



PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 20 PAŹDZIERNIKA 2021 R.

(C/2024/5447)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2021-2022

Posiedzenia od 18 do 21 października 2021 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
2. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania: patrz protokół	3
3. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu) (działania następcze)	3
4. Przygotowania do posiedzenia Rady Europejskiej, które odbędzie się 21–22 października 2021 r. (debata) .	3
5. Konferencja klimatyczna ONZ w Glasgow, Zjednoczone Królestwo (COP26) (debata)	30
6. Pierwsza część głosowania	47
7. Konferencja klimatyczna ONZ w Glasgow, Zjednoczone Królestwo (COP26) (ciąg dalszy debat)	47
8. Wznowienie posiedzenia	54
9. Nagroda im. Sacharowa za 2021 rok (ogłoszenie laureata)	54
10. Nasilenie prawicowego ekstremizmu i rasizmu w Europie (w związku z niedawnymi wydarzeniami w Rzymie) (debata)	55

Spis treści	Strona
11. Skład komisji i delegacji	68
12. Strategia UE na rzecz ograniczenia emisji metanu (debata)	68
13. Pierwsza rocznica faktycznego zakazu aborcji w Polsce (debata)	78
14. Wzmożenie wysiłków na rzecz zwalczania prania pieniędzy (debata)	87
15. Porozumienia w sprawie globalnego podatku, które mają zostać zatwierdzone na szczycie G20 w Rzymie, 30 i 31 października (debata)	98
16. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania	101
17. Porozumienia w sprawie globalnego podatku, które mają zostać zatwierdzone na szczycie G20 w Rzymie, 30 i 31 października (ciąg dalszy debat)	101
18. Wznowienie posiedzenia	105
19. Druga część głosowania	105
20. Wznowienie posiedzenia	106
21. Zawracanie migrantów na granicach zewnętrznych Unii Europejskiej (debata)	106
22. Sytuacja humanitarna na Haiti po niedawnym trzęsieniu ziemi (debata)	119
23. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	122
24. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	122
25. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące stanowiska zajętego w głosowaniu: patrz protokół	122
26. Korekty i zamiary głosowania: patrz protokół	122
27. Porządek dzienny następnego posiedzenia	122
28. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	122

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 20 PAŹDZIERNIKA 2021 R.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

Viċi President

1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(Hin tal-ftuh tas-seduta: 9.00)

2. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania: patrz protokół

3. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu) (działania następcze)

Il-President. – Nixtieq inħabbar ukoll li fir-rigward tad-deċiżjonijiet mid-diversi Kumitati biex jidhlu f'negozjati interistituzzjonali, skont l-Artikolu 71(1), imħabbra fil-ftuh tas-seduta nhar it-Tnejn 18 ta' Ottubru:

irċevejt talbiet għal żewġ votazzjonijiet fil-Parlament skont l-Artikolu 71(2) mill-Grupp tal-Hodor u mill-Grupp tax-Xellug wara deċiżjonijiet tal-Kumitat LIBE li jidhol f'negozjati dwar il-proposta għal regolament dwar it-tishih tal-mandat tal-Europol u dwar il-proposta għal regolament dwar it-tishih ukoll tal-mandat tal-Europol – l-ewwel wiehed dwar il-kooperazzjoni ma' partijiet privati, l-ipproċessar ta' data personali u appoġġ għar-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni, u t-tieni wiehed dwar id-dhul ta' twissijiet fis-SIS.

Il-votazzjonijiet ser isiru għada fl-ewwel seduta ta' votazzjoni mill-9.45 sal-11.00.

Rigward id-deċiżjonijiet l-ohra għad-dhul fin-negozjati, ma rċevejt l-ebda talba għal votazzjoni fil-Parlament minn Membri jew minn grupp politiku jew gruppi politiċi li jilhqu tal-anqas il-limitu medju.

Il-Kumitati jistgħu għalhekk jibdew in-negozjati abbażi ta' dawn ir-rapporti.

4. Przygotowania do posiedzenia Rady Europejskiej, które odbędzie się 21–22 października 2021 r. (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on preparation of the European Council meeting of 21-22 October 2021 (2021/2888(RSP)).

I would like to remind all colleagues that for all the debates of this part-session there is not going to be a catch-the-eye procedure and blue cards will not be accepted. And also, as has happened, we will see some interventions remotely from different Liaison Offices of the Parliament in the different Member States.

Anže Logar, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, from tomorrow, leaders will meet in Brussels for the October European Council, where they will discuss the key issues facing the EU and its citizens today and in the future.

The meeting will, of course, start with the usual exchange with the European Parliament. Leaders will discuss the current state of play on COVID-19. The vaccination rollout in the EU has been largely successful, but more needs to be done, especially regarding vaccination hesitancy and disinformation. Further coordination is also needed with regard to free movement and travel to the EU. Given the global nature of the pandemic and the emergence of new variants, international solidarity remains important. The rapid removal of obstacles hampering the global rollout of vaccines is crucial to allow Member States to speed up delivery of vaccines to countries most in need.

COVID-19 has taught us that we need to be better prepared for the pandemics of the future. In this context, leaders are expected to call for the conclusion of the negotiation on the health union legislative package. Member States continue to support the strong and central role of the WHO in global health governance, as well as the creation of an international treaty on pandemics.

The hike in energy prices is, without a doubt, one of the most pressing issues for our citizens and industry today. Following their informal dinner in Brdo in Slovenia, leaders will discuss recent developments in energy prices and possible measures at EU and national level, taking into account the recent Commission communication. The Commission has identified various measures that are at their disposal at national level to mitigate the effect of soaring energy prices. In addition to that, we also expect the leaders to take a closer look at what could be of help at European level, both in the short term and in the medium and long term, to reduce our dependency on fossil fuel.

At a more strategic level, leaders are expected to have an open discussion on trade. When it comes to the EU's global influence, trade remains the most effective instrument in our toolbox. Leaders will discuss how to make the best use of this instrument in light of recent experiences.

Leaders will also assess the implementation of the June European Council conclusions on the external dimension of migration. Eight action plans for countries of origin and transit have been presented. Now these plans need to be made operational and implemented without delay. Leaders are expected to call on the Commission to present proposals for financing action on all migratory routes and to report regularly to the Council in this regard.

Europe's digital transformation is also on the agenda, as it is an important driver of economic growth, job creation and competitiveness. Leaders will take stock of progress on the digital agenda, including cybersecurity and connectivity, and give a political push to work on existing and future proposals and initiatives. Inclusive and sustainable digital policies and digital connectivity remain important.

With regard to external relations, leaders will discuss the preparation for the upcoming Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) Summit in November and the Eastern Partnership Summit in December. The prime objective of the Eastern Partnership Summit is to demonstrate the importance of the relationship with Eastern partners. A united EU position is essential if we want to engage these partners successfully. The leitmotif of resilience, recovery and reform should guide the way.

In view of the upcoming COP26 summit, leaders are expected to call for an ambitious global response to climate change, urging major economies that have not yet done so to set ambitious, nationally-determined contributions in time for COP26, to present a long-term strategy for reaching net zero emissions by 2050, and to meet their commitments on climate finance. We will come back to COP26 in our next debate. Leaders will also call for an ambitious post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework ahead of next year's COP15 meeting on biodiversity in Kunming.

I very much look forward to hearing your opinions on these important matters.

Ursula von der Leyen, *President of the Commission*. – Madam President, we will be discussing many important topics at tomorrow's European Council. One will certainly be COVID. Now is an important moment to take stock because we have now reached the mark of one billion doses of vaccines exported from the European Union. This is exceptional, because we are the only region in the world – the only one – that has kept exporting vaccine doses throughout all the difficult months we have just overcome. So we really managed to keep our promise to export every second dose that is produced in Europe, and to date we've exported to 150 countries around the world.

Of course, we will also be discussing different topics, like cyber or digital. The Polish debate we had yesterday, so I will not focus on that. Today, I want to focus on the topic of electricity prices, which is very important for us.

Let me begin with three simple facts. The first fact is that gas prices are, and have always been, cyclical, and they are set by global markets. So it's not a regional or local phenomenon; it's a global phenomenon. But, of course, we see that because of the price rise in gas, it is now difficult for many families to make ends meet and we see businesses, for example, at risk of closing.

The second fact is that renewables are on a winning path. If you look at solar energy today, it's 10 times cheaper than it was 10 years ago. If you look at wind power – which, by definition, is more volatile – it is 50% cheaper today than it was a decade ago.

The third topic is the question of imports. Here, if we look at gas, we see that 90% of the gas we use is imported, while 97% of oil is imported. Renewables are home-grown.

So these three facts show us that the transition to clean energy is not only vital for our planet, but is also crucial for our economy and for resilience to energy price shocks.

What are the causes of the current spikes? First of all, the global economy is recovering from the pandemic and, with that, energy demand is rising. Second, we had an unusually long and cold winter, which meant lots of heating, followed by an unusually hot summer, meaning lots of cooling and use of energy, and this affected the entire northern hemisphere. Third, the whole world is affected, so this means that irrespective of a country's energy or climate policies or energy mix, they are affected by the rise in energy and electricity prices. In fact, we see that the prices in Asia are even higher than they are here in Europe.

Yet there is something specific to the European situation. If we look at gas and our suppliers, while Gazprom has honoured its long-term contracts with us, it did not respond to higher demand as it did in previous years. So Europe is today too reliant on gas, too dependent on gas imports. As I said, we import 90% of the gas we use, and this makes us vulnerable.

The answer is to diversify suppliers, but also to keep the role of natural gas as a transitional fuel – and we have to debate this in depth – and, crucially, to speed up the transition to clean energy. So the European Green Deal is, in the mid to long term, a crucial pillar of European energy sovereignty in the 21st century.

I was speaking about the mid to long term, but citizens rightly expect us to act now. They want quick responses. Therefore, let me turn to the measures we are deploying to address the situation in the short term.

Our priority is to give relief to vulnerable families and businesses. Some measures can be taken very swiftly under the current EU rules. This includes relief for businesses and families – and when I say 'businesses', of course I'm talking about SMEs – through State aid, targeted support to consumers, and cuts to levies and taxes. Because, let us remind ourselves that if we look at the price itself, on average one third of the wholesale energy price is set by the market, one third depends on infrastructure and one third, on average, depends on taxes and levies. There are some Member States where 50% of the electricity price is taxes and levies. So this is where Member States can act very quickly, and 20 of our Member States are already doing that.

À moyen et long terme, la Commission agira dans cinq domaines cruciaux.

Premièrement, nous devons mettre fin à la spéculation sur les marchés de l'énergie. C'est pourquoi nous renforçons notre surveillance des marchés du gaz et du carbone et nous avons demandé à l'Autorité européenne des marchés financiers d'examiner les comportements en matière de négociation de quotas d'émission.

Deuxièmement, nous évaluerons le fonctionnement du marché de l'électricité. L'organisation de notre marché de l'électricité a donné de bons résultats. Toutefois, à l'heure actuelle, les prix du gaz tirent les prix de l'électricité à la hausse. Nous avons donc demandé à l'Agence de l'Union européenne pour la coopération des régulateurs de l'énergie (ACER) de réaliser une première évaluation du système à la lumière de l'expérience actuelle d'ici mi-novembre. Elle formulera ensuite des recommandations sur la manière de mieux lutter contre l'extrême volatilité des prix.

Troisièmement, nous établissons activement des contacts avec les fournisseurs étrangers de gaz. Equinor Norvège, par exemple, a déjà annoncé une augmentation de ses livraisons. Et début 2022, nous présenterons une stratégie de dialogue international sur l'énergie, également pour aider les États membres dans leurs contacts internationaux.

Viertens werden wir uns mit der Frage der Gasspeicherung befassen. Es gibt derzeit keinen europäischen Rahmen für strategische Gasreserven, wie wir ihn beim Öl zum Beispiel haben.

Wir könnten uns besser vorbereiten, etwa durch regelmäßige Stresstests unserer Speicher- und Reaktionskapazitäten, und wir werden neben der strategischen Gasreserve auch erkunden, welches Potenzial zum Beispiel die gemeinsame Beschaffung von Gas am globalen Markt hat – gegebenenfalls auf freiwilliger Basis der Mitgliedstaaten. Wir könnten da nämlich einen großen Vorteil am Markt nutzen – die Skalierungseffekte –, wenn wir unsere Kräfte auf europäischer Ebene bündeln. Auch hier kann ein gemeinsamer europäischer Ansatz eine positive, starke Hebelwirkung entfalten.

Schließlich zeigt diese Krise, dass wir bei den Investitionen in erneuerbare Energien mehr Tempo brauchen. Jedes Kilowatt Strom aus erneuerbaren Energiequellen ist nicht nur eine Versicherung gegen steigende Energiepreise; es trägt eben auch dazu bei, unsere Abhängigkeit von Importen zu verringern, und es macht unsere Gesellschaft und unsere Wirtschaft krisenfester. Wir müssen daher mehr tun bei den Investitionen in erneuerbare Energien und in ein Energiesystem mit angemessenen Lagerungskapazitäten, ein Energiesystem mit grenzüberschreitenden Netzverbänden, gesicherter Grundlast und flexibler Stromerzeugung.

Und genau das – nämlich diese Investitionen – das tun wir jetzt zum Beispiel mit NextGenerationEU, unserem Aufbauprogramm. In den bisher vorgelegten nationalen Plänen – und das sind 22 Mitgliedstaaten, in denen die Pläne jetzt bestätigt sind – sind 36 Milliarden Euro gezielt für saubere Energie vorgesehen. Das beginnt bei grünem Wasserstoff bis hin zur Offshore-Windenergie.

Schließlich und endlich – und dieser Punkt ist mir wichtig, auch wenn er sich vielleicht banal anhört: Was auf dem Weg in eine Energiezukunft – wenn ich es so nennen darf – entscheidend ist, ist echte europäische Teamarbeit. Denn eine wesentliche Hürde sind hierbei die Genehmigungen. Das hört sich sehr banal an, ist aber ein Riesenthema. Es dauert im Durchschnitt sechs bis sieben Jahre, bis eine Windkraftanlage genehmigt ist. Damit ist sie noch lange nicht installiert, geschweige denn *up and running*. Das muss sich ändern.

Hier will ich ganz klar sagen: Hier sind wir alle mit im Boot, das heißt, die lokale Ebene, die nationale Ebene und die europäische Ebene. Da ist keiner, der sagen kann: Bei mir ist alles in Ordnung. Wir alle müssen da besser werden.

Die Kommission wird im nächsten Jahr deshalb im Rahmen der Erneuerbare-Energien-Richtlinien Leitlinien zu dem Thema Genehmigungen vorlegen, Meine Bitte ist hier, dass wir ganz eng zusammenarbeiten mit dem Parlament und mit dem Rat, damit das nicht wieder verwässert wird, sodass wir nicht aus dieser Genehmigungsfalle oder Verlangsamung herauskommen.

Honourable Members, science has been telling us for years that we must accelerate the transition towards a carbon-neutral economy. Now the economy is adding another reason to do so. The upcoming COP26 in Glasgow will be the moment for the whole world to speed up action, because the world is not yet on track to match our commitments under the Paris Agreement – we should be fully aware of that. So much more needs to be done to prevent global temperatures from rising more than 1.5 degrees over pre-industrial levels. The European Union will bring to Glasgow the highest level of ambition. We do it for all future generations, we do it for our planet and we do it for Europe.

Esther de Lange, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, we cannot start this debate today about the upcoming European Council without looking back at yesterday's debate with Prime Minister Morawiecki, because at this Council, clearly the rule of law risks being the elephant in the room. And let me remind all of you of Article 15 of the Treaty: 'The European Council shall provide the Union with the necessary impetus for its development and shall define the general political directions and priorities thereof.'

On the rule of law, we heard the Commission yesterday, and we thank you for that. But the European Council has not been giving any political directions at all. Our European House is built on a foundation of common values and common rules: democracy, the rule of law, freedom of the media and independence of the judiciary. If we allow this foundation to be taken apart country by country, brick by brick, the entire House we built of peace, of prosperity, of freedom, of opportunity is in danger – and this will not happen under the EPP's watch. This will not happen under this Parliament's watch.

Now that we see an increasingly divided and toxic debate on the rule of law in Europe, it is of the utmost importance that the European Council finally takes its responsibility in this regard and gives the impetus and directives they are normally so very keen to give.

You call yourself European leaders. Well, now, on this very fundamental issue, it is your time to lead.

Madam Vice-President, let me touch upon some other issues on the Council's agenda. On vaccination, for the EPP it is clear that we need to avoid the perception of first and second class citizens when it comes to vaccination. Europe can be proud that it is at the forefront of the global vaccination drive, that it has vaccinated a large amount of its own citizens while providing vaccines to the world. And let me use this opportunity to thank those doctors and nurses who are currently actually preparing their hospitals for what is going to come in the weeks ahead. But it is worrying that some countries stay behind when it comes to vaccination rates, and we expect all the support needed from the European Council to help Member States to drive up their vaccination coverage.

Finally, on energy prices – the cost of simply heating our homes and running our businesses. The current energy crisis is confronting us with the reality of energy dependence in Europe. This is not new. It was always predicted that this would have a political price, but now we see what it really means. It is also a warning about a limited ambition when it comes to the Energy Union, and that we should not include any technology or energy source from our transition plans in the Green Deal, nor gas as a transition technology.

The Green Deal simply won't work if it leaves people literally out in the cold, and therefore this Council should focus on concrete measures for citizens in the short term, especially those at risk of energy poverty. For the medium term, we should not only discuss our high – and let me say, for the EPP, justified – ambitions for 2030 and 2050, but also make sure that we have the conditions and the infrastructure in place to get there.

Then my last line, Madam President of the Commission, was including streamlining and speeding up planning permission procedures. You mentioned that in your discourse, and I would like to, on behalf of my Group at least, ask you to present those plans as quickly as you can. We need to get to work.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, presidenta Von der Leyen, de la misma manera que la compañera de Lange quiero comenzar, evidentemente, refiriéndome a un debate que ayer celebramos en esta Cámara y que evidencia la preocupación de la gran mayoría de los demócratas europeos con respecto a lo que está ocurriendo en estos momentos con la defensa y la garantía del Estado de Derecho en Europa.

Ayer fuimos exigentes con la Comisión para que actúe en esta materia. Hoy lo somos con el Consejo, también, para que incorpore en sus debates la necesidad de avanzar en esta cuestión y de no permitir que siga poniéndose en peligro el futuro del proyecto europeo.

Nos enfrentamos cada vez más a una cascada de retos y desafíos en nuestras vidas y no son pocas las razones para que la Unión Europea actúe desde dentro, pero también desde fuera de sus fronteras.

El zarpazo de los precios de la electricidad nos empuja a la pobreza energética, desestabiliza gobiernos, frena la recuperación económica, quiebra el apoyo político y social a la transición ecológica y expone nuestra vulnerabilidad en las relaciones con nuestros socios. Presidenta Von der Leyen, hace dos semanas afirmó que la Comisión estaba dispuesta a estudiar formas para desacoplar el precio del gas de la energía. La semana pasada la Comisión presentó un paquete de medidas que, es verdad, pueden ser un primer paso, pero son todavía totalmente insuficientes. El invierno se acerca y no podemos aceptar que millones de ciudadanos y ciudadanas de la Unión Europea estén condenados a elegir cada día entre comer o calentarse. No puede ocurrir eso en la Unión Europea. Es la hora de abordar la excepcionalidad de la situación con medidas excepcionales. Necesitamos una batería de herramientas para actuar en distintos frentes, desde la reforma de las reglas del mercado mayorista de la electricidad hasta la lucha contra la especulación de mercados de derechos de emisiones de CO₂, pasando por la puesta en marcha de una plataforma europea centralizada de compra de gas natural

que facilite la creación de las reservas estratégicas. Y también debemos mejorar nuestra seguridad energética con la diversificación de fuentes de energía, proveedores y rutas, así como a través del apoyo a terceros países para que aceleren sus propias transiciones energéticas.

El éxito o el fracaso de la vacunación global también decidirá el lugar que la Unión Europea ocupa en el mundo. La vacunación mundial se ha acelerado, pero la brecha Norte-Sur sigue siendo muy amplia. Mientras que la Unión Europea ha conseguido vacunar a más del 70 % de su población, menos del 3 % de la población de los países más pobres está protegida frente a la enfermedad. De los 2000 millones de dosis a países de rentas bajas que COVAX tenía previsto distribuir hasta finales de este año, solo se han distribuido 300.

Si algo nos ha enseñado la pandemia es que los desafíos globales deben abordarse desde una mirada global. Para superar esta pandemia y la amenaza de la enfermedad, esta debe ser eliminada en todos los rincones del planeta. Convertir la vacuna en un indicador más de la desigualdad es, además de inmoral, la confirmación de que no hemos entendido nada. Cuanto más se permita que se propague el virus, más probabilidades hay de que mute en nuevas variantes resistentes a las vacunas. Ahora que hemos avanzado con éxito en la vacunación, tenemos este reto tan importante.

Y el próximo Consejo Europeo tampoco puede olvidar uno de los talones de Aquiles de Europa: la migración. No habrá solución al drama humanitario que viven nuestras fronteras hasta que no se logre un acuerdo migratorio basado en los principios de responsabilidad, solidaridad y humanidad.

Tal y como nuestro Grupo ha recordado hoy a la Comisión Europea por carta, la intención de varios Estados miembros de levantar muros y de permitir devoluciones en caliente viola los derechos más fundamentales de los seres humanos. El proyecto europeo no nació para construir muros sino para derribarlos. Decía Willy Brandt que las barreras mentales perviven por más tiempo que las de hormigón. Frente al populismo nacionalista y las proclamas eurofóbicas debemos usar los instrumentos legales a nuestra disposición, aplicando el mecanismo de condicionalidad, recurriendo los atropellos jurídicos y defendiendo la independencia judicial.

Ante esta situación de urgencia por los precios de la energía golpeando a los más vulnerables, con la desigualdad en la distribución de las vacunas en el mundo y con la pérdida de vidas humanas en nuestras fronteras, no podemos limitarnos una y otra vez a no llegar a la nada. Necesitamos que los compromisos se conviertan en resultados, y para lograrlo no olviden escuchar también la voz de este Parlamento.

(Aplausos)

President. – Allow me now to welcome the next speaker in his first intervention in this House as Renew Group leader: Stéphane Séjourné.

Stéphane Séjourné, au nom du groupe Renew. – Madame la Présidente, permettez-moi un petit mot, que vous décompterez forcément de mon temps de parole, pour vous remercier, remercier mes collègues de m'avoir choisi pour représenter ce groupe et souhaiter, avec l'ensemble des groupes politiques de cet hémicycle, la meilleure coopération dans les prochaines semaines – avec des enjeux qui sont particulièrement importants, tant à la Commission qu'au Conseil.

Quel moment pour prendre la tête du troisième groupe pro-européen de cet hémicycle, au moment où, en deux semaines, les citoyens européens ont eu droit à une remise en cause de la part du gouvernement polonais des fondements de l'état de droit et de l'architecture juridique, à des campagnes antieuropéennes financées par le contribuable de la part du gouvernement hongrois et à des insultes grossières – désolé, Monsieur le Ministre – de la part du premier ministre slovène qui pourtant préside le Conseil de l'Union. Et nous avons entendu hier matin le premier ministre polonais nous demander et demander à l'Europe de régler les vrais problèmes. Je suis d'accord avec cette affirmation: il faut régler les vrais problèmes. Mais à qui la faute, si ce n'est aux membres du Conseil qui utilisent les institutions européennes pour les débats de politique interne?

Alors oui, l'Europe, c'est du sérieux. L'Europe a des règles, l'Europe a une cohérence politique, l'Europe a surtout un objectif: faire que les Européens vivent mieux, plus libres, plus égaux dans un monde instable. L'Europe doit également – et je maintiens la revendication du groupe politique pro-européen Renew Europe – faire entendre sa voix, la voix des Européens, la voix des Européens convaincus, attachés aux valeurs et qui veulent des solutions concrètes à nos problèmes.

Madame la Présidente de la Commission, Monsieur le Ministre, vous trouverez toujours le groupe Renew Europe en appui pour trouver des solutions contre la hausse des prix de l'énergie. Les plus fragiles ne pourront pas payer les factures. Le pacte vert n'est pas un problème, mais une solution, et nous trouverons des solutions pour l'autonomie vis-à-vis des pays tiers comme pour une Europe décarbonée – nous pouvons y réfléchir avec aussi la commissaire Kadri Simson.

Le groupe Renew sera toujours également en appui quand il s'agira de trouver des solutions pour les entreprises aux pénuries de matières premières, comme en ce moment, où certains mettent à l'arrêt des usines. La stratégie industrielle doit être érigée au rang des priorités absolues, comme l'a justement dit Thierry Breton, pour réduire nos dépendances stratégiques sur les terres rares, sur le silicium, sur les semi-conducteurs qui sont importants pour notre industrie.

Toujours et encore à vos côtés quand il s'agira d'avancer en ce qui concerne le pacte sur la migration et l'asile: on peut trouver ici, dans cet hémicycle, au Conseil et à la Commission, un équilibre entre solidarité et responsabilité.

Toujours, enfin, à vos côtés pour défendre les accords commerciaux de quatrième génération qui sont les seuls capables de rassurer nos populations.

Néanmoins, le groupe Renew Europe établira un rapport de force au niveau interinstitutionnel pour défendre la position du Parlement. Nous demandons ici au Conseil une réaction forte à la remise en cause par le Royaume-Uni des accords signés par l'Union européenne; nous devons défendre l'intérêt européen dans ces accords. Nous demandons aussi au Conseil européen de réels engagements sur Covax, pour continuer à vacciner le monde – c'était une demande, une forte demande, de notre groupe politique.

J'ai une conviction, qui est sûrement partagée dans cet hémicycle: aucun Européen ne vit moins bien à cause de la primauté du droit européen. Aucun Européen ne vit moins bien. Cela, c'est une certitude. Aucun Européen ne vit moins bien à cause de la Cour du Luxembourg. Aucun Européen ne vit moins bien parce que nos collègues ici, dans cet hémicycle, vont contrôler dans les États membres le respect des règles par les membres du Conseil. Aucun Européen ne vit moins bien. Aucun. Par contre, nous avons une responsabilité. Monsieur le Ministre, Madame la Présidente, nous comptons sur vous pour que le Conseil débouche sur des avancées concrètes, qui mettent derrière nous toutes les attaques inadmissibles contre l'Europe.

Ska Keller, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, before looking ahead to the Council meeting, I need to look back and refer Minister Logar to some remarks that his Prime Minister, Prime Minister Janša, has made lately via Twitter. He has degraded MEPs. He has promoted ridiculous conspiracy theories and he has used anti-Semitic stereotypes.

I'm not willing to get used to this kind of political rhetoric. It undermines our democracies and we must call it out for what it is – dangerous populism. I'm happy to hear, Minister, that you're going to discuss disinformation at the Council, so I'm sure you can bring it up, or your Prime Minister obviously can bring it up here.

We have seen that democratic values can never be taken for granted, must always be defended, and I am proud to know that my Group, but also the majority of this House will agree with me when I say that.

Yesterday we debated the situation in Poland, a country that is turning its back on the EU, even though one should always keep in mind that it's not the country, which has a huge support for the European Union, it is the government that is turning the country's back on the EU and its values. And we called on the Commission yesterday to take strong actions in defence of our Treaties. But the truth is that the Council also has a role to play.

In the Council there are some around the table who blatantly violate the most fundamental of our common rules. So I wonder, will the prime ministers and presidents finally, and in all clarity, speak up to them? Will the Council start finally the hearings on Article 7? Because the real crisis for our Union is when there is no strong response when some deviate from our common values.

I would also like to hear some clear words from Council members on the human rights crisis at the European borders. People are dying at our borders because of our lack of action. They are being pushed back at the borders, beaten, humiliated, left helpless, and yet no one seems to care. And this needs to stop.

Europe's borders and what happens there are our common responsibility. That the human rights of people in need are systematically violated cannot be an acceptable state of play. Human beings are not weapons. They are not threats. Right now, every dictator in the world has understood that the one thing that the Europeans are very much afraid of is to send children, women and men. If they want to put pressure on us, that's what they will do. But rather than being frightened, we should finally establish a fair asylum system based on human rights and solidarity. And this Parliament has again and again proven to be ready.

And Europe also needs to reduce its dependency on autocrats when it comes to energy. Instead of building infrastructure that will tie us forever to the goodwill of not necessarily well-meaning governments, we need to invest in renewable energy at home to help the climate, but also to tackle energy poverty. It is a big problem all over Europe. We have the means to solve it. We have done, unfortunately, all over Europe, too little for too long and this must change.

Marco Zanni, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signora Presidente, signora Presidente von der Leyen, signor Presidente Logar, prima di passare alle tematiche del Consiglio, una riflessione sul dibattito di ieri, visto che tanti colleghi, ancora oggi, ci tengono a toccare quell'argomento.

Credo che quest'Aula e queste istituzioni dovrebbero guardare ai temi sollevati nel dibattito di ieri, nel dibattito che costantemente abbiamo sulla Polonia, con meno ipocrisia.

Perché non riconoscere le forzature e gli errori che abbiamo commesso negli ultimi trent'anni nel perseguire l'integrazione europea vuol dire non capire che la situazione in cui l'Europa è oggi è causa di questo approccio, è causa di un approccio che, non potendo convincere con la bontà dei risultati gli Stati e i cittadini europei della bontà dell'integrazione europea, ha cercato di perseguitarla forzando i trattati, utilizzando *backdoor*, che non sono proprio il percorso più indicato per perseguire questo obiettivo.

E mi domando cosa abbiano da dire tanti colleghi sentendo quello che dice oggi nella sua campagna per le presidenziali francesi uno dei paladini del diritto europeo, Michel Barnier, quando davanti ai suoi sodali, ai sodali del suo partito, che oggi qui si schierano tra le file del Partito popolare europeo, dice e parla della supremazia del diritto francese su quello europeo. Credo che riceverebbe un trattamento molto diverso da quello che noi oggi riserviamo alla Polonia o ad altri Stati membri che dicono la stessa cosa.

Credo che, senza ipocrisia, si debba riconoscere, per il bene del futuro dell'integrazione europea, il fatto che sono gli Stati membri, le Costituzioni nazionali a legittimare queste istituzioni e non il contrario, e se saremo capaci di riconoscere questo, credo che anche l'integrazione europea ne abbia beneficio.

Passando ai temi del Consiglio, ci sono tanti temi importanti, però credo che ne manchi uno fondamentale, che è quello dell'economia e della ripresa economica. Ecco, su questo tema vedo troppa compiacenza da parte dei governi e delle istituzioni europee, perché è vero che oggi stiamo vivendo un periodo di crescita che negli ultimi venti o trent'anni non avevamo mai visto in Europa, però è altrettanto vero che questa crescita arriva dopo un tonfo memorabile e che ancora a livello di occupazione siamo ben distanti dal recuperare i livelli pre-pandemia e in alcuni casi addirittura i livelli pre-crisi dell'eurozona nel 2010.

Credo che si debba fare una riflessione più profonda sulla sostenibilità del modello socioeconomico che l'Unione ha perseguito fino adesso, cioè quello di renderci dipendenti attraverso un modello mercantilista dalle influenze estere, perché qualcuno il nostro enorme surplus commerciale lo deve assorbire.

Velocemente sugli altri temi. Energia e costi: anche qui non credo che la situazione che viviamo oggi sia una situazione temporanea ed eccezionale. Credo che purtroppo stia diventando una situazione strutturale, che può proseguire nel medio-lungo termine, e se anche un giornale prestigioso come l'*Economist* in prima pagina mette in dubbio l'efficacia e le basi della transizione verde proposta dall'Unione europea, credo che una riflessione sul pragmatismo di questa transizione la dobbiamo fare.

Gli ultimi due temi: immigrazione e relazioni esterne. Sull'immigrazione, sono molto contento che finalmente almeno il Consiglio europeo abbia deciso di cambiare marcia e di cambiare approccio e abbia capito che l'unico modo per risolvere questo problema è proteggere i nostri confini esterni. L'immigrazione irregolare è fuori legge, è contro il nostro diritto e la dobbiamo combattere.

L'ultimo punto: le relazioni esterne. L'Indo-Pacifico è un punto fondamentale, credo che il Consiglio debba proseguire nella cooperazione con il gruppo Quad, non stando dietro magari ai capricci di un presidente come Macron, perché è fondamentale che l'Europa partecipi attivamente a contrastare il regime cinese e il suo espansionismo.

Raffaele Fitto, a nome del gruppo ECR. – Signora Presidente, signora Presidente della Commissione, signor rappresentante del Consiglio, onorevoli colleghi, a me dispiace che questa mattina il dibattito inizi così come lo abbiamo lasciato ieri, parlando ancora di Polonia.

È una sorta di fissazione. Questa settimana in questa sessione si parla di Polonia ogni giorno, in tutti i modi, anche quando non è all'ordine del giorno, perché probabilmente c'è una fissazione vera da parte di qualcuno. Io proporrei al Presidente – lo farò anche nella prossima Conferenza dei presidenti – di istituire durante la sessione parlamentare una giornata sfogatoio per la Polonia, in modo che tutti i colleghi possano venire qui e parlare contro la Polonia.

Perché questo è quello che sta accadendo, anche nell'ambito di un dibattito come questo, sull'ordine del giorno del Consiglio europeo, sul quale, Presidente, io ho colto degli aspetti molto importanti e positivi, anche da quello che Lei ha detto, e vorrei provare a dare un contributo, perché dovremmo parlare delle questioni vere che interessano i cittadini, non di una presunta democrazia imposta da Bruxelles e da questo Parlamento, che cerca di spiegare ai cittadini dei paesi che eleggono regolarmente, tanto in Polonia quanto in Ungheria quanto in Slovenia, i loro governi, che questi governi non vanno bene al Parlamento europeo, alle forze politiche di opposizione, che mettono in campo questo meccanismo.

È paradossale la discussione che abbiamo di fronte a noi ed è offensiva anche per il rispetto dei valori democratici che questo Parlamento dovrebbe portare avanti.

Detto questo, il Consiglio ha una serie di punti molto importanti. Io vorrei partire da un'esigenza fondamentale che è quella della ripresa economica, che è un punto decisivo. La Presidente della Commissione ha fatto alcuni riferimenti molto importanti, che io vorrei cogliere, però anche indicando quelle che sono le nostre posizioni e alcune forti perplessità rispetto a delle scelte che vengono portate avanti, partendo dal tema dell'impennata dei prezzi del gas e dell'energia, un tema che sicuramente rappresenta un vero limite e che rischia di colpire duramente i nostri consumatori e le nostre imprese.

Qui io mi ricollego al tema della transizione verde e colgo nelle Sue parole, Presidente von der Leyen, dei punti fondamentali, ma che rappresentano anche, rispetto all'impostazione della Commissione, dei limiti. Lei ha parlato di un problema vero, il problema vero è quello della tempistica delle autorizzazioni e delle scelte sull'energia rinnovabile, ed è il tema che rende non credibile l'impostazione del Green Deal. Perché se noi abbiamo quella tempistica – sei-sette anni – per poter realizzare un intervento di energia rinnovabile, abbiamo la certezza che la programmazione messa in campo è una programmazione che non troverà una sua attuazione.

E questo riguarda anche un altro aspetto al quale Lei ha fatto riferimento, molto importante, che è quello relativo all'approvvigionamento da terzi, sul quale serve un quadro chiaro per l'Europa, portando all'ordine del giorno di questo dibattito e di questo Parlamento anche la questione del Nord Stream 2, insieme a tante altre questioni che riguardano l'approvvigionamento esterno di energia e gas, che sono decisive rispetto alla credibilità di questo impianto che noi portiamo avanti.

Così come voglio concentrarmi su un'altra questione importante: il tema dell'immigrazione. Le dichiarazioni sono indivisibili in linea di principio, ma a marzo si è rinviato a giugno, a giugno si è rinviato a ottobre, a ottobre non so a quando si rinvierà il tema relativo alla questione dell'immigrazione.

Abbiamo tre problemi, tre fronti diversi sui quali l'Europa si appropria in modo sbagliato e differente. Il primo è quello del rapporto con la Turchia, dove Erdoğan sembra dettare l'agenda anche con le sue dichiarazioni, perché mette all'incasso quello che è il suo atteggiamento, il suo comportamento per bloccare quel flusso migratorio, un secondo flusso pericolosissimo, cioè quello che viene utilizzato strumentalmente da Lukashenko rispetto all'azione che sta avvenendo in Afghanistan e al tentativo di mettere in campo una strumentalizzazione grave della gestione del flusso migratorio rispetto ai paesi dell'Est europeo.

E un terzo fronte che è quello del Mediterraneo, dove crescono la presenza, l'importanza e la rilevanza politica della Russia e della Turchia, diminuisce quella dell'Europa e dove si sta prefigurando uno scenario nel quale utilizzare ancora una volta, con lo stesso meccanismo, il tema dell'immigrazione.

Su questo noi ci aspettiamo delle risposte serie, insieme al tema della transizione digitale, che è un altro aspetto molto importante. Su questo noi incalzeremo il lavoro del Consiglio e svolgeremo la nostra azione in Parlamento, con la preghiera di parlare di questioni vere e di evitare che ci possa essere continuamente questa discussione, che ormai è paradossale e strumentale e politica contro alcuni governi, esclusivamente con una finalità da campagna elettorale che dovremmo cercare di dismettere da questo Parlamento.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, les attaques de l'extrême droite contre la démocratie doivent être au cœur des débats du prochain Conseil européen.

Ce qui se passe en Pologne est le résultat d'une opération minutieusement préparée de destruction de la démocratie et de l'état de droit. En mettant au pas les juges, le gouvernement d'extrême droite est en train de s'attribuer les quasi pleins pouvoirs et il le fait avec un but bien précis: avoir les mains libres pour harceler les personnes LGBTI, museler les oppositions et empêcher les femmes d'avorter. Cette dérive est gravissime. Et le gouvernement polonais fait diversion en agitant l'épineux débat de la primauté du droit européen sur les constitutions.

Madame von der Leyen, je vous ai écoutée hier et les jours précédents. Permettez-moi de vous dire que vous tombez dans leur piège en allant sur ce terrain pour revendiquer une primauté inconditionnelle et absolue qui n'existe pas dans les faits. L'enjeu n'est pas là. Non, le droit européen ne prime pas en toute circonstance sur les constitutions nationales et je pense d'ailleurs que nous devrions instaurer un principe de non-régression pour que les règles européennes ne puissent jamais entraîner une perte de droits sociaux et écologiques au niveau national, comme c'est trop souvent le cas. Mais oui, les principes démocratiques et les droits fondamentaux doivent être inviolables en Europe. Il faut donc une réponse politique et j'interroge ici la responsabilité de tous ceux qui ont participé aux chasses aux sorcières lancées par l'extrême droite. Ce ne sont ni les musulmans ni les immigrés qui nous mettent tous en danger, mais bien les apprentis dictateurs réactionnaires: Morawiecki en Pologne, Orbán en Hongrie ou Janša en Slovénie et ceux qu'ils inspirent, comme Zemmour et Le Pen en France. Quand les États refusent l'austérité, vous leur mettez immédiatement le couteau sous la gorge. Mais quand l'extrême droite détruit la démocratie, vous baissez les yeux, ça suffit! Cessez une bonne fois pour toutes de tergiverser et prenez enfin les sanctions qui s'imposent contre l'extrême droite.

Je lance également l'alerte sur une autre priorité absolue: le financement de la bifurcation écologique et sociale. L'Europe s'apprête à donner des leçons à la terre entière à la COP26 en se prétendant la championne du climat, mais elle refuse obstinément d'aller chercher l'argent là où il est pour agir, comme dans le cas des milliers de milliards cachés par les voleurs des Pandora Papers dans les paradis fiscaux. Et vous avez raté une occasion en or de mettre un terme à l'évasion fiscale des multinationales en donnant votre blanc-seing à un taux minimum de taxation des entreprises de seulement 15 % au niveau international. Ce taux est une honte, car il est à peine supérieur à celui de paradis fiscaux notoires comme l'Irlande, alors qu'un taux de 25 %, par exemple, nous aurait permis de récupérer au moins 120 milliards d'euros de plus chaque année. Résultat: les multinationales se frottent les mains et on risque d'accélérer encore un peu plus la course mondiale au dumping fiscal.

Alors, qu'attendez-vous pour récupérer enfin l'argent volé des évadés fiscaux? C'est la condition absolue pour pouvoir lancer le grand chantier du climat et lutter contre les inégalités. Tout le reste ne sera que l'éternel refrain: paroles et paroles.

Permettez-moi un tout dernier mot sur les prix de l'énergie: vous ne réglerez pas le problème de la flambée des prix tant que vous ne sortirez pas de la logique du marché, dans lequel spéculateurs et actionnaires s'enrichissent pendant que les gens paient leurs profits. Alors, s'il vous plaît, pour les gens, mettons de côté la logique de marché pour une fois et ayez le courage d'organiser à l'échelon européen un blocage des prix de l'énergie et des produits de première nécessité.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Présidente de la Commission, au prochain Conseil européen, vous montrerez jusqu'où vous voulez aller pour que la Pologne accepte la primauté du droit européen. Mais, probablement, la Pologne vous dira: «L'Espagne peut l'ignorer et nous ne pouvons pas?». Et vous ne pourrez pas répondre, parce que l'Espagne ignore la décision de la Cour de Luxembourg qui affecte notre immunité depuis des mois. En conséquence, la Pologne se sentira légitimée pour continuer à défier l'Union. Et puis, ce sera peut-être la Hongrie. Et puis un autre pays, et un autre...

Vaut-il vraiment la peine de menacer sérieusement les projets européens, Madame la Présidente, seulement pour protéger l'État espagnol et sa dérive autoritaire par l'inaction des institutions européennes? Et vous connaissez l'origine du problème; vous le savez parfaitement. L'Espagne est le seul, j'insiste, le seul des États européens ayant un passé totalitaire fasciste qui n'a pas pu construire sa démocratie sur la défaite du fascisme, du totalitarisme. J'insiste: c'est le seul. Ceci n'est pas une opinion, c'est un fait historique, mais un fait historique aux conséquences dramatiques, si dramatiques que si vous n'arrêtez pas bientôt les violations de l'état de droit que l'Espagne continue de perpétrer aujourd'hui, le mauvais exemple de ce pays finira par blesser mortellement le projet européen.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to welcome President von der Leyen and the Minister back to the European Parliament.

This is an important European Council because we see more and more negative impacts of the crisis generated by increased energy prices. People are affected by it. People see their purchasing power reduced and they expect concrete solutions. We had the first debate here in the Parliament two weeks ago and the European Commission presented their toolbox with many very good ideas last week.

I totally support the fact that there should be an investigation into unfair competition practices, and also the approach that we should mitigate the effects on vulnerable consumers, and also the approach that there should be EU coordinated action. But, Minister, this week, the European Council should allow the Commission to do more.

Firstly, on joint procurement – exploring the benefits of joint procurement is not enough. We need that joint procurement. We need it now. If we purchase together, we are much stronger. The Council should give the Commission the possibility to move ahead with this sooner. With the Parliament, if this is put on the table, we shall of course support it immediately.

On energy storage, we also need more concrete proposals, not only for batteries and hydrogen, but also for gas, because that was one of the main sources of the crisis. I completely welcome the approach of the Commission on the financing in seeing the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) as a source of funding to support vulnerable consumers.

In the end, let us explore together if we can do during this crisis what we did during corona, to use the EU budget to reimburse some of the expenses which Member States had by increasing the co-financing rate and by making eligible some expenses which Member States might have to help people in this crisis.

Ismail Ertug (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Exzellenz, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Sehr verehrte Frau Kommissionspräsidentin, ich glaube, es war richtig, dass Sie heute Ihren Schwerpunkt auf die Energiepolitik gelegt haben. Ich möchte meine limitierte Zeit dazu nutzen, um auf ein anderes wichtiges Thema hinzuweisen, nämlich das der Bedeutung der Digitalisierung.

Eine sichere und nachhaltige digitale Infrastruktur ist das Fundament für unsere Wirtschaft. Klar ist aber auch, dass sich die EU zukünftig in einem globalen Wettbewerb um die digitale Vorherrschaft befindet. Wenn wir über den digitalen Wandel in kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen sprechen, müssen wir zweifellos auch darüber reden, wie sich die großen Tech-Konzerne auf dem Weltmarkt verhalten und auch ihre marktbeherrschende Stellung ausnutzen. Dies wird uns allen jeden Tag aufs Neue deutlich, ob in den sozialen Netzwerken oder auch beim Online-Einkauf. Die Digitalisierung darf weder zulasten der Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer gehen, noch darf sie zu einem permanenten Nachteil für die kleinen und mittleren Betriebe führen.

Um eben auch die Ziele des Pakets „Fit for 55“ nutzen und erreichen zu können, müssen wir auf neue Technologien setzen. Frei nach dem Prinzip „*No Green Deal without new technologies*“ ist das letztendlich nach meiner Auffassung eine große Chance. Ob das das automatisierte Fahren ist oder das *Geofencing* – wir müssen alle Möglichkeiten nutzen, insbesondere im Bereich der Mobilität, wo wir bei den Emissionen mit der größte Haupttreiber weltweit sind, um hier zurande zu kommen.

In diesem Sinne müssen wir gemeinsam als Europäische Kommission und Europäisches Parlament den Druck auf die Mitgliedstaaten aufrechterhalten, um zu einer Lösung zu kommen.

Luis Garicano (Renew). – Señora presidenta, qué desgraciado discurso el del señor Comín i Oliveres. Todavía no se han dado cuenta ustedes de que lo que está en juego en Polonia es el Estado de Derecho, y eso es lo que rompieron ustedes en Cataluña cuando gobernaban. Eso, el Estado de Derecho, la capacidad de una sociedad para convivir, es fundamental, y eso es lo que está en juego en Polonia.

Yesterday, President von der Leyen concluded the debate on the rule of law with a pretty shocking comment. Instead of proposing bold action, she opened the door for Poland's recovery plan to be approved, and the condition she set was simply that the Polish Government commit to a country-specific recommendation on reforming the judiciary. That would be a terrible mistake. The Polish plan cannot be approved until Poland recognises the primacy of European Union law.

Let me just read out loud, Mr Šefčovič, from the Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF) regulation. We agreed on a regulation that states that the plans to be approved must include Member States' systems to prevent, detect and correct corruption, fraud and conflict of interests when using the funds in the Facility. Mr Commissioner and Mr Minister, how can a country claim to have sufficient controls against corruption if its judiciary is not independent? How can we legally – how can you legally – argue that ignoring the European Court of Justice is compatible with the requirements of this RRF regulation? You cannot, because, without a functioning judiciary, we cannot be sure that there is no corruption and that Poland will fight corruption. For decades, we Europeans have fought for the rule of law, and the key to that fight is the existence of a judiciary and of a European Court of Justice that defends the Treaties.

Dear colleagues, we should not concede an inch on that fight, and that is why we from Renew Europe call on you, the Commission, and you, the Council, to reject the Polish Government's recovery and reconstruction plan until the primacy of EU laws is recognised. European money should not be at risk of being used to perpetuate the Polish ruling parties in absolute power.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, the European Council will hold, amongst others, a strategic discussion on EU trade policy. This is one of the most important tools we have at our hands to advance globally our agenda on human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with international law.

Now, this is exactly the opposite to what the EU has done with its fisheries and agriculture agreements with Morocco in relation to Western Sahara. The European Court of Justice has once again ruled that these agreements were illegal because they ignored its status as an occupied territory to be decolonised, and the Commission failed to secure the prior consent of the Sahrawi people.

I hope that the EU institutions responsible for trade relations finally learned the lesson that also when it comes to trade policy, the European Union remains a community built on the rule of law.

We will remain vigilant so that the EU does not yet again collide with internationally recognised rights, such as the right to self-determination, because of its desire to develop and maintain close trade relations with certain partners.

Jérôme Rivière (ID). – Madame la Présidente, ce qu'il y a peut-être de plus admirable dans cette enceinte, c'est la capacité que nous avons à débattre sans tenir compte de l'avis des peuples, en méprisant leurs choix et en poursuivant un processus implacable pour imposer aux pays membres, aux nations, un corpus idéologique, un carcan juridique qui a pour objectif de les priver de leur souveraineté. C'est Raymond Aron qui évoquait un fédéralisme invisible et c'est celui-ci qui détruit à petit feu les nations, qui organise une subversion migratoire «systémique» – je crois que c'est un qualificatif que vous appréciez – et qui soumet les pays membres à son joug inflexible.

À chaque réunion du Conseil européen sont mises en place des intrusions de plus en plus fortes dans des domaines propres aux politiques nationales, sans lien avec les traités. Demain, ce sera la santé, après demain, la défense et en essayant dans ces domaines d'imposer la primauté du droit communautaire, c'est l'identité même des nations qui est en péril. Votre approche du processus de transition énergétique, votre méthode, c'est plus de précarité, plus de pauvreté et moins de pouvoir d'achat pour les citoyens. Lorsque vous affirmez que le droit de l'UE prime sur le droit national, y compris sur les dispositions constitutionnelles, cela ne reflète pas les traités. C'est un mensonge. C'est en revanche le visage de votre projet spoliateur de nos identités.

Nous préférons, avec Maurice Druon, répéter que «le pouvoir, sans le consentement de ceux sur lequel il s'exerce, est une duperie qui jamais ne dure longtemps, un équilibre éminemment fragile entre la peur et la révolte, et qui se rompt d'un coup quand suffisamment d'hommes prennent ensemble conscience de partager le même état d'esprit».

Vous auriez pu retenir les leçons du Brexit: il n'en est rien. Le processus qui organise une submersion migratoire, nous n'en voulons pas. Certaines nations européennes en ont pris pleinement conscience et refuseront cette folle politique du pacte d'immigration qui veut voir une civilisation remplacer la nôtre sur notre sol. Ce processus, qui dénonce des pays membres à la vindicte de notre assemblée, nous n'en voulons pas. La Hongrie et la Pologne, on l'a entendu hier, sont sans cesse sous le feu des menaces de suspensions des plans de relance, au seul motif qu'elles souhaitent préserver leur identité, leur histoire et leur art de vivre.

Les citoyens des nations d'Europe en ont assez. L'Europe à laquelle ils aspirent, c'est celle des nations et des libertés, celle des coopérations librement consenties. Certainement pas celle d'un centralisme bruxellois qui méprise les nations.

President. – I would like to inform this House that Mr Comín i Oliveres has asked to make a personal statement, which I will allow under Rule 173 of the Rules of Procedure, and that means at the end of this agenda item it can be made.

Beata Szydło (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zanim przejdę do omówienia tego, co będzie się działo na szczycie Rady Europejskiej, powiem dwa zdania nawiązujące do wczorajszego dnia, skoro wszyscy z Państwa tutaj poświęcacie temu tak dużo czasu.

Proszę zostawić Polskę w spokoju, naprawdę, i nie rozprzestrzeniać kłamstw i fałszywych informacji na temat tego, co dzieje się w mojej ojczyźnie. Jeżeli Państwo nie byli w Polsce – zapraszamy, przyjedźcie. Zobaczycie, jaki to jest piękny, bezpieczny i, przede wszystkim, rządzący się demokratycznie kraj. I skończmy z tymi głupotami, bo zamiast koncentrować się na sprawach istotnych dla Europejczyków po raz kolejny, kolejny dzień toczą Państwo debatę o niczym.

A tymczasem w Europie jest naprawdę bardzo dużo problemów do rozwiązania i Europejczycy mają prawo oczekiwać, że wreszcie Parlament Europejski zajmie się ich sprawami. Jednym z takich poważnych problemów, o którym trzeba głośno mówić, jest kryzys energetyczny i to, co czeka wszystkich Europejczyków, kiedy będą musieli płacić bardzo wysokie rachunki za prąd, za ogrzewanie.

A dlaczego tak się stało? No między innymi dlatego, że ten Parlament Europejski nie reaguje na szantaże Gazpromu i zgadza się bezkrytycznie na to, co Gazprom wyczynia w Europie. Nord Stream 2 – przecież to Państwa decyzje spowodowały, że dzisiaj mamy taki kłopot.

Pernando Barrena Arza (The Left). – Señora presidenta, estamos viviendo un aumento dramático en los precios de la luz eléctrica; en el País Vasco hemos conocido apogones y movilizaciones ciudadanas porque es un tema que afecta a las economías más modestas de manera brutal, y las medidas que nos ha presentado la Comisión no van dirigidas a bajar el precio de la energía, sino a paliar sus efectos en la factura doméstica, y ahí se quedan.

Con unos precios disparatados, la Comisión Europea sigue sin cuestionar el modelo de precios marginalista que provoca esta escalada de precios, un modelo que provoca que paguemos el megavatio hora a los precios actuales, sin importar si la generación de energía viene de fuentes renovables, mucho más baratas. Abaratar el IVA no es en absoluto una solución; bajar la tributación de las eléctricas es un desastre que afecta doblemente a la cobertura social de las familias europeas.

Hace un par de semanas, diecinueve diputados y diputadas enviamos una carta al vicepresidente Timmermans y a la comisaria Simson y les recordábamos que los Estados miembros sí disponen de herramientas legales para intervenir el precio de la energía en situaciones de emergencia como la actual, y por lo tanto, y de cara al próximo Consejo Europeo, hay que volver a exigir que las administraciones públicas se involucren, aumenten su participación en las eléctricas y aseguren el abastecimiento a toda la ciudadanía a precios soportables.

Las ineficiencias de un modelo de mercado del siglo pasado, que ya no responde a la realidad del siglo xxi, son más que notorias y ya no se aguantan. Hay que preparar los cambios previstos para el 2030 para avanzar hacia la transición energética, y esta situación no nos hace situarnos en el camino correcto; hay que hablar seriamente, ya, de un cambio de modelo productivo.

Kinga Gál (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Ahogy a Bizottság 2015-ben képtelen volt kezelni az illegális migrációs válságot és hibát hibára halmozott, elkésett a cselekvéssel, ugyanezt látjuk most az energiakrízist illetően a rohamosan növekedő áram- és gázárakkal, amelyek az európai polgárok többségét érintik. Magyarország nem engedi az energiakrízis költségeit az állampolgáraival megfizettetni, rezsicsökkentést hajtott végre. Bár ezért Magyarország a Bizottság részéről csak bírálatot kapott és kap, a magyar fogyasztók legfeljebb az üzemanyagköltségek növekedését érzik ma és nem a hatalmas energiaár-emelkedést. Miközben Berlinben a gáz vagy áram ára duplája a budapestinek, Bécsben pedig háromszorosa. Noha ez egy szabályozási kérdés, a Bizottság nem segíti a tagállamokat.

A párhuzam az illegális migrációs válsággal egyértelmű. Magyarország évek óta hatékonyan védi a külső határokat, amiért szintén csak fegyelmet kap. Most, amikor keletről is migrációs nyomás nehezedik az Unióra, végre a külső határok védelme kellene elsőbbséget kapjon, hogy az illegális migrációt Európától minél távolabb sikerüljön megállítani. Az energiaválság vagy a migrációs krízis nem válhat hitvita tárgyává sem az EP-ben, sem a tagállamokban.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señora presidenta, hay dos amenazas a la recuperación: la alta factura eléctrica y la vacunación estancada a nivel global. Desde Europa debemos actuar con inteligencia, no como el Gobierno de España, donde sus medidas intervencionistas con la luz solo ponen en peligro a las familias y a las empresas. Cuando el Gobierno de Sánchez mete la mano en la economía, suben los precios, y lo único que debería estar subiendo es la vacunación.

Debemos, desde Europa, continuar con la cooperación con los terceros países. Deberíamos informar mejor, utilizar los canales apropiados para llegar a los jóvenes y combatir con firmeza las *fake news* que ponen en riesgo la salud.

Y hablando de mentiras y de *fake news*, permítanme una reflexión sobre el papel que el señor Borrell está desempeñando sobre Venezuela. Ha ocultado el informe del Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior, que advierte que una misión europea de observación electoral puede contribuir a legitimar el proceso electoral fraudulento en Venezuela. Ha evitado comparecer en el Parlamento despreciando a los demócratas venezolanos y, además, se muestra duro contra Leopoldo López y blando con Maduro. Y, para más inri, ha dicho que unas elecciones en Venezuela no pueden ser como en Suiza. Y yo le pregunto y ¿por qué no? ¿No deben tener los venezolanos el derecho a elegir sus representantes libremente?

Esta actitud de Borrell blanquea la dictadura. ¿Quizás a los socialistas españoles ya les va bien la dictadura venezolana? ¿Quizá porque ya ha empezado a cantar el llamado «El Pollo» Carvajal y a reconocer pagos del régimen a ex dirigentes socialistas?

Aún no sabemos quiénes tienen minas de oro en Venezuela. Lo que sí sabemos es que el régimen venezolano tiene una mina de apoyos con socialistas como Borrell. Señor Borrell, comparezca en el Parlamento, defienda a los demócratas en Venezuela. Y señores del Consejo, tomen nota.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Fru talman, kommissionen och rådet! Den här debatten handlar om solidaritet och om människors liv och hälsa. En global tillgång till vaccin är avgörande för att hantera pandemin, och det ligger i allas intresse.

EU måste agera kraftfullt för att säkerställa den globala tillgången. Vi måste bistå andra och bekämpa pandemin i världen. I diskussioner om pandemi och vaccin måste den globala tillgången lyftas mycket tydligare. Rådet ska också diskutera migrationen. EU har inte en dag att förlora. Det krävs att alla medlemsstater står upp för en ansvarsfull migrationspolitik.

Men jag vill också nämna den punkt som inte står på dagordningen för veckans möte. Det handlar om Polen. I går lyssnade vi på Polens premiärminister. Ett skrämmande tal som ännu en gång visar att beslutsfattarna i Polen inte respekterar det som vårt samarbete bygger på. Vi socialdemokrater förväntar oss att rådet prioriterar denna fråga. Vi förväntar oss att alla medlemsstater står upp för vår gemensamma värdegrund, för rättsstatsprincipen och för kvinnors och hbtqi-personers mänskliga rättigheter.

Vi har alla ett ansvar och vi kan inte tillåta undantag. Vi har många verktyg. Villkorsmekanismen är ett. Det är dags för kommissionen och rådet att sätta hårt mot hårt.

Илхан Кючюк (Renew). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Комисар, г-н министър, несъмнено най-важният въпрос, който предстоящият Европейски съвет трябва да разгледа, е свързан с високите цени на електроенергията в Европа, които са на ръба да окажат пагубни последици за европейската икономика.

Цифрите са шокиращи. В някои държави членки цените на електроенергията са три пъти по-високи от нивата им преди година. Наше задължение сега е да защитим индустриите и особено потребителите преди зимния сезон.

И ето няколко краткосрочни действия, които могат да бъдат предприети. На първо място, помощ, национална, за енергийно бедните семейства. На второ място, помощ за малките и средните предприятия, които са в изключително затруднено положение. И на трето място, да се помисли по-дългосрочно за справяне с кризата.

