



PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 29 MARCA 2023 R.

(C/2023/1565)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2023-2024

Posiedzenia z 29 i 30 marca 2023 r.

BRUKSELA

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
3. Uroczyste posiedzenie – Uroczystość z okazji 25. rocznicy zawarcia porozumienia wielkopiątkowego	3
4. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego	9
5. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia	9
6. Wnioski o skorzystanie z immunitetu	10
7. Skład komisji i delegacji	10
8. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu)	10
9. Wykładnia Regulaminu	10
10. Porządek obrad	10
11. Konkluzje z posiedzenia Rady Europejskiej 23–24 marca 2023 r. (debata)	18
12. Fluorowane gazy cieplarniane — Substancje zubożające warstwę ozonową (debata)	36

Spis treści	Strona
13. Rozporządzenie w sprawie ogólnego bezpieczeństwa produktów (debata)	47
14. Prawa dzieci z tęczywch rodzin i rodziców tej samej płci, w szczególności we Włoszech (debata)	54
15. Wznowienie posiedzenia	63
16. Prawa dzieci z tęczywch rodzin i rodziców tej samej płci, w szczególności we Włoszech (ciąg dalszy debaty)	63
17. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych	65
18. Porządek dzienny następnego posiedzenia	72
19. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	72

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 29 MARCA 2023 R.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Wznowienie sesji

President. – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday, 16 March 2023.

2. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(The sitting opened at 15:04)

3. Uroczyste posiedzenie – Uroczystość z okazji 25. rocznicy zawarcia porozumienia wielkopiątkowego

President. – Good afternoon, nice to see you all. Can I please ask you to take your seats? We have an important anniversary to mark, dear colleagues. We have with us the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission for this momentous occasion.

We will begin today's plenary session by marking the 25th anniversary of the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement. Today, we highlight the continued significance of an agreement that is grounded in peace and reconciliation – an agreement that is helping to instil harmony between people. I invite you first to view a short video to mark this important moment.

(A video was shown in the Chamber)

Dear friends, there are few examples in European history of a people's peace agreement such as the 1998 Belfast/Good Friday Agreement – brokered by the people of all of Northern Ireland, aided by the governments of the United Kingdom and Ireland, and supported by the European Union and the United States of America.

Endorsed by people on both parts of the island of Ireland, agreeing to lift borders that divided communities. Defended by the people during post-Brexit uncertainty, when the importance of the agreement became even more relevant.

Time and again, over the years, the European Union and this Parliament reiterated its unwavering support for the hard-earned peace process on the island of Ireland. Going forward, the 2023 Windsor Framework lays down arrangements for the Protocol on Ireland/Northern Ireland. It will charter a new way forward towards ending post-Brexit uncertainties.

Dear Europeans, the European peace project was borne from the ashes of World Wars. It held the ambition of bringing peoples together in the hope of lasting peace and prosperity. Nobel Peace Prize laureate John Hume said in this House, and as we just heard in the video: 'What we all have to learn is what the peoples of Europe learned. Difference is not something we should be engaged in conflict about. It is something we should respect.'

Europe is a place of reconciliation where everyone's voice counts. This European Parliament is a place where peoples of Europe have come together, setting aside past resentment to talk and to listen. The transcripts of the dialogue held in this Parliament between former Members of the European Parliament from Northern Ireland is evidence of that willingness to set aside animosity and that willingness to talk and to listen. And this House evidently provided a platform for this dialogue for peace.

Twenty-five years ago, Members of the European Parliament welcomed the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement with warm and heartfelt admiration and with gratitude, because Northern Ireland's people reminded all Europeans of the fundamental values on which Europe's peace and prosperity lay. Over 25 years of peace, people's daily lives in Northern Ireland have been transformed. They no longer live with the threat of violence. All-island cooperation is everywhere to be seen.

And yet, this Belfast/Good Friday Agreement still needs nurturing. Issues relating to social justice and civic cooperation were central to the Agreement. Civil activists and promoters of peace in Northern Ireland know that commitment to civil and political rights is key.

The Agreement restored self-government to Northern Ireland on the basis of power-sharing and all of us here believe in parliamentary democracy. We will do what we can to promote that concept and I look forward to being able to exchange ideas with parliamentarians in Northern Ireland.

As that young woman in the video said, 'if the Good Friday Agreement were to go, aye, it probably might be quite scary'. And that is why we are marking the 25th anniversary of the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement in this House of European democracy today. Because preserving peace is so important and listening to all sides respectfully is key.

Charles Michel, *President of the European Council*. – Madam President of Parliament, Madam President of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, dear friends, Alexandra Park sits in the heart of North Belfast. During the Troubles, this park was sliced in two by a wall – like a dark scar winding through the green landscape. A 'peace wall', it was called, because like the dozens of other 'peace walls' erected over four decades, it was built to stop the fighting. These walls divided two communities that shared the same language but that would not use that language to talk to each other. For decades, they fought. For decades, they kept their children apart.

Ladies and gentlemen, 25 years ago, the Good Friday Agreement was signed: a remarkable achievement that took real political leadership and visionary leaders that did not fear compromise. It broke the cycle of decades of violence and ushered in peace, stability and reconciliation. This agreement took 700 days of negotiations by men and women of courage, along with the determination of our American friends. The UK and Ireland's membership in the EU – and later in the single market – provided common ground on which to build a lasting peace, by bringing people together and by removing the physical, economic and psychological barriers between people.

The EU was crucial to reaching the Good Friday Agreement and has been essential to ensure its survival throughout all these years. In fact, the Good Friday Agreement also echoes back to another major moment in history, 41 years earlier: the Treaty of Rome; this founding treaty of our European Union that aspired, after the tragedy of World War II, to build up a spirit that unites and to draw down borders that divide.

Peace in Ireland and European integration are staked in the same ideal, exploiting the richness of diversity rather than sowing division. The Good Friday Agreement is also an important reminder that we are all capable of feeling strong emotion and connection to more than one nation. This is not something to fear: multiple identities are part of human nature and we should keep this in mind across our regions that are on their own journeys of peace, reconciliation and cooperation within our European family.

Ladies and gentlemen, the 'peace wall' in Alexandra Park still stands today, but this symbol of division now has a gate, with families crossing between the two sides. What was once a symbol of fear and separation is now, today, a sign of peace, progress and common future. It is an open door to greater tolerance, respect and diversity. This was the spirit and energy that forged the Good Friday Agreement 25 years ago, and this is the spirit and energy we still need today to protect these hard-won gains and to build a lasting peace for the children on the island of Ireland and everywhere in Europe.

Ursula von der Leyen, *President of the Commission*. – Madam President Metsola, dear Roberta, President Michel, dear Charles, honourable Members, 25 years ago, the leaders of Northern Ireland, Ireland and the UK made the impossible come true. For years, every attempt to broker peace had failed. At Easter in 1998, when a new proposal was put on the table, the talks were once again on the verge of collapse. It felt like Northern Ireland could return to violence. It took the courage and the vision of some extraordinary leaders to cross the finish line.

But this success was not only made at the negotiating table in the places such as Hillsborough Castle. At the time, outside the castle, a small crowd of schoolchildren had gathered, with their parents and their teachers. They came from Catholic and Protestant families, and they carried balloons and signs with two simple words: 'Peace, please'. It was a stark reminder of what was at stake in those negotiations. Not only different identities, ideals and allegiance, but the future of the children in Northern Ireland. The Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement has delivered on the simple demand of those children, with 25 years of peace, 25 years of possibilities.

So today, we celebrate brave leaders, like John Hume and David Trimble, who came from opposing sides and ended up sharing a Nobel Peace Prize. But we also celebrate all the peace-loving people of Ireland and Northern Ireland – the unsung heroes of the Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement.

The Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement not only ended 30 years of the Troubles, it also opened a new era of cooperation. As the first line of the agreement says, it is 'the opportunity for a new beginning' for the two communities and the two islands, and it was indeed a new beginning.

In these 25 years, Northern Ireland has taken giant steps forward, also thanks to European support. Checkpoints have been replaced with sports venues and schools. Just recently, a wall was torn down in West Belfast to make room for an EU-funded community centre. Of course, many other walls still stand, not all wounds have healed. While a peace deal can be signed with the stroke of a pen, reconciliation is always the work of generations.

But, as one of Northern Ireland's greatest sons, Van Morrison, said, 'For the healing, go on with the dreaming'. And this is what makes the Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement so important. Beyond the letter and the spirit, there is a promise of a better future for all the people of Northern Ireland.

Sadly, the Brexit referendum raised new challenges for both the letter and the spirit and the promise of the Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement. Since 2016, everyone in our Union has worked hard to avoid that Brexit became an obstacle on the path of reconciliation on the island of Ireland. This journey was never smooth. But our goal is now finally in sight. As a set of joint solutions under the Withdrawal Agreement, the Windsor framework continues to support the letter, the spirit and the promise of the Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement. It preserves our precious Single Market. It preserves Northern Ireland's integral place in the United Kingdom's internal market. And, crucially, it preserves the foundations of peace by avoiding a hard border on the island of Ireland.

I want to thank the British Prime Minister, Rishi Sunak, for his can-do approach. Together, we are staying true to the Good Friday promise that never again will there be a hard border on the island of Ireland.

All of this is an immense opportunity for the people of Northern Ireland. They will have the same food on their supermarket shelves and the same access to medicines as in the rest of the UK, and they will continue to have unique access to the Single Market, that is, the most powerful driver of growth all across our continent. Everyone in Northern Ireland will benefit from this, whether they identify as Irish, British, Northern Irish, European or a combination of all these. So I can only hope that rationality will once again prevail, just like it did 25 years ago.

Honourable Members, thanks to the Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement, there's a whole generation of young people in Northern Ireland who were born and raised in peace, who will not accept to go back to the problems of the past, who just want to live a full life. They understand better than anyone else that peace and prosperity were not achieved once and for all on that Good Friday Agreement, a quarter of a century ago. Peace and prosperity must be re-won, day after day, generation after generation.

So today, we do not just gather for commemoration, but for a new commitment to keep working for reconciliation in Northern Ireland, in spite of all setbacks, for the next 25 years and way beyond. The UK may have left our Union, but peace remains the European promise.

Long live Europe.

David McAllister, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, as just rightly described by our three Presidents, the troubles in Northern Ireland were one of the darkest chapters in recent European history.

For the longest time, deep historic rifts between unionists and nationalists made any negotiations for lasting peace seemingly impossible. With the 25th anniversary of the Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement, we are celebrating a historic development that remains essential to peace and indeed reconciliation in Northern Ireland.

Dear colleagues, the true test of political leadership comes when it takes courage to lead against popular belief, and the peace process on the island of Ireland has known more than one courageous political leader. The Good Friday (Belfast) Agreement demonstrates it is possible to achieve great good in politics. Ever since 1998, we, as the European Union, have worked alongside our UK and Irish partners to implement exactly this agreement. It was exactly in this spirit that we conducted the Brexit negotiations amid the rise of old questions of sovereignty and national identity. Preventing a hard border on the island of Ireland was and is an essential priority for the European Union.

Particularly in times of serious geopolitical challenges, a stable cooperation with the United Kingdom is so crucial. Much more unites us than divides us. As just mentioned by the Commission President, the Windsor Framework: with this Windsor Framework, we have found practical solutions to the challenges in the implementation of the Protocol on Ireland and Northern Ireland while maintaining the integrity of our EU single market. Indeed, the Windsor Framework offers a united way forward, but it also honours the historic achievements we are commemorating today. Together with our UK partners, let us use this momentum to walk the talk and to implement the solutions reached on paper.

Pedro Silva Pereira, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, for the last 25 years, the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement has delivered on its promise of peace and stability for Northern Ireland. Peace is not a minor issue, as we all know, and we should recall this today more than ever. 25 years of peace in Northern Ireland is a remarkable political achievement that indeed deserves proper celebration, so that we all can praise the progress made and the parties involved can renew their commitment to working together for a peaceful future in Northern Ireland.

Carefully negotiated and successfully concluded in 1988 under a Labour government led by Tony Blair, with the full engagement of remarkable Irish political leaders, the Good Friday Agreement made all the difference for the people in Northern Ireland. Instead of violence, peace; instead of confrontation, dialogue, compromise and co-operation; instead of struggles for domination and power, cross-community power sharing. Challenging resentment and disbelief, the Good Friday Agreement has worked for the last 25 years and still sets the framework for new ambitions for the future of the island of Ireland.

The European Union is not just a mere spectator of the Good Friday Agreement; it is an engaged party in this international agreement, fully committed to delivering its promises in all its parts. That is why it was always clear for the European Union that, despite Brexit, and while safeguarding the integrity of the European Union's single market, we had to keep the promise of not having a hard border again between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland.

This has been, since the beginning, the goal of the commonly agreed Northern Ireland Protocol, just as it is now the goal of the recently agreed Windsor framework. For us it is clear that the time has come to turn the page of this absurd confrontation against the EU. More than that, we need immediately to see power-sharing coming back to Northern Ireland so that after 25 years of peace, we can build 25 years of prosperity for the people in Northern Ireland.

Barry Andrews, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – President Metsola, President Michel, President von der Leyen and colleagues, today's ceremony is very, very welcome. Sometimes we under-sell the EU's role in sustaining peace in Northern Ireland – a role I would argue is even more significant than that of the United States.

The peace in Northern Ireland is, in my view, one of the European Union's greatest achievements. It was the EU that provided the financial support through structural funds and the PEACE programme. It was the EU and its single market that made borders less relevant. It was the EU that provided the context and arena for closer relations that otherwise would have been impossible.

In May 2007, Ian Paisley, a former MEP, contacted the Irish Government to request that José Manuel Barroso would come to Belfast to be in attendance at Paisley's first official meeting with Martin McGuinness. The presence of the EU was visually important to what otherwise would have been an awkward moment for Paisley.

And it was the EU that provided the symbolism of peace-building. As the 1952 Coal and Steel Treaty aimed at 'building a broader and deeper community among peoples long divided by bloody conflict', SDLP MEP and Nobel Prize-winner, John Hume, used this language as a framework to ensure that the EU would play a role – much to the irritation of the UK Government.

However, ultimately the greatest credit goes to the people of Northern Ireland. Now, after an era of peace, 25 years later, the tantalising prize of prosperity awaits. For the next generation, the EU must continue to play a role and, in my view, support reform of the Good Friday Agreement. Presently, the cost of staying out of the Northern Ireland Executive is too low, and for too long bad behaviour has been rewarded.

While the Brexit negotiations have been agonising – and in this respect, I'd like to pay tribute to both Michel Barnier and Maroš Šefčovič for all of their perseverance – the Good Friday Agreement and the EU's role in it can only be properly honoured by staying the course and maintaining support for a speedy return of the Northern Ireland Executive and the dawn of a new era in Northern Ireland.

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, today we are celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Good Friday Agreement. The Good Friday Agreement came after long conflict. 3 500 people have lost their lives in decades marked by violence, by insecurity and by hatred. This agreement is a symbol of committed peace-building, and 25 years later we acknowledge the hard work, the political will and the commitment that was put into making it happen by so many people.

Colleagues, we all know that Brexit has shaken the political situation in Northern Ireland and made many of the questions that still need resolving more difficult, and this is not going to go away for a while. But, with the Windsor Framework, the European Union and the UK have recently shown that constructive negotiations based on trust and understanding have a good outcome even in difficult situations. We will continue to do everything in our power to secure peace in Northern Ireland and to support the Good Friday Agreement.

Let's also never forget, peace is not only the absence of armed conflict. Safeguarding fundamental rights of all citizens is a crucial part of a sustainable peace, and that is why the European Convention on Human Rights has played such an important role for peace-building in Northern Ireland and the Good Friday Agreement. That is why defending the European Convention on Human Rights is absolutely crucial, especially now that we see it being put under attack.

Colleagues, the European Union was built on promoting peace. On the ruins of violent conflict, millions of people came together. So let us not only remember the great effort it took to achieve peace and the Good Friday Agreement, but let's build on this spirit for the future – for a peaceful, a just and a democratic Ireland, United Kingdom and Europe built on understanding, on trust and on human rights.

Geert Bourgeois, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitters, collega's, na jarenlange politieke vijandigheid, onrust en geweld zorgt het Goede Vrijdagakkoord al 25 jaar voor een periode van vrede en democratie, democratie als middel om politieke doelstellingen te bereiken.

Wat volgde was stabiliteit met machtsdeling tussen ooit gezworen vijanden.

De Brexit bracht echter weer onrust en spanningen met zich mee. Tot elke prijs moest worden voorkomen dat het Goede Vrijdagakkoord onderuitgehaald werd.

Na lange en aanslepende discussies is uiteindelijk met het Windsor-akkoord een goede regeling getroffen over het protocol voor Noord-Ierland.

Dank aan alle betrokken partijen, ook aan onze onderhandelaars, die 25 jaar later – opnieuw – over de eigen schaduw konden springen.

Politieke wil en verantwoordelijk leiderschap van de onderhandelaars bij het Goede Vrijdagakkoord gaven een hele generatie de kans om op te groeien in vrede en welvaart, de essentie van wat de EU nu al 75 jaar voor óns betekent.

Mijn fractie hoopt oprecht dat, in de geest van het Goede Vrijdagakkoord, als kostbare erfenis van verzoening, alle betrokken partijen het nieuwe Windsor-akkoord aangrijpen:

als een startpunt dat opnieuw kansen biedt aan burgers en bedrijven om een welvarende toekomst uit te bouwen in Noord-Ierland,

als de aanzet om de democratische instellingen in Noord-Ierland opnieuw te laten functioneren, en

als het scharniermoment voor een hernieuwde positieve samenwerking tussen het VK en de EU, en dat op –hopelijk – veel meer domeinen dan nu het geval is.

Marco Campomenosi, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io il 10 aprile 1998 ero un giovane militante e seguivo la questione irlandese con passione. Con l'accordo del Venerdì Santo ho imparato una lezione che porto dentro di me, che riguarda anche il tentativo necessario di comprendere le ragioni dell'altro quando ci si pone rispetto a un tema politico. In questo caso, poi, parliamo di un accordo che è servito a terminare decenni di spargimento di sangue nel nostro continente.

È per questo infatti che, tra gli appelli che sono già arrivati nei giorni scorsi, sottolineo quello delle Chiese cristiane, proprio perché la religione è stata usata da ambo le parti in alcune fasi del conflitto per renderlo più aspro. Quindi il loro appello, secondo me, è uno dei più importanti.

Ricordo bene come in questi venticinque anni l'accordo si sia dimostrato in parte anche fragile, ma una fragilità che è sempre stata nell'ambito di una discussione o, perché no, di un conflitto politico che non ha mai più visto parlare le armi, di un dibattito politico come nelle democrazie si dovrebbe fare, un dibattito che deve restare solo politico.

L'anniversario dei venticinque anni oggi giunge in maniera opportuna perché, come ha ricordato la Presidente della Commissione, il Regno Unito è giunto a un accordo con Bruxelles che, credo, favorirà commercio e sviluppo e, in questo senso, spero che quest'Aula, nei prossimi mesi e nei prossimi anni, possa cessare di avere nei confronti di Londra quell'atteggiamento spesso ostile che deriva ancora dal non aver accettato il risultato della Brexit.

Credo che in quest'anno la crisi geopolitica che stiamo vivendo, non solo in Ucraina e in altre parti del mondo, ci abbia insegnato che il rapporto che le nostre capitali hanno con Londra è basato su valori, sull'adesione a organismi internazionali e sulla lotta al terrorismo internazionale, che superano ogni possibile divisione e lontananza.

Però è chiaro che i nostri dibattiti spesso qui sono retorici, ma gli eventi sono il risultato di ogni periodo storico. Ogni epoca ha i suoi protagonisti. Il lavoro di donne e di uomini è ciò che determina, poi, il raggiungimento di obiettivi politici. Per questo credo che nelle nostre attività di politici sia importante prendere anche esempio da chi venticinque anni fa ha saputo, in Irlanda e nel Regno Unito, lavorare per la pace, ponendo fine a decenni di conflitto.

Ecco, se posso fare un appello, cerchiamo tutti noi di essere all'altezza di chi ci ha preceduto, degli uomini che hanno fatto grande il nostro continente, per conseguire obiettivi di pace, di benessere e di libertà in tutti gli scenari.

Chris MacManus, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – *A Uachtarán*, it is only right that this house celebrates the Good Friday Agreement and the 25 years of peace and progress it has brought to the island of Ireland. This historic agreement put in place a new constitutional framework in the north of Ireland that would finally guarantee equality, justice and human rights.

The Good Friday Agreement is a peace process and a political process. It's a living, breathing document. It is a framework which guarantees that the people of Ireland – north and south – will decide whether to unite or whether the North remains tied to Britain. My hope is that, within this decade, the people will be asked to be part of a new Ireland – a modern, forward-looking society based on peace, equality and social progress within the European Union. The future of the whole island is one where we work together for the benefit of all.

Over the years, most of the problems have stemmed from Tory Governments' failure to act – as the Agreement says they should – with rigorous impartiality. A continued failure to uphold the Agreement. Consistently taking one political side does nobody any favours. It merely delays the progress that we know must happen.

To those who reject the very principles of the Good Friday Agreement, I have a simple message: equality benefits everyone. We should be able to move beyond seeing our neighbours as our enemies. Attempts to deny rights to different groups of people – marriage equality, reproductive rights, language rights – damage the economic and social cohesion of the North. We should all be working together for the benefit of all the people, which is why the Executive in the North must be established without delay. Building an economy that benefits everyone; building a society that works for all, where no one is left behind.

That's why it is important that this House celebrates the 25th anniversary. And I have no doubt that this House and the EU will continue to play an important role for the next 25 years as the Good Friday Agreement embarks upon its next chapter.

President. – Thank you very much, Mr MacManus, thank you to all the colleagues.

4. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego

President. – We now move to the agenda of this current plenary. I understand that there are many points of order, but I need to make a few announcements first, and then everybody will be given the floor.

First of all, dear colleagues, our LGBTI Intergroup has raised the issue of the new so-called anti-homosexuality bill in Uganda. Uganda's parliament last week passed one of the world's toughest laws against homosexual activities. If signed into law by the President, this could mean life sentences for people who identify as LGBTI.

The bill is deeply concerning. It targets entire communities and serves to scapegoat LGBTI persons. And this Parliament has repeatedly reaffirmed that people should be allowed to live as they wish to live, be who they wish to be, and love as they wish to love. And we reiterate that now.

5. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia

President. – The minutes and the texts adopted of the sitting of 16 March 2023 are available. Are there any comments?

I see that there are no comments, so the minutes are approved.

6. Wnioski o skorzystanie z immunitetu

President. – Stefano Maullu, former Member, and Clara Ponsatí Obiols have submitted requests for defence of their parliamentary immunities in the context of legal proceedings in Italy and Spain respectively. These requests are referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

7. Skład komisji i delegacji

President. – The Renew Europe Group has notified me of decisions relating to changes to appointments within committees. These decisions will be set out in the minutes of today's sitting and take effect on the date of this announcement.

8. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu)

President. – Several committees have decided to enter into interinstitutional negotiations, pursuant to Rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure. The reports, which constitute the mandates for the negotiations, are available on the plenary webpage and their titles will be published in the minutes of the sitting.

Pursuant to Rule 71(2), Members or political groups reaching at least the medium threshold may request in writing by tomorrow, Thursday 30 March at midnight, that the decisions be put to the vote. If no request for a vote in Parliament is made within the deadline, the committees may start the negotiations.

9. Wykładnia Regulaminu

President. – The AFCO Committee has proposed an interpretation of Rule 9(6) of Parliament's Rules of Procedure. The text is available on the plenary webpage and will be published in the minutes of the sitting.

Pursuant to Rule 236(4), Members or a political group reaching at least the low threshold may contest the committee's interpretation within a period of 24 hours following this announcement. If the interpretation is not contested, it shall be deemed approved.

10. Porządek obrad

President. – We now come to the order of business. So I understand that there are some colleagues who want to make points of order, also with regard to changes of the agenda, so we'll take them one by one.

Vincenzo Sofo (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non posso non sottoporre all'attenzione vostra la gravità di quanto accaduto ieri in Francia, dove la Corte di Cassazione ha negato all'Italia, ancora una volta, l'estradizione di dieci terroristi, accusati di crimini efferati come omicidi, ma che da decenni vivono impuniti sotto la protezione di uno Stato membro di questa comunità.

Ora, vi chiedo come sia possibile tollerare all'interno dell'Unione europea, che del rispetto dello Stato di diritto fa un principio fondante, che possa esserci un paese che tutela il terrorismo, applicando ancora nel 2023 la dottrina Mitterrand e impedendo a un altro Stato membro di compiere nel proprio paese quella giustizia tanto attesa dal suo popolo.

Chiediamo dunque alle istituzioni europee di prendere una posizione forte a tutela di quelle famiglie delle vittime del terrorismo, che sono cittadini europei tanto quanto tutti gli altri e che dunque hanno il sacrosanto diritto di ottenere giustizia, perché lo Stato di diritto è un principio che deve valere per tutti e non può essere un'arma da utilizzare a piacimento solo per colpire politicamente dei governi non graditi.

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, I would like to use this opportunity to remind us that on 17 March, two weeks ago, the International Criminal Court issued the arrest warrant to President Putin for the war crime of the unlawful deportation of Ukrainian children. Let us congratulate the ICC with this very important decision. Ukraine really deserves international justice against the inhuman and criminal behaviour of Putin's regime.

From another side, Madam President, I would like to remind you that some time ago this House overwhelmingly supported the establishment of a special tribunal for the crime of war aggression, which is the mother of all the war crimes, and asked EU institutions to lead the international process for establishment of such a tribunal. We are still awaiting for the implementation of our political will on the creation of special tribunal and, Madam President, we need your leadership for it to happen.

Madam President, there is one more related and urgent issue. In two days' time, Russia for the month of April will take a rotating Presidency in the Security Council of the United Nations. The question is very clear: can the war criminal head the United Nations Security Council? Democracies should boycott Security Council procedures while Russia will be in the Presidency and I would like to suggest that you should issue a special statement on behalf of all of us to support such an international boycott initiative.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, I would like to raise a point of order on the basis of Rules 7 and 8. Specifically, I would like to draw your attention to President Metsola's failure to comply with the President's obligations to assert my immunity and protect the independence of this Chamber.

Yesterday, I was illegally arrested in Barcelona, and I requested President Metsola to defend my immunities. I have received no answer to my request and, to my knowledge, she has taken no action whatsoever except, as she has recently informed, passing on the case bureaucratically to the JURI Committee.

I have to wonder about this lack of compliance of the defence of immunities in front of an illegal arrest of a Member of the European Parliament, which has not happened before in the history of this Parliament. Is this a policy of the Presidency or is this just an attitude that you reserve for us Catalans?

President. – Thank you, dear Member. I presume you did not hear my announcements at the beginning of the session, so I ask you to look back at what I said exactly.

I see Ms Montserrat wants the floor, and then many other colleagues.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señora presidenta, ustedes se piensan que esto es el Parlament de Catalunya, en el que hacen lo que les da la gana. Esto es el Parlamento Europeo y aquí la democracia se defiende frente a aquellos que la pisotean. Aquí, todos sabemos que ustedes son prófugos de la justicia, que han atropellado la ley y que deben responder ante la justicia española.

Ya está bien de tanto teatro secesionista, del numerito electoral de ayer en Barcelona, de venderse como víctimas y de manipular la verdad. Aquí lo único que ha cambiado es que Sánchez ha cedido ante ustedes por miedo a perder el poder, rebajando el Código Penal español.

Señores socialistas, la dignidad de un país no se vende nunca, ni por un puñado de votos. Ni inmunidad, ni impunidad. Defensa del Estado de Derecho y de la democracia, siempre.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señora presidenta, yo, como catalán, le pediría, por favor, que intente evitar que esta Cámara se convierta en un espacio de debate político que va en contra de los principios que acabamos de defender. Veníamos de estar celebrando un espacio de encuentro, de unión, de acuerdo. Este tipo de situaciones no ayuda para nada.

Usted ha dado una salida a una situación que... Mire, yo tengo una opinión —la he dado antes en los medios de comunicación— pero creo que este no es el espacio. El espacio —usted lo ha conducido adecuadamente adonde se tiene que producir— es en la comisión correspondiente. Me gustaría que esta Cámara no se utilizase para hacer un *show* político, que creo que en un momento como este, y después de estar hablando de lo que estábamos hablando, degrada absolutamente y creo que no conviene a su acción política.

President. – Yes, that is exactly what I announced, in fact.

Ms Riba, last one on this point, please.

Diana Riba i Giner (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, me gustaría invocar también el artículo 8 del Reglamento interno del Parlamento Europeo para referirme a la detención de la compañera Clara Ponsatí por el juez del Tribunal Supremo español, Pablo Llarena, cuando ella, después de cinco años de exilio, volvió a su hogar, Cataluña.

Es inaudito que un juez decreta una detención por un delito que ni tan solo implica privación de libertad, como es el delito de desobediencia, y posteriormente se la retenga durante horas, a pesar de tener todos sus derechos políticos intactos.

Por eso, exigimos a la Presidencia de esta Cámara que defienda la inmunidad de la eurodiputada Ponsatí y que exija a la justicia española que, de una vez por todas, acate la legalidad europea y abandone el *Brexit* judicial en el cual se ha instalado.

President. – I ask you, dear colleague, also to listen to my announcements earlier.

Now we go to the agenda. With the agreement of the political groups, I wish to put to the House the following proposals for changes to the final draft agenda.

On Thursday, firstly, the report by Mr Lagodinsky on the request for the waiver of the immunity of Anna Júlia Donáth is to be added to the votes. Then, due to the withdrawal of the candidacy of Martin Klus, the report by Mr Kuhs on the nomination of the Slovak nominee for a member of the Court of Auditors is withdrawn. If there are no objections, these changes are approved.

We now move to changes requested by political groups. For Wednesday, the Greens Group has requested that the Council and Commission statements on ‘The rights of children in rainbow families, especially the case of Italy’ be added as the last point in the afternoon. I give the floor to Ms Reintke to move this request.

Terry Reintke, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, ‘if you are a parent in one Member State, you are a parent in every Member State’ – these are the words of our Commission President Ursula von der Leyen. Yet in the last weeks, we witnessed yet another attack on rainbow families in Europe, this time in Italy.

The practice to recognise certificates of same-sex parents has been restricted by the Interior Ministry and actually one person who is affected by this is sitting in the tribune, Giuseppe Sala, the Mayor of Milan. It’s great that you are here. We stand with you defending the LGBTI community.

I want to be crystal clear: we are not surprised by these attacks but, still, we are outraged. And we will stand in solidarity with the community in Italy and everywhere in Europe. And this is why it is absolutely important that we have this debate right now, because for this Parliament, all EU citizens and all families are worth the same and deserve fundamental rights.

And if I may say, Madam President, we have, together with other groups, come up with a compromise for the title. The title would now read ‘The rights of children in rainbow families and same-sex parents, in particular in Italy’, to be discussed tonight with an extended session by one hour and to be voted by RCV.

President. – Thank you, so that would mean that the alternative proposal of Brando Benifei is now not on? Or will I give you the floor, Mr Benifei? I don’t know what compromise between whose groups has been reached.

Brando Benifei, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, the S&D also proposed a title along the same lines of the Greens who have just presented it. Our priority is that a debate on the ongoing situation actually takes place, so we are happy to converge on the Greens' proposal for the title and to support this debate. And thanks also from our side to the Mayor of Milan here, Giuseppe Sala, and all the mayors that in Italy are working to support this fight for the rights of all children.

Jeroen Lenaers, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, we are not against a debate about the rights of children in rainbow families, because these are important topics to discuss, but we cannot pretend that they are restricted to only one particular Member State. Pretending that they are restricted to only one particular Member State – even though it might be politically convenient for some people here – doesn't do anything to support rainbow families across the EU.

We have to decide what kind of parliament we want to be. Are we a European, credible parliament where we discuss common European challenges? Or are we nothing but a theatre where national opposition parties can attack national governments because they are too weak to make an impact at home? Let's leave national politics to national parliaments.

