

C/2024/1169

2.2.2024

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 10 MAJA 2023 R.

(C/2024/1169)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2023-2024

Posiedzenia od 8 do 11 maja 2023 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	6
2. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu) (działania następcze)	6
3. Rola rolników w transformacji ekologicznej i odporności sektora rolnego (debata)	6
4. Wznowienie posiedzenia	7
5. Rola rolników w transformacji ekologicznej i odporności sektora rolnego (ciąg dalszy debaty)	7
6. Wznowienie posiedzenia	37
7. Uroczyste posiedzenie – Przemówienie prezydenta Portugalii Marcela Rebelo de Sousa	37
8. Wznowienie posiedzenia	41
9. Głosowanie	41
9.1. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Komisja i agencje wykonawcze (A9-0101/2023 - Jeroen Lenaers, Monika Hohlmeier) (głosowanie)	41
9.2. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Parlament Europejski (A9-0086/2023 - Isabel García Muñoz) (głosowanie)	41
9.3. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Rada Europejska i Rada (A9-0085/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)	41

Spis treści	Strona
9.4. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Trybunał Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej (A9-0073/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)	41
9.5. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Trybunał Obrachunkowy (A9-0081/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)	41
9.6. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Europejski Komitet Ekonomiczno-Społeczny (A9-0074/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)	42
9.7. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Komitet Regionów (A9-0080/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)	42
9.8. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Europejski Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich (A9-0067/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)	42
9.9. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Europejski Inspektor Ochrony Danych (A9-0070/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)	42
9.10. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych (A9-0088/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)	42
9.11. Absolutorium za rok 2021 — Prokuratura Europejska (EPPO) (A9-0079/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)	42
9.12. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejskie Centrum Rozwoju Kształcenia Zawodowego (Cedefop) (A9-0125/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)	42
9.13. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Fundacja na rzecz Poprawy Warunków Życia i Pracy (Eurofound) (A9-0109/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)	42
9.14. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Praw Podstawowych Unii Europejskiej (A9-0141/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)	42
9.15. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejskie Centrum Monitorowania Narkotyków i Narkomanii (A9-0107/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)	42
9.16. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Środowiska (A9-0143/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)	42
9.17. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Bezpieczeństwa i Zdrowia w Pracy (EU-OSHA) (A9-0132/2023 - Alin Mituța) (głosowanie)	42
9.18. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Centrum Tłumaczeń dla Organów Unii Europejskiej (A9-0104/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)	43
9.19. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Leków (A9-0106/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)	43
9.20. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Współpracy Wymiarów Sprawiedliwości w Sprawach Karnych (Eurojust) (A9-0122/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)	43
9.21. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Fundacja Kształcenia (A9-0135/2023 - Alin Mituța) (głosowanie)	43
9.22. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Bezpieczeństwa Morskiego (A9-0113/2023 - Ilana Cicurel) (głosowanie)	43
9.23. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Bezpieczeństwa Lotniczego (A9-0098/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)	43
9.24. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd ds. Bezpieczeństwa Żywności (A9-0131/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)	43

Spis treści	Strona
9.25. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejskie Centrum ds. Zapobiegania i Kontroli Chorób (A9-0146/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)	43
9.26. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Cyberbezpieczeństwa (ENISA) (A9-0115/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)	43
9.27. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Kolejowa Unii Europejskiej (A9-0100/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)	43
9.28. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Szkolenia w Dziedzinie Ścigania (CEPOL) (A9-0102/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)	43
9.29. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Straży Granicznej i Przybrzeżnej (A9-0142/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)	43
9.30. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Programu Kosmicznego (przed 12 maja 2021 r.: Agencja Europejskiego GNSS) (A9-0116/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie) ..	44
9.31. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Kontroli Rybołówstwa (A9-0112/2023 - Ilana Cicurel) (głosowanie)	44
9.32. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Chemikaliów (A9-0133/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)	44
9.33. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Dostaw Euratomu (A9-0126/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)	44
9.34. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Współpracy Organów Ścigania (Europol) (A9-0138/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)	44
9.35. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Instytut ds. Równości Kobiet i Mężczyzn (A9-0121/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)	44
9.36. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd Nadzoru Bankowego (A9-0110/2023 - Alin Mituța) (głosowanie)	44
9.37. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd Nadzoru Ubezpieczeń i Pracowniczych Programów Emerytalnych (A9-0103/2023 - Gilles Boyer) (głosowanie)	44
9.38. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd Nadzoru Giełd i Papierów Wartościowych (A9-0137/2023 - Gilles Boyer) (głosowanie)	44
9.39. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Współpracy Organów Regulacji Energetyki (ACER) (A9-0111/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)	44
9.40. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Wsparcia BEREC (Urząd BEREC) (A9-0129/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)	44
9.41. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Instytut Innowacji i Technologii (EIT) (A9-0130/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)	44
9.42. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd Wsparcia w dziedzinie Azylu (A9-0123/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)	44
9.43. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Zarządzania Operacyjnego Wielkoskalowymi Systemami Informatycznymi w Przestrzeni Wolności, Bezpieczeństwa i Sprawiedliwości (eu-LISA) (A9-0105/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)	45
9.44. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejskie Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Realizacji Projektu ITER i Rozwoju Energii Termojądrowej (Fusion for Energy) (A9-0092/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)	45
9.45. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie w celu Badań z zakresu Zarządzania Ruchem Lotniczym w Jednolitej Europejskiej Przestrzeni Powietrznej 3 (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie SESAR) (A9-0118/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)	45

Spis treści	Strona
9.46. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Ekologicznego Lotnictwa (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie „Czyste Niebo 2”) (A9-0078/2023 - Joachim Stanisław Brudziński) (głosowanie)	45
9.47. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Biotechnologicznej Europy Opartej na Obiegu Zamkniętym (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Bioprzemysłu) (A9-0093/2023 - Joachim Stanisław Brudziński) (głosowanie)	45
9.48. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Inicjatywy w dziedzinie Innowacji w Ochronie Zdrowia (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Drugiej Inicjatywy w zakresie Leków Innowacyjnych) (A9-0069/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)	45
9.49. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Czystego Wodoru (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Technologii Ogniw Paliwowych i Technologii Wodorowych 2) (A9-0083/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)	45
9.50. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Europejskie Przedsięwzięcie Kolejowe (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie Shift2Rail) (A9-0090/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)	45
9.51. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Kluczowych Technologii Cyfrowych (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie ECSEL) (A9-0082/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)	45
9.52. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie w dziedzinie Europejskich Obliczeń Wielkiej Skali (A9-0089/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)	45
9.53. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – ósmy, dziewiąty, dziesiąty i jedenasty Europejski Fundusz Rozwoju (A9-0114/2023 - José Manuel Fernandes) (głosowanie)	45
9.54. Absolutorium za rok 2021: wyniki, zarządzanie finansami i kontrola agencji UE (A9-0144/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)	46
9.55. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd ds. Pracy (A9-0117/2023 - Alin Mituța) (głosowanie)	46
9.56. Sprawozdanie za rok 2022 dotyczące Serbii (A9-0172/2023 - Vladimír Bilčík) (głosowanie) . . .	46
9.57. Sprawozdanie za rok 2022 dotyczące Kosowa (A9-0174/2023 - Viola von Cramon-Taubadel) (głosowanie)	46
9.58. Wpływ rosnących kosztów finansowania zewnętrznego Instrumentu Unii Europejskiej na rzecz Odbudowy na budżet UE na rok 2024 (A9-0163/2023 - Johan Van Oortveldt) (głosowanie) . .	46
9.59. Zasoby własne: nowy początek dla finansów unijnych – nowy początek dla Europy (A9-0155/2023 - José Manuel Fernandes, Valérie Hayer) (głosowanie)	46
9.60. Przystąpienie UE do Konwencji Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej: instytucje i administracja publiczna Unii (A9-0169/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari) (głosowanie)	46
9.61. Przystąpienie UE do Konwencji Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej: współpraca wymiarów sprawiedliwości w sprawach karnych, azyl i zasada non-refoulement (A9-0170/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari) (głosowanie)	47
10. Wznowienie posiedzenia	47
11. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia	47
12. Eksternalizacja wniosków o azyl i uzależnienie przekazywania środków finansowych państwom trzecim od wdrożenia umów o powrotach (debata na aktualny temat)	47
13. Zboże ukraińskie na rynku europejskim (debata)	64
14. Aktualizacja ram prawnych dotyczących walki z korupcją (debata)	81

Spis treści	Strona
15. Plan działania na rzecz Europy socjalnej – dwa lata po szczycie w Porto (debata)	92
16. Walka z cyberprzemocą wśród młodzieży w całej UE (debata)	106
17. Adekwatność ochrony zapewnianej przez ramy ochrony danych UE–USA (debata)	117
18. Debata na temat przypadków naruszania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (debata)	126
18.1. Wolność mediów i wolność wypowiedzi w Algierii, sprawa dziennikarza Ihsane El-Kadiego	126
18.2. Białoruś: nieludzkie traktowanie i hospitalizacja czołowego przywódcy opozycyjnego Wiktara Babaryki	131
18.3. Mjanma/Birma, w szczególności rozwiązanie demokratycznych partii politycznych	135
19. Nowe odwierty ropy naftowej na Alasce – wpływ na globalny kryzys klimatyczny i prawa ludności rdzennej (debata)	138
20. Wpływ podniesienia stóp procentowych przez EBC na gospodarstwa domowe i pracowników (debata)	142
21. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania	148
21.1. Przystąpienie UE do Konwencji Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej: instytucje i administracja publiczna Unii (A9-0169/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari)	149
21.2. Przystąpienie UE do Konwencji Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej: współpraca wymiarów sprawiedliwości w sprawach karnych, azyl i zasada non-refoulement (A9-0170/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari)	149
21.3. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Leków (A9-0106/2023 - Katalin Cseh)	149
21.4. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Centrum Tłumaczeń dla Organów Unii Europejskiej (A9-0104/2023 - Olivier Chastel)	150
21.5. Absolutorium za rok 2021 — Prokuratura Europejska (EPPO) (A9-0079/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa)	150
22. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia	150
23. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia	150
24. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	151

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 10 MAJA 2023 R.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.00 Uhr eröffnet.)

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

Der Präsident. – Zu den Beschlüssen mehrerer Ausschüsse über die Aufnahme interinstitutioneller Verhandlungen gemäß Artikel 71 Absatz 1, die bei der Eröffnung der Sitzung am Montag, 8. Mai 2023, bekanntgegeben wurden, hat die Präsidentin keine Anträge auf Abstimmung im Parlament von Mitgliedern oder einer oder mehreren Fraktionen erhalten, durch die mindestens die mittlere Schwelle erreicht wird. Die Ausschüsse können daher die Verhandlungen aufnehmen.

3. Rola rolników w transformacji ekologicznej i odporności sektora rolnego (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Rolle der Landwirte als Wegbereiter für den grünen Wandel und einen widerstandsfähigen Agrarsektor (2023/2696(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I would like to thank the European Parliament for including this important issue on the agenda. During the pandemic we were reminded of the essential work done by health care workers. Now the war has reminded us of the vital role of farmers.

So this debate highlights the essential role and contribution of our farmers to the green transition, food security and the resilience of the agriculture sector. Because a resilient Europe needs a resilient agriculture sector. The level of resilience that EU agriculture has shown in these challenging times is greatly due to the success of our common agricultural policy.

President. – Do you have translation, colleagues? Three languages at the same time? Possibly they are trying to catch up with what happened yesterday! In that case we have to wait. I also have two languages now too. I guess the expression 'simultaneous interpretation' is getting a completely new meaning!

I do not want to increase the pressure. Possibly we should interrupt for two or three minutes.

(The sitting was suspended at 9.03 for technical reasons)

4. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.09 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

5. Rola rolników w transformacji ekologicznej i odporności sektora rolnego (ciąg dalszy debaty)

President. – Colleagues, I would ask you to put your earphones on and test your language, even if you do not need interpretation. Has anybody only one language and only the language he or she has chosen? I would propose, Minister, that you just restart.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I would like to thank the European Parliament for including this important issue to the agenda.

During the pandemic, we were reminded of the essential work done by healthcare workers. Now the war has reminded us of the vital role of the farmers. This debate highlights the central role and contribution of our farmers to the green transition, food security and the resilience of agricultural sector. Because a resilient Europe needs a resilient agriculture sector. The level of resilience that EU agriculture has shown in this challenging time is greatly due to the success of our Common Agricultural Policy.

The CAP not only guarantees our food security and safety, it also contributes to protecting the environment and the climate change mitigation and adaptation. As our two institutions have recognised by adopting its recent reform, the CAP has to adapt to new challenges in order to continue providing these benefits to society. More specifically, it should adapt to help us address today's climate and environmental challenges and to meet our international commitment.

Enabling the green transition is important for society as a whole, but this is also the only way for our agriculture sector to remain sustainable, resilient and competitive in the future. Successive CAP reforms have, from 2003 onwards, raised the environmental standard for farmers. This win-win situation has been achieved through a decision-making process that also includes the farming sectors. Over time, our farmers have grown increasingly aware of the consequences of climate change.

During the Swedish Presidency, the Council has held special policy discussions on the agricultural aspects of the green transition. Moreover, the Council has adopted conclusions on how our rural sector could utilise the full opportunities offered by the bioeconomy.

The political guidance provided by the Council aims to make sure that the sensitive, special circumstances of the farming sector will be duly taken into account in discussions going forward. I would also like to mention that the Presidency will hold a conference and a meeting in the south of Sweden, focusing on how CAP can contribute to meeting high environmental and climate ambitions while ensuring increased production and resilient agriculture. We intend to continue this work in cooperation with the upcoming Presidency. Now, I'm looking forward to hearing your intervention, and thank you for your attention.

Mairead McGuinness, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, good morning, colleagues, I do want to raise the podium before I start – so apologies. I want to look you in the eye. This is a really, really important debate and I think it's why so many Members are here this morning. And I want to thank my friend and colleague in Parliament, Minister Roswall, for her very crisp and clear reference to agriculture and its key role around sustainability.

The issue about the translation was important to resolve because I do not want anything lost in translation in this key debate. And perhaps there are issues around that very point. The first thing to say is: Wednesday morning, European Parliament, Strasbourg, discussing agriculture and food is really important. This is a key debate. It acknowledges that our farmers and our food producers are absolutely essential to deliver a resilient agriculture and food sector. And I think farmers are much more than just enablers of the green transition. Frankly, it will not happen without farmers.

And I think I believe many of you in this Chamber share my gratitude to our farmers. I had a very healthy breakfast this morning, so I want to thank those who produced the breakfasts that we all enjoyed, and those who work the land and in the food industry. We enjoy in Europe a food system with strong levels of safety and supply. It delivers a wide choice for consumers across our Member States, and it gives expression to our different cultures and traditions.

Farmers are in a very unique position. They manage natural resources on which their livelihoods depend and, in turn, we depend on farmers' ability to manage land, biodiversity and water, to generate food, feed, fibre, fuels and other biomass in a sustainable way, maintaining the resources in a good condition so that they can continue to produce for future generations. So our farmers and our farm workers are not only producers and stewards of the natural environment; they are also one of the first sectors to feel the harsh impacts of the climate and biodiversity crisis.

The challenge we face is how to address unsustainable aspects of our food systems and support farmers in the green transition – building resilience, ensuring lasting food security – and this is what the European Green Deal agenda is all about.

I want to start by addressing the issue of food security. Climate change, biodiversity loss and resource scarcity are some of the biggest threats we face today and, indeed, in the coming decades. And this is a threat to our food security. A resilient agricultural sector reduces the impact of climate disasters like droughts, floods and heatwaves.

The Russian invasion of Ukraine brought to the fore the strategic importance of a resilient agri-food system. We experienced disruptive effects on production costs, on the availability of fertilisers and, more broadly, serious harm to global food security. We have significant food price inflation and this, as we know, impacts food affordability, particularly for low-income households.

Our EU production capacity also faced pressure due to the devastating impacts of droughts last summer, which was the driest in 500 years. And we are again witnessing major droughts already this year, leading to severe water stress in certain European regions. Despite these difficulties, farmers have delivered – showing remarkable resilience while maintaining a reliable supply of food.

But I think it is clear that to ensure food security, we need a resilient agri-food system, which brings me to my second point: the need for a green transition. We live in uncertain and very volatile times, so moving towards a more sustainable food system has to continue to guide the EU's political policy and legislative agenda, as enshrined in our Green Deal. Addressing sustainability challenges in our path to ensuring food security not just for tomorrow, but for the longer term. And I think we all know that time is of the essence.

I want to acknowledge and I know and understand that there are concerns about some legislative proposals before you – and I am here to listen to those concerns. But I think there is broad agreement amongst all of us on the objectives of having a more sustainable agriculture and food sector. And farmers themselves want this, too.

So we need to look at all the proposals and see how they work together, rather than considering them separately. We are keen to engage in detailed discussions with you to forge the best possible legislative measures to ensure the productivity of EU agriculture today and in the future.

But let's stand back a little and look at some of the facts. We face a climate crisis and emissions from agriculture which, despite their relative low level, need to start coming down. And we must act decisively to halt and reverse the decline of biodiversity. Managing soils, water and air quality is key.

I think you all know that about 80% of crops depend on animal pollination, and the value that we put on this is EUR 5 billion to our agriculture output. We have a dramatic decline of pollinators in Europe and this is a major threat to food production. And indeed, when it comes to the natural enemies of crop pests, their estimated contribution to pest control – so nature's contribution – at least 50% of pest control occurring in crop yields happens through nature.

And if we look to our soils, over 60% of soil in Europe is degraded, and this directly impacts soil health and its capacity to produce food. These are all vital resources that underpin yields for farmers and nutritious and healthy products for consumers. Our farmers are at the front line to address many of these challenges because they know that healthy soils and water management are important to secure their livelihoods.

Agriculture provides solutions to mitigate climate change and restore natural resources. Farming practices, crop rotation, integrated pest management and conservation, tillage, indeed, conservation agriculture: these all help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve soil health. So we must strive for agricultural systems that are regenerative and part of the circular economy. Improved nutrient management, managing farm by-products and recycling are key.

Supported by the common agricultural policy, EU farmers are well placed to move to these sustainable systems. And indeed, if you look at the figures in the strategic plans, over 30% – or close to EUR 98 billion – of total public funding delivers on these objectives.

These systems can deliver carbon storage and play a role as important carbon sinks, and this is crucial for creating a new source of potential income for our farmers through carbon farming. Our proposal for carbon removal certification will enable this. Farming and forestry are the only sectors that can provide new materials without depleting the earth.

The European Parliament, in 2021, demonstrated strong support for the EU Biodiversity Strategy. You understand how urgent it is to stop and reverse biodiversity loss. And while I'm speaking of water, bear with me.

(The speaker drank from a glass of water)

I didn't do that for effect – I was just thirsty. But it actually makes the point that I could actually reach for a glass of clean water. There are many, many people around the world who cannot, who don't have a glass and certainly don't have clean water. So I hope it made a point as well as satisfied my thirst.

And in one sense I've said a lot of what needs to be done, and I think the time is right to do this now. President von der Leyen – in her State of the Union in 2020 — said that nature is our first ally to adapt to the consequences of climate change. Because we need well-functioning ecosystems – they are the very basis for sustainable growth, including for our agriculture and fisheries sector.

The Nature Restoration Law is actually the bedrock of the international commitments in the Kunming-Montreal deal on biodiversity. And you know, EU and Member States were instrumental in achieving a high level of ambition and clear targets.

If I turn to pesticides, we need to reduce the use and risk of chemical pesticides because the science on this is putting us in this direction. Not acting fast enough now will have a long-term effect on our food security into the future. And indeed, as I said, up to half of our crops depend on pollinators and these are at risk. There are alternative alternatives to chemical pesticides – crop rotation, plant breeding, new breeding techniques and biological pest controls – and we need to integrate those into our farming systems.

Without the actions set out in our proposal for nature restoration and the sustainable use of pesticides, farmers' livelihoods and, indeed, food security will be put at risk. Again, this is what the science is telling us. These proposals are about ensuring that there is a future for our farms, our farmers and those who work in the food supply chain. Our proposals aim to help farmers, not harm them.

The Commission recognised the exceptional circumstances affecting the food system since the start of the Russian war. We have increased concerns about global food security and we were reminded about the important role that Europe – the European Union – plays in global food security. In our staff working document, in January of this year, we looked at the main drivers affecting food security – both the supply and demand sides in the short and the long term. And really the conclusion was that we do need to act on these issues now.

A consistent and comprehensive implementation of the European Green Deal – including the farm to fork and biodiversity strategies – will help the EU secure a sustainable, inclusive and resilient food system within a realistic time frame and with necessary support instruments.

Going beyond regulatory and support measures, there are needs for changes in terms of consumption, reduction of food waste and increased innovation to provide all the tools needed to achieve our sustainability objectives, without jeopardising productivity during the transition.

The assessment concluded that the key challenge for policymakers is to pave the way for a transition towards a more sustainable and resilient food system that meets and reconciles short and long-term needs at the same time. And we do need to make sure that our policies are well designed and balanced.

The Commission is listening carefully to the concerns expressed by this House, by Member States, by stakeholders, including farmers. So as a consequence, for example, the Commission showed its openness to consider alternatives to a total ban on the use of pesticides in sensitive areas. These alternatives are intended to safeguard agricultural production, while still protecting health and the environment. The Council has requested additional input and evidence, and that will be delivered to the Council – and in parallel to the European Parliament – around our assessment of impacts.

And while the focus in the headlines is on food security and environmental performance, it's true that our farming sector is facing other challenges that we cannot ignore. The sector does not attract people, so there is not a rush of young men and women to become farmers.

This House is really concerned about the lack of generational renewal in agriculture, and this is the third, and it's a key, point. We have a very diversified agriculture across our Member States, but we see this common problem. The number of farmers is declining. Small farmers are opting out, renting land or, indeed, selling. Farmers are ageing – the average is 57. There is some light at the end of this tunnel: we are seeing more women go into farming. And one figure that struck me is the increase in the share of women female farm managers – to 31%, which is encouraging. But I do think we share this concern about generational renewal and our policies have to support – as Member States are doing – young farmers to get established.

But encouraging young men and women to farm will not succeed if they cannot earn decent incomes for their efforts. We also need to make our rural areas more attractive and dynamic, and farmers are at the core of this. Indeed, I would say that perhaps COVID lockdowns have encouraged people to think about moving and living in rural areas, but they need connectivity, schools, access to health and, of course, mobility.

This is the European Year of Skills. I think when it comes to skills around translating research and innovation to farm level, we have to assist our farmers in giving them the knowledge and allowing them to put it into practice. And this is a key part of the strategic plans.

It is a unique opportunity because the research is there and it just needs to be, as I say, drilled into the soils of Europe by our farmers. Farmers have an appetite for knowledge and they will change if they are given the tools to do that. Just to say that Europe invests EUR 9 billion in research and innovation on food, bioeconomy, natural resources, agriculture and environment. That is a significant amount of funding and we need to make it work at farm level.

I have overstayed my welcome. I've spoken for over nine minutes and I thank my friend, the Minister, for sharing her time with me. But what I wanted to do was to give justice to this debate, and to deal with the concerns that I have heard and those who want change to happen, but want to help and support our farmers in that direction.

So we need farmers – maybe we need to say that louder and clearer – not just to produce our food, but also to tackle those many challenges I have addressed and, indeed, that you will as well. It goes without saying that farmers are the enablers in this agenda on sustainability, but they can only play their part with the right incentives, the right support instruments, the right skills and the right innovation. It is our shared responsibility to give farmers clarity about what we are doing and why. And I look forward now to all of your contributions.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Frau Kommissarin! Wir haben uns heute morgen durch technische Probleme etwas Verspätung eingehandelt, was durch die Teilung der Redezeit auch nicht wesentlich besser geworden ist. Ich möchte nicht, dass das in dieser wichtigen Debatte zu Lasten der Kollegen am Schluss geht, deshalb werde ich auf die Redezeit achten, und ich wäre auch dankbar, wenn die Redner aus der ersten Runde die ausgewiesenen Redezeiten nicht als unverbindliche Vorschläge betrachten würden.

Außerdem haben wir jetzt schon viele Wortmeldungen zum Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. Ich weise darauf hin, dass die Dienste immer so ein bisschen im Blick haben, wer während der ganzen Debatte da ist. Wenn wir nachher auswählen müssen, wird auch das ein Kriterium sein.

Herbert Dorfmann, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Herr Minister, Frau Kommissarin, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nachhaltigkeit ist ein Begriff, den wir inzwischen immer und überall verwenden. Er kommt eigentlich aus der Land- und Forstwirtschaft, und das zu Recht. Ich denke, es gibt keinen Wirtschaftszweig, in der das Prinzip des von den Vorfahren Bekommens, Bewirtschaftens, Weitergebens so gelebt wird wie in der Landwirtschaft. Man braucht es sich eigentlich nur anzuschauen. Wir brauchen nur schauen: Wie viele Betriebe gibt es in der restlichen Wirtschaft, die über Jahrhunderte von der gleichen Familie bewirtschaftet werden, und wie viele gibt es davon in der Landwirtschaft? Deshalb ist es schon ein bisschen am Rande des Absurden, wenn es scheinbar alle besser wissen als die Bäuerinnen und Bauern selbst, wie man einen landwirtschaftlichen Betrieb nachhaltig führen kann.

Das bedeutet nicht, dass in der Landwirtschaft alles perfekt wäre. Natürlich gibt es wie überall auch in Sachen Nachhaltigkeit deutlich Luft nach oben. Aber wir verkennen viel zu oft, dass auf unseren Höfen zum Glück viele ausgebildete, hochmotivierte Bäuerinnen und Bauern sind, die wenig Lust mehr haben, sich täglich zurufen zu lassen, was sie alles falsch machen – oft von Menschen, die weder eine Ausbildung in der Landwirtschaft haben noch einen einzigen Tag auf einem Hof gearbeitet haben.

Deshalb: Wenn wir Dinge verbessern wollen, müssen wir das mit den Bäuerinnen und Bauern gemeinsam tun. Das ist eine Frage des Respekts. Es ist eine Frage der Würde gegenüber jenen, die täglich dafür sorgen, dass wir alle zum Essen und zum Trinken haben. Und genau diese Auseinandersetzung auf Augenhöhe, Frau Kommissarin, hat es bei den Vorschlägen zur Reduzierung von Pflanzenschutzmitteln und zur Wiederherstellung der Natur bisher eben nicht gegeben. Deshalb sind die Vorschläge der Kommission auch so unglaublich schlecht ausgefallen, deswegen werden sie von meiner Fraktion auch nicht unterstützt – nicht, weil wir die Ziele nicht teilen würden oder, wie Linke und Grüne in den letzten Tagen so fleißig getwittert haben, weil wir die ewig Gestrigen wären.

Landwirtschaft, Lebensmittelversorgung ist eine strategische Frage für die Union. Wir brauchen hervorragende und auch junge Bäuerinnen und Bauern, die ausgebildet sind und die mit Begeisterung Landwirtschaft betreiben. Das ist einmal die Grundvoraussetzung, wenn wir den Grünen Deal auch auf unseren Feldern umsetzen wollen. Die werden wir aber ganz sicher nicht bekommen, wenn wir die Bauern tagtäglich kritisieren, sondern nur, wenn wir sie wertschätzen und respektvoll miteinander umgehen.

Iratxe García Pérez, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, no puedo más que estar de acuerdo con la comisaria McGuinness cuando dice que el sector agrícola es un sector estratégico en la Unión Europea. La guerra de Ucrania nos ha mostrado nuestras debilidades, la dependencia energética de forma muy evidente. Por eso tenemos que entender el gran papel que están desempeñando los agricultores y ganaderos en la Unión Europea garantizando los suministros de alimentos en la Unión Europea sin tener que depender.

Pero también hay que tener en cuenta otras cuestiones fundamentales en este debate, señorías. La ciencia deja cada vez menos margen al negacionismo climático de la derecha y la ultraderecha. Hemos vivido el mes de abril más seco desde que hay registros. El informe del servicio Copernicus de la Comisión Europea muestra que las temperaturas en Europa aumentan el doble de la media mundial. Estamos en cifras récord de días declarados como olas de calor y atravesamos largas sequías. En el año 2022, el 63 % de los ríos europeos tuvieron caudales inferiores a la media europea.

Pero si hay algo más grave que las sequías y las olas de calor, es el falso dilema de la derecha entre el apoyo a los agricultores o la protección al medio ambiente. ¿Cuál será el futuro de la agricultura si las políticas negacionistas convierten nuestros ecosistemas en desiertos?

Lo peligroso es combatir el conocimiento científico incurriendo en errores como la legalización de pozos ilegales en Doñana y mostrando su rechazo a dos de los grandes objetivos de la Comisión Europea en su Pacto Verde: la reducción del uso de pesticidas en la agricultura y la reconstrucción de una quinta parte de los hábitats destruidos en la Unión Europea para 2030.

La conservación de la tierra y de la actividad agrícola no puede ser rehén de cálculos electoralistas. La única manera de preservar a medio y largo plazo el valor excepcional de nuestros campos es revisar estas cuestiones.

Frente a las falsas promesas imposibles de cumplir, los socialdemócratas garantizaremos el trabajo de los agricultores en nuestros ecosistemas únicos cumpliendo con los compromisos del Pacto Verde y de la Legislación sobre el Clima.

Señorías, el clima habla. La transición ecológica necesita valentía y veracidad para proteger el trabajo de nuestros agricultores en un medio ambiente sostenible, que no es sino proteger el futuro de nuestro modo de vida tanto en las ciudades como sobre todo en el campo.

Ulrike Müller, *im Namen der Renew-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Als aktive Bäuerin bin ich viel bei den Landwirtinnen und Landwirten unterwegs und versuche, die Politik rund um den *Green Deal*, um *Fit for 55* und *Farm to Fork* zu erklären. Was ich dabei vor allem erfahre, sind Frustration, Unverständnis und Wut über mangelnde Wertschätzung, Bevormundung und Verbotspolitik. Der Titel der heutigen Debatte ist gut gewählt, denn es sind die Landwirte, die auf den Feldern und Weiden alles umsetzen müssen. Aber unsere Politik steht damit leider überhaupt nicht im Einklang.

Die Herausforderungen sind gewaltig, und um diese zu bewältigen, braucht es Technologieoffenheit und wissenschaftliche Freiheit. Tatsächlich erleben wir aber ideologisch geprägte Verbotspolitik und realitätsfremde Vorgaben. Wie sollen wir den Menschen im Sektor so das Gefühl der Rechtssicherheit und der Perspektive geben, frage ich Sie alle hier.

Unsere Bauernfamilien und das Ernährungsgewerbe haben sich als zuverlässige Partner der Bürgerinnen und Bürger in unserer Union erwiesen. Sie haben in schwierigsten Zeiten die Lieferketten aufrechterhalten. Diese Menschen haben unser Vertrauen und unsere Unterstützung verdient. So, wie Pflanzen und Tiere Luft zum Leben brauchen, so braucht auch dieser Wirtschaftszweig wieder deutlich mehr Luft, um sich entwickeln zu können.

Mehr Freiheit wagen, statt eine ganze Branche zu Tode zu regulieren. Ich wünsche mir von den Kolleginnen und Kollegen in diesem Haus mehr Mut zur Freiheit, nicht nur, aber insbesondere in der Agrarpolitik, um Versorgungssicherheit in der EU zu gewährleisten.

Martin Häusling, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Was die EVP seit Tagen hier macht, ist ein Frontalangriff auf den *Green Deal* und die *Farm-to-Fork*-Strategie. Hier setzt sich die Politik aus dem Agrarausschuss fort, wie wir sie alle schon seit Monaten erleben: Entweder ist Timmermans am Niedergang der Landwirtschaft schuld, der Wolf oder die Grünen. Es ist unglaublich, was sich da abspielt.

Kein Wort, Herr Dorfmann, zur Klimakatastrophe, nicht ein einziges Wort. Die Kollegin hat es ja gesagt: Schauen wir doch nach Spanien, nach Italien, oder schauen wir auf die Waldbrände in Kanada: Was läuft gerade für eine Klimakatastrophe ab? Die gefährdet unsere Ernährungssicherheit und nicht Gesetzgebungsverfahren der Europäischen Union. Und Sie bremsen ja eine ambitionierte Klimapolitik immer noch aus.

Kein Wort zur Krise der Biodiversität. Natürlich hat auch die Landwirtschaft eine Verantwortung: ausgeräumte Landschaften, zu viele Pestizide – das ist auch ein Treiber der Krise in der Biodiversität. Kein Wort darüber von der EVP. Und auch ein Verlust an Biodiversität gefährdet unsere Ernährungssicherheit. Was Sie gerade machen, ist, sich hier als Schutzpatron einer Landwirtschaft aufzuspielen, der Sie ja schon lange nicht mehr sind.

Sagen Sie doch einmal: Diese wunderbare Agrarpolitik hat 5 Millionen Betriebe in den letzten 15 Jahren die Existenz gekostet. Ist alles wunderbar? Sie reden über Ernährungssicherheit, sprechen aber überhaupt nicht an, dass immer noch 30 % der Nahrungsmittel weggeworfen werden, dass immer noch 60 % der Nahrungsmittel in den Futtertrog geworfen werden. Das sprechen Sie nicht an.

Es ist nicht alles wunderbar in der Landwirtschaftspolitik! Wir müssen es ändern, und die Kommission hat Antworten gegeben, die wir auch unterstützen. Wir brauchen eine agrarökologische Wende, und zwar nicht irgendwann, sondern jetzt. Da kann ich nur sagen: Wenn wir das jetzt nicht hinbekommen, dann verpassen wir eine Chance, die wir so schnell nicht wieder zurückbekommen.

Nicola Procaccini, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ciò che accade in diverse zone d'Europa ci ricorda come gli agricoltori siano continuamente chiamati ad affrontare le sfide del cambiamento climatico: siccità, inondazioni, degrado del suolo, solo per citarne alcune.

Queste sfide non solo minacciano i loro redditi familiari ma mettono a rischio la sicurezza alimentare dell'intero continente. Se da un lato è quindi giusto favorire l'evoluzione sostenibile dell'agricoltura, dall'altro lato bisogna evitare di schiacciare la produzione con obblighi burocratici e pesi economici insostenibili per i nostri agricoltori, soprattutto se non protetti dalla concorrenza sleale di chi, fuori dall'Unione europea, non è tenuto a rispettare gli stessi standard ambientali, sanitari e sociali.

Con le norme e i regolamenti che vengono adottati qui dentro, ma soprattutto con i fondi economici che vengono stanziati qui dentro, dobbiamo valorizzare il mestiere di agricoltore e di allevatore, perché sono loro a garantirci i prodotti locali di alta qualità, profondamente radicati nella cultura e nell'alimentazione di noi europei.

È importante allora non metterne a rischio la vitalità e la resilienza in nome di false ideologie ambientaliste, come la sostituzione della carne animale di cui si nutre l'umanità da millenni con quella artificiale prodotta in laboratorio, o come con la commercializzazione di farine di vermi, oltretutto appaltata dalla Commissione a una multinazionale del Vietnam in regime di monopolio.

Fanno bene i governi conservatori, come quello italiano, a contenerne la diffusione, anche in nome della trasparenza e della salute pubblica, agendo in una sorta di sussidiarietà al contrario che dimostra chi è dalla parte giusta della storia.

Sapete cosa diceva uno dei padri del pensiero conservatore, sir Roger Scruton? «I nostri agricoltori, non i nostri politici, sono i veri amministratori della terra».

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, les agriculteurs européens sont des acteurs majeurs de la transition verte. Ils ont déjà fait beaucoup d'efforts pour réduire l'utilisation des engrais de synthèse et des pesticides. Le progrès technique leur permet en outre aujourd'hui de recourir à des procédés vertueux, comme la méthanisation de proximité ou l'agriculture de précision. La nouvelle politique agricole commune est quant à elle conçue pour les inciter à diversifier leurs efforts, notamment grâce aux écorégimes.

Grâce aux agriculteurs, la transition verte a donc déjà bel et bien commencé. Il faut toutefois rester raisonnable et résister à la précipitation de la stratégie «De la ferme à la fourchette» qui voudrait l'imposer à marche forcée. La priorité de l'agriculture européenne est de nourrir les peuples d'Europe. Il ne faut jamais l'oublier.

La guerre en Ukraine est venue nous rappeler que notre autonomie alimentaire est une nécessité. Or, la stratégie «De la ferme à la fourchette» entraînerait une décroissance agricole de 15 % si on l'appliquait. C'est pour moi le vrai problème dont on devrait parler aujourd'hui. Non pas suspecter les agriculteurs d'être de mauvais élèves de l'écologie, mais dénoncer la contradiction entre cette stratégie européenne et l'exigence d'autonomie alimentaire.

Pendant qu'on y est, on devrait s'inquiéter plus largement de la perte du sens des réalités de la Commission. M^{me} von der Leyen et son équipe veulent par exemple convertir, d'ici 2030, 25 % de la surface agricole à l'agriculture biologique, alors que la crise économique détourne les Européens des produits biologiques jugés trop chers. Rien qu'en France, la consommation de produits biologiques a diminué de plus de 6 % dans les neuf premiers mois de 2022 et le nombre d'agriculteurs qui opèrent une conversion du bio vers le conventionnel ne cesse de croître. Votre stratégie «De la ferme à la fourchette» est inadaptée, mais votre orgueil et votre certitude de tout savoir mieux que les peuples vous empêchent de l'admettre.

Anja Hazekamp, namens de *The Left-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, het gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid heeft ons honderden miljarden landbouwsubsidies gekost. Ondertussen zijn vele miljoenen boerenbedrijven verdwenen, waarvan 85 % kleine bedrijven. De grote bedrijven worden groter en de kleine bedrijven gaan kapot. Die miljarden aan landbouwsubsidies hebben ons daarnaast een klimaat-, een water- en een biodiversiteitscrisis opgeleverd en veroorzaken dagelijks ontzettend veel dierenleed.

Wij verwachten van boeren dat zij aan de basis staan bij het realiseren van de doelen van de Green Deal. Boeren hebben namelijk een wereld te winnen bij een duurzaam voedselsysteem. Daarvoor is een radicale verandering van het Europees landbouwbeleid nodig. Maar daar zijn de landbouwlobbyisten in Brussel het niet mee eens. Zij behartigen enkel de belangen van bedrijven die een duurzaam voedselsysteem in de weg staan. En dat zijn de bedrijven die landbouwgif, kunstmest en veevoer produceren. Dat zijn de exporteurs van melkpoeder, kaas, varkens en kippen. Het is duidelijk dat vele Europarlementariërs hier ook alleen oog hebben voor de miljardenbelangen van de agro-industrie en helemaal niet omkijken naar de kleinschalige boeren.

Het aanpakken van gevaarlijk landbouwgif en de methaanuitstoot, maatregelen voor natuurherstel, het verminderen van het aantal dieren in de vee-industrie, een ambitieuze dierenwelzijnswetgeving die voldoet aan de behoeften van dieren in plaats van aan de behoeften van de industrie, inclusief een verbod op bontfokkerijen, het houden van dieren in kooien en lange diertransporten: allemaal noodzakelijk voor een duurzame voedselproductie en een leefbare planeet, allemaal afgeremd door de landbouwlobby en hun woordvoerders hier in het Europees Parlement, die elke vooruitgang blokkeren.

Laten we luisteren naar die boeren die samen met ons de handen uit de mouwen willen steken, in plaats van te luisteren naar mensen die hun kop in het zand steken.

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la figura dell'agricoltore è da sempre centrale nell'evoluzione della società e oggi più che mai è fondamentale per accompagnare l'umanità verso un mondo più sostenibile e verso una maggiore sicurezza alimentare.

La transizione ecologica deve avere l'agricoltore quale figura chiave per la nostra corretta convivenza in un pianeta che si appresta ad avere dieci miliardi di abitanti. Dunque, o sarà sostenibile o non sarà, cioè non avrà un futuro.

Abbiamo trovato una visione condivisa sul *phasing out* dai pesticidi, ma dobbiamo ascoltare con maggiore attenzione le richieste del settore e incoraggiare gli esempi virtuosi. Ci sono *smart farm* efficienti e sostenibili in Sardegna, in Sicilia, in Austria, in molte regioni europee.

Valorizziamo questi esempi, investiamo più soldi europei in progetti virtuosi che mettano l'agricoltore al centro della nostra azione di rinnovamento verso una sostenibilità completa. Una transizione autentica che possa renderci più ricchi e assicurare un futuro a noi, ai nostri figli e al pianeta intero.

Norbert Lins (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Ministerin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich freue mich, Frau Kommissarin, dass Sie hier sind. Ich frage mich aber, wo der Landwirtschaftskommissar ist, warum er sich dieser Debatte nicht stellt, wo er sich heute Morgen versteckt; das ist schon die Frage. Ich glaube, es gehört zum Respekt gegenüber diesem Haus, dass der Landwirtschaftskommissar sich dieser Debatte stellt.

Nächste Woche, am 15. Mai, müssen die Bäuerinnen und Bauern den Antrag, ihren Förderantrag für die neue Agrarpolitik, zum ersten Mal abgeben. Ich glaube, vielen wird dann bewusst, welche Anforderungen, welche Herausforderungen diese neue gemeinsame Agrarpolitik an die Bäuerinnen und Bauern stellt – Stichworte *enhanced conditionality*, *eco-schemes*. Ich glaube, wir sehen damit, was unsere Landwirtschaft jetzt schon leistet, was wir ihr in Zukunft abverlangen, und selbstverständlich leistet die Landwirtschaft jetzt schon einen großen Beitrag für Umwelt- und Klimaschutz.

Ich glaube aber, dass wir die Landwirte überfordern. Derzeit sind 80 Gesetzesinitiativen von der Europäischen Kommission da, 30 mit direkter Auswirkung auf die Landwirtschaft: die SUR, *Nature Restoration Law*, *animal welfare*, *industrial emissions*, *sustainable food systems*, um nur einige zu nennen. Es wird gepusht, gepusht, gepusht. Und Europas Landwirtschaft muss immer mehr immer schneller leisten. Die Bäuerinnen und Bauern kommen bei der Umsetzung, was wir von ihnen verlangen, nicht mehr nach.

Lassen wir die Bäuerinnen und Bauern doch arbeiten! Gerade bei der jetzigen Ernährungslage müssen wir ihnen Lust machen, diesen wunderschönen Beruf auch weiter ausüben zu können, insbesondere was die junge Generation betrifft.

Mohammed Chahim (S&D). – Voorzitter, de rol van boeren bij de groene transitie: waar hebben we het dan over? Zij die vragen om steun voor vergroening, of de boeren van de megastallen, de piekbelasters? Boeren hebben een toekomst in Europa. Boeren spelen een enorme rol in de vergroening, maar wel biologische boeren. Boeren die een eerlijke prijs krijgen van tussenhandelaren en supermarkten, want het moet wel lonen. Terwijl het in Oostenrijk lukt om zonder maatregelen biologische boeren een prominente plek te geven in onze supermarktschappen, waardoor die boeren een goede prijs krijgen en kunnen concurreren met niet-biologisch, halen wij er in Nederland onze neus voor op en zien we biologisch vooral als duur. Een mythe die moeilijk te doorbreken is.

Pak degenen die alleen maar profiteren van het werk van de boeren aan, zij die enorme economische winsten maken ten koste van de boeren. Pak de graaiflatie aan. Daar moeten we iets aan doen. Door het systeem te veranderen en nieuwe verdienmodellen te ontwikkelen, is een duurzame landbouwsector mogelijk. En boeren die daaraan bijdragen moeten worden beloond. Kiezen tussen boeren en de natuur is een valse tegenstelling. Boeren moeten ook beloond worden voor natuurbeheer. Zet je daarvoor in, want met een njet help je noch de boeren, noch de natuur.

Pascal Canfin (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je voudrais d'abord m'adresser à mes collègues du camp conservateur. Vous êtes engagés aujourd'hui dans une offensive contre le pacte vert sur la transition agricole. Pourtant, nous avons réussi à trouver des accords sur l'industrie, sur la mobilité. Pourquoi ne pourrions-nous pas y arriver tous ensemble, avec les socialistes et éventuellement avec les Verts, sur la transition agricole? Pourquoi y aurait-il une exception où nous ne pourrions pas réussir sur l'agriculture ce que nous avons réussi à faire par ailleurs?

Parce qu'avoir une offensive idéologique de votre part, qui nie la réalité de ce qui est vécu par les agriculteurs, c'est-à-dire l'impact du choc climatique partout en Europe, la perte de nature, la perte des pollinisateurs qui fait qu'ils ont une baisse des rendements. La première cause sur la baisse des rendements des grandes cultures en Europe, c'est l'impact du changement climatique. Donc travaillons ensemble sur les solutions.

Et les solutions – et là, je m'adresse aussi aux écologistes – sont basées sur la nature, mais elles sont aussi dans la technologie. Et c'est pour cela que le paquet de solutions qui est proposé par la Commission européenne, basé sur la nature – restaurer les écosystèmes, le biocontrôle pour se passer des pesticides et, demain, les nouvelles techniques génomiques pour aller chercher de nouveaux progrès techniques –, c'est un ensemble qui devrait nous réunir plutôt que nous diviser. Parce que ce n'est vraiment pas rendre service à l'agriculteur européen, à l'agricultrice européenne et à nos fermiers que de s'opposer de manière totalement idéologique, en colportant des rumeurs et des choses totalement fausses sur les textes qui sont contenus dans le pacte vert.

Travaillons ensemble, ayons des solutions pour l'avenir et c'est comme cela qu'on répondra aux attentes des agriculteurs.

Sarah Wiener (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte hier ganz klar sagen: Die Verringerung von Pestizideinsatz, die Umsetzung des integrierten Pflanzenschutzes und die Wiederherstellung der Natur liegen im Interesse der Landwirte. Warum? Ganz einfach: Die Wiederherstellung der Natur, von lebenswichtigen ökologischen Systemleistungen wie Bodenqualität, Bestäubung, Wasserqualität, Schädlingsbekämpfung usw., trägt zu einem gesunden, produktiven und widerstandsfähigen Lebensmittelsystem bei. Agrarökologische Praktiken erhöhen das Einkommen von Bäuerinnen und Bauern, senken die Kosten von externen teuren Inputs und machen mehr unabhängig von der Agrarindustrie. So schafft man rentable, langfristig nachhaltige und stabile Lebensmittelsysteme.

Bäuerinnen und Bauern und ihre Familien und alle, die bei landwirtschaftlichen Flächengebieten leben, sind den gesundheitlichen Auswirkungen von Pestiziden besonders ausgesetzt. Dazu gehören verschiedene Krebsarten – Non-Hodgkin-Lymphom, Eierstockkrebs, Brustkrebs, Prostatakrebs, Hirnkrebs –, neurologische Störungen, Alzheimer, Parkinson, Herz-Kreislauf-Erkrankungen, Entwicklungsverzögerungen bei Kindern, negative Auswirkungen auf die Fortpflanzungsfähigkeit und kognitive Störungen.

Lassen Sie uns also gemeinsam anpacken und gemeinsam mit unseren Bauern den Weg Richtung Nachhaltigkeit gehen, denn ...

(Der Präsident entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Pane předsedající, farmáři jsou klíčovými hráči v zelené tranzici, protože se nejvíce starají o naši přírodu a krajinu. Jejich hospodaření má přímý vliv na stav půdy a vody. My jako konzervativci jejich zapojení podporujeme a vždy podporovat budeme. Musíme ale myslet na to, že farmáře nemůžeme zabít šílenou byrokracií, přidávat jim další úkoly a odvádět je od jejich primárního úkolu – produkce potravin. Evropský parlament a Komise ale našim farmářům nenaslouchají. Hlavní strůjce zelené tranzice Frans Timmermans nechodí do Výboru pro zemědělství a rozvoj venkova, i když jeho nápady dopadají výrazně právě na farmáře. Mimochodem vidíme, co se dnes děje v jeho Nizozemsku. Výbor pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin bere Výboru pro zemědělství a rozvoj venkova kompetence i v otázkách týkajících se zelené transformace v zemědělství. Přitom absolutně nemá ponětí, jaká je zemědělská praxe a jak to na zemědělský sektor dopadne. Nebo je jim to jedno. Důležitý je pro všechny boj s CO₂, ale nikdo už neřeší, že právě farmáři nám mohou pomoci. Jen jim musíme naslouchat.

Elena Lizzi (ID). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, prima di tutto volevo dire che, ascoltando gli interventi di oggi, mi pare che la maggioranza scricchioli, non sono tutti più così convinti di questo Green Deal.

Partendo dall'Italia, voglio ricordare che il mio paese ha già implementato molte delle politiche richieste dal Green Deal e con la più ampia superficie destinata all'agricoltura biologica, il 17 %.

Recentemente l'aumento dei prezzi e le interruzioni della catena di approvvigionamento hanno però messo in difficoltà il settore agricolo in generale, che però ha dimostrato grande tempra e ancora resiste. D'altronde, si chiama settore primario, io lo dico sempre, perché ci fa vivere e sopravvivere a tutto.

Vi siete mai messi nei panni di un agricoltore? Avete mai dialogato con chi ogni giorno dedica la vita al lavoro nei campi? Io sì, questa è stata anche la storia della mia famiglia, e questo è quello che vi direbbe, se ascoltato: non voglio un'Europa che mi imponga una transizione verde così veloce. La terra è la mia casa e io faccio già di tutto per salvarla, ci vivo. Io, agricoltore, devo avere il tempo di recepire le vostre politiche per adattare ai miei terreni e alla mia vita. Io, agricoltore, sono stanco di essere vessato da richieste incoerenti e arbitrarie che ostacolano il mio lavoro, invece di agevolarlo. Io, agricoltore, tramando il sapere dei miei nonni alle nuove generazioni e alla tecnologia, mentre voi a Bruxelles producete ogni giorno regole e imposizioni che vanno contro la mia sopravvivenza. Io, agricoltore, sono allibito nel vedere politiche europee che minacciano le mie specialità e promuovono carne sintetica, grilli e cavallette, che poco hanno a che vedere con la transizione verde, con la mia esperienza e soprattutto con la vostra lunga vita.

Cari colleghi, così ci vedono i nostri agricoltori, anzi vi vedono. Gli obiettivi legati alla transizione verde devono essere conciliati con le possibilità dei nostri agricoltori. Le attuali politiche favoriranno le importazioni dai paesi terzi, dove non è prevista reciprocità e i controlli sui prodotti sono meno rigorosi di quelle imposte ai nostri agricoltori.

Luke Ming Flanagan (The Left). – Mr President, if you ignore the climate crisis, if you ignore the biodiversity crisis, then you are not defending farmers. You are destroying them, destroying them for short-term political gain.

Five million farmers have disappeared in the last 15 years, 37%. They didn't leave because they were making too much money, they left because policy had failed them. All the negatives that are in agriculture today are there because that is what policymakers asked farmers to do – to expand, to get bigger, intensify, feed the world – policies that have brought us to where we are today: an agricultural system that is devouring both farmers and the environment.

In school in the 1980s, we were taught in Ireland that our hedgerows were a waste of land and that we were a bit thick for not exploiting every last square metre. Now farmers are told the opposite. It's no surprise farmers are annoyed and confused. But we actually know what we need to do; it isn't necessary to reinvent the wheel. We must encourage a less intensive agricultural system that respects nature and lives within its means, be that organic farming, agroforestry or paludiculture on organic soils.

We need to learn from what has worked. When Natura 2000 was first introduced, there was a guaranteed payment of EUR 242 per hectare for farmers in Ireland. In today's money, that's over EUR 500 per hectare. Farmers who weren't included were livid. The message is clear: if you pay people for doing environmental work, they will do it. If you don't, they won't.

A strategy to achieve this must look at all aspects. The Green Deal and the biodiversity strategy will only work if they are matched by concrete action in other areas, particularly trade and competition policy. We cannot ask farmers to produce to the highest standards and then undermine their very existence in trade and competition policy.

Der Präsident. – Ich will kurz darauf hinweisen, dass wir einen Redner auf der Rednerliste haben, der eine politische Durchsage auf der Kleidung trägt. Das entspricht nicht unseren Regeln. Dieser Kollege wird später nicht das Wort erhalten, wenn wir uns nicht auf der Linie der Regeln bewegen.

Maxette Pirbakas (NI). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, oui, les agriculteurs ont un rôle à jouer dans la transition écologique en tant que facilitateurs de cette transition verte, c'est vrai, mais ce n'est pas leur rôle premier. Leur rôle premier, c'est de produire: produire des biens agricoles pour nous nourrir, produire pour dégager un revenu décent pour eux et leurs familles.

Quand j'entends ici certains propos qui se veulent écologistes mais qui se révèlent surtout anti-agriculteurs, j'ai l'impression que les agriculteurs sont des gens mauvais dont la seule préoccupation est de polluer la terre et les cours d'eau avec des engrais et des pesticides. Dans nos textes, on lit en filigrane que les agriculteurs sont le problème, qu'ils refusent de comprendre les enjeux globaux.

L'approche en cours ici est toujours punitive. Les agriculteurs doivent être dressés à coups de règlements et de directives, mais jamais on ne s'inquiète de leurs conditions de vie difficiles, des suicides, des bas revenus, des décès prématurés. Cette approche méprisante qui sous-tend la plupart de nos textes est insupportable aujourd'hui.

Les agriculteurs ont leur part à jouer dans la transition verte, mais on ne leur demande pas, au nom de cette transition, de rogner sur les rendements, donc sur leurs revenus, ou d'accepter une pénibilité accrue du travail. Moi-même, en tant qu'agricultrice, je dis que nous voulons bien prendre notre part du fardeau global, mais pas plus que notre part.

Siegfried Mureşan (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, we have just decided together the new common agricultural policy, which is under implementation since the beginning of this year, and this is why I say now that the priority needs to be to implement what we have decided together. Do not add additional costs, additional burdens to the farmers. Farmers have already needed to adapt a lot. They have already made sacrifices. What they need now is predictability, not new burdens and not unpredictability.

My group, the EPP, is committed to the Green Deal, to the transition to the green economy, but we want this to be done with farmers, not against the farmers. We have to create a framework in the rural areas which attracts farmers, young farmers, female farmers, not a framework which rejects farmers. Farmers are essential to our society. They ensure high quality food products here in Europe, they ensure food security. So we have to listen to them. We have to treat them with respect.

The war in Ukraine, dear colleagues, we have to recognise, changed a lot in terms of market situations, in terms of price volatility, in terms of risks to food security, and we have to take this into account in any decision that we are making. This is why, on nature restoration, on pesticides, the new reality has to be taken into account.

Herbert Dorfmann has said, on behalf of our group, everything that had to be said. May I add, on behalf of the EPP Group, that there should be no additional measures, no proposal for the reform of the common agricultural policy right now. Let us implement what we decided.

One last word, Commissioner McGuinness, we appreciate your presence today here, your efforts, but the Commissioner on Agriculture belongs in a debate on agriculture in the European Parliament. Commissioner Wojciechowski is absent. He is weak. He is not defending farmers. Please convey to him that we expect him to listen to farmers and to listen to the European Parliament.

IN THE CHAIR: MARC ANGEL

Vice-President

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señor presidente, bienvenidos a este debate de la agricultura europea. Sin duda es un buen momento para reconocer el papel estratégico y esencial de los agricultores con este debate prioritario.

Pero, señorías, no está bien aprovechar este debate para estrategias electorales o eslóganes electorales. Señores del PPE, no está bien. Yo sé que ustedes creen en los agricultores, pero utilizarlos de eslogan no queda bien. Como no queda bien la crítica permanente que hacen los Verdes, también, a la insostenibilidad de la agricultura europea. Tampoco es eso.

Los agricultores llevan veinte años trabajando con una condicionalidad y una sostenibilidad medioambiental importantes. Veinte años. Con la condicionalidad y la ecologización. Por tanto, no empiezan desde cero.

Ahora bien, ¿qué está pasando? Pues que acabamos de terminar una reforma de la PAC, que nos llevó cinco años, que hemos tenido una pandemia, que tenemos una guerra con Ucrania y que en la Comisión —el comisario está ausente, pero afortunadamente tenemos a la señora McGuinness con nosotros, la mejor cara de la Comisión— les recuerdo que tenemos un comisario que es de la extrema derecha. Y la presidenta, del PPE. Del PPE.

Por tanto, tenemos que abordar la situación de que tenemos ahora diez procedimientos legislativos y nos quedan nueve meses. Y eso genera incertidumbre. Y no necesitamos transmitir pancarta electoral, señores del PPE, necesitamos incentivos para los agricultores, instrumentos de apoyo, innovación, seguridad jurídica y reciprocidad en las importaciones. Alto y claro lo decimos. Dejemos la propaganda de un extremo y de otro extremo.

Elsi Katainen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitos ministerille ja komission jäsenelle myös esittelystä. Tämän kauden EU-politiikan ytimessä ovat todellakin maa- ja metsätalous, me viljelijät ja metsänomistajat.

Ilmastotalkoiden tärkein ja vaikuttavin toimi on päästöjen vähentäminen, mutta myös hiilensidonnalla on tärkeä roolinsa. Meillä on tasan kaksi alaa, maa- ja metsätalous, jotka kykenevät sitomaan hiiltä. Siksi onkin surullista, että sektori on joutunut syyllistävän keskustelun keskiöön ja kannustusten sijaan rajoitusten piiriin. Meidän, politiikan tekijöiden, vastuu on kannustaa ja nostaa arvoonsa osaavat ja vastuuntuntoiset viljelijämme, jotka haluavat kehittää tuotantotapoja kohti parempaa hiilensidontaa.

Meillä on paljon tutkimusta ja hankkeita, jotka tukevat hiili- ja ilmastovisasta viljelijää, mutta samalla tarvitsemme myös poikkitieteellistä tutkimusta ja erityisesti siten, että viljelijät ovat kehitystyön osapuolena, eivät vain poliittisten ja tieteellisten toimien kohteena.

Haluaisinkin kiittää komissiota siitä, että vihdoinkin viljelijöille tarjotaan kannusteita hiilsertifikaattiehtoutuksen myötä. Hiilensitojia on palkittava. Tärkeintä tulevassa valmistelussa on, että korvaukset ovat ihan oikeasti todellisia ja että järjestelmä on myös luotettava. Toivon komissiolta oikeudenmukaista valmistelua myös LULUCF:n AFOLU-järjestelmään, kun sen aika sitten myöhemmin tulee.

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, meine Damen und Herren! Es wirkt wie ein Stück aus dem Tollhaus. Wir befinden uns inmitten der größten Krise der Menschheit, der Zwillingskrise Klimawandel und Artensterben. Die Wissenschaftsgemeinde ist sich einig wie selten. Weltklimarat, Weltbiodiversitätsrat, die Welternährungsorganisation, die Vereinten Nationen – alle drängen zum Handeln, um unsere Ernährungssicherheit zu erhalten. Dazu brauchen wir wirksame Maßnahmen, um den Zusammenbruch der Ökosysteme und der Insektenpopulationen zu stoppen, denn ohne sauberes Wasser, fruchtbare Böden, lebendige Bestäuber wird es keine Zukunft für unsere Landwirtschaft und unsere Ernährung geben.

Und jetzt will die Unionsfraktion ernsthaft vorschlagen, die zwei zentralen Gesetzesvorschläge, die wir dafür brauchen, abzuräumen – die Pestizidverordnung und das Gesetz zur Rettung der Natur, das Renaturierungsgesetz. Dabei ist der Druck auf unsere Ökosysteme hoch wie nie. Wie sehr muss man die Augen vor der Realität verschließen, um nicht zu erkennen, dass Dürren, Insektensterben, Rückgang der Bodenfruchtbarkeit als allererstes unsere Landwirtinnen und Landwirte treffen werden? Wie unverantwortlich ist es, mit populistischen Falschaussagen Stimmung zu machen, während die Zukunft der Ernährungssicherheit auf dem Spiel steht?

Liebe EVP, besinnen Sie sich, kommen Sie auf den Boden der Tatsachen zurück! Arbeiten Sie konstruktiv an Lösungen mit!

No nature, no farmers, no food.

Krzysztof Jurgiel (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Rola rolników w transformacji ekologicznej może być znacząca. Jednak w kolejnych latach przeciętny rolnik będzie musiał: realizować wzmocnioną warunkowość dla otrzymania dopłat bezpośrednich, zredukować średnio o połowę wykorzystanie pestycydów i nawozów sztucznych, uwzględnić praktyki ochrony krajobrazu, poprawić swoje praktyki gospodarowania zasobami wodnymi, pozbyć się klatek hodowlanych, zadbać, aby jego działalność była niskoemisyjna. Gospodarstwo może zostać zalane wodą zgodnie z rozporządzeniem w sprawie odnowy zasobów przyrodniczych. A wszystko to, Szanowni Państwo, w kontekście zmniejszonego budżetu wspólnej polityki rolnej, skutków brexitu, pandemii Covid, wojny na Ukrainie i kryzysu na rynkach energii.

Mam pytanie: czy ktokolwiek z obecnych na tej sali jest w stanie choćby w przybliżeniu podać ocenę skumulowanych skutków transformacji? Obym był złym prorokiem, ale w ten sposób zamiast odporności budujemy sobie raczej katastrofę w postaci masowego odpływu zasobów ludzkich z rolnictwa w ciągu kolejnej dekady oraz przenoszenia produkcji rolnej do państw trzecich.

Sylvia Limmer (ID). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Bereits das Verbot, Pflanzenschutzmittel anzuwenden, und damit verbundene Rechtfertigungspflichten oder so groteske Aufzeichnungspflichten wie die Reinigung von Arbeitsgeräten, die in Zukunft nach Brüssel zu melden wäre, sind eine absolute Zumutung für Landwirte. Aber Ihre neueste Idee, dass Landwirte nun eine CO₂-Entnahme aus der Atmosphäre zu zertifizieren haben, toppt alles, was man sich bisher an grünem Schwachsinn hat einfallen lassen.

Z. B. sollen Landwirte ihre Äcker in Brachflächen umwandeln und dafür CO₂-Zertifikate erhalten, mit denen sie dann zwar nicht handeln können, sich aber wirklich ergebnisorientiert belohnen lassen können von Lebensmittelkonzernen, die damit ihren CO₂-Fußabdruck glaubwürdig dokumentieren sollen. Was für eine steile Karriere vom Biogas-Ölscheich, Solarenergieunternehmer oder Windparkvermieter zum woken CO₂-Gärtner. Nur eines sollen Landwirte nicht mehr: verlässlich gesunde Lebensmittel produzieren. Was horrend steigende Lebensmittelpreise zur Folge haben wird.

Und weil es sinnlos ist, sich hier an die Kollegen in diesem Parlament zu wenden: Liebe Landwirte, liebe Bürger, werden Sie wach, wenn Sie nicht morgen mit Insektenfraß, laborgezüchtetem Zellmatsch und ab und zu mit einem winzigen Stück Fleisch eines armen Schweins aus einem chinesischen Mastturm enden wollen!

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, last week, at the EPP's party conference in Munich, the party passed a resolution to kill the sustainable use of pesticides regulation and the nature restoration law.

We talk a lot about disinformation in here. The EPP thinks that the nature restoration law has the aim of taking 10 % of agricultural land out of production. We wish it had. That's what scientists are begging us to do. But that's not what's happening. Please read the text.

There is not a single serious scientist in Europe who would argue that the new pesticides regulation or the nature restoration law would pose a risk to European food security.

Looking at the EPP resolution, one can only assume that you represent the interest of the pesticide giants and big agriculture, and not the interest of the small farmer.

And what are you proposing instead? New breeding techniques? No GMOs? And who will benefit from that? The chemical industry. Come on. How about saving small farmers? Because that's not what you are doing.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, danas raspravljamo o ulozi vas, poljoprivrednika, u zelenoj tranziciji.

Vaša uloga je iznimno jednostavna, vi morate nestati. Zašto? Zato jer smetate novoj suludoj ideologiji potpune kontrole nad stanovništvom Europske unije za koje će u skorijoj budućnosti jedina hrana biti umjetno stvorena hrana nadopunjena uvezenim kukcima s istoka. Normalnu bio hranu moći će kupovati i jesti isključivo bogati.

Rat protiv poljoprivrednika je započeo u Nizozemskoj. Tamo se farmerima, temeljem zakona, želi oduzeti njihovo zemljište i predati u ruke građevinskom sektoru jer je navodno poljoprivreda opasna po zemljište i stanovništvo. Oni se ne daju. Tako se neće dati ni poljoprivrednici u Hrvatskoj i drugim zemljama Europske unije.

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señor presidente, estimada comisaria McGuinness, quisiera aclararle a la señora García Pérez, presidenta del Grupo Socialista, que la legalización de los pozos ilegales de Doñana la hizo el presidente del Gobierno, señor Sánchez, concediendo trece autorizaciones el año pasado. Estúdiese, señora García Pérez, las competencias administrativas en España. Y para falsas promesas las del señor Sánchez, que no ha ejecutado las infraestructuras hídricas que prometió hace cinco años.

Señorías, me temo que la política medioambiental que están impulsando el vicepresidente socialista, el señor Timmermans, y el señor Sinkevičius es la crónica de un desastre anunciado. Cuando sacaron un informe en el que se detallaban la enorme pérdida de producción agrícola y el aumento de costes que supondrían el Pacto Verde y la Estrategia «De la Granja a la Mesa», pensamos que darían marcha atrás. Nos equivocamos.

Cuando estalló una guerra a las puertas de Europa, atravesamos una crisis energética y estuvo en riesgo nuestra seguridad alimentaria, pensamos que darían marcha atrás. Pero nos volvimos a equivocar.

Y ahora que la inflación está batiendo récords históricos, ahora que la cesta de la compra está más cara que nunca y ahora que las protestas del campo se suceden por toda Europa, ahora nos vuelven a decir que no van a dar marcha atrás. Me temo que la ceguera ideológica les impide ver la realidad que tienen delante de sus narices.

Señor Timmermans, señores socialistas, basta ya de imponer más exigencias inasumibles a los agricultores y ganaderos. Los trabajadores del campo de toda Europa están saliendo a la calle para pedirles un poco de cordura y deben escucharlos. No se puede hacer política medioambiental caiga quien caiga, sin escuchar a los propios afectados.

Si pretenden continuar, tendrán enfrente al Partido Popular, que estará como siempre del lado de los agricultores, del lado del mundo rural, del lado de medio ambiente y del lado de la sensatez.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Viele meiner Vorrednerinnen und Vorredner haben das hier heute schon betont: Ohne Landwirtinnen und Landwirte in Europa gelingt uns die Transformation nicht, denn die Transformation, der Klimawandel und auch die Bedrohung der Artenvielfalt betreffen die Landwirtinnen und Landwirte als erstes. In vielen Regionen in der Europäischen Union ist allerdings bald keine Landwirtschaft mehr möglich, wenn wir uns nicht endlich beim Klimaschutz bewegen. Wer das nicht wahrhaben will, kann ja gerne mal in der Po-Ebene bei den Reisbauern nachschauen oder bei den Weizenbauern in Spanien. Wegen der Dürre dort droht ein weiterer Totalausfall.

Die Augen also vor dem Problem zu verschließen, wird uns nicht helfen. Wir müssen miteinander arbeiten und nicht gegeneinander – auch in diesem Haus. Wenn ich die Debatte hier heute verfolge, dann ist das mehr Wahlkampf als echte Diskussion um das Problem. Meine Fraktion in allen Ausschüssen, auch wenn wir uns sehr intensiv in den Inhalten auseinandersetzen, steht bereit, einen Kompromiss zu finden, der den Landwirten hilft, aber auch sicherstellt, dass wir das *Nature Restoration Law* hinbekommen und weniger Pestizide in der Europäischen Union einsetzen. Ich frage die EVP, ob sie bereit sind, gemeinsam diesen Weg zu gehen, oder dieses Wahlkampftheater fortführen wollen.

Dacian Cioloș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisară, fermierii europeni trebuie să poată produce în continuare hrană de calitate, accesibilă și sănătoasă, dar, în același timp, să și trăiască din ceea ce produc și să reziste și presiunii cauzate pe piață de agresiunea Rusiei în Ucraina. De aceea, avem nevoie, în acest moment mai mult ca oricând, de viziune, de coerență și de realism atunci când facem propuneri legislative și luăm decizii la nivel european.

Resursele naturale pe baza cărora producem azi trebuie să fie în stare bună și la dispoziția generațiilor viitoare. Haideți deci să nu gândim doar pe termen scurt sau din ambiții politice, electorale și să nu ne jucăm electoralist cu viitorul agricultorilor. Actele normative pe care Comisia Europeană le propune pe bucăți de mai bine de un an încoace au șansa să facă bine pe teren doar dacă sunt privite și negociate în mod integrat, pentru că efectul lor e legat. Agricultorii nu pot separa lucrurile așa cum le facem noi pe bucăți, în legislație. Fermierii lucrează cu natura, dar și pentru cei care vor hrană. Ei nu pot separa aceste două lucruri pentru că așa vrea abordarea birocratică și politică.

Claude Gruffat (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, nous faisons face à la sixième extinction de masse. Mais visiblement, mes collègues du PPE, qui ont demandé ce débat, ont décidé de nier les constats scientifiques sur ce sujet. Le déclin des pollinisateurs, la stérilisation des sols, la chute de la biodiversité sont les menaces majeures. Et même la Commission le dit dans son document de travail de janvier dernier.

Vouloir rejeter la loi sur la restauration de la nature et le règlement sur l'usage durable des pesticides poussent les agriculteurs, non pas au bord du précipice, mais dans le précipice. Ces deux lois permettent de poser les fondations d'un nouveau modèle agricole qui déboucherait enfin sur une agriculture plus résiliente, pourvoyeuse d'emplois et de valeur ajoutée. Se faire les chantres du statu quo, les apôtres de l'agro-industrie et du libre-échange, et l'avocat d'une PAC qui accorde 80 % des fonds à 20 % des plus grandes exploitations est irresponsable, surtout quand on sait que les pertes agricoles liées au changement climatique ont déjà triplé ces dernières années en Europe. Plus on attend pour agir, plus les coûts pour la société seront importants. Les faits scientifiques sont là. Arrêtez de les ignorer, arrêtez de les snober, et agissez.

Robert Roos (ECR). – Voorzitter, boeren horen bij Europa, boeren horen bij Nederland. Al eeuwenlang zijn het de boeren die ons voedsel produceren. Bedrijven gaan vaak van vader op zoon, van moeder op dochter. Het is niet zomaar een beroep: het is een traditie, een manier van leven.

