was not given a chance to explain a law that is truly exceptional and a law one of a kind. No other law has been adopted without a time limit and by restricting freedom of expression.

The fears of the Hungarian opposition and of international critics were justified, as in the past two months Viktor Orbán has abused his powers in Hungary. By decree, private businesses have been placed under state control, while Orbán's family and circle of friends received billions of state funding. Opposition-led municipalities were deprived of their revenues, namely local business tax. Opposition political parties, including opposition parties, have been stripped of their state finances and funding, and citizens have been recently arrested for expressing their opinion.

Orbán is not only a coward for not having come here to defend his law, but he is also an opportunist. He tramples on European values and builds his autocratic regime from European funds and from EU money, and will continue to do so while German business and other Western investors find themselves comfortable in Hungary and get preferential business treatment in Hungary, and thereby I mean low wages, a flexible labour law, state benefits and low taxes.

Values versus profits, this is the dilemma. I think it is time for the European institutions to get their priorities right.

Christophe Hansen (PPE). – Mr President, I've only been a Member of this House for less than two years, but I have to say, ladies and gentlemen, that I have lost track on the countless times we discussed the democratic backslide in Hungary and in Poland. Our respective positions, including mine, are therefore well known. So, I will spare you my usual alarm about the power grab the Orbán government is operating in Hungary.

Today, I would rather wish to address the Commission and the Council. Where were you when democracy in Hungary was put on lockdown? Why is the Commission, Guardian of the Treaties, so reluctant to act on defence of European values? I have to say that I expect more than blunt and critical statements by Commissioner Jourová.

And why is the Council so much afraid of its own shadow to act on Member States that are persistently corrupting treaties and our EU values? Those are the real questions that need to be addressed today. It is time for action. We have enough of those words.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Mr President, COVID-19 in Hungary: introducing special economic zones to take over companies of strategic importance and transfer local taxes to Fidesz controlled county councils; changing legislation so that further big parts of revenues of municipal governments are taken over by the central government; rejecting the Istanbul Convention and respect for trans people; amending the Criminal Code to punish so-called 'misrepresented facts' with up to five years. I could easily go on and would only refer to developments over the last two months. Everything to combat the virus looks more like combating opposition parties, municipalities, journalists, civil society. And how can the EPP, calling itself the 'people's party', still continue with flimsy debates about a potential expulsion of Fidesz, leading to nothing? And how can you, Commissioner Jourová, say we still see no reason for infringement procedures?

Looking back over the past 10 years, what still needs to happen? And the Council and the Member States, we all know the Article 7 procedure is completely deadlocked. Will you now finally protect democracy and fundamental rights also for Hungarian citizens, and are you ready to suspend EU payments to Orbán? It's high time to act.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señor presidente; escuchen: este Parlamento Europeo defiende el núcleo de las libertades de cada ciudadano y de cada ciudadana de toda la Unión, incluyendo Hungría, lógicamente.

Los poderes extraordinarios de un Gobierno deben ir acompañados también de un escrutinio extraordinario de lo que hace, de una libertad de expresión extraordinaria y de una capacidad de crítica política efectiva y de reglas de juego que lo permitan.

Representamos a 450 millones de ciudadanos. No nos sentimos vasallos de ningún Gobierno; nos sentimos libres e iguales.

Y debe escucharlo el presidente Orbán y deben escucharlo todos los presidentes. Bajo el estado de alarma, bajo la pandemia no se suspende la democracia.

Y, desde luego, no habrá ningún resquicio de arbitrariedad de los poderes públicos que la Comisión de Libertades Civiles de este Parlamento no mire, no critique y no enumere, y sobre el que no actuemos en este Parlamento.

He de decirles que no puede haber impunidad y que escuchen: no vamos a parar en este Parlamento.

Annalisa Tardino (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo Parlamento purtroppo non perde occasione per dimostrare di essere alla mercé delle sinistre.

Siamo ancora nel pieno dell'emergenza mondiale più grave dal secondo dopoguerra: dovremmo concentrare gli sforzi su come superare la crisi e trovare gli strumenti utili ad aiutare i nostri cittadini. Invece il Parlamento europeo ritiene prioritario tenere un dibattito su come il governo ungherese avrebbe violato lo Stato di diritto, attaccandolo ancora una volta solo perché non va a genio alle sinistre.

Si tratta del solito atteggiamento di «due pesi e due misure» che, invece, non vede muovere critiche al governo Conte, che in Italia non solo ha agito dimostrando tutta la sua incompetenza ma ha, di fatto, abolito per mezzo di decreti la democrazia, quella stessa democrazia che invece Orbán ha rispettato, ottenendo il voto del Parlamento eletto.

Ebbene, mentre migliaia di europei sono confinati a casa, altri muoiono, altri ancora aspettano di tornare al lavoro, assistiamo a meri attacchi ideologici che non fanno altro che svilire questa Istituzione.

Noi ci dissociamo in pieno, guardiamo negli occhi i nostri cittadini e vi vediamo lo sdegno...

(Il Presidente toglie la parola all'oratrice)

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, despite arresting people for sharing the numbers of free hospital beds on Facebook, the Hungarian Government is still saying that the debate on the rule of law in Hungary is just an evil conspiracy by the European Union against Hungary. Look, you have attacked journalists, you have attacked independent NGOs, you have attacked the freedom of academia, you have led smear campaigns against minorities, against the European Union, against Jean-Claude Juncker himself, and now it's the trans community. This is not about equal gender recognition. This is a message. It is a message to everybody who is different. Either you assimilate with what we think is right or we will make you do it.

But I can tell you — and this goes to the Hungarian Government — you will not win with this. This continent thrives with freedom and diversity and we will fight for that. You will not break this community. Trans people will not cease to exist just because you want them to, and we in this Parliament and in the European Union will stand with this community and defend their rights.

(Applause)

Elżbieta Rafalska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Węgry podobnie jak mój kraj, Polska stały się ofiarą nadzwyczajnych ataków politycznych w Parlamencie Europejskim. Każda okazja jest dobra, by atakować Węgry i Polskę. Nie zmienia tego nawet pandemia.

Większość krajów podejmuje wyjątkowe i konieczne środki w walce z COVID-19, ale szczególnym nadzorem obejmuje się jednak Węgry, zarzucając im, że rozwiązania prawne przyjęte w ramach zwalczania pandemii, w tym również przeciwdziałanie gospodarczym skutkom kryzysu, to atakowanie i osłabianie demokracji. A przecież przyjmowane ustawy są zgodne z konstytucją, działa Trybunał Konstytucyjny, działa parlament, który zadecyduje o terminie zniesienia stanu zagrożenia. Funkcjonują krajowe mechanizmy kontroli i równowagi, a rząd ma silny mandat wyborczy, który jest przedmiotem zazdrości wielu państw członkowskich.

Proszę powiedzieć, dlaczego podczas tej debaty nie może być przedstawione stanowisko rządu węgierskiego. Wiemy, że z takim wnioskiem występował węgierski minister sprawiedliwości.

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, there's no doubt about it. Democracy has been attacked in Poland. Democracy has been attacked in France. There is vicious racism, similar to Hungary, in other states, but Hungary has taken it a step further. There has been a blatant and clear-cut authoritarian takeover, and it's not an accident. It's the product of a 10-year assault on judicial independence, on media freedom, on civil society and the right to organise. A 10-year assault in which the Council and the Commission did nothing.

We've had more of the same here today. There needs to be an immediate getting behind Article 7 infringements proceedings. There needs to be an immediate mechanism to cease funding those who would trample on democracy. There needs to be a political ostracisation of those who undertake the types of actions that everybody knows are being engaged in in Hungary today.

Because if we don't do that, then all of the other States who have the same tendencies will go the same way. And we are betraying the citizens of Hungary and all of those across the Union.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Mr President, Mr Orbán's violations of human rights and freedoms are not a new thing. The EU has looked the other way for too long. What we see in Hungary is alarming, yes, and action is urgent, but please do look beyond Hungary.

In Spain, Mr Sánchez' government is also using COVID-19 to enact new authoritarian policies. The police are instructed to search for negative messages that may also be punished with five years of prison, exactly like in Hungary. They are wiretapping without judicial controls and Mr Sánchez is still ignoring the advice of the United Nations and Amnesty International and political prisoners have not been released in spite of instructions by these bodies. Double standards must end in the EU. Both Hungary and Spain need to be accountable for their violations of Article 2.

Loránt Vincze (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Szögezzük le, hogy a magyarországi jogállamiságról rendezett mai vitát egyetlenegy új fejlemény sem indokolja. Azok a hamis hírek, amelyek a magyar helyzettel kapcsolatban Európát elárasztották, sorra cáfolatra leltek. Például hogy a magyar parlament nem ülésezik, pedig ülésezik, törvényeket fogad el. Tudjuk, hogy a 2010-es megválasztása óta az európai baloldal folyamatosan támadja Orbán Viktort. A magyar polgárok azóta hét országos választáson szavaztak bizalmat neki és a Fidesznek. Egyértelmű tehát, hogy brüsszeli boszorkányüldözéssel nem lehet választásokat nyerni.

A hamisnak bizonyuló támadásoknak helyet adó vitákkal az Európai Parlament viszont a saját hitelét veszíti el a polgárok előtt. Vagy rendezzünk egyórási vitát a jogállamiságról minden tagállam esetében. Kezdehetnénk mindjárt Romániával, ahol Johannes elnök múlt héten gyakorlatilag azt állította, hogy a kisebbségi jogok bővítése nemzetárulás. Szavai a román alkotmány szellemét és a jogállamiságot is sértik. Ebben a kérdésben miért nem szólalnak meg az aggódó hangok?

Sylwia Spurek (S&D). – Mr President, today, we need to deal with the situation in Hungary again. Why?

While the pandemic overwhelms Europe, on the one hand, we can see people losing their jobs, getting sick and dying, while at the same time, in the centre of Europe, there are governments that take this opportunity to violate democracy and fundamental human rights. When Viktor Orbán's ruling party restricts the rights of LGBTI people or blocks the ratification of the Convention on Violence Against Women, we cannot turn a blind eye. Refusing cries for dignity, a private life, to live free from discrimination and violence is refusing fundamental human rights and another backward step in democracy in Hungary.

This also sets a dangerous precedent for the future of the whole European Union. Equality among people and uniform guarantees of rights are among our key values. We can no longer tolerate the breaches of fundamental human rights, especially in our own backyard.

The European Union can no longer avoid the responsibility. We cannot say that these are not the EU's competences. The Commission's measures are insufficient. It's not enough to analyse, monitor, appeal. Human rights are the competences of the European Union. The Commission must act here and now.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Mr President, it's a pity that Mr Orbán didn't have the guts to appear here for our debate. He of course realises that it's easier to silence his Hungarian critics than Members of the European Parliament because, let's face it, under the rules of Mr Orbán and his cronies, democracy has been killed in Hungary. It's dead. But the Council keeps shamefully protecting him and talking about values and democracy, but they refuse to even put it on the agenda.

I would also wish to be critical of my own government for once and wish that the Dutch Prime Minister and Minister of Finance would be as critical of the destruction of the rule of law in the European Union as they are of violating budget discipline. And I wonder why the EPP continues to protect Mr Orbán. There are many good people in the EPP, true Democrats and defenders of the rule of law, but, as long as Fidesz is a member of the EPP, the EPP is complicit in the destruction of democracy and the rule of law. Kick him out. Kick him out. Don't wait any longer.

Finally, killing democracy should not be funded with European taxpayers' money. So not a penny more to Mr Orbán to line the pockets of his oligarchs.

(The President cut off the speaker)

Gunnar Beck (ID). – *(Beginn des Redebeitrags bei ausgeschaltetem Mikro)* ... Regierung, so der Vorwurf, nutze die Krise, unbefristet den Notstand auszurufen und den Rechtsstaat abzuschaffen.

Wahr ist: Das ungarische Parlament hat den Notstand gebilligt und kann ihn jederzeit beenden. Hier hingegen sind viele Abgeordnete in Corona-Ferien, und von daheim per E-Mail werden schuldenfinanzierte Billionen-Hilfen beschlossen – auf fehlerhafter Rechtsgrundlage und wider das Eigenmittelgebot von Artikel 311.

Das Deutsche Verfassungsgericht rügt die EU-Gefälligkeitsjustiz, indes die deutsche Regierung Verunglimpfung der EU und ihrer Symbolik mit drei Jahren Gefängnis bestrafen will. Der französische Moralist La Rochefoucauld nannte Heuchelei den Tribut, den das Laster der Tugend zollt. Das Rechtsstaats- und Heuchelei-Problem aber hat nicht Ungarn, sondern die EU.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Zdrowie, praca i bezpieczeństwo: te trzy obszary w życiu każdego obywatela są najważniejsze. Reszty może nie być. Szczególnie w dobie zagrożenia tak potężnego, jakim jest pandemia koronawirusa.

Historia nas oceni. O czym dzisiaj dyskutuje Parlament Europejski? Czym my się zajmujemy? Tym, że są kraje, które chcą walczyć i zabić nie demokrację, pani in't Veld, tylko koronawirusa. Każdy kraj ma prawo podjąć decyzję, jak chronić własnych obywateli. Miały do tego prawo Węgry, Polska, Hiszpania, Włochy. Każdy na swój sposób, bo każdy zna swoje społeczeństwo, swoje mechanizmy, a także swoją konstytucję. Węgrzy postąpili zgodnie ze swoją konstytucją, zgodnie z demokracją i nam nie wolno się mieszać do tego, że chcą chronić swoich obywateli przed śmiercią.

Historia nas oceni i warto, żebyśmy zajęli się tu i teraz walką z kryzysem gospodarczym, który będzie po pandemii, a nie... *(Przewodniczący odebrał mówczyni głos)*

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Επίτροπε Jourovά, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι ευρωβουλευτές, με αφορμή την πανδημία η κυβέρνηση της Ουγγαρίας περιθωριοποιεί το Κοινοβούλιο και το κάνει χωρίς ορατό όριο αναστολής αυτών των μέτρων. Υπονομεύει την ελευθερία του λόγου και επιβάλλει δυσανάλογες ποινές όχι μόνο σε εκείνους που διασπείρουν ψευδείς ειδήσεις αλλά σε εκείνους που ασκούν κριτική στον Orbán, όπως ο 64χρονος ο οποίος βρέθηκε να απολογείται γιατί ανέβασε στο Facebook κριτική κατά του Orbán και τον αποκάλεσε τύραννο. Κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η ιστορία είναι γεμάτη παραδείγματα όπου η κατ' επίφαση προσωρινή αναστολή ατομικών ελευθεριών και η υπονόμηση των δημοκρατικών θεσμών οδηγεί σε μια πορεία χωρίς επιστροφή στον αυταρχισμό. Γι' αυτόν τον λόγο η Επιτροπή οφείλει να δράσει άμεσα και να ζητήσει την επιβολή κυρώσεων κατά της κυβέρνησης της Ουγγαρίας μέχρι να συμμορφωθεί. Ξέρετε δεν πρόκειται για μια διαμάχη μεταξύ Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και Ουγγαρίας. Πρόκειται για την απαραίτητη συμμόρφωση μιας κυβέρνησης ενός κράτους μέλους στις αρχές και τις αξίες που μας κρατάνε μαζί. Αν ξεκινήσουμε τις εκπώσεις τώρα, κανένας δεν μπορεί να εγγυηθεί το μέλλον μας.

Lena Düpont (PPE). – Mr President, we are facing exceptional times these days, a time when fast action and clear messages were needed, when bold steps had to be taken. And so, we the Member States, the European Union, did – fast, flexible and with a clear head.

Entering the next phase, at least in some countries, it is time to evaluate the measures that have been taken. Were they appropriate? Are they efficient? Did they serve the purpose without harming democracy?

We fought the virus, not our core values, the founding principles of the Union. But what rule of law also means is being accountable on every side, setting clear rules that are the same for everyone under review, developing reliable procedures, incorporating the right to defend those being criticised, if needed, by a representative of government.

And here we are at the heart of the current reform where we urgently need a strong and objective rule about a reliable and permanent rule of law mechanism that sets clear rules on every side. If we want to avoid ongoing but fruitless debates, this should be in everyone's and every state's interest.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank you for this very important discussion. We are speaking here about the emergency regime in Hungary and I think that it's very important that the Commission is monitoring the emergency measures taken in Hungary, but also in all the other Member States.

We live in very challenging times, we live in an extraordinary situation which requires extraordinary and special measures to be taken. When we look at the extraordinary measures and the emergency regimes, we have to – and I've also repeated what I said at the beginning – look into how the regime is applied, and here there are very clear requirements that measures must be – only to the extent necessary – relevant for the solution or tackling the Corona crisis, proportionate measures and also time a limit. And the time limit is something where we have the biggest concerns regarding the Hungarian regime.

The Commission is monitoring the situation in all states, but in the case of Hungary I can reveal to you today that I have daily reports. I have weekly reports from our permanent representations, but I am following very closely the Hungarian situation daily reports. I am very well informed about the cases now of two people who were detained in relation to the spread of so-called fake news. I am informed about the actions taken by the government in relation to self-government and so on.

On a daily basis we are assessing whether we can take legal action. And I said before, and I will repeat it here: we are not opening infringement proceedings on Hungary yet. We are closely monitoring all the measures, and we also have to take into consideration that in our toolbox is also Article 7 and that the debate in the Council is ongoing and I am sure we will come back to it when the Council holds the General Affairs Council session.

But on concrete measures, because we said that we are monitoring all the concrete measures taken under the emergency regime, I would like to be more concrete here to give you some examples. The Commission's attention has been drawn to certain degrees which allow employers and employees to agree bilaterally to derogate from almost all provisions of the Hungarian labour code.

As the labour code transposes several EU directives the Commission is currently analysing these measures as regards their compatibility with EU labour and social law. Also, the Commission is examining several decrees as regards their compatibility with the General Data Protection Regulation.

Just these two examples of the concrete focus of the Commission in these days. And indeed, many of you mentioned here that there should be EU money should be provisional on the distribution conditioned by the basic principles of the rule of law in the countries. Well, when I came with this idea in 2017, it created a lot of noise, people said 'we cannot go that far'. I think now, with the situation developing in a wrong direction in a couple of states, we see that making money conditional on compliance with the basic principles set out in Article 2 of the Treaty is the proper thing to do.

Today, the Commission will have the debate about the Multiannual Financial Framework, about the budget for the next seven years. I will emphasise again and again in every fora at which I have a chance to speak about the new budget, that the conditionality has to be maintained and that the system of voting about the concrete cases must not be voted down.

And I am happy that this is still in the negotiating box of the budget and it has to remain there and it has to keep its teeth because the Commission proposed something which might really create or bring about some real difference.

We have now the joint European roadmap towards lifting COVID-19 containment measures after 15 April and we underlined that the general state of emergency is exceptional emergency powers for governments should be progressively replaced by more targeted interventions in line with constitutional arrangements of each country.

So this is what we expect Hungary to do, to go along with the rest of the other Member States and to release the confinement measures and to come back to what I already called before 'old normal', or at least the old normal. And again, the context relating to Hungary is that this is the country which is under the Article 7 procedure.

So we must build our new steps and next steps on the basis of common values. We must come back to normal checks and balances and the citizens must benefit fully from their rights.

If I can have a little bit longer I would like to add something a little bit personal and I will speak Czech. I remember very well the time – I said I would speak Czech ... you see, after six years of being here it's deformation...

Velmi dobře si pamatuju dobu, kdy bylo Československo okupovanou zemí od roku devatenáct set šedesát osm. Okupace a totalitní režim nás všechny velice ovlivnil. Žili jsme ve strachu a snili jsme o tom, že jednoho dne budeme žít ve svobodné společnosti, že jednoho dne přijde ke slovu a bude uskutečněna naše touha po svobodě, touha po aktivním občanství, že budeme mít možnost svobody slova, že budeme mít fungující samosprávy, které budou dostatečně finančně vybaveny, aby dělaly kvalitní veřejnou službu, že budeme mít svobodné volby, které zajistí střídání lidí u moci, že budeme mít mocné, ale ne všemocné, že nikdo nebude v té naší krásné zemi nad zákonem, že budeme mít otevřené hranice, že si budeme užívat otevřenosti, svobody a občanského sebevědomí.

Dámy a pánové, dnes jsme okupováni koronavirem a mnoho státníků Evropské unie řeklo, že v této době je nezbytné omezení některých svobod a že se budeme muset smířit s tím, že po velice krátkou limitovanou dobu, po dobu nezbytnou, budeme muset tato omezení snést. Zároveň státníci řekli jasně lidem, že mohou očekávat návrat ke všem těm úžasným věcem, které jsem tady před chvílí vyjmenovala, těm věcem, o kterých jsme snili v totalitním Československu. Já tomu věřím, že se to stane. Věřím tomu, že v zemích, kde jsou pochybnosti – a dnes se bavíme o Maďarsku –, že i občané Maďarska budou toužit po tom, aby se Maďarsko vrátilo k demokratickým principům a že se toho dočkáme minimálně teď, po skončení té koronavirové okupace, ale že budeme muset dál s Maďarskem vést dialog, že bude muset Komise dělat svou práci a reagovat právním způsobem podle pravidel, pokud k tomu budou všechny právní podmínky, že bude muset i mezinárodní společenství vyvíjet tlak na Maďarsko, aby se vrátilo do klubu bezpochybně demokratických zemí. Přála bych si to, protože tady není v sázce jenom situace v Maďarsku, ale je to vlastně velká výzva pro celou Evropskou unii.

Děkuji Vám i za tu možnost, že jsem mohla tady říct trošku ze svých osobních vzpomínek. Mám dlouhý životopis a teď bych řekla, že je dobře, že si toto pamatuju, protože mi to taky dává sílu pracovat na této agendě.

Der Präsident. – Frau Kommissarin Jourová! Ich möchte Ihnen persönlich für Ihre persönlichen Worte danken.

Ich glaube, die Diktaturen, die wir auf diesem Kontinent gesehen haben, machen uns verantwortlich dafür, dass diese Dinge nicht wieder passieren. Und weil wir Diktaturen unterschiedlicher Farbe auf dem Kontinent haben, sind wir das auch allen Menschen schuldig, unabhängig davon, von welcher Farbe sie von Unfreiheit bedroht werden.

Ich habe eine andere Vergangenheit als Sie, aber ich erinnere mich noch sehr genau: Vor einigen Jahren in Straßburg kam eine Fahrradgruppe, die das Grüne Band entlanggeradelt war und dann quer ab nach Straßburg, und einige, auch aus Ihrer Heimat, sind mit Tränen in den Augen in den Innenhof des Europäischen Parlaments gefahren. Vielen Dank für ihre persönlichen Bemerkungen!

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, the Presidency of the Council as a whole attaches great importance to upholding the rule of law and the protection of fundamental rights. In the aftermath of the crisis, the Union as a whole, will need to be very vigilant in respect of the values set out in Article 2 of the Treaty of the European Union.

The Croatian Presidency recognises the crucial role that rule of law plays in all our democracies. It is a key guarantee that our common values are protected and a joint responsibility of Member States and all EU institutions. This is no less important when facing the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic where unprecedented circumstances led many Member States to adopt far-reaching measures in order to rapidly and effectively curb the spread of the virus.

Member States have already given broad support to the Commission's initiative to monitor the extraordinary measures and their application across the Union on an equal basis for all Member States. Similar efforts, based on equality of approach and monitoring developments across the Union, are underway by different European institutions, the Fundamental Rights Agency, but also the Council of Europe.

Furthermore, the Commission is in the process of preparing the first annual report on the rule of law in the Union, to be published later this year, focusing on several rule of law areas. During the Croatian Presidency, this process remains in the preparatory phase. The Commission is leading the work and the Member States are involved in all the process.

I mentioned earlier that Article 7 procedures concerning Poland and Hungary were on the agenda of the General Affairs Council on 25 March. However, due to the COVID-19 emergency, that meeting had to be cancelled. Unfortunately, the emergency is not over and for the time being, it is not possible to hold a formal Council meeting.

As we already mentioned, on 6 and 22 April, emergency measures adopted in response to the COVID-19 crisis were discussed at informal video meetings by ministers of justice and European affairs. The ministers exchanged views on national and EU measures taken so far in response to the COVID-19 outbreak, including their duration, scope and effectiveness, as well as the impact of emergency measures on fundamental rights and the rule of law. Ministers shared their experience and best practices in the overall context of a collective EU response.

The Council remains seized of the Article 7 procedures and the Croatian Presidency is ready to continue proceeding at the General Affairs Council as soon as the situation allows us to convene formal Council meetings.

We continue to follow all developments closely. At the same time, we hope that the ongoing dialogue at the political level between the Commission and the Member States concerned will bring some tangible results.

The Presidency will pay particular attention to the views expressed here today during this debate.

PRESIDÊNCIA: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA

Vice-Presidente

Presidente. – Bom dia a todos. Eu queria agradecer o contributo do Conselho para este nosso debate e, com esta intervenção do Conselho, encerramos o ponto da ordem do dia sobre a questão da Hungria e do Estado de Direito e dos Direitos Fundamentais.

Está, então, encerrado este debate.

Declarações escritas (artigo 171.º)

Dominique Bilde (ID), *par écrit*. – Comment l'Union européenne pourrait-elle conserver la moindre crédibilité au regard de son acharnement purement idéologique contre la Hongrie de Viktor Orban? La raison sous-jacente en est, bien entendu, son opposition à la politique migratoire déraisonnée que Bruxelles n'a cessé d'imposer aux peuples européens.

Le deux poids deux mesures ne cesse de sidérer. Prenons le cas de l'Albanie, avec qui on a ouvert en catimini les négociations d'adhésion à la faveur de la crise sanitaire. Les mesures d'urgence ainsi que les lois sur la liberté de la presse ne conduisaient-elles pas récemment son président lui-même à la qualifier de potentielle «Corée du Nord de l'Europe»? Quant au Monténégro, toujours en proie aux dissensions relatives aux droits de l'Église orthodoxe serbe, n'a-t-il pas su habilement tirer parti de la crise pour inquiéter les prêtres et fidèles de cette confession?

Le point commun de ces deux États candidats est qu'ils ne dérogent pas à la ligne idéologique imposée par Bruxelles. Reste que les citoyens des États membres ne sont pas dupes de ces manigances et que, par ce parti pris systématique, l'Union aura tôt fait de perdre dans l'opinion ce qui lui restait de légitimité.

Andrea Bocskor (PPE), *írásban*. – Magyaroként, európai néppárti, fideszes kollégáimmal közösen szeretném elősegíteni tájékozódásukat a koronavírus elleni védekezésről szóló magyarországi törvénnyel kapcsolatban. Írásbeli hozzászólásainkban a törvény teljes szövegét elérhetővé tesszük az Önök számára. Kérem, olvassák el, győződjenek meg arról, hogy a szövege mindenben megfelel a demokratikus alapelveknek. 7. § Ez a törvény a kihirdetését követő napon lép hatályba. 8. § E törvény hatályvesztéséről a veszélyhelyzet megszűnésével az Országgyűlés dönt. 9. § E törvény a) 2. §-a az Alaptörvény 54. cikk (4) bekezdése alapján, b) 5. §-a az Alaptörvény 24. cikk (9) bekezdése alapján, c) 6. § (1) bekezdése az Alaptörvény XXIX. cikk (3) bekezdése és 31. cikk (3) bekezdése alapján, d) 6. § (2) bekezdése az Alaptörvény XXIX. cikk (3) bekezdése, 2. cikk (1) bekezdése és 35. cikk (1) bekezdése alapján sarkalatosnak minősül.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR), *в писмена форма*. – Свидетели сме на кулминацията на безпрецедентен за историята на ЕС процес, чиито бюрократи на най-високо ниво водят открита война с неудобни страни членки и правителства.

Войната срещу Унгария и Виктор Орбан протичаше под всякакви възможни претексти – от уж отстояване на свободата на словото, до критики защо Унгария си позволява да не приема масово мигранти на територията си. Даваше се ясна заявка, в продължение на години, че консервативната и национална линия на правителството в Будапеща е нежелана от Брюксел и либералното крило, което управлява този Съюз на уж суверенни страни членки. Тази кампания достига своята грозна кулминация.

За удобен претекст на поредната атака се използва момент, в който светът страда от глобална пандемия, погубваща хиляди човешки животи. Правителствата се борят да намерят спасение за гражданите си. Това прави и правителството в Будапеща, справяйки се, изглежда умело, съдейки по данните до момента. Докато ЕС си позволява поредната атака срещу Орбан тъкмо заради мерките, които Будапеща прилага за справяне с вируса. Това е цинизъм, безочие и пълна липса на елементарен човешки морал.

Призовавам европейските граждани от всички политически семейства и партии да се обединят в този тежък за континента ни момент, вместо да се принизяват до сцени на грозни и бескрупулни политически атаки.

Kinga Gál (PPE), *írásban*. – Magyaroként, európai néppárti, fideszes kollégáimmal közösen szeretném elősegíteni tájékozódásukat a koronavírus elleni védekezésről szóló magyarországi törvénnyel kapcsolatban. Írásbeli hozzászólásainkban a törvény teljes szövegét elérhetővé tesszük az Önök számára. Kérem, olvassák el, győződjenek meg arról, hogy a szövege mindenben megfelel a demokratikus alapelveknek. 6. § (1) A helyi önkormányzat vagy a nemzetiségi önkormányzat képviselő-testülete feloszlásának kimondása esetén e döntés hatálya a veszélyhelyzet megszűnését követő napon áll be. (2) A veszélyhelyzet megszűnését követő napig időközi választás nem tűzhető ki, a már kitűzött választások elmaradnak. A kiadott ajánlóíveket a törvény hatálybalépését követő tizenöt napon belül le kell adni a választási irodában, amely azokat megsemmisíti. A ki nem tűzött és az elmaradt választást a veszélyhelyzet megszűnését követő tizenöt napon belül ki kell tűzni. (3) A veszélyhelyzet megszűnését követő napig országos és helyi népszavazás nem kezdeményezhető, a már kitűzött országos és helyi népszavazások elmaradnak. A népszavazás kezdeményezéséről, az európai polgári kezdeményezésről, valamint a népszavazási eljárásról szóló 2013. évi CCXXXVIII. törvény II–IV. Fejezetében meghatározott valamennyi határidő megszakad. A határidők a veszélyhelyzet megszűnését követő napon újra kezdődnek. A ki nem tűzött és az elmaradt országos és helyi népszavazást a veszélyhelyzet megszűnését követő tizenöt napon belül ki kell tűzni.