Но в същото време не бива да обвиняваме Зеления пакт, нито пък се нуждаем от индивидуално вземане на решения. Това, от което имаме нужда, е европейски подход за справяне с непосредственото въздействие на настоящата криза чрез прилагане на общи мерки и чрез въвеждане на реформа на енергийния пазар на Европейския съюз, включително с колективен договор за цените на доставките на газ в конкретно бъдеще.

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Wenn Sie hier die Ratssitzung am 21./22. Oktober debattieren wollen, kommen Sie nicht umhin, zwei Schlaglichter auf die brennenden Themen zu legen, die jetzt in Europa dominieren.

Das eine ist die Verschuldungssituation, die immer prekärer wird – mit 12 Billionen an Schulden und auf der anderen Seite einzelnen Staaten, die immer mehr aus dem Ruder laufen, wie etwa Griechenland mit 200 Prozent Verschuldung, zum BIP gesehen. Und die Kriterien, die eigentlich notwendig wären, um Stabilität hineinzubekommen – die 3 Prozent Neuverschuldung, 60 Prozent Gesamtverschuldung – die sind vergessen.

Und was geschieht? Dass man hier versucht, mit neuen Geldern eine Vergemeinschaftung der Schulden zu erreichen, und mit der Vergemeinschaftung der Schulden in letzter Konsequenz herauskommt, dass Nettozahlerländer wie etwa jenes Land, aus dem ich komme – Österreich –, hier noch mehr zur Kasse gebeten werden und dieser Weg abzulehnen ist, weil in den Ländern selbst für Stabilität zu sorgen ist.

Zweiter wichtiger Punkt: Migration. Wir haben ein Plus von 40 Prozent an Asylanträgen im Vergleich zum August des vergangenen Jahres. Ich begrüße, dass hier zwölf Staaten in der Europäischen Union einen Hilferuf gestartet haben, dass mit Mitteln der Gemeinschaft die Grenzen entsprechend gesichert werden müssen. Das wäre einmal etwas Schlaues, in einer gemeinsamen Aktion Europas Grenzen zu schützen und das andere, *Push-backs*, endlich auch zu realisieren und ihnen nicht ablehnend gegenüberzustehen. Es gibt seit dem Jahr 2014 eine Verordnung der Europäischen Union, die es ermöglicht, hier entsprechende Zurückweisungen vorzunehmen. Wenn Sie weiter nichts tun, wenn Sie weiter zusehen und das Problem sich immer mehr verschärft, dann führen Sie Europa in eine immer größere Krise. Ich ersuche Sie, aufzuwachen, tätig zu sein, sich an jenen Dingen zu orientieren, die wichtig sind, die essenziell sind für dieses Europa.

Johan Van Overtveldt (ECR). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, de stijgende energieprijzen, de zeer hoge energieprijzen staan hoog op de politieke agenda. De ongemakkelijke waarheid is dat we op korte termijn met onze rug tegen de muur staan. We liggen aan het Russische gasinfaus en kunnen op dit moment enkel hopen op een milde winter. Veel cynischer moet het echt niet worden.

De vraag mag trouwens gesteld worden, denk ik, waarom deze zelfverklaarde geopolitieke Commissie deze crisis niet zag aankomen. De toolbox van mogelijke maatregelen die de Commissie vorige week voorstelde, moet de bittere pil een beetje temperen. Maar het gaat eigenlijk om ad-hocmaatregelen die de modale burger een beetje te veel uit het oog verliezen. Wie vandaag werkt en investeert, betaalt het gelag van politiek geklungel. Een structurele oplossing is noodzakelijk.

De Commissie verwacht daarbij veel heil van hernieuwbare energie. Maar over de olifant in de kamer, namelijk kernenergie, wordt met geen woord gerept. Kernenergie zorgt voor minder CO₂, maakt ons minder afhankelijk van import en levert meer bevoorradingszekerheid. Ik ben dan ook verheugd dat al minstens tien lidstaten vragen om kernenergie aan te stippen als duurzame investering.

Chris MacManus (The Left). – Madam President, People's ability to power and warm their homes is a fundamental right – a right threatened by soaring energy prices. In Ireland, there have been over 30 price hikes announced by suppliers this year. We have seen decisive action across Europe to protect energy-poor households. The Irish Government must follow suit. The Commission has outlined that the best long-term solution is the just energy transition. This transition must put communities and households at the centre of our energy policies.

Right now, our energy system still panders to corporate polluters. In Ireland, our energy security is endangered by the government's overindulgence of data centres. Europe's energy policy must prioritise people's right to clean, affordable energy above corporate profits and market ideologies. There is nothing just about a transition that results in rising energy prices and the threat of power outages to families and workers. A true just transition must put people first, not corporations.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, današnja rasprava je o pripremi sastanka Europskog vijeća, koji će početi uskoro, pa bi bio red da se tamo razgovara i o problemima temeljnih prava i demokracije u Uniji i naših građana, ne samo izvan Unije. Htio sam pitati gospođu von der Leyen je li možda obožavatelj serijala filmova o Jamesu Bondu. Ima jedan znakovitog naziva iz 89. godine, s Timothyjem Daltonom, koji me podsjetio na situaciju koju imamo danas u Europi.

Ono što smo, nažalost, dobili s COVID putovnicom je dozvola za infekciju, dozvola za širenje. Imamo, nažalost, sve više primjera iz prakse, a ima i sve više znanstvenih dokaza koji pokazuju da posjednici COVID putovnice itekako mogu zaraziti druge ljude. Znači, mogu ulaziti na okupljanja, u bolnice, među ljude. COVID putovnica daje lažan osjećaj sigurnosti, a to je potpuno krivi pristup. S druge strane, potpuno zdrave ljude bez putovnica ograničava se u njihovim ustavnim pravima i vođenju normalnog života. Dosta je više te segregacije. Znači, ako COVID putovnica nije ovdje zbog zdravlja, zašto je onda tu? Zar Međunarodni ratificirani dokumenti, kao što je Oviedo konvencija za biologiju i medicinu, ne znače više ništa o ovome domu?

Putovnica je nelogična, neznanstvena, štetna i treba je dokinuti.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, en ce moment même, des milliers de personnes utilisées comme une arme d'un nouveau genre par la dictature biélorusse sont jetées contre les frontières de la Pologne, de la Lituanie, pour tenter de fracturer l'entrée dans l'espace européen. Et ceci est l'indice, un indice de plus, de ce défi migratoire majeur auquel nos pays vont devoir faire face ensemble dans les années qui viennent.

C'est dans ce moment même que certains groupes politiques, certains collègues ici au Parlement européen et une partie, même, de la Commission ont décidé de mettre en accusation l'agence Frontex, agence de gardes-frontières, au motif qu'elle garde les frontières, comme s'il s'agissait là d'une atteinte à la dignité humaine. Alors que, chers collègues, nous le voyons bien, c'est contre la dignité humaine que se fera notre impuissance actuelle sur le front migratoire.

Maintenant que les accusations contre Frontex ont été peu à peu levées, il est fondamental que nous puissions sécuriser le budget de cette agence, mais cela ne suffira pas. Il faut aussi que nous puissions garantir le cadre légal indispensable pour lutter contre les réseaux de passeurs, pour reconduire hors de nos frontières ceux qui y sont entrés illégalement et pour faire en sorte, enfin, qu'une vraie pression soit mise sur les pays tiers afin de garantir leur coopération en la matière.

Ce sujet est devant nous, comme l'ont rappelé récemment douze ministres de l'intérieur de l'Union européenne. Ils n'ont malheureusement obtenu pour l'instant, pour toute réponse, que le fait que l'Europe ne financerait pas la construction de frontières, de murs et de barrières. Nous savons pourtant qu'il est nécessaire qu'enfin une réponse efficace soit apportée sur ce sujet. Le Conseil va y travailler en parlant de la nécessité de coopérer avec les pays tiers, mais souvenons-nous qu'aucune coopération ne suffira si nous ne sommes pas capables de faire efficacement ce travail de lutte contre l'immigration illégale.

Javier Moreno Sánchez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, voy a hacer un llamamiento a su generosidad en el tiempo para hacer un inciso de diez segundos en este debate. Hoy se cumplen diez años del final del terrorismo de ETA en España. Yo creo que hoy, en esta causa de la democracia europea, debemos celebrar esta gran victoria de la democracia española.

Señorías, la crisis energética está llevando a muchas familias y empresas a una situación insostenible y puede mermar la cohesión social, las esperanzas de la recuperación económica y el apoyo de la ciudadanía a la transición verde y digital de la Unión Europea. Por eso, ante este problema europeo solo cabe una respuesta europea, como ya ha planteado el presidente Sánchez últimamente y como lo reiterará mañana en el Consejo Europeo.

Señorías, desde esta Casa debemos respaldar esta propuesta, como lo está haciendo la Comisión. A corto plazo debemos responder a las necesidades de los más vulnerables —como está haciendo el Gobierno de España, señora Montserrat— con medidas fiscales y desvincular los precios de la electricidad y del gas. Debemos negociar conjuntamente la compra del gas, como hicimos con las vacunas, y crear reservas estratégicas europeas, al tiempo que corregimos la especulación financiera que se está produciendo en los mercados de emisión de derechos de CO₂. Y a medio y largo plazo debemos seguir apostando por energías más baratas y más limpias, como hemos propuesto en el Pacto Verde Europeo.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter collega's. Zoals wel vaker het geval is, staat ook deze keer het belangrijkste punt van de Europese Raad niet op de agenda. Ik heb het over Polen. We hebben hier gisteren een Poolse premier gezien die weigerde in dialoog te gaan, en het is overduidelijk dat het Poolse hooggerechtshof compleet gepolitiseerd is en nu als wapen wordt gebruikt tegen het Europees Hof van Justitie, dat die politisering heeft aangeklaagd. De Commissievoorzitter heeft gisteren gezegd ver te willen gaan, en financiële en andere sancties op te leggen.

Maar de vraag die ik vandaag wil voorleggen is: Waarom treedt de Raad niet op, meneer de minister? U hebt het instrument om dat te doen: artikel 7. Dat is een krachtig instrument waarmee we voorzichtig moeten omspringen. Maar de manier waarop Polen zich gedraagt, tart toch alle verbeelding. Er is meer dan voldoende grond om het Poolse stemrecht in de Raad te schorsen. We moeten duidelijk zeggen: Europa is geen cashmachine waar je gewoon geld kunt uithalen, maar waarvan je de waarde niet accepteert. Meneer de minister, ik hoop echt dat de Raad morgen de moed vindt om die beslissing te nemen.

Joachim Kuhs (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Seit gestern habe ich über 600 Mails von besorgten polnischen Bürgern erhalten und viele davon auch sorgfältig gelesen. Ihre Botschaft ist einhellig: Wir Polen stehen zu unserer Regierung und zu unserer Verfassung. Wir wollen keine EU, die uns unsere Art zu leben vorschreibt und die ihre Kompetenzen überschreitet. Wir wollen keine EU, die uns moralisch verurteilt und unserer Regierung antisemitische Stereotype vorwirft, wie wir es heute gehört haben.

Herr Minister, Sie haben in den nächsten Tagen viele wichtige Themen und eine lange Tagesordnung. Ob Polen darauf steht, weiß ich nicht. Aber darüber sollten Sie vorrangig reden, denn Ihr Haus steht in Flammen. Sie müssen diesen Brand löschen – oder wollen Sie die Polen aus der Union drängen? Wollen Sie der Totengräber dieser sich immer mehr aufblühenden Union sein? Stärken Sie die wahren Werte Europas und seine überwiegend christliche Identität. Stoppen Sie die Corona-Maßnahmen und beenden Sie die Spaltung der Gesellschaft in Geimpfte und Ungeimpfte. Geben Sie Freiheit, Sire!

Robert Roos (ECR). – Voorzitter. De Europese Raad zal deze week van gedachten wisselen over vaccinatiestrategieën in de Europese Unie. De vaccinatiestrategie van dit Parlement werd onlangs duidelijk: na het aanbieden van vrijwillige vaccinaties, waar ik groot voorstander van ben, gaat het EP nu over tot vaccinatiedwang.

Vaccinatie is een recht, geen plicht. Om toegang te krijgen tot het werk worden in dit Parlement medewerkers en leden van het Parlement verplicht om telkens een test te ondergaan of zich toch maar te laten vaccineren. Daarbij is een negatief testresultaat niet voldoende. Een QR-code is verplicht. Dit Parlement, het Huis van de Democratie, sluit de deuren voor wie vragen heeft bij deze stappen richting een controlemaatschappij.

Beste vertegenwoordigers van de Commissie en de Raad, is dit een voorbeeld voor de rest van de Europese Unie? Moet straks iedereen een QR-code hebben om te kunnen gaan werken? Ik doe een beroep op de Commissie en de Raad om waakzaam te zijn. Alstublieft geen tweedeling van de samenleving en geen controlemaatschappij. Want vrijheid onder voorwaarden is geen vrijheid.

Mario Furore (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'aumento del prezzo del gas del 250 per cento da gennaio a oggi è una mazzata per l'economia, per le imprese, per quei milioni di cittadini che si troveranno davanti a un bivio: pago le bollette o spengo i riscaldamenti?

Questo è un problema che colpisce tutta l'Europa, nessuno escluso, e a un problema europeo si risponde con soluzioni europee. La Commissione finora si è dimostrata debole e indecisa, tocca al Consiglio europeo mettere in campo misure incisive, come quella di una centrale di stoccaggio comune, una proposta del governo italiano e spagnolo che va accolta.

Inoltre, dobbiamo accelerare sulle eco-energie e liberarci una volta per sempre dalle fonti fossili. Il Movimento 5 Stelle propone un superbonus europeo, perché ogni watt risparmiato è un investimento per imprese e cittadini. Se l'Europa crede davvero nel Green Deal, deve contribuire a finanziare con risorse europee gli sforzi degli Stati membri per la riqualificazione energetica delle case dei loro cittadini. Inoltre, l'Unione deve inserire il superbonus europeo fra quelle politiche di investimento che meritano lo scorporo dal patto di stabilità e crescita. Basta vincoli di bilancio, investiamo nel futuro dei cittadini.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Madam President, I was listening carefully to the Council and Commission statements on the programme and they have my endorsement, but let me mention three issues that deserve attention. They are from the area of the economy.

First, I appreciate the long and competent statement of the Commission President on energy, and we know what are the causes. Despite of the fact that the current crisis, almost crisis, is caused by mostly external factors, I guess we should pay more attention to the ongoing transformation from a fossil-based fuel energy economy to more clean and sustainable. It's obvious that natural gas will play a role and we should reflect it, in my opinion, we should better coordinate the capacities and reserves across the EU to be sure that we are more resistant and, if necessary, we should finance an increase of those capacities.

Second, on electricity. Electricity does not respect borders. It respects the rule of physics. That's why we need more coordination not just at the level of Member States, but of the regions to make sure that we have sufficient capacities to provide the supply and also to be ready for the commissioning of resources. Second, I hope that the Council will clearly mandate the Commission to go on with implementation of the far-reaching OECD tax agreement. This is a must and this is in our favour.

Last, but not least, in Glasgow I guess we should not only present our goals, but we should make sure that others will join and others will take their fair share of effort to protect our planet.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Presidente Charles Michel è chiamato a gestire una riunione del Consiglio europeo che si apre in un clima molto pesante, ne abbiamo avuto un assaggio ieri durante il dibattito con l'imbarazzante show del primo ministro polacco Morawiecki qui in Aula.

Ma voglio ricordare anche le vergognose uscite dei giorni scorsi del premier sloveno Janša che, invece di onorare e rispettare le istituzioni che deve rappresentare in quanto Presidente di turno dell'Unione, ha attaccato colleghi euro-parlamentari – anche la mia famiglia politica dei Socialisti e Democratici – ha definito alcuni eurodeputati «burattini di Soros», costringendo il Presidente Sassoli a intervenire e pretendere rispetto.

Vorrei dunque esprimere la mia piena solidarietà ai colleghi e chiedere gentilmente al premier Janša di spendere meno tempo su Twitter e di mettere la sua Presidenza al lavoro per rispondere a questioni reali e urgentissime, come l'emergenza dei prezzi dell'energia, che ogni giorno erode il potere d'acquisto dei cittadini europei e richiede azioni forti, e la gestione della pandemia, che in alcuni paesi vede numeri drammaticamente in rialzo.

Abbiamo bisogno di un vertice europeo che si occupi di questioni reali, non della propaganda della destra sovranista, e di leader all'altezza.

Isabella Tovaglieri (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il rialzo improvviso dei prezzi dell'energia, dovuto anche alle politiche *green* dell'Unione europea, frena la ripresa e rischia di avere gravi ripercussioni su imprese e cittadini.

In Italia, nonostante i correttivi introdotti dal governo, quest'anno le famiglie spenderanno mediamente 300 euro in più per elettricità e gas. Nel settore produttivo il caro energia mette a repentaglio la nostra ritrovata competitività, mentre il rialzo dei carburanti sta già penalizzando moltissimi settori trainanti del «Made in Italy».

Questa situazione mette in discussione un modello di transizione energetica molto ambizioso, ma certamente poco realistico. Quante imprese infatti con i risicati margini di guadagno potranno investire nella riconversione? Ma soprattutto, è giusto che, mentre il mondo intero inquina, siano solo gli europei a dover pagare il prezzo della transizione verde? L'Europa rifletta su queste contraddizioni e persegua i suoi obiettivi climatici con meno ideologia e più pragmatismo.

Geert Bourgeois (ECR). – Voorzitter, collega's, ik heb hier al herhaaldelijk gewezen op de achterstand van de Europese Unie inzake digitalisering, investeringen in bijvoorbeeld artificiële intelligentie. In 2020 vond meer dan 80 procent van die investeringen in de Verenigde Staten en in China plaats. In de Europese Unie slechts 4 procent, amper 4 procent.

U moet dus dringend de omslag maken naar een budget voor de 21ste eeuw, met meer investeringen in onderzoek en ontwikkeling. Verder is samenwerking met de Verenigde Staten cruciaal. De Handels- en Technologieraad (TTC) moet tot resultaten komen inzake regelgeving op het gebied van data. Wij moeten de ambitie hebben om wereldwijd de standaarden te zetten, een TTC-effect te creëren.

Tot slot regelgeving: ja, maar die moet de markt stimuleren. Die mag de markt niet afremmen. Wij moeten onze starters kansen geven. We moeten veel meer groei-bedrijven hebben. Wij hebben geen enkel Europees bedrijf in de wereldwijde top 15 van digitale bedrijven.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani kolege, poštovani građani, preduvjet vladavine prava je jednaki pristup prema svim državama članicama. Danas je potpuno jasno da Europska komisija nema jednake kriterije prema svim državama članicama.

I dok se prozivaju samo suverene vlade Poljske i Mađarske, blagonaklono se gleda na marionetsku vladu Republike Hrvatske. Europski sud je prije nekoliko godina donio odluku da hrvatski javni bilježnici nisu nadležni za donošenje rješenja o ovrsi hrvatskih građana i europskih građana. Hrvatski sudovi nisu poštovali tu odluku skoro deset godina. Milijuni rješenja o ovrsi doneseni su u ovršnim postupcima kojima su troškovi bili deset i sto puta veći od glavnice. Time su hrvatski građani oštećeni za više od milijardu kuna.

Što je Europska komisija učinila po tom pitanju? Je li prozvala hrvatsku marionetsku vladu? Nije.

Benoît Lutgen (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, le sommet européen aura notamment comme objectif d’avoir un débat stratégique sur la politique commerciale commune. J’ose espérer que ce sera l’occasion d’avoir aussi une dimension démocratique. Comment voulez-vous que nos agriculteurs, par exemple, continuent d’accepter que des produits importés sur le territoire européen ne respectent pas les mêmes normes sanitaires, environnementales ou sociales sur notre territoire? Il s’agit d’un enjeu démocratique. Il en va de même pour la politique climatique: comment pouvoir atteindre les objectifs climatiques sans avoir les mêmes exigences par rapport à ces produits importés? Nos traités commerciaux, donc, doivent être revus à l’aune de ces différents éléments.

En ce qui concerne la politique commerciale, j’ose espérer aussi que la politique énergétique y sera jointe. Certains collègues sont intervenus pour mettre l’accent sur ce point, et je les rejoins notamment sur cette indépendance énergétique qui doit être la plus forte possible au niveau européen. Il faut, bien sûr, développer les énergies renouvelables, mais aussi avoir une politique forte sur le plan nucléaire et notre autonomie en la matière, au niveau européen, pour éviter de façon structurelle ce que nous connaissons pour le moment et aussi pour éviter d’être dans les mains, notamment, de la Russie.

Jens Geier (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Minister, Herr Kommissar! Ich hatte eigentlich vor, wie viele Kolleginnen und Kollegen heute Morgen noch mal auf die Energiepreise zu sprechen zu kommen, aber ich habe mich entschlossen, nach der Debatte ein paar Bemerkungen über den Verlauf hier zu machen.

Ich habe heute Morgen von der rechten Seite des Hauses viel Kritik am Zustand der EU gehört und die steile These, dass sie – also die EU – und ihre Fehler der letzten 30 Jahre an dieser Krise schuld seien. Vielleicht bin ich ja falsch informiert, aber soweit ich weiß, sind alle Staaten freiwillig in die EU eingetreten. Keiner ist gezwungen worden. Sie haben alle einen Vertrag unterschrieben, den die Mitgliedstaaten selbst entworfen und einstimmig angenommen haben. Und wenn die europäischen Organe jetzt die Einhaltung dieser Verträge fordern, dann sind sie übergriffig?

Die Fehler machen doch in Wirklichkeit die Mitgliedstaaten. Man kann nicht in dieses Staatenbündnis eintreten, die Vorteile wie den Binnenmarkt, die Freizügigkeit, die Kohäsionsfonds in Anspruch nehmen wollen und ansonsten, bitte schön, machen können, was man will. Denn die EU ist nicht Disneyland.

Der Europäische Rat hat jetzt die Chance, bei der Krise der Energiepreise endlich Handlungsfähigkeit zu beweisen. Meine Bitte an Frau von der Leyen wäre, dringend dafür zu sorgen, dass der Europäische Rat kein unverbindliches Kaffeetrinken wird. Die Bürger erwarten das.

Anna Fotyga (ECR). – Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, whatever you say and do about Poland, I will defend my country, always. On energy prices, please try to lower our dependence on Russia rather than trying to appease this country. In this respect, I think that the Eastern Partnership Summit is extremely important. It should be ambitious, supportive to our partners, but also seeing difficulties and dangers clearly. In this respect, I would like to turn to Georgia and please speak up for the detained former president of Georgia, Mikhail Saakashvili.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovane kolegice i kolege, nisam mislio o tome govoriti danas, ali ipak nekako se osjećam dužnim početi s odgovorima zastupnicima Sinčiću i Kolakušiću.

Nažalost, nije rijetkost da se i s ove govornice obraća na takav način i da i s ove govornice slušamo takve potpuno neutemeljene demagoške tirade. Jednostavno nema uvijek niti prostora, a niti previše smisla svakoga puta odgovarati. Zastupnici koriste mandat kako žele i branit ću u konačnici i to njihovo pravo i ovdje u Europskom parlamentu, zato što vjerujem u slobodu i zato što vjerujem u predsjedničku demokraciju.

Istodobno, mislim da je ključno još jednom podcrtati i razumjeti da postoji stvarno dramatična razlika između takva dva oblika političkog rada. Dakle, s jedne strane, performansa i predanog ozbiljnog rada, egzibicionizma i stvarnog utjecaja na europske dokumente, oholo destruktivnosti s jedne strane i pokušaja pronalaska odgovora na neka stvarno teška europska pitanja. Zato su neusporedivi isključivost i suradnja s onima s kojima se i ne slažeš oko svega, glasanje protiv pomoći državama članicama i, s druge strane, osiguravanje rekordnog paketa, ali možda još više od svega nemogućnost zajedničkog rada s ikim tko nije uvjeren u nekakvu grandioznost tvoga lika i djela, s jedne strane, i traženja pravih kompromisa za interes hrvatskih i europskih građana.

Robert Biedroń (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! 7 października Parlament Europejski przyjął kolejną rezolucję dotyczącą sytuacji na Białorusi, wzywającą Radę Europejską do wdrożenia kolejnego pakietu sankcji i przygotowania związanej z tym strategii. Jutro państwo się spotykacie i chciałbym zapytać z tego miejsca, jak wygląda sprawa w tej kwestii, która dotyczy bezpieczeństwa nie tylko mieszkańców i mieszkanki Białorusi. Jak wiemy, sytuacja tam niestety staje się coraz trudniejsza: co najmniej 812 więźniów politycznych, ludzie są mordowani i prześladowani, doszło do uprowadzenia samolotu pod banderą Unii Europejskiej, a Unia Europejska nadal nie wdrożyła skutecznego mechanizmu sankcji, jeśli chodzi o reżim Łukaszenki. Dlatego chciałbym zapytać pana ministra, co Rada zamierza zrobić w tej sprawie. *Żywie Białaruś!*

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, we often say in the EU that the future is green and digital, but we cannot take these transformations for granted. Therefore, I was pleased to see both issues high on the agenda of the Council once again.

The recent rise in energy prices is, of course, of huge concern. This is a global problem, but Europe has been particularly exposed due to a combination of factors. We must reach the EU's 2030 goal of cutting emissions by 55%. That is without question. But, in the meantime, the lights must stay on. That means diversifying our gas supply immediately, something my country, Ireland, may need to revisit, and something rightly articulated by President Ursula von der Leyen here this morning.

In delivering our climate targets, we must ensure the transition to clean energy is as smooth as possible in terms of energy costs and security. Increased energy efficiency and accelerated deployment of renewables will be key in this regard. While the vital role the digital world has to play in communications, education and business is clear, with other areas it is less obviously relevant. It has been very positive, therefore, to see the wide-ranging impact of the digital transformation being recognised in the work of Parliament through the mainstreaming of digitalisation across our policy work.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Voorzitter. De Europese top zal gedomineerd worden door de uitspraak van het Poolse hof. En laat ik klip en klaar zijn: Kaczyński en zijn vrienden moeten geraakt worden waar het hun het meeste pijn doet. Daarom de oproep van de PvdA aan de Commissie – wat ook de Nederlandse regering zal inbrengen in de Raad: Kijk of de Europese fondsen ingehouden kunnen worden, maar blijf bijvoorbeeld mensenrechtenorganisaties in Polen steunen.

Voorzitter, als je elke maand de eindjes aan elkaar moet knopen, vind je klimaatverandering misschien zorgelijk, maar ben je vooral bezig met het betalen van de verhoogde huur, van de zorgpremie en van de energierekening. Zorg daarom dat de lage en de middeninkomens in Europa mee kunnen komen in de transitie. En laten we ons in Europa niet laten gijzelen door Poetin of lieden die de hoge energierekening aangrijpen om niets aan klimaatverandering te doen.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, κύριε Επίτροπε, κύριε εκπρόσωπε του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου, σήμερα βρίσκομαι εδώ αναμένοντας να ακούσω ξεκάθαρες απαντήσεις για τις δράσεις και τα μέτρα που προτίθενται να λάβουν η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο για να αναχαιτίσουν, επιτέλους, την τουρκική επιθετικότητα, προκλητικότητα και παραβατικότητα, καθώς και τις καθημερινές εγκληματικές ενέργειες σε βάρος της Κύπρου και της Ελλάδας, δύο κρατών μελών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που συνεχίζουν με ιώβεια υπομονή να αναμένουν, επιτέλους, την ευρωπαϊκή έμπρακτη αλληλεγγύη.

Αυτό που συμβαίνει με την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και την Τουρκία είναι άκρως απαράδεκτο, προσβλητικό, προκλητικό και εξευτελιστικό για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, διότι η Τουρκία συνεχίζει να γράφει στα παλαιότερα των υποδημάτων της και να περιφρονεί τις αποφάσεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου και της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, ενώ η ίδια η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση συνεχίζει να τη χρηματοδοτεί και να την επιβραβεύει, αντί να λαμβάνει τιμωρητικά μέτρα.

Θα ήθελα να γνωρίζω πραγματικά, κύριε Επίτροπε, κύριε εκπρόσωπε του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου, εάν αισθάνεστε ότι επιτελείτε στο έπακρον το καθήκον σας απέναντι σε δύο κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο, εάν αισθάνεστε ότι ο πραγματικός ρόλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, μιας δύναμης που θέλει να πρωταγωνιστήσει στην ανθρωπότητα, είναι να παραμένει απλώς θεατής και παρατηρητής των εγκληματικών ενεργειών της Τουρκίας.

Και μη μου πείτε τα γνωστά τετριμμένα ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν διαθέτει τα μέσα και τα όπλα για να αντιμετωπίσει την Τουρκία. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση διαθέτει το πλέον ακαταμάχητο και ισχυρό όπλο και μέσο —την οικονομία— και μπορεί, σήμερα κιόλας, να λάβει μέτρα εναντίον της Τουρκίας, παγώνοντας την τελωνειακή ένωση και παγώνοντας τα κονδύλια του προϋπολογισμού. Τολμήστε το και πράξτε το, και να είστε βέβαιοι ότι η Τουρκία θα συμμορφωθεί και θα λάβει διαφορετικές αποφάσεις όσον αφορά την προκλητική συμπεριφορά ... *(Η Πρόεδρος αφαιρεί τον λόγο από τον ομιλητή.)*

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, resolver o problema das pessoas tem que ser a nossa prioridade. As lições da resposta à pandemia, em particular as lições de estratégia da vacinação, demonstram que o trabalho colaborativo e solidário é mais eficaz e responde melhor ao que os cidadãos esperam de nós.

Espero que este espírito de solidariedade e de cooperação inspire as importantes decisões com que o Conselho Europeu será confrontado, na transformação digital, inclusive, na resposta conjuntural e estrutural ao aumento dos preços da energia, na definição de uma nova geração de políticas comerciais sustentáveis e no uso de todos os instrumentos à nossa disposição para assegurar uma vacinação massiva e global.

Portugal, o meu país, tem 87% da população vacinada. O Haiti, cuja situação humanitária debatemos hoje neste plenário, tem 0,7%. Não deixar ninguém para trás na vacinação é um desafio de civilização, é um desafio de sobrevivência. Temos de estar à altura.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). – Doamna preşedintă, este un Consiliu European extrem de important în contextul în care nu am învins definitiv pandemia de coronavirus, iar creşterea preţurilor la energie îngrijorează cetăţenii europeni din toate ţările. Răspunsul ferm şi coordonarea acţiunilor la nivel european împotriva COVID 19 sunt încă necesare, deoarece există posibilitatea de apariţie a unor mutaţii în viitor şi, din păcate, sunt ţări care încă nu au atins obiectivul vaccinării.

De la începutul anului preţul de piaţă al gazelor naturale şi al energiei electrice au crescut extrem de îngrijorător. Comisia a prezentat săptămâna trecută setul de instrumente şi acţiuni care mi se par foarte potrivite şi am avut o dezbatere în Comisia ITRE pe care o prezidez, în care s-a solicitat ca la nivelul Comisiei Europene să existe sprijin activ faţă de statele membre, dar şi să se asigure că aceste măsuri sunt implementate.

Cred că statele membre trebuie să poată folosi nu doar banii rezultaţi din creşterea preţului certificatelor de emisii, dar şi alte fonduri europene necheltuite în exerciţiul financiar 2014-2020, pentru a atenua impactul creşterii preţurilor prin plafonare, prin compensarea parţială de facturi sau prin scheme de ajutor de stat pentru IMM-uri şi industrie.

Cred că trebuie adoptată cât mai repede taxonomia pentru gazele naturale şi energia nucleară şi trebuie să găsim acele mecanisme în funcţionarea EU ETS care să ne protejeze pe cât posibil de creşteri speculative a preţului certificatelor de CO₂. Trebuie să acţionăm acum şi sunt convins că Consiliul European va da un mesaj foarte ferm.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamna preşedintă, dragi colegi, pandemia nu a trecut. Mai sunt multe state membre care întâmpină probleme în a gestiona criza medicală. De aceea, acest subiect trebuie să fie primordial pe agenda Consiliului European. În România, din cauza incompetenţei partidelor de dreapta, avem astăzi peste 500 de decese pe zi. La fiecare două minute moare o persoană, iar acest lucru riscă să readucă întreaga Europă în zona roşie.

Uniunea Europeană trebuie să intervină, nu poate să lase lucrurile la voia întâmplării, mai ales că executivul din România a ratat atât campania de vaccinare, cât și achiziția de teste din banii europeni. Efectele negative ale pandemiei asupra economiei și societății sunt doar la început. Consiliul trebuie să fie mai activ în a reacționa și este valabil, inclusiv pentru criza prețurilor din domeniul energiei.

Profiturile cresc, iar populația europeană se răcește și, dincolo de cinismul unor lideri politici, este nevoie de măsuri active și de acțiuni europene, care să ofere soluții la provocările și greutățile întâmpinate de cetățeni. Mă aștept de la Consiliul European viitor să vină cu soluții și decizii clare, pentru că indecizia costă vieți.

Anna Zalewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Koleżanki i koledzy! Dzisiaj Europejczycy oczekują od Komisji Europejskiej, Unii Europejskiej dwóch rzeczy: bezpieczeństwa granic i bezpieczeństwa energetycznego. Dlatego mam nadzieję, że Rada Europejska wyśle następujące komunikaty: po pierwsze, wskaże, że Polska właściwie chroni granicę europejskiej, i będzie ją wspierać każdego dnia i na każdym kroku. A po drugie, że zdecyduje się na rewizję ETS-u po to, żeby ceny energii nie szły w górę (to wina ceny uprawnień do emisji dwutlenku węgla, która wzrosła w ostatnich dwóch latach prawie czterokrotnie), na rewizję pakietu „Fit for 55” (dlatego że jest źle napisany, źle policzony, będzie powodował, że ceny, które dzisiaj są tak wysokie, wzrosną wielokrotnie), jak również na to, że trzeba zablokować Nord Stream 2. Blokują to dwie grupy: S&D i EPP. To oni współpracują z Putinem.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio ricordare che la costruzione dell'Europa è partita proprio dall'energia, da un progetto di gestione comune del carbone e dell'acciaio e oggi, di fronte alla terribile crisi dei prezzi che colpisce famiglie e imprese, dobbiamo avere lo stesso coraggio, la stessa visione, dobbiamo fare un salto in avanti nell'integrazione europea.

Occorrono nuove competenze e nuovi ruoli per l'Unione, anche andando oltre le basi giuridiche. Se c'è la volontà politica degli Stati membri si può fare, perché le sfide che viviamo insieme, della transizione da un lato e dell'emergenza dall'altro, lo richiedono. Il *toolbox* non basta. Sul tavolo del Consiglio ci sono proposte timide e parziali. Oltre alle bollette bisogna affrontare subito i problemi strutturali del mercato dell'energia, che è troppo frammentato e non abbastanza interconnesso, cioè è troppo poco europeo.

Nelle proposte della Presidente mancano alcuni punti importanti, ad avviso del mio gruppo: un meccanismo di acquisto comune, perché l'Europa sia più potente nei negoziati e anche nel gioco geopolitico; un piano con l'Africa per lo sviluppo delle rinnovabili; lo stop alla speculazione finanziaria che c'è nel meccanismo delle ETS.

La lezione del Covid ci ha insegnato che insieme siamo più forti e io spero che i signori del Consiglio se ne ricordino.

Andreas Schieder (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Die Energiepreise steigen in ganz Europa, und der kommende Winter wird der Test sein, ob es uns gelingt, dass die Antwort auf den Klimawandel auch eine sozial gerechte Antwort ist, ob es uns gelingt, dass wir den Klimawandel sozial gerecht werden bewältigen können.

Wir müssen Energiearmut verhindern. Niemand darf in Europa frieren, auch nicht im kommenden Winter. Das heißt, wir brauchen ein Maßnahmenpaket: befristete Senkung der Steuern auf Energie, die Verbesserung der Lagervorräte, die Unabhängigkeit von Importen aus dem Ausland, den Ausbau der erneuerbaren Energie – und den rasch mit Leitungen –, und auch Energiesparen und Energieeffizienz müssen ganz oben auf der Agenda stehen.

Gerade hier können wir Wesentliches bewältigen. Wenn wir die Energiearmut und die steigenden Energiepreise bekämpfen wollen, dann müssen wir jetzt auch in einen massiven Ausbau der erneuerbaren Energie investieren. Auch ganz nach dem Motto, dass Energiesparen – das heißt, der Wenigerverbrauch – im Vordergrund stehen muss nach dem Motto: Das beste Kraftwerk ist jenes, das gar nicht erst errichtet werden muss, weil wir effizient handeln.

So gesehen wird auch die Diskussion im Europäischen Rat zeigen, ob die europäischen Regierungschefs willig sind, genau diese Fragen sozial gerecht zu bewältigen. Nur die Augen zu verschließen, wird nicht reichen.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Gospa predsedujoča, Evropa se je znašla na pragu energetske krize. Dražijo se elektrika, gorivo, kurilno olje, zemeljski plin. Nujno je hitro ukrepanje za pomoč najrevnejšim v ogrevalni sezoni.

Povišanje cen energentov je posledica tudi v preteklih špekulacijah. Industrija in gospodinjstva niso povzročila danih razmer, pandemične razmere so mnogim prihodke močno znižale ali celo ustavile. Nesprejemljivo je, da lov za kapital-skimi dobički distributerjev finančno prizadene potrošnike.

Povišane cene energentov bodo marsikoga pahnile na rob preživetja. V Sloveniji zaradi naraščajočih cen energentov revščina grozi okoli 40 tisoč gospodinjstvom. Ljudje ne smejo biti prisiljeni izbirati med ogrevanjem ali hrano.

Voditelje Unije pozivam, da ukrepajo skupaj, kot se je to zgodilo v primeru covida. Vlade imajo moč in odgovornost pomagati svojim ljudem in državam. Potrebujemo evropski energetske Marshallov načrt in ne smemo dopustiti, da s prehodom v zeleno in brez ogljični družbo kogarkoli pustimo zadaj.

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, I really would like to thank all honourable Members for indeed a very rich debate on tomorrow's European Council. As Ms De Lange, Mr Séjourné and many others reminded us already at the beginning of this debate, I think it was clearly once again confirmed how rule of law, how respect for our common European values is important for this House.

Yesterday, we had a profound debate on these issues and the situation in Poland, and I can only reconfirm that the position of the European Commission on this issue is very clear and that President von der Leyen will present and defend this position in tomorrow's debate.

Several honourable Members also raised the issues of migration, and rightly so, because recent events have reminded us that migration demands our continued attention and action. As you know, last month we presented a renewed EU action plan against migrant smuggling, and for the first time we are placing a special focus on state-sponsored smuggling of migrants. And I also would like to underline that in our forthcoming package on Schengen, we will also give particular emphasis to the phenomenon of instrumentalisation of migrants.

Honourable Members have been also referring to the vaccines, and I think it's good to look at this in the wider perspective. And indeed, I think this is one area where we as Europeans can be proud about this success story. Not only did we secure enough doses for our citizens, but we've been very fair also to the global community because we exported the same amount of doses to more than 150 southern countries. To export one billion doses is no mean feat, it is a huge achievement for Europe and for our industry.

But I heard your calls, from Ms García Pérez, that we have to continue to play our leading role in COVAX and to make sure that distribution of the doses and the vaccines, especially in the lower income countries, is significantly accelerated.

But the topic which dominated today's discussion, and all parliamentary leaders intervened in that respect, was energy, energy prices. And these clearly would be also the crucial topics for debate by the European Council members, European leaders, tomorrow. I would like to reassure you that we in the Commission recognise the urgency of the situation, and we must, as Mr Schieder just referred to, prevent energy poverty and negative spillover effects to the wider economy.

I was listening very carefully to Mr MacManus, Mr Kelly, Mr Mureşan, Mr Zorrinho, Ms Jongerius, Mr Buşoi, who have been making very important points in this regard. And I think that the urgency of this matter has to be translated to the steps for immediate relief to the most vulnerable families and businesses, which we can do now.

Under current rules, especially if you are talking about these categories of SMEs and vulnerable families, we can do a lot through state aid, through targeted support to consumers, to use these new windfall profits of the ETS, which were much higher, I think, by more than EUR 10 billion this year compared to last year. And we can work together with Member States on cutting energy taxes and levies, and I am glad that 20 Member States are already proceeding in that regard.

On top of this, I also want to tell you that we hear you loud and clear, and we will clamp down on speculation in energy, gas and carbon markets as was proposed by Mr Moreno Sánchez. As you probably know, we have already asked the European Securities and Markets Authority to proceed with an examination of the trading with all emission allowances.

Several of you called for assessment of the functioning electricity market design. Indeed, our market design never performed under such volatility of the prices. Therefore, we asked ACER, the agency of the European energy regulators, to proceed quickly to prepare preliminary findings, which I hope we will be able to share with you definitely before the end of the year, and then it would be up to us to decide how to proceed further.

On top of this, we know that a big issue in our energy markets is supply of gas. Therefore, we are reaching out to foreign suppliers. We are helping Member States to coordinate their global outreach. And as Mr Niedermayer said, and I think it's a very valid point, we have to do better in how we manage our strategic reserves, how we manage our global storages, because this time this crisis is not caused by the lack of infrastructure, as it was five, six, seven years ago.

We have enough interconnectors. We have good pipelines. We have solid gas storages. We just need to manage them better, more responsibly, to make sure that Europe is more resilient, and for that, I think we can find inspiration in how we manage oil reserves with a three-month reserve, and I think we should proceed in the same way in the case of gas, and therefore the Commission will prepare a European framework for this type of approach in the future and for more regular stress testing of our energy systems before each winter.

Having said all this, I think it just underlines what is very important, and thank you very much to the honourable Members for highlighting how dependent we are on the imports of fossil energy and how important it is to focus more on development of truly indigenous European energy sources. Sun and wind are not only clean, but they are truly European and therefore also this crisis must just reinforce our ambition for COP26 in Glasgow, where I am absolutely convinced Europe will prepare the most ambitious approach on how to solve not only current energy prices, but how to tackle the challenge of our lifetime, and this is climate change.

Anže Logar, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, let me tackle some issues that were put forward during today's debate.

There was a statement that the Council has not given any direction regarding the debate on the rule of law. Let me inform you that the priority of the Slovenian Presidency is a discussion on the rule of law. Yesterday's General Affairs Council discussed the rule of law – a horizontal view. Next month, in November, there will be a country-specific discussion on the rule of law, and as well in December there will be a discussion on the rule of law. This topic has been discussed among leaders before, even if it was not on the formal agenda of the Council, and, in addition, if any of the leaders wish to raise this important issue at the European Council, they can always do so. As we heard from several of your interventions, we can expect that they will do so and will raise the issue. Therefore, we expect a discussion on this topic will take place during the European Council as well.

There was a question regarding the Eastern Partnership and Belarus. The Belarusian decision to suspend its participation in the summit, which will be the first in a physical format since 2017, is not unexpected, but is regrettable, especially for all that strive for democratic procedure and dialogue. Hence, there will be no invitation, but we need to continue reaching out to civil society and keep pressuring the authorities in Minsk. I think all institutions are doing so, including the Presidency.

Right now, we are drafting the final declaration that will be issued at the end of the summit. There was a question regarding broadening sanctions. There is also a discussion regarding that in many rounds of discussion in the Foreign Affairs Council, especially as we see the instrumentalisation of migration for the purposes of politicisation of the issue. Especially the use of migratory pressure on the border of European states shows that the sanctions have their effect.

Coming to migration, there are several concerning developments. We are witnessing, in the vicinity of the European Union, the number of irregular migrants arriving via the Mediterranean Sea or via the West African route increase by 39%, in comparison to 2020, and arrivals via the Central Mediterranean route have increased by 76%. The Council will discuss the migration situation on the various routes with a focus on developments on the routes that give rise to serious concern and require instant and immediate reaction. The European Council will as well call on the Commission and the High Representative, in close cooperation with Member States, to immediately enforce concrete action for priority countries of origin and transit. The European Council will also condemn and reject any attempt by third countries to instrumentalise migrants for a political purpose.

On energy prices, the Presidency is active in this field. On 22 September, the informal meeting of Energy Ministers took place, where several delegations started to voice concern about increasing energy prices, and a couple of delegations also made concrete suggestions, mostly aimed at renewing the functioning of the EU Emissions Trading System.

In the last two weeks, energy prices were further discussed at the Competitiveness Council, at the Eurogroup, at the EU-Western Balkans Summit, and at the Environment Council. Following these meetings, five Member States put forward the idea to reform the wholesale electricity market. We discussed this in the plenary during the first October session.

On 13 October, the Commission released its toolbox to help Member States to curb the rise of energy prices, and Member States already have a chance to react to this Commission communication. After the discussion at the summit, the Presidency has also scheduled an informal ministerial meeting of energy ministers on 26 October. So this topic is high on the agenda and discussed in many Council meetings.

Spoštovane poslanke in poslanci, najlepša hvala za vaše pripombe in komentarje. Predsedstvo bo z njimi podrobno seznanilo predsednika Evropskega sveta.

V veliki meri teme Evropskega sveta pokrivajo vprašanja, ki ste jih sami izpostavili v današnji razpravi. Gre za ključna vprašanja, s katerimi se danes sooča Evropska unija ter njeni državljani in državljanke, predvsem pandemija COVID-19, porast cen energije, vprašanje migracij pa tudi dolgoročna strateška vprašanja, na primer trgovina in digitalna preobrazba Evrope.

Za izpostavljene izzive ste tudi sami ugotovili, ni preprostih odgovorov tudi ni preprostih rešitev, vendar pa se je med krizo COVID-19 izkazalo, da smo skupaj močnejši in ko so pred nami globalni izzivi, kot so podnebne spremembe, migracije, krepitev demokratičnih standardov, hitro spreminjajoči svet, moramo delovati z združenimi močmi in verjamem, da bodo sklepi Evropskega sveta pravi odgovor za izzive, ki so pred nami. Hvala za našo razpravo.

President. – Thank you very much, Mr Logar, for closing the debate. I remind all the colleagues that Mr Comín i Oliveres has asked under Rule 173 to make a personal statement. You can now do it for one minute.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señora presidenta, señor Garicano, le agradezco que haya esperado al fin del debate para escuchar esta intervención y permita que hable con todo el respeto, pero con toda contundencia.

Ya sé que a algunos de ustedes no les gusta nada la historia, pero la historia dice que el nazismo fue derrotado en Alemania; el fascismo fue derrotado en Italia; el salazarismo, en Portugal; el estalinismo, en los países del Este... Pero el franquismo no fue derrotado en España, y España es la excepción de la Unión Europea, y quien vulneró los principios y los valores europeos en el año 2017 no fue el Gobierno catalán poniendo urnas y permitiendo que las personas fuesen a votar, fue el Estado español pegando a votantes que iban a votar pacíficamente, encarcelando a un Gobierno inocente y ahora persiguiéndonos a nosotros contra lo que exige el Consejo de Europa.

Por cierto, yo acabo con una pregunta: ¿a usted le parece que el Tribunal Supremo español y el Tribunal Constitucional español deben someterse a las decisiones del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea? ¿Sí o no? Porque no lo están haciendo, y a ustedes les parece bien.

President. – Thank you very much, your time is up.

Mr Garicano, would you like also to express a personal statement in this regard? You can make it from your own place.

Luis Garicano (Renew). – Señora presidenta, el señor Comín, efectivamente, insulta gravemente a mi país y debo responder.

Estos días todo el Parlamento ha condenado la falta de respeto al Estado de Derecho y a la democracia que está sucediendo en un país europeo. Los derechos de las minorías están siendo vulnerados y la separación de poderes está siendo vulnerada.

Eso es exactamente lo que sucedió en Cataluña en el año 2017. El Gobierno catalán y un Parlamento representando a menos de la mitad de los catalanes pasó a una legislación que sometía al Tribunal Supremo catalán, al Poder Judicial, a la decisión del Gobierno catalán. De hecho, ese presidente del Tribunal Supremo era nombrado por el presidente del Gobierno catalán exactamente como se ha intentado hacer en Polonia, primer punto. Y segundo, se vulneraban los derechos de las minorías. De hecho, de la mitad de los catalanes. Se vulneraban sus derechos a la protección de los espacios públicos, se vulneraban sus derechos lingüísticos, como se ha hecho sistemáticamente.

La realidad es que Europa sabe mucho de lo que es el nacionalismo y por eso, señor Comín, ustedes se sientan en el Grupo de los No Inscritos, porque nadie les quiere.

Il-President. – Id-dibattitu nġhalaq.

Sqarrijiet bil-miktub (Artikolu 171)

Joanna Kopcińska (ECR), na piśmie. – Sukcesywny rozwój i dystrybucja bezpiecznych i skutecznych szczepionek przeciwko COVID-19 stanowi trwałe rozwiązanie i odpowiednią reakcję na pandemię. Osiągnięcie jak najwyższego poziomu zaszczepienia społeczeństwa jest niezbędne z punktu widzenia bezpieczeństwa epidemicznego, natomiast osiągnięcie odporności populacyjnej jest kluczowe w zapobieganiu zagrożeniu epidemicznemu kolejną falą pandemii. Należy aktywnie działać poprzez programy, które pozwalają na szczepienia poza placówkami służby zdrowia, utworzyć punkty szczepień w aptekach, centrach handlowych i punktach drive-thru. Szczepienia muszą być możliwe w zakładach pracy, instytucjach wspierających osoby niepełnosprawne oraz szkołach. Najważniejsze dla szczepień trudno dostępnych populacji są mobilne punkty szczepień oraz wyjazdowe punkty szczepień.

Pandemia jest problemem, któremu należy stawić czoła solidarnie poprzez rozpoczęcie procesu dzielenia się szczepionkami z państwami trzecimi. Popieram transakcje zarówno z krajami europejskimi, jak i pozaeuropejskimi mającymi na celu przekazywanie szczepionek, a zwłaszcza z zadowoleniem przyjmuję doniesienia, że Polska zobowiązała się także do pełnienia roli koordynatora przekazywania szczepionek przez państwa UE na rzecz krajów Partnerstwa Wschodniego. Zdaję sobie sprawę z ogromnych wyzwań związanych z przekazywaniem szczepionek z uwagi na fakt, że umowy APA zawierają ograniczenia odnośnie terytorium dystrybucji i możliwości przekazywania szczepionek, dlatego aby ten skomplikowany proces mógł się odbyć zgodnie z prawem, oczekuję pełnego wsparcia KE w tym zakresie.

István Ujhelyi (S&D), írásban. – Holnap ülésezik ismét az Európai Tanács, amelyen egy fontos, több mint egymillió magyart érintő probléma vélhetően nem fog az asztalra kerülni. Mégpedig azért nem, mert Orbán Viktor jelenlegi magyar miniszterelnök ezt nem tartja fontosnak, nem illeszkedik a kampányguruk által előre megírt háborús napirendjébe, de az is előfordulhat, hogy egyszerűen csak túl gyáva, vagy túl erőtlen érdekérvényesítő ahhoz, hogy a tanácskozás részévé emelje. Pedig ez lenne a dolga, sőt: kötelessége.

Több mint egymillió magyar ember kénytelen ugyanis jelentős anyagi terheket, vagy más korlátozásokat elszenvedni az Unión belüli utazásai során csak azért, mert az EU által nem engedélyezett kínai, illetve orosz vakcinákkal oltották őket – ezeket pedig a tagállamok nem fogadják el automatikusan. A magyar kormány eddig képtelen volt az EU tagországainak többségével bilaterális megállapodást kötni az oltások elfogadtatásáról, itt lenne tehát a lehetősége Orbánnak, hogy erre kérje miniszterelnök- és államfő-kollégáit. Ott ülnek majd mind az asztalnál. Dolga lenne a magyar kormányfőnek az is, hogy az Európai Tanács ülésének – formális vagy informális – témájává tegye a harmadik oltás ügyét: elérve, hogy legalább a harmadikként megkapott uniós vakcinák elegendőek legyenek a keletivel oltott magyarok korlátozásmentes utazásához. Hiába lobbizom az EU intézményeinél ez ügyben, ha a jelenlegi magyar kormány egyetlen lépést sem tesz az ügyben.

5. Konferencja klimatyczna ONZ w Glasgow, Zjednoczone Królestwo (COP26) (debata)

Il-President. – Il-punt li jmiss fuq l-aġenda huwa d-dibattitu dwar:

— il-mistoqsija għal tweġiba orali lill-Kunsill dwar il-Konferenza tan-NU dwar it-Tibdil fil-Klima fi Glasgow, ir-Renju Unit (COP26) imressqa minn Pascal Canfin, Lídia Pereira, Javi López, Nils Torvalds, Catherine Griset, Pär Holmgren, Anna Zalewska, Petros Kokkalis, fisem il-Kumitat għall-Ambjent, is-Saħha Pubblika u s-Sikurezza tal-Ikel (O-000065/2021 - B9-0039/21) (2021/2667(RSP)), u

— il-mistoqsija għal tweġiba orali lill-Kummissjoni dwar il-Konferenza tan-NU dwar it-Tibdil fil-Klima fi Glasgow, ir-Renju Unit (COP26) imressqa minn Pascal Canfin, Lídia Pereira, Javi López, Nils Torvalds, Catherine Griset, Pär Holmgren, Anna Zalewska, Petros Kokkalis, fisem il-Kumitat għall-Ambjent, is-Saħha Pubblika u s-Sikurezza tal-Ikel (O-000066/2021 - B9-0040/21) (2021/2667(RSP)).

Bas Eickhout, *deputising for the author*. – Madam President, we now turn to a very important discussion on climate change and the climate conference that we're going to have in Glasgow in two weeks' time, which is very clearly going to be one of the most important climate conferences we've seen in the last couple of years, where member states of the world need to be stepping up their climate ambition.

If you look at climate science and the latest IPCC report that was launched in August this summer, it is becoming more and more clear that the climate impacts are more severe and there are clearer reasons to limit global warming well below two degrees, as we said in the Paris Agreement. We have now very clearly said that we want to keep it below 1.5 degrees.

If you look at the current pledges on the table, we are not on track. What's even worse is that, at this stage, if we look at all the national pledges around the world, emissions are still expected to rise by 2030. However, the IPCC and climate science is making very clear that by 2030, in order to keep 1.5 degrees within reach, we need a reduction of 45% by 2030 globally. Yet we are not on track if we look at the current pledges.

This is also why the Glasgow moment is so important for raising the ambition of all the different countries in the world. We are very much aware – and this is also described in the resolution – of the achievements and the changes that we have seen in the United States. However, we are, of course, also concerned about the developments in the United States in translating their promises into legislation, and there we see some issues as well, which are sure to be debated in Glasgow. But we are also very concerned about the other big player: China. Their pledges to reach carbon neutrality by 2060 and the peak of emissions by 2030 are insufficient if we look at what needs to happen. We will make that message also very clear.

We also expect stronger commitments from some of our partner countries. A country like Australia is certainly worth mentioning, because they have not yet come forward with climate neutrality targets despite all the other developed countries doing so.

Looking at Europe – and this is clearly in the resolution – we comment on the 'Fit for 55' and the package that is there upfront. However, we do realise that steps need to be taken within Europe to translate that into law. The proposals have been made by the Commission, but we as a House, and also the Member States, need to develop on that. Very importantly – and this is probably also an assignment for the European Commission – there is still a lack of mainstreaming of the Green Deal and climate policies into all the areas and fields. I would certainly also like to mention climate finance here.

In this regard, maybe it would sometimes be good to refer to the Paris Agreement, because quite often people talk about the Paris Agreement, but you sometimes wonder whether people have really read the Paris Agreement. Article 2, the backbone of the Paris Agreement, makes very clear that things need to happen on mitigation and adaptation, but the third element of Article 2 very clearly also obliges all the signatories of the Paris Agreement to make their financial flows consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development. So the third pillar of the Paris Agreement, besides mitigation, adaptation, is making the financial flows consistent with our low carbon pathways. Here is another assignment for Europe where action is still to be taken.

Looking at all the issues that are on the table, at the rulebook, we are happy that Europe is finally taking steps on the common five years' timeframe. Indeed, it was probably about time to take steps there. But we also just want to stress once again that action need to be expected from aviation and maritime. Here too, it is very important to state that aviation and maritime do fall under the Paris Agreement. There was a decision that maybe two other UN bodies could handle this, but maritime and aviation do fall under the Paris commitments. Sometimes some people say that they're not part of the Paris commitments. I think we need to make that point very clear.

For the rest of the resolution, I think it's very clear on innovation, on competitiveness. It also very much welcomes the carbon border adjustment mechanism (CBAM) as part of the 'Fit for 55' package, so that this entire package makes very clear that Europe can deliver on the promises it makes, so that we will ensure that in Glasgow we have a leading role. That's probably our final point. Let this leading role also be seen on some of the sectoral agreements on coal phase-out, the end of the combustion engine. These are the kinds of discussions that are being done in Glasgow as well, and we expect Europe to be at the forefront of that debate.

Anže Logar, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, it is a great pleasure to address you today to discuss the preparation ahead of COP26, which will take place in Glasgow very soon. After the postponement of COP last year and a stark reminder in the last IPCC report of the dangers of climate change, it is more urgent than ever to strengthen global climate action and to finalise without delay the implementation of the Paris Agreement. It is important that the world comes out of Glasgow with bold climate targets and an ambitious and effective rulebook to guide global mitigation and adaptation measures for the years to come.

As you noted in your question, COP26 has four major objectives. First, is to substantively raise global emission reduction and commit to achieve net zero emissions in line with the latest scientific findings, in order to keep 1.5 degrees within reach. Second, to finalize the rulebook on the issue of carbon markets, as well as to agree on a common time frame, aligning the timelines of the climate pledges of all parties and ensure that global climate action is conducted in a transparent and accountable manner. Third, to strengthen global adaptation measures and building resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change. And fourth, to increase the global efforts to meet the climate finance pledge of USD 100 billion a year to developing countries.

For each of these objectives, the EU negotiation position is clear. As you know, the Council adopted earlier this month its conclusions on the EU position at COP26. The conclusion emphasised the extreme urgency of stepping up the global response to address the climate emergency and underlined the need for a just and fair climate position across the world.

Regarding the rulebook on Article 6, the agreement to be reached at COP26 should ensure a robust accounting for the use of international carbon markets, avoid double counting and also guarantee environmental integrity and ambition. In Glasgow, the EU will also express its preference for a common time frame of five years for all parties, with a view to reaching consensus during the negotiation. Moreover, the EU will insist on transparency and accountability to be delivered through the Enhanced Transparency Framework, which will be essential to build and maintain trust among parties as we implement our commitments.

Finally, as regards climate finance, the EU and its Member States will continue scaling up their contribution to international climate finance as part of the goal of developed countries to collectively mobilise USD 100 billion per year through 2025 and will continue to urge other developed countries to do the same.

The EU and its Member States are the largest contributor of international public climate finance and since 2013 have more than doubled their contribution. I understand that the Commission and some Member States have further strengthened their pledges ahead of the meeting in Glasgow. In any event, the EU will engage constructively with the other parties to ensure a stronger climate finance goal for the post-2025 period.