Maar als het aan de EU en de VN ligt, is dit binnenkort voorgoed verleden tijd. Door handelsakkoorden wordt onze markt overspoeld met producten uit de halve wereld, maar tegelijkertijd draaien we met wetgeving over klimaat en over stikstof onze eigen boeren de nek om. Deze *Great Food Reset* leidt in Nederland tot schrijnende taferelen. Per jaar plegen 20 tot 30 boeren zelfmoord, en zonder boeren ligt honger op de loer. Kijk naar Sri Lanka, waar een perfecte implementatie van de *environmental social governance* pardoos tot hongersnood en chaos leidde.

Stop met dat onmenselijke beleid. Stop met de natuurherstelwet. Stop met die Agenda 2030 waarbij boeren worden kapotgemaakt voor het ideaal van een CO₂-loze heilstaat. Laten we onze boeren weer beschermen en koesteren, want: *no farmers, no food, no future*.

President. – I would remind all our colleagues that the Bureau has decided that nobody should wear any signs or symbols so please respect this.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Mr President, we have seen several times some messages and signs from t-shirts from the left wing, and you can't really ban t-shirts.

President. – All the colleagues who are vice-presidents treat everybody equally in this House. The rules are for all of us.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Yes they are, but rules have to be sensible so that you can really follow them. If you can't follow the rules, if you can't control the rules, they are not sensible rules. That's the difference.

President. – Please come to the subject.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Yes, the subject. I think I just have one minute to 90 seconds here. Just two very short things.

First of all, I know that the Green Deal is like a religion for all the European Commission and the European Parliament and all the EU citizens, and everybody is just eating and sleeping every day just for the Green Deal, but just a small question for the Commissioner, who is a very lovely lady, about the facts.

In the last 30 years, the EU has now three times less CO₂ emissions. So it's a very good thing to have any scientific proofs that there is some kind of effect for climate change – that from 1990 we have changed for three times more greener, so we have three times less CO₂ emissions. So do we have any proofs that this is the positive outcome, that this is why we have less some kind of climate storms, some kind of weird things? Do you have any proof of that?

The second thing, you mentioned that you are surprised and you are also very sad – I am also very sad – that we don't really have young farmers in Europe anymore. I just checked about the statistic: the four biggest food producers in the world are China, India, US and Brazil. So the whole EU together is producing less food than Brazil. What do you think? What are the real reasons why it is much harder to produce food here in Europe than in Brazil? Is it maybe too much bureaucracy? Is it maybe too much religion for the Green Deal? So just a small question for you.

Marcel de Graaff (NI). – Voorzitter, Ursula von der Leyen heeft in haar *mission letter* aan de schandalig afwezige commissaris voor Landbouw verklaard dat hij de VN-duurzaamheidsdoelen moet realiseren. Hiermee wordt duidelijk dat de EU slechts een vazal is van de superrijken in de Verenigde Staten, die de VN-agenda bepalen – zoals Bill Gates, die de grootste grondbezitter van de Verenigde Staten is.

De lokale boeren moeten van hun land gejaagd worden en moeten onteigend worden. De elite wil de grond in handen krijgen en hun *mega food hubs* inrichten. Wie de grond bezit, bezit de voedselproductie, en hierdoor komt de macht over het volk in handen van een elite.

Dit EU-beleid is antidemocratisch, en daarom moet de EU stoppen met het terroriseren en onteigenen van lokale boeren, stoppen met stikstofregels, stoppen met die hele Green Deal, omdat de macht bij het volk moet liggen. Dat is de basis van democratie.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Cara Comissária, Cara Ministra, Caras e Caros Colegas, na União Europeia, os agricultores produzem alimentos de enorme qualidade, a preços acessíveis e no respeito de elevados padrões de normas de segurança alimentar e também de bem-estar animal e no respeito de normas exigentíssimas em termos ambientais.

Os agricultores são essenciais, como a pandemia o demonstrou. Agricultores que, no entanto, têm dificuldades face aos custos de contexto agravados pela guerra.

E, aqui, peço ao Conselho e à Comissão: é necessário pagar aos agricultores o que lhes devemos. É necessário que os Estados-Membros paguem atempadamente as ajudas do primeiro pilar. No meu país, em Portugal, há 180 000 agricultores em risco de não receberem atempadamente os subsídios a que têm direito no âmbito do primeiro pilar.

Abram também as candidaturas para o desenvolvimento rural e não sobrecarreguem os agricultores com mais burocracia. Não os sobrecarreguem também, num momento como o atual, com mais exigências.

Não é possível, não é justo, nem aceitável diminuir a área de produção em 10 %. Isso terá uma consequência: custos dos alimentos mais caros, mais importações, produtos que não respeitam os mesmos padrões em termos de exigências ambientais.

Defendemos o gradualismo. Os agricultores são essenciais e têm demonstrado grande responsabilidade e são os melhores amigos do ambiente. Valorizem os agricultores e o mundo rural.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria McGuinness, onorevoli colleghi, le piogge della scorsa settimana hanno sommerso migliaia di ettari di frutteti e campi coltivati in Emilia Romagna.

È solo l'ultima delle sempre più frequenti catastrofi climatiche che affliggono le nostre aree rurali e tutti i nostri cittadini. Per affrontare la sfida dell'adattamento e della mitigazione dei cambiamenti climatici serve quindi una partecipazione convinta e coordinata dei nostri agricoltori.

Ma le nostre proposte negli ultimi mesi, le proposte della Commissione, sembrano a volte ignorare questa necessità, limitandosi a imporre maggiori obblighi e limitazioni produttive senza offrire alternative, a partire dalle biotecnologie sostenibili o da supporti adeguati.

Al contrario gli Stati Uniti, con l'*Inflation Reduction Act*, hanno destinato 20 miliardi di dollari al settore agricolo proprio per sostenere la transizione ecologica dei loro agricoltori.

Ebbene di fronte a tali cifre e alla totale assenza di contromisure da parte dell'Unione, come possiamo continuare a chiedere maggiori impegni ai nostri agricoltori con il rischio di perdite di competitività e di produttività che evidentemente impatterebbero anche sui consumatori?

Jan Huitema (Renew). – Voorzitter, geachte commissaris, boer zijn is niet alleen een manier om brood op de plank te brengen. Het is een passie, een identiteit. En misschien wel het belangrijkste voor boeren en boerinnen is de continuïteit van hun boerenbedrijf. Sicco Mansholt zei het vroeger al: als je een boer van zijn boerderij af haalt, dan komen er oerkrachten los.

Boeren en boerinnen worden elke dag geconfronteerd met de uitdagingen op het gebied van milieu, natuur en klimaat. Ze zijn naarstig op zoek naar een groen verdienmodel voor de continuïteit van hun bedrijf. De afgelopen jaren zie je al grote verbetering als het bijvoorbeeld gaat om het gebruik van gewasbeschermingsmiddelen, antibioticagebruik, dierenwelzijn, maar ook het investeren in agrarisch natuurbeheer. Maar boeren en boerinnen moeten mee in een ratrace van steeds weer veranderende wet- en regelgeving. Elke keer wordt er een kaart uit het kaartenhuis gehaald, en er wordt geen kaart teruggeplaatst. Dit is niet houdbaar. Als je offers vraagt van boeren en boerinnen, geef ze dan ook iets terug.

Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, the truth is sometimes really simple and evident: no nature, no food; no nature, no farmers.

With our common project to bring back nature in our life in the European Union, with the nature restoration law on which we have to work, with the reduction of use of pesticides, we want to work together with our farmers and foresters. They know, of course, that without nature, without bees and pollinators, without water in the soil, there will be no yield.

So it's our common project to help those who work with soil and with life to produce our daily food. That's an evidence. It's our common project to sustain the needed transformation of practices and not to block. Instead of spreading stories of fear and food insecurity, as our colleagues from the conservatives are doing now on a daily basis.

Because the truth is sometimes really simple and evident. No nature, no food; no nature, no farmers.

Geert Bourgeois (ECR). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, de boer is graag de hoeder van de natuur, maar hij moet de middelen hebben om de enorme kosten van de groene transitie te betalen. Welnu, die middelen heeft hij niet. Het EU-beleid van inkomenssteun faalt. Veel boeren leven in armoede.

De boer moet geld krijgen voor zijn waar. Het gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid wil de boer een redelijke levensstandaard verzekeren, maar het mededingingsbeleid heeft daar geen oog voor. De Commissie moet hier verandering in brengen.

Ten tweede moet de boer rechtszekerheid krijgen. Vlaanderen wil geen natuurherstelwet die investeringen en de toekomst van de landbouwer totaal onzeker maken. Ook hier moet de Commissie veel proportioneler te werk gaan, gelet op de grote verschillen inzake ruimtelijke ordening en bevolkingsdichtheid van de lid- en deelstaten.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Mr President, Commissioner, I would subscribe to your words, but please accompany me to a reality check.

Elnök Úr! A zöld átmenethez a gazdák istenadta szövetségesek, hiszen természeti kincseink megőrzése az ő meg- és túlélésük záloga. A jogszabályok azonban, amelyeket csak úgy ont magából a Bizottság, a megváltozott körülmények ellenére túlzott bürokratikus és pénzügyi terhet ró rájuk anélkül, hogy az intézkedések pozitív hatását bármilyen hatásvizsgálat alátámasztaná.

A szőlőtermelők és borászok a legelkötelezettebbek a fenntartható fejlődés mellett. Ahogy viszont a Bizottság ténylegesen eljár a címkézési szabályok, a növényvédő szerek betiltása és a körforgásos gazdálkodás terén, az egyenértékű a családi birtokok és borászatok tönkretételével.

27 tagállami szabályozás, 27 körforgásos címkézési, visszaváltási, újrahasznosítási kötelezettséggel a legkisebbeknek is. Egy termelőnek a saját országában történő regisztrációja már nem jelent automatikus belépést egy másik tagállamba. Egyes nemzeti egészségvédelmi szabályok, mint az ír, jelölési előírásokkal gátolják a közös európai borspiac fejlődését.

Miért veri szét a Bizottság az egységes piacot? A gazdák komoly emberek, ez így hiteltelen politika. Egy ideológia nevében ne tegyék tönkre saját termelési hagyományainkat, sokszínűségünket és versenyképességünket. Nagyon kérem, ehhez ez a Parlament ne asszisztáljon!

Marlene Mortler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Und wenn ich wieder auf die Welt komme, dann werde ich wieder Bauer, es gibt keinen schöneren Beruf. Diesen Satz hat mein Mann so oft gesagt. Dabei ist der Wandel, die Transformation auf unserem Hof bis heute Normalität und Realität. Schon vor über 20 Jahren haben wir den Grünen Oskar, einen Bayerischen Umweltpreis für innovative Ideen erhalten. Ich weiß, dass diesen Preis Millionen von Betrieben in Europa auch verdient haben, denn sie geben jeden Tag ihr Bestes für unsere Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher. Danke und Respekt!

Ob Fischwirt, ob Forstwirt, ob Tierwirt, Winzer oder Hauswirtschaft – die 14 klassischen grünen Berufe zeigen die Vielfalt in unserer Branche. Mein Mann hat den Landwirt als Seiteneinsteiger mit viel Liebe erlernt. Und, lieber Siggie, du schaust uns nun schon lange von oben zu. Du warst mein größter Kritiker, mein bester Ratgeber. Ich weiß, was du denkst: Marlene, das darfst du nicht zulassen in Europa. Ihr fahrt unsere Landwirtschaft mit eurer weltfremden Politik an die Wand. Es reicht! Wacht auf! Hört endlich zu!

Denn wir haben die sichersten Lebensmittel mit bester Qualität. Gleichzeitig hauen wir unsere Bauern in die Pfanne, stellen sie unter Generalverdacht und sagen ihnen, dass sie keine Ahnung von ihrem Beruf haben. Das ist dünnes Eis, auf dem sich die EU-Kommission bewegt, es droht einzubrechen mit diesem Bombardement an schlechten Gesetzen.

We should not kill our farmers, we should support them.

Und wir, liebe Grüne, wir sind die Mutmacher. Ihr seid die Angstmacher. Wir arbeiten für *Farmers for Future*.

César Luena (S&D). – Señor presidente, vaya de entrada todo mi apoyo, toda la comprensión. Vengo de donde vengo por los agricultores.

Lo decía mi compañera Clara Aguilera. Yo creo que no es bueno ni utilizarlos, ni mentir, ni manipular. Voy a aprovechar estos escasos segundos para desmontar las falsedades, por ejemplo, sobre la Ley de Restauración. Miren, cuando se dice que está en riesgo la seguridad alimentaria, sencillamente se miente. Cuando se dice que un 10 % de las tierras agrícolas debe destinarse a paisajes sencillamente se miente. Y, por cierto, no hay ninguna obligación para los agricultores que no esté ya recogida en la PAC.

Por tanto, los agricultores son un actor clave para completar y para desarrollar el Pacto Verde Europeo, y la gran mayoría de ellos quiere asumir ese papel. La obligación de esta Cámara es negociar y hacer compatible lo que es compatible, que son las políticas sostenibles con las políticas agrícolas. No están enfrentadas y quien juega a enfrentarlas perderá y tendrá que responder ante la sociedad y ante la historia.

Asger Christensen (Renew). – Hr. formand! Fru kommissær!

Har vi en landbrugskommissær, kan jeg spørge? Udvikling, ikke afvikling! Det er fremtidens landbrug, og det er landmændenes DNA. Der skal nye værktøjer i værktøjskassen: nye genomteknikker, hurtige godkendelser af bio-pesticider, præcisionslandbrug. Det er nødvendigt for at komme i mål med den grønne omstilling. Det er vigtigt, at man har en høj og effektiv landbrugsproduktion for at efterkomme den stigende efterspørgsel, der er på fødevarer på verdensplan. Fødevarerforsyningsikkerhed er helt, helt afgørende. Derfor skal der udvikles ikke afvikles. Mange landmænd er allerede godt i gang med nye innovative tiltag mod madspild. Kun sådan skåner vi klimaet og miljøet. Derfor giver det ingen mening at piske landmændene med afgifter og bureaukratiske regler. Vi skal bruge guleroden frem for pisen i den grønne omstilling.

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, maybe let's establish some facts first. Over the last 15 years, more than 5.3 million farms were lost. Food crisis during the COVID-19 pandemic, the profit for supermarkets raised with more than 100 %. And CAP money? Still, 80 % of all the CAP money is going to the 20 % biggest farmers.

Then look at what's happening in our climate system. Droughts are hitting Europe. Look at Spain at this moment. Even the EU is now giving money to Spain to compensate for the droughts. Our nature is in a bad state and without nature, no food.

So something needs to change. We can't afford a status quo. This has happened under the watch of the EPP for 15 years. Something needs to change.

For example, the Commission is doing some very careful proposals to reduce dependency on pesticides, which are also affecting the health of our farmers. We want to restore our nature, to increase resilience of our agriculture ecosystem. Saying 'no' to these changes is just sticking your head in the sand that's getting drier every year.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señor presidente, llevan décadas maltratando al sector agrícola y ahora les piden que sean facilitadores de la transición verde. Cuando estaban en sus casas atemorizados por el virus de Wuhan, había miles de agricultores españoles que trabajaban para que ustedes pudieran comer fruta, hortalizas o verduras. No tenemos derecho a pedirles ni un solo sacrificio más. Inmólese ustedes en el altar del fanatismo climático. Ustedes decidieron hace tiempo que se abandone a los agricultores y que la seguridad alimentaria de Europa quede en manos de países como Marruecos o Turquía.

Nosotros rechazamos cualquier iniciativa que suponga más obligaciones verdes, reducción de la productividad, subida de costes, aumento de importaciones o pérdida de empleo.

Marruecos ha aumentado exponencialmente sus exportaciones a la Unión, hundiendo los precios en España y cerrando explotaciones. Y ustedes se lo pagan financiando su plan de regadíos mientras criminalizan a nuestros agricultores en Murcia o en Huelva, haciéndoles responsables de la degradación de ecosistemas como el Mar Menor o Doñana, cuando ustedes saben que la culpa es de su fanatismo, que derriba presas y que impide la inversión en infraestructuras hidráulicas para llevar agua al campo español.

¿Quieren resiliencia del sector? Suspendan todas las obligaciones verdes. Impongan un arancel verde a las importaciones para compensar los sacrificios de nuestros productores como consecuencia del cumplimiento de las obligaciones comunitarias.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, enfin, ce matin, le rôle de premier plan que jouent les agriculteurs a fait l'objet d'un débat prioritaire. Et pourtant, chers collègues, depuis le début de notre mandat, et ce malgré des crises inédites auxquelles nous avons dû faire face, de très nombreuses propositions ont été mises sur la table, entraînant avec elles un nombre important de nouvelles contraintes, de nouvelles obligations sans aucune contrepartie pour le monde agricole, et surtout sans se préoccuper ni de la sécurité alimentaire, ni de la sécurité énergétique.

Règlements sur les pesticides, sur la restauration de la nature, inclusion des bovins dans la directive sur les émissions industrielles: autant de textes qui font la part belle à l'*agri-bashing*, et qui sont synonymes de punitions et de contraintes supplémentaires pour les filières agricoles. Comment donner envie à des jeunes de s'installer dans ces conditions?

Tous ces textes prônent la décroissance et essaient de nous faire croire que pour sauver la planète, il suffit d'arrêter de produire. Moi, je crois au contraire avec les élus de mon groupe politique, le PPE, que nous devons miser sur le «produire mieux». Nous devons miser sur des solutions qui valorisent le travail des agriculteurs pour la planète. Voilà pourquoi nous attendons des propositions concrètes et positives sur les NBT, dans le domaine du plan des protéines, sur la certification carbone. Il est temps d'aller dans un sens positif et d'arrêter ces initiatives totalement hors-sol.

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Domnule președinte, în 2019, Președinta Comisiei anunța noua revoluție a Europei (*Green Deal*). Scopul strategiei: nobil, obiectivele: asumate, inclusiv de fermieri. Patru ani mai târziu însă, vedem un sector agricol european vlăguit. Sub impactul cumulativ al condițiilor și al evenimentelor, fermierii constată că trebuie să suporte mare parte din povara transformării și că, deși slăbiți și în permanentă căutare de soluții, au ajuns și suspexții de serviciu când trebuie blamat cineva angro pentru toate problemele de mediu.

În plus, vocea lor e rareori ascultată și uneori devin fără voce și armă în războaie politice sterile. Poate că ar trebui să conștientizăm totuși că lumea din 2019 nu mai există; că ambițiile noastre, deși valide, ar trebui recalibrate rațional pe alocuri; că încă există în Europa dublul standard în privința subvențiilor pentru est-europeni și a importurilor din țări terțe care inundă piața, deși nu respectă principiile *Green Deal*; că sectorul trebuie ascultat și că, în loc să facem o armă din fermier, mai bine i-am da fermierului arme să își poată îndeplini misiunea în *Green Deal*.

Jérémy Decerle (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, effectivement, on aurait préféré avoir Monsieur le Commissaire à l'agriculture à vos côtés pour nous écouter, mais ce n'est pas le cas.

Je suis à peine surpris par bon nombre d'interventions entendues ce matin. Une certaine droite conservatrice, qui avait pourtant en partie voté le *Green Deal* il y a trois ans, nous fait croire aujourd'hui qu'on peut refuser le changement. Et puis une certaine gauche, les Verts en tête, qui joue la carte du catastrophisme, condamne sans raison, et est donc inaudible des agriculteurs. La responsabilité politique n'est pas tant de nous demander si on doit changer, mais de nous demander comment.

Et les agriculteurs ne nous ont pas attendu pour faire évoluer leurs pratiques. Ils n'ont pas attendu non plus, bien sûr, la guerre en Ukraine. Oui, évidemment, ils contribueront au *Green Deal*, mais si on leur en donne les moyens. Et les moyens de limiter notamment nos dépendances sans remettre en cause la productivité globale. Soyons ambitieux, mais ne sous-estimons surtout pas l'investissement que cela représente financièrement et humainement, et préférons, vous l'avez dit, toujours l'incitation forte, motivante, responsabilisante à la sanction décourageante et très rarement efficace.

Benoît Biteau (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, il y a urgence maintenant pour les paysans, pour les générations futures, de prendre conscience que, sans nature, je dis bien sans nature, mes chers collègues, il n'y a pas d'agriculture, il n'y a pas de nourriture. L'agriculture est un secteur stratégique pour atteindre la souveraineté alimentaire, mais également pour être au rendez-vous de l'histoire. Face aux dérèglements climatiques, à l'effondrement de la biodiversité, à la préservation de la santé – et c'est précisément en intégrant cette approche globale que nous pouvons allumer le cercle vertueux qui sort l'agriculture de la mauvaise ornière dans laquelle elle est enlisée, afin de pouvoir enfin proposer des revenus dignes aux paysans.

Plutôt que de continuer d'opposer écologie et économie, nous devons revenir aux fondamentaux, comme je l'ai fait moi-même en tant que paysan, basés sur l'efficacité de l'agronomie, du bon sens paysan, comme par exemple nourrir des herbivores avec de l'herbe plutôt qu'avec du maïs et du soja, comme restaurer la fertilité des sols, alternative efficace et redoutable à cette dépendance mortifère aux pesticides, aux engrais de synthèse, aux semences certifiées, et à l'irrigation. C'est d'ailleurs ce que réclament les citoyens quand la question agricole, alimentaire, écologique et climatique s'installe dans un véritable débat de société.

Simone Schmiedtbauer (PPE). – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kommissarin! Ich bin während jeder freien Minute, wo ich nicht hier in Straßburg oder Brüssel bin, in den Gemeinden, in den Regionen meines Heimatlandes Österreich unterwegs. Ich besuche Betriebe, ich tausche mich mit den Bäuerinnen und Bauern aus und rede mit ihnen, natürlich auch über ihre Sicht auf die Ideen der Kommission. Ich muss Ihnen ganz ehrlich sagen, die Antworten machen mich als glühende, überzeugte Europäerin zutiefst betroffen. Als praktizierende Land- und Forstwirtin kann ich sie aber leider voll und ganz nachvollziehen.

Unsere Bäuerinnen und Bauern können nicht mehr. Mit jedem neuen Vorschlag, der auf sie zukommt, kommt eine Lawine an Auflagen, Kontrollen und Verboten auf sie zu. Sie kommen ganz einfach nicht mehr mit. Sie fragen sich: Kann ich den Beruf, den ich erlernt habe, noch ausüben, den Betrieb, der seit zig Generationen weitergegeben wird, überhaupt noch bewirtschaften, so, wie ich es gelernt habe und wie ich es seit Jahren erfolgreich und nachhaltig mache? Oder bin ich nur noch zum Verwalter von einem Stück Land geworden, auf dem ich EU-Gesetze umsetzen darf?

Wenn eine Berufsgruppe so derart in die Pflicht genommen wird, wenn nur noch über Bewirtschaftungseinschränkungen oder gar Flächenstilllegungen diskutiert wird, was glauben Sie dann, wie sich diese Menschen fühlen? Es geht um Menschen, die genau mit diesen Flächen und genau dieser Bewirtschaftung seit Generationen ihr Geld verdienen und nicht nur ihre Familien ernähren, sondern uns alle miteinander.

Wir bekennen uns zum EU-Green Deal, denn für uns Bodenbewirtschaftenden und -bewirtschafteter ist ein umfassender Klima- und Umweltschutz alternativlos. Aber das Rezept für eine umwelt- und klimafreundliche Ernährungsweise kann nicht sein, dass wir die Produktion aus Europa vertreiben und anschließend unser Essen aus Übersee in Containern nach Europa schiffen. Das Rezept für eine umwelt- und klimafreundliche Ernährungsweise sind Regionalität, Saisonalität und starke, resiliente Familienbetriebe.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, certains membres de cette assemblée semblent remettre en question les engagements que ce Parlement a pris dans le cadre du Green Deal et voudraient rejeter des textes essentiels à la mise en œuvre de cette stratégie, comme la restauration de la nature et la réduction de l'usage des pesticides.

Pourtant, vous le savez, il n'y aura pas d'agriculture, pas de pollinisation, pas de revenus pour nos agriculteurs sans des sols en bonne santé, sans lutte contre l'extinction des espèces, sans une gestion raisonnée des ressources en eau. Ce n'est pas une position idéologique de droite ou de gauche, c'est simplement ce que les scientifiques nous disent. Mais vous, les conservateurs, vous avez décidé de tourner le dos à la science et d'utiliser des arguments populistes pour faire peur à la population, laissant planer le spectre d'une famine en Europe due à cette stratégie. Et c'est une erreur.

Dans une Europe où il fait plus de 40 degrés en Espagne en avril, où des restrictions d'eau sont appliquées même pendant les mois d'hiver dans certains États membres, il y a urgence à changer notre modèle agricole. Il est indispensable de mettre en place dès maintenant des méthodes d'adaptation planifiées de notre agriculture qui doivent être pensées sur le long terme pour lutter contre les effets du changement climatique de façon pérenne. Donc chers collègues, ne faisons pas l'autruche et mettons-nous autour de la table pour discuter de ces textes essentiels qui nous ont été proposés par la Commission.

Атидже Алиева-Вели (Renew). – Г-н Председател, земеделците изразиха готовност да бъдат част от зеления преход, но последните законодателни предложения на Комисията, ограниченото финансиране, високата инфлация, наслагващите се кризи настройват все по-песимистично земеделците. Нараства опасният тренд на антиевропейски настроения сред земеделската общност. Въпросът е екзистенциален: „Да бъде или да не бъде“?

Ще имаме ли успешен зелен преход с европейско земеделие, производство на храни, достойни доходи за земеделците и продоволствена сигурност на Европа? Или зелените амбиции ще изоставят европейското земеделие и ще създадем нови зависимости? За чиста храна, чист въздух, чиста вода са нужни реалистични и изпълними цели и адекватно финансиране.

Колеги, да работим разумно и отговорно. Нека направим така, че земеделците да останат на страната на Европа и зеления преход. Земеделието е призвание, земеделието е начин на живот, професия на надеждата. Нека не погубваме надеждите на нашите земеделци.

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! 5,3 Millionen Bauernhöfe haben seit 2007 in der EU ihre Hoftore für immer zugesperrt. 15 Jahre Europäische-Volkspartei-Dominanz im Agrarausschuss, 15 Jahre fast ausschließlich konservative Agrarminister in der EU, 15 Jahre Lobbying für billige Einkaufspreise für die Lebensmittelindustrie, Lobbyieren, um die Landwirte in der Abhängigkeit von Pestiziden und Kunstdünger zu halten, Lobbyieren für die Milliarden Gewinne der Gentechnik-, Saatgut- und Chemieindustrie. Ja, unter Vortäuschung, die Bäuerinnen und Bauern hier zu vertreten, verhindern Sie klima- und umweltfreundliche Landwirtschaft, wo Sie können.

Dabei sind viele innovative Betriebe schon viel weiter: pflugloser Anbau mit Gründünger und Schlitzsaat, Ersatz von Importsoja durch Leguminosesilage, z. B. Agri-Photovoltaik statt Hagelnetze und Fungizide im Apfelanbau. Die Liste lässt sich beliebig verlängern.

Hören Sie auf, hier die Interessen der Agrarindustrie zu vertreten! Gehen Sie aus dem Weg und lassen Sie uns das Potenzial einer klima- und umweltfreundlichen Landwirtschaft hier heben – zum Wohle der Natur, zum Wohle der Menschen und zum Wohle einer vielfältigen, kleinstrukturierten Landwirtschaft in einem vitalen ländlichen Raum!

Esther de Lange (PPE). – Voorzitter, “De boer wil echt wel veranderen.” Dat zijn niet mijn woorden, maar die van Roy Meijer. De Nederlanders kennen hem misschien. Voor degenen die niet uit Nederland komen: een jonge melkveehouder uit Drenthe. Deze boer is helemaal niet tegen duurzaamheid of biodiversiteit, net zoals de EVP dat niet is. Want laten we wel wezen, en dat zeg ik vooral tegen de collega’s van de groenen, de socialisten, de liberalen, die nu net doen alsof de EVP zich massief tegen de Green Deal keert: zonder ons was die Green Deal er niet geweest en dat weten jullie heel erg goed. En ik ben trots op het resultaat dat we vorig jaar op dat gebied hebben bereikt.

Maar – laat me dan ook duidelijk zijn – de Europese Volkspartij en het CDA eisen wel dat die Green Deal niet alleen groen is, maar ook een deal. Dat ze banen oplevert in Europa. Dat ze hand in hand moet gaan met de productie van voedsel, van hernieuwbare energie en met het winnen van grondstoffen. En dat is waar de natuurherstelwet de plank mislaat. Dit is waarom de Commissie deze moet terugnemen naar de tekentafel.

Because we refuse to starve Europe of food, of energy, of resources to save nature. There must be a smarter way.

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Colegas, alguns grupos políticos à direita procuram fazer uma equivalência entre rejeitar propostas legislativas em curso e uma suposta defesa dos agricultores. Que, para defender os agricultores, nada pode mudar ou que este não é o tempo da mudança. Uma retórica falaciosa que, supostamente, pretende estar ao lado dos agricultores, mas não está. Não está, porque a larga maioria dos agricultores quer avançar, quer contribuir para o restauro da natureza, quer proteger a biodiversidade, quer combater as alterações climáticas, que resultam em secas extremas, como aquela que os agricultores, no meu país, em Portugal, já estão de novo a enfrentar.

O que pedem é que lhes sejam disponibilizados os meios, os recursos para continuarem a ser guardiães da natureza. O que os agricultores pedem não é que se pare, mas que nós, políticos, aqui, compreendamos que as características sociais e económicas das nossas comunidades agrícolas não lhes permitem fazer todos os esforços de um dia para o outro.

Mas é por isso que nós estamos aqui. É essa a nossa responsabilidade: encontrar soluções que permitam gerar benefícios sociais, económicos e ambientais claros para todos os agricultores de hoje e de amanhã.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, *wake up!* Mag ik jullie dat zeggen? *Wake up.* Kijk naar de cijfers: 5,1 miljoen boeren zijn we verloren de afgelopen vijftien jaar. Eén derde van onze Europese landbouwbedrijven. Dat zijn er duizend per dag. Duizend boeren per dag die verdwijnen in ons Europa. En voor de boeren die nog willen boeren, wordt het haast onmogelijk gemaakt. De ene verplichting volgt de andere op.

Ook wij, mevrouw de Lange, zijn niet tegen de Green Deal, maar het is de cumul van de maatregelen die maakt dat de boerenstiel niet kan overleven, terwijl landbouw de stichtende factor was bij Europa. En vandaar, mevrouw de Lange, sluit ik mij heel graag bij uw pleidooi aan. Laten we dit maar eens zeggen, want dit debat gaat over één ding: wat met de natuurherstelwet? Wel, die moet terug naar de tekentafel, die moet terug naar de Commissie. De impact op de landbouw is te groot. En ook al die andere wetten – de natuurherstelwet, de pesticidenwet, de industriële emissies – daarvan, mevrouw de commissaris, moet er een impactanalyse komen.

Laat de boerenstiel in Europa overleven. Zorg dat we niet van andere landen afhankelijk zijn voor ons voedsel.

Colm Markey (PPE). – Mr President, and in particular Commissioner McGuinness, you've always had a great understanding of the issues in agriculture and it's great to have you here today. However, one has to ask the question: where is the agricultural Commissioner? And where is the practical input that is sorely missing from this debate?

Farmers fully accept that there is a biodiversity and indeed an environmental crisis, but they want to and can be part of the solution. They understand biodiversity and they understand the environment better than anybody. They work in it every day. But the proposed legislation, nature restoration in particular, does little to enhance biodiversity. Drawing lines in the map does little to enhance biodiversity.

There is a fundamental problem. The current legislation pits food production against the environment, puts them on the opposite ends of the same spectrum. We need to enable biodiversity to flourish in an active, productive model. If we don't do this, it quite simply won't work.

The Commissioner talked about carbon farming. Well, legislation leaves no room for the additionality that's required in carbon farming. We need to stop legislating, stop lecturing and stop pontificating. We need to empower, enable and work with – that's how we'll get real change in agriculture.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Diese konservative Erzählung, dass es die Landwirtschaft und den *Green Deal* auf unterschiedlichen Seiten gibt, finde ich vor allen Dingen eines – pseudosolidarisch. Schon jetzt bedrohen Dürre und Wassermangel nicht nur die Lebensgrundlage unserer Landwirte, sondern auch die Versorgung mit nachhaltigen Lebensmitteln. Die politische Antwort darauf darf aber nicht sein: Alles bleibt so, wie es war, wir bevorteilen Agrarindustrie und lassen kleine und mittlere Höfe sterben.

Echte Solidarität zeigen wir, indem wir unsere heimische Landwirtschaft mit dem immer krasserem Druck auf dem Weltmarkt nicht alleine lassen. Echte Solidarität in unserer Landwirtschaft zeigen wir, indem wir die Rahmenbedingungen dafür schaffen, damit die gerechte Transformation hin zu einer nachhaltigen und resilienten Landwirtschaft gerade auch für kleine Betriebe gelingt.

Wenn es also der EVP wirklich um die Landwirte ginge und nicht nur darum, deren legitime Zukunftsängste für ihren eigenen Feldzug gegen den *Green Deal* zu missbrauchen, dann würde ich Ihnen raten, mal ein Drittel des EU-Haushaltes in den Blick zu nehmen – die gemeinsame Agrarpolitik. Hier werden Großgrundbesitzer mit Milliarden gepampert, während diese für die Investition in eine zukunftsfähige Landwirtschaft fehlen.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, laat mij spreken over de natuurherstelwet. Artikel 14 van dat voorstel vraagt boeren om 10 % van hun landbouwgrond uit productie te halen. Voor Vlaanderen loopt dit op tot bijna 15 %. Dat zijn 172 000 hectare vruchtbare grond aan 100 000 EUR per hectare in mijn streek. Rekent u dat zelf uit.

Deze wet houdt geen rekening met de dichtbevolkte context van Vlaanderen en daarom steunen we met CD&V geen beleid dat voedselproductie doet afnemen, dat een stikstofcrisis XXL veroorzaakt bij ons, en dat de boerenstiel in Vlaanderen uiteindelijk op de helling zet.

De Europese Commissie heeft geen enkele moeite gedaan om de gevolgen van die wetgeving in kaart te brengen. Minder rendabiliteit, meer onzekerheid voor de boer, en op het einde van de rit nog minder boeren die eraan willen beginnen. Het huiswerk moet u opnieuw doen, beste Europese Commissie, zodat u tot dezelfde conclusie kan komen die wij al lang vaststellen op het terrein. Boeren willen echt wel de groene transitie maken, maar enkel op voorwaarde dat er voorspelbare, stimulerende en haalbare wetgeving komt.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Komisare, mieli kolegos, nėra abejonių, kad klimato kaitos stabdymas yra būtinas mūsų visų prioritetas. Ūkininkai tą taip pat žino. Kaip Jūs, gerb. Komisare, teisingai pastebėjote, jie pirmieji pajunta klimato kaitos poveikį – sausros ir liūtys pirmiausia paliečia jų laukus. Tačiau rengdami planus žaliajai pertvarkai, turime kartu užtikrinti pakankamą paramą pokyčiams skatinti. Ūkinė veikla yra ir turi išlikti neatsiejama mūsų aplinkos dalis. Gerb. Komisare, Jūs minėjote, kad naujosios genominės augalų veisimo technologijos gali suteikti daug galimybių ir prisidėti prie atsparesnės ir tvaresnės žemės ūkio maisto produktų sistemos ir žaliojo kurso tikslų įgyvendinimo. Deja, iki šiol nei mūsų mokslininkai, nei ūkininkai, negali pilnai išnaudoti šio potencialo. Todėl turime kuo greičiau patobulinti reglamentavimą ir atverti galimybes naudotis mokslo pasiekimais.

Ir pabaigai. Nepaisant Europos Sąjungos įsipareigojimų, tiesioginių išmokų nelygybė toliau tęsiasi. Lietuvoje ir kitose Baltijos šalyse ūkininkai gauna tiesiogines išmokas, gerokai mažesnes nei Europos Sąjungos vidurkis. Jei siekiame tikrai teisingo perėjimo prie žalesnės ir atsparesnės ekonomikos, turime įvykdyti senus pažadus ir užtikrinti tiesioginių išmokų vidurkį šalyse, kur jos mažesnės.

Adam Jarubas (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Doceniam Pani udział w dzisiejszej debacie. Jeszcze niedawno zasiadaliśmy wspólnie w tych ławach. Zawsze dobrze rozumiała Pani interesy rolników. Ale chcę dzisiaj zadać pytanie: gdzie jest komisarz ds. rolnictwa Janusz Wojciechowski? Dlaczego nie ma odwagi bronić strategii „Od pola do stołu”, przy okazji wytłumaczyć się z nieudolności w przygotowaniu europejskiego rolnictwa na kryzys wojenny – napływ, zalew zboża i innych produktów, które miały trafić do państw potrzebujących?

Jeszcze przed kryzysem rolnym do stanowiska Parlamentu w sprawie tej strategii EPL wprowadziła jasny zapis: nasze poparcie zależy od tego, że wykazemy, że przyjęte przepisy nie zaszkodzą rolnikom, nie narażą bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego Europy. Czy mamy tę pewność? Nie mamy, skoro w grudniu ubiegłego roku Rada musiała żądać od komisarza, wezwać do uzupełnienia oceny skutków rozporządzenia pestycydowego, wymieniając długi katalog brakujących informacji.

W Parlamencie, mimo naszych wezwań, nie poczekano nawet z terminem poprawek na uzupełnienie tych informacji. Dlatego złożyliśmy poprawki o odrzuceniu tego rozporządzenia, skoro nie wiemy, jakie ono przyniesie skutki.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Ministre, Madame la Commissaire, merci pour vos propos qui sont bien loin des déclarations de ces derniers jours de Monsieur Weber, chef de file du PPE, qui sont du pur populisme à un an des élections européennes. Ce ne sont pas les agriculteurs qu'il écoute, ce sont les représentants des multinationales de l'agrochimie et de l'agro-industrie qui, eux, font d'énormes bénéfices dans cette crise au détriment des agriculteurs et des consommateurs. Son camp n'est pas celui des agriculteurs, il est celui de la finance et des dividendes.

Vous le savez comme moi, l'enjeu n'est pas de produire plus. L'enjeu est de permettre l'accès à l'alimentation, et les alternatives existent pour à la fois nourrir les gens, préserver la biodiversité, et garantir un vrai revenu aux agriculteurs. La science européenne l'affirme aujourd'hui et a même modélisé une agriculture sans phytos pour 2050 en retrouvant la voie de l'agronomie et de la régulation des marchés. Mais il est vrai que ces alternatives font faire moins de bénéfices aux multinationales.

Alors que le nombre d'agriculteurs ne cesse de diminuer, et alors que le Green Deal que vous dénoncez nécessite une augmentation du nombre d'agriculteurs pour gagner le défi climatique et de la biodiversité, le PPE s'est transformé en porte-parole du monde de l'argent au détriment de l'avenir de nos enfants, en fossoyeur de l'agriculture européenne. En fait, vous voulez que tout change pour que rien ne change. Voilà votre projet. De grâce, sortez donc de ces postures: l'agriculture, l'alimentation, la santé humaine, et la biodiversité valent bien mieux.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señor presidente, querida comisaria, estoy seguro de que me va a entender mejor que cualquiera de sus colegas. Los agricultores y ganaderos no son los enemigos. Tampoco lo son los pescadores. Entiéndanlo bien y actúen en consecuencia. La Estrategia «De la Granja a la Mesa», la propuesta de reducción del uso de productos fitosanitarios o la Ley de Restauración de la Naturaleza van en contra de los intereses del sector agrario.

Nuestros agricultores se sienten perseguidos, señalados como si fueran los culpables del cambio climático. Los agricultores y ganaderos europeos han hecho un gran esfuerzo para reducir las emisiones de CO₂ y los nitratos, pero la Comisión los ataca sin piedad.

Querida comisaria, exigimos que la Comisión haga propuestas legislativas basadas en datos, en ciencia, sin demagogias, sin equivocaciones, y, sobre todo, que no pongan en peligro la seguridad alimentaria de la Unión. Los agricultores son parte de la solución y quieren seguir viviendo de su trabajo, que no es otro que alimentar a los ciudadanos europeos con productos de calidad.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisară, stimați colegi, faptul că nu avem aici comisarul pentru agricultură nu arată decât dezinteresul față de fermieri, dezinteresul pentru un sector atât de important. Vrem să schimbăm lucrurile. Doamna comisară, ați spus câteva lucruri foarte bune. Unul dintre ele este acela: fermierii au îmbătrânit. Nu mai avem tineri fermieri. I-am scris domnului comisar și i-am propus un centru de excelență pentru tinerii fermieri. În România funcționează. Sunt 300 de tineri care au absolvit acest curs și se întorc în rural să lucreze. De ce nu facem nimic concret ?

Da, punem sarcină ca și cum pe un pod de două tone trecem cu 10 tone și sigur că nu mai pot suporta fermierii. Fermierii au nevoie de claritate, ați spus, în ceea ce facem noi aici, dar ce facem noi aici? Fără a pune ceva în loc, un mecanism de a-i ajuta, PAC-ul este un dezastru. Sunt diferențe între ceea ce dăm, subvenții la fermieri, între țările din Est și țările din Vest. Nu am făcut acest lucru, nu am făcut nimic și, în plus, ce mai facem? Dăm creștere de cantitate, de scădere a pesticidelor, dar iarăși este neuniform în statele membre. Fermierii au nevoie de un mecanism de sprijin. Intră cereale din Ucraina... (*Președintele a întrerupt vorbitoarea*).

Irène Tolleret (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, l'agriculture européenne est l'agriculture la plus durable du monde. Et pourtant, quand j'entends certains parler dans cet hémicycle, je n'ai pas l'impression qu'on parle des mêmes agriculteurs que ceux que je connais. Ceux qui en ce moment même, parce qu'on a voté beaucoup de textes, sont en train de faire bouger leurs pratiques, et qui font face à un système informatique qui ne permet pas de saisir aujourd'hui la nouvelle politique agricole commune. Ceux qui attendent désespérément des actes délégués, parce que selon qu'il y a ou non le mot «ou», on sort d'une impasse industrielle. Ceux qui se demandent pourquoi, au niveau du groupe d'experts de la Commission sur la taxonomie agricole, il n'y a pas un seul représentant de l'agriculture et qui du coup, ont des banques qui leur disent «on ne va pas pouvoir vous suivre sur vos projets d'énergies renouvelables».

Donc oui, bien entendu, les agriculteurs européens s'intéressent à l'environnement, et s'intéressent au changement climatique, sinon nous n'aurions pas l'agriculture la plus durable du monde. Mais de grâce, soyons au rendez-vous, tous unis pour que l'ensemble des textes que nous produisons, on arrive à les appliquer simplement chez nos agriculteurs.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, o papel dos agricultores é produzir alimentos e garantir a segurança e soberania alimentares. E se, de facto, estão aqui preocupados com o ecossistema e com a agricultura, então avancemos com políticas que garantam os meios para apoiar os pequenos agricultores e as práticas agrícolas agroecológicas.

A agricultura familiar e os pequenos e médios agricultores com quem temos contactado, nas jornadas que estamos a fazer em Portugal, enfrentam uma situação económica dramática, com o aumento dos custos de produção, o esmagamento dos preços à produção e a expressiva redução dos rendimentos, a que se junta agora a situação de seca extrema.

Questionam a PAC e o seu modelo de exploração superintensiva e de monocultura, servidor da água que não têm e que é responsável pelo encerramento de 400 000 explorações agrícolas nos últimos 30 anos e pela perda de 700 000 postos de trabalho.

Precisam de outra política que assegure a soberania alimentar, que valorize e apoie a pequena e média produção e que garanta preços justos ao produtor.

Peter Jahr (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Ministerin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Corona-Krise – Ernährungssicherheit war nie gefährdet. Ukrainekrieg – Ernährungssicherheit war nie gefährdet. Mit ein wenig Humor könnte man sagen: Das ist unseren Landwirten gelungen trotz der politischen Eingriffe aus Brüssel. Ich denke, unser Hauptproblem ist, die Landwirte verstehen unsere Politik nicht mehr. Neulich hat mich ein Landwirt gefragt: Wollt ihr uns überhaupt noch? Und ich muss sagen, das hat gegessen. Deshalb meine Forderungen:

Erstens: Reden wir mit den Landwirten! Zweitens: Nutzen wir die innovative Kraft der Landwirte! Drittens: Starten wir endlich mal eine Entbürokratisierungskampagne! Lassen wir die neue Reform erst einmal in Kraft treten und wirken! Und vor allem: keine neuen Gesetze und Vorschriften.

Wir haben einen *New Green Deal*, das ist richtig, aber was wir brauchen, ist auch ein *farmers' deal*. Und deshalb, liebe Kommission: Die Landwirte sind nicht das Problem, sie sind unsere Lösung.

Cristina Maestre Martín De Almagro (S&D). – Señor presidente, una afirmación que es obvia: sin la agricultura no podemos vivir. Necesitamos una agricultura resiliente. Eso es lo que ha dicho la comisaria. ¿Lo es ahora mismo?

Se habla mucho de la seguridad alimentaria, pero ¿realmente la tenemos? ¿Por cuánto tiempo? Las cosechas se están perdiendo por culpa de la sequía y del cambio climático. Por poner un ejemplo: en España, el 50 % del cereal de la cosecha se ha perdido por la sequía.

Y se habla también —se ha hablado mucho aquí— de los agricultores jóvenes. ¿Que atractivo pueden tener los agricultores para dedicarse a la agricultura si están en permanente crisis?

Por lo tanto, se tiene que apoyar a los agricultores y no se pueden ofrecer disyuntivas entre el Pacto Verde y la agricultura. Ambos se pueden conjugar, pero necesitan recursos, necesitan apoyo y no se tiene que criminalizar al agricultor. Pero tampoco se puede utilizar la agricultura como un elemento de confrontación y de demagogia y, ante todo, de antieuropeísmo.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, the Nature Restoration Law is a one-size-fits-all for the entire European continent, where there's huge differences in diversity, agricultural practices, soil types and topography and cultures. And there's been no impact assessment carried out whatsoever in the Nature Restoration Law. We are asking farmers, landowners and the entire society to buy into something that can fundamentally change our farming practices, our food security and how we live in rural communities across Europe, without having a scintilla of evidence as to the outcomes that may arise from the proposals in the Nature Restoration Law.

Commissioner, we have to go back to the Commission. We have to go back to the drawing board. Everybody wants to address the degradation of biodiversity and our ecosystems. But the idea – from an Irish perspective alone – that we would rewet the entirety of peatland in Ireland would mean fundamental changes not only to how we farm in Ireland, but how rural communities would live in Ireland. We must go back to the drawing board and base it on fact and impact assessment.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsednik, spoštovana komisarka, podpredsednik. Evropskim kmetom se lahko zahvalimo, da imamo zdravo hrano, hrano, dostopno po cenah, ki jo kupijo povprečni Evropejci, in da imamo tudi najbolj trajnostno kmetijstvo.

Kmetje so vedno podporniki Evropske unije, vendar danes, ko čakajo na vnos teh vlog za subvencije za letošnje leto, s strahom gledajo na to, kaj jim pripravljamo v Evropskem parlamentu in pa predvsem na predlog Evropske komisije. Zato so mnogi evropski kmetje na cestah – nizozemski, pa tudi slovenski –, ki enostavno ne razumejo, zakaj bi bilo potrebno prepovedati rabo pesticidov na skoraj polovici kmetijskih površin, ki nam jih primanjkuje. Kje so tista nova semena, ki bodo bolj odporna na bolezni, na škodljivce? Kje so nove metode preciznega kmetijstva, s čimer bi lahko rešili problem?

Kmetom je treba pomagati, ne pa nalagati nove ovire, kajti v nasprotnem primeru bo Evropa lačna, kot je bila po drugi svetovni vojni.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, imamo ogroman problem. Naime, najbolji proizvodi se ne izdvajaju na tržištu kao takvi. Moramo stati zato na kraj zakidanju proizvođača, ali i varanju potrošača.

Potrebna je apsolutno nova EU oznaka za najbolje i najkvalitetnije poljoprivredne proizvode jer mora postojati jasna distinkcija između najboljih, najkvalitetnijih poljoprivrednih proizvoda i onih ostalih. Bilo da je riječ o maslinovom ulju, o siru, o medu, o vinu ili o nekom petom proizvodu. Zato tražim novu oznaku *premium* proizvoda jer dosadašnja oznaka zemljopisnog podrijetla nije dovoljna. Zato želim novu oznaku vrhunske kvalitete – *premium* – iznad ove postojeće oznake.

I to je sjajno rješenje i za kvalitetne proizvođače, ali i potrošače koji će konačno znati što kupuju. Hrvatska, naime, kao i ostale male zemlje, ne može na tržištu konkurirati količinom, kvantitetom, ali može kvalitetom i vrijeme je da takvi kvalitetni proizvodi budu i zakonski prepoznati.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, este trist că discutăm astăzi despre rolul fermierilor în tranziția ecologică și a unui sector agricol rezilient, ca și cum ar fi posibil să ai toate acestea fără fermieri. Nu cred că putem vorbi astăzi de securitate alimentară fără un sector agricol puternic, iar acest lucru înseamnă o finanțare adecvată, dar mai ales avem nevoie de o legislație predictibilă și care să poată fi ușor implementată de fermieri.

În același timp, avem nevoie de studii de impact serioase, ancorate în realitățile din teren și nu de studii făcute în niște birouri somptuoase de către oameni care nu au fost în viața lor într-o fermă, tributari doar gândirii lui Timmermans. Doamna comisară, are Comisia studii de impact la Regulamentul privind reducerea pesticidelor cu 50 % sau la Regulamentul privind refacerea naturii? Pentru că noi nu știm la aceste studii de impact. Pot fermierii să facă față acestor provocări? Deoarece aceștia ne spun că nu pot să facă față acestor provocări.

Salvatore De Meo (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo acceso dibattito sull'importanza dell'agricoltura conferma ancora una volta come l'Europa e questo Parlamento non riescano a trovare una soluzione pragmatica e di buon senso e tutto questo a discapito della nostra credibilità.

Ascoltare e interpretare quello che gli agricoltori ci stanno dicendo, qualcuno pensa che possa significare negazionismo e questo è un grave errore. Vorrei sottolineare che gli agricoltori sono probabilmente i più europei di tutti per aver toccato con mano ciò che significa Europa.

Dobbiamo soltanto comprendere che la sostenibilità ambientale non può essere un'ideologia, dobbiamo invece far sì che essa venga declinata e attuata con azioni concrete e praticabili e che vengano messe in campo azioni di supporto, perché gli agricoltori significano sicurezza alimentare e gli agricoltori sono evidentemente quelli che ci hanno permesso anche di identificarci sullo scenario globale come i migliori produttori al mondo.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, deputy Commissioner McGuinness said this was a very important debate, a key debate, a really important debate. And yet the Commissioner in charge is not here. Now, we've had over 50 speakers in Parliament. They all came according to their mandate. None of them sent in a deputy. So I think, for really important, key debates in future, if a Commissioner doesn't turn up, we have to put down a vote of no confidence in them.

Having said that, I am totally in favour of Farm to Fork, Green Deal, biodiversity improvement, sequestration and reducing emissions. I think the new eco-schemes in the CAP will help enormously and they have been embraced by farmers to ensure that. But if there are new measures in addition to those, then I think they have to be matched with new money. Otherwise, farmers are going to lose productivity, food security is going to be jeopardised and they'll go out of business.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, změny klimatu dopadají právě na zemědělce, a proto zemědělci jsou těmi hlavními aktéry, kteří realizují řadu opatření, ať už je to *carbon farming*, regenerativní zemědělství, všechna ta opatření, kterými se bojuje proti změnám klimatu a která jsou také nástroji pro udržitelné zemědělství. Nyní jde o nařízení o snížení používání pesticidů, které, domnívám se, by mělo být dopracováno, zejména doplněno např. o alternativní biologické pesticidy. Komise by měla také předložit posouzení dopadů, a to se týká také nařízení o obnově přírody, které by mělo být dopracováno v souladu s výzkumem a s členskými státy. Pro nás, evropské lidovce, je potravinová bezpečnost i ochrana přírody prioritou a já děkuji paní komisařce, že tuto diskuzi bere vážně.

Christine Schneider (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Wir sind uns in dem Ziel einig: Wir wollen eine starke Land- und Forstwirtschaft, ja, und wir wollen eine widerstandsfähige Landwirtschaft. Wir wollen eine langfristige, aber ja, wir wollen auch eine kurzfristige Ernährungssicherheit, denn wenn wir uns nur auf die langfristige Ernährungssicherheit konzentrieren, werden unsere Betriebe nicht mehr hier sein. Und die, die nicht mehr hier sind, können nicht für die Ernährungssicherheit der Zukunft sorgen. Das ist die erste Differenz.

Wir wollen die Ziele des Grünen Deals erfüllen. Die Landwirtschaft will 50 % der Pflanzenschutzmittel reduzieren, und ja, wir wollen die Biodiversität erhalten. Über das Ziel sind wir uns einig, aber nicht über den Weg.

Die Landwirtschaft – sie ist Teil der Lösung. Ich sage es sehr deutlich, Frau Kommissarin McGuinness: Wenn Sie die Vorschläge geschrieben hätten, hätten wir, glaube ich, eine gute Gesprächsgrundlage. Aber die Vorschläge der Kommission zum Naturschutz-Paket dividieren hier dieses Parlament, weil sie keine Antworten auf unsere Fragen geben, wie es weitergeht mit dem Ausbau der regenerativen Energien. Das ist das Problem. Das Problem ist im Vorschlag der Kommission.

Ljudmila Novak (PPE). – Gospod predsednik! Sprašujem se, ali res želimo povečati samooskrbo z doma pridelano hrano? Ali res želimo izvajati strategijo od vil do vilic?

Če to želimo, potem pomagajmo kmetom, da bodo lažje pridelovali zdravo hrano. Če želimo, da bomo imeli tudi mlade kmete, ki so naša prihodnost, potem jim moramo omogočiti, da bodo lahko od svojega dela tudi dostojno živeli. Kmetje imajo veliko dela na polju, travniku, gozdu ali v hlevu. Zakaj morajo dolgo v noč delati še kot birokrati? Ali bo uvožena hrana z drugih koncev sveta res bolj zdrava in primernejša za naše državljane? Kaj pa izpusti? Kako naj kmet pridelava dovolj hrane za svojo živino, če ne sme kositi svojih travnikov, ko je čas za to?

Kmetje potrebujejo razumne in spodbudne rešitve za pridelavo zdrave hrane, ne pa evropskih birokratskih ovir.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Mairead McGuinness, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you, colleagues, for what has been a very rich and very important debate. In fact, 15 Members looked for catch-the-eye, and in my time that's a record. So it shows the extent of interest and concern about farming, the Green Deal and food production.

You will have watched me take copious notes because I was a journalist. In fact, I was one of those journalists who broadcast on the national broadcaster, RTÉ, showing farmers how to drain the land, rip out hedgerows, use lots of fertiliser to ramp up production, because that was public policy at that time, decades ago. Before I left journalism, we had turned the page and I was producing programmes showing farmers how to plant hedgerows, stop draining land and how to be more careful with inputs. So public policy changes all the time and we, as policymakers, need to explain better why these changes are necessary.

If you look at CAP reform, today the new CAP will actually support natural habitats, because in the past there were no payments on these habitats and farmers naturally removed habitats in order to qualify for payments. We've changed that and rightly so – not before time.

How farmers 'feel': I heard this word used and I think we cannot ignore feelings, because perception is reality for those who feel. The words 'respect', 'dignity', 'value' were used. I take those words to heart because I think we in the Commission fully respect the dignity and we value our farmers. But if there is a sense that that is not the case, I hope it's heard loud and clear in this Chamber on behalf of the Commission.

I do acknowledge the sense of frustration because – hands up – I live on a farm, with a farmer. And he doesn't just tell me his own woes, but he talks to me about the neighbours. The farms where there is no one interested in taking over the farm in our parish, in our community. The young farmers who are doing their best to adapt to the new techniques and want support to do it. And maybe the older ones – perhaps like himself – who remember being told to do different things and are a little bit confused by what we're asking them to do.

So thank you to those who called for this debate. Maybe we needed it months ago – perhaps to clear the air. And the one thing I would ask us all to focus on today from this debate: be very focused on our shared objectives, because the vast majority of the speakers spoke about wanting a sustainable agriculture, a sustainable countryside, farmers that are free to farm and do it in a way that is close to the climate and the environmental objectives.

If we keep the focus on where we want to go, let us together find a path. I said, and I repeat, the Commission is listening very carefully to all of the contributions and the concerns. On nature restoration, we have an impact assessment. The concerns about 10% of the area committed to nature restoration – it's not an objective overnight, perhaps over time. But we are committed to accommodating those who have real concerns about it being implemented in a blanket way.

Agriculture is complex because it's about people, it's about place, it's about culture, it's about society. I – for my sins – studied agricultural economics. And, I can tell you, that's not simple either. But I learned two things there. One is that if you want to see change happen, you need to use the tools of sociology, of support, of encouragement. Not finger pointing – I agree so I'll put my hands down. I won't point any fingers because I want our farmers to be facilitated in the change we are asking them to make.

And secondly, around farming, many spoke about disappearing farms and farmers. They don't disappear; farmers make some choices. Many are forced to make choices to farm elsewhere. Some farm part time. I think there is a question as we evolve in developed societies, there are usually less and less farmers, and that is an issue for us about how we are going to be sustainable. So we need to think long and hard how we accommodate the choices young people make, if they earn better incomes elsewhere. It's something that we can work on together.

And finally, I just want to say that these notes that I have taken and highlighted will be brought back to my colleagues in the Commission because, frankly, our rural areas are so important to delivering the Green Deal that you have all signed up to. And I believe that if we listen carefully to each other and to farmers and rural communities, we can find a way forward that allows them to farm with dignity and allows them to feel they are respected fully.

And frankly, we've become very comfortable, because when the CAP started out a journey, there was hunger, and farmers responded and they fed us, so we never had to worry. So now with that spirit, I hope this House will work with the Council and Commission to deliver a new Green Deal for farmers that they can take ownership of and be proud of.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you very much for your contributions.

It is evident that there are different views in this House on how we should adopt our agriculture policy. However, there seems to be two points where we all can agree, and also Commissioner McGuinness focused on the things that we agree on. First, that farmers are on the front line of the green transition. And second, that we must do this transition in close cooperation and partnership with farmers.

So therefore, let me just take this opportunity to summarise the Council's three main types of action taken in supporting the role of farmers as enablers of the green transition and resilient agriculture sector.

First, the recent Council conclusion will provide appropriate political guidance and make sure that farmers will be able to fully utilise the possibilities provided by the green transition.

Second, the Council will continue to follow closely the situation of the agricultural sectors and of agricultural markets and any developments in the Union's agriculture trade relations. The Council will also continue to follow the results of the application by the Member States of the new CAP rules through their strategic plans. And, as several of you have pointed out, the CAP not only guarantees our food security, it also protects the environment.

Third, the Council and the Special Committee on Agriculture will continue to be involved in the discussions of the proposals concerning regulations and directives related to the Green Deal. This will ensure that we properly consider the special circumstances of the agriculture sector and the particular Member States, which also many of you have pointed out here today.

Finally, many of you have raised the importance of ensuring Europe's food security. I agree with you on this note, and this does not stand in contrast with pursuing the green transition. As many speakers also have here today pointed out, with many droughts and heatwaves, we will have less food security in the future. With the adoption of the Green Deal, Fit for 55, Farm to Fork, the green transition has been placed in the centre of the EU's agricultural policy. As an essential part, it is an overall strategy to increase our economic competitiveness. All this goes hand in hand, as also a lot of you have said.

Farmers play a crucial role in ensuring food security and sustainable agriculture. So let us work together to build a more sustainable and resilient, secure food system, one that supports farmers and nourishes both people and the planet.

President. – Thank you very much for this very rich debate.

The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Sara Cerdas (S&D), por escrito. – Os agricultores desempenham um papel fundamental na transição verde e na construção de um setor agrícola resiliente. A adoção de práticas agrícolas sustentáveis, como a agricultura de precisão e a agricultura biológica, conduzem à redução do uso de produtos químicos nos terrenos, salvaguardando os recursos naturais e atenuando os efeitos negativos das alterações climáticas, a fim de proteger a nossa saúde e a biodiversidade.

Ainda que a transição para uma agricultura sem carbono seja uma prioridade da União Europeia, é essencial ter em atenção as especificidades com que se deparam os agricultores das diferentes regiões da União Europeia, em especial das Regiões Ultraperiféricas. A orografia acentuada e o tipo de solo destas regiões impossibilitam o uso de máquinas pesadas e exigem trabalho manual árduo, o que os coloca em desvantagem face a grandes superfícies. O caminho em direção a um setor agrícola sustentável e resiliente não pode ser alcançado apenas pelos agricultores. As políticas da UE devem reconhecer e disponibilizar as ferramentas necessárias para apoiar os trabalhadores agrícolas, investindo adequadamente em pesquisa e em infraestruturas necessárias, essenciais para facilitar a adoção de práticas sustentáveis e garantir uma transição justa, que não deixe ninguém para trás.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), în scris. – La solicitarea grupului PPE, Comisia Europeană a venit în fața Parlamentului pentru a-și explica politicile care afectează agricultura europeană. Din punctul nostru de vedere, Comisia trebuie să fie foarte atentă în privința legislației din mai multe domenii care, direct sau indirect, adaugă tot mai multe condiții și obligații fermierilor europeni.

Fermierii noștri sunt sub o presiune constantă, care a început cu obligațiile prevăzute de Pactul Ecologic și continuă cu dificultățile produse de războiul din Ucraina. Comisia trebuie să conștientizeze rolul crucial al agriculturii și să își adapteze politicile astfel încât să nu adauge poveri suplimentare unui domeniu care deja are în față provocări uriașe.

Măsurile din Pactul Ecologic deja reduc producția agricolă, scad veniturile fermierilor și fac ca investițiile în agricultură să fie nesigure, iar noua propunere a Comisiei, Legea privind restaurarea naturii, nu face decât să înrăutățească această situație prin reducerea terenului care poate fi folosit pentru producția agricolă.

Riscul este să punem în pericol stabilitatea alimentară și să creștem inflația și mai mult.

Din păcate, Comisia a făcut multe propuneri fără să aibă la bază studii de impact economic și social și din această cauză combinarea prevederilor din legi diferite are un rezultat dezastruos.

Edina Tóth (NI), írásban. – Magyarország elkötelezett a zöld átállás mellett, azonban úgy vélem, hogy az átgondolatlan és elhamarkodott döntéseknek nem most van itt az ideje: az európai gazdáknak az elmúlt években olyan óriási kihívásokkal kellett megküzdeniük, mint a szélsőséges időjárás, a háborús konfliktus nyomán kialakult energiaválság és a koronavírus járvány okozta nehézségek. A már amúgy is nehéz helyzetet most tovább súlyosbítja az Európai Bizottság növényvédőszer-csökkentésre vonatkozó javaslata, amely fűnyírólvszerű, minden tagállamra vonatkozó 50 százalékos növényvédőszer-csökkentést javasolt anélkül, hogy figyelembe vette volna az egyes tagállamok eltérő kiindulási pontjait és eddig elért eredményeit, illetve nem tartalmaz előzetes számításokat a termelés várható csökkenéséről, az élelmiszerárak és az importkitettség növekedéséről. Egy ilyen abszurd javaslat komoly veszélybe sodorhatja a hagyományos mezőgazdasági termelést és tovább büntetné a gazdáinkat, akik már eddig is jelentős erőfeszítéseket tettek a növényvédőszer kiváltására. Csak olyan javaslat lehet a megoldás, amely a csökkentést az egy hektárra vetített növényvédőszer használat uniós átlagához igazítja és nem azonos mértékben, hanem azonos mértékre csökkenti a felhasználást!

A növényvédőszer-használat csökkentése ösztársadalmi érdek, de olyan megállapodásra van szükség, amely megtalálja az egyensúlyt az egészségügyi, a környezet- és klímavédelmi, valamint a versenyképességi és gazdasági szempontok között!

(The sitting was suspended at 11.35)

IN THE CHAIR: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

6. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(The sitting resumed at 11.41)

7. Uroczyste posiedzenie – Przemówienie prezydenta Portugalii Marcela Rebelo de Sousa

President. – Dear colleagues, we have with us today the President of Portugal, Marcelo Rebelo de Sousa.

Presidente, bem-vindo! Obrigada por estar aqui hoje.

When you last addressed this House, in 2016, you anticipated many of our common challenges and spoke of issues that continue to be relevant today. In the face of adversity, you called for unity and solidarity. Because you understood, already then, that we had more to gain by working together. That is how we dealt with the pandemic. That is how we stood up to the Russian aggression in Ukraine.

President, I would like to commend you on your efforts in protecting our European values and in fighting social exclusion. The social and economic impact of the war in Ukraine, the energy prices and an increased inflation rate across our Union are once again testing our unity and commitment towards those values.

The call for more unity and solidarity is perhaps today more pressing than ever before. This is the moment to stand together. This is Europe's moment to stay united.

New political and security challenges pose a greater, more complex threat to our democracies. The rise of populism and Euroscepticism, fuelled by information warfare and disinformation campaigns, seek to erode trust in democratic institutions by hampering citizens from making informed decisions. How we responded to this, and how we will continue to respond to those looking to undermine our democracy, will be the litmus test of our values.

Here I am convinced that Portugal will continue to play its part. Surveys after surveys show that the Portuguese population is exceedingly euro-optimistic especially about the future of the European Union. This is encouraging – and yet we must keep doing more. More to bring the message of Europe closer to our people.

More to show that the values that bind us as Europeans, is still so much greater than what can ever seek to divide us. And more to assure our citizens that their vote at the European elections next year does in fact matter.

Estimado Presidente, the floor is yours.

Marcelo Rebelo de Sousa, Presidente de Portugal. – Senhora Presidente Roberta Metsola, Senhoras Deputadas, Senhores Deputados, três curtas palavras prévias – curtas, porque o tempo urge e a Europa não pode perder tempo.

First of all, to congratulate you, Madam President, and your young, determined and visionary mandate confirming that in the current Europe there is room for everyone without the inevitable differences of geography, history, demography, or the cultural, social, economic or political diversity.

A segunda palavra para reiterar, em nome de Portugal, a total gratidão, abertura e solidariedade a uma união de Estados e de povos que nos faz mais livres, mais justos, mais democratas, mais realizados, um a um e todos em conjunto, do que se vivêssemos separados, distantes, solitários. Portugal estava, está e estará sempre na primeira linha da defesa da Europa e da União Europeia.

A terceira palavra para lembrar que passaram sete anos desde que aqui estive, em 13 de abril de 2016, um mês e quatro dias depois da minha posse no primeiro mandato, noutra tempo, noutra mundo, noutra Europa. Acreditava-se ainda na ordem internacional, mesmo se em crise; na balança de poderes existente, mesmo se em mudança; na reforma das instituições universais, mesmo se adiada; na segurança europeia herdada do século XX, mesmo se fragilizada; na vitória da diplomacia sobre a guerra, mesmo se mais complexa; no avanço dos direitos humanos, mesmo se mais difícil; na primazia da globalização, do multilateralismo, das causas comuns – direitos humanos, clima, oceanos, migrações, refugiados, terrorismos, pobreza, desigualdade, poder da mulher, combate à pobreza infantil, rejuvenescimento dos sistemas políticos, económicos e sociais.

A União ainda era a 28 – antes do referendo britânico – com outros líderes nacionais e europeus, e muitos pensavam poder ir adiando reformas, reaproximação dos europeus e alargamentos por algum tempo, sem saber bem quanto tempo.

Excelências, este tempo de adiamento terminou e terminou abruptamente, com dois anos de pandemia e mais um ano de guerra. Uma guerra ilegal, injusta e imoral. Erro chocante da Federação da Rússia, ao qual a União respondeu com princípios, firmeza, unidade, solidariedade, cooperação transatlântica e visão de futuro.

Assim, passou a correr uma legislatura deste Parlamento. Passou praticamente um ciclo político europeu, um ciclo vivido em emergência, com pandemia e suas fases, paragem económica e seus efeitos sociais, guerra, crise na energia e inflação e cumulativos outros efeitos económicos e sociais. E na emergência gere-se o dia a dia, tem-se menos disponibilidade para ponderar as grandes questões que se colocam à União, aos europeus, a todos nós. E falta apenas um ano para as eleições europeias.

Excelências, quais são as questões essenciais que temos e teremos de enfrentar nestes anos decisivos? São uma mais sete. Simples de enumerar, mas mais difíceis de responder.

Uma, a mais urgente: garantir que da guerra que tem martirizado o povo ucraniano e atingido muitos mais povos por todo o mundo e, em particular, na Europa, possa sair uma paz legal, justa e moral, respeitando o direito internacional e os direitos humanos, prevenindo novas guerras, dando novo futuro a quem hoje vive na incerteza pessoal, económica e social.

E depois, sete questões desse outro futuro, questões de médio e longo prazo.

Primeira questão: quer a União sair, no pós-guerra e pós-recuperação económica sustentável como efetiva potência global? Sim ou não? Na nova balança de poderes – não ainda uma nova ordem internacional, que demorará a emergir – perante potências confirmadas, potências diminuídas pela guerra ou pela economia, que papel quer desempenhar a União Europeia?

A minha resposta é simples: o maior, o mais forte possível, só possível em unidade. Senão, acabará por ser o menor, o mais fraco possível.

Segunda questão: de que União Europeia estamos a falar? Com alargamento? E se sim, como e em que termos?

A minha resposta é: sim, com alargamento, dentro do melhor possível, isto é, com a melhor preparação política, institucional, económica e financeira possível. Só essa preparação tornará o alargamento um êxito para todos como queremos. A não preparação poderá redundar numa desilusão dramática para todos – os que estão e os que legitimamente esperam vir a estar.

Terceira questão: União Europeia com que poder económico? O que significa, com que capacidade de recuperação e consolidação económica e social, num ambiente, a vários títulos externos e internos à União, complexo e desfavorável?

A minha resposta é e só pode ser: pensar naquilo que está a sacrificar milhões de europeus, acelerar a recuperação da economia, não minimizar os reflexos sociais mediatos e os efeitos políticos também mediatos da inflação, os efeitos conjuntos da pandemia e da guerra. A recuperação económica europeia tem de ser acelerada para aproximar mais e mais os europeus da União Europeia.

Quarta questão: a União Europeia com que linhas-mestras de governação económica e financeira a médio e a longo prazo, sobretudo se pensarmos no alargamento a mais Estados-Membros e nas suas legítimas expectativas quanto aos fundos europeus?

A minha resposta é e só pode ser: a de não adiar a clareza na definição dessas linhas-mestras, económicas e financeiras, para o futuro. Porque, se adiarmos essa definição, tudo ficará mais pesado e atribulado para resolver mais tarde.

