

C/2024/5928

4.10.2024

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 2 MAJA 2022 R.

(C/2024/5928)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2022-2023

Posiedzenia od 2 do 5 maja 2022 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
3. In Memoriam	3
4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia	4
5. Skład komisji i delegacji	4
6. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu)	4
7. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 6 Regulaminu)	4
8. Podpisanie aktów przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 79 Regulaminu)	4
9. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół	4
10. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół	4

Spis treści	Strona
11. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	5
12. Porządek obrad	5
13. Wybór posłów do Parlamentu Europejskiego w powszechnych wyborach bezpośrednich (debata)	7
14. Zmiana załączników IV i V do rozporządzenia (UE) 2019/1021 dotyczącego trwałych zanieczyszczeń organicznych (debata)	27
15. Plan działania UE na rzecz rolnictwa ekologicznego (debata)	34
16. Prześladowanie mniejszości z powodu przekonań lub religii (krótka prezentacja)	46
17. Unijna strategia wspierania edukacji dzieci na świecie: łagodzenie skutków pandemii COVID-19 (krótka prezentacja)	49
18. Osiągnięcie przez kobiety niezależności ekonomicznej dzięki przedsiębiorczości i samozatrudnieniu (krótka prezentacja)	53
19. W kierunku zrównoważonej niebieskiej gospodarki w UE: rola sektorów rybołówstwa i akwakultury (krótka prezentacja)	56
20. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych	60
21. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	67
22. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia	67
23. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	68

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 2 MAJA 2022 R.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Wznowienie sesji

President. – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday 7 April 2022.

2. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(The sitting opened at 17.03)

3. In Memoriam

President. – Dear colleagues, this European Parliament mourns the loss of a President, a gentleman, a great European and a passionate believer in the power of politics to improve lives. Lord Henry Plumb – for us, President Plumb – passed away on 15 April.

President Plumb became a Member of this House in 1979, the year of the first European elections. His commitment to Europe translated into actions, and as a new generation of Europeans, we continue to carry forward his legacy for a stronger European democracy.

In 1987, spearheading the expansion of the powers of this House, Lord Plumb was the first President to address the European Council. And a year later, President Plumb awarded the first Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought to Nelson Mandela and to the Russian political dissident Anatoly Marchenko. Thirty-three years on, the fight for democracy and fundamental rights remains as real as ever.

Most notably, President Plumb dedicated his whole life to safe and fair agriculture by strongly advocating for European food production. His work in this field serves as a model for our Parliament as we strive to ensure stable feed and food policy with a war on our continent.

For his commitment, his career and his achievements in this House, for all those who knew and loved him, for his children John and Christine, colleagues, I would like to invite you to now observe a minute of silence.

(The House rose and observed a minute's silence)

4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia

President. – The minutes and the texts adopted at the sitting of 7 April are available. Can I ask, dear colleagues, do you have any comments?

No, that does not seem to be the case, and therefore the minutes are approved.

5. Skład komisji i delegacji

President. – The PPE Group, the Verts/ALE Group and the non-attached Members have notified me of decisions relating to changes to appointments between committees and delegations. Those decisions will be set out in the minutes of today's sitting and shall take effect on the date of this announcement.

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

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

Pursuant to Rule 71(2), Members or political groups reaching at least the medium threshold may request in writing by tomorrow, Tuesday, 3 May at midnight, that the decisions to enter into negotiations be put to the vote. If no request for a vote in Parliament on the decisions to enter into negotiations is made within that deadline, the committees may then start the negotiations.

7. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 6 Regulaminu)

President. – I was informed that no objections have been raised within the Conference of Committee Chairs to the recommendation by the AGRI Committee not to oppose a delegated act pursuant to Rule 111(6) of the Rules of Procedure, and the recommendation is available on the plenary web page.

If no objections are raised by a political group or Members reaching at least the low threshold within 24 hours following this announcement, the recommendation shall be deemed to have been approved, otherwise it will be put to the vote.

8. Podpisanie aktów przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 79 Regulaminu)

President. – Since the adjournment of Parliament's session on 7 April, I have signed, together with the President of the Council, three acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure in accordance with Rule 79 of Parliament's Rules of Procedure. The titles of the acts will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

9. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół

10. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół

11. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

12. Porządek obrad

President. – We now come to the order of business. The final draft agenda as adopted by the Conference of Presidents on 28 April pursuant to Rule 157 has been distributed.

First of all, I would like to inform you that I have received one request for urgent procedure from the ENVI Committee pursuant to Rule 163 on the following legislative file: Transitional rules for the packaging and labelling of veterinary medicinal products. The vote on this request will be taken tomorrow.

Next, with the agreement of the political groups, I wish to put to the House the following proposal for changes to the final draft agenda. Since the President of the European Council will not be present in Strasbourg, this item, scheduled as the first item in the afternoon of Tuesday, will not take place. Then on Wednesday, the vote on the report by Mr Hansen on distortive foreign subsidies is brought forward to Wednesday, and the debate on this report, scheduled for the afternoon, is removed from the agenda. The deadlines on this are: amendments or rejection, Tuesday, 3 May at noon; split and separate votes: Tuesday, 3 May at 19.00.

We were also informed that the Council cannot be present for the debate on the Council and Commission statements on the state of play of the EU-Moldova cooperation taking place Thursday morning, and therefore the debate is changed into a Commission statement. If there are no objections, then this change is deemed approved.

Also for Wednesday, the PPE Group has asked that a Commission statement on the call for the submission of a legislative proposal on a European lend-lease regulation be added as the second item on Wednesday afternoon. The debate is to be wound up with a resolution to be voted on Thursday. I give the floor to Sven Simon to move the request on behalf of the PPE Group.

Sven Simon, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Madam President, on behalf of the PPE, I would like to ask to put a new initiative on the agenda, a motion for a resolution calling for the submission of a legislative proposal on a European lend-lease regulation.

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, le groupe auquel j'appartiens est favorable, sans ambiguïté et sans réserve, au soutien militaire à l'Ukraine. Nous voulons même que les livraisons d'armes soient plus nombreuses, plus rapides et que plus de pays puissent y participer dans l'Union européenne.

Ceci étant dit, voir arriver sans préavis, sans examen préalable, un projet d'ajout d'un point technique, précis et qui mérite un examen approfondi, à notre ordre du jour, ne me paraît pas la bonne approche ni la bonne méthode. Nous risquons d'avoir un débat incertain, imprécis, des hésitations, des doutes, des réticences en public. Et le seul qui pourrait s'en réjouir, c'est le président russe Vladimir Poutine.

Le groupe auquel j'appartiens ne voit pas de raison de lui faire ce cadeau. Nous sommes donc opposés à la demande d'ajout présentée par nos collègues du PPE.

President. – Thank you, Ms Loiseau. I'll put the request to the vote by roll call, and give time for colleagues to enter their voting card.

(Parliament rejected the request)

The agenda in this regard remains unchanged.

For Tuesday, the S&D Group has asked that the debate on the follow-up of the Conference on the Future of Europe taking place on Tuesday afternoon be wound up with a resolution to be voted on Wednesday. I give the floor to Ms García Pérez to move the request on behalf of the political group.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, durante el fin de semana tuvimos la oportunidad de celebrar el último pleno de la Conferencia sobre el Futuro de Europa, cuyas conclusiones fueron muy claras en el sentido de cuáles deben ser los siguientes pasos que cabe dar.

Por eso, es importante que este Parlamento celebre un debate al respecto y, además, que ese debate vaya acompañado de una resolución donde podamos expresar la posición de esta Institución en cuanto a las cuestiones fundamentales que hay que tener en cuenta de esa Conferencia.

Hay acuerdo por parte de un número importante de grupos de esta Cámara con respecto a la resolución y, por lo tanto, debería ser incorporada al orden del día para que fuera votada el día después del debate, es decir, el miércoles.

President. – Thank you, Ms García Pérez. Would any colleague like to speak against?

Mr Verhofstadt, you want to speak in favour? I think you can get 30 seconds to speak in favour! You are in favour.

(Mr Verhofstadt indicated that he was indeed in favour)

Stéphane Séjourné (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, je comprends que l'on ne peut pas s'exprimer en faveur. Néanmoins, je souhaite exprimer également, au nom de mon groupe, le soutien à cette résolution qui a été aussi présentée en Conférence des présidents et qui souhaite que cette résolution aboutisse.

President. – Mr Weber, would you like the floor?

(Mr Weber indicated that he did not wish to speak)

OK, thanks a lot, that's clear. Let's put the request to the vote.

(Parliament approved the request)

Therefore the debate on the follow-up to the Conference on the Future of Europe will be wound up with a resolution to be voted on Wednesday. I'll give you the deadlines. Motions for resolutions: Monday, 2 May at 19.00; amendments to the motions for resolutions and joint motions for resolutions: Tuesday 3 May at noon; amendments to the joint motions for resolutions: Tuesday at 13.00; and split and separate votes: Tuesday at 19.00.

Also on Wednesday, The Left Group has asked that Council and Commission statements are added on the resignation of the Frontex executive director in light of the OLAF inquiry into Frontex as the fourth item on Wednesday afternoon, after the Council and Commission statements on threats to stability, security and democracy in Western and Sahelian Africa. I give the floor to Cornelia Ernst to move the request on behalf of her Group.

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! Wir möchten zu diesem Thema unbedingt eine Aussprache durchführen. In Anbetracht des Rücktritts des Exekutivdirektors von Frontex, Fabrice Leggeri, in der letzten Woche ist die Aussprache auch dringend notwendig.

Und ich will darauf verweisen, dass die Abgeordneten bis zum heutigen Tag noch keinen Zugang zu dem 200-seitigen Bericht der OLAF-Untersuchung haben, die im direkten Zusammenhang mit diesem Rücktritt steht.

Das Europäische Parlament hat die Aufgabe, Frontex zu kontrollieren, und wir müssen diesen Rücktritt mit der Kommission und dem Rat besprechen. Frontex duldet seit Langem Grundrechtsverletzungen an den EU-Außengrenzen, wie wir wissen. Der OLAF-Bericht hat weitere Anhaltspunkte gegeben, und dazu, denke ich, müssen wir uns verständigen. Wir bitten um Ihre Unterstützung, und das auch mittels *roll call vote*.

President. – Would any colleague like to speak against? Mr Sarvamaa, please go ahead.

Petri Sarvamaa (PPE). – Madam President, as the EPP Group spokesperson on budgetary control, and therefore the committee responsible for the discharge of agencies, I would like to underline that, first of all, partly on the same grounds that this was moved, namely that we simply have no way to discuss all of the investigation. There is no point in having this discussion.

And, secondly, the discharge we are going to vote on Wednesday will be most probably and also my group will be for postponing the discharge as the clear majority of groups, including yours, will be asking for postponing. So, therefore, we want to have a thorough look at what happened and what did the OLAF report say actually, and then come back to this after the second discharge report so that we all have the possibility to have a meaningful discussion on this subject.

President. – Thank you very much, Mr Sarvamaa. Now I put the request to the vote by roll call.

(Parliament rejected the request)

So the agenda in this regard remains unchanged.

With this, we come to the end of all the requests and the agenda is therefore adopted. The order of business is established.

PREDSEDÁ: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podpredseda

13. Wybór posłów do Parlamentu Europejskiego w powszechnych wyborach bezpośrednich (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je rozprava o správe, ktorú predkladá Domènec Ruiz Devesa, v mene Výboru pre ústavné veci, o návrhu nariadenia Rady o priamych a všeobecných voľbách poslancov Európskeho parlamentu, ktorým sa zrušuje rozhodnutie Rady (76/787/ESUO, EHS, Euratom) a Akt o priamych a všeobecných voľbách poslancov Európskeho parlamentu pripojený k tomuto rozhodnutiu (2020/2220(INL)) (A9-0083/2022).

Chcem vám týmto iba pripomenúť, predtým než začneme, že testujeme niektoré z odporúčaní špecializovanej skupiny pre reformu pléna. Mnohí ste to mali už predtým možnosť zažiť, takže všetky tie pravidlá sa uplatňujú.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, ponente. – Señor presidente, vicepresidenta Jourová, gracias por su presencia y gracias también a los colegas que permanecen en el hemiciclo. Muchas y sinceras gracias también a mis colegas del equipo negociador de este proyecto de ley: Sven Simon por el PPE, Guy Verhofstadt por Renew, Damian Boeselager por Verts/ALE, Leila Chaibi por The Left y Fabio Castaldo por los NI, por sus excelentes contribuciones y su magnífica cooperación. Porque esta propuesta de ley electoral europea la hemos realmente hecho entre todos, cinco grupos políticos democráticos y proeuropeos: socialistas, democristianos, liberales, verdes y la Izquierda.

La propuesta llega hoy al Pleno tras diez meses de intenso trabajo y de negociaciones difíciles. Creo sinceramente que hemos redactado un proyecto de ley sin duda innovador y ambicioso, pero también equilibrado. Todos los grupos políticos han encontrado reflejadas algunas de sus prioridades más importantes.

Así, se propone una solución para reforzar el principio del cabeza de lista para presidir la Comisión Europea mediante una circunscripción paneuropea compuesta por veintiocho escaños adicionales. Pero es una solución equilibrada. La ciudadanía podrá votar no solamente las candidaturas nacionales, sino también las presentadas por partidos políticos europeos, con el número uno de esa lista europea como candidato a presidir la Comisión. Esta segunda papeleta será la misma en toda Europa.

El elector recibe así un nuevo empoderamiento, pues además de elegir diputados podrá respaldar directamente un partido político europeo, un programa electoral común y un candidato a presidente de la Comisión, como además sucede en las democracias parlamentarias nacionales.

Con un mismo mecanismo se consiguen tres objetivos: se europeiza la campaña electoral con veintiocho candidatos, que deben hacer campaña por toda Europa y no solo en un Estado miembro y sobre problemas nacionales; se visibilizan y se empoderan los partidos políticos europeos y se hace real el principio del cabeza de lista que hasta ahora ha sido virtual.

Este Parlamento ya aprobó la idea de una circunscripción paneuropea en el año 2015 y, posteriormente, ha habido un acuerdo político de esta casa a mitad de mandato también para ir en esa dirección. Pensamos que el acuerdo que se plantea hoy refleja ese acuerdo de medio mandato con fidelidad. Si queremos evitar que en el año 2024 se vuelva a ignorar el sistema de los cabezas de lista candidatos a presidente de la Comisión, esta reforma es absolutamente necesaria.

¿Por qué es equilibrada esta propuesta? Primero, por el número. No se agotan los cuarenta y seis escaños disponibles, se deja espacio para futuras ampliaciones. Se respetan las actuales circunscripciones nacionales con su actual número. Dos terceras partes de la lista se reservan para los Estados medianos y pequeños, garantizando que los puestos elegibles no sean ocupados prevalentemente por candidatos provenientes de los Estados más poblados.

Hay que tener también en cuenta un hecho que considero, colegas, incontrovertible. Se han presentado enmiendas, se han pedido votos separados, pero no se ha presentado ninguna alternativa a esta propuesta. Por tanto, queda claro que para aquellos que no aceptan el *statu quo*, que entienden que necesitamos avanzar para que esas elecciones del 2024 sean plenamente europeizadas, la apuesta tiene que ser la de este informe. No hay otra alternativa más que enmiendas o votos separados que buscan amputar este informe.

Por tanto, animo con convicción y confianza a que transitemos todos juntos en favor de una democracia europea más fuerte y más cercana, respaldando este informe en su integridad en la votación de mañana.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – The elections to the European Parliament are among the largest democratic exercises in the world, and reinforcing that democratic dimension is absolutely essential.

Citizens are directly represented at Union level in the European Parliament, and every citizen has the right to participate in the democratic life of the Union. This is an important aspect of the legitimacy of the Union and its decision-making process.

Whilst the Commission has no direct, formal role to play in the special legislative procedure, the Treaties provide for the reform of the European Electoral Act. It fully recognises the importance of the Parliament's proposal for this reform and supports its overall objectives.

I want to thank the rapporteur, Mr Ruiz Devesa for his work on the report, and for the constructive spirit it reflects. As I have said before, the Commission stands ready to facilitate the process and to make available its legal and institutional expertise, research on electoral processes, and insight into inter-institutional relations.

The President highlighted in her political guidelines that improvements to the lead candidate system, as well as the issue of transnational lists, should be addressed in the context of the Conference on the Future of Europe. The conference has considered many aspects of European democracy, including the electoral law, and many of the issues that the Parliament's draft raises.

The Commission looks forward to the final conclusions of the conference, and stands ready to cooperate in the follow up. And I, myself, am ready to help advancing the negotiations on your proposal, should you so wish.

Sven Simon, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank you, I would like to thank our rapporteur, Domènec, I would like to thank Guy Verhofstadt for a very delicious red wine from his own vineyard, I would like to thank those colleagues who cannot support this file for a really challenging debate, and I am very happy that I didn't lose friendships over this file.

Domènec said that this file is innovative and balanced. Well, I would perhaps even go one step further: the law in front of us today is a historic draft. For over 45 years, no reform of European electoral law has succeeded. But in those 45 years, our Union has changed dramatically. It has become a functioning single market, a currency Union, a political Union, and it is set to become a geopolitical project.

But the increase in competences has not been met with a reform of the democratic legitimation of its institutions. Citizens have no direct say on how to choose leading figures of the Commission and the policies they stand for. The idea behind a European-wide constituency is to allow citizens to directly express a preference for a European political family with a second vote at the ballot. We want to spark a European public debate.

Colleagues, remember the situation in 2019, when everybody was so disappointed because we had the lead candidate, and in the end the European Council proposed somebody who we didn't campaign for. We want to put lead candidates on the ballot. With that move we won't change the Treaty, that is true. But we want to make European parties directly electable for voters. This is a historic chance and a window of opportunity. Let's use it now.

Gabriele Bischoff, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Diese Woche haben wir als Parlament wirklich eine große Chance. Wir haben die Chance, europäische Geschichte zu schreiben und das europäische Projekt ein Stück weiter nach vorne zu tragen.

Bei der Abstimmung um dieses EU-Wahlrecht geht es um ein paar wirklich zentrale Fragen. Haben wir hier im Haus den Mut für mehr Europa? Haben wir den Mut für wirklich europäische Wahlen für das Europäische Parlament? Denn bislang haben wir weitgehend 27 sehr oft an nationalen Themen ausgerichtete Europathemen, die eben den Wahlkampf dominieren. Europäische Parteien spielen – fragen Sie die Bürgerinnen und Bürger vor Ort – kaum eine Rolle.

Es geht aber auch um die Frage: Möchten wir den Europäerinnen und Europäern eine Zweitstimme geben bei den Wahlen, um wirklich darüber zu entscheiden, wer und welcher Spitzenkandidat, welche Spitzenkandidatin nach der Wahl die Präsidentin oder der Präsident der Europäischen Kommission wird? Hier geht es ja nicht um irgendeine Spitzenposition, sondern hier wird die europäische Politik zentral gestaltet.

Bei der Zukunftskonferenz, die letztes Wochenende zu Ende ging, haben uns die Bürger und Bürgerinnen in dieser Frage einen ganz klaren Auftrag mitgegeben: Sie möchten, dass wir ein Europawahlrecht haben, das Europa nicht nur im Namen trägt. Und deshalb haben sie als eine der zentralen Forderungen auch dieser Zukunftskonferenz vorgeschlagen und mit unterstützt, dass dieses Wahlrecht geändert wird.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa hat als Berichterstatter eine wirklich gute Arbeit geleistet. Er hat die Zweifler mitgenommen – er hat es versucht. Er hat mit jedem, mit jeder geredet, um wirklich ein Modell zu entwickeln, wo die Kleinen nicht befürchten müssen, dass sie zu kurz kommen, wo sie denken, dass da nur die großen Länder vertreten sind; und zusammen mit den Schattenberichterstattern eine kluge Lösung gefunden.

Aber es geht hier doch nicht nur um transnationale Listen und Spitzenkandidaten. Auch in Sachen Geschlechtergerechtigkeit – schauen Sie sich im Haus um – gibt es hier noch viel zu tun, auch das finden Sie in dem Vorschlag. Oder wenn es um Barrierefreiheit geht: Auch hier haben wir noch einen Sprung nach vorn zu machen.

Deshalb: Hier wurde nichts übers Knie gebrochen. Hier hat man sich wirklich die Zeit genommen, um zu Lösungen zu kommen. Morgen steht das zur Abstimmung. All die – die gucke ich an –, die jetzt noch Zweifel haben oder die sagen, ich fürchte mich auch ein bisschen vor so einer Lösung – geben Sie sich hier einen Ruck! Es ist der dritte Anlauf im Parlament für transnationale Listen, für klare Regelungen für Spitzenkandidaten, für mehr Demokratie in Europa und für eine wirkliche Europäisierung. Lassen Sie uns den Mut haben, zusammen diesen Schritt zu gehen!

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, I want first of all to thank the rapporteur, Domènec Ruiz Devesa, who did an excellent job because this is not only about Spitzenkandidaten, not only about transnational list, it is a complete electoral law. It's a huge legislative file that we have prepared that is an overhaul of the electoral system on the 8th, on transnational votes, on a democratisation for the Spitzenkandidaten on the election day, on everything.

I want to thank especially Sven Simon for his intervention. I have older bottles in my cellar, but I will wait until the votes are sent to open them, so we will see.

So let there be no hesitation for those who believe in Europe to vote in favour of this. I know that Mr Annemans' idea people vote against. He's against Europe. He's against the European demos. He will say it himself, he has another opinion about Europe in any way and in any way, a Europe that is not based on transnational list and on a European demos. That's the reality.

And I want all those who have hesitations to reflect on that. Listen to Mr Annemans and you will know why you will vote in favour of this file in a few moments, in a few seconds. Don't follow those in fact who don't want a European demos and who think that democracy can express itself by simple addition of national democracies.

By the way, this file doesn't abolish national democracy. What we have is we give two votes to the people, one vote on European level to vote for his own representative in the European Parliament, national representative on the parliament, and then a second vote to express the European concerns, the European challenges that are at stake.

And the most important point of this side, and I think Sven Simon has quietly underlined it, is this is also to avoid the catastrophe – may I say that? – of 2019. In 2019, when the Parliament was an outsider, I should say, in the designation, the nomination of the leading figure of the European Union, the President of the Commission. By this system, there will be a democratisation of the Spitzenkandidat. There will be votes for the Spitzenkandidat, and it will be impossible in my opinion, dear colleagues, that the Council will choose somebody else, will nominate somebody else than the Spitzenkandidat who has won the elections in 2024.

That is what is at stake, with the balance between big Member States, small Member States and medium Member States. So for those who are still hesitating, this is in fact an historical and existential file for Europe and for the European project.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

President. – Just before the next speaker, Mr Rangel has asked for a blue card, which is not typically used in the first round of speakers, but feel free to have the floor for 30 seconds, as Mr Verhofstadt agrees.

Paulo Rangel (PPE), *blue-card speech*. – Mr President, first I would like only to say that I don't know why someone forgot that in 2018 this idea was repealed by this House by a huge majority. And this was not said by the rapporteur, which is a false thing. In 2018, this idea was repealed.

But what I would like to ask you is, where did you see a link between the lead candidate and transnational lists? Because when I read the piece of legislation, there is not one word about your lead candidate. I see it in recitals, I see it in the resolution, but not in the text of the law. And so this is false, that to have a lead candidate we need transnational lists. That is false. And I would like you to quote me what is the article in the piece of legislation where this is written?

Guy Verhofstadt (Renew), *blue-card answer*. – On the first point it is a different file from the file in 2018, because for good reasons you have voted against it because there was no balance between big Member States, medium Member States and small Member States. Well, we, especially in Domènec's report, have taken that as the basis for the proposal, so making a balance between the Member States so that that argument that you have used, with right reasons, doesn't exist anymore.

Second point: the second point is that you cannot put that in that file in the electoral law. Therefore, it is in the recital. And in the recital we explain very clearly what the engagement is of this Parliament, that we will never designate, nominate, a President of the Commission who has not been a lead candidate – lead candidate on this transnational list.

Damian Boeselager, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, 18 years ago today, 10 countries joined the European Union in enlarging the ‘original club’. And I think what we have learned and seen over the last 20 years is that basically, the backroom deals between chancellors, prime ministers and presidents do not work anymore. And why is that? Because they are too non-transparent, and they’re inefficient.

And so what we need to do now in this mandate as well is to give a voice to European citizens. And this is exactly what the second vote does. It gives a second voice to citizens, allowing them to actually express what kind of Europe they want. Is it a more restrictive Europe, a conservative Europe, where migration is a bit curbed, where you have more money for small and medium-sized businesses, and money for Europol? Or is it a more social Europe, where you have minimum wages and I don’t know what? Or is it more liberal, or is it more bold, whatever kind of Europe they want. So you dare more democracy, you don’t take a single thing away from citizens – you give them a vote.

So don’t listen to those people who tell you it’s otherwise. Don’t listen to those who say, ‘28 people, they are so far away from the citizens’. That’s not what this is about. It’s about bringing European parties closer to citizens; that they can, actually, for the first time in their lives, vote for them, say: I like this European programme, I like this European candidate, I like this European party, I want this. Currently, they can’t. And so this is what this is about.

Don’t listen to the people who say, ‘oh, the small and medium-sized Member States, they won’t have a voice’. This is not true. In the first place, if you look at Europe, small and medium Member States field the biggest and most prominent figures already. But it’s not only that. In the file, as Verhofstadt also said, there are enough conditions in there to ensure that this is not the case. So don’t listen to them.

This is really about all of us thinking, as a Parliament, how can we ensure that we can make the step towards a European parliamentary democracy, how we can dare more democracy? And that’s why I would really ask you to vote in favour.

There are other positive elements, we have heard about them. There’s voting age 16, and this is an indication which is positive. There’s a better gender representation with quotas and zipped lists, and there’s a lot more positive in there that is in regard to minimum standards.

But there’s also one really negative element in there and I have to mention this. We introduce a threshold of 3.5% for Germany, which, from my perspective, is really sad and bad. I have not heard a single sound argument why this is needed. There’s not a single sound argument out there, and it does take away five million votes from European citizens. That is as much as the smallest five Member States together.

I would still ask you to vote in favour, even though it reduces my likelihood of getting re-elected, because I think it’s so important that we give citizens a voice, and that we dare more democracy with the second vote.

Gerolf Annemans, *namens de ID-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, ik zal Guy Verhofstadt niet ontgoochelen. Dit verslag past in wat ik de “Brexitparadox” noem. Het leek mij logisch dat de voorstanders van een verdere machtsuitbreiding van de gecentraliseerde eenheidsstaat die de Europese Unie wordt genoemd, zich na het vertrek van een grote en belangrijke lidstaat als het Verenigd Koninkrijk zouden bezinnen over de vraag of ze niet te ver zijn gegaan, of de bevolking van de Europese Unie wel achter het concept staat en of er niet gestreefd moet worden naar een evenwichtigere verhouding met het verlangen van de meeste Europese burgers naar nationale identiteit.

De elite in het Europees Parlement, aangevoerd door Guy Verhofstadt, en in de Europese Commissie heeft daarentegen in een soort paniecreactie het omgekeerde gedaan. De ridders van de Europese staat en het Europese wereldrijk zijn in een kramp geschoten en hebben in enkele jaren tijd de macht en de bevoegdheden zodanig uitgebreid dat we nu welhaast kunnen spreken van een onomkeerbare toestand: Europese schulden, Europese belastingen, de vervanging van de lidstaten door een meerderheidsbeginsel, volksgezondheid, de uitbouw van een militair complex, de organisatie van onbeperkte immigratie en de vervolging van lidstaten die hier niet in meegaan. Deze zaken zijn in de afgelopen jaren in versneld tempo ingevoerd, uit vrees voor het ontwaken van de publieke opinie.

Als kers op de taart wil de Europese Unie ook nog een eigen verkiezingssysteem invoeren. Zij plaatst daarmee de wijze waarop lidstaten tot nu toe, volgens hun eigen politiek-culturele inzichten, hun afgevaardigden in het Europees Parlement konden en mochten verkiezen, onder haar toezicht. Daarnaast wordt een beginsel in het leven geroepen van volksvertegenwoordigers die niet meer namens hun eigen volk, maar enkel nog namens de Europese Unie zetelen. Voor mensen zoals ik, die liever wat bezinning hadden gewenst over de richting waarin de Europese samenwerking moet evolueren – een kwestie van historisch belang – is dit verslag geen goed nieuws.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от илето на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, категорично съм против този доклад, разбира се. Той е поредно доказателство и пореден пример за това как в тази зала има хора, които живеят съвсем на различно място, извън живия живот. Този доклад ясно показва, че продължава да се мисли в схемите на неправителствени организации и да се мисли в посока на това да се отнеме суверенитет от националните държави и да се даде на неправилни организации, да се даде на хора, които не са отговорни пред никого.

Да не говорим, че този доклад нарушава – категорично нарушава – и Договорите. Възможно е броят на европейските представители от една държава да наруши и да излезе извън рамките на тези договори. Това ясно показва едно нещо – тук в тази зала продължавате да си мислите, че светът се върти около вас, което обаче не е вярно. А изборителното право трябва да остане в националните държави, в националните демокрации и в гражданите, защото те са отговорни, те избират, те живеят в собствените си държави и няма нужда някой да им казва отвън как да живеят и как да не живеят.

Така че съм категорично против този доклад, той е вреден и той върви към катастрофа.

Leila Chaibi, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais d'abord féliciter mon collègue Domènec Ruiz Devesa pour cet excellent rapport. Je ne vais pas revenir sur un des sujets majeurs qui fait débat, qui est celui des listes transnationales, mais je voudrais revenir sur un autre élément.

Vous constaterez que, dans ce rapport, il est fait mention de la possibilité d'avoir des listes alternées femmes, hommes, femmes, hommes, femmes, hommes. Alors les Français qui m'écoutent diront: «oui, et alors?». Et moi avant de travailler sur ce rapport, j'aurais été la première à dire: «oui, et alors?» Parce qu'en France, les listes alternées, c'est la norme, c'est la loi. Toutes nos élections se déroulent par scrutin de listes alternées et personne de tous les bords de l'échiquier politique ne remet cela en question car ça permet d'assurer une représentation à peu près égale des deux genres dans les fonctions électives.

Et franchement, je n'aurais jamais cru que revendiquer des listes alternées fasse de moi une Simone de Beauvoir. Eh bien au contraire. Quand le sujet a commencé à être évoqué dans les négociations, certains ont hurlé au scandale. Donc, au final, les listes alternées sont mentionnées dans ce rapport, mais seulement à titre indicatif, comme une possibilité. Et c'est bien dommage que cela ne soit pas obligatoire, car cela aurait permis de rééquilibrer la proportion de députées européennes par rapport à la proportion de députés européens. Et cela sachant que 21 pays sur 27 envoient plus de députés européens que de députées européennes ici dans cet hémicycle, et que certains pays n'ont aucune femme élue au Parlement européen.

Alors je vous avoue que je me pose une question: la commission des affaires constitutionnelles dans laquelle nous avons négocié ce rapport est la moins paritaire du Parlement européen. Est-ce que j'ai l'esprit tordu de penser qu'il y a un lien avec le fait que les listes alternées aient été l'objet de tant de polémiques? J'ai la tentation de croire que, si notre Assemblée avait été paritaire, les listes alternées auraient été une évidence.