President, honourable Members, a number of parties, NGOs, young people gathered last month in Milan and the public at large have called on the COP to do more to address the climate emergency. They are right. The world is currently not on the path to keep global warming well below 2 degrees and keep 1.5 degrees within reach. Many more collective efforts are needed to keep our planet's temperature within safe limits.

In this context, at COP26, the EU wants to negotiate an ambitious and effective implementation of the Paris Agreement, and we call on all parties to come forward with strengthened national emissions reduction targets and international climate finance pledges.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank honourable Members for the opportunity to have this important debate as we look ahead to preparations for the upcoming 26th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Glasgow.

Science demonstrates that global average temperatures will exceed 1.5 degrees within the next 20 years in all scenarios. The United Nations report on the parties' nationally determined contributions revealed that we are well off the Paris consistent pathways necessary to respond. However, limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees by the end of the century, with the temperature overshoot, is still possible. It is still possible if parties achieve drastic cuts in emissions in the coming decade and net zero emissions around 2050.

Significantly increased global mitigation efforts will reduce the risks and impacts of climate change, but we will also need to collectively and urgently scale up our efforts to adapt to the many unprecedented and irreversible changes in the climate systems in all regions of the world. As if all this was not enough, the latest report from the OECD shows that the donor community is off track from reaching the goal of mobilising USD 100 billion annually from 2020 to 2025.

Against this background, the COP26 Council conclusions, adopted two weeks ago, set out the EU's main political objectives for Glasgow: raising global ambition, enhancing resilience and scaling up climate finance. We have a strong responsibility to those societies most vulnerable and existentially threatened by climate change. These are exactly the messages Executive Vice-President Timmermans is bringing to the many countries he is visiting and to the many meetings he is holding, also this week and today, to prepare for COP26.

The EU has been consistently calling upon all parties, particularly the world's largest economies and biggest emitters, to step up their game before Glasgow. The nationally determined contributions and net zero strategies of all parties should set each of us on a path to net zero emissions, in line with the principles of progression and the highest possible ambitions, as set out in the Paris Agreement. In particular, parties in G20 countries that haven't enhanced their nationally determined contributions (NDCs) or have not submitted net zero strategies need to come forward as soon as possible.

Furthermore, we can only ensure the effective implementation of the Paris Agreement by all parties if we have a robust and ambitious framework of rules. Therefore, COP26 should address the single element of the rule book left outstanding from the previous two conferences – the guidance on voluntary cooperation and market-based mechanisms under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement – as well as conclude arrangements under the enhanced transparency framework, which is the backbone of a well-functioning Paris Agreement.

Securing a meaningful outcome for market measures under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement is a key priority for the EU. Compromises that put environmental integrity at risk are not acceptable to us. Fostering global ambition, ensuring environmental integrity and avoiding double counting are at the core of the Paris Agreement and of the EU position on market mechanisms.

Ambition is not only mitigation action. COP26 should deliver a signal that priority must be given to adaptation. The EU will contribute fully to achieving the Paris Agreement global goal on adaptation by enhancing resilience both at home and in vulnerable communities around the world. This is why we adopted an adaptation strategy for the EU, which was submitted to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) ahead of Glasgow and calls for the other parties also to communicate how they are stepping up their respective adaptation actions.

The COP outcome should also provide a sense of balance in the treatment of mitigation and adaptation, which is a key concern for our developing country partners. The EU remains fully committed to a sustained and increased investment in enhancing resilience and adaptation in the most disaster-prone countries and regions. International cooperation on adaptation is a highlight of the new strategy, with a priority for Africa, least developed countries and small island developing states.

Furthermore, the EU and its Member States support many activities to avert, minimise and address loss and damage through development cooperation, disaster risk reduction and humanitarian aid, as well as dedicated climate funds, organisations and initiatives inside and outside the climate process.

However, we must be mindful that all actors must step up their efforts to face the challenges of climate change. We need to advocate for mainstreaming the climate issue in other relevant policy areas so that we can better consider the risks and needs of the most vulnerable in all our support efforts and in international processes. We have to do this in the same way that the EU supports mainstreaming of climate action across all financial flows, including development institutions.

Action demands resources and we should continue showing our solidarity to the most vulnerable countries. The EU and its 27 Member States remain the largest contributor of public climate finance to developing countries, including to the multilateral climate funds, and contributed EUR 21.9 billion in climate finance for 2019. This is double the level in 2013. As you know, President von der Leyen, just last month, committed an additional EUR 4 billion until 2027.

As part of a global effort, the EU will continue to take the lead in mobilising climate finance from a wide variety of sources, instruments and channels. These include instruments to unlock the huge potential of private finance through the targeted use of public climate finance. Therefore, it is crucial to make swift and ambitious progress on making all finance flows consistent with the Paris Agreement. To this end, following the Commission's action plan on financing sustainable growth and the follow-up strategy for financing the transition to a sustainable economy, progress is being made on various fronts: on an EU taxonomy for environmentally sustainable economic activities, on sustainability-related disclosures for issuers and for financial market participants, on the European Green Bond Standard, and on corporate sustainability reporting.

That is encouraging, but we must continue to catalyse and accelerate action from all economic actors to reach the objectives of the Paris Agreement. We see leaders from the private sector, civil society, youth and other stakeholders coming together to show determination to accelerate transformative change on a scale that has not been seen before. All this demonstrates increasing awareness of the need for global climate action.

Finally, climate change, the biodiversity crisis and desertification, as well as land, water and ocean degradation, are strongly interconnected and reinforce each other. Climate change and the nature crisis can only be successfully addressed in a coherent approach that comprises mutually beneficial strategies, including nature-based solutions with safeguards. We cannot solve one crisis without solving the other. This was very clearly highlighted by the recent joint report by the UN, the IPCC and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, and this must also be reflected in the upcoming two COPs.

We saw a positive first part of the biodiversity COP15 in Kunming last week, and we will pursue our efforts in this regard, also in view of the second part of COP15, which will reconvene in face-to-face mode in Kunming next spring. Therefore, the EU will continue pursuing closer cooperation and synergies between the UN, the UNFCCC and the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, including the alignment with the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, and we will further advance measures for mutually reinforcing co-benefits for climate mitigation and adaptation and halting biodiversity loss.

We should all offer our strong support to the UK COP26 Presidency with a view to a successful outcome in Glasgow.

PRESIDÊNCIA: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA

Vice-Presidente

Lídia Pereira, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhoras e Senhores Deputados, ninguém, absolutamente ninguém, nenhuma outra potência económica tem feito tanto como nós no combate às alterações climáticas. E é preciso dizê-lo e repeti-lo sem medo: somos os líderes globais na definição de metas, mas também na tradução dessas metas em alterações à legislação, concretas.

A próxima década será, com as iniciativas legislativas que correm neste Parlamento, a década da alteração para um novo paradigma de sustentabilidade. Os europeus e, em particular, as novas gerações não mais toleram que se continue a maltratar o planeta e a sua biodiversidade. Mas, também por isso, também na sua reivindicação temos de ser capazes de os representar condignamente.

Já não nos basta fazermos bem o nosso trabalho e termos uma sociedade que se desenvolve de forma sustentada. Temos também de pressionar os outros países e, em particular, os que mais poluem, a fazê-lo, a reduzir rapidamente as suas emissões. Precisamos, portanto, de uma liderança forte e eficaz, de uma liderança que tenha a coragem de afirmar que somos nós, a Europa, quem lidera, mas também que exige aos outros que faça a sua parte, que tenha a coragem de afirmar que fazemos a nossa parte e outros não, e que, por exemplo, a China continua a investir massivamente em novas centrais de energia a carvão, prejudicando o trabalho e o esforço feito por outros. Mas que também a sociedade e as organizações ambientais tenham a coragem de o dizer e de direcionar também a sua ação para outras regiões do globo onde pouco ou muito pouco se faz. Da nossa parte, aqui no Parlamento Europeu, vamos, acredito, com uma posição sólida, abrangente e ambiciosa para Glasgow.

Quero, e espero, que a Comissão e o Conselho sigam com ambições semelhantes em matérias fundamentais como as metas nacionalmente determinadas e a mobilização de financiamento não só para a mitigação das alterações climáticas, mas também para a sua adaptação. Como poderemos, de resto, construir um mundo melhor se não cuidarmos da casa que é todos?

Javi López, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, frente a la emergencia climática no podemos competir entre nosotros, no podemos enfrentarnos —de hecho, se trata de esa lógica de suma cero en la que se ha introducido el mundo en muchas de sus dimensiones—; frente a la emergencia climática solo podemos hacer una cosa, que es cooperar: cooperar entre nosotros, cooperar para que la comunidad internacional cumpla con los acuerdos ya establecidos —como el Acuerdo de París—, cooperar para una reducción rápida y profunda de las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero y cooperar para que la emergencia global en la que se ha convertido el cambio climático se convierta en acción global colectiva.

Y el mayor instrumento para la cooperación que tenemos es la CP, la Conferencia de las Partes en la Convención Marco de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Cambio Climático, y, en la importante reunión de la CP que ahora vamos a celebrar en Glasgow, el Parlamento Europeo lo que quiere expresar, con esperanza, pero también con exigencia, es que necesitamos avances inmediatos, ambiciosos y concretos para combatir el cambio climático, avances para que el conjunto del G20 se comprometa a ser climáticamente neutro en el año 2050. Hemos tenido algunas buenas noticias, ¿no?: algunos avances relevantes en esta materia desde Europa, en los Estados Unidos, en Japón, en China...

Pero necesitamos más, necesitamos determinar las contribuciones nacionales y avances en esta materia: necesitamos avances en el cumplimiento de los compromisos de financiación climática —deberían ser 100 000 millones para los países en vías de desarrollo—; necesitamos avances en la regulación de los mercados de carbono. La pandemia nos ha enseñado de lo que es capaz la humanidad con voluntad colectiva y con capacidad para movilizar recursos y financiación; ahora debería ser el momento de poner en pie una recuperación global verde que Europa sea capaz de liderar en el mundo, acelerar el abandono de nuestra dependencia de las energías fósiles e impulsar un programa climático que vaya de la mano de una transición justa y social, porque el planeta y nuestra vida, nuestra forma de vida, están en juego.

Nils Torvalds, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, to not repeat what my colleagues have already said, I have a map with me. You probably can't see all the details of the map, but it's actually very interesting. On this side, you see what China has been building and is planning in terms of coal power production. This is India. This is the United States. This map could easily be used to pinpoint and point fingers at developing countries. But this is not actually what I'm trying to convey in this speech.

There is a more interesting part when you look at the technological side of the factories, because all of a sudden you see a lot of western companies actually doing a lot of work in these parts of the world, where they are earning dirty money by building power stations fired by coal. So I think what we have to do in Glasgow is to find the leadership and show that this is not the way forward. We need to show that there are other technologies and we need to be generous with these technologies, because those who are in need of them won't have the money to use them unless we give it to them. Therefore, as my friend Commissioner Sinkevičius said on developing countries, doing something to get the money on the table is very important.

Pär Holmgren, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Det minsta vi kan göra är så mycket som möjligt. I över 30 år nu så har klimatforskningen varit väldigt tydlig med vad vi måste göra. I över 30 år så har klimatpolitiken gjort för lite, för sent. Nu börjar faktiskt tiden rinna ifrån oss.

I senaste rapporten från FN:s klimatpanel finns en sammanställning som visar hur sannolikheten för att vi ska lyckas nå Parisavtalet bara minskar och koldioxidbudgeten för framför allt 1,5-gradersmålet krymper väldigt, väldigt fort. Den är snart helt slut.

Det är givetvis världens fattiga och världens unga som bär minst skuld för det här och för deras skull så är verkligen det minsta vi kan göra, så mycket som möjligt från och med nu.

Ursula von der Leyens tal i den här kammaren för några veckor sedan visade tyvärr att EU-kommissionen inte alls är beredda att leverera det som krävs. Hur ska vi med de utgångspunkterna kunna övertyga andra delar av världen att leverera, när inte ens vi själva har en klimatpolitik som är i linje med klimatvetenskapen?

I dag och i morgon så tar vi i parlamentet ställning till en resolution med många bra, skarpa krav på världens ledare. Krav om att alla 2030-mål måste höjas, att vi måste tillföra mer pengar till klimatomställning och klimatanpassning i fattiga länder och att vi antligen givetvis ska få ett stopp på det fossila och först och främst få stopp på de fossila subventionerna.

Det här är bra, men var fanns egentligen de rösterna när vi klubbade igenom EU:s klimatlag eller när vi diskuterade vår gemensamma jordbrukspolitik eller utsläppshandel? Det verkar tyvärr fortfarande vara väldigt lätt för stora grupper av den här samlingen, i den här salen, att lägga skulden på andra delar av världen utan att leverera fullt ut.

Men jag vill verkligen avslutningsvis be er alla om att vi från och med nu verkligen tillsammans gör så mycket som möjligt, för att åtminstone hålla kvar möjligheten att lyckas med Parisavtalet.

Silvia Sardone, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo dibattito sugli obiettivi della Conferenza delle Nazioni Unite sui cambiamenti climatici rischia di essere molto simile ai «bla bla bla» di cui ha parlato il vostro idolo Greta.

Le vostre azioni sull'ambiente sono inefficaci e costose, e non lo dico io, non lo diciamo noi, ma lo dice la Corte dei conti europea, che vi ha criticato per aver speso male una montagna di soldi. Infatti 135 miliardi sono già stati spesi e non avrebbero sortito alcun effetto nella lotta ai cambiamenti climatici. Nonostante errori e obiettivi fuori portata, volete buttare altri soldi dei contribuenti europei, altri 320 miliardi per i prossimi sette anni e mille miliardi per il Green Deal fino al 2030.

L'utopia *green* sta già producendo danni in un contesto di crisi: gravi difficoltà a reperire energia, posti di lavoro persi, delocalizzazioni, bollette e costi in aumento per le famiglie. Intanto la Cina continua tranquillamente a inquinare e ha addirittura ordinato la produzione a massima capacità di oltre 120 miniere di carbone. L'Europa fa esperimenti ai danni dei cittadini, facendosi dettare la linea da chi non rinuncia poi a voli *low cost*, aria condizionata e telefonini di ultima generazione.

La verità è che la vostra proposta *green* si nutre di catastrofismo, ma non offre soluzioni praticabili in così breve tempo, con il rischio di condannarci tutti a una regressione economica autoinflitta. Insomma, noi chiediamo più pragmatismo, un approccio globale, più tempo e più attenzione ai cittadini, piuttosto che alle mode *green*.

Anna Zalewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Na szczycie klimatycznym Unia Europejska, Europa musi być nie tylko i nie tyle liderem, co musi być przede wszystkim wiarygodna, bo tylko wtedy może przekonywać do swoich racji, do swoich ambicji.

Może być wiarygodna z dwóch powodów. Po pierwsze, kiedy powie, że ma za sobą Europejczyków, że ma za sobą obywateli, że powiedziała swoim obywatelom, że zapłacą wielokrotnie więcej za energię, za ciepło, za gaz, za wodę, za cenę biletu lotniczego, za samochód, za mieszkanie. Jeżeli uzyskamy taką zgodę, to wtedy będziemy wiarygodni, a pakiet „Fit for 55” mówi obywatelowi, Europejczykowi, tylko tyle, że zapłacisz, absolutnie ci w tym nie pomożemy i trochę nie ma dowodów, na ile przełoży się to na emisję, na ile przełoży się to na ochronę środowiska.

Po drugie, będziemy wiarygodni, jeżeli będziemy poszukiwać wszystkich możliwych metod: i tych, które są, i tych, które się dopiero pojawiają. Dlatego nie rozumiem, dlaczego w stanowisku Komisji, Unii Europejskiej, Parlamentu Europejskiego nie znajdują się zapisy dotyczące pochłaniaczy i sztucznych wychwytywaczy. To nowe technologie, które naprawdę wyłapują wyemitowany dwutlenek węgla, co zresztą jest zgodne z raportem IPCC. Jeżeli będziemy potrafili poprzeć to argumentami na szczycie klimatycznym, jeżeli to udowodnimy, wtedy będziemy wiarygodni, wtedy będziemy naprawdę liderem.

Petros Kokkalis, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Mr President, as our resolution states, it is vital that the COP26 forge a new consensus on the necessary climate action and ambition to achieve global climate neutrality by the mid-century, and on robust short-term and medium-term policy measures.

In our resolution, we acknowledge and commit to act upon our responsibility for our historical greenhouse emissions and the development gap between the global north and the global south. We recognise the connection between the underlying causes of pandemics, biodiversity loss and climate change. We embrace the need for urgent systemic change for the well-being for all within planetary boundaries. We demand the end of all direct and indirect fossil fuel subsidies by 2025 at the latest.

We admit that, taken together, all new indices, including our own, imply a sizeable increase in global emissions unfit for 1.5. We commit to a significant additional increase in adaptation finance, prioritising grants and debt relief. We submit that the EU's leadership through example is crucial to engaging third countries in the fight against climate change.

As it stands our resolution probably represents the most progressive and ambitious mandate on climate action in the world. It is now our duty in this House and in the Commission, in COP26 and beyond, to back up our words – all of our 24 ‘whereases’ and 23 ‘regards’ and 125 paragraphs — with action and prove, above all to the younger generation, that we, as representatives of the European people, can deliver more than the world's best ‘blah blah blah’.

Edina Tóth (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Két évvel ezelőtt Timmermans biztos úr arra kapott megbízást, hogy igazságos és kiegyensúlyozott módon érje el az uniós klímacélokot. A valóság azonban teljesen másképp fest. A glasgow-i klímacúcsra készülve azt láthatjuk, hogy ma Európában rezszi- és energiaválság van és ebben az EU felelőssége egyértelmű.

Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Számos tagállamban az európai emberek teljes mértékben kiszolgáltatottá váltak az energiaszolgáltatóknak, akárcsak a vállalkozások. Az Európai Bizottság most pedig a gépkocsi- és lakástulajdonosokat akarja megadóztatni, klímavédelemnek álcázva a rezsiárak emelkedését. Kérem a Bizottságot, hogy hagyja abba a polgárok pénztárcájára hárított klímapolitikát és tegyen eleget kötelezettségének, hogy a zöld átmenet során vállalkozásaink megőrizhessék versenyképességüket. A klímacsúcs árnyékában az uniós zöld ambíciók megvalósítása közepette senkit sem hagyhatunk az út szélén.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Während der letzten COP in Madrid hat der Europäische Rat sich – später als das Europäische Parlament, aber immerhin – für die Klimaneutralität bis 2050 ausgesprochen, und mittlerweile ist das in Europa Gesetz.

Wir haben in Madrid mit vielen Abgeordneten und Vertretern anderer Nationen gesprochen und sie ermuntert, auf diesem Weg zu folgen. Japan, Südafrika, die USA und Kanada und viele andere haben das getan. Ich stimme der Entschließung zu, wenn wir sagen, dass bei China noch viel Arbeit notwendig ist, denn CO₂-neutral 2060 reicht sicherlich nicht aus. Aber ich finde es besonders schändlich, dass Australien als reiches Industrieland noch keine solche Verpflichtung abgeben hat, und daran müssen wir hart arbeiten.

Auf allen Ebenen muss die internationale Klimapolitik Priorität haben. Und wir müssen auch – das hat der stellvertretende Vorsitzende richtig gesagt – beim Schiffs- und beim Luftverkehr mehr machen. Wir sollten nicht so argumentieren, als ob wir national oder in Europa eine Luftsäule hätten, und wenn wir die dekarbonisieren, dann wäre alles gut, sondern wir müssen viel mehr international und gemeinsam arbeiten.

Aber ich widerspreche nachdrücklich allen, die sagen, wir müssten jetzt beim Paket „Fit für 55“ irgendwelche Abstriche machen, weil wir hohe Energiepreise haben. Erneuerbare Energien und Energieeffizienz können so etwas sein wie die Impfung bei der Coronakrise: Wenn wir investieren, dann werden wir immun gegen hohe Preise fossiler Brennstoffe. Und wenn die Krankheit schlimmer wird, dann ist das bei Corona genauso wie bei den hohen Energiepreisen: Dann darf man nicht aufhören, den Impfstoff zu produzieren, sondern dann muss man schneller machen mit dem Impfen. Deswegen ja zu „Fit für 55“ – gerade wegen der hohen Energiepreise.

Mohammed Chahim (S&D). – Voorzitter, collega's, commissaris, minister, twee jaar geleden stond ik hier ook voor mijn eerste plenaire speech en ook toen ging het over een klimaatresolutie: de klimaatresolutie voor de COP van Madrid. En ook toen stond die klimaatresolutie vol met wensen en verlangens, maar om eerlijk te zijn gingen we op dat moment met weinig concrete plannen naar de klimaattop. We hadden een oproep: "Doe met ons mee!", maar concreter werd het niet. Ja, "We hebben ambities, we hebben een wens, we hebben een droom om halverwege deze eeuw klimaatneutraal te zijn."

Maar het is nu echt wel anders. We zijn nu twee jaar verder. We hebben twee jaar niet stilgezeten. We hebben de Europese Green Deal. We hebben onze klimaatwet en we hebben het "Klaar voor 55"-pakket. Meneer Liese, ik ben het helemaal met u eens. Het "Klaar voor 55"-pakket is ons antwoord op de energiecrisis die we nu beleven om onafhankelijker te worden en om betere toegang te krijgen, voor betaalbare energieprijzen.

Dit jaar gaan we dus naar de klimaattop met concrete plannen en we roepen iedereen op om met ons mee te doen. Laat ik een slogan gebruiken van een andere politieke partij: we moeten nu wel "doorpakken", want klimaatverandering gaat verder dan Europa. We moeten de beloftes van de Overeenkomst van Parijs omzetten in daden en zorgen voor voldoende internationale financiering. Want ook daarin moet Europa leiderschap tonen en anderen motiveren hetzelfde te doen.

Ik hoop dat ik hier volgend jaar sta om te praten over de COP27 en dat we in ieder geval met elkaar concluderen dat Glasgow geslaagd was in het invulling geven aan de Overeenkomst van Parijs, zodat we onder die anderhalve graad blijven of in ieder geval dat die anderhalve graad binnen bereik ligt. Maar ik hoop ook dat we dan de eerste stappen hebben gezet om te komen tot een internationale beprijzing van CO₂.

Voorzitter, de resolutie die voorligt is een goede basis om over twee weken met onze partners wereldwijd in gesprek te gaan. Ik heb nu, net als toen in Parijs, hoge verwachtingen van Glasgow, zeker als ik zie dat Amerika weer aan tafel zit en ook China heeft uitgesproken dat het klimaatneutraliteit zal bereiken, weliswaar rond 2060. Laten we niet vergeten dat de Chinezen 100 jaar na ons gestart zijn met hun industriële revolutie.

Morten Petersen (Renew). – Hr. formand! FN har for nylig beregnet, at selvom alle landes nuværende klimaløfter blev opfyldt, så ville de globale udledninger, stadigvæk stige svarende til at temperaturerne vil stige med helt op til 2,7 grader i år 2100. Og det er helt katastrofalt. Intet mindre. At reducere de globale udledninger til nul i 2050, det er den eneste vej frem. Men det går for langsomt. Vi er simpelt hen nødt til at hæve vores klimaambitioner. Vedvarende energi, energieffektivisering, det er helt afgørende i den grønne omstilling. Vi har brug for at rulle alle tilgængelige, rene og effektive teknologier ud så hurtigt som muligt. Og her i Europa-Parlamentet, der har vi en kæmpe opgave foran os med at gennemføre den europæiske grønne pagt. Det kan kun gå for langsomt, og klimaet må og skal tænkes ind i alle EU-politikker på kryds og tværs. Kære kolleger, klimatopmødet i Glasgow, det er det vigtigste klimatopmøde i nyere tid. Det er her, vi forhåbentlig kan og skal løfte ambitionerne. Og det er her, EU virkelig skal gå forrest.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Représentant du Conseil, chers collègues, nous le savons, la planète brûle avec les mégafeux, elle coule avec les inondations et chaque Européenne, chaque Européen ressent aujourd'hui dans sa chair le dérèglement climatique. Mais nous oublions trop souvent la famine à Madagascar ou les inondations en Inde.

Et pourtant, nous ne sommes qu'à 1,2 degré de réchauffement climatique. Au rythme actuel, le 1,5 degré ce n'est pas pour la fin du siècle, mais pour la fin de la décennie. Si tous les engagements, toutes les promesses sont tenus, ce sera 2,5 degrés et la catastrophe. Si nous n'agissons pas, ce sera 3,5 degrés et le chaos. Le GIEC nous dit tout des responsabilités et de l'origine de ce dérèglement climatique.

Mais ce qui nous importe, nous ici, c'est la responsabilité politique et, aujourd'hui, ce qui nous empêche d'avoir un avenir bienveillant pour nous et pour nos enfants, c'est le conformisme politique, c'est la complaisance ou, trop souvent, l'aliénation vis-à-vis de lobbies puissants, ces lobbies du vieux monde, ces lobbies des énergies sales ou de l'agriculture intensive.

Nous le voyons chaque jour du point de vue politique: la politique agricole commune n'est pas compatible, la politique commerciale n'est pas compatible avec notre agenda climatique. Et ce que nous avons aujourd'hui, ce sont des victimes du dérèglement climatique, ce sont des victimes de la crise énergétique. Alors, il nous faut investir dans les économies d'énergies, dans les énergies renouvelables. Et, s'il doit y avoir une prise de guerre à Glasgow, c'est la fin des subventions aux énergies fossiles. Au niveau mondial, au niveau européen, 50 milliards ou 100 milliards de subventions publiques aux énergies fossiles, c'est inacceptable! Pour nous, pour nos enfants, mettons fin aux subventions aux énergies fossiles.

Paolo Borchia (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il timore è che la prossima COP si ridurrà al solito costoso nulla di fatto, facendo finta che non ci sia stata una pandemia e che la domanda di certe fonti energetiche si possa generare per legge.

Pochi giorni fa è stato pubblicato in Italia un sondaggio in base al quale l'85 per cento degli intervistati ritiene che la transizione energetica sia economicamente conveniente. Questo la dice lunga sul lavoro di indottrinamento che è stato fatto, perché parlare di convenienza economica significa non avere idea dei sacrifici che verranno richiesti alle prossime generazioni.

E mentre diventa sempre più drammatica la questione delle materie prime, dove il tema dell'approvvigionamento ormai ha superato quello del prezzo, l'Unione chiede lacrime e sangue agli europei, costruendo i presupposti per un aumento della disoccupazione e per nuove delocalizzazioni.

Nel frattempo la Cina aumenta la produzione di carbone. Salgono i prezzi dell'anidride carbonica – verosimilmente destinati a superare i 100 euro a tonnellata – aumenteranno le bollette, qualcuno magari sarà contento perché finalmente le rinnovabili saranno convenienti, ovviamente si tratta di una filosofia totalmente sballata perché i salari sono fermi. Siamo in un contesto post-pandemico, non possiamo soffocare la ripresa con l'inflazione.

Servono tempi e flessibilità, serve un mix energetico dove le rinnovabili devono avere, certo, un ruolo centrale, ma devono essere sostenute anche da fonti di transizione, come ad esempio il gas. E in vista di Glasgow dobbiamo accettare che parlare di obiettivi fuori portata non vuol dire essere ambiziosi, ma significa continuare a prendere in giro la gente con promesse irrealizzabili.

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, máme dvě možnosti, co se odehraje v Glasgow v relaci k EU. Buď ukážeme, že naše unijní politika je relevantní, může sloužit jako vzor, anebo budeme ostatním pro smích. Obávám se, že schválením tohoto usnesení, které tady nyní diskutujeme, nastane druhá varianta: budeme pro smích. Mí kolegové se opět utrhli ze řetězu a do textu začlenili řadu problematických bodů, které jdou daleko nad rámec pozice Rady. Opravdu myslíte vážně co nejrychleji odstranit podporu pro všechna fosilní paliva včetně zemního plynu? Kde máte posouzení dopadu na začlenění klimatické neutrality mezi ústavní povinnosti členských států? Pokud to s dekarbonizací myslíme vážně, musíme definovat věrohodný jízdní řád a ne sepisovat seznam přání bez jakékoliv opory v realitě, zvláště pokud máme na svou stranu dostat i rozvojové země, pro které bude plnění Pařížské dohody obtížnější než pro nás.

Hlasujte proti.

Silvia Modig (The Left). – Arvoisa puhemies, lupauksia ja sitoumuksia ilmaston suhteen on nyt paljon. Mutta missä olemme todellisuudessa? UNEP:n päästökuiluraportin mukaan Pariisin sopimuksen osapuolten tähän mennessä tekemillä päätöksillä olemme menossa kohti yli kolmen asteen lämpenemistä, kun Pariisin sopimuksen mukaisesti meidän tulee tavoitella puoltatoista. Siksi Glasgow'n huippukokous on äärimmäisen tärkeä. Sen on muutettava nuo lupaukset konkreettisiksi. Tarvitsemme tehokkaita lyhyen aikavälin toimia, ja tarvitsemme niistä päätökset nyt. Edelleen tarvitsemme tiukempia päästövähennyssitoumuksia, jotta pääsemme Pariisiin polulle. Tarvitaan systeeminen muutos. Fossiilista polttoaineista on päästävä eroon mahdollisimman nopeasti, ja kaikki investoinnit tästä eteenpäin on suunnattava kestäviin energiamuotoihin. Arktisella alueella öljyn etsintä on lopetettava.

Tarvitsemme syvällisemmän ymmärryksen siitä, että biodiversiteetti ja ilmaston lämpeneminen eivät ole erillisiä asioita. Kun meidän tulee pyrkiä suojelemaan ja ennallistamaan metsien luonnollisia hiilinielujia, on meidän samalla huolehdittava biodiversiteetistä. Mitä vahvempi on luonnon monimuotoisuus, sitä parempi on planeettamme sopeutumiskyky väistämättä edessä olevaan lämpenemiseen. Ja rikkaana maanosana meidän velvollisuutemme on kantaa historiallinen vastuumme ja toimia sillanrakentajana pohjoisen ja eteläisen pallonpuoliskon välillä, jotta myös kehittyvillä mailla on todellinen mahdollisuus tehdä ilmastotekoja. Ja meidän on pystyttävä sopimaan globaalista hiilineutraaliustavoitteesta, joka mahdollistaa meille puoleentoista asteeseen pääsyn.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συζήτηση ενόψει της COP26 χρησιμοποιεί σαν πρόσχημα την υποβάθμιση του περιβάλλοντος με στόχο να προωθήσει την «πράσινη» μετάβαση που υιοθετούν η ΕΕ, οι ΗΠΑ και η Κίνα, παρά τις αντιθέσεις τους για το ποιος θα εξασφαλίσει μεγαλύτερο κομμάτι της πίτας.

Η πράσινη απελευθέρωση της ενέργειας, η απολιγνιτοποίηση και το κλείσιμο υδροηλεκτρικών έργων, η μονοκαλλιέργεια ΑΠΕ με μοναδικό κριτήριο τα κέρδη των ομίλων, κορυφώνουν την ακρίβεια, την ενεργειακή φτώχεια και οδηγούν σε πανάκριβες και απρόσιτες «πράσινες» λαϊκές κατοικίες.

Με την ευρωενωσιακή στρατηγική, όλες οι ελληνικές κυβερνήσεις, η σημερινή και οι προηγούμενες, άνοιξαν την πόρτα στα «πράσινα μονοπώλια», αφήνοντας τα δάση, τον λαό και το βίος του απροστάτευτα από πυρκαγιές, πλημμύρες και σεισμούς. Αυτά, όπως και οι συνέπειες των ιμπεριαλιστικών επεμβάσεων της ΕΕ, των ΗΠΑ και του ΝΑΤΟ, η απόλεια χιλιάδων ζώων και η καταστροφή του περιβάλλοντος θεωρούνται δεδομένα.

Επομένως, οι λαοί δεν έχουν να περιμένουν τίποτα από την COP26. Διέξοδο μπορεί να δώσει ο αγώνας τους για κατάργηση των πράσινων χαρατσιών και των φόρων στην ενέργεια, η διεκδίκηση μέτρων αντιπυρικής, αντιπλημμυρικής, αντισεισμικής θωράκισης και προστασίας των δασών, καθώς και η πάλη για το δικαίωμα των λαών να ζουν σε ένα ασφαλές και υγιεινό περιβάλλον.

Hildegard Bentele (PPE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! In Glasgow müssen wichtige Entscheidungen getroffen werden – zu verbindlichen CO₂-Reduktionszielen, zur Finanzierung und zur Anpassung an den Klimawandel.

Noch wichtiger aber als die Mega-Konferenzen alle zwei Jahre wäre es aus Sicht der EVP, den internationalen Klimaschutz zu einem Dauerthema zu machen und hierfür innerhalb der EU einen Klimabeauftragten mit Kabinettsrang zu ernennen, der oder die ständig mit Regierungsvertretern aus den anderen 160 Staaten daran arbeitet, den Klimaschutz nach vorne zu bringen. Denn nur, wenn wir auf der ganzen Welt den Kohleausstieg, den Ausbau erneuerbarer Energien, von Energieeffizienz und von Wasserstoff schaffen und gemeinsam Katastrophenschutz betreiben, werden wir die Erderwärmung aufhalten können.

Die USA haben es verstanden. Ja, auch wir brauchen einen John Kerry, und nein, ein Vizepräsident Timmermans für Klimapolitik reicht nicht aus, denn er hat ja, wie wir sehen, alle Hände voll zu tun, den Grünen Deal innerhalb der EU anständig voranzubringen.

Mit dem neuen Haushalt haben wir uns die Vorgabe gegeben, 30 % unserer Ausgaben, beispielsweise in der Entwicklungspolitik und in der Agrarpolitik, für Klimaschutzmaßnahmen auszugeben. Die Taxonomie soll zusätzlich Finanzströme nachhaltig kanalisieren. Hier braucht es dringend jemanden, der auf Kohärenz und Effizienz achtet. Sonst verpuffen unsere Bemühungen. Sonst werden wir vielleicht nicht zum Vorbild in der Welt, und sonst lernen wir vielleicht zu wenig von unseren Partnern.

Also bitte: Lassen Sie uns uns an guten Beispielen orientieren und die EU mit einem hochrangigen Klimabeauftragten in der internationalen Klimapolitik endlich besser aufstellen.

Jytte Guteland (S&D). – Mr President, I'm hopeful we now have a better chance than ever to honour the Paris Agreement. The EU is leading the way with its Climate Law and climate package. The US has new targets and a new progressive president. Even China has pledged climate neutrality.

I don't think it's possible to underestimate the importance of the Glasgow summit. In Paris, we changed direction, but the emissions kept rising. COP26 must be a turning point – not just for the conversation, but also for emissions. As Parliament's delegate to COP26, I will do everything I can to spread our message for increased ambition.

Today, we are adopting our negotiation mandate with a clear message to the world. Today's pledges, which will result in three degrees of heating, are far from enough to avoid a climate catastrophe. Instead, we need radical action, such as ending fossil fuel subsidies, pricing emissions as in the ETS and action on climate finance. Most importantly, we need a true crisis mindset to take us from words to action.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Renew). – Domnule președinte, domnule Sinkevičius, azi sunt un simplu poștaş, pentru că aduc vocea tinerilor din România. Acum două săptămâni, acest parlament ținea un eveniment care s-a numit „Evenimentul tinerilor europeni” cu motto-ul „Viitorul le aparține”. Dar, le aparține cu adevărat? Ce vor, de fapt, acești tineri? Vor, de fapt, o planetă sănătoasă, vor păduri, vor o economie curată, corectă, prietenoasă cu mediul.

Chiar nu vor să fie generația care are bilete în primul rând la drama intitulată „Încălzirea globală”. Pentru cine decidem, de fapt, la acest scop? Pentru ei, pentru cei care vor rămâne și vor simți pe pielea lor schimbările climatice. Noi, s-ar putea să nu mai fim aici în 2050, însă, ei vor continua. Este exact cum a spus Elena Ferrante în romanul ei: este lupta dintre cei care rămân și cei care pleacă. Copiii noștri nu mai trebuie să moară de poluare în Europa, nu trebuie să fie prinși în dezastre naturale, în inundații, în incendii de pădure, în deversări toxice.

When the water kills the fish. That's how you know how ill it is.

Aceasta este vorba unui rapper, nu e vreun filozof. Dar, ceea ce exprimă foarte bine, este anxietatea unei întregi generații. Așa că, ascultați-i!

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! In wenigen Tagen beginnt die Klimakonferenz in Glasgow, und viele Wissenschaftler sagen: Das ist die letzte Chance, um die Welt auf einen 1,5-Grad-Pfad zu bringen.

Denn derzeit steuern wir auf katastrophale 2,7 Grad zu. Heute wurde der *Production Gap Report* veröffentlicht, und er zeigt: Nach den derzeitigen Plänen würden bis 2030 240 % mehr Kohle, 57 % mehr Öl und 71 % mehr Gas gefördert, als für 1,5 Grad verträglich wäre. So würden wir in die Klimakatastrophe schlafwandeln, und noch unseren Kindern und Enkeln werden die Debatten, die hier heute über Subventionen für fossiles Gas oder energieintensive Plastikproduktion geführt werden, absurd vorkommen.

Ich höre immer wieder von Kolleginnen und Kollegen in diesem Haus: Die EU darf es nicht übertreiben, und die anderen Staaten sollten auch etwas tun. Ja, natürlich müssen alle Staaten das Übereinkommen von Paris einhalten. Aber das Übereinkommen sagt eben auch ganz glasklar, dass die Industriestaaten mit ihren hohen historischen Emissionen in der Pflicht sind, mehr zu tun und deutlich vor 2050 klimaneutral zu sein.

Packen wir es an. Die Lösungen sind da, die Erneuerbaren sind kostengünstig geworden, Effizienzmaßnahmen finanzieren sich letztlich selbst. Wir müssen es einfach nur tun.

Aurélia Beigneux (ID). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, la défense de la biodiversité et des écosystèmes, si riches en Europe, est notre devoir vis-à-vis des générations futures. Cet objectif est atteignable, mais encore faut-il ne pas tomber dans le dogmatisme auquel nous habitue ce Parlement. Beaucoup de fonctionnaires européens se sont convertis à la religion, voire à la secte, Greta Thunberg. Pour ma part, je suis un député réaliste qui connaît la place de l'Europe dans le monde et les difficultés de nos nations respectives.

Sur fond de culpabilité climatique, cette résolution souhaite donc des transferts de richesses massifs des États membres vers le reste du monde. Espérer un changement de la part du tiers-monde est une vision utopique qui n'aura aucun effet, peu importe l'argent distribué. Encore une fois, nous menons seuls la bataille de l'écologie, alors que la plupart de la pollution mondiale vient d'Amérique et de Chine.

La COP26 est un énième exemple du paradoxe européen. Des efforts supplémentaires nous sont constamment demandés alors que nous ratifions dans le même temps de néfastes traités de libre-échange, pire exemples de mondialisation sauvage et d'empreinte carbone. Nous ne pouvons pas faire d'écologie sans frontière et il est donc impératif de revenir au bon sens en produisant en Europe et en France.

Alors que l'écologie est affaire de mesures, de limites et de frontières, l'Union européenne en fait un moyen de centralisation en faveur du global, du sans-frontières et des monopoles; alors que l'écologie est affaire de démocratie, de participation et de coopération, l'Union européenne en fait une affaire de bureaucrates et de gestionnaires de capitaux. Voilà pourquoi il est urgent de revenir à une écologie nationale qui préservera notre mode de vie, une écologie garante d'un avenir meilleur pour nous, pour tous, et non à une écologie punitive qui impactera une fois de plus nos concitoyens.

Grzegorz Tobiszowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzy! Panie Ministrze! Myślę, że troska o klimat, o czyste powietrze i o to, by przygotować następnym pokoleniom bezpieczną przyszłość, to jest coś, co nas wszystkich łączy. To, myślę, nie tworzy sporu.

Myślę, że ideą, która powinna również nas łączyć, jest to, abyśmy w tych dążeniach byli skuteczni i pragmatyczni. Bowiem tylko skuteczność sprawi, że będziemy wiarygodni w naszym przekazie. Bowiem jak popatrzymy – i to już tu padało z tej mównicy nie raz – jaki udział w trosce o klimat mają poszczególne kontynenty i ludne kraje przemysłowe, to musimy z pokorą zauważyć, że jeśli nie przekonamy do tego wielkich krajów, wielkich gospodarek – jak Chiny, Stany Zjednoczone, Brazylia, Rosja i możemy wymienić... czy Indie – to niestety nie będziemy skuteczni w trosce o klimat i nie osiągniemy celu, który sobie tu słusznie zakładamy.

Dlatego też kieruję pytanie do naszych przedstawicieli: z jakimi argumentami jedziemy – nie przesłaniem, lecz argumentami – byśmy realnie przekonali kraje w świecie do tego, abyśmy wspólnie tę troskę o klimat, o czyste powietrze wygrali, i byśmy rzeczywiście byli skuteczni i wiarygodni?

Idoia Villanueva Ruiz (The Left). – Señor presidente, la COP 10 de 2019 terminó con muchos de los grandes problemas aún sin resolver y desde entonces nos hemos enfrentado a una pandemia mundial, que nos ha mostrado los efectos devastadores de la falta de preparación, la interrelación entre nuestro planeta y las personas, y la gran vulnerabilidad a la que estamos expuestos. Se acelera la pérdida de biodiversidad, se agravan las sequías, las hambrunas y avanza el deshielo.

La COP 26 en Glasgow debe marcar un antes y un después en la carrera contra el colapso climático. Mucho hemos debatido sobre la reducción de emisiones, sobre objetivos climáticos para la próxima década, pero nada se materializa todavía. La ciudadanía está asistiendo incrédula ante la falta de decisión, ambición y valentía. Europa debe cooperar y ser ambiciosa.

Para hablar de contaminación debemos hablar claramente de quién y qué contamina. Evitar que los grandes contaminantes conviertan la COP en un espectáculo y patrocinio propio. Hay que hablar de justicia ambiental, pero también de justicia social, que solo podrá producirse con una transición valiente sobre un modelo agotado. Hay que cerrar, de una vez por todas, el abismo entre lo que nos están pidiendo y las decisiones que tomamos.

Márton Gyöngyösi (NI). – Mr President, at the convergence of a health, economic and climate crisis, we are presented with a unique opportunity to set our societies on a sustainable course. The ambitious goals set out in the European Green Deal can be an instrument for transition to a new green growth model that mobilises green investment to create new industries, jobs to dampen the social tensions created by transition, and a cleaner environment for all. But there are preconditions for success that need to be addressed in Glasgow.

Net-zero emissions by 2050 and transformation of our economies are a collective target, rather than one that commits each and every Member State to net-zero emissions. We need guarantees and sanctions to make it a credible commitment of all those involved. Second, bring the USA, China, but also the developing world, on board with similarly ambitious targets as the EU's. Finally, the adoption of the Paris Agreement rulebook to set the fight against climate change into operation.

Jessica Polfjärd (PPE). – Herr talman! Endast veckor innan COP 26 ser vi nyheter om att den globala produktionen av fossila bränslen ökar. Det är en utveckling i helt fel riktning om vi ska nå våra klimatmål.

Just nu hör vi också av många skeptiska och ängsliga röster när det är tvunget att hela samhällen faktiskt behöver ställa om. Det är röster som är styrda av rädsla. Rädsla för förlorade jobb, rädsla för sämre framtidsutsikter och rädsla för att kastas ut i osäkerhet. Jag förstår den rädslan. Men jag vet också att ställa om inte behöver betyda att stänga ner.

Den gröna omställningen innebär enorma möjligheter, inte bara för klimatet, utan även för jobb och tillväxt. Jag kan se det i min hemstad, Västerås, där investeringar i ny batteriteknik skapar hundratals nya jobb. Jag kan se det i den norra delen av mitt hemland Sverige, där framtidens hållbara industrier växer fram och skapar nya möjligheter och nya arbetsmarknader för hela samhällen.

Det kräver modiga människor som vågar satsa och tro på framtiden. Därför måste mod ersätta rädsla. Hoppfullhet måste ersätta skam och ångest. Det är när vi leder med exempel som vi kan göra skillnad på riktigt. Det är när vi visar att satsningar på klimatet också kan vara satsningar på jobb och tillväxt. Det är då vi kan få med oss andra länder i vårt viktiga arbete.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo tutti con gli occhi puntati su Glasgow, ma non deve essere un ennesimo incontro per la Conferenza delle Nazioni Unite, ma un appuntamento decisivo per le azioni di adattamento e contrasto al cambiamento climatico.

L'ultimo rapporto dell'IPCC evidenzia chiaramente come con gli obiettivi assunti finora dai firmatari dell'accordo di Parigi non raggiungeremo l'obiettivo di mantenere a livello globale l'aumento della temperatura al di sotto dei 2°C.

L'Unione europea ha fatto la sua parte, con il Green Deal, la legge sul clima «Fit for 55» che – anch'io sono d'accordo con chi l'ha detto prima di me – è la nostra risposta alla crisi energetica, all'aumento dei prezzi dell'energia, non la causa. Però, purtroppo, solo pochi giorni fa la Cina ha annunciato di voler aumentare ancora l'utilizzo del carbone nel suo mix energetico, facendo seguito alla posizione già presa da altri paesi nel mondo, anche industrializzato.

Allora la COP deve essere l'occasione per portare tutti gli attori internazionali a fare quanto ha fatto l'Unione europea, mettendo nero su bianco gli impegni che intendono prendere, a partire da un'intesa vincolante e globale sul *phasing out* del carbone e un accordo sull'erogazione entro il 2025 del fondo per accompagnare il Sud del mondo nella transizione ecologica ed energetica.

Abbiamo vissuto un'emergenza sanitaria, adesso abbiamo la responsabilità di evitare che l'emergenza climatica già in atto anche alle nostre latitudini produca danni irreparabili al nostro ecosistema sconvolgendo di nuovo le nostre vite.

Emma Wiesner (Renew). – Herr Talman! Kollegor! Nästa vecka åker jag till klimattoppmötet i Glasgow, men min största farhåga är att det här mötet återigen blir ett möte med mycket snack och lite verkstad.

EU och resten av världen måste enas om att öka sina klimatambitioner markant, för att vi ska klara 1,5-gradersmålet. Vi måste samarbeta. Fler länder måste anta bindande mål i klimatarbetet för klimatneutralitet senast 2050. Vi måste få med oss Kina och Indien.

Dessutom bör vi vara ledande i arbetet för ett globalt pris på koldioxid. Men det är också oerhört viktigt att vi erkänner att det inte har gjorts tillräckligt på internationell nivå, men inte heller på EU-nivå. Vi måste göra vår egen hemläxa och snabba på ambitionerna i vårt klimatpaket och arbetet vi jobbar med just nu. Vi måste gå från ord till handling. *We have to walk the talk.*

Ville Niinistö (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the Glasgow COP meeting is not just one of the climate meetings in an unending row. I've been to a few and I know how people can treat them, but this is the checking point of the Paris Agreement where we check whether we are in line with our climate targets. If we fail here, the next checkpoint five years from now will be too late. So I would urge you, Commissioner, and the whole Commission, to treat this as the vital climate meeting that will decide whether we can achieve our global climate agreements and keep global warming to 1.5 degrees.

Currently we are using our carbon budget globally within the next 10 years. It will run out in the 2020s if we don't change our policies. Even five years from now, when the next checkpoint is, it may be that temporarily the temperatures are already above 1.5 degrees. So many countries have long-term goals, even China, but few countries have short-term implementation and this is where the EU must push for all countries to come with real commitments, contributions, in the short term, phasing out fossil fuels, financing climate investments in poorer countries, and making sure that we are on track in the next few years to get emissions down seriously. If we fail on this, it will be too late to achieve our targets with policies in the 2030s, so this is your job.

Sylvia Limmer (ID). – Herr Präsident! In zwei Wochen treffen sich wieder Politiker und eine sich stetig vermehrende selbsternannte Klimaelite, um die selbst ausgerufenen Katastrophen mit Worten und viel Geld zu bekämpfen. In einem unvergleichbaren, irren Reisespektakel kommt man mithilfe des bösen CO₂ – welches man selbstredend dort ganz gerne verbieten würde – aus aller Herren Länder zusammen. Man maßregelt die Bürger, sei es bei der Fortbewegung, dem Wohnen, neuerdings sogar beim Essen und – nicht zu vergessen – beim neuen grünen Denken.

Aber haben Sie sich irgendwann einmal gefragt, mit welchem Recht Sie sich einbilden, Ihr Anliegen und Ihre angeblich unaufschiebbare Reisetätigkeit sei wichtiger als die Fahrt zur Arbeit eines Vaters, einer Mutter, die übrigens Ihr Anliegen und Ihre Reise finanzieren?

In Glasgow werden Ihnen 240 tonnenschwere elektrische Super-SUVs zur Verfügung stehen, damit sie sich besser fühlen. Leider fehlen die Ladesäulen, weshalb Generatoren herangekarrt werden, die mit hydrogeniertem Frittenfett betrieben werden sollen – so jedenfalls der Plan. Vor zwei Jahren in Madrid: hinter riesigen Messehallen containerweise Müllberge, in denen zuvor Ihr Woke-Klimaessen eingewickelt war. Ihre Pippi-Langstrumpf-Klimawelt scheidet schlicht an schnöden Realitäten, beschert dem Steuerzahler aber Rekordpreise, die Sie wenig scheren. Der Fahrdienst erledigt schließlich das Tanken.

Es wird Zeit, dass Sie von Ihrem eigenem Gift kosten. Bleiben Sie zu Hause, schalten Sie die Heizung ab und ernähren Sie sich vegan von heimischen Feldfrüchten, die woke bei Mondlicht geerntet wurden. Das wäre ein Anfang – statt in Glasgow weiter Steuergelder in Milliardenhöhe in der Welt zu verteilen.

Christophe Hansen (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, le changement climatique est une réalité et la personne qui vient de parler est aussi celle qui condamne la vie de nos enfants pour sa gloire populiste. Je condamne vivement ses propos du plus profond de mon cœur.

Et ceux qui lient la flambée des prix de l'énergie à nos ambitions climatiques jouent le jeu mesquin de Vladimir Poutine et de ses semblables. Car c'est justement notre dépendance à ces énergies fossiles qui nous rend vulnérables. Chers collègues, le futur sera essentiellement renouvelable et j'en suis profondément convaincu. Mais cette transition aura également un prix.

Au niveau européen, il est indispensable d'assouplir au plus vite les lignes directrices concernant les aides d'État en faveur du climat, de l'énergie et de l'environnement. Au niveau de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce, il faut trouver des solutions pour supprimer les tarifs sur les biens utilisés pour la production des énergies renouvelables ou l'amélioration de l'efficacité énergétique. La conférence des ministres du 30 novembre sera à cet égard une occasion à ne pas rater.

Chers collègues, le financement de la lutte contre le changement climatique et de la transition énergétique nous impose un défi titanesque. Dans ce contexte, le règlement sur les obligations vertes européennes, dont je suis responsable au sein de mon groupe politique, peut véritablement créer un climat de confiance et de transparence, afin d'inciter les investisseurs à opter pour les obligations vertes. Car, actuellement, malgré un développement prometteur et notre rôle pionnier dans le domaine, seuls 2,6 % des obligations émises en Europe sont des obligations vertes. On peut faire mieux et on doit le faire très vite.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, cinq ans après l'accord de Paris, le faible niveau d'engagement des nations du monde entier pour la neutralité climatique est alarmant. Et si nous n'agissons pas, ou si peu, la planète connaîtra une augmentation de la température globale de 3,2 degrés d'ici à 2100, soit plus du double de l'objectif fixé lors de la COP21.

Les catastrophes naturelles qui parsèment l'actualité européenne nous ont encore rappelé l'urgence d'agir. Il faut donc respecter l'accord de Paris, mais il faudra même aller encore plus loin. La COP26 sera le baromètre de l'action mondiale en faveur du climat et, lors de celle-ci, il sera essentiel de réaffirmer, voire de réviser, l'objectif de limitation de la hausse des températures de 1,5 degré. Dans le cas contraire, les victimes se compteront par millions.

L'Europe doit être un acteur majeur en exhortant les États à rehausser leurs contributions nationales, à légiférer pour le climat, à soutenir les citoyens dans cette transition tout en mettant en place des stratégies ambitieuses dans tous les secteurs de l'économie. Se remettre réellement en question ou saborder définitivement notre avenir? Voici le choix qui se présente à nous.

Frédérique Ries (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, «On ne peut pas manger de charbon, on ne peut pas boire de pétrole et on ne peut pas non plus respirer du gaz». Ce sont les mots de Vanessa Nakate, une jeune Ougandaise qui s'exprimait il y a quelques jours au sommet des jeunes pour le climat, à Milan. Et elle a raison. On doit changer de paradigme, sauf à accepter que les catastrophes climatiques de cet été soient un avant-goût de l'enfer qui pourrait être le nôtre demain.

Trois objectifs principaux pour cette COP26, pour changer de trajectoire: la neutralité climatique dès 2050 pour tous les pays du G20; au minimum 100 milliards de dollars par an pour aider les pays en voie de développement – on en est loin; une évaluation tous les cinq ans des 188 plans nationaux au lieu de 10, c'est largement insuffisant au vu des objectifs.

Parce que l'urgence est de mobiliser, de convaincre les réticents que sont la Russie, la Chine, l'Inde, le Brésil et les autres. Aujourd'hui, même dans les rails de Paris, nous allons tout droit vers un réchauffement de presque trois degrés. On va tout droit dans le mur. Très sincèrement, nous sommes nombreux ici à fatiguer d'utiliser des superlatifs à chaque fois que l'on est amenés à parler du climat à cette tribune. On en a marre des mots. On veut des actes.

Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous apprenons aujourd'hui – enfin, il nous est confirmé aujourd'hui, en 2021 — que l'une des plus grandes entreprises européennes, j'ai nommé Total, savait et avait connaissance des conséquences climatiques de ses actions depuis 1971. 1971: 50 ans, ça fait 50 ans que nous savons, que nos entreprises savent, et que nous œuvrons à marche forcée et à toute allure vers l'abîme.

Nous apprenons aussi aujourd'hui, le même jour, en même temps, que nous allons produire dans les années qui viennent 240 % de charbon en trop, 71 % de gaz en trop et 57 % de pétrole en trop pour respecter les engagements des accords de Paris. Nous aurions pu éviter le drame, mais dénis, connivences, fabrique du doute... Nous ne l'avons pas fait. Nous nous sommes entêtés sur la route des énergies fossiles. Il est temps de changer de position. Prenons nos responsabilités.

La COP de Glasgow doit sonner le glas des énergies fossiles. Condamnons les entreprises écocidaires et avec le Danemark, le Costa Rica, des milliers de scientifiques et des milliers d'ONG, décidons et lançons un traité de non-prolifération des énergies fossiles. Il faut en cesser la production tout de suite pour que plus jamais des entreprises comme Total ne puissent nous mener sciemment vers le désastre.

Marco Dreosto (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Consiglio ha definito la posizione dell'Unione in vista della COP26 che si terrà nei prossimi giorni a Glasgow, ponendo l'accento sull'intensificazione della risposta globale all'emergenza climatica e quindi sulla necessità di una transizione che sia giusta e soprattutto equa.

Proprio per questo, quando vengono prese decisioni che impattano nell'immediato e direttamente su tutti i cittadini, non bisogna dimenticarsi delle peculiarità dei nostri territori e dei singoli Stati all'interno dell'Unione.

Come relatore ombra di questa relazione all'interno della commissione ITRE, ho lavorato a lungo affinché si potesse mettere in evidenza e tenere conto di queste differenze, per fare in modo che la transizione ecologica non rappresenti una perdita netta per le nostre aziende, soprattutto per le piccole e medie aziende che – voglio ricordare – sono un patrimonio non solo dell'Italia ma dell'Europa intera.

Dobbiamo evidentemente preservare le unicità dei nostri territori e non c'è urgenza che possa cambiare questa nostra priorità.

Pernille Weiss (PPE). – Hr. formand! Klimatopmødet i Glasgow vil forhåbentlig resultere i langt flere og langt bedre internationale aftaler end topmødet i Madrid i 2019. Coronaen gav os jo et ekstra forberedelsesår – et år, der forhåbentlig ikke er spildt. COP 26 skal handle om, hvordan vi når Parisaftalen. Især handler det om at få fælles aftaler på plads og ind i kalenderen. Og så handler COP 26 om at inspirere hinanden ved at gøre det, vi hver især kan gøre, meget bedre sammen. Og vi kan faktisk godt nå at gøre Europaparlamentets beslutning endnu bedre og mere resultatorienteret. Vi kan nemlig alle sammen stemme for ændringsforslag nummer 15, så det bliver flettet ind i den tekst, som vi tager med til Skotland. Lige nu risikerer forslaget nemlig at miste såkaldt grøn og erhvervsvenlig opbakning fra Renew, og længere mod venstre i salen, ja, der hører jeg, at man ikke kan lide ændringsforslaget og den gode idé om en klima-CO₂-mærkning, fordi den ikke kommer fra jer selv. Helt ærlig! Sådan vinder vi ikke klimakampen, smid nu forfængeligheden væk og støt op om ændringsforslag nummer 15. Så EU foreslår verden, at vi går sammen om at udvikle en CO₂-mærkning, som giver klar og troværdig besked om produkters klimaaftryk. Evidensbaserede og fuldt forskningsbaserede livscyklusvurderinger inkluderer selvfølgelig en CO₂-mærkning, som fjerner »green washing« fra al handel én gang for alle. Det er der altså brug for, så stem for ændringsforslag 15 nu! Allesammen!

Niels Fuglsang (S&D). – Hr. formand! Kære kollegaer, Kommission! COP 26-mødet i Glasgow er verdens vigtigste møde. Det er nu vi har chancen for at øge vores ambitionsniveau, for at gøre mere for at reducere CO₂-udledningerne. Vi ved, at den nuværende indsats er fuldstændig utilstrækkelig. Med den nuværende indsats vil vi ifølge FN's Klimapanel havne på en temperaturstigning på over tre grader inden udgangen af dette århundrede. Det ville have katastrofale følger, og derfor skal vi bruge denne her mulighed. Noget af det første vi skal gøre – og et resultat, som jeg mener er helt nødvendigt på COP 26-mødet – det er, at vi udfaser subsidier til fossil energi. Vi ved, at der hvert minut – hvert minut – ifølge Den Internationale Valutafond bliver givet ni millioner euro i støtte til kulkraft, i støtte til fossil energi. I 2018 var det 50 milliarder euro, der blev givet til fossil energi i subsidier. Det skal vi have udfaset. EU må gå forrest. Vi skal presse på for, at vi får stoppet det her kulsvineri.