Quinta questão: União Europeia com que política de relacionamento com os outros continentes? O que é mais vasto do que apenas política de migrações. Do que se trata é de uma política de relacionamento com os outros continentes. A União Europeia quer ficar distante, fechada sobre si mesma por causas antigas e recentes, como a pandemia, como a guerra, ou quer ser ativa, antecipatória, aberta?

A União Europeia não pode esquecer que, noutros continentes, está difícil de se compreender que esta guerra não é europeia, é global. A União Europeia não pode esquecer ou congelar, por egoísmos fúteis, parcerias e acordos com continentes fundamentais para ela, como a África, como a América Latina e, nalguns aspetos, com a Ásia. Não pode adiar aquilo que, a prazo, só criará problemas nas migrações e na compreensão do peso da Europa no mundo. Os egoísmos nacionais têm de ceder perante os valores da União Europeia.

Sexta questão: a União Europeia quer ou não continuar pioneira no clima e, também, na transição energética, no digital, no conhecimento, na ciência, na tecnologia? Ou prefere esperar pelo fim deste período, desta conjuntura que se vive, para enfrentar estes desafios?

A minha resposta é: não são separáveis as questões. Uma potência global, como a União Europeia quer ser, tem de ser pioneira no clima, tem de ser pioneira na ciência, na tecnologia, no conhecimento, no digital, na energia. Se não for, ficará para trás. Não será uma potência global.

Sétima questão: União Europeia atenta à juventude, à solidariedade entre gerações, à mudança geracional nos sistemas políticos, económicos ou sociais ou lenta a renovar, contrastando com outras sociedades de outros continentes que são jovens e, por isso, mais rápidos a agir e a antecipar?

Não tenho dúvidas. A minha resposta é e só pode ser: a União Europeia tem de acelerar a mudança geracional. Não pode esquecer os menos jovens sacrificados, económica e socialmente, pela pandemia ou pela guerra, mas tem de apostar na juventude. A Europa tem de ser uma Europa que não aceite a separação dos jovens, que não aliene os jovens, que aumente a participação dos jovens, que rejuvenesça os sistemas políticos, económicos e sociais dos Estados-Membros. Porque, se não for assim, criará vazios que serão preenchidos por aquilo que muitos chamam populismos, movimentos antissistémicos.

Se isso acontecer, é por nossa culpa. Não é por culpa dos populismos ou dos movimentos inorgânicos. Eles fazem aquilo que é sua intenção fazer. Nós não fazemos aquilo que devíamos fazer. E, temos de fazer a tempo, antes que seja tarde.

Numa palavra, uma urgência muito imediata: enfrentar esta guerra e garantir o caminho para uma paz que seja legal, justa e moral. E depois, sete questões para o novo ciclo político europeu, que irá de 2024 a 2029. Sendo que, ainda antes de 2029, várias lideranças nacionais atingirão limites de mandatos, nalguns casos sem renovação possível.

Numa palavra, temos à nossa frente, a um ano das eleições de 2024, dois caminhos.

Um caminho: o de, por causa da guerra e da mais lenta recuperação, gerirmos o dia a dia, olharmos para o dia a dia, resolvermos o imediato, esperando pelo período posterior às eleições de 2024.

Outro caminho: não ficar apenas por vagas ideias abstratas, ou por um ou outro grupo de trabalho, ou deleitando-nos com debates de pormenor institucional que não dizem nada ao dia a dia dos europeus. O outro caminho é o de percebermos que só se ganha o futuro, vendo esse futuro numa perspectiva de médio a longo prazo, antecipando a construção do futuro, evitando os vazios, as frustrações, os afastamentos.

É verdade que a Europa e a União Europeia se fizeram fazendo, com avanços e recuos, salvando, muitas vezes no último minuto, o que parecia impossível. É certo que vivemos no domínio da incerteza, da imprevisibilidade, da crise. O incerto passou a ser vezes demais a nossa certeza. Isso dá-nos o alibi para não pensarmos no médio e longo prazo. Mas é mais uma razão para não renunciarmos aos princípios e tomarmos a iniciativa de liderarmos os acontecimentos, olharmos para o médio e longo prazo.

Eu, Portugal, os portugueses acreditamos na Europa. Eu, Portugal e os portugueses acreditamos nos seus valores e princípios definidores. Acreditamos na liberdade, no pluralismo, na democracia, na solidariedade, na justiça social e, portanto, nos direitos humanos. Eu, Portugal e os portugueses queremos uma Europa mais forte, que lidere, que antecipe e não que vá a reboque dos acontecimentos. Eu, Portugal e os portugueses acreditamos no futuro de uma Europa não dos chefes de Estado, não dos chefes de governo, não dos líderes partidários, não dos outros líderes políticos e sociais, uma Europa das mulheres e dos homens europeus, porque essa é a Europa que nós queremos para o futuro. Sem essas mulheres e esses homens, não há, nem haverá, Europa forte dentro de si e no mundo.

É este o desafio. Temos pouco tempo, muito pouco tempo para o anteciparmos e a Europa merece-o. Os milhões e milhões de europeus merecem-no. O mundo merece uma Europa mais forte. A Europa, como sempre, vencerá.

President. – Thank you very much, President, for that amazing speech. The session will now close and we will resume with the vote.

(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND*Vizepräsident***8. Wznowienie posiedzenia**

(Die Sitzung wird um 12.06 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

Manfred Weber (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte eine kurze Intervention machen, weil wir heute früh eine Diskussion über die Agrarpolitik in der Europäischen Union auf der Tagesordnung hatten. Bei dieser Diskussion um die europäische Agrarpolitik wurden die Sorgen unserer Bauern zum Ausdruck gebracht, die Zukunftssorgen, die da sind. Leider Gottes war bei dieser Diskussion der zuständige Kommissar nicht anwesend.

Der Kommissar Wojciechowski ist jetzt vor zwei Minuten in den Plenarsaal hereingekommen. Jetzt ist er da, wir heißen ihn willkommen. Aber ich möchte deutlich machen: Wir erwarten zukünftig vom Agrarkommissar Respekt gegenüber dem Europäischen Parlament, dass er bei Debatten zur Agrarpolitik in diesem Raum anwesend ist. Das Verhalten ist so nicht akzeptabel.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank! Ich werde es der Präsidentin berichten.

9. Głosowanie

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Abstimmung.

9.1. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Komisja i agencje wykonawcze (A9-0101/2023 - Jeroen Lenaers, Monika Hohlmeier) (głosowanie)

9.2. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Parlament Europejski (A9-0086/2023 - Isabel García Muñoz) (głosowanie)

9.3. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Rada Europejska i Rada (A9-0085/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)

9.4. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Trybunał Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej (A9-0073/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)

9.5. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Trybunał Obrachunkowy (A9-0081/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)

- 9.6. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Europejski Komitet Ekonomiczno-Społeczny (A9-0074/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)
- 9.7. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Komitet Regionów (A9-0080/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)
- 9.8. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Europejski Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich (A9-0067/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)
- 9.9. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Europejski Inspektor Ochrony Danych (A9-0070/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)
- 9.10. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych (A9-0088/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)
- 9.11. Absolutorium za rok 2021 — Prokuratura Europejska (EPPO) (A9-0079/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa) (głosowanie)
- 9.12. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejskie Centrum Rozwoju Kształcenia Zawodowego (Cedefop) (A9-0125/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)
- 9.13. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Fundacja na rzecz Poprawy Warunków Życia i Pracy (Eurofound) (A9-0109/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)
- 9.14. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Praw Podstawowych Unii Europejskiej (A9-0141/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)
- 9.15. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejskie Centrum Monitorowania Narkotyków i Narkomanii (A9-0107/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)
- 9.16. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Środowiska (A9-0143/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)
- 9.17. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Bezpieczeństwa i Zdrowia w Pracy (EU-OSHA) (A9-0132/2023 - Alin Mituța) (głosowanie)

- 9.18. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Centrum Tłumaczeń dla Organów Unii Europejskiej (A9-0104/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)**
- 9.19. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Leków (A9-0106/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)**
- 9.20. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Współpracy Wymiarów Sprawiedliwości w Sprawach Karnych (Eurojust) (A9-0122/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)**
- 9.21. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Fundacja Kształcenia (A9-0135/2023 - Alin Mituța) (głosowanie)**
- 9.22. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Bezpieczeństwa Morskiego (A9-0113/2023 - Ilana Cicurel) (głosowanie)**
- 9.23. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Bezpieczeństwa Lotniczego (A9-0098/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)**
- 9.24. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd ds. Bezpieczeństwa Żywności (A9-0131/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)**
- 9.25. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejskie Centrum ds. Zapobiegania i Kontroli Chorób (A9-0146/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)**
- 9.26. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Cyberbezpieczeństwa (ENISA) (A9-0115/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)**
- 9.27. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Kolejowa Unii Europejskiej (A9-0100/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)**
- 9.28. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Szkolenia w Dziedzinie Ścigania (CEPOL) (A9-0102/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)**
- 9.29. **Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Straży Granicznej i Przybrzeżnej (A9-0142/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)**

- 9.30. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Programu Kosmicznego (przed 12 maja 2021 r.: Agencja Europejskiego GNSS) (A9-0116/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)
- 9.31. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Kontroli Rybołówstwa (A9-0112/2023 - Ilana Cicurel) (głosowanie)
- 9.32. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Chemikaliów (A9-0133/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)
- 9.33. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Dostaw Euratomu (A9-0126/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)
- 9.34. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Współpracy Organów Ścigania (Europol) (A9-0138/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)
- 9.35. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Instytut ds. Równości Kobiet i Mężczyzn (A9-0121/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)
- 9.36. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd Nadzoru Bankowego (A9-0110/2023 - Alin Mituța) (głosowanie)
- 9.37. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd Nadzoru Ubezpieczeń i Pracowniczych Programów Emerytalnych (A9-0103/2023 - Gilles Boyer) (głosowanie)
- 9.38. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd Nadzoru Giełd i Papierów Wartościowych (A9-0137/2023 - Gilles Boyer) (głosowanie)
- 9.39. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Współpracy Organów Regulacji Energetyki (ACER) (A9-0111/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)
- 9.40. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Wsparcia BEREC (Urząd BEREC) (A9-0129/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)
- 9.41. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Instytut Innowacji i Technologii (EIT) (A9-0130/2023 - Katalin Cseh) (głosowanie)
- 9.42. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd Wsparcia w dziedzinie Azylu (A9-0123/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)

- 9.43. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Agencja Unii Europejskiej ds. Zarządzania Operacyjnego Wielkoskalowymi Systemami Informatycznymi w Przestrzeni Wolności, Bezpieczeństwa i Sprawiedliwości (eu-LISA) (A9-0105/2023 - Ramona Strugariu) (głosowanie)
- 9.44. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejskie Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Realizacji Projektu ITER i Rozwoju Energii Termojądrowej (Fusion for Energy) (A9-0092/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)
- 9.45. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie w celu Badań z zakresu Zarządzania Ruchem Lotniczym w Jednolitej Europejskiej Przestrzeni Powietrznej 3 (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie SESAR) (A9-0118/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)
- 9.46. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Ekologicznego Lotnictwa (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie „Czyste Niebo 2”) (A9-0078/2023 - Joachim Stanisław Brudziński) (głosowanie)
- 9.47. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Biotechnologicznej Europy Opartej na Obiegu Zamkniętym (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Bioprzemysłu) (A9-0093/2023 - Joachim Stanisław Brudziński) (głosowanie)
- 9.48. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Inicjatywy w dziedzinie Innowacji w Ochronie Zdrowia (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Drugiej Inicjatywy w zakresie Leków Innowacyjnych) (A9-0069/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)
- 9.49. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Czystego Wodoru (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Technologii Ogniw Paliwowych i Technologii Wodorowych 2) (A9-0083/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)
- 9.50. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Europejskie Przedsięwzięcie Kolejowe (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie Shift2Rail) (A9-0090/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)
- 9.51. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie na rzecz Kluczowych Technologii Cyfrowych (przed 30 listopada 2021 r.: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie ECSEL) (A9-0082/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)
- 9.52. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Wspólne Przedsięwzięcie w dziedzinie Europejskich Obliczeń Wielkiej Skali (A9-0089/2023 - Ryszard Czarnecki) (głosowanie)
- 9.53. Absolutorium za rok 2021: budżet ogólny UE – ósmy, dziewiąty, dziesiąty i jedenasty Europejski Fundusz Rozwoju (A9-0114/2023 - José Manuel Fernandes) (głosowanie)

9.54. Absolutorium za rok 2021: wyniki, zarządzanie finansami i kontrola agencji UE (A9-0144/2023 - Olivier Chastel) (głosowanie)

9.55. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejski Urząd ds. Pracy (A9-0117/2023 - Alin Mituța) (głosowanie)

9.56. Sprawozdanie za rok 2022 dotyczące Serbii (A9-0172/2023 - Vladimír Bilčík) (głosowanie)

— Nach der Abstimmung über Absatz 36:

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, this Parliament stood in solidarity with the people of Serbia following the mass shootings in Belgrade and Mladenovac on Monday. This is why I propose to move the following amendment after paragraph 36.

Paragraph 36a reads as follows ‘Condemns in the strongest possible terms the acts of mass shooting in Serbia in May 2023; stands in mourning and in solidarity with the families of victims and the people of Serbia; calls for thorough investigation of all killings and a full delivery of justice.’

(Das Parlament ist damit einverstanden, dass der mündliche Änderungsantrag zur Abstimmung gestellt wird.)

9.57. Sprawozdanie za rok 2022 dotyczące Kosowa (A9-0174/2023 - Viola von Cramon-Taubadel) (głosowanie)

9.58. Wpływ rosnących kosztów finansowania zewnętrznego Instrumentu Unii Europejskiej na rzecz Odbudowy na budżet UE na rok 2024 (A9-0163/2023 - Johan Van Overtveldt) (głosowanie)

9.59. Zasoby własne: nowy początek dla finansów unijnych – nowy początek dla Europy (A9-0155/2023 - José Manuel Fernandes, Valérie Hayer) (głosowanie)

9.60. Przystąpienie UE do Konwencji Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej: instytucje i administracja publiczna Unii (A9-0169/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari) (głosowanie)

Der Präsident. – Wir kommen nun zum Bericht von Herrn Kollegen Kohut und Frau Kollegin Kokalari. Er betrifft das Übereinkommen des Europarats zur Verhütung und Bekämpfung von Gewalt gegen Frauen und häuslicher Gewalt in Bezug auf die Organe und die öffentliche Verwaltung der Union.

Normalerweise sind hier keine Interventionen nach der Geschäftsordnung vorgesehen. Die Präsidentin hat den beiden Kollegen gewährt, kurz zu intervenieren. Allerdings wurde mir gesagt, sie hätte „sehr kurz“ gewährt. Mal sehen, wie die Interpretation dieser Ausnahme ist.

Arba Kokalari (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, this is a historic vote. After 10 years, this European Parliament is delivering on safety and freedom of women. This is a vote for all those millions of women who are living in violence, who are living unsafe, in fear. And we are saying now that Europe has zero tolerance against violence against women and that Europe will not be affected by Russian disinformation campaigns or anti-European values.

I want to thank my co-rapporteur, Łukasz Kohut, and the Swedish Presidency, who made together the accession of the Istanbul Convention real, because we show in this House and in this Union that when we work together, we can fight the violence against women. We can show that when we unite our forces, Europe becomes better, Europe becomes freer and safer. And that's what it's all about.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Mr President, dear colleagues, this is a truly great day. Now I know that it was worth going into politics. This is a good day for the European Union and for all those fighting for a stronger community and more integrated European Union. Last but not least, this is a great day for all women, Europeans, all those affected by domestic violence, but also for those who, thanks to the Istanbul Convention, we will be able to protect. Could there be anything more crucial for the politicians to do? I am fully aware that today's vote on the accession of the European Union to the Istanbul Convention is a matter of simple human sensitivity. So don't be afraid. Do it for your grandmothers, mothers, daughters and wives. Let's make the European Union a better place to live.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Frau Kollegin und Herr Kollege, für diese kurze Intervention bei diesem wichtigen Anliegen, aber ich weiß nicht, ob die Interpretation des Wortes „kurz“ die Begeisterung erhöht, künftige Ausnahmen von der Geschäftsordnung zu gewähren.

9.61. Przystąpienie UE do Konwencji Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej: współpraca wymiarów sprawiedliwości w sprawach karnych, azyl i zasada non-refoulement (A9-0170/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari) (głosowanie)

Der Präsident. – Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

(Die Sitzung wird für kurze Zeit unterbrochen.)

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

10. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 13.22 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

11. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia

Die Präsidentin. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar.

Gibt es Einwände?

Damit ist das Protokoll genehmigt.

12. Eksternalizacja wniosków o azyl i uzależnienie przekazywania środków finansowych państwom trzecim od wdrożenia umów o powrotach (debata na aktualny temat)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema (Artikel 162 der Geschäftsordnung) – Externalisierung von Asylanträgen und Verknüpfung der Finanzhilfe für Drittstaaten mit der Umsetzung von Rückführungsabkommen (2023/2690(RSP)).

Ich weise die Mitglieder darauf hin, dass es bei dieser Aussprache keine spontanen Wortmeldungen gibt und dass auch keine „blauen Karten“ akzeptiert werden.

Jean-Paul Garraud, auteur. – Madame la Présidente, notre continent fait face à une immigration massive depuis des années et ce Parlement souhaite l'aggraver avec le pacte «asile et migration». 966 000 demandes d'asile ont été enregistrées en 2022 dans les pays de l'Union européenne et affiliés, soit un record depuis 2016. Les chiffres des premiers mois de l'année 2023 sont dans cette continuité et laissent craindre le pire. Alors que voulez-vous? Que voulons-nous? Tel est le débat que nous avons réussi à imposer à ce Parlement.

Vous voulez une immigration de peuplement sous prétexte démographique, nous voulons donner la priorité à nos nationaux. Vous précipitez des malheureux entre les mains des passeurs, nous voulons supprimer les pompes aspirantes de l'immigration. Vous voulez accueillir toute la misère du monde, quitte à détruire nos sociétés, nous voulons préserver et protéger nos peuples, notre identité, notre civilisation. Subir l'immigration de masse n'est pas une fatalité. Des solutions existent, que vous ne voulez pas voir.

Nous les proposons depuis des années, et certaines sont mises en œuvre dans des États membres de l'Union européenne comme au Danemark, pays social-démocrate. Pourquoi donc les socialistes d'ici ne feraient-ils pas ce que font les socialistes de là-bas? Le Danemark applique une politique d'immigration exemplaire qui fait consensus auprès des Danois. Cette politique protège la population et fait preuve d'une grande humanité. Le Danemark dit «stop» à l'immigration de peuplement et n'accueille des ressortissants étrangers qu'à titre exceptionnel, toujours sous conditions, rendant ainsi son sens initial au droit d'asile. L'accès à la nationalité danoise est quant à lui très strict. Cette politique sociale-démocrate démontre que l'opposition à l'immigration de masse concerne tout le monde et dépasse les clivages politiques dans l'intérêt supérieur de la nation et des peuples.

Depuis quelques mois, ce pays porte le projet de délocaliser des centres d'accueil de demandeurs d'asile en dehors de l'Union européenne, en l'occurrence au Rwanda. Un accord a été trouvé entre les deux pays. Il s'agit maintenant d'organiser le transfert. Bruxelles doit soutenir cette initiative et faciliter sa mise en place. Une majorité des peuples européens est certainement en accord avec une telle politique. Pourtant, l'Union européenne s'apprête à adopter, avant les élections de 2024, le pacte sur la migration et l'asile qui permettra l'arrivée de 60 à 70 millions de migrants en Europe. Ceux-ci seront répartis dans les États membres par un coordinateur choisi par la Commission et sans aucune légitimité démocratique, en violation de la souveraineté des nations.

Je rappelle au ministre français de l'intérieur, M. Darmanin, toujours prêt à donner des leçons aux autres comme il vient de le faire avec l'Italie, que les eurodéputés macronistes ont soutenu et voté ce pacte, et sont donc en faveur du tsunami migratoire qui en découlera. Il est donc particulièrement scandaleux de la part de ce ministre de condamner la politique migratoire italienne et ainsi de créer un incident diplomatique majeur entre la France et l'Italie, à l'heure où la coopération entre ces deux États est primordiale. Le double langage du ministre et du gouvernement français est manifeste: faites ce que je dis, mais pas ce que je fais.

L'exemple de Mayotte, département français, est aussi très significatif du désastre de cette politique migratoire. Face à une invasion migratoire venant des Comores, qui refusent de reprendre leurs ressortissants, la France continue d'octroyer des aides à cet État et favorise donc l'aggravation de cette invasion. Encore un double langage de la France: la fermeté dans le discours, du laxisme dans les actes.

L'Union européenne doit cesser d'octroyer des aides pécuniaires aux États qui refuseraient de récupérer leurs nationaux. C'est un principe qui doit être entériné. Le financement des pays tiers doit être subordonné à la mise en œuvre des accords de retour. Ces mesures dissuasives seraient très efficaces et protectrices à la fois des peuples européens et des candidats à l'immigration qui ne risqueraient plus leur vie en Méditerranée. Faute de quoi le malheureux exemple de Mayotte sera demain l'avenir de la France et l'avenir de l'Europe.

Les maux qui touchent notre pays ne sont pas le fruit du hasard, mais bien le résultat de choix et de décisions politiques qui ont été prises, et sur lesquelles nous devons impérativement revenir. Le grand stratège athénien Thucydide disait que l'épaisseur du rempart compte moins que la volonté de le prendre. En l'occurrence, l'Europe n'a ni de rempart ni la volonté de défendre ses peuples, une première dans l'histoire. L'Europe, telle qu'elle est, encourage sa propre submersion migratoire. Des solutions concrètes existent, qui conjuguent fermeté et humanisme, tel que c'est l'objet de notre débat. Appliquons-les.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, since the start of the Swedish Presidency I have already had the chance to address this plenary several times on migration issues, which shows the importance of the topic for the EU as a whole.

And I would like to start my intervention today by repeating one of my previous messages. An effective EU migration policy requires a long-term and comprehensive approach which tackles several related goals, in particular: saving lives, providing international protection to persons who are entitled to it, and effectively returning those who are not; fighting smugglers; ensuring proper management of our external borders; enforcing cooperation with our partner countries, the countries of origin, transit and departure; addressing the root causes to reduce irregular departures; and providing predictable legal pathways.

The fact is that we need to address all these factors to remind us of the complexity of the migration challenge and the need to avoid one-sided policies. This is the spirit of the Migration and Asylum Pact, a common long-term solution, where we – the Council and Parliament – must work together. And the clock is ticking.

I would now like to turn to the issues of today's specific debate: external processing of asylum applications. This discussion is not new. In June 2018, in an attempt to eliminate incentives to embark on a dangerous journey, the European Council called on the Council and the Commission to swiftly explore the concept of regional disembarking platforms. The context back then was quite similar to the current situation in the Central Mediterranean, which we have discussed in this House on several occasions. There was a high number of migrant arrivals by sea and, as a terrible consequence, a high number of deaths.

The Council explored the option for a system where asylum application would be processed in the territory of neighbouring countries. It must be said, however, that this possibility did not materialise, as there was no support for relevant third countries. Therefore, the Council has never taken a position on external asylum application, since there has never been a concrete proposal.

As a matter of fact, there is no practical experience of such schemes in Europe. While I will refrain from entering into debate on whether externalising asylum applications is compatible with the EU *acquis*, I do want to underline the universal principle of the right to seek asylum and the responsibility of the receiving state to provide protection in case of need, in respect of the rule of non-refoulement. This can never be emphasised enough.

Instead, let me focus on our comprehensive and operational cooperation with countries of origin and transit through mutual beneficial partnerships that cover all migration routes. We monitor the implementation of the action plans for the Western Balkans and the Central Mediterranean routes, and we expect action plans for the Atlantic, Western and Eastern Mediterranean routes to be presented by the Commission very soon. We wish to reduce the irregular migration flows and increase returns, while taking into account the needs of partners that are not that are not necessarily migration-related.

This brings me to the question of making funding to third countries conditional on the implementation of returns agreements. It is clear that returns are one of the weakest elements in our migration management and that we need to enhance our return rates, while obviously ensuring the full respect of international law. Against that background, the European Council in February recalled the importance of a unified, comprehensive and effective EU policy on return and readmission of an integrated approach to reintegration.

To that end, it was underlined how important it is to leverage all relevant EU policies, instruments and tools. This includes diplomacy, development aid, trade and visas, as well as opportunities for legal migration. The concept of making EU funding dependent on returns and readmission cooperation is implicit in some of these leverages, like development aid and trade. So far, Member States have agreed on a legal framework allowing for the visa leverage to be implemented in case of unsatisfactory returns and readmission cooperation by third countries.

With regard to trade, the new EU generalised scheme of preferences forces trade leverages. This proposal is currently subject to interinstitutional negotiations. We are aware of how complex and even controversial the use of such leverage is. Experience shows that leverages have sometimes had the opposite effect of their original purpose.

We are also aware of the gap between the Council's and Parliament's views on these issues. Nevertheless, I think that this is a discussion that we must have in an open manner. And in doing so, we must try to answer questions like: what options do we have when countries of origin do not abide by the international obligation to take back their nationals? How can we develop a serious and frank relation with countries of origin if we do not dispose of instruments to promote our interests? But with that, I look forward to hearing your views on these other questions in this difficult, but absolutely necessary, debate.

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, taking the figures of the first trimester this year, European Union countries registered fewer irregular entries than last year on all migratory routes, except the Central Mediterranean, where arrivals have increased fourfold. Regrettably, there is loss of lives on all routes.

This underscores the necessity to continue working more actively and more efficiently with countries of origin and transit. We aim at long-lasting solutions. Migration management with our partners only works with mutual long-term engagement and ownership on both sides.

The European Union and its Member States continue to invest in the social and economic development of partner countries and on the response to climate and environmental events to reduce the root causes of irregular migration.

We are also investing EUR 0.5 billion in border management and the fight against migrant smuggling in North Africa and the Western Balkans to strengthen a comprehensive migration partnership.

We are supporting Türkiye through a new EUR 220 million project of surveillance equipment to prevent irregular migration.

We have launched an anti-smuggling operational partnership with Morocco, Niger and the Western Balkans.

Another has just been agreed in principle with Tunisia, and we hope to agree further partnership with other partners soon. Last week, Commissioner Johansson travelled to Tunisia to reinforce our migration partnership, notably as regards the prevention of irregular departures, strengthening anti-smuggling cooperation, supporting returns from Tunisia to sub-Saharan Africa, and strengthening return and reintegration, as well as labour migration cooperation. As with all our partners, European Union migration cooperation with Tunisia is part of our border strategic partnership with Tunisia.

For truly comprehensive partnerships, we are accelerating discussions with Member States to launch talent partnerships on legal migration with Morocco, Tunisia and Egypt, as well as Pakistan and Bangladesh.

The European Union and its Member States also work closely with countries of origin in the framework of comprehensive partnership to return those who do not have the right to stay in the European Union in an effective, safe and dignified way.

The European Council in February called for swift action to ensure effective returns using as leverage all relevant EU policies, instruments and tools including diplomacy, development, trade and visas, as well as opportunities for legal migration.

We cannot engage on returns in isolation. Cooperation on returns is part of the overall relationships with the EU. We have already put in place this approach in the visa policy, establishing a formal link between readmission, cooperation and possible restrictive visa measures. As a part of our trade policy, we propose that failing to cooperate on readmission would be a ground of withdrawal in the generalised scheme of preferences.

Moreover, the regulation on the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument — Global Europe sets now an indicative spending target for migration and introduces a flexible, initiative approach. This is not conditioning funding to the implementation of return arrangements, but encourages cooperation. It is recognising that in every partnership there are interests on both sides.

Ladies and gentlemen, last year, the European Union Member States received nearly 1 million asylum applications – about 50 % more than in 2021, and the highest number since 2016. In addition, 4 million people fleeing Ukraine registered for temporary protection.

Providing protection to those in need and upholding the right to asylum is a legal and moral obligation to which the European Union is strongly committed. EU Member States should share this task in a spirit of solidarity and fairness and full respect of international and Union law.

EU asylum law applies only to asylum applications made at the border of and in the territory of a Member State. The Commission has consistently maintained that the external externalisation of asylum processing is incompatible with EU law and we share the UNHCR's concerns about the compatibility of such schemes with international obligations as well.

The Commission proposals for a comprehensive pact on migration and asylum do not provide for external processing. Increased cooperation with partner countries in the fulfilment of joint and global responsibilities for managing migration is, however, a clear and top priority. We will continue to pursue intensified partnerships in this respect.

The Commission also fully supports, however, resettlement efforts. We will provide EUR 0.5 billion in funding for resettlement and humanitarian admission for 2023–2025, offering support to resettle around 50 000 persons.

We will continue to prioritise safe and legal pathways for those in need of international protection from Libya via Niger and Rwanda by strengthening the emergency transit mechanisms. The Commission discussed these solutions with Member States at the high-level EU Resettlement Forum meeting on Monday.

Thank you and I look forward to the discussion.

Jeroen Lenaers, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, before I start my intervention, can I just express my surprise a little bit? Because this morning we had a debate on agriculture and the Commission was represented by the financial services Commissioner. Now we have a debate on migration and the agricultural Commissioner is here. And I really don't see the logic in sending Commissioners to debates on topics that they have no relevance to, and I would really hope that you could also express our discontent about that to the European Commission as a whole.

Now I'll start my intervention. You can start the clock again, if you don't mind.

We recently had several debates here in this House about migration, and rightfully so, because we see irregular arrivals to Europe at crisis levels and further increasing as we speak, and we see more and more Member States reaching the limits of what can be reasonably expected from them in terms of reception, capacity and procedures. And these debates have also clearly shown that there is no silver bullet when it comes to tackling this challenge. As much as some of the colleagues here would like to believe it is, we will not be able to address the migration challenge only with dumbed-down Twitter-proof slogans. We cannot just switch migration off and we can also not fully shift the responsibility off to other countries. We need a European and a holistic approach.

We must, yes indeed, better protect our borders. We must fight human smugglers. We must prevent dangerous departures. And we need to ensure effective returns. And we need much more intensive cooperation with third countries to do that along the migratory routes. And I acknowledge and I am glad that the Council also sees this – that action is necessary to ensure effective partnerships on all these priorities, using all EU instruments at our disposal is necessary.

We need renewed focus on the external dimension of our migration policy. But that doesn't mean that we should ignore the internal aspects. We need a true European migration and asylum policy that is fit for purpose and answer the needs of our times. The Pact on Migration contains all these ingredients, and Mr Garraud, I would really advise you to read it, because everything you said about the pact has been nonsense so far. This House has adopted its position. I would really invite the Council to do the same. I appreciate the work of the Swedish Presidency to get these negotiations going, to get an agreement, and to get this back from ideas to reality.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señora presidenta en ejercicio del Consejo, señor comisario, ¿por qué llevamos tantos años discutiendo con tanta intensidad sobre migraciones y asilo? Por tres razones muy poderosas.

La primera, porque el Tratado de Lisboa ordena una política y legislación común europea en materia de inmigración y asilo y hace de este Parlamento legislador, con lo que hace tiempo pretérito el pasado en que los Estados tenían competencia exclusiva en la materia.

La segunda, porque una mayoría clara de este Parlamento Europeo, con muchas resistencias, viene sosteniendo un enfoque integral completo que dé cuenta de la dimensión exterior, con cooperación al desarrollo y ayuda humanitaria, pero también de la dimensión fronteriza, atacando el tráfico ilícito y combatiendo a los traficantes de personas, y que, al mismo tiempo, dé cuenta de la dimensión interior, con un trato respetuoso y digno y conforme al Derecho europeo de las personas que llegan a la Unión Europea, con una distribución que esté regida por los principios de responsabilidad compartida y de solidaridad. Solidaridad vinculante cuando sea necesaria.

Y la tercera razón es que tenemos precisamente una oportunidad de hacerlo con el Nuevo Pacto sobre Migración y Asilo. Y esto sale al paso de las respuestas siempre parciales, fragmentarias y en la dirección equivocada que pretenden que la solución estaría en la externalización de las demandas de asilo o la condicionalidad de los fondos europeos a retornos que sean indignos y no voluntarios. Los retornos son parte del sistema, pero tienen que ser retornos dignos y voluntarios y respetuosos con el Derecho internacional humanitario, con la legalidad europea, con los valores europeos. Porque es la única forma de construir una respuesta europea y eficaz.

Fabienne Keller, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Ministre Jessika Roswall, les propositions de l'extrême droite face au défi migratoire se résument dans le titre de ce débat, voulu par le groupe de Monsieur Bardella. Il faudrait renvoyer les demandeurs d'asile loin de chez nous et faire du bâton notre seul outil de politique étrangère. Avec vous, on fermerait la porte aux familles ukrainiennes, aux femmes et aux filles afghanes, qui fuient la guerre et les traitements les plus horribles. De toute évidence, nous ne partageons pas les mêmes valeurs. Et quand bien même la morale humaine n'est pas dans votre radar, vos propositions sont un énième mirage.

Les tentatives d'externalisation des demandeurs d'asile par le Royaume-Uni, comme par le Danemark, sont un échec: pas un demandeur d'asile n'a été renvoyé au Rwanda. Avec mon groupe Renew Europe, avec d'autres groupes autour du centre de ce Parlement, nous considérons, au contraire, que la dimension extérieure de la migration est un pilier central, comme vous l'avez dit Monsieur le Commissaire, du Pacte européen sur l'asile et la migration. Ce pacte, Mesdames et Messieurs, que vous avez rejeté lors du vote en avril dernier. Nous plaçons pour bâtir au niveau européen des partenariats globaux mutuellement bénéfiques avec les principaux pays tiers d'origine et de transit des migrations. Ce travail est déjà à l'œuvre, Madame la Ministre, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous l'avez rappelé.

Nous défendons l'établissement d'un dialogue continu avec nos partenaires extérieurs et d'une aide opérationnelle résolue de l'Union européenne pour combattre les réseaux de passeurs. Bien sûr, ça vous gêne qu'il y ait de vraies réponses qui sont une solution à une perspective européenne. Nous proposons d'intensifier les retours volontaires beaucoup plus efficaces. J'en suis convaincue avec mon groupe, c'est en européens, Mesdames et Messieurs, que nous agissons efficacement face au défi migratoire.

Die Präsidentin. – Ich sage jetzt zu all jenen, die Zwischenrufe starten: Unterlassen Sie das! Hören Sie den europäischen Abgeordneten zu, die am Rednerpult stehen, und respektieren Sie die Würde des Hauses!

Tineke Strik, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Council, Commission, more than four years ago, most states worldwide committed to offer refugees sustainable protection and future and to guarantee equitable responsibility sharing because the largest hosting countries cannot be left alone.

And look at us now. It has become common to call for fences, to push back refugees and deny their rights, and conclude shady deals with repressive regimes, leaving the protection for refugees to them. The EU slogan is: 'Break the business model of smugglers.' But what we do is feeding them by blocking all pathways to protection. And we even pay the Libyan coast guard, identified by the UN as smugglers and traffickers conducting crimes against humanity. The EU slogan is: 'Avoid dangerous routes.' But the Rwanda deal of Denmark says it all. Even people identified as refugees in those outsourced asylum procedures are still not welcome on the Danish soil.

Colleagues, the world is too small to turn your backs on refugees, on common responsibilities. Don't fool yourself, don't fool your voters, and don't betray our values.

Vincenzo Sofo, a nome del gruppo ECR. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, rispondo intanto innanzitutto al mio collega del PPE perché, forse, una ragione la presenza del Commissario europeo all'Agricoltura ce l'ha in un dibattito sull'immigrazione, visto che la maggior parte dei migranti che arrivano irregolarmente in Europa poi vengono utilizzati come schiavi nei nostri campi a raccogliere le arance e a fare la manodopera per quattro soldi.

Nel 2022 sono arrivati 330 000 migranti irregolari e ne sono stati trovati illegalmente all'interno dell'UE oltre un milione, numeri che certificano una crisi migratoria di proporzioni gigantesche, con flussi migratori aumentati in un solo anno del 59 %, con punte del 108 % per quanto riguarda il Mediterraneo e del 136 % per quanto riguarda i Balcani occidentali, quindi aumentando del 50 % il numero di domande di asilo, che sono arrivate a quasi un milione.

Nonostante ogni anno a circa mezzo milione di queste persone venga però ordinato di lasciare il territorio, poiché non aventi diritto d'asilo, nel 2022, tanto per fare un esempio, a essere stati poi effettivamente rimpatriati sono stati meno di 80 000 clandestini.

Cifre irrisorie che dimostrano che a essere inefficace non sia la politica migratoria del governo italiano, come ha grottescamente affermato il ministro di Macron, Gérald Darmanin, facendosi smentire persino dal Commissario europeo Johansson, poiché nessuna nazione da sola ha la forza di affrontare un'emergenza del genere.

A essere inefficace, semmai, è stata la politica migratoria dell'Unione europea, poiché l'unica soluzione possibile è appunto una soluzione europea e a rilevarlo è persino la Corte dei conti europea, che ha denunciato gli scarsi progressi fatti dall'UE nel concludere i negoziati con i paesi terzi, sottolineando la poca sinergia tra Stati membri e la poca capacità di mettere in campo le azioni necessarie per indurre i paesi terzi a occuparsi della riammissione dei loro cittadini.

D'altronde basta ricordare che l'UE è il maggiore donatore al mondo di aiuto allo sviluppo, fornendo il 43 % dei fondi mondiali, una cifra che nel 2021 ha raggiunto i 70 miliardi di EUR ma che non siamo riusciti a far fruttare né in termini di influenza geopolitica nei paesi beneficiari e neppure in termini di semplici accordi di gestione efficace dei flussi migratori.

Quindi, insomma, un vero disastro politico sul quale finalmente, grazie anche all'Italia, sempre più governi stanno aprendo gli occhi, chiedendo quindi di riformare le norme che regolano le politiche migratorie europee. Norme che necessitano di una cooperazione con paesi terzi, da subordinare però alla loro disponibilità di salvaguardare l'integrità delle nostre frontiere.

Azioni essenziali per la tenuta economica e identitaria dell'Europa che però sono ostaggio dei partiti di sinistra presenti in questo Parlamento, disposti a far esplodere bombe sociali nei propri territori pur di ingrassare le tasche di qualche affarista dell'immigrazione.

Annalisa Tardino, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, controlli alle frontiere esterne, e non a Lampedusa, e rimpatri: questo chiediamo da quattro anni.

Finalmente ci si concede un dibattito che chiede un nuovo approccio e la sinistra estrema decide di boicottarlo, non inviando deputati a prendere la parola. La stessa sinistra che fa proclami e grida allo scandalo per le stragi in mare oggi si astiene in Aula, perché la vera intenzione è mantenere lo status quo e fare affari con il business dell'immigrazione clandestina. Credo sia un comportamento vergognoso che non rispetti non solo quest'Aula, ma nemmeno i cittadini, loro elettori.

Da tempo chiediamo che le procedure di asilo si svolgano prima dell'ingresso nel territorio europeo e in Nord Africa per gli ingressi via mare, con personale delle agenzie europee nel rispetto dei diritti, per eliminare arrivi massicci e viaggi della speranza.

Ben venga che adesso molti governi e persino i socialisti tedeschi ci diano finalmente ragione. Ben vengano iniziative europee concrete per dare risposte all'emergenza immigrazione, come chiediamo da anni, ma vogliamo il vostro aiuto per fermare le partenze attraverso una maggiore cooperazione da parte di paesi terzi e la certezza sui rimpatri.

In Europa, anche grazie al nostro governo, siamo al lavoro affinché si diano le giuste risposte ai cittadini, che chiedono sicurezza e un'immigrazione legale e controllata.

Gli altri, invece, preferiscono continuare con hotspot stracolmi, morti in mare, delinquenze e aiuto ai criminali che si arricchiscono sulle spalle delle persone. Diciamo basta, finalmente!

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! Dass es solch eine Debatte ins Plenum geschafft hat, eine Debatte, die offen zum Bruch von EU— und internationalem Recht auffordert, die zu illegalen Handlungen aufruft und von einem geradezu penetranten neokolonialen Gestus geprägt wird. Das ist eine Schande für dieses Parlament, meine Damen und Herren!

Wer Asylverfahren auslagern, Drittstaaten finanziell erpressen will, um möglichst viele Menschen loszuwerden, wirft die Menschenrechte in die Tonne und schafft das individuelle Recht auf Asyl ab. Das wollen wir nicht! Sie sind besessen vom Abschiebewahn und ergötzen sich in Ihren zutiefst rassistischen Fantasien.

Ich warne die Kommission davor, und im Übrigen auch den Rat, sich zu Erfüllungsgehilfen der Rechten zu machen und mit einem Vorschlag doch noch irgendwie um die Ecke zu kommen, der solchen Fantasien die Türen öffnet. Werden Sie bitte schön – die Kommission – Ihrer Rolle als Hüterin der Verträge gerecht; hier wäre es wirklich wichtig.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Madam President, dear colleagues, instead of the ill-conceived and long-indulgent EU position on migration, Europe needs a policy based on strong border control, the elimination of asylum abuses and support for third countries together. The proposal to examine asylum applications outside of Europe has been a long-standing Hungarian position. All that's needed now is political will to implement it. Initiatives in this regard in Denmark, the UK, Italy and – most recently and most interestingly – Germany are steps, I think, in the right direction.

If Europe wants to have real refugees, it has to differentiate between them and economic migrants. The systematic abuse of the asylum system must end and Europe should not tolerate illegal entry into its own territory. While Europe should give support to third countries, that support cannot be unconditional. Third countries must cooperate. They have to prevent illegal migration out of those countries and they have to readmit those returned from Europe.

Die Präsidentin. – Bevor ich der nächsten Abgeordneten, Frau Lena Düpont, das Wort erteile, möchte ich noch einmal alle im Haus an unsere eigenen Regeln erinnern, die wir uns gesetzt haben, nämlich dass die Aussprache von Würde und Respekt getragen sein soll, und darauf weise ich jetzt hin.

Gleichfalls auch darauf, dass jetzt die Sprecherinnen und Sprecher für die Fraktionen jeweils ein bisschen länger gesprochen haben. Ich kündige nur an, mit allen gleichermaßen zu verfahren und 10 Sekunden quasi nach Überziehen der Zeit das Wort dann zu entziehen. Also nur, dass Sie schon Bescheid wissen.

Lena Düpont (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Was für ein Schauspiel! Erst sich kaum an Verhandlungen beteiligen, dann Abstimmungen boykottieren und dann behaupten, schon immer für Inhalte eingestanden zu haben. Werte Kollegen, dieser Pakt zu Asyl und Migration wird mit parlamentarischer Arbeit, mit Ringen zwischen den Fraktionen in der Mitte des Hauses entschieden.

Wo stehen wir also? Im Mandat ist die externe Dimension enthalten. Wir machen deutlich, dass wir eine Kooperation auf Augenhöhe wollen. Auch Drittstaaten tragen eine Verantwortung für Menschen auf der Flucht. Dafür haben wir zahlreiche Instrumente an der Hand – sie sind heute schon genannt worden. All das sind vielversprechende Hebel, wenn sie mit Anreizen und Konditionen verbunden sind. Die Erwartungshaltung auf allen Seiten muss klar sein.

Als EVP haben wir immer klargemacht, dass wir eine frühestmögliche Entscheidung über Schutzbedürftigkeit haben wollen, um alle Beteiligten aus dem *legal limbo* herauszuholen. Unseren Anspruch an Humanität können wir am besten in geordneten Verhältnissen aufrechterhalten. Richtung Berlin kann ich da nur sagen: Herzlich willkommen in der Regierungsverantwortung!

Pietro Bartolo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo dibattito è surreale.

Ma cosa volete esternalizzare? Smettetela di inventarvi soluzioni impraticabili dal punto di vista giuridico e umanitario e ammettete chiaramente che voi, queste persone, non le volete.

Che queste persone muoiano in mare, che vengano rinchiusi nei lager, che vengano rispediti nei luoghi da quali fuggono per voi è indifferente, l'unica cosa che vi interessa è di non averle qui per poi prendervi cura di loro o, peggio ancora, per non dovere rischiare la «sostituzione etnica». Vergognatevi. La vostra disumanità mi disgusta.

Signora Presidente, non solo non utilizzo interamente il minuto a mia disposizione ma esco anche da quest'Aula, perché non voglio e non serve ascoltare quello che hanno ancora da dire.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Gestern haben wir den Europatag gefeiert. Diese Europäische Union ist eine direkte Reaktion auf das, was in diesem Zweiten Weltkrieg geschehen ist. Wir haben beschlossen, dass wir zusammenarbeiten, damit so etwas Schreckliches nicht wieder passieren kann. Aus dem Zweiten Weltkrieg haben wir eine zweite Lehre gezogen, nämlich aufgrund der Tatsache, dass die Nazis Menschen verfolgt haben – aufgrund ihrer sexuellen Orientierung, ihrer Religion, ihrer Nationalität, ihrer Herkunft –, gibt es das Asylrecht.

Diese Europäische Union ist ein Ort der Freiheit und der Demokratie und der Menschenwürde für alle diejenigen auf der Welt, die verfolgt werden aufgrund eben dieser Gründe, aus denen die Nazis andere Menschen verfolgt haben in Europa. Deswegen ist dieses Asylrecht auch nicht verhandelbar. Wer es verhandeln möchte, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wie die Faschisten von heute das Asylrecht nicht mehr wollen, der verlässt den europäischen Wertekonsens.

Für mich ist klar, dass dieser Asyl- und Migrationspakt den europäischen Wertekonsens verteidigen muss. Mit der Zuwanderung qualifizierter, Frau Präsidentin, mit der Rückführung derjenigen, die kein Asylrecht haben, aber auch mithilfe von denjenigen ...

(Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Damien Carême (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, l'extrême droite nous impose sans honte ce débat et ses propos nauséabonds, alors que nous célébrions hier les valeurs de l'Europe, et commémorons lundi le lourd héritage sur lequel notre Union s'est bâtie. Jusqu'où repousserons-nous les limites de l'indécence? Plutôt que de l'ignorer, mesurons la gravité du moment. Partout en Europe, la rhétorique dangereuse de l'extrême droite imprègne les discours et politiques. Quand allez-vous mettre un terme à cette fuite en avant, Monsieur le Commissaire? Sûrement pas en cautionnant cette obsession pathologique des retours, et en se rendant en Tunisie et ailleurs pour participer à des marchandages dangereux avec des pays tiers, comme l'a fait récemment la commissaire Johansson.

Que reste-t-il de nos valeurs quand le PPE appelle la Commission à financer des murs, quand ils s'érigent déjà sur plus de 2 000 kilomètres en Europe? Que reste-t-il de notre humanité quand une barge est installée dans un port pour enfermer durant des mois des demandeurs d'asile lorsqu'on ne peut pas directement les renvoyer au Rwanda?

Pour parfaire notre forteresse Europe, nous violons le droit, dépensons des milliards pour nous calfeutrer, mais surtout nous brisons des milliers de vies. Les appels à s'affranchir de nos obligations internationales se multiplient partout, sans conséquences. Il est temps pour nous, Parlement, Commission et Conseil, d'agir et de rappeler que nous ne transigerons jamais sur nos valeurs, en matière migratoire comme ailleurs, ou alors l'Europe aura échoué.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Jesteśmy cały czas poddani presji migracyjnej. Jednym z kluczowych elementów powstrzymania tej presji jest sprawny system powrotów dla nielegalnych imigrantów. Tymczasem ten system wymaga pilnej zmiany, ponieważ wnioski nie są realizowane. Tylko w ciągu ostatnich miesięcy wydano prawie 124 tys. nakazów powrotów. Statystyki są powalające. Realizujemy mniej niż 30% z nich. Nielegalni imigranci, wykorzystując luki, przedzierają się przez granicę, migrują wewnątrz między państwami, uciekając przed realizacją nakazu opuszczenia terytorium Unii Europejskiej.

Potrzebujemy twardego prawa, które będzie działać. Niestety wszelkie głosy w sprawie usprawnienia procesu powrotu giną w krzyku unijnej lewicy i jej nierealnych pomysłów, których cel jest tylko jeden – maksymalnie osłabić odporność państw Unii Europejskiej przed kolejnymi falami migrantów i przebudować społeczeństwo. Chcę bardzo podziękować, Pani Przewodnicząca, za zwrócenie uwagi, bo nikt w tej izbie nie zasługuje na to, żeby z tego miejsca, a tym bardziej prawica, krzyczeć, że mamy rasistowskie fantazje albo jesteśmy opętani. Dziękuję za to zwrócenie uwagi. Nie pozwólmy na to.

Tom Vandendriessche (ID). – Voorzitter, collega's, wij worden overspoeld door ongewenste migratie. Miljoenen komen naar Europa. Zij vluchten helemaal niet voor oorlog, want minstens twee derde van hen zijn asielbedriegers. Ze komen naar hier omdat ze allerhande sociale en financiële voordelen kunnen ontvangen zonder er ooit aan bijgedragen te hebben. Het gevolg is een asielchaos die het perfide businessmodel van de mensensmokkel in stand houdt, onveiligheid betekent voor onze mensen en ons sociaal systeem ondermijnt. Dit is onhoudbaar.

De Europese Unie weigert onze buitengrenzen te beschermen. Integendeel. Met het EU-migratiepact wil ze doelbewust miljoenen jaarlijks naar Europa halen. Dat is niet duurzaam.

Asielrecht is een humanitaire opdracht. Om dat asielrecht opnieuw houdbaar en duurzaam te maken, is een fundamenteel ander migratiemodel nodig. Het recht op asiel betekent geen recht op verblijf. Opvang moet daarom per definitie in eigen regio. Wie illegaal onze thuislanden binnendringt, moet elk recht op asiel verliezen. Ontwikkelingssamenwerking en handel moeten we afhankelijk maken van de bereidheid illegalen terug te nemen en migratie actief mee te helpen bestrijden. Een duurzaam, houdbaar en vooral humaan asielbeleid is wel degelijk mogelijk.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, we'll hear a lot of fearmongering today, but the EU should take responsibility for the violations of human rights that take place on its borders day after day, and for its partnerships with third countries.

The Melilla massacre resulted in disappearances and deaths. You want to talk about pushbacks? Well, Moroccan police entered Spanish land, dragged lifeless bodies out of the Spanish control area, and migrants were pushed back to Morocco. The Spanish police acted in complacency with the Moroccan police. Is this what we call cooperation? No one has been held accountable so far.

A smart migration policy is one that can demand complex measures to third parties because one is responsible for one's own duties. This starts by holding Member States accountable instead of looking the other way.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kolegice i kolege. Europa je danas pod sve snažnijim migracijskim pritiskom, pogotovo države članice koje su na vanjskoj granici, uključujući i moju državu Hrvatsku.

Azil – međunarodno pravo na zaštitu – se dramatično zloupotrebljava diljem Europe i to je činjenica. Imamo zato obvezu svi zajedno i ovdje, u Europskom parlamentu, u drugim europskim institucijama, u europskom društvu, pristupiti ovom pitanju trezveno, pristupiti ovom pitanju zajedno i maknuti pritisak s naših granica.

Danas postavljamo pravila za ubuduće. Treba nam svima zajedno malo više zajedništva, malo više odgovornosti, a malo manje ideološke ostrašćenosti. Treba nam malo više strateškog promišljanja, a malo manje emotivnih ucjena, jer u konačnici riječ je o sigurnosti naših granica. O sigurnosti našeg teritorija i o sigurnosti cijele Europe.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, o tema que, hoje, nos é aqui trazido a debate é absolutamente degradante e lamentável e é promovido por uma extrema-direita cuja retórica incendiária e tóxica nos deve envergonhar a todos.

Os migrantes e refugiados não são mercadoria. São pessoas. Não são uma moeda de troca e a nossa política externa e de cooperação e desenvolvimento não é uma política de trocas neste sentido. Os nossos valores, os valores da solidariedade, da defesa da dignidade humana, da defesa do direito ao asilo não estão à venda.

Caros Colegas, àqueles que, aqui e lá fora, procuram impor a narrativa do ódio, do medo e com isso capturar a opinião pública dizemos: não passarão. Em nome da solidariedade, da proteção e do acolhimento daqueles que procuram uma oportunidade de vida em condições de segurança e dignidade: não passarão!

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, the offer of EU development funding in return for cooperation on returns and readmissions is based on a myth. A myth that such funding can tackle the root causes of migration. The evidence shows that such interventions actually increase irregular population movements in the short term.

Why is it controversial to come in here to this hemicycle and insist that we base our policy on evidence and research?

If you want to know what externalising European asylum policy looks like, let's just look at the case of the RSF in Sudan. They have received EU funding to manage migration policy on the Libya-Sudan border. This is the RSF, the successor of the Janjaweed that stands accused by the ICC of genocide. And they are the people that we are outsourcing our migration policy to. That's what externalising looks like. It looks like what happens in Libyan detention centres, where their gross violations of human rights.

So what we need to do is honestly face this issue, express solidarity with those who are facing the challenges, and we also need to bring in the European Asylum and Migration Pact.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, this is now the second plenary in a row where we hear this far-right kind of fearmongering about migration. And it's clear because, in the end, this is the only topic that actually drives your voter base. You take a highly complex issue and you trying to propose inhumane, complex and unpractical solutions. I have seen it with the AfD: it was a dying party but then they took the issue of migration and try to grow on that.

But we have to be honest to our citizens: the real solutions don't lie there. We already fund third countries like Libya – actually militias over there – to build camps, to host people there. And we see murder, we see rape and we do not see a humane solution. So if we want to really defend the European way of life, our European values, we have to find solutions that are actually in accordance with that. So let's find a European asylum system with a European asylum application. And then I'm sure the far right will deflate like a popped balloon.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señora presidente, cuatro cosas voy a decir: la norma, el dato, la realidad y la solución.

La norma dice que las fronteras exteriores solo podrán cruzarse por los pasos habilitados y con la documentación exigida, y que los Estados miembros ordenarán la expulsión de cualquier persona de un tercer país que haya entrado irregularmente en territorio europeo. Pero no se puede expulsar al que ha solicitado protección internacional.

El dato es que en España en 2022 se presentaron 118 000 solicitudes de protección internacional, casi el doble que el año anterior. Y solo tenían derecho algo más de 14 000, ni siquiera el 10 %. De todas ellas, 114 000 se presentaron cuando ya estaban los inmigrantes en territorio nacional español —no lo pidieron en el puesto habilitado al efecto— o con sus permisos temporales caducados o cuando les detenía la policía.

La realidad es que estamos ante un fraude masivo realizado con conocimiento de las autoridades, una quiebra de la legalidad, un negocio para las ONG y un riesgo para toda Europa.

La solución es que las peticiones de asilo se realicen y tramiten en Estados terceros para que no se haga cuando ya están en territorio europeo y evitemos el problema. Que se condicionen la ayuda y las exenciones de visado al establecimiento de acuerdos de retorno.

Nuestro dato mata su relato. Nosotros, defendiendo la ley y Europa, ustedes, defendiendo los intereses de los explotadores.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear lady from Sweden, first of all, I remember very well: it was 2020 in September in the LIBE Committee, where our Commissioner, Ms Ylva Johansson, were introducing the migration pact. She stated very clearly that we need migration pact because we need the legalised ways to come to Europe from the third countries, especially from Africa and Middle East, because we are getting old in Europe, and we need new people because demography is in the minus.

So this is one of the reasons why we need a migration pact. But I've never heard from the Commission, I've never heard from the Member States, that we need the European way to solve the problem with the demography, how to get more kids. Just now, the statistics are very clear: 1.5 kids per female in Germany, 1.4 in Italy. So we are just dying out. And, if the main solution from the Commission is just to replace with the people from the third countries, then good luck with the European way of life. This is not my Europe.

About the numbers: if the migration will follow as it is in Germany, and if demography will stay in the minus, in eight years, in 2100, there will be about 40 million non-Germans and 35 million so-called Germans.

So I think this is not the way how to go forward, because even yesterday there was Europe Day. And the father, Mr Robert Schuman, he was Christian and he stated very clearly on the 1950s, European family has to be based on the Christian values, and ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Nicolas Bay (NI). – Madame la Présidente, le chaos migratoire est là, installé sans interruption depuis 2015. L'Europe et l'Italie en première ligne sont menacées aujourd'hui de submersion. Courageusement, Giorgia Meloni est lucide et fait face, alors qu'il y a quelques mois seulement, Emmanuel Macron se précipitait pour accueillir l'Ocean Viking et ses clandestins à Toulon. Gérald Darmanin, qui ose tout, prétend aujourd'hui faire la leçon à l'Italie alors qu'il se laisse lui-même humilier par un micro-pays comme les Comores.

Certains ici voient l'immigration comme une fatalité, voire comme une opportunité. Mais l'immense majorité des 450 millions d'Européens exige que leur identité et leur sécurité soient enfin défendues. Tarir les flux migratoires et inverser la tendance est possible. Cela nécessite une vraie volonté politique et, enfin, de la fermeté.

Les solutions, nous les connaissons: installer et financer des centres hors d'Europe pour les demandeurs d'asile, démanteler les mafias de passeurs et contrôler les ONG, expulser systématiquement tous les clandestins sans permettre leur régularisation et obliger leur pays d'origine à les récupérer. Certains diront bien sûr que ces pays n'accepteront jamais, mais nous pouvons les y contraindre diplomatiquement et économiquement. Imposons nos conditions au lieu de toujours nous soumettre aux leurs. Il faudra que l'Europe tout entière se montre ferme si elle veut survivre.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Das Asyl- und Migrationsthema ist eine europäische Herausforderung, die auch einer europäischen Lösung bedarf. Leider haben wir in den letzten Jahren auf europäischer Ebene keine Antwort auf steigende Migrationsströme nach Europa gefunden. Eine Ausrichtung der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit an Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung der Ursachen von Migration ist mit Sicherheit der richtige Schritt.

Auch Rückführungsabkommen sind ein wichtiger Meilenstein in der Asylpolitik, und viele Länder berücksichtigen bereits die Einhaltung dieser Abkommen bei ihrer Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Jedoch jegliche Hilfe, wie wir es heute hier gehört haben, zu verweigern, wäre der Schritt in die falsche Richtung, da Notsituationen in Drittstaaten noch verschlimmert werden könnten. Dennoch ist eine stufenweise Konditionalität von Mittelvergabe und Einhaltung von Verträgen durch Drittstaaten vorstellbar. Denn es liegt auch in der Verantwortung der Drittstaaten, unsere EZA-Mittel effektiv für die Menschen vor Ort zu verwenden, damit es weniger Druck gibt, das Land zu verlassen.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Voorzitter, Commissie, Raad, collega's. Ja, ook ik schaam me, net als veel collega's, voor het feit dat hier zelfs omvolkingstheorieën in het debat worden ingebracht. Het is een schande voor dit Parlement. Maar wij, de redelijke krachten, zijn met veel meer.

Een Deens asielverzoek behandelen in Rwanda: het is zo bizar dat ik het niet eens ga bespreken. We weten al lang – en u weet het ook – dat het niet werkt, dat verdragen zich ertegen verzetten, dat humaniteit zich ertegen verzet en dat het ontzettend veel geld kost.

Dat een extreemrechtse fractie van makelaars in angst dit debat aanvraagt, verbaast me niet. Maar ik hoop nooit te hoeven wennen aan het overnemen van deze retoriek door anderen, door wie dan ook. Want het enige wat werkt, is werken en onze energie geven aan oplossingen die wel werken.

Dus Commissie en lidstaten, laat u niet afleiden door dit kleine groepje makelaars in angst. Stop met het dehumaniseren en angst aanjagen. Verdedig de verdragen, de grondrechten en werk aan draagvlak. Dat draagvlak is er.

Assita Kanko (ECR). – Voorzitter, in heel Europa worstelt men met het migratie- en asielbeleid, maar als je over oplossingen wilt praten, ben je extreemrechts. Als je wilt voortmodderen, ben je een held. Waar zijn wij mee bezig?

Ik heb het gehad met de hypocrisie van links en van bepaalde ngo's. Ik heb het gehad met de taboes die echte oplossingen in de weg staan. Hoeveel mensen moeten nog sterven voordat de oogkleppen worden afgedaan? Waarom ziet men niet hoe racistisch de linkse houding en het opengrenzenbeleid is?

Een Europese paradigmashift voor migratie en asiel is nodig om te vermijden dat steeds meer onschuldige mensen sterven in hun zoektocht naar een ander leven. Asielbeleid moet buiten de EU starten in de landen van herkomst of in de buurt. Wat vluchtelingen nodig hebben, is een veilige plek om te verblijven. Die plek is niet per se in Europa. Dit beleid moeten we combineren met strategische bijdragen aan globale veiligheid, want de wereld is een geheel waar ook Europa toe behoort.

We moeten als EU moediger worden. Zo geven wij Europa nog een toekomst.

Silvia Sardone (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, veniamo da anni in cui in questo Parlamento sono stati invitati personaggi come Carola Rackete a pontificare in maniera patetica sull'immigrazione e sull'accoglienza.

Da troppo tempo ci aspettiamo strategie nuove da parte della Commissione europea, che invece purtroppo è succube dei buonisti di sinistra e di coloro che puntano a porte aperte per tutti i migranti.

A marzo, dopo la tragedia in mare in Italia, abbiamo visto la Presidente della Commissione dire: «sull'immigrazione servono soluzioni europee». Ben svegliata, considerando che in questi quattro anni nulla è stato fatto.

Poi abbiamo sentito il Presidente del Consiglio Michel che ha promesso: «lavoriamo per arrivare entro la fine del mandato a un patto europeo sulla migrazione e l'asilo, dobbiamo farlo per lottare insieme contro i criminali che speculano sulla miseria». Parole, solo parole in tutti questi anni e solo adesso, tra l'altro, venite sulle nostre posizioni. Ricordiamo che Matteo Salvini, per aver difeso i confini dell'Italia e quindi dell'Europa, è ancora sotto processo.

Ora, finalmente, in Parlamento arriva un dibattito che si concentra sul fermare l'immigrazione irregolare e non alimentarla come vuole la sinistra. Da anni noi diciamo che servono hotspot nei paesi del Nord Africa e che le domande di asilo devono essere trattate negli Stati terzi.

Noi crediamo che l'Europa dovrebbe attivarsi per legare gli aiuti economici ai paesi africani a precisi impegni sui rimpatri dei migranti irregolari e a misure per contrastare le partenze dei barconi.

Il tempo delle promesse e dei vostri slogan è finito, sull'immigrazione bisogna muoversi, lo chiedono i cittadini europei.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il tentativo di ridurre la pressione migratoria verso l'Unione europea non dovrebbe mai tradursi in misure che impediscono di richiedere protezione internazionale in un territorio sicuro, esponendo quindi a rischi di detenzione arbitraria, violenze e discriminazione.

Questo succede soprattutto quando si preferisce delocalizzare l'asilo, il controllo dei flussi migratori e delle frontiere, eludendo strategicamente obblighi internazionali e trasferendo le responsabilità altrove.

Oggi l'Unione europea tende a prevenire arrivi irregolari e aumentare i rimpatri concentrando gli sforzi su pratiche di esternalizzazione e cooperazione con Stati terzi, sulla base di logiche di scambio riguardanti finanziamenti condizionati e altri strumenti.

Da anni tentiamo di colmare le carenze delle nostre politiche nell'assicurare una migrazione ordinata, sicura e fondata su solidarietà ed equa ripartizione delle responsabilità.

Le nostre risorse finanziarie dovrebbero essere ugualmente utilizzate per diversi aspetti dei processi migratori, come le loro cause profonde, lo sviluppo locale, le vie legali di accesso.

Non alimentiamo la dipendenza da paesi con tutele dei diritti umani inadeguate e da cui si corre il rischio di subire ricatti.

Nadine Morano (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, je suis heureuse aujourd’hui parce que je rentre du Danemark où j’ai passé trois journées de travail intensives, où je suis allée voir les centres de retour et cette politique ferme, décidée par un gouvernement social-démocrate, mais dans une cohésion nationale et politique qui devrait faire rêver l’ensemble de notre hémicycle.

J’invite d’ailleurs les socialistes et les Verts à y aller faire un petit stage de formation. J’observe d’ailleurs que les députés socialistes danois votent contre les socialistes de ce Parlement européen, notamment contre Monsieur López Aguilar, et qu’ils votent avec Nadine Morano.

Alors oui, je pense qu’il faut externaliser les demandes d’asile. Oui, je pense qu’il faut conditionner nos aides au développement du continent africain à la maîtrise de leurs politiques migratoires, et qu’il faut même donner une surprime à ceux qui y contribuent.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Sur President, Saleh – isem li qed nuza biex niproteġi l-identità ta’ ġuwni ta’ 24 sena mill-Jemen – ġie ppersegwitat, stuprat għall-ikel, miżmum at *gunpoint* minn min suppost kellu jiproteġih wara li l-ġenituri tiegħu keċċewh mid-dar għax hu gay fl-età ta’ 18-il sena. Għex fl-għerien, kiel miż-żibel, raqad fuq il-bankini fil-Jemen, u issa fl-Eġittu, fejn qieghed bħalissa, wara li għennih jahrab mill-Jemen.

Skont intom, dan għandu japplika għall-ażil minn pajjiż illi lanqas biss jirrikonoxxi; skont intom, dan għandu jaġmel minn kolloxx biex jibqa’ fejn hu minkejja li qed jiġi ppersegwitat u kważi maqtul ta’ kuljum. Idealment hadd ma jkollu għalfejn jahrab minn pajjiżu, hadd ma jkollu għalfejn jahrab mill-gwerer u hadd ma jkollu għalfejn jahrab il-perseguzzjoni imma dik mhijiex il-verità, dik mhix ir-realtà ta’ dawn in-nies.

Intom tal-lemin estrem, li ilkom tgħidu li dawn għandhom japplikaw għall-ażil minn dawn il-pajjiżi, lesti li tgħinu lil dan il-ġuwni? Lesti li tingħaqdu miegħi u m’ohrajn sabiex naraw illi dan il-ġuwni jkollu hajtu protetta u jkun fl-Ewropa, fejn jista’ jgħix ta’ dak illi verament hu? Probabbilment le, għax lanqas biss temmnu li ahna l-Ewropej għandu jkollna dad-drittijiet fundamentali u l-ugwaljanza.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu ! Potrzebujemy efektywnej polityki migracyjnej i azylowej. Ale czego możemy spodziewać się po zarówno lewej stronie Parlamentu, jak i propozycjach Komisji Europejskiej?

Popatrzmy, jak wyglądała sytuacja w Polsce, która przyjęła w pierwszych miesiącach wojny ponad 9 milionów uchodźców wojennych. Jak zachowała się Komisja Europejska? Jakiego udzieliła wsparcia? Oprócz słów pełnych wzruszenia i opowieści o tym, jak bardzo przewodnicząca Komisji, jak i komisarz Johansson są poruszone sytuacją uchodźców wojennych, tak naprawdę Polska nie otrzymała odpowiedniej, adekwatnej pomocy na zabezpieczenie podstawowych potrzeb uchodźców wojennych.

Popatrzmy na sposób zarządzania przez Komisję Europejską, przez panią przewodniczącą, przydziałem komisarzy do odpowiednich debat. Dziś z krytyką spotyka się komisarz Wojciechowski? Przecież to jest odpowiedzialność szefowej Komisji Europejskiej, kogo do jakiej debaty dedykuje.

To pokazuje, że Ursula von der Leyen nawet nad tym nie panuje. Zatem krytyka posłów niemieckich z EPL-u względem zarządzania Komisją również w tym zakresie jest w pełni uzasadniona.

Bernhard Zimniok (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Die Migration ist die Schicksalsfrage unseres Kontinents. Die katastrophale Energie- und Wirtschaftspolitik können wir reparieren, den ganzen Genderschwachsinn wieder abschaffen. Wenn wir aber diese Migrationspolitik fortsetzen, werden wir in absehbarer Zeit die Minderheit in unserem Lande sein. Dann ist es zu spät für Kurskorrekturen. Die Bürger wollen keine Islamisierung, keine ständigen Messermorde und keine Sexualverbrechen. Werte Kollegen, begreifen Sie endlich: Multikulti, wie es hier praktiziert wird, ist gescheitert.

Insofern wäre es ein guter Anfang, wie vorgeschlagen, Asylzentren außerhalb Europas einzurichten und die Entwicklungshilfe an die Umsetzung von Rückführungsabkommen zu koppeln – was wir übrigens schon seit Jahren fordern. Aber um die Migrationskrise wirklich zu lösen, braucht es mehr als das. Erst letzte Woche habe ich deshalb ein neues Asylkonzept fertiggestellt und die Lösungen zur Rettung Europas darin vorgestellt. Wichtige Maßnahmen sind ein sofortiger Einreisestopp und eine Abschiebeoffensive, um die Abermillionen an kulturfremden und größtenteils unqualifizierten Migranten zurückzuführen. Kein einziger Asylbewerber darf mehr einen Fuß nach Europa setzen.

Das heißt aber nicht, dass wir tatsächlich Verfolgten nicht helfen wollen. Natürlich nicht! Wir helfen ihnen vor Ort und gewähren ihnen Schutz in kultur- und sprachnahen Partnerländern. So helfen wir den wahren Flüchtlingen und unterbinden die Migration in unsere Sozialsysteme. Ich appelliere an Sie: Handeln wir endlich, bevor es zu spät ist!

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštivanje pravnog poretka je temelj Europske unije. Sve države članice ilegalni prelazak državnih granica smatraju teškim kaznenim i prekršajnim djelom. Za njih su predviđene kazne zatvora i visoke novčane kazne.

Sada, ekstremna ljevica u ovom parlamentu predvođena EPP-om, Renew-om i SND-om, umjesto da zahtijeva poštivanje pravnog poretka i da se vode milijuni kaznenih postupaka protiv počinitelja kaznenih djela koji su ilegalno prešli naše granice, oni sada od nas zahtijevaju da mi kršimo vlastite propise, ne pokrećemo kaznene i prekršajne postupke, tim ljudima i tim kriminalcima dajemo stanove, dajemo radna mjesta, oduzimamo ih građanima Europske unije. Jel to to? Jel to moderna Europa? Ekstremna ljevica je, predvođena EPP-om, opasna po ovu Europu.

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señora presidenta, los autócratas han convertido la migración en un arma, las mafias la han convertido en un negocio, los terroristas en una oportunidad y los populistas de uno y otro lado en un instrumento de presión política.

Frente a todos ellos, frente a aquellos que pretenden usar las tragedias ajenas para su propio beneficio, Europa debe responder con determinación. Porque tenemos la obligación de dar garantías a quienes necesitan protección internacional, pero también debemos proteger nuestras fronteras de amenazas externas que pongan en peligro la seguridad de nuestros ciudadanos.

