



C/2025/983

14.2.2025

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 22 LISTOPADA 2023 R.

(C/2025/983)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2023-2024

Posiedzenia od 20 do 23 listopada 2023 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	4
2. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu) (działania następne)	4
3. Zmiana porządku obrad	4
4. Sytuacja humanitarna w Strefie Gazy, konieczność uwolnienia zakładników i potrzeba przerwy humanitarnej prowadzącej do zawieszenia broni, a także perspektywy pokoju i bezpieczeństwa na Bliskim Wschodzie (debata)	5
5. Wznowienie posiedzenia	23
6. Debata z cyklu „Oto Europa” z udziałem premiera Bułgarii Nikołaja Denkowa (debata)	23
7. Wznowienie posiedzenia	38
8. Głosowanie	38
8.1. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 4 do budżetu ogólnego na 2023 r.: zmniejszenie środków na płatności – inne dostosowania i aktualizacje techniczne (A9-0363/2023 - Fabienne Keller) (głosowanie)	38
8.2. Procedura budżetowa na rok 2024 – wspólny projekt (A9-0362/2023 - Siegfried Mureșan, Nils Ušakovs) (głosowanie)	38

Spis treści	Strona
8.3. Uruchomienie Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji – wniosek EGF/2023/002 BE/Makro – Belgia (A9-0351/2023 - Petri Sarvamaa) (głosowanie)	38
8.4. Elektroniczna publikacja Dziennika Urzędowego Unii Europejskiej (A9-0352/2023 - Adrián Vázquez Lázara) (głosowanie)	38
8.5. Umowa między UE a Czarnogórą dotycząca działań operacyjnych prowadzonych przez Europejską Agencję Straży Granicznej i Przybrzeżnej w Czarnogórze (A9-0369/2023 - Lena Düpont) (głosowanie)	39
8.6. Umowa o wolnym handlu między Unią Europejską a Nową Zelandią (A9-0305/2023 - Daniel Caspary) (głosowanie)	39
8.7. Umowa o wolnym handlu między UE a Nową Zelandią (rezolucja) (A9-0314/2023 - Daniel Caspary) (głosowanie)	39
8.8. Powołanie członka Trybunału Obrachunkowego – Petri Sarvamaa (A9-0349/2023 - Gilles Boyer) (głosowanie)	39
8.9. Powołanie członkini Trybunału Obrachunkowego – Annemie Turtelboom (A9-0350/2023 - Tsvetelina Penkova) (głosowanie)	39
8.10. Przepisy dotyczące VAT w epoce cyfrowej (A9-0327/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)	39
8.11. Uzgodnienia dotyczące współpracy administracyjnej w dziedzinie VAT potrzebne w epoce cyfrowej (A9-0324/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)	39
8.12. Przepisy dotyczące VAT odnoszące się do podatników, procedury szczególnej oraz uregulowań szczególnych dotyczących deklarowania i zapłaty VAT z tytułu sprzedaży na odległość towarów importowanych (A9-0320/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)	39
8.13. Zrównoważone stosowanie środków ochrony roślin (A9-0339/2023 - Sarah Wiener) (głosowanie)	39
8.14. Opakowania i odpady opakowaniowe (A9-0319/2023 - Frédérique Ries) (głosowanie)	40
8.15. Cyfryzacja i prawo administracyjne (A9-0309/2023 - Karen Melchior) (głosowanie)	40
8.16. Wnioski Parlamentu Europejskiego w sprawie zmiany traktatów (A9-0337/2023 - Guy Verhofstadt, Sven Simon, Gabriele Bischoff, Daniel Freund, Helmut Scholz) (głosowanie)	41
8.17. Negocjacje w sprawie umowy o statusie dotyczącej działań operacyjnych prowadzonych przez Frontex w Mauretanii (A9-0358/2023 - Tineke Strik) (głosowanie)	41
9. Wznowienie posiedzenia	41
10. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia	41
11. Zmniejszyć obciążenia regulacyjne, by wykorzystać potencjał przedsiębiorczości i konkurencyjności (debata na aktualny temat)	41
12. Zagrożenie dla praworządności w następstwie umowy rządowej w Hiszpanii (debata)	53

Spis treści	Strona
13. Utrata niezależności sądów i prześladowanie działaczy prodemokratycznych w Hongkongu (debata)	76
14. „Cyprus confidential” - konieczność uniemożliwienia obchodzenia sankcji i przepisów dotyczących przeciwdziałania praniu pieniędzy w UE (debata)	81
15. Trzydziestolecie kryteriów kopenhaskich: nowy impuls dla polityki rozszerzenia UE (debata)	89
16. Niepodjęcie działań legislacyjnych przez Komisję w następstwie rezolucji w sprawie oprogramowania Pegasus (debata)	102
17. Zmiana inicjatywy UE na rzecz owadów zapylających – Nowy ład na rzecz owadów zapylających (debata)	111
18. Debata na temat przypadków naruszania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (debata)	119
18.1. Ostatnie ataki na kobiety i obrońców praw kobiet oraz arbitralne zatrzymania europejskich obywateli w Iranie	119
18.2. Bezprawne zatrzymanie prezydenta Mohameda Bazouma w Nigrze	124
18.3. Zabójstwo obywatela Gruzji Tamaza Ginturiego przez rosyjskie oddziały okupacyjne w Gruzji	127
19. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania	129
19.1. Procedura budżetowa na rok 2024 – wspólny projekt (A9-0362/2023 - Siegfried Mureşan, Nils Ušakovs)	130
19.2. Zrównoważone stosowanie środków ochrony roślin (A9-0339/2023 - Sarah Wiener)	130
19.3. Opakowania i odpady opakowaniowe (A9-0319/2023 - Frédérique Ries)	130
19.4. Wnioski Parlamentu Europejskiego w sprawie zmiany traktatów (A9-0337/2023 - Guy Verhofstadt, Sven Simon, Gabriele Bischoff, Daniel Freund, Helmut Scholz)	131
20. Porządek dzienny następnego posiedzenia	132
21. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia	132
22. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	133

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 22 LISTOPADA 2023 R.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.01 Uhr eröffnet.)

2. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu) (działania następce)

Der Präsident. – Bevor wir in die Debatte eintreten, haben wir einige Mitteilungen zu den Beschlüssen mehrerer Ausschüsse über die Aufnahme interinstitutioneller Verhandlungen gemäß Artikel 71 Absatz 1 der Geschäftsordnung zu machen, die bei der Eröffnung der Sitzung am Montag, den 20. November, bekannt gegeben wurden.

Die Präsidentin hat von der ECR-Fraktion und anderen Mitgliedern, durch die mindestens die mittlere Schwelle erreicht wird, einen Antrag zur Abstimmung über den von den Ausschüssen EMPL und FEMM im gemeinsamen Ausschussverfahren gefassten Beschluss zur Aufnahme von Verhandlungen über den Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über Standards für Gleichstellungsstellen im Bereich der Gleichbehandlung und Chancengleichheit von Frauen und Männern in Arbeits- und Beschäftigungsfragen erhalten. Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 23. November 2023, statt.

Zu den anderen Beschlüssen über die Aufnahme von Verhandlungen hat die Präsidentin keine Anträge auf Abstimmung im Parlament von Mitgliedern oder einer oder mehreren Fraktionen erhalten, durch die mindestens die mittlere Schwelle erreicht wird. Die Ausschüsse können daher die Verhandlungen aufnehmen.

3. Zmiana porządku obrad

Der Präsident. – Gemäß Artikel 158 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung möchte ich Sie informieren, dass die Reihenfolge der morgigen Abstimmungssitzung auf Vorschlag der Präsidentin und mit Zustimmung der Fraktionen geändert wird.

Die Abstimmung über die Beratungen des Petitionsausschusses 2022, die derzeit als letzter Punkt vorgesehen ist, wird nach der Abstimmung über die Digitalisierung der grenzüberschreitenden justiziellen Zusammenarbeit (Änderung bestimmter Richtlinien und Rahmenbeschlüsse) stattfinden.

Ich bitte Sie, diese Mitteilungen zur Kenntnis zu nehmen.

4. Sytuacja humanitarna w Strefie Gazy, konieczność uwolnienia zakładników i potrzeba przerwy humanitarnej prowadzącej do zawieszenia broni, a także perspektywy pokoju i bezpieczeństwa na Bliskim Wschodzie (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu der humanitären Lage im Gazastreifen, dem Erfordernis der Freilassung der Geiseln und einer sofortigen humanitären Feuerpause, die in eine Waffenruhe mündet, und den Aussichten auf Frieden und Sicherheit im Nahen Osten (2023/2983(RSP)).

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad, en nombre del Consejo.* – Señor presidente, señoras y señores diputados, comisario Lenarčič, acabo de volver de una misión de cinco días por los países de Oriente Medio —los países árabes, Israel y Palestina— y he percibido la intensa emoción con la que se viven los acontecimientos allí.

Debería ser posible llevar a cabo el debate sobre lo que está ocurriendo superando la emoción y con la vista puesta en la construcción de la paz.

Es cierto que el 7 de octubre el mundo vio la mayor masacre, el mayor pogromo de judíos cometido después de la Segunda Guerra Mundial, y que también vio a continuación los bombardeos de Gaza, que las Naciones Unidas califican de catástrofe humanitaria inédita. Pero no es una catástrofe natural, no es un terremoto ni una inundación, sino una catástrofe producida por el hombre como consecuencia de un bloqueo que impide que lleguen los bienes básicos para la subsistencia de la población. La propia Organización de las Naciones Unidas lo califica de matanza.

Debería ser posible reconocer el derecho de Israel a defenderse y, al mismo tiempo, indignarse por lo que está pasando con los civiles en Gaza y en Cisjordania. Debería ser posible defender el derecho de los palestinos a tener un Estado sin que eso implique ser calificado de antisemita. Debería ser posible criticar la política del Gobierno de Israel —porque los Gobiernos de cualquier país pueden ser objeto de crítica— sin que por eso tenga uno que verse acusado de querer mal a los judíos. No confundamos las cosas: una cosa es criticar al Gobierno de un país y otra cosa es manifestar el rechazo a una parte de la población. Pero también digo que las manifestaciones que presentan la cara fea del antisemitismo no ayudan a la causa palestina: al contrario.

En este momento, la Corte Penal Internacional ha iniciado ya investigaciones para saber qué es lo que está ocurriendo allí. Su fiscal general, Karim Khan, con quien he estado en contacto, ha lanzado advertencias graves a todas las partes, señalando que Israel tiene también obligaciones claras con respecto a la guerra que está librando contra Hamás, que no son solo obligaciones morales, sino que también son obligaciones jurídicas derivadas del Derecho de los conflictos armados y que afectan al acceso de la población a los bienes básicos para su subsistencia. Y que cada escuela, cada hospital, cada iglesia, cada mezquita, son lugares protegidos y, a menos que pierdan esta condición de lugar protegido como consecuencia de su utilización para fines militares, tienen que ser respetados.

Si existe alguna duda sobre si ese territorio o propiedad han perdido o no su condición de protegidos, el atacante debe asumir que siguen estando protegidos, debe ofrecer la prueba de que ha perdido su condición y tiene que facilitar la salida de los civiles allí atrapados.

De la misma manera, los ataques indiscriminados con cohetes desde Gaza contra Israel son también violaciones del Derecho internacional humanitario.

Fui de los primeros en decir que impedir el acceso de agua, electricidad y bienes básicos atentaba contra el Derecho internacional humanitario. Y el fiscal de la Corte Penal Internacional —lo dice él, no lo digo yo— ha advertido firmemente a Israel de la necesidad de hacer esfuerzos visibles sin más demora para permitir la entrega de alimentos, medicinas y anestésicos a los civiles.

A la Unión Europea le preocupa enormemente lo que está pasando. Y, muy en concreto, nos hemos manifestado contra los ataques perpetrados por colonos israelíes contra civiles palestinos en Cisjordania, que siguen aumentando. También a ello se ha referido el fiscal de la Corte Penal Internacional.

Ustedes saben que yo represento al Consejo y, por lo tanto, a todos los Estados miembros. También saben que eso no es fácil porque, en ocasiones, los Estados miembros no han estado alineados en una misma posición. Como, por ejemplo, en el voto en la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas, donde ocho votaron a favor de una pausa por razones humanitarias, cuatro votaron en contra y los demás se abstuvieron.

Existe una posición común del Consejo Europeo que sí defiende pausas —pausas en plural— y corredores humanitarios y pide a Israel que, cuando ejerza su derecho a la defensa, lo haga de acuerdo con las leyes humanitarias y las leyes internacionales que rigen la guerra.

Pero hasta ahora ha habido distintas manifestaciones de distintos líderes europeos sobre cómo este derecho a la defensa de Israel se está ejerciendo y, cuando no hay una posición común, el alto representante no la puede representar. No la puede representar pero tiene que seguir trabajando para construirla. Tiene que seguir trabajando para hacer posible que los Estados miembros converjan en una posición que les permita ser una fuerza geopolítica en este conflicto. Y es lo que estamos intentando.

Con el convencimiento de que no habrá una solución militar a este conflicto, de que no se puede matar una idea, de que la única manera es tener una idea mejor. Y la idea mejor solo puede ser el reconocer que dos pueblos que se disputan desde hace más de cien años la misma tierra deben y pueden vivir juntos si la comunidad internacional se compromete a ello.

Y hasta ahora no lo hemos hecho. Llevamos treinta años —desde los Acuerdos de Oslo— repitiendo que la solución son los dos Estados, la solución son los dos Estados, la solución son los dos Estados... Pero hemos hecho poco o nada para conseguirlo. Hemos creído que el problema se podía encapsular y que podíamos olvidarnos de los palestinos, puesto que los Estados árabes ya estaban haciendo la paz con Israel. Y el drama que ha explotado nos demuestra que eso no es suficiente.

Hay que también hacer la paz entre Israel y Palestina. Y para hacer la paz entre Israel y Palestina será necesario que todos —y en particular nosotros, los europeos— nos comprometamos para superar el gigantesco dolor que los acontecimientos iniciados por el ataque terrorista de Hamás contra los kibutz de la frontera en Gaza han producido.

Esta puede ser una ocasión para que la paz pueda ser construida. Y eso es lo que la Unión Europea pretende. Hemos presentado propuestas. Los «tres noes» —Gaza no puede quedar bajo el control de Hamás, no puede ser ocupada por Israel de nuevo, no puede ser dividida— y los «tres síes»: una autoridad palestina tiene que volver a Gaza, los Estados árabes tienen que comprometerse (y no solo financiando la reconstrucción) y los europeos también tenemos que ser una parte activa de una solución.

Una solución que solo puede pasar por un acuerdo que permita lo que hace años venimos reclamando: la convivencia de dos pueblos enfrentados que deben poder compartir la misma tierra y la misma paz.

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, distinguished High Representative Borrell, let me from the outset reiterate in the strongest terms our condemnation of the heinous attack by Hamas and Israel last month, and underline that Israel has the right to defend itself while respecting international law, in particular international humanitarian law.

Also, as stated by President von der Leyen earlier today, we wholeheartedly welcome the agreement reached on the release of the 50 hostages and on a pause of hostilities. We stress, at the same time, the urgent need for all hostages to be released immediately, and we will work with our humanitarian partners to use the pause for the humanitarian surge in Gaza.

Allow me to focus on three issues in my intervention. The humanitarian situation in Gaza, including the question of access into Gaza, the European Union's humanitarian response, and the outlook beyond the immediate humanitarian crisis.

First, on the humanitarian situation in Gaza. There has been no let-up in the intense bombardment and fighting in Gaza. Casualty rates remain very high. At least 12,700 Palestinians are reported killed, including a very high proportion of women and children. 1.7 million people are displaced within Gaza. Thousands are currently on the move. We are seeing ongoing attacks on and fighting around medical facilities, which are protected under the international humanitarian law. There is an acute shortage across Gaza of all the most basic necessities: food, medicines, including anaesthetics, water. According to the United Nations, food assistance currently covers only 10% of the minimum caloric intake. Medical facilities are either on the brink of collapse or have already shut down. Only 9 out of 35 hospitals in Gaza are reportedly still functioning, and this only partially. The toll on the United Nations and on aid and medical workers in Gaza has been appalling. At least 108 staff members of UNRWA alone have been killed since the beginning of this crisis.

Humanitarian access into Gaza remains extremely challenging. Over the last month, fewer than 50 trucks a day, on average, have been going into Gaza through the Rafah crossing from Egypt. This is woefully inadequate. And for several days last week, not a single truck was able to get in. The acute shortage of fuel in Gaza remains a major constraint. The agreement on 18 November by Israel to allow 120,000 litres of fuel for humanitarian operations is a step in the right direction, but will only cover one third of the daily critical needs. Without fuel, trucks cannot move and humanitarian actors cannot operate. Fuel is vital for hospitals for clean water. It is needed for the treatment of sewage to avert the looming public health crisis, and for mobile networks, without which no humanitarian assistance can be delivered inside Gaza. The amount of fuel available to humanitarian actors in any humanitarian crisis should depend on their needs, and needs alone.

Second, on EU response, as President von der Leyen announced we have quadrupled our humanitarian funding for the occupied Palestinian territory to more than EUR 100 million. This is being rolled out as we speak, supporting our accredited partners on the ground: the United Nations, the Red Cross and Red Crescent, and international non-governmental organisations. They are distributing food and water, maintaining emergency medical services where possible, helping with mass casualty management, ensuring basic hygiene and so on. And we are continuously ramping up our European in-kind response. There have already been 15 EU humanitarian air bridge flights so far for Gaza, and more are in the pipeline. These are cargo flights for our humanitarian partners and for our Member States. President von der Leyen was on the ground in el-Arish last weekend during the unloading of one of our flights. Most of the cargo from these flights has already gone into Gaza. We have, moreover, established a joint coordination cell with the Red Cross and Red Crescent to organise and channel our assistance. In parallel, we are helping the Egyptian Red Crescent to further build up its logistical capacity and through the Union Civil Protection Mechanism, we are supporting Egypt's frontline medical response. The key challenge to repeat is access – access for humanitarian assistance into Gaza. In the first instance, this means allowing a sufficient number of trucks into Gaza through Rafah and, if possible, opening another land crossing. But we should also explore all other possible avenues for allowing additional assistance into Gaza. Ensuring adequate humanitarian access will also require putting in place urgent and extended humanitarian pauses throughout Gaza and for a sufficient number of days, as called for last week by the United Nations Security Council in its Resolution 2712, which was facilitated by Malta. We hope that the agreement on a pause of hostilities that has just been reached will allow for a substantial surge in humanitarian aid delivery into and within Gaza, and we certainly hope that this will not be a one-off.

Third, on the prospects for Gaza and the broader Israeli-Palestinian conflict. High Representative, we spoke about that already. Even as we respond to the immediate humanitarian challenges and do everything we can to promote respect for international humanitarian law, we need a step change in efforts to put work on a political solution to the conflict back on track. This means reinvigorating and accelerating efforts that have long been stalled towards a two state solution, as the only way forward that can offer hope to both Palestinians and Israelis. More specifically, this will require working towards a solution for Gaza as an integral part of a solution to the broader Israeli-Palestinian issue. Preventing any forcible displacement of Palestinians out of Gaza. Preventing any return of Hamas to Gaza, as well as any long term Israeli security presence in Gaza. Urgently de-escalating the situation in the West Bank, and in particular stopping the extremist settler violence, which has increased dramatically in recent weeks. And supporting a legitimate Palestinian authority in administering Gaza. There is no alternative to engaging now, if we are to break the spiral of violence, restore hope to people in Palestine and Israel, and prevent broader instability in the Middle East.

Rasa Juknevičienė, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, I have the feeling that we see the world too simplistically when we divide ourselves into either pro-Israel or pro-Palestinian, and when many are repeating 'two-state solution'. But this mantra will not work unless there is a fundamental agreement among Israel's neighbours that Hamas must not happen again, that the Jewish state has the right to exist. I was shocked when, after the bloody attack by Hamas, we saw the celebration in Gaza – and not only Gaza squares.

As long as Hamas exists, it is difficult for me to believe in the success of the two-state solution. Hamas must be destroyed. That must be the task of the entire democratic community. Hamas, ISIS, al-Qaeda are the same. The same cancer. They will be reborn again and again until the cause of the cancer is isolated, including terrorist states such as Iran or Russia.

We have two wars of a similar nature in both neighbourhoods of European Union. Both are aimed at destroying democratic states: Israel and Ukraine. So many people are suffering. Europe's future security and long-lasting peace depend on our response. The challenge is clear: democracies must win.

Pedro Marques, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, High Representative, Commissioner, colleagues, as the sun rose today, a beam of hope came to Israel and Gaza. After weeks of indiscriminate bombing, a humanitarian truce was achieved last night.

This must be the beginning of the end of the nightmare that started with the terror of Hamas and the death of more than 1 000 Israelis. But punishing the civilian population in Gaza was also not admissible, and it is not even effective, for peace is the only way to really eradicate the ideology of Hamas from Palestine and the region.

Every one of the thousands of civilians that lost their lives in Gaza brought Israel not one millimetre closer to long-lasting peace. This bloodshed must end for good. A permanent ceasefire, the full release of the hostages, is urgent and needed. We need a true political strategy with a viable political horizon.

The far right in Israel has no permanent solution to this conflict. We as Europeans, we truly need to commit ourselves to the global effort of peace and the two-state solution.

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de Renew-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, we zijn deze morgen wakker geworden met het beste nieuws van deze week. Er is eindelijk een tijdelijk staakt-het-vuren en er worden toch alvast vijftig gijzelaars vrijgelaten.

Laat dit het begin zijn van een blijvend staakt-het-vuren en van het vrijlaten van alle gijzelaars van dit conflict, dat al veel te lang aansleept. Want het is een ware humanitaire nachtmerrie, de grootste moord op de Joden sedert de Tweede Wereldoorlog. Bombardementen op scholen en ziekenhuizen, twee miljoen mensen in Gaza die op zoek zijn naar water, voedsel, medicijnen, naar veiligheid. En dan de gijzelaars. De hel op aarde noem ik het. En die hel op aarde, die moet nu stoppen.

Meneer Borrell, u heeft de boodschap duidelijk uitgedragen in de regio en ik vond u vandaag ook sterker dan ooit hier in uw uitspraken over dit conflict. Ik wil u daarvoor van harte danken. Dit is een Europa dat ik graag zie. In tegenstelling tot de kakofonie die we in het begin van het conflict wel degelijk gezien hebben, ben ik heel erg blij met de kracht die u vandaag uitdroeg.

Ik ben ook heel erg fier op het bezoek van de Belgische premier De Croo vandaag samen met zijn ambtsgenoot Sánchez aan de regio. Het toont voor mij — ik ben dan een fiere Belg — hoe een klein land groot kan zijn, want België heeft zijn rol gespeeld, in tegenstelling tot sommige andere Europese landen die hun houding lieten afhangen van vriendschapsbanden of angstverbanden uit het verleden.

Voor mij is dit ook een wake-upcall voor Europa en dan kijk ik ook naar de Commissie, want eigenlijk toont dit ook ons politieke falen. Al jaar en dag — u heeft het gezegd, dertig jaar denk ik — pleiten wij voor die tweestatenoplossing. Maar nooit deden we iets om die tweestatenoplossing dichterbij te brengen. Europa heeft ook hierin eigenlijk geen betekenisvolle rol gespeeld, en we moeten kijken naar de Verenigde Staten en naar Qatar.

Voorzitter, u heeft de Raad en de Commissie langer laten spreken. Als hoofdonderhandelaar wil ik nu ook hier mijn punt maken. Wij vinden dat Europa hervormd moet worden. Als wij echt een geopolitieke macht willen zijn, dan hoop ik dat jullie straks voor het verslag van collega Guy Verhofstadt zullen stemmen, dat Europa hervormd wordt en dat we een rol van betekenis kunnen spelen in conflicten als deze.

Jordi Solé, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, hoy vemos un pequeño rayo de luz tras casi cincuenta días en la oscuridad de la guerra y de la muerte. Damos la bienvenida a la tregua de cuatro días con intercambio de parte de los rehenes y los presos. Es un paso en la buena dirección, pero no es suficiente. Necesitamos un alto el fuego permanente, la liberación de todos los rehenes y multiplicar la ayuda humanitaria.

Tras los actos abominables de Hamás del 7 de octubre, Israel tenía que responder. Pero la respuesta militar israelí contra Hamás no tenía por qué convertirse en la guerra contra los palestinos de Gaza. La realidad está siendo una respuesta indiscriminada y desproporcionada con el resultado de que uno de cada doscientos habitantes en la Franja de Gaza ha sido asesinado, en su mayoría civiles inocentes, muchos de ellos niños. Este conflicto, en relación con su duración, se ha convertido ya en el conflicto más mortal para los niños y niñas en las últimas décadas.

El Derecho internacional y el Derecho internacional humanitario imponen normas que deben respetarse incluso en los casos de auténtica quiebra humana, como son todas las guerras. Cuando las armas hayan callado, más allá de la reconstrucción, alguien tendrá que encargarse de recoser las profundísimas heridas de esta guerra horrible, pero también de este conflicto interminable entre israelíes y palestinos que, entre todos, por omisión, hemos dejado que se enquistara. Ya hemos visto dónde nos ha llevado la gestión de conflictos que algunos creían que era la solución. No hay ningún nivel de violencia que sea gestionable para siempre, porque los conflictos enquistados siempre acaban explotando.

Hay que pensar en el día después, en una Gaza sin Hamás, pero también sin ocupación y sin bloqueo, y con un Gobierno palestino legítimo y eficaz que la población pueda sentir como suyo. La solución para la Gaza de la posguerra no puede separarse de la solución para el conjunto de los territorios palestinos ocupados, ni tampoco de las garantías de seguridad para Israel.

Hermann Tertsch, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señor presidente, dijo Golda Meir que la guerra en Palestina, en Israel, se acabaría cuando los palestinos quieran más a sus hijos de lo que odian a los judíos. Eso no ha sucedido aún. Estamos muy lejos de ello.

También debemos decir que nosotros hemos colaborado a esto, porque estamos financiando libros en los territorios palestinos que solo fomentan el odio a Israel y que fomentan sistemáticamente toda la cultura del terrorismo. En Gaza se celebró con entusiasmo lo que sucedió el 7 de octubre, y en los territorios controlados por la Autoridad Palestina también se celebró con entusiasmo. La Autoridad Palestina —a la que aquí se presenta como estupenda frente a Hamás— es también la que sigue dando premios a los terroristas por los judíos que matan.

En ese sentido, Israel tiene el derecho a acabar esta guerra acabando para siempre con Hamás, con esa amenaza. Y aquí parece ser que algunos no quieren que suceda. Va a suceder y lamentando todas las muertes, lamentando todas las desgracias— esperamos que termine, tiene que terminar, con esas garantías que Israel se dará a sí mismo porque nosotros no se las damos.

Marco Zanni, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho sentito tanti colleghi interrogarsi sul motivo per cui, ancora una volta, su un tema di politica estera l'Europa è irrilevante. Basta vedere le posizioni prese dalle varie istituzioni europee dal 7 ottobre: non solo in Consiglio ma anche le altre Autorità hanno espresso posizioni divergenti, hanno iniziato un litigio personale che purtroppo negli scorsi mesi abbiamo visto troppo spesso. E badate bene che questo non è colpa dei nazionalismi ma è colpa dei personalismi, di chi antepone la propria carriera politica all'interesse comune.

Passando alle questioni concrete, sicuramente accogliamo con piacere la notizia che una parte degli ostaggi verrà liberata presto. Ma è necessario, per capire bene quello che sta succedendo e quello che deve fare quest'Aula, comprendere quello che è successo il 7 ottobre e quello che sta succedendo in quell'area. Perché quello che è accaduto il 7 ottobre non è il grido di un popolo che reclama la propria sovranità ma è un atto terroristico di un'organizzazione che ha come obiettivo la cancellazione di uno Stato, perché questo è quello che è scritto nello statuto di Hamas e questo è quello che fa Hamas con i suoi sostenitori, compreso l'Iran.

Se quindi non comprendiamo questo punto, non possiamo capire quali sono le soluzioni concrete che possiamo portare avanti e non capiamo qual è il supporto che oggi quest'Aula e queste istituzioni devono dare allo Stato di Israele, che vive costantemente sotto la minaccia della sua distruzione.

E un pensiero alla sinistra, al suo corto circuito, alla sua dimensione dialettica che su questi temi è come sempre l'autogol: da un lato, ogni giorno ci chiedono il rispetto per tutte le minoranze, per le persone LGBT, per le donne e, dall'altro, sostengono il fondamentalismo islamico che nega i diritti alle donne, che condanna a morte le persone omosessuali e che reprime la libertà.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, ce matin nous poussons un premier «ouf» de soulagement après l'annonce d'une trêve et de la libération à venir de plusieurs dizaines d'otages. Je pense bien évidemment aux familles qui vont retrouver leurs proches, à celles qui n'ont pas encore cette chance et pour qui nous devons continuer à tout faire pour obtenir leur libération. Je pense aussi aux habitants de Gaza qui seront protégés des bombes pendant quelques jours, mais qui savent que leur calvaire reprendra bientôt.

Car de jour en jour, le bilan humain continue de s'alourdir et l'Union européenne s'est rendue complice de ce massacre en refusant de le condamner. Oui, vous avez laissé mourir 14 000 civils, dont plus de 5 000 enfants. Vous avez laissé Tsahal détruire de manière délibérée des hôpitaux, des maisons, des écoles. Vous n'avez rien dit de ces crimes mais vous êtes constamment opposés au cessez-le-feu – car la trêve ne peut pas être une simple parenthèse, il faut un cessez-le-feu durable.

Qu'allez-vous dire, chers collègues, aux milliers de parents qui ont perdu leurs enfants? Que ce sont des dommages collatéraux? Pourquoi aucune sanction n'a encore été envisagée à l'encontre d'Israël? Nous en sommes, à raison, au 12^e paquet de sanctions contre la Russie, mais comment allez-vous expliquer que nous ne faisons rien contre les crimes de guerre de l'armée israélienne à Gaza?

Ce «deux poids, deux mesures» est insupportable et il a des conséquences concrètes à Gaza, mais aussi en Cisjordanie, dont on parle trop peu, où la colonisation s'accroît de manière toujours plus brutale. Les colons israéliens n'ont plus aucune limite. Chaque jour, des Palestiniens sont insultés, menacés, brutalisés, assassinés, chassés de leurs terres. Nous assistons à un nettoyage ethnique. C'est un devoir moral de le stopper car chaque vie palestinienne compte. C'est une obligation diplomatique car la paix n'émergera qu'avec une solution à deux États. C'est un impératif stratégique car ce qui se joue au Proche-Orient aura des conséquences mondiales.

Nous sommes aujourd'hui, chers collègues, à un point de bascule. Si l'Union européenne persiste dans son aveuglement, non seulement elle se couvrira de honte, mais elle enterrera aussi définitivement le droit international et avec lui, l'espoir d'une paix durable.

Sabrina Pignedoli (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Gaza è l'inferno in terra: mancano acqua, cibo e medicinali. I neonati muoiono in terapia intensiva per mancanza di elettricità. Le scuole vengono bombardate, così come le ambulanze e gli ospedali. In un mese e mezzo sono stati uccisi oltre 5 000 bambini, 200 fra medici e infermieri, più di 60 operatori dell'informazione e oltre 100 dipendenti dell'ONU. È una carneficina.

Cos'altro deve succedere per farci dire basta? Come abbiamo condannato i crimini di Hamas, oggi dobbiamo condannare i crimini di Netanyahu e del suo esercito. L'Europa sostenga l'ONU e il Segretario generale Guterres nel tentativo di fermare questo massacro.

Ringrazio l'Alto rappresentante Josep Borrell per quello che sta facendo, ma l'Unione europea è la grande assente, con pesanti responsabilità per ciò che sta accadendo a causa della sua inerzia. Eserciti una vera azione diplomatica: riconosciamo lo Stato palestinese e fermiamo le relazioni economiche con chi uccide deliberatamente civili. Tollerare l'annientamento di un popolo è complicità nella violazione dei diritti umani.

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben von Anfang an als Parlament die bedingungslose Freilassung aller Geiseln gefordert. Die israelische Regierung hat jetzt einem Deal zugestimmt, wo 50 Geiseln unter der Bedingung freigelassen werden, dass 150 palästinensische Häftlinge freigelassen werden und es eine viertägige Waffenruhe gibt.

Ich freue mich mit den Freizulassenden und ihren Familien. Das Bedauerliche ist, dass in der Wahrnehmung vieler Palästinenser und Araber es offenbar die Terrorgruppe Hamas ist, die die israelische Regierung zu Konzessionen zwingt, und dass es in der Frage einer dauerhaften Friedensregelung seit Oslo nicht zu Fortschritten mit den Vertretern der Palästinenser gekommen ist, die bereit sind, mit Israel zu reden und sein Existenzrecht anzuerkennen.

Wir müssen uns nach dem Ende der Hamas-Herrschaft in Gaza als Europäer – am besten koordiniert mit den USA – dafür einsetzen, dass im Rahmen der Vereinten Nationen ein robustes Mandat etabliert wird – für Gaza –, wo eine starke internationale Präsenz zunächst für humanitäre Hilfe und dann für einen Wiederaufbau in Gaza sorgt.

Und das muss dann einmünden in einen Friedensprozess, wo Wahlen stattfinden und die Verhandlung für eine Befriedung des Konfliktes sorgen wird. Ich bin dafür, dass wir dieses Gaza nicht sich wiederholen lassen und dass es auch keine weitere Intifada im Westjordanland geben muss, weil es zu einem genuinen Friedensprozess kommt.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Mr President, Mr High Representative, Mr Commissioner, first of all I would like to commend your statements and personal efforts since the crisis escalated. The role of the European Union in this crisis could have enormous importance for our global role, our relations with the Middle Eastern countries and other global partners. EU must be more engaged, but the neighbouring countries should also assist more in mitigating the effects of this humanitarian disaster.

Of course Israel has a right to defend himself, targeting terrorists from Hamas, but the way it does must be regarded through a clear set of rules that are internationally recognised. Depriving civilians of essential commodities to survive cannot be justified, especially if more than half of civilian victims are children. The exchange of hostages and temporary ceasefire are the first positive steps, but many more are needed to accomplish a sovereign Palestinian State that is in peace with the State of Israel, a goal that we must continue pursuing.

Nicola Beer (Renew). – Herr Präsident! Bei aller höchst berechtigten Sorge um die humanitäre Krise in Gaza, um das Leid der Bevölkerung, die zivilen Opfer, darf das Wesentliche nicht in Vergessenheit geraten: Auslöser dieses Leids ist der barbarische Terror der Hamas. Terror, der anhält. Täglich schießt Hamas Raketen auf israelische Zivilisten, missbraucht die Menschen in Gaza als Schutzschilde – darunter über 200 Geiseln in ihrer Gewalt. Es liegt in den Händen der Hamas, das Leiden zu beenden, die Waffen zum Schweigen zu bringen, und dazu ist die Freilassung aller Geiseln zwingend.

Für einen wirklichen Frieden aber muss der Terror der Hamas enden. Wäre es vermessen zu denken, dass Israelis und Palästinenser dies gemeinsam vollbringen? Zu hoffen, dass Führungspersonen mit Persönlichkeit, auch mit eigenen schmerzlichen Erfahrungen des Verlusts geliebter Menschen, dafür einstehen, diesen Konflikt zu beenden? Zu glauben, dass Politiker bereit sind, sich über Machtinteressen hinwegzusetzen und an einer gemeinsamen Zukunft zu arbeiten?

In Europa ist dies nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg gelungen. Wir brauchen einen neuen Oslo-Moment, und wir als EU sollten alles tun, dies zu unterstützen.

Grace O’Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, people all over the world are asking, ‘What can we do to stop a war that has taken 5 000 children from their mothers, and has left an entire generation traumatised, while the families of hostages now hold their breath to hear if loved ones will be released?’

EU leaders have entirely failed to give an answer to that question, ‘What can we do?’ You have failed to call for a ceasefire. You have failed to react to breaches of international law. Gaza is in ruins while settlements in the West Bank continue to expand. Netanyahu and his far-right Government are emboldened by your silence. So others must provide the answers where you have failed.

Here’s what you can do. Demand a permanent ceasefire now. End trade with settlements now. Recognise the Palestinian State now. The EU must be courageous, not complicit.

Assita Kanko (ECR). – Mr President, today I have a question – a pressing question – for some western feminists: how can you remain silent when women and girls are raped, tortured, their bodies carried around naked and spat on by bearded men shouting *Allahu Akbar*? Then you can never call yourself a feminist again.

Every day, including today, some western hypocritical feminists should be ashamed of their silence on the horror that Hamas men inflicted to women and girls on 7 October. And that includes big names we were once proud of. Why are their lips sealed and their hearts of stone when it comes to the excruciating pain of Jewish women? The MeToo movement and so-called intersectional feminists do not care about all women. If they remain silent, it means they have lied to us about their commitment to women’s rights. Their actions support the oppressor, not the victims. Also the EU money does indirectly.

Those who say nothing about these women and the hostages should not be standing here and speaking about human rights. When you are under attack by terrorists, a ceasefire is like raising your hands when you are being shot at. Perhaps it's worth considering that a real, lasting ceasefire will start with bringing back all the hostages to their homes and the rapists to justice.

Anders Vistisen (ID). – Hr. formand! Denne her debat er jo altid meget følelsesladet, og jeg tror sådan set ikke, der er nogen i det her kammer – det håber jeg i hvert fald ikke – der mener, at et hvilket som helst civilt dødsfald ikke er et dødsfald for meget. Hvis det kan undgås, skal det undgås. Men retorikken er lidt forloren. F.eks. når FN's generalsekretær udtaler, at »vi er vidner til det største tab af civile. Det er fuldstændig uden parallel. Det er uden fortilfælde i min tid som generalsekretær.« Lad os minde hinanden og ham om, at mens han har været generalsekretær, er konflikten i Syrien stadig i gang. 500 000 døde. Konflikten i Yemen er ikke løst, 377 000 døde. Afghanistan, 100 076 døde. Dafur 300 000 døde, Irak 400 000 døde og Congo over 660 000 mennesker døde. Der er en slående forskel på, når muslimer slår muslimer ihjel, når arabere slår arabere ihjel, og når israelere prøver at bekæmpe Hamas. I forhold til den retorik, vi hører her i huset, i forhold til den retorik, vi hører fra FN. Lad os bare huske på, at når man spørger palæstinenserne både i Gaza og på Vestbredden, om de støttede terrorangrebet den 8. oktober, svarer tre ud af fire, at det gør de. Israel har en ret til at forsvare sig selv. Vi har en ret til at bekæmpe islamisk terrorisme, og det er vi nødt til at gøre, indtil kampen er vundet.

Manu Pineda (The Left). – Señor presidente, vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad, este Parlamento se negó el pasado lunes no ya a pedir un alto el fuego, sino tan siquiera a debatir sobre ello. Van 14 128 personas asesinadas por Israel en la Franja de Gaza, de las cuales 5 840 niños, 3 920 mujeres y 6 000 personas sepultadas bajo los escombros de la Franja de Gaza. Solo en las tres primeras semanas de este genocidio han muerto más niños en la Franja de Gaza que en todo 2022 en todos los conflictos que hay en el mundo. ¿Cuántos niños y niñas palestinos tienen que morir asesinados bajo las bombas israelíes para que este Parlamento Europeo y la Unión Europea pidan ya un alto el fuego?

Si hablamos de rehenes, pidamos que se liberen a los 240 israelíes en manos de Palestina y a los 7 400 palestinos secuestrados en las cárceles israelíes. ¿O solo duelen los rehenes de un lado? De esos 7 400, 880 son niños y niñas.

Si realmente quieren la paz, escuchen a nuestros pueblos. Nuestros pueblos están en la calle exigiendo lo que nosotros nos negamos a exigir:

En primer lugar, un alto el fuego. Un alto el fuego, no una pausa humanitaria. Un alto el fuego definitivo. Un alto el fuego justo. En segundo lugar, que tomemos acciones más allá de las palabras. Que tomemos acciones para acabar con la ocupación. Que ya no digamos más lo de que «estamos profundamente preocupados» y tomemos decisiones que presionen al ocupante a acabar con la ocupación. Y, en tercer lugar, sumarnos a la iniciativa para llevar a Netanyahu y a todos los responsables y cómplices de este genocidio ante la Corte Penal Internacional.

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Borrell, δεν χρειάζεται πτυχίο δικηγόρου για να καταδικάσετε τις φρικαλεότητες του κατοχικού Ισραήλ στη Γάζα. Δεν χρειάζεται. Γιατί σπέρνουν τον θάνατο σε νεογνά, παιδιά, αμάχους, γυναίκες, βομβαρδίζοντας νοσοκομεία, σχολεία, με χιλιάδες νεκρούς. Καταρρέουν ένα-ένα τα fake news του ισραηλινού στρατού που δολοφονήσε ως και ισραηλινούς αμάχους, πάντα με τα γνωστά προσχήματα περί αυτοάμυνας για να δικαιώσει την κατοχή. Στόχο δεν έχει τη Χαμάς, αλλά τη ματαίωση ίδρυσης ανεξάρτητου παλαιστινιακού κράτους, την εκκαθάριση της Γάζας από Παλαιστίνιους για να γίνει αυτή κερδοφόρο για την αστική τάξη του Ισραήλ, εμπορικό και ενεργειακό πέρασμα. Καταδικάζουμε τα σχέδια αυτά που στηρίζουν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και οι κυβερνήσεις, όπως αυτή της Νέας Δημοκρατίας στην Ελλάδα.

Απαιτούμε να σταματήσει η στρατιωτική επίθεση και η κατοχή. Καμία εμπλοκή και διευκόλυνση της σφαγής του παλαιστινιακού λαού. Εκατομμύρια διαδηλωτών σε όλο τον κόσμο αχρηστεύουν τη βρώμικη προπαγάνδα, υπερασπίζονται το δικαίο του παλαιστινιακού λαού και απαιτούν ανεξάρτητο παλαιστινιακό κράτος στα σύνορα του '67 με πρωτεύουσα την Ανατολική Ιερουσαλήμ, με απελευθέρωση των πολιτικών κρατουμένων και επιστροφή των προσφύγων στις εστίες τους.

Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE). – Señor presidente, el 19 de octubre aprobamos por inmensa mayoría en este Parlamento Europeo una Resolución que condenaba los ataques de Hamás y se hacía eco del sufrimiento del pueblo palestino como escudo humano de Hamás. Pero, de los veinte diputados que votaron en contra de aquella Resolución — absoluta minoría en este Parlamento—, dos han sido nombrados ministros del Gobierno de España.

El señor Borrell explicaba que le resulta muy difícil alcanzar acuerdos dentro del Consejo Europeo. Pero ¿cómo va a poder hacerlo si la Presidencia del Consejo Europeo la ostenta el Gobierno de España con estos dos ministros?

El Parlamento ha hecho su labor. Nuestra presidenta estuvo donde tenía que estar al principio, igual que la presidenta de la Comisión. También se han puesto en marcha fondos financieros. Estamos ahí para ayudar.

Pero esta es la historia europea: aquí estamos debatiendo otra vez después de dos semanas, no sé para qué, cuando lo que tenemos que hacer es hallar soluciones. Ayuda financiera, presencia europea... Han sido los Estados Unidos y otros países los que han conseguido esta pausa humanitaria. ¿Dónde estábamos nosotros? Pues ahí está la explicación, con este Consejo Europeo que tenemos.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Herr talman! Kollegor. Ett litet område i Mellanöstern, helt avskilt från omvärlden. Inget ställe för civila att söka skydd bortom bomber och pansarvagnar. Där berövas kvinnor, barn, spädbarn och äldre, även journalister och vårdpersonal, sina liv.

Platsen har ett namn – Gaza i Palestina, världens största utomhusfängelse. Skriken efter hjälp borde eka i allas öron, även våra här inne i vårt parlament. Men hela den svenska högern – M, KD och L tillsammans med SD – och hela den europeiska extremhögern verkar vara döva på grund av sin fientlighet mot palestinier.

Ja, Hamas och andra terroristorganisationer ska bekämpas. Samtidigt måste det säkerställas att oskyldiga palestinier och israeler räddas och att inte Gazaborna fördrivs från sina hem. Gårdagens överenskommelse mellan Israel och Hamas är viktig för att rädda civila.

Vi får dock aldrig glömma att även kriget har lagar som måste respekteras av alla parter, alltid. EU måste bidra med humanitärt stöd, stödja Palestinska myndigheten, få slut på lidandet och ta ett globalt ansvar för en tvästatslösning, genom att bland annat erkänna Palestina. Israeler och palestinier förtjänar fred och säkerhet.

And finally, I want to thank HVP Borrell and Commissioner Lenarčič for your important work. But, I also must say that I'm ashamed of Commissioner Várhelyi and his actions.

Bernard Guetta (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, dans nos 27 capitales, à Washington et dans tous les pays de la Ligue arabe, on ne parle plus que des deux États israélien et palestinien. Beaucoup ne veulent pas y croire, mais la Palestine verra bel et bien le jour aux côtés de l'État d'Israël pour la simple et bonne raison qu'il n'y a pas d'autre solution à cette guerre de 100 Ans. Mais qui expulsera, dit-on, les 500 000 colons? Eh bien, une minorité tentera une vaine résistance, la plupart rentrera en Israël et d'autres deviendront résidents étrangers dans ce nouvel État.

Le problème n'est pas là. Le vrai problème est que la raison n'a plus assez de défenseurs, ni d'un côté ni de l'autre. Et c'est pour cela que la paix, une paix juste et pérenne, devra être imposée de l'extérieur, comme le partage de 47 l'avait été par les Nations Unies. Notre Union aura là un rôle fondamental à jouer, et plutôt que de se disputer sur les mots «trêve» ou «cessez-le-feu», notre Parlement doit d'ores et déjà, d'urgence, pleinement s'y préparer.

Hannah Neumann (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, as we debate, families in Israel are mourning children, parents, spouses barbarically killed by Hamas terrorists on 7 October. They fear for the lives of hostages, and they are seeking shelter from ongoing Hamas shelling. In Gaza, people are mourning their children, parents, spouses who have become victims of Israel's shelling of civilian infrastructure. They fear for those who remain exposed to ongoing airstrikes and suffer under the siege of Gaza.

All human beings have the right to live in safety and freedom. Demanding this for one group does not question this right in relation to another group. Empathy is not a zero-sum game.

The announced release of hostages linked to a temporary truce offers a new glimpse of hope to end the spiral of violence. The European Union, together with the UN, Arab states and the US, must facilitate a process where both Israelis and Palestinians can work on solutions to live side by side in peace. Hopefully for good this time.

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αναμφισβήτητα, βασικός ένοχος για την κατάσταση στη Γάζα είναι οι ΗΠΑ που χρηματοδότησαν τους Ταλιμπάν στο Αφγανιστάν και τη Χαμάς για να πληγεί η Φατάχ και ο Αραφάτ. Επίσης βασικός ένοχος είναι και ο Erdoğan, ο οποίος δεν διστάζει να στηρίζει ανοιχτά την τρομοκρατική οργάνωση της Χαμάς. Κι εμείς αναρωτιόμαστε, κύριε Borrell, πώς η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στηρίζει, συνομιλεί και χρηματοδοτεί τον συγκεκριμένο δικτάτορα. Ερχόμενοι στο σήμερα, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν θα πρέπει να παραλάβει κανέναν μουσουλμάνο εξτρεμιστή στο έδαφός της, ειδικά τη στιγμή που δεν το πράττει αυτό καμία αραβική χώρα. Είναι ντροπή, αντί να μιλάμε για απελάσεις, να σχεδιάζουν κάποιοι την άφιξη και άλλων λαθρομεταναστών στις γειτονιές μας.

Bernhard Zimniok (ID). – Herr Präsident! Weder auf den Kriegsverlauf noch auf die Freilassung von Geiseln haben wir in diesem Konflikt irgendeinen Einfluss. Die EU ist völlig außen vor, spielt politisch nicht einmal eine Nebenrolle und wird auch keine spielen – alles Tagträume. Viel wichtiger wäre eine Debatte hier in diesem Haus darüber, welche Konsequenzen in Europa aus diesem Konflikt jetzt schon zu ziehen sind. Die antisemitischen Demonstrationen des überwiegend muslimischen Mobs auf unseren Straßen sollten für uns alle ein Wecksignal sein.

Es besteht dringender Handlungsbedarf, um der Islamisierung hier in Europa endlich Einhalt zu gebieten. Aber was wurde nach diesen Machtdemonstrationen unternommen? Wurden Islamisten ausgewiesen, Organisationen verboten, illegale Migranten abgeschoben, ein Aufnahmestopp verhängt? Nichts dergleichen, nichts! In Deutschland reisen ohne Kenntnis der Regierung Taliban-Funktionäre ein, halten Hasspredigten in DITIB-Moscheen. Wieso dürfen Islamisten weiter ihre Hetze verbreiten? Will die EU der Islamisierung so lange zuschauen, bis sie vollendet ist?

Werte Kollegen, wachen Sie auf und bekämpfen Sie die Islamisierung Europas, bevor es zu spät ist! Konzentrieren wir uns auf das, was wir machen können, und nicht auf unsere Tagträume!

Miroslav Radačovský (NI). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, postoj nás, Európanov, k židovskému národu je neúprimný a pokrytecký. Po celé stáročia sme fyzicky likvidovali židovský národ. Nakoniec sme to zdokonalili holokaustom a vyvražďili sme šesť miliónov nevinných Židov. Nedokázali sme s nimi žiť. Vytvorili sme im štát. A keďže my sme s nimi nedokázali žiť, povedali sme Palestínčanom: vy s nimi musíte žiť! Vy s nimi musíte žiť, ale za nie rovnakých podmienok, nie ako rovný s rovným. Izraelčania dostali vlastný štát. Palestínčania dostali pásмо Gazy, dostali západný breh Jordánu, okupované územie bez hlavného mesta, bez vízie do budúcnosti. A toto je hlavný dôvod a príčina toho, čo sa dnes deje na Blízkom východe. A zopakujem to, čo som povedal pred asi pol mesiacom. Nikdy nikomu sa v živote nepodarí zničiť historicky ťažko skúšaný židovský národ. Ale ani nikdy nikomu sa nepodarí zničiť ťažko skúšaný palestínsky národ. Začnime rokovanie o mieri. Žiadajme vytvorenie palestínskeho štátu. Toto je budúcnosť.

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, I would like to emphasise the dramatic situation of children in Palestine. We cannot be blind. 5000 kids were killed. 700,000 are displaced because their homes have been destroyed. Thousands are injured. There is a lack of water, electricity. Children have to be protected. But this is not the only situation in Gaza Strip. In the West Bank territory, an 11-year-old girl was sentenced to prison, 12 years – this is cruelty.

We have to protect children. We cannot accept it. As the European Parliament, we have to react, and I call on European institutions to act and to react. Children are innocent and there is no black-and-white scenario. The war is not a solution. We have to protect kids, children. Hospitals, schools have to be protected. Stop this war.

Elena Yoncheva (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la situation humanitaire à Gaza est insupportable et près de 900 000 personnes déplacées trouvent refuge dans les installations des Nations Unies. Au moins 17 de ces installations ont été directement touchées, ce qui est effroyable. Au lieu de discuter de la manière d'imposer des conditions supplémentaires à l'aide, l'Union devrait faire pression pour davantage de couloirs humanitaires et s'assurer que cette aide parvienne réellement à la population de Gaza.

Et aujourd'hui, ce conflit dépasse les frontières d'Israël et de Gaza, avec le récent détournement d'un cargo par les Houthis au Yémen. Nous savons désormais que des citoyens européens se trouvent à bord de ce navire, des équipages bulgares et roumains. Quelles mesures, Monsieur Borrell et Monsieur Lenarčič, comptez-vous prendre pour faciliter la médiation et libérer les otages du navire? Quelles mesures?

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew). – Señor presidente, hoy hay un rayo de esperanza con la liberación de rehenes israelíes y un alto el fuego durante cuatro días.

Pero todos sabemos que esto es claramente insuficiente. Lo que está sucediendo en Gaza es terrible: Gaza hoy es una fosa en la que yacen más de 16 000 cadáveres, y quiero decir que no estamos haciendo todo lo que debemos para evitar esta catástrofe humanitaria.

La Unión Europea no permitiría a ningún otro país que estuviera vulnerando las normas básicas del Derecho Internacional, la protección de los civiles, la protección del personal humanitario, la protección de la prensa, la prohibición de los ataques a hospitales... El Derecho Internacional Humanitario y su cumplimiento es lo que divide a los países democráticos de los regímenes autocráticos y de las organizaciones terroristas.

Nuestra doble vara de medir la defensa de los derechos humanos, del Derecho Internacional, en este conflicto es insufrible. Y nos va a pasar factura. Va a pasar factura al papel necesario que tiene que desempeñar la Unión Europea en la solución de la paz, que no es otra que la solución de dos Estados.

Mounir Satouri (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, d'abord, merci Monsieur Borrell, face à la cacophonie et à l'irresponsabilité, vous avez tenu ces dernières semaines la barre haute et je vous en remercie.

Depuis hier, on a eu deux nouvelles. La possible trêve humanitaire avec la libération des otages. C'est une bonne nouvelle et il faut encourager un cessez-le-feu permanent et durable. Et la preuve que nous n'avons jamais financé le Hamas. Le commissaire Várhelyi, qui a jeté l'opprobre sur l'Union européenne, sur l'administration et qui a mis en danger le personnel européen doit partir et il en va de l'honneur de l'Union européenne.

Nous ne sommes audibles dans le monde que lorsque nous sommes les faiseurs de paix, les promoteurs de la stabilité, les gardiens du droit international, les promoteurs du droit humain. C'est ça notre rôle! Alors, exigeons tout cela! Et nous avons les moyens pour y arriver, nous sommes le premier partenaire économique et commercial d'Israël, le premier financeur de l'autorité palestinienne. Nous pouvons peser, nous avons des outils. Nous devons activer le régime de sanctions contre celles et ceux qui nuisent aux droits humains et nous devons exiger une solution de paix durable. Deux États, c'est la seule condition de la stabilité dans le monde.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, mijnheer de hoge vertegenwoordiger, mijnheer de commissaris, aan allen die vandaag menen vooral Israël te moeten bekritisieren, inclusief de heer Borrell, zou ik de volgende vragen willen stellen: Wie houdt er al meer dan zes weken meer dan tweehonderd onschuldige burgers in gijzeling? Precies, Hamas.

Wie zaaide er 7 oktober jongstleden dood en verderf op een vredig muziekfestival en in vele kibboetsen? Precies, Hamas. Wie zet onschuldige burgers in als een menselijk schild? Precies, Hamas.

Zeker, alles moet er nu op gericht zijn alle gijzelaars zo snel mogelijk vrij te krijgen. We hebben de wanhoop en het verdriet gezien in de ogen van hun familieleden die ons hun schrijnende verhalen vertelden. Dat er nu een akkoord ligt over vrijlating van een eerste groep is wat dat betreft hoopgevend. Maar laten we niet vergeten: om tot een duurzame vrede te komen, zal Hamas toch echt van het toneel moeten verdwijnen. Israël verdient onze blijvende steun in die strijd.

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, bambini morti per attacchi scriteriati; donne e uomini civili uccisi senza pietà solo perché palestinesi; persino neonati che muoiono nelle incubatrici perché è stata sottratta la corrente elettrica persino agli ospedali: questo succede in Palestina; queste sono le gravi responsabilità di Netanyahu.

Un mese fa, in quest'Aula ho chiesto all'Europa di condannare questo orrore, queste violazioni del diritto internazionale e non è successo nulla. Abbiamo condannato giustamente l'azione terroristica di Hamas, abbiamo condannato giustamente l'atto di guerra della Russia di Putin. Ma cosa aspettiamo a condannare la politica criminale di Netanyahu?

È una vergogna accusare di antisemitismo chi critica questo governo di Israele: migliaia di ebrei stanno protestando in tutto il mondo contro i crimini di Netanyahu. Che fa l'Europa? Non vi fanno orrore quei bambini disperati, quei corpi in terra senza più calore? Esistono morti di serie A e di serie B? Esistono crimini e violazioni del diritto che l'Europa tollera?

No. Dunque, per rispetto a quei bambini palestinesi innocenti uccisi dalle scelte di Netanyahu, l'Europa deve prendere posizione e condannare subito o non sarà più Unione europea ma sarà squallida ipocrisia.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Mr President, 'bring them back home' – that was the desperate cry of the families of the hostage that were brutally abducted by the terrorist organisation Hamas when it launched its heinous attack on Israel on 7 October.

Today, it appears 50 hostages are going to be released as part of a deal that includes the release of 150 Palestinian prisoners in a four-day humanitarian pause. And of course, we welcome this development and hope it leads to more positive developments.

Israel has indicated its willingness to continue to discuss the humanitarian pauses in exchange for release of the hostages. Today, I would like us not to forget that there are another 200 families that are desperate at this moment, that are in excruciating pain, that are wondering about their loved ones, and to them, I would like to say that 'bring them home' means 'bring them all back home'.

Nacho Sánchez Amor (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor Borrell, quiero agradecerle su impecable posición política, pero también su posición moral en la gestión nada fácil de un conflicto tan envenenado.

Lamento que la Comisión (que empezó fatal), tras el daño que le hizo la posición inicial del comisario Várhelyi a la Unión Europea, hoy se haya dedicado solo a describir la situación sin establecer ninguna responsabilidad política por lo que está pasando.

Señor Borrell, yo quiero advertirles a usted y a mis colegas del enorme riesgo que corremos por las acusaciones desde el Sur Global de que la Unión actúa con dobles raseros morales en sus juicios sobre los muchos conflictos recientes. Algunas acusaciones con razón y otras no, pero el riesgo del desarme definitivo de nuestro poder blando está ahí presente.

Nosotros, tan exhibicionistas de nuestros principios y nuestros valores, no podemos ofrecer al mundo una imagen peligrosa de incoherencia moral, juzgando de modo diferente conflictos u operaciones militares por encima de las fronteras internacionales con excusas preventivas.

Para esta Casa, el respeto al Derecho internacional es nuestra brújula, sin preferencias ni excepciones. Y nos duelen igual los niños muertos sean israelíes o palestinos.

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, aujourd'hui, le Proche-Orient tout entier est pris en otage. Je pense bien sûr aux 240 otages détenus par le Hamas. Tous les hommes, toutes les femmes, tous les enfants, tous doivent rentrer chez eux. Je pense aux 2 millions de Gazaouis. Eux aussi, le Hamas les a pris en otage. Ce sont nous, Européens, qui nous préoccupons de leur sort et qui occupons la première place de l'aide aux Palestiniens. Le Hamas construit des tunnels, pas des écoles. Il achète des armes, pas des médicaments. Il ne sert pas la cause palestinienne, il s'en sert pour s'enrichir et pour nourrir son projet fou, antisémite et islamiste.

Et je pense à la paix, cette paix dont les accords d'Oslo dessinaient les contours et dont les artisans sont morts. Arafat n'est plus, et en Palestine, qui a son courage, le vrai courage de la paix ? Rabin a été assassiné. Aujourd'hui, des extrémistes israéliens encouragent les colons à s'en prendre aux Palestiniens en Cisjordanie. Ils ne dessinent aucun avenir pour Gaza, hormis la destruction. Ils ont trahi Rabin et pris la paix en otage.

Nous autres Européens savons ce qu'est le terrorisme islamiste et nous sommes solidaires du peuple israélien. Nous autres Européens savons ce que sont les souffrances du peuple palestinien. Et je tiens à vous remercier, Josep Borrell et Janez Lenarčič, pour vos positions courageuses et votre action inlassable. Vous nous faites honneur. La paix, ce sont les Israéliens et les Palestiniens de bonne volonté qui devront la construire ensemble... *(Le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)*

Teuvo Hakkarainen (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, entäpä jos sinun kotiisi ammuttaisiin päivittäin raketteja vuosi vuoden jälkeen, ryhtyisitkö vastatoimiin? Varmasti ryhtyisit tai sitten luovuttaisit kotisi viholliselle. Juutalaisten mereen heittäminen on jokapäiväistä puhetta. Voiko siltä pohjalta edes neuvotella? Hamasin peruskirjassa lukee, että jokainen juutalainen pitää poistaa maan päältä. Tältä pohjalta on turha odottaa rauhaa näiden ihmisten kanssa.

Gazan väestö on yksiselitteisesti joutunut Hamas-terroristien uhriksi. Ja nyt Euroopan unioni ja Suomi on rahoittanut Gazassa olevia niin sanottuja pakolaisia, mutta rahat ovat menneet Hamas-terroristeille, jotka ovat rakentaneet niillä luolastoja sairaaloiden ja siviilien... *(Puhemies keskeytti puhujan.)*

David Lega (PPE). – Mr President, commissioners, I want to talk about hostages. I want to talk about the over 200 Israeli women, children and men whom Hamas kidnapped on 7 October. And I want to talk about the Palestinians in Gaza whom Hamas has taken hostage too. And while I welcome the positive news about a possible deal, it is still vital to stress that Hamas must release all hostages – *all* hostages.

The vicious terror organisation Hamas, set on annihilating the State of Israel, has butchered Israelis, raped women in front of their children, burned humans alive. But Hamas is also tormenting Palestinians in Gaza, blocking their escape, using them as human shields, refusing basic rights, torturing people for being gay, silencing women. Hamas leaves no hope for the future of Gaza and for the people of Gaza that they claim to represent. Hamas must be defeated: from the river to the sea, all hostages must be free.

Udo Bullmann (S&D). – Herr Präsident, wertere Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wenn es dazu kommt, dass Geiseln freikommen, wenn es dazu kommt, dass Feuerpausen eingehalten werden, dann sind das wichtige und richtige Schritte – aber es ist nicht genug.

Die Menschen in den Todeszonen Israels, die Menschen in den Todeszonen Gazas brauchen mehr. Und ja, Herr Borrell hat Recht: Wir müssen in Richtung Frieden blicken. Aber was heißt das? Das heißt für die Europäische Union, dass wir auch die Kraft und die Courage aufbringen müssen, den Weg dafür zu ebnen.

Die Menschen in Israel müssen in Frieden und in Sicherheit leben können. Wo sind die Vertreter der arabischen Nachbarstaaten, die ihre Stimme erheben und das mit garantieren? Ja – wo sind die Freunde Israels, die klar und unmissverständlich deutlich machen, dass keine weiteren unschuldigen Menschen sterben dürfen und dass die Gewalt der Siedler gestoppt gehört?

Herr Kommissar, Herr Hoher Beauftragter, lassen Sie uns Teil der Antwort werden! Lassen Sie uns Teil der Lösung sein, die die Todesspirale ein für alle Mal stoppt!

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar und Außenbeauftragter! Ja, die Waffen müssen schweigen, und zwar die Waffen aller vom Iran organisierten und finanzierten Terrorgruppen: der Hisbollah, der Hamas, der Islamischen Revolutionsgarden und aller islamistischen Terrorgruppen in aller Welt – auch in Europa, in der EU, in unseren Hauptstädten. Wenn diese Waffen schweigen, dann gibt es keinen islamistischen Terrorismus mehr.

Und ja, die Geiseln müssen befreit werden, und in diesen Stunden gibt es offenbar die Gelegenheit dazu. Aber nicht hier aus dem Europäischen Parlament, aus gemütlichen Sesseln, können wir entscheiden, wann die richtige Zeit ist für eine Pause zur Geiselfreiung, sondern nur die Profis der israelischen Armee können das entscheiden. Die israelische Regierung entscheidet das als unsere Partnerregierung politisch, und offenbar gelingt das.

Aber einige werden nie heimkehren: Das sind die über 1000 durch diesen islamistischen Angriff ermordeten Kinder, Frauen und Männer.

Ich bin einer, der immer Islam und Islamismus unterscheidet. Deshalb fordere ich Muslime auf, sich zu distanzieren von dem Antisemitismus, der in ganz Europa jetzt wieder Platz greift; er gehört mit aller Härte des Gesetzes bekämpft, genauso wie rechtsstaatliche Verfahren die Terroristen, die für den 7. Oktober verantwortlich sind, zur Verantwortung ziehen werden.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Alto-Comissário, Senhor Comissário, antes de mais uma palavra de reconhecimento pela clarividência, pela firmeza e pela determinação em momentos em que a cacofonia reinante nos ameaçou retirar de um papel ativo no Médio Oriente.

Ontem, como milhares de cidadãos, recebi no meu e-mail pessoal um pedido de ajuda de uma organização não governamental, que a dada altura dizia: «As nossas equipas que ainda trabalham em Gaza estão exaustas e aterrorizadas. Temos crianças a ser operadas no chão do hospital e a serem amputadas sem anestesia». Diante disto, pouco mais é necessário dizer.