Linea Søgaard-Lidell (Renew). – Hr. formand! Det snart 6 år siden, at verdens lande lavede en vigtig klimaaftale. Dengang mødtes de i Paris. Nu mødes de snart igen i Glasgow. Jeg vil egentlig gerne minde dem om noget, for hvor meget kan man egentlig, nå at glemme på 6 år? Det var for eksempel aftalen, at vi skulle sætte en global pris på CO₂. Det har vi ikke gjort endnu. Det var også aftalen, at vi skulle give 100 milliarder dollars om året til udviklingslandenes grønne omstilling. Vi er kun oppe på 80. Det var også aftalen, at vi skulle holde os til en temperaturstigning på halvanden grad. Det overholder vi engang selv i EU med vores klimamål. Hvis verdens ledere skulle have fået hukommelsestab siden 2015, så har forskerhold ellers jævnlige mindet dem om, at vi skal gøre noget nu. Og det håber jeg, især de mest forurenende lande i G20 er klar til at tage vigtige skridt for i Glasgow. Det ville for eksempel klæde dem at sætte en dato for, hvornår al fossil energi – også naturgas – skal være helt ude af billedet. Vi må ikke stå her igen om seks år og spørge, hvorfor vi ikke gjorde noget, dengang vi havde chancen.

Michael Bloss (Verts/ALE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen! Sechs Jahre nach Paris fahren wir mit Klimazielen und Maßnahmen zur Klimakonferenz, die nicht einmal das 2-Grad-Klimaziel einhalten. Das ist schlicht und einfach enttäuschend. Da hilft es auch nichts, mit dem Finger auf andere Länder zu zeigen und zu sagen: Die machen auch nicht mehr.

Kehren wir vor unserer eigenen Haustür! Wenn wir wirklich globale Vorreiterin sein wollen, dann bedeutet das: keine neuen fossilen Subventionen; dann bedeutet das auch ein Enddatum fürs Erdgas, und es bedeutet, sich der Initiative anderer Staaten anzuschließen, die sich zu einem Kohleausstieg im Jahr 2030 verpflichten.

Dazu die Frage an die Kommission: Werden wir Teil dieser Initiative sein? Unsere Messlatte muss sein, ob die zukünftigen Generationen noch auf diesem Planeten leben können, noch die gleichen Freiheiten genießen können wie wir. Darum geht es: um das 1,5-Grad-Ziel. Wir Grüne streiten dafür, dass die Europäische Union genau das schafft und damit wirklich Vorreiterin beim Klimaschutz ist.

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caro Comissário, Senhor Ministro, caros colegas, a COP26 é mais um marco nesta corrida contra o tempo que é o combate às alterações climáticas. A União Europeia apresenta-se em Glasgow como uma referência pelo que já fez e pela estratégia que definiu para o seu futuro. O Programa-Quadro Horizonte Europa, em especial a nova geração de parcerias com a indústria, é disso um exemplo.

Várias das áreas abrangidas têm uma importância decisiva para o cumprimento das metas definidas: a descarbonização da indústria, a biodiversidade e a economia circular, o hidrogénio, a aviação e a ferrovia. Sabemos que não basta mudar os comportamentos ou impor metas. Só com soluções inovadoras teremos sucesso, soluções que conciliem a transição verde com a criação de emprego e de riqueza. Mas também temos de renovar as ambições. Precisamos, por exemplo, de fazer a transição plena para uma energia limpa e acessível, apostando em novas soluções e potenciando as existentes, em especial as energias renováveis.

Tudo isto exige cada vez mais um forte investimento em ciência, desenvolvimento tecnológico e inovação.

Петър Витанов (S&D). – Г-н Председател, четох някъде, че климатичните изменения са най-големият кризисен мултипликатор: повишаването на стрелката на термометъра води не само до повишаване на природните катаклизми, но и до неравенство, до повече емиграция, до политическа нестабилност. Ясно е, че Европейският съюз трябва да бъде за пример не само с целите си за климатична неутралност, но и с поносимата социална цена за тяхното изпълнение.

Но реалната борба с климата може да дойде тогава, когато са решени глобалните проблеми със сигурността. Защото никой не мисли за климата и за замърсяването, когато води военни действия или се подготвя за война. Знаете ли, че един военен самолет харчи 10 000 литра керосин за един час — колкото целия жизнен цикъл на една семейна кола? Или знаете ли, че 10-15% от емисиите на Америка по времето на Студената война са следствие на военните?

За това нека не бъдем лицемери пред COP 26. Европейският съюз може да помогне за климатичната борба, ако участва активно в деескалацията на напрежението между Съединените щати, Русия и Китай.

Claudia Gamon (Renew). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Die Fakten zum Klimawandel sind eindeutig: Wir haben keine Zeit mehr. Deswegen ist es für mich auch immer wieder verstörend, zu hören, dass es auch Staatschefs gibt, die glauben, dass wir noch Zeit hätten, um auf Lösungen zuzuwarten.

Das Motto lautet ein wenig: „Schauen wir mal, dann schauen wir weiter.“ Gelernte Österreicherinnen kennen diese Gelassenheit, aber es ist das, was uns direkt in die Katastrophe führen wird. Ich bin es sehr leid, nur noch beim Weiterwursteln zuzuschauen. Wir brauchen klare Maßnahmen, denn Ziele gibt es schon zu Genüge. Wir brauchen konkrete Vereinbarungen, denn luftige Ambitionen haben auch viele. Und wir brauchen strikte Fristen, denn es gibt keine Zeit mehr zu verlieren.

Jeder Bruchteil mehr an Erwärmung wird sich in weiteren Katastrophen niederschlagen: Hitzewellen, Dürre, Überschwemmungen. Die COP 26 muss zu einer klimapolitischen Revolution werden. Mir ist es auch wichtig, zu sagen, dass die Politik Verantwortung für die nächsten Generationen hat, die nach uns kommen, die es viel schlimmer treffen wird und die wahrscheinlich nichts mehr dagegen tun können werden.

Sara Matthieu (Verts/ALE). – Voorzitter, collega's, we gaan naar de klimaatconferentie van Glasgow met een heel pijnlijke vaststelling. Met de huidige klimaatplannen stijgt de temperatuur met maar liefst 2,7 graden en dat is heel ver van de door ons beloofde 1,5 graad in Parijs. Meneer, dat serieus? Wat zeggen we daarmee tegen de mensen die het slachtoffer werden van de overstromingen deze zomer in bijvoorbeeld België en Duitsland?

Maar het is nog niet te laat. We moeten en kunnen het beter doen dan de klimaatplannen die vandaag op tafel liggen. Klimaatmarsen overal in Europa brachten opnieuw duizenden mensen op straat om om meer ambitie te vragen. Toegegeven, Europa kan dit niet alleen. We moeten de klimaatsteun voor ontwikkelingslanden fors optrekken, en ook de VS en andere grootmachten moeten meedoen. Maar Europa moet de ambitie hebben om hen te inspireren, zodat ook zij eindelijk hun verantwoordelijkheid zullen nemen.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). – Mr President, the challenge in transitioning to a cleaner future ahead of us was already enormous without the burden of the urgency to react and act. Reaching climate neutrality by 2050 means undertaking an enormous challenge, which requires a far-reaching transformation of our economies and societies, not only of our energy sector or industrial one.

The realities we are facing at the moment are diverse. We have to act to reach the 2030 target and climate neutrality by 2050. We have to recover from the economic crisis and we have to face energy price hikes at the moment. It is time to show that the Green Deal is not only an environmental but also a growth strategy aiming to transform the European Union into a modern, resource-efficient and competitive economy.

Meeting the increased production will require not only enhanced generation of renewable energy but also consolidated public and private investment in infrastructure, building storage capacities and a competitive renewables market.

Natural gas still plays an important role in the EU mix, and the EU will continue to depend on natural gas for some years to come. That's why it is essential to recognise the role of carbon capture, utilisation and storage (CCUS) in our climate mitigation strategy, especially as a solution to carbon emissions from heavy industry, and we have to convince all the other global players to follow our example and act with ambition and determination.

(O debate está suspenso.)

6. Pierwsza część głosowania

Presidente. – Muito obrigado. Antes de prosseguir, queria anunciar o primeiro período de votação de hoje. Votaremos os dossiês conforme indicado na ordem do dia. O período de votação decorrerá entre as 13h00 e as 14h15, e a votação, naturalmente, é realizada segundo o mesmo procedimento utilizado nos períodos de votação anteriores. Todas as votações serão realizadas por votação nominal. Declaro, então, aberto o período de votação. Isto significa que poderão votar até às 14h15. Os resultados das votações serão comunicados às 19h00.

7. Konferencja klimatyczna ONZ w Glasgow, Zjednoczone Królestwo (COP26) (ciąg dalszy debat)

We now continue with the debate on

— the question for oral answer (O-000065/2021 – B9-0039/21), and

— the question for oral answer (O-000066/2021 – B9-0040/21).

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D). – Mr President, the last Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) science report shows us the harsh truth. Projected scenarios with different emission cutting schemes all show that keeping warming below 1.5°C will be impossible with the current rate. So we have to do more. Seeing all the videos of the fires around the globe, it's time to speak about the climate heating, because it's only average which can speak about a rise of some degrees and warming.

The United Nations brings us around the same table to tackle the challenge that is common for all the people on this planet: climate change, climate heating. COP26 is an important milestone after the Paris Agreement. Almost 200 countries showed their plans to cut emissions by 2030, but still the report shows increasing emissions from 2010 to 2030. We have to succeed in these negotiations.

I have high hopes in front of the citizens that a lot can still be done in Glasgow. I do welcome Joe Biden back to the work, and I think it's a good sign that China promises to stop financing overseas coal. It's important, as the Commission said, that adaptation and mitigation, also in the least developed countries and small islands, are taken on board. We cannot heat our globe.

Charles Goerens (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, allons tout droit à l'essentiel. Toutes les énergies vont désormais devoir être consacrées à l'atténuation de la catastrophe climatique. Par exemple, les fonds que nombre de pays entendent consacrer à la course aux armements vont manquer à la révolution technologique dont la planète aura besoin pour mener à bien la transition énergétique, gigantesque chantier requérant l'investissement total de tous, à commencer par la Chine, les États-Unis, l'Union européenne et j'en passe.

Nous n'avons plus le droit de gaspiller nos ressources. Le *business as usual* nous mènera droit dans le mur. Le potentiel technologique et là pour réaliser des objectifs de l'accord de Paris. Soyons créatifs et rappelons que la fin de l'âge de la pierre taillée n'a pas été provoquée par un manque de pierres, mais a été rendue possible grâce à l'innovation.

Politiquement parlant, l'on voit peu d'exemples dans l'histoire où tant de conditions doivent être réunies pour éviter le pire. Fixons donc les vraies priorités. Nous n'avons plus le droit à l'erreur. Les jeunes générations nous enverront au diable si Glasgow devait entrer dans l'histoire comme le sommet de la honte, de l'impuissance et de l'irresponsabilité.

Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE). – Hr. formand! Jeg var med i 2009 i København, årets efter i Cancún og i Paris i 2015. Stemningen var hver gang alarmeret, men især efter Paris hilste vi lettede resultaterne velkommen. Bagefter raslede ambitionsniveauet ned igen, og mismodet voksede. Nu er de unge lykkeligvis kommet på gaden. De og vi ved, at i Glasgow er det selve deres fremtid, der er på spil. Nu gælder det. Sætter vi på, at vores børne- og oldebørn i fremtiden vil tale om COP26 med begejstring? At her trådte verdens ledere endelig i karakter og traf de nødvendige beslutninger, så vi kan håndtere klimakrisen? Eller vil de vrede og modløse konstatere, at deres liv og fremtid åbenbart betød mindre for os end kortsigtede økonomiske interesser og business as usual? Vi håber givetvis alle på det første. Det resultat afhænger alene af den politiske vilje, og selv om den oftest har været fraværende, så husk: Politisk vilje er heldigvis en fornybare ressource.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, doamnelor și domnilor colegi, schimbările climatice reprezintă o realitate care nu poate să fie contestată. Omenirea întregă se confruntă cu fenomene meteorologice severe, fie că vorbim de inundații, incendii sau secetă. Viețile și bunurile noastre, ale tuturor, sunt puse în pericol. Astăzi, ne confruntăm și cu o criză a resurselor energetice, care la rândul ei, afectează populația Uniunii Europene.

Toate aceste lucruri sunt o consecință a neglijenței responsabililor politici, care, de-a lungul timpului, au ignorat semnalele primite în acest sens. Ne revine, astăzi, nouă tuturor, sarcina deloc ușoară, de a face pași concreți în această direcție, iar Conferința de la Glasgow este o nouă etapă în acest demers. Încă de la început, aș dori însă să subliniez necesitatea ca, înaintea oricărei decizii care va fi luată, să avem studiile de impact care să facă o evaluare asupra ceea ce înseamnă acele decizii, în așa fel încât să nu afectăm sectoarele economice.

Planurile de recuperare și reziliență reprezintă o bună oportunitate de a finanța aceste acțiuni, iar statele membre trebuie să se asigure de utilizarea eficientă a acestor resurse. Sectorul agricol trebuie să fie văzut ca un partener serios în bătălia cu schimbările climatice. Eforturile, însă, trebuie să fie făcute la nivel global, și nu doar regional. Sau, mai exact, degeaba impunem fermierilor din Uniunea Europeană condiții de mediu, câtă vreme, în altă parte a globului, de unde importăm alimente, lucrurile au scăpat de sub control.

Dacă vrem să reușim cu adevărat în acest domeniu și să atingem obiectivele Acordului de la Paris, atunci trebuie să fim serioși unii cu ceilalți, indiferent în ce parte a globului ne aflăm.

Romana Jerković (S&D). – Poštovani gospodine predsjedavajući, kolegice i kolege, ukoliko naše uspjehe u borbi protiv klimatskih promjena danas uspoređujemo s onima od prije deset godina, vidimo napredak. No, svi se slažemo da uloženi naponi ni izbliza nisu dovoljni.

Pred nama su brojni zahtjevi, poput ukidanja svih subvencija na fosilna goriva, smanjenja emisija stakleničkih plinova i povećanje investicija u obnovljive izvore energije. Prema Međunarodnoj energetskej agenciji u narednom desetljeću moramo utrošiti ulaganja u čiste tehnologije kako bismo spriječili rast temperature više od jednog i pol stupnja do 2050. godine.

Stoga je UN-ova konferencija prilika da svjetski čelnici prihvate i ambicioznije obveze, pa možda i onu koja se odnosi na promjenu sadašnjeg neoliberalnog ekonomskog modela u model koji će se temeljiti na kriterijima kao što su socijalna pravdnost i zadovoljstvo ljudi.

Nemojmo propustiti tu priliku! Danas trebamo pozvati sve vlade da povećaju svoje nacionalne doprinose i stanje u kojemu se nalazimo shvate alarmantnim.

Ulrike Müller (Renew). – Herr Präsident! In der EU arbeiten wir sehr ambitioniert, um mehr Klimaschutz in der Landwirtschaft zu haben. Der Vergleich mit dem Rest der Welt zeigt, dass wir weit fortgeschritten sind: Während in der Landwirtschaft hier in Europa etwa 10 % der Treibhausgasemissionen gemacht werden, sind es global knapp 20 %. Gleichzeitig erwarten wir aber bis 2050 ein globales Bevölkerungswachstum von jetzt sieben auf zehn Milliarden, die alle ein Recht auf ausreichende Ernährung haben.

Das Pariser Klimaschutzübereinkommen hält fest, dass Klimaschutz die Lebensmittelproduktion nicht gefährden darf. Wir sollten uns das sehr zu Herzen nehmen und die Landwirtschaft stärker in den Fokus der Klimadiplomatie nehmen. Wir Europäer müssen einen stärkeren Beitrag für eine moderne und effiziente Landwirtschaft – gerade in den ärmeren Ländern – leisten. Gleichzeitig sind wir aber auch in der Pflicht, unsere landwirtschaftlichen Familienbetriebe zu erhalten, statt die Lebensmittelproduktion in Drittstaaten zu verlagern. Sonst leisten wir dem Klimaschutz nämlich einen Bären-dienst.

Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE). – Vice-President Silva Pereira, Commissioner Sinkevičius, there are links between the climate crisis and the issue of refugees coming from amongst the most disadvantaged people in the world. These were the words of David Puttnam in his Shirley Williams memorial lecture last week. Many refugees come from the developing world and the global south. We made a promise to developing countries in Copenhagen in 2009 that we would provide them with USD 100 billion of climate finance. Living up to our promises can help achieve this. It can also strengthen the practices and the efforts of indigenous people to address and respond to climate change. We must also listen to women. Women often have a strong body of knowledge and expertise that can be used in climate change mitigation, disaster reduction and adaptation strategies. Nations with greater female representation in positions of power have smaller carbon footprints.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Mr President, the ambitious Paris climate accord has committed almost the entire world to reduce the increase of global temperatures in the next decades. With the recent earthquakes, fires and floods, we have experienced how unpredictable our planet can be. These are warning signals that we must change something. We are not the masters of nature. These catastrophes will only increase if we don't stop global warming. In the recent Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) mission to Greenland, I have personally witnessed the urgency to act now.

The EU has taken a leading role with its Green Deal and the Fit for 55 programme, and even the new European Power House, through which we try to create a healthier, safer, more aesthetic and sustainable environment for future generations. We should work on energy diversification and independence. I welcome the dedication of the G7 to accelerate their efforts, ensuring that the largest global economies are engaging in a race towards climate neutrality.

At the COP26 in Glasgow, participants should take stock of the efforts undertaken and renew the consensus needed to preserve the planet.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, aplaudimos los acuerdos globales de la Conferencia de las Partes en la Convención Marco de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Cambio Climático y esta CP de Glasgow; estos objetivos están unidos a los fondos NextGenerationEU, con los que pretendemos transformar nuestra movilidad, nuestra economía y nuestros hábitos de consumo y avanzar en sostenibilidad y resiliencia, pero, con la misma energía, recordamos que esos objetivos y principios se transforman en hechos a nivel local.

Hay potentes alianzas regionales, como la que preside el País Vasco, que ofrecen compromiso, trabajo y liderazgo desde la proximidad: necesitan reconocimiento y una participación real en la gestión de estas herramientas. Por eso sería conveniente que estas cumbres acojan una participación local y regional más intensa y que se cumpla el mecanismo de participación local y regional que establece el Reglamento que regula los fondos.

¿Es esta por eso una de las medidas que va a defender la Comisión para garantizar progresos significativos en la CP26? Espero con interés su respuesta, señor comisario.

Eleonora Evi (Verts/ALE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi sono i tribunali a ricordare ai governi gli impegni che hanno preso per lottare contro la crisi climatica.

Oggi è l'Agenzia internazionale per l'energia – e quindi non un gruppo di ambientalisti, estremisti radical chic – che ci dice che è necessario cambiare radicalmente, in maniera totale, il settore dell'energia e che non c'è più spazio per le fonti fossili. Oggi questo Parlamento europeo chiede per l'ennesima volta di fermare i sussidi alle fonti fossili in vista della COP a Glasgow.

In Italia invece cosa succede? Il ministro per la Transizione ecologica fa di tutto per cercare di rallentarla, la definisce «un bagno di sangue», alimentando una narrazione del terrore che spaventa cittadini e imprese. Addirittura ha fatto scadere i termini per il piano PiTESAI, di fatto consentendo la ripresa dei permessi per le trivellazioni, in totale contrasto con le raccomandazioni europee e internazionali.

Basta raccontare bugie, perché la trasformazione in chiave ecologica della nostra società, se guidata con coraggio, porterà enormi opportunità e posti di lavoro.

Agnès Evren (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, la COP 26 est un événement capital. L'Union européenne s'est engagée à être le premier continent neutre en carbone en 2050 et c'est tant mieux. Force est de constater qu'avec le paquet climat, les promesses se sont traduites en actions concrètes. Mais, à nous seuls, nous ne représentons que 10 % des émissions mondiales. Autant dire que sans approche globale et sans engagement mondial lors de la COP 26, nous n'irons pas bien loin.

Il est donc urgent d'augmenter les investissements dans les pays en voie de développement et d'ériger en priorité absolue la sortie du charbon dans le monde d'ici 2050. Mais pour cela, il nous faut cesser d'être naïfs. Il faut également que la Commission européenne fasse preuve de courage sur une énergie essentielle à la mise en œuvre de nos objectifs: le nucléaire. Comment se fait-il que nous ne sachions toujours pas, malgré les conclusions de plusieurs groupes d'experts en ce sens, si le nucléaire sera bien inclus par la Commission européenne dans la taxonomie? Comment est-ce possible qu'à l'heure de la flambée des prix de l'énergie, de la nécessaire décarbonation de notre mix énergétique, nous en soyons toujours à nous poser la question du soutien à une énergie non émettrice de carbone et peu coûteuse?

Mes chers collègues, le succès de la COP 26 doit être construit sur notre expérience et notre réalisme, pas sur une idéologie mortifère qui refuse de croire en l'innovation et voudrait nous faire penser que nous devons décroître pour progresser.

Karin Karlsbro (Renew). – Herr Talman, kollegor och kommissionär! Vi kan inte säga att vi inte vet, att vi inte kan. Ansvar för att rädda klimatet är vårt. Det går om vi vill.

Jag är stolt över att EU bestämt sig för att vara världens mest ambitiösa miljöorganisation, över att Europa ska leda genom att agera.

Utsläppen måste ner globalt. Ingenting skulle vara så effektivt som ett globalt pris på koldioxid. Förorenaren måste betala även utanför EU. Importerade utsläpp kan inte längre vara gratis. Det ska helt enkelt vara dyrt att släppa ut. Vi måste sluta sponsra koldioxidutsläpp. Alla subventioner till fossila bränslen måste bort.

För varje dag som går då vi inte uppfyller klimatmålen blir läget alltmer akut. Elektrifiering, ny teknik, modern kärnkraft, stopp för fossila bränslen är det som behövs. Det går om vi vill.

Karima Delli (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Représentant du Conseil, mes chers collègues, en matière de climat, la question n'est pas d'être pessimiste ou optimiste, mais réaliste. Va-t-on écouter les scientifiques? Va-t-on écouter cette vérité qui dérange?

Le succès de cette COP26 ne se fera pas sur des mots ni sur des promesses, mais sur des faits et des outils pour tenir nos engagements. Alors, qu'attendons-nous? Qu'attendez-vous? Nous sommes submergés. Notre planète, nos populations sont emportées par le même tsunami. Une apocalypse inarrêtable si nous n'agissons pas maintenant. Nous sommes à un point de bascule: soit c'est l'action, soit c'est la mort. Et que proposons-nous? Une série de mesurette dictées par des intérêts économiques. Sur le transport – moi qui suis présidente de la commission des transports –, rien n'est réellement proposé.

Alors, allons-nous nous réveiller? La COP26 est la dernière opportunité de balayer devant notre porte, de faire de l'Europe la cheffe de file sur la bataille du climat. Qu'elle mette fin maintenant aux énergies fossiles, notamment, et qu'elle soit également l'exemple de la neutralité carbone. Mais je vous le dis, quoi qu'il advienne à Glasgow, il y aura un avant et un après. L'histoire retiendra ceux qui font preuve de courage et d'ambition. Mais l'histoire n'oubliera jamais ceux qui sont dans l'inaction et la résignation.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, the UN climate summit in Glasgow is just around the corner, and it is disappointing to hear that expectations for progress are low, even in the year when the effects of climate change are so apparent. We've seen floods, hurricanes, wildfires and killer heatwaves growing in frequency and intensity with spiralling impacts on economies and societies. The cost of adaptation in the future will far exceed the cost of action now. This is why the green transition is fundamental for our future economic development. The key word here is 'transition'. This must be managed responsibly, but it cannot be used as a means to reduce ambition to serve short-term interests. Too often, this is the case with national governments.

The European Union was critical in building the coalition needed to conclude the Paris Agreement in 2015, which I was honoured to attend on behalf of Parliament. Success in Glasgow may again depend on EU leadership. We all took hope from the accomplishment in Paris but, tragically, annual global greenhouse gas emissions continue to rise. At this point, we were supposed to come back and increase ambition. Instead, we do not see the global political will for a variety of reasons. We've discussed at length the deepening energy crisis, and with hostility between the US and China, the two top greenhouse gas emitters, the EU must ensure it takes the lead in Glasgow. Europe must act, but Europe must not act alone. The other big emitters must step up to the plate.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, jasno je da je konferencija u Glasgowu jedna od posljednjih, ako ne i posljednja prilika, posljednja šansa da spriječimo potpuni klimatski kolaps, klimatsku katastrofu. Mislim da to konačno svi skupa shvaćamo i ne želim ponavljati non-stop jedno te isto, jer kako bi rekla najpoznatija klimatska aktivistkinja: „Ma dosta je više bla bla bla politike i ispraznih govora svih tih političara.”

Naime, mi baratamo velikim riječima, ali djela izostaju. Uzet ću samo jedan primjer – promet. Promet je, naravno, najveći klimatski problem za Europu, koji oko 30 % emisija CO₂ emitira, a u tih 30 % – 72 % je cestovni promet i cilj je bio da do 2020. ostvarimo 10 % obnovljivih izvora energije. upravo u tom prometu. I nismo to ostvarili. I ništa.

Ma nemojmo više tako raditi! Dakle, ne više bla bla bla, nego realni ostvarivi ciljevi i hitna financijska pomoć za njih, posebice u zemljama s manjim BDP-om po stanovniku, kao što je to Hrvatska.

Maria Spyraki (PPE). – Mr President, the UN Climate Change Conference in November is a unique opportunity for the EU to lead once again, this time to reduce methane emissions, which is the second gas responsible for raising the temperature in the planet after CO₂.

President von der Leyen and US President Biden have already announced the global methane pledge, an initiative to reduce global methane emissions to be launched at the COP26. The European Union and eight countries have already declared their support for the global methane pledge. These countries include six of the top 15 methane emitters globally and together account for over one fifth of global methane emissions and nearly half of the global economy.

Starting from COP26, methane emissions reduction should be a top priority for the EU's climate diplomacy. For this reason, it is our duty as the EU to take the lead and proceed with actions within the context of the EU's diplomacy and external relations. This should follow a UN-based path to spearhead a binding international agreement on methane mitigation.

The European Union has a duty as a global leader to continue to enlist additional countries to join the global methane pledge. The next 10 years will be very crucial. We do not have a second chance because we do not have a second planet.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, like a lot of other speakers, I recognise the importance of COP26, but I am not optimistic about the outcome. On the one hand, we have so many governments who know the right thing to do but don't know how to turn that to electoral advantage. On the other hand, as was said in France in 2017, there are millions of people for whom the end of the world is far less a pressing issue than the end of the month as far as their pocket is concerned. So it is my view that, until we have a binding, justiciable international agreement based on a minimum carbon price, while acknowledging the specific vulnerabilities of developing countries, we're setting ourselves up for failure.

The Paris Climate Accord is voluntary and based on two degrees of warming that I don't think anybody believes is achievable at this point. Climate change is driving disease, conflict and migration – sometimes all three at once. Seeing it as a security issue might help. Otherwise, I feel that we are relying on the intellect, the activism and, frankly, the idealism of the next generation to clean up our mess.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like once again to thank the honourable Members for raising this important issue in this House. Today's debate has clearly provided additional political momentum.

I have listened carefully to your interventions and I am encouraged by your support and by your commitment to maintain the European Union's role as a leader in the field of international climate action. Strong and united European Union messaging will be instrumental to deliver on our leadership during COP26 in Glasgow and beyond.

Let me briefly address just a few of the many issues you raised today. Many of you have mentioned the fact that we need to better mainstream climate into all policies, and I could not agree more. I also highlighted this in my introductory remarks. You mentioned transport, agriculture, trade and many more. This is a collective responsibility, a collective task for us all: the Commission, the Member States and the European Parliament. You have also pointed to the fact that others need to follow our ambition – and yes, this will be our ambition in Glasgow, and this is what we are working for at full speed. The EU accounts for only an 8% – and decreasing – share of global emissions. We need all countries to join the global race to zero emissions. If they do, we will all win.

This is what my colleague, Frans Timmermans, is doing right now: reaching out to our partner countries all over the world and encouraging them to join this global race. And here I have to comment on what Ms Bentele said. She thinks that the EU needs a climate envoy like John Kerry. Well, let me be very clear: I could not imagine a better climate envoy than Frans Timmermans already is. He is a respected, efficient and passionate fighter for our common cause, and he's well supported by the Green Deal team in the Commission, of which I am proud to be part.

So yes, we will need to hear from other parties – but also from the private sector – how quickly we can expect the phasing out of coal and the internal combustion engine and how quickly we can expect the phasing in of technologies and energy sources, such as the scaling up of renewables and the production of the use of green hydrogen.

Finally, many of you have made it very clear today that we have had enough words and we now need action. As far as our EU goals are concerned, our Fit for 55 package is our proposal for action. It's exactly the action we need to translate our noble objectives into concrete steps. So I count on this House and on the Council to proceed as efficiently as possible with your legislative work on this very complex package, and I can only reassure you that the Commission will assist and support you in this work where necessary.

I am convinced that the European Commission and the Council, under the leadership of the Slovenian Presidency, will contribute to the adoption of a comprehensive and balanced Glasgow outcome, which will ensure an ambitious global response to climate change and which will keep the 1.5°C goal within reach, in line with the Paris Agreement and in light of science. After Glasgow, our work must continue, both domestically and internationally. With our domestic experience and external policy instruments and dialogues, we are in a position to help our partners to advance their transition to a low-carbon, climate-resilient economy.

Thank you again for the opportunity to have this debate. I look forward to continuing our dialogue in the future.

Anže Logar, *predsedujoči Svetu*. – Spoštovane poslanke, komisar, gospe in gospodje, ob koncu se želim zahvaliti za današnjo razpravo. Svet z zanimanjem pričakuje prispevek Parlamenta k razpravi pred konferenco pogodbenic v Glasgowu. Pozorno bomo proučili resolucijo, ki jo nameravate sprejeti v kratkem.

Mednarodna angažiranost z močnim, na pravilih temelječem multilateralizmom, je ključna za doseganje uspešnih rezultatov pri spoprijemanju s podnebnimi spremembami. Vsi se strinjamo, da je potrebna znatno večja ambicioznost na globalni ravni, če naj se v Glasgowu dogovorimo o zavezah, pri katerih bo cilj 1,5 stopinj Celzija, gledano skupaj, še vedno dosegljiv.

Vendar pa podatek, da v Glasgow ne bo predsednika Ruske federacije Putina najverjetneje v fizični obliki, tudi ne predsednika največje, najbolj naseljene države na svetu, torej Kitajske, ni dobra popotnica za globalno doseglo skupnega cilja.

Po drugi strani pa je Evropska unija odločena, da v Glasgowu naredi vse, kar je v njeni moči, in da od tam odide s trdnim pariškim pravilnikom in močnejšo podnebno ambicioznostjo na globalni ravni skladno z dolgoročnimi cilji Pariškega sporazuma. Hvala lepa za današnjo razpravo.

Presidente. – O debate está encerrado.

A votação realizar-se-á ainda hoje, e a votação final, amanhã.

Declarações escritas (artigo 171.º)

Sara Cerdas (S&D), *por escrito*. – A Conferência das Nações Unidas sobre Alterações Climáticas em Glasgow, no Reino Unido (COP 26), a realizar-se entre os dias 31 de outubro e 12 de novembro, tem o potencial de ser um dos momentos mais marcantes na história da nossa luta contra as alterações climáticas. O impacto da COP 15, que gerou o Acordo de Paris, é bem conhecido, mas esta próxima conferência pretenderá passar à fase de implementação. Para tal, precisamos de mais compromisso e empenho nesta luta e, em específico, na redução de emissões. À semelhança dos esforços da União Europeia, também os restantes Estados deverão apresentar ambiciosas contribuições nacionalmente determinadas que permitam atingir o objetivo de temperatura do Acordo de Paris: o único que garante a sobrevivência do nosso planeta e das futuras gerações. Deverão também ser intensificados os compromissos de financiamento de medidas de mitigação e adaptação às alterações climáticas, em que especial consideração deve ser dada aos países com baixo e médio rendimento e mais vulneráveis aos impactos negativos das alterações climáticas. Apenas com esforços coletivos e mundiais conseguiremos alcançar a descarbonização da economia que se pretende atingir com a atual transição climática e energética, tendo em vista a neutralidade climática em 2050.

Pedro Marques (S&D), *por escrito*. – A União Europeia tem demonstrado o seu compromisso na luta contra as alterações climáticas. Seja com metas ambiciosas de redução de emissões, seja com fundos europeus destacados para esta prioridade. Mas medir o sucesso da transição verde exige mais critérios. Em primeiro lugar, a inclusão social. Queremos uma transição justa, que não deixe ninguém para trás. Não há que escolher entre cuidar do planeta e cuidar das pessoas. Queremos os 2. Em segundo lugar, a adesão internacional. Esta é uma luta de todos, por todos. A Europa pode liderar por exemplo, mas não pode fazer este caminho sozinha. É preciso chamar à responsabilidade todos os países, todos os protagonistas. A COP26 de Glasgow é, por isso, um momento fundamental de coordenação e cooperação. Contamos que seja também um momento de compromisso e mudança.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – A vigésima sexta Conferência das Nações Unidas sobre o Clima (COP26), que se realiza em Glasgow entre 1 e 13 de novembro deste ano, não pode ser mais uma cimeira marcada por grandes proclamações, títulos sonantes na imprensa e focada apenas na definição de objetivos ambiciosos, que, sendo importantes, são também claramente insuficientes para que uma descarbonização efetiva e sustentável aconteça. É necessária uma análise de malha mais fina que conduza a ações que garantam uma transição justa, em que não sejam os mais pobres e os mais desfavorecidos a pagar os custos da mudança, envolvendo os indivíduos, as famílias e as comunidades num desafio que estruturalmente melhore as suas vidas, não apenas no plano da qualidade do ar e da proteção contra as catástrofes naturais, mas também na redução das desigualdades económicas e sociais e na preservação da biodiversidade. O aumento dos preços da energia que tem marcado a retoma económica pós-pandemia à escala global demonstra que são precisas medidas urgentes, designadamente na melhor regulação dos mercados e nas medidas de desincentivo à utilização de combustíveis fósseis e de incentivo à produção de energias limpas e às práticas energeticamente eficientes, incluindo o investimento em melhores interligações e na armazenagem.

(A sessão é suspensa às 13h34)

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

8. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(The sitting resumed at 15.05)

9. Nagroda im. Sacharowa za 2021 rok (ogłoszenie laureata)

President. – Ladies and gentlemen, colleagues, it is a particular honour for me to announce the decision of the Conference of Presidents of today, to award the Sakharov Prize 2021 to Aleksei Navalny, Russian anti-corruption activist and an advocate for change.

Aleksei Navalny has showed great courage in his attempts to restore the freedom of choice to the Russian people. For many years he has fought for human rights and fundamental freedoms in his country. This has cost him his freedom and nearly his life. On behalf of the European Parliament, I call for his immediate and unconditional release.

All harassment, intimidation and attacks against the opposition, civil society and media by the Russian authorities must stop.

Today, the Parliament has also honoured a group of Afghan women, by committing to the organisation of a full week of activities to raise attention to their situation. We are talking about a group of women such as Shaharзад Akbar, Mary Akrami, Zarifa Ghafari, Palwasha Hassan, Freshta Karim, Sahraa Karimi, Metra Mehran, Horia Mosadiq, Sima Samar, Habiba Sarabi and Anisa Shaheed. They have all fiercely fought for equality and human rights, and the European Parliament wants to honour these women's bravery, as they are among the first to suffer violations of their most basic rights and freedoms after the Taliban seized control of their country.

Colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, today is testament to the commitment of this House to the people of Russia and Afghanistan who yearn for a life without fear. We are with you. Together we will see that freedom will prevail; that democracy will prevail.

10. Nasilenie prawicowego ekstremizmu i rasizmu w Europie (w związku z niedawnymi wydarzeniami w Rzymie) (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on the rise of right-wing extremism and racism in Europe (in light of recent events in Rome) (2021/2933(RSP)).

Anže Logar, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, the EU is built on diversity and tolerance. However, extremisms are still present in different forms. The COVID-19 pandemic has put our societies under additional pressure and exacerbated risks for extremist behaviour. There is evidence from different sources such as the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights and the Council of Europe, or the European Union Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment ('EU SOCTA 2021') by Europol, that confirms an alarming increase in intolerance, hatred and extremism in Europe.

I would like to emphasise that our Union was conceived and developed as a project of solidarity, cooperation and tolerance. These values are quintessential to our project and need to be defended in a decisive manner.

Last December, the European Council underlined the importance of combating incitement to hatred and violence, as well as intolerance. At that meeting, the European Council stated that it was essential to prevent radicalisation and address the ideologies behind terrorism and violent extremism, including online.

It is particularly important to respond to the risk of extremism in a timely manner. We need to react to it at an earlier stage of its emergence. Early identification of radicalisation that can lead to violent extremism and even terrorism, and the identification of drivers of radicalisation are of crucial importance. Prevention of fertile grounds for radicalisation is also important. Extremism and racism are spread, notably over the Internet, through disinformation campaigns, conspiracy theories, terrorist content, illegal hate speech, challenging the functioning of our democracy and other possible occasions.

As you know, the Commission has adopted a number of important initiatives to respond to those challenges, the most recent being the first EU strategy on combating anti-Semitism and fostering Jewish life. The Presidency attaches great importance to combating illegal content online. We aim to reach a general approach on the Digital Services Act by the end of November.

On 28 October 2021, the Slovenian Presidency is organising jointly with the Commission a virtual conference to discuss how to effectively combat hate crime and hate speech, with a particular focus on combating hate speech online and on the protection of victims of hate crime.

There is no better way to fight extremism and racism than education and open public debate. We have a lot of experience and best practice to share among ourselves to improve democratic resilience, media literacy, critical thinking and conflict resolution skills.

I would like to conclude by stressing how important it is to prevent our societies from becoming dominated by hatred. We are therefore obliged to take all incidents of that kind seriously and never ignore them. We shall be respectful to each other.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the terrorist attacks in Christchurch, Hull and Hanau are strong and very worrying signals of how violent right-wing extremism is posing an increasing threat globally.

Recently, violent right-wing extremist groups have also used COVID-related conspiracy theories and disinformation to incite violence. In Rome, on 9 October, a neo-fascist group used a demonstration against COVID-related measures to unleash chaos on the city and attack the headquarters of a trade union confederation. These facts also show that hatred, violence and intolerance are not only hiding in the dark corners of the web or in the inner circles of clandestine organisations. They have become more and more mainstream and risk erupting into public violence and undermining the stability of our democracies.

Article 2 of the Treaty of the European Union refers to a union founded on respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities, of course.

I firmly believe that if we are to uphold our fundamental EU values and to apply the fundamental rights enshrined in the Charter, we need a prompt and comprehensive response to the rise of violent extremism, as well as racism and xenophobia. No compromise is possible.

This Commission decided to tackle these issues openly and on all fronts. From a legislative perspective, the regulation addressing the dissemination of terrorist content online will oblige internet service providers to remove all forms of terrorist content within one hour of receiving a removal order by an EU Member State, while making sure fundamental rights are respected. At the same time, under the EU Internet Forum, guidance to internet platforms on proscribed violent, right-wing extremist groups, symbols and manifestos, is under preparation to support them in their content moderation efforts.

The Commission is also working with Member States to agree on a common, non-legally binding, working definition of violent right-wing extremism, to facilitate their identification and information-sharing about the phenomenon.

In September 2020, we adopted an EU Anti-racism Action Plan establishing the main policy actions for the next five years. Racism needs to be addressed at all levels of governance and through different measures. That is why the EU Anti-racism Action Plan includes not only legislative measures, but also measures addressing social attitudes, stereotypes and economic concerns. The Action Plan also refers to ongoing Commission initiatives to address extremist propaganda and to support the safety and security of public spaces, like places of worship or other establishments that could be targeted by extremists.

The Commission has appointed a new coordinator on anti-racism because we would like to have a more direct dialogue with communities and civil society. In addition, two weeks ago, the Commission adopted the first-ever EU strategy on combating antisemitism and fostering Jewish life. Antisemitism is incompatible with EU values. Yet, nine out of ten Jews in Europe consider that antisemitism has increased in their country. With this strategy, the Commission is determined to significantly step up the fight against antisemitism. It is Europe's long-term commitment to a safe, inclusive future for our Jewish communities and Jewish life in all its diversity in the EU.

At the same time, we see increasing evidence of anti-Muslim hatred throughout the EU. Attacks, such as the one in Hanau, were also fuelled by anti-migrant and anti-Muslim sentiments. The European Commission will continue to work with the European Muslim community in a long-term commitment to a safe, inclusive future for our Muslim communities and Muslim life in all its diversity in the EU.

Furthermore, we often observe a continuum between the spread of hate speech or hateful conspiracies circulating online and episodes of violence or hate crime inspired by right-wing extremist ideologies. Racist and xenophobic hate speech is illegal under EU law. The Commission is seeing to the proper transposition and implementation of this legislation through dialogue with Member States and, where needed, infringement procedures.

In the last 12 months, the Commission has launched 10 infringement proceedings against Member States. With a view to enhancing the criminal law response to hate crime and hate speech, the Commission is working on an initiative which aims to extend the current list of EU crimes in the treaties to include hate speech and hate crime. To respond to the online dimension of illegal hate speech, the Commission has also developed a voluntary code of conduct with major social media platforms. The code has achieved fast progress on removing online hate speech. We have seen removal rates go up from 28% in our first monitoring in 2016 to a removal rate of up to 71% in 2020. The most recent evaluation, published on 7 October, shows a slight decrease in the average removal rate, while a large majority of the notices were reviewed within the 24-hours prescribed by the code.

The proposal for a Digital Services Act tackles all forms of illegal online content across Member States. All these initiatives have contributed to progress. We constantly speak to Member State authorities, civil society organisations, as well as IT companies to address right-wing violent extremism and its manifestation of intolerance and racism.

There is no single solution or a single actor that can win in isolation. We have to work together and join forces to protect our democracies and protect our common values.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

Viči President

Javier Zarzalejos, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, permítame unirme a las palabras de la Presidencia en el anuncio del Premio Sájarov y en el reconocimiento debido por este Parlamento a las mujeres afganas.

Lo primero en mi intervención es expresar la condena más absoluta, más radical, por los actos de violencia que nos traen a este debate. Tenemos plena confianza en la actuación de las autoridades italianas, que sabemos que están afrontando esta amenaza con toda determinación y con todos los instrumentos legales y constitucionales a su alcance para impedir que nadie que utilice, que justifique o que exalte la violencia pueda tener cabida en un sistema democrático. A nosotros nos toca ahora apoyar a la sociedad italiana y a sus autoridades, y así lo quiero hacer aquí.

La violencia se combate con las armas del Estado de Derecho. No se le ofrece acomodo ni en las calles ni en las instituciones. Es una amenaza para la democracia lo que nos trae aquí a debatir, y es una amenaza para la seguridad de los europeos y sus libertades. En el mundo real y ahora, de manera muy preocupante, también, en el mundo digital.

Efectivamente, tenemos motivos para preocuparnos, porque ese radicalismo, ese fascismo en Europa asoma con diversas caras: la cara del fascismo antisemita que amenaza y profana y quiere perpetuar la violencia de persecución contra los judíos; el fascismo xenófobo que quiere sustituir la ley por el odio; ese fascismo nacionalista como el que agrede y amenaza a jóvenes militantes de mi partido en el País Vasco y silencia por la fuerza a organizaciones cívicas defensoras de la Constitución en Cataluña —como ha ocurrido con la Asociación Universitaria S'ha Acabat! recientemente en Barcelona— ; y ese populismo fascista que habla del pueblo pero lo divide y lo enfrenta.

Los sistemas democráticos en Europa se enfrentan a la presión polarizadora de los extremos, que constituyen la peor herencia de los totalitarismos que hemos sufrido. Por eso, ninguna tolerancia, ningún compromiso con los que utilizan la violencia. Ni cuando dicen que utilizan la violencia para defender a la nación ni cuando dicen que agreden a policías para hacer la revolución social.

Brando Benifei, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, «il Parlamento europeo esorta gli Stati membri a vietare i gruppi neofascisti e neonazisti e qualsiasi altra fondazione o associazione che esalta e glorifica il nazismo e il fascismo», questo dice la risoluzione intitolata «Aumento della violenza neofascista in Europa», approvata il 25 ottobre 2018.

Sono passati tre anni, ma le cose non sono migliorate. A Roma formazioni di ispirazione neofascista hanno infiltrato movimenti di protesta, assaltando e devastando la sede nazionale Cgil, cent'anni dopo simili attacchi dei fascisti di Mussolini. Parliamo del più grande sindacato italiano, a cui voglio portare anche da qui la solidarietà del nostro gruppo parlamentare, come già fatto scendendo in piazza questo weekend, al segretario Maurizio Landini, agli altri sindacati e leader sindacali italiani.

La destra ultranazionalista di questo Parlamento ha fallito cercando di impedire questo dibattito, oggi necessario. Ma come ho detto all'inizio, il Parlamento europeo ha già una posizione chiara, in linea con quanto chiede anche il Partito Democratico in Italia: le formazioni neofasciste e neonaziste, come Forza Nuova e non solo, vanno sciolte.

Serve una reazione dura. Grazie alle inchieste della stampa libera, a Fanpage e a Piazzapulita in Italia, abbiamo scoperto che questa galassia nera cerca di infiltrare anche i partiti con finanziamenti e scegliendo persone di riferimento.

Alla destra europea e italiana chiedo meno reticenza, meno balbettii quando bisogna difendere insieme la nostra democrazia dall'eversione. Mi rivolgo a Giorgia Meloni e a Matteo Salvini, abbiamo visto da parte vostra troppa timidezza nel riconoscere la matrice politica evidente di questi attacchi. Vergognatevi almeno un po' e provate per una volta a essere all'altezza della storia dell'Europa uscita dal nazifascismo e della Costituzione italiana, nata dal sacrificio di sangue della Resistenza.

Nicola Danti, a nome del gruppo Renew. – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, era dal 1922, cioè da pochi mesi prima dell'avvento del regime fascista, che in Italia una sede sindacale non era attaccata da gruppi estremisti.

Questo evento, con il carico simbolico e la rilevanza mediatica che porta, segna un cambio di passo nella strategia politica dei gruppi di estrema destra, portando la propria azione da piccoli eventi politici a una dimensione di evidenza nazionale.

Davanti a questa recrudescenza abbiamo bisogno di dare un segnale forte di intransigenza verso la violenza e la violazione delle regole del vivere civile, segnale che dovrebbe accomunare tutte le forze politiche democratiche di destra e di sinistra senza se e senza ma. Unità che però non abbiamo riscontrato a causa delle parole troppo indulgenti dei partiti della destra italiana.

Anni di propaganda populista e nazionalista hanno contribuito a creare una base culturale su cui oggi attecchiscono con facilità forze che si richiamano agli anni bui dell'Europa. Questi movimenti neofascisti hanno dimostrato di avere una forte capacità di penetrare negli spazi di emarginazione, sfruttando e alimentando, soprattutto attraverso la rete, le paure delle persone, costruendo nemici, siano essi rappresentati dagli immigrati o, come in questo caso, dai vaccini e dal Green Pass.

Ma l'intransigenza non basta, serve togliere al motore di questa destra estremista la benzina, affrontare i problemi alla radice, fare una profonda operazione culturale di memoria, soprattutto per i più giovani.

Presidente, vorrei concludere ricordando che uno dei responsabili di questo attacco alla sede della Cgil è stato deputato di questo Parlamento e che in passato finanziamenti destinati a partiti politici europei sono stati erogati anche a forze estremiste. Mi auguro che, in questo Parlamento, i suoi organi facciano i necessari approfondimenti per evitare che tutto ciò accada di nuovo.

Ignazio Corrao, a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è vero, in Italia il virus del fascismo esiste ancora, ma per fortuna ha dimensioni marginali e il paese che ne ha vissuto la catastrofe e lo ha sconfitto sul campo ha sviluppato anticorpi efficaci.

L'attacco al sindacato a Roma, che ricorda la pagina più buia della nostra storia, è un atto osceno che dovrebbe essere condannato da tutti, senza alcuna eccezione. Purtroppo invece vari partiti istituzionali in Europa strizzano l'occhio a fascisti e violenti. È il caso in Italia di Fratelli d'Italia e della Lega, che usano un linguaggio ambiguo e non riescono a rinnegare fascismo e fascisti.

Ci sono però delle cose da spiegare su questi fatti. In primo luogo, questi gruppetti, composti soprattutto da ultras e fanatici, sono numericamente molto limitati e i suoi componenti sono ben conosciuti alle forze dell'ordine italiane. Dovremmo chiederci perché, durante manifestazioni pacifiche, questi siano stati lasciati liberi di generare caos, con le forze dell'ordine infiltrate tra i violenti o impegnate a reprimere il lato pacifico della manifestazione. È successo a Roma, è successo in passato tante volte e sta continuando a succedere.

Le manifestazioni in Italia contro l'uso del Green Pass per poter lavorare non sono manifestazioni fasciste, vi partecipano persone che soffrono un forte disagio sociale e che hanno diritto a manifestarlo, visto che nessun paese nell'Unione europea applica sul lavoro le imposizioni previste in Italia dal governo Draghi.

Violenti e neofascisti fanno in realtà il gioco di chi vuole reprimere il dissenso e in Italia questa cosa purtroppo non è una novità.

Paolo Borchia, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, strumentale, decontestualizzato e di parte: così sintetizzo questo dibattito autorizzato con ingiustificabile superficialità da parte della Conferenza dei presidenti, perché oltre ai fatti di Roma ce ne sono stati di analoghi accaduti a Milano ma, visto che sono stati provocati da anarco-insurrezionalisti, qualcuno ha fatto finta di nulla.

Il mio gruppo ha segnalato in Conferenza dei presidenti che un rapporto del 2020 di Europol sottolinea come i casi di violenza siano stati originati per la maggior parte da gruppi di sinistra e non di destra, ma questo non è stato tenuto in considerazione. Poi leggo il titolo del dibattito e mi pongo una domanda: ma cosa c'entra il razzismo con i fatti di Roma? Aprite gli occhi, perché la gente è spaventata dalle bollette, dall'inflazione, dalla povertà, dalle conseguenze post-pandemia. È una società spaccata tra garantiti e non garantiti.

Condanniamo le violenze alla Cgil, Commissaria, sì, le condanniamo, ma non dimentichiamoci il silenzio seguito a numerosi attacchi alle sedi dell'UGL, un altro sindacato, un sindacato che non è di sinistra. Il mio partito, la Lega, ha subito centinaia di aggressioni negli ultimi mesi, e voi muti. Anche negli ultimi giorni ci sono stati episodi legati al radicalismo islamico, e voi muti.

Cari colleghi di sinistra, perché non chiedete un dibattito anche su questi episodi e la smettete di trattare quest'Aula come se fosse il giardino di casa vostra? Questa è la plenaria del Parlamento europeo, non è una sede di partito.

Raffaele Fitto, a nome del gruppo ECR. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io sono sinceramente stranito dalla relazione della Commissaria. Siamo qui per un dibattito dove dal titolo al merito si usano due pesi e due misure.

La premessa è d'obbligo, la solidarietà piena alla Cgil per quello che è accaduto a Roma, così come è assolutamente d'obbligo condannare «senza se e senza ma» ogni atto violento e ogni infiltrazione di associazioni o movimenti che possano richiamarsi al neofascismo, così come si richiamano alle posizioni anarco-comuniste.

Perché Lei oggi qui, cara Commissaria, non ha fatto cenno al rapporto Europol. Allora, se Lei non vi ha fatto cenno, glielo ricordo rapidamente. Perché basta leggere il rapporto Europol per capire che gli estremismi, da una parte e dall'altra, vanno condannati con forza, vanno condannati con durezza. 98 arresti nel 2019, 24 nel 2020 in Italia, 22 attacchi nel 2019, 24 nel 2020, solo uno viene ricondotto all'estremismo di destra, che noi condanniamo con forza, ma non è possibile non dire una parola su tutto il resto, non è possibile assumere in quest'Aula le posizioni dal punto di vista istituzionale mettendo in campo un dibattito che è privo del racconto reale di ciò che è accaduto.

Perché se in Italia è accaduto quello che è accaduto, Lei avrebbe dovuto, così come quest'Aula avrebbe dovuto sottolineare le gravissime responsabilità nel sistema di gestione della sicurezza del nostro paese, che hanno portato il nostro partito a chiedere le dimissioni del ministro dell'Interno.

Perché la manifestazione verso e contro la sede della Cgil è stata guidata da un signore che è oggetto di un provvedimento che non gli avrebbe consentito di essere in piazza e la stessa ministra, rispondendo a un'interrogazione in Parlamento, ha detto che non si è intervenuti per non procurare violenza, a differenza di quanto invece è accaduto a Milano e di quanto è accaduto nelle scorse ore a Trieste.

Ecco perché a noi non va bene questa impostazione. Ecco perché questo dibattito appare fazioso. Ecco perché noi non abbiamo alcuna difficoltà a condannare con decisione tutti gli atti che possono essere ricondotti a estremismi, che non fanno bene e che non devono far parte del dibattito civile e democratico del nostro paese in Europa.

Ma non possiamo accettare un'impostazione come quella alla quale stiamo assistendo oggi, non possiamo accettare che la rappresentante della Commissione venga qui per raccontare in modo parziale e fazioso un racconto che non corrisponde alla realtà dei fatti. Non possiamo accettare che qui vengano poste delle condizioni per poter parlare di alcune manifestazioni e non di altre manifestazioni.

Vedete, quello che è accaduto in Italia è molto grave. Così come è grave anche quello che è accaduto successivamente, perché esprimere la solidarietà, cercare di allontanare in qualsiasi modo condannando posizioni di questo tipo non può voler dire in alcun modo trasformare questa vicenda in un attacco al principale partito di opposizione. Perché questo è accaduto in Italia, è accaduto esattamente il contrario di quello che ci si sarebbe aspettato da un dibattito del genere, ed ecco perché noi vogliamo, con molta chiarezza, esprimere un giudizio fortemente negativo su questa impostazione.

Vedete, sono giorni che noi discutiamo della Polonia la mattina e il pomeriggio, il giorno dopo dell'Italia, immaginando che ci sia un racconto che viene fatto in questo Parlamento che non corrisponde in alcun modo a quella che è la realtà dei fatti. Ecco perché non abbiamo alcuna paura di esprimere con forza e con chiarezza la nostra posizione e lo facciamo con la consapevolezza che il nostro rapporto e il nostro impegno è assolutamente accordato con l'interesse dei cittadini e che condanniamo con forza qualsiasi posizione estrema e violenta.

Marc Botenga, a nome del gruppo *The Left*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche noi eravamo a Roma in solidarietà con la Cgil. E siccome parliamo dell'Italia, parliamone.

L'Italia oggi è l'unico paese dell'Unione europea dove la gente vive peggio di trent'anni fa, i lavoratori guadagnano meno di trent'anni fa, e questo è il risultato concreto, chiaramente, di politiche, politiche portate dal governo, certo, di centrosinistra, ma anche di destra ed estrema destra. E la gente è arrabbiata, stufa, e ha ragione. Ha ragione di manifestare. E in quel contesto l'estrema destra cosa fa? Vuole canalizzare, deviare la rabbia della gente non contro i 50 miliardari, la Benetton, Berlusconi, Ferrero, ecc., no, non contro di loro, ma contro prima i migranti, adesso i sindacati, la Cgil e i sindacati di base, quali che siano; nello scontro fra lavoratori e multinazionali l'estrema destra picchia o divide la classe operaia.

Allora, come ci si oppone? Siamo chiari, abbiamo bisogno di puntare il dito innanzitutto contro i veri responsabili di questa crisi sociale, e questi sono, certo, le politiche tradizionali, Commissione europea e governi nazionali, ma anche quelle grandi imprese, quelle grandi aziende che ora sfruttano i lavoratori in Italia e altrove in Europa.

Cambiamo politica. Basta far pagare i lavoratori. Piuttosto che sbloccare i licenziamenti aumentiamo gli stipendi, qualcosa che la destra non proporrà mai. E se il piano di rilancio europeo non serve a niente, non serve a questo, non servirà a niente.

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η ανησυχία της ΕΕ και του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου για την άνοδο της ακροδεξιάς και του ρατσισμού στην Ευρώπη είναι υποκριτική. Αυτό αποδεικνύει το άθλιο κατασκεύασμα των δύο άκρων, της εξίσωσης του κομμουνισμού με το τέρας του φασισμού, που αναμασούν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και οι κυβερνήσεις, η παραχάραξη της ιστορίας, ο αντικομμουνισμός και οι απαγορεύσεις κομμουνιστικών κομμάτων. Αυτά τροφοδοτούν και ξεπλένουν τόσο την ακροδεξιά, όσο και τις φασιστικές δυνάμεις. Τις τροφοδοτεί η πολιτική των απελάσεων, των επαναπροωθήσεων και οι υπερδομές-φυλακές για πρόσφυγες και μετανάστες, που καλλιεργούν τον ρατσισμό.

Οι επιθέσεις ακροδεξιών και φασιστών στη Ρώμη, όπως και η δολοφονική δράση φασιστικών εγκληματικών ομάδων στην Ελλάδα, έχουν τη στήριξη μηχανισμών του αστικού κράτους και αστυνομικών δυνάμεων και καλύπτονται από κυβερνητικά στελέχη.

Έναν χρόνο από την καταδίκη της εγκληματικής και ναζιστικής Χρυσής Αυγής, είναι εξοργιστική η αποφυλάκιση στελέχους της. Κανένας εφησυχασμός. Ο φασισμός και το σύστημα που τον γεννά, ο καπιταλισμός, έχουν κοινή βάση την εξουσία των μονοπωλίων. Οι λαοί με την οργάνωση και την πάλη τους έχουν τη δύναμη να απομονώσουν αυτές τις συμμορίες και να εξαλείψουν τις αιτίες που γεννούν τον φασισμό.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Pani predsedajúca, rozumiem, že niektorým Európanom po roku pandémie, ktorá obmedzila nám všetkým životy, sa žiada hlasno vyjadriť svoj nesúhlas s nariadeniami, ktoré prijímajú jednotlivé vlády. Nemôžeme však dovoliť, aby im zlosť zatienila oči a uverili fašistom a populistom. Extrémisti dnes robia to isté, čo kedysi robil Hitler. Priživujú sa na nešťastí a hovoria ľuďom to, čo sa im páči, a nie to, čo je potrebné. Dnes nestačí len zachraňovať zdravie a sociálne podmienky či pracovné miesta. Dnes musíme bojovať proti populistom a fašistom, ktorí pod rúškom ľúbivých slov šíria nenávisť, štvú ľudí a popritom získavajú na popularite. Sú medzi nimi tí istí fašisti, ktorí popierajú holokaust. Tí istí agresori, ktorí nabádajú k násiliu na uliciach. Ich ambíciou nie je zachraňovať životy či zdravie ľudí alebo zachraňovať pracovné miesta. Ich jedinou ambíciou je dostať sa k moci, po ktorej túžia. Nenávisť, ktorú neonacisti šíria, je hrozbou, ktorú nemôžeme podceňovať. Sám som ako etnický Róm objektom rôznych útokov. Vyhrážky o fyzickej likvidácii mňa a mojej rodiny zašli tak ďaleko, že sme museli mať policajnú ochranu pred tými istými fašistami a agresormi, ktorí dnes burcujú proti opatreniam. To, čo sa v súčasnosti odohráva nielen v Taliansku, je naliehavou výzvou pre celú Európsku úniu. Musíme lepšie s ľuďmi komunikovať. Ľudia sa nemôžu báť, že skončia bez príjmu v neistote. Musíme sa však postaviť k tým, ktorí šíria ideológiu fašizmu a extrémizmu, ako ku zločincovi, pretože fašizmus nemá nič spoločné so slobodou slova. Fašizmus je zločin.