I listened very carefully some time ago when Stéphane Séjourné said in Strasbourg, 'We will systematically vote against any change of the agenda that targets national issues'. And I also heard Iratxe García Pérez say we need to respect the European debates in the European Parliament.

Let us show today that those principles are there not only when they suit us. So we propose the following debate title: 'The rights of children in rainbow families'.

Nicola Procaccini (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, senza voler entrare nel merito della questione, c'è un errore sostanziale nella richiesta dei gruppi delle sinistre rosse e verdi che vorrei fosse chiaro a tutti. Viene imputato all'attuale governo italiano qualcosa che non ha fatto e di cui, evidentemente, non può essere responsabile.

In Italia oggi non c'è una legge che autorizza la trascrizione dei minori avuti all'estero da parte di coppie omosessuali od omogenitoriali. Il prefetto di Milano, come tutti i prefetti d'Italia, non è un politico, ma è un pubblico ufficiale che applica le leggi vigenti. Lo so io e lo sanno le sinistre italiane, che, nei dieci anni in cui hanno governato l'Italia, avrebbero potuto fare tutte le leggi che volevano. Non le hanno fatte e oggi utilizzano, invece, il corretto comportamento di un pubblico ufficiale italiano per processare nel Parlamento europeo il governo della propria nazione, che è in carica da nemmeno cinque mesi. Questa secondo me è una vergogna, da qualunque parte la si guardi.

President. – So I ask you now, Ms Reintke, whether you agree with the S&D proposal or the EPP proposal?

I see you can treat the Green and the S&D proposal as a joint one, so we vote on that. I put the request to the vote by roll call.

(Parliament approved the joint request)

Therefore there will be a Council and Commission statement on 'The rights of children in rainbow families and same-sex families, in particular in Italy' as a last point this afternoon, extension until the end of the evening.

We move next to a request by The Left Group for Wednesday that the Commission statement on 'Immediate measures to counter the impact of the interest-rate increase decided by the ECB on households and workers' be added as the last point tonight. As a consequence, the sitting would be extended to 21:00. I give the floor to João Pimenta Lopes to move the request on behalf of The Left Group.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, Caros Deputados, em meados deste mês, o Banco Central Europeu fixou as taxas de juro de referência em 3,5 %, após o sexto aumento consecutivo dessas taxas, e anunciou já novos aumentos.

Medidas que têm um impacto brutal, ainda que desigual, pesando sobre as dificuldades económicas dos trabalhadores, das famílias, das empresas, de Estados. Impactos dramáticos que pesam sobretudo, e muito, sobre as famílias, na habitação, em particular nos países, como é o caso do meu país, onde predomina a taxa de juro variável.

Ora, estas famílias estão sem saber se vão continuar a poder pagar as rendas das casas, tendo em conta os aumentos tão significativos. A Comissão e o Conselho não podem continuar a ignorar esta realidade. Os trabalhadores e as famílias exigem medidas concretas e urgentes.

Este Parlamento não pode ficar impávido a assistir ao desastre para onde se empurram milhares e milhares de famílias. Seria inconcebível atrasar este debate, aqui nesta casa, de um tema que afeta tanto a vida das pessoas. Faça-se o debate.

President. – Does any colleague want to speak against this request? Otherwise I'll put the proposal to a vote by roll call.

(Parliament rejected the request)

For Thursday, tomorrow, The Left Group has requested that a Commission statement on 'The right to protest and the proportionate use of force in France' be added as the first point in the morning. The debate would be wound up with a resolution to be voted in April, and as a consequence, the sitting would start at 8:30. I give the floor to Manon Aubry to move the request.

Manon Aubry, au nom du groupe The Left. – Madame la Présidente, une manifestante au pouce arraché par un tir de LBD. Un cheminot éborgné par une grenade de désencerclement. Une manifestante violée lors d'une fouille policière. Deux militants écologistes dans le coma, entre la vie et la mort. Des centaines d'arrestations arbitraires de jeunes. Un étudiant victime d'insultes racistes à qui un policier dit: «Toi, je t'aurais bien pété les jambes». Un manifestant qui se fait délibérément rouler dessus par un policier. Des élèves autrichiens en sortie scolaire mis, au hasard, en garde à vue. Des élus en écharpe, dont plusieurs d'entre nous ici, gazés. Des journalistes empêchés de faire leur travail. Voilà, chers collègues, la réalité des violences policières contre le mouvement social en France.

Alors, après les alertes du Conseil de l'Europe, de l'ONU, d'Amnesty, de la presse internationale, on ne peut pas regarder sans rien faire ce spectacle terrible. Cette doctrine de maintien de l'ordre, ces pratiques sont inacceptables au sein de l'Union européenne et c'est pourquoi notre Parlement doit exprimer sa condamnation la plus ferme.

Madame la Présidente, si vous me le permettez, cette demande est conjointe au groupe socialiste, au groupe des Verts et au groupe de la Gauche, avec un débat demain matin et un vote au mois d'avril, avec ce titre exact: le droit fondamental de manifester et l'usage proportionné de la force par la police, et avec évidemment une résolution.

François-Xavier Bellamy, au nom du groupe PPE. – Madame la Présidente, oui, bien sûr, les Français traversent un moment éprouvant et, bien sûr, dans ces moments de tension en particulier, tout policier qui faute doit être sanctionné. Ça n'autorise pour autant ni les amalgames, ni les ingérences. Et notre Parlement n'a pas à se substituer à la justice qui peut être librement saisie par tout citoyen en France.

Mais nous ne refusons pas pour autant un débat. Cet après-midi, nous avons entendu quelque chose d'extraordinaire, chers collègues, nous avons entendu l'extrême gauche condamner la violence. Mais pourquoi n'avez-vous pas été jusqu'au bout, chère collègue, pourquoi n'avez-vous pas parlé de la pluie de pierres et de feu qui est tombée sur les policiers et les gendarmes samedi, dans une manifestation interdite par la justice à laquelle vous participiez?

La violence est incompatible avec la démocratie et jamais, jamais, jamais, nous ne devons la tolérer. Et c'est la seule chose que nous devrions avoir à dire tous ensemble. Tous ensemble, autour des policiers et des gendarmes qui sont là pour défendre la force publique qui nous préserve de la violence.

Depuis plusieurs semaines, ils sont plus de 800 à avoir été blessés gravement et j'espère que vous aurez honte de les avoir insultés ici. J'espère que vous aurez honte devant eux, devant leur famille, devant ce jeune gendarme qui aujourd'hui est sur un lit d'hôpital pour avoir été grièvement blessé il y a quelques jours. J'espère que nous saurons dire tous ensemble que nous sommes avec les forces de l'ordre pour défendre la liberté.

Guy Verhofstadt, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, personnellement, je dois vous dire que je crois que cette affaire serait mieux discutée et débattue dans l'Assemblée nationale de la France. C'est une démocratie, la France. Il ne faut pas l'oublier. En plus, pour qu'il n'y ait pas de malentendu, Madame Aubry, s'il y a des ripostes policières exagérées, je vais être le premier à les dénoncer et aussi à les condamner. Mais cela reste naturellement des ripostes. Cela veut dire une réaction à d'autres violences qu'on a vues sur nos télévisions. C'est ça la réalité. Et des violences qui sont, et ça c'est encore plus grave, Madame Aubry, parfois encouragées par des partis politiques aujourd'hui en France.

Des gens qui disent: «N'écoutez pas les élections, ce n'est pas légitime». Ce qui est en fait le plus important, c'est la censure populaire, pas la majorité parlementaire. Eh bien, vous faites des gestes, Madame Aubry, mais j'ai quand même, une fois, regardé votre compte Twitter.

J'ai été interrompu deux ou trois fois, Madame la Présidente, il faut me laisser tout de même donner ces quelques exemples. Permanence de M. Ciotti vandalisée: pas de condamnation sur votre Twitter. Le bébé d'Aurore Bergé menacé: rien sur votre Twitter. La porte d'entrée de l'hôtel de ville de Bordeaux incendiée: pas de réaction de M^{me} Aubry sur Twitter. Et puis des centaines de policiers blessés: pas question d'en parler.

Je propose un autre titre pour le débat, si débat il y a: «Violence en politique, une menace grandissante pour le droit à manifester. La démocratie et ceux qui la défendent.»

President. – So we will put the first request to the vote. A Commission statement on 'The fundamental right to demonstrate and the proportionate use of force', with a resolution to be voted in April.

(Parliament rejected the request)

It is rejected. And therefore, Mr Verhofstadt, do you still keep your proposal or do we have no debate?

OK. So you do not maintain your proposal. The agenda in this case remains unchanged.

We move to Thursday. The Greens/EFA Group has requested that a Commission statement on the rule of law in Greece be added in a joint debate with the Commission statement on 'The 2022 rule of law report – the rule of law situation in the European Union'. The statement would be wound up with a resolution to be voted in April. I give the floor to Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield to move the request.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, indeed, the Democracy, Rule of Law and Fundamental Rights Monitoring Group (DRFMG) went on a mission to Greece recently, and we made assessments of a number of issues concerning rule of law and fundamental rights. We therefore now need an open debate in this House.

It has been, in fact, a longstanding demand from a number of Members of this Parliament, coming from different groups already for a long time, because our concerns are serious. In fact, it's been nearly one year that we've been waiting, because on 9 April 2021, Giorgos Karaivaz was assassinated – a sinister remembrance of the deaths of Daphne Caruana Galizia and Ján Kuciak, journalists all murdered in relation to corruption.

That is why we need on this debate, like on others today, a debate in this House. We make this request with a Commission statement, please, because the Council will not be there tomorrow. We will also need a resolution to be voted in April, and we propose to be in the joint debate tomorrow with the 2022 Rule of Law report – and we ask for RCV, of course.

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, I think the last half an hour gave us a clear idea and a proof that obviously the European Parliament, in these kind of agenda debates, is becoming more and more a platform for national debates. I think that's obvious. We feel it all in this room and I want to wish all the best to all contributors to the debate for good headlines for tomorrow in Spain, in France, wherever you want to see these debates.

I think, as the European Parliament, we cannot continue like this. That is my feeling. We have to focus on European issues. And I want to underline, like Jeroen already did and last time Iratxe, who is today not with us, did the same, saying we have to focus on European issues when we spoke about Spain.

I quote now Stéphane, when he was last time saying on behalf of Renew, 'But, dear colleagues, in view of the challenges facing in the coming months in front of us, let's avoid these changes to the agenda. My group will systematically vote against requests to modify the agenda on purely national issues.' That's what Stéphane said last time.

I really ask us all now, having in mind that we only have one request for rule of law, and that is about Greece, and having in mind that in six weeks in Greece there will be elections, if it's even worth only having a national debate about this and in having in April a resolution. Dear friends, it's purely driven by national interests to have a campaign here. That's why, let's refuse and let's vote against.

President. – I put the request of the Green Group to a vote by roll call.

It is adopted, and therefore we have a Commission statement on the rule of law in Greece that is added as a joint debate with the Commission statement on 'The 2022 rule of law report – the rule of law situation in the European Union'. The statement will be wound up with a resolution to be voted in April.

Now the EPP Group has requested that there be a Commission statement on the rule of law in Spain and a Commission statement on the rule of law in Malta.

(Laughter)

I think the first part of this session about respect we have ignored immediately after the end of the ceremony. I have a list of requests. I will read them out and I will ask the individual groups whether they will maintain them.

So first of all, to the EPP Group, are those requests on the table? Have they been made?

Jeroen Lenaers, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, as we very much indicated, we believe this is a House to have European debates, but we have been inspired. So, if we are going to have a joint debate about rule of law with the Rule of Law report and rule of law in Greece, we believe there are some other issues that could be dealt with in this same debate.

The first one is the rule of law in Spain, because the behaviour of this Spanish Government is moving further and further away from respect of the rule of law. When they don't like the Council on the Judiciary, they simply adopt a law to prevent it from functioning. When they need an independent attorney general, they appoint their dear, loyal party colleague, the former Minister of Justice. When they don't like democracy, when they find it too complicated, they rule by decree.

Remember, the S&D stood here on other countries saying ruling by decree is ruling like a dictator. So either you are ruling like a dictator, or this is something we need to discuss in the European Parliament tomorrow. So our request is a debate on the rule of law in Spain, with a resolution to be adopted in April.

President. – Who would like to speak against? Ms Gualmini.

Can I please ask you to respect your colleagues who have asked for the floor? Please, Ms Gualmini, go ahead.

Elisabetta Gualmini (S&D). – Actually, how do you dare to ask for a debate on the rule of law in Spain when you know the only problem with that is that you are blocking the renewal of the General Council of the Judiciary after four years.

So really, this is really anti-democratic and outrageous, colleagues.

Jeroen Lenaers, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Madam President, well, we can vote as you like. On Malta I think there is even more reason maybe to have a debate.

President. – OK, wait, then we have to deal with it as the next request. Fine. So we'll wait.

Is this on Spain? Are you speaking against the insertion of a statement on the rule of law in Spain? Go ahead.

Stelios Kouloglou (The Left). – Mr Weber, why have you left the poor colleague, Mr Lenaers, to argue, exactly again, as you said two minutes ago?

One last thing, the rule of law in Greece is not a national issue. You know, two of our colleagues have been spied on here. All of us who were talking with them, including Mr Kyrtos, who was in your party before you, and the Greek secret services were listening to you, Mr Weber. Are you going to talk about that?

(The President cut off the speaker)

President. – Thank you, this is not about the item on the agenda now. So we put to the vote the request of the EPP Group to include Spain in the Commission statement.

(Parliament approved the request)

And we now go to another request from the EPP Group, this time to include Malta. Do you want to take the floor again, Mr Lenaers?

Jeroen Lenaers, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Madam President, I do apologise for taking so much of your time but in Malta, an author, Mr Mark Camilleri, published documents showing WhatsApp messages between an MP from the ruling governing party and Yorgen Fenech, who is the alleged mastermind behind the murder of Daphne Caruana Galizia. Now these messages exposed abuse of power, bribery and trading and influence, and this information was known to the police for already three years, and nothing has happened. The only thing that has happened is that the author has been criminalised for publishing the documents, even forcing him to leave the country.

It's a disgrace, and it's further proof of how the rule of law is being systematically undermined by this government in Malta. And, as such, it also warrants a debate with a resolution adopted in April.

President. – Thank you, Mr Lenaers. I see Mr Agius Saliba would like to speak against.

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D). – L-ipokrisija tal-Grupp tal-Popolari tixghel u tibbrilla f'dan il-każ. Ghandna sitwazzjoni fejn l-EPP jiddefendu sitwazzjoni fejn Membru minn dan il-Parlament, kollega tagħna hawnhekk, Nikos Androulakis, il-mex-xej tal-PASOK, jigi spijjat, il-mobile tieghu jigi spijjat. Immaġinaw kieku grat f'Malta, kemm-il riżoluzzjoni nitolbu. Imbagħad niġu hawnhekk b'sejha minn naħa tal-Grupp tal-Popolari illi dawn qeghdin jghidu illi għandu jsir dibattitu fuq Malta għaliex evidenza mill-Qorti, li l-Qorti qalet li hija protetta u m'għandhiex tohroġ, kontra d-deċiżjoni tal-Qorti, giet ipubblikata.

Issa jiena mhux qed niddefendi dak illi kien hemm miktub imma illi evidenza tohroġ mill-Qorti u tiġi ppubblikata kontra, kontra d-direzzjoni tal-Qorti, nahseb dik hija xi haġa li allaharess qatt dan il-Parlament jiddefendiha.

Jekk verament irridu nitkellmu fuq separazzjoni bejn il-qrati, il-gvernijiet, l-eżekuttiv u s-saltna tad-dritt, ma nistgħux hawnhekk nippruvaw inqajmu diskussjoni kontra deċiżjoni tal-Qorti Maltija li hija totalment separata mill-organi tal-Gvern.

President. – I put the request to the vote by roll call.

(Parliament approved the request)

Therefore there will be a Commission statement on the rule of law in Malta, and a resolution.

Thank you very much. One and a half hours later, the agenda has been adopted.

(The order of business was thus established)

11. Konkluzje z posiedzenia Rady Europejskiej 23–24 marca 2023 r. (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on the conclusions of the European Council meeting of 23-24 March 2023 (2023/2580(RSP)).

Charles Michel, *Président du Conseil européen.* – Madame la Présidente du Parlement, Madame la Présidente de la Commission, Mesdames et Messieurs les membres du Parlement.

Ladies and gentlemen, the world is more dangerous and predictable today. The multilateral rules-based order is under threat and this is precisely why we are strengthening our EU-United Nations cooperation. And it is why Secretary-General Guterres joined our European Council meeting last week.

Our discussions focused on three topics: the war in Ukraine, climate change and reform in the global financial system. Russia is attacking Ukraine and attacking our international rules-based system but the multilateral system is resisting and standing firm.

The UN has played a key role in finding concrete solutions on humanitarian support to refugees, on the Black Sea Grain Initiative and on nuclear facilities. The EU and United Nations also cooperate on many global issues such as climate change and, for instance, we have seen recently with the historic agreement on the High Seas Treaty.

The 27 EU leaders also reaffirmed their commitment to the 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals, and rediscussed the importance of reforming the global financial system to fight poverty and to make the world fairer.

Ladies and gentlemen, President Zelenskyy has addressed every European Council since the start of the war, and last week was no exception. And President Zelenskyy made one thing very clear: to defend itself, Ukraine needs more weapons and more ammunition. We endorsed the decision on ammunition agreed by the Foreign Affairs Council. We acted quickly. It took barely six weeks after Prime Minister Kallas proposed the idea and when we tasked the High Representative with taking it forward.

Our goal is to provide 1 million rounds of ammunition within the next 12 months. The European Peace Facility and the European Defence Agency will help to get it done. And this joint EU initiative constitutes a major new step towards a genuine European defence.

We also discussed the recent International Criminal Court's decision. This is the beginning of a process to hold Russian leaders accountable for their crimes in Ukraine. And we also agreed to step up efforts, along with our partners, to prevent the circumvention and backfilling of our sanctions.

Ladies and gentlemen, yesterday I was in Moldova, where we shared the EU's strong message of solidarity with the Moldovans. We also prepared the 2nd meeting of the European Political Community, which will take place in Chişinău on 1 June. Moldova is under growing pressure from Russia. It needs our support. We have mobilised over EUR 1 billion in the past year to support its resilience and stability and we are ready to do more. That's why we've invited the Commission to present a support package for Moldova before summer.

Ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, we also had an important debate on our long-term competitiveness, and we agreed to focus on three areas. First, building smarter regulation. We need to make life easier for our businesses and create the conditions for our businesses to flourish right here in the EU. And this means cutting red tape, faster permitting, shorter deadlines, easier procedures and digital solutions.

Second, unlocking investment to ensure our long-term competitiveness. We need massive investments in technology, innovation, connectivity. Financing is the lifeblood of our European businesses, especially our SMEs, so we need to make it easier for them to get the private capital and investment they need to innovate, scale up and thrive. And we have the financial means at our disposal. Savings represent EUR 1.5 trillion in the European Union. The Capital Markets Union will help make this happen. It's time to speed up work and get this done.

And, third point, boosting research and innovation. The EU needs to become a powerhouse of innovation, especially in areas with tremendous growth potential like renewable and cleantech. We will therefore increase investment in R&D, help innovative products and services get on the markets.

We also discussed trade – essential to our prosperity. Since the 1950s, trade has grown from 5 % to 25 % of our GDP, and we need to consider a number of issues. Trade is influenced by geopolitics, and we must navigate our trade relations in this complex landscape.

In relation to the US, we are a close and strategic ally. In recent months, we have discussed our economic cooperation, notably on the IIA and the WTO reform. We are working together with the United States to find a solution to the issues raised by the IRA.

As for China, we face the reality as it is today. China is a major trading partner and has become more assertive and more challenging. So we need to be clear on our goal. We want to derisk, not to decouple.

It's also important to maintain a multilateral trade system with a reformed World Trade Organization at its core, and this includes its dispute settlement mechanism. The 27 leaders agreed to continue our ambitious trade agenda while defending our interests.

On migration, we continued our work from last month's summit. We are implementing the concrete measures agreed, and the Council Presidency and the Commission updated us on the progress so far. We will continue our work on this. It's a priority for us all.

Dear colleagues, we also held on Friday a Euro Summit with the participation of Christine Lagarde and Paschal Donohoe. And this meeting focused on two key points.

First, the current economic and financial situation. Our economies entered 2023 on a healthier footing than expected but the impact on inflation remains a serious concern, and we agreed to continue to closely coordinate our economic policy responses and we also reiterated that the economic governance framework is key for a strong economic and monetary union.

Second, we focused on our European financial architecture. Our banking sector is resilient, with strong capital and liquidity positions, and the banking union has significantly strengthened our resilience. But we should not be complacent. We therefore called for continued efforts to complete our banking union. Speeding up progress on the Capital Markets Union is also a top priority.

The EU is a staunch defender of multilateralism, and the rules-based international order will continue to work to make Europe stronger and more sovereign, and to make the world a fairer place for everyone.

Ursula von der Leyen, *President of the Commission*. – President Metsola, President Michel, honourable Members. Indeed, we had a lot of topics on the agenda in the last European Council. I want to focus on three of them, and the centrepiece was certainly competitiveness with the view of our response to the Inflation Reduction Act.

You are very familiar with the backdrop, so we discussed how to answer to the Inflation Reduction Act. You know what's on the table. The first part is the negotiated part. You know that we confirmed with our American friends our understanding that European carmakers get access to the US market and to US tax breaks with leased electric vehicles.

The second part is that we negotiate an agreement that will ensure that critical raw minerals for batteries that are extracted and processed here in the European Union are treated equally to those from Canada and Mexico, for example, as if we had a free trade agreement.

Third, President Biden and I established a transparency dialogue on the clean tech subsidies. This is one part; this is the negotiated part. But the bigger and more important part is that we have to do our homework here in the European Union. We know that, today, European companies are leaders in net-zero research and innovation. We have set ourselves very ambitious targets for the deployment of renewables. However, our policies have a gap, and that is the support for the manufacturing of clean technologies.

You all know this situation where, the moment a new technology moves to commercial deployment at scale, and so is really scaling up, that is just the moment where manufacturing often moves outside the European Union. We know that China is the largest producer of all mass-manufactured clean tech, from batteries to solar panels, from certain types of electrolyzers to heat pumps.

This is especially concerning because, according to the International Energy Agency, renewables will account for over 90% of global electricity expansion in the next five years. In other words, China will be the biggest winner of this expansion, and if we do not act right now, this Chinese dominance over the clean tech value chain will become even more – not less – pronounced.

This is why the Commission has put forward two acts. The first is the Net-Zero Industry Act and the second is the Critical Raw Materials Act. We discussed the Net-Zero Industry Act. It will create a regulatory environment that is conducive to scaling up the clean tech industry in Europe, so precisely the gap that we have right now, in order to fill this gap and to really encourage scaling-up.

This is combined with European funding or state aid – both possibilities are possible – and with a matching clause, so that we have transparency on what happens on the American market. In other words, the Net-Zero Industry Act aims at keeping European companies in Europe, and not seeing them emigrate across the Atlantic or to China.

The second element we discussed is the proposal of the Critical Raw Materials Act on the table. Now, we all know that the critical raw materials are vital for our twin transition, namely decarbonisation and digitalisation. While the demand for these raw materials is projected to increase drastically, we know that Europe heavily depends on imports. Of course, this dependency that we have on imports threatens not only our climate and digital objectives, but also weakens our industrial base. Therefore, the Critical Raw Materials Act aims at significantly improving the conditions for extracting, processing and – very importantly – recycling these critical raw materials here in the European Union. At the same time, we are strengthening our cooperation with reliable partners around the world, whether it be zinc or nickel from Canada, or lithium from Chile.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, mon deuxième thème: l'Ukraine. L'Ukraine a été un autre sujet important de nos discussions la semaine dernière. Depuis le tout premier jour de la guerre, nous avons travaillé ensemble dans un seul but: faire échouer le plan de Poutine visant à effacer l'Ukraine de la carte. Pour atteindre ce but, nous avons intensifié notre aide financière. Nous avons mis sur pied une plateforme de reconstruction pour rebâtir ce beau et héroïque pays. Enfin, et c'est une vraie première pour notre Union, nous avons acheté en commun des armes dont l'Ukraine a besoin pour se défendre.

Notre prochaine étape sera de doter l'Ukraine des munitions dont elle a grandement besoin. Nous allons donc investir 2 milliards d'euros venant de la Facilité européenne pour la paix, pour assurer la livraison continue de munitions. Elles viendront de stocks existants ou feront l'objet d'une acquisition conjointe. Nous devons aussi aider notre industrie de la défense à augmenter sa capacité de production de munitions, y compris avec l'appui budgétaire de l'Union européenne. C'est-à-dire qu'il faut agrandir les installations de production, renforcer les chaînes d'approvisionnement et soutenir la réaffectation de sites de fabrication existants.

Nous avons dit que nous soutiendrons l'Ukraine quoi qu'il en coûte, et l'Europe tiendra sa promesse.

Und das dritte Thema, über das ich aus dem Europäischen Rat berichten möchte, ist ein anderer Aspekt des russischen Kriegs in der Ukraine. Jeder Krieg ist grausam. Aber dieser Krieg zeigt eine Grausamkeit und Brutalität des Kremls, was eine ganz neue Dimension entwickelt.

Ich spreche zum Beispiel von der Verschleppung ukrainischer Kinder. Putins Schergen sollen rund 16 200 Kinder nach Russland entführt haben. Sie wurden aus ihren Familien und aus ihrer Kindheit gerissen. Sie wurden ihrer Heimat und ihrer gewohnten Umgebung beraubt und, wenn wir nicht aktiv werden, auch ihrer Zukunft.

Das zynische Adoptionsgesetz, das Russland im vergangenen Mai erlassen hat, erleichtert die Adoption dieser Kinder aus der Ukraine. Das Risiko ist also groß, dass sie für immer im Nirgendwo verschwinden. Das sind Kriegsverbrechen! Die, die daran beteiligt sind, müssen zur Verantwortung gezogen werden!

Genau aus diesem Grund hat der Internationale Strafgerichtshof einen Haftbefehl gegen den russischen Präsidenten erlassen. Das ist ein Schritt, der seinesgleichen sucht. Mit dieser Entscheidung ist die Welt für Putin ein ganzes Stück kleiner geworden. Wenn er in eines der 123 Länder reist, die mit dem Internationalen Strafgerichtshof zusammenarbeiten, riskiert er seine Verhaftung. Jeder Besuch in einem dieser Länder, sei es in Afrika oder Asien, sei es in Europa oder Südamerika, wird so für ihn zu einem unkalkulierbaren Risiko.

Wir unterstützen den Gerichtshof, bis der Gerechtigkeit Genüge getan ist. Wir haben bereits Sanktionen gegen 16 Personen verhängt, die für die Verschleppungen verantwortlich sind, darunter die sogenannte Russische Beauftragte für Kinderrechte. Aber wir müssen mehr tun. Wir müssen versuchen, herauszufinden, wo sich die entführten Kinder aufhalten. Und wir müssen alles daransetzen, sie nach Hause zu bringen.

Ich bin den Mitgliedstaaten, die uns unterstützen, sehr dankbar. Ebenso möchte ich dem UN-Generalsekretär António Guterres dafür danken, dass die Vereinten Nationen und ihre Agenturen mit Rat und Expertise, die sie leider in diesem Thema haben, an unserer Seite stehen.

Meine Damen und Herren Abgeordneten, Kinder sind die schwächsten und verletzlichsten Opfer eines jeden Krieges. Es ist gerade in Zeiten des Krieges, dass wir sie und ihre Rechte besonders schützen müssen: ihr Recht, frei zu sein, ihr Recht, sicher zu sein, ihr Recht, geborgen zu sein. Lassen Sie uns gemeinsam mit unseren ukrainischen Freunden die Rechte der Kinder verteidigen.

Slawa Ukraini! Long live Europe!

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, President von der Leyen, President Michel, I first of all want to thank the Swedish Presidency. The top priority of this Council meeting was competitiveness, and this was so urgently needed. In the last 20 years, we lost 30% of our industrial strength on the global share. This has to be stopped, otherwise we cannot defend our European way of life. We need to put aside the illogical positions and speed up with European competitiveness. And that's why more innovation, less red tape, quicker procedures, more trade: this is what Europe needs and that is what is now also in the Council conclusions. And we have to implement it now.

But the Council meeting was also overshadowed by a split inside of the German Government about the famous combustion engine debate. Yes or no? Yes or no? Yes or no? We as the EPP always had a clear line about supporting a technological, open approach, if fuels can be part of a climate-neutral future. But, first of all, markets and consumers decide and not, first of all, bureaucrats and politicians.

Other parties had more problems, with Wissing and Le Maire discussing these issues, and also, in other parties, they were to have discussions on this. Now this saga is over, but frankly speaking, a lot of observers ask themselves: what is now the promise to Wissing and the German FDP? So the legal set is unchanged. Do we need now a delegated act? Will the European Parliament be fully involved, in this House? We have a lot of discussions about involving the European Parliament and that's why I think, in the process, the Commission also must clarify the European Parliament is fully involved. Democracy means the decision will be discussed and decided here in this House.

Let me focus on an additional point. We cannot sell off our competitiveness to China, and Ursula von der Leyen underlined this. Our job is to create jobs in Europe and not, first of all, in China. And speaking about China, in November, Olaf Scholz went alone to China after selling the Hamburg Harbour to COSCO. Then our President Charles Michel was in December in China. Now, I learned this week Sánchez will go to China and at the end of the week Ursula von der Leyen, together with Emmanuel Macron, will go to China. In one week, two trips and three leaders, in a way. So, it is good that we are there, but I ask myself: do we really have a common voice? Do we have really a common understanding?

Until now, we have no joint, common China policy formulated in one document. I must say, after the visit of Xi in Moscow, we cannot afford to engage with China from a position of weakness, without a clear position. We need European missions to China, not national or personal trips that undermine probably the European unity in the world's eyes. We need a clear China strategy, especially when it comes to trade, innovation, resources, defending our European values. And we need it now. That's why, let's do this together.

I want to underline that, from an EPP point of view, we have to do this together with our American friends. We should not allow that China is splitting up Europe, but we should also not allow that China is splitting up the transatlantic cooperation. Europe needs unity and ambitions in these things. Again, coming back to the picture of Xi and Putin in Moscow, everybody sees what are the alternatives: a freedom-based world dominated by us or by the autocrats. For us, the EPP, things are crystal clear.

Finally, Council was also discussing a little bit on migration. I heard your statement today, President Michel, but I must say that this was not a sufficient answer to the development. We've had more than 26 000 migrants arriving on the Italian shores since January: four times the number for the same period in 2022. Europe is again sleepwalking into a new migration crisis, and that's why we have to open the eyes. We have to see it. We have to discuss it. We have to give a proper answer. For the moment, I have to say, Italy, Malta, Spain, Greece are quite alone in these things. What we need is solidarity to fight against trafficking of poor people. We need European solidarity with strengthening Frontex and being also present in the Mediterranean to rescue people. And we need European solidarity for an asylum system which really works. Good news is that in the LIBE Committee, we finalised the vote yesterday so we are ready for negotiations. Let's make now out of this start of the negotiations a success.

Pina Picierno, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'ultimo Consiglio europeo ha affrontato temi cruciali per la nostra Unione, dimostrando ancora una volta che l'Europa è la nostra comunità di destino ed è l'unica risposta possibile ad ogni problema nazionale.

Tra le altre cose, si sono ribaditi gli impegni sulle politiche migratorie, impegni ancora parziali, Presidente von der Leyen e Presidente Michel. Serve più coraggio, serve più coraggio sulla redistribuzione e serve più coraggio soprattutto sulla ricerca e sul soccorso, perché noi non vogliamo più piangere in quest'Aula e fuori da quest'Aula dei morti a causa delle tragedie che avvengono nel Mediterraneo.

