

C/2024/6015

10.10.2024

RAPPORTI VERBATIM TAD-DIBATTITI TAD-9 TA' ĠUNJU 2022

(C/2024/6015)

IL-PARLAMENT EWROPEW

SESSJONI 2022-2023

Dati tas-seduti: 6-9 ta' Ġunju 2022

STRASBURGU

Werrej	Paġna
1. Ftuħ tas-seduta	4
2. L-istat tad-dritt u l-approvazzjoni potenzjali tal-Pjan Nazzjonali ta' Rkupru (RRF) tal-Polonja (mozzjonijiet għal riżoluzzjoni mressqa): ara l-Minuti	4
3. It-talba biex titlaqqa' Konvenzjoni għar-reviżjoni tat-Trattati (dibattitu)	4
4. Strument kummerċjali ġdid biex jiġu pprojbiti l-prodotti magħmula bix-xogħol furzat (dibattitu)	28
5. Tkomplija tas-seduta	37
6. Hin tal-votazzjonijiet	37
6.1. Is-sitwazzjoni tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem fix-Xinjiang, inklużi x-Xinjiang police files (RC-B9-0310/2022, B9-0310/2022, B9-0311/2022, B9-0312/2022, B9-0318/2022, B9-0319/2022, B9-0325/2022) (votazzjoni)	38
6.2. L-istrumentalizzazzjoni tal-ġustizzja bħala strument ta' repressjoni fin-Nikaragwa (RC-B9-0293/2022, B9-0293/2022, B9-0298/2022, B9-0301/2022, B9-0306/2022, B9-0313/2022, B9-0315/2022) (votazzjoni)	38
6.3. Il-ksur tal-libertà tal-media u tas-sikurezza tal-ġurnalisti fil-Georgia (B9-0295/2022, RC-B9-0300/2022, B9-0300/2022, B9-0302/2022, B9-0303/2022, B9-0304/2022, B9-0309/2022) (votazzjoni)	38
6.4. L-istat tad-dritt u l-approvazzjoni potenzjali tal-Pjan Nazzjonali ta' Rkupru (RRF) tal-Polonja (B9-0316/2022, RC-B9-0317/2022, B9-0317/2022, B9-0320/2022, B9-0321/2022, B9-0322/2022, B9-0323/2022) (votazzjoni)	38

Werrej	Paġna
6.5. Strument għal akkwist internazzjonali (A9-0337/2021 - Daniel Caspary) (votazzjoni)	38
6.6. Id-dritt ta' inizjattiva tal-Parlament (A9-0142/2022 - Paulo Rangel) (votazzjoni)	38
6.7. Theddid globali għad-dritt għall-abort: il-possibbiltà li l-Qorti Suprema tirrevoka d-dritt għall-abort fl-Istati Uniti (B9-0289/2022, B9-0292/2022, B9-0299/2022) (votazzjoni)	38
6.8. It-talba biex titlaqqa' Konvenzjoni għar-reviżjoni tat-Trattati (B9-0305/2022, B9-0307/2022) (votazzjoni)	38
6.9. Strument kummerċjali ġdid biex jiġu pprojbiti l-prodotti magħmula bix-xogħol furzat (B9-0291/2022) (votazzjoni)	38
7. Tkomplija tas-seduta	39
8. Approvazzjoni tal-Minuti tas-seduta ta' qabel	39
9. Qtugh illegali ta' siġar fl-UE (dibattitu)	39
10. Spjegazzjonijiet tal-vot	47
10.1. L-istat tad-dritt u l-approvazzjoni potenzjali tal-Pjan Nazzjonali ta' Rkupru (RRF) tal-Polonja (B9-0316/2022, RC-B9-0317/2022, B9-0317/2022, B9-0320/2022, B9-0321/2022, B9-0322/2022, B9-0323/2022)	47
10.2. Strument għal akkwist internazzjonali (A9-0337/2021 - Daniel Caspary)	48
10.3. Id-dritt ta' inizjattiva tal-Parlament (A9-0142/2022 - Paulo Rangel)	48
10.4. It-talba biex titlaqqa' Konvenzjoni għar-reviżjoni tat-Trattati (B9-0305/2022, B9-0307/2022)	50
10.5. Strument kummerċjali ġdid biex jiġu pprojbiti l-prodotti magħmula bix-xogħol furzat (B9-0291/2022)	51
11. Korrezzjonijiet għall-voti u intenzjonijiet tal-vot: ara l-Minuti	51
12. Dokumenti mressqa: ara l-Minuti	51
13. Deciżjoni biex jiġu ppreparati rapporti ta' inizjattiva: ara l-Minuti	52
14. Deciżjoni biex tiġi applikata l-proċedura b'kumitat kongunt (Artikolu 58 tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura): ara l-Minuti	52
15. Kumitati assoċjati (Artikolu 57 tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura): ara l-Minuti	52

Werrej	Pagna
16. Petizzjonijiet: ara l-Minuti	52
17. Approvazzjoni tal-minuti tas-seduta li għaddejjja u trażmissjoni tat-testi adottati	52
18. Dati tas-seduti li jmiss: ara l-Minuti	52
19. Għeluq tas-seduta	52
20. Interruzzjoni tas-sessjoni	52

RAPPORTI VERBATIM TAD-DIBATTITI TAD-9 TA' ĠUNJU 2022

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

1. Ftuh tas-seduta

(H συνεδρίαση αρχίζει στις 9.02)

2. L-istat tad-dritt u l-approvazzjoni potenzjali tal-Pjan Nazzjonali ta' Rkupru (RRF) tal-Polonja (mozzjonijiet għal riżoluzzjoni mressqa): ara l-Minuti

3. It-talba biex titlaqqa' Konvenzjoni għar-revizjoni tat-Trattati (dibattitu)

Πρόεδρος. – Το πρώτο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη αφορά τις δηλώσεις του Συμβουλίου και της Επιτροπής με θέμα το αίτημα για τη σύγκληση συνέλευσης για την αναθεώρηση των Συνθηκών (2022/2705(RSP)).

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you, good morning to everybody.

Dear colleagues, you know that in the Conference on the Future of Europe, we gave our citizens a central role. We have heard their voice, and now it's up to each institution to deliver on the follow-up of the Conference according to the commitment in the joint declaration at the beginning of the Conference. Follow-up is a shared responsibility. The Commission is ready to play its part in turning proposals into concrete action. Next week already, the Commission is putting forward a communication that charts out the way for the follow-up of the Conference outcome in areas that fall under the Commission's remit. There is already a lot the institutions can do and some of the proposals can be implemented rather swiftly. The first new Commission proposal responding to the final report will be announced by President von der Leyen in her State of the Union address in September.

Recent examples show that even in the midst of a worldwide pandemic or a war, Europe is able to deliver on areas that are not explicitly provided for in the Treaties. We have procured billions of vaccines for Europeans and worked on kick-starting the economy through Next Generation EU, to mention just two examples. Beyond this, we could go further. As you say in your resolution, Europe could play a greater role, for example, in health and in defence, and in some key areas, unanimity voting does not make sense and we need to be able to move faster.

The European Parliament is now on the path to use its powers to call for treaty change and the Commission is ready to play its part. We have to find the most direct way to follow up on the conclusions of the Conference, either by using the full limits of what can be done within the treaties or, if needed, changing the treaties where necessary. And now it is delivery time. That's all for the beginning.

Sven Simon, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das ist doch ein trauriges Bild heute Morgen. Die ganze Veranstaltung dient eigentlich dazu, die französische Ratspräsidentschaft aufzufordern, noch in diesem Monat einen Konvent zur Vertragsänderung einzuberufen. Und sie ist offensichtlich so ambitioniert, dass sie es noch nicht einmal schafft, pünktlich zur Sitzung da zu sein. Das ist eine Schande.

Wir sind uns einig darüber, dass die Europäische Union handlungsfähiger werden muss. Wir brauchen einen Paradigmenwechsel vom Schutz voreinander zum Schutz füreinander in der Welt. Wir müssen handlungsfähig werden im Bereich Handel und Investitionsschutz, Sicherheit und Verteidigung – ein globaler Akteur. Wir brauchen mehr Gemeinsamkeit im Bereich Forschung und Entwicklung. Wir wollen eine Energieunion, ohne den europäischen Kontinent zu deindustrialisieren, ihn aber klimaneutral machen.

Wir reden hier über ein Rahmenregelwerk. Deshalb ist es falsch, politische Ideologien durchsetzen zu wollen. Wer Maximalforderungen aufstellt, die Europäische Union zu einem sozialistischen Projekt umgestalten will, der wird verlieren. Und wer bei der Frage von Vertragsänderungen und dem Artikel 48 – wo es darum geht, der Europäischen Union mehr Kompetenzen zu übertragen oder Kompetenzen zurück zu übertragen auf die Mitgliedstaaten – Kolleginnen und Kollegen dieses Hauses von vornherein ausschließt, der wird genauso scheitern. Das ist nicht der Geist von Schuman, De Gasperi und Helmut Kohl.

Ich habe in den letzten Tagen große Zweifel bekommen, ob die handelnden Akteure in diesem Haus wirklich diesen Geist der Gemeinsamkeit verinnerlicht haben, den wir brauchen, um handlungsfähig zu werden, um die Verträge zu ändern. Die Forderung an Macron lautet klar und deutlich: nicht nur Reden halten, sondern konkret werden.

Das, was die EVP will, ist kein sozialistisches Projekt. Deshalb hat sie diese EntschlieÙung auch nicht unterzeichnet, sie wird aber überwiegend dafür stimmen. Das, was wir wollen, ist Europa umbauen, handlungsfähig in der Welt werden und in Europa in Vielfalt geeint sein.

Gabriele Bischoff, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Sehr verehrter Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir sind heute hier zusammengekommen und diskutieren eine historische Entscheidung, nämlich dass tatsächlich das Europäische Parlament ganz klar die Verantwortung übernimmt, die Frau Šuica auch angesprochen hat: Die Verantwortung zu sagen, jetzt müssen wir einen Konvent in Auftrag geben, und wir müssen ihn starten. Nicht, weil wir nichts anderes zu tun haben, sondern wir sehen, in welchen ernstesten Zeiten wir sind.

Und wir haben den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern, die wir zusammengerufen haben, die über Monate gearbeitet haben, eines versprochen: dass wir ihre Vorschläge ernst nehmen und dass wir nicht sagen: Gut, wir laden die mal ein, lassen die doch ein paar Vorschläge machen, und dann machen wir *business as usual*.

Und deshalb ist es wichtig, dass wir auch klar die Bereiche benennen, die wichtig sind und die den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern auch wichtig sind: nämlich eine Gesundheitsunion, eine Energieunion. Aber sie wollen auch ein stärkeres soziales und demokratisches Europa. Und wer soziales Europa mit Sozialismus gleichsetzt, hat doch nichts begriffen und sollte vielleicht mal Jean-Claude Juncker in die Fraktion einladen – einen derjenigen, die das soziale Europa im letzten Jahrzehnt wirklich vorangetrieben haben, und die begriffen haben, wie wichtig auch dieses Element eines europäischen Einigungsprozesses ist.

Aber es geht heute um das Thema Verantwortung. Und das bedeutet tatsächlich auch in der Tat, dass wir keinen Weihnachtsbaum dekoriert haben mit allen Wünschen, die man sich vorstellen kann, sondern zugehört haben, was die Bürgerinnen und Bürger gesagt haben, die uns klar ins Stammbuch geschrieben haben. Ein Punkt ist essenziell: Mit Einstimmigkeit zerstören wir dieses europäische Projekt, weil wir nicht handlungsfähig sind, weil wir nicht reagieren können. Und deshalb haben wir auch hierauf einen Schwerpunkt gelegt in dieser EntschlieÙung, zusammen.

Und das bedeutet eben tatsächlich auch, dass so etwas, was letzstens noch einmal im Europäischen Rat mit Ungarn passiert ist, in Zukunft nicht mehr passieren kann. Auch deshalb haben wir gesagt: Das Thema Sanktionen ist hier wichtig, um sicherzustellen, dass wir in Zukunft es wirklich schaffen, in den wesentlichen Politikfeldern mit qualifizierter Mehrheit zu entscheiden.

Und ich glaube, es ist wichtig, dass wir diesmal mit großer Mehrheit diese Entschließung mit den Änderungen tatsächlich hier auch über die Schwelle tragen, weil nur, wenn wir ein klares, ein starkes Signal an den Europäischen Rat, an den Rat, an die Mitgliedstaaten senden, werden wir hier auch erfolgreich sein. Und deshalb ist es schade, dass die französische Ratspräsidentschaft nicht dabei ist. Aber ich hoffe, dass sie die *message*, die hier gegeben wird, mitkriegt.

Und deshalb kann ich Sie nur alle bitten: Nehmen Sie diese Verantwortung wahr, diese historische Chance: große Mehrheit für diese Entschließung.

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, for those who are still doubting if they are going to vote for this resolution, let me maybe recall what happened last week in Europe concerning the sanctions. The Americans, when the war started on 24 February, were capable immediately, three weeks after that, to launch – by an Executive Order of President Biden – an embargo on oil, on coal and on gas. And they did that on 8 March, so the war started 24 February, and 8 March, by an executive order, the Americans were ready to stop the funding of the war machine of Putin.

You have to compare that with the way we in Europe have handled that same issue. For us, it has taken three months to come to a conclusion. It was on, I think, 4 May that Ms von der Leyen said, 'yes, I have a proposal' – two months after the Americans, and then it has taken three weeks, nearly a month, to decide on it, and it will be implemented by the end of the year. And there will be an exception for a number of Member States, especially for Hungary, because of unanimity and the veto right. That is the reality of today. Europe is not fit for the world of tomorrow. The world of tomorrow is not a world of nation states, dear colleagues. The world of tomorrow is a world of empires. Whether you want it or not, China is an empire; India is an empire; the US is an empire; Russia wants to be an empire. In such a world, only a European Union that is not based on unanimity, not based on veto rights, not based on such an instrument can survive.

Therefore, I think we did a good thing to ask for a convention, Article 48, and to concentrate on the main issue that blocks the Union for the moment – and that is this unanimity rule, the veto right that exists today in our Treaties.

I think the two articles that we have mentioned are not the only articles I hope that we as Parliament will want to reform, but we will have the chance to discuss that in the Constitutional Affairs Committee. But at least giving up the veto right in sanctions, creating a passerelle clause that was never used – it was created in the Nice Treaty – it has never been used since the moment that it was in the Treaties.

By launching a possibility to have, with qualified majority, a passerelle clause, I think that it is absolutely needed to survive with the European Union in this 21st Century. So I hope for a massive 'yes' for the call for this convention to make that a reality.

Daniel Freund, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, it's surprisingly easy to say why the EU needs reform in four words: Orbán has a veto. One 'no' from a dictator can block what 450 million Europeans want. And what might have been conceived initially to protect minority rights has now become a tool for extortion. Vetoes are misused for extra cash. Vetoes are misused to destroy the rule of law in the European Union.

Today, we will start to change this, because we in the European Parliament want to change the Treaties. We want to fix the most important design flaw of the European Union and to get rid of vetoes. Not because we here in the Parliament want this, but because European citizens want this with an overwhelming majority. They told us over and over again at the Conference.

And when change is coming, well, there is resistance. And to get to this historic moment today of triggering Article 48 was incredibly hard work. But the next few weeks are going to get even harder because some governments do not want to listen to what their citizens want. They do not want European democracy. They want to call the shots. And I think, in this situation, it's important to say their names. Sweden, do you really want to prevent better social rights for all Europeans as inscribed in a social progress protocol? Latvia, do you think it's a good idea that the dictator in Hungary has a veto on sanctions and threatens your security as a border state of Russia? Denmark, do you really think it's a good idea that one country can ensure that Apple only pays 0.05% taxes?

Of course, they'll tell you that's not what they want, but that is what they are doing. They are preventing what Europeans want: a better Europe. And after Trump, after Brexit, after the pandemic, and now with war, it is time for reform. We need to change the Treaties, because I really fear we might not get a second chance.

Gerolf Annemans, *namens de ID-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de samenwerking van de Europese lidstaten binnen de Europese Unie is sinds de uittreding van het Verenigd Koninkrijk paradoxaal genoeg veranderd in een snelheidsrace: een waanzinnige versnelling van de centralisering en de totstandbrenging, in de plaats van de lidstaten, van een eenheidsstaat of zelfs, in de woorden van Guy Verhofstadt, een wereldrijk. Hij vergat daarbij dat de Verenigde Staten een gasexporteur zijn en bij de afkondiging van sancties ook meteen aankondigden de uitvoer van gas naar Europa dit jaar nog te zullen vertienvoudigen. De Europese Unie grijpt iedere crisis, waaronder de coronacrisis en de oorlog in Oekraïne, aan om deze evolutie sluipend te versterken en te versnellen.

De Conferentie over de toekomst van Europa was een veredelde theatervoorstelling en in feite een grote mislukking. Krap enkele honderden burgers daagden voor de conferentie op en werden vervolgens tijdens de bijeenkomsten door professionals gemanipuleerd en gestuurd in de richting van een lijstje voorstellen die nagenoeg een kopie zijn van de meest verregaande unificerende projecten van de eenheidsstaat.

De conferentie gaf de links-liberale en groene meerderheid van het Europees Parlement vervolgens de kans om deze voorstellen te bevorderen tot de enige en onomkeerbare weg voor samenwerking op het Europese continent. Deze meerderheid noemt zichzelf sinds de mislukte stemming van gisteren de “pro-Europese meerderheid”. Wie het daarmee niet eens is, behoort tot de “anti-Europese minderheid” of, korter nog, tot “extreemrechts”.

De ID-Fractie verwerpt deze zogenaamde resultaten van de conferentie en blijft zich enkel inzetten voor een vrije en onderhandelde Europese samenwerking waarin de lidstaten en volkeren niet van hun rechten worden ontbloot. Europese normen kunnen niet worden opgelegd aan burgers wier lidstaat daarmee niet akkoord is gegaan. De klemtoon moet komen te liggen op de terugkeer van macht naar de lidstaten. Een wijziging van de verdragen is voor ons dan ook enkel nuttig als in deze mogelijkheid wordt voorzien. Wij willen meewerken aan Europa, maar Europa moet veranderen en niet erger worden dan het nu al is.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, en janvier 2015, le président de la Commission, M. Juncker, avait osé dire: «Il ne peut y avoir de choix démocratique contre les traités européens», traités qui ont d'ailleurs été imposés de force, en niant le «non» français au référendum de 2005, et qui nécessitent plus que jamais d'être revus, de la cave au grenier. Et notre groupe était bien seul, ces dernières années, à demander l'organisation d'une convention pour la révision.

Mais que les choses soient claires: cela ne pourra pas juste être l'exercice de com' auquel la présidence française s'est livrée avec la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe. Et j'aurais bien aimé interpellier directement M. le ministre, qui doit sûrement être très occupé, M. Beaune, à faire campagne en France pour dénigrer le terrain européen, j'aurais aimé lui demander de faire le test autour de lui, de sortir de la bulle européenne, et de demander qui a entendu parler de cette conférence. En réalité pas grand monde, et c'est dommage, car les quelques contributions de citoyens sont éclairantes. Et j'ai un scoop pour vous: ils ne demandent pas plus de concurrence, de libre-échange ou d'austérité, mais plus de démocratie, d'actions pour le climat, de services publics, de droits sociaux.

Alors, une convention pour réviser les traités européens: oui, mille fois oui, mais pour se débarrasser de la règle des 3 % de déficit, arrêter le libre-échange à tout va, sortir les biens communs et les services publics du marché, mettre un terme à l'unanimité qui protège les paradis fiscaux et donner le droit d'initiative au Parlement – des propositions que nous formulons dans ce document. Mais tout cela nécessite une rupture claire et nette avec la logique néolibérale actuelle de l'Europe.

À défaut, acceptez qu'il y ait des choix démocratiques contre les traités européens et que des États agissent en éclaireurs au niveau national pour sortir de ces dogmes, y compris en désobéissant ponctuellement pour faire bouger les lignes. Il y va de notre capacité même à répondre aux urgences écologiques et sociales, face auxquelles les traités européens actuels nous paralysent.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Mr President, the CoFE was a pretence to invite debate and participation, but the priority was not to upset the status quo. For example, when participation delivered an initiative with the second highest level of citizen support, as the clarity mechanism for self-determination, it was simply brushed away ungraciously.

But once we start debating the future of Old Europe, it becomes obvious that Jean Monnet's dream of the Union of Peoples is watered down every day. And unless the Treaties are revised, our future as a democracy is doomed. Citizens' rights are eroded while the EU institutions just look away, and fundamental rights are just another issue bargained off by governments behind closed doors.

Something as basic as language diversity cannot be left to the will of Member States that often just want minority languages extinct.

(The speaker uses a non-EU language)

How come the Catalan language spoken by 11 million European citizens – European citizens! – cannot be used in this Chamber? This is not a Union of the Peoples. The European Union must cease to be a cocktail of governments. EU institutions must advance in democratic accountability. We need change.

Πρόεδρος. - Σας ευχαριστώ. Επόμενος ομιλητής ο κ. Rangel για ενάμισι λεπτό και στη συνέχεια, επειδή ήρθε με μια μικρή καθυστέρηση, ο κ. Weimers. Θα του δώσω τον λόγο, λόγω της σημασίας του θέματος, με την παράκληση να μην επαναληφθεί αυτή η καθυστέρηση. Κύριε Rangel, έχετε τον λόγο.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Mr President, dear Vice-President, and I would like to say dear Minister, but unfortunately the Council decided to be absent in this debate. They decided: they are not here.

Guy Verhofstadt (Renew). – Mr President, he's coming to the debate. The problem is that his train was delayed by 50 minutes.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – From France? It's a shame.

Πρόεδρος. – Με συγχωρείτε, θέλω να θυμίσω σε όλους τους συναδέλφους ότι όταν ζητούν τον λόγο επί της διαδικασίας, κύριε Verhofstadt, τον ζητάνε από τον πρόεδρο. Και δεύτερον, θέλω να υπενθυμίσω σε όλους ότι στην έναρξη της συνεδρίασης σημείωσα ότι, σύμφωνα με την ενημέρωση που έχω από τις υπηρεσίες, ο κ. Clement Beaune έχει μια καθυστέρηση με το τρένο και υπολογίζει ότι θα έρθει σε 20 με 25 λεπτά καθυστέρηση. Είναι προς αξιολόγηση αυτή η πληροφορία, αλλά την έδωσα στην αρχή της συνεδρίασης. Τα 25 λεπτά έχουν περάσει. Ελπίζω να φανεί από λεπτό σε λεπτό ο εκπρόσωπος του Συμβουλίου. Ευχαριστώ.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Mr President, I have to say again: if you want to have a debate on this issue, the Council has to do everything to be present. And that is the truth, because this is an image that shows very well what is the commitment with this, with the Conference. Because in other debates, they don't have these kinds of problem.

And so I would like to say that, because we have to be fair, the ones that are clearly in favour of a Convention, not only for changing the unanimity rule in the case of sanctions – it's a good example, but we are aiming for something much more ambitious, in my opinion. And so, we cannot reduce our debate to this issue of sanctions. It's a good example of things that don't work so well, but we have to give to Europe again a new inspiration of democratic legitimacy. That should be our main task.

And so I would like to say I praise the Commission because they are present. I regret that the Council have this unfortunate coincidence and cannot be here at this moment. But let us see. We will see. Today we'll approve this resolution, I hope, and then we will see what is the attitude and the commitment of the French Presidency; that we can see in 15 days.

Charlie Weimers, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Mr President, the left liberal majority in this House, led by centraliser-in-chief Guy Verhofstadt, seeks to abolish national vetoes, expand powers for the Union in the areas of health, energy, defence and social and economic policy. And ensure the European Pillar of Social Rights, which spawned the Minimum Wage Directive, a direct attack on the Swedish labour model, is fully implemented.

This House and its well-funded lobby of centralists, funded by the taxpayers themselves in many cases, seek to enshrine these and other proposals to transfer more power to Brussels and away from democratic, legitimate national parliaments.