Marek Belka (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! „Spójrzcie, jak wciąż sprawna, jak dobrze się trzyma w naszym stuleciu nienawiści. Jak lekko bierze wysokie przeszkody, jakie to łatwe dla niej – skoczyć, dopaść.” Słowa piosenki Hanny Banaszak, polskiej piosenkarki, co chwila zyskują na aktualności w kolejnych miejscach świata. Mieszkańcy Waszyngtonu, Rzymu czy Warszawy to tylko jedni z wielu ofiar terroryzmu głupoty, agresji, której celami są nie tylko budynki, instytucje i porządek, ale przede wszystkim wiedza, autorytety, rozsądek i ludzka solidarność. Ani człowiek przebrany za bizona plądrujący Kapitol, ani Czarne Koszule w Rzymie atakujące biura związków zawodowych, ani nawet tzw. „patrioci” zagłuszający uczestniczki Powstania Warszawskiego nie mają programu, wizji, celu innego niż chaos i zniszczenie. Barbarzyńcy XXI wieku nawet nie próbują prowadzić dyskusji, w ich rozumieniu o kształcie świata decydować powinien argument siły.

Nasza Wspólnota powstała na popiołach i gruzach Europy doświadczonej nienawiścią – tego nie wolno nam zapomnieć. Tu nie ma miejsca na żadną historyczną reasumpcję. Kiedy wandale rozpalają nam w salonie ognisko, a jako podpałki używają naszych rodzinnych pamiątek, nie możemy tylko biernie się przyglądać. Wszyscy wspólnie musimy potrafić się temu przeciwstawić.

Powtarzając za przesiedlonym w czasie II wojny światowej do Litzmannstadt Ghetto, a następnie więzionym w Auschwitz Marianem Turskim: „Europa, nie bądź obojętna, bo jeśli nie, to się nawet nie obejrzysz, jak na ciebie, jak na twoich mieszkańców jakieś Auschwitz nagle spadnie (...).”

Sandro Gozi (Renew). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la mobilitazione contro i duri attacchi alla sede della Cgil ha mandato un messaggio molto chiaro all'Europa intera: l'Italia ha gli anticorpi per difendersi dal virus fascista.

Certo, è vero, c'è chi insegue alcune minoranze, no vax, no pass, c'è chi soffia sul malcontento, c'è chi, è incredibile, dà ancora residenza politica a gente che nel ventunesimo secolo pensa di fare politica con il braccio destro teso, che attacca gli ebrei, che attacca i migranti, che attacca le libertà sessuali. Ecco perché, onorevole Fitto, è essenziale che tutte le forze parlamentari, anche l'estrema destra come il Suo gruppo, taglino completamente i ponti con i violenti senza ambiguità.

Noi aspettiamo parole chiare, aspettiamo anche atti convincenti. Lo dico in particolare al gruppo ECR e al gruppo ID, secondo me anche oggi avete perso un'occasione importante, perché, anziché attaccare il vero problema di questo continente, che non è il fascismo, ma il nazionalismo e il populismo, avete attaccato la Commissione europea. Straordinario. E questa è la divisione secondo me profonda, al di là dei dibattiti sulla Storia, che non mi interessano, non credo che ci sia un pericolo fascista, non credo che ci siano dei partiti fascisti né in Italia né altrove.

La differenza però tra noi e voi, quando si parla di estremismo, è che noi riteniamo che l'Unione europea debba agire per lo Stato di diritto, debba agire per le libertà fondamentali, che quando facciamo i dibattiti sullo Stato di diritto non sia un'indebita ingerenza nella sovranità di uno Stato membro. Voi invece pensate che la sovranità sia assoluta, talmente assoluta che in modo assoluto può anche comprimere libertà fondamentali e lo Stato di diritto.

Se c'è un dibattito vero, per cui anche questo dibattito di oggi è utile, è marcare le differenze. Credo che noi dovremmo continuare a batterci per lo Stato di diritto e le libertà fondamentali in tutto il nostro continente.

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman! Att vara demokrat kommer med uppgiften att reagera instinktivt mot dem som med hot och våld försöker skrämman andra människor till tystnad.

Vi folkvalda har ett alldeles särskilt ansvar att stå längst fram i ledet i kampen mot rasismen och extremismen. Vi ska konkretisera det demokratiska motståndets nolltolerans mot dem som inte respekterar demokratiska spelregler. Den politiker som relativiserar och inte med tydlighet tar avstånd från de antidemokratiska krafterna, är en politiker som ger dessa krafter kraft och möjligheter.

Så vem vill du vara? Den som möjliggör rasismen, hatet och våldet? Eller vill du vara den som gör motstånd?

Jean-Lin Lacapelle (ID). – Chère Présidente, chers collègues, le Parlement européen consacre un débat entier à dénigrer ses adversaires en les qualifiant d'extrêmes droites, terme qui n'est qu'un élément de langage qui vous sert d'épouvantail pour attaquer tous ceux qui se détournent de la ligne officielle et qui bousculent votre système et sa pensée. Hier la Pologne, aujourd'hui l'Italie.

Avec votre idéologie *Woke*, vous n'hésitez pas à condamner notre histoire et à qualifier nos mœurs et notre culture d'idéologies relevant de l'extrême droite. L'extrême droite est partout. En revanche, quand en Ukraine des bataillons arborant des symboles nazis combattent les Russes, vous faites silence, car ils servent vos intérêts et votre idéologie sectaire. Quand le mouvement islamiste Milli Görüs organise en Europe la cinquième colonne nationaliste du dictateur Erdoğan, on ne vous entend plus. Vous parlez d'extrême droite, mais vous construisez une Europe carcérale et sectaire.

Et malgré les avertissements graves, comme le Brexit, vous êtes incapables de la moindre remise en question de votre fonctionnement. Les Européens sont de moins en moins dupes de vos manœuvres. Ils savent que lorsque vous les qualifiez d'extrêmes droites, vous tentez de disqualifier les seuls défenseurs de la liberté, de la démocratie et de la souveraineté. Votre Europe fédérale est un échec depuis 40 ans. Elle s'éteindra pour donner place à celle que nous appelons de nos vœux: une grande Europe des nations et des peuples libres.

Nicola Procaccini (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Partito Democratico ha ottenuto giovedì scorso che si tenesse questo dibattito, pensando forse di mettere in difficoltà il centrodestra italiano a pochi giorni dalle elezioni amministrative.

Ecco, io voglio ricordare a me stesso e a tutta l'Aula che il capo delegazione del Partito Democratico è uno di quelli che hanno votato contro la risoluzione di condanna di fascismo, nazismo e comunismo.

Questo dibattito è una vergogna, perché sporca vigliaccamente l'immagine dell'Italia all'estero e perché muove da un fatto inesistente; non esiste alcuna escalation dell'estremismo di destra in Europa, tantomeno a Roma. C'è stato un solo deprecabile episodio causato da pochi criminali già noti alle forze dell'ordine e a margine di una manifestazione pacifica di protesta contro l'obbligo di Green Pass per poter lavorare. Fine, nient'altro.

Ma sono contento che si faccia questo dibattito, così ci date modo di parlare del rapporto 2021 di Europol sul terrorismo religioso e politico nell'Unione europea. Qui c'è scritto che gli unici attentati politici avvenuti in Italia sono di estrema sinistra, 24, e c'è scritto che gli unici attentati avvenuti in Europa di estrema sinistra sono avvenuti in Italia. Questo c'è scritto.

Mentre dai dati di Eurojust, l'agenzia, veniamo a sapere dell'escalation dei processi per attentati terroristici in Italia: ben 42 nell'ultimo anno, 19 di natura jihadista, 23 di sinistra, 0 per quanto riguarda l'estrema destra.

Nelle stesse ore in cui la sinistra otteneva la celebrazione di questo dibattito, l'Europa veniva bagnata dal sangue di David Amess, deputato conservatore britannico accoltellato a morte da un jihadista dentro una chiesa, e cinque passanti in Danimarca, quasi tutte donne, venivano uccise a caso da un jihadista con arco e frecce. Ecco, temo che di questo qui dentro non parleremo mai.

Sira Rego (The Left). – Señora presidenta, seguro que les suena: defensa del modo de vida europeo; proteger nuestras fronteras de la invasión de inmigrantes; la violencia de género no existe y el cambio climático, tampoco; erradicar la ideología LGTBI; dictadura progre; estercolero multicultural... Esta narrativa forma parte cotidiana de nuestros días, es el marco necesario para que progresen las políticas de extrema derecha, pero también es el paso previo para la escalada violenta de los nuevos fascismos: agresiones a personas LGTBI, tiroteos a migrantes, justificación de crímenes nazis y fascistas, masacres terroristas y —el último episodio— el asalto a la sede del sindicato mayoritario italiano.

No es casual que sea contra la organización de trabajadores y trabajadoras: la guerra que ha abierto a la extrema derecha contra los derechos se dirige de forma certera contra los lugares que representan los intereses de la gente trabajadora; ellos nunca se equivocan de bando, siempre con las élites, siempre contra los pueblos.

Extirpar su narrativa, desplegar Estado social, garantizar derechos para todas: esa es la mejor vacuna contra el avance de la extrema derecha, y recordar cada día que para ser demócrata hay que ser antifascista.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i recenti eventi di Roma hanno riacceso l'attenzione sulla pericolosità dei gruppi di estrema destra, che usano la violenza sia fisica che morale come metodo della propria azione politica. Sono anche l'ennesimo segnale di un crescente fenomeno che interessa ogni Stato membro dell'Unione europea.

Le aggressioni squadriste subite da un sindacato e da un presidio ospedaliero, avvenute con il coinvolgimento di esponenti di una forza politica di estrema destra, sono oggetto in Italia di un dibattito sulla legittima richiesta di scioglimento dei movimenti politici di ispirazione fascista.

Con l'intenzione di acquisire proseliti e popolarità, gruppi estremisti e violenti strumentalizzano il disagio di fasce sociali derivante dal contesto emergenziale e sanitario in corso con lo scopo di colpire i simboli della democrazia, delle istituzioni, delle libertà civili, alimentando la retorica dell'odio, la xenofobia, il razzismo e altre forme di intolleranza.

Queste condotte vili e deprecabili che nessuna risposta forniscono alle problematiche riguardanti lavoro, sicurezza e salute, sono un insulto ai valori delle società democratiche e vanno condannate e perseguite fermamente.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, paní komisařko, vážené dámy a pánové, s demokracií je to někdy jako s instantní kávou. Vypadá to jako káva, voní to jako káva, někomu to chutná jako káva, ale v žádném případě to káva není. Demokracie je křehká věc a já nechci využívat půdu Evropského parlamentu k vyřizování politických účtů. Když přišli nacisti do České republiky, tehdejšího Československa, tak moje rodina byla první na řadě. Když přišli komunisti k moci v tehdejší Československu, tak moje rodina byla první na řadě. Každý ten extrém zleva nebo zprava přináší jednu věc, a tu mají společnou. Žádná lež jim není svatá. My nechceme, aby tady vládli extremisté. My nechceme vracet Evropu zpátky do kolejí, které už tady prostě měly skončit. My nechceme nikoho, kdo bude ostrakizovat druhého pro jeho názor. My chceme pluralitu, ale není možné akceptovat, když někdo přichází s extrémními názory a snaží se tyto extrémní názory, které jsou postaveny na lži, veřejně prezentovat. Myslím si, že i demokracie má své hranice, a o těch se dneska bavme.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non avrei mai voluto oggi qui in Aula un dibattito come questo, ma quanto è successo nel mio paese con l'attacco squadrista alla sede di un sindacato, la Cgil, da parte di soggetti appartenenti a Forza Nuova e ad altre organizzazioni di estrema destra merita una risposta ferma e decisa, anche da parte di questo Parlamento.

Quando si assiste ad atti con evidenti matrici neofasciste, con la premeditazione nella scelta di obiettivi da colpire e l'utilizzo della violenza quale metodo di azione politica per attaccare la democrazia, le istituzioni e i sindacati non si possono fare i distinguo che ho sentito anche qui dentro.

E fatti come questi non si devono nemmeno derubricare a gesti di pochi e isolati individui violenti, come invece è successo nel mio paese, anche da parte di partiti presenti in Parlamento, con la volontà precisa di minimizzare in modo ambiguo e irresponsabile l'ispirazione di queste organizzazioni politiche all'eredità fascista dalla quale non si riesce mai a prendere le distanze fino in fondo.

Ma occhio, perché l'attacco alla democrazia non arriva solo dalle manifestazioni degli estremisti di destra, ma passa anche dagli insulti razzisti. Passa anche in Europa da leggi illiberali che cancellano i diritti delle minoranze, le libertà di espressione, passa dalla costruzione di muri, dalla cultura dell'intolleranza, dal populismo, dal nazionalismo, dalla retorica delle facili soluzioni. Ecco perché serve una presa di posizione netta di tutto il Parlamento, senza esclusioni. E ricordo che questo dibattito è stato voluto non dal Partito Democratico, ma è stato votato dalla maggioranza dei gruppi nella Conferenza dei presidenti.

Serve però anche, e concludo, un rinnovato impegno di fronte alle crisi di oggi, per l'integrazione europea, per la democrazia, i diritti umani e lo Stato di diritto con cui abbiamo assicurato in Europa pace e prosperità per decenni.

Romeo Franz (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die rechtsradikalen Gewaltexzesse in Rom reihen sich in den europaweiten Trend der Radikalisierung rechter Hetze und steigenden Gewaltbereitschaft der politischen Rechten ein. Das ist traurig und empörend.

In Coronazeiten hat sich dieses Phänomen verstärkt. In Vicenza wurde im August eine Bombe auf ein Sinti-Camp geworfen. Menschen werden aufgrund ihrer Ethnie oder Hautfarbe zum Sündenbock gemacht. Menschen mit Romani-Hintergrund wurden zum Teil von der Polizei geschlagen, gedemütigt, in ihren Vierteln eingesperrt, ohne Zugang zu Trinkwasser und Gesundheitsversorgung. Politiker hetzen gegen Roma und bezeichnen sie als Überträger von COVID-19. Antiziganismus und Antisemitismus wurden durch Verschwörungstheorien angeheizt.

Auch in diesem Haus haben wir wohlbekannte Akteure, deren rassistische Parolen wir ertragen müssen, wie zum Beispiel Herrn Dzhambazki oder Herrn Zanni. Verehrte Mitglieder dieser Fraktionen: Sie tragen hier in meinen Augen Mitverantwortung für diese bedauernswerten Fälle rechtsextremer Gewalt in den Städten Europas.

Meine Damen und Herren, wir müssen als demokratische Kräfte gegen diese Akteure zusammenstehen. Wir haben bestimmt unterschiedliche Meinungen, welche Maßnahmen gegen die Pandemie am effektivsten sind. Aber klar ist doch: Wir führen darüber Diskussionen im Rahmen demokratischer Werte und nicht, indem wir hetzen und als geistige Brandstifter Angst und Schrecken auf der Straße verbreiten. Wir müssen alle Teile unserer Gesellschaft vor diesem rechten Hass schützen. Wir brauchen endlich verbindliche Maßnahmen.

(Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Simona Baldassarre (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i regimi nazisti e comunisti hanno commesso omicidi di massa, genocidi e deportazioni, causando nel corso del ventesimo secolo perdite di vite umane e di libertà di una portata inaudita. Questo abbiamo ricordato nella risoluzione sulla memoria europea di inizio legislatura.

Noi ne siamo ancora convinti e condanniamo ogni totalitarismo. La violenza va sempre condannata, tutta, da quella dei facinorosi che hanno invaso la Cgil a Roma a quella dei black bloc o dei centri sociali.

È per questo che ci opponiamo all'uso strumentale con cui la sinistra lancia falsi allarmi per dividere e mistificare. Secondo Europol l'Italia l'anno scorso non ha avuto episodi di terrorismo di estrema destra, mentre ben 23 sono stati gli attacchi violenti di gruppi di estrema sinistra e anarchici, e nel 2018 siamo stati il paese europeo più colpito da attacchi di estrema sinistra.

Come diceva Leonardo Sciascia, il più bell'esemplare di fascista in cui ci si possa imbattere oggi è quello del sedicente antifascista unicamente dedito a dare del fascista a chi fascista non è.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πολύ επικαρη η συζήτηση σήμερα, και συγχαρητήρια, κύριε Επίτροπε.

Ντρέπεται ο φασίστας να πει ότι είναι φασίστας, αλλά, επειδή τα γεγονότα της Ρώμης έρχονται σε συνδυασμό με τα γεγονότα των Αθηνών —θα μάθετε ότι βγήκαν οι ναζί στον δρόμο και ξυλοκοπούσαν τους ανθρώπους πάλι κατά τις τελευταίες ημέρες, ενώ αποφυλακίστηκε και ένας ναζιστής— θέλω να θέσω το θέμα λίγο διαφορετικά: είναι η ακροδεξιά θέμα αισθητικής;

Αν κάποιος με ναζιστικά σύμβολα στο σώμα του, με ξυρισμένο κεφάλι και με όλα τα αξεσουάρ που δημιουργούν concept βαρβάρου, όπου το αφήγημά του είναι η καθαρότητα της φυλής, του μίσους σε αλλόθρησκους, σε διαφορετικούς, σε ό,τι κρίνει αυτός ότι δεν πρέπει να υπάρχει, να ζει και να αναπνέει· και ένας άλλος, ευπρεπώς ενδεδυμένος, με καλές σπουδές, αποδέχεται την ουσία, τον πυρήνα των αντιλήψεων αυτών και τοποθετεί όλα αυτά στην κεντρική ατζέντα της πολιτικής του· ποιος από τους δύο είναι πιο επικίνδυνος; Ποιος από τους δύο δίνει κάλυψη στο έγκλημα; Ποιος από τους δύο δηλητηριάζει τις ψυχές των ανθρώπων; Και οι δύο. Γιατί ο ένας είναι το αφήγημα και ο άλλος είναι το όπλο.

Για αυτό, λοιπόν, σας καλώ, ειδικά το PPE, επειδή υπάρχουν κόμματα που καλύπτουν αυτές τις απόψεις, να φορέσετε κι εσείς στο πέτο σας αυτό το τρίγωνο που έχω εγώ και οι σύντροφοί μου, που δείχνει ότι είμαστε ενάντια στον ναζισμό και στον φασισμό.

Miroslav Radačovský (NI). – Pani predsedajúca, fašizmus, nacionalizmus, antisemitizmus, rasová nadradenosť, dve svetové vojny, gilotína, kolonializmus, otrokárstvo, koncentračné tábory je to najhoršie, čo mohol človek vytvoriť. Je však pravdou, že tvorcami týchto zvrátených ideológií historicky sú naši západoeurópski priatelia. My, kultúrne národy východnej Európy, sme nikdy tvorcami takýchto zvrátených ideológií neboli. Je preto povinnosťou nás, kultúrnych národov východnej Európy – Čechov, Slovákov, Poliakov, Maďarov – dbať a dozerať na to, aby v hlave našich priateľov a spolu s nimi nevznikla myšlienka vytvorenia opätovne akejsi ideológie, ktorou by ovládli celú Európu. To je našou povinnosťou. A na záver, ako Slovák som hrdý na to, že Slovensko má v prepočte na počet obyvateľov najviac ocenení Spravodliví medzi národmi: Jad va-šem.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Fru talman! Kollegor! Attackerna den 9 oktober mot fackförbundet CGIL i Italien är en attack mot demokratin och EU:s grundläggande värden. Jag är rädd att historien upprepas.

De första koncentrationslägren i Tyskland ämnades bland annat åt fackföreningsaktiva. Under Mussolinis tid förde fascisterna krig mot fackföreningsrörelsen i Italien och den 9 oktober i år attackerades CGIL av samma gamla mörkermän.

När normalisering av högerextremism sker, leder ord snabbt till handling. Fascism, nazism eller vad vi än väljer att kalla det är inte en åsikt. Det är ett brott!

Till alla här inne som hävdar att de är demokrater. Jag hoppas att ni inte normaliserar dessa vidriga åsikter genom att ingå samarbeten med dessa högerextremister, varken i detta parlament eller på hemmaplan på nationell nivå. I mitt land Sverige pågår dessvärre en farlig utveckling där traditionella konservativa partier, inklusive det liberala partiet, omfattat det högerextrema partiet Sverigedemokraterna.

Låt oss protestera högt i både ord och handling, för i dag är det fackföreningsrörelsen i Italien och i morgon är det var och en av oss här inne.

Salima Yenbou (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, le 2 juillet: Orbán, Le Pen, Salvini et d'autres leaders d'extrême droite signent une déclaration pour «réformer l'Europe». Les 23 et 24 septembre: Orbán leur déroule le tapis rouge lors d'un sommet à Budapest. Le 9 octobre: les leaders du parti Forza Nuova incitent la foule à la violence à Rome. Les 8 et 9 octobre: au sein de notre Parlement, lors de l'événement EYE, des jeunes Européens issus de minorités sont harcelés, leurs ateliers perturbés par d'autres jeunes invités par l'extrême droite française.

Oui, Madame la Commissaire, ils ne se cachent plus. C'est nous qui fermons les yeux. Nous avons tellement normalisé la violence, le racisme et la haine que même M^{me} Marine Le Pen n'est plus la candidate la plus radicale en France et que l'extrême droite, c'est aujourd'hui 33 %. Regardez l'exposition de Rainer Opolka en Allemagne, «Les loups sont de retour». Oui, l'heure est grave. Le bloc républicain et démocratique doit se rassembler et non se diviser sur des dogmatismes qui n'ont plus d'importance face à ces haines et à leurs conséquences.

President. – I understand that this is a very important debate, but can I recall — also for all the colleagues, and also those previous — that, according to Rule 10(3), Members shall not display banners, for everybody's information, in these kinds of debates.

Filip De Man (ID). – Voorzitter, collega's, dit is te gek voor woorden. In Rome richtten enkele heethoofden vernielingen aan en al meteen moet er hier een groot debat over racisme en fascisme komen. Niet in de gemeenteraad van Rome dus, nee, in de plenaire vergadering van het Europees Parlement.

Waarom? Die Forza Nuova in Italië behaalde 0,1 procent van de stemmen. Niet echt een gevaar voor de democratie. Men is hier zeer eenzijdig in de verontwaardiging. Over het vele linkse geweld in Italië wordt geen debat gevoerd. Evenmin een debat over de islamitische terreur die Europa treft. Geen woord bijvoorbeeld over de recente moordpartij door een moslim in Noorwegen. Geen woord over de Somaliër die vorig weekend een Engelse volksvertegenwoordiger doodde.

Collega's, we zouden ons beter bezighouden met de echte problemen: zorgen voor voldoende en betaalbare energie in plaats van die krankzinnige Green Deal, het versterken van onze economische slagkracht ten opzichte van China en natuurlijk het stoppen van de islamisering en de massale migratiestromen.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! A békés tüntetés joga mindenkit megillet. Az erőszak minden formáját el kell ugyanakkor utasítani, az agresszióra nem lehet mentség. Az azonban több mint érdekes, miért csak a szélsőjobb atrocitásai érik el az Európai Parlament ingerküszöbét. 2006 októberében a szocialista-liberális Gyurcsány-kormány alatt a dicsőséges magyar 56-os forradalomra emlékezők békés gyűlését verte szét a rendőrség. Nem emlékszem EP-vitára és elítélésre. A rendőrterror elrendelői ma a leeurópaibb pártnak hazudják magukat és önök ehhez asszisztálnak.

2016 szilveszterén migránsok tömegesen zaklattak nőket Kölnben. A német sajtó elhallgatta. Nem emlékszem EP-vitára. 2020-ban, 21-ben Baszkföldön, Madridban, a Vox kampányeseményén szélsőbaloldali provokátorok kővel dobálták meg a politikusokat. Nem emlékszem EP-vitára. Talán azért, mert ott a szélsőbaloldal a szocialistákkal közösen kormányoz? Múlt héten Milánóban és Torinóban baloldaliak és anarchisták káoszt okoztak. Erről miért nem beszélünk? Én csak annyit kérek, ez a ház végre mérjen egyenlő mércével. Elég abból, hogy a baloldalnak csak közepe, a jobboldalnak meg csak széle van. Elvárom, hogy az EP egyformán utasítsa el a jobbról és balról jövő agressziót.

Dietmar Köster (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Es ist einfach, die Menschenfeindlichkeit von Nazis zu belegen, wie das jüngst in Rom geschehen ist.

Aber deren menschenverachtende Ideologie ist schon längst in der sogenannten gesellschaftlichen Mitte angekommen. Diese Mitte ist alles andere als friedlich und neutral. Denn zur Mitte zählt sich auch, wer gefängnisartige Flüchtlingsunterkünfte rechtfertigt, wer eine brutale Grenzpolitik unterstützt, wer es rechtfertigt, dass täglich Menschen im Mittelmeer ertrinken, oder der Hasstiraden gegen den Staat Israel oder gegen queere Menschen akzeptiert.

Solange immer noch links und rechts gleichgestellt werden, gewinnen rechte Kräfte immer mehr an Einfluss, und in einem Klima der Akzeptanz ihrer Ideologie ist rechtsextremer Terror nicht weit. Deshalb müssen wir besonders die Narrative der Rechtsextremen bekämpfen und klar sagen: Faschismus ist keine Meinung, Faschismus ist Verbrechen.

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, la montée de l'extrême droite constitue une menace grave pour nos sociétés. En effet, l'extrême droite a utilisé la crise lors d'une manifestation à Rome pour propager ses idées racistes, fascistes et de fausses informations. Certains ont brandi le passeport sanitaire comme un frein à leur liberté. Dans toute l'Union européenne, des groupes d'extrême droite utilisent le passeport et la vaccination et ciblent les couches les plus vulnérables de la société avec leur théorie du complot. Ils trouvent dans ces communautés un terrain fertile pour leurs fausses informations et vont même jusqu'à se comparer aux victimes de l'Holocauste et de l'esclavage. Ceci est inacceptable.

Il est temps de s'attaquer à la montée du racisme qui gangrène la société partout en Europe. Lors des Rencontres de la jeunesse européenne, EYE 2021, ici à Strasbourg, au cœur de la démocratie, nous avons eu des faits similaires. Des jeunes d'extrême droite ont harcelé des jeunes filles musulmanes. Ils ont massivement perturbé les ateliers avec des diatribes haineuses et des propos racistes. Ne fermons pas les yeux. Combattons le racisme. Ce phénomène croissant est nuisible à la cohésion sociale dans nos États.

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Minister, Frau Kommissarin, worüber reden wir hier? Rechtsextreme Gewalt? Ernsthaft? Letzte Woche wurden in Stuttgart zwei Mitglieder der Antifa zu langjährigen Haftstrafen verurteilt, weil sie drei Mitglieder einer konservativen Gewerkschaft halb totgeschlagen hatten. Reaktion des EU-Parlaments und von Frau Dalli: null.

In Leipzig reichten kürzlich 1 300 Polizisten nicht, um die Antifa in Schach zu halten. Schwere Steinplatten wurden von den Häusern auf Polizisten geworfen – das sind klare Mordversuche. Reaktion des EU-Parlaments und von Frau Dalli: null.

In Berlin reichten letzte Woche 3 500 Polizisten nicht, um ein linksextremes Lager zu räumen. Wieder kam es zu schweren Ausschreitungen, wieder wurden diverse Polizisten verletzt. Reaktion des EU-Parlaments und von Frau Dalli: null.

Vor allem die AfD sieht sich immer wieder schweren Attacken der Linksextremen ausgesetzt. Allein in Berlin wurden ungefähr 30 Autos von Mitgliedern der AfD angezündet, darunter auch meines. Unsere Wohnungen werden attackiert, unsere Büros, unsere Häuser, unsere Familienangehörigen, unsere Abgeordneten. Reaktion in jedem Fall: null.

Und deshalb, Frau Dalli, hier mal ein klarer Arbeitsauftrag: Wachen Sie endlich auf! Tun Sie etwas gegen den mörderischen Linksextremismus! Das wäre endlich mal eine vernünftige Aufgabe für Sie.

Massimiliano Smeriglio (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le violenze neofasciste di Roma, la deriva autoritaria polacca e di altri Stati, la costruzione di un'opinione pubblica antisistema alimentata da *fake* e ideologia no vax e la torsione razzista presente nella nostra società sono parte del medesimo fenomeno: la crescita del rancore sociale e di forme sempre più violente di lotta politica, favorite anche dalla crisi economica e sociale post-pandemia.

Esistono i fascisti, una minoranza, che vanno fermati, con ogni mezzo e in ogni paese dell'Unione a partire da interventi drastici di pubblica sicurezza. Ed esiste un fascismo diffuso, subculturale, che influenza centinaia di migliaia di persone e che dobbiamo combattere con la politica, il dialogo, la formazione politica e culturale e con interventi forti di inclusione sociale, di reddito e di lavoro.

Quello che abbiamo di fronte è un fenomeno mondiale che riguarda la fragilità delle nostre democrazie. Ed è un tema europeo. E noi da qui dobbiamo rilanciare politiche pubbliche capaci di contrastare il fenomeno.

Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for raising this very important discussion at the plenary today. As President von der Leyen stated in last year's State of the Union speech, hate is hate and no one should have to put up with it.

We have solid legislation for tackling racism, discrimination and extremist violence. We also have robust policy initiatives in place to support the Member States in undertaking their obligations, and we expect them to do their part.

This is not a battle between right and left, or between conservatives and progressives. It is a battle between the promoters of democracy, human rights and equality and those that reject these principles. At EU level, we have to take a clear stance and act accordingly, not only through words, but with concrete actions. We must all do our part, and I thank you for it.

Anže Logar, *predsedujoči Svetu*. – Spoštovani poslanci, predsedujoča, komisarka. Pluralizem, svoboda izražanja in strpnost so naše skupne vrednote. A jih moramo osvojiti in shranjevati vsak dan kot družba in kot individuumi. Zato so pomembni izobraževalni sistemi, javna razprava in verodostojno poročanje medijev.

Evropski svet je na tem področju v zadnjih letih okreplil svoje aktivnosti. Sprejel je na primer vrsto konkretnih ukrepov zoper nasilni ekstremizem in terorizem kot tudi sklepe o zunanjem delovanju Evropske unije na področju boja proti terorizmu in nasilnemu ekstremizmu.

Svet bo še naprej pozorno spremljal tovrstne razprave ter pravočasno in odločno opozarjal na vse odklone v smeri radikalizacije aktivnosti oziroma dialoga.

Il-President. – Id-dibattitu ngħalaq.

Stqarrijiet bil-miktub (Artikolu 171)

Stefania Zambelli (ID), *per iscritto*. – Un dibattito durante la Plenaria del Parlamento europeo sui pericoli connessi all'avanzata dell'estremismo di destra e del razzismo, alla luce dei fatti di Roma dello scorso 9 ottobre, è semplicemente lontano dalla realtà. Condanniamo senza se e senza ma, ogni tipologia di violenza. Ma parlare di pericolo di violenza fascista in Italia, quando secondo l'ultimo rapporto dell'Europol sulla violenza politica in Europa, in Italia sono avvenuti ben 24 attentati di stampo politico nel 2020 e tutti sono di estrema sinistra, è assolutamente fuorviante e sporca l'immagine dell'Italia in questo Parlamento e all'estero. Non possiamo accettare che le sedute plenarie vengano strumentalizzate da alcuni gruppi politici per dibattiti ideologici e faziosi.

Condanniamo invece ogni tipo di violenza, di qualsiasi matrice essa sia.

11. Skład komisji i delegacji

Il-President. – Il-Membri mhux affiljati nnotifikaw lill-President bid-deċizzjoni dwar il-bidla rigward ħatriet fi hdan kumitat. Din id-deċizzjoni ser tiġi inkluża fil-minuti tas-seduta tal-lum u għandha tidhol fis-sehh fid-data ta' din it-thab-bira.

12. Strategia UE na rzecz ograniczenia emisji metanu (debata)

Il-President. – Il-punt li jmiss fuq l-aġenda huwa r-rapport tal-Onor. Maria Spyraki dwar l-Istrategija tal-UE biex jitnaqqsu l-emissjonijiet tal-metan (2021/2006(INI)) (A9-0277/2021).

Maria Spyraki, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, methane is a powerful greenhouse gas, warming the planet 80 times as much as carbon dioxide over a 20-year period before degrading to CO₂. We should provide a fair, comprehensive and clear legislative framework, setting binding measures and methane reduction targets covering all sectors, leading to a significant reduction of methane emissions in the EU by 2030.

Ahead of COP26, a challenge is arising. By concluding a global agreement on reducing methane emissions, we can ensure a new era of fast-track reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. After the announcement by the President of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, and the US President, Joe Biden, of the Global Methane Pledge – an initiative to reduce global methane emissions to be launched at the UN Climate Conference in Glasgow in November — we have to start working intensively in order to prepare the legislative framework as soon as possible, and to engage all relevant stakeholders.

More than half of global methane emissions stem from human activities in three sectors: energy, waste and agriculture. In this framework, it is important to proceed with an ambitious revision of our environmental legislation. The upcoming methane regulatory measures should strive to achieve significant emissions reductions, swiftly and as cost-effectively as possible, and provide incentives and support to companies to achieve performance standards in an optimal manner, while fully respecting the 'polluter pays' principle.

In the energy sector, inputs account for over four-fifths of the oil and gas consumed in the EU, and most methane emissions associated with oil and gas are occurring outside EU borders. That's why we must explore regulatory tools on fossil energy inputs, develop methods with importing and partner countries to align our efforts, and secure a UN-based pathway on methane as soon as possible.

In the meantime, we could proceed with bilateral agreements with these exporting partner countries. It is necessary also to provide credible data, identify issues and efficient measures and assess the progress achieved. A mandatory MRV (Measurement, Reporting and Verification) system would improve Member States' reporting to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, and a strong leak and detection repair system is also a critical element for our strategy.

We should encourage the Commission to proceed with initiatives on the mitigation of methane from coal mines. It is important for us to include the closure of abandoned sites. In Greece, we have Western Macedonia and the Megalopolis Lignite Centre. It is important, finally, to ensure that we provide financial aid so that the cost will not be paid by our citizens.

We also have to support the establishment of an independent International Methane Emissions Observatory, in partnership with the United Nations Developmental Programme and the Climate and Clean Energy Coalition under the International Energy Agency (IEA).

At the same time, we need to ensure a just transition for sectors in which methane emissions reductions may have socio-economic impacts, especially for agriculture. We have to incentivise farmers and SMEs to adapt, provided that a lot of innovative best practices are in place. It is important to establish a framework that incentivises and rewards farmers, along with the entire value chain, and especially front runners for their efforts.

In the waste sector, we should support Member States and regions to stabilise biodegradable waste prior to disposal, increase its use to produce climate neutral, secure and bio-based materials and chemicals, and divert this waste towards bio-gas production.

We must provide specific incentives suited to each Member State's conditions to ensure separate collection of bio-waste, to the maximum possible extent, including by encouraging public private sector cooperation.

To conclude, I would like to thank all my colleagues and the shadow rapporteur for the collaboration and support during the negotiation process. We have managed to finalise a very balanced report and to send the right message to our citizens: by reducing methane now, we will prevent nearly 0.3 degrees Celsius of warming by 2045. The immediate implementation of methane reduction measures for human sources of methane could reduce methane emissions by as much as 45% by 2030.

As the President of the Commission declared, on the road to COP26, we will reach out to global partners to bring as many as possible on board for tackling methane emissions with the EU Green Deal and the EU Methane Strategy, we are ready to lead the way.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi, rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy. – Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteur and congratulate Ms Spyraiki on the very good, very balanced, report and for the good cooperation with the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE). I also congratulate Commissioner Kadri Simson on the good new strategy to reduce methane emissions. We need to strengthen the business case for capturing methane emissions.

The main points for ITRE: highlighting the role of gas in energy transition and also highlighting the work done so far by the gas industry; leak detection and repair (LDAR) and measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) as the key priorities to ensure better understanding of methane emissions to better data and more adequate reduction of emissions; compulsory MRV and LDAR framework that also includes imports in order to have an equal playing field for the industry.

We welcome the Commission's consideration of rules banning routine venting. We call for stronger measures and incentives for methane emissions in coalmines in a specific programme to address methane emissions from abandoned and closed coalmines. And finally, recognising the role of infrastructure operators in tackling methane leaks and calling for incentives.

Asger Christensen, *ordfører for udtalelse fra Landbrugsudvalget*. – Fru formand! Metanreduktion er ekstremt vigtigt, fordi det vi beslutter i dag, det kan vi se resultatet af i morgen. Som rapportør for landbrugsudvalget vil jeg gerne takke de øvrige udvalg for et fantastisk godt samarbejde, som vi har haft omkring denne betænkning. Mit mantra har været, at vi skal reducere metanudledningen og ikke produktionen. For mig er det helt afgørende, at vi ikke skubber landbrugsproduktionen ud af EU. Det vil kun gøre klimabelastningen større. Derfor skal vi fokusere på ny teknologi, innovation, som kan reducere metanudledningen. Det er helt nødvendigt, at vi bruger alle de værktøjer, der er i værktøjskassen. For eksempel nye foderadditiver, som kan reducere køernes metanudslip. Vi skal også blive bedre til at udnytte vores husdyrgødning til biogas. Her vil den nye teknologiske udvikling omkring biochar virkelig skubbe os i den rigtige retning. På den måde kan restprodukter fra landbruget bruges til at producere fornybar energi, grøn energi. Det er en win-win-situation for landmændene og for klimaet. Jeg er meget optimistisk med hensyn til, at vi nok skal finde de løsninger, der skal bruges, for at nå vores mål om metan. Strategien understreger, at landbruget er en del af løsningen på klimaudfordringen.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank honourable Members for inviting me to this timely discussion.

The Commission welcomes the Parliament's own-initiative report on our methane strategy prepared by Ms Spyraiki and its recommendations. Many of them are in line with, and endorse, the actions set out in the Commission's strategy.

Methane has accounted for roughly 30% of global warming since pre-industrial times and is proliferating faster than at any other time since record-keeping began in the 80s. The most rapid and cost effective methane emissions savings can be achieved in the energy sector. This is why we are preparing a legislative proposal to reduce methane emissions in the energy sector for adoption in December this year. It will rest on the following key pillars: improve the accuracy of information on the exact amounts and main sources of methane emissions to allow for more effective and more targeted methane abatement measures, and achieve immediate emission reductions across the energy supply chain by intervening on those fronts where action is possible. This includes mandatory leak detection and repair and limiting venting and flaring. We are also exploring the possibility to incentivise methane emission reductions outside the EU from our trading partners. The EU is a global fossil fuel importer and must use this leverage to foster methane emissions commitments among its suppliers.

This can only be a progressive process, and we will work on further measures once more accurate and reliable data becomes available. I also want to underline that, alongside this proposal, we have been working with our energy partners and other key fossil importing countries to tackle methane emissions globally. Thanks to EU energy diplomacy and partnership with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), in October 2020, the independent International Methane Emissions Observatory (IMEO) was created. Furthermore, in September 2021, the Union and the United States announced the Global Methane Pledge, which represents a political commitment to reduce collectively global methane emissions by 30% by 2030. So far, 36 countries have committed their support, representing one third of total world methane emissions. Many more are expected to join. The Pledge will be launched at the COP26 in Glasgow.

The European Parliament report also covers environmental legislation. We are now reviewing these parts and the options set out in the report in the ongoing impact assessments. Moreover, the revision of the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) will look into measures such as methane emissions from relevant sectors – agriculture, industry and energy – whilst ensuring that there is no overlap in regulation.

Agriculture also has a significant potential to deliver on methane emissions savings. A range of mitigation technologies and practices are available. These are mainly related to the improvement of animal diets, herd management, manure management and soil protection, breeding, herd health and animal welfare. The current common agricultural policy (CAP) is supporting mitigation actions for methane reduction in the livestock sector. In the post-2020 CAP, the higher level of flexibility will give Member States the possibility to design a specific combination of interventions for reducing emissions from agriculture. The Commission is encouraging Member States to include methane reduction schemes in their strategic plans for the CAP.

A significant share of global methane emissions in the agriculture sector originates outside of the EU. The Commission and the Member States have been very active in various international fora for reducing emissions from agriculture and agri-food systems.

In conclusion, I welcome the Spyraki report and take it as an encouragement for the Commission to move forward with these bold and concrete legislative measures. I am looking forward to continuing the excellent cooperation with the Parliament on this topic.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Peter Liese, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal herzlichen Dank an Maria Spyraki und herzlichen Glückwunsch zu dem Bericht, den sie vorgelegt hat.

Methan ist ein riesiges Problem: Es ist das zweitwichtigste Klimagas. Auch wenn es eine kürzere Lebensdauer als CO₂ hat, hat es doch ein erheblich höheres Treibhausgaspotenzial. Gerade die nächsten zehn Jahre – genau wissen wir es nicht, aber die nächsten Jahre – werden entscheidend sein, um gefährliche Kipppunkte im Klimasystem zu vermeiden, zum Beispiel das Auftauen der Permafrostböden in Sibirien. Also zu viel Methan in den nächsten zehn Jahren kann sehr, sehr viel Methan für unsere Kinder und Enkelkinder bedeuten, und dann können wir den Klimawandel nicht mehr in den Griff bekommen.

Aber ich bin sehr dafür, dass wir das Ganze nicht zu einem Streit zwischen Klimaschutz und Landwirtschaft machen. Landwirte sind Teil der Lösung. Sie bieten auch viele Senken an, zum Beispiel durch Humusaufbau oder nachhaltige Forstwirtschaft. Deswegen sollten wir sie nicht stigmatisieren, sondern gemeinsam mit den Landwirten an der Reduktion von Methanemissionen arbeiten.

Wir sollten im Gassektor Leckagen verhindern, und wir sollten endlich dafür sorgen, dass in ganz Europa kein Abfall mehr auf der Deponie landet. Das muss ein Ende haben, denn auch da entsteht Methan, und wir vernichten wichtige Rohstoffe, die unsere Kinder noch brauchen.

Und als Letztes: Frau Kommissarin, herzlichen Glückwunsch zu dem Abkommen mit den USA. Klimaschutz ist keine nationale oder rein europäische Aufgabe. Wir brauchen internationale Zusammenarbeit, und auf dem Weg müssen wir weitermachen.

Marcos Ros Sempere, *en nombre del Grupo S&D.* – Señora presidenta, cada día que pasa y no actuamos contra el cambio climático es un día perdido para las próximas generaciones y para nuestro planeta; el tiempo pasa: no podemos perder un segundo en conseguir el cumplimiento del Acuerdo de París y la reducción del 55 % de emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero para 2030.

El metano, después del CO₂, es el segundo mayor contribuyente al cambio climático y representa más del 10 % de las emisiones totales de gases de efecto invernadero en Europa; contribuye además a la formación de ozono en la atmósfera inferior, un potente contaminante del aire que causa graves problemas de salud.

Quiero agradecer a la ponente, la señora Spyraiki, y al resto de sus señorías el trabajo realizado para poder llegar a este informe, con el que estamos pidiendo a la Comisión que la estrategia de la Unión Europea para la reducción de emisiones de metano contemple la creación de un marco legislativo amplio respecto a las emisiones de metano, con medidas vinculantes en todos los sectores —energía, reciclaje, agrícola y ganadero, especialmente—; la imposición de medidas de control de emisiones en las importaciones, en toda la cadena de valor —la Unión Europea lidera las políticas de control, pero debe imponerlas a sus socios en el exterior—, y la prohibición de prácticas como el venteo y la combustión, así como la apuesta por la conversión de residuos agrarios y ganaderos en biogás y la implicación de los Estados miembros introduciendo medidas eficaces y sostenibles en sus planes estratégicos nacionales, que deben ser supervisados estrictamente por la Comisión. La Comisión debe incorporar estas y otras medidas contempladas en este informe en su propuesta legislativa, que presentará en diciembre, sobre la reducción de emisiones de metano en el sector energético.

No podemos decaer en nuestro empeño de que Europa sea el primer continente climáticamente neutro en 2050, materializando el Pacto Verde Europeo y contribuyendo al bienestar y a la salud de los ciudadanos actuales y de las generaciones futuras.

Martin Hojsík, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, we have to do the utmost to limit the global warming to 1.5 degrees. We got a taste this summer and honestly, I think we are standing on the brink of a climate disaster. But there is no chance to achieve this if we don't act on methane, if we don't properly act on methane, and act now, because honestly, we have overlooked it way too much.

I'm not going to repeat the words of Maria Spyraiki about potency and the timeline, but it's clear that we have something on our hands where we clearly need to act. Sadly, we don't really even have a proper overview. We see the releases of documentations about the previously unknown leaks all around the world, and this is something which needs to call us even more urgently to action. We need to act above all in the energy sector. MRV and LDAR – these might be shortcuts, but they are really important words. We need to ban routine flaring and venting, and we need to act at home and abroad, because not just climate has no boundaries, but most of our footprint is abroad. And it will provide a level playing field for European businesses.

We have to look at our agriculture – not just the cows' diet, our diet; together with the farmers, not against the farmers. We have to solve the landfills with circular economy, and we have to take methane to the global stage in Glasgow. I hope that we will see some proper action led by Europe there as well. Madam Commissioner, I hope that what we see from you is soon also an ambitious legislation that will not only deliver for this House but for our future.

Jutta Paulus, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I really want to thank especially Maria Spyraiki for her great leadership on this file and to all colleagues who have contributed so much to making this own-initiative report a really strong call for action.

Maria has already pointed out that we need to tackle all sectors. We must not focus only on the energy sector, as the Commission proposed in its methane strategy last year, but we need to focus on agriculture too, since this is the biggest contributor in the European Union, and the waste sector.

We have heard of the global methane pledge. Of course, this is a fantastic document of international cooperation but, unfortunately, it falls short of what is actually needed. A 45% reduction by 2030 is possible, and it is necessary if we want to stand a chance to get onto the 1.5 degree path, which is really important because our survival may hang on this number.

So we need binding targets for all sectors. I want to reiterate that measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) and the leak detection and repair programme (LDAR) should therefore be tackled in the legislation and not limited to the energy sector. And they have to be implemented as quickly as possible, for example by 2023. The same goes for venting and flaring. And, of course, we must extend our legislation to the imports, so give the suppliers a clear timeline for their right to export to the EU. They have to adhere to this legislation. But, of course, this must not be used as an excuse to prolong the use of fossil fuels. The phase-out of fossil fuels is the most valid instrument for reducing methane emissions in the energy sector.

Sylvia Limmer, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Nach CO₂ werden also die Methanemissionen angegangen, die – so der vorliegende Bericht – das zweitwichtigste Treibhausgas seien. Als Quellen werden ganz klar die Landwirtschaft mit 40 %, die fossilen Brennstoffe mit 35 % und die Abfallwirtschaft mit 20 % genannt.

Da nach grünem Selbstverständnis ein Ende der fossilen Energieträger aufgrund der CO₂-Emissionen möglichst gestern eh beschlossener Konsens ist, bleiben noch zwei Stellschrauben: Die Landwirtschaft – explizit die Viehhaltung – und die Stickstoffdüngung seien die Hauptquellen.

Die Lösungsansätze bleiben dennoch vage: vegane Ernährung, die Nutzung irgendwelcher Rückstände in Biogasanlagen – Dung gäbe es in der idealen veganen Welt nicht mehr – und dass „in einer Bioökonomie neue Fertigkeiten und neues Wissen“ irgendwie vom Klimahimmel fielen.

Den Stickstoffdünger bräuchte man übrigens in einer veganen Welt mehr denn je. Es mag ja stimmen, dass 53 % der Methanemissionen in der EU aus der Landwirtschaft stammen. Aber nur 5 % der weltweiten Emissionen stammen aus der EU, und damit beträgt der Anteil der landwirtschaftlichen Methanemissionen aus der EU global gesehen also nur 2,6 %.

Selbst wenn Sie auf der Stelle komplett auf die Nahrungsaufnahme verzichten, werden Sie die Welt nicht retten. Das ist die schlechte Botschaft. Die gute Nachricht ist – zumindest für mich –, dass über 6,5 Milliarden Menschen auf der Erde nicht von ihrer lächerlichen EU-Verbotspolitik betroffen sind.

Anna Zalewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Koleżanki i Koledzy! W sprawozdaniu czytamy o bardzo wielu wartościowych pomysłach i rozwiązaniach, ale niestety jest kilka, które budzą poważne wątpliwości i o których trzeba byłoby jednak powiedzieć. Po pierwsze, brakuje dokładnych analiz i rozwiązań, a przede wszystkim informacji o tym, ile już zrobiły przedsiębiorstwa w Unii Europejskiej, żeby osiągać różnego rodzaju rezultaty. Warto to odnotować, dlatego że od bardzo wielu lat prowadzona jest taka praca.

Po drugie, wątpliwości budzi jednak propozycja aktu prawnego z wiążącymi celami. Dlaczego? Dlatego że takie rozwiązania już są. Przecież razem pracujemy nad pakietem „Fit for 55”. Właściwie zaczęliśmy tę pracę i w kilku dokumentach rozwiązania dotyczące metanu już są. Naprawdę zbędna jest biurokracja.

Po trzecie, nie ma źródeł finansowania. Nie możemy wprowadzać kolejnych aktów, które są tylko pomysłem bez źródeł finansowania. I wreszcie, bez rozwiązań globalnych naprawdę nie uda nam się tego zrealizować. Nie wiem, czy Państwo wiedzą, ale budowa Nord Stream 2, którą przede wszystkim dwie grupy wspierają – S&D i EPP, została sprawdzona przez m.in. satelitę Kopernik i mamy tam systematycznie ogromne wycieki metanu. To my za to odpowiadamy, bo my, czyli Unia Europejska, współuczestniczymy w budowie Nord Stream 2.

Mick Wallace, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, there are many positives in this report, which calls on the Commission to propose for the first time a legislative framework specifically for methane, which would set binding measures and reduction targets for 2030, in line with science-based pathways for 1.5 degrees.

Farmers often feel that agriculture is the only sector being targeted, but this report acknowledges that methane emissions in the energy sector are also a huge problem. Therefore, we are asking for mandatory MRV, mandatory leak detection and repair, and a ban on routine venting and flaring for all fossil fuels placed on the EU market.

But agriculture is still by far and away the biggest source of methane emissions in the EU. We need to reduce livestock production and consumption. We should do this by targeting large-scale farms and by properly supporting family farms to prevent the further loss of family livestock farms and the further concentration and intensification of livestock farming.

Colm Markey (PPE). – Madam President, we all know that global warming is the challenge of our time, and after carbon, methane is key among the gases that we need to address. But if we are to solve the methane problem, we need to recognise the different sources of methane and the different approaches needed.

Biogenic methane is just one of the key sources that needs to be addressed.

Science recognises that biogenic methane is essentially a 12-year cycle, and we need to reduce the amount of methane being produced in that cycle by the animals, as opposed to an ideological and unrealistic position of eliminating the animals altogether.

Research and technology has shown us that we have tools. Things like dietary supplements, advances in breeding, manure management and greater use of pasture based systems can be key to solving the problem. I've put forward sensible, constructive, practical solutions that could create the framework to allow this to happen.

Farmers also want to play their part. They are probably closer to nature than anybody. For most farmers, their love of nature and the environment is the very reason why they became farmers in the first place.

I believe farmers who are closest to the problem are best placed to solve the problem, but we have to give them the tools and the chance to get on with it.

Nicolás González Casares (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, lo cierto es que reducir las emisiones de metano es una forma rápida y eficiente de lucha contra el cambio climático. La Unión Europea es el principal importador de gas y petróleo. Entre el 75 y el 90 % de las emisiones de metano están asociadas a combustibles fósiles importados y que se emiten fuera de la Unión. Por lo tanto, debemos trabajar para que esto lo contemple un marco legal, para que nuestras importaciones estén libres de metano.

Para eso necesitamos crear ese marco regulatorio robusto. Y en eso hemos trabajado en esta Estrategia. La esperada próxima propuesta reguladora de la Comisión en el sector de la energía es una oportunidad para implementar medidas obligatorias de detección y reparación de fugas, así como reglas para prohibir el venteo y la quema más allá de situaciones de seguridad con objetivos vinculantes.

Permítanme decir también que ni la ganadería ni el mundo rural son culpables de las emisiones de metano. Podemos trabajar con ellos. Podemos aprovechar las oportunidades que esto supone para el mundo rural en el ámbito de la economía circular y el aprovechamiento del biogás y del metano.

Mauri Pekkarinen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, se on sanottu jo monta kertaa, aiheutamme ilmakehään metaanipäästöjä paljon vähemmän kuin hiilidioksidipäästöjä ja metaanipäästöt pysyvät siellä huomattavasti lyhyemmän aikaa. Mutta metaanipäästöt ovat valtavan paljon vaarallisempia ja haitallisempia kuin muut kasvihuonekaasupäästöt. Siksi niiden kimppuun on käytävä.

Ihmisen aiheuttamista metaanipäästöistä maatalouden osuus on suurin, energian osuus toiseksi suurin. Energiasektorilla metaanivuotojen tunnistaminen ja virheiden korjaaminen maakaasuinfran osalta erityisesti on kiireinen tehtävä. Tässä satelliittiteknologia on avainasemassa runsaasti päästöjä tuottavien ongelmallisempien alueiden havaitsemisessa. Kiinnitän tässä kuitenkin erityistä huomiota maatalouden, lähinnä kotieläintalouden, metaanipäästöihin. Lannan ja lietteen metaanipäästöistä voidaan erittäin merkittävä osa tuottaa biokaasuksi, fossiilisia raaka-aineita korvaavaksi raaka-aineeksi. Prosessissa syntyy kaiken lisäksi kuiva-ainesta, joka soveltuu puolestaan erittäin hyvin biolannoitteeksi.

Osana Euroopan vihreän kehityksen ohjelmaa EU:n tulisikin edistää biokaasun tuotantoa jäsenvaltioissa. Eräissä jäsenvaltioissa onkin jo ryhdytty tällaisiin toimiin omatoimisesti. Metaanista tuotettu biokaasu soveltuu moniin eri tarkoituksiin: liikenteen polttoaineeksi ja lämmitykseen. Sitä voidaan myös nesteyttää, mikä edelleen laajentaa sen käyttömahdollisuuksia.

Herbert Dorfmann (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ja, Methan ist ein effizientes, leider sehr effizientes Treibhausgas, und ja, Reduktion ist natürlich ein wichtiges Ziel. Aber ich denke, die Debatte, die wir hier führen, muss auch auf wissenschaftlichen Fakten basieren. Deshalb muss man schauen: Woher kommt das Methan? Kommt es von Tieren? Wenn es von Tieren kommt, kommt es von Nutztieren oder kommt es von Wildtieren, die es auch in der Natur gibt, oder kommt es von anderen Faktoren wie zum Beispiel für die Energie genutztem Methangas?

Wie bereits mehrmals in dieser Debatte gesagt: Methan wird zum Glück in unserer Atmosphäre in 10 bis 12 Jahren abgebaut. Es geht also darum, zu schauen, ob der Viehbestand aufgestockt wird. Wenn er nicht aufgestockt wird, dann befindet sich dieses Methan ja in einem ungefähr zwölfjährigen Zyklus. Und die Aufstockung von Nutztierbeständen, die es leider in der Welt auch gegeben hat, findet vor allem außerhalb der Europäischen Union statt. Wenn man schaut, wie sich Tierbestände in den letzten zehn Jahren verändert haben, dann sind in manchen Teilen der Welt, aber nicht in der Europäischen Union, die Nutztierbestände regelrecht explodiert, und hier gilt es sicherlich anzusetzen.

Aber ich denke, man muss auch aus dem Denken heraus, dass wir Methan nur allein sehen. Man sollte auch bedenken, dass Tiere Gras nutzen, dass Tiere Dauergrünland nutzen, dass gerade Dauergrünland auch ein ganz wichtiger Faktor ist, damit Photosynthese stattfindet, damit also CO₂ – ein anderes wichtiges Treibhausgas – wieder absorbiert werden kann und Kohlenstoff damit gebunden werden kann. Also ja, man muss die Sache angehen. Aber nein, wenn es nur darum geht, Tierzucht, Fleisch- oder Milchkonsum zu verteufeln.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Methanemissionen sind in der Tat viel zu lange vernachlässigt worden, und dabei sind sie besonders kurz- und mittelfristig sehr gefährlich, weil sie eine starke Klimawirkung haben.

Es ist daher außerordentlich wichtig, dass wir schnell wirksame Maßnahmen ergreifen. Daher finde ich es, ehrlich gesagt, etwas enttäuschend, dass die Kommission erst im Dezember mit legislativen Vorschlägen kommen möchte, die sie uns schon seit Jahren verspricht. Umso mehr gilt jetzt: Dieser Versuch muss sitzen, Frau Kommissarin.

Die internationalen Bemühungen zur Methanvermeidung sind gut und notwendig. Aber von der europäischen Seite muss noch mehr kommen. Das *Global Methane Assessment* zeigt, dass wir weltweit bis 2030 ohne große Kosten 45 % des Methans vermeiden können. Das muss unser Ziel sein, und vor allen Dingen brauchen wir dafür eine schnelle Reduktion, auch im Energiebereich.

Eine Leerstelle bleibt, die wir uns anschauen müssen, das ist der Landwirtschaftsbereich mit den 40 % Emissionen. Und schließlich ist es nicht nur aus Klimasicht notwendig, Methan zu reduzieren, sondern gerade auch aus Gesundheitssicht. Denn am Boden entsteht gefährliches Ozon, wodurch jährlich Hunderttausende Menschen weltweit sterben. Auch daran müssen wir arbeiten. Ich hoffe, dass wir Erfolg haben werden.

Elena Lizzi (ID). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, la strategia è sicuramente di notevole importanza, ma presenta diverse criticità che siamo obbligati a esaminare e sulle quali dal dossier non arrivano garanzie o non arrivano certezze. Anzi, noi vediamo ancora alcune minacce per le nostre piccole imprese.

Come gruppo ID, e noi della Lega in particolare, abbiamo proposto gradualità e progressività nella riduzione delle emissioni, poiché un taglio repentino andrebbe a danneggiare in primo luogo le nostre piccole imprese e le nostre medie imprese e noi non possiamo autorizzarlo o perlomeno avallarlo.

Sappiamo tutti che l'Unione europea contribuisce solo per il 5 per cento alle emissioni totali di metano e che le emissioni rilasciate al di fuori dell'Unione europea per produrre e fornire gas fossile nell'Unione europea sono pari a 3-8 volte la quantità di emissioni provenienti dall'interno dell'Unione. Seppure l'obiettivo di riduzione delle emissioni sia quindi condivisibile, il problema derivante non è solo europeo.