O direito da defesa de Israel em relação aos ataques do Hamas só é legítimo se pautado pelo mais estrito respeito pelo direito humanitário internacional. Acabou o tempo das meias-palavras. A trégua e a libertação de reféns, hoje anunciada, é motivo de esperança mas não chega. A União Europeia tem que ser clara na exigência de um cessar-fogo definitivo, da libertação dos reféns, mas também do fim da violência na Cisjordânia.

Temos que nos pautar pela luta pela defesa da solução de dois Estados, única que garante a paz.

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Г-н Председател, г-н Борел, нека да поздравим Израел за усилията, които полага за освобождаване на заложниците. Но нека да е ясно, че докато съществува Хамас, хуманитарната катастрофа ще продължи и няма да има мир. Решението е само едно – унищожаване на Хамас, на Хизбула и на всички останали терористични организации в региона.

Що се отнася до мирното население в Газа, то явно не е толкова мирно, след като мъже от него стават терористи. Това население видимо подкрепя Хамас. Необходими са нови санкции срещу държавите, които подкрепят тероризма в региона. На първо място Иран, но да не забравяме и за Русия. Мир и палестинска държава трябва да има, когато няма да има палестински тероризъм. Свободна Палестина означава свободна от Хамас.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signor Alto rappresentante, onorevoli colleghi, sono ore decisive: i negoziati in corso sembrano portare a una possibile tregua, a un rilascio degli ostaggi. Ci auguriamo che possa accadere quanto prima.

Questo lieve ottimismo, però, lascia subito spazio alla constatazione di una drammatica situazione sul campo: a più di un mese dal criminale attacco di Hamas, i morti continuano ad aumentare a Gaza; mancano beni di prima necessità: acqua, cibo, medicinali, combustibile. Questo scenario drammatico lo ha potuto vedere proprio lei, Alto rappresentante, e ha tracciato, io credo, correttamente la strada da seguire: sì a un'immediata cessazione delle ostilità per garantire il passaggio degli aiuti umanitari verso Gaza; no alla sua rioccupazione da parte di Israele e no all'espulsione forzata dei palestinesi.

Voglio ripeterlo come l'ho già detto in quest'Aula: Israele ha il diritto di difendersi ma non alla vendetta e i civili vanno protetti. L'Europa sta dimostrando nei fatti che può, se vuole, parlare con una voce propria e svolgere una funzione diplomatica importante.

Continuiamo a farlo. Facciamolo veramente. Non c'è più tempo: fermiamo questa guerra.

Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε Borrell, οι εξελίξεις στην περιοχή της Γάζας, η προσωρινή κατάπαυση του πυρός που ανακοινώθηκε πριν από μερικές ώρες, η οποία περιλαμβάνει και επιστροφή αιχμαλώτων, ανοίγει ένα μικρό παράθυρο ελπίδας. Από την πρώτη στιγμή καταδικάσαμε την τρομοκρατική επίθεση της Χαμάς, που άνοιξε τον ασκό του Αιόλου. Υπερασπιστήκαμε το δικαίωμα του Ισραήλ στην αυτοάμυνα, ενώ την ίδια ώρα δηλώσαμε ότι οι άμαχοι και ο απλός παλαιστινιακός λαός δεν πρέπει να πληρώνουν για τα εγκλήματα της Χαμάς.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, επιβάλλεται να βρεθεί λύση στο τεράστιο ανθρωπιστικό ζήτημα. Θέλω στο σημείο αυτό, κύριε Borrell, να θυμίσω την πρωτοβουλία της Κύπρου για δημιουργία ανθρωπιστικού διαδρόμου από τη χώρα μου προς την εμπόλεμη περιοχή. Η Κύπρος είναι το εγγύτερο γεωγραφικό ευρωπαϊκό έδαφος στο πεδίο των συγκρούσεων και δηλώνει παρούσα με έμπρακτο τρόπο στην προσπάθεια για επίλυση του ανθρωπιστικού θέματος. Χαίρομαι, κύριε Borrell, που στηρίζετε αυτήν την πρωτοβουλία. Μια πρωτοβουλία η οποία ουσιαστικά δεν είναι μόνο κυπριακή, αλλά είναι και ευρωπαϊκή.

Der Präsident. – Meine Damen und Herren, ich habe jetzt folgendes Problem: Wir haben in wenigen Minuten unseren Gastredner am heutigen Tag, den Premierminister von Bulgarien, hier im Raum. Ich habe aber sehr viele „Catch the eye“-Wortmeldungen – die kann ich nicht alle nehmen. Ich bin verpflichtet, fünf zu nehmen, und hier muss ich nach der *gender balance* und nach der *balance* der Fraktionen vorgehen.

Und zweitens ersuche ich den Rat und die Kommission, sich an die Redezeit zu halten.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Janina Ochojska (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Uważam, że powinniśmy dążyć do równowagi w mówieniu o konflikcie izraelsko-palestyńskim, apelować o uwolnienie wszystkich zakładników, żądać zawieszenia broni, skrytykować Izrael za odwet na Palestyńczykach, ale zdecydowanie potępić Hamas i inne organizacje terrorystyczne. Tę przemoc należy jak najszybciej zakończyć.

Trudno mi zapomnieć palestyńską dziewczynkę, która utraciła obie ręczki i miała zranioną twarz, czy ciała wcześniej zmarłych z powodu braku prądu. Nie zapomnę również widoku ciał Żydów pomordowanych przez Hamas.

Wizja stabilnego pokoju musi zacząć się od wybaczenia i od dialogu.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señor presidente Othmar Karas, alto representante y vicepresidente Josep Borrell y comisario Janez Lenarčič, yo creo que hay que felicitar al alto representante por esta gira que ha hecho por los países de Oriente Medio, que creo que ha sido muy útil para dejar clara la posición europea.

Creo que es positivo que se deje claro también por parte de la Unión Europea que estamos en contra de que Hamás controle la Franja de Gaza. Y se debe hablar del futuro de la Franja de Gaza, yo creo que ese debate también hay que ponerlo encima de la mesa: la idea que ha señalado Josep Borrell de que la Autoridad Palestina se haga cargo de la Franja con el apoyo de la Liga Árabe, de las Naciones Unidas, y de que, como también ha dicho, se relance el proceso de paz y la solución de dos Estados.

Y animo asimismo a que la Unión Europea valore la posibilidad de trabajar para plantear también una propuesta de paz europea, como en otros momentos han hecho los Estados Unidos. Creo que eso podría también dar un valor agregado al proceso de paz por parte de la Unión Europea.

Abir Al-Sahlani (Renew). – Mr President, allow me to start by apologising to the children of Gaza on our disappointing positions so far. We have let them down. We have let their lives be taken away from them and not defended their equal right to life.

And let me thank also Mr Borrell for finally raising his voice in a just way, standing up for all humans' human rights, because something that has been very clear and strongly shown is that we have applied double standards when it comes to implementing human rights for all. The people of Gaza, the Palestinians have been treated with double standards, and that is just a fact.

Yesterday I listened to the Israeli former Ambassador, Élie Barnavi, and he said that we have to show courage. That means that we have to now start to force both sides into the peace negotiations. We have to have a Marshall Plan for Gaza, and we have to recognise the state of Palestine and bring on the... *(The President cut off the speaker)*

Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE). – Hr. formand! Og tak til Borrell for en fin tale. Der er et punkt, der slet ikke har været talt om i dag, og det er truslen, der sker nu i Libanon. I går blev ni dræbt, heraf to journalister og en gammel kvinde. 45-46 000 er internt fordrevet. 45 000 oliventræer er blevet ødelagt, hugget ned, spredt med »white fosfor«. Og lad mig citere, hvad den israelske forsvarsminister – Defence minister Galant – har sagt. De flyver overalt i arabiske medier nu. »What we are doing in Gaza, we can do in Beirut.«

Jeg synes, vi skal være meget mere opmærksom på den alvorlige trussel, der er ved at ramme os alle sammen, fordi vi ikke ser de ting, der sker i øjeblikket. Også i Beirut og i Libanon er der jo stærke erindringer om, hvad det er, de har været ude for. Så vi kan ikke garantere, at de bare sidder med foldede hænder og håber, at det går godt. Hvis ikke vi er meget, meget mere tough. Jeg ved, at Borrell ved det, men jeg tror, at alle skal vide det her.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovane kolege, kažete da Izrael ubija civile i to koristite kao argument da osudite Izrael.

Jasno je, dakle, da svaka vijest o nekom ubijenom civilu šteti Izraelu, a koristi Hamasu. I iz toga je jasno zašto Hamas ne pušta civile da odu, nego ih koristi kao živi štit. Tražite primirje. U tom primirju, naravno, Hamas neće sjediti prekriznih ruku, nego će se pregrupirati i dobaviti dodatno oružje. Zašto ne tražite potpuno razoružanje Hamasa? Zašto ne tražite poštene izbore u Gazi?

Dakle, svi vi koji danas osuđujete Izrael ustvari štitite Hamas i štitite radikalni islamistički terorizam i vodite taj terorizam i u Europu kroz potpuno nerazumnu migrantsku politiku. Mislim da bi bilo vrijeme da shvatite da Izrael danas, kad uništava Hamas, ustvari radi uslugu svima nama.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Janez Lenarčič, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, I listened very carefully to all the interventions and I would like to summarise my concluding remarks in the following five points.

One: there can be no doubt that the international humanitarian law applies fully in this conflict, as in any other conflict, and it is binding on all parties. And it is also quite obvious that international humanitarian law is not being respected. Large numbers of civilians have been killed in Israel on 7 October. Hostages were taken. Rockets have been fired indiscriminately across Israel. More than 12 000 civilians have been killed in Gaza. Humanitarian aid is being obstructed. More than 100 UN staff have been killed, and so on. These are violations of international humanitarian law and they have to stop.

Second, it is urgent to improve humanitarian access into Gaza and within Gaza. Now let me explain what this means in practice. With the help of the UN Security Council resolution adopted last week, resolution No 2712, which says, inter alia, what this access means. It means, I quote, 'urgent and extended humanitarian pauses and corridors throughout the Gaza Strip for a sufficient number of days to facilitate the continuous, sufficient and unhindered provision of essential goods and services throughout – again, *throughout* – the Gaza Strip, including water, electricity, fuel, food and medical supplies, as well as emergency repairs to essential infrastructure', and so on. This is the law. This is what the law says and we still have not seen it complied with fully by all parties to this conflict.

Third point: I also wish to stress the importance of the role of the United Nations. The role of the United Nations in humanitarian assistance to Palestinian territories is indispensable. And I want to say that very clearly, because the United Nations has been attacked by some recently. And I just want to make it clear that without them, there can be no meaningful humanitarian assistance to Gaza and other parts of Palestinian territory.

Fourth: for us as the European Union and our Member States, it is essential to step up the humanitarian response, both in kind and in funding, and the European Commission is committed to doing its part.

And finally, my fifth point: while our focus has been on Gaza, we should not lose sight of the deteriorating situation in the West Bank, and we should step up our efforts on the political front towards a two-state solution.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad, en nombre del Consejo. – Señor presidente, ya les había advertido al principio que debía ser posible ver los dos platillos de la balanza. Y si hay que decirlo otra vez y repetirlo todas las que hagan falta, lo repito: lo que ocurrió el 7 de octubre es algo absolutamente reproable y condenable que no puede ser justificado en nombre del derecho a la defensa contra la colonización ni en nombre del combate para construir un Estado palestino. No.

Cuando se me pregunta: ¿es que los palestinos no tienen también derecho a defenderse? Es que lo del 7 de octubre no fue un acto de defensa. Fue un acto de terror en el que se atacó a civiles indefensos de forma premeditada. Hay que decirlo todas las veces que haga falta, porque parece que algunos no quieren escucharlo cuando algunos lo decimos.

Hay que decir también que los cócteles molotov lanzados contra sinagogas en Berlín o los eslóganes en la otra punta del mundo —en Sídney— contra los judíos no tienen nada que ver con la solidaridad con el pueblo de Palestina. Solamente representan el antiguo odio contra el pueblo judío, que ha escrito la peor página de la historia de Europa y que tenemos que combatir todos los días sin excepción y sin duda alguna.

¿Hay que repetirlo otra vez? Hagámoslo todos los días, pero no por eso dejemos de reconocer lo que ocurre en Cisjordania con una colonización que va contra las resoluciones de las Naciones Unidas. Ni minimicemos los errores que hayan podido cometer unos y otros en esta tragedia que dura ya demasiado tiempo.

Y si queremos hablar de la ley y el Derecho, escuchemos lo que dice precisamente el encargado de aplicarla, el fiscal de la Corte Penal Internacional, cuando nos recuerda que su tarea no tiene que ser desarrollada basándose en emociones, sino basándose en pruebas objetivas y verificables, y que está llevando a cabo la investigación necesaria para responder a lo que ahora percibimos como un drama y que después —cuando llegue el caso— tendrá que ser convertido en actos de acusación frente a una defensa.

No cambiemos la emoción por la razón. Las emociones están a flor de piel en esa parte del mundo, pero a nosotros aquí nos corresponde intentar superarlas para ver un camino por el que transitar juntos hacia la búsqueda de una paz que no podrá ser construida solo sobre la destrucción militar de una organización terrorista, sino sobre la esperanza del pueblo palestino para poder vivir en libertad y dignidad. Sin eso, no habrá paz.

Y la paz no es solamente algo que se necesita por razones morales. Ahora que está tan de moda hablar de la necesidad y la virtud, no es solo por la virtud, es por la absoluta necesidad. Y quien más necesita la existencia de un Estado palestino es Israel, porque la mejor garantía de paz y seguridad para Israel es la existencia de un Estado palestino inscrito dentro del orden internacional y que respete la convivencia justa. Y en eso es en lo que tenemos que invertir.

Y ahora permítanme que descienda un poco a un pequeño debate hispano-español. Señor López-Istúriz, España no preside el Consejo Europeo. Que yo sepa, el Consejo Europeo lo preside el señor Charles Michel, no lo preside el Gobierno español. El Gobierno español ostenta la Presidencia rotatoria del Consejo de la Unión Europea, que es otra cosa. Y las transferencias en materia de política internacional han sido transferidas alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad representante. Por lo tanto, si quiere criticar a alguien, critíqueme a mí.

Seguramente, necesitaré su apoyo más que su crítica, porque —créame— es muy difícil encontrar el punto de equilibrio en un momento en que cada uno solamente atiende a su dolor. Y es lógico que así sea. Donde nadie quiere hablar del día después, porque todos están en el día de hoy. Unos queriendo acabar con Hamás y otros queriendo evitar más muertos entre su pueblo.

Pero habrá un día después, y ese día después es cuando la Unión Europea tiene que estar en la cita con la historia y ser capaz de contribuir más, no solo como el buen samaritano que acude a ayudar y minimizar los daños que ya se han producido, sino a evitar que se produzcan más. No solo con toda la ayuda humanitaria que mi compañero Janez Lenarčič está desarrollando de una forma admirable, sino también con el compromiso político para que esta ayuda humanitaria no tenga que dedicarse a curar las heridas, porque de poco sirve dar de cenar una noche si vas a morir al día siguiente bajo las bombas.

Con lo que tenemos que colaborar es con la ayuda humanitaria y con el compromiso político para evitar una cosa y la otra. Espero que este Parlamento contribuya activamente a esta solución superando también sus lógicas diferencias.

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich danke Ihnen für die so wichtige und intensive Debatte zu diesem Thema. Ich bitte die Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die ich beim „*Catch the eye*“ nicht drannehmen konnte, um Vergebung, aber es war mir aus zeitlichen Gründen nicht mehr möglich.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Marc Botenga (The Left), par écrit. – Des ministres israéliens nient ouvertement l'existence d'un peuple palestinien, proposent l'expulsion de tous les habitants de Gaza vers l'Égypte, et utilisent des cartes où la Palestine a été rayée. Israël assume ouvertement sa volonté de nettoyage ethnique. En paroles et en actes. Au nord de Gaza la moitié des immeubles ont été détruits, un million et demi de Palestiniens chassés de leurs maisons. En un mois seulement, Israël a tué des milliers d'enfants et de bébés innocents, assassiné des journalistes, des médecins et leurs familles, des travailleurs des Nations unies et de l'Organisation mondiale de la Santé. Le nettoyage ethnique ne se limite pas à Gaza. En Cisjordanie occupée, des villages palestiniens entiers sont vidés de leurs habitants. À Jérusalem, les quartiers chrétien et arménien sont menacés par les colons israéliens. Mais malgré tout cela, malgré les dénonciations faites par les plus importantes agences des Nations unies et ONG internationales, l'Union européenne refuse de condamner Israël ou d'appeler à un cessez-le-feu. Pire, dans les faits, l'Union européenne soutient les crimes israéliens. Par l'argent, par les armes, par l'Accord d'Association UE-Israël. Elle se rend complice du nettoyage ethnique. Basta. Suspensions l'Accord d'Association. Arrêtons l'exportation d'armes. Retirons les diplomates européens.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI), per iscritto. – Sarò forte e crudo, così come forti e crude sono le immagini che ci arrivano quotidianamente dalla striscia di Gaza e quelle relative all'attacco di Hamas del 7 ottobre scorso. Tutti noi dovremmo imprimerne queste immagini nei nostri occhi e nei nostri cuori. Tutti noi dovremmo fermarci un momento, guardare queste immagini, immedesimarci nelle sofferenze dell'una e dell'altra parte, e dire basta, una volta per tutte. Quello che sta accadendo rappresenta una macchia nella storia dell'umanità. Questa macchia appartiene a tutti noi e diventerà un peso nella coscienza di tutti i nostri popoli.

Pertanto, è necessaria una risposta globale. È improcrastinabile che la comunità internazionale, senza fazioni ed eccezioni, si impegni per pervenire a un cessate il fuoco immediato. Allo stesso tempo, è essenziale sgombrare il campo dalle ambiguità: facciamo appello a tutti quegli Stati, arabi e non, che non hanno ancora preso le distanze da Hamas affinché taglino i ponti con quest'organizzazione terroristica e barbara. Solo così potremo veramente sostenere la ricerca di una soluzione definitiva a questa ferita che rimane aperta da tanti, troppi anni.

Cari colleghi, la storia ci giudicherà sulla base delle nostre azioni. Adoperiamoci affinché si ponga fine a questo conflitto una volta per tutte.

Alfred Sant (S&D), in writing. – Diplomatic discourse about humanitarian issues and the search for a ceasefire, not just a truce, must continue. Given the levels of barbarity (attributable to both sides) which the Israel-Hamas war has reached, that discourse and that search should be accompanied by a re-evaluation of the position that European nations adopt towards Israel and the Palestinians (in the absence of a Palestinian state). On the one hand, we are told, there is a new confrontation being set up by a Russia-China-Iran axis, against the 'Western' coalition that the US and Europe represent, plus Israel and hopefully some Arab states, chief of which Saudi Arabia. On the other hand, the Palestinian issue is presented as an anticolonial struggle against an invading tribe simply intent on practising ethnic cleansing. Europe should not accept both sides of this fundamentally misleading dichotomy. It should follow the line taken by UN Secretary-General Guterres. His is the best available assessment of the ongoing atrocious situation, no matter who rebuts it. A European policy in favour of a two-state solution to the Middle East 'problem' should be situated strictly in the political context set by Guterres, if Europe is to contribute validly to the establishment of some kind of just peace to Palestine.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – No dia 7 de outubro de 2023 Israel foi vítima de um brutal ataque terrorista. No total, cerca de 1 200 israelitas e estrangeiros foram mortos nesse ataque, a grande maioria dos quais no primeiro dia dos ataques do Hamas.

Israel tem o direito de se defender. Mas ninguém tem o direito de estar acima do direito internacional e do direito humanitário. Depois disso, mais de 14 000 pessoas foram mortas em Gaza. Mulheres, crianças e idosos indefesos foram vítimas de um conflito que não os protegeu. A catástrofe humanitária em Gaza atingiu níveis intoleráveis. O direito humanitário não pode continuar a ser violado. As soluções humanitárias têm que ser imediatas. Aquelas que tem sido possível desbloquear são manifestamente insuficientes.

Para travar a tragédia humanitária e a proliferação do conflito é preciso ir mais além. É preciso que o processo de libertação dos reféns prossiga e conduza a um cessar-fogo imediato. É precisa uma solução política baseada no princípio dos dois Estados, que como disse Joseph Borrell, tem sido proclamada há trinta anos mas nunca implementada, que inclua o controlo de Gaza por uma Autoridade Palestiniana reconhecida e um processo de reconstrução que constitua um fator de pacificação no Médio Oriente.

(Die Sitzung wird um 10.45 Uhr unterbrochen.)

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

5. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(The sitting resumed at 10.50)

6. Debata z cyklu „Oto Europa” z udziałem premiera Bułgarii Nikołaja Denkowa (debata)

President. – Dear colleagues, we have the Prime Minister of Bulgaria, Nikolay Denkov, with us today. Prime Minister, welcome to the European Parliament. Thank you for being here. A special welcome also to Mariya Gabriel, the Deputy Prime Minister, whom we know so well in this House.

Prime Minister, this is the first time you are here since we have seen the conclusion of the critical governmental rotation agreement in Bulgaria that finally managed to break through the political deadlock and gave Bulgaria an important perspective, stability and European outlook, and for that we are grateful.

Sixteen years of European Union membership have been transformative for Bulgaria and for Europe. It has given new impetus for businesses, for industry, for science, for technology. It has brought opportunities for people and for young people, in particular. It has more brought more social and judicial benefits and reforms, because EU membership promotes equality, social justice, democracy and the rule of law. And in times of geopolitical change, these European values must be defended.

Dear Prime Minister, I would like to particularly thank Bulgaria for its support for Ukraine, for providing military aid, for providing political support. Europe is stronger thanks to Bulgaria and your government, and will be stronger still when you join the eurozone and finally take your rightful place in the Schengen area.

Next June, 6.8 million Bulgarians will be called upon to choose the 17 elected Members of the European Parliament who will represent them here. We must work together to make sure people understand why they must vote – why it is important. Their voice matters for the European Union and Bulgaria's future, and we must keep listening and keep delivering.

Prime Minister, the floor is yours.

Николай Денков, *министър-председател на България* – Уважаема г-жо Председател на Европейския парламент, уважаеми председатели на парламентарни групи в Европейския парламент, уважаеми членове на Европейския парламент, уважаеми г-н Държавен секретар, уважаема г-жо комисар, дами и господа,

За мен е чест да застана пред вас, представителите на обединена Европа, в този красив и изпълнен със символика град. На този ден преди 105 години, броени дни след примирието, което слага край на Първата световна война, френските войски навлизат в Страсбург. А на утрешния ден преди 79 години генерал Филип Льоуклер и 2-ра бронирана дивизия на Френската свободна армия, подпомогнати от съюзниците, освобождават Страсбург от нацистката окупация.

Страсбург е град с богата и бурна история. Бил е част от Римската империя, след това е бил в пределите на Франкската империя и на Свещената римска империя, за кратко е бил независим свободен град, а в последните два века е преминавал непрекъснато ту във Франция, ту в Германия.

Етимологията тълкува Страсбург като град на пътищата. В миналото по тези пътища са се движели повече войници и танкове, отколкото търговци и стоки, по тях са ехтели повече изстрели и стонове на ранени и умиращи хора, отколкото песни на пътуващите музиканти. В миналото да се намираш на кръстопът често е било проклетие, а не предимство. В миналото тези пътища са разделяли хората, днес те ги свързват. В миналото небето над Страсбург е било раздирано от зловещия вой на снаряди, изстребители и бомбардировачи, днес там летят пътническите самолети, цветните балони и шарените детски хвърчила. В миналото Страсбург често е бил „ябълката на раздора“, днес Страсбург е „белият гълъб на мира“ и символът е тук.

В миналото Юлий Цезар, Карл Велики, Карл Пети, Наполеон Бонапарт, Адолф Хитлер и Йосиф Сталин са се опитвали да обединят Европа чрез завоевателни войни и да подчинят останалите народи със силата на оръжието. И колкото по-жестоки и безскрупулни са били тези войни, толкова по-краткотрайни са били успехите им.

Днес, за пръв път в своята многовековна история, Европа е обединена по мирен път в равноправен съюз на независими държави, в който основни ценности са солидарността, свободата, демокрацията, равенството пред закона, правовата държава, зачитането на човешкото достойнство и основните права на всички граждани. И в Страсбург заседават вие, Парламентът на обединена Европа, гарант и пазител на тези ценности.

Уважаеми членове на Европейския парламент, моята родина е една от най-старите държави в Европа, запазила името България от създаването си през 681 г. до наши дни. В своята хилядолетна история тя е била присъединявана насилствено за 167 години към Византия и за близо пет века към Османската империя. Но страната ни успява да възкръсне благодарение на дейците на българското Възраждане Паисий Хилендарски, Георги Раковски, Любен Каравелов, Христо Ботев и много други. Един от тях, Васил Левски, когото българският народ нарича Апостолът на Свободата, е духовният вдъхновител на независима и европейска България. Още през 1872 година той прокламира, че България трябва да бъде, щирам, „демократична република, в която всички народности, българи, турци, евреи и пр. ще бъдат равноправни във всяко отношение и всички ще живеят по един общ закон, който ще се избере по вишегласието на всички народности. Да бъдем равни с другите европейски народи зависи от собствените ни задружни сили.“ Толкова е актуално и днес, че няма какво повече да се добави.

В най-новата си история България е била обект на непрекъснати опити за доминация, част от тях успешни, от страна на Руската империя и на Съветския съюз. За съжаление тези великоруски апетити продължават и в наши дни и страната ни е обект на целенасочени хибридни атаки. Тайните служби и пропагандата на Путин се възползват от икономическата и суровинна обвързаност на страната ни с Русия, както и от историческите и културни връзки между народите ни, за да разделят и противопоставят обществото ни на русофили и евроатлантици. Затова пълноправното членство на България в ЕС и НАТО е най-голямата гаранция за продължаването на демократичния и европейски път на развитие на родината ни. Затова трябва да завършим европейската си интеграция с присъединяване към Шенген и Евронатата.

Използвам случая, за да благодаря горещо на всички европейски депутати, които подкрепиха България за Шенген и по този начин ни помагат да преодолеем една европейска несправедливост.

Въпреки изпълнения с предизвикателства исторически път на страната ни, България винаги е била неразделна част не само от военните постижения на Европа (нека да напомним спирането на инвазията на Арабския халифат пред Константинопол от Хан Тервел през 718 г.), но и от европейската култура и просвещение – вероятно най-яркият пример е кириллицата, създадена от св. Климент Охридски в края на IX в. на базата на глаголицата на св. св. Кирил и Методий. Стремежът ни е съвременна България също да даде своя достоен и съществен принос в развитието на ЕС. Разбираемо е, че в повечето от последно присъединените се страни, особено в по-бедните, битова нагласата ЕС да се приема основно като източник на щедри фондове, помощи и място за по-добре платена работа. Убедени сме, че този стереотип на мислене

трябва да бъде разбит, затова позволете ми да перифразирам известната мисъл на президента Джон Ф. Кенеди: Не питайте какво може да направи Европейският съюз за страната ви, питайте какво страната Ви може да направи за Европейския съюз.

Уважаеми членове на Европейския парламент, за съжаление, ЕС не е изолиран остров на мира и благоденствието. На границата му вече близо две години бушува опустошителна война, в която руските агресори се опитват да сломят порива на украинския народ да живее в независима, свободна и демократична държава. Не по-малко кръвопролитен е и подновеният въоръжен сблъсък в Близкия изток, предизвикан от бруталната терористична атака на Хамас срещу цивилни граждани, жени и деца, и широкомащабният военен отговор на Израел, при който вече загинаха хиляди палестинци, включително много жени и деца. Перспективите за разширяване на конфликта и превръщането му в регионален не са за подценяване, особено като се има предвид нестабилната ситуация в Ливан, Сирия, Ирак и Йемен, както и режимите на аятоласите в Иран и на талибаните в Афганистан. Тревожно е и положението в Далечния изток, където Северна Корея продължава да предизвиква световната общност с ядрената си програма за военни цели и редовното изстрелване на ракети, способни да носят ядрени бойни глави. Голям риск крие и непрекъснато растящото напрежение между Китай и Тайван. Нестабилна е и обстановката в Африка на юг от Европа. В последните години в няколко страни в Централна и Западна Африка – Габон, Нигер, Чад, Гвинея, Мали и Буркина Фасо, демократично избраните правителства бяха свалени от военните. Притеснително е, че някои от тези преврати бяха извършени с решаващата помощ на наемници от ЧВК „Вагнер“ и доведоха до идването на власт на проруски режими. Като прибавим към това продължаващите граждански войни в Либия, Судан и Етиопия, анархията в Сомалия и множеството терористични атаки в Тунис, Египет, Кения, Нигерия и други страни, виждаме един изключително тревожен свят, обзет от нестабилност в голяма част от континента на юг от ЕС.

Не можем да си затваряме очите пред тези геополитически предизвикателства. За да се справи с тях, Европа трябва да бъде силна, а за да бъде силна, трябва да бъде единна. Двете основни идеологически и политически течения в ЕС, консерватизмът и либерализмът, могат и трябва да се развиват не в остро противопоставяне, а във взаимно разбиране и сътрудничество. Границите на нашите държави, историята и традициите на нашите народи, християнството и семейството са консервативни ценности, от които съвременният свят продължава да има нужда. Границите на Европа, които станаха толкова видими през последните години заради кризата с мигрантите и войната в Украйна, са естествено обобщение на тази консервативна ценност. Но светът се променя и става все по-глобален, либералните идеи си пробиват път не само в икономиката, но и в политиката, културата и международното сътрудничество. Правата на жените, на малцинствата, на различните, на имигрантите вече са неразделна част от либералната демокрация. Трябва да отсеем крайностите и да се обединим около най-добрите консервативни и либерални ценности в името на бъдещето на Европа. Трябва да се преборим с омразата като политически инструмент и с поляризацията като политическа платформа за завоюване на властта. Само така ще си върнем доверието на гражданите и ще продължим напред. Обединена и силна Европа трябва да играе по-активна роля в международните отношения като влиятелен и силен посредник и гарант на мира. Едновременно с това ЕС трябва да укрепва връзките си със стратегическите си съюзници от НАТО и да засилва отбранителните си възможности в сътрудничество между страните вътре в Съюза, включително да обмисли внимателно идеята за създаване на единна европейска армия.

Уважаеми членове на Европейския парламент, предвид сложната международна обстановка разширяването на ЕС придобива изключителна важност. България винаги е била решителен поддръжник и радетел за приемането на Западните Балкани в ЕС. В същото време вярваме, че страните от този критичен за стабилността и мира в Европа регион трябва да бъдат приети, когато изпълнят всички необходими изисквания. Присъединяването трябва да се основава на реални постижения, които отразяват реалното желание на кандидатите да се развият като интегрална част от европейското семейство, а не на резултат от политически сметки. Приветстваме решението на ЕК да препоръча започване на преговори за присъединяване с Украйна и Молдова. Надяваме се в близко бъдеще към тази група да се включи и Грузия. Безспорно ЕС се нуждае от укрепване на институциите и усилване на капацитета за разширяване, но смятаме, че този важен процес и работата по присъединяването на нови страни трябва да вървят успоредно и едновременно. Решението докладите за върховенство на закона да важат и за новоприетите страни е една добра гаранция за контрол, а и самите страни да се чувстват оценявани по мярка, прилагана и за държавите членки. Всички досегашни разширявания на ЕС показват, че увеличаването на страните членки не намалява силата на Съюза. Напротив, той става все по-мошен.

Уважаеми членове на Европейския парламент, днес в Европа все по-често се забелязват известни признаци на умора от войната в Украйна и се надигат гласове против помощта за украинския народ и украинските бежанци. Все повече европейци си задават въпроса защо трябва ние да понасяме тежестите и несгодите от една далечна война между две страни, които не са част от ЕС. Не е ли по-добре да се направят някои отстъпки на Путин и войната да приключи. Цитира се латинската сентенция *Rex potior bello* и нейният съвременен вариант: „И най-лошият мир е по-добър от най-добрата война“. Но също така е хубаво да си припомним една мисъл на американския философ Джордж Сантаяна, цитирана от Уинстън Чърчил във връзка с Мюнхенското споразумение от 1938 г.: „Тези, които не помнят миналото,

са осъдени да го повтарят.“ Печално известно е как завършиха опитите Хитлер да бъде омиловителен с непрекъснати отстъпки. Същото важи и днес. Войната на Путин срещу Украйна всъщност е война на Путин срещу Европа. Като помагаме на Украйна, помагаме на Европа. Като защитаваме Украйна, защитаваме Европа. Иначе утре в положението на Украйна може да се озове Молдова, вдрутиден балтийските републики, после Полша, Румъния, България и други европейски държави.

Уважаеми членове на Европейския парламент, непосредствено следствие от войните и нестабилната глобална среда е и увеличаващата се имигрантска вълна. Поради голямата привлекателност като място за работа и живот, огромното мнозинство от търсещите сигурно убежище се насочва към Европа. Но ЕС не е в състояние да приеме неограничен брой имигранти, без това да застраши нормалното функциониране на институциите му. Още повече, че интеграцията на голяма част от вече приетите имигранти върви бавно и незадоволително, за което свидетелстват редица инциденти, нападения и атентати, извършени от радикализирани елементи, голяма част от които родени, израснали и получили образованието си в страни от ЕС.

Нуждаем се от нова стратегия и подход, които да разграничават ясно бежанците от войните от икономическите имигранти. ЕС трябва да направи всичко възможно за улесняване приема на бежанците и да предприеме всички необходими мерки за спиране и обезкуражаване на икономическите мигранти. Освен това трябва да се намери необходимият баланс между солидарността и реалните възможности, както на отделните държави, така и на Европейския съюз като цяло. Надяваме се, че всички тези въпроси и предизвикателства ще бъдат взети предвид в новия Пакт за миграцията и убежището. В тази връзка бих искал да напомня, че България е изпълнила всички изисквания за приемането ѝ в Шенгенското пространство и всяко по-нататъшно отлагане е неприемливо и демотивиращо за нашата страна и за нейните граждани. Разбираме, че в момента самото функциониране на Шенгенското споразумение е изправено пред сериозни проблеми и много страни възобновяват проверките по границите си, но не смятаме, че това може да бъде аргумент за неприемането на България и Румъния. С нашите две държави в Шенгенското пространство границите на Европа ще са по-добре защитени и Европа ще бъде по-силна.

Уважаеми членове на Европейския парламент, позволете ми накрая да ви припомня една трогателна история за войната, помощта и солидарността.

На 5 март 2022 г., броени дни след нахлуването на руските войски в Украйна, в официалната Фейсбук страница на словашката гранична полиция е публикувано следното съобщение:

„Едно едва 11-годишно момче от Запорожието премина пеша граничния пункт от Украйна в Словакия. С една найлонова торбичка, паспорт, завързан на врата и телефонен номер, написан на ръката. То дойде съвсем само, защото майка му трябвало да остане в Украйна.“

„Казвам се Хасан, на 11 години съм. Имам две сестри и трима братя“, представя се детето на изумените граничари. Четири дни продължава пътуването от дома му до словашката граница, след като майка му го изпраща до жп гарата.

„Нашето семейство има известен опит“ - продължава цитатът. „Ние избягахме от армията на Путин, когато живеехме в Сирия. Тогава бях на 12. Баща ни беше убит и трябваше да се преместим в Украйна при семейството на майка ми. И така, минаха осем години и отново Русия, отново армията на Путин“, разказва по-големият брат Закария, студент в Словакия, чийто телефон е написан на ръката на Хасан.

„Искам да благодаря на всички словашки граничари и доброволци. Не мога да оставя майка си сама, тя е неподвижна, затова заведох сина си на гарата и го качих на влака. Моля, спасете нашите украински деца и им дайте безопасност“, допълва майката на момчето, Юлия Владимировна.

„Сълзи в очите ни... Това е най-великият герой от предишната нощ“, завършва публикацията на словашката гранична полиция.

Детето е пропътувало 1200 км., първоначално с влак, а накрая пеша. Съвсем самичко, денем и нощем в суровата украинска зима, гладно, премръзнало, уплашено и преследвано от воя на сирените и грохота на снарядите. В очите на граничните полицаи може и да е имало сълзи, но в очите на детето – не. Както се вижда от публикуваните снимки, малкият герой дори опитва да се усмихне.

Това е трагедията на хората, за които ние четем като статистика в различните медийни публикации.

Уважаеми членове на Европейския парламент, започнах словото си със символиката на днешната и утрешната дата. Позволете ми да завърша с още две знакови събития, случили се на тези дати. На този ден преди 133 години е роден героят на Френската съпротива срещу нацистката окупация, първият премиер на свободна следвоенна Франция, първият президент на Петата република, генерал Шарл де Гол. А на 23 ноември 1959 г. президентът де Гол произнася своята знаменита реч „От Атлантика до Урал“, в която изразява увереността си, че един ден цяла Европа от Атлантическия океан до планинската верига на Урал ще бъде единна. Тогава, в разгара на Студената война, когато Желязната завеса разделя Европа „от Шчечин на Балтийско до Триест на Адриатическо море“, това твърдение на де Гол е звучало абсурдно. Още по-абсурдно звучи то днес в разгара на горещата война в Украйна, когато всеки ден загиват стотици европейски мъже, жени и деца.

Но един ден, когато днес ще стане вчера, а утре ще бъде днес, когато путиновци и лукашенковци ще бъдат само една срамна страница от историята на техните страни, а децата ни няма да бъдат принуждавани да бягат от войната сами, с паспорт, завързан за вратлетата им и телефон номер, изписан на ръчичките им, тогава тази мечта може да се сбъдне. Наша е отговорността свободна, демократична и обединена Европа да пребъде!

Андрей Ковачев, *от името на групата PPE*. – Г-жо Председател, г-жо Комисар, колеги,

Добре дошли, уважаеми г-н Денков, уважаема г-жо Габриел! Много съм щастлив, че днес сте сред нас.

България има проевропейско, демократично, предвидимо правителство, на което Вие сте Премиер, основно благодарение и на държавническото поведение на партия ГЕРБ и на нейния председател г-н Борисов, благодарение на нашето желание България да излезе от капана на омразата и хаоса от последните три години. Особено днес, както Вие очертахте тази изключително тревожна ситуация по целия свят, е много важно всяка страна от Европейския съюз да има предвидимо, проевропейско и ефективно правителство.

За съжаление, със сериозната роля на Вашата партия се стигна до голямо забавяне в европейското финансиране за българската икономика, спиране на важните инфраструктурни проекти, което доведе до сериозни щети и пропуснати ползи за бизнеса и гражданите. Неясното геополитическо поведение в предишната Ваша коалиция с проруските сили се надявам да не се повтори в Общинския съвет в София. ГЕРБ отново Ви се притече на помощ на втория тур и Вие не загубихте столицата. За нас демократична и европейска България е преди всичко, дори над партийните интереси.

Ние сме и ще продължим да бъдем гарант за това като основен стабилизиращ политически фактор в България. Надявам се също така общите ни усилия за демократична обществена среда, култура и образование да бъдат успешни и остатъците и пропагандните артефакти на тоталитарната диктатура да намерят своето място в музеите и учебниците. Надявам се, че и в миналото ще остане и подписването на меморандуми с приближени до руски олигарси фондове, както и тази странна защита на дерогацията за внос на суров руски нефт от рафинерията, близка до Кремъл, Лукойл, чрез която България пълни военния бюджет на Кремъл.

Искам да завърша с благодарност, особено към г-жа Габриел, за нейните усилия за преодоляване на пречките пред България за приемането ни в Шенгенското пространство, както и в подготовката ни за еврозоната. Също така да благодаря и за изключително добрата работа на г-жа Габриел за резултата, който получихме от членството ни в Съвета за правата на човека на ООН. Това е много добър сигнал за България.

Г-н Денков, г-жо Габриел и разбира се, г-жо Иванова, много окуражаващи са сигналите от последните няколко дни за разбирателство на проевропейските демократични сили в България. Днес гласуването в българския парламент е също такъв сигнал. Имаме много работа пред нас и съм убеден, че с общи усилия, г-н Денков, ще можем да постигнем още повече успехи за европейското развитие на България – уважаван и достоен член на Европейския съюз, един по-ефективен, по-обединен Европейски съюз, който работи за физическата, социалната и икономическата сигурност на своите граждани.

Петър Витанов, *от името на групата S&D*. – Г-жо Комисар, г-н Министър-председател, добре дошли в Европейския парламент. Идвате в ден, в който макар и индикативно, ще се гласуват предложения за бъдеща промяна на Договорите за Европейския съюз, включително взимане на решения, свързани с разширяването, и затова използвам възможността да попитам: каква е позицията на българското правителство по въпроса с квалифицираното мнозинство и единодушието, когато става дума за разширяване? И понеже вече споменахте, че подкрепяте предложението на Комисията за започване на преговори с Молдова и Украйна, как това ще се отрази на процеса по разширяване в Западните Балкани и как виждате този процес, така че страните от Западните Балкани да не загубят своите стимули в интеграционния си път?

Stéphane Séjourné, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Premier ministre, chers collègues. Merci, Monsieur le Premier ministre, de ce discours très pro-européen. Votre gouvernement, dans la continuité du précédent, a fait d'ailleurs souffler un vent nouveau sur la Bulgarie et notamment sur les aspects européens. C'est l'objet de mon intervention aujourd'hui. Ce vent, il est européen, comme je le disais, il est progressiste. Il est surtout bienvenu et c'est cette nouvelle énergie qui fait de la Bulgarie un solide allié européen, notamment dans le soutien concret à l'Ukraine face à l'agresseur russe. Ma famille politique européenne soutient en tout cas cette orientation politique et ce changement.

J'en profite notamment pour saluer l'esprit de responsabilité de votre parti, qui a également conduit à former une coalition malgré les différences, on l'a vu à l'instant, dans l'intérêt du pays, dans l'intérêt surtout de l'Europe. Il y a souvent eu, dans ces institutions, une forme de fatalisme quant à certaines difficultés de la Bulgarie au sein du Bloc en matière de lutte contre la corruption, en matière de lutte contre le réchauffement climatique ou d'unité du continent du point de vue international. Mais, il faut le dire, les réformes de votre gouvernement, de votre prédécesseur, ont estompé beaucoup de critiques.

Aujourd'hui nous travaillons en commun, avec une vision commune, une vision européenne, celle de l'Europe verte, celle d'une Europe innovante, celle d'une Europe solidaire de l'Ukraine, celle d'une Europe souveraine, celle d'une Europe fondée sur l'état de droit. Et dans cette Europe de demain, la Bulgarie a sa place. Une place prépondérante, notamment dans la perspective de l'élargissement aux Balkans occidentaux.

Vous savez que dans mon groupe, nous avons des députés qui sont très investis sur le sujet, mais nous avons aussi avec nous des responsables européens qui doivent jouer leur rôle. Et il est temps enfin, que la Bulgarie, avec son voisin roumain, entre dans l'espace Schengen. Nous ne pouvons pas décevoir les espoirs des Bulgares et j'en appelle également à mes collègues du PPE.

Monsieur le député, vous le savez, pour ce qui est de Renew, nous avons fait notre part du chemin. Nous avons convaincu nos alliés de prendre cette décision de soutenir les Bulgares dans l'espace Schengen et il faudrait que le PPE puisse convaincre ses alliés également, et notamment je pense aux Autrichiens qui aujourd'hui mènent toujours cette opposition de principe. Monsieur le Premier ministre, avec Renew Europe, vous avez toujours ce chemin, vous aurez toujours un allié et nous vous soutiendrons dans ces efforts.

Philippe Lamberts, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Mr Prime Minister, we were born actually – Mr Prime Minister, I know that Mariya Gabriel is more attractive to you than me, because she's your partner in government! – we were born actually six months apart. And when we were born, we were separated, you and I, by an iron curtain. And it remains to me a deep joy to see that our two countries are now part of the same Union. And it's a Union, as you said, of choice of freedom and based on rule of law.

And like you, and maybe you didn't say it explicitly, but I really resent when some European politicians are comparing the European Union to the new Soviet Union or to a renewed Third Reich, where we would be submitted by force. We all chose freely to be part of that Union, and that remains a source of pride. And let no one believe that the European Union is a repetition of the past failures in Europe.

The second thing I want to say is that I totally agree with you when you say that what is happening in Ukraine is basically the defence of the values on which the European Union has been built. This is our struggle, and I must say that yes, it entails efforts from the Members of the European Union to help Ukraine, but frankly speaking, they are putting their lives on the line. We are just putting part of our wealth to help them, and I think that's the least we can do.

The third thing where I agree with you is that yes, the European Union is a union freely chosen, but it has to be merit-based. And there again, when the merits are there, the decision should follow. Yes, Bulgaria and Romania must be part of Schengen. And for citizens this is probably, with the common currency, the most emblematic meaning of what it means to be part of the European Union. So full support for that.

I will finish with the values you mentioned a lot, the conservative and liberal values. And then the green in me said, 'hang on one second, yes, the conservatives and the liberals have brought a lot to Europe, but I think that there's more to European political diversity and values diversity than just those two families'. I think that the left has brought these values of social justice, and that lies at the heart of the European Union.

And I would finish with the thing that was most absent from your speech. Well, you know, if you and I and our kids and grandkids will live in the 21st century and beyond, well, it will be because we have been able to protect this planet as our common home. And indeed that lies as well at the heart of the values of the European Union, making sure that indeed, the planet on which we live will be welcoming us for generations to come.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-жо Председател, г-н Министър-председател, колеги,

Г-н Министър-председател, започнахте встъплението си с кратки исторически препратки, които обаче от моя гледна точка бяха доста, доста частични. Нека Ви напомня, че около днешните дати в годините назад се случва и Ньойският диктат и незаконната окупация на западните български покрайнини, черната граница, които стават със съгласието на държавата Франция, на която Вие благодарите днес. С мълчаливото съгласие, нарушаване на договори, разделяне на селища, гонене на хора, единствено, намесата на президента Уилсън спасява българската нация от разделение. Това също трябва да се помни, трябва да се казва специално тук, в Страсбург, защото никой не печели от частичното цитиране на историята.

Моето впечатление, г-н Министър-председател, е, че сгрешихте с епитафията на президента Кенеди на неговата надгробна плоча. Казахте, трябва да видим какво правим ние за Европа, за Европейския съюз. Вие сте български министър-председател, а не високопоставен европейски чиновник. Вие трябва да се питате какво прави българското правителство за българските граждани. Всяка сутрин пред огледалото това трябва да се питате, защото българските граждани са Вашите началници и работодатели, а не европейските бюрократи. Това са важните неща. Иначе казахте, че виждате бели балони, че виждате красиви шарени хвърчила и шарени балони, бели гълъби. Сигурно обаче българските граждани виждат високи цени на горива, на транспорт и т.н. Това е защото България не е в Шенген, а България не е в Шенген, г-н Денков, защото икономическите интереси на част от европейските държави пречат, те са икономически. България е изпълнила всички задължения, обаче някакви хора изпълняват икономическите си интереси и това трябва да им казвате Вие. Вие сте министър-председателят. Вие трябва да казвате в Европейския съвет, не може заради вашите икономически интереси българските граждани да страдат. Не може да има високи цени, не може българите да стоят отвънка. Не може да сме втора ръка хора. Не може. Това не е европейско, това не е европейско и не е редно. Всичко останало е лицемерие. Всичко останало е двоен стандарт. Не можем да си позволяваме това нещо. Вие не сте представител на туристическа фирма. Вие сте министър-председателят. Трябва да тропнете по масата и да им говорите важно на тези хора, те да Ви разбират.

Цитирахте също така нашата подкрепа за Украйна. Тя е важна и трябва да я има, разбира се. Но когато ние оказваме подкрепа на хора в беда и в нужда, Вие трябва да изисквате подкрепата на тези хора за Македония, за българската кауза в Македония. Защото не споменахте нито дума за репресиите, за насилието, за отказването на правото на самоопределение. Колега Сежурне, говорите как ще ни подкрепяте, но и във Вашата група има хора, които се правят, че не виждат насилието над българите в Македония. Обяснете им го. Те са във Вашата група. Вие кандидатствате за Renew. Там ще ви бъдат началници ДПС, те в България са Ви началници и тук ще Ви бъдат началници. Няма лошо. Така сте си го избрали и така сте си го подредили. Не, това не е някакъв проблем особено, но все пак им кажете, има насилие над българите в Македония. Това не е европейско. Правото на самоопределение, правото на национално самочувствие, правото на национално достойнство – това са европейски ценности, европейските ценности. Зад Вас стоят Ваши дипломати. Кажете им, когато защитават тези дела в Страсбург, да бъдат по-активни, да защитават наистина българската кауза. Защото това са важните неща.

А! Западните покрайнини, говорихме за окупацията, за Ньойския диктат. Там има един поет, Иван Николов се казва. Този месец на осми, на Архангеловден, на деня на окупацията, на Косово бяха сръбските власти и цивилни полици при поет. Претърсват го. Обадете му се, вижте този човек, окажете му подкрепа. Неговото право на самоопределение е нарушено от сръбската власт, пробелградска, прокремълска. Това става и в Македония, това се отказва на българите и това не може да продължава по същия начин.

За Шенген, говорихме го вече. Щяхте да проверявате субсидиите, ами проверете ги, селскостопанските. Разликата в субсидиите е това, което прави българските земеделски производители по-бедни, по-неконкурентоспособни. Това трябва да се провери и това трябва да се постави тук. Това трябва да бъде обсъдено и трябва да бъде поставено в дневния ред. Превозвачите, отново говорихте много за това какво се случва в международна обстановка в Чад, в Мали и в Буркина Фасо. Това са важни неща, но според мен дневният ред на българския министър-председател и фокус трябва да бъде върху интересите на българските граждани и как те, българските граждани, да имат достъп до единния пазар, до пътуването, до европейските перспективи и хоризонти, а не да бъдат гражданите втора ръка.

Така че в личен план Ви желая крепко здраве, но в политически ще Ви трябва много твърдост, много кураж, много характер и много политически гръбнак, за да отстоявате българският интерес. Българският интерес на форматите, на които трябва да го представявате и трябва да го устоявате.

IN THE CHAIR: DITA CHARANZOVÁ

Vice-President

Gunnar Beck, *on behalf of the ID Group*. – Madam President, honourable Prime Minister, allow me to congratulate you on your decision to order an investigation into the 2023 Bulgarian-Turkish gas deal concluded by your predecessor. The Southern Gas Corridor, we all know, is used to launder Russian gas via Turkey, and to circumvent EU sanctions, which so far have had little effect on the Russian economy.

The European Commission knows this full well, as its EUR 400 million subsidy agreement with the Gas Corridor contains a secrecy clause, which prohibits any probe into the provenance of the gas. In other words, former Prime Minister Borisov was given a free licence to launder Russian gas in return for his loyal support for Mrs Merkel and her party throughout his years in the Council.

Moreover, under the gas deal, Bulgargaz has to pay Turkey's state owned gas company Botaş an annual service fee of EUR 2 billion. Northern European citizens are paying cohesion funds to Bulgaria, which Bulgaria then appears to be handing over to Erdoğan. EU policy, it seems, is riddled with hypocrisy.

On Bulgarian accession to Schengen, I agree with the position taken by the Austrian and Dutch governments. We need to reform Schengen before we can talk about Schengen expansion.

There's also the regrettable issue of Bulgarian officials selling Schengen visas to illegal migrants. Of course, the main culprit here is Germany, which is creating pull factors for migrants to enter via southern Europe, and resisting credible rules for pushbacks and comprehensive repatriation of illegal migrants.

We therefore call on the Bulgarian Government to help us in the fight for ambitious migration reform in the EU. Then I can't imagine your application finally to join the Schengen system would pose too many problems.

Nikolaj Villumsen, *on behalf of the The Left Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, and Prime Minister, this is Europe. A Europe where we stood united in solidarity with Ukraine after the brutal attack by Putin. A Europe that has imposed sanctions against Putin for his grave violations against international law and human rights. A Europe that actively has engaged in making sure that war crimes in Ukraine will be prosecuted. Dear colleagues, this is a Europe I'm proud of.

But when we look at the horrors unfolding in Gaza, and the response of the European Union, we have clearly failed. We stood united in condemning the brutal terror attack of Hamas. Good. We have stood united in a call for immediately releasing of all hostages. Good.

But we have failed in protecting the innocent children and people of Gaza. They have died by the thousands. Those alive are struggling to survive. If they live, they will be traumatised. This is Europe.

This Europe has for years failed to speak up against Israeli violations of international law; failed to speak out against the human-rights violations that Palestinians in the occupied territories daily suffer; failed to pressure for a sustainable two-state solution, where both Israelis and Palestinians can live in peace and prosperity, side by side.

Dear colleagues, dear Prime Minister, Europe can do better. Let this Europe be a Europe of strong values. A Europe that speak out for international laws in all matter. A Europe that speak out against killing of civilians, whoever they are. A Europe that speak out for peace and prosperity, for both the people of Israel and Palestine.

Tatjana Ždanoka (NI). – Madam President, honourable Prime Minister Denkov and Ms Gabriel, yes, I want to start with also acknowledging what Philippe told. I was a little bit surprised when you spoke about conservatism and liberal values, not mentioning social values while President Metsola spoke about.

But nevertheless, I have to remind that the Bulgarian Presidency, when it took place in the beginning of 2018, supported our proposed guidelines for employment policies in the Member States. I was a reporter at that time and thanks to that, the directive on minimum wage appeared. But our proposal was more ambitious. And what do you think about the proposal of minimum income for the EU? And I have to remind you that Bulgaria is the State at the bottom of the list of minimum wage. Smaller minimum wages than my country as well.

Another question is about rights and about rights of minorities. You spoke about Vasil Levski mentioning Bulgarians, Jews and Turks as equals. But what happens now? What do you think about the rights of minorities, especially the rights to participate in election campaigns in their own language? We know the decision of the European Court where Bulgaria lost, and the same problem exists in my country, Latvia, as well. Abolishing education, abolishing rights to speak in pre-election campaigns in minority languages – it is not the Europe you mentioned as a Europe uniting. 'United in diversity' means not only unity of 27 Member States, but also of all languages of all cultures within European Union.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Madam President, dear Prime Minister, dear Commissioner Ivanova, I would like to say that Bulgaria is a country whose history is intertwined with Europe, and it is really in the origin of the DNA of Europe, from its ancient times to modern times. Your country gave us the alphabet of Saints Cyril and Methodius, and you are speaking, in a very clear way, the language of freedom after 1990. So it's a pleasure – and it's really something that completes the European project – to have Bulgaria in the European Union and also in NATO.

And I also have to congratulate you and Mariya Gabriel for the return of political stability and responsible behaviour – a clear pro-European government. And I would like to say here that Mariya Gabriel – a very, very committed pro-European – is a very important actor of your executive.

Then let me tell you that I understand the difficulties in the external landscape of a country that has its coast in the Black Sea – so close to the war – but at the same time, it is very important to call on you to step up your efforts to end fossil fuel dependence on Russia. Could you clarify how you plan to close this loophole on Russian oil? We are here as the European Union to support you, but we need also your efforts in this field.

And let me tell you that we are also a bit worried with the European funds, because the instability of the last two years paralysed the development and the implementation of these European funds. So what is the plan for the next two years where you have a very, very tiny time?

And only to say: we are totally with Bulgaria and with Romania on your Schengen accession. And we, as the EPP, we already condemn the EPP government that is blocking that. I hope that liberals with the Netherlands would do the same, especially after these elections.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Madam President, dear Prime Minister, dear Deputy Prime Minister, Romania and Bulgaria deserve to be accepted to the Schengen Area, and this needs to happen fully, and it needs to happen now. It is unacceptable for our two countries to be left out, even though we fulfil all the Schengen criteria, and we have efficiently protected the European borders for so many years.

We live, dear Prime Minister, in a difficult region, but we have always defended European values and the cohesion of our Union. We did that during difficult times in the Western Balkans. We helped build a safe Black Sea region, while maintaining a good relationship with Turkey, Georgia and the countries in the Black Sea. We are proving it once more today with the support provided to Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova.

Romania and Bulgaria are not second-rank Members, and people should stop looking at us this way. That is why I call upon the EU leaders to support our accession to Schengen all the way: by having a vote by the end of the year, in order to show that respecting the rules in the EU pays off.

Илхан Кючюк (Renew). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Министър-председател, колеги, много пъти съм участвал на такива дебати и всички са завършвали с едно и също заключение. Дебат за вътрешната политика на България. Нека да направим така, че този дебат да не бъде за вътрешната политика на България, а да бъде дебат за бъдещето на Европа, в който искаме България да участва много активно и да използваме това проевропейско мнозинство за необходимите реформи, които са така належащи както в национален контекст, така и в европейски.

Ако има по един въпрос консенсус от години наред между Европейската комисия, евродепутатите, българския национален елит, това е темата за Шенген. До края на 2023 г., ако не се случи присъединяването на България и Румъния в Шенген, ние рискуваме много като Европейски съюз. Рисуваме да подкопаем устоите на всичко, което постигнахме през тези повече от 70 години. Защо? Защото българските и румънските граждани не могат да продължават да бъдат третирани по същия начин, както са третирани през последните години, защото те не са по-различни от германските, австрийските, холандските и други граждани. Защото българската икономика търпи огромни щети. И ако искаме да имаме Съюз, който се основава на силна икономика, която е конкурентноспособна, Съюз, който разчита на единния пазар, трябва България и Румъния да бъдат част от Шенген.

Още една тема, която ми се струва много важна. На мен ми се иска, г-н Министър-председател, България да бъде амбициозна с идеите си, с плановете, с предложенията си, които прави в европейските институции. Няма как да имаме ЕС, който иска да има силна външна политика, ако продължаваме да взимаме решения по този начин. Винаги ще бъде *too little, too slow*. 27 държави се събират, вземат решения и как го вземат, с месеци, с отлагане, с пазарлъци. Има редица инициативи, включително и на държави, които са от нашата черга, така да се каже, за промяна на начина на вземане на решения. Да се премине от единодушие към квалифицирано мнозинство. Знам какво ще ми отговорят тези националистически сили. Илхан Кючюк иска да прокара интересите на Западните Балкани. Никога това не е било тема. Темата за разширяване, политиката за разширяване не е била част от този дебат. Затова нека да бъдем амбициозни и отговорни пред бъдещето на ЕС, защото той е съюз на всички нас.

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Prime Minister, Commission, colleagues, I want to thank you, Prime Minister Denkov, for talking to us and with us. You dwelt quite extensively on historic issues and you spoke about the European spirit of Bulgaria that your national hero emphasised, and I'm sure all of us loved it. You quoted JFK, and I like that too. So let me ask you this question: what will Bulgaria do for the EU with regard to EU enlargement?

You didn't mention the name of your neighbouring country, North Macedonia, whose access so far has been blocked by Bulgaria. In vague terms only you seemed to question the real will of candidate countries. Can anybody question the real European will of North Macedonia, a country that even went as far as changing its name in order to open the door to Europe?

After Mr Dzhambazki spewed hate against North Macedonia here, I would like to ask you, Prime Minister, to be more specific. What will you do to help open the door for North Macedonia? I believe Bulgaria must avoid hampering the accession process with overhyped national blockades.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, академик Денков, г-жо Габриел, г-жо Комисар, аз мислех да говоря за култура и образование, обаче както вървят нещата, ще тръгна да говоря за Шенген, аз съм заместник-председател на комисията по култура и образование. Искам само да кажа на хората, които смятат, че България не трябва да влиза в Шенген, че всички нелегални мигрантски канали са финансирани от следните държави, ако те не го знаят: Австрия, Холандия, Франция и Германия. Това не са български канали за пренос на мигранти. Другото, което искам да кажа на колегата от Зелените е, че когато бият и убиват българи им забраняват да се самоопределят, не ми казвайте, че Джамбазки използва езика на омразата. Просто разберете какво се случва в Македония.

А сега по въпроса за образованието, което ме интересува изключително много. За съжаление в България бюджетът за култура е 0,4%, а този за образование е 4,1%. На мен това ми изглежда изключително малко. Тук преди известно време гласувахме в нашата комисия минималният бюджет за култура да бъде 2%. Значи ако вървим с тези темпове, България ще го достигне според мен след около 150 години. Предполагам, че Вие имате някакъв план за действие, защото според мен културата и образованието са нещо изключително важно и трябва да бъдат задължително приоритет.

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Im deutschen Sprachraum kennen wir das Sprichwort „Am Abend wird der Faule fleißig“, und genau das ist es, was mir einfällt, wenn ich mir die Beschlussfassungen der jüngeren Vergangenheit ansehe, das, was wir heute und in den vergangenen Tagen zu beschließen haben, und das, was Sie noch beschließen wollen.

Bevor ich aber auf diese politischen Irrsinnigkeiten, Wahnsinnigkeiten, aus meiner Sicht völlig verfehlten Maßnahmen zu sprechen komme, auch noch ein Wort zu der Vergangenheit dieser *This is Europe*-Debatte. Als wir diese Mandatsperiode begonnen haben und Sie mit einer irrwitzigen Lockdown-Politik hier Chaos über den ganzen Kontinent gebracht haben, als Sie mit dieser Lockdown-Politik hier Konkurse, Arbeitslosigkeit, Rekordschulden produziert haben, mitunter im psychischen Bereich manchen Menschen gigantisch zugesetzt haben, Sie mit der Bestellung von 1,8 Milliarden Impfdosen die Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft beschäftigen und jetzt ein Gutteil dieser Impfdosen verrottet – da haben wir einmal die erste kapitale Art des Versagens der Europäischen Union.

Es ging weiter mit der Ukraine/Russland-Auseinandersetzung, wo in elf oder zwölf Sanktionswellen sich die Europäische Union und dieses Haus und eine Mehrheit hier nur ins Knie geschossen hat und hier massive Teuerungen produziert hat, massive Inflation, Arbeitslosigkeit, Konkurse usw. produziert hat. Das ist der falsche Weg.

Und jetzt, nachdem hier mit diesen zwei kapitalen Totalversagensmaßnahmen Bilanz gezogen werden muss, geht es weiter mit einer Irrsinnigkeit nach der nächsten. Einem Grünen Deal, der zwar nett klingt, aber in Wahrheit dazu führt, dass Europa seine Konkurrenzfähigkeit völlig verliert, dass wir mit der E-Mobilität, der Atomwirtschaft in Wahrheit ein Energie- und Geschäftsfeld aufbereiten, was politischer Irrsinn ist, wo Sie mit einer Mehrheit beschließen, dass Insekten unserem Essen beigemischt werden können.

Man greift sich nur noch auf den Kopf, in welche Richtung diese Europäische Union unterwegs ist. Und wenn man hier als Frage stellt: *This is Europe?*, ist meine Antwort ganz klar: Diese Europäische Union geht völlig in die falsche Richtung, und ich hoffe, dass die Wahlen kommenden Jahr, 6. bis 9. Juni, eine Kehrtwende in Richtung eines guten, freien und friedlichen Europas ... (*Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.*)

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, Prime Minister, thanks for being here and for the meetings you had with us and your cabinet and your President on the recent rule of law monitoring visit to Bulgaria. Bulgaria, of course, is the oldest independent country in Europe – a magnificent place and people. But for all the hope that EU membership would help transform it, the truth is that it remains the poorest country in the EU, experiencing an 11% drop in population as young people left to find opportunities elsewhere.

While scandal after scandal dogged previous administrations – ‘Barcelonagate’, ‘The Eight Dwarves’, the golden bars, massive corruption facilitated by the absolute power of the Prosecutor General and the close collaboration with former Prime Minister Boyko Borissov – your party came out of the movement of the people to change all that. And that movement has made changes. But many issues remain, and I think it’s really important that it’s put on record here that all of those cases of those in power accused of robbing the Bulgarian people will be investigated, those responsible held to account and that there will be no impunity.

Lastly, I agree with you totally: Bulgaria should be in Schengen, but I do have a concern that the European Commission is demanding a price for that – that you act as Europe’s brutal military border guards, in violation of human rights. There have been multiple accounts of pushbacks. We have a black book on pushbacks here, which I’m going to give you as a present, which I hope you read to investigate the evidence in it and ensure the upholding of human rights.

Андрей Новаков (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Премиер, г-жо Комисар, скъпи приятели, полагам усилия да започна с нещо положително, затова искам да благодаря на премиера Денков за усилията, които полага и за гарантираната и заявена проевропейска, проатлантическа ориентация на България – нещо, което беше задължително и много важно.