Si sono anche invitati, a proposito di redistribuzione, i legislatori a completare i lavori per l'approvazione del Patto su migrazioni e asilo. Allora io voglio dire che ho trovato davvero incomprensibile – non so dirlo diversamente – l'atteggiamento delle forze sovraniste, Lega e Fratelli d'Italia, che hanno votato ieri in commissione LIBE contro quel Patto, che la stessa Giorgia Meloni aveva sostenuto. E il loro voto dimostra, ancora una volta, che le forze sovraniste hanno inteso l'Europa solo come cassa di risonanza della loro propaganda, fatta oggi sulla questione migratoria e in precedenza su tanti altri temi.

Ma l'Europa, e concludo Presidente, resta l'unico luogo politico dove è possibile trovare soluzioni alle opportunità e anche alle tragedie del nostro tempo.

Malik Azmani, on behalf of the Renew Group. – Madam President, dear President of the Commission, dear President of the Council, dear Vice-President Šeřčovič, dear President Metsola, dear colleagues, we are faced with several crises and conducting fundamental reforms. We are refurbishing and rebuilding our European House at the same time.

For our citizens, it's a lot. How do we strike a balance between tackling climate change but remain competitive? How can we afford to pay for our energy bills now and in the future? How can we make ends meet while inflation is eating away the salaries and food prices are rising? All these challenges against the backdrop of a horrible war being fought on our continent.

The best way to deliver good jobs and protect income is a more competitive Europe. Yes, we must react to the new global dynamics and enhance strategic autonomy, without losing sight of earning capacity.

The engine of our economy is our Single Market. Let's deepen it, not fragment it. Deepening the Capital Markets Union, lowering energy costs and embracing new technology, and also signing new trade deals. What better signal could we have before the elections, Madam President, than in a host of new trade agreements – from South America, even perhaps from the United States?

Colleagues, irregular migration is a great concern for many. That is why Renew Europe worked hard to build a majority in this House on files that are building blocks of the migration and asylum pact.

Let's use this momentum. It's now up to the Council. Promises of progress in June cannot become September, and September cannot slip to December. We need the full attention of the Commission and the Council to deliver the real results now. Our institutions are ready.

Colleagues, the war in Ukraine shows Europe is best when it acts with unity. We welcome the joint purchase of ammunition, an initiative born in the Renew Europe family. The agreement to create the new International Centre for Prosecution of the Crime of Aggression against Ukraine is important. And I think I speak for the House when I say we look forward to welcoming Mr Putin in The Hague – and as a Dutch MEP, you can imagine that I will be there.

Madam President, the uncertainties faced by our citizens must be met with an iron resolve to address their concerns and bring hope for a brighter tomorrow. And we ask you both to play your part to make this a reality.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président, d'abord, merci d'être là, puisque vous étiez là il n'y a pas longtemps avant le Conseil, vous revoici après. Je pense que c'est une bonne formule.

La fois dernière, je vous entretenais d'un sujet sur lequel la voix des Verts apparaît peut-être parfois incongrue – c'était la compétitivité. Aujourd'hui, autre thème du Conseil: le commerce international. Vous allez dire: tiens, quelle mouche l'a piqué, il veut parler de commerce international? Ma question de départ est de savoir si l'Europe peut être autarcique. La réponse que nous posons, c'est que même si elle le voulait, elle ne le pourrait pas. En fait, je pense que nous ne devons pas le vouloir, parce que l'Europe n'est pas une île. Elle fait partie de cette planète, et, ne serait-ce que pour le bouleversement climatique, nous savons que nous sommes dépendants des autres. Ce que nous devons éviter – et les années récentes nous l'ont rappelé –, c'est la surdépendance, tant du côté de nos fournisseurs – et on l'a vu du côté de la Russie – que du côté de nos clients; on l'a vu aussi du côté de la Chine.

Ce que, me semble-t-il, la politique commerciale de l'Union européenne doit viser, ce sont donc des interdépendances choisies au bon niveau et avec les partenaires de notre choix. Ces interdépendances, me semble-t-il, doivent viser trois objectifs. Le premier, c'est la résilience de nos sociétés par la diversification, à la fois des fournisseurs et des marchés. Deuxièmement – et ne voyez pas de hiérarchie dans les objectifs –, il faut le dire, c'est la consolidation d'alliances stratégiques. Je le répète, l'Europe n'est pas une île. Quand on voit aussi le recul de la démocratie sur la planète, je pense vraiment qu'entre démocraties européennes et non européennes, on a vraiment intérêt à se serrer les coudes. Enfin, et ça c'est nouveau – le bouleversement climatique et les limites planétaires nous l'imposent –, c'est la convergence réglementaire. Je dis bien la convergence: ça ne veut pas dire l'identité réglementaire instantanée, mais bien la convergence réglementaire, en particulier en matière sociale et environnementale. Le commerce international ne peut pas mener à une course au moins-disant sur ces matières-là.

Le problème que nous avons – et c'est là que nous avons probablement une nuance avec les discours enthousiastes, dont celui de Malik il y a un instant, ou celui de Manfred un peu avant –, c'est que tous les mandats de négociation des traités actuellement discutés ont été décidés, ont été adoptés dans le monde d'avant: le monde d'avant la pandémie, le monde d'avant la prise de conscience climatique, le monde d'avant la guerre. Et donc nous devons vraiment nous poser la question de la mesure dans laquelle il nous faut revoir les accords – et celui du Mercosur est un bon exemple – pour les mettre en accord avec les objectifs stratégiques, climatiques, sociaux et environnementaux de l'Union européenne. C'est à cela que je nous invite à travailler. Et peut-être – ce n'est pas encore un scoop – que l'accord de libre-échange avec la Nouvelle-Zélande montre le bon chemin.

Nicola Procaccini, a nome del gruppo ECR. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Presidente Michel, signora Presidente von der Leyen, il gruppo ECR ha accolto positivamente il cosiddetto Quadro di Windsor tra la Commissione europea e il governo del Regno Unito, in quanto rafforza la nostra alleanza con Londra, permettendoci di voltare la pagina della Brexit e di concentrarci sulle difficili sfide che abbiamo in comune.

Questo accordo assume poi un significato ancora maggiore alla luce del 25° anniversario di quello firmato a Belfast, il giorno del Venerdì Santo, che abbiamo appena celebrato.

Nel Consiglio europeo si è affrontato il tema dell'immigrazione. Ci auguriamo che si arrivi presto a un'iniziativa comune, concreta, urgente ma di lungo periodo. Serve un approccio nuovo e diverso nelle politiche dell'immigrazione dell'Unione. Certamente bisogna salvare le persone in mare, ma nel contempo bisogna impedire che si mettano in mare. Bisogna fermare il traffico di esseri umani e nello stesso tempo occorre rimuovere le cause che spingono le persone ad abbandonare la propria terra per emigrare in Europa. Non c'è nulla di razzista o di sovranista in questo, onorevole Picierno, ma buon senso, lungimiranza e vera generosità.

Il Consiglio europeo si è poi giustamente soffermato sul tema della competitività e delle politiche industriali. Per essere maggiormente competitiva, l'Unione non deve calare dall'alto un modello produttivo unico. L'Unione deve fissare degli obiettivi, anche ambientali, lasciando però gli Stati liberi di scegliere le modalità per raggiungerli. Si chiama neutralità tecnologica. Vuol dire non essere schiavi di interessi opachi, vuol dire essere consapevoli della realtà che ci circonda e della sua evoluzione nel tempo.

Cari colleghi, il termine Pasqua deriva dall'ebraico e significa «passaggio». Il mio augurio è che anche a livello dell'Unione europea ci sia un passaggio verso un rinnovato approccio politico, meno ideologico, meno astratto, meno centralista. Buona Pasqua a tutti.

Marco Zanni, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dalle parole che avevamo sentito durante l'ultima sessione plenaria di Strasburgo e anche dalle parole che sentiamo oggi sul tema competitività e sul futuro della nostra industria e dell'economia, sembra che le istituzioni europee abbiano le idee chiare, e quindi targettizzare nelle proposte quei punti che ci mancano, dalla riduzione della complessità burocratica all'implementazione di un mercato dei capitali funzionante, che sono i primi due requisiti per gestire un progetto di transizione industriale così imponente come quello che proviamo a gestire.

Mi permetterete però di essere un po' scettico guardando alla proposta che ha presentato la Commissione e anche guardando al passato ad alcuni provvedimenti in momenti di crisi che queste istituzioni hanno cercato di portare avanti. Tanti colleghi come me siedono in questo Parlamento da molto tempo e purtroppo, in questi ultimi dieci anni, abbiamo vissuto tante criticità, tanti momenti di crisi, laddove le istituzioni europee hanno provato a proporre degli strumenti innovativi e rivoluzionari. Purtroppo questi strumenti innovativi e rivoluzionari, annunciati con tanta fanfara, si sono rivelati poca cosa.

Guardando all'ultima proposta della Commissione, il pacchetto sulla transizione industriale che è stato presentato, le cui linee guida sono state delineate in quest'Aula, mi viene in mente quello che la Commissione Juncker fece col Piano Juncker. Venne presentato in Aula con tanta fanfara sulle stesse basi, perché i problemi erano gli stessi: troppa burocrazia, troppa complessità, troppo centralismo e un mercato dei capitali non sviluppato. Ecco, il Piano Juncker non ha raggiunto quegli obiettivi e oggi ci troviamo a parlare di nuovo degli stessi problemi con soluzioni simili.

Non funziona, non può funzionare così. Noi stiamo gestendo una transizione industriale importante e lo dobbiamo fare con pragmatismo. La fallacia del pacchetto sulla transizione industriale dimostra come tutta la base del Green Deal, partita nel 2019, regga su basi non solide. Siamo ancora in tempo per cambiare e siamo ancora in tempo, e chiudo Presidente, per capire che questo progetto è nato come progetto di libertà, sia dopo la Seconda guerra mondiale, sia nel 1992 contro il dirigismo sovietico. Oggi vedere queste istituzioni propagandare il dirigismo e il centralismo mi preoccupa non poco. Questo è un progetto di libertà. Dobbiamo mantenere questi principi saldi nelle nostre proposte.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Michel, κυρία von der Leyen, η Σύνοδος Κορυφής είχε μία πολύ πλούσια ατζέντα. Αλλά τώρα που έχουμε την ευκαιρία να τη συζητούμε μετά τη Σύνοδο Κορυφής, πρέπει να αξιολογήσουμε τα αποτελέσματα, και τα αποτελέσματα είναι εξαιρετικά φτωχά, και η ευθύνη βαραινει εσάς, κύριε Michel, το Συμβούλιο, περισσότερο από ό,τι την Επιτροπή. Να είμαστε ειλικρινείς!

Ήταν στην ατζέντα οι αλλαγές στο Σύμφωνο Σταθερότητας. Η Επιτροπή με καθυστέρηση χρόνων κατέθεσε μια πρόταση που, αν και ανεπαρκής, είναι ένα μικρό θετικό βήμα, γιατί όλοι ξέρουμε ότι το Σύμφωνο Σταθερότητας εδώ και χρόνια δεν ανταποκρίνεται στην πραγματικότητα. Και τι αποφασίζετε, κύριε Michel; Ότι προσυπογράφετε τα συμπεράσματα του Ecofin του Μαρτίου, τα όποια συμπεράσματα του Ecofin του Μαρτίου τι λένε; Ότι δεν καταλήξατε, γιατί διαφωνείτε μεταξύ σας, διότι κάποιες κυβερνήσεις μέσα στο Συμβούλιο, βλέποντας το πράγμα εγωιστικά και αναβλητικά, θέλουν να σκοτώσουν και να παραπέμψουν στις καλές δεσές ακόμη και αυτήν την ανεπαρκή πρόταση της Επιτροπής, που είναι προϋπόθεση για να γίνουν οι επενδύσεις.

Δεύτερο θέμα: έχουμε μια τραπεζική κρίση. Η Επιτροπή έχει καταθέσει μια πρόταση για το EDIS, το Ευρωπαϊκό Σύστημα Εγγύησης Καταθέσεων, την οποία στηρίζει και η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα, που φρενάρει επί χρόνια. Μα πάλι στο Συμβούλιο; Και έρχονται οι καινούργιες αναταράξεις στο τραπεζικό σύστημα, που άγγιξαν ακόμη και τη Deutsche Bank, την «too too big to fail», και εσείς ακόμη κλώθετε. Αφήνετε τα χρόνια να περνούν.

Και τέλος, μιλάτε για ανταγωνιστικότητα και σωστά. Αλλά μπορούμε να πετύχουμε τους στόχους μας για την καινοτομία, την έρευνα, τις ευρωπαϊκές επενδύσεις, το sovereign fund, που προτείνετε με έναν προϋπολογισμό του 1% του ευρωπαϊκού ΑΕΠ; Πού είναι η συνδρομή του Συμβουλίου, για να προχωρήσει η συμφωνία για τους ίδιους πόρους; Και τι θα γίνει επιτέλους και με την κοινωνική ατζέντα, που επί χρόνια μετά τη σύνοδο του Γκέτεμποργκ παραμένει μια άδεια ετικέτα, γιατί εσείς στο Συμβούλιο αρνιάσατε την επιτάχυνση της πολιτικής ενοποίησης; Να γιατί νομίζω, κυρία Πρόεδρε, ότι είναι πιο σημαντικό να συζητάμε όχι πριν τις Συνόδους Κορυφής αλλά μετά τις Συνόδους Κορυφής, γιατί φαίνεται ότι το καράβι της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με κύρια ευθύνη του Συμβουλίου πάει πολύ λίγο, πολύ αργά, και συχνά σε λάθος κατεύθυνση.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. PINA PICIERNO

Vicepresidente

Maria Angela Danzi (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Presidente von der Leyen, signor Presidente Michel, l'esito dell'ultimo Consiglio europeo, come Movimento 5 Stelle, non ci soddisfa. L'Europa non può vincere la sfida globale della transizione sostenibile senza risorse aggiuntive.

La sola deroga degli aiuti di Stato non basta e avvantaggia paesi come la Francia e la Germania, aumentando la disegualianza tra gli Stati membri. Lo chiedo a voi: Italia, Spagna e altri piccoli paesi dove troveranno le risorse per finanziare la transizione che vogliamo convintamente? Le nostre imprese saranno in grado di competere con quelle americane e quelle cinesi? Occorre un nuovo *Recovery Fund*, finanziato con nuovo debito europeo.

Sui migranti il Presidente Meloni sbaglia a fare asse con i paesi sovranisti, contrari alla redistribuzione e alle vie legali di accesso. Procediamo senza indugio alla riforma del regolamento di Dublino.

Cara Presidente von der Leyen, per evitare tragedie come quella di Cutro serve più solidarietà e tutto il suo coraggio e la sua determinazione di donna e di madre. La esorto, Lei può, noi ci crediamo perché lo ha dimostrato in altre tragiche circostanze.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Madam President, President Michel, thank you for keeping Ukraine high on the agenda of the European Council. Let me be clear: the best and quickest way for peace in Europe and in Ukraine, and for safeguarding peace on our continent, is providing immediate and consistent military support to Ukraine. This helps Ukraine and it protects also Europe.

We should not be afraid of Russia's defeat. We should be afraid of Russia's victory. The stronger Russia becomes, the more dangerous it is for us, for our way of life. The weaker Russia is after the war, the less it will be able to challenge the rule of law, democracy, freedom of speech, freedom of expression, democratic institutions and European institutions. This is what we stand for, and these are the actual targets of the Russian Federation. We can better protect these if Russia is defeated; a strong Russia is a danger for us, not a weak Russia.

President Michel, thank you also for travelling to Moldova yesterday and for supporting the Republic of Moldova. And I believe that it is correct that the European Council has asked the Commission to put forward a new support package for Moldova ahead of the next European Council.

For us, the EPP Group, into that package belong two elements. Strengthening the European security hub in the Republic of Moldova that we are helping create together, because the security challenges for our neighbourhood and for us are the same; through that security hub, we can better tackle those challenges. And secondly, trade. The more we help Moldova, Ukraine, to develop economically, the closer they will be to the European Union, the easier, the smoother the integration process. So security and trade are essential in relations with Ukraine and with Moldova.

Dan Nica (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamna președintă von der Leyen, domnule președinte Michel, vreau să salut Concluziile Consiliului și vreau să vă cer să nu uitați un singur lucru: ați vorbit de competitivitate. Prețurile la energia electrică pe care le plătesc fie oamenii, fie industria, sunt cele care determină în proporție covârșitoare competitivitatea economiei Uniunii Europene.

Din păcate, lipsesc două elemente: o bursă la care să fie tranzacționate gazul metan și energia electrică, care să asigure o reglementare. Avem reglementare peste tot în Uniunea Europeană, dar ca să vedeți ce, nu reglementăm nici piața de gaze, nici piața de energie electrică. Și acest lucru mai duce la ceva – lipsa transparenței. Nimeni nu știe în Uniunea Europeană de ce plătește facturile acestea uriașe la gaz sau la electricitate, pentru că există o lipsă de transparență cvasitotală – și acest lucru trebuie reglementat de urgență.

Ați vorbit de faptul că s-a introdus acest *Net-Zero Industry*. Este foarte bine. Dar nu uitați un lucru: nu putem să promovăm industria europeană atâta timp cât din banii de taxe și impozite, din fondurile europene, nu acordăm acea prevedere care a existat și care a fost eliminată, greșit, spun eu, ca în achiziție, 50% din produsele achiziționate din banii de taxe și impozite pe care le-au plătit cetățenii europeni, să fie produse în Uniunea Europeană. Nu avem cum să facem producție de masă dacă nu introducem această prevedere.

Și, ultimul lucru, materiile critice – dați drumul la reglementarea care să permită exploatarea pe toate părțile lanțului de producție, inclusiv de rafinare în Uniunea Europeană. Sunt state membre, sunt din România, 16 materiale din lista de materiale critice sunt în România, din 31. Toate solicitările de a începe să utilizăm aceste materiale critice, unele dintre ele foarte rare și foarte valoroase, din păcate, nu au primit un răspuns favorabil și cred că acest lucru ar trebui să fie corectat de îndată și cred că domnul vicepreședinte Šefčovič se va ocupa de acest lucru.

Nicola Danti (Renew). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Vicepresidente della Commissione, signor Presidente del Consiglio, sette righe, sono quelle le conclusioni che il Consiglio europeo ha dedicato al tema dell'immigrazione, finiti i fiumi di lacrime versati dopo la tragedia sulle coste italiane.

La politica è l'arte di trovare compromessi e soluzioni. Governare la realtà, non mettere la testa sotto la sabbia. Ci sono le responsabilità di molti governi, a partire da quello italiano che vince la palma d'oro dell'incoerenza, come fedele alleato di Polonia e Ungheria, i nemici del ricollocamento. Un governo che in questi giorni, in commissione LIBE, come hanno ricordato altri colleghi, ha votato contro la modifica del Trattato di Dublino.

Collegli, non saranno le motovedette o i fili spinati a fermare chi scappa da guerra, fame e libertà sopresse, affidando a un viaggio le proprie speranze, e ancor meno il messaggio che oggi in Europa ci sono governi cattivi di destra.

Certo, non ci sono soluzioni facili, capaci di risolvere il problema in poco tempo, ne siamo consapevoli, ma sette righe, sette righe di rinvio a data da destinarsi sono certamente una non risposta, non degna della nostra Europa.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, the European economy is subject to pressures that can weaken its competitiveness and therefore its ability to generate and redistribute wealth. The latest scare related to, once again, the strength of the banking system. The geopolitical dynamic also poses challenges such as inflation or reducing strategic dependencies on technologies, energy or critical materials. And all this while we have to align our economic base to the ecological transformation.

To successfully overcome all these challenges, there is a key area in which we are not doing enough, where we continue to lag behind, namely investment in research, development and innovation. At the last European Council meeting, it was again requested that we achieve the target of investing 3 % of GDP in research, an objective that today only four Member States fulfil – and we have been pushing for this goal for 21 years now. It will turn out that governments will make much more effort to reach the 2 % military spending target than the R&D target and this is worrying because we are talking about the long-term competitiveness of our economy.

Beata Szydło (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowny Panie Komisarzu! Wzywam Komisję Europejską do podjęcia natychmiastowych działań, aby wesprzeć Polskę i inne państwa graniczące z Ukrainą w sprawie transportu ukraińskiego zboża. Dzisiaj polscy rolnicy i rolnicy z tych krajów, które sąsiadują z Ukrainą, mierzą się z niebywałym problemem, ponieważ potrzebują wsparcia. Okazuje się bowiem, że zboże, które miało być przewożone tranzytem, zostaje na terenie naszych krajów. Potrzebne jest natychmiastowe działanie finansowe i systemowe. Komisja Europejska musi wykorzystać wszystkie możliwości prawne, proceduralne, wszystkie narzędzia systemowe, ażeby takiej pomocy udzielić w ramach solidarności z rolnikami polskimi.

Polska jest jednym z krajów najbardziej zaangażowanych w pomoc Ukrainie i nie musimy tego nikomu udowadniać. Od pierwszych dni tej strasznej wojny Polska zaangażowała się w pomoc humanitarną, militarną i ekonomiczną. Jesteśmy solidarni z Ukrainą, jesteśmy solidarni z państwami Unii Europejskiej, które tę pomoc niosą, ale dzisiaj potrzebujemy solidarności dla polskich rolników.

Wzywam jeszcze raz Komisję Europejską do podjęcia jak najszybszych działań, żeby wspomóc polskie rolnictwo, przyczynając odpowiednią pomoc finansową i systemową.

Jordan Bardella (ID). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président Charles Michel, pour le général MacArthur, les batailles perdues se résument en deux mots: trop tard. Depuis maintenant deux décennies, notre dépendance à la Chine n'a cessé de croître. D'abord cantonnée au rôle d'artisan d'une économie bon marché et de produits bas de gamme, l'empire chinois est désormais devenu l'incontournable mondial. Elle est, puisque nous parlions d'énergie, un passage obligé pour les fabrications des éoliennes et des panneaux photovoltaïques dont l'Union européenne a quasiment fait les seuls piliers de sa transition énergétique.

Elle est devenue un prédateur de premier plan pour les entreprises européennes les plus stratégiques. Le rachat spectaculaire en 2016 de l'Allemand Kuka, leader de la robotique industrielle, du port du Pirée en Grèce la même année, n'en sont que des illustres symboles et peut-être l'arbre qui cache la forêt. Elle est un concurrent des plus féroces dans l'économie de la connaissance et les technologies de demain, de l'intelligence artificielle jusqu'aux voitures électriques. Carlos Tavares, le très respecté patron de Stellantis, déplorait tout récemment que l'on ait déroulé le tapis rouge aux constructeurs chinois.

Face à cette réalité, le temps n'est plus au constat mais à l'action. Nous devons préserver nos marchés publics aujourd'hui plus ouverts que ceux de la Chine, privilégier les entreprises européennes dans la commande publique, protéger nos actifs stratégiques, investir à la fois dans l'innovation et l'éducation. La protection de notre souveraineté passe aussi par une enquête approfondie sur les soupçons d'espionnage qui pèsent sur TikTok, ses liens avec le pouvoir chinois et sur la manipulation des précieuses données d'utilisateurs européens par des mains qui ne sont pas les nôtres.

L'Europe n'est pas vouée à demeurer la proie de Pékin. Il en va de notre avenir, de notre liberté, de notre souveraineté, de notre indépendance et de notre puissance.

Kinga Gál (NI). – Elnök asszony! Az Ukrajnában egy éve zajló háború kapcsán a tanácsülésen, ahogy hallottuk, a fegyver és lőszerszállítások fokozása került előtérbe. Pedig fegyverszünetre, békére lenne szükség az eskaláció elkerülése végett, továbbra is kiállva Ukrajna függetlensége mellett.

Ugyanúgy: Ukrajna európai integrációja támogatandó, ugyanakkor előfeltétele kell legyen a területén élő kisebbségek, így a kárpátaljai magyarok jogainak garantálása. Az Uniónak stratégiai irányváltásra van szüksége. Az ukrajnai háború súlyos következményei – az infláció, az energiaárak és az egyre erősebb illegális migrációs nyomás a külső határokon – egyértelmű jelei ennek.

Miközben a deklarációk és tervek ambiciózusak, hiányoznak mögülük a reális hatásvizsgálatok, épp úgy, ahogy hiányoznak az Oroszországra kivetett szankciók hatásának elemzései. Az ideologikus megközelítés rontja Európa versenyképességét, és a gazdasági növekedést veszélyezteti.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señora presidenta, hablar de la Unión Europea es hablar de una historia de éxito y logros compartidos. Lo hicimos superando la crisis de 2008, la pandemia con las vacunas, los fondos europeos y con una unidad frente a Putin.

Pero necesitamos una Europa que siga dando la mano a los europeos y unas instituciones europeas que piensen más en sus ciudadanos. Debemos luchar contra el cambio climático, pero sin imposiciones inalcanzables a corto plazo que arruinan a empresas y familias. Debemos proteger el medio ambiente, pero contando con los agricultores y los ganaderos, y no yendo contra ellos. Debemos promocionar y cuidar nuestros productos, no ponerlos en peligro con decisiones dañinas en materia de pesca o con competencia desleal frente a productos nacionales, como los cítricos; o criminalizarlos, como ocurrió con el vino. Debemos reindustrializar Europa, crear empleo y riqueza, para dar oportunidades a todos nuestros jóvenes. Pero también debemos proteger el Estado de Derecho y la integridad de nuestros países frente a los movimientos que buscan la ruptura, dividir a la sociedad y saltarse la ley.

Lo que afecta a un país afecta a toda la Unión Europea. Europa es el mejor proyecto de unión, convivencia y economía. Levantemos, por tanto, el sentimiento europeísta y logremos que todos crean en la Unión Europea.

(La oradora se niega a responder a una intervención de Bogdan Rzońca realizada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»).

Presidente. – C'è un cartellino blu per lei da parte dell'onorevole Rzońca. Non l'accetta? Onorevole Rzońca, se vuole può comunque intervenire.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), *wystąpienie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Bardzo podobała mi się Pani wypowiedź. Jestem tak samo jak Pani wrażliwy na biedę, o której Pani mówiła. Chciałbym natomiast poznać Pani zdanie na temat jednego ze źródeł tej biedy i kryzysu gospodarczego w Unii Europejskiej. Mianowicie myślę o europejskim systemie handlu uprawnieniami do emisji dwutlenku węgla. Chciałem zapytać Panią, jakie jest Pani zdanie w tej materii? Bo my wiemy – czy uważamy – że około 50 proc. drożyzny energetycznej, ciepłej, w Unii Europejskiej jest wynikiem wprowadzenia tego bardzo złego systemu.

Presidente. – L'onorevole Montserrat ha facoltà di non replicare, visto che non desidera farlo. Andiamo avanti con la discussione.

Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Vice-Presidente, é bom saber que a União Europeia tem finalmente uma política industrial assumida e não envergonhada para reduzir a nossa dependência naquilo que são condições essenciais para a transição verde, como os painéis solares, ou para a transição digital, como os semicondutores.

Uma política industrial obriga-nos a fazer o mesmo que fazem os nossos concorrentes: ajudar as nossas empresas e apoiar a inovação. São bons objetivos para a política industrial, se conseguirmos ser simples e rápidos na sua execução, se isso não prejudicar a coesão social e territorial e se reduzir a dependência, não significar protecionismo, mas sim diversificação das nossas relações comerciais.

Estreitar as nossas parcerias com a América Latina, conferindo importância a esta região com quem temos tantos laços culturais e comerciais, como tenho defendido neste Parlamento desde 2019, deve ser, por isso, uma prioridade. Assim o esperamos.

Katalin Cseh (Renew). – Madam President, dear colleagues, this Parliament welcomes the strong and unanimous Council conclusions, making it crystal clear that the European Union's support for Ukraine is unwavering and that we condemn Russian aggression.

But colleagues, do you think this message also gets to our citizens? Because right now in Hungary, just like in the past weeks and months, billboards are spread across the country condemning the European Union for putting sanctions on Russia. This is a bomb. The Brussels sanctions are destroying us. These are the sanctions Viktor Orbán has voted for as well. Outright lies are being spread about the European Union and sadly, they are working.

Recent polls show that 63% of Hungarians believe that EU sanctions are to blame for record high inflation – even though Hungary's inflation is twice the EU's average. Far-right anti-European forces are learning this tactic across Europe. Why don't the EU institutions stand up against these lies?

The Council conclusions also highlight that we need to fight Putin's disinformation machine, but one thing the EU has always been reluctant to do is to stand up against disinformation within our Union. The EU should start doing that. The future of our European project is at stake.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Fru talman! Efter rådmötet deklarerade regeringen Kristersson att unionens konkurrenskraft står högst på agendan. Ett litet hopp efter en mandatperiod med över 6000 nya rättsakter från Bryssel. Men det enda konkreta som EU-ledarna kom fram till var att de en gång per år ska diskutera konkurrenskraften. Ingen som har följt debatten om EU:s svar på USAs gröna företagssubventioner är väl förvånad.

Kommissionens kontring handlade om att öppna upp för statsstöd till företag. Ert förslag, ordförande Charles Michel, har kallats Karl Marx på steroider. Det är uppenbart att statliga stöd och detaljstyrning av företagsamheten är på modet här i Bryssel, vilket är raka motsatsen till konkurrenskraft. Att man ens ska behöva stå och förklara det här!

När EU genomdriver principen om att skrota minst en lag för varje ny lag som antas, när EU inför solnedgångsparagrafer som gör att byråkratin inte tillåts växa, då står unionens konkurrenskraft högst på agendan.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Bundeskanzler Scholz hat in Brüssel einen faulen Kompromiss für E-Fuels beim EU-Verbot für Verbrennungsmotoren ausgekugelt. Der deutschen Autoindustrie hilft das nicht mehr. Sie verliert ihren Exportschlager Verbrennungsmotor und konkurriert nun mit E-Autos aus China und den USA. Beide sind massiv subventioniert, während die Kommission EU-Subventionen blockiert. Ebenso wenig hilft es den meisten Autofahrern, die sich gar kein E-Fuels-Auto leisten können.

Die deutsche und die europäische Wirtschaft profitierte bislang erstens von günstiger russischer Energie und zweitens von Exporterfolgen, vor allem nach Übersee. Die EU unter deutsch-grüner Irreführung macht Energie unbezahlbar und gefährdet unsere Exportwirtschaft und damit unsere Lebensgrundlage. Beenden Sie endlich Ihren grünen Schwachsinn und Ihre Stagflationspolitik für unsere Wirtschaft und geben Sie freie Fahrt für freie Bürger.

Francesca Donato (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Presidente Michel, il Consiglio europeo ha ribadito il sostegno al piano di pace di Zelensky, che proibisce ogni negoziato e punta ad attaccare i territori riunitisi alla Russia tramite referendum.

Ora, con lo strumento europeo per la pace forniremo munizioni per due miliardi di euro. Quindi è chiaro: per voi la guerra è pace. L'Ucraina, inoltre, è già in debito con l'Unione europea per 34 miliardi di euro. Quando li restituirà? Mai. Dovremo rinunciare a riaverli per non mandarla in *default*, e lo sapete bene. Ma chi coprirà allora il buco nel bilancio europeo?

Parlate poi di sicurezza alimentare e sostenete l'export dei prodotti ucraini verso l'Unione, ma, dopo che verranno esplose in Ucraina le munizioni britanniche a uranio impoverito, chi comprerà più il grano ucraino contaminato? Voi? E del progetto di salvare il pianeta cosa mi dite, quando le super potenze nucleari hanno abbandonato i propositi di disarmo e stanno incrementando i propri arsenali a fronte delle crescenti tensioni con l'Occidente? Vi preoccupate di più delle auto diesel che delle bombe atomiche?

Intanto le proteste contro le vostre politiche attraversano l'Europa e non si fermeranno. Se avete deciso che l'Unione europea debba suicidarsi, allora il successo è garantito. Complimenti!

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente do Conselho, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão, antes de mais, queria naturalmente felicitar a Comissão.