Elisabetta Gualmini (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Nelle ultime settimane si sta verificando un ulteriore grave peggioramento per quanto riguarda il rispetto delle norme di Stato di diritto e di pieno funzionamento della democrazia in Ungheria. Prima la decisione di Orbán di approvare delle misure di emergenza che annullano del tutto il ruolo del Parlamento per un periodo indefinito di tempo e consentono al suo governo di governare attraverso decreti. Poi, la limitazione alla libertà di stampa, dato che il governo che ha imposto pene severe e assolutamente sproporzionate – come la reclusione – a chi è accusato di diffondere disinformazione, come denunciato da vari esponenti della stampa e delle opposizioni. Quindi, la decisione da parte dei due partiti della maggioranza al governo, di non ratificare la Convenzione di Istanbul "Sulla prevenzione e la lotta contro la violenza nei confronti delle donne e la violenza domestica", che rappresenta il trattato internazionale di più ampia portata per affrontare questa grave forma di violazione dei diritti umani. Non possiamo più tollerare che un Paese membro violi costantemente i principi fondanti dell'Unione (articolo 4 TUE) e continui a ricevere miliardi di euro in finanziamenti europei. Nel nuovo bilancio pluriennale ci devono essere condizionalità durissime nell'erogazione dei fondi per quei Paesi che non rispettano le regole dello Stato di diritto.

Balázs Hidvéghi (PPE), *írásban*. – Magyaroként, európai néppárti, fideszes kollégáimmal közösen szeretném elősegíteni tájékozódásukat a koronavírus elleni védekezésről szóló magyarországi törvénnyel kapcsolatban. Írásbeli hozzászólásainkban a törvény teljes szövegét elérhetővé tesszük az Önök számára. Kérem, olvassák el, győződjenek meg arról, hogy a szövege mindenben megfelel a demokratikus alapelveknek. 1. § Ez a törvény az Alaptörvény 53. cikk (1) bekezdése alapján a Kormány által kihirdetett, a veszélyhelyzet kihirdetéséről szóló 40/2020. (III. 11.) Korm. rendelet (a továbbiakban: Rendelet) szerinti, az élet- és vagyonbiztonságot veszélyeztető tömeges megbetegedést okozó humánjárvány megelőzése, illetve következményeinek elhárítása, a magyar állampolgárok egészségének és életének megóvása érdekében elrendelt veszélyhelyzettel (a továbbiakban: veszélyhelyzet) összefüggő sajátos szabályokat állapítja meg. 2. § (1) A Kormány a veszélyhelyzetben – a katasztrófavédelemről és a hozzá kapcsolódó egyes törvények módosításáról szóló 2011. évi CXXXVIII. törvényben meghatározott rendkívüli intézkedéseken és szabályokon túl – az állampolgárok élet-, egészség-, személyi-, vagyon- és jogbiztonságának, valamint a nemzetgazdaság stabilitásának garantálása érdekében rendeletével egyes törvények alkalmazását felfüggesztheti, törvényi rendelkezésektől eltérhet, és egyéb rendkívüli intézkedéseket hozhat. (2) A Kormány az (1) bekezdés szerinti jogkörét – a szükséges mértékben, az elérni kívánt céllal arányosan – a Rendelet szerinti humánjárvány megelőzése, kezelése, felszámolása, továbbá káros hatásainak megelőzése, illetve elhárítása céljából gyakorolhatja.

Livia Járóka (PPE), *írásban*. – Magyaroként, európai néppárti, fideszes kollégáimmal közösen szeretném elősegíteni tájékozódásukat a koronavírus elleni védekezésről szóló magyarországi törvénnyel kapcsolatban. Írásbeli hozzászólásainkban a törvény teljes szövegét elérhetővé tesszük az Önök számára. Kérem, olvassák el, győződjenek meg arról, hogy a szövege mindenben megfelel a demokratikus alapelveknek. 2020. évi XII. törvény a koronavírus elleni védekezésről 1. Az Országgyűlés annak érdekében, hogy a Kormány a COVID-19 fertőzés okozta tömeges megbetegedést okozó, 2020. évben bekövetkezett humánjárvány megelőzésére, illetve következményeinek elhárítására valamennyi szükséges rendkívüli intézkedést megtehesse, szem előtt tartva különösen annak lehetőségét, hogy az Országgyűlés ülésezése a humánjárvány következtében szünetelhet, annak tudatában, hogy vészes időkben felelős döntéseket kell hozni, és hogy az eddig megtett – és a potenciálisan előttünk álló – intézkedések szokatlan és idegen korlátozásnak tűnnek, de ezek betartása, az összefogás és a fegyelmeltség a magyarság legfontosabb erőforrása lehet, a közös cselekvés, a nemzeti összefogás, az egészségügyben és a rendfenntartásban dolgozók, illetve valamennyi érintett áldozatos munkája elismerésével, a Kormány veszélyhelyzetben alkotott rendeletei hatályának meghosszabbítására vonatkozó felhatalmazás megadására és kereteinek meghatározására a következő törvényt alkotja.

Ádám Kósa (PPE), *írásban*. – Magyaroként, európai néppárti, fideszes kollégáimmal közösen szeretném elősegíteni tájékozódásukat a koronavírus elleni védekezésről szóló magyarországi törvénnyel kapcsolatban. Írásbeli hozzászólásainkban a törvény teljes szövegét elérhetővé tesszük az Önök számára. Kérem, olvassák el, győződjenek meg arról, hogy a szövege mindenben megfelel a demokratikus alapelveknek. 3. § (1) Az Országgyűlés az Alaptörvény 53. cikk (3) bekezdése alapján felhatalmazza a Kormányt, hogy a veszélyhelyzetben az Alaptörvény 53. cikk (1) és (2) bekezdése szerinti kormányrendeletek hatályát a veszélyhelyzet megszűnéséig meghosszabbítsa. (2) Az Országgyűlés a veszélyhelyzet megszűnését megelőzően az (1) bekezdés szerinti felhatalmazását visszavonhatja. (3) Az Országgyűlés a Rendelet hatálybalépését követően e törvény hatálybalépéséig megalkotott, (1) bekezdés szerinti kormányrendeleteket megerősíti. 4. § A Kormány a veszélyhelyzet elhárítása érdekében az intézkedések hatályának fenntartásáig megtett intézkedésekről rendszeresen, az Országgyűlés ülésén – annak hiányában az Országgyűlés elnöke és az országgyűlési képviselőcsoportok vezetői részére – ad tájékoztatást. 5. § (1) Az Alkotmánybíróság elnöke (a továbbiakban: elnök) és az Alkotmánybíróság főtárgya gondoskodik az Alkotmánybíróság veszélyhelyzetben történő folyamatos működéséről, és megteszi az ehhez szükséges szervezeti működtetési, ügyviteli és döntés-előkészítési intézkedéseket. (2) Az

Alkotmánybíróság teljes ülése, valamint a tanács ülése a veszélyhelyzet megszűnéséig az elnök döntése alapján elektronikus kommunikációs eszköz igénybevételevel is megtartható. (3) Az elnök a veszélyhelyzetben engedélyezheti az Alkotmánybíróság ügyrendjétől való eltérést.

Beata Mazurek (ECR), na piśmie. – Czy możemy winić Węgrów za to, że jako jedno z pierwszych państw w Europie podjęły zdecydowane kroki w walce z koronawirusem? Już od 10 kwietnia rząd Węgier rozpoczął wprowadzanie przepisów, których celem było ograniczenie wpływu pandemii koronawirusa na krajową gospodarkę i rynek pracy. I tak np. specjalne strefy gospodarcze, gdzie znajdują się inwestycje najważniejsze dla gospodarki narodowej, zostały wyłączone spod zarządu samorządów i podporządkowane administracji państwowej wraz z przejściem opłacanych podatków. Te decyzje poprzedziło wprowadzenie 30 marca dekretów zawieszających niektóre akty prawne, zakazujących przeprowadzania wyborów uzupełniających i referendum, podnoszących wymiar kar za złamanie nakazu kwarantanny czy rozpowszechnianie fałszywych informacji na temat pandemii.

Działania węgierskiego rządu umożliwiły wznowienie już w kwietniu produkcji przez największe zakłady produkcyjne, m.in. przez fabryki Audi, Mercedesa, Opla i Suzuki. Dzięki szybkim i stanowczym działaniom rządu nie tylko ograniczono rozmiar strat w gospodarce i powstrzymano jej wygaszanie, ale także liczba zakażonych na Węgrzech pozostaje mniejsza niż np. w Czechach czy Austrii (pięciokrotnie mniejsza).

Powyższe dane wskazują na słuszność decyzji podjętych przez rząd Victora Orbana, który skutecznie chroni swój kraj i swoich obywateli przed szalejącą pandemią.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), írásban. – Ugye már senkit nem kell arról meggyőzni, hogy Orbánt udvariaskodással nem lehet megállítani. A magyar miniszterelnök számtalanszor eljátszotta már, hogy Európában kulturált politikus módjára viselkedik, majd otthon, az Önök háta mögött szidja az Európai Uniót, az európai értékeket, és mindent megtesz azért, hogy diktatúrát csináljon Magyarországból. Orbán csak az erőből ért. Politikáját a pénz motiválja, hogy minél többet lopjon, és ezt most a járvány alatt, a felhatalmazási törvény hatálya alatt is minden nap bebizonyítja. Sorra hozza az olyan rendeleteket, melyeknek semmi köze a járványhoz, de alkalmasak arra, hogy haverjai gazdagodjanak, és hogy a demokratikus értékeket még tovább rombolja.

Be kell fejeznünk egymás győzködését, hogy egy-egy ilyen vita során siránkozunk, hogy Orbán mindennel szembe megy, amit mi értéknek tartunk. Egész egyszerűen meg kell állítani. Nem hónapok múlva, nem mindenféle ultimátumot adva, hanem azonnal.

A magyar miniszterelnök lopásra épülő politikáját egyszerűen meg lehetne állítani. Ki kell zárni az uniós pénzek elosztásából. Ebből értene Orbán. Semmi másból. Ha Önöknek valóban fontosak a közös értékeink, akkor ne halogassuk tovább: kössük jogállamisághoz a kifizetéseket. Ezt várják a magyarok, mert ez az érdekünk, minden európai érdeke.

Kati Piri (S&D), in writing. – Arresting people for giving their opinion. Blocking the Istanbul Convention for ‘promoting gender ideology’. Banning legal gender recognition for transgender people. These are some examples of measures taken since Hungary declared an indefinite state of emergency under the guise of combatting the Covid-19 pandemic. None of these decisions prevent the virus from spreading. All they prevent is people from being themselves, being protected and speaking their minds. Hungary is not a democracy anymore. In the past ten years, we saw how an EU member state put an end to its rule of law. We just stood by and watched. Even after the latest developments, the EU is not able to take action. In a statement calling for proportionate crisis measures, the Commission President managed not to mention the country it was all about: Hungary. Still, there is no infringement procedure and no progress in the Article 7 procedure. How many more warnings, letters and expressed concerns do we need? Let this ‘state of emergency’ finally be the reason to take real action. The longer we wait, the higher the chance we miss our last opportunity to make a difference for the Hungarian people.

Sándor Rónai (S&D), írásban. – Nem ez az első alkalom, hogy a magyar kormány tevékenységét ebben a házban kell megvitatnunk. Tíz év alatt sok alkalom adódott már. Most a felhatalmazási törvény kapcsán kell beszélnünk róla. Egy törvény, amellyel teljhatalmat adott magának a kormány a járványhelyzetre hivatkozva. Mindenki látja Orbánék ámkfutását, hiába próbálják mindenhol elhíttetni, hogy semmi baj a magyar jogállamisággal. De van, engedjék meg, hogy néhány példát felsoroljak az ún. járványintézkedésekből. A kormány az önkormányzatokat bevételektől fosztotta meg, ami miatt sok helyen komoly gondba kerültek. Sok önkormányzatnál készülnek elbocsátásokra, mert egyszerűen nem tudják kigazdálkodni a béreket. Ott vannak például a sporttámogatások. Képtelenség megérteni, hogy miközben a munkájukat elvesztő embereknek juttatnak valamit, milliárdokat költöttek el stadionokra, uszodák építésére. A járvány alatt sikerült több ezer ember közalkalmazotti státuszát is megszüntetni. És persze, hogy a veszélyhelyzet alatt volt fontos megfűrni a kormánykoalíciónak az Isztambuli Egyezményt is. Mondják meg, hogy mi köze van ezeknek az intézkedéseknek?

seknek a járványkezeléséhez? Semmi. Annál inkább van köze a kormányzati hatalom kiterjesztéséhez, a jogállamiság tovább tiprásához.

Isabel Santos (S&D), *por escrito*. – O debate sobre as violações do estado de direito na Hungria tornou-se algo recorrente no seio do Parlamento Europeu ao longo dos últimos quase 10 anos. O surto de Covid19 apenas veio exacerbar a crise da democracia na Hungria. Temos vindo a assistir à mais pura e descarada deriva autocrática. A coberto da declaração do estado de emergência, o Senhor Orbán passou a governar por decreto, sem escrutínio parlamentar, por tempo indeterminado e a liberdade de imprensa vê-se cada vez mais restringida a pretexto da necessidade de combater desinformação.

A discriminação dos transsexuais é levada ao extremo ultrajante, aproveitando o silêncio do tempo de quarentena. Uma longa lista de episódios que vai crescendo diante das palavras ocas e da inação da Comissão, do Conselho e do PPE - a família política do FIDEZ. Não podemos continuar a ser complacentes com autocratas. É tempo de atuar com coragem e determinação. A falta de efetividade na defesa dos seus valores fundamentais ameaça arruinar a credibilidade da UE. É imperioso que se adote um mecanismo de proteção da democracia e do estado de direito fundado na condicionalidade do respeito pelos mesmos para o acesso a transferências financeiras do Orçamento UE.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR), *в писмена форма*. – Отново се занимаваме с дебат лишен от смисъл. Сега е времето за бързи и смислени действия. Трябва да обсъждаме конкретни мерки, които да спасят човешки животи и да възстановят икономиката. Вместо това, вие сте решили да си разчистите старите сметки с Унгария и Орбан. Обявявате се против така наречената тирания, но всъщност използвате позицията си, за да накажете тези държави членки, които отказват да се присъединят към вашата мечта за Империя Европа и нейните „нови ценности и морал“.

Защо иначе слушаме днес за Истанбулската конвенция? Тя няма нищо общо с настоящата криза или с извънредните мерки в Унгария. Колеги, отново използвате истински проблеми, за да прокарате насила леви идеи. Не ви интересуват гражданските права и свободи, а само политическите ви цели. Къде са обвиненията срещу социалистическото правителство в Испания и тяхната кампания за дезинформация? Защо скачате само срещу унгарските мерки за борба с фалшивите новини? Та нали целият ЕС е против дезинформацията?

Лицемерно е, колеги, да се криете зад фалшива загриженост за конституционните права на унгарците, но да не обръщате внимание на опитите на Конте да заобиколи италианската Конституцията. Занимавайте се с истинските проблеми в ЕС. Нека се върнем към смислена и обществено полезна дейност.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), *písomne*. – Opatrenia vlád a ich zväčšené právomoci, v čase boja s koronakrízou, nesmú byť vládami zneužívané. A to v žiadnom štáte EÚ vrátane Maďarska. Je nevyhnutné, aby EÚ monitorovala každý pokus členského štátu o obmedzenie slobody občanov a ich základných práv. Zvlášť pri krajinách, z ktorých dlhodobo zaznievajú varovné signály o nedodržiavaní demokratických pravidiel. Parlament musí mať právomoc ukončiť núdzový stav. Medzinárodné dohody naďalej platia. Právomoci majú mať jasné mantinely a nebyť úmyselne definované na čo najširší manévrovací priestor použitia moci. Za obzvlášť nebezpečnú považujem benevolentnú a samovoľnú kriminalizáciu občanov, či novinárskej obce, bez možnosti adekvátne sa brániť v konkrétnom čase.

József Szájer (PPE), *in writing*. – While the Parliament has still failed to restore its legitimate functioning, it is now arbitrarily extending the scope of the procedures for which it is supposed to have a mandate. The current functioning of the European Parliament is based on a Bureau decision with limited scope to urgency procedures. Deviation from the order of ordinary plenary sessions is also only possible on the grounds of urgency, ensuring the possibility for the President to convene extraordinary sessions of the Parliament. Commission proposals on the pandemic, discharge and other decisions related to the budgetary power of the Parliament do require an urgency procedure. It should be noted however that the extension of the scope of the urgency procedures beyond these is strictly unlawful and would be even if, provided, but not allowed, the Bureau decision on the current functioning and the electronic voting system gave a legitimate mandate for the Parliament to operate. Fisheries Partnership Agreement, dactyloscopic data exchange in the United Kingdom, just to name a few examples, do not meet the criteria of the urgency procedure hence does not fall within the scope of the operation allegedly provided for by the Bureau decision allowing the electronic voting system.

Hermann Tertsch (ECR), *por escrito*. – Ha sido lamentable escuchar hoy a eurodiputados lanzar acusaciones y difamaciones contra Hungría. Viktor Orbán cuenta con un respaldo parlamentario de más de dos tercios —137 sobre 190—, que le ha otorgado poderes especiales para una eficaz lucha contra la pandemia, que está siendo un éxito.

Añadido sarcasmo es oír esas acusaciones por boca de una socialista española. Un miembro del PSOE de Pedro Sánchez, aliado con los comunistas de Podemos, que pisotean toda garantía democrática, vigilan, amenazan y persiguen opiniones críticas y utilizan a la policía para la intimidación política. Con una raquítica minoría lograda con engaños, tiene que gobernar con separatistas, golpistas y filoterroristas. Mientras España sufre la peor mortandad por habitante del mundo, con 40 000 muertos ya, en parte ocultados por el Gobierno. Y 50 000 sanitarios contagiados, fruto de fracaso e incompetencia. El Gobierno socialcomunista, con nexos con dictaduras en Venezuela y Cuba y vínculos con la organización terrorista narcotraficante colombiana FARC, está desmantelando la democracia en España y construyendo una jaula.

Comparen Hungría y España hoy, tanto en libertades democráticas como en lucha contra el coronavirus, y verán que donde tiene que alarmarse la Comisión no es en Budapest, es en Madrid.

István Ujhelyi (S&D), *írásban*. – Magyar képviselőként és hazafiként végtelenül szomorú vagyok, hogy ismét a magyar kormány politikája van napirenden. Magyarország ennél többet érdemel. Nézzük a valóságot! Az MSZP online felületén elindította a „Diktatúra-figyelő” alkalmazást, amely sorra veszi azokat a túlkapasokat, amelyeket a Fidesz végez a koronavírus elleni védekezés mögé bújva. Van belőle számtalan. Az elmúlt napokban például „rémhírtérjesztés” miatt több embert előállítottak a rendőrök, mert közösségi oldalakon kritizálták a kormány járványkezelését.

A Fidesz erkölcsstelenségét bizonyítja az is, ahogy a járványt az ellenzéki polgármesterekkel való leszámolásra használja: a napokban nyújtották be azt – a veszélyhelyzetre hivatkozó – javaslatot, amely adóbevételket és jogosítványokat vesz el a kormány által kiválasztott (ellenzéki) önkormányzatoktól és adja oda azt a fideszes vezetésű megyei önkormányzatoknak. Végtelenül gyalázatos, hogy a magyar kormány még ezt a járványhelyzetet is politikai bosszúra és zsákmányszerzésre használja fel.

Most, amikor a következő hétéves költségvetésről is döntünk majd, fel kell merülnie a kérdésnek: hogyan lehet szankcionálni egy EU-ellenes tagállami kormányt anélkül, hogy az országot, vagy a polgárait bármilyen kár érje. Javaslom, hogy kössük az uniós források kifizetését az Európai Ügyészséghez való csatlakozáshoz! Amíg Orbán erre nem hajlandó, ne dönthessen az európai források elosztásáról! Bírálják el független brüsszeli döntéshozók a pályázatokat! Ne hizlalhassa tovább EU-forrásokból oligarcháit és a lopakodó diktatúráját!

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. – Koronaviruspandemia asettaa kaikki eurooppalaiset yhteiskunnat tilanteeseen, jossa riskit oikeusvaltio- ja demokration periaatteiden rikkoutumisesta ovat tavanomaista suurempia. Yhteiskunnat, joissa kyseisillä periaatteilla on jo aiemmin pyyhitty lattiaa, ovat vaarassa ajautua yhä syvemmälle autoritäärisyyden kierteeseen. Kun tällaisessa kierteessä ajautuu riittävästi syvälle, on sieltä erittäin vaikea enää nousta. Unkari on nyt todella lähellä tätä rajaa ja sen demokratia lähellä hajoamista. Unkarin kohdalla huoleni ei liity vain poikkeustilalainsäädäntöön vaan maan pidempään kehitykseen. Orbánin hallitus on Unkarissa järjestelmällisesti kaventanut median, kansalaisyhteiskunnan ja tieteen liikkumatilaa sekä keskittänyt valtaa itselleen tavalla, joka ei ole demokraattisen yhteiskunnan pelisääntöjen mukainen. Unkarin tilanteeseen on herätty Euroopassa aivan liian myöhään. Eri maiden oikeusvaltiokehitystä seuraavat tahot ovat varoittaneet Unkarin kehityksestä jo 2010-luvun alusta lähtien, jolloin Fidesz suunnitteli ensimmäisiä merkittäviä muutoksia maansa institutionaaliseen rakenteeseen. Tilanne on otettu vakavasti vasta, kun suurta vahinkoa on jo tapahtunut. On selvää, että viimeistään nyt kaikki ne toimenpiteet, joita aiemmin on pidetty liian hankalina, on otettava täysimääräisesti käyttöön. Artikla 7:n mukaista menettelyä on nopeutettava ja Unkari on vietävä tilanteeseen, jossa sen äänioikeus neuvostossa on uhattuna. Vielä tärkeämpää on se, että EU:n rahahanat katkaistaan. Ne ovat Viktor Orbánin elämänlanka, jolla hän rakentaa omaa keskusjohtoista kapitalismiaan, jossa voittajia ovat valtaapitävät ja heidän lähipiirinsä.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR), *na piśmie*. – To naprawdę niezrozumiałe, dlaczego w czasie pandemii zajmujemy się kwestią praworządności na Węgrzech, a konkretnie rzekomym jej łamaniem przez nadzwyczajne środki wprowadzone, tak jak w wielu innych państwach członkowskich, w celu skutecznej walki z pandemią. Dodatkowo forma, w jakiej prowadzona jest ta debata, nie pozwala rządowi węgierskiemu na zaprezentowanie argumentów w swojej obronie. To jest niezgodne z zasadą rzetelnego procesu, która też stanowi podstawową zasadę praworządności. Gdyby przewodniczący PE dopuścił przedstawiciela rządu węgierskiego do głosu, dowiedzielibyśmy się, że ustawa o stanie nadzwyczajnym nie daje rządowi nieograniczonych uprawnień. Kończą się one bowiem wraz z końcem pandemii lub nawet wcześniej, jeśli parlament tak postanowi. Komisja Europejska zdaje sobie z tego sprawę, dlatego nie wszczyną postępowania w sprawie uchybienia zobowiązaniom państwa członkowskiego. Dzisiejsza debata jest kolejnym dowodem na stosowanie

w UE podwójnych standardów.

7. 70° anniversario della Dichiarazione Schuman (discussione)

Presidente. – Tenho a honra de introduzir o ponto seguinte da ordem do dia, nada mais nada menos do que as declarações do Conselho e da Comissão sobre o 70.º aniversário da Declaração Schuman (2020/2642(RSP)). Como todos sabem, não estão previstos para este debate os tradicionais procedimentos «catch the eye» nem «cartão azul».

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, we are celebrating the 70th anniversary of the Schuman Declaration in truly unprecedented and challenging circumstances. Today, we are faced with heart-breaking numbers: more than 100 000 people have died in the European Union.

Let me from the outset express my sympathy with those who have lost their loved ones and my gratitude to the essential workers in hospitals and care homes, but also in shops, transportation and public services.

Moreover, millions of citizens have faced unprecedented restrictions aimed at containing the spread of the virus. The pandemic is putting our societies under serious strain. But the crisis has shown that, with the right synergy and close cooperation between Member States and EU institutions in the spirit of the Schuman Declaration, we can provide efficient and effective solutions.

The Commission and the ECB took exceptional steps. The Parliament and the Council adopted, without delay, emergency packages of legislation. The European Council has given overall direction. I will not go into details on the EU response. Let me just say that work continues with a sense of urgency and a determination.

As Prime Minister Plenković said on Saturday, from the start of our Presidency, we have been dealing with complex and important issues for the future of Europe: from ensuring an orderly Brexit and agreeing on a mandate for negotiation with the United Kingdom to negotiation of the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) package, discussions about the Green Deal and with a strong emphasis on enlargement policy and our strategic relations with the Western Balkans.

The negotiations on the MFF for the period 2021-2027 will now intensify with a new approach in the changed circumstances. Of course, the COVID-19 pandemic poses an unprecedented and unexpected challenge for all of us, as well as unprecedented administrative and logistical challenges for our Presidency. We've had to react quickly and find solutions to be able to ensure continuity of decision-making and make sure that the Union can act.

Within the Council, we have ensured effective discussions and rapid agreements on a number of European regulations and guidelines for more flexible use of European funds, easier procurement and production of medical equipment, and assuring the flow of goods across borders as well as the transport corridors.

In addition, we have facilitated the repatriation of all European citizens from third countries, enabled coordinated monitoring of the development of the epidemiological situation and facilitated the decisions on reducing restrictions at a national level, which should also lead to a revival of tourism and business activities.

Our response to the crisis is comprehensive and strong in order to preserve jobs, entrepreneurship and ensure a rapid and effective recovery while strengthening the solidarity and resilience of all Member States and our neighbours.

Furthermore, I would like to highlight our work on enlargement; first with the new methodology, then with the Council decision to open negotiations with Albania and North Macedonia. I would also like to highlight the recent EU-Western Balkans Zagreb Summit and the adoption of the Zagreb Declaration, which reaffirms and consolidates a clear European perspective and future of our Western Balkan partners.

It is a situation where the European Union is facing the greatest challenges since the World War 2. The Conference on the Future of Europe can serve as an important framework for reflection, open debate and a vision of our common European future in a dialogue between all Member States, European institutions and with full involvement of our citizens and other stakeholders.

The Presidency will spare no efforts in working to reach a consensus in the Council as soon as possible and in securing an agreement with the other European institutions on the timing and manner of launching this conference, which is important for the long-term future of Europe.

'World peace cannot be safeguarded without the making of creative efforts proportionate to the dangers which threaten it', said Robert Schuman in the opening words of his Declaration 70 years ago. Today, the context is obviously different, but the dangers are no less real and deserve creative efforts proportionate to them.

The motto of the Croatian Presidency: 'a strong Europe in a world of challenges' applies today even more than on the first day of our Presidency. I have travelled from Zagreb to this plenary for almost 10 hours to underline our Presidency's determination to continue working closely with the European Parliament. Indeed, it is my firm belief and we remain united in solidarity, we can emerge from this crisis together.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, 75 years ago, the guns of the Second World War in Europe fell silent. The Nazi regime was defeated, but Europe lay in ruins. Just five years later, on 9 May 1950, Robert Schuman made a declaration that would profoundly change this continent and would put it on a path that no one could have anticipated. For me, this is a very special moment. Seventy years ago, Robert Schuman started a journey, step by step. He showed us the way and the direction. And today, here we are. Just seven days ago, at the EU-Western Balkans Summit, we laid the ground for reuniting the Western Balkans with our union, reuniting Europe's history with its geography.

Yes, today, our union faces its greatest challenge yet: a pandemic that knows no borders, a pandemic that threatens our lives and our way of life, a pandemic that has tested our union to its core. But, as so often in history, this crisis has also shown Europe's greatest strengths: our commitment to unity, born of common values and shared history, and our solidarity with those in need. Schuman's words resonate today more strongly than ever before: 'it is no longer a time for vain words, but for a bold, constructive act'. The Schuman Declaration embodied the perfect balance, the delicate dance between idealism and pragmatism, without which there would be No European Union and No European solidarity as we know it today. He famously said, 'Europe will not be made all at once according to a single plan. It will be built through concrete achievements which first create a *de facto* solidarity.'

This crisis has put that solidarity to the hardest of tests. In March, some even said that we would not pass these tests. But, if you look around the world today, Europe has become the beating heart of solidarity: French patients treated in German hospitals, Polish doctors and Romanian nurses working in Italy, and a huge recovery plan is in the making. The world is watching. Our European model will only mean something to the world if we show solidarity within our union's borders, to each other, and beyond, with our partners globally.

Since the pandemic began, the European Union has been working on all fronts to contain the spread of the coronavirus, support health systems, protect and save lives, and counter the socioeconomic impacts of the pandemic, with historically unprecedented measures at both national and EU level. The Commission will directly support the healthcare systems of EU countries with EUR 3 billion from the EU budget, matched with EUR 3 billion from the Member States to fund the Emergency Support Instrument and the rescEU common stockpile of equipment. The rescEU initiative helps secure vital equipment, from ventilators to personal protective equipment, and to mobilise medical teams for assistance to the most vulnerable, including in refugee camps. The first hosting state of this stockpile is Romania.

The production of the first ventilators has started, and some 330 000 protective masks were delivered to Spain, Italy and Croatia in the past weeks. Since the beginning of the outbreak, thanks to the EU Civil Protection Mechanism and consular protection coordination, the European Union has brought home over half a million citizens stranded all over the world. Thanks to the Emergency Support Instrument, the European Union has procured another 10 million masks, the first 1.5 million of which have already been delivered to 17 Member States.

I want to thank this House for having launched the 'Europeans Against COVID-19' campaign. This Europe Day, the Commission and the Council joined forces with you, and we all pay tribute to those who are making history today, the everyday heroes fighting the coronavirus in our hospitals, in research labs, or by delivering personal protective equipment to those in need, because we know that coronavirus knows no borders.

Tackling this pandemic is a global challenge and the EU is leading the global effort to develop and deploy effective diagnostics, treatments and a vaccine. Without this tool, every country in the world remains vulnerable. Countries and international organisations are joining forces to develop these tools and put the structures in place that ensure they are universally available and affordable. How wealthy a country is should not determine whether its people get to live without this virus.

That is why President von der Leyen launched an international pledging marathon on 4 May. So far, we have raised EUR 7.4 billion, and this includes a pledge of EUR 1.4 billion from the Commission. But we know that more is needed and I am confident it will come. The crisis gives us an opportunity to lead by example and to reach for our highest aspirations, even when, in the short term, it might be easier to give in to our lowest instincts.

We will be remembered tomorrow for how we act today. Therefore, this crisis forces us to reflect. The pandemic will have a lasting effect, not just on the global system, but also on our daily lives. It is vital that on our path to recovery, we reach out, engage and listen to citizens, at European, national, regional and local level.