За жалост положителните неща поприключват, защото България трябва да се върне към онази стабилност и предвидимост, която имаше преди години. Впрочем тя беше видима и когато тук в залата беше премиерът Бойко Борисов. За жалост България беше сред държавите, които бяха стожери в Европейския съюз и институциите виждаха стабилност и предвидимост, виждаха по-малко балони и хвърчила. Днес това не е факт. За съжаление живеем под угрозата на надвиснали оставки, на скандали, което се отразява на всички нас и на имиджа на България. Инвеститорите идваха и оставаха, а днес това не е така. Може да ви изненадам, но противно на реалността в България, освен въпросът кой, е много важно да питаме колко. Например колко са разплатените средства от европейските фондове? Ще Ви отговоря – два, 2%. Колко са средствата, разплатени от Плана за възстановяване и устойчивост? Три, 3 %. Колко са държавите, които имат такива

показатели като България ? Нула. Нито една. Можем да продължим със серията от въпроси. Колко ще бъде разликата от договорените пари за 2024 г. и тези, които ще стигнат до общините ? Голяма най-вероятно.

Аз мисля, че страната ни отново трябва да се погрижи за инвестиции в общините и регионите. Европейските пари бяха видими и осезаеми във всяка община, а това вече не е така. И тази трагедия трябва да спре така, както трябва да спрем прехвърлянето от стария програмен период на средства за цели, различни от предвидените. Тези пари бяха за пътища, жп линии и мостове и за нищо друго.

Ето защо на основание чл. 22 и чл. 29 призовавам Европейската комисия да използва специални мерки и гаранции, че България няма да загуби европейски средства от Плана за възстановяване и устойчивост, като приложи график за тяхното спазване. Неизпълнението на европейските инструменти лишава хората от реформи и инвестиции. Тук оценяваме не декларациите, а действията и постигнатите резултати.

Елена Йончева (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Премиер, правителството, което оглавявате, оправдава съществуването си с постигане на няколко цели – членството на България в Шенген и еврозоната, както и с необходимостта от стабилност в сложната геополитическа ситуация. Във вътрешен план предстои да видим дали заявката за реформа в правосъдието ще се осъществи. Предложените промени в Конституцията сякаш целят по-скоро да уязвят българския премиер, отколкото да укрепят интегритета на съдебната власт. Пет месеца по-късно можете ли да кажете дали целите на Вашето управление ще бъдат постигнати?

Относно Шенген избрахте пътя на убеждението на Австрия и Нидерландия, двете държави, които продължават да блокират пътя ни към Шенген. Готови ли сте да окажете натиск върху двете страни с механизмите на Съюза и ще приемете ли половинчато решение за влизането – вдигането на контрола само на въздушните граници ?

И още, г-н Премиер, в неделя йеменските хути отвляха в Черно море кораб с 24 души екипаж. Сред тях има и български граждани. Г-н Денков, не смятате ли, че България трябва да има по-активна роля в диалога с йеменските хути ? И редно ли е да оставяме преговорите на трети страни, при това на страни извън Европейския съюз?

Dacian Cioloș (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, domnule prim-ministru, suntem împreună, românii și bulgarii, captivi cancelarului austriac Nehammer în chestiunea Schengen și știu că faceți mari eforturi diplomatice pentru a debloca atât vetoul Austriei, cât și rezervele de anul trecut ale Olandei. Aș avea două întrebări pentru dumneavoastră.

Când am condus Guvernul României, am colaborat foarte strâns pe chestiunea eliminării vizelor pentru Canada cu guvernul bulgar de atunci și forța în negociere a fost mai mare. Așa că vă întreb dacă în acest moment există acest tip de ofensivă și de coordonare comună cu partenerii români, cu guvernul din România?

A doua întrebare este dacă în aceste negocieri sunteți pregătiți să acceptați anumite elemente care ar debloca aceste discuții? Cu o decizie clară: politica Consiliului din decembrie că ambele țări aderă la Schengen în cursul anului viitor, cel târziu, chiar dacă acest lucru s-ar întâmpla în etape, în cursul anului viitor. Deci m-ar interesa dacă există – evident, nu o să dezvăluim aici elementele de negociere, dar cred că e important să putem avea o decizie finală privind aderarea la Schengen în acest an în Consiliu.

Ioan-Rareș Bogdan (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, excelențele voastre, domnule prim-ministru, îi dau o veste proastă cancelarului Nehammer: Austria nu mai este imperiu. Au trecut vremurile când împărăteasa Maria Tereza le-a pus ciobanilor români taxe așa de mari încât i-a alungat din Transilvania lor, peste munți, în Valahia. Ungaria are miliarde de euro suspendate din cauza nerespectării statului de drept, Polonia, la fel. Nu și Austria, care blochează accesul României și Bulgariei în Schengen și încălcă Tratatul fără să aibă niciun motiv plauzibil.

E un mister de ce nu a declanșat Comisia Europeană procedura contra Austriei, care a încălcat cinci articole ale Cartei Drepturilor Fundamentale din Uniunea Europeană. Prin blocarea României și Bulgariei s-au adus pagube de sute de miliarde de euro nu doar acestora, ci întregii economii europene. Dacă tot promovează dna Von der Leyen, Green Deal-ul și cere emisii zero, o anunț cu respect ceva: în fiecare an, camioanele care аșteaptă și 24 de ore la frontiere generează 46 000 de tone de dioxid de carbon.

Și totuși, Austria a scăpat când exact Comisia Europeană, gardianul tratatelor, ar trebui să-i ceară despăgubiri. În Consiliul JAI de peste două săptămâni Europa are șansa istorică de a elimina abuzul comis împotriva cetățenilor români și bulgari. În cazul unui vot negativ al Austriei, cer respectuos statelor membre Schengen să își dovedească respectul și susținerea pentru România și Bulgaria și să renunțe din proprie inițiativă la a-i mai discrimina pe români și bulgari, permițându-le accesul în țările europene prin porțile de intrare sau culoarele Schengen.

Dovadă de bună-credință și sigur, românii și bulgarii ar putea controla la sânge camioanele, mașinile mici și trenurile austriece, ca nu cumva să se strecoare migranți ilegali prin intermediul statului austriac.

IN THE CHAIR: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

Beatrice Covassi (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signor Primo ministro, onorevoli colleghi, cos'è l'Europa oggi? Un progetto comune che deve diventare ogni giorno di più orizzonte di speranza per i suoi cittadini. Questo significa andare avanti sull'allargamento dell'area Schengen, come lei ha giustamente rivendicato, garantendo libertà di movimento e opportunità per tutti. Così come serve progredire sull'adesione alla valuta comune per rafforzare economia e mercato interno.

Ma una cosa deve essere chiara: l'Unione europea non è soltanto un grande blocco commerciale ed economico. L'Europa è una comunità di destino che si regge sui valori comuni sanciti dai trattati e fa della coesione, della solidarietà e della pace le sue armi più potenti.

Questa consapevolezza deve riflettersi nel nostro lavoro da qui alle elezioni europee. È necessario che l'Europa parli con una voce sola in politica estera – penso all'Ucraina e all'impegno per la pace in Medio Oriente, dove in queste ore arriva una prima tregua – che rafforzi democrazia, crescita sostenibile e inclusione con la riforma dei Trattati, del Patto di stabilità e crescita, del diritto di asilo e consolidi l'Unione della salute.

Siamo all'appuntamento della storia, cari colleghi. E allora è tempo di ritrovare oggi il coraggio della politica.

Искра Михайлова (Renew). – Г-жо Председател, г-жо Комисар, г-н Министър-председател, колеги,

Г-н Министър-председател, поставихте въпроса за това как да допринесем за обединена Европа, как България да допринесе. Моят отговор е с амбициозно и конструктивно участие на България в реализирането на политиките на Европейския съюз и тук ще обърна внимание на политиките за енергийна сигурност и независимост, които са част и от Зеления пакт на Европейския съюз.

Какво е Вашето мнение, г-н Министър-председател, за потенциала на мерките за енергийна ефективност и обновяване на сградния фонд за постигане на целите на енергийния микс, намаляване на въглеродния отпечатък и декарбонизация, особено от гледна точка на България – страна, която е силно зависима от руски доставки на енергоносители, забавила е подготовката и реализацията на плановете си за справедлив преход и актуализацията на националния план за енергетика и климат. Също така е наследила сграден фонд, изграждан според остарели социалистически стандарти.

Ева Майдел (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, г-жо Комисар, г-н Министър-председател, добре дошъл в Европейския парламент! България е прифронтна държава във войната, която Русия започна срещу Украйна. Предишните български правителства отказаха да предоставят военна помощ на Украйна и с това създадоха впечатление в целия ЕС за неяснотата на българската позиция по руската агресия.

В новото мнозинство в българския парламент това вече е преодоляно, смятам, до голяма степен. Но точно заради тези подозрения към България е важно да се изясни дали България контролира спазването на условията на дерогацията за вноса на руски петрол за Лукойл, която предишното редовно правителство поиска от Европейската комисия. По този повод, първо, България има задължение да уведоми Европейската комисия за изпълнението на ембаргото срещу Русия от 2014 г., и второ, конкретно по решението за дерогацията, трябва да уведомим държавите членки и Европейската комисия за всеки износ от Лукойл, който минава по изключенията, свързани с екологичните рискове. Затова бих искала да получа много кратък и ясен отговор: направило ли е това българското правителство и уведомили ли сте държавите членки и Европейската комисия?

Цветелина Пенкова (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Министър-председател, г-жо Комисар, България и Румъния са част от Европейския съюз вече 17 години. Родените в годината на нашето присъединяване са почти пълнолетни граждани и въпреки това, поради политически интереси не сме пълноценни членове на най-важните интеграционни съюзи, а именно Шенген и еврозоната. Недопустимо е цяло едно поколение да бъде третирано като втора ръка европейци. Европейският парламент и Европейската комисия категорично многократно заявяват подкрепата си за присъединяване на България и Румъния към Шенген. От над 12 години ние отговаряме на всички критерии.

Два въпроса към Вас, г-н Премиер. Как се развива партньорството ни с Румъния и какви са възможностите за обща реакция? И какви дипломатически стъпки направи в последните месеци настоящото управление, за да убеди държавите, които ни блокират, че българските граждани не могат да бъдат подложени на тази дългосрочна дискриминация. Що се отнася до еврозоната, отново закъсняваме. С Хърватия започнахме този път едновременно, но заради политическата нестабилност у нас ние вече три години не сме напреднали.

Andreas Schieder (S&D). – Madam President, Prime Minister, I am a convinced European Social Democrat and from Austria, and I have to say I think European solutions and cooperation is better than veto. So therefore I have to say clearly I do not understand the Austrian veto against the Schengen membership of Bulgaria and Romania. I think it is a big mistake European-wise, but also Austrian-wise.

Secondly, Prime Minister, being a European I have also to say I work very much on the enlargement and I am very much involved in the Western Balkans and therefore I think also that North Macedonia needs the support of Bulgaria in order to enter the European Union. They have made huge reforms and they would be your best friend. So please also help North Macedonia to be quite soon a member of the European Union.

Matjaž Nemec (S&D). – Gospa predsednica. Spoštovani predsednik vlade, spoštovani visoki zbor, dobrodošli v Evropskem parlamentu. Spoštovani premier, niz kriz v zadnjih letih – od zdravstvene, energetske, finančne in varnostne – je močno zaznamoval Evropo in celoten svet.

Vnovič se je izkazalo, da sta odpornost na eni strani in seveda kredibilnost Unije na drugi strani odvisni od sodelovanja in solidarnosti držav članic. Unija je odporna, kolikor smo enotni. Spoštovani, zato je nesprejemljivo, da do danes Bolgarija in Romunija še vedno nista del Schengena, kljub temu da sta izpolnili pogoje že več kot pred desetletjem. Nesprejemljivo je, spoštovani premier, da politično preigravanje peščice zavira evropsko idejo mnogih Evropejcev.

Temu moramo narediti konec tudi v širitveni politiki, ki se mora odvijati na podlagi objektivnih meril in ne na parcialnih interesih. Širitev Evropske unije je zato najboljša strateška garancija za mir na dolgi rok, spoštovani visoki zbor!

Zato, spoštovani premier, od Bolgarije še naprej pričakujemo proevropsko držo, ki jo zagovarjate in jo upravičeno pričakujete pri vprašanju bolgarskega pristopa k Schengenu.

Иво Христов (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Премиер, напоследък в българския политически дебат понятието Европа бе изместено от евроатлантизма. В името на евроатлантизма България се отказа от дългосрочен договор за доставка на газ, докато Европа продължава да внася руски газ. В името на евроатлантизма и в разрез с критериите от Копенхаген България даде ход на амбициите на Скопие да се присъедини към Съюза. Междувременно в Северна Македония българите са все така преследвани без реакция от Брюксел. В името на евроатлантизма България е на път да се откаже и от дерогацията за внос на руски петрол. На конкурсите за превъоръжаване на армията европейските фирми бяха пренебрегнати. В името на евроатлантизма бе зарязана борбата с корупцията и бе създадена сегашната управляваща коалиция. Междувременно вратите на Шенген остават затворени за България, планът за възстановяване и развитие буксува, а българите все повече отказват да гласуват.

Г-н Премиер, мисля за неотложно да се избистрят понятията и целите на Вашето правителство с надеждата на европейските избори догодина българите все пак да намерят смисъл да отидат до урните.

Николай Денков, *министър-председател на България* – Уважаема г-жо Председател, уважаеми председатели на комисии, уважаеми членове на Европейския парламент, ще се опитам в рамките на пет минути да отговоря на основните въпроси, като започна с това, че образуването, сформирването на коалицията, която управлява в момента България, беше единствената възможна проевропейска възможност за съставяне на правителство, което да може да създаде стабилност в държавата. И аз искам специално да благодаря на г-жа Мария Габриел, която днес е тук с мен, с която заедно хопим на срещи, за да убедим всички, които имат съмнение, че ние можем, готови сме и работим заедно за европейското развитие на България.

От тази гледна точка за мен е действително разочаровашо, че част от българските евродепутати днес не подкрепиха тези усилия на дебата, а се опитаха отново да създадат някакво разделение, което е абсолютно излишно. България е проевропейски настроена страна и нашето управление ще работи за европейското развитие на България.

Благодаря за коментарите за това, че наред с консервативните и либералните ценности, ние можем и трябва да добавим и социалдемократическите, и тези, които се носят от зелените партии, там, където можем да намерим общо решение за развитие на Европа в посоките, които ще донесат благоденствие, просперитет и спокойствие на европейските граждани. Никой няма право да претендира, че единствено той може да намери решение, така че да, трябва да обединим усилия там, където намерим общи решения, и да работим заедно, за да можем през следващите години да осигурим развитието на Европа.

Г-н Джамбазки ме попита какво може да направи Европейският съюз за България и защо съм отстъпил от тезата, че трябва да очакваме такова развитие. Отговорът е прост, защото много често интересите не са противоположни, интересите са взаимни. Това, което можем да направим заедно, е най-доброто, което може да помогне и за развитието на България. И затова е важно България да бъде напълно интегрирана в европейските структури, в Шенген, в еврозоната, защото когато се вземат решения за развитие на Европа, те трябва да съответстват на интересите на България и няма противоречие в това.

По отношение на въпросите, свързани с Лукойл, руския нефт, искам абсолютно категорично от тази трибуна да кажа: България никога по време на нашето управление, и нямам информация и за преди това, не е нарушавала европейските регламенти, не е нарушавала законите, нито фирмата Лукойл е нарушавала тези регламенти и закони по отношение на преработката и износа на нефт и на нефтопродукти. Така че всякакви спекулации и всякакви слухове в този дух трябва да бъдат опровергани и ще бъдат опровергани с факти. Аз съм ги проверил и няма такива нарушения.

По отношение на инвеститорите искам да уверя всички, че прогресът, който направи България през последните месеци по отношение на върховенството на закона, вече дава резултати. Освен че беше премахнат мониторингът върху правосъдната система на България, освен че България беше класирана на първо място по най-бързо развитие на напредък в правосъдната си система, увеличението на преките чуждестранни инвеститори в България за тази година е с повече от 50% – петдесет процента повече преки чуждестранни инвеститори в България. Така че това е ясен знак, че усилията на българското правителство се разбират и се подкрепят.

И накрая, има ли сътрудничество с Румъния? Разбира се, всеки от премиерите, от президентите може да използва различни изразни средства, но ние с Румъния сме убедени заедно, че трябва да работим, за да развием целия регион на Балканския полуостров. Инициирахме тристранни срещи. Започнахме да работим по програми, които имат за цел да развият цялата инфраструктура от Гърция през България към Румъния, към Молдова, към Украйна и затова работим заедно. Разбира се, това е част от общоевропейското усилие да развием региона на Балканите.

И накрая ще завърша със Северна Македония. За разлика от много от вас, аз помня чудесно нашите отношения със Северна Македония в 90-те години, когато всичко изглеждаше, че се развива много добре. Ние бяхме първата държава в света, която призна Северна Македония като независима европейска държава. За съжаление през годините нашите отношения се влошиха и аз не смятам, че България има вина за това. Затова искам да кажа ясно, че в настоящия момент България няма други изисквания към Северна Македония, освен тези, които залегнаха в решението на Европейския съюз през миналата година. Няма двустранни отношения днес между България и Северна Македония, има отношения между Северна Македония и Европейския съюз. Тях трябва да изпълни Северна Македония, за да може да отвори процеса на преговорите. И в това отношение аз не приемам никакви критики към нашата страна днес. Благодаря ви.

President. – Thank you very much, Prime Minister Denkov. Thank you for this very good debate.

The debate is closed.

(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)

7. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(The sitting resumed at 12.15)

8. Głosowanie

President. – The next item is the vote.

(For the results and other details concerning the vote: see minutes)

Mr Dzhambazki, do you have a point of order to do with the votes?

Angel Dzhambazki (ECR). – Madam President, yes, it is a point of order, if I may. I would like to ask you to postpone Wiener report, 'Sustainable use of plant protection products', under Rule 200.

President. – OK, we will take that before the vote according to Rule 200.

Now we move to the votes.

8.1. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 4 do budżetu ogólnego na 2023 r.: zmniejszenie środków na płatności – inne dostosowania i aktualizacje techniczne (A9-0363/2023 - Fabienne Keller) (głosowanie)

8.2. Procedura budżetowa na rok 2024 – wspólny projekt (A9-0362/2023 - Siegfried Mureşan, Nils Ušakovs) (głosowanie)

– *After the vote:*

President. – Congratulations to the rapporteurs. The joint text agreed by the Conciliation Committee on 11 November 2023 has been approved by both Parliament and the Council. The budgetary procedure for the financial year 2024 can thus be deemed to have been completed. The Union's general budget for the financial year 2024 is definitively adopted, and I will now sign the budget.

(The President of Parliament signed the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2024.)

8.3. Uruchomienie Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji – wniosek EGF/2023/002 BE/Makro – Belgia (A9-0351/2023 - Petri Sarvamaa) (głosowanie)

8.4. Elektroniczna publikacja Dziennika Urzędowego Unii Europejskiej (A9-0352/2023 - Adrián Vázquez Lázara) (głosowanie)

- 8.5. Umowa między UE a Czarnogórą dotycząca działań operacyjnych prowadzonych przez Europejską Agencję Straży Granicznej i Przybrzeżnej w Czarnogórze (A9-0369/2023 - Lena Düpont) (głosowanie)
- 8.6. Umowa o wolnym handlu między Unią Europejską a Nową Zelandią (A9-0305/2023 - Daniel Caspary) (głosowanie)
- 8.7. Umowa o wolnym handlu między UE a Nową Zelandią (rezolucja) (A9-0314/2023 - Daniel Caspary) (głosowanie)
- 8.8. Powołanie członka Trybunału Obrachunkowego – Petri Sarvamaa (A9-0349/2023 - Gilles Boyer) (głosowanie)
- 8.9. Powołanie członkini Trybunału Obrachunkowego – Annemie Turtelboom (A9-0350/2023 - Tsvetelina Penkova) (głosowanie)
- 8.10. Przepisy dotyczące VAT w epoce cyfrowej (A9-0327/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)
- 8.11. Uzgodnienia dotyczące współpracy administracyjnej w dziedzinie VAT potrzebne w epoce cyfrowej (A9-0324/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)
- 8.12. Przepisy dotyczące VAT odnoszące się do podatników, procedury szczególnej oraz uregulowań szczególnych dotyczących deklarowania i zapłaty VAT z tytułu sprzedaży na odległość towarów importowanych (A9-0320/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)
- 8.13. Zrównoważone stosowanie środków ochrony roślin (A9-0339/2023 - Sarah Wiener) (głosowanie)

President. – We move now to the point of order by Mr Dzhambazki because it is just before the vote on the Wiener report.

Angel Dzhambazki, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Madam President, dear colleagues, I would like to postpone this vote under Rule 200.

President. – I understand you are doing this on behalf of your political group, Mr Dzhambazki, and therefore we will put the proposal to a vote.

(Parliament rejected the ECR Group's proposal)

Is there another point of order?

Sylvia Limmer, im Namen der ID-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte das auf Deutsch ausführen. Es geht um unseren Änderungsantrag 376 Teil 2, für den unsere ID-Fraktion eine namentliche Abstimmung beantragt hat, und zwar fristgerecht. Und in dieser aktuellen Liste, die im Übrigen erst heute Vormittag – das ist eigentlich skandalös – die erst heute Vormittag tatsächlich herumgegangen ist, ist das nicht aufgeführt, und deshalb beantrage ich, dass diese namentliche Abstimmung noch eingefügt wird.

President. – Since you make it on behalf of the group, just to warn the other groups that there will be a recorded vote on that point, but I will alert well enough in advance.

(Before the vote on the Commission proposal the President agreed to suspend the vote for a few moments)

– *After the vote on the Commission proposal:*

Sarah Wiener (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ein schwarzer Tag für die Umwelt und für die Gesundheit, für die Gesellschaft und für die Befreiung der Landwirtinnen und Landwirte von der Agroindustrie.

(Tumulte)

Aber ich möchte hiermit nach Artikel 59 Absatz 4 der Geschäftsordnung des Europäischen Parlaments die Rücküberweisung des Berichts an den ENVI-Ausschuss beantragen.

(Beifall)

(Parliament rejected the request)

8.14. Opakowania i odpady opakowaniowe (A9-0319/2023 - Frédérique Ries) (głosowanie)

– *After the vote on the Commission proposal:*

Nils Torvalds (Renew). – Thank you for a very difficult vote. I can understand that many Members have some doubts about the future, therefore I would like to refer it back for interinstitutional negotiations in accordance with Rule 59(4).

(Parliament approved the request)

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

8.15. Cyfryzacja i prawo administracyjne (A9-0309/2023 - Karen Melchior) (głosowanie)

Karen Melchior (Renew), in writing. – Dear Colleagues, since the Treaty of Lisbon, we have witnessed an increasing number of citizens directly interacting with the Union. Which is great. But how do we meet them?

Many of our Member States have rules to provide legal certainty and protect citizens interacting with national public administrations. However, as of now, no such rules exist for the European Union. Our House has already addressed these issues in: the resolution of 15 January 2013 with recommendations to the Commission on a Law of Administrative Procedure of the European Union; and in the resolution of 9 June 2016 for an open, efficient, and independent European Union administration and the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council for an open, efficient, and independent European Union administration.

Only to be dismissed by the European Commission.

We desperately need regulations for an open, efficient, and independent EU administration, outlining principles for the digitization of administrative procedures and the development and implementation of digital solutions. The call for rules at the level of EU bodies is rooted in the understanding that such regulations are necessary for good administration.

It is emphasized that these rules should include special provisions related to digitalization, ensuring that European citizens can enjoy easy and efficient access to digital services and solutions, aligning with the principles of the rule of law and citizen rights.

The Commission wants to – again – claim that the existing rules are sufficient and dismiss the need for additional regulations. Public administrations and digitalisation was highlighting by annual meeting European Ombudsmen this year. We must include aspects of digitalisation in the citizens' rights when they faced with administrations.

Therefore, our endeavour is also to incorporate new digital solutions to meet the needs of efficient administrations, while ensuring the full rights of citizens.

With this vote that we are about to cast now, I urge the Parliament to maintain our strong signal to the Commission against their inability and reluctance to address these issues.

The same signal that was displayed when the file was unanimously adopted across the entire political spectrum of groups in the JURI Committee on 24 October 2023. The time for action is now – and the Commission ought to listen this time.

8.16. Wnioski Parlamentu Europejskiego w sprawie zmiany traktatów (A9-0337/2023 - Guy Verhofstadt, Sven Simon, Gabriele Bischoff, Daniel Freund, Helmut Scholz) (głosowanie)

8.17. Negocjacje w sprawie umowy o statusie dotyczącej działań operacyjnych prowadzonych przez Frontex w Mauretanii (A9-0358/2023 - Tineke Strik) (głosowanie)

President. – That concludes the vote. Thank you, colleagues, for your constructive work!

(The sitting was briefly suspended.)

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

9. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(The sitting resumed at 15.05)

10. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia

President. – The minutes and the texts adopted of yesterday's sitting are available. Are there any comments?

As that is not the case, the minutes are approved.

11. Zmniejszyć obciążenia regulacyjne, by wykorzystać potencjał przedsiębiorczości i konkurencyjności (debata na aktualny temat)

President. – The next item is the topical debate under Rule 162 on reducing the regulatory burden to unleash entrepreneurship and competitiveness.

I would inform Members that for this debate there is no catch-the-eye procedure and no blue cards will be accepted.

Markus Ferber, Verfasser. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Frau Ministerin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Die Europäische Kommission hat erst in der vergangenen Woche eine neue Konjunkturprognose veröffentlicht, die ziemlich düster ausgefallen ist. Die Kommission hat diese Herbstprognose selbst mit einer bezeichnenden Überschrift versehen: „Eine bescheidene Erholung nach einem schwierigen Jahr“. Ich glaube, das ist eine gute Zusammenfassung unserer ökonomischen Situation in dieser Europäischen Union.

Wir sollten uns aber nichts vormachen: Diese schwachen Wachstumsaussichten lassen sich nicht nur auf eine Konjunkturdelle oder auf die hohen Energiepreise zurückführen. Wer das als Erklärungsmuster nimmt, der macht es sich zu einfach. Wir haben vielmehr ein strukturelles Problem, das sich darauf zurückführen lässt, dass sich die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und das Produktivitätswachstum der europäischen Wirtschaft in den vergangenen Jahren stetig verschlechtert hat.

Wenn die größte Volkswirtschaft in der Europäischen Union – die Volkswirtschaft aus dem Land, aus dem ich komme – mittelfristig nur noch ein Potenzialwachstum von 0,4 % hat, dann ist das, glaube ich, ein klarer Hinweis, dass hier einiges im Argen liegt. Die Probleme sind weitgehend hausgemacht. Die Weltwirtschaft wächst, Europa stagniert, und die größte Volkswirtschaft in Europa schrumpft.

Nahezu jeder Legislativvorschlag, den die Kommission in dieser Legislaturperiode vorgelegt hat, hat unseren Unternehmen neue bürokratische Lasten aufgebürdet. Neben den materiellen Lasten, über die man sicherlich im Einzelfall immer diskutieren kann, war das große, einende Element in dieser Legislaturperiode der enorme Aufwuchs an Berichtspflichten, der mit nahezu jedem Gesetzgebungsvorschlag einherging, und mit der Nachhaltigkeitsberichterstattung und dem Lieferkettensorgfaltspflichtengesetz kommen ja erst noch zwei ganz große bürokratische Hämmer auf unsere Unternehmen zu.

Berichtspflichten verursachen enorme bürokratische Lasten, lösen aber von sich aus heraus kein Problem; sie sind die Definition von überflüssiger Bürokratie. Die Kommission hat nun erste zaghafte Vorschläge gemacht, um Berichtspflichten abzubauen. Das geht zwar in die richtige Richtung, aber das geht natürlich noch lange nicht weit genug.

Das heißt, wir müssen das Thema Bürokratieabbau, Wettbewerbsfähigkeit, Wachstum zum Leitmotiv der nächsten Legislaturperiode und der nächsten Amtszeit der Europäischen Kommission machen, sonst sieht es dauerhaft relativ düster aus mit der Zukunftsprognose für Europa.

Und wenn die Kommission selbst einen Kostenindex vorlegt, wo sie die Kosten, mit denen Unternehmen belastet sind, beschreibt und zu dem Ergebnis kommt, dass zum Beispiel die Nachhaltigkeitsberichterstattung in diesem Jahr noch keine Kosten generiert; und wenn ich in der Kommission nachfrage, da wird mir gesagt: Ja, weil es ist ja noch nicht gültig, der delegierte Rechtsakt tritt ja erst am 1. Januar in Kraft. Ja, haben Sie überhaupt verstanden, was Unternehmen tun müssen? Die müssen sich jetzt schon vorbereiten. Natürlich entstehen da jetzt schon Kosten, weil wenn sie zum 1. Januar Daten liefern müssen, können sie ja nicht erst am 1. Januar mit der Arbeit anfangen. Also hier wird wirklich auch falsch gemessen und an die Öffentlichkeit ein falsches Ziel gesetzt.

Europa hatte sich mit der Lissabon-Strategie einmal vorgenommen, zum wettbewerbsfähigsten und dynamischsten wissensbasierten Wirtschaftsraum der Welt zu werden. Von diesem Ziel sind wir meilenweit entfernt; wir brauchen hier dringend eine Umkehr. Die Kommission ist aufgefordert, das zu liefern.

Ángeles Moreno Bau, *presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, estoy aquí hoy para tratar un tema de suma importancia para la Unión Europea, un tema que ocupa un lugar destacado en su agenda política: nuestros esfuerzos comunes por liberar el potencial del espíritu empresarial y la competitividad en Europa y reducir la carga normativa.

La reducción de la carga administrativa constituye un requisito previo para mantener la competitividad de la economía y las empresas europeas —sobre todo las pymes— y complementa los importantes esfuerzos realizados recientemente para apoyar el espíritu empresarial.

La competitividad es fundamental para facilitar y acelerar las transiciones ecológica y digital de la economía europea en un mundo que se enfrenta al aumento de la tensión geopolítica y la competencia estratégica mundial. Esto explica por qué este tema ha ocupado un lugar destacado en los órdenes del día del Consejo Europeo. Primero, en marzo de este año, las y los dirigentes pidieron que se avanzara en los trabajos sobre un marco reglamentario que propicie el crecimiento, reduciendo la carga administrativa y realizando controles de competitividad para las nuevas propuestas legislativas. A continuación, en junio, el Consejo Europeo hizo balance de los progresos realizados y de lo que queda por hacer para aumentar la competitividad y la productividad a largo plazo.

En este contexto, celebramos que el programa de trabajo de la Comisión para 2024 incluya varias propuestas para racionalizar y simplificar las obligaciones de presentación de información con el objetivo de reducirlas un 25 %. Estamos hablando de una cantidad importante de propuestas legislativas encaminadas a reducir la carga administrativa. Algunas de ellas ya han sido presentadas y otras lo serán en el futuro.

Unos días después de la adopción del programa de trabajo de la Comisión para 2024, el Consejo Europeo pidió precisamente que se impulsasen los trabajos en este ámbito, en particular en relación con las obligaciones de presentación de información, especialmente para las pymes y las empresas emergentes. El Consejo está dispuesto a hacer el trabajo que le corresponde y abordar con rapidez y eficiencia las propuestas de la Comisión Europea. No obstante, todas y todos somos conscientes de que las principales dificultades residen en los detalles de la manera de avanzar en los trabajos de simplificación.

Como colegisladores, podemos contribuir en gran medida a que la carga administrativa se mantenga al mínimo cuando negociamos expedientes legislativos importantes. De hecho, a menudo, la carga administrativa aumenta como resultado de una suma de costes pequeños y proporcionados encaminados a alcanzar otros objetivos políticos clave. Tenemos ejemplos concretos de esto en nuestro trabajo diario. Piensen, por ejemplo, en nuestros debates sobre actos legislativos ya adoptados, como la Reglamento de chips, y sobre propuestas que todavía se están finalizando o negociando, como el Reglamento de Materias Primas Fundamentales o el Reglamento sobre la industria de cero emisiones netas.

En relación con estos y con otros muchos expedientes, hemos tenido dificultades para alcanzar el delicado equilibrio entre nuestro deseo de recibir más información de los operadores del mercado y la carga que podría implicar la recogida de datos. Parte del proceso afecta principalmente a las autoridades de los Estados miembros, que necesitan simplificar las herramientas y las prácticas de la administración pública. No obstante, en los trabajos legislativos a nivel de la UE, también se debe tener en cuenta la necesidad de simplificación.

En resumen, la Presidencia española está decidida a tramitar las propuestas para reducir las cargas de la forma más rápida y eficiente posible y espera un nivel de ambición similar por parte del Parlamento. Este es también el motivo por el que debates como el de hoy resultan importantes para aumentar la conciencia colectiva sobre el asunto e impedir que perdamos de vista el objetivo.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Madam Minister, I would like to thank you, and especially Mr Ferber for having added this pertinent topic of reducing regulatory burden to the debate.

This is an important effort to support our entrepreneurs and businesses, which have faced numerous challenges in recent years, from the pandemic to high inflation and the energy price crisis, alongside wider societal changes such as the twin green and digital transition. In the new geopolitical context and amidst strong global competition, it is crucial that we look at boosting all factors that drive economic growth and sustainable competitiveness.

Our March communication on long-term competitiveness highlighted that the growth enhancing regulatory framework is a central part of this, and it announced our goal to streamline reporting obligations and reduce its burden by 25%. We made it clear that these efforts will not undermine our policy objectives, such as tackling the climate crisis. Rather, they will give fresh impetus to our efforts to simplify and cut unnecessary burdens. The less red tape they are faced with, the more our businesses, and especially our SMEs, can focus on building sustainable growth.

To follow up on the communication, reducing burden was made a top priority in our 2024 Commission work programme, which we presented last month. It included 26 new rationalisation proposals, in addition to the 15 we had already adopted between March and October. With the data already available, we have estimated that the proposals could bring EUR 3.6 billion in cost savings, while total cost savings of all 41 proposals is estimated to be even bigger.

Let me give you some examples. First, the reform of the Union custom code is expected to bring EUR 2 billion in savings by cutting burdens related to customs and VAT reporting for traders, including by providing one single EU interface and facilitating data reuse. Second, it is estimated that a proposal for the revision of the regulation on European statistics will save a further EUR 450 million. Third, we have proposed to postpone the deadline for adoption of the sector-wide European sustainability reporting standards. This will give stakeholders more time to adapt to the new requirements, and we also adjusted the thresholds of the accounting directive so that more than a million companies will benefit from the simpler reporting requirements. Moreover, the work programme includes 16 evaluations and fitness checks of existing legislation and they will help us to identify further potential to reduce administrative burden and look at cumulative costs.

Honourable Members in order to carry this work forward, we will seek to engage more closely with our businesses and stakeholders. First, we launched a call for evidence last month asking stakeholders for their input. We will also pursue targeted consultations with, amongst others, companies, SMEs, the SME envoys network and Member State experts. And second, I have asked our 'Fit for Future' expert group to contribute to this exercise. Third, each Commission Directorate-General will prepare targeted plans for 2024 and beyond. We will report on the progress made on cutting burden from reporting requirements in the next annual burden survey.

This focus on existing burden is complemented by our efforts to limit new burden. For instance, our 'one in, one out' approach acts as a cost break for new proposals. It means that we offset newly introduced burdens by removing equivalent burdens, ideally in the same policy area. The last annual burden survey, published together with our SME relief package in September, reported about the first year of full implementation of this approach, and it shows that the overall expected savings from the 2022 proposals, once adopted by co-legislators, would amount to EUR 7.3 billion, providing significant relief for businesses and citizens.

While we already have a top-notch better regulation framework, we also made ensuring its systematic and systemic application a priority. We introduce a new mandatory competitiveness check in all impact assessments and strengthen the SME test and the regulatory scrutiny board. Together with the incoming EU SME envoy, this would ensure greater focus on the impact on businesses, especially SMEs.

We are also developing a more innovation-friendly approach to regulation through the greater use of regulatory sandboxes and testbeds. Better law-making is, of course, a joint effort and we will need your support, together with that of the Council, to make sure that our EU laws are simpler, more targeted and easier to comply with in order to boost the competitiveness of our businesses.

And finally, Madam President, I want to mention the series of clean transition roundtables with industry we are organising in order to remain fully engaged with those who are at the core of the implementation of the Green Deal. The first one was held in October with a focus on hydrogen, with further ones to follow soon. We are also holding a series of green dialogues with citizens, local authorities, social partners and other stakeholders as part of our efforts to ensure a just transition. Together, I believe we can make a real difference that will be felt by our businesses and our citizens.

Henna Virkkunen, PPE-ryhmän puolesta. – Arvoisa puhemies, komissaari, neuvosto, kuluneella kaudella EU:n komission työohjelmassa oli lähes 600 aloitetta. Se on aivan valtava määrä. Samalla kun on aivan oikein edistetty Euroopan vihreää siirtymää ja digitalisaatiota, komissio on tuottanut aivan valtavan määrän uusia direktiivejä, asetuksia ja delegoituja säädöksiä, enkä ollenkaan sano, että Euroopan parlamentti olisi ollut mitenkään parempi tässä byrokratian vähentämisessä.

Seurauksena on ollut valtavasti päällekkäistä, ristikkäistä lainsäädäntöä ja velvoitteita, jotka kohdistuvat meidän teollisuuteemme ja yrityksiimme. Hallinnollinen taakka on näille valtava, suurille yrityksille, mutta erityisesti kun puhumme pk-yrityksistä. Tähän on laitettava stoppi. Meidän on oikeasti kevennettävä ja vähennettävä sääntelyä, eikä vain puhuttava siitä kauniisti. Muistamme hyvin, että tämän kauden alussa komissio lupasi toteuttaa *one in, one out* -sääntöä, eli aina, jos tulee joku uusi velvoite, toisesta päästä kevennetään. Tuloksia ei ole tästä syntynyt. Nyt uutena komissio on luvannut liittää competitiveness checkin, kilpailukykyarvion, jokaiseen uuteen lainsäädäntöön, samoin kuin SME-testin. Odotamme tästä tuloksia.

Totta kai on myönteistä, että komissio on nyt ensi vuoden työohjelmassaan tarttunut asiaan ja nostanut tämän yhdeksi prioriteetiksi. Mutta kyllä meidän täytyy tulevalle EU-kaudelle asettaa tavoitteeksi koko Euroopan strategisen kilpailukyvyn vahvistaminen. Se tarkoittaa sitä, että meidän on luotava lainsäädäntöä, joka kannustaa investoimaan ja innovoimaan Euroopassa. Ylimääräistä hallinnollista taakkaa on kevennettävä ja annettava yrityksille mahdollisuus ideoida uutta ja luoda uutta.

Laura Ballarín Cereza, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señora vicepresidenta, vicepresidente Šefčovič, señorías, ¿por qué legislamos? Legislamos porque queremos proteger la salud de nuestros ciudadanos, avanzar en materia de estándares sociales e impulsar el crecimiento de nuestras empresas.

Legislar es dar respuestas a una realidad cambiante por el progreso tecnológico a crecientes demandas ciudadanas o al deterioro del medio ambiente. Por ello, creemos que la derecha de esta Cámara tiene una actitud irresponsable y que alimenta el euroescepticismo con debates como este.

Después de cuatro años de cooperación constructiva entre las grandes fuerzas de este Parlamento, ahora el Partido Popular Europeo pide una moratoria legislativa, que no avancemos tanto ni tan rápido. Esta postura encierra otra agenda, y es la de aprovechar para impulsar la desregulación.

Como familia socialdemócrata, mostramos nuestro rechazo a este camino. En el grupo S&D, siempre hemos defendido una regulación equilibrada y basada en la ciencia, porque es imposible garantizar la competitividad futura de la Unión Europea si no apostamos —con compromisos vinculantes y medidas de apoyo— por las tecnologías del futuro y luchamos para evitar el desastre climático.

No es serio simplificar y decir que regulación equivale a menos competitividad. Es más, la competitividad nos permite crear oportunidades económicas en línea con nuestras prioridades estratégicas como continente.

Eso sí, los métodos de trabajo de la Comisión deben avanzar hacia una regulación simplificada, profundizar en nuestro mercado común e incorporar las propuestas de sectores afectados garantizando siempre que la carga regulatoria sea digerible para las pymes. Ahí sí que nos van a encontrar.

En resumen, optimizar la carga regulatoria, sí. Impulsar la desregulación para disimular el negacionismo climático, no.

Morten Løkkegaard, *for Renew-Gruppen*. – Fru formand! Vi har talt om de her problemer i årevis, og nu er det vist på høje tid, at vi får gjort noget ved dem. Vi må sætte handling bag ved de ord, som der har været alt, alt for mange af. Det voksende bureaukrati kvæler vores konkurrenceevne og udfordrer vores iværksættere. I den benhårde konkurrence med USA og Kina ja, det er altså nødvendigt, at vi begrænser vores bureaukratiske byrder, nu.

Derfor er Kommissionens forslag om at reducere indrapporteringsforpligtelsen et vigtigt skridt, som vi sætter pris på. Men vi er nødt til at gå videre. Vi er nødt til at indføre et egentligt konkurrence tjek på ny EU-lovgivning, og det skal ske allerede fra den næste samling. Før vi vedtager en ny lov, skal vi sikre, at det ikke underminerer iværksættere og mindre virksomheders muligheder for at konkurrere. De udgør trods alt hele skelettet i vores erhvervsstruktur i Europa. Det er vigtigt, at vi indser det. Inden længe så vil Renew Europe og jeg på vegne af vores gruppe præsentere et papir på konkurrenceevne, hvor vi præsenterer ti forslag, der gerne skulle hjælpe og booste vores erhvervsliv. Det glæder mig til at præsentere både over for Kommissionen og over for jer kolleger. Vi skal sørge for, at vores bureaukrati bliver begrænset nu. Vi skal forbedre vores konkurrenceevne.

Henrike Hahn, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Produkte *Made in Europe* sind weltweit gefragt – von mittelständischen Automobilzulieferanten bis zu Global Players wie Airbus in Donauwörth oder Toulouse. Dafür gibt es gute Gründe. Klar ist: Um im globalen Wettbewerb erfolgreich zu sein, müssen Unternehmen in Europa flexibel und innovativ sein, und wir müssen die Berichte über zu viel Bürokratie ernst nehmen. Unternehmerinnen und Unternehmer müssen anpacken, statt am Schreibtisch in Papierfluten zu versinken. Und es gibt wirklich keine Veranstaltung, die ich mit Unternehmerinnen und Unternehmern erlebe, in der nicht über das Thema Bürokratie gesprochen wird – und das muss auch in Brüssel ankommen.

Die Kommission hat mit ihrem KMU-Entlastungspaket einen ersten Aufschlag gemacht, von vereinfachten Steuerregeln bis hin zu einer verbesserten Methodik für die Berichterstattung zu ESG-Fragen, weil das eben auch immer wieder Thema ist, und auch nationale Regierungen können viel tun. Das deutsche Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft hat gerade ein Konzeptpapier gegen Bürokratie vorgelegt, mit richtigen Lösungen von Praxis- und Digitalchecks bis hin zur Vernetzung nationaler Transparenzregister.

Das Problem ist erkannt, das heißt, es braucht jetzt die Lösungen. Aber ich warne dennoch vor künstlicher Überzeichnung, denn manche konservativ denkende Kolleginnen und Kollegen – auch gerade hier im Europäischen Parlament – benutzen diese wichtige Aufgabe „Entbürokratisierung“ als politischen Code für eine 100 %-Deregulierung und auch gleichzeitig als eine Attacke gegen den Grünen Deal. Und über sinnvolle EU-Gesetzgebung mal eben mit dem Rasenmäher zu gehen, statt sich wirklich verantwortungsvoll ganz genau das anzuschauen, was geändert werden muss, das ist natürlich keine verantwortungsvolle Sachpolitik, sondern schlichtweg Populismus.

Was wir stattdessen brauchen, sind weniger, klare, einfache und transparente Regeln, die Innovation und Wettbewerbsfähigkeit von Unternehmen unterstützen und eben gleichzeitig auch Verbraucher und Umwelt zugutekommen – und genau so geht eben nachhaltiges Wirtschaften *Made in Europe*.

Michiel Hoogeveen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, het bedrijfsleven in de EU wordt steeds verder verstikt door een spervuur aan wet- en regelgeving. Ondernemen wordt steeds moeilijker gemaakt. In de bancaire sector, die nog 80 % van de bedrijfsleningen aan het mkb verstrekt, houdt 20 % van de werknemers zich tegenwoordig bezig met compliance. Ter verduidelijking, in Nederland zijn er twee keer meer complianceofficers dan wijkagenten. De EU zorgt voor 90 % van de regeldruk voor ons mkb. Financiële audits, riskmanagement, privacywetgeving. Daarbovenop komen nog allerlei rapportageverplichtingen zoals over arbeidsomstandigheden, over klimaat, over gendergelijkheid ... de lijst stopt niet.

Onlangs maakte ik een tour langs typisch Nederlandse bedrijven. Een kaasmaker uit Noord-Holland vertelde mij dat hij 50 000 EUR per jaar kwijt is aan auditors en consultants. Voor mijn collega's aan de linkerkant: dat is dus één medewerker minder op de werkvloer.

Collega's, aangezien u toch allemaal met uw telefoon aan het spelen bent, google eens op *Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive* of, zoals we het hier kennen, CSDDD. Wat ziet u dan? Juist: allemaal grote consultancy- en advocatenkantoren. U zorgt ervoor dat zij profiteren. Niet de ondernemer, niet de werknemer.

Mevrouw Von der Leyen beloofde ons minder regeldruk, maar zoals wel vaker bleef het bij loze beloftes. Ondernemers verliezen vertrouwen en hoop. Dat gaat ten koste van ons allemaal.

Jordan Bardella, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, au fil des années, l'Union européenne n'a cessé d'alourdir le fardeau réglementaire qui pèse sur nos entreprises. Tous les prétextes semblent bon pour empiler des normes qui sont devenues autant d'entraves à la compétitivité de nos économies. Dans un entretien récent, le nouveau patron du Medef, français, lui-même dénonçait cette prolifération normative européenne, de même que la lenteur administrative qui préside au déblocage des fonds publics européens. Il s'alarme de la formation d'un fossé structurel qui se creuse entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis.

Ces mots, qui sont ceux du patronat français, doivent nous alerter. Dans le domaine de l'intelligence artificielle, cette profusion de normes s'illustre par un cadre contraignant qui fait de nous les champions pour réglementer des business que d'autres créent à notre place. Elle s'illustre dans l'agriculture par des normes écologiques que nous sommes les seuls au monde à appliquer et dont nous dispensons les producteurs hors d'Europe. Enfin, ce bavardage réglementaire trouve l'un de ses meilleurs exemples dans la directive Devoir de vigilance que nos concurrents, au premier rang desquels les États-Unis et la Chine, regardent avec intérêt, curieux de savoir si nous allons être assez fous pour accrocher un nouveau boulet à nos propres pieds.

À l'heure où la sobriété est devenue un mot de vocabulaire courant, il serait de bon ton que l'Union adopte la sobriété normative. Arrêtez de croire que la Commission doit se mêler de tout et qu'elle sait tout faire mieux que les principaux concernés. Laissez nos entreprises et nos entrepreneurs se jeter avec leurs talents dans la compétition mondiale. Laissez-les travailler, produire, créer, innover, embaucher et tout se passera bien.

Maria Angela Danzi (NI). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, un'Europa che non produce, un'Europa che non innova è destinata a morire.

Difendere le imprese, ma soprattutto le piccole imprese, significa dunque difendere il lavoro e il futuro della nostra società. Ma il mondo delle imprese non deve arroccarsi in una torre d'avorio, difendendo come l'ultimo dei Mohicani un modello che non è più sostenibile, né ambientalmente, né economicamente, né socialmente.

La transizione energetica e digitale è una sfida che dobbiamo cavalcare e vincere insieme senza paura. Noi come Parlamento europeo dobbiamo fare la nostra parte: semplificare il quadro normativo, snellire la burocrazia, acquisire fonti di finanziamento che aiutino le nostre piccole imprese ma, soprattutto, armonizzare la tassazione a livello europeo, evitando che le multinazionali abbiano dei benefici sul piano fiscale.

Così ammaziamo la nostra piccola impresa. Noi siamo dalla parte delle piccole imprese che costituiscono sempre il 99% delle imprese europee.

Markus Pieper (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident! Die europäische Wirtschaft will ihren Beitrag zum Klimaschutz leisten. Die Unternehmen wollen in sichere Zuliefererstrukturen investieren. Und die Europäische Union bietet genau dafür auch den Rahmen.

Wir haben viele Dinge, die wir über neue Handelsverträge, über den Grünen Deal, über den *Net Zero Industry Act*, im Sinne der Wirtschaft regeln. Dennoch beklagt sich die Wirtschaft über Bürokratie. Warum? Weil wir einen wichtigen Grundsatz verlassen haben: Wir haben mittlerweile zu wenig Zutrauen in die Marktwirtschaft und zu wenig Zutrauen in die Menschen. Warum machen wir CSRD, Taxonomie, EHS und Gebäuderichtlinie gleichzeitig? Es gibt doch schon Umwelt- und Sozialgesetze, die alles regeln.

Warum mit Taxonomie und CSRD auch in die Bankenfinanzierung reinregieren, wo wir doch schon den Emissionshandel haben, der die Einhaltung der CO₂-Ziele garantiert? Warum die Häuser der Menschen zu Hause zwangssanieren, wo doch die Gebäudewirtschaft gerade in den Emissionshandel aufgenommen wurde? Das verstehe ich nicht, das verstehen die Unternehmen nicht. Wir glauben immer weniger an den Markt, gleichzeitig regulieren wir mit Hosenträger und Gürtel gleichzeitig.

Der Grüne Deal macht Sinn. Ja, auch Lieferkettengesetzgebung hat eine klare Berechtigung. Aber es kommt im Moment alles auf einmal, und die Unternehmen ersticken in Bürokratie. Geben wir ihnen Luft zum Atmen!

Ich finde, Ihr Entlastungspaket ist ein toller Anfang. Ich betone, Anfang. Wir brauchen einfach viel mehr Vertrauen in die Marktwirtschaft, viel mehr Vertrauen in die Unternehmen. Das ist der beste Beitrag zum Bürokratieabbau.

René Repasi (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Bürokratieabbau ist in aller Munde, aber ich muss schon sagen, es ist doch echt eine absurde Debatte. Die EVP möge sich doch mal entscheiden. Vor einigen Wochen laden sie hier Anu Bradford aus den Vereinigten Staaten ein und bejubeln sie für den *Brussels effect* – der heißt: Alle in der Welt wollen unsere Produktstandards nachahmen, und deswegen ist es der Binnenmarkt, der dominiert über allem. Und gleichzeitig wollen sie genau das alles abschaffen. Ja, schießen wir uns jetzt mit unseren Regeln ins Knie, oder ist das eigentlich der Weg zu unserer Weltmeisterschaft? Man weiß es nicht so ganz genau.

Aber was ist denn eigentlich Bürokratie? Wir hören: Berichtspflichten; neue Vorschriften; und am allerschlimmsten: elendslange Vorschriften mit bizarren Unterausnahmen. Ja, warum haben wir eigentlich Berichtspflichten? Wir haben Berichtspflichten, damit Kapital investieren kann in irgendwelche Instrumente, die beweisen können, dass sie nachhaltig sind, indem Atomenergie und Erdgasenergie produziert wird. Das zeigt ja doch, dass es eigentlich nicht ganz der richtige Weg ist.

Ja, lassen Sie uns mal echte Handlungspflichten beschließen! Ja, und genau das machen wir jetzt im EU-Lieferkettengesetz. Daher: herzlich willkommen, uns darin zu unterstützen!

Und dann: Warum haben wir eigentlich diese elendslangen, riesengroßen Vorschriften? Jedes Mal, wenn die Kommission uns einen Entwurf schickt, kriegen wir Bombenmassen an E-Mails rein, mit freundlichen Änderungsanträgen von der Industrielobby. Die werden dann Copy-and-paste ins Gesetzgebungsverfahren hineingebracht, und wir kriegen absurde Vorschriften heraus.

Daher: Ja, auf jeden Fall ein Moratorium. Bitte ein Moratorium, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, keine Lobbyisten-Änderungsanträge mehr in diesem Haus! Dann erreichen wir auch Bürokratieabbau.

Stéphanie Yon-Courtin (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, la semaine dernière, le maire d'une petite commune de Normandie me disait avoir mobilisé un agent pendant une semaine pour répondre à un appel à projet européen. Résultat des courses: aucun fonds européen accordé et un maire qui considère désormais l'Europe comme une technostucture inaccessible au plus grand nombre. Cette situation, c'est le lot quotidien de nos maires et des dirigeants de millions de PME européennes, qui se battent chaque jour pour accéder à ce que l'Europe peut à leur offrir et en bénéficier concrètement. L'Europe concrète, l'Europe des territoires, n'est pas encore une réalité.

Preuve en est que nous n'avons jamais parlé autant d'Europe que lorsque la rumeur a enflé sur le fait que l'Europe (la Commission européenne) voulait interdire les boîtes de camembert ou les bourriches d'huîtres. Je viens de Normandie et je me réjouis que nous ayons pu voter un amendement pour déroger à ce texte.

Agissons au plus vite pour que les élus locaux et les chefs d'entreprise européens parlent d'Europe, et en bien. L'Union européenne régule, et c'est une bonne chose pour le fonctionnement de notre marché intérieur, pour notre compétitivité et notre sécurité, mais ce millefeuille réglementaire peut rapidement devenir indigeste, surtout lorsqu'on n'a pas le numéro d'urgence de l'Europe en cas d'indigestion.

L'annonce de madame la présidente Ursula von der Leyen de la création d'un représentant des PME et votre confirmation est un signal positif qui doit être concrétisé et amplifié au plus vite. Monsieur le Commissaire, agissons dès maintenant pour nos millions de petites entreprises et pour la compétitivité en Europe.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Fru talman! Herr kommissionär! På senmedeltiden skulle ingen gissat att Europas många krigande och splittrade småstater skulle komma att dominera världen. Mingdynastin, ottomanerna och stormogulerna hade större befolkning, bättre militärer och var ekonomiskt och kulturellt mer högtstående.

Men det var Europa som kom att styra världen medan de andra sjönk tillbaka. Orsaken? Kravet på likriktning från imperiernas centrala institutioner. Frånvaron av en centralmakt och rivaliteten mellan olika kungadömen stimulerade en strävan efter innovation och framsteg. Europa fick en uppåtriktad spiral av ekonomisk tillväxt som med tiden gav oss ett försprång framför alla andra.

Medan andra har anammat vårt framgångsrecept har vi övergivit det. EU:s avreglering och detaljstyrning är i dag det största hindret för innovation och utveckling. Fler än 9 300 nya eller uppdaterade rättsakter under den här mandatperioden talar sitt tydliga språk. I dag röstade den här kammaren för att förbjuda de träförpackningar som Camembert finns i, som ett exempel.

Medlemsstaterna, företagen och medborgarna behöver inte bättre regleringar. De behöver avsevärt färre regleringar, mindre byråkrati och mycket mer frihet.

Paola Ghidoni (ID). – Signora Presidente, signor Vicepresidente, onorevoli colleghi, ci sono due modi di guardare allo Stato: come ad un'istituzione che deve essere servita dai cittadini o come ad un ente che giustifica la sua esistenza con i risultati.

Io penso che le istituzioni debbano essere al servizio delle persone, non viceversa. Che chi lavora e dà lavoro sia aiutato e non ostacolato. Perché senza il lavoro e il valore che esso crea viene meno la sostenibilità del servizio pubblico.

L'Italia è la prima nazione in Europa per pressione burocratica. Il nostro governo lo ha ben chiaro e sta semplificando molte norme. Anche l'Europa però deve contribuire a questo processo. Regolamenti e direttive ostacolano la crescita, dissuadono gli investitori, alimentano la classe burocratica sulle spalle dei settori produttivi.

Lo chiedo insieme agli agricoltori italiani, chiamati a far fronte a 133 regolamenti e 46 direttive europee. E io credo che a questo punto l'Europa debba produrre una norma vale a dire quella di fissare un tetto al numero dei regolamenti... *(La Presidente toglie la parola all'oratrice.)*

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Az európai vállalatok joggal kongatják a vészharangot, hogy mennyi teher nyomja a vállukat. A Eurochambers szerint az üzleti kilátások a 2008-as válság óta most a legrosszabbak. A német családi vállalkozások közös nyilatkozatot adtak ki, hogy az uniós szabályok már kritikus mértékben túlterhelik őket. A cégeknek valóban számos kihívással kell szembenéznük: gazdasági visszaesés, magas kamatok, geopolitikai feszültségek, töredező ellátási láncok, egekbe szökő energiaárak. A BusinessEurope szerint Brüsszel az elmúlt években 850 új kötelezettséget varrt a nyakukba, 5000 oldalnyi terjedelemben, zöldítés és fenntarthatóság címen. Joggal mondja tehát a legnagyobb francia üzleti érdekképviselő elnöke, hogy a normateremtő delírium miatt az EU ugyanannyi frusztrációt és bosszúságot okoz, mint amennyi reményt ad.

Nem túl kecsegtető megnyilatkozások, a jelentéstételi kötelezettségek von der Leyen asszony által megígért 25 százalékos csökkentése így legfeljebb arra lesz elég, hogy a Bizottság lebontsa a saját maga által épített akadályokat. Semmi nem lett a négy éve megígért, „egy új szabály esetén egyet vezessünk ki” elvből. A Bizottságnak tehát sürgősen irányt kellene váltania, le kell bontania a felesleges bürokráciát, és a javaslatait alá kellene vetnie versenyképességi és kkv-tesztnek, még mielőtt minden vállalat Európán kívül keresi a boldogulását.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, teší ma, že môžeme hovoriť o téme zníženia regulačnej záťaže, pretože je to dôležitá téma pre zlepšenie podnikateľského prostredia a pre zlepšenie našej konkurencieschopnosti v globálnom meradle. V prvom rade, z môjho pohľadu, treba hovoriť o využití prostriedkov, ktoré máme. A tým hlavným prostriedkom je náš spoločný trh. Potrebujeme ho nielen využívať, potrebujeme ho dokončiť a potrebujeme odstrániť tie bariéry, ktoré ešte stále na spoločnom trhu máme preto, aby z neho ešte viac profitovali firmy a predovšetkým občania. V ďalšom rade je dôležité hovoriť o vymožitelnosti práva a lepšom prístupe k finančným zdrojom.

Z tohto pohľadu veľmi vítam iniciatívu Komisie vzhľadom na smernicu o oneskorených platbách, pretože potrebujeme zlepšiť disciplínu a potrebujeme ju zlepšiť hlavne pre pomoc malým podnikateľom. Ruka v ruku so znížením regulačnej záťaže ide aj o využívanie digitálnych technológií. Je dôležité, aby sme nielen uplatnili ten právny rámec, ktorý sme tu vytvorili, ale aj rozvíjali digitálne zručnosti a predovšetkým zlepšili prístup k internetu. Aj to súvisí s regulačnou záťažou. Veľmi podporujem náš spoločný cieľ znížiť administratívnu záťaž o 25 %, ale je dôležité, aby nielen nevznikli nové regulácie, ale aby nedochádzalo k tzv. goldplatingu, aby sa ešte viac nepreregulovávali v jednotlivých štátoch. Verím teda, že spoločnými silami budeme viac inovovať ako regulovať.

Eero Heinäluoma (S&D). – Madam President, this is an important debate. Nobody likes burden. On the other side, calling legal obligations to protect people or the environment a burden is more of an ideological statement.

I fully understand some legal requirements are demanding, in particular for SMEs. And yes, we need to be more proportionate and ensure Member States can adjust more to national circumstances. At the same time, we absolutely need rules to protect consumers and workers, to protect the environment, to protect our health.

An example: almost month after month, we face a natural disaster. Only 25% of natural catastrophe losses were insured. That's the reason that insurance companies need to be better prepared to protect us, to protect the future of our children. These rules are not a burden. They are just common sense.

Dragoș Pîslaru (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, domnule vicepreședinte Șefcovič, cât ne costă birocrația? La nivel european fiecare procedură administrativă cere unei companii mari să scoată din buzunar 1 euro pe angajat, unei companii medii 4 euro per angajat, iar unei întreprinderi mici 10 euro per angajat. Nu este deci de mirare că povara administrativă este principala problemă a peste jumătate dintre IMM-urile la nivel european.

Birocrația costă timp, bani, resurse umane, potențial de inovare, menținerea competitivității. Pe lângă ceea ce Comisia Europeană își propune – și este o inițiativă foarte bună să revenim la o manieră mai clară de reducerea a costurilor administrative – parte din greutatea administrativă vine la nivel național. Sunt state membre care încă nu digitalizează procesele și încă nu creează reformele de care este nevoie.

În 2016, în România exista Comisia de tăiat hârtii care exact acest lucru făcea: să scoată reglementările inutile, să reducă taxele și numărul de formulare. Între timp, până și această inițiativă a fost acoperită de hârtii. Avem nevoie și la nivel național de dereglementare și digitalizare.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR). – Señora presidente, comisarios, señorías, es muy triste ver cómo se ha desmantelado nuestro tejido productivo. Durante este mandato, más de la mitad de esta Cámara se ha empeñado en hacer la vida imposible a las empresas con exigencias injustas y desproporcionadas.

Por su empeño con las agendas ideológicas, se ha dejado atrás al que genera prosperidad y puestos de trabajo. Ahora, al final, a escasos meses de las elecciones, se habla de relanzar el emprendimiento: pues es un poco tarde, porque el daño ya está hecho.

Para hablar en serio de emprendimiento es necesario un cambio en la composición de esta Cámara el próximo 9 de junio. Apostemos por quien pone sentido común y valora la iniciativa de los emprendedores. Debemos crear un ambiente regulatorio favorable replanteando legislaciones y, por supuesto, abrir espacio a la creatividad, hoy reducida a las transiciones ecológica y digital.

Si no hay un cambio de rumbo, seguiremos en un decrecimiento en espiral.

Matteo Adinolfi (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in un momento in cui il panorama economico è caratterizzato da sfide senza precedenti, è fondamentale adottare misure concrete per agevolare e sostenere la crescita del settore imprenditoriale, soprattutto giovanile.

In un contesto come quello attuale, la semplificazione normativa deve rappresentare un passo essenziale per favorire lo sviluppo delle imprese, piccole e medie, e garantire un rapporto meno passivo e più collaborativo con gli enti pubblici. Ridurre gli oneri normativi, infatti, non significa solo alleggerire il carico burocratico, ma rappresenta un investimento nel tessuto economico europeo, perché la promozione dell'imprenditorialità è cruciale se si vuole garantire la creazione di posti di lavoro e la prosperità a lungo termine.

La competitività dell'Europa dipende dalla nostra capacità di fornire alle imprese gli strumenti necessari per competere a livello internazionale. E uno di questi strumenti è quel processo radicale di sburocratizzazione, che consentirebbe alle aziende italiane ed europee di rilanciarsi e adeguarsi ai cambiamenti imposti dal mercato globale.

Lídia Pereira (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, todos sabemos o que é que as empresas precisam, pois o diagnóstico já está feito. Temos legislação, impostos e burocracia a mais, e simplificação, competitividade e financiamento a menos.

O que nos tem sobrado em palavras tem faltado em ações concretas para apoiar as pequenas e médias empresas, os 24 milhões de motores da nossa economia. Precisamos de reduzir drasticamente a lista interminável de leis que aumentam, de ano para ano, as obrigações das PME. Precisamos de simplificar a relação das empresas com o Estado e, sobretudo, eliminar os obstáculos que enfrentam no acesso ao financiamento.

Em Portugal, é preciso baixar os impostos já. Precisamos de reformas estruturais na saúde, na educação, na habitação, e é inaceitável termos impostos e burocracias no máximo e serviços públicos no mínimo. Só com crescimento económico é que temos melhores salários e é, também, com menos burocracia que pomos o país a crescer.

Este já não é o tempo das discussões, este é o tempo das decisões, e haja coragem para as tomar.

Ivars Ijabs (Renew). – Godātā prezidentes kundze! Godātais komisāra kungs! Es un visa komanda, kas šeit Parlamentā strādā pie mūsu jaunuzņēmumu konkurētspējas ziņojuma, protams, atbalstām šo Komisijas mērķi, proti, par 25 % samazināt atskaišu rakstīšanas slogu. Un es tiešām ceru, ka Komisija ieviesīs dzīvē šo principu – vispirms domā par mazajiem – un priekšlikumus visām šīm *one in, one out* iniciatīvām.