Thankfully, there seems to be some recognition in the Council that there is no public longing for more power transfers. I hope these attempts to render my country, Sweden, to the status of a subservient, net-paying province of the United States of Europe will be strongly rejected by the Council. And if they're not, they should be subject to approval by referenda in all Member States. Would you dare that?

Πρόεδρος. – Έδωσα τον λόγο στον κ. Weimers, παρότι δεν ήταν στην ώρα του παρών, γιατί πιστεύω ότι είναι σωστό και δίκαιο να δείχνει το προεδρείο μια ευελιξία σε τέτοιες σημαντικές συζητήσεις να εκπροσωπείται η φωνή όλων των πολιτικών ομάδων.

Τον λόγο τώρα έχει ο κ. Ruiz Devesa για ένα λεπτό.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señor presidente, gracias, sobre todo, a los compañeros que han elaborado esta importante Resolución —que cuenta con todo mi apoyo—, apoyada por cinco grupos de esta Cámara.

En el año 1950, el 9 de mayo, se conocía la Declaración Schuman. Seis países europeos ponían en común el carbón y el acero. Y esa Declaración decía en dos ocasiones, no solo en una, que esa Comunidad Europea del Carbón y del Acero era el primer paso para establecer una federación europea. Y, efectivamente, esa promesa no se ha realizado completamente, aunque hemos hecho muchos avances en la federalización de la Unión Europea. Y ahora tenemos que dar un paso más. ¿Por qué?

Porque este ya no es, señorías, el mundo del Tratado de Lisboa. El Tratado de Lisboa supuso un avance fenomenal. Pero comparemos las circunstancias de hoy en día con las del año 2007. Son radicalmente diferentes: el cambio climático, la digitalización, el papel de China en el mundo, pero, también, más recientemente, la pandemia y la agresión de Putin a Ucrania.

Por tanto, tenemos que actualizar nuestro marco constitucional, mejorando la toma de decisiones, superando la unanimidad, convirtiendo al Parlamento en el centro de la construcción política europea, pero también añadiendo al Tratado nuevas políticas y nuevas capacidades.

Πρόεδρος. – Υπενθυμίζω ότι τώρα που ολοκληρώθηκε ο κατάλογος των εγγεγραμμένων ομιλητών εκ μέρους των πολιτικών ομάδων υπάρχει η δυνατότητα της κάρτας των αιτημάτων για catch-the-eye και τα λοιπά. Επόμενος ομιλητής ο κ. Durand για ενάμισι λεπτό.

Pascal Durand (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Vice-présidente, merci pour vos mots. Mon cher Guy, tu as dit tout à l'heure que l'Europe n'était pas prête à affronter le monde de demain. Pardon, mais je pense qu'on peut dire qu'elle n'est déjà pas prête à affronter le monde d'aujourd'hui. J'imagine – et nous devrions tous imaginer – ce que serait la situation au sein même de l'Europe et en Ukraine si, aux États-Unis, Donald Trump avait été réélu. Si, effectivement, les États-Unis avaient décidé de ne pas aider l'Ukraine, de ne pas aider l'Europe face à l'invasion de M. Poutine. Nous devons donc nous poser la question en conscience: quelle capacité l'Europe a-t-elle de défendre ses valeurs, ses intérêts et son territoire même?

J'ai entendu beaucoup de choses et je vais être très très rapide là-dessus. J'ai entendu des collègues parler d'une Europe plus socialiste, d'une Europe trop néolibérale, d'une Europe trop ci, trop ça... mais ce n'est pas la question. La question qui se pose aujourd'hui, c'est: est-ce que nous voulons une Europe forte, une Europe capable de défendre ses valeurs, une Europe capable de peser sur le monde qui l'entoure? Est-ce que nous voulons une Europe plus démocratique? Eh bien si c'est ce que nous voulons, alors, mes chers collègues, ne nous posons pas la question: votons l'ouverture de cette convention. À demain!

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, some of the conclusions from the CoFE picture a more ambitious Europe that to be turned into reality requires changes in the Treaties. And this demand for change comes at a very timely moment where several crises are clearly reinforcing the case for more Europe.

Now the question is whether the Conference's efforts, particularly those from the citizens' component, are going to be in vain, or they will mean a boost to more integration and reshape our Union into a stronger, more efficient and accountable democracy, better fit for today's world.

Now we, the Parliament, have the historical opportunity to ask for the revision of the Treaties for the convening of a convention that brings about much-needed changes, such as the end of vetoes. And this will be essential, not only to honour the legacy of the Conference, but also to better protect European values and to advance a more efficient and, why not, a more federal Europe.

Antonio Maria Rinaldi (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Conferenza sul futuro dell'Europa doveva servire ad aprire un dibattito sulle reali cause delle crisi che hanno colpito l'Unione per renderla sostenibile, invece di proporre meccanismi per aggirare il Parlamento, legittimando iniziative nell'interesse di alcuni e a discapito di altri, in quanto la modifica del trattato più discussa è nel superamento del voto all'unanimità, a favore del voto a maggioranza qualificata in Consiglio, anche in tema di politica estera, sicurezza comune, bilancio e fiscalità.

Se l'obiettivo è quello di superare celermente un meccanismo di ostacolo allo sviluppo di una difesa comune, l'articolo 48 non offre alcun iter per renderlo possibile in tempi brevi, perché la procedura semplificata riguarda solo modifiche relative alle politiche e azioni interne dell'Unione e neppure la procedura di cui al paragrafo 7 dell'articolo 48 può applicarsi a decisioni nel settore della difesa.

Eliminare l'unanimità metterebbe inoltre a repentaglio la sovranità degli Stati membri, perché consentirebbe la creazione di alleanze di blocco fra paesi e questo non rientra nello spirito dei trattati.

Le modifiche dovranno riguardare invece tutta la governance economica, a iniziare dal cosiddetto statuto monetario presente nel trattato sul funzionamento dell'UE, agli articoli 123, 124 e 125 sul divieto di monetizzazione, di *bailout* e di solidarietà fiscale, che hanno reso l'eurozona incapace di affrontare le crisi negli ultimi decenni.

I cittadini che rappresentiamo attendono una politica fatta di investimenti e di riforme strutturali, già in parte compiute ma animate da obiettivi punitivi prociclici, non dettate solo dal rapporto deficit/PIL o da miopi vincoli obsoleti di bilancio e condizionalità, come gli aiuti di Stato, e da uno statuto della BCE con soli target inflattivi e non occupazionali. È il divieto di *lender of last resort* e non certo la modifica del voto all'unanimità in Consiglio che comprometterebbe la tutela degli interessi dei singoli Stati membri.

Geert Bourgeois (ECR). – Voorzitter, wij zijn voorstander van een van onderen uit opgebouwde Europese Unie en werken samen als dat meerwaarde oplevert. We willen evenzeer meer eerbied voor de subsidiariteit. De Europese Unie is gebouwd op een representatieve democratie.

Commissaris, u hebt geen stem gegeven aan de burger, maar aan enkele honderden burgers. Alle burgers moeten gelijk worden behandeld en dit kan alleen als zij hun stemrecht kunnen uitoefenen. Er is naar onze mening dan ook geen verdragswijziging nodig. Dit zou immers een vlucht vooruit zijn, weg van de problemen die nu moeten worden aangepakt.

De Europese Unie moet zorgen voor groei en moet werkgelegenheid scheppen, veel meer investeren in innovatie, de grenzen beschermen en ambities hebben om handelsverdragen te sluiten. Binnen de bestaande verdragen ligt zoveel braakliggend terrein, maar deze paden worden niet betreden.

De aanpak van de recente crisissen heeft bewezen dat het Verdrag van Lissabon dit allemaal toelaat en niet alleen toekomstbestendig is, maar ook zeer flexibel.

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

Sven Simon (PPE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Ach, da habe ich so lange dafür gekämpft, dass wir vom Rednerpult aus reden können, und jetzt fangen wir wieder an mit diesem komischen Kram.

Herr Bourgeois, Sie haben angesprochen, und das ist das, was ich immer noch nicht so ganz zusammenbekomme: Wir brauchen einen gemeinsamen Grenzschutz und müssen da stärker werden. Und wir müssen stärker werden beim Abschluss von Handelsverträgen. Aber das ist doch gerade der Punkt, wofür wir Vertragsänderungen bräuchten, weil wir einfach gemeineuropäisch nicht stark genug sind, weil die Europäische Union fast keine Kompetenzen beim gemeinsamen Grenzschutz hat.

Bei den Handelsverträgen, um gemeinsam stark zu werden, um unsere Interessen zu vertreten, um unsere europäischen Standards in der Welt zu setzen, können wir doch auch nicht immer auf den Langsamsten warten, nur weil irgendeine kleine Interessengruppe in Österreich keinen Handelsvertrag haben will. Deshalb brauchen wir doch Vertragsänderungen. Also, das verstehe ich nicht so ganz an der Argumentation.

Geert Bourgeois (ECR), *„blauwe kaart”-antwoord*. – Ik ben ervan overtuigd dat de EU wel degelijk een migratiebeleid kan en moet voeren binnen de bestaande verdragen.

De handelsverdragen zijn een volledige bevoegdheid van de Europese Unie. De investeringsbeschermingsverdragen zijn een gemengde bevoegdheid, omdat daarbij bevoegdheden worden overdragen door de lidstaten, te weten de justitiële bevoegdheid. Handelsverdragen zijn echter een volledige bevoegdheid die niet door de Unie wordt uitgeput. Het Franse voorzitterschap van de Raad was op dit vlak dan ook een zeer grote ontgoocheling. Er bestaat in deze periode slechts één handelsverdrag, te weten met Vietnam.

We moeten onze bevoegdheden uitputten, resultaten boeken en meerwaarde voor de burgers tot stand brengen. Dit kan allemaal binnen het Verdrag van Lissabon.

Helmut Scholz (The Left). – Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin! Lassen Sie mich mit einem Zitat beginnen: „Der Augenblick ist gekommen, um den veralteten Ballast über Bord zu werfen und sich für den kommenden Umbruch bereit zu halten, der so ganz anders ist, als man ihn sich vorgestellt hat. Der Weg, der uns erwartet, wird weder bequem noch sicher sein. Wir müssen ihn jedoch beschreiten, und wir werden es tun“ (Spinelli und Rossi, 1941).

Ja, unsere Aufgabe ist es jetzt, den Weg weiter zu öffnen, auszubauen, um den Herausforderungen des 21. Jahrhunderts gerecht zu werden. Denn alles ist ja eigentlich in der Debatte gesagt: Klimawandel, gute Arbeitsverhältnisse, Gesundheitunion, gerade mit den Erfahrungen von COVID-19 und der Pandemie, eine Wertebeständigkeit und die Weiterentwicklung der Werte, die Bürgerinnen und Bürger umtreibt, wenn sie in den Alltag schauen und auf die Herausforderungen des Klimawandels, solidarisches Zusammenleben und Frieden mit dem Blick nach Ukraine und dem russischen Krieg dort.

Nehmen wir also den Artikel 48, insbesondere Punkt 2 ernst! Beginnen wir zu arbeiten, und zwar gemeinsam, um die unterschiedlichen Sichten, Zielsetzungen, Fragestellungen miteinander zu diskutieren und das Versprechen, dass wir alle gemeinsam hier in diesem Raum vor einem Monat gegeben haben, die Empfehlungen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger in die Tat umzusetzen. Und dafür brauchen wir den Artikel 48, und dafür brauchen wir den Konvent. Fangen wir an zu arbeiten!

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

Maria Grapini (S&D), *intervenție de tip „cartonaș albastru”*. – Stimate coleg, înțeleg din discursul dumneavoastră că susțineți această această temă și o susțin și eu, cel puțin din două puncte de vedere: faptul că Parlamentul nu are drept de inițiativă legislativă și faptul că, iată, țara mea stă afară, pentru că se opune o singură țară, fiind unanimitate în Consiliu.

Dar, vă întreb, credeți că trebuie să mergem spre o uniune federală sau să rămânem o uniune de state cu subsidiarități și constituții naționale?

Helmut Scholz (The Left), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte”*. – Ich glaube, der Artikel 48 Absatz 2 ist genau der Weg, um diese Frage miteinander zu diskutieren.

Ich persönlich kann mir durchaus ein föderales Europa vorstellen. Wir haben in unserer Partei zum Beispiel eine Debatte über die Republik Europa. Wir haben vor 20 Jahren über Europa der Regionen, ohne die Nationalstaaten, diskutiert. Wir haben über ein Europa der Bürgerinnen und Bürger gesprochen. Es gibt also sehr unterschiedliche Vorstellungen.

Ich glaube, der Konvent ist genau die richtige Methode, gemeinsam mit den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern, mit der organisierten Zivilgesellschaft diese Fragen zu erörtern.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovani kolege, poštovani građani, predložene izmjene ugovora o Europskoj uniji koje uključuju da sada Europsko vijeće ne bi više donosilo odluke jednoglasno nego preglasavanjem korjenite su promjene samog bića Europske unije. Potrebno je postaviti pitanje: Bi li sve države koje su sada članica Europske unije pristale biti članicama? Koliko građana Europske unije želi uistinu takvu promjenu?

Pošteno je organizirati inicijativu referendumu. Europski propisi to poznaju. Prikupiti barem milijun potpisa u minimalno sedam država i organizirati da građani Europske unije kažu mišljenje o tome. Naći ćemo se u situaciji da će preglasavanjem biti dovedeni u pitanje temeljni nacionalni interesi pojedinih država. I to ne smijemo učiniti mi bez građana.

(Govornik je pristao odgovoriti na intervenciju zatraženu podizanjem plave kartice)

Daniel Freund (Verts/ALE), blue-card speech. – Dear colleague, you spoke of the European Citizens Initiative and the 1 million signatures one can gather. I wanted to ask you if you're aware that, unfortunately, the European Citizens Initiative doesn't currently allow to propose any changes to the Treaty, and how you suggest to deal with that? Don't we need a convention, then, to actually change the possibility for the European Citizens Initiative precisely to make those kind of changes that you talked about?

Mislav Kolakušić (NI), odgovor na intervenciju zatraženu podizanjem plave kartice. – Građani Europske unije – dakle, to smo svi mi, bilo članovi političkih stranaka, bilo nezavisni zastupnici, bilo bilo građani koji se uopće ne bave politikom, nego su članovi različitih udruga – imaju pravo pokrenuti svaku inicijativu i zatražiti od Europske komisije postupanje u tom smislu. Tako da ne vidim nikakvih problema u tome. Ovo što mi pričamo je upravo izigravanje prava građana.

(Govornik je pristao odgovoriti na intervenciju zatraženu podizanjem plave kartice)

Tomislav Sokol (PPE), intervencija zatražena podizanjem plave kartice. – Kolega Kolakušiću, govorite o suštinskim promjenama ugovora. Ne znam znate li da se već više od 90 posto akata u Vijeću donosi kvalificiranom većinom, a ne jednoglasno. Dakle, to je moje pitanje jer je na tragu toga koja su to područja za koja smatrate da su ključna da ostanu u nadležnosti država u smislu da se odlučuje jednoglasno. Ili smatrate da se o svemu treba odlučivati jednoglasno za razliku od sadašnje situacije kad se više od 90 posto toga odlučuje kvalificiranom većinom.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI), odgovor na intervenciju zatraženu podizanjem plave kartice. – Dakle, svi znamo što znači jednoglasno. Jednoglasno znači: svi smo jednaki, svi smo ravnopravni. Kada se odlučuje većinom, onda mali nikada nisu ravnopravni. To znamo. Vidjeli smo to i na primjeru Jugoslavije, vidjeli smo na primjeru Sovjetskog Saveza i upravo je to nešto što nam se nikada ne smije dogoditi. A ovi prijedlozi idu u tom smjeru.

Loránt Vincze (PPE). – Mr President, Vice-President, dear colleagues, the first question one could raise is whether there is a treaty-change opportunity. After all, there is a war in our neighbourhood, a severe recession is looming, energy prices are going through the roof... Why start a long and complicated political and legal procedure now instead of seeking fast and effective answers to the most pressing questions?

Some say the Conference on the Future of Europe legitimises starting treaty change. But let's be honest, we know the Conference was neither sufficiently representative in its choice of stakeholders nor sufficiently pluralistic in the way it adopted its decisions. Yet, colleagues, I say there is a treaty-change opportunity.

The past decade has shown us that a stronger, faster and more united Europe is needed to answer challenges during economic crises, health crises, in areas like border protection, defence, climate change and energy security. We can certainly have a successful convention if we allow ourselves sufficient time to seek pragmatic consensus – if we avoid ideologically driven, dead-end debates and do not waste our energy discussing issues that are completely irrelevant for the majority of citizens, such as transnational lists, and if we do not pursue the nuclear option of forcing the will of the majority on all, at any cost, by abolishing the unanimity rule.

We will need wisdom to respect the diversity of the Member States, having in mind a difficult ratification process in the end. It is not uniformity that makes us stronger, but our diversity in pursuing common goals.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi il Parlamento europeo, per la prima volta nella sua storia, attiverà la procedura per convocare una convenzione per riformare i trattati istitutivi dell'Unione.

È una svolta attesa da molti anni, poiché oggi i cittadini europei ci chiedono più protezione sociale, salari più alti, più impegno per la difesa dei diritti umani, più investimenti per lo sviluppo sostenibile. Dobbiamo ascoltarli e per rispondere alle loro richieste dobbiamo abolire il diritto di veto e aprire una vera fase costituente per una nuova Europa.

Al Consiglio europeo il 23 giugno i nostri governi dovranno rispondere davanti alle loro opinioni pubbliche. Il tempo dei convegni è finito, è il tempo di decidere. Per chi vuole un'Europa più unita, più forte, per decidere di più insieme, deve poterlo fare, deve poter andare avanti. È il momento dell'Europa unita, è il momento del coraggio. Non deludiamo i nostri cittadini, costruiamo un futuro migliore per l'Europa, tutti insieme.

Charles Goerens (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, le citoyen européen est majoritairement en avance sur le politique. Cela se confirme dans nombre de sondages où les citoyens se prononcent à une écrasante majorité en faveur d'une défense européenne crédible. Cela se confirme aussi dans les sondages ayant trait au soutien à apporter aux pays en développement. Idem pour la santé, l'énergie, notre position dans le monde.

Les citoyens européens répondent à ces questions sans détour, sans arrière-pensée. Ce qui les motive, c'est leur souci de se retrouver dans un cadre décisionnel politique qui soit à même de répondre à leurs attentes. Les citoyens s'expriment contre les blocages, contre les chantages, contre les marchandages, contre les magouilles, qui ont bonne conjoncture quand le moins-disant budgétaire, le plus récalcitrant, le moins respectueux des valeurs fondamentales et parfois aussi le plus corrompu abuse de la règle de l'unanimité pour bloquer le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne.

Mettons enfin un terme à cette mascarade.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, le mois dernier nous parlions conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe et implication des citoyens, hier droit d'initiative législative pour ce Parlement, et aujourd'hui article 48 et révision des traités. Parce qu'effectivement il nous faut changer les traités, qui ne nous permettent pas d'avoir des institutions efficaces et pleinement démocratiques, à cause de ce fameux problème de l'unanimité.

L'Union européenne de juin 2022 est un espace démocratique chahuté, bousculé par le retour de la guerre toute proche, pressé par sa jeunesse balkanique, qui en a marre d'attendre à la porte, traversé par tous les défis de l'urgence climatique, et qui a enfin abandonné partiellement la rigueur monétaire, à cause de la pandémie puis de la crise énergétique.

Mais, au milieu de tout cela, il y a un autocrate qui s'amuse. Il prend un malin plaisir à délayer les décisions, à empêcher des avancées majeures et à faire manger dans sa main tous les autres gouvernements, les autres chefs de gouvernement. Et cet autocrate, il est possible qu'il soit installé durablement. L'unanimité, aujourd'hui, elle ne protège pas les petits pays: elle fragilise au contraire notre futur commun et, surtout, elle fait danser les décisions de l'Union européenne au rythme d'un autocrate.

Hélène Laporte (ID). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe a été transformée en une véritable opération de communication, gommant ainsi les multiples manœuvres et échecs. Cette conférence a été très peu suivie. En fait d'exercice ouvert, transparent et délibératoire, il ne s'est agi en réalité pour le Parlement que d'organiser une démocratie qui a été bien mise à mal, et dont la participation citoyenne donnait blanc-seing aux dirigeants européens pour pousser les feux de l'intégration.

Sans surprise, l'exécutif européen a annoncé se tenir prêt à réformer l'UE pour, notamment, abandonner le vote à l'unanimité au Conseil dans tous les domaines, y compris la fiscalité et la politique étrangère, à l'exception de l'adhésion de nouveaux États ou de cas non précisés affectant les valeurs fondamentales de l'Union.

Cette proposition phare de cette conférence nécessite une révision des traités. Or, de nombreux États membres s'opposent au lancement d'une telle procédure. Ils ne sont pas moins de treize. En cas de validation, cette réforme provoquerait la fin du droit de veto, alors que, dans les organisations internationales, en application de la conception de souveraineté absolue des États, le veto est une pratique courante.

Emmanuel Macron demande que cette question soit traitée lors du sommet prévu les 23 et 24 juin. Il souhaite ainsi profiter de tous les leviers politiques afin d'avaliser à marche forcée une réforme aux conséquences désastreuses, notamment pour la politique étrangère des États membres.

Si cette réforme devait aboutir, l'histoire oubliera qu'elle a pris racine au sein d'une conférence qui devait prétendument associer les citoyens à une vaste réflexion pour réformer l'Europe, mais qui sera restée largement sous le radar des Européens, réduisant cette consultation à un dispositif artificiel qui aura permis de déclencher la fin de la règle de l'unanimité.

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

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ich würde gerne Frau Laporte fragen: Sie müssen sich schon entscheiden. Wir haben jetzt die Bürger beteiligt – 800 zufällig ausgewählte Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Sie sehen diesen Ansatz als einen, der die Bürger nicht mit einbezieht, das trifft aber nicht auf die Realität zu.

Und wenn wir jetzt sagen, nachdem wir die Bürgerinnen und Bürger einbezogen haben: Nein, uns gefällt das Ergebnis nicht und deshalb wollen wir das nicht berücksichtigen, machen Sie genau das, was Sie ja hier der Europäischen Union vorwerfen: Sie nehmen die Bürgerinnen und Bürger nicht ernst. Darauf hätte ich gerne Ihre Antwort.

Hélène Laporte (ID), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Madame, j'ai été moi-même coordinatrice au nom du groupe ID pour la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe, et la seule chose dont je me suis aperçue, c'est que, non, ce n'était pas représentatif. Il y a eu très peu de citoyens qui se sont inscrits sur la plateforme en ligne. On a eu plusieurs réunions, dont d'ailleurs une plénière, qui ont été annulées faute d'ordre du jour. Non, la représentativité n'y était pas vraiment, Madame.

Hermann Tertsch (ECR). – Señor presidente, desde el Tratado de Lisboa, la Unión Europea encadena una crisis tras otra. Es evidente que aquí se han hecho cosas muy mal y algunos vemos los errores, aprendemos y buscamos enmienda. Otros, llenos de soberbia, se obcecan y perseveran en los errores y no reconocen lo evidente.

El proyecto de una Europa federal nos lleva a ser gobernados por una casta de burócratas, oligarcas y ONG ideologizadas y parasitarias, que destruirían la democracia, la libertad y también la Europa unida.

Su idea de democracia de esos 800 ciudadanos a dedo.

Diese 800 Bürger, das ist ein Witz.

Eso de los 800 elegidos a dedo, y que son los que nos dicen lo bien que van las cosas, es una mala broma, es una farsa.

Las naciones deben hacer juntas lo que hacen mejor juntas y soberanamente lo demás. La sanidad, la educación, la justicia no deben ser competencias europeas, y quienes quieran hacer tratados nuevos o una convención para la revisión de los tratados para pisotear las soberanías nacionales solo están invitando a países que quieran seguir siendo soberanos a tomar el camino del Reino Unido, que no se ha hundido y está disfrutando en sí de lo que es otra situación, fuera de aquí por desgracia, pero otra situación que en absoluto es peor que la que tenemos.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, recordo neste debate o processo da Convenção sobre o Futuro da Europa, que lançaria as bases para uma dita Constituição Europeia. Uma farsa que foi então exposta pela rejeição em diversos referendos, sendo que a União Europeia desrespeitou os resultados desses processos de sufrágio popular, impondo depois o Tratado de Lisboa.

