

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 18 MAJA 2022 R.

(C/2024/5933)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2022-2023

Posiedzenia z 18 i 19 maja 2022 r.

BRUKSELA

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
3. Uroczyste posiedzenie – Przemówienie Mai Sandu, prezydent Republiki Mołdawii	3
4. Oświadczenie Przewodniczącego	7
5. Zatwierdzenie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia	7
6. Skład Parlamentu	8
7. Weryfikacja mandatów	8
8. Wniosek o skorzystanie z immunitetu	8
9. Skład komisji i delegacji	8
10. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu)	8

Spis treści	Strona
11. Podpisanie aktów przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 79 Regulaminu)	8
12. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół	8
13. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	9
14. Środki wykonawcze (art. 112 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	9
15. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	9
16. Porządek obrad	9
17. Głosowanie nad wnioskami o zastosowanie trybu pilnego (art 163 Regulaminu)	11
18. Układ o stowarzyszeniu UE z Republiką Mołdawii (debata)	12
19. Zabójstwo palestyńskiej dziennikarki Szirin Abu Akleh i gwałtowne zajścia podczas jej pogrzebu (debata) .	20
20. Sprawozdanie Komisji na temat praworządności za rok 2021 (debata)	23
21. Skład Parlamentu	44
22. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Macedonii Północnej (debata)	45
23. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Albanii (debata)	52
24. Postępowania sądowe przeciwko opozycji i zatrzymanie przywódców związkowych na Białorusi (debata) .	59
25. Minimalny poziom opodatkowania grup wielonarodowych (debata)	66
26. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych	80
27. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia	87
28. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	87

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 18 MAJA 2022 R.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Wznowienie sesji

President. – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday 5 May 2022.

2. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(The sitting opened at 15.05)

3. Uroczyste posiedzenie – Przemówienie Mai Sandu, prezydent Republiki Mołdawii

President. – Dear colleagues, we have the President of Moldova, Maia Sandu, with us today.

President, let me start by thanking you – as you have just witnessed – for accepting our invitation to address the European Parliament. We are really honoured to welcome you here today.

I also want to thank you for your courage in the midst of Russia's unjust and illegal invasion in Ukraine that has had such a profound impact on Moldova. Thank you for the efforts of your country and your personal commitment in sustaining a vision of a European future for your country against all odds. We know how deeply the combination of the COVID pandemic, the 'weaponisation' of energy supplies and the Kremlin's full-scale war against Ukraine have affected your country.

Moldova's commitment to the European project is welcome. We are united in our commitment towards sustaining peace in Europe and to our shared values of democracy and the rule of law. This is why we want to forge a way forward where Moldova does not feel alone.

I also want to praise your efforts, and those of the Moldovan people, in welcoming 450 000 Ukrainians that transited through Moldova, and for opening your homes and hearts to the 90 000 refugees who have sought shelter in your country. We have to – and we are ready to – show the same degree of solidarity with your country. As we have already, we must continue to support you politically, financially and with any in-kind assistance needed to fight the consequences of Russia's war in Ukraine.

President, we are also ready to support you as you start the process of applying for candidate status for EU membership. We know that Moldova is looking to us with a sense of purpose. Every country must follow its own path, its own timeline, but we must not be afraid to use the power of Europe to improve people's lives, to change generations.

This is why the European Union needs to send a clear and firm political signal that we recognise the European aspirations of Moldova and your effort in implementing key reforms that bring your country closer to us. Moldova belongs in the European family.

Dear President, dear Maia, the floor is yours.

Sandu Maia, *President of the Republic of Moldova*. – Dear President Metsola, dear Roberta, honourable Members of the European Parliament, I feel here among the true friends of Moldova and the circle of the family of our people. Allow me, above all, to thank you on behalf of all Moldovans for your constant, unwavering support of Moldova and its European future, at good times and at bad times. Your support has been vital in keeping Moldova on its democratic path and supporting the aspirations of our people to live in peace and prosperity and to decide on our own future.

Thank you for this opportunity to address you at a time when our region and the world is going through its most difficult period in a long time. After the end of the Cold War, expectations were high among our newly independent states for a new beginning. A new beginning of peace and development, which would relegate to the distant past unabashed land grabs and geopolitical conquests by larger states.

We all hoped that utter disrespect for national borders and the way of life chosen by newly independent states would not recur. We expected that buffer zones and spheres of influence would no longer guide relations between neighbours. Above all, we expected that states would be treated as peoples with their own aspirations, and that their will and voice would be heard and respected.

Russia's war against Ukraine seeks to put an end to these hopes and sends us all a century back in history. This war was caused precisely by geopolitical designs to reshape the region, to divide it into spheres of influence, to seize territory. Russia has attacked a neighbouring state, just as big powers did in the past, and has unleashed an unimaginable tragedy on the Ukrainian people and the entire European continent.

Russia's war against Ukraine was designed to turn Ukraine into something that nobody would want to be – a geopolitical annex of a more powerful neighbour. The Baltic States, the Bulgarians, the Hungarians, the Poles, the Romanians, the Czechs, the Slovaks and the Germans – free states today – remember vividly and all too well what this means. We had hoped and expected that those times would never return.

Yet they did. We all see with our own eyes the tragedies of women, men, children and elderly people who lost their homes and their loved ones. We all saw crimes against Ukrainians who did no wrong to anyone. Moldova feels deeply the pain and the tragedy that Ukraine is going through.

In the early morning of 24 February, Moldova woke up to a new, grim reality. Like many in our country, I could hear the bombs falling over Odesa from my office. But the shock, agony and disbelief of the war was met by our citizens with kindness, generosity and compassion. In a matter of a few hours, our authorities started receiving tens of thousands of refugees fleeing the brutality of the war. Only in a few weeks, our population of 2.6 million people increased by 4%. Almost half a million Ukrainians crossed our border, and around 90 000 people are still with us, hosted by my big-hearted fellow citizens.

Half of the refugees today are children, and this constitutes 10% of the total number of children in my country. We are overwhelmed, but determined to do our best to help those in need. We will continue to provide humanitarian support to Ukraine and will continue to stand by the Ukrainian people, our neighbours, our friends, our partners.

We have immediately condemned Russia's war against Ukraine. We support the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, as we always did. Crimea is Ukraine. Donbas is Ukraine. Kyiv is Ukraine.

And they will always be. This war has no justification, and it must be stopped immediately.

In the last three decades, Moldova has had many achievements of which we can be proud. Throughout our independent history, Moldova has been and remains a democratic country with free and competitive elections. Freely expressed will and dignity of our people is a fundamental value which is at the foundation of our state. Our people have never allowed their freely expressed will to be taken away from them. Those who tried were always met with failure.

Moldova today is guided and run by its people and they have consistently stopped politicians who wanted to impose their ill designs on the country. The freedom and the dignity of our people makes us a country with a strong European identity, which we deeply value.

And our democracy and the freedom of speech are becoming stronger. This year, Reporters Without Borders ranked Moldova 40th out of 180 countries in the World Press Freedom Index. That is 49 positions better than last year.

They cite changes initiated by the government and improvements in the situation of journalists.

We are working on consolidating democratic processes. We are taking serious steps to make sure that all political parties and their election campaigns are financed legally and transparently. We are working on countering disinformation and building a strong and resilient civil society and mass media. The people of Moldova gave us a strong mandate to reform the country and bring it closer to the European Union.

Today, like never before, the government's commitment to reform institutions is unquestionable and profound. We are well on course towards reforming justice, a too long overdue process. Courts are becoming cleaner, prosecution more professional and impartial. We have eliminated a big number of corruption schemes through which the state and the people have been robbed in the past.

But building independent, strong institutions takes time. I am asking for your help in tackling the big corruption. I am asking you to sanction the corrupt politicians who captured institutions in the past, stole significant amounts of public money, and have moved abroad, investing the stolen money, including in countries with consolidated democracies. I'm asking you to help us recover the stolen money and bring the corrupt fugitives to justice. The EU states and institutions, the international community, should do more to reject the dirty money, especially the dirty money coming from fragile democracies.

History and our own transition experience has taught us that the sustainability of democratic achievements is closely linked to economic development. A major challenge for us is to create economic opportunities for everyone at home, to convince our young people that it is worth trying to build a future in Moldova.

Over the past nine months, the government and the parliament have been working together to improve the business environment. We are working with the business community inside and outside of Moldova to demonstrate that Moldova is changing and becoming a better place for one to build his or her future. We have increased support to SMEs and launched dedicated programmes for young entrepreneurs.

With your help, we started building up our energy security and resilience. We embarked on the reform of our security sector. We are strengthening our border management capacity. We are taking steps to improve the efficiency of public spending, to improve coverage and targeting of the social assistance programmes, and to eliminate undeclared work. We are taking measures to improve access to quality education and health services.