Tomēr, tikko kā pabeidzot darbu pie sadarbībspējīgās Eiropas likuma, es vēlētos uzsvērt, ka mērķis – dokumentu iesniegšana tikai vienu reizi, kur sabiedriskā sektora iestādes savā starpā sadarbotos, – ir ļoti tāls no sasniegšanas, jo iestāžu sadarbībspēja digitālajā vidē joprojām ir milzīga problēma gan valstu iekšienē, gan valstu starpā.

Mums ir ne tikai jāsamazina regulēšanas un atskaišu rakstīšanas slogs par 25 %, mums ir arī jāpanāk, lai saziņas ātrums ar valdības iestādēm pieaugtu par tiem pašiem 25 %. Katrai politikai, katram lēmumam visos valdības līmeņos ir jātiek pieņemtiem digitāli pēc noklusējuma un sadarbspējīgi dažādu datubāzu starpā.

Mēs redzam, cik strauji mūsu dzīvē šobrīd ienāk mākslīgais intelekts. Ja mēs vispār gribam paturēt cilvēku kontroli pār mašīnām, mūsu pārvaldei ir jābūt elastīgākai un daudz ātrākai, pretējā gadījumā pārvalde vēl joprojām zaudēs saikni ar Eiropas [...] (*sēdes vadītāja liedz runātājam turpināt runu*).

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzy! Światowa gospodarka przeszła w ostatnich latach przez poważne kryzysy, także dla europejskich przedsiębiorstw, zwłaszcza małych i średnich. Był to okres wzrostu kosztów działalności, ograniczenia produkcji i walki o przetrwanie. Czeka nas teraz mozolny proces odbudowy naszego potencjału. Musimy odtworzyć autonomię strategiczną w wielu sektorach, gdzie przez lata przenosiliśmy produkcję do państw trzecich, wydłużając łańcuchy dostaw. To wymaga jednak zmniejszenia liczby regulacji i obniżenia oderwanych od rzeczywistości celów w zakresie redukcji emisji, które wypchnęły miejsca pracy z Europy.

Także w sektorze nowych technologii, takich jak sztuczna inteligencja, musimy więcej swobody zostawić dla innowacji, których w Unii Europejskiej tworzymy bardzo mało. Przepisy, nad którymi obecnie pracujemy, muszą zachęcać do badań i rozwoju. Nadmierne obciążenia administracyjne to recepta na jeszcze większe uzależnienie od importu technologii z zewnątrz.

Isabella Tovaglieri (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le nostre imprese sono più avanti delle istituzioni europee che dovrebbero stimolarne la crescita e la competitività, invece di frenarla con norme e vincoli, come ormai accade troppo spesso, ogni giorno con le misure legate alla svolta *green*.

Le nostre imprese sono più avanti perché sanno già da sole che l'attenzione all'ambiente è un fattore di competitività e che bisogna investire nella transizione *green* per rimanere sul mercato.

Le nostre imprese sono più avanti perché chiedono di poterlo fare con incentivi e tempistiche adeguate, non con diktat assurdi che impoveriscono il nostro tessuto produttivo e che rischiano di trasformare l'Europa da aspirante potenza mondiale a serva delle economie più inquinanti del mondo.

Agli imprenditori che lottano ogni giorno per difendere il primato e la qualità delle nostre produzioni dico che non sono da soli e che in quest'Aula c'è ancora chi combatte per liberare le loro energie per un futuro migliore.

Hildegard Bentele (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir sind im letzten Jahr einer Legislatur, in der es einen massiven Zuwachs an neuen Regulierungen gab. Ja, einige waren berechtigt, weil wir unsere Klimaziele rechtlich verankert haben, ebenso wie die dafür notwendigen Instrumente. Wir mussten kriegsbedingt unsere Energieversorgung umstellen, und auch für eine ressourceneffizientere Wirtschaft waren neue Produktvorgaben notwendig.

Aber die Kommission und besonders auch die linke Seite des Parlaments haben sich viele Extras geleistet – vor allem die, von Unternehmen über detaillierteste Nachhaltigkeitsberichtspflichten entscheidende Verbesserungen der sozialen und ökologischen Bedingungen weltweit zu erwarten und davon – und das ist die Kirsche auf dem Törtchen – zunehmend auch Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten abhängig zu machen.

Für viele kleinere und mittlere Unternehmen – das kann ich Ihnen sicher sagen – hat das mittlerweile zu einem Bürokratie-Burnout geführt. Und das ist fatal. Der Mittelstand ist unser innovatives Rückgrat, und in Berlin beispielsweise sind kleine Unternehmen mit weniger als sechs Mitarbeitern die Hauptarbeitgeber.

Wir in der EVP kämpfen mittlerweile in jedem Dossier für ein „Weniger ist mehr“ und sagen – für uns vielleicht ungewöhnlich radikal: Diesen Kommissionsvorschlag brauchen wir gar nicht.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señora presidenta, la Unión Europea no debe olvidar que el emprendimiento necesita una financiación, unas normas amables y seguras y protección frente a la morosidad y al retraso en los pagos.

En esta línea, transmito dos mensajes de la Asamblea de Pequeñas y Medianas Empresas europeas que celebramos la semana pasada en Bilbao.

Las personas y la tecnología son las claves de nuestra competitividad e independencia estratégica en el mundo global. Una formación profesional predictiva y más fondos para la Plataforma de Tecnologías Estratégicas para Europa (STEP) son la base de nuestra soberanía industrial y productiva.

La digitalización que promueve el plan de recuperación y resiliencia mejora nuestra competitividad y debe reducir las cargas administrativas y de gestión de nuestras pymes. La implantación de la plataforma OOTS (sistema técnico «solo una vez») antes de fin de año es nuestra propuesta para no repetir trámites y simplificar procedimientos.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Madam Minister, if you allow me to start to respond to our first speaker, who proposed also to have this topical debate this afternoon, to Mr Ferber, because I think he opened a very important political but also philosophical aspect of our cooperation: what is the role of the of the legislation? And I would like to reassure the honourable Member that we in the European Commission see the primary role of the legislation as a measure and an instrument to bring more benefits than costs. We are always proposing legislative measures when they are bringing much better end results than the potential costs.

And, as we have been also reminded by several honourable Members who intervened, like Ms Ballarín Cereza or Mr Heinäluoma, I think through this modern and progressive legislation we actually built the European Union, which is socially just, which is environmentally friendly and through which we became champion in tackling climate change. I think this is what we should be absolutely proud of. Thanks to the so-called Brussels effect, we became a true global trendsetter and global standard-shaper.

And after having said all this, I also would like to reassure Mr Ferber, but also Ms Virkkunen and many other speakers, that we take the problem of administrative burden very, very seriously. If you look at our reporting and our efforts, just after one year of full operation of 'one in, one out', we brought to you the savings of more than EUR 7 billion – in one year. So I think this is really worth remarking, and I would like to underscore that this is a really important result.

Since the President of the Commission announced the very laser-focused approach to cutting the reporting obligations, and we are really working very hard on that since March, we brought indeed the measures saving additional EUR 3 billion.

I would like to underline that we achieved that not through deregulation, not through legislative moratorium, but by changing legislative culture in the Commission. We are very much focused from the first moment, when our experts start to draft the legislation, to look at the costs. What would be the reporting obligations? How can we make this more user-friendly? We are introducing at every level of assessing the legislative proposal, the competitiveness checks. What would be the SMEs impact? How can we make sure that this proposal will pass the SME test, which I know is very important for many honourable Members in this House? And, of course, we have been discussed with you on many occasions – and I saw Ms Melchior here in the room – how to make 100% sure that our legislation would be digital by default. And we would use at every possible occasion the 'once only' principle – that once you share your data with the public institutions it is there, and the entrepreneur or the common citizen should not be asked another time to provide the same information.

But in other cases, we had to legislate actually to cut the burden. Just to give you two examples, which I referred to in my introductory remarks, we would not be able to bring you these billions of savings if we did not introduce the legislative proposals for VAT in the digital age, or to change the Union custom code, which makes it much easier, which makes it digital and which makes it uniform across the EU Member States.

So what I think is very important, and I very much appreciate the focus of this afternoon's debate, is that we need to see the cutting of the red tape as a joint task. I am very obliged to Mr Repasi, who reminded us about the waves of amendments coming to the European Parliament, but also coming to the Council, and you know that these are our ongoing discussions that, unfortunately, they are coming in such a pace that we are not able to do the impact assessment of these amendments and very often we in the Commission are surprised how our proposal is actually changed in the course of the legislative process. And we respect that it is your right, we should do that, but we should also – and that is our ongoing plea – once we propose significant amendments, the European Parliament, the Council, should also be able to provide with the impact assessment what it means in the end for the outcome and final legislation.

And on the last point, if we allow, because it was repeated several times in the discussion, it is also very important to work very closely with other Member States. And I think Ms Hahn presented very good examples of how very often even the very good legislation from the Member States is either not properly implemented or so much gold plated that it really increases the administrative burden.

So I very much appreciate that we have also the Presidency with us, because it is indeed a common task: European Parliament, Council, Commission, and the implementation on the regional and national level would be very important.

The last point, Madam President, a very concrete point, which we are, of course, happy to provide more detailed information to Mr Ferber and Mr Hoogeveen on the corporate sustainable reporting directive. We have been doing our utmost and we wanted to have the best possible advice, so we have been working with the European Financial Advisory Board to help us to streamline the European sustainable standards. So this is done. We are, of course, measuring the impact and we will be coming back to you with a proper reporting on how this falls and how this is reported under the 'one in, one out' rule. Next year, we will be presenting the next annual burden survey.

So once again, Madam President, thank you very much for this debate, and thank you very much for creating this opportunity to underline that this is our common task, and we, from the European Commission, will take it and are taking it very, very seriously.

Ángeles Moreno Bau, *presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señora presidenta, señorías, señor comisario, la mayoría de los esfuerzos de estos últimos meses se han centrado en políticas destinadas a lograr los objetivos de Europa sacando provecho de la creatividad y la energía del sector privado.

Al final, serán nuestras empresas, nuestras investigadoras y nuestros investigadores, y nuestras ciudadanas y nuestros ciudadanos quienes hagan posibles las transiciones ecológica y digital, al tiempo que garantizan la autonomía estratégica europea y la resiliencia de nuestras cadenas de suministro. Con este fin, debemos asegurarnos de que todas nuestras acciones están encaminadas a fomentar el espíritu empresarial y la competitividad con los incentivos y las medidas adecuadas.

Hoy, aquí, nos hemos centrado en tratar nuestro objetivo común de reducir la carga administrativa de las empresas y ha quedado claro que, como colegisladores, debemos contribuir a garantizar que los nuevos actos legislativos tengan el equilibrio adecuado entre los requisitos de información y la necesidad de reducir la burocracia.

Las propuestas de la Comisión en este sentido son, como he dicho al principio, un buen punto de partida. Ahora les toca al Consejo y al Parlamento demostrar que estarán a la altura del desafío en términos de velocidad y ambición. No debemos olvidar que aquello que decidamos en los próximos meses repercutirá directamente en el entorno empresarial. Debemos responder adecuadamente a las expectativas y demandas de nuestra ciudadanía que quiere que la administración pública sea eficiente y la apoye.

President. – The debate is closed.

12. Zagrożenie dla praworządności w następstwie umowy rządowej w Hiszpanii (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on the threat to the rule of law as a consequence of the governmental agreement in Spain (2023/2992(RSP)).

Before I give the floor to the Secretary of State for Foreign and Global Affairs, I would like to remind all Members participating in the debate – I think we are all expecting a quite lively debate – to respect the standards of conduct. You have all signed the code of conduct, and I really would like to remind you to respect the speaking time and the dignity and the reputation of the European Parliament.

Ángeles Moreno Bau, *presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, permítanme subrayar —de entrada— que el Estado de Derecho está en el centro de nuestra acción política, ya que nuestra Unión no es simplemente un mercado único, sino una comunidad de valores.

Estos valores están amenazados en un entorno geopolítico que parece cada día más hostil. Nuestra Unión solo podrá prosperar si todos nosotros —los Estados miembros e instituciones de la Unión Europea— permanecemos unidos en la protección y el fortalecimiento de estos valores.

Conviene recordar desde el principio que intervengo hoy aquí en calidad de Presidencia del Consejo de la Unión. Cuento con su comprensión para las limitaciones de mi intervención, en particular en un debate sobre la política interior española. Sí creo que es conveniente subrayar que apenas hay precedentes de organizar un debate en esta institución sobre una ley nacional que no ha sido aprobada en el Parlamento de un Estado miembro.

En el pasado, España ha aprobado leyes de amnistía. Asimismo, otros Estados miembros han aprobado leyes similares sin que se suscite un debate en este Pleno. Por otra parte, esta es inequívocamente una cuestión constitucional interna española que debe debatirse en el Parlamento español. Toda vez, además, que el texto de la proposición ya salvaguarda expresamente las normas y los valores europeos.

Si el Parlamento español decide aprobar esta ley, estará sometida al control del Tribunal Constitucional de España, cuyos miembros han sido designados de acuerdo con preceptos constitucionales que se llevan aplicando varias décadas. Y, en ese caso, la ley será ejecutada por los jueces competentes. Un debate en profundidad sobre un texto no aprobado y de competencia exclusivamente nacional no contribuye a mejorar la democracia europea. Todo lo contrario, muestra tendencias preocupantes.

Centrar los debates en cuestiones nacionales perjudica el debate sobre las políticas, valores e intereses europeos, algo contrario a la naturaleza y los objetivos de las instituciones comunitarias. La equiparación de una iniciativa perfectamente habitual en los Estados miembros —como es la amnistía— con otros procedimientos que sí resultaban claramente excepcionales desde el punto de vista del Estado de Derecho induce a confusión.

Emplear para la batalla partidista un consenso amplio como es la defensa del Estado de Derecho en la Unión Europea — con procedimientos sólidos y mayorías casi unánimes— puede acabar perjudicando las iniciativas en defensa de estos valores.

Por lo tanto, en interés de los valores europeos y de la defensa compartida del Estado de Derecho, creemos necesario dar a cada debate una dimensión adecuada.

Permítanme continuar con nuestra actuación en el Consejo en el ámbito del Estado de Derecho como Presidencia del Consejo, que ha sido una prioridad a lo largo del semestre de la Presidencia española en cada reunión del Consejo de Asuntos Generales desde el pasado mes de julio —pues figuraba en el orden del día al menos un punto relacionado con el Estado de Derecho—.

Se celebraron dos sesiones del diálogo del Consejo sobre el Estado de Derecho basadas en el informe de la Comisión sobre el tema. En septiembre, un debate horizontal permitió a los ministros abarcar las amplias tendencias de la Unión. Y, en octubre, un debate específico por países se centró en la situación de Dinamarca, Alemania, Estonia, Irlanda y Grecia. Además, hemos dedicado una energía considerable a la evaluación del propio diálogo cuatro años después de la última revisión en 2019.

Nuestro objetivo es ahora consagrar en las conclusiones del Consejo el actual enfoque reforzado del diálogo de este sobre el Estado de Derecho —que solo puedo valorar como una experiencia verdaderamente positiva—.

Al mismo tiempo, hemos reafirmado el compromiso del Consejo de llevar adelante los procedimientos en virtud del artículo 7, apartado 1, del Tratado de la Unión Europea en curso. Estos se debatieron la semana pasada en el Consejo de Asuntos Generales. Ello ha permitido al Consejo recibir de la Comisión una imagen precisa y actualizada de la situación sobre el terreno en los países sometidos a los procedimientos de dicho artículo, especialmente en lo que se refiere a las recientes reformas legislativas y a la evolución política.

Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, quisiera también aprovechar esta oportunidad para afirmar aquí que, como Estado miembro, España ha estado siempre plenamente comprometida con los elementos centrales del Estado de Derecho en nuestra Unión, muy especialmente con la separación de poderes y la independencia del Poder Judicial. Los sucesivos gobiernos españoles han apoyado incondicionalmente la participación reforzada de la Unión en los asuntos relacionados con el Estado de Derecho.

Nuestra cooperación y nuestro diálogo con la Comisión en este ámbito son sin reservas. Esto incluye, desde 2020, la elaboración del informe anual sobre el Estado de Derecho que nos proporciona a todos una instantánea detallada de la situación en esta materia en toda la Unión y en cada Estado miembro.

Nos tomamos muy en serio las recomendaciones y las preocupaciones expresadas por la Comisión en su informe sobre el Estado de Derecho 2023 y estamos trabajando activamente para abordarlas.

El próximo semestre, España será uno de los Estados miembros que participará por segunda vez desde 2020 en el debate específico por países en el marco del diálogo del Consejo sobre el Estado de Derecho. Como siempre, lo esperamos con interés y participaremos de forma constructiva y con una mentalidad abierta. Acogemos con satisfacción esta oportunidad de revisar y debatir en profundidad los principales elementos del Estado de Derecho en España.

Didier Reynders, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, madame la secrétaire d'État, mesdames et messieurs les députés, je suis devant vous aujourd'hui pour un débat sur la situation de l'état de droit en Espagne, et nous devons, vous le savez, plus que jamais protéger la démocratie et l'état de droit dans l'ensemble de l'Union européenne. La Commission a intensifié ses efforts à cet égard et le rapport annuel sur l'état de droit joue, comme vous le savez, un rôle central dans ce domaine.

En juillet, la Commission a publié la quatrième édition du rapport, qui comprend une évaluation des recommandations spécifiques adressées à tous les États membres. Nous l'avions fait pour la première fois – émettre des recommandations – en 2022, nous avons donc réalisé une évaluation de leur mise en œuvre dans le rapport de 2023.

Je souhaiterais développer nos recommandations relatives à l'état de droit en Espagne et aborder aussi quelques développements récents.

In relation to the Spanish justice system the 2023 Rule of Law Report highlights that the situation of the Council for the Judiciary raises serious concerns as, firstly, the council has not been renewed in spite of the urgency and secondly, no steps have been taken to adapt the appointment procedure for its judge members. Moreover, the lack of renewal is having an impact on the work of the Supreme Court and the justice system as a whole, raising concerns in relation to the number of cases adjudicated by the Supreme Court and its length of proceedings. We continue to call on all parties involved to take the actions necessary for the successful implementation of the recommendation made in 2022 and in the 2023 report.

The Commission also noted that concerns remain because the term of office of the prosecutor general and of the government coincide. The Commission has reiterated its recommendation to strengthen the statute of the prosecutor general, in particular with respect to avoiding such coincidence of the terms of office. The report also referred to the incompatibilities regime for judges with other professions, such as political appointments. In particular, the lack of cooling-off periods for judges or prosecutors having been members of the executive or legislative powers continues to raise concerns. The same is true for the fact that judges continue to acquire seniority in service while they are in political office.

As regards the quality of the Spanish justice system, the report acknowledges progress in several areas. This includes the legal aid framework, an increase of the total number of judges, progress in digitalisation, and the tabling of a draft law on the right of defence. The report also acknowledges that most indicators of the efficiency of justice have improved. This includes the disposition time in civil, commercial and administrative cases in first instance and the clearance rate for civil and commercial cases. The length of proceedings in the Supreme Court remains, however, a challenge.

As regards the anti-corruption framework, the report underlines that a reform on criminal procedure to address the length of investigations and prosecutions, and a draft law on lobbying are pending. The report also mentions that the reform of corruption-related offences introduced the offence of illicit enrichment and revised the offence of misappropriation, including by lowering penalties in some instances, which was criticised by stakeholders. Rules on conflict of interests of top executive officials are not sufficiently implemented. In this context, the Commission recommends Spain to strengthen the rules on conflict of interest and asset declarations of persons with top executive functions by reinforcing the sanctioning power of the Office for Conflicts of Interest.

As regards media freedom and pluralism, Spain fully implemented the recommendation made in 2022 on ensuring adequate resources for the National Audiovisual Media Regulatory Authority. Work is also ongoing to strengthen access to information. In this context, the Commission continues encouraging Spain to continue the work on the revision of the Law on Official Secrets in order to make access to official information easier for journalists and citizens at large. The report also reflects that the chair of the Management Board of the Public Service Media exercises her functions ad interim since September 2022, and thus so with executive powers further to the modification of the public service media statute.

When it comes to checks and balances, concerns have been raised regarding certain procedural practices in Parliament, including the excessive use of emergency procedures. These practices bypass the requirements for public consultation, impact assessment and consultation of the relevant state bodies and may have an adverse impact on the quality of legislation. The report also refers to the efforts that the government is undertaking, with several initiatives aimed at increasing public participation in policy-making.

Regarding civil society, the report regrets that negotiations in Parliament did not lead to a reform of the Citizen Security Law, which could have addressed concerns regarding its impact on the civic space.

Since the publication of the Rule of Law report in July, a number of developments have been taking place. The Commission is aware of the agreement signed between two political parties in the context of the investiture of the new Spanish Government following the elections of July. We are aware that this agreement provides for the approval of an amnesty law and for special committees of the Parliament. On 8 November, I sent a letter to two Spanish ministers inquiring about the draft amnesty law. In this letter, I also recall the need to prioritise the situation of the Council for the Judiciary, to which I referred previously in my intervention. I have received a reply from Minister Bolaños, in which he expressed his openness to dialogue and readiness to meet with the Commission in order to provide further explanations about the draft law. Following this exchange of letters, the Commission has been officially informed by the Spanish Government that a proposal for an amnesty law has been tabled in the Spanish Congress on 13 November 2023.

Over the last two weeks, the Commission has been receiving complaints and letters by a large number of citizens and stakeholders. They expressed concerns on whether the draft law and the special committees of the Parliament comply with the fundamental values of the European Union, as laid down in Article 2 of the Treaty on the European Union, and in particular, the rule of law and the separation of powers, as well as with the relevant provisions of EU criminal law, including on terrorism, corruption and the protection of the financial interests of the Union. Also, many Members in this House have written to the Commission and made use of their right to ask parliamentary questions.

The Commission maintains its long-standing position on the issue of Catalonia. This is and remains an internal matter for Spain, which has to be dealt with in line with its constitutional order. As regards the draft amnesty law, the Commission, as guardian of the Treaties, is currently analysing the draft and remains in contact with the Spanish authorities. The Commission will carry out that analysis very carefully, independently and objectively to determine its compliance with EU law, including the fundamental values enshrined in the Treaty.

I can assure you that the Commission will remain seized of this matter and will continue following these developments, also, of course, in the context of the preparation of our 2024 Rule of Law Report. The rule of law is what binds us together.

Of course, I thank you first for your attention, but I will take with much attention all the remarks that will be possible to listen this afternoon in this House. I am looking forward to listening to your interventions and, of course, maybe to try to react at the end of the debate.

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, Mr Secretary, dear colleagues, I start with a quote: ‘The General Council of the Judiciary expresses its intense concern and desolation at the degradation, if not abolition, of the rule of law in Spain’. The General Council of the Judiciary a few days ago published this. Civil society in Spain is asking for mass demonstrations, hundreds of thousands are participating. The pictures on Sunday were very impressive.

And first of all, I have to say that here in this House, Socialists, Greens and The Left were not even ready to allow a debate, a simple debate about what’s happening in Spain in this moment of time. I have to say, the Socialists and the Left lost all credibility to defend the rule of law on the European level with such behaviour. The Left is silent in this House, but Europe is not. That’s why I add another quote of a socialist, of Felipe González – a socialist, a statesman who brought Spain into Europe. I quote: ‘This amnesty destroys society. It is not part of the Constitution. It can put an end to the Constitution’.

This is not a party issue. It’s about the rule of law. When corruption, violence and even terrorism goes unpunished, it breaks the rule of law. When people in Spain are no longer equal before the law, it breaks the rule of law. When misuse of public funds are not sanctions anymore, it breaks the rule of law. When people who are on the payroll of Vladimir Putin and do not respect the Constitution of Spain have the Spanish Government in their hand, it breaks the rule of law. And when there is a coalition text signed by the party leader, Sánchez, asking for a special committee of the parliament to check judgments of independent courts, then it’s fundamentally breaking the rule of law, dear friends.

Commissioner Reynders, the people in Spain are expecting a Europe that protects the rule of law. You have to give an answer to all the European flags among the demonstrators in Madrid. Sánchez is elected – no doubt about this. He will come to Strasbourg in December. He is Prime Minister. We respect the majority voted for him.

But the problem is you cannot promise not to do an amnesty until three days before the elections, and then you do it. You cannot be in power for five years saying to the people that an amnesty is not constitutional, and then you do it. That’s not acceptable. And as a Bavarian, let me also say that we have nowhere else in Europe with so many regional rights than in Catalonia, not even in Bavaria or in South Tyrol. So please stop separatism. We need more unity in Spain and we need more unity in Europe, dear friends.

There was an alternative, and that was the alternative showed by Alberto Núñez Feijóo. Whereas Alberto tried to negotiate with Sánchez until the end to keep Spain in the centre, to form a government of national unity, Sánchez chose the votes of separatists. Whereas Alberto wants to bring the country together, Sánchez prioritised his personal egoism, chose to split Spain, stays from now on in the hand of extremists and risks a new referendum in Catalonia.

Colleagues, the Spanish people have a Spanish and a European flag in their hand. Why? Because they believe that Europe is for freedom, democracy and the rule of law, and the EPP will never give up on defending these principles. Pavel defeated Babiš in the Czech Republic. Tusk defeated Kaczyński in Poland. In Portugal, our friends will defeat the corrupt socialist government and Luís Montenegro will become Prime Minister.

And in Spain, Feijóo will finally defeat Sánchez. Sooner or later, Feijóo will be the next Prime Minister of Spain, whether you like it or not. History is on his side. The rule of law always wins at the end. And while Sánchez will go down in history as the man who broke the rule of law, Feijóo will be remembered as a Prime Minister who stood for the future of Spain and saved the rule of law in Spain.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, por respeto a esta Cámara, al Parlamento Europeo, y por respeto a España, a nuestro país, apelo a quienes van a intervenir en este debate a hacerlo con serenidad, con responsabilidad y, sobre todo, con la verdad.

¿Quieren ustedes debatir sobre las amenazas en España a nuestro Estado de Derecho? Pues yo les voy a decir cuáles son las grandes amenazas a nuestra democracia: no asumir los resultados electorales del pasado 23 de julio y la mayoría absoluta parlamentaria que apoya al nuevo Gobierno es una grave amenaza para nuestra democracia. ¿Cómo puede el Partido Popular afirmar que la Constitución Española está en peligro, cuando viola constantemente desde hace cinco años, con su bloqueo, la renovación del Consejo General del Poder Judicial —al que se ha referido el señor Weber— caducado desde hace cinco años? ¿Cómo puede vanagloriarse el Partido Popular de defender el Estado de Derecho en España, cuando el Gobierno de Mariano Rajoy utilizó a la Policía Nacional para destruir pruebas de corrupción de su propio partido y crear la mal llamada «Policía Patriótica» para espiar ilegalmente a sus adversarios políticos? ¿Cómo puede jactarse el Partido Popular de ser el garante de la unidad de España, cuando durante el Gobierno de Mariano Rajoy tuvo lugar la mayor crisis territorial de la historia de la democracia de España, con dos referéndums y una declaración unilateral de independencia? ¿Cómo puede defender el Partido Popular la democracia en España, cuando hoy prenden la mecha los movimientos ultras y no condenan la violencia contra las sedes del Partido Socialista, las amenazas a militantes socialistas y los ataques a periodistas?

Señorías, ante la mayor crisis territorial de la democracia española solo hay dos caminos: el fracasado de la imposición y la amenaza o el camino del diálogo, el entendimiento y la reconciliación.

Señor Weber, mentir no está bien. Y usted ha mentido. Usted hizo unas declaraciones a un medio español el pasado fin de semana donde dice: «Amnistía a delitos de terrorismo no se ha visto en Europa. La Unión Europea tiene que actuar ya». Le leo literalmente el artículo 2, letra c), de la Ley de Amnistía: «Quedan excluidos de la aplicación de la amnistía prevista en el artículo 1 los actos tipificados como delitos de terrorismo castigados en el Código Penal». A partir de ahora, cualquier afirmación en este sentido estará demostrando que mienten sin pudor.

Señorías del PP, no hay mayor ataque al Estado de Derecho que su alianza con la extrema derecha. Siempre que ustedes bendicen a la extrema derecha para gobernar atacan al Poder Judicial, a la prensa, a las mujeres y al colectivo LGTBI. Su abrazo a la extrema derecha representa el fracaso de un proyecto de involución. Mientras que en España el Gobierno de Pedro Sánchez cuenta con el apoyo de ocho de las once fuerzas parlamentarias, ustedes están cada día más aislados porque no son capaces de ver que su mimetismo con la extrema derecha los está devorando.

Señorías, hoy la historia de España es una historia de éxito y el principal problema del Partido Popular y de Vox es que son incapaces de entender España. Son incapaces de entender que la grandeza de España reside en su diversidad y en su pluralidad.

Pero no hay marcha atrás. Somos la socialdemocracia. Somos el Partido Socialista Obrero Español: el que contribuyó a recuperar las libertades después de cuatro décadas de dictadura franquista, el partido que puso en pie el Estado del bienestar, el partido que puso fin al terrorismo de ETA y, ahora, vamos a ser el partido que recupere la convivencia entre catalanes y entre catalanes y el resto de españoles.

Señor Weber, ha hecho usted algunas citas. Frente a los ataques contra la libertad y los mensajes de odio, le recomiendo que lea, junto al señor Feijóo, a Antonio Machado: «Al andar se hace camino, y al volver la vista atrás se ve la senda que nunca se ha de volver a pisar».

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājs vietnieks

Adrián Vázquez Lázara, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, hoy debatimos sobre el Estado de Derecho en España, mi país. Ojalá este debate nunca hubiese tenido lugar, pero los últimos acontecimientos no nos dejan más opción que denunciarlos aquí, en la sede de la soberanía europea, donde nuestros valores se representan y se defienden cuando son atacados, le pese a quien le pese, señora García. Hoy, donde antes hemos dicho Polonia y Hungría, decimos España, y eso os debería avergonzar a muchos de los que estáis aquí.

Esta semana se ha formado el nuevo Gobierno del señor Sánchez, un Gobierno legítimo pero cimentado en un acuerdo político que da inicio a la voladura de nuestro Estado de Derecho. Para aferrarse al poder, el señor Sánchez no solo entrega el Gobierno a un fugado de la Justicia —a quien hasta la diputada Iratxe García llamaba prófugo hasta hace escasas semanas—, sino que lo hace a cambio de una ley de amnistía a medida, redactada por aquellos que van a beneficiarse de ella: políticos que dejan de ser iguales al resto de los ciudadanos para convertirse en una casta intocable, y nos están viendo desde allí arriba.

Delitos de prevaricación y corrupción... impedir que se sigan investigando delitos de terrorismo... sí, señora García, impedir que se sigan investigando delitos de terrorismo y también constituir las comisiones parlamentarias del *lawfare* para intervenir el poder judicial desde la puerta de atrás.

Y esto no solo lo digo yo, lo dicen millones de españoles que han salido a las calles en las últimas semanas. Y también lo dicen el Consejo General del Poder Judicial, todas las asociaciones de jueces, colegios de abogados, colegios de fiscales, académicos: la sociedad civil en general.

Y ahora me dirijo a vosotros, eurodiputados socialistas, que sois compañeros en esta Cámara. Compañeros con los que hemos defendido el Estado de Derecho en Hungría, en Polonia, juntos. ¿Qué pasa, ahora es diferente? ¿Qué ha cambiado? ¿Tan distintos somos ahora para no defender lo que pensábamos correcto hace doce semanas? Hacedlo. Alzad la voz. No frivoliceis con este tema porque ya sabemos cómo acaba. Lo estamos viendo en dos países de la Unión. Usad vuestra influencia. Y os aviso, la historia se escribe en días como los de hoy. Pensáoslo bien: si esto lo hace uno que dice ser de los vuestros, es que, tal vez, ya no es tanto de los vuestros.

En cuanto a la Comisión Europea, confiamos en vuestra valentía. Sabemos que será un camino largo y quedan muchas batallas por librar, pero, señor Reynders, no se fíe. Ya sabe usted cómo se las gasta el señor Bolaños, que ahora es el superministro que lo concentra todo: ejecutivo, legislativo y judicial. Pero sé que la Comisión —y ya termino, presidente— hará lo más difícil, que no es otra cosa que lo correcto.

Jordi Solé, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, ahora resulta que los grupos de la derecha y de la extrema derecha están preocupados por el Estado de Derecho en el Estado español. Ahora.

¿Y dónde estaban sus preocupaciones cuando hace seis años nos apalearon a los catalanes por votar en un referéndum? Lo aplaudieron con las orejas. ¿Dónde estaban cuando los jueces retorcieron hasta el extremo el Código Penal para imponer de manera aberrante largas penas de cárcel a nueve demócratas? Lo celebraron como si hubieran ganado otro Mundial. ¿Dónde estaban cuando nos metieron Pegasus en el móvil para espiarnos? Claro, la razón de Estado es una alfombra que lo cubre todo.

¿Dónde estaban cuando la «operación Cataluña» intentó —con medios ilegítimos e ilegales— desacreditar al independentismo? Efectivamente, todo por la patria: incluso las cloacas.

Señores y señoras del PP, ¿dónde estaba su preocupación por el Estado de Derecho cuando a uno de los suyos se le escapó en sede parlamentaria que controlarían desde detrás la Sala Segunda del Tribunal Supremo? Silencio ensordecedor. Quizás esto no se lo han contado, señor Weber.

Pero ahora sí, ahora se preocupan porque vamos a sacar adelante una ley de amnistía que es tan necesaria como justa: un paso hacia adelante para devolver a la política lo que nunca debería haber salido de allí y avanzar en la resolución democrática de un conflicto que es político.

Señor Reynders, yo creo que puede estar tranquilo. A pesar del pulso de la derecha política, judicial y mediática contra la amnistía, se demostrará que ni va en contra de la Constitución española ni en contra de los valores fundamentales de la Unión Europea. Al contrario, intenta reparar un fallo democrático, el fallo que ha significado la represión policial, judicial y económica contra un movimiento democrático, legítimo y muy vivo —mal que les pese a algunos— como es el independentismo catalán.

Sin embargo, sí que hay una cosa que le debe preocupar: que en las manifestaciones de estos días se haya exhibido simbología nazi y se hayan hecho proclamas fascistas e insultos machistas y racistas. Eso sí que nos debe preocupar a todos.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, egocéntrico, narcisista, manipulador, mentiroso, sin empatía ni remordimientos y con una patológica necesidad de poder y control. Este es Pedro Sánchez.

Pedro Sánchez, que durante años ha defendido en España que la Ley de Amnistía sería inconstitucional, ha decidido — para mantenerse en el poder y conseguir el voto de siete diputados separatistas— aprobar una ley inconstitucional de amnistía que constituye un golpe a la separación de poderes y, por ello, al Estado de Derecho.

Sedición, malversación, desórdenes públicos, atentado, fraude fiscal, blanqueo de capitales, desobediencia, lesiones y terrorismo son solo algunos de los delitos cometidos por los separatistas que no van a poder ser juzgados. Asaltaron con violencia nuestra democracia, nuestra convivencia y nuestra libertad.

De conformidad con el artículo 2 del Tratado, la Unión se fundamenta en el Estado de Derecho, pues el Estado de Derecho existe cuando las leyes son normas generales iguales para todos, permanentes y justas, y hay separación de poderes.

Una ley de amnistía tiene el efecto devastador de privar a los jueces de la función constitucional de juzgar y hacer ejecutar lo juzgado. El Consejo General del Poder Judicial, el Tribunal Supremo, los fiscales, altos funcionarios, catedráticos, profesores de universidad en España, de forma unánime hablan y denuncian el golpe al Estado de Derecho.

Las leyes de amnistía solo son admisibles si la Constitución las prevé expresamente —Portugal, Italia, alguna nación europea—. Porque es la Constitución la que establece la distribución del poder entre los poderes del Estado.

Al contrario, nuestra Constitución prohíbe expresamente los indultos generales. Por ello, la amnistía es un acto arbitrario, antidemocrático, es un golpe de Estado. Tanto, que Sánchez ha llegado a cambiar al letrado mayor del Congreso para que le haga un informe *ad hoc* a demanda. Stalin estaría orgulloso de Sánchez. Nosotros le despreciamos.

Los españoles han salido masivamente a manifestarse en la calle en un movimiento democrático sin precedentes. Miles de españoles todas las noches exigen cada día ley y justicia a las puertas de la sede del Partido Socialista en la calle Ferraz. Ferraz es ya un símbolo de la resistencia pacífica, democrática y ciudadana en todo el mundo.

La prensa internacional se hace eco de la desproporcionada violencia que el Gobierno de Sánchez ordena contra los jóvenes que reclaman ley y justicia.

Millones de españoles exigen, comisario, una respuesta concreta, precisa y decisiva en defensa de la Constitución y el Estado de Derecho, pues ven cómo España transita el amargo camino de la tiranía ante el silencio de Bruselas.

Ningún europeo decente entendería que la Comisión aplicase un doble rasero en comparación a su reiterada homilía con los Gobiernos conservadores de Polonia y Hungría, máxime cuando la situación en España es extremadamente más grave.

Sánchez ha convertido España en un espacio de impunidad, donde el delincuente recibe recompensa y la víctima humillación.

Ustedes han despertado a España. España ha despertado. La juventud está en la calle exigiendo libertad y democracia, como en sus mejores tiempos. A todos los españoles: movilización permanente y Noviembre Nacional.

Jean-Paul Garraud, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, ce n'est pas dans nos habitudes de nous immiscer dans les affaires internes d'un autre État. Mais comme tout principe comporte des exceptions, le risque plausible d'une dislocation du territoire national espagnol retient évidemment toute notre attention. En difficulté pour obtenir une majorité au Parlement espagnol, le Premier ministre a préféré des alliances contre nature afin de conserver son poste et son gouvernement. Triste réalité d'un reniement qui est en voie de très mal tourner. La promesse d'une loi d'amnistie pour les séparatistes catalans a mis le feu aux poudres car elle contient de nombreuses dispositions favorables à une véritable sécession et elle contreviendrait également à une notion souvent mise en avant ici: celle de l'état de droit.

En effet, la Commission, toujours prompte à clouer au pilori la Hongrie et la Pologne pour non-respect de cet état de droit, est encore silencieuse lorsqu'un gouvernement socialiste s'apprête à contourner le pouvoir judiciaire par pur intérêt politique. Ces manœuvres du Premier ministre espagnol ont provoqué des manifestations de grande ampleur qui occupent l'espace public depuis des semaines. Un véritable mouvement de fond existe dans la population. Par cette colère légitime et salutaire, le peuple espagnol exprime son attachement à son pays et à son identité nationale.

Les différentes cultures locales et régionales, en Espagne comme en France, peuvent coexister sereinement dans le cadre national. Il faut donc défendre nos nations et leur intégrité et gagner le combat face aux déconstructeurs en tous genres, dont certains siègent d'ailleurs au sein même des institutions européennes. Dans l'intérêt de l'Espagne et de son unité, il faut espérer que si cette loi a été votée, le Tribunal constitutionnel garde la tête froide en invalidant le texte et que le roi tienne bon face aux pressions des socialistes et des séparatistes.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señor presidente, tercera entrega de la parodia que lleva representando el Partido Popular en esta Cámara desde el principio de la legislatura. Lleva por título: «España se rompe y el Gobierno es ilegítimo, salvo que sea el mío». Sonroja, avergüenza y apena, pero ya no sorprende.

Señorías del Partido Popular, retengan esta idea: España sería Polonia si ustedes gobernarán, pero no gobiernan. Controlen sus frustraciones y aprendan a perder.

La amnistía es un mecanismo extraordinario, pero no es ajeno a nuestra tradición jurídica. Está plenamente normalizada en Europa y avalada por sus tribunales, y en España se utiliza desde hace más de un siglo. Se adapta a nuestro sistema constitucional y en nuestra democracia se inició con la amnistía de 1977, refrendada por los tribunales. Claro que a ustedes no les gustó la Constitución, ni tampoco esa amnistía. Les gustan más las amnistías fiscales o los indultos masivos sin control parlamentario. Recuerden que, en un solo Consejo de Ministros, el señor Aznar indultó a 1 400 personas, más de las que podría amnistiar ahora una ley que exigiría amplísimas mayorías. Por cierto, han indultado ustedes delitos abyectos.

Esta ley española es un instrumento para desandar un camino que nunca se debió transitar, necesario para garantizar la convivencia. No ataca al Estado de Derecho, sino que lo garantiza frente a quienes lo banalizan y creen que pueden usar a los jueces a su antojo. Han conseguido que el Consejo General del Poder Judicial ya no sea digno de su nombre.

A nosotros nos interesa el diálogo y lo que les interesa a ustedes ya lo hemos visto en estos días: las algaradas, el odio y la polarización.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señor presidente, señor Weber, la Ley de Amnistía, cuando esté publicada, anulará, entre otras, las sentencias que dictaron los jueces del Tribunal Supremo español contra mis colegas del Gobierno catalán sobre los hechos del 1 de octubre. Les cayeron entre nueve y trece años de cárcel. Los jueces de su país, los jueces de Schleswig-Holstein, juzgaron estos mismos hechos. ¿Y usted sabe que dijeron? Dijeron que no era rebelión. Dijeron que no era sedición. Dijeron que no eran ni siquiera desórdenes públicos. Dijeron que era un ejercicio de derechos fundamentales.

¿Quién tenía razón, señor Weber? ¿Los jueces alemanes o los jueces españoles? ¿Quién tenía razón? ¿Los jueces que consideran que la unidad de la patria está por encima de los derechos fundamentales o los que entienden que los derechos fundamentales son precisamente la finalidad superior de un verdadero Estado de Derecho? ¿Quién tenía razón, señor Weber?

La ley de Amnistía no es un ataque al Estado de Derecho. El ataque al Estado de Derecho fue el abuso del Derecho penal que hicieron los jueces del Tribunal Supremo. Lo que es una amenaza para el Estado de Derecho es la deriva trumpista que está haciendo el PP de la mano de Vox. Y lo que es una amenaza para el Estado de Derecho es que usted, señor Weber, les esté acompañando en este viaje... *(el presidente retira la palabra al orador)*

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señor presidente, escucha, Europa, la voz de una mujer catalana y española, que asiste atónita al desmantelamiento de la democracia en España por el pacto entre Sánchez y un prófugo de la justicia. Sánchez, para conseguir los siete votos que le permitan gobernar, y Puigdemont, para lograr la amnistía de un golpe a la democracia y de gravísimos delitos de corrupción y terrorismo.

Escucha, Europa, el grito de millones de españoles que dicen «no» a una amnistía que acaba con la igualdad ante la ley, la independencia judicial y la separación de poderes. Una amnistía que crea ciudadanos de primera y de segunda.

Escucha, Europa, al expresidente socialista Felipe González decir «no y no» a la amnistía de Sánchez.

Escucha, Europa, esto que dijo Pedro Sánchez: «Traeré de vuelta a Puigdemont a España para ser juzgado». Solo su falta de escrúpulos y su oportunismo político son mayores que sus engaños.

Escucha, Europa, el latido de nuestras leyes, de nuestra Constitución y de nuestro Estado de Derecho, que asisten impotentes al deterioro de nuestra democracia.

Escucha, Europa, el fin de los contrapesos y el lamento de las instituciones españolas, todas sometidas al control del Gobierno.

Escucha, Europa, la denuncia de todos los jueces españoles contra un pacto de *lawfare*, que convierte a los jueces en delincuentes y a los delincuentes en jueces.

Escucha, Europa, la vergüenza de España que tiene el único Gobierno europeo sostenido por comunistas, independentistas y exterroristas. Estos son los socios de Sánchez. Este es el Gobierno de España.

Escucha, Europa, a los padres fundadores. No permitas que Sánchez convierta en España el sueño europeo en una pesadilla populista.

Escucha, Europa, el clamor de las calles y plazas de España. Una nación que defiende con orgullo su libertad y democracia porque hoy están siendo duramente hostigadas y atacadas. La amnistía de Sánchez es la condena de Europa.

Escucha, Europa. Actúa, Europa. ¡Viva la democracia! ¡Viva la libertad! ¡Viva España! ¡Viva Europa!

René Repasi (S&D). – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, dear colleagues, it is emotionally understandable that the right side of the house is frustrated after the Spanish elections. Yet it is rather surprising that the Commission gets involved in an internal legislative process even before a draft law is adopted. The Commission should, at least in my understanding, stand beyond party politics.

But more importantly, the amnesty law has nothing to do with EU law. Amnesties are a common instrument in Europe in order to overcome difficult political situations, where you arrive at a point of 'tourner la page'. Whether or not they are used is a highly political and sensitive matter, closely linked to the national specificities, something that politically is hard to judge by outsiders in the European Union, including Germans, such as me.

Yet EU law can also limit the consequences of such amnesty, admittedly, namely in two cases that the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights violated or the directive on the fight against fraud of Union financial interests. So, let's have a look at this law that was sent to the Spanish Parliament on 13 November. The Charter is interested that core crimes are not undermined, and these are the crimes related to torture or inhumane treatment. The amnesty law does not apply to these cases. There is the just mentioned directive on the Union financial interests, Article 2 of this law. The amnesty law does not apply to offences against financial interests of the European Union.

Colleagues, the Spanish Government did in this law everything to accommodate the requests of European Union law, and the Commission will not come to a different conclusion. What remains is a political question – whether the amnesty is a way to find out the situation in Spain or not. And that is what is to be debated. But it is for the Spanish Parliament to debate this and not the European one.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señor presidente, la Ley de Amnistía, que se tramita con plenas garantías, la aplicarán los jueces. Pretenden ignorarlo quienes no aceptan el resultado electoral ni la mayoría absoluta que apoya esta proposición, ni confían en el Tribunal Constitucional que la revisará. Se colocan así fuera del sistema.

El 3 de octubre del año 2017, este Parlamento subrayó —criticando una actuación policial en Cataluña cubierta por esta amnistía— que las cuestiones políticas se resuelven políticamente, no a porrazos. El Grupo de Trabajo sobre la Detención Arbitraria de la ONU o Amnistía Internacional subrayan que la persecución penal —hasta de actos parlamentarios— con que se reprimió al independentismo tiene muy discutibles fundamentos jurídicos, mucho peores que los de esta propuesta.

Mi partido, EAJ-PNV, europeístas, desde siempre, apoya la amnistía porque propicia la negociación y el acuerdo, porque propone soluciones desde nuestro lema «Unida en la diversidad». Es la alternativa a su «A por ellos», una receta antidemocrática, fracasada y tan antigua que alimenta los vivos a Franco que se corean en las protestas contra esta iniciativa de paz y de palabra.

Diana Riba i Giner (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, las amnistías no son una anomalía. Varios Estados miembros las contemplan en sus constituciones y, en las últimas décadas, se han aprobado hasta cincuenta en la Unión Europea. Este es precisamente el caso del Estado español con la amnistía de 1977. Es más, posteriormente se han hecho hasta tres amnistías, pero como aquellas eran fiscales no les causaron tanto malestar. Supongo que para algunos de ustedes es más provechoso amnistiar a corruptos antes que a demócratas condenados por poner urnas.

Señorías del PP, habrá Ley de Amnistía porque hay una mayoría parlamentaria que la apoya. Esto les frustra, pero la realidad es que ustedes fracasaron a la hora de formar Gobierno porque no convencen, viven del conflicto y cada vez es más difícil diferenciarlos de la extrema derecha. Y hay que reconocer que verles manifestándose al lado de símbolos fascistas y nazis no ayuda, la verdad.

Verán, en esta Cámara preocupa el Estado de Derecho en España. Preocupa que el Consejo General del Poder Judicial lleve cinco años caducado, que senadores del PP alardeen que controlan las salas del Tribunal Supremo por la puerta de atrás y que jueces hagan caso omiso a la separación de poderes al manifestarse contra leyes aún por aprobar.

Sabemos que con esta amnistía no terminamos con el conflicto, pero permitirá abordar, en pie de igualdad, el fondo de la cuestión, que es, ni más ni menos, que el derecho a la autodeterminación de Cataluña.

Hermann Tertsch (ECR). – Señor presidente, la amnistía es inconstitucional, es ilegal, no tiene cabida en nuestro ordenamiento jurídico. No lo digo yo, no lo dice la ultraderecha, no. Lo dijo Pedro Sánchez. Cito textualmente otra vez: «la amnistía es ilegal, es inconstitucional, no tiene cabida en nuestro ordenamiento jurídico» (Pedro Sánchez). Su ministro Grande-Marlaska, el 4 de noviembre de 2019: «La amnistía no está reconocida por el ordenamiento jurídico español». Carmen Calvo, entonces vicepresidenta de Sánchez, el 27 de abril de 2021: «¿Planteamos la amnistía? La única respuesta posible es que no es planteable porque sería suprimir uno de los tres poderes del Estado».

Tenían razón, y prometieron jamás hacerlo hasta que perdieron unas elecciones y su mayoría ya no les llegaba con extremistas comunistas, exterroristas, golpistas y malversadores indultados la pasada legislatura. Pero tras las elecciones del 23 de julio les faltaban esos votos y los tenían que pedir a los criminales golpistas de ahí arriba, a los criminales golpistas fugados que están allí.

Y esos se los han dado en unas negociaciones secretas fuera de España, unas negociaciones para una amnistía, para seguir engañando a los españoles. Que si *lawfare* o no *lawfare*. Ahora resulta que hay unas comisiones en el Parlamento que van a controlar a los jueces y el señor Reynders no se entera, al parecer, de que hay unas comisiones que van a aterrar, a aterrorizar a los jueces. Eso es lo que está pasando en España, señores. Y eso es un golpe de Estado. Eso es precisamente un golpe de Estado, con los criminales y con los golpistas.

President. – I just would like to remind you, colleagues, when you are speaking, to think about the terminology you are using sometimes.

Manu Pineda (The Left). – Señor presidente, la amenaza para el Estado de Derecho en España no es la Ley de amnistía. En Europa se han aprobado más de cincuenta leyes de amnistía y no ha habido ningún problema. La última vez, en Portugal el pasado agosto.

El problema o la amenaza para el Estado de Derecho en España es que tenemos una derecha española que no tiene conceptos democráticos —ni están, ni se los espera—. Vivimos la transición que vivimos, la que pudimos tener, la que tuvimos bajo el paraguas de «todo atado y bien atado». Y vimos cómo un ministro franquista pasó de firmar penas de muerte a ser un demócrata de toda la vida y ser un padre de la Constitución. De esa derecha, estos lodos. Nos encontramos con que esta derecha considera que cualquier Gobierno que no suyo no es legítimo. Desde el año 1993 no hay Gobierno que no sea de derechas que sea legítimo para ellos.

Vemos cómo tienen secuestrado el Consejo General del Poder Judicial desde hace cinco años, ese al que hacía referencia al señor Weber. ¿Qué podemos esperar de eso? Estamos viendo un llamamiento golpista: esas manifestaciones de miles, miles con la mano en alto, con la bandera franquista, cantando el Cara al sol y gritando «¡Viva Franco!». Esos a los que ustedes están llamando demócratas y pacíficos, están haciendo llamamientos al golpe de Estado, a la guerra civil entre españoles. Y ustedes no son ni demócratas ni patriotas, porque vienen aquí a perjudicar al Estado español, a tildarnos de no demócratas, al igual que vinieron hace unos meses a intentar que no llegaran los fondos allí.

Señores, os recomiendo a los distintos alumnos del señor Fraga, os recomiendo... *(el presidente retira la palabra al orador)*.

President. – Please conclude now, thank you. There is no interpretation any more. Please behave according to the rules of this House.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Mr President, dear colleagues, after the 2017 events, several people were convicted by Spanish courts of serious crimes, such as sedition and the misuse of public funds. Those defending this Sánchez deal now really suggest that those crimes were never really committed. If that's the case, why didn't the socialists speak up at the time against the court rulings? Or if those crimes were committed, then the reality is that the socialists are trading laws and the Spanish constitution just to remain in power. Isn't this a textbook example of a serious violation of the rule of law?

Amnesty is for extraordinary situations. Forming a government after an election is no extraordinary event. The deafening silence here in Brussels and Strasbourg, of all the left-wing tenors of the rule of law, is incredible. Mr Aguilar, for instance. My colleague, chair of the LIBE Committee. Aren't you ashamed to try to defend the indefensible? All of this is crystal clear proof that all the talk in this House about the rule of law has absolutely no credibility. I wish strength and perseverance to the Spanish nation. *Viva Espana!*

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora secretaria de Estado, señor comisario, sobre si este es un asunto interno o no interno, les leo las palabras de Iratxe García: «Durante estas semanas he insistido en muchas ocasiones en que el Parlamento Europeo no tiene que juzgar a nadie, pero tiene que garantizar el respeto al Estado de Derecho, la separación de poderes y la justicia». Eso es lo que estamos haciendo aquí hoy: estamos cumpliendo las palabras de Iratxe García.

Quería decir a mis colegas socialistas y a los Verdes que yo creo que son demócratas y que creen en el Estado de Derecho. Díganme: ¿ustedes creen que es posible crear comisiones parlamentarias para investigar al poder judicial? ¿Creen que esto es Estado de Derecho? ¿Que esto es respeto por la separación de poderes? Esto es una violación sistemática del Estado de Derecho.

La Ley de amnistía, el nombramiento de un ministro y un asesor del Gobierno como miembros del Tribunal Constitucional, el bloqueo en el Consejo General del Poder Judicial, el cambio de la legislación relativa a la sedición y la malversación fueron violaciones del Estado de Derecho puntuales; la Ley de amnistía y el acuerdo son una violación sistemática del Estado de Derecho.

Y por eso digo que nunca aceptaré en mi vida que un Estado en el que las comisiones parlamentarias investigan al poder judicial y que dicen (*inaudible*) judicial de persecución política es una democracia. Eso es el Estado de 1984 de George Orwell (*el presidente retira la palabra al orador*).

Javi López (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, hoy las fuerzas conservadoras de esta Cámara han decidido traer aquí un debate para manchar el buen nombre de una de las democracias más consolidadas de Europa e instrumentalizar a las instituciones europeas. Y la razón es la incapacidad de asumir el resultado de las urnas en las últimas elecciones en España, el 23 de julio.

España votó y una mayoría parlamentaria ha dado continuidad a un Gobierno progresista. Y no solo eso, esa misma mayoría de representantes de la soberanía nacional ha puesto en marcha la medida de gracia más generosa de todas, que es una Ley de amnistía perfectamente constitucional —como así recoge la jurisprudencia del Tribunal Constitucional español— y que tiene un encaje jurídico total en el espacio europeo.

Ustedes saben que esa medida se recoge explícitamente en constituciones como la italiana, la francesa, la sueca y, al mismo tiempo, ¿ustedes saben que se ha puesto en marcha en cincuenta y cuatro ocasiones en Europa? Entonces, ¿por qué nunca nadie trajo esa medida aquí, diciendo que se contravenía el Estado de Derecho? ¿Por qué? En el caso de España, se pone en marcha para pasar página definitivamente a la mayor crisis constitucional que ha vivido nuestro país en cuarenta años. Por cierto, hay que añadir que se produjo durante los Gobiernos del Partido Popular. Se trata de una medida que demuestra la solidez de la democracia española y un perdón que hace más fuerte a la sociedad española.

Europa y esta casa están llenas de historias de cicatrices y sabemos, porque somos buen ejemplo de ello, que podemos pasar de la confrontación a hacer de la palabra, la voz y la convivencia nuestra forma de relacionarnos. Pero ¿por qué cuentan ustedes con la complicidad del Partido Popular Europeo en este debate? ¿Por qué? Lo cierto —y vamos a ser honestos— es porque usted, señor Weber, contaba con la pieza de España y del Gobierno de España para los juegos de poder de Europa en 2024. Esa es la realidad de lo que hay detrás. Y los españoles han dicho «no» a su estrategia, que vemos en varios Gobiernos nacionales y que querría reproducir aquí, que son acuerdos entre la extrema derecha y la derecha.

Si a ustedes les preocupa el Estado de Derecho en España, desbloqueen el infame bloqueo del Consejo General del Poder Judicial. Acaben de una vez con el acoso a representantes públicos y a las sedes de los partidos y dejen de abrir la puerta de las instituciones a la extrema derecha. España seguirá contando con un Gobierno digno, que defiende el interés general y que va a seguir comprometido con los valores de Europa y su futuro. No lo duden.

(*El orador se niega a que Paulo Rangel le formule una pregunta con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»*).

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (Renew). – Mr President, we come to a plenary today concerned again about the threats to the rule of law in the European Union. As the Liberals, we have spearheaded this cause and have led the defence of the rule of law each and every time anyone has attempted to confront it – just to name them, Poland, Hungary or today Spain.

We are worried to see political concessions like an amnesty war or a parliamentary investigation of an independent judicial system. Sacrificing the rule of law and the separation of powers in exchange of votes to secure a government is political corruption and, I would say, a political mistake. Prioritising political wins over upholding legal institutions sets a dangerous trend, allowing politics to sway legal matters. It erodes the essential balance of power, a trait of every healthy democracy. Upholding the rule of law and an independent judiciary are non-negotiable here in this European House. That is why:

Ciudadanos españoles, no estáis solos.

Nicola Procaccini (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in questo Parlamento abbiamo sentito parlare innumerevoli volte di Stato di diritto, solitamente quando c'era da attaccare dei governi non graditi alle sinistre impegnati a realizzare il programma con cui avevano vinto le elezioni.

Il nostro gruppo ha sempre denunciato questa strumentalizzazione politica. Lo Stato di diritto è una cosa seria: è la separazione dei poteri giudiziario, esecutivo, legislativo, non un argomento da campagna elettorale permanente. L'atroce paradosso è che oggi, per la prima volta in una grande nazione europea, come la Spagna, viene davvero brutalmente violato lo Stato di diritto da parte di coloro che se ne sono riempiti la bocca per anni: socialisti e comunisti, pur di rimanere al potere nonostante la sconfitta elettorale, decidono di votare per la cancellazione di reati come sedizione, malversazione, insurrezione, persino terrorismo, in cambio di sette voti.

È la più clamorosa prevaricazione del potere politico su quello giudiziario mai vista in Europa. Ed è anche la più clamorosa truffa democratica mai vista in Europa, perché, come hanno ricordato gli amici di Vox, durante la campagna elettorale, Pedro Sanchez si era sempre dichiarato contrario all'amnistia per i secessionisti.

A proposito di democrazia, il commissario Gentiloni al Congresso socialista di Malaga ha affermato: «Quello che sta accadendo in Spagna è coerente con il nostro modello democratico», lo stesso giorno in cui lei, commissario Reynders, esprimeva al contrario gravi preoccupazioni per quello che sta accadendo in Spagna.

Ora, agli uomini e alle donne di Spagna voglio dire solo questo: francamente, non so se potrete contare sulle istituzioni europee. Mi auguro di sì. Ma di sicuro potrete contare sull'amicizia e la solidarietà e il sostegno di tutti i patrioti d'Europa.

Nicolas Bay (NI). – Monsieur le Président, ces derniers jours, le peuple espagnol est dans la rue et proteste contre la trahison de son Premier ministre, Pedro Sánchez, minoritaire dans les urnes, qui viole ouvertement la Constitution en s'alliant avec les criminels séparatistes catalans pour se maintenir au pouvoir.

La Commission et le Parlement ne cessent de parler de l'état de droit en Pologne, en Hongrie et partout ailleurs dans le monde, inventant des menaces, enchaînant les procès de Moscou contre des accusés qui sont souvent condamnés par avance.

Mais cette fois-ci, en Espagne, nous assistons à un authentique coup d'État, un viol caractérisé de la Constitution au mépris d'une décision de justice pourtant fondée en droit. Nous assistons au démembrement d'une nation et à l'amnistie de criminels pour des raisons basement politiciennes. Et Bruxelles ne dit rien. La gauche et les macronistes se taisent, ils soutiennent même ouvertement cette forfaiture. Pourquoi? Eh bien parce que ce sont les socialistes qui sont à la manœuvre bien sûr.

Sánchez et son gouvernement se montrent illégitimes, voire illégaux, en laissant faire la Commission, et notre Parlement se couvre de honte. Dans sa logique habituelle, Bruxelles devrait se précipiter pour engager des sanctions, notre hémicycle devrait élaborer aussitôt une résolution. Et là, absolument rien! Ce «deux poids, deux mesures» montre à quel point l'habituel discours sur l'état de droit n'est qu'une minable comédie de la gauche pour nuire à ses adversaires politiques.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Mr President, colleagues, whenever a politician attacks the rule of law, they ask everyone else to be silent. This is exactly what happened in the European Parliament today. The representative of the Government of Spain asked us all to be silent. And our answer is 'no'! We are not going to be silent. Europe is not going to be silent. Europe sees, Europe listens, Europe hears the millions of people in Spain who defend the rule of law. We will be with the people in Spain and we will be defending the rule of law.

Why? Because the rule of law is a European value and we all have to protect the rule of law. We have to make sure that in every corner of Europe, people who respect the law are safe and people who breach the law are held accountable. This is Europe. The rule of law is under attack in Spain. The amnesty law is an attack upon the rule of law. Everyone in Europe knows that Spain has a government that attacks the rule of law.

I know what an attack on the rule of law means, because in my country, Romania, in the past, politicians also tried to attack the rule of law. And when the rule of law was attacked in my country, we went to the streets. Hundreds of thousands of people went to the streets to defend the rule of law. We went to the streets for months and we won. As a result, today no politician in my country dares to attack the rule of law. The rule of law is strong and protected. Romania is credible because politicians know that people will not accept it.

This is also my message to the people of Spain: do not accept the weakening of the rule of law. Do not accept the weakening of Spain. Say loud and clear what you want. Say it publicly and say it for as long as it is needed. If you are present and visible, you will win. And Spain will never, ever have a government that attacks the rule of law.

Si estáis presentes y sois visibles, ganaréis. Y España jamás tendrá un Gobierno que vuelva a atacar el Estado de Derecho. Sacad la bandera de España, sacad la bandera europea. No estáis solos, aquí en el Parlamento Europeo estamos con vosotros.

Pedro Marques (S&D). – Mr President, I ask you for the same tolerance of the previous speaker, because I have to defend the honour of my country and I will do it in Portuguese.

Senhor Weber, devo defender a honra do meu país pelo que aqui fez hoje. No meio do ataque às instituições espanholas, dirigiu-se ao governo do meu país e chamou corrupto ao governo do meu país. Desrespeitou assim Portugal. Peço à Mesa deste Parlamento (o Senhor Presidente tinha falado na importância do cuidado com a terminologia usada), peço à Mesa deste Parlamento que avalie o que fez aqui o Senhor Weber. Desrespeitou Portugal, desrespeitou um governo democrático europeu.

E digo-lhe mais: não descerei, não descerei ao seu nível! Não descerei ao seu nível. Sempre lhe lembrarei apenas que António Costa se demitiu para deixar funcionar a Justiça sem estar acusado de nada. No seu governo de Espanha, do PP de Rajoy, esse governo foi derrubado por terem sido condenados por corrupção, e Rajoy agarrou-se ao poder até ao fim e foi derrubado por uma maioria parlamentar.

É muito mau o que aqui fez hoje no ataque a um governo europeu, Senhor Weber.

Tivemos aqui o discurso inflamado também do Senhor Rangel, como também o tinha feito em Espanha. O Senhor Rangel, com uma total desonestidade intelectual, veio a Espanha fazer um discurso sobre a Espanha Una, sobre a Constituição.

O que escreveu ele em 2017, quando governava o PP em Espanha por alturas do referendo na Catalunha? Rangel escreveu, e cito: 'Por mais que custe aos mais conservadores, a unidade de Espanha só pode ser mantida com o modelo federal'. E dizia mais: 'É politicamente errada a fixação no argumento jurídico e legal. A Constituição e as leis podem mudar. O argumento tem de ser político.'

Isto era Rangel em 2017. Agora é discursar em Madrid na defesa do Estado Uno e da Constituição.

(O orador prossegue em língua espanhola)

Ahora, para terminar, hablaré unos segundos en español.

Hablemos también de Esteban Pons. Esteban Pons, antiguo diputado al Parlamento, ha dicho esta última semana que el Tribunal Constitucional tendrá que decidir de qué lado está, si del lado de los constitucionalistas o del de los enemigos de la Constitución.

Presidente, ¿qué respeto a la independencia de la justicia es esto? ¿Hablan ustedes en la derecha de presión política sobre la justicia? Pues les diré que la derecha española, con sus coaliciones con la extrema derecha, es la que está poniendo en cuestión el Estado de Derecho en Europa *(el presidente retira la palabra al orador)*.

President. – Actually, Mr Marques, you have a blue card. Would you agree to take a blue card from Mr Rangel?

Pedro Marques (S&D). – Mr President, no – I was expecting a blue card by Mr Weber to explain himself. I don't want Rangel to explain Mr Weber.