The Conference on the Future of Europe is an ideal forum for that and should commence as soon as conditions allow it. The Conference, as a pan-European democratic exercise, can reinforce the link between European citizens and the institutions. It can help rebuild trust and solidarity, even in the new coronavirus reality. The context might have changed, but our determination has not. We want the Conference on the Future of Europe to give citizens a greater say in shaping future EU policies, and we want this to be a joint exercise, involving the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on an equal footing. That is also why any decision on when to launch the Conference must be a joint one taken by all three institutions. Given the circumstances, my colleague and friend, Vice-President Šuica, who is leading the Commission's efforts on the Conference, is following this debate remotely from Croatia. She is very much looking forward to joining the debates in this House in a physical mode as soon as possible.

In order to be ready for the launch of the Conference under the containment measures scenario, the Commission is exploring digital solutions to enable us to host virtual debates and dialogues. We are working on a multilingual digital platform, allowing citizens to share their results and promote interactive ways for public engagement as part of the Conference. Such a digital platform would be open to all EU institutions. But a digital solution alone cannot reach everyone and cannot compensate for the real deal: face-to-face town hall discussions and workshops across the continent, reaching people from all walks of life. To protect the health of our citizens, we need to be patient and plan accordingly, step by step. Once the Council has adopted its mandate, we will get there. I am confident that the next step, the joint declaration by the Parliament, the Commission and the Council, which is necessary to launch the Conference, is within reach.

A little more than 30 years ago, I was looking through the barbed wire of the infamous Iron Curtain to Austria. This fence was just two kilometres from our apartment and I passed it every single day. I could see the people, the houses and the lights on the other side of the Danube, but I was told by my father that I would never be able to cross the border. Therefore, for me, the Schuman Declaration celebration is also a celebration of the European dream and freedom. I am sure that Robert Schuman would be proud today of how much we have accomplished. But I am also convinced that he would push us higher and further. Therefore, let's respond to his inspiration by building an even fairer, greener, freer and stronger Europe.

(Applause)

Esteban González Pons, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, la Unión Europea es la herencia política que nos deja la generación de nuestros padres. Nuestros padres entendieron que, o se construía Europa, o volverían la dictadura y la guerra. Europa o guerra. La idea es tan sencilla que Robert Schuman solo necesitó 868 palabras para explicarla. Y conviene recordarlo hoy porque, igual que hace cien años, el nacionalismo ha vuelto a arraigar en el corazón de los europeos. El nacionalismo es el coronavirus que infecta nuestra política.

Es nacionalista dar veintisiete respuestas nacionales diferentes a una única pandemia. Es nacionalista no homologar los criterios por los que se cuentan infectados, muertos o curados para tener una mejor posición nacional en el *ranking* de países. Es nacionalista cerrar fronteras sin coordinación. Es nacionalista la insolidaridad con las mascarillas, las medicinas, las plazas hospitalarias o la ayuda económica,

Es nacionalista llegar al Consejo Europeo con la intención de llevarse el máximo dinero poniendo el mínimo posible. Es nacionalista valorar los éxitos nacionales por cuánto me llevo para mi país y no por cuánto conseguimos todos los países juntos. Es nacionalista que para el plan de recuperación ningún primer ministro esté contemplando la economía europea en su conjunto.

¿Es que ya no quedan líderes europeístas en Europa? Dejemos de enfrentar al norte y al sur y al este y al oeste solo para obtener votos en nuestros respectivos países. Si sembramos cizaña entre europeos, recolectaremos discordia entre europeos. Ser europeísta es explicar al norte y al sur, al este y al oeste. Los europeístas nos entendemos, no nos enfrentamos.

Aparquemos de una vez nuestros egoísmos nacionales, nuestras filias y nuestras fobias. Abandonemos el «yo» y el «mío» para pensar en el «nosotros» y en «lo nuestro». La historia ha demostrado que podemos avanzar juntos sin renunciar a nuestras identidades nacionales. Frente al discurso egoísta del nacionalismo, defendamos la generosidad del patriotismo europeo y el valor de la paz.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, antes de tomar la palabra sobre este punto me gustaría poder contestar -ya que no lo he podido hacer, al no haber tarjeta azul- al señor Gunnar Beck, del anterior debate, que ha dicho que los diputados que no estaban aquí están de vacaciones.

Señor Beck, no se equivoque. Creo hablar en nombre de todos ellos: si no están aquí, no es por capricho. Están salvando vidas, están cumpliendo las normas que establecen los distintos Gobiernos nacionales.

Yo entiendo que la extrema derecha no está muy acostumbrada a esto, pero realmente los diputados y diputadas que no están aquí lo hacen de forma responsable, porque tienen en cuenta que es necesario parar este virus entre todos.

Este 9 de mayo se cumplieron setenta años de la Declaración de Schuman. Con esta declaración y de las cenizas de la Segunda Guerra Mundial se inició el camino de la paz, la libertad y la solidaridad de la Unión Europea que conocemos hoy.

En estos setenta años, Europa ha dado paz y prosperidad a su ciudadanía y ha crecido hasta veintisiete países. A pesar de los escollos que han aparecido en esta travesía, la Unión siempre ha salido reforzada, y hoy podemos reivindicar orgullosamente nuestro lema de «Unida en la diversidad».

En la construcción del proyecto común europeo, los socialistas y demócratas estamos orgullosos de nuestra contribución para que la Unión no fuera solo un mercado común. Fue con Jacques Delors, en 1989, cuando se introdujo la dimensión social con la adopción de la Carta de los Derechos Sociales Fundamentales de los Trabajadores, y ha sido nuestro objetivo, desde entonces, construir una comunidad y no solo un mercado. Y lo seguirá siendo.

Desafortunadamente, este año celebramos un 9 de mayo distinto, con el duelo por los que han fallecido por esta crisis y saliendo de nuestros encierros ante un porvenir lleno de incertidumbres.

Como presidenta del Grupo de la Alianza Progresista de Socialistas y Demócratas, pero también como ciudadana europea, tengo el convencimiento de que de esta crisis saldremos más fuertes. En este aniversario, nuestra familia política quiere reivindicar una salida valiente frente a esta crisis, y necesitamos realmente la unidad de todos los demócratas europeos.

Ya antes de la crisis, la Unión había planteado una conferencia europea para replantearnos su futuro, y ahora debemos incluir también la recuperación.

Que sea la conferencia para la recuperación y el futuro de Europa, porque será visible. Y será importante que esta discusión establezca las prioridades políticas escuchando a la ciudadanía, a la sociedad civil; que esta conferencia no se quede exclusivamente en la burbuja de Bruselas, que nos podamos abrir y escuchar a quienes tienen cosas que decirnos.

Estimados colegas, el proyecto europeo ha sido siempre un proyecto de futuro y no ha sucumbido al pesimismo. Como pensaba Jean Monnet, cada crisis es una oportunidad para dar un paso adelante. En este setenta aniversario, transformemos esta crisis en oportunidad -con el recuerdo de los que no están- para renovar la Unión Europea haciéndola más fuerte, más justa y más solidaria.

Pascal Durand, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, tout le monde aujourd'hui applaudit le génie visionnaire des pères de l'Europe, des Schuman, Monnet, Adenauer, Spinelli. Au risque de décevoir, je préférerais relever leur intelligence et leur pragmatisme. Ils ont compris, à l'époque, que nous n'arriverions pas à reconstruire l'Europe nécessaire sans l'inscrire dans la coopération, la paix, la démocratie et la solidarité. Sans solidarité entre les peuples et entre les États, disaient-ils, il n'y aura pas d'avenir durable pour l'Europe.

Alors, soixante-dix ans plus tard, où en sommes-nous? Nous ne partons pas de rien, nous avons réussi à construire une économie extrêmement puissante, un marché, une libre circulation pour les personnes et pour les biens. Nous avons réussi à asseoir la démocratie et à intégrer les pays qui étaient de l'autre côté du mur. Cela est une avancée que nous ne pouvons pas nier.

Mais cela ne suffit pas, cela ne suffit plus. Nous avons besoin de devenir une grande puissance politique. Nous avons besoin de consolider notre démocratie. Pour cela, nous avons besoin – vous l'avez rappelé, Monsieur Šefčovič –, bien sûr, nous avons besoin de réussir cette conférence pour le futur de l'Europe. Nous avons besoin de faire bouger notre démocratie avec les citoyens. Nous avons aussi besoin d'en finir avec la stupide règle de l'unanimité qui bloque toute évolution. Nous avons besoin de parler d'une seule voix. Nous avons besoin de modèles qui dépassent les intérêts de chacun des pays membres pour porter un intérêt général européen.

Oui, nous devons être à la hauteur des défis du vingt et unième siècle, définir les nouvelles règles d'une communauté basée sur la coopération, sur un commerce et des nouvelles règles, sur du juste échange, sur la paix, l'environnement et le social. Je dois dire que sans cette capacité à construire, sans cette capacité à coopérer, sans sortir de cette compétition fiscale qui enrichit les uns et appauvrit les autres, nous n'y arriverons pas.

Je voudrais juste terminer en rappelant une phrase d'un poète français. Jacques Prévert disait que l'on reconnaît le bonheur au bruit qu'il fait en nous quittant. J'exprime aujourd'hui le souhait que nous n'ayons pas, demain, à entendre le bruit de la démocratie, de la paix, de la justice qui nous quittent.

Jörg Meuthen, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wir sprechen heute über den Schuman-Plan, der sich zum 70. Mal jährt. Dieser Plan bildete den Grundstein für das Gebilde, das wir heute die Europäische Union nennen. Es war ein guter Plan mit historischen Auswirkungen. Er markierte den Auftakt zur deutsch-französischen Aussöhnung, den Beginn des europäischen Friedensprojekts, das bis heute Bestand hat. Er sah Frieden und Prosperität durch wirtschaftliche Kooperation vor. Das war klug, und es hat geklappt – bis heute. Über Jahrzehnte wurde das zum heutigen EU-Binnenmarkt ausgebaut.

So weit, so gut, so erfolgreich. Nicht vorgesehen war damals die Abschaffung der nationalen Souveränitäten. Nicht vorgesehen war die Auflösung Frankreichs, Deutschlands und weiterer Staaten in einem Kunstgebilde namens Vereinigte Staaten von Europa. Das wäre auch nicht klug gewesen, und das ist es auch heute nicht. Trotzdem betreiben Heerscharen heutiger Politiker auch in diesem Haus dieses Projekt und produzieren damit das krasse Gegenteil des von Schuman Intendierten: Divergenz statt Konvergenz, Aggression statt Friedfertigkeit, Zerfall statt Kooperation. Sie verstehen nur das Chaos nicht, das sie damit anrichten, weil sie viel mehr wollen, als der Schuman-Plan in kluger Beschränkung auf wirtschaftliche Kooperation vorsah, werden wir am Ende alles verlieren. Das ist von historischer Tragik für die Nationen Europas.

Ska Keller, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the success of the Schuman Declaration is certainly undoubtable. Lasting peace on a warring continent is a paramount achievement. But still, our Union has come even further, has been even more successful by working together. We expanded to overcome big parts of the Iron Curtain division and integrated in an ever closer Union to the benefit of the people living within. Crises, like the one we are crossing today, prove how much we have come to take for granted all the achievements of our Union. Just think about the freedom of movement.

However, it is hardly the time to pat ourselves on the back. The world today is very different from that of Schuman. We have digitalisation, globalisation, a growing nationalism, climate change. All those have fundamentally affected our realities, and the COVID-19 crisis today leaves millions without jobs, a stable income or future perspectives.

Today, our Union needs an immense leap forward. Europe needs again a Schuman-type future-proof solution oriented action. So what can this leap forward be? First of all, it should be a people and planet centred recovery from the multiple crises that Europe is currently facing – the social inequalities, the climate and biodiversity crises, the public health crisis. It is high time we used all the instruments at our disposal to create the most ambitious social, economic and environmental transformation the world has ever seen, and this must ensure that no one is left behind.

Secondly, this leap forward must re-anchor our European Union in the respect of citizens' rights, democracy and fundamental rights, because these have too often been sidelined in recent years.

Thirdly, a strong and future-proofed Union must also look beyond its immediate borders. Our Union must always offer shelter to those seeking protection. It must be open to countries that want to join and meet our rules.

We are living through challenging times for our Union. We must now prove that we can live up to those challenges. Seventy years from now, history will judge whether we have passed the test.

Derk Jan Eppink, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, 70 jaar na de verklaring van Schuman staat Europa weer op een kruispunt. Welke kant gaan wij op? Er zijn eigenlijk twee kanten. Eén kant is de vorming van een soort EU-staat, waar het grootste deel van dit Parlement voor is, met een Europese regering, Europese belastingen, een Europees leger en Europese schulden. De grote pleitbezorger van dit idee is de heer Verhofstadt, die hier helaas nu niet is, maar we vonden een boekje van hem van vroeger, zeker tien jaar geleden, waarin hij pleit voor een Europees rijk. Hij spreekt over een "New Age of Empires". Je hebt een Russisch rijk, een Chinees rijk, een Amerikaans rijk en nu moet er ook nog een Europees rijk, een European Empire, bijkomen.

Nou, wij, de Europese Conservatieven en Hervormers, willen een andere kant op, namelijk een gemeenschap van soevereine Europese staten, met een gemeenschappelijke markt voor handel en nijverheid bijvoorbeeld. Geen centralisatie zoals nu, ook geen bureaucratie. Wij willen wel flexibiliteit en laat elk land zelf bepalen welke munt het wil hebben. Wij willen ook respect voor de grondwetten van de verschillende landen en een bescheiden begroting voor noodhulp.

Daarom zeg ik in mijn laatste seconden spreektijd: laat de burgers bepalen wat ze willen. Laat ze dat bepalen in een referendum. Wat willen zij? Het Europees rijk van de heer Verhofstadt of onze gemeenschap van Europese staten?

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, l'Union européenne est toujours prête à romancer sa propre histoire, mais rarement à en tirer des leçons. Prendre au sérieux l'exercice de mémoire qui nous est proposé aujourd'hui nous permettrait pourtant d'apprendre des politiques menées par le passé face à des circonstances exceptionnelles.

Pour faire face aux crises, les États ont souvent taxé les plus fortunés: une taxation sur les entreprises profiteuses de guerre en France en 1916, une contribution exceptionnelle des grandes fortunes en 1945 en Allemagne.

Le niveau actuel des inégalités et de l'injustice fiscale n'est pas le cours naturel des choses. Alors que nous faisons désormais face à une des pires crises de notre histoire, comment ne pas mettre de nouveau à contribution ceux qui continuent de s'enrichir démesurément? Aujourd'hui, ceux qui profitent du coronavirus s'appellent Amazon, Netflix, Carrefour ou Sanofi. Taxons leurs bénéfices exceptionnels plutôt que de faire payer la crise aux peuples européens.

L'histoire nous démontre également que rembourser une dette insoutenable ne peut être l'horizon d'un peuple. C'est pour cela que plus de la moitié de la dette de guerre de la République fédérale d'Allemagne a été effacée en 1953. La Grèce aurait dû d'ailleurs bénéficier du même traitement de la part de l'Union européenne. La corona-dette n'est ni légitime ni remboursable. Organiser sa mise en commun et son annulation via la Banque centrale européenne est la seule solution viable, sauf à vouloir imposer à l'ensemble des peuples européens une austérité sans précédent.

Face au coronavirus et au défi climatique, chefs d'États et institutions européennes ont une responsabilité unique: ne pas passer à côté de l'Histoire et redonner enfin un sens au mot solidarité.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Voorzitter, 70 jaar geleden gaf Robert Schuman in Parijs het startschot voor de bouw van een verenigd Europa op basis van concrete verwezenlijkingen in onderlinge solidariteit. En concrete verwezenlijkingen kwamen er. We kregen de kans om over de grens te gaan en er te werken, te wonen, te ondernemen. Vrijheden die wij een aantal maanden geleden nog als vanzelfsprekend ervoeren, maar die vandaag de dag ineens weer onder druk staan. Overal in Europa gingen grenzen op slot. In mijn eigen dorp wordt ineens de doorgang versperd door metershoge hekken en containers tussen Nederland en België. Dat is onnodig en het zet de bijl aan de wortel van onze samenwerking en daarmee van onze welvaart.

Meer coördinatie is nodig, zeker in deze fase. Het is ondenkbaar dat we doeltreffende exitstrategieën kunnen ontwikkelen als we niet intensiever met elkaar samenwerken. Dus: oogkleppen af en weer over grenzen heen kijken. Ook voor onze grensondernemers, want zij worden net als veel andere ondernemers hard geraakt in deze crisis. Een ondernemer die bijvoorbeeld in Nederland een onderneming heeft maar in België of Duitsland woont, krijgt van geen enkel land ondersteuning. Ze dragen jarenlang belastingen en sociale premies af, maar als het erop aankomt kunnen ze nergens terecht. Deze mensen voelen zich in de steek gelaten. Ze vragen zich af waar dat ene Europa gebleven is.

Ik kan me dat gevoel heel goed voorstellen. 9 mei zou een Europese feestdag moeten zijn, maar zolang er containers op de grens staan en er grensondernemers tussen wal en schip vallen, valt er niet zoveel te vieren. Mocht Robert Schuman vandaag geleefd hebben, dan zou hij volgens mij eerder een traantje gelaten hebben.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señor presidente en este setenta aniversario de la fundación de la Unión —de nuestro proyecto—, Europa se enfrenta a la situación más difícil desde el año 1950. La pandemia del coronavirus es solamente el último reto de una larga lista a la que nos venimos enfrentando en los últimos diez años. Desde el cambio climático a la nueva geopolítica, pasando por la digitalización, el Brexit y la elección de Trump en la presidencia de los Estados Unidos.

Es verdad que Schuman dijo en su Declaración —y se ha recordado mucho—, que Europa no se haría de una sola vez, sino a través de la creación de solidaridades de hecho. Pero también dijo —y hay que decirlo a la vez— que la CECA era el primer paso para una federación europea. Recogía así el espíritu del manifiesto de Ventotene, una misión histórica que nosotros debemos culminar.

Por eso, este momento no es la ocasión de los pequeños pasos, sino la de un gran paso adelante. Es el momento de responder a la triple crisis de salud pública, económica e institucional con tres uniones: la sanitaria, la financiera y la política.

Gerolf Annemans (ID). – Voorzitter, een van de belangrijkste voordelen van founding fathers is dat ze meestal nooit tegenspreken. Dus wordt Schuman er in dit Parlement ook nu vandaag weer veelvuldig bij gesleurd om de uitbreiding van de gecentraliseerde eenheidsstaat te propageren. Nochtans is de COVID-19-crisis een historisch moment, want het is het momentum van de eigen lidstaat geworden. De lidstaat is het enige forum met voldoende democratie. Alleen aan democratie en in vertrouwen kunnen we levensbelangrijke zaken overlaten, zoals het beheer van onze nationale grenzen, de gezondheidszorg en de op vrijwillige solidariteit gebaseerde sociale zekerheid.

Waarde collega's, als u de toekomst van Europa enkel ziet als een steeds hechtere Unie en niets anders, zoals in de conferentie daarover nu reeds teksten voorliggen, dan mist u dat momentum. Europa zal nooit zoiets kunnen of mogen zijn. Europese samenwerking zal de verscheidenheid moeten respecteren. Anders, voorspel ik u, zal u uw Unie doen uiteenspatten.

Peter Lundgren (ECR). – Herr talman! När vi nu firar 70-årsjubileet av Schumandeklarationen befinner vi oss samtidigt i en av de absolut värsta kriserna unionen någonsin upplevt. Till ett mycket högt pris visar det sig nu också att EU är ett projekt som vid varje kris är handlingsförlamat och inte klarar att reagera snabbt och solidariskt.

Redan från början har ju EU-projektet handlat om byggandet av en politisk och ekonomisk union. Det visar sig dock klart nu att unionen har växt till en gigantisk koloss på lerbettor som suger åt sig mer och mer makt från medlemsstaterna.

Det är dags att reformera detta projekt till vad det borde vara. Det borde vara ett samarbete för att främja handel och därmed också i en förlängning fred. En 70 år gammal deklaration behöver uppdateras. Den behöver uppdateras till nutid och den behöver uppdateras till den värld vi ser framför oss nu.

Leila Chaïbi (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, s'il est vrai que nous fêtons un anniversaire, alors c'est peut-être le moment de partager le gâteau. Nous fêtons aujourd'hui les soixante-dix ans de la déclaration Schuman et cela fait soixante-dix ans qu'en Europe, il y a les discours et les actes. Dans les discours, c'est solidarité et dans les actes, c'est concurrence et chacun pour soi.

Cela a commencé avec Robert Schuman, en 1950, qui nous expliquait que la solidarité allait être au cœur de la construction européenne et qui, en même temps, mettait en place les bases de l'Europe des marchés. Plus récemment, en France, le président Macron, à peine élu, nous a fait un discours grandiloquent, à la Sorbonne, sur l'Europe, dans lequel il a répété treize fois le mot solidarité et, en même temps, sur les recommandations de la Commission européenne, il s'est mis à casser, casser les services publics et casser notamment le service public de la santé, dont nous voyons aujourd'hui à quel point il est essentiel à la solidarité.

Partout en Europe, c'est la même histoire et il est grand temps d'écouter les citoyens, leur colère, la colère des citoyens qui n'en peuvent plus de ce jeu de dupes et qui, partout, réclament, à juste titre, leur part du gâteau.

Herbert Dorfmann (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! In welcher Hälfte des vergangenen Jahrhunderts hätten Sie lieber gelebt, in der ersten Hälfte oder in der zweiten Hälfte? Ich für mich bin froh, dass ich in der zweiten Hälfte des vergangenen Jahrhunderts geboren und aufgewachsen bin, in einer Zeit der Hoffnung und nicht des Hasses und der Zerstörung.

Ich denke, der politische Geist Robert Schumans und der Politiker seiner Zeit hat ganz maßgeblich Anteil an diesem, meinem Glück. Aber ich will auch, dass meine Kinder, die in der ersten Hälfte dieses Jahrhunderts geboren sind, und ich selber und meine Generation weiter an diesem Glück teilhaben können und dass wir es weiter genießen können.

Unser Segelschiff „Europäische Union“ ist an einer ganz entscheidenden Boje angekommen. Wir können weitersegeln in Richtung Wohlstand und in Richtung Zukunft. Dann brauchen wir aber eine Route, wir brauchen eine Vision, und wir brauchen den Glauben, dass wir die Zukunft gemeinsam gestalten können. Oder wir können kehrtmachen an dieser Boje, und wir können zurücksegeln in dieses Europa des Gegeneinanders, der Nationalismen und der Opportunismen.

Ich bin überzeugt: Wir brauchen Courage. Wenn ich mir diese Tage und Wochen der Krise anschau, dann habe ich den Eindruck, diese Courage und dieser Wille sind uns manchmal abhandengekommen. Jede Krise – und in einer solchen befinden wir uns ganz ohne Zweifel – ist auch eine Chance, auch eine politische Chance. Die Menschen erwarten, dass wir in diesen schweren Tagen und Wochen der Corona-Krise konkrete Antworten geben. Und mit der Zeit, mit dem Geist Robert Schumans und seiner politischen Zeitgenossen können wir diese Antwort geben. 70 Jahre Schuman-Erklärung sind daher ein Anlass zum Feiern, aber auch ein Anlass, darüber nachzudenken, wie wir mit dem Erbe dieser Politiker umgehen.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Niemand hätte sich doch vor 70 Jahren vorstellen können, welche Fahrt dieses großartige Projekt Europas aufnehmen würde, dessen Grundstein mit dieser Schuman-Erklärung gelegt worden ist – weil es mutige Europäer wie Schuman, Monet und Spinelli gab.

Und wir stehen jetzt hier an einem Wendepunkt Europas. Was wir dringend brauchen, ist genau dieser Schuman-Moment wie vor 70 Jahren, der uns hilft, aus dieser Krise herauszukommen und die Weichen für eine handlungsfähige, starke und krisenfeste Union zu legen. Und im Geiste der Schuman-Erklärung müssen wir jetzt dafür sorgen, dass wir diese Krise auch wirklich als Chance nutzen.

Stellen wir uns doch nur einmal vor, wir hätten vor zehn oder 15 Jahren den Mut gehabt, Europa tatsächlich zu reformieren. Wir hätten keine Grenzsicherungen und neuen Nationalismus, keine Kleinstaaterei und nationale Alleingänge und keinen krisenanfälligen Euro. Deshalb ist es wichtig, dass wir jetzt diese Zukunftskonferenz als neuen Startpunkt für diesen Schuman-Moment sehen. Denn Europa wird nicht durch schöne Phrasen, sondern die Solidarität der Tat gebaut.

Mara Bizzotto (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, settant'anni non sono bastati per fare l'Europa.

Prendiamo l'emergenza coronavirus: dov'è finita la tanto sbandierata solidarietà europea? Prima avete trattato gli italiani come appestati, poi avete fatto finta di chiedere scusa e adesso, che è tempo di tirare fuori i soldi, cosa fate? Ci volete fregare quei soldi a prestito e con il MES: e voi questa la chiamate solidarietà? Ma non provate un minimo di vergogna?

Gli italiani hanno bisogno di soldi veri, come i miliardi che il nostro paese paga ogni anno a questa Europa schiava delle banche e delle multinazionali. Noi non vogliamo la vostra elemosina, noi vogliamo indietro i nostri soldi, tutti e subito, perché dobbiamo salvare la vita di milioni di italiani e la vita di milioni di imprese.

Cari burocrati europei, Schuman, De Gasperi e Adenauer si stanno rivoltando nella tomba di fronte alle vostre azioni. Voi avete tradito il sogno europeo, voi state uccidendo l'Europa perché, se non l'avete ancora capito, o questa Europa cambia subito oppure è destinata a morire.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Cieszę się, że widzę tak dużo posłów na tej sali. Pani minister reprezentująca prezydencję Chorwacji powiedziała, że jechała tu prawie 10 godzin samochodem. Ja jechałem prawie 12 właśnie po to, żeby powiedzieć podczas tej sesji o wielkim człowieku Robercie Schumanie, który wraz z Alcidem de Gasperim i innymi ojcami założycielami Europy postanowił stworzyć konstrukcję, która byłaby zaporą dla dwóch totalitaryzmów XX wieku, z jednej strony komunizmu, a z drugiej strony narodowego socjalizmu w Niemczech. W moim przekonaniu należą mu się słowa wielkiego uznania.

Przypomnijmy, że wyobrażał on sobie wspólną Europę jako strukturę gospodarczą, lecz odwoływał się także do chrześcijańskich korzeni, do dziedzictwa, do tradycji. Powinniśmy o tym pamiętać i nie amputować tego dziedzictwa, które jest częścią naszej europejskiej historii.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la dichiarazione Schuman, che ha dato avvio all'integrazione europea, colpisce ancora per la sua ambizione e il suo pragmatismo.

La stessa ambizione e lo stesso pragmatismo, commissario vicepresidente Šefčovič, dobbiamo averli oggi: non possiamo perderci in discussioni infinite. Va benissimo far ripartire presto la conferenza sul futuro dell'Europa, ma non deve essere una passerella per chiacchiere inconcludenti, serve arrivare all'obiettivo.

Orgogliosi della nostra storia e dei tanti obiettivi raggiunti, dobbiamo rimettere mano profondamente alla nostra Unione per superare i ritardi, gli errori e le incapacità dell'Unione quale è oggi. Questo vuol dire basta con i veti incrociati degli Stati membri, basta con estenuanti negoziati sul bilancio, dando finalmente maggiori risorse proprie all'Unione tramite una *web tax* e una tassa sulle transazioni finanziarie speculative. Basta con la troppa timidezza di fronte alle violazioni dello Stato di diritto e dei diritti sociali.

Spero che questo Parlamento possa essere unito nel lottare per questi obiettivi, perché io credo che oggi serva la federazione europea. Se non ora, quando?

Jordan Bardella (ID). – Monsieur le Président, à l'occasion des soixante-dix ans de la déclaration de Schuman, vous vous vantez de fêter l'Europe en grande pompe, mais de quelle Europe exactement parlez-vous?

Parlez-vous de cette Europe qui bafoue, en 2005, le non de la France et des Pays-Bas à la fumeuse Constitution européenne? Parlez-vous de cette Europe des accords de libre-échange, le dernier en date avec le Mexique, qui imposa à nos agriculteurs la concurrence internationale déloyale? Parlez-vous de cette Europe qui s'est couchée face au chantage d'Erdogan, arrosant la Turquie de milliards d'euros sortis de la poche des contribuables européens? Parlez-vous de cette Europe qui a laissé la Grèce seule assurer la protection de notre continent face à l'invasion migratoire? Parlez-vous de cette Europe dont le premier réflexe face au virus a consisté à mettre en garde les pays européens qui ont rétabli les frontières et dont l'impuissance a jeté l'Italie dans les bras de la Chine?

L'Europe que vous célébrez est le cheval de Troie d'un front populicide qui préférera toujours la misère du bout du monde plutôt que celle du coin de sa rue, comme en témoigne votre obsession d'intégrer l'Albanie et la Macédoine du Nord, en pleine crise sanitaire.

La véritable Europe, nous la construirons sans vous et vos chimères, mais avec les peuples, les nations et leur souveraineté qui en sont le cœur battant.

Nicola Beer (Renew). – Herr Präsident! „Europa lässt sich nicht mit einem Schlage herstellen und auch nicht durch eine einfache Zusammenfassung. Es wird durch konkrete Tatsachen entstehen, die zunächst eine Solidarität der Tat schaffen.“ Dieser Satz von Robert Schuman zur Geburtsstunde Europas hat nichts an Aktualität verloren.

In den Trümmern des Krieges waren es gemeinsame Ressourcen, Kohle und Stahl, die das Vertrauen zwischen den Erzfeinden schufen, die die Grundlage für einen gemeinsamen Raum des Rechts legten.

Schuman war Jurist, Rechtsanwalt, Justizminister. Kein Wunder, dass seine Idee Europas eine Rechtsgemeinschaft war – in der nicht die Macht über dem Recht, sondern das Recht über der Macht steht, in der nicht Sieger und Besiegte einander gegenüberstehen, sondern Staaten sich versammeln hinter der verbindenden, aber auch für alle verbindlichen Richtschnur des Rechts.

So wurde aus Konflikt kein Krieg, aus Streit kein Blutvergießen, sondern die Suche nach einem gemeinsamen Interesse.

Diese Gemeinschaft des Rechts ist unsere wertvollste Ressource. Diese Ressource gilt es über alle politischen Lager, alle unterschiedlichen Auffassungen zu bewahren und weiter auszubauen für ein besseres Europa.

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank you for this very important debate. Your statements have been very clear. On one side, most of us acknowledge that we have accomplished a lot together since the Schuman Declaration and there is a lot of which we are rightly so proud of. But, at the same time, you called for more solidarity, more action and, what I would call, result-oriented policies from our Union, which, as Ms Keller has said, must be more planet- and people-centred.