Martin Sonneborn (NI). – Herr Präsident! Liebe Kollegen von den ehemaligen Volksparteien, zum wiederholten Male versuchen Sie nun schon, eine unseriöse Wahlrechtsreform durchzuboxen, um in Deutschland zu den Europawahlen eine 3,5 %-Hürde einzuführen. Das greift vor allem unser Grundgesetz und das Bundesverfassungsgericht an, das eine solche Sperrklausel bereits 2011 und 2014 abgelehnt hat. Das Bundesverfassungsgericht ist neben dem HSV und Rheinmetall die letzte deutsche Institution, die in der Bevölkerung noch einen Hauch von Ansehen genießt. Und nun will die Groko Haram das EU-Recht missbrauchen, um das höchste deutsche Gericht zu umgehen und sich die Mandate von sieben kleineren Parteien anzueignen?

Wie wollen Sie Polen und Ungarn von der Schönheit unseres EU-Rechts überzeugen, wenn Sie es hier dazu missbrauchen, um demokratische Standards zu senken? Moment: Das würde Viktor Orbán und der polnischen PiS-Partei sogar gefallen. Ich ziehe den letzten Satz zurück.

Ich fordere Sie nachdrücklich auf, hier keine verfassungswidrigen Gesetze einzubringen. Wir sind schließlich nicht in Bayern – Verfassungsschutz. Smiley.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Mr President, this electoral law is a bad electoral law because, instead of reinforcing democracy, it puts the citizens further away from their representatives. This is a bad law because it will create two kinds of MEPs: the ones that feel themselves Europeans and the others that will be the locals. And this is unacceptable to a parliament.

This idea of transnational lists has nothing to do with lead candidates, as we see when we read the piece of legislation, because we have lead candidates in all our countries and we don't have nationwide constituencies. This is not a federalist idea, it's anti-federalist, because I don't know any federation where there is a federal constituency. Not the United States, not in Switzerland. And I am not going to say that they are anti-American or they cannot represent the United States because they are elected in Texas or they are elected in Nevada.

This is something that we should bear in our minds: that we should be closer to the citizens. That is the most important principle of democracy. And transnational lists break this principle.

That is the reason why I'm very pro-European, Mr Verhofstadt, and I cannot accept that someone says that those who are against transnational lists are not pro-European or are not federalist. It's quite the opposite: it's those who want devolution and to be close to the citizens who are against this electoral law. It is a bad project and I hope it will not be approved.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE), *blue-card speech*. – Paolo, there's no animal like the EU, so you won't find any comparisons in other systems. The second point, on bringing European citizens closer; you change nothing by just giving them a second vote. How can that bring citizens further away from the European Union the first time they can actually vote for a European party that you're part of? And third, on the Spitzenkandidat, there is no system on this earth where the Spitzenkandidat is actually registered in the law. So this is in Germany – I don't think in any other system – this is by practice, so why do you think that this is worse than, for example, the German system?

Paulo Rangel (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – But if you look at all the systems, you have the lead candidate without any constituency. I see my prime minister was elected in at least one constituency and Mr Boris Johnson was in a very local constituency. And this was not a problem. Why do you need a European-wide constituency?

And second, let me say, I am a federalist and I want Europe to be a federation, and that's the reason why I am against transnational lists, because they are not a federal instrument. They are a centralisation instrument.

This is not by chance. It is normally the MEPs from the big countries that are in favour of that because they know that their rate will be much higher. And it's in representing also the small and medium sized countries that I'm here defending this position.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Daniel Freund (Verts/ALE), *blue-card speech*. – Mr President, for the last two years, Paolo Rangel has argued against the transnational lists. But what I actually want to ask you is, what is your alternative? You campaigned for Manfred Weber, I suppose, in the last European election. He was dismissed in the Council. And I guess most of your voters had no idea who he is, couldn't vote for him. There wasn't a single election poster for him in Portugal. So how can this not be a good idea?

And on that question of not giving a chance to small countries, there have been three presidents of the European Commission from Luxembourg. Isn't it time to also give larger countries a bit of a chance for Commission Presidency?

Paulo Rangel (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – In fact, you cannot complain because the President of the Commission is German now. But let me tell you something that is very clear. I always defended that the European parties were on the ballots, in the ballot papers at home, across all Europe. Now, with this system and, by the way, I defend the direct election of the President of the Commission, that will be a different system but it would be much more democratic than the transnational lists. And, you know, I have a fear with transnational lists, because imagine in Italy, an Italian on the Socialist list, but not an Italian in the EPP or the Greens list, and this will create a nationalistic debate about the transnational lists and it will be counterproductive. And that is something that you should bear in mind.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i cittadini chiedono un'Europa più forte che faccia pagare le tasse alle grandi multinazionali e alla finanza speculativa, che fermi la catastrofe climatica, che garantisca sicurezza e protezione da minacce alla salute, ma anche dal nuovo spettro della guerra. In tutti questi campi le sfide da affrontare si declinano sempre più sul piano transnazionale.

Per questo, per rafforzare il legame tra i territori e le dinamiche globali, è fondamentale la possibilità di votare direttamente per il candidato Presidente della Commissione europea, presentato da ciascuno dei partiti politici all'interno di una lista paneuropea transnazionale di 28 parlamentari.

In questo modo sì, rafforziamo la dimensione europea delle elezioni, insieme alla possibilità per gli Stati membri di far votare i sedicenni, oltre al rafforzamento della parità di genere. Dobbiamo votare per questa riforma. In questo modo possiamo costruire insieme una democrazia europea più forte.

Pascal Durand (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, je remercie M^{me} Jourová d'avoir dit ce qu'elle a dit au nom de la Commission. Je tiens à vous remercier. Évidemment Domènec et tous mes tous mes collègues savent à quel point je les salue et je salue leur travail. Mais je tiens à remercier la Commission parce que vous aviez dit dès le départ de la Conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe que vous faisiez du respect de ce qui allait être proposé par les citoyennes et les citoyens européens la condition de la poursuite de notre travail.

Et vous avez effectivement rappelé que, dans la Conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe, la question des listes transnationales – mais si, mon cher Paulo, on y reviendra – la question de rendre l'Europe plus démocratique a effectivement été évoquée et est sortie du groupe de travail sur la démocratie. Donc nous allons en débattre. Et, cher Paulo, n'ayez pas peur, n'ayez pas peur, la démocratie, le fait que des citoyennes et des citoyens puissent s'exprimer, puissent voter, puissent se considérer comme européens! Quelle horreur! Quelle horreur! Des gens se considèrent français, espagnols, portugais, mais aussi européens et ils vont avoir l'opportunité de le dire démocratiquement dans une urne.

Et oui, l'Europe n'est pas un État, alors ne cherchons pas des comparaisons qui sont compliquées. Mais moi je vais en prendre une très simple: qui connaît – rien que le nom déjà – le Spitzenkandidat au Portugal? Qui a voté pour M. Weber au Portugal? Qui a voté pour M. Timmermans? Personne, et pourtant on veut en faire le président de la Commission!

Et bien non. La démocratie veut que nous sortions de 27 élections nationales et que nous y ajoutions une élection européenne pour choisir démocratiquement l'avenir de l'Union européenne.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une intervention «carton bleu»)

Paulo Rangel (PPE), *intervention «carton bleu»*. – Monsieur le Président, je dois dire que j'ai déjà parlé effectivement mais j'aime ce débat car c'est un débat parlementaire. Pour la première fois, je vois un débat parlementaire ici, et ça, c'est très bon. Je veux seulement poser une question à Pascal Durand. Est-ce que les États-Unis ne sont pas une démocratie? Est-ce que la Suisse n'est pas une démocratie? Est-ce que nous avons besoin de créer cette figure artificielle des listes transnationales pour avoir une représentation, une vraie démocratie en Europe? C'est ça le problème de l'Europe? Je pense que non.

Pascal Durand (Renew), réponse «carton bleu». – Paulo, je le répète, l'Europe n'est pas un État. L'Europe est une construction démocratique sui generis et nous avons la nécessité de créer un corpus européen, une citoyenneté européenne, de partager. Nous avons des valeurs, nous avons une histoire européenne extrêmement riche, extrêmement importante. Elle a des millénaires.

Nous devons créer ce corps et nous pouvons le faire à travers les élections. Et ce que nous n'avons pas et que les États-Unis ont, ce sont des partis transétatiques parce que oui, on vote au Texas, en Californie, mais on vote pour le représentant de l'État des États-Unis. Donc, c'est ça que nous voulons faire et nous le ferons ensemble. J'en suis sûr, on va le faire.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une intervention «carton bleu»)

Maria Grapini (S&D), intervenție de tip „cartonaș albastru”. – Eu am o nelămurire.

Appreciez modul în care s-a pledat. Este într-adevăr o dezbatere vie, ca să zic așa, dar întrebarea mea este: nu credeți, domnule Durand, că ar fi trebuit întâi să avem aprobată cetățenia europeană și după aceea să avem liste, circumscripție electorală europeană? Pentru că s-a blocat la Consiliu. De ce nu avem noi acum? Așa mi s-a spus când am intrat, așa mi s-a spus în țara mea: o să fii cetățean român, dar o să fii și cetățean european. Și iată că Consiliul au blocat acest lucru. Și iată că, din acest motiv, în Spania, de exemplu, cetățenii români nu pot să primească cetățenie spaniolă și să își păstreze și cetățenia. Dacă era cetățenie europeană, totul era rezolvat.

Pascal Durand (Renew), réponse «carton bleu». – Donc, si je comprends bien, la question est: pourquoi n'y a-t-il pas une citoyenneté européenne en plus des situations nationales? C'est-à-dire, pourquoi est-ce qu'on n'aurait pas un passeport européen en plus des cartes d'identité? Pourquoi est-ce qu'on n'aurait pas des citoyens texans et californiens qui sont en même temps citoyens américains? Eh bien, je partage à 100 % votre proposition. Et oui, je défends le fait que nous ayons un passeport européen et je défends le fait que nous conservions des cartes nationales d'identité.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, ne pouvons-nous pas apprendre de l'histoire et du temps présent? La guerre en Ukraine qui nous concerne tous, cette crise énergétique inextricable, les alertes du rapport du GIEC qui montrent l'absurdité de penser les solutions dans les limites des États nations, c'est la sixième limite planétaire qui vient d'être franchie sur neuf et nos conditions de vie commune sont gravement mises en danger.

Mais cette démocratie européenne reste immature, incohérente, sans représentants européens élus directement par toutes les citoyennes et tous les citoyens. Les chefs de gouvernement et les médias des États membres ne parlent que de politique nationale et, sans surprise, électeurs et électrices ignorent beaucoup de l'évolution des lois qui ont pourtant un impact sur leur vie et qui se décident parfois sans eux, bien que nous soyons nombreux ici, on vient de le prouver, à essayer de faire vivre un débat européen. Et le sentiment d'appartenance à cet espace européen ne s'intensifie pas, la confiance dans un destin commun non plus, l'adhésion à un projet fédérateur non plus.

La proposition du Parlement est de 28 membres sur les listes transnationales, c'est trop peu, mais c'est indispensable. Si ce Parlement choisit encore une fois la concurrence entre les peuples et une vision étriquée de la citoyenneté européenne, nous prenons le risque de perdre encore des décennies face à la détérioration des droits et des libertés ou face aux ravages du dérèglement climatique.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Herr Präsident, Vertreter der Kommission! Im Vorgriff auf die EU-Zukunftskonferenz und den EU-Bundesstaat will dieses Haus das EU-Wahlrecht hier gleich mehrfach reformieren. Erstens, durch transnationale Listen: Fortan wählen wir bei Europawahlen keine vertrauten nationalen, sondern unbekannte EU-Parteien. Deutsche oder Niederländer stimmen für Portugiesen oder Malteser, während Griechen von Iren oder Finnen vertreten werden. Es ist eine Situation wie in Indien nach 1948. Abgeordnete sprechen Englisch, sodass ihre Wähler sie nicht verstehen; nur dass Inder durchweg besser Englisch sprechen als viele hier *Globish*.

Zweitens soll die betrugsanfällige Briefwahl nun EU-weit eingeführt werden. Drittens soll das Wahlalter auf 16 Jahre herabgesetzt werden. Ich weiß schon, warum: Sie meinen, die wählten alle stramm links. Aber seien Sie vorsichtig: Marine Le Pen gewann vor acht Tagen nicht nur die Stimmenmehrheit bei Arbeitern und mittleren Angestellten, sondern auch bei den Jugendlichen. Viertens, all der Quoten-Klimbim; aber niemand wird ein besserer Abgeordneter, nur weil er, sie, es Frau ist oder man sich nicht entscheiden kann.

Ach, es ist alles sehr offensichtlich, was ich hier sage. Ich wünschte, ich könnte origineller sein, aber leider ist die Wahrheit nicht immer interessant.

Beata Mazurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Idea wprowadzenia ponadnarodowych list kandydatów na posłów do Parlamentu Europejskiego narusza art. 14 Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej, który wyraźnie mówi, że to państwa członkowskie otrzymują mandaty. Artykuł ten precyzyjnie stanowi, że żadnemu państwu członkowskiemu nie można przydzielić więcej niż 96 miejsc. Dlatego wprowadzenie ogólnounijnego systemu wyborów rażąco narusza postanowienia Traktatu. Gdyby jedno państwo otrzymało więcej niż 96 miejsc, to dodatkowo zaburzy różnorodność Unii Europejskiej i w konsekwencji będzie faworyzować duże państwa.

To propozycja, która nadaje pozatraktatowe uprawnienia, dalej posuwa agendę federalistyczną i narusza traktatową zasadę pomocniczości. Propozycja rezolucji oburza też z innych powodów: mianowicie zapis jej mówiący o tym, iż każdy obywatel powyżej 18. roku życia powinien móc głosować i mieć prawo do kandydowania, z zaleceniem wprowadzenia minimalnego wieku uprawniającego do głosowania na poziomie 16 lat. Czy Państwa zdaniem 16-latkowie są na tyle dojrzały emocjonalnie, żeby wybierać osoby reprezentujące ich w Unii Europejskiej?

Jako ECR sprzeciwiamy się tej rezolucji. Jako członek Prawa i Sprawiedliwości również tej rezolucji nie popieram i my wszyscy nie popieramy.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, a presente iniciativa integra-se no caminho de aprofundamento federalista da União Europeia, procurando imiscuir-se em competências dos Estados, na sua organização do ato eleitoral e tradições eleitorais próprias. Daqui rejeitamos a criação de um círculo eleitoral comum e listas transnacionais para as eleições para o Parlamento Europeu, que, além de acentuar desequilíbrios e distorções já hoje existentes, representaria uma criação artificial sem correspondência com a realidade na Europa ou com os interesses dos povos, que contribuirá para um maior afastamento de eleitores e eleitos e que nos afasta de um projeto de cooperação entre Estados soberanos e iguais em direitos.

Criar melhores condições para uma mais genuína expressão da vontade de cada povo e pluralidade de representação de cada Estado-Membro deve ser alcançado através de uma redistribuição de número de mandatos por Estado-Membro no Parlamento Europeu, compensando aqueles que, em termos relativos, mais mandatos perderam no contexto dos sucessivos processos de alargamento e que mais foram prejudicados pela desequilibrada distribuição de mandatos fixada pelo Tratado de Lisboa.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovani kolege, dragi građani Europske unije, kada sam se prije dvije godine kandidirao na europskim izborima vjerovao sam da me čeka vrhunac demokracije i poštivanje prava.

Danas nažalost znam da to nije tako. Izborni sustav koji se ovdje stvara osmišljen je za uski politički kartel koji s građanima Europske unije nema nikakve veze. Zajedno s kolegama iz devet država Europske unije prije deset mjeseci podnijeli smo zahtjev za registraciju europske političke stranke. U tom postupku, Tijelo za europske političke stranke teško krši sve propise Europske unije i uopće odbija donijeti odluku u našem zahtjevu, već deset mjeseci, iako je zakonski rok od 30 dana. Deset puta su ga prekršili.

Nakon svega, meni je potpuno jasno da je jednostavnije u Putinovoj Rusiji registrirati antiputinovsku stranku nego u Europskoj uniji europsku političku stranku, proeuropski orijentiranu.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Mr President, I'm really enjoying this discussion. I hope we can actually bring it to our constituents in the Member States but I do believe the moment I begin talking about transnational lists back home, you know, there will be a big silence. The discussion just goes dead, that is the reality. And that's why I want to say, as a convinced European, that transnational lists are creating a problem rather than fixing it.

If I am to be blunt, transnational lists are a problematic solution to a problem that did not exist to begin with. Transnational lists go against the very principle of European unity and equality of European citizens. They could create a division among MEPs based on their constituencies, creating confusion as to which constituencies are represented by which MEPs. This whole notion could add more distance between the elected transnational MEPs and their voters. It would, in turn, create questions about the legitimacy of the elected MEPs and the applicability of their vote. Possibly, it could trigger a discussion on European versus local MEPs, thus creating an additional dividing line in European politics.

Indeed, I could go on and on, but I think this concept only deepens divisions in Europe, and this is the fundamental problem. I don't see any valid data that would tell us otherwise, and we don't have any examples from other political systems. We can always argue Europe is *sui generis*. It is! But let's not experiment.

Let's look at practical solutions, how we can bring more voters to the European elections in 2024. I'm saying this as somebody, who is coming from a country that has seen the lowest turnout in European elections, and I can tell you convincingly, transnational lists are not going to resolve the problem. We should rather strive to bring Europe closer to our citizens by honest and diligent political work, not by creating transnational lists.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Daniel Freund (Verts/ALE), *blue-card speech*. – I wanted to ask, I mean, we're elected today in two different constituencies. You're elected in Slovakia, I'm elected in Germany. I could argue now that my constituency is slightly larger than the one that you were elected in and yet we have the exact same rights, powers, our vote counts exactly the same. So how do you think that Members elected on a transnational list would be any different from that?

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – The answer is very simple. We are elected on a single list. With two lists, you create two different classes of MEPs, two different classes of candidates, two different classes of people running for political office, and that is the problem. You also create different constituencies. At the moment, my country is a single electoral district. Very simple, very clear. This sort of revolution would not make – believe me – a positive difference when it comes to participation in European elections and a tie and connection between those who vote and those who are elected.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE), *blue-card speech*. – My question is in regard to the European parties. I mean, how many of your voters really know the EPP? That's my first question. And the second question is: if you don't like the transnational list system, what is your idea of improving the European Union? Because we have already lost one Member State, the United Kingdom. We need to get more democratic. What's your idea of improving the European Union?

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – I don't think transnational lists are going to improve the European Union. We can lose any other Member State because of the way we don't connect our domestic politics to European issues and European agenda to domestic politics. And this is not going to be done through transnational lists.

Well, we have to be actively engaged. We have to have a much longer, much more massive campaign. We have to have a permanent campaign in our constituencies and bring the issues back to our voters. Talk to our voters, connect with them, and do this through diligent work, not through social engineering, such as transnational lists.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Mr President, the reform of the European electoral law proposed by our colleague Domènec Ruiz Devesa goes far beyond transnational lists, has many positive aspects and deserves our vote in favour.

But not all proposals are so good as they might seem, and that's the case of transnational lists. First, it would be an artificial democratic exercise to ask electors to choose between lists of foreign politicians that they simply do not know. Secondly, in a single EU-wide constituency, the eligible seats will always stand to benefit those countries with more population to the prejudice of others, no matter what safeguard mechanisms we can invent. And, thirdly, it would be absolutely misleading to create the illusion of a direct election of the President of the Commission, when we all know that the rules of the Treaty of Lisbon will remain in place, meaning that the President will be elected by secret ballot in this Chamber and under proposal of the Council.

Nevertheless, as I said, the proposal has many positive aspects and as a whole, it will deserve our support.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Helmut Geuking (PPE), *Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Glauben Sie persönlich, dass dieses Gesetz rechtsverbindlich ist? Ich kann die Rechtmäßigkeit nicht erkennen und die Rechtsverbindlichkeit auch nicht. In Sachen Spitzenkandidaten: in einer Erwägung – das reicht bei weitem nicht aus. Zweitens natürlich: Die Prozent-Klausel wurde speziell für Deutschland gemacht – Sie haben es vorher schon gehört. Halten Sie das für demokratisch, dass die großen Parteien sich hier massiv die Sitze der kleinen Parteien aneignen, um noch mehr Einfluss zu bekommen? Auch auf den transnationalen Listen werden sich die großen Parteien wiederfinden, nicht die kleinen Parteien. Das heißt, Sie stärken Ihre Machtposition hier im Europäischen Parlament. Halten Sie diesen Weg für richtig? Oder sagen Sie auch mit mir, nein gegen das, was da vorliegt?

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – I recognise the efforts made by the rapporteur to address the issue: the concerns of smaller and medium-sized countries. But the real problem is that the mechanism proposed doesn't solve the issue because inside even the group of medium-sized countries, of course there is a difference between those who have more population than the others.

So the eligible seats will tend to go more to the countries with more population, even inside the group of the medium-sized countries. So, in the end, it remains unfair and it changes the representation of our population, of our citizens here in the European Parliament.

Sandro Gozi (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, tout d'abord c'est un beau débat, je crois que nous pouvons être satisfaits.

L'idée de listes transnationales a été plébiscitée à la Conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe et ce Parlement s'est engagé à donner suite aux demandes des citoyens. En effet, les citoyens ont raison, ils voient plus loin que nous, je trouve, car la démocratie européenne ne peut plus être prisonnière d'une logique strictement nationale et seulement des 27 débats nationaux. Les listes n'enlèvent rien à personne, mais elles doublent le pouvoir de choix démocratique des citoyens qui pourront voter sur deux listes: l'une nationale, l'autre transnationale.

Ils pourront aussi choisir la présidence de la Commission. Sur ce point, notre position est claire: il ne peut y avoir une tête de liste candidate à la présidence de la Commission que si nous pouvons voter les listes. Pas de listes, pas de tête de listes. C'est élémentaire mon cher Paulo Rangel. Comme en 2019, les listes nationales sont un pas nécessaire, elles sont aussi un test. Lors de l'élection de la Présidente Metsola, un accord de mi-mandat a été signé et les listes en sont une priorité. Les groupes se sont engagés à les respecter: *pacta sunt servanda*.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une intervention «carton bleu»)

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), *wystąpienie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Moje pytanie jest następujące: Ponieważ Pan reprezentuje Renew jako bardzo znaczącą siłę polityczną w Parlamencie Europejskim, przypuszczam, że dyskutowaliście Państwo z ekspertami z zakresu psychologii rozwojowej, psychologii dziecięcej, psychologii młodzieżowej. Chciałem zapytać o ten wiek – 16 lat. Czy rzeczywiście uważa Pan osobiście i czy ma Pan na to jakieś dowody, że ta grupa osób, która będzie miała prawo wyborcze, umiejętnie i odpowiedzialnie z niego skorzysta? Chciałbym, żeby Pan podał po prostu jakiś przykład ekspertów, których wykorzystywaliście do tego, żeby zaproponować taki wiek wyborczy.

Sandro Gozi (Renew), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Tout d'abord l'âge de seize ans, ce n'est pas une obligation cher collègue, c'est une option. Dans certains États membres, le droit de vote est à partir de seize ans et dans d'autres c'est à 18 ans. S'il y a des États qui veulent choisir cette possibilité d'accorder le droit de vote à seize ans pour les élections européennes, grâce à cette loi électorale, ils pourront le faire. Les États membres qui ne souhaitent pas aller dans ce sens pourront garder le droit de vote à 18 ans ou à un autre âge. Donc, du moment qu'on laisse le libre choix et étant donné qu'il y a des États dans lesquels on peut déjà voter à seize ans, je ne vois vraiment pas où est le problème.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une intervention «carton bleu»)

Paulo Rangel (PPE), *intervention «carton bleu»*. – Monsieur le Président, avant tout, je dois dire que je ne comprends pas l'interprétation des conclusions de la conférence. J'étais dans le groupe de travail et j'ai entendu les citoyens dire que ce n'était pas le cas. Et dans les conclusions, c'est très clair qu'il y a une double vision parce qu'il est question de l'élection directe du président de la Commission, c'est dans les conclusions écrites que nous avons approuvées ici.

Seulement une question: quel est le rôle du Conseil dans ce modèle? Le Conseil c'est un organe antidémocratique. Ne serait-il pas plus rationnel de changer le traité et de dire que le Parlement nomme le président et le Conseil donne son consentement? Ça serait vraiment la réforme en faveur du candidat de tête de liste.

Sandro Gozi (Renew), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Cher Paulo, je suis sûr que là, on en est en train de débattre de bonne foi. Et si on fait un débat de bonne foi, tu peux bien rappeler à nos chers collègues que, dans les panels de citoyens, les citoyens avaient demandé carrément d'élire la moitié des membres de cette plénière en votant directement pour des partis politiques européens. Tu ne peux pas dire le contraire parce que c'est dans les panels de citoyens, et tu pourrais être démenti facilement.

Le deuxième point, c'est que les conclusions de la conférence, clairement, indiquent le souhait des citoyens d'élire une partie des membres de ce parlement sur des listes transnationales. Donc, lorsque j'ai dit et rappelé que les citoyens nous demandent ça, j'ai dit exactement la vérité et je crois que ce Parlement devrait respecter son engagement et y donner suite.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une intervention «carton bleu»)

Sara Skyttedal (PPE), *blue-card speech*. – Mr President, as you know, the motto of the European Union is 'united in diversity'. And I really believe this is the strength of the European Union. And as you're all aware, there's also quite a diversity within our groups in the European Parliament. And this for a very good reason, I believe, because the message that I have as EPP from Sweden is probably different than the one representative from EPP in Germany or in Portugal, and so on.

So, I really believe that you're overestimating your electability in other countries. I really don't understand how someone representing Macron's party from Renew thinks that they could speak to a Swedish voter and tell them how they are elected. Or do you really believe that a major European message would be electable in a country other than yours?

Sandro Gozi (Renew), *blue-card answer*. – Thank you, colleague. No, colleague, I want to reassure you: I am Italian, elected in France, but I don't think I will be a candidate also in Sweden. But let me say that we don't take anything away from the Swedish system. Nothing will change for Sweden. Your voters will elect you, or others, exactly in the same way, only they will have an additional democratic choice, an additional democratic power. They will be able also to vote directly for the European People's Party. I don't think that today your voters can directly elect your European party. So we only increase democracy, nothing else.

Manuela Ripa (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Demokratie wird wieder heiß diskutiert. In der Ukraine wird nicht nur die Freiheit, sondern auch die Demokratie verteidigt. Warum verteidigen wir die Demokratie nicht auch hier im Europäischen Parlament? Demokratie bedeutet Partizipation. Stabile Demokratie bedeutet Partizipation aller. Unsere Gesellschaft ist vielfältiger geworden. Der Umgang mit Diversität ist zu einem Markenzeichen einer stabilen Demokratie geworden. Eine Prozenzhürde bei Europawahlen ist laut Bundesverfassungsgericht verfassungswidrig, denn sie ist ein schwerwiegender Eingriff in die Grundsätze der Wahlrechts- und der Chancengleichheit, und dies ist nicht zu rechtfertigen.

Es kann doch nicht die Aufgabe dieses Parlaments sein, den Wählerwillen von vornherein auszuschließen. Neue Prozenzhürden dienen nur dem Machterhalt großer Parteien, von denen sich die Menschen zunehmend abwenden. Wir brauchen keine künstliche Ausgrenzung von Wählerinnen und Wählern durch Prozenzhürden, zumal dies de facto nur für Deutschland gelten würde. Dieses Parlament sollte daher geschlossen für die Demokratie und gegen Prozenzhürden stimmen.

Laura Huhtasaari (ID). – Arvoisa puhemies, Euroopan unionin taloudellinen ja poliittinen eliitti haluaa keskittää vallan ylikansalliselle tasolle ja tuhota Euroopan kansallisvaltioiden identiteetit ja kulttuurit. Yksi askel tähän tavoitteeseen on eurooppalainen vaalilaki. Olen häkeltynyt, että EU-eliitille ei enää riitä Euroopan parlamentin vaalit, jotka ovat kokoelma kansallisia vaaleja. Nyt ollaan ajamassa EU:n laajuista vaalipiiriä sekä halutaan perustaa Euroopan vaaliviranomainen. EU:n suunta ei ole enää vain EU:n liittovaltio, vaan Euroopan yhtenäisvaltio.

EU haluaa mennä pidemmälle kuin mitä Amerikan yhdysvallat on tänä päivänä. Texasille ei tulisi kysymykseenkään, että kalifornialainen voisi äänestää texasilaisista ehdokkaista. Minä aion tehdä kaikkeni, että saksalainen ei tule valitsemaan ja äänestämään suomalaisia poliitikkoja.

Rakentavampi tapa toimia täällä EU:ssa olisi koordinoida eurovaaleja ja keskittyä teknisiin yksityiskohtiin, kuten vaalipäivän ja määräaikojen harmonisointiin. Jäsenvaltioille voisi tarjota kyllä hyviä esimerkkejä, jotka ne voisivat halutessaan ottaa käyttöön.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, de kiezer loopt iedere vijf jaar niet bepaald warm voor de Europese verkiezingen. Om daar verandering in te brengen, wordt ons sinds 2014 het Spitzenkandidatensysteem opgedrongen, in het kader waarvan pan-Europese lijsttrekkers door de EU trekken en campagne voeren. Zij debatteren met elkaar en keuzen wat, maar tot echte voeling met de burger komt het niet. De enige interesse die er is, komt vanuit de in zichzelf gekeerde EU-bubbel. We horen vaak dat de kloof tussen de burger en de politiek kleiner moet worden. Uw antwoord daarop is: laten we de kloof nog groter maken. Daarom kijken we nu naar transnationale kieslijsten, de zoveelste wanhopige zoektocht naar een Europese demos.

Wij hebben het voorstel aan de Nederlanders voorgelegd en dit vandaag gepubliceerd. Ik raad u aan hetzelfde te doen. Slechts drieëntwintig procent van de Nederlanders is enthousiast over dit idee. Aangezien u zelf niet tot het inzicht kunt komen, zal ik het voor u zeggen: mensen willen dit niet. Mensen hebben geen interesse in Euro-nationalistisch politiek optreden. Als we een sterke band tussen de kiezers en de verkozenen tot stand willen brengen, moeten we de afstand tussen hen zo klein mogelijk maken. Dit onbegrijpelijke voorstel doet het tegenovergestelde.

Helmut Scholz (The Left). – Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, lieber Berichterstatter! Danke für die Arbeit. Ja, die Veränderungen hin zu einer wirklichen europäischen Wahlgesetzgebung sind überfällig, und das zeigt die heutige Debatte, glaube ich, sehr eindrücklich und vor allen Dingen auch nach draußen in die Öffentlichkeit.

Sehr viele Bürgerinnen und Bürger wollen ein demokratisches und für jedermann verständliches und zur Mitgestaltung offenes Funktionieren Europas. Das hat die Zukunftskonferenz eindrucksvoll gezeigt, Kollegin Grapini, und auch ein Argument für die heutige Debatte geliefert. Und auch die Fraktion Die Linke sieht die Einführung EU-weiter Listen bei der nächsten Europawahl, das Herabsetzen des Wahlalters auf 16 Jahre, die Festlegung des 9. Mai als einheitlichen Wahltag und die so notwendige Herstellung von Geschlechtergerechtigkeit als entscheidende Schritte hin zu einem EU-weit einheitlichen Wahlgesetz.