Abbiamo piacere di sapere che altri paesi si allineano, ma noi chiediamo di verificare l'intreccio delle responsabilità nel mondo globale, che però nella richiesta non viene affrontata.

Norbert Lins (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Als Europäisches Parlament sind wir ja immer gut darin, ambitionierte Ziele zu setzen. Ich möchte allerdings jetzt über konkrete Maßnahmen sprechen, insbesondere was die Methanemissionen in der Landwirtschaft betrifft, denn da gibt es positive Nachrichten. Eine Studie zeigt, dass wir allein durch technologischen Fortschritt die Emissionen im Bereich der Landwirtschaft erheblich senken können, und zwar durch drei mögliche Instrumente.

Erstens: Die Nutzung von Zusatzstoffen im Futter, eine Anpassung der Ernährung der Rinder könnte das Methan deutlich senken. Es gibt viel Forschung dazu. Wir sollten es einfach in der Praxis fordern. Zweitens: Die Züchtung auf niedrigen Ausstoß von Methan könnte die Emissionen erheblich senken. Und drittens – das haben schon einige Kollegen genannt: Der Erhalt von Grünland ist nicht nur wichtig für die Kohlenstoffspeicherung, Biodiversität oder schöne beweidete Landschaft für den Tourismus, sondern vor allem klimarelevant durch die Fütterung von Wiederkäuern sowie die erhebliche CO₂-Vermeidungsleistung durch die Bereitstellung von klimafreundlichem Biogas als Energieträger.

Neben den Innovationen, glaube ich, sollten wir eine Debatte führen über die unterschiedliche Berechnung von fossilem und biogenem Methan. Ich fordere die Kommission auf, das genau zu prüfen.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Gerbiama komisare, gerbiami kolegos. Kovoje su klimato kaita metano daroma žala minima antroje eilėje po anglies dioksido, o kai kuriais požiūriais – kaip troposferos ozono formuotojas, taip pat ir sveikatos problemų kontekste – jis netgi kenksmingesnis.

Vis dėlto metanas gali būti puikiu pavyzdžiu grėsmę paverčiant galimybe. Remiantis inovacijomis ir mokslu įmanoma ne tik sumažinti išmetamo metano kiekį, bet ir efektyviai panaudoti esamą. Pavyzdžiui, metanu varomi traktoriai nebėra nepasiekiamas ateitis, tikėtina, metano panaudojimas bus plėtojamas ir plačiau. Mano rankose publikacija, visai nesena, apie Lietuvoje sukonstruota hibridinį – turbūt pirmąjį pasaulyje profesionaliam naudojimui skirtą – biometanu ir elektra varomą traktorių, o panašias technologijas plėtoja ir kiti gamintojai.

Tikiuosi, kad technologiniai sprendimai ir parama jiems, orientacija ne į draudimus, o į paskatas bei žiedinę ekonomiką prisidės prie bendro metano taršos mažinimo ne tik žemės ūkio, bet ir kituose sektoriuose.

Kadri Simson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their interventions. Most of these relate to the three most important sectors for methane emissions, and therefore I will also reply on these three sectors.

As concerns energy, many of you mentioned this. Many of the issues mentioned, and also included in the report, such as the call to establish binding rules on the measuring, reporting and verification of methane emissions and mandatory leak detection and repair, are planned to be covered in our December legislative proposal. At this very moment, with the high energy prices, I think that it is also important to note that the higher the gas prices, the higher the cost-effectiveness of the measures to mitigate methane emissions is, because methane should be used as a natural product rather than escaping to the atmosphere.

On the international side, the International Methane Emissions Observatory (IMEO) will provide reliable data on methane emissions and will therefore represent a powerful tool to drive global action to reduce global methane emissions. The Global Methane Pledge, as a joint EU-US initiative, represents a strong outcome of our renewed transatlantic agenda to continue and strengthen our cooperation on climate change and decarbonisation of energy. It includes a commitment to move towards using the best available inventory methodologies to quantify methane emissions, with a particular focus on high emission sources.

As concerns the environmental legislation, we are reviewing the Industrial Emissions Directive, the Sewage Sludge Directive, the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive and the Landfill Directive. Although it is too early to go into more details, I hope that, during the review process, we will be able to address most of the issues mentioned in the report.

As concerns agriculture, the current common agricultural policy is supporting mitigation actions for methane reduction in the livestock sector, mainly through the Pillar II rural development programming. This includes investments for the modernisation of animal housing, the creation of local innovation groups with farmers and specific thematic focus groups of the European Innovation Partnership on methane emission reduction and carbon sequestration in grasslands. The EU soil strategy also has the potential to become a milestone in EU policies related to a healthy environment in the long run.

The legislative ecosystem represented by the Green Deal will, directly and indirectly, affect millions of lives and jobs in all sectors, and the Commission is particularly careful to ensure a fair and just green transition for all, especially vulnerable groups in the energy, agri-food and other sectors.

In the post-2020 CAP, Member States will have the possibility to design a specific combination of interventions, reducing emissions from agriculture. Still, rural development programmes will be the main tool for supporting investment, innovation, and knowledge transfer advisory services. Finally, as already mentioned, the Commission is encouraging Member States to include methane reduction schemes in their strategic plans for the CAP.

Thank you for bringing to my attention many important issues concerning the reduction of methane emissions in your interventions today and, of course, in the report. I am pleased to see that our level of ambition in reducing methane emissions is very much aligned. Therefore, I am looking forward to continue working on this topic with Parliament.

Maria Spyraki, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I would like to thank all colleagues for their comments and say frankly that I was trying to take into account their concerns, especially when they were based on scientific evidence. I have to try to do my best in this long process.

Following the recent climate agreement with the US, it is our best hope in the EU to be able to lead the world in the right direction. It is now the time to suggest and negotiate a binding global agreement on methane mitigation at the COP26 meeting in Glasgow in line with the model pathways that limit global warming to 1.5°C from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) special report, the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report and the 2021 United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Global Methane Assessment. In this regard, it is of paramount importance to proceed with immediate and rapid reductions in methane emissions, paying attention to economic and social sustainability and, in this decade, it is one of the effective measures for the EU climate action.

Methane emission reduction complements the necessary reductions in carbon dioxide emissions and many of the emission cuts required by the Paris Agreement and could already be achieved with low cost, as the Commission said, and technically feasible methane mitigation. Commissioner, we fully endorse your approach and your arguments on methane reduction in the energy sector and we are looking forward to our cooperation.

When it comes to the agriculture sector, I would like just to repeat that it is included in the report as it is important to establish a framework which incentivises and rewards farmers along with the entire value chain and especially frontrunners for their effort. I would like to kindly ask all of you, dear colleagues, here in this House on this day, to vote in favour and to support the EU strategy to reduce methane emission. Now we should not think about the next election, but above all, about the next generation.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Muutosehdotuksista toimitetaan äänestys tänään ja loppuäänestys toimitetaan torstaina 21.10.2021.

Ehkä te voitte mennä keskustelemaan salin ulkopuolelle, kun teillä on niin paljon sanottavaa.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Асим Адемов (PPE), *в писмена форма*. – Селското стопанство се посочва като основен източник на емисии на метан в ЕС (53%), следван от сектора на отпадъците (26%) и енергетиката (19%). В същото време, трябва да отчетем различния ефект върху атмосферата от биогенния метан от преживните животни и метана от изкопаеми горива, и да ги оценяваме по различен начин. В допълнение, не трябва да забравяме, че селското стопанство крие огромен потенциал за намаляване на вредните емисии чрез инвестиции в иновации, нови фуражни добавки, подобрена селекция и генетика, пасищно отглеждане, интегрирано управление на оборския тор, производство на биогаз от селскостопански отпадъци и др. В тази връзка селското стопанство е част от решението и добрите практики за управление на животновъдството могат да доведат до намаляване с 30% на емисиите на парникови газове. За целта е необходимо да работим с фермерите, а не срещу тях с призови за намаляване на консумацията на месо и на отглеждането на животни. Това производство е от жизненоважно значение за запазването на селските общности и е важен източник на заетост в селските райони. Земеделските стопани следва да разполагат с необходимите инструменти и финансови стимули за внедряване на практики за улавяне на въглерод и метан с цел по-нататъшно намаляване на емисиите в селското стопанство.

Daniel Buda (PPE), *în scris*. – Obiectivul Uniunii Europene de reducere a tuturor emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră pentru 2030, vizează inclusiv emisiile de metan. Metanul este a doua cauză, după dioxidul de carbon, pentru schimbările climatice. În această luptă, UE are nevoie de parteneri. Fără eforturi globale și cooperare internațională, această bătălie este deja pierdută, întrucât o parte semnificativă a emisiilor globale de metan provin din afara UE.

Creșterea emisiilor de metan afectează biodiversitatea și producția agricolă, în timp ce reducerea emisiilor de metan, alături de utilizarea tehnologiilor existente poate oferi multiple beneficii, inclusiv un randament mai bun al culturilor. UE poate limita emisiile din agricultură prin inovație tehnologică, precum și prin stimulente și parteneriate cu fermierii. Fără stimulente financiare, fermierii europeni nu vor putea să facă față noilor condiționalități și politici europene, iar securitatea alimentară poate fi pusă în pericol.

UE trebuie să asigure condiții de concurență echitabile pentru producătorii europeni, iar importurile din țări terțe trebuie să respecte aceleași standarde. Este imperios necesar să se asigure o tranziție echitabilă pentru toate sectoarele în care reducerile emisiilor de metan pot avea un impact socioeconomic, astfel încât să evităm relocarea activităților economice și agricole în afara Uniunii Europene.

13. Pierwsza rocznica faktycznego zakazu aborcji w Polsce (debată)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana neuvoston ja komission julkilausuma Puolan tosiasiallisen aborttikiellon ensimmäisestä vuosipäivästä (2021/2925(RSP)).

Anže Logar, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, abortion and reproductive rights are a highly sensitive and complex issue across Europe, from both ethical and legal perspectives. They touch upon some of the most fundamental questions.

The European Council of Human Rights consistently ruled that Member States enjoy a wide margin of appreciation as to whether, and under what circumstances, abortion is permitted under their national law. As far as the European Union is concerned, primary law confirms that Union law does not interfere with constitutional provisions and other national legislation of the Member State relating to abortion.

In accordance with Article 168(7) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Union action in the field of public health should respect the responsibilities of Member States for the definition of their health policy and for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care. In this context, the European Pillar of Social Rights states that everyone has the right to timely access to affordable, preventive and corrective health care of good quality.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, one year ago, the ruling of the Polish Constitutional Court on abortion, resulting in a near-total ban on abortion, sparked a wave of protests in Poland. The EU has no competence on abortion rights within a Member State. Legislation in this area is up to the Member State concerned. When making use of their competences, Member States must respect fundamental rights, which bind them by virtue of their national constitutions and commitments under international law.

The European Court of Human Rights has recognised the lack of access to abortion services as a violation of the right to family and private life. All women across the EU should have equal access to good quality healthcare and treatment. Sexual and reproductive health is integral to our general health.

We hear of situations in Poland, such as unsafe underground abortions, women with financial means going abroad to have abortions, but without medical follow up at home, and even more difficult situations arising for women in a vulnerable position. The COVID-19 pandemic has made the reality even more challenging.

Women's rights are a gauge for the overall situation of fundamental rights. High-quality sexual and reproductive health services are essential to women and girls, as well as for men and boys.

While often any reference to sexual and reproductive health and rights is quickly linked to abortion, they also cover issues such as contraception, education, prevention, treatment of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases, as well as fertility and sex-specific cancers. These rights are core to gender equality.

The Commission continues to monitor the developments in all Member States regarding gender equality. We encourage Member States to safeguard women's equal access to good quality healthcare services.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Pani Przewodnicząca! My wiemy, że kwestie aborcji, ochrony zdrowia to kompetencje krajów członkowskich, i my tutaj nie zmienimy ustawy. Niemniej myślę, że z tej Izby jest potrzebny sygnał, jest potrzebna ta dyskusja skierowana do polskich kobiet, że wiemy o ich problemach, że je znamy i je gorąco z tego miejsca wspieramy.

Kolejny raz na tym forum mówimy o polskich kobietach w rocznicę wyroku upolitycznionego Trybunału Konstytucyjnego, który de facto zakazuje aborcji. I z tego miejsca chciałabym dosadnie powiedzieć: żaden zakaz nie ograniczy liczby zabiegów, nie sprawi, że kobiety będą chciały być matkami. Polski rząd siłą próbuje zmusić kobiety do heroizmu bez właściwego zrozumienia ich problemów i wsparcia. Powtórzę kolejny raz, że żaden polityk nie może być sumieniem polskich kobiet, ani w ogóle kobiet. Gdy popatrzymy na statystyki, w Polsce w 2019 roku aż 98 % zabiegów aborcji miało podłoże medyczne ze względu na nieodwracalne wady płodu. Niestety Polkom odebrano możliwość wyboru, a przecież wiemy, że żadna ustawa, nakaz, ani nawet zasiłki nie zmienią zakorzenionych współczesnych cnót niewieścich. To smutne, że to nie polski rząd, a rządy innych krajów członkowskich: Czech, Belgii, krajów skandynawskich czy Królestwa Niderlandów wyciągają do Polek pomocną dłoń.

Polska staje się krajem nieprzyjaznym dla matek, a ciąża obarczona jest ryzykiem i strachem. Wiele Polek ma problemy z zajściem w ciążę. Gdy niepłodność uznawana jest za chorobę społeczną, polski rząd zamyka programy in vitro, które nie tylko były ogromnym sukcesem, ale również dla wielu rodziców były szansą na własne potomstwo. Dodatkowo rząd nie rozwiązuje problemu z dostępem do badań prenatalnych, odpowiedniej opieki okołoporodowej, nie mówiąc już o właściwej pomocy i wsparciu dla rodzin, które wychowują niepełnosprawne dzieci, czy o tak potrzebnej edukacji seksualnej.

Jako kobieta i polityk zawsze będę broniła praw polskich kobiet, bo wiem, że bez właściwych rozwiązań gwarantujących wiedzę, wsparcie i możliwość wyboru zamiast świadomych ciąż będziemy świadkami rozpaczy i ludzkich tragedii.

(Przewodnicząca odebrała mówczyni głos)

Predrag Fred Matić, u ime kluba S&D. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, moram vam iskreno reći da sam razočaran što danas ponovno moramo raspravljati o ovoj temi u Europskom parlamentu i to ne zbog toga što sam se umorio ponavljajući neke stvari ili što smatram da tema nije važna, već zato što sam iskreno, a očito i naivno, vjerovao da će se sramotna odluka o *de facto* zabrani pobačaja promijeniti te da nećemo ponovno Poljskoj objašnjavati što su ljudska prava i što je i na čemu se temelji Europska unija.

Jučer smo imali sastanak s poljskim aktivistkinjama koje su nam pričale o svom iskustvu i ostao sam šokiran jer ne samo da im je pristup medicinskoj skrbi gotovo pa u potpunosti uskraćen nego su one, koje su hrabro izašle na ulicu i da se protiv toga pobune, sada izložene prijetnjama smrću, nasilju i zlostavljanju.

Ženama iz Poljske mogu reći da se divim njihovoj hrabrosti, ustrajnosti i snazi da se bore protiv zabrane pobačaja, da govore, viču i da stoje na ulici braneći ono što smo odavno izborili, a sada im se uzima. I moram vam reći, za to smo djelomično odgovorni i mi u ovoj kući, kao i Europska komisija koja se hrabro skriva iza argumenata nacionalnih kompetencija i konstantno bježi od odgovornosti i sankcioniranja Poljske i ostatka družine koji misle da je u redu uzimati europske novce i pritom pljuvati sve europske vrijednosti. Njihova dobitna formula vrlo je primitivna, ali učinkovita – prepotentnost poljske vlade i impotentnost europskih institucija.

Stoga pitam vas sve i Komisiju: što ćemo konačno po tom pitanju učiniti? I zapamtite, ako ne djelujemo odmah i odlučno, danas je to Poljska, a sutra neka druga država članica.

Karen Melchior, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, equality is a fundamental value of the European Union, and equality starts with our right to decide over our own bodies. This Parliament debated the undermining of the rule of law in Poland, at length, yesterday. Our debate today and the debate yesterday are linked.

Today, we debate the decision one year ago by the unconstitutional Constitutional Tribunal, which flies in the face of the right for equality. The backlash against gender equality and equal rights for LGBTIQ are directly linked to the rule of law. Our defence of rule of law starts with the defence of minority rights and gender equality.

Over the last five years, the Polish Government has abandoned the values that unite Europe. Minorities have been under attack, the rule of law has been under attack and women's bodies have been under attack. Our democracies are in danger when minorities and women come under attack. When miners went into the coalmines, they brought along canary birds so that they could be warned when the miners were in danger. Minorities and women are the canaries in the coalmine of democracy. But are you listening? Have we heard that they've stopped singing?

The right to abortion should not be a political battle, but the Polish Government has made it into an ideological battleground. Human rights defenders are receiving threats, harassment and intimidation from their own government, trying to silence them. Therefore, it is important to show them that they are not alone and to show the Polish Government that the rest of Europe is watching. The right to abortion has slowly but surely been stolen from Polish women. Thank you to the Member States providing supports to these Polish women.

I'll conclude by saying that the fight of Polish women for their rights is also my fight. I am not free and equal until all women in Europe are free and equal.

Sylwia Spurek, *w imieniu grupy Verts/ALE*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Bronimy życia, życia kobiet. Pod takim hasłem Polki znowu wyjdą na ulice. Przeciwko odbieraniu prawa do godności, za prawem każdej kobiety do decydowania o własnym życiu.

Na tej sali musimy mieć odwagę powiedzieć: aborcja to po prostu świadczenie medyczne. Aborcja jest prawem człowieka. Aborcja jest OK. Bez prawa do aborcji nie ma w Unii równości, nie ma polityki spójności.

Od decyzji Trybunału Konstytucyjnego mija rok. Czy Komisja szukała rozwiązań? Czy wygodniej było porzucić temat i zasłaniać się brakiem kompetencji? Pani komisarko, jeżeli kompetencje są dla was barierą, czas na debatę o zmianie kompetencji i propozycje legislacyjne. Czas, żeby Komisja bezwarunkowo trzymała stronę kobiet, żeby wsparła odważne Polki, które od lat konsekwentnie protestują na ulicach mimo hejtu, represji, kosztem życia prywatnego i zawodowego.

Nicolaus Fest, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Minister, Frau Kommissarin! Polen, Polen, Polen, immer wieder Polen! Immer wieder setzen die Linken hier im Parlament Polen auf die Tagesordnung. Und wenn man gar nichts Aktuelles mehr findet, dann redet man über einen Jahrestag, über ein angebliches Abtreibungsverbot, das faktisch nicht besteht.

Aber ich finde dieses Konzept gut. Ich hätte auch noch ein paar Jahrestage, die ich hier gerne mal mit Ihnen debattieren würde, zum Beispiel den Jahrestag des Anschlags auf das Theater im Bataclan durch muslimische Migranten, den Jahrestag des Anschlags in Berlin durch einen muslimischen Migranten, den Jahrestag der Silvesternacht in Köln 2015 mit über 1000 sexuellen Übergriffen auf Frauen durch – Sie werden es ahnen – muslimische Migranten, die Jahrestage der Anschläge auf *Charlie Hebdo* und des Mordes an Samuel Paty und dann noch die Jahrestage der Anschläge von London, Amsterdam, Brüssel, Hamburg, Dresden, Wien, Nizza, Barcelona, Stockholm und so weiter und so weiter.

Fällt Ihnen etwas auf? Warschau, Krakau, Kattowitz, Danzig und Breslau sind komischerweise nicht auf dieser Liste und übrigens auch nicht Budapest. Vielleicht macht die polnische Regierung – und auch die ungarische – doch sehr viel mehr richtig, als viele hier im Saal ahnen.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Aborcja nie jest, nie była i nigdy nie będzie OK. Trzeba mieć świadomość, że te osoby, które dopuszczają się aborcji, przeżywają potem bardzo wielkie cierpienia, czasem z tej traumy nie są w stanie się otrząsnąć przez całe życie.

Pani komisarz Dali wyraziła troskę, jeśli chodzi o dostępność aborcji w Polsce. Pani komisarz, a jak to jest z aborcją na Malcie? Czy to nie jest tak, że to właśnie na Malcie jest najbardziej restrykcyjne prawo w tej kwestii w Unii Europejskiej? Czy dlatego ta sprawa Malty nie jest podnoszona w Parlamencie Europejskim, bo na Malcie jest lewicowy rząd i dlatego lewicowa większość w Parlamencie Europejskim jest ślepa nie na jedno, ale na oboje oczu? To pokazuje, jak pełni jesteście państwo hipokryzji. Tą debatą dajecie świadectwo degradacji istoty praworządności w Unii Europejskiej. Uważacie, że aborcja jest OK, że to jest prawo? Absolutnie nie! Proszę zwrócić uwagę, że aborcja nie jest i nie była powszechnym prawem człowieka i nie jest objęta żadnym prawnie wiążącym traktatem międzynarodowym. Ostatnio dyskutowaliście państwo o aborcji w Teksasie, więc myślę, że niedługo to nie tylko będzie parlament Unii Europejskiej, ale całego świata. Otóż nie, jesteście państwo w błędzie.

Jak kwestia aborcji jest regulowana w prawie międzynarodowym? Konwencja ONZ o prawach dziecka stwierdza, że dziecko ze względu na swoją niedojrzałość psychiczną i fizyczną wymaga szczególnych zabezpieczeń i opieki, w tym odpowiedniej ochrony prawnej zarówno przed, jak i po urodzeniu. Czy państwo wiecie, że dziecko, które się nie narodziło, jeszcze nie przyszło na świat, ma prawo do dziedziczenia? Ale wy uważacie, że nie ma prawa do życia. Trybunał Konstytucyjny w Polsce działający legalnie i praworządnie orzekł, że jedna z trzech przesłanek przerwania ciąży jest nieprawna, zatem ją uchylił. Pozostałe dwie nadal funkcjonują. Dyskutujcie o faktach w oparciu o prawdę, a nie o imaginacje, fałsz i kłamstwa.

Malin Björk, *on behalf of the The Left Group*. – Madam President, these days all eyes are on Poland because of its constitutional court. Already one year ago, on 22 October, this politically controlled, illegitimate court ruled that abortions should be nearly banned. So women's rights in this case have everything to do with the rule of law.

I think it's time that this House recognises that. The link between the rule of law and women's rights is a direct one. Where there is no rule of law, there can be no respect for women's rights and Poland is a good example of that. But the women are resisting. We have invited a few of them here to a press conference this morning, and they are freedom fighters, they are democracy fighters, they are fighters for women's rights, and they are fighters for the rule of law. They are telling us to step up, to step up our game, because they are strong, they are inspiring, they are really inspiring. But they expect more from us. So let's do more. Let's not let one more day pass before we stand in solidarity with all Polish women.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Madam President, today's debate is yet another example of the European Parliament's leftist and liberal forces interfering in the matters of a sovereign Member State.

Yesterday, you were attacking the decision of the Constitutional Court of Poland in a more than four-hour-long debate, but you failed to realise that the Polish court decision was a direct consequence of your own harmful policies.

You've been transgressing your competences over and over again, with the intention to breach the Treaties. You are calling for procedures and sanctions against democratically-elected governments solely because they do things that you may disagree with or you don't like.

You should finally accept that not every idea that you may have or come up with becomes automatically a human right.

This House has to understand once and for all that there are areas where it is exclusively for Member States, for governments and their citizens to make a decision, and not you. And this is going to remain like this, whether you like it or not.

Let's make one thing clear today: you, the leftists in this House, are the greatest danger to European cooperation, exactly because you refuse to accept that there can be other views and opinions than your own.

Nathalie Colin-Oesterlé (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, mes chers collègues, il y a un an, le désormais politisé Tribunal constitutionnel polonais, qui est aujourd'hui au centre des débats, jugeait contraire à la Constitution polonaise l'avortement en cas de malformation grave et irréversible du fœtus ou de maladie incurable ou potentiellement mortelle. Cela revient à rendre illégaux 98 % des avortements en Pologne.

Si le droit à l'avortement est une question sensible et qui relève de la compétence de chaque État membre, le Parlement européen peut se prononcer. Il doit même se prononcer lorsqu'elle devient un enjeu majeur de santé publique. Dans le monde, une femme meurt toutes les neuf minutes d'un avortement clandestin. La Pologne avait déjà jusqu'en 2020 l'une des législations les plus restrictives d'Europe en matière d'interruption volontaire de grossesse et comptait plus de 100 000 avortements clandestins par an. La Pologne est aussi l'un des pays européens où l'accès à la contraception est le plus difficile, derrière la Biélorussie, l'Ukraine et la Turquie.

Alors que nous construisons ici l'Europe de la santé, dans ce Parlement dont Simone Veil, si engagée sur les questions de santé, a été la présidente, et alors que nous légiférons pour permettre à tous les citoyens européens un égal accès aux soins, pouvons-nous continuer à accepter que des femmes, des citoyennes européennes, mettent ainsi leur vie en danger?

Nous le savons, le fait de limiter l'accès à l'avortement n'en réduit pas le nombre. Selon l'OMS, dans les pays où l'avortement est totalement interdit ou autorisé uniquement pour préserver la vie ou la santé d'une femme, seul un avortement sur quatre est sécurisé. Inversement, lorsque l'avortement est légal pour des motifs plus larges, neuf avortements sur dix sont pratiqués dans des conditions sûres. La question, Madame la Commissaire, qui se pose aujourd'hui est de savoir ce que fait le gouvernement polonais des femmes qui mettent ainsi leur propre vie en danger. Que fait-on? Que fait-on des mères qui portent leur enfant pendant neuf mois en sachant pertinemment qu'il ne survivra pas? La Pologne n'est malheureusement pas le seul pays à avoir restreint ses droits d'accès à l'avortement, mais il faut nous rester extrêmement vigilants afin que la santé publique l'emporte sur toute considération.

Robert Biedroń (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Piekło kobiet trwa. Rok temu Kaczyński przypieczętował wyrok na kobiety. Polska stała się de facto patriarchalnym państwem religijnym, w którym Polki niczym bohaterki opowieści podręcznej są pozbawiane głosu i sprowadzane do roli inkubatora. To przerażające barbarzyństwo i ugruntowane przez rząd tortury.

Niestety fundamentalni religijnie i politycznie polscy talibowie nie poprzestają na tym. Do Sejmu trafił właśnie kolejny projekt ustawy, który będzie traktował zmuszanie do aborcji w przypadku zagrożenia zdrowia i życia kobiety jako morderstwo. I grozić będzie za to dożywotnie więzienie. To niestety PiS doprowadził do tego, że dzisiaj, w 2021 roku, Polki mają mniej praw, niż kiedy Polska wstępowała do Unii Europejskiej.

Więc, Pani Komisarz, kiedy Wy, jako Komisja, mówicie, że nic nie możecie zrobić, to dzisiaj możecie – bo de facto ograniczono prawa kobiet, Polek, które są obywatelkami także tej Wspólnoty, Unii Europejskiej. I z tej sali dzisiaj – to jest nasz obowiązek nie tylko polityczny, nie tylko prawny, ale i moralny – musi do tych kobiet, które dzisiaj tutaj są na sali, płynąć jasny przekaz: nigdy więcej nie będziecie szły same. Jesteśmy z Wami!

President. – Thank you, colleague. It's my unpleasant duty to remind everyone that badges and banners are not allowed, even on clothing, in this House.

Michal Šimečka (Renew). – Pani predsedajúca, vážená pani komisárka, obmedzenie žien v ich rozhodovaní o ich vlastnom tele je asi jedna z najponižujúcejších legislatív, ktorú dnes môžeme v Európskej únii vidieť. A to poľské rozhodnutie z minulého roku je v tomto kontexte mimoriadne drastické a nebezpečné. Samozrejme, v prvom rade pre zdravie žien, ale aj celkovo pre ľudské práva a základné hodnoty Európskej únie. Už len preto, že to rozhodnutie bolo vydané nelegitímnym ústavným súdom. Ale už to nie je len problém Poľska. Dnes vidíme, že táto ultrakonzervatívna radikálna agenda sa šíri aj do ďalších krajín. Na Slovensku, odkiaľ pochádzam, práve dnes, od dnes vlastne rokujú poslanci o návrhu na sťaženie prístupu k interrupciám, čo by znamenalo priblíženie k tomu poľskému modelu. Je to už piaty pokus na Slovensku a tentoraz hrozí, že bude nakoniec úspešný. Pri tomto smutnom výročí by som teda chcel vyjadriť solidaritu a podporu poľským ženám. Všetkým ženám ktoré musia podstupovať zdravotné riziko a poníženie len kvôli stredovekej ideológii niektorých politikov.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, tabassées, gazées, harcelées, menacées de mort, en Pologne, les militantes qui se mobilisent pour le droit à l'avortement mettent leur vie en danger. Ce qu'elles subissent est d'une brutalité inouïe, d'une brutalité d'un autre temps. Les femmes, de manière générale, sont présentées comme des ennemies en Pologne, aujourd'hui, par le gouvernement. Cela incite des groupes extrémistes à les cibler sans scrupules. Par ailleurs, elles subissent aussi des violences institutionnelles, comme la prison parfois.

Cette volonté de faire taire les femmes démontre la stratégie du gouvernement polonais. Encore une fois dans l'histoire, le corps des femmes est utilisé comme un outil de répression parmi d'autres, dans une trajectoire autoritaire. Parce que ces atteintes aux droits fondamentaux ne sont pas isolées. Il n'y a pas que l'interdiction de l'avortement: le gouvernement polonais a aussi restreint fortement l'accès à des services gynécologiques; il s'oppose à l'éducation sexuelle des jeunes; il y a évidemment l'immense discrimination des personnes transgenres et les attaques globales contre les droits des personnes LGBTI+.

En Pologne, certains construisent un projet de société réactionnaire qui veut enfermer les femmes dans un rôle de reproductrices et s'opposer à toute remise en cause du modèle patriarcal. Ce projet de société n'a pas sa place dans l'Union européenne avec nos traités et nos chartes.

Beata Mazurek (ECR). – Wczoraj podczas debaty o Polsce został przywołany św. Jan Paweł II. Pozwólcie państwo, że zacytuję teraz jedną z wielu wypowiedzi papieża Polaka, dla którego ochrona życia stanowiła jeden z kluczowych tematów jego nauczania. „Człowiekiem jest również nienarodzone dziecko. Co więcej, Chrystus w sposób uprzywilejowany utożsamia się z najmniejszymi. Jak więc można nie widzieć szczególnej Jego obecności w istocie jeszcze nienarodzonej, spośród wszystkich istot prawdziwie najmniejszej, najsłabszej, pozbawionej jakiegokolwiek środka obrony, nawet głosu, która nie może protestować przeciw ciosom godzącym w jej najbardziej podstawowe prawa? Gdy państwo nie używa swej władzy w służbie praw tego, który jest najsłabszy, zagrożone są podstawy praworządności państwa.”

Polska będzie bronić praworządności. Nie damy sobie narzucić lewicowego dyktatu. Będziemy bronić praw dzieci nienarodzonych i powtarzać do znudzenia, że kompetencje w zakresie organizacji systemów ochrony zdrowotnej, opieki zdrowotnej leżą w kompetencjach państw członkowskich.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left). – Señora presidenta, con su lucha, las mujeres polacas nos han dado una lección que deberíamos recordar porque la ultraderecha está obsesionada con las políticas natalistas en toda Europa.

Por ejemplo, el Partido Popular español presentó hace unos años un recurso de inconstitucionalidad contra la ley del aborto de 2010 para atacar la libertad de las mujeres, acabar con la educación sexoafectiva y ampliar un régimen de objeción de conciencia del que ya abusan decenas de hospitales; como aún no se ha resuelto, ahora sueñan con volver a la legislación restrictiva que teníamos en 1985.

Esta misma semana, esta Cámara ha debatido sobre el Estado de Derecho en Polonia. Pues bien, la prohibición del aborto por parte de un Tribunal Constitucional nombrado a dedo por el Gobierno está completamente fuera de este marco: el aborto es un derecho, no solo un servicio sanitario, y, allí donde se viola, se viola el Estado de Derecho, sea en la Polonia de hoy o en la España del mañana; por eso, quienes nos quieren al servicio de la familia, la patria, la nación y la religión nos tendrán enfrente.

(Aplausos)

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dámy a pánové, já bych se zde chtěl také vyjádřit proti nálezu polského Ústavního soudu, který výrazně omezuje možnosti ženy zvolit potrat. Na jedné straně potraty opravdu patří do národní politiky jednotlivých členských států, ale na druhé straně je třeba říci, že možnost ženy svobodně se rozhodnout je univerzálním právem žen, které jsou nejen Polkami, ale také jsou občankami Evropské unie. A to je důvod, proč bychom to měli řešit, proč vítám tuto debatu a proč by Evropská komise měla o tomto tématu jednat s polskou vládou. Univerzalita lidských práv, ochrana lidských práv je agenda Evropské unie. Je to jedna z hodnot, na kterých evropská integrace stojí, takže já moc prosím, paní komisařko, věnujme tomuto pozornost. Tlačme na polskou vládu, jednejme s polskou vládou. Je třeba najít takovou právní úpravu, která bude obhajitelná v dnešním evropském kontextu. Není možné, aby občanky jedné členské země měly takto omezená práva oproti občankám jiných členských států. To je dlouhodobě neakceptovatelné i proto, že potom dochází k pokrytectví, a ženy, které chtějí podstoupit potrat, musí jezdit z Polska do jiných členských států. To znamená, že to řešení je naprosto nevýhodné, nevhodné a podle mého názoru neobhajitelné.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Fru talman! Kommissionär! Sedan abortförbudet infördes i Polen har tiotusentals gravida kvinnor och flickor drabbats. Ett abortförbud hotar inte bara människors hälsa och välmående. Det hotar människors frihet, värdighet och egenmakt.

Sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa är en grundläggande del av hälsa och välbefinnande för alla människor. Det handlar om att få välja om, när och med vem man vill ha barn. Det handlar om rätten till säker vård. Det handlar om egenmakt och sexualitet. Det handlar om jämlikhet och jämställda relationer. Polens abortförbud kränker kvinnors grundläggande mänskliga rättigheter, och det är i strid med rättsstatens principer.

Vi kan inte invänta fler årsdagar av denna fruktansvärda lag. För kvinnors och flickors rättigheter är mänskliga rättigheter.

Samira Rafaela (Renew). – Madam President, the anti-abortion law in Poland has been exceptionally harmful and changed the daily lives of Polish women and girls. Thousands of women have crossed borders to Germany, England, the Netherlands and Belgium – amidst a pandemic, may I remind everyone.

The work of NGOs such as Abortion Without Borders does not go unnoticed. They are helping thousands of women by accessing the right paperwork, preparing travel arrangements, ensuring safe and legal pathways to abortion. You are true heroes.

The Polish government has no respect for fundamental rights. They neglect women, they disregard our bodies, and they put women's lives at risk. Commissioner Dalli, this is unacceptable. These men in power are criminalising women's rights.

So support NGOs financially to ensure safe abortion and make sure the Polish government doesn't receive a penny out of the EU COVID-19 recovery fund.

So thank you, I say to all the Polish women who fight for change. Now it's time the EU fights for you.

Diana Riba i Giner (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, de nuevo, hoy nos toca hablar de Polonia.

Seguramente nos tocaría denunciar de nuevo la deriva autoritaria del Gobierno polaco y la de su brazo ejecutor, el Tribunal Constitucional. Pero hoy no les dedicaré ni un segundo más.

Por el contrario, centraré mi minuto de intervención para hablar de ellas. Para hablar de las luchadoras, para hablar de las mujeres polacas y para lanzar un mensaje muy alto y claro para todas vosotras desde el Parlamento Europeo: no os dejaremos solas.

Hemos visto con enorme orgullo y admiración cómo os movilizabais para defender vuestros derechos, vuestros cuerpos y vuestras libertades. Voy a ser clara. La negación de los derechos sexuales y reproductivos es una forma de violencia de género y una violación de los derechos humanos. Y en esta casa los derechos humanos se defienden. Ninguna mujer será libre mientras siga habiendo mujeres sometidas. Por esto, compañeras, os prometemos que seguiremos luchando a vuestro lado, defendiendo vuestros derechos, que son también los derechos de todas nosotras.

(Aplausos)

Izabela-Helena Kloc (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pseudopostępowa większość w Parlamencie Europejskim urządza sobie dziś rocznicę delegalizacji aborcji eugenicznej w Polsce. Rozumiem, że celebrowana przez was kultura śmierci potrzebuje takich igrzysk. W waszym gronie są też kobiety, które aborcję nazywają prawem człowieka. Zgodnie z tą logiką mordowane dzieci nie mają żadnych praw, a więc nie są ludźmi.

W ciągu tego roku urodziło się w Polsce wiele dzieci, które jeszcze dwa lata temu nie miałyby na to szans. Pytam się zatem: czy macie coś do powiedzenia tym kobietom, które trzymają w ramionach swoje dzieci i są szczęśliwe? Czy byłyby szczęśliwe, gdyby dziś mogły wspominać jedynie koszmar aborcji?

Wszystkim Polkom i Europejkom, które w tym roku urodziły swoje dzieci, chcę powiedzieć jedno: nigdy nie będziecie żałować tego, że wybrałyście miłość. Za kilka lat wasze dzieci powiedzą wam to same: mamo, Kocham cię i dziękuję za to, że jesteś! Dziękuję za to, że żyję!

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Madam President, Member States and the extreme right do not own their citizens, not even women. Women's rights are human rights, because women are human beings. That's why sexual and reproductive rights and the right to an abortion are human rights, and human rights are part of the rule of law.

This gross and aggravated offence to women's rights that is happening in Poland, caused by this arbitrary and extrajudicial government, is exactly the reason why we need stronger tools in the rule of law and in non-discrimination in the EU. We also need to keep a very close eye on what is happening in other Member States, for example in Slovakia.

Indeed, I hope that, if my rights were threatened in Finland by this kind of arbitrary extreme-rightist government, someone in the EU would step up and fight for my rights. So it is my duty to fight for the rights of Polish citizens and Polish women.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Madam President, the de facto abortion ban of the Polish PiS government is a fundamental breach of fundamental human rights, and I can repeat again: we will not accept it here in this House in the European Parliament. Democracy and women's rights are intrinsically linked. If you attack the one, you also violate the other.

The European Union will take action. I call for freezing the funds of the PiS government. Let me also remind you it is part of the responsibility as government to support human rights activists and NGOs and not to have them arrested, brutalised and chased in court cases, as is happening right now. It is utter disrespect of the European Parliament to sue an expert we invited to hear on the many issues women are facing in Poland and why. Therefore, full solidarity with all those fantastic women's rights defenders in Poland on the streets. Full support for all of you.

Chrysoula Zacharopoulou (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, les femmes polonaises n'ont pas peur. Elles n'ont pas peur de mettre en péril leur vie pour avorter clandestinement. Elles n'ont pas peur des menaces de mort qu'elles reçoivent, car elles osent se révolter. Personnellement, je ne sais pas ce qui me révolte le plus: les dérives autoritaires du gouvernement polonais ou bien de notre impuissance à protéger nos concitoyennes européennes?

Le pouvoir polonais s'affranchit de toutes les règles démocratiques et les droits humains tombent comme des dominos. Justice, médias, personnes LGBTI, femmes, tous sont persécutés au cœur de l'Europe. Jusqu'où laisserons-nous l'autoritarisme gangréner l'Europe? Non, le peuple polonais n'a pas peur de défendre ses droits. Alors, qui a peur? C'est vous, la Commission, et c'est vous, le Conseil.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałam się państwa zapytać, czy wiecie, co to jest hipokryzja? Mogę wam to pokazać na bardzo prostym przykładzie. Hipokryzja to jest np. udawanie, że chroni się ludzkie życie od poczęcia aż do naturalnej śmierci. Zamiast kobietom w rozpaczliwej sytuacji podać rękę, otoczyć opieką, wesprzeć, spycha się je bezdusznie do nielegalnego, niebezpiecznego też dla zdrowia i życia, podziemia lub wysyła się je za granicę. Szacunek do życia? Hipokryzja tego rządu, członków partii rządzącej, też tych obecnych na sali, jest po prostu nieznośna. Na naszej wschodniej granicy przez decyzje tego właśnie rządu, który udaje, że chroni życie, dorośli i dzieci za drutem kolczastym umierają z głodu, pragnienia i wyziębienia. Pozwolę sobie zauważyć, że również oni są dziećmi poczętymi, tyle że już dużymi, i to naprawdę nie jest ich wina. Do polskiego rządu nie apeluję już o nic, bo nie mam żadnych złudzeń i bardzo mi przykro.

Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, strong women's rights are an asset and an achievement that the whole of Europe must be proud of. We should not take them for granted, though. We can only achieve a Union of equality if all women in Europe have access to good quality health care and their fundamental rights are guaranteed and respected.

The EU4Health regulation intends to address health inequalities. This is, of course, also valid for access to sexual and reproductive healthcare. In fact, the EU4Health programme can be used to support Member States' actions to promote access to sexual and reproductive healthcare, and support integrated and intersectional approaches to prevention, diagnosis, treatment and care. The Commission will continue to support Member States' efforts in implementing the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals related and relevant to women's health, such as on universal access to sexual and reproductive care, family planning and education.

The Commission calls on Member States to ensure the respect of their obligations in line with international human rights law. We stand in solidarity with the women in Poland who have shown resistance and resilience. Strong women's rights are an asset for the whole of the European Union.

Anže Logar, predsedujoči Svetu. – Spoštovana predsedujoča, komisarka, spoštovane poslane in poslanci. Pozorno sem prislunhil današnji razpravi. Kot sem že v uvodu povedal, sta splav in reprodukativne pravice zelo občutljivi in kompleksni vprašanji, vključno s pravnega in etičnega vidika, ki sprožata tudi številne odzive.

Ponovno poudarjam, da pravo Evropske unije v zvezi s splavom načeloma ne posega v ustavne odločbe oziroma določbe in drugo nacionalno zakonodajo držav članic. Hkrati pa zagotavljam, da bo predsedstvo naredilo vse, kar je v njegovih močih, za zaščito žensk, saj temu vprašanju pripisuje velik pomen. Hvala lepa.

Puhemies. – Alamme vaihtaa aiheita. Odotan, että komissaari McGuinness saapuisi paikalle. Ehkä me odotamme komissaaria pari minuuttia.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Christine Schneider (PPE), schriftlich. – Mit dieser Debatte bekunden wir unsere Solidarität mit den Tausenden von polnischen Bürgern, die im vergangenen Jahr in Polen auf die Straße gegangen sind. Wir unterstützen auch die Tausenden von Polen, die am 10. Oktober 2021 für den Verbleib Polens in der EU demonstrierten und gegen die Regierung protestierten.

Rechtsstaatlichkeit, die Unabhängigkeit der Justiz und die Achtung der bürgerlichen Freiheiten sind für ein demokratisches Land unabdingbar. Wir dürfen nicht tatenlos zusehen, wenn die Rechte von Frauen, Mädchen oder LGBT-Personen in Frage gestellt werden.

Daher unterstütze ich die Forderung an die polnische Regierung, die Urteile des Europäischen Gerichtshofs sowie die Empfehlung der Europäischen Kommission zur Rechtsstaatlichkeit, einschließlich der Zusammensetzung des Verfassungstribunals, umzusetzen.

14. Wzmożenie wysiłków na rzecz zwalczania prania pieniędzy (debata)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana komission julkilausuma rahanpesun torjuntatoimien lisäämisestä (2021/2909(RSP)).

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, thank you for the opportunity to outline our very determined efforts to fight money laundering and how the Commission is working to ensure the effective application of existing anti-money laundering rules. We adopted a very ambitious anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism (AML/CFT) package on 20 July and I look forward to working with Parliament to reach a swift adoption.

This package should be seen in the context of a comprehensive AML/CFT policy at Union level. Enforcement is a key element of that comprehensive policy. Effective implementation of the existing AML rules is at the very core of our approach to fighting money laundering. And over the years since the first AML Directive in 1991, the EU has been reinforcing its anti-money laundering rules. These rules are now amongst the toughest in the world and will be further strengthened once the July 2021 AML package is adopted.

But they will only be effective if they are enforced equally across the board. This is confirmed by the work carried out by this Parliament through the Panama Papers Inquiry Committee and the TAX3 Special Committee. This was also confirmed by the debate that this House had a fortnight ago about the Pandora Papers.

In the European Union, we need to ensure that beneficial ownership registers are up and running and fully populated. We will use our enforcement powers under the Treaty to that end, and we will work in international forums to make sure that other jurisdictions will follow suit by bringing about full transparency of beneficial ownership.

Honourable members, we share the same ambition: effective implementation, one of the pillars of our AML policy, must remain at the centre of all our actions. Our enforcement approach to AML is based on several tools available to the Commission.

First, a thorough control of transposition. We are determined that our existing rules on AML are fully implemented, even as we negotiate the new proposals. And let me be very clear: existing legislation must be fully and correctly transposed and applied on the ground in our Member States.

On the fourth Anti-Money Laundering Directive (AMLD4), we started with infringement procedures against all Member States for incomplete or incorrect transposition. Today, there are three ongoing non-conformity cases – all of them at the stage of letters of formal notice.

On the fifth Anti-Money Laundering Directive (AMLD5), the Commission sent letters of formal notice to 16 Member States on the grounds of partial or non-transposition. Five Member States have reached the stage of reasoned opinion. One letter of formal notice has already been sent for incorrect transposition. More letters are likely to follow in the coming months as we complete conformity checks.

Transposing AMLD4 and AMLD5 was a very difficult process for Member States. We in the Commission supported the efforts of Member States by cooperating with them, while in parallel launching formal infringement proceedings.

The special report of the European Court of Auditors on AML identified the limited resources the Commission has to carry out transposition checks. But I want to say that even with those limited resources – and I assure you of this – we are doing our utmost to implement the recommendations in the report and to ensure that AMLD is fully and correctly transposed.

A second tool available to us is to ensure effective implementation of the AML Directive, and this involves a proactive look at the state of play of application of the rules as transposed in the national laws of Member States. The Council of Europe is conducting a study on the effective implementation of the AML framework in each Member State, including on-site visits to all Member States and looking at core provisions of our rules, for example, whether supervisors and financial intelligence units are sufficiently staffed; the functioning of registers of beneficial ownership, and how the supervision of the non-financial sector is carried out.

Another tool we use are country-specific recommendations (CSRs) within the European Semester. Here, the Commission issued 11 AML-related CSRs last year, and we plan to make greater use of the semester for AML in the next cycle.

This year, most Member States that have received CSRs have included AML in the Recovery and Resilience Plans. Next Generation EU provides further leverage for monitoring progress in Member States. Where measures on AML have been included in Member States' plans, their implementation will be monitored through milestones and targets.

The European Banking Authority (EBA) also has powers in the field of anti-money laundering, particularly in relation to investigating whether a national supervisor has breached Union law when carrying out its tasks. We expect the EBA to make full use of its powers.

In addition to national competent authorities, it is important to involve civil society. The Commission is currently implementing a pilot project requested by Parliament called 'Capacity building, programmatic development and communication in the context of the fight against money laundering and financial crimes'. This is aimed at increasing AML awareness and empowering civil society in this area.

The proposals presented in our 20 July AML package will strengthen the current framework. Under the new AML Regulation, obliged entities will be subject to directly applicable rules. In particular, the AML Regulation provides for harmonised requirements for consumer due diligence, and such requirements are more detailed and granular than at present and will be further refined via implementing legislation prepared by the future EU AML authority. The single rulebook will also further specify our rules on beneficial ownership, to improve our knowledge of who is behind a transaction and to exercise its control over a company or legal arrangement or entity. These new rules will clarify the concept of control and increase the powers of registers to get accurate information.

We fully share the findings of the European Court of Auditors, which viewed the AML package as an opportunity for the Commission and the co-legislators to remedy the fragmentation of the EU AML framework.

For enforcement to be as efficient and effective as possible, we urgently need an AML single rulebook. With this new legislative package, the Commission has fully delivered on this recommendation from the European Court of Auditors. A new EU supervisory authority, the EU AML Authority (AMLA), will have a key role in ensuring that all national authorities effectively implement the single rulebook.

In order to best prepare the ground for the new authority, in particular with respect to the supervision of the non-financial sector and the functioning of financial intelligence units (FIUs), Member States need to make tangible headway in efficiently implementing the AML framework. With this in mind, we will follow up on the findings of the Council of Europe report.

AMLA, the new authority, will also have the possibility to conclude working arrangements with the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF), Europol, Eurojust and the European Public Prosecutor's Office to ensure good cooperation of all actors, as it is critical to bridge the gaps between the preventative and repressive strands of the EU AML framework.

As regards the law enforcement angle, the fight against criminal finances will play a prominent role under the new European multidisciplinary platform against criminal threats (EMPACT) 2021-2025 initiative, the flagship instrument for cooperation among Member States, agencies and EU bodies to fight organised crime.

The creation of the European Financial and Economic Crime Centre at Europol in June 2020 is a significant step to reinforce law enforcement efforts against financial crimes. We will bolster these efforts by supporting operational cooperation at the Anti-Money Laundering Operational Network (AMON) of money laundering investigators and by proposing, next year, stronger rules on asset recovery and confiscation to ensure that crime does not pay.

AML is an area where the smooth exchange of information is crucial. One of the priorities of the Commission in this area was to take over the management of the FIU.net system, pending its transfer to AMLA in the future, and I am happy to confirm to the House that that transfer has now been successfully completed. We expect the new authority to be established in 2023 and to start its activities in 2024. The direct supervision of certain high-risk financial entities will only begin in 2026, which is when AMLA will reach its full staffing.

Until then, our commitment to fighting money laundering, by all possible means, remains strong and unchanged, and I'm happy to count on this House's continued support on this very important issue. Thank you, colleagues, for your engagement. I look forward to hearing your views.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Markus Ferber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Die Europäische Union hat schon seit Jahren ein Geldwäscheproblem. Es gibt Schätzungen, nach denen sich das Volumen von verdächtigen Transaktionen innerhalb Europas auf einen dreistelligen Milliardenbetrag beläuft. Die Europäische Kommission hat auf Drängen des Europäischen Parlaments im Sommer dieses Jahres nun endlich unsere langjährigen Forderungen aufgegriffen und Vorschläge für ein verbindlicheres Regelwerk und eine eigenständige und hoffentlich auch kraftvolle Behörde vorgelegt.

Das sind zweifelsohne Vorschläge, die in die richtige Richtung weisen. Wir sollten uns aber nichts vormachen: Im Kampf gegen Geldwäsche kommen wir nur voran, wenn auch die Mitgliedstaaten mitziehen, und daran scheitert es heute leider viel zu oft.

Wenn ich nur mein eigenes Land, Deutschland, nehmen darf, so sehen wir zum Beispiel, dass die beim Zoll angesiedelte Anti-Geldwäsche-Spezialeinheit einen riesigen Berg von unbearbeiteten Verdachtsfällen vor sich herschiebt. Inzwischen wird sogar schon wegen Strafvereitelung im Amt ermittelt. Dafür trägt übrigens der Bundesfinanzminister und möglicherweise zukünftige Bundeskanzler Olaf Scholz die Verantwortung, und es ist doch interessant, dass er bei der Anhörung im zuständigen Ausschuss zugeben musste, dass er diese Behörde, die er selber geschaffen hat, noch nie besucht hat.

Aber es mangelt nicht nur an Vermögen, es mangelt auch an Willen in den Mitgliedstaaten. Wir brauchen eine stärkere europäische Rolle und eine starke europäische Behörde, sonst werden wir kläglich scheitern.

Eero Heinäluoma, *S&D-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, on kulunut 30 vuotta siitä, kun ensimmäinen rahanpesu-direktiivi hyväksyttiin. Sen jälkeen on hyväksytty neljä muutakin direktiiviä.

Silti Euroopan tilintarkastustuomioistuimen tuore raportti on surullista luettavaa. Rahanpesun vastaiset toimet on toteutettu jäsenvaltioissa hajanaisesti ja ilman selkeitä prioriteetteja. Rahanpesu jatkuu edelleenkin todellisenä miljardiluokan ongelmana.

Säädökset purevat kyllä tavallisiin pientalletajiin, mutta edelleenkin sadat miljoonat eurot siirtyvät tileiltä toisille ilman todellista estettä. Rikollinen raha muodostaa yhteisöllemme myös aidon turvallisuusuhan.

Järeitä toimia tarvitaan. Direktiivien sijaan sitovaa lainsäädäntöä. Kansallisten valvojien rinnalle tarvitaan eurooppalainen valvoja. Todelliset edunsaajat rahaliikenteessä on selvitettävä, ja korkean rahanpesuriskin maat on listattava ilman epärointiä.

Ramona Strugariu, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, first I would like to welcome the new AML/CTF package proposed by the Commission, the single rulebook, the new AML Authority, the new rules on beneficial ownership transparency. I'm looking forward to working on these proposals. At the same time, please let me remind you that we have 16 AMLD IV infringement procedures launched by the Commission, including Romania, and four AMLD V procedures open. This approach to AML coming from the Member States cannot continue like that. If we do not properly transpose and implement; if we do not properly equip our law enforcement with the right tools to fight money laundering; if we do not have strong and independent justice systems, we will not succeed. This is a call to responsibility and respect for the rule of law in all of the Member States. Let us do this properly.

Secondly, we have all witnessed the Pandora Papers: more than 230 politicians from 90 countries, 35 current or former heads of state, 133 Forbes billionaires, whose combined fortunes exceed 500 billion, and 46 Russian oligarchs. This is crushing. Each and every single name on this list needs to be properly audited. Each and every Member State needs to do this. Then we can say that we are countering money laundering, secret jurisdictions, tax havens and evasion properly: EU institutions and EU members, shoulder to shoulder, as it should be.

Mikuláš Peksa, za skupinu Verts/ALE. – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, jak jsme mohli sledovat v kauze *Pandora Papers*, lidem s penězi a vlivem se stále daří obcházet evropská pravidla proti praní špinavých peněz a za různých pochybných manévrů si pak za to kupují utajené zámečky ve Francii a podobně. Ono není přijatelné, aby vládní úředníci klamali občany skrytými špinavými penězi uloženými v Karibiku a zároveň vlastně, třeba díky svému postavení, v rámci Rady vyškrtávali více dalších a dalších zemí z listiny daňových rájů. My naléhavě potřebujeme přezkoumat právní předpisy Evropské unie bojující proti praní špinavých peněz, abychom zajistili jejich lepší fungování. Zákonů mohou fungovat opravdu jenom tehdy, pokud je lidé respektují. Jsem hluboce znepokojen, že se například české vládě dařilo čtyři roky se úspěšně vyhýbat transpozici evropské směrnice včetně těch částí o vlastnictví a identitě nebo o přístupu k informacím, protože tady mi opravdu připadá, že česká vláda se chová podle přísloví, že „kdo nekrade, tak okrádá rodinu.“

Takže moc oceňuji návrh Komise učinit stávající ustanovení, která jsou dobrovolná, povinnými a zřídit úřad Evropské unie pro boj proti praní špinavých peněz, aby se zajistila transparentnost. Ale bohužel budeme muset udělat ještě daleko více, než kolik jsme udělali doteď.

Antonio Maria Rinaldi, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria McGuinness, onorevoli colleghi, in un minuto è difficile fare un discorso molto approfondito, però vorrei dire una cosa che credo stia a cuore a tutti i cittadini europei.

Vedete, i nostri elettori ci chiedono: come mai quando noi versiamo, magari per la paghetta per andare a mangiare una pizza o un hamburger, ai nostri figli e facciamo il trasferimento su una carta prepagata, anche di soli 20 euro, sì, di 20 euro, noi dobbiamo portare una serie di documenti alti così? Non solo noi che facciamo il versamento ma anche coloro i quali ricevono, i nostri figli. E poi leggiamo sui giornali che è permesso trasferire da una parte all'altra parte del mondo cifre, ho letto sui giornali addirittura per i Pandora Papers, 32 trilioni di dollari. E non succede niente.

Noi qui siamo chiamati, siamo obbligati a dare delle risposte ai cittadini europei. Questo Parlamento esiste per dare questo tipo di risposte.

José Gusmão, em nome do Grupo The Left. – Senhor Presidente, a Comissão Europeia tem-se mostrado sempre muito veloz a perseguir todos os Estados-Membros que implementem políticas orçamentais, políticas públicas, políticas sociais que violem regras de governação económica. Mas é curioso verificar que, quando se trata de regular a criminalidade do sistema financeiro, a evasão fiscal, a lebre transforma-se na tartaruga.

E é por isso que temos tantos Estados-Membros, como o meu próprio, que ainda não transpuseram a legislação sobre branqueamento de capitais; é por isso que continuamos a ter vistos *gold*, esse instrumento ao serviço da criminalidade financeira, em vários Estados-Membros, mais uma vez incluindo o meu próprio; e que, apesar de todas as declarações de intenções da Comissão Europeia, continuamos a ter uma lista de *offshores* não cooperantes, que é absolutamente ridícula e que mostra que não estamos só a falar de lentidão. No caso da proteção de *offshores* que escondem o percurso através do qual o dinheiro é lavado, a Comissão Europeia não é só lenta, é cúmplice ativamente.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Corte dei conti europea ha delineato un quadro preoccupante sul fronte della lotta al riciclaggio di denaro nel settore bancario. Nonostante i continui aggiornamenti delle norme in materia, secondo le stime di Europol il valore delle transazioni sospette in Europa ammonta a centinaia di miliardi di euro, pari a circa l'1,3 per cento del PIL dell'Unione europea.

La legislazione europea antiriciclaggio, costituita da direttive e non da regolamenti, continua a essere recepita in modo frammentato e disomogeneo, mentre la Commissione purtroppo è lenta nel garantirne l'attuazione e ad avviare procedure di infrazione.

Come la Corte evidenzia, sono necessari interventi per il miglioramento delle valutazioni del rischio di riciclaggio, nonché per il finanziamento del terrorismo in merito ai paesi terzi, nonché sulle procedure di vigilanza, lo scambio di informazioni, le indagini e le decisioni relative alle violazioni del diritto dell'Unione europea riguardanti enti creditizi e istituzioni finanziarie.

Colmare le carenze del sistema bancario per colpire chi intende convertire e movimentare i proventi illeciti deve essere una priorità per tutelare l'economia legale.

Lídia Pereira (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, o branqueamento de capitais é um crime especialmente grave e complexo. Não o combater não é apenas atacar as operações concretas, mas é cortar o fluxo financeiro que alimenta o terrorismo, a criminalidade organizada e as redes de tráfico de pessoas, drogas ou armas.

A ambição europeia, aqui, não se justifica apenas pela necessidade de recuperar 1% do PIB europeu que se perde. É motivada sobretudo pela urgência de travar crimes que atentam contra os nossos valores, os nossos valores fundamentais. As propostas da Comissão vão no bom sentido, mas é preciso ir mais longe e, para isso, precisamos do empenho dos governos nacionais.