Por um lado, pelo sucesso que, aliás, também para o qual contribuí o Senhor Vice-Presidente, teve no Acordo-Quadro de Windsor para a Irlanda do Norte e também pelo sucesso obtido em Washington, quanto ao Ato de Redução da Inflação e o impacto que ele tem sobre a Europa.

Mas queria aqui, a propósito desta cimeira ou deste Conselho Europeu, deixar um alerta importante em particular ao Presidente do Conselho, sobre a questão dos acordos comerciais.

É fundamental dar uma resposta em tempo útil e rápido à questão do Mercosul. O continente latino-americano esperou vinte anos. Nós temos um acordo pronto – não é o acordo ideal, mas é o acordo possível.

E nós estamos a deixar países como o Brasil, como a Argentina, como o Paraguai, como o Uruguai e como tantos outros do continente sul-americano, que estão à espera deste exemplo; estamos a entregá-los claramente ao poder da China, ao poder da Rússia e da sua orientação geopolítica.

É fundamental, não só por razões económicas, mas também geopolíticas, concluir o acordo com o Mercosul.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora presidenta de la Comisión, señor presidente del Consejo Europeo, bienvenidos, es un placer estar aquí para repasar las conclusiones de la última reunión del Consejo Europeo y me detendré especialmente en la propuesta y en el respaldo del Consejo Europeo a la revisión de las reglas fiscales.

El debate sobre la necesidad de adaptar nuestro marco de gobernanza económico llevaba tiempo encima de la mesa. El Parlamento aprobó hace ya más de un año un informe solicitando el cambio de esas reglas fiscales.

La Comisión ha abierto el debate y celebro que el Consejo lo haya respaldado y que proponga que la Comisión se anime a presentar esas nuevas iniciativas legislativas, con las que, sin duda, debemos ir hacia un modelo más flexible, donde se tenga más en cuenta la situación financiera y la posición fiscal de cada uno de los Estados. Además, en ese nuevo marco que la Comisión propone —más flexible y donde haya más negociación—, debemos exigir también, por parte del Parlamento, una mayor implicación en la supervisión y el control del conjunto de la gestión del Semestre Europeo.

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Madam President, Mr President, Mr Vice-President, I am glad to see that the European Union, the Member States, stay firmly together on our further support to Ukraine. However, I would like to see also Europe's Member States stand firmly together also when it comes to mitigating the economic impact of the war – the impact on our economies, on our competitiveness.

China leads the world in 37 out of 44 key critical technologies and Europe is just lagging behind. We need to ensure we can compete as a global leader in strategic technologies and succeed in this digital and climate transition. But in order to achieve this, we need to include all clean energies available in the new Industry Act. For some it will be solar, for others, nuclear. This is what is missing, from my point of view, in the Council's conclusions.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Madam President, well, at least we have about ten times more people on the balcony there than we have in the chamber, so it's a really interesting debate.

First of all, when Ms von der Leyen was speaking about the influence of China, if somebody's surprised that we have to rely now on the raw materials that are controlled by the Chinese, well, welcome on Earth. Of course we are relying on China if we are following the Green Deal policy, and all with the sun and wind because, well, just a pure fact is that most of the resources are in Asia and in Africa. And in Africa, most of the resources are controlled by the Chinese. So good luck with the Green Deal.

Secondly, I'm just using the chance to have a small debate with our lovely Vice-President of Parliament, our Italian colleague from the Socialists and Democrats Group, who mentioned in the first round of the debate that migration is a great issue. Of course it's a great issue. And she proposed one solution is the distribution of the migrants. Well, I would like to say that it's a very nice proposal, but very kindly I say no because it is a very bad idea and it has been always very bad idea. If you look at the solutions for migration, well, we just have a very good experience from Poland and Lithuania: if you are illegal, close the border and send back; if you are a real refugee, you will get help. But most of those people, they are not refugees, they are just migrants. So good luck in Italy with solving migration.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, when we say that the European Union is a club of states instead of a true union and that it has democratic deficiencies because of that, we refer to the use of the European Council – that is absent right now – as the shield to protect Member States' shameful actions from the scrutiny that they merit.

Despite the EU institutions' grandstanding on fundamental rights and democratic values, only yesterday I was arrested in Barcelona in apparent breach of my immunity as a Member of this Chamber and of European law. Neither the Council nor the Commission nor the Presidency of this Parliament has so much commented on it, let alone called for my release, as the occasion required.

The interests of Member States that infringe the fundamental rights of their citizens, such as Spain, always come before the rights of the citizens of this Union. We will not stop our fight until our right to self-determination, and through that our political rights, are respected and the Union lives up to its promise of democracy.

Presidente. – Grazie, onorevole Ponsatí. Lei sa che è necessario attenersi al tema della discussione. Aveva già avuto occasione di intervenire anche all'inizio. L'ho lasciata parlare anche in considerazione del fatto che, appunto, ha enunciato all'inizio di questa seduta. Procediamo con la nostra discussione.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Madam President, Commission, Council, colleagues, we have a war criminal to defeat and, following the leadership of the Commission and the High Representative / Vice President in particular, the Council is also increasingly getting the message. It seems that the historic artillery deal gives the brave defenders of Europe's democracy something to actually defend themselves with. But the truth is, we all know Ukraine needs much more shells, more long range missiles, more modern jets, and it needs our tanks faster.

That's what the Council must get to work on yesterday, and it's a pity that Mr Michel had to leave. Stop the incrementalism. It must also get serious about candidate states. While the Council naively welcomed this sort-of deal between Kosovo and Serbia, Vučić is actively bragging about his unwillingness to sign it. This agreement is binding. Serbia will also have to implement, and the EU must take charge. Don't let Vučić play you again. As for Putin, there's just one deal on the table – for Russia to get out of Ukraine. All of it. I will join colleague Osmani in The Hague to welcome him there. *Slava Ukraini!*

Claudia Gamon (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin! Das Thema Auto bewegt sehr viele junge Menschen, vor allem Klimabewusste. Ein gut informierter Schüler hat mir gestern hier im Haus die Frage gestellt: Die Sache mit den E-Fuels – kommt das vom Lobbying aus der Autoindustrie? Viele sind überrascht zu hören, dass die Industrie eigentlich schon viel weiter ist, als es viele in der Politik sind.

Die europäische Autoindustrie wollte Klarheit. Die haben eigentlich jetzt schon Enddaten für ihre letzten Verbrennermodelle, die weit vor 2035 liegen. Was wir jetzt aber stattdessen weiterhin haben – auch dank dem Rat –, ist Unsicherheit, weiterhin Unsicherheit auch für die europäische Autoindustrie. Und die steht in einem harten globalen Wettbewerb um die Elektromobilität, die wir jetzt zu verlieren drohen wegen gefühlten Wahrheiten, anekdotischem Wissen, Fehlinformationen und vollkommen fehlgeleiteter Nostalgie für das Leben von gestern.

Auf dem Weg zu dieser Elendslösung hat man auch noch die europäische Demokratie nachhaltig beschädigt. Da kann man sich nur bedanken bei der deutschen Regierung und auch bei der österreichischen Regierung – für absolut gar nichts.

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Wir schreiben das Jahr 2023, und seit dem Jahr 2015, in dem die Migrationskrise mit dem sogenannten Arabischen Frühling ihren Beginn genommen hat, hat sich die Europäische Union bis heute in keinem Bereich wirklich als kompetent erwiesen, dieses Problem auch entsprechend zu lösen.

Wir haben im vergangenen Jahr in der Europäischen Union eine Million Asylanträge gehabt. Wir wissen, dass mehr als die Hälfte davon keinen Schutzstatus erhalten wird – weder laut Genfer Konvention noch subsidiär oder mit humanitärem Titel –, sondern dass hier Migration stattfindet. In Wahrheit ist das wichtige Asylrecht hier zu einer Migrationsgeschichte verkommen und überstrapaziert Europa in einer Art und Weise, wo man sagen muss, es müsste hier endlich etwas passieren. Es passiert aber nichts, auch wenn es wieder im Rat zur Debatte steht.

Die Briten und die Amerikaner tun wenigstens etwas, und ich sage jetzt einmal, es ist ein guter Weg, klarzumachen, dass diejenigen, die illegal einreisen, gar keine Möglichkeit haben, hier ein entsprechendes Asylverfahren zu erhalten. Die Europäische Union wäre gut beraten – auch im Interesse dessen, Asyl als wichtiges Recht hochzuhalten –, endlich solche Regeln zu machen, illegale Migration davon abzuhalten, als Asyl entsprechend instrumentalisiert zu werden, und damit auch wieder für soziale Stabilität zu sorgen und diese immer höher werdende Kriminalität in Europa endlich aufzuhalten.

Marcel de Graaff (NI). – Voorzitter, de Europese Raad zegt in zijn conclusies te werken aan een concurrerende EU. Tegelijkertijd zegt hij 1 miljoen stuks munitie toe aan Oekraïne en juicht hij over de 10 miljoen EUR waarmee de Europese Unie het arrestatiebevel voor president Poetin gekocht heeft bij het Internationaal Strafhof.

Geen woord over de gevolgen van de sancties die uitsluitend door het Westen worden gevolgd. Geen woord over het faillissement van grote industrieën en banken. Geen woord over de financiële, economische en militaire superioriteit van het Chinees-Russische blok ten opzichte van de G7.

De Europese Raad weet heel goed dat er zonder het goedkope Russische gas en zonder goede handelsbetrekkingen met China geen sprake van kan zijn dat de EU ooit nog concurrerend wordt met wie dan ook. Daarom roep ik de Raad op stappen te zetten richting vrede in het conflict dat het Westen aan het verliezen is, richting het opheffen van de sancties die onszelf vernietigen en richting het normaliseren van relaties met Rusland.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, celebro las conclusiones del Consejo Europeo. Aplaudo especialmente las referencias a las medidas restrictivas. Yo llevo insistiendo en los últimos meses en que hay que reforzar los servicios de la Unión y de los Estados miembros encargados del cumplimiento de las sanciones. Me alegro de que las conclusiones vayan en esa línea. Las sanciones no están solo para ser adoptadas, sino también, y sobre todo, para ser implementadas.

Además, sería muy conveniente que, aparte de los Estados miembros y algunos países afines, un mayor número de países se una a algunas de nuestras sanciones. Desde luego, lo que tenemos que pedirles a todos los países es que no ayuden a Rusia a eludir su impacto. Debemos ser muy vigilantes y evitar que los productos que nosotros no exportamos a Rusia directamente puedan llegarle a través de terceros países. Celebro, por ello, el nombramiento del señor O'Sullivan como enviado especial.

Termino ya, presidenta, con unas palabras sobre la condena de la guerra. Hay que seguir reforzando la mayoría de los países que rechaza el comportamiento ilegal de Rusia. Por ello, me parece necesario que los comunicados conjuntos que se adopten en reuniones internacionales de alto nivel, en los que participen países europeos o la Unión, puedan incluir una clara condena de la guerra de Rusia contra Ucrania y del uso de la fuerza. No es momento de ambigüedades, ni de frases abstractas, ni de implícitos. Hay que ser claros y contundentes.

Costas Mavrides (S&D). – Madam President, I'm reading straight from the statement of the Euro summit that goes like this: 'We call for continued efforts to complete our Banking Union in line with the Eurogroup statement of 16 June 2022.' I wonder who prevents the completion of the Banking Union with its third pillar – that is the European Deposit Insurance System, which is pending for more than 10 years. Well, the answer is very simple. It is a decision up to the European Council itself, and specifically some Member States don't want to do that.

Now, with that in mind I want to end up like this. Recently, you have seen the last few calm days in the banking sector. I think this is the right time to emphasise that without the European deposit system, not only the system is unfair and unfairly competitive, but also it's an ethical commitment of the European Council to fulfil its obligations towards European citizens across the European Union.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, konkurencieschopnosť je kľúčová pre našu bezpečnosť, ako aj pre živobytie našich občanov. Znepokojuje ma preto nedostatok konkrétnych krokov v záveroch Rady. Naviac včerajšie rozhodnutie o zákaze spaľovacích motorov aj v tomto kontexte považujem za gól do vlastnej bránky. Kroky na ochranu životného prostredia sú, samozrejme, správnou cestou. Nesmú však byť prijímané slepo. Musia brať do úvahy širší kontext vrátane geopolitického vývoja a celkovej ekonomickej situácie. Zoberme si príklad Slovenska a jeho sekundárnej závislosti na Číne prostredníctvom automobilového priemyslu. Na to, aby sme ochránili životné prostredie a zároveň posilnili konkurencieschopnosť, musíme spolupracovať s naším priemyslom. Rozhodnutia, akým je aj to včerajšie, ktoré pomáhajú čínskym spoločnostiam ovládnuť trh, však ohrozujú samotnú existenciu nášho priemyslu a ekonomickú bezpečnosť.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, gerbiami kolegos, Komisijos nariai. Iš tikrųjų labai svarbu, kad Vadovų Taryboje buvo paminėta ir sustiprinta parama Ukrainai bei atkreiptas dėmesys į būtinumą stiprinti Europos pramonės konkurencingumą. Aš čia pabrėžčiau vieną dalyką. Labai svarbu, kad ir gynybos pramonė galėtų stiprėti ir kad tas konkurencingumo palaikymas būtų susijęs ir su karinio mobilumo dalykais bei ryšiais tarp įvairių šalių, ir kai kurių projektų įgyvendinimas būtų prioritetas, pvz., tokio transporto projekto kaip „Rail Baltica“, kuris galėtų pagerinti karinį mobilumą ir taip pat mūsų ryšį ir paramą Ukrainai. Dar viena natą norėčiau pabrėžti, tai yra atkreipti dėmesį į būtinybę stiprinti spaudimą Baltarusijos režimui, kuris tęsia politinių kalinių kankinimus, kuris grasina branduoliniu ginklu ir kuris taip pat prisideda prie Rusijos vaikų deportacijos iš Ukrainos. Todėl siūlau, kad būtų atkreiptas į tai dėmesys ir sustiprintos sankcijos Baltarusijos režimui, kad būtų paleisti politiniai kaliniai ir kad būtų išsaugotos kitų politinių kalinių gyvybės. Tokių, kurių dabar yra suprastėjusi sveikata, kaip A. Beliackio ir kitų.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Caro Vice-Presidente, começo por saudar a ratificação pelo Conselho Europeu das conclusões do Conselho ECOFIN sobre a revisão das regras de governação económica.

Aguardamos, agora, que a Comissão apresente as iniciativas legislativas necessárias. O Parlamento Europeu aguarda-as há muito.

Uma coisa é certa: queremos *net zero industry*. Precisamos de investir em setores estratégicos sem afetar os objetivos da coesão. Precisamos de ter cadeias de abastecimento estáveis para as transições climática e digital. Temos de reforçar a autonomia estratégica da União Europeia.

As propostas que a Comissão se prepara para apresentar para a revisão das regras de governação económica devem criar um contexto favorável e a capacidade orçamental e de investimento necessárias dos Estados-Membros e da União Europeia para podermos concretizar estes objetivos e não se tornarem elas próprias bloqueadoras destas prioridades políticas-chave para o futuro da União Europeia.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señora presidenta, en este Consejo se ha vuelto a evidenciar la importancia de evitar que la mentira y la desinformación sean utilizadas. Yo le voy a pedir, primero, perdón por mi intervención. No pensaba tener que realizarla, pero no podemos permitir que en esta Cámara la mentira y la desinformación prosperen, porque la mentira solo prospera en el silencio.

Una diputada que no está presente —porque ya ha hecho el *show* y ya se ha ido— ha denunciado una detención ilegal por parte de un Estado miembro, cosa que es absolutamente falsa. Fue detenida para comparecer delante de la Justicia porque no quiso comparecer delante de un juez. Ser diputado de este Parlamento no habilita a nadie a faltar el respeto al Estado de Derecho.

Repito, le pido disculpas por tener que intervenir en este minuto. Lo he dicho antes: este no es el foro. No es el foro para que aquellos que han abusado de su condición de gobernantes, y que han abusado de su condición de diputados, abusen de su condición para traer debates improcedentes a este Parlamento.

Presidente. – Grazie onorevole Cañas. L'ha detto lei stesso, non era questa la situazione e il momento adatto per discutere di questo argomento, ma lo avete fatto. Ora proseguiamo, per quanto possibile, con la nostra discussione.

Özlem Demirel (The Left). – Frau Präsidentin! Es gibt einen kausalen Zusammenhang zwischen Armut und Reichtum. Genauso gibt es auch einen Zusammenhang zwischen dem Krieg, den Preissteigerungen und der steigenden Armut in der Europäischen Union. Seit einem Jahr höre ich von Rat und Kommission nur Berichte darüber, wie viele Waffen wir jetzt in die Ukraine geschickt haben, wie viele Sanktionen beschlossen wurden und wie viele Milliarden man in die Verlängerung des Krieges gesteckt hat – nichts darüber, wie dieser Krieg enden soll. Auch heute hörte ich viele Worte der Kommission darüber, die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der europäischen Unternehmen zu stärken – nichts über die sozialen Verwerfungen in der Europäischen Union.

Ich weiß nicht, ob Sie das nicht mitbekommen haben, aber die Armut weitet sich aus, Mittelschichten erodieren, Menschen können von ihren Löhnen nicht mehr leben. Und dagegen muss etwas unternommen werden! Sie müssen etwas dafür unternehmen, diesen Krieg zu beenden, und etwas dafür unternehmen, dass es soziale Sicherheit für die Arbeiterinnen und Arbeiter gibt.

Und ich sage es Ihnen noch mal, falls Sie es nicht mitbekommen haben: Immer mehr Menschen und die Gewerkschaften in der Europäischen Union wehren sich dagegen. In Frankreich sehen wir das beste Beispiel, wie Menschen gegen eine unsoziale Rentenreform kämpfen und von der Polizei dafür angegriffen werden. Am Montag legte die Gewerkschaft ver.di den kompletten Verkehr in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland lahm und forderte einen Inflationsausgleich.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, liebe Kommission, tun Sie etwas für die Bevölkerung in der EU! Tun Sie etwas für soziale Sicherheit und nicht nur etwas für den Krieg und die Rüstungsindustrie!

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, mais uma vez, o Conselho passa ao lado da difícil situação com que milhões de trabalhadores e famílias se confrontam todos os dias, em face da continuada degradação dos salários reais, do brutal aumento do custo de vida e da acumulada perda de poder de compra.

Enquanto tiram fotos sorridentes sobre a vossa propaganda, permanecem impávidos sobre a deterioração das condições sociais e económicas dos trabalhadores e dos povos, que resultam das vossas opções políticas – a exemplo da energia ou do aumento das taxas de juro –, e favorecem uma cada vez mais desigual distribuição da riqueza e o aumento obscuro dos lucros dos grandes grupos económicos.

Da vossa parte, nem uma palavra para o necessário e urgente aumento dos salários e pensões, o controlo de preços de bens essenciais, a fixação de preços máximos na energia e o fim da regra marginalista ou a tributação cabal dos lucros excessivos.

Enfim, entre outras medidas concretas e imediatas para contrariar a tragédia social que se torna cada vez mais evidente.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, my dear colleague, Executive Vice-President, Mr Timmermans, I really would like to thank all of the honourable Members for appreciating all the efforts which have been invested in making sure that we found an agreement on the future use of the e-fuels in cars. And I would like to reassure Mr Weber and many others who intervened in that regard that we will now work on getting the CO₂ standards for a cars regulation as soon as possible and of course the European Parliament will get their say on the legality and politics of the delegated act. I know that my colleague, Frans Timmermans, will intervene on other topics, but I'm sure also that his presence here is just proving that this is exactly how we are going to act in the next weeks and months.

I would like to appreciate also the remarks of Mr Azmani and Mr Lamberts on the importance of the competition activity of the European economy and the Commission, as many of you referred to, presented the proposals of Net-Zero Industry Act and Critical Raw Material Act just to make sure that we would increase our overall security, our open strategic autonomy, and also making sure that we would avoid over-dependency on critical raw materials and sensitive technologies we need for the future.

We know how costly our over-dependence on Russian fossil fuels has become, but we learned lessons from that experience and as you would see from these proposals, but also by our work on the first ever common purchase of gas, that we want to make sure that we will not repeat that mistake.

And therefore your support and clear call, which was reflected in the European Council conclusions, to spare no efforts to make sure that we will use European economic and political weight, not only to get the adequate volumes of gas we need, but also to push the prices lower, is, for us, our primary objective.

As you know, we are working very much on a tight schedule against the clock but I would like to reassure you that we will open the first ever tender for the common purchase of gas already this May. And we very much appreciate that it was clearly reflected also in the European Council conclusions and it got support from the honourable Members of this House.

I would like also to thank Mr Reuten and Madam Charanzová and many others for all their encouraging statements and interventions regarding how important European support for Ukraine is. And, as you know, we do our utmost to get all necessary supplies to Ukraine as soon as possible so they can defend themselves.

The Secretary General of the UN, Mr Guterres, when he was having an exchange with the European leaders, was highlighting how much he appreciates our solidarity lane proposals through which the Ukrainian grains found the way to where they are needed the most, in the Global South.

And we very much appreciate, as Madam Szydło was referring to, the role of especially bordering countries in this regard: Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria. And we know that this assistance and these efforts have a cost, and we are looking into the ways how we can assist these countries also as much as possible.

To the honourable Member, Mr Rangel, I would like to thank for his support and encouragement for the Windsor framework. I just would like to inform you that just last Friday with my counterpart, the Foreign Secretary of the UK, James Cleverly, we approved all the necessary decisions in the joint committee and we open a new chapter in EU-UK relations. And now I believe we can focus on the future and we can focus on how to use the full potential of the EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Dominique Bilde (ID), *par écrit*. – Il est heureux que les instances dirigeantes aient pris conscience de l'urgence de la réindustrialisation — un réveil tardif, toutefois, dans la foulée de la pandémie de COVID-19 et de l'inflation galopante. Mais toute stratégie en la matière butera sur une protection déficiente de nos intérêts face à la concurrence étrangère, notamment chinoise.

Cela vaut aussi bien sur le marché européen qu'au-delà, puisque le Président de la Banque européenne d'investissement avait dû déplorer que l'Union soit incapable de privilégier ses entreprises dans les projets soutenus via son aide publique. Et comme l'Europe ne produit plus rien, toutes ses orientations ont une fâcheuse tendance à se retourner contre elle. Exemple en matière d'énergies renouvelables: à en croire le Financial Times, les têtes pensantes bruxelloises auraient découvert le pot aux roses, à savoir que «plus des trois quarts» des panneaux solaires importés dans l'Union européenne proviennent «d'un seul pays».

Je passe sur les risques avérés de vol de propriété industrielle, face auxquels les Européens semblent rester l'arme au pied. Il en résulte qu'à défaut d'un tournant protectionniste, nos tentatives de réindustrialisation resteront une vue de l'esprit. Or, sur ce point, les Européens attendent davantage que des incantations. Je vous remercie.

Victor Negrescu (S&D), *în scris*. – De la debutul războiului de agresiune declanșat de Federația Rusă, am depășit multe provocări însă, așa cum au evidențiat concluziile Consiliului European, trebuie să ne intensificăm eforturile pentru a ne adapta economia la actualul context. Fie că vorbim despre măsuri pe zona de energie, politica industrială, agricultura sau creșterea competitivității Uniunii în sectoare cheie, Europa trebuie să-și seteze o agendă ambițioasă prin care să-și dezvolte piața internă, să-și crească autonomia strategică și să protejeze cetățenii de efectele negative. În acest context, în calitate de responsabil al grupului social-democrat din PE pentru bugetul european de anul viitor, am solicitat un sprijin mai consistent pentru zonele afectate de tranziția industrială, mediul rural, IMM-uri, educație, tineri și sănătate, precum și ajustarea programelor europene raportat la rata inflației.

Contextul dificil cu care ne confruntăm trebuie să ne determine să menținem unitatea europeană, sens în care am integrat și referințe la suplimentarea sprijinului acordat statelor aflate în prima linie, dar și cel acordat Republicii Moldova, prin care vom putea ajuta această țară în parcursul său european. Fac apel la Comisia Europeană și la statele membre să accelereze adoptarea de măsuri prin care Uniunea să-și mențină reziliența, coeziunea și sprijinul cetățenilor, având convingerea că doar împreună putem depăși toate aceste provocări.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), *in writing*. – Europe is facing a number of challenges, we should therefore foster our efforts on EU unity to strengthen its solidarity with Ukraine and measures aimed at boosting investment and EU economic competitiveness. Slovakia is setting a good example, being one of the countries which has supplied MiG fighter jets to Ukraine. Supplying artillery ammunition to Ukraine through the use of the European Peace Facility is vital for European security. Every hour is important on the battlefield, so we should ramp up our joint efforts of support.

12. Fluorowane gazy cieplarniane — Substancje zubożające warstwę ozonową (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca, in discussione congiunta:

— la relazione di Bas Eickhout, a nome della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sui gas fluorurati a effetto serra, che modifica la direttiva (UE) 2019/1937 e che abroga il regolamento (UE) n. 517/2014 (COM(2022)0150 - C9-0142/2022 - 2022/0099(COD)) (A9-0048/2023), e

— la relazione di Jessica Polfjärd, a nome della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sulle sostanze che riducono lo strato di ozono e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1005/2009 (COM(2022)0151 - C9-0143/2022 - 2022/0100(COD)) (A9-0050/2023).

Bas Eickhout, *rappporteur*. – Madam President, colleagues, Vice-President, welcome, have a seat. We are here discussing, in the end, the phase-out of fluorinated gases. Fluorinated gases are very highly potent greenhouse gases. So one molecule of one of F-gases can even warm up the climate to the level of 24 000 times more than CO₂.

And that is exactly what we're trying to do here: what we're going to do here is making an end to these F-gases and making sure that natural alternatives are being used so that this part of our economy will reach climate neutrality as promised also by 2050.

This goes back to when we were initially looking at CFCs that were causing, of course, a hole in the ozone layer and we replaced them with F-gases along the years but, of course, these, as I said, were very potent greenhouse gases. So there is an idea of some of the companies to say let's every time then move away from these F-gases to other F-gases that have a lower impact, but still have an impact on our climate system and even to the level of going to PFAs, so damaging chemicals, whereas in many of these sectors natural alternatives are available, are existing and should be put at the front. And that is exactly what we are doing here and proposing here in the report.

So maybe just some highlights of the report. First of all, as I said, we are accelerating the transition to climate neutrality, meaning that in total quota F-gases will go to zero by 2050, ensuring climate neutrality in this low-hanging fruit. Secondly, we limit the risk of a lock-in to intermediate solutions like PFAs, so those sectors that can make the switch should make the switch to natural alternatives and skip the phase of PFAs that are damaging chemicals, and we would like to skip that and prevent that lock-in in intermediate solutions. Thirdly, we are providing certainty for consumers and investors. Those sectors that can move should move faster, and the bands that we are proposing in the report are very clear, are also thought of on making sure that they can deliver in time so that also the investors know what the direction of innovation in Europe should be.

We also take international responsibility by adding an export ban, which means that if we are going to clean up our own suppliers and we are going to clean up our own products, we are also making sure that we are not going to export steel products with F-gases to other countries outside the EU and this export ban is also part of the deal.

We are also there to prevent illegal trade and we want to accelerate training and employment in order to make sure that people, of course, also are being helped in making sure that they can do the new instalment.

There was, of course, a lot of discussion on heat pumps specifically, and we have paid a lot of specific attention also in our negotiations on the heat pumps, so there will be extra space in the quota system until 2030 and there is also a very clear check for the Commission to make sure that indeed we are still reaching the targets of REPowerEU. And if there are issues with quotas, then the Commission will also make sure that they will intervene and create more quotas where necessary.

Also with switchgear, we have been looking at specific needs there and, for example, for the high voltage, we will make sure that if there is a move towards an end of F-gases, that there will always be at least two bidders so that we are not creating any monopoly.

So all this together is very much clearly putting up European innovation for European SMEs central and, yes, you get a lot of lobby mills, but be aware most of those lobby mills are from American and Japanese companies who still would like to invest in these chemicals, which also have patents. Well, we here go for the natural alternatives which a lot of European SMEs are already innovating on, so a vote for what we have achieved in the ENVI Committee is a vote for European SMEs, is a vote for European innovation. And with that, I would like to thank my colleagues, and I'm looking forward to a fruitful and nice lively debate.

IN THE CHAIR: MARC ANGEL*Vice-President*

Jessica Polfjärd, *föredragande*. – Herr talman! När vi inledde den här mandatperioden så tog den här unionen på sig ett stort och avgörande uppdrag: att ställa om våra samhällen för att bli mer hållbara. Det var ett stort och viktigt steg för att göra Europa grönare, mer konkurrenskraftigt, men också mer hälsosamt. Det innebär såväl möjligheter som utmaningar. Det ligger ett stort ansvar hos oss beslutsfattare att leva upp till de miljö- och klimatmål som vi har satt upp. Samtidigt är dessa också möjligheter för en hållbar utveckling där vi kombinerar hållbarhet med tillväxt och konkurrenskraft.

Mycket har redan gjorts under den här mandatperioden, men vi behöver ta ytterligare steg, och i morgon tas ett viktigt och konkret steg framåt i det här arbetet när det kommer till att förbättra vårt ozonskikt. Utsläpp från ozonnedbrytande ämnen har resulterat i ett sämre ozonskikt som bidragit till den globala uppvärmningen. Förebyggande av utsläpp från dessa ämnen är nyckeln till att förhindra skador mot hälsa och miljö. Det är nämligen precis det som blir följderna av ett skadat ozonskikt, och därför någonting vi behöver arbeta med för att klara unionens klimatmål. Det nuvarande regelverket är det viktigaste EU-instrumentet för att fortsätta arbetet med att förbättra och återställa ozonskiktet. Det har också visat sig fungera väl och därför bygger vårt förslag på tidigare framgångar med ytterligare åtgärder för att minska utsläppen.

Detta är inte bara en framgång för hälsan och miljön, utan också för europeisk industri som garanteras långsiktighet i sitt arbete med det nya regelverket. Jag är glad över att vi i de politiska grupperna kan stödja ett ambitiöst och balanserat förslag om att fortsätta att göra våra ansträngningar. Jag vill därför tacka skuggföredragandena för deras engagemang och arbete under det senaste halvåret, men också det tekniska teamet som har jobbat hårt.

På detta sätt höjer vi ambitionerna samtidigt som vi skapar rätt förutsättningar för alla inblandade parter att kunna leva upp till det nya regelverket. Tillsammans har vi kunnat enas om några viktiga saker. För det första innebär de högre ambitionerna att vi får ett regelverk som sätter fokus på ozonutsläpp där de är som störst och allvarligast jämfört med tidigare. Detta är viktigt för arbetet som vi gör, för att det ska få så stor effekt som möjligt för att förbättra ozonskiktet. För det andra har vi säkerställt att vi inte vidtar drastiska åtgärder som riskerar göra mer skada än nytta. Ska vi exempelvis fasa ut vissa substanser ska andra alternativ finnas tillgängliga och redo att användas.

I miljö- och klimatarbetet är en sak vägledande: höga ambitioner kombinerat med realism, och att tillväxten säkras. Med texten vi har på bordet visar vi Europa ännu en gång att en mer hållbar ekonomi går att kombinera med rätt förutsättningar för människor och industrin. Jag hoppas att ni alla vill ge stöd till det här förslaget, och att vi också kan gå in i förhandlingar med ministerrådet med ett tydligt och starkt mandat ifrån Europaparlamentet.

Frans Timmermans, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, today we discussed two important proposals. In our view, they represent a step forward towards limiting global temperature increase and fulfilling our promises on the Paris Agreement.

Fluorinated greenhouse gases and ozone-depleting substances are extremely potent human-made greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming when released into the atmosphere. Ozone-depleting substances damage the very ozone layer itself that protects earth and humanity against dangerous ultraviolet radiation from the sun.

These chemicals have or used to have many very practical applications in our everyday life, for example in fridges, air conditioners, insulation foams, in fire protection and as propellants in asthma sprays. Our existing rules have been quite successful and have already delivered very important emissions reductions. However, scientific evidence pushes us to be more ambitious.