Dass aber Sie, Kollege Simon, für die EVP die Einführung einer 3,5 %-Hürde für Deutschland de facto zur Vorbedingung für Ihre Zustimmung zu der hier heute so umstrittenen Frage der Einführung eines europäischen Wahlkreises und transnationaler Listen gemacht haben, wirft schon Fragen auf, vor allem, Herr Präsident, inwiefern das Wahlgesetz ein Mehr an aktiver und passiver politischer Beteiligung aller, gerade auch bis heute Ausgeschlossener, Kritischer, Enttäuschter liefert. Lehnen wir diesen Punkt in der Abstimmung ab!

Eero Heinäluoma (S&D). – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitokset esittelijä Domènec Ruiz Devesalle perusteellisesta työstä. Esityksessä on paljon kohtia, joista voi olla iloinen. Sellainen on esimerkiksi sukupuolten tasa-arvon huomioiminen vaalien ehdokasasettelussa.

Eurooppa-aatteen ohella vaalilakia uudistettaessa on syytä pitää muistissa toinenkin tärkeä periaate, ja se on läheisyysperiaate. Päätetään asiat mahdollisimman lähellä kansalaisia ja siirretään EU-päätöksentekoon – vaikkapa vaalilaissa ratkaistavaksi – asioita vain silloin kun niistä on lisäarvoa.

Jättäisin vaalien tarkan päivämäärän kansallisesti päätettäväksi jäsenvaltioissa. Me tiedämme, että on erilaisia äänestyspäivätaraditioita.

Ja ylikansalliset ehdokaslistat: pidetään mieluummin vaalit lähellä ihmisiä ja annetaan äänestäjille mahdollisuus valita ehdokkaista, jotka he todella tuntevat ja tietävät. Tällä on tietysti erityisen suuri merkitys pienten maiden, vaikkapa Suomen, Ruotsin tai Tanskan kannalta, joten toivon, että eri jäsenvaltioiden ja eri kansalaisten tarpeet huomioidaan, kun vaalilakia uudistetaan.

Ulrike Müller (Renew). – Herr Präsident! Natürlich wollen wir alle ein fortschrittliches Europawahlrecht. Mir erschließt sich allerdings noch nicht der Mehrwert der transnationalen Listen für die Bürger. Die Zukunft wird uns Antworten liefern.

Für mich undenkbar ist aber die Sperrklausel von 3,5 % für Kleinparteien in Deutschland. Parteien, die bei uns kommunal verwurzelt sind und aktiv in regionale Parlamente mit über 5 % gewählt wurden oder in Landesregierungen vertreten sind, sollen künftig mit einer Sperrklausel aus dem Europäischen Parlament ausgeschlossen werden. Die Freien Wähler insbesondere waren Mitglied bei der Europäischen Demokratischen Partei, bevor sie ins Europäische Parlament gewählt worden sind. Alle hier vertretenen Parteien machen hier solide demokratische Arbeit.

Deshalb bitte ich Sie um Zustimmung zum Änderungsantrag 26, der zusätzlich zum ausgehandelten Paket aufgenommen werden soll. Ansonsten sind künftig 5 Millionen Wählerstimmen ungültig. Dies ist weder demokratisch noch europäisch, sondern hilft nur den großen Parteien.

Roman Haider (ID). – Herr Präsident! Dieses Parlament könnte ja in diesen Zeiten der Krise, wo alles teurer wird, ein Signal der Sparsamkeit setzen und die durch den Brexit freigewordenen Parlamentssitze einfach einsparen. Das könnte man, macht man nur nicht.

Denn was fordern die vier Blockparteien hier in diesem Parlament – große Teile der Volkspartei, die Sozialisten, die sogenannten Liberalen und die Grünen? 28 zusätzliche Sitze für völlig sinnlose transnationale Listen, die auch gar kein Wähler will, und dazu natürlich noch mehr Geld für ihre Fraktionen, und auch noch eine neue EU-Wahlbehörde, die auch kein Mensch braucht.

Und dann will man auch noch den Parteien ihre Kandidatenlisten mittels Quoten vorschreiben. Das ist absolut demokratiefeindlich. Und natürlich soll dann auch noch gleich beim EU-Wahlrecht das Einstimmigkeitsprinzip im Rat abgeschafft werden. Das ist überhaupt das Lieblingsthema der Eurokraten und Zentralisierer. Dieses ganze Vorhaben ist eine Zumutung, eine Bürgerverhöhnung der Extraklasse.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Mr President, it is time to take the European Parliament to the next level and, indeed, it is time to take the European project to the next level, and this could not have come at a better time.

Citizens were given the opportunity to speak directly in this Chamber itself, and they told us the changes they want to see for the European Union to be closer to them, closer to citizens. And what a stronger signal than this: the strengthening of democracy with Parliament itself initiating this procedure now for the 2024 European elections.

And with these changes, we are not only proposing a second ballot with a small transnational list, voting to give European political direction, with a lead candidate to preside over the European Commission. But it also gives 16 year olds the right to vote. It works for gender equality in this Chamber, and gives stronger rights to people with all abilities to participate in our elections. Having the European demos strengthens each Member State because we are so much stronger when we are together.

Let us make history together tomorrow in our vote!

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Comissária, se tivéssemos dúvidas sobre a importância deste relatório, podemos olhar para o Eurobarómetro. Janeiro deste ano: 55% dos europeus consideram que o voto nas eleições europeias é a forma mais eficaz de a sua voz ser ouvida. Março de 2021: 19% dos europeus contra listas transnacionais, 42% a favor, 69% querem nas eleições europeias pronunciar-se sobre quem deve presidir à Comissão Europeia. Sistemáticamente pedimos mais transparência, mais democracia, mais poder de participação dos cidadãos.

As propostas do Parlamento Europeu neste relatório vão exatamente neste sentido. Não temos dúvidas dos desafios para os Estados-Membros, para a apropriação destes princípios, mas temos que fazer este caminho. Este relatório faz um esforço bem-sucedido para responder a problemas identificados há cinco anos.

Destaco dois: não fragilizar a representação dos pequenos e médios Estados-Membros e assegurar o equilíbrio de género. Por isso, apelo ao voto favorável no relatório, nas listas transnacionais e no processo transparência.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Sara Skyttedal (PPE). – Herr talman! Den gröna gruppen påstår att det är av omtanke om väljarna som man föreslår det här, men jag undrar vad det är för typ av väljare som ni träffar. När jag möter väljare i Sverige så talar de ofta om att vi Europaparlamentariker är långt borta från den verklighet som de befinner sig i, att vi saknar närheten till den vardag som folk lever i och att det leder till två konkreta problem: dels att vi fokuserar på fel frågor och lägger tid på saker som våra väljare helt enkelt struntar i, till exempel det här, men också att vi inte fullt ut förstår konsekvenserna av de beslut som vi fattar och hur de påverkar familjer och företag ute i verkligheten.

Hur kommer förslaget om transnationella listor att minska avståndet mellan väljare och politiker? Hur tror ni att det kommer att påverka politikerföraktet? Vilken väljare är det egentligen som har efterfrågat att få rösta på en italienare eller en finne i stället för en person från sitt eget land? Brysselbubblan är verklig. Låt oss försöka spräcka den i stället för att ta den allt längre bort från verklighetens folk.

Mónica Silvana González (S&D). – Señor presidente, estamos hablando de democracia, pero si una democracia no incluye a las personas con discapacidad, estará incompleta.

Tenemos que recordar que hay catorce Estados miembros en los que todavía más de 400 000 personas no pueden ejercer este derecho fundamental. Con esta reforma del Acta Electoral Europea haríamos que Europa fuese 400 000 veces mejor. En España lo hemos hecho: hemos reformado la Ley electoral para que voten las personas con discapacidad.

Estamos a tiempo y por eso les pido el favor de que mañana voten a favor de desvincular la capacidad jurídica del derecho fundamental del voto y que voten a favor de mejorar los colegios electorales y hacerlos accesible, no solamente físicamente, sino también sensorialmente.

Europa puede ser 400 000 veces mejor si incluimos a las personas con discapacidad. Esta reforma del Acta Electoral Europea lo hace. Pido el voto a favor.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señor presidente, las listas transnacionales solo tienen ventajas. No restan nada a los Estados, solo suman y aportarán aire fresco a un Parlamento al que ayudarán a evitar que se reproduzcan aquí debates nacionales.

Alcanzamos, además, un compromiso al respecto los grandes grupos del Parlamento. Nos acercan, además, a la ciudadanía porque europeas y europeos han propuesto esta reforma en la Conferencia sobre el Futuro de Europa porque la gente quiere elegir al presidente de la Comisión, el modo que tiene de expresar que cree en un «demos» europeo.

Apoyo esta idea desde la legitimidad de representar aquí a una formación empeñada en construir la Unión desde abajo, de propiciar que el País Vasco tenga aquí la voz, el reconocimiento y el papel que debe desempeñar en una Unión de la que somos fundadores.

Lo fuimos porque apostamos desde el principio por construirla desde toda su diversidad. Por eso nos oponemos a los porcentajes que puedan dejar fuera a naciones y culturas que son europeas.

Además, apoyamos las listas transnacionales que fortalezcan hacia arriba nuestra voluntad de convivir y cooperar. Eso significa vivir unidos en la diversidad. Por eso, hablar de centralismo, refiriéndose a los poderes de la Unión, es aquí una broma. Los centralistas son quienes se oponen hacia arriba a más Europa y reniegan hacia abajo de su propia diversidad.

Daniel Freund (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, if you break it down, what is democracy? Well, it is candidates running for an election based on a programme. And us MEPs have been elected like that since 1979. But the European Commission doesn't have that link yet. In the last election, ten of the Commissioners actually ran in the election, but Ursula von der Leyen was not on the ballot anywhere in Europe. There were 420 names on the ballot that I voted on in Germany, but Ursula von der Leyen wasn't on it, even Manfred Weber wasn't on it, because I live in a different state of Germany than he does.

And I, as an MEP, am not just elected to blindly defend the interests of the people in my hometown or the Germans that could vote for me. I'm here in this European Parliament to make laws that are good for all Europeans. So it's more than the sum of the 27. And to those now that say, like Paolo Rangel, let's elect the Commission President directly, I think that's a bad idea because it weakens this European Parliament, this House that I'm a proud Member of.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja chciałem zapytać i poprosić o jednoznaczną odpowiedź. Mianowicie chodzi o art. 14 Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej. Czy ten artykuł nie zostanie po prostu zburzony przez wprowadzenie dodatkowego – europejskiego – okręgu wyborczego? Proszę zatem powiedzieć – zwracam się do Pani Komisarz – czy ta nowa ordynacja nie działa przeciwko traktatom europejskim.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, there's no doubt about it, there's a huge disconnect between the citizens of Europe and the EU institutions. We see growing inequality, tiny numbers voting, even a country leaving. And what we have here is actually a technical fix to something that isn't a technical problem, because the reasons people aren't voting isn't because of shenanigans around the allocation or the breakdown of the way in which you divided the spoils or anything like that.

The reason is that there is a disconnect from the citizens because this is a neoliberal project which furthers the interests of big business ahead of the interests of citizens. And the citizens of Europe know that the Parliament isn't a real parliament. Its powers are very limited. It's a consensus factory really, a sideshow to the real power, which is wielded by the Council and where neoliberal governments can crush economies if it suits them.

We in Ireland remember the eurozone crisis and the iron rod of austerity. So until we address that, any voting arrangements you like isn't going to change that.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Nekatere elemente te spremembe te zakonodaje podpiram v tistem delu, ko govorimo o mlajših ljudeh, ki imajo dostop do volitev. Podpiram tudi, da omogočimo lažji dostop invalidom. Vsekakor pa sem zelo zadržan in nasprotujem transnacionalnim listam.

Mi smo vsi izvoljeni v državah. Imamo svoja volilna okrožja, nagovorimo volivce in potem tem volivcem tudi odgovarjamo. Vsak konec tedna sem ob petkih veliko med ljudmi in nihče me še ni doslej vprašal oziroma ogovoril s tem, da bi bila ta demokracija v Evropi boljša, če bi – ne vem – Slovenci zastopali nekdo iz Finske ali od kod drugod.

Mi smo združeni v politične skupine in tam lahko potem tudi svoje politične interese skupin zastopamo. Vsekakor pa to, kar je bilo rečeno v razpravi, da je to sedaj približek temu vodilnemu kandidatu in da to je porok, da bo vodilni kandidat tudi predsednik komisije, enostavno ne drži in je zavajajoče. Hvala.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Dezbateră din această seară arată că, de fapt, încă sunt foarte multe lucruri de clarificat și cred că este, din punctul meu de vedere, acum mai neclar decât a fost la începutul dezbaterii. Și am să spun câteva lucruri.

S-au spus aici argumente foarte mari: unele sunt tehnice, unele sunt politice. În primul rând, trebuie să se răspundă și poate doamna comisar să răspunsul. Ce facem cu articolul 14 din Tratat? Adică îl încălcăm sau nu? Trebuie să știm ce facem cu asta.

Al doilea: eu sunt dintr-o țară de 20 de milioane. Cetățenii dintr-o țară și mai mică, de exemplu Croația sau o altă țară mai mică, nu au posibilitatea să cunoască cele 27 de locuri. Și sunt mulți candidați pentru cele 28 de locuri din toate statele. Cum explicăm cetățenilor? S-a argumentat, aici că, mă rog, conferința cetățenilor ar fi optat pentru acest lucru. Întrebarea mea este câți dintre cetățeni au participat la această dezbatere? Nu cumva noi suntem mai reprezentativi pentru că avem în spate milioane de voturi, pentru că acum, când vorbim, ne votează o țară întreagă pe noi?

Și mai este un răspuns care ar trebui să se dea. Eu fac parte dintr-un partid mic care nu face parte dintr-o familie europeană. Partidele mici se exclud sau nu?

Da, susțin persoanele cu dizabilități, susțin egalitatea.

(Președintele întrerupe vorbitorul)

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, točno je što je rekao gospodin Verhofstadt da ovaj prijedlog neće ukinuti nacionalne liste.

Međutim, nije rekao činjenicu da će to oslabiti nacionalne liste. Naime, dosad se 100 % zastupnika biralo iz nacionalnih lista a sad će se taj postotak smanjiti jer će se neki određeni postotak zastupnika birati iz transnacionalnih lista. Prema tome, jednostavno to što govorite da nacionalne liste ništa neće izgubiti jednostavno logično matematički nije točno i nemojte to govoriti. Druga stvar, retorika jasno pokazuje da se nameću neki europski standardi, recimo da mogu glasati ljudi mlađi od 18 godina, od 16 pa nadalje što nije ingerencija Europske unije. I treće, kad govorimo što je dobro za demokraciju, dobro je da glasač pozna onoga za kojeg glasa a ja u Hrvatskoj mogu odgovorno reći da ljudi ne poznaju te ljude koji će voditi te liste, i zato jednostavno mi, ako je ono što je demokratski je da se glasa za nacionalne liste.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, the people advocating for this initiative claim they want more engagement from the citizens across Europe with the EU. But, I mean, how in God's name is this going to fix us?

Many people are asking, what is democracy? Democracy is where the people have a say in how their society is organised. There isn't much of it around. In Member States, it's been watered down dramatically by the weakening of local government – one of the best vehicles that the people had for connecting with those that were ruling them.

Everything has been centralised and it's even worse at EU level. Who runs this place? We have three institutions – we've the European Parliament, we've the Council and we've the Commission. We are the only ones directly elected but we can't initiate legislation. If it's really a question of democracy, why aren't we the ones that are initiating legislation? The Council is more powerful and so is the Commission than us. The Council meetings are held in secret and the Commission are not elected by the people. How can you talk about this place having democracy? That's a myth.

Helmut Geuking (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Ich hätte ganz gern einmal von der Frau Kommissarin gewusst, inwieweit das Spitzenkandidaten-Modell rechtsverbindlich ist. Denn meines Wissens nach ist das nicht rechtsverbindlich, das nur in Erwägungen reinzuschreiben, und daher kann man sich diesen Zahn ziehen. Das ist eine Mogelpackung hoch zehn, was wir hier vorliegen haben, und es dient nur einem Interesse: Es dient nur dem Interesse des Machtausbaus der großen Parteien, vor allem der deutschen Parteien. Das ist natürlich zum Fremdschämen gegenüber der CDU, wovon ich massiv enttäuscht bin. 3,5 %-Sperrklausel, wobei das Verfassungsgericht geurteilt hat: Eine Sperrklausel von 3 % ist schon nicht zulässig – zwei Mal.

Jetzt will man hier das Recht beugen und benutzt dieses Parlament dafür. Das ist ein Skandal. Das ist eine absolute Rechtsbeugung, die in Deutschland stattfinden soll, um hier das Bundesverfassungsgericht zu untergraben. Dies kann und darf man nicht zulassen, und deswegen kann man nur insgesamt dagegen stimmen.

Zu transnationalen Listen sage ich Ihnen ganz ehrlich: Der Bürger möchte vor Ort in der Region seine Kandidaten kennenlernen und die ins Parlament entsenden – damit man sich hier einig wird – und nicht irgendwelche fiktiven Abgeordneten wählen. Vielen lieben Dank, aber hier erwarte ich Ihre Antwort, Frau Kommissarin.

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

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I thank the honourable Members very much for this debate. Very interesting, very lively, very concrete, factual. I myself didn't know what exactly to expect when I was coming here. And for me, this is very important that now I know that the spectrum of the opinions is so wide and there are so many arguments, pros and cons.

I would like to use this opportunity of having these concluding remarks maybe to clarify once again the position of the Commission. But first of all, let me react on several comments. First of all, indeed, as Pascal Durand said, I said that the recommendations of the Conference on the Future of Europe should be respected, and we should work with them for respect. We have 325 recommendations, and the one which suggests the changes of the electoral system is there, is one of them.

To be honest, more than the institutional issues, the people we are discussing in this room, the matters which they see as important in their everyday life. Ms Bischoff was here with me and with many others. It was incredible what was happening here over the plenaries, also now on Friday and Saturday. The people obviously want to see more resilient Europe, more secure. They want to have Europe where there will be more justice and fairness, especially social fairness. They indeed want to have a more democratic Europe, European Union and more understandable.

And this is connected with what Ms Grapini said, the question about European citizenship. That is one of the recommendations also that we should strengthen that so that the European citizens are not only asked to come once in five years to elect, to cast their vote. We want, we need, healthy democracies need active and well-informed citizens. So, these are the matters which we heard from the citizens. Eight hundred citizens were selected and they worked well with those who represented the European Parliament, national parliaments and social partners and some other institutions.

So, this is it. I take the recommendations which were delivered to us through the conference as a task, and we will discuss further when and how to deal with the recommendations, including this one.

And now what the Commission wants: indeed, as Mr Rangel before indicated to me informally that the Commission should be impartial. So I want to confirm once again the position which maybe was not very clear. I said at the beginning that the Commission is supporting the overall objectives of Mr Ruiz Devesa's proposal.

When you look at the European Democracy Action plan, you would see in it that what we propose for Europe is to keep and to guarantee free and fair elections, strengthen democratic legitimacy of the candidates, a level playing field for the candidates and fair electoral and transparent electoral campaigning, which will guarantee visibility and accountability of the candidates.

Here comes the question: whether the candidates, which will be elected through the transnational list, will be able to be fully accountable to their voters in different countries. I do not say yes or no. It's for you to debate it. But I believe that in this higher turnout, in elections, in these overall objectives, we are on the same page with the proposal we discussed today.

And I also said that the Commission will act as a facilitator of the process, which includes also to be able to give the Commission legal opinion on the legal conditions and the questions which you asked, whether this proposal is not getting outside the framework of the Treaty, this is for the Commission for the Legal Service. And we will, of course, watch the process of voting on the final proposal also in the Council, because, as we know, the Council will have to unanimously vote. High time to do that. In the previous mandate, it was in 2000. Oh, I am beyond the time, sorry, I will conclude soon.

In 2017, what I heard in the Member States when the proposal for the changes of the electoral system appeared, I heard many times 'it was too late'. Many national politicians, in fact, were caught by surprise. And that's why I think that it's high time to introduce the changes this year. Otherwise, the system will remain the same for 2024.

Sorry, I wanted to say more but these were the most important things I wanted to share with you. And thank you once again. I don't remember such an open and vivid and constructive debate in this Parliament. This was a really amazing experience for me.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, gracias a todos los colegas que han intervenido en este vivo debate. El informe, por lo menos, tiene el valor de haber generado un debate tan intenso y tan dinámico.

Sí quiero aprovechar para recordar —por lo que decía la vicepresidenta en su última intervención sobre si los diputados elegidos en una lista europea serían responsables ante los que lo han elegido, dejando la pregunta en abierto— que cabe recordar que, de acuerdo con el Tratado, señora vicepresidenta, los diputados al Parlamento Europeo ya representamos al conjunto de la ciudadanía, no representamos solamente al país donde hemos sido elegidos.

Pero creo que también ha quedado claro que, aunque ha habido mucha negatividad por parte de algunos colegas respecto, concretamente, a la circunscripción paneuropea, no se ha presentado una sola propuesta alternativa para resolver el problema de las veintisiete elecciones nacionales paralelas que tenemos en este momento en las elecciones al Parlamento Europeo, ni para visualizar el candidato a presidente de la Comisión.

También creo que hay que recordar, como ha dicho también algún colega, que realmente votar contra este proyecto de ley, ya sea en una parte o en todo, supone también votar contra la mejora de los derechos electorales de las personas con discapacidad, votar contra la posibilidad de votar por correo postal y también votar en contra de la igualdad de género, bien a través de listas cremallera, bien a través de cuotas. Tengamos esto bien presente mañana en la votación.

Además, este proyecto llega en un importante momento para Europa, tras la pandemia, la agresión de Putin a Ucrania y la conclusión de la Conferencia sobre el Futuro de Europa. Europa se está reforzando ya en su dimensión sanitaria, en la financiera, en la energética y en la defensiva. Nuestra cohesión política interna también es importante en este momento.

El sistema del cabeza de lista, si se aplica correctamente, constituye un refuerzo del liderazgo político de Europa y de su legitimación democrática. Este proyecto de ley electoral refuerza nuestra unión política, construye el *demos* europeo. Este Parlamento, precisamente ahora, no puede ausentarse de esta cita con la historia.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

Hlasovanie sa uskutoční v utorok 3. mája 2022.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR), *písomne*. – Predkladatelia navrhujú, aby sa počet europoslancov rozšíril o 28. Títo dodatoční poslanci by mali byť vyberaní z nadnárodnej kandidátky. Nemyslím si, že je potrebné navyšovať počet europoslancov v časoch, keď čelíme mnohým krízam (ruská agresia, vysoká inflácia, rast cien energií, pandémie koronavírusu ...), kvôli ktorým bude čoraz nevyhnutnejšie verejné výdavky razantne optimalizovať. Myslím si tiež, že vytvorenie novej kategórie europoslancov by bolo ďalšou komplikáciou systému fungovania Európskej únie bez toho, aby sme mali zanalyzované prínosy takejto investície. Podľa môjho názoru by k zlepšeniu fungovania EÚ inštitúcií a k zvýšeniu záujmu o eurovoľby pomohlo skôr to, ak by sme ďalej odbúravalí bariéry spolupráce členských štátov, napríklad v oblasti služieb. Tiež by pomohlo, ak by bola EÚ viac transparentná. Aspoň tak, ako je transparentné Slovensko, kde sa zmluvy so štátom zverejňujú. Tiež by pomohlo, ak by bola Únia zrozumiteľnejšia. V súčasnosti veľmi zrozumiteľná nie je, napríklad materiály, o ktorých rokuje Európsky parlament, sú pre verejnosť menej zrozumiteľné než tie, o ktorých rokuje Národná rada SR.

Victor Negrescu (S&D), *în scris*. – Ca urmare a pandemiei și în contextul războiului din Ucraina, suntem într-un moment de răscruce pentru Uniunea Europeană. Avem nevoie de o schimbare, avem nevoie de noi mecanisme prin care să întărim reziliența, dar și suveranitatea europeană. Un astfel de instrument este cel al participării democratice.

Listele transnaționale pot conferi posibilitatea unei reprezentativități europene pentru membrii Parlamentului European, dar mai ales o responsabilitate directă față de toți cetățenii europeni. Astfel, putem spera și la implementarea adecvată a sistemului prin care primul de pe listă să fie propunerea pentru șefia Comisiei Europene și să întărim în acest fel legitimitatea executivului european.

Trebuie însă să evităm accentuarea dezechilibrului între statele membre și să ne asigurăm că România nu pierde din reprezentativitate. Dar de la intenții bune la practică, drumul este lung. Mai avem de lucrat, dar împreună sunt convins că o să găsim soluția.

Guido Reil (ID), *schriftlich*. – Mir ist völlig schleierhaft, was daran demokratisch sein soll, wenn ein Malteser plötzlich dänische Interessen zu vertreten hat oder ein Zypriot belgische oder ein Rumäne deutsche. Meiner Erfahrung nach sind die Abgeordneten hier ausreichend damit beschäftigt, die Probleme der Länder, aus denen sie kommen, zu erkennen und über Lösungswege nachzudenken. Was für Übermenschchen haben Sie denn im Kopf, die plötzlich alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten intim kennen sollen? Abgesehen davon bin ich fasziniert von der Möglichkeit, mich demnächst als Frau zu identifizieren. Sobald Sie Ihr gender-glückliches Reisverschlussverfahren beschließen und jeder zweite Listenkandidat bei einer künftigen EU-Wahl weiblich zu sein hat, wird mich das sicherlich in eine schwere persönliche Krise stürzen, voller Benachteiligungserfahrungen, an deren Ende ich mich ganz als Frau fühlen werde, beseelt von der Idee, dieses Gefühl weiter zu tragen und den Wählerix und auch Sie, liebe Kollegix, in einer zweiten Amtszeit damit zu beglücken. Nein, Demokratie ist, wenn der gewählte Volksvertreter so nah am Bürger dran ist wie nur irgendwie möglich. Ob ein Volksvertreter männlich oder weiblich ist, ist Jacke wie Hose. Da erscheinen mir, als einfachem Arbeiter mit gesundem Menschenverstand, Quoten für bestimmte Berufsgruppen viel sinnvoller. Damit hier endlich mal Verstand einzieht.

László Trócsányi (NI), *írásban*. – A Devesa-jelentés az európai parlamenti választások tapasztalatai alapján levont, szükséges jogszabály-pontosítások és kiigazítások helyett valójában a transznacionális lista ideológiai megfontolású, sokadik alkalommal történő követelésére épül. A dokumentum az egyre szorosabb egység gondolatából építkezik, az európai integráció történetét lineáris, föderalista szemléletből mutatja be, amely mindinkább a központosítás felé halad. Az Európai Parlament nem a szuverenitás hordozója, a szerződések urai a tagállamok. Az Európai Unió intézményrendszere sajátos entitás, de semmiképp sem egy szövetségi állam. A transznacionális lista javaslatának elfogadása emiatt a centralizáció irányába tett jelentős lépés lenne, amelynek vesztesei a kis és közepes tagállamok lennének. A tervezet ráadásul nem egy átgondolt javaslat, hiszen csak 28 képviselő vonatkozásában, kísérleti jelleggel vezetné be a transznacionális listát. Emellett az Európai Választási Hatóság létrehozása a bürokráciát és szükségtelen párhuzamosságokat erősítené. Fontos hangsúlyozni továbbá, hogy a választójogi korhatárok központi szabályozásának esetében is kérdéses, hogy az összhangban lenne a szubszidiaritás elvével. A választójogi korhatár hatályos szabályozása az egyes tagállamokban ugyanis hosszú alkotmánytörténeti fejlődésnek az eredménye. Üdvözlendőnek tartom azonban, hogy az állásfoglalás megjeleníti a nemzeti és nyelvi kisebbségek európai demokráciában való részvételének ügyét, valamint a fogyatékkal élők választójog gyakorlásával kapcsolatos, speciális szempontjait. Az európai demokrácia szempontjából elengedhetetlen, hogy mindenkor figyelembe vegyük a tagállamok egyenjogúságának elvét.

14. Zmiana załączników IV i V do rozporządzenia (UE) 2019/1021 dotyczącego trwałych zanieczyszczeń organicznych (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je rozprava o správe, ktorú predkladá Martin Hojsík v mene výboru pre životné prostredie, verejné zdravie a bezpečnosť potravín, o návrhu Zmena príloh IV a V k nariadeniu (EÚ) 2019/1021 o perzistentných organických látkach (COM(2021)0656 – C9-0396/2021 – 2021/0340(COD)) (A9-0092/2022).

Martin Hojsík, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, as the rapporteur for the review of the waste limits for the persistent organic pollutants, I'm very proud of what we have achieved in the ENVI Committee, but also of the great support from all the major groups. I would therefore like to thank all my colleagues who are supporting low, responsible limits for the content of the POPs in the waste.

And we are not talking about some nice chemicals, these are some of the worst chemicals known to mankind. Examples: we are talking about PFAs – forever chemicals; we talking about dioxins, DDT. And unfortunately, even years after the restrictions, after we banned these chemicals, we still find them in the water, we still find them in the products: in the toys that our kids play with, or in the breastmilk of the new mothers.

That is why the international Stockholm Convention requires parties, including the European Union, to prohibit and/or take legal and administrative measures necessary to eliminate – and I am highlighting eliminate, going down to zero – both the production and the use of chemicals listed in the Annex A, and their import and export. Why? Because they are persistent, they are for ever, they do not really break apart. And the limits? The limits are there because we have to have some limits. But ultimately, they are also bio-accumulative, they are going up in the food chain, and we are on top of the food chain.

A recent report from the scientists, who concluded that the chemical pollution has now passed the safe limits for humanity, is indeed and should be a global wake-up call. Therefore, what we decide during this review, and with the other co-legislators, will have an impact on public health and environment. It will have impact beyond national and European boundaries, as the waste limits also influence what we dispose in third countries, especially in developing countries. It is also why African countries are desperately asking EU to adopt low limits, because they see this as a light at the end of the tunnel to limit pollution to their own environment from the waste that we dump there. The limits that we adopt decide whether to allow those dangerous chemicals to enter our lives through waste.

Adoption of the ENVI report means a clear ‘no’ to the toxic economy, clear ‘no’ to toxic recycled material, because these are waste limits. But dumping of waste, think of resource for the circular economy. We don’t want a circular economy that contains toxic chemicals. So I hope that tomorrow we will defend the result from the Environment Committee, and it will help to free our economy from pollution, increase the trust of our citizens in recycled materials and products. This is absolute precondition for a circular economy. I believe that this will be the case, as our report is ambitious but also realistic at the same time. The limits that we propose are within the impact assessment of the Commission. And the Commission said that it was technically and economically feasible. Therefore, there is no reason why not to adopt lower limits that the Commission proposed.

As a step forward towards toxic-free future, my ENVI report proposes to adopt a limit of 200 mg/kg on some of PBDEs, brominated flame retardants, with a review to lower it further in next 5 years; 200 mg/kg for the HBCDD, with a review to decrease it to 100 mg in 5 years; considerably lower limits for dioxins and furans; thresholds for the PFOAs to reflect the commitment in the chemicals strategy for sustainability to reduce the contamination by the PFAS that sadly many people are affected with; limit of 420 mg/kg for short-chain chlorinated paraffins; and we are also adding a new group of perfluorinated substances that will be soon listed – and by soon, I mean early June — to the Convention; last but not least, we address the incoherence between the classification of all waste containing old and new POPs to ensure effective treatment of all POPs waste.

I hope that by adopting the report tomorrow, we, the European Parliament, will stand behind the public interest, and I hope that we get a strong mandate for our negotiations in a trilogue. It will not be easy, but I can promise you we’ll do the best.

