



C/2025/1574

13.3.2025

STENOGRAMA DEZBATERILOR DIN 28 FEBRUARIE 2024

(C/2025/1574)

PARLAMENTUL EUROPEAN

SESIUNEA 2023-2024

Ședințele dintre 26 și 29 februarie 2024

STRASBOURG

Cuprins	Pagina
1. Deschiderea ședinței	5
2. Comunicarea Președintei	5
3. Negocieri înaintea primei lecturi a Parlamentului (articolul 71 din Regulamentul de procedură) (măsuri subsecvente)	5
4. Consolidarea apărării europene într-un peisaj geopolitic volatil – Punerea în aplicare a politicii externe și de securitate comune – raportul anual pe 2023 - Punerea în aplicare a politicii de securitate și apărare comune – raportul anual pe 2023 (dezbateri comune – Securitatea și apărarea europeană)	5
5. Reluarea ședinței	32
6. Ședință solemnă – Alocuțiune susținută de Iulia Navalnaia	32
7. Reluarea ședinței	38
8. Votare	39
8.1. Permisele de conducere (A9-0445/2023 - Karima Delli) (vot)	39
8.2. Certificatul suplimentar de protecție unitar pentru produsele fitosanitare (A9-0020/2024 - Tiemo Wölken) (vot)	39

Cuprins	Pagina
8.3. Certificatul suplimentar unitar pentru medicamente (A9-0019/2024 - Tiemo Wölken) (vot) . . .	39
8.4. Certificatul suplimentar de protecție pentru produsele fitosanitare (reformare) (A9-0023/2024 - Tiemo Wölken) (vot)	39
8.5. Certificatul suplimentar de protecție pentru medicamente (reformare) (A9-0022/2024 - Tiemo Wölken) (vot)	39
8.6. Brevetele esențiale pentru standarde (A9-0016/2024 - Marion Walsmann) (vot)	40
8.7. Indicațiile geografice ale Uniunii Europene pentru vin, băuturi spirtoase și produse agricole (A9-0173/2023 - Paolo De Castro) (vot)	40
8.8. Reducerea mai rapidă și mai sigură a surplusului de impozite reținute la sursă (A9-0007/2024 - Herbert Dorfmann) (vot)	40
8.9. Cerințele de raportare (A9-0009/2024 - Anna Cavazzini) (vot)	40
8.10. Negocierile în curs legate de un acord privind statutul activităților operaționale desfășurate de Agenția Europeană pentru Poliția de Frontieră și Garda de Coastă (Frontex) în Senegal (A9-0032/2024 - Cornelia Ernst) (vot)	40
9. Reluarea ședinței	40
10. Aprobarea procesului-verbal al ședinței anterioare	41
11. Asasinarea lui Alexei Navalnii și necesitatea unei acțiuni a UE în sprijinul prizonierilor politici și al societății civile oprite din Rusia (dezbateri)	41
12. Redobândirea avantajului competitiv al UE – o Uniune prosperă într-o economie mondială fragmentată (dezbateri pe o temă de actualitate)	54
13. Activitățile financiare ale Băncii Europene de Investiții – raportul anual 2023 (dezbateri)	66
14. Componenta comisiilor și a delegațiilor	76
15. Raport referitor la Raportul Comisiei din 2023 privind statul de drept (dezbateri)	76
16. Reluarea ședinței	89
17. Votare	90
17.1. Punerea în aplicare a politicii externe și de securitate comune – raportul anual pe 2023 (A9-0389/2023 - David McAllister) (vot)	90
17.2. Punerea în aplicare a politicii de securitate și apărare comune – raportul anual pe 2023 (A9-0403/2023 - Sven Mikser) (vot)	91

Cuprins	Pagina
17.3. Drepturile omului și democrația în lume și politica Uniunii Europene în acest domeniu – raport anual pe 2023 (A9-0424/2023 - Nacho Sánchez Amor) (vot)	91
17.4. Activitățile financiare ale Băncii Europene de Investiții – raportul anual 2023 (A9-0031/2024 - David Cormand) (vot)	91
17.5. Raport referitor la Raportul Comisiei din 2023 privind statul de drept (A9-0025/2024 - Sophia in 't Veld) (vot)	91
17.6. Recomandare către Consiliu, Comisie și SEAE privind situația din Siria (A9-0041/2024 - Nathalie Loiseau) (vot)	91
18. Reluarea ședinței	91
19. Prevenirea deceselor din cauze profesionale în urma tragediei de la Florența (dezbateri)	91
20. Aprofundarea integrării UE în vederea extinderilor viitoare (dezbateri)	96
21. Colectarea și schimbul de date referitoare la serviciile de închiriere de locuințe pe termen scurt (dezbateri)	111
22. Necesitatea unei decizii urgente a Consiliului în favoarea modificării statutului de protecție al lupilor în Convenția de la Berna (dezbateri)	119
23. Îmbunătățirea protecției Uniunii împotriva manipulării pieței în cadrul pieței angro de energie (dezbateri)	125
24. Cadrul pentru identitatea digitală europeană (dezbateri)	130
25. Extradarea și urmărirea penală a lui Julian Assange și implicațiile asupra libertății presei (dezbateri)	138
26. Explicații privind votul	142
26.1. Permisele de conducere (A9-0445/2023 - Karima Delli)	142
26.2. Indicațiile geografice ale Uniunii Europene pentru vin, băuturi spirtoase și produse agricole (A9-0173/2023 - Paolo De Castro)	142
26.3. Punerea în aplicare a politicii externe și de securitate comune – raportul anual pe 2023 (A9-0389/2023 - David McAllister)	142
26.4. Punerea în aplicare a politicii de securitate și apărare comune – raportul anual pe 2023 (A9-0403/2023 - Sven Mikser)	143
26.5. Activitățile financiare ale Băncii Europene de Investiții – raportul anual 2023 (A9-0031/2024 - David Cormand)	143
26.6. Raport referitor la Raportul Comisiei din 2023 privind statul de drept (A9-0025/2024 - Sophia in 't Veld)	143

Cuprins	Pagina
27. Ordinea de zi a următoarei ședințe	144
28. Aprobarea procesului-verbal al prezentei ședințe	144
29. Ridicarea ședinței	144

STENOGRAMA DEZBATERILOR DIN 28 FEBRUARIE 2024

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Deschiderea şedinţei

(The sitting opened at 9.01)

2. Comunicarea Preşedinţei

President. – Based on the conclusions of the Advisory Committee dealing with harassment complaints concerning Members of the European Parliament and after taking into account the observations of the Member concerned, I have decided to impose a penalty on José Ramón Bauzá Díaz pursuant to Rule 10(6) and Rule 176, as a result of his behaviour towards his accredited parliamentary assistant, which constituted psychological harassment. The penalty consists of a reprimand.

The Member concerned has been notified of the decision, and has not lodged an internal appeal with the Bureau under Rule 177. The penalty is therefore final.

3. Negocieri înaintea primei lecturi a Parlamentului (articolul 71 din Regulamentul de procedură) (măsurî subsecvente)

President. – In relation to the decisions by several committees to enter into interinstitutional negotiations pursuant to Rule 71(1) announced at the opening of the sitting on Monday 26 February, I have received no request for a vote in Parliament by Members or a political group or groups reaching at least the medium threshold. The committees may therefore start the negotiations.

4. Consolidarea apărării europene într-un peisaj geopolitic volatil – Punerea în aplicare a politicii externe şi de securitate comune – raportul anual pe 2023 - Punerea în aplicare a politicii de securitate şi apărare comune – raportul anual pe 2023 (dezbateră comună – Securitatea şi apărarea europeană)

President. – The next item is the joint debate on:

— Council and Commission statements on strengthening European defence in a volatile geopolitical landscape (2024/2581(RSP));

— the report by David McAllister, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the implementation of the common foreign and security policy – annual report 2023 (2023/2117(INI)) (A9-0389/2023);

— the report by Sven Mikser, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the implementation of the common security and defence policy – annual report 2023 (2023/2119(INI)) (A9-0403/2023).

Mathieu Michel, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, Madam President of the European Commission, honourable Members of the European Parliament, 2023 was a very challenging year. The international system continues to face multiple and overlapping challenges. We face two wars on our doorstep while climate, food and energy crises pose threats to global peace and security, hamper global governance and slow down sustainable development. This forces us to fundamentally rethink our Union.

Right now, two issues are urgent priorities: Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine and the war that has flared up once again in the Middle East. In the current geopolitical contexts, security and defence must be the top priority of Europeans. Two years ago, the Strategic Compass was proposed and launched. At that time, nobody paid a lot of attention. Now the need to strengthen our defence at EU level has become obvious to everybody.

Russia's invasion of Ukraine marks a watershed moment in European defence. Within weeks, dogmas that had stood for decades were overturned. First, the European Peace Facility was used to incentivise Member States to give more military equipment to Ukraine. Never before had the EU financed the delivery of military equipment to a country at war. So far, the EU and Member States have mobilised more than EUR 28 billion of military assistance. Later, the largest military mission in the EU's history was launched to train the Ukrainian army. By the end of this summer, 60 000 Ukrainian soldiers will have been trained on EU soil. The training they receive is what Russia's new recruits often lack. It significantly increases their chances of survival.

But the Russian war of aggression has also highlighted the significant weaknesses resulting from 30 years of neglect in defence capacities. The weaknesses exist in terms of material, but also in terms of interoperability. Today, defence budgets are 40% higher than a decade ago, but we still have a long way to go and we all need to accelerate. We are not going to be able to play a geopolitical role if we are not able to defend ourselves.

Defence is a national competence. It is the Member States that have armies. We must be able to mobilise our armies to face common threats. We have to make them work together better in order to have more interoperability, more mobility, capacity together and more coordination. We need to spend better. But spending more does not automatically mean spending better. To get the best results, we need economies of scales. To ramp up production, the European defence industry needs certainty of long-term demand.

This idea is at the heart of our ammunition initiative. We need to aggregate Member States demand, procure jointly and support European industry in ramping up their production capacity. Through the European Defence Agency, we have put in place 60 framework contracts to place orders to the European defence industry.

We must follow this example in other areas. Together with European Defence Agency, EU Ministers of Defence have already identified the key capabilities they need, ranging from ground combat capabilities and integrated air missiles defence to underwater warfare capabilities, space services, cyber defence or other strategic enablers. All this, a stronger EU defence with Member States spending more and better together, will also help strengthen NATO.

Through the Strategic Compass, we are also working to make our armies more interoperable and our EU operational engagement more effective. Evacuations, such as in Afghanistan and Sudan, have shown that EU Member States often depend on outside help to protect and evacuate their citizens. We need the capacity to act with partners where possible, but also alone if needed. By 2025, we will have a Rapid Deployment Capacity allowing us to quickly deploy up to 5 000 troops in response to crisis situations. As part of this work, we conducted last October, the first live EU military exercise in Cádiz in Spain.

Interoperability is also key for our CSDP mission. In this more and more volatile world, they are increasingly important to protect European security interests abroad and contribute to global and regional stability. We are already working closely together in the context of our common security and defence policy missions. Since the beginning of this legislative mandate, the EU has launched seven civilian and military missions, including last week, our new maritime security operation ASPIDES in the Red Sea. Through ASPIDES, ATALANTA and our coordinated maritime presence in the Gulf of Guinea, we are showing that the EU can act decisively when our maritime security is at risk.

Other examples of our concrete operational engagement – and not only military – are the civilian missions launched last year in Armenia to contribute to stability along the border with Azerbaijan or in Moldova to strengthen their resilience against hybrid threats.

Russia's war against Ukraine has reminded us how critical traditional military capabilities, like tanks, artillery or ammunition remain, but also how much hybrid threats and space, cyber and critical infrastructure as well as information manipulation have changed the threat landscape.

In the past two years, we have seen progress in building capacities in all of those areas. But we can do more. If we want to be a geopolitical player, we need to have the means. And the means start by having a strong defence capacity and a strong defence industry.

Ursula von der Leyen, *President of the Commission*. – Madam President, Mr State Secretary, honourable Members, in the last years, many European illusions have been shattered. The illusion that peace is permanent. The illusion that economic prosperity might matter more to Putin than destroying a free and democratic Ukraine. The illusion that Europe on its own was doing enough on security – be it economic or military, conventional or cyber.

As we look around us, it is clear there is no room for any more illusions. Putin used the peace dividend to prepare for this war. As a result, the world is as dangerous as it has been for generations. Russia's brutal war of aggression against Ukraine is now in its third year and is more entrenched and intense than ever.

We are seeing the potency and the dangers of a rising and disturbing league of authoritarians. North Korea is delivering order after order of ammunition shells to Russia. And Iran is providing attack drones and, crucially, also the technology behind them to inflict untold damage on Ukrainian cities and citizens. The continuing war in Gaza and the large-scale destabilisation in the Middle East point to an era of insecurity and conflict in the region and beyond. And we are also seeing the continued rise of aggressive economic competition and distortion, which brings with it some very real European security risks.

So, to put it as bluntly as outgoing President Niinistö of Finland did last month: 'Europe has to wake up.' And I would add: urgently. We all know there is so much at stake here – our freedom and our prosperity. And we have to start acting like it.

We need to start working on the future of the European security architecture in all of its dimensions, and with all of the speed and political will that is required. Because the truth is, we have not been living with conflict merely since 2022, but for far longer. The threats to our security and prosperity and our way of life come in many different forms, and we all know them. Some of them are obvious, some of them are hazier on the surface. Be it tackling political interference, reducing our dangerous dependency – a policy that I have called de-risking – or be it eliminating hostile actors from our critical infrastructure, we Europeans must be on guard. This is not just about defeating bullies on the battlefield, but across all our societies.

The good news is we have started a lot of that work already. In fact, the last years have not only served to shatter some European illusions, but they have also shattered many illusions about Europe. That our unity would not hold in the face of a war on our continent, or that our rules and divisions would hold us back in providing massive financial, military and political support. Well, over the last two years, Europe has shown and proven that it will support Ukraine for as long as it takes. And we have also shown and proven that a more sovereign Europe is not just wishful thinking.

At this point, let me be very clear. European sovereignty will make our partnerships stronger. It will never affect the importance and the need for our NATO alliance. In fact, a more sovereign Europe, in particular on defence, is vital to strengthening NATO. That is why I am pleased with the news that Sweden will soon become a NATO ally. And I want to congratulate Sweden, under the leadership of Prime Minister Ulf Kristersson, on the historic step for this country.

At its core, European sovereignty is about taking responsibility ourselves for what is vital and even existential for us. It is about our ability, but also about our willingness to defend our interests and values ourselves. This is what leaders agreed with the Versailles agenda just after the start of the war to reduce our strategic dependencies in critical areas like energy, like key technologies – you remember the semiconductors – economic capacities and, of course, defence.

Member States have stepped up. Just last week, the naval mission Aspides was launched to protect against the direct threat to the freedom of navigation – freedom of navigation that serves as a bedrock of global trade in one of the world's most critical waterways. And Member States have stepped up their defence spending too. Their national defence budgets have already risen by 20% from last year. And NATO has just announced that it expects 18 of its members to beat the 2% defence spending target this year. That is up from only three members a decade ago. And, together, we are now spending more jointly on common capacities and projects between Europeans. The European Peace Facility has mobilised EUR 6.1 billion to support the Ukrainian armed forces with lethal and non-lethal military equipment and supplies.

The European Defence Fund is investing in high-end defence capabilities in critical areas such as naval, ground or air combat, space-based early warning systems or cyber. And we have taken big steps forward in growing our defence, industrial and manufacturing capacities. In the next weeks, we will announce award decisions under the ASAP programme, and this funding will enable us to roughly double European ammunition production to over two million shells a year by the end of 2025.

Honourable Members, all of this progress shows that Europe has started to grasp the urgency and the scale of the challenge that is ahead of us. But there is a lot more to do and we need to move fast. The threat of war may not be imminent, but it is not impossible. The risks of war should not be overblown, but they should be prepared for. And that starts with the urgent need to rebuild, replenish and modernise Member States armed forces. In doing so, Europe should strive to develop and manufacture the next generation of battle-winning operational capabilities and to ensure it has sufficient quantity of material and the technological superiority that we may need in the future. That means turbocharging our defence industrial capacity in the next five years.

At the heart of this must be a simple principle: Europe must spend more, spend better, spend European. We will put forward some proposals in the next weeks with the first ever European Industrial Defence Strategy. One of the central aims of the strategy, and the European Defence Investment Programme that will come with it, will be to prioritise defence joint procurement. Just as we did it very successfully with the vaccines or, for example, with natural gas. This will help us reduce fragmentation and increase interoperability. But to do this we must collectively send a strong signal to industry. This is why we will look at how to facilitate, for example, offtake agreements. They need security and the knowledge that the products will be taken off. Or, for example, advanced purchase agreements where we provide guarantees. This would give our defence industry companies very stable orders and, most importantly, predictability in the long run.

We will increase support for industrial ramp-up, as we are now doing with ammunition with ASAP. We will identify European defence projects of common interest to focus efforts and resources where it has the biggest impact and added value. And we will focus on innovation to ensure Europe has that edge in the new technologies, which we see being deployed across the world in different continents.

This must be a truly European effort. And that is why I am proud to announce that we will set up an Office for Defence Innovation in Kyiv. This will bring Ukraine ever closer to Europe and it will enable all Member States to draw on Ukraine's battlefield experience and expertise in industrial defence innovation.

Honourable Members, making this step together on defence will not be easy. It will require bold decisions and political courage. And it will require, above all, a new European defence mindset from institutions to industries to investors. That is why I'm very encouraged by the words of President Calviño that the EIB is ready to do more, to contribute, to join projects that boost the European defence industry. And I really call now on Member States to endorse this proposal. Defence industry in Europe needs access to capital.

I would like to encourage our public and private lenders to support our defence industry and in particular, small and medium enterprises. Also in defence, small and medium enterprises are the backbone of our industry. They are the driver of innovation and a critical factor in the single market. And the topic needs undivided attention. This is why I'm personally supportive of a designated Defence Commissioner for the next Commission.

And beyond that, I would like us to think bigger. It is time to start a conversation about using the windfall profits of frozen Russian assets to jointly purchase military equipment for Ukraine. There could be no stronger symbol and no greater use for that money than to make Ukraine and all of Europe a safer place to live.

Honourable Members, ultimately, this is about Europe taking responsibility for its own security. The simple truth is: we do not have the luxury of comfort. We do not have the control of elections or decisions in other parts of the world. We simply do not have the time to skirt around the issue. With or without the support of our partners, we cannot let Russia win. And the cost of insecurity – the cost of a Russian victory – is far greater than any saving we could make now. This is why it is time for Europe to step up. Long live Europe.

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, President von der Leyen, Council, dear colleagues, as EPP, we are, first of all, happy to have the debate today. Such an upgraded top-level debate about the Defence Union. EPP was asking for this for a long period of time and that's why it is good to have it.

For us, first of all, I want to underline that the subject itself is not innovative at all. I said it already in my last speech: in 1945, Adenauer, Schuman, De Gasperi started with the Defence Union. The French Parliament rejected, De Gasperi had tears in his eyes after it failed in the French Parliament.

The idea, in 1954, was, after the Second World War, unifying armies, never again war in Europe. What a fascinating idea behind it – and we are back to this debate. We are back to this debate – again we discuss this subject with the idea never again war in Europe. But that means today to be strong, and that's why we are so happy to have this debate.

The first point, from an EPP perspective, is: the debate about NATO-EU is, for us, not a debate at all. The NATO is fundamental for us. We also welcome Finland and Sweden joining the NATO. The EPP parties in Finland always were in favour – even when it was unpopular in the country – in favour of joining. Socialists finally also are supporting now joining the NATO from the both countries, so welcome in the club.

But there is a good outcome. We have them now among us and, in the long run, we must understand that 330 million Americans will not defend, in the long run, 440 million Europeans. We have to do it by our own means. That's why it's not in contradiction, it's the same as what we are doing here to strengthen NATO with a strong EU pillar.

The concrete actions is now to implement the European single market, and there we welcome very much the presentation of Ursula von der Leyen, the ambitions of Ursula von der Leyen. The Americans have one tank, we have 17 different kinds of tanks. The Americans have 30 weapon systems, we have 160 weapon systems. It's so obvious that we are wasting money.

We have to buy European. We have to care about our jobs. We have to do common export rules for the future, to have common industry in defence. We need to coordinate all this. That's why the idea to have a Commissioner responsible for doing so is exactly what we need – and on short term, we have to finance it. So, the EIB development is a good one, but I want to add also that, on the taxonomy rules, we have to rethink them, because, currently, taxonomy rules are also an obstacle for financing defence goods. That's why we have to make it possible that the private sector is financing this.

Listening to the Council speaker, I have to say that we heard so much already about these kind of speeches, that it is national responsibility. My clear demand is: stop speaking, please act now, on the Council side.

We need also joint actions about the areas where we have an obvious European added value, and it is about cyber defence, about a missile defence shield, about the joint mission, for example, in the future of sub-Sahara to not hand over the region to Wagner troops or to the Islamist terrorists. That is another point for us that we have to care about the current state of play, on defending Ukraine.

Erlauben Sie mir, auf Deutsch weiterzumachen. Wir spüren, dass die Geschlossenheit in der Europäischen Union leider Gottes bröckelt. Ich bin enttäuscht über das, was manche Führer auf nationaler Ebene die letzten Tage von sich gegeben haben. Emmanuel Macron hat eine sinnlose Debatte angestoßen über die Fragestellung, ob französische Truppen in der Ukraine eingesetzt werden. Diese Debatte war sinnlos und sie hat Europa und die westliche Hemisphäre gespalten.

Und das Zweite: Der deutsche Bundeskanzler Olaf Scholz hat in Deutschland die Weisung ausgegeben, mit der Lieferung von-Taurus Raketen würde Deutschland Kriegspartei werden, was rechtlich falsch ist und was er ja leider Gottes bei den Leopard-Panzern auch schon formuliert hat, was nur die russische Propaganda bestätigt, nämlich, dass damit einige Teile Deutschlands, Europas Teil des Kriegs werden könnten.

Beide Führer haben zur Spaltung Europas beigetragen und nicht zur Einheit Europas. Ich kann nur sagen: Hört damit auf! Putin hasst die Art, wie wir leben. Die Ukraine darf nicht fallen. Wir müssen Russland stoppen. Appeasement funktioniert nicht, wie wir es bei Nord Stream 2 erlebt haben. Und deswegen: Danke an Ursula von der Leyen, Roberta Metsola, Donald Tusk, der sehr stark war. Ich möchte auch Giorgia Meloni erwähnen, die im G7-Gipfel eine starke Rolle gespielt hat. Wir brauchen jetzt Menschen, die zusammenführen, die Einigung zeigen, und nicht Menschen, die spalten. Und deshalb: Putin versteht nur die Methode der Stärke. Und ich möchte am Schluss George Washington zitieren:

'The best way to prevent war is to prepare for it.'

Pedro Marques, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, colleagues, an important debate, this one, at an existential moment for Europe and the world.

One has to start by saying we did well on responding to yet another existential threat to the world – that was COVID. We were safe and the Europeans recognise it, but the rest of the world accused us of just taking care of the rich people in the West. We did also well when Putin invaded Ukraine with an extraordinary effort by our High Representative, we were united from the beginning, sanctioning Putin and delivering weapons to Ukraine.

Now, yet another war came to our borders, increasing the uncertainty of the times that we live. We can't simply look the other way when 30 000 people died in a few months at the hands of the Israeli army in Gaza. The rest of the world is yet again questioning our moral compass. But it is us that should be questioning, 'What are we doing in these dramatic times?'

President von der Leyen, if we want to be safer in the world, we have to be a more geopolitical Europe, as you correctly pointed out at times. But the world will not forgive us for our double standards. The world will not partner with us if they feel left behind, just as long as they are not Caucasian or rich. If we want to be more geopolitical, we need to keep our moral compass and then we have to go geostrategic and start really mobilising all our instruments.

Where are our concrete actions for lasting partnerships with Africa and Latin America? Will we just give up to President Macron's domestic problems and turn our back on the rest of the world? We can't continue to hesitate. We need to go forward, not stall our ambition. If we want to be safe, we need to be stronger to make ourselves respected in the world. Where are the funds, the actual funds that we need for the strategic autonomy of Europe?

A greener Europe will also be a safer Europe for the future. Have you told Mr Weber, President von der Leyen, have you told him this much? Do you know that the EPP is trying to tear down the green policies that we built, also with the work of the Commission, trading the future of Europe and the planet for just a few thousand votes?

A Europe with more opportunities for all is also a safer Europe for all. Where are your concrete policies for a more social Europe? Have you forgotten the politics for the people, particularly those that suffered the most here in Europe?

The EU also misses proposals to really face the threats of China, or even the aggressive IRA of the US. Not with words and strategies, but with resources for our economy to match the ambition of these programmes of particularly the Chinese rivals. A global vision, we do need; a strategy, we do need – but we also need concrete tools to act. Where are our teeth when some of our natural allies, let alone our opponents, challenge our common values or interests?

What did you do in concrete terms to stop Netanyahu's unacceptable actions in Gaza that followed the madness of Hamas? What did you do to actually promote lasting peace? Why didn't you personally call for an unconditional ceasefire now that millions have their lives threatened in Rafah, Madam President? Guterres and Borrell, they led by example in this conflict, but from you, I am sorry to say, President von der Leyen, it's been silence in action after a serious initial mistake.

A safer Europe will be a Europe that projects its strengths in the world to promote peace, not war, to promote development, not inequalities. A safer Europe will be able to be more relevant in its own defence, saying yes to NATO, saying yes to its neighbours. But it has to be a Europe based on solidarity and knowing that, as always, an eye for an eye will only turn this world into blindness.

Valérie Hayer, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Secrétaire d'État, chers collègues, trop longtemps, nous avons ignoré les signes de la bascule du monde. De plus en plus, nos valeurs de liberté et de démocratie sont désormais attaquées, physiquement ou virtuellement. Malgré ces menaces, nous nous sommes trop habitués à un certain confort. Ce confort, il a pu nous faire oublier par moments la dure réalité que peuvent nous infliger les soubresauts de la géopolitique. L'habitude de la paix, ce formidable miracle européen, est devenu une situation prise pour acquise, alors que cette paix est l'élément essentiel à notre liberté, à notre prospérité.

Chers collègues, à force de ne compter que sur nos alliés américains pour assurer notre défense, nous avons fini avec un sous-investissement chronique dans nos capacités de défense. Le réveil ne pouvait être que brutal! Il y a deux ans, Vladimir Poutine lançait une guerre d'invasion sur le sol européen. Les pires atrocités ont été commises. Les pires menaces planent désormais au dessus de nos têtes. Chers collègues, depuis le 24 février 2022, la naïveté a fait son temps, et c'est pourquoi, aux côtés de sa population héroïque, nous soutiendrons l'Ukraine jusqu'à sa victoire.

Et nous devons nous aussi nous préoccuper de notre sécurité! Nos liens avec nos alliés sont précieux. Les remettre en cause serait irresponsable. Mais à partir du moment où il existe un risque que nos priorités stratégiques prennent des chemins différents, nous ne devons plus tergiverser. Nous ne pourrions pas nous réveiller au lendemain des élections américaines sans avoir anticipé le monde d'après. Nous, démocrates, refusons de laisser notre union à la merci des agresseurs, et ce, contrairement à ceux dont les liens avec Poutine sont connus et documentés ici, à l'extrême droite et à l'extrême gauche de cet hémicycle. Ne comptez sur eux pour ne défendre ni notre continent, ni leur propre pays. Chers collègues, je voudrais également faire passer un message. Inutile d'attaquer nos chefs d'État, ici ou là. Ils sont la clé! C'est un débat stérile. Sinon, nous pouvons refaire le monde et regarder qui nous a mené à nos dépendances. Je ne le ferais pas! Soyons responsables collectivement, sinon nous faisons le jeu de Vladimir Poutine.

Et je pose la question: qui mieux que l'Europe pour protéger l'Europe? Chers collègues, il est temps d'agir. Et cela commence par mettre fin à l'unanimité en politique étrangère européenne, domaine où aujourd'hui, un seul gouvernement, même inféodé à une puissance étrangère, peut mettre en danger nos intérêts vitaux à tous. Il nous faudra ensuite penser à de nouvelles initiatives, et je pense ici à la création de l'Académie militaire européenne, à l'heure où nos forces armées doivent être pleinement interopérables. Mais il faut aussi inventer de nouvelles formes de financement pour notre protection et bâtir un vrai marché unique de la défense pour que nous puissions enfin nous protéger nous-mêmes. Il en va de notre sécurité à tous!

Terry Reintke, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Frau Präsidentin, Herr Minister! Die Ukraine kämpft für ihre und für unsere Freiheit, für ein demokratisches, für ein freies Europa. Für den Kampf der Ukraine und natürlich für unsere eigene Sicherheit in der Europäischen Union müssen wir endlich Ernst machen mit einer gemeinsamen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik – nicht in irgendwelchen Sonntagsreden, sondern im wirklichen Machen. Denn nur ein geeintes Europa – und das wissen alle hier – ist ein sicheres Europa.

Nur leider zeigen uns gerade einige, wie es nicht geht. Anstatt sich intern eng zu koordinieren und europäisch zu führen, fallen Emmanuel Macron und Olaf Scholz mit offensichtlichen Missstimmungen auf. Macron, der mit seinen politischen Initiativen nicht über die fehlenden Taten aus Paris hinwegtäuschen kann: Frankreich rangiert bei der Militärhilfe für die Ukraine weit abgeschlagen hinten. Dabei brauchen wir viel mehr praktische Hilfe für die Ukraine, auch aus Paris. Und Olaf Scholz? Olaf Scholz fällt gerade leider eher durch völkerrechtlich halbgeare Äußerungen zum Taurus auf anstatt mit klarer europäischer Leadership. Auch das reicht einfach nicht, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen.

Denn wir sind gerade an einem zentralen Punkt. Zwei Jahre nach der brutalen Invasion Russlands in der Ukraine brauchen wir mit aller Klarheit eine Botschaft aus Europa, dass wir die Ukraine unterstützen werden, damit sie diesen Krieg gewinnen kann. Wir bräuchten deshalb gerade jetzt einen deutsch-französischen Motor – geeint mit einer proeuropäischen polnischen Regierung im Weimarer Dreieck –, der die Kraft aufbringt, nicht nur für die Unterstützung der Ukraine, sondern auch, um endlich sicherheitspolitisch die richtigen Weichen in Europa zu stellen.

Denn die Zahlen zeigen es: Die Zusammenarbeit in der Verteidigungspolitik ist immer noch die Ausnahme und nicht die Regel in der Europäischen Union. Das muss sich dringend ändern. Seit Jahren erreichen wir nicht die selbst gesetzten Ziele, was die Beschaffung angeht, was die gemeinsame Beschaffung angeht, aber auch, was gemeinsame Forschung und Entwicklung in der Europäischen Union angeht. Das ist nicht nur strategisch unklug für Europa, sondern das ist auch ein völlig ineffizientes Einsetzen von Steuermitteln. Das muss sich dringend ändern, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, und das nicht in 15 Jahren, sondern jetzt – für unsere Sicherheit, für die Ukraine. Denn wir können Putin kein besseres Geschenk machen als eine zerstrittene, national isolierte europäische Sicherheitspolitik.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, noch eine Sache muss sich ändern: das ideologische, dogmatische Festhalten an der schwarzen Null gegen jeden Verstand. Nicht nur, weil wir jetzt gemeinsam in die Sicherheit investieren müssen und in unsere Freiheit – denn ja, der *Green Deal* ist ein ganz wichtiger Teil dafür, unsere Sicherheit und Freiheit zu verteidigen, uns unabhängig zu machen von Diktatoren wie Wladimir Putin –, sondern auch, weil wir diese Investitionen nicht gegen dringend nötige Investitionen zum Beispiel für den sozialen Zusammenhalt in unseren Gesellschaften ausspielen dürfen. Eine sozial gesplattene Europäische Union ist nicht nur ungerecht, sondern eine Gefahr für unsere Demokratie. Deswegen dürfen wir auch da nicht müde werden, für soziale Gerechtigkeit zu investieren.

Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wir haben es in der Hand: Werden wir uns in den nächsten Jahren auseinanderdividieren lassen oder gehen wir mit gemeinsamer europäischer Stärke in die Auseinandersetzung mit Putin, um gemeinsam unsere Werte und die Sicherheit Europas zu verteidigen? Ich weiß, was ich will.

Nicola Procaccini, a nome del gruppo ECR. – Signora Presidente, Presidente von der Leyen, onorevoli colleghi, questa discussione arriva al termine della legislatura e con grave ritardo. Negli ultimi cinque anni in quest'Aula abbiamo parlato molto di più di monopattini elettrici e farfalle che di geopolitica e di difesa militare.

L'idea della sinistra rossa e verde di fare dell'Europa una superpotenza erbivora ha occupato interamente l'agenda della Commissione europea e di conseguenza quella parlamentare. Siamo stati sommersi da grandi discorsi sulla necessità di andare in bicicletta per non emettere CO₂. Ci siamo addormentati in un sogno ma nel frattempo il mondo ha continuato a vivere nella realtà e la realtà è un posto bello ma pericoloso. Noi conservatori europei abbiamo sempre avuto le idee chiare in questo senso: abbiamo sempre pensato che l'Unione europea non dovesse occuparsi di tutto, ma di poche cose, anche se importanti: «*Doing less, doing better*» è sempre stato il nostro messaggio.

La difesa comune dei confini e degli interessi europei è una delle poche cose per cui l'Unione europea serve, eccome se serve! Perché è ovvio che la sicurezza sta nei numeri e non sempre gli interessi coincidono al di qua e al di là dell'oceano Atlantico. Rendere più saldo ed efficiente il pilastro europeo della NATO serve a rafforzare anche l'Alleanza atlantica. Per favore, non scandalizziamoci quando Trump viene a svegliarci dal nostro «sogno verde»: non possono essere sempre gli altri a pagare o a morire al posto nostro.

Comunque, oggi non è necessario dividersi sulla prospettiva di un esercito europeo che – consentitemi la digressione personale – la destra italiana sostiene da 50 anni, quando i super europeisti di oggi sostenevano l'Armata Rossa. Ciò su cui possiamo concordare, per adesso, è su una migliore integrazione degli eserciti nazionali e su una produzione comune degli armamenti, che costa ma è necessaria, che se fatta insieme, può consentirci di spendere meno e meglio.

Servono coraggio, realismo e buon senso. Nonostante i ritardi e qualche ipocrisia nei suoi scopi, la missione europea ASPIDES nel Mediterraneo è la strada giusta da seguire. Sono tempi difficili, è vero. Ma in realtà lo sono sempre stati. Publio Siro, uno schiavo romano divenuto libero molti anni fa, scrisse «Non è facile difendere da soli ciò che desiderano in tanti: la nostra libertà».

Jean-Paul Garraud, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, l'Union européenne se rêve en une suprapuissance disposant à terme de sa propre défense. Voici encore une atteinte directe à la souveraineté de nos nations, qui ne peut se partager avec une souveraineté européenne existant uniquement dans l'idéologie des eurobéats. Le soldat n'est pas prêt à mourir pour l'Europe. L'ancien chef d'État-major de l'armée française, Pierre de Villiers, affirmait ainsi: «On meurt pour son chef, on meurt pour des valeurs, on meurt pour sa patrie. On ne meurt pas pour une Communauté économique européenne».

Vantée comme un moyen de renforcer l'Europe face à toutes les menaces, la vision utopiste d'un conglomérat d'armées nationales sous commandement d'officiers d'autres nationalités est irréalisable. Ou alors, il faudrait aller chercher comme pilier de cette défense européenne l'OTAN, qui protégerait surtout des intérêts américains. Et que deviendrait la puissance nucléaire française? Car comment créer une zone de défense européenne sans la partager, ce qui ne peut en aucune façon être envisagé? La tentation est grande pour le président Macron d'essayer d'exister à l'international quand il est si contesté au niveau national, lui qui vient d'être désavoué avec fracas par les nations européennes et les États-unis sur l'envoi de troupes en Ukraine. Ses déclarations guerrières, ajoutées à celles d'autres responsables européens, m'ont persuadé que si l'Union européenne avait disposé d'une armée, elle l'aurait engagée, quitte à nous entraîner dans une escalade mortelle dans le cadre du conflit russo-ukrainien. Pour avoir une Europe forte, il nous faut d'abord et avant tout des États forts. Alors, avant de vouloir créer une défense européenne, renforçons nos propres armées. Elles en ont tellement besoin.

Martin Schirdewan, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! Wenn man Ihnen so zuhört, Frau von der Leyen, aber auch den Kolleginnen und Kollegen von grün bis konservativ, dann vernimmt man immer wieder die gleichen Worte: mehr Geld für Waffen, Aufrüstung, Kriegsfähigkeit, Kampfbereitschaft. Ich finde, es ist sehr einfach – und ihr macht es euch alle sehr einfach –, sich hinter diesen großspurigen Worten zu verstecken, um vom Versagen der eigenen Politik abzulenken.

Dabei ist doch die Unfähigkeit, nur eine der aktuellen Krisen zu bewältigen, offenkundig. Die soziale Ungleichheit in der Europäischen Union nimmt ungebremsst zu. Hunger und Armut sind für viele Menschen wieder Alltag geworden. Die Klimakrise verschärft sich weiter. Bei der Migration fällt Ihnen nur ein, Menschenrechte abzuschaffen, statt Menschen zu schützen. Und bei Krieg und Frieden vernimmt man nichts außer diesem schrillen Geschrei nach Aufrüstung, von dem einzig und allein die großen Rüstungskonzerne profitieren werden. Und selbst sozialdemokratische Politiker quatschen mittlerweile ahnungslos von der europäischen Atombombe. Und der französische Präsident Macron will gegebenenfalls Bodentruppen in die Ukraine schicken. Ich stelle Ihnen mal eine ernsthafte Frage, Herr Gahler, für einen Freund: Seid ihr eigentlich alle verrückt geworden?

Ein neues Wettrüsten führt uns nicht in Sicherheit, sondern direkt in die nächste Katastrophe. Sie alle betreiben eine fahrlässig gefährliche Politik, und brutale Kürzungspolitik bei gleichzeitiger Aufrüstung bedeutet, dass die Menschen weniger soziale Sicherheit, weniger Gesundheitsversorgung, weniger intakte Schulen vorfinden, während ihr Geld direkt auf die Konten der Großaktionäre umgeleitet wird. Das kann doch einfach alles nicht mehr Ihr Ernst sein. Und diese Politik ist der Treibstoff, durch den die extreme Rechte gestärkt wird und die Demokratie gefährdet wird.

Wenn Sie irgendeine der großen Herausforderungen für die Menschheit lösen wollen, braucht es doch einen grundlegenden Politikwechsel hin zu einer strategisch unabhängigen Europäischen Union, die natürlich verteidigungsfähig sein muss – was denn sonst? –, die aber natürlich auch den Prinzipien folgt, dass Diplomatie, friedliche Konfliktlösung, die Stärkung internationaler Organisationen und eben nicht ein neues Wettrüsten die Voraussetzung für Frieden schaffen und die deshalb, auch wenn es gerade unpopulär zu sein scheint, gegenseitiger Abrüstung verpflichtet bleibt. Es geht nämlich darum, den Frieden zu gewinnen und nicht den Krieg.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Kinga Gál (NI). – Elnök Úr! Drámai időket élünk. Európának stabilitásra, békére és prosperitásra van szüksége. Ezért támogatjuk a közös védelempolitikát, valamint az európai védelmi ipar megerősítését elősegítő kezdeményezéseket, és az uniós elnökségünk alatt, a magyar elnökség alatt is ez prioritásunk lesz.

Sajnálatos, hogy a most vitatott kétéves jelentés ideológiai alapú ahelyett, hogy az Unió versenyképességének romlását próbálná visszafordítani. Ideológiai okokból támadja alaptalanul a bővítési biztost, noha elismerést érdemelne azért, hogy a bővítési politika lendületet kapott.

A Nyugat-Balkán integrációjának felgyorsítása az EU alapvető stratégiai érdeke. Ellenezzük a minősített többségi szavazásra irányuló javaslatokat, mert erősen korlátozná a tagállamok szuverenitását, és elfogadhatatlanok az ismételten Magyarországgal szembeni politikai támadások, hiszen következetesen elítéljük az orosz agressziót, és humanitárius eszközökkel erőn felül támogatjuk és segítjük Ukrajnát.

De a béke pártján állunk, és kiállunk amellett, hogy háborús retorika és fegyverszállítások helyett békétárgyalásokkal, minél hamarabb véget kell vetni a pusztításnak a szomszédunkban.

David McAllister, rapporteur. – Mr President, Madam President, Minister, ladies and gentlemen, since we adopted our previous report on the implementation of the common foreign and security policy on 18 January last year, the world has changed significantly.

While Mr Putin is relentless in his war of aggression against Ukraine, the horror terrorist attacks launched by Hamas against Israel on 7 October have set the Middle East on fire. In our external action, we need to adapt to these new circumstances. For too long, the European Union has been too cautious; we have not proactively defined and defended our interests in the world. This needs to change.

I would like to fully underline what our Commission President, Ursula von der Leyen, has said this morning in this plenary and it was actually our Commission President, Ursula von der Leyen, who recognised this already back in 2019 when she spoke of a geopolitical Commission and a European Union that needs to understand the language of power. Listening carefully to all the contributions this morning, one thing is obvious: one logical conclusion can only be a strong defence portfolio.

But what actually does that mean concretely? Yes, I would like to see a Commissioner for Security and Defence in the next European Commission. She, or perhaps he, should coordinate all EU and Member States defence initiatives and ensure that we are stronger by acting together. Yes, I would want to see EU Member States procure their defence products jointly to improve the interoperability of our armed forces and to reduce the costs for taxpayers. The EU defence industry reinforcement act, EDIRPA, was an important starting point, but it is far from enough.

Yes, we must help the European defence industry to increase its production capacity to ensure that our armed forces are fully equipped. We must provide Ukraine with whatever it takes to win this war as long as it takes.

Also, in that regard, we made a first step with the act in support of ammunition production. But we urgently, colleagues, need to go further with a future European defence investment programme and by establishing a well-funded Ukraine assistance fund under the European Peace Facility. Ultimately, it is about further establishing a single market for defence.

The long-term goal, dear colleagues, is, of course, to develop a true European Defence Union, a fully-fledged European Defence Union. All our activities need to be closely coordinated with NATO, with our transatlantic partners, the Americans, the Canadians, the British. Let us remain transatlantic and at the same time become more European. That is the way forward.

And I would once again like to address our Commission President, because since 2019, dear Ursula von der Leyen, you have taken the right approach. You are strengthening Europe's global footprint and supporting the principles that inspired our own creation, development and enlargement. Since we have discussed my own report extensively in AFET, I will not refer to my own report. I would just like to thank all colleagues involved, especially the shadow rapporteurs, the involved staff members and also the team of the High Representative / Vice-President for the constructive and fruitful cooperation.

Since this will be the final report on the implementation of our common foreign and security policy in this legislature, hopefully the next Commission and the next High Representative are invited to use this year's CFSP report as a guide for their priorities.

Sven Mikser, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, President of the Commission, colleagues, Russia's aggression against Ukraine has made many of us reassess our previously held convictions and beliefs about European security needs.

What is more, it has exposed vulnerabilities caused by decades of underinvestment in defence and security, both in individual Member States as well as at the European Union level. Let me say that, perhaps unlike in Finland or Estonia, the conservatives in some larger countries were also complicit in this strategic naivety.

Russia's brutal aggression against Ukraine must not succeed. It is our moral duty to support the fight for the survival of a sovereign, democratic European nation. But we have to understand that Ukraine's defeat would also be devastating for EU security and present a mortal threat to the rules-based international order as we know it.

Since Putin escalated his war over two years ago, the EU has taken many unprecedented steps. The use of the European Peace Facility to reimburse Member States for equipment donated to Ukraine and the initiative to ramp up production of ammunition and missiles are steps in the right direction. But I am sure that the history books will not judge us based on what we did or spent or what we said in this noble Chamber, but on whether we actually managed to help Ukraine win the war.

So we need to do more and do it now. It's a matter of utmost urgency because while we are talking, Russia is making gains on the ground that will be very difficult and costly to reverse later. We know that Putin's Russia presents not only a threat limited to the indirect implications of the Ukraine war. There is and will be for the foreseeable future a direct military threat from Russia to EU Member States, territories and people.

In order to provide credible deterrence against the threat or, if necessary, defend our continent, we will need to spend more on defence. It's true that more Member States are spending 2 % of their GDP on defence than did so ten years ago, but we know that several larger Member States still fall short of that important threshold.

Also, while we have launched on the EU level important initiatives such as EDF, EDIRPA and ASAP to boost joint research and innovation, promote joint procurement and address critical capability shortfalls, it is imperative that we also put additional money on the table. It is impossible to use the same money twice and cannibalising the budgets of existing programmes to finance newer ones is not going to be sustainable.

On the defence-industrial level, I think it's important that we understand that this new security reality will be with us for the foreseeable future, so our industries must have confidence that the orders from governments will not stop the moment the arms fall silent in Ukraine.

Europe's strategic autonomy, obviously, will not be unlimited. It must always be our first choice to act together with our friends and allies. It would be a great mistake to brush our allies aside just for the sake of going alone. Let me recall the words of NATO Secretary-General Stoltenberg, who recently described the calls for creating a European nuclear deterrent without the US as unhelpful.

But at the same time, we cannot fully ignore the uncomfortable truth that Donald Trump may return to the White House next year. Moreover, there is also far less of a consensus on Capitol Hill when it comes to America's global security responsibilities than just a few years ago. We cannot completely rule out America's turn towards greater isolationism, and this possibility underscores the need to build a militarily stronger and more capable Europe.

Finally, while we need to be ready to go alone if necessary and build alliances whenever possible, it is clear that beyond collaborating with our most immediate allies and fellow democracies, we are only going to prevail if we manage to form larger coalitions and convince the rest of the world that our cause is just.

Immediately after the beginning of Putin's full-scale war, we managed to pull together a coalition of more than 140 countries in the UN General Assembly. Today, after months of ongoing humanitarian catastrophe in Gaza, recreating such a coalition would be very difficult.

I am convinced that every one of us condemns the horrific terror attacks of Hamas and demands the immediate release of all the hostages. The vast majority of us are committed to a two-state solution that provides security for Israel and delivers on the legitimate aspirations of Palestinian people. If it is so, we need to do more, we need to do something very tangible in order to end this unnecessary suffering of millions of displaced and starving people.

Only by doing this – which is also a moral obligation – we can convince the rest of the world that we are really committed to maintaining and strengthening the rules-based international order.

President. – I took notice that Mr Danjean will today have his last speech in the House, and I want to take the opportunity to thank you for your contributions and for your service. I think your seriousness and the reliability with which you have rendered that service is why you are so highly esteemed in the whole House, across the benches. Thank you, Mr Danjean.

(Applause)

Arnaud Danjean (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Secrétaire d'État, il n'est jamais trop tard pour se réveiller, même si la guerre russe en Ukraine et les spéculations sur une possible défaillance de l'allié américain ne datent pas d'aujourd'hui, ni même d'il y a deux ans, mais d'il y a déjà dix ans.

Depuis, nous avons eu beaucoup d'effets d'annonce, beaucoup d'incantations, quelques actions, c'est vrai, mais trop peu et trop lentement. Et je vous renvoie à cet égard aux débats que nous avons ici même il y a deux ans, à la veille et à la suite du fameux sommet de Versailles, où on nous avait promis monts et merveilles. Mais tout cela tarde à se matérialiser.

Comment s'assurer aujourd'hui que nous n'en resterons pas une nouvelle fois à des déclarations sans lendemain? D'abord, face à l'urgence, évitons de perdre du temps et de l'énergie dans des débats qui divisent, au lieu de nous mobiliser pleinement sur ce qui doit nous unir et nous rassembler. La priorité absolue aujourd'hui, c'est de produire et de livrer des équipements et des munitions, pas de spéculer publiquement sur des options qui divisent les Européens. Cela vaut pour le président de la République française comme pour le chancelier allemand.

Ensuite, il faut reconnaître qu'il n'y a qu'une catégorie de producteurs, les entreprises, et qu'une catégorie d'acheteurs, les États. La Commission, et vous l'avez d'ailleurs très bien expliqué, Madame la Présidente, n'est pas productrice, elle n'est pas acheteuse non plus de matériel de défense. Ce n'est pas son rôle. Son rôle, et vous l'avez rappelé, est de faciliter et de fluidifier ce lien entre entreprises et États aussi directement et simplement que possible. À cet égard, il est impératif, Manfred l'a rappelé et je ne peux qu'insister sur cet aspect, de sortir de toute ambiguïté sur les contraintes qui découragent les financements publics et privés vers l'industrie de défense. La fameuse taxonomie, qu'elle soit environnementale ou sociale, fait peser trop d'incertitudes sur des acteurs qui sont prêts à s'engager, mais qui ont peur d'être en contradiction avec des injonctions parfois imprécises ou contradictoires.

Enfin, les États membres gardent la responsabilité majeure et ils ne doivent pas la fuir. Ils passent les commandes, ils achètent, ils livrent. Qu'ils revitalisent donc au bon niveau la Facilité européenne pour la paix, qu'ils adaptent les règles de la Banque européenne d'investissement, et qu'ils se regroupent ou qu'ils fassent seuls pour acheter et livrer. Mais qu'ils le fassent vite, l'économie de guerre, ce ne sont pas des effets de manche, ce sont des commandes.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Voorzitter, Commissievoorzitter, Raad, collega's, onze veiligheid in Europa wordt bedreigd. In de eerste plaats door de agressieoorlog van Rusland in Oekraïne. Het moet duidelijk zijn waar wij staan. Dappere Oekraïners verdedigen ook onze democratie en onze veiligheid. En wij hebben maar één taak: Oekraïne geven wat nodig is om te winnen. Dat doen we nu niet, en u draagt daar mee de verantwoordelijkheid voor.

Ik wil zien dat u beiden landen die niet genoeg doen – en dat zijn er best veel – aanspreekt, doordringt van de urgentie. Dit is onze gezamenlijke taak. We kunnen dit. Dat weet ik zeker. Maar niet als we twijfelen en aarzelen over munitie, over onze voorraden en over de ATACMS.

Maar er is meer. De vrienden van Poetin in Europa komt u regelmatig tegen. Ook dan staan onze veiligheid, onze waarden en onze democratie op het spel. Dat is niet los van elkaar te zien. Als u zich laat chanteren door Orbán tot het onterecht vrijgeven van tien miljard euro, maar ook, Commissievoorzitter, als u bijvoorbeeld spreekt met president Vučić en hij u schoffeert tijdens een persconferentie, of als u commissaris Várhelyi maar laat begaan met zijn steun voor Dodik en Vučić. Ook dan staan onze waarden op het spel.

We moeten duidelijk zijn naar degenen die stabiliteit en recht ondermijnen, en de mensen steunen die het tegendeel willen. En ja, onze geloofwaardigheid wordt ook beïnvloed door onze stellingname buiten de Europese Unie. En dan heeft u, voorzitter van de Commissie, mij teleurgesteld omdat het u meer dan twee weken kostte om dezelfde woorden van medeleven en humaniteit uit te spreken over de duizenden onschuldige slachtoffers in Gaza als voor de slachtoffers van de vreselijke terreuraanval. U blijft volharden – net als veel regeringsleiders – in het herhalen van de mantra dat het allemaal moet binnen het internationaal recht. Dat gebeurt nu niet, en u weet dat. Er moet nu een staakt-het-vuren komen.

Maar ik eindig positief door u, mevrouw von der Leyen, ondanks mijn kritiek te bedanken voor uw inzet voor Oekraïne. Lever daar niet op in. Laat u niet afleiden door verkiezingen. De inzet van dit Parlement laat zien dat het kan. Effectief, meerderheidsbesluitvorming, scherpe keuzes met betrekking tot defensie, voor Europa, voor onze waarden.

Malik Azmani (Renew). – Mr President, dear colleagues, I start by paying respect for the Ukrainian people, who continue to fight for our common freedoms.

Colleagues, all Ukrainians ask for is weapons. They need to defend their country. Ukraine is losing ground because they don't have them. No one can say when or where Russia's invasion will end, but we know that any victory for Russia is a blow to European security. The less we do now, the higher cost later.

We must produce through the European defence industry, but this will take time. In the short term, what Ukraine needs must be jointly procured worldwide and the Commission should take emergency measures to remove all barriers and stimulate investment in the European defence industry. Now is the time to do what's necessary to enhance our European security.

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, President von der Leyen, Minister, colleagues, it's good to have this debate. It's good to have brought unity in this House. But looking at the crisis which we are confronted with, regarding European security, what is it worth to agree on a CFSP report if we don't have the national leaders that we would need to turn plans into action?

I applaud your speech, President von der Leyen, but other people elected to lead Europe are failing her. Let's just look at President Macron and Chancellor Scholz – sensing that the helpful leadership of President Biden is waning, they're presently at each other's throats, belittling, undercutting and insulting each other. While one of them is a hero of grandiose statements without real substance, the other – whose party is still partly an appeasement party – hides his timidity behind a play with alternative facts ad nauseam.

What about other big EU countries? Where's Italy? Europe's historical mother, barely visible. Where's proud Spain? Her leader, when he spoke to us here, had only empty words and no interest.

Some leadership comes from countries in the EU's north and east. The proposal from Estonia of 0.25% of GDP going to defence – that's a leadership proposal.

I think we have to rally citizens when leaders fail. So let's form a phalanx of parliaments in order to turn this crisis into a step forward. *Hic Rhodus, hic salta*.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Mr President, Russia and Belarus weaponise migrants against Europe's frontier. Yet the resolve of Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland holds strong – border barriers work.

Unfortunately, the Commission believes physical barriers don't efficiently improve border management and refuses to fund them. That's a security problem. They believe EU funds are better spent – I'm not joking – on circus workshops to integrate military-age male migrants and empty parties in the metaverse. Every year, hundreds of thousands of migrants are told to return. Everybody knows it: they don't! Because their countries won't even take them back.

Greece wants sanctions against those countries, an EU deportation mechanism. We should support them – it should be in this report – and use the sanctions to pay for physical border barriers. The Commission should immediately inform uncooperative countries that for every migrant they refuse, EUR 20 000 will be deducted from the EU funds they receive. And for every weaponised illegal migrant entering Europe, it will cost them EUR 200 000.

Some of you talk about Fortress Europe like it's a bad thing. I say: fund that wall and make Morocco, Turkey, Syria and Pakistan pay for it!

Der Präsident. – Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben jetzt noch 40 Redner, bis auf eine Ausnahme haben alle eine Minute. Wir sind jetzt zweimal rum. Wenn jeder seine Rede überzieht, dann werde ich der folgenden Vizepräsidentin empfehlen müssen, das Verfahren der blauen Karte abzukürzen, oder wir kommen total außer Kontrolle. Einige Fraktionsvorsitzende, die gesprochen haben, sind noch da. Wir müssen mit den Redezeiten was ändern, aber ich kann jetzt nicht anders handeln als wirklich auf die strenge Einhaltung der Redezeit zu achten, und ich bitte auch alle Kollegen um entsprechende Disziplin.

Anders Vistisen (ID). – Hr. formand! I dag skammer man sig over at være dansk, over at have en regering og en statsminister, der prøver at fortie og besnakke danskerne, når det kommer til de reelle intentioner bag EU's forsvarspolitik. Men her er man befriende ærlig. Her siger man åbent, at det handler om skabelsen af en egentlig europæisk hær. At det handler om et angreb på landenes vetoret i udenrigs og forsvarspolitikken. At det handler om at skabe en egentlig EU-udenrigspolitik. Alt det er noget forfejlet vrøvl. Det kommer kun til at skabe mere uenighed, mere ustabilitet i Europa, på kontinentet.

Men i det mindste er man ærlige om, at det er det, der er ambitionen. I Danmark fører vi en forløjet debat, hvor man prøver at sondre mellem det, der er ambitionen her, nemlig at EU skal blive en egentlig superstat, et Europas Forenede Stater med egen udenrigspolitik, med egen sikkerhedspolitik, med eget forsvar, mens man påstår, at man stadigvæk hylder idealet om nationalstaten i mit hjemland. Så i det mindste kan jeg takke jer for at være ærlige, selvom politikken konsekvent er elendig.

Özlem Demirel (The Left). – Herr Präsident! Frau von der Leyen sagte eben, Europa müsse aufwachen, und meinte damit: Wir müssen bereit sein, mehr aufzurüsten. Wir müssen bereit sein, kriegstüchtig zu sein. Deshalb möchte ich sagen und an die Völker in Europa appellieren und sagen: Ja, wacht auf, Völker dieser Erde!

Denn es sind Tage wie diese, die mich sehr nachdenklich stimmen. Ich erinnere mich an Tagen wie diesen an den Roman „Im Westen nichts Neues“, an die Szenen der jungen Männer, die voller Euphorie in den Krieg zogen und dann einige Jahre später verkrüppelt und desillusioniert aus dem Ersten Weltkrieg zurückgekehrt sind. Sie benutzen hier gerade hehre Worte wie Freiheit, Demokratie, Sicherheit, um Aufrüstung zu legitimieren. Dabei ist Aufrüstung und Krieg genau das Gegenteil davon. Imperiale Kriege sind nichts weiter als die größte Barbarei.

Seit Russlands Überfall auf die Ukraine sagen Sie nur noch: Rüstet auf! Rüstet auf! Größer, schneller, höher, mehr! Und was bedeutet das bitte? Herr Macron meinte gestern sogar, den neuen Napoleon spielen zu müssen und zu behaupten, wir müssen in der Ukraine Bodentruppen haben. Was bedeutet das anderes, als dass hier gerade der dritte Weltkrieg vorbereitet wird?

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Krieg ist das Gegenteil von Sicherheit. Die Völker Europas sehnen sich nach sozialer Sicherheit. Sie wollen Sicherheit. Deshalb kann ich nur sagen: Völker, wir müssen tatsächlich den Kriegstreibern hier in den Arm fallen und tatsächlich gegen die Aufrüstung eine starke Friedensbewegung aufbauen. Denn es geht um unsere Zukunft, um die Zukunft unserer Kinder.

Márton Gyöngyösi (NI). – Mr President, dear colleagues, the EU is facing the greatest security challenge since World War Two. While NATO remains the guarantee of its security, Europe has to demonstrate it can defend its own people, culture and values on its own, if necessary.

A precondition for that is the creation of the legal framework for a European army, both at the level of the EU and the individual Member States, followed by a harmonised and integrated defence industry, common military programmes and projects.

I would suggest that in its next term the Commission sets common European defence as a top priority and creates two major portfolios headed by a commissioner each. I am very glad that Ursula von der Leyen mentioned the first one in her statement: one responsible for the establishment of a common army, air force and navy, and another, which is equally important, for harmonising intelligence the activity of the national secret services.

This is critical in European defence given the recent level of Russian interference, targeted killings, hacking and cyberattacks on European territory.

Rasa Juknevičienė (PPE). – Mr President, first, my congratulations to Sweden. Now, we will be much stronger together, but we must realise that the war started by Russia is not a short-term crisis. Putin started this war thinking that democracies in general would not be able to withstand it. But we must be able to withstand.

We need a clear plan to help Ukraine to win. We need a consensus that each State allocates at least 0.25% of GDP to the victory of Ukraine. This should be the foundation of a real EU Defence Union.

On army, for me, an example of someone who is serious in the European Union about security is the army of Finland. Many EU countries have gotten used to comfort and prosperity and we have unprepared societies. We must consider returning to conscription and training of young people. Don't give up, Europe!

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Mr President, back in 2016 I had an honour of working on the report of this House on the European defence union. Then, the phrase itself raised many concerns. Unfortunately, time has proven us right.

Even though the geopolitical challenges in this mandate led to several positive steps in the field of common defence, the European Union should be more proactive and less reactive. Common foreign security and defence policies cannot remain the weakest links of our integrations.

Institutional reforms that will increase our cohesion and coherence are absolutely needed. Still, they must be based on a clear assessment of Europe's needs rather than being used as a political power tool. Only a strategically autonomous European Union can be the best guarantor of peace on our continent, and the best partner to our allies in the NATO.

For the EU, it's high time to go the extra mile for the sake of its own security and relevance.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, Europa moet wakker worden, voor onze vrijheid, voor onze veiligheid. Ursula von der Leyen heeft het gezegd, wel, ik zou het niet beter hebben kunnen zeggen. Meer uitgeven, meer samen uitgeven, beter uitgeven: absoluut. Werken aan een echte EU-defensie-industrie: absoluut. En dat zal nodig zijn, want herinner u het plan van commissaris Breton. We gingen 1 miljoen granaten produceren binnen het jaar. Helaas moet ik zeggen dat we dat niet hebben gehaald. Ik denk maar net de helft. We moeten ze elders gaan aankopen: in Zuid-Afrika, in Zuid-Korea en dan nog betaald met het geld van anderen.

Dat is waar momenteel onze Europese defensie-unie staat. Want eerlijk gezegd: waar staan we na twee jaar oorlog op ons continent? Waar? Hebben we een witboek voor onze Europese defensie? Hoe zit het met de relatie tussen Europa en de NAVO? We moeten weg van de unanimitéit.

We need a real Commissioner for Defence. We need one Minister for Foreign Affairs. We need, colleagues, a real European army. We need it for Europe, we need it for our citizens.

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, la creación de una política propia de defensa ha sido siempre una piedra en el camino de la integración europea. La invasión rusa de Ucrania quizá será el momento en que nos dimos cuenta de la urgencia de cambiar nuestro paradigma de seguridad y defensa. Además, nos estamos replanteando —más a la fuerza que por convicción— algunas de las bases que en buena parte han sustentado nuestra prosperidad relativa. Si realmente apostamos por la famosa autonomía estratégica, por ser un poder normativo o por el poder blando, quizás, no nos bastará. Porque querer más autonomía estratégica implica asumir más responsabilidad.

Pero la cuestión clave de una política de defensa europea es cómo utilizamos mejor, de manera más integrada y eficiente nuestras capacidades. Y en las propuestas de industria de defensa veo, con preocupación, que se pone el acento en producir más, con una lógica temeraria de multiplicación del gasto público, en vez de gastar mejor y con una auténtica visión de integración, superando marcos nacionales y mentales obsoletos. Gastar mejor en defensa tradicional para proteger más otras dimensiones de la seguridad humana relacionadas con la justicia social, el bienestar y la sostenibilidad.

Anna Fotyga (ECR). – Madam President, the accession of Sweden is a triumph of NATO, but also a triumph of unanimity, adding to our common security and building, even in difficulty, unity of the collective West – unity achieved in respect to opinions of even the smallest nations, in particular those having a long tradition of fighting for freedom and independence.

That, I address to our partners and future allies, in particular to Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova: my concerns are, tomorrow, to become yours. All our thoughts and efforts should be to help you to join the collective West as soon as possible and Ukraine to defeat Russia with our help.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Madam President, dear colleagues, first of all, unfortunately, Ms von der Leyen has left, but we have to understand, of course, that when we talk about the common security and defence policy in the EU, that there can only be a strong policy if we have strong Member States who are spending enough for defence and who are really realising the world we are living.

I was just checking the numbers before this debate. The current situation has been that Mr Macron is very big with the words, very nice words, but the fact is that the French has given to Ukraine only specifically military aid only for about EUR 600 million, from the GDP only 0.067 % has been to aid Ukraine.

When our Spanish colleagues were saying also very beautiful words about the common security policy and how to help Ukraine against Russia, Spain has spent only 0.072 % of their GDP to help Ukraine, and all expenses for defence in Spain are only 1.3 % of the GDP, so it's pretty far away from the target 2 %.

So I think we have to finish the stories about the common beautiful policy until we don't spend enough for our own...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, there are 18 condemnations in the common security and defence policy annual report. Not one of them is directed at Israel. Yet, unlike Israel, none of the 11 countries condemned are carrying out a genocide right now.

The report emphasises full support for Israel and for Israel's right to defend itself in accordance with international law. I would like the rapporteur of the report to please point out what system of law he is appealing to, because nowhere in international law does it allow for a state to claim the right of self-defence against a threat that emanates from a territory it occupies, from a territory that is kept under belligerent occupation.

Israel is a foreign nation illegally occupying Palestine. The Palestinians are the ones with the right to self-defence, not the Israelis. This part of it makes a mockery of the notion of international law of human rights. You are twisting international law to justify a genocide and then accuse everyone else of human rights abuses. This place is losing the plot.

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, μαζί με το NATO και τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, πρωταγωνιστεί σε βάρος των λαών στο δίχρονο ιμπεριαλιστικό πόλεμο στην Ουκρανία κόντρα στην καπιταλιστική Ρωσία, στη γενοκτονία του παλαιστινιακού λαού από το κράτος-κατακτητή Ισραήλ, ρίχνει λάδι στη φωτιά στον πόλεμο στην Υεμένη. Στο πλαίσιο της ΚΕΠΠΑ δίνονται δισεκατομμύρια για εξοπλισμό, τεχνητή νοημοσύνη και πυρομαχικά. Επίσης, εντείνονται οι διεργασίες νέας κλιμάκωσης για αποστολή στρατευμάτων του NATO και του ευρωστρατού, με «λαγό» τη δήλωση Μακρόν. Ως και επίτροπος Άμυνας ορίζεται.

Γεμάτη κινδύνους είναι η ευρωενωσιακή επιχείρηση Ασπίδες, η ανάληψη του συντονισμού της μέσω του Στρατηγείου της Λάρισας από την κυβέρνηση της Νέας Δημοκρατίας, όπως και η αποστολή της ελληνικής φρεγάτας ΥΔΡΑ· όλα για τα συμφέροντα των εφοπλιστών και των ομίλων διαμετακόμισης, με σύμπλευση και του ΣΥΡΙΖΑ και του ΠΑΣΟΚ. Τώρα να ακυρωθεί η επιχείρηση Ασπίδες και να επιστρέψει η ελληνική φρεγάτα. Καμία εμπλοκή. Ανυποχώρητος λαϊκός αγώνας του λαού ενάντια στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και τις κυβερνήσεις που καταπνίγουν τις λαϊκές ανάγκες στο βωμό των ιμπεριαλιστικών πολέμων και της εκμετάλλευσης.

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Madam President, colleagues, on Ukraine I said yesterday what needs to be said. I welcome that there is movement to enlarge the scope of the activities of the European Investment Bank to defence that will hopefully also end the hesitance of private banks to engage in defence-related activities.

I welcome the announcement of the Commission President that she intends to install a Defence Union Commissioner in the new Commission, and I would like to see it as an ambitious approach. As a Commissioner, this 'DUC' should be assigned all defence-related EU actions within the remit of the European Commission, and in particular on defence research, the support for the industrial base, military mobility, the procurement and transfer directives, resilience, defence and training. All Commission actions should be encompassed in a single Multiannual Defence in Union Instrument, which the DUC oversees. The DUC should be assigned by the Council the role of the EU's Special Representative for the Defence Union. In that role, he should in particular oversee the EDA and PESCO, military staff, military committee, military missions and operations and should be responsible for the relationship with NATO and should be assigned the responsibility to inform the European Council about the readiness of the EU to move to a common defence.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Fru talman! Jag vill rikta ett tack för allt det stöd vi har fått för Sveriges ansökan om att bli medlem i Nato. Rysslands invasion är ett hot mot hela Europas säkerhet, och EU måste fortsätta sitt stöd ekonomiskt, humanitärt och militärt.

Nu nås vi av rapporter om att ukrainska styrkor ransonerar och får slut på ammunition vid frontlinjen. Därför behöver vi stärka försvarsförmågan, och det arbetet handlar nu om att öka det militära stödet till Ukraina – och tiden är knapp. Vi måste donera mer, köpa in mer och producera mer ammunition.