Por eso necesitamos una política migratoria eficaz, coherente e integral. Y para ello la Unión Europea debe usar todos los instrumentos a su alcance, no solo la política interior, sino también la cooperación al desarrollo o la política comercial, condicionando los acuerdos con nuestros vecinos y socios a su colaboración para el retorno de migrantes irregulares y la lucha contra las mafias.

Es hora de que los europeos pongamos nuestros recursos y nuestra influencia al servicio de una política migratoria más efectiva.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Madam President, colleagues, how can we deter illegal migration and deaths at sea, and provide protection for those in need? Well, by relocating the entire asylum process abroad, as Denmark is doing with Rwanda. The far-right government of Denmark. Oh, wait: it's a Social Democratic liberal government. You don't have to be a conservative to pursue reasonable migration policies, but you do have to be a realist.

Although initially rebuked by Commissioner Johansson as bad and completely unrealistic, the model is gaining support. The Dutch Parliament called for cooperation with Denmark on Rwanda-style reception centres. Even Herr Weber, the EPP chief, supports this policy. Our very own Prime Minister, Ulf Kristersson, stated in Copenhagen that centres outside the EU probably is the future.

Colleagues, externalising processing alone won't remove incentives, though. Let me be clear: it's essential that both processing and reception take place outside Europe. Only this way can we curb illegal migration, while at the same time providing refuge for those in need of international protection.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle (ID). – Madame la Présidente, enfin un débat sur l’immigration, n’en déplaise à Madame Keller, ou Madame «l’éclair» puisqu’elle a déjà disparu de l’hémicycle. Enfin un débat qui pose des questions pertinentes car l’externalisation des demandes d’asile est enfin évoquée. Elle est pour nous d’une totale logique depuis longtemps. Avec une augmentation de 50 % des demandes d’asile en 2022, près d’un million déposées l’an dernier, la situation est chaque jour plus dramatique.

Par principe, une demande d’asile doit être déposée en dehors du territoire national du pays d’accueil, car chacun sait que le droit d’asile dont l’Union européenne cherche à se donner le monopole est aujourd’hui un vecteur essentiel d’immigration illégale. Cette question pose pour nous l’enjeu essentiel: redonner aux États leur pleine maîtrise en matière de politique d’asile. Les gouvernements seront ainsi mis devant leurs responsabilités et ne devront plus subir les quotas de migrants illégaux imposés par l’Union européenne.

D’autre part, nous exigeons une conditionnalité dans les aides. Sans reprise des migrants illégaux, criminels et délinquants, ce doit être la fin des aides financières. Le droit d’asile est un droit exceptionnel et doit le rester, et ne pas devenir une filière d’immigration à part entière. Nous n’avons plus les moyens ni les capacités d’accueillir la misère du monde, car nous ne sommes ni un hôtel ni un guichet social.

Rob Rooken (ECR). – Voorzitter, het is weer lente en de massale immigratie bereikt weer record na record. Daar zijn we het hier allemaal over eens, van links tot rechts. Het asielsysteem is kapot. Het is tijd voor een fundamenteel ander beleid. En het doel is duidelijk: er moet veel minder migratie komen naar Europa. We laten alleen nog maar immigranten toe die van meerwaarde zijn voor onze samenleving. Noodhulp geven we in derde landen. Extern asiel aanvragen, dat kan heel goed: kijk naar Denemarken. Wat hebben we hiervoor nodig? Slechts drie zaken.

Allereerst een effectieve grensbescherming, en dat heb ik al vaker gezegd hier: laat Fort Europa maar werkelijkheid worden. Frontex moet ermee stoppen bootjes naar Europa te brengen met mensen: die moeten terug naar waar ze vandaan komen. De buitengrenzen moeten dicht en illegale binnenkomst gaan we niet meer belonen met een asielaanvraag. Dan zullen mensen stoppen om die levensgevaarlijke overtocht te ondernemen.

Ten tweede, een effectief terugkeerbeleid. Akkoorden met derde landen zijn nodig. En wie geen terugkeerders opneemt, krijgt geen geld, geen visa, et cetera. Er is veel meer te doen om die landen te dwingen hun eigen onderdanen terug te nemen. Als het doel blijft om terugkeer alleen ... (*de Voorzitter onderbreekt de spreker*) ... vrijwillig te laten doen, dan wordt het heel lastig.

Ten derde, een effectieve asielpcedure vanuit derde landen ... (*de Voorzitter ontnemt de spreker het woord*)

Tuovo Hakkarainen (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, hakemusten käsittelyn siirtäminen EU:n ulkopuolelle on yksi askel eteenpäin siirtolaisvirran rajoittamiseksi, mutta ei kuitenkaan poista uhkaa kymmenien tai satojen miljoonien ihmisten vyörymisestä Eurooppaan.

Ainoa ratkaisu on lopettaa kerta kaikkiaan kulkurilaumojen vastaanotto ja elättäminen. Tähän löytyy kyllä keinot. Yksinkertaisesti rajat kiinni. Eurooppa ja EU eivät voi olla koko maailman syöttökaukalo.

Jos hakemusten käsittely siirretään esimerkiksi Libyaan, miksi EU:n tulisi rahoittaa tämäkin? Libyan tulee itsensä huolehtia, ettei kansainvaellusta saavu sen alueelle. On mentävä juurisyihin eli jäädä lähtömaiden asemaan. Kunkin kansakunnan on itse ratkaistava ongelmansa.

Janusz Wojciechowski, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, I thank you for your contributions.

We know that many Member States are facing high migratory pressure in different ways. We have adopted several operational action plans to respond to this situation – for the Central Mediterranean, last November; for the Western Balkans in December. In March, we presented a strategic framework for European Integrated Border Management, together with a recommendation to Member States on the mutual recognition of return decisions and expediting returns.

Last year we also saw a sharp increase in the number of asylum applications. Our response must be effective solidarity between Member States. I thank those Members who called here today for a quick adoption of the Pact on Migration and Asylum. We feel we have the solution on the table and the political will on the Parliament's and Council's sides to adopt it during this mandate.

It is our responsibility to deal with asylum applications. People have the right to apply for asylum and the right to have access to a fair procedure. The external processing of asylum applications raises fundamental questions about access to asylum procedures and effective access to protection. The Commission will monitor any proposals to externalise systems or procedures with a view to protecting the fundamental rights to asylum established in the Charter.

Our goal is always to manage migration and asylum in a sustainable and human way, caring for the European societies under pressure, partnering closely with third countries and upholding the right to asylum. Let's meet this challenge.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for the interesting debate. There is no doubt that the situation in the main countries of origin and transit need our full attention and that our cooperation with these countries must receive priority. It is also of utmost importance that we build relations with our partners on a common understanding of our respective challenges and to our mutual benefit.

Ladies and gentlemen, striking the right balance on migration will be difficult but we need to try, because the alternative – just to settle with the current system – is not desirable. We can do better.

So finally, in this context, I also once again want to stress how important it is to reach an agreement on the Migration and Asylum Pact, and I welcome that the European Parliament has adopted its position on the key text of the package. As I said before, the clock is ticking, but we are also making progress together.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D), *γραπτώς*. – Η μετανάστευση είναι αρμοδιότητα κάθε κράτους μέλους και όχι της ΕΕ. Η ΕΕ παρέχει άσυλο και προστασία σε πρόσφυγες που κινδυνεύουν ή καταδιώκονται λόγω πεποιθήσεων. Πώς ενεργεί ένα κράτος στα εξωτερικά σύνορα της ΕΕ, που για χρόνια είναι θύμα υβριδικών επιθέσεων από ένα αδίσταχτο καθεστώς που εργαλειοποιεί τους μετανάστες;

Όταν το καθεστώς της Λευκορωσίας διοχέτευε οργανωμένα και παράνομα μεταναστευτικές ροές σε κράτη μέλη, όπως η Λιθουανία, η Πολωνία και η Λετονία, τα πληττόμενα κράτη και οι Βρυξέλλες χαρακτήρισαν την κατάσταση ως μορφή σχεδιασμένου υβριδικού πολέμου με σκοπό να ασκηθεί πίεση στην ΕΕ λόγω των κυρώσεων της κατά της Λευκορωσίας. Μεταξύ άλλων, η Λιθουανία θέσπισε νομοθεσία επαναπροώθησης των μεταναστών που διασχίζουν παράνομα τα σύνορα.

Φυσικά, πρέπει να επικεντρωθούμε στη ρίζα των προβλημάτων στις χώρες που εγκαταλείπουν οι μετανάστες, αλλά πώς αντιμετωπίζεται το πρόβλημα τώρα, από κράτη όπως η Κύπρος, όπου η τουρκική υβριδική επίθεση συνεχίζεται για χρόνια με εκρηκτικούς αριθμούς με στόχο να ανατραπεί η δημογραφία αιώνων; Η συνταγή κανόνων της ΕΕ για ίδια διαχείριση των μεταναστευτικών ροών έχει αποτύχει γιατί δεν προσαρμόζεται στις ιδιότυπες συνθήκες ανά κράτος, όπως στην Κύπρο με την συνεχιζόμενη κατοχή. Η Κύπρος θα έπρεπε προ καιρού να διακηρύξει ότι η παράνομη είσοδος από την Τουρκία στο κατεχόμενο έδαφος της Κύπρου ακυρώνει κάθε κανόνα προστασίας.

Janina Ochojska (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Według nowej propozycji w krajach trzecich miałyby powstać centra, gdzie migranci i uchodźcy oczekiwaliby na decyzję o przyznaniu azylu lub innej formy ochrony międzynarodowej. Moją obawę budzą przede wszystkim warunki, które panowałyby w takich ośrodkach, skoro te znajdujące się w UE są często w krytycznym stanie. W 2022 roku zostało złożonych 1 mln wniosków azylowych, co stanowi tylko 0,2% obywateli wszystkich krajów należących do Unii. Liczba ta, wobec liczby przyjętych Ukraińców, jest pięć razy mniejsza, a jednak i dla Ukraińców znalazły się miejsca. Argumenty, że zaleje nas fala migrantów, są bezpodstawne. Nie zgadzam się z licznymi wyrazami poparcia dla budowy murów, które miałyby ochronić Europę przed napływem migrantów i których budowa miałaby być finansowana przez UE. Żaden z posłów nie powiedział, jakie inne rozwiązania są przewidywane, jeżeli ochrona granic przez mury zawiedzie. Jaki może być kolejny krok? Nie wiadomo też, na budowę ilu km murów KE wyraża zgodę oraz gdzie miałyby być umiejscowione. Nadal nie dysponujemy informacją, czy Komisja przewiduje wypłaty odszkodowawcze rodzinom osób, które z powodu wielokrotnego pushbackowania straciły życie na granicach wewnątrz Unii. Nie zgadzam się z pozycją posłów EKR, zgodnie z którą każdy kraj musi sam rozwiązywać swoje problemy, należy zamknąć granice, statki odsyłać, wprowadzić twarde prawo.

13. Zboże ukraińskie na rynku europejskim (debata)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu ukrainischem Getreide auf dem europäischen Markt (2023/2695(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, for more than a year, Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine has caused significant human casualties and forced millions of people to flee from their homes.

Before the brutal invasion, Ukraine was a leading global exporter of grain. However, the invasion has highly impacted the supply and prices of food and fuel worldwide. Ukraine has seen a dramatic drop in its exports, resulting in major food security concerns for millions of people in Europe and around the world.

The EU has responded by supporting the Black Sea grain initiative and the grain from Ukraine initiative. These initiatives, including the EU solidarity lanes, have helped to bring down food prices by increasing the amount of Ukrainian grain available on the market.

But it is important to remember that these arrangements only exist in the first place because of Russia's blockade and the bombing of Ukrainian ports and shipping lanes.

The Russian embargo of Ukraine ports and bottlenecks in the solidarity lanes also have greater effects on farmers in EU countries neighbouring Ukraine than on farmers in other EU countries. In response to this too, we managed to come together, recognising that unilateral measures must not be our answer to the Russian threat. Instead, we reiterate our continued solidarity and support for Ukraine, as well as our solidarity with EU countries on the frontline.

This March, the financial support package of EUR 56 million for Bulgaria, Poland and Romania was approved. Then, last week, it was followed by exceptional and temporary preventive measures agreed with Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia, and the second support package of EUR 100 million for these five frontline countries. These efforts are a clear signal of our unity and solidarity.

At the same time, these measures can be ensured that four agricultural products – wheat, maize, rapeseed and sunflower seed – can continue to be released for free circulation in all EU Member States, except in the five frontline countries. These products will be able to reach their intended destinations in the EU and in third countries where they are needed.

The Russian aggression has caused substantial negative consequences for millions of people also outside of Ukraine. It is crucial that we continue to show solidarity, first and foremost with Ukraine and its people who suffer horribly, but also with other others who are disproportionality affected. We must ensure that our support is sustainable, long term and reliable.

We must also work to ensure a seamless extension on the autonomous trade measures vis-à-vis Ukraine. The continued suspension of tariffs demonstrates the strong EU support for Ukraine also when it comes to trade. The Commission has support of the Swedish Presidency in finding broad agreements, especially with regard to Ukraine. We welcome more opportunities to enhance exports from Ukraine to through the EU.

In the face of the Russian threat, we must remain committed to finding constructive solutions in the challenges we are facing without compromising our unity and EU solidarity.

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, thank you for organising this very important debate. Honourable Members, the impact of Russia's illegal war on Ukrainian agriculture and global food security is severe and sobering. Large areas of Ukrainian agricultural land have been polluted by landmines, and around 24% of arable land will remain uncultivated during the next season.

This is why we are helping Ukraine, including economically. In doing so, we have opened up the European Union fully to free trade with Ukraine. This process started already in 2014, following the first Russian aggression against Ukraine when the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement between the European Union and Ukraine was signed and trade liberalisation took place, including the removal of tariffs on most cereals.

Honourable Members, it is very important to remember that free trade for the majority of agricultural products, free import from the majority of agricultural products started not in 2022, but in 2014. This is the consequence of decisions adopted in 2014. For example for maize, for rapeseed, that rate was free from tariffs before the war, from after the decision adopted in 2014.

In 2022, under the Autonomous Trade Measures Regulation, this substantial liberalisation was further extended to the remaining agricultural and industrial barriers. Ukrainian cereal imports were substantial before the war. In 2021, the European Union bought around 7 million tonnes of maize and around 300 000 tonnes of wheat.

However, in 2022 these imports increased further to 12 million tonnes of maize and over 2.8 million tonnes of wheat. This significant increase affected the market of five frontline countries: Poland, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria and Slovakia at the same time as Ukrainian traditional logistics chains were disrupted by the war. Millions of tons that were usually shipped via Ukraine and Black Sea ports must now transit instead through its neighbouring EU Member States. Not all of these exports reached their traditional markets in the EU such as Spain, Portugal and Italy or third countries. In fact, their significant volumes in the street have been sold in the neighbouring Member States, saturating domestic logistical chains and destabilising local markets.

Since April 2022, after the start of the war, Ukrainian Ukraine exported 48 million tonnes of grains, half of which to the European Union. The imports of grain into the five frontline Member States for four sensitive products – maize, wheat, rapeseed and sunflower seed – increased to 10.3 million tonnes from just 141 000 tonnes imported in 2021, out of which 3.4 million tonnes remained in Poland, 2.5 million tonnes in Romania, 2.3 million tonnes in Hungary, 1.1 million tonnes in Bulgaria and about 800 000 tonnes in Slovakia.

This important quantity caused market disturbances and presented difficulties for farmers in these countries to sell their own cereals. It is also worth highlighting the important role played by the frontline Member States in terms of transit and solidarity lanes, with Romania marking some 6.5 million tonnes of grain transiting from Ukraine in the course of the year.

The Commission is fully aware of this situation and I am pleased that we have recently agreed on a common European approach to address this problem. The support package that the Commission has put forward under the condition that all unilateral measures are lifted has been designed to help the frontline Member States and their farmers to mitigate the difficulties they are facing with issues related to logistical bottlenecks resulting from the imports of certain agri-food products from Ukraine.

Let me outline the key elements of the package. First of all, on 2 May 2023, the Commission took temporary preventive measures pursuant to the safeguard clause included in the Autonomous Trade Measures Regulation to address the exceptional challenges caused by logistical bottlenecks in the five Member States. These preventive measures cover the four most sensitive products – wheat, maize, rapeseed and sunflower seeds. The transit of these products within the European Union and to third countries will continue to be ensured. These products will reach and circulate freely in the all European Union Member States except Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia.

Second, where necessary the Commission is ready to launch four other sensitive products and an assessment of the situation on the Union market pursuant to the expedited safeguard mechanism under the new ATM regulation upon its entry into force.

Third, the Commission is putting forward an additional exceptional support measures of EUR 100 million for affected farmers in the five Member States of Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia. Those Member States will have the possibility to top up this amount with a 200% national co-financing rate. This comes on top of the exceptional support measures of EUR 56.3 million adopted in early April for Bulgaria, Poland and Romania.

Fourth, the Commission and Member States will work to facilitate the transit of Ukrainian grain exports via the solidarity lanes so that they reach those countries in need. This includes continued work on lowering overall logistics costs, streamlining controls, better coordinating transit and enhancing infrastructure and equipment at ports, transshipment terminals or border crossing points under the EU solidarity lanes.

Solidarity lines and the continuation of the Black Sea Grain Initiative are complementary and essential to ensure adequate food supplies for those countries in need of them. The European Union therefore fully supports all efforts of the United Nations to prolong the Black Sea Grain Initiative.

When we look at the improvements, it has been noted that the European Union is doing its part to support countries in need. Trade figures also show that our ties with vulnerable partners are strengthening. The European Union exports of wheat to the least developed countries increased by over 50% in 2022 compared to the year before Russia's war. The opposite perception exists and shows how Russia's propaganda is designing and permeating the world today.

As always, when discussing the relationship between the European Union and Ukraine, we must remember that Russia's war continues. Russia has not stopped in Ukraine before and will go further if it is able and allowed to do so. We must therefore not forget that Ukraine is fighting not only for its own freedom, but also for ours, defending the European and democratic values we are so much proud of. That is why we will continue to stand with Ukraine and its people for as long as it takes. Thank you for your time. I look forward to your contributions.

Norbert Lins, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Frau Ministerin! Schön, Herr Kommissar, dass Sie jetzt da sind; wir hätten Sie gerne auch heute Morgen bei der Agrardebatte begrüßt.

Es ist unbestritten, dass der Ukrainekrieg uns vor große Herausforderungen stellt. Die Getreidepreise in den ukrainischen Anrainerstaaten sind im Sinkflug, die Situation ist prekär, die Bäuerinnen und Bauern sind dringend auf finanzielle Hilfe angewiesen. Nur: Die von Ihnen vor Kurzem beschlossenen Schutzmaßnahmen stellen keine langfristige Lösung dar. Um den Binnenmarkt auf Dauer zu sichern, dürfen wir das Problem nicht in der EU weiterschieben.

Der Zustrom von ukrainischem Getreide in den europäischen Anrainerstaaten ist ein hausgemachtes Problem, und da hat auch die Europäische Kommission eine Verantwortung; das war uns schon vor einem Jahr klar. Sie müssen sich endlich überlegen, wie Sie die *solidarity lanes* auf die nächste Stufe heben. Das ukrainische Getreide muss in den bedürftigen Staaten landen, darf nach Grenzübertritt nicht irgendwo versickern.

Die globale Lebensmittelknappheit, hohe Inflation und der Zusammenbruch von Währungen bedrohen die Ernährungssicherheit im Nahen Osten und in Nordafrika. Die Nachfrage dieser Drittstaaten sinkt nicht, weil weniger Bedarf ist, sondern weil Haushaltsdefizite da sind, hohe Staatsverschuldung, Währungsabwertung und gefährliche Inflationsraten da sind – das schreibt das Welternährungsprogramm. Und wenn wir da bei den Exporten sind, glaube ich, dass wir feststellen müssen, wir können nicht alle 60 oder 120 Tage hoffen, dass Russland das Abkommen im Schwarzen Meer weiterlaufen lässt. Und das aktuelle läuft ja in einer Woche aus.

Ich glaube, dass wir die *solidarity lanes* stärken müssen, dass wir Logistikhilfen auf den Weg bringen müssen, dass wir ukrainisches Getreide, insbesondere Weizen, kaufen müssen, dass es in der Kommission endlich einen Sonderbeauftragten geben muss oder eine Taskforce, die sich dieses Problems annimmt, und dass wir jetzt schnell reagieren und symbolisch jetzt gleich loslegen müssen mit dem humanitären Getreideexport. Das wäre mal ein Signal auch an die Bauern, sowohl in Polen als auch insbesondere in Rumänien.

Marek Belka, *w imieniu grupy S&D*. – Pani Przewodnicząca ! Panie Komisarzu ! Zgoda na import ukraińskiego zboża na rynek unijny była i jest przykładem solidarności, jaką okazujemy walczącemu narodowi Ukrainy. Poprzez handel wspieramy wysiłek wojenny naszego sąsiada. Niestety nierozwaga i brak odpowiednich działań rządzących obarczyły głównymi kosztami polskich producentów rolnych.

Polski rząd znał możliwe konsekwencje otworzenia naszego rynku na import zboża z Ukrainy, ale przez wiele miesięcy nie podjął żadnych działań. Zboże z Ukrainy miało przejeżdżać przez Polskę tranzytem, a rząd nie zainwestował w magazyny portowe, infrastrukturę kolejową czy dodatkowe wagony do transportu zboża. Gdy ceny zboża spadały na jesieni, minister rolnictwa podpowiadał, żeby zboże trzymać, a rząd nie wnioskował do Unii o nałożenie kontyngentów i ceł.

Nielegalne blokady importu nie rozwiążą problemu, który tkwi po prostu w nieaktywności rządzących, którzy problemami rolników interesują się dopiero wobec protestów. Rozwiązania leżą na poziomie unijnym, zarówno w sprawie tranzytu, jak i ochrony rolników. Żeby po nie sięgnąć, należy jednak z Unią pracować, a nie wciążyć się klócić.

Dacian Cioloș, *în numele grupului Renew*. – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, românii au primit refugiați ucraineni cu brațele deschise, iar România și-a pus la dispoziția Ucrainei porturile pentru exportul de cereale. Este absolut necesar să continuăm să susținem Ucraina, dar trebuie în același timp să avem grijă și de fermierii europeni din statele care au graniță cu Ucraina.

Dificultățile cu care aceștia se confruntă nu sunt o problemă regională, ci una europeană, și soluțiile trebuie să fie europene și pe termen lung. Noua recoltă se apropie și trebuie să oferim predictibilitate fermierilor. Măsurile care au fost anunțate de Comisie sunt bune, dar, din punctul meu de vedere, nu sunt suficiente. Comisia ar trebui să aplice cât mai repede soluții pe care și noi, Grupul Renew, le-am propus. E nevoie în continuare de culoarele de solidaritate și după 5 iunie și e imperativ să evităm șantajul Rusiei, dar trebuie să ne asigurăm că aceste cereale ajung în statele terțe care au nevoie de ele și că producătorii de cereale din statele de la frontiera cu Ucraina sunt protejați în același timp.

E nevoie deci de o acțiune rapidă, cu atât mai mult cu cât acesta este un subiect care, vedem, este folosit de partidele extremiste care cântă partitura Rusiei pentru a submina efortul Uniunii Europene de a ajuta Ucraina. În același timp, cred că această criză este un semnal clar că ne dorim, evident, Ucraina și Republica Moldova în Uniunea Europeană, dar că, până atunci, va trebui să ne pregătim politica agricolă și politicile europene, ca să fie în măsură să primească aceste țări în Uniunea Europeană.

Markéta Gregorová, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, the Russian war of aggression in Ukraine has severely disrupted the EU's agricultural markets and food prices. The entire global food price market depends on Ukrainian supplies and might affect all EU consumers, especially if the extreme weather continues, which makes the actions of certain Member States deplorable.

The trade policy is solely a European competence and should not be interfered with by individual Member States, notably when their unilateral actions are based on simple political gains, undermining our European solidarity. Such interferences might reverse the trade liberalisation's positive outcomes and play into hands of 'disinformators'.

Additionally, I would appreciate more transparency on the deal's content. Could the Commission share its plans on how they are planning to resolve this issue structurally, instead of just providing a temporary solution? Notably, if we will have to renew the trade measures in a year again?

Dominik Tarczyński, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowny Panie Komisarzu! Zawsze formułuję swoje wystąpienia w języku angielskim, ale dzisiaj zdecydowałem się mówić w swoim języku ojczystym, bo to ogromna duma, że komisarzem ds. rolnictwa jest Polak. Dzisiaj to wyjątkowa duma. Dlaczego? Chciałbym przedstawić kilka danych, faktów, a nie opinii politycznych, na przykładzie Polski.

Dlaczego decyzja o przedłużeniu tej liberalizacji była dobra? Polska w obrocie z Ukrainą ma 4 miliardy nadwyżki. 4 miliardy euro. Unia Europejska ma 2 miliardy na minusie. Cała Unia Europejska ma minus 2 miliardy, a Polska ma 4 miliardy, i to dzięki Polsce cała Unia Europejska ma plus 2 miliardy euro. Panie Komisarzu! Polska zarabia 4 miliardy euro. Dzięki tej decyzji 4 miliardy euro trafia do polskich rodzin, trafia na 500+. Opozycja dobrze wie, szczególnie Polska, co to 500+ – chociaż zna to tylko z gazet, nie wiedziała jak sama wprowadzić. A więc dzięki tym pieniądzom są realizowane projekty wspierające rodziny.

Co by było, gdybyśmy nie poparli liberalizacji? Nie byłoby podstawy prawnej do tego porozumienia, które zakazuje sprzedaży teraz czterech rodzajów zbóż w Polsce. To dzięki komisarzowi Wojciechowskiemu udało się doprowadzić do porozumienia, że zboże ukraińskie w Polsce jest zakazane. Gdybyśmy nie przedłużyli rozporządzenia, które – uwaga – zostało wprowadzone przez waszego ministra w 2014 roku, a teraz było tylko przedłużone, to nie byłoby podstawy prawnej, aby zakazać sprzedaży.

To my zakazaliśmy sprzedaży, a 4 miliardy dla Polski zarabiamy. Wy tracilibyście te pieniądze. Nie wspomnę o Hiszpanii, która przez wielką suszę zagrożona była głodem i błagała o to, aby to zboże dotarło do Hiszpanii. My ratujemy Hiszpanię, Unię Europejską i wspieramy Polskę. 4 miliardy i za te 4 miliardy, Panie Komisarzu, chcę podziękować.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, par solidarité avec l'Ukraine, l'Union européenne a décidé en 2022 d'accueillir sans restriction ses exportations agricoles. Le résultat ne s'est pas fait attendre: cinq États limitrophes, parmi lesquels la Pologne et la Hongrie, se sont retrouvés submergés par les céréales ukrainiennes.

C'était prévisible mais, comme d'habitude, la Commission n'a rien anticipé. Elle vient heureusement de réagir après plusieurs mois de tergiversations. Mieux vaut tard que jamais. Elle a d'abord débloqué 100 millions d'euros du fonds d'urgence pour secourir les céréaliers de ces cinq États. Elle a ensuite annoncé le 2 mai que les céréales ukrainiennes ne pourront plus être vendues dans ces cinq pays, elles pourront juste y transiter en vue d'être expédiées vers des pays tiers, notamment d'Afrique du Nord. Mais il est à craindre que d'autres États membres de l'Union soient déstabilisés à leur tour par leur arrivée massive.

Moralité: la Commission ne parvient pas à avoir une stratégie agricole cohérente à moyen terme. Pas plus que son programme «De la ferme à la table», sa gestion des céréales ukrainiennes n'a réussi à tenir compte des réalités du monde agricole.

Kateřina Konečná, *za skupinu The Left*. – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, rok přihlížíme neschopnosti Evropské komise zajistit tak banální věc, jako je kontrola dovozu obilí z Ukrajiny, které bylo určeno pro tranzit do zemí mimo Evropskou unii a samozřejmě skončilo na našem trhu. Poškozuje naše zemědělství a končí ve výrobcích a na pultech našich obchodů. A to už se vůbec nebavím o potenciálních zdravotních rizicích. Nebýt země jako je Polsko a Maďarsko, tak tento problém prostě neřešíte dodnes. Přestože v posledních dnech došlo k posunu, chci vás opět varovat, že vaše řešení může zanedlouho přinést nové problémy. Pět zemí si sice vyjednalo zákaz dovozu a kompenzace, ale vy teď opět povolujete dovozy do EU, takže problém bude prostě přetrvávat. Máme přeci jednotný trh, na kterém můžeme převážet výrobky bez jakýchkoliv omezení. Navíc nadále zcela ignorujete tikající bombu dovozu dalších komodit, jako jsou drůbež a vejce. Pokud chcete pomáhat Ukrajině s exportem zemědělských produktů do rozvojových zemí, tak laskavě zajistěte, aby šlo skutečně pouze o tranzit, a to opravdu účinným opatřením.

Miroslav Radačovský (NI). – Pani predsedajúca, neviem, čo je nové na východnom fronte. Informácie sú rôzne. Lepšie by nám o tom vedeli povedať Taliani a Nemci, lebo ich dedovia si na východný front teda pamätajú. Ale s určitosťou viem, a vieme to aj my všetci, hoci sa tvárime, že nie. Spojené štáty americké a Rusko sa bijú o Krym, bijú sa o prístavy v Čiernom mori. A trpia, poľnohospodári. Trpia poľnohospodári, máme problém s obilím.

Ono viete, najlepšie by bolo riešenie také, aby tie americké vojská odišli domov. Nech sa hrajú na vojakov niekde v Nevadskej púšti. A my, Slováci, by sme im tam mohli doručiť ešte aj, máme dobré húfnice Zuzana. Dokonca máme aj prezidentku Zuzanu. Aj tú by sme im mohli poslať. A ani by sa nemusela vrátiť. Ale v skutočnosti predsa to nie je možné.

Všetci vieme, o čo tu ide. Vieme, kto s kým bojuje a kto trpí. Trpia naši slovenskí poľnohospodári, vaši poľnohospodári, a my sa tu hráme na vojakov? Prímerie chce Čína, prímerie chce pápež. Prímerie chcú všetky krajiny sveta. A my chceme len bojovať, bojovať a riešiť zbytočné problémy. Všetci už raz prinútime tých Američanov, aby prestali.

My v Európe si to sami tu doma vyriešime. To je všetko.

Herbert Dorfmann (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Frau Minister, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die *solidarity lanes*, diese Solidaritätskorridore, hat es in Wirklichkeit nie gegeben, und es gibt sie bis heute nicht. Oder es hat sie nur in der Phantasie und in der Kommunikation der Kommission gegeben. Per Definition fängt ein Korridor nämlich irgendwo an, beispielsweise in der Ukraine, und er hört irgendwo auf, beispielsweise in Ägypten, in Libanon oder eben auch in Spanien. In der Realität wurden aber nur die Grenzen zwischen der Ukraine und der Europäischen Union geöffnet, ein paar Grenzinfrastrukturen verbessert, und das Ganze hat man dann einfach Solidaritätskorridore genannt.

Das Problem, das wir heute in den Grenzstaaten der EU zur Ukraine haben, war klar absehbar. Ich war selbst vor einem Jahr an der Grenze. Ich habe sogar einen Brief geschrieben an die Kommission, vor dieser Entwicklung gewarnt. Passiert ist gar nichts.

Nun haben einige Grenzstaaten entgegen der Regeln des gemeinsamen Binnenmarkts einseitige Einfuhrbeschränkungen eingeführt. Übrigens das Land, das am stärksten betroffen ist – Rumänien –, hat das nicht getan. Was ist die Antwort der Kommission? Die Maßnahmen werden einfach legalisiert. Die Folgen sind meiner Meinung nach vollkommen klar. Das Problem wird einfach um ein paar 100 Kilometer Richtung Westen verschoben, und die Entwicklung dürfte sich leider dort wiederholen. Oder was würden Sie, Herr Kommissar, morgen tun, wenn Deutschland, Frankreich oder Belgien einseitige und illegale Einfuhrverbote für ukrainische Produkte einführt? Einfach diese dann legalisieren?

Ein Korridor ist ein Korridor. Die Kommission hat endlich akzeptable Vorschläge zu machen, damit es wirklich grüne Korridore aus der Ukraine gibt und nicht nur einfach offene Grenzen.

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señora ministra, la desgraciada invasión de Ucrania —y es el objetivo principal de toda esta Cámara, de todos nosotros, acabar con ella— ha traído efectos colaterales, efectivamente, con esas importaciones.

Hay cinco países afectados por la entrada masiva de grano, pero no por ello debemos impedir que los importadores tradicionales, como es el caso de mi país, España, que habitualmente ya tenía un mercado abierto con Ucrania sobre cereales, sigan importando. He de decirles a ustedes que en un año de sequía la situación es aún más grave, con un 26 % menos de producción. Por lo tanto, las importaciones al mercado europeo desde Ucrania son importantes para España.

Sí quiero manifestar finalmente mi apoyo a que el objetivo sea acabar con la invasión de Ucrania. Sí a la solidaridad con los Estados miembros afectados y no a las medidas unilaterales adoptadas por algunos países, que deben ser retiradas ya, inmediatamente.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein (Renew). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Oczywiście musimy pomagać Ukrainie i chcemy to robić. To jest zupełnie oczywiste. Ale pytanie mam do pana komisarza: co Pan zrobił, Panie Komisarzu, żeby kraje graniczące z Ukrainą były tranzytem, były pomocą, a nie chaosem na rynku zboża i rujnowaniem swoich rolników?

Opozycja w Polsce już w zeszłym roku wyraźnie alarmowała, że nadpodaż spowoduje gwałtowny spadek cen. Ale ani Pan, ani polski rząd, który tu zresztą pana przysłał na to stanowisko, które Pan piastuje, nie przygotował nic.

Z mediów słyszę, niestety, że kilka firm bliskich rządowi na tej sytuacji się znacznie wzbogaciło. Rolnicy polscy zostali przez pana środowisko polityczne oszukani, więc proszę się nie dziwić, że oczekują i bardzo głośno to wyrażają, że poda się Pan do dymisji, a rząd zmienimy w wyborach już w październiku.

Bronis Ropé (Verts/ALE). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, Ministre, Komisare, kolegos, pagalba Ukrainai turi išlikti mūsų prioritetu. Puikiai žinome kas iš tiesų sukelia maisto krizę trečiosiose šalyse. Tai Rusija blokuoja ir riboja grūdų tiekimą bei pasitelkia šią situaciją Europos Sąjungai kaltinti. Turime aktyviai veikti, kad Ukrainos grūdai turėtų galimybes saugiai pasiekti Ukrainos uostus ir būti išvežti svetur. Grūdų, skirtų trečiosioms šalims, transportavimas traukiniais į Europą nėra ekonomiškai atsiperkantis. Tai nereiškia, kad neturime to tęsti. Tačiau siūlau imtis priemonių užtikrint, kad Ukrainos grūdai skirti eksportui keliautų tiesiai į mūsų uostus, jų nebūtų galima parduoti vidaus rinkoje. Jei norime prisidėti prie kovos su badu negalime leisti, kad kitoms šalims skirta produkcija ir toliau liktų Europoje.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Paní předsedající, jsem ráda, že státy našly dohodu s Komisí ohledně dovozu ukrajinského obilí a umožní tranzit přes svá území. Je důležité, aby koridory solidarity i nadále fungovaly bez omezení, aby Ukrajina mohla obchodovat se zemědělskými plodinami. Je to jediné, jak mohou financovat chod státu a boj proti agresivnímu Putinovi. Evropská komise musí pracovat na takových opatřeních, jako je kontrola a podpora transportů nebo možné stažení přebytečných surovin z trhu prostřednictvím intervenčních celoevropských výkupů a jejich využití pro humanitární pomoc. Východiskem ze současné situace je celoevropské řešení. V žádném případě ale ne jednostranné zákazy a selektivní kompenzace, které destabilizují trh ještě více. Naše podpora Ukrajiny nesmí být ohrožována a podkopávána.

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

Vizepräsidentin

Sylvia Limmer (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Mit einer Milliarde Euro aus Brüssel wird ein Solidaritätskorridor für Getreide bzw. Agrarprodukte aus der Ukraine eingerichtet, um angeblich die Ernährung der Welt zu sichern. 1 Milliarde für Transportkosten und Infrastruktur. Dumm nur, dass man anschließend mit mindestens weiteren 151 Millionen Euro osteuropäische Landwirte ruhigstellen muss, die sich durchaus zu Recht in ihrer wirtschaftlichen Existenz durch ukrainisches Getreide bedroht sehen. Dieses landet nämlich jetzt nicht mehr auf den Tellern der Hungrigen der Welt, sondern der Großteil verbleibt in der EU.

Die Sicherung der Ernährung der Welt bleibt also ein Märchen; die Kommission kann es nicht. Während gleichzeitig die einheimische Landwirtschaft in der EU durch grüne Verbotspolitik abgeschafft wird.

Milan Uhrík (NI). – Pani predsedajúca, ukrajinské obilie na Slovensku bolo plné zakázaných pesticídov, ktoré spôsobujú rakovinu, a u nenarodených detí mutácie. Tak sme logicky volali po zákaze tohto obilia. Z Bruselu nám však prišla odpoveď, že Slovensko toto obilie zakázať nemôže, pretože tým porušujeme hospodársku súťaž a voľný trh. Inými slovami nám Európska komisia vlastne odkázala, budem vulgárny, držte hubu a to obilie jedzte.

A ja sa pýtam: Za čo nás máte? Vraj nemôžeme to obilie zakázať. Tak potom o čom, prosím vás, ešte môžeme rozhodnúť, ak nie o tom, aký chlieb vôbec môžeme jesť? Kto z vás by dal svojim deťom jesť chlieb z toxického obilia, ktoré spôsobuje rakovinu? Kto vás? Kto z vás? A máme byť o tom ticho len kvôli tomu, že to obilie je z Ukrajiny.

A to mňa absolútne nezaujíma. Slováci nebudú jesť toxické potraviny ani z Ukrajiny, ani odinakadiaľ, pretože zdravie našich ľudí aj Európanov je predsa pre nás prvoradé.

(Rečník súhlasí so zodpovedaním otázky položenej zdvihnutím „modrej karty“)

Dacian Cioloș (Renew), blue-card question. – Mr Uhrík, can you please ask your national authority in charge of food safety and phytosanitary to check the cereals? Because this is his responsibility to enforce European legislation, putting some norms on the import of any products on the European market? So please, first of all, ask your national authority to do this work and not to punish the European Union for imaginative fault.

Milan Uhrík (NI), odpoveď na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty. – Slovenské authority, slovenské ministerstvo pôdohospodárstva, najprv zatĺkalo, že ukrajinské obilie sa na Slovensku nenachádza. Potom pripustili, že sa nachádza. Potom tvrdili, že sa v ňom toxické pesticídy nenachádzajú. Potom povedali, že sa nachádzajú. Potom tvrdili, že to nebolo použité v mlynch a v pečive. A potom sa ukázalo, že nakoniec tá múka bola distribuovaná.

Čiže áno, aj naše authority potvrdili, že to obilie je plné nebezpečných chemikálií, ktoré na Slovensku povolené nie sú. A znevýhodňuje to aj slovenských poľnohospodárov, pretože tí musia dodržiavať vysoké normy, vysoké štandardy, ale ukrajinskí ich majú nižšie. Tak to likviduje aj slovenské európske poľnohospodárstvo.

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, let's talk straight. All the complaints about Ukrainian cereals, it has very little to do with Ukraine itself. Let's be clear: the European single market was opened for export of Ukrainian cereals one year ago. A year ago, the EU also decided to open transit solidarity lanes for Ukrainian grains when Russia closed traditional transit through the Black Sea.

Most of those instruments were well functioning without big problems and complaints till the spring of this year. What has changed at the beginning of this year? Not EU policy or its implementation, but the global prices for cereals changed very radically in the course of last year. From the beginning of this year, they started to go down. If the global price for wheat before the war was USD 200 per tonne, in the middle of last year, it jumped up to USD 450 per tonne.

European farmers, including farmers from Central Europe, were very happy with such a price and were forecasting that this price, in the spring of this year, will increase even more. But from the beginning of this year, the prices for grain went down in the same way as prices for oil, gas or fertilisers. Now the price for wheat is only USD 250. Farmers in Central Europe became very unhappy. The predicted profits evaporated. They started to look who can compensate that. The EU did it. But Ukrainian grain has nothing to do with such a global development.

As a European, I feel ashamed that some EU Member States are behaving in such a way that it looks like that not-received profits are more important than survival of Ukraine.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Pirmininke, Ministre, gerbiamas Komisare, mieli kolegos, daugiau nei prieš metus, Rusijai pradėjus neišprovokuotą ir nepateisinamą agresijos karą Ukrainoje, žinojome, kad turime visomis išgalėmis padėti užpultai šaliai. Solidarumo linijos ir susitarimai, leidę Ukrainai eksportuoti grūdus, buvo ypač svarbi šios pagalbos dalis, ir labai apmaudu, kad dėl kelių, o gal keliolikos, subjektų noro pasipelnyti, ši iniciatyva tapo kontraversiška. Neapsigaukime, Rusija naudojami šia situacija. Putinas nesikuklina naudoti visų turimų ginklų ir atvirai meluoti, jei Ukrainos grūdai nepasiekia trečiųjų šalių. Rusija prisistato kaip badaujančių gelbėtoja. Negalime leisti tokiai situacijai tęstis. Eksportui skirtus Ukrainos grūdus reikia padėti išvežti iš šalies, tačiau turime užtikrinti, kad jie neliktų Europoje, pasiektų mūsų uostus ir būtų išsiųsti ten, kur jų labiausiai reikia. Bendradarbiavimas su Jungtinių tautų maisto programa galėtų būti vienas iš būdų užtikrinti atsekamumą ir atsakomybę. Taip pat negalime pamiršti, kad grūdų eksporto problema smarkiai pablogina susisiekimo sistemos trūkumai, ypač geležinkelių vėžių skirtumai. Turime skirti daugiau dėmesio Ukrainos prijungimui prie Europinės geležinkelio sistemos.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamna președintă, stimată doamnă ministru Roswell, domnule comisar Wojciechowski, agricultorii români, la fel ca fermierii din întreaga Uniune Europeană, inclusiv din Polonia, din țara dumneavoastră, trebuie să respecte reguli stricte în cultivarea pământului, în cantitățile de chimicale folosite sau în creșterea biodiversității. Odată cu *Green Deal*, aceste standarde vor deveni și mai stricte. Sigur, probabil vor duce la o siguranță crescută a calității pentru consumatorii europeni, la un impact mai mic asupra mediului, însă toate aceste reguli aduc cu sine prețuri mai ridicate, care nu pot concura cu cele ale cerealelor provenite din Ucraina, unde condițiile și regulile nu sunt atât de stricte.

Tocmai de aceea, noi, ca Uniune, am hotărât să ajutăm ca marfa din Ucraina să ajungă la clienții tradiționali, însă ne confruntăm acum cu faptul că aceste cereale rămân pe piața europeană. Este nevoie de o colaborare urgentă, cu rezultate rapide, între Comisia Europeană și statele membre pentru a opri speculațiile, domnule comisar, că dumneavoastră ați fi avut o reacție cam întârziată, și pentru a ne asigura că toate cerealele ucrainene care vor tranzita Uniunea Europeană nu vor rămâne aici.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich kann den Ärger von Präsident Selenskyj bestens verstehen. Wer Ja zur Solidarität mit der Ukraine sagt, muss auch Nein zur anhaltenden Erpressung durch Russland sagen. Und das ist klar: Wir müssen alles tun, um die Ukraine beim Export ihres Getreides zu unterstützen. Es ist Teil der russischen Kriegsführung von Anfang an gewesen, die Ukraine als wichtigen globalen Getreidelieferanten auszuschalten. Dazu dienten die brutalen Angriffe auf die Infrastruktur sowie die Blockade der ukrainischen Häfen. Damit die letzten Einnahmen der Ukraine, nämlich der Verkauf von Getreide auf dem Weltmarkt, nicht versiegen, hat die EU schnell reagiert und mit dem Aufbau von Solidaritätskorridoren auf dem Landweg begonnen. Das ist wichtig!

Zudem wurde der Ukraine die zollfreie Einfuhr von Getreide in die EU ermöglicht. Das ist nicht illegal, sondern es ist rechtskonform. Genau diese Schritte brauchte es, um die Ukraine im Kampf gegen die russische Aggression zu unterstützen. Eine Blockade, wie wir sie jetzt gesehen haben an den Grenzen in Polen und an den anderen Grenzstandorten, ist nicht nur ein Bruch des EU-Rechtes, sondern es verletzt vor allem auch die Solidarität mit den ukrainischen Landwirten, die diese Einnahmen so dringend benötigen.

Ohne eine schnelle und umfassende Ausfuhr der ukrainischen Getreidevorräte wird es für die ukrainischen Landwirte nicht nur bei der Aussaat und bei der Feldbestellung schwieriger, sondern es fehlen am Ende auch die wichtigen Lagerkapazitäten. Wer jetzt durch die Ukraine fährt, sieht eben die kilometergroßen Parzellen nicht abgeernteter Sonnenblumen- und Maisfelder.

Deshalb, in aller Kürze: Ukrainische Landwirtschaft verdient unsere hundertprozentige Unterstützung. Sie muss für ihr eigenes Überleben Einnahmen aus den Getreideverkäufen erzielen. Deswegen sind wir und die Grenzstaaten in der Europäischen Union in der Pflicht, unseren Beitrag dazu zu leisten.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzy! Pani Minister ! Nie ulega wątpliwości, że problemy z eksportem ukraińskiego zboża i swoista huśtawka cen na rynkach światowych zbóż to konsekwencje agresji Rosji na Ukrainę, a także wojny hybrydowej, którą Rosja prowadzi nie tylko w odniesieniu do surowców energetycznych, ale także właśnie w stosunku do surowców rolnych. Ubocznym skutkiem powstania korytarzy solidarnościowych był nadmierny import zbóż do krajów przyfrontowych, w tym do mojego kraju – Polski – który spowodował destabilizację rynków zbóż w tych krajach.

Chciałbym panu komisarzowi podziękować, i panu komisarzowi Dombrovskisowi, za szybką reakcję na wystąpienie premierów pięciu krajów i wprowadzenie unijnego, co chciałem podkreślić, zakazu wwozu czterech zbóż do tych właśnie pięciu krajów. Chciałbym także Panu podziękować za dwukrotne już uruchomienie rezerwy kryzysowej, która właśnie trafia do rolników tych krajów, a przy okazji także ministrom 22 krajów członkowskich, którzy zgodzili się, żeby właśnie te pięć krajów korzystało z rezerwy kryzysowej.

Mam nadzieję, że Pan wesprze także działania poszczególnych rządów, które u pani komisarz Vestager starają się o akceptację programów pomocy publicznej.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Van annak bája, hogy akkor vitázunk a témáról, miután tegnap már szavaztunk az ukrán kereskedelem liberalizációs jogszabály meghosszabbításáról. De jobb később, mint soha.

A Bizottságnak óriási a felelőssége, hogy az afrikai éhezőknek szánt gabona jó része az Unió keleti határain levő országokban rekedt. Örülök ugyanakkor, hogy a regionális összefogás hatására a Bizottság végül csak meghallgatta Kelet-Közép-Európa hangját. Ehhez az kellett, hogy négy tagállam egyoldalú védintézkedést vezessen be. Kérdezem, ha a 7000 százalékkal megnőtt ukrán kukoricabehozatal, vagy az 1000 százalékkal megugrott gabonaimport a francia vagy a német piacon landolt volna, és nem a magyar, lengyel, szlovák, bolgár vagy román piacon, mennyi ideig kellett volna várni a Bizottság válaszára? Nincs kétségem: a fölösleges gabona már egy hét múlva hegyekben állt volna a Berlaymont előtt, és a Bizottság azonnal reagált volna.

Szokják meg végre, hogy a mi gazdáink problémái ugyanolyan jelentősek, mint a nyugati gazdáké. A piac zavar keleten és nyugaton egyaránt európai probléma.

Nem kérdéses, hogy Ukrajna mellett állunk, de nem engedjük meg, hogy a háború árát a kelet-közép-európai gazdák fizessék meg.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, doamnelor și domnilor colegi, încă de la început aș dori să subliniez faptul că nu punem sub semnul întrebării necesitatea ca fermierii din Ucraina să fie mai departe sprijiniți. În acest context, subliniez faptul că România a asigurat transportul a peste 60 % din cerealele ucrainene către zonele terțe. În același timp, însă, domnule comisar, cantități însemnate de cereale au rămas în România și au pus o presiune incombensurabilă asupra fermierilor care, pur și simplu, nu au mai avut unde să-și vândă produsele la prețuri care să le acopere costurile de producție.

Culoarele de transport au fost inaccesibile pentru aceștia, infrastructura de transport fiind atât insuficientă, dar și foarte scumpă. Comisia Europeană și statele membre trebuie să înțeleagă că este nevoie suplimentară de vapoare, de camioane și vagoane de tren pentru a asigura un transport eficient. România și statele din proximitatea războiului nu pot fi lăsate singure în această situație. Altfel, se pune întrebarea, domnule comisar, ce facem cu fermierii din aceste țări?

Le-am dat subvenții europene să producă cereale. Aceștia au cheltuit din banii proprii pentru a înființa culturile, iar acum vedem că rămân cu cerealele în stocuri. Cred că în momentul de față singura soluție este ca aceste cereale să fie gestionate direct de Comisia Europeană și apoi expediate în cadrul programelor internaționale de combatere a foametei către zonele africane, acolo unde peste 42 de milioane de cetățeni suferă de foamete, iar suspendarea exporturilor de cereale fără taxe vamale pentru cele cinci state trebuie să fie prelungită și după 5 iunie.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario Wojciechowski, onorevoli colleghi, il supporto e la solidarietà dell'Unione al popolo ucraino non può essere messa in discussione, soprattutto di fronte a una chiara strategia russa che mira a dividerci incoraggiando iniziative unilaterali e non conformi al diritto dell'Unione, come quelle prese da alcuni Stati membri nelle scorse settimane.

Tuttavia la Commissione non può lasciare che gli effetti delle misure a supporto dell'economia ucraina impattino in modo sproporzionato solo su alcuni settori, come quello agroalimentare, senza mettere in campo una strategia adeguata contro i fenomeni distortivi che hanno portato a un crollo dei prezzi dei cereali, nonostante i costi di produzione sempre più elevati per i nostri agricoltori.

La mobilitazione della riserva di crisi per la seconda volta nel giro di pochi mesi dimostra come l'attuale budget della PAC non sia sufficiente a far fronte a situazioni geopolitiche emergenziali, aggravate da fenomeni speculativi all'interno dell'Unione.

Serve quindi uno sforzo maggiore anche sul fronte interno, signor Commissario, per continuare a essere davvero al fianco dell'Ucraina e, come sottolineato proprio ieri dal cancelliere Scholz, prepararne adeguatamente l'ingresso nell'Unione.

Атидже Алиева-Вели (Renew). – Г-жо Председател, пет държави, една от които България, месеци наред бяха оставени сами. Ситуацията с украинското зърно на европейския пазар показва, че са нужни още мерки. Тежкото положение на производителите от Източна Европа изисква, подчертавам, общи европейски решения и спешни решения, запазвайки солидарността ни с Украйна.

Днес говорим за сектор зърно, но са засегнати секторите мляко, месо, плодове и зеленчуци, мед. Българските производители, които получават най-ниските плащания в Европейския съюз, настояват, г-н Комисар, да знаят ще продължи ли наложената забрана, ще се допълва ли тя с нови продукти? Ще се гарантира ли занапред засиленият контрол за транзитно преминаване на тези продукти? Ще има ли адекватна финансова помощ за засегнатите земеделци, защото вече обявената не е достатъчна? Българските и европейските земеделци трябва да получат подкрепата на Европа.

Mazaly Aguilar (ECR). – Señora presidente, señor comisario, es verdad que el corredor que se ha habilitado para sacar el grano de Ucrania ha provocado un movimiento enorme de esos cereales en los países limítrofes. Esa es la razón por la que la Unión Europea, habiendo caído los precios brutalmente en esos países limítrofes, ha dado una ayuda de cien millones de euros a dichos países. Estamos hablando de Polonia, de Hungría, de Bulgaria, de Rumanía y de Eslovaquia. Todo eso está muy bien. Pero, ¿qué es lo que sucede con los países que son el destino final de estas masivas exportaciones de grano de Ucrania?

Según las Naciones Unidas, el segundo país después de China que más grano ha recibido a través de estos corredores es el mío, es España: 4,8 millones de toneladas. Le siguen Turquía con 2,9 e Italia con 1,95. Y esta entrada de esos 4,8 millones de toneladas ha hecho que los precios de los productos de los cereales españoles hayan caído un 28 % desde el verano de 2022, a pesar de la enorme sequía que padece mi país.

Podemos y debemos ser solidarios con Ucrania, pero ¿quién lo es con mis agricultores españoles? ¿Hasta cuándo la Comisión va a mirar hacia otro lado?

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Fontos leszögezni, hogy egész Közép-Európa erőn felül teljesítve óriási segítséget nyújt az ukrán állam és az ukrán nép számára. Magyarország már több mint másfél millió ukrán menekültet fogadott be, és segített meg, és folyamatosan küldjük a humanitárius segélyeket is, nemcsak a magyarlakta területekre, hanem a háború által jobban sújtott távolabbi vidékekre is.

Az viszont egyáltalán nem fogadható el, hogy segítségnyújtás gyanánt a Bizottság olyan rosszul előkészített, átgondolatlan intézkedéseket erőltet a tagállamokra, amelyekkel a haszonleső spekulánsok folyamatosan visszaélnék, és amelyek súlyos károkat okoznak a közép-európai gazdáknak.

Felszólítom a Bizottságot, hogy sokkal nagyobb figyelmet fordítson az első számú feladatára, ez pedig az európai emberek, köztük az európai gazdák érdekeinek a védelme. Nem helyezhetjük előrébb más országok érdekeit, még akkor sem, ha háború sújtja őket. Továbbra is készek vagyunk segíteni, de nem hagyjuk, hogy a felelőtlen döntések miatt a saját gazdáink tönkremenjenek.

Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Panie i Panowie! Winni jesteśmy solidarność i wszelkiego rodzaju wsparcie dla Ukrainy, również w zakresie możliwości eksportu przez Ukrainę płodów rolnych. Ale nie można tego czynić w taki sposób, który prowadzi do katastrofy, do bankructw tysięcy gospodarstw w państwach graniczących z Ukrainą, również w Polsce.

Korytarze solidarnościowe okazały się fikcją, a Komisja przez długi czas problem lekceważyła. Jeszcze w lutym pan komisarz Wojciechowski pisał, że ten import zboża na obszar Unii jest pożądanym i Komisja będzie badać sytuację rolników państw frontowych.

Panie Komisarzu, ta sytuacja, z którą mamy do czynienia, to jest próbka tego, co czeka europejskie rolnictwo, unijne rolnictwo po włączeniu Ukrainy do jednolitego rynku. Już dzisiaj trzeba budować strategię selektywnych okresów przejściowych, ale również już dziś strategię wzmacniania gospodarstw rolnych w Unii Europejskiej, żeby wzmocnić ich odporność i konkurencyjność na ten przyszły czas, kiedy będziemy mieli Ukrainę w Unii Europejskiej.

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, apreciez măsurile Comisiei, care le permit un respiro de o lună fermierilor est-europeni afectați de importurile masive de cereale ucrainene.

Sigur, ar fi fost și mai bine dacă strategia ar fi fost concepută de la început astfel încât să nu dezechilibreze piața unică și să ajute atât producătorii ucraineni, cât și pe cei din România, Polonia, Bulgaria, Cehia și Slovacia.

Acum niciunii nu sunt mulțumiți. Prețul la cereale s-a prăbușit. UE a fost împânzită de proteste, iar Rusia continuă, se pare, cu elan, să exporte produse, inclusiv alimentare, în unele state membre.

Solicit deci Comisiei ca, odată cu reînnoirea acordului cu Ucraina, să pregătească și extinderea interdicției de import în statele membre afectate, pentru că situația nu e rezolvată.

România are probleme mari, fiind un caz unic. Ea are legături și maritime, și fluviale, și rutiere cu Ucraina. Portul Constanța e copleșit de valul de mărfuri din zona de conflict și blocajul nu ajută pe nimeni.

Va fi nevoie și de o monitorizare strictă a produselor ucrainene, inclusiv făină, miere, zahăr și ulei, precum și de un mecanism de prevenire a posibilelor eludări ale excepțiilor.

Ulrike Müller (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Unsere Unterstützung beim Export von Getreide ist für unsere ukrainischen Partner existenziell wichtig. Diese Unterstützung ist eine europäische Aufgabe; daher müssen wir sie auch gemeinsam und mit deutlichen europäischen Antworten beantworten können. Die größte Herausforderung ist natürlich dieses Schwarzmeerabkommen, diese Logistik, diese Senkung der Transportkosten. Alles ist für mich ziemlich klar.

Aber was wir natürlich jetzt auch bemerken, ist, dass die Situation in diesen fünf Ländern sehr, sehr ernst ist. Das dürfen wir nicht auf die Seite schieben. Wir müssen uns tatsächlich Gedanken machen, wie wir echte Lösungen hinbekommen. Hier in diesen Ländern das ukrainische Getreide zwischenzulagern, die Preise innerhalb der EU zu drücken und Händlern zusätzlich Geld zu verschaffen, das ist nicht unsere Aufgabe, Herr Kommissar.

Ich glaube, wir sollten eine ehrliche Debatte führen. Wenn Spanien und einige europäische Länder dieses Getreide von der Ukraine brauchen, dann müssen wir die Rahmenbedingungen dafür setzen, und das ist die Aufgabe der Kommission. GD MOVE, GD AGRI und GD Trade müssen hier zusammen Lösungen erarbeiten.

Асим Адемов (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, всички сме солидарни с Украйна и желаем по-скорошно стабилизиране на търговията в Черноморския регион. Но предприетите от Европейския съюз действия за гарантиране на продоволствената сигурност под формата на коридори на солидарността и временно либерализиране на търговията с украински стоки в Европейския съюз доведоха до сътресения на пазарите в държавите членки, които са в близост до Украйна, каквато е и България.

Мерките за либерализация на практика увеличили неравнопоставеността на земеделските стопани от Европейския съюз и тези от Украйна поради разликата в производствените стандарти и по-ниската себестойност на украинската продукция. Суспендирането на митата се отрази крайно негативно върху пазара на суровото мляко, зърнените и маслодайните култури в България, който беше наводнен от по-евтина селскостопанска украинска продукция.

Удължаването с още една година на безмитния внос на селскостопански продукти от Украйна ще бъде пагубно за земеделските стопани в нашите страни, ако не се гарантира транзитната функция на коридорите за солидарност и не се въведат ефективни защитни механизми, включително за забрана на внос при сътресения на пазара.

Петър Витанов (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, България е била и продължава да бъде солидарна с тежката съдба на украинските граждани. Но като икономическо обединение Европейският съюз трябва да се грижи и за европейските производители, защото те са ключови за повишаване на благосъстоянието и за развитие на селските райони.

Приветстваме решението на Европейската комисия с увеличената солидарност за производителите от първа линия на петте държави. Макар финансовият пакет да не може да компенсира шетите, важно е, че в този критичен момент преди новата реколта нашите фермери могат да посрещнат своите нужди. Същевременно Европейската комисия трябва да наблюдава не само тези четири култури, но и продукти, като сухото мляко, като медът, където има индикации за сериозно увеличаване на вноса, респективно повече засегнати европейски фермери.

Дали приетият на 2 май регламент ще постигне заложените в него цели е дискуссионен въпрос, но най-важно е Европейската комисия да предложи устойчиво решение за периода след 5 юни, което да не е в ущърб нито на Украйна, нито на останалите европейски производители.

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Madam President, Commissioner, Minister, dear colleagues, Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine has an important economic dimension in addition to the direct military one. Ukraine simply has to finance its defence forces and withstand the brutal aggression of Russian imperialism, spending almost half of its national budget on this. It is understandable that economic activity, including trade in agriculture products, is needed to supplement the budget.

By maintaining these solidarity lanes for Ukraine to trade its agricultural products with third countries and extending the EU's tariff-free trade with Ukraine, we are providing an important opportunity for Ukrainians to maintain their economic viability and jobs. I am confident, dear colleagues, that European consumers will mobilise their support and solidarity with Ukraine to purchase and consume Ukrainian agricultural products, especially if their national producers cannot satisfy the demand. After all, 'buying Ukrainian' sounds very European.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Mam Panu do przekazania zaproszenie od lubelskich rolników na merytoryczne spotkanie, m.in. od rolników, którzy są skupieni wokół Stowarzyszenia „Oszukana Wieś”.

Chcieliby Panu przedstawić swoją perspektywę. Chcieliby zapytać, między innymi, gdzie Pan był w drugiej połowie 2022 r., kiedy przez całą Polskę niósł się krzyk rozpacz polskich rolników, którzy znaleźli się w dramatycznej sytuacji po napływie w sposób niekontrolowany ukraińskiego zboża.

Oni, tak samo jak i ja, nie mają najmniejszych wątpliwości, że Ukrainie trzeba pomagać, ale dziwią się, że po tym wszystkim, co stało się w ciągu ostatnich 10 miesięcy, Pan chce kontynuować politykę, która wcale nie pomaga zwykłym Ukraińcom, a buduje tylko nową oligarchię. Będą zarabiać wielkie międzynarodowe korporacje, a europejscy i polscy rolnicy będą tylko tracić.

Ci ludzie zasługują na uwagę. Ci ludzie zasługują na wysłuchanie. Ci ludzie zasługują przede wszystkim na pomoc, ale realną pomoc, a nie na taką jałmużnę, jaką proponuje im polski rząd i Komisja Europejska.

(Mówca zgadza się odpowiedzieć na pytanie sygnalizowane podniesieniem niebieskiej kartki)

Marek Paweł Balt (S&D), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Pani Przewodnicząca, Panie Europosśle! Mamy bardzo poważny kryzys na rynku zbóż w wielu krajach europejskich. Mam do pana pytanie, bo dzisiaj wszyscy się tym bardzo emocjonujemy: czy były interwencje, czy ma Pan wiedzę, że były interwencje europosłów Parlamentu Europejskiego u pana komisarza w sprawie możliwego kryzysu zbóż? I czy ma Pan wiedzę, że można było temu przeciwdziałać wcześniej? Jakie były odpowiedzi pana komisarza? Jakie były odpowiedzi ze strony Komisji, jeśli takie apele były ze strony europosłów?

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Dziękuję bardzo, panie pośle. Oczywiście, że takie interwencje były. Oczywiście, że już w połowie ubiegłego roku – w połowie ubiegłego roku! – w Polsce ostrzegano przed tym dramatem, który się stanie w związku z decyzjami, które zostały podjęte.

Interwencje? Proszę bardzo, tu siedzi na sali pan poseł Jarosław Kalinowski, który był autorem interwencji w sprawie ukraińskiego zboża, którą osobiście także podpisałem z posłem Jarubasem, do pana komisarza Wojciechowskiego.

Mało tego, podpisaliśmy także list w sprawie drobiu. Czekamy w tej chwili na odpowiedź ze strony pana komisarza, bo także kolejnych branż rolniczych zaczyna dotyczyć ta dramatyczna sytuacja, bo następni są w kolejce producenci owoców miękkich. I ten dramat będzie następował w rolnictwie, w jednej po drugiej branży rolniczej, nie tylko polskiej, ale i europejskiej.

Martin Hlaváček (Renew). – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, řešení, které Evropská komise přináší pro ukrajinské obilí, není nejlepším řešením. Zákaz dovozu jen do vybraných pěti zemí je bezprecedentní. Nepřinese účinek pro evropský trh, který, jak víte, nemá hranice a zboží tak bude putovat dále bez omezení v rámci Evropy. Účelem také rozhodně nemělo být rozdat kompenzace vybraným zemědělcům, ale vyřešit uspokojivě a bezpečně tranzit přes Evropu do třetích zemí a nezatěžovat evropský trh. Správné řešení by tedy mělo vypadat takto: za prvé, zajistit řádně tranzit – místo určení, oznamovací povinnost a trestat podvodníky. Za druhé, zavést cla s tím, že výjimku dostanou ty členské státy, které ukrajinské obilí potřebují. A zatřetí, rozšířit ochranu také na živočišné produkty, především drůbež, vejce a další. To je časovaná bomba. Mohl byste prosím toto navrhnout do vašeho návrhu po pátém červnu?

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, včera jsme zde v Evropském parlamentu velkou většinou 537 hlasů schválili pokračování liberalizace obchodu pro Ukrajinu s komoditami, pšenicí, řepkou, slunečnicí a kukuřicí. Chceme, aby pokračoval vývoz těchto komodit z Ukrajiny, protože to je důležité jak pro ukrajinské zemědělce, tak pro třetí země, které toto zboží potřebují. Ale všichni souhlasíme s tím, že je to zboží určené zejména pro třetí země. A tady je ten problém a také úkol. Pane komisaři, vy jste zde zmínil zlepšení těch tras solidarity a já bych měla tři otázky. První otázkou je: Jaké konkrétní kroky povedou k tomu, aby se skutečně tyto komodity dostaly do třetích zemí, aby byly vyvezeny? Jednáte s OSN, konkrétně se Světovým potravinovým programem o odkoupení nadbytečných komodit, které zůstávají na evropském trhu a které jsou potřeba pro třetí země, kde hrozí hladomor? Víme, kdo s ukrajinským obilím na území EU spekuluje?

Radosław Sikorski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Wysoka Izbo! Panie Komisarzu! Nikt nie wyprzedzi mnie we wspieraniu bohaterskiej Ukrainy w jej walce w obronie przed rosyjską agresją. Ale, Panie Komisarzu, czuję się przez Pana i Komisję wprowadzony w błąd. Bo w odpowiedzi na rosyjską blokadę eksportu przez Morze Czarne, przez Polskę miały powstać korytarze tranzytowe, aby to, co Ukraina wcześniej eksportowała do Afryki, mogło znowu trafić do Afryki.

Tymczasem otworzyliście europejski rynek bez kontyngentów – a słyszy się, że nawet bez niektórych kontroli – na całą ukraińską żywność. Nie tak się umawialiśmy. Protestowali polscy rolnicy. Protestował Donald Tusk. Protestowało Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe. A czemu Pan nie protestował? Nie zauważyłem, żeby Pan protestował.

I to, co najważniejsze: Putin się odgraża, że z powrotem zablokuje eksport przez Morze Czarne, czyli że wszystko to, co jest na Ukrainie wyprodukowane w tej chwili i cały tegoroczny zbiór może trafić na rynek europejski, w tym głównie do Polski. Co Pan wtedy zrobi? Pan proponuje, żeby ten system dalej działał. Uzależnił Pan los polskiego i europejskiego rolnictwa od dobrej woli Putina. Tego Panu nie wybaczymy. I tym sposobem zaszkodził Pan sprawie polskiego rolnictwa i życzliwości Polaków dla wspierania Ukrainy. Niestety.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Doamna președintă, stimați colegi, cu toții vrem să ajutăm Ucraina. Ucraina a fost atacată în mod ilegal, injust, ilegal de către Federația Rusă și cu toții vrem să ajutăm Ucraina.

Însă trebuie să ajutăm Ucraina în așa fel încât să nu afectăm fermierii din state membre ale Uniunii Europene și, domnule comisar, deja de un an de zile știm că avem un excedent de cereale în Ucraina, prea multe cereale, și știm că este nevoie de aceste cereale în alte state din afara Uniunii Europene.

În poziția dumneavoastră de comisar pentru agricultură trebuia să vă asigurați că tranzitul cerealelor, de acolo unde sunt prea multe cereale, acolo unde este nevoie de ele, este organizat cum trebuie. Aceste cereale au inundat piețe ale statelor membre ale Uniunii Europene, afectează producătorii locali, afectează fermierii locali și de aceea, domnule comisar, trebuie să puneți în funcțiune și să faceți ca acest mecanism să funcționeze exact așa cum l-am gândit de anul trecut. Punerea lui în funcțiune a întârziat și acest lucru este obligația directă a dumneavoastră, în postura de comisar pentru agricultură.

Peste două-trei luni de zile va veni recolta pe acest an deja și trebuie să fie clar: cerealele să poată părăsi Ucraina, state membre din Uniunea Europeană să fie doar zone de tranzit și să meargă acolo unde este nevoie de ele.

Este obligația dumneavoastră să apărați fermierii din toate statele membre ale Uniunii Europene. Este obligația dumneavoastră să apărați fermierii în situație de criză, dar trebuie să ne pregătim pentru astfel de situații, pentru a evita să intrăm din nou în perioade de criză în viitor. De aceea, acel mecanism pe care l-am decis trebuie să funcționeze. Este o soluție europeană pentru fermierii din toate statele europene.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, eu cred că este foarte important să nu împărțim Europa în două, între cetățeni europeni și cetățeni care sunt astăzi atacați de Putin doar pentru că își doresc ca deasupra țării lor să fluture tot steagul Uniunii Europene. Putin ne-a adus pe lângă acest conflict de securitate și criza de refugiați, și iată o nouă criză pe care trebuie să o dezbatem cu foarte multă seriozitate și fermitate.

Comisia Europeană are obligația să iasă din această stare lentă în care tratează lucrurile, pentru că, într-adevăr, criza cerealelor este o problemă extrem de serioasă și are nevoie de răspunsuri ferme, de reguli foarte clare, de norme extrem de precise, pentru a putea ajuta agricultorii europeni.

Prin țara mea, prin România, au trecut peste 60% din cerealele exportate din Ucraina, care au tranzitat Uniunea Europeană. Evident că avem nevoie de răspunsuri unitare, imediate.

Katarína Roth Neveďalová (S&D). – Pani predsedajúca, nenadarmo sa hovorí, že Ukrajina je obilnica Európy. A predovšetkým toto obilie, o ktorom tu všetci stále hovoríme, malo byť určené Afrike, a naozaj ľuďom, ktorí sú chudobní a ktorí hladujú.

My vo východnej Európe alebo v strednej a východnej Európe nechceme naozaj toto lacné nekontrolované obilie, pretože nevieme, akého je úplne konkrétneho pôvodu. A ako bolo už povedané. U nás máme na Slovensku vzorky, ktoré dokazujú, že toto obilie nie je vhodné na konzumáciu podľa našich noriem.