To start with fluorinated gases or F-gases: these were the fastest-growing greenhouse gas emissions before we regulated them. Since we introduced the HFC phase-down in 2014, the emissions of F-gases in the EU have started to decrease. In 2020, they were already 20% below their peak. But it's not enough. We need to do better and innovations on the way allow us to do so.

The new rules before you today will further reduce F-gas emissions, contributing to Europe's 2030 climate target and beyond. It equips our economy better and our pathway towards climate neutrality, setting an example to the rest of the world, and hopefully they will follow. We can transform this part of our economy so that it is no longer dependent on these highly warming gases.

In the end, the whole world will have to make this transformation, and our industries will be the first to supply these low-carbon and climate-neutral solutions. This transition will bring benefits for citizens as well, with, for instance, heat pumps that are more energy efficient. We want to have more heat pumps, but we also want them climate-ready. All sectors have to be part of this, be it for medical dose inhalers or switchgear. They will all have to make the switch. Still, I have to stress the regulation only gives incentives for the switch but does not prohibit existing safe solutions where these are required.

On the report of Bas Eickhout, in detail, we welcome that it supports the introduction of a quota price, as it will reduce misuse of the system and help us in implementing the regulation and the Montreal Protocol. However, we should analyse carefully the added value of the additional earmarking proposed for the remaining quota revenue. The new F-gas rules must facilitate better control and prevent illegal activities, and we welcome Parliament's efforts to further strengthen them. With your vote tomorrow, you will start and we will start building an economy where F-gases are no longer part of the problem, but rather part of the solution.

Turning briefly to the ozone-depleting substances regulation: going ahead with their successful phase-out is really essential for our climate agenda. Thanks to the Montreal Protocol, we can expect that the ozone hole will recover by approximately 2070 and prevent a major impact in global warming.

Models indicate that the existence of the protocol has prevented up to 2 °C of climate warming by 2070 because of ozone-depleting substances only. But these effects are, in short, only if there is no backsliding. The danger is real, as shown by recent illegal production of ozone-depleting substances in China. The EU must continue leading by example and inspire others in the world to be ambitious.

One major area where emissions still occur is an insulation foams in old houses when buildings are demolished or renovated. This can be avoided by obligations to recover and destroy the ozone-depleting substances. I very much welcome that the ENVI Committee supported this concrete measure.

As regards the use of ozone-depleting substances in feedstocks. It is the Commission's belief that our proposal is already fully aligned with the Montreal Protocol, in which feedstock use is not restricted. We will continue the debate but urge for caution that a deviation from this approach might result in relocation of EU companies and potentially higher emissions globally.

On both files, it is important for Parliament to be ambitious. This is again climate leadership in the making and I warmly want to thank the rapporteurs and their shadows for a job extremely well done.

Stelios Kypouropoulos, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, F-gases are used in many applications, from medical devices to heat pumps, refrigeration and switchgears. Their reduction is crucial, as they are several thousand times stronger than carbon dioxide. By supporting this report, we have the opportunity to help our climate targets and secure a safe environment. However, we are not only supporting the environment, but we are also supporting the industry and giving a clear direction.

We are supporting leading EU manufacturers who are global frontrunners in clean alternatives, and who are showing the way to other manufacturers worldwide. We support the fundamentals of the compromise text from the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI), as it is important to give a clear message for this direction to all parts of the industry and provide solid ground for all EU companies, especially the SMEs.

For the EPP, it was important to table very specific amendments – some jointly with Renew – to ensure that those who have not yet moved to clean alternatives have the time to do so safely, by taking into consideration the safety concerns, energy efficiency and the priority targets. I would like to thank the ENVI rapporteur, Bas Eickhout, and the rest of the shadows for their help during the conciliations. I would also like to thank the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE) rapporteur, Sara Skytvedal, for her valuable contribution. I would like to ask you all to vote in favour of the proposal, the specified EPP Group amendments, and to support this report as a whole.

Günther Sidl, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Das inzwischen verbotene FCKW ist sicher noch vielen ein Begriff. In der EU ist es seit 1995 verboten. Hier hat das Verbot sehr eindrucksvoll gezeigt, dass dies der wirksamste Weg ist, wenn es darum geht, Forschung und Innovation für echte Alternativen voranzutreiben.

F-Gase finden sich in Klimaanlage, Wärmepumpen, Schaltanlagen oder als Treibgas in Asthmasprays. Doch sie haben ein besonders hohes Treibhauspotenzial. Gleichzeitig können sie in fast allen Anwendungsfeldern relativ gut vermieden werden. Die EU hat daher bereits 2014 mit der F-Gas-Verordnung einen wichtigen Schritt gesetzt. Und es geht jetzt darum, bei dem vorliegenden Bericht nachzuschärfen und unsere Ansprüche auf die Höhe der Zeit zu bringen.

Ich verstehe, dass jede Änderung zunächst zu Verunsicherung führt. Wir setzen aber auf europäisches Know-how, und wir wollen hier bei uns Forschung und Innovation stärken. Es geht uns vor allem darum, dass wir europäische Unternehmen fördern und unterstützen, daher braucht es Augenmaß und Planungssicherheit. Das ist mit Sicherheit hier bei dem vorliegenden Bericht gewährleistet. In Folge haben wir auch einige Sicherheitsnetze eingezogen. Was wir aber mit Sicherheit nicht haben wollen, sind teure und vor allem kurzzeitig anwendbare Zwischenlösungen sowie der stärkere Einsatz anderer chemisch giftiger Substanzen – das wollen wir mit Sicherheit nicht.

Ondřej Knotek, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the protection of the ozone layer is one of the priorities of Renew Europe and, therefore, we really welcome the agreement that is put on the table on the ozone-depleting substances.

We believe that further restriction of those substances will help close the ozone layer and as such will contribute to the public health. So I believe we will be able to support this proposal successfully tomorrow.

Now, concerning the second regulation on fluorinated gases, we have here, as correctly said, ambitious proposals from the Environmental Committee aiming to vastly and fastly reduce the use of fluorinated gases. The direction is good, to my feeling with this report, we would undermine further sustainability elements such as the circular economy, energy or material efficiency. And as well, we could put a risk on meeting the goals of the REPowerEU.

This is the reason why some elements have been some amendments, parallel plenary amendments have been tabled in order to address those concerns. I believe that we will be able also to support those amendments.

One example for all Renew Europe proposes to bring into the game the spare parts, because we definitely do not want to force the public to buy new devices before the end of the given life of their currently used product.

At the end, I would like to thank to both rapporteurs and all the shadow teams and all those working on those two pieces of legislation. They are very interesting, very technical, and I believe we will have tomorrow a successful vote.

Pär Holmgren, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Först av allt ett stort tack till min svenska kollega Jessica Polfjärd. Det har varit väldigt roligt att jobba ihop. Det har varit ambitiöst och det har blivit ett bra resultat, men med tanke på det så undrar jag verkligen, hur kommer det sig att Moderaterna hemma i Sverige inte är ambitiösa i klimatfrågan och klimatomställningen?

Den utvärdering som klimatpolitiska rådet gjorde i dag på förmiddagen var ju inte bara en sågning – det var en motorsågsmassaker av den nuvarande moderatledda regeringens klimatarbete hemma i Sverige. När det gäller ordförandeskapet i ministerrådet så har det varit allt annat än ambitiöst när det gäller klimatomställningen. Så fort ordet *skog* kommer in så har man till och med agerat snarare som en bromskloss i klimatomställningen.

Men du, Jessica, har gjort ett jättebra jobb. Jag hoppas att du kan vara en inspiration för andra moderater hemma i Sverige. Om inte annat får du väl ringa hem till statsministern och säga att det är dags att höja ambitionerna även på hemmaplan. För det behövs verkligen!

Alexandr Vondra, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, well, if you know, we will vote tomorrow on the revision of the Regulation on fluorinated greenhouse gases, also known as 'F-gases', which belongs among the greenhouse gases. Therefore, like CO₂, they have come under the Commission's scrutiny.

It is, of course, right to limit the use of F-gases, because they have a high global warming potential, even greater than CO₂ itself. At the same time, it should be done wisely and definitely not by shooting ourselves in our own foot. Besides their other applications, F-gases are used in heat pumps, which become one of the most effective tools to save energy and to cut off from Russian gas. That is why more and more households are installing them and public demand is increasing.

I want to thank Bas Eickhout for his rapporteurship, which he carried out in an open-minded and constructive way. I want to thank him, for example, for finding a solution regarding the usage of F-gases for the cooling of nuclear power plants.

On the other hand, some crucial elements are still missing in the final compromise. The phase-out of the F-gases in the heat pumps is, in my opinion, too fast for us to be able to meet the requirements. Therefore, I want to recommend that we vote for some amendments.

Danilo Oscar Lancini, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la revisione del regolamento F-Gas tocca molti settori e avrà un'importanza cruciale per l'industria europea e italiana.

Ancora una volta il Parlamento ha prodotto una relazione che, se adottata, porterà ad un'importante contrazione del fatturato di imprese italiane leader, compromettendo posti di lavoro in Europa e spostando gli investimenti fuori dall'UE.

Questo testo è negativo per l'ambiente, danneggia gli obiettivi di REPowerEU e rallenta la decarbonizzazione e l'indipendenza da combustibili fossili. In alcuni settori, vietare le apparecchiature che contengono F-Gas a effetto serra, anche se a basso potenziale di riscaldamento globale, non è oggi realizzabile rapidamente. Poche apparecchiature che utilizzano F-Gas possono usare fonti alternative, o per mancanza di innovazione tecnologica o perché potenzialmente pericolosi o peggiori da un punto di vista ambientale.

Bisogna riconsiderare la parola «transizione ecologica». Dobbiamo tener conto dei tempi, scandirli meglio e dividerli con le industrie. Dobbiamo consentire alle industrie di salvaguardare l'ambiente, i lavoratori, le famiglie e tutto l'indotto colpito da questa revisione. Proseguire in questa impostazione ideologica utilizzata fino ad ora, non aiuta l'economia europea, ma va a danno delle imprese, dei nostri territori e fornisce l'ennesimo assist ai *competitor* esteri. Questa è una direzione sbagliata, se vogliamo sostenere l'ambiente e la nostra industria.

Noi sosterremo gli emendamenti che presenterà il PPE, perché l'impostazione ambientale è corretta e la condividiamo, siamo tutti a favore dell'ambiente, ma dobbiamo farlo rispettando dei tempi che ci consentono oggi, attraverso le nostre industrie, di poter mantenere il benessere che abbiamo raggiunto.

Nikolaj Villumsen, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Mr President, Hello? Hello? Are you aware that there is a climate crisis? Frankly, I'm just asking because tomorrow we are voting on the extremely climate-harmful F-gases. But the right wing in this House are trying to undermine the compromise agreement we made in the committee. We agreed on a complete phase-out of F-gases. This agreement is now in danger.

We all know that F-gases are up to 24 000 times more damaging to the climate than CO₂. We all know that F-gases contribute to more EU emissions than several Member States. We all know that the technology to get rid of and phase out F-gases exists.

I would therefore like to ask my friends, my colleagues on the right wing, why are you trying to punish those innovative companies that have developed the needed green technologies? Why are you gambling with our future to protect technologies of the past instead of creating green jobs for the future? Why not be ambitious when we can? Let us adopt the compromise we made in the committee. Let us choose a green future for our children. Let us take climate action now.

Edina Tóth (NI). – Elnök Úr! A fluortartalmú üvegházhatású gázok és az ózonkárosító anyagok csökkentése elengedhetetlen az éghajlatváltozás elleni küzdelem és polgáraink egészsége érdekében.

Fontos a most hatályban levő határértékek felülvizsgálata, azonban minden új intézkedésnek arányosnak és kellően megalapozottnak kell lennie. Sajnos az EP javaslata ennek nem felel meg. Fontos megérteni azt, hogy egyes alkalmazások esetén, például nukleáris erőművek hűtésénél igenis szükség van ezen gázokra, hiszen azok központi szerepet játszhatnak az uniós klímacélok elérésében.

Tisztelt Timmermans Biztos Úr! A mostani helyzetben nem engedhetjük, hogy európai munkahelyek ezreit sodorjuk veszélybe átgondolatlan uniós szabályokkal. A klímasemleges gazdaságra való átállásnak minden tekintetben méltányosnak kell lennie, ezért arra kérem Önt, hogy az embereket, a munkavállalókat helyezze középpontba, most is, és minden jövőbeni jogalkotási javaslatánál is.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Man sieht es nicht, aber diese F-Gase sind wirklich ein Sauzeug, und ich versuche das auch auf Englisch zu übersetzen: *F-gases are a very dirty stuff*. Wir müssen sie loswerden. Das ist wichtig für Klima und Umwelt.

Jetzt heißt es: Ja, aber das ist ein Problem für die Wirtschaft und für die Arbeitsplätze. Aber ich bin davon überzeugt, das Gegenteil ist der Fall: Die europäische Industrie ist innovativ. Sie hat die Alternativen schon entwickelt und bietet sie an, oft im Gegenteil zu amerikanischen und japanischen Unternehmen. Und das ist dann kein Protektionismus, sondern Unterstützung von Innovation, wenn wir Gesetze machen, die die Umwelt schützen, und die europäischen Unternehmen einfach besser sind.

Ich bin deshalb sehr dankbar – dem Berichterstatter und allen anderen, vor allen Dingen Stelios Kypouropoulos in der EVP –, dass wir hier einen guten Bericht haben. Aber ich bin auch davon überzeugt, dass wir Änderungsanträge brauchen. Ich bitte insbesondere um Unterstützung der Änderungsanträge 152 und 160. Hier geht es um das Handwerk, um Reparaturen und Ersatzteile. Und ich denke, das müssen wir berücksichtigen; dann kann aus einem guten ENVI-Bericht ein sehr guter Plenarbericht werden – gut für das Klima, gut für die Umwelt, gut für die innovativen Unternehmen und gut für Europa.

Rovana Plumb (S&D). – Mr President, dear Vice-President Timmermans, dear colleagues, first of all, allow me to congratulate Ms Polfjärd for the report and also the cooperation during the negotiations. I would also like to thank our staff.

Well, in the ozone-depleting substances field, more than 2 000 small- and medium-sized enterprises operate at EU level and it is important to strengthen the Commission proposal with the social dimension being in line with the European Pillar of Social Rights.

On the other hand, introducing maximum emission levels and the schedule for phasing out for quantitative limits are important pieces of the emissions and pollutants package under the European Green Deal. The EU's Ozone Regulation, we can say that this is one of the big success stories of the EU environmental policy and shows how excellent results can be achieved with clear, binding rules, which were missing over years and decades at the level of climate ambition, and in addition cementing Europe's position as a global leader at the Montreal Protocol.

Emma Wiesner (för Renew-gruppen). – Herr talman! Visste ni, att det förra året såldes dubbelt så många värmesystem som använde fossilgas, jämfört med värmepumpar, i Tyskland? Det här visar oss att vi behöver varenda värmepump om vi ska klara av att fasa ut den ryska gasen. Men f-gaser används i värmepumpar – f-gaser som har otroligt hög påverkan på klimatet och växthuseffekten och som måste fasas ut.

Här, kära kolleger, står vi som så många gånger förr i ett dilemma. F-gaserna måste fasas ut, men gör vi det för fort så skjuter vi oss själva i foten. Vi hindrar elektrifieringen och vi får svårare att fasa ut den ryska gasen. Gör man som de i det högra hörnet vill, då ignorerar man klimatpolitiken och gör ingenting, men gör man som i Miljöpartiets drömvärld, då fasar man ut allt av ondo över en natt och har inga alternativ att byta ut gasen med.

Därför behöver vi en realistisk miljöpolitik, så att man gör saker, men har två tankar i huvudet samtidigt. Vi måste fasa ut f-gasen, men vi måste göra det med realistiska alternativ, och vi måste klara av att lösa klimatfrågan både på kort och på lång sikt.

Anna Zalewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Grupa ECR nie ma problemu z zagłosowaniem za rozporządzeniem dotyczącym substancji zubożających warstwę ozonową. To rzeczywiście porządkowanie, dostosowanie definicji czy też dostosowanie do innych aktów prawnych. Rzeczywistość się trochę zmieniła i trzeba unowocześnić ten dokument. Natomiast mamy duży kłopot z rozporządzeniem dotyczącym gazów fluorowanych, dlatego że on jest nierealny i niemożliwy do zrealizowania. I tak naprawdę jest wbrew temu, co jest w dokumencie RePowerEU, do którego pan Timmermans jest szczególnie przywiązany. Nie ma takiej możliwości, żeby w takim tempie odejść od gazów fluorowanych i jednocześnie nie martwić się o pompy ciepła, które są tutaj alternatywą. To spowoduje zaburzenie systemu energetycznego, efektywności energetycznej, upadek małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw i wreszcie właściwie niedostępność pomp ciepła na rynku, bo będą tak drogie.

Tutaj trzeba się zastanowić, wydłużyć czas, pokazać alternatywy, wycenić te alternatywy, żeby nie być podejrzanym, że dbamy o interesy kilku – szczególnie niemieckich – firm.

André Rougé (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je voudrais illustrer l'hypocrisie de formations politiques de notre assemblée. En exemple: le cas très concret de la centrale électrique de l'Ouest guyanais, projet très innovant, résidant dans la création d'une centrale photovoltaïque au sol pour alimenter en énergie une zone autour de Saint-Laurent-du-Maroni.

La société qui porte le projet est pionnière dans le domaine de l'hydrogène d'origine renouvelable. Cette technique remplit à 100 % les critères européens en termes de transition verte et d'indépendance énergétique. Les procédures terminées, et alors que les travaux commençaient, certains activistes soutenus par des écologistes et LFI tentent d'empêcher l'avancée du projet en bloquant physiquement les travaux.

La seule alimentation électrique actuelle de cette partie de la Guyane française est une centrale thermique très polluante. Il est curieux de voir cette schizophrénie pour la transition et les énergies renouvelables, ici, pour la surenchère et l'affrontement, comme seuls savent le faire les écologistes-terroristes qui l'ont appelé samedi à Sainte-Soline, là-bas.

Le tout alimente encore une fois la stratégie du chaos et de la zadisation généralisée. J'appelle à défendre ce projet bénéfique et à ne pas trop accorder de crédit aux écologistes virtuels que nous pouvons croiser ici.

Le Président – Cher collègue, je trouve que le terme de terroriste n'est pas approprié pour qualifier des activistes écologiques.

Catch-the-eye procedure

President. – We go to the catch-the-eye now. We have five speakers and I would ask you to be brief, one minute.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule prim-vicepreședinte, trebuie să găsim și să implementăm cele mai bune soluții pentru protejarea mediului.

Însă să ne amintim că însuși Pactul Verde European menționează că această tranziție trebuie făcută în detrimentul unei Europe care prosperă, care este echitabilă pentru toți și care are o economie modernă și competitivă.

Această propunere a Comisiei, de revizuire a Regulamentului privind gazele fluorurate, pune în pericol industrii întregi, locuri de muncă, competiția justă pe piața europeană și independența energetică a statelor membre.

Nu este inteligent să luăm decizii pentru care societățile și statele noastre nu sunt încă pregătite și pentru care nu vor fi pregătite nici după 2026. Să fim realiști, trebuie să ne asigurăm mai întâi că măsurile necesare pentru eliminarea echipamentelor de bază de gaze fluorurate se fac treptat, completând ambițiile UE în materie de climă și energie, fără să ne facem rău singuri, să ne adâncim dependența energetică de alte state. Și am văzut ce s-a întâmplat atunci când am fost dependenți de Rusia și ne-a șantajat.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, o Regulamento dos Gases Fluorados é ambicioso, projetando uma meta de zero emissões a partir de 2050 e que apoiamos.

É verdade que os gases fluorados são prejudiciais para a atmosfera, mas gostaria de chamar a atenção para o desflurano, que é um gás anestésico usado para cirurgias de doentes pediátricos, idosos e obesos e porque até agora não existe nenhuma alternativa segura e eficaz que substitua este gás anestésico.

Em terceiro lugar, também dizer que as emissões do desflurano são muito limitadas, dado que acontecem em locais estritamente necessários e quando existem tecnologias capazes de recaptar o desflurano e prevenir a sua emissão para a atmosfera.

A proibição deste anestésico poderá colocar milhares de cirurgias em risco. Chamo a atenção para este facto. Não se trata de escolher um caminho em detrimento de outro. Temos que salvaguardar estes doentes enquanto salvamos o planeta com esta proposta ambiciosa e pela qual saúdo ambos os relatores.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señor presidente, quiero manifestar mi total compromiso con el objetivo de que la Unión sea climáticamente neutra en 2050 y apostar por que esta transición hacia una economía cero en emisiones se guíe por la participación, la puesta en valor del conocimiento social disponible, el consenso y la tecnología.

Así, evitaremos episodios como el recientemente vivido con la prohibición de la venta de vehículos de combustión. Una carrera por obtener el titular más vistoso penalizó propuestas igual de eficaces, pero desde la neutralidad tecnológica. Espero que aprovechemos las lecciones aprendidas.

Un ejemplo es la enmienda 56 —que apoyo— al artículo que vetaba un anestésico administrado por inhalación y difícilmente sustituible, especialmente en cirugía pediátrica. La propuesta original planteaba una excepción para el veto cuando su uso fuese imprescindible y no hubiese alternativa clínica. Obligaba, además, a justificarlo mediante un procedimiento complejo, pero eso no evitaba las emisiones. Nosotros apoyamos que, además, se permita el uso de esta sustancia cuando se utilice en combinación con un sistema de captura de estas emisiones nocivas. Me baso en un proyecto en marcha en el Servicio Público Vasco de Salud (Osakidetza): una tecnología que evita las emisiones, reduce la huella de carbono del hospital que lo implanta, garantiza a los anestesiólogos la libre elección de anestésico y se adapta fácilmente a las prácticas de trabajo de cualquier hospital.

Conocimiento, consenso y tecnología mejor que titulares e ideología.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми заместник-председател на Комисията, направеното предложение е нереалистично, неизпълнимо, наивно и до голяма степен ще причини загубата на работни места в европейския континент и отговаря на интересите на лобисти, като например сектора на пропана.

Не се съмнявам в добрите намерения на докладчиците, но си мисля, че за пореден път сме свидетели на това как едни добри намерения ще пренареждат и ще помагат да бъде пренареждана индустрия и тази зала ще бъде използвана да гласува в една или в друга полза. Пак казвам, това е в интерес например на немски фирми, но в никой случай не е в интерес на фирмите в Централна и Източна Европа, които работят в тази сфера.

Отново повтарям, тук виждам лобизъм в интерес и в посока на фирми, които се занимават и произвеждат, както и продават пропан, с който се предполага да се заменят тези газове, както ги наричат, и виждаме същото нещо, което се случи и с пакета Мобилност, което се случи с двигателите с вътрешно горене. Един климатичен истеризъм, който обаче минава в лобизъм и всъщност застрашава работни места.

Ladislav Píčík (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, dame i gospodo, mjesecima ovdje raspravljamo o važnosti ušteda energije i prelaska na čišće izvore energije. Postavili smo si jako dobar cilj da ćemo imati novih 50 milijuna toplinskih pumpi u Europskoj uniji do 2030. godine.

No, s ovakvom Uredbom o fluoriranim plinovima to jednostavno nećemo postići. I tko će tada odgovarati?

Ljudi će zbog povećanih cijena manje prelaziti na toplinske pumpe. Nećemo uštedjeti energiju, a poskupjet će i hladnjaci, nastradat će maloprodaja, nastradat će poljoprivreda i turizam.

Da, fluorirani plinovi su štetni, pogotovo neki. Međutim, potrebno nam je vrijeme da razvijemo alternative. Kakvu odluku ćete donijeti, onu koja sad dobro zvuči, ali je nerealna ili odluku koja donosi dobre rezultate za ljude i okoliš?

Zato vas pozivam da budete realni i učinkoviti, da odbijete ENVI amandmane i da glasate za naše amandmane koji mogu ovo izvješće učiniti dobrim.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Frans Timmermans, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you, and thank you to the Members for their contribution to the debate. The proposals we're discussing today together could bring about a total reduction in the EU's greenhouse gas emissions of 490 million tonnes in CO₂ equivalents by 2050. It's a significant number, slightly higher than the total annual greenhouse gas emissions of a country like France.

I'm very pleased to see that Parliament agrees on the general architecture of the proposals and that there is broad support. It's fundamental that we remain united in the fight against climate change, that we do not to close our eyes to science and that we let scientists guide us. That's what we're doing today: taking science as your guiding principle – that's realistic; closing your eyes to science – that's unrealistic and dangerous, especially for jobs.

I recognise that the timing of some requirements for when products need to make the shift to more climate-friendly gases has been here an element of discussion? I note that several amendments seem to think it is better to delay these dates, for instance, for heat pumps. And I do also note that my good friend Alexandr Vondra is now such a warm proponent of heat pumps – that came as a welcome surprise. But for heat pumps, this comes at a time where we need to increase deployment rapidly to meet our REPowerEU and 2030 climate goals. The Commission is well aware of this and included heat pumps as a strategic sector in the Net-Zero Industry Act.

And let me add, since this issue was mentioned just a while ago, two of the biggest factories for making heat pumps, in the world, will be built in eastern Europe. And that is going to lead to a lot of jobs and well-paid jobs and long-term jobs. So let's not create caricatures here, please.

But as many in EU industry, we don't think it helps to continue business as usual. These two plans show that clearly. We need to invest now in the right manufacturing, not the obsolete ones. Technologies exist and by asking to make the shift early on, we create a competitive advantage for our industry, not a disadvantage. Some of us are fighting every day – every day – to convince you and others that we do not help our workers, our industry, our growth by tying ourselves, by chaining ourselves to the past. And I hope this Parliament has the wisdom to understand that this can be done and it gives us a competitive edge, an advantage over other parts of the world if we are forward-looking.

So, delaying these bans, as some amendments propose, cannot, in all earnestness, be seen as being in the interest of the European Union, of its people and of its workforce. So I call on the European Parliament to be also ambitious on this tomorrow and engage in a swift negotiation process to reach an agreement with Council before summer so that the new rules for both F-gases and ozone-depleting substances can apply from 2024 onwards. This will send an early signal to industry as well as getting better tools to prevent illegal activities.

Bas Eickhout, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, first of all, I really would like to thank all my colleagues who have been part of the negotiations. Here I want to stress that, during those negotiations, we have been talking to many European industries: from Poland, from Czech Republic, from Italy, from Greece. Exactly those companies in those countries who are saying, 'We are ready.'

When you are saying this is a green ideology, you are defending American and Japanese companies who like to sell some of these chemicals and are only interested in innovation in the chemicals themselves, which in the end even deliver PFAS in heat pumps. That's what you're aiming for, and that's not what we are aiming for.

We are aiming here for European innovation, and it is not only Germany. This is exactly indeed what Vice-President Mr Timmermans is also rightfully saying. This is not the kind of old argument to say, 'Ah, this is promoting German industry.' This is an industry that is all over Europe, and it's all over Europe investing in innovation and in new jobs. And that's exactly what we're supporting here. It's the American and the Japanese companies that are not going into that innovation. It's the European ones.

So, this time it is very clear-cut and we have sufficient time. We have talked to a lot of industry who said we can do it already next year, but we even allow them more time; we even have safeguards; we even have asked the Commission to make sure that they are keeping it on track for the implementation of REPowerEU. All that is in place, and then now still delaying things because some of the American and Japanese lobby is asking you to do so? I think this is time to choose for European industry and European innovation, and that's what we're going to do tomorrow.

Jessica Polfjärd, fördragande. – Herr talman! Tack till alla er som har bidragit till debatten, även om den här gången inte var så hård. Jag kan konstatera att det råder en stor samstämmighet och ett brett parlamentariskt stöd om hur viktigt det är att vi arbetar ambitiöst och målmedvetet med vår miljö- och klimatpolitik. Det gläder mig också att vi sätter sakfrågan i centrum och lämnar orealistiska förslag därhän.

Som jag inledde denna debatt så visade Europaparlamentet med detta förslag hur vi kan arbeta fram ambitiösa och realistiska förslag för att möta våra miljö- och klimatutmaningar. Miljö- och klimatutmaningar är vår tids stora fråga, och precis som utmaningarna är också möjligheterna det. Den gröna omställningen kan bidra till Europas välbefinnande, utveckling och konkurrenskraft. Låt oss tillvarata dessa möjligheter och göra det möjligt så långt det bara går.

Tack igen till de politiska grupperna, och tack till skuggföredragandena som har varit med och arbetat och förhandlat fram detta förslag. Jag får också rikta ett extra tack till Pär Holmgren från Gruppen De gröna som riktade beröm åt mitt håll. Jag ska gå hem och fundera på om det var bra eller dåligt.

President. – The joint debate is now closed, and as you heard from many colleagues, the vote will be held tomorrow.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Mihai Tudose (S&D), în scris. – Raportul privind gazele fluorurate este un exemplu trist de bune intenții compromise de lipsa de realism și excesul populist-ecologist. M-am abținut la votul final, după ce o serie de amendamente, împotriva cărora am votat, au alterat substanța propunerii Comisiei Europene. Un exemplu elocvent sunt termenele pentru interzicerea de produse, sisteme și echipamente. A institui interdicția de la 1 ianuarie 2024 pentru unele echipamente de refrigerare și de la 1 ianuarie 2025 pentru echipamente de climatizare și pompe de căldură autonome care conțin gaze fluorurate înseamnă o presiune nejustificată asupra pieței, a producătorilor și a consumatorilor deopotrivă.

Sunt de acord cu eliminarea gazelor fluorurate, din cauza efectului lor de seră, dar reducerea trebuie să fie treptată, pentru ca sectoarele vizate să se poată adapta tehnologic pentru a dezvolta alternative nepoluante, iar cetățenii să nu fie forțați să cumpere produse noi înainte de finalul ciclului de viață al celor deținute deja. Nu e normal să fie astfel bulversate industria deja lovită de pandemie și de criza energetică, piața afectată de disfuncționalitățile lanțurilor de aprovizionare și consumatorii împovărați de greutățile traiului zilnic. Pentru ce? Pentru eliminarea accelerată a gazelor fluorurate, care reprezintă 2,5 % din emisiile de gaze cu efect de seră ale UE!

13. Rozporządzenie w sprawie ogólnego bezpieczeństwa produktów (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Dita Charanzová, on behalf of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on general product safety, amending Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Council Directive 87/357/EEC and Directive 2001/95/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (COM(2021)0346 - C9-0245/2021 - 2021/0170(COD)) (A9-0191/2022).

Dita Charanzová, rapporteur. – Mr President, Mr Vice-President, well, this law is our safety net and constitutes the general framework for ensuring the safety of all products circulating in the Union's market, sold offline and online.

The new benefits for consumers from these regulations are long and important. Companies will have to make sure they have internal processes in place to make sure that they only produce or sell safe products, from smartphones to toys. Just because something is cheap is no excuse. More requirements to report if anyone in the supply chain sees something dangerous, they are now 'see something, say something' requirements.

Companies will also have to keep records of who they buy from and to which other companies they sell to. This will mean we can trace dangerous products. No longer can a company say, yes, it is unsafe, but I don't know where it went to. They must know.

Chemicals are the most reported problem with products, but it is not always the final producer who is the source of the problem. Every product has to have a legal representative inside the European Union, even if it is a product sold straight from China. This means there will be someone to hold responsible if something goes wrong.

50% of dangerous products come from China. Today you just get a random address somewhere that is impossible to check, let alone find someone responsible there for what they make.

Now, every product must have on the label the name of the legal representative in the European Union, their address and email address. Moreover, you can sue them if they don't solve the problem, and to make sure it works, consumers can sue as a group.

We made sure that all accidents and reports of dangerous products must be checked and reported to the authorities. If someone reports something to a marketplace or trader, they have to report it. This will help governments spot bad products faster. This law makes it so online marketplaces must remove dangerous products and fast to this maximum, and it must be done.