I EU måste vi stå starka och hålla samman och inte låta oss splittras av de högerextrema krafterna. EU måste fortsätta sitt ihärdiga stöd till Ukraina nu.

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Madam President, Council representative, Commissioner, dear colleagues, the war in Ukraine, Russia's military aggression against Ukraine require an urgent and strong EU capacity to respond adequately to the situation. Limited defence budgets of Member States, insufficient defence industrial capacities and slow collective EU action are the main reasons for the EU's insufficient response towards war on our continent.

Colleagues, the European Commission must establish a kind of war cabinet, now and fully operational. It must consist of the President of the Commission and several key Commissioners responsible for finance, defence industry and common security and defence policy.

Secondly, decisions on a compulsory contribution from Member States to military support for Ukraine must be taken. A common level of support from national budgets is essential. Certain derogations can be provided to neutral ones.

And thirdly, the EU must use the instrument of European bonds to finance long-term defence and production capabilities, which must form the basis for the future creation of the European Defence Union.

Ville Niinistö (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, coming from the EU country that has the longest border with Russia, namely Finland, I cannot emphasise too much the need for us to move from words to operational strength in security and defence in Europe.

It is important that we realise that we have to urgently put the focus on conventional weapons for Ukraine and our own defence readiness in making European cooperation the rule for armed forces and defence industries.

The most urgent task is to realise that Russia is in war economy. Russia's war policies will not stop if we do not support Ukraine enough to force them to do that. Russia has increased, by the accounts of the Bank of Finland, by 35 % the production of war-related industries from the pre-war period in 2002. That means that they will continue as long as they can.

So it's not enough for us to support Ukraine as long as they need. We need to support them as much and as fast as they need, and that means strengthening European defence and security cooperation and putting the focus on quality and operational strength.

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Madam President, the most pressing challenge of our time is to contain the Russian aggression and to provide, immediately, more military help to Ukraine. We do not need more empty promises, but concrete deeds. We must deliver more guns. At home, we do not need new uniforms, we do not need to build a European army to compete with NATO and we do not need a never-ending debate about extending the QMV.

But we urgently need to generate more resources for our defences and we terribly need to modernise our obsolete armed forces. It's the way to make Europe stronger, and stronger NATO, to contain Russia and deter it. The entry of Sweden into NATO is certainly a great move in the right direction.

Francesca Donato (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi è quanto mai urgente esprimere la nostra ferma opposizione alla proposta di Macron di mandare i soldati dell'Unione europea in Ucraina, un'idea folle che scatenerrebbe senza dubbio un'escalation bellica, con conseguenze disastrose per tutta l'Europa.

La politica di sicurezza europea deve sempre rientrare in un quadro di difesa, basato su una cooperazione strategica tra i Paesi membri dell'Unione. Per ogni aspetto militare è fondamentale continuare a operare nell'ambito della NATO, l'Alleanza che ha garantito la pace e la sicurezza in Europa sino ad oggi dal dopoguerra. Allo stesso tempo, dobbiamo promuovere un tavolo negoziale fra Russia e Ucraina per cercare una soluzione pacifica e duratura al conflitto in corso.

Il dialogo e la diplomazia, accompagnati dalla deterrenza garantita dalla presenza dell'Alleanza Atlantica, sono sempre state le uniche vie efficaci per risolvere le controversie internazionali e garantire la pace nel nostro continente. Invito dunque tutti a riflettere sulle conseguenze delle nostre azioni e a lavorare insieme per restituire all'Europa stabilità, sicurezza e pace, non dimenticando che la difesa della vita umana e il rispetto delle minoranze sono i principi fondamentali che ci guidano.

Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE). – Madam President, our Ukrainian friends are fighting a war for us. Once again, others are fighting our wars for us. We must face reality: this is no longer sustainable. Europe needs to be able to protect itself.

This is a serious debate that will define our future capacity to protect our democratic societies and our international liberal order as we know it. It requires vision, leadership and responsibility.

I am happy to see that this debate is gaining more momentum and that the Commission, led by President von der Leyen, is doing all it can to provide us with more tools to keep strengthening our defence capabilities. There is much still to be done: more commitment from our Member States, especially from my country, Spain.

In any case, I am convinced that this debate is evolving and that in her second mandate as President of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, alongside this Parliament, will be able to consolidate a European defence policy which will increase our strategic autonomy, bring our European project to the next level and be a real sign to Putin, Xi Jinping, Iranian ayatollahs and all those threatening Europe.

Jens Geier (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, sehr geehrter Vertreter des Rates, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mehr Ausrüstung, Kapazitätsaufbau, Kooperation in der Verteidigungsindustrie, die Aufrechterhaltung der Verteidigungsfähigkeit der Ukraine im Kampf gegen das imperialistische Russland – alles das ist richtig. Was aber nicht funktionieren wird: in die Verteidigung zu investieren und allen anderen zu empfehlen, ihre Ansprüche zurückzustellen. Denn das wird unsere Gesellschaften zerreißen.

Energieversorgung und die Industrie klimaunschädlich zu machen kostet Geld. Kinder aus der Armut zu holen kostet Geld. Bezahlbare Wohnungen bereitzustellen kostet Geld. Digitalisierung, Innovation, Infrastruktur – alles das kostet Geld. Investitionen werden sich nicht aus den Haushalten darstellen lassen, und ohne Kredite wird es nicht gehen. Auf alle diese Bedarfe muss die EU und müssen ihre Mitgliedstaaten angemessen reagieren – ohne Sparappelle und Schuldenbremsen.

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, notre continent est aujourd'hui à un moment de bascule. La guerre y sévit par le choix d'un homme, Vladimir Poutine, qui veut la capitulation de l'Ukraine et notre asservissement. Les États-Unis pourraient faire en novembre un choix isolationniste et funeste.

Aujourd'hui, c'est à nous de choisir. Ou bien nous prenons le risque de voir la Russie gagner en Ukraine et les États-Unis nous tourner le dos, et ce risque serait considérable pour notre sécurité. Ou bien nous faisons sans attendre le choix d'une vraie défense européenne. Ce qui nous manque aujourd'hui, ce ne sont ni les idées, ni les initiatives. Et je veux saluer ici la conférence réunie à Paris pour accélérer et renforcer le soutien à l'Ukraine. Ce qui nous manque, ce sont les financements pour produire les armes qui feront reculer Vladimir Poutine et le dissuaderont de nous attaquer.

Alors n'attendons plus! Kaja Kallas a proposé un emprunt de défense commun, faisons-le! La BEI pourrait investir dans la défense, donnons-lui le mandat pour le faire! Si nous voulons rester en paix, il nous faut bâtir sans plus tarder l'Union européenne de la défense dans les faits, et plus seulement dans les mots.

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Gut, über Europas Verteidigungsstrategie hier zu sprechen. Vorab ein Satz, den Sie sich auf der Zunge zergehen lassen sollten: Willst du Krieg? Dann schicke Waffen. Willst du Frieden? Dann schicke Diplomaten. Ich habe das Gefühl – angesichts dessen, worüber hier diskutiert wird –, dass hier ganz bewusst ein Kriegsszenario nicht geschürt wird, aber zumindest am Köcheln gehalten wird, was etwas komplett Falsches ist.

Ich erinnere daran, dass wir mittlerweile eine Diskussion führen, EU-Truppen in die Ukraine hineinzuschicken. Ich erinnere daran – was aus meiner Sicht absurd ist –, dass wir mittlerweile eine Diskussion führen, die Europäische Union mit Atomwaffen ausstatten zu wollen. Ich erinnere an die – aus Sicht eines österreichischen Politikers – absurde Situation, *Sky Shield* implementieren zu wollen, was für uns zwei Milliarden Euro an Belastungen wäre.

Ich sage als Österreicher: Besser, ich nehme die zwei Milliarden Euro, stecke sie in das österreichische Bundesheer zur Absicherung unserer Neutralität, anstatt hier diese kriegerische Geschichte weiter voranzutreiben. Ich bleibe dabei: Österreich ist ein neutrales Land, und wir könnten, sollten und müssten uns hier aktiv als Ort des Friedens anbieten. Das wäre der zehnmal bessere Weg, als hier diese Säbelrasselei weiter voranzutreiben.

Marcel de Graaff (NI). – Voorzitter, de ambitie van de EU om mee te tellen op wereldniveau is ongeloofwaardige propaganda. De EU is een samenraapsel van totaal verschillende landen en culturen, uitgehold door massamigratie, tot over de oren in de schulden, de-industrialiserend, hard op weg om de eigen voedsel- en watervoorziening te vernietigen. De EU wordt een derdewereldland, een derderangs Amerikaanse vazal.

De EU en de NAVO hebben deze oorlog tegen Rusland economisch, politiek en op het slagveld verloren. Daarom bespraken westerse regeringsleiders deze week het sturen van Europese soldaten naar Oekraïne. Ze hebben het over onze kinderen, onze vaders, broers en zonen, waarmee ze deze zinloze oorlog willen rekken om nog meer miljarden te verdienen aan de wapenindustrie. Een EU-defensie-unie is een doodlopende weg van escalatie en oorlogshitserij. Er is maar één weg naar veiligheid en dat is de weg van vrede, dat is de weg van onderhandelingen met respect voor alle partijen.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Voorzitter, vicevoorzitter van de Europese Commissie, staatssecretaris, collega's, onze defensie versterken moet nu eerst en vooral gebeuren door de snelle ontwikkeling van voldoende performante defensie-capaciteiten, en dat inderdaad met een sterke industrie waarin onze kmo's alle kansen krijgen. We zien daartoe uit naar het nieuwe strategische kader EDIS en we staan klaar om de Europese Commissie daarvoor te feliciteren. Maar laat ons tegelijk meteen eerlijk zijn met de burgers: de gevraagde budgetten en het nodige maatschappelijke draagvlak zullen overtuiging en vastberadenheid vragen van ons allemaal, zeker in het licht van de oorlog in Oekraïne.

De versterking van onze defensie gaat natuurlijk over veel meer dan onze industrie alleen. De budgettaire afspraken gemaakt in NAVO-verband moeten erg ernstig worden genomen, ook in België. Het is duidelijk dat de impact daarvan ook voelbaar zal zijn voor onze burgers en daarom zijn we dringend toe aan een maatschappelijk debat over het belang en de kost van de nood aan veiligheid.

Javi López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, el contexto geopolítico ha cambiado radicalmente durante los últimos años y ha significado el fin de la inocencia para Europa y su despertar estratégico.

Una vecindad con graves conflictos en sus puertas, una invasión a Ucrania que ha roto la arquitectura de seguridad europea y, seamos honestos, la posibilidad de que Trump vuelva a la Casa Blanca y que nuestra dependencia del vínculo atlántico haga que nuestra seguridad se vea afectada. Tenemos que dejar de externalizar nuestra política de seguridad.

Durante los últimos años, hemos contribuido para reforzar la industria europea de la defensa mediante la Ley de adquisición común con el EDIRPA, un programa de inversiones europeas, el Reglamento relativo al apoyo a la producción de municiones y la capacidad de despliegue rápido. Y, hay que decirlo, una respuesta madura al apoyo a Ucrania en materia de asistencia militar y una política de sanciones sin precedentes. Pero no es suficiente, necesitamos aumentar nuestras capacidades y modernizarlas en materia de defensa, una mayor cooperación europea y el desarrollo verdadero de la industria europea para ser un actor geopolítico creíble y autónomo en el mundo.

Bart Groothuis (Renew). – Voorzitter, dames en heren, ik sta hier vandaag voor u als trans-Atlanticus, dus als iemand die waardeert dat onze militaire veiligheid enkel is gegarandeerd bij het superieure militaire strategische vermogen van de Amerikanen. Dat is de belangrijkste reden dat Poetin voorsnag Europese NAVO-lidstaten niet aanvalt.

Maar die Amerikaanse vrienden hebben wij in Europa van onszelf vervreemd. Bij vrijwel alle wapensystemen die absoluut noodzakelijk zijn om op schaal op te kunnen treden, maar die ook te duur zijn om zelf te ontwikkelen of om zelf te kopen, laten we het over aan de Amerikanen, en daardoor kunnen wij onszelf nu niet verdedigen. Dus, die systemen gaan we vanaf nu in Europa zelf ontwikkelen of zelf kopen, in Europa of in de VS.

Het Defensiefonds van 100 miljard is de absolute noodzaak. Maar een volwaardige Europese pijler binnen de NAVO heeft ook een Europese Veiligheidsraad nodig met landen die niet in de EU zitten, maar wel in de NAVO: Noorwegen, het Verenigd Koninkrijk, Turkije. Wacht niet met het opzetten van zo'n structuur, maar begin daarmee vandaag.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Ministra, Senhor Vice-Presidente,

primeiro queria saudar a adesão da Suécia à NATO que é um facto estratégico fundamental para a Aliança Atlântica e para a Europa.

A invasão da Ucrânia pela Rússia de Putin é um desafio existencial à União Europeia, à democracia, à liberdade no mundo e, por isso, é fundamental apontarmos para uma União Europeia da defesa.

Na indústria da defesa, na cooperação militar, que seja o pilar europeu da NATO, que não dê lugar a nenhum exército europeu e que, pelo contrário, reforce a NATO, que, aliás, é uma organização amplamente apoiada pelos países europeus e, em particular, pelo meu país, Portugal. Queria, aliás, dizer que não deve haver deslocação de tropas para a Ucrânia sob o risco de exponenciarmos o conflito.

E queria, finalmente, lamentar que o Partido Socialista português, aqui pela voz de um dos seus eurodeputados, tenha vindo com um discurso viscoso, ambíguo, claramente alinhado para fazer uma aliança com os dois partidos que são anti-NATO, numa altura de guerra. Pedro Marques, que pena estar aliado ao Bloco de Esquerda, ao Partido Comunista que são contra a NATO.

Portugal precisa da defesa da NATO. É uma pena que os socialistas portugueses com um discurso que não falou sobre política externa nem de defesa, tenham vindo... *(A Presidente retira a palavra ao orador)*

Νίκος Παπανδρέου (S&D). – Madam President, colleagues, I hear the calls for peace from one of the colleagues and for negotiations. But the people we're talking about do not listen to negotiations.

And perhaps if we are a third-world country, it's because we do not have a strong defence policy. Something happened recently and that is called Ukraine. Did we shake our paralysis? Did we wake up for a new voice? Are we changing, building a new Europe? Yes.

In that distant and also close Ukraine, we show that when we want, we can support our ideals. However, the world still doubts us. They doubt us because of our response or absence of response to the destruction of Palestine, to the Kurds in Syria, to Armenia and Central Africa.

And if Trump wins, as Javi López said, we need to have our own defence policy because the umbrella of protection will be full of holes. At some point, we have to give our citizens the sense that Europe can protect its own borders from aggressors.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (Renew). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vogliamo essere noi stessi gli artefici del nostro destino, oppure vogliamo ridurci a essere la scacchiera su cui altre potenze giocheranno nei prossimi anni? Basta ambiguità, basta tatticismi! Dopo un assurdo letargo di quasi 70 anni, è tempo di creare un vero esercito europeo.

Quanto previsto dallo Strategic Compass e già superato dal dramma della guerra in Ucraina. Serve istituire subito una forza di reazione rapida di almeno 50-60 mila unità, non le 5-6 mila attualmente previste. Una forza che sia multi-dominio, in grado di operare con asset e unità tanto nei domini convenzionali, tanto in quelli emergenti, cyberspazio su tutti.

Serve rinforzare la base industriale europea nel settore della difesa, decuplicando il Fondo europeo di difesa e incentivando più cooperazioni rafforzate tra gli Stati volenterosi. E creiamo infine un'accademia militare europea, un quartier generale europeo, così da avere un comando strategico unitario per tutte le nostre missioni e operazioni.

Chiaramente, tutto questo sarà inutile se ancora decideremo all'unanimità. Serve quindi anche passare alla maggioranza qualificata subito. Questo è quello di cui abbiamo bisogno per difendere l'Ucraina e per difendere l'Europa. Questo è il tempo del coraggio, della serietà, è il tempo dell'azione!

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća,

prije svega, želim čestitati izvijestitelju Davidu McAllisteru na izvrsnom izvješću koje obuhvaća sve aspekte vanjske i sigurnosne politike koja je bila izuzetno zahtjevna u prethodnoj godini. Rat u Ukrajini, pogrom Židova i talačka kriza na Bliskom istoku, geopolitičke napetosti u Indopacifiku te rastuće tenzije na zapadnom Balkanu, sve su to izazovi za naše granice, a i za unutarnju stabilnost, kao i sigurnost europskih građana.

Dopustite također da zahvalim izvijestitelju što je uključio moj amandman, bitan za mir i sigurnost, koji uključuje važnost principa podjele vlasti u Bosni i Hercegovini, kao što je i vlast bila dogovorena za *Good Friday Agreement* u Sjevernoj Irskoj, putem pravednog izbornog zakona koji poštuje presude Ustavnog suda, jedinog tijela koje tumači Daytonsko-pariški mirovni sporazum o legitimnom predstavljanju, te presude međunarodnih sudova.

Nedavno je usvojeno izvješće o preventivnoj diplomaciji. Ti amandmani također su uključeni u ovo izvješće o zajedničkoj vanjskoj i sigurnosnoj politici gdje se traži od međunarodne zajednice da razmisli o naučenim lekcijama, da ne gasimo sukobe nego da ih preveniramo.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, empieza ya el tercer año de guerra en un momento en que la situación militar de Ucrania se ha deteriorado. El camino a seguir parece claro: tenemos que reforzar y modernizar nuestra industria de defensa y facilitar cuanto antes munición al ejército ucraniano. La Comisión Europea está actuando ya en este sentido: pienso en el Fondo Europeo de Defensa, el Reglamento de Apoyo a la Producción de Municiones, el llamado Reglamento EDIRPA y otras propuestas que hoy no se han anunciado.

Yo veo bien un comisario para la industria de defensa, pero también deseo que, dentro de las formaciones del Consejo, haya un Consejo de Ministros de Defensa. La amenaza rusa es brutal, gravísima, pero no podemos olvidar otros riesgos a nuestra seguridad. Pienso en la crisis de Oriente Medio, a la que no se ha prestado la atención necesaria en los últimos años, o la grave situación que atraviesa el Sahel, que tiene repercusiones directas en nuestras fronteras.

Por último, la OTAN es esencial, pero los europeos debemos responsabilizarnos cada vez más de nuestra propia defensa y aumentar nuestras capacidades. Parece claro que no podemos depender exclusivamente de los Estados Unidos si, además, no sabemos quién ocupará la Casa Blanca dentro de unos meses.

Krzysztof Brejza (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Europa stoi dzisiaj przed wyzwaniem, przed którym nie stała od czasu zakończenia II wojny światowej. Realnym zagrożeniem dla Europy, dla jej bezpieczeństwa jest putinowska Rosja, która w sposób bestialski zaatakowała Ukrainę. My, Polacy, wielokrotnie w swojej historii doświadczaliśmy skutków imperiaлизmu rosyjskiego. Cały czas doświadczamy wojny informacyjnej, a także bezwzględnych działań w sferze gospodarczej. Tylko Unia Europejska jako silna i skuteczna wspólnota, ale przede wszystkim wspólnota obronna, tylko taka Unia Europejska jest w stanie odeprzeć zagrożenia płynące ze strony reżimu kremlowskiego.

Premier polskiego rządu Donald Tusk powiedział ostatnio, że nadszedł czas, by przebudzili się politycy i przebudziły się społeczeństwa Europy, bo świat trzęsie się w posadach. Jak nigdy wcześniej dziś potrzeba tego przebudzenia. Potrzeba europejskiej wspólnoty w dziedzinie obronnej. Dziś jest ten czas, by zbudować razem bezpieczną i silną Europę, taką, która jest zdolna do obrony swoich wartości, do obrony pokoju, demokracji, obrony nie tylko dla nas teraz, ale również dla przyszłych pokoleń.

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Madam President, colleagues, planning the future of our defence and security, we need to get rid of the illusion that our security can be built only on our fears.

Now, with Russian war against Ukraine, we are lost in the crossroads of our fears. We rightly fear what will happen with our security if Russia will win in Ukraine. But at the same time, we fear that chaos will happen in Russia, if Russia will be defeated. We fear a long-term war in Ukraine; that we shall become tired of such a war. And we fear to give Ukraine enough weapons for the victory in the near future, because we are afraid that Putin will escalate.

President Roosevelt once prudently said, 'The only thing we have to fear is fear itself.' Let us stop our fears and let us declare: Putin needs to be defeated and he will be defeated. And we shall invest into Putin's defeat. That will open the doors for positive transformations in Russia.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, discutăm consolidarea apărării comune. Din păcate, prea puțin s-a vorbit despre pace. Doamna Președintă a Comisiei din nou pleacă după ce își spune punctul de vedere. Nu-i este interesant să afle și punctele de vedere ale Parlamentului. Da, sigur că trebuie să consolidăm apărarea, dar trebuie să luptăm și pentru pace.

Asta așteaptă cetățenii europeni și uite, țara mea are 2,5 % din buget pentru apărare, dar, din păcate, nu este tratată la fel ca celelalte state care au mai puțin pentru apărare și cel mai bun exemplu este Austria. Este discriminată România și la fermieri, și la Schengen. Vorbim aici de consolidare: pentru a putea să consolidăm apărarea și pentru a lupta pentru pace, avem nevoie să ne propunem măcar acest lucru.

Nu avem diplomatic un rezultat foarte bun și da, poate că este bună propunerea să avem un comisar pentru pace, dar ce facem acum? Popoarele sărăcesc, oamenii mor pe front și nu reușim să găsim soluția de pace.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća,

poštovani francuski liberali, nemojte kriviti Sjedinjene Američke Države za loše vojno stanje europskih država jer su vas oni uvijek pozivali da povećate vojni proračun, a vaše lijevo-liberalne vlade taj su proračun smanjivale.

Predstavnik socijalista kaže da bi Europska unija trebala biti moralni svjetionik, i ovaj Parlament vrlo rado prihvaća tu ulogu, pa onda svima na svijetu objašnjavamo što bi trebali raditi. No, pitanje je s kojim autoritetom. Mi demografski propadamo, gospodarski nazadujemo, vojno smo sve slabiji i onda bismo pozvali sve druge da budu poput nas?

Trebate priznati da ste vodili pogrešne društvene, gospodarske i migrantske politike. Nama treba jaka Europa, zdravo društvo temeljeno na obitelji, zdravo gospodarstvo temeljeno na slobodi, a ne na socijalističkoj jednakosti na koju se poziva predsjednik socijalista, a koja nikad nije donijela napredak u gospodarstvu, i treba nam suradnja s NATO-om, suradnja s državama s kojima dijelimo istu kulturu i civilizaciju.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora presidenta de la Comisión, las ambiciones proclamadas por la presidenta Von der Leyen de que la Unión Europea madure de una vez hacia un actor geopolítico relevante con una política exterior de seguridad y defensa y, no digamos, que la próxima Comisión incorpore una cartera de Defensa estarán incompletas si no se aborda la reforma institucional que permita superar las contradicciones que muestra la Unión Europea a la hora de tomar sus propias decisiones y que, además, lo haga superando la crítica del doble estándar y del doble rasero.

Si hemos actuado unidos defendiendo a Ucrania frente a la brutal agresión de Putin, debemos hacer lo mismo en la otra esquina del Mediterráneo, ante la desproporción brutal de la ofensiva militar israelí en Gaza, exigiendo no solamente el alto el fuego con una voz audible y unitaria sino, además, el cumplimiento de las medidas cautelares de la Corte Internacional de Justicia y, sobre todo, la solución diplomática de los dos Estados.

Андрей Новаков (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, през 2023 г. Евробарометър направи проучване: 8 от 10 европейски граждани искат повече пари за отбрана. 8 от 10 искат общи обществени поръчки за отбранителна техника. 8 от 10 искат координирани действия, за да се отбраняваме сами. Сигурно не сте пропуснали да забележите, че това е 2023 г., а през 2024 г. светът не е станал по-спокоен.

Според мен сигналът е ясен. Всички в Европа искат обединени усилия за това да се пазим заедно. Как да го направим, освен да заделим повече пари? Първо, изграждане на инфраструктура, която позволява свободно движение на отбранителна техника. Нали не си представяте да се отбраняваме, докато нашата отбранителна техника чака в задръствания, както се случва и с камионите? Това нещо не може да продължи. Имаме да изграждаме тенти, транспортна мрежа, която да позволи свободното придвижване в спокойно време на хора и стоки, но когато се налага да се отбраняваме – и на отбранителна техника. Задължително, бърза процедура за изграждане на такива обекти. Хората да видят, че Европа стои зад тях в тези трудни моменти.

Costas Mavrides (S&D). – Madam President, I applaud the Commission President's initial apologetic statement that illusions have been shattered and, in fact, it is our moral duty to defend a sovereign country, such as Ukraine, being the victim of Russian aggression.

But illusions are still prevailing. Here are some examples. We can't have strategic autonomy with increasing dependency of our food supply on sources outside of EU. We can't have internal security with a socially divided EU that doesn't prioritise the concerns and needs of its own citizens. By the way, European sovereignty is already violated by the illegal occupation of the Republic of Cyprus. And this is EU soil, for which matter the Commission's President remains silent.

Finally, to accomplish our economic, social, environmental goals, we need common defence and security and that is a proof that we care about EU in total.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałem powiedzieć, że w świetle tego, o czym mówiła pani Ursula von der Leyen, zupełnie niezrozumiałe jest ciągłe przesuwanie zapowiadanego od dawna EDIP-u, strategii rozwoju europejskiego przemysłu obronnego. Chciałem się zapytać pana przewodniczącego Šefčoviča, jakie są tego przyczyny? To jest świadectwo jakiejś naszej wewnętrznej słabości i zupełnie jest niezgodne z tym, co mówiliśmy tutaj o konieczności szybkości działania i naszej jedności. Bardzo prosiłbym o szybką decyzję i wytłumaczenie, dlaczego takie opóźnienie ma miejsce.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señora presidenta, quería aprovechar este debate sobre política europea de seguridad y defensa para añadir una propuesta concreta a las que ya se han planteado.

De la misma manera que de la mano de Nacho Sánchez Amor y Josep Borrell se ha lanzado ya una propuesta de academia diplomática europea, creo que debemos también poner en marcha una verdadera academia militar europea, actualizando y reforzando la actual Escuela Europea de Seguridad y Defensa.

Necesitamos un programa anual y permanente para formar a los oficiales de todos los ejércitos de los Estados miembros, como paso previo para que puedan participar en la Capacidad de Despliegue Rápido de la UE, en las misiones de la política exterior y de seguridad común y también para hacerlo —con un enfoque verdaderamente europeo— en un marco de clases multinacionales, desarrollando un *esprit de corps* y complicidades personales con carácter previo a la participación en las misiones.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Unia to nie tylko dotacje i fundusze. Unia to wspólnota wartości, której fundamentem musi być wspólna polityka obronna. Putin codziennie przelewa krew niewinnych ludzi na wschodzie, a wygrana izolacjonisty w Stanach jest realna. Europo, czas się kończy. Czas się ogarnąć. Czas przygotować się na najgorsze. Czas przełamać głos krótkowzrocznych populistów. Szydło, Jaki i Saryusz-Wolski, wszyscy jak jeden mąż głosowali przeciwko współpracy obronnej w Europie, ale teraz ich głos już nic nie znaczy. Teraz pojawia się szansa na reformę Unii, bo Polska wróciła do gry. Po pierwsze europejski legion, czyli unijne siły szybkiego reagowania. Po drugie, wspólny rozwój sektora zbrojeniowego. Po trzecie, tarcza atomowa dla Europy. NATO to nasz główny gwarant bezpieczeństwa, ale musimy być gotowi na każdy scenariusz.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A *Uachtaráin*, Ireland is a neutral country, but neutrality doesn't make you immune to modern phenomena such as terrorist attacks, cyberattacks, disinformation campaigns, political interference. An example was when our HSE was attacked, a cyberattack, a year or two ago, doing significant damage to our health services.

Also, Ireland hosts, in its territorial waters, thousands of energy pipelines and subsea cables, which are vital for not just Ireland, but the European economy. Russian forces were seen to be observing and monitoring and mapping these some time ago, but our defence forces are underinvested in and are incapable of responding.

We need to work with our European partners and invest more in, particularly, our defence forces, so that they can at least monitor and help defend us from these type of attacks.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, gerbiami kolegos. Sveikinu Švediją jungiantis prie NATO. Taip pat noriu atsakyti dešiniams ir kairiesiems, kurie kalbėjo apie taiką. Taika gali įsivyrėti momentaliai, tik tam yra viena sąlyga: agresorius Putinas turi atitraukti savo karines pajėgas iš Ukrainos. O kol to nėra, reikia gintis, reikia remti Ukrainą ginklais tiek, kiek reikia, ir tokiais, kokiais reikia. Reikia tą daryti solidariai, nes kovai su kovo įveikimu mes paskyrėme septynis šimtus milijardų eurų, o paramai Ukrainai, deja, – tik 50 milijardų. Mes turime stiprinti Europos gynybos pramonę, bet to taip pat neužtenka. Mums reikia sustiprinti Europos Sąjungos sienas, kurios ribojasi su Putino agresija. Reikia ne tvorų nuo emigrantų, bet reikia gynybinių barjerų. Ir tam reikia Europos Sąjungos lėšų, kad agresoriui Putinui nesinorėtų patikrinti mūsų sienų.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

David McAllister, Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte Ihnen allen danken für diese offene und konstruktive Debatte. Es ging ja heute Morgen nicht nur um Sicherheits— und Verteidigungspolitik, sondern auch um den Jahresbericht des Europäischen Parlaments zur Umsetzung der Gemeinsamen Außen— und Sicherheitspolitik wie auch um den Bericht des Kollegen Sven Mikser zur Umsetzung der Gemeinsamen Sicherheits— und Verteidigungspolitik.

Ich habe die zwei Stunden sehr aufmerksam zugehört und habe festgestellt, dass es doch einen breiten Konsens in diesem Haus gibt zwischen den Fraktionen, dass wir unsere Gemeinsame Außen— und Sicherheitspolitik, dass wir unsere Gemeinsame Sicherheits— und Verteidigungspolitik weiter stärken müssen, mit Ausnahme der Vertreter von der ganz linken Extremen und der ganz rechten Extremen. Da dieser Bericht der letzte dieser Art ist, den wir in dieser Wahlperiode beschließen werden, könnte er auch – und das wäre mein Wunsch – zusammen mit dem Bericht des Kollegen Mikser als *guideline* dienen für die nächste Kommission, für die Kommissionspräsidentin und auch für den nächsten Hohen Vertreter und Vizepräsidenten der Kommission.

Eines ist in jedem Fall klar: Wir erleben einen geopolitischen Epochenbruch. Deshalb ist es umso wichtiger – wahrscheinlich wichtiger als je zuvor –, dass die Europäische Union endlich – wie es Jean-Claude Juncker einmal genannt hat – Weltpolitikfähigkeit erlernt. Wir müssen als Europäische Union endlich unserer außen— und sicherheitspolitischen Rolle in dieser Welt gerecht werden.

Ich möchte nochmals allen danken, die hier im Plenarsaal anwesend sind, die zu dieser Debatte beigetragen haben, nochmals danken den Schattenberichterstattern und dem Team des Hohen Vertreters und Vizepräsidenten der Kommission und insbesondere auch dem Vizepräsidenten der Kommission Maroš Šefčovič, der heute die gesamten zwei Stunden hier im Plenarsaal mit dabei war. Ansonsten möchte ich vollkommen das unterstreichen, was Kommissionspräsidentin Ursula von der Leyen heute zur Sicherheits— und Verteidigungspolitik gesagt hat. Wir müssen jetzt endlich konkrete Schritte gehen.

Sven Mikser, rapporteur. – Madam President, Vice-President of the Commission, representative of the Council, colleagues, I will not repeat what I said during my initial remarks. Let me just say that it has been a very constructive debate and I believe it has further underscored the need for a more confident and more militarily capable European Union.

The CSDP implementation report and also the CFSP implementation report that we are going to be voting on later today, I believe lay out a good and credible path towards that more capable and more confident European Union. It's been aiming at a moving target and it will continue to be aiming at moving target, but we will have to continue adjusting our sights and making the effort.

I would like to finally thank all the colleagues, especially the shadow rapporteurs, as well as the staff, the assistants and the advisors who have contributed to putting together this report.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, State Secretary, honourable Members of the European Parliament, first, I would like to thank you for this very important debate, which all political leaders of the groups and most of the honourable Members clearly called a milestone.

You would recall that a few years ago, talking about European sovereignty, strategic autonomy or European defence was very difficult in Brussels, but also in this House. But it's quite clear that two wars close to our borders, energy prices crisis and rough geopolitics, which are shaking the international post-Second World War order and security architecture, galvanised the European response. I would like to reassure all of you that we in the European Commission hear you loud and clear and we respect your calls for urgent action.

Ms Hayer was referring to the European miracle of peace, and it's clear to all of us that this miracle must be defended now. Ms Reintke was rightly underlining then that United Europe is more secure Europe. Therefore, I appreciate the overwhelming support for strategic autonomy and common procurement.

We know that common procurement or common purchase works. As the common purchase of vaccines, we have incredible results for common purchase of gas, including the latest round concluded yesterday. It clearly demonstrates that if the European Union acts together and uses its political weight and economic strength, we always get excellent results because the world listens and business acts. And I am sure that we will succeed with this approach also in the area of defence.

I would like to thank both rapporteurs, Mr McAllister and Mr Mikser, for the important reports on CFSP and CSDP. And I would like also reassure all of you that all your interventions regarding unwavering support for Ukraine, the importance of complementarity of our actions with NATO, creating conducive environment for financing an investment for defence sector, calls for better interoperability, increase of production capacity and more coordination will be properly reflected in our proposals on the EU Defence Industrial Strategy and investment programmes which we will table next week.

As you probably heard me saying in different settings, I am convinced that European unity is our most precious currency. So let's use it wisely and again, to build Europe, which should be even stronger, more secure and ready for this new insecure world.

Mathieu Michel, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, honourable Members, allow me to thank you for your longstanding support to the EU's common security and defence policy.

Today's debate illustrates the importance of staying united and firm in supporting Ukraine with the tools to defend itself. In the European Council of 14 and 15 December, EU leaders stressed the importance of timely, predictable and sustainable military support for Ukraine, notably through the European Peace Facility and the EU Military Assistance Mission, as well as through direct bilateral assistance by Member States.

At the Special European Council of 1 February, EU leaders gave a clear task to the Council to reach agreement on the Ukraine Assistance Fund by early March 2024. Work is currently ongoing in the Council.

The European Union has stood by Ukraine and for peace since day one, and we will remain steadfast in our support until Ukraine prevails against Russia's aggression. It is important to strengthen the defence industrial sector and to work jointly to better create synergies in defence production. In this sense, we are taking concrete steps: the conclusions of the December European Council called for the swift presentation of the European defence industrial strategy.

The Commission, together with the High Representative, should present this strategy very shortly. The aim of the strategy is to strengthen the European defence technology industrial base in the broad sense. The issues of access to war materials and critical technologies, harmful dependencies and security of supply are part of this discussion.

Its aim, however, is not to build a protectionist industry. Its aim is to build a competitive industrial base that will help support and address Member States' and allies' requirements. The strategy will offer a framework and vision for the next years, it will not in itself be a legal or regulatory instrument.

Besides, the European Council has also called on the Commission to present a proposal for a European Defence Investment Programme, or EDIP. EDIP was announced in the joint communication on defence investment gaps. EDIP would be an industrial programme building on EDIRPA, ASAP and possible other elements. The EDIP Regulation could serve as the anchor for future joint development and procurement projects of high common interest at EU level.

If we want to be a geopolitical player in an increasingly dangerous world, we need to have the means to defend ourselves, but also the capacity to respond to challenges and emerging conflicts in other parts of the world, be it in Africa, the Middle East or even the Indo-Pacific.

President. – Thank you very much State Secretary Michel, thanks Vice-President Šefčovič, thanks to the rapporteurs David McAllister and Sven Mikser and of course to everybody who participated in the debate.

The debate is closed. The vote will be held today.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Marc Botenga (The Left), par écrit. – Parfois, nous lisons que la collaboration militaire entre pays européens permettrait de dépenser mieux et donc de dépenser moins. La présidente de la Commission européenne vient d'avouer que ce n'est pas l'objectif. L'objectif est de dépenser plus. Et comment? En offrant des subsides énormes et gratuits aux multinationales de l'armement, dont les cours en bourse se portent pourtant très bien depuis la guerre en Ukraine. C'est une erreur. Cette politique renforcera les entreprises d'armement au détriment d'autres entreprises. D'autre part, certaines entreprises qui pourraient produire par exemple des avions Canadair de lutte contre les incendies seront poussées à produire des avions de chasse. Une militarisation de l'industrie. Direction une économie au service de la guerre. Ce n'est pas cette Europe-là dont nous avons besoin. L'Europe ne doit pas s'inspirer du modèle impérialiste américain, qui dépense des sommes folles afin de pouvoir faire la guerre partout dans le monde. Il faut d'abord rationaliser les dépenses. Nous dépensons déjà bien plus que d'autres pays, pensons à la Russie, l'Inde, ou le Brésil. D'une part, nous devons nous focaliser sur la défense stricte du territoire. D'autre part, nous devons investir dans une sécurité collective sur le continent européen, seule garantie d'une paix réelle.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR), na piśmie. – Jeśli chcesz pokoju, gotuj się do wojny. To przysłowie łacińskie jest dziś jak najbardziej aktualne. Powinniśmy je bardzo poważnie wprowadzać w życie. Historia i rzeczywistość wokół nas potwierdzają prawdziwość tych słów. Niestety, wojna nie jest dziś dla nas zagrożeniem hipotetycznym, ale trwa realnie za wschodnią granicą UE i zagraża nam wszystkim. Rosyjski agresor nie zamierza wycofywać się z ukraińskiego terytorium ani przerywać zbrodniczej napaści. Coraz częściej grozi krajom sąsiadującym z Ukrainą, w tym Polsce. Naszym obowiązkiem jest być gotowymi, by bronić naszej wolności, życia i wartości. Dlatego przystąpienie Szwecji do NATO jest dobrą decyzją, która powinna być też sygnałem dla Ukrainy, Gruzji czy Mołdawii – państw partnerskich i sojuszników NATO. Tylko działając wspólnie, dbając o współpracę transatlantycką, mamy realną szansę, by powstrzymać imperialistyczną, agresywną politykę Rosji i Putina. Ukraina nie może być osamotniona w obronie przed siepacami Putina. Jeśli nie zostanie on z Ukrainy wyparty, kto wie, gdzie pójdzie za ciosem? Z terrorystami się nie pertraktuje, a lista rosyjskich zbrodni z każdym dniem jest coraz dłuższa. Wspólnie i solidarnie walczmy z tym zagrożeniem, bądźmy tak gotowi, jak to tylko możliwe, bo nie mamy żadnej gwarancji, że rosyjska agresja nie uderzy w kolejne państwo.

Witold Jan Waszczykowski (ECR), na piśmie. – Z niepokojem odbieram kolejną debatę o europejskiej wspólnej polityce bezpieczeństwa i obrony. Dowodzi ona, że historia nie uczy Europejczyków. Przypomnę, że nie poradziliśmy sobie sami w pierwszej i drugiej wojnie światowej. Ani w zimnej wojnie, ani w konflikcie bałkańskim. Nie daliśmy rady sami w Libii ani w walce z państwem islamskim ISIS. Jesteśmy bezradni wobec rosyjskiej agresji na Ukrainę. Unia nawet nie próbuje rozwiązać ostatniej odsłony konfliktu palestyńsko-izraelskiego. Dlaczego, mimo tak negatywnych doświadczeń, znowu marzymy o samodzielności militarnej, o strategicznej autonomii, kompasie etc.? Wojna rosyjsko-ukraińska powinna definitywnie przekonać nas do ścisłej współpracy transatlantyckiej. Właśnie teraz, gdy za oceanem pojawiają się wątpliwości, powinniśmy przedstawiać wiarygodną ofertę współpracy zamiast autonomicznych, egoistycznych rozwiązań.

Niepokoï również lekcewaŹenie faktów. Nie mamy w Europie wspólnej definicji i wspólnej listy zagroŹeñ. Nie możemy zatem mieć tych samych odpowiedzi na róŹne zagroŹenia. Nie moŹe teŹ wiêkszość narzucać innym sposobów przeciwstawiania siê zagroŹeniom. Wspólnie zaś musimy brać pod uwagê róŹne uwarunkowania róŹnych pañstw członkowskich. Zachodni przyjaciele powinni zrozumieć wreszcie, Źe nasze wschodnie doŹwiadczenia i oparte na nich propozycje zapewnienia bezpieczeñstwa Europie sà realistyczne i praktyczne.

Powstrzymajmy Rosjê od ingerowania w Europie, utrzymajmy obecnoœć USA i miarkujmy hegemonistyczne zapêdy niektórych pañstw członkowskich. Tylko polityka solidarna i transatlantycka współpraca zapewni pokój naszej Europie.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.20)

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

5. Reluarea ședinței

(The sitting resumed at 11.37)

6. Ședință solemnă – Alocuțiune susținută de Iulia Navalnaia

President. – Dear members, dear colleagues, we gather here today to pay tribute to Alexei Navalny, in the presence of his brave wife Yulia Navalnaya.

(Applause)

Dear Yulia, thank you for your readiness to speak in this Chamber to the world in such painful circumstances. It is truly an honour to welcome you to the European Parliament.

Before we begin, I would like to invite everyone to turn their attention to the screens to watch a short video about the life and legacy of Alexei Navalny.

(A video was shown in the Chamber)

Dear Yulia, dear colleagues, on 16 February we received the tragic news of Sakharov Prize laureate Alexei Navalny's death. For many in Russia and outside, he represented hope: hope in better days; hope in a free Russia; hope in the future; hope that courage can overcome. And while his killers sought to cruelly extinguish that hope, they failed. The hope he represented remains as bright as ever.

This House and its Members condemn his killing in the strongest possible terms. It is a crime that deserves an international and independent investigation. The world is owed justice.

While we pay tribute to his memory, I want to express our deepest condolences to you dear Yulia, to your children Daria and Zakhar, to Alexei's parents Lyudmila and Anatoly, to his family, friends and countless supporters in Russia and across the globe.

Alexei Navalny dedicated his life to the fight against corruption and for a democratic Russia. He did not give up when they tried to poison him. He did not give up when he was unjustly imprisoned. He did not give up when his sentence was extended in a sham trial. He did not give up even when confronted with suffering and injustice. And neither must we.

Democracy takes bravery, and Alexei understood that. That is why he went back to Russia in 2021. That is why he could not be broken. And that is exactly what made the regime so afraid of him.

But Alexei's fight endures. The many brave people that took to the streets of Russia after his death show – yet again – the fragility of authoritarianism.

I take solace in the fact that if history teaches us anything, it is that the pillars of autocracy, in the end, always – *always* – crumble under the weight of its own corruption and people's inherent desire to live freely. And when they inevitably do, it will be thanks to what Alexei and your family did.

So dear Yulia, on behalf of the European Parliament that stands in admiration of your courage, I thank you. The floor is yours.

(Loud and sustained applause)

Yulia Navalnaya. – Dear Madam President, dear ladies and gentlemen, thank you for this opportunity to be here today.

After Putin tried to kill Alexei for the first time, we lived in southern Germany for several months. Alexei was recovering from the poisoning – learning how to walk and write all over again. We walked a lot, sometimes going on short trips. On one of them, we went to Strasbourg with our children. It is one of my and Alexei's favourite cities. We have been there several times together, and then, three years ago, we decided to show it to them.

Now my husband is dead. I am back in Strasbourg, but I am no longer walking around with my family. I stand here and address you, and in your person, the whole of Europe.

I thought that in the 12 days since Alexei's murder, I would have time to prepare for this speech. But first, we spent a week getting Alexei's body and organising a funeral. Then I chose the cemetery and the coffin. The funeral will take place the day after tomorrow and I am not sure yet whether it will be peaceful or whether the police will arrest those who have come to say goodbye to my husband.

(Applause)

However, I'm standing here now because your voters have an important question. They're asking you about it and then you're asking me. The question is: 'How can I help you in your fight?'

Last Saturday was two years since Putin started a full-scale war against Ukraine. A brutal and sneaky war. The whole world rushed to Ukraine's aid. But two years have passed, there is much exhaustion, much blood, much disappointment, and Putin has gone nowhere. Everything has already been used: weapons, money, sanctions... Nothing is working. And the worst has happened: everyone got used to the war. Here and there people start to say: 'Well, we will have to come to an agreement with Putin anyway...'

And then Putin killed my husband, Alexei Navalny. On his orders, Alexei was tortured for three years: he was starved in a tiny stone cell, cut off from the outside world, and denied visits, phone calls, and even letters. And then they killed him. Even after that, they abused his body and abused his mother.

On the one hand, the public murder has once again shown everyone that Putin is capable of anything, and that you cannot negotiate with him.

(Applause)

But on the other side, I can also see how shocked everyone is. Many people have the feeling that Putin cannot be defeated at all. And in this desperation, they are now asking me: 'How can I help you?'

And I am thinking about how Alexei would answer this question. I will try to answer it, but to do so I have to tell you a little about what he was like. Alexei was an inventor. He always had new ideas for everything, but especially in politics.

You have elections at the beginning of June. Many of you will be campaigning – meeting voters, giving interviews, shooting commercials. Now imagine that all of this is impossible. No TV station will do an interview with you. No money in the world can help you with a commercial. And the voters who came to the meetings will be arrested along with the candidate. Welcome to Putin's Russia.

(Applause)

And yet Alexei Navalny has managed to become the most famous politician there. He was able to inspire millions of people with his ideas. How did he do that? He was always fantasising and experimenting. You're not allowed on TV? Let's learn how to make YouTube videos so the whole country can watch them. You're not allowed to vote? You can come up with a tactical voting strategy to take seats away from the ruling party. Even in Putin's gulag, Alexei managed to pass on ideas for projects that would make the Kremlin panic. He was the opposite of everything boring.

This is the answer to the question. If you really want to defeat Putin, you have to become an innovator. You have to stop being boring.

(Applause)

You cannot hurt Putin with another resolution or another set of sanctions that is no different from the previous ones. You cannot defeat him by thinking he's a man of principle who has morals and rules. He's not like that, and Alexei realized that a long time ago. You are not dealing with a politician but with a bloody mobster. Putin is the leader of an organised criminal gang. Putin is the leader of... Sorry.

(Applause)

Thank you. It's good to repeat it again: Putin is the leader of an organised criminal gang. This includes poisoners and assassins, but they're just puppets. The most important thing is the people close to Putin: his friends, associates, and keepers of the mafia's money.

You, and all of us, must fight this criminal gang. And the political innovation here is to apply the methods of fighting organised crime, not political competition. Not diplomatic notes, but investigations into the financial machinations. Not statements of concern, but a search for mafia associates in your countries, for the discreet lawyers and financiers who are helping Putin and his friends to hide money.

In this fight you have reliable allies – there are tens of millions of Russians who are against Putin, against the war, against the evil he brings. We must not persecute them – on the contrary, you must work with them. With us.

(Applause)

Putin must answer for what he has done to my country. Putin must answer for what he has done to a neighbouring, peaceful country. And Putin must answer for everything he has done to Alexei.

(Applause)

My husband will never see what the Beautiful Russia of the Future will look like, but we must see it. And I will do my best to make his dream come true, the evil will fall and the beautiful future will come.

(The House rose and accorded the speaker a standing ovation)

President. – Thank you very much, Ms Navalnaya, for that powerful statement. Now we will have a round of speakers from all political groups, starting with the Chair of the EPP Group, Manfred Weber.

Manfred Weber, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Madam President, Madam Navalnaya, I was informed about the death of Alexei Navalny at the beginning of the Munich Security Conference, Friday, 11.00. Andrius Kubilius sent me a text message. My first thought was, 'This is not a coincidence. This is planned. This is the killer, Putin, behind.'

Last week was another final wake up call. No one today can be so naive to doubt about the brutal and murderous nature of Putin's regime.

Dear Mrs Navalnaya, our thoughts are with you and your children and all those who loved and admire your husband, Alexei Navalny. All of Europe mourns a brave man killed by a brutal regime.

Alexei Navalny loved freedom, and for that he was deprived of it and locked up in prison. Alexei Navalny wanted a free Russia, that's why he couldn't be tolerated in Putin's unfree Russia. Alexei Navalny believed in people and knew how to inspire them. That is why the Putin regime prevented him from speaking.

Navalny was a hope for Russia, but above all, he had hope. He had hope that the corruption will not be unpunished. His work helped identify many of Putin's friends who are now facing the toughest sanctions in Europe's history. He had hope in a democratic future for Russia. He showed Russians that one man saying 'no' is enough to scare a regime. He had hope in power of truth, the truth that Putin hides, that Putin fears, but to which he will have to answer.

Dear Mrs Navalnaya, we admire your courage. You are keeping alive the hope for a free and a democratic Russia. As Europeans, and as democrats, we will carry that hope with you together.

Alexei Navalny died for freedom and democracy in Russia, just as people died for freedom and democracy in Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, in their fight against an unfree communism. Before 1988, not many could have imagined that once we would be here together, living in a free and democratic Europe. So what I want to say is, everything is possible. That is why we will never give up the dream of a free and democratic Russia.

Pedro Marques, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, Madam Navalnaya, today we pay tribute to Alexei Navalny, the 2021 Sakharov Prize laureate, for his courage and his ultimate sacrifice for democracy and for freedom in your country against the tyranny and the corruption of Putin's regime.

He paid the highest price with his own life, but his legacy will live through you, through your family, and it will be honoured through the Russian people. We express our heartfelt condolences to you, his brave wife, but also to your family.

This House has repeatedly condemned, in the strongest possible terms, the persecution of Alexei Navalny, his poisoning, all the politically motivated rulings, the trump charges, calling for his immediate and unconditional release. But you challenged us here today, and we heard you loud and clear. That is something that I want to say to you.

The news of his death in the hands of the Putin regime in a remote Siberian prison outraged us and was met with the strongest condemnation. It sent shockwaves, you know, around Russia, but around the world. We could witness it personally all over Europe.

Alexei was a political leader, one of the most brave ones, with powerful convictions that inspired people, raising collective consciousness for what was happening and is still happening in Russia. He represented the hope and the vision for a different, for a better Russia.

His death brings us back to the memories, the darkest moments in the Russian history and the conditions of his imprisonment and the violence he suffered makes Putin and the regime ultimately responsible for his fate.

We demand an international and an independent investigation into the circumstances of his death, and for all responsible for his detention, for his treatment, and for his death to be held to account. Truth must be told, consequences must be borne and justice must be served.

The memory of Alexei will live into the ages. He was a fighter, a fighter for democracy and a democratic Russia will prevail one day. Be brave, Madame Navalnaya. For your family, for Alexei's memory, but for the people of Russia.

Valérie Hayer, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, chère madame Navalnaïa, avant de m'adresser à cet hémicycle, je tiens à m'adresser à vous personnellement. Évidemment, ce malheur a un retentissement politique international, mais il est avant tout un drame personnel et humain. Je voudrais vous adresser, à vous qui venez de perdre votre mari, ainsi qu'à vos deux enfants et à vos proches, mes sincères condoléances.

Votre courage est exemplaire et admirable, et sachez que tous les démocrates ici saluent la mémoire d'Alexeï Navalny. Alexeï Navalny, c'est le symbole du courage, de l'abnégation face à l'injustice et la corruption, sans jamais faiblir. Il aura fait face jusqu'au bout à un régime qui n'a plus que pour seule réponse à toute contestation la répression et les assassinats. Car il nous faut dire les choses clairement aujourd'hui! Oui, l'entière responsabilité de cet assassinat incombe à l'État russe, et en particulier à son président, Vladimir Poutine.

Alexeï Navalny avait dévoilé au grand jour le système Poutine, profondément corrompu et qui a verrouillé toutes les portes du pouvoir et des institutions. Alors, si nous voulons véritablement lui rendre hommage, nous devons faire ce qu'il a toujours attendu de nous: asphyxier Poutine et ses proches par tous les moyens! Les sanctions sont une chose, mais elles ne font pas tout, vous l'avez dit, et les déclarations non plus. Nous devons combattre toutes les organisations qui fondent son système criminel.

Chers collègues, nous ne pouvons pas laisser l'opposition russe seule face à Poutine et ses affidés. Il nous incombe de nous y opposer, nous aussi, chaque jour, car désormais leurs assassinats et leur propagande s'exportent aussi ailleurs en Europe. Cette propagande et ces mensonges qui ne bénéficient qu'aux mêmes, Poutine en Russie et ses relais extrémistes chez nous — extrémistes qui, une fois qu'ils arrivent au pouvoir, s'empressent de jouer le jeu du Kremlin.

Chère madame Navalnaïa, je conclurai en vous réaffirmant tout notre soutien, mais aussi toute notre détermination à vous accompagner dans votre courageux combat pour cette Russie démocratique et libre que vous appelez de vos vœux. Nous ne vous laisserons pas seule. Nous serons là, à vos côtés, jusqu'au bout!

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, dear Yulia Navalnaya, it is hard to imagine what you have been going through in these last weeks, months, years.

And when you were speaking about how you and your husband with your family were visiting Strasbourg a while ago and how you miss him right now, I was imagining what it would do to me if I lost my beloved partner to a brutal regime.

And I know that probably it cannot even touch the pain that you have been feeling, but let me tell you on behalf of my whole group that we share this pain, we strongly support you and we are by your side in this difficult time.

In order to keep your husband's memory alive, we have to do everything in our power not only to demand an independent investigation, but also to protect the remaining political prisoners in Russia and all those who are suffering from this brutal regime.

The murder of Alexei Navalny has made it clear yet again: the biggest enemy of Vladimir Putin is democracy, the biggest enemy of Vladimir Putin is freedom. Freedom and democracy are what Putin is most afraid of because they threaten his democratic rule and they were symbolised by your brave late husband. They threaten his system based on corruption and lies.

So, our struggle has to be even more determined. Let us fight for our democracy and freedom here in Europe, but also let us stand in solidarity with all those fighting for it in Russia and elsewhere in the world. And even in this difficult time, when we all have difficult debates back home, when there are a lot of political challenges ahead of us, colleagues we can never forget the price that so many political prisoners in Russia, in Belarus and elsewhere are paying to fight for freedom and democracy.

If they have the strength to fight and pay this price, we cannot be tired. If they have the strength to go on, we have to do all we can in order to support them because in the end of the day – I am sure and I want to say this to you – in the end of the day, freedom will win, there will be a free Russia and we will fight for it side by side together with you.

Nicola Procaccini, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono intervenuto molte volte in quest'Aula, eppure mai come oggi sento il peso delle parole per la commozione che ci attraversa tutti, per il senso della storia che ci sembra di poter cogliere in questo momento.

Ho ascoltato le parole della signora Naval'naja, cercando di mantenere un rispettoso distacco per non lasciarmi influenzare dall'emozione. Ma è stato difficile. Personalmente, seguo le vicende politiche di Aleksej Naval'nyj da anni. Ho sempre apprezzato il coraggio e la fantasia, la serenità e la fede con cui ha portato avanti le proprie idee, anche quando in pochi riuscivano a comprenderne il senso e il valore. Un estremista: così lo hanno etichettato talvolta il *mainstream* occidentale, solitamente la televisione pubblica di Putin.

In realtà Aleksej Naval'nyj era solo un uomo innamorato della Russia, della sua storia e della sua gente. Cristiano, nato in una famiglia di militari, Aleksej non era un pacifista. Ma si è sempre battuto per la sua patria, senza armi né paura. Hanno provato a ucciderlo tante volte, nei modi più vigliacchi. Ci erano quasi riusciti: ma niente. Così lui ha dato un bacio a sua moglie, ha salutato i suoi ragazzi, ha preso un aereo ed è tornato in Russia, dove sapeva che ad attenderlo ci sarebbe stata la più terribile delle prigionie e la più scontata delle morti. È finita la sua esistenza, ma non il suo sogno di una Russia libera dai tiranni e in pace con il mondo.

Qualcuno ha detto «Beato quel popolo che non ha bisogno di eroi»: io non sono d'accordo. Tutti i popoli ne hanno bisogno, in pace come in guerra. Sono quegli uomini e quelle donne che parlano agli altri e per gli altri, anche quando tutti sono muti e solitari. Come quel ragazzo, che nell'agosto di tanti anni fa affrontò da solo la morte, bruciandosi davanti ai carri armati sovietici che invadevano Praga. Il giorno in cui è morto Jan Palach ha vinto la libertà ed è nata l'Europa che amiamo. Sarà lo stesso per Aleksej Naval'nyj. Il 16 febbraio hanno ucciso un uomo libero, ma ne sono nati migliaia in Russia, in Europa e nel mondo.

Jaak Madison, *on behalf of the ID Group*. – Madam President, Ms Navalnaya, first of all, from our political group, all the regrets goes to you and for your children, for your son and daughter, because the biggest loss what you can have is to lose your father as a children. So that's why it was very emotional to listen to your statement and I agree that most of us will absolutely feel what you feel, even if it's very hard for us to feel the same as you are doing.

You were saying absolutely right things about Russia, the current Russia, what we have today. And the very sad story is that the independent polling stations have shown that too many people are still supporting the regime of Putin. They are supporting the ideas of the old imperialist Russia. There are about 70% of the people who are saying that, yes, we have to restore the great Russia and should have the same kind of borders that they had in history.

But the other side of the coin is that almost 30% of the Russian people doesn't like those ideas. It means that almost 30 million people in Russia would like to have a normal country with stability, with freedom and peace. And as I am from Estonia, of course we feel it like from the bones, like what is it like to live next to the country who would like to occupy you?

But it gives hope also for us to have a normal future, normal cooperation, because I am sure that everybody here in this room would like to have a normal cooperation with the biggest country in the world that's called Russia, to have a normalised relations, to have a normal economy, to have a normal friendship. And that's also why I'm looking forward for the future, that maybe in the future, one day, it is possible to have normalised relations with our neighbours.

And that gives the hope that there are still about 30 million people, including you, who are standing against this regime and hoping for a better Russia and a better future. I think I said enough, I really wish the best for you and for children, and I'm more than sure that one day we will have a great country called Russia who has no kind of imperialist ideas and will have normal relations with all the neighbours in Europe.

Nikolaj Villumsen, *on behalf of the The Left Group*. – Madam President, dear Yulia Navalnaya, it is both good and very sad to see you here today in Strasbourg. It is so incredibly sad because the reason for you being here is so tragic and wrong. Nobody should have to die for speaking up for what they believe in.

All of us here today mourn with you the loss of your husband, Alexei Navalny – a man who became one of the symbols of resistance to Putin's regime, who stood up for what he believed in and spoke out loud also in the face of repression. Alexei Navalny helped expose Putin to the world. He shone a light on the enormous corruption of Putin and his oligarch friends.

It was something that clearly frightened Putin. Because despots like Putin are afraid of facts, of debate, of truth. And your husband tried to bring forward all of that. And for that, he was poisoned and he was accused by the Putin regime. He was unjustly jailed, tortured and he paid the ultimate price.

And yet, despite the sadness and the loss that led here, it is also good to hear you and to see you speaking out here today in Strasbourg, because it means that Putin did not succeed in silencing the critique. It means that the fight against repression continues.

Dear Yulia Navalnaya, to offer you my condolences seems way too little. What I can offer you is my profound respect and admiration for the work of your husband and of you and for everyone who dares to stand up against despots like Vladimir Putin. May the death of Alexei Navalny not be in vain. May democracy triumph in the end.

President. – Thank you very much, dear colleagues. Thank you, Ms Navalnaya.

This session is now closed.

(The House rose and applauded)

(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)

7. Reluarea şedinţei

(The sitting resumed at 12.16)

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, vorrei sollevare un punto all'ordine del giorno, in virtù dell'articolo 195 del regolamento del Parlamento europeo.

Abbiamo sentito la straziante testimonianza di Julija Naval'naja, un promemoria della necessità di intensificare i nostri sforzi a tutela di coloro i quali, come Naval'nyj, hanno fatto della difesa dei diritti e della dignità umana la loro missione.

Insieme ad altri colleghi e a Gariwo – la foresta dei Giusti, le ho inviato una lettera che le chiede di impegnare il Parlamento europeo a celebrare solennemente la Giornata europea dei Giusti il prossimo 6 marzo. La giornata sarebbe resa particolarmente significativa dal lancio di un appello per la liberazione di Jurij Dmitriev e Narges Mohammadi, veri combattenti per la verità e la giustizia, tuttora imprigionati dai regimi di Mosca e Teheran.

Un appello per la loro liberazione deve diventare un obiettivo politico condiviso: ci auguriamo che lei possa accogliere la nostra richiesta e dare spessore alla Giornata europea dei Giusti il prossimo 6 marzo.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señora presidente, al amparo del artículo 195, una cuestión de observancia del Reglamento interno, pues no hay ninguna disposición en nuestro Reglamento interno que regule los minutos de silencio o actos de respeto en esta Cámara.

En el día de hoy hemos escuchado a Yulia Navalnaya, esposa del opositor asesinado por el régimen de Putin, y ahora votaremos, entre otros, el Informe sobre los derechos humanos y la democracia en el mundo y la política de la Unión Europea al respecto. Pero no podemos ser parciales ni sectarios. Me gustaría que este Parlamento mostrara interés por el terrorismo de extrema izquierda que se cobró una nueva víctima en España el pasado sábado. Sergio Delgado fue asesinado por un grupo de cobardes de extrema izquierda cuando disfrutaba con sus amigos de una despedida de soltero en Burgos.

Según el último informe de Europol, de los dieciséis ataques terroristas que se efectuaron en suelo europeo en 2022, trece fueron de extrema izquierda o anarquistas, siendo los movimientos separatistas vasco y catalán los más violentos en España.

También me gustaría que este Parlamento mostrara interés por la vida de Marta, una joven de dieciséis años asesinada por un argelino en Algemesí, Valencia... *(la presidenta retira la palabra al orador)*.

8. Votare

President. – The next item is the vote.

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

8.1. Permisele de conducere (A9-0445/2023 - Karima Delli) (vot)

– *After the vote:*

Karima Delli, *rapporteure*. – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, je voudrais remercier mes corapporteurs. Le résultat de ce rapport n'est pas à la hauteur des enjeux, je vous le dis. L'Europe qui protège, qui sauve des vies, n'est pas réellement incarnée dans ce rapport. Nous devons justement montrer à quel point nous étions en faveur et dans l'accompagnement des familles et des victimes. Même si ce rapport est adopté, je considère qu'il n'est pas à la hauteur des enjeux. Je voudrais quand même vous remercier parce que le débat a eu lieu et que je suis une démocrate, mais les *fake news*, les arguments fallacieux, la volonté de dénigrer ce que peut faire l'Europe ne seront jamais acceptés. Et je vous le dis, même si ce rapport n'est pas à la hauteur, je me battrai jusqu'au bout pour sauver des vies. Merci Pauline Déroulède, merci Floraine Jullian, merci aux victimes, et nous continuerons à nous battre parce que la vie n'a pas de prix.

8.2. Certificatul suplimentar de protecție unitar pentru produsele fitosanitare (A9-0020/2024 - Tiemo Wölken) (vot)

8.3. Certificatul suplimentar unitar pentru medicamente (A9-0019/2024 - Tiemo Wölken) (vot)

8.4. Certificatul suplimentar de protecție pentru produsele fitosanitare (reformare) (A9-0023/2024 - Tiemo Wölken) (vot)

8.5. Certificatul suplimentar de protecție pentru medicamente (reformare) (A9-0022/2024 - Tiemo Wölken) (vot)

8.6. Brevetele esențiale pentru standarde (A9-0016/2024 - Marion Walsmann) (vot)

8.7. Indicațiile geografice ale Uniunii Europene pentru vin, băuturi spirtoase și produse agricole (A9-0173/2023 - Paolo De Castro) (vot)

8.8. Reducerea mai rapidă și mai sigură a surplusului de impozite reținute la sursă (A9-0007/2024 - Herbert Dorfmann) (vot)

8.9. Cerințele de raportare (A9-0009/2024 - Anna Cavazzini) (vot)

President. – Before we move to the last vote, I remind you all that there will be another voting session this afternoon at 17.00.

8.10. Negocierile în curs legate de un acord privind statutul activităților operaționale desfășurate de Agenția Europeană pentru Poliția de Frontieră și Garda de Coastă (Frontex) în Senegal (A9-0032/2024 - Cornelia Ernst) (vot)

– *After the vote:*

Cornelia Ernst, Berichterstatlerin. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Dieser Bericht über einen möglichen Einsatz von Frontex in Senegal wurde von PPE und extremen Rechten in gemeinsamer Aktion mutwillig zerstört. Anstatt Fakten anzuerkennen – dass der Senegal zwar eine Zusammenarbeit mit der EU will, nicht aber ein solches Frontex-Abkommen –, wollen Sie dennoch die Befugnisse der Frontex-Agentur, die eine erbärmliche Menschenrechtsbilanz hat, rücksichtslos ausweiten.

Es ist Ihre arrogante, neokoloniale Agenda, die es nicht erträgt, dass ein Land wie Senegal, wo Migration als normaler Teil gesellschaftlichen Handelns angesehen wird, mit einem Nein antwortet. Wir als Europaabgeordnete haben die Pflicht, das Handeln der EU in Drittstaaten zu hinterfragen und zu überwachen. Auch wenn PPE und extreme Rechte es nicht wahrhaben wollen: Die Kolonialzeiten sind vorbei – und das ist gut so! Wir als Linke stehen an der Seite der senegalesischen Zivilgesellschaft und daran ändert sich auch nichts.

President. – That concludes the vote.

(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

9. Reluarea ședinței

(Die Sitzung wird um 13.16 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

10. Aprobarea procesului-verbal al şedinţei anterioare

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar.

Gibt es Einwände?

Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung ist genehmigt.

11. Asasinarea lui Alexei Navalnîi şi necesitatea unei acţiuni a UE în sprijinul prizonierilor politici şi al societăţii civile oprite din Rusia (dezbattere)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu der Ermordung von Alexei Nawalny und der Notwendigkeit von EU-Maßnahmen zur Unterstützung der politischen Gefangenen und der unterdrückten Zivilgesellschaft in Russland (2024/2579(RSP)).

Mathieu Michel, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, it is an emotional day today. The European Union is outraged by the death of the Russian opposition politician Alexei Navalny, for which the ultimate responsibility lies with President Putin and the Russian authorities. Our thoughts are with his wife, Yulia Navalnaya, who honoured this Chamber with her presence today, his family, and with all those in Russia and beyond, who believe in a democratic and peaceful future for Russia.

Alexei Navalny gave hope to democrats and civil society in Russia, which is why so many people from all over the country joined his actions and listened to his messages of another Russia. We will honour his memory as a freedom fighter.

Russia must allow an independent and transparent international investigation into circumstances of his sudden death. We also repeat international calls on Russia to immediately and unconditionally release all other political prisoners held in similar horrific conditions.

President, honourable Members, Commissioner, Yulia Navalnaya was also present at the Foreign Affairs Council meeting last week. She thanked the EU for our strong statements and support over the last three years. Her words were also a call for further actions. The EU will spare no efforts to hold Russia's political leadership and authorities to account in close coordination with our partners, including through further sanctions.

The EU global human rights sanctions regime enables the EU to address human rights violations and abuses around the world. It signals the EU's strong determination to stand up for human rights. Through this regime, the EU is sending a clear message: there is a cost to serious human rights violations and abuses. Those listed are banned from entering the EU and have their assets frozen.

Sanctions are part of a wider policy in order to bring about a change in conduct from those responsible. They are an important part of our response, albeit not the only one.

The EU supports NGOs, civil society organisations, human rights defenders and independent journalists inside and outside Russia. EU support – our support – is crucial for those organisations to ensure legal defence for political prisoners, including citizens participating in demonstrations against the war on Ukraine.