Pán komisár, vy ste povedali, že Slovenská republika dostala približne 800 tisíc ton obilia za posledné obdobie. Ale kompenzácia podľa nového schváleného harmonogramu je nejakých päť miliónov eur, čo mi vychádza asi 6 a pol eura na tonu. A to sa mi nezdá ako úplne v poriadku.

Ide o východnú Európu, treba si to povedať. Ide o východnú Európu. Keby išlo o Francúzsko, Nemecko, Taliansko, tak by sme tu inak rozprávali všetci. Ako bolo povedané, takisto viacerými predrečníkmi.

Viete, naše krajiny, ktoré sú najviac teraz zasiahnuté týmto problémom obilia z Ukrajiny, sú takisto krajiny, kde je teraz veľmi veľa ukrajinských utečencov. Kde naši obyvatelia naozaj nie sú úplne na tom najlepšie, a myslím si, že mali by sme sa starať práve o ich zdravie a o to, čo títo obyvatelia chcú. Tieto krajiny, týchto päť krajín, tvorí jednu pätinu Európskej únie a jednu pätinu jej obyvateľov. A takto by sme k tomu mali aj pristupovať.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, I wish to intervene as a member of the Development Committee of the Parliament and passing references have been made by previous speakers about the implications of this issue for our development partners. And I think it's important, therefore, that we spell it out: developing countries are suffering food price inflation to a very great degree, and it has to be said that lives are at stake.

The number of people who are food insecure in Africa has doubled in 2020, and if there has been improvement on the supply of food to our developing partners, it is largely because of the Black Sea grain initiative, which is now at stake since last Monday.

I wish to also make reference to the global report on food crises, released this month, which itself was unequivocal. It said: 'The global food crisis has been partially made worse by the growing number of food trade restrictions put in place by countries with a goal of increasing domestic supply and reducing prices in response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine.' So this makes it absolutely clear that, yes, we need a European solution to guarantee support for Ukraine, for legitimate concerns of eastern Central European farmers, but also for our development partners.

Beata Mazurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Panie Komisarzy! Sytuacja, której byliśmy świadkami w ostatnim czasie, dotycząca ukraińskiego zboża, obnażyła prawdę o tym, jak bardzo komisyjny projekt tzw. korytarzy solidarności jest niedopracowany i wymaga natychmiastowej naprawy. Dodatkowo debata pokazuje, że wiele państw Unii, zwłaszcza oddalonych od linii ukraińskiego frontu, nie rozumie Europy Wschodniej.

Z powodu braku mechanizmów zabezpieczających transport zboża zostało ono w magazynach, doprowadzając do destabilizacji na rynkach. Polscy rolnicy, obciążeni szeregiem stale rosnących wymagań unijnych, nie mają szans konkurować na rynkach skupu z ukraińskimi produktami rolnymi, które nie podlegają i nie spełniają surowych norm europejskich.

Wsparcie Ukrainy jest naszym moralnym obowiązkiem i my, jako Polska, chcemy dalej pomagać naszemu sąsiadowi, służąc za przykład reszcie Europy. Ale nie może się to odbywać kosztem europejskich rolników i prowadzić do ruiny sektora zbóż czy drobiarskiego w naszym kraju i w państwach sąsiadujących.

Cieszę się, że w końcu Komisja się ocknęła. Obawiam się jednak, że nie doszłoby do tego, gdyby nie wspólne i solidarne działanie premierów Polski, Słowacji, Rumunii, Bułgarii i Węgier. Bez ich inicjatywy wspólny rynek rolny dalej pewnie byłby pogrążony w chaosie.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, the key problem here is not actually the war. It's industrial food production under neoliberal capitalism. The glut of grain on the markets in Poland, in Romania, Bulgaria shows that the ongoing food price crisis is not and never was, about a shortage of food. It's all about distribution and dysfunctional markets.

We have a food system that systematically fails to get food where it's needed, prevent rising hunger or deliver stable livelihoods for farmers. We have a food system that's destroying the climate on which it relies for its very existence.

But the Commission is not doing anything to address this. In fact, it will do anything but address the rampant financial speculation on staple foods, which has caused food prices to spike and led to such extreme dysfunction that grain rots in Poland while people starve in the Global South. What an obscenity! It will do anything but impose a windfall tax on the giant agribusinesses who profit so handsomely from other people's misery. We need a complete and radical transformation in how we produce and deliver and distribute food.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamna președintă, dragi colegi, România a fost printre primele state europene care au creat culoarele verzi de solidaritate cu Ucraina pentru a facilita exportul grânelor către nordul Africii, dar, în absența unor mecanisme europene de sprijin și a unei strategii coerente pentru statele aflate în prima linie, fermierii noștri au fost puternic afectați, în mod special din cauza celor care au profitat și au speculat situația existentă. Din păcate, domnule comisar, nu am auzit nicio soluție pe termen lung din partea dumneavoastră astăzi.

Contextul acesta ne arată, de fapt, că este nevoie de mai mult sprijin din partea Uniunii Europene pentru mediul rural și pentru fermieri. De aceea, desfășurăm în aceste zile, împreună cu Partidul Social Democrat și „PES activists România”, campania „Sate românești cu bani europeni”, prin intermediul căreia, alături de fermierii români, atragem atenția decidenților europeni asupra nevoilor comunităților mici. Îl invit pe domnul comisar să susțină în perioada următoare creșterea alocărilor financiare pentru mediul rural și agricultură la revizuirea bugetului european pe termen lung, să se asigure că aceste grâne ajung acolo unde trebuie și să arate că se preocupă cu adevărat de soarta persoanelor care trăiesc în aceste zone rurale.

Anna Zalewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Europejscy rolnicy, szczególnie polscy, otworzyli swoje serca, domy, stworzyli miejsca pracy dla Ukraińców, bo przecież toczy się wojna. Ona będzie toczyć się pewnie przez wiele miesięcy. Dlatego tak ważne jest, że debatujemy. I pewnie pierwszy wniosek jest taki, że powinniśmy raz w miesiącu dyskutować na ten temat, by te wszystkie kwestie rozstrzygać. Również po to, żeby zapobiegać dezinformacji.

Bardzo wielu zależy na tym, żeby podsycać gniew rolników, bardzo często słuszny, by ten szacunek był, to wsparcie, by ta jedność skierowana do Ukrainy została zburzona. Dlatego potrzebne są działania doraźne. Dobrze więc, że zagłosowaliśmy za wnioskiem wczoraj. Bo on w art. 4 pozwala na blokady, te blokady, które już mają miejsce i będzie pozwalać na inne, ale również na to, żeby myśleć o pomocy publicznej, by wspierać rolników na każdym kroku. Ale myślę, że też trzeba podyskutować nad systemowymi rozwiązaniami, popatrzeć chyba inaczej na wspólną politykę rolną. Wojna każe nam weryfikować różnego rodzaju akcenty. To ważne, co robimy dla rolników europejskich.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Janusz Wojciechowski, Członek Komisji. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ja też odpowiem w języku polskim, bo w tym języku było najwięcej pytań, uwag i wystąpień. I także padło w tym języku pytanie: dlaczego pan się nie sprzeciwił? Nie sprzeciwił otwartemu handlowi z Ukrainą? Więc ja chcę jeszcze raz przypomnieć: otwarty handel z Ukrainą, bezcłowy handel zbożami, prawie wszystkimi, został wprowadzony w 2014 roku. Pan poseł Sikorski był wtedy ministrem spraw zagranicznych rządu polskiego, reprezentował wtedy Polskę. Dlaczego się Pan nie sprzeciwił? Kolega pana posła Hetmana był ministrem rolnictwa z pańskiej formacji. Reprezentował Polskę w sprawach rolniczych. Dlaczego się nie sprzeciwił wtedy?

Ja mogę odpowiedzieć, dlaczego ja się nie sprzeciwiłem i dlaczego Komisja Europejska nie sprzeciwiła się otwartemu handlowi z Ukrainą w 2022 roku. Trwała wojna. Ukraina była okrażona z trzech stron, i atakowana i okrażona – od wschodu, od południa i od północy. Panowie chcieliście, żeby Unia Europejska, w dodatku rękoma komisarza z Polski, zamknęła Ukrainę od Zachodu? Nigdy! Tego nie wolno było zrobić. Po stokroć, nie wolno było tego zrobić. I dlatego decyzje, jakie podjęła Komisja Europejska, były najlepszymi z możliwych.

Przypomnę te decyzje. Czy przewidywaliśmy trudności? Tak, przewidywaliśmy. Dlatego już w marcu 2022 r., w pierwszych tygodniach wojny, Komisja Europejska przygotowała pakiet rozwiązań związanych z kryzysem wojennym, w tym pomoc publiczną dla rolników dotkniętych tym kryzysem wojennym. Zabiegałem osobiście, żeby rolnictwo zostało włączone w ten pakiet pomocowy – zostało włączone. I jeśli już Pan tak wyeksponował – czy też inni mówcy – sprawy polskie, to przypomnę, że z tego pakietu pomocowego Polska trzykrotnie, za zgodą Komisji Europejskiej, uzyskała zgodę pomoc publiczną. Pierwszy raz – 838 mln euro na pomoc nawozową, drugi raz – 126 mln euro na pomoc na dopłaty do zbóż. Trzeci raz, to jest decyzja sprzed kilku dni, 435 mln euro na kolejną pomoc do zbóż, i w międzyczasie trzykrotnie rezerwę kryzysową – 44 mln euro, potem 30 mln euro i ostatni pakiet – 40 mln euro. Łącznie 1 620 mln euro. Przykro mi było słuchać, że niektórzy to jałmużną nazywali. 1 620 mln euro pomocy dla rolników w jednym kraju, dotkniętych skutkami tej wojny w Ukrainie.

Szanowni Państwo! Już bez jakichś emocji chciałem z całego serca podziękować wszystkim państwu posłom nie tylko za tę debatę, ale przede wszystkim za to, że ten trudny problem rozwiązaliśmy w duchu europejskiej solidarności. Że przyjęte rozwiązania dla pięciu krajów rzeczywiście dotkniętych tym nadmiernym importem zostały przyjęte ze zrozumieniem, że 22 kraje okazały solidarność i zgodziły się na te pierwszy raz w historii Unii Europejskiej regionalne rozwiązania. Nie było nigdy takiej interwencji. Jeżeli była, to na całym rynku unijnym. Tu zostały przyjęte rozwiązania dotyczące pięciu krajów. Wyjątkowa, bez precedensu sytuacja. Dziękuję za zrozumienie tej solidarności europejskiej. Była potrzebna i została okazana.

Dziękuję państwu posłom za wczorajsze głosowanie i przedłużenie tego rozporządzenia liberalizującego handel z Ukrainą. To jest bardzo dobra decyzja i dzięki tej decyzji te środki ochronne zastosowane wobec tych pięciu krajów będą mogły być przedłużone, bo ich przedłużenie będzie konieczne. Bez tej decyzji tego przedłużenia by nie było. 5 czerwca wróciłby stan z porozumienia z 2014 roku, czyli bezcłowy handel – ten, który za pana ministra Sikorskiego został wprowadzony, czyli bezcłowy handel na rzepak, na kukurydzę. Te dwa produkty najważniejsze z punktu widzenia Polski akurat. Ta decyzja o przedłużeniu tych ram jest niesłychanie ważna.

Szanowni Państwo! Korytarze solidarnościowe. To nieprawda, że one nie zadziałały. Komisja ma pełne dane, ile zostało nadane w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich i ile zostało przyjęte jako import docelowy. Proszę bardzo, Rumunia – i tutaj wielkie podziękowania dla Rumunii, dla rumuńskich rolników i dla całej infrastruktury, która przyjęła największy ciężar korytarzy solidarnościowych – 9 mln ton zboża, ziarna zostało wysłane do Rumunii. Zostało 2,5 mln ton, a 6,5 mln ton przejechało jako tranzyt. W przypadku Polski nadane zostało 4 mln 100 tys. ton. 3 mln 400 tys. ton zostało, a 700 tys. ton przejechało – dokładnie tyle, ile miało przejechać. Wystarczy, proszę państwa, popatrzeć na mapę Europy i świata. Polska nie leży na szlaku handlowym z Ukrainy do Azji czy do Afryki. No nie leży, ani nawet do Hiszpanii. Tu, gdzie było zapotrzebowanie na tranzyt, tam on miał miejsce, a gdzie indziej go nie było. Przez Węgry tranzytem przejechało 300 tys. ton, przez Słowację jeszcze mniej. Największy ciężar tranzytu przyjęła na siebie Rumunia. Więc teza, że korytarze solidarnościowe się nie sprawdziły, jest po prostu nieuprawniona. Problemem stał się import docelowy – i ten został ograniczony w drodze naprawdę bardzo dobrego porozumienia.

Szanowni Państwo! Jeszcze raz chcę podziękować za rozwiązanie tego problemu w duchu europejskiej solidarności. To jest najważniejsze, że tę solidarność potrafiliśmy osiągnąć. Co będzie dalej? Proszę państwa, toczy się wojna i trzeba pamiętać, co robi na rynkach światowych Rosja. W ubiegłym roku wyeksportowała 15 mln ton zboża. W tym roku zamierza zwiększyć do 25 mln ton. I politycy rosyjscy nie ukrywają, że ich celem jest całkowite wyparcie Ukrainy z rynków światowych i zastąpienie ukraińskiego eksportu własnym eksportem. Korzystają z tego, że żywność jest wyłączona z sankcji. Wykorzystują to na rynku. Pamiętajmy, że Rosja nie pierwszy raz w swojej imperialnej polityce używa żywności jako broni.

Ale myślę, że te rozwiązania, które Komisja Europejska przyjęła naprawę w duchu europejskiej solidarności, to są najlepsze rozwiązania, jakie można było przyjąć w tej sytuacji. Co do innych produktów Komisja analizuje sytuację. Jeśli chodzi o drób, to mięso drobiowe jest problemem w całej Unii Europejskiej – zaczyna być. I niewykluczone, że ta klauzula bezpieczeństwa, którą zamierzamy w tej sprawie uruchomić, może doprowadzić do przywrócenia kwoty taryfowej. Nie przesądzam tego, bo to będzie zależało od analizy rynku. To samo dotyczy jaj. To samo dotyczy również cukru. Co do innych produktów to postępowanie na podstawie klauzuli bezpieczeństwa przesądzi, czy zastosujemy środki ochronne czy nie. Ale też przypomnę, że to właśnie w tym rozporządzeniu liberalizującym została wprowadzona klauzula bezpieczeństwa, dzięki której można było zastosować środki ochronne.

Szanowni Państwo, jeszcze raz dziękuję. To jest bardzo trudna debata, ale pamiętajmy, że winę za tę sytuację, stuprocentową, ponosi Rosja, która dopuściła się niesprawiedliwej, niczym nieuzasadnionej, brutalnej agresji przeciwko Ukrainie i że tam toczy się walka nie tylko o wolność Ukrainy, ale także o naszą.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Thank you, Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioners, Russia's brutal invasion of Ukraine has disrupted food and fuel markets worldwide.

The EU continues to stand united in its support to Ukraine on all possible fronts and as long as it takes. Of course, this includes making sure that agricultural exports remain an important source of revenue for the Ukrainian economy and that they can contribute to food security in Europe and globally.

At the same time, we should acknowledge that farmers in some countries may be affected more than those in others. We must be ready to react quickly to alleviate disruptions to the single market while ensuring food security in the EU and in the world.

Over the past years, export has been growing and prices have dropped. This happens thanks to the EU response and the creation of solidarity lanes and the Black Sea grain initiative brokered by the United Nations.

Meanwhile, the preventive and temporary measures agreed with the five frontline Member States that were adopted last week are far reaching. They should bring some relief to farmers in countries neighbouring Ukraine. But as I said in my first intervention, the Presidency continues to monitor and follow the situation and are ready to further actions.

Together we can support farmers while maintaining our strong support for Ukraine. Thank you very much for the debate and thank you for your attention.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Witold Jan Waszczykowski (ECR), na piśmie. – Problemy z ukraińskim zbożem na rynku europejskim i szerzej – z globalnymi łańcuchami dostaw żywności – dowodzą, że rosyjska agresja przeciwko Ukrainie nie jest konfliktem lokalnym. Celem rosyjskiego agresora jest wywołanie kryzysu i zniechęcenie zachodnich rządów i społeczeństw do dalszego zaangażowania po stronie Kijowa. Jednak to kraje frontowe, takie jak Polska, pozostają nieustannie najbardziej zaangażowanymi orędownikami sprawy Ukraińskiej. Pomimo tego, iż wojna u naszych granic dotyka nas dużo bardziej dotkliwie niż np. niechętnych do pomocy Niemców czy Francuzów. Kwestia ukraińskich produktów rolnych, w tym zbóż, nie jest tutaj wyjątkiem. W sposób oczywisty kraje flanki wschodniej UE przyjęły na siebie największy ciężar wynikający z tymczasowego otwarcia na ukraińskie produkty rolne. Komisja Europejska zobowiązała się do pomocy w dalszym przesyłce zalewających nasze rynki ukraińskich produktów zbożowych. Liczę na to, że tym razem Komisja wywiąże się ze złożonych Polsce i innym krajom obietnic.

14. Aktualizacja ram prawnych dotyczących walki z korupcją (debata)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zur Aktualisierung des Rechtsrahmens für die Korruptionsbekämpfung (2023/2685(RSP)).

Nicolas Schmit, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, almost 68% of Europeans think that corruption is widespread in their country. Corruption undermines the trust in democratic institutions and is damaging our societies. Corruption costs the EU at least EUR 120 billion each year. Corruption is a threat to security. It is an increasingly cross-border crime. In the past six years, Eurojust has registered more than 500 cross-border cases. Corruption and organised crime go hand in hand. Almost 60% of organised crime activity uses corruption as a regular tactic. Daphne Caruana Galizia was trying to unveil corruption when she was murdered, like Slovak journalist Jan Kuciak, brutally killed with his fiancée, Martina. Corruption can infect any level of society. If left to run rampant, corruption will suffocate our democratic society, destroy its institutions, as well as the lives of many citizens.

Last September, at her State of the Union speech, President von der Leyen promised that the Commission would step up the fight against corruption at home and abroad. Last week, the Commission and High Representative delivered an anti-corruption package for healthy democracies and institutions that citizens can trust. We are proposing a comprehensive set of measures to fight corruption where it hurts the corrupt the most. This includes an update of our existing legislative framework to combat corruption. Definitions and penalties related to corruption differ too much among EU countries. This makes cross-border investigations more difficult and creates loopholes. We propose that all kinds of corruption are criminalised, not only bribery offences. We propose to raise standards on illicit enrichment, trafficking and influence, abuse of power and obstruction of justice. We target both public and private sectors and will raise penalties across the EU.

The proposal aims to provide law enforcement, prosecution and the judiciary with the tools they need to combat corruption. This includes a sufficiently long statute of limitations to bring proceedings to an end. It also will ensure that immunity or privileges from prosecution can be lifted by an effective and transparent process in a reasonably short period.

But better than fighting corruption, we need to prevent it. Prevention helps to create a culture of integrity in which corruption and impunity are not tolerated. Prevention has wider benefits in promoting public trust and managing the conduct of public officials. 70% of last year's rule of law recommendations on corruption concerned prevention. We want to see, in each EU country, specialised anti-corruption bodies that are trusted, well-funded and independent. In this line, we will soon table a proposal for an interinstitutional ethics body to serve as an example for our Member States.

We cannot stop the fight against corruption at our borders. Corruption can also undermine the principle and objectives that the EU promotes through its common foreign and security policy: democracy, the rule of law, human rights, peace, international security and sustainable development. This is why, in parallel to the Commission's initiatives strengthening the fight against corruption within the EU, High Representative Borrell, with the support of the Commission, has submitted to the Council a proposal to establish a new CFSP sanctions regime targeting serious acts of corruption worldwide. It is, of course, for the Member States in the Council to decide whether to adopt such a sanctions regime. We are sending a clear message that the EU is not open for business to those who engage in corruption wherever that occurs.

Javier Zarzalejos, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, hay que celebrar esta iniciativa de la Comisión porque va a resolver situaciones inaceptables dentro de la Unión en lo que se refiere a la persecución y al castigo de la malversación. Y se lo agradecemos especialmente los españoles, que hemos visto, con asombro y con vergüenza, cómo el Gobierno de España y su mayoría parlamentaria hace unos meses modificaron el Código Penal para disolver el delito de malversación y rebajar las penas.

Repito, disolver el delito de malversación y rebajar las penas. ¿Cómo lo hicieron? Por un procedimiento de urgencia y con una enmienda a un texto legislativo que se estaba tramitando en el Parlamento. ¿Por qué lo hicieron? Para beneficiar a sus aliados políticos condenados por malversar fondos públicos para financiar el proceso secesionista en Cataluña.

Y ahora que tenemos la propuesta de la Comisión, ¿ahora qué? Pues ahora animamos al Gobierno de España para que aproveche esta oportunidad y no espere a que la propuesta sea finalmente aprobada para rectificar y corregir un grave error político y legislativo.

Le animamos a que haga los deberes de verdad, a que restablezca el delito de malversación y a que recupere las penas que le corresponden. Le animamos a que sea diligente y busque el acuerdo, al menos con el principal partido de la oposición. Y le animamos a que lo haga antes del inicio de la próxima Presidencia de turno del Consejo, que España asumirá el próximo 1 de julio.

Sinceramente, señor comisario, tengo poca confianza, pero a ver si ustedes en la Comisión tienen más éxito que nosotros y convencen al Gobierno de España para que arregle pronto otro de los desastres legislativos que le caracterizan.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, comisario Schmit, estamos debatiendo la actualización de la estrategia europea contra la corrupción. Muy bien. Es un compromiso de la presidenta de la Comisión, Ursula von der Leyen, en esta legislatura y que además trae causa del impulso que le dimos en la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior a luchar contra la corrupción, como recuerda bien la comisaria Malmström. Y, por tanto, está completamente fuera de lugar el intento al que nos tiene acostumbrados el Partido Popular, y particularmente el Partido Popular Español, de intentar mezclar el cumplimiento de este objetivo europeo con la situación en ningún Estado miembro de la Unión.

Está bien definir con criterios comunes el soborno, el tráfico de influencias, la apropiación indebida, el abuso de funciones, la obstrucción de la justicia y el enriquecimiento ilícito, e imponerles sanciones mínimas, como hace precisamente el Código Penal español. Y creemos, además, que esto sirve para establecer un criterio claro de que la lucha contra la corrupción es un principio básico de la idea europea de Estado de Derecho, democracia y promoción de los derechos fundamentales. Porque es un criterio que se exige a todos los Estados miembros en su acceso a la Unión: ser capaces de garantizar, con independencia judicial y con fiscalía la investigación de los delitos, superando así las diferencias entre los plazos de prescripción y las enormes heterogeneidades de recursos disponibles para la investigación de los delitos que se constatan actualmente en los Estados miembros, no ya digamos entre los Estados candidatos a la Unión.

Ramona Strugariu, în numele grupului Renew. – Doamna președintă, corupția ucide. Este o realitate pe care multe societăți au trăit-o pe propria piele. Au căzut guverne, pentru că oamenii au vrut mai multă integritate, transparență, responsabilitate, standarde mai înalte în politică și un cadru mai puternic pentru statul de drept. Salut noua propunere a Comisiei. Noi trebuie să fim primii care spunem că mandatul public este un spațiu în care niciun politician nu are voie să abuzeze de putere și să acționeze în propriul interes. Vom avea structuri de tip DNA în fiecare stat membru și ne vom asigura că acestea au resurse și formare adecvată pentru a preveni și combate corupția.

Vom alinia definițiile infracțiunilor considerate acte de corupție la nivel european pentru a include, pe lângă darea sau luarea de mită și deturnarea de fonduri, traficul de influență, abuzul în serviciu, obstrucționarea justiției și îmbogățirea ilicită legată de infracțiunile de corupție. Ne vom alinia ca să fie mai puternice, nu ca să fie mai slabe. Asta este speranța mea. Avem nevoie de mai multă transparență în cheltuirea banilor publici. Asta previne corupția. Fiecare leu cheltuit din buzunarele oamenilor contează. Avem de făcut aceste lucruri dacă ne dorim o Europă fără corupție, dreaptă și prosperă, cu respect față de banul public și statul de drept și ar trebui să începem cu noi, cu instituțiile europene, cu fiecare dintre noi în parte, ca să fim noi înșine un exemplu că într-adevăr combatem corupția.

Daniel Freund, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Sie haben über den Schaden gesprochen, den Korruption anrichtet. Leider sind die Zahlen der Kommission mittlerweile mehr als 10 Jahre alt. Aktuellere Schätzungen gehen eher von 1200 Milliarden Euro aus. 1200 Milliarden Euro, die die Europäerinnen und Europäer jedes Jahr verlieren – in Misswirtschaft, in Korruption, in Bestechung.

Ich glaube, dass wir in Europa entschiedener dagegen vorgehen müssen, dass dieses Geld nicht verloren geht; das ist allen klar. Ich freue mich sehr, dass Ursula von der Leyen jetzt auf ihre Rede im letzten September Taten folgen lässt und einen Vorschlag macht, was die Korruptionsbekämpfung angeht. Die Vorschläge sind gut, aber ich glaube, sie sind nicht der große Wurf, den wir jetzt brauchen, um diesen enormen Schaden, den Korruption anrichtet, wirklich anzugehen.

Ich glaube, darüber hinaus ist auch wichtig, dass, wenn wir gegenüber den Mitgliedstaaten, auch gegenüber dem Rest der Welt, wirklich glaubhaft sein wollen, dann auch die EU-Institutionen selber liefern müssen. Wir haben im letzten Dezember den größten Korruptionsskandal in der Geschichte der EU hier gehabt. Auch danach hat Ursula von der Leyen noch einmal ihr Bekenntnis gemacht, dass wir eine unabhängige Ethikbehörde einrichten müssen. Den Vorschlag, den Ihre Kollegin Jourová jetzt machen will, den kann ich nur als Etikettenschwindel bezeichnen. Und ich kann Ihnen schon gar nicht zustimmen, zu sagen, das soll jetzt das große Vorbild für die Mitgliedstaaten werden. Denn nur ein Gremium, das sich über die Harmonisierung von Regeln zwischen den EU-Institutionen hält, das ist doch nicht das, was wir brauchen.

Wir brauchen ein Gremium, das endlich die Regeln, die wir schon haben, durchsetzt. Weil diese Kultur der Straflosigkeit, wo man gegen diese Regeln verstößt und es passiert nichts, das ist doch das, was wir angehen müssen. Und dafür brauchen wir ein Ethikgremium, das sich auch mit Einzelfällen auseinandersetzt.

Ich hoffe sehr, dass wir an dem Vorschlag noch mal nachbessern, bevor er hoffentlich in den nächsten Tagen kommt.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba, en nombre del Grupo ECR. – Señora presidente, señor comisario, parece que el escándalo de corrupción del Parlamento Europeo, destapado este año por la policía belga, ha despertado de la siesta a una parte de la burocracia europea que ahora quiere armonizar la lucha contra la corrupción. Varios miembros del Grupo Socialista han sido detenidos y están siendo investigados por haber recibido dinero de Qatar o Marruecos, entre otros, para legislar en favor de estos y no de los europeos.

Se explica así que la Unión destine millones de euros a financiar la modernización de la agricultura marroquí con dinero de los impuestos de los agricultores españoles que sufren la competencia ilegal.

Los españoles tenemos claro que corrupción y socialismo van de la mano. El Partido Socialista en España, en cuarenta años, acumula 126 condenas por corrupción que afectan a 3 300 millones de euros. Y el Gobierno de Sánchez ha cambiado la ley penal española para beneficiar a los políticos ladrones con una rebaja de penas, por lo que las personas decentes no vemos mal que por una vez la Comisión Europea promueva reformas para combatir la corrupción.

Ahora, esperemos que en las siguientes fases del proceso legislativo no se convierta esto en un pastiche federalista.

Susanna Ceccardi, *a nome del gruppo ID.* – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in politica la fiducia è fondamentale perché, se il cittadino non si fida delle istituzioni e dei suoi rappresentanti, le istituzioni sono meno rappresentative e quindi più deboli.

La corruzione esiste da quando esiste il potere pubblico ed è uno dei vizi umani più detestabili.

La vicenda del Qatargate è stata probabilmente lo scandalo più grande che ha colpito questo Parlamento. È una vicenda su cui gli inquirenti stanno ancora indagando ma che pone una questione fondamentale: la sinistra europea si è sempre vantata di una certa superiorità morale, evidentemente inesistente. Le belle parole come difesa dei diritti, protezione degli ultimi, contrasto alle ingiustizie sono zero contro le immagini delle valigette gonfie di denaro. Anzi, peggio, diventano ipocrisia.

La corruzione rappresenta una minaccia per la nostra economia; quando le aziende pagano tangenti per ottenere appalti o per evitare sanzioni, questo può portare a un aumento dei costi o una diminuzione della qualità dei prodotti e dei servizi offerti.

I corrotti inquinano il vivere civile ed è per questo che la politica ha il compito e il dovere di isolarli, ma la soluzione non è aggiungere norme, cavilli, burocrazia, così da rendere i burocrati sempre più forti e potenti, ma semplificare le norme per le persone oneste che desiderano lavorare e mettersi alla prova. Semplificare le norme e ridurre il peso dello Stato nella vita dei cittadini, è questa la soluzione.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left.* – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je dois dire que j'ai eu un faux espoir. Quand la Commission a annoncé la présentation de règles contre la corruption, je me suis dit: «enfin». Enfin des règles contre ceux qui monnayent leur vote contre des valises de billets. Enfin une réforme profonde des institutions européennes, après le Qatargate, après les textos cachés entre la présidente von der Leyen et le PDG de Pfizer, après le pantouflage de la commissaire Neelie Kroes chez Uber, et tant d'autres scandales. Enfin une action contre les conflits d'intérêt et pour la transparence.

Mais en fait, ce n'est pas le cas. Ne touchons surtout pas à un cheveu de l'opacité des institutions européennes. Concentrons-nous uniquement sur la corruption des États. L'Union fait la leçon, mais elle tergiverse sur ses propres promesses. Adieu les grandes déclarations, faites la main sur le cœur, ici, dans cet hémicycle il y a quelques mois, et bonjour les réformatées éparpillées et discutées à huis clos pour que les libéraux, la droite et l'extrême droite qui vient encore nous donner des leçons, mais en réalité dans le huis clos, puissent tranquillement maintenir le statu quo.

Alors, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous avez parlé de l'autorité éthique indépendante. Cela fait quatre ans qu'on l'attend et j'ai envie de dire que, au vu de ce qui s'annonce, une autorité éthique indépendante, sans réelle indépendance et sans réel pouvoir d'investigation et de sanction, autant dire que ce sera un coup d'épée dans l'eau. Et dans le même temps, nous apprenons que sept commissaires européens acceptent que des gouvernements étrangers leur offrent des nuits d'hôtels de luxe. Alors, chers collègues, la lutte contre la corruption est essentielle. La proposition de la Commission pour renforcer les garde-fous des États membres est bienvenue, mais les institutions européennes doivent d'abord balayer devant leur porte si elles veulent parler de lutte contre la corruption d'une voix crédible.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, govorimo danas o ažuriranju zakonodavnog okvira za borbu protiv korupcije. Moja Hrvatska premrežena je korupcijom. O tome sam mnogo puta ovdje govorio.

Borba protiv korupcije, naravno, počinje voljom. Iskrenom voljom da se s korupcijom obračuna. Ona počinje sa stavom. Sa stavom: nećemo dozvoliti da se krade i učinit ćemo sve da to zaustavimo pod svaku cijenu. Ima primjera iz svijeta gdje su se stvari preko noći uredile kada se pojavila volja. Strogi zakoni i momentalno izvršenje istih tih zakona.

Kada hrvatska vlast govori o tome, o antikorupciji, to je često samo deklarativno, isprazno, formalno. Takve volje nema u hrvatskoj vladi. A kako bi i bilo kad je vodi osuđena zločinačka organizacija. Npr. cijeli natječaj za poticanje inovacija u Hrvatskoj je kriminaliziran. Radi se o milijardama kuna iz europskih fondova.

Takve volje nema niti u europskim institucijama. Što očekivati od Bruxellesa ako je sklopio onakav ugovor s farmaceutskim kompanijama i ne odgovara nizašto? Njih ne zanima puno kako žive hrvatski građani, njima je najvažnije da imaju u Hrvatskoj nekoga, neku vlast, koja će ih slušati. To je jedino bitno – politički projekt. Što se institucije tiče, ostaje nam nada da će hrabri pojedinci u lošem ili barem neadekvatnom sustavu odraditi svoj posao. Pozivam ih odavde da budu hrabri i odrade svoj posao bez obzira na sve pritiske.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Korruption schadet nicht nur der Gesellschaft, sie untergräbt auch die Werte der EU und schwächt die Politik. Zeitgleich schadet sie aber auch dem Einkommen der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Daher ist es unerlässlich, dass wir jetzt unseren aktuellen Rechtsrahmen modernisieren.

Der Vorschlag der Kommission sieht dafür neue Instrumente sowohl auf europäischer Ebene als auch auf nationaler Ebene vor, mit denen die konsequente Bekämpfung von Korruption in Europa und auch darüber hinaus forciert wird. So wird durch eine europaweite Harmonisierung der Definition von Korruptionsdelikten, die in allen Mitgliedstaaten angewandt wird, und durch eine verstärkte Zusammenarbeit der nationalen Behörden die effektive Strafverfolgung grenzüberschreitend erleichtert. Eine unabhängige Justiz ist dabei der Grundpfeiler eines funktionierenden Rechtsstaates.

Es kann daher auch nicht sein, dass Medien oft früher über Sachverhalte Bescheid wissen als die Beschuldigten selbst. Auch hier müssen wir die notwendigen Schritte setzen, um zu gewährleisten, dass unser Rechtsstaat nicht auf diese Weise ausgehebelt wird.

Pascal Durand (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, si vous m'autorisez, je commencerai par citer un penseur, aujourd'hui centenaire, et qui a donc vu passer beaucoup de choses en un siècle. C'est Edgar Morin. Et celui-ci disait, je veux le lire pour ne pas me tromper: «À force de sacrifier l'essentiel pour l'urgence, nous avons fini par oublier l'urgence de l'essentiel». Et l'essentiel, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous l'avez dit, c'est la confiance que les citoyennes et les citoyens portent à leurs institutions, et portent à leurs représentants. Et c'est cela, cet essentiel, que nous devons préserver à travers la lutte contre la corruption.

Alors oui, des urgences, nous en avons eues, bien entendu, mais nous devons aujourd'hui veiller à ce que cette confiance dans les États, dans les institutions, dans les représentants, renaisse. Et pour cela, il faut agir. Alors, vous l'avez dit, et je voudrais juste insister sur un point: nous devons avoir des autorités indépendantes, des contre-pouvoirs, la justice des autorités administratives pour l'ensemble des institutions européennes, afin de reconstruire ce socle démocratique essentiel.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu»)

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Uważnie słuchałem Pana wypowiedzi odnośnie do zaufania do instytucji publicznych. A dzisiaj rano przeczytałem w jednej z gazet tu w Brukseli, że kolejnych siedmiu komisarzy korzystało za darmo z hoteli w Katarze, Egipcie, Maroku, Jordanii i Wietnamie. Komisarzy. I co więcej, oni sami przyznali się do tego, że korzystali z darmowych hoteli. Chciałbym poznać Pana zdanie na ten temat. Co Pan o tym myśli?

Pascal Durand (S&D), réponse «carton bleu». – Si j'en crois le ton de votre question, je pense que mon opinion est la même que la vôtre, c'est-à-dire que c'est absolument scandaleux. C'est pour ça que je ne veux pas viser une institution en particulier: je pense qu'il faut sortir de l'«entre-soi», et il faut arrêter de faire en sorte que, dans un espace de bocal entre amis, finalement, on juge de l'importance des conflits d'intérêt ou pas. Il faut qu'il y ait désormais des autorités indépendantes, que l'on fasse confiance à la justice, et que cette justice et ces autorités portent sur l'ensemble des institutions, aussi bien sur la Commission, bien sûr, mais chez nous aussi, il faut qu'on balaye devant notre porte, et le Conseil également. C'est vital pour la démocratie. Je crois que nous partageons exactement la même analyse.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Madam President, colleagues, Commissioner, corruption is a poison that sometimes kills quite literally. Like in one country, hospitals sold in a crooked deal. In another country, dozens of young people killed in a train crash despite the hundreds of millions of EU funds that were supposed to be spent on railroad security. Journalists that are exposing corruption are murdered. And, yes, also Qatargate.

The anti-corruption package, I'm sure, will find a broad majority in this House and we will probably strengthen it. Let's see how it will fare in the Council, given that some of the worst offenders are sitting in the Council and the European Council.

Because the real weakness of your proposal, Commissioner, lies in the enforcement mechanisms, because it's built on the presumption or rather the pretence of compliance by the Member States. But we know that some national governments are deeply corrupt. Indeed, in some cases, it seems to be their *raison d'être*.

We need a strong enforcement mechanism, European enforcement mechanism, and therefore I hope that you will also put forward the proposal to further strengthen the powers of the European Public Prosecutor that has proven to be the best force against corruption in the entire Union.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, there is no healthy democracy with corruption. Not only does corruption destroy public services and hurt deeply the finances of a country, but it also creates imbalance in powers, and it fosters a climate of threats and fear because those wanting to uncover corruption need to be silenced by those corrupted. And this is why we have, in the EU, journalists getting killed because they are investigating corruption cases.

And the EU is sick because of so much corruption involving high-level politicians, public servants and public funds in so many heavy sectors of the economy – healthcare, transportation, construction, waste management, aerospace and defence, agriculture, food, labour, social protection, a number of European economic sectors. And we know the documented and the most grave situations: Hungary, Malta, Czech Republic, Greece, Croatia, Bulgaria. But in fact, all EU Member States are concerned and we have, for the moment, not been good at all at enforcing our rules. We are very good at saying rules but not at enforcing them.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, σας ευχαριστούμε πάρα πολύ για την εισήγησή σας, τίθεται όμως ένα απλό ερώτημα: Έχουμε κράτη που κάνουν τη δουλειά τους και μια Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση που δεν την κάνει ή αντίστροφα ή και τα δύο μαζί; Χάνουμε χρήματα ή χάνουμε την ψυχή μας με τη διαφθορά;

Τι ορίζεται ως διαφθορά; Νομίζω ότι θα το ορίσουμε σήμερα: «η κατάχρηση ανατεθείσας εξουσίας προς ίδιον όφελος του ατόμου ή του συστήματος» δηλαδή, κατάχρηση από κρατικούς λειτουργούς ή ολόκληρους μηχανισμούς όπου εμπλέκονται, κατά περίπτωση, το κράτος, το βαθύ κράτος αλλά και το παρακράτος. Από μικρής κλίμακας παραβατικότητα για μια πολεοδομική υπόθεση, μέχρι τη συμμετοχή αστυνομικών στα «κυκλώματα της νύχτας» ή τη συμμετοχή «των κυκλωμάτων της νύχτας» στην ιεραρχία της αστυνομίας —τα ακούσαμε σε πανελλαδικό δίκτυο στην Ελλάδα· από μια ιστορία όπου ένας κομματάρχης προσλαμβάνει έναν σταθμάρχη και χάνουμε 57 ανθρώπους, μέχρι τους εμπειρογνώμονες που έστειλε η Ευρώπη και η χώρα δεν ήθελε να τους ακούσει —ήθελε τους δικούς της— ή τις διαδικασίες της διερεύνησης. Στην Ελλάδα, οκτώ στους δέκα πολίτες βλέπουν μεγάλη διαφθορά στα μέσα ενημέρωσης, στην πολιτική, στον δημόσιο τομέα, στην τοπική αυτοδιοίκηση, στη δικαιοσύνη και στην υγεία.

Να έρθω τώρα για να γίνω χρήσιμος: Πού είναι ο μηχανισμός επιβολής, κ. Schmit; Εγώ συμφωνώ με την εισήγησή σας, αλλά νομίζω ότι λείπει αυτό: Χρειαζόμαστε νέους κανόνες, χρειαζόμαστε ελεγκτικούς μηχανισμούς και ανεξάρτητες αρχές, για να τελειώσει αυτό το «μαγείρεμα» κατά της δημοκρατίας. Χρειαζόμαστε συμπαγέστερο πλέγμα ελέγχων και λογοδοσίας. Για εμάς, για την Αριστερά, είναι θέμα δημοκρατίας.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, efforts to improve our anti-corruption framework are welcome, of course, but when will we tackle the political misuse of anti-corruption laws turned into lawfare to repress dissidents?

Spain has a widespread problem of corruption that starts right at the top at the head of the state. And yet, instead of actually combating it, they use the pretence of fight against corruption to prosecute Catalans. My colleagues in this Parliament remain in exile because they are absurdly accused of misappropriation of funds for organising a referendum.

Dozens of Catalan officials face criminal prosecution. They could face prison sentences of more than 10 years and millions in fines for doing their duty and obeying the Catalan Parliament. This is lawfare. This is corruption, and everybody in this Parliament knows it.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a corrupção mina os alicerces da União Europeia, enfraquece as instituições que nos representam e é talvez a primeira responsável pela ascensão dos extremismos.

Nos Estados de direito com respeito pelo princípio da separação de poderes é suposto que a justiça seja capaz de combater a corrupção com eficácia. O problema é que nem sempre assim acontece. De cada vez que alguém com responsabilidades políticas, de funcionários dos diferentes órgãos representativos do poder aos políticos, é envolvido nas teias da corrupção é todo o regime democrático que paga. É por isso que não podemos tolerar um sistema que se mostra incapaz de julgar e de punir, muitas vezes porque os crimes prescrevem, por causa da lentidão da justiça.

Enquanto falo, depois de um grande escândalo mediático, há um ex-primeiro-ministro de Portugal que pode não vir a ser julgado por crimes gravíssimos, porque podem prescrever. Não se trata de ser absolvido ou condenado. Trata-se de não ser sequer julgado, o que é inaceitável e nenhuma pessoa de bem compreende. É simplesmente repugnante.

Os povos europeus não toleram uma justiça que não é cega, que não é igual para ricos e para pobres, e isto tem de ser combatido. Não nos podemos simplesmente resignar e baixar os braços.

A corrupção tem efeitos perversos na sociedade, nas democracias, na economia, enfraquece as instituições em que confiamos, reduz a credibilidade dessas instituições. É por isso que eu saúdo esta iniciativa. Esta proposta de diretiva mostra que não nos conformamos, que exigimos mais para a defesa da credibilidade das instituições, dos valores fundadores da União, da democracia, da igualdade.

Termino, Senhora Presidente. A mensagem que queremos enviar é clara: não toleramos a corrupção na União Europeia. Exigimos que aqueles que praticam atos de corrupção sejam responsabilizados.

Lara Wolters (S&D). – Voorzitter, corruptie is een ziekte. Mevrouw Jurová zei het al. Het kruipt onder de huid van de democratie, verzwakt vertrouwen, verspreidt zich en infecteert de samenleving, ook hier in Europa. Dank dus voor dit goede voorstel om de strijd tegen corruptie op te voeren.

En toch. En toch is het zo dat integriteit niet alleen in wetten te vatten is. Lidstaten moeten elkaar aanspreken op het belang van betrouwbare overheden, van transparantie en openheid, van investeren in goed onderwijs en in solide openbaar bestuur. Dat zeg ik tegen de lidstaten die hier niet vertegenwoordigd zijn, en daar moet echt een tandje bij.

Ten tweede hebben we natuurlijk al een aantal instrumenten voor corruptiebestrijding, maar die moeten wel worden gebruikt. Kijk naar Hongarije: aanhoudende corruptie op het allerhoogste niveau. Viktor Orbán schermt nu met wat hervormingen en meteen horen we geruchten dat de Commissie misschien van plan is om toch de Europese geldkraan weer open te draaien. En om bij die metafoor te blijven: dat is natuurlijk dweilen met de kraan open.

Dus ik dank u voor uw voorstel, maar als we serieus werk willen maken van corruptiebestrijding, dan is handhaving nodig en dan zullen we doortastender moeten zijn wat betreft Europees geld. De komende weken zijn daarin cruciaal.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señora presidenta, con todas las fuerzas, la corrupción tiene que ser combatida con toda la fuerza para que no gane terreno, para que no carcoma nuestros sistemas y nos lleve al colapso democrático o también económico. Así pues, la propuesta de la Comisión es bienvenida, yo creo que por casi todos nosotros. Enhorabuena. Y va a tener todo nuestro apoyo, desde luego de nuestro grupo.

En España llevamos meses denunciando la reforma acometida por el Gobierno español, que crea un tipo atenuado para algunos de sus socios de legislatura contra delincuentes reales. Y, de hecho, España sigue cayendo en la prevención y lucha contra la corrupción y aparece en el *ranking* global junto con Botsuana y Cabo Verde.

Los economistas Acemoglu y Robinson escribieron hace veinte años *Por qué fracasan los países*. Hay países que fracasan y otros que no. La transparencia, la lucha contra la corrupción, la integridad son claves para no degradarse. Los países que no combaten la corrupción con todas sus fuerzas serán más pobres y menos libres. Por eso, señor comisario, gracias por ayudarnos en este combate. Gracias. Es una cuestión de todos los europeos.

Mikuláš Peksa (Verts/ALE). – Paní předsedající, vážení kolegové, protikorupční balíček předložený Komisí je sice krok správným směrem, ale zdaleka nedosahuje toho, co je nezbytné. Evropa již nemůže být bezpečným útočištěm pro zkorumpované úředníky a jejich špinavé peníze, zejména v důsledku *Qatargate* a množství ruských oligarchů, kteří se snaží obejít sankce. Tento legislativní návrh konečně dává Evropě příležitost postihnout zkorumpované úředníky ze zemí mimo Unii dlouho požadovaným evropským Magnitského zákonem. Rozšiřuje také definici korupce a normy pro trestné činy a minimální tresty. Nejdříve však musíme zajistit, aby si orgány Evropské unie zametly před vlastním prahem, a to zřízením nezávislého etického orgánu se skutečnými vyšetřovacími a donucovacími pravomocemi.

Aby Komise mohla skutečně bojovat proti korupci v Evropě, musí také lépe využívat stávající mechanismus podmíněnosti právního státu, který umožňuje zmrazit evropské dotace v případě vážného porušení demokratických hodnot. Rovněž by tak měly být mechanismem zacíleny i jiné země než třeba Maďarsko. A konečně Evropa by měla posílit úlohu evropského veřejného žalobce, který je klíčový pro ochranu rozpočtu Evropské unie před rozsáhlými podvody a korupcí, aby také zasahoval v oblasti obcházení sankcí a trestných činů proti životnímu prostředí. Boj proti korupci prostě musíme brát vážně.

Marisa Matias (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, a corrupção mina as democracias e a legislação europeia não é apenas insuficiente. Está completamente desatualizada. Esta proposta, que agora foi apresentada, se não for mais longe, corre o risco de ser ainda uma mão cheia de nada.

É fundamental desenvolver legislação que abranja os setores público e privado, para enquadrar os crimes de corrupção, para melhor preveni-la e para melhorar a aplicação das penas. Precisamos de propostas que criminalizem não apenas o suborno, mas também propostas que possam criminalizar a apropriação indevida, o tráfico de influências, o abuso de funções, a obstrução à justiça e o enriquecimento ilícito. Sobre o tráfico de influências, teríamos muito a dizer sobre os recentes casos nas instituições europeias, mas a Comissão escolheu ignorar esses mesmos casos e, assim, minar ainda mais a confiança dos cidadãos.

Há ainda uma outra lacuna. Não podemos esquecer o enorme trabalho dos jornalistas e denunciantes, o trabalho que têm feito na denúncia da corrupção e do crime organizado. Estes jornalistas arriscam a liberdade e a sua vida para nos alertar. Por isso, são também necessários instrumentos legais que os possam proteger.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Nyilván minden korrupcióellenes fellépés és intézkedés üdvözlendő, és ez is egy nagyon ambiciózus javaslatcsomag. Egy irányelvet vezet, bűncselekményi definíciókról van benne szó, büntetőeljárásokról, sőt még szankciókról is külső szereplők irányába.

De érdekes módon egy dolog hiányzik ebből a csomagból, egy dolgot nem találunk, nem találjuk az elefántot a szobában, ahogy mondani szokás. Ez pedig nem más esetünkben, mint minden idők legsúlyosabb brüsszeli belső korrupciós botránya, ami itt indult, ebben a Parlamentben, amikor az egyik alelnököt elvitte a rendőrség, aztán elvitt másokat is. De ma már tudjuk, hogy az Európai Bizottság is érintett ebben a kérdésben. Az egyik főigazgatója saját magának engedélyezett luxusutazásokat, ajándékokat fogadott el, és további vizsgálatok is elindultak.

Úgyhogy azt javaslom, hogy először a saját házuk táján söprögessenek, tegyék rendbe ezt a kérdést, számolják fel a brüsszeli korrupciót, és csak azt követően tegyenek további javaslatokat!

(A felszólaló hajlandó válaszolni egy kékkártyás kérdésre)

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew), *blue-card question*. – It's a very simple question. Wouldn't you think it would be a great idea if all EU Member States, including your own, were members of EPPO?

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI), *blue-card answer*. – Well, I think what's really important is that the procedures against corruption and crime should be useful, should be used and should be efficient. And if a national institution is efficient and it fights corruption, that is good enough and a European central institution will not solve the problem. We have seen this with the Brussels corruption – exactly that example. What we need are efficient steps against corruption, be that at national level or at European level.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il pacchetto presentato dalla Commissione europea è un buon punto di partenza per aggiornare, rafforzare e armonizzare il quadro legislativo europeo della lotta alla corruzione.

In particolare sottolineo l'importanza della proposta di una direttiva sulla lotta alla corruzione e, come Parlamento, dovremmo migliorarla per rafforzare la capacità di mettere in campo misure concrete per prevenire, individuare e punire questo tipo di reati.

Servono più trasparenza, risorse dedicate e una maggiore sensibilizzazione per una cultura del contrasto alla corruzione. È necessario poi armonizzare le definizioni del reato di corruzione e incrementare le sanzioni. Infine va migliorato l'aspetto investigativo per assicurare efficacia alle indagini e ai processi negli Stati membri.

L'esempio deve partire dalle istituzioni europee, proprio per via anche di quei recenti scandali che conosciamo. Serve istituire urgentemente, dunque, l'organismo etico indipendente con un mandato di controllo per le istituzioni e le agenzie dell'Unione europea, non possono ancora esserci gruppi politici che bloccano l'istituzione di questo organismo etico, ne abbiamo bisogno.

Con questo ambizioso pacchetto possiamo avanzare nella lotta alla corruzione e noi faremo la nostra parte.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospod predsednik. Afera LuxLeaks, afera Galvinovo poročilo, tako imenovana afera „denar za vpliv“. Najodmevnejša, afera Cresson, ki je vodila do odstopa celotne Komisije in trenutno najbolj aktualna, Quatargate. To je zgolj nekaj odmevnih korupcijskih škandalov na evropski ravni, še več jih je na ravni držav članic. Vsi spodbijajo naše demokratične vrednote in nadalje lomijo že tako krhko zaupanje v politiko.

Tukaj smo zato, da delamo za skupno dobro vseh ljudi, ne zato, da ustvarjamo lažjo pot podjetjem, državam, posameznikom z globokimi denarnicami na račun lastnega okoriščenja.

Resda imamo nekaj protikorupcijskih varovalk in mehanizmov, a več kot očitno ne dovolj. In čeprav je ta predlog direktive prišel, ne bom ravno rekla prepozno, ampak pozno pa, nam vendarle končno prinaša enotno nadnacionalno zakonodajo s sankcijami proti kriminalnim dejanjem korupcije. In tako bodo tisti, ki se bodo želeli okoriščevati, končali skupaj z ostalimi kršitelji za zapahi.

Miroslav Radačovský (NI). – Pán predsedajúci, v boji s korupciou mám ako starý sudca skutočne dlhoročné skúsenosti. Veľmi sa mi páči slogan pani Jourovej. Korupcia je ako rakovina. Ak ju necháme rásť, zadusí nás, zadusí našu demokraciu, naše inštitúcie. Korupcia tu existuje tisíc rokov, odkedy sa človek stal Homo sapiens. Korupcia sa rovná krádeži.

My sme sa snažili krádežiam zabrániť tým, že sme ukladali rôzne tresty. Stáročia sme utínali ruky, vešali za hák, topili, lámali v kolese a kradlo sa stále. Čiže cesta trestaním asi k tomu nevedie.

Prevenca je nutná. A tá nutná prevenca je predovšetkým v oblasti, kde sa tá korupcia najviac vyskytuje. Nie je predsa možné, aby napríklad na Slovensku hlavný štátny radca mal príjem 1 000 eur ako úradník a rozhodoval o niekoľko miliónových zákazkách alebo verejných obstarávaníach.

Nie je predsa možné, aby úradníci verejnej správy a štátnej správy mali taký minimálny príjem a rozhodovali o veciach miliónových, aby to nebolo pokušenie na akúsi korupciu.

A tu je cesta do tejto prevencie. Je tu aj ďalších množstvo vecí, o ktorých by som vedel rozprávať aj šesť hodín, ale za minútu sa to nedá.

Vlad Gheorghe (Renew). – Domnule președinte, avem nevoie ca de aer de acest cadru comun pentru combaterea corupției. E ceea ce am susținut tot timpul în Parlamentul European. Mai putem tolera politicieni care se lasă mituiți? Nu mai putem tolera partidele care îi pun pe liste și nici guvernele acestor partide care lucrează împotriva propriilor cetățeni, pentru că corupția ne afectează pe toți, absolut pe toți, și ne costă enorm, la toate nivelurile, ne face vulnerabili, ne sărăcește și ne umilește.

Cetățenii s-au săturat de corupție și nu mai vor să mai audă scuze. Avem nevoie de un cadru comun împotriva corupției, pentru a nu mai exista tot felul de portite, pentru ca ei să nu mai poată să mai scape, fie singuri, fie cu ajutorul unor oameni puși tot de ei. Avem unelte, avem procurori buni, avem Parchetul European. Haideți să le dăm uneltele ca să-i prindă pe corupți și să le ia banii pe care-i fură.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come Movimento 5 Stelle da sempre ci siamo resi promotori degli obiettivi della recente proposta di direttiva sulla lotta alla corruzione.

L'Unione europea reagisce finalmente con determinazione nel combattere uno dei fenomeni transnazionali più impuniti e pericolosi per l'integrità dei processi democratici, l'economia legale e la coesione sociale.

Condividiamo l'importanza della prevenzione e della creazione della trasparenza attraverso misure anticorruzione, tra cui quelle che introducono norme in materia di dichiarazione patrimoniale, lobbying e «porte girevoli».

Da tempo attendevamo un'armonizzazione delle legislazioni nazionali, l'ampliamento delle definizioni e dell'elenco dei reati perseguibili, sanzioni più rigorose e pene accessorie tra cui la rimozione dai pubblici uffici, l'incandidabilità e l'esclusione dall'accesso ai finanziamenti pubblici.

I termini di prescrizione sufficienti a fare giustizia e revoca di immunità e privilegi daranno più forza alle autorità di contrasto; questo quadro renderà più agevole limitare anche l'azione della criminalità organizzata e dei «colletti bianchi».

Siamo tutti chiamati a fare la nostra parte affinché questa direttiva diventi subito uno strumento efficace.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Podczas tej debaty usłyszałem po raz kolejny, że w Hiszpanii zmniejszono kary za korupcję, bo dzięki temu socjalistyczny rząd i sądy socjalistyczne mogą wypuszczać na wolność skorumpowanych kolegów socjalistów. We Francji prezydent uchwała prawo, pomijając parlament francuski, a na ulicy policja bije protestujących. I to jest dobre. Tam w Hiszpanii, we Francji jest to praworządne, a Polsce – chociaż OLAF nie stwierdził dotąd nieprawidłowości – przyklepia się łątkę niepraworządności.

Widać zatem niestety, że w Unii Europejskiej dominują różne miary, różne oceny i że są działania polityczne wymierzone w rządy prawicowe. I za to jest mi elementarnie wstydy.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, the Commission proposal for an anti-corruption directive is certainly not unwelcome, particularly coming from a country like Ireland where corruption is actually part of daily life.

Names like Liam Lawlor, Bertie Ahern, Ray Burke – names very familiar to our friends in Fianna Fail and in Renew. Denis O'Brien, Michael Lowry – well known to Fine Gael, with the corruption ridden National Asset Management Agency established by the two of them. Widespread corruption in the police force, whistle-blowers hounded by government Ministers when they speak out.

Let's just say that when it comes to corruption, Ireland certainly has had more than its fair share. Not that anybody is ever called to account for it. The Irish establishment is actually very good at protecting its own. We saw this last week in the Irish Parliament when our Tánaiste abused parliamentary privilege to slander an independent media outlet as Kremlin agents because they had the audacity to question the financial dealings of one of his Ministers. If this happened in an authoritarian state, we'd be giving out.

So the efforts to tackle corruption are one thing, but let's see what happens when it gets into the hands of Member States.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Nicolas Schmit, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, first I want to thank you for your interventions on this very, very important topic.

Corruption affects us all. It damages our societies, our democratic institutions and our Union values. It destroys – and it has been said by several of you – particularly the trust on which our institutions are built.

We obviously need to strengthen prevention. We need strong instruments of repression and penalties against corruption at national and European levels. With the new anti-corruption framework, we are taking a 360-degree and whole-of-society approach, from prevention to effective prosecution. EU countries will have to comply with a robust standard on criminalisation, sanctions, definitions, people to be covered, including politicians and higher officials.

Our new anti-corruption package fits into our overall efforts to protect the rule of law. We have taken action on judicial independence, on protection of media, and now we close this circle with anti-corruption. And we count on Parliament's support to adopt this legislation soon.

Concerning the investigative powers of ethic bodies: obviously the Commission takes good note of the comments which have been made. As you know, the work is ongoing to ensure stronger support from all European institutions. What we need is clear. We need full transparency and effective measures to combat and sanction effectively all corruption cases in all institutions.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), kirjallinen. – Korruptio on kuin syöpä, joka nakertaa yhteiskunnan perustuksia ja horjuttaa sen tasapainoa. Haluan erityisesti keskittyä yhteen korruption ilmentymään, nimittäin suureen vaalirahoitukseen liittyviin riskeihin.

Euroopan parlamentin sääntöjen mukaan yli 150 euroa suurempaa lahjaa meppi ei saa ottaa vastaan. On hämmentävää, että samainen meppi saa laillisesti ottaa vaalirahalahjoja moninkertaiset määrät ilman, että hänen tarvitsee edes kertoa lahjan antajaa. Vaalirahan lahjoittajat pitäisi saada päivänvaloon, jotta voidaan seurata, kenen lauluja poliitikko laulaa, kun hoitaa poliittisia tehtäviä.

15. Plan działania na rzecz Europy socjalnej – dwa lata po szczycie w Porto (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zum Fahrplan für ein soziales Europa: zwei Jahre nach dem Gipfel von Porto (2023/2586(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for the opportunity to speak about the work carried out in the Council on the implementation of the European Pillar of Social Rights action plan, as we mark two years since the Porto Social Summit. At the Porto Social Summit in 2021, leaders considered the role of the social pillar in the post-COVID-19 recovery. The action plan was meant to further guide the development of the Union's social dimension.

Two years later, we are facing challenges which would have appeared as remote scenarios in 2021. First and foremost, we have a war of aggression at our doorstep, with no immediate end in sight. This is coupled with dramatic food and energy price inflation, and all this takes place in a crucial and challenging period of digital and green transition.

As Parliament correctly notes in its motion for resolution, the cost of living and the energy crisis have hit the most vulnerable groups the hardest. Until now, employment levels remain high in the European Union, thanks to the swift actions taken during the pandemic. One of the most important ways to keep employment high is to ensure continuous upskilling and reskilling, which we had an important debate here on yesterday in the plenary.

While the employment and social issues are largely the responsibility of the Member States, the Pillar for Social Rights and its action plans are guiding instruments in this field.

The Council supports the idea of working towards general EU goals. At the same time, the national goals must take into account the different starting points of the Member States. The goals are monitored within the framework of the European Semester, which is a good tool to support the implementation of the social pillar's principles.

As Presidency, we are working with the European Semester in accordance with established practice. When it comes to the legislative initiatives we have, since Porto, adopted minimum wage directive and the pay transparency directive; non-legislative initiatives such as the care strategy and Child Guarantee have also been established.

Looking ahead, the Swedish Presidency committed to reaching a general approach on the platform workers directive. Going forward, non-legislative initiatives, such as the Council recommendation on social dialogue, play an equally significant role. We need to respect the division of competences between the EU level and the Member States, as well as the role of the autonomy of the social partners.

To conclude, a broad and coordinated involvement at all levels of government – regional, national and European – and social partners involved are key to ensuring that the principle of the European Pillar of Social Rights becomes a reality for our citizens. I'm looking forward to the debate.

Nicolas Schmit, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to start by thanking the Chair and the members of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs for their initiative on proposing a resolution on a roadmap on a social Europe two years after Porto.

You recall the importance of strong social policies in the EU leading to social progress and fairness, and the key objective of a sustainable development where the economic, social and environmental dimensions stand on an equal footing. Two years ago, during the Portuguese Presidency at the Porto Social Summit, we discussed the future of social Europe and EU leaders, social partners and civil society agreed on a social commitment. We agreed to address the pressing challenges: fighting poverty, inequality, unemployment and addressing demographic change, as well as supporting the twin green and digital transition.

A lot has happened since, not least – and it has been mentioned by the Presidency – not least with Russia's criminal war of aggression that has brought devastation and destruction to our continent. Not only did it shake our conviction that peace was once and for all guaranteed on the European continent, high inflation and energy prices put a strain on many workers and households, especially the low and middle-income and mainly small businesses. The Portuguese Government, in cooperation with the Commission, convened the Porto Social Forum two years after the Porto Social Summit, and your resolution does not only recall the commitments that were taken, but also indicates how to shape further the social dimension.

We have committed to our citizens to improve their living and working conditions, responding to their expectations. Therefore, our actions must live up to this promise. That is why the Commission wants to deepen the implementation of the European Pillar of Social Rights with the aim of a fair and competitive social market economy that works for people. Your proposed resolution makes key proposals on many fundamental aspects. It helps ensure that Europe's social dimension remains high on the EU political agenda. Your resolution is a strong call to continue our work to fully implement the European Pillar of Social Rights and all its principles. And this objective is shared by the Commission.

A lot has been achieved since the Porto Summit. A large majority of the concrete actions aimed at continuing to implement the principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights have already been adopted or will be proposed. The adoption of the directive on adequate minimum wages certainly represents in this context an historic achievement. Together with Member States, we have finalised the programming of the European Social Fund Plus with almost EUR 100 billion in investments in employment and social policies. Now we must move forward together with Member States to ensure implementation and concrete results on the ground. The Porto main targets are essential, and Member States have presented their national targets that have to be respected.

The fight against poverty remains of essence, not only because poverty divides our societies and increases social injustice. It also represents a loss of economic and human potential. Poverty and a high degree of inequality weaken the resilience of our societies. We must take bold action to tackle poverty, head on, investing in social and labour policies, inclusive education and training. Adequate social protection has to ensure equal opportunities for everyone and special support to those who need it most. We must prioritise investment in stronger social safety nets, better social infrastructure, including affordable social housing, healthcare and childcare.

We are also working intensively to set the right conditions for the EU economy to thrive in the green and digital transitions. In this framework, the creation of quality jobs and good working conditions is a priority. Europe needs a strong and innovative industry, as the Commission is promoting in its green deal industrial plan. Too many workers do not enjoy, presently, decent working conditions and struggle with low wages, little job security, few opportunities for advancement. And next week we will have in Stockholm an important meeting on health and safety at the working place.

Ensuring decent working conditions means, among other things, investing in safe workplaces, reducing precarious work contracts, better enforcing labour rights, guaranteeing gender equality and same wages. We also must improve work-life balance. We must promote collective bargaining and social dialogue as an essential tool to develop joint solutions to the challenges we are facing in today's world of work, and the directives on adequate minimum wages and proposal for platform work are important steps in this direction. Investing in skills ensures that citizens have the competences to succeed in the new world of work. This is essential to empower workers and to strengthen the EU's competitiveness. The European Year of Skills – we had a discussion yesterday, and it has been launched yesterday – helps instil a culture and mindset of upskilling and reskilling.

For Europe to become an innovative industrial location by 2050, strong and targeted employment and social policies are needed in conjunction with industrial, economic and fiscal policies. Over several years now, the European Semester has a strong social anchor. A framework to monitor social convergence should play an important role in the context of economic and social governance. We share the objective to strengthen the social dimension of the European Semester and to foster upward social and economic convergence.

With the Economic Governance Review, the Commission has proposed to facilitate reforms and investments that enhance inclusive growth, support fiscal sustainability and address common EU priorities, including the European Pillar of Social Rights. We share your view on the importance of essential services, also in the light of economic, social and territorial disparities. We will soon present a Council recommendation to develop social economy framework conditions. The consultation of the social partners on the revision of the directive on the European works councils is ongoing. This year we will also update the Quality Framework for Traineeships, put forward an initiative on the digitalisation of social security systems and a proposal for a European disability card.

Together we have achieved a lot, but a lot of work is still ahead of us. We need to continue joining forces and uphold our determination in building a strong social Europe. That, as the Porto Forum underlines, has also a geopolitical dimension.

Dennis Radtke, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Sozialforum in Porto ist aus meiner Sicht eine wichtige Standortbestimmung auf dem Weg zu einem sozialeren Europa. Ich hoffe sehr, dass es uns gelingen wird, diese Institution eines Sozialforums zu verstetigen, damit wir auch dafür Sorge tragen, dass das Thema „Soziales Europa“ ganz oben auf der Agenda auch der politischen Top-Entscheider in der Europäischen Union bleibt.

Aber machen wir uns nichts vor. Gefühlt ist es manchmal so, dass dieser Weg zu einem sozialeren Europa beim Gehen immer länger wird. Wir hatten die Pandemie, wir haben Krieg, Inflation, Energiekrise, und das trifft vor allen Dingen diejenigen, die eh schon hart getroffen sind in unserer Gesellschaft, aber mittlerweile sind auch diejenigen in der Mitte unserer Gesellschaft betroffen von all dem.

Die Krise ist in der Mitte angekommen, und deswegen ist es richtig, dass wir darauf auch in unserer Entschließung, die wir morgen verabschieden, klar Bezug nehmen. Es ist auch richtig, dass wir dazu aufrufen, dass wir endlich eine voll integrierte Strategie zur Bekämpfung von Armut bekommen, und zwar eine, die Armut in ihrer Mehrdimensionalität auch begreift. Damit meine ich nicht als Zielsetzung, möglichst viele neue Richtlinien auf den Weg zu bringen; das alleine macht es nicht. Aber mir geht es darum, dass wir endlich zu ganzheitlichen Ansätzen bei der Armutsbekämpfung kommen, liebe Freundinnen und Freunde.

Es ist in dieser Periode schon viel erreicht worden fürs soziale Europa – ob Mindestlohn, ob Kindergarantie, ob Regulierung von Plattformarbeit, wo wir sehr, sehr weit gekommen sind, aber es ist noch viel zu tun, und ich freue mich auf das gemeinsame Streiten mit Euch für die gemeinsame gute Sache.

Agnes Jongerius, *namens de S&D-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, meneer de commissaris, mevrouw de minister, een fatsoenlijk minimumloon waar je een goed gevulde boodschappenmand mee kan vullen, of een ouderschapsverlof zodat beide ouders de mogelijkheid hebben om tijd door te brengen met hun kinderen, of als werknemer niet te hoeven werken tussen kankerverwekkende stoffen: dat klinkt allemaal heel logisch. Het klinkt ook allemaal heel vanzelfsprekend, maar dat was niet zo lang geleden nog helemaal niet het geval. Er zijn mensen in deze plenaire vergaderzaal die Europa graag zien als louter een economische unie, als een gezamenlijke markt, als een gezamenlijke munt, maar gelukkig is Europa intussen heel wat meer.

Op de eerste sociale top in Göteborg verankerden we zes jaar geleden voor het eerst de sociale belofte aan alle Europeanen met de Europese pijler van sociale rechten. Dit boekwerkje vat samen waar een Europa dat werkt voor mensen uit bestaat, keurig uitgewerkt in twintig pijlers. Maar met dit boekje kan je helaas niet naar de bakker gaan en zeggen: mag ik wat brood van u? En je kunt het ook niet op de post naar het energiebedrijf sturen in de hoop dat daarmee je energierekening betaald is. Dus – gelukkig – hebben we twee jaar geleden in Porto besloten dat er een actieplan moest komen, zodat de principes van de pijler ook omgezet werden in concrete doelen. Doelen om de armoede te bestrijden en doelen om de werkgelegenheid te bevorderen. Maar sinds deze top in Porto – het is al gezegd – is er een oorlog, een energiecrisis, een koopkrachtcrisis overheen gekomen, en dus moeten we zeggen: er is meer nodig. Ik noem een aantal voorbeelden uit de resolutie.

De schoonmaker, de verpleegkundige in de thuiszorg, de vuilnisophaler – kortom mensen die betaald worden van publiek geld – moeten ook fatsoenlijk betaald worden. Publiek geld mag niet naar louche uitzendondernemers gaan of naar waardeloze en slechtbetaalde banen. Of een ander voorbeeld: de energierekeningen stegen in de afgelopen winter naar ongekende hoogten. Maar dat mag nooit betekenen dat mensen in de kou komen te zitten. Elektriciteit en water moeten altijd voor iedereen betaalbaar zijn. Leveranciers mogen mensen nooit afsluiten. En een laatste voorbeeld: elke Europese inwoner moet toegang hebben tot een fatsoenlijke sociale basis om op terug te kunnen vallen. Want we moeten eerlijk zijn: niet alle Europeanen profiteren van de economische samenwerking.

Europa moet meer zijn dan markt en munt, en dus is het hoog tijd om deze belofte voor mensen in te lossen in de praktijk.

Dragoş Pîslaru, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister, dear colleagues, the recent years and the multiple crises that we went through have taught us important lessons. COVID has forced us to explore opportunities in difficult times. And we've learned that investing in the resilience of our health and social protection systems means, in practice, investing in people, especially in the most vulnerable ones.

The renewal of our social systems has to be made with a cross-sectoral and intersectional approach. We need to get out of silos and connect our policies. Social Europe is not just about one particular committee: it's about all of us acting together, regardless of the committees and the names of those committees. A social Europe is a Europe where we have social investments, in which the main resource of a strong economy is recognised to be people – having access to opportunities, to a better life, to skills, to competitiveness. A Europe that protects its children and creates opportunities for young people. The European Pillar of Social Rights and its action plan, together with the targets that are guiding lights in our long-term structural transitions of the labour market and welfare systems.