President. – Mr Weber is not asking you to answer a blue-card question. According to the Rules you have a right to do it. Please check the Rules. And at the end of the debate you have the right to speak again if you really feel violated. You can do it to defend your honour at the end of the debate. I will give you the floor if you really feel it is necessary. But not now.

Colleagues, you have the Rules. You can ask for the floor at the end. It happens from time to time. What kind of a Rules point are you asking? What point of order?

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Mr President, ‘intellectually dishonest’ – I was accused of being intellectually dishonest. And I would ask you, President, to also verify the behaviour of this speaker, Mr Marques, because he accused me of being intellectually dishonest. So he asked for fair treatment and he is the first to have now fair treatment. And I am not going to answer, but he has to study my books, because he doesn’t know anything about what I have written.

You have to study!

President. – Thank you, sir, we get the point. Mr Rangel, I remind you that at the end of the debate you have a right to speak. You have a right, but not now. Thank you very much.

Mazaly Aguilar (ECR). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, la Ley de amnistía que el presidente Pedro Sánchez quiere aprobar es una traición. Traición al pueblo español, a la Comisión, a la separación de poderes, a la independencia del poder judicial. De tal manera que los jueces, cuando dictan sentencias, si no son del agrado del Gobierno, serán perseguidos.

Y, para seguir siendo presidente del Gobierno español, el señor Sánchez no ha dudado en absoluto en alinearse y pactar con los enemigos de España. Con los independentistas catalanes que dieron un golpe de Estado. Y si esta Ley sigue adelante, ese delito no solo no existirá, sino que persistirán en tener su independencia, que, por cierto, pagaremos el resto.

Y también con los separatistas vascos, herederos de una banda terrorista que segó la vida a cientos de españoles, entre ellos socialistas, y que ahora querrán ser una república independiente, también a costa nuestra. La democracia en España está en peligro, y la Unión Europea tiene que aprender —lo que ha hecho el pueblo español— y darse cuenta de que esa Ley no solamente quiere destruir España, sino que será un torpedo bajo la línea de flotación de Europa. Y eso se lo garantizo, no lo duden ni un instante.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Señor presidente, señorías, según los socialistas, vender al país por siete votos es un asunto interior. Bueno, no estaría muy sorprendida si, tras un momento, hablando de Hungría y Polonia con la mayor efervescencia, nos juzgan por cualquier tipo de asunto. ¿No ven alguna discrepancia en esto? Y lo hacen con la máxima conspiración de la Comisión Europea y son maestros en la aplicación selectiva del Estado de Derecho y de la doble moral.

En el caso de Hungría, Bruselas sigue reteniendo fondos y pregunta sobre el tamaño de las oficinas de los jueces. Al mismo tiempo, Sánchez ofrece la amnistía a criminales que fueron sentenciados no solo por un referéndum ilegal, sino también por fraude y malversación de fondos. Sánchez mete en los órganos judiciales a sus «compis». En el Congreso, con el nuevo concepto de *lawfare*, unas comisiones de investigación políticas podrán expresar su opinión sobre jueces y juicios ya celebrados.

La reacción de Bruselas a este ataque claro contra la independencia de la justicia: una carta de preocupación. Querida Dolors, españoles, la solución no llegará de Europa. Bruselas solo se preocupa si gobierna la derecha. Mantengan la unidad que se ha formado por las manifestaciones en las calles y esto va a ayudar a cambiar el rumbo de España.

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Mr President, I feel the obligation to say several words because I was witness of demolition of the rule of law in Poland. As a Polish Member of this House, I would like to remind you, even from the last month, the case of Lex Tusk. Do you remember? Thank you, Iratxe, thank you colleagues for your immediate reaction on that. Thank you, European Commission, Mr Reynders, for the immediate debate on that because this law was not implemented. So I feel that you still have a chance. I’ve seen millions on the streets, like in Poland, like in Warsaw, with national and European flags. Why? Because the rule of law is universal. It’s a European one. There is No Spanish rule of law or Polish rule of law. There is one democracy and one rule of law, a universal pillar of democracy in Europe. And we have to protect it because we are talking not only about Spain, but on condition of democracy in Europe. And we have to react. And you have still a chance not to go the Polish way because this is only a question of time. Building the majority by political corruption is a crime and crime has to be punished. This is only a question of time. In Poland it will be punished in Spain, too. So let’s think about that, because I would like that. If you are talking about the rule of law, you would like to be credible. We have to be credible as a whole House. *No a la impunidad.*

No a la impunidad.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisario Reynders, Parlamento Europeo, el Partido Popular español se ha cubierto de fracaso en el intento de investir a su candidato a la Presidencia del Gobierno ante el Congreso de los Diputados.

No contento con ese amargo sabor de boca, intenta refrescarlo aquí en este Parlamento con un debate forzado sobre una iniciativa legítima adoptada conforme a la Constitución Española. Una proposición de ley orgánica en la que no hay ninguna sombra de control judicial, ni *lawfare*, ni comisiones de investigación. Una proposición minuciosamente articulada para superar el control de constitucionalidad que —con seguridad— el Partido Popular va a derrochar a través del recurso directo y las cuestiones de inconstitucionalidad y también las cuestiones prejudiciales ante el Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea, porque excluye los delitos financieros de la Unión.

Que lo sepa todo el mundo: en esta ley orgánica o proposición, no existe ninguna amenaza contra el Estado de Derecho ni la democracia en España, ni contra el procedimiento legislativo. Menos salvedad hecha del ejercicio filibustero de reforma unilateral con mayoría absoluta en el Senado del Partido Popular para intentar entorpecer su tramitación parlamentaria, contraviniendo las reglas de urgencia descritas en el artículo 90 de la Constitución Española.

No hay ninguna amenaza contra la independencia judicial en España que no sea el bloqueo grosero y contumaz del Consejo General del Poder Judicial por el Partido Popular hasta la náusea, cinco años caducado por exclusiva responsabilidad del Partido Popular.

Por tanto, que lo sepa todo el mundo estamos ante una ley singular, conforme a la jurisprudencia del Tribunal Constitucional para atender una crisis excepcional que tuvo lugar durante el tiempo de gobierno del Partido Popular, que no fue capaz de evitarla ni tampoco de defender después adecuadamente la reputación constitucional de España, la misma que ahora ustedes atacan con saña y sin tregua.

Y le digo al Partido Popular que deje que su frustración supure hasta el punto de alimentar la rabia de quienes se manifiestan ante las sedes del Partido Socialista con esvásticas y con saludos nazis, porque eso sí que es la negación absoluta de los valores europeos y del Estado de Derecho que nosotros representamos.

«Cómo mueren las democracias» es el título de un ensayo más citado que he leído. Mueren cuando se niega la legitimidad de la alternativa, cuando se niega la posibilidad de que otros consigan —de acuerdo con los procedimientos constitucionales— las mayorías absolutas con las que hacerse investir y llegar al Gobierno en los parlamentos democráticamente elegidos por la soberanía popular. Así mueren las democracias.

Señores del Partido Popular, déjenme decirles que el Partido Popular no está en el Gobierno, que lo sepa todo el mundo, porque no ha sido capaz de pactar sino con su desprendimiento de extrema derecha. ¿Y sabe por qué? Porque una mayoría absoluta del Congreso de los Diputados ha decidido que no puede aspirar a gobernar España quien ni la entiende, ni la acepta, ni la ama —por más que se le llene la boca— como realmente es: plural, mucho más diversa y mucho más plural de lo que cabe en el Partido Popular... *(el presidente retira la palabra al orador).*

Cristian Terheş (ECR). – Mr President, what we are witnessing right now in Spain under the leadership of the extreme left-wing communist and socialist government, led by Pedro Sanchez, is the replacement of the rule of law by the Marxists' rule of chaos, with a purpose to establish a new legal order. To remain in power, Pedro Sanchez clearly prefers, instead of respecting the constitution, to drive Spain into legal chaos by granting amnesty to thousands of people who violated law and the Spanish constitution. If individuals who have broken the law and violated the constitution in Spain can receive amnesty from a temporary politician to consolidate power, then Pedro Sanchez is clearly a threat to Spain's territorial integrity and sovereignty, as well as to the EU rule of law.

The Spanish people have spoken already in defence of their country's integrity and the supremacy of their constitution, and the EU must do the same. Any politician who chooses to violate his country's constitution to remain in power is a threat to both his country and the EU rule of law. I urge, therefore, the European Commission to openly condemn Pedro Sanchez's abuses and unconstitutional actions in Spain and demand his immediate resignation.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Mr President, what an absolute sadness that we are now seeing Spain, such a great country hostage to such miserable and dangerous manoeuvres. In my country also, in France, we had an amnesty law after immensely painful historical divisions. But it was announced ahead of elections, not improvised after. It was debated in public with the citizens, not agreed in secret with condemned people. It was for the future of the country, not for the survival of a weak government.

I have a very simple question to the Socialist colleagues here, to the friends of Pedro Sánchez. Did anyone of you defend this rupture of inequality among the Spanish people ahead of the vote of the Spanish people? This is a very simple question. And why are you Socialists always repeating that this is only an internal issue and nothing that concerns Europe? You have always been so vocal and so insistent when you were criticising Hungary or Poland about the rule of law. And indeed this is about the rule of law that we are speaking right now. The fact that law rules over politics and not short-term political interests over the legal order confirmed by the people, is the very basis of democracy since it was founded at the birth of the European spirit 25 centuries ago. And we are here because of this. Those of us who write the law, do not have any right to destroy it. This would have a name, this is called corruption.

A final word to all the people of Spain who are defending now this rule of law and freedom,

Queridos amigos españoles, ánimo. España no se rinde.

Eero Heinäluoma (S&D). – Mr President, I'm really delighted that it seems that this Parliament really holds the rule of law in high regard, and I hope that all of us are ready to do it in every circumstances and in every situation.

From history, we know that the rule of law also means the possibility of reconciliation for forgiveness and pardon. Here, I think of Nelson Mandela and his way of fostering national reconciliation, and I'm just wondering if there is someone in this House who would say that Nelson Mandela didn't have the right to give pardon. In my own country, Finland, after a very bloody civil war, those guilty of rebellion were pardoned, so I totally understand that national reconciliation is sought in Spain, and an amnesty law for those related to the Catalan independence process movement is being prepared to achieve this aim.

Pursuing national reconciliation and granting amnesty is fully in line with the rule of law, as my colleague René Repasi just said. We ought to respect the efforts of Spanish people and Prime Minister Sanchez for reconciliation in Spain. That's my message today.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, španjolski socijalisti mislim da bi trebali voditi brigu o tome kakvu sliku o Španjolskoj stvaraju pred drugim europskim narodima.

Ono što mi vidimo je premijer Sanchez, koji je očito godinama govorio protiv Zakona o amnestiji, govorio da je taj zakon protuustavan, a sad ga provodi. Mi smo vidjeli sve ankete koje su rekle da je većina socijalističkih birača protiv amnestije i za cjelovitu Španjolsku, a premijer sad i to krši. Dakle, ono što mi vidimo je čovjek koji je spreman učiniti sve samo da bi zadržao vlast u svojim rukama.

No još više me zabrinjava reakcija Europske komisije. Prvo srdačna čestitka o sklapanju tog koalicijskog sporazuma od strane Ursule von der Leyen, zatim ovaj govor gospodina Reynoldsa, koji se očito drži onoga kad ne znaš što reći, onda je samo važno da imaš dugačak govor. Dakle, to je neprihvatljivo.

Jedino što moram reći, jedini demokratski izlaz iz toga je da premijer Sanchez podnese ostavku, raspiše ponovljene izbore, a da Europska komisija ne koristi vladavinu prava samo za napade na Mađarsku i Poljsku, nego da objektivno ocjenjuje i sve druge države.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Mr President, separation of powers is an essential pillar of the rule of law. Judges should not make policy and politicians should not take the seat of judges. And it is extremely concerning to see that, in Spain, this concept is completely turned around. Prime Minister Sánchez no longer protects the separation of powers. Instead, he embraces the power of separation. A slippery politician who will do anything to cling on to power, and who cares more about his own position than about the unity of his country or the opinion of his citizens. Exactly the type of behaviour that has no place in a democratic system, that has no place in Europe, and it only serves the interests of those opposing democracy in the first place. Let us not forget Putin was willing to spend billions in support of the Catalan independence movement in order to undermine the stability of Spain and, through Spain, the stability of Europe. He can now sit back and relax because the Spanish Socialists are doing his job for him and free of charge.

Not so long ago, Prime Minister Sánchez vowed he would never support amnesty. He justified spying on Catalans because of the graveness of their crimes. Here in this House, not so long ago, with the full support of the S&D Group, we criticised Russia's deep interference with the Catalan movement and demanded a real investigation. Today you defend an amnesty for all those involved. If this was about any other European country, you would have been screaming for the European Commission to intervene, and rightfully so. Today you are telling Commissioner Reynders to mind his own business. It is pure hypocrisy. Spain deserves better. Europe deserves better.

Izabela-Helena Kloc (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! 23 lipca Hiszpania poszła spać demokratyczna, a obudziła się separatystyczna. Rząd współtworzą skrajni nacjonałiści stosujący niedawno jeszcze terroryzm, a dziś wykluczenie i przemoc wobec współobywateli. Trudno się dziwić, że w umowie koalicyjnej zapowiedziano frontalny atak na trójpodział władzy. Parlamentarne komisje mają oceniać wyroki niezawisłych sądów, a mający wpływowych przyjaciół przestępcy będą objęci amnestią.

Tymczasem, cóż, przewodnicząca Komisji Europejskiej przesyła gratulacje. Obecni tu posłowie, którzy akceptują to, co dzieje się w Hiszpanii, sami odbierają sobie moralne prawo mówienia o praworządności. Pedro Sánchez miał do wyboru: praworządność lub uformowanie rządu. Wybrał to drugie, a cenę zapłacą wszyscy obywatele Hiszpanii, zwłaszcza mieszkańcy Katalonii i Kraju Basków.

Javier Zarzalejos (PPE). – Señor presidente, el 23 de julio hubo elecciones generales en España. Antes del 23 de julio, la amnistía era absolutamente inconstitucional y nunca se concedería, y Carles Puigdemont era un prófugo de la justicia. Después del 23, la amnistía es la quintaesencia de la Constitución y Carles Puigdemont es un exiliado. Hombre, alguna explicación merece la cosa.

Y aunque citar a Mandela es muy tentador creo que la explicación es mucho más simple: un político que regala impunidad a sus aliados para que le hagan presidente del Gobierno. Y cuesta creer que en la Europa del Estado de Derecho la impunidad es la moneda de cambio que se cambia por votos.

Porque sí hay una amnistía que va a borrar la malversación, los delitos contra el Estado de Derecho y la responsabilidad por actos de terrorismo (señora García, el artículo dos, léalo entero). Una amnistía que va a cancelar la investigación judicial sobre la injerencia rusa que este Parlamento ha declarado ya probada. Una amnistía basada en un pacto político contra la independencia judicial que prevé que el Parlamento pueda revisar actuaciones judiciales. Una amnistía que no promueve el reencuentro —a la vista está— sino que está generando una gravísima fractura y división en la sociedad española.

Y por favor, no citen a Portugal y a Francia para legitimar la amnistía. Los delitos que esta amnistía comprende y va a borrar son, precisamente, los delitos que en las amnistías en Francia y en Portugal quedaron excluidas.

Señor Reynders, si esta amnistía sale adelante, si esta amnistía de malversadores, terroristas (presuntos) y sediciosos sale adelante, creo que la voz de las instituciones europeas, cuando tengan que defender el Estado de Derecho, será mucho más débil.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Lídia Pereira (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Espanha não se cala e nós também não.

Este Parlamento não pode ser o refúgio de quem foge à justiça. E não pode ser o palco daqueles que querem a desintegração de Espanha e a destruição da Constituição. Este é um debate europeu. O acordo de Sánchez viola a Constituição, mas viola também os tratados e os valores europeus. É contra o Estado de direito porque amnistia quem foi condenado pela justiça, por votos. É contra a separação de poderes porque quer colocar os políticos a controlar os juízes, por votos. É contra a igualdade porque pede a todos os espanhóis que paguem a dívida de alguns, em troca de votos.

Aos milhões que enchem as ruas em Espanha, e não se calam, eu quero dizer: a Europa não se calará.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señor presidente, yo quiero expresar hoy ante la Cámara que apoyo la proposición de ley de amnistía que ha presentado el Grupo Parlamentario Socialista en el Congreso de los Diputados, por una serie de razones que, en realidad, no vienen al caso en esta Cámara y que no me daría tiempo a explicar.

Al mismo tiempo, entiendo que los compañeros del Partido Popular —sobre todo del español— estén en desacuerdo con esta proposición de ley. Pueden ustedes cuestionar su oportunidad, pueden cuestionar su justificación, pueden cuestionar los efectos de la misma, pero eso no significa que la proposición de ley en sí misma constituya un ataque al Estado de Derecho. Porque, además, ustedes tendrán la oportunidad —como es seguro que utilizarán la ocasión— de utilizar sus cincuenta diputados o senadores para presentar un recurso ante el Tribunal Constitucional, que será el que se pronunciará en un sentido o en otro y, en ambos sentidos en los que se pronuncie, habrá funcionado el Estado de Derecho en España.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señor presidente, voy a intentar descomprimir un poco la situación diciendo las cosas como son. ¿Y cómo son las cosas? Pues resulta que el presidente del Consejo de la Unión Europea ha sido reelegido en su país pagando por siete votos la amnistía a unos delincuentes, a unos fugados de la justicia y a unos investigados por corrupción y terrorismo. Es duro escucharlo, pero es así.

¿Cuál es el interés general de esta decisión? ¿Prima la virtud? No, prima el interés. El interés de ser presidente. ¿A costa de qué? A costa del sacrificio del Estado de Derecho en España y del concepto básico sobre el que se sustenta la Unión Europea: la igualdad entre los ciudadanos. ¡Por siete votos! ¡Por siete votos se es capaz de sacrificar el Estado de Derecho! ¿Y quién lo ha hecho? El presidente del Consejo de la Unión Europea, que hoy no está aquí, pero esperemos que venga en este semestre para poder decírselo a la cara: usted, por siete votos, ataca los fundamentos de esta Unión.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, qué mal perder tienen algunos, pero qué mal perder. Les faltó decir «¡Viva Franco!». Y alguno incluso levantó la mano, los hemos visto. La verdad, cuando dicen que en las calles hay mucha gente yo lo que veo son camorristas, insultadores de mujeres, insultadores de las minorías, de los distintos pueblos, camorristas de la calle.

Y qué triste que el Partido Popular se asocie a Vox. Miren, yo a ustedes no los vi en las manifestaciones de denuncia del genocidio al pueblo palestino. No los vi en las manifestaciones de trabajadoras y trabajadores contra la precariedad. Yo no los vi en las manifestaciones por la defensa de la sanidad pública. Por no verlos, no los veo casi nunca en el Pleno. No me refiero a algunos, pero sí a la mayoría.

La Resolución sobre el auge de la violencia neofascista en Europa, de la que fui coponente en este Parlamento, pide textualmente a los Estados miembros sanciones a quienes inciten públicamente a la violencia o al odio. De eso es de lo que deberían ustedes preocuparse.

Y, sí, formo parte del bando democrático, del bando antifascista.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR). – Señor presidente, la agresión que estamos sufriendo los españoles es existencial. Vemos que nuestro suelo, nuestro concepto de España, se desmorona. Logros de generaciones en un orden democrático, sangre de compatriotas derramada, desperdiciada por una ambición sin escrúpulos de partidos políticos que han dejado claro que son capaces de vender a su madre patria. ¿Para qué? Pues no para lo que se imaginan. ¿De verdad creen que los españoles vamos a tragar con lo que pretenden unos políticos irresponsables, que han abusado de la confianza de los ciudadanos para, con sus votos, traicionarlos?

La disolución de nuestro orden constitucional es un precedente que amenaza el propio de la Unión Europea. Si no hay una declaración contundente por parte de la Comisión, señor Reynders —hoy la hemos echado en falta—, saben que se pueden desencadenar pretensiones parecidas en otros Estados. ¿Eso es lo que buscan? ¿Un debilitamiento de la identidad nacional?

No vamos a dejar de cumplir nuestro deber de defender a nuestra patria ante quien quiere verla partida en miles de pedacitos.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, when I heard that there was a debate on the rule of law in Spain, I thought, 'Great! Is this about state surveillance on journalists and politicians with Pegasus? Is it undercover police tactics involving intimate sexual relationships with activists to infiltrate social movements? Is it people having their eyes mutilated by Spanish police rubber bullets, or singers being sent to jail or exiled for their lyrics?' But no, of course not. The debate, as usual, is about Catalonia and an amnesty for people who should never have faced persecution in the first place.

Have you any idea how pathetic this looks to people outside of here? This is a political issue. Political dialogue is something that Spain has lacked for years, resorting instead to abusing a judicial system known for its dubious independence. Self-determination and an end to political persecution are nothing but basic democratic demands guaranteed by the charter, and I support them.

(The speaker concluded in a non-official language)

(The President cut off the speaker)

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, vreau mai întâi să mulțumesc președinției spaniole, cu care lucrez foarte bine în calitate de raportor și cred că trebuie să respectăm acest lucru. În al doilea rând, domnule comisar, vreau să vă spun că am atenționat de când am introdus acest mecanism de funcționare a statului de drept că poate fi folosit cu dublă măsură.

Vreau să vă reamintesc că inițiativa legislativă despre care tot dezbatem acum este o problemă internă. Orice guvern poate să aibă inițiativă legislativă, că trece sau nu trece nu este problema Comisiei Europene.

Când v-am făcut o scrisoare, domnule comisar, în care am solicitat pentru a avea o răspundere a magistraților uniformă în toate statele membre, mi-ați răspuns că organizarea justiției și funcționarea justiției este subsidiaritate. Este răspunsul semnat de dumneavoastră. Atunci, de ce doriți acest lucru? PPE-ul, dacă v-a deranjat atât de mult, de ce n-ați făcut reclamație că nu funcționează statul de drept înainte de alegeri și nu după rezultate?

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señor presidente, no pensaba pedir la palabra, pero creo que hay que decir algo que es importante. Es algo mucho peor que dar impunidad a cambio de siete votos. En realidad, el gran problema es que los socialistas les han dado la razón. Y no la tienen. Los secesionistas catalanes de todos estos años no tenían y no tienen la razón.

No es un déficit democrático. Es un problema de identitarismo excluyente y de populismo rancio. Y el problema, cuando se les da la razón, es que ustedes ahora son sus rehenes. Primero fueron los indultos. Esos indultos que Tomás y Valiente nunca habría apreciado, porque no hubo arrepentimiento. Es la modificación del Código Penal para debilitar la malversación o eliminar la sedición, para hacernos más débiles. Y ahora, una impunidad a gran escala. Y lo que viene por detrás: una mutación constitucional fraudulenta. Porque ¿se puede cambiar la Constitución? Sí, pero no yendo contra las leyes y contra la voluntad de la mayoría de los españoles. Este es el problema.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Didier Reynders, membre de la Commission. – Monsieur le Président, madame la secrétaire d'État, mesdames et messieurs les députés, je voudrais d'abord vous remercier pour vos interventions. Cela a permis d'avoir un certain nombre de commentaires et d'avis parfois très différents, sur le débat qui nous occupe. Mais je me réjouis tout d'abord que nous puissions continuer notre dialogue sur la situation de l'état de droit dans tous les États membres. Et je me tiens à la pleine disposition de votre Parlement à cet égard, en séance plénière, en commission ou dans tout autre format.

Concernant la situation en Espagne, je répète que nous apprécions la volonté des autorités espagnoles d'avoir un dialogue avec la Commission sur les réformes à venir. J'insiste toutefois sur l'importance de mener à bien toutes les réformes nécessaires en matière d'indépendance et d'efficacité de la justice, de lutte contre la corruption, de liberté des médias et d'équilibre des pouvoirs et de les mettre en œuvre concrètement.

À cet égard, la Commission a émis plusieurs recommandations à l'intention des autorités espagnoles dans son rapport sur l'état de droit de juillet dernier. Nous continuerons à suivre la situation en Espagne comme dans tous les États membres. Cela s'applique aussi aux développements récents concernant la loi d'amnistie, au sujet desquels nous sommes en contact étroit avec les autorités espagnoles. Et de façon plus générale, nous y travaillerons dans le cadre de la préparation du rapport 2024 sur l'état de droit.

Je reviens au projet de loi d'amnistie. Le débat et l'analyse de ce texte vont d'abord intervenir en Espagne, dans le cadre constitutionnel espagnol, et pour commencer, au Parlement espagnol.

En tant que gardienne des traités, la Commission analyse le projet de loi ou la proposition déposée au Parlement pour assurer sa compatibilité avec le droit de l'Union. Je voudrais à ce sujet remercier les intervenants dans différents groupes d'avoir rappelé qu'il y avait effectivement un lien avec le droit de l'Union, puisque cette compatibilité doit être vérifiée non seulement avec l'article 2 du traité UE concernant les valeurs qui fondent l'Union, mais aussi avec certains éléments du droit pénal au niveau européen. En tant que gardienne des traités, la Commission doit agir pour vérifier cette compatibilité.

Ainsi donc l'État de droit nous unit et c'est de manière tout à fait indépendante et objective que la Commission mènera cette analyse sur la proposition déposée, les amendements qui pourraient l'être dans le cadre des débats, et sur tous les textes qui pourraient traduire l'accord politique conclu pour la formation du nouveau gouvernement espagnol (beaucoup ont évoqué d'autres aspects que nous n'avons pas encore rencontrés dans les textes qui nous ont été soumis). Et nous terminerons notre analyse lorsqu'un texte final aura été adopté par le Parlement espagnol.

Je suis convaincu que nous aurons encore l'occasion de débattre de cette situation, mais en tout cas, la Commission mènera son analyse comme elle le fait à l'égard de tous les États membres, sur un pied d'égalité, en utilisant les mêmes critères, les mêmes méthodologies et elle produira des conclusions qui pourront être comparées à toutes celles que nous déposons lorsque nous travaillons sur une situation dans un État membre déterminé.

Ángeles Moreno Bau, *presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, señorías, señor comisario, permítanme reiterarles que la Presidencia y el Consejo en su conjunto conceden gran importancia al Estado de Derecho. Esto es particularmente esencial en los tiempos difíciles que atravesamos, ya que nuestra acción exterior solo puede ser eficaz y creíble si nuestros valores se cumplen plenamente también dentro de la Unión.

Como Estado miembro y parte de esta Unión, España suscribe plenamente los elementos centrales del Estado de Derecho, muy especialmente la separación de poderes y la independencia del poder judicial. Continuaremos la buena cooperación con la Comisión en el contexto de los informes anuales sobre el Estado de Derecho y, como siempre, nos comprometemos a considerar cualquier recomendación que surja de este ejercicio con un espíritu constructivo y democrático.

President. – Now, as I promised, I would like to give the floor at the end of the debate, according to Rule 173, to Paulo Rangel. But please follow the Rules until three minutes.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Mr President, it is only a very, very short remark to say that I was expecting that – when you are conducting our session and someone exaggerates a bit in the way it refers to a colleague – you should intervene. And you did not do it.

It's no hard and no personal feelings with Pedro Marques, not at all, even if what he said, that is intellectually dishonest. And now I do not expect any correction from you, because he has the opportunity to read, if he wants, my last book that is already in all libraries and bookshops and there this is very clearly explained. By the way, it was already published before, but I do not want to give any constitutional law lesson, because I saw in the last days, after this proposal of the Spanish Government that our socialists have forgotten all lessons from constitutional law, and now they are against a separation of powers.

So I do not pretend to teach anybody, not even a Portuguese colleague, only to say that I am not intellectually dishonest.

President. – So, colleagues, thank you for this debate. The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Laura Ballarín Cereza (S&D), por escrito. – Los socialistas creemos que la verdadera amenaza para nuestra democracia es que las derechas españolas no asuman los resultados electorales del pasado 23 de julio y la mayoría absoluta parlamentaria que ha dado continuidad a un Gobierno progresista.

Lamentablemente, el Partido Popular (PP) y sus socios de gobierno de la extrema derecha prefieren alimentar conspiraciones y comportamientos antidemocráticos antes que apostar por la cordura, la coherencia y la convivencia de nuestro país. Y, sobre todo, siguen dando cancha a los movimientos ultras y no condenan la violencia contra las sedes del Partido Socialista, las amenazas a militantes socialistas y los ataques a periodistas.

Por último, los socialistas defendemos que la proposición de ley orgánica en cuestión no supone ninguna amenaza contra el Estado de Derecho ni la democracia en España, ni contiene ninguna sombra de control judicial o *lawfare*. La verdadera amenaza contra la independencia judicial en España es el bloqueo de la renovación del Consejo General del Poder Judicial, caducado desde hace cinco años.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D), por escrito. – Los socialistas creemos que la verdadera amenaza para nuestra democracia es que las derechas españolas no asuman los resultados electorales del pasado 23 de julio y la mayoría absoluta parlamentaria que ha dado continuidad a un Gobierno progresista.

Lamentablemente, el Partido Popular (PP) y sus socios de gobierno de la extrema derecha prefieren alimentar conspiraciones y comportamientos antidemocráticos antes que apostar por la cordura, la coherencia y la convivencia de nuestro país. Y, sobre todo, siguen dando cancha a los movimientos ultras y no condenan la violencia contra las sedes del Partido Socialista, las amenazas a militantes socialistas y los ataques a periodistas.

Por último, los socialistas defendemos que la proposición de ley orgánica en cuestión no supone ninguna amenaza contra el Estado de Derecho ni la democracia en España, ni contiene ninguna sombra de control judicial o *lawfare*. La verdadera amenaza contra la independencia judicial en España es el bloqueo de la renovación del Consejo General del Poder Judicial, caducado desde hace cinco años.

Ibán García Del Blanco (S&D), por escrito. – Los socialistas creemos que la verdadera amenaza para nuestra democracia es que las derechas españolas no asuman los resultados electorales del pasado 23 de julio y la mayoría absoluta parlamentaria que ha dado continuidad a un Gobierno progresista.

Lamentablemente, el Partido Popular (PP) y sus socios de gobierno de la extrema derecha prefieren alimentar conspiraciones y comportamientos antidemocráticos antes que apostar por la cordura, la coherencia y la convivencia de nuestro país. Y, sobre todo, siguen dando cancha a los movimientos ultras y no condenan la violencia contra las sedes del Partido Socialista, las amenazas a militantes socialistas y los ataques a periodistas.

Por último, los socialistas defendemos que la proposición de ley orgánica en cuestión no supone ninguna amenaza contra el Estado de Derecho ni la democracia en España, ni contiene ninguna sombra de control judicial o *lawfare*. La verdadera amenaza contra la independencia judicial en España es el bloqueo de la renovación del Consejo General del Poder Judicial, caducado desde hace cinco años.

Alicia Homs Ginel (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialistas creemos que la verdadera amenaza para nuestra democracia es que las derechas españolas no asuman los resultados electorales del pasado 23 de julio y la mayoría absoluta parlamentaria que ha dado continuidad a un Gobierno progresista.

Lamentablemente, el Partido Popular (PP) y sus socios de gobierno de la extrema derecha prefieren alimentar conspiraciones y comportamientos antidemocráticos antes que apostar por la cordura, la coherencia y la convivencia de nuestro país. Y, sobre todo, siguen dando cancha a los movimientos ultras y no condenan la violencia contra las sedes del Partido Socialista, las amenazas a militantes socialistas y los ataques a periodistas.

Por último, los socialistas defendemos que la proposición de ley orgánica en cuestión no supone ninguna amenaza contra el Estado de Derecho ni la democracia en España, ni contiene ninguna sombra de control judicial o *lawfare*. La verdadera amenaza contra la independencia judicial en España es el bloqueo de la renovación del Consejo General del Poder Judicial, caducado desde hace cinco años.

Nacho Sánchez Amor (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialistas creemos que la verdadera amenaza para nuestra democracia es que las derechas españolas no asuman los resultados electorales del pasado 23 de julio y la mayoría absoluta parlamentaria que ha dado continuidad a un Gobierno progresista.

Lamentablemente, el Partido Popular (PP) y sus socios de gobierno de la extrema derecha prefieren alimentar conspiraciones y comportamientos antidemocráticos antes que apostar por la cordura, la coherencia y la convivencia de nuestro país. Y, sobre todo, siguen dando cancha a los movimientos ultras y no condenan la violencia contra las sedes del Partido Socialista, las amenazas a militantes socialistas y los ataques a periodistas.

Por último, los socialistas defendemos que la proposición de ley orgánica en cuestión no supone ninguna amenaza contra el Estado de Derecho ni la democracia en España, ni contiene ninguna sombra de control judicial o *lawfare*. La verdadera amenaza contra la independencia judicial en España es el bloqueo de la renovación del Consejo General del Poder Judicial, caducado desde hace cinco años.

IN THE CHAIR: MARC ANGEL

Vice-President

13. Utrata niezależności sądów i prześladowanie działaczy prodemokratycznych w Hongkongu (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the statement by the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the destruction of judicial independence and the persecution of democrats in Hong Kong (2023/2984(RSP)).

Commissioner Dubravka Šuica is standing in for the High Representative this evening.

Dubravka Šuica, *Vice-president of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Beijing imposed a national security law on Hong Kong over three years ago, in June 2020. Since then, we have witnessed the rights and freedoms that the people of Hong Kong enjoyed in the past decline rapidly and dramatically. Hong Kong has changed fundamentally. The political opposition in Hong Kong is now effectively muted. Most independent media outlets closed. Many civil society organisations disbanded. More than 280 arrests have been made under the National security law or colonial era sedition legislation. The trials of Jimmy Lai, the so-called Hong Kong 47 and Stand News are emblematic cases that we are following closely. The European Union strongly condemned the extraterritorial application of the national security law in July, when Hong Kong authorities issued arrest warrants and bounties for eight pro-democracy activists living outside Hong Kong.

EU Member States adopted Council conclusions in July 2020, setting out the initial European response to the imposition of the National Security Law on Hong Kong. That position of the Council remains largely valid and it continues to guide our action. The national security law also threatens to undermine judicial independence. For instance, the executive decides if a case affects national security and it handpicks the judges that preside over national security cases. Sweeping changes to the electoral system have also severely weakened democracy in Hong Kong. This is illustrated by the district council elections coming up in December. Not a single pro-democracy candidate has passed the new nomination procedure. There are no signs that these drastic changes are likely to be reversed. On the contrary, additional national security legislation is being prepared. China has failed to implement its international commitments under the Senior British Declaration of 1984. Hong Kong's high degree of autonomy and the rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong were supposed to be guaranteed until at least 2047. It is crystal clear that China has consciously dismantled the one country, two systems principle.

The European Union will continue to raise human rights concerns with China. Human rights dialogues are an integral part of our frank exchanges with China, and in particular in relation to Hong Kong we will continue to remind China of its international commitments. We will do so in direct contacts, including the upcoming EU-China summit, as well as through public statements. Despite the drastic changes, there are still political and social aspects that distinguish Hong Kong from mainland China. The internet remains largely unrestricted. The media landscape is still more diverse, despite most independent outlets closing down. And there have been positive court rulings on equal treatment of same sex couples.

In short, some pockets of freedom persist. The European Union will continue to implement the July 2020 Council conclusions. Our coordinated measures in response to the national security law.

Miriam Lexmann, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioners, colleagues, the totalitarian regime of the Chinese Communist Party has destroyed Hong Kong's high degree of autonomy and freedom. This is a fact. Moreover, the assault on the judicial independence and abuse of the law to crack down on pro-democracy activists has been central to Beijing's strategy to silence all democratic opposition in Hong Kong.

In the last years, this House has passed multiple resolutions about the deteriorating situation in Hong Kong. But they have been met with a frustrating lack of response from the Council and the Commission. That is why I want to remind colleagues that the deterioration of the freedoms and the rule of law in Hong Kong also directly impacts us, as the growing evidence of sanction invasion through the city continues to show.

Colleagues, it's time for the EU to act. The existing Council conclusions need updating and implementing. We must insist on the immediate release of all people detained under the NSL and for the ending of the political show trials.

Finally, it is time for John Lee and other Hong Kong and Chinese officials to be held accountable, including by imposing EU targeted sanctions.

Isabel Santos, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, alguns perguntarão o que há de novo em Hong Kong e eu digo que nos últimos anos nada há de novo debaixo do sol em Hong Kong, a não ser o agudizar das continuadas afrontas aos direitos e às liberdades fundamentais. Esta é uma das marcas do poder autocrático de Xi Jinping, assente no esvaziamento da independência do poder judicial, à qual se sobrepõe o veredito político, e na feroz perseguição das vozes contestatárias dentro e até, veja-se o desplane, fora do território.

Uma situação que também se alastra a Macau, não esqueçamos isso, onde depois da revisão da Lei de Segurança Nacional, à imagem da lei imposta a Macau, foi recentemente alterada a lei eleitoral, excluindo de qualquer candidatura a chefe do Governo regional e todos aqueles que não sejam considerados patriotas, ou seja, alinhados com Pequim, para que ninguém tenha dúvidas. E tudo isto sem direito a recurso judicial, porque quem pode manda e Xi Jinping manda.

Mais uma vez, diante da opressão a que todas as forças democráticas têm sido sujeitas, diante da marca de opressão a que tem sido sujeita a imprensa e todos os ativistas, pedimos mais uma vez a libertação imediata e incondicional de Jimmy Lai e de todos os ativistas pró-democracia, bem como dos chino-portugueses Tsz Lun Kok e Joseph John, detidos em Hong Kong. E pedimos que a cimeira UE-China de dezembro não seja um mero solilóquio diplomático.

A abordagem destas questões tem que ser feita com clareza e frontalidade e tem que ser consequente. Instamos as autoridades a deixarem de impedir o trabalho de todos os jornalistas. Condenamos as autoridades chinesas por atentarem contra os direitos fundamentais das comunidades de Hong Kong na União Europeia e solicitamos a todos os Estados-Membros que suspendam os tratados de extradição com a China, Hong Kong e Macau.

Hilde Vautmans, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, colleagues, Commissioner, millions: millions of brave demonstrators took the streets in Hong Kong and demanded for democracy, civil rights and freedoms. The national security law has stopped any protests and oppressed fundamental rights. Instead of the principle of one country with two systems, we now see one country imposing its system. Anyone who resists could face a lifetime in jail for anything that the Chinese regime dislikes. Hong Kong's puppet government can appoint judges and overturn rulings.

Colleagues, when the rule of law is in the hands of the Chinese Communist Party, there is no rule of law. As this Parliament's China rapporteur, I will always stand up for the brave people of Hong Kong. We will never forget them. In our new recommendation for the China policy, we call on the EU to condemn China's human rights violations with one single voice. Only then we can defend our values.

We will always, colleagues, repeat our call for sanctions against those responsible for the destruction of democracy and the rule of law in Hong Kong.

Reinhard Bütikofer, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – President, Commissioner, colleagues, the 25th annual report on recent developments in Hong Kong is a dire, dark, dystopian report. Step by step, all the freedoms guaranteed under the Hong Kong Basic Law are being suffocated in violation of international law, and I join the criticism of colleague Lexmann that the Council has been dodging these developments. We demand on you to speak up.

The freedom of press is denied. The freedom of association, the freedom of speech, and the freedom of the vote. Not a single opposition candidate has been allowed to run for the district elections, because if just one opposition person would be elected, everybody would be able to see through the ruse of the totalitarian measures.

The United Nations Human Rights Council has urged Hong Kong to repeal the national security law, but instead hundreds have been arrested – some in custody since 2021, without trial, even in solitary confinement.

I would say we should focus on five demands in dealing with Hong Kong. First of all, don't forget the fate of the democratic fighters like courageous Chow Hang-tung, who gave a very good speech in defence of democracy at her trial. So continue and guarantee trial observation.

Second, sanction John Lee. John Lee is one of the main culprits of these measures. Do not normalise the relationship with his regime. Make sure, through a business advisory, that European companies will not inadvertently become complicit and raise these issues and tell the public how you do that at the upcoming China EU summit.

Anna Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, I'm afraid that picture you painted in your presentation, Commissioner, is less rosy than presented. Both of us know from bygone times how communist rule is able to slowly, consequently suffocate any free will, free speech, freedom of association and a free society within Hong Kong.

On enacting the PRC national security law, four new crimes were introduced: secession, subversion, terrorism and collusion with international organisations. All of these help the judiciary system of Hong Kong to really curb any free activity. We have to act with full resolve here in the European Parliament and in our discussions with PRC authorities.

Anders Vistisen, for ID-Gruppen. – Hr. formand! Kina er en trussel, men Kina har været en trussel lige siden den kommunistiske magtovertagelse. Det kinesiske kommunistiske diktatur har stået for forbrydelser mod menneskeheden på en skala, der fuldt ud tåler sammenligning med Stalins Rusland og Hitlers Tyskland. Alligevel har vi ikke set en stærk fordømmelse fra Europas side af Kinas kommunistiske styreform. Det er jo stærkt bekymrende, at det, som Kina har kunnet vokse sig stærk af, i forhold til den økonomiske magt, der nu er blevet til en militær magt, har været en fuldstændig »laissez faire tilgang« fra Europas side. En tilgang, hvor man gang på gang har givet efter over for det kinesiske diktatur. Ja, selv i denne sal har vi folk siddende, der under hele den kolde krig forsvarede kommunismen og stadig i dag ikke har anerkendt det omfang af forbrydelser, som det kommunistiske Kina har stået for gennem tiden. Så hvis vi skal have et opgør, hvis vi skal redde Hong Kong, så kræver det først og fremmest et hårdt opgør med Kina. Men jeg tror ikke på, at viljen er til stede, for EU og Europa har svigtet på den dagsorden i årtier.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, negli ultimi mesi la drammatica situazione in cui versa Hong Kong è finita troppo lontana dai riflettori, scavalcata dalle altrettanto, e forse anche più, drammatiche notizie che ci arrivano da altre parti del mondo, penso all'Ucraina, penso alla Palestina. Eppure abbiamo il dovere morale di tenere alta l'attenzione su un Paese che ha visto l'arresto di oltre 200 attivisti filodemocratici, che ha visto il progressivo smantellamento delle istituzioni democratiche e dell'intero impianto di diritti civili che era un tempo il suo vanto.

La popolazione di Hong Kong continua la sua battaglia e noi dobbiamo essere al loro fianco contro la brutalità repressiva del Partito comunista cinese. Dobbiamo sospendere tutti i trattati di estradizione che ancora alcuni Stati membri hanno verso la Cina. Dobbiamo sanzionare duramente questa politica annessionista che viola gli impegni internazionali di Pechino, che mostra sempre più i tratti di una dittatura incompatibile con i nostri principi e valori.

Faccio un appello chiaro a tutti quei leader politici europei, e specialmente in Italia, che ancora oggi strizzano l'occhio a Pechino, che ancora oggi difendono spudoratamente memorandum fallimentari e ipocriti. Non barattiamo i nostri principi e valori sull'altare di un *business as usual* dal quale abbiamo solo molto da perdere e poco o niente da guadagnare. Altrimenti non rimarrà nulla del nostro essere europei, democratici e difensori delle libertà individuali. Il vostro silenzio è complice. Oggi noi siamo tutti cittadini di Hong Kong.

David Lega (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, Europe's biggest long-term threat remains the Chinese communist regime, which seeks systemic global supremacy, and they have a plan to achieve it. Tiananmen, Tibet, Xinjiang, Hong Kong. In 2019, Hong Kongers stood and sang for freedom. Thousands, including children, were arrested and jailed. And in 2020 came the infamous National Security Law, which continues to strangle freedom, with new restrictions now threatening all remaining independence for civil society, business and the judiciary. We are seeing freedom of religion tested, with the regime's red and gold flag now being paired alongside Christian pulpits.

This Parliament has called for targeted sanctions against all those responsible for ongoing crackdowns, for the release of Jimmy Lai and all human rights defenders, and for the protection of Hong Kongers in Europe. So my question to the Commission is, how will human rights in Hong Kong be prioritised in the EU-China summit this December?

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, l'Union européenne est bien plus qu'une simple unité économique. C'est un projet politique fondée sur le respect de l'état de droit. Et depuis des années, les citoyens de Hong Kong nous montrent que cet idéal compte. Que oui, une justice indépendante vaut la peine qu'on se batte pour elle. Aujourd'hui, ils en paient le prix. Répressions, disparitions, emprisonnements, procès arbitraires. Elle est là, la réponse du gouvernement chinois. Et ne nous y trompons pas, cette réponse nous est aussi destinée et nous devons être très fermes.

Mais pour être entendue, l'Union européenne doit être unie. En Européens, nous devons mettre fin à notre dépendance à l'égard de la Chine, travailler à notre autonomie stratégique, accélérer notre réduction des risques, ne laisser passer aucune attaque contre l'état de droit et soutenir le peuple de Hong Kong.

Oui, Madame la Commissaire, ce n'est qu'avec une Europe forte que nous pourrions aider les citoyens de Hong Kong. Alors, cessons de tergiverser et avançons.

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Herr talman! Kommissionen, kollegor och åhörare. Från folkmassan i tågasmolnet hörs ljudet av skräck och slagord. Demonstranternas starka stämband skapar synkade ramsor. Det är ljudet av hängivenhet och ett envist bevis att Hongkongarna är beredda att dö för sin frihet.

Så skriver den svenska liberalen och författaren Simona Mohamsson i sin bok Hongkong RIP.

Kampen om Hongkong är större än en stads öde. Det är en uppgörelse om Kinas inflytande i världen. 2019 reste sig folket i Hongkong och protesterade mot vad som blivit ett land, ett system. Trots löften om att Hongkong skulle tillåtas behålla sitt fria, demokratiska samhälle så krossade Kina drömmen med kraft och fortsätter att göra det.

Därför ska EU tala klarspråk med en enad röst om att Kina är vårt största hot mot den liberala demokratin i världen.

Engin Eroglu (Renew). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren Kollegen! Über was reden wir heute hier? 7,5 - Millionen Menschen, die in Hongkong in den letzten drei Jahren alles verloren haben, was man verlieren konnte, wenn man an westliche oder globale Werte denkt – nicht nur Freiheit, sondern auch die Würde wurde verloren. Es ist unbestreitbar, dass die Kommunistische Partei innerhalb von drei, dreieinhalb Jahren hier 7,5 Millionen Menschen, die in einer Amtssprache Englisch in Freiheit geboren sind, aber heute in einer kommunistischen Diktatur leben, aufwachsen müssen oder sozialisiert werden – und China hört nicht damit auf; es geht weiter.

Wenn wir uns anschauen, dass über 60 % der Schulen christliche Träger in China sind, wird hier nicht einmal haltgemacht vor der Religionsfreiheit. Wir müssen – und das ist meine feste Überzeugung – den Scheinwerfer der Diskussion auch auf die Kommunistische Partei in China legen, denn ich bin der festen Überzeugung, dass das, was dort in Hongkong passiert, nicht zum Lehrstuhl von anderen Autokraten weltweit werden darf. Und das heißt für uns, dass wir jetzt bei dem Gipfel Europa-China darüber reden müssen und die Welt klar darüber aufklären müssen, was in Hongkong innerhalb von drei Jahren passiert ist.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, do you seriously think this institution has the moral or political authority to shout about breaches of human rights in Hong Kong, or anywhere else for that matter, when the majority of MEPs in here are supporting a genocide in Gaza? Once again, we are carrying out the bidding of NATO hawks.

Chinese President Xi Jinping went to the US to work towards thawing relations last week. Why are you here stirring the pot again on the pretext of human rights abuses, when you clearly don't give a damn about human rights? Can we talk about the right to protest and freedom of expression being taken away by France and Germany? Can we talk about the French and German police brutalising and arresting thousands of protesters in the streets and German forces raiding people's homes for showing solidarity with the besieged Palestinian people?

How can you throw stones with the blood of over 5 000 children on your hands? The moral bankruptcy of European exceptionalism knows no bounds.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question)

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), blue-card question. – Mr Wallace, just hypothetically assuming that you were right and we were all illegitimate in raising human rights issues, why do you, as the self-declared human rights defender, not take up the cause? Why do you keep silent about the crimes that the CCP commits in China?

Mick Wallace (The Left), blue-card answer. – I have no problem addressing abuses anywhere. And to tell you the truth, I haven't seen a government I liked anywhere on the planet yet, not even in Ireland.

But what is really sickening is the inconsistency in this place. There's over 5 000 children dead in Gaza. There's over 3 000 women. It's a genocide being carried out by a brutal apartheid regime. And this place is supporting the genocide. This place still hasn't called for a ceasefire. We still supply arms to the Israelis to kill Palestinian people. What gives us the moral right?

(The President cut off the speaker)

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Dubravka Šuica, *Vice-president of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, honourable Members, this debate shows that Hong Kong matters to the European Union. We have strong economic ties. The European Union remains the largest foreign business community in Hong Kong. Some 1 600 companies are in business in Hong Kong. The last year, the European Union was Hong Kong's third largest trading partner in goods, after mainland China and Taiwan.

At the same time, Hong Kong matters to the European Union because the deliberate dismantling of Hong Kong's autonomy, democracy and fundamental freedoms affects us directly. The European Union, as a matter of foreign policy and as a matter of values, will consistently speak out on the right of people to express themselves. The European Union will also continue to remind China of the need to uphold its international commitments. The European Union Office in Hong Kong is constantly monitoring political developments and human rights. Together with European Union Member States in Hong Kong, the European Union Office regularly conducts trial observations – already 112 this year. This European diplomatic presence is valued by civil society in Hong Kong, and it marks our determination to stand up for rights and values which are universal.

And to Mr Lega and others, although he left, we showed repeatedly that we are ready to react decisively to address serious human rights violations around the world. When it comes to Hong Kong, we are closely following the situation. We have made it clear that developments in Hong Kong have an impact and on all EU-China relations. We continue implementing the July 2020 package, as already said, but at this stage, we are not currently considering additional measures. As for restrictive measures or sanctions – because he asks about sanctions, any decision to designate persons or entities under an existing sanctions regime, or to amend an existing sanctions regime or set up a new regime, is for the Council, who is here now, to make, acting by unanimity.

President. – The debate is now closed.

14. „Cyprus confidential” - konieczność uniemożliwienia obchodzenia sankcji i przepisów dotyczących przeciwdziałania praniu pieniędzy w UE (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on Council and Commission statements on Cyprus Confidential – the need to curb enablers of sanctions-evasion and money-laundering rules in the EU (2023/2986(RSP)).

Ángeles Moreno Bau, *presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, gracias por invitar al Consejo a este debate. Me gustaría comenzar asegurándoles que el Consejo, al igual que el Parlamento y la Comisión, tiene la firme voluntad de luchar contra el blanqueo de capitales y la financiación del terrorismo. Juntos hemos logrado ya importantes avances en este ámbito, en particular mediante modificaciones a la Directiva contra el blanqueo de capitales, el paquete bancario y el Reglamento sobre la Autoridad Bancaria Europea, así como en el marco del Derecho penal.

Este año hemos adoptado la refundición del Reglamento sobre transferencias de fondos que, mientras tanto, ha entrado en vigor. Además, prosiguen, por supuesto, las negociaciones sobre el Reglamento contra el blanqueo de capitales, la Directiva contra el blanqueo de capitales y la nueva Autoridad de Lucha contra el Blanqueo de Capitales y la Financiación del Terrorismo, que será la piedra angular de nuestro marco común en este ámbito. Todos estos avances dan buena fe de nuestro empeño común por desarrollar un marco más sólido y armonizado y con mejor supervisión. Nuestros respectivos equipos de negociación están trabajando a tiempo completo en este asunto con el fin de lograr nuestro objetivo.

Este debate se refiere en concreto a la investigación denominada «Chipre confidencial». Me abstendré de hacer comentarios sobre noticias en prensa o sobre la situación de un Estado miembro en particular. Entiendo que las autoridades chipriotas están llevando a cabo las investigaciones oficiales pertinentes y que estas deben seguir su curso. Lo que sí puedo decir, desde el punto de vista del Consejo, es que tengo la plena convicción de que el paquete legislativo que estamos debatiendo actualmente dificultará enormemente las actividades de los delincuentes, en particular actividades como las señaladas en este asunto.

La Presidencia está haciendo todos los esfuerzos posibles por lograr un acuerdo político con ustedes, sin lugar a dudas, antes de que finalice la actual legislatura. Dejar pasar esta oportunidad hasta la siguiente legislatura nos privaría de nuestro marco reforzado y sería ciertamente de lamentar. Dicho esto, conservo el optimismo en lo que respecta a las perspectivas para la conclusión de estas negociaciones. Nuestras instituciones están de acuerdo en que es una cuestión urgente como atestigua este debate mismo.

Presidente, señorías, comisario, creo que nos encontramos en un momento importante, en el que tenemos la oportunidad de avanzar hacia un régimen de enorme eficacia para luchar contra el blanqueo de capitales y la financiación del terrorismo. Aguardo con gran interés proseguir las negociaciones sobre el paquete de lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales y concluir las con éxito, esperemos que el mes que viene.

Asimismo, me gustaría aprovechar esta ocasión para mencionar nuestra labor en lo que se refiere a la elusión de sanciones, especialmente en el contexto de la guerra de agresión de Rusia contra Ucrania. Como saben, el undécimo paquete de sanciones contra Rusia incluye un sistema mucho más sólido para bloquear posibles vías de elusión. Es importante que todos los bienes y tecnologías sancionados —pero especialmente todos los bienes de combate que Rusia podría utilizar con fines militares para continuar su agresión contra Ucrania— sean bloqueados. Dada la magnitud de las medidas adoptadas, es muy importante aplicarlas de manera correcta y uniforme. Pero el éxito empieza aquí, con una buena cooperación entre las autoridades competentes de los Estados miembros y la Comisión.

En conclusión, quisiera reiterar nuestra total determinación de seguir colaborando con el Parlamento en este ámbito.

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, the Cyprus Confidential investigation has made serious allegations of sanctions circumvention and money laundering in Cyprus.

According to the investigation, there may also have been instances of tax avoidance or even tax evasion involved. We note that the Cypriot authorities have already announced that they will investigate these matters. We are raising these issues with them too.

A year and a half after the beginning of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, it is essential for us to stay vigilant about any violation or circumvention attempts that could weaken the intended impact of our sanctions. As you know, we have 11 packages of far-reaching sanctions in place. The High Representative and the Commission proposed a 12th package on 14 November. This is currently being discussed in the Council.

We take any allegation of breaches of European sanctions very seriously. We have also been determined to drive forward a very ambitious agenda to fight money laundering and terrorist financing. As a result, the European Union has some of the toughest money laundering rules in the world, thanks also to the commitment of this House.

As you know, we are working to strengthen our tools to fight money laundering with the ambitious package under negotiation. There is no room for complacency. We have to ensure that European rules are correctly implemented by Member States and European operators to prevent crime, protect the European Union financial system and ensure sanctions are enforced.

In July, the Commission opened an infringement procedure against Cyprus on the grounds of incorrect transposition of the fifth Anti-Money Laundering Directive. This action was taken before the Cyprus Confidential investigation.

We keep a close eye on the implementation of European law. This infringement mainly relates to how the national beneficial ownership register works. The beneficial ownership register is a pillar of any national framework against money laundering. It contains data on the beneficial owners of companies and trusts: who actually owns what. A complete and accurate beneficial ownership register is essential for enforcing sanctions because it can help identify the true owners, who often are behind complex corporate structures.

The EU Member States are responsible for implementing and enforcing sanctions. The Commission has dedicated significant efforts to support Member States in this task. We provide guidance and bring national authorities together on a regular basis to exchange data and best practices. We want to help make sure that sanctions are uniformly applied across the European Union. We set up the 'freeze and seize task force' to improve the cooperation with and among Member States on sanctions implementation.

But there will always be unscrupulous actors looking to make a profit no matter what, including by violating or circumventing sanctions. Violating sanctions is a crime in most Member States, but how offences are defined and the types and levels of penalties differ significantly across the Member States.

To address this problem, the Commission last year proposed a directive to harmonise definitions and penalties for sanctions violation. The proposal contains a detailed list of criminal offences targeting violations of different types of European sanctions, such as asset-freeze measures, sectorial measures, travel bans and arms embargoes. The list of criminal offences also covers specific cases of sanction circumvention.

I want to thank the rapporteurs, the shadow rapporteurs and their teams working on anti-money laundering files and the proposal on the violation of sanctions. I know that Parliament takes these matters as seriously as the Commission does.

The Commission is closely following developments in Cyprus. Last week, 14 November, Cyprus launched its electronic system for the beneficial ownership register. The roll-out of the whole system is planned for 2024. The Commission is working closely with national authorities to address risks of circumvention, including providing guidance and legal clarity. In June of this year, a Commission delegation travelled to Nicosia to meet Cypriot officials responsible for sanctions implementation and enforcement.

Cyprus is setting up a National Sanctions Implementation Unit. We are watching these efforts closely. We will continue to monitor the situation, and we are available to help the relevant authorities in Cyprus on this matter. I look forward to your views.

Λουκάς Φουρλάς, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, τα όσα είδαν το φως της δημοσιότητας σχετικά με τη δημοσιογραφική έρευνα για την Κύπρο θα πρέπει να διερευνηθούν διεξοδικά και σε περίπτωση που εντοπιστούν παραβάσεις από οποιονδήποτε, ένας είναι ο δρόμος: αυτός της δικαιοσύνης. Δεν τίθεται καμία συζήτηση περί τούτου. Αυτοί που έκλεψαν, αν έκλεψαν, αυτοί που παραβίασαν τους νόμους, αν τους παραβίασαν, ναι, να πάνε φυλακή, όσο ψηλά και αν βρίσκονται.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, κατηγορείται η Κύπρος για ένα πρόγραμμα το οποίο έχει καταργηθεί τον Νοέμβριο του 2020, την ώρα που αυτό το πρόγραμμα βρίσκεται σε ισχύ σε άλλες ευρωπαϊκές χώρες. Στο στόχαστρο η Κύπρος. Όχι αδικώς, με αυτά που δημοσιεύονται. Οφείλω, όμως, εδώ να σας υπενθυμίσω και κάποιες άλλες αλήθειες που δεν πρέπει να ξεχνάμε. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έκανε πειραματόζωο, το 2013, την Κύπρο με το κούρεμα καταθέσεων. Χιλιάδες συμπατριώτες μου φτωχοποιήθηκαν. Χιλιάδες περιουσίες χάθηκαν σε μια νύχτα. Ευτυχώς, δέκα χρόνια μετά από αυτό, το πείραμα δεν έχει επαναληφθεί πουθενά αλλού.

Ακόμα μια αλήθεια: η Κύπρος στη βάση αρχών και αξιών, στήριζε πάντα τις αποφάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, έστω και αν αυτές είχαν τεράστιο οικονομικό και πολιτικό κόστος για την πατρίδα μου. Αυτά είναι καλό να μην τα ξεχνάμε. Στέκομαι μπροστά σας και υπερασπίζομαι τον λαό μου και την πατρίδα μου και όχι τους κλέφτες και όσους εκμεταλλεύτηκαν τυχόν αδυναμίες του προγράμματος. Επαναλαμβάνω, όσο πιο γρήγορα πληρώσουν αυτοί που ενέχονται, εάν ενέχονται, τόσο πιο γρήγορα θα καθαρίσει και το όνομα της χώρας μου.

Eero Heinälouoma, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Danske Bank, Deutsche Bank, Credit Suisse and now the latest one, the Cyprus Confidential files. The list of money laundering scandals in the EU seems to be endless. Criminals, oligarchs and the super-rich continue to get help of our financial system and intermediaries to launder their money. And the fact is that especially Russian money is also a security threat to us. This has to stop for good. And this is not a question of Cyprus, it is a question of whole financial system.

That is why S&D takes the lead in pushing for an ambitious and effective AML package. This package ought to close its regulatory loopholes despite any kind of resistance. I have great confidence in the Spanish presidency. Let's work together to create a better world for honest entrepreneurs and citizens. Let's close the loopholes. Let's set up stringent rules around beneficial ownership to ensure we identify the real criminals behind the opaque corporate structures. Let's come forward with strict and effective rules around targeted financial sanctions against the oligarchs. Let's close the loopholes in the crypto sector to ensure it will not be used anymore to finance terrorism. Strict and effective AML rules will make Europe more fair and safe. That is what our voters expect from us.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, I would like to start by thanking the journalists who, once again, were the ones who have uncovered wrongdoing. We are now talking about Cyprus Confidential, but it could be LuxLeaks, Panama Papers, the Paradise Papers ... We have to ask ourselves, why is it that journalists seem to be the ones who are actually in charge of law enforcement? Why is it that all this wrongdoing is not uncovered by the authorities: the national authorities and the European authorities?

And quite frankly, I am tired of hearing the European Commission say, 'oh, this is national competence'. The only kind of enforcement that the Commission does is seeing to it that a Member State transposes the legislation, and your responsibility ends there. I recommend that you read the Treaties once. It doesn't say there that it's only about transposition. You are responsible for enforcing EU laws and the European Commission is not doing its job. You know why? Because you rely exclusively on national authorities doing their duty. But you know what? When it's about corruption and financial wrongdoings, the national authorities very often are the culprits. They're complicit. They're involved. Cyprus, Malta ... I mean, we can give so many examples. And this is the problem. It's happening right under your noses. And because of this lax attitude of the European Commission, never mind the national authorities that are guilty of this, the European Union is turning into a gangster's paradise – because there is complete impunity, because of your very legalistic interpretation or very narrow interpretation of the Treaties, which I'm sure is wrong.

Finally, we are now working on the directive to criminalise sanction circumvention, and I would very much like to invite the Council to join the European Parliament in fighting for strong enforcement and harmonisation, closing all the loopholes.

Saskia Bricmont, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, coffre-fort pour les oligarques russes, place financière opaque favorable au contournement des sanctions et des règles européennes contre le blanchiment de capitaux, système d'octroi de visas dorés. Non, ce n'est pas le scénario de la toute dernière série Netflix, c'est bien ce que révèle «Cyprus Confidential» sur Chypre, un État membre de l'Union européenne.

Alors que la Russie déclenchait sa guerre contre l'Ukraine, les facilitateurs financiers chypriotes se sont empressés d'aider les oligarques russes et les alliés de Poutine pour protéger leurs actifs et éviter les sanctions occidentales en place depuis 2014.

Permettre à des criminels de passer entre les mailles du filet des mesures restrictives européennes contre la Russie, c'est non seulement une violation de la législation européenne et un contournement des sanctions, mais c'est aussi une forme de complicité avec la Russie de Poutine.

Si la mauvaise réputation de Chypre n'est plus à faire, connue pour sa législation trop laxiste qui permet une industrie florissante du secteur financier et du secret financier surtout, sa complaisance tourne en complicité. Elle sert aussi de courroie de transmission à l'argent sale et aux fortunes russes vers l'Occident, alors que le mot d'ordre est de faire barrage à Poutine il appartient donc aussi au Conseil de légiférer, de réagir.

Quand les sanctions, qui sont notre seule arme non militaire contre Poutine, sont ainsi contournées, et quand la citoyenneté européenne fait l'objet de transactions financières et bénéficie à des criminels de guerre, la menace pour la sécurité européenne est réelle.

L'action chypriote, mais aussi la mollesse de la Commission face aux demandes répétées de notre assemblée de légiférer sur les visas dorés, et de faire en sorte que la loi européenne soit respectée, sont impardonnables face à une situation connue de longue date et toujours pas réglée malgré la guerre aux frontières de l'Union.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner, ECR-ryhmän puolesta. – Arvoisa puhemies, tämä uusi Kyproksen tietovuoto paljasti hälyttävää tietoa maan rahoitussektorin kytköksistä Venäjään. Esimerkiksi kirjanpitojätti PwC:n Kyproksen-toimisto on avustanut Putinin lähipiiriä samaan aikaan, kun Venäjä on käynyt hyökkäyssotaa Ukrainaa vastaan. Kyproslaiset yritykset ovat avustaneet EU:n pakotteiden alaisia henkilöitä pakotteiden kiertämisessä.

Maan rahoitussektori on jo pitkään ollut täynnä venäläistä rahaa. Maassa on tehty yli kahdensadan miljardin dollarin edestä venäläisten investointeja.

Nostan tässä yhteydessä esiin sijoittajien kansalaisuusjärjestelyt eli kultaiset viisumit. Kyproksella on ollut viime vuosiin asti mahdollista hankkia EU-passi kahdella miljoonalla eurolla vain kuuden kuukauden odottelun jälkeen. Monelle venäläisoligarkille EU-passin hankkiminen on siis voinut järsäytyä yksinkertaisella tilisiirrolla. Pidän tärkeänä, että nämä kulttaisten viisumien käytännöt kielletään koko unionin alueella ja että jo ostetut EU-kansalaisuudet mitätöitäisiin.