To all supporters of Mr Navalny who feel that they have lost hope following his death, I reassure you that the EU will continue to use its communication channels and the international human rights to reiterate our unequivocal position on the situation in Russia.

Kadri Simson, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, on 16 February we received very sad reports, by the state-controlled Russian media, of the sudden death of the Russian opposition politician and anti-corruption activist, Alexei Navalny, in Siberia. His tragic and unnecessary death was confirmed by his family and lawyer when they arrived the following day to this inhumane and grim penal colony, reminding us of dark Soviet times.

Let me, once again, on behalf of the European Union, express my deepest condolences to Mr Navalny's family, children, and friends, and all those who worked with him for the benefit of their country. We admire the bravery of Mr Navalny.

The EU has repeatedly called on the Russian authorities for his immediate and unconditional release, pointing to the dangerous conditions where he and other Russian political prisoners are held. Our colleagues in Moscow have tried in vain to reach out to Russian authorities on his case. They have been observing the politically motivated court hearings in Moscow.

Through his life, Alexei Navalny demonstrated incredible courage and determination through his anti-corruption work across Russia, spreading a message that inspired many, especially young people. He represented the possibility of a different Russia.

In October 2020, the EU was the first to adopt sanctions to respond to the assassination attempt of Mr. Navalny, after he was poisoned with a toxic nerve agent. Moreover, the very first listings in March 2021, adopted under the EU Global Human Rights Sanctions Regime, were also related to the case of Mr Navalny. Since then, we have further expanded our sanctions, addressing his case, and we will continue to do so in response to his death.

These sanctions are also meant to complement other tools: the EU's substantial support to civil society, human rights defenders and independent media inside and outside Russia. The EU is committed to continue supporting NGOs, civil society organisations, human rights defenders and independent journalists.

Russian NGOs receive support from the EU, for example, for legal defence for political prisoners, including citizens participating in anti-war demonstrations. Russian human rights defenders also receive EU support for temporary relocation, trainings and urgent practical assistance, and for monitoring the human rights situation in Russia. The EU supports Russian-language independent media and journalists.

We will continue keeping the international pressure on Russia for the human rights violations and supporting individuals, including through trial observation. Mr Navalny's death makes us even more committed to continue this essential support.

Honourable Members, we join international calls, by the UN Secretary-General and other UN bodies, on Russia to allow for a full, transparent and credible investigation. We also urge Russia to immediately and unconditionally release all other political prisoners.

Mr Navalny's death is yet another sign of the accelerating and systematic repression in Russia. Our answer will be our continued and substantial support to Russian civil society, human rights defenders and independent media inside and outside Russia, and to hold those responsible of Navalny's death to account.

Rasa Juknevičienė, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, dear colleagues, freedom comes at a high price. These are the words of Boris Nemtsov, murdered nine years ago. They were echoed by Alexei Navalny. Today, freedom is costing the most for the Ukrainian people. Putin is trying to kill hope that Russia can be different in every way he can. Putin has used Alexei's body to mock and bully. He mocked his extremely strong mother, Lyudmila Navalnaya.

This reminds us of our history of bloody Soviet occupation, the communist Russia, when the bodies of Lithuanian freedom fighters were desecrated, when mothers could not pick them up, lying in open air in front of churches.

Putin is trying to show that we are helpless. There are around 700 political prisoners in Russia, including Vladimir Kara-Murza and Ilya Yashin. Their lives are all in danger. Over 1 400 are in Lukashenka's prisons. Their lives are also in danger. The murder of Navalny should not frighten us, but mobilise us in a common struggle for freedom. Our freedom is also threatened. The most important thing today is not to be afraid. Just as the Ukrainians are not afraid. Just as Navalny was not afraid. Not to be afraid of fully defeating Putin and helping Ukraine to win.

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, w imieniu grupy S&D. – Panie Przewodniczący! Rosja to kraj, w którym ludzie walczący ze skorumpowaną kliką pana Putina żyją krótko. Umierają, zastrzeleni pod murami Kremla, na klatce schodowej swojego domu, na ulicach Berlina. Umierają, otruci w londyńskich szpitalach lub rzekomo zupełnie bez powodu w łagrze, ulokowanym przez rządzących sadystów na północ od koła polarnego.

Aleksiej Nawalny wiedział, co stało się z Niemcowem, Politzkowską i wieloma innymi. A jednak po uratowaniu mu życia w niemieckim szpitalu, bezpośrednio zagrożonego w wyniku otrucia wojskową trucizną przez agentów Kremla, postanowił wrócić do Rosji. Jak prawdziwy patriota chciał walczyć o uczciwą i demokratyczną Rosję, próbując swoim przykładem obudzić swoich rodaków z letargu, strachu, beznadziei i obojętności. Uczciwość i wolność to największe zagrożenie dla obecnego dyktatora Rosji, jego złodziejskiej, zbrodniczej ośmiornicy. Nawalny został pozbawiony wolności przez służalczych sędziów. Trafiał do kolejnych więzień, gdzie był nieludzko traktowany przez bandytów w uniformach straży więziennej.

Składamy hołd uczciwemu i odważnemu człowiekowi. Miejmy nadzieję, że obywatele Rosji wreszcie się obudzą. Rosja, która przez stulecia była największym więzieniem świata, prześladowającym na równi swoich obywateli, jak i podbite i zniewolone narody, nie musi być taka. Wystarczy, że Rosjanie w to uwierzą.

Bernard Guetta, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, le courage a un nom: il s'appelle Navalny! Le courage dont cet homme a fait preuve — ce courage d'aller braver la mort en opposant jusqu'au bout rire, sourire et ironie à ses bourreaux, de changer l'histoire en allant défier un tyran, fauteur de guerre, menteur et assassin — nous appelle, nous les Européens, à ne pas faillir. Nous devons dire à ces élus trumpistes qu'ils se couvrent chaque jour un peu plus de sang ukrainien, que l'histoire les aura bientôt rangés dans le camp du cynisme et de la lâcheté, et qu'ils trahissent honteusement leur pays et l'indispensable solidarité des deux rives de l'Atlantique.

Nous devons immédiatement livrer des missiles Taurus et des Mirage aux Ukrainiens. Nous devons œuvrer jour et nuit à notre défense commune, à ce bouclier européen, seul à même d'assurer notre sécurité et le triomphe de la liberté. Nous devons mettre l'assassin d'Alexeï Navalny hors d'état de nuire!

Sergey Lagodinsky, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, 14 years ago, Alexei and myself were riding a bus bringing us back to the Yale University to New Haven. We were discussing prospects for Russian politics. I was sceptical, but Alexei was the one who changed my mind with one simple phrase: we shall convince them if we are able to reach them. This was the essence of his understanding of what it means to be a leader for common good. It was not about exerting benefits, not about serving lobbies. It was about reaching out to his fellow citizens, telling them the truth, believing in them and giving them hope.

I don't have any sentimental relationship to my country of origin, but Alexei and people like him have become my sentiment. People who differ in politics but are united on democracy. People like him and his wife Yulia, who returned to their homeland because they belong to their homeland, to their people, even risking their lives, even losing their lives. People like Vladimir Kara-Murza, who continues speaking the truth despite being poisoned and imprisoned. People like Navalny's lawyers who continue serving the rights, civil rights and freedom, even though losing them themselves.

This resolution is a testimony, a message to those courageous people who believe and don't give up in despair, even in the face of death. For many of them and for me, Alexei never died. Alexei cannot be killed because you cannot kill hope. And so, Alexei is still alive in my memory, smiling against the sun of New England as we continue our bus ride and discuss about the beautiful future of Russia. And he reminds me again and again in what he believes: we can convince them if we're able to reach them.

Anna Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, today we pay tribute to Alexei Navalny, his memory, his work, and also extend our deepest sympathy to his entire family and friends. I would like especially to mention lawyers because their work was restless and really very important.

Naturally, we demand immediate, unconditional release of all political prisoners in the Russian Federation, but also of all those who were prisoners and of civilians deported forcefully from Ukraine to Russia.

This war should be stopped, but we believe that stopping Putin is by showing force. Therefore, we have to remember about necessity to help Ukraine defeat Russia.

I'm sure that all spring of nations, eradication of neo-colonialism and also improvement of life and fulfilment of dreams of those who could dream about future beautiful Russia is via a very strict, rigid action by the international community. We first have to support Ukraine.

Malin Björk, för The Left-gruppen. – Herr talman! För omvärlden råder det inga tvivel om att Putin och hans regim direkt eller indirekt mördade Navalnyj. Putin vill släcka allt hopp om ett öppet, demokratiskt Ryssland och därför vågade han inte låta Navalnyj leva. Men Navalnyjs död kommer inte släcka hoppet för alla dem som fortsätter att kämpa för ett demokratiskt och fritt Ryssland, med plats för olika människor och olika åsikter.

Putins regim förföljer i stort sett alla oppositionella. Alla krigsmotståndare, men också civilsamhället: journalister, artister, konstnärer och hbtqi-personer. Alla som arbetar för ett demokratiskt Ryssland; de har ingen plats i Putins värld.

Vårt arbete nu är att se till att vi stöttar alla de demokratiska krafterna i Ryssland, alla som står upp mot Putins regim. Då, mina vänner, då kan vi inte fortsätta att köpa Putins olja och fossilenergi. Vi måste sätta ett stopp. Och vi måste se till att vi också ger skydd till dem som måste fly Putins terror. Vår solidaritet med dem som ställer sig upp mot Putin måste vara total.

Milan Uhrík (NI). – Pán predsedajúci, s istým obdivom sledujem, ako sa celý Európsky parlament v prípade smrti pána Navaľného zmenil na detektívov, ktorí presne vedia, čo sa stalo. Asi sa zhodneme na tom, že jeho smrť mesiac pred prezidentskými voľbami nebola náhodná. Ale myslím si, že na skutočnú verziu toho, čo sa stalo, si budeme musieť možno že ešte niekoľko rokov počkať.

Mňa však mrzí iná vec. Mrzí ma, že ste niektorí rovnakú pozornosť nevenovali tomu, keď v slovenskej väznici, v slovenskom väzení zahynul za veľmi rovnakých okolností a podmienok bývalý policajný prezident, generál Lučanský. Tak isto mal najprv vylúpnuté oko a rozbitú hlavu. Potom to štátne autority popreli a napokon ho našli mŕtveho. To však vtedy mnohým v tejto sále vôbec nevadilo, pretože na Slovensku vládla vláda, ktorá bola liberálna a ktorá bola čisto proeurópska, bez nejakých sebavedomých ambícií.

A to by som vás chcel poprosiť, keby do budúca táto dvojtvárnosť a tento dvojaký meter v Európskom parlamente nebol.

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, Alexei Navalny believed in the dream of beautiful Russia of the future, in the future of a normal, democratic Russia. Because of that, he was killed.

Do we believe in the future of democratic Russia, in the possibility of democracy in Russia? If not, then let's be at least honest. Let's not speak how much we support Russian civil society and Navalny's cause because, in such case, those are only empty words.

Navalny was a brave leader who was mobilising millions of people with his personal example and words 'don't be afraid', because only in such a way, Russia's transformation into the beautiful Russia of the future can be created. We shall not help such transformation only with inflation of our traditional boring statements of solidarity and condemnation.

Like our statements of solidarity are not helping Ukraine to win the war. Ukraine needs ammunition and we can deliver it. In the same way, only the victory of Ukraine can bring the collapse of Putin's regime and open the doors for Russian people to transform Russia. Let's not be afraid of the defeat of Russia. We can make it happen, we can be brave and help Russian people. That is how Navalny's dream will be realised.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Mr President, dear colleagues, the murder of Alexei Navalny is another chapter of Putin's inhuman, repressive and brutal regime.

The Stalinist methods, lack of transparency and circumstances surrounding it show that the ultimate responsibility lies on dictator and the Russian state. The aftermath and the horrendous pressure imposed to his family, friends and lawyers is a sharp reminder of whom we are dealing with.

Therefore, I welcome today's address of Ms Yulia Navalnaya, a very courageous woman, in our House. I think it's also clear that democratic Russia is unfortunately very far from reality. This House has always supported Russian democratic activists, independent civil society and all courageous citizens opposing the brutal dictatorship of Putin.

Unfortunately, for now, it seems that the struggle will take more time than expected. Anyway, we need to keep the Kremlin under pressure and hold dictatorship accountable.

Dear colleagues, with the European elections approaching, as well as with the US elections in November, we have to be able to expect the unexpected. But let us not lose the focus and always remember that we are a union of the values. We must not stay silent to brutal dictatorship in our immediate neighbourhood. Our citizens are counting on our voice and they are expecting our response.

Guy Verhofstadt (Renew). – Mr President, I have to tell you that I find this debate here outrageous. Everybody is trying to honour Navalny, but that is not the topic of the debate. The topic of the debate is what will be the action and the reaction of the EU after the murdering of Navalny? And you come here from the Council and the Commission is here to applaud Yulia, but we have nothing to say about the measures we're going to take. What are we going to do?

The Americans, Joe Biden, have announced – four days after the murder of Navalny – 500 sanctions against the Russian Putin regime. And we? What we have done? We have written a text, a letter, with 87 Members of Parliament to ask for three things, and nothing has been done in the meanwhile.

First of all, Magnitsky sanctions against all those involved in the murder of Navalny: judges, prison guards and so on. Nothing has been decided or proposed by the Commission today or in recent days.

Secondly, we ask that the Navalny list of 6 000 people will be used in a new sanction package, a 14th sanction package, a list of 6 000 people. Nothing has been proposed in the meanwhile, already 14 days.

And thirdly, that the Russian assets finally will be seized, finally will be seized. Yellen, yesterday, the American administration says that they have no problems to seize the Russian assets. And the Commission and the Council is proposing nothing.

I find it shameful. I want a real strategy towards Russia and not coming here in the Parliament, applauding Yulia and doing nothing at all.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, colleagues, how deep the persecution of human rights defenders and political opposition in Russia is, is revealed by the situation of lawyers who defend them. Yesterday, Alexei Navalny's lawyer was arrested briefly in Moscow. Three of them have already been detained earlier for accusations of extremism, and one of them is under arrest warrant.

Yesterday, our 2009 Sakharov laureate, Oleg Orlov, from Memorial, was convicted on repeated discreditation of the Russian army. He defended himself alone because he did not want to risk that his lawyers would face persecution and prison. And Oleg said in his final statement in court, 'I regret nothing'.

We must show our utmost respect for him and other people persecuted, but we must also find ways, as the European Union, to defend lawyers and their important work. Many of them are now in exile. It is the ultimate eradication, even of the remainders of rule of law and judiciary, if lawyers cannot even do their work.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Myślę, że ta debata musi pokazać naszą jedność. To bardzo ważne, bo Rosja chciałaby Europy podzielonej. Myślę, że ta śmierć może i powinna wzmocnić naszą reakcję wobec tego imperium zła. Tutaj pan premier Verhofstadt mówił, że Komisja robi źle, pewnie tak, że Rada robi źle, pewnie tak, a ja tylko przypomnę, co stało się po śmierci Borysa Niemcowa 10 lat temu. Otóż Parlament Europejski nie zamroził relacji z Dumą rosyjską i parlamentem, po tym jak nastąpiła napaść Rosji i zajęcie Krymu i Donbasu, zamroził dopiero wtedy, gdy zginął Borys Niemcow. Myślę, że tym bardziej teraz, po śmierci Nawalnego, Europa powinna pokazać swoją jedność.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, the rights of all people must be respected. As I've said many times before, Alexei Navalny should not have been in prison. His death in detention is appalling and an impartial investigation into the circumstances absolutely necessary.

But while respecting the dead, we also have to be accurate in our memories. Was he Russia's democratic messiah? I don't believe so. A courageous activist? Yes. But what kind? A free marketeer, a fan of the 90s reforms that led to Putin, a race-baiter ejected from the liberals who then founded a nationalist coalition with the extreme right and led anti-immigration rallies in the 2000s. A gun-rights activist who made ads joking about shooting Muslims.

Of course, none of this justifies his treatments. His rights are just as important as anybody else. But if Navalny had been a socialist or a trade unionist, I don't think anybody here would know his name.

Two hundred Palestinian journalists have been murdered since October. They don't matter, because our ally killed them. It's very clear we care nothing about oppressed civil society unless it's in our geopolitical interest.

Márton Gyöngyösi (NI). – Mr President, colleagues, in Putin's Russia, the scale of political murders against opponents, critics or rivals is starting to resemble Stalin's Great Purge in the 1930s. Navalny's death is a hero's death and an enormous loss for all those yearning for a free and democratic Russia.

It also shows, however, the enormous challenge Putin's opposition faces. Everyone knows why Putin's critics fall out of windows. Everyone knows who orders the assassinations, poisonings and abductions of Russian dissidents on the territory of the EU. But nobody understands why the EU does nothing to defend itself. Nobody knows why Putin's puppets within the EU have not been sanctioned so far.

We don't know why the EU doesn't stop Russian secret service activity on its own territory, and we haven't heard of measures the EU will take against Putin's accomplices who shake his hand, model his regime, echo his narrative and say cynically to those remembering Alexei Navalny that he 'doesn't deserve respect'. The quote is from Viktor Orbán, for the sake of all those who do not know it and could not guess.

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, la mort d'Alexei Navalny, un crime dont le régime russe est responsable, a fait remonter en moi un énorme cri de colère, une révolte profonde. Ce régime autoritaire, dictatorial qu'est le régime russe de Vladimir Poutine écrase tous ceux qui s'opposent à lui en les éliminant comme si c'étaient des pions, et non des êtres humains. Il écrase les opposants politiques, mais aussi tous ceux qui, simples citoyens, avocats ou journalistes, expriment la vérité. Les prisons regorgent de prisonniers qui n'ont commis d'autre délit que de proclamer la vérité. J'évoquerai le nom de la journaliste Alsu Kurmasheva, qui attend en prison sans rien savoir du sort qui lui est réservé. Il est de notre devoir de soutenir ceux qui, en Russie et partout dans le monde, luttent pour la vérité, la liberté et la démocratie.

Et chez nous, nous avons l'obligation de combattre ces partis extrêmes qui justifient le régime russe, qui participent à la menace contre nos valeurs et institutions démocratiques de manière ouverte ou souterraine. Je voudrais finir sur les mots d'Alexei Navalny: «If they decide to kill me, you are not allowed to give up». Nous continuerons à mener une lutte constante pour la liberté et la démocratie.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Mr President, Commission, Council, colleagues, countless times we said that we should prevent the killing of Alexei Navalny at all costs. The truth is, we did not succeed. Putin's regime murdered Alexei. We have to transform this failure, and our grief, into meaningful action, not just hollow words.

So, Council, Commissioner, where are the second- and third-layer sanctions? The group of second- and third-layer supporters of Putin put on the sanctions – targeted sanctions on officials involved in the prison regime, the judges, the prosecutors, everyone?

In this regard, use the list of the Navalny Foundation and get serious on enforcement. It's shameful – it's laughable what we do in this regard. Get tough on his friends in Europe – Orbán, Dodik, Vučić – and, yes, also rapidly increase military support to Ukraine.

We have to take example in people braver than ourselves, like Navalny, like Kara-Murza, and look Putin in the face and say, 'You will not win', and get to work.

Malik Azmani (Renew). – Mr President, bravery has a name: Alexei Navalny. Would we have been able to do the same? Willing to suffer for our beliefs? Willing to die for our convictions?

Putin is a coward. He fears freedom and people who fight for it. He fears heroes like Navalny. Yulia Navalnaya will continue that fight and of course, we stand by her side.

But we need to continue to help Ukraine and make sure Putin does not succeed. We need to keep harbouring political refugees and we need to honour Navalny like we did Magnitsky, by seizing the Russian regime's assets and putting all the actors responsible for his killing on the Magnitsky Act.

Navalny was clear: we are not allowed to give up. The dark days of Putin will end; Navalny's legacy will continue to shine. Alexei, we will not give up!

Bronis Ropé (Verts/ALE). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, ministre, komisare, gerbiami kolegos. Įvardinkime, kas iš tiesų vyksta Rusijoje. Nepriklausoma teisinė sistema sunaikinta, laisvos žiniasklaidos nebėra, pilietinė visuomenė užgniaužta, daugėja politinių kalinių, o dalis jų tiesiog nužudomi. Taigi tarptautinė visuomenė nebėra toliau apsimesti, jog Putinas yra demokratinės šalies prezidentas. Rusijos Federacija tapo diktatūra ir Aleksejaus Navalno nužudymas tai įrodo. Putinas nėra neįveikiamas. Jis bijo savo kritikų net tuomet, kai jie mirę. Puikus to pavyzdys – kliūtys surengti Navalno laidotuves. Norint pokyčių Rusijoje turime padėti tiems, kas kelia baimę Kremliui. Turime vykdyti koordinuotą apsikeitimą nuteistaisiais, suteikti prieglobstį nuo politinio persekiojimo bėgantiems žmonėms.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Pane předsedající, politické procesy, věznice uprostřed pustých sibiřských plání a záhadná úmrtí disidentů a politických soupeřů jsou jak z knihy *Souostroví Gulag* od Solženicyna. Ale je to smutná a krutá realita dnešního Ruska pod vládou tyranského a mafiánského režimu Vladimíra Putina, návrat do dob nejhlubšího stalinismu.

Dnes zde mluvíme o osudu Alexeje Navalného, ale při té příležitosti bych chtěla zmínit i další, jejichž jména by neměla být zapomenuta, jako Boris Němcov nebo Anna Politkovská. Chtěla bych věřit, že i Rusko bude jednoho dne svobodnou demokratickou zemí, která respektuje lidská práva, občanská práva a svobody, územní celistvost sousedních států a mírové soužití. Proto si važme toho, co v Evropě máme, a braňme naše hodnoty – svobodu, demokracii a lidská práva.

Silvia Modig (The Left). – Arvoisa puhemies, Euroopan unionin arvoinin kuuluvat vapaus, oikeusvaltio ja demokratia. Putinin Venäjää ja Aleksei Navalnyin kuolema ovat synkkä esimerkki siitä, mikä on se vaihtoehto, jos emme pidä kiinni näistä arvoista.

Kun katsomme Venäjää, näemme, mitä yhteiskunta näyttää, joka ei noudata oikeusvaltion periaatteita. Kun katsomme Venäjää, näemme, mitä näyttää yhteiskunta, joka ei suojele moniäänisen median vapautta. Kun katsomme Venäjää, näemme, mikä on se todellisuus, kun ihmisoikeuksia ei kunnioiteta. Kun katsomme Aleksei Navalnyin kohtaloa, näemme, mitä tarkoittaa pahimmillaan se, kun ihmiseltä viedään vapaus ilmaista mielipiteensä.

Vapaata yhteiskuntaa vaatineen Navalnyin viesti venäläisille oli: "Älkää luovuttako!" Meille viestin tulee olla sama. Me emme saa luovuttaa, vaan meidän on puolustettava unionimme arvoja ja eurooppalaisten vapautta kaikilta yrityksiltä sitä horjuttaa, tulivat ne sitten rajojemme ulkopuolelta tai niiden sisältä. Oikeusvaltio ja ihmisoikeudet ovat vapauden perusta.

Kinga Gál (NI). – Elnök úr! Együttérzünk a Navalnij család tagjaival, és egyetértünk azzal, hogy ki kell vizsgálni halálának körülményeit. Kiállunk az emberi méltóság mellett. Nyugodjék békében!

Több mint két éve zajlik a háború Ukrajnában, és nem látszik a vége. Álláspontunk a kezdetektől egyértelmű: elítéljük Oroszország katonai agresszióját, és kiállunk Ukrajna területi integritása és szuverenitása mellett. Ott állunk az ukrán menekültek mellett is. Több mint 1,3 millió ukrainai menekültet fogadtunk be. Minél tovább tart a háború, annál több lesz a kár és az emberáldozat. Meggyőződésünk, hogy ennek a pusztításnak csak és kizárólag a béke vethet véget.

Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE). – Señor presidente, tuve el enorme privilegio de conocer a Alexéi Navalni personalmente, y me impresionaron inmediatamente la humildad en su trato y su firmeza de carácter. La humildad y la firmeza son los atributos de un líder. Siento enormemente, querido Alexéi, la falta de humildad y firmeza en Europa. Siento la falta de liderazgo, un liderazgo que tú sí tuviste.

No estamos acostumbrados, tras ochenta años de paz, a sufrir ni a defender nuestros valores y principios. Es más, tenemos incluso en este Parlamento diputados de la extrema izquierda y de la extrema derecha que defienden a Putin, a Maduro, al régimen de Irán y, además, cobran de ellos, y países de Europa —mi país, España, entre ellos— que compran el gas ruso de Putin.

Los que te admiramos en tu liderazgo continuamos tu trabajo en Europa. Seguiremos denunciando a los dictadores, la corrupción y a los agentes que moran entre nosotros. Va por ti y por tu ejemplar vida.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la morte di Aleksej Naval'ny è una ferita, una ferita allo stato di diritto, alla democrazia. Una ferita che ha un unico responsabile: il criminale di guerra Vladimir Putin.

Questo Parlamento non ha soltanto il compito – il dovere – di ricordare Naval'ny, ma nel suo nome io credo che questo Parlamento abbia il compito di agire, per esempio muovendosi per contrastare le terribili influenze russe che esistono: esistono nelle istituzioni continentali, nei media, nei social network. Noi abbiamo soprattutto il dovere qui di sostenere senza esitazioni anche il coraggioso popolo ucraino, le sue istituzioni, perché è lì che in questo momento si sta giocando il destino dell'Europa, è lì che si gioca il destino della nostra libertà, colleghe e colleghi.

E allora non permettiamo che le elezioni europee diventino un volano per la propaganda putiniana: Aleksej Naval'ny è solo l'ultimo di una lunga serie di dissidenti uccisi; e voglio ricordare in questa sede un italiano di cui ieri ricorrevano 30 anni dalla morte: si chiamava Andrea Tamburi, era un dirigente del Partito radicale e lavorava per una Russia libera e democratica. Trent'anni dopo non ha avuto ancora giustizia.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, de moedige Aleksej Navalny is twaalf dagen geleden brutaal vermoord. We hebben net zijn echtgenote hier beluisterd en we waren allemaal aan het applaudiseren. We leven allemaal mee. Maar daar gaat het in de politiek niet om. In de politiek moet je moedige acties durven nemen.

Collega Guy Verhofstadt heeft het hier net heel duidelijk gezegd: wat heeft Europa in godsnaam in die twaalf dagen al gedaan? We hebben de Magnitsky-sancties. Hebben we ze ingevoerd? Nee. Die 6 000 namen van de Navalny-lijst – ik denk dat ik dit hier al minstens vier, vijf keer gevraagd heb: waarom staan die nog altijd niet op die sanctielijst? Waarom gebruiken we die bevroren tegoeden in godsnaam nog altijd niet? Waarop zitten wij nog te wachten? Twaalf dagen.

Ik vind dat Europa nu moedig moet zijn. En wat moeten we extra doen? Opheldering vragen natuurlijk over zijn dood. Heel dringend: de drie advocaten van Navalny die nu nog in de gevangenis zitten, moeten vrijgelaten worden. Voor mijn part met een gevangenenruil, maar die moeten vrijgelaten worden. Laten we nu moedig zijn zoals Navalny is geweest.

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Navalnyjs död är inte bara ett tragiskt fall långt borta. Att en tyrann som Putin systematiskt tystar sina politiska motståndare med de mest vidriga metoder angår oss alla. Att vi dessutom, alla fördomanden till trots, fortsätter att stödja Putin genom att köpa hans fossila energi är en skam.

Vi måste gå från alla dessa vackra ord till handling. Vi måste se till att Navalnyjs död, Putins förtryck över delar av sin egen befolkning och Putins krig i Ukraina inte glöms bort. Vi måste påminna oss om att friheten att organisera sig och höja sin röst inte kan tas för given, och vi måste påminna oss om att vi kan göra väldigt mycket mer än vad vi gör i dag.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel 2021 Aleksej Naval'ny ha scelto con coraggio di ritornare in Russia dopo aver subito un tentativo di avvelenamento. Sapeva che sarebbe stato rischioso, ma lo ha fatto per manifestare i principi in cui credeva: libertà e giustizia. Questi sono i principi che coincidono con i nostri stessi valori.

La condizione umana e politica di Naval'ny, terminata in una prigione siberiana, e la sua lotta contro la corruzione di uno dei regimi più repressivi del mondo hanno scosso le coscienze dell'opinione pubblica mondiale.

Questo Parlamento farà di tutto per onorare il suo esempio di coraggio e la sua figura di oppositore politico di un regime autocratico. A chi sta dietro le sbarre per motivi politici, agli uomini, donne e tanti giovani oppressi che oggi in Russia vorrebbero un cambiamento deve arrivare forte il messaggio di solidarietà e di sostegno a resistere.

L'Europa porti speranza e pace là dove oggi c'è paura, morte e oppressione.

Sandra Kalniete (PPE). – Godātais sēdes vadītāj! Kolēģi! Naļaiņijs bija varonīgs cilvēks, taču viņa nāve nedrīkst palikt tikai skumju un piemiņas runu līmenī. Mums ir jāvērtina Putina režīms gan sankcionējot Naļaiņija fonda atklātos korrumpantus, gan atbalstot Krievijas opozīciju, neatkarīgos žurnālistus, cilvēktiesību cīnītājus, disidentus un prasot politiskās atbildības atbrīvošanu. Pēc viltus vēlēšanām Eiropa nedrīkst atzīt Putinu par leģitīmi ievēlētu prezidentu.

Taču izšķirošā cīņa par Putina režīma sakāvi notiek Ukrainā, jo zaudējums karā sagraus režīmu. Tāpēc Eiropas Savienībai un NATO ir jāpārtrauc vilkt sarkanās līnijas un baidīties no kara eskalācijas un jāatbalsta Ukraina ar vismodernākajiem ieročiem. Krievija nekad nav uzbrukusi stiprākam pretiniekam un mēs esam stiprāki. Mums ir jārikojas apņēmīgi un ātri. Mēs nedrīkstam vilcināties un atkārtot vēsturiskās kļūdas, kuras noveda līdz II pasaules karam.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, presidente en ejercicio del Consejo, señora comisaria, impresionante el testimonio esta mañana de Yulia Navalnaya. Y contundente y prolongado el aplauso de este Parlamento Europeo puesto en pie ante el testimonio del martirio y asesinato del heroico Alexéi Navalni, premio Sájarov por este Parlamento Europeo en 2021 y creador de una fundación de lucha contra la corrupción con la que plantó cara a la Rusia de Putin, un vecino inexorable de la Unión Europea —el país más grande del mundo—, una amenaza existencial para nuestros valores y, por supuesto, para esa proclamada vocación de crecer y madurar de una vez como un actor geopolíticamente global de la Unión Europea de la que hablábamos esta mañana.

Aquí tenemos un examen de credibilidad. Muchas voces en este Parlamento Europeo dudan que la Unión Europea lo pueda aprobar, pero otras apostamos porque lo supere. En primer lugar, manteniendo el apoyo militar a Ucrania. En segundo lugar, manteniendo las sanciones y asegurando que no habrá impunidad para los perpetradores del asesinato de Alexéi Navalni. Pero finalmente imaginando —como quería Yulia Navalnaya esta mañana— estratégicamente, en su política exterior y de seguridad común, una Rusia después de Putin, una Rusia distinta a la Rusia de Putin, una Rusia libre y democrática como la que soñó Alexéi Navalni.

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

Urmas Paet (Renew). – Austatud president, head kolleegid! Aleksei Navalnõi tapmisega saatis Putini režīm taas kord Vene ühiskonda ähvarduse, et kõik, kes on režīmi vastu või temas isegi kõhklevad, hävitatakse ning ka kohtuprotsessid ja vangla on ainult näitemäng enne oponendi lõplikku hävitamist. Putin jätkab sellega Venemaal hirmul põhineva ühiskonnakorra kindlustamist, nii nagu Venemaa ajaloos on varemgi korduvalt olnud. Hirmu abil loodab ta kindlustada kuulekuse ja lojaalsuse ning toetuse agressioonile Ukraina vastu. Navalnõi tapmine asetub ka eelseisvate Vene presidendi pseudovalimiste konteksti, et isegi ettemääratud tulemusega niinimetatud valimistel ei sõandaks keegi tegelikult Putiniga konkureerima minna. Navalnõi tapmine on poliitiline mõrv, mille eest vastutab Venemaa režīm ja selle juhid. Euroopa Liidu inimõiguste sanktsioonirežīmi tuleb kohaldada kõigi suhtes, kes osalesid Navalnõi vangistuse agoonias. Euroopa Liit peab ka tõsiselt üle vaatama, kuidas saab senisest paremini kaitsta Vene opositsiooni esindajaid ja inimõiguste kaitsjaid nii eksiilis kui ka Venemaal. Ja nagu ütles Julia Navalnaja täna siinsamas, mõni hetk tagasi: „Putin peab kandma vastutust selle kurja eest, mis ta on teinud Venemaale, Venemaa naabritele ja Alekseile.”

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo addolorati, sconvolti dalla storia di Aleksej Naval'ny, dalla ferocia con cui Putin lo ha soffocato, privato della libertà e dalla morte arrivata in un carcere russo. L'Europa piange Naval'ny ed è giusto farlo, benché molte sue idee fossero per me sbagliate: non si può morire per avere informato il popolo.

Ma se Naval'ny possiamo soltanto ricordarlo, celebrarlo, dovremmo mobilitarci tutti e con forza per salvare un altro giornalista, Julian Assange, che senza colpe né condanne è privato della libertà da dodici anni e sta al carcere duro da cinque anni e rischia di morire in cella se verrà estradato. Ero a Londra con alcuni colleghi la scorsa settimana per sostenere Assange e chiedo a tutto il Parlamento di farsi sentire con posizioni ufficiali, con decisione e durezza. Assange è un giornalista, non un criminale.

L'Europa non si volti dall'altra parte, non permetta che democrazie trattino un giornalista, come ha fatto Putin. Dopo aver perso Naval'ny, difendiamo Assange prima che sia troppo tardi: *«Free Julian Assange now»*.

President. – I just would like to remind you that it is not a debate about other persons. We are speaking about Alexei Navalny.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, Алексей Навални знаеше, че връщайки се в Русия, ще бъде убит от режима, при това по много мъчителен начин, но въпреки това той отиде в отечеството си. Навални ще остане завинаги символ за другата Русия – Русия на демокрацията, доброто, културата, литературата, музиката, на великите постижения на науката.

Навални започна да живее своя вечен живот и ще остане този символ за демократична Русия. За съжаление тя в момента не съществува. Режимът в Москва отдавна вече не се прикрива под някакви демократични одежди, а се е превърнал в диктатура. Путин разбира само от политика на сила и ясни граници и затова Европейският съюз, както и нашите партньори Великобритания и Съединените щати, трябва да продължат с ефективната подкрепа за отбраната на Украйна и незабавна доставка на всичко необходимо за тази отбрана.

Отправлям отново апел за освобождаването на всички политически затворници в Русия и Беларус. Призовавам Съвета и Комисията незабавно да предприемат мерки за санкции за всички, които са отговорни за убийството на Алексей Навални, както и тези 6 000 души, които са в списъка на фондацията на Алексей Навални, да бъдат също в списъка на ЕС. Бог да прости Алексей Навални. Неговият символ на демокрацията ще продължи да живее вечно.

Ilan De Basso (S&D). – Herr talman! Vi lever i en osäker tid. Auktoritära ledare och rörelser gör vår värld farligare. Ryssland har försökt knäcka den europeiska sammanhållningen genom att vrida av gaskranen, sprida desinformation och öka konfliktnivån i våra samhällen.

Aleksej Navalnyj var en sann demokratikämpe som till sista andetaget stod upp för sin övertygelse och våra gemensamma demokratiska värderingar. Proryska högerextrema krafter försöker nu, tillsammans med etablerade partier och ledare, splittra och försvaga våra samhällen. Deras grepp om ekonomi och politik måste brytas.

Demokratins framtid är beroende av att hela samhället är med och mobiliserar i kampen för demokrati och frihet. Både vår historia och samtid lär oss en sak: demokratins försvarare får aldrig vara tysta.

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, our Commission President, Ursula von der Leyen, has stated on 1 March 2022, in our special plenary sitting on the occasion of the beginning of Putin Russia's war of aggression, that, among other things, we have to keep our hand outreached to the other Russia.

Well, now, one of the possible faces of this other Russia is passed away. But it's a tragedy that Alexei Navalny died, but he died for a reason he conveyed to us before his death. He said, 'If I will die, if they will murder me, that means they are weak and we have to continue the fight.'

And Yulia Navalnaya has visited us in the European Parliament today, which is in itself already meaningful this visit, and she continues to fight. I want to say to those who claim this or that, what Alexei Navalny would have stated would be wrong, who are we to judge somebody who gave his life for freedom? Who paid the ultimate price for the people of Russia, for freedom, for Europe and the world?

President. – Mr Mandl, could you take a blue-card question from Ms Ruohonen-Lerner?

Oh, I am sorry, it seems Ms Ruohonen-Lerner did not want to put a blue-card question after all.

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – If I may respond, I highly appreciate parliamentarism – the fact that we have the opportunity to do an exercise like a debate. That's what distinguishes democracy from the Putin Russia state with its totalitarianism and its dictatorship.

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D). – Pirmininke, Putino režimas ir toliau brutaliai naikina savo šalies pilietinę visuomenę. Aleksejaus Navalno nužudymas per Miuncheno saugumo konferenciją – tai įžūlus Putino iššūkis Vakarams ir visiškas nebaudžiamumo demonstravimas. Kremliaus režimas kariauja du karus: vieną Ukrainoje siekdamas sunaikinti ukrainiečių teisę į laisvę ir teisę rinktis savo šalies ateitį, o kitas karas nukreiptas prieš pačios Rusijos žmones, prieš pilietinę visuomenę ir opoziciją, siekiant užtildyti visus, kas nepaklūsta Putino režimo diktatui. Akivaizdu, kad politinė įtampa auga ir tampa kompleksiškesnė, todėl nepakanka išlaikyti vien tik aršią retoriką Rusijos atžvilgiu, o būtina imtis realių veiksmų, ypač aktyviai remiant Ukrainą ir išplečiant sankcijas, ypač tiems, kurie prisidėjo prie A. Navalno mirties, bei užkertant kelią sankcijų apėjimui. Kremliaus režimui sugebėsime pasipriešinti tik būdami vieningi ir solidarūs su Ukraina bei palaikydami jos žmonių kovą už savo šalį.

Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Mr President, this afternoon, we were part of an emotional exchange when we listened to the words of Yulia Navalnaya, the widow of Alexei Navalny, the murdered opposition leader from Russia.

In her words, he is dead, but his dream of a free Russia should not die with him. We must continue the fight for a free Russia. The fight against information, against lies, the fight against criminality, the fight against assassins. We must tackle those who continue to facilitate and hide Russian money. We must continue to defend democracies – our democracies.

And in continuing this fight for a free Russia, we support our neighbours in Ukraine. They too are fighting for freedom, for democracy, against a brutal Russian regime. And they are fighting in our name. We need to understand that Alexei Navalny's fight was just not for his dream of a free Russia, but for our freedoms and our democracies.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Mr President, I want to support the colleagues that have already expressed that we don't need, in this debate, a collection of eulogies or remembrance. Of course, Navalny has been killed, has been murdered. And what we need to propose here is concrete answers to this crime and also to prevent these type of crimes in the future.

For this reason, I want to emphasise two measures. First, to use the Navalny list. Six thousand people that are proposed for a long time to be sanctioned, coming precisely from the Navalny Foundation. This is what the Commission should be working on.

And second, we need personal sanctions for all those that are involved in the incarceration of Navalny since he came back into Russia, meaning since 2021 onwards: prison responsables – he has been in more than one, two or three prisons – judges, police officers. All these people have to be targeted.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (Renew). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è stato un pugno al cuore nella gelida Siberia a spezzare la vita di Aleksej Naval'ny. Vladimir Putin pensava, con questo crimine, di colpire al cuore tutta la società civile russa, spezzandone i sogni di libertà e di democrazia. Si sbagliava, perché migliaia sono state le persone che si sono radunate nelle principali città russe per onorarne la memoria, e migliaia continueranno a farlo, sfidando apertamente le autorità del regime.

Noi dovremmo essere al loro fianco ogni giorno: ma lo siamo davvero? Io ho chiesto con una interrogazione di agire ora per salvare, ad esempio, la vita di Vladimir Kara-Murza. Quanti altri eroi dovremo piangere – come diceva bene il collega Verhofstadt – prima di adottare le sanzioni del *Magnitsky Act* per tutti i responsabili della persecuzione di Aleksej? Prima di estenderle a tutta la lista Naval'ny di 6.000 fiancheggiatori? Prima di sequestrare e donare all'Ucraina tutti i beni del regime degli oligarchi congelati in Europa?

Oggi le parole di Julja ci hanno toccati nel profondo. Noi rispondiamo e dobbiamo rispondere al suo appello. Smettiamo di essere noiosi, dimostriamoci all'altezza del coraggio di Aleksej, se non vogliamo che il suo sacrificio divenga vano. Meno parole, più fatti.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Świeć Panie nad duszą Aleksieja Nawalnego! Wielki szacunek i wsparcie dla jego najbliższych! Putin zgasił gwiazdę nadziei na wolność i demokrację. Z tej śmierci i innych ofiar Putina trzeba, aby Unia Europejska wyciągnęła wnioski. I mam taką refleksję. Zastanówmy się, jaka by była Europa i świat, gdyby nie interesy, gospodarka polityczna z Rosją i Putinem. Co mogłoby być, gdyby nie budowa Nord Stream 2 z Gazpromem? Czy Nawalny i setki innych więźniów politycznych dzisiaj by żyło? Czy Rosja zaatakowałaby Ukrainę? Czy dziesiątki tysięcy Ukraińców by żyło, gdyby nie technologiczna współpraca między Francją, Niemcami i Rosją? Ogromnym błędem było kokietowanie, dyktatura i umowy handlowe. Jeżeli ktoś jeszcze w Unii marzy o resecie z Moskwą, to tak jakby deptał po grobie pomordowanych. Wołam: sankcje, sankcje, sankcje i jeszcze raz sankcje – dotkliwe, polityczne, osobiste dla reżimu, kordon sanitarny dla politycznych oprawców.

Andrey Novakov (PPE). – Mr President, some of us are living in the dream that we are in a candy shop and the war is far away and we are not part of it and we just support it with speeches.

Yesterday in Bulgaria, two Russian spies were caught doing their duties as belonging to the Russian Federation military forces. Those people, yes, probably did not shoot anyone, but they did not work in favour of European Union, respecting our rules and our way of life. So the soldiers are already here. Yes, maybe a different type of soldiers, but they are here.

The death of Alexei Navalny is yet another example that Stalinism is back in Russia and we should be prepared that nothing good we can expect from Russia and we should be prepared, sparing enough funds to prepare our military forces to react if the worst is coming to us.

Vlad Gheorghe (Renew). – Domnule președinte, Putin este un criminal în serie și într-o lume civilizată, criminali în serie trebuie să stea la pușcărie, nu la butoane. Putin are și complici. Din păcate, îi vedem și pe aici, prin Parlamentul European, îi vedem prin parlamentele țărilor noastre, sunt complici care îi fac treaba și în schimbul acestui troc, ei primesc resurse, primesc bani direct. Foarte mulți dintre ei primesc troli, primesc infrastructură.

Complicii criminalilor în serie trebuie să stea la pușcărie, nu în parlamente, cu atât mai puțin în Parlamentul European. Avem reguli, le putem modifica dacă considerăm că nu sunt suficiente, dar mai întâi să le aplicăm pe cele pe care le avem și să punem procurorii să-și facă treaba. Putin l-a omorât pe Alexei Navalnii, pe Boris Nemțov, pe mulți alți activiști pentru drepturile omului și politicieni de opoziție din Rusia și omoară în fiecare zi oameni în Ucraina. Cât mai stăm să-l lăsăm pe el și pe complicii lui în libertate? Ei trebuie să înfunde pușcăria, în frunte cu Putin.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I have taken note of your comments and concerns and I will convey them to HR/VP Borrell.

As you know, five days ago, the 13th package of sanctions against Russia was adopted. It requires unanimity and it will not remain the last one.

Russia's illegal, unjustified and unprovoked war of aggression against Ukraine has amplified internal repression, severely curtailing the freedoms of association, peaceful assembly and expression, drastically limiting media freedom, introducing more censorship and fundamentally undermining the independence of the judiciary and the fair trial guarantees.

We repeat calls on Russia to fully implement all rulings of the European Court of Human Rights. On behalf of HR/VP, I can assure you that we will continue to call upon the Russian authorities to uphold their domestic and international obligations to respect, protect and fulfil human rights, including to uphold the rights of persons belonging to minorities and persons in vulnerable situations.

We will continue to call on the Russian Federation to fully cooperate with the UN and all special procedures related to the human rights situation in the Russian Federation. This is not only our moral obligation, but so much more. It defines who we are and what do we believe in. Our shared values make us stronger together.

Mathieu Michel, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, the debate today underscores the critical need to maintain vigilance, attention and more on developments in Russia. It's clear that we have to continue to send a strong and united message to Russia's political leadership.

I repeat, Russia must allow an independent and transparent international investigation into circumstances of the sudden death of Alexei Navalny. We also repeat international calls on Russia to immediately and unconditionally release all other political prisoners held in similar horrific condition. We will hold them accountable, just as we hold them accountable for the human rights violations and crimes committed against Ukraine and its people. Justice will prevail.

I heard that some of you were wondering why the EU had not imposed any new sanctions yet. Work is ongoing in view of new restrictive measures in response to Alexei Navalny's death. We have to bear in mind that all decisions on imposing new sanctions are made by Member States in the Council through unanimity. These discussions are ongoing. Rest assured that the EU will stay vocal on the human rights situation in Russia, including with public communication and in international human rights fora. We will continue to keep the international pressure on Russia.

At the same time, we will continue to help and cooperate with Russian organisations and movements who share our values both inside and outside Russia to support a different future for Russia.

Alexei Navalny will be remembered as a brave man, a talented organiser and a modern politician who early understood the power of social media. A man who gave hope and believed in the future of a different Russia. He used his influence to bring mass protests to the streets across Russia, exposing the corruption of Putin's regime. Navalny's conviction will not fade away. He will remain a true inspiration for many across Russia and beyond.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Esmu saņēmis sešus rezolūciju priekšlikumus, lai noslēgtu šīs debates.

Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (171. pants)

Eva Maydell (PPE), *in writing*. – Alexei Navalny's brutal murder showed that Putin's authoritarianism knows no boundaries and no humanity. Without an adequate response to this heinous crime, Putin will only feel emboldened to imprison more democratic activists.

We must go beyond strong words and our existing sanctions with more tangible responses. Most fundamentally, we must give asylum to democratic activists from Russia. If we do not help them, they will lose their lives in colonies beyond the Arctic Circle or on the Red Square. The only way these courageous activists can continue their heroic efforts for a Russia where citizens are free to think and demand authorities remain accountable is by first surviving.

I admire the courage of Yulia Navalnaya and all other activists who continue the path of the martyr Alexei Navalny. These brave heroes know what happens to people who dare to stand up to Putin; they remember the sacrifice of Anna Politkovskaya, Boris Nemtsov and too many others.

However, courage alone is not enough. The EU should provide a safe haven so that democratic activists can regain their strength in this long fight. This support would help Russia rise again as a democracy.

Janina Ochojska (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Aleksiej Nawalny zmarł 16 lutego 2024 w kolonii karnej nr 3 w Jamalsko-Nienieckim Okręgu Autonomicznym po trzech latach męki i tortur. Miał tylko 46 lat. Jak powiedziała żona, Julia Nawalna, jej mąż był torturowany, przetrzymywany w betonowej skrzyni – celi o wymiarach 6 m². Miał do dyspozycji tylko łóżko, jedną książkę i jeden kubek. Był całkowicie odcięty od wszelkich kontaktów, telefonów i listów. Śmierć Aleksieja Nawalnego jest ogromnym ciosem dla demokratycznej Europy oraz dla opozycjonistów w Rosji i innych reżymowych krajach. Był dla nich i pozostanie symbolem nieustępliwej walki z korupcyjną władzą. Wierzę, że naród rosyjski ma w sobie siłę nadziei na wolność i na lepszą przyszłość. Akt poświęcenia Nawalnego dla daremnej, wydawałoby się, sprawy, stał się zwycięstwem. Europa i Stany Zjednoczone powinny wszystkimi siłami dążyć do zakończenia wojny, wesprzeć Ukrainę w odbudowie oraz Rosję w dążeniu do przemian. Powinniśmy kierować się nie wpływami politycznymi, a dobrem każdego narodu, który pragnie żyć w wolności i poszanowaniu prawa. Tego chciałby Nawalny.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), *kirjallinen*. – Aleksei Navalnyin nimi on liitetty siihen pitkään oppositiohahmojen ja valtaapitäviä haastaneiden listaan, jotka diktaattori Putin on putsannut pois tieltään. Maan todellinen oppositio on joko maanpaossa, vankilassa tai murhattuna.

Entinen presidentti Medvedev lausui hiljattain, että venäläismiehityksen alla elävät ukrainamieliset asukkaat on lähetettävä työleireille Siperiaan. Kymmeniä tuhansia lapsia on kaapattu ja heidän ukrainalainen identiteettinsä yritetään häivyttää. Käynnissä on kansanmurha.

Poliittiset murhat eivät ole Venäjällä yksittäistapauksia. Maassa on voimissaan murhanhimoinen kuolon kultti, jossa ihmisarvolla ei ole merkitystä.

Kaikki, jotka taistelevat tätä Putinin terrorikonetta vastaan, ansaitsevat arvostusta. Puutteistaan huolimatta Navalnyillä oli oma roolinsa tässä paljastaessaan hallinnon korruptiota. Suurimmat sankarit löytyvät kuitenkin Ukrainan etulinjasta niiden joukkojen piiristä, jotka puolustavat maataan ja perheitään venäläiseltä imperialismilta.

12. Redobândirea avantajului competitiv al UE – o Uniune prosperă într-o economie mondială fragmentată (dezbatere pe o temă de actualitate)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par aktuāliem jautājumiem (Reglamenta 162. pants) par mūsu konkurences priekšrocības atgūšanu: plaukstošā ES sadrumstalotā globālajā ekonomikā.

Vēlos informēt deputātus, ka šajās debatēs nebūs brīvā mikrofona procedūras un netiks pieņemti zilās kartītes jautājumi.

Morten Løkkegaard, author. – Mr President, Minister, Commissioner, pleased to see you for this very, very important subject, topic and debate. As a matter of fact, this debate is so important that I will spend just a few minutes in my mother tongue so that my home audience also get a chance to get some of the very important points.

Konkurrenceevne er tilbage på dagsordenen. Efter flere år, hvor debatten stort set har været fraværende omkring konkurrenceevne, ja så er den tilbage. Konkurrenceevnen er allerøverst på den politiske agenda i EU og i medlemslandene, og det er ikke noget tilfælde. Konkurrenceevnen er nemlig ikke bare et spørgsmål om tørre tal, om virksomheder, om statistik osv. Det er et spørgsmål om, eller er blevet, et spørgsmål om tryghed. Vi er midt i en krig. Verden er blevet et mere utrygt sted, hvor grænser er truede. Der er pres på vores demokratier verden over. Vi har med andre ord ganske enkelt ikke råd til at tage chancer. Vi skal sikre en robust økonomi i Europa. Vi skal skabe den nødvendige tryghed. Det handler om tryghed og om at skabe tryghed gennem stigende velstand og ved at sikre penge til vores borgere, til deres velfærd. Faktisk er det et, synes jeg, grundlæggende politisk løfte til de europæiske borgere, at EU skal sikre vækst og velstand og i dette tilfælde altså også tryghed. Krigen i Ukraine har skabt høje energipriser. Den har skabt inflation, som rammer vore virksomheder. Her skal det europæiske fællesskab derfor være garant for, at vi netop sikrer stigende vækst og velstand, og det kræver bl.a. gode vilkår for det europæiske erhvervsliv. Men vores virksomheder står over for en alvorlig krise. Deres muligheder for at konkurrere globalt er blevet forværret over en årrække. Vi taber terræn til USA. Vi taber terræn til Kina. EU's andel af den globale BNP forventes at skrumpes fra det nuværende 15 ned til 9 i 2050. Alene i år vurderes EU at nå BNP vækst på kun sløje 0,6 %, mens væksten i USA forventes at være mere end tre gange så høj; 2,1%, og Kina buldrer derudaf med en vækst på 4,7 %. Det er åbenlyst, at der er brug for helt akut handling. Fortsætter vi skåltalerne uden at følge op med handling, risikerer vi at miste vores iværksættere og vores virksomheder, der ganske enkelt flygter væk fra det europæiske område. Målet er derfor meget klart: Europa må ikke ende med at blive et frilandsmuseum. Europa skal være et nyt vækstcentrum. Netop derfor præsenterede den liberale gruppe i Parlamentet i går en ti-punktsplan. For mit parti Venstre og for Renew Europe vil det kommende valg være afgørende for EU's konkurrenceevne og derfor denne pjece, hvor vi kommer med ti ideer til, hvordan vi kan styrke konkurrenceevnen. Som frontløber på dagsordenen er det vores mål at gøre økonomier til et centralt tema i den kommende valgkamp. Tiden her tillader jo ikke, at jeg opremser alle disse gode forslag. Nogle af de mest centrale vil jeg dog lige nævne, at vi selvfølgelig fjerner og arbejder konstant på at fjerne bureaukrati, der begrænser vores erhvervsliv. Von der Leyen var jo selv i sin 'state of the Union'-tale inde på, at der skulle gøres noget. Lad os holde Kommissionen fast på det løfte og gerne tilføje mere endnu.

Vi vil satse massivt på øgede investeringer i forskning og udvikling. Det er fuldstændig afgørende, vi ligger lavt i forhold til vores konkurrenter. Og endelig som noget helt konkret, at vi gør meget ud af enforcement, altså håndhævelse. Faktisk ned til et punkt, hvor vi foreslår en håndhævelseskommissær, der kan sikre en ens og fair håndhævelse på tværs af medlemslandene. Det er et stort problem i dag.

Så slutteligt, konkurrenceevne handler om at skabe velstand, sikre velfærd og skabe tryghed. Præcis derfor bør økonomi og konkurrenceevne stå allerøverst på dagsordenen, og derfor er det også godt, at vi tager debatten i dag. Jeg ser frem til at høre synspunkterne fra kollegaerne og fra Rådet og fra Kommissionen.

Mathieu Michel, président en exercice du Conseil. – Monsieur le Président, honorables parlementaires, Monsieur le Commissaire, le marché unique est au cœur de notre compétitivité. Avec plus de 440 millions de consommateurs et d'importantes économies d'échelle, il fait de l'Union le plus grand espace commercial du monde et un territoire particulièrement attractif pour les investissements étrangers. Le sujet évoqué est également au cœur des priorités de la présidence belge, raison pour laquelle nous avons souhaité mandater M. Enrico Letta afin de réaliser un rapport sur l'avenir du marché intérieur.

Vous le savez, le marché unique est une fondation économique solide qui a permis d'agréger la demande de biens et de services, de diversifier nos sources d'approvisionnement avec de nombreux accords commerciaux stratégiques avec des pays tiers et aussi de développer de nombreuses possibilités d'innovation. Il a soutenu la productivité tout en développant les droits sociaux et des conditions de travail équitables pour les Européens. Le marché unique est aussi la pierre angulaire de notre compétitivité économique à long terme. Nous le savons, l'économie européenne est confrontée à des défis importants: l'instabilité géopolitique, le changement climatique, l'accélération technologique, la hausse des prix de l'énergie, les pénuries de main d'œuvre et de compétences, ou encore les dépendances stratégiques et la concurrence internationale. Ces multiples défis montrent clairement l'importance de renforcer la résilience du marché unique, un objectif partagé par toutes les institutions européennes.

Le Conseil a déjà commencé ses discussions sur le rapport annuel sur le marché unique et la compétitivité, qui sera d'ailleurs à l'ordre du jour du Conseil «Compétitivité» du 7 mars prochain. Les ministres auront l'opportunité d'échanger leurs points de vue sur l'évolution annuelle des différents facteurs de compétitivité abordés dans le rapport, en vue d'identifier les principaux défis à venir et les mesures nécessaires pour les relever.

Nous devons poursuivre nos efforts pour réduire considérablement nos dépendances stratégiques, notamment vis-à-vis du secteur clé de l'énergie, où les prix restent très élevés. Nous avons fait beaucoup ces dernières années, mais je suis convaincu que nous pouvons encore en faire davantage ensemble. Le marché unique constitue un puissant moteur de cohésion entre les États membres et contribue à la prospérité de nos citoyens. Les consommateurs bénéficient de produits et services sûrs et de qualité qui respectent les plus hauts standards et, dans de nombreux cas, ces règles sont devenues des normes internationales, renforçant ainsi le rôle de l'Union européenne au niveau mondial en tant que *standard-setter*.

Les transitions écologique et numérique offrent une opportunité unique pour relancer la compétitivité de nos entreprises. Les ingrédients de notre succès des 30 dernières années — règlements communs, normalisation, reconnaissance mutuelle, protection des consommateurs, conditions de concurrence équitables, innovation — sont les ingrédients pour maîtriser avec succès cette double transition. Les discussions sur l'évolution du marché unique et la compétitivité de l'Union seront donc alimentées par la publication du rapport de haut niveau de M. Enrico Letta sur l'avenir du marché unique, et du rapport de Mario Draghi sur l'avenir de la compétitivité européenne.

Monsieur le Président, honorables parlementaires, Monsieur le Commissaire, les Européens sont créatifs, talentueux et travailleurs. Ils contribuent chaque jour à la prospérité et à la solidarité de l'espace européen. Ils sont la fondation de notre compétitivité et aussi de notre autonomie stratégique. Nous nous devons d'être à leurs côtés et de leur faire confiance afin de libérer leur plein potentiel. Nous devons veiller à ne pas alourdir inutilement notre cadre législatif et à alléger la charge administrative pesant sur celles et ceux qui construisent chaque jour une économie solide et résiliente. Les règles existantes doivent être appliquées de manière cohérente, concertée et efficace. Nous devons nous attaquer au risque de fragmentation du marché et garantir des conditions de concurrence équitables pour tous. La meilleure garantie d'une compétitivité forte est le renforcement d'un marché unique qui soit en même temps inclusif, convergent et ambitieux. La présidence belge en fait une priorité.

Thierry Breton, *membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Ministre, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je voudrais vous remercier d'avoir proposé aujourd'hui ce débat sur la compétitivité de l'Europe. Une Europe prospère, c'est une Europe compétitive, sans dépendance excessive, engagée avec succès et dynamisme dans sa double transition verte et numérique, et qui sache préserver ses emplois et son modèle social.

Pour atteindre ses objectifs, je considère qu'une politique de compétitivité européenne doit pouvoir s'articuler autour de quatre piliers. Le premier pilier, c'est un cadre politique favorable aux investissements industriels sur les marchés d'avenir. Et c'est tout le sens des initiatives que nous avons prises dans le domaine, par exemple, des matières premières critiques, des semi-conducteurs, des industries «Zéro net».

Ces textes législatifs puissants contribuent à accélérer la production industrielle en Europe comme aucun autre instrument de l'Union européenne ne l'avait fait auparavant, via des cibles de capacité manufacturière, un choc de simplification sectorielle, des financements publics ciblés pour favoriser évidemment l'investissement privé et pour soutenir l'ensemble des acteurs économiques, et en particulier les plus petits. Mais il est clair que ces instruments seuls ne suffiront pas.

Les estimations de la Commission identifient un besoin de 650 milliards d'euros par an pour la double transition verte et numérique. Et encore, c'est sans compter nos besoins nouveaux et accrus en matière de défense! Monsieur Draghi, dont on vient de parler à l'instant, est un peu moins ambitieux pour sa part, puisqu'il indique que, pour faire face à la Chine et aux États-Unis, il nous faudrait investir plus de 500 milliards d'euros par an dans notre double transition.

Et si une majorité de ces crédits doivent venir de financements privés, un tiers de cette enveloppe devrait venir de fonds publics. Cet argent public doit être globalement européen, car dans le cas contraire, nous ferons face à un florilège d'aides d'État qui vont évidemment morceler le marché intérieur et en un mot, le fragmenter. C'est donc uniquement au niveau européen que nous pourrions répondre à notre partenaire et allié américain, par exemple, qui, avec l'*Inflation Reduction Act*, a lancé un plan d'investissement public massif qui dépasse désormais les 850 milliards de dollars. Dans ce cadre, comme le propose excellemment Morten Løkkegaard, je suis pour que l'on étudie les voies pour établir un véritable fonds de souveraineté européen, bien différent de STEP, évidemment, destiné à maintenir la compétitivité de notre industrie européenne.

Le deuxième pilier, c'est évidemment sécuriser nos chaînes de valeur. L'Europe ne peut rester compétitive, ouverte et une destination d'investissements étrangers de premier choix que si elle s'inscrit dans des relations commerciales équilibrées, réciproques et mutuellement bénéfiques. On ne peut évidemment, on l'a répété à maintes reprises, y compris dans cet hémicycle, remplacer une dépendance au gaz russe par une dépendance aux technologies chinoises, ce qui nécessite un usage sans délai, ni hésitation de tous nos instruments contre les pratiques déloyales. Dans ce cadre, j'attends avec impatience le résultat de l'enquête sur les subventions publiques aux voitures électriques, et j'appelle de mes vœux un élargissement de nos réflexions à d'autres domaines des technologies propres, comme par exemple les renouvelables.

J'ajoute que nous venons de lancer une première enquête dans le cadre des règlements sur les subventions étrangères concernant le secteur ferroviaire, et je peux vous indiquer ici que d'autres suivront. Enfin, nous devons revoir clairement notre logiciel sur les accords de libre-échange. Bien sûr, le commerce international est nécessaire et créateur de richesse, mais quand les normes imposées à nos entreprises ou à nos agriculteurs — on en parle beaucoup en ce moment — ne sont pas les mêmes que celles imposées à leurs concurrents, c'est inacceptable et cela nuit directement à la compétitivité de nos acteurs économiques. Et pour garantir des conditions de concurrence équitables, il faudra plus que de simples références au respect de l'Accord de Paris sur le climat ou à des mesures «miroirs» appliquées aux produits sans tenir compte des processus de production.

Ce n'est pas être protectionniste que de dire cela, c'est préserver notre compétitivité! C'est ne plus être naïfs. C'est aussi pouvoir dire à nos agriculteurs, aux ouvriers, aux salariés aux quatre coins de l'Europe, à tous nos entrepreneurs, aux investisseurs, que les choix sociaux et environnementaux faits ici en Europe ne seront plus mis à mal par une fuite de notre production là-bas, ailleurs dans le monde.

Le troisième pilier, c'est la modernisation de notre marché intérieur, comme le rappelle Enrico Letta, qui doit rendre son rapport dans quelques jours, en avril, nous devons mener une réforme majeure du marché unique, des télécoms et du *cloud* pour construire les infrastructures numériques nécessaires pour la transition numérique. C'est la clé de voûte de notre décennie numérique. C'est un facteur essentiel de la compétitivité économique dans une société de l'information, dans une société de la donnée. Je viens, du reste, à cet effet de présenter un livre blanc sur cette question qui devrait, dès 2025, tracer la voie vers un acte sur les réseaux numériques indispensable pour notre marché intérieur et permettre de tirer le bénéfice complet de la transition numérique.

Nous devons également passer à la vitesse supérieure dans le marché intérieur de l'énergie. Tous les entrepreneurs me le disent: une énergie abondante, bon marché et décarbonée est la clé de notre rebond en matière de compétitivité. Beaucoup, évidemment, reste à faire, et notamment en matière d'interconnexion, d'intégration du nucléaire et d'énergies renouvelables. Et puis enfin, et c'est le troisième point, il est temps de libérer le serpent de mer de l'union des marchés de capitaux. Nous devons permettre davantage d'investissements privés, faciliter l'accès aux marchés pour les start up, les PME, les très petites entreprises, et financer les immenses ambitions et transitions auxquelles l'Europe est confrontée.

Par ailleurs, il nous faut aussi sérieusement réfléchir à la mise en œuvre de notre acquis. Car il faut bien avouer que ce travail de coordination essentiel, qui dépasse les seules questions du marché intérieur, mérite d'être toujours amélioré. C'est pourquoi je trouve très intéressante l'idée portée par le groupe Renew d'un vice-président de la Commission en charge du contrôle de la mise en œuvre de nos instruments, ce que nous appelons en anglais l'*enforcement*.

Le quatrième et dernier pilier, c'est celui des compétences. Notre compétitivité repose également sur un accès aux talents et à une main d'œuvre qualifiée. Je tiens à souligner ici l'excellent travail que nous avons pu faire ensemble avec mon collègue Nicolas Schmit sur ces questions sociales. Il a fait un travail remarquable! C'est un grand commissaire à l'emploi et à la formation. Nous devons accroître nos efforts de formation afin de couvrir les besoins de notre marché. Bien entendu, il s'agit d'une compétence des États membres, mais nous devons nous coordonner sur cette question, notamment au travers des académies des technologies propres que nous avons lancées ou du cyber, comme nous l'avons fait, là encore, dernièrement.

Lídia Pereira, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhor Presidente, qual é a principal vantagem competitiva da Europa? É o mercado interno. A resposta é óbvia, mas as políticas têm de ser consequentes.

Só seremos competitivos se o nosso mercado for completamente integrado. Não teremos um mercado integrado enquanto investirmos apenas 2,2 % do PIB em investigação e desenvolvimento e enquanto países como Portugal investirem metade da Bélgica ou da Suécia na relação com o PIB.

Não teremos um mercado integrado enquanto países europeus, como Portugal, continuarem nos lugares mais baixos do índice de competitividade fiscal e não teremos um mercado integrado enquanto não apostarmos na União dos Mercados de Capitais e, já agora, na literacia financeira para todos os cidadãos.

O aumento da nossa competitividade é uma missão de todos, União, Estado e empresas. Eu confio nas empresas europeias, façamos agora a nossa parte.

René Repasi, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Herr Minister, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Europa hat ein Wettbewerbsfähigkeitsproblem. Das packen wir an, indem wir Europa zu einem Ort der schöpferischen Zerstörung machen. Nicht Staatsgeld wird uns retten, sondern Innovation.

Aber wie sieht es aus in Europa? An Universitäten findet alles statt außer Forschung. Stattdessen werden Forscherinnen und Forscher in Unmengen von Forschungsförderanträgen gebracht, die kaum Erfolg haben. Ein Produkt wird kaum zur Marktreife gebracht, weil es fehlendes Kapital gibt und Kapital mehr an den Stakeholder-Value denkt, als die Idee zu fördern. Der Markt achtet nicht auf Marktmacht, sondern schützt die Kleinen nicht, wenn sie kommen. *Killer acquisitions* ist das Stichwort.

Was brauchen wir? Wir brauchen Universitäten, die der Ort der Forschung werden, indem wir sie befreien vom neoliberalen Griff auf das Marktmodell unserer Universitäten. Zweitens braucht das Kapital Wege in die Innovation durch eine Gesellschaftsrechtsform, die dem Gesellschaftszweck verpflichtet ist. Und drittens: Vor allem brauchen wir eine Wettbewerbspolitik, die die Marktmacht bekämpft und nicht nur die Missbräuche und deswegen unsere Kleinen vor den *killer acquisitions* schützt.

Ondřej Knotek, *za skupinu Renew*. – Pane předsedající, pane komisaři, pane ministře, evropský průmysl stagnuje a zbytek světa vyrábí levněji a na náš úkor a s více emisemi. Výsledkem je, že Evropa ztrácí konkurenceschopnost a světové emise skleníkových plynů neklesají.