However, despite our achievements, we have been hit hard by a succession of crises culminating with the war against Ukraine. The country's resources are overstretched. The socio-economic situation is difficult. The dramatic increase in energy prices is the main reason for a historical surge in inflation – 27%. The measures that we are taking to build energy security will show results only in a few years. Investments have practically stopped because of the war at our border. Supply chains have been interrupted. Even though 76% of our trade is with the European Union, an important part was with Ukraine, Belarus and Russia. Financing the shortfalls in revenue is no simple task.

The Transnistrian conflict is another challenge that the country is facing. We remain committed to a peaceful, political resolution of the Transnistrian conflict, fully preserving Moldova's sovereignty and territorial integrity within our internationally recognised borders. Recent tensions inside the Transnistrian region, however, have increased concerns over potential destabilisation. The Moldovan Government works hard to keep the situation stable and peaceful by pursuing a diplomatic track of conflict resolution. And we will continue to do so for the sake of our citizens on both banks of the Nistru River. We do not want war or destabilisation.

We have a vision for peaceful reintegration of the country, which will guide our efforts to keep the situation stable. We believe today there is no immediate threat of Moldova being dragged into the war.

Moldova is also a neutral country by constitution, a provision still backed by a majority of our citizens, which we respect. However, to be really neutral, we have continuously called for the withdrawal of Russian troops from our territory, because their presence in the Transnistrian region fundamentally violates our neutrality and our independence.

Ladies and gentlemen, despite the long list of overlapping challenges that I just talked about, Moldova is strongly determined to stay part of the free world. We are part of Europe.

The EU's values are our values – respect for human life and the pursuit of everyone's dreams in dignity and peace, as human beings. I ask you to increase the EU's support for Moldova – for the sake of Moldovans who want to preserve their democracy and freedom, but also for the sake of Europe, to have a stable, predictable and reliable partner and contributor to peace in its eastern neighbourhood.

At the same time, our independence, peaceful development, economic and political reforms must have an anchor, and this anchor is a clear perspective of EU accession, the status of a candidate country.

In the middle of the dramatic events, myself, the Prime Minister and the Speaker of the Parliament signed, on 3 March, the application for EU membership. We made this choice inspired by the aspirations of our people. We chose EU accession as a path towards freedom, prosperity and peace. A path that will require a lot of work, coordination and goodwill, but one that is worth every step.

On 12 May, we submitted the completed comprehensive assessment which will provide the basis for the European Commission to issue its opinion on Moldova's candidate status. This was a significant collective effort on behalf of our small civil service, parliament, civil society and our diaspora abroad. We all worked hard because, as a country, we believe in the EU, in its values and in its bright future.

We are aware that political decisions at EU level have to be made. We are also aware that these are not easy decisions, but granting Moldova candidate status is the right decision.

First, I want to say this: we belong in the European Union. We are a European country with a European language, a European history, and a European political system. At least one third of us are already EU citizens. Our big diaspora is among you. You have likely met us. We live side by side with you. We pay taxes and contribute our share to the common good. We come from a diverse society where different cultures have co-existed in peace and harmony for centuries, preferring compromise to confrontation. In this, we are Europeans.

Moldova's democracy is gradually strengthening. We are fully committed to advancing reforms, ensuring rule of law and strengthening an independent and corruption-free justice system.

Our economy and trade is increasingly connected and integrated into the European market. The EU is our main trading and investment partner.

Very important for us – the EU is a peace project. The waves of EU integration transformed Europe from a continent of war to a continent of peace. It embodies the successful struggle for peace and reconciliation, for democracy and human rights.

We are not naive to believe that EU accession can take place overnight. We understand that the accession process is long and complicated, and we don't look for shortcuts. We deem accession as based on meritocracy and achieved results, and not on geographic sequence. We fully respect the meritocratic principle.

At the same time, we would like to see pragmatism and strategic political flexibility on behalf of the EU Member States. A prospect of accession would send to Moldovan citizens a strong signal that the EU stands by us.

For us, EU membership status is the light at the end of the tunnel in these very difficult and uncertain times. It is a clear target and a strong political message to mobilise everyone – society, business community and authorities – around the European integration process. We need a political decision that will be for Moldova the lighthouse in these terrible storms, guiding our country for years ahead.

Ladies and gentlemen, here at the European Parliament, I know I'm speaking to people who are already convinced. This House is the consciousness of the European people. It is the institution that represents the people of Europe. It provides a vision for Europe. It is driving Europe and it is standing by us, and I am very grateful for your support.

It is just days ago that you, Members of the European Parliament, our friends and partners, have passed a resolution urging the EU to grant Moldova a candidate status. Thank you for this on behalf of all Moldovans. Thank you for recognising our European choice and our hard work in implementing reforms, our constant fight for democracy. We are asking for nothing more than to live in peace, that our voices be heard and taken into account and to be guided in our affairs by the will of our people. Defending these values with your help, we will be able to build a prosperous future for our citizens.

I ask you to become Moldova's ambassadors in your countries and call on policymakers to support Moldova in its path to stay part of the free world by joining the world's most successful peace project. I urge you to hear this strong message from the Moldovan people – the European Union should once again show that it is the world's most successful union for advancing peace, prosperity and democracy.

The EU has created the longest period of peace in Europe's history and it can do so again. Extend this anchor of peace once again to states seeking safe harbour, which truly merit and believe in this.

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

President. – Thank you very much President Sandu, dear Maia. As you can see by the reaction and the standing ovation of this House, we truly thank you for your commitment, your vision and your leadership. And we stand with you.

4. Oświadczenie Przewodniczącego

President. – In consultation with the Swedish and Belgian prime ministers, I today sent a letter to my counterpart, Mr Mohammad Baqer Qalibaf, Speaker of the Islamic Consultative Assembly, the Majlis. On behalf of the European Parliament, I expressed our strong opposition to the death sentence on Professor Ahmad Reza Djalali and his execution, announced to take place this Saturday.

Professor Djalali is a Swedish-Iranian national and a scholar at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel and the University of Eastern Piedmont.

The European Parliament strongly opposes the death penalty and has expressed its position in various resolutions. Most recently, in February of this year, we adopted a resolution on the death penalty in Iran, in which we called on Iran to halt the execution of Professor Djalali, to pardon him and to release him immediately and unconditionally. I am repeating this call today. The death penalty is not a deterrent to capital crimes; it is an intolerable denial of the most basic human right – the right to life.

Professor Djalali's confession was extracted under torture and followed by a grossly unfair trial, so I hereby once more call on the Islamic Republic of Iran to set Ahmad Reza Djalali free.

5. Zatwierdzenie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia

President. – The minutes and the texts adopted of the sitting of the 5 May 2022 are available. I ask you, dear colleagues, whether there are any comments? This does not seem to be the case, and therefore they are approved.

6. Skład Parlamentu

President. – Following the election of Tanja Fajon as a member of the national parliament of Slovenia, Parliament takes note that, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, her seat is vacant as of 13 May 2022.

7. Weryfikacja mandatów

President. – The Legal Affairs Committee has proposed that Parliament confirm the validity of the mandates of 26 Members who joined Parliament as a consequence of the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union, and 23 Members who joined Parliament as replacements for outgoing members. The list of these Members and the dates of entry into effect of their mandates will be published on Parliament's website.

8. Wniosek o skorzystanie z immunitetu

President. – Helmut Geuking has submitted a request for defence of his parliamentary immunity in the context of proceedings before the Regional Court of Hamburg. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, that request is referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs as the committee responsible.

9. Skład komisji i delegacji

President. – The EPP, S&D and ID Groups and the Non-attached Members have notified me of decisions relating to changes to appointments within 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.

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

President. – The IMCO and INTA 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, Thursday 19 May, at midnight, that the decision to enter into negotiations be put to the vote. If no request for a vote in Parliament is made within the deadline, the committees may start the negotiations.

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

President. – I would also like to inform that in the course of the current part-session of Parliament, I shall sign, together with the President of the Council, six acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure in accordance with Rule 79 of our Rules of Procedure. The titles of these acts will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

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

13. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół**14. Środki wykonawcze (art. 112 Regulaminu): patrz protokół****15. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół****16. Porządek obrad**

President. – We now come to the order of business. The final draft agenda as adopted by the Conference of Presidents on 4 May, pursuant to Rule 157, has been distributed. I would like to remind that I informed you all by email about the reception of two requests for urgent procedure from the ENVI and LIBE Committees, pursuant to Rule 163, on the following legislative files:

— proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2016/1628 as regards the extension of the empowerment of the Commission to adopt delegated acts; and

— proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2018/1727 of the European Parliament and the Council, as regards the collection, preservation and analysis of evidence relating to genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes at Eurojust.

The vote on these two requests will be taken today once the order of business is established and, if adopted, the vote will be held on Thursday.

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.

We were informed that the Council cannot be attending this part-session in Brussels, and therefore the Council and Commission statements on the prosecution of opposition and detention of trade union leaders in Belarus, the fight against impunity for war crimes in Ukraine and European solidarity and energy security in face of Russia's invasion of Ukraine and recent cuts of gas supply to Poland and Bulgaria, are changed into Commission statements.