Γιώργος Γεωργίου, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, έχουμε κουραστεί να ακούμε μεγάλα λόγια. Ευτυχώς που υπάρχουν και οι τίμιοι δημοσιογράφοι —και τους συγχαίρω, βέβαια— να μας αποκαλύπτουν το βάθος ενός συστήματος διαφθοράς και διαπλοκής. Είναι αυτό το σύστημα που με την απραξία τους και τον εθισμό τους στην αδιαφάνεια διαφυλάσσουν οι ίδιοι οι θεσμοί της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, των φορολογικών παραδείσων και της προστασίας των κλοπιμαίων στο όνομα της ελεύθερης αγοράς.

Πρόεδροι, πρωθυπουργοί και άλλοι αξιωματούχοι κρατών μελών κατά καιρούς εμπλέκονται σε σκάνδαλα. Δυστυχώς, και ο τέως πρόεδρος της δικής μου χώρας, ο κύριος Αναστασιάδης, μαζί με μια χούφτα επιτήδειους. Ο λαός μας, όμως, ο λαός της Κύπρου, να ξέρετε, δεν είναι κλέφτης. Είναι άνθρωποι τίμιοι που δύσκολα τα βγάζουν πέρα και θυμώνουν με αυτά που ακούνε. Διότι ξέρουν πως τίποτα δεν θα γίνει ούτε εδώ ούτε στη χώρα μου. Να σας θυμίσω τα Panama Papers. Κάνατε κάτι; Θα μας μιλήσετε και μας είπατε ήδη για διάφορες νομοθεσίες, λες και αυτό είναι το πρόβλημα, ενώ την ίδια στιγμή κάποιои κλείνουν πονηρά το μάτι στη διαφθορά και τη διαπλοκή. Επειδή το πρόβλημα είναι συστημικό. Επειδή μια παροιμία λέει: το ένα χέρι νίβει το άλλο και τα δύο το πρόσωπο. Τόσο απλά.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Mr President, when explaining what is our work on ML reviews, I am always saying that an ML system is only as strong as the weakest points.

Unfortunately, we have too many weak points in Europe. Dealing with the financial sanctions, this is the same exercise as anti-money laundering. We need to track the flows and understand who owns what. So it is not surprising that we have seen such a failure of some firms in Cyprus. What is maybe surprising is that some large multinational firms are involved.

It is highly appropriate that EP negotiators are calling for stronger safeguards during our ML negotiation. And it's a little bit frustrating that we must convince about it the Commission and the Council all over again. We have the right pieces on the table: AMLA should look after good enforcement across the Member States, and better access to asset registries should also help a lot.

Even if we agree on stronger ML review, the job is not over. Those who want to help criminals to hide or launder money will be looking after weak spots. We must make sure that there are not many. At the same time, we also must implement the really tough sanctions on those who are not following the law. I hope this is exactly what Cypriot and other authorities will do very quickly.

Δημήτρης Παπαδάκης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τη στιγμή που κυπριακός λαός πλήρωνε τεράστιο κόστος με τη λήψη κυρώσεων κατά της Ρωσίας, δυστυχώς, κάποιои λίγοι, εκμεταλλευόμενοι κενά στον χρόνο εφαρμογής των κυρώσεων, προχωρούσαν στην αλλαγή ιδιοκτησίας εταιρειών που θα περιλαμβάνονταν στη λίστα των κυρώσεων. Αυτά στο βωμό του προσωπικού κέρδους, αδιαφορώντας ακόμη και για τη φήμη της χώρας τους, νιώθοντας ότι λειτουργούν σε καθεστώς ανομίας και ατιμωρησίας. Με τις κυρώσεις πλήγηκε ο τουριστικός κλάδος σε τεράστιο βαθμό, έκλεισαν επιχειρήσεις και οι Κύπριοι αγρότες σταμάτησαν να εξάγουν τα προϊόντα τους στη Ρωσία, βλέποντας τους Ρώσους επενδυτές να μετακομίζουν στην Τουρκία και στο κατεχόμενο κομμάτι της Κύπρου.

Δυστυχώς, η αρνητική αναφορά του ονόματος της χώρας μου αμαυρώθηκε από αυτούς τους λίγους και προστίθεται στις αρνητικές αναφορές εμπλοκής της Κύπρου μετά από τα Panama Papers, τα χρυσά διαβατήρια και την Pegasus. Η νέα κυβέρνηση δια του προέδρου της ανέφερε ότι κανείς δεν είναι υπεράνω της φήμης της χώρας μας και ότι όλα θα διερευνηθούν. Αναμένουμε ότι δεν θα μείνουν μόνο ως διακηρύξεις, αλλά θα διερευνηθούν και θα τιμωρηθούν αυτοί που παραβίασαν τις σχετικές αποφάσεις. Ήδη στην Κύπρο έχει ποινικοποιηθεί η παραβίαση των κυρώσεων και γίνεται ακόμη πιο αυστηρό το θεσμικό πλαίσιο. Διαφάνεια παντού και για όλους, σε ολόκληρη την Ευρώπη.

Stéphanie Yon-Courtin (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, alors que nous sommes au 11^e train de sanctions contre la Russie, un consortium de journalistes dénonce de potentielles opérations de blanchiment d'argent de la part d'oligarques russes à Chypre, au sein même de l'Union européenne. C'est un scandale de trop qui ne fragilise pas qu'un seul État membre, mais toute l'Europe, tant notre système financier est interconnecté.

À l'heure où le monde est touché par des conflits multiples où prospèrent la corruption et le blanchiment de capitaux, des fléaux qui, avec la digitalisation de l'économie, ne connaissent aucune frontière, nous avons besoin en urgence de plus d'Europe. Plus d'Europe avec nos nouvelles règles pour lutter efficacement contre le blanchiment d'argent et s'assurer d'une application efficace des sanctions. Plus d'Europe avec la future Autorité européenne de lutte contre le blanchiment d'argent, l'AMLA, qui sera un outil clé pour y parvenir en travaillant en étroite coopération avec l'Autorité de surveillance des marchés financiers, l'AEMF, basée à Paris.

Car le second sujet, c'est bien celui de la supervision des marchés financiers. Les autorités de surveillance nationales ont toujours un pouvoir important, mais elles doivent coopérer entre elles parce que cela a des conséquences sur tout notre marché. Il faut donc étendre les pouvoirs de l'AEMF pour envisager une supervision directe sur nos marchés financiers. Donc une institution forte avec un règlement unique pour une application harmonisée sur l'ensemble du marché intérieur, c'est la solution pour mettre fin au *Forum Shopping* et en finir enfin avec ces scandales qui affaiblissent nos démocraties.

Rasmus Andresen (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! „Wir werden gegen Putins Helfershelfer vorgehen, und wir werden gegen all jene vorgehen, die Russland dabei helfen, die Sanktionen zu umgehen oder sein Kriegsarsenal aufzufüllen.“ Mit diesem sehr starken Versprechen hat Kommissionspräsidentin Ursula von der Leyen Russlands Helfern in der Europäischen Union den Kampf angesagt.

Die Recherche Cyprus Confidential zeigt, dass hinter diesen Worten leider viel zu wenig Taten stecken: Hundert sanktionierte Russen machen ungestört Geschäfte auf Zypern. Russisches Geld fließt nach wie vor in großen Mengen über Zypern in die Europäische Union. Zypern ist seit vielen Jahren für russisches Geld das Einfallstor. Und trotz vollmundiger Ankündigungen – auch von zyprischen Regierungen – ist es bisher nicht gelungen, mit dieser Praxis zu brechen.

Wir müssen entschlossen gegen Geldwäsche und gegen die Umgehung von Sanktionen vorgehen. Wir brauchen klare Regeln zur Offenlegung von Oligarchenvermögen wie beispielsweise Luxusjachten, Gemälde oder Privatjets. Es ist inakzeptabel, dass die Mitgliedstaaten beim Geldwäschepaket aktuell in den Verhandlungen mehr Transparenz blockieren und es so Oligarchen erleichtern, ihr Vermögen auch in der Europäischen Union zu verstecken.

Wir müssen uns stärker mit der Rolle von Wirtschaftsprüfungsgesellschaften wie PricewaterhouseCoopers auseinandersetzen; die spielen keine gute Rolle. Sie helfen russischen Oligarchen dabei, ihr Vermögen in der Europäischen Union zu verstecken. Und es wird jetzt Zeit für die Europäische Kommission, zu handeln – im Notfall auch gegen Zypern, denn wer Sanktionen umgeht, muss damit rechnen, auch selbst sanktioniert zu werden.

Anna Fotyga (ECR). – Mr President, Commissioner, even a general overview of the ICIJ Cyprus Confidential files based on seven leaked records raises enormous concern. Almost 100 billionaires and oligarchs have been able to evade imposed sanctions both post Crimea annexation and post February 2022, a full scale invasion, were able to evade sanctions thanks to European financial services systems, predominantly Cypriot but not only, thus enhancing Putin's possibility to maintain further aggression and war crimes in Ukraine.

Commissioner, you rightly raised the issue of beneficiary ownership records. We have to work on this because it is important, but we have to carefully overview the issue. It is certainly extremely disturbing.

Ralf Seekatz (PPE). – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kollegen! Die Ereignisse in Zypern zeigen, dass es wirklich allerhöchste Zeit ist, dass wir mit der neuen Verordnung endlich ein einheitliches Regelwerk und Rahmenwerk in der Union verabschieden und auch schaffen werden. Es ist aber auch deutlich geworden, dass wir mehr Wert auf die eigentlichen Prioritäten legen müssen. Während wir hier gerade zwischen dem Europäischen Parlament und Rat verhandeln, welche Warenhändler oder Fußballvereine wir mit weiteren Pflichten belasten wollen, wird anderenorts russisches Schwarzgeld völlig unbehelligt gewaschen und werden Sanktionen umgangen und großzügige goldene Visa erteilt. Die strengeren Regeln, die wir seit über zwei Jahren verhandeln, nutzen nichts, wenn sich einige Mitgliedstaaten nicht ausreichend um die Umsetzung der jetzt schon geltenden Regeln kümmern.

Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen die großen Fische auch fangen wollen. Die Kommission muss endlich durchgreifen und sicherstellen, dass auch die aktuellen Regeln durchgesetzt und Sanktionen umgesetzt werden. Nur dann machen auch die neuen Regeln, die wir mit sehr viel Engagement verhandeln, Sinn.

Niels Fuglsang (S&D). – Hr. formand! Kære kollegaer, så står vi her desværre igen. Det nye læk, vi diskuterer i dag, viser med al tydelighed, at når vi taler om skattely, når vi taler om hvidvask, så peger pilen ikke kun ud mod fjerne stater i Stillehavet. Så peger pilen i allerhøjeste grad også mod os selv her i EU. For det læk, vi har set nu, viser, hvordan finanssektoren i Cypern hjælper russiske oligarker. Hjælper våbenhandlere. Hjælper en olievirksomhed, der er ejet af det syriske regime, med at skjule sig, med at skjule deres penge. Jeg er ked af at sige det kollegaer, men det er jo klart at hykleriet driver ned af væggene her i bygningen og i EU i det hele taget. For vi er alle sammen enige om, at skattely skal bekæmpes, men alligevel lader vi stå til mange steder rundt omkring i EU. Luxembourg er et af verdens største skattely. Irland er usolidariske, når de dumper selskabsskatterne for at tiltrække store virksomheder, og nu har vi også fået blotlagt, hvordan Cypern med sine lempelige regler i finanssektoren og deres nærmest ikke eksisterende kontrol faciliterer skattely, faciliterer hvidvask. Det kan simpelt hen ikke blive ved med at gå. Vi bliver nødt til at sætte ind. Lad os leve op til vores egne standarder. Lad os putte de lande, de EU lande, der agerer som skattely på vores sortliste for skattely. Det er tid til at handle.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Domnule Președinte, *Cyprus confidential* ne-a arătat, negru pe alb, cum companii europene din Cipru, de această dată, facilitează transferul de fonduri în numele miliardarilor Putiniști, pentru a evita sancțiunile impuse de UE în urma invaziei Rusiei în Ucraina. Transferul clandestin a 5 milioane de dolari în aceeași zi în care au fost impuse sancțiunile UE, nu este doar o încălcare a legii, ci și un dispreț flagrant pentru principiile care stau la baza angajamentului nostru colectiv pentru pace, justiție și stat de drept.

Această investigație ne arată din nou vulnerabilitățile în aplicarea sancțiunilor și subliniază urgența unei supravegheri mai solide. Nu putem permite instituțiilor financiare să submineze eforturile Uniunii Europene de a-i trage la răspundere pe cei responsabili de agresiune și de încălcări ale drepturilor omului. Cer Consiliului să urgenteze finalizarea negocierilor pentru noua autoritate de combatere a spălării banilor și pentru întreg pachetul legislativ pentru combaterea spălării de bani. Trebuie să livrăm și trebuie să oprim Putinismul, în toate formele lui.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, once again, thanks to the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists, we are made aware of a huge money laundering scandal in the EU. The latest investigation shows how financial firms in Cyprus have aided Russian oligarchs in hiding their wealth offshore. So it seems that Cyprus has widely contributed to Russian influence through its golden passports and visa schemes. Dozens of Russian billionaires were clients of the island's professional service providers. Some have come under sanctions since February-2022 and others since 2014. 800 companies registered in tax and secrecy havens, all controlled by Russians. This poses a wider question about the capacity of our institutions to prevent these deficiencies from rotting our union from within. It took years for the Commission to start acting on golden passport schemes. Right now, Malta is not even considering stopping its own scheme. We have to call this what it is: selling European citizenship to make dirty money, giving the opportunity to dangerous people or mafia or foreign malicious actors to interfere and exert power in the EU. It needs to stop.

Ελένη Σταύρου (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, μετά λύπης βρίσκομαι σήμερα στο βήμα. Ως Κύπρια πολίτης και ευρωβουλευτής, το πρώτο που έχω να πω είναι: όλα στο φως. Οι αρμόδιες αρχές σε εθνικό και ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο οφείλουν να διερευνήσουν σε βάθος τις κατηγορίες και να πράξουν αναλόγως. Τα δημοσιεύματα αυτά πάνε πίσω τριάντα χρόνια.

Οφείλω να επισημάνω την τεράστια πρόοδο που σημειώνει η Κύπρος τα τελευταία χρόνια στα θέματα της διαφάνειας, της εποπτείας και του ξεπλύματος, όπως διατυπώνονται από τις δηλώσεις Αμερικανών και Ευρωπαίων αξιωματούχων που εξυμνούν την πρόοδο της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας. Παρά τις παραδοσιακές σχέσεις με τη Ρωσία, η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία στήριξε αμέσως όλες τις κυρώσεις απέναντί της, σε αντίθεση με άλλα πολύ ισχυρότερα κράτη μέλη. Το πράξαμε, αφού εδώ και 49 χρόνια παραμένουμε διαιρεμένοι από την τουρκική εισβολή και κατοχή του βορείου τμήματος της πατρίδας μας, κάτι το οποίο αφήνει την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ανενόχλητη, αφού επιδεικνύει την ίδια ευαισθησία που επιδεικνύει σε άλλες αντίστοιχες περιπτώσεις παραβίασης του διεθνούς δικαίου. Θα θέλαμε να δούμε τις ίδιες κυρώσεις να επιβάλλονται και κατά της Τουρκίας.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αυτό αποδεικνύει και στην πράξη ότι οι κυρώσεις, με τις ελλείψεις και τις παρακάμψεις τους, δεν στερούν από τον Putin τη δυνατότητα χρηματοδότησης του επιθετικού πολέμου εναντίον της Ουκρανίας. Στην Κύπρο, αν ληφθούν μέτρα για την απομάκρυνση ρωσικών κεφαλαίων, κάτι που προφανώς είναι δίκαιο και αναγκαίο, αυτά δυστυχώς θα πάνε κυρίως στα κατεχόμενα και στην Τουρκία που δεν εφαρμόζει κυρώσεις με την κατανόηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και του NATO. Ακόμα και η εφαρμογή κυρώσεων οδηγεί σε αμφιλεγόμενες καταστάσεις. Το μεγαλύτερο διυλιστήριο της Ιταλίας, για να φύγει από τον έλεγχο ρωσικής εταιρείας, κατέληξε στον έλεγχο ενεργειακού ομίλου που ελέγχεται από γαλλοισραηλινό δισεκατομμυριούχο, ο οποίος έχει καταδικαστεί για απάτες σε Ρουμανία και Ελβετία. Πήρε το σημαντικότερο διυλιστήριο της Ιταλίας, ενώ η ελληνική και η κυπριακή δικαιοσύνη αρνήθηκαν να εφαρμόσουν ευρωπαϊκό ένταλμα σύλληψης που εξέδωσε σε βάρος του η Ρουμανία. Επενδύτης στην εταιρεία του και συνεργάτης του η ανιψιά του Έλληνα πρωθυπουργού Αλεξία Μπακογιάννη.

Ζητούνται αποτελεσματικότητα, συνέπεια και ήθος.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, the reason businessmen using a secrecy jurisdiction to hide and move money has got into the news is, let's face it, because they're Russian businessmen. Now, I'm very glad to look at the ways in which the ultra-rich hide and protect their money and the people who help them do it. But I do have a worry, because feverish hatred of all things Russian in Europe, spurred on by geopolitical manoeuvring, has consistently now for years been weaponised to ram through measures in Europe which would otherwise be strenuously resisted by those who call themselves progressive. It's everywhere from crackdowns on NGO financing to efforts to criminalise sanctions-evasion that's going to make humanitarian work even more difficult than it is already.

So it's the war on terror all over again. Anything back then was justified if you were combating terrorism; now you can do what you like as long as you're fighting Russia. So I really plead with colleagues, be outraged by all means, but don't let it be used as another excuse for policies that will end up being used against civil society, while the oligarchs – Russian, Ukrainian and European – will find ways, and they will find ways, to carry on as before.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable members, dear colleagues, I want to thank you for your views and for your comments.

Before I start concluding, may I reply to Ms in 't Veld, to Mr Georgiou, to Mr Fuglsang. I will repeat, the European Commission opened an infringement procedure by sending a letter of formal notice to Cyprus on 14 July this year, on the grounds of its incorrect transposition of the current, fifth Anti-Money Laundering Directive. Cyprus had notified the complete transposition of the directive, but the Commission has identified several instances of incorrect transposition, mainly related to the functioning of the national beneficial ownership register. The Commission is closely following once again the situation and assessing recent developments in Cyprus, as Cyprus has recently launched its electronic system of beneficial ownership register, last week, on 14 November, with the rollout of the entire system planned for 2024, as I said in my introductory remarks.

I want to mention some of the measures in the July 2021 anti-money laundering package, which will strengthen our arsenal in the fight against money laundering. First, there is the European anti-money laundering authority. In the Commission proposal, the authority will be responsible for supervision and support financial intelligence units. Second, the single EU rulebook will bring more consistency, with detailed rules for the private sector in a directly applicable regulation. In the Commission proposal, we addressed auditors, trust and company services providers and other enablers. These enablers present specific risks, as emphasised by the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists. The rules in the anti-money laundering regulation would apply also to these operators, not only to banks or financial institutions.

Our proposed package is also ambitious on the transparency of beneficial owners. Non-EU legal entities linked with the European Union would have to sign up to the European Union's beneficial ownership registers. We have already agreed on some groundbreaking parts of the package – that includes the Transfer of Funds Regulation and the Markets in Crypto Asset Regulation. This means that new technological avenues for money laundering and terrorist financing are covered. We do believe our future rules will help make sure that European Union gatekeepers are well supervised and carry out their work well, whether they are inside or outside the financial sector, and regardless of which Member States they operate in.

So I repeat my call to Parliament and the Council to conclude negotiations on the anti-money laundering package as soon as possible and with as much ambition as possible. We also have efforts on the taxation side of things. The Council recently adopted the eighth Administrative Cooperation Directive. This sets rules for reporting crypto-asset transactions and allows for the automatic exchange of information between tax authorities.

Finally, it is important that the Council addresses the use of shell structures within the European Union. We have a directive pending, which should be concluded quickly and ambitiously.

Ángeles Moreno Bau, *presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, he escuchado con enorme interés sus intervenciones, así como la información facilitada por la Comisión.

Como dije en mi intervención inicial, la Presidencia otorga una enorme importancia a las negociaciones en curso en torno a los diversos instrumentos de lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales. Estamos convencidos de que, al final del proceso, la Unión contará con mejores herramientas para hacer frente al blanqueo de capitales y a la financiación del terrorismo.

La lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales supone un esfuerzo constante que exige estar permanentemente adaptándose y proporcionar todas las herramientas a los agentes involucrados. Por consiguiente, la Presidencia permanecerá a disposición del Parlamento para dialogar sobre este asunto según sea necesario.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Mr President, very briefly, I have the feeling that we're a bit in the Twilight Zone. There is a massive scandal and the Commission says after a debate like this, 'Oh, we're only responsible to see that EU laws are transposed and the Council says everything is fine because we have laws'. Who is responsible? We didn't get an answer to that in this debate.

I find this such a lack of respect, not just to the European Parliament, but to the European citizen. Can we please get an answer from both institutions as to what they're going to do to make sure that such a scandal cannot happen again, and not because crooks are suddenly good people, but because they will enforce the law.

President. – The debate is closed.

15. Trzydziestolecie kryteriów kopenhaskich: nowy impuls dla polityki rozszerzenia UE (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on Council and Commission statements on 30 years of Copenhagen criteria – giving further impetus to EU enlargement policy (2023/2987(RSP)).

Ángeles Moreno Bau, *presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, señorías, señora comisaria, nos hemos reunido aquí para reflexionar sobre los treinta años de los criterios de Copenhague, es decir, las condiciones fundamentales que todos los países candidatos deben cumplir para convertirse en Estados miembros.

Ante todo, deseo destacar que la ampliación ha sido un éxito rotundo para la Unión Europea. Ha contribuido a unir nuestro continente, superar divisiones históricas y crear una Unión más fuerte. Al estar inspirada en los criterios de Copenhague, ha generado reformas transformadoras y consolidado nuestros valores comunes y los principios de la democracia, los derechos fundamentales y el Estado de Derecho.

La ampliación también ha reforzado la influencia de la Unión Europea en el mundo, lo que nos ha permitido desempeñar un papel más importante a escala mundial. La guerra de agresión de Rusia contra Ucrania nos ha recordado que la política de ampliación de la UE es, al mismo tiempo, una inversión geoestratégica en los ámbitos de la paz, la seguridad, la estabilidad y la prosperidad.

El año pasado, el Consejo Europeo adoptó decisiones históricas para confirmar la perspectiva europea de Ucrania, Moldavia y Georgia. Reitera también el compromiso pleno e inequívoco con la perspectiva de integración en la UE de los Balcanes Occidentales.

La ampliación es una de las prioridades del Consejo y seguiremos haciendo todo lo que esté en nuestras manos para avanzar en el proceso de adhesión de los candidatos, de plena conformidad con los criterios de Copenhague.

En este contexto deseo recordar que el proceso de adhesión es un proceso condicional basado en el mérito. Los requisitos generales siguen siendo los mismos para todos los candidatos: es preciso cumplir criterios políticos, económicos y administrativos para poder hacerse cargo de las obligaciones que conlleva la pertenencia a la Unión Europea. Básicamente, en lo que respecta a los criterios de Copenhague los candidatos tienen que estar preparados. El consenso renovado de 2006 sobre la ampliación reafirma la necesidad de una condicionalidad justa y rigurosa, combinada con el principio de mérito propio, teniendo en cuenta también la capacidad de la Unión Europea para admitir a nuevos miembros. Recientemente, en la declaración acordada por los dirigentes de la UE en la Cumbre de Granada, celebrada el 6 de octubre en España, se ha establecido una senda clara en este sentido.

Volviendo a los trabajos en curso del Consejo sobre la ampliación, deseo destacar que la Presidencia acoge con satisfacción el paquete de ampliación de este año. Se trata de un tipo de paquete jamás visto hasta ahora, que abarca diez socios.

Por su parte, la Comisión ha hecho cuatro importantes recomendaciones clave. Como ya saben, la Comisión recomienda iniciar negociaciones de adhesión con Ucrania y Moldavia. Además, recomienda que el Consejo adopte los marcos de negociación necesarios para ambos candidatos, una vez que estos países hayan adoptado determinadas medidas fundamentales. En cuanto a Georgia, la Comisión recomienda que se le otorgue el estatuto de país candidato siempre y cuando se sigan una serie de pasos. En relación con Bosnia y Herzegovina, la Comisión recomienda iniciar negociaciones de adhesión una vez que el país alcance el nivel requerido de cumplimiento de los criterios de adhesión. Actualmente, el Consejo está estudiando el paquete, incluidos los informes y estas recomendaciones.

La Presidencia se ha propuesto como objetivo claro que el 12 de diciembre el Consejo de Asuntos Generales adopte unánimemente las conclusiones del Consejo sobre ampliación, lo cual nos alegrará enormemente. Luego, en la siguiente reunión del Consejo Europeo, los dirigentes de la Unión Europea tendrán que tomar una decisión sobre las recomendaciones de la Comisión.

Dubravka Šuica, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, 30 years ago the Copenhagen Criteria were established by the Copenhagen European Council in 1993 and strengthened by the Madrid European Council in 1995. They set clear benchmarks on the basis of which aspiring European Member States' accession paths could be assessed. The Copenhagen criteria are the following: First, stability and institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for, and protection of, minorities. Second, a functioning market economy and the ability to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the European Union. And third, the ability to take on the obligations of membership, including the capacity to effectively implement the rules, standards and policies that make up the body of European law, the *acquis*, and adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union. The criteria must be met for accession. They constitute a central element of our enlargement policy and remain a key pillar of our policy. Our yearly enlargement reports analyse the stability of institutions, the rule of law, known as the fundamentals of all aspiring European Union Member States. The functioning market economy and ability to cope with competitiveness are core to the economic chapters. We examine the alignment with the European *acquis* in our annual

enlargement package, and in more detail during the screening process and when opening chapters during accession negotiations.

Two weeks ago, as all of you know, we adopted a big enlargement package. Then country reports for the first time and the growth plan for the Western Balkans. The Commission recommended that the Council open accession negotiations with Ukraine and Moldova. The Commission recommended the opening of accession negotiations with Bosnia Herzegovina. Once the necessary degree of compliance with the membership criteria is achieved, latest by March of next year. Further, we recommended to grant candidate status to Georgia on the understanding that certain steps are taken.

A functioning market economy and the ability to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the European Union are equally important as democratic institutions. This is why we are boosting investment and economic growth even before accession. The aim of the growth plan is to boost the economy of the Western Balkans in the next years, in order to close the socio-economic gap between the Union and our partners by the end of this decade. The offer provided by the Growth Plan is therefore a unique opportunity for the Western Balkans to speed up their economic growth and convergence with the European Union, as well as through targeted reforms accelerating the path towards European Union membership. Therefore, the Growth Plan is creating the possibility of early integration of the region into the European Union even before they join our Union. This House has a key role in making it happen. The financial pillar of the growth plan, the EUR 6 billion growth facility, needs to be adopted during the mandate of this Parliament, as we have no time to waste.

Honourable Members, the Copenhagen Criteria have stood the test of time. They capture the essence of what a candidate country needs to do in order to prepare its political, economic and legal system for European membership. But most importantly, they are an expression of the foundation and values on which the European Union is built. The existence of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for, and protection of, minorities, the existence of functioning market economies, and the ability to take on the obligations of membership. We must continue building our joint future based on these criteria.

Michael Gahler, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! 30 - Jahre Kopenhagener Kriterien – ich denke, das waren damals richtige Kriterien im politischen und im wirtschaftlichen Bereich, und sie sind es bis heute geblieben.

Damals haben sie dafür gesorgt, dass die Kandidatenländer präzise einen Rahmen vorgegeben bekamen, an dem sie sich orientieren konnten. Das ist vielleicht auch der Unterschied zu den Ländern, die bisher in der Östlichen Partnerschaft waren. Die hatten diesen präzisen Rahmen nicht, da war diese Beitrittsperspektive noch nicht drin. Und die Folge war unter anderem, dass eben in Ländern wie der Ukraine, ich sage mal, der Wilde Osten – also in Anspielung auf den Wilden Westen – weiterhin zugange war und auf diese Art und Weise Oligarchen Strukturen aufgebaut haben, eben weil sie dachten, sie könnten weiterhin so agieren, wie sie es bis vor Kurzem auch in der Ukraine veranstaltet haben.

Diejenigen, die im mitteleuropäischen Bereich – ja, in der Wendezeit – auch sich das eine oder andere aneignen konnten, haben relativ früh dann mit diesen Kriterien verstanden: Aha, jetzt geht es Richtung Rechtsstaat, jetzt müssen wir uns an den Rahmen halten, der vorgegeben ist, und haben insofern aus meiner Sicht den Rechtsstaat viel früher umarmt und auf die Art dann auch dazu beigetragen, dass wirtschaftlich, aber auch politisch hier ein Rahmen gesetzt wurde in den Beitrittskandidatenländern, der dann kompatibel sein sollte mit der Europäischen Union.

Ich bin zuversichtlich: Wenn wir diese Kriterien im politischen und im wirtschaftlichen Bereich auch mit den neuen Beitrittskandidaten – auch im westlichen Balkan – konsequent anwenden und umsetzen, ist das die Voraussetzung dafür, dass wir Mitglieder bekommen werden in der Zukunft, die auf diese Art und Weise auch eine Stärkung der Europäischen Union darstellen, aber auf der anderen Seite auch natürlich für sich selbst eine Stärkung erfahren.

Die Mitgliedschaft in der Europäischen Union ist für alle, die inzwischen dazugehören, eine Win-Win-Situation, auch dank der Kopenhagener Kriterien.

Tonino Picula, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Madam Commissioner, Copenhagen Criteria were a remarkable set of rules and political commitments that set the tone and prepared the European Union for accepting 10 new Member States for following years. The list of priorities was political, economic and then administrative criteria as the last step. Already then, special importance was given to the European Union's absorption capacity. Thirty years later, we have not done much to increase our absorption capacity. We did not fully deliver on our commitments, but nor did the candidate countries deliver on the needed reforms. We keep prioritising economic agenda, thus maintaining so-called stableocracy. This is most evident in the case of Serbia. We have to bring back to the centre clear political criteria guaranteeing democracy and the rule of law.

In December, the Council has a historic opportunity to deliver on its commitments to Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, and especially to Bosnia and Herzegovina. It's an opportunity that we cannot miss.

Dacian Cioloș, în numele grupului *Renew*. – Domnule președinte, cred că nu există o mai bună ocazie de a celebra 30 de ani de la definirea criteriilor de la Copenhaga decât cu o decizie clară a Consiliului de a începe negocierile de aderare la UE cu Moldova și Ucraina, cu o perspectivă clară pentru Balcanii de Vest. Este un moment oportun și pentru a pune pe masă o nouă viziune privind politica europeană de extindere, în fața cu realitățile actuale, cu provocările geopolitice de azi. Pentru că, după cum am văzut, după fiecare val de extindere, în ciuda îngrijorărilor inițiale, acesta s-a dovedit a fi un succes și Uniunea a ieșit mai întărită.

Acum putem privi cu maturitate o nouă extindere, să gândim viitorul Uniunii într-o dimensiune lărgită, dar și cu un rol și o responsabilitate redefinite în această regiune. Aș spune și cu mai mult curaj. Nu ne putem permite ca interesele înguste ale unor guverne care atacă constant valorile Uniunii să pună la îndoială parcursul european al Moldovei și Ucrainei sau să fie luate ostatece, Moldova și Ucraina, într-o decizie în Consiliu, pentru că un prim-ministru are un interes particular.

Uniunea Europeană mai poate arăta încă o dată că obiectivul principal pentru care a fost făcută pacea și prosperitatea în interiorul granițelor sale poate fi atins, de data aceasta, într-un spațiu mai larg, dar și mai aprofundat și pentru mai mulți cetățeni.

Thomas Waitz, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Manche von uns hier im Haus unterstützen beitragswillige Länder schon seit vielen Jahren. Seit der illegalen Invasion Russlands in die Ukraine sind es mehr geworden, weil viele hier im Haus verstanden haben, dass es hier nicht nur um wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und kulturelle Zusammenarbeit geht, sondern auch um handfeste geostrategische Interessen. Gerade was den Balkan anbelangt, realisieren viele, dass das nicht eine Region ist, die irgendwo am Rande Europas ist, sondern in der Mitte unserer Europäischen Union, und dass gerade in diesem Land sehr viele Einflussfaktoren von außerhalb stattfinden.

Jetzt haben wir einige Schritte gemacht, um dem Beitritt dieser Länder Vorschub zu leisten, um endlich unser Engagement als Europäische Union ernsthaft in die Debatte einzubringen und die Länder zu unterstützen. Ich unterstütze das, und ich freue mich darauf, alle Länder des Westbalkans früher oder später in der Europäischen Union willkommen zu heißen.

Wir müssen aber selbst unsere Kriterien – nämlich die Kopenhagener Kriterien – ernst nehmen, wenn wir in Beitrittsgespräche gehen, wenn wir in Beitrittsverhandlungen gehen. Wir müssen ehrlich hinsehen und nicht so tun, als wären da keine Probleme, als wären nicht Gesetze erlassen worden in der Republika Srpska, die es z. B. zivilgesellschaftlichen Organisationen verunmöglichen, ihre Arbeit zu machen, die es Journalisten verunmöglichen, offen ihre Meinung zu sagen.

Wir dürfen nicht verheimlichen, dass in Serbien zwar Gesetze erlassen worden sind, aber die Umsetzung dieser Gesetze im Detail dort, wo es für die Menschen spürbar wird, leider oft nicht so stattfindet, wie wir das gerne wollen. Wir müssen anerkennen, dass es in manchen Bereichen noch gravierende Probleme mit der Rechtsstaatlichkeit gibt, obwohl Reformen durchgeführt werden. Montenegro, Albanien sind noch nicht dort, wo wir hinmüssen. Und es hilft uns nicht, wenn wir uns selbst in die Tasche lügen oder die Kommission sich mit uns gemeinsam in die Tasche lügt und sagt „Ja, guter Fortschritt hier, guter Fortschritt da“.

Wir müssen dafür Sorge tragen, dass die wesentlichen Kriterien, die wesentlichen Grundwerte – Meinungsfreiheit, Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit, eben die Kopenhagener Kriterien – ernsthaft und seriös eingehalten werden. Das muss die Basis unserer Beitrittsgespräche sein und bleiben.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, копенхагенските критерии са нещо много хубаво, само че не се спазват. Не се спазват и не се прилагат така, както трябва да се прилагат. Това би трябвало да означава, че общностите, които могат и искат да се самоопределят по определен начин, би трябвало да могат да го правят. Особено държавите, които искат да бъдат кандидати за членове в Европейския съюз.

Такава една държава е, простете за повторението, Северна Македония. Там се отрича правото на национално самоопределение. То е потискано и то е отнемано и отказвано на тези хора, които са с македонско гражданство, но с българско национално самосъзнание. И всички колеги, които работите тук, би трябвало да го знаете. Особено колегите, които са от т.нар. бивша Югославия и колегите от Австрия. Работите по тази тема. Добре знаете, че трябва да се оказва натиск върху правителство в Скопие, за да може да се случи това, което ние всички искаме. Ние всички искаме Република Северна Македония да започне преговори и да се присъедини към Европейския съюз, защото нейното място е в Европейския съюз.

Ние всички знаем, че има про-кремълска и про-белградска пропаганда там и тя трябва да се спре. Но и ваша роля е да оказвате влияние върху това правителство. Вашата задача и роля да оказвате натиск върху това правителство и да позволите българите да се определят като българи, за да започне тази държава да преговаря с Европейския съюз.

President. – All speakers should take into account that the very good capacities of the interpreters have some limitations and we do not want to introduce like in basketball the effective playing time.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, pour la France, l'élargissement de l'Union européenne en 2007 n'a pas été seulement une déception, mais l'accélérateur d'une sortie de l'histoire. Alors que l'Union européenne veut continuer sur le chemin de l'obésité, il est important de nous souvenir que les promesses de paix, du progrès social et d'amplification de notre influence dans le monde étaient trompeuses.

L'anniversaire des critères de Copenhague est d'ailleurs particulièrement paradoxal puisque la Commission européenne a émis un avis favorable pour la candidature de l'Ukraine, alors même qu'il est évident que Kiev ne remplit pas ces critères. Toute la crédibilité de la construction européenne est donc abîmée, puisque l'Union européenne érige de grands principes qu'elle s'empresse d'oublier et de balayer en fonction des circonstances. L'intégration des pays des Balkans dans l'Union européenne, c'est toujours plus de mafia dans les campagnes françaises. L'Ukraine dans l'Union européenne, c'est la guerre dans l'Union.

Et pour accélérer tout cela, vous voulez en plus que la France accepte d'abandonner ses fonctions régaliennes pour que les votes à la majorité qualifiée soient systématisés au sein du Conseil européen. Il me semble inconcevable qu'un pays membre du Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU devienne tributaire des décisions d'États qui ont délégué leur indépendance à l'OTAN. Avec vos propositions, la France pourrait être entraînée demain dans toutes les folies guerrières des uns et des autres s'il y a une majorité contre elle. Nombreux sont les Français qui ne veulent pas un nouvel élargissement de l'Europe, ils regrettent déjà suffisamment les précédents et ils ont bien raison de craindre les suivants.

Γιώργος Γεωργίου (The Left). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τον περασμένο Ιούνιο, η κυρία von der Leyen δήλωσε ότι οι Ουκρανοί είναι έτοιμοι να θυσιάσουν για την ευρωπαϊκή προοπτική. Πιο πριν, με το ξέσπασμα του πολέμου, με αυθαίρετο και συναισθηματικό τρόπο τους απέδωσε το καθεστώς της υπό ένταξη χώρας. Διερωτώμαι αν αυτά θεωρούνται κριτήρια για τη διεύρυνση.

Κυρία Αντιπρόεδρε, είπατε ότι πρέπει να τηρούνται κριτήρια. Πρόσφατα, το Ευρωπαϊκό Ελεγκτικό Συνέδριο δήλωσε ότι στην Ουκρανία δεν υπάρχουν επαρκείς δικλίδες ασφαλείας κατά της διαφθοράς, ενώ παράλληλα μίλησε και για συστημικό κίνδυνο από τους олигархες και τα κατοχυρωμένα συμφέροντα. Πού πάει το κριτήριο του κράτους δικαίου; Το ζήτημα που θίγω δεν αφορά ούτε στην Ουκρανία, ούτε στη Μολδαβία, ούτε σε οποιαδήποτε άλλη υπό ένταξη χώρα. Αν την θέλουν και την δικαιούνται, аς την πάρουν. Μήπως όμως κατεβάζουμε μέσα από την όποια διεύρυνση, πολύ χαμηλά τον πήχη των κριτηρίων, υπηρετώντας άλλες σκοπιμότητες; Προέχουν τελικά οι λαοί και τα συμφέροντά τους, ο εκδημοκρατισμός και η ευημερία τους ή η εξυπηρέτηση γεωπολιτικών σκοπιμοτήτων εκ μέρους ισχυρών κρατών της Ένωσης;

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, 30 years have passed since we set out our criteria for accession. And after an initial impetus that brought us to the current 27 members, we started recording an enlargement fatigue that need to be left apart.

The Russian criminal war against Ukraine, as well the other war crimes committed in our neighbourhood, most notably by Azerbaijan in Nagorno-Karabakh, are making enlargement a first-class priority. But empty promises are no longer enough: we must push not only for Western Balkans, Moldova, Georgia and Ukraine, but also for a concrete action plan for the access of Armenia. And the first step will be to grant Yerevan the candidate status as soon as the official request is made.

National political leaders must leave apart the short-sighted will to maximise internal consensus by obstructing the enlargement process, they must embrace a truly strategic vision and move further in the accession process for our future members before they will lose hope, starting from the most aligned to our foreign policy.

Widening and deepening are two rails of the same track. Our European project will never be completed until all the European countries that share our democratic values are part of the family. Let us move towards this direction now.

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, today we are celebrating 30th anniversary of the EU decision on Copenhagen criteria, which was also a strategic signal that Central Europe and Baltic states are invited to join the European Union. What is the difference in between of then and now?

At that time we in the Central Europe and Baltics were quite chaotic, not very stable, post-totalitarian democracies. EU was prudent and brave enough in Copenhagen to offer us a perspective to join EU, and in that way it stabilised us and modernised us. EU enlargement is the most effective instrument to transform EU neighbourhood into stable and successful democracies. At that time our economies were less than 30% of EU average. Now we are reaching EU level and we are overcoming some economies of the old Europe. At that time, EU was unfortunately not brave enough to offer the same perspective for Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia, and that is the reason why those countries were left behind in their development and lost almost all those 30 years.

After the first wave of enlargement into Central Europe, EU declared that it 'lost appetite' for further enlargement, including into Western Balkans and Ukraine, and that was the biggest geopolitical mistake of EU, because that led to Russia's war against Ukraine.

Now it's time for EU to come back to the geopolitical prudence and bravery like it was done in Copenhagen. From now on, negotiations with accession countries should continue for three or four years, like it was in our case, and let us be ready in 2030 to celebrate new members of EU – Western Balkans, Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, há poucos anos atrás muitos julgavam que o Brexit iria provocar um terrível efeito dominó, capaz de pôr em causa a própria existência da União Europeia.

A realidade hoje é muito diferente. Nenhum Estado-Membro dá sinais de querer sair e, pelo contrário, temos hoje dez países a querer entrar, nove dos quais já com estatuto de candidato. São cada vez mais os que percebem que pertencer à União Europeia é uma mais-valia.

Como correlator deste Parlamento para o alargamento e o aprofundamento da União, devo recordar que os critérios de Copenhaga são requisitos de adesão e que não pode haver transigência no respeito pelos valores europeus e pelos princípios do Estado de direito. Por isso, cada candidatura será avaliada pelo seu mérito à luz das reformas concretas efetuadas. Mas se os países candidatos têm de fazer reformas, também a União Europeia tem que se reformar no plano institucional e financeiro para estar em condições de absorver novos Estados-Membros.

Não adianta iludir os problemas, é preciso fazer o trabalho de casa para que o alargamento possa ser um sucesso.

Илхан Кючюк (Renew). – Г-н Председател, днес разсъждаваме по една класическа дилема: дали политиката по разширяване е продукт на геополитически причини или е продукт на копенхагенски критерии. Отговорът е ясен. Винаги геополитиката има предимство. Така се е случило, когато и моята страна България се присъедини към Европейския съюз. Определено не бяхме готови по всички критерии, но водещата база беше критерийната. Да, трябваше да изпълним основните критерии на Копенхаген – стабилността на институциите, демокрацията, върховенството на правото, спазването на правата на малцинствата, функционирането на пазарната икономика и готовността да бъдем част от един финансов, икономически и политически съюз, който да върви заедно с всички останали държави – членки, вече на Европейския съюз.

Днес обаче сме изправени, струва ми се, пред една по-сериозна дилема: дали искаме многоангажиращо не просто финансово, социално и икономически да подпомогнем страните от Западните Балкани, плюс Украйна, Молдова и Грузия към това пространство, което споделя общи ценности на върховенството на правото и на демократични стандарти. И за мен отговорът трябва да бъде да, категорично да, ако искаме да бъдем геополитически Европейски съюз.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, rule of law and democracy have always been the rock-solid foundations of our Union. That is our strength. These foundations have been made criteria to become an EU member in Copenhagen 30 years ago, to all those aspiring to join. It was true then as it is true now. Yet today we live in a world of clash between rule of law and rule of gun, between democracies and autocracies, between a rule-based order and a world of aggression.

EU enlargement is a moment of truth for Europe. Our investment in enlargement today will make us more independent and secure tomorrow. I would like to underline two guiding principles for that endeavour. Firstly, enlarging our Union is EU's geopolitical necessity, but it is also a geopolitical choice, a choice that must be loud and clear; a choice, in the case of the Serbian President, which is incompatible with authoritarian tendency in cosyng-up with Beijing and Moscow. Secondly, Copenhagen criteria entail the process and progress based on merits. This means making sure that the judiciary plays an independent role in fighting corruption and organised crime, and standing with us in foreign policy – more important today than ever.

Dear friends in the Western Balkans, in Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia: enlargement is a choice for us, but also a choice to you. So it is up to you to move forward with credible reforms as the EU has finally woken up to the call of history.

Anders Vistisen (ID). – Hr. formand! 15 år efter den store østudvidelse står vi her igen. Vi står i situationen, hvor et stort flertal her i huset, EU-Kommissionen, Rådets formand, ønsker en stor udvidelse mod øst. Men har nogen lært af fortiden? Har nogen lært af det kaos, som østudvidelsen bragte, fordi man netop ikke holdt sig til de aftalte spilleregler? Vi har set en bølge af social dumping. Vi har set en bølge af organiseret kriminalitet. Ja, selv den dag i dag – 15 år efter vores sidste store udvidelse – har en række medlemsstater stadig ikke adgang til Schengensamarbejdet, stadig ikke adgang til eurosamarbejdet, fordi man endnu ikke er klar.

Og i den situation, der taler man om at udvide EU med op til 55 millioner nye indbyggere, alle kommende fra lande, der er endnu fattigere og har en endnu dårligere tilstand på retsstatssituationen, end Polen og Ungarn, som dette hus elsker at kritisere. Så hvornår stopper hykleriet? De samme mennesker i dette hus, som på hver eneste plenarsamling, ønsker angreb på den polske regering, ønsker angreb på den ungarske regering, står nu og siger: Lad os tage noget mere af den type regeringer ind. Det er ikke svært at se, når man ser på korruption, når man ser på LGBT-rettigheder, når man ser på alle de parametre, I plejer at gå op i, hvor disse lande ligger. Alligevel står I og byder dem ind med åbne arme, og jeg siger bare: Så må I også tage ansvaret for konsekvenserne.

(Taleren accepterede at besvare et blåt kort-spørgsmål)

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew), blue-card question. – Colleague, you mentioned many so to say shortcomings of the new Member States. But there are some shortcomings within older Member States. You didn't speak about the lack of democracy in Hungary. The group, I mean, which accommodates probably some affiliated from Orbán party. You did not mention about opt-outs some countries use to limit their participation within the European Union. And finally, you did not speak about the unification of Europe. Do you still believe that this is a very technical project, as the European Union is?

Anders Vistisen (ID), *Blåt-kort-svar*. – Det er jo sjovt at bringe de danske forbehold ind i debatten, netop fordi de danske forbehold er givet i traktaten, netop fordi den danske befolkning stemte nej til Maastricht-traktaten, og derved var man nødt til at give Danmark forbeholdene. Vi ønsker at beholde forbeholdene, og jeg sagde faktisk ordret i min tale, at det er de samme individer her i salen, der kritiserer Ungarn, men ønsker Moldova. Det hænger simpelthen ikke sammen. Niveauet i Ungarn er højere.

Emmanuel Maurel (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, je comprends les peuples qui veulent rejoindre l'Union européenne, à commencer par le peuple ukrainien qui est agressé et de qui nous sommes solidaires. Je comprends les collègues, sincères, dans cet hémicycle, qui considèrent que c'est notre devoir moral de les accueillir et que c'est aussi nécessaire d'un point de vue géopolitique. Mais à l'encontre des évidences, je pose la question: sommes-nous prêts à absorber un tel choc? Les conditions économiques et politiques sont-elles réunies? Je crois que non. Les conditions politiques, vous en avez parlé: les pays dont on parle ne respectent évidemment pas les critères de Copenhague.

Mais il y a aussi notre propre situation: la crise économique que nous rencontrons, la crise sociale, l'explosion des inégalités. Et je ne suis pas sûr que les salariés européens soient prêts à payer pour un nouvel élargissement, à la fois en raison des transferts budgétaires mais aussi du dumping social. Je vous dis de penser à cela: l'Europe est une construction très fragile et je ne suis pas sûr que nous soyons prêts aujourd'hui à absorber 50 millions d'habitants supplémentaires dans l'Union européenne.

Ernő Schaller-Baross (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Ha egy erős Európát akarunk, bővítéspolitikánknak tekintettel kell lennie a geopolitikai és biztonságpolitikai szükségleteinkre. Az Európai Unió zsarolási vagy hitegetési eszközként tekint a bővítésre, vagy éppen kettős mércét alkalmaz a tagfelvétel során, azaz saját egységét és hitelességét ássa alá. Kérem, tartózkodjunk ettől. Az Európai Unióba belépni kívánó országoknak eleget kell tenniük a jogszabályokban foglalt feltételeknek. Természetesen, de különösen a koppenhágai kritériumoknak. Ezen feltételek minden csatlakozni szándékozó ország tekintetében azonosak, azonosnak kell lenniük.

Nemcsak a bizalmat, de az uniós tagállamok geostratégiai érdekeit is sérti, hogy a Nyugat-Balkán egyes országait az EU immár több mint 10 éve hitegeti jelentős előrelépés nélkül, míg Ukrajnával kapcsolatban felgyorsított bővítési politikát folytat. Mi annyit kérünk, hogy mindenkire ugyanazok a szabályok vonatkozzanak.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, обединението на нашия континент на базата на общите ни европейски ценности е най-важното условие за нашата сигурност и просперитет. Трансформиращата сила на Европейския съюз трябва всеки ден да бъде подновявана с ясни планове и времева рамка за приемането на новите страни членки. Където оставим сива зона в Европа, Русия ще се опита да я запълни. Това усетиха на свой гръб украинците въз основа на нашата голяма грешка, че не ги приехме тогава в НАТО. Пълната интеграция на тези страни в нашия Съюз е наложително като геостратегическа инвестиция в стабилна, силна и обединена Европа. Разбира се интеграцията е двупосочна улица и страните, които са кандидати, трябва да преодолеят проблемите, наслагвани от миналото. Да се постигне историческо помирение, преодоляване на говора на омраза и недискриминацията на всички граждани, независимо от това как се самоопределят. Това е справедливо и основополагаща ценност на Европейския съюз.

Тук искам да кажа, че носталгията към комунизма, към Тито и инерцията от този период не са част от копенхагенските критерии. И колкото по-бързо разберем това, че тази инерция от миналото трябва да бъде преодоляна в страните от бивша Югославия, толкова по-добре. Ние искаме да дадем ясен сигнал на гражданите на страните от региона, че не са забравени и че правим всичко възможно, за да им помогнем, но пълноправното членство зависи от волята и на техните политически елити да изпълнят необходимите реформи.

Alessandra Moretti (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono passati 30 anni dai criteri di Copenaghen per i quali uno Stato può diventare membro dell'Unione europea. In questi 30 anni in Europa e nel mondo sono cambiate molte cose ma una cosa però è rimasta la stessa: ossia la politica dell'allargamento rappresenta uno degli strumenti più importanti per garantire la pace, la sicurezza e la prosperità dei popoli.

L'aggressione russa all'Ucraina ha di fatto l'obiettivo anche di indebolire il processo di allargamento e di adesione e ciò porterebbe alcuni Paesi, a pochi passi dai nostri confini, a cadere nelle braccia di regimi autoritari. Mi rivolgo quindi ai Balcani occidentali, alla Serbia, in particolare, chiedendo loro di proseguire nel processo di adesione al fine di garantire il rafforzamento dello Stato di diritto, la solidarietà e la crescita comune attraverso un percorso chiaro senza ambiguità.

Da parte dell'Unione serve un bilancio più ampio e risorse proprie sufficienti per affrontare le sfide future. Ma serve soprattutto la riforma dei Trattati per semplificare le procedure decisionali e rendere questa Europa più vicina alle esigenze e soprattutto alle speranze dei cittadini europei.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovane dame i gospodo, potpredsjednice Komisije, kad nas netko pita kakvu mi tu Europu želimo '25. ili '30., ja sam siguran da bi svi rekli i zelenu, i digitalnu, i veliku proširenu.

I dok se po pitanju proširenja zbilja nemamo s čime hvaliti, po ova prva dva pitanja puno smo učinili. A zašto se po pitanju proširenja nemamo puno s čime hvaliti da smo nešto učinili u zadnjih deset godina? Pa ja bih rekao da krivaca ima i tu i tamo. Kad kažem tamo, onda mislim na, naravno, neprovođenje reformi u državama koje su van Europske unije, a kada mislim tu, onda mislim na sve ono što je i moja Hrvatska prolazila sa Slovenijom, a i što sada prolazi Sjeverna Makedonija s Bugarskom. Dakle, uvijek nekakvi problemi, da ne kažem ucjene ili blokade.

Ali ja sam danas sretan čovjek. Sretan, jer mislim da svi zajedno shvaćamo da se politika proširenja kao jedna od temeljnih politika Europske unije vraća u fokus i da shvaćamo da reforma Europske unije i proširenje mogu i trebaju ići ruku pod ruku. Hvala vam na tome.

Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, this is an important anniversary, particularly with the new enlargement impetus. Because of that, we should assess the state of the Union. For too long, the EU has neglected the internal attacks on its main values. We should demand the same governance and rule of law standards from existing members as we set for the candidates. Especially now, when the enlargement process seems to have got a new breath, we must hold aspiring members to the highest standards, but also create methods to enforce those standards on current members across the Union. If a country has to fulfil Copenhagen criteria to join us and can then wipe themselves with them the other day, we will never be a Union – a functioning one, at least.

We must establish post-accession compliance measures, going beyond what is currently in place to actually ensure the functioning of the European Community. Otherwise, we promise our neighbours instability, whether we accept them or not.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, les critères de Copenhague qui célèbrent leurs 30 ans sont une liste de critères relatifs à la santé économique, à la stabilité et au respect de la démocratie, critères que doivent respecter impérativement tous les pays désireux d'intégrer l'Union européenne.

Alors je vous prends au mot. Où est la stabilité de l'Ukraine attaquée par la Russie? Où est la stabilité de la Moldavie, dans la région de Transnistrie qui a fait sécession avec 20 000 tonnes d'armes? Où est le respect de la démocratie au Kosovo qui persécute la minorité serbe? Où est la prospérité économique lorsque la plupart des Balkans sont sujets à une pauvreté énorme et une corruption massive? Où est l'économie sociale dans une Albanie gangrenée par les trafics d'armes, de drogue et de prostitution? Où est la démocratie en Turquie où des journalistes sont emprisonnés et les opposants brimés?

Stop à l'hypocrisie. C'est Erdogan qui a le mieux démontré l'inutilité de ces critères fantoches de Copenhague lorsqu'il a dit n'avoir aucune intention de reconnaître le génocide arménien car il ne figurait pas parmi ces critères. Ces critères sont en réalité à géométrie variable, idéologiques, secondaires dès lors que l'Union européenne a décidé qu'elle voulait poursuivre son projet expansionniste, mais terriblement funeste pour l'avenir de l'Europe.

Kateřina Konečná (The Left). – Pane předsedající, před devatenácti lety má země vstoupila do Evropské unie a byla tak jedním z prvních států, který se připojil po přijetí kodaňských kritérií. Česká republika tato kritéria týkající se, mimo jiné, zásad demokracie, právního státu či respektu k právům národnostních menšin před svým přijetím musela naplnit. Jejich naplnění se po třiceti letech jejich existence požaduje po všech státech, co mají zájem vstoupit do Evropské unie. A je to tak správně. Jistě bychom nechtěli přijmout zemi, která porušuje práva menšin či zemi, kde korupce dusí veškeré zásady právního státu a ničí lidské životy.

V současnosti však neustále slyšíme, že Ukrajina, která je jedním z nejzkorumpovanějších států v Evropě, kde jsou práva národnostních menšin zásadním způsobem porušována a kde opozice čelí pronásledování, patří do Evropské unie. Ráda bych proto připomněla jako občanka státu, jenž kodaňská kritéria naplnil, že neexistuje žádná zrychlená cesta pro vstup do Evropské unie a že žádný stát, který předtím tato kritéria nenaplnil, do Evropské unie rozhodně nepatří. Nereálné sliby jsou k ničemu.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Mr President, colleagues, the Copenhagen criteria set the rules to transform Europe after the Cold War and define the foundation for any future enlargement. The ‘big bang’ enlargement of 2004 was successful precisely because of these criteria from 1993. Thanks to their power to change former communist countries into democratic regimes, we are all much stronger and resilient across an enlarged European Union.

Today, the Copenhagen criteria are as relevant as ever. After Russia’s brutal aggression against Ukraine, there is a strong political will across Europe to enlarge further in our east neighbourhood and in the Western Balkans. Yet, just like in the past, there can be no shortcuts for the accession countries. They do have to adapt to the EU’s democratic and rule of law principles. And, at the same time, we in the EU must reform ourselves in order to prepare for new Member States.

The next enlargement can succeed if we all again rediscover the meaning, the power and the benefits of the Copenhagen criteria. Dear colleagues, enlargement takes hard work, but it pays off.

Nacho Sánchez Amor (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, señora secretaria de Estado, en materia de ampliación siempre parece haber una tradicional tensión que, a veces, se convierte en una especie de falso dilema entre las consideraciones geopolíticas y las del examen de valores y principios. Siempre, desgraciadamente, la situación geopolítica juega para rebajar las exigencias en materia de coincidencia de valores.

Es verdad que, históricamente, los procesos de ampliación de la Unión se han producido en situaciones geopolíticas: las tres democracias del sur después de sus transiciones, el acercamiento de todo el Este tras la caída del imperio soviético...

Pero el camino de la adhesión es un camino normativo y enfocado a los valores, en el que no hay atajos. Utilizo la misma expresión que ha utilizado el colega Bilčík. Es normativo, no es transaccional y está basado en mérito.

Cuidado, por tanto, con las excesivas flexibilidades por razones geopolíticas: porque, además, algunos otros candidatos, como Turquía, harán jugar cualquier flexibilidad en favor de sus condiciones. Y, por cierto, habrá que plantearse, en algún momento, si un proceso de adhesión puede durar eternamente sin ningún progreso como está siendo el caso de Turquía.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo, la política de ampliación es una de las más exitosas de la Unión Europea. Desde la adopción de los criterios de Copenhague, dieciséis países se han adherido a la Unión y han tenido que efectuar amplias reformas. Ahora, la agresión rusa a Ucrania ha traído de nuevo a la actualidad el proceso de ampliación que llevaba un tiempo estancado.

En este contexto me parece importante hacer algunas consideraciones. En primer lugar, es evidente que el artículo 49 del Tratado y los criterios de Copenhague tienen que cumplirse. La ampliación es un proceso individual basado en los méritos de cada país. El retraso de un candidato no puede suponer que el resto de países tenga que retrasar su entrada, y me parece inconveniente poner fechas fijas. No podemos acelerar plazos ni, como se ha dicho, permitir atajos, ni crear expectativas erróneas.

También la Unión tiene que estar preparada para la ampliación: lo que se llama capacidad de ampliación o de absorción. Y esto significa, entre otras cosas, más recursos presupuestarios. Me preocupa que en este contexto se hable de recortes y que estos recortes puedan afectar a la cohesión o a la agricultura.

Y termino: la ampliación al este no puede hacernos olvidar la vecindad meridional. La Unión Europea tiene que prestar también la mayor atención a los graves problemas a los que se enfrentan nuestros vecinos de la orilla sur del Mediterráneo.

Rovana Plumb (S&D). – Doamnă vicepreședintă, doamnă secretară de stat, dragi colegi, extinderea Uniunii Europene nu este numai despre admiterea de noi state membre, despre acquis-ul comunitar sau despre criteriile de la Copenhaga. Extinderea Uniunii Europene este despre atingerea potențialului Uniunii Europene, este despre poziționarea noastră pe harta lumii într-un moment de mari tensiuni și competiții strategice. Este despre oameni și valorile pe care și le asumă.

Suntem la un punct de inflexiune în istorie și trebuie să avem tăria de a face alegerile corecte, dar și de a ne asuma eforturile necesare punerii în practică a acestor decizii. Moldova, Georgia, Balcanii de Vest și Ucraina au ales calea europeană. Oamenii aceștia, în multe cazuri, au plătit prețul alegerii lor cu sânge. Pachetul pe extindere propus de Comisia Europeană este gestul potrivit la momentul potrivit și are toată susținerea noastră.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedniče, poštovana potpredsjednice, od Kopenhaških kriterija je prošlo 30 godina.

Te '93 godine Hrvatska i Bosna i Hercegovina su bile pod agresijom, a rat je uhvatio nespremnu Europu. Dvije godine nakon toga je potpisan '95. Daytonski mirovni sporazum. Tad su Austrija, Švedska i Finska ušle u Europsku uniju. Za to vrijeme '93. Belgija je dobila Ustav gdje su zastupljene sve tri jezične skupine konačno s jednakim udjelom vlasti kroz federalizaciju. Godine 2004. bio je veliki val proširenja, koji je zahvatio istočnu Europu, a 2005. Republika Hrvatska dobila je kandidatski status uz Tursku i Sjevernu Makedoniju. Republika Hrvatska ulazi zadnja 2013.

Tek je rat u Ukrajini otvorio priču o miru i sigurnosti, proširenju na realan način. Gospodo draga, Rim nije sagrađen u jednom danu, a tako ni reforme ugovora nisu niti će biti promijenjene, niti su nužne da bi se ostvarilo proširenje. Proširenje je nužno da bismo se fizički obranili od ugroza koje dolaze od strane onih koji u međuvremenu koriste vakuum koji smo ostavili.

Na kraju, otvorite pregovore s Bosnom i Hercegovinom, od nje je sve počelo.

Matjaž Nemec (S&D). – Gospod predsednik, spoštovani visoki zbor. Pred tremi desetletji smo se v širitveni politiki zavezali demokraciji, človekovim pravicam, pravni državi, gospodarskemu razvoju in blaginji. To je bila obljuba o enotnosti, varnosti, o napredku za vse, ki so del naše evropske skupnosti.

Nato smo zavezo evropske perspektive pred dvajsetimi leti dali tudi Zahodnemu Balkanu. A vse prevečkrat se dandanes zdi, da smo na obe obljubi pozabili.

Kopenhagenske kriterije kršijo obstoječe države članice. Širitvena politika je bila več let v mrtvem teku, torej ob zaostrenih geopolitičnih razmerah v soseščini postajata obe zavezi ne zgolj politično smeli, ampak strateško nujni.

Širitvena politika ob vseh svojih težavah ostaja največja garancija miru, varnosti in stabilnosti, a ta s seboj sicer prinaša številne izzive in pasti, ki jih bo morala Evropska unija pred prihodnjimi širitvami nujno razrešiti.

Torej, spoštovani, Evropa ne bo nikoli dokončana in popolna brez Zahodnega Balkana v svoji družini. Spoštovani, to zmoremo! Imamo moralno dolžnost, da to našo zavezo tudi uresničimo. Hvala lepa.

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir sprechen hier zum 30-jährigen Jubiläum der Kopenhagener Kriterien. Die Kriterien sind gut, aber ihre Anwendung ist in eine Schiefelage geraten, und sie sind sicher nicht hinreichend, um Europa mehr Stärke nach außen zu geben, wie es Europa brauchen würde.

Die Kopenhagener Kriterien kennen eine Wertedimension, eine Wirtschafts- und Wettbewerbsfähigkeitsdimension und eine strukturelle Dimension, den sogenannten *acquis*, wo es um die Einhaltung von Regeln geht. De facto wird in allem, was Erweiterung betrifft, immer nur bürokratisch-administrativ – vor allem seitens der Europäischen Kommission, wobei ich die heute anwesende Kommissarin Dubravka Šuica ausnehme; sie ist aus dem Parlament gekommen, kennt den Parlamentarismus und weiß, was Leadership bedeutet – es wird Bezug genommen auf diese bürokratischen Fragen, nicht auf die Werte.

Sonst könnten wir nicht mit der aktuellen serbischen Führung locker verhandeln oder die Türkei unter der aktuellen Führung als Beitrittskandidat behandeln. Und was Wettbewerbsfähigkeit betrifft, da nimmt sich Europa heute oft insgesamt aus dem Spiel, wir verlangen es aber von Erweiterungskandidaten.

Wir brauchen Leadership, wir brauchen einen klaren Willen – wie bei der deutschen Wiedervereinigung und anderen Momenten in der Geschichte Europas.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, 1993 m. birželio mėnesį įvykęs Europos vadovų susitikimas tapo svarbiu žingsniu panaikinant Europos kontinentą dalijusios Berlyno sienos žymes. Tai buvo išmintingas ir labai pasvertas politinis sprendimas, atvėręs vartus Europos vienyjimui procesui, procesui, kuris sustiprino pačią Europą. Kopenhagos kriterijų reikšmė nesunykė ir dabar. Suprantama, juos keičia nauja geopolitinė situacija ir atsiranda poreikis jos strateginiams veiksniams. Kopenhagos kriterijai nustatė objektyvius narystės parametrus, objektyvius, todėl atsirado galimybė valstybių kandidačių palyginamumui ir konstruktyviai konkurencijai. Mielie kolegos, nepamirškime mūsų kontinento politinės istorijos ir nebijokime eiti vieningos Europos keliu.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, trideset godina nakon njihova definiranja Kopenhaški kriteriji i dalje označavaju ključne uvjete koje države kandidatkinje moraju ispuniti da bi postale članice Europske unije.