A to je špatně, tohle nemůže být! Emisní povolenka je nejdražší na světě. Evropská emisní povolenka je skutečně nejdražší a uměle zdražuje výrobu a občanům zvedá ceny energií. A proto Vás, pane komisaři, vyzývám, předložte takové úpravy, které umožní zafixovat cenu emisní povolenky dlouhodobě na ceně 30 EUR za povolenku. Tím nastartujeme opět konkurenceschopnost Evropy a občanům zajistíme cenově více dostupné energie, protože nebudeme předčasně zbytečně uzavírat některé stabilní fosilní zdroje.

Ano, Evropa odejde od fosilních paliv, ale ne dříve, než je budeme moci nahradit novými jadernými zdroji a občasnými obnovitelnými zdroji. Pro konkurenceschopnost Evropy a v zájmu světového klimatu je, aby některé státy v Evropské unii ještě řadu let energeticky využívaly uhlí a jiná fosilní paliva, a cena emisní povolenky tomu nemůže bránit.

Anna Cavazzini, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Was ist eine der größten Bedrohungen für die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit in der Europäischen Union? Es ist der Klimawandel mit seinen extremen Wetterereignissen, mit der Störung von Lieferketten oder der Infragestellung von ganzen Geschäftsmodellen. Deshalb sind der *Green Deal* der EU und seine Fortführung ein zentraler Baustein für die Stärkung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit in der Europäischen Union. Der *Green Deal* schafft Planbarkeit für die Unternehmen und er schafft Bürokratie ganz konkret ab.

Wir wissen doch alle: Eine EU-Regel ist tausendmal besser als 27 verschiedene Regeln und eine Fragmentierung des Binnenmarktes. Deshalb müssen wir jetzt – und muss die Kommission vor allen Dingen auch in der nächsten Legislatur – den *Green Deal* fortführen und ausbauen. Wir müssen endlich eine komplette Unabhängigkeit in der Energieversorgung bekommen und 100 Prozent Erneuerbare – die sind billiger und machen uns unabhängig von Autokraten.

Zweitens brauchen wir klare Leitlinien und Standards für eine grüne europäische Industriepolitik mit mehr Fertigungskapazitäten in der EU in strategischen Schlüsseltechnologien. Denn auch hier können wir es uns nicht leisten, abhängig zu sein von Autokraten.

Drittens – und das wurde von vielen heute schon erwähnt – brauchen wir mehr europäische Investitionen. Wir haben eine riesige Investitionslücke, was die Finanzierung des *Green Deal*, aber auch des Digitalen angeht. Und ich möchte nicht, dass jeder einzelne Mitgliedstaat – ob der dann reich ist oder weniger reich – dafür selber verantwortlich ist. Wir brauchen ein europäisches Instrument, damit uns der Binnenmarkt nicht auseinandergerissen wird.

Und letzter Punkt, weil meine Zeit abläuft: Wir müssen auch die Nachfrage nach unseren grünen Produkten steigern, und das können wir durch die öffentliche Beschaffung machen. 14 Prozent des BIP sind die öffentliche Beschaffung. Lassen Sie uns die nutzen, um unsere grünen Industrieprodukte zu kaufen.

Geert Bourgeois, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, de Europese Green Deal had van meet af aan moeten samengaan met een Europees pact voor welvaart en jobs. Dat gebeurde niet. Daardoor verliezen we industrie. Daardoor verhuizen bedrijven naar de Verenigde Staten en zijn we hopeloos afhankelijk van China voor de broodnodige materialen voor de groene en de digitale transitie. Daarbovenop liet de Commissie het gelijke speelveld voor staatssteun los, waardoor Vlaanderen bijvoorbeeld jobs en investeringen verliest.

Wat moet er gebeuren? Welnu, wij moeten de interne markt voltooien. Ten tweede moet er een drastische shift komen in het Europese budget richting grensoverschrijdende investeringen en hoog-innovatieve investeringen. In plaats van bedrijven te bedelven onder regels, moeten we burgers en bedrijven een hoopvol en rechtszeker perspectief bieden.

Gunnar Beck, *on behalf of the ID Group*. – Mr President, in 2008, the EU economy was still noticeably larger than that of the US. Today, the US economy is more than a third larger. Year on year, the gap is widening because growth paths have been diverging. Even struggling post-Brexit Britain is easily outperforming Germany and France. So, why is Europe so manifestly and collectively failing?

First, because of the Green Deal which assumes that the EU, with a share of about 8% of worldwide CO₂ emissions, can singlehandedly limit global warming. The Green Deal is saving nothing, but it will certainly make poor people even poorer.

Secondly, an inflationary monetary policy which sustains a vicious spiral of stagflation.

Third, self-defeating sanctions and the dumbest energy policy in the world, which harm us more than Russia and which have replaced Germany's dependence on cheap Russian gas with dependency on high-price Russian energy re-exported via India or Azerbaijan.

Fourth, a truly fantastical migration policy which relies on unqualified mass migration as a replacement for tens of millions of native skilled labourers on the verge of retirement.

The result of this suicidal policy mix, I sadly but confidently predict, will be the collapse both of the European economies and of our welfare states. Europe's decline is often compared to that of the Roman Empire, but Rome declined over five centuries and was undermined by all-too-human decadence and overwhelmed by external forces.

Modern Europe, by contrast, is experiencing the strangest death ever. It's the first intentionally de-developing civil civilisation, both intellectually and economically. We have lost faith in everything except the woke ideology, which is defying the laws of nature, of scientific inquiry and of economic progress all at once. The whole world is secretly laughing at the closing of the European mind. So, the EU today, I'm sad to say, is making history for Chinese and Russian historians to record.

Emmanuel Maurel, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, je trouve qu'on a tendance à trop aborder les questions économiques, ici en Europe, sous l'angle de la seule compétitivité. Or, ce qui devrait aussi nous préoccuper, c'est la faiblesse de la croissance, particulièrement dans la zone euro. Si l'on excepte la période post-Covid, elle n'a dépassé 2 % que deux fois en quinze ans. Cette performance est parmi les plus médiocres du monde, et surtout si on regarde par rapport aux États-Unis, où c'est le contraire, il y a un vrai décrochage.

La différence entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis, par exemple, c'est la conduite de la politique macroéconomique. Il faut se rendre à l'évidence, l'austérité budgétaire nous a tués à petit feu, et nous, au lieu d'en tirer les conclusions, nous avons choisi, comme cela a été dit il y a quelques jours, de repartir sur cette voie funeste. Or, on ne peut pas séparer la compétitivité de la croissance et notamment de l'investissement car, sans eux la compétitivité finit par s'épuiser.

Il y a une autre raison, et le commissaire y a été sensible. La grande différence entre l'Europe et ses partenaires commerciaux, c'est la religion de l'ouverture économique et du libre-échange. Les États-Unis, la Chine, le Brésil, ces pays se protègent. Nous, au contraire, on continue à être des religieux du libre-échange, ou alors quand on se protège, c'est trop peu et trop complexe, comme on l'a vu avec le programme STEP. Donc, si on veut vraiment être compétitifs, il faut changer radicalement de politique économique.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Mr President, our global economy is changing very quickly. The main drivers are employment of new technologies, increased competitiveness of Asian economies, a decline in global trade as well as decarbonisation. This is completely changing level playing field for the factories.

We did well in setting the policies, setting the predictable rules and the targets, but so far, we failed to support the transformation of the economy and the businesses, and obviously secure some financial support.

Instead of having EU VAT single market consistent tax policies or financial support policies, we are going for relaxation of the rules and a fragmented policy, and this is far from being optimal. At the same time, our firms are still facing heavy regulation and fragmented rules.

I guess competitiveness must become quickly a number one topic of EU, together with the security. It is really time to act.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, l'Europa rischia un gap di competitività – forse già ne soffre – nei confronti delle altre grandi potenze del mondo e delle economie che noi conosciamo. Noi non possiamo permetterci di arretrare, di perdere terreno in tema di capacità di ricerca tecnologica e anche di posizionamento nell'*upstream* dell'innovazione, pena una perdita per tutte le dimensioni della vita dell'Europa.

Ci siamo sempre considerati un gigante economico e per questo dicevamo che non possiamo rimanere un nano politico. Oggi il dilemma ritorna, secondo me in altri termini: se noi diventiamo anche un nano politico, noi saremo un nano economico e un soggetto politico influente sulla scena mondiale, proprio nel momento in cui la tumultuosa geopolitica richiede che l'Europa abbia un ruolo da protagonista.

Per questa ragione io penso che la decisione di una strategia per la competitività, una strategia di rilancio degli investimenti, le grandi scelte che ci suggeriscono Draghi, il rapporto Letta, le cose che lei ha detto, signor Commissario, dei quattro pilastri: tutto ciò secondo me non potrà avvenire se noi non faremo insieme una riforma politica.

Solo un'Europa unita federale che affronti la riforma dei trattati porrà la premessa per tutto questo. Gli Stati nazionali in conflitto tra loro non ci porteranno lungo la strada della riconquista della competitività.

Mauri Pekkarinen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, tuottavuus, kilpailukyky ja kasvu. Kaikkien näiden sanojen takaa löytyy osaaminen ja innovatiivisuus. Meillä Euroopassa satsaaminen vain innovaatioihin ei ole noudatellut niitä toiveita ja tavoitteita, mitä itse olemme asettaneet. Monet muut maat, meidän kilpailijat, ovat ajaneet ohi. Kun meillä liikutaan kahdessa prosentissa, Kiina, USA ja monet maat kulkevat kolmesta viiteen prosentin satsauksen kohdalla.

Meillä sekä yksityiset että julkiset satsaukset ovat riittämättömiä. Rahaa Euroopan unionilla on. Koheesiorahat, elvytysrahat ja sosiaalinen ilmastorahasto ovat yhteensä pitkästi yli tuhat miljardia euroa. Niiden käyttö tänä päivänä, kun katsotaan mihin niitä suunnataan, on kaikkea muuta kuin excellenssiä. Niitä käytetään tavalla, joka ei tuota kilpailukykyä ja tuottavuutta Euroopalle.

Minun toiveeni on, että kun seuraavaa ohjelmakautta valmistellaan aluekehityksessä, näiden rahojen ja ennen kaikkea näiden rahojen ja muidenkin vastaavien rahojen käytössä otetaan excellenssiä ja otetaan laatua ja kilpailukykyä parantava vaikutus keskeiseksi kriteeriksi rahojen allokaatiossa.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! Żeby rozwiązać problem, trzeba najpierw postawić diagnozę. A diagnoza, Panie Komisarzu, jest prosta, ta diagnoza jest czytelna – Europa stała się karłem gospodarczym z powodu realizacji polityki klimatycznej. Polityki klimatycznej, która powoduje, że następuje ucieczka emisji. Firmy wyprowadzają produkcję poza Unię Europejską. Czy chcecie Państwo udawać, że nie widzicie, że ten statek tonie? Ten statek, który nazywa się Unia Europejska, nabrał tak bardzo wody, że on już tonie. Rolnicy zdesperowani wychodzą na ulice. Przemysł wyprowadza produkcję poza Unię Europejską, a my dyskutujemy grzecznie o niczym.

Czas ratować gospodarkę unijną. Czas opamiętać się. Skoro Pan mówi o dobrej współpracy w Komisji Europejskiej, to proszę mi powiedzieć, dlaczego szefowa Komisji Europejskiej chce przykręcić jeszcze bardziej śrubę klimatyczną i doprowadzić do redukcji emisji aż o 90%? To będzie zagłada europejskiej gospodarki. Czas na opamiętanie.

Mathilde Androuët (ID). – Monsieur le Président, conforter la prospérité économique de l'Union européenne et reprendre l'avantage de la concurrence internationale. Voilà une belle ambition, qui n'est autre que de la méthode Coué, Monsieur Breton! Comment pouvez-vous parler de prospérité dans un continent que vous avez déjà désindustrialisé depuis des décennies, qui voit un niveau de faillites d'entreprises au plus haut depuis 2008, qui accroît les traités de libre-échange commerciaux qui favorisent nos concurrents plutôt que nous, qui voit ses pépites scientifiques et technologiques se faire déclasser par des puissances émergentes?

Regardons les réalités en face: l'attractivité européenne s'étirole pendant que les autres continents, tout spécialement l'Asie et l'Amérique du Nord, tirent leur épingle du jeu. L'Union européenne aura par exemple été incapable d'anticiper les conséquences de l'*Inflation Reduction Act*, qui fausse la libre concurrence avec l'industrie européenne par le subventionnement massif des entreprises américaines. Le résultat? Un nombre incalculable de secteurs stratégiques échappent aux Européens sous le poids des subventions américaines et de l'absence totale de soutien des instances bruxelloises.

Qu'il s'agisse du secteur automobile, de l'énergie ou encore du numérique, les entreprises européennes finissent par préférer investir à l'étranger plutôt que sur notre continent, par manque de compétitivité sur notre propre sol. Un comble! La guerre économique est impitoyable. Il serait naïf de croire que nous pourrions la gagner si nous ne nous battons pas à armes égales avec nos adversaires et refusons par dogmatisme des leviers cruciaux. Oui, il faut réindustrialiser, oui, il faut relocaliser, oui, il faut se fixer comme cadre la souveraineté économique. Sans cela, nous n'aurons de cesse de nous appauvrir. Avec cela, avec ces armes, nous redeviendrons une véritable puissance mondiale.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Pán predsedajúci, vďaka európskej spolupráci zažívame na našom kontinente takmer osemdesiat rokov mierového spolunažívania a polstoročie ekonomickej prosperity.

Musíme si uvedomiť, že je to najmä vďaka rozvoju malého podnikania, ktoré tvorí polovicu európskeho produktu a vytvára 100 miliónov pracovných miest. Rozvoj malého podnikania je priamo úmerný s rozvojom našej konkurencieschopnosti.

A tu chcem upozorniť na jednu zásadnú vec, s ktorou sa boria malí podnikatelia, a tou je byrokracia. Boj proti byrokrácii zásadne môže zlepšiť našu pozíciu v globálnej konkurencieschopnosti.

Oceňujem na jednej strane aktivity Komisie, čo sa týka 25 % zníženia regulačnej záťaže alebo aktivity „one in, two out“, ale pri každej novej regulačnej záťaži sa musíme pozrieť na to, či to zjednodušuje prostredie alebo či to zhoršuje pozíciu podnikateľov.

Ak budeme úspešne bojovať proti byrokrácii, tak spolu s diverzifikáciou energetických zdrojov, rozvojom vzdelávania a rozvojom digitálnych zručností dokážeme znovu získať našu konkurenčnú výhodu. Takže verím, že sa nám to podarí.

Lara Wolters (S&D). – Mr President, so, European companies have the right to exploit children, they have the right to destroy forests and, most of all, European companies have the right not to ask any questions or right any wrongs.

To be very clear, this is not what I think. This is what Emmanuel Macron, Giorgia Meloni and Christian Lindner have fought for together over the past weeks. And if I sound angry now, it's because I am.

We had a deal, but business lobbies would not give up and here we are. These leaders have now become convinced that accountability is a burden and human rights are a nice-to-have. For them, fair competition is speaking big words about European norms and values, and then encouraging a cut-throat race to the bottom. The European way of life, well apparently, that's the European right to wealth at the expense of others.

The cynicism of today's developments, the shamelessness, the outrageous injustice of big business lobbies who tell their political leaders what to do instead of the other way round. And as always, the victims of corporates' wrongdoing are ignored. Time is running out. I urge Member States to stop their political games and approve the due diligence law.

Svenja Hahn (Renew). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kollegen! Ich bin davon überzeugt, dass wir mehr Wettbewerbsfähigkeit brauchen. Denn das ist auch ein Einsatz gegen die Drohung von Autokraten für unsere Demokratie und Wirtschaft. Aber Wettbewerb werden wir nicht stärken oder wir werden auch nicht resilienter werden, wenn wir unseren Binnenmarkt abschotten und nur einzelne Unternehmen politisch protegieren.

Denn ich höre viel zu oft, dass „fairer Wettbewerb“ gesagt wird, aber eigentlich Protektionismus und Subventionen gemeint sind. Dabei ist die europäische Wirtschaft so vielfältig mit vielen kleinen und mittelständischen Playern. Und auch ihnen müssen wir ermöglichen, auf Weltniveau zu spielen.

Dafür muss aber vor allen Dingen Ursula von der Leyens Kommission endlich aufhören, immer neue bürokratische Gesetze zu schaffen, die zwar gut gemeint, aber schlecht gemacht sind, wie leider auch das Lieferkettengesetz. Wir müssen Barrieren und Bürokratie im Binnenmarkt abbauen und wir müssen geplante Gesetze auf den Prüfstand stellen und bestehende verschlanken. Wir brauchen neue Absatzmärkte durch mehr Freihandel und Zugang zu Energie und Rohstoffen durch neue Partnerschaften. Und wir brauchen mehr Mut und Freude an technologischem Fortschritt. Wir brauchen eine Wirtschaftswende für mehr Wachstum, Wettbewerb und Wohlstand in Deutschland und Europa.

Marie Dauchy (ID). – Monsieur le Président, sur un débat d'actualité consacré à la compétitivité industrielle européenne, comment ne pas évoquer le cas le plus emblématique de l'incompétence de nos dirigeants en la matière? Je veux évidemment parler de l'entreprise Atos, ancien fleuron industriel français, qui comptait parmi les dix entreprises les plus importantes dans le secteur essentiel des services numériques, aux côtés d'IBM ou de HP. Mais regardez où nous en sommes maintenant! Après des dizaines d'années de choix désastreux, ce joyau est au bord de la faillite.

Oui, vous avez bien entendu: l'entreprise Atos a perdu plus de 4 500 % de sa valeur boursière et est étranglée par une dette de plus de 5 milliards d'euros. Et qui est responsable de cette débâcle industrielle? Thierry Breton, bien sûr! Thierry Breton, l'actuel commissaire européen au marché intérieur, a été PDG d'Atos entre 2008 et sa nomination à la Commission européenne en 2019. Et que s'est-il passé pendant ces années? Rien de positif, puisqu'il a complètement manqué le virage stratégique de son secteur d'activité, notamment celui du *cloud computing*, laissant à Atos un appareil productif complètement obsolète.

Alors, avant de rêver d'une Europe prospère sur le plan industriel, tâchons de ne pas confier les postes décisionnaires à des responsables qui ont détruit notre industrie! Nous ne pouvons pas permettre à des incompetents de continuer à ruiner notre économie et notre avenir. Il est grand temps de prendre des mesures fortes pour protéger nos entreprises et nos emplois.

Hildegard Bentele (PPE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Europa hat mit dem Binnenmarkt, mit seiner vielfältigen Industriestruktur, seinen Fachkräften und seinem innovativen Mittelstand grundsätzlich eine gute Ausgangslage im internationalen Wettbewerb. Aber dieser Wettbewerb ist viel intensiver und die Anforderungen an unsere Industrie sind viel größer geworden. Um unseren Planeten lebenswert zu erhalten, müssen wir anders produzieren. Um unser freiheitliches Gesellschaftsmodell zu verteidigen, müssen wir dessen wirtschaftliche Grundlage absichern.

Wir haben in dieser Legislatur schon einiges für eine europäische Industriepolitik erreicht, aber wir brauchen noch mehr. Bei der Regulierung müssen wir für Kohärenz und Einfachheit sorgen, für Konzentration auf das Wesentliche, das technisch Machbare, die effizienteste und damit kostengünstige Lösung für Übergangs— und Testphasen, kurz: auf bessere Gesetzgebung als bisher.

Zweitens: die Wettbewerbsbedingungen. Sie müssen fair und transparent sein. Dieses Thema muss die Kommission konsequenter, klug und gemeinsam mit unseren Partnern weltweit angehen. Drittens: Investitionen. Wir werden sechsmal so viel davon brauchen wie bisher. Konventionelle Bankenfinanzierungen kommen zunehmend an ihr Ende. Deshalb sollten wir als EU die Kapitalmarktunion angehen, um verstärkt Risikokapital anzuziehen.

Schließlich: Die Kommission kann das nicht alleine. Alle Mitgliedstaaten sind aufgefordert, ihre Verwaltungsprozesse zu beschleunigen und in Infrastruktur zu investieren. Wir brauchen jetzt gemeinsam Ehrgeiz und Aufbruch für Industrie *made in Europe*.

Ivars Ijabs (Renew). – Godātais prezidenta kungs! Godātais Bretona kungs! Ir skaidrs, ka Eiropas konkurētspējas atjaunošana šobrīd ir atslēgas lieta, lai mēs pārvarētu tos ģeopolitiskos izaicinājumus, un tāpēc es esmu ļoti pateicīgs savam kolēģim no "Renew" Morten Løkkegaard, kurš ar šo desmit punktu plānu patiešām mums ir iedevis skaidrus orientierus.

Es gribētu pievērsties divām lietām šī plāna kontekstā. Pirmkārt, tas ir tas ieviešanas jeb *enforcement* jautājums – kā mēs dalībvalstīs ieviešam Eiropas regulas un direktīvas, visas tās no zaļā kursa līdz pat digitālajai paketei, kas tagad stājas spēkā. Tas, kas patiešām trūkst – fatāli trūkst – ir nevis jaunas iniciatīvas no Komisijas puses, bet gan vienota piemērošana un esošā regulējuma savstarpēja saskaņošana, un tāpēc ideja par jaunu komisāru ieviešanas lietā es domāju, ka būtu noteikti apsverama.

Otra lieta, protams, ir pētniecības un attīstības izdevumi. Mēs varam Eiropā sasniegt 3 % jau līdz 2027. gadam, ja mēs to gribam. Šis mērķis ir uzstādīts jau sen, bet viņš diemžēl paliek ļoti utopisks šobrīd. Tā ir Eiropas kopīga problēma, kur arī Eiropas institūciju ziņā ir mudināt dalībvalstis vairāk līdzekļu ziedot pētniecībai un attīstībai.

Gianna Gancia (ID). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, in questo importante dibattito, desidero – con il poco tempo che ho a disposizione – sottolineare tre punti importanti.

Il primo punto è sicuramente pensare ad una riforma vera dei trattati verso un'Europa come entità unica, geopolitica, forte, e una riforma in senso liberale, federalista per avere un'economia davvero forte.

Il secondo punto è prevedere il nucleare di 4ª generazione, perché su questo si potrebbe pensare di ottenere in rapido tempo una forma di indipendenza energetica.

E infine lasciatemi fare una considerazione per quello che riguarda le piccole e medie imprese, che rappresentano 100 milioni di lavoratori e che non trovano uno spazio adeguato in Europa per la loro crescita a causa di una oppressione burocratica che soffoca la loro agilità. Soprattutto, ci sono sicuramente problemi serissimi all'accesso ai finanziamenti e quindi su questo dobbiamo lavorare.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, komission jäsen, kilpailukyyn vahvistaminen on Euroopan unionin seuraavan kauden kaikkein tärkein teema. Kansainvälisten jännitteiden kasvu, sota, on nostanut geotalouden merkitystä ja meneillään on uudenlainen maailmantalouden blokkiutuminen.

Euroopan on vahvistettava omaa toimintakykyään sekä taloudessa ja turvallisuudessa että vähennettävä riskipitoisia riippuvuuksiaan. Meidän on luotava Eurooppaa, joka houkuttelee innovoimaan ja investoimaan Euroopassa. Tiedämme, että tällä hetkellä me emme pärjää tässä kilpailussa riittävän hyvin.

Meidän on kevennettävä yritysten hallinnollista taakkaa. Meidän on nopeutettava lupaprosesseja, jotta saamme investointeja liikkeelle. Meidän on varmistettava, että hyvät hankkeet saavat Euroopassa kilpailukykyisen, tehokkaan rahoituksen ilman, että samaan aikaan rikomme sisämarkkinoita, ja ennen kaikkea meidän on varmistettava osaavan työvoiman saanti myös tulevaisuudessa.

Eva Maydell (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, we are approaching the end of the term of the European institutions and while many like to look back on our record and take stock, I think, more importantly, we need to set a clear vision for the future we want to build in Europe.

I think the only thing that has to be bigger than our ambitions to make Europe the best place to make business and the most competitive place in the world has to be our determination to make this a reality. That would mean, though, less bureaucracy and cutting red tape. That would mean greater focus on implementation. That would mean less fragmentation of our capital markets and more start-ups able to scale up.

Today, I hope in this debate we can commit on Europe about the big ideas, Europe that has created the eurozone and the single market. We are facing a backdrop of global multi-crisis and I believe Brussels can ensure the economy can survive to unleash that vision of more unicorns, more growth and more opportunities for companies and people in Europe.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, en 2023, le PIB américain a augmenté cinq fois plus vite que le PIB européen. Nous partions de la même situation en 1980. Aujourd'hui, le PIB par habitant en France, dans mon pays, est 40 % inférieur à celui des États-Unis. Nous voyons bien que l'Europe s'enlise dans le décrochage économique et les causes sont très faciles à connaître. Elles sont simples.

Première d'entre elles, la fragilité démographique, mais aussi le décrochage de notre éducation, le faible investissement dans la recherche et l'innovation et le coût de l'énergie pour des choix industriels désastreux que nous payons aujourd'hui.

Mais plus grave que tout encore, le coût écrasant de la complexité normative asphyxie nos entreprises. Nous ne sommes pas aujourd'hui en Europe en train de décrocher parce que nous aurions trouvé plus fort que nous devons nous. Nous sommes en train de décrocher parce que ceux qui travaillent en Europe, ceux qui produisent en Europe, savent que la contrainte publique, le poids des charges, le poids de la fiscalité sont devenus leur premier problème et leur premier danger. C'est le scandale majeur. La politique doit soutenir ceux qui travaillent, mais elle est devenue leur obstacle.

Pour sortir du déclin, nous avons besoin de retrouver cette sagesse simple, celle de la liberté. Et tant que nous continuerons de rendre la vie impossible à ceux qui travaillent dans nos pays, nous continuerons de trouver le chemin de la pauvreté et de la sortie de l'histoire.

Thierry Breton, *membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, merci pour ce débat. Je remercie encore M. Løkkegaard, le rapporteur, pour son excellent travail, dont la qualité des échanges a démontré précisément l'intérêt. Enfin la qualité, Madame Dauchy, est peut-être un peu excessive en ce qui vous concerne. Désinformation, mensonges éhontés, réécriture de l'histoire. Décidément, Madame Dauchy, vous suivez votre maître un peu comme un caniche, votre maître du Kremlin. On connaît vos méthodes, on connaît vos narratifs qui, totalement hors contexte, n'impressionnent personne.

Mais pour le reste, je tiens vraiment à remercier le Parlement parce que ces échanges montrent que le logiciel européen, si vous me permettez cette expression, a fortement évolué depuis maintenant quatre ans. Pour le dire simplement, aujourd'hui, la politique industrielle n'est plus un instrument tabou. Le mot industrie non plus. Tout le monde sait comme c'est important. Tout le monde sait que ceux qui ont pu croire un moment que l'avenir appartenait aux entreprises sans usines se sont fortement trompés. On sait qu'il n'en est rien.

Et aujourd'hui, cette politique industrielle que nous menons, secteur par secteur — je me souviens notamment de ce qu'on a fait dans les semi-conducteurs — est un élément essentiel de la boîte à outils européenne pour la préservation de notre compétitivité dans un contexte global et de plus en plus fragmenté. Il faut une politique industrielle qui fonctionne main dans la main avec une politique de renforcement de notre marché intérieur. Certes, Monsieur Bellamy, vous l'avez dit justement, moins de normes, plus de souplesse, il faut redonner de la liberté évidemment à nos entreprises. C'est également une politique industrielle qui puisse utiliser tous les leviers disponibles, par exemple les marchés publics qui sont, on le sait, un formidable levier représentant 14 % du PIB européen. Et puis, c'est une politique industrielle qui puisse renforcer notre politique commerciale, je l'ai dit, et vice-versa, le tout au service d'une Europe prospère, résiliente, ancrée dans notre modèle social et résolument engagée dans cette double transition dans laquelle nous devons fournir tous les efforts que vous connaissez.

Beaucoup de chemin a déjà été parcouru. Bien entendu, le travail doit continuer. Et notamment sur la base du débat d'aujourd'hui, je sais que nous pourrions compter sur le Parlement européen, et je vous en remercie.

Mathieu Michel, *président en exercice du Conseil*. – Monsieur le Président, chers parlementaires, Monsieur le Commissaire, beaucoup de choses ont été dites. Effectivement, dans un contexte géopolitique excessivement difficile, il est essentiel et indispensable de renforcer notre compétitivité, très certainement, si nous voulons continuer à jouer un rôle international de premier plan à l'avenir.

Nous devons très clairement être aux côtés de celles et de ceux qui construisent chaque jour ce projet européen et, certainement dans sa dimension économique, leur faire confiance afin, comme je l'ai dit tout à l'heure, de continuer à libérer leur plein potentiel. Il y a 30 ans, le président Jacques Delors a lancé le marché unique, la réalisation la plus ambitieuse et la plus réussie de l'Union. Nous lui devons aujourd'hui de défendre et garder son héritage avec soin et de l'adapter à la nouvelle réalité géopolitique, car il est le garant de notre prospérité et de notre solidarité future.

President. – The debate is closed.

During the next debate I would ask colleagues to stick to their speaking time, as we have another voting session, as you know, at 17.00.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Enikő Győri (NI), *írásban*. – Ideje szembenézni a valósággal: Európa versenyképessége válságos állapotban van. Idén a gazdasági növekedés várhatóan 1% alatt marad, miközben Kína 4,6%-os, USA 2,1%-os, de még a szankciókkal sújtott Oroszország is 2,6%-os bővüléssel számolhat.

Az elmúlt öt évben Brüsszel mindent elkövetett, hogy Európa elgáncsolja magát és előnyt adjon versenytársainak. Nem a saját érdekeit tartotta szem előtt, helyette elhibázott szankciókkal, egetverő energiaárakkal, rekordmagas inflációval, ideológián alapuló gazdaságpolitikával ásta alá a versenyképességét.

850 új kötelezettséget varrt a vállalatok nyakába, 5000 oldalnyi terjedelemben. Nem véletlen, hogy az üzleti kilátások szintje a 2008-as pénzügyi válság óta most a legalacsonyabb. Okkal mondható, hogy az elmúlt 5 év az elvesztegetett lehetőségek ideje volt.

Európa veszített a globális pozíciójából: 2010-ben még 22%-kal vette ki részét a világ GDP-jéből, ma már csak 17%-kal. Ami talán még kiábrándítóbb, az elmúlt 15 évben az USA gazdasága 82%-kal bővült, míg az eurózónáé csak 6%-kal.

Ráadásul a Bizottság engedett a Parlament ideológiai nyomásának, és túlzott fenntarthatósági feltételhez köti a kereskedelmi megállapodásokat. Szép lassan nem marad partner, aki kereskedni akarna velünk. Kérem a Bizottságot, hogy ne öltöztesse zöld köntösbe a protekcionizmust. A versenyképességhez összeköttetések kellenek.

Brüsszel épp csak azt felejtette el, hogy versenyképes gazdaság nélkül nincs európai jóléti modell sem. Sürgős változásra van tehát szükség.

13. Activitățile financiare ale Băncii Europene de Investiții – raportul anual 2023 (dezbateri)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par David Cormand ziņojumu Budžeta komitejas vārdā par Eiropas Investīciju bankas finanšu darbībām – 2023. gada ziņojums (2023/2229(INI)) (A9-0031/2024).

David Cormand, rapporteur. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, tout d'abord, Madame la présidente Calviño, toutes mes félicitations pour votre élection à la tête de la BEI. Je suis ravi de pouvoir échanger avec vous sur les missions de la Banque d'investissement que vous dirigez désormais.

Voilà presque cinq ans que j'ai la responsabilité de suivre, au nom de la commission des budgets, l'activité de la Banque européenne d'investissement. Je tiens à remercier mes collègues rapporteurs fictifs ainsi que leurs équipes avec lesquelles nous avons mené ce travail dans un esprit constructif. L'un des objectifs qui était le nôtre était alors de faire de la BEI la Banque européenne du climat. Cette mutation a été enclenchée. Je souhaite d'ailleurs saluer très chaleureusement le président Werner Hoyer, votre prédécesseur, avec qui nous avons pu travailler et échanger pour aller dans ce sens.

La feuille de route pour le climat a entériné plusieurs engagements importants, à commencer par l'objectif de 50 % de prêts pour le climat déjà atteint l'année passée. En 2021, la fin du financement des énergies fossiles a été confirmée, bien qu'elle ait été un peu ternie par les centaines de millions d'euros investis durant la période de transition dans des projets gaziers. La Banque s'est engagée à ne pas financer le développement de l'extraction minière des eaux profondes. Ce sont autant d'indicateurs et de standards positifs qu'il faut souligner, sur lesquels il faut s'appuyer pour bâtir une prochaine feuille de route pour le climat améliorée et encore plus ambitieuse, par exemple pour éliminer définitivement les projets néfastes non seulement pour le climat, mais plus globalement pour l'environnement, et notamment la biodiversité.

Une banque aussi importante que la BEI doit veiller à consolider ces évolutions en ne cédant pas aux impulsions et opportunités éphémères. Elle joue son rôle prescripteur en faisant preuve de cohérence. Madame la Présidente, je vous invite à ne céder ni aux sirènes des défenseurs d'industries du passé, ni aux pressions du court terme. Sur le nucléaire, la BEI a toujours refusé de financer le déploiement d'une technologie particulièrement coûteuse à développer et financièrement vulnérable. Les thuriféraires de l'atome pensent avoir trouvé une nouvelle martingale avec les petits réacteurs nucléaires. Comme d'habitude, ils se trompent, et la BEI aurait tort de mêler son sort aux perspectives plus qu'incertaines de cette technologie. Si la BEI a un rôle dans le financement de la recherche et du développement, du traitement des déchets ou de la gestion des risques, elle ne doit pas s'aventurer dans un domaine qui pourrait porter atteinte à la solidité financière de ses fondations.

En revanche, dans le domaine énergétique, la BEI doit poursuivre le financement de stratégie d'économie d'énergie sur l'ensemble des territoires de l'Union. Par exemple, en Normandie, c'est l'isolation des collèges publics à laquelle la BEI a contribué. La BEI doit également être une actrice stratégique du déploiement à grande échelle de production d'énergies renouvelables, en soutenant des projets partout dans l'Union, en y associant les populations et les acteurs des territoires concernés.

De la même façon, je pense qu'il est dangereux de vouloir changer les critères de financement du secteur de la défense. Évidemment, la guerre d'agression russe en Ukraine rebat les cartes. La guerre est de retour sur notre continent et Poutine n'a qu'une obsession, c'est de fragiliser l'Europe. Depuis le début de cette attaque, nous, Union européenne, sommes unis dans ce combat, et tout doit être fait pour aider l'Ukraine. En ce sens, le paquet de 50 milliards d'euros acté récemment est un engagement nécessaire. L'aide financière et militaire nécessaire doit continuer à être apportée.

Mais le rôle d'une banque d'investissement n'est pas de pallier la défaillance d'États, bien mieux à même de financer la fabrication d'armes et de munitions. Comment la BEI pourrait-elle être en mesure d'assurer la traçabilité d'armements dont elle assumerait le financement? La situation exige une prise de responsabilité directe des institutions aptes à contribuer, dans les meilleures des conditions, au financement, à la production et à l'acheminement d'armements et de munitions. La BEI n'est pas une solution adaptée à cette mission. Il n'est pas nécessaire de modifier les critères d'attribution des prêts. La banque consent déjà à financer des projets spécifiques quand les applications ont un usage double, c'est-à-dire civil et militaire.

IN THE CHAIR: MARC ANGEL

Vice-President

Le Président. – J'invite la nouvelle présidente de la Banque européenne d'investissement, Madame Nadia Calviño Santamaría, à prendre la parole. Bienvenue chez nous, Madame Calviño.

Nadia Calviño Santamaría, President of the EIB. – Monsieur le Président, merci beaucoup à tous ces honorables parlementaires qui sont ici et qui nous accompagnent, ainsi qu'aux représentants de la Commission européenne.

It is a great honour and a pleasure for me to address this House for the first time as President of the European Investment Bank Group. I was recently in the European Parliament representing the Spanish Presidency of the Council and at that time, I already said how happy I was to see so many known faces, so many friends, so many colleagues and partners.

In the eight weeks since I took the job as President of the European Investment Bank Group, I have been engaging with the different stakeholders. I met President Metsola last week. Today, we signed a memorandum of understanding to cooperate in the communication to European citizens in the run up to the European elections and deepening our cooperation, in particular with the European Parliament, will be one of my top priorities going forward.

I would like to wholeheartedly thank the rapporteur, Mr Cormand, and the shadow rapporteurs, for their excellent work. I think this resolution that you're voting today is extremely valuable and timely and the European Investment Bank Group and the European Parliament can count on each other – as strategic partners can – to ensure that we continue to support key European programmes that are of the essence if we want the bank to deploy its full potential in financing the investments that Europe needs.

Programmes such as InvestEU, the NDICI, yesterday's approval of the Ukraine facility, the STEP programme – all of these are key guarantees and support programmes from the European budget that allow the EIB to leverage, to mobilise private investment and to close the investment gap for the twin green and digital transitions.

Last week, I had the chance to address European finance ministers and exchange with them our key priorities going forward. My priorities were very strongly supported by them, the first of which is obviously to consolidate our role as Europe's climate bank.

Gearing up investment in adaptation, mitigation and the energy transition is the top priority for the European Investment Bank and that has to do with the rollout of renewables, but also the manufacturing of net-zero technologies inside the EU and financing new cutting-edge technologies. We will work on a new water programme to support countries at the forefront of the impact of climate change and also a programme to support SMEs in Europe, gearing up investment in new, energy-efficient and economically profitable technologies.

Our second priority will be accelerating digitalisation and technological innovation. It is clear that cutting-edge technologies and putting Europe at the forefront of this technological race is of the essence going forward and so we will support a new programme, a faster programme, a fund for the acceleration of strategic technologies and economic resilience. This means net-zero technologies, but also chips, artificial intelligence, life science, advanced materials, critical raw materials.

Third priority: stepping up investment in security and defence. It is quite clear that Europe needs to step up its capabilities in the area of security and defence industries. We are already investing in this area. For the past eight years, we have supported projects regarding R&D, new technologies, critical infrastructures, cyber security, space, dual-use technologies and equipment. This means investing in drones, border protection systems. I know these are two of the key priorities to frontline countries.

The Strategic European Security Initiative was upgraded to EUR 8 billion only last year. Only EUR 2 billion have been invested so far. The European Investment Fund launched, in January, a new EUR 175 million programme – the European Defence Equity Initiative – to support SMEs and start-ups in this field and we are ready to do more and better to contribute to joint projects that boost European industry and reinforce our capacity to protect and also our deterrents vis-à-vis third countries. I very much welcome the support that President von der Leyen gave here today to this approach.

Our fourth priority is contributing to a modern cohesion policy. This is within the EIB's DNA. It is not only the right policy, it is also the smart thing to do if we want opportunities to be where talent is. Talent is equally distributed throughout the whole EU, but opportunities are not. And we have a key role to play to ensure that carbon competitiveness and cohesion are inseparable elements to ensure that the green transition is a European success.

Fifth priority: developing innovative financing for agriculture and the bioeconomy, possibly exploring gearing up insurance and de-risking schemes for these key areas for the European economy.

Our sixth priority going forward would be gearing up investment in social infrastructure and this includes education, skills of course, health and affordable housing. These are key infrastructures and we want inclusive growth, sustainable growth and also increasing Europe's growth potential.

Seventh priority: pioneering the capital markets union, the European Investment Bank Group can pull together other financial institutions to build the building blocks of a true, deep and broad capital markets union, pioneering European-wide financial instruments to that effect.

And last but not least, we need to focus our activity outside the EU on our strategic priorities. Support to Ukraine is obviously a top priority. The recent adoption of the Ukraine facility, the EU4U facility, are being extremely helpful. Together with the EBRD and other key financial players and national governments, we want to continue to support Ukraine now and to contribute to its rebuilding once the war is over as soon as possible, I hope.

Then, a successful enlargement process, support to our neighbourhood, focusing actions in Africa, Latin America and Asia in supporting the Global Gateway initiative. This will be one of our top priorities going forward to reinforce Europe's voice in the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, to sum up, the European Investment Bank Group – the financing arm of the EU – is investing in Europe's future. It is investing in our shared future. These priorities are closely interlinked. They're targeting key challenges. They're fully aligned with European policies. They are fully aligned with the priorities that have been flagged by the European Parliament and that are summed up in the statement and the report that will be voted today and aim at closing the investment gap related to the twin green and digital transitions, strengthening Europe's cohesion and competitiveness, our strategic autonomy, our security and resilience. And I am really looking forward to working closely with the European Parliament and the European Commission going forward to further strengthen our ability to respond

to the citizens expectations.

President. – Thank you very much, Madam President, for your very comprehensive presentation of the EIB's priorities.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, honourable Members, dear colleagues from the EIB, I would like to welcome this report and thank Parliament's Committee on Budgets and in particular its rapporteur, David Cormand.

The EIB Group has been instrumental in the implementation of the EU policies inside and outside the Union, from its support to the Green Deal, to the rollout of Global Gateway and in the deployment of InvestEU. In the current tense geopolitical circumstances, the EIB's stronger involvement and support of EU strategic priorities is indispensable.

As we look ahead, there are a few points I want to highlight. First, the EU's competitiveness: we need to strengthen the EU's competitive edge, and we need the EU's bank to work closely with us to make it happen. Innovative start-ups and scale-ups are key to Europe's future economy and society. Both the EIB and the EIF are well placed to help create a favourable investment environment, provide venture capital, and catalyse public and private funding.

I appreciate the rapporteur's focus on the importance of the EIF, particularly its role in enabling SMEs to scale up their operations. To highlight, the number of EIF-supported SMEs throughout 2023 amounted to 350 000. Competitiveness must go hand-in-hand with green and digital transitions. The EIB, as the EU's investment bank and climate bank, is at the forefront of climate financing, and I welcome that.

In 2023, more than half of the EIB's financing was deployed for climate and environmental sustainability objectives. The EIB contributed to REPowerEU and the recent approval of EUR 5 billion in support of our wind power package are worthy examples to be mentioned.

In view of new and emerging risks, the EIB Group has a large role to play in strengthening our economic security. The EIB Group should also adapt and step up its support to foster research and development of the EU industrial base in such strategic areas as advanced semiconductors, quantum computing, biotechnology, net-zero industries, clean energy and critical raw materials.

Second, let me recall the impressive role of the EIB Group in implementing our flagship investment programme, InvestEU. The implementation is well on track, and I am happy to see that the EIB and the EIF are generating many operations under InvestEU to support the EU priorities of overall resilience of the EU economy.

Third, EIB activities outside the EU: the Global Gateway strategy is a geopolitical project to position the EU in a competitive international marketplace, while supporting our partner countries in responding to their investment needs. In 2023, we have worked hard with the EIB to implement EFSD+, the financial arm of NDICI – Global Europe, resulting in around EUR 3.7 billion in EIB financing against EUR 2.5 billion in 2022.

The EIB should continue supporting the rollout of the strategy in line with EU priorities such as sustainable connectivity, boosting security of global supply chains, and facilitating clean and digital transitions. At the same time, EIB intervention should be focused on where it brings the highest additionality and added value both for our partner countries and the EU.

Fourth, I have to highlight the EIB's role in Ukraine. It will be important to gradually increase EIB operating capacity and to prioritise investments in line with the Ukraine plan. With the anticipated imminent approval of the EUR 50 billion Ukraine Facility, the EIB is expected to play a major role in implementing its investment pillar. I expect the EIB to coordinate closely with other implementing partners to ensure high complementarity and best possible delivery.

Fifth, Russia's war dramatically changed the security paradigm here in Europe. We need to increase our defence readiness and this requires a joint effort, including from the EIB. We cannot ignore the geopolitical threats and the needs of Ukraine and the EU to defend itself.

I particularly welcome the Defence Equity Facility established with the EIF, which is a first step in support of innovative companies developing technologies with dual-use applications. While we support the EIB commitment to reach EUR 8 billion by 2027 in financing to defence and security, further efforts should be taken to assist the European defence industry in line with the latest Ecofin discussions.

José Manuel Fernandes, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhor Presidente, Caras e Caros colegas, o Banco Europeu de Investimento tem um papel fundamental, crucial, é uma mais-valia para o investimento na União Europeia e para a prossecução dos nossos objetivos, nomeadamente no âmbito da transição climática e transição digital.

O Banco Europeu de Investimento, nem sempre temos consciência, é o maior emitente mundial de obrigações verdes, mas temos de fazer mais, nomeadamente nas pequenas e médias empresas. Não basta dizer que elas são a espinha dorsal, porque são, mais de 99 % das empresas na União Europeia são PME e correspondem a cerca de 75 % do emprego.

Nós tivemos uma pandemia, nós estamos a viver uma crise resultante da guerra. Há Estados-Membros, como o meu, que não têm nem instituições financeiras de desenvolvimento, nem um banco de fomento com força para ajudar as pequenas e médias empresas.

Pois bem, é necessário que o BEI reforce o apoio às pequenas e médias empresas e utilize, por exemplo, o InvestEU para este objetivo. As pequenas e médias empresas precisam de apoio para o investimento, mas também para a capitalização. É possível ajudarmos as pequenas e médias empresas renegociando, por exemplo, a dívida.

O Banco Europeu de Investimento também tem um papel importante naquilo que é a Europa global e aí congratulo-me com a abertura, por exemplo, de um gabinete no Brasil, com o objetivo do Global Gateway e também no apoio para a África.

Parabéns pelo trabalho desenvolvido, muito sucesso para o futuro.

President. – Just to inform you, colleagues, that I am now closing the catch-the-eye list. We have three people on it, but we are running late. We have a big vote at 17.00 so I'll take the three. There will be no catch-the-eye in the next debate.

Eero Heinäluoma, *S&D-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa Euroopan investointipankin pääjohtaja Nadia Calviño, onnea uudesta tehtävästä ja menestystä työhön! Euroopan investointipankki tekee tärkeää työtä kasvun, puhtaan siirtymän ja uusien työpaikkojen vauhdittamiseksi. Tarvitsemme jatkossakin hyvin resursoitua pankkia globaalin kilpailun kiristytessä.

Eurooppalaisen innovaation ja eurooppalaisten yritysten tukemisen lisäksi, vaikutukset ovat tärkeitä myös kansalaisten hyvinvoinnille. Tästä syystä S&D-ryhmämme pyytää pankkia investoimaan sosiaaliseen infrastruktuuriin, kuten edulliseen ja energiatehokkaaseen asuntokantaan, terveyteen, sukupuolten tasa-arvoa edistäviin hankkeisiin sekä ratkaisuihin, jotka parantavat ympäristöä.

Pankin täytyy myös elää ajassa ja uudistua, kun maailma ympärillä muuttuu. Tästä syystä on tarve jatkossa tarkastella pankin roolia etenkin puolustusalan hankkeissa. Vielä kerran uudelle pääjohtajalle onnea ja menestystä! Parlamentti on valmis yhteistyöhön.

Charles Goerens, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, et si, au cours de l'année 2024, l'Union européenne devait rester la seule à vouloir aider l'Ukraine dans son combat pour sa liberté, serions-nous, dans ce cas, encore à même de mobiliser les ressources indispensables à cette fin? Les caisses sont vides. Nous pouvons gratter les fonds de tiroir. Cela ne suffit pas! Nous pouvons demander aux États membres de faire un effort supplémentaire. Cela prend beaucoup de temps. Nous pouvons demander à l'Union européenne de financer les besoins de l'Ukraine. La réponse risque de venir trop tard.

Le temps presse et toutes les solutions envisagées risquent de durer trop longtemps et de venir trop tard. Soyons donc ouverts à la possibilité de voir la Banque européenne d'investissement jouer un rôle dans le financement des équipements militaires dont a besoin l'Ukraine. J'ai cosigné un amendement qui invite les responsables de la Banque européenne d'investissement à modifier sa liste d'éligibilité de ses interventions. C'est difficile, je le concède, mais arrêtons de chercher toujours des prétextes pour ne rien faire!

Jorge Buxadé Villalba, en nombre del Grupo ECR. – Señor presidente, señora presidenta Calviño, ha pasado de unirse al cierre de las nucleares en España, condenando a los españoles a la dependencia energética, a decir que va a financiar proyectos nucleares ahora en el BEI.

Cinco años pegada al señor Sánchez no pasan en balde. Con el tiempo, iremos conociendo todas las concesiones que el señor Sánchez ha hecho para que usted esté en este puesto. Esta es la primera para su amiguito, el señor Macron.

El 21 de febrero fue detenido Koldo García, amigo del señor Sánchez, exasesor del ministro de Transporte, cuando usted era ministra de Economía. Una presunta —pero enorme— trama de contratos públicos con sobreprecio para pagar la clásica mordida socialista, ya vamos por 50 millones y subiendo. Son fondos que luego presuntamente blanquearon en Luxemburgo y países terceros. Están implicados la presidente del Congreso y el ministro de Memoria Democrática. Lo de memoria será por el dinero y el oro del Banco de España que el Partido Socialista robó y se llevó a Moscú. Y todo con fondos europeos, de esos que usted gestionaba. Algo nos podrá decir.

Tres cosas le pido: corte el grifo a Marruecos, dedíquese a hacer de banco y financie cualquier proyecto rentable, liberando al BEI del fanatismo climático, y llame a Sánchez, ya que estamos, y dígame que se vaya.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας *The Left*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Calviño, θα ήθελα να σας συγχαρώ για την ανάληψη των καθηκόντων σας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων και θέλω να πιστεύω ότι θα είναι το ίδιο ή και περισσότερο επιτυχημένη με τη θητεία σας ως υπουργού Οικονομικών της Ισπανικής Κυβέρνησης.

Χρειαζόμαστε αύξηση των επενδύσεων και αυτό το πρόβλημα δεν μπορεί να το λύσει μόνη της η αγορά. Χρειαζόμαστε την ενεργητική συμμετοχή της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων για να μοχλεύσει και ιδιωτικές επενδύσεις· για να πετύχουμε τους στόχους για το κλίμα, χωρίς να γίνει αυτή η αντιμετώπιση της πρόκλησης πηγή για τη δημιουργία νέων ανισοτήτων και ενεργειακής φτώχειας· για να κάνουμε όσα πρέπει για το νερό· για να υπηρετήσουμε τη δημόσια υγεία· για να κερδίσουμε το στοιχείο της νέας τεχνολογίας· για να επενδύσουμε στην καινοτομία· για να αποκτήσει επιτέλους παρουσία και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στους ψηφιακούς γίγαντες και να μην είναι όλοι αμερικανικοί ή κινεζικοί· και για να κερδίσουμε το στοιχείο της συνοχής, γιατί υπάρχει κίνδυνος να αυξηθούν οι ανισότητες, που είναι ήδη μεγάλες, και οι κοινωνικές και οι περιφερειακές, αν δεν χρηματοδοτηθεί η ψηφιακή και πράσινη μετάβαση με τρόπο που να μειώνονται αυτές οι ανισότητες.

Η έκθεση του κ. Cormand στηρίζει προοδευτικούς στόχους. Ζητούμε και ελπίζουμε και εσείς να μπορέσετε να κάνετε μια στροφή προς προοδευτικότερη και κοινωνικότερη ατζέντα σε σχέση με τον προκάτοχό σας.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Elnök Úr! Európa égető kihívásokkal néz szembe. Sürgősen javítani kell a versenyképességünkön. A józan ész talaján állva kell végrehajtani a zöld és digitális átalálást. Új lendületet kell adni az iparnak, és helyzetbe kell hozni a kis- és középvállalkozásokat.

Az Európai Beruházási Bank mindig is fontos szereplője volt az uniós prioritások támogatásának. 2023-ban több mint 75 milliárd euró hitelt nyújtott a fenntartható fejlődés, a kohézió, az innováció és a digitalizáció területén. Külön öröm, hogy ebből 675 millió euró Magyarországra érkezett. Célunk, hogy a bank aktivitása éves szinten elérje az 1 milliárd eurót.

Mindez azonban nem elég. Egy versenyképes Európának szüksége van a zöld energia, az infrastruktúra fejlesztések és a kkv-k fokozottabb és bürokrácia mentes támogatására. Ezen a területen az EIB-nek nagyobb szerepet kell vállalnia. A bank támogatáspolitikáját nem vakíthatja el a szélsőséges zöld ideológia, annak a realitások mentén kell megvalósulnia. Ezért fontos, hogy az EIB a jövőben támogasson nukleáris energiára épülő projekteket is. Enélkül ugyanis nincs sikeres zöld gazdaság, és nincs versenyképes Európa.

Ana Collado Jiménez (PPE). – Señor presidente, si tuviera que explicarles a los ciudadanos lo que es el BEI, les diría que es el Banco de la Unión Europea. Es el único banco cuyos accionistas somos los Estados miembros, cuyos intereses representa. Les diría también que proporciona su financiación y su experiencia para proyectos de inversión que contribuyen a que se consigan los objetivos políticos de la Unión (lo han dicho): industrialización, digitalización, pymes, cambio climático, etc. Les diría, además, que desde hace poco lo preside una española, Nadia Calviño, y eso debe ser motivo de orgullo para todos nosotros.

Pero hay otras preguntas para las que yo no tengo las respuestas y seguro que los ciudadanos también están interesados en conocerlas. Por ejemplo, el Ministerio de Economía, que hasta hace poco presidía la señora Calviño, lleva más de dos años lejos de ser un ejemplo de transparencia y de gestión de los fondos europeos. ¿Debemos fiarnos más de su capacidad ahora al frente del BEI de la que tuvo gestionando estos fondos en el Ministerio?

Otra pregunta: ¿pactó el señor Sánchez su nombramiento a cambio de su voto a Fráncfort en la reciente elección de la sede de la Autoridad de Lucha contra el Blanqueo de Capitales y la Financiación del Terrorismo?

Y, por último, ¿tendrá usted, señora Calviño, más cuidado vigilando el uso de los fondos europeos, evitando así casos de corrupción como el de las mascarillas que acaba de estallar en España?

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, señora presidenta Calviño, en primer lugar, deseo felicitarla por la reciente elección para estar al frente de la principal institución financiera y de promoción del crecimiento de la Unión. Y disculpe también algunas veleidades de política nacional que acaban llegando a demasiados sitios, donde no deberían.

Poco he de añadir al resumen de las prioridades para esta nueva etapa del BEI. Yo creo que en el informe que aprobamos en el Parlamento Europeo hay una identificación clara de la necesidad de avanzar en esa ayuda contra el cambio climático y la transición digital, y me ha gustado mucho la referencia —también importante para esta casa— sobre la cooperación que tiene que hacer el Banco, también en financiación de viviendas sociales o de actividades sociales que ayuden también a mejorar la cohesión.

Pero, realmente, el gran reto, con independencia de las distintas prioridades, es la inversión en la Unión Europea. Acabamos de cerrar un acuerdo de reglas fiscales —un buen acuerdo— pero Europa necesita más financiación y, además, la necesita a nivel comunitario y el Banco Europeo de Inversiones está llamado a ser un ente clave en esa transición.

Stéphanie Yon-Courtin (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, aujourd'hui les défis numériques, environnementaux et de sécurité ont démontré la nécessité d'une Europe puissante où le financement est le nerf de la guerre. Véritable bras financier de notre Union, la Banque européenne d'investissement doit intensifier ses efforts pour soutenir nos objectifs.

Vous l'avez rappelé cette semaine, Madame la Présidente Calviño, l'un des secteurs prioritaires doit être celui de la défense. Or, la BEI n'a investi que 2 milliards sur les 8 milliards d'euros prévus pour les projets de défense. Et dans cette période de conflits multiples aux portes de notre Union, il est urgent de se doter d'un vrai budget pour faire de l'Europe de la défense une réalité. Ajoutons à ceci le besoin de financement annuel de 745 milliards d'euros pour financer les transitions numérique, écologique, y compris, et sans oublier, le nucléaire.

Enfin, la BEI joue un rôle déterminant pour le développement de nos territoires. En cofinanciant un parc éolien dans ma région, en Normandie, elle a permis de créer mille emplois et également de lancer le tramway de Caen dans le Calvados. La BEI est, et doit rester, synonyme d'Europe concrète pour nos citoyens.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, vážená paní prezidentko – mám pouze jednu minutu –, ale dovolím si Vám nejprve pogratulovat k zisku funkce prezidentky Evropské investiční banky. K výroční zprávě této instituce: nejprve chci uvést, za co lze Evropskou investiční banku pochválit. Za prvé, je to poskytování dlouhodobých financí a odborných znalostí pro nadějně projekty a pomoc také se získáním dalších investic k dosažení cílů, na kterých jsme se v rámci Evropské unie shodli.

Za druhé, je to podpora zelené a digitální transformace a musím tedy přivítat kroky Evropské investiční banky, protože již vlastně polovinu svých zdrojů věnovala na opatření v oblasti klimatu a udržitelnosti životního prostředí. Také pozitivně oceňuji reakci Evropské investiční banky na COVID-19 i během války na Ukrajině. Kde vidím naopak prostor ke zlepšení: zaprvé, v transparentnějším přístupu Evropské investiční banky vůči Evropskému parlamentu, zadruhé, v boji proti daňovým podvodům a zatřetí, ve výzvě k podpoře jaderné energetiky Evropskou investiční bankou, protože bez ní zelená evropská politika nebude úspěšná.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Isabel Benjumea Benjumea (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora Calviño, bienvenida al Parlamento Europeo y enhorabuena por su nombramiento. En primer lugar, permítame felicitarle por su milagrosa conversión en relación con las energías nucleares. Hasta hace muy poco, durante cinco años en el Gobierno español, usted las ha combatido y las ha excluido de cualquier tipo de inversión. Por lo tanto, bienvenida sea esta conversión milagrosa y espero que trabaje para que el Gobierno español también empiece a apostar por esta energía.

En segundo lugar, usted ha hecho una referencia al papel tan importante que desempeñará el BEI en relación a los fondos de recuperación. Como bien sabe, el BEI va a gestionar veinte mil millones de los créditos que van a ir dirigidos a las comunidades autónomas en España. A día de hoy, las comunidades autónomas reclaman información, no saben absolutamente nada de cómo se va a gestionar este fondo.

Y esto nos recuerda a la pésima gestión de los fondos de recuperación en España, bajo su liderazgo, donde tenemos cero impacto en el PIB y donde, a día de hoy, seguimos sin tener datos reales sobre la ejecución de los mismos.

Estamos generando frustración, la misma que... *(el presidente retira la palabra a la oradora).*

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, it's often forgotten that the European Union was founded primarily as a means to prevent future wars. The European Investment Bank was established in the 1958 Treaty of Rome with a mission to facilitate equitable development in the EU through lending to regions that are less developed and to support the EU's internal market.

The EIB's current mission statement is to boost Europe's potential in terms of jobs and growth, support action to mitigate climate change and promote EU policies outside the EU. Yesterday, however, the EIB president said the bank was ready to do more and better to contribute to projects which boost the European defence industry.

Can anyone tell me how a bank with a mission statement to facilitate equitable development throughout EU Member States can justify committing funding to defence industry to the tune of EUR 8 billion? It's worrying to hear that the EIB president says that supporting the US/NATO proxy war in Ukraine is a priority now. This is turning into a money laundering exercise for the military industrial complex. The architects of the Treaty of Rome would be turning their graves if they knew that the European Investment Bank had turned into a de facto money lender to the EU arms industry.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, the European Investment Bank has approved loans of EUR 650 million for Israeli infrastructure since the launch of its latest genocidal attack in Gaza.

To give you an idea of the scale of what that represents, it's the equivalent of 90 % of the EIB's total investment in Palestine since its first loan in 1995. From 1995 to date, it's invested more than EUR 2 billion in Israel, compared to EUR 725 million in Palestine. At the same time, we've seen countless examples of Israel destroying EU-funded projects with impunity in the West Bank, assets worth hundreds of thousands of euros, funded by countries like Ireland, being routinely destroyed by settlers. You've even managed to approve a loan to Israeli's Leumi Bank for EUR 240 million in December, the same bank which has frozen UNRWA bank accounts. I'm wondering at this stage as to whether you're actually complicit in genocide.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Parliament Members for the enlightening debate held today. The report testifies, overall, that the EIB Group is on a good path, in particular as a frontrunner in the area of climate action.

Nevertheless, the challenges ahead of us warrant a closer than ever cooperation with the EIB Group to ensure that its activities are aligned with the evolving economic and geopolitical context, new and emerging risks, and EU policy priorities.

The Commission, as the main provider of mandates to the EIB Group, will continue to cooperate in a fruitful manner in order to advance the EU policy agenda in the EU as well as outside the Union. I look forward to continuing our close cooperation with the EIB Group and the European Parliament to support EU policy goals.

Nadía Calviño Santamaría, *President of the EIB*. – Mr President, Members of the European Parliament, dear Commissioner, thank you very much.

Five points from my side. First of all, to thank you for your statements and ideas, for the support and the trust that the vast majority of the persons and the groups in this Parliament have shown for the European Investment Bank Group. Also, thank you very much for your suggestions on how we can improve our contribution to European policies. You have mentioned words such as competitiveness, economic security, re-industrialisation, mobilising and catalysing private investment, the climate change and the green transition. All of these elements are within our strategic priorities, as testified by our investments in 2023 and the results that are included in your report. So thank you very much.

Second point is also to thank the European Commission for its mandate. As you rightly pointed out, throughout the guarantees and mandates coming from the European budget agreed by all European institutions – and I know very well how important the role is of the European Parliament in getting those funds to fund the mandates and the guarantees – we have European successes. Joint successes like InvestEU, it has been mentioned, to fund strategic investment to fund the European industry; the NDICI, the core of our external action in our neighbourhood and beyond.

So, going forward, keeping those mandates and guarantees will be absolutely indispensable if we want the European Investment Bank Group to continue to leverage the funds, the capital and the European budget, mobilising public and private investment and thus closing the investment gap and making all these transitions a European success.

My third point is to thank wholeheartedly also Mr Fernandes and Ms Győri; they have mentioned SMEs and this is at the core of the mandate, not only of the bank but also very especially of the European Investment Fund. We have been not only providing financing and supporting European SMEs, but also scaling up startups and supporting European strategic technologies so that these startups can remain in Europe and do not have to go abroad to get the necessary financing to grow as fast as possible. SMEs are at the heart of our economic tissue, and we are strongly committed to contributing and to continue to develop innovative financial instruments to provide support to these companies and allow them to also benefit from the green and digital transition.

My fourth point has to do with cohesion and social infrastructures. Both Mr Papadimoulis, Mr Fernández, you have stressed how important it is to ensure that our policies and our investments get to those parts of Europe that are less rich, less developed. Almost half of our financing inside the EU last year went to these regions. And this is, as I explained in my introductory remarks, not only fair, not only just not only correct, it is also smart if we want to continue to have strong growth and prosperity throughout the whole EU.

A fourth important point made by Mr. Goerens, Mr Heinäluoma, Ms Yon-Courtin and also by Mr Wallace, in a very different sense, has to do with security and defence. If we do not have security we cannot have prosperity, we cannot defend our mode of life, we cannot defend our shared values. That is why it is important at this point in time and this geopolitical context, to step up our activities and our support for European industry in the areas of security and defence.

For the past eight years, the EIB Group has been supporting the European security and defence industry. We have put in place the strategic programme with up to EUR 8 billion. We have mobilised innovative financing with this new defence equity facility managed by the European Investment Fund. Here, we are talking about defence. And when we're talking about defence, we're talking about drones, we're talking about new technologies, we're talking about ports for our navies. It is air transport capabilities for our airborne forces, it is border protection, it is satellites that can be used for civil objectives, but also by militaries. It is cyber security against Russian attacks. It is space, where the European Investment Bank is amongst the biggest financiers in Europe already.

That is why we had a very important exchange with European finance ministers last Friday and we agreed two concrete takeaways. To engage with the European Commission and other stakeholders on the definition and scope of dual use; I will report back in two months' time to European finance ministers on where we are in this definition. Secondly, to work together to accelerate the investment of the EUR 6 billion remaining under this facility, providing streamlined processes and also a single window, so as to facilitate the investments that are necessary at this point in time.

Our security also has to do with supporting Ukraine at this point in time, no doubt about it. That is why when we are talking about actions outside the EU, we are also supporting the efforts of this country right now and will, I hope, very soon, engage in mobilising private investment for the reconstruction of the country.

A final point on climate. Mr Polčák, Mr Cormand, of course, and many others have mentioned the importance of Europe making the green transition a success. That is why we have been investing in all key technologies for the green transition. Ms Benjumea and others have spoken about some specific technologies. Let me be very clear: the European Investment Bank has been financing net-zero technologies in the past. We have been investing in R&D, in the fuel cycle, in security. Only some weeks ago, we financed more than EUR 100 million in Romania to ensure the recovery of tritium, a nuclear fuel. We do this hand in hand with Euratom, so fully aligned with European policies. That is what we will continue to do, supporting R&D and all technologies that are playing a key role in the green transition, with a very special emphasis on renewables, which is obviously our top priority and where the European Investment Bank Group is already playing a very important role.

Let me close here, thanking you again for this very productive exchange and looking forward to deepening our cooperation in the coming years.

President. – Thank you very much. You can be assured that the Parliament is willing to cooperate very well with you.

David Cormand, rapporteur. – Monsieur le Président, nous avons une expression en France qui dit: on n'est pas toujours prophète en son pays. Ça arrive à tout le monde. En tout cas, permettez-moi de dire qu'après quelques interventions que j'ai entendues, je suis encore plus fier et heureux que vous soyez présidente de cette BEI. Et si vous étiez française, je serais particulièrement heureux qu'une femme qui a votre parcours dirige désormais la plus puissante banque publique d'investissement du monde. Ce n'est pas rien et je pense que vos compatriotes sont globalement très fiers de cela.

Sur les questions qui ont été évoquées, je rappelle ce qui va être proposé au vote tout à l'heure. Il n'y a pas de demande de la part du Parlement de modification de la politique de la BEI en matière nucléaire. Ce n'est pas dans le rapport que vous aurez à voter tout à l'heure. Pourquoi? D'abord parce que vous le faites déjà et que si on entend par soutien au nucléaire le financement du déploiement de nouvelles centrales, ce sont de tels investissements à long terme que la BEI n'est pas un outil adapté à cela. Cela mettrait en danger la pérennité financière de la BEI. Donc ce serait une très mauvaise idée, en dehors de ce qu'on peut penser sur le fond, sur la question de la technologie nucléaire. Mais je n'ai vraiment pas assez de temps pour parler de ça.

Vous avez évoqué, Madame la Présidente, la question du programme Eau. Juste pour dissiper d'éventuels malentendus, un tel programme doit contribuer à sécuriser le cycle de l'eau et non pas à le perturber, puisque dans un certain nombre de nos pays, il y a un débat important sur la fabrication et le développement de ce qu'on appelle des mégabassines, qui non seulement ne résolvent pas la question agricole, mais altèrent encore davantage le cycle de l'eau.

Un mot aussi sur une expression qui est souvent utilisée sur la *twin transition*, c'est de dire que la transition verte et la transition numérique, ça va ensemble. Non. Ce sont deux transitions qui sont nécessaires mais qui ne sont pas de même nature. La transition écologique, c'est la transition de notre modèle de production qui aujourd'hui repose sur le carbone. La transition numérique, c'est les questions technologiques. Et j'insiste sur ce point parce qu'il y a parfois une confusion à considérer que, par nature, le numérique permettrait de préserver nos ressources. Ce n'est pas le cas. C'est même plutôt l'inverse. En réalité, je fais référence aux matières critiques.