To develop new concrete solutions, we need to have social investment at the forefront of our action, especially right now that we have the context of the revision of the economic and very important social governance. We need to put in place a mix of policies and measures that would ensure that the social Europe is not a political debate. It's not an ideological task. It's a highly competitive Europe that takes care of all people, and it is a Europe where we need to do that together.

Rosa D'Amato, *a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE*. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, signora Ministro, onorevoli colleghi, due anni fa a Porto i capi di Stato hanno fatto grandi promesse sulla necessità di rafforzare la dimensione sociale dell'Europa. A due anni di distanza non vi è alcuna misura concreta per rispondere alla povertà dilagante, all'erosione del potere d'acquisto di milioni di famiglie, al divario crescente fra i territori.

Per Noi Verdi Europei è fondamentale rivedere il patto di stabilità e crescita; basta strangolare lo sviluppo e la convergenza con misure di austerità.

Le regole fiscali devono servire per investimenti verdi e sociali, nei servizi essenziali come sanità, scuola, trasporto sostenibile. Altrimenti i divari territoriali e quelli sociali continueranno a crescere.

Serve subito una direttiva europea sul reddito minimo al di sopra della soglia di povertà, perché è una misura efficace contro la povertà.

Così come è urgente una direttiva europea perché i tirocini per i nostri giovani siano retribuiti e di qualità, si metta così fine a pratiche abusive in tutta Europa e si blocchi la fuga dei cervelli.

Soltanto se torniamo a investire nelle persone possiamo creare una società resiliente e sostenibile, anche e soprattutto dal punto di vista economico.

Il summit di fine maggio è un'occasione importante: rivedere i trattati e mettere al centro i diritti sociali. L'Europa ha un futuro solo con un nuovo e ambizioso patto sociale, è l'unica risposta possibile alla crisi che stiamo vivendo.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, los europeos son cada vez más pobres, no menos. Tendrá que ver con la línea política de esta Cámara.

Una vez más, el pretexto de lo «social» se utiliza como instrumento para que la Unión Europea avance en competencias. Y digo pretexto porque las iniciativas legislativas —hasta quince— aquí propuestas no solo son un abuso, sino que también son antisociales. No van a repercutir en el bienestar de los ciudadanos porque, si se ahoga el ecosistema de prosperidad y emprendimiento, los beneficios sociales no podrán garantizarse. Y menos cuando la raíz del problema no quiere atajarse.

Señorías, da igual que se pongan infinitos recursos en una estructura artificial de cuidados si las políticas no dan reconocimiento y apoyo a la familia como célula básica de la sociedad.

Señorías, los europeos no pueden satisfacer su anhelo natural de ser padres, lo demuestra la crisis demográfica, ante la cual se cierran los ojos.

Nuestra cultura es modelo de éxito, es lo que nos hace atractivos, y una inmigración descontrolada acabaría con este ambiente de libertad del que todos —incluso el que viene— queremos disfrutar.

Miren los países que siguen otro rumbo, comprueben los buenos resultados. No solo en la dimensión económica, sino también en el ambiente de esperanza. Donde los jóvenes pueden emprender una vida frente a una agenda que solo quiere ofrecerles migajas como el *co-living*, el no tendrás nada y serás feliz, la cultura del subsidio o la victimización..., la soledad.

El modelo social debe ser equilibrado. Apoyar al vulnerable, pero nunca acabar con la motivación. El esfuerzo debe ser una recompensa. Esto es lo que debemos promover.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, en 2021, onze pays signaient une lettre, quelques jours avant la tenue du sommet social de Porto. Leur objectif: dire que les nations doivent impérativement garder le contrôle sur leurs politiques sociales. C'était simple, c'était clair, c'était le bon sens même.

Pourtant, la Commission a fait tout le contraire depuis, en nous imposant des directives sur le SMIC européen, sur les revenus minimum garantis et maintenant sur les rémunérations des stagiaires. Les États sont peu à peu dépossédés de leur droit démocratique à décider eux-mêmes.

L'offensive européiste est totale. En s'attaquant aux formations et à notre enseignement, à l'assurance chômage, à nos salaires et même à la manière de les négocier via les conventions collectives, les Français se retrouvent pris en charge par l'Union européenne du berceau à la tombe. Emmanuel Macron n'avait plus qu'à s'occuper de nos retraites en utilisant les mêmes méthodes douteuses que la Commission. C'est désormais chose faite.

Bref, le sommet social de Porto est la feuille de route d'une Europe qui sort de son lit pour déborder sur tous les aspects de notre vie. C'est la raison pour laquelle nous disons: non. Face à cela, les groupes Identité et démocratie et ECR défendent ensemble un autre modèle: le respect de la souveraineté, la lutte contre l'immigration qui pèse sur nos budgets sociaux ainsi que la fin d'un dumping social et de la concurrence déloyale. Oui à une vraie politique pour les travailleurs. Une politique qui ne peut être que nationale.

José Gusmão, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhor Presidente, na Cimeira Social do Porto, e nos meses que a antecederam e que se seguiram, foram feitas proclamações muito ambiciosas sobre o Pilar Europeu dos Direitos Sociais. Mas a verdade é que em muitos debates, esse pilar, um termo que prometia muito no futuro da construção europeia, tem revelado ser um pilar muito frágil. Desde logo, nos modestos objetivos que foram definidos para o combate à pobreza, mas também na fraca resposta que foi dada por tantos governos por essa Europa fora a esse desafio já de si modesto.

Mas há também outras contradições que temos que resolver, se quisermos falar a sério sobre a construção de uma Europa social. Precisamos de ter regras de governação económica que permitam combater efetivamente a pobreza, dando lugar aos serviços públicos e às políticas sociais que essas políticas merecem.

Precisamos, também, de apostar num regresso a um mercado de trabalho marcado por direitos e não pela precarização a que temos assistido, que faz com que milhões de trabalhadores a tempo inteiro europeus, apesar de trabalharem a tempo inteiro, continuem a ser pobres.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, η φτώχεια και ο κοινωνικός αποκλεισμός απειλούν 95 εκατομμύρια εργαζομένους. Σε 10 χώρες απαγορεύεται ο συνδικαλισμός. Σε περισσότερες από 15 χώρες παραβιάζεται το δικαίωμα στην απεργία. Περισσότεροι από τους μισούς εργαζομένους δουλεύουν χωρίς συλλογική σύμβαση. Παντού γενικεύονται οι ελαστικές μορφές απασχόλησης. Σαρώνει η μερική ανεργία με ευρωενωσιακά πολυδιαφημισμένα προγράμματα. Πάνω από το 30% εργάζεται με μισθό χαμηλότερο από τον κατώτατο μισθό. Η κοινωνική ασφάλιση έχει μετατραπεί σε εμπόρευμα. Τα όρια συνταξιοδότησης σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη ξεπερνούν το προσδόκιμο ζωής.

Αυτά είναι αποτελέσματα του ευρωπαϊκού πυλώνα των ελάχιστων δικαιωμάτων που ωθεί συνεχώς στον πάτο του ορίου επιβίωσης κάθε εργασιακό, μισθολογικό κοινωνικό δικαίωμα των εργαζομένων στο όνομα της δήθεν «ανακούφισης των ευάλωτων». Αυτές είναι οι ράγες στις οποίες κινείται η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, στις οποίες έχουν «κλειδώσει» η ΝΔ, ο ΣΥΡΙΖΑ και το ΠΑΣΟΚ-ΚΙΝΑΛ, γιατί το φτήνυμα της εργατικής δύναμης είναι προϋπόθεση προκειμένου να θωρακιστεί η κερδοφορία των λίγων. Αυτός ο δρόμος οδηγεί τα δικαιώματα των πολλών «στον Καιάδα». Είναι αναγκαίο ένα δυνατό ΚΚΕ, επομένως, καθώς και μαζικός οργανωμένος αγώνας για αλλαγή πορείας, για να έρθουν οι λαϊκές ανάγκες στο προσκήνιο.

Cindy Franssen (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, minister, collega's, exact twee jaar geleden werd het actieplan voor de uitrol van de sociale pijler voorgesteld. Tijd dus om een balans op te maken en te zien waar we staan met onze dure beloftes.

We hebben reeds heel wat stappen gezet: de richtlijn voor adequate minimumlonen, de richtlijn voor loontransparantie – die ervoor moeten zorgen dat werken loont en de loonkloof wordt aangepakt –, een betere bescherming tegen gevaarlijke stoffen op de werkvloer, de kindergarantie, het Sociaal Klimaatfonds, het Europees platform voor de bestrijding van dakloosheid en het nog lopende dossier van de platformwerknemers.

Maar door de energiecrisis en de hoge inflatie rijzen de kosten voor levensonderhoud ondertussen de pan uit. Mensen kunnen nauwelijks overleven. Meer en meer gezinnen raken in moeilijkheden. Aan het huidige tempo zullen we de doelstelling om tegen 2030 het aantal mensen in armoede met 15 miljoen te verlagen, niet halen.

Crisissen zijn er niet om de klok een aantal decennia terug te draaien. Wel integendeel. Aan de vooravond van *Rerum Novarum* is het hoog tijd om alle zeilen bij te zetten en om er in lijn met de beginselen van het Europees Sociaal Handvest en de sociale pijler voor te zorgen dat iedereen meekan, ook de meest kwetsbaren. Europa zal sociaal zijn of zal niet zijn.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Wenn wir uns angucken, dass wir über den Aktionsplan zur Säule sozialer Rechte sprechen und die Jahre nach Porto, müssen wir noch einmal sehen, dass es ohne dieses Haus in Zusammenarbeit mit der Kommission diese Säule nie gegeben hätte. Und das ist, wie wenn man ein Kind geboren hat: Man will weiter sehen, dass es wächst und gut gedeiht. Man hat eine Verantwortung, und das haben wir hier fraktionsübergreifend, weil wir als Parlament das wollten.

Deshalb ist es wichtig, zu gucken, was wir erreicht haben – der Kommissar hat das unterstrichen, andere auch – aber auch, dass wir gucken, dass dieses Kind weiter gedeiht, auch in Zukunft, weil wir viele Projekte haben, die wir umsetzen müssen, weil wir das den Menschen in Europa versprochen haben.

Deshalb ist für mich ein Punkt nochmal ganz wichtig. Wir haben eine riesige Transformation vor der Brust: Green Deal, Digitalisierung, die Menschen machen sich Sorgen um ihre Arbeitsplätze. Sie haben jetzt schon weniger in der Tasche aufgrund sinkender Kaufkraft. Unser Signal muss auch sein: An dieser Transformation werden wir euch beteiligen. Wir stärken eure Rechte auch dabei, diese Transformation zu gestalten. Ihr seid nicht nur Opfer und dem ausgeliefert, sondern wir werden zusammen sicherstellen, dass wir niemanden zurücklassen.

Und deshalb sind all die Projekte, die in der Entschließung stehen, toll, und ich danke den Berichterstattern – das ist genau die Verantwortung, die Eltern haben.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, nosotros apoyamos muy mayoritariamente esta Resolución sobre una hoja de ruta hacia una Europa social: dos años después de la Cumbre Social de Oporto. Pero dos años después de Oporto tenemos que reconocer que en esta hoja de ruta nos hemos olvidado de las clases medias. Y dos años después de Oporto hay que reconocer que las clases medias se han empobrecido y se están empobreciendo a pasos agigantados.

Hay una erosión de las clases medias, y las clases medias son el sostén de nuestra democracia. Y esa erosión está alimentando el discurso populista. No fijar una parte de la Europa social en las clases medias es un error que vamos a pagar muy caro si no somos capaces de incorporar a las clases medias a esa hoja de ruta de la Europa social. Porque las clases medias deben reconocerse como una parte sustantiva de aquello que nos preocupa y de aquello que nos ocupa.

Porque mientras los ricos son cada vez más ricos, todos los demás son cada vez más pobres. Y como todos los demás somos cada vez más pobres nuestra mirada social no puede ni debe olvidarse de las clases medias. Por eso, desde el Grupo Renew, desde los liberales, hemos conseguido, con el apoyo mayoritario, que se hable por primera vez de la necesidad de impulsar un plan de acción europeo para las clases medias. Al comisario, siempre que me escucha, siempre le pido que inicie planes de acción. Pero es que este plan de acción para las clases medias, este plan de acción europeo es clave. Es importante, comisario. Háganlo. Las clases medias lo necesitan. Y Europa y la Europa social lo requieren.

Sara Matthieu (Verts/ALE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, minister, collega's, de top in Porto twee jaar geleden beloofde de armoede in Europa aan te pakken. Helaas, niets is minder waar. De levensduurtecrisis heeft nog meer mensen in de armoede doen terechtkomen. Banken en luchtvaartmaatschappijen worden gered met miljarden euro's aan staatssteun, maar geld vrijmaken om de armoede echt terug te dringen? Nee, die investeringen blijven helaas uit.

De inflatie, de energiecrisis en de torenhoge levenskosten smeken om extra sociale maatregelen. Voor de groenen betekent dat fatsoenlijk en betaalbaar wonen voor iedereen. Dat betekent energie als een basisrecht: we zetten niemand in de kou. De leeflonen in Europa moeten boven de nationale armoedegrens. We moeten de lidstaten ondersteunen bij hoge werkloosheid door een SURE 2.0. En we moeten investeren in onderwijs en gezondheidszorg.

Alleen zo beschermen we miljoenen mensen in Europa echt tegen de armoede.

Guido Reil (ID). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir reden heute über das Sozialsystem der Zukunft. Und was für eine Überraschung – nach dem Klima-Sozialfonds reden wir jetzt auch über ein grünes Sozialschutzsystem, was entwickelt werden soll. Also grün und sozial passt aber leider nicht zusammen. Grün bedeutet den Verlust von Billionen hoch bezahlter Arbeitsplätze, steigende Mieten, steigende Energiekosten und steigende Lebensmittelkosten.

Grüne Politik ist nicht sozial, sie ist dumm und asozial. Ein Beispiel aus Deutschland: Die Deutschen sollen ab nächstem Jahr gezwungen werden, mit Wärmepumpen zu heizen. Jetzt abgesehen davon, dass es diese Wärmepumpen nicht gibt und sie sehr teuer und nicht in der Lage sind, alte Gebäude zu beheizen, funktionieren diese Pumpen mit Strom, vermeintlich grünem Strom. Nur dumm ist, dass die Menschen im Winter heizen müssen. Da kommen so Grüne nicht drauf, weil man das nicht so weiß. Aber die meisten heizen im Winter, und im Winter gibt es den wenigsten grünen Strom. Also diese Politik ist dämlich und asozial.

Leila Chaïbi (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Monsieur le Commissaire, avant, ma famille politique et moi nous avons l'impression de crier dans le désert. Mais la crise sanitaire et la guerre en Ukraine sont passées par là. Et face aux conséquences sociales terribles pour les ménages européens, on s'est rendu compte de l'importance des services publics, des hôpitaux, des aides d'État. Une porte s'est entrouverte. Les lignes ont bougé. Les dogmes de l'austérité, de la concurrence, ces logiciens sont devenus obsolètes.

Pourtant, depuis les promesses du sommet social de Porto il y a deux ans, que s'est-il passé? Plein de bonnes idées, mais toutes arrêtées au milieu du gué. Une directive sur les salaires minimums européens qui ne fixe pas de seuil. Une directive sur la transparence salariale qui va concerner moins de 1 % des travailleurs. Une initiative sur le revenu minimum qui est non contraignante. La porte est entrouverte, mais certains, derrière, poussent pour la refermer.

Les élections européennes de l'an prochain sont une occasion de trancher le débat. Déciderons-nous d'ouvrir complètement la porte, de mettre plus qu'un pied dedans, et de jeter à la poubelle ces dogmes qui mènent les peuples européens dans le mur? Je veux lancer un avertissement: si l'Union européenne laisse les citoyens à la porte, elle ne survivra pas.

Ádám Kósa (NI). – Elnök Úr! 2021-ben a tagállamok vezetői által elfogadott portói nyilatkozat kiváló keretet ad a jövő szociális foglalkoztatáspolitikájának megvalósításához, de ahogyan a nyilatkozat is aláhúzza, ehhez tiszteletben kell tartani a szubszidiaritás elvét, a nemzeti szociális védelmi rendszerek sajátosságait és a tagállamok hatáskörét! Meg kell értenünk, hogy éppen a tagállamok döntési szabadsága az, ami garantálja a szociális és foglalkoztatáspolitikai sikerességét.

Magyarországon például egyedülálló támogatási rendszer épült ki a családok számára, mert meggyőződésünk, hogy a születési arányok növelését támogató stratégia a társadalmi fenntarthatóság és a társadalmi haladás szükséges alapja. A családok fontossága megkerülhetetlen, és hisszük, hogy ez a fenntartható szociálpolitika alapja, nem pedig a gazdasági migránsok meghívása.

Ez a mi döntésünk, kérem, tartsák tiszteletben!

Sara Skyttedal (PPE). – Herr talman! EU:s sociala pelare antogs under socialdemokratiskt värdskap vid toppmötet i Göteborg 2017. Den svenska socialdemokratin gjorde då en inrikespolitisk poäng av att den sociala pelaren inte skulle leda till mer EU-lagstiftning på det sociala området. Vi som synade den bluffen, och som varnade för förlorad kontroll över välfärden som resultat, vi beskylldes för att föra fram borgerlig skrämselfpropaganda.

Sedan dess har vi som bekant fått nya EU-direktiv om bland annat minimilöner, lönetransparens, plattformarbete och en kvoterad föräldraförsäkring. Ingen kan längre på allvar hävda att EU:s sociala pelare betyder något annat än mer överstatlig lagstiftning om arbetsmarknaden och sociala frågor, vilket förstås är vad den enade vänstern i EU hela tiden har efterlyst, eller hur?

Den resolution som vi röstar om i morgon upprepar den växande kravlistan på ytterligare ny överstatlighet, som vänstergrupperna i Europaparlamentet aldrig tröttnar på att uppdatera och utvidga. Det handlar bland annat om ny påtvingad EU-lagstiftning om försörjningsstöd och praktikplatser. Det handlar om en större styrning av vården, barnomsorgen och bostadspolitiken. Det handlar om att dagens regelverk, som uppmuntrar och premierar ordning och reda i statsfinanserna, ska luckras upp. EU ska i stället kunna bekosta den europeiska vänsterns allt längre önskelista. Det är inte så att man undrar om vänstergrupperna i Europaparlamentet är medvetna om subsidiaritetsprincipen i fördragen. Det är alltmer tydligt att vänstern inte förstår att ett starkt Europa visserligen byggs genom samarbete, men med respekt för medlemsstaternas kompetenser.

(Talaren godtog att svara på en fråga ("blått kort"))

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), blue-card question. – I have a small question for you, Madam, because there will be a review of the EU Multiannual Financial Framework. It will be very, very soon. And I want to ask you, what are your priorities, or your group's, where we will dedicate more money after reviewing this situation?

Sara Skyttedal (PPE), blue-card answer. – I'm not sure really if I understood the question of my esteemed colleague. I don't know if it's possible to repeat the question. More money to what?

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), blue-card question. – Review of Multiannual Financial Framework. It will be very soon. For you, for your groups, what are priorities? Where should we give more money and which priority is for you the most important?

Sara Skyttedal (PPE), blue-card answer. – Okay, so you're asking about an update on the Multiannual Financial Framework. From my point of view, I think the EU should prioritise more strongly right now. We have a war in Europe and I see that we have a strong interest in protecting our security. From my point of view, I see that the defence industry needs to get stronger financing. This should go before the interest of a more socialist Europe.

Estrella Durá Ferrandis (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señora ministra, señorías, dos años después de la Cumbre Social de Oporto, nos encontramos ante nuevos retos, pero frente a un mismo debate: ¿cómo construir una Europa más social?

Y es que aún tenemos mucho trabajo por delante si queremos vivir en una Europa donde las personas puedan permitirse una vivienda decente y pagar las facturas, una Europa en la que se reduzca la pobreza y se potencie el acceso a un mercado de trabajo de calidad.

De nuevo en Oporto se abre otra oportunidad para marcar nuevos objetivos y diseñar mecanismos, que deben ser vinculantes, para combatir todo este desafío.

Porque para promover la inclusión y combatir la pobreza, garantizar el bienestar de las personas y crear unos espacios de trabajo seguros y con buenas condiciones, hace falta legislación.

La creación de una directiva sobre rentas mínimas adecuadas en Europa debe ser una prioridad en esta nueva agenda de Oporto, para cumplir con los compromisos de reducción de pobreza ya fijados en la pasada Cumbre, además de ayudar a grupos vulnerables a acceder a un buen trabajo.

Y, por otro lado, si los salarios y las condiciones laborales deben estar en la lista de prioridades, esto incluye la salud y, en concreto, la salud mental.

Mucho hemos debatido ya en esta Cámara acerca de la necesidad de regular el teletrabajo, garantizar el derecho a la desconexión y frenar el control masivo y la vigilancia de los trabajadores mediante un mal uso de la inteligencia artificial. Todos estos factores, fruto de la digitalización, incrementan los riesgos psicosociales y tienen un impacto negativo en la salud mental de trabajadores y trabajadoras. Esta nueva hoja de ruta en Oporto puede cubrir los vacíos legales y abogar también por directivas para prevenir los riesgos psicosociales en el terreno laboral y regular la gestión algorítmica y el uso de la inteligencia artificial en los lugares de trabajo.

En definitiva, tenemos tarea pendiente para garantizar que lo social sea el principio rector de toda política y que guíe cualquier transición, ya sea verde o digital.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, chaque jour davantage, nous écrivons l'histoire. Le chemin de l'Europe sociale, cette Europe juste qui garantit des droits à tous ses citoyens sans aucune distinction. Cette Europe verte qui engage tous ses citoyens dans la transition climatique. Cette Europe réactive qui protège tous ses citoyens face à la pandémie de la COVID ou à l'agression illégale de l'Ukraine.

Salaire minimum, transparence des rémunérations et protection des travailleurs des plateformes deviennent des réalités tangibles grâce à notre action et à notre détermination. Et à l'inverse, chaque jour davantage, sur les plateaux télé, les populistes d'extrême droite vous racontent des histoires. Ils se font les chantres du pouvoir d'achat. Mais ici, où nous pouvons changer les choses, où nous faisons les lois, ils rejettent chaque texte, chaque avancée que nous obtenons pour la protection et la convergence sociale. Demain encore, ils n'hésiteront pas à voter contre cette résolution.

L'hypocrisie, l'imposture, l'escroquerie, il est temps de les dénoncer. Voter, c'est écrire l'histoire. Alors continuons ensemble à tracer l'histoire de l'Europe sociale.

Mounir Satouri (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Monsieur le Commissaire, face aux crises, le forum de Porto doit consacrer un nouveau contrat social européen. Il y a urgence à ne pas laisser les gens s'enfoncer dans la pauvreté sans protection de leurs droits. Il y a urgence à ne pas laisser les eurosceptiques prospérer sur la misère. Il y a urgence à ne pas laisser l'extrême droite diffuser le repli, la haine. Il y a urgence à ne pas laisser la violence de la pauvreté saboter le projet européen. Il y a enfin urgence à faire avancer l'Europe, une Europe de la solidarité, protectrice, inclusive et émancipatrice.

Nos dirigeants ne peuvent plus se cacher derrière les limites qu'ils ont eux-mêmes assignées aux compétences sociales au niveau européen. Pour que plus jamais les libertés économiques ne s'imposent face aux droits sociaux, votons pour l'intégration d'un protocole de progrès social dans nos traités. Chers collègues, votez en faveur de l'amendement numéro un qui nous permettra d'avancer vers une plus grande Europe sociale.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, dois anos depois da Cimeira Social do Porto, podemos perguntar: as pessoas vivem melhor? Os portugueses vivem melhor? Não, não vivem.

No que diz respeito ao combate à pobreza, se os objetivos do plano de ação que saíu desta cimeira já eram pouco ambiciosos em 2021, está agora mais que provado que são claramente insuficientes.

Há cada vez mais pessoas em situação de pobreza, cada vez mais se empobrece a trabalhar, a precariedade continua e a austeridade espregueada. E, tal como sempre o dissemos, a proclamada diretiva dos salários mínimos adequados mais não fez do que legitimar a perpetuação do empobrecimento de quem trabalha.

Outra pergunta: os serviços públicos respondem às necessidades das populações? O que temos assistido é à continuação do desinvestimento sistémico no Serviço Nacional de Saúde e na escola pública. A isto junta-se o aumento do custo de vida que assola o dia a dia das pessoas, das idas ao supermercado às contas da energia, às prestações da casa.

O que se impõe é o controlo e a fixação dos preços dos bens essenciais, é garantir melhores salários e pensões, valorizar quem trabalha e investir nos serviços públicos em vez de proteger os lucros dos grupos económicos.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, a 73 anni dalla dichiarazione Schuman possiamo guardare indietro ed essere coscienti dei passi avanti che abbiamo compiuto.

Ma se veramente vogliamo preservare e migliorare ancor di più ciò che abbiamo ottenuto con fatica, con tante e innumerevoli sfide, una vera e propria Europa sociale per noi è il prossimo passo da compiere, necessario e imprescindibile.

Con la risoluzione dello scorso marzo abbiamo ribadito nuovamente la necessità di dotarci di una direttiva su un adeguato reddito minimo, una direttiva che serva a migliorare ulteriormente accessibilità, adeguatezza ed efficacia di questi strumenti. Le reti di sicurezza sociale contribuiscono a ridurre le disuguaglianze e le disparità sociali, rafforzando la convergenza sociale verso l'alto e promuovendo al contempo l'integrazione nel mercato del lavoro.

Tuttavia mentre noi cerchiamo di spingere in questa direzione, alcuni paesi, tra cui purtroppo il mio, l'Italia, stanno in realtà riducendo il loro supporto ai cittadini più fragili e divergendo sempre più dal resto dell'Unione, speculando biecamente con la loro propaganda sulla pelle dei più deboli.

L'Europa a cui aspiriamo, quella che vogliamo e dobbiamo lasciare ai nostri figli, è un'Europa sociale e inclusiva, solidale, che non lasci nessuno indietro.

Dobbiamo e vogliamo muoverci tutti nella stessa direzione e quei governi che tornano indietro vanno sanzionati, non tollerati o, ancora peggio, elogiati per i propri misfatti.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor presidente, el pilar europeo de derechos sociales se proclamó en el año 2017 en Gotemburgo y estableció una hoja de ruta clara para poder conseguir una Europa justa, una Europa equitativa, fuerte, inclusiva y llena de oportunidades. Era la brújula de orientación para la Europa social.

Hay tres pilares. Uno es el empleo. Es una lucha titánica para poder conseguir empleo de calidad y salarios dignos. Desgraciadamente, mi país, España, lidera el *ranking* de paro en toda la Unión Europea. Es un tema crucial para poder tener una Europa de oportunidades. La formación era otro de los pilares, la formación continua, además de la lucha contra la pobreza para poder reducirla, porque eso está en el corazón de la Europa social.

Se han dado pasos en el desarrollo de este pilar social como los siguientes:

La Estrategia Europea sobre Discapacidad: parece que aprobaremos la tarjeta europea, pero queda camino por hacer; la educación inclusiva, el paro es muy alto en el sector de la discapacidad; la vida independiente; la no discriminación, la Directiva sobre no discriminación sigue en el cajón.

La Estrategia Europea de Cuidados: también es importante, pero también queda mucho por hacer, para poner en valor a los cuidadores profesionales y a los no profesionales.

El Convenio de Estambul —lo hemos aprobado esta mañana—, para luchar contra la violencia de género, y la Estrategia para la igualdad entre hombres y mujeres, pero también queda mucho camino por hacer en materia de igualdad de oportunidades. También hemos aprobado las Directivas sobre los salarios mínimos y la transparencia salarial.

Pero, en definitiva, tenemos que seguir avanzando para poder conseguir esa Europa inclusiva. Tenemos que conseguir que los derechos sociales estén al mismo nivel que los derechos económicos y que los derechos ambientales.

João Albuquerque (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a adoção do Pilar Europeu dos Direitos Sociais foi um marco histórico para a União Europeia e, depois de muitas décadas de reivindicação, foi a coragem dos governos socialistas de Portugal e da Suécia que permitiu consagrar um conjunto de princípios fundamentais e que são um garante da proteção social da população europeia.

Quero, por isso, começar por saudar o Governo português, pelo forte empenho que colocou na realização da Cimeira Social do Porto, há dois anos, e por promover, daqui a umas semanas, um novo Fórum Social na cidade invicta. É a demonstração clara de que os direitos sociais são a principal prioridade política dos socialistas europeus.

Como sabemos, a União Europeia tem feito, nos últimos tempos, um debate fundamental sobre o seu posicionamento político e estratégico no mundo. No confronto com os nossos parceiros, que também são nossos concorrentes, há uma coisa que me parece evidente: a principal vantagem competitiva da Europa reside nos elevados níveis de proteção social e de direitos fundamentais que aqui garantimos e que não têm paralelo em nenhuma parte do mundo.

É por isso que quero deixar aqui um apelo à Presidência sueca e à direita europeia, juntem-se às forças progressistas desta Câmara para tornar vinculativos os objetivos do Pilar Europeu dos Direitos Sociais e fazer da Europa um continente social. É isso que nos pedem os nossos concidadãos, desde as ruas da Afurada aos bairros de Malmö, pelos direitos de todas e de todos e a uma melhor qualidade de vida na União Europeia.

Max Orville (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Ministre, des engagements forts pour construire une Europe plus juste ont été pris à Porto. Ils placent l'Union européenne sur la voie du plein emploi et du progrès social. Une action forte est d'autant plus nécessaire aujourd'hui dans un contexte d'augmentation du coût de la vie, de pénurie des compétences et de précarité énergétique.

Pas à pas, nous construisons l'Europe sociale avec les directives sur les salaires minimaux et la transparence des rémunérations, ou encore le règlement sur le Fonds social climat. Nous avons avancé à grands pas ces dernières années. Cependant, le compte n'y est toujours pas. Il y a tant de chantiers à finaliser et d'autres à ouvrir: la protection des travailleurs, des plateformes, la portabilité des droits sociaux, la garantie des stages de qualité. Face aux mutations des marchés de l'emploi, nous devons encadrer le télétravail, assurer un droit réel à la déconnexion, améliorer le bien-être au travail. Avec l'année européenne des compétences, nous devons offrir à chacun des perspectives. Le socle européen des droits sociaux doit rester notre boussole. Réaffirmons-le ensemble à Porto et accélérons sa mise en œuvre.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu»)

Leïla Chaïbi (The Left), question «carton bleu». – Monsieur Orville, de la même manière que madame Vedrenne, vous avez indiqué soutenir la directive pour les travailleurs des plateformes. Vous savez qu'en ce moment, cette directive est bloquée au Conseil, où on a un groupe d'États, avec en premier lieu le gouvernement français, la France, qui est en train de faire en sorte de mettre des exceptions, des exemptions, des délais suspensifs, de tout faire pour diluer la directive.

Est-ce que vous pouvez faire passer le message que vous avez exprimé là au président de la République et au gouvernement français pour qu'il arrête de saboter la directive au Conseil et qu'on arrive à aller dans le sens de la proposition qui avait été faite par M. Nicolas Schmit d'une directive pour protéger les travailleurs des plateformes?

Max Orville (Renew), réponse «carton bleu». – Je ne pense pas malheureusement que cela appelle une réponse. J'ai entendu la question de la collègue, mais je ne suis pas, comment dirais-je, je ne suis pas celui qui va pouvoir porter cette demande à un président de la République sur le plan national. Nous sommes ici au Parlement européen.

Katrin Langensiepen (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Ministerin, liebe Bürgerinnen und Bürger auf dem Podium! Finanzunion, Wirtschaftsunion – was wir brauchen, ist eine Sozialunion. Wir haben es geschafft, wir haben den Mindestlohn erkämpft. Als 2007/2008 die Finanzkrise, Wirtschaftskrise, Immobilienkrise über uns hereinbrach, waren viele junge Menschen arbeitslos. Die Jugendgarantie, eine Stärkung der Jugendgarantie, war dann die Folge. Wir brauchen aber viel mehr.

Obdachlosigkeit ist ein schwerwiegendes Thema in der Europäischen Union. Wenn wir über Versorgung der Menschen im Winter reden, müssen wir aber auch genauso gut darüber sprechen, wie der Zugang zu Wasser, zu Unterkünften in den Hitzesommern in den europäischen Mitgliedstaaten ist.

Eine weitere Krise, die wir vor einiger Zeit hatten, ist die Corona-Krise. Wie viele Menschen sind zu Hause im Dunkeln? Sie sind an ME/CFS erkrankt, nicht nur aufgrund von Corona, aber auch aufgrund dessen, können nicht mehr teilhaben. Arbeitskräfte fehlen uns, die nicht an der Ausbildung teilnehmen können.

Armutsbekämpfung muss in der nächsten Legislatur der Schwerpunkt sein in unserer Arbeit; dafür werden wir streiten.

Marc Angel (S&D). – Mr President, the European Pillar of Social Rights, a real shield to avoid the reversal of social progress, will not become a reality with a declaration of principle. Therefore, it's good that we have the action plan of Commissioner Schmit, which is being implemented. But we also need a social progress protocol integrated in our EU Treaties, as requested by Europeans during the Conference on the Future of Europe. It is time to deliver more.

The Pillar of Social Rights will not be implemented properly without sufficient social investment. Social investments need to be excluded from the excessive deficit calculations. Skills also need a more solid foundation. Workers cannot benefit from skilling opportunities if they do not have a decent minimum income that allows them to live in dignity while upskilling and reskilling. Poverty will not magically disappear. We cannot only blame the geopolitical situation, inflation and the increase of the interest rates.

My political choice as a member of the Group of Socialists and Democrats is to make social progress a reality for all, and not only with the aim to leave no one behind, but to ensure that we first focus on those who have already been left behind. And for all these reasons, the Porto Social Forum needs to make a difference for millions of Europeans facing poverty on a daily basis.

Marianne Vind (S&D). – Hr formand! Europa er blevet fattigere og mere usikkert for helt almindelige familier. Arbejdet udføres mere end nogen sinde på digitale platforme. Lønningerne rasler ned, og der åbnes fødevarerbanker i stribevis for at undgå, at folk sulter. Dette her er en bombe under velfærdsstaten, hvis vi ikke får rettet op nu!

Vi kan tale meget om, hvilken løsninger, der er de rigtige, men én ting er sikkert; vi kan gøre meget i EU! Først og fremmest skal vi have skovlen under det voksende antal af falske selvstændige, for arbejdsgiverne skubber nemlig ansvaret fra sig om fair løn, forsikring og pensioner. Arbejder man som arbejdstager, skal man også være ansat som en.

Vi skal gøre meget mere for at styrke arbejdsmarkedets parter i Europa, sikre gode vilkår for kollektive forhandlinger og slå fast, at retten til medlemskab af en fagforening er OK.

Vi skal sikre, at ingen mennesker bliver syge eller dør af deres arbejde. Vi kan vende tendensen. Lad os komme i gang!

Milan Brglez (S&D). – Gospod predsednik, spoštovani komisar, kolegice in kolegi. Socialni vrh v Portu leta 2021 je poseben mejnik, saj je pandemija covid-19 prva kriza, kjer so države članice na prvo mesto postavile socialne posledice krize.

Ker dve leti po Portu socialni vidiki obnove po pandemiji zaostajajo za gospodarskim, digitalnim in okoljskim razvojem in ker prehajamo v trajno krizo, potrebujemo načrt za socialno Evropo.

Socialne posledice pandemije, vojne v Ukrajini, rasti cen prihajajo z zamikom, vendar so to jasni, negativni učinki. Gre za poglobljanje revščine in socialne izključenosti najbolj prikrajšanih, zažira se v srednje sloje, peščica bogatih pa bogati na račun krize. Vse to vodi v Evropo neenakosti, razpadanje evropskega povezovanja.

Zato je potrebno izkoristiti srečanje v Portu, da uresničimo in okrepimo jamstvo za otroke, evropske minimalne plače, evropsko strategijo za oskrbo ter mehanizem za ublažitev tveganja brezposelnosti SURE. Potrebujemo pa tudi ambiciozen zakonodajni okvir do leta 2030 in po njem za Evropo kot prostor socialne varnosti in blaginje.

Der Präsident. – Nachdem mir nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ keine Wortmeldungen vorliegen, darf ich sofort Herrn Kommissar Schmit um seine abschließenden Bemerkungen bitten.

Nicolas Schmit, membre de la Commission. – Monsieur le Président, honorables parlementaires, je vous remercie d'abord pour ce débat à un moment crucial, à un moment où effectivement l'Europe subit plusieurs crises à la fois. Nous sortons à peine de la crise de la Covid. Nous subissons les conséquences de la guerre criminelle contre l'Ukraine, avec l'inflation, avec l'incertitude qui pèse sur nos économies. Et donc que veulent les Européens? Puisque j'ai beaucoup entendu soi-disant les gens qui interprètent la volonté et les idées des Européens et des Européennes. Enfin, on croit savoir ce qu'ils veulent.

D'abord, ils veulent plus de justice sociale, ils veulent plus de justice dans la société, c'est une énorme majorité qui exige cette justice. Et puis ils ne remettent pas en cause leur système de protection nationale. D'ailleurs, la Commission ne met en cause l'importance des systèmes nationaux de protection sociale. Mais ce qu'ils veulent, c'est qu'à côté il y ait une Europe sociale forte, parce que les bons systèmes de protection nationaux ne tiendront pas le coup si ces systèmes n'ont pas un soutien européen, s'ils n'ont pas des règles européennes qui les protègent.

Et donc un sondage, fait d'ailleurs avant le sommet de Porto, marquait que 88 % des Européens, et je ne pense pas que cela ait changé depuis, 88 % des Européens veulent une Europe sociale. Non pas de façon abstraite, mais pour eux-mêmes, parce qu'ils ont compris qu'une Europe sociale faible veut dire un démantèlement des systèmes sociaux nationaux.

J'ai entendu qu'effectivement il est important maintenant de lutter contre la pauvreté, et je crois que c'est un défi majeur quand plus de 90 millions d'Européens sont exposés au risque de pauvreté. Mais j'ai aussi entendu quelqu'un qui a dit que la crise était arrivée au milieu de la société, et que même on réclame un plan d'action pour les classes moyennes. Et je comprends que cette crise affecte tout le monde, ou presque, il y en a qui y échappent assez facilement.

Et qu'est-ce que ça veut dire un plan d'action pour les classes moyennes, et qui vise-t-on? On vise ces millions d'Européens, travailleurs intellectuels, ces ouvriers qualifiés qui avaient un bon emploi, un bon salaire, une convention collective; ces infirmiers et infirmières qui travaillaient avec une protection sociale, avec des conditions de travail décentes, tous ceux-là se considèrent comme faisant partie des classes moyennes. Eh bien, soudain, toutes ces catégories-là sont exposées à plus de risques, à des conditions de travail moins bonnes, à des salaires souvent de plus en plus faibles qui ne leur permettent pas une vie décente.

Et alors? Un plan d'action, oui, mais qu'est-ce que c'est qu'un plan d'action pour les classes moyennes? Un plan d'action pour les classes moyennes, c'est d'abord un bon emploi, c'est un emploi de qualité, c'est un emploi avec un salaire décent, c'est un emploi avec une convention collective qui les protège. C'est cela en fait, le premier point d'un bon plan d'action pour tout le monde, y compris pour les classes moyennes.

C'est d'abord un système éducatif valable qui donne aux enfants des chances valables, avec l'idée qu'effectivement la mobilité sociale fonctionne. C'est aussi une grande aspiration, y compris des classes moyennes. C'est aussi le droit à la requalification. On en a parlé amplement hier, du droit à la formation, à l'apprentissage tout au long de la vie. C'est effectivement un système fiscal qui ne pénalise pas les classes moyennes tout en avantageant ceux qui ont les investissements ailleurs ou d'autres formes de revenus. C'est aussi une politique de logement parce que c'est là où souvent les familles, les ménages tombent dans une précarité. Parce que vu la situation sur le marché du logement, eh bien ils n'arrivent plus à se loger correctement, ou bien pour se loger correctement, ils doivent renoncer à beaucoup de choses dans la vie courante.

Donc voilà, en fait ce qu'on appelle un plan d'action pour les classes moyennes, c'est en fait un plan d'action basé sur le socle des droits sociaux. Ce sont des services sociaux qui fonctionnent, qui sont accessibles à tout le monde, mais qui sont aussi de qualité. Voilà, je crois que c'est cela dont il faut parler à Porto et qu'il faut mettre en œuvre. C'est le plan d'action pour mettre en œuvre le socle des droits sociaux.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I wish to thank you all for this very interesting and good debate. And as several of us have said, and as Commissioner Schmit just said also, this debate two years after Porto is in a time after COVID, in the middle of a war, high energy costs and inflation. It's a different time. And we all need to work with these multiple complex challenges broadly on regional, national and European level, and in a time of green and digital transition – and the green and digital transition offer excellent opportunities to strengthen our growth and competitiveness. And to succeed, we must pursue this in close cooperation with the social partners. This is how we create jobs, while at the same time ensuring that no one gets left behind.

As Presidency of the Council I can reiterate our full commitment to achieving agreements on legislative and non-legislative initiatives that are on the table and contribute to the implementation of the social pillar principles. Thank you very much for this debate and for your attention.

Der Präsident. – Zum Abschluss der Aussprache wurden zwei Entschließungsanträge eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 11. Mai 2023, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Pedro Marques (S&D), *por escrito*. – Caros colegas, com a Cimeira Social do Porto, a Europa deu um passo na direção certa. Criámos objetivos concretos para o emprego, a formação profissional e a redução da pobreza. Não é só uma declaração de boas intenções, já há medidas no terreno. Uma é a diretiva relativa aos salários mínimos, que empurra os governos a seguir uma trajetória de melhoria nos ordenados. Outra é a garantia para a infância, de combate à pobreza das crianças. Portugal já deu o exemplo: em 2023 o orçamento para o abono de família duplicou face a 2022.

Mas para que o Pilar Social Europeu não fique por aqui, há que dar recursos aos governos. E isso, tal como esta resolução vinca, tem de estar bem presente nas negociações sobre a reforma da governação económica. As novas regras orçamentais não podem ser mais do mesmo. Têm de colocar as pessoas e a sua vida em primeiro plano. É essa a nossa grande prioridade.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. – On kulunut kuusi vuotta siitä, kun tämä talo yhdessä Euroopan neuvoston ja komission kanssa julkisti Euroopan sosiaalisten oikeuksien pilarin. EU sitoutui tuolloin vuodelle 2030 asetettuihin tavoitteisiin työllisyydestä, osaamisen ja koulutuksen parantamisesta, terveyden suojelemisesta, inklusiivisuudesta ja köyhyyden ja eriarvoisuuden vähentämisestä.

Olemme toki päässeet eteenpäin sosiaalisen Euroopan rakentamisessa. Viime syyskuussa komissio julkisti hoito- ja hoivastrategian, jolloin ensimmäistä kertaa aloimme asettaa EU:n laajuisia vaatimuksia hyvälaatuiselle hoivalle. EU:n vammaiskortti taas on erinomainen esimerkki menestyksekkäästä kokeilusta, joka pitää mahdollisimman pian laajentaa koko unioniin. Myös terveysunioni on ottanut isoja harppauksia eteenpäin koronaviruspandemian aikana ja sen jälkeen.

Tämä on erinomainen asia, mutta sosiaalinen Eurooppa on muutakin kuin terveyttä. Paljon on vielä tehtävänä. Esimerkiksi EU:n syrjinnänvastainen direktiivi olisi välttämätön pilarin tavoitteiden täyttämiseksi, ja neuvoston täytyykin edistää direktiiviä mahdollisimman nopeasti. Tätä parlamentti on näkyvästi vaatinut. Terveys-, sosiaali- ja ympäristöky-symykset kietoutuvat yhteen. EU:n kestävän vihreän siirtymän takaamiseksi meidän täytyy luoda myös Euroopan sosiaaliliunioni. Sosiaalisten tavoitteiden on kuljettava käsi kädessä ympäristötavoitteiden kanssa, koska niitä ei voi erottaa toisistaan: vihreä siirtymä vaikuttaa niin terveyteen kuin ihmisten toimeentuloon ja asumiseenkin – meidän jokaisen arkeen ja elämään. Lopullisen tavoitteemme tulee olla vihreä ja sosiaalinen EU. Se parantaa jokaisen eurooppalaisen elämänlaatua ja sosiaalisten oikeuksien turvaamista.

16. Walka z cyberprzemocą wśród młodzieży w całej UE (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zur Bekämpfung des Cybermobbings unter jungen Menschen in der EU (2023/2697(RSP)).

Didier Reynders, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, as part of the Commission's work to build a Europe fit for the digital age, it is a priority to ensure that children are protected, empowered and respected in the online environment in the same way as offline. This was also confirmed in the European Declaration on Digital Rights and Principles signed by the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission at the end of last year.

In the last decade, digital services have undoubtedly changed the daily lives of all Europeans. They have transformed and increased the possibilities to communicate, share information and exchange opinions and ideas. However, digital services have also become a source of new risks and challenges. Increased access and anonymity of the internet have made cyberbullying more pervasive and more challenging to prevent. Anyone can become a victim of cyber bullying, and the consequences can be devastating. Globally, 1 in 3 children report experiencing online bullying. In 2020, 33 % of girls and 20 % of boys in Europe reported experiencing disturbing content online at least once a month. And the pandemic has not improved this situation. For over five years, cyber bullying has consistently been the biggest issue for young people contacting the EU-funded safer internet centres across Europe. At the end of 2022, nearly 1 in 6 contacts to their helplines was about cyber bullying. For example, in Ireland, the Irish hotline reported in 2021 that 83 % of victims of intimate-image abuse were female and 73 % were between the ages of 25 and 34. Half of the reported images were found on video sharing services. 23 % were uploaded to image hosting services. 19 % were posted to social media platforms. These statistics are alarming, but the EU has a solid toolbox to face these problems, including legislation, policies and funding.

Our commitment is well reflected in the Digital Services Act, the Audiovisual Media Services Directive, the 2022 Better Internet for Children Strategy and in the EU Comprehensive Strategy on the Rights of the Child, as well as in the Commission's proposal combating violence against women and domestic violence. First of all, the Digital Services Act creates a wide set of due diligence obligations applicable to intermediaries of digital services. The new rules are adapted to the type, size and nature of the service concerned. The most stringent rules are imposed on the digital services that have more than 45 million users in the European Union. The very large online platforms and search engines. The DSA recognises the specific risks related to serious negative effects on a person's physical and mental well-being, as well as consequences on physical and mental development of children caused by using these platforms. The DSA also obliges online platforms to put in place appropriate and proportionate measures by, for example, designing their interface or its parts with the highest level of privacy, safety and security for minors by default, adopting standards for protection of minors or participating in codes of conduct for protection of minors. The DSA obliges the very large online platforms and search engines to assess the actual and foreseeable effects of their services on mental health. They should also implement solutions that remedy the negative effects.

Just two weeks ago, the Commission adopted the first designation decisions, resulting in the formal designation of 17 very large online platforms and two very large search engines. The rules of those services will enter into application four months after their formal designation. The Commission's services have started engaging with these designated services, notably as regards their measures to protect minors. This is an issue to which the Commission attaches particular importance.

There are also specific EU rules for video sharing platforms and on-demand services which do not qualify as intermediaries under the DSA. The Audiovisual Media Services Directive obliges platforms to take specific measures on the protection of minors for audiovisual content which may impair their physical, mental or moral development. The list of required measures includes establishing and operating age-verification systems and parental-control measures. In addition, the platform must ensure that users have the possibility to report, flag and red content if they consider that it may impair physical, mental and moral development of minors, for instance, pornographic content. To improve children's well-being online, the Commission adopted in 2022 the Better Internet for Kids strategy with three pillars: a safe age, appropriate digital environment, digital empowerment, and active participation of children. Under the strategy, the co-funded safer internet centres in all Member States play an important role in supporting children's mental health in the online environment. Examples of good practices for the safer internet centres include a cyber-bullying kit for people with intellectual disabilities from the age of 12, for caregivers and police in Luxembourg, a dedicated mobile app for young people to report cyber bullying in France, online courses for teachers in Poland or lesson plans on Coco's Law in Ireland. In Ireland, the EU funded hotline also offers a portal for reporting intimate image abuse. The Commission

will also ensure that the 116 111 harmonised number addresses cyber bullying in cooperation with the EU co-funded safer internet helplines.

We cannot forget that cyber bullying often takes a gendered angle where young women or men are harassed online for reasons related to their gender. This constitutes a form of gender-based violence. This type of violence is covered by the Commission's proposal combating violence against women and domestic violence from 2022. The proposal provides for the EU-wide criminalisation of certain forms of violence against women, including cyber violence. It will notably criminalise cyber harassment at EU level. The proposal also foresees specific measures to protect and support victims, for example, by making it easier to remove harmful online content. And while this form of cyber violence concerns predominantly women and girls, the proposed directive also covers cyber harassment against men and boys.

Moreover, racist and xenophobic hate crimes and hate speech are prohibited under EU law. The framework decision on combating racism and xenophobia of 2008 requires the Member States to criminalise hate speech and hate crime on the basis of race, colour, religion, distance or national or ethnic origin. In this context, the Commission initiated in 2016 a voluntary code of conduct with major social media platforms. We are now looking at further interplay between the DSA and the code.

Finally, protection and repression against cyber bullying cannot go without prevention, in particular at school. The European Education Area addresses well-being in schools to build positive learning environments for all learners. In this context, two flagship initiatives address bullying: the Council recommendation on pathways to School Success; and the launch of an expert group on supportive learning environments for groups at risk of underachievement and for supporting well-being at school.

So I thank you for your attention and I will be very attentive to your reactions.

Der Präsident. – Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Bevor ich das Wort an Herrn Paulo Rangel gebe, möchte ich anlässlich der heutigen Debatte über die Bekämpfung von Cybermobbing unter jungen Menschen in der EU die Anwesenheit von Frau Jackie Fox würdigen: Sie ist heute bei uns. Frau Fox ist die Mutter von Coco, einem jungen Mädchen aus Irland, das jahrelang unter Cybermobbing gelitten hat. Diese Schikanen führten zu Cocos tragischem Selbstmord im Jahr 2018. Auf Basis dieser persönlichen tragischen Erfahrungen startete Frau Fox eine landesweite Kampagne in Irland, die 2021 zur Einführung des Gesetzes über Belästigung, schädliche Kommunikation und damit verbundene Straftaten führte, besser bekannt als „Coco's Gesetz“, das eine ganze Reihe von Online-Missbrauchspraktiken abdecken soll.

Aufbauend auf dem Erfolg des irischen Gesetzes, der Initiative von Frau Fox, das bereits zu mehreren gesetzlichen Straftatbeständen geführt hat, setzte sich Frau Fox nun dafür ein, Cybermobbing auch auf EU-Ebene zu kriminalisieren. Für uns als Gesetzgeber ist es daher eine Ehre und eine Verantwortung, Sie, Frau Fox, heute bei uns begrüßen zu dürfen und Ihnen für Ihre Initiative zu danken.

Paulo Rangel, *em nome do Grupo PPE.* – Senhor Presidente, Caro Comissário, Caros Colegas, por aqui passam muitos assuntos técnicos, muitos assuntos importantes que são debatidos com distanciamento, com objetividade, com frieza. Mas há dias, como o de hoje, em que nós não falamos simplesmente como deputados, como legisladores, falamos como seres humanos, como mães, pais, irmãos, como cidadãos.

Há hoje no nosso continente, neste momento, milhares de crianças e adolescentes que são atormentadas, perseguidas, ameaçadas por uma nova pandemia criminal, o *cyberbullying*. Se há abusos e *bullying* que nos revoltam na rua, nas escolas, no desporto, caros colegas, há torturas muito cruéis também no mundo digital, exercidas secretamente por mensagens privadas insistentes que se apagam e autodestroem e, publicamente, em canais virais da Internet, nas redes sociais.

As crianças vivem com o fantasma da humilhação, da angústia, do sentimento de culpa, do isolamento, da depressão e, por vezes, até com ideias de suicídio, que é a única forma de fugirem a essa perseguição.

Falemos das coisas como elas são. O *cyberbullying* é um crime. O futuro que Nicole Fox nunca teve foi um crime e agradecemos à sua mãe, Jackie Fox, por dar oportunidade a tantas outras crianças de não terem que passar por esse final.

Nós temos de proteger as crianças e para isso precisamos de um crime autónomo, de um crime próprio, de *cyberbullying*, de abuso digital, que possa, no fundo, travar o uso de muitas plataformas de formas variadas, a intensidade da agressão com a disseminação viral e a forma secreta, silenciosa, discreta como este *bullying* se faz.

O *cyberbullying* é crime. Os jovens têm de saber que é crime, os pais têm de saber que é crime, os professores têm de saber que é crime, os tribunais têm de saber que é crime, e nós não podemos mais ignorar esta pandemia criminal que é o *cyberbullying*.

Heléne Fritzon, *för S&D-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Tack kommissionär, Miss Fox. "Jag ville inte leva längre", det sa den trettonåriga Moa, som utsattes för nätmobbning. Vi kallar det nätmobbning för att skilja på det som händer på nätet och det som händer i verkliga livet. Men mobbning på nätet är precis lika verkligt som mobbning på andra platser i samhället. Den stora skillnaden är att mobbningen på nätet, den finns där hela tiden.

Enligt en studie av *Plan International* trakasseras varannan flicka på nätet, och var femte flicka har slutat med, eller minskat, sin användning av sociala medier efter att ha utsatts för kränkningar. Det är helt oacceptabelt! Nätmobbning är inte bara ett hot mot våra barn och ungas hälsa – det är ett allvarligt hot mot demokratin. Nu måste EU ta krafttag. Det är bråttom nu, vi måste agera!

Laurence Farreng, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, l'Union européenne est pionnière dans la régulation du numérique. Avec la législation sur les services numériques, nous avons rendu illégal en ligne ce qui est illégal hors ligne et nous avons soumis les géants du net – type Google, Amazon, Facebook, Instagram – à de nouvelles obligations pour assurer que nos entreprises et nos citoyens puissent être en sécurité en ligne.

Oui, nous avons des règles fortes, uniques, mais une priorité demeure: mettre fin à la loi du plus fort. La lutte contre le cyberharcèlement est une urgence car nous sommes face à de véritables tragédies que nous découvrons trop tard. Que dire aux enfants harcelés à l'école et dont le calvaire continue à la maison sur Internet? Que faire pour les adolescents qui peuvent être menacés, insultés sur les réseaux sociaux, victimes de chantage, mis en scène dans des «deepfakes» pornographiques comme cela arrive à de nombreuses streameuses de jeux vidéo? Enfin, que répondre aux parents – - Madame Fox, merci pour votre initiative –, que dire aux parents dont les enfants ont décidé de mettre fin à leurs jours à cause du cyberharcèlement?

Il nous faut maintenant passer d'un état de fait à un état de droit. Cela passe par une volonté forte, une volonté européenne, car ce harcèlement ne connaît pas de frontières. Oui, il faut renforcer le règlement sur les services numériques. Il faut sensibiliser dès le plus jeune âge aux conséquences du cyberharcèlement. Il faut avoir une attention particulière pour les jeunes filles et surtout rester à l'écoute de l'innovation et se préparer aux diverses formes de harcèlement qui arriveront notamment dans le cadre du métavers. Ces défis appellent une stratégie européenne forte à laquelle nous devons veiller pour protéger nos enfants.

Alexandra Geese, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, sehr verehrte Frau Fox, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Jeder zehnte junge Mensch zwischen 10 und 19 ist Opfer von Cybermobbing gewesen, jeder Dritte kennt ein Opfer. Das ist eine Massenepidemie, die schwerste Folgen für die mentale Gesundheit von Kindern und Jugendlichen hat, bis hin zum Suizid.

In der Verantwortung für die Bekämpfung stehen viele, zuallererst die großen Digitalplattformen. Sie müssen ihre Algorithmen ändern, einfache Meldewege einrichten und gemeldete Cybermobbinginhalte unverzüglich löschen. Daran arbeiten wir hier in Europa.

Vor Ort brauchen wir Digitalbildung, wir brauchen Schulsozialarbeit. Aber vor allem müssen Hass und Hetze im Internet jetzt endlich gesellschaftlich geächtet werden, und dafür braucht es das Vorbild der Erwachsenen und ganz besonders von uns hier, in der Politik.

Und da kann es doch nicht sein, dass in diesen Tagen in Deutschland der ehemalige Vorsitzende der Jungen Union, also einer Jugendorganisation, auf Twitter gegen die Erzieherin einer katholischen Kindertagesstätte hetzt und sie für die rechten Hetzer mit den Kontaktdaten zum Abschuss freigibt. Das ist Cybermobbing auf höchstem Niveau, und das ist genau das Vorbild, das wir nicht brauchen.

Elżbieta Kruk, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Cyberbullying – nękanie w sieci – to współczesne oblicze przemocy. Najnowsze statystyki dotyczące cyberprzemocy na świecie każą bić na alarm. Dotyczy ona od 20% do nawet 50% młodych ludzi. Ważna jest nie tylko skala, ale też konsekwencje, jakie przemoc w sieci może powodować. A ma ona nawet bardziej niszczycielskie skutki niż tradycyjne formy przemocy.

Badania pokazują, że ofiary cybernękania są dużo bardziej narażone na depresję, lęki i zachowania samobójcze. Warto też przy tej okazji zauważyć, że do zwiększenia skali cyberprzemocy bezpośrednio przyczyniły się lockdowny związane z Covid-19. Badania naukowców z amerykańskich uniwersytetów ujawniły, że przemoc w serwisach społecznościowych wzrosła ze względu na ograniczenia covidowe nawet o 70%.

Kluczowe jest dziś wsparcie Komisji Europejskiej dla działań zapobiegających przemocy w internecie. Jest to wyzwanie, które wymaga współpracy państwa, szkoły, firm technologicznych, a także rodziny. Jak ważne jest wsparcie rodziny – tak dziś osłabianej przez różne działania, w tym tej izby – pokazuje fakt, że wśród powodów nękania w sieci są problemy psychiczne młodych ludzi, w tym poczucie niepewności czy osamotnienia.

Alessandro Panza, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, in Italia un adolescente su due è vittima di bullismo e cyberbullismo, dato preoccupante e in costante aumento. Nel 2022 il 31 % dei minori è stato almeno una volta vittima di atti di cyberbullismo, contro il 23 % del 2020.

È una forma di violenza che può avere gravi conseguenze sulla salute mentale e fisica dei nostri figli: ansia, depressione, isolamento sociale, disturbi alimentari, autolesionismo, fino al suicidio.

La prevenzione del cyberbullismo è possibile, deve diventare una priorità per tutti noi e dobbiamo proclamare anche in quest'Aula la nostra determinazione a combatterlo. Dobbiamo educare i nostri giovani all'uso responsabile e sicuro delle nuove tecnologie, ma dobbiamo anche considerare che oggi il 22 % dei minori passa cinque ore al giorno sul telefonino e il 63 % lo fa senza controllo.

Noi genitori, prima che politici, abbiamo il dovere morale e sociale di essere in prima linea in questa battaglia, perché il ruolo di educatori parte da noi, e dobbiamo farlo spiegando anche ai più piccoli che il semplice invio o inoltrare di una foto, che in qualche modo prende in giro un compagno di classe o un amico, è già un atto di bullismo.

Dobbiamo fare passi concreti affinché dalle famiglie parta un percorso di consapevolezza e condivisione, che possa essere raccolto dalle istituzioni per realizzare e coordinare azioni concrete volte non solo a prevenire ma anche a punire severamente i bulli.

Non sempre si celano perfidi aguzzini dietro agli atti di cyberbullismo ma certamente, sempre, ci sono delle vittime. Per i primi serve consapevolezza ed educazione per abbandonare definitivamente comportamenti lesivi, per i secondi serve attenzione e aiuto da parte delle famiglie e delle istituzioni, che solo insieme possono combattere e sconfiggere questo fenomeno.

Ragazzi, denunciate sempre, non abbiate paura!

Chris MacManus, on behalf of The Left Group. – Mr President, I want to welcome this debate on confronting cyberbullying amongst young people. And I want to acknowledge my colleague, Frances Fitzgerald, who has done sterling work in this regard. And I especially wish to praise the work of Jackie Fox, who joins us today to honour her daughter Coco, a victim of cyberbullying. You are in our thoughts.

Bullying has a profound effect on the victims. Technological advances such as social media give space to the bully to hide behind a keyboard whilst inflicting untold hurt to their victims. Our responsibility as legislators, therefore, is to combat cyberbullying. We know too well that cyberbullying left unchallenged escalates, leading to serious harm. Early intervention by confronting cyberbullying can help prevent the situation from deteriorating and protect potential victims.

That is why I believe that we must act decisively in order to protect our young people from the tragic consequences of cyberbullying. Now let's act with urgency and let's enact an EU Coco's Law.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, this is a very important debate today, and I'm not asking you to listen to me, but indeed to Jackie Fox, who is with us today and for which we are very grateful that you're here and for everything you have done. Jackie Fox, the mother of Nicole 'Coco' Fox, who was the victim of relentless bullying – both off and online. She was bullied up to a point where she saw no way out anymore, ultimately resulting in her taking her own life. And there are simply no words to describe this tragedy.

But Coco's story is unfortunately not an isolated case. All over Europe, children are victims of cyberbullying, often with terrible consequences. In Europe, every month, one out of ten children becomes a victim of online bullying. And the terrible thing is, in many Member States, cyberbullying is not even a crime.

Imagine how Jackie felt when the police informed her that there was nothing they could do against the bullies responsible for her daughter's suicide. I cannot imagine it, and I can only hope I will never have to experience it. It only further increases my admiration for your strength, your bravery and your determination, dear Jackie, that you have turned this tragedy into a mission – a mission to make sure that children in Ireland are protected against bullying in a way that Coco was tragically not.

And Coco's law is now in force in Ireland, which makes cyber bullying a crime. But the mission is not over yet. We need to take Coco's law to the European level, and I can only express my hope, regardless of our political differences, that we can come together in this Parliament and make sure that all children in Europe are effectively protected against such despicable behaviour. Let's do it together and let's do it in honour of Coco and all other victims.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Voorzitter, het internet is onveilig voor kinderen. Het is alsof we kinderen alleen laten in een stadscentrum op een drukke zaterdagmiddag. Er kan van alles gebeuren. En een van de vormen die internet zo onveilig maken, is cyberpesten, maar ik zie ook sextortion – het afpersen van een ander met intieme beelden – als onderdeel daarvan. Het wordt hoog tijd dat deze trend van cyberpesten, sextortion en andere vormen van virtueel geweld wordt doorbroken. En dat kan ook op verschillende manieren.

Ten eerste hebben we een Europees centrum nodig tegen kindermisbruik dat aanbieders van onlinediensten – het is al genoemd: de grote platformen – de beste voorbeelden kan geven hoe hun diensten veiliger worden voor kinderen. Desnoods gedwongen moet dat gebeuren: *safety by design*. Ten tweede moeten er betere mogelijkheden komen om vormen van pesten te melden en ook hulp te zoeken: de helplijn. En ten slotte ben ik het zeer eens met Jeroen Lenaers: het moet ook strafbaar kunnen zijn, zodat de politie ook in actie kan komen.

Voorzitter, het is onze plicht om het internet veiliger te maken voor onze kinderen, zo snel mogelijk.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, we confer rights on citizens in terms of free movement of people, we confer rights on people with regard to the single market and business, but at this stage we do have to do something, Commissioner, with regard to conferring rights on young children and teenagers around the issue of cyberbullying and online bullying.

I don't come to this podium with any answers, but I certainly come to this podium understanding the pressure that's on young people across Europe and even in my own home country, Ireland, because of cyberbullying, and where young people now reside in their social outlets – on their phone.

If we don't do something, we sadly and tragically will have many more Coco Foxes across Europe. I want to commend Jackie, Coco's mother, for her vigorous campaigning on this issue, not for Coco, but in Coco's memory, to ensure that we do something as a community, not just here in this Parliament, but across communities as we flow out from here.

I also acknowledge MEP Frances Fitzgerald for her highlighting this issue and asking that we do something tangible and meaningful. If we can do anything to honour the tragic passing of Coco Fox, let us work collectively together to come up with solutions in terms of dealing with social media platforms, anonymous online bullying, and the fact that we do need to ensure that online bullying is seen not just as some faceless offence, but as a crime as well. I commend whatever this House can do, but we must do something.

Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Mrs Fox, let's be honest, bullying is not, unfortunately, a new problem. But what is new is the scale and reach of cyber bullying. There is a growing tendency for more and more young people to become victims of its devastating real-life consequences, which can affect their social life and may cause them to experience anxiety, depression and even suicidal ideation. This issue is not just a concern for parents though, it is also a political one that demands real action.

I think our proposal of this House should go in three directions: (i) education, raising awareness among young people about the dangers of cyber bullying, (ii) law, holding abusers and predators accountable for their actions. It is long overdue that bullying someone through their intimate pictures should be made a criminal offence, and of course, (iii) support, supporting victims through counselling, so no case ends in a tragedy. Let's make sure together that we can use technology with enthusiasm, not fear of harassment or abuse.

Gianna Gancia (ID). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, innanzitutto un saluto alla mamma coraggiosa di Coco.

Il miglior modo per affrontare il fenomeno del cyberbullismo è innanzitutto definirlo una piaga sociale: quando parliamo di cyberbullismo, la tendenza è a concentrarsi unicamente su chi subisce il gesto, senza soffermarci sui molteplici aspetti di un fenomeno enormemente complesso.

Il cyberbullismo ci obbliga ad andare, anche giuridicamente, oltre la classica distinzione tra vittima e carnefice, perché la varietà di formati offerti da una miriade di applicazioni e di piattaforme comporta il ramificarsi e il differenziarsi di questo fenomeno.

Gli effetti a breve e medio termine del cyberbullismo sono sotto gli occhi di ognuno di noi e dobbiamo ora anche prevedere che questo potrà verosimilmente accadere nel metaverso.

È fondamentale pensare a pene severe, pene severe per far sì che questa strategia europea di lotta al fenomeno sia efficace. Lo sappiamo, è un obiettivo ambizioso e ci pone una progettualità a lungo termine. Per questo dobbiamo coinvolgere tutti gli attori chiamati in causa: ragazzi, famiglie, scuole, istituzioni e giganti del tech.

Il nostro obiettivo non è solo un obiettivo educativo, noi stiamo parlando di una questione di civiltà.

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Mr President, I want, of course, to begin by welcoming Jackie Fox to the European Parliament, as you did President, and thank you for that and Commissioner, for your comprehensive speech.

Jackie is seated in the gallery for this important debate on cyberbullying. And as you now know, Jackie is the mother of the late Nicole Fox, known as Coco, from Ireland, who tragically took her own life in 2018 as a result of cyberbullying. We know that cyberbullying is killing young people across our continent, and we know that there is a legislative vacuum across Europe at present. Every day a young person takes their life haunted by what has been done to them, mentally tortured by brutal bullying in forms that, as we know, are now evolving. A digital world now allows, as colleagues have said, for total access, not a moment of peace from bullies.

Colleagues, it is time we stood up and took action. Coco's law, named after Nicole Fox, was enacted in Ireland in 2021. It's aimed to target behaviour online that is killing people. What is illegal offline must be illegal online. The brave work of Jackie ensured this happened in Ireland. We need to do this at a European level.

I think we all know that and I think this is what our young people are asking of us. They are asking us to keep them safe online. It is our responsibility as legislators to keep every single European citizen safe online. Cyberbullying knows no borders, and that's why the EU must act now. Thank you all and thank you to Jackie.

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D). – Sur President, it-tfal għandhom jgħixu hielsa minn kull forma ta' diskriminazzjoni, minn kull forma ta' intimidazzjoni, iħossuhom differenti, jagħżlu li jitolqu kmieni mill-iskola, iħossu, ikollhom ukoll ħsibijiet suwiċidali li sfortunatament jistgħu jwasslu għal sitwazzjonijiet traġiċi bħal dak ta' Coco.

Dawn huma biss ftit elementi li jħossu ż-żgħażaġh, it-tfal meta jiġu bbuljati. Il-konsegwenza tal-vjolenza u l-bullying, inkluż il-bullying online, għandhom effetti kbar, effetti profondi u dejjiema fuq l-iżvilupp fiżiku, psikoloġiku u emozzjonali tat-tfal. Matul il-pandemija, hajjet uliedna u ż-żgħażaġh tagħna saru haġa wahda mad-dinja online. Hekk kif gara wkoll bil-bullying illi issa m'għadux ristrett biss fl-iskejjel imma sar ukoll predominanti fid-dinja online. Jekk irridu li ż-żgħażaġh isiru ċittadini diġitali u kunfidenti, kompetenti u attivi, jeħtieġ ambjent diġitali sikur fejn jistgħu jirnexxu mingħajr ma jibżgħu, mingħajr ma jħossuhom mhedda. Għal dan il-ghan jeħtieġ li jkunu mġhammra b'hiliet u kompetenzi diġitali u bil-ħsieb kritiku meħtieġ għat-tehid tad-deċizzjonijiet responsabbli online u l-indirizzar ta' firxa wiesgħa ta' riskji online, inkluż il-bullying.

Nagħlaq hawn: il-prevenzjoni u l-qerda tal-bullying online tinvolvi impenn profond li jrid jibda mill-komunitajiet, fl-iskejjel u fid-djar tagħna. Iżda jeħtieġ li dan isehh flimkien ma' strategija Ewropea.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, es un crimen nuevo pero es un crimen viejo, y Jackie Fox, una madre coraje, nos ha traído hasta aquí. Y con toda humildad le mandamos el abrazo de nuestro Grupo y, desde luego, mi reconocimiento personal más profundo.

Ocurre en todos nuestros países, comisario. Hay unas gemelas en España, Leila y Alana, que el pasado mes de febrero, con 13 años, se lanzaron desde un tercer piso para acabar con su vida y una de ellas falleció en el acto. Eran unas niñas emigrantes argentinas que habían llegado a un pequeño pueblo de Cataluña y estaban en su primer año de instituto.