Pretendem agora, em traços gerais, repetir a operação de mistificação então lançada. Torna-se, por isso, necessário, uma vez mais, defender a reversibilidade dos Tratados, começando pelo Tratado de Lisboa e incluindo o Tratado Orçamental e a matriz neoliberal, federalista e militarista neles contida.

Defendemos o direito inalienável de cada povo a debater e se pronunciar de forma esclarecida, incluindo por referendo, sobre o conteúdo e o objetivo dos acordos e Tratados atuais e futuros. O que se impõe é defender um processo de genuína cooperação entre Estados soberanos e iguais em direitos e uma Europa que defenda a soberania e a democracia, os direitos, possibilitando caminhos alternativos de futuro, justiça, progresso e paz.

(La oradora acepta responder a una intervención realizada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»)

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D), *intervención de «tarjeta azul».* – Señora Pereira, he decidido dirigirle esta interpelación porque usted es una mujer de izquierdas, provenimos de la misma tradición. La izquierda ha sido siempre internaciona- lista, no ha sido nunca una defensora del Estado nación; no lo he visto nunca en los escritos de Marx ni de Engels.

Sin embargo, usted ha hecho aquí una defensa cerrada del veto, de la soberanía nacional como el paradigma de la acción política. Me resulta verdaderamente incomprensible.

Sandra Pereira (The Left), *resposta a intervenção «cartão azul».* – *(início da intervenção com o microfone desligado)* ... sim, somos internacionalistas mas também somos defensores da soberania de cada povo, e de cada povo decidir aquilo que será o seu futuro. E aquilo que este projeto nos tem mostrado, também pela sua matriz federalista, militarista e neoliberal, o que tem acontecido, são as assimetrias de desenvolvimento entre diferentes Estados, a questão também do aumento das desigualdades e a questão da prevalência de uns Estados que dominam outros. E o que a regra da unanimidade iria fazer era acentuar ainda mais essa tendência, ao mesmo tempo que não iria resolver o problema dos trabalhadores e dos povos.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, I would like to strongly support our call for the convention and raise three points in this context.

First, European treaties codify our past. They, of course, also reflect lessons learned from problems we faced together and overcame or not. But they should also give us effective instruments to cope with the challenges of tomorrow, and that is why treaties need changes. For the years to come, we will need a legal framework that will offer a more unified European jurisdiction, leave no space to populist political forces undermining European foundations, allow us to be more proactive, hopefully also less prescriptive and more principle-based.

Of course, thinking ahead requires political will, strategic vision, but also a lot of political courage. And my second point is that the good news here is that aiming towards treaty change, we will not be starting from scratch. The one-year-long debate in the framework of the Conference on the Future of Europe and citizens' engagement offer a vision of a Europe caring about democracy and the rule of law, competitive internationally, climate-friendly, socially sensitive, providing security and able to build global alliances.

The moment is, indeed, as many of you said, unique. As for this treaty change, we have brave and pragmatic citizens with us.

And the last point: our resolution will send a strong political signal about the need of changing European treaties in all areas that will make the Union fit for the future. And the Conference has proven that a convention is the best path towards the new treaties the Union needs.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, as preocupações dos cidadãos vão muito para além da revisão dos Tratados e há, com certeza, muitas coisas que podemos e devemos fazer desde já, explorando o potencial ainda disponível no Tratado de Lisboa.

Mas também é um facto que várias das propostas dos cidadãos que se tornaram conclusões da Conferência sobre o Futuro da Europa implicam uma revisão pontual dos Tratados. Ora levar a sério essas conclusões significa, portanto, permitir que essas propostas sejam ao menos discutidas no local próprio, que é uma convenção.

Por isso, faz sentido aprovar esta resolução, para que uma convenção possa discutir a limitação da regra da unanimidade, o reforço das competências europeias, o direito de iniciativa legislativa do Parlamento Europeu e os mecanismos de defesa do Estado de Direito.

Outros temas, como a arquitetura institucional, que permita conciliar o aprofundamento da integração com cenários de alargamento, mereceriam também ser discutidos. Mas para isso o primeiro passo é convocar uma convenção, e é isso que devemos fazer.

Sandro Gozi (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, le constat de la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe est très clair: l'Europe sera démocratique et puissante ou elle ne sera pas. Nous avons voulu ce débat citoyen, lancé, je veux le rappeler, en 2019 par le président Macron. Nous devons respecter nos engagements et, aujourd'hui, lancer la révision des traités.

C'est donc très bizarre, pour moi, ce matin, d'entendre les critiques de Manon Aubry et celles, aussi, cela m'étonne, de Paulo Rangel, parce que s'il y a eu ces dernières années un gouvernement qui s'est engagé constamment pour la réforme de l'Union européenne, c'est bien le gouvernement français.

Dans cette époque d'empires et de puissances planétaires, nous devons décider si nous voulons exister ou disparaître. Et l'unanimité est la meilleure garantie de notre disparition. Nous avons besoin de plus d'efficacité, de plus de puissance et de plus de démocratie. Sur ce point, cher Sven Simon, le président Macron a toujours été très clair. Il est urgent de réviser les traités pour nous libérer des veto nationaux. Nous l'avons dit, bien sûr, mais l'urgence de dire ne dispense pas de l'obligation de faire. Faisons-le.

Πρόεδρος. – Πριν δώσω τον λόγο στον κ. Beaune εκ μέρους της Προεδρίας και του Συμβουλίου, θα ήθελα να σας πω ότι έχουν αιτηθεί μπλε κάρτα ο κ. Simon και η κ. Grapini, αλλά επειδή έχουν πάρει ήδη το δικαίωμα της μπλε κάρτας δεν θα τα δώσω και πάλι για δεύτερη μπλε κάρτα από τον ίδιο συνάδελφο, πολύ περισσότερο που ο Σιμόν έχει μιλήσει κιόλας, για να προχωρήσουμε τη συζήτηση και να μιλήσουν και άλλοι ομιλητές. Just a minute, I think it's better to give the floor to the representative of the Council. Mr Beaune, you have the floor.

Clément BEAUNE, *président en exercice du Conseil.* – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Vice-présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je serai extrêmement bref parce que j'ai conscience de la faveur à M^{me} Aubry de pouvoir faire à la présidence du Conseil, que je représente ce matin, et je réagirai à la conclusion des débats comme il se doit et selon l'ordre prévu.

J'ai suivi vos débats depuis le train. Je ne sais pas si c'était une coopération franco-allemande, mais un train allemand puis un train français ont été en retard et en difficulté. Je vous prie de bien vouloir m'en excuser. C'était indépendant de ma volonté, et je tenais à être présent pour ce débat. J'ai vu que cela avait permis à M^{me} Aubry de pouvoir faire campagne nationale en accusant la présidence française d'être en retard, avant de quitter l'hémicycle sans délai, sans doute pour reprendre des activités de campagne, ce qui témoigne de l'intérêt de La France insoumise pour les débats de cette ampleur.

Je serai très bref, simplement pour dire que le travail qui a été fait par cette conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe vous doit beaucoup, dans ce Parlement européen. Il s'est tenu avec vous, chère Dubravka, Madame la Vice-présidente, cher Guy Verhofstadt, avec les autres coprésidents, la présidence slovène et la présidence portugaise, dans cet hémicycle, avec des citoyens qui se sont engagés.

Le Parlement européen défend, et ce sera l'objet de vos débats encore, une suite ambitieuse à ces travaux. Je le dis avec précaution puisque vous connaissez de manière transparente les débats qui existent entre États membres sur les suites à donner à cette conférence et aux travaux qui ont été remis, le 9 mai, aux trois coprésidents.

Mais le président de la République, Emmanuel Macron, l'a dit dans l'hémicycle: du côté de la France, nous soutiendrons cette ambition. Nous sommes favorables à l'idée d'une convention et nous considérons que les changements de traités, s'ils ne sont pas un projet en soi, sont une des options que nous devons absolument regarder pour tous les changements qui le nécessiteraient. Ces débats feront l'objet de discussions au Conseil. J'ai décidé, au nom de la présidence française, de les organiser dès le prochain Conseil des affaires générales, le 21 juin, avant le prochain sommet européen.

Je souhaitais donc vous dire cette ouverture, le débat qui continue au sein des États membres et au sein du Conseil, bien entendu, comme il le fait ici. Mais il est certain, je redis les mots du président de la République, que nous devons ne pas décevoir sur les travaux de cette conférence inédite sur l'avenir de l'Europe et considérer que les changements proposés doivent être mis en œuvre le plus rapidement possible – la Présidente de la Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, l'a évoqué de manière concrète lors du 9 mai et de la restitution de ces travaux –, mais sans fermer aucune porte, bien au contraire, à des changements, des changements de traités, y compris des évolutions ambitieuses, et un travail démocratique à ciel ouvert qui se poursuivrait. Je sais que le Parlement européen, avec des nuances, parfois des différences entre groupes politiques, y tient.

Je voulais simplement vous remercier de porter cette ambition et de vous faire les relais de ces travaux citoyens. Pardon de cette interruption dans vos débats. Je vais continuer à les écouter sagement et j'interviendrai de nouveau par la suite, en conclusion, de manière plus protocolaire et institutionnelle.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I think the first thing that a reformed Europe should do is improve our train system. Colleagues, I want to take one second to thank those individuals who had the foresight to build this Union that we are currently debating in. I think it's a huge achievement that we have this chance to debate here together.

But since the founding, a lot has changed and we have discussed it and heard it here. There are a lot of topics that we need to work on here together in the European Union so the 'what' has changed. But also we realise the examples of the 'how' that need to be improved. We have heard about the veto. I would add, in general, that we should also improve the Council as a whole, maybe abolish it and replace it with a more functioning body.

But I just want to say one thing. This debate is not about left or right. It is not. It is about giving citizens the chance to choose what kind of direction their Europe should take. It's about empowering a government that is elected by a parliament to make decisions and to be able to act. And if the citizens don't like it, in the next elections they can vote this government out. So let us not make it about left or right. Let's make it about daring more democracy.

Peter Kofod (ID). – Hr. Formand! Jeg håber, at der er mange, der følger Parlamentets arbejde i dag. Jeg håber, der er mange, der har fulgt med i konferencen om Europas fremtid. For hvis man har gjort det, så vil man vide, at I og det her system vil blande sig i alle aspekter af europæernes liv. Den rædsel af et slutdokument, som konferencen vedtog –den danske oversættelse er på 49 sider – levner ikke noget, står ikke tilbage for noget, alt er simpelthen noget, som EU skal blande sig i, og det skræmmer mig meget. Et stærkt Europa er ikke nødvendigvis lig med endnu mere EU. Tværtimod. I dokumentet vil man endda opfordre til, at vi blafrer med EU-flaget til sportsevents og alt muligt andet for at vise en fælles europæisk identitet, som ikke findes. Som ikke findes! Jeg er dansker, det her hus består af polakker, italienere, tyskere osv. Lad os være stolte over den forskellighed, mangfoldighed, som Europa rummer. Jeg syntes, I er for meget, jeres system får aldrig nok, og jeg vil tillade mig at stemme imod.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Mr President, this Parliament might be a federal fantasyland, but the world out there is not. According to some colleagues, we need to call for a convention so they can change the Treaties. But why?

After the Conference on the Future of Europe, it was claimed that we needed to listen to the citizens. Well, in that respect, please let me give you some results on how the Dutch feel about the EU. Getting rid of veto power? Against. A European asylum policy? Against. Transnational voting lists? Nobody cares. And European taxes? Only one in ten thinks this is a good idea.

President, when I meet citizens and I speak with them about the EU and the future of the EU, they talk about a strong common market that works for them. So let that be our focus instead of wasting our time on the ideas of overambitious federalists.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Mr President, Madam Vice-President, Minister, colleagues, as we live in unprecedented times, as war of aggression has returned to our continent, we must take a close look at how the EU can do more and better for Europeans. While many of our foundations continue to serve us well, Brexit, together with several European crises, led us to the Conference on the Future of Europe with a forward-looking ambition.

Now, I believe the conclusions of this Conference, combined with a fragile state of our Union, make a clear cut case for a forward-looking Convention. We cannot turn a blind eye to public calls for change as the world around us has changed so much. Europe's role continues to be challenged across our continent and globally. I see the Convention as the best way to seek honest, well-prepared and evolutionary answers to the requests made by European citizens.

Europe must be ready to provide security, protection and international leadership in coming decades. We must be an attractive project, a magnet ready to accept new Member States from the Western Balkans and offer a clear EU membership perspective to Ukraine. Widening and deepening, dear colleagues, have for many years been a source of the strength and resilience of the Union.

The Convention must take place and we should embrace it as an opportunity. It must be a forum for open and genuine discussion, and we cannot prescribe its outcome now. Today we can support the democratic process, creation of a credible platform that can deliberate for a stronger and more effective Europe, and tackle possible Treaty changes on the basis of clear principles.

This is why I support today's resolution. Our change is the key to our survival. The Convention should seek the best ways for Europe to succeed. And, Mr Minister, we need some clear answers from the French Presidency. Are you with us?

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Domnule președinte, dragi colegi, în contextul crizelor pe care le traversăm și având în vedere concluziile Conferinței privind viitorul Europei este nevoie ca Uniunea Europeană să dispună de noi instrumente prin care să poată proteja populația. Dar schimbarea tratatelor nu este un scop în sine. Este nevoie de o Europă mai unită, mai umană, mai eficientă. Vorbim astfel de competențe pe zona de sănătate, de politici sociale, de energie sau chiar de educație.

În același sens, Parlamentul European, ca principală instituție reprezentativă la nivel european, trebuie să aibă dreptul de inițiativă legislativă, pentru a putea îndeplini voința cetățenilor. De asemenea, pe anumite subiecte punctuale, precum aderarea la spațiul Schengen sau aplicarea sancțiunilor impuse statelor agresoare, este nevoie de o procedură mai facilă.

Dar există și o linie roșie. Nu ne dorim ca anumiți burocați europeni să decidă netransparent. Vrem ca vocea fiecărei țări și a fiecărui cetățean european să fie auzită cu adevărat la nivel european. De aceea, pentru ca votul nostru privind schimbarea tratatelor să fie reflecția voinței cetățenilor, Partidul Social Democrat, din care fac parte și PES Activists România, realizează o consultare publică la nivel național, la noi în țară. Vă invit, de asemenea, pe dumneavoastră să faceți la fel.

Nicola Danti (Renew). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Vicepresidente, signor Ministro, la riforma dei trattati non è più procrastinabile. Ce lo ha detto la pandemia e ce lo dice la guerra oggi. I risultati della Conferenza sul futuro dell'Europa ci hanno consegnato un ventaglio di proposte in questo senso.

Convocare una convenzione per rivedere i trattati, quindi, non è più un'opzione ma un dovere. Istituzioni più efficienti, capaci di decidere abolendo il voto unanime, un Parlamento più forte, nuove aree di cooperazione e di azione comune sono elementi essenziali per garantire i nostri valori e il nostro sviluppo.

In un mondo in cui ormai rappresentiamo molto meno del 10 % della popolazione e che rischia di vedere spostato il baricentro dello sviluppo a Est, l'Unione europea rappresenta la nostra unità minima di azione. Pensiamo forse di poter affrontare le sfide del mondo con piccole patrie e con piccoli interessi nazionali? Alcide De Gasperi diceva: «Un politico guarda alle prossime elezioni, uno statista alla prossima generazione». A noi la scelta se essere l'uno o l'altro.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Mr President, at the launch of the Conference on the Future of Europe, I offered Guy Verhofstadt a wager for any sum that the Conference conclusions were prearranged and would call for more EU integration, less unanimity, more migration, more fanciful green humbug and more EU debt. In short, they would call for a federal EU state.

Mr Verhofstadt declined the offer, for he well knew that all I predicted would come true, that the Conference process was a farce. To achieve a federal state, the EU requires Treaty revision. However, 13 Member States, including the Czech Republic and Sweden, have rejected Treaty change. The ID Group welcomes the declaration of the 13. We will support any initiative to bring the EU back to reason, prosperity and democracy, and to save us from a dysfunctional EU state.

Carlo Fidanza (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Vicepresidente, signor Ministro, di fronte alla pandemia prima e alla guerra poi ci siamo risvegliati deboli e indifesi. Ci si è accorti, con colpevole ritardo, che ci sarebbero serviti sicurezza energetica, catene del valore più corte, investimenti nella difesa, sovranità alimentare.

Se oggi tutto questo non lo abbiamo non è per colpa dei trattati, ma delle scelte politiche che sono state fatte o non fatte in questi anni da leader politici europei e in gran parte, a sentir loro, europeisti, almeno a parole. Al contrario, quando l'Europa raramente ha avuto una forte volontà politica, l'ha espressa sviluppando appieno il potenziale degli attuali trattati, ed è quello che pensano anche 13 governi, non solo noi, evidentemente.

Abbiamo il sospetto, per non dire la certezza, che a voi non interessi rimuovere l'unanimità per deliberare più rapidamente le sanzioni alla Russia o per avere un'Europa più forte, ma per imporre a colpi di maggioranza un'agenda politica determinata, fatta di immigrazione di massa, distruzione della famiglia, fondamentalismo climatico.

È per questo motivo che non ci fidiamo di questa falsa volontà riformatrice e continuiamo con forza a difendere i principi fondativi di questi trattati, primi tra tutti la sussidiarietà e la centralità degli Stati nazionali.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, a Choimisinéir agus mo chara, an tIar-Fheisire Ivo Belet, fáilte romhat ar ais.

The Treaties are the foundation of the EU and every action taken by it. They should not be changed hastily or flippantly, but that is not to say they should not be changed at all. As the world around us changes, we in the EU must also be ready to adapt when necessary.

During the Conference on the future of Europe, citizens shared their views and ideas on a broad range of topics, from climate change to jobs, to European democracy. As representatives of the citizens, we have an obligation to take on board their proposals. We should do what we can within the boundaries of the Treaties as they stand.

That being said, I believe that now is the time to convene a Convention, bringing together heads of government, and representatives of national parliaments, of this Parliament and the Commission to thoroughly examine and consider whether our Union and our citizens would benefit from a revision of the Treaties.

The purpose of today's resolution is to signal to the Council our wish to convene a Convention. It is not the place to decide this Parliament's proposals for Treaty revisions. Such a significant decision must be well informed and given adequate time, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the AFCO Committee on this report. I will be supporting the amendments tabled jointly by the EPP and other Groups. I hope, colleagues, that you do the same and that you support the convening of this Convention.

Aurore Lalucq (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Ministre, ravie que vous soyez là. On a entendu votre petite pique vis-à-vis de ma collègue Manon Aubry, et je ne pense pas que la NUPES, même si elle obsède pas mal votre gouvernement en ce moment, soit responsable non plus des retards de trains. On ne vous reproche pas d'être en retard; ne reprochez pas à ma collègue Manon Aubry d'avoir attendu une heure et d'avoir été obligée de partir.

Je vais commencer maintenant mon discours. Soixante milliards, c'est ce qu'on devrait toucher aujourd'hui, là, tout de suite, maintenant, mais un pays nous en empêche, un gouvernement nous en empêche: c'est le gouvernement polonais. Il nous en empêche à cause de l'unanimité, et à cause de cela il est au cœur de toutes nos attentions, à travers une sorte de chantage – en gros: je bloque tout si vous ne me donnez pas mon argent.

Et cette situation de l'unanimité ne pose pas que des problèmes d'un point de vue fiscal: elle nous empêche d'avancer sur la question fondamentale qui est celle de l'état de droit. Aussi, je le dis avec une certaine force et une certaine gravité: tous les ennemis, aujourd'hui, de la majorité qualifiée font le jeu de certains États, qui sont dans une dérive totale actuellement. La meilleure garantie, aujourd'hui, pour protéger la démocratie, c'est la majorité qualifiée.

Nicola Beer (Renew). – Herr Präsident! Mir ist ein verspäteter Staatssekretär mit Ambitionen, Europa zu verbessern, lieber als eine pünktliche Schnarchnase. Denn jetzt ist der Moment, voranzukommen mit einem Konvent. Europas Verfasstheit ist angespannt, nicht erst seit Putins Krieg, Herr Simon! Und gerade Kanzlerin Merkel hat 16 Jahre lang verschlafen, die EU ambitionierter und handlungsfähiger zu machen.

Mit den Bürgern sind wir auf diesem Reformweg bereits weiter. Sie zählen jetzt auf uns, dass wir die gemeinsamen Reformansprüche auch umsetzen, dass wir machen, nicht nur reden, dass wir unser Handwerk verstehen, dass wir Mehrheiten schaffen, dass wir den Rat hinter uns bringen, dass wir jetzt das nächste Kapitel des europäischen Reformwegs schreiben.

Und die Zeichen, sie stehen diesmal günstig. Die deutsche Regierung verspricht Reformen im Koalitionsvertrag, der französische Präsident gibt Rückenwind, gestern warb der irische Taoiseach hier im Plenum dafür. Jetzt gilt es, Herr Simon, dieses Momentum zu nutzen für ein Europa mit neuer Entschlossenheit und Entscheidungsfähigkeit. Jetzt müssen wir dranbleiben, unter französischer Ratspräsidentschaft auf diesem Juli-Gipfel Europas Reform zur Chefsache machen.

Das sind wir allen Europäerinnen und Europäern schuldig. Enttäuschen wir sie nicht, machen wir Europa besser! Wir haben nur das eine Europa.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Żeby usprawnić proces decyzyjny w Unii Europejskiej, nie trzeba zawracać kijem Renu, wystarczy Unię odbiurokratyzować i wystarczy, żebyśmy się po prostu w tej Unii wzajemnie szanowali, bo Unia powstała jako wspólnota silnych, suwerennych i niezależnych państw. Ta różnorodność była zawsze jej siłą przez lata. Poszanowanie dla krajowych tradycji, legislacji, praw, obyczajów oraz wspólny fundament oparty na prawie rzymskim, prawie do życia, na etyce chrześcijańskiej. To był fundament Unii Europejskiej, to była jej siła. To była główna myśl Schumana, którą dzisiaj chcecie obalić.

Niestety w ostatnich latach Unia Europejska stała się bezdusznym biurokratycznym Lewiatanem, który jest skupiony na nagonce na te kraje członkowskie, które myślą inaczej niż liberałowie, niż Zieloni, niż lewica razem wzięci. Panuje duch braku szacunku dla wewnętrznych decyzji podejmowanych przez tworzące wspólnotę państwa, systematyczne ataki przeciw rządowi, które nie zgadzają się z głównym inżynierem zmiany traktatu, mają tutaj miejsce. Dlatego my mówimy „nie” dla takich zmian. Reformy systemowe powinny stanowić powrót do korzeni, do wspólnych wartości narodów i państw. Stanowcze „nie” dla federalizacji i dla pozatraktatowego wzmocnienia instytucji. Natomiast „tak” dla silnych państw członkowskich oraz jasno określonych w traktatach kompetencji i instytucji Unii Europejskiej.

Hildegard Bentele (PPE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ein Jahr lang haben wir mit Bürgerinnen und Bürgern getagt. 49 Empfehlungen und 325 Maßnahmen sind dabei als Ergebnis herausgekommen.

Alle beteiligten institutionellen Akteure haben zugesagt, die Empfehlungen auf ihre Umsetzung hin zu prüfen. Und wir als Europäisches Parlament gehen heute den ultimativen Schritt und rufen Artikel 48 an, um formal den Weg auch für Vertragsänderungen zu öffnen.

Ganz oben steht aus meiner Sicht Verteidigung und Außenpolitik. Der Überfall Russlands auf die Ukraine hat uns eindringlich vor Augen geführt, wie schlecht wir militärisch aufgestellt sind und wie wenig gemeinsam wir als EU noch immer mit einer Stimme nach außen sprechen. Zweitens: Energiepolitik. Unsere Energieversorgung muss europaweit sichergestellt, diversifiziert und klimaneutral werden. Drittens: Gesundheit, Krisen- und Katastrophenschutz. Die während der Pandemie ergriffenen sinnvollen europäischen Maßnahmen gilt es abzusichern.