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ

Wiceprzewodnicząca

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, let me start by expressing my sincere gratitude to this House for the hard work that went into the highly technical and very important report we are discussing this evening and which you will vote on tomorrow. I would like to thank the ENVI Committee and especially the rapporteur, Mr Hojsík and all shadow rapporteurs for an extremely thorough and timely report.

We need to remember that this legislative revision will be instrumental in helping us attain the objectives of the European Green Deal. It is fully in line with the zero pollution action plan, the chemical strategy for sustainability and the circular economy action plan. It also implements our international obligations under the Stockholm Convention and, of course, it ensures the environmentally sound management of waste which contains persistent organic pollutants toxic to the environment and to human health.

We very much appreciate your efforts to find the best approach to minimise emissions of persistent organic pollutants from waste and to promote the uptake of safe secondary materials.

Looking at the amendments you propose, I see that our objectives are clearly aligned. I also note that you would like to go further and faster on the limit values to be set in waste for most of the substances in scope. I also take note of your request to the Commission to equate the concept of the persistent organic pollutants waste with that of hazardous waste in the review of EU waste legislation, and of your proposal to list an additional family of these substances constituted by perfluorohexane sulfonic acid and its components.

Setting these limits is a delicate exercise. We need to consider both our obligation and our very legitimate desire to reduce the presence of these substances to a minimum, but also technical feasibility and proportionality. The interplay with Green Deal objectives such as climate neutrality and the ambition for a more circular economy are also very important and need to be taken into account.

All these points will require further discussion in the coming weeks and months. Some of them will depend on the decision to be taken in the forthcoming Conference of the parties to the Stockholm Convention about the listing.

Thanks to the swift and efficient work on this complex file in the ENVI Committee, it has been possible to build broad support for your mandate, little more than five months after the Commission adopted its proposal. This is truly remarkable, bringing us to where we are today with trilogues scheduled to commence in less than two weeks.

The legislative proposal to amend the waste annexes of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Regulation was one of the first deliverables the Commission proposed under the circular economy action plan. It may also be the first to be adopted, with a political agreement in sight before the end of June.

And I sincerely hope we can achieve that. And I can assure you that we can count on your sustained support and you can count on the Commission's constructive support during the negotiations.

Deirdre Clune, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, at the outset I would like to thank our rapporteur, Mr Hojsik, for his cooperation and for bringing us all together. And we have, I hope, a balanced report tomorrow that will get the approval of this House, as persistent organic pollutants, or POPs, are carbon-based compounds that remain in the environment for a long time, toxic organic compounds, and because of their very slow breakdown properties, they're known as 'forever chemicals'.

They can be transported long distance, cross-border, by air, by water, ending up in the food chain and ultimately accumulating in human tissue. They can be passed from one generation to the next, even if they are no longer required or used, they still persist in our environment. And one of the risks of POPs is that whilst they are no longer required, they can still be present in waste streams such as construction waste, packaging and plastics, electronic waste, among others.

No country or Union can manage these elements unless we have cooperation internationally, so it's essential for the Aarhus Protocol, the Stockholm Convention, to find the restrictions necessary for such pollutants. These revisions that we have today will seek to minimise, eliminate where possible, the releases of these POPs – well, I think they should be consistently called persistent organic pollutants – and to regulate the waste containing or contaminated by such chemicals. And I believe that this ambitious proposal will contribute to better management of these toxic wastes and to their removal or to their destruction.

The objective of my work and that of my colleagues I know has always been to protect human health and the environment from these polluting substances. And I believe that we are going a long way to doing that here. So this report attempts to strike a balance with our Green Deal ambitions relating to toxic-free material cycles, recycling and circularity and reducing greenhouse emissions. So I'd encourage us all to support this tomorrow and to give us the mandate to move forward to the trilogues.

Maria Arena, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, derrière ce petit mot gentil qui s'appelle POP, qui pourrait sembler sympathique, se cachent des substances particulièrement dangereuses, cancérigènes, toxiques pour la reproduction et qui viennent perturber notre système endocrinien. Ce sont des molécules chimiques que l'on retrouve dans les dioxines, dans les pesticides, dans les insecticides ou encore dans les retardateurs de flamme. Elles sont par ailleurs, et on la dit, très persistantes dans l'environnement. Elles nous contaminent aujourd'hui et elles contaminent les générations futures et elles contaminent aussi loin, très loin de l'endroit où on les a émises.

Décider de limites de concentrations plus basses, comme nous l'avons fait au sein de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire contribue donc directement à mieux protéger les citoyens, mais aussi à assainir l'environnement pour les générations futures. Certains ont évoqué, lors des discussions, le fait que des limites plus basses de ces concentrations sur les matières recyclées conduiraient à plus d'incinération, donc plus de pollution.

Mais cela n'est pas une fatalité, car de plus en plus de techniques ne nécessitant pas justement la combustion sont aujourd'hui disponibles et permettent de détruire ces substances encore présentes aujourd'hui, et ce, sans émettre de dioxines. Ce sont donc ces filières-là que nous devons soutenir en imposant des limites plus contraignantes plutôt que d'inciter à incorporer ces substances toxiques dans le recyclage.

Notre commission demande aussi un alignement du seuil déchets dangereux avec les limites prévues à l'annexe 4, et ce, pour une meilleure gestion de ces déchets hautement toxiques, au moment où nous révisons le règlement sur l'exportation des déchets, parce que nous devons aussi être vigilants sur ce que nous faisons en dehors de l'Union.

Je rappelle que des limites trop faibles de polluants organiques persistants dans les déchets sont contraires à l'objectif de la convention de Stockholm, et donc il s'agit maintenant d'être cohérents. Je vous invite donc à soutenir ce texte qui demande aussi à la Commission de revoir ses ambitions à la hausse lors du trilogue, et ce pour contribuer à la réalisation d'un environnement non toxique et sans délai.

Manuela Ripa, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die EU hat im Rahmen des europäischen *Green Deal* zwei große Ziele: die ressourcenschonende Kreislaufwirtschaft einerseits und frei von Schadstoffen zu sein andererseits. Beide sind zentrale Ziele für unsere Gesellschaft. Jedoch passen sie im Falle von persistenten organischen Stoffen, kurz POP, nicht zusammen, denn POP gehören zu den gefährlichsten und schädlichsten Chemikalien überhaupt, sowohl für unsere Gesundheit als auch für die Umwelt.

Hier muss ganz klar der Grundsatz gelten: Erst gefährliche Chemikalien raus aus den Produkten und dann recyceln oder gar nicht recyceln. Deshalb müssen Grenzwerte für POP-Abfälle so streng wie möglich ausfallen. Sie dürfen nicht durch Recycling wieder in den Kreislauf zurückgeführt werden. Je strenger wir diese Giftstoffe handhaben, desto mehr werden auch die Innovationen bei den Produkten und beim Recycling erhöht, POP-freie Produkte zu entwickeln. Ziel muss es sein, POP komplett aus unseren Alltagsprodukten zu entfernen. Unser Vorschlag ist der richtige Weg für den Schutz unserer Kinder und für eine schadstofffreie Umwelt.

Aurélia Beigneux, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, pendant des années, ce Parlement a prôné une mondialisation sans limites, préférant le mondial au local et favorisant les intérêts des grands groupes contre les attentes des citoyens. Tous les traités de libre-échange ont été signés. Toutes les politiques ultralibérales ont été déployées.

Alors félicitations, car aujourd'hui vient l'heure du bilan. À cause de ces choix néfastes, la pollution par le plastique est devenue la conséquence la plus visible de cette mondialisation désastreuse. On sait évidemment que l'environnement ne peut pas assimiler ce plastique et on connaît évidemment les répercussions inadmissibles sur la vie animale, notamment aquatique. Le plastique est vecteur de substances extrêmement toxiques pour le corps humain, on le sait, mais les polluants organiques persistants sont également présents dans notre vie quotidienne. La première urgence est donc d'alerter nos concitoyens sur ces risques majeurs.

Mais lorsque la Commission décide enfin d'agir, les solutions proposées relèvent, comme toujours, de la précipitation, sans aucune concertation avec les acteurs de terrain. Les experts, comme les professionnels du secteur du bois par exemple, nous mettent en garde contre certaines de vos solutions et déplorent le manque de consultation. Nos interlocuteurs à nous, ce sont les professionnels et pas vos idoles comme Greta Thunberg.

Alors, on le sait, pour vous, l'écologie ne peut être que punitive et fédéraliste. Mais celle que nous proposons est localiste et nationale. Vous avez fait de l'environnement un club privé qui a applaudi les propositions les plus antinationales et les plus hystériques. Pendant ce temps, les citoyens les plus concernés ne voient jamais l'action de l'Union européenne, sauf pour saborder leur travail et les sanctionner.

Bert-Jan Ruissen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de volksgezondheid moet uiteraard vooropstaan bij de vaststelling van grenswaarden voor verontreiniging in gerecyclede producten. We moeten echter wel nagaan of dit vanuit het oogpunt van sortering mogelijk is. De amendementen van collega Vondra verdienen daarom absoluut onze steun.

Ik ben blij dat ook PFAS in de bijlage worden genoemd, maar ben niettemin van mening dat op dit vlak meer actie nodig is. Lozingen in oppervlaktewater kunnen hiermee namelijk niet worden voorkomen. Ik vraag hierbij met name aandacht voor de Schelde en de Westerschelde. De vergunningen zouden in Vlaanderen zijn aangescherpt, maar wie garandeert dat alles daar nu wel op orde is?

Ik wil de Commissie dan ook vragen werk te maken van een totaalverbod op PFAS, zoals door verschillende landen wordt bepleit, en ervoor te zorgen dat het toezicht en de handhaving in de lidstaten naar behoren verlopen. We moeten de tijd van giftige lozingen definitief achter ons laten.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de Fractie The Left*. – Voorzitter, al tientallen jaren vergiften wij onze leefomgeving, en daarmee ook onszelf, met chemische stoffen die voor eeuwig giftig blijven. We moeten van deze vervuilende erfenis af.

Wij hebben veel te lang zeer gevaarlijke stoffen gebruikt in brandvertragers, antiaanbaklagen en post-its. Ik ben daarom blij dat de Commissie en het Parlement strengere normen willen vaststellen voor deze stoffen. Het is van cruciaal belang dat we ervoor zorgen dat onze grondstoffenstromen, waaronder gerecycled afval, volkomen veilig zijn.

Er is echter veel meer actie nodig. Wij weten van meer stoffen, waaronder alle PFAS en nieuwe stoffen zoals GenX, dat ze zo gevaarlijk en zo hardnekkig zijn dat ze verboden moeten worden. Nederland heeft samen met een aantal andere landen een voorstel gedaan voor een Europees verbod op deze stoffen. Ik wil de Commissie dan ook vragen hier zo snel mogelijk werk van te maken.

Ten slotte ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Patvarieji organiniai teršalai dėl išskirtinai neigiamo poveikio aplinkai ir žmonių sveikatai privalo būti atitinkamai reglamentuojami ir nuolat vertinami. Priimant sprendimus reikėtų atsižvelgti į tai, kad patvarieji organiniai teršalai ne tik ilgai nesuyra, bet ir gali pasklisti toli nuo savo šaltinio bei atsidurti kitose valstybėse. Ne veltui nuo pastarųjų apsaugoti žmonių sveikatą ir aplinką yra priimta Stokholmo konvencija.

Tikiu, kad svarstomas pasiūlymas yra tinkamas siekiant žaliojo kurso tikslų. Turėtų būti skatinamas tik toks perdirbimas, kuris užtikrintų netoksiškų medžiagų ciklus. Neturi būti pateisinamas žalingų ir pavojingų cheminių medžiagų įtraukimas į perdirbimo procesus, kuomet naudojimui ir vartojimui sugrįžtų aptariamoms pavojų sveikatai keliančios medžiagos. Teisinga yra orientuotis į tai, kad nustatomos ribinės vertės būtų suderinamos su mokslo ir technikos pažanga. Taip pat vertėtų ieškoti visų įmanomų būdų, kurie galėtų užtikrinti pažangių atliekų rūšiavimo ir nuodingųjų medžiagų pašalinimo iš jų technologijų skatinimą, remtis mokslu ir investuoti į tai. Paremdami teikiamą pasiūlymą, užtikrinsime geresnį patvarių organinių teršalų ir ES žaliojo kurso tikslų suderinamumą.

Cindy Franssen (PPE). – Voorzitter, in een duurzaam milieubeleid wordt ingezet op een milieu zonder vervuiling en wordt altijd rekening gehouden met de gezondheid van de mens. Zover zijn we echter nog niet. Er ligt voor ons nog altijd een zware marathon in het verschiet.

Wij kunnen onszelf niettemin veel tegenwind besparen door te voorkomen dat giftige stoffen via het recyclingproces een tweede leven kregen. Het kan immers niet de bedoeling zijn mensen opnieuw aan schadelijke en vaak giftige chemische stoffen bloot te stellen. We willen en moeten zowel werknemers als consumenten maximaal beschermen. Er zijn, zeker nu we in het kader van de circulaire economie steeds meer inzetten op recycling, strengere regels nodig om de blootstelling te beperken en te voorkomen. Ook de circulaire economie moet gifvrij zijn. De grenswaarden die we vandaag strenger maken, vormen in dit verband een eerste stap in de juiste richting. Dit kan en moet echter sneller.

De regulering van schadelijke stoffen moet niet langer per stof maar per groep worden aangepakt. Niet-essentiële toepassingen van stoffen waarvan bewezen is dat ze schadelijk zijn, moeten onherroepelijk worden afgeschaft. De volksgezondheid moet in deze dossiers altijd en resoluut de richting van onze regelgeving aangeven. In dit geval is deze richting strenger.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Maria Spyraki (PPE). – Madam President, today we are facing another important challenge, and this is how to practically align the Persistent Organic Pollutants Regulation with the Stockholm Convention and with the overall aim to protect human health and the environment.

What we need to keep in mind is that in each and every step we have to set the basis for sustainable chemicals by design, maintaining the precautionary approach and also setting the standards for POPs in waste. We therefore need to take actions to prohibit, while implementing legal and regulatory measures necessary to eliminate both the production and use of chemicals listed in Annex A and the import and export of these chemicals. We have to guarantee that the transition to a high-quality, toxic-free materials cycle cannot coexist with an approach that allows the recycling of POPs-containing waste based on weak POPs limit values. In this regard, we should be able to establish a framework, but it is about creating a global level playing field, leveraging, at the same time, the EU position on the chemical markets.

I am fully in line with the limits that the rapporteur proposed to the respective annexes. Adoption of high limits leads to contamination of recycling of POPs, which re-enter the economy instead of being disposed of. And needless to say that the market players will have a strong role in the implementation of the POPs Regulation. They will be able, according to the market knowledge, a condition to adapt for a toxic-free environment and a truly circular economy.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, people living in Ireland produce more than 40 million tonnes of waste every year. Most of our hazardous products are exported to other European countries, and much of this waste contains toxic organic compounds that we call POPs.

During the process, as colleagues have said, whether ingested or inhaled, these pose a severe risk to human health and to the environment. And shockingly, now, we find that POPs can be found worldwide, in all major climate zones and geographic areas, including deserts, where there are no significant sources of POPs.

This is the reality of an insane economic system which generates pollution without a sense of responsibility for future generations. While we talk about exporting our waste and improving our recycling processes, this won't protect the entire biosphere from toxic properties. So while I welcome the tightening of limits and so on, we mustn't forget that we must concentrate on achieving non-toxic material change and a new approach to human activity.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, the transition to high-quality and toxic-free material cycles cannot be achieved while allowing persistent organic pollutants to be recycled in materials. The weak limits on the presence of persistent organic pollutants proposed by the Commission would undermine the Stockholm Convention and the European Green Deal. Weak limits would do more harm than good. Weak limits would undermine the credibility of recycling.

I'm fairly happy with the text of the regulation before us, as amended by the Environment Committee. The limits and the presence of persistent organic pollutants that are agreed are all stricter than the current limits and most of them go beyond the Commission's proposal. This should lead to an enhanced protection of the environment and human health.

The elimination of toxic legacy substances from waste is vital to ensure a safe and clean circular economy and this amending regulation can certainly help to achieve that.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, I have listened carefully to the different interventions and I have taken good note of the ideas and desires of honourable Members for increased ambition. I am pleased to see that we agree on the need to increase the scope and the stringency of our control on persistent organic pollutants in waste. In doing so, we will ensure tighter and better waste management. It will mean destroying greater amounts of these pollutants in waste and ensuring that what remains is managed in a sound way minimising emissions to the environment.

Regarding the level of ambition, I hear very clearly your call for limits that are stricter than those proposed by the Commission for most substances. The Commission too would like to go further, but when we proposed these limits, we did so on the basis of the best information available and on the basis of a balanced assessment of what is feasible from a technical, environmental and socioeconomic point of view.

In its proposal, the Commission has set ambitious limit values. They are systematically lower than the values for substances that were already in place. We also met the reduction requirements demanded by this House a little less than three years ago. We therefore consider that further work and honest discussions will be necessary for some of the limits proposed.

We need to find a base that allows recyclers and other operators to continue and even accelerate the essential work they do in reducing the presence of persistent organic pollutants in waste. Recyclers are not the problem. They are part of the solution.

Thank you once again for your work and for the very useful discussion today. And we look forward to engaging very soon in constructive trilogue negotiations with you and the Council.

Martin Hojsík, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, first of all, let me thank you for the very interesting debate on this topic and for the support and encouragement that I got from you during this debate.

Now, this is indeed a global problem. I myself was in the Arctic more than 20 years ago to witness the toxic pollution there. I was on the Agbogbloshie dumpsite in Ghana, where computers with PBDEs from Europe are ending and polluting the local environment, and I witnessed the measurements of mountain goats from the High Tatras in Slovakia, polluted with POPs chemicals.

We really have to eliminate these chemicals. Toxic recycling is not an option. And I have to say to the Commission that what we are proposing is not something that we pulled out of our fingers. These values are stricter than those proposed by the Commission, yes, but are within what the Commission, in its own impact assessment, said is technically, economically and socially feasible. Just the Commission decided to go for the middle of the range and we decided to go for ambition, because we believe that human health needs to have a very strong priority, that the best cancer is the one you don't have to cure. It's actually also the cheapest and with the least suffering.

I was happy to hear the engagement also from the ECHA being stronger on the PFAS. And I'm really happy for that. But I also hope that we can be equally strong on the brominated flame-retardants. The technologies are there. We really need to clean up our economy of the toxic chemicals, of the worst toxic chemicals, which the POPs are, to start proper transformation to a sustainable circular economy without the toxic chemicals, with the trust of the consumers, and with the future that fits the planetary limits.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 3 maja 2022 r.

15. Plan działania UE na rzecz rolnictwa ekologicznego (debata)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Simone Schmiedtbauer w imieniu Komisji Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi w sprawie planu działania UE na rzecz rolnictwa ekologicznego (2021/2239(INI)) (A9-0126/2022).

Chciałam Państwu przypomnieć, że obowiązuje swoboda wyboru miejsc, z wyjątkiem dwóch pierwszych rzędów, które są przydzielone przewodniczącym grup.

Będą Państwo mogli zgłosić się do zabrania głosu z sali (catch-the-eye) i do procedury niebieskiej kartki po umieszczeniu karty do głosowania w czytniku.

Pragnę również przypomnieć, że w sali posiedzeń plenarnych mówcy zabierają głos z głównej mównicy z wyjątkiem pytań z sali, pytań zadawanych przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki i wniosków w sprawie przestrzegania Regulaminu.

Simone Schmiedtbauer, Berichtstersterin. – Frau Präsidentin, geschätzter Herr Kommissar, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Als Agrarabgeordnete aus dem Bio-Spitzenreiterland Österreich ist es mir eine besonders große Freude und Ehre, federführend für die Positionierung des Europäischen Parlaments zum wichtigen Bio-Aktionsplan der EU verantwortlich zu sein. Denn regional und im Einklang mit der Natur hergestellte, qualitativ hochwertige Lebensmittel sind wichtig für die Lebensqualität der Menschen in Europa, aber auch für den Klimaschutz. Dafür steht unsere Biolandwirtschaft. Und diesem Leitbild für eine nachhaltige Bewirtschaftung müssen wir in Europa definitiv mehr Raum geben.

Beim Bio-Aktionsplan achten wir darauf, dass es einen sehr guten Mix aus den richtigen Instrumenten und Anreizen, aber auch ausreichend Flexibilität gibt, damit jedes EU-Land maßgeschneiderte Möglichkeiten bekommt, seinen Biosektor individuell weiterzuentwickeln, und die europäische Bio-Vision in eigene nationale oder regionale Bio-Strategien gießen kann.

Denn unsere Regionen starten aus vollkommen unterschiedlichen Ausgangssituationen. In manchen Ländern haben wir bereits über 25 % biologisch bewirtschaftete landwirtschaftliche Nutzfläche, in anderen liegen wir bei 0,5 %. Von den Landwirtinnen und Landwirten über die Veredelung und Verarbeitung, dem privaten Sektor mit Einzelhandel, Gastronomie, dem öffentlichen Sektor mit der öffentlichen Beschaffung bis hin zu den Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten: Wir müssen die Menschen abholen. Wir müssen die Voraussetzungen für nachhaltiges Wachstum schaffen und nicht nur, bitte, von Zielen sprechen.

Deshalb haben wir im Bio-Aktionsplan der EU Prioritäten gesetzt. Der Förderung des Bio-Konsums kommt eine bedeutende Rolle zu. Das Wachsen des Biosektors kann nur mit einem marktorientierten Ansatz und einer ganzheitlichen Weiterentwicklung der Lieferkette nachhaltig gelingen. Es braucht Wachstum von Angebot und Nachfrage im Gleichgewicht, damit bitte auch die Preise stimmen.

Weiters weisen wir auf das immense Potenzial kurzer regionaler und saisonaler Lieferketten hin. Sie bringen ökologische und wirtschaftliche Vorteile für unsere Biobauern und die ländlichen Regionen, indem Einkommen gesichert und Arbeitsplätze geschaffen werden, während gleichzeitig ein wesentlicher Beitrag zum Tierwohl sowie zum Schutz von Umwelt, Klima und Biodiversität geleistet wird.

Wir bestehen auch auf der Einbindung der lokalen und regionalen Ebene, denn die Vertreter der Regionen und der Gemeinden, die wissen am besten, wo der Schuh drückt und wo man bei der Weiterentwicklung des Biosektors gezielte Schritte setzen kann – sei es in den Schulen, Kindergärten, Kinderkrippen, bei der Zusammenarbeit der Landwirtinnen und Landwirte miteinander und mit den Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten, beim grünen Beschaffungswesen in Kantinen oder in anderen Bereichen.

Der Bio-Aktionsplan der EU muss auch unbedingt von einer starken Forschungs-, Innovations- und Digitalpolitik flankiert werden. Limitierende Produktionsfaktoren müssen überwunden werden – es geht um die Verfügbarkeit von Proteinfuttermitteln, Vitaminen, Dünger und Pflanzenschutz. Auch Ressourcennutzung muss stetig effizienter werden, um gesellschaftlichen Erwartungen und der Zukunft Rechnung zu tragen. Smart Farming und Bio müssen Hand in Hand gehen.

Die COVID-19-Pandemie und die russische Invasion in der Ukraine haben noch einmal deutlicher gemacht, dass die EU ihre Ernährungssicherheit stärken und ihre Abhängigkeit von Importen von außerhalb der EU verringern muss. Ein starker, nachhaltiger und vor allem vielfältiger EU-Agrarsektor ist eine ganz wesentliche Komponente unserer Ernährungssicherheit. Die Biolandwirtschaft kann und wird ihren wichtigen Beitrag zur künftigen Ernährungssicherheit der EU leisten.

Ich möchte mich auch bei meinen Kolleginnen und Kollegen aus den verschiedenen Fraktionen bedanken, die sich in den Verhandlungen sehr konstruktiv eingebracht haben. Beim Erarbeiten des Berichts zum Bio-Aktionsplan der EU haben wir ideologische Unterschiede größtenteils zugunsten von gesundem Hausverstand zurückgestellt, denn im Kern sind wir uns einig, dass wir den Biosektor in Europa ausbauen und stärken wollen. Diese Vision hat auf Ausschussebene hundertprozentige Zustimmung gefunden.

Zum Abschluss möchte ich noch einmal betonen, dass zukunftsgerichtete Landwirtschaft nicht nur Bio sein muss und kann. Ich bin selbst konventionelle Landwirtin und weiß genau, dass wir auch mit anderen nachhaltigen Landwirtschaftsmethoden hochqualitative Lebensmittel mit ganz hohen Tierwohlstandards erzeugen können.

Bei der Weiterentwicklung eines nachhaltigen EU-Lebensmittelsystems gibt es kein einheitliches landwirtschaftliches Modell, das für alle Länder und Regionen geeignet ist. Es braucht in Zukunft beides: Biolandwirtschaft und konventionelle Landwirtschaft, um unsere Menschen zu ernähren.

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, I would like to start by thanking the rapporteur, Ms Schmiedtbauer, and the shadow rapporteurs for the report on the action plan for the development of organic production.

The Commission shares Parliament's goal of the European food system delivering sustainably produced and nutritious food at affordable prices, and ensuring food security in a way that ensures a healthy society and healthy planet contribute to social and economic well-being, protect the health of the ecosystems, and ensure the profitability of agricultural production and therefore of fair living for farmers.

To contribute to the achievement of this goal, the Commission has included in both the farm to fork strategy and the biodiversity strategy, the Green Deal target of 25% of European Union agricultural land under organic farming by 2030, and a significant increase in organic aquaculture.

The reason for this commitment to organics is the various benefits that organics can bring. The increased area to 25% of organic production will also contribute to other objectives of the farm to fork strategy, in particular, it is expected to contribute to the target of a 50% reduction in the use and risk of pesticides.

In this context, we are pleased to observe that Parliament recognises the various environmental benefits that organic agriculture offers, including reduced greenhouse gas emissions, increased carbon storage by plus 26% compared to conventional, and its potential to help the agricultural sector play its part in the fight against climate change, while addressing key challenges such as the loss of jobs in rural areas, soil fertility and biodiversity loss, as well as promoting resilience in the face of economic challenges.

To support the achievement of the 25% Green Deal target, the Commission has adopted on 25 March 2021, the action plan for the development of organic production. This plan takes a demand-driven approach and aims first and foremost to increase the demand for organic products. At the same time, it goes beyond demand and takes a comprehensive approach in the sense that it also aims to increase further the supply of organic products and the sustainability of the organic sector.

It addresses the public sector at all levels of governance – EU Member States, regions and cities – and the private sector along the value chain: farmers, food processors, wholesale, retail, etc. It also puts much emphasis on research and innovation, which can really make the difference in creating a competitive and sustainable farming system.

Against this background, the Commission welcomes Parliament's overall support for its communication on an action plan for the development of organic production, and in particular its favourable stance – the objective of increasing the European Union's agricultural area under organic farming by 2030 through the development of supply and demand – and the Commission's recognition of organic farming as one of the main components on the EU path towards more sustainable food systems.

In particular, in this period where it is of the utmost importance to reduce the long-term dependency on chemical raw materials, organic farming that doesn't use any chemicals, inputs for fertilisation or pest control increases the resilience of the European food system.

The Commission is looking forward to the final adoption of this report and its recommendations. They will contribute to support the development of organic agriculture in the European Union.

Honourable Members, I thank you for your attention and will be happy to listen to your comments and suggestions.

Herbert Dorfmann, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wenn wir Landwirtschaft in Europa insgesamt nachhaltig machen wollen, spielt Biolandwirtschaft natürlich eine ganz wichtige Rolle. Natürlich nicht die einzige; es geht auch darum, konventionelle Landwirtschaft nachhaltiger zu machen, beispielsweise auch durch integrierte Produktion. Aber der Aktionsplan zur Biolandwirtschaft, den die Kommission vorgelegt hat, erkennt die zentrale Rolle des Marktes bei der Weiterentwicklung der Biolandwirtschaft an.

Nur wenn Menschen auch zum Bioprodukt greifen und bereit sind, die Mehrkosten, die in der Produktion notgedrungen entstehen, zu zahlen, dann hat die Biolandwirtschaft auch eine langfristige Entwicklungschance. Und das können wir unterstützen: Wir müssen Bioprodukte bewerben, die Menschen hinführen zu dieser Kaufentscheidung.

Und dann kauft die öffentliche Hand selbst viele Lebensmittel ein, für öffentliche Verpflegung in Schulen, in Krankenhäusern. Wir müssen Voraussetzungen schaffen, dass hier auf regionale, auf hochwertige und auch auf Biolebensmittel gesetzt werden kann. Und da gibt es tolle Beispiele in Europa, wo etwa Schulen hochwertig einkaufen, versuchen, weniger Lebensmittel zu verschwenden, und durch Änderungen im Ernährungsplan insgesamt nicht mehr Geld ausgeben als vorher.

Wir befinden uns auch in einem ganz sensiblen Moment in diesem Augenblick. Lebensmittelpreise steigen in der gesamten Europäischen Union an, Lebenshaltungskosten steigen insgesamt. Viele Familien wollen oder müssen einen Ausweg aus dieser Situation suchen und greifen leider dann auch zu billigeren Lebensmitteln. Und die positive Marktentwicklung, die wir bei vielen Bioprodukten in den letzten Jahren hatten, droht einzubrechen. Damit schwindet auch der Anreiz für die Bauern, auf Bioprodukte umzusteigen. Hier müssen wir aufpassen, dass dieser schwierige Moment nicht zu einer längerfristigen Bremse für den Biomarkt wird.

Clara Aguilera, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, quiero felicitar a la señora Schmiedtbauer y a todos los ponentes, especialmente a Eric Andrieu, de mi grupo político, que han hecho un gran trabajo con este informe, que concluye aquí con la votación mañana del nuevo Plan de acción de la UE para la agricultura ecológica, que viene a ser la continuación del anterior, que ha durado desde 2014 a 2020, y en el que se establecen 23 nuevas propuestas.

Creo que el desarrollo de la agricultura ecológica ha sido evidente en la última década: ha crecido un 66 % (todavía quizás aún un porcentaje bajo para lo que nos gustaría) y se le dedica el 8,5 % de la superficie.

Yo estoy muy orgullosa de mi región, Andalucía, en donde le dedicamos el 23 % de la superficie agraria, es decir, que pronto estaremos en el horizonte de ese 25 % sin ni siquiera Pacto Verde.

Hay mucha desigualdad entre unas regiones y otras, y entre unos países y otros.

No hay duda de que hay que reforzar el consumo y aumentar el conocimiento. Pero creo, como bien se recoge en el informe, que el desarrollo y el crecimiento deben estar ligados al enfoque basado en el mercado.

Атидже Алиева-Вели, *от името на групата Renew*. – Госпожо Председател, г-н Комисар, бих искала да започна с благодарност към докладчика, г-жа Шмидбауер. Renew Europe приветства плана за биологично производство. Ползите от биоземеделieto са многобройни и те са едновременно за хората и за природата. Факт е, че държавите имат различни изходни точки, както и различни климатични и географски особености. Това обуславя и необходимостта от целенасочен подход, който да взема предвид тези особености.

Считам, че изготвянето на националните планове за биологично производство ще бъде добър инструмент за стимулиране на този тип земеделско производство, но те трябва да бъдат реалистични, финансово обезпечени, с ясно определени цели и времеви рамки. И най-важното – следва да бъдат прилагани ефективно.