All of you called for the big debate with our European citizens under the Conference on the Future of Europe to take place as soon as possible. Because at a time like this we all feel that we need to listen more to the people – I would say even more than before – to include them in our decision-making and then, of course, to draw lessons about how we can fulfil their proposals, wishes and dreams in the best possible way.

I think we have to remind ourselves that, when Robert Schuman made his declaration for this bold and constructive action in 1950, his words did not fall on deaf ears. There was immediate follow-up. Less than one year later, the founding six countries would go on to sign the Treaty of Paris, establishing what would later become the European Union. This is how they materialised his call for peace in Europe and for legal protection against the different views of those who were more powerful at that moment, as Ms Beer has just reminded us. It was done in a big rush and what is often overlooked is the fact that, with the negotiations being done so quickly, the piece of paper that ministers signed was, in fact, left blank.

I like this because it is both a symbol of Europe's unwritten potential and that of integration being quite difficult and uncertain, but also the trust among those who were signing this blank sheet of paper that what they were doing together would be good for the future. They trusted each other because they wanted the best for our people and for our countries.

Many of you referred to Robert Schuman's famous statement that we would not build a common Europe, this important common project, all at once and in one go, but through consecutive victories on a long and hard path, and that this would be the moment when we would forge European solidarity.

I think that, if the founding fathers were with us today, on one side they would be very much impressed at how we have filled that piece of paper with successes. But I am confident that they would also have a lot of inspiration about how to proceed further.

I think that very soon they would realise, as Mr González Pons has pointed out, that it should be absolutely normal and natural to be a strong patriot and a strong European at the same time. We just want the best for our people, the best for our country and the best for our Europe. Sometimes I'm puzzled by how much proof we need to realise that, even in such a crisis as this, we do not have a single European country that can do a better job than if we do it all together as Europeans.

Ms García Pérez, Mr Durand and Mr Benifei have underlined the importance of making the debate on the Conference on the Future of Europe as relevant as possible. I would like to thank you very much for the proposals which I heard that we should include the topics of recovery and the renewed need for solidarity, and that we should debate honestly about all subjects which matter to our citizens, even such pertinent questions as fair taxation and how we can improve our common fight against tax fraud and tax evasion, which was put Mr Durand and Ms Aubry.

I agree with Ms García Pérez that the holidays look very different from what we are going through this spring. I think that we should thank all those who are working very hard, including you, honourable Members of the European Parliament, because, without your quick action, we wouldn't have been able to adopt so many measures, which I believe saved many lives and will save millions of jobs.

So now I think that the major lessons learned from the Schuman Declaration in our debate today are that we need to focus on immediate steps. We have to have an ambitious multiannual financial perspective. We have to have a recovery fund with strong firepower. We need to tackle the crisis, relaunch the economy and give a new boost to our European project through this intimate and in-depth debate with our citizens. I believe that this would be something that Robert Schuman would suggest to us and I think that this will be the best way to respect his legacy.

(Applause)

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, seventy years after the Schuman Declaration is a good moment to reflect about Europe, the challenges that face us and how we can continue to make sure the Union is effective in addressing them and delivering solutions.

As I said, in these challenging circumstances, the Presidency will do its utmost to steer our work in preparing and reaching the decision needed to address the COVID-19 crisis, as well as the impact on so many aspects of our lives. Active and effective cooperation between our institutions will be crucial in that regard.

In all these very difficult circumstances, as you know, my capital city, Zagreb, was hit by a strong earthquake on 22 March, leaving many of our citizens homeless and further traumatised on top of the COVID-19 pandemic.

I thank everyone warmly for all the help and support we received. I hope that we will all learn from the experience of this crisis and work towards making Europe more resilient to similar or any other potential future crises, especially in protecting our supply chains, diversifying and bringing back to Europe end production of essential strategic goods and food in order to ensure Europe's self-sustainability.

Regarding the Conference of the Future of Europe that indeed we planned launching on 9 May. As you will understand, in the last period, our work in the Council had focussed on the immediate priority of the response to the pandemic.

However, we are determined to come back to it – first to reach a consensus on a Council position and then by negotiating among our institutions. A new target date for a launch of the conference should be agreed, and recent developments certainly need to be taken into consideration.

To that effect, the Presidency had the first exchange with Member States already this week.

Presidente. – Muito obrigado. Com esta intervenção encerramos a discussão sobre o 70.º aniversário da Declaração Schuman.

Declarações escritas (artigo 171.º)

Clara Aguilera (S&D), por escrito. – En el 70.º aniversario de la fundación de la UE, nos enfrentamos a la situación más difícil desde el año 1950. La pandemia del coronavirus nos deja miles de personas fallecidas y una depresión económica que no se recuerda desde 1929, sumándose a los retos que afrontamos en la última década: cambio climático, una geopolítica agresiva, crisis migratorias, desafío digital, *Brexit* y la elección de Trump en los EE. UU., entre otros.

En estas siete décadas Europa ha vivido el período más prolongado de paz y prosperidad, dotándose del mercado interior más grande e integrado del mundo, del euro y de una serie de políticas de inversión colectivas que han garantizado la libertad política, el progreso económico y el bienestar social.

El 9 de mayo de 1950 Robert Schuman afirmó que Europa «no se haría de una vez, sino creando solidaridades de hecho» pero también dijo que la CECA era la primera etapa «para una federación europea», misión histórica que debemos culminar. Por ello, Europa debe dotarse de nuevos instrumentos para abordar las tres crisis que vivimos en este momento: crisis de salud pública, económica y política que solo podremos abordar a través de una unión sanitaria, financiera y política europeas.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR), na piśmie. – Jesteśmy w trakcie kolejnej sesji Parlamentu Europejskiego, która odbywa się w Brukseli, nie zaś w Strasburgu, w gronie kilkunastu, a nie kilkuset posłów na sali plenarnej. Głosujemy korespondencyjnie, w biurach, a nie na sali plenarnej. Dlaczego? Bo to nie jest zwykły czas i nie są to zwykłe okoliczności. Dlatego niezbędne są szczególne środki zaradcze nie tylko w Brukseli, ale i w całej Europie i na świecie. I takie też środki i działania podjął rząd w Budapeszcie. Niestety ta debata pokazuje, jak bardzo działania instytucji europejskich potrafią być oderwane od rzeczywistości. Instytucje potrafią jednak być konsekwentne: każda okazja, by uderzyć w rząd Węgier, jest wykorzystywana. Szuka się na wszelkie możliwe i niemożliwe sposoby „istnienia wyraźnego ryzyka poważnego naruszenia przez państwo członkowskie wartości, o których mowa w artykule 2 [Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej]”.

Apeluję do Parlamentu Europejskiego, Rady, a szczególnie do Komisji Europejskiej, by w tym szczególnym czasie skoncentrować się na współpracy i współdziałaniu w walce z samą epidemią, jak i jej skutkami (skoro nie udało się naleźć lub chociaż lepiej przygotować do tej sytuacji), nie zaś wracać ze szczególnym upodobaniem do doszukiwania się zagrożeń dla demokracji w państwie węgierskim, które walczy o swoich obywateli.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D), per iscritto. – Il settantesimo anniversario della dichiarazione Schuman, primo passo della costruzione europea, cade nel momento più difficile per l'Europa dalla fine della seconda guerra mondiale, in cui però ancor più emerge tutta l'importanza della dichiarazione e dell'ideale in essa implicito di «un'unione sempre più stretta».

La crisi sanitaria, economica e sociale senza precedenti che la pandemia di Covid-19 ha generato dimostra come sia sempre attuale la consapevolezza, contenuta nella dichiarazione, che l'Europa deve sorgere «da realizzazioni concrete che creino anzitutto una solidarietà di fatto», e che solo «un'Europa organizzata e vitale» può davvero contribuire, oltre che «alla civiltà» e al «mantenimento di relazioni pacifiche», alla tutela dei suoi cittadini e alla promozione dei valori di libertà, uguaglianza, giustizia, legalità, tutela dei diritti fondamentali e rispetto per lo Stato di diritto.

L'esigenza di solidarietà, coordinamento e azioni congiunte, alla base della dichiarazione, non è mai stata così evidente: in particolare, nell'immediato come nel medio e lungo periodo, la solidarietà europea è e sarà fondamentale perché nessuno sia lasciato indietro.

È quindi indispensabile rafforzare le Istituzioni e le politiche europee, la loro efficacia e democraticità: solo perseverando nello spirito della dichiarazione, l'Unione potrà affrontare le difficili sfide che l'attuale momento storico pone.

Johan Danielsson (S&D), *skriftlig*. – EU grundades för att säkra fred, stärka handel, skapa jobb och ge framtidstro. I år är det 70 år sedan Schumandeklarationen. EU har förändrats drastiskt sedan dess. EU har lyckats bevara freden i Europa och samarbetet har fördjupats. Men utvecklingen har inte alltid varit till fördel för arbetstagare och fackliga organisationer. Det är viktigt med ett EU som löser medlemsländernas gemensamma problem. Samtidigt måste EU respektera fackliga fri- och rättigheter, och ge länderna politiskt och rättsligt handlingsutrymme att skapa ordning och reda på arbetsmarknaden. Oseriösa företags intressen av att röra sig över gränserna kan inte överordnas fackliga rättigheter.

Vi behöver ett EU som bidrar i kampen mot växande ojämlikhet, osund konkurrens och social dumpning. Ett EU som skapar ett golv av skydd och rättigheter för arbetstagarna på den inre marknaden, och som sätter gränser för globala företagsjättars ensidiga vinstintressen och stänger dörrarna till skatteflykt. Det är avgörande för EU:s framtid att vi lyckas föra en politik som levererar åt vanligt folk. Det är grunden för oss socialdemokrater. Och det är med den insikten som jag arbetar för en ambitiösare europeisk arbetsmiljöstrategi, för ökade möjligheter att organisera sig fackligt och träffa kollektivavtal, och för bättre förutsättningar för medlemsländerna att garantera likabehandling av arbetstagarna.

György Hölvényi (PPE), *írásban*. – Robert Schuman francia kereszténydemokrata külügyminiszter nyilatkozatának 70. évfordulóján megállapíthatjuk: az Európai Unió éppen feléli az ő örökségét, mindazt a szellemi és erkölcsi tőkét, amelyből az integráció évtizedeken át példátlan sikerrel táplálkozott. Sürgető feladataink megoldása, a 21. századi közös európai útkeresés helyett a balliberális politikai mainstream pártpolitikai játszótérként használja az uniós intézményeket, messze túlterjeszkedve azok eredeti funkcióján, nevezetesen az európai jogalkotáson. Világosan látjuk, hogy ez az „elit” a szemünk előtt hagyja veszendőbe menni a Robert Schuman-i örökséget. Sőt, ezt a hagyományt bizonyos politikai csoportok egyszerűen megtagadják. Miközben a soha nem látott szoros együttműködésről beszélnek, összezárva rohamoznak mindenkit, aki nem az ő oldalukon áll, mindenekelőtt a nem balliberális kormányokat. Mindez egy hosszú folyamat, amely egyre szélsőséesebb példákat mutat. Része ennek hazám ismételt megtámadása is, amelynek tanúi lehettünk a ma reggeli plenáris vitán is – a megszokott koncepciók keretében.

A másik oldal folytonos, mindazonáltal alaptalan célkeresztbe állítása Schuman hagyatékának megcsúfolása, de mindez őket egyáltalán nem érdekli. Mára tehát ennek a „játéknak” a részévé, elősegítőjévé vált az Európai Parlament is. Legfontosabb feladatunk, hogy megtaláljuk a módját, miként tudunk ezen változtatni. Meggyőződésem szerint a Robert Schuman-i örökség ezt is jelenti: nem hagyni. Hagyatéka továbbra is kulcsa jelenlegi válságunk legyőzésének, egyben az európai egység megmaradásának.

Alicia Homs Ginel (S&D), *por escrito*. – En el 70.º aniversario de la fundación de la UE, nos enfrentamos a la situación más difícil desde el año 1950. La pandemia del coronavirus nos deja miles de personas fallecidas y una depresión económica que no se recuerda desde 1929, sumándose a los retos que afrontamos en la última década: cambio climático, una geopolítica agresiva, crisis migratorias, desafío digital, *Brexit* y la elección de Trump en los EE. UU., entre otros.

En estas siete décadas Europa ha vivido el período más prolongado de paz y prosperidad, dotándose del mercado interior más grande e integrado del mundo, del euro y de una serie de políticas de inversión colectivas que han garantizado la libertad política, el progreso económico y el bienestar social.

El 9 de mayo de 1950 Robert Schuman afirmó que Europa «no se haría de una vez, sino creando solidaridades de hecho» pero también dijo que la CECA era la primera etapa «para una federación europea», misión histórica que debemos culminar. Por ello, Europa debe dotarse de nuevos instrumentos para abordar las tres crisis que vivimos en este momento: crisis de salud pública, económica y política que solo podremos abordar a través de una unión sanitaria, financiera y política europeas.

Virginie Joron (ID), *par écrit*. – Non à la construction d'un bar de 400 places et d'un deuxième Parlement européen à Bruxelles, utilisons les bâtiments de Strasbourg, siège officiel du Parlement européen. Depuis 1958, Strasbourg est le siège du Parlement européen parce qu'il symbolise la réconciliation franco-allemande initiée par Schuman. Pour Strasbourg, le Parlement c'est 11 000 emplois et 637 millions d'euros par an. Pourtant, en 1993, un deuxième parlement a été (mal) construit à Bruxelles. Les cathédrales durent 1 000 ans mais ce bâtiment sera prochainement détruit. La démolition a été repoussée après les élections européennes pour éviter tout scandale. La reconstruction coûtera au moins 0,5 milliard d'euros. Le projet prévoit 900 places de députés, soit 200 en trop (est-ce pour les 96 députés turcs) et 940 places de bars pour les députés et leurs collaborateurs contre 1 260 places en salles de réunions. Tous les anti-Strasbourg cachent ces dépenses pharaoniques à venir, promettent moins de CO₂ et 616 millions d'euros en vendant le Parlement de Strasbourg et en licenciant son personnel. La stratégie inverse, qui serait de concentrer les activités à Strasbourg, n'a jamais été étudiée. Rien que pour l'épidémie de COVID-19, l'UE a donné 775 millions au Maghreb. La démocratie n'est pas à vendre.

Karol Karski (ECR), *na piśmie*. – 70 lat temu Robert Schuman wygłosił deklarację, która stała się fundamentem Unii Europejskiej, jaką dzisiaj znamy. Tym gestem zapoczątkowano niezwykle projekt polityczny, który zapewnił 70 lat pokoju i dobrobytu.

Jestem dumny, że przez te wszystkie lata udało nam się stworzyć wspólną gospodarczą i polityczną w oparciu o chrześcijańskie korzenie i europejskie wartości takie jak solidarność, wolność, tolerancja, równość w różnorodności i poszanowanie praworządności.

Ubolewam, że obchody tak ważnej rocznicy mają miejsce w chwili, gdy Unia Europejska stoi przed jednym z najtrudniejszych wyzwań od początków jej historii: kryzysem zdrowotnym, gospodarczym i społecznym wywołanym pandemią COVID-19. Każdy kryzys pozwala jednak wyciągnąć wnioski i może być doskonałą okazją do dalszego rozwoju, gdyż wskazuje na nasze słabości i niedociągnięcia. Wykorzystajmy to.

Jestem pewien, że ojcowie założyciele Unii Europejskiej byłiby zaskoczeni, jak bardzo rozwinął się ich projekt. Z drugiej strony 70. rocznica utworzenia Wspólnoty Europejskiej może być dobrym momentem do zatrzymania się i zastanowienia, czy nie powinniśmy przemyśleć kierunku, w którym zmierzamy, przypomnieć sobie o zasadzie pomocniczości, europejskiej solidarności oraz równości wszystkich państw członkowskich. Wydaje się bowiem, że w Brukseli, a zwłaszcza w Parlamencie Europejskim zbyt często się o tych wartościach zapomina.

Илхан Ключук (Renew), *в писмена форма*. – Днес ние знаем, че обединението на Европа е сложен процес. То ще бъде изградено с постиженията, които създават чувството на солидарност и доверие. Доверие, което съгражда основите на една нова, работеща и единна Европа.

70 години след декларацията на Шуман и благодарение на усилията на визионерите и поколения европейци, днес мирът и просперитета са основни идеали на нашия общ континент. Реализирана е мечтата на милиони граждани, но и осъзнаваме, че различията са богатството. От разпокъсани и разрушени от опустошителни войни страни, днес Европа задава световните стандарти за демокрация, човешки права и свободи и върховенство на закона. За тези 70 години Европа е била изправена на кръстопът неведнъж. Кръстопът на тежки избори и надежди.

И днес, Европа е изправена пред подобен избор. Нуждаем се от смелост, амбиция и солидарност, за да оформим бъдещето. Само тогава ще сме способни да отговорим на очакванията на нашите граждани, но вярвам, че заедно ще успеем да съградим Европа на всички европейци!

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), *por escrito*. – En el 70.º aniversario de la fundación de la UE, nos enfrentamos a la situación más difícil desde el año 1950. La pandemia del coronavirus nos deja miles de personas fallecidas y una depresión económica que no se recuerda desde 1929, sumándose a los retos que afrontamos en la última década: cambio climático, una geopolítica agresiva, crisis migratorias, desafío digital, Brexit y la elección de Trump en los EE. UU., entre otros.

En estas siete décadas Europa ha vivido el período más prolongado de paz y prosperidad, dotándose del mercado interior más grande e integrado del mundo, del euro y de una serie de políticas de inversión colectivas que han garantizado la libertad política, el progreso económico y el bienestar social.

El 9 de mayo de 1950 Robert Schuman afirmó que Europa «no se haría de una vez, sino creando solidaridades de hecho» pero también dijo que la CEEA era la primera etapa «para una federación europea», misión histórica que debemos culminar. Por ello, Europa debe dotarse de nuevos instrumentos para abordar las tres crisis que vivimos en este momento: crisis de salud pública, económica y política que solo podremos abordar a través de una Unión Sanitaria, Financiera y Política europeas.

Dace Melbārde (ECR), rakstiski. – “Ideja par vienotu Eiropu turpmāk vairs nebūs dzejnieku tēma vai utopiska vīzija; tā būs dzīva realitāte, jo Eiropas cilvēku sirdsapziņa būs sapratusi, ka šī ideja ir viņu izglābšanās iespēja.” Šie 1953. gadā vēlamības formā Robēra Šūmaņa izteiktie vārdi Covid-19 pandēmijas laikā iekļaujas tagadnes formā, jo glābiņš ir rodams pārnacionālā sadarbībā, atkāpjoties no agrākās valstu “egoistiskās domāšanas”. Tagad, kritiski analizējot dalībvalstu un arī Eiropas Savienības institūciju sākotnējo reakciju uz pandēmiju, redzam, ka spējam ātri rast kopīgo vērtību pamatu efektīvai sadarbībai. Tostarp līdz tādai pakāpei daloties ar resursiem, ka pacientus no vienas valsts pandēmijas smagāk skartajiem reģioniem pieņem kaimiņvalsts slimnīcas. Mēs esam ieausti kopīgā ekonomiskā, politiskā un kultūras tīklojumā, ko īpaši skaidri sajūtam, kad pēkšņi aizslēgtās robežas daudziem atgādina vēl nesenu pagātni, kura vienlaicīgi jau šķiet tik tāla, taču citiem tas ir kas nepieredzēts. Eiropas brīvības ir kļuvušas tik pašsaprotamas. Covid-19 ir iespēja nolikt malā pēdējo gadu nesaskaņas, kas sējušas šaubas par ES politisko identitāti, un ar konkrētiem darbiem apliecināt savstarpējo palāvību un uzticēšanos. Tostarp arī vienojoties par atveseļošanās plānu, kurā īpaša uzmanība jāpievērš sociālās nevienlīdzības novēršanai, un kopīgu nākotnes redzējumu konferencē par Eiropas nākotni, turklāt — kā uzsverts, — neatstājot nevienu iepakāļ. Arī mūsu nākotnes pamatā liekamas Eiropu veidojošās pamatvērtības: miers un solidaritāte.

Leszek Miller (S&D), na piśmie. – Deklaracja Schumana to kamień węgielny Wspólnot Europejskich i dzisiejszej Unii. Świątując 70. rocznicę jej podpisania, warto jednak przypomnieć, że deklaracja ta, zwana też planem Schumana, dotyczyła nie tylko sektorowej koordynacji wydobycia węgla i produkcji stali w państwach EWWiS, lecz przede wszystkim koncepcji utworzenia federacji europejskiej opartej na wspólnych wartościach wywodzonych z filozofii greckiej, prawa rzymskiego i chrześcijańskiego humanizmu. Ten nadrzędny cel deklaracji Schumana został przeniesiony w 1957 roku na grunt traktatu rzymskiego i widnieje tam do dziś zakodowany jako proces tworzenia coraz ściślejszego związku pomiędzy narodami Europy.

Obecnie znajdujemy się w szczególnym momencie integracji. Z jednej strony obchodzimy 70. rocznicę podpisania deklaracji Schumana i dziesięciolecie obowiązywania Traktatu z Lizbony, z drugiej doświadczamy bezprecedensowego kryzysu związanego z pandemią o wielowymiarowych skutkach zdrowotnych, gospodarczych i instytucjonalnych. Unia Europejska i państwa członkowskie powinny wykorzystać ten moment, by zrobić krok naprzód i wyjść z tego kryzysu wzmocnione. Nie tylko w oparciu o mechanizmy prointegracyjne zawarte w Traktacie z Lizbony (klauzule pomostowe), lecz także poprzez wypracowanie bardziej dalekosiężnych propozycji, m.in. w zakresie wzmocnienia pozycji Parlamentu Europejskiego, wprowadzenia ogólnej zasady głosowania w Radzie większością kwalifikowaną czy konstytucjonalizacji Europejskiego filaru praw socjalnych. Z pewnością doskonałą okazją ku temu będzie konferencja w sprawie przyszłości Europy.

Urmas Paet (Renew), kirjalikult. – Ühendatud Euroopa mõte oli vältida veel ühte sõda. Ja seni on nii ka läinud. Euroopa Liit on rahuprojekt ning ühendatud Euroopa on elanud rahu ja sõdadeta. Euroopa tugevus on ka Eesti tugevus. Selleks on meil aga eriti vaja tugevat ja üksmeelset Euroopat, mis teab, mida tähendavad vabadused, ning ka seda, kui lihtne on neist ilma jääda.

Tänases ja homses maailmas on oluline, et Eesti välispoliitika tegutseks iga päev kahe peamise eesmärgi nimel. Need on Eesti julgeoleku kindlustamine ning heaolu kasv. On tähtis, et Eesti geopolitilise asendiga ning ajalooga riik hoiaks ja panustaks liitlaskeskkonda meiega samu väärtusi jagavate riikidega. Eesti liitlased on ennekõike Euroopa ja muus demokraatlikus maailmas. Seetõttu tuleb suurte välispoliitiliste eesmärkide nimel aidata Eestil oma igapäevase tegevusega kaasa sellele, et Euroopa Liit ja NATO oleksid tugevad ja toimivad. Paremat keskkonda, mis tagaks Eesti julgeoleku ja heaolu, ei ole kuskilt mujalt võtta. Kõigest, mis Euroopa koostegutsemist nõrgestab, tuleks nüüd ja järgnevatel aastatel hoiduda. Selle eest hoolitsevad paraku teised meist hoopis erinevas väärtusruumis olevad jõud.

Guido Reil (ID), schriftlich. – Vor 70 Jahren gab der damalige französische Außenminister Robert Schuman seine Erklärung, die als Anfang des Prozesses der europäischen Integration und Geburt der heutigen Europäischen Union gefeiert wird. Im Grunde genommen wurden die deutsche und die französische Kohle- und Stahlindustrie der nationalen Kontrolle entzogen und einer gemeinsamen europäischen Behörde unterstellt. Damit wurde der Frieden in Europa gesichert. Was heute unbekannt ist, ist dass Robert Schuman wie Jean Monnet und andere Vorfechter der europäischen Integration auch die Idee eines Eurafrikas umarmten. Der Zugang zu den afrikanischen Rohstoffen würde Europa ermöglichen, sich als starken Kontinent zu halten. Als 1957 die Europäische Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft (EWG) gegründet

wurde, besaß Frankreich noch immer ein umfassendes Kolonialreich. Das System der Präferenzzölle und Finanzhilfen war für die französische Regierung eine Voraussetzung für den Beitritt zur EWG. Frankreich betrachtete die euroafrikanische Freihandelszone als ein Mittel, um seine Hegemonie in und über Westafrika zu behalten. Interessant ist, dass in der Nachfolge des Zivilisationsauftrages der Berliner Konferenz (1884-1885) – die Afrika formell aufteilte – sowohl die Schuman-Erklärung als auch die EWG die Assoziation der überseeischen afrikanischen Territorien als ein Instrument zur Verbesserung der Entwicklung Afrikas umschrieben. In verschiedenen späteren Übersetzungen der Erklärung wurden die einschlägigen Sätze dieser Erklärung gestrichen.

Alfred Sant (S&D), *in writing*. – On 9 May 1950, the Schuman declaration launched the political and economic construction of Europe. Its central genial premise was that Europe could be peacefully united by concentrating on concrete step by step measures to enable convergence between its national economies via the establishment of a single common market. National and regional interests would be taken into account in a detailed give-and-take, creating a shared European acquis. Though very successful, this approach was fundamentally rejigged in the 1990's, following the collapse of the USSR. Rapid deepening and enlargement became the order of the day, sometimes run in a hegemonic manner. The deepening such as with the eurozone but also Schengen was left half done. Fast enlargement has led to spreading political and economic divergences within the Union. Now, Union members find themselves increasingly unable to agree on concrete sectoral policies, for which the Union has at least partial competence. Among them: migration; long term Union budgeting; eurozone financial management; dealings with Russia and the US; a containment and recovery strategy vis-à-vis the corona virus pandemic; and soon possibly a final solution with the UK post-Brexit. Robert Schumann would not have been amused. We have gotten far away from the strategy he set.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu*. – Sukanka 70-osios Schumano deklaracijos metinės. Jis kalbėjo apie bendruomenės kūrimą Europoje, bet ne apie tokią, kokią matome šiandien. Šiuolaikinė ES turi mažai ką bendro su politiko idėjomis, kuris remiasi krikščionybe ir laiko tautų egzistavimą kažkuo akivaizdžiu ir būtinu. Visi politikai, kurie tylėdami apeina tikrąsias politiko idėjas, ne tik perbraukia jo viziją, bet naikina vaisius, kurie atsirado po susitarimo pagal jo koncepciją. Prisiminkime per šią sukaktį tikruosius Europos bendrijos įkūrėjo tėvo žodžius, galbūt jie dar kartą palies Europos politikų sąžinę. R. Schumanas ne kartą perspėjo dėl pavojingų padarinių nukrypstant nuo krikščioniškųjų vertybių, tautų bendruomenių šalinimo, institucijų ir ekonomikos dominavimo virš tikrų santykių tarp žmonių. Tarp daugelio įspėjimų jis pasakė: „Saugokitės tų, kurių žavesys mus veda į pasyvumą. Tų, kurie nori užmigdyti mus apgaulingame saugumo jausme. Saugokitės tuščių garantijų teikėjų, kurie žada apgaulingas saugumo užtikrinimo priemones. Etapais ir žingsniais po žingsnio jie bando įvesti tai, ką sveika tautos dvasia atmeta. Galutinis jų tikslas yra aiškus. Jie bando užgesinti religinį gyvenimą šalyse ir žmonėse. Dėl meilės savo vaikams norime užkirsti kelią šioms pasekmėms. Tokia mūsų laikysena, kurią mes priimame, neturėtų kilti tik dėl pasipriešinimo, bet daugiausia todėl, kad negalime išduoti savo tautos dvasios“. Ginč dėl būsimos Europos Sąjungos formato verta prisiminti dar vieną R. Schumano mintį – „Demokratija bus krikščioniška arba jos visai nebus“.

8. Utilizzo di applicazioni di tracciamento dei contatti nella lotta al coronavirus (discussione)

Presidente. – Passamos ao ponto seguinte da nossa ordem de trabalhos, e o que está inscrito na ordem do dia é, como sabem, as declarações do Conselho e da Comissão sobre a utilização de aplicações informáticas de localização e rastreio de contactos na luta contra o coronavírus (2020/2634(RSP)).

Gostaria de recordar que, neste debate, como nos anteriores, não haverá procedimentos «catch the eye» nem perguntas na forma de «cartão azul».

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, thank you for this opportunity to address the European Parliament on an issue so closely related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The work on COVID-19 contact tracing applications fits within the more general work to ensure a safe return to our normal social and economic activity as quickly as the circumstances allow. Contact tracing applications can help restore life in the European Union as we used to know and appreciate it – the unrestricted movement of people, goods and services – while upholding the highest health and safety standards. They would support the revival of our tourism, aviation and shipping industries.

We have followed with interest the statements and declarations coming from the European Parliament, especially the resolution on EU coordinated action to combat the COVID-19 pandemic and its consequences. As you are aware, the Commission presented its recommendation on 8 April 2020 on a common Union toolbox for the use of technology and data to combat and exit from the COVID-19 crisis. All Member States welcomed the initiative and there was overall agreement that this technology is a key element in the mix of measures for the exit strategy.

On 9 April, the European Data Protection Board also issued its guidance on this subject. When the Ministers responsible for telecommunications and digital issues held an informal videoconference on 5 May, they reached consensus on the need to ensure the interoperability of national applications. At this point in time, we have national solutions – some already working, some under development. To save time and effort, work on interoperability should take into account the progress already made at the national level.

We must also make sure that, irrespective of the technical solutions adopted, these apps are trusted enough to be used by our citizens in large enough numbers. This will not happen unless the apps can be used on a voluntary basis, ensure adequate protection of personal data and privacy and avoid the stigmatisation or any potential misuse of the collected and stored data. There is a need for a joint shared approach and common standards in developing such apps. These apps should do nothing more than trace contacts. Malfunctioning of the app could potentially change the life of our users, so the efficiency of the application should always be checked.

It is also important to mention that there are sizeable regional differences between digital services across and between the different Member States. We must ensure digital inclusion in every part of Europe. Bridging this gap will not happen without investments, interconnectivity, technological and human digital skills. In this respect, the Croatian Presidency is working on the Council conclusions as our answer to the Commission communication on shaping Europe's digital future. The issues include the resilience of our digital infrastructure, the importance of reliable data availability at the European level, the urgency of implementing our e-health initiatives, the importance of improving the digital aspects of our education, our security, of our networks and data. All these aspects will be covered in the Council conclusions.