Viertens: Unsere Entscheidungsverfahren. Bei Einstimmigkeit bestimmt immer der Langsamste das Tempo. Das können wir uns nicht mehr leisten – auch im Hinblick auf die Vergrößerung der EU durch Beitritte. Wir brauchen die qualifizierte Mehrheitsentscheidung als Standard, und zwar auch dann, wenn es darum geht, Konsequenzen einzuleiten, wenn ein Mitgliedstaat unsere Grundwerte verletzt.

Abschließend: Wir als Europäisches Parlament und wir als EVP wollen unser einmaliges Friedens- und Wirtschaftsprojekt zukunftssicher machen und dazu alle Reformmöglichkeiten ausschöpfen. Aber ein Konvent wird Jahre dauern. Er darf keine Ausrede sein, die vielen bestehenden praktischen und pragmatischen Möglichkeiten nicht zu nutzen, um die EU handlungsfähiger zu machen.

Stellen Sie sich nur einmal vor, der Ukraine-Krieg wird zum Stellungskrieg. Stellen Sie sich vor, es breitet sich eine Hungersnot aus. Stellen Sie sich vor, die Energie wird knapp. Stellen Sie sich vor, in zwei Jahren ist Donald Trump in den USA zurück an der Macht und China bestimmt immer stärker die weltweiten Wertschöpfungsketten. Da können wir nicht auf Konventergebnisse warten; da brauchen wir vor allem verantwortungsvolle proeuropäische Führungspersönlichkeiten in den Mitgliedstaaten und in der EU, die flexibel und schnell Lösungen einleiten.

Deshalb, Herr Minister Beaune, werden Sie den Konvent auf die Tagesordnung des Europäischen Rates am 21. Juni setzen.

Giuliano Pisapia (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono passati oltre dieci anni da quando abbiamo modificato i trattati europei. L'Europa di oggi è ben diversa da quelle di dieci anni fa. Come dimostrano l'approvazione del *Recovery Fund* o l'accoglienza di milioni di persone fuggite dalla guerra e dalla fame, l'Unione europea è in grado di rispondere alle sfide che ha davanti.

Però troppe sono le occasioni in cui l'unanimità e i veti incrociati tra i governi hanno impedito una risposta europea ed equa. È arrivato il tempo di cambiare, di cambiare passo e di aprire il cantiere delle riforme dei trattati.

C'è chi dice che non è il momento. Al contrario, è proprio nei momenti difficili che si costruisce l'Europa di domani, guidati dallo stesso spirito che ci ha permesso, settant'anni fa, di trasformare l'Europa in un continente dove vige la forza del diritto e non più il diritto della forza. Non sprechiamo questa occasione.

Se esistono problemi devono esistere anche le soluzioni. Oggi possiamo e dobbiamo fare un ulteriore passo in avanti nel nostro cammino verso un'Europa più forte e più giusta.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señor presidente, dos metáforas para hoy: una positiva y una negativa. Los trenes de los representantes del Consejo se han retrasado, y lo cierto es que el Consejo ha perdido trenes durante años: trenes para resolver los problemas de manera más eficaz y más rápida. La parte positiva y la metáfora de hoy es que usted ha llegado a tiempo y esto es lo importante: ha llegado a tiempo.

Más allá de los sesgos ideológicos de cada cual, más allá de los orígenes territoriales de cada cual, debemos pensar en términos geopolíticos. Por eso necesitamos una convención, no por obsesiones de tipo ideológico, de tipo territorial.

Ante los temas más graves, no tiene sentido que un solo país pueda bloquear las decisiones de la Unión, porque nos debilita, nos inmoviliza y nos hace perder credibilidad. En tiempos de digitalización, de inteligencia artificial, de ataques híbridos, de la guerra a las puertas, no podemos estar con tonterías. Tenemos que pensar en términos geopolíticos.

Por eso debemos romper el tabú de no tener una convención o de no poder tocar reglas del Tratado. Se trata de tener reglas más ágiles, más eficaces y de resolver problemas para todos nosotros. Sí a la convención.

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕКР). – Г-н Председател, колеги, с огромна и приятна изненада научих, че се интересувате и много защитавате демокрацията. Това е много хубаво. Само че вчера, когато получихте урок по демокрация, когато беше отхвърлено вашето зелено безумие под формата на зелена спелка, всички изведнъж спряхте да сте демократи и поисквахте да се гласува пак. Що за двоен стандарт? Когато нещо ви отърва – демокрацията е хубава. Когато не ви отърва – не е хубава, искате пак да се гласува, да се променя. По тази ваша причина, това лицемерие, този двоен стандарт, предложената от вас реформа всъщност ще бъде и е пълен провал. Олицетворяваше го този човек дето крещеше тук, пишеше накрая на Конференцията за бъдещето на Европа в продължение една минута.

Вие ни предлагате съюз на двойните стандарти, на бюрокрацията, на ляво либералната диктатура. Ние сме живели под болшевишка диктатура и не искаме нов Съветски съюз. Това, което ни предлагате вие, е нов Съветски съюз, в който ще взимате решения с мнозинство, които после ще ни налагат на останалите. Не, няма да стане. Това, което искаме ние, е съюз на суверените държави. Искате съюз, основан на идеята за европейска общност, за равнопоставеност, свобода, суверенитет. Искате нашия си съюз, на традиционните семейства. Искате съюза на националните държави и на нациите. Това е нашият съюз – Европа на отечествата.

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Г-н Председател, кризите показаха, че имаме нужда от нови правомощия във всички сфери. Имаме нужда от повече Европейски съюз, а не от по-малко, но за да имаме повече, е необходимо да задълбочаваме политическата интеграция. Това е цел, която не може да се реализира без промени в договора от Лисабон. Какви точно да бъдат тези промени ще реши Конвентът. От нас зависи да дадем шанс за неговото свикване. Но ние не трябва да окичваме договорите с много играчки като коледни елхи, защото рискуваме елхата в един момент да падне.

Отдавна говорим за правото на законодателна инициатива. Това трябва да се случи. От съдбовно значение е и въпросът за премахването на изискването за постигане на единодушие в Съвета. Едно такова решение ще направи нашия Съюз по-оперативен и динамичен. Необходимо е повечето решения да се вземат с квалифицирано мнозинство. Военната агресия на Русия прибави нови аргументи към тази необходимост. Единодушието трябва да се запази само за приемането на нови държави членки и за евентуални промени в основните принципи. Само тези три неща да постигне Конвентът – съгласие за нови общи европейски политики, законодателна инициатива и премахване на изискването за единодушие, той ще оправдае свикването си.

Leszek Miller (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wnioski z zakończonej w maju konferencji o przyszłości Europy to jasny sygnał, że mieszkańcy naszej Unii oczekują zmian. Można oczywiście mieć uczucie niedosytu, że debata nie była tak szeroka jak zakładaliśmy, ale to nie przekreśla znaczenia głosu tysięcy obywateli. Dlatego też nasz Parlament, kierując się wyrażonymi opiniami, wzywa Radę Europejską do zwołania Konwentu, który rozpatrzy zmiany w traktatach. Celem tych zmian jest umożliwienie Unii Europejskiej szybszego i skuteczniejszego działania, szczególnie w przypadkach takich kryzysów jak COVID 19 czy agresji Rosji na Ukrainę. Aby tak się stało, instytucje unijne muszą odejść od głosowania metodą jednomyślności na rzecz kwalifikowanej większości. Niezbędny jest także zwrot w kierunku pogłębienie integracji europejskiej i metody wspólnotowej w kierunku federalizacji. Te czynniki powinny znaleźć miejsce w zmianach traktatów, jeśli chcemy osiągnąć większą sprawność i skuteczność w mechanizmach decyzyjnych naszej Unii. Zwołanie Konwentu jest niezbędne.

Radosław Sikorski (PPE). – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the peoples of Europe demand a health union. They demand an energy union. And above all, in the face of Putin's cruel aggression, they demand a defence union. We need standing military forces. We need a Commissioner for defence. We need joint purchases of equipment. We need a joint headquarters. And this cannot be done without Treaty change. We need to do it because in future, if Mr Trump returns to the White House or the United States is involved in the Pacific, we might not be able to rely on the United States, and we should not be helpless.

So I'm in favour of moving to the Convention, but don't take it for granted that I would always be in favour of majority voting. Because in this crisis, on the one hand, I feel Mr Orbán should not be allowed to veto sanctions, and on the other hand, we have a structural problem. Germany and France, the largest countries in the EU, are also the most secure. And during the Ukraine war they have not convinced me that they feel the sense of threat of us on the flanks. If we move away from unanimity, they will get an effective veto on anything the EU does, and this requires consideration. I am looking forward to a lively debate.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Gospodine potpredsjedniče, potpredsjednice, kolegice i kolege, osnivački ugovori oduvijek su privlačili pažnju javnosti i bili predmet polemika. U tom smislu Konferencija o budućnosti Europe napravila je dodatan iskorak omogućivši dijelu građana da iskažu vlastito viđenje o budućnosti Unije. U okolnostima pandemije koja je zahvatila sve države članice ne čudi stoga da građani izmjenom ugovora žele povećati ovlasti Europske unije vezane uz zdravstvo.

Kao zastupnik koji aktivno radi na kreiranju zdravstvenih politika, snažno podupirem osnaživanje uloge EU-a u području zdravstva stvaranjem Europske zdravstvene unije. Konkretno, smatram da zaštitu javnog zdravlja posebno vezano uz one probleme koje države ne mogu same riješiti, treba uključiti u članak 4., ali isto tako i izmijeniti članak 168. Ugovora o funkcioniranju Europske unije i na taj način ojačati nadležnosti EU-a u ovom području.

S druge strane, treba biti oprezan s reformom sustava odlučivanja, pogotovo ako bi takva reforma uključivala zamjenu sustava jednoglasnosti odlučivanjem kvalificiranom većinom. Pravo veta osigurava državama članicama zaštitu interesa u njima strateškim područjima, a to je posebno važno za manje države članice, koje i u zajedničkoj Europi imaju pravo očuvati vlastita prava i identitet.

Zato nisam sklon eksperimentiranju i smatram da Europska unija svoje ključne ciljeve može ostvariti i u okviru postojećeg sustava odlučivanja. Golema većina akata Unije već se ionako donosi u redovnom zakonodavnom postupku kvalificiranom većinom država članica i to je sasvim dovoljno.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, convocar esta convenção apresenta-se como a consequência lógica da Conferência sobre o Futuro da Europa, a única forma que temos de respeitar os compromissos que assumimos com os cidadãos. Mas isso exige mais ambição política e isso exige não fazer mais do mesmo.

Mas queria levantar dois pontos. Em primeiro lugar, a necessidade e a possibilidade de explorarmos mais as portas abertas pelo Tratado de Lisboa, em matéria de passar da unanimidade para a maioria qualificada, por exemplo na política fiscal, ou fazermos mais na política de defesa.

Um segundo ponto: a convenção não pode atrasar decisões políticas, designadamente a revisão das regras de governação económica e do Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento. Estas medidas, estas decisões, podem ser tomadas no quadro dos atuais tratados e têm que ser tomadas com toda a urgência.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, χωρίς αλλαγή των Συνθηκών δεν πάμε πουθενά. Ακόμη πληρώνουμε το όχι των Γάλλων και των Ολλανδών στο Ευρωσύνταγμα πριν από 18 χρόνια. Σήμερα ο ένας λέει όχι γιατί φοβάται μην πληρώσει κάτι παραπάνω, ο άλλος θέλει να κρατήσει το φορολογικό του πλεονέκτημα, ο τρίτος θέλει την ομοφωνία νομιζοντας ότι έτσι προστατεύει τα εθνικά συμφέροντα. Συγκρίνουμε τον εαυτό μας με το παρελθόν μας και νομιζουμε ότι προοδεύουμε. Στην πραγματικότητα μένουμε ολοένα πιο πίσω με βάση τις απαιτήσεις του σύγχρονου κόσμου.

Ένα χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα, ξοδεύουμε όλοι μαζί τα τριπλά για την άμυνα από ό,τι η Ρωσία. Αλλά ο Πούτιν έχει το πλεονέκτημα στην Ουκρανία γιατί δεν είμαστε ούτε ενωμένοι, ούτε οργανωμένοι. Χάνουμε και στον ανταγωνισμό με τις ΗΠΑ και την Κίνα. Διαχειριζόμαστε μεγάλες ιδέες και μεγάλη προοπτική. Δεν πρέπει λοιπόν να είμαστε μικροί στις αντιλήψεις μας.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisară, domnule reprezentant al Consiliului, nu pot să încep decât cu o critică la adresa dumneavoastră, pentru că motivul este pueril, să spuneti că a întârziat trenul. Dumneavoastră trebuie să vă luați măsuri, să fiți aici, la un subiect atât de important.

Pentru că un coleg de la Renew amintea de ce spune domnul Macron, am să reamintesc și eu ce a spus în 2017. Eu sunt pro-european. Eu, sunt pro-europeană și doresc ca proiectul Uniunii Europene să existe, pentru că e, în context global, nevoie să avem o Uniune Europeană puternică. Dar nu cea pe care o vrea domnul Macron. Și așa cum a spus în 2017, vă spun acum că nu o susțin niciodată: că vrea o Europă cu două viteze.

Voi susține această rezoluție, avem nevoie ca Parlamentul European să aibă inițiativă legislativă. Nu mai vreau unanimitate în Consiliu, pentru că țara mea este în afara spațiului Schengen exact din cauza opoziției unuia sau a doi șefi de stat. Dar, domnule ministru, transmiteți-i domnului Macron că scopul de a modifica tratatele nu este să avem o Europă cu două viteze. Ne ducem spre scepticism. Cetățenii au nevoie să aibă încredere în Uniunea Europeană.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, Vice-President, Minister, in 2021 the Irish Government originally co-signed a letter with 11 other Member States opposing Treaty change that might arise from the Conference on the Future of Europe. The idea that a bottom up, citizen-led exercise in participatory democracy would be pre-emptively rejected by 12 Member States seemed tone-deaf to me. The letter said, and I quote, ‘it should not create legal obligations, nor should it duplicate or unduly interfere with the established legislative processes’. This seemed ridiculous to me, and despite this discouragement, many thousands of citizens across the European Union participated in the Conference. And I am delighted to say that the Irish Taoiseach yesterday in this Hemicycle announced that Ireland is fully committed to Treaty change that might arise from a Convention.

A final note – a cautionary message perhaps – is that Ireland is the only country constitutionally obligated to hold a referendum to give effect to EU Treaty change. At the same time, Ireland is also most consistently positive towards EU membership. There may be a cautionary tale for everybody in that.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I was listening carefully to this debate this morning, and I want, first of all, to thank you for inviting me to this debate. I think now that all of us agree that, following this intense year of deliberation and engagement with citizens through the Conference on the Future of Europe, the input of engagement of citizens helps reinforce representative democracy. At the beginning it was not like this, but now I am sure that all of us can share this opinion.

We should not lose out of sight that what we have achieved is historically significant. Every institutional component of the Conference gave its consensus on 49 proposals. In the words of President von der Leyen, the Conference weaved and crafted the vision of Europe that delivers on what matters most that helps to make everyday life better.

And we have all listened to the citizens. We all have a role in following up to the proposals of the Conference. Effective feedback is vital to this process. This is where we show that the message from citizens has been well received.

For the Commission as a first step, the follow-up will take the shape of a communication and President von der Leyen will announce the Commission’s first initiatives, as I already said this morning, in her State of the Union address.

The subsequent Commission work programme will see the further implementation of a number of proposals. For the European Parliament, part of the response includes calling for Treaty change. As President von der Leyen said in her speech at the closing of the Conference, the Commission will always be on the side of those who want to reform the European Union and to make it work better. As mentioned earlier, the Commission is ready to play its part. That’s all for my side. Thank you for having me here today and I am looking forward to voting.

Clément BEAUNE, président en exercice du Conseil. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Vice-présidente, chère Dubravka Šuica, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires, pardon encore de vous avoir rejoints un peu tardivement ce matin. Je voulais, en conclusion des débats, redire quelques mots, de la manière la plus transparente possible, à ce stade du processus.

Beaucoup l'ont dit, mais je veux encore insister sur ce point – nous l'avons aussi constaté ensemble le 9 mai: cet exercice, qui s'est déroulé pendant plus d'un an, pendant cette conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe, a permis, de manière inédite dans tous nos États membres, à travers toutes nos institutions, par des contributions en ligne et par des débats dans cette assemblée plénière réunie ici même, d'avoir un ensemble de propositions ambitieuses, qui attendent aujourd'hui des réponses fortes de toutes nos institutions.

Je mesure ce matin l'engagement du Parlement européen et, comme la vice-présidente, j'attends avec impatience le résultat de vos votes – mais je pense qu'il sera lui-même ambitieux. Je veux vous dire qu'au sein du Conseil le débat continue. En tant que présidente, nous avons une responsabilité et un engagement, que le président de la République a rappelés ici le 9 mai.

D'abord, une responsabilité: c'est de faire vivre cette conférence et ses suites. Je ne vous l'ai pas caché, vous le savez: il y a des débats, parfois des divergences, aujourd'hui encore, entre les États membres. La question de la révision des traités en fait partie. Plusieurs ont cité, pour s'en réjouir ou pour le déplorer, le fait que treize États membres avaient exprimé des réticences sur ce point. Du côté de la France – nous ne l'avons pas caché, et cela sera notre position, bien sûr, au-delà de ce semestre de présidence –, nous y sommes favorables, nous y sommes ouverts et nous pensons que cela va faire partie des options que nous ouvrirons après cette conférence.

Mais la responsabilité institutionnelle que nous avons, l'engagement que nous prenons, c'est d'ouvrir ce débat sans tarder du côté du Conseil, même s'il est difficile, surtout parce qu'il est difficile. Dès le Conseil des affaires générales, je le disais, que je présiderai le 21 juin, et en lien avec le président du Conseil européen, le président de la République souhaitera que nous puissions évoquer cette question aussi lors du Conseil européen de la fin du mois de juin.

Il appartiendra bien sûr au Président Charles Michel, dans sa responsabilité, et compte tenu de l'ordre du jour de la situation sur l'Ukraine en particulier, d'en décider, mais je pense qu'il serait nécessaire d'évoquer ce point dès le mois de juin pour ne pas perdre de temps et ne pas décevoir sur le suivi de ce processus.

Plusieurs autres exercices continueront. Du côté du Conseil, nous sommes en coordination, encore cette semaine, au niveau du président de la République et du premier ministre tchèques, pour que la présidence suivante continue à s'emparer de ce dossier, à le mettre à l'ordre du jour, notamment du Conseil des affaires générales, et que le Conseil exprime rapidement une position sur le fond, ce que nous n'avons pas encore fait.

Nous avons aussi pris l'engagement, Madame la Vice-présidente, vous l'avez rappelé, parce que nous le devons aux citoyens, qu'il y ait un événement de suivi collectif à l'automne, après les réunions du Conseil et du Parlement, après les discours de la Présidente de la Commission européenne sur l'état de l'Union et le programme législatif pour 2023, et que nous puissions, entre institutions, revenir vers les citoyens pour dire ce que nous avons fait de leurs propositions et les premières mesures de mise en œuvre.

Sur la question de la convention et de la révision des traités, pour en revenir à la position de la France, que j'exprime ce matin, je le dis: je pense que nous devons nous montrer le plus ouverts possible. Je remercie beaucoup ceux qui l'ont portée: M. Freund, M. Boeselager, M. Verhofstadt, M. Durand et beaucoup d'autres.

Nous devons être ouverts à ce processus. Il est délicat, il ne résout pas tout, mais il est indispensable. Nous devons être ouverts au sein de ce processus, je le redis solennellement, à une révision des traités, avec une approche simple. C'est que c'est un outil, et pas un projet en soi. Tout ne se résout pas avec une révision de nos traités, tout ne nécessite pas une telle révision. Je le redis aussi: il y aura des États membres qui y seront réticents, voire opposés – il y en a aujourd'hui en tout cas. C'est la sincérité que de le rappeler.

Mais nous en avons besoin, parce qu'un certain nombre de sujets nécessitent des réflexions sur le plan institutionnel. Tous ne nécessitent pas non plus une révision des traités, mais ils peuvent en faire partie, comme la question de l'unanimité, sur laquelle, là aussi – et c'est une évolution importante –, le président de la République a dit, y compris sur les sujets de politique étrangère, que nous étions ouverts à une évolution, qui est le sens de l'histoire, vers plus de majorité qualifiée ou la totalité de la majorité qualifiée – sujet également sensible, je ne vous l'apprends pas, au sein du Conseil, mais notre position est claire sur ce point.

Nous devons aussi – et ce n'est pas une façon d'éviter le débat, au contraire, c'est un gage d'efficacité – avancer sans tarder, quoi qu'il arrive, sur beaucoup d'autres propositions qui ne nécessitent pas une révision de nos traités. Dans les neuf groupes de travail, dans les trois cents propositions qui ont été rassemblées – même un peu plus –, il y a beaucoup de choses, sur les questions de santé, sur les questions d'éducation, sur les questions commerciales, sur les questions écologiques, qui peuvent avancer avec une directive, un règlement, un débat parlementaire, parfois une décision de la Commission ou une position du Conseil.

Nous devons évidemment le faire. Cela nécessite des moyens budgétaires; cela nécessite des débats qui ne reviennent pas nécessairement à une révision des traités, car, sinon, nous n'avancerions pas assez vite, quoi qu'il arrive. Donc je crois que l'on doit ouvrir ces deux pistes en même temps, ces deux types de réformes en même temps.

Je ne serai pas plus long parce que je vois que j'ai déjà dépassé mon temps, mais je voulais vous dire à quel point cet exercice, la France, avec quelques autres ici présents, l'avait beaucoup souhaité et porté. Je remercie le Parlement d'en avoir été sans doute le plus grand moteur. Nous devons maintenant en faire une réalité concrète, un projet inspirant pour notre Union européenne. Dans les mois et les années qui viennent, nous serons, du côté de la France – croyez-en mon engagement personnel –, au rendez-vous.

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, diese Debatte hat deutlich gemacht, dass dieses Parlament alles daran setzen wird, Motor der Umsetzung der Vorschläge der Konferenz zur Zukunft Europas zu sein – alles, was ohne Vertragsreform geht, und alles, wofür eine Vertragsreform notwendig ist.

Daher ist der Konvent einzuleiten und hat sich mit all diesen Fragen zu beschäftigen und konkrete Ergebnisse zu erarbeiten.

Zum Abschluss der Aussprache wurden 2 Entschließungsanträge eingereicht*.

Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet heute, Donnerstag, 9. Juni 2022, statt.

*Siehe Protokoll.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Kinga Gál (NI), írásban. – A balliberális frakciók javaslatára az EP jelenlegi határozatával az Európa Jövője konferencia-sorozat végkövetkeztetéseit kívánja tovább erőltetni. Ezek nagyobb hatalmat adnának az amúgy is folyamatosan erősödő európai intézményeknek, veszélyeztetve a nemzeti szuverén döntéshozatalt. Ezek olyan centralizációs modell felé vinnék az európai integrációt, amely az Európai Egyesült Államok képét vetítené előre, gyengítve a tagállamok döntéshozatali erejét. A Konferencia folyamata nem volt sem demokratikus, sem pluralista, a végkövetkeztetések ilyen módszerrel történő elfogadása pedig nem legitim. Ezért az ezen alapuló határozati javaslatát az EP balliberális többségének nem tudjuk támogatni. Európa népe a nyílt társadalmak helyett demokratikus társadalmakat szeretne. A helyzet összetett, amely nyílt és őszinte vitát érdemel. Egy olyan megújulásra van szükség, amelyik az európai nemzetek alkotmányos önazonosságát, kultúráját és hagyományait nem túllépné akarja, hiszen ezáltal szétverné a teljes konstrukciót. Ez azonban nem jelenthet mesterséges, ideológiai alapon erőltetett föderalizációt és centralizációt. Végre a valós problémákra kellene valós megoldásokat találni. Az ideológiailag motivált centralizációs törekvések ugyanis csak a válságok elmélyülését eredményezik. Mi abban vagyunk érdekelték, hogy a nemzeti önrendelkezés jogát tiszteletben tartva együtt egy demokratikusabb és ellenállóbb Uniót teremtsünk. Egy erős Európai Unió csak erős, szuverén tagállamok kölcsönös megértésen alapuló együttműködéséből születhet meg. Mi még hiszünk a vélemény pluralizmusában, és a szabadságban.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR), písomne. – Myslím si, že Únii by pomohlo viac transparentnosti, analýz hodnoty za peniaze, založených na objektívnych dátach a najlepších praktikách v členských štátoch a menej protekcionizmu. Ak chceme dať Komisii viac právomocí, musí najskôr ukázať lepšie výsledky. Teda, predpokladom presunu právomocí z členských štátov na Komisiu je, že ho podporia korektné analýzy objektívnych dát.