Moreover, the title of the Commission statement, scheduled as the third item on Thursday morning, is changed into REPowerEU plan – European solidarity and energy security in face of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, including the recent cuts of gas supply to Poland and Bulgaria.

Finally, the report by Ms Kalniete on temporary trade liberalisation supplementing trade concessions applicable to Ukrainian products under the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement is added directly to the votes on Thursday.

If there are no objections, these changes are approved.

With regard to Wednesday, the ID Group has asked that a Commission statement on the persecution of Christians around the world, notably the case of Deborah Samuel, be added as the last item today, on Wednesday. As a consequence, the sitting would be extended until 11 p.m.

I give the floor to Mr Jean-Paul Garraud to move the request on behalf of the ID Group.

Jean-Paul Garraud, au nom du groupe ID. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, au Nigeria, le 12 mai dernier, une jeune étudiante chrétienne, Deborah Samuel Yakubu, a été lapidée à mort puis brûlée, car elle s'était simplement plainte de l'afflux de messages religieux sur le groupe WhatsApp de sa classe, ce qui fut jugé blasphématoire par des islamistes.

Les communautés chrétiennes subissent dans certains pays musulmans de nombreux meurtres et agressions, des profanations d'églises et de cimetières, des attaques de processions. Mais ceci se déroule aussi en Europe et en France. Pourtant, la Commission européenne refuse toujours de nommer un coordinateur de la lutte contre la christianophobie ou d'établir une stratégie européenne pour combattre ce fléau, alors qu'un tel coordinateur a été créé pour lutter contre l'antisémitisme et l'islamophobie.

Le Parlement européen se doit de débattre de cet important sujet de la persécution des chrétiens dans le monde et, plus spécifiquement, du cas de la jeune Deborah Samuel Yakubu. Tout faire pour éviter de tels drames est une absolue nécessité; ne rien faire serait, a contrario, coupable.

President. – Thank you, Mr Garraud. Can I ask whether any Member would like to speak against? If not, we move straight to the vote by roll call.

So I open the vote, giving colleagues the time to put the cards in the machines.

I close the vote. That is rejected, and therefore the agenda is unchanged.

Also for Wednesday, The Left Group has asked that the Commission statement on the targeting of journalists in Palestine by the Israeli occupation, in particular the case of Shireen Abu Aqla, be added as the second item today.

I give the floor to Mr Manu Pineda to move the request on behalf of The Left Group.

Manu Pineda, en nombre del Grupo The Left. – Señora presidenta, venimos a pedir una declaración de la Comisión sobre el ataque a periodistas palestinos por las fuerzas de ocupación israelíes, en particular el caso de Shireen Abu Akleh.

El régimen israelí mata a palestinos y a palestinas prácticamente cada día: en el último año, más de trescientos muertos, dos de ellos periodistas; además, también hay un periodista encarcelado. A pesar de eso, el régimen israelí goza de una relación privilegiada con esta Unión, con la Unión Europea; una relación privilegiada que está ayudándole a perpetuar una ocupación que dura ya muchas décadas.

Creemos que es necesario que aquí se debata este asunto y que nos posicionemos al respecto, porque, si no, podría parecer que para la Unión Europea y para este Parlamento Europeo hay muertos de primera y muertos de segunda. Creo que este debate es inaplazable.

Por lo tanto, pedimos que se debata esta cuestión. Sabemos que hay otra propuesta sobre el mismo tema. Para nosotros lo importante, la prioridad es que se produzca el debate y, por lo tanto, estamos dispuestos a que se unan ambas propuestas.

Evin Incir, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, I hope that we can agree that the latest dark months have taught us that there is never a time for silence when people are suffering. We need to end impunity regardless of where violence and violations of human rights and international law take place.

Therefore, I also would like to propose a similar topic, but the topic would rather be 'on the killing of Palestinian journalist Shireen Abu Aqla and the violent incident at her funeral', with one round of speakers, after the debate on Moldova. I think it is important to show that we stand with journalists all around the world.

President. – Can I ask The Left Group whether it agrees with the S&D proposal, with Ms Incir? You agree? Okay. Then I put the request with this title from Ms Incir to a vote by roll call.

I close the vote. That is adopted.

Therefore, a Commission statement on the killing of Palestinian journalist Shireen Abu Aqla and the violent incidents at her funeral is added as a second item on Wednesday. The statement will be followed by a round of political group speakers.

The agenda is adopted and the order of business is thus established.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS*Vizepräsident***17. Głosowanie nad wnioskami o zastosowanie trybu pilnego (art 163 Regulaminu)**

Der Präsident. – Wir kommen nun zur Abstimmung über die Anträge auf Beratung im Dringlichkeitsverfahren.

Wir stimmen dabei über zwei Anträge ab. Der erste Antrag betrifft den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Verordnung (EU) 2016/1628 hinsichtlich der Verlängerung der Befugnisse der Kommission zum Erlass delegierter Rechtsakte.

Vor der Abstimmung kann nur dem Antragsteller und einem Redner gegen den Antrag, zusammen mit dem Vorsitz oder dem Berichterstatter des zuständigen Ausschusses, das Wort erteilt werden.

Möchte jemand dazu sprechen? Das ist nicht der Fall. Daher stelle ich den Antrag zur Abstimmung.

(Das Parlament beschließt die Dringlichkeit.)

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 19. Mai 2022, um 12.00 Uhr statt.

Änderungsanträge können bis heute, Mittwoch, 18. Mai 2022, 17.00 Uhr eingereicht werden. Die Frist für die Beantragung getrennter und gesonderter Abstimmungen ist heute, Mittwoch, um 20.00 Uhr.

Der zweite Antrag betrifft den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Verordnung (EU) 2018/1727 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates hinsichtlich der Erhebung, Sicherung und Analyse von Beweismitteln im Zusammenhang mit Völkermord, Verbrechen gegen die Menschlichkeit und Kriegsverbrechen durch Eurojust.

Vor der Abstimmung kann wiederum nur dem Antragsteller und einem Redner gegen den Antrag, zusammen mit dem Vorsitz oder dem Berichterstatter des zuständigen Ausschusses, das Wort erteilt werden.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *Chair of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs.* – Mr President, at this stage, I'm humbly and kindly asking you to endorse this proposal for amending the Eurojust Regulation. You know what it's like: after the war launched by Putin's Russia against Ukraine, the urgent need came to light to amend the Eurojust Regulation precisely to ensure its capacity to prevent impunity of the atrocities perpetrated in this war against Ukraine by Russian troops.

The purpose of this amended regulation is precisely to set up an automated management data system and a storage facility with the aim of helping Eurojust to preserve and share evidence which is relevant precisely to prevent impunity of those crimes perpetrated in the war against Ukraine.

That is the only purpose of these amending regulations: precisely to help Eurojust to better cooperate with Member States, third states, and most importantly, with the International Criminal Court and its prosecutor, which opened an investigation on the matter, to help the joint investigation teams, which are already underway, and to make sure that, as swiftly as possible, Eurojust has the capacity to assist and support Member States in their investigations and eventually prosecutions of all those to be held accountable for those war crimes, namely: genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes.

Those are the crimes which are contemplated in this amended regulation. And the idea is, by the urgent procedure, you know what it's like, in one first reading, we will have the vote tomorrow, that will be the end of our position insofar as the Council agrees to the position that has been endorsed by the LIBE Committee, which we will be voting on tomorrow. That means that if Coreper, i.e. the Council, agrees to the European Parliament position, that will be the end of the procedure, that will be the entry into force of this amended regulation. That is the idea.

So, I kindly request you to endorse this urgent procedure so that we show once again that, when it's needed, we may achieve concrete results in fighting against impunity of war crimes.

Der Präsident. – Möchte jemand gegen diesen Antrag sprechen? Das ist nicht der Fall. Dann komme ich zur Abstimmung.

(Das Parlament beschließt die Dringlichkeit.)

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 19. Mai 2022, um 12.00 Uhr statt. Änderungsanträge können bis heute, 18. Mai 2022, 17.00 Uhr eingereicht werden, und die Frist für die Beantragung getrennter und gesonderter Abstimmungen ist ebenfalls heute, um 20.00 Uhr.

18. Układ o stowarzyszeniu UE z Republiką Mołdawii (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Dragoș Tudorache im Namen des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten über das Assoziierungsabkommen zwischen der EU und der Republik Moldau (2021/2237(INI)). Dies passt zum heutigen Vortrag der Staatspräsidentin.

Ich erinnere Sie daran, dass mit Ausnahme der ersten beiden Reihen, die für die Fraktionsvorsitzenden vorgesehen sind, freie Sitzplatzwahl besteht.

Nachdem Sie Ihre Abstimmungskarten in das Abstimmungsgerät eingeschoben haben, können Sie über Ihr Abstimmungsgerät spontane Wortmeldungen und blaue Karten beantragen. Ich nehme an, dass Sie alle die Abstimmungskarte eingeführt haben, weil wir ja zuerst namentliche Abstimmungen durchgeführt haben.