Et puis un mot pour finir, Monsieur le Président, si vous le permettez, sur Global Gateway, vous en avez dit un mot. Je pense qu'il y a un enjeu stratégique, politique majeur à ce que la visibilité des investissements des banques publiques d'investissement proches de l'Union européenne – il y a la BEI, il y a un autre outil qu'est la BERD – soit plus lisible, plus visible. On est dans un moment critique où beaucoup de zones du monde attendent des choses de notre part et être plus visibles sur nous et plus lisibles sur nos politiques est un enjeu stratégique et géopolitique majeur.

Bref, merci. Ravi d'avoir l'occasion de travailler avec vous. Vous, vous venez d'être élue, nous, nous avons des élections à affronter dans quelques mois, donc on verra ce qui se passe. Mais en tout cas, bonne route à nos côtés pour les actions que vous voulez entreprendre.

President. – I would like to thank all the colleagues who stayed throughout the whole debate. The debate is now closed and the vote will be held today.

14. Componenta comisiilor și a delegațiilor

President. – The EPP and S&D groups have notified the President of decisions relating to changes to appointments within committees and delegations. These decisions will be set out in the minutes of today's sitting and take effect on the date of this announcement.

15. Raport referitor la Raportul Comisiei din 2023 privind statul de drept (dezbatere)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Sophia in 't Veld, on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the Commission's 2023 Rule of Law report (2023/2113(INI)) (A9-0025/2024).

I just have to announce that there will be no catch-the-eye because we are running late and we have a 70-minute vote after this debate. So I will also ask colleagues to keep to their speaking time.

Sophia in 't Veld, rapporteur. – Mr President, Commissioner, it's a pity, actually, that the Council is absent. It would have been a very educational debate for them, I suppose.

First of all, I would like to start by welcoming the annual report – the edition that we are discussing today. I think the next one is already in the making. And having been one of the driving forces behind it – the author actually of the legislative initiative proposal at the time for the annual report – I am very pleased to see that it is year on year developing into a very useful instrument, not least in connection with the Conditionality Regulation.

However, if everything were fine, then we would have a very short debate. So I would like to express a couple of recommendations and concerns, nevertheless. First, on horizontal remarks, on the method – and we've had this exchange many times before so you are aware of the position of the European Parliament – we consider that further changes are needed. We need this report to become even more independent from the Member States.

If we read the report of the European Commission, it is still fairly mild in describing situations which in reality are actually extremely worrying. I mean, if you read the report of the Commission, you think, okay, there are some concerns in the European Union, but it's all under control. Whereas if you look at the overall picture, I'm a lot more worried than that. And I think if you use the sources outside your national interlocutors, the government interlocutors, then the picture is somewhat more grim.

We have also repeatedly called for this report to be part of an interinstitutional agreement. And I find it very disappointing that the proposal of the European Parliament and the Commission to have cooperation with the Council on this topic – even in the shape of a pilot project – is being rejected by the Member States. I mean, that tells you something about the spirit in which they see this annual rule of law cycle.

And finally, we also feel that the report would gain in strength and credibility if it's drawn up by a panel of independent experts. Just this week, the European Court of Auditors has issued a report on the rule of law toolkit. It also includes some remarks on this report. And I think some of the remarks underline what I've just said.

Secondly, in implementing or upholding the rule of law, neutrality vis-à-vis the Member States is key. And that was actually the reason behind this whole report – that all Member States will be measured by the same yardstick. And here I see a risk. I think that, contrary to what some people in Hungary might claim, any decision of the European Commission to intervene is not politically motivated. However, I sometimes detect some political motivation behind the decision not to intervene because there are some countries that would definitely justify an intervention.

Finally, I think there are a couple of horizontal issues that we've addressed: independence of the judiciary, safety and freedom of journalists, the fight against corruption, the creation of equality bodies and such issues. But I would like to conclude with one issue that is particularly topical today. Today we are remembering the train crash at Tempe in Greece one year ago, which is very closely connected to corruption: a rail safety system that was not put in place because of reasons of fraud and corruption, which had been detected by the European Public Prosecutor, but not by the national authorities and not by the Commission. So you can see how corruption and fraud can literally cost lives. And therefore I think we should step up the fight against corruption even more.

Didier Reynders, *membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je suis d'abord heureux d'avoir cet échange de vues avec vous sur le rapport annuel de la commission sur l'état de droit. Cela devient maintenant un cycle habituel de débats au sein de votre assemblée.

L'un des objectifs du rapport est précisément de servir de base pour de tels débats politiques et je me réjouis de souligner que nous avons largement atteint cet objectif déjà avec les trois éditions précédentes. Le rapport fait régulièrement l'objet de débats, tant ici au Parlement européen qu'au sein des parlements nationaux ou au sein du Conseil. Le rapport a également suscité des discussions internes au sein des États membres sur l'état de droit et sur les mesures qui peuvent être prises pour le renforcer.

Le rapport permet aussi d'améliorer la connaissance mutuelle des systèmes nationaux respectifs. Il sert désormais de référence aux États membres lorsqu'ils engagent des réformes, notamment sur la base des recommandations émises dans les rapports de 2022 et 2023.

— Allow me to also recall President von der Leyen's announcement in the State of the Union speech that the Commission will open the 2024 Rule of Law Report to some enlargement countries. I am pleased to inform you that the Commission has invited Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia to participate in the exercise for 2024.

These four countries have been invited, as they are the most advanced either in their respective accession process or concerning the level of preparedness when it comes to the rule of law. This is thus the countries for which Chapter 23 on the rule of law and fundamental rights, and Chapter 24 on justice, freedom and security, are open or which are above some level of preparation when it comes to Chapter 23.

The Commission welcomes the draft resolution we are debating today on the fourth edition of the Rule of Law Report, which was adopted in July last year. As you know, the Rule of Law Report covers four pillars: the independence, quality and efficiency of justice systems; anti-corruption frameworks; media freedom and pluralism; and all the institutional checks and balances there are. These are key independent pillars for ensuring the rule of law. The draft resolution welcomes the focus on these key areas.

As regards the specific topics covered under each area, the Commission is following up on the challenges and developments identified in the previous report, deepening our assessment in certain areas or adding new topics that emerge across Member States, as relevant. For example, the 2023 report systematically looks at public service media and at the implementation of judgements of the European Court of Human Rights, topics that were raised also by the European Parliament.

The functioning of national checks and balances in how Member States responded to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the use of intrusive surveillance software such as Pegasus, are also part of the report, where relevant. Furthermore, the Commission has also taken due note of your request to cover the cooperation with the European Public Prosecutor's Office, which is already mentioned in the Rule of Law Report.

The economic dimension of the rule of law is an important issue, as respect for the rule of law is essential for the correct application of EU law and for a well-functioning single market. Judicial and anti-corruption reforms, in particular, can have an important impact on the business environment, as already often highlighted in the European Semester reports.

Rule of law reforms are also part of many Member States national recovery and resilience plans. Last but not least, they are essential for the protection of the EU's financial interests.

Your draft report recognises the Commission's efforts to engage with civil society. You also call on the Commission to work closer with the Fundamental Rights Agency in the context of the rule of law cycle.

In this respect, I am pleased to flag that in follow up to the 2023 report, we continued to hold national rule of law dialogues, organised jointly with the Fundamental Rights Agency and directly involving national civil society in a number of Member States. We intend to extend these dialogues further.

We managed to gradually advance the date of adoption each year since the second report, whilst also extending, each year, the consultation period for the Member States and other stakeholders.

The 2023 report presents the Commission assessment based on a well-established methodology and showing objectivity and equal treatment among Member States. Our assessment is also informed by a variety of sources, but I confirm that is the assessment of the Commission, and it is the role of the Commission to do that, so we will continue to work in such a way.

For the 2023 report, and in direct response to requests from the Parliament and civil society, we have also taken steps to increase the transparency and inclusiveness of all joint work even further. We are now publishing additional information about the calendar of the exercise, including, more specifically, the schedule for the country visits for 2024. In addition, we now provide more information on the composition, role and meetings of the network of national rule of law contact points.

As you know, the report has evolved throughout these four years since the beginning of my mandate. Since 2022, it includes country-specific recommendations addressed to each Member State. The aim of these recommendations is to assist and support Member States in their efforts to take forward reforms.

The 2023 report assessed the follow-up given to the first set of recommendations that the Commission issued in the year before. We can see that the report has become a true driver of positive reforms. Important efforts are ongoing in many Member States to follow up on the recommendations of the previous year. This is, however, happening at various speeds and levels of completeness, with some important concerns remaining in certain Member States.

Overall, within this framework of one year, around two thirds of the recommendations issued in 2022 have already been followed up fully or partially. The 2023 recommendations either build on last year's recommendations where there was no or partial implementation, or address new challenges identified since last year.

We are now preparing this through the fifth edition of the annual Rule of Law Report that we plan to adopt at the beginning of July this year. In fact, since the end of January, we have been in an intensive phase of the virtual country visits, meeting and engaging with another average three Member States per week. So, I am sure that we will continue to intensify the work with the Member States, the stakeholders, the civil society in such a way to have a real possibility to promote the culture of the rule of law in all the Member States.

But it is true that if it is not enough to organise a dialogue on such a basis, on the basis of the report, it is needed to do more, and we are using all the tools like infringement proceedings, sometimes with some decision requests to the court to import some fines. But also, we are using the budgetary instruments that we have at our disposal.

You know that you have put a lot of reforms in the recovery and resilience plans, with some milestones in those plans concerning the fight against corruption or the reforms concerning the justice system to give some examples. In one case, we have used also the conditionality mechanism.

Thank you for your support in the way to organise the process with all those instruments. But also thank you for such a debate about the rule of law report. Again, it is an important element to promote the culture of the rule of law in the entire European Union.

Lukas Mandl, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich danke der Berichterstatterin für die gute Zusammenarbeit in den Verhandlungen. Ich betone immer wieder: Rechtsstaatlichkeit gehört zu den großen Versprechen der Europäischen Union nach innen und nach außen. Jeder Mensch, jede Unternehmung auf dieser Welt soll sich darauf verlassen können, dass in Europa, in der Europäischen Union Recht gilt und Recht gesprochen wird, dass Rechtssicherheit herrscht. Und auf dasselbe sollen sich Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Europäischen Union verlassen können.

Es war mir wichtig, dass wir in diesem Bericht die besondere Rolle der Polizei in der Wahrung der Rechtsstaatlichkeit auch einmal hervorheben und dass wir ganz besonders darauf eingehen, dass es eine wirtschaftliche Dimension der Rechtsstaatlichkeit gibt, die ein Herzstück der Europäischen Union betrifft, nämlich den Binnenmarkt, der uns stark macht, der uns Wohlstand gibt, der uns soziale Sicherungssysteme erst ermöglicht. Wenn Unternehmen aus Mitgliedstaaten in anderen Mitgliedstaaten nicht Fairness vorfinden, unfair behandelt werden, nicht auf Rechtssicherheit vertrauen können, dann ist der Binnenmarkt gefährdet.

Erstmals gibt es ein Kapitel in diesem Rechtsstaatlichkeitsbericht des Parlaments auch als Empfehlung für den nächsten Bericht der Kommission. Erstmals wird adressiert, was extrem ist innerhalb der Europäischen Union. Spanische Bürgerinnen und Bürger können sich nicht auf Rechtsstaatlichkeit verlassen. Wenn ihre Regierung für den Stimmenkauf zur Bildung dieser Regierung mehr als 1 000 Verurteilte begnadigt, die sich zum Teil übelster Verbrechen bis hin zu terroristischen Aktivitäten schuldig gemacht haben, die spanische Bürgerinnen und Bürger in Angst und Schrecken versetzt haben, dann ist das in der Europäischen Union nicht akzeptabel und gehört entsprechend adressiert.

Cyrus Engerer, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, populism, disinformation, lack of transparency, and the weakening of institutions and procedures are putting the rule of law and democracy under threat in the European Union.

And I urge this House to keep on defending democracy, keep on defending human rights and keep on defending the rule of law as a key priority in the next mandate after June, because European citizens depend on their representatives, both at national level and European level, especially when those in power think that popularity absolves them from respecting the rule of law, defending democracy or from protecting human rights. Because in a democracy, popularity should never make anyone believe that they are above the law, or that they could decide which fundamental rights citizens could enjoy.

I thank the Commission for once again taking this positive step to look at the situation in each and every Member State. However, I would like to see this procedure happening in a more independent way, rather than relying on Member States having an independent panel which evaluates each and every Member State.

And I also would like to see the Commission, as a guarantor of the treaties, to have concrete and speedy actions, to enforce the rule of law, democracy and fundamental rights. Because what we have seen happening with Hungary, for instance, and the conditionality mechanism, is shameful on the Commission.

We can never stress enough that democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights are the foundations on which everything else is based on. It is in this light that I cannot but show my disappointment at how our President herself failed to take this message and the resolution adopted by this House to Greece, and pretend that there are no issues, where – I remind – government was tapping politicians and journalists, there are systematic flaws in the rule of law in Greece, and where a journalist has been assassinated and until today, there is total impunity.

To conclude, I would like to encourage citizens and civil societies, all European universities and students, human rights defenders to engage in critical thinking, to lead strong democratic revolutions. Some want critical thinking to be seen as a crime. Some political forces are trying to control the media, leading to a situation where pluralism or independent reporting becomes less and less possible. Do not allow this to happen. Do not allow everyone to shut your mouth.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, cuando en julio de 2023 la Comisión Europea publicó su informe sobre el Estado de Derecho en España no reflejaba la magnitud de los problemas que los Gobiernos de Pedro Sánchez han creado y siguen creando.

Se agudizan los ataques a la independencia de los jueces y la colonización de las altas instituciones del Estado. Se ha producido la investidura a cambio de una promesa de impunidad a delincuentes, juzgados o imputados por graves delitos. El Gobierno de Sánchez ha eliminado el delito de sedición, ha rebajado las penas por malversación, ha indultado a delincuentes que reiteran su intención de delinquir y ahora pretende amnistiar a prófugos de la justicia, investigados por terrorismo, malversación y alta traición e investigados en los expedientes sobre la injerencia rusa en Europa.

Y lo último, señorías, es un multimillonario escándalo de corrupción que la Oficina Europea de Lucha contra el Fraude investigará y que llega al menos hasta el número dos del Gobierno y del Partido Socialista cuando ocurrieron los hechos.

No podemos permanecer ciegos ni a la corrupción ni a las derivas populistas que suelen venir juntas, sean del signo que sean. La gravísima degradación de nuestro Estado de Derecho pone en riesgo la calidad de la democracia europea en su conjunto. Ojalá puedan integrar todos estos hechos para tener un análisis cabal de lo que ocurre en nuestros países.

Diana Riba i Giner, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, este es el cuarto año que realizamos este ejercicio y, aunque reconocemos que la Comisión ha ido mejorando la metodología de estos informes, estamos lejos de tener un instrumento efectivo y eficaz para proteger el Estado de Derecho en la Unión Europea.

Si la Comisión no pone soluciones para cada problema identificado y aplica mecanismos de sanción a los Estados que lo ignoren, correremos el riesgo de convertir este informe en un mero trámite repetitivo, lleno de lenguaje eufemístico y artificial, o, lo que es peor, en una pista de aterrizaje para hacer política partidista y nacional. Lo vimos en el debate sobre el Estado de Derecho en España hace unos meses y ya lo estamos viendo hoy.

Señorías del PP, de VOX y de Ciudadanos: ¿tanto miedo tienen de un borrador de ley que pasará todos los filtros políticos y constitucionales que ustedes siempre han defendido? ¿Ahora, de repente, les preocupa el Estado de Derecho en España? No nos decían lo mismo cuando era sólido, cuando denunciábamos el juego sucio del ministro de Interior en la «Operación Cataluña». ¿No decían que España era una democracia plena y consolidada, mientras justificaban el uso de Pegasus para espiarnos de forma ilegal, mientras había presos políticos o mientras bloqueaban la reforma del Consejo General del Poder Judicial? A ver si uno de los problemas principales que tiene el Estado de Derecho en España es que no exista una derecha mínimamente democrática.

Patryk Jaki, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Mamy kolejny raport o łamaniu praworządności. I złożyliście do niego poprawki o pozytywnych zmianach w Polsce. I ja chciałbym, żebyście teraz wszyscy usłyszeli, jakie to pozytywne zmiany są wprowadzane w Polsce, bo w przyszłości mogą dotyczyć was wszystkich.

Władze mediów publicznych w Polsce miały prawnie zapewnioną kadencję. Tusk jednak nie chciał czekać i siłą zajął publiczne media bez żadnej podstawy prawnej i wyrzucił prawie wszystkich pracowników, w tym kobiety w ciąży i niepełnosprawnych. A budynki kazał otoczyć policją. Do całej akcji jego minister użył sfałszowanych aktów notarialnych, a prokurator, który to wykrył, został zdegradowany. W międzyczasie bezprawność akcji Tuska potwierdziły sądy i Trybunał Konstytucyjny. Do żadnego wyroku Tusk i jego ludzie się nie zastosowali, a decyzję Trybunału jego minister uznał za – cytuję – „nieistniejącą”, bo – też zacytuję – „nie spełnia kryteriów doniosłości”. Więc prawdziwi prawnicy i ci ludzie, którzy krzyczeli o niezawisłości sądów, muszą mieć niezły zgryw, kiedy słyszą, że komunikat ministra o doniosłości jest wyżej niż ustawy i konstytucja.

Do tego minister sprawiedliwości Bodnar wyrzuca codziennie prawie jednego sędziego z jakiejś funkcji. I pytanie, czy takiej niezawisłości naprawdę chcieliście? Do tego ludzie Tuska chwilę później wzięli się za prokuratora krajowego. Nie mogą go odwołać bez zgody prezydenta, więc zajęli siłą jego gabinet. A jemu i jego zastępcom wyłączyli karty i nie wpuszczają do budynków. I zastanawiacie się pewnie, po co on to wszystko robi? Chwilę później się okazało. Jego ludzie skręcili sprawę marszałka Senatu od Tuska, wobec którego 250 osób zeznało, że żądał od nich łapówki. 250 osób. Czy znacie podobną sprawę w historii Unii Europejskiej? I wy uważacie, że te zmiany są dobre i praworzadne. Polityka więc bywa przewrotna. Ja wam chcę wszystkim powiedzieć. I uważajcie, żeby któregoś dnia ktoś nie zrobił wam tego tutaj w Parlamencie Europejskim. Budynki zajął siłą. Wyłączył karty. Uznał, że komunikaty prasowe są wyżej niż ustawy. I jeszcze jedno. Ja nie oczekuję od was żadnej interwencji. Nie macie do tego prawa teraz. Nie mieliście wcześniej. Ale chcę, żeby świat usłyszał o waszej hipokryzji.

Patricia Chagnon, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, dans le rapport sur l'état de droit au sein de l'Union européenne, la Commission et le rapporteur rivalisent pour distribuer des bons et des mauvais points autour d'eux et tirent à boulets rouges sur tous ceux qui oseraient s'écarter du diktat fédéraliste de Bruxelles.

Mais les mêmes qui rivalisent pour pointer les manquements des autres font la sourde oreille quand il s'agit de pointer les leurs. Sur les 43 pages que comporte le rapport, seulement quelques lignes évoquent du bout des lèvres la survenue du très inquiétant et du très grand scandale et très important scandale du Qatargate. Ce scandale qui a ébranlé le Parlement européen le 9 décembre 2022 et qui depuis, a connu de nombreux rebondissements. Le corrupteur désigné, le Qatar, les corrompus présumés, les députés européens, à commencer, rappelons-le, par Eva Káilí, alors vice-présidente socialiste du Parlement.

Mais qui peut aujourd'hui nous certifier que l'étendue de l'influence et de la corruption de nos institutions par le Qatar se limite aux sacs remplis d'argent liquide retrouvés chez madame Káilí? Plus d'un an plus tard, de nombreuses questions restent en effet sans réponse. Pire, d'autres questions s'y sont rajoutées.

Mais pourquoi l'OLAF, l'organe de contrôle de l'Union européenne, ne réagit-il pas? Existe-t-il un lien, même indirect, entre le Qatar et les subventions aux associations proches des Frères musulmans, comme le Femysso? Pourrait-il y avoir un lien entre le Qatar et les politiques immigrationnistes de l'Union européenne qui contribuent à aggraver le communautarisme islamiste sur notre continent? Et pourquoi enfin, la majorité des députés de ce Parlement européen ont-ils refusé une commission d'enquête interne? Il est plus que temps de faire toute la lumière sur l'influence du Qatar et de leurs relais ici, au sein de l'Union européenne et peut être même au-delà. Il y a urgence. Hier, l'émir du Qatar a été reçu par Emmanuel Macron à l'Élysée et nous continuons ici à fermer les yeux.

Anne-Sophie Pelletier, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je voudrais saluer l'importance de ce rapport et des constats qu'il pose. L'état de droit est fondamental pour faire progresser la démocratie qui est aujourd'hui attaquée, fragilisée.

Et pourquoi? Parce que nous devons nous inquiéter du respect de l'état de droit au sein de certains États membres. Et c'est pourtant ce cadre démocratique qui permet la garantie de nos libertés fondamentales et aucun État, encore moins membre de l'Union, ne devrait pouvoir s'y attaquer impunément. Ainsi, nous devons préserver la liberté de la presse, les libertés publiques, comme nous l'avons rappelé dans notre combat contre l'utilisation des logiciels espions tels Pegasus.

En fait, trop de gouvernements jouent avec nos droits fondamentaux, comme si ceux-ci n'étaient que des variables d'ajustement. Ce Parlement a d'ailleurs déjà établi de nombreux manquements au sein des États membres et les amendements de dernière minute déposés par certains groupes ne pourront pas changer la réalité des choses.

Alors demain, faisons que ce rapport soit adopté pour ce qu'il contient, pour ce qu'il représente. Mais je pense aussi pour l'espoir qu'il porte à des lendemains meilleurs pour notre vie démocratique.

Milan Uhrík (NI). – Pán predsedajúci, ja som si tú správu Európskej komisie o právnom štáte prečítal. Slovensko sa v nej spomína celkovo 23-krát, väčšinou v negatívnom zmysle.

V správe vyjadrujete napríklad hlboké znepokojenie nad krokmi novej slovenskej vlády prijať predpisy, ktoré by zabezpečili transparentnosť mimovládnych organizácií financovaných zo zahraničia. Tak to je teda naozaj veľký problém, aby tie organizácie boli transparentne financované. Na Slovensku vám tiež vadí rušenie špeciálnej prokuratúry a údajne nedostatočné práva pre LGBT komunitu. A slovenskej novej vláde dokonca vyčítate aj zámer rozdeliť Rozhlas a televíziu Slovenska. Ale viete, čo je najzaujímavejšie? Táto správa je za rok 2023, pričom všetky tie zlyhania, čo sa tam spomínajú, sú z roku 2024. Údajné zlyhania. Ale zlyhania predchádzajúcej vlády z roku 2023 tam nie sú spomínané ani jedným slovom. Ani to, že bývalá vláda nechcela vyhlásiť predčasné voľby na Slovensku.

Táto správa je jednoducho absolútne účelová a spolitizovaná. Napísaná bruselským liberálmi proti vlasteneckým vládam a nemá väčšiu cenu ako cena papiera, na ktorej je napísaná.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, hablemos de Estado de Derecho, pero también de ejemplaridad y lucha contra la corrupción. ¿Son ustedes conscientes de lo que está ocurriendo en España? Se pretende borrar la justicia con una amnistía infame que elimina la separación de poderes, la independencia judicial y la igualdad de todos los españoles. Se negocia una amnistía a la carta, fuera de la Unión Europea, con un prófugo al que la Justicia pide investigar por terrorismo y sobre el que este Parlamento advierte de vínculos con Rusia.

Por si fuera poco, el Gobierno de España, contrario a lo que defiende Europa, rebaja el delito contra la corrupción, la malversación. Y, por si no tuviéramos suficiente, estalla una millonaria trama de corrupción dentro del Gobierno socialista de España: un presunto escándalo de comisiones ilegales durante la pandemia en varios ministerios y los gobiernos regionales socialistas, que también pudo usar fondos europeos para ello. Investiguen.

Si quieren que hablemos de Estado de Derecho y ejemplaridad en Europa, hagámoslo. Pero tomen nota cuando alertamos, tomen nota de este informe. Nada de esto puede quedar en papel mojado.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario Reynders, cuarto Informe del Estado de Derecho con sus cuatro capítulos: estrategia contra la corrupción, independencia del Poder Judicial, libertad de prensa y control democrático de los poderes públicos.

Pero, en lugar de poder hablar aquí del vínculo entre el Estado de Derecho, la condicionalidad y el artículo 7, me toca hablar una vez más, lamentablemente, de lo que he escuchado decir a la portavoz del Partido Popular español al verter su inquina contra el Gobierno de España con argumentos tan injustos como falsos.

Señora portavoz del Partido Popular, ha hablado usted de corrupción, y déjeme decirle que no hay un solo miembro del Gobierno que preside Pedro Sánchez que haya estado no ya encausado ni acusado, sino ni siquiera señalado en ningún proceso penal. Y me lo dice usted, que se sentó en un Consejo de Ministros del Partido Popular, donde hay cuatro miembros de su Consejo de Ministros del Partido Popular en estos momentos sentados ante un tribunal penal en España. El ministro del Interior, por la policía patriótica, que intentó destruir las pruebas de delitos muy graves. Dos vicepresidentes del Gobierno, que fueron ministro de Economía y ministro de Fomento, encausados penalmente por enriquecimiento ilícito. Y un ministro de Trabajo, que fue presidente de la Comunidad Valenciana, encausado por todos los delitos imaginables de corrupción.

De manera que, señores del Partido Popular, a la cuestión: hablen de Estado de Derecho, reserven toda su capacidad de ruido para el Congreso de los Diputados, que ya les sufre bastante. Pero ahórresela —por favor— a este Parlamento Europeo.

Martin Hojsík (Renew). – Pán predsedajúci, napriek existencii robustného mechanizmu na ochranu demokracie a právneho štátu v Európskej únii správa Komisie za rok 2023 ukazuje zhoršujúci sa trend naprieč členskými štátmi a odvtedy sa situácia len zhoršila.

Pán komisár, sám to vidíte najlepšie na Slovensku, krajine, odkiaľ pochádzam. Od momentu zverejnenia správy Komisie po dnešnú debatu prešlo len niečo vyše pol roka. No za ten krátky čas nová Ficova vláda prijala najväčšiu trestnoprávnú novelu za uplynulých 20 rokov. Napriek varovaniu Komisie, napriek Vašej osobnej žiadosti, aby Slovensko neprijímalo túto trestnú novelu v zrýchlenom konaní. Ešte sa ani nestala účinná a už ju dnes opravovali. Opäť v zrýchlenom konaní. A ešte aj robia obštrukcie Ústavnému súdu.

V Belgicku sa prijímala trestnoprávna novela 8 rokov a začne byť účinná až o dva. Na rozdiel od slovenských pár týždňov. Cítite ten rozdiel? Slovenská vláda prechádza po demokracii a právnom štáte parným valcom, ktorý si požíčala z Maďarska.

Liberalná demokracia a právny štát sú základné piliere Únie. Ak ich dovoľíme zničiť, zničíme Úniu ako takú. Nedovoľme to.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, les droits et les libertés sont enfin devenus un sujet de conversation régulier et formalisé dans l'Union européenne. Il a fallu attendre qu'un gouvernement démantèle méthodiquement l'état de droit. Pourtant, malgré ce précédent en Hongrie, un processus similaire a lieu aujourd'hui en Grèce, sans suffisamment de réactions: affaiblissement des autorités indépendantes, climat terrifiant pour les journalistes, suspicion de corruption de dirigeants et de services de l'État, procureurs harcelés, services société civile criminalisés, droits fondamentaux attaqués. En Slovaquie s'annoncent des restructurations des médias publics et des purges dans les institutions, premier pas vers la captation du pouvoir.

Mais il y a un autre pays, cité trop souvent dans ce rapport, qui devrait attirer notre vigilance: la France. Mentionnée pour l'abus de ses forces de l'ordre, pour la détention de journalistes, pour l'attaque aux libertés associatives. Des mesures successives antiterroristes et de restriction de libertés civiles ont beaucoup fragilisé l'état de droit en France, et ce depuis plus d'une décennie. Si un autocrate arrivait au pouvoir, l'arsenal répressif serait en place. Mais sans même un changement de président, on peut se demander aujourd'hui si la démocratie en France ne décline pas déjà.

Dominik Tarczyński (ECR). – Mr President, I have a question for the Commissioner. In your report, I'm trying to find a single sentence about the Tusk government's unconstitutional decisions. Is there a single sentence about unconstitutional decisions from the Polish Government?

I'm happy you're smiling and I'm happy you're happy about this debate. You know that this report is used as a political tool by the left against conservative governments. That's how it was, that's how it is, and that's how it will be in this Chamber, because only Hungary and Poland were attacked for years.

There you go; you've got a reaction. He knows what I'm talking about, Mr Halicki. Don't cry, Mr Halicki. Your time will be up, and we don't want you to interfere in Polish businesses. The Polish nation will find a way to get rid of Tusk. You did not have a right to interfere in the past; you do not have the right to do it now. This is hypocrisy, because one of the senators was arrested today from your party for corruption ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Georg Mayer (ID). – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kollegen! Das mit der Rechtsstaatlichkeit, das ist halt immer so eine Sache. Entweder gilt sie für alle – immer und ohne Wenn und Aber – oder sie tut das eben nicht. Die Frage ist für mich natürlich schon: Was versteht eigentlich die Union unter Rechtsstaatlichkeit? Die Union, die immer gerne mit dem Finger auf andere zeigt, sollte, denke ich, da mal vor der eigenen Tür kehren, Herr Kommissar.

Denn da hat man oft den Eindruck, da ist mehr Willkür als Rechtsstaatlichkeit am Programm – wenn man zum Beispiel finanzielle Mittel zurückhält für Mitgliedstaaten wie Polen und Ungarn und wenn man dann weiß, dass gestern zum Beispiel in der Kommission und im Politbüro von der Leyen beschlossen wurde, dass 137 Milliarden Euro auf einmal freigegeben werden für eine Justizreform, die nach wie vor ja auch noch nicht stattgefunden hat in Polen.

Das sind also die Erlebnisse, die man dann hier hat zur Rechtsstaatlichkeit. Das konterkariert natürlich die Verlässlichkeit der EU-Verträge – denn Sie verstoßen damit gegen EU-Verträge – und damit natürlich auch das Vertrauen der Menschen in genau diese EU-Verträge. Denn wenn man das Recht biegt und bricht, dann kann man sich nicht darauf verlassen, dass die Menschen dem noch vertrauen. Wer sich dem Mainstream hier nicht anpasst, der muss damit rechnen, dass er sanktioniert ist. Die Frage, die sich mir stellt, ist: Verstehen Sie das unter Rechtsstaatlichkeit? Ich nicht.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Mr President, dear colleagues, as we are coming near to the end of this mandate, it's perhaps a good idea to reflect upon what's so wrong with this rule of law bandwagon. The approach used by the Commission and this Parliament is fundamentally flawed in principle. For instance, matters relating to life and death, family, marriage, or the upbringing of our children, stem from norms dating back thousands of years. They are also closely linked to religious beliefs and our attitudes towards the supernatural.

Evidently, these topics are sensitive and they can be divisive. It is certainly not the prerogative of this House to decide upon these crucial ethical issues. The sovereign decision about them remains with Member States, in line with their national constitutions, traditions and convictions.

Different opinions and different conclusions on some of these things are possible, and they should be respected. It is utterly wrong to disguise political and moral debates as if they were legal ones, and to sanction those who continue to defend traditional values. Brussels should stop the aggressive promotion of a radically left wing ideology and worldview, because this destroys good European cooperation.

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Drodzy Państwo – to przede wszystkim do panów Jakiego i Tarczyńskiego – po co tak krzyczycie? Po co takie emocje? Prawdy nie zakrzyczycie. Prawda jest w sprawozdaniu, a dotyczy ono roku 2023, między innymi tego procesu, w którym rząd Prawa i Sprawiedliwości pana premiera Morawieckiego łamał zasady demokratyczne i między innymi tuszował korupcję na najwyższych szczytach władzy. Tego dotyczy to sprawozdanie.

Ale na szczęście fakty się zmieniły i przyszłe sprawozdanie dla Polski będzie dużo korzystniejsze, bo zapisaliśmy Polskę do Prokuratury Europejskiej, z której nas wyprowadziliście, bo nie boimy się kontroli OLAF-u, a tam, gdzie była defraudacja, przywrócone będą i środki europejskie, bo mają służyć społeczeństwu, i pełna ich ochrona, bo rozdzielamy prokuratora generalnego od politycznego nadzoru ministra sprawiedliwości, bo media publiczne finansowane z kieszeni polskich podatników przestały stosować hejt, przestały organizować przestępstwa, bo mieliśmy i dramaty z tego powodu, śmierci. I to jest odpowiedzialność tych hejterów, którzy zatrudniani byli z budżetowych pieniędzy. Skończyło się wasze panowanie, bezkarność i brak odpowiedzialności. A odpowiedzialność będzie, bo komisje śledcze też działają.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Herr talman! Demokrati, mänskliga fri- och rättigheter och rättsstatens principer måste erövras av varje generation för nuet och framtiden. Vårt europeiska samarbete bildades som en motkraft till auktoritära och extremistiska krafter som hade försatt Europa i spillror.

Men nu är auktoritära krafter på frammarsch igen när moskéer och synagogor sätts i brand eller attackeras, när människor som jag – med lite mörkare pigment, född utanför EU:s gränser, uppvuxen i en förort och kvinna – blir attackerade med sexistiska och rasistiska påhopp, när stödet till civilsamhället skärs ner, när fria oberoende medier demoniseras, när hbtqi-rörelsen misstänkliggörs, när domstolar attackeras. Denna utveckling är inte ett naturfenomen. Vi kan förändra utvecklingen. Det är i våra händer och det är i folkets händer.

Då finns det inte heller någon plats för det som konservativa krafter dessvärre, och vissa liberala krafter, sysslar med när de normaliserar högerextremism och deras ideologi.

Vad vi behöver de kommande åren är progressiva krafter runt om i Europa som vänder på utvecklingen.

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, cher Marc Angel, Monsieur le Commissaire, cher Didier Reynders, l'état de droit, le cœur de notre démocratie est attaqué de toute part. La liberté d'expression, l'indépendance de la justice, la liberté des médias, le respect des règles ne sont pas, chers collègues, des acquis. Ce sont des cibles de choix pour tous les ennemis de la liberté au sein de l'Union européenne, comme surtout pour les puissances étrangères.

Monsieur le Commissaire, cher Didier Reynders, je veux saluer votre engagement décisif pour réarmer l'Europe et protéger nos valeurs fondamentales et nos droits. Depuis 2020, vous éditez ce rapport annuel de la Commission européenne sur l'état de droit ainsi que les recommandations pays par pays. C'est un outil précieux pour identifier les failles et répondre avec force aux causes du recul de l'état de droit.

Grâce à votre action, à notre détermination aussi au Parlement européen, mon groupe Renew avec la coalition du centre, les fonds européens sont désormais conditionnés au respect de l'état de droit et des valeurs européennes. Merci Monsieur Reynders. La protection de l'état de droit, c'est ce qui fait que nous sommes, chers collègues, profondément européens, ne lâchons rien.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, the latest Rule of Law Report shows a serious pressure on the rule of law in many EU countries. The Annual Report is supposed to be the key to unlocking the EU's rule of law toolbox, but far too often, this toolbox remains closed. The numerous concerns described in the Report are not followed with infringement actions, interim measures, steps in Article 7 proceedings, or budgetary conditionality measures.

I welcome the country-specific recommendations, but we need to see more strategy. Please differentiate between incidental and systematic breaches, expand the scope and cover all the EU's fundamental values, including democracy and fundamental rights, and ensure an effective follow-up and enforcement.

Mr President, rule of law is the cornerstone of our Union; we cannot afford to dialogue and see what happens. The 2023 Report sends an alarming message, and I urge you, Commissioner, as guardian of the Treaties, to enforce like our Union's future depends on it, because it does!

Nicolas Bay (ECR). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, ce rapport annuel est une réédition du précédent, une litanie interminable d'attaques politiques contre vos adversaires, contre ceux qui refusent les injonctions de la Commission européenne. Comme toujours, vous vous prévaliez de l'état de droit et prétendez agir au nom de ce concept flou qui reste à géométrie variable, selon vos intérêts et vos ennemis du moment.

On ne trouve rien sur les agissements scandaleux du nouveau gouvernement polonais de Donald Tusk. Pas un mot de la purge massive dans l'audiovisuel, exécutée manu militari sans décision de justice. Pas un mot sur les atteintes aux prérogatives du président polonais Duda, ni sur l'opération de police à l'intérieur même du palais présidentiel. Pas un mot, enfin, sur toutes les autres atteintes à la Constitution.

Votre silence et l'inaction de la Commission prouve que toute la comédie jouée depuis 2016 contre la Pologne, contre la Hongrie, n'était en réalité qu'un prétexte politique, une supercherie pour nuire à des gouvernements conservateurs. Ce que vous ne supportez pas, c'est que ces pays soient opposés aux politiques immigrationnistes et progressistes décidées dans des bureaux gris à Bruxelles. Vous agissez contre les choix démocratiques et la souveraineté des États. Vous ne leur pardonnez pas de défendre leur peuple, leur identité, leur nation, c'est-à-dire notre civilisation.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση της Επιτροπής για το κράτος δικαίου είναι το αμερόληπτο θεσμικό εργαλείο μας για την αξιολόγηση της προόδου κάθε κράτους μέλους στα ζητήματα ποιότητας της δημοκρατίας. Η φετινή έκθεση αναγνωρίζει τη σημαντική πρόοδο που έχει σημειώσει η Ελλάδα και αναδεικνύει τις μεταρρυθμίσεις που έγιναν από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση για την ενίσχυση της διαφάνειας, της ισότητας, για τον καλύτερο οικονομικό έλεγχο των κρατικών λειτουργιών και την ασφάλεια των δημοσιογράφων. Η χώρα μου σήμερα κατατάσσεται μεταξύ των 20 κορυφαίων δημοκρατιών σύμφωνα με τον Δείκτη Δημοκρατίας 2023.

Ως προς το κείμενο για το κράτος δικαίου και την ελευθερία των μέσων ενημέρωσης στην Ελλάδα, το Ανώτατο Δικαστήριο της χώρας διαμαρτυρήθηκε έντονα για αόριστες αναφορές και για την αδικαιολόγητη ευθεία παρέμβαση στο έργο της ανεξάρτητης Δικαιοσύνης. Συνάδελφοι, θέματα προς βελτίωση στα κρίσιμα θέματα της δημοκρατίας παρατηρούνται σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης. Γι' αυτό, όταν είμαστε καταγγελτικοί για παραβάσεις του κράτους δικαίου, έχουμε υποχρέωση να παραθέτουμε επίσημα στοιχεία. Οι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες απαιτούν από εμάς αντικειμενικότητα με υψηλό αίσθημα ευθύνης.

Ibán García Del Blanco (S&D). – Señor presidente, el informe sobre el Estado de Derecho, de alguna manera, es un diagnóstico de cómo están nuestras democracias en cuanto al estado de salud de lo que es el elemento central, es decir, la salud del Estado de Derecho. Hay elementos de este informe que precupan y otros que son más positivos, como que haya habido seguimiento sobre dos tercios de las debilidades señaladas en el informe anterior o sobre que se hayan puesto encima de la mesa medidas contra la corrupción.

Lamentablemente se ha ido utilizando, o se viene utilizando, este informe también como una herramienta de paso corto, como una herramienta de combate político partidista a nivel nacional. Hoy hemos tenido otra muestra de ello. Otra vez, compañeros o colegas de este Parlamento, españoles de los partidos de la derecha han utilizado este debate e intentan utilizar este informe para transformarlo en un elemento de oposición contra el Gobierno de España.

Llama la atención el desahogo de alguien denunciando la corrupción que se sentaba en un Consejo de Ministros cuyo ministro de Interior está denunciado por crear una policía política para perseguir a adversarios políticos, nada menos. Yo les digo, señorías del Partido Popular, que, si quieren ayudar, y ayudarnos a ayudar, a nuestro país conjuntamente, trabajemos juntos para acabar con el bloqueo del Consejo General del Poder Judicial. Por cierto, está aquí el comisario Reynders, él puede dar buena cuenta.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist wichtig, dass wir diesen Rechtsstaatsbericht hier wieder diskutieren. Wir müssen ihn aber auch mit konkreteren Konsequenzen verbinden. Es reicht nicht aus, nur die Lage in der Rechtsstaatlichkeit in verschiedenen Ländern zu analysieren, sondern wir müssen tatsächlich auch mehr umsetzen.

Aber es ist wichtig, dass wir diesen Bericht haben, weil wir in alle Länder in der ganzen Europäischen Union schauen. Und sonst ist es immer das Argument von den Rechten gewesen, wenn wir hier über Ungarn beispielsweise diskutieren, dass ja immer nur ein Land am Pranger steht. Heute, wo wir über alle Länder sprechen, wird dann wieder nur über Ungarn gesprochen, oder jeder spricht über sein eigenes Land. Das ist wirklich besonders.

Aber wenn der Kollege gerade von der Fidesz ernsthaft sagt, der Rechtsstaat sei irgendein mythisches Gebilde und es gebe eben traditionelle Werte und Familie und das wollten wir hier aus Brüssel irgendwie unterbinden, dann muss man sich wirklich fragen: Haben Sie nicht ein bisschen Scham, das hier zu machen? Was traditionelle Werte in Ungarn bedeuten, das wissen wir ja jetzt. Das bedeutet Vertuschung von Kindesmissbrauch und Begnadigung dessen. Das sind Ihre traditionellen Werte! Darum geht es doch. Deswegen muss hier klar sein: Der Rechtsstaat in Europa, der muss gemeinsam verteidigt werden von der Europäischen Kommission und vom Europäischen Parlament!

Daniel Freund (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die EU-Kommission setzt die Rechtsstaatskonditionalität zu zurückhaltend ein. Sie lässt sich von politischen Überlegungen und nicht von Fakten leiten, und die EU-Kommission prüft nicht richtig, ob die Reformen in Ungarn auch wirklich umgesetzt wurden, bevor 10 Milliarden Euro an Orbán freigegeben wurden. Die Kommission setzt unzureichend Personal zum Schutz des Rechtsstaats ein.

Sehr geehrter Herr Reynders, das ist mal ausnahmsweise nicht die Meinung von uns Abgeordneten hier im Europäischen Parlament, sondern es ist die Einschätzung des Europäischen Rechnungshofs, der Ihrer Überwachung von Rechtsstaatlichkeit in der Europäischen Union gerade ein ziemlich schlechtes Zeugnis ausgestellt hat: zu spät, zu wenig, zu undurchsichtig. Ich muss sagen – Sie tragen uns ja jetzt, ich glaube, in fünfter Fassung die Rechtsstaatssituation in der Europäischen Union vor –, an vielen Stellen wird die Situation nicht besser. Wenn wir aber die Werkzeuge, die die Europäische Union hat, die Konditionalität nicht einsetzen, um die Rechtsstaatlichkeit auch zu schützen, dann wird es nicht besser. Nur den Abstieg zu dokumentieren kann ja nicht Ziel sein, sondern wir müssen den Rechtsstaat wirklich entschieden verteidigen.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Pán predsedajúci, rád by som sa prihovril európskemu, ale zvlášť slovenskému publiku. Prosim, nikdy sa na Slovensku nenechajme oklamať, že našim priateľom v Európe na nás nezáleží a že vlastne ani poriadne nevedia, čo sa u nás deje. Vedia to veľmi dobre. Vývoj v oblasti právneho štátu a všetky jeho podrobnosti z Bruselu i zo Štrasburgu pozorne sledujeme. Slovensku venujeme značnú pozornosť. Na Slovensku nám záleží. Dnešná správa je dôkazom toho, že spravodlivosť nikde v Európe nefunguje vo vákuu. Nato, aby všetci občania pocítili, že spravodlivosť platí pre všetkých rovnako, potrebujeme mať funkčný systém: patrí sem transparentnosť, jednoznačný boj proti korupcii, spôsobom, akým sa spravame k neziskovým orgaizáciám, patrí sem aj sloboda a nezávislosť médií, v ktorej môžu fungovať kritickí novinári. Je mi ľúto, že tento boj musíme na Slovensku dnes viesť. Viem, že ho napokon vyhráme, a to aj s pomocou našich európskych priateľov. No je mi ľúto rokov, ktoré kvôli Ficovi a jeho kumpánom stratíme. Je mi ľúto dobrého mena Slovenska, ktoré Fico teraz systematicky ničí. Je mi ľúto rokov, ktoré sme mohli mať a venovať na rozvoj. Dámy a páni, jednu vec však viem sľúbiť: vytrváme.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Gdyby obywatele Polski nie obudzili się 15 października, słuchalibyśmy teraz o kolejnych ceglach wyciąganych z muru praworządności. Przed wyborami w Polsce praworządność była rozumiana nie jako rządy prawa, tylko prawo rządu PiS do decydowania zgodnie z własnym interesem. Demokracja była rozumiana nie jako władza ludu, tylko władza nad ludem karmionym propagandowymi oparami z telewizji publicznej.

Europosłowie jak ja, którzy bronili państwa prawa i europejskich wartości, byli z kolei nazywani zdrajcami. Dziś mogę z dumą powiedzieć, że to my mieliśmy rację. Minęło kilka miesięcy, a już wiemy, że zamrożone środki z KPO i WRF-u wpłyną do Polski, że minister sprawiedliwości uzyskał w Brukseli akceptację dla pakietu ustaw przywracających porządek prawny i że już tylko chwile dzielą nas od zamknięcia procedury z artykułem siódmym. Obudziliśmy się z populistycznego snu. Głęboko wierzę, że podobnie będzie na Węgrzech i na Słowacji.

A Wy – panie Tarczyński, panie Jaki – blokowaliście miliardy euro dla Polski. Teraz przynajmniej nie przeszkadzajcie i nie szczujcie na Polskę w Parlamencie Europejskim.

Javier Zarzalejos (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, gracias primero a la ponente de este informe, que apoyamos y al que tenemos que dar la bienvenida. Sabe el señor comisario que nosotros hemos apoyado este instrumento porque necesitamos una Comisión Europea a tiempo completo, no una Comisión Europea a tiempo parcial en la defensa y en la garantía del Estado de Derecho.

Y como he visto que hay una cierta tensión en este debate, habrá que recordar —con toda serenidad— algunas cosas. Sí, el escándalo de corrupción que ha estallado en España y que afecta al Gobierno socialista tiene implicaciones europeas graves y que irán saliendo. Y no, no es Estado de Derecho pactar con los delincuentes la reforma del Código Penal, no es Estado de Derecho rebajar el delito de malversación, no es Estado de Derecho declarar que el fiscal general del Estado depende del Gobierno, no es Estado de Derecho amnistiar a malversadores ni es Estado de Derecho ni es europeo intercambiar impunidad por votos para permanecer en el Gobierno.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, il s'agit du quatrième rapport de la Commission européenne sur l'état de droit dans l'Union européenne et il est devenu une habitude vertueuse. On se souviendra à cette occasion de l'engagement initial du Parlement européen sur cette question.

Il y a de très nombreux enseignements dans le rapport. Tout le monde ne l'a pas entendu ici, mais je l'atteste. Je relève seulement quelques éléments. En positif, on notera que 65 % des recommandations de 2022 ont été prises en compte et c'est, je crois, une réelle utilité du rapport. À l'inverse, là où les problèmes demeurent, ils s'aggravent et on notera une augmentation significative de situations préoccupantes dans les États membres, et non des moindres.

Pour agir sur ces situations, l'instauration d'un lien direct entre le respect de l'état de droit et l'accès aux financements européens a été une étape. Mais je pense qu'il faut évoluer vers quelque chose d'assez simple, même si c'est compliqué à mettre en place, c'est-à-dire des recommandations contraignantes. De même, un référentiel plus large, qui porte sur toute forme de discrimination, mais aussi sur les discours de haine, devrait faire partie des pistes à explorer par le prochain Parlement et la prochaine Commission.

Didier Reynders, membre de la Commission. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je suis impressionné de voir de minute en minute l'intérêt croissant pour le rapport sur l'état de droit au sein de votre hémicycle. Je vous en remercie!

Pour ce qui concerne le débat, je voudrais vous dire qu'il est important de souligner que le rapport n'est pas une fin en soi, mais un point de départ pour contribuer à des réformes nécessaires. Cela implique que les États membres poursuivent le débat sur le rapport et ses recommandations. Et, pour faciliter cet engagement, la Commission se rend de manière proactive dans les États membres pour discuter des problèmes que nous avons identifiés dans le rapport. Ces discussions se poursuivent tant au niveau politique que technique avec tous les États membres.

Depuis juillet dernier, j'ai moi-même participé à plusieurs débats avec votre Parlement, tant sur les questions horizontales que sur la situation dans certains États membres, au départ du rapport publié au mois de juillet. Cela a notamment permis de discuter du suivi des recommandations faites par la Commission à chaque État membre. Et pour conclure, je voudrais revenir sur deux ou trois éléments. Le premier, je reconnais que le rapport publié en juillet 2023 ne dit rien sur le gouvernement installé en Pologne après les élections d'octobre 2023. La Commission a un rôle proactif, mais pas à ce point-là.

Pour ce qui concerne le dialogue que nous mettons en place avec les États membres, je voudrais insister sur deux exemples. En Espagne, nous sommes en train de mener un dialogue structuré avec les deux principaux partis politiques pour tenter de mettre en œuvre les recommandations principales concernant la justice, c'est-à-dire le renouvellement du Conseil de la justice et la réforme concernant ce Conseil.

En Pologne, nous sommes en train, effectivement, de voir avec le gouvernement comment mettre en œuvre un plan d'action qui a été présenté au Conseil «Affaires générales» de l'Union européenne pour restaurer l'état de droit. Et je me réjouis que nous ayons déjà pu constater, notamment l'adhésion volontaire de la Pologne aux textes que nous avons mis en place pour installer le Parquet européen. C'est un élément important de voir que la Pologne rejoint cette logique du Parquet européen.

Mais lorsque le dialogue n'est pas suffisant, je voudrais simplement confirmer que nous utilisons, comme je l'ai dit tout à l'heure, d'autres moyens. Puisque la question a été posée, je rappellerai qu'en ce qui concerne la Hongrie, il n'y a toujours aucun euro du plan de relance versé à la Hongrie, en raison de l'absence de mise en œuvre d'un certain nombre de réformes, et la conditionnalité est toujours mise en œuvre sans changement. J'ai entendu un certain nombre de commentaires sur ce point.

Alors voilà, je vous remercie encore du dialogue que nous avons pu mener aujourd'hui et du rapport que vous avez présenté. Le prochain rapport de la Commission, comme je l'ai dit tout à l'heure, sera publié au début du mois de juillet.

Sophia in 't Veld, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, Commissioner. I will very rapidly respond to some points and cover some countries. First of all on Hungary, there is no need to say very much; it's in a league of its own. I think that President von der Leyen's decision to release the EUR 10 billion was spectacularly misguided, but I'm glad to hear that no payments have been made yet.

Greece and Slovakia are, as far as I'm concerned, the two most worrying situations at the moment. With regard to Spain, the report states very clearly that the amnesty law merits an independent assessment, and we are happy that the Spanish Senate has requested an opinion by the Venice Commission.

The stalemate with regard to the General Council of the Judiciary must be resolved urgently, but I would also like to underline that the underlying problem in Spain, in my view, is not a legal one, but a profoundly political one, and it has to be resolved through political dialogue.

Malta still merits our attention, and Italy is getting into the danger zone. I am referring specifically to freedom of the media and equal rights. Poland, Slovenia and Bulgaria seem to be positive examples, but extremely complex and fragile. Poland, in particular, shows us how rebuilding the rule of law from rubble is extremely difficult. There are also specific, but not systemic issues in other countries, such as excessive police violence or the maltreatment of migrants.

As regards spyware, this is a huge threat to democracy, and the Commission's refusal to act has turned Europe into a spyware Wild West. I am very worried by the lack of response from this House to last week's highly alarming revelations that Pegasus spyware had once again been found on the phones of MEPs, and we treat it as if that is normal.

As a final remark, I would like to clarify to some colleagues, in particular those with close ties to the Kremlin, if you think that you can offend me by calling me a liberal, you're wrong. I'm actually proud to be a liberal.

President. – Concerning spyware, dear colleague, in fact we had an intensive discussion in last Monday's Bureau and this discussion will continue.

Thank you very much, rapporteur, for your excellent work, and dear colleagues for this excellent discussion.

The debate is now closed. The vote will be held in a minute.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE), γραπτώς. – Είναι πραγματικά τραγικό το γεγονός ότι κάποιοι συνάδελφοι προσπαθούν εμμονικά να εξυπηρετήσουν μικροπολιτικές σκοπιμότητες ενόψει και των ευρωπαϊκών εκλογών, «πυροβολώντας» την αρχαιότερη δημοκρατία όχι μόνο της Ευρώπης, αλλά και ολόκληρου του κόσμου. Επαναλαμβάνω, κάποιοι εμμονικά και συστηματικά επιμένουν να στήνουν την Ελλάδα στον τοίχο, παρουσιάζοντάς την ως ένα κράτος αυταρχικό, όπου κανένας θεσμός δεν λειτουργεί, εξισώνοντας την ακόμη και με την Ουγγαρία του Ορμπάν. Πρόκειται για συκοφάντηση της Ελλάδας για μικροκομματικά οφέλη που τραυματίζουν την ίδια την αξιοπιστία της ΕΕ.

Beata Kempa (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Na tej sali wielokrotnie niszczone dobre imię mojej Ojczyzny. Porównywano mój kraj i jego rząd do autorytarnej Białorusi. Mówiono o łamaniu praw człowieka, atakach na demokrację. Niszczyliście dobre imię mojej Ojczyzny tylko dlatego, że rządził nią prawicowy, konserwatywny rząd. Rząd, który nie chciał zgodzić się na relokację tysięcy imigrantów, rząd, który nie chciał przyjąć euro, zaakceptować związków partnerskich ani federalizacji Europy skutkującej podziałem Unii. Nagle po zmianie władzy i zgodzie rządu Donalda Tuska na relokację imigrantów Komisja Europejska chce przyznać KPO. Jest zgoda na relokację, więc nie ma już problemu z praworządnością. Nie ma? A może nigdy nie było? Bo ta wasza praworządność polegała tylko i wyłącznie na szantażu, aby zmienić rząd. Polska była, gdy nie było Unii. I będzie, gdy was nie będzie.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. PINA PICIERNO

Vicepresidente

16. Reluarea ședinței

(La seduta è ripresa alle 17.19)

Presidente. – Prima di passare alle votazioni vorrei dedicare un momento al ricordo del primo anniversario del tragico incidente ferroviario che è avvenuto in Grecia il 28 febbraio 2023. In quell'occasione 57 persone hanno perso la vita e molte altre hanno subito ferite permanenti. Il Parlamento europeo li ricorda. Il nostro sostegno va alle famiglie delle vittime e a coloro i quali stanno ancora guarendo dalle ferite.

Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, j'aimerais faire un rappel au règlement avec l'article 195. La répression que subissent actuellement en Europe les militants écologistes qui ont recours à des actions pacifiques de désobéissance civile constitue une menace majeure pour la démocratie et les droits humains. Ce sont les mots du rapporteur des Nations unies aux défenseurs de l'environnement, Michel Forst, dans le rapport qu'il publie ce jour.

Écoterroristes, écovandalistes, menaces pour la démocratie. Malgré la convention d'Aarhus, les États membres s'évertuent à condamner des actes inoffensifs qui n'ont d'autre objectif que de pointer l'inaction illégale des États sur le climat, la biodiversité, la pollution ou la santé, documentée par les scientifiques. En France, aujourd'hui dans le Tarn, la police allume des feux au pied des arbres dans lesquels sont accrochés les «écureuils», ces défenseurs de la nature. Intoxication par les flammes qui risquent de mettre le feu à la forêt, privation de sommeil, de nourriture et d'eau, arrestations violentes et dangereuses, insultes et même menaces de viol, ces pratiques sont indignes de l'état de droit européen.

Il est temps de réagir. Je demande à ce que le Parlement européen, notre institution, et l'Europe, condamnent enfin les atteintes aux droits des défenseurs de l'environnement et financent à leur tour la mission du rapporteur des Nations unies.

17. Votare

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca il turno di votazioni.

(Per i risultati delle votazioni e altri dettagli che le riguardano: vedasi processo verbale)

17.1. Punerea în aplicare a politicii externe și de securitate comune – raportul anual pe 2023 (A9-0389/2023 - David McAllister) (vot)

– dopo la votazione sull'emendamento 50 :

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, colleagues, in line with Rule 180 of the Rules of Procedure, I would like to move the following oral amendment to introduce a new paragraph after Paragraph 57.

Here is how it reads: 'Is strongly concerned about a public statement from President Vučić in February 2024 explicitly endorsing possible military measures from the PRC against Taiwan in contradiction to the EU's policy supporting the status quo in the Taiwan Strait and warning against unilateral measures, in particular by force or coercion.'

Il Parlamento accetta di porre in votazione l'emendamento orale.

– dopo la votazione sull'emendamento 57:

David McAllister, rapporteur. – Madam President, I would like to raise to move oral amendments to two amendments, number 44 by the S&D and number 58 by the EPP, tabled to paragraph 77 of the annual CFSP report. Both oral amendments are factual updates taking stock of the fact that the Hungarian Parliament has now also ratified Sweden's NATO membership.

First, on Amendment 44, tabled by the S&D, it would say, 'welcomes, in this regard, Türkiye's and Hungary's long-delayed decision to finally approve Sweden's accession to NATO and urges the Turkish national authorities to cooperate closely with the EU's Sanctions Envoy'.

The second one, on Amendment 58, tabled by the EPP, it would say, 'welcomes the decision of the Grand National Assembly of Türkiye and the Parliament of Hungary to ratify Sweden's application to join NATO'.

Il Parlamento accetta di porre in votazione gli emendamenti orali.

– dopo la votazione sull'emendamento 81:

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (Renew). – Madam President, I would like to table an oral amendment that I deem as essential to substantiate the other amendments that I have already presented on behalf of Renew Group on the establishment of the European Civil Peace Corps.

The amendment reads as follows: 'Whereas there is a need for a comprehensive peace-building approach involving civilian specialists to implement practical measures for peace; whereas local and international NGOs perform crucial conflict prevention and peaceful conflict resolution activities, and it is of the utmost importance to make the most of their experience.'

I hope I can count on your full support, dear colleagues, and that this new paragraph can be added to the text.

Il Parlamento accetta di porre in votazione l'emendamento orale.

17.2. Punerea în aplicare a politicii de securitate și apărare comune – raportul anual pe 2023 (A9-0403/2023 - Sven Mikser) (vot)

– dopo la votazione sull'emendamento 85:

Sven Mikser, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, following the recent developments in relation to Sweden's accession to NATO, I would like to move the following oral amendment to paragraph 96. I suggest to delete the section of the paragraph beginning with the words 'takes note' until the words 'without any further delay', and to replace it with the following text: 'welcomes, in this regard, Türkiye and Hungary's long-delayed decision to approve Sweden's accession to NATO'.

Il Parlamento accetta di porre in votazione l'emendamento orale.

17.3. Drepturile omului și democrația în lume și politica Uniunii Europene în acest domeniu – raport anual pe 2023 (A9-0424/2023 - Nacho Sánchez Amor) (vot)

17.4. Activitățile financiare ale Băncii Europene de Investiții – raportul anual 2023 (A9-0031/2024 - David Cormand) (vot)

17.5. Raport referitor la Raportul Comisiei din 2023 privind statul de drept (A9-0025/2024 - Sophia in 't Veld) (vot)

17.6. Recomandare către Consiliu, Comisie și SEAE privind situația din Siria (A9-0041/2024 - Nathalie Loiseau) (vot)

Presidente. – Con questo si conclude il turno di votazioni.

(La seduta è sospesa alle 18.31)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

18. Reluarea ședinței

(Die Sitzung wird um 18.35 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

19. Prevenirea deceselor din cauze profesionale în urma tragediei de la Florența (dezbattere)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zu dem Thema „Nach dem tragischen Vorfall von Florenz: Tödliche Arbeitsunfälle verhindern“ (2024/2601(RSP)).

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of Parliament, first of all, I would like to present my sincere condolences to the families and friends of the workers who lost their lives and the ones who were injured in an accident at a supermarket construction site on 16 February in Florence.

This should never have happened. It is a tragedy. It is not acceptable that workers die while they are working. In the European Union, all workers are entitled to a healthy and safe work environment, a right guaranteed by Article 31 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Improving health and safety at work has been an important issue for the EU since the 1980s, and a lot has been achieved.

The existing EU legislation and measures for the safety and health of workers have contributed to an overall reduction of about 70 % fatal work accidents between 1994 and 2021. However, despite this considerable improvement, a number of deaths at work continue to occur, as we have just seen with this accident at work in Florence.

In general, the construction sector is regularly the economic activity sector with the highest number of fatal accidents per year in the EU. In 2021, the latest year for which data is available at EU level, 741 or over 20 % of fatal accidents in all economic sectors happened in the construction sector. Every accident, every death at work is one death to many. This is why, for Commissioner Schmit, who I am replacing today, occupational safety and health has been at the forefront and the Commission has set a very ambitious objective to address the situation.

For the first time, a 'vision zero' approach to work-related death was introduced by the current EU Strategic Framework on Health and Safety at Work. Our vision is to end all accidents and diseases caused by work. This requires that efforts are deployed by all actors for reaching this goal. The Commission is actively working towards this goal and made substantial progress to pursue this ambitious approach.

For example, in January this year, the Senior Labour Inspectors' Committee launched an EU-wide inspection and enforcement campaign in which all Member States take part. We are also progressing on the review of the practical implementation of the directives in the health and safety at work area. This review is planned to be finalised by the end of next year.

The European Agency for Safety and Health at Work supports the work of the Commission by providing practical tools and information for companies on how to protect their workers and prevent work accidents in the construction sector. Up to now, there exist more than 20 online interactive risk assessment tools for the construction sector in different EU Member States.

Honourable Members, no one should die at work. I count on you to continue to work in this direction.

Dennis Radtke, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Eigentlich ist es ja schon tragisch, dass wir diese Debatte hier heute überhaupt auf der Tagesordnung haben. Deswegen taugt die ganze Debatte auch nicht für politische Polemik oder Fingerzeigen. Ich finde, die Kommissarin hat völlig recht, man muss erst einmal die Tragödie würdigen und an die Angehörigen denken und denjenigen, die überlebt haben, eine baldige und gute Genesung wünschen.

Aber trotzdem müssen wir diese Debatte auch nutzen, weil wir als Europäische Union Zuständigkeiten haben bei der Frage Gesundheit und Sicherheit am Arbeitsplatz. Und wir müssen uns schon auch die Frage stellen, warum wir vor allen Dingen bei der Frage *Subcontracting* immer wieder diese Arbeitsunfälle sehen. Das ist ja kein italienisches Phänomen, sondern es ist ein europaweites Problem, dass wir immer wieder dort, wo die Sub- und vor allen Dingen Subsubsub-Unternehmer tätig werden, große Probleme haben, was die Einhaltung von Arbeitsschutzvorschriften und anderer Dinge angeht, auch Unterstützung, Sicherheitsausrüstung, persönliche Sicherheitsausrüstung etc.

Deswegen sollten wir vielleicht diesen tragischen Vorfall in Florenz auch dazu nutzen, um uns mit der Frage zu beschäftigen: Inwieweit ist das, was wir auch durch die Richtlinie aus 1989 bisher auf den Weg gebracht haben, inwieweit ist das eigentlich ausreichend, inwieweit ist das eine passende Antwort, um in Zukunft solche Unfälle zu verhüten? In jedem Fall sollte es uns eine Mahnung sein, auch auf anderen Politikfeldern das Thema Untervergabe und *Subcontracting* noch einmal sehr eng in Augenschein zu nehmen.

Beatrice Covassi, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dalla mia città, Firenze, ferita dall'ennesimo tragico incidente sul lavoro, con cinque morti e tre feriti nel cantiere di costruzione di un supermercato, arriva un appello a prendere iniziative urgenti.

Al momento del dolore deve seguire quello dell'azione. Occorre fare di più e farlo adesso in tutta Europa, unendo istituzioni, imprese, enti locali e sindacati, così come proponiamo nella Carta di Firenze. È tempo di superare la logica del massimo ribasso negli appalti, che poi si traduce troppo spesso nel mettere a repentaglio la vita e l'incolumità di lavoratrici e lavoratori.

Il numero di incidenti e decessi sul lavoro in Italia, una media di tre morti al giorno nel 2023, ci dice che non è più possibile avere subappalti a cascata, che servono ispezioni serie con il personale necessario. E che occorre unificare anche le regole per appalti pubblici e privati, regole che servono a salvare vite e a garantire il diritto a chi esce di casa la mattina per andare a lavorare, come noi, di potervi fare ritorno la sera.

Morire di lavoro in Europa nel 2024 non è accettabile: ricordiamocelo bene, cari colleghi, a 100 giorni....

(Il Presidente toglie la parola all'oratrice)

Nicola Danti, a nome del gruppo Renew. – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, i tragici eventi dell'incidente del cantiere di Firenze hanno aperto una ferita nel cuore dei fiorentini, ma anche squarciato un velo su realtà che non possiamo permetterci di ignorare.

Ciò che è avvenuto nella mia città ci impone di riflettere sui temi della sicurezza, della prevenzione e del lavoro nero, con l'umiltà di riconoscere che ancora non abbiamo fatto abbastanza. I dati europei e italiani sui morti del lavoro parlano infatti di una vera e propria strage. Se aggiungiamo a queste cifre quelle degli infortuni, che spesso hanno effetti permanenti sulla vita di alcune persone, il quadro diventa ancora più fosco.

Certo, in nessuna attività umana è assicurato il rischio zero, ma è evidente che dobbiamo fare di più, soprattutto nei cantieri dove, purtroppo, questi drammi sono ricorrenti. Le norme sugli appalti e subappalti, la formazione del personale e il controllo nei luoghi di lavoro devono essere le priorità che anche come Parlamento europeo abbiamo il dovere di perseguire. Non possiamo permettere che i fatti di Firenze siano solo l'ennesima aggiunta ad una lunga lista di tragedie.

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, «Le morti sul lavoro sono colpa dell'immigrazione selvaggia». Non sono le parole mie. È il titolo a caratteri cubitali che campeggiava su un quotidiano italiano all'indomani dell'incidente di Firenze. Quel titolo vergognoso è la testimonianza di una classe politica che nasconde le sue responsabilità: vale per l'Italia, ma anche per l'Europa.

Nell'Unione europea ogni anno muoiono sul lavoro oltre 3000 persone. In Italia solo nel 2023 le vittime sono state più di 1000. Senza contare i morti che non finiscono nelle statistiche, uccisi, ad esempio, dai veleni dell'industria fossile: penso a Taranto, la mia città.

Le soluzioni ci sono. In edilizia si limiti il subappalto, così da garantire la responsabilità solidale lungo tutta la catena. Invece, in Italia il governo di destra modifica il codice degli appalti, sì, ma cancella il divieto di aggiudicare i contratti con il massimo ribasso, premiando il subappalto a cascata. Sui fatti di Firenze le responsabilità penali saranno accertate.

Quelle politiche però sono chiare e riguardano anche la Commissione europea. Il nuovo codice degli appalti in Italia rientra tra le riforme del PNRR. Bruxelles non sia complice e blocchi questa riforma.

Elżbieta Rafalska, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Najnowsze sprawozdanie Eurostatu dotyczące bezpieczeństwa pracy w 2023 roku wskazuje branże, które są najbardziej niebezpieczne. I do tych branż należy budownictwo.