Didier Reynders, *membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les membres du Parlement européen, je voudrais vous remercier également d'avoir inclus ce débat dans la plénière d'aujourd'hui.

La pandémie qui sévit actuellement ne connaît pas de frontières. Les données et la technologie peuvent nous aider dans la lutte contre le coronavirus et dans la levée progressive des restrictions et le rétablissement de la libre circulation des personnes. Les applications de traçage des contacts peuvent jouer un rôle dans cette entreprise.

The Commission adopted the recommendation on 8 April setting out the principles and showing the respect of fundamental rights and, in particular, the right to privacy and personal data protection and the prevention of mass surveillance and stigmatisation.

It was followed by a common EU toolbox developed by the Member States with the support of the Commission and complemented by Commission guidance on the respect of privacy and data protection.

Our guidance sets key principles. National health authorities or authorities responsible for the crisis management should be the controller. The installation of an app on a user's device should be voluntary. If proximity data is used, it should be stored on an individual's device and only shared at the initiative of the user.

For contact tracing there is no use of geo-localisation data, only proximity data based on Bluetooth. Only the personal data that is necessary to meet the purpose of the app can be processed. The identity of the user of the app will not be disclosed to other users. The personal data should not be kept for longer than necessary. Timelines should be based on medical relevance. In addition, the app should be only used during the crisis and be deactivated, at the latest, when the pandemic is over.

The deactivation should not depend on de-installation by the user. The data and the entire application should be protected through state-of-the-art security techniques, including encryption.

And finally, data protection authorities should be fully involved and consulted in the development of an app and should keep its deployment under review.

Le but des applications de traçage des contacts est d'aider à briser les chaînes d'infection et à sauver des vies. Cependant, cela ne fonctionnera que si les citoyens savent qu'ils sont en sécurité et que leurs données et leur vie privée sont entièrement protégées. Les citoyens doivent avoir la certitude que les applications seront utilisées exclusivement pour lutter contre la pandémie. Ce sont là les conditions préalables au développement, à la reconnaissance et à l'utilisation de telles applications.

J'insiste sur ce point: il ne doit pas y avoir de doute. Ces applications ne peuvent pas être utilisées pour une surveillance de masse. Les individus garderont et devront garder le contrôle de leurs données. C'est le fondement de la précision et de l'efficacité de ces applications pour contenir la propagation du virus.

Il est donc essentiel d'identifier les solutions les moins intrusives et qui respectent pleinement les exigences de protection des données personnelles et de confidentialité telles que définies dans le droit de l'Union européenne.

It is also essential that we have a coordinated European approach. This European approach is clear. These apps must be voluntary, transparent, temporary, cyber-secure, using temporary and arbitrary identifiers, rely on proximity data, Bluetooth technology and not on geo-localisation. That means no tracking. And they must be interoperable across borders, but also across operating systems.

As regards the two different approaches referred to as centralised and decentralised, both can be compatible with privacy and data-protection rules, and both need to follow high standards of data security. From a data-minimisation perspective, the decentralised approach is preferable since less data would be stored on the back-end server than under the centralised one.

Regardless of the approach chosen, we should strive to have a common approach to ensure interoperability of the apps. The Commission is working with Member States on this issue as a top priority, and I am glad that guidelines on interoperability for approved contact tracing mobile applications in the EU were adopted yesterday by the e-Health networks of Member States and published on the Commission website.

I cannot emphasise enough how important interoperability will be for the cross-border circulation of people in the Union and for many sectors, including tourism.

We should also make sure that national health authorities are able to adjust the epidemiologic barometers of the apps and to obtain the necessary aggregated information to monitor the efficiency of the measures taken.

The Commission also firmly believes that the process regarding the selection of the apps as well as their functioning, should be transparent. The technical specifications and the source code of the apps should therefore be published.

Some Member States are using manual tracing together or instead of tracing apps. Their tracing modalities need to be in line with personal data protection rules as well. We will also be attentive to this.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, comme nous le savons tous, les États membres ont commencé à introduire les premières étapes des mesures de déconfinement. C'est pourquoi nous avons besoin d'une approche européenne coordonnée. Nous devons agir ensemble avec responsabilité et solidarité pour arrêter ce virus.

Monsieur le Président, je vous remercie de cette occasion de préciser les lignes de force annoncées par la Commission en collaboration avec les États membres. Je suis évidemment à l'écoute des remarques, des observations des membres de votre Assemblée.

Andreas Schwab, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist zweifellos eine gute Nachricht, dass die Grenzkontrollen in Zentraleuropa nun ab dem Wochenende weitgehend und bis Mitte Juni vollständig aufgehoben werden.

Das einige und freie Europa darf durch diese Pandemie nicht 100 Jahre zurückgeworfen werden. Wichtig ist aber jetzt, dass die Bürgerinnen und Bürger ihre langsam wieder entstehende Freiheit verantwortungsvoll nutzen. Und wie uns ein Hygieneprofessor aus Dänemark diese Woche gesagt hat, ist es eben so, dass Hygiene und Abstand nicht alles sind im Leben. Aber ohne Hygiene und ohne Abstand ist alles, was wir jetzt machen, nichts. Deswegen geht es vor allem darum: Abstand halten und Hände waschen.

Europa kann, in dem Falle können die Mitgliedstaaten den Bürgern aber natürlich ihre Freiheit und deren Nutzung dadurch erleichtern, dass sie auch digital unterstützt werden, wenn sie einem Ansteckungsrisiko ausgesetzt waren. Und deswegen, lieber Herr Kommissar, haben Sie vollkommen zu Recht auf die Bedingungen hingewiesen, die auch meiner Fraktion von besonderer Bedeutung sind.

Wir glauben, dass diese App dann viele Bürgerinnen und Bürger überzeugen wird, wenn sie ihnen etwas bietet – wenn sie ihnen Sicherheit bietet, wenn sie ihnen Informationen bietet und wenn sie für sie nützlich ist. Sie muss überall in Europa funktionieren. Sie muss also operabel sein. Dafür sind die Mitgliedstaaten gefordert, weil die Gesundheitssysteme der Mitgliedstaaten eben noch immer unterschiedlich organisiert sind. Und sie muss einige weitere Dinge bringen, nämlich keine Geolokalisierung, Anonymität, die Nutzung muss freiwillig sein. Sie muss gegen jede Art von Cyberangriffen geschützt sein. Und sie muss gelöscht werden, sobald sie nicht mehr gebraucht wird.

Gesundheitsschutz ist eine hoheitliche Aufgabe. Aber in diesem Fall ist es gerade auch die Eigenverantwortung der Bürger, die wir in Betracht ziehen müssen. Deswegen hoffe ich, dass diese App bald zur Verfügung steht.

Birgit Sippel, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, are contact tracing apps a silver bullet against the virus? Today, there is no evidence that apps can contain a disease, but there are serious fundamental rights concerns, and therefore the app must be truly voluntary, with no incentives to use them and no discrimination against people not willing to use them or who cannot use them. Entry into a country should not depend on using the app. Freedom of movement is a fundamental right, not a prize for downloading an app.

Apps must only be used for contact tracing with no access for commercial players or law enforcement, and data should be stored in a decentralised way. This is important because, especially in exceptional times, interference with fundamental rights must remain proportionate, necessary and limited in time. Governments now have a chance to show that Europe can lead the way in countering this pandemic without compromising on fundamental rights.

So why is it that only a few Member States fully involved their data protection authorities? What are they afraid of? We can't accept any ideas to install systems of surveillance via contact tracing apps or by using location data, drones, or by openly debating to discriminate on the basis of so-called immunity passes?

Let's be honest: there is nothing like a silver bullet. Even a fundamental rights-friendly app can only be an addition to physical distancing, masks and more tests. Technologies and the crisis should never be used to destroy our common values and democratic principles, but let us explore how technology can help to better protect people.

Karen Melchior, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, I say to the House: without knowing, you could be infected right now. I, too, could be infected. Without showing a single sign of infection, I could be infecting the people I stand next to. Digital technology is a tool in the fight against the spread of COVID-19, and it can be both beneficial and effective to trace contacts in order to notify people at risk.

The use of the applications must be strictly and exclusively limited to the purpose of COVID-19 tracing. Tracing applications should assist manual tracing used for centuries to combat epidemics. Applications are not a panacea to combat the virus, but a complementary tool. We have to trace the virus, not the European citizens. We unite against the coronavirus while we safeguard our fundamental rights.

We must insist on mandatory standards and strong guarantees for their preservation, especially the right to privacy and data protection. We do not have to choose between our rights and our health. We must ensure ethical, transparent and secure use of these applications. Therefore, we need a European coordinated approach also ensuring European-wide interoperability.

Firstly, we must agree at a European level on privacy by design and data minimisation. Secondly, using such applications must be based on the explicit, freely given and informed consent. It should never be mandatory. We do not want immunity passports. We want to stop the virus from travelling.

Thirdly, technology will not be effective without the trust of people. Citizens need to receive adequate and objective information on tracing contact policies, their content, their purpose and expected outcomes.

Finally, the use and deployment of contact tracing applications must be subject to continuous and strict monitoring, technical evaluation and scientific scrutiny. We must ensure that these applications are safe for our citizens and have their trust, and that the applications serve the purpose of tracing COVID-19.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, bien que nous puissions comprendre l'objectif de sécurité sanitaire qui motive la mise en place d'un certain nombre d'applications de traçage, je souhaiterais en revanche évoquer un certain nombre de zones de flou qui persistent autour, à la fois de l'exploitation de ces données personnelles qui seront recueillies, et de leur destruction.

Tout d'abord, concernant leur exploitation, comment pouvez-vous nous garantir la totale confidentialité des données qui seront recueillies? Qui les exploitera? Tout à l'heure vous avez parlé d'autorités sanitaires, mais quelle est leur composition? Est-ce qu'elles sont médicales? Si c'est le cas, très bien. Est-ce que ce sont des autorités politiques? Si c'est le cas, cela pose un vrai problème.

Enfin, concernant la destruction de ces données recueillies, qui ordonnera les opérations de destruction? C'est la première question que je pose. Deuxièmement, dans quel délai? Quelles sanctions, également, sont prévues? Concernant le délai, nous souhaitons que ce soit effectué immédiatement après la fin, l'extinction de l'épidémie. Et puis, qui contrôlera ces opérations de destruction, afin de préserver les libertés individuelles de nos compatriotes, ainsi que bien sûr toute la confidentialité de ces données recueillies?

Alexandra Geese, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nur mit dem Vertrauen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger könnten Tracing-Apps ein hilfreiches Instrument im Kampf gegen das Corona-Virus sein und auch ein Vorzeigeprojekt wertebasierter europäischer Digitaltechnologie. Denn ein Konsortium europäischer Hochschulen hat einen Standard entwickelt, der eben die hohen Datenschutzanforderungen erfüllt, den unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu Recht fordern.

Im Gegenzug sind viele bereit, diese App auch zu installieren, aber dafür braucht es Vertrauen. Deswegen ist es eben so brandgefährlich, wenn Regierungen dieses Vertrauen gefährden, indem sie auf zentraler Speicherung bestehen oder Politiker besondere Rechte oder gar Pflichten an diese App knüpfen.

Wer also will, dass Bürgerinnen und Bürger Vertrauen haben können, der muss auch Vertrauen in sie haben und jede Kontroll- und Überwachungsfantasie aufgeben. Hier haben wir nämlich die Chance zu beweisen, dass freie Demokratien das Virus erfolgreich bekämpfen können. Denn bei dieser App gehen Vertrauen, Datenschutz und Gesundheit Hand in Hand.

Beata Mazurek, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Walka z pandemią koronawirusa może mieć różne oblicza. Z jednej strony mamy medyków, którzy narażają swoje zdrowie i życie, stojąc na pierwszej linii zmagania z niewidzialnym wrogiem, z drugiej zaś postęp technologiczny umożliwia wprowadzanie rozwiązań, które będą ograniczały rozprzestrzenianie się zarazy.

Zgadzamy się na metody proponowane przez Komisję, mogą nam w tym pomóc, jednakże do końca nie jest jasne, jak to narzędzie będzie funkcjonować. Priorytetem dla Komisji powinna być ochrona prywatności użytkowników, a informacje wrażliwe powinny być przechowywane zgodnie z obowiązującymi przepisami o ochronie danych osobowych. Trzeba działać wspólnie i wykorzystać potencjał państw członkowskich mających doświadczenie w tworzeniu podobnych aplikacji, choćby takich jak Polska, gdzie mamy aplikację do kontrolowania osób na kwarantannie, a od niedawna aplikację ProteGO, która informuje o potencjalnym zagrożeniu zakażeniem koronawirusem.

Musimy wykorzystać nowe technologie do walki z koronawirusem. Pamiętajmy jednak o tym, że rozwiązania te muszą być dostosowane do warunków poszczególnych państw członkowskich, aby skutecznie chronić ich obywateli.

Anne-Sophie Pelletier, au nom du groupe GUE/NGL. – Monsieur le Président, cette crise montre encore une fois les défaillances de votre système. Parmi elles, le manque de moyens dans les hôpitaux, de matériel médical, dépendance vis-à-vis de la Chine, destruction du tissu industriel.

Ceux qui nous disaient qu'il n'y a pas d'argent magique sont les mêmes qui ont sacrifié nos services publics de santé sur l'autel de l'austérité, en suivant les 63 recommandations de la Commission, qui visaient à privatiser et à réduire les dépenses. 63 recommandations plus tard, les soignants et les hôpitaux craquent. 63 recommandations plus tard, nous comptons les morts.

Alors, les Harpagon modernes, au lieu de réparer ce qu'ils ont cassé, présentent un remède miracle: les applications de suivi des contacts. Aux peuples solidaires qui ont accepté et respecté le confinement, on demande encore de sacrifier leur liberté. Les garanties que vous donnez, que donne la Commission sur la protection de la vie privée ne sont pas convaincantes. Aucune crédibilité, alors qu'en Hongrie et en Lettonie, on suspend ces droits.

Et pendant que nos PME se meurent, les GAFAM outre-Atlantique se goinfrent. Devons-nous en plus leur concéder nos données par l'intermédiaire de ces applications?

Vous voulez, Monsieur Reynders, sauver des vies. Eh bien testez massivement les citoyens, donnez des moyens supplémentaires, apprenez de vos erreurs, investissez dans l'hôpital public plutôt que de jouer aux apprentis sorciers avec nos libertés. Et cela, j'aimerais ne pas le répéter 63 fois.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gli Stati membri si apprestano a revocare gradualmente le misure di confinamento e in questa fase, che chiaramente non è esente da preoccupazioni, l'uso di tecnologie e di applicazioni di allerta, prevenzione e tracciamento dei contatti darà un contributo importante alla lotta al coronavirus.

I cittadini europei che volontariamente decideranno di usarle si aspettano il pieno rispetto di norme e principi in materia di protezione dei dati personali, nonché il rispetto della vita privata e familiare, il rispetto del principio di non discriminazione e la libertà di circolazione.

Saranno indispensabili dunque campagne informative chiare e trasparenti sul loro funzionamento, sull'uso e sulla conservazione dei dati, affinché sia comprensibile la finalità di aiutare a combattere la pandemia e allertare in caso di potenziali rischi di contagio.

In Italia il governo italiano ha annunciato il lancio di *Immuni*, un'app che consentirà il tracciamento di prossimità senza raccogliere dati personali in grado di svelare identità, dove si va o chi si incontra, dunque un valido strumento finalizzato solo all'uso responsabile di dati per la tutela della salute pubblica, senza minare i diritti fondamentali e le libertà individuali.

Axel Voss (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Die extreme Krise erfordert es, letztlich so schnell wie möglich in den Alltag zurückzukehren, und hierbei helfen Tests, Schutzmasken und eben auch Tracing-Apps, also eine digitale Lösung.

Es ist dabei auch offensichtlich, dass man hier europäisch zusammenarbeiten muss, und das heißt eben auch, dass man in Zukunft schnell die benötigten Standards vorlegen muss. Die Empfehlungen der Kommission waren hier sehr lobenswert in puncto Datenschutz, Interoperabilität, bloß fehlten am Anfang eben bei dieser Entwicklung die interoperablen Apps mit den technischen Vorgaben, und das führt letztlich zu Fragmentierungen.

Dabei muss ich mir auch die Frage stellen, warum eigentlich nicht der Rat selber mal auf die Idee kommt zu sagen: Wir müssen in dieser Krise auch zusammenarbeiten und hier vielleicht auch mal ein leuchtendes Beispiel in dieser Zusammenarbeit geben, und deshalb muss hier auch mehr an der Einstellung des Rates gearbeitet werden. Die EU muss hier Führung übernehmen, gerade bei einer solchen extremen Krise. Wir müssen gemeinsam handeln, auch im Digitalen, und die Effizienz dieser ganzen Tracing-Apps auch unter den Gesichtspunkten betrachten, was wirklich effizient ist und nach vorne führt.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Voorzitter, misschien kunnen apps voor het traceren van contacten in combinatie met tests ons helpen om te leven met het coronavirus. Vanuit fundamentele vrijheden zijn er wel vier voorwaarden. Het moet tijdelijk zijn, transparant en dus opensource, decentraal met opslag op de telefoon, en vrijwillig. Iemand die de app niet kan of niet wil gebruiken, mag de toegang niet worden geweigerd. De apps mogen geen immunitetspaspoorten worden. Bovendien moeten de apps Europees grensoverschrijdend werken. Dat is noodzakelijk voor Europa. Daarover zijn gisteren afspraken gemaakt. Die moeten strikt worden nageleefd.

Laten we ten slotte niet vergeten waarom het voor minister De Jonge en de andere landen zo lastig is om de app te ontwikkelen. We zijn voor de ontwikkeling van de apps afhankelijk van Silicon Valley. Google en Apple zijn de poortwachters van onze telefoons en daarmee essentieel voor onze gezondheid. Laten we daarom ook kijken hoe we een vaccin kunnen ontwikkelen tegen de afhankelijkheid van grote technologiebedrijven.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Mr President, I've heard some people refer to this app as a so-called 'deconfinement app', as if the app is going to reopen the borders. Well, let me tell you something. It will not. We need a range of other measures. What will open the borders is a common European approach and interoperability. That is what will open the borders. What we are seeing is Member States going in all directions again, with not just 27 national apps, but even a range of regional apps. Now that is a barrier to free movement.

National governments are presenting the app as a silver bullet against the pandemic, but not only is it not a silver bullet, it's also not going to solve the problem of politicians that they have to reconcile health concerns and economic concerns and are just hoping for this app to be the answer to that dilemma when it's not.

But we do need full transparency on the decision-making – and not just on the technical aspects, but also on why governments choose a particular model, why they choose particular providers. Where are the political and commercial interests?

Finally, I agree with everyone who said it must be strictly voluntary. Not only does that mean that it should not be mandatory, but there has to be a legal ban on making downloading the app a precondition for entering public spaces like public transport or schools or gyms, or indeed crossing the borders, because freedom of movement in Europe is a fundamental right.

David Cormand (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, les applications de suivi des contacts nous sont présentées comme une nécessité absolue pour faire face à la COVID. Mais rien n'est moins sûr. Le Bluetooth, par exemple, n'est pas efficace pour détecter qui a fait l'objet d'un contact à risque. Sa portée de détection est largement supérieure à un mètre cinquante et il ne détecte ni les murs ni les étages. Mais, surtout, ce système avalise l'idée, démocratiquement mortifère, qu'au nom de l'intérêt général supérieur, on peut accoutumer les populations à une incursion supplémentaire dans leur vie privée.

Alors, disons les choses clairement: non seulement la surveillance de masse n'est pas une solution mais elle constitue de surcroît un danger avéré pour nos libertés fondamentales. Certains disent que ce procédé serait provisoire. Mais l'histoire récente prouve que nos démocraties ne parviennent pas à rendre les libertés qu'elles suspendent en temps de crise. Chaque recul est définitif. Notre responsabilité est donc de ne céder ni à la peur, ni à l'émotion, et de tenir bon face aux sirènes trompeuses d'une plus grande sécurité offerte par cette technologie.

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è un bene che la Commissione europea abbia fornito linee guida per le app che garantiranno la tracciabilità dei contagi, ed è fondamentale fra queste l'attenzione alla privacy dei cittadini, ma altrettanto lo è assicurare la trasparenza delle società che sviluppano le app, affinché non ci siano conflitti di interesse che minerebbero proprio la protezione dei dati degli utenti e la credibilità di questi strumenti.

Questi strumenti devono portarci presto alla riapertura di Schengen, devono portarci a una mobilità garantita in piena sicurezza proprio alle porte della stagione turistica in Europa, mostrando così un'Europa unita nelle difficoltà e non solo nelle diversità.

Avrei anzi visto bene un'unica app per tutti gli Stati membri onde evitare possibili disparità, e a tal proposito ribadisco la totale contrarietà dell'Italia ad accordi come quelli ipotizzati in questi giorni da alcuni paesi su fantomatici «corridoi del turismo» fra Stati membri, che creerebbero pratiche commerciali sleali penalizzando proprio chi si è mosso prima, e meglio di altri, nel combattere il coronavirus.

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, nous avons la chance, en Europe, d'avoir une protection exceptionnelle des données personnelles. Nos données ne sont stockées qu'avec notre consentement. Pourtant, nous pouvons parfois être bien généreux de nos données et les mettre à disposition d'entreprises commerciales, de réseaux sociaux où nous étalons nos déplacements, d'applications qui enregistrent nos pas, le rythme même de notre cœur. C'est assez particulier mais c'est le libre choix de chacun. Nous arrogerions-nous le droit de l'interdire? Bien sûr que non.

Alors, j'ai quelques difficultés à comprendre la peur que l'on peut instiller aux gens disposés à utiliser une application de traçage afin de mieux maîtriser la propagation de la COVID-19. Une application qui n'est pas utilisée à des fins commerciales, mais pour le bien commun, par des institutions publiques. Une application installée et utilisée sur base volontaire, qui requiert le consentement de l'utilisateur à chaque étape et respecte la législation européenne.

Où et quand la liberté de l'individu est-elle menacée? Une telle application, comme un élément entre autres me permettant d'apporter une certaine sécurité supplémentaire à ma famille, à mon entourage et à d'autres, c'est presque un devoir pour les pouvoirs publics de la mettre à disposition des citoyens et de les informer au mieux.

Patrick Breyer (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Nicht nur Edward Snowden warnt, dass im Windschatten der Corona-Pandemie dauerhafte Kontroll- und Überwachungsstrukturen aufgebaut werden.

Obwohl die Pandemie in Europa inzwischen unter Kontrolle ist, wollen Regierungen die Rückkehr zu unserem normalen Leben davon abhängig machen, dass wir in ein Gesellschaftsexperiment zur digitalen Verhaltenserfassung einsteigen. Bisher sind es Menschen, die Kontaktpersonen Infizierter erfragen und benachrichtigen. Das schützt uns Studien zufolge deutlich besser als jede App und vermeidet massenhafte Fehlalarme. Wer von Ihnen glaubt wirklich, dass eine einmal eingeführte Kontakterfassungstechnik überall in Europa dauerhaft freiwillig bleiben wird? Das ist doch eine Illusion.

Liebe Regierungen, sorgen Sie endlich für ausreichende Schutzausrüstung und Gesundheitsversorgung, für Testangebote, für Impfstoffversorgung, sorgen Sie für zukünftige Pandemien vor. Das sind Sie uns schuldig, nicht Überwachungstechnik und Datensammlung!

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Mr President, COVID-19 is also testing us digitally. Health systems can look after their citizens without geolocation and undue control of their privacy. With or without COVID-19, governments do not need to know where citizens are at all times. There are technologies aligned with these principles and it is not acceptable that EU governments use invasive software. We do not need to go to China to see alarming practices. Spain is routinely censoring websites and apps. GitHub has been pressured by the Spanish Government to censor codes, and the Government of Pedro Sánchez recently hinted at plans to use an app that would track citizens to see if they change regions. This is happening within the EU and should not be tolerated. Europe must lead by example, safeguarding civil rights and individual freedom, including in the digital world.

Massimiliano Salini (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, noi, come paesi dell'Unione europea, abbiamo individuato il punto problematico tra le tante sfide che stiamo affrontando: il punto problematico è, ancora una volta, una posizione unitaria all'interno della quale i paesi membri dimostrino di avere una coscienza della dimensione comunitaria.

Anche su questa partita delle applicazioni ci siamo mossi con una certa imbarazzata e parziale capacità di condivisione.

Abbiamo due problemi: il primo è l'individuazione della tecnologia corretta, Lei è stato molto chiaro, una tecnologia compatibile con la tutela della privacy.

Il secondo è l'individuazione di un modello comune per affrontare queste problematiche, perché l'applicazione non è sufficiente per risolvere il problema: è un'integrazione di ciò che, come strumento per la protezione delle persone in termini sanitari e in termini sociali, avremo saputo condividere.

Didier Reynders, membre de la Commission. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je crois qu'il était opportun que nous ayons l'occasion de débattre à nouveau de cette problématique ici en séance plénière. Et ce débat démontre clairement le rôle central du travail commun que l'on peut réaliser entre institutions pendant cette crise.

Je soulignerai tout d'abord que les mesures extraordinaires que nous devons prendre pour lutter contre la pandémie ne doivent pas compromettre le fondement de notre projet européen, nos valeurs et les droits fondamentaux. L'utilisation d'une application n'est jamais, comme l'ont rappelé M. Schwab ou M^{me} Sippel, qu'un élément complémentaire qui vient s'ajouter à toute une série d'autres: les règles d'hygiène, les règles de distanciation sociale ou les tests à réaliser en grand nombre. Tous ces éléments font partie d'un tout.

Je voudrais insister sur un élément très particulier qui a été évoqué à plusieurs reprises: l'interopérabilité. Si nous voulons un projet communautaire efficace, il nous faut une véritable interopérabilité et ce, quel que soit le nombre d'applications dans les États ou dans les régions. C'est ce à quoi nous travaillons avec les différents États. Je crois qu'il est d'ailleurs préférable de laisser se développer des applications différentes que de vouloir à tout prix une application unique à l'échelon européen, ce qui aurait d'ailleurs probablement freiné l'innovation dans le cadre de ce projet.

Je voudrais également insister sur la sécurité. Nous sommes très axés sur la cybersécurité et quels que soient les opérateurs qui souhaitent développer des applications (Apple, Google ou d'autres), ils devront respecter les règles européennes en matière de protection des données, de sécurité et d'interopérabilité. Ce n'est pas devant ce Parlement d'ailleurs que j'aurais besoin de rappeler l'importance du règlement général de protection des données. Nous avons des outils, de contrôle et de mise en œuvre.

Des autorités nationales de protection des données existent, elles sont regroupées au sein d'un conseil à l'échelon européen, le Comité européen de la protection des données et je peux vous dire que déjà aujourd'hui, certaines dispositions prises notamment dans les mesures d'urgence pendant la pandémie sont examinées par ce réseau européen pour vérifier leur compatibilité avec les dispositions du règlement général, c'est le cas notamment pour un certain nombre de décrets adoptés en Hongrie.

Je tiens à souligner que tout ce que nous annonçons dans nos lignes directrices pourra être contrôlé non seulement par les autorités nationales, mais aussi par un réseau européen qui échange et qui cherchera la meilleure façon d'appliquer concrètement les règles que nous rappelons d'ailleurs plutôt que nous les fixons car ces règles se trouvent dans le règlement général. Et nous resterons particulièrement vigilants sur l'utilisation qui sera faite des applications de traçage. Elles peuvent contribuer de manière importante à la lutte contre la pandémie de COVID-19, mais nous devons faire en sorte, que nos valeurs et nos règles de protection des données soient pleinement respectées par l'ensemble des opérateurs.

Je voudrais également préciser que la transparence et la communication sont des éléments essentiels pour une utilisation efficace des applications. C'est pourquoi nous sommes intervenus très tôt, avec une recommandation sur la boîte à outils et des lignes directrices sur l'application de nos règles de protection des données. Je voudrais dire à M. Lacapelle que si nous entendons remettre la gestion de ces applications aux autorités de santé, c'est qu'elles sont particulièrement sensibilisées à la confidentialité des données médicales et au secret professionnel et qu'elles ont aussi la capacité de définir pleinement les paramètres épidémiologiques pertinents de ces applications. Dans la perspective d'une réouverture des frontières, et d'un soutien au marché intérieur, il faut avant tout être attentif à l'interopérabilité et observer une démarche commune.

Enfin, nous nous attacherons au caractère volontaire de ces applications et veillerons à ce que l'on ne tente pas de les rendre, de manière indirecte, plus ou moins obligatoires, notamment lorsqu'il s'agit de franchir les frontières. C'est un aspect auquel je serai très attentif et sensibiliserai les autorités nationales de protection des données.

Je vous remercie encore une fois pour ce débat, Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, parce qu'il est important que nous agissions suffisamment tôt pour faire en sorte que cet outil, parmi d'autres, nous aide à lutter contre la pandémie et à sortir de la crise dans des conditions pleinement respectueuses de nos valeurs et de la protection des données. L'Europe a été pionnière en matière de protection des données personnelles, elle doit le rester pendant la crise et à la sortie de la crise.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, this is an important subject, and I would therefore like to underline once more the main points of the telecommunications ministers' videoconference from the beginning of May.

First, the contact tracing apps will have high importance for the gradual relaxation of various national measures, including opening of borders. Second, the coordinated approach and interoperability at EU level is needed. And third, adequate protection of personal data and privacy should be provided.

Whatever technological solutions the Member States choose, the use of their apps should be based on consent, and storage should be ensured at the highest level of privacy and the protection of personal data. Interoperability will be the key to the success of these applications across borders and operative systems. Additionally, it should be encouraged that all the data collected through the tracing app is stored in a clearly defined time-limited manner.

I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss this important subject with all of you, and thank you for your remarks and suggestions, I took good note of them. And I am sure that our institutions' common aim is to find the most effective solutions for tackling this epidemic and to make sure that our people and our economies can return to normality as quickly as possible.

Presidente. – Está encerrado o debate.

Declarações escritas (artigo 171.º)

Magdalena Adamowicz (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Dzisiejsza dyskusja o wykorzystaniu aplikacji na smartfony w zarządzaniu rozprzestrzenianiem się pandemii ma nie tylko kluczowe znaczenie w kontekście stopniowego znoszenia restrykcji związanych ze swobodą poruszania się w Unii, ale także w kontekście ochrony prywatności obywateli UE.