Wenn Sie sich für eine spontane Wortmeldung melden möchten, ersuche ich Sie, dies ab jetzt zu tun und nicht bis zum Ende der Aussprache zu warten.

Außerdem möchte ich Sie darauf hinweisen, dass blaue Karten auch für eine kurze Wortmeldung hochgehalten werden können und dass danach eine Anschlussfrage zulässig ist.

Ich weise Sie auch darauf hin, dass Wortmeldungen im Plenarsaal weiterhin vom zentralen Rednerpult vor mir erfolgen, außer spontane Wortmeldungen, blaue Karten und Bemerkungen zur Geschäftsordnung.

Ich ersuche Sie daher, die Rednerliste im Blick zu behalten und sich kurz vor Beginn Ihrer Redezeit zum Rednerpult zu begeben.

Dragoș Tudorache, rapporteur. – Mr President, I cannot think of a better timing and better sequence to debate and vote on our report on Moldova. We have just heard from the President of the Republic, Maia Sandu. Her powerful words are the words of the majority of Moldovan citizens.

Through the hardship of multiple crises, and through the kindness of their solidarity with Ukrainian refugees, the Moldovans have spoken to us today about their aspirations, about their ambitions, about their European projections. That hardship, that solidarity and that commitment to European values is the most significant test of identity, of belonging, that a nation must pass in its path to integration.

And I am therefore proud that we here in this House are not ignoring the call of the Moldovans and the powerful plea of President Maia Sandu. I am proud that our report is as clear as it can be: we want that the Republic of Moldova is given candidate status.

Of course, the road to actual membership will be long and full of hard work, and the Moldovans understand that. Today, we've heard the President being highly realistic about this perspective. But the force of the political message itself is not to be underestimated. And this message is not only to the citizens of Moldova. It also tells the world that the European Union stands by those with whom it shares values, and it does so in a concrete and tangible manner.

And it is certainly a message to Putin, and to all dictators of the world, that we remain united in the face of aggression, that autocracy and atrocity will not prevail over democracy and the quest for self-determination.

Going beyond words, the European Union and the Republic of Moldova must turn this political momentum into practical steps. There are reforms to be done. Our report mentions a good number of key transformations that the country must go through: justice and anti-corruption, the banking sector, energy security and diversification, and economic convergence, administrative reform. All these are 'construction sites' where Moldova must get hard at work.

And we also use our report to call for the Commission and the EEAS to find creative and constructive ways to assist the country with gradual forms of sectoral integration. We need a model and methodology of integration that is more dynamic and aligned with geopolitical realities, one that motivates and energises by allowing merit-based incremental access to EU tools and programmes, including participation in institutional work at EU level.

To conclude, I want to thank the shadows from all political groups – not only for the very constructive attitude with which we've worked together on this report, but also for sharing the vision that this Parliament has for the future of Moldova.

Olívér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first, let me thank the European Parliament for inviting President Maia Sandu today, who we have just heard addressing the House. I met the President earlier today and I reiterated to her our support to Moldova. I also took the opportunity to praise the humanitarian efforts undertaken by the country and the government – and she herself – by welcoming and opening their homes to those fleeing the war in Ukraine.

Now, let's focus on some key elements highlighted in your report. We take very good note of your call to grant candidate status to Moldova in line with Article 49 of the Treaty on European Union and on the basis of merit. We understand the importance of the EU membership application for the Moldovan people.

Following the request by the Council, the Commission has swiftly launched its work on the opinion. In this regard, I would like to commend the swift replies of the Moldovan authorities to both parts of our questionnaire. This is crucial in preparing our assessment. These replies, combined with information already available to us through our ongoing work with Moldova, will support our preparation of the opinion which we intend to deliver before the European Council meeting in June this year, so that further decisions can be taken by the Council at that time.

In parallel, we continue to strengthen sectorial cooperation under the Association Agreement and Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area. Earlier this month, during the plenary session in Strasbourg, I have already highlighted some of our actions on the ground to support Moldova with crisis-related and financial assistance. Today, I am pleased to announce that we are making additional support available to the Moldovan border guards by granting executive powers to the European Border Assistance Mission to Moldova and Ukraine, also known as EUBAM, for border control activities.

I want to reassure you that the Commission remains fully committed to Moldova and will continue to provide help and assistance for its pressing needs while continuing our long-term reforms mentioned in your report, including in the justice, energy and public administration sectors.

We are currently preparing the 2022 bilateral assistance programme for Moldova. It will build on the recently adopted programme for last year and will focus on improving Moldova's socio-economic resilience. The Commission is actively involved in the recently launched Moldova Support Platform. The initiative of France, Germany and Romania provides an additional channel to support the country in a comprehensive manner by pooling a large group of donors, including international financial institutions.

We share your concerns on the recent developments in Transnistria. We remain fully committed to facilitating a comprehensive, peaceful and sustainable settlement of the Transnistrian conflict.

Finally, we are closely monitoring the situation and we are stepping up our support for strengthening Moldova's resilience, including by working on cybersecurity, hybrid threats, fighting disinformation, and providing Moldova's armed forces with medical, logistics and communications equipment.

Andrzej Halicki, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I think that I can say not only in the name of the EPP that today we were impressed by President Maia Sandu's statement – a very strong and brave leadership. This is something that we also need to cooperate with Moldovan society, and I think that the anticipated bright future is achievable. We can do it together, and candidate country status has to be granted as soon as possible, at the same time as it should be for Ukraine.

It's very important. It's a political decision. But as Dragoș Tudorache said, there are many challenges. We are facing many tough, complicated reforms. I'm very glad to see this strong leadership because many things are done. But, of course, a long list of projects are still on the list and have to be done.

So, dear Commission, there is another request: a support group for the Republic of Moldova is needed within the EU structure, in a similar way like for Ukraine. Moldova is important for our common security. It is also our benefit to have Moldova as a secure well-developed country within our family, and we have to do it as fast as we can.

So, for the President, the confirmation from the House: yes, you are a part of Europe. Long live Moldova! Long live Europe with Moldova together!

Juozas Olekas, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, we can say that today we have the Republic of Moldova Day in the European Parliament. First, addressed by Moldova's President, Ms Sandu, now, a debate on the EU Association Agreement with the Republic of Moldova: it is a sign that Moldova is very high on the Parliament agenda.

First, I would like to thank Moldova for their efforts to help Ukrainian refugees. I call on the EU to continue its efforts to provide support to Moldova, so that Moldovans can continue to help their Ukrainian neighbours. The EU should step up its financial efforts to help stabilise the country's economy in the face of a refugee crisis.

The report also welcomes Moldova's EU application. We support the country's efforts to become a full member of the European family. Of course, there is still a big round of reforms facing Moldova, including justice reform and the approximation of its law with the European ones. But I believe that candidate status would galvanise reform efforts and would give a clear vision for its citizens.

I would also call the country to boost its efforts to cut dependency on one big supplier from the east. Moldova has to increase its connectivity with the rest of Europe, to look for the new supply routes, and to put more attention on alternative energy resources.

The report calls on the EU to make it easier for Moldova and its citizens to participate in some EU programmes, for example, such as DiscoverEU. I strongly believe that such a step will further boost pro-European sentiments in the country.

Ramona Strugariu, *în numele grupului Renew*. – Domnule președinte, vreau în primul rând să îi mulțumesc colegului Dragoș Tudorache pentru acest raport excelent. N-a fost deloc ușor. Contextul acestui raport a fost în continuă evoluție atât în bine, odată cu depunerea cererii de aderare a Republicii Moldova, cât și în rău, odată cu invazia Ucrainei.

Tocmai din pricina acestui context, mesajul nostru de astăzi este esențial: suntem alături de Republica Moldova mai mult decât niciodată. Ne dorim să ni se alătore în sânul Uniunii și mai cu seamă îi suntem alături în implementarea reformelor curajoase pe care autoritățile de la Chișinău le-au demarat.

Pentru asta trebuie să fim însă mai strategici și mai hotărâți. Dialogul politic trebuie intensificat, cooperarea sectorială trebuie extinsă, asistența macrofinanciară trebuie crescută și trebuie să devină mai coerentă, cu accent pe granturi. Înființarea unui grup de sprijin pentru Republica Moldova, după modelul celui deja creat pentru Ucraina, ne-ar permite să acompaniem mai bine reformele în justiție, lupta împotriva corupției, redresarea economică, inclusiv pregătirea viitoarelor negocieri de aderare.

În final, un cuvânt despre reforma justiției și eforturile anticorupție. Vreau să încurajez autoritățile de la Chișinău să continue cu aceeași determinare pe această cale. Aceste sectoare sunt fundamentale pentru a oferi cetățenilor Republicii Moldova viitorul pe care îl merită și îl merită împreună cu noi aici, în Uniunea Europeană.