Движението за права и свободи отдавна изработи концепция за чисти храни и биологично производство, съзнавайки, че това ще е изключително благоприятно за земеделците и за развитието на селските райони, имайки предвид ползата за опазване на околната среда и по-високите доходи за фермерите. Земеделците също проявяват интерес, но имат нужда от подкрепа, премахване на административните тежести и опростяване на процедурите при сертификация.

България има потенциала да се превърне в една от водещите държави по производство на чисти храни, което от своя страна ще гарантира достойни доходи за фермерите. Крайно време е този потенциал на страната ни да бъде развит, като се изготви дългосрочна визия и стратегия, която да даде нужната предвидимост и подкрепа за сектора. Важно е да насърчаваме късите вериги за доставки на храни и да стимулираме консумацията на местни продукти, които отговарят на високите европейски стандарти за качество.

Claude Gruffat, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, notre modèle d'agriculture actuel est une triple catastrophe: pour l'emploi paysan, pour la biodiversité et pour la santé publique. La nouvelle PAC est un accélérateur de ce drame en cours. La guerre en Ukraine, quant à elle, nous rappelle l'urgence absolue qu'il y a à sortir d'un modèle agricole sous perfusion d'hydrocarbures pour ses engrais et pour ses pesticides.

Le vote de cette semaine sur le plan d'action pour l'agriculture biologique est donc une belle opportunité de redresser la barre. Contrairement aux industriels et aux financiers, je pense, comme le commissaire Timmermans, qu'il y a urgence à produire mieux, et certainement pas à produire plus, pour assurer la souveraineté alimentaire de l'Europe comme dans le monde.

C'est pourquoi, j'ai déposé plusieurs amendements afin que le texte final reste fidèle aux objectifs du pacte vert et de la stratégie «De la ferme à la fourchette». Parmi ceux-ci, l'objectif de 25 % de surfaces agricoles en bio dans l'Union européenne d'ici 2030 et, comme vous l'avez souligné tout à l'heure, Monsieur le Commissaire, la création d'outils pour faire des collectivités des acteurs de la transition agricole et alimentaire par l'outil de la commande publique, pour les cantines par exemple.

La catastrophe agricole n'est pas une fatalité: envoyons un signal fort pour la souveraineté des paysans, de l'environnement et de notre santé.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Sprawozdanie pani poseł Schmiedtbauer na tyle dobrze wyważy akcenty pomiędzy ekologicznymi ambicjami a realiami ekonomicznymi w krajach unijnych, że zostało przyjęte w Komisji Rolnictwa przez aklamację, co chciałbym podkreślić. Jednak poziom rolnictwa ekologicznego w poszczególnych krajach członkowskich jest bardzo zróżnicowany, o czym tutaj była mowa. A zatem ustanowienie celu wiążącego na szczeblu unijnym wymaga znacznego zwiększenia nakładów w krótkim czasie, co stawia w trudnej sytuacji państwa członkowskie, których rolnictwo cechuje się niższym stopniem zaawansowania. Dlatego dobrze, że sprawozdawczyni podkreśla konieczność zapewnienia odpowiednich zachęt finansowych do modernizacji i dbania o rentowność gospodarstw rolnych.

Trzeba jednak podkreślić, że agresja Rosji na Ukrainę i trwająca tam wojna uderza we wszystkie unijne strategie i być może będzie także ciosem dla rozwijania unijnego rolnictwa ekologicznego. W zaistniałej sytuacji bowiem priorytetem powinno być zwiększanie wydajności produkcji żywności, a w szczególności utrzymanie płynności dostaw surowców rolnych, by między innymi uniknąć klęski głodu, szczególnie w Afryce, gdzie do tej pory Ukraina zaspokajała znaczną część zapotrzebowania na zboże.

Na koniec chciałbym Pani Sprawozdawczyni podziękować za poparcie poprawek mojej frakcji, ECR. Szczególnie zależało nam na tej, aby podnoszenie świadomości ekologicznej i standardów środowiskowych musiało także dotyczyć naszych partnerów handlowych z krajów trzecich, by w ten sposób ograniczyć dysproporcję wymogów i obciążeń między rolnikami unijnymi i ich partnerami spoza Unii Europejskiej.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de Fractie The Left*. – Voorzitter, we overschrijden voortdurend de grenzen van de aarde. Twee weken geleden hebben we in Nederland alle grondstoffen opgemaakt die de aarde ons in één jaar kan bieden.

Dit is niet het moment om laks te zijn in de hoop dat de volgende generaties met een oplossing zullen komen. De intensieve landbouw laat miljarden dieren lijden, is sterk afhankelijk van landbouwgif en kunstmest, verwoest de biodiversiteit en stoot bovendien zeer veel broeikasgassen uit.

Dit is het moment om ambitieus te zijn en de doelstelling van de “van boer tot bord”-strategie om in 2030 minstens 25 procent aan biologische landbouwgrond te hebben, te omarmen. Dat betekent hoge normen voor dierenwelzijn, geen schadelijk gif en een duidelijk keurmerk, zodat burgers geïnformeerde keuzes kunnen maken die niet alleen belangrijk zijn voor hun eigen gezondheid, maar bovendien voor de gezondheid van de hele planeet en al haar bewoners.

Ten slotte ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi ricordiamo Sir Plumb, sapendo che il biologico è l'unica strada per la tutela ambientale, sicurezza alimentare e maggiore indipendenza da produttori extra UE, nonché prevenzione dei danni provocati da prodotti non sani alla salute dei cittadini.

Dobbiamo quindi essere ambiziosi, pretendere obiettivi quali il 25% minimo della produzione biologica e un autentico bando dei pesticidi dannosi. L'Italia è già al 20% del bio, la Sicilia al 22%. Dunque è possibile. Allora premiamo i produttori, diamo più soldi agli agricoltori siciliani, sardi, italiani o di qualunque altra regione europea che siano davvero virtuosi, che facciano davvero il biologico. Stop invece agli aiuti a chi non li merita.

Dopo anni di pandemia e guerra stiamo vivendo sulla nostra pelle quanto ci costi dipendere da altri paesi produttori di cui spesso importiamo prodotti di scarsa qualità che abbassano il prezzo delle nostre eccellenze. È un sistema che non funziona e che spetta a noi cambiare per renderlo funzionale ad un futuro felice per noi e per i nostri figli. Ci vogliono coraggio e mani libere. Le abbiamo, onorevoli colleghi?

Norbert Lins (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal herzlichen Dank an die Kollegin Simone Schmiedtbauer für ihren Bericht. Man sieht, der ist einstimmig angenommen worden. Das zeigt zum einen, wie wichtig uns über die Fraktionen hinweg die Förderung der Biolandwirtschaft ist, und auf der anderen Seite natürlich, welche hohe Qualität der Bericht von Simone Schmiedtbauer aufweist.

Nun zum Inhalt: In den letzten Wochen ist uns vor Augen geführt worden, wie wichtig eine stabile und regionale Lebensmittelproduktion ist. Biolandwirtschaft spielt dabei, auch gerade bei den Leistungen für das Klima und die Artenvielfalt, eine wichtige Rolle. Wenn wir in Zukunft über die Biolandwirtschaft in Europa sprechen, ist mir eines sehr wichtig: Ökologischer Anbau ist wichtig und muss gefördert werden.

Allerdings ist der konventionelle Anbau genauso wichtig. Beide Formen können nachhaltig sein und sind wichtig für die Ernährungssicherheit und die Bezahlbarkeit von Lebensmitteln. Bei der Förderung von Biolandwirtschaft müssen deshalb meiner Einschätzung nach diese vier Punkte im Mittelpunkt stehen: Die Förderung von Ökoanbau muss marktkonform sein. Bio anzubauen muss sich lohnen, braucht Anreize, darf nicht erzwungen werden und bedarf keiner Quote. Es braucht eine Akzeptanz in der Bevölkerung, und Ziele müssen realistisch sein.

Zweitens: Bio muss produktiver werden. Die jetzige Unsicherheit auf den Märkten und der steigende Hunger in der Welt machen eine Produktionssteigerung auch bei den Ökobäuerinnen und -bauern notwendig.

Drittens: Bio muss innovativer werden und aufgeschlossen sein, auch was Technologien betrifft. Es darf hier keine formalen Ausschlusskriterien geben, was die Resilienz und was die Resistenz angeht.

Viertens: Durch den Ukraine-Krieg erleben wir einen Mangel an Bioeiweißfutter; Biolandwirte müssen auf konventionelles Futter zurückgreifen. Es zeigt sich, dass nicht nur die konventionelle Landwirtschaft unabhängiger werden muss, sondern dass wir eine gesamteuropäische Eiweißstrategie brauchen.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich hebe noch einmal die Qualität des Berichts hervor und bitte um Ihre Zustimmung.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous le savons tous, le développement de l'agriculture biologique est un enjeu majeur pour l'avenir de l'agriculture européenne. C'est le moyen de véritablement réduire l'utilisation des pesticides et de répondre aux enjeux de santé humaine. C'est également le moyen de contribuer à la vitalité sociale et économique de la ruralité et de progresser en matière de bien-être animal.

Le rapport que nous voterons demain est tout à fait équilibré et soutient l'ambition affichée par la Commission et je tiens ici à remercier la rapporteure Simone Schmiedtbauer. Mais si ce rapport voté en commission soutient l'objectif d'augmentation des surfaces en agriculture bio d'ici 2030, il ne pointe pas le chiffre de 25 % mentionné par la Commission et il nous semblait important de produire un amendement, ne serait-ce que pour évaluer le bienfait des politiques publiques à l'avenir.

Je veux également rappeler avec force que réduire la moitié de l'usage des pesticides d'ici 2030 n'est pas un saut dans le vide, les alternatives comme le biocontrôle se développent et les centres de recherche les plus en pointe sur le sujet considèrent que la fin des pesticides de synthèse est atteignable d'ici 2050, à condition qu'on s'en donne les moyens et qu'on maintienne fermement le cap, ce qui est le cas dans ce rapport.

Ulrike Müller (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zuerst möchte ich mich ganz herzlich bei Simone Schmiedtbauer bedanken für die hervorragende Arbeit.

Im Agrarausschuss haben wir Ihren Bio-Aktionsplan ja einstimmig angenommen. Damit haben wir unterstrichen, dass wir uns grundsätzlich darüber einig sind, dass ein höherer Anteil an Biolandwirtschaft dazu beitragen kann, die Ziele des *Green Deal* und der *Farm-to-Fork*-Strategie zu erreichen. Der Weg dorthin soll aber auf keinen Fall auf Zwang und Vorschriften basieren.

Ich bin davon überzeugt, dass eine Steigerung der Produktion an biologischen Lebensmitteln nur zusammen mit einer gesteigerten Nachfrage funktionieren kann. Dabei wissen wir aber auch, dass Bioprodukte in der Regel ja teurer sind als konventionelle Ware. Und bei der derzeitigen Inflation mit höheren Energiepreisen und gesteigerten Lebensmittelpreisen ist es allerdings fraglich, ob die Konsumenten in naher Zukunft vermehrt Bioprodukte kaufen.

Weiter möchte ich darauf hinweisen, dass wir die Landwirte bei der Entwicklung hin zu mehr Biolandwirtschaft angemessen unterstützen müssen. Die Umstellung auf eine biologische Wirtschaftsweise ist nach wie vor eine große Herausforderung und birgt viele Risiken für den einzelnen Landwirt. Eine bessere Unterstützung während der Umstellungsphase ist deshalb notwendig, und ein Ansatzpunkt wäre auch eine verbesserte Strategie, um Umstellungsware zu vermarkten, Herr Kommissar. Durch ein klares Logo für Umstellungsware beispielsweise könnten Kunden dies leichter erkennen und so auch gezielt kaufen, um die Landwirte in dieser Phase zu unterstützen.

Mit den Verbrauchern an unserer Seite kann es uns gemeinsam gelingen, Bioproduktion nach vorne zu bringen. Und trotzdem dürfen wir natürlich auch die konventionelle Landwirtschaft, die regional, saisonal erzeugt, nicht vergessen.

Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Ich möchte hier die sogenannten neuen Gentechniken erwähnen. Für Biobauern ist der Push zu Deregulierung besonders besorgniserregend: Sie müssen zu 100 % GVO-frei bleiben, und das wollen die Kunden auch. Wie sieht die Zukunft für die Biolandwirtschaft aus, wenn GVO unentdeckt den Markt überfluten dürfen? Dies hätte man im Bericht auch angehen müssen.

Ein weiterer Aspekt, der mir besonders am Herzen liegt, ist der Tierschutz. Ich hoffe auf breite Unterstützung für den Änderungsantrag, der anerkennt, dass die Biolandwirtschaft im Tierschutz führend ist. Natürlich kann das Tierwohl auch in vielen Biobetrieben und beim Transport verbessert werden. Doch bei der für 2023 geplanten Revision der EU-Tierschutzgesetzgebung sollten Bio-Standards als Kompass dienen.

Und ich weiß, ich kenne das Gegenargument, das lautet immer: Das ist zu teuer! Nun, in den letzten zwei Jahren haben wir alle am eigenen Leib erfahren, wie viel ein schlechter Umgang mit Tieren uns als Gesellschaft tatsächlich kosten kann.

Mazaly Aguilar (ECR). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, estoy de acuerdo con la señora Schmiedtbauer cuando recoge en su informe la realidad de la situación de la producción ecológica y señala que las medidas e instrumentos propuestos por la Comisión deben basarse en la evaluación de impactos y en análisis exhaustivos, primando, por supuesto, la base científica a la ambición política.

Porque cuando la Comisión dice que, para este plan de acción sobre la producción ecológica, la base es el Pacto Verde Europeo y la estrategia «de la Granja a la Mesa», se equivoca. La base, a mi juicio, para el desarrollo razonable de este plan de acción es el sentido común. Y el sentido común nos dice que para avanzar en el sistema alimentario europeo debemos priorizar la rentabilidad de la producción agrícola y, por tanto, una vida justa para los agricultores.

Así que creo firmemente que la agricultura ecológica u orgánica puede convivir con la agricultura tradicional sin necesidad de que le impongamos cuotas ni objetivos que estrangulen la rentabilidad y la supervivencia de nuestras explotaciones y nuestros agricultores. Muchas gracias, señora Schmiedtbauer, ha sido un informe espléndido.

Daniela Rondinelli (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissario Wojciechowski, il piano d'azione per il biologico può rappresentare uno strumento importante per conciliare gli obiettivi ambientali e la sovranità agricola europea, questioni oggi più che mai preminenti.

Ma porre l'obiettivo del 25% di terre coltivate a biologico entro il 2030, quando diversi Stati non arrivano neanche al 5%, significa due cose: o è la scusa per creare un biologico annacquato che alimenterà distorsioni e dumping ambientale, oppure si sta proponendo qualcosa che è destinato già a fallire in partenza.

Nel mio paese, in Italia, milioni di agricoltori hanno già investito risorse molto importanti sul biologico e di certo non vogliono competere con nuovi prodotti bio, frutto di una politica europea blanda o banale.

Occorre certamente ampliare il mercato per il biologico, ma senza metterlo in concorrenza con i prodotti a denominazione di origine, che invece rappresentano le eccellenze da proteggere e non da annullare.

Nessuna scorciatoia, quindi, come la distribuzione esclusiva di prodotti bio nelle mense pubbliche, oppure il trasferimento dei fondi europei destinati invece alla promozione dei prodotti agroalimentari o la totale assenza dei controlli sui prodotti bio che provengono dai paesi terzi.

Quindi noi vorremmo un vero biologico, rispettoso della natura e che riconosca agli agricoltori un giusto compenso e un giusto guadagno.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – În primul rând, felicitări raportoarei și tuturor colegilor implicați în acest dosar!

Indiscutabil, sănătatea cetățenilor este subsumată consumului de alimente ecologice. Apreciez, în acest context, eforturile Comisiei Europene de a promova prin politicile sale un consum de alimente sănătoase.

În același timp, trebuie să fim conștienți de faptul că producția în sistem BIO este mult mai dificil de realizat comparativ cu producția în sistem convențional. Astfel, fermierii trebuie să fie bine plătiți pentru aceste eforturi într-un mod care să contribuie la bunăstarea lor și să le asigure un trai decent. Statele membre trebuie, în același timp, să asigure mecanisme care au capacitatea de a absorbi întreaga producție ecologică atunci când piața liberă nu reușește să facă acest lucru în timp util, cunoscută fiind perisabilitatea produselor BIO. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să crească producția ecologică, dar, în același timp, nu trebuie să uite că are misiunea de a diminua efectele războiului și ale pandemiei Covid și să asigure securitatea alimentară nu doar la nivel european, ci și la nivel mondial.

În concluzie, realitățile de astăzi ne obligă să regândim planul de acțiune pe viitor! Războiul din Ucraina va afecta siguranța alimentară. Să nu fim naivi, stimam colegi și să conștientizăm acest lucru. Prețurile multor alimente au crescut deja considerabil. Nouă, decidenților politici, ne revine astăzi responsabilitatea de a face tot ceea ce este necesar ca cetățenii să aibă acces la alimente de calitate și mai ales la prețuri accesibile!

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhor Comissário, Caros Colegas, vejo com agrado o reconhecimento da agricultura biológica como um forte componente do percurso da União Europeia rumo a sistemas alimentares mais sustentáveis. O caminho para o aumento do consumo e da produção de produtos biológicos e para atingir também a meta de, pelo menos, 25% das terras agrícolas cultivadas em modo biológico é, porém, ainda longo e difícil.

Gostaria, por isso, de salientar o papel que as políticas públicas, nomeadamente a Política Agrícola Comum, terão neste caminho, auxiliando os agricultores nesta transição, tanto através do apoio financeiro como de serviços de aconselhamento e formação. Em paralelo, um desenvolvimento harmonioso do setor biológico implicará também a aposta em mercados e cadeias de abastecimento, bem como em promoção de medidas que estimulem a procura de alimentos biológicos, garantindo, assim, a prosperidade e a estabilidade do mercado, a remuneração justa dos agricultores e preços acessíveis aos consumidores.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, v poslední době je zřejmé, že ekologická produkce bude hrát v následujících letech čím dál větší roli. Požadují to spotřebitelé, tuto potřebu vidí i politici a úředníci, kteří nastavují pravidla hospodaření na zemědělské půdě. Navyšování ekologického zemědělství ale musí být přirozené. Musí být v souladu jak nabídka takové produkce, tak poptávka po ní. Musíme mít zároveň na paměti potřebu produkce dostatečného množství potravin pro naši populaci, což je ještě důležitější nyní v době ruské invaze na Ukrajinu.

Jako stínová zpravodajka ECR k této zprávě musím říct, že se paní zpravodajce podařilo zpracovat vyvážený dokument, který bere v úvahu všechny aspekty ekologického zemědělství včetně případných rizik, které musíme eliminovat. Za podstatné považují zejména potřebu zpracovávat hodnocení dopadů nové legislativy, nutnost, aby zavedení ekologického zemědělství bylo v souladu s tržními principy, výzvu pro využívání inovativních technik, např. šlechtitelství, a flexibilitu pro jednotlivé členské státy a jejich rozdílné startovací podmínky. Tyto podmínky se nám do zprávy podařilo zakomponovat, proto ji frakce ECR v hlasování podpoří.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, umjesto da kod nas u Hrvatskoj organska poljoprivreda cvjeta, recimo na razrušenoj Banovini, moram ovdje parafrazirati pismo udruge Hrvatski krški pašnjaci koja najbolje to opisuje.

Jedina smo zemlja članica Europske unije koja orkestrirano u medijima kleveče svoje vlastite poljoprivrednike i proizvođače hrane i prema kojima se ministarstvo odnosi bez imalo razumijevanja. Sve je to odraz poljoprivredne politike koju kreiraju uvoznici lobiji u Hrvatskoj i koji žele zatrti svaki ozbiljniji oblik poljoprivredne proizvodnje a naročito mesa i mlijeka, tako da nam i dalje mogu prodavati meso upitne kvalitete po dampinškim cijenama u trgovačkim centrima. Ni ne čudi činjenica što nam je DZS prije nekoliko dana objavio da prošli mjesec imamo najmanju proizvodnju mlijeka u povijesti i da nam je stočarska proizvodnja pred samim izumiranjem. Nije slučajno da nam poljoprivredno zemljište zarasta u korov jer administracija nije u 30 godina uspjela kvalitetno riješiti zakon koji je mijenjan čak 29 puta. Jedina smo zemlja članica koja nije uredila tržište, osigurala otkup domaćih proizvoda i zaštitila domaće proizvođače i koja oporezuje potpore poljoprivrednicima.

I konačno, nije ni čudno što nam svaki drugi čovjek obolijeva od raka zbog uvozne jeftine hrane, ali je najbitnije da uvoznici hrane iz godine u godinu i dalje ostvaruju svoje abnormalne profite koje nemaju nigdje drugdje.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je voudrais d'abord remercier ma collègue, Simone Schmiedtbauer, pour ce rapport qui était un travail d'équilibriste, mais elle a bien relevé le défi, encourageant la production biologique, mais tout en ayant une approche pragmatique.

Et c'est ce qu'il faut aujourd'hui, du pragmatisme. Lorsqu'on se fixe des objectifs pour développer la production biologique, il faut surtout s'assurer qu'il y ait un marché en face. Et on voit bien dans un certain nombre de pays membres, c'est le cas chez moi en France, qu'il y a un véritable problème avec la production biologique car le coût est plus important. C'est notamment le cas dans le secteur du lait: les producteurs ont beaucoup de mal à écouler leur production et à trouver des débouchés. C'est notre responsabilité d'être attentifs à ce point-là parce que nous emmenons les agriculteurs vers des investissements colossaux. Donc, il faut être sûr que derrière, il puisse y avoir une rentabilité et une demande.

En assurant le développement plus large des marchés publics écologiques, ce rapport propose de très bonnes solutions. Bravo!

Je voudrais également saluer le fait que le rapport n'oppose pas l'agriculture biologique et l'agriculture plus conventionnelle, qui elle aussi fait beaucoup d'efforts pour se renouveler. Je crois que ça doit être salué. Nous avons déjà l'agriculture la plus exigeante en Europe.

Et enfin, je voudrais insister sur la nécessité de travailler à des chaînes d'approvisionnements locales, parce que ça aussi, c'est une piste à explorer, et pour l'alimentation et pour l'environnement.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signora Presidente, Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, lo straordinario sviluppo dell'agricoltura biologica a livello europeo negli ultimi dieci anni è la dimostrazione di come i nostri agricoltori, se adeguatamente guidati e incentivati, rappresentino degli alleati imprescindibili nell'erogazione di servizi ambientali all'intera comunità e nel raggiungimento degli obiettivi del Green Deal. Un modello che merita quindi di essere rafforzato tramite un piano d'azione mirato e tramite la condivisione e l'implementazione su scala europea delle buone prassi sviluppate dagli Stati membri più virtuosi.

Non possiamo permetterci quindi, Commissario, che obiettivi ambiziosi posti dalla Commissione sviliscano l'altissima qualità delle produzioni europee, aprendo le porte all'importazione di prodotti biologici che non rispettano i nostri standard di sostenibilità ambientale, ma anche sociale ed economica.

Per questo chiediamo una valutazione d'impatto rigorosa affinché l'obiettivo del 25 per cento di superficie agricola destinata al biologico diventi un'opportunità per i nostri produttori e per i nostri consumatori, con l'obiettivo di innalzare la qualità delle nostre produzioni e non di svalutarle.

Colm Markey (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to welcome this action plan on organics and the recognition that any expansion has to be market-led. Organics by its nature has a higher cost base and it needs a premium price in order to fund the costs involved. If it's saturated, it undermines that market for new producers but also for existing producers who have invested heavily in the industry. We also need to simplify procedures to make it more accessible for new entrants.

There's a need for research and development, particularly into plant varieties that are more suitable to organics, but particularly into farm practices which are fundamentally different from traditional agricultural practices. Ireland has shown its commitment to organics going forward. It had traditionally a very low level, and it has increased its investment fivefold and it has a target of 7.5% organics by 2027. Organics has a key part to play alongside conventional agriculture. It's vital that we get the strategy correct.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Salvatore De Meo (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io voglio rivolgere un ringraziamento alla relatrice, che ha saputo coniugare in modo pratico le esigenze del settore biologico con quelle degli agricoltori.

È stato detto che il nostro obiettivo è quello di sostenere sì la produzione biologica, facendo sì che i nostri agricoltori diano il loro contributo al Green Deal, ma non dimentichiamoci che bisogna garantire una corretta formazione del prezzo, per fare in modo che i prodotti biologici possano essere conosciuti, apprezzati e consumati.

A questo proposito ribadisco, come è stato anche citato all'interno della relazione, l'importanza dei mercati all'ingrosso, perché sono delle grandi piattaforme di servizi, citate anche nella strategia *Farm to fork*, che sono importanti per la formazione del prezzo non solo come garanti della trasparenza, ma anche facilitatori di un sistema agroalimentare più giusto nei confronti degli agricoltori e dei consumatori.

Infine, ribadisco anch'io la necessità di proteggere i nostri produttori e i nostri consumatori di prodotti biologici, soprattutto da importazioni extraeuropee, e dobbiamo garantire un reale principio di equivalenza.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem přesvědčen o tom, že potřebujeme tento akční plán a děkuji paní zpravodajce za velmi kvalitní zprávu. Nejde pouze o otázku pesticidů, hnojiv, dopadů těchto látek na biodiverzitu, ale samozřejmě také o odolnost celého systému, protože současný systém skutečně není odolný a nenahrává naší i potravinové soběstačnosti. Tento cíl bychom měli vnímat jako jeden z prvních a prioritních i ve světle války na Ukrajině. Musíme budovat řetězce, které jsou udržitelné, samozřejmě co nejlépe na vyhovujícím, na tržním základě, a také řetězce, které jsou co nejkratší, tzn. podle naší strategie „Od farmáře ke spotřebiteli“. A důležitá je cena, protože ta bude významně určující, jak tato naše strategie bude úspěšná. Měli bychom pomoci zemědělcům k tomu, aby dokázali dostat se na trh za udržitelných a relativně slušných cen.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, gerbiamas Komisijos nary, šis pranešimas gerai subalansuotas ir gali prisidėti prie saugesnio ir sveikesnio maisto gamybos Europos Sąjungoje ir ne tik. Mano šalies, Lietuvos, ūkininkai yra pasiruošę plėtoti ekologinį ūkininkavimą, įtraukiant į šią veiklą ir daugiau jaunų ūkininkų. Tačiau, kaip Jūs, gerbiamas komisare, gerai žinote, skirtingų Europos šalių ūkininkai startuoja šiam darbui iš skirtingų pozicijų. Lietuvos ir kitų Baltijos šalių ūkininkai už tą patį darbą gauna skirtingas tiesiogines išmokas, nors visos sąlygos ūkininkavimui yra vienodos, kaip visoje Europos Sąjungoje. Todėl dar kartą kreipiuosi į Jus, komisare, kad padarytumėte viską, jog tiesioginės išmokos būtų visiems vienodos. Tada galėsime tikėtis, jog ir ekologinio ūkininkavimo ambicingi tikslai bus įgyvendinti.

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Das 25 %-Ziel für den Ökolandbau ist wichtig. Und es ist gerade jetzt wichtiger denn je, weil der Überfall auf die Ukraine uns doch gezeigt hat, wie abhängig die konventionelle Landwirtschaft von Energie ist, um mineralischen Stickstoff zu produzieren, wie abhängig aber auch viele von Futtermittelimporten sind. Und dann kann man doch eindeutig sagen: Da ist Öko kein Luxus, sondern dringender denn je, auch im Hinblick auf ein anderes Agrarmodell.

Beim Leguminosenanbau, wie es die Biobetriebe machen, da wird selber Stickstoff erzeugt – es macht unabhängig von Sojaimporten, und das ist ein wichtiges Ziel. Ich darf und muss hier auch betonen, dass die Ziele der Biodiversitätsstrategie und die Ziele des Klimaschutzes nur mit Ökolandbau erreicht werden können. Ich weise aber, wie viele andere auch, darauf hin, dass 25 % nicht nur auf dem Acker erreicht werden müssen. Wir brauchen auch 25 % in den Kantinen, in den Schulen, in den Kindergärten. Das darf kein Luxus sein, sondern das muss selbstverständlich werden, dass wir da Bio anbieten.

Und ein Punkt noch, Herr Kommissar: Wir brauchen mehr Geld für Forschung, mehr Geld für Innovationen im Biolandbau. Und das ist eine dringende Forderung, die der Sektor an Sie hat.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, het verslag van Simone Schmiedtbauer is een uitstekend en zeer evenwichtig verslag geworden. Wat mij in dit verslag met name aanspreekt is de vraaggerichtheid. Ik ben er sterk van overtuigd dat van bovenaf opgelegde percentages en doelstellingen averechts werken en tot marktverstoringen en prijsdalingen leiden, waarmee niemand gediend is, en zeker niet de biologische landbouwer. Daarom doen we er goed aan het door de Commissie voorgestelde percentage van 25 procent niet te omarmen.

Laten we daarnaast niet vergeten dat ook de gangbare landbouw bijzonder duurzaam kan zijn mits wij voor goede instrumenten, een goed regelgevingskader en goede nieuwe rassen zorgen en voldoende gewasbeschermingsmiddelen ter beschikking stellen aan landbouwers, zodat zij kunnen ingrijpen.

Een top-downbenadering met betrekking tot biologische landbouw werkt niet. Onze benadering moet vraaggericht zijn.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, a agricultura biológica pode desempenhar um papel importante na mitigação dos efeitos das alterações climáticas e na restauração da biodiversidade. Defendemos uma abordagem de cadeias curtas de abastecimento, não sujeita à orientação do mercado, mas sim às necessidades de alimentação dos povos e à sua capacidade de produzir os alimentos de que necessitam.

As quotas de terras agrícolas sob produção biológica variam significativamente em toda a União Europeia e não existe um modelo agrícola único que se adapte a todos os países e regiões. Importa, pois, que as estratégias nacionais ou regionais em matéria de agricultura biológica, promovidas pelos Estados-Membros, respondam às suas necessidades e ao objetivo de garantirem a soberania alimentar e que essas estratégias assegurem apoios adequados para os agricultores, sobretudo os pequenos e médios agricultores.

Alertamos ainda para a classificação de sal biológico, que deverá apenas ser classificado como tal quando aquele é produzido segundo processos naturais, sem aditivos nem emissões de carbono na sua produção, que caracterizam a produção de sal marinho.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Janusz Wojciechowski, członek Komisji. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dziękuję jeszcze raz wszystkim Państwu Posłom. Jeszcze raz gratuluję pani sprawozdawczyni, pani poseł Schmiedtbauer, bo rzeczywiście to się rzadko zdarza, że sprawozdanie w tak wrażliwej sprawie, jaką jest rolnictwo ekologiczne, zostaje przyjęte praktycznie przez wszystkich jednocześnie. I także chcę wyrazić satysfakcję, że jest to sprawozdanie w pełni zgodne z podejściem Komisji do rolnictwa ekologicznego.

Potrzebujemy rolnictwa ekologicznego jako ważnej części rolnictwa jako takiego, całego systemu żywności i dlatego ważne jest to podejście kompleksowe. A więc mówimy o wspieraniu konsumpcji, o krótkich łańcuchach dostaw, dobrosztanie zwierząt, o współpracy na wszystkich szczeblach, bo to musi być współpraca rolników, przetwórców i także systemu dystrybucji produkcji ekologicznej, a także o rozwijaniu, wspierania konsumpcji.