Príklad: Kým začne EÚ vytvárať tlak na to, aby členské štáty, ktoré ešte nie sú v menovej únii, do nej rýchlo vstúpili, bolo by správne vyhodnotiť, prečo podľa viacerých štúdií štáty, ktoré do eurozóny vstúpili, majú nižšie HDP, než keby do nej nevstúpili. Bez uvedeného kroku by razantná centralizácia mohla stimulovať odstredivé sily v Únii.

Alin Mituța (Renew), in writing. – Citizens were asked during the past year to think how the EU could work better for them. One of the most resounding answers was changing the Treaties. The Parliament has taken, through this resolution, the first step in the right direction. We need to keep the promise of the Conference – that citizens will be listened to, and their proposals will be implemented, including through the revision of the Treaties. We need a revision of the Treaties to let the EU protect the health of its citizens, for a swift and decided foreign policy, without the unanimity principle, or for giving the Parliament the right of legislative initiative. All were key proposals from the Conference on the Future of Europe and I welcome the resolution as an important step forward. Moreover, the results of the Conference shows us that citizens must be involved more often in the decision – making process of the EU. Not only 5 years, when they vote, or every 20 or 30 years when something similar to the Conference happens, but annually, in a structured manner.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), písomne. – Aj Európska únia, tak ako každé spoločenstvo, potrebuje v dlhodobých časových horizontoch reformovať, inovovať a reagovať na nové spoločenské, hospodárske či politické výzvy.

Revízia zmlúv EÚ by mala reflektovať predovšetkým výsledky Konferencie o budúcnosti Európy. Občiansky hlas je veľmi dôležitý. Zároveň nás pandémie COVID-19 a nedostatok energií naučili, že Európska únia potrebuje viac kompetencií v oblasti zdravotníctva a energetiky.

László Trócsányi (NI), írásban. – Az Európai Parlament úgy véli, hogy szükség van az uniós szerződések módosítására és ehhez a Konvent összehívására. A hivatkozási alapja a kudarcos és semmilyen legitimitációval nem bíró Európa Jövőjéről szóló Konferencia zárókövetkeztetése. Már a Konferencia megkezdésekor tudhattuk, hogy azok, akik a tollat fogják, milyen irányba kívánják vinni az Európai Unió jövőjét. Mi mégis jóhiszeműen és tisztességgel vettünk részt a vitákban, hiszen számunka valóban fontos Európa egysége. Mi nem a centralizációban és nem egy ideológiailag vezérelt Európában hiszünk. Számunkra egy olyan európai integráció vonzó, amely a tagállamok együttműködésén alapszik, és amely tiszteletben tartja a tagállamok nemzeti identitását. Mi egy olyan európai integrációt szeretnénk, amely hatékony válaszokat ad olyan kérdésekre, amelyek Európa polgárait foglalkoztatják. Az európai integráció sokáig egy olyan sikertörténet volt, amely számos eredményt tudhat magáénak. Az elmúlt tizenöt évben az Európai Unió azonban több olyan kihívással is találkozott, amely megrendítette az integráció iránti bizalmat. Márpedig amikor baj van, különösen szükséges, hogy Európa országai összefogjanak. Ezzel szemben ma a megosztottság az úr, bizalmatlanság jellemző a tagállamok kormányaival szemben, felesleges jogállamisági viták és eljárások zajlanak. Ahhoz, hogy az Európai Unió visszanyerje a megínogni látszó bizalmat, jóval kevesebb idológiára és a tagállamok érdekeit figyelembe vevő, professzionális cselekvésre van szükség.

4. Strument kummerċjali ġdid biex jiġu pprojbiti l-prodotti magħmula bix-xogħol furzat (dibattitu)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über ein neues Instrument zum Verbot von Produkten, die in Zwangsarbeit hergestellt wurden, von Bernd Lange im Namen des Ausschusses für internationalen Handel (O-000018/2022 – B9-0015/22) (2022/2611(RSP)).

Bernd Lange, Verfasser. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! In den letzten Monaten haben wir Masken getragen und häufig auch Handschuhe, diese schönen blauen Einmalhandschuhe. Die kommen weltweit zu 65 % aus Malaysia, werden dort mit Zwangsarbeit von Firmen produziert. Menschen müssen dort viel Geld bezahlen, um einen Arbeitsplatz zu bekommen, und werden dann in Zwangsarbeit – man kann schon fast sagen – gehalten. Also eine Situation, die im Grunde überhaupt nicht mehr tragbar ist. Dort werden Produkte hergestellt, die uns schützen, auf dem Rücken von Menschen, die nicht über ihre Arbeit frei entscheiden können. Die USA haben übrigens auch einen *import ban* für diese Handschuhe ausgesprochen, wegen der Zwangsarbeit.

Wir haben gerade neue Informationen über Zwangsarbeit in Xinjiang in China gehört, wo eben auch Produkte unter Zwangsarbeit hergestellt werden. Und deswegen frage ich mich: Wie kann das eigentlich sein, weil ja schon seit 1930 die Internationale Arbeitsorganisation Zwangsarbeit verboten hat? Jede Art der Arbeit und Dienstleistungen, die von einer Person unter Androhung von Gewalt und Strafe ausgeführt wird und die nicht freiwillig geleistet wird, ist Zwangsarbeit. 1957 ist das nochmal von der ILO aufgenommen worden mit der Konvention 105. Und auch in den SDGs – in SDG 8 ist es nochmal aufgegriffen worden. Also fast 100 Jahre klares Bekenntnis gegen Zwangsarbeit. Doch wie sieht es 100 Jahre später aus? 25 Millionen Menschen müssen Zwangsarbeit leisten weltweit, in ganz verschiedenen Ländern.

Und da frage ich natürlich die Kommission: Wann ergreifen wir als Europäische Union, die wir für Freiheit und Demokratie einstehen, Maßnahmen, um diesem Zustand Abhilfe zu schaffen? Wann und wie wird die Kommission agieren?

Sieben Punkte sind da besonders von Interesse: Zum einen natürlich die Frage, wie wir es hinkriegen, einen Importvermarktungsban zu organisieren, sodass wir die Vermarktung ins Zentrum setzen, weil wir natürlich alle Produkte, die mit Zwangsarbeit hergestellt werden, nicht mehr auf unserem Markt sehen wollen und das natürlich in Einklang mit den WTO-Regeln geschehen muss.

Zweitens: Wir brauchen eine klare Definition von Zwangsarbeit, basierend auf den ILO-Kriterien, den 11 Indikatoren und natürlich auch der Erweiterung, der Modernisierung der 1930er Konvention Nummer 29 aus dem Jahre 2014.

Drittens: Wir brauchen klare Evidenzkriterien für die Feststellung von Zwangsarbeit, aber auch den Dialog mit Unternehmen, um klarzustellen, dass sie die Möglichkeit haben, ihre Sicht der Dinge darzustellen und gegebenenfalls auch sicherzustellen, dass ihre Produkte nicht aus Zwangsarbeit herrühren. Wir brauchen ein klares Monitoring, eine Transparenz, und deswegen wollen wir auch gerne ein Datensystem haben, wo wir alle entsprechenden Informationen transparent darstellen können und Behörden auch Stichproben machen können.

Wir brauchen natürlich auch eine Durchsetzung, das heißt, wenn Zwangsarbeit festgestellt ist, dass man auch beschlagnahmen kann und auch ein zwangsweiser Dialog mit dem Hersteller durchgeführt wird, um sicherzustellen, dass auch Abhilfe vor Ort entsteht.

Wir können das nicht alles alleine machen. Deswegen brauchen wir auch internationale Kooperation, vielleicht die Erfahrungen aus den USA anzuschauen und aufzunehmen, aber auch darüber hinaus. Wir wollen ja keine Umgehungsstatbestände schaffen, dass Produkte dann auf andere Märkte geschifft werden.

Und wir müssen siebte natürlich auch sehen, dass es eine Kohärenz zu anderen Gesetzgebungen gibt, damit wir nicht einen riesigen bürokratischen Wust produzieren, sondern kohärent mit anderen Gesetzgebungen sind.

William Hudson hat vor einiger Zeit formuliert: „*Life is the best thing we have.*“ 25 Millionen Menschen haben nicht die Freiheit, ihr Leben selbst zu gestalten. Deswegen müssen wir das anpacken und gemeinsam für die Abschaffung der Zwangsarbeit eintreten.

Dubravka Šuica, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, the Commission is addressing forced labour in global value chains as a priority. Forced labour exists on every continent, including Europe, unfortunately. However, it should be noted that the physical characteristics of a product do not reveal whether forced labour has been used. It also often takes place at the early stages of a supply chain. To address it efficiently, we need to tackle the root cause, which is often related to economic, social, political or cultural circumstances. Other root causes include legislative gaps and the lack of effective enforcement.

Finding effective solutions requires a long-term effort, combined with short— and medium-term European Union action. It will require pooling together a number of relevant policy tools at European level and in the international context. I would like to thank you for the questions you have asked. We are still developing our approach and we still expect to receive comments from stakeholders. Therefore, I will not reply to all your questions in detail today, but they are all well noted for our further consideration.

In response to your questions on the process, we aim to adopt a legislative proposal after the summer break. Executive Vice-President Dombrovskis and Commissioner Breton co-lead on this file, with all relevant Commission services as well as the External Action Service closely associated. Executive Vice-President Vestager is also associated with this file.

The initiative requires urgent action, which does not allow preparing an impact assessment, but the Commission will publish the evidence of a staff working document. The Commission published on 23 May a call for evidence for public feedback. Furthermore, we are currently holding targeted consultations with EU and international stakeholders. This proposal will also respond to the recommendations of the Conference on the Future of Europe, the fight against child labour and forced child labour.

As regards the content of the new instrument, the guidelines were presented by the Commission President in her State of the Union speech last September, and in the Commission communication on decent work worldwide. This provided the basis for the instrument we are currently fleshing out. The aim of the legislative proposal will be to effectively prohibit the placing on the EU market of products made by forced labour, and this marketing prohibition would cover both domestic and imported products.

The instruments would have a risk-based enforcement, build on international standards and complement existing horizontal and sectorial EU initiatives, in particular due diligence and transparency obligations. The measure would introduce a prohibition to place products made with forced labour on the EU market. Therefore the relevant legal basis could be Article 114 of the Treaty, possibly combined with Article 207 of the Treaty if deemed relevant.

The legislative proposal should recognise the role of due diligence in identifying, preventing, mitigating and accounting for the use of forced labour in value chains. It should be coherent with the due diligence obligations established in existing initiatives. It may be useful to give guidelines to companies to help them carry out various steps of due diligence. This should be in line with those guidelines to be developed in the framework of the proposal for a directive on corporate sustainability due diligence. Such guidelines should be tailored for different types of economic operators, especially those not covered by the above-mentioned proposal.

We should avoid placing unnecessary additional administrative burden on businesses and the enforcement authorities, and we should provide tools to help them with implementation. For example, an important element will be information-sharing on the risks of forced labour. The proposal should also consider the specific situation of SMEs, both in its design and enforcement.

Forced labour is a very complex issue. The international dimension is important and we are cooperating with partners, including the US and Canada – who indeed have their own systems – but also with international organisations.

The initiative should consider ways to cooperate with third countries, including countries where supply chains originate.

Daniel Caspary, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Bernd Lange hat einige Beispiele über Zwangsarbeit gebracht, und wir alle haben noch die schrecklichen Informationen und Bilder der jüngsten Enthüllungen über die Situation in China im Gedächtnis.

Ich zitiere aus einer mündlichen Anfrage an die Europäische Kommission: „In den Vereinigten Staaten ist die Einfuhr von Waren, die von Gefangenen hergestellt wurden, gesetzlich verboten. Entsprechend wurde der Verkauf von Erzeugnissen mehrerer solcher Firmen am heimischen Markt unterbunden.“ Und die Frage war dann an die Kommission – ich zitiere weiter: „Welche Maßnahmen wird die Kommission treffen, um die direkte und indirekte Einfuhr von solchen Erzeugnissen in die EU zu verhindern? Ab wann beabsichtigt die Kommission eine möglichst enge Zusammenarbeit mit den Behörden in den Vereinigten Staaten in Bezug auf die Erkennung dieser Waren?“

Das ist nicht unsere Anfrage von heute. Das ist eine Anfrage, die einige Kollegen und ich gemeinsam am 7. Juni 2010 der damaligen Kommission gestellt haben, und am 23. September 2010 war die Debatte. Damals hat Kommissar Füle zugesagt, dass man sich mit dem Thema beschäftigt und dass die Kommission Vorschläge machen wird, und bis heute ist nicht viel passiert.

Im Jahr 2011, am 15. Dezember, haben Kollegen und ich nachgefragt. Antwort, damals von Kommissar De Gucht: Jawohl, wir werden etwas machen; da soll es irgendwelche Arbeitskreise in der Kommission geben, und wir werden auf das Parlament zurückkommen. Dann ist wieder nichts passiert. Am 25. Februar 2013 haben wieder einige Kollegen und ich nach. Am 18. April eine schriftliche Antwort. Wir kennen alle das Ergebnis: Es ist wieder neun Jahre nichts passiert. Ich könnte diese Reihe gerade fortsetzen.

Heute haben wir das Thema auf der Tagesordnung. Wir geben der Kommission mit unserer EntschlieÙung eine klare Aufgabe mit. Und nachdem Kommissionspräsidentin Ursula von der Leyen angekündigt hat, das Initiativrecht des Parlaments auch anzuerkennen, kann ich nur sagen: Bitte das tun, was wir in der ersten Ziffer fordern, nämlich wir fordern ein neues WTO-konformes Instrument als Ergänzung der Sorgfaltspflichten von Unternehmen. Und ich wünsche mir, Frau Kommissarin, dass Sie und Ihre Kolleginnen und Kollegen möglichst schnell wirklich mit einem Gesetzestextvorschlag auf uns zukommen.

Raphaël Glucksmann, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame, chers collègues, un crime contre l'humanité hante nos armoires et nos magasins depuis de trop longues années. La déportation et la réduction en esclavage du peuple ouïghour.

Quand vous achetez une chemise Zara ou une paire de Nike, vous pouvez vous retrouver lié sans le savoir, sans le vouloir, au système concentrationnaire chinois. Pourquoi? Parce qu'il n'existe en Europe aucune loi, aucun instrument pour empêcher l'importation des produits du travail forcé. Parce que notre marché est ouvert aux quatre vents et que rien ne vient contrarier l'avidité de multinationales prêtes à tout pour dégager leurs marges faramineuses et verser leurs dividendes délirants.

Le moment est venu de tourner pour de bon la page de l'irresponsabilité et de l'impunité. En ce jour, nous, représentants des citoyennes et des citoyens d'Europe, nous envoyons un message clair aux exploiters les plus cupides. Vous allez désormais devoir respecter des règles. Ce vote est le résultat de plusieurs années de mobilisation. Il a été rendu possible par le courage de centaines de milliers de citoyennes et citoyens européens.

L'exigence que ces jeunes de France et d'ailleurs ont formulé à notre endroit est simple, basique: permettez-nous de nous habiller, de nous déplacer, de téléphoner sans être complices de crimes. Osez, osez affronter les lobbies et les tyrans. Soyez enfin dignes de la mission que nous vous avons confiée. Notre résolution, si largement soutenue, dessine un instrument simple et efficace pour bannir les produits de l'esclavage du marché européen. Un jour prochain, les douaniers du Havre ou de Rotterdam saisiront donc des cargos venus de Chine ou d'ailleurs et bloqueront les produits du travail forcé avant qu'ils n'arrivent dans nos magasins et dans nos armoires.

Jusqu'à ce jour, nous ne lâchons rien. Nous serons dignes de notre mission. Et enfin, enfin, nous oserons affronter la cupidité de ces multinationales qui pensent pouvoir jouir sans fin d'un monde sans règles.

Samira Rafaela, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, today, millions of people globally go to work facing inhumane conditions to produce products we all enjoy. Even in this House, many of us are using or wearing goods made by forced labour without us even realising it. And therefore the new instrument to ban products made by forced labour from our markets should be an instrument with which we can truly act. And in its design, we must ensure that this new legislation is WTO compatible. Also to make sure that countries comply to the international commitments and it must be able to limit products from our market made through forced labour when we as EU have clear evidence that this is the case.

We must ensure it complements existing or upcoming EU legislation, for example due diligence, and as a Union that respects and promotes universal values globally, we need to ensure that forced labour goods do not enter our market, because this is about human rights. This is about credible trade policies. This is about our credibility, making sure that our partners, our customers trust us. And it is time we put a serious halt to the infringements of basic human rights. And it means that if we have clear evidence, if we have clear signs that these products are not OK, that these products are not ethical, then we need to do something about it.

And I call upon the Commission to present us a legislative proposal no later than September this year. We have several experiences now that we are waiting for very important and needed legislation. And like I said, this is about human rights. Please come with a proposal no later than September.

Anna Cavazzini, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, I do not want to buy products made by Uyghurs in detention camps. I do not want to see products made by workers in debt bondage in Malaysia on the EU single market. And the European Parliament is united and clear: the EU needs to act. Forced labour must be banned and consumers must know they are not buying products of modern slavery. And for that it is really, really important how the instrument looks like, because the devil is in the detail.

In our resolution that was carried by all the Groups and a very broad majority in the Trade Committee, we demand to properly ban products linked to forced labour, not only a watered-down product-withdraw mechanism like the Commission is discussing it. We want the instrument to be remedy-centred, because the idea is that we help the workers that are in modern slavery.

The instrument needs to be encompassing and should not exclude certain businesses. I thank President von der Leyen very much that she, in her initiative last year, in her speech of the Union, announced this instrument, but in order for this to not be like an empty promise, and that we don't have another 10 years, the Commission needs to come now with an instrument that is effective and that will work for the people currently in forced labour. So we need to make the EU a driving force in banning forced labour globally.

Guido Reil, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zwangsarbeit ist die Sklaverei des 21. Jahrhunderts und muss bekämpft werden. Ein Importverbot für Produkte, die unter Zwangsarbeitsbedingungen hergestellt wurden, ist ein guter Ansatz; deswegen werde ich natürlich zustimmen.

Dennoch ein paar kritische Anregungen. Gegen wen geht es hier heute? Geht es hier gegen Bangladesch? Geht es hier gegen Katar? Das wären gute Beispiele. Nein, es geht gegen China, und es geht um die Unterstützung der Uiguren. Und die Uiguren werden tatsächlich unterdrückt und ausgebeutet. Aber so wirklich frei lebt in China niemand, denn Kommunismus und Menschenrechte und Freiheit sind nicht kompatibel. Und die Uiguren per se für Heilige zu erklären ist auch nicht so ganz richtig, denn beim islamischen Terror weltweit sind Uiguren immer in der ersten Reihe, auch bei Al-Qaida und beim IS.

Und vorgemacht hat uns diese ganze Gesetzgebung die USA, und das haben wir schon gehört. Nur, die USA führt gerade einen Handelskrieg mit China. Und gerade der USA ist es völlig egal – die arbeiten wirklich mit jedem Schurkenstaat dieser Welt zusammen, wenn es zu ihrem Vorteil geht. Auch das sollten wir nicht vergessen.

Geert Bourgeois, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, we zijn het erover eens dat dwangarbeid een van de zwaarste inbreuken op de mensenrechten is. Voorzitter Lange liet al weten dat naar schatting 25 miljoen mensen wereldwijd het slachtoffer zijn van dwangarbeid. Het is aan ons om de invoer van producten die met dwangarbeid zijn vervaardigd, aan te pakken. Zulke producten horen namelijk niet thuis op onze interne markt en in de schappen van onze winkels.

Deze regelgeving had wat ons betreft beter kunnen worden opgenomen in de regelgeving inzake zorgvuldigheid. Die laat echter op zich wachten. Bijgevolg wordt, naar het model van de Verenigde Staten, gekozen voor een invoerverbod.

Ik heb daar een aantal bedenkingen bij: ten eerste zullen er 27 douaneautoriteiten optreden en moeten we er daarom waakzaam voor zijn dat malafide invoerders niet kiezen voor de zwakste schakel van die 27. Voorts zal er internationale samenwerking nodig zijn, waarbij we naar de Verenigde Staten moeten kijken. Deze samenwerking moet verder gaan dan het tegengaan van malafide invoer. We moeten kortweg proberen dwangarbeid wereldwijd aan te pakken. Ten slotte wil ik bijzondere aandacht vragen voor de administratieve lasten, zeker voor de kmo's, die niet in staat zullen zijn de hele toeleveringsketen te bewaken, en wil ik pleiten voor samenhang in de desbetreffende regelgeving, wanneer deze wordt vastgesteld.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Was haben ein Auto, ein T-Shirt, ein Computer und eine Banane gemeinsam? Sie alle dürften Spuren von Zwangsarbeit aufweisen.

Das Leid der Menschen verbirgt sich in der Undurchsichtigkeit globaler Lieferketten. Weltweit – das ist gesagt worden – werden 25 Millionen Menschen dazu gezwungen, bestimmte Produkte und Waren herzustellen; viele dieser Güter werden auch bei uns hier in der EU verkauft.

Wie lange schauen wir noch weg? Produkte moderner Sklaverei und Zwangsdienstleistungen haben auf dem europäischen Markt, so meinen wir, nichts zu suchen. Und europäische Unternehmen sollten nicht von Menschenrechtsverletzungen profitieren. Ich meine, europäische Bürgerinnen und Bürger wollen bei ihrem Kauf die Sicherheit haben, dass niemand leiden musste, um dieses Produkt herzustellen.

Viel zu viele Unternehmen haben es versäumt, freiwillig die notwendigen Maßnahmen zu ergreifen, um das Problem anzugehen. Deshalb meine ich, Frau Vizepräsidentin, die Kommission muss endlich handeln.

Wir brauchen drei Schlüsselinstrumente, die zusammen etwas bewirken werden: ein starkes Importverbot, eine solide, verbindliche und durchsetzungsfähige Gesetzgebung zur Sorgfaltspflicht von Unternehmen und den verbindlichen UN-Vertrag über Wirtschaft und Menschenrechte.

Tiziana Beghin (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Vicepresidente, la schiavitù dovrebbe essere un fenomeno del passato, relegato alle pagine più buie dei libri di storia, ma purtroppo è ancora attualissimo perché nel mondo ci sono 25 milioni di persone che si trovano in condizione di lavoro forzato, e i tre quarti di queste sono donne e ragazze.

La Commissione sta per presentare un nuovo regolamento che toglierà dal mercato i beni prodotti tramite lavoro forzato. Io ne sono orgogliosa, perché credo che è anche a questo che serve il commercio internazionale. Ma perché questo strumento funzioni bisogna che si applichi a tutto il processo di produzione e non solo ai prodotti finiti. Per cui vorrei chiedere quale sarà il campo di applicazione di questo regolamento, come la Commissione intenda vegliare sul rispetto effettivo delle regole, perché la situazione nel settore tessile ha esposto tutte le carenze dei sistemi internazionali di audit e certificazione, anche di fronte a violazioni gravi e reiterate.