Astăzi, în plen, când Președinta Maia Sandu a luat cuvântul, erau studenți din Republica Moldova, de la College of Europe, care au asistat la acest discurs. Cred și sper că au fost mândri de liderul lor, de Republica Moldova și de reprezentarea pe care ea o are în Europa. Ei așteaptă și noi cu toții așteptăm Europa în familia europeană.

Viola Von Cramon-Taubadel, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Moldova is truly European. It has a European government that, in a short time, managed to make significant democratic improvements. It has generous people who have received thousands of Ukrainian fleeing the war.

Despite being a progressive country, Moldova also faces many challenges. The Russian invasion of Ukraine and illegal military presence in Transnistria threaten Moldova. Poverty, corruption and energy dependency make Moldova vulnerable. Even more so, the hybrid operation and disinformation coming from Moscow weaken Moldova's political stability.

However, today is a historic moment to write a better future for the country. For this, the Moldovan Government needs to navigate through very difficult waters, and the EU will be there to show the way. We already helped to ramp up the pressure from Gazprom, to accommodate thousands of Ukrainians and to support Moldova's territorial integrity. There is much more that the EU can – and should – do. Most importantly, we need to make sure that the financial help actually arrives in Moldova, speaking not only to President Sandu this morning; they reminded us how much we can help through our financial support. So why hasn't Moldova received the funds we promised?

Moldova needs to continue pro-democratic reforms, combat corruption and uphold fundamental freedoms, and make sure that democratic development creates a foundation for economic progress so that Moldovans use their talents and skills to generate prosperity in their country. I strongly believe in the European future of Moldova, and for that to happen, we need to secure its European presence now.

Bernhard Zimniok, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Die geplante EU-Erweiterung ist nicht nur ein völlig falscher, sondern ein hochgradig gefährlicher Ansatz. Falsch ist er schon deshalb, weil sowohl die Balkanländer als auch die Republik Moldau kaum eines der Kopenhagener Kriterien erfüllen, die Voraussetzung für einen EU-Beitritt sind.

Er ist auch deshalb falsch, weil das hochkorrupte Moldau – derzeit auf Platz 105 des Korruptionsindexes – auf viele Jahre Nettoempfänger wäre. Wer soll das bezahlen? Vermutlich wie immer Deutschland, das dank der Politik der Bundesregierung auf dem Weg ist, ins Armenhaus zu kommen.

Gefährlich ist der Beitrittsplan, weil das abtrünnige Transnistrien ein Referendum über den Beitritt zu Russland plant. Wir würden uns also nicht nur einen hochkorrupten Staat in die EU holen, der über Jahrzehnte hinweg Nettoempfänger wäre, sondern können auch noch in einen direkten Konflikt mit Russland hineingezogen werden.

Es gibt also keinen einzigen vernünftigen Grund im Interesse unserer Bürger, über einen Beitritt Moldaus zur EU überhaupt nachzudenken.

(Zwischenruf)

Shame on you!

Anna Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, luckily, today we send a really powerful signal to the Moldovan people in an extremely difficult time, surviving a period of instability, difficulties after COVID – yet showing enormous generosity in welcoming Ukrainians fleeing atrocities in a war waged by Russia in Ukraine.

It is an enormously powerful message by Maia Sandu's statement here in the European Parliament and by a very good report we have issued jointly, in consensus, over political divisions.

We acknowledge Moldova as a member of the European community, of a European community of nations that want to realise their aspirations. And we want to help the Moldovan authorities and Moldovan people in achieving candidacy status to the EU as soon as possible.

Emmanuel Maurel, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, nous avons tous été émus par le discours empreint de gravité de M^{me} Sandu, qui est la première ministre courageuse d'un pays éprouvé et qui déploie des efforts immenses pour accueillir un flot de réfugiés fuyant la guerre en Ukraine. Je crois que c'était bien pour nous, parlementaires européens, de lui réaffirmer notre soutien au moment où ce pays est confronté à des difficultés immenses et – cela a été dit mais je le répète – au moment où l'intégrité territoriale de la Moldavie est remise en question, notamment par Tiraspol, qui a fait une déclaration d'indépendance complètement irresponsable, et par certains dirigeants russes qui rêvent d'un corridor entre la Crimée et la Transnistrie. Il est bien que, collectivement, nous nous y opposions.

Mais je pense qu'il faut aller plus loin dans l'aide, parce qu'il n'y a pas que l'aide d'urgence, il y a l'aide en réponse à la crise sociale et je ne voudrais pas qu'on ait les recettes habituelles qui consistent à dire: «On va vous faire des prêts et des accords de libre-échange». Il faut être à la hauteur des attentes des Moldaves; il faut être à la hauteur des attentes de la jeunesse moldave, qui émigre massivement parce qu'elle est confrontée à des difficultés matérielles immenses. Nous devons apporter un soutien face à l'urgence, mais aussi sur le long terme – et pour cela, il y a besoin d'argent et pas seulement de prêts ou d'un hypothétique accord de libre-échange.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, Președinta Republicii Moldova ne-a spus astăzi foarte clar: „cetățenii Republicii Moldova doresc aderarea Republicii Moldova la Uniunea Europeană, doresc să trăiască în siguranță, stabilitate, cu perspectivă de prosperitate, la fel ca cetățenii statelor noastre” și răspunsul nostru, dacă cetățenii Republicii Moldova doresc să ni se alăture, trebuie să fie unul singur: „Da, Republica Moldova are perspectivă europeană, Republica Moldova poate deveni stat membru al Uniunii Europene, haideți să lucrăm împreună pentru a îndeplini acest lucru”.

Am văzut cu toții în ultimele luni cum cetățenii Republicii Moldova au primit refugiați din Ucraina, în deplin spirit european. Și-au deschis casele pentru cetățenii din Ucraina care aveau nevoie de ajutor, au oferit hrană, au oferit apă, au oferit adăpost și siguranță cetățenilor din Ucraina.

Exact așa cum cetățenii moldoveni și-au deschis casele pentru cetățenii ucraineni, la fel trebuie și noi, Uniunea Europeană, să deschidem ușa pentru apropierea Republicii Moldova și mai mult de Uniunea Europeană și perspectiva ca Republica Moldova să adere la Uniunea Europeană.

Reforme îndeplinite în mod ambițios de guvernul proeuropean de la Chișinău sunt incluse în raportul colegului nostru Dragoș Tudorache și detaliate în acest raport. Știm că mai este mult de făcut până la momentul aderării, dar mesajul nostru important trebuie să fie „da, ne apucăm de lucru”.

Și exact așa cum Finlanda și Suedia doresc să adere la NATO și vor fi acceptate amândouă în NATO, exact așa, dacă Ucraina și Republica Moldova doresc să adere la Uniunea Europeană, este obligația noastră să le oferim această perspectivă.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, I want to thank the rapporteur on this valuable reflection on the state of play of our relations with Moldova. We acknowledge many of reforms undertaken, and specify the ones that should remain a priority in the upcoming months and, most notably, the strengthening of the state institutions and justice reform.

The European Parliament will remain a strong supporter of all of the reform processes, as confirmed by the Memorandum of Understanding with the Parliament of Moldova last year. We cooperate in many areas, but we should do more and we should increase our financial institutions' assistance for all of the necessary reforms.

Lastly, given the changed security context following the Russian invasion of Ukraine and the pro-European geopolitical orientation, Moldovan efforts should be acknowledged politically too. Supporting a swift assessment of Moldova's readiness and applications for EU membership would be an essential step in the right direction. We support that.

Dacian Cioloș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, raportul prezentat de colegul nostru Dragoș Tudorache este fără echi-voc. Republica Moldova este o țară cu adevărat europeană, condusă de o președintă și de un guvern cu o agendă reformistă. O treime dintre cetățenii Republicii Moldova sunt deja cetățeni europeni, deci locul Republicii Moldova este în Uniunea Europeană și semnalul de aderare trebuie să vină acum, când dorința moldovenilor este foarte clară.

Istoria nu trebuie să se împiedice în proceduri și de aceea lideri europeni trebuie să fie, să se arate cel puțin la fel de curajoși ca și Maia Sandu. Cum ar mai trebui Moldova să dovedească atașamentul la valorile europene, când a riscat totul pentru a fi în această familie – și ați văzut solidaritatea pe care cetățenii Republicii Moldova au arătat-o față de refugiații ucraineni? Ați văzut și o Republică Moldova care și-a asumat toate riscurile și costurile economice, fiind de partea Ucrainei și a Uniunii Europene în această agresiune rusă.

Dar Republica Moldova este și o țară a cărei economie este fragilă și care nu mai are cum să exporte produse nici în Ucraina și nici în Republica Moldova. De aceea, are nevoie de un ajutor foarte clar acum din partea Uniunii Europene, care trebuie să sprijine, din punctul meu de vedere, eliminând taxe la frontieră pentru produse din Republica Moldova, crescând cotele de export în Uniunea Europeană pentru produsele moldovenești.