Ten niechlubny ranking budownictwa, jeśli chodzi o ilość wypadków, trwa od wielu, wielu lat i pewnie dotyczy wszystkich krajów Unii Europejskiej. Wypadki w budownictwie to 22,5% wszystkich wypadków śmiertelnych, a ponad 12,9% wszystkich pozostałych wypadków. Potwierdzeniem tej sytuacji jest ta śmierć pięciu pracowników na inwestycji budowlanej we Florencji. Śmierć zdarzająca się w sytuacji, w której pracownik idzie do pracy i nigdy z niej nie wraca, jest dramatem. Trzeba zrobić wszystko, żeby obniżyć drastyczną ilość wypadków w budownictwie.

Susanna Ceccardi, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, lo scorso 16 marzo a Firenze cinque operai sono morti a causa del crollo di una trave nel cantiere di un supermercato: una strage terribile. Su quel cantiere lavoravano più ditte con subappalti a cascata.

Fino a un anno fa in Italia i subappalti dei subappalti erano vietati. Ma poi l'Unione europea ci ha costretto ad applicare la direttiva 24 del 2014 che li consente, nel nome del libero mercato. Quattro vittime su cinque erano immigrati e la metà di loro non era a posto col permesso di soggiorno.

Tutti abbiamo pianto per loro, ma pochi hanno riconosciuto che molti migranti irregolari, disposti a fare qualsiasi cosa per sopravvivere, sono facile preda della criminalità organizzata o dei caporali infami e senza scrupoli, che li sfruttano senza pietà in mansioni pericolose per una paga da fame.

L'immigrazione irregolare che la sinistra europea continua a fomentare non salva i migranti: talvolta li uccide. Questa Europa inclusiva e umanitaria deve essere meno ipocrita!

Marina Mesure, au nom du groupe The Left. – Monsieur le Président, aujourd'hui, cela fait deux ans jour pour jour que Benjamin est parti au travail et n'est pas revenu. C'est aussi le 29^e anniversaire de Flavien qu'il ne fêtera jamais. Les morts au travail, à Florence comme partout en Europe, ce ne sont pas que des chiffres, ce ne sont pas que des noms. Ce sont des vies brisées à jamais, ce sont des êtres chers arrachés à leurs proches. Et je vous le dis, je suis profondément indignée qu'en 2024, l'Union européenne et les États membres ne soient toujours pas capables de garantir à tous un environnement de travail sain et sûr.

Pourtant, les outils existent pour qu'aucune famille n'ait à vivre et à traverser ces drames terribles: limiter la sous-traitance, responsabiliser les donneurs d'ordre, améliorer les conditions de travail, augmenter les moyens humains et financiers de l'inspection du travail. Il faut condamner sévèrement les employeurs qui ne respectent pas les règles et mettent en danger les travailleurs. Et lorsque malgré tout, il y a des accidents qui adviennent, il faut absolument accompagner juridiquement, psychologiquement et économiquement les proches des victimes.

Chers collègues, il est grand temps de faire de la lutte contre les morts au travail notre priorité absolue. Il faut rendre hommage à celles et ceux qui ont perdu la vie au travail, mais surtout faire en sorte que plus personne ne perde sa vie en essayant de la gagner.

Maria Angela Danzì (NI). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, ancora morti a Firenze. È una strage quotidiana per l'Italia che detiene un triste primato: nel nostro Paese ogni 8 ore muore un lavoratore.

In materia di appalti e subappalti, vanno predisposte norme comuni sia per quanto riguarda gli appalti pubblici, sia per quanto riguarda gli appalti privati. Non facciamo confusione: è quello che chiediamo.

Bisogna coniugare il diritto alla concorrenza e la tutela delle piccole imprese con la sicurezza del lavoro, che non è negoziabile. Basta subappalti a cascata: producono ribassi anomali e frammentazione delle misure di sicurezza. Snelliamo le procedure per ottenere permessi di soggiorno: i lavoratori servono. Potenziamo i controlli sulla sicurezza e sottraiamo dal patto di stabilità le spese per i controlli.

Basta compromessi! Basta indignazione e cordoglio ma azioni dirette a salvaguardare la salute dei nostri lavoratori.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Ich bin meiner Kollegin Covassi sehr dankbar, dass sie das auf die Tagesordnung gesetzt hat. Wir haben in den letzten vier Monaten 30 Menschen verloren, die bei Arbeitsunfällen auf Baustellen in Europa ums Leben gekommen sind. Wir wissen doch, dass es immer wieder mobile Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer sind und dass die Subunternehmerketten das Problem sind, weil sie wirklich menschenunwürdige Arbeitsbedingungen bieten. Wir wissen das alles, und ich bin sehr froh, dass die Frau Kommissarin gesagt hat, niemand soll auf der Arbeit sterben.

Aber wir haben es in der Hand, die Subunternehmerketten zu regulieren. Wir wissen, dass der Baubereich das Problem ist, dass wir auch hier mehr Kontrollen tatsächlich durchführen und die Beschäftigten besser schützen müssen in Europa. Sonst bleiben das nämlich Krokodilstränen hier. Deshalb ist es eben auch wichtig, und wir haben das auch bei unserer Reform der Koordinierung der sozialen Sicherheit angesprochen: Der Bausektor ist wirklich ein Problemsektor, und deshalb müssen wir hier stärkere Sicherheitsplanken einziehen.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (Renew). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è vergognoso, assurdo e aberrante ancora contare i morti sul lavoro nel 2024. Eppure è quello che accade in Italia. I cinque operai che hanno drammaticamente perso la vita nel cantiere di Firenze lo scorso 16 febbraio sono solo gli ultimi di una lunghissima serie. Quest'anno sono già infatti 181 le morti bianche, mentre nel 2023 si sono contate più di 1000 vittime, quasi tre al giorno.

Il punto è chiaro: c'è un totale fallimento dello Stato, incapace di mettere in sicurezza i propri lavoratori. Non è sufficiente legiferare perché altrettanto importante è assicurarsi che quelle norme siano veramente rispettate. Dobbiamo rimboccarci le maniche e metterci a lavorare urgentemente su un sistema di controllo che sia efficace e uno sanzionatorio che sia realmente dissuasivo, specialmente sul tema dei subappalti, che vengono spesso usati per far sfuggire i responsabili alle proprie responsabilità.

Non è possibile che altri lavoratori paghino con la vita le inefficienze dell'intero sistema della prevenzione del lavoro. Eccetto i rari casi fortuiti, l'unica colpa di questi sfortunati non è che quella di fidarsi delle persone che hanno il dovere deontologico di proteggerli, Stato incluso. Basta morti sul lavoro!

Katarína Roth Neveďalová (NI). – Pán predsedajúci, bezpečnosť a ochrana zdravia pri práci je veľmi dôležitá. A až 97 % rôznych nehôd, ktoré sa na pracovisku stávajú, by sa dalo predísť, keby sa urobilo naozaj dostatočné školenie alebo bezpečnostné opatrenia, na ktoré občas zamestnávateľia zabúdajú.

Ľudia sú unavení ľuďia, majú veľa práce a nemajú dostatočný oddych, a preto sa môže stať občas takisto nejaké nešťastie. O to väčší problém je, ak je toto nešťastie smrteľné. A myslím si, že každá takáto smrť je absolútne nezmyselná a veľmi ťažko sa vysvetľuje rodine, ktorá zostane po takomto zamestnancovi.

Ľudia si zamestnanie vyberajú. Už to nie je ako kedysi. Už to nie sú otroci, ktorí musia pracovať pre zisky spoločnosti, ale ľudia si vyberú, kde chcú pracovať, a vyberú si z nejakého dôvodu. A preto by zamestnávateľia mali k nim pristupovať takisto s rešpektom a chrániť ich práva, ich prácu a, samozrejme, aj ich život.

O to dôležitejšie je v súčasnej dobe takisto aj spolupráca s odbormi, so zástupcami zamestnávateľov, ktorí navrhujú veľmi dobré a pozitívne opatrenia, aby sa predchádzalo nielen takýmto nešťastiam, nehodám, ale aby sa chránilo zdravie a život zamestnancov, pretože to nesmie byť obetované na úkor zisku.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Carlo Fidanza (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la piaga delle morti bianche non merita di essere strumentalizzata. Le speculazioni politiche mancano di rispetto alle vittime, al pari dell'inezia della politica.

In Italia, con il governo Meloni, sono stati assunti ben 800 nuovi ispettori del lavoro per vigilare su fabbriche e cantieri. La sicurezza sul lavoro verrà inserita come materia di studio fin dalle scuole primarie.

Dopo la tragedia di Firenze sono già state varate nuove norme: la patente a crediti, che punirà le aziende che non fanno formazione e non garantiscono la sicurezza sul posto di lavoro; un nuovo concorso per ispettori per aumentare ulteriormente i controlli di almeno il 40 %; nuove misure di prevenzione e di contrasto al lavoro irregolare; l'estensione della verifica della congruità del costo della manodopera anche agli appalti privati; il potenziamento del sistema sanzionatorio dei subappalti.

Passi importanti nella giusta direzione, quella di un impegno sociale che ci vedrà sempre in prima linea.

Marc Botenga (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, perdre la vie au travail, ne pas savoir quel droit on a après, c'est horrible, et cela mérite qu'on en discute ici. Mais soyons clairs, on l'a vécu en Belgique, on le vit tous les jours et maintenant, il y a ce drame en Italie sur ce chantier. Combien de sous-traitants y avait-il actifs sur ce chantier? Combien?

Alors là, il y a une mesure que nous pouvons prendre au niveau européen grâce à une directive qui limite la sous-traitance. Celle-ci est devenue un véritable *business model* utilisé par des entreprises partout en Europe pour ne pas octroyer aux travailleurs les droits auxquels ils auraient normalement accès, non seulement ceux qui s'inscrivent dans le cadre du contrat de travail, mais aussi, tout simplement, les droits humains.

Et deuxièmement, ne venez pas dire aux États qu'ils doivent couper dans leurs services sociaux, dans leurs administrations pour ensuite vous plaindre qu'il n'y a pas assez d'inspections sociales, qu'il n'y a pas assez d'inspection du travail. Donc, arrêtez aussi cette austérité, nous avons besoin d'une inspection sociale et du travail forte partout en Europe.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I want to thank you for this constructive debate. The Commission will continue to put forward measures to address all causes of accidents and illness at work.

We will also continue to support the work on instruments such as the guides and tools produced by the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work to further help employers and workers prevent accidents and illness at work.

I look forward to our continued cooperation on this matter and thank you once again for raising awareness of this very important issue.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Dominique Bilde (ID), *par écrit*. – Je souhaiterais commencer par une pensée pour les victimes de cette tragédie de Florence et leurs familles. Malheureusement derrière ce drame humain on découvre des scandales: un chantier controversé, des travailleurs aux noirs, voir illégalement présents sur le territoire italien... Je me garderai de donner des leçons: ce serait malvenu quand dizaines d'ouvriers sans papiers travaillent actuellement sur les chantiers des Jeux Olympiques de Paris. Les décès liés au travail sont, hélas, une réalité, en particulier dans le secteur de la construction. Nous nous efforçons d'apprendre de ces drames pour qu'ils ne se reproduisent pas. Mais où poser les limites ? Nous ne pourrions jamais mettre un contrôleur derrière chaque ouvrier. Tant que les chantiers seront remplis d'entreprises qui ne communiquent pas toujours, que les prix seront tirés vers le bas avec du matériel de mauvaise qualité, que des ouvriers non formés, parfois exploités y travailleront, comment empêcher les accidents et les morts ? Les normes et les règles ne suffisent plus. Il est temps de parler responsabilité individuelle. Que ceux qui trichent, qui fraudent et qui abusent assument leurs choix et payent en conséquence. Ce n'est que comme ça que l'on protégera nos travailleurs et garantirons la sécurité sur nos chantiers.

20. Aprofundarea integrării UE în vederea extinderilor viitoare (dezbatere)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Petras Auštrevičius im Namen des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten und Pedro Silva Pereira im Namen des Ausschusses für konstitutionelle Fragen zu einer Vertiefung der EU-Integration mit Blick auf eine künftige Erweiterung (2023/2114(INI)) (A9-0015/2024).

Pedro Silva Pereira, *relator*. – Senhor Presidente, o relatório sobre o aprofundamento da integração europeia tendo em vista o alargamento, que aqui apresento com o meu colega relator Petras Auštrevičius, é certamente um dos mais importantes e sensíveis da agenda do Parlamento Europeu neste final de mandato. Agradeço, por isso, a excelente colaboração com o meu correlator e a contribuição de todos os relatores-sombra.

O facto deste relatório ser o resultado de um exercício conjunto das Comissões dos Assuntos Constitucionais e dos Negócios Estrangeiros, permitiu ao Parlamento Europeu chegar a um texto final com mensagens políticas muito claras e fortes sobre as várias dimensões do processo de alargamento.

Sem dúvida, os desafios colocados pela guerra de agressão da Rússia contra a Ucrânia reforçaram a importância geoestratégica do alargamento, mas não basta proclamar que o alargamento é importante, é preciso garantir as condições para que seja viável e possa ser um sucesso.

Por isso, a primeira mensagem deste relatório é que o alargamento não pode ser tratado com ligeireza. Pelo contrário, só pode ser um processo exigente, sem vias rápidas e sem calendários pré-definidos. Os países candidatos têm mesmo de fazer as reformas para cumprir os critérios de Copenhaga, com destaque para o respeito pelos valores e princípios fundamentais da União, direitos humanos e funcionamento da democracia e do Estado de Direito. E é melhor tratar disso agora do que quando for tarde demais.

Cabe à União prestar aos países candidatos apoio técnico e financeiro nessas reformas, mas deve também sancionar a estagnação e o retrocesso, se necessário, suspendendo financiamentos ou as próprias negociações.

Outra mensagem forte deste relatório, pela primeira vez afirmada com clareza, é que é preciso pôr em paralelo as reformas nos países candidatos e as reformas que a própria União Europeia tem de fazer para poder absorver novos Estados-Membros.

No plano europeu são necessárias reformas institucionais, mas também orçamentais. É evidente que uma União Europeia com 35 ou mais Estados-Membros não pode funcionar com as regras de uma Europa a 27. É preciso alargar as decisões por maioria qualificada para reduzir os riscos de bloqueios com a regra da unanimidade, simplificar processos de decisão, reavaliar o sistema de ponderação de votos no Conselho.

É necessário rever a composição do Parlamento Europeu sem excluir, à partida, a possibilidade de um aumento razoável na dimensão do Parlamento, para que todos possam continuar aqui a sentir-se justamente representados.

A própria composição da Comissão terá de ser repensada e temos ainda de consagrar soluções de integração diferenciada, explorando os mecanismos de flexibilidade previstos no Tratado de Lisboa.

Finalmente, a reforma orçamental, e deixem-me ser absolutamente claro, não seria sério avançar para um ambicioso processo de alargamento sem primeiro garantir um orçamento europeu à altura das necessidades e sem prevenir as consequências em políticas europeias vitais como a política de coesão e a política de agricultura.

O que este relatório faz é reconhecer a importância do processo de alargamento e é exatamente por isso que diz que os critérios de adesão são para levar a sério e que, a par das reformas dos países candidatos, a própria União Europeia tem de se reformar.

Para garantir que isso acontece, o Parlamento Europeu faz questão de ter uma palavra decisiva a dizer e, para que a sua voz seja mais forte, eu peço a todos o vosso apoio a este relatório.

Petras Auštrevičius, Rapporteur. – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, Komisijos nary, kolegos. Europos Sąjunga, kaip europiečių bendradarbiavimo, stabilumo užtikrinimo ir demokratijos projektas, dar kartą yra išbandoma laiku, tačiau yra tvirtai kontinentą vienijanti idėja. Europos valstybių narių pasiekimai ir ambicijos inspiruoja kitas valstybes siekti narystės ir šlietis prie jos. Tai teisingas pasirinkimas, kurį patvirtina realus gyvenimas ir jo pokyčiai. Būkime atviri, Europos Sąjungos plėtros įtakoti pokyčiai, ekonominės gerovės augimas, naujos visuomenių perspektyvos, auganti Europos Sąjungos tarptautinė galia ir įtaka tik patvirtina plėtros politikos pasiekimus. Kartu mes esame stipresni. Europos Sąjungos gebėjimas pasinaudoti nustatytais plėtros derybų proceso procedūromis nustato vienodai objektyvias ir abipusiai naudingas sąlygas. Plėtra yra reformų kelias, kuris užtikrina Europos teisės įsigaliojimą ir sektorialių politikų vykdymą, derinant nacionalines ir Sąjungos kompetencijas. Kandidatų valstybių stojimo procesas lemia tų valstybių sėkmę ateityje. Iki šiol nėra nė vienos Europos Sąjungos valstybės narės, kuri savo pavyzdžiu negalėtų patvirtinti didelių ir pozityvių visapusiškų pokyčių. Taip buvo ir tai tęsis. Šiuo metu stovime ant naujos Europos istorijos slenksčio, už kurio yra galimybė iš esmės išbaigti Europos vienijimosi procesą. Rytų Europos ir Vakarų Balkanų valstybės gali ir turi pakartoti ankstesnius plėtros proceso sėkmės pavyzdžius. Kandidatės siekia. Europos Sąjunga turi sudaryti kuo aiškesnes žaidimo sąlygas būsimajame plėtros procese. Kandidatų demonstruojama pažanga reformų ir derybų metu yra lemiamas stojimo kriterijus, bet pagrindinių demokratinių vertybių ir Europos Sąjungos bendros užsienio ir saugumo politikos palaikymas yra kritiškai svarbus. Valstybės kandidatės privalo pasirinkti, į kurią vertybių ir saugumo erdvę jos siekia integruotis. Suprantama, plėtra keičia ir Europos Sąjungą, jos sektorines politikas, bei reikalauja papildomų finansinių resursų. Neišvengiamai privalome tobulinti ir efektyvinti Europos Sąjungos sprendimų priėmimą, mažinant veto teisės įtaką sprendimams, nulemiantiems Europos Sąjungos ateitį. Aš sutinku, kad Europos Sąjungos plėtros ir reformų proce-

sai turi vykti vienu laiku, ranka į ranką ir įvertinant sprendimų priėmimo greitį. Stiprinant Europos Sąjungą iš vidaus ir vienijant Europos kontinentą, turime stiprinti konkurencingumą ir saugumą. Tokia Europos ateitis yra reikalinga europiečiams.

Leiskite, mieli kolegos, padėkoti visiems, ruošusiems šį pranešimą, ypač Pedro Pereirai, mano kolegai iš Konstitucinių reikalų komiteto. Tai buvo gera komanda, kuri, aš tikiuosi, ir tęs savo veiklą ateityje, kadangi šį pranešimą reikės įgyvendinti.

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, it is a pleasure to be with you today for this debate, replacing Executive Vice-President Šefčovič, who unfortunately could not be present.

Europe's history is one of liberal democracies getting stronger and more prosperous together. Since 1957, the European Union and the European Community before it have successfully gone through several rounds of enlargement, developing into today's Union of 27 Member States. The decision taken by the European Council in December 2023 completes the picture.

The Western Balkans, Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia belong to the European family. They are a crucial part of a Europe whole and free. As stated in Parliament's report, in an increasingly volatile geopolitical context, the political urge of so many countries to join the EU underscores the promise of enlargement and shows that the European Union remains an anchor of peace, prosperity and security.

Let us just look back when the EU experienced its last major enlargement exactly 20 years ago. Nobody can contest that in spite of the global economic turbulence that we lived through during these years, enlargement has been and still is a success story which has improved the lives of millions and has reinforced our economic resilience. We have also reasons to believe this will be replicated.

A larger Union has greater geopolitical weight and influence on the global stage, including as an economic partner. A larger Union can help reduce critical dependencies and allows it to act more autonomously. A larger Union strengthens the competitiveness and growth potential of the single market, creating new opportunities for European citizens and businesses. A larger Union is an opportunity to enhance energy security and to promote higher environmental, social and consumer standards.

Most importantly, as the co-rapporteurs are stating, a larger Union, if well managed, will be the opportunity to expand and anchor democracy, the rule of law and respect of human rights across our continent. However, for these benefits to materialise, full and sustained political commitment is required from all sides.

First and foremost, enlargement is and will remain a merit-based process. It requires major efforts by the candidate countries, and for the EU itself, we must show the same determination. Both trucks should advance in parallel. We must start preparing today for the Union of tomorrow. Whilst we widen the union, we must also deepen it. We can and we must do both at the same time. We must use enlargement as a catalyst for progress and reforms.

Honourable Members, I note that this is also one of the main messages of the report presented to us today that will feed into the preparations for the communication that the Commission will present soon. To conclude, I would therefore like to warmly thank the two rapporteurs for their invaluable contribution. This is a keystone in our ongoing collective reflections.

Danuta Maria Hübner, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Vice-President, Commissioner, colleagues, it was a pleasure to work on this report at this time. European enlargement policy is a powerful tool to promote democracy, the rule of law, respect of fundamental rights. It also gives the EU a stronger voice on the world stage.

For aspiring countries, a credible, merit-based prospect of EU membership is the key driver of transformation. Striving to join the European Community, they see the EU membership as a geostrategic investment in prosperity, stability and security based on common European values. Becoming part of the largest single market in the world opens doors for businesses to expand, innovate, invest and create new jobs.

Recent rebooting of the enlargement policy after the aggression of Russia has a geopolitical logic. It will expand the democratic space on our continent and make it clear to Russia what is our preferred political order in Europe.

But there are risks. The end of the war is unpredictable. We failed to isolate Russia globally, and we must spare no effort to avoid a decline of support for Ukraine.

European enlargement has always been a 'win-win' situation for the Union and the newcomers. To ensure it this time, the EU must make its institutional and structural frameworks fit for purpose.

The EU has committed to stand with Ukraine every step of the way towards the end of the war and the accession. We expect from the Commission to step up the efforts and proceed swiftly and timely with all the phases of accession process, and provide the negotiating framework by mid-March. Indeed, history is watching us.

Sandro Gozi, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, il y a des moments où toute une génération est appelée à démontrer qu'elle est à la hauteur des défis de l'histoire. Nous vivons l'un de ces moments: une période d'accélération intense de l'histoire qui impose une transformation profonde de l'Union. À 27, l'Union n'est pas capable d'assumer toutes ses responsabilités, notamment par rapport à la guerre et au nouveau désordre mondial. Une Union à 36, faute de réforme, sera complètement paralysée.

Nous devons réorganiser notre continent, et c'est une transformation qu'il faut aborder sans totem ni tabou, si nous voulons être crédibles et donc influents et puissants. Nous devons réformer l'Union en profondeur en procédant à une révision des traités, à une réforme des politiques communes, notamment l'agriculture et la cohésion, et à une réforme du budget.

Le choix qui s'offre à nous est clair: exporter notre stabilité ou importer l'instabilité qui est à nos portes. Mais pour que cela soit accepté et partagé par nos citoyens, de nouvelles ressources sont nécessaires. Il n'y a pas d'autre choix, pas d'autre voie. Oui, chers collègues, réformons l'Union pour unifier le continent!

Thomas Waitz, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, yes, this report that was built with a big consensus between the political parties is also pointing out on the criteria that we need to apply when it comes to new membership candidates. Yes, there's also geostrategic reasons for us to speed up the candidacy process, but we, in this report, state very clearly that Copenhagen criteria have to be the basis of negotiation and of an accession process.

Also, we need to start to reward countries that have a full alignment with our security and foreign policy. We need to reward those that align, but we also need to set consequences for the ones that do not align, because we also have candidate applicants that are actively cooperating with China, that are actively aligning their security and foreign policy with Russia, that are backtracking on democratic standards like election law. There we need to be consequent and also withdraw funds from these countries, because otherwise the process of accession is not a trustworthy one, if you do not reward the ones that deliver.

We need to look towards the East, and we need to look towards the new big candidate countries. First of all, the support for Ukraine needs to be uncontested and there is some additional work to do. Because unfortunately we cannot rely on the support that will be coming from the US: who knows how these presidential elections end. We need to take responsibility within the European Union, within our States, and support Ukraine to defend this illegal invasion into the country. That's the first step and then we look into the candidate process.

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, saying that enlargement necessitates EU centralisation via treaty change is a blatant lie. Such claim is factually wrong and biased, both politically and ideologically.

Enlargement is just a false pretext to build, as planned, a European superstate to replace the European Union of today. The ultimate proof of it is that planned reform proposes to preserve, not to eliminate, the veto on decision on enlargement. The vast scientific empirical research which has been analysing the impact of previous enlargements – from the early years until the last one – on the functioning of the EU institutions, proves that the enlargement had no negative effect on the decision-making capacity of the EU. It is also confirmed by the documents of the Council secretariat. On the contrary, empirical data prove that the speed of decision-making has actually increased.

Moreover, various serious academic studies demonstrate that, after each enlargement, decision-making was faster when there were more Member States. Additionally, experts say that with a view to enlargement, you should decentralise, not further centralise. Centralising reform is not necessary thus, and would be counterproductive in that respect.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle, *au nom du groupe ID.* – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, nous discutons une dernière fois avant les élections européennes de l'élargissement de l'Union européenne, que vous souhaitez étendre aux pays des Balkans jusqu'à la Géorgie, en passant par la Moldavie, l'Ukraine et même la Turquie. Permettez-moi donc, moi aussi, une dernière fois, de vous rappeler pourquoi nous nous y opposons fermement.

Premièrement, nous ne souhaitons pas réviser les traités, car vous souhaitez supprimer la règle de l'unanimité, et donc supprimer le droit de veto des États lorsqu'il s'agit d'intégrer ou non un nouveau pays dans l'Union européenne. Cela va à l'encontre du suffrage universel, à l'encontre de la volonté des peuples et donc de la démocratie, valeur à laquelle vous êtes tant attachés quand, bien évidemment, cela vous arrange.

Deuxièmement, nous nous opposons à ces élargissements parce qu'ils compromettent la sécurité de nos nations et de nos compatriotes. Comment pourrions-nous être rassurés en intégrant dans l'Europe l'Albanie et sa mafia, le Kosovo et sa majorité islamiste, l'Ukraine en pleine guerre et dont on sait que, d'autre part, son adhésion signerait la mort de nos agriculteurs français, ou la Turquie qui, avec ses 85 millions d'habitants, deviendrait le pays le plus peuplé d'Europe et menacerait l'équilibre de notre civilisation?

Enfin, cette obsession idéologique que vous avez à vouloir intégrer ce qui ne correspond en rien à nos racines et à nos valeurs accentuerait la submersion migratoire dont on sait qu'elle est chez vous, non un problème, mais un projet. Stop à tout cela! C'est une Europe des nations indépendantes et souveraines que nous réclamons. C'est une Europe des peuples libres dont la parole est respectée que nous souhaitons. En cela, nous vous sommes totalement opposés et, le 9 juin, nous rendrons la parole aux peuples.

Emmanuel Maurel, *au nom du groupe The Left.* – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je trouve que nous allons un peu vite en besogne. Je ne conteste pas, évidemment, l'utilité d'un débat approfondi sur les conséquences institutionnelles d'un hypothétique élargissement, mais je pose la question: que vont penser les opinions publiques de cet empiètement à vouloir adapter l'Europe à l'adhésion de huit nouveaux pays comptant 60 millions d'habitants?

Cette précipitation donne l'impression qu'il n'y a plus de débat, que l'élargissement est acté et qu'on est déjà passé à autre chose. Mais précisément, l'élargissement fait débat et il y a un certain nombre de réticences parmi les Européens. D'abord, d'un point de vue social; intégrer des pays aux salaires si bas ne peut qu'aggraver le dumping social au sein de l'Europe. Il y a aussi la question de la faisabilité de l'élargissement. Que va devenir, par exemple, la politique agricole, si on rattache l'Ukraine? Comment vont s'en sortir nos agriculteurs, qui souffrent déjà de la suppression des droits de douane sur la volaille et sur les céréales? Comment pourrions-nous financer cet élargissement à budget constant, sachant que les nouveaux pays n'ont pas les moyens de cotiser? Je ne trouve aucune réponse sérieuse à ces questions légitimes, et je pense qu'on ne rend pas service au projet européen en faisant comme si ces questions ne se posaient pas.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, non si tratta di discutere se sia necessario o meno ampliare l'Unione europea.

Ovviamente, una volta che i Paesi candidati soddisfano i criteri stabiliti, devono poter accedere all'Unione europea, perché l'Unione non è un club chiuso e deve avere le porte aperte ai paesi dei Balcani, all'Ucraina, eccetera. Ma questa necessaria e storica espansione – inevitabile – deve avvenire con responsabilità e la riforma istituzionale del sistema decisionale del Consiglio è una precondizione per qualsiasi ampliamento.

Bisogna porre fine all'unanimità su molti temi che oggi non possono essere approvati, per via della regola della maggioranza e quindi, semplicemente, non possono essere approvati. Il Consiglio europeo al momento non può più funzionare con l'unanimità. Lo sappiamo tutti che l'unanimità non favorisce la costruzione europea ma la tiene in ostaggio degli interessi individuali di ciascun Paese: lo sappiamo tutti.

Quindi, senza riforma istituzionale qualsiasi ampliamento comporterà una maggiore paralisi. Non si tratta del fatto che i nuovi Stati penalizzano l'Unione, ma che ne traggano beneficio come spazio di democrazia, di giustizia sociale e di prosperità. E soltanto un'unione più efficace potrà continuare a servire questa sua....

(Il Presidente toglie la parola all'oratore)

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, we answered the Russian aggression against Ukraine with a strong geopolitical move, with an ambitious enlargement agenda, but the whole enlargement process can be very slow. The Western Balkans are an example, and we do not want to repeat it. The process will depend on both sides, on the political will of candidate countries to make reforms, and on the political will of the 27 EU Member States to support enlargement.

I am more concerned with our side, because we still do not know how to stop the Orbánisation of the Union, when one country can blackmail and misuse veto power for selfish purposes. The blackmail through veto power that Hungary was using on Ukrainian issues in the last several years is a clear violation of Article 4 of the Treaty on European Union, which demands from Member States their sincere cooperation and loyalty to the Union.

The Commission has an obligation to defend the Treaty, but the best way to defend enlargement from Orbánisation threats is to abandon the possibility to use the veto right during the negotiation process. Let's do it.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Ja, dieser Bericht hat eine klare Message: dass Erweiterung nur mit Reformen geht. Das greift den Spirit auf, den ich vor einigen Monaten im Auswärtigen Amt erlebt habe, mit vielen Außenministern aus den Erweiterungsländern, die gesagt haben: Wenn wir so riesige Reformen machen können, um den Besitzstand zu erfüllen, um eben alles umzusetzen, dann wird die EU das doch wohl auch schaffen, ihren Teil zu übernehmen und Reformen durchzuführen. Hier wurde schon viel gesagt, in welchen Bereichen das passieren muss, zum Beispiel mit Blick auf die Einstimmigkeit.

Ich möchte aber noch einen Aspekt nennen: Wenn wir wirklich zur schrittweisen Integration der Kandidatenländer kommen, müssen wir das aus dem Blick der Bevölkerung tun. Ich denke, es ist ganz wichtig: Wer Zugang zum Binnenmarkt haben will, der muss auch unsere Sozialstandards und unseren sozialen Besitzstand anwenden, sonst führt es massenhaft zu Sozial- und Lohndumping, und die Konsequenzen tragen die EU-Bürgerinnen und —Bürger, aber auch die Beschäftigten, die hierherkommen und zu Hungerlöhnen und nicht abgesichert arbeiten.

Dacian Cioloș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, Uniunea Europeană a devenit mai puternică după fiecare extindere. Toate statele care s-au integrat în Uniunea Europeană s-au dezvoltat economic în mod accelerat după aderare și ne dorim același lucru și cu țările din Balcanii de Vest, și cu Ucraina și cu Republica Moldova, care așteaptă aceleași perspective din partea noastră. Dar pentru asta, viitoarea extindere trebuie să ne prindă pregătiți, cu instituții europene mai eficiente și cu o capacitate decizională ridicată.

Va trebui să lucrăm împreună, mai ales cu Ucraina, pentru ca Uniunea să poată primi o țară mare în piața internă, cu sectorul agricol și agroalimentar. Trebuie pregătită și discutată reforma Politicii Agricole Comune, în paralel cu pregătirea aderării Ucrainei. În același timp, să avem un dialog permanent atât cu Ucraina, dar și cu fermierii noștri și să fim consecvenți într-un parcurs de integrare graduală. Doar așa putem să servim în mod sustenabil imperativul geopolitic și necesitatea de întărire a pieței interne deopotrivă, pentru că provocările se fac deja simțite în țările noastre.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, élargir est une stratégie d'investissement dans la paix, la démocratie, l'état de droit et la sécurité. La guerre déclenchée par la Russie contre l'Ukraine a rappelé aux pays européens l'importance de continuer à élargir l'Union européenne et à renforcer cet espace de valeurs et d'humanisme. Notamment, nous avons trop négligé la relation avec les pays des Balkans qui attendent depuis si longtemps. Mais il faut des feuilles de route claires pour chaque pays candidat à l'adhésion.

Les procédures d'adhésion actuelles ont montré leurs défaillances. Nous n'avons pas su accompagner la société civile et les populations de ces régions qui luttent pour la démocratie et pour un avenir européen. Trop souvent, la Commission comme les États ont privilégié des intérêts géopolitiques ou commerciaux dans les Balkans, et le processus d'intégration n'a pas suffisamment pris en compte les capacités de réforme ainsi que les progrès ou les reculs démocratiques. Chaque pays candidat doit être évalué honnêtement et dans un dialogue non seulement avec les dirigeants, mais aussi avec les citoyennes et les citoyens. Nous devons penser une intégration graduelle, mais surtout, nous devons avoir un commissaire à la hauteur de la tâche pour le prochain mandat.

Quand en Serbie, des libertés fondamentales ont été attaquées, cela a été ignoré. Quand des fonds européens distribués dans cette région ont été remplis les poches d'une élite dirigeante, cela n'a pas suffisamment été contrôlé. Nous avons besoin d'un meilleur suivi de l'utilisation de l'argent, d'une évaluation renforcée par la Commission, et il faut peut-être aller jusqu'à introduire une conditionnalité pour les pays en voie d'adhésion aussi.

Thierry Mariani (ID). – Monsieur le Président, les Français sont opposés à l'élargissement de l'Union européenne et à des abandons supplémentaires de souveraineté au bénéfice de l'Union européenne. La France est membre du Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU et la France possède l'arme nucléaire. La France ne peut pas voir l'indépendance de sa politique étrangère abandonnée au profit de nations qui ont une histoire et des intérêts tout simplement différents des nôtres.

Le combat contre la domination supranationale du peuple français est fondateur de toute l'histoire de France. Tout notre roman national proteste contre une telle abdication. L'Alliance des Français issus de la résistance gaulliste, communiste et nationaliste avait déjà permis d'empêcher l'avènement de la Communauté européenne de défense en 1954. À l'époque, déjà, après l'horreur nazie et face au bloc de l'Est, on entendait de beaux esprits affirmer qu'il fallait consentir à l'affaiblissement de la France pour renforcer l'Europe. Cet argument, nous l'avons entendu à de nombreuses reprises dans notre histoire, et nous avons toujours su y résister.

Madame von der Leyen et M. Weber, qui veulent soumettre la France à Bruxelles, ont malheureusement des relais en France avec les amis de M. Macron et ceux de M. Ciotti. Ils exigent aujourd'hui le vote à la majorité qualifiée au Conseil pour les questions de politique étrangère et réclameront demain la mise sous tutelle de l'Union européenne de l'arme nucléaire française. Déjà, les élargissements successifs ont desservi la France en contraignant notre pays à se solidariser des intérêts géopolitiques de l'Europe orientale en délaissant notre zone naturelle d'influence en Méditerranée. Demain, supprimer le droit de veto des États membres en matière de politique étrangère nous rendrait donc encore plus dépendants d'intérêts divergents des nôtres. Le 9 juin, les Français vous adresseront un message clair...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)

Katarína Roth Neveďalová (NI). – Pán predsedajúci, politika rozširovania Európskej únie je podľa mňa jednou z najlepších vecí, ktorú máme. Avšak ktokoľvek chce byť členom Európskej únie, musí splniť pravidlá tak, ako sme to museli všetci, ktorí sme dnes tu. A všetci, samozrejme, všetky krajiny musia súhlasiť so vstupom tejto krajiny.

Myslím si, že je to dobrá politika. Je to spôsob zlepšovania života, pokroku, lepšej spolupráce pre všetkých ľudí v Európe. Podporujem rozširovanie Európskej únie o krajiny na Balkáne, pretože si myslím, že tieto krajiny čakajú na členstvo dosť dlho a mali by sme vyvinúť viac úsilia na to, aby sme im na tejto ceste pomohli.

V otázke Ukrajiny som však viac skeptická a chcela by som vyzvať, aby sme sa vyvarovali falošných sľubov a ohýbaniu našich vlastných pravidiel len preto, aby sme sa zapáčili Ukrajine. Cesta Ukrajiny do Európskej únie bude podľa mňa ešte veľmi dlhá, ale musia si ňou naozaj prejsť celú tak ako všetci. Tak ako všetky krajiny pred nimi. A zmena pravidiel v ich prospech nebude fér nielen voči nám ostatným, ale aj voči tým krajinám, ktoré som práve spomenula, napríklad krajinám na Balkáne.

A čo sa týka tohto návrhu, som veľmi rada, že hovoríme opäť o komisárovi Európskej únie pre rozširovanie, pretože to je jeden zo spôsobov, ako tomu pomôcť.

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ

Wiceprzewodniczka

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Caro Comissário, o alargamento à Ucrânia, aos Balcãs Ocidentais, à Moldávia, agora até à Geórgia, mais do que um desígnio geoestratégico e geopolítico da União Europeia, é também um direito, diria eu, dos povos destes países. É por isso que devo dizer que, enquanto português e europeu, vi com alguma tristeza que o governo português foi dos últimos a aceitar o estatuto de candidato, foi mesmo último, para a Ucrânia, e tem posto sempre reservas, ou por causa dos fundos, ou por causa das falsas expectativas, sempre tudo é muito difícil. Tenho pena que isto tenha acontecido.

Em todo o caso, para o PPE, a verdade é que é fundamental nós irmos acolher estes Estados e, portanto, é preciso, naturalmente, progredir não apenas dando-lhes esse horizonte, mas também fazendo aquelas reformas que sejam necessárias a nível institucional e financeiro.

Há um ponto que é fundamental, hoje a própria sobrevivência da União Europeia depende também deste alargamento. Foi posto com a guerra na Ucrânia um desafio existencial à União Europeia e, por isso, o alargamento é decisivo para que a União Europeia possa ser uma realidade não apenas para os nossos povos, mas extensiva a todo o continente europeu.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Madam President, this report represents ongoing support for the future EU enlargement, continuing on the ideas of the new enlargement strategy report. Today, I would like to make several key points.

Every candidate country should be judged on their own merit. Our fundamental values, such as the rule of law and democratic standards, must be a pillar of our assessment if the country is ready to join the European Union. Building bridges and highways is welcomed, but respect for fundamental values must be a precondition for that.

The European Union is more than an economic union. It's the Union of values and the Union of shared risks. Once the candidate country fulfils all the criteria, there should be no political delays to its accession. The necessary EU reforms must take place in parallel.

European Union enlargement is one of the most successful EU policies, but it must continue. On that note, we expect concrete results from the Council meeting in March.

Илхан Кючюк (Renew). – Г-жо Председател, аз се радвам, че този доклад ще бъде гласуван утре, защото той е много ясен, с конкретни предложения, които дават послания в две посоки. Първото послание е, че който си изпълнява условията, може да бъде част от Европейския съюз. Второто послание е, че политиката по разширяване може да върви ръка за ръка с политиката по задълбочаване на реформите в рамките на Европейския съюз. И може би най-важното е, че този разговор намира своята институционална рамка тук, в Европейския парламент. Нека да бъдем обаче една идея по-откровени към себе си. Ако не се беше случило най-лошото, а именно войната на европейска територия, какъв геополитически резултат щеше да отчете Европейската комисия? Нулев. Нулев напредък по отношение на политиката по разширяването. 20 години в страните от Западните Балкани чакат да направят стъпка напред. Мисля, че сме им длъжници.

Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE). – Paní předsedající, vážené kolegyně a kolegové, Ukrajina, Moldavsko, Gruzie, ale i posun v Bosně a Hercegovině a v dalších zemích. Pracujeme na společné budoucnosti a ujišťujeme se o tom, že chceme naše vztahy utužovat. Zjevně chceme všichni stejný výsledek. Ale volíme k němu schůdnou cestu?

Evropský parlament opakovaně žádá stejně jako občané Evropské unie o otevření základacích Smluv, o zásadní reformy v právu veta, v tom, jak se rozhodujeme, kdo a jak země zastupuje, jak volíme komisaře. V žádném členském státu ale po změně Smluv a vlastně ani po zásadních reformách apetit není.

Máme teď mnoho let před tím, než přistupující země naplní kritéria vstupu. Máme čas a mrháme jím na politické zbabělosti. Kam se poděli vizionáři? Nebo spíš, proč už žádní nejsou pouštěni ke kormidlu? Potřebujeme větší odvahu. Myslete na to u voleb.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, този доклад е провокиран най-вече от позицията на българското правителство по отношение на защита на правата и законните интереси на местните македонски граждани с българско национално самосъзнание. Те все още не са вписани в конституцията на Република Северна Македония, както беше обещало правителството на Република Северна Македония. И това ако не е нарушение на човешки малцинствени права, здраве му кажи. А това е основен европейски принцип и основна европейска ценност. Сега, за да заобиколят тези критерии, част от вас искат да отнемат права от държавите членки и да оставят хора извън суверенните правителства да решават и да подкрепят или не подкрепят правителства и държави, които не отговарят на критериите така, както не отговаряше правителството на Република Северна Македония. Вие по тези критерии може да приемете и Северна Корея. Те също са на север и ще се впишат идеално в критериите „нарушаване на човешки права“. Затова, уважаеми колеги, мисля, че този подход е погрешен и мисля, че Европейският парламент и Комисия, и Съюз трябва да гледат копенхагенските критерии, трябва да гледат спазването на човешките права, правото на самоопределение и правото на национално достойнство.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, la guerra en Ucrania ha puesto sobre la mesa el debate acerca de una mayor integración de la Unión y el futuro de la ampliación.

Son asuntos importantes y complejos que tenemos que abordar con prudencia y el mayor consenso posible. Los Tratados son fruto de muchos años de integración, de largas y arduas negociaciones, y reflejan equilibrios delicados entre las distintas visiones e intereses de los Estados miembros.

Por otra parte, una mayor integración en algunos ámbitos no requiere necesariamente una modificación de los Tratados; no olvidemos, además, que existen las cláusulas pasarela. Hay que ser prudentes: me parece que no hay un amplísimo consenso actualmente en esta Cámara —ni mucho menos en el Consejo— sobre la reforma de los Tratados y, además, tampoco es imprescindible una modificación de los Tratados para que podamos avanzar —al menos parcialmente— en el proceso de la ampliación.

Queremos que la ampliación siga siendo una de las políticas más exitosas de la Unión. Para ello, los criterios de adhesión deben cumplirse, sin atajos.

La ampliación necesitará también de más recursos presupuestarios pues, de lo contrario, podrían verse afectadas políticas tan importantes como la adhesión o la agricultura. No se trata de recortes en ellas, sino de más recursos.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, gracias por su presencia. Por cierto, lo primero que habría que decir es que es lamentable que no participe el Consejo en este debate y que no esté presente.

Se trata de un debate sobre un informe que conecta y que plantea la cuestión de la ampliación junto con la profundización y parece que al Consejo esto no le parece importante y no le interesa. Realmente deplorable.

Pero, entrando en materia, debo en primer lugar felicitar —y no de manera protocolaria— a los ponentes —a Pedro Silva y a Petras Auštrevičius—, y al resto de ponentes alternativos, porque no era nada fácil juntar las dos perspectivas: la perspectiva de política exterior y la perspectiva constitucional. Y han hecho un gran ejercicio, que era necesario porque, de la misma manera que no podemos decir que todo tiene que estar reformado en el Tratado y todas las instituciones modificadas para avanzar en la ampliación, tampoco es sostenible plantear una ampliación en piloto automático sin adaptar nuestras instituciones.

Creo que el informe ha alcanzado el equilibrio adecuado. Son dos procesos que se refuerzan mutuamente.

Charles Goerens (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, mettons-nous à la place de l'Ukraine ou de la Moldavie, deux pays menacés dans leur existence. Les deux candidats à l'adhésion à l'Union européenne savent que, seuls, ils sont perdus. Ils aspirent à pouvoir résoudre leurs problèmes de sécurité ou de vulnérabilité et de précarité économiques. Ils ont besoin de partenaires forts, unis, capables de prendre des décisions en temps opportun.

Sommes-nous déjà devenus ce point d'ancrage tant espéré par les pays candidats? Hélas non, pas encore! La guerre au cœur de l'Europe nous a fait redécouvrir ce que nous savons depuis longtemps: il faut mettre en place une union politique, l'union de la défense, une politique extérieure et non 27 politiques extérieures et des mécanismes décisionnels permettant à l'Union d'agir, de réagir et de peser dans les affaires du monde.

Nous le savons, nous le répétons à longueur de journée et nous avons fait adopter un rapport invitant le Conseil européen à lancer une convention européenne appelée à engager l'indispensable réflexion sur la modification de notre fonctionnement. Ayons cette audace afin de pouvoir affronter la tête haute les problèmes qui sont devant nous!

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, kannatan lämpimästi uusien ehdokasmaiden suuntautumista länteen ja niiden lähentymistä läntisiin instituutioihin. Samalla pidän tärkeänä, että EU:hun liittymisen on aina oltava ansioihin perustuva menettely, eikä ohituskaistoja ole. Ehdokasmaiden on täytettävä niille annetut tiukat kriteerit ennen kuin jäsenyys voi tulla ajankohtaiseksi.

Käsitlemässämme mietinnössä esitetään muutoksia perussopimuksiin. EU:n mahdollista laajentumista ei mielestäni tulisi käyttää keppihevosenä perussopimusten avaamiselle ja EU:n liittovaltiokehityksen edistämiseksi. Mietintö sisältää esimerkiksi kehotuksia yksinkertaistaa EU:n päätöksentekomenettelyä ja siirtää yksimielisyysvaatimuksesta kohti määräännemistöpäätöksiä, mitä en voi kannattaa. EU:n on koostuttava itsenäisistä suvereenista jäsenvaltioista, eikä siitä pidä kehittää liittovaltiota tai supervaltiaa.

Sandra Kalniete (PPE). – Godātā prezidentes kundze! Kolēģi! Tā bija kļūda 2003. gadā apsolut Rietumbalkānu valstīm nākotni Eiropas Savienībā un pēc tam vilcināties. Šo kļūdu nedrīkst atkārtot ar Ukrainu un Moldovu, tāpēc ziņojums par ES integrācijas padziļināšanu un paplašināšanos ir stratēģiski nozīmīgs dokuments. Parlaments ir pirmā ES institūcija, kas nāk klajā ar savu pozīciju par nepieciešamajām reformām, lai šīs desmitgades beigās Eiropas Savienība būtu gatava integrēt desmit valstis.

Mums ir jāpaaugstina Savienības lemtspēja, paplašinot jomas, kurās lēmumu pieņem ar kvalificētā vairākuma balsojumu. No vienprātības principa jāatsakās arī jautājumos par paplašināšanās sarunu atvēršanu un slēgšanu.

Paplašināšanās būs milzīgs finansiāls izaicinājums kohēzijas un lauksaimniecības politikām. Tāpēc nākamajā daudzgadu budžetā ir jāparedz atbilstošs finansējums, lai Savienība spētu finansēt gan kandidātvalstu reformas, gan to iesaistīšanu Eiropas Savienības politikās.

Marina Kaljurand (S&D). – Austatud istungi juhataja! Euroopa Liidu ees on täna kaks protsessi. Venemaa agressioon Ukraina vastu tegi võimalikuks selle, millest veel mõned aastad tagasi me isegi ei unistanud – Euroopa Liidu laienemise itta. Selle tõestuseks on otsus alustada liitumisläbirääkimisi Ukraina ja Moldovaga ning anda kandidaatriigi staatus Gruusiale. Samal ajal on jätkunud arutelud Euroopa Liidu reformide üle, mis said alguse Euroopa tuleviku konverentsil. On täiesti selge, et Euroopa Liit vajab reformimist, alustades siseprotseduuridega ja lõpetades valmisolekuga laienemiseks. Mõlemad protsessid on vajalikud ja mõlemad protsessid peavad toimuma paralleelselt. Reformid ei tohi saada ettekään-deks laienemise pidurdamisele, sest laienemispoliitika on üks Euroopa Liidu edukamaid geopolitilisi vahendeid. Meie ees

on ajalooline võimaluste aken, mis saab võimalikuks tänu Ukraina võitlusele ja mille hinnaks on Ukraina rahva veri ja kannatused. Me ei tohi seda akent sulgeda. Ajalugu ei andesta. Aitäh!

Katalin Cseh (Renew). – Madam President, dear colleagues, it is absolutely essential that we create a credible path for accession for countries in our neighbourhood. It is our strategic interest in the face of Russian aggression, but it is also the right thing to do.

But also, let's face it: in the recent years, the enforcement of the rule of law reforms have not been adequate in the enlargement countries. Just take the example of Serbia, when it was the Commission that watered down the standards. So, we need transparent and firm criteria on the rule of law front.

Also, we have to have our own house in order. Stopping democratic backsliding in the EU is step number one for a credible accession policy, and getting rid of the unanimity voting is step number two.

We need to welcome new members into an EU that works properly, that can properly accommodate them. With 27 members already, we often find ourselves in gridlock. Let's be honest to ourselves: this is not working. So let's be bold when it comes to enlargement and also when renewing Europe.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Pani predsedajúca, sú to už viac ako dva roky od brutálnej ruskej invázie na Ukrajinu. Invázie, ktorá nám pripomína, že naše spoločné európske hodnoty v dnešnom svete nie sú samozrejmosť.

Ruský agresor sa cielene snaží podkopať demokraciu a oslabiť našu bezpečnosť nielen vojnou na Ukrajine, ale aj zahraničným zasahovaním, šírením dezinformácií a proti-európskej propagandy. Ruská vojna na Ukrajine prináša tragické straty, preto musíme konať bezodkladne a európsky projekt posilniť.

Rozšírenie je opäť našou politickou prioritou a to je dobrá správa. Je aj politickou nádejou. Musíme v ňom uspieť na Ukrajine, v Moldavsku, Gruzínsku i na západnom Balkáne. Naši partneri potrebujú jasný signál. V časoch vojny musíme držať spolu, ale to isté očakávame aj od našich partnerov. Stabilita, bezpečnosť a demokratická odolnosť krajín západného Balkánu i Východného partnerstva a susedstva sú neoddeliteľne spojené so stabilitou a bezpečnosťou našej Únie.

Rozšírenie je našim historickým záväzkom. Je aj príležitosťou na bezpečnejšiu európsku budúcnosť. Preto potrebujeme podstatné vnútorné reformy. Máme šancu byť v Európskej únii silnejší a odolnejší voči ruskému agresorovi. Nepremárnime tento geopolitický moment.

Andreas Schieder (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Die Erweiterungspolitik ist eines unserer stärksten Instrumente, gerade in dieser instabilen globalen Situation. Aber nur dann, wenn wir sie ernst meinen. Das heißt, jedes Land nach seinen Fortschritten, nach den notwendigen Reformen, die getroffen werden. Aber das heißt auch, dass wir verhindern müssen, dass wir selbst unglaublich werden und dann zum Beispiel die Erweiterung aus bilateralen Prozessen von einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten blockiert werden darf.

Und gleichzeitig müssen wir auch sagen: Wenn Länder Rückschritte machen, dann muss es auch die Möglichkeit geben, gegebenenfalls beim Erweiterungsprozess einen Halt oder auch einen Rückschritt einzuziehen. Aber – und das ist, glaube ich, auch ein ganz wichtiger Punkt – der Erweiterungsprozess wird nur dann erfolgreich sein, wenn wir uns innerhalb der Europäischen Union auch auf eine erweiterte Union vorbereiten und die Entscheidungsfindungen in Europa so aufstellen, dass sie auch mit 30 und mehr Mitgliedern möglich sind – das heißt mit einem starken Parlament und mit Mehrheitsentscheidungen und weniger Entscheidungen im Rat.

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Fru talman! Vi får aldrig glömma bort vad Rysslands krig mot Ukraina handlar om. Putin accepterar inte att Ukraina gång på gång valt den europeiska vägen. De har avsatt en president, genomfört en revolution och utkämpat ett krig i snart tio år för att bli en del av den europeiska familjen.

Ukraina slåss inte bara för sin egen existens; de kämpar också för oss. Man försvarar sin dröm att bli en del av den europeiska demokratiska familjen till ett mycket, mycket högt pris.

Nu är det vår skyldighet att välkomna Ukraina in i EU. Detsamma gäller Moldavien som vi inte kan vända ryggen och låta dem hamna i Rysslands klor. EU-medlemskap innebär krav som måste uppfyllas. Men det ställer också krav på oss att forma ett Europasamarbete som passar för fler. Det är så vi bygger fred för framtidens Europa.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, колеги, разширяването на Европейския съюз е основен мотивационен инструмент за реформите в страните кандидати. От една страна, ние не трябва да разочароваме гражданите на тези страни и да не оставим възможност на Русия да променя обществените нагласи в страните кандидатки. От друга страна, политическият елит, както управляващи, така и опозиция на тези страни, имат огромна отговорност да продължат смелите реформи да скъсат в бивша Югославия с наследството на комунизма и негативните последици от този тежък период върху образованието и толерантността към всички граждани, независимо от техния етнически произход, а в случая със Северна Македония, към най-голямата историческа етническа общност на географския регион Македония – македонските българи. И Европейският съюз и страните кандидатки трябва да положат огромни усилия, за да може да кажем „добре дошли“ до края на следващия мандат на Европейския парламент на следващата страна кандидат.

Не смятам обаче, че преминаването към квалифицирано мнозинство по отношение на политиката за разширяване е правилно. Това е най-вътрешната политика на Европейския съюз. Кого ще приемеш в твоето семейство, не може да не попиташ другите участници в семейството кой ще бъде част от семейството ти.

Alessandra Moretti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche nel corso di questa sessione plenaria abbiamo più volte ricordato la guerra di aggressione di Putin in Ucraina, abbiamo rinnovato la richiesta del cessate il fuoco su Gaza e abbiamo votato una relazione che giustamente riporta l'attenzione sulla Siria.

È lampante che la situazione internazionale sia drasticamente peggiorata ed è ancora più evidente la necessità di un'Europa che sia determinata e forte nella sua politica estera. Serve procedere nell'allargamento, che ricordo essere il principale investimento per garantire pace, stabilità, sicurezza e democrazia.

Dobbiamo dare risposte a quei Paesi che da troppi anni sono in attesa di entrare nella nostra famiglia e che rischiano di perdere la spinta europea. È importante non solo per il nostro futuro, per il loro futuro.

Nel frattempo è nostro dovere preparare l'Unione europea a questo allargamento. Non è immaginabile un'Unione europea allargata, efficace e determinante, se manteniamo le regole esistenti.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospa predsednica! Integracija in širitev Evropske unije bi seveda morali potekati sočasno, toda ne pogojeni ena z drugo. Zadnje čase veliko govorimo o tem in prav je tako.

Ampak žal je velik razkorak med tem, o čemer se pogovarjamo tukaj in med stališči držav članic, ki imajo škarje in platno dejansko izključno v svojih rokah. Kako gre že tisti znameniti Jean Monnetev stavek: Unija bo izoblikovana v krizah? No, sama bi si želela, da se to ne bi dogajalo samo med krizami, pod težo gole nujnosti. V tem mandatu smo sicer naredili veliko, ampak naše ambicije se ne smejo zmanjšati. Pri širitvi bi si morali prizadevati več. Gledamo pa blokade določenih držav, običajno popolnoma neupravičeno.

S tem se zapravlja ogromno kredibilnosti v državah Zahodnega Balkana. Seveda morajo v regiji storiti več pri reformah, ampak mi si s praznimi obljubami delimo del te odgovornosti oziroma smo odgovorni, celo krivi še bolj, ker druga stvar so še reforme same Unije, ker bi morali končno spremeniti naše temeljne pogodbe, vključno z omogočanjem večje fleksibilnosti za naslavljanje skupnih izzivov ter ključno demokratizacijo delovanja Evropske unije.

Thijs Reuten, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues – and indeed No Council, which is a shame. What is EU enlargement about? At its core, it's about improving people's lives, about finishing the work that we started over 70 years ago: creating the large zone of democracy and rule of law on our continent. It has been our most successful foreign policy instrument, and it became a geopolitical necessity now to protect ourselves and our neighbours against autocracy and continued instability.

But the EU itself needs to improve as well. It is up to us to make sure these two things go hand in hand in the interest of old and new citizens alike. We have an opportunity to turn the upcoming accession of countries into a win-win situation, strengthening and reforming our Union, while at the same time living up to our promises towards candidate countries.

We have to ensure that the one process will not be hijacked by the other. We cannot have a situation that candidates have implemented all reforms, but we are not ready. Let's unleash all creativity to reform and complete our Union as soon as possible.

The citizens of Kyiv, Pristina and Tirana are Europeans. They want their democracies protected, want clean air, fair wages, freedom of choice, fundamental rights. They want a better life. Let us live up to the promise of Europe – for ourselves, for all Europeans.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća,

proširenje Europske unije ne smije se koristiti kao izgovor da se ukine pravo veta država članica u Vijeću, a upravo je to ono što se ovim izvješćem pokušava postići. Pod krinkom povećanja učinkovitosti Unije, ovo izvješće zagovara uvođenje glasovanja kvalificiranom većinom u Vijeću u ključnim područjima poput vladavine prava, VFO-a, pokretanja pregovora o pristupanju te otvaranju i zatvaranju pregovaračkih pojedinačnih klastera.

Tvrdnja da je proširenje nemoguće bez ukidanja prava veta naprosto je netočna. Godine 2004. kad je pravo veta bilo još raširenije, dogodilo se najveće proširenje Europske unije u povijesti. Kako tada uvođenje kvalificirane većine nije bilo potrebno? A dapače, brzina odlučivanja nakon toga se u europskim institucijama samo povećala.

Prema pravilima međunarodnog prava za pristupanje novih država, uvijek će se tražiti ratifikacija od strane svih postojećih članica. Kakvog onda ima smisla preglasavati pojedine zemlje članice kod otvaranja i zatvaranja pregovora kad će se na kraju te države opet jednoglasno morati složiti s proširenjem i ratificirati ugovor o proširenju?

Kolegice i kolege, potpuno je jasno da bi ukidanje prava veta i uvođenje preglasavanja negiralo temeljne dimenzije suvereniteta, povećalo podjele u Europskoj uniji i ugrozilo sam njen opstanak.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario Reynders, sí, estamos de acuerdo en que la historia de las ampliaciones es la historia de un éxito, del mismo modo en que el único caso de salida voluntaria de la Unión —artículo 50, *Brexit*— se salda con un fiasco para quienes lo promovieron.

Pero son varios los debates en este Pleno en los que hemos urgido a la Unión Europea a salir de la edad de la inocencia y eso significa, en cuanto a ampliaciones —a Moldavia, Georgia, Ucrania y los Balcanes—, que no puede haber ampliación que no calcule su impacto sobre la política de cohesión; sobre el presupuesto constante, sin recursos propios; sobre la política agrícola, y sobre la dimensión estratégica de nuestra vecindad inexorable con Rusia. Por tanto, hay que acometer la ampliación en serio y reformar también el método decisional.

Pero, comisario Reynders, si hay un punto en el que importa calcular bien las consecuencias de la ampliación es precisamente en la idea europea de democracia y Estado de Derecho del artículo 2, porque no puede haber margen de maniobra alguna para los recién llegados en cuanto a variaciones, quebrantos o quiebras con respecto a la idea europea de democracia y una deriva liberal.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, Europe's best export products are not German cars or French wine; it is the EU enlargement. It is our peace, democracy and the prosperity that we manage to spread from Lisbon to Bucharest.

The European Union again stands at a crossroads. The call of history that came with Russia's tanks is a wake-up call across Europe. In this era of geopolitical shifts, we must remember the lessons of the past, as the decisions we make today will shape our shared future.

But to keep this dream alive, we must stay credible: fight autocrats, don't boost them; reform the way the EU functions; manage budgets and expectations; joint lending, joint defence, joint responses to crisis. That is what will prepare us to get new members from Montenegro to Ukraine. Let's finally get serious and be ready for Europe's next export of success stories.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Pani predsedajúca, rozšírenie Európskej únie je všeobecne považované za jeden z najväčších geopolitických úspechov a v našom strategickom a bezpečnostnom záujme.

Nemôžem však súhlasiť s jednostranným naratívom, ktorý predpokladá, že budúce rozširovanie môže byť úspešné len vtedy, ak ho bude sprevádzať zmena základných zmlúv a zrušenie práva veta v niektorých politikách.

Nesúhlasím ani s tvrdením správy, že požiadavky občanov v rámci Konferencie o budúcnosti Európy je možné realizovať iba prostredníctvom presunu kompetencií do Bruselu. Podľa právnej analýzy Európskej rady je totiž možné až 300 z 326 odporúčaní občanov uskutočniť v rámci existujúcich kompetencií.

Kolegovia, čelíme množstvu vnútorných výziev a vonkajších hrozieb. Európska únia musí nájsť riešenie efektívne. Robiť to, na čo má kompetencie, namiesto mrhania energie na oblasti, v ktorých kompetencie nemá. Predovšetkým však treba politickú vôľu a naďalej slúžiť našim občanom a chrániť ich záujmy

Matjaž Nemec (S&D). – Gospa predsednica! Širitev Unije je geostrateška naložba v stabilnosť, varnosť, mier, demokraciu in blaginjo vseh nas, v to sem prepričan.

Pozdravujem skupni napor obeh poročevalcev, ki sta uspela zagotoviti močno in uravnoteženo besedilo glede prihodnosti širitve. Gotovo bo potrebno vložiti še veliko dela, predvsem pa politične volje tako s strani držav kandidat kot seveda Unije same, ker pri pristopanju k EU ni bližnjic in gledanja čez prste. Učinkovitost pristopnih pogajanj mora vedno temeljiti na dosežkih posamezne kandidatke, napredku pri reformah ter izpolnjevanju kopenhavenskih kriterijev. A svoje mora storiti tudi Unija, vključno z institucionalno in finančno reformo EU in njenih institucij.

Pred tem so potrebni vmesni koraki, zato še posebej pozdravljam, da besedilo tudi na mojo pobudo poziva k vključevanju opazovalcev iz držav kandidat v ustrezne organe in institucije. Za konec pa še poziv: smo pred mesecem-marcem, torej EU naj še pred evropskimi volitvami odpre pogajanja tudi za Bosno in Hercegovino.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, enlargement is not only important for geopolitical reasons, but also to offer the citizens of our neighbourhood a chance to enjoy the rights and values of the EU. But a core EU value is trustworthiness. So when a candidate country delivers, we must do too. And we fail to do that, for instance with North Macedonia – a champion in reforms.

The report calls for an end to the veto. But already now Member States should stop blocking accession talks just for internal reasons. Don't politicise the accession process. This undermines our credibility and, therefore, the motivation of citizens to reform and sacrifice in order to belong to us. Please don't take that away from them.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Didier Reynders, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for this debate. I want just to add that the Commission is currently working at laying the ground for the pre-enlargement policy reviews announced by the President of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, in her 2023 State of the Union address.

It will be the contribution from the European Commission to the discussions, but we are taking into account, of course, all the remarks that we have listened to about the internal reforms and the different elements that you have put in the debate.

We are driven by the belief that completing our Union is the best investment in peace, security and prosperity for our continent. So we will continue to work together to try to make progress. And, of course, full respect for the rule of law will be a precondition, like we have said in our strategy to try to enlarge the European Union.

Petras Auštrevičius, Rapporteur. – Pirmininke, gerbiami kolegos. Aš esu Jums labai dėkingas už labai turiningą ir konstruktyvią diskusiją, nes jūs kalbėjote iš savo patirties. Jūs geriausiai žinote, kiek narystė Europos Sąjungoje gali keisti ir įtakoti valstybės narės ateitį ir padėtį. Aš labai tikiuosi, kad šią žinią jūs nunešit ir savo rinkėjams. Štai rinkimų kampanijos metu į Europos Parlamentą mes privalome kalbėti atvirai su savo piliečiais, su rinkėjais, su europiečiais tam, kad galėtume išklausti ir jų argumentus, išsakomus nuogastavimus ir paaiškinti situaciją. Nereikia gąsdinti – mes galime įveikti ir Europos reformų visą paketą, ir pasiruošti plėtrai, ir priimti naujus narius, jeigu mes turėsime kelio žemėlapi. Aš labai tikiuosi, kad šis klausimas bus vienas iš centrinių rinkiminės kampanijos metu. Žinoma, kitas Europos Parlamentas ir kitos sudėties Europos Komisija privalės priimti labai atsakingus sprendimus. Aš tikiuosi jų konstruktyvaus požiūrio, mūsų vienybės, kad galėtume padaryti tai, apie ką mes kalbame jau seniai. Ir, žinoma, pabaigai aš noriu pasakyti, kad tikrai vieningi ir stiprūs mes galime įveikti visus ateities iššūkius. Jų netrūks, bet kuo vieningesni ir stipresni mes esame, tuo labiau užtikrinti įveiksime tą kelią.

Aš dėkoju visiems, dar kartą dalyvavusiems diskusijoje, visiems pranešėjams. Tai dar kartą patvirtina, kad mes aiškiai ir atsakingai priimame šios dienos uždavinius ir bandome juos spręsti kartu ir laiku.

Pedro Silva Pereira, relator. – Senhora Presidente, queria agradecer o contributo de todos neste debate, e também da Comissão Europeia, e penso que vale a pena lembrar neste momento que, há uns anos, por ocasião do Brexit, alguns anteviam um efeito dominó que poderia fazer implodir a União Europeia. A história foi diferente, hoje não há nenhum país a querer sair e, pelo contrário, temos muitos a quererem entrar. São hoje nove os países que têm o estatuto de candidato. Isso é um sinal claro de vitalidade da União Europeia, da esperança que ela representa para muitos, mas é também uma enorme responsabilidade para todos nós.

Seria um erro tratar o processo de alargamento com ligeireza e, por isso, apesar do que aqui disse o Deputado Paulo Rangel, que nunca resiste a trazer a política nacional para o Parlamento Europeu, esteve bem o primeiro-ministro português, António Costa, quando chamou a atenção, em devido tempo, ele e outros, para a necessidade de levar a sério o que tem de ser feito para que o alargamento seja viável e possa ser um sucesso. Isso, aliás, tornou-se um lugar comum, é reconhecido por todos e é reconhecido também por este relatório.

Os países candidatos têm de fazer reformas para cumprir os critérios de adesão, sem vias rápidas nem calendários pré-definidos e também a própria União Europeia tem de fazer, em paralelo com as negociações de adesão, importantes reformas institucionais e orçamentais. Ignorar isso seria vender ilusões e seria uma irresponsabilidade perigosa para o futuro do projeto europeu.

Portanto, a moral da história é: todos têm que fazer com seriedade o trabalho de casa para que o alargamento seja possível e para que possa ser um sucesso. É essa a mensagem do Parlamento Europeu com este relatório, que votaremos amanhã, e conto com o vosso apoio nessa votação.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 29 lutego 2024 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Andrea Bocskor (NI), írásban. – Az Európai Unió bővítése kulcsfontosságú annak megerősítése szempontjából, hiszen az utóbbi idők elhibázott döntései alapjaiban gyengítették meg az Uniót, annak versenyképességét és biztonságát. Így az EU bővítési politikája egyrészt az egyik legerősebb szakpolitikái és geopolitikai eszközévé kell váljon, másrészt az európai polgárok érdekeit és biztonságát kell szolgálnia, a stabilitás és a béke záloga kell legyen.