Infine, bisognerà fare in modo che chi effettua i controlli abbia tutte le risorse necessarie a investigare, perché questo regolamento non deve restare un insieme di buone intenzioni inapplicabili, ma funzionare per rendere il commercio più giusto e pulito.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Grundsätzlich muss es die Aufgabe eines Staates sein, mit der jeweiligen Gesetzgebung dafür zu sorgen, dass Zwangsarbeit verboten ist und entsprechend bestraft wird. Traurig ist, dass Zwangsarbeit nicht nur in Drittländern vorkommt, sondern auch in Europa. Daher gilt es, die schwarzen Schafe nicht zu schützen, denn neben der menschlichen Katastrophe führt Zwangsarbeit auch zu erheblichen Wettbewerbsverzerrungen.

Forced-Labour-Produkte vom Markt zu verbannen, ist wichtig, aber noch wichtiger ist es, die richtigen Hintermänner zu finden, aber auch darauf zu achten, dass Unternehmen nur aufgrund hinreichender Beweise beschuldigt werden. Es ist ohnedies für viele, vor allem für kleine Betriebe, schwierig, überhaupt die Möglichkeit zu haben, in Drittländern von ihren indirekten Zulieferern Informationen über ihre Arbeitsbedingungen zu bekommen. Falsche Beschuldigungen von Unternehmen, Missachtung von Betriebsgeheimnissen, überbordende Auflagen würden zu einem enormen Wettbewerbsnachteil in der Europäischen Union führen.

Summa summarum begrüßen wir von der EVP ein WTO-konformes Handelsinstrument, denn Zwangsarbeit darf im 21. Jahrhundert auf diesem Planeten keinen Platz mehr haben.

Inma Rodríguez-Piñero (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, 9 de junio de 2022: mientras estamos celebrando este debate, veinticinco millones de personas sufren el trabajo forzoso en el mundo. La mayoría de ellas, mujeres, niñas y niños, poblaciones desplazadas y los grupos más vulnerables de la sociedad. Para los socialdemócratas, la erradicación del trabajo forzoso en todas sus variantes, en todo el mundo, es una gran prioridad, porque pocas cosas son más importantes que garantizar condiciones de trabajo decentes.

La Unión Europea ambiciona su consecución en su acción interna y en su política exterior y comercial apoyando las normas de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo y su implementación en nuestros acuerdos comerciales. Pero no es suficiente. Para erradicar de una vez por todas esta salvaje plaga del trabajo forzoso necesitamos dotarnos de nuevas y más eficaces herramientas.

Por eso, defendemos y reiteramos nuestra petición a la Comisión para que presente urgentemente en este Parlamento un instrumento potente para prohibir la entrada en el mercado europeo de mercancías elaboradas o transportadas en condiciones de trabajo forzoso. Sin excepciones. Otras sociedades avanzadas disponen de estos instrumentos; Europa tiene que actuar urgentemente.

Europa no puede permitir que algunos países basen su desarrollo en el trabajo esclavo de sus ciudadanos. No puede aceptar que empresas europeas colaboren con contratistas en terceros países que esclavizan a sus trabajadores. Nadie debería aceptar que personas en situación de debilidad sean explotadas por otras que obtienen pingües beneficios por ello.

Nuestra aspiración en cuanto a la eficacia de este instrumento no va dirigida a un país concreto, es una aspiración universal. Pero, evidentemente, todos hemos visto las terribles imágenes de la situación que vive el pueblo uigur en China. Esperamos que nuestra actuación alivie de inmediato esto. Por ello, le pedimos urgentemente que presente ese instrumento en el Parlamento.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – A Uachtaráin, a dhaoine uaisle, beidh mé ag labhairt Gaeilge.

Leis na híomhánna agus na cáipéisí scanrúla a eisíodh i gComhaid Phóilíneachta Xinjiang, ní féidir glacadh le neamhghníomhaíocht leanúnach an Aontais Eorpaigh níos mó.

Is féidir linn ar a laghad ar bith ráthaíocht a thabhairt dár saoránaigh nach mbeidh siad féin comhpháirteach sa mhí-úsáid seo trí tháirgí ó shaothar éigeantais a cheannach gan fhios dóibh féin.

Ach nílimid inár n-aonar agus muid ag féachaint leis na ráthaíochtaí sin a thabhairt. An mhí seo, cuirfidh na Stáit Aontaithe toirmeasc ar allmhairiú earraí ó Xinjiang, murar féidir leis an allmhairteoir fianaise shoiléir a chur ar fáil nach de thoradh saothar éigeantais a táirgeadh na hearraí.

Cuireann sé imní orm go ndéanfar na táirgí seo a atreorú i dtreo na hEorpa. Mar sin, ní foláir don Choimisiún anailís agus bearta éifeachtacha a dhéanamh chun aghaidh a thabhairt ar an reachtaíocht seo.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, il y a un an et demi, la Commission et le Conseil nous présentaient comme un succès l'accord d'investissement avec la Chine alors qu'il y avait déjà des persécutions et il y avait la répression à Hong-Kong. Il y a un an presque jour pour jour, ce parlement bloquait la discussion sur l'accord d'investissement avec la Chine et contraignait la Commission à intégrer la question du travail forcé dans le débat européen.

C'est une bonne nouvelle et, aujourd'hui, nous en sommes effectivement à la fois à renforcer la responsabilité des entreprises, mais aussi à réfléchir à un instrument beaucoup plus puissant et beaucoup plus systématique sur le travail forcé, qui touche 25 millions de travailleurs, et particulièrement de travailleuses, dans le monde. C'est tant mieux si la politique commerciale européenne commence à évoluer.

Mais, dans le Xinjiang, le travail forcé, ce n'est pas simplement de l'esclavage moderne, c'est un instrument qui participe à une stratégie génocidaire. Et donc nous devons immédiatement et très rapidement, au niveau européen, imposer un embargo sur les importations du Xinjiang, où tous les secteurs sont concernés par le travail forcé. Un embargo sur les importations du Xinjiang!

Alessandra Basso (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, il mercato della nostra Unione è il più richiesto dell'intero pianeta e non possiamo permettere che ad accedervi siano beni prodotti da paesi dove vige ancora la pratica barbarica del lavoro forzato. Per prima cosa dobbiamo mettere la vita prima del profitto.

Dobbiamo aiutare le nostre imprese, spesso penalizzate dalla concorrenza sleale basata sullo sfruttamento anche di bambini. Chi sfrutta i bambini spegne la luce del mondo, perché sfruttare i bambini significa commettere un crimine contro l'umanità.

Ritengo che sia interessante approfondire lo studio del sistema di valutazione e controllo applicato dalle dogane americane per il controllo dei casi sospetti di sfruttamento del lavoro forzato, che ha già portato al blocco di 912 carichi nei primi mesi nel 2022. Perché quando un uomo ti dice che è diventato ricco grazie al duro lavoro, la prima cosa da chiedere è: al lavoro di chi?

Manon Aubry (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, 25 millions de personnes sont forcées de travailler dans le monde, dont 4 millions d'enfants. Ils produisent nos vêtements, notre nourriture, nos téléphones portables, et la plupart du temps sans même qu'on le sache. De nombreuses entreprises comme Nestlé, Zara ou Huawei s'enrichissent sur cet esclavage moderne pour nourrir leur soif de profit.

Il y a un an, la Présidente de la Commission européenne annonçait en grande pompe l'interdiction d'importer, sur le marché européen, des produits issus du travail forcé. Pourtant, le commissaire chargé du commerce traîne la patte depuis. On nous dit que cette mesure aurait un impact trop négatif sur le commerce européen, et qu'il faudrait peut-être l'assouplir...

Alors qui croire? Qui croire, à la Commission? La Commission des grands discours ou celle des grands renoncements? La Commission qui dénonce le travail forcé des Ouïghours en Chine ou celle qui conclut avec ce pays un accord commercial? Celle qui promettait une loi ambitieuse sur le devoir de vigilance ou celle qui nous propose une directive au rabais?

Contrairement à vous, notre position est invariable: nous défendrons toujours les droits humains avant les profits des entreprises. Alors n'attendez plus: nous voulons nous habiller, nous alimenter ou téléphoner sans être complices du travail forcé.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, tato debata, myslím, vyznívá jednoznačně. Všichni zde podporujeme, aby legislativní návrh byl předložen co nejdříve. Jsme společenství hodnot a ochrana lidských práv je pro nás jedno z klíčových témat našeho společného žití v Evropě.

Otázka je tedy, aby návrh byl předložen co nejdříve. Je opravdu ostudné, že již více než deset let probíhá debata o tom, že návrh bude předložen a schválen. A je samozřejmě důležité bavit se pak o konkrétní podobě návrhu. Je třeba přijmout takový návrh, který bude efektivní, který nebude možné obcházet, protože je samozřejmé, že z takového byznysu, z nucených prací plynou obrovské zisky a že těm, kteří tento byznys využívají, se náš zákaz nebude líbit. Tedy je důležité znát konkrétní podobu právní úpravy, aby nebylo možné ji obejít. A za druhé mít takovou právní úpravu, která nebude administrativně šikanovat slušné podnikatele.

Dnes je tedy jasný signál Evropského parlamentu – toto chceme zakázat. A prosím paní komisařku a Evropskou komisi, abychom co nejdříve během podzimu již vedli zde debatu o tom, jak ta konkrétní právní úprava má vypadat. Bylo to zde řečeno – 25 milionů lidí pracuje v rámci nucených prací. Takto hrubě jsou porušována jejich lidská práva. Zvláště případ Číny a Ujgurů považují za nejvíce odstrašující, protože tam to není jen otázka ekonomiky, ale i politické likvidace této menšiny, tohoto národa.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Voorzitter, velen hebben gewezen op het hoge cijfer in verband met dwangarbeid in Europa. Hieruit blijkt dat het een langdurig, hardnekkig probleem is, dat momenteel vanwege de situatie van de Oeigoeren in China extra aandacht krijgt. Ik ben het ermee eens dat het probleem in China nog groter is. Het gaat daarbij uiteraard niet alleen om dwangarbeid, maar bovendien om een georganiseerd regime dat zijn mensen onderdrukt. Er wordt door sommigen, misschien wel terecht, gesproken van genocide.

Het is daarom de hoogste tijd om dit probleem aan te pakken. Op dit vlak mogen wij als Parlement trots zijn. De werkzaamheden van de Commissie zijn immers op ons initiatief van start gegaan en we verwachten dan ook dat daaruit een sterk instrument voortkomt. Daarbij moet niet alleen worden gekeken naar de grootte van bedrijven, die vaak niet relevant is, maar bovendien naar de gebieden waar zich de grootste risico's voordoen. Het spreekt voor zich dat we een verbod op dwangarbeid moeten combineren met passende zorgvuldigheid en ervoor moeten zorgen dat deze aanpak ook in onze handelsovereenkomsten terugkomt.

Ten slotte moeten wij ook in de Europese Unie onze verantwoordelijkheid nemen om dit hardnekkige probleem voor-
goed op te lossen.

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Herr talman! Det som den kinesiska staten kallar för yrkesutbildning, i Xinjiang, är i praktiken koncentrationsläger för att genomföra folkmord på uigurerna. Där sitter omkring en miljon människor i fängelse, enbart på grund av att de tillhör en minoritetsgrupp. Där genomförs inte bara politisk indoktrinering och tortyr, utan även ett cyniskt utnyttjande för tvångsarbete i stor skala för kinesisk export. 80 procent av all bomull i Kina produceras där, och Kina står för en fjärdedel av världens bomullsproduktion.

Vi vill handla med alla länder, men vi vill inte ha en enda tråd eller en enda tygbit vävd under slaveri. Vi ska inte köpa och bära kläder befläckade med ofrihet och blod. EU är världens viktigaste handelspartner. Vi ska använda den styrkan för att säga ja till alla människors frihet och nej till tvångsarbete. En lagstiftning behövs som kompletterar och förstärker förslaget om due diligence som vi redan arbetar med här i parlamentet.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, vingt-cinq millions: c'est l'estimation du nombre de personnes qui sont contraintes au travail forcé dans le monde, y compris au Brésil ou en Indonésie, où l'Union européenne veut conclure des accords de libre-échange, ou encore en Chine, avec laquelle l'Union européenne voulait conclure un accord d'investissement. Six à dix millions sont des enfants: des chiffres qui ne font que grimper du fait de la pandémie et de la guerre en Ukraine, qui enfonce davantage les familles dans la précarité.

Les produits issus de cet esclavage moderne atterrissent sur le marché européen. Cinquante milliards d'euros de marchandises qui arrivent en Europe sont teintées du travail des enfants. Les États-Unis ou le Canada ont su agir pour que leurs citoyens ne soient pas complices de ces violations des droits humains. Qu'attend donc l'Union européenne pour en faire autant? Pour ce Parlement, interdire aux produits liés au travail forcé d'accéder à son marché est le meilleur moyen d'y parvenir et le meilleur moyen de signifier aux États que, tant qu'ils le pratiquent, il n'y aura plus de commerce ni d'investissements avec eux.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, o trabalho forçado é um grave abuso dos direitos humanos. Mulheres, crianças, mas também homens, são vítimas de trabalho forçado em muitos países, em todos os continentes, como aliás lembrou na sua intervenção inicial. Tem de ser combatido e definitivamente erradicado. Sem medidas e ação concreta não haverá resultados. A União Europeia deve usar todos os instrumentos de que dispõe para este combate. Desde logo, a política comercial. Proibir produtos fabricados com recurso ao trabalho forçado é um contributo.

A criação de um novo instrumento comercial, proibindo a importação e exportação de produtos fabricados ou transportados usando trabalho forçado, a par das regras de dever de diligência em matéria de sustentabilidade das empresas, é inadiável. É esse o nosso pedido à Comissão. É tempo de banir definitivamente o trabalho forçado.

Sara Mathieu (Verts/ALE). – Voorzitter, de EU mag geen afzetmarkt zijn voor producten die vervaardigd zijn door middel van moderne slavernij. We moeten onze verantwoordelijkheid nemen en een verbod instellen op producten die met dwangarbeid in verband kunnen worden gebracht. Ik wil u daarom vragen hier zo spoedig mogelijk werk van te maken. We weten immers dat een dergelijk verbod niet alleen mogelijk is, maar ook werkt. Dit kunnen we zien in de landen die ons zijn voorafgegaan, zoals de VS en Canada, waar al tientallen miljoenen euro's aan compensatie aan slachtoffers is uitgekeerd.

Het Europees Parlement, met de Groenen als drijvende kracht, pleit er zeer duidelijk voor de handel aan de grens te stoppen en ervoor te zorgen dat slachtoffers en ngo's klachten kunnen indienen, zodat autoriteiten op basis daarvan producten kunnen vasthouden en deze, wanneer er niet langer sprake is van dwangarbeid, pas weer kunnen vrijgeven wanneer is vastgesteld dat de slachtoffers compensatie hebben ontvangen. Zo kunnen we echt een vuist maken tegen de Oeigoerse dwangkampen in China.

Europa moet een krachtig handelsinstrument in het leven roepen om ervoor te zorgen dat in de schappen van Europese winkels geen producten meer liggen die met behulp van dwangarbeid zijn vervaardigd.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Mr President, you would have hoped that it would not be necessary to ban forced labour, and not only out of moral decency, but also because nearly every country in the world has ratified the ILO Forced-Labour Convention. But as everyone before me has already explained, a trade instrument to ban forced labour is urgently needed. Look at what's happened in Qatar and look at what is happening in China. President von der Leyen announced such an instrument almost a year ago in her State of the Union, and nevertheless, we are still waiting.

The longer we wait, the higher our expectations become. We do not want a proposal with legal and technical loopholes that companies could slip through, and I therefore call upon the Commission to finally show some ambition. Companies will only change their business model when faced with consequences. People must be put before profits.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisară, trebuie să spun că sunt foarte bucuroasă că am ajuns cu acest subiect, însă, așa cum se spunea aici, dacă a durat 10 ani să tot discutăm găsirea unui instrument, sper să nu mai dureze tot 10 ani până îl aplicăm. Pentru că, vedeți, discutasem înainte un subiect important. Parlamentul nu are putere de inițiativă legislativă și stăm la mila Comisiei: preia sau nu preia rezoluțiile noastre.

Viața are prioritate, doamna comisară, și știți bine acest lucru: să așteptăm 10 ani o decizie, pierdem încrederea cetățenilor. Da, munca forțată trebuie exclusă, nu numai din țările terțe, pentru că fac, într-un fel, și concurență producătorilor din spațiul Uniunii Europene, din piața internă, dar trebuie eliminată și în interiorul pieței interne, pentru că am destule exemple când cetățeni din Est sunt ținuți la o muncă indecentă, ca să nu spun mai mult, în alte state.

De aceea, cer imperativ să veniți cu o propunere, ca să avem un instrument comercial pentru eliminarea muncii forțate.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Dubravka Šuica, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, only a few comments. First of all, the Commission aims at adopting the legislative proposal after the summer break, as many of you asked.

The initiative requires urgent action, which does not allow us to prepare an impact assessment, but the Commission will publish the evidence, as I said earlier, in a staff working document. We published a call for evidence on 23 May, and it is open for public feedback until 24 June. We encourage stakeholders to submit comments.

All of us know that combating forced labour is nothing new. Our trade agreements commit our partners to signing and effectively implementing the ILO fundamental conventions, including on forced labour. Company law instruments and proposals oblige companies to report on forced labour and address it in their operations and supply chains. Moreover, our anti-trafficking directive from 2011 ensures that Member States penalise human trafficking and forced labour.

And to conclude, I do appreciate the valuable comments and questions raised in this debate today. It is clear that we have the same objective. Combating forced labour and promoting due diligence standards are priorities of the European Union's agenda on business and human rights. We are looking forward to further exchanges with you on this issue. Thank you Mr President, thank you honourable Members, thank you Mr Lange, so we are looking forward to having legislative proposals soon.

Der Präsident. – Frau Vizepräsidentin, herzlichen Dank für Ihre Antwort.

Zum Abschluss der Aussprache wurde 1 Entschließungsantrag eingereicht^(*).

Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet heute, Donnerstag, 9. Juni 2022, statt.

Die Sitzung wird für einige Minuten unterbrochen. Sie wird um 12.00 Uhr mit der Abstimmung wieder aufgenommen.

(Die Sitzung wird um 11.46 Uhr unterbrochen.)

^(*) Siehe Protokoll.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

5. Tkomplija tas-seduta

(The sitting resumed at 12.00)

6. Hin tal-votazzjonijiet

President. – The next item is the vote.

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

- 6.1. **Is-sitwazzjoni tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem fix-Xinjiang, inklużi x-Xinjiang police files (RC-B9-0310/2022, B9-0310/2022, B9-0311/2022, B9-0312/2022, B9-0318/2022, B9-0319/2022, B9-0325/2022) (votazzjoni)**
- 6.2. **L-istrumentalizzazzjoni tal-ġustizzja bhala strument ta' repressjoni fin-Nikaragwa (RC-B9-0293/2022, B9-0293/2022, B9-0298/2022, B9-0301/2022, B9-0306/2022, B9-0313/2022, B9-0315/2022) (votazzjoni)**
- 6.3. **Il-ksur tal-libertà tal-media u tas-sikurezza tal-ġurnalisti fil-Georgia (B9-0295/2022, RC-B9-0300/2022, B9-0300/2022, B9-0302/2022, B9-0303/2022, B9-0304/2022, B9-0309/2022) (votazzjoni)**
- 6.4. **L-istat tad-dritt u l-approvazzjoni potenzjali tal-Pjan Nazzjonali ta' Rkupru (RRF) tal-Polonja (B9-0316/2022, RC-B9-0317/2022, B9-0317/2022, B9-0320/2022, B9-0321/2022, B9-0322/2022, B9-0323/2022) (votazzjoni)**
- 6.5. **Strument għal akkwist internazzjonali (A9-0337/2021 - Daniel Caspary) (votazzjoni)**
- 6.6. **Id-dritt ta' inizjattiva tal-Parlament (A9-0142/2022 - Paulo Rangel) (votazzjoni)**
- 6.7. **Theddid globali għad-dritt għall-abort: il-possibbiltà li l-Qorti Suprema tirrevoka d-dritt għall-abort fl-Istati Uniti (B9-0289/2022, B9-0292/2022, B9-0299/2022) (votazzjoni)**
- 6.8. **It-talba biex titlaqqa' Konvenzjoni għar-reviżjoni tat-Trattati (B9-0305/2022, B9-0307/2022) (votazzjoni)**

— *After the announcement of the result of the vote on the resolution as a whole:*

President. – Congratulations, I will transmit this to the Council.

- 6.9. **Strument kummerċjali ġdid biex jiġu pprojbiti l-prodotti magħmula bix-xogħol furzat (B9-0291/2022) (votazzjoni)**

President. – That concludes the vote.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.29)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND*Vizepräsident***7. Tkomplija tas-seduta***(Die Sitzung wird um 15.00 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)***8. Approvazzjoni tal-Minuti tas-seduta ta' qabel**

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar. Gibt es Einwände?

*(Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung ist genehmigt.)***9. Qutgh illegali ta' sigar fl-UE (dibattitu)**

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission betreffend den illegalen Holzeinschlag in der EU von Dolors Montserrat im Namen des Petitionsausschusses (O-000020/2022 – B9-0016/22) (2022/2523(RSP)).

Ich erinnere Sie daran, dass mit Ausnahme der ersten beiden Reihen, die für die Fraktionsvorsitzenden vorgesehen sind, freie Sitzplatzwahl besteht. Nachdem Sie Ihre Abstimmungskarte in das Abstimmungsgerät eingeschoben haben, können Sie dann über Ihr Abstimmungsgerät spontane Wortmeldungen und blaue Karten beantragen.

Ich weise Sie auch darauf hin, dass Wortmeldungen im Plenarsaal weiterhin vom zentralen Rednerpult aus erfolgen, außer spontane Wortmeldungen, blaue Karten und Bemerkungen zur Anwendung der Geschäftsordnung.

Vlad Gheorghe, supleant al autorului. – Domnule președinte, peste două treimi din cetățenii europeni consideră că schimbările climatice afectează zilnic. Mai mult de jumătate dintre europeni consideră schimbările climatice principala provocare pentru viitorul Uniunii, iar 87 % sunt de acord că lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice înseamnă îmbunătățirea propriei stări de sănătate și bunăstare. Nouă din zece tineri europeni sunt extrem de categorici în ceea ce privește protecția mediului înconjurător.

Poate credeți că 2024 e încă departe, că electoratul mai poate fi păcălit, că tema mediului este mai puțin importantă decât altele, că lumea va uita până atunci cine ce votează în Parlamentul European sau în parlamentele naționale. Ei bine, toate eurobarometrele, toate studiile realizate la cererea Comisiei, toate sondajele la nivel național arată clar că vă înșelați.

Oamenii vor mai mult de la partide și de la politicieni. Vor rezultate, nu promisiuni. Vor legi aplicate, nu discursuri. Vor schimbări reale, nu campanii electorale. Oamenii care trăiesc an de an secetă pronunțată, temperaturi record, inundații devastatoare, furtuni tropicale în zonele temperate, alunecări de teren și toate celelalte fenomene extreme care au luat între 90 și 140 de mii de vieți în Europa în ultimele decenii. Sute de jurnaliști, activiști, avertizori de integritate agresivi și chiar uciși în timp ce încercau să protejeze păduri și arii Natura 2000 de hoții de lemne.

Ignorând problema tăierilor ilegale, votăm împotriva emisiilor de seră. Nu vrem să schimbăm nimic din ceea ce se întâmplă acum pe teritoriul Uniunii, nu doar în România, în Ungaria sau Austria. Nu îi apărăm pe acești oameni, pe familiile lor, pe copiii lor. Nu votăm cu gândul la cetățeni, pe care avem datoria să reprezentăm, ci cu gândul la negocieri individuale și de grup, la linii de partid, la convingeri sau interese personale.