Dragi colegi, haideți să nu ignorăm dimensiunea simbolică pe care o poate aduce oferirea statutului de candidat la Republicii Moldova la Uniunea Europeană. Este un moment istoric nu doar pentru estul Europei, pentru toată Europa și trebuie să ne arătăm la înălțimea acestui moment istoric din care Republica Moldova trebuie să facă parte.

(Vorbitorul a fost de acord să răspundă unei intervenții de tip „cartonaș albastru”)

Eugen Tomac (PPE), intervenție de tip „cartonaș albastru”. – Domnule președinte, domnule președinte Cioloș, ați spus că Republica Moldova se confruntă cu o criză economică extrem de periculoasă și Uniunea Europeană trebuie să acționeze imediat. Ați dat câteva exemple. Vă rog frumos să detaliați aceste exemple, pentru că sunt esențiale și ele trebuie să ajungă și în Republica Moldova.

Dacian Cioloș (Renew), răspuns la intervenția de tip „cartonaș albastru”. – Domnule președinte, *(începutul intervenției nu a fost făcut la microfon)* ... pentru întrebare, domnule Tomac. Mă refeream la câteva lucruri foarte concrete, pentru că dincolo de promisiuni și de vorbe frumoase, putem să arătăm și exemple concrete și mă bucur că este domnul comisar aici ca să audă.

În urmă cu câțiva ani, când eram comisar european, am eliminat cotele de import în Uniunea Europeană pentru vinul moldovenesc. Au fost și atunci și state membre care s-au temut de această decizie, că vom fi invadați de vinul moldovenesc. Iată că piața europeană nu a fost perturbată. Republica Moldova își vinde vinul în Uniunea Europeană și producătorii s-au putut dezvolta.

Același lucru îl putem face și pentru alte produse agricole, produse agroalimentare care ar ajuta enorm economia din Republica Moldova, fără ca aceasta să aibă un impact negativ asupra pieței europene.

Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the Republic of Moldova has had challenging times in this unprecedented crisis. Combined with the effects of the Russian war of aggression that raised energy and commodity prices, it has all had a detrimental impact on Moldova. Hence, the EU's help and assistance are crucial in this situation.

The country certainly needs its reforms improving decentralisation, crucial reforms considering concerning the institutional set-up of the public administration and resilience against state capture.

At the same time, the Moldovan Government has been eager to continue to work on its reform, and to have the EU in close integration and sectoral cooperation. The Moldovan citizens spoke, and chose to deepen European relations. We need to support our friends in the Eastern Partnership, and that is why we should highly endorse granting the candidate's request, based on merit.

Rasa Juknevičienė (PPE). – Mr President, today, many people around the world want to defeat Putin. The people of Moldova have already won against Putin by voting for Maia Sandu and her team. Putin openly supported the Kremlin candidate and lost.

The EU must give clear hope to the Moldovan people, who have voted for the European way and rejected corrupt politicians. Moldova took in refugees from Ukraine and clearly sided with the democratic states, despite the Kremlin threatening Moldova in the same way as it is threatening Ukraine.

The people of Moldova deserve to be part of the European family, and the Council should send a clear signal. Moldovans need a European perspective. If we do not seize this opportunity, there may not be another one soon.

The EU has the chance to become a real geopolitical actor. A firm hand extended to Moldova would be a step towards it.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Mr President, colleagues, at the same time as we see backlash on our fundamental rights in some of our own Member States, we see progress on our European values in countries aspiring for EU membership.

Moldova has in recent years taken important steps towards more democracy and respect for the rule of law, even though a lot remains to be done and needs to be intensified as regards judiciary reform and the end of corruption. Moldova has also taken a big responsibility for people in need, being the country receiving most Ukrainian refugees per capita and showing deep solidarity.

As hard as we must be towards our Member States that take negative steps backwards, we need to salute those wanting to join our Union that take positive steps forward. We need to continue supporting the Moldovan people that has clearly shown that they want to be a part of our Union. My message to all our friends in Moldova is: we stand by you, we support you and we hope to see you represented here in this Parliament soon.

Urmas Paet (Renew). – Mr President, Moldova is in a very difficult situation due to Russia's aggression against Ukraine, which is why the European Union must give Moldova its full support.

Moldova is a very important recipient of Ukrainian refugees. There are more than 100 000 refugees in the country, mostly in Moldovan homes. That is why Moldova needs EU financial support to help these people.

At the same time, Moldova is completely dependent on Russia for energy. The EU also must help Moldova increase its energy security by creating new connections. Otherwise, Russia will have a significant leverage to influence Moldova. Moldova's only power plant is in Russian-controlled Transnistria.

In addition, the EU should increase its import quotas for Moldovan agricultural and other products in order to give Moldova better access to the EU market. This would also help reduce economic dependence on Russia.

It is also important that the EU soon respond positively to Moldova's application for EU membership. This would give Moldova and its pro-European government a clearer perspective.

Ewa Kopacz (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Panie Komisarzu! Wojna w Ukrainie, zagrożenie jej eskalacją, olbrzymie problemy ekonomiczne to codzienność dzisiejszej Mołdawii. Mimo to Mołdawia przyjęła pół miliona uchodźców z Ukrainy, pół miliona w kraju mającym dwa i pół miliona mieszkańców. Mołdawia każdego dnia udowadnia, że politycznie i mentalnie jest częścią Europy. Jej obywatele dokonali wyboru, zagłosowali na prezydent Maię Sandu, opowiedzieli się więc za Europą. Mołdawia jest mocnym ogniwem Partnerstwa Wschodniego. Jestem pewna, że wobec wojny w Ukrainie musimy więcej uwagi poświęcić stabilizowaniu całego regionu. Mołdawia potrzebuje oczywiście wsparcia materialnego, ale tak naprawdę przede wszystkim potrzebuje nadziei. Stworzenie realnej perspektywy europejskiej dla Mołdawii jest dla nas zarówno moralnym obowiązkiem, jak i wyrazem politycznego rozsądku.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, dezbateră de astăzi, legată de acordul privind aderarea Moldovei la Uniunea Europeană este binevenit. Este binevenită și doamna Președintă, care și-a prezentat punctul de vedere, dar cred că este nevoie nu numai să votăm acest acord, ci să găsim o soluție de a ajuta și a sprijini cetățenii din Republica Moldova, acum când sunt în fața focului, în fața războiului, acum când nu mai au piață de desfacere, când au probleme economice, financiare.

Să devansăm acel ajutor care l-am propus, să îi susținem cu proceduri și cu regulamente privind administrația publică, pentru că spunea doamna Președintă că au o criză privind funcționarii în administrația publică și să găsim soluții să devansăm acei bani care au fost programați să fie dați Republicii Moldova, pentru că cunosc foarte bine Republica Moldova. Moldovenii sunt generoși, dar dacă nu au din ce, nu pot să dea mai mult.

Și noi avem datoria istorică acum să sprijinim Republica Moldova pentru a grăbi aderarea și pentru a sprijini financiar cetățenii de acolo.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Gerbiamas pirmininke, gerbiami kolegos, šiandien iš tikrųjų matėme ir girdėjome Moldovos žmonių pasirinkimą. Iš tikrųjų džiugu, kai darbai nesiskiria nuo kalbų – kas kalbama, tas ir dirbama. Ir tikrai mus labai gerai nuteikia, kad ši šalis kryptingai dirba, pasirinkusi savo kryptį, ir siekia sukurti demokratišką, saugią šalį ir sukurti gerovę savo žmonėms. Todėl Europos Komisija turėtų deramai įvertinti Moldovos pasirinkimą ir nedelsiant suteikti kandidatės statusą. Tikrai šis procesas neturėtų užtrukti pakankamai ilgai. Turėtume sudaryti galimybę, kad Moldova galėtų greitai prisijungti prie Europos bendrijos.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, felicit raportorul, domnul Tudorache a făcut o treabă foarte bună, însă vreau să pun accent pe o chestiune ce ține de decizia politică pe care trebuie să o ia Uniunea Europeană.

Pentru că să nu uităm un lucru extrem de important: Republica Moldova este victimă a Pactului Ribbentrop-Molotov, este o fostă republică sovietică, care, la fel ca țările baltice, a fost o victimă a unor înțelegeri criminale. Tocmai de aceea astăzi, prin discursul pe care l-a transmis doamna Președintă Maia Sandu, a subliniat o chestiune extrem de importantă și anume că poporul Republicii Moldova este european.

Românii din Republica Moldova vorbesc o limbă oficială a Uniunii Europene. O bună parte din cetățenii Republicii Moldova sunt deja cetățeni ai Uniunii Europene și tocmai de aceea este esențial să accelerăm acest proces și să facem dreptatea pe care cetățenii Republicii Moldova o merită.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Olivér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, dear Members, thank you very much for this discussion and the very clear commitment shown today towards Moldova and its people.

Let me assure you that we are closely following the situation in Moldova and that we continue to work on the opinion on Moldova's application for membership to the European Union. We will, of course, also continue – and look forward advancing – our collaboration to find additional ways to help Moldova to face the current crisis, because we think that we will have more help needed for that country, and we are ready to deliver that.