Señor comisario, es el crimen de la banalidad del mal. Y es una plaga. Y debe ser un eurodelito. Porque no podemos permitir la impunidad aunque muchos de los perpetradores sean menores y haga falta —sí— formación y haga falta que la comunidad se implique, y los profesores. Lo que usted quiera. Y hagan falta datos. Pero lo que no puede haber es coste cero para esa tortura moral a los niños y jóvenes de la que no pueden escapar. Es una plaga. Es el crimen de la banalidad del mal. Y debemos actuar.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Verts/ALE). – Domnule președinte, „Bă, ești un jeg! Ești un gunoi! Pune-ți, bă, ștreangul de gât. Meriți bătut! Idiotule! Prostule! Trădătorule!” Cam așa arată bullyingul online, la care probabil noi, politicienii, suntem imuni, dar copiii noștri nu sunt imuni. Un adolescent de 18 ani a fost găsit spânzurat, iar colegii spun că nu mai făcea față atâtor umilințe. O fată a fost supusă unui *shaming* de nedescris, cu o poză luată ilegal de la toaletă și postată viral pe rețelele sociale. Azi, Partidul Aur a adus tineri în Parlamentul României cu gloanțe, parcă bătându-și joc de masacrul din Serbia.

Acestea nu sunt cazuri izolate. Aceasta este o epidemie europeană de bullying. România e pe locul trei la capitolul bullying. Sistemul public a eșuat până acum, din păcate, ba chiar pot spune că l-a încurajat. Copiilor vreau să le spun ceva. Nu vă fie rușine! Vorbiți despre asta! Dacă acasă nu vă ascultă, vorbiți cu un psiholog, cu un profesor, vorbiți cu noi aici, la Uniunea Europeană, pentru că noi înțelegem și vă ascultăm. Dar nu sunteți singuri. Bullies sunt înfrânți mereu. Asta trebuie să vă amintiți.

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, il y a des moments où les mots nous manquent. Devant une mère dont l'enfant s'est suicidé à cause de ce que lui infligeaient des harceleurs, nous nous sentons complètement démunis. Pourtant, le courage de cette mère nous donne aussi envie de nous battre. Jackie Fox a transformé son chagrin en force, et a agi pour éviter à d'autres jeunes le sort de sa fille. Son combat a abouti en Irlande au vote d'une loi, *Coco's Law*, qui criminalise le harcèlement en ligne. Aujourd'hui, Jackie s'adresse à l'Union européenne.

Internet et ses réseaux sociaux sont des outils performants qui nous permettent entre autres de rester connectés à nos familles et amis. Malheureusement, ce sont aussi des instruments à disposition d'agresseurs sans scrupules et malveillants. Face à l'intention de nuire, à l'anonymat du bourreau, et à l'absence de responsabilisation, la victime est démunie. Il faut être conscient que cette persécution brutale atteint près de la moitié des jeunes de l'Union européenne, les amenant trop souvent à la scarification, l'automutilation, quand ce n'est au suicide.

Il est donc inconcevable que le harcèlement soit pris à la légère ou minimisé. Certains États membres ont déjà pris des dispositions légales contre le cyberharcèlement, il nous faut relayer ceci au niveau européen. Les institutions européennes ont bien reconnu les dangers posés par le harcèlement en ligne. Mais pour être efficaces, il est nécessaire d'adopter une stratégie concrète dans tous les États membres afin de faire face à l'ampleur du phénomène. Le harcèlement en ligne tue. À nous de l'ériger en infraction pénale dans toute l'Union européenne. C'est maintenant qu'il faut agir.

Thank you Jackie!

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisario Reynders, este Parlamento Europeo ha mostrado su determinación para combatir penalmente todas las formas de cibercriminalidad que crecieron geoméricamente a propósito de la pandemia, pero el ciberacoso que hoy nos ocupa existía antes de la pandemia, como pone trágicamente de manifiesto la muerte de la joven irlandesa Coco, a cuya madre Jackie rendimos tributo hoy aquí.

Porque hay muchos y muchas niñas expuestas a esa persecución de la que no pueden escapar. Y nos interpela esa amenaza no solamente a quienes somos padres y madres de hijos menores sino a todos los grupos de esta Cámara y, consiguientemente, a este Parlamento Europeo, para no solamente dar contenido a la estrategia contra el ciberacoso en la red con medidas de prevención, de educación digital, de autodefensa, de tutoría emocional frente a la depresión, el aislamiento y la tentación del suicidio, sino también con Derecho penal, porque hay que garantizar que el ciberacoso no quede impune.

Siguiendo el ejemplo de la legislación penal irlandesa, es imprescindible que una directiva penal europea sea capaz de ordenar a todos los Estados miembros que transpongan esa legislación penal a sus ordenamientos internos.

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Mr President, in English there is the children's saying 'sticks and stones may break my bones, but words can never hurt me'. Sadly, this is no longer true. The internet seems to remove adults' limits, but for children who have not learned yet the power of their words, this is even worse. Group chats, discord Chats, sites like Instagram and TikTok have transformed bullying, especially among girls. Cyber bullying has not replaced it offline in schools, but has added to it, making it no longer end at the school's gates.

So what do we do? First, we, as parents, must seek to try to understand and help our children to understand the harm of their actions. But equally important is to praise and support those young people who stand up to their so-called friends, both online and offline, and say, 'no', what is happening here is not acceptable. Bullying is not new with time, hopefully the cyberbullying of today will end. But we must do everything we can to make it end sooner rather than later.

Javier Zarzalejos (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, es realmente lamentable que con demasiada frecuencia se tenga que producir un hecho trágico para que se tomen medidas legislativas. Los legisladores deberíamos anticiparnos y afrontar problemas que sabemos que existen y que no pueden ser silenciados.

La vida de Coco Fox no tenía que haberse perdido. Pero ahora lo que tenemos que hacer es honrar su memoria y la lucha de su madre, Jackie Fox, para afrontar este flagelo desde el punto de vista legislativo.

Tenemos que proporcionar una protección integral a los menores con normas concretas —no solo declaraciones— que establezcan obligaciones, procedimientos de denuncia adecuados, protocolos eficaces de prevención, compromiso por parte de los padres y tutores, del sistema educativo, de las autoridades, de las organizaciones y de la sociedad civil y, por supuesto, el compromiso firme de todas aquellas compañías que ofrecen servicios digitales dentro de la Unión Europea.

El ciberacoso es una realidad que los menores sufren en silencio y en humillación, que les destroza psicológicamente y que en muchos casos les marca con consecuencias difíciles de borrar, cuando no con consecuencias letales. El ciberacoso no es solo el *bullying* digital, es la extorsión sexual, es la persecución, es la inducción a cometer actos que son gravemente lesivos para la integridad mental, la integridad moral y la integridad física de los menores.

Gracias, Frances, por tu iniciativa y tu compromiso. Apoyamos rotundamente esta causa y pedimos en este debate la criminalización del ciberacoso en todo el ámbito de la Unión Europea, con la adopción de las medidas de prevención, de investigación y de sanción a los acosadores y el apoyo que las víctimas merecen.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtarán*, Nicole ‘Coco’ Fox’s life may have been tragically cut short, but thanks to the courageous work of her mother, Jackie, we may finally be able to act and pass legislation that punishes and outlaws cyberbullying.

I have been working on cyberbullying now for over a dozen years, and it can happen on social media, messaging apps, online gaming platforms, or even via text messages and emails. Technology, by and large, is positive but there are also ever-deepening connections involving some negatives, especially on social media. The rise of cyberbullying has been alarming, with more and more young people falling victim to this form of abuse.

For Coco, intimate images of her were put online against her will – a horrendous thing for anyone to face, never mind for someone of such a young age. In 2021, Ireland adopted Coco’s Law, which covers a wide range of offences including online abuse, cyberbullying and image-based abuse. Those found guilty can face up to seven years in prison. Jackie is right: it should be a criminal offence to torment and torture somebody online. I fully support calls for Coco’s law to be extended across the EU. We must protect our youth, in particular from the dangers of cyberbullying, and create a more positive and inclusive online culture.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Maria Walsh (PPE). –Mr President, ‘It’s not a criminal offence.’ This is what police said to Jackie Fox after her daughter Nicole had suffered extreme torment which resulted in her ending her life. Jackie’s dedication to ensuring that Coco’s law was delivered in Ireland has ensured that what is a crime offline is made a crime online.

But as we speak, thousands of young Europeans are living with cyberbullying, being threatened with violence, being told to end their lives. Suicide is the second leading cause of death for young people under the age of 19 in our EU. What does that say about our policies if our young Europeans have nowhere to turn to for protection? We cannot allow them and their families to go through this trauma and heartbreak.

Online bullying will not stop without legal consequences. EU legislation on cyberviolence and cyberbullying cannot wait. And I ask you all to please ensure Coco’s law is put in place throughout our EU in the name ‘Coco’s Law’ for Jackie and the spirit of her daughter, Nicole.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovana gospođo Fox, hvala vam od srca na vašim naporima. Hvala jednako tako Frances na trudu što možemo razgovarati, a morali smo to očito i prije, o ovoj važnoj temi.

Otpriblike svaki treći korisnik interneta je dijete, a istraživanje EU Kids Online iz 2020. pokazalo je da je gotovo 50 posto djece bilo izloženo nasilju na internetu. Stoga smatram da svako nasilje zahtijeva reakciju okoline i nikako nemojmo umanjiti ono elektroničko. I to mora biti kazneno djelo. Brže i lakše od tradicionalnog zlostavljanja – poslati uvredljivu poruku, proširiti je, postalo je puno lakše. Nasilnik ne može vidjeti trenutnu reakciju žrtve, manja je vjerojatnost da će osjećati krivnju. Mobilni uređaji omogućuju stalni pristup internetu i ostavljaju korisnika podložnim napadima u svakom trenutku.

Kolegice i kolege, budućnost je digitalna, to je tako jasno. Međutim, lica djece koja su doživjela nasilje stvarna su i tu među nama. Oni imaju svoje ime i prezime. Završit ću, u Republici Hrvatskoj, iz koje dolazim, Ministarstvo unutarnjih poslova ima takozvani *Red Button* stisnimo *Red Button* za svu djecu.

Ljudmila Novak (PPE). – Gospod predsjednik! Če nas nekdo sramoti na cesti in nas ozmerja in imamo priče, gremo na sodišče in ga tožimo, bo moral plačati kazen. Če nas pa nekdo ozmerja in sramoti preko spleta, pa se mu nič ne zgodi. Vemo pa, kako zaradi tega lahko nekdo trpi celo tako, da naredi samomor. Vemo tudi, kako so mladostniki občutljivi, kako jih vse moti v dobi odraščanja, kako bi na sebi vse spremenili in kako mora biti šele grozno, ko vidijo svoje spakedrane, popačene slike in sramotenje od svojih vrstnikov. Mladostnikom tudi največ pomeni to, kar mislijo njegovi vrstniki o njem, ne starši ali odrasli. Zato gospa Fox, vi ste vztrajali zaradi svoje ljubezni do hčerke in zaradi svoje bolečine in ste uspehi. Vaša hčerka je žal morala umreti, da smo se tudi mi zganili in bomo ukrepali.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, kyberšikana je forma násilí, která ničí životy a zabíjí. Tato definice by měla také vést k nové evropské legislativě tak, jak tuto cestu otevřela právě Jackie Fox.

Thank you, Jackie for being here. Thank you for your testimony.

Chci vás ujistit, že ani my to nevzdáme. Stejně jako vy jste to nevzdala. Váš zákon, který jste prosadila v Irsku, *Coco's law*, je přesně tím, co může být a ukazuje se, že je efektivní v boji proti kybernetickému násilí. To, co je trestné offline, musí být trestné i online. Ještě jednou vám děkuji. Pro nás je vaše svědectví závazkem a pro tisíce rodičů i dětí, které trpí, je to ukázkou toho, že mohou otevřít oči a mohou se bránit tomuto násilí. Nevzdáme to.

Francesca Peppucci (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questi sono oggetti che sono parte integrante del nostro vivere ma che ormai, con il loro utilizzo diffuso e inappropriato, possono diventare strumenti pericolosi e subdoli, dove chi è più fragile è sottomesso rispetto a chi, invece, si crede forte.

Possiamo permetterci di aspettare? Possiamo permetterci di essere indifferenti o sottovalutare il fenomeno del cyberbullismo? La risposta è no. Soprattutto se questo porta a disturbi d'ansia, dell'umore, disturbi del comportamento alimentare, autolesionismo, ma peggio ancora alla morte, e significa che noi abbiamo il dovere assoluto di agire per garantire tutele efficaci su tutto il territorio europeo, anche adottando misure severe e decise.

Ho l'onore di essere il parlamentare europeo più giovane del mio paese, uno dei più giovani del Parlamento europeo ed è inaccettabile, al giorno d'oggi, vedere morire giovani perché messi all'angolo, perché derisi, scherniti, sottoposti a molestie e ricatti.

Per tutto il territorio dell'Unione europea diamo al più presto strumenti, diamo misure, diamo regole, altrimenti saremo solo persone che dicono belle parole, ma parole che cadono nel vuoto, in cui purtroppo è caduta Coco. Grazie, Signora Fox.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Pán predsedajúci, online šikana je problém, ktorý nadobúda obrovské rozmery. Podľa najnovších prieskumov má takmer štvrtina detí vo veku od 9 do 17 rokov skúsenosť s online šikanou. A zároveň jedna tretina týchto obetí o tom s nikým zatiaľ nehovorila.

Najzraniteľnejšia skupina obyvateľov, deti, sa alarmujúco často stretáva s týmto fenoménom, ktorý poškodzuje ich psychické zdravie, pohodu a môže mať ďalekosiahle následky. Je preto našou povinnosťou zakročiť.

Zamerajme sa na zvyšovanie povedomia detí, rodičov či učiteľov. Pomôžme im komunikovať a primerane na situáciu reagovať. Zároveň je potrebné do najvyššej možnej miery podporovať členské štáty, aby mali dostatok zdrojov a účinný právny rámec na boj proti online šikane. Veď ide o duševné zdravie našich detí.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear Minister, to the mother of Coco, to Jackie Fox, I want just to say thank you for your initiative, for your campaign, for your courage.

Honourable Members, thank you for this debate. All forms of hatred and intolerance are incompatible with EU values and fundamental rights. A safe, secure and trusted digital space is a cornerstone of the European digital age. The Commission is committed to ensuring that children and young people benefit from the unprecedented opportunities of the digital age, but also to mitigating the potential risks. While we acknowledge that the issue of cyberbullying raises concerns at Member State and at EU level, we are convinced that the EU's legislative and policy framework is fit for purpose.

With the entry into application of the Digital Services Act (DSA), the European Union now has powerful new tools to tackle mental health risks online, in particular for minors and young people. The Commission will work in close cooperation with the National Digital Services Coordinators in the supervisory framework established by the DSA. The Commission is also setting up a digital enforcement ecosystem, bringing together expertise from all relevant sectors.

To build the internet we want to see, coordinated efforts are needed. The success relies on cooperation between the Commission, the European Parliament, Member States and key partners such as industry, international organisations and civil society at large. In that context, the Commission would like to stress that, given the increasing prevalence of online forms of gender-based violence, it is essential that the co-legislators swiftly adopt an ambitious text. We appreciate the European Parliament's support for the Commission's proposal on combating violence against women and domestic violence, and we are looking forward to the adoption of the report.

To conclude, we want also to review the Directive on victims' rights, to reinforce the support to the victims of crimes, in particular children, and to try to convince the Member States to extend the list of Euro-crimes to include hate crime.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir slēgtas.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (171. pants)

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη (PPE), *γραπτώς*. – Ο διαδικτυακός εκφοβισμός έχει πάρει τρομακτικές διαστάσεις στις ευρωπαϊκές κοινωνίες και αυτό δεν τιμά όλους εμάς που έχουμε τα εργαλεία και τη δύναμη να προστατεύσουμε τα παιδιά μας από κάθε είδους απειλές. Έρευνες δείχνουν ότι τα νεαρά θύματα εκφοβισμού στον κυβερνοχώρο έχουν περισσότερες από διπλάσιες πιθανότητες να αυτοτραυματιστούν και να εμφανίσουν αυτοκτονική συμπεριφορά. Όλοι έχουμε στο μυαλό μας ανάλογα παραδείγματα από τις χώρες μας, αφού μιλάμε για πραγματικές καταστάσεις βίας που σήμερα βιώνουν περισσότεροι από τους μισούς νέους στην ΕΕ. Τα βήματα που έχουν γίνει σε νομοθετικό επίπεδο αφορούν ορισμένα μόνο κράτη μέλη και δεν αρκούν, όπως δεν αρκούν και οι αποσπασματικές κυρώσεις. Είναι κατεπείγουσα ανάγκη η θέσπιση μιας ενιαίας ευρωπαϊκής νομοθεσίας με αυστηρές ποινές για τους δράστες και κυρώσεις για τις διαδικτυακές πλατφόρμες που φιλοξενούν ρητορική μίσους, παρενοχλητικό ή εκφοβιστικό υλικό, απειλές, εξυβρίσεις και δημοσιοποίηση ευαίσθητου περιεχομένου των χρηστών. Χωρίς την ολοκληρωμένη αντιμετώπιση του διαδικτυακού εκφοβισμού σε όλη την ΕΕ η απάντησή μας θα είναι αδύναμη. Οι πλατφόρμες μέσω κοινωνικής δικτύωσης όπου λαμβάνει χώρα ο εκφοβισμός είναι ισχυρές. Μόνο μια πανευρωπαϊκή απάντηση μπορεί να αποδείξει ότι η αποφασιστικότητα της ΕΕ είναι ισχυρότερη. Ήρθε η ώρα να αναγνωρίσουμε τον διαδικτυακό εκφοβισμό ως ποινικό αδίκημα και να πάρουμε τα μέτρα μας.

Stefania Zambelli (ID), *per iscritto*. – Il fenomeno della violenza online contro i minori e i giovani è purtroppo in grande ascesa in tutto il mondo a causa dell'uso sempre più frequente dei social e di internet da parte di tutte le fasce di popolazione.

Preoccupa però il fatto che ci sia ancora pochissima consapevolezza e conoscenza di questo fenomeno in rapida crescita. I dati infatti ci parlano di numeri allarmanti: in Italia si stima che tra il 15 % e il 20 % della popolazione minorile sia stata vittima di cyberbullismo. La pandemia, il lockdown e la scuola online hanno solamente peggiorato questa situazione. Si stima ci sia stato un incremento del 70 % delle segnalazioni di questi episodi durante il COVID-19.

Tutto ciò ha portato a pericolose conseguenze sui giovani vittime di questo tipo di bullismo: isolamento sociale, problemi scolastici, disturbi psichiatrici e rischi di autolesionismo. Purtroppo non tutti i ragazzi riescono a parlarne in famiglia, per vergogna o per paura.

Dobbiamo dare un segnale forte: per prima cosa dobbiamo lavorare per prevenire questi episodi online e dobbiamo sostenere con forza bambini e giovani vittime di bullismo sui social e su internet.

17. Adekwatność ochrony zapewnianej przez ramy ochrony danych UE–USA (debata)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Padomes un Komisijas paziņojumiem par ES un ASV datu privātuma regulējuma sniegtās aizsardzības pietiekamību (2023/2501(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, as we navigate the digital age, we must ensure that personal data is collected, processed and transferred in a responsible and secured manner. At the same time, we cannot underestimate the importance of transatlantic data flows in driving innovation, collaboration and economic growth. By striking the right balance between privacy and free flow of data, we can unlock the full potential of the digital economy while safeguarding individual rights and freedom.

Today's debate certainly reflects the importance of transatlantic data flows. There needs to be clear rules that ensure that the digital developments improve, rather than hamper, the transatlantic cooperation. This is not only important for our economies, but also for the trust in our digital environment and for protection and personal data.

The European Parliament has stressed that the ability to transfer personal data across borders could be a key driver of innovation, productivity and economic competitiveness as long as there are adequate safeguards.

The Council shares this view and considers that adequate decisions are essential, too, for companies to transfer personal data safely to third countries. It is for the benefit of both companies and individuals that these decisions comply with all the criteria set under the GDPR and the Court of Justice case law.

The Commission's draft adequacy decision should also be considered in light of our common objectives with the United States to ensure safe, secure and trusted cross-border data flows that protect consumers and enhance privacy protections while enabling transatlantic trade. Both sides have committed to keep working together to strengthen the legal certainty when it comes to transatlantic flows of personal data. We clearly need to pay special attention to US agencies' access to data and the need to guarantee access for Europeans to an independent and impartial redress mechanism. The United States commitment on these two elements should inform our discussion on this subject, and I encourage the dialogue the LIBE Committee will have next week in US.

I would also like to stress that Member States will play their role in scrutinising this draft decision during the comitology procedure. As we celebrate the fifth anniversary of the GDPR's effective application, we have a timely opportunity to demonstrate and ensure its ability to facilitate the free flow of personal data within the Union and the transfer to third countries, while ensuring a high level of protection of personal data.

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear Minister, honourable Members, I am grateful for this opportunity to debate with you today before the vote of an important resolution of the European Parliament concerning the US Data Privacy Framework. I very much appreciate the particular vigilance of Parliament in this file. Considering your essential role in the preservation of fundamental rights, such as the right to privacy. During my intervention, I would like to underline some important elements of the new contemplated framework.

First of all, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that this new framework is very different compared to the previous one, the EU-US Privacy Shield. In the meantime, the European Court of Justice has clarified the requirements to be fulfilled in order for the European Union to adopt an adequacy decision. As you know, the Court of Justice invalidated the privacy shield on 16 July 2020, concluding in its *Schrems 2* ruling that the safeguards were insufficient on the US side in the field of national security. This ruling was a strong reaffirmation of the fundamental right to data protection under EU law. The Court confirmed that the protection must travel with the data and that the level of this protection must be adequate to EU standards. The requirements of the Court guided me in the negotiations with my US counterparts, the Secretary of Commerce, Gina Raimondo, and the US Attorney General, Merrick Garland. I can assure you that this ruling has really been my mandate.

Let me recall that the privacy shield was invalidated by the Court for two reasons: first, insufficient safeguards in terms of necessity and proportionality as regards access to personal data by US intelligence agencies and, second, insufficient safeguards in terms of individual redress in this area. It is on these two key points that on behalf of the Commission I have negotiated with the US and I consider that we have obtained very significant changes to the US legal framework to address these two issues. The US have indeed changed the rules governing the operations of their intelligence agencies, which had not been the case under previous frameworks. This should not be underestimated in an area as sensitive for any country as national security. Our draft adequacy decision is built on these new US rules and I am pleased that the European Data Protection Board has also recognised and welcomed significant improvements.

Another important element is that the solutions found are similar to those accepted by our highest court in Europe, when striking the delicate balance between, on the one hand, privacy and, on the other hand, important public policy objectives, such as the protection of national security. Indeed, these solutions are based on the legal standards applied to EU Member States by the European Court of Human Rights, the EU Court of Justice and national constitutional courts. This is notably true for the necessity and proportionality requirements which are for the first time clearly spelled out in details in the US legal order. The US authorities will be obliged to balance different factors, the same as those required by the case-law of the EU Court of Justice, such as the nature of the data, the seriousness of the threat or the likely impact on the rights of individuals.

Let me now say a few words on the new redress mechanism. The data protection review code is an essential element of the new framework. It will be composed of independent judges. Let me underline straight away that contrary to some allegations, these judges could not be dismissed by the executive. The European Data Protection Board has notably highlighted that the new framework puts in place an independent and impartial court that will take binding and enforceable decisions on complaints lodged by Europeans. This board will adopt fully resonant decisions after having heard a special advocate. The special advocate will have as exclusive mission to represent the interests of the individual and will need to be a member of the bar. Therefore, it will be subject to exactly the same ethical and professional obligations as any lawyer in the US, notably in terms of independence. It is true that the information contained in the initial response given to the individual at the end of the process will be limited. But it will still clearly state that if a violation was found, it has been remedied. And the concerned individual will have access to the full resonate decision when this will no longer pose a risk to national security. These limitations are part of the balance to be found between the adversarial process and the protection of information relating to national security. This has been fully accepted by the European Court of Human Rights when accompanied by safeguards similar to the ones negotiated with the US.

Finally, the functioning of this redress mechanism, including due process aspects and compliance with the decisions of the new court, will be overseen by an independent body specifically responsible for data protection, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, nous travaillons actuellement pour répondre aux observations formulées dans l'avis du Comité européen de la protection des données, et nous examinerons aussi attentivement la résolution qui sera adoptée par votre Parlement.

Je peux déjà vous dire qu'en réponse à l'avis du Comité européen de la protection des données, nous sommes prêts à fournir des explications supplémentaires, à clarifier davantage certains aspects du nouveau cadre, et à renforcer le suivi concernant plusieurs éléments. Parallèlement, nous travaillons en étroite collaboration avec les États-Unis à la mise en œuvre du nouveau cadre. Il va de soi que les éléments de mise en œuvre doivent être pleinement en place pour que notre décision d'adéquation puisse entrer en vigueur. Pour conclure, je souhaiterais souligner que ce nouveau cadre a pour but d'assurer la continuité de la protection pour les citoyens, et la sécurité juridique pour les entreprises.

Je me suis engagé personnellement dans ces négociations avec les États-Unis, et j'estime que nous avons obtenu des avancées significatives qui répondent aux exigences de la jurisprudence de la Cour européenne de justice, et permettent dès lors de conclure en faveur d'une équivalence entre la protection offerte aux États-Unis et le cadre juridique de l'Union.

J'espère pouvoir compter sur votre soutien pour reconnaître ces améliorations importantes que nous avons obtenues par le biais de nouvelles règles juridiques contraignantes aux États-Unis. Des progrès importants qui ont notamment déjà été reconnus par le Comité européen de la protection des données. Bien entendu, soyez assurés que la Commission sera particulièrement vigilante pour assurer la mise en œuvre de ce nouveau cadre juridique, et n'hésitera pas à réagir en cas de problème éventuel. Je vous remercie pour votre attention et je vais évidemment être à l'écoute de vos observations.

Radosław Sikorski, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen. What happens to our data is important to us citizens. Let me give you a drastic example: those of us on the Polish opposition who have been targeted with the Pegasus anti-terrorist software still don't know what happened to the data that was gathered, which is completely unacceptable.

Transatlantic data flows are also essential to the EU-US economic relationship. They are important for our companies, for our investments, for our trade in services. It is therefore crucial that we finalise a new EU-US agreement governing data flows to bring legal certainty to transatlantic data transfers.

In the EU, we have the GDPR, which governs how the personal data of individuals in the EU may be processed and transferred. The US lacks such a legal framework. Concerns that the data of EU citizens might not be in safe hands once it is transferred to the US are legitimate. However, President Biden's executive order clearly outlines that the US intelligence agencies be subject to limitations when collecting and using our data. The order determines the principles of proportionality and necessity in line with EU standards.

Most concerns previously raised by the European Court of Justice on the previous two agreements have been addressed. Some concerns do remain, but I'm of a more positive assessment than made in our resolution. I call on the Member States and the Commission to ensure that the outstanding issues are addressed in order to avoid another ECJ ruling that would strike down the new framework.

Let us ensure that our companies have legal certainty and our citizens can trust that their data are secure. Commissioner, I rest the matter in your competent hands.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner Reynders, we are here to discuss the decision of the European Commission to launch the process to adopt an adequacy decision as to the EU-US data privacy framework. For the third time, we have the record in mind, because the European Court of Justice in relevant rulings 2015 and 2020 invalidated two previous instruments: Safe Harbour and Privacy Shield.

What's different now? The Biden Administration. President Biden has adopted, actually, an executive order – which is a presidential decree – introducing significant steps to come closer to the European standards, which would have been completely unthinkable under the Trump administration. And we certainly recognise those improvements as to safeguards and guarantees. But as to the majority of the LIBE Committee, which adopted a resolution on the matter, we are not there yet because there is a missing point as to the judicial independence, transparency and access to justice and legal remedies which are to meet the standards of the European Data Protection Regulation according to its interpretation by the European Court of Justice.

So we're calling on the Commission not to miss any point this third time and to properly address continuing negotiations. This concerns us to judicial redress and access to justice of the European citizens so that this time we adopt a mechanism that genuinely provides adequate safeguards and protection for the data of EU citizens and businesses.

Moritz Körner, *im Namen der Renew-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der *privacy shield* hat die Bürgerrechte unserer Bürger nicht geschützt. Deswegen habe ich dafür gekämpft, dass er wekommt. Es ist auch gut, dass er weggekommen ist, denn wir brauchen tatsächlich einen Datenaustausch, der tatsächlich unsere Bürgerrechte schützt, und das ist nicht der Fall. Das hat der EuGH jetzt zum zweiten Mal gesagt.

Wenn man zwei Mal gescheitert ist, dann wäre ich ehrlich gesagt ganz, ganz vorsichtig. Beim dritten Mal muss der Versuch jetzt wirklich sitzen. Herr Schrems hat schon angekündigt, dass er wieder klagen wird, weil es eben noch nicht Schrems-proof ist, weil es eben noch nicht so ist, dass wir tatsächlich davon ausgehen können, dass dieses Abkommen auch vor dem Europäischen Gerichtshof halten kann.

Schützen wir endlich unsere Bürgerrechte, unsere Daten! Aber vor allem, schaffen wir auch endlich Rechtssicherheit für die Unternehmen! Ich bin ehrlich gesagt entsetzt, hier zu hören, was die EVP hier erzählt und wie sie morgen wieder mit Änderungsanträgen kommt und sagt: Das ist alles nicht so schlimm.

Ich fordere Sie auf: Übernehmen Sie dann aber auch die Verantwortung, wenn das das dritte Mal scheitert vor dem Europäischen Gerichtshof, wenn dann wieder kleine Unternehmen dastehen und sagen: Jetzt haben wir aber die Rechtsunsicherheit, weil wir wieder von vorne anfangen können. Zweimal ist das schon passiert, jetzt soll das das dritte Mal wiederkommen.

Darum geht es doch hier. Sprechen Sie mal mit kleinen mittelständischen Unternehmen und nicht immer nur mit Business Europe, die keine guten Argumente in der Sache haben, sondern möglichst schnell hier ein solches Abkommen haben wollen. Schaffen wir tatsächlich Rechtssicherheit für unsere Unternehmen, die sich darauf verlassen können, dass Daten sicher in die USA transferiert werden, und sichern wir unsere Bürgerrechte! Darum geht es. Die USA müssen aufhören, uns auszuspionieren, und wir brauchen endlich ein rechtssicheres Abkommen. Darum geht es hier auch morgen in der Abstimmung.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, again the Commission is trying to allow unconditional flows of personal data across the Atlantic. Once again, the Commission is using our fundamental rights as collateral in the quest for a closer transatlantic relationship – and, once again, we find ourselves here in this Parliament urging the Commission to do the right thing and not to grant, to the US, an inadequate level of data protection.

In the EU, our right to data protection is enshrined in law. Citizens know that the collection of the data is only done when necessary and in a proportional way, and in case of a breach they are able to challenge this in a court of law and to know the outcome. In the US, the executive order that was issued in October 2022 does not take the place of a federal data protection law, nor does it pave the way for the end of the ongoing mass surveillance or bulk collection of data by the US National Security Agency.

It also does not change the fact that European victims of US surveillance are unable to seek effective judicial redress. The latest agreement may be called the EU-US Data Privacy Framework, but this new name does not reflect the reality. No sufficient changes have been made in the US to safeguard personal data without significant reforms.

It is quite clear that the US does not have an essentially equivalent level of data protection. There is also, of course, a significant risk that all of this will anyway be struck down by the CJEU again. This means more legal uncertainty and disruption for citizens and businesses on both sides of the Atlantic.

This debate is about protecting our personal data, but it is also about protecting our EU values, fundamental rights and civil liberties.

Elżbieta Kruk, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Ochrona danych osobowych jest podstawowym prawem obywateli. Dlatego przekazując te dane odbiorcom w państwach trzecich, trzeba zapewnić przynajmniej taki stopień ochrony osób fizycznych, jaki obowiązuje w Unii.

Od wielu lat Komisja zmagają się z problemem umożliwienia przepływu danych osobowych między Unią a Stanami Zjednoczonymi, bowiem Trybunał Sprawiedliwości już dwukrotnie unieważnił wynegocjowane w tym zakresie umowy. Przedłożony projekt rezolucji mocno krytykuje nowe porozumienie z USA mające na celu uregulowanie transatlantyckiego transferu i przechowywania danych. Nie zauważa przy tym ulepszeń w zakresie ochrony danych osobowych, jakich tu dokonano.

Wydaje się, że zawarta w projekcie rezolucji krytyka amerykańskiego podejścia do prywatności idzie zbyt daleko. Rozumiem skomplikowanie problemu. Przypominam jednak o znaczeniu transatlantyckich przepływów danych dla wielu obywateli i przedsiębiorstw. Tymczasem brakuje obowiązującej podstawy prawnej, która pozwalałaby na w pełni bezpieczny i swobodny transfer danych do USA.

W istocie jednak mamy dziś szerszy problem. Potrzebujemy nowych regulacji prawnych, być może nawet nowego modelu ochrony danych osobowych przystającego do współczesnej globalnej gospodarki cyfrowej.

Gianna Gancia, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, riteniamo che sia fondamentale stabilire standard di trasparenza e privacy a protezione dei cittadini europei che siano il più rigorosi possibile.

Non possiamo scendere a compromessi sui temi dei diritti umani e delle libertà individuali. I dati sensibili sono un'arma e una risorsa non solo economica, quindi, Commissario, è opportuno raggiungere i massimi obiettivi in materia di protezione dei cittadini europei.

Solo così saremo certi di agire nell'interesse di tutti i cittadini europei.

Cornelia Ernst, im Namen der Fraktion The Left. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Ja, also ich komme mir ein bisschen so vor wie in dem Film „Und täglich grüßt das Murmeltier“, denn die alten Probleme sind ja wieder da. Erstens sind die Mechanismen und Strukturen in einer *executive order* festgelegt und können jederzeit vom jetzigen oder kommenden Präsidenten gekippt, geändert oder sonstwie verwendet werden. Zweitens ist das durch die *executive order* geschaffene Gericht leider nur ein Scheingericht. Es ist so, dass ja auch dessen Verfahren vertraulich bleiben sollen.

Und drittens – und das ärgert mich richtig: Ihnen, Herr Kommissar, sind Geschäftsinteressen ganz klar wichtiger als Grundrechte, denn Sie sind bereit, die Massenüberwachung von EU-Bürgerinnen und –Bürgern ohne angemessene Überprüfung und Wiedergutmachung hinzunehmen, während die USA – und das ist der Unterschied – gleichzeitig ihre eigenen Bürgerinnen und Bürger genau davor schützen.

Sie verhökern unsere Daten und sorgen letztlich dafür, dass das Ganze zum dritten Mal vor dem EuGH landet und dann wieder gekippt werden wird. Womit wir beim Ausgangspunkt wären – Und täglich grüßt das Murmeltier.

Lena Düpont (PPE). – Mr President, since Groundhog Day was mentioned just in the previous speech, there is one important message about Groundhog Day, which is the possibility to learn, to improve, to get better, to break the cycle. Does that apply to the new draft adequacy we are discussing? It's true the previous ones had been nullified by Court. Obviously there was something to learn and to improve. Both partners, the Commission and the US counterparts, listened. What we have in front of us is now a complete other agreement than before, because thanks especially to the judgment, it was for the first time clearly defined under which conditions, restrictions and guarantees access by US authorities can be possible. And this is reflected in the adequacy proposal in front of us. It clarifies that the United States ensure an adequate level of protection for personal data of EU citizens, including the important conditions and restrictions of proportionality and necessity for national security reasons and the obligation to delete personal data.

Moreover, the draft adds safeguards as well. It entails strong remedies and binding redress measures for our citizens. Do we have in mind the uncertainty with elections looming? Of course. And so does the Commission with the possibility to immediately withdraw once there is a reason to. And surprisingly, these improvements had also been acknowledged by the European Data Protection Board, whose advice we normally happily follow in this House. So let us work with these points and the remaining concerns. Will the draft be tested before Court? Quite sure, since you're all following the debate, it will be, which, by the way, is a quite normal procedure for our system of checks and balances. But if we don't give it a try, there's only one certainty – Groundhog Day forever!

Marina Kaljurand (S&D). – Mr President, Commissioner, Council, colleagues, to start with, I would like to recognise, Commissioner, your efforts in negotiating with the United States and legal steps taken by Biden administration. But regrettably, this is not good enough for our citizens. There are still too many uncertainties.

There is the overall legal uncertainty about the executive order that can be overturned at any time by the President of the United States. Second, there is uncertainty over whether our citizens will have access to effective judicial redress. Even the Commission themselves have told Parliament that they wish for this judicial redress system to be tested, implying that it remains to be seen whether it actually is effective. And third, uncertainty whether the adequacy decision will stand the test of the Court of Justice, notably on bulk data collection.

Commissioner, therefore, I urge you not to rush to adopt another quick-fix adequacy decision before the legitimate concerns, including the ones raised by this House, will be adequately addressed.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Mr President, well, Commissioner, of course you deserve 10/10 for trying. The problem is that I was here when Safe Harbor was defended by the European Commission with the same vigour. It was shot down by *Schrems 1*. Then came Privacy Shield, and the European Parliament said, 'we don't believe it's watertight'. 'No, no, no', said the commission, this is watertight, it's fantastic. And then came *Schrems 2*. Now we're having the same debate and we're absolutely certain we're going to have *Schrems 3*, because I heard Mrs Düpont, who has left in the meantime, say, 'well, why don't we give it another try?' Well, I would tell you why we shouldn't give it another try: this is about the protection of citizens, but also legal certainty for companies. We cannot play with the rights of citizens and companies like this. It's not a game, Mrs Düpont. If it's not legally sound, the Commission shouldn't adopt an adequacy decision, no matter how desperately we want it politically, because the ECJ doesn't do politics. The ECJ will just look, 'okay, here we go again, third time, which part is it that you didn't understand?' And it's going to strike it down again because we know that it is not legally sound. So please, Commissioner, go back, close the loopholes and don't adopt an adequacy decision because before it's legally sound.

Patricia Chagnon (ID). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, pourquoi vous ne dites pas la vérité? Aujourd'hui, il ne peut y avoir de protection numérique européenne réelle car vous avez totalement raté la transition numérique. L'Europe, ou plutôt l'Union européenne, a laissé à Google et Microsoft le pouvoir immense, avec des millions de serveurs, de s'imposer comme les gardiens des données numériques des Européens. Et le *Cloud Act*, la loi d'extraterritorialité américaine permet aux autorités américaines d'accéder à ces données. Notre retard en la matière est gigantesque. 7,8 millions de serveurs dans les datacenters de Google et de Microsoft, alors que OVH, le leader européen, n'en dispose que de 400 000.

Face à cette carence, qui est, je le dis, criminelle pour nos États, il y a deux solutions. Soit, comme vous le faites, vous vous limitez à une réponse normative et vous laissez l'Europe otage des Américains. Soit, comme nous le préconisons, vous lancez un grand plan numérique européen d'infrastructures et de recherche qui garantit à nos États la protection de leurs données et leur souveraineté.

Sven Simon (PPE). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Der Schutz personenbezogener Daten ist ein Grundrecht. Mit der Datenschutz-Grundverordnung haben wir weltweit Maßstäbe gesetzt, auf die wir stolz sein können. Wenn wir aber jetzt in vielen Bereichen feststellen, dass die Anwendung dieser Verordnung – jedenfalls nach deutscher Lesart – zu absurden Situationen führt, dann müssen wir doch natürlich darauf reagieren.

Städten und Gemeinden soll die Nutzung von Facebook oder Instagram zur Information ihrer Bürger verboten werden. Die Bundesregierung, viele Landtage bei uns im Land müssen digitale Angebote abschalten. An Schulen und Universitäten dürfen wir keine amerikanischen Videokonferenz-Systeme mehr nutzen. Das ist doch grotesk, wenn wir überlegen, dass wir sie hier im Parlament und in der Kommission selbst nutzen.

All das, weil die Äquivalenz des europäischen Datenschutzes auf amerikanischen Servern nicht formal sichergestellt sein soll. Jetzt haben die Amerikaner reagiert, mit der Exekutivanordnung 14086 auf unsere Bedenken reagiert, erhebliche Verbesserung für den Schutz europäischer Daten eingeführt – übrigens ein weiterer Punkt, auf den wir Europäer stolz sein können. Mit einer Anerkennung der Äquivalenz wären alle Anwendungsprobleme der DSGVO für Schulen, Rathäuser und Universitäten gelöst.

Das, was mich jetzt ärgert, ist, dass Datenschutzfragen selbstverständlich Grundrechtsfragen sind und immer abgewogen werden müssen. Aber die Art und Weise, wie auch diese Debatte heute läuft, so unkonkret wie Sozialdemokraten, Grüne, Liberale und Linke die Einigung in diesem Haus blockieren, das ist nicht mehr nachvollziehbar. Deshalb: Stimmen Sie für den Änderungsantrag 12 der Europäischen Volkspartei! Beenden Sie den DSGVO-Wahnsinn an unseren Schulen und Universitäten!

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Verbesserter Datenschutz EU-USA – machen wir uns doch nichts vor! US-Überwachungsgesetze ermöglichen nach wie vor massiven Zugriff auf Daten europäischer Bürger, sie agieren gewissermaßen wie ein großer Datenstaubsauger. Und ja, die *executive order* des US-Präsidenten zeigt Verbesserungen und enthält dennoch Probleme: die ohne öffentliche Debatte aktualisierbare Liste legitimer Überwachungsziele, unterschiedliche Definitionen etwa von Verhältnismäßigkeit, ein Gericht im Rahmen der Exekutive. Das ist keine unabhängige Justiz, und eine *executive order* kann jederzeit verändert, zurückgenommen werden. Rechtssicherheit sieht anders aus, und daher sehe ich die Gefahr, dass auch dieser sogenannte Angemessenheitsbeschluss scheitern wird.

Und dabei verpassen wir hier eine einmalige Chance: *Section 702* des *Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act* läuft aus. Reformen hier sollten Bedingung für den Angemessenheitsbeschluss sein.

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, cher Roberts Zile, Monsieur le Commissaire, cher Didier Reynders, Madame la Ministre, chère Jessika Roswall, le règlement général sur la protection des données, le fameux RGPD, est la démonstration d'une Europe qui protège. Il protège les données personnelles, la vie privée des citoyens européens. C'est un acquis fondamental, mais fragile.

J'accueille favorablement le projet de la Commission pour un nouveau cadre de protection des données entre l'Union et les États-Unis. Cet accord répond aux exigences formulées par la Cour de justice européenne et il offrira à nos concitoyens une voie, chers collègues, de recours en justice sur le sol américain en cas d'utilisation illégale de leurs données personnelles. C'est un progrès important.

Monsieur le Commissaire, le Comité européen de la protection des données a formulé plusieurs recommandations, en insistant notamment sur l'importance du suivi continu de la bonne mise en œuvre et du respect de ces règles aux États-Unis. Monsieur le Commissaire, entendez-vous mettre à jour l'accord pour prendre en compte ces recommandations? Nous comptons sur votre détermination et celle de la Commission pour protéger les données personnelles des Européens.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, Madam Minister, it's been nearly three years since the EU-US Privacy Shield was invalidated, leaving European businesses in an extremely difficult position, forcing them to rely on individual legal agreements with little explicit guidance on how they should operate. This has jeopardised the very data protection that we are seeking to secure for our citizens. The EU and the US have the largest bilateral trading relationship in the world and services are a huge component. The US is our closest and our most trusted ally and we need to work together to shape global rules on data protection and privacy in a meaningful way.

In its opinion, the European Data Protection Board takes note of, and I quote, 'substantial improvements compared to the previous legal framework'. It also highlights the introduction of an individual mechanism of redress for EU citizens.

Colleagues, data protection is fundamental in a world shaped by constant digital communication and advancing AI technology. Those calling for renegotiations will never be satisfied. And the resolution put before us today reflects an ideologically driven agenda which prevents us from concluding meaningful negotiation with the United States and distracts us from focusing on similar issues with other countries that pose far greater threats.

So, Commissioner, moving forward with an adequacy decision as soon as possible is in the best interest of everyone concerned.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, this is actually an excellent report. It makes clear that you can dress it up any way you like, as the Commission is trying to do again, but the unalterable fact is, until the US stops its mass surveillance of EU citizens' data, then there is no legal basis on which that data can be sent there. Full stop. End of story. This has been going on for a decade. Those facts haven't changed. European citizens' data is not safe in the US. And what does this mean? It means that ordinary people's communications are ruthlessly rifled through by America's spy agencies consistently, relentlessly, with zero regard for their privacy. That hasn't changed. The Commission may be taken in by Biden's executive order and his Potemkin Appeal court, but the rest of us know that's an insult. This insult is no surprise by the US. It's par for the course in how they treat their friends. There's no parity of esteem between the relationship between Europe and the US. The US creates problems and gaslights Europe into dealing with them. The first step in an abusive relationship is to recognise that you're in one. Maybe it's time that Europe started to wake up.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Didier Reynders, membre de la Commission. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, il ne fait aucun doute que les données personnelles des citoyens européens doivent être protégées de manière adéquate lorsqu'elles sont transférées en dehors de l'Union européenne. L'arrêt Schrems II de la Cour européenne de justice a rappelé les exigences qui s'imposent pour garantir la protection de la vie privée dans un monde numérique interconnecté et sans frontières, où un transfert de données peut avoir lieu en un seul clic.

Nous avons veillé à respecter ces exigences tout au long des négociations avec les États-Unis. Quant aux entreprises, elles doivent pouvoir s'appuyer sur des mécanismes de transfert solides, juridiquement sûrs et prévisibles. C'est ce à quoi elles s'attendent à juste titre, car elles sont amenées à transférer des données en dehors de l'Union dans le cadre de leurs opérations quotidiennes.

C'est en travaillant avec des partenaires internationaux ayant des approches similaires à la sienne que l'Union peut être en mesure de façonner les règles du jeu au niveau global. Ceci est encore plus important lorsque d'autres acteurs internationaux avancent un agenda différent, basé sur des valeurs fondamentalement différentes des nôtres.

Avec ce nouveau cadre pour les transferts de données transatlantiques, nous sommes parvenus, je le répète, à obtenir des modifications importantes de la part des États-Unis, ce que le Parlement avait appelé de ses vœux. Ces progrès méritent d'être reconnus. Je remercie le président de LIBE d'avoir reconnu ces progrès. Le Comité européen pour la protection des données a été précis dans son opinion en reconnaissant également ces progrès, et nous allons bien entendu tenir compte de cette opinion comme des recommandations du Comité.

Face aux remarques très générales entendues aujourd'hui, je voudrais rappeler l'opinion précise du Comité européen de protection des données sur les deux éléments essentiels visés par l'arrêt de la Cour de justice en 2020.

In its opinion, the EDPB recognised that the executive order introduces in US law requirements reflecting the principles of necessity and proportionality foreseen under EU law and in the case-law of the EU Court of Justice and of the European Court of Human Rights. The executive order does not just refer in the abstract to the terms «necessity» and «proportionality». Rather, it specifies what these concepts mean through concrete requirements. For example, it makes clear that surveillance can only take place when it is justified in light of a specific public interest objective.

In addition, the executive order lists the factors that intelligence agencies must take into account and balance in deciding on whether and how to conduct surveillance. These include, for instance, the importance of the public interest pursued, the impact on the privacy of individuals, the intrusiveness of the specific measure to be used, and there are other elements. These are exactly the type of factors to which the Court of Justice and the European Court of Human Rights refer in cases concerning the interference with privacy. And we have found a way to create an administrative tribunal, as we also have in Europe, that nevertheless provides a number of guarantees typical for the judicial process. A few examples: the Data Protection Review Court will be a body placed within the executive but composed of members from outside of the US Government. These members will be appointed on the basis of specific qualifications, similar to those used to select members of the judiciary. They could only be dismissed for cause, so on service grounds, for example, if they are mentally or physically unable to perform their tasks and cannot receive instructions from the government.

A fully independent oversight body, the Privacy and Civil Oversight Board, will check and certify on an annual basis that the court functions as intended. This will include checking, for example, whether complaints are handled in a timely manner, whether the court has full access to the necessary information, whether its decisions are complied with by the intelligence community, whether and how the court applies the safeguards provided for in the executive order, and there are other elements in the executive order. That is a further important guarantee that will allow us to verify whether the system functions well in practice.

Finally, the EDPB also concluded in its opinion that the safeguards provided do not give reason to doubt the Data Protection Review Court's independence. And so I want to say that it's very important to take into account this progress in the appraisal of the adequacy decision, the possible adequacy decision. Of course, I repeat, that we will continue to work on the draft adequacy decision in the comitology process with the Member States, but also taking into account the opinion and recommendations of the EDPB and, of course, the elements that we have seen in the proposal for a resolution that we will find maybe in the final resolution of Parliament, and the remarks that I have heard also today in this debate.

Je voudrais terminer, Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, en vous disant que, si nous n'avancions pas, en reconnaissant les progrès importants qui ont été réalisés, tant par rapport au *Safe Harbor* qu'au *Privacy Shield*, nous risquons d'envoyer un message excessivement négatif à ceux qui, aux États-Unis et ailleurs dans le monde, s'engagent pour des réformes en faveur de la protection des données personnelles.

Avec le règlement général, nous avons donné le ton. Nous voyons des réformes se mettre en œuvre partout sur les cinq continents. Il nous appartient maintenant de faire en sorte que, dans notre analyse de la situation chez un certain nombre de partenaires, nous prenions en compte la réalité des systèmes politiques, en l'espèce aux États-Unis un système présidentiel, auxquels nous avons à faire face, et la réalité des systèmes de protection de la sécurité nationale, comme de protection des données personnelles qui, je le répète, restent au cœur de notre démarche lorsque nous discutons avec des partenaires internationaux.

Voilà, Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je prends bonne note, bien entendu, des remarques en sens divers que nous avons entendues à l'occasion de ce débat, et nous allons continuer à travailler sur le projet, qui fait l'objet d'un examen avec les États membres et qui fera l'objet encore, évidemment, d'un débat au sein de la Commission.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I will be brief. As already stated, Member States will play their role as part of the upcoming scrutiny process for this draft decision, as Commissioner Reynders said. In addition, the Council is of the view that the adequacy decisions are important to ensure an effective protection of the rights of data, data subjects and enable economic players to develop their activities.

It is essential that the EU-US data privacy framework ultimately meets our standards as set out by the GDPR and the Court of Justice. The effective implementation of these safeguards will be important for both our citizens and for our economy. Thank you very much for this debate and for your attention.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Esmu saņēmis rezolūcijas priekšlikumu, lai noslēgtu šīs debates.

Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (171. pants)

Andrus Ansip (Renew), *kirjalikult*. – Turvaline andmevahetus Euroopa Liidu ja USA vahel on nii liidu kui ka USA huvides. Kahetsusväärne on eksiarvamus, et Atlandi-ülene andmevahetus teenib vaid ameeriklaste huve. Liidul olid andmevahetuseks õigusraamistikud Safe Harbor ja Privacy Shield, kuid siiski leidis Euroopa Kohus, et need lahendused ei ole piisavalt turvalised. Peamiseks murekohaks oli privaatsus, mida raamistikud piisavalt tugeva hoiakuga ei kaitsnud. Kaks ebaõnnestumist aga ei tähenda, et turvalise lahenduse leidmine oleks võimatu. Liidul ei ole tegevusetuseks õigustust, kuid just tegevusetust minu meelest see ettepanek ELi–USA andmekaitseraamistiku pakutava kaitse piisavuse kohta pakub. Seetõttu ei saa ma hääletada selle ettepaneku poolt.

18. Debata na temat przypadków naruszenia praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (debata)

18.1. Wolność mediów i wolność wypowiedzi w Algierii, sprawa dziennikarza Ihsane El-Kadiego

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par pieciem rezolūciju priekšlikumiem attiecībā uz mediju brīvību un vārda brīvību Alžīrijā, žurnālista Ihsane El-Kadi lietu (2023/2661(RSP))*.

Christian Sagartz, *Verfasser*. – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Fall des algerischen Journalisten Ihsane El Kadi steht stellvertretend für Journalistinnen und Journalisten, Online- und Offline-Publizisten, für Medienunternehmerinnen und Medienunternehmer, die zunehmend unter Druck kommen. Sie sind bedroht durch erschwerte Arbeitsbedingungen; in vielen Ländern droht ihnen Foltergefängnis und Mord. Gerade deshalb ist es die Aufgabe von diesem Europäischen Parlament, genau hinzusehen, wenn Medienfreiheit und Pressefreiheit bedroht sind.

Lassen Sie mich einen Gedanken noch anfügen: Die technischen Erneuerungen, die wir in den letzten Jahrzehnten erlebt haben, vor allem in den letzten Jahren, die Möglichkeiten, etwas zu publizieren, selber im Internet zum Journalisten zu werden, buchstäblich Informationen zu teilen – die haben Vorteile, sie haben aber auch Gefahren, und auch dieses Parlament ist nicht blind gegenüber Gefahren. Wir haben schon den zweiten Ausschuss in Fragen der Desinformation, den Sonderausschuss, der sich auch damit befassen muss, was eben genau zum Schutz von Qualitätsjournalismus geschehen muss, nämlich denen auf der Spur zu sein, die bewusste Desinformation streuen, um Gesellschaft zu splenden und Demokratie zu gefährden.

Für mich ist es wichtig, dass wir Grundrechte hier in diesem Haus deshalb hochhalten und nicht nur in unseren Mitgliedstaaten mit einem scharfen Auge auf Grundrechtsverletzungen blicken, sondern auch darüber hinaus in vielen Ländern, unseren Nachbarländern und weltweit, dass wir hier ein Mahner, ein Verteidiger, eine Verteidigerin für Menschenrechte und Pressefreiheit sind.

Was passiert gerade in Algerien? Der Senat hat die Offenlegung von Quellen verpflichtend gemacht, ein neues Gesetz bringt viele Medien unter Druck. Ganz bewusst wurde die Finanzierung aus dem Ausland massiv unter Strafe gestellt. Journalisten werden in ihren Arbeitsbereichen massiv unterdrückt und eingeschränkt. Gerade deshalb möchten wir stellvertretend den Fall von Ihsane El Kadi hier vor das Parlament bringen und fordern seine sofortige Freilassung.

Matjaž Nemeč, *Avtor*. – Gospod predsednik, spoštovani visoki zbor, dragi kolegi. V Evropskem parlamentu trdno stojimo na strani medijske svobode. Vedno se bomo odločno postavili za pravico do svobode izražanja. To so temeljne evropske vrednosti, za katere so na žalost tudi novinarji v Evropi že plačali svoja življenja.

Torej stojim na strani svobode, ne glede na to, kje je ta ogrožena ali omejena – bodisi v Evropski uniji bodisi zunaj nje. Še posebej pa smo pozorni na primere, ko so tarča novinarji ali mediji, ki so kritični do oblasti.

Alžirija je sicer v zadnjih letih napredovala po indeksu svobode medijev. A v Evropskem parlamentu bomo vedno opozarjali na zaprte novinarje. Alžirija sicer ostaja strateška partnerica Evrope in Evropske unije in prijatelji si moramo včasih naliti čistega vina. Zato se pridružujem pozivu po spoštovanju svobode izražanja in medijev ter proti pregonu novinarjev, sindikalistov in političnih aktivistov. Hvala lepa.

Georgios Kyrtos, *author*. – Mr President, Algeria has a long way to go as far as media freedom and freedom of expression are concerned. Our aim is not to antagonise the Algerian Government, or other governments in the region, but to encourage them to improve the situation and create an environment that will help develop European-Algerian understanding and cooperation.

We therefore believe that the Algerian authorities should act, as a first important step in the right direction, to release from prison the prominent journalist Ihsane El Kadi and review in a positive, constructive way the cases of other journalists and media workers. The complicated international environment, especially in the energy sector, creates new opportunities for developing our cooperation, provided we can create a positive framework.

Jordi Solé, *autor*. – Señor presidente, a pesar de que la Constitución de Argelia protege claramente la libertad de prensa, en los últimos años se han producido hechos y decisiones judiciales que en la práctica contradicen esta protección. El caso de Ihsane El Kadi es el más reciente. Periodista crítico con las autoridades que ya había sido previamente objeto de intimidación, fue recientemente sentenciado a cinco años de cárcel y sus dos medios clausurados. A partir de acusaciones espurias relacionadas con financiación procedente del extranjero el resultado de todo el proceso, pendiente de apelación, es un claro ataque a la libertad de prensa. En consecuencia, este Parlamento hace un llamamiento a las autoridades argelinas para que liberen a Ihsane El Kadi.

Fomentar una prensa libre e independiente es fundamental para consolidar un espacio de libertades. Esto incluye también la protección de los derechos de aquellos periodistas y ciudadanos en general críticos con las autoridades.

Si bien la propuesta de Nueva Ley de Información contiene algunos avances, lo cierto es que los medios y periodistas siguen encontrando obstáculos para ejercer su profesión con libertad e independencia. Por todo ello, pedimos a las autoridades argelinas que eliminen estos obstáculos y mejoren la protección de los derechos fundamentales en el país.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *autor*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Bardzo się cieszę, że Algieria blisko współpracuje z Unią Europejską, Europą, krajami członkowskimi, gdy chodzi o kwestie energetyki. I to się bardzo poprawiło, wiadomo, po agresji Rosji na Ukrainę. To jest kraj związany z Europą, chociażby przez fakt, że bardzo długo był kolonią francuską, że dziesiątki milionów euro europejskiego podatnika szły, idą i pewno będą iść do Algierii w ramach różnych programów w kontekście Partnerstwa Południowego. No i jest Algieria uważana za część francuskich wpływów, a więc wpływów Unii Europejskiej.

Ale to nie oznacza, żebyśmy sami sobie sznurowali usta i skazywali się na milczenie, gdy chodzi o to, co tam się dzieje. Ja rozumiem – jestem długo w polityce – ale wolność mediów i równowaga medialna jest podstawą. Stąd też cieszę się, że w tej sprawie mówimy jednym głosem ponad podziałami.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *autor*. – Señor presidente, la verdad es que desde 2019, cuando estallaran las protestas del Hirak, hemos visto un deterioro progresivo de la libertad de prensa en Argelia. Desde entonces, al menos doce periodistas han sido detenidos y varios medios han sido cerrados.

Los ataques a la prensa y la libertad de expresión no son un problema exclusivo de Argelia, sino que forman parte de una realidad regional, como hemos señalado en los últimos plenos, con debates sobre Marruecos y Túnez. Casualmente, todos estos países son con los que la Unión Europea tiene acuerdos migratorios y energéticos, que, una vez más, parecen ser más importantes que el respeto a los derechos humanos.

Pedimos la libertad de Ihsane El Kadi y de todos los periodistas detenidos en Argelia, pero pedimos también de nuevo un nuevo marco de relaciones entre la Unión Europea y los países del Magreb.

Por último, quería aprovechar mi intervención para agradecer al pueblo argelino su apoyo incondicional al pueblo saharauí y su derecho a la autodeterminación.

Michaela Šojdrová, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, dear colleagues, Algeria is among the world's worst countries in terms of press freedom – ranked 136 out of the 180. The press situation in Algeria has been in decline since 1992.

However, the recent adoption of new media law and the detention of Ihsane El Kadi escalated the situation to the extreme. Freedom of expression and other fundamental rights should not be played with. They are clearly set in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and their violation goes against Article 2 of the EU-Algeria Association Agreement.

Ihsane El Kadi's conviction on receiving funds for political propaganda and harming the state's national security is absurd and cannot stand. That is why we urge the authorities to amend security-related charges in the penal code used to criminalise their right to freedom of expression and to conform the law to international human rights standards. El Kadi must be released, for we must not let the voices of journalists in Algeria be silenced.

Margarida Marques, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a resolução que vamos votar não é apenas sobre o jornalista El-Kadi, é sobre a falta de liberdade de expressão e de imprensa na Argélia.

Os números não mentem. De acordo com os Repórteres Sem Fronteiras, no índice anual de liberdade de imprensa, a Argélia ocupa o lugar 134 de 180 países. Referências a situações de corrupção e de repressão a manifestações podem ser fatais para os jornalistas.

A Constituição garante a liberdade de imprensa, mas sujeita às características e os valores religiosos e culturais da nação. O Código Penal prevê prisão pela divulgação de notícias que ponham em causa a ordem e a segurança nacionais. O novo Código de Informação introduziu novas sanções.

A liberdade de imprensa e de expressão são direitos fundamentais. Esta resolução pede às autoridades argelinas que garantam o pleno exercício destes direitos e apela à libertação imediata dos que se encontram arbitrariamente e ilegalmente detidos.

Só a estabilidade política, económica e social na Argélia permitirá reforçar a cooperação dos dois lados do Mediterrâneo.

José Ramón Bauzá Díaz, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, comisario Reynders, el pasado miércoles celebrábamos el Día Mundial de la Libertad de Prensa, una fecha que nos recuerda y exige que para que nuestras sociedades avancen debe haber personas que relaten lo que acontece y denuncien lo que sucede. Este año Ihsane El Kadi ha tenido que sufrir en su propia persona la eliminación total de ese derecho pues, al igual que muchos de sus compañeros, es víctima de una persecución en la que los cargos imputados nada tienen que ver con contar la verdad a sus ciudadanos.

Desde esta Cámara exigimos su liberación inmediata y la del resto de presos políticos en Argelia, que ya en el año 2019, con el Hirak, demostró que es una sociedad abierta y, sobre todo, con hambre de democracia.

Desgraciadamente, detener y callar a periodistas se ha extendido al resto de la región y en ese caso hemos denunciado la deriva autoritaria de la esperanza democrática del Magreb, que es Túnez.

Y en enero, también en esta Cámara, la gran mayoría también denunció la situación de la prensa en Marruecos. Por cierto, me pregunto qué harán mañana nuestros compañeros socialistas españoles en esta votación.

En definitiva, señor comisario, señorías, la vecindad sur requiere nuestra verdadera atención. De su estabilidad y de su progreso también depende nuestro proyecto europeo.

Manu Pineda, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señor presidente, vemos que, a pesar de los pesares, el *lobby* marroquí sigue teniendo mucho peso en este Parlamento y que es capaz de imponernos su agenda. Vemos también, con tremenda preocupación, que hay grupos empeñados en mantener a la Unión Europea como ariete de intereses ajenos, aunque esto vaya en contra de nuestros propios conciudadanos.

En Argelia hay una población que sufre la violación permanente de sus derechos humanos: los refugiados saharauis a los que Marruecos expulsó de su tierra y obliga a permanecer en medio del desierto.

Hoy manifestamos aquí nuestra tremenda preocupación por la detención de un periodista de Argelia, casualmente un Gobierno que no acepta los mandatos del bloque atlantista, pero no nos preocupa lo más mínimo que un periodista español, Pablo González, lleve encarcelado quince meses en Polonia, Estado miembro de esta sacrosanta Unión Europea, solo por informar de forma independiente, en vez de hacerlo al dictado de los que realmente imponen su política exterior en la Unión.

Estimados colegas, con este doble rasero, estamos acabando con la poca credibilidad que le queda a este Parlamento.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, 137 sono i giorni passati da quando il giornalista Ihsane El Kadi è stato arrestato solo per aver pubblicato articoli critici nei confronti delle autorità algerine, i suoi mezzi di informazione sono stati chiusi e lui dovrà scontare una pena di altri cinque anni.

La violazione della libertà di stampa e il mancato rispetto delle libertà fondamentali e dello Stato di diritto sono in Algeria da almeno quattro anni all'ordine del giorno, ma mai come oggi destano forti preoccupazioni.

Come Europa non possiamo guardare inermi ciò che accade dall'altra parte del Mediterraneo, in Algeria o altrove. Le autorità rilascino Ihsane El Kadi e tutti i detenuti per reati d'opinione e rispettino la libertà di stampa.

La Commissione europea stabilisca nuove azioni comuni con l'Algeria, prevedendo condizionalità sul rispetto della democrazia e dei diritti umani. Non possiamo avere partenariati che non siano basati su questo.

Ancora una volta, l'Unione europea deve alzare la voce perché le libertà democratiche non siano un'eccezione ma una regola, ovunque, dentro e fuori i nostri confini.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtarán, ar dtús, ba mhaith liom mo chomhghleacaithe, an t-údar a chuir an tuarascáil seo le chéile a mholadh, mar tá sé an-tábhachtach go ndírímid ar cad atá ag tarlú san Ailgéir, go háirithe maidir le saoirse na meán agus sa chás seo an t-iriseoir El Kadi. Gan saoirse na meán, ní féidir le saoránaigh teacht ar thuairimí éagsúla ná a n-aigni a dhéanamh suas maidir le cad atá ag tarlú. Níor mhaith lena lán rialtas go mbeadh na meán saor mar ní féidir leo ansin na daoine a chur faoi chois. Feicimid é seo mar shampla sa Rúis. Ach tá sé ceart ag an Aontas, cé go bhfuil gaol maith againn leis an Ailgéir ó thaobh cúrsaí trádála agus geilleagair, ag an am céanna, níor cheart dúinn síil dhall a chasadh ar cad atá ag tarlú maidir le cás El Kadi agus caithfimid brú a chur ar na húdaráis ann é a ligean saor.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, the sentencing of Algerian journalist Ihsane El Kadi to five years in prison is obviously deeply concerning and indicates the direction in which Algerian society is going: far from the aspirations of the Hirak in 2019. Three hundred political prisoners of conscience, systemic dissolution of civil society organisations, the muzzling of the press, the arrests and intimidation – and none of this seems to be particularly bothering the European Union at all.

In the urgent search for alternative gas supplies, you don't want to deal with the authoritarian regime of Russia, so you'll deal with other regimes that have equally disturbing human rights records. And I think the visit of Josep Borrell to Algiers recently exposes this hypocrisy, along with our extension of security cooperation in the Sahel with the same players. This is not going to be of any benefit to the citizens of Algeria.

So, you know, it seems to me as long as the gas flows, we don't care. So can we please drop the pretence that we have values where others don't? And be honest, it's always about interests and it's always about the wealthy enriching themselves at the expense of the majority.

(Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās beigās.)

Didier Reynders, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for giving me the opportunity to join this debate on Algeria – a close neighbour and long-term partner of the European Union.

EU-Algeria relations are comprehensive, strong and cover a broad range of issues, including energy security and trade. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is a key building block of our partnership as reflected in the EU-Algeria Association Agreement. Human rights and fundamental freedoms are universal as enshrined in well-established international law. Algeria subscribes to that view and has sealed them in its constitution. Recently, however, we have observed a number of arrests, prosecutions and detentions of journalists and human rights defenders in that country. One of the most prominent cases is that of Ihsane El-Kadi, the director of the editorial division of Radio M and the news website Maghreb Emergent, who was arrested in December and sentenced to a five-year prison term in April. Among friends and partners, it is not only possible, but necessary, to address matters of concern frankly and openly, as HR/VP Borrell did most recently during his visit to Algeria on 12–13 March, where he met with President Tebboune, Prime Minister Ben Abdel Rahman and members of Algerian civil society, including businesspeople, artists and journalists. As the HR/VP stressed during his press conference, Algeria's election to the United Nations Human Rights Council also entails special responsibilities for the promotion and protection of human rights, particularly the protection of fundamental freedoms such as freedom of the press and freedom of expression.

In addition to the high-level visits, the EU also addresses human rights in the framework of the EU-Algeria Association Agreement, notably in the Political and Human Rights Dialogue Subcommittee and through continuous contacts with civil society representatives in Algeria and in Brussels. The EU is ready to engage in further dialogue with Algeria and to strengthen our cooperation in this field. I appreciate the various suggestions you have put forward on how this could be best achieved.

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

Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

18.2. Białoruś: nieludzkie traktowanie i hospitalizacja czołowego przywódcy opozycyjnego Wiktara Babaryki

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par pieciem rezolūciju priekšlikumiem attiecībā uz Baltkrieviju: necilvēcīga izturēšanās pret pazīstamu opozīcijas līderi Viktor Babaryka un viņa stacionēšana (2023/2693(RSP))*.

Seán Kelly, author. – *A Uachtaráin*, the Lukashenko regime continues to blatantly violate and abuse human rights and fundamental freedoms in Belarus, as the authorities continue to crack down on political activists. A campaign of violence and repression has been intentionally directed at those who were, or were perceived to be, opposing the government or had expressed critical views.

Two weeks ago, it was reported that Viktor Babaryka, a politician who ran against dictator Alexander Lukashenko in the 2020 presidential election, was hospitalised with a punctured lung and signs of physical abuse. The following evening, he had disappeared completely. Babaryka is currently serving a 14-year prison sentence for politically motivated charges. He was detained in 2020 as part of the ongoing crackdown on those who oppose Lukashenko's rotten regime.

Babaryka was considered one of Lukashenko's main political opponents during the president's election campaign in 2020. Those close to him are unaware of his whereabouts and of course cannot visit him. Before his hospitalisation, Babaryka was sent to a closed prison-type facility for prisoners who commit serious violations.

The Government of Belarus must immediately bring the systematic repression of perceived critics to an end and immediately release all detainees held on political grounds. The government owes it to its people to end this mass repression and to conduct impartial and transparent investigations. We call for the immediate, unconditional release of political opposition figures such as Viktor Babaryka and the more than 1 400 political prisoners Belarus continues to unjustly incarcerate.

Thank you, President, and thank you to my colleagues who were involved in this report.

Juozas Olekas, author. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues. The illegitimate ruler of Belarus is taking further steps trying to silence the opposition to his regime. The case of Viktor Babaryka, who had to be hospitalised while serving a politically-motivated sentence is yet another example of how a repressive system is abusing its powers – beating up detainees, denying them access to medical help, to lawyers and to family members, harassing and prosecuting lawyers who are representing political prisoners.

The European Parliament should be very clear. The sanctions against the regime and all his enablers will only increase. The EU has to work with the third countries to expand the sanctions regime as widely as possible. We should work further to establish accountability for all perpetrators of human rights violations, and we must step up the efforts to help the victims of the political repression and their family members.

Petras Auštrevičius, author. – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, former Belarusian presidential candidate Viktor Babaryka was illegally arrested a month before the August 2020 presidential elections and sentenced to 14 years in prison. A 14-year prison sentence is one fifth of the average life expectancy of men in Belarus, which currently has more than 1 500 political prisoners.

The Lukashenko regime does not stop taking revenge on its rivals, even after imprisonment. Political prisoners are completely isolated. They are cut off from contact with other prisoners and with the outside world. They are constantly terrorized and abused. Already four prisoners have died, and Viktor Babaryka was hospitalized with traces of beatings that necessitated surgery. There is no information about his state of health for the time of being.