Și de aceea, peste tot în Uniune cetățenii ne penalizează, ne penalizează prin absentism, prin vot de blam, prin susținerea partidelor extremiste și a curentelor antieuropene. Despre tăierile ilegale de pădure știm cu toții că nu sunt doar infracțiuni de mediu. Gradul de distrugere și nivelurile la care ne afectează acest flagel reprezintă o crimă, iar victimele nu suntem doar noi, ci toate generațiile viitoare.

Cetățenii europeni au înțeles asta demult. Ne-o transmit prin numeroase petiții și inițiative pe care sunt sigur că le primiți cu toții. Dacă aveți impresia că în țara voastră tăierile ilegale nu există, vă înșelați. Ce se taie în alte țări europene ajunge pe piața unică, ce se fură într-un stat membru ne costă pe toți – miliarde și miliarde de euro anual. Dacă aveți impresia că în țara voastră acest flagel se pedepsește, Europol vă arată cu cifre că vă înșelați. Dacă aveți impresia că mediul poluat, biodiversitatea distrusă și toate schimbările climatice se opresc la granițele voastre, din nou, vă înșelați.

Și atunci, de ce unii colegi și unele grupuri parlamentare încă refuză să pedepsească tăierile ilegale la nivel european? Asta mă întreb și eu. Se întreabă și cetățenii. Asta ne întreabă și presa după fiecare vot în comisii și în plen. De ce în 2022 pentru o infracțiune de așa amploare încă nu avem un regim european unitar și o instituție europeană specializată? De ce pe un domeniu unde Uniunea are competențe nu vrem să legiferăm, deși acesta este mandatul nostru primit prin vot de la cetățenii europeni care ne plătesc?

Am cerut și insist asupra înființării procurorului verde european pentru că tăierile ilegale dintr-o țară afectează întreaga Uniune. Vă rog să susțineți această propunere de rezoluție și întrebarea asociată, ca pași în plus cu care să ne apropiem de obiectivele planului verde și să combatem infracțiunile de mediu careucid cetățenii europeni. Ne afectează tuturor sănătatea și pun în pericol viitorul copiilor noștri.

Dubravka Šuica, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable members, first I would like to thank the Petitions Committee for adding this oral question to this week's plenary agenda and for giving us the opportunity to discuss today this highly important topic.

Let me start by stressing the Commission is strongly committed to protecting and restoring existing forests worldwide and that the protection of forests features very highly on our political agenda. This EU forest strategy, which we adopted last year, which is anchored in both the European Green Deal and the EU diversity strategy, builds on the multiple roles played by forests for the climate, biodiversity, society and the economy. It strives to ensure that our forests deliver on all those fronts. Our goal is to overcome the challenges related to climate change and biodiversity loss and at the same time to promote the bio-economy to unlock the potential of forests for our future.

If we want the European Union to succeed in its transition towards sustainability, we will need forests that are bigger, healthier and more resilient than today. In this spirit, the forest strategy shows how increased climate and biodiversity ambitions can go hand-in-hand with economic prosperity. It is a realistic strategy, which also acknowledges that our forests are under threat. We have seen how, during the pandemic, illegal logging actually increased in the European Union. The EU forest strategy for 2030 states explicitly that the implementation and enforcement of our relevant *acquis* to protect forests needs to be stepped up, and the Commission is determined to play its role as guardian of the Treaties. Over the past years, where we concluded that EU legislation was not properly implemented, we have launched infringement procedures against the Member States concerned, for example, Poland, Slovakia, Romania and Estonia.

In your oral question, you ask how the Commission plans to assess the extent of illegal logging and the economic losses it causes within the European Union. In relation to the economic losses linked to illegal logging, we do not have official recent estimates, but we can see from various data sources that it could be substantial. A study of the World Bank gives estimates of foregone tax revenue due to illegal logging for 2017 Europe without Russia. It estimates that between USD 19 million and USD 380 million in tax income was lost.

The EU Timber Regulation remains the EU's primary tool for preventing illegally logged timber entering EU markets. The Commission assesses the correct enforcement of EU Timber Regulation by Member States on the basis of their annual reporting of relevant, substantiated concerns and trade data. In addition, the Commission relies on satellite images available to evaluate illegal logging in protected Natura 2000 sites, and on reports from civil society on the ground.

We will continue to work closely with Member States to develop other relevant initiatives and tools, including under the framework of the regulation of deforestation, which the Commission proposed in November 2021. The regulation of deforestation will eventually replace the Timber Regulation and expand reporting obligations by Member States. It proposes reporting on the content of checks, their follow up, country of origin and production of timber. This will allow the Commission to better assess the quality of Member States' enforcement activities.

Let me now turn to the second part of your oral question concerning the compliance of Member States with their commitments to restore areas deteriorated by illegal logging. The Commission has opened several infringements against Member States to address illegal logging that has taken place in Natura 2000 sites in breach of the Habitats Directive. In these cases, the Commission has asked Member States to restore deteriorated areas and to present a restoration plan. On this basis, the Commission will carefully assess the delivery of such commitments using both satellite intelligence and field evidence as appropriate.

Lastly, on the publishing of the detailed assessment of all forest management plans in Member States, we plan to do this through the new legislative instrument on EU forest monitoring plans for 2023. Furthermore, the assessment will consider how to support and advice foresters in setting up those plans. In parallel, the Commission is using geospatial intelligence to assess individual cases where there might be a risk to compliance. For example, geospatial intelligence is increasingly being used by the Commission to assess complaints about natural forest habitat deterioration in special areas of conservation.

Finally, the Commission is also developing the EU observatory on deforestation and forest degradation, which investigates changes in the world's forest cover and associated drivers.

Honourable Members, thank you for your attention, and I look forward to your questions and comments.

Valter Flego, u ime kluba *Renew*. – Poštovana potpredsjednice Komisije, poštovane kolegice i kolege, živimo u teškim vremenima i to svi znamo. Cijene energenata, nevažno pričamo li o nafti, o plinu ili o električnoj energiji, rastu, cijene dobara rastu, cijene hrane rastu. Samim time, naravno, rastu troškovi života i poslovanja.

Imamo nikad veću inflaciju i logično je da se trgovačka društva, obrti, ljudi, građani snalaze na svakakve načine, ali to nikako nije i ne smije biti opravdanje za nepoštivanje zakona i za nezakonitu sječu, za uništavanje šuma. Profit i kratkoročna rješenja, odnosno zarada ne smije nikad biti iznad održivosti i zakona, ali na žalost u mnogim slučajevima danas je samo profit postao važan.

Zato predlažem Komisiji da zajedno s državama članicama, zajedno s regijama, ali i gradovima uvedemo svi zajedno reda u prostor. Nevažno, govorimo li o nezakonitoj sječi ili, na primjer, o bespravnoj gradnji, pogotovo u mediteranskim zemljama, koja opet nepovratno uništava najvažniji resurs, a to je, naravno, prostor. Dakle, princip je isti. Zakon se mora poštivati, a države članice i regije, uvjeren sam, žele zajedno s Komisijom riješiti taj problem.

I ponavljam, treba sinergijski djelovati bilo da govorimo o nezakonitoj sječi, bilo da govorimo o bespravnoj gradnji. I zato predlažem da se koriste resursi država, regija i grada, a to su prije svega ljudi, to su prije svega mehanizmi i njihovo poznavanje stanja na terenu kako bi poštivali i provodili zakone.

U tom partnerskom, odnosno sinergijskim efektu lakše će se detektirati ta mjesta nepoštivanja zakona. Lakše će se isto tako sankcionirati prekršitelji, a što je najvažnije, na taj način dugoročno sačuvati i priroda i okoliš za buduće generacije.

Eleonora Evi, a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi membri della commissione per le petizioni abbiamo ricevuto tantissime petizioni che denunciano come il disboscamento illegale sia un fenomeno in crescita in Europa. I cittadini, in particolare, lamentano che le leggi europee, che presentano già diverse lacune, abbiano forti carenze proprio nell'applicazione a livello territoriale.

Io credo che abbiamo quindi bisogno di un migliore controllo e di migliore armonizzazione. L'Unione dovrebbe infatti promuovere l'uso di metodi scientifici per monitorare la deforestazione e verificare l'origine legale del legname in commercio e valutare l'efficacia della gestione forestale.

E poi, sono d'accordo con il collega Gheorghe, serve una figura di procuratore ambientale nell'Unione europea contro i crimini ambientali transnazionali, tra cui appunto il disboscamento illegale. Un procuratore ambientale a livello europeo faciliterebbe le indagini transfrontaliere e l'armonizzazione dei procedimenti giudiziari in tutta l'Unione.

Infine, è necessaria però anche una chiara definizione del reato di disboscamento illegale, perché gli Stati membri, le organizzazioni e gli *stakeholder* hanno delle interpretazioni ad oggi molto diverse.

Joachim Kuhs, im Namen der ID-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, werte Kollegen! Diese EntschlieÙung über illegalen Holzeinschlag ist ein weiterer Versuch der EU, Kompetenzen im Bereich Naturschutz, Umweltschutz und Forstwirtschaft an sich zu reiÙen. Unter dem Vorwand großflächiger Holzeinschläge, die hauptsächlich in Staaten wie Rumänien, Griechenland und der Slowakei stattfinden, sollen Tracking- und Tracing-Systeme sowie Zertifizierungssysteme für Holz implementiert werden, um die Holzentnahme und den Holzexport besser kontrollieren zu können. Wie Landwirte und private kleine Waldbesitzer diesen bürokratischen Wahnsinn stemmen sollen, das ist schwer vorstellbar.

Hinzu kommt: Zwischen den Begriffen Holzeinschlag und Entwaldung wird nicht klar unterschieden; die Begriffe sind schwammig. Nebenbei bemerkt: Hauptursache für die Entwaldung dürften gelegte Waldbrände sein, nicht illegaler Holzeinschlag.

Die EU-Forststrategie für 2030 begegnet weiteren grundsätzlichen Bedenken. Sie ist nicht nur ein Bürokratiemonster, sie ist vor allem ein gravierender Eingriff in nationalstaatliche Kompetenzen, und sie widerspricht dem Subsidiaritätsprinzip. Oder glauben Sie wirklich, dass die Wälder Finnlands genauso zu bewirtschaften sind wie die wenigen Bäume auf Malta oder in Zypern?

Und so geht es weiter: Mit den Totschlagbegriffen Klima oder Biodiversität sollen noch mehr Waldflächen unter Schutz gestellt werden und so der seit Generationen erfolgreichen nachhaltigen Bewirtschaftung entzogen werden. Der Holzeinschlag müsse reduziert werden, wird gesagt, um Klimaschutzziele und den *Green Deal* zu erfüllen. Dabei wird komplett ausgeblendet, dass die Ersetzung der fossilen Energieträger mit Onshore-Windkraft zu erheblichem Waldverbrauch führt. So besteht zum Beispiel in Deutschland die Gefahr, dass ein jahrhundertalter Wald wie der Reinhardswald der Installation von Windkraftanlagen geopfert wird. Das kann so nicht funktionieren.

Aber was können wir tun? Wir müssen wieder verstehen, was Nachhaltigkeit ist. Der Begriff der Nachhaltigkeit wurde ja bereits vor über 200 Jahren in der Forstwirtschaft erfunden. Damals fuhr man noch nicht mit dem *harvester* in den Wald, um zu ernten. Da ging man kleinteilig und mit Rücksicht auf den Baumbestand vor. So haben wir in Mitteleuropa eine wirklich diversifizierte und nachhaltige Forstwirtschaft erhalten. Die dürfen wir uns nun nicht mit diesem neuen Bürokratiemonster und mit neuen Auflagen kaputtmachen lassen.

Weiter gilt: Naturschutz, Umweltschutz und Forstwirtschaft müssen Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten bleiben. Wir sollten alles tun, um dem Subsidiaritätsprinzip wieder Rechnung zu tragen.

Ryszard Czarnecki, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! To jest temat ważny. On oczywiście tak naprawdę w jednych krajach jest większym problemem, w innych krajach jest mniejszym problemem. Akurat mój kraj – Polska – prowadzi bardzo rozsądną, zrównoważoną politykę leśną. Przynajmniej od siedmiu lat inwestujemy w lasy, ale też nie będziemy nikomu tego modelu narzucać. Traktujemy lasy jako dobro narodowe. Ale też podkreślam, na pewno jest to jakiś problem w skali Unii Europejskiej.

Chciałem podziękować Pani Komisarz za bardzo profesjonalne wystąpienie. Cieszę się, że nasza koleżanka z Europarlamentu przez 6 lat, dzisiaj tę funkcję sprawuje. Myślałem, że Pani Komisarz powie, czy nielegalnie pozyskuje się drewno w Dubrowniku, pięknym Dubrowniku, gdzie Pani była przez dwie kadencje burmistrzem. Tego nie słyszałem, ale może tego problemu tam nie ma.

Myślę, że w tej sprawie byłoby dobrze, abyśmy działali do pewnej granicy. Nie może to się stać pretekstem, aby zauważając ten problem tworzyć instrumenty, które by wychodziły poza obecne ramy działania Unii Europejskiej i pozwalały Unii wchodzić w kompetencje krajów członkowskich.

Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Wir verlieren täglich wertvolle Wälder in der EU durch rechtswidrigen Raubbau, und das sogar in stark geschützten Natura-2000-Gebieten. Dabei gehen kriminelle Netzwerke besonders brutal vor. Rücksichtslos werden hektarweise Wald kahlrasiert; wir kennen die Bilder. Das ist ein enormer ökologischer, aber auch wirtschaftlicher Schaden. Und es wirkt sich nicht nur fatal auf Böden, Artenvielfalt oder Klima aus, sondern erschüttert auch vor Ort das Vertrauen in den Rechtsstaat.

Ich habe zwei Fragen an die Kommission:

Warum ist die Kommission bisher nicht weiter in dem Verfahren gegen Rumänien vorgegangen? Warum sind wir nicht vor Gericht, obwohl nachweislich absolut nicht genug unternommen wird, um illegale Abholzung endlich zu verhindern?

Und die zweite Frage, vielleicht an Ihren Kollegen vom AGRI: Ist es nicht die Tatsache, dass wir es in der EU nicht schaffen, große Kahlschläge als legale Holzerntemethode zu regulieren, die uns daran hindert, zum Beispiel mit Satellitentechnologie illegale Kahlschläge eindeutig zu erkennen und die Akteure zu stellen? Wenn wir die Prinzipien einer nachhaltigen und schonenden Waldwirtschaft EU-weit verbindlich machen würden, könnten wir nicht illegale Kahlschläge viel besser eindämmen?

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, г-жо Комисар, уважаеми колеги, горите са национално богатство. Зеленото е родолюбие. Горите са белят дроб на планетата – в това няма никакъв спор. И докладът на колегата е много навременен. Незаконната сеч и незаконното добиване на дървесина е кражба от бъдещите поколения и то трябва да бъде много строго санкционирано. Едновременно с това обаче трябва да се знае и да се посочи кой го прави. В България, в която имаме една от най-големите площи гора и в Европа и изобщо, горите се управляват от Българската социалистическа партия, която стои отляво. Член е на социалисти и демократи, на социалдемократи. А се добива незаконно от функционери на „Движението за права и свободи“ – хората, които са в групата „Обнови Европа“. Така че, когато говорим за унищожаването на горите, посочвайте тези, които го правят. А те са отляво и отляво – в тези редици. Това са хората, които секат незаконно гори. Продават ги, унищожават ги и по този начин застрашават не само нашия живот, но и на всички останали. Това, което искам да ви кажа е, че зеленото родолюбие и гората трябва да се пазят.

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, in many EU countries we are having a problem with illegal logging. I've witnessed it in Estonia, in Slovakia, in Poland, in Spain, in Romania and other countries. But let me focus on Romania. While the Environmental Commission is compiling an enormous amount of evidence towards an infringement procedure, there is ongoing illegal logging in Romania happening, concretely in the Făgăraș Mountains, in the Iași area. Every citizen can see on Google Maps how deforestation increased in Romania while we were compiling the information for the infringement procedure.

Did the Romanian Government really better the situation? I don't know. An environmental impact assessment only being done after the forest has been logged, I think is not serving the purpose. To actually reduce transparency and reduce the amount of information that is provided to citizens in the public tracking system for wood trucks is actually not the direction that I think the Romanian Government should go in preventing illegal logging.

We have to see that while we are doing an infringement procedure, we see something like panic logging in the region – this increased access to the forests and increased deforestation. And I would urge you to start the court case as soon as possible to save as much as can still be saved, please. I coincide with the question of the public: please tell us what the next steps will be.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtarán*, the Commissioner is absolutely correct when she says we need more forests in Europe. Obviously illegal logging has to be tackled and eliminated, if at all possible, and I support our endeavours in that regard.

Fortunately, in my country, it's the opposite problem we have: we can't get legal logging, because of rules by the department for planning permission, permitting, etc. – a whole backlog they tried to blame on the European Union, until, of course, that was disproved. And as a result, they have a target of setting 8 000 hectares per year, and they are only meeting 2 000. So I would ask the Commission to look at that and ensure that those who want to set forest in Ireland are facilitated, not what is happening at the minute.

Now a good news story is that there is a company in Ireland set up by Enda Keane, Treemetrics, which recently launched a climate-smart forest management platform with the support of the ESA, and I think that's something that could be very helpful and I would ask the Commission to look into it.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke. Gerbiama Komisijos vicepirmininke. Dėkoju už Jūsų pasisakymą ir pranešimą. Jūs labai gerai paminėjote, kad mes turime gerą įrankį – miškų strategiją – ir kad miškai yra mūsų planetos plaučiai. Iš tikrųjų išsaugant miškus ir užkertant kelią nelegaliai miško ruošai yra svarbūs labai du dalykai. Pirma, tai, kad legaliai miškų ruošą būtų prieinama nelabai subiuokratinta. Čia mano kolega minėjo apie trukdžius išduodant legalius leidimus. Bet, kita vertus, man atrodo, kad priežiūra miškų kirtimo taip pat yra labai svarbu. Jūs paminėjote palydovines sistemas, kurios yra naudojamos įvertinant miškų būklę. Galbūt galima būtų geriau pasidalinti su šalimis narėmis ir su vietiniais ekspertais, kad ta priežiūra miškų būtų geresnė, o tie, kurie kerta nelegaliai, kad jie būtų atitinkamai nubausti.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, the European Union should move swiftly, and the Commission should move swiftly, to take infringement proceedings against countries who fail to implement the basic standards of protection in terms of forestry and illegal logging. And certainly with the technology and satellite observation and tracking systems in place, it should not be beyond the capabilities of Member States not only to observe but to prosecute those that are involved in illegal logging. And I would urge that the Commission would take infringement proceedings against countries who fail to act.

In terms of Ireland, as was already referenced, in Ireland the opposite is the case. We can't plant forestry due to regulation, planning difficulties. And if we do plant it, we can't harvest it – and I'm talking about commercial forestry – because of the inability of the public administration to deal with licensing for felling. So I would also invite the Commission to look at Ireland's track record to try and meet our goals of increasing forestry, bearing in mind we have only 11% of our landmass under forestry, and we simply are not meeting any targets in terms of our ambition to increase the amount of forestry planted for commercial purposes.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ponieważ w tej dyskusji została wymieniona Polska, chciałbym powiedzieć – jest takie polskie powiedzenie, przysłowie „Nie było nas, był las, nie będzie nas, będzie las”. To jest, wydaje się, rzecz oczywista, ale zanim będziecie Państwo próbowali krytykować Polskę, to parę danych.

Polska jest dzisiaj w europejskiej czołówce, jeśli chodzi o powierzchnię lasów. Obecnie powierzchnia lasów w Polsce wynosi ponad 9,2 mln hektarów, co odpowiada lesistości na poziomie 29,6 proc. Zdecydowana większość to lasy państwowe, z czego około 7,3 mln hektarów zarządzane jest przez Państwowe Gospodarstwo Leśne – Lasy Państwowe.

Ważny podkreślenia jest fakt, że w moim kraju lasy rosną na glebach najsłabszych. Odpowiedzialna polityka leśna to bardzo dobra okazja, aby nisko pokłonić się właśnie tu, w Parlamencie Europejskim, ludziom odpowiedzialnym za tę politykę. W pas się kłaniam polskiemu leśnikom, polskiemu przyrodnikom, pracownikom parków narodowych, parków krajobrazowych, polskiemu myśliwym. Szczęść Boże. Darzbór.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, the European Court of Auditors released a report recently linking logging rates to an increase in the consumption of solid biomass for energy purposes. Now, to meet renewable energy targets, burning biomass is the cheapest alternative, so many countries are effectively forced to do so to meet their targets.

Sixty per cent of the EU's renewable energy is coming from biomass, which continues to rise. This leads to the burning of even more wood and the creation of more emissions in a vicious circle. How is this a sound environmental practice? Forest biomass should not be considered a renewable energy source: it actively harms forests by creating a cash-crop forestry plantation industry, which of course makes space for the illegal logging industry in Europe. We seriously need to reconsider the inclusion of forest biomass under the EU Renewable Energy Directive. It is damaging European forests.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisară, cred și eu cu tărie că avem nevoie de o determinare mult mai puternică în a combate tăierile ilegale în Europa. Vin dintr-o țară care a fost expusă unor defrișări ilegale greu de înțeles și de explicat, pentru că mafia nu are culoare atunci când atacă pădurile. Însă ceea ce vreau să spun cât se poate de sincer este că în ultimii ani legislația în România a fost puternic modificată, mult îmbunătățită.

Dacă până recent tăierea a cinci metri cubi de lemn însemna contravenție, astăzi este infracțiune. Mulți pleacă în pușcărie tocmai pentru că se ating de păduri și cred că România poate și este obligată să își îmbunătățească instrumentele prin care combate defrișările ilegale și asta vom face în continuare.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-н Председател, ще обърна внимание на нещо, което всички вие пропускате. Това се нарича така наречената „битова сеч“ – незаконна битова сеч. Това са хора, които не могат да се отопляват през зимата, и в някои населени места в България започнаха да сечат парковете в населените места. Мисля, че това е резултат от енергийната политика на Европейския съюз. Мога да ви кажа, че цените на газа само за шест месеца миналата година преди войната в Украйна се вдигнаха с 300 процента в България. Разбирам, че тези хора ще сечат. Може би трябва да има някаква обща енергийна политика и да има някаква защита за населението. Аз не ги оправдавам, че унищожават дърветата. Но започвам да ги разбирам. Скоро никой няма да може да си плати тока. Благодарение на зелената сделка.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, thanks to colleagues for tabling the initiative. I mean, four days ago on every social media platform, the EU was celebrating World Environmental Day, and one of our key targets was to fight deforestation, recognising that forests play a vital role in mitigating the catastrophic impact of climate change. And yet the European Union's forests only account for 5% of the world's forests. And in countries like my own, which is twice the size of Switzerland, it is only half of the forestry. And I'm delighted that colleagues from the government parties in Ireland are present, so maybe their government might address this problem, but the forests that we have, we've got to protect. And in that context, illegal logging is important to address.

I agree with the colleague who spoke before me. There is a distinction between people, out of energy poverty, eking out some fuel to heat their homes and the industrial scale illegal logging which is going on very often cross-border and done through organised crime. There has to be stronger coordination at EU level, but also a holistic approach that allows forest planning with a stronger role for local communities.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for all your comments. You know, the European Union forest strategy refers to the need to better respond to new challenges and needs, in particular concerning climate and biodiversity objectives and the issue of forest health, which is of concern for all Member States. It specifically announces further work on indicators and thresholds and refers to the need to better address these challenges. We intend to work jointly with Member States and stakeholders and assess how these could best be used to demonstrate, communicate and further develop the forest sector's sustainability.

With regard to the use of remote sensing to fight illegal logging, it is important to note that it is the competence of Member States to control the enforcement of the European Union Timber Regulation. It is generally not a sufficient tool to ensure its enforcement, and the planned legislative proposal on a forest monitoring framework will, however, ensure better access to data on forest logging and help fight illegal logging. I already mentioned that the Commission is determined to play its role as guardian of the Treaties. I said that over the past years when we concluded that EU legislation was not properly implemented, we have launched infringement procedures against the Member States concerned. I mentioned Poland, Slovakia, Romania and Estonia, and now a few words on Romania.