A tagjelölt országok Unióhoz való csatlakozása mindenképp valós érdemeken és reformokon kell alapuljon, valós teljesítményt kell felmutatni pl. a demokrácia, jogállamiság területén, és maradéktalanul teljesíteni kell a koppenhágai kritériumokat, többek között az emberi jogok – köztük a nemzeti és nyelvi kisebbségek jogainak – tiszteletben tartását! Emellett megengedhetetlen a kettős mérce vagy „gyorsítópályák” alkalmazása a csatlakozási folyamat során!

Elfogadhatatlan, hogy egyes országok, mint pl. a Nyugat-Balkán országai, bár évtizedek óta dolgoznak az Unióhoz való csatlakozás érdekében, és készen állnak a csatlakozásra, ideológiai okok miatt még mindig parkolópályán vannak! Az Unió bővítését velük kell mielőbb elkezdni, hisz ez új lendületet, energiát adna a stagnáló szövetségnek! Végezetül fontos elmondani, hogy a jelentés, sajnálatos módon, a bővítési folyamatot magát arrogáns módon arra használja fel, hogy az EP-nek többlet jogköröket és a szuverenitást sértő intézményi reformokat követeljen, melyek közül a legátlatzóbb a Tanácsi minősített többségi szavazásra való áttérés szorgalmazása.

Jarosław Duda (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Dziękuję sprawozdawcom za przygotowanie raportu dotyczącego pogłębienia integracji europejskiej z myślą o przyszłym rozszerzeniu. Proces rozszerzenia ma strategiczne znaczenie dla realizacji priorytetów UE, takich jak pokój, demokracja, bezpieczeństwo, ochrona środowiska czy poszanowanie praw wszystkich obywateli. To właśnie ten proces, integracja, przyjmowanie wartości europejskich, wzmacnianie praworządności, podejmowanie reform i wdrażanie dorobku prawnego UE, prowadzi do zbliżenia, gotowości współpracy i podejmowania odpowiedzialności, do rzeczywistego członkostwa. Dlatego potrzebujemy dobrej metodyki akcesyjnej. Zarówno kraje kandydujące, jak instytucje UE potrzebują jasno określonych wskaźników postępów integracji, bardzo dobrego monitoringu, odpowiednich procedur reagowania zarówno na osiągnięcia, jak i ich brak. Wsparcie finansowe reform w krajach kandydujących jest istotnym elementem integracji, wymaga jednak programowania, nadzoru i oceny rezultatów, aby niemożliwe były marnotrawienie, korupcja czy wykorzystanie tych środków niezgodnie z przeznaczeniem. Środki wspierające reformy powinny być zróżnicowane w odniesieniu do poszczególnych krajów i przyznawane w oparciu o zasadę „więcej za więcej”. Zgadzam się z autorami sprawozdania, że należy zwiększyć przejrzystość, wzmocnić uczestnictwo obywateli i ściśle zaangażowanie społeczeństwa obywatelskiego w proces rozszerzenia i kontrolę nad jego przebiegiem. Unia Europejska i kraje kandydujące potrzebują skutecznych kampanii informacyjnych dotyczących rozszerzenia. Jasna informacja, skuteczna komunikacja to podstawowe instrumenty wspierające zaangażowanie obywateli i przeciwdziałające dezinformacji.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Mimo że całym sercem popieram rozszerzenie Unii, nie mogę zagłosować za tym sprawozdaniem, dlatego że zawiera ono niczym nieuzasadnione założenie, że rozszerzenie zakłada pogłębienie. Cóż za przeciwna logika! Ja zaryzykowałbym nawet twierdzenie, że Unii potrzebne jest raczej spłylenie w wielu obszarach, to znaczy pozostawienie większej wolności państwom członkowskim i obywatelom. Nie ma zwłaszcza żadnych dowodów na to, że jednomyślność uniemożliwia sprawne podejmowanie decyzji. Zniesienie zasady jednomyślności oznaczałoby, że w realnej polityce dwa najsilniejsze państwa zachowają możliwość weta, gdyż trudno byłoby sobie wyobrazić sytuację, że jedno z nich zostanie przegłosowane. Będą się najpierw układać między sobą. „Pogłębienie” zmieniałoby fundamentalnie charakter Unii. Pozbawiłoby ją tego, co stanowi jej największą zaletę – że ciągle jeszcze jest dobrowolnym blokiem suwerennych państw, które współpracują ze sobą, dzieląc się swoją suwerennością w pewnych obszarach.

21. Colectarea și schimbul de date referitoare la serviciile de închiriere de locuințe pe termen scurt (dezbatere)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Kim Van Sparrentak w imieniu Komisji Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie gromadzenia i udostępniania danych dotyczących usług krótkoterminowego najmu lokali mieszkalnych i zmieniającego rozporządzenie (UE) 2018/1724 (COM(2022)0571 - C9-0371/2022 - 2022/0358(COD)) (A9-0270/2023).

Kim Van Sparrentak, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, we all know the wonderful and well-crafted founding myth of Airbnb – the dream of having your own bed and breakfast, even if just an air mattress in your apartment. And, sure, short-term rentals created opportunities, be it for the development of tourism in areas that were previously unfindable in tourist guides or by providing hosting alternatives to travellers.

But in the last decade, we have seen a massive growth of the short-term rentals phenomenon, and the occasional renting out of spare rooms has turned into a full-blown business model driven by investors. In Amsterdam, 78% of the 8 739 listings on Airbnb are entire homes or apartments. That means that almost 7 000 homes or apartments are rented out for tourism rather than for residents. Meanwhile, there are not enough teachers in Amsterdam because they simply can't afford to live there anymore.

This development is simply capitalism doing its job. Renting out to tourists is more profitable than long-term rentals. On average, a listing in Amsterdam can generate an income of EUR 22 000 per year so houses are rented out as a holiday place for profit rather than as a home to live in.

Research convincingly shows that short-term rentals contribute to driving up housing prices and rents. They also put the liveability of neighbourhoods under pressure. There are, of course, noise disturbances, but locals also see convenience stores and other services for residents disappear. And when you live in a neighbourhood with many Airbnbs, this has a dramatic effect on the social cohesion in your area.

So you think, okay, if the situation is that bad, why don't cities do something about it? And that's where this legislation comes into play. Many cities and regions are trying to tackle overtourism and have developed local rules on short-term rentals, often introducing a maximum number of nights and guests that accommodation can be rented for and an obligation to register or – in certain cities – to obtain authorisation for renting out a flat to tourists. And in some cases – where the situation is extremely pressing – we have zone bans that have been introduced.

But you need one thing to make sure that you can enforce these rules and that's data – data on which listings are rented out for how many nights and to how many guests. Cities have been requesting to receive this data from the platforms for years, but the short-term rental platforms have been unwilling to share data with cities and have started an endless series of court cases to try to get rid of rules. So cities have put in place special inspection teams that have reverted to online and offline detective work, and are spending up to EUR 2 million a year to get a grip on their housing stock. Again, this is a burden smaller authorities can't carry.

So with this regulation, we are making clear that Big Tech doesn't make the rules. And we are obliging these platforms to share data with authorities on a regular basis. Short-term rental platforms have to share data on the number of nights and the number of guests in an accommodation that was rented out on a monthly basis to a national platform. If local authorities want access to the data, they have to put in place a registration procedure.

The sharing of data will allow cities and other authorities to better enforce the existing rules – including through the removal of illegal listings – and will contribute to fighting the housing crisis by tackling speculation and safeguarding access to affordable housing.

I want to thank all the shadow rapporteurs for their constructive approach that allowed us to bridge our political differences, resulting in unanimous support in the IMCO Committee for the trilogy outcome. I therefore count on strong support as well in the vote tomorrow.

And I want to thank again the Commission because we called for getting this legislation into place. We also asked the cities who came to Europe many times to ask for help. And now, within a year, we have managed to get an agreement.

Thierry Breton, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, Madame la rapporteure Kim van Sparrentak, tout d'abord, je voudrais vous remercier de me donner l'occasion d'intervenir sur la question relative aux locations de courte durée dont la rapporteure vient de rappeler l'importance pour nos concitoyens européens à de multiples égards.

Le Parlement et le Conseil sont parvenus à un accord politique seulement douze mois après la proposition de la Commission, ce qui reflète évidemment l'engagement du Parlement européen, et en particulier celui de M^{me} la rapporteure Kim van Sparrentak, mais aussi l'ensemble du travail accompli par tous ceux qui l'ont accompagnée.

Les locations de courte durée sont un pilier important de l'écosystème touristique. Elles sont largement utilisées par les citoyens européens et les visiteurs extra-européens, avec un total de 125 millions de nuitées passées en location de courte durée, et ce rien qu'en août dernier. Évidemment, cela bénéficie aux hôtes, aux clients et aux destinations touristiques partout en Europe. En même temps, cela ne doit pas se faire au détriment des communautés locales. Et nous sommes bien conscients que les locations de courte durée peuvent avoir un impact sur l'offre de logements abordables dans certaines régions. Avec ce nouveau règlement, nous aidons les autorités locales, mais aussi régionales, en leur fournissant les données nécessaires pour gérer les locations de courte durée sur leur territoire de manière efficace et proportionnée. Désormais, les obligations de diligence des plateformes seront précisées afin de faciliter en particulier le respect par les hôtes et le contrôle par les autorités. Le règlement obligera les plateformes à partager avec les autorités publiques les données d'activités, mais permettra également de mieux lutter contre les annonces illégales.

L'accord politique a abouti à des dispositions que la Commission estime bien calibrées dans ce sens. Tous les acteurs vont bénéficier de ce nouveau cadre réglementaire: tout d'abord, évidemment, les pouvoirs publics qui vont obtenir des données plus fiables pour élaborer en particulier des politiques de tourisme et de logement appropriées et proportionnées; deuxièmement, les hôtes, qui vont bénéficier de systèmes d'enregistrement harmonisés et, enfin, les plateformes, qui vont fonctionner dans un cadre juridique unique et stable.

Je suis satisfait que ces aspects clés aient pu être conservés dans le texte final, et je voudrais remercier le Parlement et le Conseil pour avoir apporté des modifications ciblées au texte et pour avoir garanti la cohérence avec la directive sur les services et le *Digital Service Act*.

Compte tenu des enjeux liés à la location de courte durée, il est important que ce cadre soit mis en œuvre 24 mois après l'entrée en vigueur du texte, et c'est dans ce but que la Commission a déjà lancé les travaux préparatoires à la mise en œuvre du règlement, avec, bien entendu, les États membres et les plateformes en ligne. Soyez assurés, bien entendu, que le Parlement sera tenu pleinement informé des évolutions!

Isabel García Muñoz, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Transportes y Turismo*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, intervengo en nombre de mi compañera, Josianne Cutajar, ponente de la opinión de Transporte y Turismo para este reglamento, que no ha podido estar hoy con nosotros.

El turismo y la hostelería siempre han estado a la vanguardia en la transición digital. Por tanto, es lógico que dicho sector tenga una regulación de vanguardia que establezca reglas armonizadas para la recopilación y el intercambio de datos en cuanto a los alquileres a corto plazo. Esto es una forma de garantizar que las autoridades públicas tengan fácil acceso a datos de calidad que les permitan legislar eficazmente y de manera proporcionada.

Josianne ha querido enfatizar desde el principio la necesidad de garantizar un ecosistema turístico equilibrado entre hoteleros, anfitriones, turistas y comunidades locales. Y equilibrio significa dotar a las autoridades reguladoras nacionales y locales de los datos necesarios para poder garantizar un parque de viviendas más asequible en zonas turísticas, sin castigar injustamente al sector del alquiler a corto plazo, que representa casi una cuarta parte de los alojamientos turísticos.

Para mi compañera ha sido especialmente importante garantizar que el registro de anfitriones sea posible de forma gratuita, o a un coste razonable, y no solo en línea para las personas con menos habilidades digitales, especialmente nuestras personas mayores.

Barbara Thaler, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, lieber Herr Kommissar, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir werden diese Woche ein neues Gesetz zum Datenaustausch zwischen Onlinevermietungsplattformen und nationalen Behörden beschließen. Und darüber freue ich mich aus zwei ganz besonderen Gründen. Erstens: Wir lösen ein lange bekanntes Problem. Alle von uns kennen Airbnb und Co. Viele Menschen verwenden sie sehr gerne, um eine Unterkunft zu finden oder um selbst zu vermieten. Und dieses Miteinander von privaten und gewerblichen Anbietern ist mittlerweile ganz normal. Aber – und das ist der Punkt hier – es müssen alle nach denselben Regeln spielen.

Und während es für gewerbliche Beherbergungsbetriebe strenge Auflagen gibt, konnte bei der Plattformvermietung oft nicht festgestellt werden, wer wo was an wen und über welchen Zeitraum vermietet. Und das ist zunehmend zu einem Problem geworden, zu einem großen Problem geworden. Und je nach Mitgliedsland oder Region wurde die Situation immer schwieriger zu überblicken. Und jetzt sind die Regeln klar. Jetzt sind die Regeln einheitlich, und wir haben freie Fahrt für Transparenz und fairen Wettbewerb.

Und zweitens gefällt mir dieses Gesetz, weil es eigentlich ein sehr schönes Beispiel dafür ist, wie in unserem Binnenmarkt Gesetze gemacht gehören. Die Europäische Union schafft einen Rahmen, der den Ländern eine solide Datenbasis gibt. Und diese Basis dient als Grundlage für maßgeschneiderte Gesetze vor Ort – unterschiedlich je nach Region oder Mitgliedsland. So geht Europäische Union. So geht Subsidiarität. Bitte gerne mehr davon! Herzlichen Dank an unsere Berichterstatterin Kim Van Sparrentak. Vielen Dank für die gute Zusammenarbeit auch an alle anderen Kolleginnen und Kollegen.

Brando Benifei, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signora Presidente, Commissario Breton, onorevoli colleghi, il regolamento sulla raccolta e condivisione dei dati relativi ai servizi di affitto di alloggi a breve termine è un importante nuovo tassello del mosaico europeo. Sono felice di averlo seguito come negoziatore per il gruppo dei Socialisti e Democratici. Lasciatemi ringraziare anche subito, però, la relatrice, Kim Van Sparrentak, per lo straordinario lavoro svolto in questi mesi.

Le piattaforme online di affitti brevi hanno stimolato l'economia del turismo ma hanno anche portato alla cosiddetta *gentrificazione* turistica delle città, minandone la vivibilità e l'accessibilità degli alloggi. Non possiamo dimenticare gli studenti universitari che pochi mesi fa nel mio Paese, in Italia, dormivano in tenda nelle piazze, manifestando contro il caro-affitti per i fuorisede. E questo problema riguarda anche lavoratori e famiglie alle prese con un mercato immobiliare fuori controllo. Oggi alcune piattaforme non rispettano gli obblighi esistenti e gli Stati si muovono in ordine sparso. Il vuoto legislativo proprio in materia di affitti brevi è un problema reale.

Questo regolamento armonizza le procedure di registrazione tra gli *host*, le piattaforme online e le autorità competenti: non è la soluzione definitiva, ma senz'altro è un primo passo fondamentale per dare agli Stati membri gli strumenti necessari per legiferare in maniera corretta. Sono orgoglioso che tutte le nostre priorità siano state confermate. Gli *host* riceveranno un numero di registrazione. Le piattaforme online dovranno assicurarsi che le informazioni fornite dagli *host* siano corrette e, infine, le autorità potranno agire in caso di uso fraudolento delle attività delle piattaforme.

Insomma, trasparenza e regole per fare in modo che, finalmente, si possano fare poi scelte politiche in un settore in continua crescita, quello appunto degli affitti brevi. L'Europa che vogliamo, capace di imporre regole utili ed efficaci anche a chi ha un grande potere come le piattaforme digitali, si costruisce passo dopo passo con scelte come questa.

Ivars Ijabs, *Renew grupas vārdā*. – Godātā prezidentes kundze! Godātais Bretona kungs! Es teiktu, ka īstermiņa īres platformas ir ļoti labs piemērs, pirmkārt, kā eiropieši var gūt labumu no šīs digitālās ekonomikas. Tas ir – gan izīrējot īpašumus, gan arī īrējot tos par cilvēciņu cenu, piemēram, iepretim lielajām viesnīcām ķēdēm. Īpaši tas attiecas, piemēram, uz ģimenēm ar bērniem, bet, protams, ka tam ir vajadzīgi noteikumi. Ir nepieciešama drošība par to, ko tu izīrē. Ir nepieciešama skaidra datu apmaiņa, īpaši jau pieejamība, šo datu pieejamība mūsu pilsētām un pašvaldībām.

Šajā regulā, un te es varu teikt tikai paldies mūsu ziņotājai Kim Van Sparrentak, šajā regulā ir labi atrasts līdzsvars starp no vienas puses, brīvu konkurenci un to vajadzīgo regulējumu. Nākamais uzdevums ir turpmāk rūpīgi saskaņot šo visu likumdošanu ar mūsu Digitālo pakalpojumu likumu, lai mūsu digitālā likumdošana visās jomās būtu saskaņota, saprotama un arī viegli ieviešama un izmantojama dalībvalstīs.

Ciarán Cuffe, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, Europe has a housing problem. We have under-occupation in some areas; we have overcrowding in others. We need to take action. There are 18 000 entire houses to rent on Airbnb in my country; thousands on another site. But there's also 13 000 people living in hotel bedrooms who would love to have more permanent occupation.

Without regulation, these platforms are a monster. Properly regulated, they can provide accommodation for all who need it. Short-term lettings are making our housing crisis worse by taking homes off the market and they're driving up prices and rents.

Meanwhile, the Commission is delaying the introduction of a registration system in Ireland. Enough is enough! We have to provide solutions, not barriers to progress. The short-term regulation is progress. Sharing data is the future. We now need measures for more oversight of short-term rentals.

Carlo Fidanza, a nome del gruppo ECR. – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, gli alloggi affittati per brevi periodi rappresentano circa un quarto del totale delle strutture ricettive turistiche nell'Unione europea.

Si tratta di un fenomeno che negli ultimi anni è stato caratterizzato da una grande espansione. Ma in molti casi questa espansione è stata senza regole e senza controlli, generando criticità come l'esposizione dei consumatori a rischi per la sicurezza, il lavoro sommerso, l'evasione fiscale, la concorrenza sleale, la trasformazione del tessuto economico e sociale delle nostre città.

Ora il buon funzionamento dell'ecosistema turistico europeo potrà trarre importanti benefici da questo nuovo regolamento, grazie ad una serie unica e semplice di norme in materia di informazione per le piattaforme e procedure di registrazione semplificate per i locatori. La maggiore trasparenza rafforzerà la fiducia dei viaggiatori e aiuterà le autorità nazionali e locali ad elaborare migliori politiche nel settore del turismo, al fine di assicurarne la sostenibilità sociale ed ambientale.

Alessandra Basso, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, ogni anno vengono prenotate circa 600 milioni di notti online: quindi ogni notte, più di 1 milione e mezzo di persone soggiorna in alloggi a breve termine.

Il tema è rilevante per i Paesi a forte vocazione turistica, come l'Italia, e siamo soddisfatti di questa proposta, anche se è una relazione iniziata con un contenuto controverso, perché non spetta all'Europa risolvere il problema delle eventuali carenze abitative.

I negoziati lo hanno riportato all'intento originario: una mappatura delle abitazioni utile in futuro a rimodulare le politiche degli affitti brevi. Ci sarà anche una maggiore trasparenza a tutela dei consumatori, spesso – ce lo dicono le cronache – vittime di truffe. Con la registrazione sarà più facile per i consumatori capire a chi rivolgersi in caso di disservizi.

Siamo sicuri che questo provvedimento contribuirà ad aumentare la fiducia dei consumatori e a migliorare complessivamente il settore degli affitti a breve termine.

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu The Left. – Paní předsedající, vážený pane komisaři, především paní zpravodajko, moc děkuji za Vaši práci, protože myslím, že je z velké části výsledkem Vašeho nasazení to, že dnes máme daný dohromady hotový text. Jsem ráda, že po letech, kdy Evropská unie oblast bydlení ignorovala, budeme zítra hlasovat o návrhu nařízení regulací alespoň toho, jaká data mají on-line platformy v oblasti krátkodobých pronájmů, jako je Airbnb, sdílet s městy. Není žádným tajemstvím, že krátkodobé pronájmy často vedou ke zvyšování cen bydlení a zhoršující se kvalitě života ve městech.

Dle regulace budou muset platformy sdílet detailní údaje o bytech, které jsou skrze ně nabízeny, a budou odpovědné za jejich úplnost a přesnost. Regulace též usnadní boj proti nelegálně nabízeným bytům. Je však na samotných členských státech a městech, aby této regulace využily. Je jen na nich, zda zavedou povolovací režimy a zda budou data od platforem požadovat. A já pevně doufám, že Česká republika toho plně využije, neboť i současná nedostatečná regulace krátkodobých pronájmů přispívá k tomu, že Praha je nejdražším městem k bydlení v celé Evropské unii. Bude zde možnost něco s trhem k bydlení dělat, tak ji využijte a přestaňte jen házet lidem, kteří si hledají bydlení, klacky pod nohy neochotou či strachem z hněvu platforem a spekulantů a zabraňovat v tom, aby měli šanci slušně bydlet.

Také pevně doufám, že budoucí Evropská komise začne být v oblasti bydlení aktivnější. Problém nedostupného bydlení se totiž týká celé Evropy a je potřeba jasně začít jednat tak, aby měl každý člověk právo na důstojné bydlení a aby města byla místem k životu.

Katarína Roth Neveďalová (NI). – Pani predsedajúca, informácie pre ľudí, ktorí používajú takéto platformy na dočasné bývanie, sú samozrejme veľmi dôležité. Veľa z nás napríklad žije v nejakej inej krajine, ako je Belgicko, Brusel, a potrebujeme občas na nejakú krátku dobu si niečo prenajať alebo chodíme na dovolenky a prenajímame si cez rôzne platformy ubytovanie, pretože sa nám nepáči bývať v hoteli.

Informácie, ktoré však tieto platformy poskytujú, sú rôznorodé, nie sú dostatočné, a preto si myslím, že je dobrým krokom, ku ktorému pristúpila Európska komisia a Európsky parlament, aby sme nejakým spôsobom unifikovali tieto informácie a dáta, ich zbieranie a aby sme vedeli hlavne, čo sa deje, kde sa to deje, a akým spôsobom môžeme potom ďalej chrániť hlavne spotrebiteľov, na ktorých nám najviac záleží.

Ja si myslím, že nám ide nielen o informácie, ale aj ochranu spotrebiteľov ako takých, aby sa potom neskôr mohli vlastne aj sami dožadovať, ak potrebujú nejakým spôsobom svoje práva ochrániť. Pretože aj dnes vidíme, že aj u nás na Slovensku, v Bratislave, rastú rôzne bytové jednotky a komplexy, v ktorých väčšina bytov je napríklad prenajímaných krátkodobu cez rôzne platformy a žijú tam rôzni ľudia, o ktorých častokrát ani veľa nevieme. Čiže ja si myslím, že to je dobrý krok. Budem ho podporovať a pani spravodajkyňa gratulujem.

Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE). – Señora presidenta, comisario Breton, sin duda los servicios digitales aportan grandes ventajas, entre ellas la optimización de los servicios tradicionales. Sin embargo, también acarrea retos que debemos enfrentar. Los alquileres de corta duración no son una excepción. Este mercado se caracteriza por un desequilibrio entre los servicios profesionales que enfrentan una carga importante de obligaciones y las plataformas en línea que se han aprovechado de la fragmentación del mercado para autorregularse.

Sin embargo, nuestra actuación desde las instituciones europeas es limitada puesto que las competencias en esta materia recaen en los Estados miembros, que muchas veces incluso ceden a los ayuntamientos. Donde sí tenemos competencias es en la gestión de los datos. Ante esta disyuntiva valoro muy positivamente la propuesta de la Comisión para regular la gestión de los datos a través de un mecanismo de transparencia.

No obstante, solo aborda obligaciones para aquellos alquileres que obtienen un número de registro, algo que depende generalmente de las administraciones locales. Por lo que, intentando dar solución a la fragmentación del mercado, estamos creando normas que van a ser aplicadas arbitrariamente a unos sí y a otros no, y esto podría generar inseguridad jurídica.

Esto me preocupa y creo que deberíamos subsanarlo.

Ondřej Kovařík (Renew). – Paní předsedající, vážený pane komisaři, skutečně stále více bytů a domů v Evropě je nabízeno pro krátkodobé ubytování turistů, a zejména v těch nejvíce navštěvovaných místech. Turistům sice tyto služby rozšiřují nabídku ubytování, na druhou stranu to ale přináší řadu nepříjemností lidem, kteří v těch dotčených místech žijí. Například v samém centru Prahy je skoro polovina bytů využívána pro tento účel. Také to může vytvářet nerovné podmínky podnikání, hlavně s ohledem na tradiční ubytovatele. Tím spíš, když se třeba celé bytové domy mění na neoficiální hotely, aniž by nutně splňovaly podmínky a normy, které pro to potřebují.

Návrh na regulaci krátkodobého ubytování je tedy vítaným a potřebným krokem. Poskytovatelům ubytování zavede povinnosti registrace a také pravidelného zasílání informací a také díky nim získají samosprávy a další subjekty lepší data o tom, v jakém rozsahu jsou tyto služby poskytovány, a mohou tak na ně lépe reagovat, například přijetím odpovídajících vyhlášek. A v neposlední řadě je to způsob, jak také lépe ošetřit práva ubytovaných a také je lépe vymáhat. Věřím tedy, že tyto nové předpisy nastaví jasné a rovné podmínky pro podnikání v této oblasti.

Leila Chaïbi (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, 1 055 euros en moyenne pour une location à Paris, vous vous dites que c'est le prix par mois pour un petit studio? Eh bien pas du tout! Tenez-vous bien, c'est le prix pour seulement une nuit dans un appartement à Paris loué sur Airbnb pendant les Jeux olympiques de 2024. Oui, 1 055 € la nuit, on atteint des records! Et malheureusement, ces records n'ont rien à voir avec le sport.

Pourquoi un propriétaire continuerait-il de louer son bien à un locataire habitant lorsqu'il a la possibilité de multiplier son loyer pendant les Jeux olympiques? La recette est simple: d'abord trouver un prétexte, souvent illégal, pour résilier le bail de ses locataires, même si ceux-ci ont toujours consciencieusement payé leur loyer. Ensuite, mettre l'appartement sur Airbnb à des prix vertigineux que seuls les touristes pourront s'offrir. Et si les habitants n'ont pas de quoi payer un appartement cet été, tant pis pour eux, ils n'auront qu'à aller voir ailleurs, loin de la ville, car de toute façon, Paris sera bientôt remplie de logements touristiques sans habitants.

Nous devons agir contre Airbnb qui vide les villes de ses logements. La première étape, ce sont les propositions qui figurent dans le rapport de ma collègue Kim Van Sparrentak. Il faut ensuite aller plus loin et limiter les locations de courte durée aux propriétaires occupants, et ce pendant une période limitée.

Włodzimierz Karpiński (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Nie będę powtarzał, jak ważny to segment usług dla obywateli Unii Europejskiej. Bardzo precyzyjnie określił to pan komisarz Breton. Rozporządzenie, nad którym jutro będziemy głosować, to bez wątpienia bardzo istotny krok na drodze do zakończenia swoistej „wolnej amerykanki” w zakresie najmu krótkoterminowego. Cieszę się, że udało nam się zbalansować rezultat, który zapewni większe bezpieczeństwo dla najemców i jednocześnie nie będzie narażał wynajmujących na konieczność konfrontacji ze skomplikowaną biurokracją.

Wierzę też, że nowe rozporządzenie pozwoli nam uporządkować rynek najmu poprzez zrównoważony rozwój, na którym skorzystają zarówno osoby korzystające z najmu krótkoterminowego, jak i stali lokatorzy. Dodatkowo rozporządzenie pozwoli na uzyskanie cennych danych również władzom lokalnym, dzięki temu też, że będą mogły zaproponować lepsze rozwiązania w swojej polityce turystycznej i mieszkaniowej. To dobry przykład, jak prawo Unii Europejskiej wychodzi naprzeciw rozwiązywaniu problemów zwykłych obywateli Unii Europejskiej.

Antonius Manders (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, toen ik het voorstel van de Commissie in de Commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming zag binnenkomen, moest ik denken aan de timesharerichtlijn. Twintig jaar geleden hadden we een vergelijkbaar probleem. Deze regels zijn namelijk nodig door het succes van de platforms die er zijn. Want als je in zo'n korte tijd 25 % van de markt kunt innemen, dan is er iets niet goed.

Ik dank Kim Van Sparrentak, want jong en oud kunnen het samen eens zijn over dezelfde manier van aanpakken: de vrije markt, maar wel binnen de regels. De platforms hebben gezorgd voor een verstoring van verschillende markten, bijvoorbeeld de huurmarkt – al verschillende keren aangehaald – waardoor huurwoningen niet meer te betalen zijn voor de mensen, de stedelingen die in de stad willen wonen en daar permanent willen verblijven. Het is een verstoring van de markt voor de reguliere hotels en bed and breakfasts, want die moeten voldoen aan allerlei vergunningen en ik weet niet wat. Het is moeilijk voor de belastingdienst om hun belastingcentjes binnen te krijgen, ook voor de steden, en het is belangrijk om hier iets aan te doen – het gaat wel heel snel, Voorzitter –, maar het is ook in het belang van de veiligheid van de toeristen.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Comissário Breton, o presente acordo vai, de facto, permitir que obtenhamos dados quantitativos cruciais para compreender melhor o alojamento local e, consequentemente, poder legislar de uma forma mais eficaz, transparente, garantindo que as decisões políticas serão baseadas em evidências e não em perceções ideológicas, como tem acontecido em Portugal. A esquerda tem alterado a Lei do Alojamento Local da qual Portugal foi pioneiro, com grave prejuízo para o setor.

O turismo tem sido força motriz para o crescimento económico de quase todos os Estados-Membros. Muitos conseguiram superar várias crises económicas, criando empregos e gerando receitas. A esquerda diaboliza sem fundamentos concretos, muito menos com soluções aparentes. Não é, seguramente, desta forma que se solucionam os problemas da habitação.

O turismo representa atualmente 8 % do PIB da União e 12 % do PIB português, criou mais de 110 000 empregos no meu país. Com a aprovação deste acordo amanhã, conseguimos voltar a colocar na agenda um setor que merece efetivamente estar em pé de igualdade com outros setores, como é o caso da educação, da saúde ou da agricultura.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Thierry Breton, membre de la Commission. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires, d'abord, je voudrais vous remercier pour l'ensemble de vos interventions. Je ne saurais trop souligner, évidemment, comme beaucoup d'entre vous l'ont fait, l'importance de ce règlement. Le segment de la location de courte durée, on le sait, est fondamentalement en croissance. Il est important d'éviter une incidence négative sur les communautés.

Certains d'entre vous ont souligné les problèmes urgents liés à la pénurie de logements abordables et à l'itinérance. Ce sont effectivement des préoccupations majeures. Les données générées par cette nouvelle réglementation aideront les autorités locales et régionales à suivre la situation de ces locations sur leur territoire et à adopter des mesures appropriées, proportionnées, bien sûr, et je tiens à le souligner, conformes au droit de l'Union.

Le règlement va donc stimuler la transformation numérique plus large de l'écosystème touristique, et cela va alimenter notre futur espace européen très important de données sur le tourisme. Enfin, ce règlement fixe une nouvelle norme pour le développement transparent et équilibré de l'économie collaborative. C'est une référence déjà prise comme exemple dans certaines autres régions du monde. Je voudrais encore, à titre personnel et au nom de la Commission, vous remercier pour ce travail et pour votre engagement en faveur de cette initiative législative. Je crois que l'on sera tous d'accord pour la qualifier de pionnière.

Kim Van Sparrentak, rapporteur. – Madam President, I think this debate has made very clear that there is very strong support for this regulation, and that the impact of the growth of short-term rentals is a concern shared by many colleagues here in the House.

So let me take the opportunity of this debate to raise one point concerning market access requirements. Whilst market access requirements – and therefore the interpretation of the Services Directive as such – were not subjects of this regulation. Legislators ensured that the possibility to establish authorisation schemes would not be undermined.

The possibility to put in place an authorisation scheme for short-term rental activities was the subject of a landmark ruling of the European Court of Justice in the Cali Apartments case. The European Court ruled that authorisation schemes can be justified by an overriding reason relating to the public interest, consisting of combating the rental housing shortage, and are therefore in line with the Services Directive.

So it's been an unpleasant surprise to hear that the Commission has started questioning – through so-called pilot infringement proceedings – the validity of rules put in place by large cities to simply protect their citizens. This can undermine existing rules and, therefore, the usefulness of data sharing, and also have a chilling effect on other authorities that want to put in place such schemes.

Several Member States have written to the Commission already with the request to stop these actions. Starting infringements has, coincidentally, also been the main demand of Airbnb when it came to this legislation. In the context of an escalating housing crisis, the Commission would simply be sending the wrong signal to local authorities that are simply trying to ensure their cities are liveable.

So let me once again state: houses are for people, not for profit. That should also be the goal of the European Union and we should make sure that people can still afford to live in our Union.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 29 lutego 2024 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Josianne Cutajar (S&D), in writing. – Tourism and hospitality have always been at the cutting edge of the digital transition. Thus, it is only fitting that such a sector has cutting-edge regulation, establishing harmonised rules for data collection and data sharing for short-term rentals.

As the Rapporteur for the Committee on Transport and Tourism's position, I have emphasised from the get-go the need to ensure a balanced ecosystem between hoteliers, hosts, holidaymakers and local communities alike. Balance means empowering national and local regulatory authority with necessary data to be able to ensure a more affordable housing stock in touristic areas without unjustly punishing the booming short-term rental sector that represents nearly a quarter of tourist accommodations. Balance entails data-driven policy and proportionate legislation to ensure quality and sustainable tourism.

I am particularly proud to have been able to guarantee that host registration will be possible free of charge or at a reasonable cost, with offline options for the less digitally skilled, especially our senior citizens. This is something that will benefit entrepreneurs but also individuals who are renting out to help make ends meet. Let's harness the power of data for a more responsible, sustainable and transparent market!

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), písomne. – Mnohé mestá a regióny sa snažia bojovať proti problémom spojeným s nadmerným cestovným ruchom, a preto vyvinuli miestne pravidlá pre krátkodobé prenájmy. Často zavádzajú pravidlá určujúce maximálny počet nocí a hostí, pre ktoré je možné prenajať si ubytovanie. Vítam povinnosti zaregistrovať sa alebo získať povolenie na prenájom bytu turistom. V niektorých prípadoch máme zavedené zákazy zón, aby sme tento problém vyriešili. Musíme zabezpečiť, aby boli registračné postupy pre hostiteľov na krátkodobý prenájom bezplatné alebo za primeraný poplatok. Hostitelia by mali, a to s cieľom zvýšiť transparentnosť procesu, potvrdiť, či získali povolenie, ak je toto uplatniteľné. Predkladané nariadenie je v súlade so smernicou o službách a zákonom o digitálnych službách. Jej cieľom je zvýšiť transparentnosť v oblasti krátkodobých prenájmov ubytovania zavádzaním harmonizovaných pravidiel týkajúcich sa registračných systémov pre krátkodobé prenájmy. Zefektívnenie zdieľania údajov medzi online platformami a verejnými orgánmi vyžaduje, aby členské štáty zaviedli digitálny jednotný vstupný bod. Pomocou tohto spôsobu môžu platformy zdieľať údaje o činnosti, ktoré doteraz nemuseli byť poskytnuté, a tým pádom neumožňovali posun v spomínanej problematike.

22. Necesitatea unei decizii urgente a Consiliului în favoarea modificării statutului de protecție al lupilor în Convenția de la Berna (dezbatere)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku obrad są oświadczenia Rady i Komisji w sprawie pilnej potrzeby przyjęcia decyzji Rady w sprawie zmiany ochrony statusu ochrony wilka w konwencji berneńskiej (2024/2602(RSP)).

Proszę o zabranie głosu pana komisarza. Niestety przedstawiciela Rady nie mamy, mimo że było wystosowane zaproszenie. W imieniu Komisji głos zabierze pani komisarz Kadri Simson.

Kadri Simson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, although the comeback of wolves is good news for biodiversity in Europe, the Commission fully acknowledges the complexities of the current situation. Wolves are returning to regions of the Union from which they have long been absent.

Increasingly, this is leading to conflict and challenges for some stakeholders and especially for livestock farmers, because of increasing depredation and killing of livestock. For that reason, on 20 December last year, in line with the commitment we made and in response to the resolution passed by this House, the Commission published an in-depth analysis on the situation of the wolves in the EU.

It contains, inter alia, the most up-to-date data available for wolf populations and damage to livestock. Our analysis confirmed that after a long period of persecution, leading to near extinction, European wolf populations have made a significant recovery. This has been especially noteworthy in the last two decades and wolves now occupy large areas of their former natural range.

On the basis of this in-depth analysis, the Commission tabled a proposal for a Council decision on the same day, asking the Union to submit them an amendment to the Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats. The proposed amendment would move the wolf from Appendix 2 – that means strictly protected species – to Appendix 3. The proposal for a Council decision is now under consideration by Member States under the leadership of the Belgian Presidency. The Commission is looking forward to a swift decision on this proposal.

At the same time, the Commission continues to urge local and national authorities to take appropriate action wherever necessary, as permitted by the derogation possibilities in the current legislation. Several Member States make regular use of such derogations to authorise lethal control of wolf specimens and specimens of other protected species as well.

As stressed by the Commission on several occasions, it is key to keep investing in damage prevention measures. Indeed, irrespective of any decision on the legal status of the wolf, it will always be essential to adopt prevention measures in order to reduce livestock depredation.

More and more Member States are now using the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development to programme support for damage prevention actions and investments. For the period 2023-27, 15 Member States have included relevant measures in their CAP strategic plans, bringing tangible solutions to farmers and local communities. And as permitted under EU State aid rules, many Member States now provide full compensation to farmers whenever damage is caused by the wolf or other protected species.

To achieve our common objectives, I would like to recall the recommendations that Commissioner Sinkevičius and Commissioner Wojciechowski have sent to all Member States in November 2021, inviting them to make the best possible use of all the available EU and national funding opportunities.

The support from the Commission will continue. We are stepping up financial support as well as our help to national authorities and stakeholders to find suitable solutions to facilitate this coexistence, in line with EU legislation and policy goals.

Herbert Dorfmann, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Im November 2022 haben wir uns hier dafür ausgesprochen, den Schutzstatus für den Wolf in der Berner Konvention abzusenken. Nun reagiert die Kommission endlich darauf, und sie schlägt dem Rat – wie soeben gesagt – vor, dies in den nächsten Wochen zu beschließen. Ich hoffe und fordere den Rat auf, dies auch zu tun und diese Entscheidung nicht allein den Umweltministern zu überlassen.

Hier geht es um ein Gesamtinteresse und nicht nur um eine Umweltfrage. Wir haben bei dieser Debatte eine Anfrage an die Kommission und an den Rat gemacht. Ich weiß nicht, wie der Rat auf diese Anfrage antworten soll, wenn ich mir die Ratsbank hier anschau. Das ist wirklich ein Skandal, dass der Rat heute Abend nicht hier ist und seinen Pflichten, denen er nachkommen muss, hier nicht gerecht wird. Ich glaube, das ist eine Missachtung von uns Parlamentariern hier heute Abend. Ich bitte Sie, Frau Vorsitzende, dies dem Rat auch so mitzuteilen.

Es geht nämlich nicht darum, die Wölfe wieder in Europa auszurotten. Es geht darum, die Tatsachen zu erkennen. Als die Berner Konvention vor 45 Jahren beschlossen wurde, war der Wolf in der damaligen Europäischen Union praktisch verschwunden. Heute haben wir wieder über 20 000 Wölfe in Europa und die Konflikte nehmen von Jahr zu Jahr zu. Der Wolf braucht den Schutzstatus „streng geschützt“ nicht mehr. Er wird sich auch ausbreiten, wenn er nur mehr „geschützt“ ist. Aber unsere ländlichen Räume brauchen diese Absenkung. Sie brauchen mehr Flexibilität im Management der Populationen, sonst werden die Schafe und Ziegen von unseren Bergweiden verschwinden.

Ob wir dann mehr Biodiversität haben, das wage ich mal zu bezweifeln. Ich denke eher nicht. Das Gleiche gilt übrigens auch für den Braunbären. Ich denke, wir sollten es den Menschen, vor allem in den Bergen, nicht unmöglich machen, in den Bergen zu leben. Sie haben ein Recht auf Sicherheit und ein Recht, ihre Tiere zu halten. Wir haben die Pflicht, ihnen das Recht zu garantieren.

Niels Fuglsang, *für S&D-Gruppen*. – Fru. formand! Jeg synes, at det er mærkeligt, at hver gang vi diskuterer ulve, så kommer det til at handle om krudt og kugler. Det kommer til at handle om, hvordan man kan skyde flest mulige ulve, og jeg synes, vi bliver nødt til at holde fast i, at i det sidste halve århundrede, altså de sidste 50 år, er der ikke et eneste dødeligt angreb fra en ulv på et menneske. Ulve er ikke livsfarlige, så vi skal ikke overdrive faren eller dramatisere ulven. Det er klart, at der er landmænd, der har problemer med, at ulve angriber deres besætninger. Det skal vi tage alvorligt. Men vi ved og det i øvrigt i mit eget land, Danmark, der har vi problemer med det, det anerkender jeg fuldt ud, men vi ved samtidig, at ulvesikret hegn, et er noget, der virker. I mit eget land, Danmark, har der ikke været et eneste angreb på besætninger bag ulvesikrede hegn. Så skulle vi ikke satse på det – at få brugt EU's landbrugsstøtte til at få sat noget hegn op, der virker, frem for at skyde løs på ulvene.

Michal Wiezik, *za skupinu Renew*. – Pani predsedajúca, zníženie ochrany vlka znamená jediné, zavedenie jeho lovu. A ten je vo vzťahu k znižovaniu škôd na hospodárskych zvieratách absolútne neefektívny a dokonca kontraproduktívny. Čo ale dokáže, je vytvoriť rámec na zlegalizovanie upytličených jedincov vlka počas kvótového obdobia. To nie je žiadna fikcia. Taký pytlák, ktorý zastrelil vlka do mraziaka, v súčasnosti na Slovensku riadi náš najvýznamnejší národný park. Znie to absurdne, no presne týmto ľuďom sa chystáte rozviazať ruky.

Preto apelujem na to, aby Komisia pristupovala tak ako vždy, na základe dát a vedy, aj k tejto citlivej otázke. Neexistujú vedecké dáta, ktoré by podporovali snahu znížiť ochranu vlka a už vôbec nie ju rámcovali ako urgentnú. Preventívne opatrenia sa ukázali ako efektívne. Problém je, že sú nedostatočne uplatňované, a tak isto je otázkou vedy, že podpora verejnosti na ochranu vlka a jej spolužitie je v kontraste s lovom vlka.

Preto prosím Komisiu, aby zostala verná svojim princípom a nepodliehala lacnému predvolebnému populistickému tlaku, aj keď prichádza z tých najvyšších miest.

Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it's a scandal to see so many colleagues calling to lower the protection status of wolves. Have you actually read the Commission's in-depth analysis? Because it lacks any scientific basis to your claim.

The study highlights the vital role of wolves to our local ecosystem. They regulate wild populations, promote tree growth in our forests and reduce the spread of diseases. The study highlights that killing wolves is neither a long-term solution for farmers nor for livestock, and it highlights the use of preventive herd protection, with fences and dogs as the most effective method for safeguarding sheep and cattle.

This attack on wolves, on the Bern Convention and on the Habitats Directive, is another conservative election campaign at the expense of nature. Together we must find solutions for a coexistence of humans and wolves, rather than repeating the old mistakes of the past. We must defend nature.

Sergio Berlato, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, se le istituzioni comunitarie lo vorranno e se il buon senso prevarrà, presto vedremo la riduzione del livello di protezione del lupo da specie strettamente protetta a specie semplicemente protetta, con la conseguente modifica degli allegati della Convenzione di Berna e della direttiva Habitat. Questa decisione permetterà a tutti gli Stati membri che lo vorranno di poter applicare piani nazionali di gestione e di contenimento che garantiranno una corretta gestione del lupo, nel pieno rispetto delle direttive comunitarie.

Questa richiesta ci è arrivata dal territorio, da tutti coloro che vogliono garantire una corretta gestione del lupo e dei grandi carnivori, garantendo un equilibrio tra le varie specie di fauna selvatica e garantendo una compatibilità tra i grandi carnivori e le attività umane, dall'agricoltura all'allevamento, alla pastorizia.

Per troppo tempo l'Europa è rimasta inerte ad assistere all'eccessiva proliferazione dei grandi carnivori, e dei lupi in particolar modo, mettendo a dura prova la proverbiale pazienza dei nostri allevatori e dei nostri agricoltori. Adesso è tempo di agire senza ulteriori esitazioni.

Alessandro Panza, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, il fatto che non ci sia il Consiglio a un dibattito che è rivolto proprio al Consiglio, è quantomeno scandaloso, una mancanza di rispetto per quest'Aula sempre rimarcata.

Lo dico agli amici dei Verdi: le reti, soprattutto in montagna, funzionano poco, molto poco, anche perché spostarle da una vallata all'altra è tutt'altro che semplice. Quindi, io mi auguro che dopo tante parole finalmente si giunga ai fatti, anche per dare delle risposte concrete ai tanti allevatori e ai tanti contadini che hanno grosse difficoltà a fare l'allevamento, soprattutto nelle aree montane dove il lupo ormai imperversa: non imperversa solo negli alpeggi ma ormai li vediamo anche nei centri urbani.

Concludo, esprimendo solidarietà a don Gaudenzio Martini, un parroco di una piccola comunità della Val Strona, nella provincia del Verbano-Cusio-Ossola, che, celebrando un'antica tradizionale messa a sostegno degli allevatori, che invoca il Signore per la tutela del bestiame da calamità, inondazioni e predatori, è stato denunciato per istigazione all'uccisione dei grandi carnivori. Ormai siamo alla follia, siamo oltre. Difendiamo i nostri allevatori.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de Fractie The Left*. – Voorzitter, heel erg lang was de wolf uitgestorven in Nederland en in grote delen van Europa, afgeschoten door jagers en beroofd van zijn leefgebied. Dankzij de strikte bescherming heeft de wolf zich enigszins hersteld, maar de wolf is nog steeds kwetsbaar.

Ik roep de Commissie dan ook op: haal het absurde plan om de wolven opnieuw uit te roeien van tafel. U ondermijnt met uw voorstel de bescherming van dieren in het wild. En vergis u niet: de mensen die hier roepen dat de wolven gedood moeten worden om de schapen te beschermen, geven helemaal niets om de schapen, want dan zouden ze niet met droge ogen toestaan dat miljoenen Europese schapen worden gedood in Europese slachthuizen. Maar nee, ze hebben gewoon een hekel aan de wolf en ze houden van hun jachtgeweer.

Ik maak me geen zorgen over de invloed van een enkele beschermde diersoort, de wolf, op de landbouw. Ik maak me meer zorgen over de invloed van de landbouw op al die andere beschermde dieren en planten die in hun voortbestaan bedreigd worden.

Norbert Lins (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin der Kommissionspräsidentin sehr dankbar, dass sie für die Kommission den Vorschlag eingebracht hat, den Schutzstatus des Wolfes von „streng geschützt“ auf „geschützt“ zu senken, zunächst im Rahmen der Berner Konvention und dann danach natürlich auch in der FFH-Richtlinie. Es geht um den Schutz der Weidetierhalter. Aber es geht natürlich vor allem auch um den Schutz der Artenvielfalt. Wir haben inzwischen eine Gefahr für die Artenvielfalt durch die Anzahl der Wölfe. Er hat keine natürlichen Feinde.

Leider führt die Riege der Blockierer die deutsche Bundesumweltministerin an. Es passiert in meinem Land praktisch nichts. In meinem Nachbarland Frankreich passiert schon jetzt auch unter dem hohen Schutzstatus einiges. Gerade ist der Abschussplan für die nächsten Jahre veröffentlicht worden. Im letzten Jahr wurden in Frankreich 209 Wölfe geschossen. Also man kann jetzt schon was machen, aber es ist dringend notwendig bei der Populationserweiterung, dass wir jetzt den Schutzstatus senken und es am 25. März hoffentlich zu einer qualifizierten Mehrheit im Rat kommt.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. PINA PICIERNO

Vicepresidente

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señora presidenta, yo me sumo a las quejas por la falta del Consejo en este debate. Creo que no es un respeto a este Parlamento y, por lo tanto, me gustaría que se le trasladara que debía estar porque queremos escuchar al Consejo en este debate. La Comisión ha expresado cuál es su acción.

Yo lo que quiero decir aquí es que, efectivamente, la alta protección del lobo ha tenido resultados, y son buenos. Bueno, he oído aquí que no son tan buenos. Es decir, son buenos resultados los del lobo. Los que no son tan buenos son los de los pequeños rumiantes. Esos no son tan buenos. Me refiero a las ovejas y las cabras de nuestra ganadería. Yo soy de España y, especialmente en el norte, en la cornisa cantábrica, es un auténtico problema ahora mismo. Es un problema. Lo que no sé es por qué no se ve, por qué no se quiere ver.

A los animalistas nos preocupan unos animales, pero no otros. Por tanto, yo defendiendo la posición de los ganaderos y creo que la propuesta de la Comisión de bajar la protección es razonable. Creo que sería un elemento, desde luego, que acogerían bien en el sector ganadero, que por cierto está protestando todos estos días en la calle y algo deberíamos escucharle.

Ulrike Müller (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Die Menschen in den Regionen mit Wolfsanwesenheit erwarten von der Politik keine langen Diskussionen, sondern Entscheidungen und Handeln. Das betrifft nicht nur die Großraubtiere, sondern in einigen Regionen auch Arten wie den Kormoran oder den Fischotter. Die Menschen sind es leid, mit den ewig gleichen Aussagen und endlosen Debatten über den günstigen Erhaltungszustand hingehalten zu werden. Das Beispiel im Schweizer Kanton Uri, in dem mit über 70 Prozent eine Volksinitiative für die Regulierung von Großraubtieren angenommen wurde, spricht doch Bände.

Wir sind endgültig an dem Punkt angelangt, an dem ein flexibleres Management, angepasst an die reale Ist-Situation, ermöglicht werden muss. Das sind wir auch unseren Regionen schuldig, die Entscheidungen treffen müssen und regelmäßig langwierigen rechtlichen Auseinandersetzungen ausgesetzt sind. Jetzt ist der Rat am Zug. Ich fordere Sie auf, faktenbasiert eine Mehrheit zur Absenkung des Schutzstatus in der Berner Konvention zu finden.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, de beschermingsstatus van de wolf moet omlaag. Onze aangenomen resolutie van 2022 was daarover glashelder. De Commissie steunt dat verzoek inmiddels. Nu de Raad nog.

Tegen ministers die nog steeds talmen en nog steeds denken dat ze de problemen kunnen oplossen met maatschappelijke dialogen zou ik willen zeggen: de tijd van praten is voorbij. Er moet nu gehandeld worden. Zeker als we ons realiseren dat er in Europa inmiddels meer dan 20 000 wolven rondlopen en de wolvenpopulatie jaarlijks met 30 % kan groeien.

De schade die wolven veroorzaken, is in sommige gebieden in de Europese Unie nu al zeer aanzienlijk: zo'n 65 000 schapen, geiten en andere landbouwhuisdieren per jaar die gruwelijk worden opengescheurd. Als wij niets doen, dreigt de situatie echt onbeheersbaar te worden. Dus Raad, u laat het vanavond afweten – kijk maar, het vak is leeg –, maar ik ga ervan uit dat u ons online volgt of dat u dit debat terugkijkt. Raad, neem uw verantwoordelijkheid.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, dimineață, în cadrul unui interviu la TV, am fost întrebat ce aş schimba eu oare în cadrul mecanismelor de luare a deciziilor la nivelul instituțiilor europene? Primul lucru pe care l-aş face ar fi acela de a-i obliga pe toți birocratii de la Bruxelles care se ocupă de dosarele privind lupii și urșii să meargă în Munții Făgăraș sau în Alpii francezi, locuri care mustesc de lupi și de urși, și să păzească o turmă de oi măcar o săptămână. I-aş obliga, de asemenea, stimați colegi, să stea de vorbă cu cele 269 de persoane din România mutilate pe viață de către urs și cu familiile celor 26 de persoane care au fost ucise. Și să le explicați cât de mult vă plac, dumneavoastră, lupii și urșii.

Curtea de Conturi Europeană, în opinia mea, ar trebui să verifice dacă nu poate fi atrasă răspunderea financiară a funcționarilor care stau în expectativă și nu sunt atenți la ceea ce înseamnă milioanele de euro plătite către fermieri pentru animalele ucise. Nu se poate, stimați colegi, ca noi să stăm să discutăm acest subiect de ani de zile, să stăm blocați în diverse proceduri birocratice și nimeni să nu răspundă. Să fie foarte clar, stimați colegi, va trebui să vină un moment în care cineva să răspundă din cauza acestui comportament și din cauza acestui imobilism instituțional, până la urmă.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já tady budu hovořit ve prospěch vlků, aby ta debata byla trošku vyrovnaná. Paní komisařko, já to rozhodnutí méně chránit vlka považuji za špatné rozhodnutí. Nejsou pro to žádné vědecké argumenty. Vaše analýza Komise vědecké argumenty neobsahuje. Je to pouze důsledek tlaku zemědělců před volbami, kteří jako lobbisté chtějí snížit počet vlků. Chtějí snížit počet vlků, aby byla méně napadána jatečná zvířata. Vy tady děláte, jako by kozy a ovce byly domácí mazlíčci a jakoby tato zvířata stejně nebyla odsouzena na jatka.

Řešme to tedy tak, že dáme více peněz na stavby ochranných prostředků, plotů a lépe chraňme tedy zvířata, která jsou vlky napadána. Ale chceme-li biodiverzitu, pokud to myslíme s biodiverzitou vážně a není to pouze volební a politický slogan, pak zkrátka nemůžeme vlky stílet. Dvacet tisíc kusů není velká populace, odborníci se na tom shodují.

Takže moc prosím, vezměte rozum do hrsti. Jinak to působí pokrytecky, že Evropská unie chrání biodiverzitu a chrání druhy, které se z přírody ztratily a teď se do ní vrací.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, yo celebro mucho que la Comisión esté dispuesta a revisar el nivel de protección del lobo en Europa. Postura que va en la línea de lo defendido desde el año 2021 por la Xunta de Galicia y otras regiones afectadas por esta problemática en España, mi país.

Ahora necesitamos que el Consejo —hoy ausente, lamentablemente— tome una decisión lo antes posible para permitir que la Unión Europea presente la propuesta de modificación del estatuto de protección del lobo en la próxima reunión del Comité Permanente del Convenio de Berna.

No se pueden ignorar las legítimas preocupaciones de quienes viven en el campo y, en especial, de los ganaderos europeos. Tienen un auténtico problema con el lobo. Urge alcanzar un equilibrio entre los intereses del sector primario y la conservación de la especie.

Me preocupa que, en España, el Gobierno haya adoptado medidas de manera unilateral —justo lo contrario de lo que pide la Comisión Europea— y haya extremado el nivel de protección del lobo sin respaldo científico. Espero que ahora tome nota, escuche a las autoridades europeas y no se oponga a la propuesta de la Comisión en el Consejo.

Se trata de un asunto de mucha relevancia para comunidades como Galicia, Cantabria, Asturias y Castilla y León. Espero que, dada la información disponible sobre el estado del lobo, el Gobierno español, por fin, corrija sus decisiones en esta materia.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, o vlkovi zde hovoříme opakovaně. Já mám pocit, že nemůžeme hovořit o nějaké velké populaci evropského vlka. Dvacet tisíc kusů, to skutečně není velká populace. Buďme rádi, že jsme se na tyto stavy dostali. Řekněme si to, prosím, upřímně, kdyby nebylo před evropskými volbami, tak bychom se o této aktivitě Evropské komise vůbec nebavili. Mě toto pokrytectví skutečně štve, protože si myslím, že v této chvíli bychom potřebovali spíše posílit skutečně biodiverzitu, posílit spíše ochranu vlka jako takového nebo minimálně nechat na stejné úrovni a jednoznačně zvýšit finanční kompenzace, které mají příslušet za náhradu za případné škody, které vlk způsobí.

Já jsem docela naštvaný z toho, že v této situaci vlastně Evropská komise vychází vstříc volání, které skutečně souvisí s evropskými volbami, a považují to za pokrytectví.

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Fru. formand! Jeg skal hilse fra Alexander Holm, en dansk biolog med speciale i naturbeskyttelse, som sender disse ord. Ulvedebatten er en sær størrelse. Fra ulvekritikerne skal vi igen og igen høre om, hvordan ulven i Europa er farlig. Uanset at der ikke har været et eneste prædatorisk angreb på mennesker siden 1974, uanset at problemulve; de ulve, der kan forcere et ulvesikret hegn, dem, der har mistet deres skyhed mod mennesker, dem der udgør en trussel for hunde, de allerede må skydes! Hvorfor kræver I mere end det? Hvorfor kalder I ulve, der ikke er et problem, for et problem? Vi har en kæmpe succes i Europa med en model, hvor rovdyr i toppen af fødekæden kan sameksistere med mennesker og deres husdyr. Efter 50 succesfulde år vil det være et gevaldigt selvmål at ødelægge modellen. Landbrugets hidtidige måde at behandle naturen på har givet os en biodiversitetskrise. Måske er tiden inde til at lytte til andre end alene landmændene og ponyejerne. Tiden er rindet ud for løsninger og landbrug, der ikke vil være kompatible med stor natur og vilde dyr. Så sæt et hegn op, læg ulveriflerne og sigt grønnere.

Martin Hojsík (Renew). – Pani predsedajúca, ako keby sme počúvali zase rozprávky, rozprávky o zlom vlkovi, ktorý zožral babičku, a preto ho treba zabiť. Pritom realita je úplne iná. Vlky pomáhajú dokonca farmárom, pretože bránia šíreniu afrického moru ošipaných. Vlky pomáhajú farmárom tým, že znižujú stavy raticovej zveri, ktorá spôsobila na Slovensku násobne vyššie škody farmárom ako vlky samotné.

Musíme naučiť spoluužívať, musíme naučiť farmárov, ako sa vedia vlkom brániť. Slovenský čuvač, obyčajný pes, dokáže ochrániť stáda pred akýmkoľvek vlkom. Robme s prírodou a nenechajme sa uniesť tým, že potrebujeme zase bezhlavo strieľať. Mechanizmy na to, ako riešiť problémové vlky máme, na to nepotrebuje žiadnu zmenu. Tieto mechanizmy ochrania ako hospodárske zvieratá, tak poníky.

Európa potrebuje žiť s prírodou a riešenia pre našu budúcnosť sú v spolupráci s prírodou, nie v strieľaní.

Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, réveillons-nous! Ne faisons pas du loup le bouc émissaire de la crise du monde agricole. À l'approche des élections, Ursula von der Leyen cède aux pressions des lobbies de la chasse et de l'agriculture industrielle. La proposition de la Commission d'adapter le statut de protection du loup sous la convention de Berne pourrait autoriser la chasse du loup. Pire, elle pourrait mettre en danger le pilier de la politique environnementale européenne, la directive Habitats. Cette proposition n'a pas de nouvelle base scientifique. Favoriser l'abattage des loups n'est pas une solution durable pour la sécurité des troupeaux. Cela peut même être contre-productif. De nombreux tirs sont déjà autorisés chaque année dans l'Union européenne, notamment en France, avec une efficacité discutée.

La Commission européenne l'a même rappelé tout à l'heure, la solution passe par la cohabitation. Il faut travailler avec les éleveurs, les bergers, et les aider à renforcer les systèmes de protection des troupeaux, que ce soit avec les chiens de berger, mais aussi avec toutes les autres solutions techniques dont on dispose. Dommage que la droite européenne préfère poursuivre sa mascarade populiste.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I have been carefully listening to the various positions expressed by you on this topic and – if you allow me a short side comment – I am coming from the country where *lupus* has a special status: it is national animal.

But from Commission point of view, we are willing to fully cooperate with the Council for the follow-up of our proposal regarding the protection status of the wolf under the Bern Convention in view of a timely decision. And the adaptation of the protection status for the wolf is meant to reflect the significant recovery since the end of the twentieth century in Europe.

Therefore, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, it is justified to allow more flexibility to national authorities to decide on the most appropriate measures to better address the situation in their specific regional contexts.

But it is also important to recall that if the wolf were moved to Appendix III of the Bern Convention, it would still remain a protected species. While providing more management flexibility to contracting parties, the obligation to conserve healthy wolf populations and to keep them out of danger would remain.

So, if the Commission proposal that was tabled on 20 December 2023 is agreed by a qualified majority of Member States in the Council, the EU will be enabled to table the amendment proposal at the next meeting of the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention, and the next meeting of the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention is scheduled to take place end of 2024.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Loránt Vincze (PPE), *írásban*. – A farkas és a romániai (pontosabban székelyföldi) barnamedve populáció látványos növekedése európai sikertörténet volna, ha nem árnyékolná be egyre több szerencsétlenség. A medvének sok ember esik áldozatául, a gazdasági károk jelentősek. A nagyarányú állománynövekedés miatt a természetes élőhelyükről kiszoruló medvék élelmet keresve a településeken gazdaságokat támadnak és dézsmálnak meg, haszonállatokat ölnek meg, emberekkel kerülnek összetűzésbe.

Változtatásra, jogszabályi rugalmasságra van szükség, hogy megelőzzük a konfliktusokat, régióinkban ne a félelem uralkodjon. Éppen ezért üdvözlöm, hogy a Bizottság nemrég a farkas védelmi státuszának módosítására tett javaslatot. A korábbi parlamenti határozat azonban nem csupán a farkas megnövekedett populációja miatt kialakult helyzetre hívta fel a figyelmet, hanem a barnamedve által jelentett veszélyre is. A polgárok hatékony intézkedéseket várnak el az EU-tól. A megoldás hasonló lenne a farkaséhoz, módosítani kell a medvék védelmi státuszát.

23. Îmbunătățirea protecției Uniunii împotriva manipulării pieței în cadrul pieței angro de energie (dezbateri)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Maria da Graça Carvalho, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica i regolamenti (UE) n. 1227/2011 e (UE) 2019/942 per migliorare la protezione dell'Unione dalla manipolazione del mercato nel mercato dell'energia all'ingrosso (COM(2023)0147 - C9-0050/2023 - 2023/0076(COD)) (A9-0261/2023).

Maria da Graça Carvalho, *relatora*. – Senhora Presidente, Cara Comissária, Caros Colegas, este novo regulamento sobre a transparência e integridade dos mercados grossistas da energia, que nos preparamos para aprovar, é uma componente importante da reforma do desenho do mercado da eletricidade.

Importante, porque nos remete para uma dimensão fundamental que é a confiança. Confiança nos mercados, confiança nos operadores que nestes atuam, tanto no setor da energia propriamente dito como no setor financeiro. Confiança dos consumidores europeus, particulares e empresas.

A invasão da Ucrânia pela Rússia, com as consequências conhecidas ao nível do preço da energia, tornou clara a necessidade de reforçarmos os mecanismos que nos protegem destas crises.

O REMIT tem sido um mecanismo relevante na prevenção das tentativas de manipulação dos mercados. Os reguladores nacionais têm cumprido o seu papel, como atestam os muitos casos de violação deste regulamento em que têm atuado e, quando justificado, punido os infratores.

Mas, na sequência da crise dos preços da energia, foram identificadas fragilidades que importa ultrapassar. Entre elas, lacunas legais que eram exploradas e também alguma sobreposição de normas, dificuldades para articular a investigação em determinados casos, nomeadamente em casos transnacionais.

Para ultrapassarmos estas lacunas e fragilidades, procurei, enquanto relatora, introduzir emendas guiadas por três princípios fundamentais e orientadores, uma dimensão europeia mais forte, coerência legislativa e transparência e um mercado reforçado. Nas negociações com o Conselho foi possível chegar a um entendimento cobrindo todos estes domínios. Entre os progressos alcançados, gostaria de referir, na dimensão europeia, um reforço dos poderes da Agência de Cooperação dos Reguladores da Energia, o ACER.

O critério para identificação de casos transfronteiriços que podem ser investigados foi modificado. Até agora estes casos teriam de envolver pelo menos três Estados-Membros, agora o mínimo serão dois. Mas a ACER vê também a sua capacidade de investigação reforçada, passando a poder desencadear e conduzir processos de investigação. Além disso, poderá aplicar sanções pecuniárias a operadores que não cooperem com as suas diligências.

Ao mesmo tempo, fortalecemos também os reguladores nacionais. No plano da coerência legislativa e da transparência, conseguimos um melhor alinhamento das definições dos mercados da energia para evitar sobreposições e sobrecarga administrativa.

Foi feita a integração adequada de outras normas pertinentes, nomeadamente a disposição relativa ao gás natural liquefeito, que foram adotadas de forma transitória durante a crise.

No que respeita ao reforço do mercado, reduzimos a burocracia, assegurámos o acesso adequado a atores de países terceiros e protegemos os investimentos, que só serão tornados públicos quando for claro que esta informação poderá afetar o mercado.

Poderia acrescentar muito mais, mas é hora de passar a palavra aos meus colegas e começar este debate que, espero, seja esclarecedor para todos nós.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I am extremely pleased to be here today for this very important occasion to endorse the revised Regulation on Wholesale Energy Market Integrity and Transparency – the so-called REMIT.

This revision is key to guarantee that the EU is protected against market manipulation and market abuse, also when it is stemming from external suppliers. It was presented last year by the Commission as a key element in view of the electricity market design reform. The EU's integrated and interconnected energy market is our biggest asset and its proper functioning is crucial. That is exactly what REMIT is ensuring.

Well-functioning energy markets are key to delivering the EU Green Deal and REPowerEU plan objectives. They build trust among all players and contribute to EU competitiveness.

I convey my warmest thanks to the rapporteur, Ms Carvalho, and to the team of shadow rapporteurs for all your efforts and remarkable work in bringing this important file to a successful and ambitious conclusion. The Parliament played a key role in delivering this file and it is a major improvement compared to the current rules.

First and foremost, the agreed provisions under REMIT introduced a new enforcement regime with ACER's enhanced role in cross-border investigations. It would allow it to pursue more effectively important cross-border cases with the most significant impact on the markets. This has been a challenge under the current framework, so it is a major step forward.

There are also several other improvements, not less important. The new REMIT will improve market transparency by streamlining, at the EU level, the process for collection and disclosure of inside information. It will enhance supervision of reporting parties and data sharing between relevant authorities.

We will increase market transparency through an LNG price assessment and benchmark and there will be more effective enforcement towards third country companies that will have to designate a representative in the EU specifically mandated for REMIT compliance.

I am looking forward to the plenary vote for REMIT tomorrow, because swift implementation will be key to ensuring timely enforcement and protection against any market abuse, including in important cross-border cases.

Ondřej Kovařík, *zpravodaj Hospodářského a měnového výboru*. – Paní předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, před dvěma lety jsme doslova zažili šok. Cena elektrické energie vyskočila na rekordní hodnoty násobně vyšší, než jsme byli zvyklí, a tento šok postihl naprosto všechny: domácnosti, firmy, ale například města a obce. A s následky se v podobě inflace potýkáme dodnes a ještě nějakou dobu budeme. Je tedy dobře, že zasahujeme také tam, kde se cena elektrické energie tvoří, tedy na trhu.