Nakon dugotrajne faze zamora proširenjem, čini se da se konačno pojavila politička volja za nastavkom ovog političkog procesa. Ako državama u susjedstvu Europska unija ne ponudi jasnu perspektivu, one će potpuno potpasti pod utjecaj stranih sila, što dugoročno predstavlja katastrofu za sigurnost Europe.

Da se razumijemo, u procesu proširenja svaku državu treba gledati isključivo individualno i prosuđivati prema zaslugama. Nema ulaska u EU preko reda. To pogotovo mora shvatiti Aleksandar Vučić za čije je vladavine srpski hegemonizam postao glavna prijetnja za stabilnost jugoistočne Europe. A demokracija u Srbiji napravila je ne jedan, već tri koraka unatrag.

S druge strane, odluka Komisije da uvjetno preporuča otvaranje pregovora o pristupanju za Bosnu i Hercegovinu potiča je za nastavak reformskog procesa u toj državi, što svakako treba pozdraviti i podržati BiH u teškim reformama koje joj predstoje.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner and colleagues, it hasn't been mentioned in this debate, but the very first enlargement of the European Union was 50 years ago, in 1973, when Ireland, the UK and Denmark joined the EEC. Had the criteria applied in 1973, there's no way that Ireland would have been able to join the EEC at that time, not only because of the conflict that was raging on the island of Ireland at that time, but also because we didn't really have a functioning social market economy. But, like so many accession stories, Ireland joining has been an unambiguously positive story.

The criteria is the way we will build our European home, but we mustn't allow Putin, in particular, to get away with weaponising the Copenhagen criteria through the seeding of conflict in neighbours and the enagement and inflaming of minority sentiment. That is why I fully endorse the decision to provide a clear pathway to membership for both Ukraine and Moldova.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Dubravka Šuica, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to thank you for sharing your views on enlargement policy and for further stressing the importance of the Copenhagen criteria. But before thanking and concluding, I would like to reply to a few questions. First to Mr Mariani, who unfortunately left, and to Ms Konečná, on Ukraine. Only a few words.

The question was: has Ukraine received special treatment due to the war? Ukraine accession process is merit-based. Ukraine has gone through the regular steps that each country who wishes to join the European Union needs to take. Since the granting of candidature status, the European Commission has published its analytical report on Ukraine's preparations for EU accession in February 2023, and it has updated Member States on progress towards meeting the seven steps of the Commission Opinion, and Ukraine has been included in the Enlargement Package for the first time this year, alongside with Moldova and Georgia. As such, no special treatment has been given to Ukraine in the enlargement process.

Despite Russia's war of aggression, Ukraine made significant progress in the implementation of the seven steps since the European Council of June last year. Ukraine has established a transparent pre-selection system for the Constitutional Court judges and reformed the judicial governance bodies. Ukraine has ensured the appointment of independent heads of the anti-corruption agencies, and has built a credible track record of high-level corruption investigations and convictions. To sustain these efforts, Ukraine took additional measures, such as the implementation of the State Anti-Corruption Programme and the restoration of the electronic asset declaration system, also with some shortcomings.

Ukraine has also advanced on the alignment of its Anti-Money-Laundering Framework with the Financial Action Task Force Centres. It has adopted a comprehensive strategic plan for the reform of the law-enforcement sector. It has stepped up systematic measures against oligarchs in such areas as competition and political-party funding, and agreed to revise an anti-oligarch law to bring it in line with European law or European rule of law standards. Ukraine has aligned its media law with European Union law, and continued to strengthen the protection of national minorities by amending the laws on minorities, and the laws on education, and taking measures to implement them – just to mention a few.

On Bosnia and Herzegovina, to colleague Željana Zovko, once again, we have to reiterate this: the Commission has recommended the opening negotiations once the necessary degree of compliance with the membership criteria is achieved. President von der Leyen was clear: the Commission is opening wide the door to European Union membership and inviting Bosnia and Herzegovina to walk the walk through it, including by showing results on addressing the Opinion key priorities. The enlargement process remains merit-based, and we expect Bosnia and Herzegovina to deliver. The Council will discuss the conclusions on enlargement by December, and the Commission will report on progress in Bosnia and Herzegovina at the latest by March 2024. This is very important.

So, if someone asks what necessary degree of compliance means, we said that the door is left open for – this concerns the requirement for membership – Copenhagen political criteria, the same formula used in the 2019 Opinion on the membership application, when the Commission identified 14 key priorities on the political criteria. So, by March 2024, we will be ready to assess again Bosnia and Herzegovina's achievements.

As evidenced by Enlargement Package published only a few days ago, 2023 has been an eventful year for enlargement. We are indeed celebrating the 30th anniversary of the Copenhagen criteria. But 2023 also marks 20 years since the Thessaloniki summit, and the first unequivocal confirmation of the European perspective for all Western Balkan countries, and also 10 years since the last enlargement to Croatia, my own country.

More than ever, it is time to seize the momentum and make swift progress. I look forward to cooperating closely with our partners on meeting the Copenhagen criteria and working towards an enlarged Union. The European project is not complete without our partners from the Western Balkans and the East. The Copenhagen criteria will continue to guide us on this journey towards an enlarged European Union. Maintaining the current dynamic around enlargement is essential, and we count on that.

Ángeles Moreno Bau, *presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señor presidente, señorías, señora comisaria, quisiera concluir haciéndome eco del parecer que también ha manifestado el Parlamento Europeo. La Presidencia cree firmemente en la relevancia estratégica de la ampliación de la Unión Europea. Al igual que hace treinta años, esta sigue siendo un fuerte anclaje para la paz, la democracia, la seguridad y la estabilidad de nuestro continente.

El proceso exige mucho a los candidatos, aunque los motivos subyacentes son buenos. Ahora que se abre ante nosotros la perspectiva de que la Unión Europea se amplíe, es fundamental que los países aspirantes aceleren sus reformas. Esto es especialmente cierto en el ámbito del Estado de Derecho, un valor fundamental en el que se basa la Unión Europea y un aspecto crucial de la transformación democrática que se halla en el mismo corazón del proceso de ampliación.

Dentro del contexto de nuestra nueva realidad geopolítica, también desearía recordar que adoptar los valores fundamentales de la Unión Europea y comprometerse a respetarlos es una opción estratégica firme, esencial para todos los socios que aspiren a pertenecer a la Unión Europea. Aceptar por completo la política exterior y de seguridad común de la Unión Europea es una parte integrante de esta opción estratégica.

Muchas gracias por este provechoso debate.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet während der nächsten Tagung statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Andrea Bocskor (NI), *írásban*. – A koppenhágai kritériumok azért születtek, hogy az Európai Unió bővítése egységes elvek és értékek mentén történjen. A bővítés célja az Unió stratégiai erősítése, békéjének és biztonságának biztosítása kell legyen. El kell kerülni, hogy az uniós csatlakozás üres hitegetéssé váljon a csatlakozni kívánó országok számára. Az elmúlt évek azonban azt mutatják, hogy az EU bővítéspolitikáját kettős mérce jellemzi: míg a Nyugat-Balkán országai több éve teljesítenek a csatlakozás érdekében, mégsem történik előrelépés, Ukrajna rohamlépésekben halad előre. Ukrajna a háború kitörése után nyújtotta be csatlakozási kérelmét, elkötelezve magát az EU értékei mellett, vállalva az Unió által javasolt reformok végrehajtását.

Azonban a reformok egy része csak látszat-cselekvés: Ukrajna a reformprogram álcája mögött meghozott törvényeivel szűkítette a kisebbségi jogokat, megfosztva ezzel az európai anyaországgal rendelkező nemzeti kisebbségeket a korábban szerzett jogaiktól. Példa erre az 1992-es kisebbségi törvényt váltó új nemzeti kisebbségekről szóló törvény Ukrainában, mely visszalépést jelent az országban élő kisebbségek joggyakorlása tekintetében. Ukrajna uniós csatlakozása csak abban az esetben támogatható, ha teljes mértékben végrehajtja az Unió csatlakozási feltételeit! A legfontosabb, hogy béke legyen Ukrainában és komoly erőfeszítések történjenek a kisebbségi jogok helyreállítása terén!

16. Niepodjęcie działań legislacyjnych przez Komisję w następstwie rezolucji w sprawie oprogramowania Pegasus (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zu dem ausbleibenden legislativen Handeln der Kommission nach der Entschließung des PEGA-Untersuchungsausschusses (2023/2988(RSP)).

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, during the October plenary session, the Commission presented its position and initiatives regarding the topic we are discussing again today.

We spoke also about our reply to Parliament's resolution of June this year. I am pleased to confirm that our reply has been formally transmitted to Parliament.

Today, I would like to underline again that the Commission strongly condemns any illegal access to interpersonal communications and other data stored on users' devices whoever the authors of such illegal access are. Any attempt to illegally access the data of citizens, including journalists and political opponents, if confirmed, is unacceptable.

Spyware is a particularly intrusive technology. If misused, it strikes against our core values. It is of utmost importance that the internal market rules and the fundamental rights to privacy and data protection, as enshrined in EU law, are fully respected all over the Union. This is why, as we announced last month, we are currently preparing a non-legislative initiative clarifying the boundaries of and interplay between EU law, in particular the data protection and privacy acquis, and national security. And we hope to have your support on this.

To be a bit more specific, let me recall that EU data protection law is fully applicable to the processing of personal data by private entities, even where such processing is required by law for national security purposes. In this case, the supervision of the necessity and proportionality of such processing falls under the remit of the Court of Justice of the European Union.

EU data protection law is also applicable when law enforcement authorities process personal data for law enforcement and criminal justice purposes. In that specific case, the Data Protection Law Enforcement Directive applies. EU data protection law does not apply to activities of the state authorities in the areas of defence and national security.

Where EU data protection law is not applicable, Member States are bound by the guarantees laid down in the European Convention on Human Rights and in their national law, including their constitutional provisions. So, Member States' responsibility for national security cannot be used to depart from EU standards and basic safeguards. Member States' responsibility to define and protect their national security interests is not a blank cheque issued for all use cases of spyware. It is notably important for the national legal framework to provide for adequate safeguards and controls, including possible judicial review.

Under EU law, as clarified by the Court of Justice, in order to justify a restriction to rights provided by EU law, Member States must demonstrate that national security or another legitimate public interest would be compromised in the case at issue and cannot refer to national security in a general way to exclude the application of EU law.

The attention given to the issue in 2023 Rule of Law Report underlines that even where the use of surveillance software is linked to national security, there is a need for national checks and balances to ensure that safeguards are in place. In this regard, the relevant country chapters of the report have included the functioning of national checks and balances for concerns over investigations into the use of spyware.

The Commission has also sought to reflect the need to address this issue in several recent legislative proposals. There are specific safeguards in Article 4 of the proposal for a European Media Freedom Act. We propose a special provision to further protect media service providers, including journalists, against the use of spyware. This protection would go further than the protection against other forms of surveillance. The discussions between co-legislators are advancing, and we count on the support of Parliament for a swift agreement on this file.

The ePrivacy Directive prohibits the interception of communication and the storage of and access to information in the terminal equipment without the prior consent of the user concerned. This directive does not apply to activities of the state authorities in the areas of defence and national security. Where the ePrivacy Directive is not applicable, Member States are bound by the guarantees laid down in the European Convention on Human Rights and by their national law.

The proposal for a Cyber Resilience Act aims to establish cybersecurity requirements for the market access in the EU of hardware and software and sets out corresponding obligations for the manufacturers of these products. It will therefore further contribute to reducing the attack surface of hardware and software that spyware is trying to exploit.

We are continuing our efforts to strengthen export controls on cyber surveillance items from the EU to third countries under the terms of the modernised Dual-Use Regulation of 2021. Any such cyber surveillance items cannot leave the EU territory without an export authorisation or licence issued by the competent authority of the Member States.

Once again, the Commission would like to reiterate that it condemns any illegal interference in personal communications as it is contrary to democratic values and undermines fundamental rights in the European Union. Any attempts by national authorities to illegally access data of citizens, including journalists and political opponents, is again unacceptable. We expect national competent authorities and courts to make full use of their powers to thoroughly investigate allegations regarding any unlawful and lawful surveillance activities.

The Commission has no investigative powers. We cannot assess whether national security was at stake in individual cases. We have no access to the relevant files and no competence in this area. What we can do is to look at the safeguards that are in place at national level, and I have described what is possible to ask in the different national legislations.

I want to thank you for your attention. Of course, I will listen to your remarks and if there are some critics, I will listen too.

Jeroen Lenaers, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, I have to say it's genuinely sad that it has to come to this – the point where we once again need a plenary debate and even a plenary resolution in order to try and get a sign of life from this Commission, because this Parliament, with a great majority, adopted an important set of recommendations to prevent abuse of spyware and to protect our citizens' fundamental rights. And we did so more than five months ago, and the Commission had three months to answer. In the meantime, the LIBE Committee sent a letter, but no action was taken. We had a plenary debate in October where also Commissioner Jourová said that it would soon be formally transmitted, and up to today I have not seen anything yet. I trust the words of the Commissioner that it has now finally been sent.

We organised an exchange of views in LIBE last month, where again, the European Commission was conspicuous by its absence. Until today, as I said, we haven't seen any official reply, but we are told, and this is surely in reply as well, that the Commission is – wait for it – 'exploring the possibility of a non-legislative initiative'. I mean, that's brilliant! The Parliament has investigated spyware for a year. We spoke to well over 200 people, organised fact-finding missions, requested meaningful studies, research, a very thorough exercise in order to come up with a comprehensive report with those concrete recommendations. What on earth has the Commission been doing in the past year and a half? It is disrespectful to the principle of loyal cooperation with Parliament, and it's a slap in the face of the victims of spyware.

The only people that I have seen who are happy with the approach of the Commission are the ones that are normally sitting right there, colleagues of the Polish Law and Justice Party who ironically find a great partner in the Commission in their attempts to sabotage our recommendations. For obvious reasons they tabled a resolution to ask you to be cautious with our recommendations. And they're so comfortable that they don't even bother to show up today because they're confident that you are dancing to their tune. So it's time to change the music. We are urging you to show respect and ambition, and you have to ask yourself which side you want to be on: the side of the rule of law destroyers, or the rule of law defenders.

Hannes Heide, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Es ist höchste Zeit, dass das Europäische Parlament ein direktes Initiativrecht für Gesetzesvorschläge erhält, um die Interessen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger wirkungsvoll durchzusetzen.

Vor fünf Monaten hat das Europäische Parlament mit großer Mehrheit Gesetzesänderungen vorgeschlagen, um Bürgerinnen und Bürger vor missbräuchlichem Einsatz von Spyware zu schützen. Bis heute warten oder warteten wir auf eine entsprechende Antwort. Und das ist eine Missachtung des in den Verträgen verankerten Loyalitätsgebots zwischen den EU-Institutionen.

Der Standpunkt der Kommission, wonach keine legislativen Maßnahmen notwendig seien, verkennet die Lage, weil neue Verdachtsfälle zeigen, dass der existierende Rechtsrahmen weder in den Mitgliedstaaten noch auf europäischer Ebene ausreichend ist, um Missbrauch zu verhindern und zu sanktionieren.

Daher ist unverzüglich ein Maßnahmenplan zur Verhinderung des Missbrauchs von Spyware gegen europäische Bürgerinnen und Bürger vorzulegen, und es sind alle legislativen und nicht legislativen Kompetenzen auszuschöpfen, die in die Zuständigkeit der Europäischen Union fallen.

Sophia in 't Veld, on behalf of the Renew Group. – Mr President, Commissioner, I listened with great interest to the first-year law student lecture we just got on what the law is, and what Member States should and should not do – that's not the problem. When Member States do not comply with the law, then what does the Commission do? That's the key question here.

And the Commission says, 'Oh, we condemn. We expect. We assist. We have no investigative powers.' Sorry, the Commission is maybe the most powerful body in the European Union, but the Commission says, 'Oh, the Member States here are spying on journalists. They are illegally selling surveillance technologies to Sudan or Madagascar, but we can do nothing about it, even if the law says that they cannot do so.'

Sorry, Commissioner, this is just not good enough. If you say you have no investigative powers I disagree with you, but even if that's the case, you don't have to have them because the entire investigation is in the report of the European Parliament. And if it is not in the report of the European Parliament, it is in all the media reports that we have seen since.

Now even the United States – not being known for being loony lefty peaceniks – have actually blacklisted Intellexa, a Europe-based company which is engaging in illegal activity. They are considered to be a threat to the national security of the United States. So what does the Commission do? Nothing! This is a gangster's paradise – Europe is a gangster's paradise. There is complete impunity for the abuse of spyware and for the illegal sale of spyware. And I wonder, if the Commission cannot fix this, then why do we have a Commission in the first place, if you are not the guardian of the Treaties?

Saskia Bricmont, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, il y a cinq mois, après des centaines d'heures de travail, la commission d'enquête PEGA a remis ses recommandations à la Commission européenne et aux États membres. Et, toujours prompt à agir dans le domaine de la sécurité intérieure, la Commission, selon ce Parlement en tout cas, peut-être pas selon elle, a le pouvoir d'agir lorsque la liberté de la presse, de réunion, d'expression, l'exercice des droits civils et politiques, lorsque la sécurité européenne sont menacés par des gouvernements européens et par des États tiers qui nous espionnent.

Et ce n'est pas seulement à ce Parlement que l'on vous demande de répondre, c'est aux milliers de victimes d'espionnage illégal: aux journalistes et leurs sources en danger parce qu'au lieu d'être protégés par vous, ils sont espionnés, aux victimes de violations des droits fondamentaux parce que nos États exportent des logiciels malveillants vers des régimes autoritaires. Depuis la fin de notre commission d'enquête, d'autres journalistes en exil, d'autres députés européens, d'autres fonctionnaires de la Commission européenne, d'autres diplomates ont été espionnés. Et toujours aucune réaction. Et au contraire, l'Union européenne continue à déballer le tapis rouge aux États tiers qui sont soupçonnés d'être à l'origine de ces attaques.

J'ai donc des questions: pourquoi le fait que le Vietnam puisse nous espionner ne suscite pas le moindre émoi? Pourquoi la France, via la société Nexa, a-t-elle pu en toute impunité exporter vers un des pays les plus liberticides au monde, alors que ce type de logiciel risque d'être utilisé contre des opposants politiques? Pourquoi des enquêtes ne sont-elles pas ouvertes sur les tentatives d'espionnage, sur notre collègue Karleskind, sur notre présidente Metsola, sur des membres de la Commission européenne?

Chers collègues, je pense que nous sommes en droit de nous demander si la Commission européenne joue délibérément avec la sécurité des Européens, qui sont aussi en droit de se demander pourquoi nos recommandations ne sont pas suivies.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, dans sa recommandation du 15 juin 2023, le Parlement européen a établi que certains États européens ont commis des abus dans l'utilisation de logiciels espions comme Pegasus ou Predator. Sur le sol européen, des journalistes et des responsables politiques ont été espionnés au moyen de leurs téléphones portables, et en dehors de l'Europe des espionnages de masse ont eu lieu du fait de l'exportation par des États membres de l'Union, ou avec leur accord, de logiciels espions. C'est ainsi qu'une société française, Nexa, semble avoir vendu le logiciel Predator à l'Égypte, au Vietnam et à Madagascar.

Il faut bien sûr dénoncer ces abus, mais faut-il pour autant en prendre prétexte pour tenter de justifier l'immixtion de l'Union européenne dans le domaine de la sécurité nationale? Je ne le pense pas. Comme le Parlement européen, le Conseil doit rappeler les États membres à leurs responsabilités et les inciter à poursuivre leurs efforts pour n'utiliser les logiciels espions que dans un cadre légal. Mais il n'appartient en aucun cas à la Commission de présenter un plan de mesures, car il s'agit d'un domaine qui relève de la sécurité nationale et donc de la souveraineté des États membres. Je vous le dis solennellement, l'Union européenne n'a pas vocation à s'immiscer dans tous les domaines.

Γιώργος Γεωργίου, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας *The Left*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Reynders, όταν λέτε ότι πρέπει να κάνουμε και να έχουμε και διάφορα πράγματα, σε ποιους τα λέτε; Σε εμάς; Και ποια είναι η δουλειά η δική σας, δηλαδή; Η επιτροπή PEGA εργάστηκε πολύ σκληρά για δεκαπέντε μήνες. Σας δώσαμε τα πάντα: γεγονότα, τις αμαρτωλές εταιρείες, ονόματα και διευθύνσεις, τα ένοχα κράτη. Κάναμε και συστάσεις, γιατί το πρόβλημα είναι πάρα πολύ σοβαρό. Κανείς δεν συγκινήθηκε. Ούτε η κυβέρνηση της Κύπρου, βέβαια, της δικής μου χώρας, που είχε πάρα πολλά να κάνει. Η αντίδραση της δικής σας Επιτροπής, με συγχωρείτε, είναι αξιοδρήνητη. Δεν νομοθετείτε. Μας παραπέμπετε στις εθνικές αρχές. Αυτές παρανομούν επικαλούμενες την εθνική ασφάλεια και το δημόσιο συμφέρον.

Τα σκάνδαλα με τις παρακολουθήσεις δεν έχουν τέλος. Οι εταιρείες παραγωγής και εξαγωγής λογισμικού θησαυρίζουν. Εσείς σφυρίζετε αδιάφορα. Η δημοκρατία, η όποια δημοκρατία σας, πάει περίπατο. Τόση αδιαφορία πια; Επιτέλους, κάντε κάτι. Διαφυλάξετε το όποιο κύρος σας.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Mr President, the mass surveillance of a democratic movement should make the government behind it fall. But not in Spain, where the government refused to clarify its role in the Pegasus, and they targeted 65 Catalan elected officials, activists, lawyers, journalists and their families, that we know of.

But not only has Pedro Sánchez not shown any willingness to hold those responsible accountable, yesterday, he reappointed the two ministers responsible for the espionage to their posts as defence and interior ministers. And believe me, Mr Sánchez was making a statement. He was telling us, 'we will continue to use Pegasus or whatever we need to keep anyone threatening the sacred unity of Spain on a short leash'.

How can we expect any kind of real investigation, as this Parliament demanded? How can we trust that we will not be targeted again? We simply cannot. And the indulgence of this Commission to such abuses is an intolerable invitation to authoritarianism.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, colleagues, today, we are here to discuss a matter of importance to our democracy – the blatant misuse of Pegasus and equivalent surveillance spyware. This issue is not just about privacy breaches; it strikes at the core of our democratic principles and the rule of law.

The European Parliament has taken significant steps drafting the most comprehensive piece of text to date, demonstrating our commitment to addressing this acute problem. However, the urgency of the situation demands more than recognition, Commissioner, it requires credible and consequential action.

Too many people have been attacked by undue use of spyware across our Union, and their number is only rising. Therefore, we call on the Commission to respond directly and comprehensively to our recommendations. By acting now, we are not only addressing a present problem, but we are preventing a potential future crisis.

As technology evolves, so do threats to our democratic systems. We must be prepared both in terms of policy and technology, to defend our institutions. And yes, this is about the upcoming European elections too. And we saw this already back in 2019 in the case of Poland. In an era where information can be a powerful tool, the misuse of spyware could influence electoral campaigns or serve as an unfair advantage to those who do not feel bound by our common values or laws. This is a matter of Europe's democratic foundations.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, voici cinq mois que nos recommandations pour lutter contre l'utilisation abusive de logiciels espions en Europe ont été présentées et adoptées. Mais malgré l'ampleur du phénomène et les conséquences dévastatrices pour des citoyens européens et l'état de droit, la Commission européenne n'a toujours rien mis en route pour y donner suite. Cette inaction ne peut plus durer.

Vous nous annoncez une initiative et elle sera la bienvenue, car on se demande quel est l'intérêt de laisser libre cours à une sorte de jungle en Europe où des armes numériques de différentes natures se déploient et se multiplient sans entraves. Les abus s'accumulent dans de nombreux domaines connexes, aussi. Voyons la France, par exemple, où des enquêtes dans les médias révèlent que la police nationale utiliserait illégalement, depuis 2015, un logiciel israélien de reconnaissance faciale, ce qui est interdit en France. Le ministère de l'Intérieur ne connaîtrait pas l'utilisation de cet outil, qui permet notamment d'analyser les visages filmés dans la rue et dont personne n'a pris la peine de tenir informée la CNIL.

Alors la question est simple combien de scandales sur les logiciels espions, comme ceux que je viens de décrire, doit-on encore attendre en Europe pour que la Commission réagisse?

Róža Thun und Hohenstein (Renew). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Rozumiem, że Komisja Europejska ma ograniczone możliwości i, na przykład, nie dysponuje komisjami śledczymi. Ale my właśnie po to powołaliśmy tutaj komisję śledczą w Parlamencie Europejskim, która wprowadzi nie miała wszelkich uprawnień komisji śledczych, tak jak to znamy z państw członkowskich, ale jednak zebraliśmy ogromną ilość dowodów na to, że prawo w Unii Europejskiej jest łamane, że obywatele nie są bezpieczni, bo koszmarna praktyka włożenia z butami w życie prywatne ludzi, którzy są niewygodni dla rządów, dla dyktatur czy dla rządów autorytarnych – ta praktyka kwitnie.

I z tego powstało dokładne i obfite sprawozdanie. Możliwe było nie tylko dzięki ogromnej pracy posłów, dzięki zespołom tych posłów, ale też dzięki ofiarom podsłuchów, które z narażeniem się na nękanie i na różne nieprzyjemności ze strony tych, którzy je podsłuchiwali, zeznawały i opowiadały o tym, co je dotknęło, i pomogły nam w tej pracy.

Więc, panie komisarzu – chciałam jedną rzecz zaznaczyć i na tym kończę, panie przewodniczący – kraje członkowskie muszą współpracować. W tej chwili w Polsce wygrały siły demokratyczne, powstaje komisja... *(Przewodniczący odebrał mówczyni głos)*

Marcel Kolaja (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, absent Council, colleagues, this is at least the third time in a very short period of time we are addressing this topic in the plenary, sadly. And the reason is illegal wiretapping and spying on journalists, opposition politicians and activists in a number of Member States, as you know.

We repeatedly asked the Commission to act to propose a legislation that will protect citizens from spying. We asked for measures to prevent rogue governments from abusing spyware. And still: no answers. Thank you for the elaboration on the existing legal framework, but that is not the answer that we were asking for. It is crystal clear that the European Parliament is the only institution fighting for the right to privacy of all Europeans, be it our fight against spyware or against breaking into an encryption or against remote biometric identification in publicly accessible spaces.

So I will finish my speech with the same words as I did already two times in this part: please act.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης (The Left). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, όταν ένας αριστερός συμφωνεί απόλυτα με τον κύριο Lenaers, που είναι από το EPP, δεν καταλαβαίνετε ότι κάπου υπάρχει μια αλήθεια; Ότι εδώ η επιτροπή, τα μέλη της επιτροπής PEGA, δούλεψαν πάρα πολύ σημαντικά και σοβαρά, όλοι οι συνάδελφοι του δημοκρατικού τόξου, και είναι δυσχερή από τη δουλειά σας; Και εδώ, στη δικιά μου χώρα, θέλω να σας πω ότι, πριν από έναν μήνα, δόθηκε παραγγελία για δικαστική έρευνα κατά δύο μελών της Ολομέλειας της ΑΔΑΕ, της κυρίας Αικατερίνης Παπανικολάου και του Στέφανου Γκριτζαλή, από τον τέως Εισαγγελέα του Αρείου Πάγου, τον κύριο κ. Ισιδώρο Ντογιάκο.

Πρέπει να τονιστεί ότι αυτή η έρευνα αφορά στην άσκηση των καθηκόντων τους ως μελών της Αρχής. Τι θα τους πούμε δηλαδή εμείς; Ότι εδώ πήραμε μια απόφαση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και η Επιτροπή ολιγωρεί; Ότι κλείνει το μάτι σε διάφορα κράτη μέλη, σε κυβερνήσεις που σπεύδουν να τροποποιούν νόμους, να βάζουν στο στόχαστρο θεσμικά κεκτημένα, προσπαθούν να συγκαλύψουν τα σκάνδαλα με αθέμιτες πιέσεις και διευκολύνουν την εξαγωγή παράνομων λογισμικών; Και εδώ υπάρχει μια συνυπαιτιότητα, ιδίως εκ μέρους της Επιτροπής. Δηλαδή, γίνεστε μέρος του προβλήματος.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση της PEGA αναγνώρισε τη μεγάλης έκτασης παρακολούθηση που συστηματικά πραγματοποιεί η Εθνική Υπηρεσία Πληροφοριών, με ευθύνη της κυβέρνησης της Νέας Δημοκρατίας και προσωπικά του πρωθυπουργού, εναντίον πολιτικών προσώπων, κομμάτων και δημοσιογράφων, σε βάρος αγωνιστών του εργατικού-λαϊκού κινήματος. Βεβαίως, δεν κάνει την παραμικρή αναφορά στις αποδεδειγμένες παρακολουθήσεις της έδρας του ΚΚΕ από το 2016. Σε κάθε περίπτωση, η παρακολούθηση από κρατικές υπηρεσίες δεν γίνεται σε «κενό αέρος».

Στηρίζεται σε νομοθετικό πλαίσιο που διαχρονικά έχει θεσμοθετηθεί από όλα τα κόμματα που κυβέρνησαν, και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Εξάλλου και το πόρισμα της PEGA αποδέχεται το απαράδεκτο νομοθετικό πλαίσιο που νομιμοποιεί τις παρακολουθήσεις, βαφτίζοντας τις υποκλοπές «καταχρήσεις». Για αυτό και ζητά την εφαρμογή του κανονισμού που επιτρέπει τη χρήση, τη διάθεση, την εξαγωγή κατασκοπευτικών λογισμικών και όχι την απαγόρευσή του. Έτσι, δεν μας ξαφνιάζει που η Επιτροπή δεν πήρε μέτρα. «Κόρακας κοράκου μάτι δεν βγάζει», όπως λέει ο λαός μας. Επομένως, με την παρέμβαση και τη δράση τους, οι εργαζόμενοι χρειάζεται να γκρεμίσουν αυτό το αντιδραστικό πλαίσιο Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, κράτους, κυβερνήσεων, της καταστολής και παρακολουθήσεων του λαού για την προστασία των συμφερόντων των λίγων.

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, για μια ακόμη φορά σε αυτή την αίθουσα, ζητούμε από την Επιτροπή να προβεί σε νομοθετική πρωτοβουλία με βάση το πόρισμα της επιτροπής PEGA. Οι εργασίες μας ολοκληρώθηκαν με επίπονη προσπάθεια και μετά από επισκέψεις στα κράτη μέλη και επαφές με τους αρμόδιους φορείς. Θυμίζω ότι η χώρα μου η Ελλάδα, αλλά και η Κύπρος, σε αντίθεση με άλλες χώρες, συνεργάστηκαν άμεσα με τα μέλη της επιτροπής και παρείχαν πληροφορίες για όλες τις εξεταζόμενες υποθέσεις.

Θυμίζω, επίσης, ότι η Ελλάδα νομοθέτησε πρώτη την απαγόρευση εισαγωγής, χρήσης, πώλησης και διανομής παράνομων λογισμικών, καθώς και την αυστηροποίηση της ποινικής μεταχείρισης της χρήσης. Είναι σημαντικό να υπάρχει ανάλογη νομοθεσία σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Όμως, κύριε Επίτροπε, χρειαζόμαστε ευρωπαϊκό πλαίσιο για το απόρρητο των επικοινωνιών και την προστασία των προσωπικών δεδομένων που να εγγυάται την ασφάλεια όλων των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών. Είναι δε επιτακτική ανάγκη να ολοκληρωθεί μέχρι το τέλος αυτής της κοινοβουλευτικής θητείας ενόψει των ευρωεκλογών του Ιουνίου του 2024.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario Reynders, cuando ha escuchado usted en este Parlamento Europeo una polifonía de voces de distintos Grupos parlamentarios, la conclusión es que ha escuchado, en realidad, una sinfonía con una misma partitura en lo esencial.

Y es que, después de un año de trabajo en la Comisión de Investigación sobre el programa Pegasus y adoptadas las conclusiones por este Parlamento Europeo, solo cabe legislar para deducir las consecuencias y establecer una norma común que prohíba la utilización de programas espías que violen derechos fundamentales, sin más, y particularmente su utilización de manera perversa para perseguir a adversarios políticos, activistas de derechos humanos, abogados u oponentes de los Gobiernos, como sabemos que ha sucedido en Estados miembros de la Unión Europea.

Queremos una norma común en materia de seguridad nacional para que no pueda invocarse ese concepto en vano al objeto de reprimir derechos fundamentales de privacidad de las comunicaciones y de confidencialidad de los datos personales.

Por tanto, pongámonos a trabajar cuanto antes, porque es absolutamente urgente una legislación europea que asegure que la Comisión de Investigación sobre el programa Pegasus, con sus conclusiones, ha servido realmente para mejorar el nivel de protección de los derechos fundamentales de los europeos.

Diana Riba i Giner (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, hace ya cinco meses que esta Cámara adoptó una serie de recomendaciones para emprender acciones contra el uso de programas espía. Fuimos muy claros. Exigimos normas para que se establezcan unas condiciones muy estrictas para permitir su uso en casos muy excepcionales, investigaciones exhaustivas sobre presuntos abusos que han salido a la luz y ayudas para las personas que hayan sido blanco de ataques.

Y mientras el número de casos sigue aumentando, ni las autoridades nacionales de los países específicamente mencionados en la recomendación ni la Comisión han movido un solo dedo ni presentado un plan con las futuras medidas de actuación.

Desde aquí, les pedimos, una vez más, que se den prisa. Cada segundo que pasan en silencio les convierte en cómplices de una de las vulneraciones de derechos más graves contra los ciudadanos de la Unión.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Debata o Pegasusie, a cały PiS zapadł się pod ziemię. Nikogo tu nie ma – ani Kempy, ani Tarczyńskiego, byłych członków komisji PEGA. A tyle mieli do powiedzenia.

Niemniej mam dla nich dobre wiadomości. Po pierwsze, wkrótce w polskim Sejmie rozpocznie pracę komisja śledcza do zbadania afery Pegasus. Po drugie, to będzie normalna regulaminowa sejmowa komisja śledcza. Nie polowanie na czarownice, ale rzetelne wyjaśnienie niegodziwości i nadużywania prawa. Najpierw weryfikacja przed komisją, a później przed wolnymi, niezależnymi sądami.

Bo mimo że PiS to nasi przeciwnicy polityczni, to nie będziemy stosować chwytów poniżej pasa. Ale musimy rozliczyć te osiem długich lat, gdy opozycja, prawnicy czy aktywiści byli inwigilowani Pegasusem, a media rządowe dostawały bezpośrednio od służb te materiały.

I tym bardziej należy się szacunek obywatelom Polski, którzy pokazali tej totalnej władzy 15 października czerwoną kartkę. Cała Europa jest dumna z tej zmiany w Polsce.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Στέλιος Κυμπουρόπουλος (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συνάδελφοι, κύριε Επίτροπε, η σημερινή συζήτηση είναι μια εξαιρετική ευκαιρία για να αποκατασταθεί η αλήθεια. Και η αλήθεια είναι ότι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, αυτός ο ναός της δημοκρατίας, το τελευταίο διάστημα έχει γίνει θέατρο για λόγους εθνικής μικροπολιτικής σκοπιμότητας, κυρίως με την απελπισμένη προσπάθεια στοχοποίησης της χώρας μου από συγκεκριμένες πολιτικές ομάδες.

Μια χώρα με παραδοσιακή προσήλωση στην υπεράσπιση των ευρωπαϊκών αξιών και του κράτους δικαίου και μια κυβέρνηση η οποία, όχι μόνο αυστηροποίησε τη νομοθεσία απαγορεύοντας τη χρήση λογισμικών παρακολούθησης, ενίσχυσε τα θεσμικά αντίβαρα και μεταρρύθμισε τον έλεγχο των υπηρεσιών ασφαλείας, αλλά και συνεργάζεται εποικοδομητικά με όλα τα θεσμικά όργανα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, και η οποία, φυσικά, αναμένει την ετυμηγορία της δικαιοσύνης ενώπιον της οποίας βρίσκεται η υπόθεση, ώστε να διαλυθεί αυτό το νέφος τοξικότητας. Φτάνει πια, λοιπόν, με την απαράδεκτη και εμμονική στοχοποίηση της χώρας μου.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, gerbiamas Komisare. Turbūt visi suprantame, kad specialiosios tarnybos turi turėti instrumentus, kad užkardytų priešišką šalių veiklą. Tačiau šie instrumentai negali būti naudojami prieš savo šalies piliečius, persekiojant politinius oponentus, žurnalistus, ir dėl to Europos Parlamentas ragina, Komisijos nare, Jus ir Komisiją imtis patvirtinti teisės aktus, kurie galėtų užtikrinti, kad mūsų žurnalistai, politiniai veikėjai galėtų savo šalyje reikšti savo nuomonę ir kad turėtų teisę į privacią vidaus gyvenimo neliečiamybę, ir kad šie rimti, geri instrumentai, kurie yra nukreipti prieš priešiškas jėgas, nebūtų naudojami persekiojant savo šalies politinius oponentus ir žurnalistus. Todėl kamuolys Jūsų pusėje, gerbiamas Komisare, ir mes Europos Parlamente lauksime Komisijos pasiūlymų.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner and colleagues, Intellexa is registered in Ireland. This is the company that has been blacklisted by the US Government. The Irish Government says there is no evidence of export and no export certification under the Dual-use Regulation. Yet Intellexa posted revenues of EUR 36 million last year in the Irish Companies Registration Office. Perhaps there is something wrong with the Dual-use Regulation. How easy is it to monitor the export of code? How easy is it to monitor the export of software?

The reality is that the EU is a permissive regulatory environment that has allowed these toxic products to undermine democracy and freedom everywhere. Next year, 4 billion people will vote in elections – a record. Think of the amount of surveillance of journalists, of activists and of candidates by these products that carry the veneer of EU regulation, that carry the EU stamp. What a shame it is that MEPs don't have the power to initiate legislation.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, first of all, I want to confirm that all reply has been formally transmitted to Parliament. So it's very clear and we will maybe discuss it again in the future, but you will see that we have sent a formal reply.

We understand that in your resolution, you are calling on the Commission to present a plan of measures to prevent the abuse of spyware in the European Union, making full use of all available legislative and non-legislative means provided by the Treaties.

I believe that today's presentation gave you already an overview of some measures already proposed. Let me first reiterate that the Commission considers that any attempt by national authorities to access citizens' data illegally, including that of journalists or political opponents, is unacceptable and should be condemned.

So, first of all, I want to say that the Member States should make sure that their security services respect rules. But when I am speaking about Member States, it is not just the government. I am speaking also about independent data protection authorities that we are supporting, and also the independent judiciary. And you know that also we are supporting the independent judiciaries, and we try to work in the different Member States to guarantee the independence of the judiciary. So, it is not just to speak about the Member States as government. We are speaking also about very clear other entities that are able to act in such a kind of situation, and certainly on data protection, privacy and on security of journalists and fundamental rights, in particular the freedom of expression.

I want to confirm that we have taken also some legislative initiatives. I do not want to repeat what I have said in my introduction, but you are now discussing the European Media Freedom Act. And there there are some provisions about the journalists and the possible use of spyware.

The same about the Cyber Resilience Act, another legislative initiative that is on the table. Of course, for the rest, I have said that enforcement is primarily a national competence of the relevant law enforcement agencies of the Member States. But, until recently, there was no legal basis for any discussion and adversary action at the EU level in this area. The new Dual-Use Regulation, however, changes this approach and introduces dedicated provisions on enforcement as part of the overall thrust towards a more effective EU export control system.

Under the terms of the new regulation, the Commission has recently, in 2022, set up a so-called enforcement coordination mechanism, which is mandated with the preparation of concrete actions, for example, for enhancing information exchange between licensing and enforcement agencies. There also we have some capacity to act with the national agencies able to react in such a kind of situation.

Of course, I have listened to a lot of comments about the use of spyware against citizens. I don't want to repeat again that it's unacceptable, but I have listened and saw the necessity to use some kind of spyware or other equipment in the national security issues. Certainly in the geopolitical situation that we are living in for the moment, with the war in Ukraine and the situation in the Middle East, it is quite important that some actors at the national level have the capacity to act with different intrusive instruments to defend the national security.

I want just to insist on the fact that when you compare with the situation in the US, the US is not a union, it's a federal state. When we are listening about some decisions taken in the US, those decisions are taken just on the basis of the national security competence of the federal government. I have had many discussions with our US colleagues and again, that's an exception in the Treaty and is more a competence of the Member States. But I have said myself that there are some limits in the way to use different kind of instruments also in national security.

In addition to the existing rules and to the proposal I referred to, we are preparing, as I said, a non-legislative initiative. This initiative would clarify the boundaries of and the interplay between EU law, in particular the data protection, a privacy acquis and national security. Of course, we will keep you fully informed about this proposal, and I am sure that we'll have to go back to such a debate with, in our mind, the different provisions of the Treaties and the different competence at different levels that I have described: the EU level, but also the level of the Member States.

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ

Wiceprzewodnicząca

Przewodnicząca. – Otrzymałam dwa projekty rezolucji złożone zgodnie z art. 132 ust. 2 Regulaminu¹.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 23 listopada 2023 r. (*).

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Ramona Strugariu (Renew), *în scris*. – În prelungirea dezbaterii pe care am avut-o în sesiunea trecută, revenim astăzi cu o nouă discuție în care dorim să reiterăm solicitarea noastră către Comisie pentru un răspuns european coordonat și un cadru legislativ coerent privind programele spion intruzive. Este nevoie de un răspuns european pentru că, oricât ne displace să o admitem, spyware-ul este o problemă europeană, cu instrumente produse în UE și exportate în alte părți.

Am asistat, de asemenea în Europa, la spionarea politicianilor, inclusiv a deputaților europeni și a funcționarilor Comisiei, precum și a jurnaliștilor, ceea ce reprezintă un veritabil atac la adresa democrației. Nu putem pune capăt acestui atac asupra democrației decât dacă avem reguli clare la nivel european care să prevină aceste abuzuri.

Avem acum pe masa negocierilor Actul european pentru libertatea presei, care conține și o propunere curajoasă a Comisiei în ceea ce privește spionajul. Iar Parlamentul European a introdus garanții suplimentare. Sper că și la nivelul Consiliului vom avea o masă critică de state membre care vor da dovadă de curaj. Apărarea securității naționale nu poate fi folosită ca un cec în alb pentru a permite supravegherea jurnaliștilor și pentru a deschide calea tuturor tipurilor de abuz.

(*) Patrz protokół posiedzenia.

17. Zmiana inicjatywy UE na rzecz owadów zapylających – Nowy ład na rzecz owadów zapylających (debata)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad:

— pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Rady przez Alexandra Bernhubera, Milana Brgleza, Martina Hojsika, Michèle Rivasi, Anję Hazekamp w imieniu Komisji Ochrony Środowiska Naturalnego, Zdrowia Publicznego i Bezpieczeństwa Żywności w sprawie zmiany inicjatywy na rzecz owadów zapylających – nowy ład na rzecz owadów zapylających (O-000050/2023 - B9-0032/23) (2023/2720(RSP)) oraz

— pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Komisji przez Alexandra Bernhubera, Milana Brgleza, Martina Hojsika, Michèle Rivasi, Anję Hazekamp w imieniu Komisji Ochrony Środowiska Naturalnego, Zdrowia Publicznego i Bezpieczeństwa Żywności w sprawie zmiany inicjatywy na rzecz owadów zapylających – nowy ład na rzecz owadów zapylających (O-000051/2023 - B9-0033/23) (2023/2720(RSP)).

Milan Brglez, *avtor*. – Gospa predsednica. Spoštovano predsedstvo. Spoštovana komisarka, spoštovane kolegice in kolegi. Evropa in svet se soočata z zaskrbljujočim upadom števila divjih opraševalcev, od katerih je odvisnih 35 odstotkov proizvodnje hrane na globalni ravni. To pomeni resno tveganje za prehransko varnost, zdravje ljudi, kakovost življenja ter prav tako za delovanje storitev naravnih ekosistemov.

Štiri od petih vrst poljščin so vsaj v določeni meri odvisne od opraševanja z divjimi in upravljanimi opraševalci, kar nenazadnje predstavlja bistven vložek za kmetijstvo in gospodarstvo na splošno. Neposredni prispevek opraševalcev k evropski kmetijski proizvodnji je namreč ocenjen na približno 15 milijard evrov. V danih okoliščinah je zato vedno več upravičenih pozivov znanstvenikov in civilne družbe k odločnemu ukrepanju za odpravo vzrokov upada števila opraševalcev.

Majhna čebela je pred nedavnim združila v evropski državljanski pobudi skoraj milijon in 55.000 prebivalcev EU, ki nas opozarjajo, kako pomembni so opraševalci za naše vsakdanje življenje in zdravje ter da moramo narediti preprosto več za njihovo zaščito. Zato vprašanje: kako države članice naslavljajo vzroke za zmanjšanje števila opraševalcev, vključno s svetlobnim onesnaževanjem? Da bi se na ravni Unije čim bolj usklajeno spopadli z upadom opraševalcev kot posledico podnebnih sprememb, intenzivnega kmetijstva, uporabe pesticidov ter onesnaževanja in degradacije naravnega okolja in habitatov, imamo od leta 2018 na razpolago splošni okvir EU oziroma celovit nabor političnih orodij, zbranih v tako imenovani pobudi Evropske unije za opraševalce.

To pobudo je Komisija pred nedavnim tudi posodobila kot odziv na nova spoznanja in zaradi očitne potrebe po novih in okrepljenih ukrepih tako na ravni Unije kot na državni in lokalni ravni z namenom uresničitve dolgoročnega cilja spremembe trenda upada opraševalcev do leta 2030. Boljše vključevanje ukrepov za zaščito divjih opraševalcev v kmetijsko politiko EU, okrepljena zaščita divjih opraševalcev pred škodljivimi kemikalijami, nadaljnja podpora aktivnostim monitoringa opraševalcev in ostalih evropskih raziskovalnih projektov, krepitev zmogljivosti na področju proučevanja opraševalcev ter podpora nevladnim organizacijam in znanosti za državljane ali državljanski znanosti lahko bistveno pripomorejo k uresničevanju ciljev pobude EU za opraševalce.

Zato se v tej luči sprašujem, kako Komisija ocenjuje skladnost strateških načrtov skupne kmetijske politike s cilji pobude EU za opraševalce. In ali namerava Svet vzpostaviti tesnejše sodelovanje med državami članicami v okviru strateških načrtov skupne kmetijske politike ter s tem omogočiti tudi izmenjavo dobrih praks za zaščito divjih opraševalcev.

Glede zaščite opraševalcev pred škodljivimi kemikalijami bi me zanimalo, ali je Komisija ob upoštevanju omejitev sedanjega postopka izdajanja dovoljenj za pesticide in biocide pripravljena nadaljevati s prehodom na celostne, sistemske ocene tveganja za okolje za širši nabor žuželk, opraševalcev, in pooblastiti zadevne agencije za ta namen.

Če želimo sprejemati kakovostne in premišljene politične odločitve, moramo več vlagati v raziskave, ki nam bodo še bolj pojasnile kompleksni svet opraševalcev. Prav tako moramo preprosto več narediti na področju krepitev zmogljivosti in usposabljanja stroke. V EU se na primer soočamo s pomanjkanjem strokovnjakov za taksonomijo opraševalcev. Njihova vloga je ključna za izmenjavo znanja in primerov dobrih praks med državami članicami, kar nenazadnje bistveno prispeva k oblikovanju ustreznih skupnih politik.

V tej luči me zanima, ali nameravajo države članice zagotoviti podporo za izvajanje obstoječih pobud Evropske unije za monitoring opraševalcev. Ali bo Komisija dolgoročno nadaljevala z izvajanjem projektov, kot so Spring, Insignia, Sting in Amber? In nenazadnje, kako nameravajo države članice in Komisija okrepiti razpoložljivost strokovnjakov za taksonomijo za učinkovitejše spremljanje opraševalcev in poročanje o podatkih?

Posodobljena pobuda Evropske unije o opraševalcih bi morala biti v središču evropskega zelenega dogovora in kot taka vodilna referenca za oblikovanje sektorskih politik in premostitev političnih vrzeli, ki naslavljajo upad opraševalcev. Strinjam se, da je pred nami še veliko izzivov, vendar z obsegom razpoložljivih orodij in ukrepov ter s politično voljo verjamem, da smo jih zmožni premostiti.

Ángeles Moreno Bau, *Presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señora presidenta, señorías, señora comisaria, me gustaría darles las gracias por haberme invitado a debatir con ustedes la postura del Consejo con respecto a la revisión de la iniciativa sobre los polinizadores.

Los polinizadores son fundamentales para la conservación de la biodiversidad, así como para la economía y, en particular, para la producción de alimentos. Existe un amplio consenso en cuanto a que la situación actual de declive del número y la diversidad de los polinizadores es insostenible y a que, si no se hace nada para revertir esta tendencia, nuestros ecosistemas estarán en peligro. Sabemos que las causas de dicho declive están vinculadas a la actividad humana: la agricultura, la extracción de recursos y el desarrollo urbano y suburbano han destruido muchos de los hábitats de los polinizadores. La polinización también se ha visto alterada por el cambio climático y los cambios de temperatura.

En este sentido creo que podemos estar de acuerdo en que hay que adoptar medidas eficaces en la Unión Europea para combatir las causas del declive de los polinizadores.

La iniciativa de la Comisión —que se adoptó inicialmente en 2018 y ahora es objeto de revisión— se centra específicamente en los polinizadores. El Consejo acoge con satisfacción la iniciativa y conviene en la necesidad de abordar el problema del declive de los polinizadores de forma integrada, empleando con mayor eficacia los instrumentos y políticas de que disponemos.

Uno de ellos es el Reglamento sobre la restauración de la naturaleza, sobre el cual los legisladores han alcanzado recientemente un acuerdo político. Este importante acto legislativo proporcionará un marco legal para los Estados miembros que la iniciativa sobre los polinizadores respaldará y complementará. El Reglamento sobre la restauración de la naturaleza prevé requisitos específicos para que los Estados miembros establezcan, a más tardar en 2030, medidas dirigidas a invertir el declive de los polinizadores.

La revisión de la iniciativa se presentó igualmente en el Consejo de Agricultura y Pesca de marzo de este año. En general, las delegaciones la valoraron positivamente y reconocieron la necesidad de reforzar la protección de los polinizadores e invertir su declive. Muchas de ellas también hicieron hincapié en medidas relacionadas que ya han incluido en sus planes de acción nacionales en virtud de la política agrícola común.

Además, considero importante que tengamos en cuenta los trabajos legislativos en curso, concretamente la propuesta de Reglamento sobre el uso sostenible de los plaguicidas. Su adopción podría contribuir en mayor medida a la protección de los polinizadores.

Durante los debates del Consejo, los Estados miembros centraron ampliamente su atención en las alternativas no químicas e instaron a la Comisión a acelerar su desarrollo y el procedimiento de aprobación.

La Presidencia española está determinada a hacer avanzar el Reglamento de productos fitosanitarios y tiene previsto acordar una posición del Consejo antes de finales de año.

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, it is a great pleasure to see the support from this House for the EU pollinators initiative. All of us know that we cannot live without pollinators. Without them, our food security, livelihoods and nature are seriously undermined. Right now, bee, butterfly and hoverfly populations continue to collapse, with many on the verge of extinction.

Hence, the Commission revision of the 2018 pollinator initiative, with the new framework adopted in January this year. Together with the proposals for nature restoration and the sustainable use of plant protection products, it forms a new deal for pollinators with the potential to reverse the decline. The trilogues on nature restoration are over, political validation is now taking place by both co-legislators, and our binding target to halt the decline of pollinators by 2030 is now in sight. This target will be crucial for their effective protection.

I will try to reply to your questions. You ask how the Commission assesses the compliance of Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) strategic plans with the goals of the pollinators initiative, and how the current CAP measures on biodiversity can help protect pollinators. Based on an assessment of the local conditions and needs, Member States prepared a national CAP strategic plans for the period 2023–2027, explaining how they will channel support to achieve the economic, environmental and social objectives of the CAP. The Commission assessed how CAP support can bring positive effects on pollination and ecosystem connectivity in the agricultural land. The strategic plans have been in place in place since January, and they support numerous practices that bring benefits to biodiversity and pollinators. Enhanced conditionality with a range of environmental conditions to be met by all farmers receiving CAP support now covers some 90% of all EU agriculture areas. Almost EUR 100 billion – one third of the entire CAP budget – is used to support the environmental and climate transition to 2027. Ecoschemes make up at least 25% of the budget for direct payments, and rural development instruments allocate at least 35% of their budget to environmental practices support.

ting our organic farming and landscape features, reducing pesticide use, and conserving or restoring biodiversity on agricultural land. Member States can make adjustments in the plans to ensure the appropriate uptake of the interventions, while maintaining the overall level of environmental ambition. The updated guidance document for the risk assessment of bees from the European Food Safety Agency (EFSA) has been much approved and now applies to more pollinator species. It will be applied by amending the relevant implementing regulations very soon. The risk of pesticides to non-bee pollinators is included in the general approach for non-target arthropods. As a major input for this, the EFSA has started updating the guidance document for terrestrial eco toxicology. In addition, ongoing research will enable a more system-based environmental risk assessment for pesticides and may allow further revisions of the risk assessment methodology.

Now to question two – a question on indicators and monitoring. The revised pollinators initiative will establish a holistic monitoring framework, enabling us to assess the state of pollinator populations and investigate key drivers of their decline. A number of monitoring initiatives along these lines have been launched by the Commission in the last five years. Looking to the future, it will be important to integrate a wild pollinator indicator that will be developed under the Nature Restoration Law in the future performance monitoring and evaluation framework of the CAP, recognising their critical importance. The Commission is developing options for a farmland pollinator indicator, which should cover the most relevant pollinator groups on the basis of a methodology that is scientifically robust.

Now, just quickly, the reply to question three – a few words on capacity building to finish with. One major impediment of effective pollinator monitoring is simply a lack of tools and experts. That is why the Commission is now implementing the ORBIT and Taxo-Fly projects, building essential tools for professional taxonomists and citizen scientists. We are also considering options for supporting the training of new taxonomy experts.

And lastly, the youth for pollinators pilot project, largely funded by this House, envisages a small grants facility for youth projects. The results will increase our understanding of the cost-benefit ratio of small grants and the best ways to address implementation challenges.

Alexander Bernhuber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Wir haben heute schon einen spannenden Tag hinter uns, wenn es um das Thema Pflanzenschutz gegangen ist, und immer wieder fällt da auch das Wort Bestäuber, Bienen und Co. Wenn es um die wahren Schützer unserer Bestäuber geht, dann sind das die Bauern; und wenn wir hier immer wieder Frontalangriffe auf die Landwirtschaft erleben, dann ist das einfach eine Lüge.

Ganz einfach, praktisches Beispiel: Ich habe in Brüssel eine Wohnung, und wenn ich da am Abend im Sommer das Fenster aufmache, das Licht brennt drinnen und es ist draußen finster, dann kommt kein einziges Insekt rein. Bei mir zu Hause am Land, wenn ich da am Abend im Büro sitze und das Fenster aufmache, sogar jetzt im Winter – ich mache das Fenster auf, fünf Minuten, und ich bin schnell wieder draußen, weil alles voller Gelsen und Co. ist.

Und dann den Vorwurf zu bekommen – gerade am Land –, die Landwirtschaft ist schuld, dass alle Insekten sterben, dann ist das doch etwas weit hergeholt. Da sieht man, dass gerade dort noch Biodiversität vorhanden ist, gerade dort noch die Möglichkeit ist, dass Bestäuber unterkommen, dass Hummeln, Bienen vorhanden sind und wir auch in den Städten etwas unternehmen sollten. Wenn nur Licht, Lichtverschmutzung ist und die Städte die ganze Nacht leuchten, dann kennen sich die Insekten wahrlich nicht mehr aus.

Und da appelliere ich an die Kolleginnen und Kollegen, dass wir hier vernünftige Ansätze diskutieren. Ich glaube, wir haben alle gemeinsam das Ziel, dass es mehr Bestäuber geben soll, das geht aber nur im Miteinander – das ist hier ganz wichtig –, und nicht in einem Gegeneinander, wo einer dem anderen die Schuld gibt.

Cyrus Engerer, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, thank you, Commissioner, for being here with us at this late hour.

This has not been a very good day for pollinators in our Parliament. It hasn't been a good day for nature or our health, as those who oppose their protection managed to kill the law to have ambitious targets on the use of harmful and toxic pesticides. This means that pollinators will continue being killed and, unfortunately, are in extinction in a number of our countries and different cities and regions. But scientists are very clear: we need clear action, or else pollinators that are very essential for 35% of the world's food crops will be lost.

There is positive news, though, because our citizens have taken action and they want action from us as well, because over one million citizens sent us an initiative to save the bees, and ultimately save also our European farmers.

In light of all this, I welcome the urgency highlighted in the Revised pollinators initiative to address this rising concern. It is high time for Member States and the Commission to listen to the plea of our citizens and to step up our efforts to protect and monitor wild pollinator populations, and to reverse pollinator decline as soon as possible, and by 2030 at the latest.

We need to halt pollinator decline – and yes, Commissioner, I agree – funds are very important, and we need more funds to encourage more, not only young people, but others, to invest their energy in helping nature.

Martin Hojsík, *za skupinu Renew*. – Vážená pani predsedajúca, dnešný deň je smutným dňom pre včely a iné opeľovače, od ktorých závisí naše prežitie. Európsky parlament napriek mnohým snahám nepodporil pomoc farmárom pri nahrádzaní nebezpečných pesticídov. Práve tých, ktoré zabíjajú včely a iné opeľovače, ale aj poškodzujú naše zdravie. Jeden neúspech nás však nemôže zastaviť. Nemôžeme sa jednoducho vzdať. V stávke je príliš veľa. Naša budúcnosť. Zaviazali sme sa k tomu, že budeme chrániť prírodu, aby opeľovače mali stále dostupnú potravu, že budeme chrániť pôdu, ktorá je ich prirodzeným prostredím a že budeme pestovať rastliny bez používania chemikálií, ktoré škodia im aj nám. Na Slovensku sa stále stretávam so včelármi, ochranármi, ale aj poznám dobrovoľníkov, ktorí sa venujú ochrane a monitorujú stavy motýľov a ďalších opeľovačov. A hovoria mi, že ich počty sa každým rokom zhoršujú a občania a občianky Európskej únie si to veľmi dobre uvedomujú a žiadajú od nás, politických predstaviteľov, nápravu. Očakávajú, že naplníme svoje sľuby. Dnes sme ich sklamali. Preto by som ešte raz chcel apelovať na Európsku komisiu, na kolegov a kolegyné tu v Európskom parlamente a na členské štáty vrátane Slovenska. Podporte ochranu opeľovačov, no nezabudnite ani na podporu všetkých aktívnych ľudí, ktorí sa chcú zapojiť do ich ochrany.

Michèle Rivasi, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je dirais qu'aujourd'hui c'est une journée noire. On a perdu aujourd'hui. On a perdu parce que notre texte sur la diminution des pesticides, qui devait passer notamment 50 % de diminution des pesticides et l'interdiction des pesticides les plus toxiques en 2030, a été un échec. Alors cette résolution sur les pollinisateurs, c'est un peu le texte de la dernière chance. Les insectes pollinisateurs, effectivement, sont en péril, en disparition annoncée. Et sans eux, nous avec.

Donc les alarmes sonnent depuis des années. Depuis plus de dix ans en effet, la nature nous envoie des signaux de plus en plus nets et suffisamment clairs pour que ce consensus scientifique s'impose: celui de paysages européens vides de vie et d'insectes pollinisateurs, alors que quatre espèces cultivées sur cinq dépendent des pollinisateurs pour se reproduire.

Je citerai quand même quelques chiffres. Ces trois dernières années, des chutes de populations d'insectes allant jusqu'à 75 % ont été observées, et le nombre de papillons a diminué de 36 % en dix ans en Europe. Une nouvelle analyse, signée en novembre 2023 par des naturalistes européens, estime que près de 2 millions d'espèces sont en voie d'extinction, dont 25 % des insectes, c'est le double des précédentes estimations. Des chiffres révélateurs de l'étendue du problème. L'avertissement est là sans changement de système, si nous ne sortons pas d'une agriculture intensive, bibe-ronnés aux pesticides et aux biocides, ce texte à lui seul ne permettra pas de réduire la disparition des pollinisateurs en Europe.

Et là, aujourd'hui, j'en ai vraiment gros sur le cœur parce que le fait d'avoir perdu cette législation, le fait que les députés n'ont pas voulu le renvoyer en commission ENVI, alors quel est notre espoir? Le seul espoir, ce sont les États membres qui doivent essayer d'avoir une politique nationale pour faire des corridors sans pesticides. Parce que contrairement à ce qu'a dit un collègue, la diminution des pollinisateurs est bien due aux pesticides. Donc j'espère qu'il n'est pas trop tard et qu'on aura l'énergie, la force et la conviction au niveau de nos différents gouvernements pour vraiment réduire de façon draconienne les pesticides.

Aurélia Beigneux, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, les Européens sont profondément conscients du danger qui plane sur les pollinisateurs, élément clé de notre biodiversité, nécessaire à la reproduction des cultures et au maintien de la diversité botanique. Mais ce danger n'est pas nouveau. L'utilisation excessive de pesticides, la perte d'habitats naturels et le dérèglement climatique font courir de grands risques sur l'équilibre naturel de nombreuses régions. Les victimes de ce déséquilibre, ce sont aussi nos agriculteurs, car la pollinisation détermine en grande partie les rendements agricoles.

Ce texte le montre bien: votre approche est encore marquée par une idéologie déconnectée, inapplicable, qui répond à la seule logique du chiffre. Avant d'empiler des règles bureaucratiques et des objectifs utopistes, rattrapons déjà notre retard sur la recherche de nouvelles technologies.

En France, la recherche agronomique a permis de développer des variétés plus résistantes aux ravages et aux sécheresses. L'agriculture n'est donc pas condamnée à détruire les pollinisateurs, bien au contraire. Mettons en place des incitations fiscales pour ceux qui adoptent déjà des pratiques respectueuses de l'environnement et réduisons au maximum les accumulations excessives et inapplicables de mesures.

Sauver les pollinisateurs, c'est sauver l'agriculture et donc garantir notre sécurité alimentaire à tous. Ce texte, l'ensemble de notre délégation, le soutient car la situation est critique. Mais nous appelons à la mise en place d'une approche beaucoup plus réaliste qui fait enfin confiance au travail de nos paysans.

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu *The Left*. – Paní předsedající, paní komisařko, již několik let si tady v této instituci lámeme hlavu s tím, jak navrátit do přírody opylovače. Já se však obávám, že s atmosférou, která zde dnes vládne, selžeme znovu. V mezidobí nám ke klasickým ohrožením jako pesticidy a choroby přibýly ještě některé agresivní invazivní druhy, například sršeň asijská. V posledních měsících se dokonce dostala i do mé země. Je zcela jasné, že pokud chceme udržet život, jak jej známe dnes, bez komplexní ochrany opylovačů se neobejdeme. Ta však nemůže vést pouze skrze slepé hájení dalšího ukončování používání pesticidů a stanovování nereálných cílů, které dále ohrozí naší potravinou soběstačnost. Ano, kolegové, mluvím právě o tom, co se zde dnes stalo s nařízením o udržitelném používání přípravků na ochranu rostlin. Tak dlouho tady někteří tlačili na pilu s dalšími nereálnými cíli, až to celé spadlo pod stůl. Nevinnou obětí se tak stávají právě naši opylovači, kterým tento fanatismus spíše přitížil. Příště by to chtělo více umírněnosti a rozumu.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana potpredsjednice Europskog parlamenta, potpredsjednice Europske komisije, kolegice i kolege, provedba novog plana za oprašivače prilika je da učvrstimo položaj europskih pčelara, koji proizvode prvoklasni med, ali su nerijetko izloženi nelojalnoj konkurenciji na policama trgovina.

Naime, nedavno istraživanje Europske komisije pokazalo je da čak 46 posto ispitanih uzoraka meda uvezenog u Europsku uniju ne udovoljava kriterijima iz Direktive o medu. Zato je važno postrožiti pravila o označavanju meda.