Aplikacje mobilne są opracowywane i już używane w niektórych państwach członkowskich w celu śledzenia osób zakażonych lub zagrożonych zarażeniem wirusem. Aplikacje tego typu mogą odegrać ważną i pozytywną rolę w procesie rozluźniania restrykcji związanych z pandemią i stopniowego powrotu do normalności. Mają jednak także niewspółmierny wpływ na nasze prawa podstawowe, takie jak ochrona danych i prywatności. Podczas gdy ochrona życia ludzkiego i zdrowia publicznego jest dla nas wszystkich sprawą najwyższej wagi, zarówno na szczeblu unijnym, jak i krajowym, to należy z całą mocą podkreślić, że rządy i sektor prywatny nie mogą promować wykorzystywania niesprawdzonych technologii o potencjale naruszania naszych praw.

Długa historia wprowadzania środków nadzwyczajnych w sytuacjach kryzysowych pokazuje, że często gdy wprowadzany jest nadzór, idzie on za daleko, nie osiąga swoich celów i niejednokrotnie pomimo zażegnania sytuacji kryzysowej jego funkcjonowanie przedłużane jest bez uzasadnienia. Mobilne programy śledzące, które bez wątpienia mogą być tymczasowymi środkami opanowania pandemii do czasu upowszechnienia oczekiwanej szczepionki, nie mogą pod żadnym pozorem stać się trwałym elementem rozszerzonego systemu nadzoru.

Marc Angel (S&D), in writing. – The European Union and the EU Member States must find coordinated common approach to support the gradual lifting of confinement measures. The Group of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (S&D) supports joint approaches, but also underlines the importance of privacy and data protection aspects of every possible digital solutions. I believe that every contact tracing app must comply with EU data protection and privacy rules and should be based on anonymised data. They can complement existing manual contact tracing and according to some Member States these applications can help interrupt the transmission chain of the virus, but the use of them must strictly remain voluntary-based and cannot be linked as condition to other rights, such as border crossings, employment or to entering to public institutions.

Markus Buchheit (ID), schriftlich. – Die Krise, welche wir erleben, lag bis vor Kurzem außerhalb unserer Vorstellungskraft. Die Menschen in Europa leben in Angst um ihre Familien, ihre Sicherheit und ihre Zukunft. Und eben diese lähmende Angst wird nun selbst zur Bedrohung. Für unsere Freiheit. Denn wer in Angst lebt, der stellt keine unangenehmen Fragen. Die „Corona-App“, das neueste faule Heilsversprechen, ist der heilige Gral für all jene, die den perversen Traum vom „gläsernen Bürger“ träumen. Sie wird uns verkauft als besondere Maßnahme für besondere Zeiten. Doch wer das behauptet, ist entweder naiv oder lügt, ohne rot zu werden. Denn einmal eingeführt wird sie bleiben, und man wird sicher neue Einsatzzwecke für sie finden. Blicken wir ins Jahr 2001. Nach den Terroranschlägen vom 11. September nutzte die US-Regierung die Gunst der Stunde und verkaufte ihren Bürgern die Einschränkungen ihrer Rechte in Form des Patriot Act als Allheilmittel gegen den Terrorismus. Heute, fast 20 Jahre später, sind diese Maßnahmen größtenteils nach wie vor in Kraft. Jede staatliche Überwachung, die wir zulassen, ist eine Büchse der Pandora. Es wird diesmal nicht anders sein. Ich schließe mit den Worten von Benjamin Franklin: „Wer die Freiheit aufgibt, um Sicherheit zu gewinnen, wird am Ende beides verlieren.“

Miriam Dalli (S&D), in writing. – Digital solutions such as contact tracing applications are essential in the fight against COVID-19, particularly as countries ease lockdown measures. However, strong privacy safeguards must be essential. Thus far the Commission has maintained that contact tracing apps should guarantee privacy, should not store unnecessary personal information including location tracking, should be installed voluntarily, and dismantled post-pandemic. Although these safeguards are essential, they must also be enforced on a Member State level and there must be interoperability between different contact tracing applications. Additionally, the Commission must enforce independent app reviews and audits on a Member State level. These apps must be frequently checked for privacy, transparency, and functional usability concerns, especially as the COVID-19 is still evolving. The Commission should help the Member States assemble a team of cross-sector experts for these reviews. Medical experts should determine that these apps can be effectively integrated into different phases of virus containment. Technical and data experts should consistently guarantee privacy and functionality. Legal experts must continuously develop and provide regulatory framework and legislation updates on data collection and data destruction. Further, this entire process must be extremely transparent so that the public feels comfortable using the apps.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D), na piśmie. – Prawo do prywatności jest jednym z podstawowych praw człowieka. Jest gwarantowane międzynarodowymi aktami prawnymi, prawem europejskim i polską konstytucją – mówi o tym wprost art. 47 ustawy zasadniczej.

Prawo do prywatności nie jest jednak prawem absolutnym, gdyż nawet w najbardziej demokratycznych państwach może być ograniczane z uwagi na ważny interes publiczny. Te ograniczenia muszą być jednak wprowadzane na podstawie prawa powszechnie obowiązującego, muszą też być niezbędne i proporcjonalne. To bardzo ważne, bo każda ingerencja w prywatność jednostki to ingerencja w jej wolność.

Pandemia koronawirusa postawiła rządy wielu państw przed dylematem, czy w imię kontrolowania rozszerzania się pandemii kontrolować przemieszczanie się obywateli czy też nie ryzykować ingerowania w ich wolność. Bo dobrze wiemy, że taka ingerencja to zawsze szansa na dokonywanie nadużyć. Tym bardziej że obecne technologie umożliwiają inwigilację na szeroką skalę. Większość rządów państw UE wybrała opcję pierwszą: w Polsce używana jest np. aplikacja Kwarantanna domowa.

Nie jestem przeciwny rozwiązaniom mającym na celu monitorowanie ruchu pandemii. W końcu chodzi o ochronę zdrowia i życia mieszkańców Unii. Chciałbym jednak mocno podkreślić, że takie rozwiązania muszą być proporcjonalne i służyć właśnie monitoringowi, a nie inwigilacji. Muszą być również spójne na poziomie UE: ochrona prawa do prywatności nie powinna być dla jednych mniejsza, a dla innych większa.

Έλενα Κουντουρά (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Δεν υπάρχει αμφιβολία ότι για την αποτελεσματική αντιμετώπιση του COVID-19 είναι απαραίτητη η χρήση της ψηφιακής τεχνολογίας. Όλοι θα θέλαμε να είμαστε ασφαλείς, γνωρίζοντας ότι έχουμε μία εφαρμογή που θα μας ενημερώνει ανώνυμα για πιθανούς φορείς του ιού. Πρώτα, όμως, θα πρέπει να έχουμε διασφαλίσει ότι οι πρακτικές συλλογής δεδομένων που αναπτύσσονται πρέπει να είναι ασφαλείς, αποτελεσματικές, διαφανείς, και ότι καλύπτουν πλήρως τα κριτήρια της καταλληλότητας και αναγκαιότητας που επιτάσσει η αρχή της αναλογικότητας. Όμως, πόσο αποτελεσματικές είναι σήμερα αυτές οι εφαρμογές; Μέχρι σήμερα παραμένουν αρκετές τεχνικές αδυναμίες που πρέπει να ξεπεραστούν άμεσα για να εξασφαλιστεί η εγκυρότητα τους. Αλλά, ακόμη και έτσι, τα στοιχεία δείχνουν ότι για να έχουν στοιχειώδη αποτελεσματικότητα θα πρέπει να τις χρησιμοποιεί το 60-75% του πληθυσμού μιας χώρας. Στην Ελλάδα, ο ευπαθής πληθυσμός, με ηλικία άνω των 50 ετών, αποτελεί την πλειοψηφία και δεν χρησιμοποιεί smartphones, σε ποσοστό 71%. Αν συνυπολογίσουμε ότι η χρήση των εφαρμογών πραγματοποιείται σε εθελοντική βάση, γίνεται ακόμα πιο φανερός ο σοβαρός κίνδυνος της αποτυχίας του εγχειρήματος. Όμως, τομείς όπως ο τουρισμός χρειάζονται πρακτικές λύσεις τώρα. Πώς θα πραγματοποιηθεί αυτό όταν κάθε κράτος της ΕΕ χρησιμοποιεί δική του εφαρμογή; Αν δεν απαντηθούν άμεσα αυτά τα ερωτήματα, φοβόμαι ότι η χρήση των εφαρμογών ιχνηλάτησης επαφών και προειδοποίησης γίνεται «too little too late»!

Elżbieta Kruk (ECR), na piśmie. – Nowe technologie i usługi cyfrowe niosą ze sobą nie tylko korzyści, ale również zagrożenia. Korzyści, kiedy służą obywatelom, zagrożenia, kiedy są używane do masowej inwigilacji obywateli, naruszania prywatności i łamania podstawowych praw człowieka pod pretekstem ochrony obywateli w dobie kryzysów. Istnieją dowody, że kryzysy są wykorzystywane do wprowadzania narzędzi obserwacyjnych, które są utrzymywane po ich zakończeniu i używane również do innych celów, czyli np. nie tylko do kontrolowania dystansu między ludźmi, ale też do kontroli tłumów czy inwigilacji obywateli. Prowadzić to może do tworzenia państw totalitarnych. Ponadto bazy danych mogą stać się celem hackerów.

Nasza prywatność i wolność z jednej strony, a bezpieczeństwo z drugiej wzajemnie się nie wykluczają, wręcz przeciwnie, możemy czuć się bezpieczni tylko wtedy, gdy nasza prywatność i wolność jest utrzymana, a nie żyjąc w państwie, które w nieograniczony sposób może ingerować w naszą prywatność. Uprawnienie państwa do obserwacji całego społeczeństwa jest niebezpieczne dla demokracji, wolności i praw obywatelskich. Istnieje wszak domniemanie niewinności. Dlatego prokuratura i sądy muszą rozpatrywać każdą ze spraw indywidualnie. Sposobem na zapewnianie prawdziwego bezpieczeństwa jest efektywne ściganie indywidualnych przypadków łamania prawa i konsekwentne karamie sprawców przestępstw. Jeśli nie będziemy o tych zagrożeniach pamiętać, nowe technologie i usługi cyfrowe mogą doprowadzić do końca wolności człowieka.

Eva Maydell (PPE), in writing. – With many countries phasing out of lockdowns, we need a comprehensive and effective strategy to decrease and mitigate the continued threat posed by COVID-19 to our societies. One component of an effective COVID-19 exit strategy is contact tracing apps, as discussed in our plenary debate today. In order for these contact tracing apps to be effective, we need high levels of trust, protection of citizens' privacy, and cross-border interoperability.

How can we ensure trust, privacy, and interoperability? First, contact tracing apps should only be used by public health authorities and be limited to the emergency response to COVID-19. These apps must be consent-based and have the utmost regard for citizens' privacy.

It is worth stressing that contact tracing apps must go hand in hand with other measures, such as social distancing, masks and testing. However, when utilised effectively, and per the above criteria, contact tracing apps can be very beneficial in helping us to learn how to live alongside the virus, until a vaccine or treatment is found.

Andżelika Anna Możdżanowska (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Skuteczna walka z COVID-19 na wszystkich frontach jest najważniejsza, by zapewnić nam powrót do normalnego życia i zapobiec dalszej zapaści gospodarczej. Aplikacja do śledzenia kontaktów w walce z koronawirusem powinna zapewnić bezpieczeństwo, jeśli chodzi o zdrowie i informacje o obywatelach UE. Maksymalny poziom zabezpieczeń danych wrażliwych, decentralizacja, interoperacyjność systemów, konkretny czas wykorzystywania aplikacji, współpraca wszystkich państw członkowskich przy tworzeniu rozwiązania to elementy, dzięki którym wszyscy zaufamy nowym technologiom. Niezwykle istotne są konsultacje ze środowiskiem medycznym oraz organizacjami pozarządowymi, branżowymi i biznesowymi, jak również całkowita dobrowolność użytkowania.

Doskonałym przykładem szybkiej reakcji, dobrej współpracy i zabezpieczeń na światowym poziomie jest aplikacja ProteGo Safe wdrażana przez Polskę. Jest to w pełni zdecentralizowane rozwiązanie niepowiązane np. z aplikacją „Kwarantanna domowa”, przeznaczone dla innej grupy użytkowników i realizujące inne cele. Jest ono na bieżąco testowane pod kątem cyberbezpieczeństwa, nie korzysta z danych lokalizacyjnych, w przeciwieństwie do rozwiązań w niektórych krajach UE nie wymaga podania własnego imienia i nazwiska, numeru PESEL, numeru telefonu ani innych danych identyfikujących i będzie stosowane jedynie w celu zapobiegania zakażeniu COVID-19. Wykorzystujmy dobre praktyki państw członkowskich, by zminimalizować ingerencję w prywatność obywateli EU.

Takich rozwiązań, zgodnych z RODO, oczekujemy dla wszystkich obywateli UE, tak by czuli się bezpiecznie, chętnie korzystali z innowacyjnych rozwiązań i chronili siebie, chroniąc innych.

Sandra Pereira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – A UE assumiu recentemente que está em curso o desenvolvimento de uma tecnologia que visa recolher dados dos cidadãos, através dos seus telemóveis, com o pretexto de analisar os padrões de mobilidade, incluindo o impacto das medidas de confinamento na intensidade dos contactos e os riscos de propagação da Covid-19.

Há alguns detalhes que para nós não estão claros, para além do âmbito de aplicabilidade e dos objetivos concretos. Assim, preocupam-nos questões como: a responsabilidade de compilação e tratamento dos dados; que dados serão usados e recolhidos; a disponibilização e o acesso aos mesmos; por que período de tempo serão guardados; se todos os Estados-Membros acordaram com o uso de tecnologia desta natureza; e, finalmente como se prevê garantir a salvaguarda dos dados pessoais, assegurando o total respeito pela proteção de dados dos cidadãos, pela sua privacidade, intimidade e confidencialidade.

Em última instância, a preocupação genuína de quem instala a aplicação não se pode transformar num mecanismo de vigilância e controlo dos cidadãos e de restrição de liberdades. Independentemente de a instalação destas aplicações ser voluntária, ninguém deve ser discriminado por não o fazer. Reafirmamos que o que é fundamental é o investimento num serviço público de saúde, de qualidade, universal e gratuito.

Christine Schneider (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Ich befürworte den Einsatz von „Corona-Apps“ um einen Ausstieg aus den gegenwärtigen Beschränkungen zu unterstützen. Soziale Distanzierungsmaßnahmen können die Infektionskurve zwar abflachen, aber wir benötigen den flächendeckenden Einsatz von Tracing-Apps, damit im Kampf gegen COVID-19-Infektionsketten über Tracingdaten nachverfolgt werden können. Wichtig ist, dass diese Apps über europäische Grenzen hinweg funktionieren und miteinander kompatibel sind. Und ganz besonders wichtig ist, dass der Datenschutz beim Einsatz von Tracing-Apps jederzeit sichergestellt ist.

Edina Tóth (PPE), *in writing*. – In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, contact tracing and warning apps can be essential tools to support the gradual lifting of confinement measures. To that end, I warmly welcome the digital initiative of the European Parliament, aiming to develop a common coordinated approach. Whether the contract tracing app is a pan-European system or a decentralised approach, it should, in all circumstances, be reliable, safe and effective. Before launching an app for broadcasting the ‘digital handshake’ of nearby phones, there should be clear guidelines on the protection of personal data and privacy. In particular, I firmly believe COVID19-related health data should be encrypted, i.e. anonymised and solely shared with public health authorities; both are cornerstone for strengthening citizens’ trust in using EU-wide digital tools. Furthermore, whereas ‘digital handshake’ remains decentralised, there should be one app per country – all of which are interoperable – to boost the effectiveness of tracing the circulation of the virus. In addition, the app should be dismantled as soon as they are no longer needed. Finally, in my opinion, an unreasonably complex solution may hinder reaching our common aim, thus we should come up with a solution as simple as possible.

Adrián Vázquez Lázara (Renew), *por escrito*. – El coronavirus nos ha devuelto a todos a una Europa que creíamos olvidada: la Europa de las fronteras. Recuperar cuanto antes la libertad de circulación debe ser una prioridad, y no podemos permitirnos desaprovechar ni una sola de las herramientas a nuestro alcance para lograrlo.

Las aplicaciones móviles para trazar contagios de COVID-19 son algunas de estas herramientas. Con la regulación adecuada, y respetando la anonimidad y privacidad de nuestros datos, esta tecnología permite que nuestros móviles intercambien un código encriptado con las personas con las que nos vamos cruzando y, en caso de haber estado en contacto con un foco de contagio, hacernos las pruebas y aislarnos con rapidez. Sin embargo, la existencia de distintos modelos de *software* para el desarrollo de estas aplicaciones ha puesto en duda su interoperabilidad entre países europeos, con el consiguiente riesgo para la libertad de circulación y, con ella, para sectores económicos clave, como lo es, por ejemplo, el turismo en España.

Exigimos a la Comisión y a los Gobiernos nacionales que, independientemente del modelo técnico que elijan para desarrollar estas aplicaciones, garanticen su interoperabilidad en toda Europa.

Loránt Vincze (PPE), *in writing*. – Contact tracing apps are one of the novel digital techniques we can deploy to manage the spread of the pandemic. We should, however, keep in mind that smartphone contact-tracing is just one element of the measures such as social distancing, masks and testing that we must put in place to slow the spread of the virus. There are several preconditions for such apps to be effective. Most importantly, they must be able to rely upon a robust testing and diagnosing infrastructure, otherwise we would not have the data to feed in the network. The second question is how to reach the 60% participation of the local populations in the contact-tracing network that is needed for the app to be effective. While we should strive to reach this figure, the approach we should take is not to make the use of apps mandatory, but to build the trust of people to use the app through solid data-protection. Third, in order to be effective in the whole of the EU, national apps should be inter-operable across borders. Interoperable national systems could be extremely important for relaxing confinement measures, the gradual lifting of border controls and the restoration of freedom of movement.

Bettina Vollath (S&D), *schriftlich*. – Die Nutzung von Tracing-Anwendungen zur Eindämmung der Pandemie kann durchaus von Nutzen sein. Solche Apps können uns dabei helfen, schneller festzustellen, wer infiziert ist und mit wem diese Person in Kontakt war. Dadurch können wir effizienter handeln und Infektionsketten schneller unterbrechen. Eines muss im Zusammenhang mit solchen Tracing-Apps jedoch absolut klar sein: Der Schutz der Privatsphäre und der Grundrechte steht über jedem Nutzen, den solche Anwendungen bringen können. Wenn ich höre, wie Politiker*innen in Europa laut über eine verpflichtende Nutzung dieser Anwendungen nachdenken, frage ich mich, ob manche Kolleg*innen die eigenen Datenschutzbestimmungen vergessen haben. Der Schutz der Privatsphäre und der eigenen Daten ist ein Grundrecht und darf – besonders in Hinblick auf die sensible Natur der Informationen – nicht dieser Krise zum Opfer fallen. Jede Tracing-App sollte sich an den von der Kommission herausgegebenen Leitlinien orientieren und an die geltenden Datenschutzbestimmungen halten – so wie es dieses Haus bereits im April in einer Entschließung nochmals betont hat. Dass dies auch wirklich der Fall ist, muss von den zuständigen Datenschutzbehörden sichergestellt werden. Denn nur wenn die Bürger*innen sich darauf verlassen können, dass ihre Rechte geschützt sind, werden sie auch Vertrauen in solche Anwendungen setzen und diese nutzen.

(A sessão é suspensa às 12.03)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID MARIA SASSOLI*Presidente***9. Ripresa della seduta***(La seduta è ripresa alle 13.17)***10. Comunicazione dei risultati della votazione****Presidente.** – I risultati del primo turno di votazioni di oggi sono i seguenti:

Emendamento 29: approvato.

Emendamento 30: approvato.

Emendamento 31: approvato.

Emendamento 32: approvato.

Emendamento 33: approvato.

Emendamento 34D: respinto.

Emendamento 10D: respinto.

Emendamento 11D: respinto.

Emendamento 12: respinto.

Emendamento 13: approvato.

Emendamento 14D: respinto.

Emendamento 15: respinto.

Emendamento 16: respinto.

Emendamento 45: respinto.

Emendamento 18: respinto.

Emendamento 1 - Discarico 2018 — Corte di giustizia: respinto.

Discarico 2018: Mediatore europeo – emendamento 1 respinto; emendamento 2 approvato.

Discarico 2018: Garante europeo della protezione dei dati – emendamento 1 respinto; emendamento 2 respinto; emendamento 3D respinto.

Discarico 2018: Corte dei conti – emendamento 2 respinto.

Discarico 2018: Consiglio europeo e Consiglio – emendamento 1 respinto; emendamento 2 respinto; emendamenti 8 e 9D approvato; emendamento 3 approvato.

Discarico 2018: Agenzia dell'Unione europea per la sicurezza delle reti e dell'informazione – emendamento 1D respinto.

Discarico 2018: Centro europeo per lo sviluppo della formazione professionale – emendamento 2D approvato; emendamento 3D respinto; emendamento 1 approvato; emendamento 4 approvato.

Discarico 2018: Fondazione europea per il miglioramento delle condizioni di vita e di lavoro – emendamento 1 respinto; emendamento 2D respinto; emendamento 3D respinto.

Discarico 2018: 8°, 9°, 10° e 11° Fondo europeo di sviluppo – emendamento 1 respinto; paragrafo 48 approvato; paragrafo 61 approvato; paragrafo 61, seconda parte, approvato; paragrafo 65 approvato; paragrafo 66, prima parte, approvato; paragrafo 66, seconda parte, approvato; paragrafo 67, prima parte, approvato; paragrafo 67, seconda parte, approvato; paragrafo 69, prima parte, approvato; paragrafo 69, seconda parte, approvato; emendamento 2, prima parte, approvato; emendamento 2, seconda parte, respinto.

Discarico 2018: Istituto europeo per l'uguaglianza di genere: emendamento 1D respinto.

Discarico 2018: Agenzia dell'Unione europea per la formazione delle autorità di contrasto – emendamento 1D approvato; emendamento 2D respinto.

Discarico 2018: Agenzia per le sostanze chimiche – emendamento 1 approvato.

Discarico 2018: Agenzia dell'Unione europea per i diritti fondamentali – emendamento 2D respinto; emendamento 1 respinto.

Discarico 2018: bilancio generale dell'Unione europea – Comitato delle regioni – emendamento 1 respinto; emendamento 2 approvato; emendamento 3 approvato; emendamento 4D respinto, emendamento 5D respinto; emendamento 6D respinto, emendamento 7D respinto.

Discarico 2018: Agenzia dell'Unione europea per la cooperazione nelle attività di contrasto (Europol) – emendamento 1D respinto, emendamento 2D approvato.

Discarico 2018: bilancio generale dell'Unione europea – Comitato economico e sociale europeo – emendamento 2 approvato; emendamento 1 respinto; emendamento 4 approvato; emendamento 5 approvato; emendamento 6 respinto; emendamento 7 approvato.

Discarico 2018: prestazioni, gestione finanziaria e controllo delle agenzie dell'Unione europea – emendamento 2 approvato.

Questi sono i risultati della votazione.

11. Secondo turno di votazioni

Presidente. – Passiamo ora al secondo turno di votazioni della giornata.

Procederemo alle seguenti votazioni:

- votazione finale sulle risoluzioni di discarico;
- votazione sugli emendamenti alla relazione sullo stato di previsione delle entrate e delle spese per l'esercizio 2021 — Sezione I – Parlamento europeo;
- votazione sulle misure temporanee riguardanti le assemblee generali delle società europee (SE) e delle società cooperative europee (SCE).

Le modalità di voto sono le stesse: le votazioni si svolgeranno utilizzando la procedura che abbiamo usato anche questa mattina.

Il secondo turno di votazioni sarà aperto dalle 13.30 alle 14.45 I risultati del secondo turno di votazioni saranno comunicati alle 17.15.

Vi ricordo che alle 14.30 comincerà la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione su vaccini e terapie nel contesto della Covid-19.

(La seduta è sospesa alle 13.23)

VORSITZ: NICOLA BEER*Vizepräsidentin***12. Ripresa della seduta***(Die Sitzung wird um 14.31 Uhr wieder aufgenommen)***13. Vaccini e terapie nel contesto della Covid-19 (discussione)**

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu Impfstoffen und Medikamenten im Zusammenhang mit COVID-19 (2020/2643(RSP)).

Ich weise die Mitglieder darauf hin, dass es bei dieser Aussprache keine spontanen Wortmeldungen gibt und dass keine blauen Karten akzeptiert werden.

Nikolina Brnjac, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, on behalf of the Croatian Presidency of the Council, it is my honour to contribute to Parliament's discussion today on vaccines and therapeutics in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

This pandemic constitutes an unprecedented challenge for Europe and the world. It has brought huge human losses and suffering, as well as social and economic damage to millions of people. It has put our healthcare systems under exceptional pressure. It has wide-ranging implications for all of us in every part of the European Union.

As we gradually start lifting confinement measures, we will have to learn to live with the coronavirus under strict conditions and constant monitoring. Only the development, production and deployment of effective and safe vaccines and treatments will hopefully provide us with a lasting solution to this global health crisis.

Vaccines and treatments will be crucial for Europe, but they will be even more critical for our most vulnerable partners with fragile health systems such as Africa.

Our ultimate and common goal, therefore, is to accelerate the development, manufacture and delivery of vaccines and treatments for everyone, everywhere at an affordable price in the shortest possible time.

The EU and its Member States have embarked on a worldwide race to find a safe and effective vaccine and treatments to counter the spread of the coronavirus.

Regarding activities at EU level, already on 10 March at their first meeting after the COVID-19 pandemic reached Europe, EU leaders committed to supporting research as part of our common response to the outbreak. The European Parliament has also raised issues relating to the development of vaccines and treatments in its resolution on EU coordinated action to combat the COVID-19 pandemic adopted on 17 April.

On April 7, the Croatian Presidency organised an informal videoconference where ministers responsible for research and innovation showed their determination to coordinate their actions and welcomed ten actions for immediate response to the crisis.

On 7 May, in an informal videoconference organised by the Commission, many Member States supported the idea of preparing a COVID-19 vaccination immunisation plan. To accelerate the coronavirus vaccine, the Commission has launched a dedicated COVID-19 data portal that enables researchers to upload, access and analyse research data. Currently, there are more than 90 vaccines in development around the globe, but only eight are so far subject to clinical trials.

Three candidates for vaccines are receiving support from EU funding through the research programme Horizon 2020. Member States are also investing in several candidates.

Moving to treatments, it is encouraging to note that there are so far more than 40 developers of potential treatments for COVID-19 who have contacted the European Medicines Agency and the Member States for scientific advice. Most of the treatments proposed are medicines currently authorised for other diseases. Clinical trials are currently ongoing to determine their efficiency for the treatment of COVID-19 patients. The EU has allocated resources via Horizon 2020 to Discovery, an EU-wide clinical trial to test treatments involving more than 3 000 European patients. The EU has already committed over EUR 500 million to different research and innovation initiatives, including approximately EUR 48 million to 18 projects on vaccines and treatments via Horizon 2020 research programmes, and EUR 72 million in public funds for a therapeutics and diagnostics innovative medicine initiative with an additional EUR 45 million in expected contributions from the industry.

Additionally, the EU has redirected EUR 150 million from SMEs and start-ups for innovative solutions to tackle the outbreak via the European Innovation Council (EIC) Accelerator programme and up to EUR 80 million to CureVac, a European vaccine developer, by a common Commission aid initiative.

In order to respond to the urgency, the European Medicines Agency will speed up its regulatory procedures so that marketing authorisation of safe, effective and high-quality COVID-19 related medicines and vaccines can be guaranteed without unnecessary delay.

Turning now to activities at international level, on 24 April, the WHO launched global cooperation for the accelerated development, production and equitable access to diagnostics, therapeutics and vaccines.

In response to this call, on 4 May, the European Union, several Member States and other G20 countries co-hosted the International Coronavirus Global Response Pledging Conference. The initiative has raised EUR 7.4 billion, including EUR 4 billion from the EU and its Member States. This is a very promising and important first step.

There are a number of key challenges. Once new therapies are identified, the challenge will be to scale up production and distribution to make them available to patients throughout the world at an affordable price.

As regards vaccines, the first challenge is the patient's safety and to produce a vaccine in extremely high quantities, since demand is global.

At the European level, already in December 2018 the Council adopted a recommendation on strengthened cooperation against vaccine-preventable diseases, which has the double aim of reducing inequalities between Member States and increasing security of vaccine supply. EU instruments such as joint procurement could be used in that spirit to help ensure fair distribution and solidarity among all Member States.

In order to tackle other important issues, such as securing sufficient and autonomous production capacity in the European Union, fair licensing and fair intellectual property rights conditions, it is necessary to involve all concerned actors, including industry and the public sector.

In this context, I find it very encouraging to see that several manufacturers have agreed to pool their resources. Public authorities, pharmaceutical companies and multilateral organisations must work together to reach the common goal of making vaccines and treatments available to as many as possible.

We will defeat the COVID-19 crisis and we will do it with a shared spirit of European and global solidarity and responsibility.

Margaritis Schinas, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, from the very first day of this crisis for us in the Commission, one consideration was evident: no country in the European Union or worldwide can battle this pandemic alone. We need to take bold steps and we need to take them together.

Containment measures have proved efficient so far and have allowed us to diminish the spread of the virus. But they will not eradicate it. For this, we need further action on three areas: first, early diagnosis; second, targeted treatments for the ill; and, third, a vaccine that will ensure immunisation. We will also need all three to be widely accessible and affordable because, as long as the virus exists in the world, no one can be safe.

This is why the European Union is taking the lead in organising a coronavirus global response pledging initiative, which took place on 4 May. The aim was precisely to lead the world effort to develop diagnostics, vaccines and therapeutics against the virus as soon as possible, not only to make it possible to get to these objectives, but also to ensure that they are accessible on a fair and equitable basis once they are discovered. I am delighted to have this opportunity, on behalf of the Commission, to discuss these issues with you in a bit more detail this afternoon.

First, vaccines. On vaccines, there is no doubt that this is the best way to truly exit the pandemic and avoid a resurgence of the disease. However, developing a vaccine is a complicated process that depends on close coordination, financial support and unity. Each of these considerations was evident during the pledging event of 4 May that the European Union led at global level.

First, we managed to attain our overall objective with an ambitious level of funding raised. We mobilised EUR 7.4 billion (USD 8 billion) in pledges, of which EUR 5 billion came from Team Europe. The second – and equally important – aspect of this pledging conference was that we sent, as the European Union, a resounding message of unity and solidarity across the world, and we also proved that, in today's turbulent times, the European Union remains a force for good for the planet.

This was only the beginning. The pledging marathon remains open until 23 May, so I take this opportunity to encourage all of you to engage in helping to find new donors, public or private, and to join forces in this unique worldwide effort.