Estamos a discutir uma reforma quando as regras atuais não são devidamente transpostas ou aplicadas, como tem acontecido em Portugal. Um novo regulamento é um passo em frente se reforçar as obrigações do mercado financeiro, sem prejudicar a competitividade das empresas. Uma revisão da diretiva é bem-vinda, se os Estados a cumprirem, e uma nova autoridade antibranqueamento de capitais é um avanço, se vier, de facto, melhorar a comunicação entre as autoridades competentes nos Estados.

O combate ao crime de branqueamento de capitais exige de todos nós ambição e realismo. Não se trata de uma mera questão de Direito, é um imperativo do Estado de Direito.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, al igual que sucede con el Estado de Derecho, en la lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales cualquier laguna en un Estado miembro afecta al conjunto de la Unión Europea; por eso, es imprescindible que los supervisores nacionales y las unidades de inteligencia financiera contra las transacciones y actividades sospechosas de blanqueo tengan reglas comunes contra la innovación tecnológica de los medios delictivos.

Por eso, damos la bienvenida a la propuesta de la Comisión: nada menos que cuatro Reglamentos —este Parlamento ha legislado, y la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior tiene memoria de ello— y cinco - Directivas penales contra el blanqueo de capitales procedentes de negocios ilícitos, pero es imprescindible, en este paquete, la Autoridad de Lucha contra el Blanqueo de Capitales y la Financiación del Terrorismo, que es un avance que podría ser más ambicioso, con más poderes de supervisión y más rápidos, particularmente contra los criptoactivos y en relación con la *travel rule*, en su eficacia contra el crimen organizado y contra el terrorismo.

Me parece importante, por último, resaltar la recomendación del GAFI, el Consejo de Europa y la OCDE para que la combinación de fuerzas de la OLAF, Europol, Eurojust y la Fiscalía Europea hagan verdad, efectivamente, que el delito no resulta provechoso.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, I welcome the announcement of the package by the Commission, and I want to commend Commissioner McGuinness on this.

Just to say at the outset, the Pandora leaks shows quite clearly that money laundering is not always by some nefarious groups; it is very often by respected politicians across the globe. I think that is an indication of why we are so slow – not just in Europe but across the globe – in terms of addressing the issue of money laundering.

It is not a victimless crime. It robs and siphons money from scarce public facilities. The other issue, of course, is it funds terrorism, drug dealing and prostitution, racketeering and smuggling of people. For all those reasons, anything we can do to stamp out this criminal act is very welcome, and I commend the announcement by the Commission on that.

We have to ensure that there is strong cooperation between the national authorities in terms of banking, oversight, and also the revenue commissioners to ensure that each country is capable of referring suspicious activities to the centralised anti-money laundering authority, so that there can be investigations. At the end of the day, there has to be prosecutions, and that often is referred back to the national authorities for prosecution. I'd like to see a bit of clarity brought on that particular issue because in the event of there being very influential people found to be money laundering, well then, can there be or is there the will to actually prosecute? Particularly, as I said, when they are people at the top end of our politics and commerce across the globe.

As I said, the Pandora Papers show that this is widespread, is nefarious, and it must be stamped out. I commend the package announced, and I hope that it is implemented speedily, and it gets cooperation from all involved in the European Union.

Claude Gruffat (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, dites-moi, Madame la Commissaire, où en est concrètement la lutte contre le blanchiment d'argent au sein de l'Union européenne? Parce que, croyez-moi, de ce pupitre, elle semble complètement à l'arrêt. Les scandales se succèdent les uns après les autres. Les interpellations indignées résonnent dans cet hémicycle tel un écho sans fin et, surtout, sans résultat concret. Pire, de nouvelles étapes dans l'inaction sont franchies. Malte, un État européen, se retrouve sur la liste grise du GAFI, l'organe international de lutte anti-blanchiment, et aucune réaction de vos services.

Aussi, nous apprenons que la France et d'autres font pression pour affaiblir les listes anti-blanchiment européennes, pourtant déjà vierges, d'États de l'Union. À quel jeu jouent les États? À quel jeu joue la Commission? L'évasion fiscale et le blanchiment d'argent nourrissent la crise actuelle avec la complicité de certains États de l'Union.

Alors, Madame la Commissaire, agissez! Les citoyens et citoyennes européens vous attendent, car bientôt il sera trop tard pour arrêter les graves crises sociales qui ne manqueront pas de surgir au sein de l'Union européenne.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Herr Präsident! Die EU-Kommission fordert die Einrichtung einer weiteren EU-Aufsichtagentur, strengere Bargeldkontrollen und ein EU-Vermögensregister. Unter dem Deckmantel der Geldwäschebekämpfung wird registriert und überwacht, was alle Bürger besitzen, kaufen, verkaufen und treiben. Dabei geht es gar nicht um Geldwäsche. Ungarns Gesetz, die Finanzierung von LGBT- und Migrations-NGOs, ausländischen Hochschulen und Medien zu regulieren, wurde vom EuGH als Eingriff in die Kapitalfreiheit gekippt.

Doch wenn die EU selbst die Kapitalfreiheit beschränkt, so ist das legal. Selbst der EU-Rechnungshof beklagt, die EU tue nichts gegen Geldwäsche bei der Schleusung von Migranten – immerhin einer 6-Milliarden-Euro-Industrie. Hier geht es um Bürgerüberwachung, Eingriffe in die Privatsphäre und die schrittweise Abschaffung des Bargelds und mitnichten um Geldwäsche und Steuervermeidung.

Javier Zarzalejos (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, cuando más del 1 % del producto interior bruto de la Unión está implicado en actividades financieras sospechosas, es evidente que el blanqueo supone un grave problema financiero y fiscal, pero también supone un grave problema para la seguridad. Por eso, necesitamos un enfoque doble, integrado: por un lado, vigilancia y prevención y, por otro, coerción para poder actuar eficazmente, desde el punto de vista policial y judicial, contra el blanqueo y contra los delitos subyacentes.

En ese sentido, las iniciativas de la Comisión resultan prometedoras, y espero que sean mejoradas en el debate parlamentario.

Permítanme referirme en particular a la autoridad que está llamada a coordinar las acciones europeas en materia de blanqueo, porque entiendo que es importante que encaje y fortalezca las capacidades que ya existen en la Unión, en especial Europol, para luchar contra la delincuencia financiera mediante unos mecanismos estrechos de coordinación y de intercambio de la información que tendremos que debatir en su momento.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Voorzitter, de commissaris, de Europese witwasregels zijn nog zo lek als een mandje. De Europese Rekenkamer weet het, het Parlement weet het en sinds de Pandora Papers weet de hele wereld het.

Maar toch sta ik hier met goede hoop, want de benodigdheden voor een sterke aanpak zijn duidelijk: transparantie over de eigenaren van brievenbusfirma's, ook als die zich buiten de EU bevinden, meer middelen voor de financiële-inlichtingen-eenheden, een sterke Europese autoriteit met middelen en een duidelijk mandaat om de gaten te dichten.

Morgen spreekt het Europees Parlement zich hier al over uit. En de komende maanden kunnen we helpen deze eisen en wensen te verwezenlijken. De nieuwe wetsvoorstellen van de Commissie tegen witwassen zijn een goede stap en met het huidige momentum, dat ik in deze kamer toch meen te bespeuren, ligt een veel strengere aanpak binnen bereik. En dat is hard nodig om alle lekken te dichten. Want financiële misdaad mag niet lonen.

Ralf Seekatz (PPE). – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Ergebnisse im Kampf gegen die Geldwäsche sind leider recht überschaubar. Obwohl sich die Schäden für die Staatskassen auf mehrere Milliarden Euro angehäuft haben, hat die EU bisher keine einheitliche Strategie zur Bekämpfung von Geldwäsche und Terrorismusfinanzierung.

Die Richtlinie wurde fünfmal überarbeitet. Regelmäßig gab es Vertragsverletzungsverfahren, leider auch, wie vom Kollegen Ferber schon angedeutet, gegen unser schönes Land Deutschland. Deshalb ist es so wichtig, dass die Kommission nun einen Verordnungsvorschlag vorgelegt hat. Diese Verordnung hat dann endlich diesen verbindlichen Charakter, den wir auch sehr, sehr zwingend brauchen.

Ebenfalls brauchen wir eine strenge und gut koordinierte Aufsicht. Die neu zu gründende Behörde kann da ein wichtiger Baustein sein. Damit ist es aber nicht getan. Die Fachbehörden der Mitgliedstaaten müssen auch effektiver und gründlicher arbeiten. Die neue EU-Behörde muss daher nicht nur die Länderbehörden unterstützen, sondern auch deren Zusammenarbeit koordinieren.

Wir müssen aber aufpassen, dass die Arbeit der nationalen Behörden dadurch am Ende nicht bürokratischer und auch komplizierter wird.

Цветелина Пенкова (S&D). – Господин Председател, в последните месеци бяхме свидетели на алармиращи финансови скандали. Санкциите над български граждани по закона „Магнитски“ и масовите разкрития на злоупотреби в досиетата „Пандора“, които включват редица европейски и български граждани, показват, че проблемите са от международен характер и Европа трябва да действа с общи усилия.

Новият законодателен проект, предложен от Комисията за борба с изпирането на пари и финансирането на тероризма в Европейския съюз, е една наложителна стъпка. Създаването на единен европейски надзор е от изключително значение, но е добре и да заложим на използването на технологии в активната борба с тези проблеми. Настоящият законодателен проект предлага специални мерки за надлежна проверка на клиентите и също така включва шеста поред поправка на Директивата срещу изпирането на пари. Но моят въпрос е не трябва ли да използваме по-ефективно технологиите в борбата с финансовите измами и как точно да направим това?

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, г-жо Комисар, колеги, според последните разкрития в досиетата „Пандора“ стана пределно ясно за всички, че се нуждаем от всеобхватна европейска политика, от засилена законодателна рамка в областта на изпирането на пари и финансирането на тероризма. Ето защо новият законодателен пакет в тази област е много повече от необходим и навременен. Много е важно тази рамка да се прилага по еднакъв начин във всички държави членки.

Приветствам предложението за регламент за борба с изпирането на пари на Европейската комисия, защото само така ще уеднаквим правилата и ще затворим вратичките в европейското законодателство, които престъпниците умело използват за злоупотреби с финансовата система. Трябва да създадем ефективен надзор, основан на общи надзорни методи и сближаване на високите стандарти в сферата на финансовия сектор.

Необходимо е и по-добро сътрудничество между административните, съдебните и правоприлагащите органи в Европейския съюз. В тази връзка обмяната на информация между звената за финансово разузнаване е от изключително значение. В крайна сметка, за да е ефективна, борбата със злоупотребите задължително трябва да стъпи на здраво трансгранично партньорство и респективно на добра информираност.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die *Pandora Papers* zeigen, dass der Kreis von Personen, die in fragwürdige Geldgeschäfte verwickelt sind, weit über das übliche Drogen- und Waffenmilieu hinausreicht. Abgesehen davon, dass diese Gelder auch zur Terrorismusbekämpfung herangezogen werden, trifft der Schaden uns alle – alle, jeden einzelnen, der seine Steuern und Abgaben im Sinne des Gemeinwohls bezahlt.

Allein im Jahr 2020 sind in den EU-Mitgliedstaaten 164 Milliarden nur durch grenzüberschreitenden Mehrwertsteuerbetrag verloren gegangen. Das ist in etwa die Summe, die wir in einem Jahresbudget zur Verfügung haben. Daher sind verschärfte Maßnahmen notwendig, vor allem auch im Bereich der zunehmenden Kryptowährungen. Diese müssen den gleichen Regeln unterliegen wie konventionelle Währungen.

Geldwäsche hat ein Ausmaß erreicht, das eine neue Behörde erfordert. Österreich als ein historischer Brückenbauer zwischen Ost und West wäre ein hervorragender Standort dafür.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO

Vicepresidente

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Mr President, it is estimated that up to USD 2 trillion is laundered globally every year. In my own country, the level of money laundering has more than doubled in the space of a year and we also have the amounts, of course, exposed in the Pandora Papers. Money laundering is a scourge in our society and disrupts our whole economy. It allows criminal organisations to thrive and to grow their murky operations.

Europe cannot afford to be seen as a gateway for dirty money to be channelled to criminals. With the Commission's new package, which I really welcome, the EU has the potential to become a global leader in the fight against money laundering. It's now up to the Member States and the European Parliament to make it a reality, and we must all be upfront. All Member States must be up front and centre in the renewed fight against money laundering in Europe. We must strive for a gold-standard anti-money laundering regime.

Criminals only need one loophole to exploit the system. Closing off these loopholes is not easy, given that we live in a complex and interconnected single market. But Europe's reputation is suffering through more and more money laundering scandals. The EU needs all the Member States to champion this cause.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Geldwäsche schafft Ungleichheit, verzerrt den Wettbewerb, schwächt den Binnenmarkt, die Wirtschaft, das Finanzsystem und uns gemeinsam als Europäische Union. Geldwäsche ist kriminell.

Die Enthüllungen der *Pandora Papers* sind die neueste Spitze des Eisbergs der vielen wachrüttelnden, ja haarsträubenden Steuer- und Geldwäscheskandale. Die offene Büchse der Pandora zeigt abermals eindrücklich, dass die aktuellen Maßnahmen zahnlos sind, nicht ausreichen, ja manchmal auch nichts bewirken. Gleichzeitig gibt es Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen 17 Mitgliedstaaten wegen mangelnder Umsetzung der Geldwäscherichtlinie.

Wir müssen daher die bestehenden Regelungen evaluieren, ob sie überhaupt tauglich sind. Und wir müssen schnell die Behandlung des neuen vorgeschlagenen Pakets in Angriff nehmen. Machen wir endlich Nägel mit Köpfen und sorgen wir dafür, dass die Geldwäsche nicht mehr der Zukunft angehört.

Mairead McGuinness, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I have really welcomed this debate, and I think we all agree that, if the current system worked, we wouldn't be reviewing it. So I welcome your support for our July package. It's really important that you work hard and fast on this proposal.

I want to speak to some of the points that were raised. To Mr Beck, who I think is not in the Chamber, we are not abolishing, and have no intention to abolish, cash. Cash is king, but cash must be clean, and, as we've heard in this debate, there is a lot of dirty cash floating through our financial system in Europe, and it has got to stop.

Mr Kelleher referred to the truth behind the dirty money, which is crimes against society, against children, and against women. It is just an evil pursuit and we have got to stop criminals in their tracks. So this is not just a financial issue. This is a massive social issue that we have a responsibility to address.

When it comes to the idea of the tools we have, yes, we will use, and are using, all of the tools available, as I outlined in my opening remarks. Specifically on beneficial ownership, we are looking very closely at the issue of beneficial ownership in a specific number of Member States, and we are vigilant. On crypto, as was referred to earlier, yes, this area is now non-transparent, and in our new proposals there will be transparency on the transactions.

So I deeply appreciate the debate here this evening and the passion you bring to it. This is a very important issue for us, and I want to assure you, as I said at the outset, not only will we implement the new proposals and work with you on them, we will continue to expect full implementation of existing rules in our Member States. But the truth is that the fight against money laundering is a global fight, and therefore it requires global action. I think this was particularly shown, again, by the Pandora Papers investigation. At this stage, it is still to be determined whether, besides tax evasion, crimes related to the illicit source of wealth are involved.

The Commission and Member States are working hard in the Financial Action Task Force to ensure that international standards are robust and up to date, including in the area of the transparency, as I have said, of beneficial ownership. This is a key area.

But our anti-money laundering (AML) system is only as strong as its weakest link, and this is why we need more Europe in this area. We need more Europe to create bridges between supervisors, among financial intelligence units (FIUs) and between supervisors and FIUs, and we need bridges to ensure that the work carried out on the prevention side effectively feeds into the work of investigators, public prosecutors and asset recovery officers. Our goal is not only to prevent financial crime, but also to bring criminals to justice and deprive them of their illicit proceeds.

I count on your full support in the future negotiations on our AML package. We will work hard and we will work fast, and, if successful, we will reduce and eliminate the crime of money laundering and the financing of terrorism. I believe we can do this together.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Caterina Chinnici (S&D), per iscritto. – Il riciclaggio di denaro costituisce uno dei principali strumenti tramite cui la criminalità, soprattutto organizzata, si infiltra nell'economia legale, alterandone gli equilibri a danno delle iniziative economiche sane. Il fenomeno è pericolosamente diffuso. Secondo Europol, le transazioni sospette in Europa ammontano a centinaia di miliardi di euro, pari a circa l'1,3% del PIL dell'UE. L'Unione europea ha adottato norme specifiche in materia, che necessitano tuttavia di essere rafforzate. Anche la Corte dei conti ha riscontrato la frammentazione istituzionale e lo scarso coordinamento a livello UE dell'attuale sistema di prevenzione del riciclaggio, e ha evidenziato il bisogno di potenziare la supervisione europea della vigilanza. Il nuovo pacchetto legislativo presentato dalla Commissione si pone nella giusta direzione del necessario potenziamento del quadro europeo di lotta al riciclaggio e al finanziamento del terrorismo, assicurandone maggiore uniformità e superando l'attuale frammentazione normativa. La nuova Autorità europea anti-riciclaggio, inoltre, garantirà quella supervisione a livello UE, oggi non sufficiente, e l'estensione delle regole sui servizi finanziari ai trasferimenti di attività virtuali renderà più trasparente un settore sin qui poco regolamentato.

Queste proposte devono ora rapidamente tradursi in atti legislativi esaustivi, che colmino le lacune esistenti e rendano più efficace il contrasto a tali pervasivi fenomeni.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D), por escrito. – La lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales y la financiación del terrorismo es vital para la estabilidad y la seguridad financiera en Europa. Las lagunas legislativas en un Estado miembro impactan en la UE en su conjunto.

Por este motivo, las normas de la UE deben implementarse y supervisarse de manera eficiente y coherente para combatir la delincuencia y proteger nuestro sistema financiero. Además, el reciente escándalo de los papeles de Pandora reveló hasta qué punto el ecosistema financiero internacional y, particularmente, el europeo, están generando evasión fiscal y contribuyendo al lavado de dinero, lo que hace que adquiera suma importancia la adopción por parte de la Comisión del paquete legislativo contra el lavado de dinero, que cumple una de las demandas que, desde hace mucho tiempo, venimos defendiendo desde el Grupo S&D.

De cara a los desarrollos de los mercados de capitales y la innovación tecnológica, y con carácter previo al inicio de las negociaciones del paquete legislativo contra el blanqueo de capitales (AML), este debate ha sido muy oportuno. Garantizar la eficiencia y coherencia del marco AML de la UE es de suma importancia.

Isabel García Muñoz (S&D), *por escrito*. – La lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales y la financiación del terrorismo es vital para la estabilidad y la seguridad financiera en Europa. Las lagunas legislativas en un Estado miembro impactan en la UE en su conjunto.

Por este motivo, las normas de la UE deben implementarse y supervisarse de manera eficiente y coherente para combatir la delincuencia y proteger nuestro sistema financiero. Además, el reciente escándalo de los papeles de Pandora reveló hasta qué punto el ecosistema financiero internacional y, particularmente, el europeo, están generando evasión fiscal y contribuyendo al lavado de dinero, lo que hace que adquiera suma importancia la adopción por parte de la Comisión del paquete legislativo contra el lavado de dinero, que cumple una de las demandas que, desde hace mucho tiempo, venimos defendiendo desde el Grupo S&D.

De cara a los desarrollos de los mercados de capitales y la innovación tecnológica, y con carácter previo al inicio de las negociaciones del paquete legislativo contra el blanqueo de capitales (AML), este debate ha sido muy oportuno. Garantizar la eficiencia y coherencia del marco AML de la UE es de suma importancia.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – La lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales y la financiación del terrorismo es vital para la estabilidad y la seguridad financiera en Europa. Las lagunas legislativas en un Estado miembro impactan en la UE en su conjunto.

Por este motivo, las normas de la UE deben implementarse y supervisarse de manera eficiente y coherente para combatir la delincuencia y proteger nuestro sistema financiero. Además, el reciente escándalo de los papeles de Pandora reveló hasta qué punto el ecosistema financiero internacional y, particularmente, el europeo, están generando evasión fiscal y contribuyendo al lavado de dinero, lo que hace que adquiera suma importancia la adopción por parte de la Comisión del paquete legislativo contra el lavado de dinero, que cumple una de las demandas que, desde hace mucho tiempo, venimos defendiendo desde el Grupo S&D.

De cara a los desarrollos de los mercados de capitales y la innovación tecnológica, y con carácter previo al inicio de las negociaciones del paquete legislativo contra el blanqueo de capitales (AML), este debate ha sido muy oportuno. Garantizar la eficiencia y coherencia del marco AML de la UE es de suma importancia.

Nicolás González Casares (S&D), *por escrito*. – La lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales y la financiación del terrorismo es vital para la estabilidad y la seguridad financiera en Europa. Las lagunas legislativas en un Estado miembro impactan en la UE en su conjunto.

Por este motivo, las normas de la UE deben implementarse y supervisarse de manera eficiente y coherente para combatir la delincuencia y proteger nuestro sistema financiero. Además, el reciente escándalo de los papeles de Pandora reveló hasta qué punto el ecosistema financiero internacional y, particularmente, el europeo, están generando evasión fiscal y contribuyendo al lavado de dinero, lo que hace que adquiera suma importancia la adopción por parte de la Comisión del paquete legislativo contra el lavado de dinero, que cumple una de las demandas que, desde hace mucho tiempo, venimos defendiendo desde el Grupo S&D.

De cara a los desarrollos de los mercados de capitales y la innovación tecnológica, y con carácter previo al inicio de las negociaciones del paquete legislativo contra el blanqueo de capitales (AML), este debate ha sido muy oportuno. Garantizar la eficiencia y coherencia del marco AML de la UE es de suma importancia.

Cristina Maestre Martín De Almagro (S&D), *por escrito*. – La lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales y la financiación del terrorismo es vital para la estabilidad y la seguridad financiera en Europa. Las lagunas legislativas en un Estado miembro impactan en la UE en su conjunto.

Por este motivo, las normas de la UE deben implementarse y supervisarse de manera eficiente y coherente para combatir la delincuencia y proteger nuestro sistema financiero. Además, el reciente escándalo de los papeles de Pandora reveló hasta qué punto el ecosistema financiero internacional y, particularmente, el europeo, están generando evasión fiscal y contribuyendo al lavado de dinero, lo que hace que adquiera suma importancia la adopción por parte de la Comisión del paquete legislativo contra el lavado de dinero, que cumple una de las demandas que, desde hace mucho tiempo, venimos defendiendo desde el Grupo S&D.

De cara a los desarrollos de los mercados de capitales y la innovación tecnológica, y con carácter previo al inicio de las negociaciones del paquete legislativo contra el blanqueo de capitales (AML), este debate ha sido muy oportuno. Garantizar la eficiencia y coherencia del marco AML de la UE es de suma importancia.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D), *por escrito*. – La lucha contra el blanqueo de capitales y la financiación del terrorismo es vital para la estabilidad y la seguridad financiera en Europa. Las lagunas legislativas en un Estado miembro impactan en la UE en su conjunto.

Por este motivo, las normas de la UE deben implementarse y supervisarse de manera eficiente y coherente para combatir la delincuencia y proteger nuestro sistema financiero. Además, el reciente escándalo de los papeles de Pandora reveló hasta qué punto el ecosistema financiero internacional y, particularmente, el europeo, están generando evasión fiscal y contribuyendo al lavado de dinero, lo que hace que adquiera suma importancia la adopción por parte de la Comisión del paquete legislativo contra el lavado de dinero, que cumple una de las demandas que, desde hace mucho tiempo, venimos defendiendo desde el Grupo S&D.

De cara a los desarrollos de los mercados de capitales y la innovación tecnológica, y con carácter previo al inicio de las negociaciones del paquete legislativo contra el blanqueo de capitales (AML), este debate ha sido muy oportuno. Garantizar la eficiencia y coherencia del marco AML de la UE es de suma importancia.

Susana Solís Pérez (Renew), *por escrito*. – Que la costumbre a este tipo de escándalos no nos haga pasar por alto la gravedad de los hechos. Los casi 12 millones de documentos expuestos públicamente en los papeles de Pandora demuestran que los que deberían ser guardianes frente al blanqueo de capitales y la evasión fiscal son, en muchas ocasiones, los que aparecen en los titulares. Los representantes públicos de la Unión Europea tenemos que actuar y ser contundentes en la condena, tanto desde Bruselas como desde las capitales de los Veintisiete.

A la hora de explorar medidas, una de las prioridades debe ser la creación de una Agencia Europea, con cimientos sólidos y los suficientes medios humanos, que vigile este tipo de prácticas. Más allá de la Resolución que aprobó este Parlamento, hay una lista negra de paraísos fiscales que se actualiza periódicamente. A pesar de las reiteradas peticiones de esta Cámara, los ministros de Economía y Finanzas de la UE decidieron excluir por motivos diplomáticos a varios países de la lista. De esta forma enviaron una señal que, a mi parecer, es totalmente equívoca.

Ahora es el momento de que la UE marque unas exigencias y criterios que corten de raíz la evasión de responsabilidades fiscales.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS*Vizepräsident***15. Porozumienia w sprawie globalnego podatku, które mają zostać zatwierdzone na szczycie G20 w Rzymie, 30 i 31 października (debata)**

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Billigung weltweiter Steuerabkommen auf dem G20-Gipfel in Rom (30./31. Oktober) (2021/2936(RSP)).

Anže Logar, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, I want to thank you for the opportunity to discuss the recent agreement reached in the OECD BEPS (Addressing Base Erosion and Profit Shifting) inclusive framework. This agreement is an important milestone, which will pave the way for further work on the EU tax legislative initiative in the Council.

Throughout the process, the Council has supported the objective of reaching a global consensus-based solution that takes into account the interests of all Member States. The fact is that the rules that govern international taxation right now have been in place for more than 100 years. That highlights the huge achievement this deal represents.

The agreement of 136 countries, including all G20 members, has required efforts and a constructive approach by everyone at the table. While the need for quick measures to force fair taxation is well understood, an agreement that includes all partners of the EU is much better. Now we have a firm statement with the new parameters for an international corporate tax framework and an ambitious implementation timeline.

Of course, it is a little early to speculate on the details of the multilateral convention that will be drafted to implement Pillar One, or on what this convention will entail for EU law and our work. But let me recall one important aspect: one of the main objectives of the work of the inclusive framework was reforming the way the profits of digital giants are distributed between the countries where these giants have their headquarters and the countries where they realise some of their profits. The deal on both pillars represents a paradigm change, which recognises that digitalisation has a profound effect on the economy and taxation, more specifically.

We also welcome the development of dispute prevention and resolution mechanisms, which will ensure tax certainty for all involved. The timeline for a multilateral convention in 2022, coming into effect in 2023, is ambitious, but we will do everything in our power to respect it.

As for Pillar Two, which will strengthen the measures covered by Pillar One, the agreed measures will remove a number of incentives for aggressive tax planning. I'm sure that we will continue working both with the EU and with our international partners to take further steps to ensure that the fair share of taxes is paid by everyone.

I hope that the fact that all EU Member States that participated in the OECD discussion are on board will open the door to a swift agreement in the Council, once we receive the proposal from the Commission.

While being optimistic, we should nevertheless remain vigilant. The statement by the inclusive framework is a very important document, but it is still not a final agreement, and technical experts now have to turn it into a set of functioning rules. This is not an easy task, even though they have the necessary and globally agreed parameters for their work.

To conclude, let me reiterate that this global deal represents a historic achievement and that we look forward to its speedy implementation by all international partners.

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, last week's endorsement by G20 finance ministers and the forthcoming endorsement by G20 leaders marks a key step towards the implementation of the historic global tax reform agreed in early October. With 136 jurisdictions on board, including developing countries, all G20 members, all OECD members, and all EU Member States that are part of the inclusive framework, this is nothing less than a tax revolution and a huge success for multilateralism. We should be proud of it.

As we emerge from the shadow of the pandemic, we have a unique opportunity to rebuild our economies on a new footing. We want to see not just a rebound, but a new era of sustained and sustainable growth. The Pandora Papers were another reminder of the injustices that characterise the global economic system today. The green and digital transition can only happen if it is based on fair taxation. Everyone must pay their fair share.

So this reset of global corporate taxation is a fundamental part of the change we need to see. Reaching this agreement is a major step forward in creating fairness in our global tax system. But we are not there yet. We must now work swiftly to ensure the effective implementation of this major tax reform. This is why, next to the key parameters for both pillars laid down in the agreement, we have also agreed on an implementation roadmap for both Pillar One and Pillar Two.

We are working on a very ambitious timeline. The OECD Secretariat is planning to finalise the Pillar Two model rules in five weeks. The text of the Pillar One multilateral convention should be finalised in spring of 2022. I must insist that we all do our utmost to deliver on this timeline of the implementation roadmap. Citizens do not ask for political agreements. They ask for effective action.

On our side, once the agreement is finalised the Commission will move very quickly to put it into practice in the EU. DG TAXUD is already drafting the directive for Pillar Two to be tabled as swiftly as possible once the model rules are all set at OECD level. We will also ensure a consistent and comprehensive implementation of Pillar One at EU level.

The European Commission has worked hard to drive forward this international effort. Getting to this point has required difficult choices for many countries, both in the EU and elsewhere. A spirit of compromise and common interest in Europe and worldwide enabled us to get here. We should be proud of this triumph for multilateralism. Now we must move forward together and without delay.

Markus Ferber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Vizepräsident, Frau Kommissarin, Herr Außenminister! In den letzten Wochen gab es im Kampf gegen unfaire Steuerpraktiken sowohl gute als auch schlechte Nachrichten zu vermelden.

Die schlechten Nachrichten waren, dass uns die *Pandora Papers* einmal mehr daran erinnern haben, dass es beim Kampf gegen aggressive Steuerplanung und Steuerhinterziehung noch viel zu tun gibt.

Die guten Nachrichten waren, dass sich 136 Staaten auf einen neuen gemeinsamen Rahmen für die Unternehmensbesteuerung mit einer globalen Mindeststeuer und neuen Regeln für die Besteuerung der Digitalwirtschaft geeinigt haben. Das war ein ganz starkes Zeichen der internationalen Zusammenarbeit.

Ich bin besonders froh, Frau Kommissarin, dass sich am Ende auch Irland, Ungarn und Estland dazu durchgerungen haben, der Vereinbarung beizutreten. Denn die Europäische Union sollte bei diesem Thema an der Spitze der Bewegung stehen. Das bedeutet auch: Sobald die Tinte trocken ist, sollte die Kommission – bitte richten Sie das dem Kollegen Gentiloni, der zuständig ist, aus – mit der Umsetzung in europäisches Recht beginnen. Wir jedenfalls stehen für eine zügige Umsetzung bereit.

An der Spitze der Bewegung zu stehen, heißt aber auch, dass wir uns an die Vereinbarungen halten, und zwar auch an die Verpflichtung, dass wir auf unilaterale Digitalsteuern verzichten. Auch das sollte, denke ich, zu der Vereinbarung dazugehören. Hier würde ich mir ein klares Signal von der Europäischen Kommission wünschen. Aber sie muss dann auch sagen, wie wir bei den Eigenmitteln der Europäischen Union zu anderen Einnahmemöglichkeiten kommen.

Biljana Borzan, *u ime kluba S&D*. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, ovo je povijesni dogovor i velika pobjeda za nas, socijaldemokrate. Sustav po kojem mali obrtnik plaća veći postotak poreza od velike multinacionalne kompanije duboko je nepravedan i mora se mijenjati. Minimalna efektivna porezna stopa će omogućiti pravedniju naplatu poreza. Veliki više neće moći šopingirati oko tražeći najbolju poreznu oazu, a Europskoj uniji se više neće godišnje ukrasti 190 milijardi eura. Je li se moglo bolje? Uvijek se može bolje. No 15 % u svakom slučaju puno je više nego nula – koliko sad imamo. Sada je ključna provedba dogovora, ali i nove inicijative kako bi se stvorila pravednija raspodjela bogatstva. Građani nisu ti koji trebaju platiti izlazak iz krize. Globalna ekonomija mora biti poštena i moramo pokazati da nema nedodirljivih.

Gilles Boyer, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, c'est d'un accord historique que nous parlons ce soir. Le mot est galvaudé, très souvent utilisé dans cet hémicycle, mais c'est la première fois que 136 pays s'accordent pour mettre à jour des règles fiscales internationales vieilles de presque un siècle qui étaient devenues totalement inadaptées à l'ère numérique. Avec deux principes clés, cela a été dit, à savoir que chacun paye l'impôt là où il doit le payer en taxant les grandes entreprises sur le lieu réel de leurs activités et en établissant un taux de taxation minimal des multinationales à 15 %. Avec un impôt minimal en vigueur, les entreprises ne seront plus en mesure de dresser les pays les uns contre les autres.

J'entends certains dire que 15 %, c'est trop peu. Et pour tout dire, je suis également de cet avis. Mais je préfère un accord mondial à 15 % à pas d'accord mondial à 20 %. C'est évidemment une première étape, une première étape importante qui nous a permis de mettre tout le monde autour de la table.

L'attente des citoyens européens est forte en la matière. Nous appelons la Commission à présenter dès que possible sa proposition de directive sur la taxation minimale afin d'assurer la mise en œuvre très rapide de cet accord au sein de notre Union européenne.

Je voudrais enfin me réjouir que nous ayons pu, sur ce sujet compliqué, réunir l'unanimité de nos États membres. Cela a été dit avant moi. Ce n'était pas du tout évident il y a de cela quelques semaines ou quelques mois, mais aujourd'hui les 27 États membres ont signé cet accord. Cela nous permettra, Madame la Commissaire, de faciliter assurément sa mise en œuvre au sein de l'Union. Nous souhaitons que cela préfigure d'autres accords unanimes en matière fiscale au sein de l'Union européenne et je sais combien l'unanimité est un sujet sensible. Vous connaissez, Madame la Commissaire, notre position en la matière.

Ernest Urtasun, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I think that the agreement reaches an important step forward. Firstly, multilateralism indexation matters demonstrate that it can deliver, and this is very important. And secondly, for the first time, we will be establishing at global level a minimum floor on tax competition, which is, indeed, very good news.

But I also have to say that the agreement leaves a bitter taste in some of the aspects. 15 percent – we know it's too low. And here we have to regret the role played by some also in Europe, for instance, to take out the words 'at least' before 15 percent.

Secondly, the thresholds are too high. This will mean that those new rules, Pillar One and Pillar Two, will affect only a very limited number of companies.

And thirdly, the way Pillar One is designed will mean that the revenues of the new mechanism will not go to countries that are more in need and where more activity actually happens. So it leaves a bitter taste, even though we recognise it's an important step forward.

Now the question is what we do at the European level, and we fully agree that this agreement needs to be swiftly implemented as soon as possible. And here there are things where greater ambition cannot be put, but there are areas where we can actually, as Europeans, put greater ambition. Nothing prevents us to change the thresholds actually at European level to put more ambition on a deal.

And here is, I think, something that the Commission should look at, because this agreement is a very first step, but we need to go much beyond what has been agreed at the OECD level.

Hélène Laporte, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, même si beaucoup d'incertitudes entourent cette révolution fiscale, notamment dans sa mise en œuvre, je soutiens le principe d'une taxation plus juste des multinationales ainsi qu'une imposition minimale effective sur les bénéficiaires.

Cette révision de la fiscalité des entreprises au niveau mondial est un élément fondamental du changement que nous devons observer. Chacun doit payer sa juste part. Il me semble équitable de réaffecter une part de l'impôt sur les bénéfices payés par les multinationales aux pays dits «de marché», c'est-à-dire ceux où elles réalisent leurs activités. L'impôt ne sera donc plus uniquement là où leurs sièges sociaux sont installés.

En fonction de sa conception finale, un impôt minimal mondial pourrait permettre de réduire le transfert des bénéfices dans tous les secteurs. Il pourrait également offrir une protection aux nombreux pays en développement lourdement poussés à accorder des exemptions et incitations fiscales aux investisseurs, les privant potentiellement de recettes fiscales supplémentaires. Les principes sont posés, mais les détails auront aussi toute leur importance. En effet, pour que cela fonctionne, la communauté internationale doit aider les pays en développement à démêler les incitations fiscales assujetties à la stabilisation dans leurs lois, traités et contrats. Dans le cas contraire, ces pays seraient doublement perdants en renonçant à des impôts du fait de l'incitation, d'une part, et en perdant les impôts au profit de pays développés, d'autre part. Le cadre inclusif devra donc s'atteler à cette question en priorité, ce qui nous démontre les difficultés pratiques de cette réforme.

Soulignons enfin que le taux d'imposition minimum de 15 % est bien inférieur à celui préconisé par le groupe de travail de l'OCDE, ce qui est une déception. Mais au-delà du taux, et surtout, la question de l'assiette d'imposition sera également primordiale.

(Die Aussprache wird unterbrochen.)

16. Ogłoszenie wyników głosowania

Der Präsident. – Bevor wir die Aussprache nun fortsetzen, bitte ich Sie um einen Augenblick Geduld.

(Der Präsident gibt die Abstimmungsergebnisse bekannt.)

Im Anschluss an diese Abstimmung über den Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2022 — alle Einzelpläne (2021/0227(BUD)) ersuche ich nun den slowenischen Ratsvorsitz gemäß Artikel 314 Absatz 4 Buchstabe c des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union, eine erste Erklärung abzugeben.

Anže Logar, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament has just adopted amendments to the Council's position on the draft budget for the financial year 2022. I take note of the differences in the positions of our two institutions concerning the draft budget for 2022 presented by the Commission. Consequently, in my capacity as President of the Council, I agree that the President of the European Parliament convenes the Conciliation Committee as required in point C of paragraph 4 of Article 314 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

Der Präsident. – Ich danke Ihnen für diese Erklärung und hoffe auf eine rasche Aufnahme der Verhandlungen und auf ein positives Ergebnis zur Sicherstellung der Zukunft Europas.

(Der Präsident gibt die übrigen Abstimmungsergebnisse bekannt.)

17. Porozumienia w sprawie globalnego podatku, które mają zostać zatwierdzone na szczycie G20 w Rzymie, 30 i 31 października (ciąg dalszy debat)

Der Präsident. – Wir setzen nun unsere Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission (2021/2936(RSP)) fort.

Michiel Hoogeveen, namens de ECR-Fractie. – Voorzitter, wij steunen de versterking van mechanismen voor beter fiscaal bestuur en de bestrijding van belastingfraude en -ontduiking. Er zijn echter nog veel landen, van de Fiji-eilanden tot Panama, die geen coöperatieve jurisdicties hebben voor belastingdoeleinden. Dus wat is dan nog het nut van de voorgestelde wereldwijde gedragscode?

Het volgende over het voorgestelde wereldwijde belastingtarief van 15 procent: belastingen zijn een nationale bevoegdheid en belastingconcurrentie hoort daarbij. De Tax Foundation heeft laten zien dat vennootschapsbelasting voornamelijk wordt gedragen door werknemers en consumenten. Tot 70 procent van de belastingdruk valt terug op arbeid. Toen de VS het belastingtarief verlaagden, was dat aantoonbaar gunstig voor investeringen, banen en lonen.

De wereldwijde minimale vennootschapsbelasting gaat niet zozeer over het beëindigen van de belastingconcurrentie tussen landen, maar eerder over het beëindigen van de concurrentie tussen de wensen van progressieven en de realiteit.

José Gusmão, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhor Presidente, o acordo sobre tributação de multinacionais da OCDE é uma fraude que assenta em duas mentiras. A primeira é a de que as empresas multinacionais passarão a ser tributadas a 15 %. Isso não irá acontecer. O primeiro pilar prevê que os primeiros 10 % de margem de lucro sejam isentos, o que significa que algumas das empresas multinacionais mais lucrativas do planeta pagarão não 15, não 10, não 5, mas 0 %, e o segundo pilar foi atirado para daqui a dez anos, ou seja, para as calendas, politicamente falando. A segunda mentira é a de que a receita será paga nos países em que a atividade económica ocorre, um dos princípios fundamentais da OCDE e que também não é respeitado nesta proposta. A parte que será distribuída pelos países que a ela têm direito corresponde a uma pequena parte do rendimento tributado, o que irá aprofundar as desigualdades entre o mundo desenvolvido e o subdesenvolvido e entre os países que promovem a evasão fiscal e os que a querem combater.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Örülök, hogy végül egy olyan kompromisszum született a globális adórendszer reformját illetően, amelyhez Magyarország jó szívvel tudott csatlakozni. Büszke vagyok rá, hogy az óriási nyomás ellenére határozott, konzisztens fellépéssel mi is aktívan formáltuk a megállapodást a nemzetközi szinten. Legfontosabb eredményünknek azt tartom, hogy a vállalati adó Magyarországon 9 százalék marad és a megállapodás nem jelent új terhet a termelő vállalatoknak.

Az ördög ugyanakkor a részletekben rejlik. Egyetértek azzal, hogy ki kell dolgozni a vonatkozó uniós szabályozást is az EU joggal történő összhang, illetve az egységes bevezetés biztosítása érdekében. Mindazonáltal remélem, hogy az Unió nem szándékozik lábon lőni magát. Ha fel akarunk zárkózni Kínához és az USA-hoz, ne tévesszük szem elől a versenyképesség kérdését. A tisztességes adóverseny pozitív, az adóharmonizáció azt megölné és külföldre kényszerítené a cégeket. Ne vezessünk be tehát a globális megállapodásban foglaltaknál szigorúbb szabályokat az Unióban. Végezetül azt se tévesszük szem elől, hogy nemzeti hatáskörrel van szó. Konszenzusra kell törekedni, tiszteletben tartva minden tagállam álláspontját.

Lídia Pereira (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, o combate à evasão fiscal e à utilização de paraísos fiscais está na ordem do dia e ainda bem. O acordo que a OCDE se prepara para celebrar na cimeira de Roma é um sinal político forte e a União Europeia não pode deixar de ser protagonista, mas o protagonismo político que se exige tem de ter correspondência no empenho legislativo.

Se o dia zero é para celebrar o acordo, o dia um tem de ser para trabalhar e dar consequência ao que será acordado. E aqui, mais uma vez, precisamos do empenho dos Estados. Se a soberania fiscal é incontornável, a cooperação é inevitável. A transferência de lucros e o planeamento fiscal agressivo prejudicam, gravemente, os orçamentos nacionais dos países em que muitas grandes empresas operam. Os dois pilares do acordo querem garantir que os lucros são tributados onde são gerados e que há uma taxa mínima de imposto de 15 %. São mudanças estruturais que vão exigir ambição, realismo e competência, sobretudo nas capitais europeias.

Os maiores obstáculos estão, por vezes, nos detalhes e as mudanças que ambicionamos têm de proteger, acima de tudo, os direitos dos nossos contribuintes, a competitividade das nossas empresas e a integridade do nosso mercado interno. Para estar à altura da ambição anunciada, temos de ir além das declarações. Está na hora de passarmos às ações.

Irene Tinagli (S&D). – Mr President, the first thing I want to express today is a great sense of achievement. One hundred and thirty-six countries have finally reached an agreement to end the deleterious race to the bottom caused by deregulated international fiscal competition. This agreement will help us fight fiscal elusion, fiscal dumping and will provide new resources to many countries that can be used to address social inequalities and to support economic recovery.

Someone says it's not enough. Yes, many of us would have loved to see a more ambitious agreement. But now we have two choices. We can keep complaining and despise the agreement, or we can acknowledge the enormous effort made, and we can push for a rapid and effective implementation of the agreement in the European Union as soon as possible.

We choose this latter option and we call on all the parties involved at the Commission, the Council and every Member State to take a step forward and to facilitate such fast and strict implementation. Now, more than ever, we need more tax justice. Let's get started.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, I welcome the agreement that the OECD finally got all Member States to agree on, but there's no doubt it was a long and tortuous road, and it did take some time.

From my perspective, as an MEP from Ireland, we had genuine concerns, and it does go to show the importance of unanimity in terms of tax issues when it comes to the European Union. The fact of the matter is, Ireland did have genuine concerns and they were addressed eventually, at the end of the negotiations, in terms of ensuring certainty around tax rates. That is very important and very significant, Commissioner. We can't have a situation where the Commission, which is to uphold and implement the treaties, at the same time, is now looking at the option of using Article 116 in areas of tax harmonisation. I believe that is against the spirit of what Article 116 is about, and I would urge caution in that direction.

It goes to show that, when we do put our collective minds together, when we make an argument, we can sit down and we can come to an agreement, and that happened with the OECD in the context of 136 countries. So it was an achievement, and it does go to show that collectively we can work together.

We now have to ensure that it is implemented in a fair manner and that it is implemented for a long period of time. In other words, we don't have people coming back to the table again next week, next month, next year, saying, 'Well, we need to raise it further. It should be increased, increased, increased.' From that perspective, we need certainty. We need the Commission now to get along with the legislation, implement it, and uphold the spirit of the treaties in terms of Article 116, and not to abuse it.

Damien Carême (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, alors oui, on pourrait pavoiser toute la soirée sur cet accord fiscal qui fixe un taux d'imposition sur les sociétés de 15 % au niveau mondial. C'est une première, c'est vrai. Mais la réalité, c'est que cet accord fixe un taux effectif de 15 % quand il aurait pu, quand il aurait dû être de 21 %. La réalité, c'est que cet accord ne concerne qu'une poignée de multinationales. La réalité, c'est encore que cet accord favorise les pays développés, laissant encore une fois de côté les pays les plus pauvres. Toujours la même histoire, encore et encore.

Donc, pavoiser serait indécent. Justice fiscale, sociale, climat, c'est le même combat et ce combat nécessite un vrai changement de cap, une vraie ambition. Cet accord est là. Nous devons donc faire avec. Par contre, rien ne nous interdit de faire mieux en Europe. Puisque la France prendra la présidence de l'Union à partir de janvier, je lance un défi à son ministre de l'économie, Bruno Le Maire, qui se réjouit de cette affaire. Tout d'abord, pour être tout à fait transparent, peut-il publier le taux effectif de taxation des multinationales concernées en France et en Europe? Et enfin, êtes-vous prêt, Monsieur le Ministre, à proposer à vos collègues de rehausser l'ambition de cet accord en fixant un taux minimum effectif intra-européen d'au moins 21 %?

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Mr President, the global pandemic has led to a consensus on something as simple as large corporations having to contribute to the welfare state in the same way as small to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Better late than never.

The international agreement is good news. As the agreement was reached, the Spanish Government announced the minimum corporate rate of 15%, as recommended, but they are cheating: the 15% applies to the tax base, not to profits – not a small detail.

The inability to properly tax large corporations and the very rich undermines the legitimacy of any redistributive system and demoralises honest taxpayers. When public figures get away with fraud and tax evasion, the moral compass of society is bankrupt. Former king of Spain Juan Carlos amassed huge sums as an international commissioner, all for the benefit of his family, including the present king. But they never pay taxes on these kickbacks, or 'presents', as they call them. But hey, no problem! Spanish tax authorities, judges and political parties all agree: they will not investigate the dirty business of the monarchy. Further proof that in Spain we are not all equal before the law.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Mr President, this agreement shows the ability of more than 130 countries to agree. Having signatures below such a complicated technical agreement in a politically sensitive area shows that we can agree, and now I guess without any delay we should implement.

This agreement doesn't mean that we solved most of the tax issues in the European Union. I can name a huge tax gap, especially in the VAT area; high compliance costs especially for our SMEs; complication for firms that want to be active in the European single market. This is the list of our troubles. I wonder, if 130 countries can agree under the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) framework – and now I am turning to you, Mr Logar – why can 27 countries not agree under the EU framework and solve at least some of the very important tax problems within our Union. Thank you very much. I hope we will also move forward.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Mr President, there's no doubt that the global tax deal is historic, and not just because even Ireland accepted it. For the first time in history, it allows a country to tax profits without the physical presence of a company on their territory and to ensure a global minimum effective tax rate. The Social Democrats have been, for a long time, strong and vocal supporters of this principle.

So yes, it's a historic deal. Is it a final deal? Let's hope not. Let it be the first of many deals, because I share the concerns: the minimum of 15% is still too low, certainly when compared to what the EU citizens pay on their income. Physical presence is still too important, and the Pandora Papers shows that it's still too easy to hide profits and wealth.

So I see the deal as a boost in our lasting effort to fight tax avoidance and to make everyone pay their fair share. This deal is historic, but the work needs to continue.

Aurore Lalucq (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, je fais partie d'une génération qui a grandi dans les années 80, en pleine contre-révolution néolibérale. Une génération à laquelle on a expliqué que l'État ne pouvait pas tout, qu'il fallait s'adapter à la mondialisation triomphante, être un winner, une génération qui, à chaque fois qu'elle proposait quelque chose, se voyait rétorquer: oui, on voudrait bien, mais malheureusement ce n'est pas possible. Une génération qui en somme a grandi avec l'instrumentalisation de pseudo-lois économiques visant à décrédibiliser toute demande légitime de citoyens. Les États mettaient en scène leur impuissance à défendre l'intérêt général. L'économie était leur arme et leur langage.

Alors, oui, cet accord fiscal mondial n'est pas parfait. Pilier 1: usine à gaz; 15 %, le taux n'est pas assez élevé. Mais si ce n'est pas 15 % aujourd'hui, c'est zéro. Aujourd'hui, les États décident ensemble d'aller chercher l'argent là où il se trouve. Et, plus important encore, on arrête de mettre en scène l'impuissance de la puissance publique, une brèche est enfin ouverte. Profitons-en.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, temos hoje em pleno funcionamento um instrumento que apoia a recuperação das economias europeias. As operações de emissão de dívida têm sido um sucesso. O dinheiro já está a chegar aos Estados-Membros, mas a criação deste fundo impôs um compromisso: reembolso assegurado por novos recursos próprios, entre eles uma taxa sobre o digital.

Este acordo na OCDE é, incontestavelmente, uma excelente notícia, impensável há bem pouco tempo, mas a obrigação de reembolso da dívida por novos recursos próprios do orçamento da União mantém-se. Há que salvaguardar as futuras gerações de contribuintes europeus e assegurar que o pagamento não se fará pela contribuição dos Estados-Membros.

Queremos uma solução para a taxa sobre o digital. Cabe à Comissão apresentar propostas que assegurem que a totalidade da receita estimada inicialmente prevista é gerada e entra no orçamento da União Europeia.

Mairead McGuinness, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for what has been a very lively debate.

As many of you have said, this political agreement which we have reached is truly historic, and the Commission will work at full speed to implement it. In parallel, the Commission will continue working on its business tax agenda.

Firstly, by cracking down on tax avoidance and evasion. Here, the Commission is already preparing new legislative initiatives that will enhance tax transparency and bring new elements under the umbrella of automatic exchanges of information to reinforce further the fight against tax evasion and avoidance. This includes a proposal before the end of this year to tackle the misuse of shell companies for tax purposes in the EU. Commissioner Gentiloni already touched on this when he spoke here two weeks ago.

Secondly, safeguarding revenues needed for our recovery and growth, while making us more competitive. The Commission will launch a broader reflection on the right tax mix for the future, and this reflection should conclude in 2022 in a Tax Symposium on the 'EU tax mix on the road to 2050', in which I would invite you all to actively participate.

The Commission counts on the support of the European Parliament to make progress on this agenda quickly and with the highest level of ambition.

Anže Logar, predsedujoči Svetu. – Spoštovani predsedujoči, komisarka, poslanci, gospe in gospodje. Podrobno sem prisluhnil današnji razpravi in lahko rečem, da je bila enotna v želji po tem, da skupaj priznamo uspeh, ki se je dosegel v zvezi z usklajevanjem davčne zakonodaje na globalni ravni.

V tem pogledu mislim, da smo skupaj lahko optimistični, da bo reforma pravil o mednarodnem obdavčenju dohodkov pravnih oseb uspešno uresničena. Ne v času slovenskega predsedstva – v času prihodnjih predsedstev, v letu ali dveh.

Zato v tem primeru od Komisije pričakujemo čimprejšnji konkretni predlog v zvezi s predlogom direktive za uveljavitev stebra dve in seveda tudi razmislek o potrebi po direktivi za uveljavitev stebra ena.

V vsakem primeru bo slovensko predsedstvo naredilo vse, kar je v njegovi moči, da pospeši ta dogovor oziroma da usklajuje stališča držav članic pri tem, da se čim prej doseže ta dogovor. Hvala.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

(Die Sitzung wird um 19.34 Uhr unterbrochen.)

18. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 20.00 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

19. Druga część głosowania

Der Präsident. – Wir kommen nun zur zweiten Abstimmungsrunde des heutigen Tages.

Die Dossiers, über die wir abstimmen, sind der Tagesordnung zu entnehmen.

Die Abstimmungsrunde ist von 20.00 bis 21.15 Uhrgeöffnet.

Ich bitte Sie, vollständig daran teilzunehmen.

Es kommt dasselbe Abstimmungsverfahren zur Anwendung wie in den vorangegangenen Abstimmungsunden.

Alle Abstimmungen sind namentliche Abstimmungen.

Ich erkläre die zweite Abstimmungsrunde für eröffnet. Sie können bis 21.15 Uhr abstimmen.

Die Ergebnisse der zweiten Abstimmungsrunde werden morgen um 8.30 Uhr bekannt gegeben.

Die Aussprachen werden um 20.30 Uhr mit der Aussprache über dieErklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur gewaltsamen Zurückdrängung von Migranten an der Außengrenze der EU (2021/2932(RSP)) wieder aufgenommen.

(Die Sitzung wird um 20.01 Uhr unterbrochen.)

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ*Wiceprzewodnicząca***20. Wznowienie posiedzenia***(Posiedzenie zostało wznowione o godz. 20.32)***21. Zawracanie migrantów na granicach zewnętrznych Unii Europejskiej (debata)**

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego są oświadczenia Rady i Komisji w sprawie zawracania migrantów na granicach zewnętrznych Unii Europejskiej (2021/2932(RSP)).

Anže Logar, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, in recent months, we have been witnessing a change in the geopolitical situation in the neighbouring regions and attempts to instrumentalise migration. For this reason, effective management of our external borders is crucial. The Schengen Borders Code must be applied in compliance with relevant EU and international law on human rights, including obligations related to access to international protection and the principle of non-refoulement, the cornerstone of both international refugee law and international human rights law.

We are aware of several reports on alleged pushbacks and mistreatment at the external borders. I can guarantee that the Presidency, the Member States and the EU institutions are taking these allegations very seriously. Violent pushbacks cannot be allowed to take place on EU soil. Member States that have allegedly been involved in migrant pushbacks are investigating the published report in depth and taking all necessary corrective actions.

As you are aware, flights and internal transport are being organised to facilitate the transit of migrants through Belarus to Lithuania, Latvia and Poland. Irregular arrivals in Lithuania in 2021 are more than 50 times higher than those in 2020, and Poland and Latvia have also faced increased irregular border crossings from Belarus.

It is not only the countries along the external EU border that are exposed and under severe pressure due to these hybrid attacks from the Belarusian regime. We are already witnessing secondary movement further into the EU. We need to adequately address attempts to instrumentalise for political purposes and other hybrid threats.

In order to achieve this, we need a swift concrete and common solution at EU level and, as we know, the EU Council will discuss this issue. Effective control of our external borders is crucial for the prevention of security risks, illegal border-crossing and possible migration pressure.

We must take advantage of all existing tools in order to have a better overview of who is entering the EU. One of those tools is the European Asylum Dactyloscopy Database (EURODAC). A swift adoption of the proposal to revise the system is one of our priorities in the field of home affairs. The Presidency believes that the revised EURODAC could play an essential role in preventing abuse of the asylum system and secondary movements of migrants.

Ylva Johansson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, two weeks ago, investigative journalists from Lighthouse Reports published allegations of violent pushbacks at our EU borders. You called for this debate in response to those reports, and I thank you for that. This is not the first time we get such reports. The Commission has received numerous allegations of pushbacks, including from the UNHCR. Violence at our borders is never acceptable, especially if it is structured and organised. We must protect our EU external borders while upholding fundamental rights, and it's possible to do both.

The very next day, after the media published these reports, I raised them at the Justice and Home Affairs Council on 7 October, and I raised these reports in personal meetings with the Croatian Minister of the Interior, Davor Božinović, and with the Greek Minister of Migration, Notis Mitarachi. The Croatian Minister announced an investigation, and since then, the Croatian national chief of police said that three policemen involved in violent pushbacks will face disciplinary proceedings. And I received assurances that any necessary follow up action will be taken.

My services have been in touch with the Romanian authorities, and the Romanian Minister is taking these allegations very seriously and has ordered an investigation. He is ready to take disciplinary measures or initiate criminal proceedings if the investigation concludes that there have been wrongdoings.

I expect Greece now to also investigate these allegations swiftly and thoroughly. It is the duty of national authorities to investigate allegations and follow up any wrongdoing.

Lighthouse Reports also published claims of abuse of EU funding. I have asked national authorities in Croatia, Greece and Romania to investigate any confirmed reports of misuse of funds, and the Commission will not hesitate to ask its competent authority, OLAF, to conduct investigations. The Commission will take action if such allegations are confirmed and will recover the funds unduly used. European taxpayers expect us to protect our borders and to uphold our rules. As a Union, we must move beyond investigations to effective border management that links border protection, to protection of fundamental rights, and in our New Pact on Migration and Asylum, we have this approach. The Commission proposes to set up an Independent Monitoring Mechanism at the border as part of a new screening procedure. It's high time to implement the Pact and especially the Independent Monitoring Mechanism. These words were spoken last week by Gillian Triggs, Assistant High-Commissioner of the UNHCR, at a conference in Malta. I couldn't agree more. Independent observers can help to establish what is really going on and bring transparency and trust.

Croatia has already set up a monitoring mechanism. It now needs to be fully implemented. Greece also needs an independent monitoring mechanism and should now turn bilateral assurances into action. I encourage Greece to make progress, but this is not only about Croatia or Greece. I call on all Member States not to wait for the Pact and already now set up independent monitoring mechanism under their respective national law provisions.

Pushbacks should never be normalised, pushbacks should never be legalised. At least seven people have died so far at our external borders with Belarus. These deaths are unacceptable. The situation is unprecedented. On the other side of the border is a violent, aggressive, illegitimate regime. A desperate regime under sanctions by the European Union, sending people to the border and into harm's way. The Belarusian regime doesn't care about people's lives. People pay a lot of money to state-owned companies to be brought to Minsk, and they're facilitated to the border with the EU. Once there, the Belarusian border guards change their attitude from helping migrants to reach the border to violently preventing them from going back.

Our priority is to save lives and to save lives we must stop the regime. During the last plenary session, I outlined our EU action against the regime in Belarus. It's time to discuss further sanctions.

On our own side of the border, transparency is now paramount. Full transparency to avoid rumours and unsubstantiated reports allows us to concentrate on supporting Poland and the people at risk.

We are not the Belarusian regime. We are the European Union. We hold ourselves to the rule of law. As the President said here this week, yesterday in fact, the rule of law protects the values on which our Union is founded: freedom, democracy, equality and respect for human rights.

As a Commission, we do not usually comment on draft laws, but reports suggest that the proposal in the amended Polish Aliens Law, to give border guards autonomy to grant access to an asylum procedure or not, is already in practice on the ground. My services are in discussion with the Polish authorities on its compliance with the EU *acquis*.