Today, if a product is removed, it often just comes back. We can see this, especially with sales of electronics and toys. This cannot happen anymore. Marketplaces must remove all sales for the same products and prevent any new sales to reappear. No matter the trader, no matter what name they call them, products have to remain removed.

And if you bought something and the online shop or normal shop has your email, they will have to email you if something you bought is recalled. How many people check the recall websites every day? How many people know that these websites exist? No one. And now you will not have to do it. They will have to tell you directly.

Finally, a repair, a replacement, or your money back. Companies have to give you a choice of at least two of them if you bought a recalled product.

Altogether, this regulation is a big win for consumers, a win for safety and a reason to feel free to shop anywhere in Europe, starting before Christmas next year.

Frans Timmermans, Executive Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I'm really happy to be here today for this debate on the General Product Safety Regulation, because instead of Commissioner Reynders, I'm doing the honours and it is an important event. He can't be here; he has other obligations this evening.

Our Single Market is only as strong as the trust that citizens have in the safety of the products that circulate within it. And I think it is high time that we upgrade our product safety rules because they're 22 years old and a lot has happened since then and they were not ready, the present rules are not ready for the digital age where most of us are not just shopping in shops but also online. And I'm sure that certainly for many in this room, that's an understatement given the time you have to spend working.

So, now, also, thanks to the rapporteur and this Parliament, we will have a new General Product Safety Regulation that is in fact a new safety net for European consumers, and one that is solid and future-proof. And I really want to warmly thank the rapporteur and the IMCO Committee for this achievement – extremely well done.

Let me highlight a few of the accomplishments. First, the introduction of the obligation to have a responsible person inside the EU who should care about the safety of your product and whom you can call, contact and, in the worst case, take to court if there is a problem. Now, all of us will have that responsible person for all products in the Single Market, including those that aren't under harmonised European rules.

As said, we are very happy that the new rules also guarantee the safety of products sold online. It contains new obligations for online marketplaces to ensure product safety building up on the Digital Services Act.

It is very important to be cautious in the area of consumer safety. It means that if a business or a government is active in the market, it has to assess the risk and take any measure that is fit. It's crucial for consumers and it's fully proportionate in our view. If products are dangerous, truly dangerous, the new and stronger framework for recalling these products should avoid the danger that these products remain at the disposal of our citizens.

I commend Parliament in particular to include the possibility for consumers to seek collective redress in case of safety problems. Together they stand stronger and this can make a big difference in ensuring that these safety rules are implemented on the ground.

Finally, we welcome that the final text provides for special protection of vulnerable consumers such as children and better access to information for people with disabilities.

Adopting new rules is one thing, but implementing, at home and in the public sphere, doesn't mean much if it is not enforced. We need Member States on board to do this. The Commission will do its utmost to coordinate product safety activities at the level of Member States, including with support from the Single Market programme.

We believe that the new regulation is a major step forward to protect consumers against dangerous products, even when markets, technology and, in fact, the whole world is changing very fast. With this law, you will give all of us a strong safety net that you can be very proud of.

René Repasi, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Rechtsausschusses*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Vizepräsident, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es war notwendig, die Produktsicherheitsrichtlinie aus dem Jahr 2001 an die Moderne anzupassen – vielleicht sogar die Postmoderne. Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher kaufen inzwischen im Internet, sie kaufen verstärkt Produkte aus Drittstaaten, und es gibt immer mehr neue Produkte, die insbesondere mit Software verbunden sind. Das galt es zu adressieren.

Es ist daher gut, dass wir diese Produktsicherheitsverordnung bekommen und das Update haben. Es ist vor allen Dingen sehr gut, dass wir eine verantwortliche Person in der Europäischen Union bekommen, die die Verantwortung übernimmt und in Verantwortung genommen werden kann, wenn Drittstaatsprodukte, die über Drittstaatsmarktplätze den europäischen Binnenmarkt erreicht haben und schädlich sind, hier auf den Markt gekommen sind.

Es ist deswegen auch gut, dass wir Online-Marktplätze benannt haben. Aber wir brauchen mehr als die Benennung von Online-Marktplätzen. Wir brauchen konkrete Handlungspflichten von Online-Marktplätzen. Sie sind die entscheidende Tür für schädliche Drittstaatsprodukte auf dem Binnenmarkt. Der *Digital Services Act* ist hierbei eine gute Grundlage und ein guter Querschnittsrechtsakt. Aber das reicht nicht aus. Das ist nicht die abschließende Regelung. Wir brauchen mehr! Deswegen fordere ich die Europäische Kommission auf: Legen Sie bitte einen eigenen Rechtsakt für Online-Marktplätze vor, damit wir hier die entsprechende Sicherheit für Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher schaffen.

Ganz wichtig: das Recht auf Reparatur. Gut, dass wir in der Produktsicherheit jetzt klargestellt haben, dass Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher bei einem Rückruf nach Ablauf der zweijährigen Gewährleistungsfrist Rechte haben – konkrete Rechte. Aber diese stehen immer noch unter dem Vorbehalt, was Herstellerinnen und Hersteller ihnen ermöglichen. Verbraucher müssen es sich aber leisten können, für die Reparatur zu gehen. Es braucht eine Pflicht zur Reparatur, und zwar eine solche, die Herstellerinnen und Hersteller nicht einfach zurückweisen können, wie es im aktuellen Vorschlag zum Recht auf eine Reparatur drin ist.

Daher lassen Sie uns auf dieser guten Grundlage aufbauen, die wir bekommen haben, die aber noch lange nicht ausreicht, um einen Verbraucherschutz in Europa sicherzustellen. Und das Recht auf Reparatur ist die nächste Chance – ein sozial gesichertes Recht auf Reparatur und ein solches, das auch tatsächlich eine echte Kreislaufwirtschaft herstellt.

Marion Walsmann, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, meine sehr verehrten Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die morgige Abstimmung zur allgemeinen Produktsicherheit ist ein wichtiger Meilenstein für den einheitlichen Binnenmarkt und für die Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher Europas. Ein gutes Verhandlungsergebnis für sichere Produkte in der Europäischen Union ist nun endlich erreicht. Das entspricht dem, was wir als Parlament schon im November 2020 im Rahmen des Initiativberichts zur Produktsicherheit, den ich als Berichterstatterin verhandeln durfte, gefordert hatten.

Bisher gelten für ein Puppenbett strengere Sicherheitsanforderungen als für ein Kinderbett. Damit ist jetzt Schluss. Für alle Produkte gelten mit der neuen Produktsicherheitsverordnung gleichermaßen strenge Sicherheitsbestimmungen – gleichgültig, ob es sich um ein Produkt handelt, welches sektorspezifischer Gesetzgebung unterliegt oder nicht, egal, ob das Produkt im Geschäft oder im Internet gekauft wurde, unabhängig davon, ob es von einem Anbieter innerhalb der EU oder außerhalb der EU gekauft wurde, und unabhängig, ob dieses Produkt vernetzt ist und neuartige Technologien, wie zum Beispiel KI, beinhaltet oder nicht.

Wir haben den Verbraucherschutz erhöht, ohne damit den administrativen Aufwand für die Unternehmen zu erhöhen. Wir haben für faire Wettbewerbsbedingungen im Binnenmarkt gesorgt und die KMU besonders berücksichtigt. Wir haben dafür gesorgt, dass es nun für jedes Produkt, das auf dem europäischen Binnenmarkt angeboten wird, auch einen Ansprechpartner in der EU gibt. Und wir haben erhöhte Verpflichtungen für Online-Marktplätze vorgesehen, die die Produktsicherheit verbessern werden – vor allem deshalb, weil über 70 % inzwischen auch online einkaufen. Und das Schnellwarnsystem RAPEX wird zu einem modernen *Safety Gate*. Wir haben dafür gesorgt, dass Produktsicherheitsbedenken schneller mitgeteilt werden können und die Identifizierung unsicherer Produkte schneller erfolgen kann und besser kommuniziert wird und natürlich Produktrückrufe nun endlich auch bei den Verbrauchern ankommen, denn heutzutage verwendet schätzungsweise ein Drittel unsichere Produkte weiter.

Meine Damen und Herren, jedes gefährliche Produkt auf dem europäischen Markt ist ein Produkt zu viel. Und deshalb haben wir gehandelt.

Christel Schaldemose, *for S&D-Gruppen*. – Hr. formand! Flere og flere europæere køber ikke længere deres produkter i de lokale butikker på gågaden. De handler online i webbutikker og på online-markedspladser, og det stiller os over for en ny udfordring. For mens vores produktsikkerhedsregler i mange år har fungeret i den fysiske offline-verden og fungeret rigtig godt og været rigtig gode, så gør det samme sig ikke gældende online, når man handler med sælger og ikke mindst fra tredjeland. Her risikerer forbrugeren kort sagt at købe katten i sækken. Legetøj med kræftfremkaldende stoffer, brandfarlige mobilopladere eller varmetæpper med stød i. Vores regler har ikke fulgt med tiden, og derfor er det godt, at vi nu gør noget. Og særligt er jeg glad for, at vi sikrer, at produkter, der er importeret uden for EU ind i EU, nu skal have de regler strammet op, så de, der gør det her, kan blive stillet til ansvar, hvis produktet ikke lever op til vores regler. Men det betyder ikke, at vi er i mål. Vi har kun lappet nogle huller. Jeg mener stadig, at der er mere at gøre i forhold til at sikre produkterne online, når forbrugerne handler. Men det er godt, at vi kommer i gang. Og det her er bedre end ingenting.

PRESEDA: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podprededa

Vlad-Marius Botoș, *im Namen der Renew-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Berichterstatterin Dita Charanzová, Herr Vizepräsident Timmermans! Die technologische Entwicklung der letzten 20 Jahre, die Fortschritte in der Forschung haben eine Überarbeitung der Produktsicherheitsgesetzgebung absolut notwendig gemacht.

Ich unterstütze Innovationen und neue Technologien. Aber wir müssen betonen, dass sich alle Hersteller auf zwei Aspekte konzentrieren müssen: auf den Nutzen, den ein Produkt hat, aber auch auf die Risiken, die es mit sich bringt. Gleichzeitig müssen wir, die Verbraucher, die Notwendigkeit einer permanenten Weiterbildung annehmen. Wir müssen die Risiken kennen, die wir gerade im digitalen Zeitalter eingehen, und lernen, sie zu vermeiden.

In einer Zeit, in der das Aufkommen neuer Produkte und Technologien an der Tagesordnung ist, kann die Verbrauchersicherheit durch eine sehr gute Gesetzgebung gewährleistet werden, die notwendigerweise von einer angemessenen Aufklärung begleitet wird.

Kim Van Sparrentak, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, rapporteur, commissaris, *it's a man's world*. Dat geldt tot vandaag ook bij het ontwerp en de veiligheid van producten, want hierbij wordt nu standaard uitgegaan van de gemiddelde witte man van 1,80 m en 70 kg, terwijl een product dat veilig is voor een man, dat zeker niet automatisch ook is voor een vrouw.

Hoewel consumenten in Europa ervan op aan moeten kunnen dat de producten die ze kopen veilig zijn, is dit keer op keer niet het geval voor de helft van de samenleving. Zo bleek tijdens de coronapandemie dat beschermingsmateriaal, zoals pakken en maskers, voor vrouwen niet in de juiste maat beschikbaar was, terwijl het juist vaak vrouwen zijn die in de zorg werken. Zij liepen hierdoor een hoger gevaar op een coronabesmetting. Ik ben daarom heel erg blij dat we nu productveiligheidsregels krijgen die van deze tijd zijn en waarin dus gender wordt meegenomen.

De strijd tegen het patriërchaat moet overal doorklinken: in de straten, in de parlementen, en bij het schrijven van een gortdroge Europese wet over productveiligheid, zodat die bijdraagt aan gendergelijkheid. Ik hoop dan ook dat de Commissie hier een voorbeeld aan neemt en bij alle wetgeving een genderbril opzet.

Beata Mazurek, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Bardzo dziękuję pani sprawozdawczyni za wspólną pracę nad tym rozporządzeniem i prowadzenie negocjacji z Radą.

Ochrona konsumentów i ich bezpieczeństwo jest jedną z podstawowych funkcji, z jakiej wywodzić się powinny państwa członkowskie i instytucje europejskie. Cieszę się, że nowe przepisy usprawniające przepływ informacji umożliwią organom nadzoru rynku szybsze reagowanie w razie wypadku spowodowanego przez dany produkt.

Doceniam fakt, że w tekście końcowym zastosowano podejście oparte na ryzyku, które skupia wysiłki tam, gdzie jest to najważniejsze dla bezpieczeństwa konsumentów i jednocześnie nie prowadzi do zahamowania handlu przez internet.

Osiągnęliśmy dobre porozumienie dla konsumentów, których produkty okazały się mieć problemy już po zakupie. W przypadku wycofania produktu z rynku dostaną stosowną informację i będą mogli wybrać pomiędzy otrzymaniem nowego naprawionego produktu a zwrotem kosztów.

Jestem przekonana, że wdrożenie nowej regulacji przyczyni się w znaczący sposób do podniesienia poziomu ochrony konsumentów i ich bezpieczeństwa na jednolitym rynku oraz ułatwi wymianę handlową między krajami członkowskimi.

Anne-Sophie Pelletier, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Rapporteuse, chers collègues, nous vivons dans une société du risque telle que théorisée par le sociologue Ulrich Beck. Les promesses de la modernité n'ont pas été tenues dans nos sociétés industrielles. La misère et les inégalités augmentent toujours plus et le progrès, en même temps que la richesse créée est confisquée par les mains de quelques-uns, a engendré toutes sortes de risques, parmi lesquels catastrophes industrielles, accidents de la vie, menaces sur l'environnement, j'en passe et des meilleures.

La confiance n'est plus. Il est de notre devoir de législateur européen de la restaurer auprès de nos concitoyens, de notre devoir aussi de s'assurer que le cadre juridique existant soit adapté et le plus protecteur possible des femmes et des hommes. La gestion du risque – de chaque risque – réel ou potentiel, présent ou à venir, doit être assurée.

En matière de sécurité des produits, je dirais même qu'il faut aller plus loin. La vigilance doit être de chaque instant, notamment quand le profit prime sur le consommateur, quand le manque de moyens des douanes permet à de grandes plateformes de vendre des produits potentiellement dangereux. La gestion du risque – de chaque risque – réel ou potentiel, présent ou à venir, doit être assurée, et c'est cela le principe de précaution.

Si un certain produit peut causer une catastrophe sanitaire ou environnementale, a-t-on besoin d'être certain que ce soit le cas pour prendre des mesures? Non. Les enjeux sont réels. On ne plaisante pas avec la vie et la sûreté des citoyens et des citoyennes européennes. Nous devons être à la hauteur. Si effectivement la peur n'évite pas le danger, il vaut mieux prévenir que subir.

Andreas Schwab (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal möchte ich der Kollegin Charanzová und unserer Schattenberichterstatterin Marion Walsmann für eine exzellente Arbeit danken und zwei Punkte in den Mittelpunkt stellen, die mir besonders wichtig erscheinen.

Der erste ist, dass auch mit dieser Verordnung – auch hier haben wir es übrigens mit einer Änderung von einer Richtlinie zu einer Verordnung zu tun – sichergestellt ist, dass das, was offline verboten ist, auch online verboten ist und dass das, was online erlaubt ist, auch offline erlaubt bleibt. Das ist wichtig, denn wir wollen einen Gleichklang der Regeln zwischen der digitalen und der analogen Welt erreichen. Das ist wichtig, denn diese Verordnung ist so alt, dass sie am Anfang noch gar nicht alle digitalen Produkte und Dienstleistungen umfassen konnte, die heute geregelt werden müssen. Und deswegen machen wir für den Binnenmarkt, für die Sicherheit von Verbraucherinnen und Verbrauchern hier einen großen Schritt nach vorne. Dafür bin ich sehr dankbar.

Zum Zweiten glaube ich aber auch, dass wir gerade für den Krisenfall – und wir beschäftigen uns ja auch gemeinsam mit einigen Kollegen mit den Folgen der Corona-Krise – sicherstellen müssen, dass auch nicht harmonisierte Produkte im Krisenfall schnell genehmigt werden können – natürlich nur für den Krisenfall und nur im Krisenfall –, aber dass wir gewissermaßen die generelle Produktsicherheitsverordnung hier für den Krisenfall adäquat erweitern, um sicherzustellen, dass wir bei Masken oder anderen nicht harmonisierten Produkten – beispielsweise bei Masken, die nicht für den Klinikalltag gedacht sind – im Krisenfall schnell handeln können und vermeiden können, dass das passiert, was damals bei der Coronakrise passiert ist – nämlich dass sich an den Grenzen, an den Zollgrenzen plötzlich wieder Produkte gestapelt haben, weil die Mitgliedstaaten sie wegen Zweifeln an der Produktzulassung nicht weitergeleitet haben.

Das hat uns in der Krise nicht geholfen. Das sollten wir ändern. Deswegen denke ich, dass die Arbeit daran, den Binnenmarkt auch für die kommenden Jahre noch zu verbessern, leider noch nicht zu Ende ist. Deswegen freue ich mich auf die weitere Arbeit daran.

Anna Cavazzini (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Hohe Produktstandards auf dem EU-Binnenmarkt – das ist der Kern von unserem Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz. Dafür legen wir uns täglich ins Zeug, und deswegen auch noch einmal vielen Dank an die Berichterstatte Dita Charanzová und an die ganzen Schattenberichterstatteinnen und Schattenberichterstatte, die eine super Arbeit geleistet haben an diesem Dossier.

Hohe Produktstandards – da profitieren Menschen ganz konkret vom EU-Binnenmarkt, denn dieser beinhaltet viel, viel mehr als nur, Hürden für Unternehmen abzubauen. Produktsicherheit – das ist kein abstraktes Problem, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Denken Sie nur zum Beispiel an Rauchmelder: Sichere Produkte retten konkret Leben.

Eine aktuelle Studie hat gezeigt, dass zwei Drittel der Produkte, die man online kaufen kann, bei Sicherheitsstandards durchfallen. Das ist absolut inakzeptabel. Und die neuen Regeln zur Produktsicherheit, die schließen diese Lücken, und die werden Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher besser schützen – online und offline.

Wir haben endlich schärfere Vorgaben, die festlegen, was Produkte sicher macht und was nicht. Das Vorsorgeprinzip ist weiterhin fest verankert – das war besonders wichtig für meine Fraktion. Wir wollen sicherstellen, dass Online-Marktplätze nicht mehr das Einfallstor sind für unsichere Produkte. Von diesen neuen Regeln werden alle Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher in der Europäischen Union profitieren.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, dovoluji mi, abych se také vyjádřil k tomuto mimořádně důležitému právnímu předpisu, který upravuje to, co já považuji za korunu evropského práva, a to je právo spotřebitelů. Chtěl bych poděkovat a vyzdvihnout roli vzácné přítelkyně a zpravodajky, poslankyně Dity Charanzové, bez jejíhož přičinění bychom tady dnes neprojednávali tak velký úspěch – novou úpravu spotřebitelského práva. Byla zde řečena celá řada důležitých změn a pozitivních posunů oproti současné platné právní úpravě, sladění prostoru online, prostoru offline, ale pro normální občany je zde celá řada nových institutů, které lidé v praxi ocení. A mimo jiné my tím můžeme ukazovat, jak je Evropská unie důležitá při ochraně jejich spotřebitelského práva.

Já velmi vítám například stanovení jasných pravidel odpovědnosti za produkty z třetích zemí. V dnešním globálním světě občané čím dále více nakupují produkty z Číny, z jiných států, ale často pak mají problém s tím, co dělat, pokud ten produkt nebude kvalitní. To, že teď zde bude určena osoba, která ponese odpovědnost za nekvalitní produkt ze třetí země, je podle mě pro normálního Evropana obrovsky důležitá věc. Ochrana zranitelných spotřebitelů, dětí, to je také věc, kterou považuji za velmi důležitou. A potom celkově nová právní úprava, která zabrání, aby výrobek, který je stažen z trhu, se opět na trh dostal. To jsou jenom některé konkrétní věci, které konkrétně lidem usnadní život, a proto právní úpravu vítám.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Mr President, thank you to the rapporteur and shadow rapporteurs for bringing us to this point. Consumers in the EU should be able to buy from anywhere in Europe or the world and know that the products they buy are safe. This needs to become the norm.

Toys, motor cars, cosmetics, clothing and electrical appliances top the list of dangerous products found in the single market, and half of those products come from outside the European Union. All products traded in the EU are subject to general safety requirements. But to keep up with challenges linked to digitalisation and the increasing amount of goods and products sold online, these rules are no longer suited to addressing current digital technological developments and the challenges.

Thanks to this new legislation, marketplaces will be safer and we will have the tools to spot dangerous products and get them removed from online marketplaces quickly. Consumers will now be informed about recalls of products that they bought before it hurts them. This General Product Safety Regulation is future-proofed, as it covers all consumer products and also new digital ones. The new rules ensure that economic operators have to have a responsible product person for products sold online and offline, whether they originate in the EU or from a third country. If a product has proven to be unsafe, economic operators are required to immediately adopt corrective measures and inform market surveillance authorities and consumers accordingly. If a product has to be recalled, consumers will be entitled to repair, replacement or refund.

These new rules for online marketplaces will increase safety, better protect consumers, and help us in reaching a level playing field when it comes to online and offline sectors.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtarán*, Commissioner, the General Product Safety Regulation is an important regulation that directly impacts the lives of every EU citizen by ensuring that all products sold in the European Union are safe for consumers.

The GPSR has allowed European consumers to trust the products they buy, particularly for high-risk products, such as toys for our children and electrical appliances. Although the GPSR has had an overall positive effect, we shouldn't ignore enforcement challenges and the fact that some dangerous products can still make their way onto the market.

The market is constantly changing, and regulation must evolve with it. I am happy that specific attention has been paid to the need to provide appropriate support for SMEs. In addition, it is positive that a repair, replacement or an adequate refund will always be proposed for customers.

The General Product Safety Regulation is an important piece of legislation, and I support all efforts to ensure it fits today's marketplace.

Frans Timmermans, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I want to thank all of you for this debate, and mostly for the work Parliament that has put into this new General Product Safety Regulation. It is an important step to achieving a high level of protection of EU consumers so that products can no longer put their health and safety in danger, and – I understand also – in a gender-balanced way, which is a good achievement.

It's also a crucial piece of legislation to ensure that all businesses compete on the basis of a level playing field. The new regulation provides strong enforcement tools and gives powers to the Member States to do what is necessary.

The Commission stands ready to do everything to facilitate the implementation of this new piece of legislation to ensure that it can be implemented quickly and properly by all stakeholders.

Dita Charanzová, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, Mr Vice-President, first of all, I would like to thank everybody who spoke today. As with many of you, I am particularly happy that we managed to have all these concrete practical improvements to product safety in the European Union while also taking the right balance – the right balance between the need to protect consumers and to keep proportionality.

I think we managed to address the weak points of our safety net, taking into account a risk-based approach, keeping bureaucracy at a minimum, and focusing on the real needs of consumers and economic operators.

I take this occasion to thank all my shadows who helped and contributed to this process. I would like to thank also the IMCO Secretariat, Renew advisors and special thanks to my assistant, Andrew Hillman – the force behind me.

Our priority was to bring the single market into the 21st century, both online and offline, to make sure Europeans have the best and widest choice of safe products. A Single Market where you can always find what is right for you, what is right for your family.

Tomorrow we can all vote in favour of this legislation and be proud that we, as the European Parliament, have done something to help our citizens to be even safer in the future.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

Hlasovanie sa uskutoční zajtra vo štvrtok 30. marca 2023.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Karol Karski (ECR), na písmie. – Szanowni Państwo, przyjęcie przez Parlament Europejski rozporządzenia dotyczącego ogólnego bezpieczeństwa produktów to ogromny krok naprzód dla konsumentów i przedsiębiorców na terenie UE. Popieram wprowadzenie tych przepisów ze względu na wiele korzyści, jakie niesie ze sobą ten akt prawny. Rozporządzenie to ujednocila poziom bezpieczeństwa produktów na całym terenie UE, co z kolei przyczyni się do wzmocnienia systemu nadzoru rynku i budowania rynku wewnętrznego na równych zasadach. Określenie przejrzystych obowiązków podmiotów gospodarczych odpowiedzialnych za obrót produktami, jak również wprowadzenie instytucji osoby odpowiedzialnej na terytorium UE dla przedsiębiorstw sprzedających swoje produkty spoza granic Unii, wprowadza precyzyjne zasady dla poszczególnych uczestników łańcucha dostaw. Wprowadzenie nowych przepisów jest również dostosowaniem środowiska prawnego do obecnej sytuacji rynkowej, w szczególności związanej z postępem technicznym i rozwojem nowych technologii, jak również rosnącą popularnością sprzedaży internetowej. Zaproponowanie proporcjonalnych obowiązków w zakresie bezpieczeństwa produktów oferowanych na internetowych platformach handlowych jest dobrym rozwiązaniem, które nie ograniczy możliwości realizacji wygodnych zakupów w atrakcyjnej cenie. Jestem głęboko przekonany, że wprowadzenie nowych obowiązków będzie miało pozytywny wpływ na ochronę konsumentów. Spójne i przyjazne prawo to sukces wszystkich mieszkańców UE, którzy czerpią korzyści w ramach wspólnego rynku.

Urmas Paet (Renew), kirjalikult. – Toetasin. Ajakohastatud seadus tagab, et ELis müüakse nii internetis kui ka traditsioonilistes poodides ainult kõrgeimatele ohutusnõuetele vastavaid kaupu. Uus määrus laiendab ettevõtjate, nt tootjate, importijate ja turustajate vastutust, suurendab turujärelevalveasutuste volitusi ja kehtestab internetipoodidele selged kohustused. Internetipõhised kauplemiskohad peavad riskide maandamiseks tegema koostööd turujärelevalveasutustega, kes omakorda võivad anda internetipoodidele korralduse kõrvaldada põhjendamatu viivituse ja hiljemalt kahe tööpäeva jooksul ohtlikud tooted müügilt või blokeerida neile juurdepääs. Väljastpoolt ELi pärinevaid tooteid tohib turule lasta üksnes juhul, kui nende ohutuse eest vastutab ELis registreeritud ettevõtja. Uuendatud normidega parandatakse ka toodete tagasikutsumise menetlust. Praegu tagastatakse vähe tooteid ning hinnanguliselt kasutab kolmandik ELi tarbijatest tagasikutsumitute tooteid edasi. Kokkuvõttes võiks öelda, et uued reeglid aitavad kõige kaitsetumaid tarbijaid, eriti lapsi.

Edina Tóth (NI), írásban. – A termékbiztonságról szóló rendelettervezet fontos lépés a modern kor kihívásainak megfelelő, hatékony fogyasztóvédelem irányába. Üdvözlöm a javaslatot, amely számos, a területet érintő kihívásra igyekszik megoldást találni. Az online vásárlás fokozott tényerése és a folyamatos technológiai fejlődés új lehetőségeket, ám egyszersmind új veszélyeket is rejt a fogyasztók számára. Ezért kulcsfontosságú, hogy online és offline is csak biztonságos termékek legyenek elérhetőek. Fontos emellett, hogy a nemzeti hatóságoknak megfelelő eszközök álljanak rendelkezésére annak érdekében, hogy a nem biztonságos termékeket gyorsan eltávolíthassák a piacról. Jelentős eredménynek tartom, hogy erre vonatkozóan korszerű szabályokat tartalmaz a javaslat. Bízom abban, hogy ezzel a jogszabállyal sikerült egy hatékony, a digitális kor kihívásainak megfelelő védőhálót alkotni az uniós fogyasztók számára.

14. Prawa dzieci z tęczowych rodzin i rodziców tej samej płci, w szczególności we Włoszech (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je vyhlásenie Komisie o Právach detí v dúhových rodinách, a najmä rodičov rovnakého pohlavia v Taliansku (2023/2629(RSP)).

Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, a Union of equality is a priority. It's a major priority of Commission President von der Leyen. A Union based on the principle of equality for all and of equality in all of its senses.

Indeed, equality and non-discrimination are core values and fundamental rights in the Union. To achieve this objective, in 2020, the Commission adopted the first-ever strategy on LGBTIQ equality. This strategy aims to build a Union where LGBTIQ people, in all their diversity, are safe and have equal opportunities to participate fully in society and thus reach their full potential.

This includes equal opportunities and rights of children with same-sex parents. Under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989, Member States must respect the rights of the child without discrimination of any kind and take all appropriate measures to ensure that the child is protected against all forms of discrimination or sanctions based on the situation of his or her parents.

Equally, under the EU Treaties and the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, all children have the same rights without discrimination, that is, irrespective of how children were conceived or born and irrespective of the type of family. When applying their national law, Member States must respect their obligations under international law. When applying Union law, Member States must respect the EU Treaties and the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, and it is the duty of the Union and of every Member State to protect these rights.

This means that in the Union, children who have same-sex parents are entitled to exactly the same rights as any or other children, and that these rights should be respected and protected by both the Union and the Member States.

It is common ground that under the EU Treaties, substantive family law falls within the competence of the Member States. Member States can therefore decide whether, under their national law, a child can have same-sex parents. However, it is equally clear that under the EU Treaties, the Union can propose and adopt measures on family law with cross-border implications. This legislation, based on mutual trust between Member States, aims to protect the rights of citizens and to facilitate the exercise of their right to free movement.

EU legislation can therefore require a Member State to recognise the parenthood of a child as established in another Member State, and that in order to avoid discriminating against certain categories of children, this obligation applies also as regards children who have same-sex parents. In fact, already today Member States are required, under Union law on free movement, to recognise the parenthood of a child with same-sex parents, as established in another Member State for the purposes of rights under Union law, such as the right to enter or reside in another Member State. This obligation on Member States was confirmed by the Court of Justice in December 2021 in the VMA case: a case concerning a child with two mothers.

In addition, under the EU Treaties, the Union has competence to propose and adopt legislation requiring Member States to recognise the parenthood of a child with same-sex parents also for the purposes of rights under national law, such as the right of a child to inheritance, to maintenance and to be legally represented in another Member State on matters such as health and schooling.

Accordingly, in 2020, President von der Leyen committed to ensure that the parenthood established in a Member State would be recognised in all other Member States. Implementing this political commitment, in December 2022, the Commission adopted a proposal on the recognition of parenthood between Member States. The aim of this proposal is to ensure that the fundamental rights of children, such as the right to an identity and to a private and family life, and their rights under national law, such as the right to inheritance, maintenance and legal representation, are respected and protected in cross-border situations within the Union.

The obligation on Member States to recognise the parenthood of a child as established in another Member State would apply without discrimination against any category of children. This means that it would apply irrespective of how children are conceived or born, irrespective of their nationality and irrespective of their type of family, therefore including the parenthood of children with same-sex parents.

The Commission proposal on the recognition of parenthood between Member States is an instrument of private international law. This means that it does not interfere with any competence of Member States as to how they define family under their national law. The proposal only applies in cross-border situations. It aims to facilitate the recognition of parenthood between Member States in order to guarantee the continuity of parenthood across borders, the rights of children across borders, and to ensure that children's right to free movement is not deterred by the fear that parenthood will not be recognised in another Member State.

The proposal would achieve those aims by harmonising rules applicable only in cross-border situations, namely rules determining which Member States' courts are competent to establish parenthood; rules determining which national law should apply to establish parenthood in a cross-border situation; rules providing how a document establishing or providing parenthood in a Member State should be recognised in another Member State; and rules creating a European certificate of parenthood that citizens can use to prove parenthood in another Member State.

I should note that the same type of measures have already been adopted by the EU legislator in other areas of family law with cross-border implications. As a second point, I point out that the Commission proposal does not require Member States to recognise parenthood established in a third country. This means that the recognition of the parenthood of a child would remain subject to the recognition rules of each Member State if the parenthood has been established by a third country. The Commission's proposal only covers the binding recognition of parenthood established by the authorities of a Member State.

I note that the mutual trust between Member States on which the Commission proposal relies is based on the fact that all Member States are required to protect the rights of children, not only under the EU Treaties and the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, but also under international law, including the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the European Convention on Human Rights and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights, all of which require Member States to protect the rights of children without any kind of discrimination and therefore including children with same-sex parents.