U okolnostima u kojima je prosječna cijena uvezenog meda iz trećih država 2,56 eura po kilogramu, odnosno 1,6 eura po kilogramu za med uvezen iz Kine, moramo dodatno raditi da bismo ojačali poziciju naših pčelara i pravilno označili pakiranja meda. S tim u vezi, potrošač prilikom kupnje mora znati točno iz koje države dolazi med, a ako se radi o mješavini meda, mora znati o kojem udjelu meda iz koje države se radi. Zato sam amandmanima zatražio uvođenje obveze navođenja točnog postotka udjela meda na pakiranjima proizvoda.

Kolegice i kolege, da bismo zaštitili oprašivače i europske pčelare, potrebna nam je ispravna provedba novog plana za oprašivače i što skoriji dogovor oko revizije Direktive o medu.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, gerbiama Komisijos nare. Mieli kolegos, aš pats auginu bites, kaip ir mano tėvas, senelis ir prosenelis. Dabar sukti medų man padedą vaikai ir anūkai, todėl puikiai suprantu neįkainojamą apdulkintojų svarbą aplinkai, žemės ūkiui, netgi šeimos ir kultūros ryšiui. Lietuvoje bitės visada buvo ypač gerbiamos ir mylimos. Švenčiausi mūsų draugystės ryšiai sustiprinami dalinant bitėmis. Laukinis apdulkintojus ir bites apsaugoti būtina, negalima leisti joms beprasmiškai žūti dėl bitininkų ir ūkininkų nesusikalbėjimo. Turime jas apsaugoti nuo naujų ligų ir parazitų, tačiau turime atkreipti dėmesį ir į ūkininkų, auginančių mums maistą ir užtikrinančių kaimo gyvybingumą, padėtį. Ribodami vienus įrankių, tokių kaip pesticidai ir herbicidai, naudojimą, turime jiems suteikti ne mažiau efektyvias priemones. Naujausios genominės technologijos, tokios kaip genų redagavimas, gali suteikti daug galimybių, leidžia auginti augalus, kurie yra atsparesni ligoms, aplinkos sąlygoms, klimato kaitos ir kenkėjų poveikiui. Tai veda prie atsparesnės ir tvaresnės žemės ūkio ir maisto produktų sistemos, prisideda prie Žaliojo kurso. Turime užtikrinti, kad mokslo ir technologijų naujovės pasiektų ūkininkus ir būtų jiems prieinamos ir įperkamos. Tokiu būdu panaudodami racionalų ūkininkavimą ir mokslo įdiegimą turėsime ir sveiką aplinką, sveikus apdulkintojus, ir sveiką maistą.

Michał Wieszik (Renew). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, ochrana opel'ovačov, to nie je nejaký rozmar. Je to nevyhnutnosť pre biodiverzitu a tým pádom aj pre zachovanie poľnohospodárstva. Návrh Komisie na revíziu iniciatívy ide dobrým smerom, pretože vychádza zo základného predpokladu, že ochrana akéhokoľvek druhu je postavená na ochrane jeho biotopu, teda podmienok, v ktorých opel'ovače nachádzajú potravu, únik, podmienky na rozmnožovanie a úkryt. To ale vyžaduje komplexnú a koherentnú legislatívu. A budme, prosím, v tomto smere k sebe úprimní. Tým, že tento Parlament odmietol legislatívu na obmedzenie používania pesticídov a takmer do nepoznania obrúsil a znefunkčnil legislatívu na obnovu ekosystémov, ideme úplne opačným smerom. My biotopy nechráňme, my lipneme na ich ďalšom poškodzovaní. Je to populistický, plytký a škodlivý prístup, ktorý musíme jednoznačne zásadne zmeniť. Inak hrozí, že aj táto iniciatíva zostane len nefunkčným formálnym aktom. A to sa nesmie stať, pretože ide o život.

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Der Kollege Bernhuber möchte also wissen, was die Kommission gedenkt, im Rahmen der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik für die Erhaltung unserer Bienen und unserer Bestäuber zu tun. Der Kollege Bernhuber fordert die Kommission auf, Vorschläge vorzulegen. Genau jener Kollege Bernhuber, der heute federführend dafür gesorgt hat, dass genau jener Vorschlag der Kommission, die Pestizide zu reduzieren – und Pestizide sind der Hauptgrund für den Verlust der Artenvielfalt, sie sind der Hauptgrund für den Verlust unserer Bienen und unserer Bestäuber –, also genau diesen Vorschlag, den die Kommission erarbeitet hat, um Pestizide zu reduzieren – nicht nur, um Bestäuber zu schützen, sondern auch unsere Gesundheit und unsere Umwelt –, hier zu versenken.

Was ist das für eine Doppelzüngigkeit? Was ist das für ein falsches Spiel, das hier die europäischen Konservativen spielen? Auf der einen Seite gute Gesetzgebung versenken, die genau unsere Bestäuber schützen soll, und auf der anderen Seite sich hier herstellen und so tun, als hätte man irgendetwas für Natur oder natürliche Bestäuber übrig. Ich würde sagen, Herr Bernhuber, schämen Sie sich!

Idoia Villanueva Ruiz (The Left). – Señora presidenta, algo tan pequeño como las abejas tiene un gran valor medioambiental y agrícola. Mantienen equilibrados nuestros ecosistemas. Son el motor de la apicultura y de ellas depende un tercio de la producción mundial de alimentos. Hoy están en grave peligro de extinción por el cambio climático, por la pérdida de hábitats, por la agricultura industrial, la agricultura intensiva y el abuso de los plaguicidas. Y, en consecuencia, también peligran la biodiversidad, la apicultura y la seguridad alimentaria.

Precisamente para garantizar nuestra propia soberanía alimentaria y la supervivencia del sector apícola, la Unión Europea debe proteger a las abejas: por un lado prohibiendo los productos tóxicos para estos insectos y, por otro, desplegando planes para salvarlas de la extinción.

Pero, desde luego, debe ir más allá, apostando por un modelo de agricultura extensiva, sostenible y ecológica, que produzca alimentos saludables y preserve la biodiversidad. De esto es de lo que va la restauración de la naturaleza: de garantizar la salud de nuestro entorno para asegurar nuestra alimentación en el futuro.

Herbert Dorfmann (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Bauern brauchen Bienen und Bestäuber, aber Bienen brauchen auch verantwortungsvolle Bauern – und das ist eine gegenseitige Abhängigkeit, nicht immer konfliktfrei, im besten Fall aber eine gewinnbringende Symbiose, und dafür müssen wir uns auch einsetzen.

Es bringt auch überhaupt nichts mehr, wenn wir einfach über die Landwirtschaft und die GAP herfahren und sie für alle Konflikte verantwortlich machen. Ich komme selber aus einer Region, in der viele Apfelbäume viele Bestäuber brauchen, und ich weiß, wo die Konfliktlinien liegen, und auch, wie eine Lösung gefunden werden kann. Wir brauchen einen klaren Bienenschutz in den Zeiten der Blüte, Pflanzenschutzmittel sollten ausgebracht werden, sobald Bienen nicht ausfliegen, Abdriften müsste verhindert werden.

Die GAP kann auch helfen, mit den Agrarumweltprogrammen der zweiten Säule, wenn wir artenreiche Wiesen und Felder fördern, mit der Konditionalität und den Ökoprogrammen der ersten Säule, z. B. mit Blühstreifen. Die Bienen schützen wir aber nicht, wenn wir die Bauern vertreiben, sondern indem wir sensibilisieren, fördern, aber auch eingreifen, wenn respektlos mit Bestäubern umgegangen wird.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, gerbiami kolegos, Komisare. Norint iš esmės spręsti apdulkintojų nykimo problemą, turime užtikrinti, kad šalys narės imtųsi panašių priemonių ir koordinuotų savo veiksmus tarpusavyje, ypač besiribojančiose teritorijose. Ne mažiau svarbu įtraukti ir kaimynines šalis, kurios nori bendradarbiauti su Europos Sąjunga. Negalime leisti, kad už kelių metrų nuo išorinės sienos žemės ūkio veikloje be jokių apribojimų būtų naudojami aplinką ir apdulkintojus naikinantys preparatai. Dar daugiau, turime kuo skubiau stabdyti žemės ūkio produktų importą, kurių auginimui buvo naudojami Europos Sąjungoje uždrausti pesticidai. Negalime apsimetinėti, kad ši problema neegzistuoja. Europos Sąjunga turi pakankamai įrankių derantis dėl prekybos sutarčių ar teikiamos paramos išsireikalauti, kad mus pasiektų tik saugūs ir nežalojantys žmonių sveikatą bei aplinką pagaminti produktai.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem se zájmem poslouchal dnešní debatu poté, jak jsme dnes bohužel odmítli omezení pesticidů v dopoledním hlasování. Ta debata opravdu ukazuje velkou bezvýchodnost. Paní komisařko, vy se můžete snažit podporovat různé projekty, granty malým a středním zemědělcům, ale ve chvíli, kdy tady nebude radikální omezení pesticidů, pak zkrátka opylovače nezachráníme a jejich počet nevýsíme. Mě to osobně mrzí. Já jsem sám osobně hlasoval pro většinu ustanovení, která omezují pesticidy. Byl jsem v tom radikálnější než moji kolegové z frakce. Nakonec neprošlo nic. Taková je bohužel politika. Takže přemýšlejme, jak se co nejrychleji vrátit k nějakému globálnímu evropskému řešení, jak omezit pesticidy. Do té doby nám zbývá pouze naše individuální drobná praxe. Já jsem zastupitelem v Praze, hlavním městě České republiky. My tam třeba řešíme otázku světelného smogu, který poškozuje hmyz. Měníme veřejné osvětlení. I takové drobné věci mají smysl. Ale bez globální restrikce, evropské restrikce, to bohužel budou pouze drobné ostrůvky pozitivní deviace.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, a few months ago, in March, we had a rich debate about the European Citizens' initiative 'Save bees and farmers!', which was mentioned by some of you this evening. That debate clearly indicated how European citizens have great expectations for European policies in support of pollinators.

I want to thank you for your efforts to build on that, and for the strong support you have shown since the very beginning of the European Union pollinators initiative. I very much look forward to working with you further – not only me, but my colleague Sinkevicius – as we roll out the New Deal for Pollinators. There is nothing more to add.

Przewodnicząca. – Otrzymałam jeden projekt rezolucji złożony zgodnie z art. 136 ust. 5 Regulaminu1.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 23 listopada 2023 r. (*).

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI), írásban. – A méhek óriási szerepet töltenek be a biológiai sokféleség és az európai élelmiszerbiztonság megőrzésében. Mi ezt magyarok nagyon jól tudjuk, hiszen az egy négyzetkilométerre jutó méhsűrűség hazánkban a legmagasabb a világon. Méhészeti nagyhatalomként jelentős erőfeszítéseket teszünk a beporzók és az ágazat védelme érdekében. Az Unióban első tagállamként adómentességet és beporzási támogatást adtunk a méhészeknek, továbbá közel 150 ezer hektáron állítottuk helyre a beporzók élőhelyeit. Fontosnak tartjuk a beporzók védelmét, azonban a méhészek támogatásáról sem szabad megfeledkeznünk!

Kevesen beszélnek arról, hogy a piaci zavarok és a Kínából beáramló hamis mézek a csőd szélére sodorták az európai méhészeti ágazatot. Ha ez így megy tovább sem méhészek, sem beporzók nem lesznek Európában. Sürgős uniós szintű beavatkozás szükséges! Sokkal szigorúbb mézcímkézési szabályokat kell bevezetni és fel kell lépni a külföldi hamisított mézzel szemben!

Edina Tóth (NI), írásban. – Az utóbbi években számos veszély fenyegette a beporzók, például a méhek létfontosságú szerepét. Kiemelendő, hogy a környezetszennyezés, a klímaváltozás komoly kockázatot jelent rájuk nézve. Ha nem vigyázunk rájuk, az az élelmiszerellátásunkra is negatív hatással lehet: a beporzók számának drasztikus csökkentése ugyanis az élelmiszerbiztonságot veszélyeztetheti. Emellett az európai méztermelők támogatása is létfontosságú. Európában sok helyen – köztük hazánkban Magyarországon is – kiváló minőségű mézet állítanak elő. Ha támogatást nyújtunk a helyi méhészeknek, nemcsak az európai méz minőségét garantálhatjuk, de a beporzók védelme is fenntarthatóbbá és megbízhatóbbá válhat.

Nagyon fontos lenne az uniós cselekvés! Kisebb lépésekkel, mint például a környezettudatosabb életmód, a helyi termékek támogatása vagy az oktatás fontosságának hangsúlyozása révén sokat tehetünk azért, hogy egy fenntarthatóbb jövőt építsünk magunknak és az eljövendő generációknak.

(¹) Patrz protokół posiedzenia.

18. Debata na temat przypadków naruszania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (debata)

18.1. Ostatnie ataki na kobiety i obrońców praw kobiet oraz arbitralne zatrzymania europejskich obywateli w Iranie

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad sześcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie ostatnich ataków na kobiety i obrońców praw kobiet oraz arbitralnych zatrzymań europejskich obywateli w Iranie (2023/2979(RSP)) (¹).

David Lega, author. – Madam President, Commissioner, yet again, we address the dire human rights situation in Iran. Johan Floderus, a Swedish citizen and EU official, remains captive to the regime's twisted hostage diplomacy. So too does Swedish citizen Ahmadreza Djalali. Yet again, we demand their immediate release and, yet again, we condemn the regime's unabating brutality.

In September last year, 22-year-old Jina Mahsa Amini was murdered for the 'crime' of showing her hair. More than 500 were then killed in crackdowns. In July, I nominated Jina Mahsa Amini and the Women Life Freedom movement for the Sakharov Prize of 2023. Two months ago, I called for a debate to echo that movement's message of dignity and opportunity, fullness and fairness, and hope. Now, yet again, I have called for this debate and put forward an urgency resolution because critically, the fight for women and freedom and even for life itself continues in Iran. In October, 16-year-old Armita Geravand was beaten to death for resisting the regime's diktat forcing hijabs. At a funeral, 2012 Sakharov winner Nasrin Sotoudeh was beaten and jailed. Women human rights defenders, opponents, are being locked up when peacefully exercising their fundamental rights, and this House demands their immediate release.

No more discrimination against women, no more hostage diplomacy. Designate the IRGC as a terrorist organisation. No more shielding Iran's leaders from accountability. If the mullahs don't stop, we will keep standing here. We will keep taking action and we will keep the pressure on again, and yet again.

Isabel Santos, Autora. – Senhora Presidente, as mulheres no Irão continuam a arriscar a sua vida ao lutar por direitos. Armita Geravand, que morreu aos 16 anos por não usar o *hijab*, é um exemplo disso.

Nasrin Sotoudeh, ativista vencedora do Prémio Sakharov, entretanto libertada, foi detida no funeral de Armita. Não usava o *hijab*.

Narges Mohammadi, Prémio Nobel da Paz, está presa e sem cuidados médicos por se recusar a usar o *hijab* no transporte entre a prisão e o hospital.

Este ano entregaremos o Prémio Sakharov a Maasa Jina Amini e ao movimento Mulher, Vida, Liberdade, um gesto contra a intolerável opressão e desumanização das mulheres iranianas.

Exigimos aqui a libertação de todas as vítimas de detenções arbitrárias no Irão, inclusive de cidadãos europeus, como Johan Floderus. Condenamos a prática de tortura e pena de morte. Pedimos aos Estados-Membros o julgamento, ao abrigo da lei internacional, dos responsáveis por estes crimes. Apelamos à designação da guarda de costumes como organização terrorista e ao alargamento do quadro de sanções a Ali Khamenei e aos seus sequazes.

Abir Al-Sahlani, *author*. – Colleagues, it has been more than one year since I cut my hair here in this very Plenary in protest, where the EU did not show the same courage as the Iranian women who were shouting on the streets on the top of their lungs, ‘Woman, life, freedom.’

(The speaker used a slogan in a non-EU language.)

Still to this very day, the regime of the mullahs in Tehran are still arresting, arbitrarily detaining, executing everyone who stands against their oppression. The last known victim is 16-year-old Armita, a young girl who took her last breath while in coma after being beaten by the morality police. At her funeral, the human rights advocate Nasrin Sotoudeh was arrested – alongside with her sister in the fight, Nobel Prize laureate Narges Mohammadi – and it has not stopped there at all. It also is holding EU citizens as hostages. The latest known victim that we know is the Swedish citizen Johan Floderus.

We, the European Parliament demand to list the IRGC on the EU terrorist list. We demand the unconditional release of all arbitrary detainees, women’s rights defenders and all EU citizens, like Johan Floderus, and we demand to stop all executions in Iran.

Jakop G. Dalunde, *författare*. – Fru talman! Mer än ett år har gått sedan Jina Mahsa Amini dog i ett iranskt polisförvar. Samtidigt fortsätter Irans kvinnor och flickor att protestera mot det iranska förtrycket. Tidigare i oktober åkte den 16-åriga Armita Geravand tunnelbana och protesterade mot slöjkravet och misshandlades och dog sedan på sjukhuset. Detta är fruktansvärt.

Vid begravningen kom Sacharovpristagaren Nasrin Sotoudeh dit för att manifesteras sitt stöd – och fängslades. Detta kan inte få fortgå. EU måste sätta mer press på Iran. Sluta förtrycka kvinnor och frita alla som kämpar för mänskliga rättigheter.

Anna Fotyga, *author*. – Madam President, I pay tribute to all victims of Iranian mullahs. In June 2023, the Human Rights Council acknowledged the heavy deterioration of the human rights situation in Iran. In October 2023, the President of the UN Human Rights Council appointed Iran as the chair of UN Human Rights Council Social Forum. This decision was defended by the High Representative / Vice President of the Commission.

Are our statements here just rituals? We demand consistency in our policy vis-a-vis Iran, in particular, with regard to the defence of human rights there, including the rights of EU citizens arbitrarily detained.

Cornelia Ernst, *Verfasserin*. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich traf Nasrin Sotoudeh 2013 in Teheran. Eine warmherzige, entschlossene Frau, Anwältin, Menschenrechtsaktivistin. Schaut man in ihre Vita, kann man es eigentlich nicht fassen: Nach dem Jurastudium 1995 verwehrte man ihr acht Jahre lang die Zulassung. Als sie sie hatte, verteidigte sie Frauen, die gegen das Kopftuch protestierten, Oppositionelle, Dissidenten, Journalisten, religiöse Minderheiten. 2010 wurde sie verhaftet, 2013 unter dem internationalen Druck wieder entlassen; fünf Jahre später wieder verhaftet, 2019 verurteilt – in Abwesenheit, ohne ihr Wissen – zu 33 Jahren und 148 Peitschenhieben.

Gefängnis, Hungerstreik, Krankheit, Hafturlaub, Gefängnis. Ihr Leben symbolisiert die schweren Kämpfe für Freiheit, Demokratie und Selbstbestimmung im Iran und gibt Kraft all denen, die jetzt in den Gefängnissen sind – viele, viele Doppelstaatler im Übrigen, wie Jamshid, Sharmahd und viele, viele, deren Namen wir gar nicht kennen.

An all diese Menschen richten wir unsere Botschaft: Wir hören euch, wir stehen an eurer Seite, wir werden niemals aufhören, euer Leben und eure Kämpfe zu verteidigen, und auch noch so viele Sittenwächter vermögen es nicht, diesen euren Widerstand zu ersticken. Denn die Uhren ticken längst anders. Irans Zukunft sind die Frauen. *Women, Life, Freedom*.

Lukas Mandl, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Gesellschaftspolitisch hat Prohibition nie funktioniert, und geopolitisch hat Appeasement nie funktioniert. Das jüngste große Beispiel dafür ist der sogenannte Atomdeal – das JCPOA-Abkommen.

Mit dem iranischen Regime ist so ein Abkommen nicht zu machen, weil sich das iranische Regime nicht an Abkommen hält. Das iranische Regime ist damit eine Bedrohung für den Frieden und die Sicherheit auf dieser Welt. Das iranische Regime ist besonders eine Bedrohung für uns Europäerinnen und Europäer, weil dieses Regime Putin-Russland beim Angriffskrieg gegen Europa mit hybriden Mitteln gegen die Ukraine mit militärischen Mitteln unterstützt und damit einer der wenigen verbliebenen Unterstützer von Putin-Russland in diesem langwierigen Krieg letztlich gegen unsere Zivilisation ist.

Das iranische Regime ist eine Sicherheitsbedrohung für die Region und fördert den Antisemitismus und islamistischen Terrorismus weltweit. Und das iranische Regime ist eine Bedrohung für die eigenen Bürgerinnen und Bürger und dort wieder ganz besonders für die Frauen, die unterdrückt werden, die gegängelt werden, die kein freies Leben haben, die weit entfernt sind von jeder Form von Gleichberechtigung. Und das wird vom Regime nicht nur gutgeheißen, sondern auch noch der ganzen Welt mit aller repressiven Gewalt präsentiert.

Wir lassen das nicht zu. Wir machen Sanktionen, wir debattieren das auch mitten in der Nacht im Europäischen Parlament, weil Europa nicht schläft, wenn Menschenrechte derartig verletzt werden.

Anna Bonfrisco, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, sappiamo tutti quali passi deve compiere l'Unione europea per stare dalla parte giusta della storia, dalla parte di donne e ragazze, in Iran, assassinate, torturate, abusate, imprigionate e oppresse.

Inserire le guardie islamiche della rivoluzione iraniana nella lista europea delle organizzazioni terroristiche, come già fatto dagli Stati Uniti. Isolare il regime dalla comunità internazionale. È proprio su questo punto che l'Europa ha fallito, poiché non ha agito per impedire che l'Iran assumesse la presidenza del Forum delle Nazioni Unite per i diritti umani. Sembra quasi uno scherzo.

Il Parlamento europeo, pertanto, deve tornare ad essere il megafono di donne e ragazze in Iran. Per questo motivo vi domando di sostenere un'azione simbolica e chiedere che il 25 novembre, una data così importante per tutte le donne del mondo, le foto dei membri del Parlamento europeo sul sito della nostra Istituzione siano sostituite dal volto di Mahsa Amini.

Noi siamo Mahsa Amini. Noi siamo Armita Garawand, noi siamo Nasrin Sotoudeh. Noi siamo la voce di donne e ragazze iraniane che hanno deciso di togliersi il velo per mostrare al mondo il loro volto, ovvero il volto di verità, dignità e giustizia. *Women. Life. Freedom.*

Emmanuel Maurel, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, répétons inlassablement leur nom: Mahsa Amini, 22 ans, et Armita Geravand, seize ans. La police des mœurs du gouvernement iranien les a tuées parce qu'elles ne voulaient plus porter le voile. Quant à Narges Mohammadi, lauréate du prix Nobel de la Paix, et Nasrin Sotoudeh, lauréate du prix Sakharov, elles croupissent toujours en prison dans des conditions de vie indignes.

Après l'échec de l'accord de Vienne sur le nucléaire iranien qui avait été provoqué notamment par Trump, les mollahs et les sinistres gardiens de la révolution ont déclenché une répression aveugle contre leur propre peuple, tuant plus de 500 manifestants et en exécutant des dizaines d'autres.

Aujourd'hui, pourtant, les femmes osent sortir sans voile. Elles ne flanchent pas. Elles submergent la police des mœurs par leur détermination et par leur nombre. Et l'Europe doit dire qu'elle est à leurs côtés. Elle doit soutenir les sanctions contre les dirigeants iraniens. Elle doit évidemment demander l'arrêt immédiat des exécutions. Elle doit aussi, et nous le ferons le mois prochain, soutenir les femmes iraniennes en leur décernant le prix Sakharov, qui sera un des meilleurs symboles de cette fin d'année.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, l'approvazione della legge sulla promozione della castità e dell'*hijab* rappresenta un altro tentativo del regime di smantellare completamente la libertà di scelta delle donne iraniane. È fondamentale che la nostra Unione si esprima pubblicamente, con fermezza, senza mezzi termini, contro una legge che non ha nulla a che vedere con le tradizioni e la cultura di un popolo ricchissimo di storia come quello iraniano.

Tra meno di un mese consegneremo il premio Sacharov alla memoria di Mahsa Amini e al movimento «Donna, vita, libertà». È un gesto importante, un gesto che dimostra la nostra vicinanza alle donne iraniane nella loro battaglia quotidiana. Ma non basta perché non basta una semplice cerimonia di consegna se poi lasciamo sole le migliaia di attivisti e di attiviste che compongono questo movimento. Nasrin Sotoudeh ha già pagato sulla sua pelle il prezzo del suo coraggio.

Occorre istituire immediatamente una *task force* europea che supporti le attività quotidiane delle migliaia di difensori dei diritti umani nel mondo ed è un dovere morale dare pieno appoggio, sostegno e protezione a coloro che si sono distinti per merito vedendosi attribuito il premio Sacharov.

Servono sanzioni individuali verso i responsabili del regime. Servono ancora, ovviamente, misure di sostegno contro le persecuzioni che la diaspora iraniana subisce ogni giorno in Europa. O scegliamo di stare dalla loro parte, oppure anche questo premio verrà svilito fino a diventare una targa svuotata di ogni significato.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, the current Iranian Government has not only ignored the voices of change but has intensified its crackdown, detaining numerous activists and exerting oppressive force against peaceful dissent.

The tragic case of Armita, a schoolgirl of only 16 years old who has been in a coma since 1 October, following a confrontation with metro officers over mandatory hijab regulations, is a really horrible reminder of the grim reality in Iran nowadays.

Such incidents are intolerable in the 21st century and must not go unaddressed. Therefore, I really urge the European Commission to intervene without delay, calling also on President Raisi to cease the suppression of protesters and release political prisoners. Failure to do so may lead to the imposition of targeted punitive measures on those responsible. Together, let us stand in solidarity with the Iranian people and reaffirm our unwavering commitment to the principles of freedom, dignity and human rights.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der monatelang inhaftierte Rapper Toomadsch Salehi ist auf Kautions frei. Die Nachricht, die uns dieses Wochenende erreicht hat, zeigt: Öffentlicher Druck wirkt. Laut sein macht einen Unterschied.

Hinter den oft anonymen Zahlen und Berichten über inhaftierte politische Gefangene stehen Menschen. Menschen und ihre Geschichten über Mut und Widerstand. Mut und Widerstand, den das iranische Regime brechen will. In Isolationshaft mit Folter. Der inhaftierte Rapper Saman Yasin schreibt in Briefen sogar von Scheinhinrichtungen.

Die psychische und physische Gewalt dieses Regimes ist grauenhaft. Es sind Methoden eines Regimes, das nichts mehr hat als diese Gewalt. Es bricht mir das Herz, zu sehen, wie währenddessen in der Diaspora die Fronten sich verhärten, man immer mehr das Trennende sucht, anstatt es gerade jetzt auf die Solidarität, auf den Zusammenhalt ankommen zu lassen – für Saman, für Jamshid, für Arash, für Nahid, für alle politischen Geiseln, für einen freien Iran. Für Frauen, Leben, Freiheit.

Ivan David (ID). – Paní předsedající, orgány Evropské unie často prosazují zásady, jejichž uplatňování samy aktivně brání. Nelze izolovat Írán a současně bránit důsledkům jeho izolace. Ve zprávě Amnesty International jsou sice popsány formy potlačování práv íránských žen na nezahalenou tvář a osobní svobodu, ale současně je kritizována Francie za to, že zahalování potlačuje. Francie jedná správně, protože zahalování je ženám vnuceno výchovou a sankcemi v islámské komunitě. Ženy většinou nechtějí být neviditelné. V celé zprávě Amnesty International ani jednou nezaznělo klíčové slovo islám. To proto, že je kritizován v islámských zemích a současně přiváděn do Evropy. Západu by slušelo více sebereflexe a méně pokrytectví a pocitu nadřazenosti.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, Madam Commissioner, the tragic deaths of Armita Geravand and Jina Mahsa Amini spotlight Iran's brutal treatment of women.

Women and girls are being punished by the hands of morality police for wearing or not wearing a piece of clothing. The regime relentlessly strips away their rights, even targeting people like Sakharov and Nobel laureates. We strongly condemn Iran's practice of arbitrary detention, police violence, torture, death sentences and executions. Iranian authorities must immediately end all discriminatory measures and withdraw the oppressive bill.

Iran must immediately release political prisoners, including European citizens. Johan Floderus, a Swedish citizen and EU official, has been held under heavy conditions in the notorious Evin prison for more than 580 days now. This must stop and we need to get him home.

We call for criminal investigation into the crimes committed by Iranian authorities and sanction those responsible for human rights violations. In the face of this grave human rights violation, we must unite our voices in this call again and again.

Gianantonio Da Re (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è trascorso ormai più di un anno dalla morte di Mahsa Amini, la giovane donna iraniana di origine curda che la cosiddetta «polizia morale» dell'Iran aveva arrestato per non aver rispettato l'obbligo di indossare il velo. Da allora le donne iraniane hanno dato vita a una delle più grandi proteste contro il regime iraniano, che ad oggi ha causato almeno 500 morti e 20 000 arresti.

Tra le persone arrestate ci sarebbero anche dei cittadini europei, tra cui due italiani, che il regime iraniano ritiene colpevoli di essere stati coinvolti o di essere stati nei luoghi delle manifestazioni a ricordo di Mahsa Amini.

L'Unione europea condanni fermamente il regime iraniano e non scenda a compromessi con chi si rende colpevole di gravi violazioni dei diritti umani: l'Europa, culla della democrazia e dei principi inviolabili dell'uomo, sia a fianco e supporti il popolo iraniano senza alcun indugio.

Przewodnicząca. – W ramach procedury „Catch-the-Eye” zgłosił się tylko jeden poseł, pan Jiří Pospíšil. Bardzo proszę. Jedna minuta.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci poděkovat kolegům, kteří připravili tuto rezoluci, ale chci upozornit na to, že téma lidská práva a Írán zde probíráme na plénu pravidelně. Zvláště v minulém volebním období zde byla často debata o tom, zda je možné s Íránem uzavřít nějakou smlouvu a spolupracovat. Jedná se o smlouvu o atomovém výzkumu – jadernou dohodu. Ta situace jasně ukazuje, my jsme to tehdy říkali, že s íránským režimem není možné uzavírat žádné smlouvy. On žádné smlouvy nechce dodržovat. Je to země, kde je nejvíce poprav na světě vedle Číny. Je to země, která nerespektuje lidská práva. Její státní a justiční systém absolutně nefunguje, nefunguje na základě zákonů a nestranných pravidel. Tedy jsem velmi skeptický k tomu, že s Íránem do budoucna bude možné nějakým způsobem spolupracovat a ty případy, které zde dnes popisujeme, to pouze ukazují.

Przewodnicząca. – Dziękuję bardzo, panie pośle. W imieniu Komisji głos zabierze wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji, pani komisarz Dubravka Šuica.

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, this year's Sakharov Prize shows the European full support for human rights and the respect, protection and fulfilment of fundamental freedoms, in Iran and elsewhere.

We were all impressed and moved by the extraordinary courage of women and men in Iran following Mahsa Amini's death in September last year. The decision of the Nobel Committee to award the Peace Prize to Narges Mohammadi also demonstrates how crucial the role of civil society is for peace and democracy. The world wants to see her free and not going on yet another hunger strike to improve her situation.

The European Union is concerned about the continued progressive deterioration of human rights in Iran. Repression and intimidation continue in a deplorable way, particularly against women. We are also concerned about the current pace of executions in the country, with at least 550 individuals executed since January, according to unofficial estimates.

We have reacted decisively to the violent crackdown on protests over the past year, including through ten rounds of sanctions. We continue to raise human rights violations, executions as well as individual cases in every diplomatic opportunity with the Iranian authorities, such as the very disturbing death of 16-year-old Armita Geravand.

Regarding the arbitrary detention of several European citizens in Iran, our position is very clear. As outlined in the Council conclusions of December 2022 and the statement of the High Representative on behalf of the European Union in February this year, we strongly reject this unlawful practice and call upon Iran to end it immediately.

We must keep our critical engagement with Iran in order to be able to work for the release of all European citizens in coordination with the Member States concerned, so we must keep diplomatic channels open. European Member States have the primary consular responsibility for these cases. That is why we have strengthened our coordination. The High Representative and his team are using every opportunity to express to the Iranian authorities our firmest disapproval of these distressing, unlawful and unacceptable detentions, including the illegal detention of our dear colleague Johan Floderus, for whom we have, of course, a different responsibility, as he is a European Union employee. We will continue to work relentlessly for the freedom of all unjustly detained European citizens in Iran.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 23 listopada 2023 r.

(¹) Patrz protokół posiedzenia.

18.2. Bezprawne zatrzymanie prezydenta Mohameda Bazouma w Nigrze

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad sześcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie bezprawnego zatrzymania prezydenta Mohameda Bazouma w Nigrze (2023/2980(RSP)) (¹).

Νίκος Παπανδρέου, author. – Madam President, colleagues, right now, at this exact moment, in the troubled country that is Niger, President Mohamed Bazoum and his son are waiting to die. His crime: being a Democrat. The son's crime: being his son. This is the sick logic of dictatorships. They are foes of light. Along with ministers and civilians, the Nigerien junta arrested democracy and snuffed out the light.

We have seen many dictatorships in our lives, unfortunately, but we continue to be offended. As George Steiner wrote a long time ago, we must never grow accustomed to even the smallest violations – we must remain outraged.

Though I have never met President Bazoum –one day I might – I get it. As a young boy of 11, I witnessed my own father being jailed and my grandfather died under house arrest. President Bazoum has been offered an escape clause to resign and go free. Simple, no? Not so simple. A warrior at heart, as I found out from my friend, he refuses to yield to his captors, even if this means he loses his life. With our vote tomorrow, we might just save a Democrat and his son. With our vote tomorrow, we show our solidarity with the people of Niger.

Javier Nart, autor. – Señora presidenta, yo conocí a Mohamed Bazoum hace años, cuando era ministro del Interior. Primero fue una relación política y después fue una relación de amistad profunda, de amistad verdadera con una persona en la que encontré un político honesto, un demócrata, un hombre de honor. Algo que es en ocasiones muy difícil de encontrar cuando el honor se transforma en, sencillamente, la oportunidad.

Hay una palabra en francés que define la calidad humana de Mohamed Bazoum, que es una mezcla de honor y de coraje. Se llama *fierté*: la *fierté* de no aceptar su libertad a cambio de renunciar a la presidencia. No porque la presidencia para él sea importante. Porque no es su presidencia, sino que significa la democracia, los valores por los cuales ha luchado toda su vida: la democracia, la libertad y la dignidad en Níger. Yo les tengo que decir que para mí Mohamed Bazoum es un ejemplo para todos nosotros. Él no defiende su presidencia, él defiende el honor, la *fierté* del pueblo de Níger.

Jordi Solé, author. – Madam President, they allow unlawful detention of President Bazoum, and the coup d'état by the military junta in Niger must be condemned with the strongest terms. We urge the military authorities to unconditionally release the legitimate President of Niger, together with his family and other officials detained, and to swiftly return to the constitutional order and to democracy. Meanwhile, while stopping budget support and security cooperation and implementing targeted measures against leaders of the junta, the EU has to ensure that humanitarian aid flows into the population in a country where, according to the UN, 4.3 million people remain in need of humanitarian assistance.

Sadly enough, this concerning situation comes as a new step backwards in the already extremely unstable Sahel region. During the last years, several Sahel countries have experienced putsch that led to the establishment of military rule. Jihadist insurgencies, extreme poverty, major migration flows, the effects of climate change. All these are factors that aggravate the situation in the Sahel. Against this backdrop, and to better contribute to peace and stability in the region, the EU has to re-evaluate and update its Sahel perspective.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *autor*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Gdybym zapytał, ilu z Państwa było w Nigrze, pewnie parę osób by się zgłosiło. Ja byłem. To może najbiedniejsze, na pewno jedno z najbiedniejszych państw Afryki, a być może i świata, państwo, które jest dyktaturą. Ale to oczywiście wcale nie oznacza, że musi to być kraj biedny, bo znamy w Afryce – stety czy niestety – państwa, które są dyktaturami, a które zapewniają obywatelom znacznie lepsze życie niż to, co się dzieje w przypadku Nigru. Na pewno ten prorosyjski przewrót, który tam się dokonał, jest fotografią wzrostu wpływów militarnych i po części politycznych Rosji na tym kontynencie. Natomiast na pewno dzisiaj trzeba domagać się uwolnienia prezydenta, który – jak słyszymy – je suchy makaron, żeby przeżyć. Bądźmy w tej sprawie zjednoczeni.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *autor*. – Señora presidenta, estos últimos años en África estamos asistiendo al crecimiento de un profundo sentimiento anticolonial europeo, especialmente antifrancés.

Esta situación está siendo utilizada en algunos países como Níger como una coartada para justificar golpes de Estado en la región. No podemos obviar el papel que están desempeñando algunas multinacionales y potencias europeas en la región del Sahel, tanto en el expolio de sus materias primas como en el control de los flujos migratorios.

Níger es el cuarto productor mundial de uranio y es una pieza clave en el intento europeo de reducir su dependencia energética de Rusia. Pero esto, desde luego, no repercute en el beneficio del pueblo nigerino. De hecho, Níger es uno de los países más pobres del mundo.

Si Europa de verdad está preocupada por los derechos humanos y la democracia en África y en países como Níger, tiene que acabar con su hipocresía política colonial de expolio de recursos, una política que solo genera miseria y dependencia. Y debe inaugurar una nueva etapa de relaciones con los países del Sahel. Esta etapa tiene que pasar por no tratar a estos países como si fueran piezas de ajedrez en su partida contra Rusia y China.

Además, debe reemplazar las relaciones de dominación a nivel militar, económico y político por relaciones entre iguales, que se basen en el respeto del libre desarrollo social y económico y en la soberanía de los pueblos.

Jiří Pospíšil, *za skupinu PPE*. – Paní předsedající, já chci navázat na autory tohoto návrhu. Je správné, aby se Evropský parlament a evropské instituce zastali sesazeného prezidenta Bazouma. Opravdu je to demokrat, člověk, který v této těžké zkoušené oblasti Afriky prosazoval principy demokracie. Byl sesazen vojenskou juntou, to bylo jasně řečeno. Je vězněn v paláci. Nicméně chci upozornit na to, že by Evropská komise měla svoji politiku v této oblasti celkově přehodnotit, protože se ukazuje, jak narůstají problémy v oblasti Sahelu.

Není to první země Sahelu, kde došlo k vojenskému převratu, kde byla sesazena vláda. Podívejme se na situaci v Mali nebo v Burkině Faso. Ta situace je tam podobná. Je to oblast, kde narůstají problémy s islámskými teroristy. Ti tam vyvolávají paniku mezi občany, mezi civilisty a pak roste touha po tom, aby jaksi vojenští představitelé převzali moc a takto bojovali. Situace s Wagnerovci, kteří se v této oblasti angažují, vliv Ruska, to jsou všechno témata, která bychom zde mohli diskutovat a která ukazují, jak je tato oblast dnes složitá, jak je citlivá a jak by naše politika v této oblasti měla brát ohled na tyto skutečnosti.

V každém případě teď udělejme vše pro to, aby prezident Bazoum byl propuštěn a mohl opustit zemi, a hlavně pro to, aby junta ustoupila a on se mohl vrátit k moci.

Carlos Zorrinho, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, o Níger vive, desde julho deste ano, sob a autoridade de uma junta militar liderada pelo chefe da guarda presidencial, que encabeçou o golpe de Estado que destituiu o Presidente Mohamed Bazoum. Desde então, com o Presidente deposto em prisão domiciliar com acesso limitado a cuidados médicos, o país vive com um plano imposto pelos militares para ver reposta a ordem constitucional.

Apenas em três anos, sob sanções regionais e internacionais impostas pela CEDEAO, pela União Africana e pela União Europeia, as condições humanitárias da população, que já eram difíceis, estão a degradar-se, com cerca de 3 milhões de cidadãos em necessidade absoluta de ajuda humanitária imediata. As condições de segurança económicas e sociais do Níger tornam-se cada vez mais frágeis e sujeitas a pressões e influências externas e pouco recomendáveis, com o risco da presença do Grupo Wagner no território.

Neste contexto, apelo a que sejam mantidas e reforçadas as sanções internacionais focalizadas nos membros da Junta, que sejam aumentados os esforços de diplomacia regional e global para pôr termo ao impasse criado pelo golpe militar, que sejam imediatamente libertados o Presidente Mohamed Bazoum e o seu filho e que seja retomada a legalidade constitucional pelo bem da população e do futuro do Níger.

Eero Heinäluoma (S&D). – Madam President, the imprisonment of democratically elected President Mohamed Bazoum is a blatant violation of all laws. His continued detention is not only personally inhumane, but also blocks dialogue towards a desperately needed resolution to the crisis. Since the military coup, the security and humanitarian situation in Niger has further deteriorated. Over 4 million people are now in dire need of aid.

I have the honour to know Muhamad Bazoum personally, and I know that he is fully committed to serving his people according to the democratic principles. He must be immediately and unconditionally released. The European Union must be ready for real actions, and also sanctions must be on the table.

At the same time, we must continue our humanitarian support to those in need. We must support an African solution to a problem in Africa. This means backing the political and diplomatic efforts made by ECOWAS and other African actors for a return to constitutional order, with Bazoum as President.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the latest military coup in Niger and the unjust imprisonment of President Bazoum represent a grave threat to democratic progress in the region. This unlawful act not only sets Niger back, but also jeopardises the stability and democratic consolidation of West Africa. Furthermore, the concerning efforts by external factors such as Russia to increase their presence in the Sahel only deepen the existing fragility of the region and undermine democratic efforts.

We welcome Economic Community of West African States-imposed sanctions and efforts for diplomatic solution. We also call on the Council to implement sanctions against the leaders of the Nigerien junta. The democratically elected president must be immediately reinstated and the constitutional order must be restored.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, almost four months after the coup in Niger, President Bazoum is still detained, with his wife and son, in the presidential palace in very difficult conditions. He has not resigned as the junta leaders would like. The EU should continue to pay tribute to his courage and perseverance.

Since the beginning of this crisis, the High Representative has been very clear. On many occasions he has called for his release and for a return to constitutional order. We are supporting ECOWAS' efforts in reaching these two objectives.

For the time being, although some likeminded countries have practically accepted the situation and are engaging with the junta, thereby weakening ECOWAS, the European Union does not believe that such unconstitutional changes can be trivialised.

The experience in Mali and Burkina Faso clearly shows that military coups do not lead to positive changes, either for the country or for the region.

We should encourage Niger to reach an agreement with the US for the return to the constitutional order, and we should stand by our views that this is the best way of ensuring peace and prosperity for the people of Niger and beyond.

The October European Council has called for the immediate release of President Bazoum and his family, and has also tasked the High Representative / Vice-President and the Commission with presenting options for European Union actions and instruments. That is what the relevant services are working on in view of the next Foreign Affairs Council on 11 December.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 23 listopada 2023 r.

(¹) Patrz protokół posiedzenia.

18.3. Zabójstwo obywatela Gruzji Tamaza Ginturiego przez rosyjskie oddziały okupacyjne w Gruzji

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad pięcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie zabójstwa obywatela Gruzji Tamaza Ginturiego przez rosyjskie oddziały okupacyjne w Gruzji (2023/2981(RSP)) (¹).

Miriam Lexmann, author. – Madam President, Commission, colleagues, let me start by thanking my dear friend Anna Fotyga and all colleagues for excellent cooperation on drafting this resolution. I believe the strong text is a testimony to this House's steadfast support for Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and the protection of human rights.

I fundamentally condemn the brutal murder of Tamaz Ginturi. Let me be clear: this horrific act, as well as all acts of murder, kidnapping, illegal abduction and torture of Georgian citizens are the direct responsibility of the Russian occupation forces. They would not happen if not for the occupation of Georgian sovereign territory. This is why all those responsible must be held accountable, including through targeted sanctions. But above all, Russia must cease its illegal occupation.

We stand by Georgia; support the Euro-Atlantic aspirations of its people; and condemn all efforts by Russia and its proxies to undermine these goals.

Sven Mikser, author. – Madam President, colleagues, on the eve of his country receiving the EU candidate candidacy status, a Georgian citizen, Tamaz Ginturi, was killed by Russian occupying forces on the administrative boundary line between Georgian-controlled territory and the Russian-occupied Tskhinvali region.

While the killing was a particularly brutal and violent crime committed by the occupants, it was far from an isolated event. Since Russia launched an aggression against Georgia and seized parts of its sovereign territory in 2008, there has been a constant stream of similar incidents, where Georgian citizens, local residents, have been harassed, where their human rights have been violated, the freedom of movement has been illegally restricted.

Simultaneously, the Russian occupying forces and the so-called authorities of the illegal entities that they have propped up are moving on with a creeping annexation, modernisation and passportisation.

Today, the EU monitoring mission is the only permanent international presence that operates close to the administrative boundary line, monitoring the situation on the ground. As such, it plays an important role in providing a modicum of stability in a tense and fragile situation. It is extremely important that we provide the EUMM with adequate resources that are urgently needed for it to carry out its mission.

The US always supported and will always support Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity. But while we demand the end to the occupation and the restoration of Georgia's territorial integrity, we should also do more to hold those immediate perpetrators of the human rights violations accountable. For that end, we call on the Council to put together, in consultation with Georgian authorities, a list of individuals responsible for the human rights violations and impose effective targeted sanctions against them.

Petras Auštrevičius, author. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, the Russian occupation of 20% of the territory of Georgia is direct evidence of war crimes and a violation of the territorial integrity of Georgia. The occupying Russian authorities are pursuing an active policy of provocation, constantly expanding the occupied territories, abducting and terrorising the local population.

Tamaz Ginturi, a 58-year-old Georgian citizen, is the latest victim of the Russian occupiers. He was murdered in cold blood while visiting his father's grave. Levan Dotiashvili, who was with him, was illegally captured.

The crimes of the Russian occupiers must be met with strong condemnation by the international community and further legal action, as well as EU sanctions against those responsible for serious human rights violations.

Markéta Gregorová, author. – Madam President, dear colleagues, dear Georgian friends, first, allow me to express my condolences to Tamaz Ginturi's beloved – my thoughts are with you.

I do not make differences between one forcefully taken innocent life or thousands. It should be met with an equally strong reaction. When Russian troops started to shoot our Ukrainian neighbours, we were quick to react and sanction. There is another occupied country in our neighbourhood whose citizens get murdered and abducted by Russia. Is Georgia further? Yes. Does it matter? No.

I urge the Council to add to the next sanction package or to a new one, those responsible for the death of Tamaz and for the suffering of Georgians. Kremlin wants them to live in fear, to give up their European path. Give them courage, and Putin will lose.

Anna Fotyga, author. – Madam President, I would like to thank all co-authors, real friends of Georgia, for excellent cooperation on this resolution, as well as very valuable contributions to final text that I hope will be voted positively.

Tamaz Ginturi, a veteran of war waged by Russia on Georgia in 2008, was killed by Russian forces near the administrative boundary line while heading to church with his companion, who was later captured and detained. We name in the resolution names of other victims, but our call is to establish the EU sanction list, similar to Otkhozoria-Tatunashvili, the Georgian list, that is to lead us in imposing sanctions for these kinds of actions against civilians and the ordinary people of Georgia, patriots of this country.

Ryszard Czarnecki, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Trzy kraje, które kandydują do Unii Europejskiej, a więc Gruzja, Mołdawia i Ukraina to kraje, których część terytorium zajmuje Rosja. W Mołdawii jest to Naddniestrze. W Ukrainie wiadomo – Krym, Donieck i Ługańsk. Wiadomo też, że w Gruzji to Abchazja i Osetia Południowa. I śmierć, o której dzisiaj mówimy, pokazuje, czym jest rosyjska okupacja, czym jest Rosja.

Dobrze, że w tej sprawie mówimy jednym głosem. Ale też trzeba jasno powiedzieć, że musimy mieć dla państw, które chcą do nas przyjąć, a są dawnymi republikami postsowieckimi, specjalny plan, tak aby siły prorosyjskie tam słabły, a siły proeuropejskie tam się wzmacniały. I myślę, że to może być elementem podziękowania dla tych Gruzinów, którzy zginęli w walce o wolność.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Madam President, colleagues, on 8 November, the Commission recommended to grant a candidate status to Georgia. Two days before this announcement, a Georgian citizen, Tamaz Ginturi, was killed by Russian occupying forces. He was shot dead for driving a car in his home country after visiting a cemetery and church. Another lost life in the evil of Russia.

This is a sad example of how Russia is casting its shadow also over countries such as Georgia. It also represents an imminent threat to the integration process of this country. Currently, 20% of Georgia's internationally recognised territory is under Russian military occupation. We once again repeat our support for Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity under the international recognised border. Russia must fulfil the obligation under the 2008 ceasefire agreement and withdraw its troops from the country. We demand the release of all Georgian citizens in the illegal custody of the occupation regime, and to impose targeted sanctions on those responsible.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci poděkovat kolegům, že vraždu Tamaze Ginturiho jasně interpretují v souvislostech chování putinovského Ruska. Ginturi je obětí putinovského Ruska stejně jako tisíce a dnes možná deseti-tisíce ukrajinských civilistů, kteří jsou zavražděni tímto šíleným režimem. My musíme vnímat, jak se Rusko chová v oblastech zemí bývalého Sovětského svazu, jak se snaží tyto země destabilizovat, podporovat tam různé nedemokratické režimy anebo přímo na ně útočí, viz případ Ukrajiny. Ginturi je obětí Putina, je obětí putinovského Ruska. Takto je třeba to vnímat a pořád připomínat. Protože pokud zapomeneme, co Putin a Rusko dělá, může bohužel dojít k tomu, že Putin vyhraje, porazí Ukrajinu a začne bezprostředně přímo ohrožovat Evropu a Evropskou unii.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, this year marks 15 years of Russia's illegal presence in Georgia, since the war in 2008. The European Union's commitment to a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Georgia is as strong as ever. We condemn Russia's continued military presence in Abkhazia and South Ossetia, which violates international law and the commitments undertaken by Russia.

Local communities continue to suffer from humanitarian challenges and human rights violations. The killing of Tamaz Ginturi is yet another blatant violent violation of human rights committed by Russian Federation border guards in Georgia. This adds to the list of Russia's illegal activities in the Georgian-occupied breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, and demonstrates the deterioration of the human rights situation there. Such actions include fencing along South Ossetia administrative boundary line, repeated and protracted closures of crossing points, as well as the use of force and illegal and arbitrary detentions of Georgian citizens.

Russia's effective control of South Ossetia and Abkhazia continues to violate several provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights. This was underlined by the European Court of Human Rights' judgment in the interstate case concerning the armed conflict between Georgia and the Russian Federation in August 2008. Since October 2008, the European Union has been fully engaged in conflict resolution efforts in Georgia. It has done so in the capacity of co-chair in the Geneva international discussions and through the efforts of the European Union's Special Representative.

The European Union monitoring mission, present in Georgia for 15 years now, remains the only legitimate international presence on the ground. The mission has played a central role, among others, in enabling the communication among the parties involved, deescalating tensions on the ground and monitoring the situation following the killing and illegal detention of two Georgian citizens.

The European Union reconfirms its commitment to stabilisation and conflict resolution in Georgia and reiterates its firm support to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia within its internationally recognised borders. We urge all parts of this conflict to engage constructively in the discussions to achieve the full implementation of the six-point agreement of 2008, and we urge Russia to fulfil all its obligations. The European Union's Special Representative will insist once again on the European Union's expectations during the Geneva international discussions this December.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 23 listopada 2023 r.

(¹) Patrz protokół posiedzenia.

19. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego są wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania.

19.1. Procedura budżetowa na rok 2024 – wspólny projekt (A9-0362/2023 - Siegfried Mureşan, Nils Ušakovs)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, protiv ovog proračuna glasao sam iz tisuću razloga, ali izdvojiti ću jedan razlog.

Opet se smanjuje proračun za ITER i program EUROfusion, program koji bi mogao trajno riješiti problem energije. Međutim, to, nažalost, nas ne zanima. Jedini sam 2020. godine upozorio da se proračun ne smanjuje. Tada je tijekom lockdowna uništen dobar dio europske ekonomije, pa se išlo rezati, a rezalo se i na ITER-u.

Tada sam upozorio da je na fuzijskim istraživanjima u Hrvatskoj angažirano sedam doktorskih studenata, deseci znanstvenika i tehničkog osoblja. Na gradnji ITER-a sudjeluju najmanje tri hrvatske kompanije.

Najštetniji aspekt čak i nije financijski, nego tehnološko zaostajanje. Diljem svijeta druge države i organizacije rade na ovom projektu i razvijaju se dok mi sve više tehnološki zaostajemo. Nepotrebno i glupo. Glasao sam protiv.

19.2. Zrównoważone stosowanie środków ochrony roślin (A9-0339/2023 - Sarah Wiener)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, přestože je pozdní noční hodina, považuji za důležité vysvětlit, co se vlastně dnes odehrálo. Bylo velkým překvapením, že nakonec nebyla přijata pozice Evropského parlamentu ke snižování pesticidů k tomuto nařízení. Chci zdůraznit, že jsem hlasovala proti zamítnutí. Podpořila jsem pozměňovací návrhy a podpořila jsem taky návrh jako celek.

Především jsme odhlasovali prodloužení lhůty pro snížení pesticidů do roku 2035. Změnili jsme referenční dobu na roky 2011 až 2013. Členské státy by měly mít větší flexibilitu pro používání pesticidů v citlivých oblastech. A velmi těsnou většinou prošla možnost výjimky pro ty členské státy, které mají nižší intenzitu využívání pesticidů, než je 35 % průměru Evropské unie. Zkrátka, schválili jsme velmi dobrý základ v rámci pozměňovacích návrhů, který ale neprošel díky těm, kteří upřednostnili ideologii před ochranou životního prostředí.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci také k tomuto bodu vystoupit, protože to hlasování jsem považoval za mimořádně důležité a ten výsledek bohužel je nešťastný. Já jsem hlasoval pro ten závěrečný kompromis i přesto, že jsem přesvědčený, že některé pozměňovací návrhy, které přinášely rychlejší a výraznější omezení pesticidů, by evropské přírodě pomohly a prospěly. Respektoval jsem to, že tyto ambicióznější návrhy neprošly, byť, jak jsem řekl, jsem pro ně hlasoval v rozporu s některými kolegy z mé frakce. Ale co mě mrzí, že na konci alespoň tento kompromis, ze kterého opakuji, jsem nebyl nadšený, neprošel. Připadá mi pořád lepší mít zde určité omezení pesticidů, než zde nemít omezení v zásadě žádné. Tedy zvítězilo politikaření. Rozumím, že někteří kolegové chtěli ambicióznější projekt, ale občas v politice platí, že je lepší kompromisní řešení, které člověka úplně neuspokojí, než řešení žádné. Bohužel teď nemáme řešení žádné.

19.3. Opakowania i odpady opakowaniowe (A9-0319/2023 - Frédérique Ries)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, chci vysvětlit, proč jsem podpořila návrh nařízení o obalech a obalových odpadech, protože je to důležité. Nechceme jednou zahynout pod tunami odpadu, který se množí. Například jen v ČR bylo v roce 2021 uvedeno na trh 1,33 milionu tun odpadu. Přitom odpad a tyto obaly mají velmi krátký životní cyklus, případně je není možné recyklovat. Za posledních 20 let jsme vyprodukovali dvě třetiny plastů, které kdy vznikly od počátku jejich masivní výroby od roku 1950. Na obaly se v EU spotřebuje nejvíce čistých původních materiálů, 50 % spotřeby papíru a 40 % spotřeby plastů. Proto považuji za důležité, aby od 1. ledna 2030 tvořily 10 % těchto obalů, které budou použity, obaly opětovně použitelné a od 1. ledna 2040 30 % těchto obalů bylo opět používáno.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem také podpořil tento návrh. Myslím si, že i přes některá kompromisní ustanovení je dobře, že jsme přijali úpravu, která povede ke snížení obalů. Je to obrovský problém. Stejně si ale myslím, že je možné dosáhnout i ještě ambicióznější cílů. Já nejsem příznivcem takovýchto regulací, kdy se tady stanoví nějaké procento a vypálí se nějaký lepočet, do kterého se má něčeho dosáhnout. Možná mám na to jistou alergii z doby, kdy jsem ještě v mládí žil v komunistickém Československu a také tamní komunistická strana dávala různá předsevzetí a cíle. Ale je dobře, že tady ten návrh prošel, že je zde jasná filozofie boje proti plýtvání s obaly, že zde je jasná filozofie recyklovat tyto obaly a doufejme, že tedy v praxi tento návrh pomůže a že neskončí pouze u nenaplněných záměrů.

19.4. Wnioski Parlamentu Europejskiego w sprawie zmiany traktatów (A9-0337/2023 - Guy Verhofstadt, Sven Simon, Gabriele Bischoff, Daniel Freund, Helmut Scholz)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Fru talman! Europas förenta stater. Det är vad majoriteten i Europaparlamentet röstat ja till här i dag.

Men jag måste säga att jag välkomnar uppriktigheten i förslaget till ändringar av EU:s grundfördrag. En gång i tiden kunde EU-centralisterna komma undan med att vifta bort våra varningar om att EU håller på att förvandlas till en superstat. Inte längre.

För i dag har Moderaternas, Kristdemokraternas, Socialdemokraternas, Miljöpartiets, Liberalernas och Centerpartiets partigrupper röstat igenom ett betänkande som vill överföra makt över skatter och finans, utbildning, hälsa, försvar och mycket mer från medlemsstaterna till Bryssel.

I ett sådant Europa har Sverige lika lite makt som en delstat i Tyskland. Vi blir en skatteprovins i norr med symboliska riksdagsval. Lita på att Sverigedemokraterna kommer göra allt vi kan för att Sverige ska värna vår demokrati och självständighet och stoppa centralisternas planerade maktövertagande.

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dnes jsem hlasovala proti navrženým změnám Smluv. Jsem pro integraci Evropské unie, která bude postupná, transparentní a projednávána s občany. Návrhy, o kterých se dnes hlasovalo, vedou k výraznému prohloubení integrace a oslabení pravomocí členských států. A jak říkám, nebyly naprosto projednány s občany. S tak radikálními změnami se prostě nemohu ztotožnit a obhajovat je před mými spoluobčany. Jsou to konkrétní změny od formální, jako je například změna názvu Komise na Evropskou exekutivu nebo zavedení funkce předsedy Evropské unie až po zásadní změny posílení kompetencí Evropské unie na úkor členských států, například nahrazení jednomyslnosti kvalifikovanou většinou v oblastech, jako je sjednávání a uzavírání obchodních dohod nebo zahraničních investic.

Myslím, že nyní potřebujeme Evropskou unii především sjednocovat a ne ji rozdělovat. Tomu odpovídá i dnešní hlasování: 291 pro, 274 proti, 44 se zdrželo. To znamená, že tento návrh nemá ani podporu většiny přítomných poslanců a poslankyň.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, убедено гласувах срещу това предложение, защото то е вредно, е насочено срещу интересите на гражданите, на държавите членки. Не само че превръщате Европейския съюз в европейски Съветски съюз, тъй като преименувате дори Комисията на Изпълнителна комисия – това е като Президиума на Централния комитет на Комунистическата партия на Съветския съюз. Главният комисар ще се казва Главен секретар. Това е толкова, толкова иронично, че ако не беше тъжно, щеше да е смешно.

Но оставете смеха. Нищо от това, което правите днес, не е смешно. Това, което се случва, е да се отнемат правомощията от държавите членки и да се предадат на никому не избираемите, неизбраните анонимни чиновници в Брюксел. Отнемате правото на вето, което е изключително важно, защото изравнява правомощията на държавите. Няма големи и малки. Когато отнемете това право, малките държави остават втора ръка, както в момента са България и Румъния, които не са в Шенген. И това е позор, защото е лицемерие, двоен стандарт и обрича държави да бъдат извън общото, да бъдат втора ръка, да бъдат втора класа. Това е грешно, това е вредно. Това ще нанесе щети на Европейския съюз. Ние ще продължим да се борим, но за Европейския съюз, който е Европейският съюз на отечествата, на суверенните държави, а не съветски социалистически Европейски съюз.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, žestoko sam protiv izmjena Sporazuma o Europskoj uniji i Sporazuma o funkcioniranju Europske unije.

Moja Hrvatska čini svega 0,4 posto ekonomije Unije i 0,8 posto stanovnika, a najviše u ovom Domu ima 1,7 posto glasačke moći. Jedina prava moć da zaštiti od loših politika je Vijeće. Međutim, ovim izmjenama to se sve želi ukinuti. Pa da citiram članak 16. stavak 3.: do sada se odlučuje kvalificiranom većinom, a sada bi se običnom. Zatim dalje, stavak 4.: više neće trebati 55 posto članova Vijeća i 65 posto stanovništva, nego samo 50 posto, dok se blokirajuća manjina u potpunosti ukida.

Ako bi došlo do, dakle, do izmjena i ako bi ovo stupilo na snagu, zemlje kao što je Hrvatska postale bi nebitne regije na periferiji i ne više države, nego regije na periferiji Unije, koje sada više ni u teoriji ne bi nitko ni za što pitao. Žestoko sam protiv ovoga.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem tento návrh také nepodpořil a tím hlavním důvodem, ač myslím, že vždycky tady obhajuji jasnou proevropskou politiku, je, že nesouhlasím s posilováním rozhodování kvalifikovanou většinou. Myslím si totiž, že to, pokud bychom takovouto variantu prosadili v návrhu, který tady připravili kolegové zpravodajové, tak tím strašně poškodíme jednotu Evropské unie. Budou-li zde země, které budou přehlasovávány při rozhodování v klíčové agendě v rámci Evropské rady, pak musíme počítat s tím, že v těchto zemích bude narůstat frustrace obyvatel, že tam tamní politické síly budou zneužívat této pozice, této atmosféry v boji proti Bruselu, v boji proti evropské integraci, a to bude dlouhodobě jednotu Evropy oslabovat. Jinými slovy, podle mého názoru posilování principu kvalifikované většiny, kdy některé země jsou přehlasovávány, dlouhodobě poškozuje jednotu Evropské unie. A to je důvod, proč jsem tento návrh nepodpořil.

Przewodnicząca. – Dziękuję bardzo, panie pośle. Na tym zakończyliśmy ten punkt porządku dziennego. Następne posiedzenie odbędzie się jutro, w czwartek 23 listopada 2023 r. o godz. 9.00.

20. Porządek dzienny następnego posiedzenia

Przewodnicząca. – Porządek obrad został opublikowany i jest dostępny na stronie internetowej Parlamentu Europejskiego.

21. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia

Przewodnicząca. – Protokół dzisiejszego posiedzenia zostanie przedłożony Parlamentowi do zatwierdzenia jutro, wczesnym popołudniem.

Zamykam posiedzenie. Życzę wszystkim dobrej nocy.

22. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Posiedzenie zostało zamknięte o godz. 23.05)

Skróty i symbole

*	Procedura konsultacji
***	Procedura zgody
***I	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, pierwsze czytanie
***II	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, drugie czytanie
***III	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, trzecie czytanie

(Typ procedury zależy od podstawy prawnej zaproponowanej w danym projekcie aktu.)

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

AFET	Komisja Spraw Zagranicznych
DEVE	Komisja Rozwoju
INTA	Komisja Handlu Międzynarodowego
BUDG	Komisja Budżetowa
CONT	Komisja Kontroli Budżetowej
ECON	Komisja Gospodarcza i Monetarna
EMPL	Komisja Zatrudnienia i Spraw Socjalnych
ENVI	Komisja Środowiska Naturalnego, Zdrowia Publicznego i Bezpieczeństwa Żywności
ITRE	Komisja Przemysłu, Badań Naukowych i Energii
IMCO	Komisja Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów
TRAN	Komisja Transportu i Turystyki
REGI	Komisja Rozwoju Regionalnego
AGRI	Komisja Rolnictwa i Obszarów Wiejskich
PECH	Komisja Rybołówstwa
CULT	Komisja Kultury i Edukacji
JURI	Komisja Prawna
LIBE	Komisja Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych
AFCO	Komisja Spraw Konstytucyjnych
FEMM	Komisja Praw Kobiet i Równych Szans
PETI	Komisja Petycji
DROI	Podkomisja Praw Człowieka
SEDE	Podkomisja Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony
FISC	Podkomisja do Spraw Podatkowych
SANT	Podkomisja Zdrowia Publicznego

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
Renew	Grupa Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
ID	Grupa Tożsamość i Demokracja
The Left	Grupa Lewicy w Parlamencie Europejskim - GUE/NGL
NI	Niezrzeszeni