The weather is getting worse. EU obligations must be applied immediately to protect vulnerable people, especially children. We must protect people's lives, their rights and their dignity, as well as our borders. Member States must conduct investigations to establish the facts and take actions, set up independent monitoring systems and ensure transparency. And all of us must now work together to get an agreement on the Pact.

Lena Düpont, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, to begin with the obvious, the European Union, each Member State, everyone acting on their behalf need to comply with fundamental rights obligation.

At the same time, they are also by national, European and international law obliged to protect borders and to fight criminal networks, smuggling and exploiting the most vulnerable ones. Even more so when these networks are state sponsored – an instrument like migratory flows – like done by Erdogan or Lukashenko. In this sense, this obligation is even more crucial when we speak about European borders, because then Schengen and our four freedoms rely on that.

No doubt it is a sensitive balance, and we witnessed just yesterday in plenary a government that does not live up to our expectations. But there are other Member States working together smoothly with European support, answering hybrid attacks together, cooperating with the Commission on alleged cases. And because it is a sensitive balance, we need to make a few things clear. Let's not expect from our officers, European or national, land or sea border, to first open up a legal review of complex questions when acting on our behalf.

The principle of non-refoulement is, of course, to be respected, but neither does it mean that access to a procedure can be practically applied at every inch of the border, nor does it mean that everyone asking for protection is eligible for that. And see, and this is the key. It is on us finding the right balance politically, legally and enforceable under difficult circumstances. Half-way to that is a pact screening border procedure, the crisis mechanism which prepares us better. The second part is the upcoming revision of the Schengen Border Code.

But the need for better coordination – measures to prevent manipulated crossings – instruments to trigger in critical situations. We are the ones that need to be in the driving seat of any orderly management, not dictators threatening the stability of the Union.

Birgit Sippel, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Zahllose Medienberichte zeigen ein erschreckendes Bild vom Zustand der Menschenrechte an unseren Außengrenzen. Bilder von gewaltsamen *Push-backs* gegen Menschen sind eine Schande für unsere Europäische Union. Denn es sind eben keine Einzelfälle, wie manche uns glauben machen möchten. Es ist ein systematischer Angriff auf das Asylrecht, auf die Genfer Flüchtlingskonvention, um dann die Regeln für internationalen Schutz, ja, die europäischen Werte selbst neu zu schreiben.

Und all das auf dem Rücken von Menschen, die bei uns in Europa Schutz und Arbeit suchen und stattdessen verprügelt und verschleppt werden. Daher müssen Medien und Nichtregierungsorganisationen Zugang zu Grenzregionen haben, aktuell gerade an der polnisch-belarussischen Grenze, wo die polnische Regierung versucht, einen rechtsfreien Raum zu etablieren.

Deshalb ganz klar die Bitte an die Kommission: Leiten Sie Vertragsverletzungsverfahren ein, und stoppen Sie den Einsatz von EU-Mitteln dort, wo *Push-backs* stattfinden.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, children are freezing to death on the borders of Europe, and your main concern is border protection and Schengen? Do you remember colleagues at the start of this mandate when a new portfolio was created, the European Way of Life – remember that? And remember the position that this House took about the promotion and the protection of the European Way of Life? Well, compare that to what is happening on our borders today, because sending children into the cold to freeze to death, sending women and children on leaky boats with no engines at gunpoint to be sent back to Turkey, sending people back to the hell of Libya in order to make a political point. Seriously, is that the European Way of Life? Is that what we stand for? Well, not in my name.

Are the frontline countries facing big problems? Yes, they are. But the only reason the people like Lukashenko and Erdoğan are able to blackmail Europe is because the Council, for years, has refused to adopt an asylum and migration policy. So it is your responsibility. You are guilty.

Now today, an NGO, a Dutch NGO, has brought before the European Court of Justice the case of a Syrian refugee who was pushed back by the Greek authorities and Frontex. And it was all documented. And again, it is citizens doing the job of the European Commission. And I know where you stand, Madam Commissioner, you have our full support. But we also know that not everybody in the Commission feels that the Commission should enforce the rules.

Madam Commissioner, you have our full support to start infringement procedures against all the countries who do the pushbacks.

Tineke Strik, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I must confess it's with deep concern and also despair that I contribute to this debate. Yesterday, in an intense debate on the rule of law, a vast majority in the Parliament demanded clear action against the destruction of the rule of law in Poland. And that makes me wonder: does the rule of law stop at our borders?

For years now, we know that thousands of people have been pushed back from the EU borders. They all could not request for protection. Many of them suffered from violence, and a number of them even lost their lives. The silence from the Commission, as guardian of the Treaties, and from the Member States has encouraged border countries to make these push packs a systematic practice, and the debate has even turned from denial to a demand that push-backs are legalised. Let's just hear the Council just a minute ago.

Dear Commissioner, I know that you condemned push-backs, but you are the vital actor who is able to put those words into practice. We depend on you to stop these flagrant violations and ensure protection, to start infringement procedures, make funding conditional and to ensure that Frontex does not facilitate but prevent push-backs.

And you also referred to the new pact proposals. But I hope you realise there is no sense in waiting for new legislation. The current rules have to be respected now, so let's avoid that at the end of our political term, we have to conclude that we did not manage to restore the rule of law at our borders and that instead we have only turned it into worse. We still have a chance, but we really do not have time to lose.

Peter Kofod, *for ID-Gruppen*. – Fru formand! Rundt om det her parlament er der hegn, der er kontrol, og der er bevæbnet politi, og det er godt. For hvis der er ballademagere eller nogen, som ønsker at skade os, som prøver at komme ind, så skal de selvfølgelig stoppes. Jeg har aldrig hørt nogen af jer klage over, at der er sikkerhed i det her parlament. Og lad mig derfor spørge: Hvorfor skal den samme sikkerhed ikke gælde for hele Europa og Europas borgere? Hvorfor mener I ikke, at Europa skal beskyttes bedre med hegn, med kontrol og med bevæbnede vagter, så vi kan stoppe folk fra bare at vade ind i Europa? Hvorfor virker hegn og kontrol, når det handler om at passe på Parlamentet og vores ansatte, men ikke når det handler om at passe på Europa og befolkningerne? Jeg drømmer om en dag, hvor et flertal herinde vil beskytte Europa, lige så godt som I ville beskytte Europa-Parlamentet, hvor hegn og kontrol og pushbacks og hvor lov og orden trumfer jeres dobbeltmoral og politiske korrekthed. Lad os beskytte Europa. Lad os bygge Fort Europa.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Pozwólcie, że rozpocznę to wystąpienie od słów podziękowania dla wszystkich funkcjonariuszy, od Hiszpanii, od Ceuty przez Włochy, Grecję, również Bułgarię, Rumunię, a kończąc na funkcjonariuszach polskiej Straży Granicznej i polskiej policji, bo to na ich barkach spoczywa dzisiaj odpowiedzialność za to, żebyście Państwo dzisiaj tutaj, w Strasburgu czy w Brukseli, mogli podczas posiedzeń plenarnych wypowiadać czasami niezbyt mądre kwestie, żebyście mogli być bezpieczni. To po pierwsze.

Po drugie, uporządkujmy tę dyskusję. Mianowicie, osoby usiłujące nielegalnie przekroczyć granicę przebywają na terytorium Białorusi – odniosę się do sytuacji mojego kraju – legalnie. Podkreślam – przebywają na Białorusi legalnie. Taki status daje im możliwość zgłoszenia się w przejściach granicznych w celu złożenia wniosku o udzielenie ochrony międzynarodowej. Należy przypuszczać więc, że świadomie wybierają nielegalny sposób przekroczenia granicy. Również rodzice tych dzieci, o których pani mówiła, również te matki tych dzieci, o których pani mówiła, nielegalnie, świadomie wybierają taką decyzję, aby, omijając restrykcje w polskich systemach, zalegalizować swój pobyt w Unii Europejskiej.

Tylko około 44 % migrantów przebywających dzisiaj w strzeżonych ośrodkach dla cudzoziemców Straży Granicznej złożyło wnioski o udzielenie ochrony międzynarodowej. Większość zatrzymanych deklaruje chęć podróży do Europy Zachodniej, do Niemiec, Holandii i Belgii. Zapytajcie mieszkańców Berlina, Monachium, Madrytu, czy chcą tych nielegalnych migrantów – nie uchodźców – nielegalnych migrantów?

Należy cały czas pamiętać, że pomimo iż pojęcie „push-back” jest sformułowaniem używanym w kontekście migracji, nie wynika z porządku prawnego. W związku z tym nie powinniśmy w kontekście prawnym, przestrzegania bądź nieprzestrzegania przepisów prawa, używać tego pojęcia, gdyż jest to język publicystyczny.

Polska w swoich działaniach ma na celu zapobieganie „push-in”, czyli nielegalnym przekroczeniom granicy przez migrantów, którzy są instrumentalnie wykorzystywani przez reżim białoruski inkasujący od tych nielegalnych migrantów od 10 do 15 tysięcy dolarów, żeby legalnie przybyli na Białoruś. A Państwo opowiadacie tu jakieś niestworzone dyrdymały.

Cornelia Ernst, im Namen der Fraktion The Left. – Frau Präsidentin! *Push-backs*, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren, sind völkerrechtswidrig, und damit muss endlich Schluss sein! Die Festung Europa zementiert sich ja nicht nur nach außen, sondern mittlerweile zieht sie sich von Mitgliedstaat zu Mitgliedstaat, von Grenzzaun zu Grenzzaun, quer durch die EU – etwas, was ich niemals für möglich gehalten hätte!

Im Auftrag von Mitgliedstaaten, zum Beispiel dem polnischen, werden Geflüchtete an EU-gesponserten Grenzwällen festgehalten. Oder sie werden irgendwo ausgeraubt. Sie werden geschlagen, gedemütigt, ausgehungert. Unter den Augen von Frontex werden Frauen, Kinder, Männer auf dem Meer ausgesetzt, in Wälder abgedrängt, in Flüsse geworfen. Zigtausende starben an den Grenzen der EU. Und nichts passiert!

Push-backs sind eine menschenrechtliche Kapitulation, und sie sind illegal! Kein nationales Gericht der Welt – im Übrigen auch kein polnisches – kann *Push-backs* legalisieren. Kernstück jedes *Push-backs* ist doch, dass Geflüchteten das Recht, einen Asylantrag überhaupt zu stellen, verwehrt wird! Damit wird das individuelle Recht auf Asyl komplett abgeschafft – es ist weg! Und das dürfen wir nicht zulassen!

Die Völker Europas haben in zwei schrecklichen Weltkriegen erfahren, was es heißt, nirgendwohin fliehen zu können. Das Grundrecht auf Asyl gehört zu den wichtigsten Werten des Nachkriegseuropas, ist die große Lehre eines Jahrhunderts, in dem Millionen Menschen im Stich gelassen wurden und ihr Leben zerstört wurde. In dieses barbarische Zeitalter darf es kein Zurück geben!

Ich fordere die Kommission auf, nicht nur gegen Lukaschenka vorzugehen, sondern gegen jeden Mitgliedstaat, der die Menschenrechte mit Füßen tritt.

Dorien Rookmaker (NI). – Madam President, let's be practical: pushbacks are a result of failing immigration policies. There are more people trying to get in than we want to let in. There is a gap between rules and reality.

If we prohibit pushbacks, because we want to comply with international law, Member States will look for other options to contain and restrain immigration. This is the situation now in Greece. Greece gives asylum seekers a status, so they can travel to Germany and the Netherlands, and there they can ask for asylum again because they are not in the system. That's the practice now.

It will not help to punish Frontex, and it won't help to punish Greece. They are doing the best they can. We simply have to change the way we work. If refugees are able to ask for asylum online outside of Europe and go through the immigration process online outside Europe, we will be able to separate refugees from the people who are just looking for a better life.

We have to change the law or we have to change reality.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, sprječavanje ilegalnih migracija, jedne od najprofitabilnijih kriminalnih aktivnosti, ali isto tako i sredstva podmuklog pritiska na Europu, iznimno je zahtjevno. I zato večeras počinjem s velikom zahvalom i priznanjem svim policajkama i policajcima koji će i ove noći po različitim terenima i različitim vremenskim uvjetima diljem europske granice još jednom izaći u nepoznato i suzbijati organizirane mreže krijumčara ljudi. Istodobno je potpuno jasno: u uređenoj Europi nema mjesta nasilju nad migrantima, a svako pojedinačno kršenje ljudskih prava, osobito onih najranjivijih, je potpuno neprihvatljivo. Kolegice i kolege, s moderniziranom policijom i bez podizanja bodljikavih žica, Hrvatska učinkovito vrši svoju pravnu obvezu i dužnost zaštite državne i europske granice. Odgovorno i zakonito, i uz nezavisni nadzor granične kontrole, jedinstveni mehanizam koji je uvela prva u Uniji.

Europsko pravo uspostavlja nedvosmislenu obvezu graničnih patrola, prevencija i odvracanja, a Europski sud za ljudska prava potvrđuje da nema mjesta povredama kod neposrednog vraćanja prilikom stihijskih i ilegalnih prelazaka. Pod hitno nam treba zajednički europski dogovor u kojem politika sprječavanja nezakonitih migracija nema nikakvu alternativu.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisaria Johansson, cuando un gobernante es un tirano y un déspota con su propio pueblo, no es ninguna sorpresa que se comporte como un gamberro y un canalla con su frontera más próxima; por tanto, toda la vecindad tiene un problema: estamos hablando de Lukashenka y de la Unión Europea.

Por supuesto que es inaceptable la utilización instrumental de seres humanos como herramienta de presión a la Unión Europea y eso requiere una respuesta europea, pero igualmente europeo tiene que ser el trato a los migrantes y a los solicitantes de asilo porque los protege el Derecho europeo de asilo y la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea, que protege no solamente a los ciudadanos europeos, sino a cualquier persona en la aplicación del Derecho europeo, y, por eso, sea Polonia, sea Croacia, sea Lituania, sea Letonia, sea Hungría, todo país que sea frontera exterior de la Unión Europea tiene la obligación de aplicar y observar el Derecho europeo de asilo, lo que incluye también Frontex, lo mismo que la Agencia de Asilo de la Unión Europea o la propia Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea.

Por eso las devoluciones forzosas en frontera son completamente inaceptables, incompatibles con el Derecho europeo: eso es así en los momentos más duros, en las situaciones más difíciles y en las fronteras más vulnerables; por eso la Comisión tiene la obligación de incoar procedimientos de infracción a cualquiera que viole el artículo 9 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Herr Minister, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ja, Menschen werden missbraucht, werden an die europäische Außengrenze gebracht, um Europa zu destabilisieren – von Lukaschenka mit der Hilfe von was weiß ich wem.

Aber auch wenn diese Menschen missbraucht werden, muss doch klar sein: Wir können nicht zulassen, dass in Europa Mitgliedstaaten völkerrechtswidrig handeln und dass Menschen, die an eine Grenze kommen und darum bitten, einen Asylantrag stellen zu können, dieser Zugang verwehrt wird und dass diesen mit *Push-backs* ein Zugang zur Europäischen Union verweigert wird.

Das ist völkerrechtswidrig, das müssen wir klar sagen. Und das klare Signal hier aus dem Europäischen Parlament muss sein: Wir lassen das nicht zu, und wir sagen den Mitgliedstaaten, die so was tun, dass das unrechtmäßig ist.

Wir müssen sehen, dass einige Mitgliedstaaten das institutionalisiert haben. Wenn Sie die Zahlen anschauen – Sie haben Kroatien genannt, Frau Kommissarin –, dann ist das eine Situation, die heute in Kroatien Normalität ist. Ich glaube, dass wir sehr darauf aufpassen müssen, dass wir einen Mechanismus bekommen, der ermöglicht, dass unabhängig gecheckt wird: Okay, was passiert eigentlich an unseren Außengrenzen? Dass Leute hingehen können, unabhängig von Zeit und Ort zu entscheiden, wo kontrolliere ich ...

(Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Damien Carême (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, vous avez récemment déclaré, s'agissant d'un mur anti-migrants aux frontières de l'Union: «Je ne suis pas contre, mais quant à savoir si on devrait utiliser les fonds européens pour financer la construction de clôtures à la place d'autres choses tout aussi importantes, c'est une autre question.»

Qu'une membre de la Commission européenne dise qu'elle ne voit dans la construction d'un mur à nos frontières qu'un simple problème comptable est choquant. Madame la Commissaire Johansson, la diplomatie a ses limites. Dans le contexte actuel, la rhétorique que vous employez à ce moment-là a une portée fondamentale.

Vous ne pouvez condamner l'instrumentalisation des exilés par le président biélorusse, tout en fermant les yeux sur l'instrumentalisation de la situation par les adeptes de la militarisation et du refoulement aux frontières. Ils exigeront toujours plus de sécurité, toujours moins de droits. Vous devez condamner fermement et tout de suite la longue liste des horreurs qui se déroulent à nos frontières et engager sans tarder des procédures en infraction envers les pays incriminés, sinon nous sombrerons plus profondément encore dans l'infamie.

Madame la Commissaire Johansson, votre rôle, celui de la Commission, est bien d'être un rempart contre celles et ceux qui vomissent leur haine et veulent faire croire que l'autre est un danger en le refoulant de manière abjecte. Ne leur abandonnez pas un centimètre de nos principes et de nos valeurs.

Tom Vandendriessche (ID). – Voorzitter, we worden overspoeld door ongewenste migratie. Miljoenen proberen onze thuislanden illegaal binnen te dringen, zich vervolgens als asielzoekers voor te doen en ten slotte de hele familie over te laten komen.

Vanaf het moment dat deze ongewenste asielbedriegers een voet op Europese bodem gezet hebben, blijken ze allerhande rechten op te kunnen eisen en sociale voorzieningen te kunnen genieten zonder er ooit aan bijgedragen te hebben. Dat is onhoudbaar.

Maar de politieke elite in Europa ligt blijkbaar meer wakker van de zogenaamde mensenrechten van deze asielbedriegers dan van de veiligheid en de toekomst van onze mensen.

Het opengrenzenmodel bedreigt onze manier van leven. Daarom moeten we onze grenzen beschermen tegen deze illegale indringers door hen met volstrekt legale, humane en noodzakelijke pushbacks onmiddellijk terug te sturen naar vanwaar ze komen. Het is onze politieke en morele plicht onze burgers te beschermen.

Anna Fotyga (ECR). – Madam President, I'd like to thank uniformed servicemen from the whole of Europe – the border guards, police, military – for guarding the EU's external borders. Their efforts vis-à-vis Belarus, for example, taken in Poland, Lithuania and Latvia make the tireless criminal hybrid operational efforts by Lukashenko under Russia's instigation ineffective.

We have to assess the security aspect of this action. Today, it was visible in this statement of Jens Stoltenberg issuing words of solidarity vis-à-vis Poland, Lithuania and Latvia. We in the EU, with our aspirations for defence and security, have to take this into account.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, the sad truth is that illegal push-backs – because I'm sorry friends, there's no such thing as a legal one – have become the new normal, in part thanks to the Commission's toxic approach to migration.

The Commission knows well that EU money funds border forces who push back refugees, who torture and beat them. It knows well that thousands of people are illegally pushed back from Croatia into Bosnia every month, without the ability to exercise their right to seek asylum, on orders from the very top of the Croatian Government. It knows well that thousands of people are pushed out to sea by Greek border guards, left to drown or disappear, on orders from the very top of the Greek Government.

But the money from the EU keeps flowing. So now, here we are at a point where our 12 Member States have actually called for the legalisation of push-backs in blatant disregard of international law. We should be absolutely ashamed of ourselves.

Michaela Šojdová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, dámy a pánové, všichni víme, že ochrana vnějších hranic patří mezi naše základní úkoly. Pokud má existovat bezpečný volný pohyb uvnitř schengenského prostoru, nemáme jinou možnost než stoprocentně zajistit bezpečnost vnější hranice. Myslím, že o to se země na vnější hranici Evropské unie snaží a nemají lehkou situaci.

Velkému tlaku čelí Chorvatsko a já důvěřuji chorvatské vládě, že zajistí bezpečnost a že také bude dodržovat lidská práva pro uprchlíky. Očekávám, že i maďarsko-srbská hranice bude důsledně chráněna, ale zároveň umožní vstup uprchlíků, kteří mají nárok na mezinárodní ochranu. Maďarsku v tomto úsilí nepochybně pomůžou mezinárodní složky včetně těch, které přichází třeba z členských států, včetně České republiky, a věřím, že se také vrátí agentura Frontex, která by měla Maďarsku pomáhat.

Osobně jsem navštívila Řecko a přesvědčila jsem se, že se zde podmínky výrazně zlepšily. Současná řecká vláda má situaci pod kontrolou. Kombinuje přísnost, důslednost a nezbytnou lidskost s respektem k lidské důstojnosti. Dokázala přemístit nedoprovázené děti ze záchytných center do *shelterů* a především na pevninu a snaží se jim poskytnout adekvátní péči včetně vzdělávání. Velkou práci zde vykonává právě neziskový sektor, kterému chci poděkovat. Zlepšila se také návratová politika a délka doby pro vyřizování azylu.

Těžké situaci čelí Polsko a pobaltské země. Uprchlíci jsou Lukašenkem zneužiti jako zbraně proti EU. Toto vydírání musíme odmítnout. Chápu, jak je to těžké pro uprchlíky, ale i oni musí znát pravdu, do jaké hry se dostali a komu mají sloužit. Polsko i pobaltské země mají v ochraně svých hranic naši plnou podporu.

Pedro Marques (S&D). – Madam President, democracy, human rights and the rule of law are the foundations of the European Union. The ambitious project that has ensured peace and prosperity since World War Two.

Yet again, some Member States are going back to policies from back then. Closed borders to refugees played a part in the millions of lives lost in those dreadful times. That is why, having again push-backs in the external borders of the EU is so shocking. Are those the values that the EU should stand for? Are refugees less human?

It is more than international law that is at stake. It is the sense of humanity itself. And, Commissioner, you were clear on condemning push-backs today. I compliment you for that and I concur with you. The European institutions cannot tolerate such behaviour. What we must repeal are not the refugees at our borders, but the acts of those who do not treat them as human beings.

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Posėdžio pirmininkė, gerbiama komisijos nare, mieli kolegos. Baltarusijos valdžia organizuoja nusikalstamą ir sistemingą suviliotųjų ir apgautų trečiųjų valstybių piliečių eksportą į Europos Sąjungą. Jeigu norite išgirsti iš manęs tai yra dvidešimt pirmo amžiaus vergovė, tikraja to žodžio prasme. Migrantų stūmimo politiką naudoja Lukašenka. Jo režimas išnaudoja migrantus ir ciniškai kaltina Lietuvą ar Lenkiją. Lietuvos pasienyje vyksta nepaskelbtas karas. Kiekvieną naktį Baltarusijos pusėje girdime šūvius. Apgauti migrantai verčiami režimo įrankiais. Hibridinės atakos akivaizdoje Lietuva daro viską, kad vykdyti savo įsipareigojimus. Mes jau žinome ir gerbiame, bet ji turi teisę gintis nuo piktavališkų veiksmų, Lukašenkos režimo piktavališkų veiksmų ir saugoti savo suvereniją teritoriją. Lukašenkos nusikaltimus žmogiškumui ir trečiųjų valstybių piliečių išnaudojimą privalo įvertinti tarptautinis teismas. Ir aš tikiuosi, kad mes visi sulauksime tos dienos.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, after two years of absence, I will be going back to the Greek islands in a couple of weeks, and I'm a bit afraid to go because I've just promised myself two years ago that I would improve the situation. But Fortress Europe is still a reality. We build wires and walls and a few of our guards hunt and beat people up, take away their phones and throw them back over the borders.

Over the last year, 300 illegal explosions have been recorded in Greece. Two weeks ago, we learned how Croatia is using shadow armies to push people back. And just today, as Sophia has also said, lawyers are suing Frontex – an EU agency – for its role in human rights violations.

Commissioner Johansson do not waiver in your defence of asylum law. Help Europe to live up to its values of compassion, law and human rights and let us turn Fortress Europe again into a shelter. For that, let's set up independent mechanisms to monitor our border guards, make EU funds for migration conditional on safeguarding human rights and trigger infringement procedures against all countries that don't follow European laws.

And please, by all means, never, never, ever legalise pushbacks.

Silvia Sardone (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la politica migratoria dell'Unione europea è un fallimento. Dodici paesi europei con governi di destra e sinistra chiedono di bloccare l'immigrazione clandestina con ogni mezzo necessario e l'Europa che dice? Alza le spalle continua a non fare nulla, succube del suo buonismo.

C'è chi ha combattuto i trafficanti di uomini, come il leader della Lega Salvini, e incredibilmente rischia il carcere per aver fatto rispettare le leggi e chi, come l'Europa, non fa nulla per limitare le partenze e gli sbarchi, alimentando il business dell'accoglienza. Non dimentichiamo inoltre il pericolo dell'estremismo islamico, visto che tanti terroristi sono arrivati via mare o tramite la rotta balcanica.

L'Unione europea è un continuo disastro sull'immigrazione: nessun ricollocamento automatico, nessuna rotazione dei porti, nessun tentativo di arginare gli sbarchi, nessuna azione per frenare le rotte terrestri di immigrazione. Solo parole vuote e un atteggiamento patetico. Vi fate dettare la linea dalla capitana Carola che vorrebbe tutti gli immigrati clandestini in Europa.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Polska znajduje się na celowniku Białorusi, wobec mojej ojczyzny prowadzona jest wojna hybrydowa. Działania prowadzone przez Mińsk zostały przygotowane i opracowane w Moskwie. Mają one na celu destabilizację całego regionu Europy Środkowej oraz zniszczenie reputacji polskich służb ochraniających granicę zewnętrzną Unii, za co chcę im z tego miejsca bardzo serdecznie podziękować. Niestety fake newsy stały się stałym elementem architektury dezinformacji wykorzystywanym przez Rosjan. Stąd tak wiele negatywnych informacji o działaniach Polski na granicy z Białorusią.

Chciałam podkreślić, że Polska w swoich działaniach ma na celu zapobieganie działaniom typu push-in, a nie push-back, czyli nielegalnym przekroczeniem granicy przez migrantów, którzy są instrumentalnie wykorzystywani przez reżim białoruski i zmuszani do przekraczania wschodniej granicy. Polska przestrzega wszelkich reguł międzynarodowych. Polska wysłała pomoc, konwoje humanitarne, które zostały zatrzymane brutalnie przez reżim Łukaszenki. Nie chcą pomóc tym ludziom, którzy są instrumentalnie wykorzystywani. Jako Wspólnota nie możemy dać się podzielić i wszyscy musimy stanąć ramię w ramię z polską Strażą Graniczną oraz wojskiem.

Pani Komisarz, dziękuję za wszelkie działania w tej materii i wsparcie, bo to ważne. Pani Komisarz, aby nasze działania były skuteczne i aby ochronić granice, należy jak najszybciej przesłać odpowiednie środki finansowe do Polski, na Łotwę i Litwę, żeby zbudować stały, sprawny system bezpieczeństwa na wschodniej granicy. Budowę takiego zabezpieczenia zapowiedziała i podjęła Warszawa, rząd w Polsce.

Geoffroy Didier (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, en matière migratoire, le véritable problème de l'Europe est clair: nos lois ne sont pas respectées et nos frontières sont quotidiennement bafouées. Selon la Commission européenne, en 2019, seul un tiers des immigrés clandestins invités à repartir dans leur pays d'origine l'ont effectivement fait. Et en France, dans mon pays, cette année, seulement, un clandestin sur huit et un débouté d'asile sur neuf sont effectivement repartis dans leur pays d'origine.

Cette grande faiblesse a deux conséquences. D'abord, elle décourage tous les Européens qui respectent les lois de continuer à le faire. D'autre part, elle dessert la cause des immigrés légaux, les véritables réfugiés, des chercheurs, des médecins ou des étudiants qui méritent d'être accueillis dignement. L'immigration zéro, ça n'existe pas et ce serait se priver des richesses humaines qui, au gré de l'histoire, ont forgé l'identité et la civilisation européenne. Mais accepter de subir l'immigration incontrôlée, c'est une pure folie qui brise la légitimité du projet européen.

J'appelle donc l'Union européenne à ne pas avoir la main qui tremble et à se faire respecter...

(La Présidente retire la parole à l'orateur)

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ta historia wydarzyła się w ubiegłym tygodniu w Polsce. Po północy grupa Kurdów została zatrzymana przez Straż Graniczną. Migranci deklarowali, że chcą ubiegać się o ochronę międzynarodową, jednak zostali wywiezieni, odepchnięci w kierunku lasu po białoruskiej stronie. Temperatura przy gruncie oscylowała wokół minus pięciu stopni Celsjusza. Wśród migrantów była czwórka dzieci: Alaa, Awin, Aland i Jwanko.

To putinowskie okrucieństwo i putinowska zagrywka, którą niestety rząd PiS legalizuje. Po pierwsze, to postępowanie niehumanitarne – nikt nie powinien być pozostawiony na pastwę losu w zimnym lesie, w szczególności dzieci. Po drugie, to postępowanie nielegalne, niezgodne z konwencją genewską, europejską konwencją praw człowieka i polską Konstytucją.

Określenie „push-back” jest eufemizmem, który nie oddaje cierpienia zmarzniętego i przerażonego człowieka w ciemnym lesie. Tortury na granicy polsko-białoruskiej muszą się skończyć! Potrzebna jest pomoc międzynarodowa! I powiem to kolejny raz na tej sali – Polska to nie PiS!

I zgadzam się z panią komisarz: szczelne granice Unii – tak, ale pomoc humanitarna – tym bardziej!

Philippe Olivier (ID). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, votre position sur la question du refoulement aux frontières est emblématique. Elle est emblématique de votre objectif politique, que dis-je politique, idéologique, qui est non pas de préserver nos pays, mais d’organiser leur submersion migratoire. Une submersion qui n’est pas pour vous un problème, mais un projet. Elle est emblématique de vos méthodes puisque, comme du temps de l’Union soviétique avec le communisme, vous arguez de vos échecs pour imposer toujours plus d’eupéisme. Elle est surtout emblématique de votre volonté de bafouer tous les principes réels de droit.

Vous partez d’un droit mou, c’est-à-dire de déclarations vagues, en l’occurrence le respect des droits humains, pour permettre à des autorités illégitimes d’édicter des mesures coercitives. Elles sont ensuite amenées à muter au gré des interprétations, interprétations judiciaires ou même extrajudiciaires, puisque vous sous-traitez leur contrôle à des ONG idéologisées. Un droit qui fluctue selon des interprétations partisanses, ce n’est pas du droit.

En matière de migration, votre souci n’est pas le droit, mais un projet de mondialisation démographique au mépris du respect des droits des peuples européens.

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, when we are talking about push-backs on the borders with Belarus, we need not to forget about the illegitimate Lukashenko regime and his crimes. He is the reason for the suffering which people of Belarus and millions on the borders are living through.

Let’s push back Lukashenko out of power and there will be no more sufferings of ordinary people either from Belarus or from far-away countries. Let’s not allow Lukashenko win this hybrid war against the European Union, that he shall us to discuss only about migrants in order not to have time to discuss Lukashenko’s crimes.

I would like to thank the Commission, including for the recent communication on a renewed EU action plan against migrant smuggling, which clearly shows that what we are facing in Lukashenko’s actions is a special hybrid warfare, using state-sponsored smuggling of migrants.

We need to remember that the smuggling of migrants is an international crime, which should be punished by all the force of international criminal law, including United Nations conventions. So, my question is very simple: is the Commission ready to bring Lukashenko to criminal responsibility for criminal smuggling of migrants?

Pietro Bartolo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, nei primi nove mesi dell’anno più di diecimila persone sono rimaste vittime dei respingimenti, tra questi tanti minori. Respingimenti violenti, effettuati con le botte e le percosse, le abbiamo viste le foto di queste violenze, li abbiamo sentiti i racconti dei migranti.

Ed è questa violenza che alcuni governi vogliono legalizzare. Stiamo parlando di serie violazioni del principio di non respingimento e dei diritti fondamentali. Stiamo parlando di esseri umani picchiati e rimandati indietro senza concedere loro il diritto di chiedere asilo. Il viceministro polacco non ha avuto vergogna di ammettere che i minori vengono respinti al confine. Cosa dobbiamo indagare ancora? Dodici ministri non hanno avuto vergogna di chiedere all’Unione di alzare muri, muri che, lo sappiamo, non serviranno a fermare le persone, ma a farci vergognare per averci pensato.

Eppure basterebbe poco: solidarietà interna e il rispetto delle persone. Chiedo alla Commissione di monitorare la situazione e agire in quanto guardiana dei trattati. Serve inoltre un meccanismo di monitoraggio indipendente ai nostri confini, come il mio gruppo ha chiesto nella lettera inviata oggi alla Presidente von der Leyen. Bisogna agire immediatamente.

Bernhard Zimniok (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Bei Berichten zu den *Push-backs* werden uns bildwirksam Frauen und weinende Kinder gezeigt. Die Realität sieht aber anders aus. Mit nackter Gewalt überwinden junge, kräftige Migranten gerade die Grenze in Polen. Und wir? Wir führen eine scheinheilige Debatte, die vom zentralen Kern des Problems ablenkt: dem völligen Versagen der EU beim Schutz der Außengrenzen.

Wenn nun betroffene Staaten selbst handeln, so haben sie nicht nur das Recht dazu, nein, sie haben auch die Pflicht, ihr Volk zu schützen und Eindringlinge abzuwehren. Frau Johansson, während Sie hier im Parlament von Zäunen und schwer bewaffneten Polizisten beschützt werden, verweigern Sie genau diesen Schutz den europäischen Bürgern. Die Bürger Europas haben die Folgen zu tragen: Morde, Vergewaltigungen, Drogenhandel, Parallelgesellschaften und Abermilliarden an Kosten. Und wir debattieren hier moralische Aspekte von *Push-backs*. Ernsthaft?

Wir sollten uns lieber fragen: Warum sichert die EU nicht endlich ihre Außengrenzen? Wieso werden kriminelle Schlepper als Seenotretter bezeichnet und warum legen wir diesen Menschen nicht das Handwerk? Es wird Zeit, das endlich zu ändern. Schützen wir Europa!

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovana povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, s najnovijim razvojem događaja na istočnim granicama Europske unije postaje očito da su u geopolitičkim strategijama migranti postali moćno oružje. Hrvatska je granica u posljednjih šest godina pod stalnim pritiskom migranata i hrvatska policija radi odličan posao u zaštiti hrvatskog i teritorija Europske unije.

I dalje smo, naravno, zabrinuti činjenicom da migranti ne prelaze granicu na službenim graničnim prijelazima i zagovaraju jasnu razliku između osoba kojima je potrebna međunarodna zaštita i migranata koji traže bolje životne mogućnosti u Europi.

Kolegice i kolege, do sada je uhićeno preko tri tisuće krijumčara ljudi na hrvatskim granicama. Za njih je to ozbiljan biznis. U 2020. godini spriječeno je skoro 30 000 ilegalnih pokušaja prelazaka granice. Uložili smo preko 200 milijuna eura u jačanje nadzora granice, a oko sedam tisuća hrvatskih policajaca čuvat će granicu Europske unije.

Kolegice i kolege, Republika Hrvatska čuva i vašu granicu, granicu Europske unije na zakonit način.

Ylva Johansson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Parliament for this debate. I feel the same urgency and deep concern that many of you have expressed today. Behind each report of pushbacks is a potential threat to the right to asylum, a right we need to protect. The number and the continuity of the reports is alarming. I repeat, there can be no normalisation or legislation or pushbacks in the European Union.

It's also important to stress that every day, every night, border guards, policemen, policewomen are protecting our external borders in compliance with EU law and fundamental rights. So when we rightly criticise pushbacks and urge each Member State to thoroughly investigate allegations and take actions, to establish the facts and trust, we should also thank all brave border guards and policemen and women in their everyday work. They show that there are no contradiction in strong protection of our external borders and strong protection of our values.

Some voices in this debate argue that we have to choose between protecting our external borders and our treaty. It's simply not true. Our priority is to save lives, and to save lives we must stop Lukashenko and the Belarus regime. Many of you have raised the unprecedented hybrid attack from the Belarus regime and I fully agree.

As I said earlier last week, the last plenary session, I outlined our EU actions against Lukashenko. This Monday, Belarus was on the agenda for the Foreign Affairs Council. Later this week it will be on the agenda for the European Council.

We need to step up our outreach to partners where Belarus has introduced new visa-free regimes to Egypt, to Iran, to Pakistan. We must cooperate with authorities or partners so that they warn their citizens of what really awaits them. And the EU continues discussion on expanding its sanctions against Belarus.

And I must also say that the best way to avoid false reports on what's going on at our external borders is transparency. We need transparency to build trust.

The situation for migrants on the Greek islands was also raised. As I said earlier, I expect the Greek Government to thoroughly investigate reports on violent pushbacks and set up an independent monitoring mechanism. But let me also stress the important progress that had been made in Greece when it comes to migration. When I took office almost two years ago, there were 42 000 migrants living on the Greek islands under unacceptable living conditions. And I know this was a concern for many of you and it was for me as well.

This has been one of the priorities and now we have totally changed the situation. It's now 4000 migrants living on the Greek islands and in Greece, there are new, efficient and fair asylum processes in place, and there are improved facilities.

All Member States should follow Croatia and establish an independent monitoring mechanism, and above all, we need to get an agreement on the pact to protect our borders, to prevent pushbacks and to uphold fundamental rights and to never allow pushbacks to be normalised.

Anže Logar, predsedujoči Svetu. – Spoštovana predsedujoča, komisarka, spoštovane poslanke in poslanci. Menim, da je bila današnja razprava zelo koristna, tudi zato, ker kaže na nujno potrebo po čimprejšnji uskladitvi držav članic glede novega pakta o migracijah in azilu.

Instrumentalizacija migracij, s katero se srečujemo in se bomo žal očitno tudi v prihodnje, nedvomno povzroča številne izzive. Zato bo tema migracij tudi ena od ključnih tem oktobrskega evropskega sveta, ki se začneja jutri.

Države članice morajo pri varovanju svojih meja in zunanjih meja EU dosledno spoštovati pravo EU in mednarodno pravo, vključno z varstvom človekovih pravic in prepovedjo nevračanja.

Skupaj moramo ukrepati na različnih nivojih, da se zoperstavimo instrumentalizaciji migracij za politične namene. Hkrati pa je treba poskrbeti, da so vsa dejanja v zvezi s tem tudi zakonita. Še enkrat hvala lepa za današnjo razpravo.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, Komisare, kolegos, Baltijos regiono šalys tiesiogiai susidūrė su hibridinio pobūdžio atakomis. Minsko režimas išnaudoja pabėgėlius vykdydamas atakas ne tik prieš Baltijos valstybes nares, bet ir prieš visą Europos Sąjungą. Ne tik šalys aplink ES išorės sieną susiduria su spaudimu dėl šio hibridinio išpuolio vykdomo Baltarusijos režimo. Vyksta tolesni, gilesni judėjimai į ES. Ši situacija tik dar kartą parodo, jog yra būtinas efektyvus mūsų ES sienų valdymas. Veiksminga išorės sienų kontrolė yra būtina siekiant užkirsti kelią saugumo rizikai. Neteisėtas sienų kirtimas ir galimas migrantų spaudimas turi būti atremiamas. Prie Lietuvos, Latvijos ir Lenkijos sienų padėtis yra beprecedentė. Kitoje sienos pusėje yra smurtaujantis neteisėtas režimas. Baltarusijos režimas žmonių gyvybėmis nesirūpina. Žmonės moka didžiulius pinigus, kad galėtų lengviau kirsti sieną su ES. Baltarusijos pasieniečiai greit pakeičia požiūrį nuo pagalbos padedant migrantams kirsti sieną iki jėga nebeleidžiant jiems sugrįžti. Mūsų prioritetas yra išsaugoti gyvybes. Siekiant išsaugoti gyvybes turime sustabdyti režimą. Todėl būtina ne tik diskutuoti apie tolimesnes sankcijas režimui, bet ir imtis konkrečių veiksmų ES lygmeniu, kad ši situacija būtų suvaldyta.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI), írásban. – 2015-ben Magyarország bebizonította, hogy ha van kellő politikai akarat, akkor meg lehet állítani az illegális migrációt. Magyarország akkor kerítést épített és módosította a jogszabályait, hogy véget vessen a menekültügyi szabályokkal való tömeges visszaéléseknek. Azóta is csak kritikákat kapunk, még úgy is, hogy ma már sok tagállam a magyar példát követi.

Hat évvel később a migráció ugyanolyan súlyos problémát jelent, mint akkoriban. Sőt, az Unió egyre több külső határszakaszán próbálnak átjutni a bevándorlók. Most már Lengyelország, Litvánia és Lettország határait is illegális bevándorlók ostromolják. A baloldali többség viszont mást sem csinál, mint mondvacsinált vádaskodásokkal és hazugságokkal akarja aláásni a külső határokat védő tagállamok erőfeszítéseit. Úgy tűnik, továbbra is sziklaszilárd az a tervük, hogy bevándorlókontinenssé akarják változtatni Európát. Továbbra sem tettek le arról, hogy kötelező elosztási kvótákat kényszerítsenek a tagállamokra.

Az elfogadhatatlan, hogy baloldali képviselők azt akarják kriminalizálni, hogy a tagállamok megvédik a határaikat. Le kell szögezni: a határ arra szolgál, és a határvédők azért vannak, hogy megakadályozzák az illegális határátlépéseket, amelyek fenyegetik egy tagállam biztonságát. És azt sem kellene elfelejteni, hogy ezzel nemcsak a saját, de a teljes Unió és minden uniós polgár biztonságát szavatolják. Nem rágalmozás és kioktatás, hanem köszönet jár az erőfeszítéseikért!

Janina Ochojska (PPE), na piśmie. – Pani Komisarz! Koleżanki i Koledzy! Z wielką uwagą przysłuchiwałam się dzisiejszej debacie! Mam wrażenie, że koncentrujemy się obecnie za bardzo na ochronie zewnętrznych granic UE, zapominając o aspekcie humanitarnym. A u progu UE znowu giną ludzie! Szczególnie w kontekście sytuacji na granicy polsko-białoruskiej musimy działać dwutorowo. Owszem, kolejne sankcje wymierzone w reżim Łukaszenki, niezależny mechanizm monitorowania czy przejrzystość działań polskiego rządu są niezmiernie istotnym elementem prowadzącym do zakończenia tzw. wojny hybrydowej sąsiadujących krajów, które wykorzystują życie niewinnych ludzi do demonstracji swojej siły. Jednak dzisiaj powinniśmy przede wszystkim skupić się na aspekcie humanitarnym.

Międzynarodowe prawo humanitarne wyraźnie mówi o tym, że każdy człowiek, którego życie jest zagrożone, ma prawo opuścić kraj pochodzenia i złożyć wniosek o ochronę międzynarodową. Na zewnętrznej granicy UE to prawo jest nagminnie łamane. Nie chodzi tylko o Polskę, ale także Grecję, Włochy czy Hiszpanię. Od 2015 r. dyskutujemy o solidarności państw członkowskich w kontekście migracji. UE, która nie reaguje i nie wywiera presji na Polskę czy Grecję w sprawie zaprzestania zawróceń bez uprzedniej weryfikacji wniosku azylowego, także łamie prawo i jest współodpowiedzialna za śmierć migrantów. Rozmowa o finansowaniu lepszej ochrony granic, w tym budowy murów, jest tylko gwałceniem podstawowych praw człowieka i konwencji międzynarodowych.

Alfred Sant (S&D), in writing. – The EU's external border regions, especially islands, have been hard hit by a crisis in tourism, exacerbated by mounting energy and transport prices. Meanwhile, still no really coherent, long-term EU support is available when it comes to dealing with the incessant waves of migration of the last two decades. Mediterranean islands are often left alone to cope with the bursts of irregular migration. In no way could this excuse any disregard for the human rights of those attempting to cross over towards the European continent. Yet, lectures about what should be done from mainland Europe (not least by armchair goodie-goodies) without the offer of a structured and permanent form of help cannot be taken seriously. While condemning without reservations any abuse of the human rights of immigrants and totally deploring the loss of lives of immigrants irregularly attempting to enter Europe, one must repeat that the real problem is the following: On this issue, EU policymakers lack solutions that apply for all of Europe. Moreover, Europe has to come clean on what it is really doing to combat the people trafficking that is feeding the supply chains which push people towards desperate journeys across the Mediterranean and elsewhere. Is Europe turning a blind eye to this ghastly criminal activity?

Sylwia Spurek (Verts/ALE), na piśmie. – Bezpieczna granica to taka, na której nikt nie umiera. Granice UE nie są więc bezpieczne – nie w Polsce, gdzie, jak donoszą media, przynajmniej siedem osób zmarło już z powodu chłodu.

O ilu zmarłych nie wiemy ze względu na wprowadzony stan wyjątkowy i utrudniony dostęp mediów i społeczeństwa obywatelskiego do informacji? Ile osób wypchnięto za granicę, uniemożliwiając im złożenie wniosku o status uchodźcy lub uchodźczyny? Ilu osobom nie zapewniono ochrony fundamentalnych praw – wody, pożywienia i schronienia, dostępu do prawnika lub prawniczki, niezbędnej pomocy medycznej?

To wygląda jak wojna – wojna polskich władz z grupą uchodźców i uchodźczyń potrzebujących pomocy. Czy po wojnie przeciwko kobietom, przeciwko osobom LGBTIQ rząd znalazł nowego wroga? Czy to nowy argument dla polityki strachu, podziałów i budowania murów?

W 2020 r. Polska wydała prawie 600 tysięcy pozwoleń na pobyt dla obywateli i obywaterek państw trzecich. Jednocześnie według propagandowego przekazu kilka tysięcy osób, uciekających przed wojną, prześladowaniami, głodem, próbujących przekroczyć granicę z Białorusią, to „fala”, „kryzys” i „element” wojny hybrydowej.

Europejski Trybunał Praw Człowieka Rady Europy już zareagował, wydając środki tymczasowe. Kiedy zareaguje Unia Europejska?

22. Sytuacja humanitarna na Haiti po niedawnym trzęsieniu ziemi (debata)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie sytuacji humanitarnej na Haiti po niedawnym trzęsieniu ziemi (2021/2931(RSP)).

Ylva Johansson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you for this important debate. Today, I will be presenting the main outcomes of the visit of my colleague, Commissioner for Crisis Management, Janez Lenarčič, to Haiti in September in the aftermath of a 7.2 magnitude earthquake, which hit the country on 14 August.

The August earthquake, unfortunately not the first natural disaster to hit Haiti, has had severe impact on its people and infrastructure. Over 2000 people lost their lives. Thousands more were severely injured. At least 50 000 families were left without any form of housing, shelter or accommodation. Several hospitals and schools were damaged, water networks, roads and bridges were equally affected. According to the latest figures, over 800 000 people are now in need of urgent aid and relief in the areas most severely affected by the earthquake.

In response to the disaster and showing solidarity with Haitian people, the EU and its Member States have mobilised the entire emergency toolbox in a true Team Europe spirit. An additional EUR 3 million in humanitarian funding were disbursed immediately after the earthquake to address urgent needs. The Member States offered in-kind assistance such as food, nutrition, shelter and healthcare equipment. Three EU humanitarian air bridge flights carried together 177 tonnes of essential relief items on behalf of our humanitarian partners like NGOs and UN bodies.

Last but not least, Haiti activated the EU's Civil Protection Mechanism and through our Emergency Response Coordination Centre, we deployed a number of civil protection experts, including French and Spanish water purification teams, a Luxembourg telecom unit, as well as a field hospital from Norway.

However, as devastating as the earthquake was, it should be seen as a crisis within a bigger, more structural and multi-layered crisis. Haiti suffers from political instability and infighting, gang violence affecting local population and humanitarian aid workers, ineffective police force and judicial system that many see as corrupt, stark inequalities and very poor economic performance. As much as 46 other populations are food insecure, and this number is growing.

The situation in Haiti is in stark contrast with its neighbour, the Dominican Republic, which is emerging as a regional leader in the Caribbean. Two countries share one island but two very different fates. Haiti can count on the EU's humanitarian aid, which going forward will prioritise disaster preparedness, resilience, food security and protection, as well as restoring access to basic services such as hospitals and schools.

However, humanitarian aid will not resolve Haiti's main problems, which are structural and deeply rooted. Our longer-term response needs to be structured around a humanitarian-developed nexus approach. Close cooperation with other development partners will also be crucial, particularly with the Dominican Republic, the United States and the United Nations.

In this regard, we welcome the decision by the international community to extend the mandate of the United Nations Integrated Office in Haiti to 15 July next year, as well as to review its scope. I look forward very much to hearing your views and opinions.

Maria Arena, au nom du groupe S&D. – Madame la Présidente, en Haïti, une catastrophe en chasse une autre. De tremblements de terre en tempêtes tropicales, ce pays a été ravagé. Dans ce pays, où les quelques infrastructures existantes ont été ravagées par les catastrophes naturelles, les ONG internationales restent la seule alternative à un système de soins et à un filet social inexistant.

La crise politique s'est ajoutée à la crise humanitaire. Depuis des mois, Port-au-Prince est soumis au feu et à la terreur. L'insécurité est devenue la règle. Des gangs armés n'ont eu de cesse de frapper. Enlèvements, assassinats, attentats ciblés se sont multipliés. Des quartiers ont été incendiés. Des femmes, des jeunes, des enfants, des journalistes, des militants, des personnalités ont été massacrés.

La crise humanitaire affiche des chiffres inquiétants. Aujourd'hui, plus de quatre millions d'Haïtiens, et principalement des femmes et des filles, ont besoin d'une aide d'urgence. Notre priorité doit être de répondre aux besoins humanitaires, bien entendu, mais aussi de participer avec les partenaires locaux, la société civile, des personnes de terrain afin d'offrir une aide efficace qui ne tient pas compte des considérations d'ordre politique et qui s'adresse aux populations. Mais ce pays ne pourra s'en sortir sans un retour à l'état de droit et sans une la lutte contre l'impunité, qui reste le fléau majeur pour les populations haïtiennes.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, on behalf of the Renew Group. – Madam President, the assassination of President Jovenel Moïse was a great shock and added to the already very difficult situation.

Let's put the crisis into perspective. Nearly 5 million people in Haiti are in need of humanitarian aid; in the capital of Port-Au-Prince alone, close to a quarter of a million people are in urgent need of emergency assistance, and 19 000 people have been displaced in their own capital from gang violence that has significantly worsened in the last year.

In addition to all this, Haiti has been hit by the worst earthquake since 2010. International actors have shown a great amount of solidarity on the ground, doing what it takes to make sure that humanitarian aid reaches its target. But Haiti has been struck by more than one crisis, and it becomes increasingly clear that aid alone is not enough. Gangs are dominating the streets of Port-Au-Prince, killing dozens by day, staging kidnappings and, not least, blocking aid and stealing critical humanitarian aid.

And now there's no clear leadership in the country, so we all ask: who can secure the situation for aid workers, as the police is not seen as somebody who helps?

We, as the European Union – and I go along with Maria Arena's view, have to do the utmost possible in order to help the people of Haiti, to show solidarity and to do everything possible from our side in order to help to meet the needs of the people.

Caroline Roose, au nom du groupe Verts/ALE. – Madame la Présidente, aujourd'hui en Haïti, les Haïtiens ne vivent pas, ils survivent. Le tremblement de terre du 14 août dernier, un mois après l'assassinat du président Moïse, a montré une fois de plus la vulnérabilité du pays. Cette catastrophe a laissé dans la souffrance des milliers de gens qui sont déjà privés des services de base. Le silence de la communauté internationale est une honte. Les droits à la sécurité et à la vie, à l'intégrité physique et psychique des Haïtiens et Haïtiennes sont constamment bafoués.

Chaque jour, les Haïtiens et Haïtiennes sont assassinés par des bandits armés bénéficiant de la complaisance des autorités policières et judiciaires. Les gangs contrôlent le pays, la population est prise au piège, les parents gardent leurs enfants à la maison de peur des enlèvements. Avec une moyenne de cinq enlèvements par jour, chaque Haïtien attend son tour. Les femmes et les filles, lorsqu'elles sont enlevées, sont victimes de viols collectifs.

Depuis 2018, la justice est à genoux. La communauté internationale ferme les yeux depuis tellement d'années. Selon la société civile, le bureau de l'ONU sur place fait plus partie du problème que de la solution. C'est notre devoir de soutenir la société civile et l'accord pour une solution haïtienne à la crise pour ramener un climat de sécurité et de démocratie. Ne pas agir, c'est être complice.

Mick Wallace, on behalf of The Left Group. – Madam President, Haiti has been one of the most systematically underdeveloped nations on the Earth since they threw off the shackles of French colonialism in 1804. The empire and its agents in Haiti have made sure that all efforts at land reform and policies that would have lifted Haiti up were stopped. This has meant crushing reparations to France, invasions, US military occupations, five sitting presidents assassinated and countless coups engineered by the US and France.

Bill Clinton forced heavy neoliberal reforms on Haiti as a condition for reversing the coup against the hugely popular President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. France and Washington orchestrated a second coup on Aristide in 2004. Under the subsequent brutal puppet leadership, no nation-building has been allowed and the casualties, deaths and the after-effects of frequent earthquakes have been compounded by this legacy of interference that continues today.

The good news is that the people of Haiti have never stopped struggling against empire and hopefully are on the verge of taking back control of their country from US and French authoritarianism.

Hannes Heide (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Bereits im Mai dieses Jahres haben wir über die Situation in Haiti debattiert und gefordert, dass der Rechtsstaat wiederhergestellt wird und dass Hilfsgelder dort ankommen, wo sie am dringendsten benötigt werden.

Wir konnten und wollten uns damals nicht vorstellen, dass alles noch schlimmer kommen könnte. Aber, nur einen Monat nach unserer Debatte wird Präsident Moïse ermordet, und am 14. August fordert das Erdbeben 2 200 Todesopfer. Gewalt, Korruption und Bandenkriminalität stehen weiter an der Tagesordnung. Erst vor wenigen Tagen wurden 17 amerikanische Missionare mit ihren Familienmitgliedern, darunter auch Kinder, entführt. Alle diese Entwicklungen erschweren Hilfs- und Wiederaufbaumaßnahmen nach dieser verheerenden Naturkatastrophe. 650 000 Menschen sind auf Soforthilfe angewiesen. Kinder können nicht in zerstörte Schulen, COVID-19 verschärft die ohnehin schon dramatische Ernährungsunsicherheit.

Die Europäische Union muss alles tun, um für stabile Verhältnisse in Haiti zu sorgen. Denn erst dann wird es möglich sein, dass Hilfe bei den Menschen ankommt, denen es an allem fehlt.

Stéphane Bijoux (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, je veux redire ici tout de suite que, malgré la distance géographique, Haïti est notre voisin. En effet, les grandes souffrances du peuple haïtien résonnent fort dans les territoires d'outre-mer européens proches d'Haïti.

Une fois encore, le drame haïtien est au cœur de cet hémicycle et je veux tout de suite remercier le Commissaire européen, Janez Lenarčič, pour son engagement aux côtés du peuple haïtien, tout de suite après ce terrible tremblement de terre. Bien évidemment, la mission humanitaire européenne doit se poursuivre auprès du peuple haïtien, mais nous savons que le combat contre la misère ne sera pas suffisant.

Des gangs criminels, parfois soutenus par des politiques locaux, sèment une terreur épouvantable et toute cette violence entrave le processus démocratique, empêche les réformes indispensables et impacte directement le fragile équilibre migratoire dans les régions d'outre-mer voisines.

Pour toutes ces raisons, l'Europe doit rester un partenaire fort du peuple haïtien, mais dans ses négociations avec les autorités d'Haïti, l'Europe doit être forte et exigeante pour que la sécurité reste au centre des priorités non négociables.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, a situação humanitária no Haiti é devastadora, como têm sido devastadoras as sucessivas catástrofes naturais que têm afetado o país nos últimos anos. As catástrofes e a fragilidade das instituições têm induzido um ciclo endémico de pobreza e caos social.

É fundamental ligar a ajuda humanitária ao reforço da resiliência da sociedade haitiana, designadamente apoiando a capacidade do Estado de fornecer serviços básicos à população.

A situação humanitária no Haiti já foi por diversas vezes debatida neste Parlamento. Sempre apelámos, e faz sentido apelar hoje de novo, a uma forte mobilização da comunidade internacional. Sempre defendemos o envolvimento alargado da União Europeia. Contudo, sem estabilidade política e mais capacidade institucional não são criados alicerces para o desenvolvimento sustentável do país.

A ajuda humanitária de emergência será mais eficaz se for combinada com uma dimensão de estabilidade e desenvolvimento em que as autoridades do Haiti também têm que estar empenhadas.

Ylva Johansson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, the EU stands in solidarity with the people of Haiti. The situation there is very dire and the country bears a resemblance to the most fragile countries in Africa.

Haiti is the largest beneficiary of the European Union's humanitarian aid in Latin America and the Caribbean, with EUR 434 000 000 provided since 1994. A very significant part of this funding has been mobilised in response to the different disasters hitting the country during this period.

The intention behind the visit of Commissioner Lenarčič was to put the spotlight on this protracted crisis affected by donor fatigue and resulting in underfunding. At the moment, only 17% of the 2021 UN humanitarian appeal is funded. EU humanitarian aid for Haiti will continue. This year it amounted to EUR 17 000 000, including EUR 3 000 000 allocated in the aftermath of the disaster. Our commitment will continue next year. The EU's co-funded post-disaster needs assessment is ongoing, with results expected in early November. A reconstruction conference is expected at the end of the year.

Once again, I would like to thank you for this debate.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Ádám Kósa (NI), in writing. – According to the World Federation of the Deaf, in the last five years, several young deaf women in Haiti have been gang-raped, brutally tortured, their organs extracted and murdered. In the middle of the pandemic, another deaf woman was violently assaulted, and the hospital personnel denied her the right to access the healthcare needed just because she is deaf. Thus, deaf people in Haiti are not even equal to other persons with disabilities. This behaviour is unacceptable and indicates the need for urgent measures. I call on the European External Action Service to take immediate action against the violation of the rights of deaf people in Haiti.

23. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

24. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

25. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące stanowiska zajętego w głosowaniu: patrz protokół

26. Korekty i zamiary głosowania: patrz protokół

27. Porządek dzienny następnego posiedzenia

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam posiedzenie. Zostanie ono wznowione jutro o godz. 8.30 i rozpocznie się od ogłoszenia wyników drugiej części dzisiejszego głosowania.

Porządek obrad został opublikowany i jest dostępny na stronie internetowej Parlamentu Europejskiego.

Dobrej nocy Państwu życzę.

28. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Posiedzenie zostało zamknięte o godz. 21.53)

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

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
ID	Grupa Tożsamość i Demokracja
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
The Left	Grupa Lewicy w Parlamencie Europejskim - GUE/NGL
NI	Niezrzeszeni