Here comes the big question: where are we on the vaccines? As the Croatian Presidency has just indicated, the WHO has identified 8 vaccine candidates in clinical evaluation and 94 candidates in pre-clinical evaluation. Three candidates are receiving support from the Commission through our Horizon 2020 programme, and Member States are also investing in several candidates. We need to focus efforts on finding the most promising solutions. That's why the Commission has proposed that an EU-wide network for clinical trials be set up. Such a network will ensure a critical mass of data from patients, help to identify the most promising vaccine candidates or therapeutics, and swiftly move them into the most appropriate clinical trials. Once developed, of course, a vaccine would need to pass a rigorous approval process, and we in the Commission will work very closely with the European Medicines Agency to ensure that this process moves as swiftly and as quickly as possible without, however, compromising on safety and efficacy.

Producing the vaccine is only half of the battle ahead of us. We should also ensure fair, widespread and equitable access to the vaccine as early as possible, not only to all Europeans, but also to the rest of the world. There are many tools that we could use to achieve this – from public-private partnerships to increased manufacturing capacity, to advance purchase agreements to ensure production. The Commission is currently in intensive discussions with both our Member States and vaccine producers to identify clearly how we can best support Member States in the purchase and deployment of vaccines. All options are on the table and we are not excluding any of them. Last week, health ministers discussed the possibility of a uniform COVID-19 immunisation strategy throughout the European Union. This would also help us to maximise access to the vaccine when it becomes available and I look forward to hearing your thoughts on these approaches this afternoon.

Let me now turn to therapeutics. The Commission has reacted efficiently to support Member States in this regard. I don't want to beautify the situation. We all know that the early stage of the crisis was not an example of optimal coordination. Many measures were taken rapidly under pressure at national level without the necessary coordination. But, once this first stage went through and our Member States saw the added value of cooperation and the interdependence that binds them together as the European Union, with the help of the Commission, we reacted efficiently to support them. Let me recall some of these actions.

Since day one, we have coordinated closely with all important actors – the European Medicines Agency, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), the national agencies, industry – to avoid or tackle bottlenecks, to better anticipate future shortages and to assist in the adaptation of production. In parallel, we have issued concrete guidance on the rational supply of medicines, regulatory flexibility and clinical trials to avoid unavailability of treatments. We have activated the rescEU stockpile of medical equipment, including therapeutics and vaccines, and we have established a COVID clearing house mechanism that facilitates the matching of the needs for medical equipment with available supplies.

Thankfully, the situation is now beginning to stabilise in the EU, but we must also continue working on the supply side. With this in mind, we are supporting a dedicated industry cooperation project to increase the supply of critical intensive care unit medicines. Parallel to that, the European Medicines Agency and the Commission have put in place a mechanism to support the rapid development and authorisation of new COVID-19 medicines and vaccines and, as we speak, we are currently preparing a joint procurement for such intensive care unit (ICU) medicines.

Let me conclude by saying that today we are, of course, discussing the short term, which is saving lives and winning the battle with the virus on the medical side, but I would like to finish with a few words about the medium and long term. The pandemic has revealed and amplified important issues with our supply chain for medicinal products. I'm very aware of how dependent we are on important pharmaceutical products or ingredients. So we need to come together quickly and identify solutions to the three emerging weaknesses from the crisis: how to strengthen our coordination mechanisms and supply chains, how to boost our preparedness, and how to improve our society's overall strategic resilience.

The Commission is preparing a new pharmaceutical strategy that will take account of the lessons learned during the pandemic and make the EU's pharmaceutical system future proof and crisis resistant. Yesterday, President von der Leyen had the opportunity to give you a bit more detail about our very intensive work on the recovery initiative, which is to be expected in the next few days. I would say that part of building this resilience for cohesive and resistant European societies passed from a very rigorous health programme that would bridge this asymmetry between what Europeans expect from Europe in the area of public health and what Europe has in terms of legal competence to face up to this challenge.

Commissioner Kyriakides and I will look forward to working very closely with this House on this endeavour. But first, I am keen to hear your thoughts on the challenges and solutions and I am very willing to take them on board and report back to you at my earliest convenience.

(Applause)

Peter Liese, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir alle sehnen uns nach Normalität. Nicht nur die Wirtschaft leidet unter dem Lockdown, sondern auch viele Menschen ganz persönlich. Aber das Coronavirus ist weiter unter uns, und es ist sehr gefährlich. Deswegen müssen wir vorsichtig sein, aufpassen, damit es nicht zu einer zweiten Welle kommt. Und wir müssen dabei auch digitale Lösungen nutzen.

Ich war ein bisschen ärgerlich und enttäuscht, dass Kommissar Reynders heute Vormittag eigentlich nur die Bedenken aufgezählt hat. Wir müssen da offensiv sein. Und wir müssen nach Italien, Spanien, Frankreich und Belgien schauen, in die Länder, die am meisten unter der Krise gelitten haben. Dort beschwert sich merkwürdigerweise kaum jemand über den Lockdown. In meinem Land, in Deutschland, hat man den Eindruck, es gebe viel Anlass, sich zu beschweren, obwohl wir wesentlich besser durchgekommen sind. Ich rufe meinen Mitbürgern zu: „Hör mir auf zu lamentieren, und sei mir solidarisch mit denen, die es viel härter getroffen hat!“

Die endgültige Lösung bringt natürlich nur ein Medikament oder ein Impfstoff. Hier bin ich persönlich nach vielen Gesprächen mit Experten optimistisch, dass wir sehr viel schneller ein Medikament und/oder einen Impfstoff bekommen als unter normalen Umständen. Die Konferenz, die die Europäische Kommission am vergangenen Montag durchgeführt hat, war ein klares Zeichen der Kooperation und des Dialogs.

Aber wir brauchen leider auch einen Plan B. Denn die Vereinigten Staaten haben auf Regierungsebene nicht an der Konferenz teilgenommen, und deswegen sollten wir zwar weiter auf Dialog setzen, aber auch bereit sein, zum Beispiel koordiniert in Europa Zwangslizenzen zu erteilen oder auch handelspolitische Instrumente zu nutzen. Als Donald Trump mit Zöllen gegen europäische Autos gedroht hat, ist Jean-Claude Juncker ins Weiße Haus gefahren und hat eine Gegendrohung ausgesprochen. Und die Gesundheit unserer Bürgerinnen und Bürger muss uns mindestens so wichtig sein wie die Autoindustrie. Ursula von der Leyen sagt: „Wir müssen die Sprache der Macht sprechen.“ Das gilt auch für dieses Thema.

Tiemo Wölken, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Wenn schon die EVP von Zwangslizenzen spricht, dann ist aber wirklich ein großes Problem zu lösen – nein, Peter hat mit vielen Dingen sehr recht.

Auf der gesamten Welt wird gerade sehr intensiv nach einem Impfstoff zur Behandlung und zur Bekämpfung dieser Pandemie gesucht. Kommissar Šefčovič hat heute Morgen von Solidarität gesprochen. Er sagte: Der Wohlstand eines Landes sollte nicht festlegen, ob die Menschen dort ohne dieses Virus leben können. Recht hat er damit.

Und doch lesen wir heute in den Medien, dass der Vorstandschef eines französischen Gesundheitskonzerns sagt: Wenn wir einen Impfstoff entwickelt haben, dann geht er als Erstes an die Amerikaner. Da frage ich mich schon, ob die Gelder, die wir als Europäerinnen und Europäer in Forschung und Entwicklung stecken, eher als ein Geschenk, als etwas, auf das ein Unternehmen Anrecht hat, angesehen werden. Das ist keine Solidarität, das ist Kapitalismus mit dem Leben von Menschen. Das können wir nicht hinnehmen.

Deswegen brauchen wir ganz klar in der Europäischen Union und weltweit gleichberechtigten Zugang zu einem Impfstoff. Ich bin froh, dass meine Fraktion einen Plan für eine europäische Gesundheitsunion entwickelt hat, aus dem hervorgeht, dass wir als Europäerinnen und Europäer erkannt haben, dass wir eine zu große Abhängigkeit vom nichteuropäischen Ausland im Bereich der Gesundheitsvorsorge haben – und die nächste Krise wird kommen. Wir sprechen im Moment gar nicht über antimikrobielle Resistenz (AMR). Insofern müssen wir da sehr viel mehr tun, und insofern freue ich mich auf die Zusammenarbeit.

Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, la santé est un bien commun, un bien public, un bien mondial, un bien européen. Nous nous défendons collectivement, au cours de cette épidémie, par nos comportements raisonnables et respectueux, comme au sein de cet hémicycle. Nous saluons les efforts de financement de la recherche menés par la Commission européenne pour développer les traitements, les vaccins et les tests. Le Parlement européen a voté massivement, lors de sa résolution d'avril, un mécanisme européen de réponse sanitaire et nous avons collectivement demandé le renforcement des agences sanitaires, une coopération plus étroite entre les chercheurs et la restauration de notre souveraineté européenne.

Ne laissons pas les pays tiers nous rendre dépendants de leur recherche et de leur production de médicaments. Ne laissons pas les GAFAM s'emparer des données médicales de nos patients. Ne laissons pas les industriels de la santé, Sanofi ou autres, faire des enchères avec les vies humaines et confisquer des chances de guérison au nom du profit. Négocions, ensemble, avec eux les prix des médicaments.

Je suis d'accord avec vous, Monsieur le Commissaire, faisons de l'Agence européenne du médicament le pivot d'études cliniques coordonnées. Nous leur éviterons ainsi de se mettre en compétition les unes avec les autres. Faisons de l'Agence de contrôle et de prévention des maladies le cœur d'un réseau de laboratoires européens d'excellence en partenariat public-privé. Nous pouvons y arriver si nous sommes des Européens déterminés, unis et solidaires, et si nous inscrivons, dans le contrat financier pluriannuel, un programme spécifique dédié à la santé.

Silvia Sardone, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sull'emergenza sanitaria coronavirus l'Europa sta compiendo gravi errori.

È mancata la solidarietà tra i paesi europei (vi ricorderete tutti del mancato invio di respiratori e mascherine nei confronti dei paesi più colpiti, come per esempio l'Italia), ogni paese ha agito in maniera diversa sui tamponi e sul conteggio dei decessi e poi anche sulle cure, sui farmaci e sui vaccini: l'Europa è stata totalmente assente.

Ma oggi voglio parlarvi della cura con il plasma iperimmune, una cura semplice che esiste in medicina da quasi un secolo, ora sperimentata sulla Covid-19 a Mantova e a Pavia, in Italia, con ottimi risultati. Vi do un po' di dati: nei pazienti gravissimi in terapia intensiva la mortalità passa dal 15 al 6 % e a Mantova su quelli gravi ma non gravissimi la mortalità è addirittura ridotta a zero. Pensate che negli Stati Uniti già 116 università fanno la sperimentazione. Parliamo dei costi: i farmaci antivirali arrivano a costare 4, 5 o 6 volte di più di una semplice sacca di plasma.

Eppure sia il governo italiano sia voi in Europa non sembrate particolarmente interessati alla cosa. Come mai? Beh non ha dietro le multinazionali del farmaco, non ci sono grandi investimenti e i poteri forti del settore, non ci sono grandi appalti e guadagni milionari. Forse allora per alcuni è meglio puntare su altro. È un errore.

Noi chiediamo che in attesa di un vaccino l'Europa supporti economicamente questa terapia e incentivi la creazione di banche del plasma dedicate nei diversi paesi europei.

Petra De Sutter, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I first want to congratulate the Commission on the successful pledging conference of last week. A lot of public money indeed has been pledged now to secure funding for the development of vaccines, diagnostics and therapeutics. This money, however, should not come as a blank cheque to the pharmaceutical industry. Policymakers should take the necessary measures to make sure that vaccines and therapeutics will be accessible to all.

First, I believe that the EU should support the W8 in setting up a transparent and inclusive governance structure that will decide on the development, production and equitable distribution of future vaccines and therapeutics globally. All relevant stakeholders, including civil society and the global south, should be represented in this governance structure.

Second, the health of our citizens should not only depend on the goodwill, as we understood it, of the pharmaceutical sector – we cannot rely on voluntary measures only. If needed, EU Member States should be able to make use of compulsory licensing.

While we Greens have always been supporting this, I was happy to hear that colleagues of other political groups like Mr Liese just now are also aboard for this idea. But to facilitate the use of compulsory licensing, it's also crucial that the EU urgently makes its legislation on data and market exclusivity more flexible. I invite us all to collaborate on this. Colleagues, let us use this health crisis to fundamentally improve our pharmaceutical system in safeguarding public health over profit maximisation. If not now, then when?

Joanna Kopcińska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! W pełni popieram zorganizowane przez Komisję wydarzenie poświęcone globalnej odpowiedzi na koronawirusa, które zarejestrowało 7,4 miliarda euro w formie datków od darczyńców z całego świata. Grupa Wyszehradzka, której częścią jest Polska, w ramach tej inicjatywy przeznaczyła 3 miliony euro na szczepionki i leki przeciwko wirusowi.

Gdy nowe metody leczenia i szczepionka będą gotowe do wprowadzenia na rynek, europejskie fundusze strukturalne i inwestycyjne powinny odegrać kluczową rolę w zwiększeniu zdolności produkcyjnych przy szczególnym zachowaniu ostrożności i zapewnieniu sprawiedliwego i właściwego przydziału środków dla każdego państwa członkowskiego. Niemniej jednak opracowanie szczepionki wiąże się ze znacznymi kosztami i wysokim ryzykiem niepowodzenia. Opracowanie bezpiecznych i skutecznych szczepionek, które zostaną dopuszczone do obrotu, zajmie dużo czasu i musimy być świadomi, że w tym procesie nie ma łatwych i szybkich rozwiązań. Szybkie znalezienie szczepionki jest istotne, ale ważniejsze jest, by była skuteczna i bezpieczna dla pacjentów. W przypadku szybkiego stworzenia szczepionki mogą nie być znane wszystkie efekty uboczne, zatem rozstrzygnięcia wymaga kwestia odpowiedzialności.

Podsumowując, chciałabym zapytać Komisję o działania, jakie planuje, by zapewnić powszechny dostęp do wyników badań naukowych nad szczepionką, znaleźć sposób na przyspieszenie badań klinicznych, a także rozwiązać kwestię odpowiedzialności, gdy szczepionki będą już zakupione i stosowane.

Marc Botenga, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Madam President, I've got a question that I don't want you to answer. That question is, how much are you willing to pay to save your life? And yet, unfortunately, that question is still very much used by many pharmaceutical companies to decide on the price of a treatment or a vaccine. That is what explains why a Belgian family had to pay EUR 1.9 million euros for a life-saving treatment to Novartis. That also explains why the CEO of Sanofi dares to threaten to give the vaccine first to the United States. And that explains why today, Belgian health authorities fear that the vaccine will not be available to all.

So that is why it is so, so important for us to make sure that no pharmaceutical company gets an exclusive right on the coming treatment or vaccine. And granted, the European Union has, by and large, talked the talk, and that is important. We've spoken about a common public good that will not belong to anybody. However, when we talk the talk, you should also walk the walk, because otherwise it's just hypocrisy. And that is why I was so surprised and, indeed, disappointed to read on the website of the Commission that you were not going to touch the intellectual property rights. Now for me, it's very, very clear. We raised 7.4 billion. That 7.4 billion should not serve the private profits of pharmaceutical companies. Let me be clear: in a pandemic, patents have no place. We have a right to a cure and we have a right to a people's vaccine.

Piernicola Pedicini (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo che valga la pena ricordare che i vaccini sono una soluzione sanitaria che serve per una politica di prevenzione, sono farmaci che vengono utilizzati per le persone sane, non per i malati, e quindi per la maggior parte della popolazione. Quindi non basta che siano efficaci ma devono essere assolutamente sicuri, privi di effetti collaterali e creati e distribuiti in grande quantità per tutta la popolazione.

Il loro sviluppo richiede quindi dei tempi molto lunghi per la ricerca, per la produzione e per la distribuzione e, dunque, non sono una soluzione per l'urgenza immediata che abbiamo in questo momento. In questo momento siamo in piena crisi pandemica e ci sono migliaia di persone che stanno morendo nell'Unione europea.

Sono stati raccolti 7,4 miliardi di dollari? Benissimo, allora la maggior parte di questo denaro deve essere impiegato per le terapie che hanno dimostrato la loro efficacia, e mi riferisco in particolare al plasma iperimmune che è stato citato poc'anzi e che negli ospedali di Pavia e di Mantova ha dimostrato di poter curare il 100 % dei malati.

Purtroppo questo avviene con l'ostacolo, con la resistenza dell'industria farmaceutica, che evidentemente non trova interesse in questa soluzione terapeutica.

Presidente, è uno scandalo! Abbiamo la soluzione a portata di mano, possiamo curare le persone che stanno per morire e possiamo salvare la nostra economia con questa soluzione, ma dobbiamo assolutamente evitare che le case farmaceutiche facciano il loro interesse privato. Dobbiamo salvaguardare invece l'interesse generale.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señora presidenta, apreciados colegas, este mes de mayo, hace cuarenta años, el mundo se liberó de la viruela gracias a otro esfuerzo global de diez años y más de 500 millones de vacunas.

El COVID es la primera crisis de la globalización, ha dado la vuelta al mundo en tan solo 115 días y este virus nos ha mostrado nuestra fragilidad. Por ello, necesitamos una vacuna y un tratamiento para dar una solución definitiva a esta pandemia.

Quiero aplaudir el liderazgo de la Comisión al lograr más de 7 000 millones de euros para financiar el desarrollo de la vacuna contra el COVID. Es el mayor proyecto de colaboración público-privado, global y sanitario.

Es el momento de ser valientes, pero también generosos. No podemos permitir ni guerras de precios ni de países, ni guerra entre lo público y lo privado. Lo tenemos que hacer juntos y debemos eliminar cualquier barrera en el acceso a las vacunas, que deben estar disponibles para todos en todos los rincones del mundo.

La deslocalización de la producción de un sector estratégico como el sanitario la hemos pagado muy cara, también en España. Debemos apostar por la reindustrialización sanitaria y la investigación en Europa, y Europa se diferencia de Estados Unidos y de China por tener los mejores sistemas nacionales de salud públicos y universales del mundo. Este es nuestro gran valor añadido.

Por ello, esta crisis nos da la oportunidad de revisar y reforzar el sistema sanitario europeo, para que sea más resiliente; y la Unión Europea debe tener más competencias sanitarias para coordinar con rapidez y eficiencia un único sistema europeo de salud.

Tenemos que trabajar para la unión sanitaria europea.

Javi López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hoy el Parlamento Europeo hace desde aquí un llamamiento a los Estados miembros y a las instituciones de la Unión Europea a coordinarse, a trabajar conjuntamente para buscar una vacuna y un tratamiento eficaz para hacer frente al coronavirus. Y queremos aunar esfuerzos no solo entre Estados e instituciones europeas, queremos aunar esfuerzos entre el sector privado y el sector público.

El Parlamento también pone como ejemplo la iniciativa de la Comisión Europea de la Conferencia Internacional de Donantes —más de 7 400 millones de euros recaudados de forma conjunta—. Pero hoy el Parlamento no solo hace esto. Hoy el Parlamento también envía un mensaje fuerte sobre la necesidad de tener una futura vacuna con un acceso universal, gratuito, justo, igualitario y que sea rápido para todos los rincones de Europa. Esto también puede ser posible gracias al mecanismo de adquisición conjunta.

Y, en tercer lugar, el Parlamento Europeo hoy también quiere que la Unión Europea en el futuro lidere a nivel global ese acceso universal y gratuito a una futura vacuna. También es un momento para hacer advertencias sobre esta lógica —que vemos en algunos casos— de competición geopolítica para encontrar la vacuna o sobre cómo puede ser la vacuna fuente también de desigualdades. Nosotros queremos cooperar en un mundo en el que algunos quieren competir. Porque frente al coronavirus no hay competición posible por algo que afecta al conjunto de la humanidad y que ha puesto en riesgo la forma de vida de todos los rincones de nuestro planeta.

Frédérique Ries (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, beaucoup de choses ont été dites, déjà, cruciales, notamment notre souveraineté retrouvée en matière de médicaments en Europe, notre certaine impréparation et manque de vision, aussi j'en viens donc directement au thème de notre débat: les traitements et les vaccins.

Pour commencer, *Discovery*, on n'en a pas encore beaucoup parlé jusqu'ici. *Discovery*, cet essai qui devait tester quatre pistes, quatre bras de médicaments, lancé le 22 mars à cor et à cri, en principe pour 3 200 patients européens et qui se retrouve aujourd'hui de facto rétréci à, je crois, 700 patients français et un seul patient luxembourgeois, selon mes informations. Je voudrais connaître les raisons de cette désaffection et j'use d'un euphémisme. Certains chercheurs à qui j'ai parlé m'ont parlé de critères européens trop rigoureux pour les tests, notamment de prix trop élevés. Je trouve assez navrant de voir des États membres de chez nous se tourner plutôt vers *Solidarity*, l'étude parallèle lancée par l'OMS.

Pour ce qui est des vaccins, 157 projets selon la *London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine*, dont 11 déjà au stade des essais cliniques. Une question se pose, elle est cruciale: qu'est-ce qu'on fait s'il est découvert aux États-Unis, en Chine ou ailleurs?

J'ai écouté vos explications, Monsieur le Commissaire, je lis la presse aussi, il y a des démentis, mais il y a des grandes manœuvres entre les grands labos et les grandes puissances, pouvez-vous rassurer les Européens sur l'accès et la disponibilité?

Herve Juvin (ID). – Madame la Présidente, nous approuvons l'allocation de moyens étendus à la recherche pharmaceutique et médicale. Cependant, nous nous inquiétons de la privatisation accélérée de la santé et de la vie en cours de constitution par un certain nombre de grands oligopoles mondiaux.

C'est pourquoi nous attirons l'attention de la Commission sur le fait qu'il est nécessaire de financer une recherche indépendante, universitaire ou publique, face à la concentration de la recherche dans les mains de grands industriels de la pharmacie.

Nous attirons l'attention de la Commission sur la nécessité d'assurer un modèle de prix à même de favoriser relocalisation et l'autonomie de nos industries pharmaceutiques et médicales et d'assurer l'accès de tous à ce bien commun qu'est la santé.

Enfin, nous mettons en garde la Commission contre les dérives de la brevetabilité du vivant qui est en train d'assurer des rentes indues à des industriels capables de stériliser la recherche, capables d'exclure du champ des prescriptions des médicaments reconnus, utilisés depuis des décennies, et qui, enfin, sont en train, à la faveur de la pandémie, d'assurer des bénéfices manifestement indus à l'oligopole pharmaceutique mondial.

Anna Cavazzini (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Der Zugang zur Medizin rettet Leben. Wollen wir, dass nur diejenigen Zugang zu Corona-Impfstoff und Medizin haben, die es sich leisten können – hier in Europa und der ganzen Welt? Wollen wir, dass afrikanische Staaten keine eigenen Beatmungsgeräte herstellen können, weil sie gegen Patentrecht verstoßen? Nein, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, das können wir doch nicht wollen! Die EU muss sicherstellen, dass alle Menschen überall Zugang zu lebenswichtiger Technologie, Medizin und einem zukünftigen Impfstoff haben.

Damit das nicht nur eine leere Wunschformel bleibt, sind ganz konkrete Schritte notwendig. Die EU-Mitgliedstaaten müssen über Zwangslizenzen einen öffentlichen Zugang zu Medizin und Impfstoffen für alle garantieren. Das haben heute schon wirklich viele Kolleginnen und Kollegen angesprochen. Die EU muss die Flexibilitäten im Handelsrecht nutzen und möglich machen, dass unter Zwangslizenzen produzierte Medizin importiert und weltweit gehandelt werden kann. Dazu brauchen wir ein klares und deutliches Statement von der Kommission, Herr Schinas.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, *we are in this together*. Lassen Sie uns heute ein starkes Signal vom Plenum aussenden, dass wir die gesamte Gesellschaft und die ganze Welt im Blick haben – und nicht nur die, die es sich leisten können!

Helmut Geuking (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte als Erstes einmal betonen: Auch wenn die Kommission sagt, wir müssen krisenresistent werden, wird es eine Krisenresistenz nie geben. Es ist nicht die erste Pandemie, die wir erleben, und es wird auch nicht die letzte Pandemie sein, die wir erleben.

Ich möchte allerdings betonen, dass ich sehr wohl zufrieden bin und es sehr positiv finde, dass wir mittlerweile weltweit 123 Impfprojekte haben, die bereits in einer Erprobungsphase sind, wo man sonst erst in zehn, elf Jahren wäre. Das heißt, diese Verfahren sind enorm verkürzt worden, und das lässt hoffen, dass wir im nächsten Jahr dann wahrscheinlich den ersten Impfstoff weltweit zur Verfügung haben werden, um den Menschen direkt zu helfen.

Ja, es muss unsere Aufgabe hier im Europäischen Parlament sein, diesbezüglich auch Rahmenbedingungen festzulegen: Wer bekommt den Impfstoff, wann, zu welcher Zeit, zu welchem Preis? Es ist selbstverständlich, dass jeder Mensch – das gehört zur öffentlichen Daseinsvorsorge – dass jeder Mensch Europas und – da hat die Vorrednerin vollkommen recht – natürlich weltweit dazu Zugang haben muss. Wir müssen einen Rahmen gestalten: Wo fangen wir an, wo hören wir auf und wie schnell kann man produzieren? Hinzu kommt, wir müssen Produktionsstätten nach Europa holen, gerade auf dem Medikamentensektor.

Gesundheitspolitik ist keine Europapolitik, und es wird Zeit, dass wir das zur Europapolitik machen. Dafür haben jetzt 21 Abgeordnete ein Manifest quasi unterschrieben, die jetzt im Interesse der Bürger und der Menschen Europas fraktionsübergreifend zusammenarbeiten wollen, um die Gesundheitspolitik europaweit voranzubringen. Darüber bin ich sehr glücklich und sehr stolz und sage den Abgeordneten: Vielen Dank, dass Sie hier mitmachen, und das werden wir noch mit Leben füllen. Ich bitte die Kommission, hier in Europa eine Institution zu schaffen, die dem auch gerecht wird.

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, we're talking about addressing symptoms and not causes. The way we produce meat today, with thousands of genetically identical chickens and pigs stuck in massive factories – natural selection, an ecosystem service that provides real-time disease protection, is more, now, effectively a thing of the past. If we do not address industrialised livestock production, we are sure to have bigger and more lethal epidemics than this one. And we cannot win the fight against COVID-19 and future infectious diseases unless we properly fund a public sector that values public health over profit.

A health service should not be a business opportunity for big pharma in a health crisis. The chief executive of the French pharmaceutical giant Sanofi said yesterday that they can deliver a vaccine to the Americans, who want to get it first, because they get more funding. This is a company that's subsidised by the French people. This is a company that distributed EUR 4 billion to its shareholders during the pandemic. The COVID-19 global response framework was announced on 4 May. What conditions will be attached to the fund? At the very least, public investment in a COVID-19 vaccine and the therapeutic development should come with hard conditionalities attached, including real equitable public access, non-exclusive licensing, and an affordable pricing model. But even attaching these conditionalities would not deal with the root of the problem. We need to de-commodify vaccines and therapeutics. We should nationalise pharmaceutical companies, and we should do it now.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Madame la Présidente, gouvernements, entreprises, comités scientifiques, tout le monde est en course pour développer le plus vite possible un vaccin contre la COVID-19.

Mais l'important n'est pas seulement de mettre tout en oeuvre maintenant pour accélérer ce développement, il est aussi de se demander si certaines choses n'ont pas été qui nous auraient permis de raccourcir considérablement le temps de recherche. Un exemple: les recherches précédentes pour les vaccins contre le SRAS et le MERS ont été arrêtées durant la première phase. Si les phases 2 et 3 avaient été menées à leur terme, une partie du travail pour découvrir le vaccin de la COVID-19 aurait déjà été effectué aujourd'hui et nous aurions gagné un temps vital.

Existe-t-il des recherches utiles sur les futures menaces pour la santé qui ne sont pas menées aujourd'hui par manque d'intérêt commercial, parce que dans ce cas, le devoir des institutions publiques est de fournir les moyens et les ressources pour que ces recherches puissent être menées à bien. Apprenons de cette crise sanitaire, anticipons, faisons tout ce qui est possible pour protéger la santé des citoyens que nous représentons.

Roberta Metsola (PPE). – Sinjura President, kull deċiżjoni li tittiehed fl-Unjoni Ewropea għandu jkollha bħala l-qofol tagħha s-solidarjetà. Ahna nafu li meta nkunu flimkien, spalla ma' spalla, inkunu aktar b'saħħitna biex nirbhu din l-isfida. Diġà hdimna u qbilna biex f'dawn iż-żminijiet ta' kriżi jkun hemm xiri flimkien – *joint procurement* – tal-ventilators u htigijiet oħra. Eżempju ċar tas-solidarjetà fil-prattika. Dan kien biss l-ewwel pass. Il-*joint procurement* għandu jsir ukoll għal meta l-vaċċin kontra l-COVID-19 ikun fis-suq. Ejjew nuru l-impenn politiku tagħna li se naghmlu dan minn issa.

U għalhekk irridu nissigillaw il-ftehim fl-Unjoni Ewropea issa biex ix-xiri tal-vaċċin isir flimkien. Biex nikkontrollaw it-tixrid tal-virus u nsalvaw il-hajjiet m'għandux ikun hemm kompetizzjoni. Hu biss meta dan ikun disponibbli għal kulhadd, f'kull Pajjiż Membru, li nkunu nistgħu nibdew nitkellmu bis-serjetà dwar kif se nirritornaw għan-normalità fil-hin, b'mod tangibbli u b'hila.

Naf li l-Ministru tas-Saħħa Malti qed jahdem ukoll favur dan fil-Kunsill. Din hi pożizzjoni li qed nahdmu ahna wkoll favur tagħha u għandha ssib qbil minn kulhadd.

Biex nikkonkludi, in-nies jistennew li l-istituzzjonijiet Ewropej jagħtu direzzjoni; joffru sens ta' tmexxija li tagħtihom serhan il-mohh. Flimkien nistgħu nipprovdha u nagħtuha bid-deċiżjonijiet u bl-azzjonijiet tagħna.

Ismail Ertug (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner, yesterday we thanked the heroes – the doctors and nurses, the truck drivers and the parents – but colleagues, I just want to ask us all: to what extent do we protect the healthcare workers in the European Union? Is the level of health care enough? This is an issue I want to raise with the Member States as well. We have to raise this issue, and I urge the Commission to come up with a directive where we deal with the level of the healthcare workers as well. And I want to say, I prefer to bite the bullet of social distancing on the beach rather than see people suffering from this crisis.

Andreas Glück (Renew). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, wert Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Europäische Union nimmt eine führende Rolle bei der Erforschung von Impfstoffen und Therapeutika wahr.