Alessandra Mussolini, a nome del gruppo PPE. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, cara Commissaria, lei giustamente ha fatto un bellissimo intervento in quest'Aula completamente vuota, perché alla sinistra, in questo Parlamento, fomentata soprattutto dalla delegazione italiana, non interessa. Non si fermano neanche davanti ai sacrosanti diritti dei bambini nati da famiglie omoaffettive pur di attaccare il governo italiano e l'Italia.

Hanno addirittura fatto un emendamento che in Italia non sarebbe stato ammesso, è inammissibile, va buttato, perché non è vero che il governo italiano ha bloccato il sindaco Sala che oggi è venuto a fare questa sceneggiata affacciato al balcone. È stata una sentenza della Corte di Cassazione, quindi i giudici, a camere riunite, che hanno detto, in mancanza di una legge, che non si possono direttamente registrare le nascite.

Io sono fermamente d'accordo con il regolamento del Consiglio sulla certificazione, il riconoscimento e l'accettazione reciproca tra gli Stati della filiazione. Secondo me quelli della sinistra, Benifei e gli altri, neanche l'hanno letto. Loro vogliono solo parlare contro l'Italia. Quindi tuteliamo i bambini, tutti, tutti, ma fermiamoci, abbiate almeno la pietà di fronte a questo. Parliamo realmente di questi temi, ma basta di attaccare l'Italia, perché se non ogni settimana noi avremo degli argomenti. Per questo argomento non c'è un testo, è stato fatto solo così: uno prende, si alza e dice «attacchiamo l'Italia, parliamo dei bambini». Vergognatevi! Voi vi dovete vergognare!

Non mi è piaciuto neanche l'atteggiamento di Sala che, anziché pensare alle stazioni di Milano dove ci sono i delinquenti, viene qui a fare le sceneggiate, non a favore dei bambini. Facendo così voi lavorate contro i diritti dei bambini. Ma vergognatevi!

Brando Benifei, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono stato chiamato in causa dall'onorevole Mussolini, dicendo che non conosco e non ho letto gli atti del governo. Ho letto però le dichiarazioni profondamente discriminatorie e violente contro le famiglie arcobaleno e i loro figli della destra italiana, una destra fuori da quello che è il canone di una forza conservatrice europea dei paesi occidentali dell'Europa e che guarda piuttosto verso, forse, il modello Orbán.

Allora io dico no all'urbanizzazione dell'Italia e sì al rispetto dei diritti di tutte le famiglie e di tutti i bambini e le bambine. Grazie quindi al Parlamento europeo, ai gruppi che hanno voluto insieme decidere di fare un dibattito su questo tema, un tema che tocca molti paesi europei, ma che oggi vede l'Italia sotto una pericolosa regressione, un tentativo in questo senso da parte del governo, bloccando la registrazione dei figli e delle figlie delle coppie omogenitoriali nei registri delle città, e la contrarietà al regolamento europeo per il certificato di filiazione.

Ringrazio quindi i sindaci delle principali città italiane, non solo Sala che era qui oggi, ma anche Gualtieri, Manfredi, Lo Russo, Lepore, Nardella e Decaro, che hanno deciso di proseguire su una scia che vede già in passato proprio le città, penso al sindaco Pisapia, oggi collega qui al Parlamento europeo, che già nel 2012 aveva dato vita a un registro delle unioni civili a Milano. Credo sia importante esserci, anche magari dagli altri paesi europei, il 12 maggio a Torino, quando ci sarà una grande manifestazione nazionale a sostegno di queste famiglie, perché il governo, che non riesce a risolvere i problemi delle bollette e l'aumento dei costi della vita e che vara una riforma fiscale contro la maggioranza dei contribuenti italiani, si accanisce sulle famiglie e sui loro figli.

Noi come Partito Democratico porteremo avanti una proposta per il matrimonio egualitario con l'accesso alle adozioni e per il riconoscimento delle coppie omogenitoriali. Lo ha detto la nostra segretaria Elly Schlein e lavoreremo in questo senso perché, anche le parole della Commissaria ce lo dicono, non ci sono bambini di serie A e di serie B, non ci sono famiglie di serie A e di serie B. Dobbiamo andare avanti a tutela dei diritti di tutte e tutti.

Nicola Danti, *a nome del gruppo Renew*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, non c'è dubbio che l'affermazione di un quadro giuridico di garanzie adeguate per le coppie omosessuali in Italia stenta ad affermarsi.

Solo nel 2016, grazie al governo Renzi che pose la fiducia in Parlamento, l'Italia si è dotata di una legge che consente le unioni civili tra persone dello stesso sesso. Le sentenze della magistratura e il coraggio di alcuni sindaci hanno poi piano piano favorito l'evolversi di un quadro giuridico che, anche in assenza di norme specifiche, garantisce i diritti delle coppie LGBT e dei loro bambini.

Oggi non si tratta di esprimere opinioni sulla maternità surrogata o su altre questioni eticamente controverse. Qui si tratta di garantire i diritti dei bambini, tutelati anche dalla Convenzione ONU sui diritti dell'infanzia. Nessuno, né il ministro degli Interni né il capo del governo italiano, vero ispiratore della decisione del prefetto di Milano, può permettersi di ledere la libertà dei cittadini futuri dell'Europa per portare avanti battaglie politiche contro le famiglie omogenitoriali.

Davanti a evidenti fallimenti della politica migratoria, economica ed estera, il governo Meloni cerca di agitare lo scontro su temi eticamente sensibili, il tutto sulla pelle e sui diritti dei bambini.

Kim Van Sparrentak, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, 'You explain to my son that I am not his mother' – this was written on one of the signs in Milan where thousands of people joined the protest against the restrictions of same-sex parents' rights. And we should all ask ourselves this. How should a parent explain to their child that in the eyes of the administration they are not a family? How should a parent explain to their child that they can no longer pick them up from school or take them to the doctor? And how can we explain to children that their parents are being scapegoated and that their rights are taken away to hide the political failure of a right wing government?

And this strategy to attack and dehumanise our community for political gain and to take away our rights isn't new. We have seen where it leads to in Hungary and we have seen where it leads to in Poland. And we can't accept yet another country, one of our founding Member States, backsliding on equal rights.

And we continue hearing the same narrative. They claim that they are protecting the children, but the only way to protect children is by ensuring their parents have the legal rights to take care of them, in all Member States.

These are European children. These are European parents. And we, as European legislators, are obliged to protect their rights. To all mums and dads, current and future, and all the rainbow children in Italy: we love you, we have your backs and we will try to do what it takes to protect you.

Carlo Fidanza, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, il ministero degli Interni italiano ha disposto alle prefetture di dare indicazione ai Comuni di interrompere la trascrizione dei figli di coppie omogenitoriali.

Lo ha fatto in forza di una sentenza della Corte di Cassazione, il supremo organo di appello del sistema giudiziario italiano, che ha chiarito, una volta di più, che questi registri violano la legge nazionale italiana. Una legge che è in vigore da ben prima che Giorgia Meloni diventasse premier e che la sinistra italiana, nei suoi lunghi anni al governo senza mai vincere un'elezione, non ha mai, mai ritenuto di cambiare, e se ci vuole provare ora è pregata di farlo nel Parlamento italiano e non nel Parlamento europeo.

Con buona pace del sindaco Sala e della sua passerella di oggi, questa è una battaglia tutta ideologica. Chi si nasconde dietro ai presunti diritti negati ai bambini nasconde che i pochi bambini toccati da questa situazione assumono tutti, tutti, tutti i diritti all'atto del riconoscimento da parte di un genitore biologico e non c'è alcuna discriminazione.

Il problema delle trascrizioni nasce soprattutto perché coppie omosessuali che hanno avuto figli all'estero, quasi sempre ricorrendo all'utero in affitto, vorrebbero che nel registro fossero iscritti due genitori. Se l'Italia facesse questo, legittimerebbe la maternità surrogata, una pratica aberrante che mercifica la donna e il bambino, alla faccia dei diritti negati, una pratica più volte condannata in questo Parlamento, vietata dalla legge italiana e che noi vogliamo rendere reato universale.

È anche per questo, signora Commissaria, che non siamo d'accordo sul regolamento proposto dalla Commissione, perché questa materia è di stretta competenza degli Stati nazionali e lo dicono chiaramente i trattati europei su cui noi ci basiamo. Quindi, per una volta tanto, fatevi un esame di coscienza e fermate questa deriva folle.

Alessandra Basso, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, con tutti i problemi che abbiamo in Europa oggi si parla di questo. Ho pensato che sarà un grande problema per scomodare l'Aula del Parlamento europeo a parlare di una questione italiana.

Ho cercato dei dati precisi, ma non li ho trovati. In alcuni articoli si parla di 150 000 bambini, ma in realtà sono molti meno. Si tratta probabilmente di famiglie allargate, non di famiglie omogenitoriali di prima costituzione. Quindi non abbiamo dati certi, ma un solo dato certo: in Italia non c'è una legge, nonostante un decennio di governi di sinistra.

E quello che è ancora più certo è che un funzionario pubblico deve far rispettare la legge e le sentenze che confermano la contrarietà all'ordine pubblico della pratica della maternità surrogata. Come la bocciatura del governo conferma sulla proposta sulla filiazione europea, riconoscimenti di tale genere avrebbero il solo effetto di far entrare dalla finestra quello che non è entrato dalla porta: l'abominevole pratica dell'utero in affitto e la mercificazione del corpo delle donne più vulnerabili sul piano economico.

Tiziana Beghin (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i bambini sono bambini e lo sono a prescindere da come sono stati procreati, da come arrivano al mondo, dalla razza e dall'orientamento sessuale dei loro genitori. I loro diritti vanno difesi, senza se e senza ma. E lo dico da mamma di tre figlie biologiche e di due acquisite.

Quello che sta succedendo in Italia, nel mio paese, è vergognoso. Un governo di estrema destra che sta facendo una guerra nascosta a famiglie, come la mia, solo perché sono diverse dalla mia. Questa non è l'Europa che sogniamo, questa non è l'Europa che nei trattati difende l'uguaglianza dei suoi cittadini e il rispetto dei loro diritti.

La risposta del Commissario Reynders a una nostra interrogazione va nella direzione giusta. Riconoscere i diritti dei figli delle famiglie arcobaleno è una questione di giustizia sociale, ma anche di legalità. Il principio di sussidiarietà non c'entra nulla perché nessuno contesta il diritto di famiglia, ma si tutelano i diritti fondamentali.

Signora Commissaria, non fermatevi qui. Utilizzate tutti i poteri previsti dai trattati per arrivare al riconoscimento dei figli dei genitori dello stesso sesso. Lottiamo insieme per un'Europa libera e aperta al prossimo.

Salvatore De Meo (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il fallimento di questo dibattito e la vera finalità di questo dibattito sono confermati dall'assenza totalitaria di tutti i parlamentari che oggi si sono accalcati per chiedere insistentemente un dibattito che aveva la sola finalità di riportare qui un tema nazionale che in questo momento viene strumentalizzato.

È sorprendente come il Parlamento si stia prestando alla strumentalizzazione politica di alcuni che hanno trasferito qui a Bruxelles una questione nazionale, un dibattito nazionale, una polemica nazionale su un tema che invece avrebbe dovuto avere un percorso diverso, non una modifica dell'ordine del giorno. Un tema delicato, sensibile, un tema dove ognuno avrebbe dovuto poter esprimere la propria posizione, pur nella diversità delle sensibilità che un tema così importante richiede, e poterlo fare senza alcun pregiudizio.

Invece si è voluto scegliere di cavalcare l'emotività nazionale, attraverso un dibattito senza risoluzione, che ha il semplice sapore, e lo avete dimostrato quando ancora oggi qui iniziate a definire il governo attuale dell'Italia un governo di estrema destra che ha soltanto la colpa di aver rilevato un'assenza di una normativa specifica e di aver richiamato una sentenza della Corte di Cassazione.

Il risultato di questo teatrino è l'ennesima perdita di tempo verso quello che sarebbe potuto essere un passo in avanti nella tutela dei diritti dei bambini e delle famiglie omogenitoriali, grazie a una discussione ben ragionata, un confronto costruttivo dove, ripeto, bisognava far convergere le diverse sensibilità e in cui sarebbe emersa quella che nel nostro caso specifico è la problematica principale, vale a dire la mancanza di una normativa e il tentativo di armonizzare una norma in tutti gli Stati.

Quindi faccio i miei complimenti ai tanti colleghi, anche italiani, che hanno voluto mettere in questo momento avanti i loro interessi politici, evidentemente troppo deboli per essere rivendicati nella giusta sede nazionale, drogando questo dibattito con questioni nazionali e fuorvianti per l'opinione pubblica.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a un intervento «cartellino blu»)

Karen Melchior (Renew), *blue-card speech*. – Thank you for accepting the blue card. You said that this is a national issue. Are fundamental rights not a European issue? The rights of children in the UN Treaty – is this not a universal issue? So how do you claim that this is not something that we should discuss in the European Parliament, where we want to ensure the fundamental rights of all European citizens? We are talking about the rights of children to have their parents recognised. This is something that is not being implemented in Italy in the lack of national legislation.

So how do you see that we as a European Parliament can ensure the rights of all children of Europe, their fundamental rights to have their parents recognised and their rights being respected?

Salvatore De Meo (PPE), *risposta «cartellino blu»*. – Nessuno mette in discussione i diritti dei bambini. Stiamo insistendo nel farvi capire che un tema così importante avrebbe richiesto un percorso diverso. Voi vi state prestando a prendere una polemica nazionale, e non è un caso che c'è una vetrina o una passerella politica.

Qui non stiamo negando la necessità di arrivare ad una norma condivisa, ma l'Europa è il luogo della divisione, non delle tifoserie. Voi state facendo soltanto un dibattito politico e il fallimento della vostra richiesta è l'assenza totale di tutti, che avrebbero dovuto invece essere qui, perché anche io sono a favore dei diritti dei bambini, ma voglio una norma, non voglio l'emotività. Non c'è una legge e c'è un tentativo da parte dell'Europa di armonizzare. Quindi questo è quello che chiediamo, di non prestarsi a una strumentalizzazione, altrimenti questo diventa il Parlamento nazionale e non credo che noi siamo stati eletti per discutere qui questioni nazionali.

Marc Angel (S&D). – Mr President, dear Commissioner Dalli, dear colleagues, children of same-sex parents and children growing up in rainbow families, they deserve to fully enjoy the same rights as their peers from opposite-sex parents. And this in all 27 Member States, and this is why it's also a European affair.

For us Socialists and Democrats, the best interests of children is always a primary consideration and priority, in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. And the best interest of the child is not only enshrined in the UN Convention, but it's also enshrined in many constitutions of our Member States, and also the Italian Constitution.

I was surprised to hear Ms Mussolini saying that she's in favour of the regulation for mutual recognition of parenthood. But why did her party colleagues in Italy in the Senate vote a resolution to veto this European Union regulation? This is facts what happened in Italy. And there we see this shift of Italy shifting towards those countries who organise state-sponsored homo- and transphobia. And also the imposition on the Italian city halls to stop the registration of children of same-sex parents, this puts a huge strain on children and it exposes them also to widespread discrimination and a lack of protection, and ultimately jeopardising them and hampering their rights to reach their full potential.

Italian mayors like Beppe Sala, they are doing what should be done. They are upholding the rights of children and they put the children's rights first. They do not want two categories of children in their municipalities. They have understood that recognising diverse families benefits everyone, and it takes no one's entitlements away.

Europe must guarantee all children to see their family acknowledged and validated by law. This is very important and this is a European issue.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Frau Kommissarin! Ich habe jetzt hier in der Debatte gerade ganz viel gehört: Das sei eine nationale Debatte, da gäbe es keine Regulierung, hin und her und was nicht alles für Argumente.

Die Frage, die wir heute Abend hier diskutieren, ist doch die folgende: Wie geht es einem Kind? Und was ist das Beste für ein Kind? Und am besten für ein Kind ist, wenn es Eltern hat, die es lieben und sich darum kümmern. Und diese Eltern sollten die Sicherheit haben und das Kind sollte die Sicherheit haben, dass diese Eltern sich um es kümmern können. Denn was passiert denn jetzt mit einem Kind, das vielleicht mit zwei lesbischen Eltern groß wird, wo jetzt die andere Mutter nicht mehr akzeptiert wird als Mutter? In dem Fall, in dem dann zum Beispiel der leiblichen Mutter etwas geschieht, hat die andere Mutter erst einmal gar keine Möglichkeiten, hat gar keine Rechte, sich um das Kind zu kümmern.

Ich finde – ja, da wird jetzt gelacht –, es ist unglaublich, dass bei so einer Frage jetzt gelacht wird. Denn das zeigt eigentlich die ganze Absurdität dieser Debatte. Es geht Ihnen nämlich eigentlich nicht um das Kind. Es geht nicht darum, dass dieses Kind dann sicher ist, dass sich das zweite Elternteil darum kümmern kann. Es geht Ihnen um Ihre Ideologie, weil es in Ihrem Sinne nicht sein darf – Herr Präsident, ich muss das jetzt zu Ende sagen –, dass dieses Kind in dieser Familie lebt. Darum geht es Ihnen. Deswegen lachen Sie an dieser Stelle, weil es nicht sein darf, dass zwei gleichgeschlechtliche Eltern ein Kind großziehen. Und weil Sie lieber, diesem Kind Rechte wegnehmen, anstatt sich darum zu kümmern! Darum geht es! Deswegen regen sie sich jetzt an dieser Stelle so auf!

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Rosa D'Amato (Verts/ALE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie Commissaria per le sue parole.

Il governo di estrema destra italiano si accanisce contro la comunità LGBTI per nascondere in realtà la propria incapacità su tanti altri temi. Un accanimento che nel suo furore ideologico miete vittime innocenti: i bambini. E allora si preferisce negare la realtà, quella della loro esistenza, quella dei loro genitori, quella dell'amore che li rende famiglie al pari di tutte le altre.

Ai problemi creati dalla mancanza di una legge che li tuteli si aggiungono gli ostacoli creati da una scelta inumana e senza senso, che spinge già i sindaci in Italia a creare ulteriori discriminazioni tra famiglie e famiglie, tra bambini e bambini, quando invece a prevalere dovrebbero essere soltanto i loro diritti, e sempre.

Io e i miei colleghi, insieme alla Commissaria nel suo lavoro, useremo tutti gli strumenti legislativi a disposizione per difendere i cittadini dalla vostra retorica odiosa e ci saranno conseguenze per le vostre azioni. Giocare sulla pelle dei bambini è una scelta che non vi sarà perdonata.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR). – Señora comisaria, señor presidente, señorías, debates como este muestran la falta de fidelidad hacia los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea, que debería mostrar un riguroso respeto a la soberanía nacional en materias de competencia exclusiva, como es el caso de la regulación de las inscripciones de niños en el Registro Civil.

Las leyes de nuestros países, nuestras constituciones, nos proporcionan una protección, un orden. Son coherentes con nuestra cultura, historia, tradiciones y jurisprudencia que han respetado el Derecho natural y el sentido común.

Hoy se quiere coaccionar a Italia por velar por su cumplimiento.

En esta casa hay quien quiere hacer borrón y cuenta nueva, lanzarnos al vacío sin medir las consecuencias que puedan tener determinadas leyes, en este caso, en los más frágiles: los niños, transformándolos de sujetos de Derecho en objetos de transacción, tratándolos como mercancía.

Esto no les protege, les expone; les expone a ser objetos de deseo. Ser padre no es un derecho, es un deseo.

Ernő Schaller-Baross (NI). – Elnök úr! A családjog az egyes nemzetek történelmében, kultúrájában és társadalmi értékrendjében gyökerezik. Kérdésként kizárólag a tagállamok hatáskörébe tartozik az, hogy a demokratikus választásokat követően megalakult olasz kormány milyen jogszabályt alkot, milyen elvek alapján működteti saját anyakönyvi rendszerét. Egyetlen tagállamra tartozik: Olaszországra. A tagállamoknak jogában áll, hogy az Olaszországhoz vagy akár Magyarországhoz hasonlóan a keresztény-zsidó értékrendre alapozva foglaljon állást ezen a téren.

Sem az Európai Parlament, sem pedig más uniós intézmény, sem pedig más uniós tagállam nem rendelkezik felhatalmazással, hogy ezt megítélje, vagy ebben a kérdésben bármilyen módon beavatkozzon. Ezért vannak a szerződéseink. Kiállunk az olasz kormány mellett, kiállunk a döntései mellett!

Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, não permitir o registo de filhos de casais do mesmo sexo nascidos no estrangeiro cria enormes incertezas e põe em risco os direitos das crianças e de muitas famílias.

Pais ou mães podem, por exemplo, estar impedidos de acompanhar os seus filhos no hospital ou de os autorizar a ir a uma simples excursão escolar. Em casos extremos, se um dos membros do casal morre num Estado-Membro que não reconhece a relação parental do outro pai ou da outra mãe, a criança pode perder não uma, mas as duas figuras parentais.

Não estamos a falar de ficção, senhoras e senhores deputados! Hoje, há crianças europeias que correm estes riscos e que, infelizmente, parecem juntar-se às que se registaram em Milão.

O Parlamento Europeu vai em breve, como disse a Senhora Comissária, começar a discutir uma proposta que tem como objetivo garantir que os pais ou as mães reconhecidos num Estado-Membro são reconhecidos em toda a União, criando um certificado europeu de filiação para as crianças.

Este processo de reconhecimento deve ser rápido, deve ser simples e acessível por meios digitais, e, como relatora da JURI para esta proposta, trabalharei nesse sentido.

Espero que este Parlamento e que todos os Estados-Membros se unam na defesa de um princípio básico: o de que nenhuma criança deve ter menos direitos na União Europeia pela forma como foi concebida ou pelo tipo de família onde nasceu.

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Mr President, and thank you very much, Commissioner, for being here.

This is a debate around fundamental rights: the rights of children in our Union, if they have the same rights as other children. This is not a question of how they were conceived. This is a question of how their parents have the right to love and protect them, no matter how their family situation is, no matter in which Member State they are.

This is a matter of our fundamental right of freedom of movement within the European Union: we should not have to check whether our family, our parenthood, is respected and protected in the countries that we wish to travel to. If we can go to the hospital if we're on holiday with our children and be allowed to come into the hospital with our child.

But this is also a question of protecting the fundamental rights of each of our countries and the children living there. We cannot have Member States, governments and administrations trying to harass families by not recognising the parenthood of children in their country.

Alexandra Geese (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die rechtsextreme Regierung in Italien greift gerade mit scharfer Rhetorik wieder einmal ihren Lieblingsfeind an: Regenbogenfamilien und ihre Kinder. Diese Kinder dürfen jetzt nicht mehr in den italienischen Städten registriert werden. Und angeblich geht es darum, das Verbot der Leihmutterschaft durchzusetzen. Aber die Kollegen hier auf der rechten Seite des Hauses und in Italien ignorieren, dass beim allergrößten Teil der Kinder, die aus Leihmutterschaften geboren werden, die neuen Eltern heterosexuelle Paare sind.

Warum wird dann die LGBTQ+-Community mit Hass überschüttet? Und das zeigt doch wieder mal: Die rechtsextreme Regierung in Italien baut die Rechte ihrer Bürgerinnen und Bürger ab und diskriminiert alle Gruppen, die nicht in ihr autoritäres Weltbild passen. Aber das ist eben nicht Italien. Viele Bürgermeister und Oberbürgermeister Italiens – allen voran „Beppe“ Sala in Mailand – setzen ein Zeichen gegen diese ausgrenzende Politik. Sie verteidigen die Rechte der Kinder, und wir in Europa stehen dabei an ihrer Seite!

Vera Tax (S&D). – Mr President, so that was a quick run – first time in Parliament!

— Voorzitter, ik ben opgegroeid in een warm gezin in Nederland, vol liefde en genegenheid. Mijn ouders houden van mij en mijn zus en hebben mij laten zien wat onvoorwaardelijke liefde is. Die is vooral niet perfect, maar wel onvoorwaardelijk. Met hulp van hun goede voorbeeld probeer ik mijn eigen kinderen met net zoveel onvoorwaardelijke liefde te laten opgroeien.

De liefde en genegenheid die ik tijdens mijn jeugd heb mogen voelen, is een voorbeeld van goed ouderschap. Je kinderen de ruimte geven om te ontdekken wat ze willen doen, dat is goed ouderschap. Je kinderen helpen opstaan als ze vallen, dat is goed ouderschap. Ouders die kunnen laten zien dat ze van elkaar houden, dat is goed ouderschap. Wat hier helemaal niks mee te maken heeft, is of deze ouders toevallig hetzelfde geslacht hebben of niet. Maar nu, in de EU, besluit de Italiaanse regering om te bekrachtigen dat het in Italië onmogelijk moet zijn om ouders van hetzelfde geslacht beide als ouder van hun kind te laten gelden. We kunnen dat als Europees Parlement, maar ook als Europese Unie, niet accepteren. De waarden van de Unie komen onder druk te staan als we dit accepteren, onder het mom van 'dat moet Italië zelf weten'. Dat werkt niet. Want wat in Italië gebeurt, staat niet op zichzelf. Overal in de wereld, in Europa en daarbuiten, staan rechten van lhbtbi-personen en vrouwen onder druk. Conservatieve religieuze antigenderorganisaties krijgen het telkens weer voor elkaar om angst in te boezemen voor zaken waar geen angst voor nodig is. Want kunt u mij vertellen wat er zo eng is aan twee mensen die van elkaar houden? De invloed van deze organisaties reikt ver. Doen alsof dit een incident is dat alleen nationaal bekeken moet worden, is de ogen sluiten voor wat er gebeurt in de wereld.

Daarom moeten we ons blijven uitspreken tegen deze organisaties. Parlement en Commissie moeten de handen in elkaar slaan om hun functioneren, de wijze waarop ze gefinancierd worden, hun strategieën en hun banden met de politiek bloot te leggen. Dit moet stoppen. Want daar waar geen transparantie is van het politieke doel, daar waar geen transparantie is van financiën, daar waar alleen angst het doel is, daar wordt niet gewerkt aan democratie, maar aan de afbraak van de democratie. Daar moeten wij de EU-burgers voor beschermen, door zichtbaar te maken wat er gebeurt. Want ieder kind heeft recht op een liefdevolle familie. Dat heeft niks te maken met hetero of gay, maar alles met de familie die het beste met je voor heeft. Dat gaat over liefde en vertrouwen. Dat is het tegenovergestelde van haat en angst. Iedereen kan kiezen.

Sandro Gozi (Renew). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in Italia, con il governo di estrema destra di Giorgia Meloni sono tante le decisioni che non condividiamo. Però questo potremmo dire che è la politica. Però le differenze diventano inaccettabili quando si fa ideologia sulla pelle delle persone. Diventano ancora più inaccettabili quando si fa ideologia sulla pelle dei nostri figli.

Negare i diritti alle coppie LGBT, infatti, come sta facendo il governo italiano, significa creare coppie eterosessuali di serie A e coppie omosessuali di serie B. Ora io mi chiedo, cari colleghi, se non sarebbe meglio usare il nostro tempo per garantire diritti per tutti, per eliminare le barriere alla libertà di circolazione europea, anziché innalzare sempre, ogni volta, nuovi muri di divisione e discriminazione tra cittadini europei basate sull'orientamento sessuale.

Guardate che è veramente squallido prendere in ostaggio i diritti dei bambini per sventolare bandiere ideologiche, come abbiamo sentito anche stasera. Perché questo sta accadendo in Italia e questo è accaduto anche purtroppo in quest'Aula, in violazione dei principi internazionali europei dell'ONU, come ha ricordato la commissaria Helena Dalli. Ecco, contro questo Renew Europe si batte e si batterà sempre.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – (*début de l'intervention hors micro*) ...et d'autres grandes villes italiennes empêchées par le gouvernement Meloni de reconnaître le lien de filiation entre un couple de même sexe et leurs enfants; des hémicycles nationaux en Italie, en France, rejetant la proposition de la Commission européenne sur la reconnaissance mutuelle de la parentalité en Europe.

L'extrême droite et la droite conservatrice détruisent les familles et mettent en danger les enfants. Ce n'est pas une polémique nationale importée au Parlement européen, c'est une question de violation des droits fondamentaux de ces familles. Et nous attendons du gouvernement italien qu'il change sa loi et qu'il la mette en conformité avec l'article 3.1 de la convention relative aux droits de l'enfant et la charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne, qui prévoient que l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant doit être une considération primordiale dans toute décision concernant les enfants.

Le lien qui unit un enfant à ses parents est indéfectible. Les droits des familles LGBTQI+ sont indéfectibles et nous nous battons jusqu'au bout dans ce Parlement et dans chaque État membre pour que le lien parental légalement établi dans un État soit reconnu dans l'ensemble de l'Union européenne. Une famille est une famille. Un enfant est un enfant. *Love is love.*

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, kolege, ovih se dana na hrvatskoj nacionalnoj televiziji u dječjem programu vrti crtić koji prikazuje ženu koja se rasrdi, skine križ s vrata, ostavlja muža, odvodi djecu i odlučuje... (*The President interrupted the speaker.*)

President. – I'm terribly sorry to interrupt, but I'm getting a message that the sound is not very good for the interpreters. Can I ask you to start again, and hopefully the sound improves?

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, kolege, ovih se dana na hrvatskoj nacionalnoj televiziji u dječjem programu vrti crtić koji prikazuje ženu koja se rasrdi, skida križ s vrata, ostavlja muža, odvodi djecu i odlučuje se za drugačiji život, postaje lezbijka, aktivistica za pobačaj, a vrhunac je, naravno, ... (*The President interrupted the speaker.*)

President. – I'm really sorry, we will need to suspend for a minute because apparently the Croatian interpreting booth is not well connected to the other language booths. I do apologise – this is not sabotage against Croatian MEPs! You can trust me. We will suspend for a minute or two and then resume once the connection is established. Thank you, and I do apologise.

(The sitting was suspended at 20.15 for technical reasons.)

15. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(The sitting resumed at 20:26)

16. Prawa dzieci z tęczyowych rodzin i rodziców tej samej płci, w szczególności we Włoszech (ciąg dalszy debaty)

President. – Apologies, colleagues, we should now be able to resume. It was a general problem, none of the interpreters' booths were hearing the room. So it was not just about Croatian.

We now continue with the debate on the Commission statement on the rights of children in rainbow families and same-sex parents, in particular in Italy.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Ako mogu samo par riječi da vidim da li postoji prijevod. Poštovani predsjedavajući, kolege, ovih se dana na hrvatskoj nacionalnoj televiziji u dječjem programu vrti crtić koji prikazuje ženu koja se rasrdi, skida križ s vrata, ostavlja muža, odvodi djecu i odlučuje se za drugačiji život, postaje lezbijka, aktivistica za pobačaj, a vrhunac je, naravno, kad otvori knjigu Karla Marxa i doživi prosvjetljenje.

Uz to, prikazuje se i mladić koji mijenja spol i jednako se to prikazuje kao oslobođenje i prosvjetljenje.

To je sve dio vašeg kulturnog rata i to rata za našu djecu, za djecu heteroseksualnih roditelja, jer biološka djeca homoseksualnog para ne postoje ako uopće smijem izgovoriti tu notornu činjenicu.

Dakle, i obitelj je univerzalna tema pa nije u ingerenciji Europskog nego nacionalnih parlamenata i vi to dobro znate pa nas svejedno gnjaviti s tom temom. Dakle, povijest je pokazala i budućnost će pokazati da se vaš put temelji na zabludama i već ste mnoge dobre ljude svojom propagandom odveli na stranputicu prodajući zablude pod istim.

U ljubavi i razumijevanju mi ćemo se i dalje boriti za istinu o čovjeku.

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, s'il vous plaît, je voudrais qu'il soit acté que Monsieur a tenu des propos profondément homophobes en disant qu'il est dangereux pour des enfants d'avoir des parents homosexuels. Je veux que ce soit acté et que la remarque lui soit faite, à tout le moins. C'est inadmissible de tenir des propos comme ça dans cette assemblée. C'était déjà le cas d'une intervenante précédente. Il faudrait que ces points soient systématiquement relevés, actés et interdits dans notre assemblée.