The crimes of Lukashenko regime must be investigated by the international tribunal. We must broaden our sanctions as soon as possible and sanction those responsible for illegal imprisonment and inhumane treatment of political prisoners in Belarus.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel, *author*. – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues. The opening line of Viktor Babaryka's presidential campaign in 2020 was 'We don't choose the time we live in, but we can choose our own path'. For this path, along with millions of brave Belarusians, Babaryka has chosen a free Belarus, a country where everyone is respected and has a freedom to build their own life stories. He himself was a boy with a poor sight, grew up into a clear-sighted leader, and transformed his extraordinary sense of responsibility towards Belarus into extraordinary courage to fight the tyranny. And because this courage is so contagious, it inspired others like his son, like Mariya Kalesnikava, 1 500 political prisoners, tens of thousands of detained Belarusians, millions of peaceful protesters. 'I would like to die in the homeland that I am proud of' Babaryka said during his campaign. And because Belarus is not yet a country he would be proud of, dying is not an option. The fight against dictatorship continues, and like every tyranny, it will fall so those who fought it can enjoy living in a free Belarus.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *autor*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Dwóch mówców przede mną pochodzi z Litwy – kraju, który tak jak Polska sąsiaduje z Białorusią. Myślę, że dobrze wiemy, jaka tam jest sytuacja. Żle się stało. Zgadzam się z moimi kolegami, że nie było zgody w gronie Unii Europejskiej co do zdecydowanych sankcji wobec Mińska. To zachęca reżim Łukaszenki. To się rzadko zdarza w polityce. To jest taki białoczarny film, albo w tę, albo we w tę.

Musimy mieć świadomość, że nasz jednolity głos w tej sprawie zwiększa szansę na wolność i demokrację na Białorusi. Nie od razu, ale zwiększa. Możemy dzisiaj mówić o panu Babaryce, dzielnym człowieku, możemy o Andrzeju Poczobucie, polskim dziennikarzu, obywatelu Białorusi, który siedzi od dawna. Warto o tych ludziach mówić. Trzeba o tych ludziach mówić. To jest nasz obowiązek moralny.

Liudas Mažylis, *PPE frakcijos vardu*. – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, Lukašenka toliau tęsia asmeninį karą prieš savo tautą. Baltarusija paversta šalimi – lageriu, kur į nelaisvę kemsama vis daugiau politinių kalinių. Egzistuoja teismų konvejeris: paskirtieji neva teisėjai nuteisia politinius aktyvistus fiziniams susidorojimui. Mes turime visų pirma reikalauti, kad būtų teisėjai – o jų vardai ir veidai žinomi – būtų patraukti į universalią jurisdikciją kaip nusikaltėliai. Viktoro Babarykos atvejais, žinom jį, o yra dar pusanatro tūkstančio tokių atvejų: įkalinami Nobelio premijos laureatai, žmogaus teisių aktyvistai, žurnalistai ir net nepilnamečiai. Neteisėti suėmimai, reguliarūs kankinimai, reikalingos medicininės priežiūros nesuteikimas yra sistema. Babarykos ir kitų opozicijos atstovų hospitalizacija nuo smurtinių sužeidimų tai ypač ryškiai parodo. Tad Europos Sąjunga privalo toliau sistemiškai plėsti individualias sankcijas Minsko režimo pareigūnams, įskaitant teisėjus, ir taikyti Baltarusijos režimui sankcijas, ne silpnėnes negu tos, kurias taikome Rusijai.

Matthias Ecke, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Strafprozesse hinter verschlossenen Türen, Isolationshaft, Straflager, Kontaktsperren, die Verweigerung medizinischer Versorgung – das ist Alltag in Lukaschenkos Belarus, und er wütet gegen die Opposition im Land, gegen die eigene Bevölkerung.

Immer wieder hören wir von der Misshandlung politischer Gefangener. Wir verurteilen den Umgang mit Viktor Babaryka, dem ehemaligen Präsidentschaftskandidaten, dem politischen Konkurrenten. Wir fordern seine Freilassung, und wir fordern Freiheit für alle 1500 politischen Gefangenen in Belarus. Wir stehen an der Seite des belarussischen Volkes, an der Seite der Opposition.

Eine Delegation dieses Parlaments wird nächste Woche in Vilnius mit Vertreterinnen und Vertretern der Opposition ins Gespräch kommen – hoffentlich mit dieser Entschließung im Gepäck. Erinnern wir uns an Schillers Worte: „Tyrannennacht kann nur die Hände fesseln.“ Den Willen der demokratischen Kräfte von Belarus wird Lukaschenko niemals brechen – niemals!

Karin Karlsbro, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, Commission, colleagues, there is still no information about Viktor Babaryka's condition after the news that he was taken to hospital with severe injuries last week. His location is unknown.

But what we know is that the situation for political prisoners in Belarus is horrific. And we know far too well about Lukashenko's brutality and contempt for life and human dignity. But, one day, justice will prevail.

Now we need to be firm and we need reactions from the EU to make it very clear: we want to know where Viktor is. We want to see him under professional and medical care and treatment. We call for Viktor Babaryka's immediate and unconditional release. This applies to all other political prisoners in Belarus as well.

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, the situation in Belarus has disappeared a bit from public attention due to this brutal and unjustified war of Putin's Russia. But the situation in Belarus is still bad. It became even worse. There are political prisoners we are talking about today, there are people accused of something even if they only conduct their right to fight for freedom, and then they are imprisoned and they are persecuted by the bodies of Lukashenko's regime – and this regime is also supporting this Putin/Russia war.

I want to recommend from the side of this very European Parliament to include the Belarusian freedom movement into the European political community, EPC. I request the decision-takers on the administrative level, in the executive branches in Europe, to decide to include also this only remaining state, which is not yet represented in the European political community, via its freedom movement into this community, meeting on 1 June in the Republic of Moldova. This will be a clear signal of the unity of the free world.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, again we are speaking about the Lukashenko regime and rightfully so, because we will not stop until this relentless dictator stops throwing his best people in jail and responds for his crimes.

Viktor Babaryka was beaten into hospital just because he stood up for what Belarusians long for – freedom. We should have been more decisive back when Lukashenko went as far as hijacking planes. If we would have done half back then of what we were able to do with Russia in February last year – and yesterday the 11th sanctions package on Russia was presented, but there was no mention of Belarus at all, like last time around.

I expect an explanation. The complicit regime of Putin's lapdog Lukashenko that actively takes part in the genocidal crime of child deportations from Ukraine must be treated accordingly. Free Viktor Babaryka; free all political prisoners; *Zhyve Belarus!*

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, mă bucur foarte mult că dezbatem acest subiect. Cred că este foarte important ca în Parlamentul European, în mod constant, să transmitem mesaje de solidaritate cu cei care se sacrifică pentru valorile noastre, pentru demnitatea umană, pentru drepturile omului, pentru libertatea de exprimare. Lukașenka este ultima relicvă sovietică pe care o avem pe acest continent și eu cred că este foarte important să nu uităm că acești dictatori se hrănesc din această linie stalinistă prin care își oprină propria națiune.

Cred că este foarte important ca Viktor Babarika să știe că noi suntem alături și că îi susținem, pentru că acești oameni luptă pentru demnitate, luptă pentru Europa, luptă pentru democrație, luptă pentru libertate. Este esențial ca dictatorii să știe că noi suntem uniți alături de națiunile care vor să scape de ei.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, dovolu mi, abych se také vyjádřil k navržené rezoluci. Chci poděkovat kolegům za předložený text a chtěl bych také podpořit tento návrh, který jasně vyjadřuje podporu opozičnímu lídrovi Viktoru Babarykovi, který bohužel, jak už tady bylo řečeno, je zcela neprávem vězněn, týrán ve vězení a v tuto chvíli se jeho zdravotní stav výrazně zhoršil. Opakovaně to zde říkáme. Nejbližší spojenec Putina Lukašenko, zločinný režim, který jasně kolaboruje s válečným štváčem Putinem, pomáhá při útoku na Ukrajinu. A myslím, že je na místě, abychom přijali toto usnesení a abychom se dále zabývali, jak zpřísnit sankce vůči Lukašenkovu režimu. Je zřejmé, že rozdíl mezi Putinovým režimem a tím Lukašenkovým je velmi malý, vychází ze stejné ideologie, oba vůdci mají stejné projevy a chovají se podobně. Takže já jsem pro, abychom zpřísnili sankce, a podporuji návrh usnesení.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, Viktor Babaryka is one of the nearly 1 500 political prisoners in Belarus whose only crime is the desire for a sovereign, democratic and prosperous Belarus. Brave men and women, their families, all suffering under the terror of Lukashenko's regime.

This is why the EU must do all in its power to put pressure on the regime, including the strengthening of our sanctions. Not only Lukashenko and his closest allies, but also his henchmen in the judiciary and in the security forces, must face consequences for their role in the terror and persecution. Viktor Babaryka, Mikola Statkevich, Pavel Seviarynets and all the political prisoners need our continued attention. The EU must not waver in its support for the people of Belarus. *Zhyve Belarus!*

Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I genuinely think it's an awful pity that we weaponise human rights in here. We've had multiple motions about human rights violations in China and Russia and Belarus and not a single word about the appalling violations in the US, Israel or our own Member States. Of course, I regret and oppose that there are people in Belarus in prison for trying to change their society, as I do those sharing the same fate in Israel or Catalonia.

I want to see the release of Belarusian trade unionists Hennadz Fiadynich, Vasil Berasneu and Vatslau Areshka. They are the representatives of genuinely independent Belarusian trade unions. They have been imprisoned for over a year now, having recently received sentences for extremism. They have never received money from foreign governments or state agencies, only funds from fellow trade unionists in other countries in the best traditions of working class solidarity. So I think rather than trying to endlessly score cheap political points in here by trying to use these sessions to achieve regime change, could we stand back and be true to international working class solidarity and allow the people in those countries to change things for themselves.

(Brīvā mikrofona uzstāšanās beigās.)

Didier Reynders, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members. The topic of today's debate is another example of unacceptable violations of fundamental rights by Lukashenko's regime.

Viktor Babaryka was arrested just before the 2020 presidential elections, for which he intended to run. He was sentenced to 14 years in prison in June 2021 for the sole reason of trying to exercise his political right to stand as a candidate. Additionally, there is now evidence that he has been victim of serious mistreatment in prison. We are doing what we can to get information, but the Belarusian authorities do not reply.

Unfortunately, he is just one example among many. The detention conditions in Belarus are appalling, especially for political prisoners, and there is widespread use of torture. Several political prisoners were recently admitted to hospital after being reportedly exposed to violence in prison. On 21 May 2021, Vitold Ashurak died in prison. We call once again for an inquiry into the circumstances and cause of his death. Only a few days ago, on 7 May, another political prisoner, blogger Mikalai Klimovich, died in prison.

The regime will do just anything to silence critical voices and calls for democracy. Almost three years since the fraudulent elections of August 2020, there are now more than 1 500 political prisoners in Belarus, and their number continues to grow.

On 6 March 2023, two other key figures from the opposition, Svetlana Tsikhanouskaya, to whom this Parliament awarded the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought, and Pavel Latushko, were sentenced in absentia to 15 years and 18 years in prison, respectively. They were targeted just for standing up for democratic rights and justice, asking for free and fair elections.

On 3 May, Raman Protasevich, a journalist who was arrested after the RyanAir plane he was on was forced to land in Minsk, and two other journalists, were sentenced to long prison terms – a demonstration of total disrespect on World Press Freedom Day.

A recent UN report concluded that gross human rights violations are being committed across the country and that some may amount to crimes against humanity. The European Union will continue to condemn this brutal repression in the strongest possible terms and stand up for human rights. The European Union has reacted firmly to the illegal actions of Lukashenko's regime by imposing robust sanctions on Belarus as a response to the violations of human rights and to its support for Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine. Let me be clear that deterioration of the situation will lead to further EU reactions.

At the same time, the European Union continues to support the people of Belarus and has provided over EUR 100 million in direct financial support to civil society in Belarus.

The European Union calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners and for the cessation of repression. The European Union will continue its efforts to ensure justice for victims and accountability for perpetrators. We will continue to stand by the people of Belarus.

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

Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

18.3. Mjanma/Birma, w szczególności rozwiązanie demokratycznych partii politycznych

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par četriem rezolūciju priekšlikumiem attiecībā uz Mjanmu, jo īpaši demokrātisko politisko partiju likvidēšanu (2023/2694(RSP)).

Marianne Vind, taler. – Hr. formand! Juntaen i Myanmar har for nyligt opløst 40 politiske partier, og denne beslutning kan vi i Europa-Parlamentet ikke sidde overhørig. Opløsning af politiske partier er endnu en handling, der fundamentalt udhuler civiles demokratiske rettigheder. For nylig meddelte fagforeningerne i Myanmar, hvordan også arbejdstagerrettighederne lider. For ikke nok med at politikere fængsles, det samme gør fagforeningsledere. I EU har vi et særligt ansvar. »Made in Myanmar«-projektet modtager EU-finansiering, men projektet respekterer ikke længere arbejdstagerne basale rettigheder. Også i EU har vi en forpligtelse til at sikre, at menneskerettighederne overholdes i Myanmar og ikke at poste penge i projekter, der legitimerer juntaens styre. Jeg tager fagforeningernes opråb fra Myanmar alvorligt og opfordrer her til aften til, at Kommissionen overvejer at stoppe »Made in Myanmar«-projektet, hvis ikke fundamentale arbejdstagerrettigheder kan sikres. Menneskerettigheder er arbejdstagerrettigheder. Arbejdstagerrettigheder er menneskerettigheder.

Abir Al-Sahlani, author. – Mr President, dear Commissioner. Thank you, firstly, colleagues, for the very good cooperation on this resolution. The military junta in Myanmar has, since the 2021 coup, launched horrific violence against its own population, resulting in the killing of over 3 000 civilians, the imprisonment of over 16 000 political prisoners, using rape as a weapon, also the displacement of hundreds of thousands of people, of which many are belonging to the Rohingya people. And this is done with impunity and this is done while Russia, China and Serbia are still sending military equipment to the military regime. And the last trick of this military regime is to dissolve the political parties, resulting in the dissolution of over 40 political parties, which make it impossible to have a political life and an opposition, but also securing the continuation of the military junta in Myanmar.

You know what? The sad fact is that the biggest group in Parliament are not participating in this resolution. And I urge every member of the European Parliament belonging to the EPP Group who still believe in democracy for all people, in freedom for all people, in peace for all people to vote in favour of this resolution, because the people of Myanmar both deserve it and need it.

Heidi Hautala, author. – Mr President, dear colleagues, this evening I want to direct my words to the members of the ousted civilian government of Myanmar, the so-called Union Parliament. Two and a half years after the military coup attempt, the atrocities by the junta are growing and the suffering of the people, including of the refugees – some of those, the Rohingyas, have been expelled from the country – are growing day by day.

So now the international community must take very seriously its responsibility to protect the people, and it is in no way acceptable that the junta is planning sham elections this year, and for that purpose it has closed and finished 40 political parties.

Now it's very important that we coordinate internationally the sanctions and that we try to find ways to address the illicit criminal economy of the junta, which is also undermining the sanctions of the democratic countries. So we need to work together with the democratic forces, the national unity government, the Union Parliament and the armed regional organisations that work all together.

This is the moment that we have to take our responsibility.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *autor.* – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! W zasadzie to palców obu rąk nie starczy, aby policzyć debaty na temat Myanmaru, czyli Birmy, w tym Parlamencie w ostatnich latach. Bo to jest never ending story, taka niekończąca się opowieść, bo cały czas o tym samym mówimy. I trochę zachowujemy się, prawdę mówiąc, jak chór w chińskiej operze, która przez trzy akty śpiewa: chodźmy, chodźmy, a nie ruszamy się z miejsca. To znaczy, oczywiście, mówimy, nazywamy rzeczy po imieniu, protestujemy. I bardzo dobrze, słusznie. Natomiast, jak przed chwilą powiedziała moja szanowna poprzedniczka, no wreszcie na poważnie powinniśmy coś zrobić. Wydaje mi się, że czas jest rzeczywiście najwyższy. Tym bardziej że do tej pory Unia Europejska w tej sprawie prezentowała pewną bezradność. To znaczy rzeczywiście nie używała poważniejszych środków nacisku ekonomicznego. A tylko to tak naprawdę nasi partnerzy w Myanmarze mogą zrozumieć. I to radzę.

VORSITZ: NICOLA BEER

Vizepräsidentin

Marina Mesure, *auteur.* – Madame la Présidente, deux ans après le coup d'État au Myanmar, la répression sanglante de la junte militaire continue et toute dissidence est étouffée. Près de 3 000 personnes ont été tuées, 1,5 million de personnes ont été déplacées. 13 000 personnes sont toujours détenues dans des conditions inhumaines. À la veille de prochaines élections, la junte a décidé de dissoudre 40 partis politiques, dont le NLD, et emprisonné plusieurs de ses membres. Il s'agit là d'une nouvelle étape vers le démantèlement complet de l'état de droit.

En solidarité avec le peuple birman et en soutien avec ses aspirations légitimes à la liberté, nous rejetons toute tentative des chefs militaires de légitimer leur pouvoir anti-démocratique par des élections fictives. Nous nous tenons aussi aux côtés des syndicats sur place parce qu'ils sont particulièrement visés par le régime. Seize organisations syndicales ont été déclarées illégales, plus de 300 responsables syndicaux ont été arrêtés, et au moins 43 ont été tués.

Malgré cela, l'Union européenne continue à travers le projet «Made in Myanmar», à financer grâce à des fonds européens des entreprises du textile qui relaient la propagande militaire et répriment les syndicats. Ceci est inacceptable et nous devons y mettre un terme. L'Union européenne doit défendre le droit à la liberté d'expression, de réunion, d'association au Myanmar et faire tout ce qui est en son pouvoir pour les protégés.

Evin Incir, *on behalf of the S&D Group.* – Madam President, colleagues, I must say that I am very shocked and it is a shame that the EPP Group refused to take part in the negotiations of this very important resolution and that they have been refusing to take part in the discussion. And this while the people of Myanmar are suffering.

The political situation in Myanmar brings to light how fragile democratic development is. The claws of the military are getting longer and longer and pushing deeper and deeper into the power. The dissolution of over 40 parties and arbitrary arrests of politicians are horrific. When addressing the oppressive junta regime in Myanmar our demands are clear. We condemn and reject the military junta's illegitimate rule. We demand an immediate end to their attacks on civilians, labour unions, journalists, religious representatives and peaceful democratic protesters, including the opposition. We demand an immediate end to their air strikes and use of rape as a weapon. The international community must now stand ready with all its available political tools. We must sanction the military junta and all those affiliated with it.

Svenja Hahn, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, this is the fifth time since the coup in February 2021 that we were debating in this plenary about this. We have been calling on the Commission and we've been calling on the Member States to act and the only thing that has happened is the number of victims has been rising. There have been about 22 000 people arrested, 3 500 being killed. The military junta has ousted the democratically elected parliament and the government.

For two years, the junta has been killing, banishing, arresting and raping people with impunity. And now they want to legitimise their rule by sham elections because they know they want to boost their image, but they don't want a real democracy. They dissolved 40 political parties. They prevented opposition leaders from running by sentencing them on politically motivated charges, because it's the autocrats and the despots of this world that terrorise and murder because of their fear of freedom and democracy.

And it's the fifth time and hopefully the last time that I'm calling in this Chamber on the Commission to ensure that none of the military conglomerate benefits from the preferential access to our single market. Because as the European Union we need to act and we need to stand in solidarity by those seeking freedom and democracy in Europe and the world.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, em Mianmar, aos assassinatos em massa, às prisões arbitrárias, à tortura, à violência sexual, às restrições severas da liberdade de reunião e de expressão, às execuções sob custódia, junta-se agora, mais recentemente, também a dissolução de mais de 40 partidos políticos e a convocação iminente de eleições fantoches para legitimar um regime absolutamente antidemocrático e absolutamente criminoso.

Diante disto, pouco nos resta a dizer mais. Restá-nos esperar que a União Europeia e que a Comissão, aqui representando o lado executivo da União Europeia, tomem medidas no sentido de sancionar a Junta Militar. Não podemos continuar sem sancionar.

Eu começo a ser um bocadinho cética em relação à aplicação de sanções, mas, neste caso, Senhor Comissário, eu não sou nada cética em relação à aplicação de sanções. Temos que sancionar a Junta Militar e apoiar a sociedade civil, numa tentativa de reverter esta situação verdadeiramente incontrollável.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, según las Naciones Unidas, más de 2 800 personas asesinadas, más de 16 000 detenidos irregularmente, más de 1,2 millones de ciudadanos desplazados, disolución de los partidos políticos. Es decir, el nivel de degradación de Myanmar es insoportable.

Y yo creo que aquí, recurrentemente, nos estamos diciendo qué podemos hacer. ¿Qué podemos hacer que no hayamos hecho? Pues hay cosas. Hay cosas que se pueden hacer. Ya sé que esto no va a ser muy popular y que no es fácil, pero ya se ha hecho —se hizo con Camboya—: se trata de la retirada de las preferencias arancelarias de que dispone el país y de las cuales una parte importante del Gobierno se beneficia, es decir, del «Todo menos armas».

¿Por qué? Porque es un instrumento. Ese instrumento tenía que servir para evitar la violación grave y sistemática de los derechos humanos. Es el momento en que se puede aplicar esa retirada temporal de las preferencias pues hay una grave y sistemática violación de los derechos humanos. ¿Qué más grave y sistemática violación de los derechos humanos casi 3 000 muertos, más de 16 000 detenidos y más de 1,2 millones de desplazados?

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Myanmar is a critical country where brave people are fighting for democracy in line with the principled values of the European Union and where a cruel regime is violating human rights. On the second anniversary of the military coup on 1 February 2023, the junta extended its so-called state of emergency for another six months. On 28 March, the military-appointed Union Election Commission decided to dissolve 40 political parties, including the National League for Democracy, arguing that they did not register with the military regime under its Political Parties Registration Law. On 29 March, on behalf of the European Union, High Representative Borrell issued a clear statement condemning this decision. A few days later, we witnessed the deadliest air strike since the coup, causing 180 civilian fatalities, including women and children, in Sagaing State on 10 April.

This drew condemnation from around the world and, needless to say, the current situation of rising violence in Myanmar is not conducive to credible and inclusive elections. Dialogue with all stakeholders is a prerequisite for an inclusive process that can provide a way forward to end the violence and pave the way for a meaningful democratic process that would truly reflect the will of Myanmar's people. Therefore, the European Union supports the ongoing diplomatic efforts of the ASEAN chair, Indonesia, to achieve this. These efforts are ever more urgent in light of the increasing number of reports of atrocities committed by the military across Myanmar. We trust that the ASEAN summit, ongoing since yesterday and ending tomorrow, will also bring along concrete measures. The European Union also continues to advocate for a global arms embargo in the UN framework and to hold to account those who have perpetrated war crimes and atrocities.

The Council of the European Union has adopted six rounds of restrictive measures against individuals and entities supporting the military regime and its human rights violations. Restrictive measures now apply to a total of 93 individuals and 18 entities. Those designated are subject to an asset freeze and a travel ban, which prevents them from entering or transiting through EU territory. In addition, EU persons and entities are prohibited to make funds available to those listed. Other EU restrictive measures will remain in place: the embargo of arms and equipment and export restrictions on equipment for monitoring communications that might be used for internal repression, the export ban on dual-use goods for use by the military and border guard police, and the prohibition of military training and cooperation with the Tatmadaw. These measures complement the withholding of EU financial assistance to the Government of Myanmar and the freezing of all EU assistance – a tool that may be perceived as a means to legitimise the junta.

The EU and like-minded partners stand ready to adopt further packages of restrictive measures if the situation does not improve. Though the sanctions adopted by the EU and partners have not brought the military back to the path of dialogue or ended the violence, they have sent a powerful message of support to the population and democratic force. And so we will continue to assess the situation to see if it is necessary to reinforce the package already in place. The European Union will continue working closely with international partners on possible future targeted sanctions following the Sagaing State air strike on civilians and the dissolution of democratic parties. Our leadership with key international partners and ASEAN in addressing a deepening human rights, humanitarian and political crisis is essential, and I thank you for your support in such a way.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt wurden 5 Entschließungsanträge eingereicht.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 11. Mai 2023, statt.

19. Nowe odwierty ropy naftowej na Alasce – wpływ na globalny kryzys klimatyczny i prawa ludności rdzennej (debata)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zu neuen Ölbohrungen in Alaska – Auswirkungen auf die globale Klimakrise und die Rechte indigener Völker (2023/2688(RSP)).

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for tabling this debate on this topic related to our priority of pursuing an ambitious climate and clean energy agenda worldwide.

The recently concluded Fit for 55 package and the European Climate Law send a clear signal to our international partners. The European Union will continue leading international efforts to fight climate change. We are mobilising our efforts to build alliances among the most climate-ambitious countries to increase the global objectives of emission reduction and to provide the necessary resources to the most affected.

There is a strong convergence of views with the Biden administration on the importance of fighting climate change and ensuring a just energy transition. The European Union and the US share the ambition to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees. Through the High-Level Climate Action Group, co-chaired by EVP Timmermans and the US Special Presidential Envoy for Climate, Kerry, we regularly coordinate our approaches in view of facilitating the effective and strengthened implementation of the Paris Agreement.

We also engage on our respective Arctic policies. The US National Strategy for the Arctic Region of October 2022 and the EU's 2021 Arctic policy both put a strong emphasis on the necessity to accelerate the fight against climate change, including promoting with global partners the setting of high standards for reducing the environmental impact of processes for exploitation and processing.

The Arctic is particularly affected by the fast warming pace, which is having a wide range of far-reaching impacts, including on local populations. As reiterated in the EU Arctic policy, the EU remains committed to the full involvement of the indigenous peoples inhabiting those regions in decisions concerning their future development.

This is in line with international human rights and the EU's fundamental rights policy. Through the EU Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy 2020-2024, we support the participation of indigenous peoples in relevant human rights and development processes, including by upholding the principle of free prior and informed consent in all decisions affecting them.

As part of our comprehensive agenda with the US, we discuss and coordinate regularly on human rights. The latest iteration of the EU-US Human Rights Consultations last took place in Brussels last month.

However, we need to recall that as regards any decision on drillings in Alaska, it is for US authorities and all stakeholders concerned by the project to assess all the relevant possible impacts. The Commission will pursue with regard to the overall political priorities that we just outlined. And I look forward, of course, to your remarks during the debate.

Jiří Pospíšil, za skupinu PPE. – Paní předsedající, dámy a pánové, dovoluji mi, abych se za naši frakci vyjádřil k tomuto bodu. Určitě je důležité debatovat v rámci environmentální politiky také o tom, kde hrozí výrazné znečištění, i když se nejedná o členský stát Evropské unie. A z tohoto pohledu vítáme to, že zde dnes debatujeme o obnovení nebo povolení nových možností těžby ropy na Aljašce a že debatujeme o tom, jaké dopady toto povolení může mít na životní prostředí nejen ve Spojených státech amerických, ale i v globálním světě, protože to není problém pouze jedné země, ale je to problém, který zkrátka nese globální rizika. A z tohoto pohledu si myslím, že je dobře, aby orgány Evropské unie sledovaly další vývoj kolem rozšíření těžby ropy na Aljašce, abychom komunikovali s našimi partnery ve Spojených státech amerických, s Bidenovou vládou i s řekněme lokálními úřady, které budou potom partnery v samotné těžbě.

Já osobně si myslím, že je třeba apelovat na naše americké partnery, aby opravdu, pokud tedy došlo k zákonnému povolení a byly schváleny všechny předpisy, které Spojené státy americké v této oblasti mají, byl brán zřetel na životní prostředí a samotná těžba byla co nejmenší. Je třeba si ale uvědomit, že ten problém není jednoduchý. Z toho, jak jsem sám situaci studoval, vyplývá, že i samotní domorodí obyvatelé jsou v této věci rozpolčení. Není zde jednotný názor u nich na to, zda těžbu povolit či ne. Jedna skupina vnímá to, že povolení těžby přinese nové peníze pro Aljašku, pracovní místa, vyšší blahobyt, druhá právě vnímá rizika pro životní prostředí. Takže je dobré, že o tom dnes zde debatujeme a měli bychom toto téma často zmiňovat při našich rozhovorech se zástupci americké administrativy.

Niels Fuglsang, for S&D-Gruppen. – Hr. formand! Forestil jer det her: Mens vi kæmper for at få lukket kulkraftværker og få skiftet vores benzinbiler ud med elbiler – ja, så med et fingerknips sætter den amerikanske præsident to millioner forurenende benzinbiler på gaden og åbner for 76 nye kulkraftværker. Vil vi acceptere det? Vil vi ikke rette henvendelse til vores amerikanske venner og protestere mod en sådan politik, der i den grad vil sjofle den Parisaftalen, som begge parter har skrevet under på? Jeg tror vi vil protestere, og derfor bør vi også rejse denne sag over for amerikanerne, fordi det, amerikanerne har gang i, det svarer til at sende millioner af forurenende biler på gaden og åbne massevis af nye

kulkræfter. Ifølge præsident Bidens egen administration, så kommer Willow-projektet i Alaska til at generere så meget olie, at det svarer til, at vi selv fik to millioner nye benziner på gaden. Det vil producere så meget ekstra CO₂ over de næste 30 år, at det svarer til 76 kulfyrede kraftværker.

Vi er langt inde i en klimakatastrofe! Alt for langt til at godkende nye olieboringer. Det Internationale Energiagentur har gjort det klart sort på hvidt: vi har rigeligt med olie! Vi har ikke brug for flere olieprojekter. Det, vi har brug for, er mere grøn energi, færre CO₂ udledninger – ikke flere olieboringer! Jeg må spørge: hvad er det, vi laver her? Vi ved, at Arktis opvarmes fire gange hurtigere end resten af kloden. Den sårbare natur i Arktis skades! Det oprindelige folks levesteder ødelægges. Det her vil ikke gavne i forhold til at få mere olie her og nu. Det er et projekt, der ikke vil gavne i forhold til uafhængighed i forholdet til Rusland. Det vil alene gavne olieindustrien. Det bør vi stoppe. Det er vores klare pligt at sende et signal til USA. Det her kan ikke fortsætte. Willow-projektet skal stoppes!

President Biden, roll the Willow Project back and stick to your climate pledges!

Malte Gallée, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Willow-Projekt muss gestoppt werden. Nicht nur, weil es katastrophale Folgen haben wird für die lokale Umwelt, für die Tiere, für die Natur. Nicht nur, weil es eine absolute Klimabombe ist, was uns alle auf der gesamten Welt betrifft. Nicht nur, weil es zu einem großen Teil gegen den Willen der indigenen Bevölkerungen vor Ort geht, die ihr traditionelles Leben fortführen wollen. Das Willow-Projekt muss vor allem auch gestoppt werden, weil Millionen junger Menschen genau das lautstark eingefordert haben.

Das ist unsere Aufgabe, in einer Demokratie auch genau darauf einzugehen. Es kann doch nicht sein, dass wir im Jahr 2023 immer noch darüber diskutieren müssen, dass neue fossile Infrastruktur nicht genehmigt wird. Die Internationale Energieagentur hat ganz klar gesagt: „Wir können es uns nicht leisten.“ Wir brauchen – auch besonders wir als Europäische Union –, wir brauchen die USA hier als starken Partner an unserer Seite im Kampf gegen die Klimakrise, aber auch im Kampf für die Menschenrechte.

Herr Kommissar, Sie haben es angesprochen: Wir stehen für das Konzept *free, prior and informed consent*. Ich fordere Sie auf: Üben Sie Druck auf die USA aus, dass sie auch die ILO-Konvention 169 mitratifizieren. Das fehlt nämlich auch noch, auch wenn sie die UN-Erklärung über die Rechte der Indigenen schon mitunterschrieben haben.

Wir brauchen die USA an unserer Seite im Kampf gegen die globale Klimakrise. Wir brauchen es als Zeichen für die junge Generation. Wir brauchen es im Interesse von all den Menschen, die in den letzten Wochen und Monaten lautstark auf die Straße gegangen sind und gesagt haben: „Wir haben ein Recht auf unsere Zukunft! Wir wollen nicht, dass unser Klima so kaputt gemacht wird, dass wir in 100 Jahren nicht mehr auf diesem Planeten leben können.“ Das ist unser aller gemeinsame Verantwortung, und dafür bitte ich Sie alle zu streiten.

Sylvia Limmer, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Mit welchem Recht man sich hier von Seiten des EU-Parlaments und einer nicht gewählten EU-Kommission in das nationale Genehmigungsverfahren des Willow-Projektes, einer Ölbohrung in Alaska, die im Übrigen auch von der lokalen *Alaska Native Village Corporation* ausdrücklich unterstützt wird, einmischte, erschließt sich mir definitiv nicht.

Ihnen sei gesagt: Im Gegensatz zu woken EU-Utopisten, wie hier versammelt oder auch nicht, wissen die US-Amerikaner die Vorteile des schwarzen Goldes zu schätzen, das auch uns Wohlstand und technischen Fortschritt beschert hat. Ihnen geht es nicht nur um die CO₂-Reduktion, die sich technisch bewerkstelligen ließe, sondern um das Ende aller fossilen Brennstoffe und um eine ökosozialistische Transformation.

Während der Rest der Welt auf Diversität bei Energiequellen setzt, verstehen Sie bei Diversität nur sexuelle Orientierung. Amerika erschließt neue Ölfelder und trimmt seine Volkswirtschaft auf Energieunabhängigkeit, eine Unabhängigkeit, die bei uns durch Flatterstrom und Atomausstieg in weite Ferne rückt.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! In der Erklärung der Vereinten Nationen über die Rechte indigener Völker wurde der Grundsatz der freien, vorherigen und informierten Zustimmung der in einem Gebiet ansässigen indigenen Völker festgelegt. Ohne diese Zustimmung dürfte eine Ölförderung gar nicht erst begonnen werden. Donald Trump ignorierte die Vereinten Nationen, als er das Projekt startete. Wir haben von Präsident Biden und Vizepräsidentin Harris erwartet, dass sie im Respekt der Vereinten Nationen und des Schatzes ihrer internationalen Abkommen und Erklärungen regieren.

Die Nuiqsut-Gemeinschaft und ihre Vertreter und Vertreterinnen haben in der Vergangenheit beklagt, dass die direkten Auswirkungen der Öl- und Gasförderung auf ihre Gemeinden zu kranken Fischen, unterernährten Karibus und einer giftigen Luftqualität bereits geführt haben. Sie lehnen das Projekt ab, wie auch viele Bürgerinnen und Bürger in den USA und auch in anderen Regionen der Erde – auch hier in der EU. Aus Protest gegen das Projekt wurden mehr als eine Million Briefe allein an das Weiße Haus geschrieben.

Als Linke im Europäischen Parlament fordern wir Sie und durch Sie – die Kommission – auf, sich dringend und proaktiv dafür einzusetzen, dass die USA dieses völlig aus der Zeit gefallene Willow-Projekt stoppen. Denn es muss somit auch auf die Agenda der nächsten Beratung des *Trade and Technology Council* gesetzt werden. Wir alle, inklusive der USA, haben uns verpflichtet, die 17 Nachhaltigkeitsziele der 2030 UN-Agenda umzusetzen.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, our concerns from the Greens/EFA Group of the European Parliament about the proposed Willow project in Alaska: there are a big opposition of the project of the natives and in the public opinion, the Willow project is a disaster for the native communities and for the wildlife. This is a huge climate threat, inconsistent with the administration's promise to take on the Biden administration.

The Alaska natives living closer to the proposed Willow project, the native village of Nuiqsut, are deeply concerned about the health and climate impacts caused by burning fossil oils and gas operations. The Nuiqsut mayor, whose community of about 525 people is the closest to the proposed development, is a prominent opponent who has called the project a climate disaster waiting to happen. She said it is affecting the health of community members.

The indigenous people have a right to free prior and informed consent under the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. And this right is being disregarded by the Government of the United States. Is not too late to say 'no' to the Willow project for indigenous people and for their home culture and the well-being of the planet. They are not a colony.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, the International Energy Agency has made it clear: to reach our climate goals, there mustn't be any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Yet, as colleagues have said, the Biden administration is giving the green light to the largest oil project in the US, despite having campaigned for an end to any new oil and gas explosion licenses on federal land, proving that he's not only a hypocrite but an extremely dangerous one.

Now there are over a million letters from citizens on President Biden's desk pleading with them to put the brakes on this oil field in Alaska. But he continues in flagrant violation of the rights of indigenous people and the planet. Tell me, please, how is this any different than the antics of Trump?

Now, this Parliament has called for a prohibition of oil and gas exploration in the Arctic, an area of the planet, which must be left undisturbed. Oil infrastructure will soon be a stranded asset. How about the EU delivers a strong message to our like-minded partner that we do not destroy every corner of the planet in the scavenge for an old technology?

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, dear Minister, No I'm not on the picture! Thank you again, honourable Members, for this debate.

Let me conclude by commending the European Parliament for its strong commitment and engagement on climate action, as well as for its commitment to human rights and the rights of indigenous peoples.

The US is one of our most important partners, with whom we exchange regularly on global challenges such as climate change, democracy and human rights. We will continue to exchange in the high-level climate action group that I have mentioned before, co-chaired by VP Timmermans and Special Presidential Envoy for Climate John Kerry. Both teams are in regular contact.

The European Union has a solid policy framework in place on human rights and this is a central element of our external action. We will continue the efforts to support and promote the realisation of our multilateral commitments and goals, including fighting climate change, ensuring a just energy transition and upholding human rights, including indigenous rights, across the globe.

So thank you again for your clear commitment. We will continue our exchange with our US partners.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

20. Wpływ podniesienia stóp procentowych przez EBC na gospodarstwa domowe i pracowników (debata)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu den Auswirkungen der von der EZB beschlossenen Zinserhöhung auf Haushalte und Arbeitnehmer (2023/2702(RSP)).

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, being European is expensive at the moment. Compared with 2021. The EU annual inflation rate tripled last year. For instance, food costs in the EU are the highest since Eurostat started collecting such data in 1997. Of course, this inflation did not rise in a vacuum. In fact, inflation began to rise in autumn 2021 as a result of rapidly increasing energy prices. The recovery after the pandemic and Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine only amplified the increases in prices.

In 2022 price increases spread to other goods and services, and prices have continued to rise in 2023. Since inflation has now been high for a long period of time, there is a risk that long-term inflation expectations will rise and that we are stuck with high inflation levels. We need to counter this. If these expectations should rise again, economic policy will need to be tighter for a long period to bring inflation down. That will hurt households who are already suffering even more, because inflation makes us poorer, especially those who are poor to begin with. Therefore, if we want to help the most vulnerable in our society, we need to fight inflation.

We are well aware of the dire economic situation for many households and companies. To address this, the Council and the EU Member States have been taking numerous measures to protect households and families at the national level. Governments need to take responsibility by continuing to pursue fiscal restraint while targeting the support primarily to vulnerable households. At the European level, the Council and the Eurogroup have highlighted their commitment to protect the most vulnerable households and viable firms while preserving incentives to limit energy consumption and increasing energy efficiency.

Fighting inflation is a balancing act. If we do too little, we hurt those who need the help the most. If we do too much, we only make the problem worse and more long-lasting. Therefore, support measures should be timely and targeted towards the most vulnerable groups, which are the ones suffering most from the increased energy and food prices. Only by adequate targeting can we ensure that the measures don't contribute further to price increases. Only by striking the right balance can we defeat inflation.

I am looking forward to the debate and I thank you for your attention.

Nicolas Schmit, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, honourable Members, well, this is a timely debate. The discussion on the impact of monetary policies and interest-rate increase on households and workers is relevant against the background of the socio-economic challenges faced by the Union and its citizens in these challenging times.

Starting from the second half of 2021, inflation has been rising strongly, reaching its highest level since more than two decades, and even more. While headline inflation has peaked in October 2022, core inflation, which excludes energy and unprocessed food, remains also high, but has edged down to 5.6% in April from a record high of 5.7% in March. High inflation reduces the purchasing power of citizens and makes many companies less competitive. Moreover, high inflation has a disproportionate impact on people with lower incomes.

Following its mandate of pursuing price stability in the euro area, the European Central Bank has tightened its monetary policy to curb inflation because curbing inflation is a key objective. Of course, higher interest rates have important implications for the economy. Increased borrowing costs due to higher interest rates affect investment and consumption. This could reduce economic activity and in turn impact the labour market, which at the present moment is still quite strong.

Households with variable-rate mortgages are particularly affected as the cost of servicing their mortgage increases. As a result, the disposable income of those households is shrinking. Increase of interest rates can also have a disruptive effect on highly indebted households and ultimately on the level of private debt, increasing the default risks. Against this background, it is important to assess and address the distributional effects of interest-rate increases on households and workers with a view to avoiding an aggravation of poverty and inequality while ensuring that our social security systems – as it was already said also by the Presidency – are well equipped to protect the most vulnerable households in the face of this challenge.

But in this particular context, we also have to look at the impact of high inflation on wages, because it depends obviously also on wages, how households react to the increase of inflation and on the increase of interest-rate hikes. Nominal wages have increased – especially minimum wages have been updated in the last year. But at the same time, in 2022 real wages have decreased by 3%. Now, there is, as you know, a debate on the danger of a spiral between prices and wages. What we can say today is that wage-price spiral risks appear extremely contained. This has been confirmed by the IMF and the European Central Bank, which concludes in its March papers that wages have had only a limited influence on inflation over the past two years. And – interesting – the ECB papers conclude that the increase in profits had been significantly more dynamic than that in wages. Now, given the situation, I just want to quote also the IMF chief economist who in April pointed to another risk of inflation on one hand and the evolution of wages on the other hand. And he speaks of a cost-of-living crisis that could come up, and therefore pleads in favour of adjusting wages to reflect changes in purchasing power precisely to cushion inflation on one hand and the increased costs due to interest-rate hikes.

To conclude, first, I think we have to factor in the cost of inaction as high inflation has a clear, harmful impact, and there is no choice between combating inflation. So I think what has been said by the Council is absolutely true. We have our main goal, which is to come back to price stability because inflation is strongly regressive, especially at the current juncture. Poorer households are more severely affected by high inflation as they spend a higher share of their income on food and energy consumption. Inflation is estimated to have already increased poverty and social deprivation by up to five percentage points in the EU, with important differences across Member States. So we have to come back, as I've already said, to price stability, as the economic and social consequences of higher and more persistent inflation would be even more dramatic.

This situation, this challenging situation, requires, as already mentioned, also a targeted policy response and constant vigilance to support the European households and workers and the most vulnerable parts of society. And these support measures need to be targeted to those most in need, but at the same time, coming back to wage policy, because this is also a way how to preserve precisely purchasing power, we have to have appropriate wage adjustments. And especially in those sectors that can afford it, we have to maintain purchasing power – in this period of higher inflation and interest-rate rises – also not only to increases in minimum wages, but also to responsible collective bargaining.

Jiří Pospíšil, za skupinu PPE. – Paní předsedající, dovoluji, abych vystoupil se stanoviskem naší frakce. To téma je mimořádně důležité, trápí většinu Evropanů. Je škoda, že ta debata probíhá takto pozdě večer. Inflation trápí všechny členské země Evropské unie, ať již jsou v eurozóně či nikoliv. Je to problém celé Evropy a je třeba říci, že není jednotný recept a i odborníci, ekonomové, se přou o to, jakým způsobem bojovat proti inflaci. A myslím si, že i to, že inflace zde trvá již řadu měsíců, je důkazem toho, že kdyby zde byl jeden efektivní recept, pak by bylo možné jej realizovat. Ale není možné, a tím reagují i na to, co říkála zástupkyně předsednické země, nedělat nic. Je třeba hledat vyvážená opatření a pokusit se inflaci srazit, protože na jedné straně rozumím tomu tématu, že kritizujeme to, že pokud Evropská centrální banka zvedne úrokovou sazbu, tak to má dopad na hypoteční trh, má to dopad na žadatele o úvěry. Na druhou stranu, pokud nebudeme dělat nic, tak drobní střadatelé, ti, o kterých zde dnes hovoříme, přichází o své úspory. Přichází o

peníze, které si našetřili, které jim inflace ničí. To znamená, že hledáme nějaké, už to zde bylo zmíněno, vyvážené řešení. A pokud Evropská centrální banka rozhodne o zvýšení úrokových sazeb, pak je to opatření jaksi běžné, po kterém sahá celá řada centrálních bank v případě, že dlouhodobě bojují proti vysoké inflaci, která potom často mívá už strukturální charakter a těžko se odvrací. Je třeba říci, že banka má být nezávislá. My zde na půdě Parlamentu můžeme debatovat o inflaci. Můžeme samozřejmě vyjadřovat své názory, ale měli bychom rozhodnutí Evropské centrální banky respektovat. Záměrně oddělit cenovou banku od politické scény je jaksi věcí právního státu a vnímání nezávislé fiskální politiky.

Agnes Jongerius, *namens de S&D-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, minister, laat mij als eerste de werknemers van een zekere Nederlandse grote supermarkt feliciteren. En ja, het is het moederbedrijf waarvan in België de werknemers protesteren tegen sluitingen. Maar deze mensen, werkzaam bij Ahold, hebben deze week weer eens bewezen: staken helpt. Overall in Europa hoor je over grootscheepse stakingsacties in ziekenhuizen, bij het openbaar vervoer en bij medewerkers dus van supermarkten. Mensen pikken het niet meer. En ik denk dat dat terecht is, want werkgevers en aandeelhouders zijn de afgelopen jaren als een soort Rupsje Nooitgenoeg door Europa gegaan.

Waar bedrijven in de afgelopen jaren miljoenen of miljarden extra winsten boekten en die uitdeelden aan de aandeelhouders, moesten de werknemers blij zijn als ze een dubbeltje extra konden verdienen. In het Nederlands hebben we daar inmiddels een woord voor: we noemen het geen inflatie, maar graaiflatie. Ik weet niet of de tolken het kunnen vertalen, maar het komt er dus op neer dat het verhaal over de loon-prijsspiraal tegengesproken moet worden en dat – zoals de commissaris net ook al zei – de dynamiek in de winsten veel groter is geweest dan de dynamiek op het loon voor ons.

We spreken over de ECB, en in Nederland spreken wij over Klaas Knot, de president van De Nederlandsche Bank, ook lid van het bestuur van de ECB. Hij beweert met grote stelligheid, ook op de Nederlandse tv, dat we uit moeten kijken voor die loon-prijsspiraal. En ik zou van hieraf willen zeggen: blijkaar heeft u de internationale consensus gemist. Het zijn niet de lonen, maar de prijzen die voor de inflatie zorgen. Het wordt tijd om wakker te worden in de nieuwe wereld. En dus zeg ik van hieruit: hup, omhoog met die lonen!

Ernest Urtausun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, el BCE volvió a subir los tipos de interés, una estrategia que, ya lo hemos dicho, es profundamente equivocada. La inflación proviene fundamentalmente de la energía y de los altísimos beneficios empresariales, como ha señalado el comisario. Pero el BCE sigue empeñado en decirnos que hay un componente de demanda en la inflación actual.

Si hubiera un componente de demanda significativo en la inflación deberíamos haber recuperado el crecimiento perdido en la pandemia, y no es el caso. Y tengo que decir que el consumo todavía está un 0,8 % por debajo de lo que era en 2019. Si con estos datos el BCE afirma que la economía está sobrecalentada, entonces esto solo puede significar que la producción potencial de la eurozona disminuyó. Pero es muy difícil afirmar que la producción potencial de la eurozona disminuyó cuando el empleo ha aumentado un 2,3 % desde 2019 y la productividad ha progresado un 1,3 % en 2022.

Es obvio, por lo tanto, que la demanda no es un componente significativo de la inflación y que, por lo tanto, lo que está haciendo el BCE es empobrecer a las familias sin poder atajar el aumento de precios. Corrijan el rumbo.

Johan Van Overtveldt, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, ik heb een boodschap voor de vrienden aan de linkerkant van het politieke spectrum die het rentebeleid van de ECB bekritisieren en bestempelen als hardvochtig en sociaal.

Die boodschap is dat de ECB eigenlijk nog doortastender en sneller had moeten handelen, want de inflatie is de meest onrechtvaardige en meest discriminerende belasting die er bestaat. Ze treft de minst begoeden in onze samenleving het hardst. Mensen en gezinnen die op de onderste trede van de sociaal-economische ladder staan, voelen de last van het duurder worden van de winkelkar proportioneel gezien het meest.

Het is daarom in ons aller belang, en niet in het minst voor de minst begoeden, dat de inflatietrein gestopt wordt. Maar monetair op de rem staan en budgettair blijven vasthangen aan aanzienlijke deficits zal ons in de *worst of all worlds* brengen, namelijk een inflatie die niet onder controle raakt, economische groei die wegwijnt, jobs die verdwijnen, en voortdurende financiële instabiliteit.

Gunnar Beck, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die Eurozone hat zusammen mit Großbritannien die höchste Inflationsrate der entwickelten Welt. Rasant steigende Energie- und Lebensmittelpreise bedeuten: Der Lebensstandard bricht ein, die Bürger müssen frieren, und Ersparnisse werden vernichtet. 2022 allein wurden deutsche Sparer um rund 200 Milliarden Euro enteignet. Doch die EZB erhöht das Zinsniveau um lachhafte 0,25 auf 3,7 % bei über 7 % Inflation. So zaghaft lässt sich galoppierende Inflation eben nicht zähmen.

Die Lage ist klar: Die EZB ist der Erfüllungsgehilfe maroder Banken und unverantwortlicher Regierungen, deren Schulden sie einfach durch niedrige Zinsen auf Kosten der Bürger weginflationiert. Dass Inflation nicht Schicksal, sondern gewollt ist, beweisen die Schweiz mit 2,6 % Inflation, Taiwan mit 2,3 % und selbst Russland mit 3,5 % – Länder mit solider Haushaltsführung, die das Weltklima eben nicht retten wollen.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, ao fim de sete aumentos consecutivos, finalmente debatemos aqui o impacto da subida das taxas de juro decididas pelo BCE.

Ao contrário do que alguns pretendem sugerir, esta é uma decisão política e não técnica. É inconcebível que uma decisão desta natureza seja tomada sem atender às causas predominantes da inflação, à situação económica e social, e às necessidades por ela criada em cada país, aos impactos diferenciados que daí decorram.

Cada vez mais famílias têm dificuldades para pagar a prestação do crédito à habitação, que aumentou brutalmente. Consequências também para as pequenas e médias empresas e para os Estados.

É preciso pôr fim à escalada dos juros e reverter este caminho, abordar as causas reais da inflação e os seus impactos, defender salários e o poder de compra. E, aqui, o senhor comissário falou de salários, quando a Comissão é corresponsável por políticas que defendem os baixos salários.

É preciso tomar medidas urgentes que ponham os lucros dos bancos a suportar os custos e os impactos dos aumentos das taxas de juro. Não podem continuar as famílias a ver agravada a sua situação, quando a banca continua a acumular lucros resultantes da subida dos juros em relação aos empréstimos, ainda para mais quando não se repercutem na remuneração dos mesmos.

Pedro Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário Schmit, Caros Colegas, amanhã, há famílias que não sabem se vão conseguir pagar a prestação do seu crédito à habitação. Há pequenas empresas que não sabem se conseguem cumprir as suas obrigações, incluindo com os seus trabalhadores. O que as ameaça cada vez mais são as altas taxas de juro.

Por isso, hoje, o Parlamento devia unir-se e passar uma mensagem forte ao BCE e à presidente Lagarde. A economia são as pessoas e as suas vidas. A economia não é apenas feita de números.

Falemos do objetivo desejável de estabilidade de preços, de que não nos afastamos. Nos últimos cinco meses, segundo o Eurostat, a inflação recuou 3 pontos percentuais. Os preços da energia, que estiveram na origem, no início desta crise inflacionista, revelam agora um controlo acrescido.

Há também dados e análises do próprio BCE, como aqui foram citados pelo Comissário Schmit, que demonstram como alguns grupos económicos, como as empresas, de uma forma geral, aproveitaram para fazer crescer significativamente as suas margens de lucro, agravando a própria inflação, ou seja, aproveitaram a crise inflacionista para aumentar lucros e, assim, agravar a crise inflacionista. Isso sim, talvez se possa chamar uma espiral inflacionista.

Como também foi referido, não foram detetados o mesmo tipo de comportamentos ou de riscos do lado da evolução dos salários.

É por isso tempo de as empresas olharem para a forma como têm estado no mercado. É tempo de o sistema financeiro olhar para as margens de lucro que também está a gerar, nomeadamente na questão da concessão de crédito neste momento ou nas taxas ativas. É tempo do BCE parar e repensar os sucessivos aumentos de taxas de juro.

Sabemos que há falcões da política monetária que continuam a defender esse aumento. Fê-lo, há pouco tempo, neste Parlamento, o Partido Popular Europeu ou, no meu país, pela voz do líder parlamentar do principal partido da oposição, a mesma coisa também o defendeu. São os mesmos falcões que, na crise financeira, defenderam a austeridade. Não aprenderam nada. É um erro e uma injustiça, neste momento, e já não encontra fundamentos na atual situação inflacionista, com custos sociais que não podemos aceitar.

As pessoas estão a olhar para nós. Nós precisamos de outra política monetária, a partir deste momento.

Rasmus Andresen (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Die aggressive Zinspolitik der Europäischen Zentralbank verfehlt ihr Ziel. Während einige wenige Konzerne, die den Energie- und den Lebensmittelmarkt dominieren, immer mehr Profite machen, leidet die Mehrheit der Menschen in der EU real unter Einkommensverlusten. Das normale Leben ist für viele Menschen unbezahlbar geworden. Die Gierflation der großen Lebensmittel- und Energiekonzerne ist das Problem.

EZB-Präsidentin Lagarde irrt, wenn sie behauptet, dass sie durch Zinserhöhungen die Inflation in den Griff bekommt. Die Nachfrage ist nicht das Problem, im Gegenteil. Wir stehen am Rande einer Rezession. Exporte und Umsätze gehen zurück. Die EZB verschärft diese Entwicklung.

Um die Inflation zu bekämpfen und für Menschen das Leben bezahlbar zu machen, brauchen wir stattdessen eine andere Finanzpolitik. Wir brauchen eine Steuer auf exzessive Übergewinne, mehr Investitionen in den Ausbau von günstiger grüner Energie und gezielte soziale Unterstützung für Menschen, die unsere Unterstützung brauchen.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR). – Señora presidente, señor comisario, señorías, hoy incluso muchos de los que tienen un puesto de trabajo no llegan a fin de mes. Las cuentas no salen. ¿Nadie se va a hacer responsable?

Las medidas de la Comisión, apoyadas por la mayoría de esta Cámara, no solo no han evitado estar en esta situación sino que en gran parte la han provocado. La crisis energética, el aumento de la masa monetaria, la escasez de oferta, la dependencia de terceros, no poder explotar nuestras materias primas, una fiscalidad sofocante, la inseguridad jurídica, el desmantelamiento de los sectores productivos, el radicalismo climático, la excesiva burocracia y regulación, un gasto político mastodóntico. Suma y sigue.

Situaciones evitables, causadas por políticas concretas, sobre las que ha advertido nuestro Grupo ECR en innumerables ocasiones, y que, a pesar de la evidencia de su fracaso, no están siendo corregidas. Hoy mismo se han votado unos impuestos europeos. Y yo me pregunto: ¿los intereses de quién se están defendiendo?

No solo se está jugando con el bienestar de las familias y los trabajadores, se amenaza la misma seguridad de nuestras naciones. Cambiemos de rumbo. Recuperemos nuestra autonomía y soberanía estratégica para garantizar nuestra prosperidad.

Irene Tinagli (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo che molte delle attuali discussioni sull'inflazione nascano da un equivoco.

Nei trattati c'è scritto che la BCE deve mantenere la stabilità dei prezzi, ma non c'è scritto che la stabilità dei prezzi è un compito esclusivo della BCE e secondo me il problema oggi nasce da qui. L'Unione e gli Stati membri potrebbero fare di più per combattere il caro-vita.

I dati ci dicono, è stato detto anche in questo dibattito, che oggi l'inflazione è in buona parte determinata da aumenti dei margini dei profitti di alcune imprese in alcuni settori: questo non si risolve con la politica monetaria. Con un'inflazione di questo tipo, affidarsi solo alla politica monetaria significa andare a colpire i redditi reali dei lavoratori e anche di quelle imprese che non hanno il potere di mercato di adottare certi comportamenti.

Per questo noi dobbiamo affiancare le azioni della BCE, da un lato aumentando l'efficacia delle politiche proconcorrenziali per evitare degli aumenti ingiustificati dei prezzi, e dall'altro attraverso una politica dei redditi generalizzata che coinvolga tutti, le imprese, i lavoratori, i governi e che guardi ai salari ma anche ai profitti. Questo è importante!

Come aveva intuito il compianto Ezio Tarantelli, un grande economista italiano, una politica dei redditi concertata è lo strumento migliore per abbassare le aspettative di inflazione e supportare la politica monetaria, in questo modo rendendo meno necessari gli aumenti dei tassi che poi finiscono per avere ripercussioni negative sui lavoratori, in particolare su chi ha un reddito fisso.

Questa è la direzione verso cui noi dobbiamo andare: lavorare tutti insieme e non aspettarsi dalla politica monetaria quello che la politica monetaria non può fare.

Claude Gruffat (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Ministre, chers collègues, pour la septième fois en moins d'un an, la BCE relève son taux d'intérêt de référence. J'ai l'impression de me répéter, mais la poussée inflationniste actuelle résulte de la hausse des prix de l'énergie et du prix des matières premières alimentaires. Et augmenter le prix de l'argent ne va pas réduire ces prix-là, ni infléchir la spéculation. Les pansements de la BCE ne résolvent rien. Les prix restent élevés, réduisant un peu plus le pouvoir d'achat des Européennes et des Européens.

Les prix des produits alimentaires ont progressé de 15 % par rapport à 2022, et expliquent à eux seuls près de la moitié de l'inflation, pénalisant les ménages les plus modestes, qui consacrent une plus grosse part de leur budget à l'alimentation. La hausse des taux d'intérêts ne résout pas ce problème, au contraire elle prive les plus modestes de l'accès au crédit.

Pourtant, il y a des solutions: un impôt sur les superprofits, la fin de la spéculation sur les denrées alimentaires, comme mon groupe le préconise et le demande. Vous l'avez compris, le problème va au-delà de la BCE. Il faut une coopération entre les États pour lutter contre la spéculation, et pour une juste répartition de la richesse produite par la fiscalité. C'est par là que passe la force de notre union.

Aurore Lalucq (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Ministre, parfois, on ne peut pas lutter contre l'inflation avec un taux d'intérêt, et il faut l'accepter. La hausse du taux d'intérêt aujourd'hui doit être questionnée pour trois raisons au moins. Premièrement, parce qu'on ne lutte pas avec un taux d'intérêt contre l'inflation importée et l'inflation énergétique. Deuxièmement, parce qu'aujourd'hui l'inflation est tirée par les superprofits, par la cupidité, l'avidité: c'est l'inflation des vendeurs, la «cupideflation» décrite parfaitement par Isabella Weber, et d'ailleurs la Banque centrale européenne est d'accord avec ce constat, il faudrait donc qu'elle se mette en cohérence. Enfin, parce que cette hausse a des conséquences sur la stabilité bancaire et financière.

S'il est évident que les banques qui se sont effondrées avaient des problèmes de gestion interne – ça on ne va pas le nier – il est évident aussi qu'à partir du moment où vous augmentez les taux d'intérêt, mécaniquement, vous dégradez les bilans bancaires parce que vous avez des moins-values latentes obligataires. La dernière chose dont on a besoin, c'est d'une crise bancaire et financière. Donc stop sur les taux d'intérêt. Et parfois, pour avoir de la stabilité des prix, il faut passer par quelque chose qui s'appelle le contrôle des prix.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Voorzitter, “Onderzoek bewijst: GRAAIFLATIE bestaat [...]”. Het is bepaald geen gewoonte van mij om een kop van GeenStijl te quoten, maar het bekt. En deze – het is ook geen gewoonte – is nog waar ook, want bedrijven veroorzaken het merendeel van de inflatie. De winstmarges staan op een naoorlogse top. En rechts vindt dat normaal. Als bedrijven de prijzen opschroeven, is dat marktwerking. Maar als werknemers om meer salaris vragen, dan volgt een waarschuwing van de bankpresident Klaas Knot.

Tuurlijk, de inflatie moet naar beneden en dat vergt een pas op de plaats, maar met name van bedrijven. Dus spreek niet werknemers aan, maar bedrijven die hun marges opschroeven en confronteer ze zo nodig met hogere looneisen en hogere winstbelastingen, want alleen met renteverhogingen is de inflatie niet op een eerlijke manier te bestrijden.

Laat dus duidelijk zijn: graaien geeft geen pas, beëindig de graaiflatie.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, no final do ano passado, a Comissão reconhecia os impactos sobre as famílias do aumento das taxas de juro, minimizando-os por pretensa predominância das taxas fixas. Omitiam os expectáveis impactos diferenciados que pesariam mais nos países com predominância de taxas variáveis, como em Portugal.

Na passada sexta-feira, Christine Lagarde afirmou saber que as famílias em países como Portugal, Espanha e Finlândia estão a sofrer com estas decisões, mas reiterou que os juros vão continuar a subir. São as consequências do preceito neoliberal da falsa independência de instituições sem escrutínio democrático que servem os interesses do capital financeiro e prejudicam os trabalhadores e os povos.

Em Portugal, centenas de milhares de famílias estão em dificuldades para pagar as prestações do crédito à habitação. Não faltam dramáticos testemunhos da opção entre comer ou pagar a renda, ou até mesmo de quem tenha que entregar a casa ao banco.

É preciso pôr fim imediato a este filme. É preciso defender o direito à habitação. É preciso pôr os lucros dos bancos a pagar estes aumentos.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Nicolas Schmit, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, d'abord, je tiens à vous remercier pour ce débat extrêmement riche et important, et qui concerne des millions de nos concitoyens. Moi, je dirai juste qu'il ne faut pas se tromper d'adversaire. L'adversaire, c'est d'abord l'inflation, et on a effectivement souligné les différentes causes de l'inflation actuelle. On ne peut pas ignorer qu'effectivement il y a eu une crise de la Covid, il y a eu des interruptions, des problèmes au niveau des chaînes de valeur. Il y a la guerre. Donc, il y a plusieurs phénomènes qui sont à l'origine de la hausse des prix actuels.

Et donc il est clair aussi qu'il n'y a pas une solution, un moyen, une mesure pour lutter contre l'inflation. La politique monétaire en est une. D'ailleurs, je dois dire que la BCE et l'Europe ne sont pas seules au monde. Nous vivons dans un contexte globalisé où d'autres banques centrales aussi mènent des politiques qui, à la fin, ont une incidence sur la situation en Europe, y compris sur le taux de change. Simplement pour vous rappeler.

Et donc il faut veiller aussi à ce contexte-là. Mais je crois que nous devons surtout veiller à ce que les familles les plus vulnérables d'abord soient soutenues, que les travailleurs retrouvent des salaires qui évitent effectivement, ce que l'économiste en chef du FMI a dit, une crise du pouvoir d'achat. Et donc avec une politique salariale qui essaye au moins de compenser ou de freiner l'impact à la fois de l'inflation, et effectivement aussi de l'impact de l'augmentation des taux d'intérêt qui vise quand même aussi à lutter contre l'inflation.

Jessika Roswall, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for your interventions. As many of you have raised today, high inflation rates hit households, families and companies hard, especially the most vulnerable groups in our society.

Many actors share the responsibility to prevent high inflation from having a lasting impact on price setting and wage formation. The ECB's task is to use monetary policy to maintain low and stable inflation, but it cannot tackle inflation alone. Instead, economic policy as a whole needs to focus on fighting inflation – both monetary and fiscal policy.

But there are there are also other things we need to look at. For example, there is a lack of competition in some industries, which has led to exaggerated price increases. Thus, effective competition enforcements can also play a role in bringing down inflation. Thanks to the coordinated response of the EU to diversify energy supplies, the voluntary reduction of energy consumption by households and businesses' initiatives to improve the functioning of markets, energy prices have come down.

The Council and Eurogroup will continue to closely monitor the situation, as will national governments. Only by working together across institutions and across policy areas can we reduce inflation as soon as possible and only then can we provide both households and businesses with the relief they so desperately need. And as Commissioner Schmit also said, more or less, 'inflation is workers' worst enemy'. And that is why we need to fight inflation together. Thank you very much for your attention and for the debate.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

21. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung.

21.1. Przystąpienie UE do Konwencji Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej: instytucje i administracja publiczna Unii (A9-0169/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, съвсем убедено гласувах срещу този доклад, който трябва, и след гласуването на Европейския парламент вписа Европейския съюз в Истанбулската конвенция по една много проста причина – този документ и тази конвенция нямат нищо общо със своето заглавие. Те налагат, предлагат и се опитват да въведат в нашите общества по заобиколен начин, под маската на защита на правата на жените една идеология, която за нас е неприемлива и която променя нашия начин на живот. Това е джендър идеологията.

Никъде по никакъв начин в държавите, в които е въведена тази Истанбулска конвенция няма ефектът, който тя цели, а именно намаляването на престъпленията, свързани с домашно насилие, насилието над жени. Това, което се случва обаче е под маската, пак казвам на една легитимна кауза, да бъдат прекарвани и вкарвани идеологии, които са срещу нашите разбирания за общество и нашето разбиране за семейство.

По тази причина гласувах против този доклад.

21.2. Przystąpienie UE do Konwencji Rady Europy o zapobieganiu i zwalczaniu przemocy wobec kobiet i przemocy domowej: współpraca wymiarów sprawiedliwości w sprawach karnych, azyl i zasada non-refoulement (A9-0170/2023 - Łukasz Kohut, Arba Kokalari)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, гласувах и против този доклад, защото съм твърдо убеден, че националните държави трябва да спазват своите конституции и своите правни разпоредби.

Конституционният съд на Република България, суверенна държава е обявил Истанбулската конвенция за противоконституционна в някои от нейните текстове. По тази причина за нас не може да има съмнение, че този документ всъщност цели нещо съвсем различно от своето заглавие, а именно прокарването на идеология, която е несъвместима с нашите разбирания за семейство, за традиции и нашият традиционен начин на живот. Под формата на борба с домашното насилие се прокарват социални роли на пола, права на статут на хора, които се определят като бежанци, за да не бъдат връщани обратно в своите държави. Те ще злоупотребяват, разбира се, с тези разпоредби.

По този начин се прави опит да бъдат заобиколени нашите законови разпоредби. Ние не сме съгласни с това и като български представител, аз се съобразявам с решението на нашия Конституционен съд. По тази причина не мога да гласувам за подобен документ. Смятам, че той въвежда идеология, която е несъвместима с моите разбирания. Затова гласувах против.

21.3. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Europejska Agencja Leków (A9-0106/2023 - Katalin Cseh)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kada govorimo o Europskoj agenciji za lijekove, treba reći da gotovo sav novac dolazi od farmaceutske industrije. To je bilo 67 posto 2007. godine da bi došlo do 89 posto 2017., a kasnije još i gore.

Druga stvar je način na koji funkcioniraju. Funkcioniraju na sličan način kao i američke DEA i CDC. To je objasnio profesor Harvey Risch, epidemiolog sa sveučilišta Yale kojeg smo imali priliku ugostiti ovdje u Europskom parlamentu neki dan. Na primjer u studiji iz siječnja 2010. o učinkovitosti cjepiva nakon treće doze, američki CDC je tvrdio da je učinkovitost 82 posto, dok je zapravo 56 posto. Namjerno su koristili krive parametre i krivu metodologiju. Cross section studiju su analizirali kao case control studiju. Iste greške su činili na svim drugim studijama koje su objavljivali na taj način.

Prema tome, dok se agencije budu bavile znanstvenom prijevarom, moju podršku neće imati.

21.4. Absolutorium za rok 2021: Centrum Tłumaczeń dla Organów Unii Europejskiej (A9-0104/2023 - Olivier Chastel)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, što se tiče prijevoda, govore uvijek da je hrvatski službeni jezik u Europskoj uniji. Također da je temeljno načelo Europske unije višejezičnost. To je u praksi mrtvo slovo na papiru.

Već sam pobrojao na deset primjera, obraćajući se javnosti, da to ne funkcionira i gdje ne funkcionira. Od plenarne, odbora, amandmana i tako dalje. Nažalost, sve je organizirano na način da se diskriminira hrvatski jezik i drugi jezici koji se, iako su na papiru službeni, tretiraju kao manjinski, čak i u službenim dopisima. Zadnji incident dogodio se prije nekoliko dana kada smo imali glasovanje o europskoj strategiji za tekstil. Naime, kompromisni amandmani, četrdesetak njih, što je 67 stranica teksta, nisu bili dostupni na hrvatskom jeziku. Odgovor Tajništva je bio: pa da, pa nikad nema kompromisnih amandmana na hrvatskom jeziku. To je tragično.

Hrvatska je 1967. godine imala Deklaraciju o položaju hrvatskog jezika u tadašnjoj Jugoslaviji. Zar moramo i ovdje sada, u Europskoj uniji, napraviti novu deklaraciju o položaju hrvatskog jezika europskim institucijama? Do kada ta bahatost?

21.5. Absolutorium za rok 2021 — Prokuratura Europejska (EPPO) (A9-0079/2023 - Mikuláš Peksa)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – (početak govora izvan dometa mikrofona)... javnog tužitelja, institucija je koja je došla vrlo kasno i s vrlo skromnim resursima. Ti resursi rastu kroz vrijeme, ali to nije ni blizu dovoljno da se kazni sav onaj kriminal koji vidimo. Pogotovo u Hrvatskoj, izrazito korumpiranoj zemlji.

Evo samo jedan primjer: tri milijarde kuna koje su dane za razvoj inovacija – tek jednim manjim dijelom se bave institucije. Mogli smo čitati u hrvatskim medijima naslove kao: „Hadezeovka gospođa Babić dobila je pet milijuna kuna za inovaciju od drvenih prozora“. Prijatelji bivšeg gradonačelnika, vrlo korumpirane osobe, 13,6 milijuna kuna. Neki bivši ministri...

Kada se bude radila revizija i kada EPP bude temeljito češljao Fond za inovacije, bojim se da će to biti tragično i pogubno, jer ono što se svuda po Europi smatra inovacijom, u Hrvatskoj se ne smatra često inovacijom i novac ide kojekakvim podobnim ljudima i za stvari koje nemaju vrijednost kakva se prezentira.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

22. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia

Die Präsidentin. – Die nächste Sitzung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 11. Mai 2023, um 9.00 Uhr statt.

Die Tagesordnung wurde veröffentlicht und ist auf der Website des Europäischen Parlaments verfügbar.

23. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia

Die Präsidentin. – Das Protokoll dieser Sitzung wird dem Parlament morgen zu Beginn der Nachmittagssitzung zur Genehmigung vorgelegt.

Damit bedanke ich mich bei unseren Dolmetscherinnen und Dolmetschern.

24. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 22.22 Uhr geschlossen.)

—

Skróty i symbole

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

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

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