Rolnictwo ekologiczne nie jest w kontrze do rolnictwa konwencjonalnego. To nie jest spór między różnymi rodzajami rolnictwa. To jest po prostu ważna część całego systemu żywnościowego.

Odbывая wizyty w państwach członkowskich, staram się spotykać rolników ekologicznych również i mam bardzo pozytywne doświadczenia. O jednym powiem, bo to jest ostatnie, z ubiegłego tygodnia. Spotkałem rolnika ekologicznego prowadzącego niewielkie gospodarstwo, 15-hektarowe, z Estonii. Rolnik ten produkuje warzywa i na tym obszarze 15 hektarów osiąga dochody roczne w wysokości 200 tys. euro. Produkuje warzywa, ma niewielkie przetwórstwo polegające praktycznie na krojeniu tych warzyw i na pakowaniu ich. Sprzedaje je sam, ma już ustalonych odbiorców. Gdyby on chciał zostać na tych 15 hektarach rolnikiem konwencjonalnym, nie miałby szans w konkurencji z dużo większymi gospodarstwami wokół. Ale jako rolnik ekologiczny może się w tej konkurencji utrzymać i utrzymuje całą swoją rodzinę. Więc myślę, że wartość rolnictwa ekologicznego leży przede wszystkim w tym, że – jeśli patrzymy na nią od strony rolników – jest to dobra oferta dla tych rolników, którzy w konkurencji konwencjonalnej mają mniejsze szanse albo nie mają ich w ogóle.

I na to przede wszystkim staramy się zwracać uwagę, współpracując z państwami członkowskimi w tej chwili nad planami strategicznymi. Rolnictwo ekologiczne jest ważnym elementem dialogu. Chcemy je rozwijać, ale nie na zasadzie przymusu. Jeszcze raz podkreślam, że ten cel 25% to nie jest cel ani dla rolników, ani nawet cel bezpośrednio wiążący państwa członkowskie. Chcemy przy pomocy zachęt, przy pomocy dobrej oferty zachęcić do prowadzenia tego rodzaju rolnictwa, ale to nie jest żaden przymus.

Myślę, że jedna też cecha jest, która występuje w tych rozmowach z rolnikami ekologicznymi (szczególnie w sytuacji, kiedy mamy tę dramatyczną sytuację związaną z rosyjską agresją na Ukrainę i obawami o bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe z tym związane), a mianowicie że rolnicy ekologiczni nie są dotknięci podwyżką cen nawozów, nie są dotknięci problemami ze środkami ochrony roślin. Są po prostu bardziej odporni w tej sytuacji. I ten aspekt też powinniśmy brać pod uwagę.

Jeszcze raz dziękuję za bardzo ciekawą debatę. Komisja w pełni popiera sprawozdanie pani Schmiedtbauer. Cieszę się z tego sprawozdania i myślę, że jesteśmy na dobrej drodze, żeby rozwijać rolnictwo ekologiczne w dobrym kierunku, bez uszczerbku dla bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego, które w tym momencie jest tak szczególnie ważne.

Simone Schmiedtbauer, Berichterstatlerin. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte Ihnen allen für die wirklich rege Diskussion zu diesem wichtigen Bericht zu unserem Bio-Aktionsplan der EU danken.

Ich darf noch einmal wiederholen: Im Kern sind wir uns einig, dass wir den Biosektor in Europa ausbauen und stärken wollen. Dieses Ziel eint uns. Zum Prozentziel: Wir wollen bis 2030 niemanden verlieren. Ganz im Gegenteil: Wir wollen viele dazugewinnen, viele Mitgliedstaaten, viele Landwirtinnen und Landwirte.

Die Kommission legt ein sehr ambitioniertes Ziel vor: eine Verdreifachung in nicht einmal acht Jahren, man könnte sagen in siebeneinhalb Jahren. Und ich möchte Ihnen noch einmal zur Veranschaulichung mitgeben: In Österreich haben wir Bio in einem jahrzehntelangen Prozess auf 26 % Biofläche gesteigert. Das ging nicht von heute auf morgen. Also vertrauen Sie mir bitte! Dafür haben wir es aber nachhaltig und sehr erfolgreich geschafft.

In unserem Bericht heben wir ganz deutlich hervor, dass der Ausbau der biologischen Landwirtschaft eines der Schlüsselemente zur Erreichung der übergeordneten *Green-Deal*-Ziele sein wird. Die biologische Landwirtschaft spielt eine bedeutende Rolle bei der Bereitstellung nachhaltiger Lösungen für viele Herausforderungen in der heutigen Zeit.

Aber bitte: Wenn wir erfolgreich sein wollen, dann gehen wir es nachhaltig an, geben wir uns die Zeit, die wir brauchen, die unsere Mitgliedstaaten brauchen, die unsere Bäuerinnen und Bauern brauchen – für uns und für unsere Umwelt.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 3 maja 2022 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Carmen Avram (S&D), în scris. – Susțin promovarea produselor agroalimentare organice la nivelul Uniunii Europene. Cu toate acestea, Comisia Europeană trebuie să țină cont atât de capacitatea de absorbție a pieței, cât și de procentul de teren cultivat în regim ecologic de fiecare stat membru în parte.

În lipsa cererii și a unui ritm organic de creștere a producției ecologice, obiectivele Uniunii Europene nu doar ca nu vor putea fi atinse, ci vor pune presiune și mai mare pe sectorul agricol, oricum greu încercat în aceste timpuri.

România are un potențial uriaș pe piața organică, însă este nevoie ca fermierii romani să fie sprijiniți nu doar la nivel național, ci și european, prin eforturi coordonate de deschidere a unor noi piețe în afara granițelor UE.

Totodată, nu trebuie uitat că producția ecologică necesită mai multe resurse naturale, cum ar fi apa. Prin urmare, România trebuie să își pună la punct rețeaua de irigații, astfel încât să poată susține un procent ridicat de teren agricol cultivat în regim organic.

Benoît Lutgen (PPE), par écrit. – Aujourd'hui, le Parlement européen se prononce sur le Plan d'action visant à développer la production biologique dans l'Union européenne, Plan envisagé par deux stratégies européennes: «De la ferme à la table» et «Biodiversité». En ce moment, le prix des denrées alimentaires augmente dans toute l'Union européenne. Pour de trop nombreuses familles, les aliments bio restent totalement inaccessibles.

Parallèlement, les incitations pour les agriculteurs à se tourner vers les produits bio diminuent également. C'est pourquoi, il faut soutenir tout le secteur bio et les agriculteurs qui s'y adonnent. Voter ce rapport qui demande un soutien et un budget plus importants pour l'ensemble du secteur de l'agriculture biologique est essentiel!

Dans ce cadre, je vous invite à soutenir l'amendement qui entend porter la surface agricole européenne biologique à 25% d'ici à 2030. Ma région, la Wallonie, est l'un des leaders européens en la matière: la superficie de l'agriculture biologique y atteint 12%, preuve qu'augmenter ce type de production est possible. Je vous invite également à voter en faveur de l'amendement proposant de fournir des aliments bio dans les écoles, les hôpitaux et les maisons de retraite. Je vous remercie.

16. Prześladowanie mniejszości z powodu przekonań lub religii (krótka prezentacja)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest krótka prezentacja sprawozdania sporządzonego przez Karola Karskiego w imieniu Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych w sprawie prześladowania mniejszości z powodu przekonań lub religii (2021/2055(INI)) (A9-0071/2022).

Przypominam, że obowiązuje swoboda wyboru miejsc, z wyjątkiem dwóch pierwszych rzędów, które są przydzielone przewodniczącym grup.

Przypominam także, że będą Państwo mogli zgłosić się do zabrania głosu z sali i do procedury niebieskiej kartki po umieszczeniu karty do głosowania w czytniku.

Karol Karski, Sprawozdawca. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Podczas tej sesji debatujemy nad sprawozdaniem w sprawie prześladowań mniejszości religijnych na świecie. Jest to temat bardzo szeroki, ważny, a zarazem wyjątkowo trudny do zamknięcia w jednym dokumencie. Przy pracy nad pierwotnym tekstem moim założeniem było opracowanie możliwie najbardziej pełnego obrazu sytuacji na różnych kontynentach, swoistej mapy prześladowań lub problemów, z którymi borykają się przedstawiciele różnych grup wyznaniowych lub też osoby niewierzące. Wymagało to oczywiście przyjęcia pewnej metodologii i swoistej gradacji problemów poprzez pryzmat religii najczęściej padających ofiarami ataków, co łączy się też z samą liczbą wyznawców oraz państw, w których tego typu wydarzenia są najczęstsze.

W wyniku bardzo dogłębnej analizy wielu dostępnych opracowań i dokumentów wydaje mi się, że udało się takiej gradacji dokonać. Okazało się, co chyba nie jest zaskoczeniem dla nikogo, że najbardziej prześladowaną grupą religijną są chrześcijanie. Niedaleko za nimi są wyznawcy islamu, a na trzecim miejscu judaizmu. Ci pierwsi padali ofiarami przemocy w aż 145 krajach. Dla porównania według dostępnych źródeł osoby niewierzące represjonowane były w 18. Podaję te informacje dla porządku, bo niestety w końcowej wersji sprawozdania zostały one usunięte. Większość grup, nie wiem, czy ze względu na polityczną poprawność czy strach przed tym, że ktoś mógłby zostać pominięty, zdecydowała, aby w sprawozdaniu o prześladowaniu mniejszości religijnych nie wymieniać żadnych mniejszości ani żadnych krajów, w których do tych prześladowań dochodzi.

Stało się to niestety standardem przy bardzo wielu dokumentach w tych corocznych sprawozdaniach o prawach człowieka na świecie, w których już od lat nie wymieniamy żadnych państw. Moim zdaniem osłabia to bardzo stanowisko Parlamentu. Niemniej jednak sprawozdanie, które udało się nam wspólnymi siłami wynegocjować, wciąż zawiera bardzo wiele ważnych punktów, które należy podkreślić. W sposób wyczerpujący wymienia na przykład różne formy, jakie mogą przybrać prześladowania, wskazuje na trudną sytuację kobiet w wielu krajach oraz podkreśla, że wszelka przemoc lub dyskryminacja ze względu na wyznawaną religię powinna się spotkać ze zdecydowaną reakcją władz danego kraju oraz społeczności międzynarodowej. Mówi o kwestiach niszczenia dziedzictwa kulturowego oraz miejsc kultu w konfliktach zbrojnych, a nawet powołuje się na Konwencję Narodów Zjednoczonych z 1948 roku o ludobójstwie.

Sprawozdanie zawiera też bardzo konkretne propozycje dla instytucji unijnych na temat tego, w jaki sposób powinny reagować na łamanie praw mniejszości religijnych między innymi poprzez szerokie współdziałanie z rządami, Kościołami, grupami wyznaniowymi, organizacjami pozarządowymi i obrońcami praw człowieka. Ważnym instrumentem są też wytyczne w sprawie wolności religii i wyznania, które powinny być okresowo oceniane i aktualizowane przy współpracy z wszystkimi stronami, które wymieniałem przed chwilą. Prześladowania na tle religijnym powinny także stać się ważną częścią krajowych strategii Unii Europejskiej, a nasze delegacje w różnych częściach globu powinny przykładać szczególną wagę do tych zagadnień.

Reasumując, uważam, że przedłożone przeze mnie sprawozdanie spełnia swoją rolę, którą powinno być zwrócenie uwagi unijnych instytucji oraz opinii publicznej na problem, jakim są restrykcje dotyczące różne grupy wyznaniowe oraz osoby niewierzące oraz ataki, których ofiarami padają one w bardzo wielu miejscach na świecie. Żałuję, że nie udało się otrzymać o wiele bardziej precyzyjnych i konkretnych zapisów wskazujących na poszczególne państwa i władze, choć w wielu miejscach sprawozdania bardzo łatwo odczytać z kontekstu odniesienia do bardzo konkretnych sytuacji. Wiem też, że posłowie podpisali wnioski o oddzielne głosowania nad kilkoma paragrafami oraz złożyli dwie poprawki do tekstu mówiące o sytuacji chrześcijan na świecie. Jako sprawozdawca uważam, że te propozycje są zasadne, i chciałbym zachęcić moje koleżanki i moich kolegów do ich poparcia. Na końcu chciałbym też podziękować za współpracę sprawozdawcom ceniom z innych grup politycznych, doradcom, a także członkom sekretariatu Podkomisji Praw Człowieka.

IN THE CHAIR: ROBERTS ZĪLE*Vice-President**Catch-the-eye procedure*

Peter van Dalen (PPE). – Voorzitter, ik heb van harte aan de totstandkoming van dit verslag meegewerkt, omdat in het Parlement naar mijn mening te weinig politieke aandacht wordt besteed aan mensen die op grond van hun godsdienst worden vervolgd.

Helaas zijn de namen van personen en organisaties die op grond van hun geloof zijn vervolgd uit het verslag weggeamendeerd. Ik wil daarom van deze gelegenheid gebruikmaken om te wijzen op een ander belangrijk verslag dat onlangs is opgesteld door de interfractiewerkgroep van het Parlement voor Vrijheid van godsdienst en tolerantie tussen religies, waarvan ik, samen met Carlo Fidanza, medevoorzitter ben. Dit verslag over de vrijheid van godsdienst of levensovertuiging in de periode 2017-2021 bevat namelijk wel concrete voorbeelden. Ik wil u dan ook adviseren dit verslag te raadplegen. Er moet in het Parlement namelijk veel meer aandacht worden besteed aan dit onderwerp.

Ten slotte hoop ik dat de Commissie snel de nieuwe gezant voor godsdienstvrijheid benoemt, aangezien we daar al veel te lang op hebben gewacht.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, dit verslag over religieuze minderheden en de vervolging waarmee zij te maken hebben, is een goede zaak. Ik sluit me evenwel aan bij de zorgen die door Peter van Dalen zijn aangekaart over het feit dat christenen niet of nauwelijks meer in het verslag worden genoemd en dat veel informatie is weggeamendeerd. Dit vind ik een zeer slechte zaak.

Wat ik echter met name onbestaanbaar en onverteerbaar vind, is dat gelovigen in het verslag worden bekritiseerd vanwege hun standpunt ten aanzien van abortus. Dit onderwerp valt niet alleen buiten het toepassingsgebied van het verslag, maar ook buiten de bevoegdheden van de Europese Unie. Ieder leven is beschermwaardig, zeker het ongeboren leven. We zouden gelovigen niet moeten bekritisieren, maar hen juist moeten prijzen omdat zij belang hechten aan de zorg voor het leven.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew). – Señor presidente, hemos hablado en este Parlamento sobre la persecución de las minorías religiosas en muchos informes de derechos humanos. Hoy lo hacemos en un informe específico que aborda la persecución de todas las minorías por motivos de creencias o de religión, pero también la persecución que sufren aquellos que no tienen ninguna.

Hemos querido en este informe no hacer una jerarquía del sufrimiento y también denunciar la instrumentalización de las creencias o de la religión para imponer políticas y leyes discriminatorias que violan los derechos humanos: en nombre de la religión se prohíben los derechos de las mujeres en Afganistán; en nombre de la religión se criminaliza a las comunidades LGTBI en Uganda; también la religión se usa para prohibir la ratificación del Convenio de Estambul, único instrumento internacional para la defensa y la lucha de las mujeres en la violencia contra ellas. Por ello, creo que es un informe completo y agradezco al ponente su trabajo.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Mr President, from Nigeria to China, the state of religious freedom continues to deteriorate. From genocide to legal restrictions, hundreds of millions of believers – be they Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, or other groups – are facing terrible suffering every day.

While I welcome the EP's report on the persecution of religious freedom, I cannot help but express my dismay at the way this report has been hijacked to stigmatise religion itself.

Today, religious persecution is one of the key drivers of many of the challenges the world faces. And that's why not ideological anti-religious stands, but firm support for the persecuted around the world, together with the appointment of a new special envoy for freedom of religion, supported with the right instruments, must be the priority.

Carlo Fidanza (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con l'intergruppo per la libertà religiosa attendevamo da tempo questa relazione, e voglio davvero ringraziare di cuore il collega Karski, che ha lavorato duramente su questa relazione, anche sul negoziato che ne è seguito.

Purtroppo però condivido con i colleghi che, nonostante gli sforzi straordinari, questa trattativa poi si è rivelata problematica. Tutti i riferimenti che dovevano e potevano denunciare la situazione in cui vivono milioni di fedeli, in primo luogo cristiani, più dell'80 per cento, ma anche baha'i, uiguri, rohingya e molti altri che quotidianamente rischiano la propria vita per il loro credo sono stati eliminati. Sono stati rimossi anche i riferimenti ai regimi colpevoli di queste persecuzioni, dalla Cina, alla Nigeria, al Pakistan.

Insomma, il mondo è pieno di persone che rischiano la vita per la loro fede, ma non scriviamo di chi è la colpa. In compenso abbiamo un testo pieno di richiami al tema dell'aborto, perché come sempre ormai si cerca di utilizzare una risoluzione importante per affermare una propria agenda ideologica.

Per questa ragione – chiudo Presidente – insieme ad altri colleghi abbiamo presentato alcuni emendamenti e richieste di voto separato, perché vogliamo essere liberi di difendere chi soffre in ragione del proprio credo, senza dover aderire al pensiero unico della sinistra.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já se také připojuji k volání svých kolegů, protože svoboda vyznání a samozřejmě i s tím související svoboda projevu patří mezi základní lidská práva a porušování těchto práv je nepřijatelné. Stejně tak je nepřijatelné, aby proti věřícím bylo zakročováno způsobem, který omezuje jejich lidská práva nebo přímo dokonce zasahuje do jejich svobody a do jejich života. Všechny tyto trestné činy se musí stíhat. Samozřejmě bohužel celá řada těchto trestných činů není hlášena a zůstávají vlastně nepotrestány. Je skutečně zarážející, že i v tomto století, v této dekádě máme stále země, kde náboženské zákony, např. zákon o rouhání, mají přednost před vnitrostátním právem. To je skutečně nepřijatelné. A myslím si, že bychom se měli zaměřit na naše dva nástroje, které máme v této zprávě rovněž zmíněny. Jsou to rozvojová pomoc a obchodní dohody. Tyto nástroje bychom měli využívat tak, abychom letošního 22. srpna, což je Den mezinárodní památky obětí tohoto náboženského pronásledování, abychom mohli říci, že jsme něco pro tyto oběti skutečně udělali.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – M-am născut în epoca sovietică în U.R.S.S., azi Ucraina, și am trăit din plin această interdicție de atașament față de identitatea spirituală. Biserica era interzisă atunci. Nu e nici astăzi departe situația pe care o vedem când patriarhul Kirill, alături de Putin, sub pretextul apărării unor interese pe care nu le înțelegem, atacă creștinii din Ucraina demolând biserici. Am fost în foarte multe țări din partea Parlamentului European: în Irak, unde m-am întâlnit cu Patriarhul Babilonului și am văzut ce înseamnă să fii creștin în Irak, ce înseamnă să ai curaj să-ți asumi această identitate. Și cred că este important să dezbaterem aceste teme și felicit inițiatorii raportului.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Janusz Wojciechowski, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, the European Union defends the right of every individual to freedom of religion and belief.

Marginalisation and scapegoating of persons belonging to religious minorities and atheists can be an early warning or already a sign of more severe persecution that, in turn, can drive to conflict and even a wider crackdown on the whole of society.

I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Karol Karski and all Members of the European Parliament who have contributed to this timely report on the persecution of minorities on the grounds of belief or religion, which provides clearer recommendations on how the European Union should continue to spearhead the protection and promotion of freedom of religion or belief.

We take good note of some key recommendations, such as the need to increase public diplomacy on freedom of religion or belief, to work on the situation of minorities in conflict situations and the protection of religious cities, as well as the strong call to the European Union to continue its firm action at multilateral level.

In line with the European Union action plan on human rights and democracy, freedom of religion or belief remains an essential priority of our external human rights policy. Accordingly, many EU delegations have enshrined it as a priority in their human rights country strategies. Let me assure you that the EU stands in solidarity with the victims.

The line with all our partners across the world is clear: the European Union consistently and unequivocally condemns discrimination, intolerance, persecution and violence against, or by, any person based on grounds of religion or belief. We call on countries to protect the right for everybody to have or not have a religion or belief, to manifest or to change their religion or belief, while condemning the criminalisation of apostasy and the abuse of blasphemy laws.

Over the past year, we carried out key actions to promote and protect freedom of religion or belief, such as raising our concerns of violations in around 20 human rights dialogues, issuing high-level statements such as an EU declaration on the occasion of the International Day Commemorating the Victims of Religious Persecution and through our work in multilateral fora.

The latest resolution on freedom of religion or belief, adopted by consensus during the last Human Rights Council session, renewed the mandate of the UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief. In addition, we also closely exchanged on freedom of religion or belief with regional organisations, in particular the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, through regular senior official meetings or the Istanbul Process.

We look forward to continue cooperating closely with the European Parliament in identifying and addressing the most serious violations of freedom of religion or belief around the world.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir beigušas. Balsošana notiks rītdien.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (171. pants)

Kinga Gál (NI), írásban. – Ez a jelentés egy fontos lehetőség lehetett volna arra, hogy felhívja rá a figyelmet, hogy ma a keresztény a legüldözöttebb vallás világszerte. Ehhez képest a jelentéstevő szövege a balliberális többség bizottsági módosítói révén már egyetlen helyen sem említi a keresztényüldözés súlyos problémáját. Helyette a meggyőződés- és vallás szabadsága alatt tárgyalja a gender-, LMBTQ- vagy abortuszkérdéseket. Meghaladva immár a 360 milliót, tovább emelkedik azoknak a keresztényeknek a száma, akik nagyfokú üldözés vagy hátrányos megkülönböztetés áldozatai. Míg egy évvel ezelőtt ez minden 8. keresztényt érintett, immár minden 7. keresztény szenved megkülönböztetést hitéért. Az üldözés formái eltérőek lehetnek az általános diszkriminációtól, a véleménynyilvánítás és szabad vallásgyakorlás korlátozásán át a fizikai támadásokig. Ez utóbbi már-már kimeríti az ENSZ által meghatározott népiirtás fogalmát. Az üldözés növekedésének egyik oka a keresztények védelmének hiánya. Éppen ezért még nagyobb szerepe van nemzetközileg a Hungary Helps Programnak, amely keresztény közösségek túlélését, otthon- és megmaradását segíti immár világszerte oda víve a segítséget, ahol a baj van. Az immáron 5 éves program több mint 40 országban indított támogatási programot félmillió embernek nyújtva segítséget. Lehetővé tették például a közel-keleti keresztények számára, hogy az elvándorlás helyett a szülőföldön maradási választást válasszák vagy a bajba jutottak a háborús helyzet enyhülése után az oda való visszatérést.

17. Unijna strategija wspierania edukacji dzieci na świecie: łagodzenie skutków pandemii COVID-19 (krótka prezentacja)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības jautājums: David Lega ziņojuma par ES stratēģiju bērnu izglītības veicināšanai pasaulē (2021/2209(INI)) (A9-0058/2022) iss izklāsts.

David Lega, rapporteur. – Mr President, we've seen it before with the global pandemic, and all over again now: education is key during crisis and wars. This report gives emphasis to the importance of education for children's well-being as a fundamental right, enshrined in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

And the report comes at a very timely moment, with the horrible war raging in Ukraine, weighing a huge toll on children, forcibly displacing them with 4.5 million who left the country and 7 million internally displaced within Ukraine itself. For the millions of Ukrainian children affected by the war, the distance learning programmes enacted during the global pandemic have proven life-saving and fundamental in ensuring the continuation of these essential formative years of children and young people's development.

As it has been for Ukraine, so it is for all children in Europe and around the world; education cannot wait and is never negotiable. All over the world, children and young people are experiencing new heights of mental health issues. As legislators, we are called upon to make choices and provide answers because we risk a lost generation if we do not intervene with corrective measures aimed at mitigating these very consequences.

We cannot allow ourselves to fail the children in our societies all over the world. We need to do our best to ensure a bright future for the younger generation and make sure that they thrive and reach their full potential, wherever they are, holding no one back but also leaving no one behind.

Education is one of the most important challenges of the century, and it needs to be treated as a matter of priority, especially in these times of crisis. Schools and education provide a safe space for many children around the world, and that's even truer for girls, giving them a healthy meal a day, shielding them from domestic violence or, even worse, from being sexually abused or exploited or from being recruited as soldiers.

So let's also think about the huge economic losses associated with a lack of proper education – both formal and vocational. Children who do not go to schools miss out on important skills that will be necessary for them to enter the labour market when they reach adulthood.

With my report, we make an important pledge and give specific recommendations to the EU Member States, the Commission and the External Action Service to prioritise education in the recovery plans and in their relationships with third countries. Education serves as a catalyst for innovation and human development, including easing young people's access to the labour market. So this report draws a clear connection between education and entry in the labour market later in life.

I will always remember my own teachers who taught me to write with a pen in my mouth, and how she forced me to always try again when I didn't do get good enough, even if it took me 15 minutes longer than all my classmates. But that helped shape me into who I am today. We know that teachers help shape the next generation, so let's make sure that all children have a teacher to remember.

I want to thank all my shadows and I hope for the full support of all my colleagues on this important topic so close to our hearts.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, education is fundamental for future global development, and also for the strengthening of human dignity itself. That is why it is crucial that in our development aid, the EU and its Member States redouble efforts to support education around the world. At the same time, we must ensure that the standards are in line with our values and carefully monitor any attempts to abuse education, undermine peace, call to violence or spread hate, including anti-Semitism.

For this reason, I believe it is necessary to ensure that our funding, including to the Palestinian authorities, as well as UNRWA, is conditional on ensuring compliance with our values. We must have a mechanism in place to guarantee transparency and to respond to any abuse of our funding. By failing to do so, we risk undermining the aims and objectives of our development aid and the very values on which our Union has been founded.

Bettina Vollath (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Herzlichen Dank an alle, der Text ist wirklich gut geworden.

Die COVID-Pandemie ist schlimm, aber besonders fatal für Kinder und Jugendliche. Viele hatten zwar auch vor COVID keinen ausreichenden Zugang zu Bildung. Die langen Schulschließungen behinderten aber das Recht auf Bildung noch zusätzlich enorm. 1,8 Milliarden Schülerinnen und Schüler hatten nur eingeschränkten Zugang. Das bedeutet ein immenses Bildungsdefizit, aber auch fehlende Betreuung und Mahlzeiten, kaum sozialen Kontakt zu Gleichaltrigen, eine erhöhte Gefahr für Gewalt, auch dafür, häusliche Gewalt, Missbrauch und Ausbeutung zu erleiden.

Digitale Lern- und Lehrmethoden waren hilfreich, aber ein Drittel der Kinder weltweit hat gar keinen Zugang zum Internet. Wichtig ist, dass wirklich alle Kinder wieder in die Schulen zurückkehren, sonst werden viele von ihnen zurückbleiben. Schulen stehen außer für Bildung auch für unverzichtbare Begegnung und psychosoziale Unterstützung. Die Europäische Union muss also umfassende Programme, Maßnahmen und Unterstützung bieten, um allen Kindern gerecht zu werden.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas pirmininke, pirmiausia noriu padėkoti pranešėjui Davidui Legai už tikrai gerai parengtą pranešimą ir prisijungiu prie tų minčių, kad švietimas yra labai svarbus ir kad pandemija padarė didelę įtaką švietimui. Nežiūrint į nuotolinį mokymą, vis dėlto kontaktinis mokymas, atėjimas į mokyklą iš tikrųjų užtikrina visiškai kitas galimybes vaikams. Pirmą kartą, atrodo, pandemija parodė, kad mes neapsaugojome vaikų arba, sakyčiau, nepakankamai apsaugojome vaikus, bet saugojomės nuo jų, kad neužkrėstų suaugusiųjų. Man atrodo, kad mes turime padaryti labai rimtas išvadas ir galbūt mūsų specialusis komitetas, įvertinant COVID-19 pasekmes, taip pat galės prisidėti prie šios problemos išmokyti pamokų pateikimo visuomenei. Taip pat labai noriu atkreipti dėmesį į mokymosi galimybes Ukrainos vaikams – tiek dabar pačioje Ukrainoje, tiek pabėgėlių vaikams. Manau, kad mūsų Komisija, valstybės narės turi padvigubinti savo indėlį, kad tie vaikai galėtų gauti išsilavinimą.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Janusz Wojciechowski, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, this debate is a timely opportunity to discuss the impact the COVID-19 pandemic has had on children worldwide, and their chance to obtain quality and safe education. Lockdowns, school closures and the resulting disruption to children's lives and that of their families and communication have negatively affected a generation.

This debate is also timely also because of, as the rapporteur, Mr Lega, said, the tragedy in Ukraine and the tragedy of children with schools under attack and millions of children forced to leave their home, their school, their country. Thank you also very much to countries and Member States organising education, including for child refugees.

I'd therefore to thank the rapporteur, Mr Lega, and all the Members of the European Parliament who have contributed to this report. We welcome the report and its recommendations.

Honourable Members, the pandemic overturned, within weeks, the global education landscape, affecting over 1.8 billion children around the world. It made us aware of how vital the availability of digital technologies, equipment and internet access is. Our approach, as published in the digital education action plan, is that proper support for a resilient and inclusive digital education must be holistic and cannot replace the wider social and community functions a school education provides for children. E-learning was not a solution for the youngest, pre-school children or those without connectivity.

Children and youth in the most vulnerable situations in every country are paying the heaviest price: children living in poverty, children in countries in conflict, children from ethnic minority groups, children with disabilities or displaced children. This further compounds the already significant negative socioeconomic consequences, with a long-term impact on children's learning, well-being and mental health, and with their development and protection.

The European Union has been working with partner countries since the beginning of the crisis to minimise the impact of the pandemic on learning and the well-being of children, to facilitate a safe return to school and to prioritise school reopening. In this regard, the European Union supports education in approximately 100 countries worldwide. We are working with partner countries to develop COVID-19 response plans and to adopt education cooperation programmes to ensure delivery of education services, distance learning, curriculum adaptation and support to teachers.

The European Union is a leading voice in the area of education in emergencies and protracted crises. We have set a target of 10% of our humanitarian aid earmarked for education in emergencies. We are also strongly committed to increasing EU external funding for education. At least 20% of the funds from the Global Europe instrument should be devoted to human development. Our support in education focuses on quality by investing in teachers' equity and by promoting girls' education, and on matching skills with emerging labour market needs.

The European Union is also fully engaged in the preparation of the UN Transforming Education Summit to be held in September 2022 — because we will only achieve our goals if we place education at the forefront of the international debate on sustainable development.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir beigušās. Balsošana notiks rītdien.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (171. pants)

Jarosław Duda (PPE), na piśmie. – Pandemia Covid-19 i związana z nią konieczność okresowego zamknięcia szkół znacząco pogorszyła sytuację ogromnej rzeszy dzieci. Naraziła wiele z nich na pogorszenie zdrowia psychicznego, marginalizację, izolację, a także zaprzepaszczanie części dotychczasowych osiągnięć edukacyjnych i osłabienie motywacji do kontynuowania nauki.

Jednocześnie negatywny wpływ pandemii na gospodarkę wiąże się z realnym ryzykiem obniżania nakładów na edukację. W tej sytuacji deklaracja paryska UNESCO, wzywająca do inwestowania w przyszłość edukacji, jest kluczowa. Wymaga szerokiego poparcia i przekucia jej na efektywne działania.