(Predsedajúci bol v snahe odovzdat' slovo dalšiemu rečníkovi prerušený.)

Ladislav Ilčíč (ECR). – If I can respond ...

President. – I'm sorry, it wasn't a blue card, but it's noted ...

Ladislav Ilčíč (ECR). – If you allowed her to have a blue card, some kind of blue card, then I should answer, I suppose.

President. – No, it was not a blue card, I'm sorry, during the catch-the-eye procedure you can't have blue cards ...

Ladislav Ilčíč (ECR). – Sorry but what was that? Yeah, I said there is no biological ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председателстващ, моля Ви, моля Ви да спазвате правилата и да не давате думата за нарушаване. Това не беше синя карта и няма право на [... не се чува]

Сега по темата. Семейството, според нашата Конституция, се състои от мъж и жена, биологичен мъж, биологична жена. Биологична жена, която е майка, и биологичен мъж, който е баща. Това е Конституцията на Република България. Това е нещо, което ние сме приели и това е приела нашата нация с мнозинство. *[Извазането е прекъснато по технически причини.]* ...

So once again there is no translation? It's a clear sabotage! I insist to speak in my own language. Sorry for that, but I will wait and ask you to solve this issue. Thank you so much.

И така, уважаеми колеги, цитирам ви Конституцията на Република България. Вие сте запознати, знаете какво е Конституцията, това е основният закон.

Според Конституцията на Република България семейството се състои от мъж и жена, биологична жена, биологичен мъж, майка и баща. Ние вярваме, че всяко едно дете има право да израсне в такова семейство, има право на своята биологична майка и на своя биологичен баща. Това е нашето вътрешно убеждение. Сега, вие може да вярвате в нещо различно. Вие може да искате вашите държави да имат други правила. Ние не спорим и приемаме това. Това е ваше право, на всеки един гражданин в собствената му държава да направи такова семейство, каквото смята мнозинството от гражданите в неговата държава.

Но ние настояваме да уважавате нашето право на европейски и на български граждани. И да вземаме решения в собствената си държава как ще подкрепяме нашите семейства и как ще възпитаваме нашите деца! И настояваме, и категорично възразяваме да не се опитвате да ни налагате някакъв друг модел. Нашето семейство е от биологична майка и биологичен баща. Вие сте решили нещо друго за вашите държави. Не възразявам, но не ме карайте да приемаме външен диктат и външен натиск.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono sollevato che questo tema sia finalmente inserito in agenda oggi, ma anche profondamente addolorato. Sì, perché la violenza e la discriminazione contro le famiglie arcobaleno e le persone LGBTI diventano ogni giorno sempre più drammatiche nell'Europa e nel mio paese, in Italia.

Le famiglie omogenitoriali italiane hanno portato avanti negli anni una battaglia coraggiosa e complessa con giudici e nelle amministrazioni comunali, ritagliandosi piccoli spazi per assicurarsi una minima forma di riconoscimento e protezione. Quelle a cui stiamo assistendo sono le ultime di una serie di azioni del governo italiano per erodere ulteriormente i loro diritti, quelli delle famiglie arcobaleno e quelli delle bambine e dei bambini italiani.

Il Commissario per la giustizia Reynders su questo tema è stato perentorio e inequivocabile. Gli Stati membri devono riconoscere i figli dei genitori dello stesso sesso ai fini dell'esercizio dei diritti derivanti dal diritto dell'UE.

Come cittadini europei abbiamo il dovere di risolvere questa questione al riparo da strumentalizzazioni ideologiche e unirvi in solidarietà con le tantissime famiglie arcobaleno e con le attiviste e gli attivisti scesi in piazza nelle scorse settimane, esortando l'Unione europea a utilizzare tutti i meccanismi a sua disposizione per garantire che l'Italia rispetti gli obblighi previsti dal diritto europeo.

Non possiamo permettere che i valori europei di uguaglianza e inclusione vengano compressi, minacciati e infine cancellati nel silenzio. Prendere in ostaggio i diritti dei bambini italiani non è solo assurdo politicamente, ma è anche inaccettabile moralmente. Colleghi, amici, non lasciamoli soli, perché l'amore è amore, sempre e comunque.

(Ukončenie vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you, and thank you, honourable Members, for this very important debate. I referred to the need for the Union and the Member States to protect the rights of children without any kind of discrimination and, therefore, without excluding children with same sex-parents from this protection.

Like any other children, children with same-sex parents are entitled to a continuity of their parenthood within the Union, to the protection of their fundamental rights, to an identity and a private and family life, and to benefit from inheritance, maintenance and other rights under national law in cross-border situations within the Union.

Such protection in cross-border situations would be achieved under the Commission proposal on the recognition of parenthood between Member States. The proposal would do so respecting the competence, of course, of all Member States in adopting their own rules on family law. But in adopting and applying their own rules on family law, Member States should not forget their obligation of non-discrimination as a fundamental principle established in the EU Treaties and in international law.

I appeal to Member States to open a dialogue on this fundamental matter in order to find appropriate solutions so that no child will be discriminated against.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

17. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu sú jednominútové vystúpenia k otázkam politického významu (článok 172 rokovacieho poriadku).

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Mr President, the Olympic Games 2024 are in real danger. The danger is the ongoing support of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) for Russia and Belarus to participate. This is unacceptable for the whole democratic world. Hiding behind a neutral flag and non-discrimination principle is not an answer to Russia's war crimes. Russia is killing civilians, abducting children and destroying Ukrainian infrastructure. Moreover, at least 260 athletes have already been killed by Russia. In February, the European Parliament clearly expressed its position when we condemned the decision to allow Russian and Belarusian athletes to compete in Paris under a neutral flag. The only flag is the vile one on the battlefield. I urgently call on the IOC Executive Board, sitting in Lausanne this week, to reflect on this reality and exclude Russia and Belarus from participation in the Olympic Games.

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Domnule președinte, dacă reprezentanții Comisiei au urmărit știrile recente despre turbulențele din sectorul agricol european, sper că au înțeles că e momentul să se hotărască. Își mai doresc hrană europeană și fermieri puternici, sau vor să le elimine pe ambele ca să ne pună în meniu hrană din import care încalcă mai toate regulile stabilite de Bruxelles în ultimii 60 de ani?

Cacofonia deciziilor Comisiei e greu de priceput. Cere sprijinirea exporturilor din Ucraina, țările de la frontieră se conformează, dar când vine vorba să-i ajute și pe fermierii lor pentru pierderile suferite, le aruncă în bătaie de joc, mărunțiș.

Spune că vrea prosperitatea agriculturii în *Green Deal*, dar, fără consultarea sectorului și fără studii de impact, ia decizii care riscă să diminueze drastic productivitatea și, implicit, hrana europenilor.

Se pregătește să elimine un pesticid vital pentru plantațiile de sfeclă, în timp ce deschide pușculița pentru a le acorda despăgubiri celor care deja s-au conformat acestei interdicții.

Deci, fermierii europeni așteaptă să îi luminezi în privința intențiilor. Asta dacă nu v-ai decis deja să scăpați de ei.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, a water quality review is presently being carried out in Ireland in terms of the Nitrates Directive and the assessment of the derogation whether or not we are reaching our aims under the water quality framework. Of course, in assessing water quality, we also have to take into account a period of time that will be required to allow the mitigating circumstances that have been put in place over the last number of years to take effect. But, also, if we do unwind the derogation in Ireland, it will have a profound impact on farming and on land use. In other words, dairy farmers will have to lower their stocking density, which means they will require more land for their farming activities, which means there will be a continual displacement across the agricultural land use spectrum: dairy farmers replacing tillage farmers, tillage farmers replacing beef and suckler farmers, and sheep farmers being completely displaced.

So when we are assessing the water quality framework, the impact of the derogation, we must also take into account the impact it will have on farming practices throughout Ireland, to ensure that if we do need to change, it must be done in a way that does not have a major impact on how family farms farm in Ireland. (Just to be open and transparent, I must declare that my family are dairy farmers, in the interest of transparency.)

Francisco Guerreiro (Verts/ALE). – Senhor Presidente, a indústria pecuária é uma arma de destruição coletiva, mas quem o diz não sou eu. São os relatórios científicos que demonstram o impacto negativo desta indústria nos ecossistemas, na saúde humana e, naturalmente, no bem-estar de biliões de animais.

Mas esta indústria é ainda mais danosa porque beneficia de um *statu quo* cultural, onde qualquer tentativa de implementar alternativas de produção e de consumo sem animais é vista como extremista.

Mais, o seu *lobby* em instituições locais, regionais, nacionais e supranacionais é contínuo, condicionante e deturpador de políticas públicas de bem-estar geral.

Mas a realidade é que esta pressão não é mais que um sinal do medo que estas indústrias têm da verdade científica e do poder de escolha dos seus cidadãos.

E a mudança para um estilo de vida sem o consumo de animais não é só possível como desejável para se alcançarmos os compromissos climáticos, regenerar a biodiversidade, melhorar a saúde humana e proteger a vida de biliões de animais.

Johan Nissinen (ECR). – Herr talman! EU vill i klimatets namn reglera allting i våra liv – allt ifrån konsumtion, transporter, byggnader och resor, som enligt kommissionen själv bara har en liten effekt på den globala medeltemperaturen, samtidigt som det slår hårt mot vårt välbefinnande och människors frihet. Måste verkligen klimatpolitiken se ut så? Nej, absolut inte. EU måste ändra sitt motstånd mot fria marknader och teknikutveckling. Det hjälper inte klimatet om Europa isolerar sig och flyttar utsläppen till andra delar av världen. Tyvärr är EU ofta ett hinder för kärnkraft och koldioxidbesparingar globalt, även om det är billigare och mer effektivt för klimatet. I stället för att främja frihet och välbefinnande verkar många tro att klimatet förbättras genom att Europas medborgare får lida, vilket är ett otroligt kostsamt misstag.

Anna Bonfrisco (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, desidero attirare la vostra attenzione sul Ponte sullo Stretto, che è centrale e sotto molteplici aspetti. Nell'unire stabilmente la Calabria e la Sicilia, unirà ancor di più l'Italia e unirà ancor di più l'Europa, collegando, attraverso il Brennero, il Mare del Nord, il Mar Baltico e il Mar Mediterraneo.

Come dichiara il ministro Salvini, il Ponte sullo Stretto sarà ben più di un ponte tecnologicamente avanzato, sarà un artefatto umano che più di qualsiasi altra infrastruttura simboleggerà la connettività del XXI secolo.

Il Ponte sullo Stretto è l'espressione di una volontà esemplare della politica di coesione dell'Italia, di quella europea e di quella euromediterranea, tutte tese al miglioramento del mercato interno, fino anche alla realizzazione dell'Unione della difesa e della mobilità militare. L'Europa sa di avere nella Sicilia la più grande e la più importante base strategica del Mediterraneo nel suo mare, sotto il suo mare e sopra il suo cielo.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, we have just passed the 20th anniversary of the Iraq War, a war where over a million people died, where people still grapple with the after-effects of the use of depleted uranium, where nobody has been held to account for a country torn apart and a region plunged into chaos. And we have a responsibility to look back and ask: how did it all happen?

Well, it happened because the people in power told us over and over things they knew were not true. It happened because a compliant media failed to ask the questions and parroted those lies day after day, beating the drum for a war of aggression dressed up as a battle of democracy against authoritarianism.

So now, as another country is torn apart, another region turned into chaos, at this uniquely dangerous phase in world history, we see the same people again baying for blood — not their own of course — seizing the moral high ground, condemning peace as appeasement, bellowing that the only option is escalation.

Well, you really have to ask yourself the question: why in God's name would we believe these liars? Now we need peace and we need it now.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, the economic coercion by the totalitarian regime of the Chinese Communist Party experienced by Lithuania last year has highlighted some hard lessons.

First, growing assertiveness and aggression of non-democratic regimes through economic, political and other means. Second, the lack of ability of the EU to jointly defend one of our Member States and the core principles of the single market.

That's why I welcome this week's political decision on the new anti-coercion instrument. The instrument addresses an important gap in our capabilities to defend our Single Market against economic coercion. It strikes a crucial balance between avoiding slide into protectionism while defending our interests and security in the face of the CCP's malign influence and attempts to undermine our democracies.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Tym wszystkim, którzy brali udział w wielkim święcie Górnego Śląska w Parlamencie Europejskim, chciałem serdecznie podziękować. Pięknie Wam dziękuję. To było niesamowite, gdy po monodramie teatru Korez „Mianujom mie Hanka”, brawurowo spersonifikowanej przez Grażynę Bułkę historii Śląska, ponad 200 osób wiwatowało i płakało jednocześnie. Tak, historia Śląska to jest prawdziwy rollercoaster. Tym bardziej się cieszę, że w panelu „Śląsk w Europie” poprzedzającym spektakl, sprawa Śląska zyskała mocnych sojuszników z Warszawy. Redaktor Adam Michnik i dr Hanna Machińska wsparli uznanie śląskiego za język regionalny i Ślązaków za mniejszość etniczną. Najwyższy czas uznać Ślązaków za mniejszość etniczną, co z automatu zalegalizuje język śląski.

Budujmy silną, zjednoczoną Europę, ale nie zapominajmy o regionach i o prawach ludzi do własnej tożsamości.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovane kolegice i kolege, politika proširenja jedna je od temeljnih i najvažnijih politika Europske unije. S druge strane, pred deset godina, skoro pred deset godina, Hrvatska je posljednja država koja je ušla u europsku obitelj i postavlja se logično pitanje što se učinilo po pitanju proširenja u tih deset godina. Ja bih rekao ne previše. Nažalost, ne previše. Krivca možemo tražiti i s jedne i s druge strane, ali ne bi nas to nigdje odvelo.

Ono što me ipak veseli činjenica je da u posljednje vrijeme intenziviraju se radnje vezano za proširenje na zapadni Balkan.

Želim iz ovog mjesta poručiti prije svega Komisiji i povjereniku da taj rad, taj napor intenziviraju kako bi iskoristili ovo vrijeme do kraja mandata i kako bi imali samo jedan cilj, a to je da kad dođe novi višegodišnji financijski okvir, dakle, govorim o 2027., da imamo i neku državu zapadnog Balkana spremnu za pristupanje našoj velikoj europskoj obitelji.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhor Presidente, a liberdade informativa, o pluralismo e a independência dos meios de comunicação são componentes fundamentais do direito à liberdade de expressão e jogam um papel fundamental numa sociedade democrática e diversa na Europa.

Isso é o que deveriam ser os meios públicos. Tudo ao contrário do que acontece na televisão e na rádio públicas galegas, que carecem de pluralidade informativa, manipulam e discriminam os profissionais.

No meu país, funcionam como a propaganda de um partido: o Partido Popular. Há cinco anos que as trabalhadoras e os trabalhadores denunciam abusos e represálias.

Por isso, envio, desde o Parlamento Europeu, todo o apoio solidário à sua luta e dignidade – defende a galega. Também sei que este vídeo nunca será exibido na televisão pública da Galiza.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, de Amerikaanse *Inflation Reduction Act* is een contradictio in terminis. De wet moedigt roekeloze overheidsuitgaven aan en werpt handelsbarrières op. Zij zal, in tegenstelling tot wat de naam beweert, inflatie juist hoog houden. De EU komt nu met tegenmaatregelen. Zo komt de Commissie met een aanzienlijke versoepeling van de EU-staatssteunregels: het industrieel plan voor de Green Deal. Zoals wel vaker bij de Commissie-Von der Leyen: grote woorden met een duur prijskaartje, want dit wordt betaald door de mensen thuis. De afgelopen jaren gooiden onze beleidmakers de economie op slot en gaven iedereen gratis geld. Daardoor hebben we hoge inflatie. In plaats van de inflatie te bestrijden, blaast de Commissie groene zeepbellen.

Voorzitter, gratis geld bestaat niet. Als de Europese Commissie doorgaat met roekeloze uitgaven, neemt ze een gok die altijd in tranen eindigt.

Patricia Chagnon (ID). – Monsieur le Président, l'immigration est un sujet absolument central. Vous en avez tellement conscience que vous avez préparé en 2020 un nouveau pacte d'immigration et d'asile. Ce qui est frappant, alors que vous êtes en train de décider de l'avenir démographique de l'Europe, c'est que vous le faites en catimini, en cachette.

Pourquoi vous ne voulez pas de grand débat sur l'immigration? Pourquoi vous n'encouragez pas des référendums dans les États membres? Pourquoi vous ignorez les sondages? Et pourquoi agissez-vous de cette manière occulte?

Vous savez très bien que depuis 2020, malgré vos colloques, malgré la mise en orbite d'associations complices, le recrutement d'experts autoproclamés, de voyages de promotion et, disons-le, des pressions politiques et financières, vous rencontrez une résistance féroce, car ce funeste pacte va à l'encontre de la volonté des peuples. Lors de nos missions officielles en Belgique, en France, aux Pays-Bas, en Grèce, partout, nous avons pu constater le décalage entre votre politique idéologique et la réalité du terrain. De plus en plus d'États membres sont ouvertement hostiles à votre politique de submersion de notre continent européen. Il est temps de les écouter et d'écouter les peuples.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, Commissioner, the move against TikTok has more to do with a reckless new Cold War posturing and driving a wedge between the EU and China than anything to do with safeguarding user data.

It's true that TikTok has the capacity to control content and collect and store its users' personal data. This is also true of Google, Facebook, Twitter and others. There are countless ways for governments to target people. If we really cared about this why did the Commission do nothing to address the abuses revealed by the PRISM programme revelations? Why don't we have a set of rules that adequately protect people in the EU?

Governments that restrict access to Western platforms are accused of being authoritarian, yet now we're banning platforms based on pure suspicion and speculation. We have regulations for a reason. They should be applied to all platforms in a rational manner. We can engage with companies to address concerns. Instead, we're busy making ourselves look unreasonable, confrontational and almost as hysterical as the Americans.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, put uvođenja jedinstvenog punjača nije bio lak ni jednostavan. Proizvođači mobitela dugo su uvjerali da će se problem s gomilanjem punjača riješiti dobrovoljno različitim neobvezujućim mehanizmima, što naravno nije rezultiralo konkretnim koristima za potrošača.

Kad sam postao zastupnik u Europskom parlamentu, nisu svi vjerovali da ćemo uspjeti uvesti jedinstveni punjač jer su lobiranja tehnoloških divova uistinu bila do tada neviđena.

Međutim, donošenjem Rezolucije o jedinstvenom punjaču 2020. postigli smo veliku pobjedu za sve potrošače u Europskoj uniji. U konačnici, novi je zakon usvojen prošle godine i njime će USB-C utor postati standardni utor za sve pametne telefone, prijenosna računala i drugu elektroničku opremu.

Međutim, pojavile su se informacije da oni tehnološki divovi koji su se godinama protivili uvođenju jedinstvenog punjača namjeravaju proizvoditi USB-C punjače certificirane samo za njihove korisnike.

Time oni ne samo da bi izigrali smisao novog zakona, nego bi se i narugali Europskom parlamentu. Stoga pozivam Europsku komisiju da osigura ispravnu provedbu zakona kojim se uvodi jedinstveni punjač jer bez ispravne provedbe zakon ostaje samo mrtvo slovo na papiru.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Hvala lepa. Vsak spodoben človek prevzame odgovornost za svoja dejanja, kajne? Če se ta izkažejo za nezakonita, pač prevzame odgovornost. Odstopi.

In kaj počne vodstvo RTV Slovenija? Generalni direktor Andrej Grah Whatmough je – dokazano na sodišču – nezakonito na položaju. Odstopil ne bo. Nekdanja direktorica televizije Natalija Gorščak je bila – dokazano na sodišču – nezakonito odstavljena. Njen naslednik, Uroš Urbanija, odstopil ne bo.

Zaposleni na RTV bodo naslednji teden stavkali. Spet. Upravičeno, seveda. Ker vodstvo ne želi prevzeti odgovornosti. Ker ne želijo končati te agonije, ker si ne želijo priznati, da so nespodobni, nedostojni svojim položajem. Sposobni zgolj onemogočanja novinarskega dela, pritlehnega mobinga zaposlenih in rušenja javnega servisa.

Zaključila bom z besedami novinarke Vala 202 Nataše Štefe, ker je z njimi povedala vse, kar moramo upoštevati tudi mi. Navajam: „Ne potrebujemo sočutja. Naj bo zakonito in po standardih. Ali pa naj zadnji ne samo ugasne televizijo, ampak luč.“ Hvala.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Herr talman! Kommissionär Ylva Johansson vill se statlig scanning av alla meddelanden på alla plattformar och i alla meddelandeappar. Nuvarande *chat control* fick så hård kritik att en solnedgångsparagraf infördes, men den är i alla fall frivillig. Nya *chat control* ska hanteras av ett nyupprättat EU-center utan specifikt fokus på skydd av barn. Risken för ändamålsglidning är uppenbar. Kommissionen har redan föreslagit att utöka listan över EU-brott i det som den kallar hatpropaganda och hatbrott. Kommer jag i framtiden att kunna varna för att den nya moskén i Karlstad riskerar att bidra till extremism eftersom den är salafistisk, eller kommer jag ha gjort mig skyldig till hatbrott? Ingen vet. Datalagringsdirektivet skulle bara bekämpa synnerligen allvarlig brottslighet, men i stället jagades fildelare. En av de största kunderna hos Tele2 för övrigt, när det kom till begäran om att lämna ut uppgifter, var Skatteverket. Nya *chat control* kräver att sökverktyg utvecklas eller godkänns av EU-centret. Existerande och fungerande system riskerar att ersättas av mindre effektiva verktyg. Kommissionens förslag skulle förbjuda säker, skyddad och privat kommunikation. Vi måste säga nej om vi ska värna om friheten.

Gianantonio Da Re (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Commissione ha proposto di includere gli allevamenti di bovini nell'ambito di applicazione della direttiva sulle emissioni industriali. Sostenere che gli allevamenti inquinano come le fabbriche è una follia. Nel periodo 1990-2020, l'Italia ha abbassato di circa un quarto le proprie emissioni, mentre il Marocco e la Turchia le hanno aumentate del 23 % e l'India del 21 %.

L'inclusione del settore bovino in questa direttiva, con una soglia numerica di capi troppo bassa, impatterebbe sulla maggior parte delle aziende, incoraggiando la scissione strumentale degli allevamenti di dimensioni medio-piccole, per eludere gli obblighi o addirittura causandone la chiusura, con conseguente perdita di posti di lavoro.

È inevitabile l'aumento delle importazioni delle carni da paesi terzi che non rispettano la nostra sicurezza alimentare. L'Unione europea tuteli e protegga i nostri allevamenti. Per i cittadini europei esiste un solo tipo di carne, quella naturale, proveniente dagli animali, non certo quella di laboratorio.

Younous Omarjee (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, il est des questions nationales qui sont des questions européennes et dont nous devons parler ici. Notre devoir aujourd'hui est de parler de la répression brutale, comme nulle part ailleurs en Europe, qui s'abat actuellement en France. À l'heure où je vous parle, Madame la Commissaire, un manifestant reste entre la vie et la mort.

Mes chers collègues, la France, ce pays qui fut un phare pour les libertés dans le monde, prend aujourd'hui la pente dangereuse d'une méthode de gouvernement de plus en plus violente et autoritaire qui porte atteinte à la garantie des droits individuels, viole les droits fondamentaux et, en définitive, affaiblit la démocratie et le modèle européen. Montesquieu disait que pour qu'on ne puisse abuser du pouvoir, le pouvoir doit arrêter le pouvoir. C'est ce que nous attendons de l'Europe et de notre Parlement européen.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisară, doresc de aici, de la această tribună, să mă adresez Comisiei Europene. Știu că mâine va avea loc o ședință importantă care vizează România: evaluarea cu privire la suplimentarea bugetului necesar fermierilor români care au fost afectați de criza de secetă, de criza generată de cerealele pe care le-am primit și le-am gestionat pentru a fi exportate din Ucraina, țară puternic afectată de invazia nedreaptă și nejustificată, brutală, a Rusiei.

Cu toții am aplaudat în această sală această deschidere extraordinară, însă cer Comisiei mâine să aloce o suplimentare de 100 de milioane de euro, bani necesari pentru a ajuta fermierii români într-un moment atât de complicat, să nu jînă cont de proasta pregătire a guvernului de la București cu privire la această evaluare și să acorde un suport de minimum 100 de milioane de euro, absolut necesar pentru agricultorii români în această perioadă.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisară, stimați colegi, în fiecare sesiune plenară vorbim despre drepturile omului, despre faptul că trebuie să ne implicăm în reducerea inechității și în garantarea drepturilor tuturor cetățenilor, oriunde ar fi ei. Este bine să avem grijă de valorile universale și să luptăm pentru ele, însă mai întâi trebuie să ne asigurăm că drepturile omului sunt respectate la noi acasă, în Uniunea Europeană, iar la această oră, dragi colegi, nu putem să ascundem faptul că românii și bulgarii nu au aceleași drepturi ca toți ceilalți cetățeni europeni.

România nu este în spațiul Schengen, ca urmare, dreptul de liberă circulație, unul dintre pilonii acestei construcții, nu se aplică românilor. Nu suntem cetățeni de mâna a doua și sunt deja mai bine de 15 ani de când această situație nu este rezolvată, de când ne facem că nu vedem încălcarea unor drepturi de care toți cetățenii europeni ar trebui să se bucure. Dacă vrem echitate și drepturi egale, trebuie să le asigurăm mai întâi, aici, la noi acasă, în Uniunea Europeană.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Herr Präsident! Deutschland zahlt netto über 40 % des EU-Haushalts. Aber in Deutschland leben ganz viele arme Menschen, vor allem arme Rentner. Dabei hat Deutschland eines der höchsten gesetzlichen und tatsächlichen Renteneintrittsalter der EU. Doch dafür, dass Deutsche länger und mehr arbeiten als viele andere, zahlen sie die höchsten lohnbezogenen Abgaben weltweit. Im Alter bekommen sie dann gemessen am Prozentsatz ihres vorherigen Arbeitseinkommens weniger Rente als Rentner anderswo.

Deutschland hat ferner die geringste Wohneigentumsquote der gesamten EU. Deshalb haben unsere Rentner auch ein höheres Armutsrisiko, denn von wenig Rente zahlen sie auch noch Miete. Deutschland hat spätestens seit Merkel die schlechtesten Regierungen weltweit. Sie mögen der EU gefallen, aber sie richten Deutschland und Europa zugrunde.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, os trabalhadores, pensionistas e suas famílias sentem de forma gravosa e injusta o continuado aumento do custo de vida, com constantes e insuportáveis subidas de preços, com uma inflação que se fixou acima dos 8 % em 2022 em Portugal, sem o correspondente aumento dos salários e das pensões.

Esta situação, que conduz ao empobrecimento dos que vivem do seu trabalho, contrasta com os maiores lucros do século alcançados pelos grupos económicos e pelas multinacionais, agravando a exploração, as desigualdades e as injustiças sociais.

Há muita miséria escondida. Os ricos cada vez mais ricos e os pobres cada vez mais pobres. São frases cada vez mais frequentes nas jornadas que andamos a fazer pelos distritos de Portugal.

Faltam políticas que deem respostas a quem está a passar mal, a quem empobrece a trabalhar; políticas que valorizem salários e pensões, que controlem preços e que tributem os lucros escandalosos dos grandes grupos económicos.

A luta organizada dos trabalhadores, que se intensifica, será determinante para alcançar as soluções necessárias que o Governo e a UE se recusam a dar.

André Rougé (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, les drapeaux de nos partenaires européens flottent devant le centre spatial guyanais de Kourou. Mais la réalité de la présence de ces nations dans la construction et le soutien aux projets spatiaux européens est bien plus contrastée. Après le départ de Soyouz du centre spatial, près de 300 emplois ont été supprimés. Nous aurions dû nous attendre au soutien de nos partenaires dans le développement du centre spatial et de ces projets. C'était oublier le choix allemand de préférer la propulsion de ses satellites depuis les lanceurs américains Space X, alors même que le lanceur européen Ariane 5 a la capacité de réaliser la même mission.

Notre voisin d'outre-Rhin a toujours préféré soutenir ses intérêts, conscient que quoi qu'il advienne, l'Union européenne lui sera profitable. Comment ne pas être interrogatif quant aux prétentions de l'Allemagne d'être représentante du moteur européen quand elle fait le choix de soutenir les projets et les aspirations de puissances extra-européennes? Le CSG Kourou et Ariane 5 illustrent la capacité pour les nations européennes de se réunir autour d'un projet moderne, ambitieux et nécessaire. J'invite l'Allemagne à ne pas jouer sa carte personnelle, mais à préférer l'Europe.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, Propusemos hoje um debate sobre as medidas concretas e urgentes a tomar para mitigar o impacto do aumento das taxas de juro do BCE.

Lamentavelmente, a direita, com os votos dos deputados do PSD e CDS, e a extrema-direita votaram contra esta proposta.

Enquanto milhares e milhares de famílias em Portugal, como noutros países, veem o garrote apertar cada vez mais, sem saber se poderão continuar a pagar a casa, por força dos aumentos que nalguns casos atingiram os 65 %, as instituições europeias passam ao lado da realidade que se agrava com as vossas políticas.

No vosso silêncio está: o povo que aguente, o povo que pague o lucro da banca. As famílias precisam de respostas concretas para ontem.

Impõem-se, entre outras medidas: pôr os lucros dos bancos a suportar as subidas das taxas de juro, definir *spreads* máximos reduzidos, possibilitar a renegociação dos créditos à habitação tendo por referência 35 % de taxa de esforço, proteger da penhora a habitação própria permanente.

President. – Before closing the meeting let me apologise to every one of you for the technical difficulties to all colleagues but also the interpreters, whose fault it wasn't but also had to work under hard conditions. We do hope that this will not happen again anytime soon.

18. Porządek dzienny następnego posiedzenia

Predsedajúci. – Ďalšie rokovanie sa uskutoční zajtra, teda vo štvrtok 30. marca 2023 o 9.00 h ráno. Program schôdze bude uverejnený a je k dispozícii na webovom sídle Európskeho parlamentu.

19. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Rokovanie sa skončilo o 21.15 h.)

Skróty i symbole

*	Procedura konsultacji
***	Procedura zgody
***I	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, pierwsze czytanie
***II	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, drugie czytanie
***III	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, trzecie czytanie

(Typ procedury zależy od podstawy prawnej zaproponowanej w danym projekcie aktu.)

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

AFET	Komisja Spraw Zagranicznych
DEVE	Komisja Rozwoju
INTA	Komisja Handlu Międzynarodowego
BUDG	Komisja Budżetowa
CONT	Komisja Kontroli Budżetowej
ECON	Komisja Gospodarcza i Monetarna
EMPL	Komisja Zatrudnienia i Spraw Socjalnych
ENVI	Komisja Środowiska Naturalnego, Zdrowia Publicznego i Bezpieczeństwa Żywności
ITRE	Komisja Przemysłu, Badań Naukowych i Energii
IMCO	Komisja Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów
TRAN	Komisja Transportu i Turystyki
REGI	Komisja Rozwoju Regionalnego
AGRI	Komisja Rolnictwa i Obszarów Wiejskich
PECH	Komisja Rybołówstwa
CULT	Komisja Kultury i Edukacji
JURI	Komisja Prawna
LIBE	Komisja Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych
AFCO	Komisja Spraw Konstytucyjnych
FEMM	Komisja Praw Kobiet i Równych Szans
PETI	Komisja Petycji
DROI	Podkomisja Praw Człowieka
SEDE	Podkomisja Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony
FISC	Podkomisja do Spraw Podatkowych
SANT	Podkomisja Zdrowia Publicznego

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
Renew	Grupa Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ID	Grupa Tożsamość i Demokracja
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
The Left	Grupa Lewicy w Parlamencie Europejskim - GUE/NGL
NI	Niezrzeszeni