Dragoș Tudorache, rapporteur. – Mr President, I concluded my first introductory remarks by thanking the colleagues, thanking the shadow rapporteurs, for their work and for the united vision. I can only thank them again for confirming this through the addresses that they've made today.

I also want to thank the Commission. I didn't do it in the first round, but I want to thank them really for how they've handled the numerous emergencies that Moldova has put on the table in the last couple of months, from energy supply alternatives to urgent budgetary support.

I also want to invite you – and I'm sure that you've heard this message today from the colleagues – to also take this message back to the Commission, both in terms of the political message that is needed, but also in terms of the very concrete support that they now need, including through export quotas, which is something that is vitally important for compensating the effects of the war.

The key political takeaway, the key political conclusion for me from today's debate is that Moldova's commitment to Europe is no longer just words. It is felt in the drive to reform the judiciary and to strengthen the rule of law. It is felt in how they hosted half a million refugees in their country, and how they withstand Russian pressure. It is a commitment that comes with risks and costs, and though they're not doing it with guns in their hands, Moldovan citizens are fighting alongside their Ukrainian neighbours for the European dream, and for the values that bring us together.

All that is needed now is our voice saying, without hesitation, that the Republic of Moldova's rightful place is by our side.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 19. Mai 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Andrus Ansip (Renew), kirjalikult. – Pärast Nõukogude Liidu lagunemist asus Eesti viivitamatult üles ehitama riigi demokraatlikke institutsioone. Eesti valis vabaturumajanduse tee. Eesti taasiseseisvumise lugu on edulugu. Paraku Moldova demokraatiseerimine ja üleminek vabale turumajandusele takerdus. Oluliseks takistuseks oli Transnistria konflikt, see tähendab Vene vägede viibimine Moldova territooriumil.

President Maia Sandu juhtimisel on Moldova teinud märkimisväärseid edusamme. Moldova eksport on ümber suunatud idaturult Euroopa Liitu. Viimase aasta jooksul on Moldova teinud olulisi edusamme ka meediavabaduses. Ühe aastaga on maailma meediavabaduse indeksis tõustud 89. kohalt 40ndaks. Nende edusammude põhjal pean võimalikuks lähemas tulevikus Moldovale Euroopa Liidu kandidaatriigi staatuse andmist.

19. Zabójstwo palestyńskiej dziennikarki Szirin Abu Akleh i gwałtowne zajścia podczas jej pogrzebu (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Erklärung der Kommission zu der Tötung der palästinensischen Journalistin Shireen Abu Akleh und den gewalttätigen Tumulten bei ihrem Begräbnis (2022/2688(RSP)).

Olívér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, dear Members, on behalf of High Representative Vice-President Josep Borrell, let me make the following statement.

Last week, we received the shocking news of the killing of journalist Shireen Abu Aqla, who was killed by a gunshot when she was reporting on an Israeli military operation taking place in Jenin in the occupied Palestinian territory on 11 May. The External Action Service spokesperson issued a statement on the same day strongly condemning her killing and sending condolences to her family, friends and colleagues. Another journalist, Ali al-Samoudi, was wounded.

The EU has called for a thorough and independent investigation clarifying the circumstances that led to her death. It is essential that this investigation clarify all the circumstances of these incidents, and as soon as possible, and that those responsible are brought to justice. It is unacceptable to target journalists while they perform their jobs. Journalists covering conflict situations must be ensured safety and protection at all times.

The European Union stands in solidarity with journalists and will continue to support their fundamental work, in particular while covering conflicts. Just days after World Press Freedom Day, the European Union recalls the crucial role played by journalists, media workers and free and independent media.

Honourable Members, on Friday last week, 13 May, during the funeral procession of Shireen Abu Aqla, we witnessed scenes that showed disproportionate use of force and disrespectful behaviour against participants of the mourning procession. The High Representative / Vice-President gave a statement on the same day, noting that the European Union is appalled by the events that took place during the funeral procession. The EU condemned this disproportionate use of force and the disrespectful behaviour.

The EU reiterates its call for a thorough and independent investigation that clarifies all the circumstances of the death of Shireen Abu Aqla and brings those responsible for killing her to justice.

Miriam Lexmann, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, the loss of any innocent life is a tragedy, and so is the death of Shireen Abu Aqla. I am equally disturbed by the violence seen at her funeral, but the rush to any judgement before the conclusion of a credible investigation is irresponsible.

Shireen Abu Aqla was killed during the Israeli anti-terror operation following the murder of 19 Israelis in a spate of terror attacks within the past few weeks. Despite overtures by the Israeli authorities to conduct a joint investigation with the Palestinian authorities, the Palestinian side has refused this offer. The tragic death of Shireen Abu Aqla is a sad reminder of the spiral of violence taking place that continues to haunt this region.

That is why we must seek the truth by supporting a joint inquiry rather than fuel any flames of hate and violence.

Finally, let me also state that we must do all in our power to ensure mechanisms and safeguards to protect journalists. In 2021 only, 55 journalists have been killed around the world, while a free press is one of the key pillars to support freedom and democracy and society that protects human rights.

Here in Europe, the brutal killings of Daphne Caruana Galizia in Malta and Ján Kuciak in Slovakia are a stark reminder that the pressure from international communities to impartial investigation plays an important role in ensuring the truth is exposed and the perpetrators are brought to justice.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, Shireen Abu Akleh, periodista palestino-estadounidense que trabajó para Al-Yazira durante veinticinco años, fue asesinada el pasado 11 de mayo mientras informaba desde Yenín. Se trataba de una de las voces más prominentes en Oriente Medio, que cubrió durante décadas el conflicto árabe-israelí; estaba trabajando con un casco y un chaleco con la palabra *press* en letras bien grandes cuando recibió un disparo letal en la cabeza justo donde no le cubría el casco.

En nombre de esta Cámara y del Grupo de Socialistas y Demócratas, quiero transmitir nuestro más sentido pésame a la familia y amigos de la periodista palestina, así como a todos aquellos que la apreciaban y valoraban su trabajo. Echaremos de menos a Shireen y condenamos con todas nuestras fuerzas este cruel asesinato, pero no nos quedemos en la condena o en el llanto: queremos pedir explicaciones y acciones.

Por un lado, esta Cámara debe pedir una investigación rápida, internacional e imparcial para esclarecer todas las circunstancias en las que se produjo este atroz acto, y, por otro lado, pedimos también que se investigue con la misma determinación los actos violentos ocurridos en su funeral el pasado fin de semana., porque las imágenes de un ataúd en hombros de amigos y familiares siendo atacado por las fuerzas de seguridad de Israel con porras y golpes nos golpean el corazón y nos indignan: nadie nadie debe sufrir este trato inhumano en el funeral de un familiar o de un amigo, es contrario a la libertad de culto y a la dignidad humana.

Esta tragedia es el síntoma de una frustración y una tensión creciente sobre el terreno que se ven alimentadas por la ausencia total de avances en el proceso de paz después de setenta y cuatro años de la creación del Estado de Israel y el inicio de la ocupación de Palestina. La situación de los palestinos y las palestinas en Cisjordania y Jerusalén Oriental se deteriora cada día más, sobre todo por las demoliciones de viviendas, las amenazas de desahucios y la continua construcción de asentamientos. Tampoco podemos dejar de pensar en los periodistas y trabajadores de los medios de comunicación. En unas semanas voy a encabezar una delegación de alto nivel de nuestro Grupo de Socialistas y Demócratas a Israel y Palestina.

Finalizo dejando claro que el mensaje que tenemos que trasladar es nuestra condena más absoluta y que necesitamos avanzar en un auténtico proceso de paz para Israel y Palestina.

Hilde Vautmans, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, one week ago, Shireen Abu Aqila, a prominent Al Jazeera journalist, was killed. She was killed while reporting in the West Bank. I'm as shocked and dismayed as you are, and I'm not sure what shocks me most – her death or the utter disrespect by Israeli police at her funeral, which I strongly condemn.

Forty-two Palestinian journalists have been killed in 2022. To get the facts straight, it is clear that we need an independent inquiry into the killing of Shireen, and we need to do better to protect journalists both within and outside our Union. Media freedom is a cornerstone of our democracy.

But colleagues, apart from the shock, I'm also angry – angry about the fact that too often we here in Europe look away when the spiral of violence continues, when new settlements plans are announced, or when another journalist gets killed or wounded. We all agree that we must tackle the root causes of this conflict. So let's get to work and play our role.

Shireen was called 'the voice of Palestine'. Let us now commit to be the voice of Shireen. We have neglected the conflict too long. We must put new energy into bringing lasting peace between Israel and Palestine.

Jordi Solé, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I condemn in the strongest terms the killing of Palestinian journalist Shireen Abu Aqila, as well as the wounding of Ali al-Samoudi. I express my utmost shock at the attacks by Israeli forces at her funeral procession where thousands of Palestinians gathered in mourning. This killing constitutes a very grave attack on press freedom.