Z drugiej strony, pandemia zmusiła nas do odejścia od schematów i poszukiwania nowych rozwiązań. Warto wykorzystać tę bolesną lekcję do zreformowania skostniałych programów i systemów edukacyjnych. Docenienie kształcenia pozaformalnego, nieformalnego, opieki mentorskiej, wolontariatu oraz wspieranie rozwoju umiejętności kluczowych mogą przyczynić się do lepszego powiązania edukacji z wymogami rynków pracy.

Nowe szanse stwarza też rozwój nowoczesnych technologii informacyjnych i komunikacyjnych, pod warunkiem że będą one powszechnie dostępne, a ich wykorzystanie w żadnym razie nie będzie prowadziło do wykluczenia i izolacji.

György Hölvényi (PPE), írásban. – Afrika lakosságának 40%-a 15 év alatti. Ezzel Afrika a föld legfiatalabb kontinense, ahol évente 10 millió új ember lép be a munkaerőpiacra. Ez egyszerre jelent hatalmas kihívást a migráció megfékezésére és lehetőséget az afrikai gazdaság felzárkóztatása számára. Az afrikai országok csak akkor tudnak élni a fiatalok jelentette lehetőséggel, ha a felnövekvő generációk megfelelő oktatásban és szakképzésben részesülnek. Az oktatás, a biztonság és a munkahelyteremtés mellett az egyik legfontosabb eszköz, amellyel a helyben maradáshoz elő tudjuk segíteni, így ezt az unió külpolitikájának minden elérhető eszközzel támogatnia kell. Ahogy arra a jelentésben is felhívtuk a figyelmet, a helyi egyházak és vallási szervezetek e téren olyan tapasztalattal rendelkeznek, amit az EU nem hagyhat a jövőben figyelmen kívül, ha valóban kézzel fogható eredményeket akar elérni. Az oktatásba való befektetés azonban önmagában nem hoz tartós eredményt! Ahogy ezt az előttünk lévő jelentésben is megfogalmaztuk: az oktatás és a szakképzés a munkaerőpiac és a gazdaság igényeihez és lehetőségeihez kell, hogy igazodjon. Az oktatás támogatása terén az Unió szerepvállalása valós eredményekkel járhat, de tényleges változást csak akkor érhetünk el, ha az EU a rendelkezésre álló forrásokat az eddigieknél sokkal hatékonyabban és célzottabban használja fel, a helyi szervezetekkel együttműködve és figyelembe veszi a tényleges helyi szükségleteket és gazdasági viszonyokat.

Ádám Kósa (NI), írásban. – Az oktatásba való beruházás a fenntartható jövő építésének előfeltétele. Azonban a megfelelő nemzeti szabályozások és stratégiák hiánya, valamint a képzett szakemberek, a szükséges infrastruktúra és a megfelelő felszerelés és létesítmények hiánya számos fejlődő országban minden szinten akadályt képez a mindenki számára elérhető minőségi oktatás előtt. A jövedelemkiesés és az iskolai lemorzsolódás a Covid-19 járvány miatt az utóbbi években gyakoribbá vált, ami jelentősen növelte a gyermekházasság, a radikalizálódás és az illegális migráció kockázatát. Márpedig a 21. század helyi gazdaságainak és életének igényeit kielégítő oktatási és tanulási készségek és kompetenciák megszerzése elengedhetetlen. Afrika robbanásszerűen növekvő fiatal népessége elsősorban a minőségi oktatás támogatását és a szakképzés előmozdítását teszi szükségessé a mobilitás, valamint a piacokhoz és jogokhoz való hozzáférés növelése érdekében. Erőfeszítéseket kell tenni a gyermekek számára a távoli iskolák helyett inkluzív, helyi oktatás biztosítására, illetve a jól képzett tanárokból való beruházásra annak érdekében, hogy a gyermekek megszerezhessék a munkaerőpiac szempontjából releváns készségeket. Különösen fontos támogatni a lányokat a minőségi oktatáshoz való hozzáférésben, és foglalkozni a lányok oktatásból való korai lemorzsolódásának problémájával. Ezért a projekteknek a lányok társadalmi szerepének növelésére, a lakóhelyüket elhagyni kényszerült vagy hátrányos helyzetű gyermekek oktatására, valamint az oktatás fejlesztésére kell összpontosítaniuk mind a túlsúlyolt nyomorregyedekben, mind az elszigetelt vidéki közösségekben.

Julie Lechanteux (ID), *par écrit*. – Bien avant la pandémie de COVID-19, le monde était confronté à une crise mondiale de l'apprentissage causée par un accès difficile à l'éducation en raison de la pauvreté, de normes absurdes et préjudiciables aux filles, mais aussi d'une scolarisation insuffisante. Selon l'Unicef, 617 millions d'enfants et d'adolescents dans le monde n'ont pas un niveau de compétence minimal en lecture et en mathématiques. Des chiffres qui font froid dans le dos! Une situation aggravée par la pandémie et par la fermeture soudaine des écoles, qui ont privé d'enseignement des millions d'enfants.

D'ailleurs, l'abandon scolaire ouvre souvent la porte à tous les abus. En France, plus de 80 000 enfants sont victimes de violence chaque année. Deux enfants sont tués chaque semaine au sein de leur famille et plus de 300 000 enfants sont pris en charge par l'Aide sociale à l'enfance (ASE). 70 % des enfants placés n'obtiendront aucun diplôme. Comme le démontrent plusieurs études, éducation et trajectoire sociale sont étroitement liées.

Donc, prenons acte du fait qu'une société qui ne se soucie pas de ses enfants est une société qui hypothèque son avenir et qui ne peut que périr, et réagissons vite, sans lubies idéologiques.

18. Osiągnięcie przez kobiety niezależności ekonomicznej dzięki przedsiębiorczości i samozatrudnieniu (krótka prezentacja)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības jautājums: Pernille Weiss ziņojuma par Sieviešu ekonomiskās neatkarības sasniegšanu ar uzņēmējdarbību un pašnodarbinātību (2021/2080(INI)) (A9-0096/2022) īss izklāsts.

Pernille Weiss, *Ordfører*. – Hr formand! Det er rigtig mange år siden, at det var mændene, der alene tjente pengene og kvinderne, der brugte dem. Den arbejdsfordeling hører heldigvis en anden tid til, og i dag både kan, vil og skal enhver af os forholde os til, hvordan samfundsøkonomien hænger sammen. For EU er den bevidste omgang af samfundets økonomiske muskel afgørende for, at vi ind i en stadig mere usikker fremtid har råd til alt det, vi gerne vil, og det, vi skal have råd til at beskytte: klimaet, miljøet, sundheden og ikke mindst friheden, demokratiet og freden.

Det er også det, der står på spil, når vi med denne betænkning forholder os til, at Europa er blevet et kontinent med et lavt iværksættelniveau – specielt når det kommer til kvindelige iværksættere. I EU tæller kvinder faktisk kun for 30 % af start-up-entreprenører, og kun 34 % af alle selvstændige. Det smitter negativt af på EU's konkurrenceevne, vores evne til innovation, bæredygtig vækst og jobskabelse.

Jeg har selv været iværksætter, og jeg har været virksomhedsejer i 12 år, og jeg ved af egen erfaring, at der er masser af kvinder, der gerne vil et liv som entreprenører. Det er kvinder, som kan skabe forretningsmodeller, arbejdspladser og virksomhedskulturer, der er mere fit til fremtiden end dem, vi hidtil har set. Men der er nogle væsentlige barrierer og udfordringer, som skal væk nu. For det første, så tror alt for mange kvinder sig mindre kompetente, end de faktisk er. Ofte er kvinder ret godt klædt på til opgaven som selvstændig. De ved det bare ikke, de har alt for lav iværksættertilid og har svært ved at finde overblik over, hvad de skal vide og kunne, og hvad de skal kunne håndtere, og hvor de skal få fat i det, de eventuelt mangler. Derfor er der i betænkningen flere anbefalinger til at fremme kompetenceopbygning gennem iværksætterprogrammer, uddannelse og netværk.

Både Kommissionen og flere medlemslande har iværksat iværksætterprogrammer, og noget tyder på, at det har en positiv effekt. Men vi ved stadigvæk alt for lidt og har brug for flere data, så vi kan se præcis, hvad det er, der fungerer. Ligesom det i det hele taget er vigtigt at blive klogere på iværksætterkvinders motivation og drive – og ikke mindst anderkende, fremme og synliggøre rollemodellerne.

For det andet er der alt for mange investorer, der ikke har fundet ud af, at det er endog en rigtig god forretning at give kvindelige iværksættere en økonomisk saltvandsindsprøjtning. Mænd modtager langt størstedelen af kapitalen i EU. Startups, der alene har mænd som stiftere, modtog i 2018 hele 93 % af alle de penge, der blev investeret i eksempelvis tech-branchen. Over for det der står, at kvinders virksomheder faktisk har en højere omsætning til trods for en lavere investering. Det understreger, at der er et kæmpe potentiale i at investere i kvinders forretningsmodeller, og det potentiale skal vores betænkning lirke op med de mange løsningsforslag, vi har fået lavet i et utroligt godt samarbejde mellem de politiske grupper igennem de sidste måneder. Det vil jeg i øvrigt rigtig gerne kvittere for med en stor tak.

Af alt det, som vi foreslår, vil jeg her til slut gerne fremhæve, at der bør oprettes kønsbevidste investornetværk, helst netværk, som i deres design bringer investorerne tættere på iværksætternes hverdag. Hele økosystemet skal aktiveres, og alle skal vide, hvor de finder hinanden, når de har brug for det. Lad mig også slutte med en løftet pegefinger til medlemslandene og til det ansvar, I har, og som EU ikke skal blande sig i: at livet som iværksætter, uanset om det gælder for en mand eller for en kvinde, også handler om, at der er en ordentlig work-life balance og en hverdag, der hænger sammen omkring privatlivet og især omkring børnefamilien. Det kan flere af jer godt gøre bedre.

I 2020 var det desværre sådan, at flere af os kendte nogen, der lukkede sin virksomhed, end vi kendte nogen, der startede en virksomhed. Det går simpelthen ikke. Vi skal have passet og plejet og udviklet grobunden for langt mere iværksætteri i EU. Nu stemmer vi om betænkningen i Europa-Parlamentet, og jeg håber, at vi får mindst 83 % til at stemme for, for det var nemlig det flotte resultat, som vi opnåede i Udvalget for Kvinders Rettigheder og Ligestilling, da udvalget stemte om den.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych chtěl ocenit zprávu mé kolegyně Pernille Weissové, protože poukázala na celou řadu témat. Samozřejmě rovnost žen a mužů je pro nás základní hodnotou, ale já bych rovněž chtěl vyzdvihnout teze, které zde paní kolegyně představila. Podnikání žen podporuje jejich emancipaci, samozřejmě jejich ekonomické postavení a zrovna země OECD mají lepší průměr než země Evropské unie. A to je skutečně zarážející. Pouhá necelá 1/3 začínajících podnikatelů jsou ženy. To není dobrá vizitka pro evropský prostor, pro naše státy. A samozřejmě pokud více žen přestalo podnikat, než začalo, tak to opravdu volá po naší pozornosti. Rozdíly v odměňování, také o tom zde byla řeč. Zrovna my v České republice máme přes 20% rozdíl a rozhodně se nelepšíme. Děkuji paní zpravodajce, že na to také poukázala ve své zprávě. Potřebujeme podnikatelské programy, vzdělávání, a zejména budování kompetencí, těch digitálních nepochybně, a také přístup ke kapitálu. Jsem rád, že tato zpráva bude hlasována, a rád ji podpořím.

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señor presidente, el espíritu empresarial y el emprendimiento son elementos muy importantes para que una sociedad pueda avanzar. Para que una sociedad pueda alcanzar su índice de competitividad, como en la Unión Europea, es imprescindible que se dé este impulso. También para la creación de empleos.

Pero aquí vemos de nuevo cómo no hay igualdad entre los géneros: hay una gran brecha y una gran diferencia entre el emprendimiento del hombre y la mujer. Precisamente porque, entre otras cosas, cuesta mucho que las mujeres consigan financiación adecuada y las empresas dirigidas por mujeres siguen representando una pequeña parte de las inversiones. También hay muy poca representación en las asociaciones empresariales.

En definitiva, creo que el de la señora Weiss es un gran informe para poner el eco, para difundir que aquí tenemos un grave problema: que no se da una igualdad de género y que hay una brecha que tenemos que resolver por el bien de la sociedad europea y por la creación de empleos.

Jessica Stegrud (ECR). – Herr talman! Som ekonom förstår jag vikten av entreprenörskap och företagande. Som individ förstår jag vikten av att kunna välja. Och som kvinna förstår jag vikten av att ges lika möjligheter, för det är lika möjligheter, inte lika utfall, som borde vara den självklara principen även när det handlar om företagande och entreprenörskap. Men så är inte fallet här i Europaparlamentet. Här vill man genom kvotering, jämställdhetsintegrering, riktade resurser, genusperspektiv och lagar tvinga fram lika utfall på alla områden. Det vi i stället borde göra är att satsa på det som gynnar oss alla och företagande i stort, nämligen utbildning, minskad byråkrati, tillgång till riskkapital och låga skatter.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, I very much welcome this report. Looking forward, it's very important that these two issues are addressed to ensure that women have independence and access to entrepreneurship and then self-employment.

There are two key issues. That is, first, education, and also childcare. Those two key components are very often a bar to women advancing themselves and their communities. And the other significant challenge, of course, is microcredit. And that is a key issue that has been identified in many reports for many years for women to access independence and entrepreneurship.

So I would urge the Commission and particularly Member States in general to ensure that any policies that are being pursued are inclusive, are dynamic, and try to reach out to equality. That being: access to education and childcare as one component, but ensuring that there's also access to credit and microfinance for the establishment of enterprises by women. So, while I commend the report, we have a lot of work to do in this House and in Member States throughout the Union.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Janusz Wojciechowski, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank rapporteur Weiss and the FEMM Committee for this own-initiative report. It confirms the Parliament's relentless dedication to women's economic empowerment, and its crucial insight on what remains to be done.

The European Commission is well aware that the gender gap in entrepreneurship has been lessening way too slowly over the past years. It is also known that woman entrepreneurs are more likely to operate smaller businesses or on a part-time basis, to have fewer employees and lower levels of financial literacy.

Clearly, gender stereotypes still pose significant barriers to women's entrepreneurship. Further, in order to encourage women to access the labour market or to be self-employed, we need to ensure the implementation of the Work-Life Balance Directive; accessible and quality childcare needs to be available in all Member States.

Through its entrepreneurship policy, driven by the Green Deal, the SME strategy, the new skills agenda and the digital education action plan, the European Commission is doing its utmost to accelerate and deepen the shift towards a more balanced world for entrepreneurship.

In accordance with the Commission's gender equality strategy 2020-2025, the SME strategy emphasises that educational and upskilling activities are essential for all SME managers and employees, with a particular focus on empowering women and girls to become founders.

Several projects on entrepreneurship education founded by the EU programme for the competitiveness of enterprises and small and medium-sized enterprises and the single market programme are being implemented on the ground with the aim, for example, to promote competencies, role models, improve access to network and mentoring.

Regarding access to funding, the Commission is currently negotiating with the European Investment Bank Group a gender-smart financing initiative under the InvestEU programme. The goal here is to provide financial incentives to female businesses, business angels and support gender investment strategies.

In terms of learning opportunities, there is a clear deficit of women in information and communication technologies and in science, technologies, engineering and mathematics. According to the OECD programmes for international student assessment, boys and girls are almost equally likely to work in a science-related field. However, with age and at higher levels of education, girls tend to steer away from the STEM and ICT subjects and are more likely to choose careers in the social and environmental sciences, as they perceive the former to be less people-oriented and to add less value to society.

To address this complex reality, the Commission has put in place a series of STEM festivals, a project that is supporting girls and women to enhance their digital and entrepreneurial competencies to create value and solve social challenges in different economic sectors.

Last but not least, with the support of the European Parliament pilot project, the Commission is putting in place learning support for entrepreneurs facing the challenges for going green and digital. The e-learning platform will give entrepreneurs and would-be entrepreneurs the opportunity to learn and acquire entrepreneurial digital and sustainable competencies. Here also a special section will be dedicated to the needs of women entrepreneurs.

The latest project is a token of the Commission and Parliament's shared willingness to work alongside to help women overcome all these barriers. Your own-initiative report clearly paves the way for the European Union, where women's entrepreneurship will finally be perceived as what it truly is: a catalyst for a more prosperous and fairer society.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir beigušās. Balsošana notiks rītdien.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (171. pants)

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE), γραπτώς. – Σύμφωνα με την ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής με τίτλο «Μια Ένωση ισότητας: Στρατηγική για την ισότητα των φύλων 2020-2025», «οι γυναίκες και οι άνδρες σε όλη την πολυμορφία τους θα πρέπει να έχουν ίσες ευκαιρίες ανέλιξης και να είναι οικονομικά ανεξάρτητοι, να αμείβονται εξίσου για εργασία ίσης αξίας, να έχουν ισότιμη πρόσβαση στη χρηματοδότηση και να λαμβάνουν δίκαιες συντάξεις». Η εξασφάλιση της ισότητας θα σήμαινε την πλήρη αξιοποίηση του δυναμικού και των ταλέντων όλων των πολιτών της ΕΕ, γεγονός που θα συνέβαλλε σημαντικά στην οικονομική ανάκαμψη της Ευρώπης, στη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας, στη μεγέθυνση και στην ενίσχυση της ανταγωνιστικότητας της ΕΕ. Παρήλθαν ήδη 25 και πλέον χρόνια από τη Διακήρυξη του Πεκίνου, μία ισχυρή διακήρυξη υπό την αιγίδα του ΟΗΕ, για την ισότητα ανδρών και γυναικών. Είναι η ώρα η ΕΕ να αναλάβει την ευθύνη της απέναντι στην ιστορία της, στον πολιτισμό της, στις αρχές και τις αξίες της και να προχωρήσει στο σεβασμό των Συνθηκών της, εφαρμόζοντας πλήρως την ισότητα των φύλων. Πιστεύω ότι τώρα είναι η ώρα η ΕΕ να αναλάβει πρωταγωνιστικό, ηγετικό ρόλο για την ισότητα των φύλων, και για να το πετύχει θα πρέπει να ηγηθεί διά του παραδείγματος της και να εφαρμόσει η ίδια πλήρως την ισότητα των φύλων.

Andželika Anna Moźdzanowska (ECR), na piśmie. – Kobiety częściej doświadczają trudności związanych z wejściem lub powrotem na rynek pracy, w szczególności po przerwie związanej z urodzeniem i wychowaniem dzieci, która często dezaktualizuje ich umiejętności i kwalifikacje zawodowe. Prowadzenie własnej działalności może być postrzegane jako strategia dla tych kobiet, które nie mogą znaleźć innej formy zatrudnienia, a co za tym idzie, sposobu zarabiania pieniędzy, lub też jako dowód istnienia „ducha przedsiębiorczości” i pragnienia bycia własnym szefem.

Dla wielu kobiet przedsiębiorczość stała się sposobem na zburzenie tzw. szklanego sufitu, przezwyciężenie problemów finansowych, większą satysfakcję z pracy oraz swobodę działania, która przejawia się możliwością ustalania własnych zasad. Należy popierać programy przedsiębiorczości skierowane do kobiet, kształcenie i rozwijanie ich kompetencji. Niezwykle istotny jest również dostęp do funduszy dla kobiet-przedsiębiorców i kobiet samozatrudnionych oraz usunięcie barier administracyjnych utrudniających zakładanie przedsiębiorstw.

Przedsiębiorczość kobiet wspiera także dywersyfikację działalności gospodarczej, stymulując innowacje i zróżnicowanie w zarządzaniu, w praktykach produkcyjnych i marketingowych, a także w produktach i usługach.

Za autorem sprawozdania należy podkreślić, że wzmocnienie pozycji kobiet-przedsiębiorców i inwesterek ma sens gospodarczy, biznesowy i etyczny. Należy zatem zająć się tą kwestią, gdyż ma ona zasadnicze znaczenie dla tworzenia nowych miejsc pracy, pobudzenia gospodarki i ożywienia gospodarczego w Europie, a także dla wzmocnienia konkurencyjności UE.

19. W kierunku zrównoważonej niebieskiej gospodarki w UE: rola sektorów rybołówstwa i akwakultury (krótka prezentacja)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības jautājums: Isabel Carvalhais ziņojuma par ilgtspējīgu zilo ekonomiku ES: zvejnīcības un akvakultūras nozaru loma (2021/2188(INI)) (A9-0089/2022) īss izklāsts.

Isabel Carvalhais, Relatora. – Senhor Presidente, Caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário, enquanto relatora para este relatório de iniciativa, começo por felicitar a proposta da Comissão sobre a nova estratégia para uma economia azul sustentável na União Europeia. Devo, contudo, dizer que também lamento a ausência de metas específicas para os diferentes setores, em particular para as pescas e para a aquicultura.

As pescas e a aquicultura são fundamentais para fornecer à Europa alimentos saudáveis, de elevado valor nutricional e com baixa pegada de carbono. Mas há ainda caminho longo a ser feito no sentido da sua maior sustentabilidade económica e ambiental.

Neste contexto, os nossos pescadores devem poder estar na primeira linha dos mais empenhados em que se revertam as perdas de biodiversidade marinha, devido ao grande impacto socioeconómico que tais perdas podem ter no setor das pescas da União Europeia.

Para tal, é necessário desenvolver mais ações inovadoras que impulsionem o investimento em soluções sustentáveis no setor das pescas e da aquicultura, através do financiamento ao abrigo do novo FEAMPA, em sinergia com outros programas da União Europeia como o Mecanismo de Recuperação e Resiliência.

E não esqueçamos que as áreas marinhas protegidas eficazes podem ser extremamente benéficas para a pesca e para a sustentabilidade dos recursos haliêuticos. É por isso que devem ser feitos investimentos devidamente baseados na ciência para a criação de áreas marinhas protegidas que o não sejam apenas no papel, mas que possam, sim, garantir a sustentabilidade dos recursos a longo prazo e, com ela, a sustentabilidade económica de todos os pescadores e não apenas de alguns.

Outra mensagem que desejo destacar diz respeito à abrangência da economia azul. Este amplo segmento da nossa economia abarca todas as indústrias e setores relacionados com os oceanos, os mares, áreas costeiras e até a aquicultura terrestre e a produção de algas. Mas daqui também decorre um desafio acrescido, pois falamos em setores que frequentemente têm objetivos e visões distintas, por vezes até antagónicas, o que, num contexto de ausência de ordenamento estratégico do espaço marítimo, causa danos, e é preocupante, sobretudo a setores mais frágeis, como a pesca artesanal.

A União Europeia e os Estados-Membros devem, por isso, abordar seriamente esta realidade que representa para mais um *stress* socioeconómico adicional sobre os ombros dos nossos pescadores.

Uma economia azul sustentável deve também incluir o desenvolvimento equilibrado das atividades emergentes, como a biotecnologia azul, a produção de energia oceânica ou o turismo, mas sempre a par das atividades mais tradicionais, como o transporte marítimo, a pesca e a aquicultura, que devem merecer igual apoio na demanda da sua sustentabilidade.

No que respeita à governança internacional dos oceanos, esta deve abordar as questões ambientais numa base intersectorial, garantindo condições equitativas e igualdade de tratamento de todas as atividades económicas marítimas. E, neste contexto, gostaria de saudar o papel das convenções marinhas regionais e das organizações regionais de gestão das pescas, com vista a reforçar a governança com base nos melhores conhecimentos científicos disponíveis.

Não posso também deixar de salientar o papel das mulheres. Em toda a cadeia de valor da pesca sustentável, elas são fundamentais, particularmente nas comunidades costeiras, devendo também elas ter acesso a condições de trabalho e rendimentos dignos, bem com uma maior visibilidade e representação nas estruturas e nos processos decisórios.

E concluo, por favor, recordando que, para aumentar a competitividade e o desempenho económico dos setores das pescas e da aquicultura, deve ser dada especial atenção também à formação profissional, à aprendizagem ao longo da vida e à divulgação de conhecimentos científicos, técnicos e práticas inovadoras e isto implica, entre outras medidas, uma cooperação mais forte e alargada entre escolas, universidades, poderes públicos e indústria, de forma a promover ações baseadas nos melhores conhecimentos científicos disponíveis, capazes de assegurar a competitividade económica, de garantir a sustentabilidade ambiental e a inclusão social destes setores tão importantes para a nossa segurança alimentar e para o futuro da nossa autonomia alimentar.

Tudor Ciuhodaru (S&D). – Eu vin dintr-o țară, România, în care această economie albastră înseamnă echilibru. Mai ales, invit pe toți să vedeți Delta Dunării, un monument al naturii care ar trebui să fie apreciat de către toată Europa. Dar, din păcate, nu suntem singuri în acest proces și ceea ce se întâmplă în zonă ne influențează viața în fiecare zi. Sper ca, după acest raport, să găsim soluțiile înțelepte și mai ales finanțarea necesară pentru ca un obiectiv pe care îl vrem viabil pentru copiii noștri să poată persista milenii. Și sper ca în acest Parlament European obiectivele României să poată fi susținute.

Grace O’Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, it is time for some common sense in ocean protection and not the bare minimum proposed by some of my colleagues here today.

Protected means protected. And we must protect our marine protected areas. Let’s face it – most marine protected areas in the EU are nothing but lines on a map. In almost every MPA today, you find gas exploration, marine traffic, and yes, intensive industrial fishing. Only 10% of EU waters are so-called marine protected areas and 86% of these MPAs are bottom trawled, while trawling is actually 1.4 times more intensive inside MPAs in northern Europe. And this, to my mind, is a complete contradiction.

So I call on MEPs tomorrow to use their vote to support concrete measures for all marine protected areas. As I said, protected must mean protected.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur very much for her work. I think in an Irish context, there’s no doubt about it, fishermen have been sold out; from the beginning of the European Union, sold out to the bigger interests of the bigger countries, and sacrificed and unsupported by successive governments. So it’s understandable then, when an important proposal – the end of bottom trawling in marine protected areas – comes on the table that they feel threatened by that. And I understand that.

But as my colleague has just said, a marine protected area must be a protected area. And the truth is that bottom trawling threatens our ecosystems, disturbs habitats, releases carbons and is a practice that we cannot have continuing. In an Irish context, our oceans are 2% marine protected areas. I understand the fishermen believe that these will get bigger and this will impact on their livelihoods. But the – I suppose – future of humanity is also at stake and the obligation is on the EU and our government to support our fishermen, which they have never done before now.

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señor presidente, la economía azul representa un amplio segmento de nuestra economía, afecta a industrias y sectores. Creo que esta opinión que ha hecho mi compañera Isabel Carvalhais es muy oportuna —y la quiero felicitar por ello—, porque viene a completar la parte de la Comunicación de la Comisión donde se hablaba poco de la pesca y la acuicultura. Creo que es importante, y en la última década hemos visto que se han dado pasos significativos para modernizar y diversificar estos sectores, incluidos los más tradicionales.

Pero, sin duda, es importante entender que, dentro de este amplio segmento de economía azul, algunos sectores pueden en ocasiones ocasionar conflictos con otros, y hay que corregirlo. Por tanto, creo que se dan muchas oportunidades en este informe de iniciativa para analizar una economía azul más sostenible.

Lamento que en las redes sociales los medios de comunicación solo hayan hablado de la pesca de arrastre. Este informe es mucho más amplio, mucho más completo, y no quiero que lo enturbie una lucha contra la pesca de arrastre. Creo que es un gran error.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, the Commission will report in December of this year to the Council and the Parliament with regard to the review of the Common Fisheries Policy. And certainly we need to take into account many voices in this particular debate. But the one thing for sure is, there are competing interests out there in our oceans across the globe.

When you look at the context of huge industrial ships, factory ships scooping up entire areas of the sea, coupled with now the concerns of local coastal communities around the issue of offshore wind – the fact that that could be impacting on the ability to fish in shallow waters in the offshores.

So the Common Fisheries Policy, I believe, has an obligation not just to look at the dividing up of the quota allocations between Member States – and Ireland must have its voice heard in that – but equally, we have to assess the impact that the factory ships are having on fishing communities across the European Union, and also to ensure that Irish fishers and those in shallow waters have access to their fishing grounds, even in the event of offshore wind becoming very prevalent in those areas.

Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, merci à M^{me} Carvalhais pour cet excellent rapport. Pourtant, certains députés veulent revenir sur un point clé: l'interdiction du chalutage de fond dans toutes les aires marines protégées.

Aujourd'hui, la grande majorité des aires marines protégées sont en réalité très peu, voire pas du tout protégées et subissent le chalutage de fond et d'autres techniques de pêche destructrices. Le chalutage de fond, qui consiste à racler le fond des océans est, selon les scientifiques, l'une des techniques de pêche ayant le plus fort impact sur les fonds marins.

Demandons l'interdiction du chalutage de fond dans les aires marines protégées européennes pour la biodiversité, pour le climat et le futur des pêcheurs. C'est une demande cohérente et un signal politique fort avant la publication du plan d'action pour la protection des écosystèmes marins par la Commission européenne. Mais cette demande dérange certains lobbies. Les tentatives pour la supprimer ou la diluer ne sont pas à la hauteur des enjeux.

Écoutons les citoyens, les citoyennes, les jeunes, les scientifiques et l'UICN. Je demande donc à mes collègues de voter demain pour les océans en interdisant le chalutage de fond dans toutes les aires marines protégées.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, I'd like to thank the rapporteur for her report. She talks about the impact of the loss of marine biodiversity, protected marine areas and the need for balanced development, the role of international governance and she talks about coastal communities.

We're in a strange place in Ireland because, as my colleague has already pointed out, fishermen in Ireland have been shafted for years. We sold out our fishing rights in return for subsidies for dairy and beef a long time ago. And the fishermen have never got a fair deal ever since.

When we're introducing rules and regulations for fishermen across Europe, we need to take on board the unique position of Irish fishing, which has not been given a fair deal. And, going forward, whatever way we're going to tackle this, the fishermen have to be part of the solution and you can't just regard them as part of the problem.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Janusz Wojciechowski, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members. I would like to thank the rapporteur Ms Carvalhais for this report, which is an important follow-up to the Commission communication on the Sustainable Blue Economy of 17 May 2021.

First, let me highlight that we have shifted over the years from blue growth to a sustainable blue economy, a concept which has the sustainable use of our marine resources at its centre. The Commission promotes an integrated and cross-sector approach to the sustainable blue economy without setting, for instance, specific objectives for fisheries and aquaculture. Nevertheless, I fully concur with you that the fisheries and aquaculture sectors are key sectors in the blue economy and provide for an important source of protein that is essential for food security and human health.

Let me now touch upon some key elements of your report and of tonight's debate.

I fully agree with you that the new projects and instruments are needed for all blue economy stakeholders. The Commission believes that new technologies, innovation and digitalisation will boost the green transition of the blue economy, also for those sectors considered established, such as fisheries and aquaculture. However, in order to fully use this potential, significant investments in innovation are needed in our coastal regions, including the outermost regions. To that end, the European Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund, with a total budget of EUR 6.1 billion, will contribute to the horizontal priorities of resilience, green and digital transition by supporting innovative projects.

In addition, I want to mention other key funding sources put in place to support the sustainable blue economy. The BlueInvest scheme together with its scale-up the BlueInvest pilot fund, the new InvestBlue economy instrument as well as the new dedicated financial instrument established together with the European Investment Fund.

I agree with you that sustainable aquaculture should play an important role in terms of food security, employment and sustainable food systems in the EU. In this regard, I want to point to the Commission's strategic guidelines on aquaculture of 2021, which provide concrete recommendations and actions.