Erstens: Diese Anstrengungen müssen auch in Zukunft fortgesetzt werden.

Zweitens: Die Zulassung von Medikamenten muss schneller passieren können. Wir wollen hier keine Kompromisse bei der Patientensicherheit, aber wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass Medikamente schneller beim Patienten ankommen.

Drittens: Selbst bei gängigen Medikamenten ist es so, dass wir weltweit nur zwei, vielleicht drei Produktionslinien haben. Hier ist es unrealistisch, dass wir die ganze Produktion wieder nach Europa bekommen, aber wir brauchen zumindest eine Diversifizierung in der Produktion.

Die Tatsache übrigens – und jetzt möchte ich noch kurz auf den Kollegen der PPE, Herrn Liese, eingehen –, dass unsere Grundfreiheiten eingeschränkt werden, zeigt, dass das Gute, das die Europäische Union mit sich bringt, nicht für selbstverständlich gelten kann. Wir müssen jeden Tag dafür arbeiten. Wichtig ist mir dabei nur, dass diejenigen argumentieren müssen, die Grundfreiheiten einschränken, und die Beweislast nicht bei denen liegt, die Grundfreiheiten leben möchten.

Jeder Mitgliedstaat der EU ist zu klein, um eine wirtschaftlich wichtige Rolle in der Welt zu spielen. Und jeder EU-Mitgliedsstaat ist zu klein, um auch einen richtigen Beitrag zur Lösung des Corona-Problems leisten zu können.

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Kommissar Schinas hat ausgeführt, wie effizient und – natürlich in toto – großartig die EU auf die Corona-Krise reagiert habe. Wie alle seine Äußerungen liegt diese Behauptung irgendwo zwischen Selbstbetrug, Selbstüberschätzung und Fake News. Ein richtiges Parlament würde ihm dies auch nicht durchgehen lassen. Es würde reden über den völligen Mangel der medizinischen Vorbereitung innerhalb der EU auf die Corona-Krise, es würde reden über die komplett fehlende Koordinierung der EU-Länder bei der Bekämpfung der Corona-Pandemie, und vor allem würde ein richtiges Parlament über das Totalversagen von Leuten wie Herrn Schinas und Frau von der Leyen und der gesamten Kommission reden. Und ein richtiger Parlamentspräsident würde diese Themen auch auf die Tagesordnung setzen und nicht über Polen, Ungarn oder – hier jetzt eben – Impfstoffe reden. Aber wir haben eben kein

richtiges Parlament, und wir haben leider auch keinen richtigen Parlamentspräsidenten.

Pär Holmgren (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman! Det är givetvis otroligt viktigt nu att vi får fram ett säkert vaccin. Vi vet att det kommer ta tid, antagligen många år, och också att det blir stora kostnader för forskning, tillverkning och även spridning. Det mesta av de här kostnaderna förväntas täckas av statlig finansiering som ska gå till att finansiera forskning hos stora multinationella företag. De här pengarna kommer utan tillräckligt tydliga villkor och krav, när det gäller till exempel immateriella rättigheter.

EU har lovat att bidra med tio miljarder kronor. Det är bra. Men för det första så kan vi inte mer eller mindre ge bort tio miljarder kronor utan att säkra en rättvis tillgång till både patent och vaccin. Om världen nu gemensamt ska finansiera framtagandet av ett vaccin, så ska världen också ha fri tillgång till patent för licenstillverkning av vaccin. Och för det andra så gäller försiktighetsprincipen – vi får inte göra om samma misstag som när vi stressade fram ett vaccin mot svininfluensan, och bara i Sverige fick 500 personer lida av det.

Fulvio Martusciello (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, tutto il mondo aspetta il vaccino: ma pensiamo a quello che è accaduto per l'AIDS, ai tempi che ci sono voluti per tentare di averlo, e ancora non l'abbiamo. E allora dobbiamo imparare dagli errori, dobbiamo imparare da quello che è accaduto.

L'Europa si è trovata totalmente impreparata ad affrontare questa pandemia. Mentre avanzava in Cina, l'Europa ha scoperto di non avere fabbriche che producevano mascherine, perché il lavoro attorno a quelle mascherine non era remunerativo e conveniva produrle in Cina, e poi ha scoperto di non avere i guanti, che si producono solo a Taiwan o in Malesia. E ancora ha scoperto che la produzione dell'alcol era contingentata. Una serie di errori che ci ha fatto trovare totalmente scoperti.

Questo virus è stato terribile, ha squarciato completamente le nostre vite. Vedete, per chi è cristiano e cattolico, come me, è un'esperienza terribile non poter dire addio a un proprio caro personalmente, ma doverlo dire in videoconferenza.

E allora ci rendiamo conto che questo virus va combattuto, e va combattuto con la solidarietà che l'Europa deve ritrovare e soprattutto capendo che non ci può essere né nord né sud, ma l'Europa deve essere unita e solidale.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Fru formand! Tak for det, og også tak for denne diskussion og fremlæggelse fra Kommissionen af de tiltag, der har været foretaget på nuværende tidspunkt. Jeg synes allerede nu, vi har lært en hel masse af coronakrisen. Først og fremmest er det utrolig vigtigt, at vi i samarbejde lærer mere om den her sygdom, og også i samarbejde gør en indsats for at finde ud af, hvordan vi kurerer, og hvordan vi vaccinerer. Det har vi fået en masse at vide om, og det er rigtig godt. Men derudover tror jeg også, at det er vigtigt, at det næste skridt håndteres på den måde, at vi lærer af, at vi ikke må være afhængige af verden uden for EU. Vi har simpelthen brug for at sikre, at vi også på europæisk plan får produceret værnemidler, får produceret vigtig medicin og selvfølgelig også får produceret vaccinen, når den på et tidspunkt er klar. Vi skal gøre det ved, at vi samarbejder, at vi finansierer det sammen og koordinerer det meget bedre på tværs af medlemslandene, end vi har gjort op til coronakrisen. Så signalet er, at vi kun løser det her sammen, hvis vi samarbejder, men også beskytter os i Europa sammen.

Margaritis Schinas, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you for this very useful debate. I identified two families of issues from your statements. One – let's call it the quest for resilience – and the other one is what happens once we have the vaccine? How do we make sure that we avoid the problems that we saw in the early stage about access to the distribution of personal protective equipment?

Let me start on the quest for resilience. There is no doubt whatsoever that Europe has to draw the lessons of this pandemic. It's evident, it's written on the wall. This is something that society will impose on all policy-making at all levels.

As far as the quest for resilience at the EU level is concerned, let me repeat what I said earlier. We have to bridge this asymmetry of expectations between what Europeans want from Europe in areas where Europe has nothing in terms of legal competence. This is a major issue. This contaminates public opinion and projects Europe in a negative light. I really hope that this will be, together with my colleagues, one of our main lines of action in the months and years to come.

Also on the quest for resilience, we have to make sure that the recovery initiative sheds light and reinforces a self-standing health problem that is able to perform not only under regular, normal circumstances, but is also designed to face up to major sanitary crises and pandemics. This is also a major challenge in front of us.

Finally, many of you also raised the issues of production, back to the EU, pricing, strategical autonomy, the place of Europe in the world and geopolitics. When it comes to pharmaceuticals and all these questions, I want to assure that they will be addressed in our pharmaceutical strategy communication, which I will be presenting to you, together with Commissioner Kyriakides, later this year.

Let me now come to – and finish – the other cluster of issues of concern to you, which is what happens once we have the vaccine, how we make sure that access is fair, equitable and widespread distribution is available to all Europeans and the rest of the world. I think there are three options for us, a three-point strategy that will allow us to act effectively in this respect.

First, we need to ensure immediate access to vaccine supplies. For this, we do have instruments to be deployed, namely we can create an EU stockpile of vaccines, serving as an immediate response through the European Union Civil Protection Mechanism, we can organise an EU joint procurement scheme, which will be secure purchase commitments in a stable framework, and the Commission could also procure directly, on behalf of Member States, vaccines making use of the Emergency Support Instrument. This was about immediate actions.

Second, regarding secure production, we are already in close contact with industry and we are exploring together with them concrete measures such as public-private partnerships to increase manufacturing capacity or to advance purchase agreements to ensure production.

Thirdly, delivery. In the beginning we might need some prioritisation. This is precisely the objective of the European immunisation strategy that I was referring to in my opening statement. Such an immunisation strategy could set priority strands for certain segments of the population, but we will also need to ensure access worldwide because, as long as the virus exists, no one is safe.

This is again precisely the purpose of our global leadership in the framework of the pledging conference that should not end on 23 May, when we have this critical mass of financing to speed up the production of vaccines. But we will also have a role, after 23 May, to make sure that the rest of the world and especially those parts of the world that have more vulnerable health systems, like Africa or Latin America, will not be left out of this development.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I wish to thank you for this important debate. We have one common goal around the world and that is to defeat the virus. As the Commissioner said, no country is able to defeat the COVID-19 pandemic alone.

There is only one way to defeat it, namely with a combination of prevention through vaccination and treatment of people who have fallen ill. Unfortunately, we still have to wait for treatments and vaccines to be found. The European Union has mobilised important resources and it is fully involved in a coordinated global effort to develop, produce and employ vaccines and treatments for all.

A positive dynamic has developed with the launching of the Coronavirus Global Response Pledging effort. The European Union is fully committed to support Member States' efforts within and outside the Union. We know that we can now count on the cooperation of all EU institutions in this endeavour. In particular, we hope we can coordinate with the European Parliament.

Until an efficient, accessible, affordable vaccine is developed, it is important that we continue respecting the epidemiological measures to protect all our loved ones.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE), *in writing*. – COVID-19 has proven one more time that vaccination represents one of the most powerful and cost-effective public health measure. The entire world is currently waiting for the development and deployment of a vaccine anti COVID-19, in order to return to the daily routine before the pandemic. We have at the moment more than 100 COVID19 vaccine development projects worldwide, 8 of them are already in clinical trial phase, of which 3 are supported by Horizon 2020. Once developed, it is important to ensure swift authorisation by our trusted partner, the European Medicine Agency and work in close collaboration with European pharma sector to provide the necessary production capacity. With great concern, I want to remind you that EU is the region of the world with the lowest confidence in the safety and effectiveness of vaccines. One of the strongest drivers for vaccine hesitancy are misunderstandings about the benefits and risks of vaccines, the severity of vaccine preventable infectious diseases and the fear of potential side effects derived from misleading information. Consequently, I stress the ongoing need to reinforce our actions, together with the Commission, Member States, EMA and ECDC to tackle vaccine hesitancy, improve vaccination coverage, promote sustainable vaccination policies, and contribute eventually to European and global health.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR), *por escrito*. – No es la primera vez que nos enfrentamos a escasez de bienes a nivel internacional: hoy son los medicamentos, mañana lo será la vacuna. Sabemos que una justa distribución de los mismos no solo garantizará la salud, también puede evitar una dramática fricción entre países. Algo que, desgraciadamente, ya ha ocurrido dentro de la UE, poniendo en entredicho esta institución.

Es momento de aunar esfuerzos, de acuerdos entre países. Pedimos a la Comisión que asuma su rol de coordinar a los Estados miembros, priorizando lo imprescindible y olvidándose de proclamas ideológicas que solo materializan rencores y acentúan la división. Debemos anticiparnos a los problemas sanitarios, necesitamos una distribución justa basada en las necesidades de los pacientes, en la demanda real, no en previsiones de almacenaje. Ante la escasez, dar prioridad a los más necesitados. Cuando llegue la vacuna, será imprescindible claridad en este sentido.

Solicitamos al ECDC que comparta información sobre la situación de cada país: resultados de test, protocolos de tratamientos, conclusiones... Información imprescindible para poder planificar la producción, orientar a la industria de cara a un posible rebrote, y que la improvisación no permita una distribución injusta de los medicamentos más eficaces o de la muy esperada vacuna.

Cindy Franssen (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – Ondanks het feit dat steeds meer lidstaten gelukkig een geleidelijke versoepeling van de coronamaatregelen kunnen doorvoeren, wordt het ook steeds duidelijker dat een behandeling of een vaccin tegen het virus onontbeerlijk blijft. De Europese Unie speelt terecht een voortrekkersrol in de internationale samenwerking in de zoektocht naar dit vaccin. Getuige daarvan onder meer de succesvolle donorconferentie van 4 mei, waar wereldwijd 7,4 miljard euro werd opgehaald. Verdere samenwerking over de grenzen heen zal nodig zijn.

Wanneer er echter een vaccin of een behandeling gevonden wordt, zal het eveneens essentieel zijn om ook een gelijke toegang voor alle burgers te verzekeren. We mogen niet toelaten dat de grote privébedrijven door middel van patenten woekerwinsten boeken met een vaccin waar de hele wereld naar snakt, en waarvoor miljarden euro's aan publieke onderzoeksfondsen zijn ingezet. Onderzoek dat met publieke middelen gefinancierd werd, moet ook in het publieke domein beschikbaar blijven. Het vaccin moet veilig, betaalbaar en universeel toegankelijk zijn. Voor mij is dit klaar en duidelijk, het is onze sociale plicht. Elke burger, in de EU en daarbuiten, heeft recht op een gelijke toegang. Dit kan enkel door internationale samenwerking, met landen, bedrijven, ngo's, universiteiten en andere onderzoeksinstituten.

András Gyürk (PPE), *írásban*. – A koronavírus-járvány terjedése az európai polgárok áldozatvállalásának és a tagállami kormányok megfelelő intézkedéseinek köszönhetően lassulni látszik. A pandémia végleges legyőzéséhez azonban tudományos áttörésre is szükség van a célzott védőoltás és terápia kidolgozásában. Fontos, hogy a vakcina és a kezelések egyetemesen hozzáférhetővé váljanak, hiszen ezt a válságot csak közös erővel tudjuk legyőzni. A megfelelő oltóanyag megtalálásához együttműködésre van szükség mind uniós, mind globális szinten. Fontos lépésnek tartom a Bizottság által kezdeményezett „Globális fellépés a koronavírus ellen” donorrendezvényt, amin az összegyűlt 7,4 milliárd euró értékű adomány szilárd alapot jelent a vonatkozó kutatások finanszírozásához.

Azonban további és nagyobb mértékű támogatásra van szükség az uniós kutatás-fejlesztés eredményeinek javításához. Hasonló együttgondolkodás és cselekvés kell a célzott terápia kidolgozásához is. Üdvözlöm, hogy az innovatív gyógyszeres kutatására irányuló kezdeményezés első pályázati fordulója eredményesen zárult. További pénzügyi eszközök biztosításával kell támogatni a köz- és a magánszféra szakértelmét és erőforrásait a vírus elleni küzdelemben. Végül érdemes számba venni a tagállami jó gyakorlatokat is. Egy ilyen jó példa Magyarország, mely egy nemzeti tudományos konzorcium által kidolgozott, innovatív vérplazma-kezeléssel és gyógyszerterápiával emberéleteket tud megmenteni. Az oltóanyag általános hozzáféréseinek biztosítása érdekében pedig Magyarország a Nemzeti Oltóanyaggyár létrehozását kezdeményezte.

César Luena (S&D), por escrito. – El desarrollo de nuevas vacunas y terapias para la enfermedad COVID-19 es crítico para Europa y también para sus socios más vulnerables como África, ya que ningún país puede superar esta pandemia individualmente. La cooperación internacional presenta un valor añadido y permite atajar bloqueos y anticiparse a posible escasez de medicamentos y productos. Globalmente se está acelerando su desarrollo y se está apoyando la investigación e innovación. Necesitamos una acción coordinada global para conseguir acciones innovativas y lanzar un mensaje de unidad y solidaridad.

Actualmente hay ocho vacunas en ensayos clínicos en humanos, de las cuales tres reciben financiación europea a través de Horizonte 2020. La Agencia Europea del Medicamento también ha escalado sus acciones frente a esta pandemia, coordinando una red europea para ensayos clínicos, proporcionando asesoramiento científico gratuito y aunando datos sobre tratamientos que, aunque requieren más ensayos, han recibido mucha publicidad como la hidroxiclороquina y el remdesivir.

Además, una vez se desarrollen nuevos tratamientos y vacunas, necesitamos un acceso rápido, igualitario, con precios justos, y que estén accesibles en todo el mundo, para lo que el mecanismo de adquisición conjunta puesto en marcha por la UE cobrará especial relevancia y debe reforzarse, involucrando a todas las partes responsables.

Cristina Maestre Martín De Almagro (S&D), por escrito. – Desde el inicio de la crisis sanitaria, ha quedado claro que ningún país puede combatir la pandemia solo. Las medidas de contención han demostrado ser efectivas hasta el momento para disminuir la propagación del virus, pero no lo erradicarán. Para esto se necesita acción coordinada adicional en tres áreas: diagnóstico temprano; tratamientos específicos para los enfermos; y una vacuna que asegure la inmunización.

Es necesario que el trabajo de los Estados y las instituciones de la UE esté coordinado para buscar una vacuna y tratamiento eficaz para hacer frente al coronavirus. Debemos implicar también al sector privado y al sector público. La Conferencia Internacional de Donantes organizada por la Comisión fue un buen ejemplo, con más de 7 400 millones de euros recaudados.

Es necesario enviar un mensaje fuerte sobre la necesidad de tener una futura vacuna con un acceso universal, gratuito, justo, igualitario y que sea rápido. A nivel europeo, el mecanismo de adquisición conjunta es la herramienta para asegurarlo.

Por último, la UE debe liderar a nivel global ese acceso universal y gratuito a la futura vacuna y tratamientos. La vacuna no puede ser una nueva fuente de desigualdad, tampoco debe utilizarse como instrumento de competición geopolítica. Es necesario cooperar, donde algunos quieren competir.

Adriana Maldonado López (S&D), por escrito. – Desde el inicio de la crisis sanitaria, ha quedado claro que ningún país puede combatir la pandemia solo. Las medidas de contención han demostrado ser efectivas hasta el momento para disminuir la propagación del virus, pero no lo erradicarán. Para esto se necesita acción coordinada adicional en tres áreas: diagnóstico temprano; tratamientos específicos para los enfermos y una vacuna que asegure la inmunización.

Es necesario que el trabajo de los Estados miembros y las instituciones de la UE esté coordinado para buscar una vacuna y tratamiento eficaz para hacer frente al coronavirus. No solo debemos aunar esfuerzos entre Estados e instituciones europeas, sino también entre el sector privado y el sector público.

Es necesario enviar un mensaje fuerte sobre la necesidad de tener una futura vacuna con un acceso universal, gratuito, justo, igualitario y que sea rápido. A nivel europeo, el mecanismo de adquisición conjunta es la herramienta para asegurar que así sea.

Por último, la UE debe liderar a nivel global ese acceso universal y gratuito a la futura vacuna y tratamientos. La vacuna no puede ser una nueva fuente de desigualdad, tampoco debe utilizarse como instrumento de competición geopolítica. Es necesario cooperar, donde algunos quieren competir.

Inma Rodríguez-Piñero (S&D), por escrito. – Desde el inicio de la crisis sanitaria, ha quedado claro que ningún país puede combatir la pandemia solo. Las medidas de contención han demostrado ser efectivas hasta el momento para disminuir la propagación del virus, pero no lo erradicarán. Para esto se necesita acción coordinada adicional en tres áreas: diagnóstico temprano; tratamientos específicos para los enfermos; y una vacuna que asegure la inmunización.

Es necesario que el trabajo de los Estados y las instituciones de la UE esté coordinado para buscar una vacuna y tratamiento eficaz para hacer frente al coronavirus. Además, no solo debemos aunar esfuerzos entre Estados e instituciones europeas, sino también al sector privado y al sector público. La Conferencia Internacional de Donantes organizada por la Comisión fue un buen ejemplo, con más de 7 400 millones de euros recaudados.

Es necesario enviar un mensaje fuerte sobre la necesidad de tener una futura vacuna con un acceso universal, gratuito, justo, igualitario y que sea rápido. A nivel europeo, el mecanismo de adquisición conjunta es la herramienta para asegurarlo.

Por último, la UE debe liderar a nivel global ese acceso universal y gratuito a la futura vacuna y tratamientos. La vacuna no puede ser una nueva fuente de desigualdad.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D), por escrito. – Desde el inicio de la crisis sanitaria, ha quedado claro que ningún país puede combatir la pandemia solo. Las medidas de contención han demostrado ser efectivas para disminuir la propagación del virus, pero no lo erradicarán. Para ello se necesita acción coordinada de la Unión y los Estados miembros en tres áreas: diagnóstico temprano; tratamientos específicos y una vacuna que garantice la inmunización.

Además, no solo debemos aunar esfuerzos entre Estados e instituciones europeas, sino también desde el sector privado y el sector público. La Conferencia Internacional de Donantes organizada por la Comisión Europea fue un buen ejemplo y consiguió recaudar más de 7 400 millones EUR de forma conjunta.

Pero es necesario enviar un mensaje sobre la necesidad de tener una futura vacuna con un acceso universal, gratuito, justo, igualitario y que sea rápido. A nivel europeo, el mecanismo de adquisición conjunta es la herramienta para asegurar que sea así.

Por último, la UE debe liderar a nivel global ese acceso universal y gratuito a la futura vacuna y a los tratamientos que se consigan. La vacuna no puede ser una nueva fuente de desigualdad y tampoco debe utilizarse como instrumento de competición geopolítica. Es necesario cooperar, donde algunos quieren competir.

Nacho Sánchez Amor (S&D), por escrito. – Desde el inicio de la crisis sanitaria, ha quedado claro que ningún país puede combatir la pandemia solo. Las medidas de contención han demostrado ser efectivas para disminuir la propagación del virus, pero no lo erradicarán. Para esto se necesita acción coordinada adicional en tres áreas: diagnóstico temprano, tratamientos específicos para los enfermos y una vacuna que asegure la inmunización.

En este sentido, es necesario que el trabajo de los Estados miembros y las instituciones de la UE esté coordinado para buscar una vacuna y tratamiento eficaz para hacer frente al coronavirus. También el sector privado y el sector público. La Conferencia Internacional de Donantes organizada por la Comisión Europea fue un buen ejemplo del camino a seguir, con más de 7 400 millones de euros recaudados de forma conjunta.

Pero es necesario enviar un mensaje fuerte sobre la necesidad de tener una futura vacuna con un acceso universal, gratuito, justo, igualitario y que sea rápido.

Por último, la UE debe liderar a nivel global ese acceso universal y gratuito a la futura vacuna y tratamientos. La vacuna no puede ser una nueva fuente de desigualdad, tampoco debe utilizarse como instrumento de competición geopolítica.

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.37 Uhr unterbrochen)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO*Vicepresidente***14. Ripresa della seduta***(La seduta è ripresa alle 17.18)***15. Rettifica (articolo 241 del regolamento) (seguito dato): vedasi processo verbale****16. Composizione delle commissioni e delle delegazioni : vedasi processo verbale****17. Comunicazione dei risultati della votazione**

Presidente. – Annuncio quindi, onorevoli colleghi, anche i risultati del secondo turno di votazioni, che sono i seguenti:

Risoluzioni sul discarico 2018 — Votazioni finali:

Impresa comune Celle a combustibile e a idrogeno 2 - approvata.

Impresa comune Clean Sky 2 - approvata.

Impresa comune Bioindustrie – approvata.

Autorità europea delle assicurazioni e delle pensioni aziendali e professionali – approvata.

Impresa comune ECSEL – approvata.

Impresa comune Iniziativa in materia di medicinali innovativi 2 - approvata.

Impresa comune Shift2Rail – approvata.

Agenzia europea dell'ambiente – approvata.

Agenzia dell'Unione europea per le ferrovie – approvata.

Agenzia europea per la sicurezza marittima – approvata.

Agenzia del GNSS europeo – approvata.

Osservatorio europeo delle droghe e delle tossicodipendenze – approvata.

Agenzia europea per la sicurezza aerea – approvata.

Ufficio europeo di sostegno per l'asilo – approvata.

Parlamento europeo – approvata.

Corte di giustizia – approvata.

Mediatore europeo – approvata.

Garante europeo della protezione dei dati – approvata.

Corte dei conti – approvata.

Centro di traduzione degli organismi dell'Unione europea – approvata.

Consiglio europeo e Consiglio – approvata.

Agenzia dell'Unione europea per la sicurezza delle reti e dell'informazione (ENISA) - approvata.

Centro europeo per lo sviluppo della formazione professionale – approvata.

Agenzia europea di controllo della pesca – approvata.

Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna – approvata.

Impresa comune SESAR – approvata.

Fondazione europea per la formazione – approvata.

Eurojust – approvata.

Impresa comune europea per il progetto ITER e lo sviluppo dell'energia da fusione – approvata.

Agenzia di sostegno al BERC – approvata.

Fondazione europea per il miglioramento delle condizioni di vita e di lavoro – approvata.

Agenzia per la cooperazione fra i regolatori nazionali dell'energia – approvata.

Agenzia dell'Unione europea per la gestione operativa dei sistemi IT su larga scala nello spazio di libertà, sicurezza e giustizia (eu-LISA) - approvata.

Istituto europeo di innovazione e tecnologia – approvata.

Agenzia di approvvigionamento dell'Euratom – approvata.

Ottavo, nono, decimo e undicesimo Fondo europeo di sviluppo – approvata.

Istituto europeo per l'uguaglianza di genere – approvata.

Autorità europea degli strumenti finanziari e dei mercati – approvata.

Autorità bancaria europea – approvata.

Agenzia dell'Unione europea per la formazione delle autorità di contrasto – approvata.

Agenzia europea per la sicurezza e la salute sul lavoro – approvata.

Agenzia europea per le sostanze chimiche – approvata.

Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie – approvata.

Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare – approvata.

Commissione e agenzie esecutive – approvata.

Agenzia dell'Unione europea per i diritti fondamentali – approvata.

Comitato delle regioni – approvata.

Agenzia europea della guardia di frontiera e costiera – approvata.

Agenzia dell'Unione europea per la cooperazione nell'attività di contrasto (Europol) - approvata.

Agenzia europea per i medicinali – approvata.

Comitato economico e sociale europeo – approvata.

Prestazioni, gestione finanziaria e controllo delle agenzie dell'UE – approvata.

Passiamo ora ai risultati sullo stato di previsione delle entrate e delle spese del Parlamento per l'esercizio 2021:

emendamento 11: respinto

emendamento 2: respinto

emendamento 3: respinto

paragrafo 10: approvato

paragrafo 11, testo originale: approvato

emendamento 4: respinto

emendamento 5: respinto

emendamento 6: respinto

emendamento 7: respinto

emendamento 8: respinto

paragrafo 30, testo originale: approvato

emendamento 9: respinto

emendamento 1: respinto

paragrafo 40, testo originale: approvato

emendamento 10: respinto

emendamento 12: approvato.

Da ultimo, misure temporanee riguardanti le assemblee generali delle società europee (SE) e delle società cooperative europee (SCE): la procedura di approvazione è approvata.

18. Terzo turno di votazioni

Presidente. – Passiamo ora al terzo turno di votazioni.

Procederemo alle votazioni su emendamenti alla proposta di risoluzione confermata sul nuovo QFP, le risorse proprie e il piano di ripresa e alla votazione finale sullo stato di previsione delle entrate e delle spese per l'esercizio 2021 — sezione I – Parlamento europeo.

Il terzo turno di votazioni sarà aperto dalle ore 17.30 fino alle ore 18.45. Avete tempo quindi fino alle 18.45 per effettuare l'operazione di voto.

I risultati del terzo turno di votazioni saranno comunicati alle ore 21.00.

(La seduta è sospesa alle 17.24)

19. Ripresa della seduta

(La seduta è ripresa alle 21.00)

20. Comunicazione dei risultati della votazione

Presidente. – I risultati del terzo turno di votazioni per oggi sono i seguenti:

Stato di previsione delle entrate e delle spese del Parlamento per l'esercizio 2021, votazione finale: approvato.

Emendamenti alla proposta di risoluzione confermata sul nuovo QFP, le risorse proprie e il piano di ripresa:

emendamento 1: respinto

emendamento 2: respinto

emendamento 3: respinto

paragrafo 9, testo originale: approvato

paragrafo 10, testo originale: approvato

paragrafo 11, testo originale: approvato

paragrafo 12 in due parti: prima parte: approvata; seconda parte: approvata

paragrafo 16 in due parti: prima parte: approvata; seconda parte: approvata

paragrafo 22 in due parti: prima parte: approvata; seconda parte: approvata

emendamento 4: respinto.

21. Dichiarazioni di voto: vedasi processo verbale

22. Correzioni e intenzioni di voto: vedasi processo verbale

23. Presentazione di documenti: vedasi processo verbale

24. Storni di stanziamenti e decisioni di bilancio: vedasi processo verbale

25. Ordine del giorno della prossima seduta: vedasi processo verbale

26. Chiusura della seduta

(La seduta è tolta alle 21.02)

Significato dei simboli utilizzati

*	procedura di consultazione
***	procedura di approvazione
***I	procedura legislativa ordinaria, prima lettura
***II	procedura legislativa ordinaria, seconda lettura
***III	procedura legislativa ordinaria, terza lettura

(La procedura di applicazione è fondata sulla base giuridica proposta nel progetto di atto)

Significato delle abbreviazioni delle commissioni

AFET	commissione per gli affari esteri
DEVE	commissione per lo sviluppo
INTA	commissione per il commercio internazionale
BUDG	commissione per i bilanci
CONT	commissione per il controllo dei bilanci
ECON	commissione per i problemi economici e monetari
EMPL	commissione per l'occupazione e gli affari sociali
ENVI	commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare
ITRE	commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia
IMCO	commissione per il mercato interno e la protezione dei consumatori
TRAN	commissione per i trasporti e il turismo
REGI	commissione per lo sviluppo regionale
AGRI	commissione per l'agricoltura e lo sviluppo rurale
PECH	commissione per la pesca
CULT	commissione per la cultura e l'istruzione
JURI	commissione giuridica
LIBE	commissione per le libertà civili, la giustizia e gli affari interni
AFCO	commissione per gli affari costituzionali
FEMM	commissione per i diritti della donna e l'uguaglianza di genere
PETI	commissione per le petizioni
DROI	sottocommissione per i diritti dell'uomo
SEDE	sottocommissione per la sicurezza e la difesa

Significato delle abbreviazioni dei Gruppi Politici

PPE	Gruppo del Partito popolare europeo (Democratico Cristiano)
S&D	Gruppo dell'Alleanza progressista di socialisti e democratici al Parlamento europeo
Renew	Gruppo Renew Europe
ID	Gruppo Identità e Democrazia
Verts/ALE	Gruppo Verde/Alleanza libera europea
ECR	Gruppo dei Conservatori e Riformisti europei
GUE/NGL	Gruppo della Sinistra unitaria europea/Sinistra verde nordica
NI	non iscritti