Návrh řešení, o kterém se dnes bavíme, k tomuto míří. Má za cíl přispět ke stabilitě cen energií, omezit jejich skokové výkyvy například snížením propojení tvorby cen elektrické energie na dalších zdrojích, jako je plyn. Důležitou částí je také lepší ochrana spotřebitelů, koncových uživatelů energií, především domácností. Na ty vysoké ceny často dopadly velmi drtivě.

Nová opatření bojují proti manipulacím na trhu tak, aby nedocházelo k nelegálním praktikám ovlivňování obchodního prostředí, jako je klamavé jednání. V neposlední řadě je nutné, stejně jak jste zmínila, paní komisařko, posílit dohled nad obchodníky, nad trhem, aby plnili své povinnosti a dodržovali pravidla. Bez toho bychom se totiž očekávané změny vůbec nemuseli dočkat.

Patrizia Toia, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, approviamo una riforma molto importante, collegata a quella del mercato elettrico, il *market design*, al regolamento su gas, biometano e idrogeno, una riforma che riguarda la protezione dell'Unione – sono parole molto impegnative – rispetto alle manipolazioni di mercato.

Quello che è successo nel 2021 e 2022 nei mercati energetici all'ingrosso, con gli aumenti esorbitanti e stratosferici dei prezzi, è stato uno shock. Certamente, ci sono delle ragioni che si possono spiegare: l'aumento della domanda da molte aree del mondo dopo il COVID, la riduzione del gas russo. Tutte ragioni concrete.

Però c'è stato dell'altro e non possiamo negarlo. Ci sono state certamente azioni di manipolazione di mercato, se non di vere e proprie speculazioni finanziarie, e il messaggio che ne è derivato è stato molto chiaro: dobbiamo intervenire e intervenire bene perché ciò non accada. Lo scopo è dunque creare regole di vigilanza più stringenti, più efficaci. E io ho insistito, assieme alla relatrice e agli altri colleghi, perché si compisse veramente un balzo in avanti, affinché questa riforma non fosse così formale.

Noi non vogliamo – come i liberisti temono – manipolare il mercato, rinchiuderlo, impedirgli di funzionare. Vogliamo che funzioni bene per garantire i cittadini e le imprese, perché il mercato non sia danno ma sia il luogo dove tutto possa avvenire con chiarezza e trasparenza.

Abbiamo anche insistito per mettere qualche regola di trasparenza agli operatori extraeuropei, perché anche quelli devono rispondere alle nostre logiche e al nostro criterio di buon funzionamento.

Jakop G. Dalunde, för Verts/ALE-gruppen. – Fru talman! När det gäller finansmarknaden ser vi det som självklart att det behövs reglering och övervakning för att skydda konsumenterna och se till att marknaden inte manipuleras. Nu har äntligen EU vaknat upp till det faktum att vi behöver samma sak för vår elmarknad. Konsumenterna behöver skydd, inte minst när det gäller gränsöverskridande handel. Konsumenterna ska kunna känna sig trygga med att det går rätt till och att vi inte får manipulerade priser och därmed orimligt höga elkostnader.

Den här lagstiftningen är ett stort steg framåt. Den är en seger både för oss i Europaparlamentet, som fått med oss kommissionen och rådet på mer progressiv lagstiftning, och för Europas konsumenter, som nu kommer få bättre skydd. Vi ökar insynen, vi ökar transparensen och vi ser till att den europeiska myndigheten har möjlighet att kunna göra egna undersökningar vid de tillfällen då nationella myndigheter inte agerar.

Europas medborgare ska kunna lita på att det pris de betalar i elräkningen är det verkliga priset och att det inte skett manipulation, varken av europeiska bolag eller av främmande makt, som riskerar att kunna använda elmarknaden som ett vapen. Detta sätter vi nu stopp för, och det är mycket bra.

Johan Nissinen, för ECR-gruppen. – Fru talman! EUs klimatpolitik har framför allt handlat om förnybar energi. För konsumenten har det inneburit att billig el har blivit dyr. På detta tillkommer också kostnader för dyra husrenoveringar, utbyggnad av laddstolpar till elbilar, koldioxidskatter och massiva klimatregleringar.

Det som gör det hela så sorgligt är att det här inte ens har någon betydande effekt på det globala klimatet, då resten av världen inte följer EU:s kostsamma väg.

Politikens fokus borde ligga på att skapa framtidsutsikter för medborgarna, att så många som möjligt har ett jobb och en stabil inkomst, att ekonomisk tillväxt är möjlig och att folk har möjlighet att äga sin egen bostad. Det kräver en energipolitik som är rationell och som är baserad på marknadsekonomi och inte dagens planekonomi som EU sysslar med.

Dan Nica (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, în sfârșit, specula în privința prețurilor energiei primește un răspuns dur, așteptat de către toți cei care au fost victimele acestor practici înșelătoare, ilegale. Mă refer aici la firme – unele dintre care au dat faliment-, care au trebuit să plătească prețuri nejustificate, oameni care și-au pierdut locurile de muncă, oameni care acasă au trebuit să renunțe la cele necesare ca să poată să-și plătească factura la energie.

Iar ei primesc astăzi din partea noastră un răspuns puternic, un răspuns pe care îl așteptau: măcar să știe că cei care s-au ocupat de practicile acestea înșelătoare au furat, au manipulat piața, au recurs la speculă. Astăzi, noi am hotărât să fie pedepsiți - 15 % din cifra de afaceri pentru firmele care s-au ocupat cu asemenea practici, 5 milioane de euro pentru directorii generali ai acestor firme care au recurs la practici înșelătoare.

Doamnă comisară, ACER, agenția europeană din domeniu, are 379 de cazuri care încă nu au început investigațiile. Trebuie să le asigurați resurse, bani și imediat să poată să ia măsurile necesare împotriva acestor firme care au furat și au distrus o bună parte a economiei Uniunii Europene și viața și bunăstarea cetățenilor europeni. Vreau să văd primul director general de companie de energie care plătește amenda de 5 milioane de euro. Doar atunci acest semnal va fi înțeles corect și nimeni nu va mai îndrăzni să fure, să mintă și să înșele în Uniunea Europeană.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, je skutečností, že před dvěma lety zažili evropští spotřebitelé opravdu obrovský cenový skok a také cenový šok. My jsme jim slibovali a slibujeme stále, že dojde k vytvoření efektivní energetické unie. A čas letí a stále tato energetická unie nefunguje. Čeho jsme byli svědky v uplynulých letech? Manipulací cen, netransparentnosti a vlastně podlamování energetické soběstačnosti Evropské unie.

Já se domnívám, že ten návrh, který je zde předložen, jde správným směrem, že má zamezovat spekulacím, zvýšit konkurenceschopnost a také kontrolovatelnost cen. Takže v tomto směru je dobré, když zastavíme všechny ty nekalé praktiky. Chtěl bych Evropskou komisi vyzvat, aby v této věci skutečně byla velmi aktivní, aby nechala vlky být, vzhledem k tomu předchozímu pojednávánímu bodu, a věnovala se skutečně povinnostem, které má na úseku energií a dodávek této komodity pro spotřebitele.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, let me congratulate the Parliament again for the broad agreement that has been reached on REMIT.

And I want to thank once again the rapporteur, Madam Carvalho, and the shadows for the very good cooperation, because it was instrumental to deliver REMIT in a short time frame such a high quality.

The Commission will work together with Member States and stakeholders to support a swift and correct implementation of these crucial measures. We are already preparing follow-up actions resulting from the revised REMIT, including new delegated acts to outline necessary and detailed technical rules.

And finally, the Commission looks forward to the upcoming approval of the electricity market design reform, and the hydrogen and decarbonised gas package. And when you will have votes on these, then this will conclude our legislative work on the EU's future-proof energy markets.

Maria da Graça Carvalho, *relatora*. – Senhora Presidente, obrigada colegas pelos vossos contributos. Não tenho muito mais a acrescentar ao que disse e ao que foi aqui debatido. Quero, no entanto, aproveitar para agradecer a todos os que contribuíram para a conclusão da revisão deste regulamento num prazo tão curto: aos colegas e, especialmente, aos relatores-sombra pela boa cooperação; ao Conselho, nomeadamente à Presidência espanhola; à Comissão Europeia, na pessoa da Senhora Comissária Kadri Simson; e à DG Energia, por estar sempre disponível para connosco dialogar. Às equipas técnicas, todas elas, e, em especial, aos conselheiros e assistentes do Parlamento Europeu, e ao meu assistente que coordenou o trabalho técnico no meu gabinete, Andrea Leonardelli.

Todos fizeram um trabalho notável em pouco tempo, num relatório que é extremamente técnico e exigente. Estou convicta de que o fruto deste trabalho irá garantir maior transparência num setor tão importante para a nossa economia e acredito que os consumidores europeus, todos os consumidores, particulares e empresas, ficarão assim mais protegidos.

Resta-me desejar que tanto a Comissão Europeia como os Estados-Membros sejam céleres na aplicação do que falta fazer, porque esta é muito importante para a resiliência e autonomia estratégica da União Europeia.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà domani.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

András Gyürk (NI), *írásban*. – Az Európai Bizottság kudarcos szankciói és elhibázott energiapolitikája súlyos válsághoz vezetett az Európai Unióban. A Brüsszel által előidézett helyzetben az energiapiacok normális működési rendjének felborulása hozzájárult a lakossági rezsizsámlák emelkedéséhez és megnehezítette a vállalkozások működésének tervezését.

Ezért időszerű a nagykereskedelmi energiapiacokon folytatott manipulációval szembeni védelem erősítése és a REMIT-rendelet szigorítása. A Ház előtt lévő rendeletmódosítás előrelépést jelenthet a nyílt és tiszta verseny területén. Egyrészt, a harmadik országbéli szereplők szabályozása, illetve a jelentéstételi kötelezettségek átláthatóbbá tehetik az energiapiacok működését. Másrészt az illetékes hatóságok jogköreinek bővítésével erősödhetnek a piaci felügyeleti mechanizmusok is. Végül örömteli, hogy a módosított REMIT-rendelet kiterjed az új kereskedelmi gyakorlatok, mint például az algoritmikus kereskedelem, szabályozására is. A módosított jogszabály valóban hozzájárulhat a lakossági és vállalati energiaszámlák kiszámíthatóságának, tervezhetőségének javításához. Azonban a megfogalmazott célok eléréséhez és az energiapiacok valódi stabilizálásához legfőképpen a józan észre építő európai energiapolitikára van szükség. Ezt nem remélhetjük a már leszerepelt Európai Bizottságtól. Ezért idén júniusban változást kell elérni Brüsszelben.

24. Cadrul pentru identitatea digitală europeană (dezbattere)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Romana Jerković, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica il regolamento (UE) n. 910/2014 per quanto riguarda l'istituzione di un quadro per un'identità digitale europea (COM(2021)0281 - C9-0200/2021 - 2021/0136(COD)) (A9-0038/2023).

Romana Jerković, rapporteur. – Madam President, dear colleagues, in today's digital era the term 'digital identity' frequently arises in relation to many of our daily activities. Whether we talk about online banking, shopping online, accessing government services online, or simply signing up for a new social media account, we all use our digital identity on a daily basis.

But our increased presence online raises multiple security challenges: identity theft, cyber-attacks and monetisation of personal data. It is our duty to protect citizens and empower them by giving them full control over the use and sharing of their personal data.

Under the new law, the biggest innovation is the European Digital Identity Wallet. This virtual and personal digital wallet, in the form of a mobile application, will allow citizens to identify themselves to safely store, manage and share personal data and documents in digital form across the EU. These include a driving licence, medical prescriptions, passports or university diplomas.

While many large tech companies today are offering their own digital wallets, the truth is that too often our personal data is used to track our online activity and is sold to marketing companies that use that data to target us with aggressive advertising.

We spend a lot of time debating about privacy and security. We insisted on including in the regulation two important principles. The first is cybersecurity by design, meaning that the wallet should be designed with the goal of preventing a cybersecurity breach, rather than repairing the problem once it occurs.

The second is privacy by design, which does not allow the issuer of the wallet to track user behaviour and to observe transactions taking place within the wallet. This concept will enforce data minimisation and help address the issue of excessive mining of personal data by big platforms.

The ambition of Parliament, and myself as rapporteur, was to give an alternative to all Europeans and to challenge the status quo. We wanted the digital wallet to be a practical tool that both European citizens and businesses will be able to use on a regular basis to solve their most practical day-to-day situations. And I think we achieved that objective.

Citizens will be able to prove their identity in a secure and privacy-friendly way, and share and electronically sign personal documents from their digital wallets with the click of a button on their mobile phone. Europeans will be able to access both public and private online services across the EU. Examples of these could be applying for a loan, submitting tax declarations, enrolling for a university, renting an apartment, online voting in elections or registering a newly born child.

It is important to emphasise that the holding of the wallet will be entirely a voluntary choice of the citizens. Moreover, this regulation has enormous potential to improve the quality, access and transparency of public services through digitalisation. This is crucial because not all Europeans have access to modern and efficient public services, such as Estonia or Denmark. We need to change this.

Finally, we also need to address the lack of interoperability. Today, only a small fraction of online public services can be accessed cross border. We need to overcome these virtual barriers across Europe by enabling access to interoperable public, private and cross-border digital services. Thanks to the new regulation and harmonised standards, citizens will finally be able to use their nationally issued digital IDs seamlessly in all Member States.

And let's face it, our societal interests, such as the right to privacy, lost out in the favour of big commercial interests. Now it's time for us to mobilise and to make technology adapt to people, instead of the reverse.

Andrus Ansip, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection*. – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, in Estonia, the digital identity has been in use for more than 20 years. It has been a success story – soon people were giving 1.3 million digital signatures per week. Our population is only 1.3 million.

Thanks to the digital signature, we save one working week a year, which is equal to 2% of GDP. Convenient digital solutions are available in every Member State, but unfortunately, cross-border access is poor because mutual recognition of digital identities has been a problem. I hope that with the digital identity wallet, we will take the necessary step towards the mutual recognition of digital identities in the European Union.

Pascal Arimont, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Rechtsausschusses*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Wir beschäftigen uns heute mit der europäischen digitalen Identität. Es ist ein Instrument, um digital unterwegs zu sein, um uns zu identifizieren oder Dienstleistungen im Internet sicher auszuführen. Damit es funktioniert, muss dieses Instrument zunächst vertrauenswürdig sein und sicher sein, sonst wird es nicht funktionieren. Wenn es so ist – und die Diskussionen, die wir in den Ausschüssen dazu hatten, waren extrem komplex, extrem technisch komplex, aber auch juristisch komplex –, wenn es denn funktioniert, und ich gehe fest davon aus, dann kann man damit Bankkonten eröffnen, Autos anmieten, Behördengänge machen, Bewerbungen machen und vieles, vieles einfacher und sicherer im Internet. Oder man kann zum Beispiel diese Identität nutzen, damit Jugendliche altersgerecht sich auf Social-Media-Plattformen einloggen können und das auch dann sichergestellt werden kann.

Die digitale Brieftasche – mit dieser Brieftasche werden wir viel leichter online nachweisen können, wer man ist und was man kann. Ich glaube, das ist eine gute Sache. Wir müssen die volle Kontrolle über unsere Daten behalten. Wir können auch Pseudonyme verwenden, werden also nicht zum gläsernen Bürger. Und auch etwas, was ganz wichtig ist: Die Leute, die nicht digital unterwegs sind, die werden nicht vergessen. Das haben wir in die Verordnung reingeschrieben und garantiert, dass es dort nicht zu Benachteiligungen kommt.

Thierry Breton, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, veuillez pardonner ma minute de retard. Mesdames et Messieurs les députés européens, tout d'abord, si vous le permettez, je voudrais remercier votre rapporteure, madame Romana Jerković, pour ce travail remarquable, ainsi que les rapporteurs fictifs et leurs équipes. Vous avez travaillé sans relâche à la finalisation de ce cadre normatif relatif à l'identité numérique qui est une véritable révolution en soi. Ceci a abouti à un accord politique solide, je peux le dire, le 8 novembre dernier.

Depuis le début du mandat, nous avons fait d'énormes progrès pour structurer le marché intérieur du numérique. Mais la situation ne serait pas complète sans une identité numérique unique, sécurisée et respectueuse de la vie privée afin de permettre un accès sûr et pratique au monde numérique et à tous les services qu'ils offrent. Permettez-moi tout d'abord de souligner quelques aspects importants de ce cadre juridique.

Tout d'abord, il permet aux citoyens de reprendre le contrôle de leur identité et de leurs données. Le portefeuille européen, l'identité numérique, est non seulement pleinement conforme au cadre réglementaire européen en matière de protection des données, mais il le renforce. Les citoyens pourront partager la quantité minimale nécessaire de données pour un cas d'utilisation particulier et rien de plus. L'identité numérique des citoyens européens n'est ainsi plus laissée par défaut, comme c'est aujourd'hui trop souvent le cas, entre les seules mains des grandes plateformes. Je tiens ici à reconnaître l'excellent travail accompli par cette institution, grâce notamment aux amendements proposés.

Les citoyens disposeront d'un tableau de bord offrant une vue d'ensemble complète du partage de leurs données. En ce qui concerne l'observabilité, je me félicite de l'inclusion de ce concept dans le règlement, et je tiens à confirmer que le texte sur lequel nous nous sommes mis d'accord ne permet pas le traitement des données à caractère personnel contenues dans le portefeuille ou résultant de son utilisation à d'autres fins que celui de la fourniture des services du portefeuille.

Un autre sujet très débattu a été le rôle des QWACs, ces certificats qui confirment l'identité de l'entité qui se tient derrière un site web. Ils empêchent la fraude, protègent l'identité et les droits fondamentaux des consommateurs dans le monde numérique et aussi constituent un élément important du cadre européen de confiance.

Je répète ici la nouvelle obligation pour les navigateurs web de reconnaître les QWACs ne restreint en rien leur politique de sécurité puisque les navigateurs web pourront appliquer leurs propres procédures et critères afin de préserver la sécurité des communications en ligne, sans imposer, par exemple, la manière dont ils vont authentifier les clés cryptographiques. Dans ce contexte, je voudrais également rappeler, si vous le permettez, les déclarations écrites que la commission a faites sur ces deux points importants que sont l'inobservabilité et les certificats d'authentification.

Le deuxième point que je souhaitais souligner devant vous ce soir sont les très nombreuses possibilités innovantes qui sont offertes par ce texte, et la réduction de la charge administrative facilitée aussi par le portefeuille d'identification. Ce portefeuille va permettre d'accéder sans discontinuité aux services en ligne, tant privés que publics, peu importe où ils se trouvent dans l'Union européenne.

Cela va permettre d'accélérer la mise en place d'un véritable marché intégré du numérique qui nous a fait défaut et qui aujourd'hui est riche de toutes les promesses que nous pourrions attendre des services qui vont en être issus. Le portefeuille va créer de nouveaux débouchés commerciaux pour les entreprises européennes et va stimuler ces nouveaux marchés, produits et services. Et cela va inciter également, c'est un élément qui est très important, à la numérisation de toute notre économie européenne.

Enfin, un point important, mais vous le savez, le portefeuille restera gratuit. Donc en conclusion, je crois vraiment qu'on peut dire qu'avec cette avancée majeure, le citoyen est au cœur du présent règlement. Tout résident et toute entreprise de l'Union qui souhaiterait utiliser le portefeuille européen d'identité numérique pourra le faire même si, je le rappelle, l'utilisation du portefeuille reste bien entendu entièrement volontaire.

Voilà, aujourd'hui, nous avons donc une occasion unique de faciliter la vie de nos concitoyens en leur fournissant une solution européenne, sûre et unique en matière d'identité numérique. Cela va placer l'Union européenne, là encore, à l'avant-garde des efforts en matière d'identité numérique sur la scène mondiale, et je crois pouvoir dire que ce sera une avancée tout à fait remarquable dans l'intérêt de nos concitoyens.

Written Statement by the Commission on draft Article 45

The Commission welcomes the agreement reached, which, in its view, clarifies that web browsers are required to ensure support and interoperability for the qualified website authentication certificates (QWACs) for the sole purpose of displaying the identity data of the owner of the website in a user-friendly manner. The Commission understands this obligation as not prejudging the methods used to display such identity data.

The Commission welcomes the agreement reached, which, in its view, clarifies that the requirement for the web browsers to recognise QWACs does not restrict browsers own security policies and that Article 45, as proposed, leaves it up to the web browsers to preserve and apply their own procedures and criteria in order to maintain and preserve the privacy of online communications using encryption and other proven methods. The Commission understands draft Article 45 as not imposing obligations or restrictions on how web browsers establish encrypted connections with websites or authenticate the cryptographic keys used when establishing those connections.

The Commission recalls that, in line with point 28 of the Interinstitutional Agreement between the European Parliament, the Council of the European Union and the European Commission on Better Law-Making of 13 April 2016, the Commission will make use of expert groups, consult targeted stakeholders and carry out public consultations, as appropriate.

Written Statement by the Commission on unobservability

The Commission welcomes the agreement reached, which in its view, confirms that this amending Regulation does not allow for the processing of personal data contained in or arising from the use of the European Digital Identity Wallet by the Wallet providers for other purposes than delivering wallet services.

The Commission also welcomes the inclusion of the concept of unobservability in Recital (11c) of the draft amending Regulation, which should prevent wallet providers from collecting and seeing the details of user's day-to-day transactions. The Commission is of the view that this concept means that there should not be correlation of data across different services for the purposes of user tracking or tracing or for determining, analysing and predicting personal behaviour, interests or habits.

At the same time, the Commission acknowledges that, in full compliance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the providers of European Digital Identity Wallets may access certain categories of personal data with the user's explicit consent, such as in order to ensure continuity in the provision of wallet services or to protect users from disruptions in their provision. That data should be limited to what is necessary for each specific purpose.

Riho Terras, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, digitalisation has been one of the two main priorities announced by President von der Leyen in the beginning of this mandate.

This regulation is the flagship of European digitalisation. All European citizens will have access to a highly secure digital identity. There will be a legally binding digital signature recognised throughout the European Union. This will simplify the everyday lives of European citizens when dealing with both public administration and the private sector. It will reduce the cost of doing business and lead to significant economic benefits.

In my home country, as Mr Ansip said, we have used this digital signature for 22 years and the results are very impressive. We have saved about 2% of the GDP per year due to efficiency in working hours. I am glad that we finally managed to conclude very long negotiations and a deal before the end of this mandate. It is a good deal which ensures the whole system is highly secure and trustworthy. I urge the colleagues to vote in favour of this agreement.

Brando Benifei, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, Commissario Breton, onorevoli colleghi, questo regolamento dà vita finalmente a una vera identità digitale europea. Ho seguito questo dossier grazie al mio ruolo di negoziatore per i Socialisti e Democratici nel parere formulato dalla commissione giuridica e permettetemi di fare per questo i complimenti alla relatrice generale, Romana Jerkovic, per l'ottimo lavoro fatto.

Il nuovo portafoglio europeo dell'identità digitale rispetterà la protezione dei dati e della privacy, sarà *open source*, su base volontaria e consentirà di memorizzare dati, credenziali e attributi personali per accedere facilmente ai servizi in tutti gli Stati membri. Tutto ciò, senza dover per forza pagare un fornitore commerciale: ad esempio, ai cittadini sarà garantito l'utilizzo di firme elettroniche gratuite.

Dopo il regolamento sull'intelligenza artificiale, l'Europa deve essere leader mondiale anche nel campo dell'identità digitale, mettendo al centro le persone e i loro diritti. Da oggi si è cittadini europei non solo offline ma anche online.

Alin Mituța, *în numele grupului Renew*. – Doamnă președintă, în primul rând, mă bucur că am ajuns după trei ani să avem pe masă acest acord privind portofelul digital european. Cred că este un instrument care va revoluționa modul în care interacționăm cu autoritățile statului, dar și cu companiile. Vom putea accesa servicii publice și vom avea toate documentele noastre la îndemână, direct pe telefon. Aceasta înseamnă eliminarea cozilor la ghișee și a timpului pierdut.

Toate acestea vor fi posibile, bineînțeles, respectând cele mai înalte standarde de securitate și de protecție a datelor cu caracter personal. Foarte important, deținătorul portofelului digital va avea control absolut asupra propriilor date. În plus, pentru mine a fost esențial ca portofelul digital să includă și o semnătură electronică gratuită pentru toți cetățenii europeni. Mă bucur că am reușit să avem acest lucru în textul final. Mulțumesc tuturor colegilor cu care am lucrat excelent la acest text, dar și echipelor noastre care au petrecut multe sute de ore în aceste negocieri.

Mikuláš Peksa, za skupinu Verts/ALE. – Paní předsedající, evropská digitální identita je určitě důležitou součástí digitální Evropy. Přináší teoreticky možnost významného zjednodušení každodenního života pro naše občany i podniky. Bohužel s sebou nese i určité obavy ohledně soukromí a bezpečnosti. Jako stínový zpravodaj jsem se snažil řešit tyto problémy, zejména co se týče povinné certifikace a takzvaného unikátního identifikačního čísla, které by se dalo zneužít k nebezpečnému sledování občanů.

Díky našim snahám se podařilo dosáhnout určitých záruk. Máme volitelné sdílení dat, máme částečně otevřený zdrojový kód. Digitální peněženka má být používána dobrovolně. To jsou určitě důležitá vítězství, ale bohužel stále existují rizika, protože ten návrh, tak jak je postavený, by přece jen potřeboval dopracovat. Jsou tam části, které by se daly zneužít ke sledování soukromí našich občanů. A to může být velký problém, speciálně ve státech, které jsou s právním státem na štíru, jako je třeba Maďarsko nebo Slovensko.

Takže ten finální návrh bohužel podpořit nemůžeme. Věřím tomu, že v Česku ta implementace proběhne v pořádku, protože tam mám plnou důvěru v našeho místopředsedu vlády pro digitalizaci, ale zbytku Evropy bych velice přál, abychom měli příležitost tento text ještě dopracovat.

Michiel Hoogeveen, namens de ECR-Fractie. – Voorzitter, hoe de Europese digitale identiteit tot stand is gekomen, is een belediging voor de democratie. In het Nederlandse parlement werd in december 2022 een motie bij meerderheid aangenomen, waarbij staatssecretaris van Digitalisering Van Huffelen werd opgeroepen niet in te stemmen met de Raadsconclusies over de Europese digitale identiteit. Deze brengt namelijk ernstige risico's met zich mee, zoals de centrale opslag van data en onveilig gebruikte technieken. Van Huffelen legde dit naast zich neer en stemde toch voor.

Het Nederlandse kabinet heeft dus ingestemd met een Europese wet waar de Tweede Kamer expliciet nee tegen heeft gezegd. Als in de EU nationale parlementen worden genegeerd, waarom zijn ze er dan überhaupt nog? De mensen die hierover moeten beslissen, zijn de Nederlandse kiezers via onze democratische mechanismen en procedures. Als we daartoe niet bereid zijn, dan kunnen we net zo goed onze nationale parlementen meteen sluiten en veranderen in een museum.

Gerolf Annemans, namens de ID-Fractie. – Voorzitter, collega's, vandaag staan we op een kruispunt. We moeten een beslissing nemen die in de toekomst diepgaande gevolgen zal hebben voor de vrijheden van Europese burgers en voor hun privacy. De hier voorgestelde wetgeving over een digitale identiteit voor de hele Europese Unie verbergt een gevaarlijke, ja zelfs een sinistere agenda.

Het idee van een digitale portemonnee legt in feite de laatste hand aan een pad dat ons zal leiden naar de totalecontrolemaatschappij. Of het nu Big Brother of Brave New World is: ik laat het in het midden. Het is een Europese Unie waarin elke transactie, elke beweging, elke interactie wordt vastgelegd. Een werelddeel waar de vrijheden van de burger afhankelijk kunnen worden gemaakt van een digitaal groen licht. Dit wordt geen comfort, maar een leiband. Geen wallet, geen portemonnee, maar een gevangenis.

Privacy-experts hebben sinds het ontstaan van dit voorstel de alarmbel geluid en gewaarschuwd. Want hoe vrijwillig is een systeem dat naleving van regels gecentraliseerd kan afdwingen door de toegang tot essentiële diensten toe te staan en dus ipso facto ook niet toe te staan? De Europese Unie kan van hieruit een allesomvattende en altijd durende QR-codemaatschappij worden.

Ik roep daarom mijn collega's op om het zekere voor het onzekere te nemen en om deze toegangspoort tot een sociaal kredietsysteem naar Chinees model te verwerpen. De keuze die voor ons ligt, is duidelijk: een toekomst van surveillance en controle omarmen, of de principes van vrijheid en autonomie hooghouden die onze democratische samenleving definiëren.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća,

Digitalnim kompasom Europska komisija postavila je ambiciozne ciljeve, pa će tako do 2030. ključne javne usluge u potpunosti morati biti dostupne putem Interneta. Taj cilj ne bi bilo moguće ostvariti bez uspostave europskog digitalnog identiteta. Zato sam se, kao izvjestitelj za digitalizaciju javnih usluga, snažno založio za uspostavu pouzdanog sustava digitalne identifikacije u Europskoj uniji.

Činjenica je da građani za korištenje različitih aplikacija svaki put stvaraju nove digitalne identitete ili se prijavljuju putem velikih digitalnih platformi pri čemu, uglavnom na strane privatne servere u trećim državama, pohranjuju osobne podatke. Zato je važno što će stvaranjem europskog digitalnog identiteta građani imati veću kontrolu nad osobnim podacima. Drugim riječima, manje će osobnih podataka europskih građana završiti u trećim državama. Usto, pomoću listica EU-a za digitalni identitet građani će moći dokazati određene osobne podatke, npr. dob, a da pritom ne moraju potpuno otkriti svoj identitet ili druge osobne podatke.

Stoga pozdravljam donošenje ove uredbe koja dolazi u trenutku kada dovršavamo pregovore o možda i najvažnijem zakonu u području digitalizacije, onom o stvaranju europskog prostora za zdravstvene podatke.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, a lo largo de esta legislatura hemos estado trabajando para redefinir la relación entre ciudadanía y mundo digital, estableciendo estándares que nos ayuden a navegar la transición digital, garantizando una ciudadanía plena —también en el mundo digital— que nos lleve a conocer y ejercer derechos en el entorno digital, pero también a gestionar sus riesgos.

El Marco para una Identidad Digital Europea es un ejercicio que debe ir acompañado de alfabetización digital y desarrollo de las competencias digitales de la ciudadanía, que es clave para reducir la brecha digital, ausencia de discriminación —garantizando la igualdad de acceso— y una firme apuesta por la privacidad y la ciberseguridad, esencial para conseguir la confianza necesaria.

Los y las socialistas queremos construir una Europa para las personas, inclusiva y en la que los datos y la privacidad sean un bien público que hay que proteger. Necesitamos alternativas públicas para los servicios que, de no ser así, ofrecerán las grandes empresas tecnológicas.

De esa manera, con esta propuesta conseguiremos hacer más seguros los servicios digitales, al tiempo que protegeremos los derechos de la ciudadanía y la salud de nuestras democracias.

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Madam President, the European Digital Identity Law is finally at the finish line. A European Digital Identity will give our citizens an easy and convenient way to interact with public administrations, cutting paperwork and making all of our lives easier. As Renew negotiator in the Committee on Legal Affairs, I fought to ensure that the law respects citizens' privacy, guarantees the security of the internet, and protects encryption. I'm glad to say that we achieved this.

The final text is unequivocal. Together with the European Commission's declaration, it says that governments should not be able to upend the security architecture of the internet. End-to-end encryption should be protected, and citizens' privacy should be guaranteed, both online and when using the wallet.

Thank you very much, Commissioner, for your work during the negotiations and for ensuring this written declaration. Thank you to the negotiation teams, and in particular to my colleagues, Alin Mituța and Andrus Ansip, for hearing our concerns for the best deal for European citizens.

Virginie Joron (ID). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, le QR Code, vous avez voulu l'inscrire dans le corps de nos concitoyens. Pas de transport, pas de soins médicaux, pas de discothèques, cafés debout, assis, couché ou plage dynamique. Le 12 juillet 2021 restera pour la France une journée noire pour nos libertés.

Cette tentation du QR Code et du crédit social à la chinoise, certains en rêvent ici. La tentation de la privation des libertés et de l'accès aux services publics et aux soins, la tentation d'identifier les citoyens obéissants et de punir les citoyens déviants en bloquant leurs comptes bancaires, comme au Canada, en Chine ou en Italie.

Évidemment, nous savons les facilités du numérique, et je n'aurais aucune crainte au sein d'un État respectueux de la démocratie. Mais nous avons vécu avec la COVID une dérive autoritaire sur des convictions qui se sont révélées erronées. Oui, l'identité numérique peut nous faire glisser vers un autre modèle de société. Et je finirai par ce passage de George Orwell, dans son livre «1984», qui prédisait la surveillance totale par les caméras de *Big Brother*: «Winston pouvait encore déchiffrer sur la façade l'inscription artistique des trois slogans du Parti: LA GUERRE, C'EST LA PAIX/ LA LIBERTÉ, C'EST L'ESCLAVAGE/ L'IGNORANCE, C'EST LA FORCE». Bienvenue en 2024!

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

Karen Melchior (Renew), question «carton bleu». – Madame Joron, je vous remercie beaucoup pour votre combat contre la surveillance. Mais comment allez-vous lutter contre la surveillance dans les autres directives, dans notre législation? Est-ce que vous allez dire non à la surveillance biométrique aux frontières de l'Europe ou pendant les Jeux Olympiques? Allez-vous vous battre pour la liberté de tous les citoyens en Europe, que ce soient des migrants ou des réfugiés, qu'ils soient danois ou français?

Virginie Joron (ID), réponse «carton bleu». – C'est un vaste sujet! La surveillance est importante. Et effectivement, aujourd'hui, nous avons des législations au niveau national qui encadrent déjà ce volet surveillance. Le problème, c'est la dérive liée à l'utilisation de ces nouveaux outils. La biométrie est peut-être utile pour certains services, notamment dans les aéroports, pour faciliter les passages, mais il faut l'encadrer. Il faut aussi voir quelle société utilise ce type de données parce qu'on le sait très bien, ce sont des données qui sont importantes et certaines entreprises les utilisent. On l'a vu avec l'affaire de Facebook: cette société a revendu à d'autres organisations les données obtenues.

Donc oui, la surveillance, il faut l'encadrer et nous continuerons à le faire. Mais il faut savoir quel usage en faire, c'est pour cela qu'il faut encadrer; c'est nécessaire d'être là en tant que garde-fous par rapport à ceux qui utilisent ces moyens utiles pour la société. On l'a vu dans le cas de la crise COVID: il y a eu des dérives, avec des discriminations à l'égard de certaines populations. Selon moi, c'est cela, le risque pour l'avenir, si on met cela dans les mains de services et d'autorités, disons, autoritaristes.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Johan Nissinen (ECR). – Fru talman! Visst låter det fantastiskt att vi ska kunna visa vår identitet och dela elektriska dokument inom EU genom en europeisk digital plånbok? Givetvis låter det för bra för att vara sant. Det medför allvarliga risker som inte kan ignoreras.

Särskilt oroande är det med korruptionsproblem i vissa medlemsstater. Kan vi lita på att dessa är kompetenta och respekterar den etiska hanteringen av dessa känsliga uppgifter, som till exempel Sverige gör? Nej, tyvärr tror jag inte det. Det är ytterst tveksamt och väcker misstanke om missbruk och olämplig övervakning.

Särskilt sätter våra medborgare säkerhet och privatliv på spel. Det är något vi måste tänka på innan vi antar ett sådant här förslag. Så länge vi har korrupta stater inom unionen riskerar vi medborgarnas säkerhet.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já vítám zřízení evropské digitální identity. Podle mého názoru tato iniciativa jde správným směrem. Nepochybně přispívá k digitalizaci naší ekonomiky a je dobrovolnou aktivitou našich občanů. Je důležité jim tento nástroj tedy dát k dispozici. Stále ale budou mít dostatečnou kontrolu nad svým soukromím a také bude zabezpečena dostatečná kontrola těchto dat.

Pro mě je důležité, že tento digitální podpis je platný jak ve veřejné správě, tak v soukromé sféře, že skutečně odstraňuje administrativní zátěž, přispívá k rozvoji podniků, je důležitým prvkem přístupu ke službám a opravdu je předpokladem pro zřízení integrovaného digitálního trhu. Takže podle mého názoru je to významný pokrok a je důležité, že – sice existují určité drobné výhrady – návrh zabezpečuje dostatečnou ochranu těchto dat.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Thierry Breton, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, mesdames et messieurs les parlementaires, madame la rapporteure, chère Romana, tout d'abord, je voudrais vous remercier pour ce débat instructif que nous avons eu ce soir. Nous sommes effectivement confrontés à une réalité complexe, évolutive, et nous devons construire ensemble notre voie.

Je voudrais souligner que l'utilisation des portefeuilles européens d'identité numérique rendra l'utilisation des services numériques plus sûre et plus pratique, tant pour nos concitoyens que pour nos entreprises. Si on compare le portefeuille aux méthodes d'identification en ligne bien établies, le portefeuille numérique des utilisateurs sera aussi pratique que les solutions actuelles, mais offrira aux citoyens plus de contrôle et plus de sécurité.

En ce qui concerne le portefeuille, ce qui est important, c'est que celui-ci n'exploitera pas de données à caractère personnel à des fins commerciales. C'est un point très important. Il ne permettra pas non plus un partage d'informations avec les gouvernements plus large que ce qui existe aujourd'hui. À l'heure actuelle, les utilisateurs partagent une multitude d'informations à caractère personnel, sans aucune visibilité ni aucun contrôle, parfois même sans le savoir.

Le portefeuille européen d'identité numérique introduit donc des garanties très solides pour la protection et le contrôle des données à caractère personnel. Les fournisseurs de portefeuilles ne peuvent pas non plus combiner des données d'identification à caractère personnel avec d'autres données à caractère personnel provenant d'autres services en ligne, à moins que les utilisateurs dûment informés ne l'autorisent explicitement.

Donc non, ce n'est en rien un modèle «à la chinoise» comme certains ont voulu le prétendre, y compris encore ce soir. Je vous remercie donc pour ce débat et compte sur votre soutien pour cette étape importante au sein du Parlement vers la finalisation d'un marché unique véritablement numérique et sûr.

Romana Jerković, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I would like to thank all the colleagues who took the floor tonight, and especially I would like to thank the shadows for their excellent cooperation. By working together, we are one step closer to a European Digital Identity for all European citizens, valid and recognised everywhere in Europe by all 27 national public administrations.

And finally, dear colleagues, digital or not, it's no longer a choice. It's a necessity and a process that cannot be undone. Technology is here and that's a fact. So let's take the best of the modern technology and let us not waste this opportunity. I invite you to support the deal tomorrow.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà domani.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. – Kauan odotettu ja tarpeellinen digitaalinen lompakko tuo helpotusta jokaisen EU-kansalaisen arkeen. Digilompakkoonsa puhelimessa jokainen voi säilöä helposti käytettäväksi kaikki tarvitsemasi dokumentit, kuten ajokortin, passin, lääkemääräykset, tutkinnot ja vaikkapa kirjastokortin. Digitaalista lompakkoa voi käyttää myös sähköiseen tunnistautumiseen verkossa, jolloin sekin nopeutuu, eikä erilaisia sovelluksia välttämättä tarvita. Digitaalista lompakkoa voisi näin käyttää muun muassa maksujen suorittamiseen, sopimusten allekirjoittamiseen tai iän todistamiseen.

Digitaalinen lompakko toimii kaikkialla EU:ssa ja helpottaa huomattavasti EU-kansalaisten liikkumista ja arkea eri jäsenmaissa. Suurten verkkoalustojen pitää hyväksyä digitaalinen lompakko kirjautumiseen ja joidenkin palveluiden tulee myös hyväksyä se tunnistautumiseen. Luonnollisesti tietoturvallisuudesta on huolehdittu, ja digitaalinen lompakko parantaa sitä, sillä dataa ei tällöin joudu usean eri palvelun käyttöön.

Tästä tulee kansalaisen arkea merkittävästi helpottava työkalu, mutta luonnollisesti mitään pakkoa käytölle ei ole ja esimerkiksi viranomais- ja muiden palveluiden on toimittava esteettömästi myös niille ihmisille, joilla tällaista digilompakkoa ei ole.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR), *schriftelijk*. – Vandaag heeft het Europees Parlement gestemd over een kader voor een Europese digitale identiteit (eID). Ik heb tegen dit verslag gestemd.

Hoewel een Europese digitale identiteitsportemonnee op het eerste gezicht makkelijk lijkt, kleven er grote nadelen en onzekerheden aan. Het onlinegebruik van een Europees digitaal identiteitsbewijs brengt grote uitdagingen met zich mee voor de bescherming van de privacy van de gebruiker. Daarbij heb ik grote zorgen over de toepassingsmogelijkheden van de eID, zeker als het gaat om het verwerken van gevoelige gegevens zoals die van onlinebetalingen. Waar stopt dit, vraag ik mij af. Kan men bijvoorbeeld in de toekomst alleen nog maar met een digitale euro betalen met de digitale portemonnee? De Europese Commissie heeft hier wel op gezinspeeld. Dit zou leiden tot massaal toezicht waar ik niet op zit te wachten.

Ik ben dan ook absoluut niet overtuigd dat de eID in de praktijk wel veilig en ethisch verantwoord is. De Nederlandse burger zit niet te wachten op een Europese digitale portemonnee, omdat er in Nederland al een goed werkend DigiD-systeem bestaat. Wat mij betreft is de eID dus ongewenst.

25. Extradarea și urmărirea penală a lui Julian Assange și implicațiile asupra libertății presei (dezbatere)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sull'estradizione e il procedimento giudiziario a carico di Julian Assange e le implicazioni per la libertà di stampa (2024/2603(RSP)).

Thierry Breton, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members of Parliament, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to take part in today's debate on the extradition and prosecution of Julian Assange and implications on freedom of press.

Freedom of expression, as well as the right to information, are fundamental rights of every human being and remain an essential foundation for democracy. The EU remains a staunch supporter of these rights and of the importance of a free and independent press. Freedom of expression is also a right that carries with it special duties and responsibilities. Limitation of these rights can be imposed by states in accordance with their national legislation and international human rights obligations, in full respect of the principle of necessity and proportionality.

This delicate balance, including between the protection of national security and the right of the public to be informed about potential threats to the public interest is a matter for courts to assess. Any individual, including Julian Assange, must be given the opportunity to challenge the restriction of his rights, including to freedom of expression, by the competent judicial authorities.

A court in the United Kingdom is currently hearing Julian Assange's case on his extradition to the US. The EU follows the judicial proceedings and does not comment on the ongoing court case.

Jiří Pospíšil, za skupinu PPE. – Paní předsedající, navážu na slova pana komisaře. Opravdu, toto je velmi závažná kauza, kde se kříží několik veřejných zájmů. Je zde jednoznačný veřejný zájem, právo veřejnosti být informován, právo na informace. Je zde otázka práva svobody projevu a na druhou stranu je zde i povinnost státu chránit princip dodržování zákona a chránit samotný právní řád. Tak to zkrátka je. Ta situace kolem Assange je podle mého názoru velmi delikátní, ale my bychom měli mít víru v právní systém Velké Británie jakožto právního státu a měli bychom opravdu velmi bedlivě sledovat probíhající soudní procesy, které rozhodnou či nerozhodnou o jeho konečné extradici.

V každém případě bychom měli jako politický orgán respektovat nezávislost justice a do samotného rozhodnutí se do procesu nevměšování. To tady bylo řečeno panem komisařem. Já to potvrzuji. Měli bychom v této věci sledovat, být bdělí, ale určitě se nepokoušet ovlivňovat soudní řízení. To zkrátka nám nepřísluší a sami zde kolikrát vedeme debatu o právním státě, právních státech v jednotlivých členských zemích.

Je třeba říci, že pokud soudy v Británii rozhodnou, tak to ještě nemusí být konečné rozhodnutí. Je možné, aby se pan Assange odvolal k Evropskému soudu pro lidská práva sem do Štrasburku, a pokud bude umožněn odkladný účinek, tak i tento orgán bude kauzu přezkoumávat. Takže opravdu zachoval bych zdrženlivost při veškerém respektu ke složitosti této kauzy.

Milan Brglez, v imenu skupine S&D. – Gospa predsednica! Spoštovani komisar, kolegice in kolegi!

Pozdravljam plenarno razpravo o izročitvi in pregonu Juliana Assangea. Kljub njeni pozni uri mora predramiti javnost, ker je pomembna ne le zanj, ampak za človekove pravice vseh nas. Upam, da se bo Assangevi izročitvi v skladu z najvišjimi mednarodnimi pravnimi standardi odločilo o Veliki Britaniji, preden bi primer prispel pred Evropsko sodišče za človekove pravice, ker bi čakanje na njegovo presojo, potem ko je bila izročitev že izvršena, lahko imelo nepopravljive posledice. Od znotraj bi bil izničen evropski sistem varstva človekovih pravic, zaradi očitnih dvojnih standardov pa bi posledično izgubila svoj pomen tudi naša kritika kršitev človekovih pravic po svetu, tukaj v Evropskem parlamentu. Ni namreč države niti demokracije, bodisi v Evropi bodisi po svetu, kjer bi bila oblast popolnoma imuna pred skušnjavo nadzora javnosti ter zlorabami človekovih pravic in vladavine prava.

Včeraj smo naredili pomemben korak omejevanja tega s potrditvijo direktive glede zaščite novinarjev in zagovornikov človekovih pravic pred očitno neutemeljenimi ali zlorabljenimi sodnimi postopki v dobro človekovih pravic javnosti in vseh Assangev, ki branijo njen interes.

Markéta Gregorová, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, Commissioner, Mr Shipton, Julian Assange – a candidate for the 2022 Sakharov Prize – brought to light documents revealing cases of war crimes and human rights violations. For these efforts, Julian has received recognition from numerous organisations advocating for freedom of speech.

A couple of hours ago in this plenary, we mourned the unjust treatment and death of a man who stood against the authority of power – a man who received the 2021 Sakharov Prize and who brought to light abuse of power and corruption. Alexei has also received recognition from freedom fighters across the world.

Why am I speaking about both of them? Because we acknowledge with one of them that the person can be a symbol, regardless of their mistakes or disagreements we might have – a symbol of the fight against injustice, oppression, corruption, of David standing up to Goliath, not afraid of the consequences.

We condemn consequences for one of them. I stand before you to also voice my unwavering support for what Julian Assange's work represents: the right of citizens to be protected against states' abuse of power, to be informed, and the right for journalists as well as individuals to expose such abuse and not fear punishment. You don't get to pick your favourite whistleblower. You either stand with all of them or none at all.

Gunnar Beck, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Bereits 2017, nach der Ermordung einer maltesischen Investigativjournalistin, forderte dieses Parlament mehr Rechtsschutz für Journalisten und Whistleblower. Jetzt können Sie Ihre Worte in die Tat umsetzen. Julian Assange, der Kriegsverbrechen im Irak ans Licht gebracht hat, läuft Gefahr, an die USA ausgeliefert zu werden, wo ihm 175 Jahre Haft wegen fragwürdiger Spionagevorwürfe drohen.

Bereits 2016 stimmte die AfD im Europäischen Parlament dafür, Assange in der EU Asyl zu gewähren. Das gibt Ihnen nun die Möglichkeit, endlich jemandem Asyl zu gewähren, der es wirklich einmal verdient. Heute Morgen kondolierten Sie zu Recht der Witwe Nawalnys. Deshalb meine Bitte: Handeln Sie, bevor es zu spät ist. Handeln Sie, bevor Assange in US-Gewahrsam das gleiche Schicksal droht wie Nawalny.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, começo por saudar John Chipton, pai de Julian Assange, que fez questão de acompanhar este debate aqui das galerias e através de quem saúdo o seu filho.

Importaria, face à decisão quanto ao pedido de extradição para os Estados Unidos da América, que terá lugar nos próximos dias, que as Instituições da União Europeia quebrassem o silêncio e se somassem aos apelos à não extradição e libertação, como protagonizados por governos, pelo relator especial sobre tortura da ONU, ou do Comissário para os Direitos Humanos do Conselho da Europa, entre muitos milhares de outros apelos.

Estamos perante o risco real para a integridade física e vida de Assange e uma séria e inaceitável ameaça ao pluralismo, à liberdade.

É hora de pôr fim a esse silêncio que não deixa de ser um espelho da hipocrisia com que abordam a liberdade de expressão e livre prática do jornalismo, que fica na gaveta quando se trata de divulgar crimes de guerra, como no caso de Julian Assange.

Impõe-se a libertação imediata de Julian Assange.

Sabrina Pignedoli (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, qual è il reato commesso da Assange? Sono stata all'udienza all'Alta Corte di Londra. Gli avvocati statunitensi gli contestano di aver pubblicato documenti segreti che raccontano la verità al di là delle dichiarazioni ufficiali: notizie di pubblico interesse, che denunciano crimini.

Altri giornalisti in passato hanno pubblicato notizie segrete, ma solo Assange da quasi cinque anni si trova ristretto in un carcere di massima sicurezza. Chi ha mentito ai cittadini, chi ha ucciso e commesso crimini di guerra, chi è colpevole di detenzione arbitraria e torture, invece, è libero. Non è mai stato accusato di alcun reato.

L'accanimento su Assange è evidentemente di natura politica. Se passa la linea degli Stati Uniti, in teoria qualsiasi giornalista potrà subire la stessa sorte di Assange. Nelle istituzioni europee ci riempiamo la bocca di libertà di stampa, di rispetto dei diritti umani e non viene mosso un dito per la liberazione di Assange.

Passiamo dalle parole ai fatti! Mobilitiamoci veramente per garantire la libertà di espressione: migliaia di cittadini lo stanno già facendo. Ora le istituzioni europee devono chiedere l'immediata liberazione di Assange.

Martin Sonneborn (NI). – Frau Präsidentin! Verzeihung, ich war noch in einer Kneipe. Wenn die EU seit 13 Jahren zu Julian Assange nicht das Geringste zu sagen hat, dann ist das das aufrichtigste Glaubensbekenntnis, das sie je abgeben hat. Denn in diesem Fall geht es nur an der Oberfläche um Assange. Es geht um Recht, Demokratie, Gesetz und Freiheit. Es geht um Regierungskriminalität und Kriegsverbrechen. Es geht um die Unterdrückung von kritischem Journalismus, die Abschaffung der demokratischen Rechenschaftspflicht und die Zerschlagung bürgerlicher Freiheiten.

Mit Assange steht oder fällt das Grundprinzip von Pressefreiheit und Demokratie. Wenn dieselbe EU, die elaborierte Langzeitstudien zu Plastikdeckeln an Milchtüten zustande bringt, ausgerechnet zu Assange seit 13 Jahren nicht das Geringste zu sagen hat, dann könnte sie deutlicher nicht zeigen, für welche Gesellschaft und für welche Werte sie in Wahrheit steht. Vergessen Sie nie: Ihre Freiheit ist nicht am Hindukusch verteidigt worden. In Wahrheit geht sie gerade in einer Zelle eines britischen Hochsicherheitsgefängnisses zugrunde, auf einer Fläche von sechs Quadratmetern.

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Julian Assange è un martire della libertà. Julian Assange è un uomo che ha vissuto in carcere gli ultimi dodici anni della propria vita senza alcuna colpa, senza condanne, solo per aver detto la verità. È un padre che non può stringere i propri figli, un marito tenuto distante dalla moglie Stella e dal padre John.

Quale Europa è quella che non si batte con tutte le proprie forze per liberare Julian Assange? Ci riempiamo la bocca di parole come libertà, diritti umani, rispetto, pluralismo. Sono cose buone solo per i film, per le fiabe? O davvero vogliamo tutelare tutti gli esseri umani, e specialmente chi ha raccontato la verità su crimini di guerra e responsabilità gravi, che senza di lui non avremmo mai conosciuto?

Se Assange verrà estradato, morirà e con lui morirà il diritto, per tutti noi cittadini europei, di essere informati in maniera libera e completa. Dobbiamo difendere lui per difendere tutti noi.

Julian, io sarò sempre con te, come ho fatto a Londra, sarò al fianco di tua moglie in questa terribile battaglia. Ma sogno che tutti i deputati si battano per te, tutti i capi di governo, tutti i cittadini europei, perché finché tu non sarai libero, l'Europa non sarà libera.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já mám respekt k tomu, co udělal pan Julian Assange. Také chápu, že být dvanáct let ve vězení je skutečně opovrženímhodné. Myslím si, že je to již vysoká míra trestu, kterému musel pan Assange čelit. Chápu i iniciativu svých kolegů. Na druhou stranu chci zde vyjádřit jistou míru zdrženlivosti, protože mluvíme o britské justici, mluvíme o právním státě a myslím si, že v tomto smyslu bych chtěl trochu odmítnout vysokou míru politizace tohoto tématu.

Myslím, že pan Assange má právní záruky, které jsou dané britským řádem a také rovněž třeba Evropským soudem pro lidská práva, kam se může rovněž odvolat. Já vnímám jako zásadní hodnotu svobodu tisku. Jak říkám, není to určité černo-bílý příběh, vnímám zde i pozitivní symbol a vzkaz, který udělal pan Assange. Ale hodnota zdrženlivosti vůči britské justici mě vede k tomu být zdrženlivý i osobně.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, je tiens tout d'abord à saluer le père de Julian Assange, qui est parmi nous aujourd'hui, John Shipton. Merci d'être parmi nous. Si les États-Unis obtiennent gain de cause et obtiennent l'extradition de M. Assange, les tribunaux donneront effectivement raison à la Maison-Blanche pour pouvoir arrêter tous les journalistes, pas uniquement Julian Assange, et les lanceurs d'alerte qui révéleraient les crimes de l'État américain et de les faire disparaître dans leur système carcéral.

La requalification du journalisme d'investigation en espionnage est une manière d'étouffer encore davantage le journalisme critique et la liberté d'expression. Les conséquences de cette potentielle décision d'extradition sont dangereuses non seulement pour Julian Assange, mais aussi pour nos libertés les plus fondamentales à l'échelle mondiale. Il est donc utile d'utiliser tout notre pouvoir diplomatique aujourd'hui envers les États-Unis et envers les Britanniques pour que cette décision n'ait pas lieu, pour qu'il n'y ait pas d'extradition et pour que M. Assange et tous les lanceurs d'alerte soient libres.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, I want to add my voice of support to the campaign against the extradition of Julian Assange. I have very little faith in the quality of US justice. However, I want to focus on the second part of this debate: the implications on freedom of the press, because some of the sponsors of this debate are themselves no strangers to attacks on the press.

One of the Irish parties of the left, Sinn Féin, identify that the extradition of Mr Assange is an attempt to suppress journalism. But this is the same party that was accused just a few weeks ago of deliberately targeting the media. According to a letter signed by the National Union of Journalists, Pen International and Reporters Without Borders, 'the number of legal actions that have been filed by Sinn Féin members points to a coordinated campaign against the media in Ireland'. According to Index on Censorship, a UK-based watchdog: 'We are not aware of members of any other Irish party taking a comparable number of concurrent cases against the media in recent years'.

The other Irish MEPs on the left have a bit of form when it comes to suing media outlets as well. What we need is an honest debate about media freedom. We can't choose the journalists that cover our activities as politicians.

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Fru formand! Dette handler om beskyttelse af whistleblowere, hvilket vi har EU-lovgivning for at sikre, fordi whistleblowere giver fundamentet og nødbremsen i vores demokrati. Men ytringsfrihed og vores sikkerhed skal også balanceres. Ulovligheder skal retsforfølges og EU's lovgivning, som jeg sagde, beskytter vores whistleblowere. Det er det, som vi har domstolene til at sikre. Men vi må også være klar over, at vi har et geopolitisk behov for bedre beskyttelse af whistleblowere i EU. Vi kan ikke leve med, at de whistleblowere, som handler i interesse for vores demokrati, for retfærdighed og for sandheden, at de flygter til Putins Rusland. Vi bliver nødt til at give bedre beskyttelse til whistleblowere i Europa. Og vi bliver nødt til at beskytte dem bedre, efter at de har været ved domstolene, og efter de er gået til pressen, sådan så de ikke, som den danske whistleblower, Anders Kærgård, begår selvmord, efter at de har været helte for vores demokrati og for sandheden.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Thierry Breton, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for your interventions. The Commission has taken good note of them. I can only repeat what I said in my introduction.

We all agree that freedom of expression and free and independent press are essential in any democratic society. As mentioned, a court in the United Kingdom is currently hearing Julian Assange's extradition case. We do not comment on the ongoing judicial proceedings.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà domani.

26. Explicații privind votul

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca le dichiarazioni di voto.

26.1. Permisele de conducere (A9-0445/2023 - Karima Delli)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem tento návrh nepodpořil. Chápu požadavek na zlepšení bezpečnosti a také vyšší ochrany účastníků silničního provozu. Samozřejmě chránit životy, zdraví a majetek je nepochybně důležitou hodnotou.

Nicméně mám za to, že tímto návrhem došlo k velmi výraznému zpřísnění řady kontrol. Dokonce mám za to, že dochází k šikaně starších řidičů, a mám za to, že je zde stanovena v tomto návrhu, který prošel, celá řada nutných speciálních vyšetření, která byla možno nahradit jinak. Také může dojít k zásadnímu zdražení získávání řidičských oprávnění nebo prodloužení licencí pro občany. Z těchto všech důvodů jsem se rozhodl tento návrh nepodpořit.

26.2. Indicațiile geografice ale Uniunii Europene pentru vin, băuturi spirtoase și produse agricole (A9-0173/2023 - Paolo De Castro)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych ráda vysvětlila svoji podporu při hlasování o zeměpisných označeních pro vína, lihoviny a zemědělské produkty. Já vítám dohodu o tomto nařízení, která zavádí pro všechny komodity jednotná ustanovení, a věřím, že nařízení přispěje k lepší ochraně kvalitních zemědělských produktů, konkrétně k zabránění nezákonného používání zeměpisných označení nejen off-line, ale i on-line a k ochraně zeměpisných označení produktů, které jsou používány i jako přísady.

Oceňuji také důraz na ochranu vinařského sektoru, na který se zeměpisné označování také vztahuje. Ochrana vína zůstane v rámci nařízení o jednotné společné organizaci trhu s odkazem na nařízení o zeměpisných označeních.

26.3. Punerea în aplicare a politicii externe și de securitate comune – raportul anual pe 2023 (A9-0389/2023 - David McAllister)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Chris MacManus (The Left). – Mr President, it's difficult to vote for a report such as this without being conscious of comments by Ursula von der Leyen, which completely disregard Irish neutrality. Last week, President von der Leyen said that we need a Commissioner for defence. This is the European Union. If she's interested in military alliances, there's a job going at NATO. But keep Ireland out of your plans!

The texts voted today also undermine national vetoes when it comes to foreign policy issues. Unanimity must be protected. This is evidenced by the Commission President's handling of the humanitarian crisis in Gaza. Her actions severely damaged the EU's credibility as a partner for peace and an honest broker for any future negotiations. And her initial response in backing Israel unconditionally has emboldened their brutal strategy in Gaza. This is the background to texts like ones voted today. And that is why we must say no!

26.4. Punerea în aplicare a politicii de securitate și apărare comune – raportul anual pe 2023 (A9-0403/2023 - Sven Mikser)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća,

sigurnosna i obrambena politika počiva na fantazijama, a ne na stvarnosti, zato sam glasao, među ostalim, protiv. Umjesto da se fokusira na mir, ona se fokusira na rat. Počiva na istim fantazijama kao na onima da će sankcije slomiti rusku privredu. Predsjednik Macron ovih dana sazvao je sastanak u Elizejskoj palači i traži da se naše vojske NATO-a pošalju u Ukrajinu. To je van svake pameti. Tko će se boriti za Ukrajinu iz Europe ako se i toliki Ukrajinci ne žele boriti, nego bježe ili u Europu ili u Rusiju?

Vojske Europe su u rasulu, ne mogu popuniti svoje redove i godišnje regrutacijske kvote. Nema opreme, oružja i toliko toga je zapravo poslano u Ukrajinu ili već uništeno. Nema niti streljiva niti dovoljno proizvodnih kapaciteta, ali ono što je najvažnije nema niti volje. Prema istraživanjima, 72 % Amerikanaca, 82 % Nijemaca, 71 % Francuza, 73 % posto Britanaca – toliki postotak ne bi se borio za svoju zemlju u slučaju rata.

O kakvoj obrambenoj politici pričamo ako nemamo ni ljudi ni sredstava ni volje? Da bi se borio ili ginuo, čovjek mora imati neke nematerijalne vrijednosti kao što su sloboda, vjera, zajednica, nacija ili pravda. Ni za kakvu ekonomsku zajednicu ni korumpirane političare se ne gine.

26.5. Activitățile financiare ale Băncii Europene de Investiții – raportul anual 2023 (A9-0031/2024 - David Cormand)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća,

glasao sam protiv ovog izvješća zbog nesposobnosti, a vjerojatno i korupcije. Ako odete na jaspers.eib.org, tamo ćete vidjeti da su to tijelo, koje je savjetodavno za projekte infrastrukture, pokrenule Europska komisija, Europska banka za obnovu i razvoj i ova Europska investicijska banka, čije je ovdje izvješće.

Oni pružaju podršku, ali zapravo rade cijeli niz grešaka. Blagoslivljaju projekte koji su preveliki, preskupi, ilegalni, suprotni prostornim planovima, koji uništavaju okoliš s opremom koja ne funkcionira. Ne treba ići dalje od hrvatskih centara za gospodarenje otpadom, hrvatskih aglomeracija i pročištača otpadnih voda, iako sam ovdje nabrajao i brojne druge projekte s periferije Europe.

Što je zapravo cilj ove banke i ovog JASPERS-a? Je li to da se riješe komunalni infrastrukturni problemi ili da zarade izvođači radova, proizvođači opreme i političke strukture koje su im omogućile te poslove? Ili neka dovedu prave stručnjake u taj JASPERS da verificiraju prave funkcionalne projekte ili neka raspuste cijelu tu priču i puste nam da radimo sami.

26.6. Raport referitor la Raportul Comisiei din 2023 privind statul de drept (A9-0025/2024 - Sophia in 't Veld)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, την ώρα που μιλάτε για κράτος δικαίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, υπάρχουν 57 νεκροί, ολοζώνταντοι στη μνήμη ενός ολόκληρου λαού. Ένας χρόνος από το προδιαγεγραμμένο έγκλημα στα Τέμπη, με ενόχους την πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που υπηρετούν όσοι κυβέρνησαν και κυβερνούν ακόμη αυτή τη χώρα. Στο «σκαμνί» οι τέσσερις οδηγίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης απελευθέρωσης των σιδηροδρόμων, κατάτμησης και εμπορευματοποίησης του ΟΣΕ.

Οι όμιλοι χωρίς κέρδος δεν εφαρμόζουν συστήματα ασφαλείας. Τα βλέπουν κόστος σε βάρος των κερδών τους. Σε 202 000 χιλιόμετρα πλήρους σιδηροδρομικού δικτύου σε όλη την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, μόλις τα 15 000 έχουν εξοπλιστεί με την απαιτούμενη σύγχρονη τεχνολογία τηλεδιοίκησης και φωτισήμανσης ERTMS και ο στόχος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης είναι αυτή να καθιερωθεί το 2050.

Με δυο λόγια: ή τα κέρδη τους ή οι ζωές μας. Καμία συγκάλυψη πολιτικών και ποινικών ευθυνών. Να λάμψει η αλήθεια, όπως απαιτούν οι συγγενείς των θυμάτων, κόντρα στον ζήλο της κυβέρνησης να μπαζώσει τον χώρο, να αποκρύψει στοιχεία από την πυρκαγιά. Εδώ και τώρα να μην κλείσει η εξεταστική επιτροπή της Βουλής, που με επιμονή του ΚΚΕ συγκροτήθηκε.

Presidente. – Onorevole Papadakis, come sa, lei deve attenersi al contenuto della relazione. Mi sembra che il suo intervento sia stato poco attinente al contenuto della relazione di cui stiamo discutendo.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já budu vysvětlovat tento bod. Tento návrh jsem podpořil. Podle mého přesvědčení je právní stát základní hodnotou Evropské unie. Je to hodnota, o kterou se musíme být schopni opřít jak členské státy, tak i jednotliví občané. A my máme řadu příkladů z minulosti, kdy došlo k porušení této hodnoty právního státu, dokonce ze strany členského státu Evropské unie.

Je důležité, aby občané měli zabezpečen rovný přístup k právům a aby ochrana těchto práv byla skutečně zabezpečena na úrovni celé Evropské unie. To znamená, musíme trvat na ochraně právního státu jako takového. Já jsem rád, že tato hodnota byla v této zprávě významně zdůrazněna, a ze všech těchto důvodů jsem tento návrh zprávy podpořil.

Presidente. – Purtroppo non è possibile tornare indietro, onorevole Šojdrová. Lei è arrivata in ritardo e non è possibile ritornare sulle dichiarazioni di voto delle relazioni precedenti. Mi dispiace molto, ma purtroppo queste sono le regole e vanno rispettate.

27. Ordinea de zi a următoarei ședințe

Presidente. – La prossima seduta si terrà domani alle 9.00. L'ordine del giorno è stato pubblicato ed è disponibile sul sito internet del Parlamento Europeo.

28. Aprobarea procesului-verbal al prezentei ședințe

Presidente. – Il processo verbale della presente seduta sarà sottoposto all'approvazione del Parlamento domani nel primo pomeriggio.

29. Ridicarea ședinței

(La seduta è tolta alle 22.48)

Legenda simbolurilor utilizate

*	procedura de consultare
***	procedura de aprobare
***I	procedura legislativă ordinară, prima lectură
***II	procedura legislativă ordinară, a doua lectură
***III	procedura legislativă ordinară, a treia lectură

(Procedura indicată se bazează pe temeiul juridic propus în proiectul de act.)

Abrevierile denumirilor comisiilor

AFET	Comisia pentru afaceri externe
DEVE	Comisia pentru dezvoltare
INTA	Comisia pentru comerț internațional
BUDG	Comisia pentru bugete
CONT	Comisia pentru control bugetar
ECON	Comisia pentru afaceri economice și monetare
EMPL	Comisia pentru ocuparea forței de muncă și afaceri sociale
ENVI	Comisia pentru mediu, sănătate publică și siguranță alimentară
ITRE	Comisia pentru industrie, cercetare și energie
IMCO	Comisia pentru piața internă și protecția consumatorilor
TRAN	Comisia pentru transport și turism
REGI	Comisia pentru dezvoltare regională
AGRI	Comisia pentru agricultură și dezvoltare rurală
PECH	Comisia pentru pescuit
CULT	Comisia pentru cultură și educație
JURI	Comisia pentru afaceri juridice
LIBE	Comisia pentru libertăți civile, justiție și afaceri interne
AFCO	Comisia pentru afaceri constituționale
FEMM	Comisia pentru drepturile femeii și egalitatea între sexe
PETI	Comisia pentru petiții
DROI	Subcomisia drepturile omului
SEDE	Subcomisia securitate și apărare
FISC	Subcomisia pentru chestiuni fiscale
SANT	Subcomisia pentru sănătate publică

Abrevierile denumirilor grupurilor politice

PPE	Grupul Partidului Popular European (Creștin Democrat)
S&D	Grupul Alianței Progresiste a Socialiștilor și Democraților din Parlamentul European
Renew	Grupul Renew Europe
Vers/ALE	Grupul Verzilor/Alianța Liberă Europeană
ECR	Grupul Conservatorilor și Reformiștilor Europeni
ID	Grupul Identitate și Democrație
The Left	Grupul Stângii din Parlamentul European - GUE/NGL
NI	Deputați neafiliați