I also fully concur with you on the need to support the development of algae production as a largely untapped, sustainable alternative raw material for many industries, including food and feed. Therefore, the Commission will come forward with the EU algae initiative in line with the Farm to Fork Strategy before the end of the year.

As stated in the report, ports have a key role to play in the development of a sustainable blue economy. They need to become real hubs of blue economy activities, including renewable energy, fisheries, aquaculture, biotechnology and tourism. Support to the development of the necessary infrastructure and digitalisation is very important in this respect.

Your report also contains important findings on the international dimension of the sustainable blue economy. I fully agree that the regional fisheries management organisations are crucial to promote science-based conservation and the sustainable management of fish stocks. Therefore, the Commission will continue efforts to upgrade the existing regional fisheries body in West Africa in line with the Commission's ocean governance communication.

I also want to underline that the sustainable fisheries partnership agreements the EU concludes with third countries aim towards resource conservation and environmental sustainability. The financial compensation targets also the sustainable economic and social development in those third countries.

Last but not least, I want to address the call for a ban on the use of bottom trawling in all marine protected areas. As you know, the Commission in its biodiversity strategy has committed to look at how to reconcile the use of bottom contacting fishing gear with biodiversity goals, given it is now the most damaging activity in the seabed and how this can be done in a fair and just way for all. We are currently looking into this question in the context of preparations for upcoming action plan to conserve fisheries resources and protect marine ecosystems, which we endeavour to present before the summer. The action plan will be based on the scientific evidence and through analysis of the social, economic and environmental impacts, based on the available data, as well as on the results of our extensive consultation with stakeholders over the last year.

The Commission is determined to ensure a balance between the urgent protection of the marine environment on the one side and the immediate social and economic challenges on the other side, as required by our fisheries and environmental legislation.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir beigušās. Balsošana notiks rītdien.

20. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības jautājums: vienu minūti ilgas uzstāšanās (Reglamenta 172. pants).

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, γεγονότα όπως η εισβολή του Πούτιν στην Ουκρανία δεν έρχονται ως κεραυνός εν αιθρία. Πάντοτε προηγούνται κάποια σημάδια· σημάδια που πολλές φορές δεν θέλουμε να τα δούμε κι ας είναι εμφανή και ξεκάθαρα. Μεγαλοϊδεατισμοί και αναθεωρητικές πρακτικές, απειλές και προκλήσεις, περιφρόνηση συνθηκών και παραβίαση κανόνων διεθνούς δικαίου, αμφισβητήσεις εθνικής κυριαρχίας, αιτήματα αποστρατικοποίησης, υβριδικές απειλές σε σύνορα γειτόνων, βεβηλώσεις μνημείων.

Όλα αυτά είναι σημάδια· σημάδια που προϋπήρχαν της εισβολής Πούτιν και που πολλοί από εσάς, αξιότιμοι συνάδελφοι, είχατε εγκαίρως επισημάνει. Όπως κι εμείς, οι Έλληνες και οι Κύπριοι ευρωβουλευτές, πολλές φορές έχουμε επισημάνει εξόχως ανησυχητικά σημάδια που προέρχονται από την Τουρκία. Για παράδειγμα, την περασμένη εβδομάδα είχαμε και πάλι μπαραζ υπερπτήσεων πάνω από το Αιγαίο και εν μέσω του Αγίου Πάσχα. Γίναμε μάρτυρες ενός ακόμα επεισοδίου βεβήλωσης της Αγίας Σοφίας.

Κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, τα μάτια όλου του κόσμου βρίσκονται στραμμένα πάνω μας. Θέλουν να δούνε αν μάθαμε το μάθημά μας, εάν, δηλαδή, πλέον δίνουμε προσοχή στα σημάδια. Ας μην τους απογοητεύσουμε.

Иво Христов (S&D). – Г-н Председател, през 2020 г. България наложи вето върху отварянето на преговорния процес със Скопие. Аргументите са известни: езикът на омразата в официалните източници и посегателствата над българската история в учебните програми на Република Северна Македония.

В последните месеци натискът на Европейската комисия и на някои наши партньори създава парадоксалното усещане, че България е страната кандидат, докато Скопие вече се ползва с привилегиите на член на клуба. Войната в Украйна се използва като допълнителен аргумент за форсиране на българското вето. От България се очаква да жертва историята си в името на висшата геополитика, но това е порочна недалновидност.

С безкритичното си отношение към Скопие Европейският съюз погавза собствените си критерии от Копенхаген и привнася в Европа нерешени въпроси с потенциал да създадат вътрешно напрежение в чувствителен регион, какъвто са Балканите.

Призовавам Комисията и Парламента да отчитат българската позиция и да не множат рисковете пред Съюза, който се нуждае от консолидация около принципите си, за да оцелее в тежките времена, които преживяваме.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Renew). – Domnule președinte, există supereroi și există eroi printre noi. În timpul pandemiei, ei au fost medicii, asistentele, fermierii, lucrătorii esențiali. Astăzi, eroii sunt voluntarii care ajută refugiații din Ucraina. Ei fac ceea ce autoritățile naționale nu ar fi putut face niciodată singure. În România, însă, Guvernul nu a acordat niciun sprijin financiar asociațiilor care fac această muncă. Nu putem aștepta după politicienii naționali. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să acorde sprijin gestionat direct de către Comisie ONG-urilor și voluntarilor. Trebuie să facem binele împreună, mai implicat, mai aproape de cetățean. „Nimeni nu este inutil în această lume în care trebuie să purtăm poverile altuia”, a spus Charles Dickens. Iar în lumea noastră, cu dezastre tot mai mari, eroii sunteți voi și vă mulțumesc.

Grace O’Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, after a strong campaign under the city’s first female chief executive, Ann Doherty, I’m delighted that Cork is set to become one of the EU’s climate neutral cities by 2030 under the EU’s mission programme.

This will mean transforming transport systems, making Cork a global centre for offshore renewable energy, fostering urban diversity as well as a strong retrofit campaign for warm, sustainable housing.

Cork is known as the ‘Rebel County’. Well, this is a chance to rebel for a sustainable future, and against an economy dependent on fossil fuels and against cold houses and fuel poverty, but to rebel against climate change – the greatest threat facing humanity. So I say, ‘up the Rebel County.’

Christine Anderson (ID). – Mr President, dear colleagues, you might not be aware, but the abolition of democracy by the global elites continues. On 3 March, the EU Commission was authorised by the Council to renegotiate the Treaty with the World Health Organisation on behalf of the Member States. Under the guise of improving global pandemic response, the plan is to allow the WHO to seize executive governance powers of the Member States in the case of a pandemic. Granting governance powers to a non-elected body is the exact opposite of democratic recourse and takes away any possibility for the people to hold officials accountable.

This amounts to no less than disenfranchising the people. We, as elected representatives by the people for the people, must not allow this to happen. I am imploring you: do what you were elected to do. Look into this and protect the rights of the people; the people you were elected by to act in their best interest.

And to all the people in Europe, I would like to say, start acting now, write to your MEPs, let them know you will not tolerate to be stripped of your rights to democratic recourse, let them know that any MEP supporting this or voting for this will not ever get your vote again. You, the people...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Herr talman! Har någon av er liberaler och socialister hört talas om påskkravallerna i Sverige? Nästan 200 poliser skadades i de kanske mest våldsamma upploppen i Sveriges historia. Vi hörde stridsropet "Allahu akbar". Vi såg ett rent hat mot majoritetssamhället. Det gjorde även de kristna som attackerades i Spanien och Frankrike när de utövade sin tro i invandrartäta områden. Sverige och Västeuropa håller på att slitas sönder på grund av massmigration.

Men ni skäller på Polen när de säkrar sin gräns från illegal migration från Mellanöstern. Ni håller ständigt specialdebatter till förmån för mer migration. Men vågar ni säga ja till vårt förslag om en debatt om den försämrade sociala sammanhållningen i våra länder? Vågar ni debattera om vad ni gör med våra barns och barnbarns framtid när ni håller era högtidstal om asylrätten, utan att tänka en sekund på morgondagen? Vågar ni fundera på ert ansvar för påskkravallerna i Sverige?

Chris MacManus (The Left). – Mr President, I want to raise an issue that is of some concern for fishing and coastal communities in my constituency. Recently, a dispute arose between fishermen and fish producers with the statutory Sea Fisheries Protection Agency (SFPA) at Killybegs in Donegal, where two fishing vessels were blocked and so forced to land their catch in Derry, for an hour's drive back to Killybegs rather than allow fish for human consumption become fishmeal.

It has now emerged that the SFPA sent a letter to fish processors in Killybegs to inform them that their in-factory weigh permits have been removed on the basis that, and I quote, 'the SFPA remains of the view that the landing took place outside of Ireland'.

Well let me reassure you, Derry is very much in Ireland, and I question the SFPA's decision and I question whether it is in keeping with the Irish Protocol, and I again call upon them to liaise with relevant stakeholders to find a solution that maintains the spirit of the Irish Protocol and protects our already hard-hit fishing and coastal communities.

Tatjana Ždanoka (NI). – Mr President, six years in a Lithuanian prison for investigative journalism. Yes, that is sentence of the first instance court sentence to Algirdas Paleckis, an outstanding journalist and politician. His guilt was to make his investigation into the events of 1991 in Vilnius when Soviet troops clashed with civilians since he doubted the official version of them.

The Court of Appeal verdict had to be announced today, but was suddenly postponed until Friday. I have personally observed several court hearings. The journalist is accused of gathering and passing information about Lithuanian judges to Russia. However, no documents or files or any other type of information that was allegedly gathered by Paleckis was presented to the court. No link to any foreign services was established. The prosecutor claims that Paleckis was in contact with an unidentified foreign agent. It is clear political prosecution in the European Union Member State of Lithuania.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Vreau să aduc în atenție un subiect care trebuie să ne frământeze mai mult, pentru că criza alimentară care se anunță este generată pe de o parte de scumpirile din energie. Dar să nu uităm că sediul principal al acestor probleme pleacă de la Kremlin, pentru că acest criminal care a declanșat războiul împotriva Ucrainei nu s-a gândit nicio clipă că, pe lângă cetățenii ucraineni, sunt afectați sute de milioane de cetățeni din întreaga lume prin scumpirile care sunt generate, iar criza alimentară obligă Uniunea Europeană să ia o serie de măsuri preventive pentru a susține agricultura Uniunii Europene. Una dintre măsuri este mărirea subvențiilor. Cred că dublarea subvențiilor în aceste momente este esențială pentru a preveni o criză majoră împotriva cetățenilor europeni. Din acest punct de vedere să nu uităm că grâul, care costa 200 de euro acum un an de zile, astăzi tona este 400. Și acest semnal spune totul.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D). – Señor presidente, me dirijo a ustedes con una honda preocupación. El Mar Menor, una de las lagunas saladas más grandes de Europa, se muere ante la escandalosa inacción del responsable político más directo: el Gobierno de la Región de Murcia.

La agricultura ilegal, la que se salta las normas, sigue contaminando la tierra y las aguas subterráneas con nutrientes que luego acaban en el Mar Menor. Se espera un nuevo episodio de anoxia con miles de peces muertos para este verano y el Gobierno de la Región de Murcia no hace nada salvo derogar las normas que lo protegían. No hizo nada después de la sopa verde de 2016. No hizo nada tras la muerte de miles de peces en 2019. Y no hizo nada cuando en 2021 se contaron por toneladas los peces que murieron. Lo único que hace es culpar a otros cuando son suyas las competencias.

Hasta en el Parlamento Europeo los diputados pudieron comprobar su estado en una misión, a pesar de que intentaron ocultar la realidad. Les pido que pongamos el foco en el Mar Menor, porque la muerte de esta joya es una pérdida para todos nosotros, para toda Europa.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, yesterday, a Russian state TV simulated a nuclear attack on Ireland and the UK. I don't want to overstate the nuclear threat, but there is no doubt that the stigma against the use of nuclear weapons in war has been significantly eroded in recent years. And I believe it is time to create a pathway to a world without nuclear weapons.

Next month, the signatories of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons meet for the first time since the signing of that treaty in 2017 and its entry into force in 2021. Sadly, only a handful of EU Member States will attend this meeting in Vienna next month, and I think that sends an extremely bad signal at a time of heightened public anxiety about the nuclear threat as a result of Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

No one, of course, is arguing for unilateral nuclear disarmament, but we can't wait for an ideal security environment. That is why the first meeting of the States Parties of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is timely and I urge the Member States, the Commission and MEPs to attend this meeting next month.

Bernhard Zimniok (ID). – Herr Präsident! Die Kommission will schon wieder Millionen von Migranten in die EU holen. Dass wir angeblich 1,75 Millionen Arbeitskräfte benötigen, aber aktuell offiziell über 13 Millionen Arbeitslose in der EU haben, zeigt schon ganz deutlich, wohin die Reise geht.

Aus einem sogenannten Talentpool von Ländern wie Bangladesch, Pakistan, Senegal oder Nigeria sollen die Arbeitskräfte kommen, um hier eine grüne digitale Wirtschaft zu etablieren. Wie hervorragend das funktioniert, sieht man ja seit 2015. Ich sage nur: Ärzte, Ingenieure, Raketentechniker aus Syrien.

Wieso wird immer nur Migration propagiert? Warum gibt es keine berufliche Förderung der Bürger? Ausbildung kostet die Firmen natürlich Geld. Da ist es einfacher, Migranten hereinzuholen. Dadurch lassen sich auch die Löhne schön drücken. Die EU macht sich damit zum Bückling der Wirtschaft. Ich fordere die Kommission deshalb auf, diese Pläne zu stoppen und stattdessen das einheimische Potenzial zu nutzen.

Jessica Stegrud (ECR). – Herr talman! Yttrandefriheten hotas i dag från många olika håll. I Sverige har vi den senaste tiden kunnat bevittna kravaller där över 180 poliser skadats, polisbilar satts i brand och områden vandaliserats. Detta för att polisen skyddar en enskild persons lagliga rätt att utöva religionskritik genom att bränna sin egen koran. Nu hörs röster från politiskt håll om att inskränka denna rättighet. Yttrandefriheten ska ge vika för våldet. Men den stora kampen om yttrandefriheten finner vi i dag på nätet och de stora sociala plattformarna. De utgör vår tids torg och mötesplats.

Grundprincipen borde vara att det som är lagligt att sägas offline även ska vara lagligt att yttra online. Därför är det ytterst bekymmersamt att EU nu går i motsatt riktning och vill se en ökad censur. Även sådant som är lagligt vill man kunna plocka bort. Det är ett farligt steg i fel riktning. Utan yttrandefrihet är vi inte fria och utan yttrandefrihet har vi ingen demokrati.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, ontem, milhares de trabalhadores saíram à rua por ocasião do dia internacional dos trabalhadores. Denunciaram o gravoso aumento do custo de vida, seja nos combustíveis, na energia ou nos bens alimentares. É necessário enfrentar, de uma vez por todas, o aumento especulativo dos preços por parte das grandes petrolíferas, dos grandes grupos de distribuição e de outros grupos económicos que estão na origem da escalada de preços de bens e serviços essenciais.

São necessárias soluções concretas para os problemas nas áreas da eletricidade, dos combustíveis, do gás, para defender a soberania alimentar dos Estados, aumentar a produção de cereais, melhorar a cadeia agroalimentar, apoiar a produção agrícola e a pequena pesca e, claro, para aumentar salários e pensões. Se não se aumentarem os salários, se não se travar o aumento do custo de vida e se se continuar a aplaudir mais gastos militares, sanções e armas, a situação só se agravará.

Os trabalhadores e o povo, que já estão a pagar a fatura, podem contar com a nossa intervenção na defesa de uma vida melhor e da paz.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci. Tretíkrát žiadam kolegov socialistov. Zbavte sa zla. Zbavte sa strany Smer, ktorá je na Slovensku vredom, ktorý treba vyoperovať.

Kým zodpovední politici ochraňovali životy počas kovidu, Smer populizmom ľudí ohrozoval. Kým zodpovední politici fašistov izolujú, Smer s nimi chce vládnuť. Kým zodpovední politici nezatvárajú oči pred Putinovým vraždením na Ukrajine, Smer Putina obhajuje.

Niet žiadnych pochybností, že za vlády Fica sa obchodovalo nielen so zákazkami, ale aj s rozsudkami. Štát de facto riadila mafia, ktorá pre ochranu biznisu s Ficom bola ochotná aj zavraždiť novinára Jána Kuciaka. Svojich politických protivníkov umlčali diskreditáciou.

Vyšlo najavo, že umlčať chceli aj mňa. Polícia, riadená mafiou zo Smeru, ma v 2015 lustrovala. Lustrovali aj moju mamu, mojich synovcov, netere, moje deti, manželku a dokonca aj moju svokru. Toto sú praktiky Smeráckej mafie.

Vážení priatelia z frakcie socialistov. Nemáte nič spoločné s mafiánmi zo Smeru. Zbavte sa ich čo najskôr. Nemajú čo robiť medzi slušnými ľuďmi.

Tudor Ciuhodaru (S&D). – E oficial. Suntem pe un teren minat. Dorința de a prelungi cu un an certificatul verde digital ne aduce tocmai pe acest teren minat pentru că nu a existat nicio logică medicală sau epidemiologică în instituirea unui astfel de demers, ci doar un instrument care a distrus și societatea, și economia, și chiar și sistemul de sănătate. Vă reamintesc doar că vaccinatul poate să se infecteze și poate să transmită boala și poate fi chiar neimunizat. Iar în aceste condiții, milioanele de cetățeni din România li s-a refuzat singurul mare drept obținut cu dificultate, odată cu aderarea țării mele la Uniunea Europeană, acela de a circula liber doar în baza actului de identitate eliberat de țara mea, România. Sunt medic, medic de urgență. Am lucrat în toată această pandemie într-un spital de suport coronavirus, Spitalul Clinic de Urgență Nicolae Oblu. Și în permanență am venit cu o strategie coerentă bazată pe testare, depistare, asigurarea de medicamente și vaccinare doar în baza unui consimțământ informat. Mie îmi pasă doar de viața oamenilor și de știință și, de aceea, vă solicit să votați împotriva prelungirii acestui pașaport verde digital.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, the Food and Agricultural Organization, a part of the United Nations, has identified the fertiliser issue as a stand-out difference between previous crises in agriculture, in 2007 and 2011. The price of fertiliser is not just an agricultural issue; it concerns the security of global food supplies. And if the European Union, as a global leader, does not take immediate action, we are going to have a profound impact on the cost of food for the poorest in the globe.

So I would call on the Commission and particularly other major food-producing countries to collectively come together to see how they can address the issue of the price of fertiliser to ensure that fertiliser is identified initially in particular for the countries that need it most in terms of planting season and the cyclical nature of crop production.

Otherwise, we will have a profound crisis for humanity in the next number of months in North Africa and across tracts of the Middle East as well. So we do need to take immediate action to drive down the price of fertiliser and increase food supply.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Mr President, last week the Conference on the Future of Europe endorsed 325 recommendations for a sovereign EU federal state with new fiscal powers, joint EU armed forces, a permissive migration regime and transnational EU electoral lists, which mean people would vote for Members of Parliament who may not speak their own language. We are told the proposals are consensus-based – really?

One political group, the ECR, left the Conference because it was a farce. My own group expressed vehement opposition. Eight days ago, Marine Le Pen won the majority of votes amongst the under 50 year olds, workers in rural France, they need to be defeated by the metropolitan and financial elites and those who quit reason.

There is no consensus. Instead, we have a cultural war between an unholy alliance of globalists, their gatekeepers and the cultural Marxist left versus traditional Europe.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, voor de mensen thuis wordt alles al geruime tijd duurder. Wij waarschuwen dan ook al langer voor inflatie. Brussel en Frankfurt zeiden dat het allemaal wel meeviel. Toen inflatie bleef doorstijgen, zei men dat dit maar tijdelijk was; de prijzen zouden even stijgen, maar dit was niets om wakker van te liggen. Nu de inflatie het ene na het andere record verbreekt, wordt met de vinger gewezen naar een andere boosdoener: Poetin. Hij speelt uiteraard een rol, maar we moeten als politiek ook eerlijk durven zijn.

De oorzaken van de inflatie zijn lang geleden gezaaid, maar wij hebben te lang achter de feiten aan gelopen. De rente had veel eerder moeten worden verhoogd. De overheidsuitgaven, bijvoorbeeld in het kader van NextGenerationEU, hebben olie op het vuur gegooid en dreigen een nieuw scenario tot stand te brengen: stagflatie. De economische groei loopt terug en de inflatie blijft stijgen. Wij weten hoe we deze stagflatie kunnen verjagen, maar zijn onze beleidsmakers en de Centrale Bank capabel genoeg om de juiste keuzes te maken?

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, tomo a palavra para alertar para a recente decisão do tribunal britânico de autorizar a extradição de Julian Assange para os Estados Unidos da América, decisão que é motivo da maior preocupação, sobretudo perante anteriores recusas de extradição em face da alegação da existência de riscos para a sua vida. Ou a preocupação expressa por um relator especial da ONU que, denunciando a prisão arbitrária e a exposição ao longo de anos a um tratamento cruel, alerta para o risco real de graves violações dos seus direitos, incluindo de liberdade de expressão a um julgamento justo, à proibição de tortura e de outras práticas cruéis, desumanas ou degradantes, caso a extradição se confirme.

A tentativa de extradição, criminalização e prisão de Julian Assange representa uma inaceitável pressão, visando condicionar a publicação de informação de interesse público.

Promovemos, por isso, um apelo dirigido às autoridades britânicas para que recusem a extradição e às norte-americanas para que encerrem as acusações contra Assange com vista à sua imediata libertação, que daqui chamamos os deputados a subscrever.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych se ve své jedné minutě chtěl věnovat nezbytnosti ukončení závislosti na ruském plynu, protože válka na Ukrajině ukázala nepochybně naši slabost a závislost na diktátorovi a jeho vojácích, kteří jsou schopni páchat neuvěřitelná zvěrstva na Ukrajině. Proto tato závislost je nadále nepřijatelná, to chci zdůraznit. A pro nás je úkolem vypěstovat vlastní soběstačnost, samozřejmě přechod na zelenou ekonomiku, udržitelnost, odolnost našeho systému. Já bych chtěl zároveň zdůraznit, že jsem nehlasoval pro okamžité ukončení dodávek ruského plynu, protože by to znamenalo také okamžitý kolaps. To ovšem neznamená, že bychom mohli jakkoliv dále přehlížet a zlehčovat zvěrstva, ke kterým dochází na Ukrajině. Musíme se odklonit od ruského plynu, s tím jednoznačně souhlasím. Přeorientovat naši ekonomiku, naši infrastrukturu a budovat vlastní energetickou unii a soběstačnost a odolnost našeho systému.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – În ultima perioadă, în Transnistria, au apărut o serie de provocări menite să genereze o potențială instabilitate în Republica Moldova. Nu trebuie să cădem în plasa celor care vor să pornească un nou conflict în regiune, dar trebuie să fim prudenți și să creștem atât sprijinul pentru Republica Moldova, cât și prezența la fața locului. Le transmit de aici, din plenul Parlamentului European, tuturor cetățenilor din Republica Moldova, faptul că Europa și România nu îi vor abandona. Așa cum am mai spus-o în calitate de ministru, când am oferit asistență pentru integrare europeană Republicii Moldova, drumul său european nu poate fi blocat. Pentru că aceasta este calea pentru dezvoltarea țării și un trai mai bun pentru cetățeni. De aceea, solicit Comisiei Europene să asiste suplimentar Republica Moldova în vederea obținerii statutului de candidat la Uniunea Europeană și implementarea unui parcurs accelerat spre integrare. Doar în Uniune Republica Moldova va avea garantată siguranța de care are nevoie și șansa la dezvoltare.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Uniunea Europeană a fost construită pe ideea de pace, pe valori de bază cum sunt respectarea legii și a tratatelor, dialogul, democrația, respectarea drepturilor omului, toleranța. De câțiva ani, vedem însă atacuri tot mai dure la adresa valorilor noastre, valorilor europene, atât prin manipulare online, prin răspândirea de știri false, prin sprijinirea partidelor extremiste de către state terțe. Chiar în ultimele două luni asistăm la atacul deschis asupra unui stat vecin, Ucraina, care a dorit să adopte valorile noastre, valorile europene, precum și la amenințări la adresa altor state care doresc respectarea acestor valori. Democrația și toleranța se pare că supără atât în exteriorul Uniunii Europene, dar, mai grav, avem cetățeni ai Uniunii care vor ca aceste valori să dispară. Cred că este momentul, dragi colegi, ca fiecare dintre noi, cei care ne dorim o Uniune Europeană unită, să susținem clar și deschis valorile democratice, toleranța, iar acestea trebuie respectate de oricine dorește să fie cetățean al Uniunii Europene.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I think there is a terrible irony that as Europe focuses on the war in Ukraine, almost without notice the journalist who more than anyone else exposed war crimes by the US military in Iraq and Afghanistan, Julian Assange, has had his extradition case dealt with quietly, without comment, without fanfare, paving the way for him to be extradited to the United States to face espionage case, which could see him in jail for 175 years, for having had the audacity to expose war crimes. And the criminals walk free while his life is in danger. His crime: shining the light.

Now, the British Supreme Court has refused to hear an appeal against the magistrate's decision to extradite him. Now he can be extradited. The case is with Priti Patel; it could also be overturned by Biden. Tomorrow is World Press Freedom Day, if the Commission and every single one of the political groups here do not raise the call for the release of Julian Assange, it makes a mockery of that day.

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο μεγάλος απεργιακός αγώνας των εργαζομένων στο μονοπώλιο της Cosco στην Ελλάδα, στην εργασιακή γαλέρα του λιμανιού του Πειραιά, για μέτρα υγιεινής και ασφάλειας, και συλλογικές συμβάσεις εργασίας, είναι δίκαιος και ηρωικός. Αγωνίζονται εργαζόμενοι που θρήνησαν πριν λίγους μήνες συνάδελφό τους από ασυντηρητη γερανογέφυρα, και τώρα άλλος συνάδελφός τους σακατεύτηκε από ύψος 12 μέτρων, ενώ η εργοδοσία τους πρότεινε αύξηση τριών ευρώ.

Εργαζόμενοι που δεν ξέρουν αν θα γυρίσουν μετά τη δουλειά στις οικογένειές τους, και με τον αγώνα τους αντιμετωπίζουν παλικαρία την άγρια καταστολή, τα ΜΑΤ της κυβέρνησης, την εργοδοτική τρομοκρατία, τις απειλές, τα δικαστήρια, τις απόπειρες οργανωμένης απεργοσπασίας. Συγκρούονται με το καθεστώς άθλιων εργασιακών σχέσεων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, των ελληνικών κυβερνήσεων και της οδηγίας για τις λιμενικές υπηρεσίες, που την είχαν ψηφίσει όλα τα κόμματα, πλην του ΚΚΕ, και προβλέπει μισθούς και δικαιώματα στα τάρταρα για τους εργαζομένους στα λιμάνια, και αμύθητα κέρδη για τους ομίλους που τα εκμεταλλεύονται. Η πάλη συνεχίζεται και η αλληλεγγύη φουντώνει για να νικήσουν οι εργαζόμενοι στην Cosco, για να νικήσουν αυτοί που παράγουν τον πλούτο.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, more than half a million people have now been forcibly deported from Ukraine to Russia, including over 120 000 children. Moreover, from Russia-occupied territories, some 2 300 children have been kidnapped in order to be adopted by Russian families.

These forced deportations and moving of people to transitory camps, where they are vulnerable and live in appalling conditions, smack of the worst Stalinist excesses. We are witnesses of a tragedy that we thought we will never see again and to which we said, 'never again'. It is our moral duty to stand up to those seeking to suppress human freedom and dignity. We must ensure that these crimes are thoroughly documented, investigated and that those responsible are one day brought to justice under Nuremberg-style trials.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, é inegável o papel que a economia azul sustentável pode desempenhar na prosperidade das regiões ultraperiféricas da União Europeia que, devido à sua insularidade, são especialmente dependentes de certas atividades, como o transporte marítimo e o turismo.

Há também que garantir a proteção dos oceanos e dos seus recursos marinhos, reconhecendo o potencial de biodiversidade nas regiões ultraperiféricas. Assim, a transição climática e energética implicará a descarbonização destes setores através da identificação de sinergias e boas práticas, como a implementação de projetos-piloto na área das energias renováveis nas regiões ultraperiféricas e também através de maior coordenação na transição aos diferentes níveis, ao local, ao regional e ao nacional.

A descarbonização significa também novas oportunidades, a criação de postos de trabalho e novas formas de atrair turismo, com o objetivo de assegurar coesão territorial, social e económica.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, in April, SIPRI reported that total global military expenditure increased in 2021 to reach USD 2.1 trillion – the highest global annual spend on record. A clear year-on-year drop in global arms sales in the post-Cold War years has been reversed, principally by the US following September 9/11. It's been a bonanza for the global arms industry ever since.

We know that global warming and climate systems breakdown are resulting in mass displacement, food shortages, starvation and instability. In response, our leaders have ignored mitigating global warming and instead spend resources primarily on militarism, stoking conflicts, further threatening life on earth.

It's never been so obvious that there is no genuine democracy under monopoly capitalism. Only the consolidation of power by the oligarchs, the barbarians. And these people are prepared to sacrifice the whole world in their wars to maintain Western dominance. Anti-war voices have rarely been so systematically attacked and yet have never been so more needed. The militarisation of Europe is not serving the interests of its citizens and support for the data war machine in Europe must end before it causes more destruction.

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Traversăm câteva crize simultane și ne pregătim pentru încă una: recesiune pe durată nedeterminată. Între strategii anti-Putin și măsuri pro Europa, nu ar trebui să ignorăm însă un fenomen care ar putea da democrației o lovitură fatală: recrudescența extremismului într-o conjunctură care creează premisele perfecte. Am răsuflat ușurați la victoria lui Emmanuel Macron. Dar, dacă facem un calcul onest, vedem că tabăra extremistă și cei susceptibili de a fi seduși de ea nu sunt foarte departe de procentul învingătorului. Iar Rusia lucrează la foc continuu, și-a aruncat furibund în luptă trolii cu misiunea de a dezinforma și a recruta simpatizanți în lumea democratică. Războiul nu i-a dezarmat pe extremiști. E doar un intermezzo pentru că ideologia lor se confundă cu a lui Putin. Dar nu este vorba doar de Putin, ci și de erorile, lipsa de viziune și de adaptare a unor partide tradiționale la nevoile acestei lumi noi. Toate acestea trebuie reparate urgent pentru a-i readuce alături de noi pe cei care au deraiat sau care se pregătesc să deraieze de la democrație. Avântul extremismului trebuie frânt înainte de a fi prea târziu.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Līdz ar to šā darba kārtības punkta izskatīšana ir pabeigta.

21. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

22. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia

Sēdes vadītājs. – Sēde ir noslēgusies, un tā atsāksies rīt, otrdien, 3. maijā, plkst. 9.00 ar prioritārajām debatēm par Komisijas paziņojumu — Žurnālistu drošības un plašsaziņas līdzekļu brīvības apdraudējumi, saistībā ar Pasaules preses brīvības dienu.

Darba kārtība ir publicēta, un tā ir pieejama Eiropas Parlamenta tīmekļa vietnē.

23. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Sēde tika slēgta plkst. 22.31.)

Skróty i symbole

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

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
Renew	Grupa Renew Europe
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