We are paying great attention to the illegal logging situation in Romania, as this puts into jeopardy human lives and the rich biodiversity of Romanian forests. We are following very closely this case as it strongly relates not only to compliance with Habitat Directive and the Timber Regulation, but also to the credibility of the EU forest strategy. We are cooperating closely with the Romanian authorities and are following up on the work that remains to be done, in particular the restoration of deteriorated forests.

Concerning the suggestions and remarks of the Irish MEPs, we have taken good note of your remarks.

Dear Members, in the past few years, several petitions have highlighted the extent to which illegal logging grew in the European Union during the pandemic. We have since opened an infringement procedure for breaches of EU environmental law. This shows that we take your pleas seriously.

I want to thank honourable Members for following this topic so closely. We are strongly committed to the protection of our forests and environmental defenders in the European Union, and we look forward to the plenary vote expected at the next plenary session this month.

And regarding Dubrovnik, there are no forests, only cypress trees and pine trees, and they are under conservation so nobody is doing illegal logging there! Thank you very much for mentioning this.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet während der nächsten Tagung statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Loránt Vincze (PPE), írásban. – Környezetünk, az élővilág védelme korunk egyik legnagyobb kihívása a rájuk nehezedő demográfiai nyomás és kapcsolódó következményeivel, mindez érinti az erdőket. A fenntarthatóság jegyében azon kell munkálkodnunk, hogy erdőink egészségesebbek legyenek, ugyanakkor az erdészet teljes értékű gazdasági ágazat maradjon, és ahogyan évszázadokon át tette, ezentúl is biztosítsa az ott élő közösségek megélhetését. Mindez nem egyszerű feladat, mióta a Petíciós Bizottság keretében foglalkozom a témával, sok kérdésről beszélünk.

Polgárok petíciókkal fordultak a Parlamenthez – többek között Romániából is – segítségünket kérve az illegális fakitermelés okozta problémák megoldására. A témát a szakbizottságban megtárgyaltuk és állásfoglalást fogadtunk el. Támogatom az illegális fakitermelés elleni hatékonyabb fellépést, keresnünk kell az intenzívebb európai együttműködés lehetőségeit, hogy megállítsuk az erdők állapotát károsító bűnözői tevékenységet. Ez mindannyiunk közös érdeke.

Köszönöm a Bizottságnak az eddigi erőfeszítéseit és a határokon-átnyúló ügyekben lefolytatott vizsgálatokat az illetékes szerveknek. Meggyőződésem, hogy a tagállamok tudatában vannak felelősségüknek és érdekelték a bűnözés visszaszorításában, ezért erősítik a jogszabályi keretet, erősítik a hatóságok hatásköreit és eszköztárát, új digitális eredetkövetési eszközöket vetnek be. Az európai belső piacon a fakitermelés és a rá épülő többi ágazat esetében is megfelelő szabályoknak kell érvényesülniük, amelyek tekintettel vannak a biodiverzitásra és garanciát jelentenek, hogy az EU-ban megjelenő faáru legális kitermelésből származik.

10. Spjegazzjonijiet tal-vot

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung.

10.1. L-istat tad-dritt u l-approvazzjoni potenzjali tal-Pjan Nazzjonali ta' Rkupru (RRF) tal-Polonja (B9-0316/2022, RC-B9-0317/2022, B9-0317/2022, B9-0320/2022, B9-0321/2022, B9-0322/2022, B9-0323/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtarán,* I voted in favour of this resolution, which outlines Parliament's concerns regarding the European Commission's recent positive assessment of Poland's recovery and resilience plan. There is no doubt that serious and sustained breaches of the rule of law abound in Poland, and the Commission would do well to adhere to the clear conditions attached to financing under the RRF in its approval of Poland's plans. European funds cannot be provided to a country whose government continues to disregard the rulings of the Court of Justice of the European Union and the European Court of Human Rights, as well as the primacy of EU law.

Vlad Gheorghe (Renew). – Domnule președinte, sunt jurist și am votat pentru această rezoluție pentru că Uniunea Europeană înseamnă respectarea drepturilor omului, libertate, egalitate, stat de drept. Orice gravă încălcare a lor trebuie să aibă consecințe. Nu putem întoarce capul când un stat membru este în afara tratatelor prin acțiunile liderilor politici și ale partidelor de la guvernare. Bani europeni trebuie să ajungă la cetățeni, nu la partide de guvernare și prietenii lor.

Hotărârile CJ UE și ale instanțelor internaționale trebuie să fie respectate. Corupția, iliberalismul, legile cu dedicație, încălcarea drepturilor unor cetățeni, toate trebuie sancționate. În Uniunea Europeană nu este nimeni mai egal decât alții: niciun stat, niciun președinte sau niciun premier, nicio formațiune politică și niciun cetățean. Nu există țări membre de mâna a doua, nu există state membre mai cu moț. Aceleași reguli trebuie să se aplice tuturor.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, колеги, продължава политическата атака срещу Полша. Полша е държава, която в момента носи тежестта на това да подпомага много хора, които бягат от война. Полша има свое национално правителство, избрано от полските граждани. Тук в тази зала има хора, които се опитват политически да променят полското правителство, да подменят вота на полските граждани. По тази причина търсят всякакви начини години наред да подменят вота на поляците.

Този доклад е част от позорното поведение, насочено срещу полската държава и полската нация – суверенната полска нация. Това е напълно неприемливо. За нас Европейският съюз трябва да бъде съюз на държави, които уважават своя суверенитет. Съюз на държави, които имат своето собствено мнение и го отстояват – равноправен съюз. По тази причина докладът и опитът да бъде спряан планът за възстановяване на Полша е напълно неприемлив и позорен. Да живее Европа на отечествата!

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, I agree with the last speaker that it should be 100% the choice of the Polish people to elect the government that they see fit.

Now the release of the Recovery and Resilience Facility Fund to Poland is an interesting one for the EU, because one day they are telling us about the rules and the regulations and what you have to do and what you don't have to do. And the next day it doesn't seem to matter quite as much. And I also find it interesting that Hungary haven't had their money released. I mean, are things that much different in Hungary and Poland? Have Poland become the best boys in the class overnight? Or is it just that this actually suits the geopolitical agenda and Poland has to be rewarded for being seriously anti-Russian, and also being very helpful towards the refugees? I think that this could come back to bite the European Commission.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-н Председател, аз мисля, че Полша е една суверенна държава, която е представила своя план, който, доколкото си спомням, е одобрен от Комисията. И мисля, че това е нормално, тъй като очевидно всяко едно правителство би трябвало да знае най-добре какви са проблемите на неговия народ. И не разбирам защо са тези политически инсинуации, които натрапват някакви странни мнения в коя държава има върховенство на закона и в коя няма. Мога да ви кажа, че в Европейския съюз няма държави, в които няма върховенство на закона. В момента вие се опитвате да Наложите на България да си махне ветото, за да влезе държава като Македония, в която няма върховенство на закона. Това искам да ви кажа. Значи тука почват някакви странни политически и геополитически, както каза колегата Уолас, разговори, в които вие ще ни натрапите държава, която е направила отвратителни неща с българите в Македония.

10.2. Strument ghal akkwist internazzjonali (A9-0337/2021 - Daniel Caspary)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, I voted in favour of this report. The International Procurement Instrument will enable the European Commission to launch consultations with third countries regarding procurement market access in order to facilitate better access for EU firms. The instrument empowers the EU to restrict access to the EU's procurement market if third-country consultations do not improve market access for EU firms. I was happy to support the compromise reached, as I believe that it will be an effective but balanced addition to the EU's trade toolbox. The EU procurement market is one of the biggest and most competitive markets in the world, therefore it is vital to ensure market access reciprocity with our trading partners. I complement Mr Caspary and the others who worked on this very important file.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, de mai bine de zece ani instituțiile europene încearcă să ajungă la un consens în ceea ce privește accesul țărilor terțe la piața internă a achizițiilor publice ale Uniunii. Votul de astăzi ne duce cu un pas mai aproape de acest obiectiv. Tocmai de aceea am și votat. Am putut vedea în ultimii doi ani și, mai ales, în ultimele luni importanța cooperării Uniunii cu țări din toate regiunile lumii.

Astăzi, Parlamentul este deschizător de drumuri, reglementând accesul partenerilor comerciali la piața internă, în condiții de echitate, cu respectarea regulilor concurenței. Desigur, acest acces presupune și reciprocitate. Astfel, instrumentul despre care discutăm astăzi va oferi Uniunii Europene pârgă de negociere necesare pentru a deschide, la rândul său, accesul întreprinderilor europene la piețe de achiziții publice ale țărilor terțe.

Este esențial ca într-o lume atât de interconectată Uniunea Europeană să fie un lider și un promotor al colaborării între state, fie ele din cele mai îndepărtate părți ale Asiei sau Africii.

10.3. Id-dritt ta' inizjattiva tal-Parlament (A9-0142/2022 - Paulo Rangel)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-н Председател, може да ви изглежда невероятно, но аз съм гласувал „за“. Въпреки че при тази конфигурация на Парламента аз имам леки притеснения, но се надявам, че това ще е добре за демокрацията, и мисля, че е нормално Парламентът да има право на законодателна инициатива. Мисля, че това е логично и нормално, защото ние сме най-близо до гражданите. Нито Съветът, нито Комисията се срещат с граждани. Мога да се подпиша с две ръце и мисля, че всички ние знаем колко те познават избирателите в Европейския съюз, за разлика от нас. И мисля че е нормално ние да можем да предлагаме неща, които ги интересуват. Защото от нещата, които виждам в този Парламент, доста от тях са сякаш измислени от хора от друга планета, от хора, които нямат връзка с действителността, и затова мисля, че е редно да бъде подкрепено.

Vlad Gheorghe (Renew). – Domnule președinte, de la preluarea mandatului de europarlamentar m-am asigurat că vocea cetățenilor europeni se aude cu adevărat în Parlamentul European. De aceea, am votat pentru această rezoluție. 90 % dintre europeni, cred că ar trebui să-i luăm mai mult în considerare în deciziile referitoare la viitorul Europei. 55 % dintre europeni menționează votul la alegerile europene ca fiind una dintre cele mai eficiente modalități de a se asigura că vocile lor sunt auzite de factorii de decizie de la nivelul Uniunii Europene.

Reprezentarea nu se face prin alianțe politice sau negocieri între grupuri și partide. Europarlamentarii sunt cei aleși prin vot de către cetățenii statelor membre. Europarlamentarii sunt cei care au datoria și responsabilitatea să-i reprezinte pe cetățeni prin legi care să reflecte încrederea acordată.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, не подкрепих този доклад, въпреки че има логика в това Европейският парламент да има някаква законодателна инициатива поради естеството на политическите процеси в Европейския съюз и Европейския парламент в момента.

Даването на законодателна инициатива в този момент, при тази политическа конфигурация, ще позволи на крайно лявото мнозинство да налага своя дневен ред, който според мен не е дневният ред на европейските граждани. Равновесието на институциите е важно и то трябва да бъде запазено с оглед да бъдат предпазени европейските държави от безумия като зелената сделка, зеления истеризъм, зеления климатичен истеризъм. Законодателна инициатива в този парламент на тези наши колеги би означавало диктат на тяхното много силно, много вокално, много силно говорещо малцинство, което обаче те налагат с хъса на една нова религия.

По тази причина си мисля, че още е рано да се говори за такава инициатива. И това би било в ущърб на интересите на гражданите на държавите членки. Все още законодателната инициатива трябва да остане според мен в националните парламенти.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, Uniunea Europeană este un organism care evoluează continuu, iar integrarea europeană, din ce în ce mai puternică, trebuie să reprezinte obiectivul nostru principal. Bineînțeles, în strictă conformitate cu principiile democratice pe care ne-am angajat să le respectăm. Tocmai de aceea, Parlamentul European, în calitate de unic reprezentant direct și ales prin vot al cetățenilor Uniunii Europene, trebuie să fie în centrul tuturor politicilor pe care Uniunea le promovează.

Dacă în 1992, odată cu semnarea Tratatului Uniunii Europene, vorbeam timid, pentru prima dată, de rolul de legiuitor al Parlamentului European, mă bucur că astăzi am dat un vot istoric, un prim pas către dobândirea de către Parlament a unui drept general și direct de inițiativă.

Cred că voința cetățenilor trebuie respectată iar Parlamentul European trebuie să aibă puteri depline și să obțină rolul pe care îl merită în ierarhia instituțiilor Uniunii Europene. Un rol pe care cetățenii Uniunii Europene îl așteaptă de la noi, mai activ, mai implicat.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, for me, I suppose this place is often kind of like a sort of delusional, backslappers' convention, with endless self-flattery about how the EU is a force for democracy and values, out fighting the autocrats. But, of course, the reality is completely different: neoliberalism, market extremism, austerity, all set in stone in the Treaties, beyond democratic reform. Unelected bodies like the ECB and the Troika bully, sabotage and depose national governments elected by their people. And as the EU grows, power moves away from national parliaments into the EU without any corresponding control by the people. The bodies of the EU are complicated and obscure, and the only body directly elected by the citizens, the Parliament, has its wings clipped. No power to propose legislation. No democracy ever looked like this. The citizens aren't stupid. The deficit is obvious. Like a real parliament, we need to initiate legislation. That's why I voted for the resolution.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, it's a bit mad that the only body that's directly elected in the EU is not allowed to legislate, but we should still question what we do when we get here. This week we continued the long legacy of neo-colonial interference in the democratic processes and internal affairs of sovereign states like Nicaragua, who try to break with the abuses of white supremacist elites and the most brutal excesses of capitalist exploitation.

When the US and its allies pull off their coups through organised violence, lawfare, election-rigging and the influence operations orchestrated through the likes of the National Endowment for Democracy and USAID, then all is well – the complete undermining of the democratic process that ushers in Western-business-friendly comprador ready to gut social services, rip up environmental protections, sell off state assets, rip up environmental protections, and drive the general population into poverty. According to the logic of the liberal ideology, this has when democracy has won. And when the people vote for those ready to stop capitalist plunder, we call them authoritarian, so sanctions must be imposed to punish them. Who's being authoritarian?

10.4. It-talba biex titlaqqa' Konvenzjoni ghar-revizjoni tat-Trattati (B9-0305/2022, B9-0307/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, I voted in favour of the motion for a resolution on the call for a convention for the revision of the Treaties. The reason I did is I believe we do have to have a discussion. We had the Conference on the Future of Europe – that did facilitate some form of debate, but the European Union is changing, is evolving, and we do need to assess where we are in terms of making sure that there is democratic accountability.

Of course, when you do start changing treaties, you have to be very conscious of something, and that is that we do not leave the citizens behind. That it's not seen as changing the treaties to centralise power. So for any revision of treaties, particularly in the functioning of the institutions and how they work, we have to have checks and balances; we have to ensure that the citizens are at the heart of the decision-making process.

The idea that we just scrap unanimity completely does undermine the concept of subsidiarity, of small Member States believing that they have a voice at the table as well. In these discussions, it is vital that we consult, listen and have the citizen at the heart of the decision-making process rather than the centre.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, гласувах абсолютно убедено против идеята за конвенция за промяна на договорите, защото тази идея за промяна на договорите е дълбоко антидемократична и тя цели едно единствено нещо – насилствена, изкуствена, фалшива федерализация, която ще отнеме суверенитета от държавите членки и ще го даде в ръцете на анонимни бюрократи, неизбрани от никого, неотговорни и неотчитащи се пред никого, които ще ни налагат безумия, които променят живота на нашите общества.

Ние твърдим, вярваме и поддържаме идеята, че всяка една национална държава трябва да решава въпросите на културата, на образованието и на семейството. Промяната в договорите ще означава, че ще се отнеме суверенитет на разумните държави, представявани от хора които са избрани от тяхната нация да взимат важни решения. Такъв пример мога да дам с Република Северна Македония. Ако вие имате този инструмент, досега да сте пуснали една държава, изградена върху антибългарска идеология, човеконенавистна, език на омразата, насочена срещу българите в Македония. Вече щяхте да сте я пуснали да преговаря за Европа. Това не е допустимо.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-н Председател, аз се присъединявам към мнението на колегата Джамбазки и също гласувах „против“. Смятам, че е недопустимо. Между другото, на Конференцията за бъдещето на Европа бяха специално подбрани, ако не знаете, определени НПО-та, които са за федерализъм.

В договорите е записано, че това е съюз между суверенни държави. Не мисля, че това трябва да се променя. Мисля, че единодушието трябва да остане. Не може мнозинство от държави да решават съдбите на други държави и не могат да налагат никакви правила и норми, които са против техния национален интерес.

На мен това ми харесваше, че има „единство в многообразието“. Сега разбирам, че този принцип ще бъде нарушен, и Франция ще иска да си направи малка приятна империя в стил Съветския съюз. Съюзът на съветските републики – ето това ни предлагате в момента. Затова гласувах „против“.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, there's no doubt about it: the EU must change radically. Its constitution isn't fit for purpose; it's an engine of neoliberalism; and its democratic credentials are not in good shape. So yes, revision of the Treaties is absolutely necessary, but not like this.

The conceit here of orderly, democratic EU reform is a trap. The Conference on the Future of Europe is actually change from above disguised as reform from below. Some citizens did participate, and fair play to them, but the process was guided by the European elites to get the outcome that they wanted. It involved people who are already in the bubble. And the outcome that they wanted is what we have here, away from unanimity in the Council, so the big states can gang up on the smaller ones and a runaway EU hurtling towards federalism, neoliberalism and militarism can be unleashed. Now we tried to improve this resolution. It wasn't possible. We're opposed to revising the Treaties under these circumstances, therefore, we voted against.

10.5. Strument kummerċjali ġdid biex jiġu pprojbiti l-prodotti magħmula bix-xogħol forzatzat (B9-0291/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, îl felicit pe raportor și Parlamentul pentru că am purtat această discuție importantă. Este esențial să avem un nou instrument comercial pentru a interzice produsele fabricate prin muncă forțată în Uniunea Europeană. Dezvoltarea și profitul economic, ca urmare a abuzului sclaviei sau încălcării drepturilor omului, nu au ce căuta în Uniunea Europeană.

Vreau să atrag atenția că munca forțată, exploatarea copiilor prin muncă sau traficul de ființe umane, sunt, din păcate, realități dure care există în continuare în multe din țările noastre. Tocmai de aceea îi îndemn pe colegii mei ca, împreună cu Comisia, să găsim noi pârghii interne pentru a ne asigura că eradicarea sărăciei și excluziunii sociale merg mână în mână cu abolirea muncii forțate și a traficului de ființe umane.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, you know you're never going to find anyone who'll stand up and say, 'You know what, I'm in favour of forced labour', but actually it's everywhere. So why is that?

On the one hand, we have the reality of the most abhorrent forms – debt bondage, trafficking, and other forms of modern slavery. But actually the lines are quite blurred, because you look at situations of poverty and the consequences of capitalism in many societies, leaving people with no choice but to engage in appalling labour practices. This too is forced labour if the alternative is starvation, and we particularly see this in the Global South in relation to the unleashing of raw materials for the digital economy.

And I think it is incumbent on us to deal with this issue in a proper way, not to instrumentalise it the way we do, and the way we did in this plenary in dealing with the Uyghurs in China, where the very good work done by the UN High Representative in visiting the People's Republic of China and discussing these issues with the Chinese authorities was undermined and debased for geopolitical reasons.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, of course we should legislate to stop all forced labour. But how many times have we had to listen to accusations about China, backed up by nothing more than the say-so of weapons-industry-funded think tanks and groups on the payroll of CIA cut-outs like the National Endowment for Democracy? Where are the full and rigorous investigations, the evidence? Screaming, unsupported accusations is not how to conduct international relations.

The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights has just visited Xinjiang, has had discussions with many groups and representatives there, and hopes this is the start of a fruitful process towards transparency and high human rights standards in China.

For this stance, which shows goodwill and respect, some of the most rabid anti-China voices have called for the High Commissioner to step down. These are McCarthyite smear tactics, which expose the racist and fanatic ideology driving the groups making these claims. We have clear evidence of widespread slave labour in the world's largest prison system in the world's most repressive police state, the United States of America. Can we start talking about them?

Der Präsident. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

11. Korrezzjonijiet għall-voti u intenzjonijiet tal-vot: ara l-Minuti

12. Dokumenti mressqa: ara l-Minuti

13. **Deciżjoni biex jiġu ppreparati rapporti ta' inizjattiva: ara l-Minuti**
14. **Deciżjoni biex tiġi applikata l-proċedura b'kumitat kongunt (Artikolu 58 tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura): ara l-Minuti**
15. **Kumitati assoċjati (Artikolu 57 tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura): ara l-Minuti**
16. **Petizzjonijiet: ara l-Minuti**
17. **Approvazzjoni tal-minuti tas-seduta li għaddeġja u trażmissjoni tat-testi adottati**

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll dieser Sitzung wird dem Parlament zu Beginn der nächsten Sitzung zur Genehmigung vorgelegt.

Wenn es keine Einwände gibt, werde ich die in der heutigen Sitzung angenommenen Entschlüsse den in diesen Entschlüssen genannten Personen und Gremien übermitteln.

18. **Dati tas-seduti li jmiss: ara l-Minuti**

19. **Għeluq tas-seduta**

(Die Sitzung wird um 16.05 Uhr geschlossen.)

20. **Interruzzjoni tas-sessjoni**

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die Sitzungsperiode des Europäischen Parlaments für unterbrochen.

—

Tifsira tas-simboli użati

*	Proċedura ta' Konsultazzjoni
***	Proċedura ta' Approvazzjoni
***I	Proċedura Leġiżlattiva Ordinarja: l-ewwel qari
***II	Proċedura Leġiżlattiva Ordinarja: it-tieni qari
***III	Proċedura Leġiżlattiva Ordinarja: it-tielet qari

(It-tip ta' proċedura tiddependi mill-bażi legali proposta mill-abbozz ta' att)

Abbrevjazzjonijiet użati għall-Komitati Parlamentari

AFET	Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Barranin
DEVE	Kumitat għall-Iżvilupp
INTA	Kumitat għall-Kummerċ Internazzjonali
BUDG	Kumitat għall-Baġits
CONT	Kumitat għall-Kontroll tal-Baġit
ECON	Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Ekonomiċi u Monetarji
EMPL	Kumitat għall-Impjiegi u l-Affarijiet Soċjali
ENVI	Kumitat għall-Ambjent, is-Saħħa Pubblika u s-Sikurezza tal-Ikel
ITRE	Kumitat għall-Industrija, r-Riċerka u l-Enerġija
IMCO	Kumitat għas-Suq Intern u l-Harsien tal-Konsumatur
TRAN	Kumitat għat-Trasport u t-Turiżmu
REGI	Kumitat għall-Iżvilupp Reġjunali
AGRI	Kumitat għall-Agricoltura u l-Iżvilupp Rurali
PECH	Kumitat għas-Sajd
CULT	Kumitat għall-Kultura u l-Edukazzjoni
JURI	Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Legali
LIBE	Kumitat għall-Libertajiet Ċivili, il-Ġustizzja u l-Intern
AFCO	Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Kostituzzjonali
FEMM	Kumitat għad-Drittijiet tan-Nisa u tal-Ugwaljanza bejn is-Sessi
PETI	Kumitat għall-Petizzjonijiet
DROI	Sottokumitat għad-"Drittijiet tal-Bniedem"
SEDE	Sottokumitat għas-"Sigurtá u d-Difiża"
FISC	Sottokumitat għall-Kwistjonijiet Fiskali

Abbrevjazzjonijiet użati għall-Gruppi Politiċi

PPE	Grupp tal-Partit Popolari Ewropew (Demokristjani)
S&D	Grupp tal-Alleanza Progressiva tas-Socjalisti u d-Demokratiċi fil-Parlament Ewropew
Renew	Grupp Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Grupp tal-Hodor/Alleanza Hiesla Ewropea
ID	Grupp Identità u Demokrazija
ECR	Grupp tal-Konservattivi u r-Riformisti Ewropej
The Left	Grupp tax-Xellug fil-Parlament Ewropew - GUE/NGL
NI	Membri mhux Affiljati