The targeting of journalists and media in Palestine must cease. More than 40 Palestinian journalists have been killed since the year 2000. More than ever, journalists are key to expose the protracted climate of impunity and violations of international human rights and humanitarian law in the occupied Palestinian territories.

I call for an immediate, thorough, independent investigation into the killing and the violence at the funeral, and for those responsible to be held accountable. I call on Israel and the Palestinian authorities to cooperate with such investigation, and I call on the EU to go beyond a statement of condemnation. We cannot be a passive bystander in front of such crimes.

This attack happens in a context of growing tensions and violence, with terrorist attacks in Israeli cities, increased settler violence around the settlements, clashes at the holy sites in Jerusalem during Ramadan, and forced evictions and demolitions in the West Bank, including of EU-funded projects. Until when has this to go on? Enough is enough. I call on the EU to take, at long last, a resolute initiative to uphold international law in the region and to secure genuine negotiations towards a two-state solution.

Bert-Jan Ruissen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, geachte commissaris, bij de dood van journalist Shireen Abu Akleh gaan allereerst onze gedachten uit naar de nabestaanden. Wat een schok. Wat een verdriet om zo een geliefde te verliezen.

De grootste fout die we vandaag kunnen maken, is om voorbarige conclusies te trekken. Ja, we zagen beelden en verklaringen, maar de werkelijke toedracht moet uit nader onderzoek blijken. Dat geldt ook voor de confrontaties bij de begrafenis. Voor de hand liggend zou zijn een gezamenlijk onderzoek van Israëlische en Palestijnse autoriteiten, eventueel met inschakeling van buitenlandse experts. Hoe merkwaardig dat Palestijnse autoriteiten een dergelijk onderzoek afwijzen en hun conclusies al hebben getrokken.

Israël is recent geteisterd door een golf van aanslagen. Dat Israël verdachte personen zoekt, is alleszins begrijpelijk. Beelden van de confrontatie tonen een schotenwisseling tussen het Israëlische leger en gewapende Palestijnen in onoverzichtelijk stedelijk gebied. De risico's voor onschuldige omstanders zijn in dit terrein groot. Dat laat onverlet dat het doden van journalisten tijdens hun werk door wie dan ook stellig veroordeeld dient te worden. Maar laat het beantwoorden van de schuldvraag over aan een onafhankelijk onderzoek en niet aan emoties of vooringenomenheid.

Manu Pineda, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señor presidente, la mañana del miércoles 11 de mayo, a las 6.13 horas de la mañana, la redacción de Al-Yazira en Ramala recibió el siguiente correo: «Las fuerzas de ocupación asaltan Yenín y rodean una vivienda en el barrio de Yabriyat. Estoy de camino, os traeré la noticia en cuanto recopilé datos claros». Lo firmaba Shireen Abu Akleh, una veterana y reconocida periodista. Cuando llegó a hacer su trabajo se vio acorralada por disparos de francotiradores israelíes. Bajó del coche perfectamente identificada, con chaleco y casco de prensa, y recibió el disparo cerca de la oreja, justo donde dejaba de cubrirle el casco. Fue un disparo extremadamente preciso.

Cincuenta periodistas palestinos han sido asesinados por Israel desde el año 2000. No es casualidad. Responde al intento de silenciar que solo en el último año más de trescientos civiles han sido asesinados por las fuerzas israelíes de ocupación. Israel no quiere testigos del sistema de *apartheid* y limpieza étnica que impone en Palestina. Israel no puede seguir participando en proyectos, en programas o en acuerdos europeos, así como tampoco puede seguir recibiendo fondos, mientras siga vulnerando el Derecho internacional y los derechos humanos del pueblo palestino.

No podemos ser cómplices del asesinato de esta periodista, ni de la transferencia forzosa de la población, ni de la detención masiva de niños y niñas, ni de la ampliación de los asentamientos ilegales. Hoy el Parlamento acepta tener este debate y les agradezco a todos los grupos que lo han apoyado que así lo hayan permitido. Pero ahora toca que la Unión pase de la palabra a los hechos.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the Parliament, I thank you for all the remarks. The EU will continue to reiterate its call for a thorough and independent investigation that clarifies all the circumstances of this murder. There must be accountability for her killing.

The EU and its Member States have more generally recently noted that the EU is concerned about the increasingly high number of casualties, including women and children, and recalls that the use of force must be proportionate and in line with international law, and only as a last resort when it is strictly unavoidable in order to protect human life.

The latest developments in Israel and the occupied Palestinian territory over the last few weeks and months highlight the dire need for renewed engagement between the parties to renew confidence and to restore a political horizon and open the path towards the relaunch of the peace process as soon as possible.

The EU has condemned terrorist attacks against Israeli civilians. We have condemned the new settlement announcements and possible forced transfers. The EU urges both parties to demonstrate their stated commitment to a two-state solution and to avoid unilateral actions which threaten it.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

20. Sprawozdanie Komisji na temat praworządności za rok 2021 (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Terry Reintke im Namen des Ausschusses für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres über den Bericht der Kommission über die Rechtsstaatlichkeit 2021 (A9-0139/2022) (2021/2180(INI)).

Terry Reintke, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, some of us, including me, have grown up believing that the global trend towards democracy and freedom only knew one direction – emancipating citizens from authoritarian regimes, strengthening the rights of all people in our societies, making Europe and the whole world a fairer, a more equal and a more democratic place.

I must admit, colleagues, that I do not believe that any more, and we do not have to look as far as Moscow to see attempts to undermine rule of law, democracy and fundamental rights, because the rule of law crisis is also happening within our Union – a Union built on values, not just economic cooperation, a Union built on a promise to all its citizens to safeguard their rights and freedoms.

But we are not helpless to these attacks on our values – quite the opposite. In the last years, with the clear leadership of this Parliament and many colleagues before me from different political groups and Member States, we have managed to expand the instruments for monitoring, for preventing and sanctioning attacks on the rule of law, democracy and fundamental rights.

One of those instruments is indeed the rule of law report of the European Commission, and the European Parliament welcomed the introduction of the rule of law report as a tool to firstly create a common basis, an overview of the situation of rule of law in the Member States.

We are happy about the commitment and the energy that a lot of people in the Commission have actually put into making it a reality, and before I come to the very much needed criticism, I would like to give some credit to those people in the Commission who have actually put effort into writing and preparing the reports.

But it is also clear that a lot still needs to be done to improve the impact of the rule of law report of the European Commission. First of all, so far the report has mostly been an exercise of description – no doubt an important part, but regarding the urgency of the situation also in the European Union, we need to go beyond that. We want the next report not only to include recommendations, but to suggest very concrete follow-up in cases of non-compliance including, for example, infringement procedures, the rule of law conditionality and Article 7 proceedings.

This would not only strengthen the report itself, but would also make the reasoning of the Commission behind how they are planning to defend the rule of law more transparent and comprehensible, not only to this Parliament, but also to the citizens in the European Union.

Secondly, regarding the scope, Parliament has always called for a more holistic approach in the assessment. The fact that an illegitimate constitutional tribunal is restricting the reproductive rights of women shows how closely the independence of the judiciary and fundamental rights are interlinked, and this should also be reflected in this report.

Thirdly, we want this report to be prepared in an inclusive and transparent way, because civil society organisations, academics and activists, are not ‘nice to have’ input givers, but an absolutely vital part to get full insight into what is happening on the ground. That is why we want NGOs to be able to give input, to make the process of writing and preparing this report more foreseeable – and yes, to create a panel of independent experts to give a much-needed outside view into the preparing of this report.

Lastly, let me say this, colleagues. I have learned that rights we have taken for granted can be taken away from us again. I went into politics not only to leave a habitable planet to future generations, but also to make sure that our daughters and granddaughters do not have less rights than we have, but actually more – to enjoy more freedom, equality and more diversity in their lives. The same is true for all of society.

I want this report to become a tool to make sure that our democracies thrive, that everyone can feel safe in their rights, and that we build a Union that shows crystal clear not only to the people in Europe, but the whole world, that even – and especially – in times of transformation, conflict and disruption, strong, viable democracies are the future, not authoritarian leaders invoking an imagined ‘better, cleaner’ past, to show clearly that commitment to the rule of law and not the law of the ruler wins the battle, not only in Ukraine, but all over Europe.

Monika Hohlmeier, in Vertretung des Verfassers der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltskontrollausschusses. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich darf heute im Namen von Petri Sarvamaa sprechen, der leider nicht hier sein kann und der zwei besondere Aspekte mit ansprechen wollte.

Zunächst einmal herzlichen Dank für den diesjährigen Bericht über die Rechtsstaatlichkeit. Wir sind froh, dass er in diesem Jahr doch schon ein Stückchen präziser geworden ist, was für uns ganz wesentlich ist. Aus der Sicht des Haushaltskontrollausschusses wissen wir jetzt, dass der Konditionalitätsmechanismus zum ersten Mal getriggert worden ist. Es wäre für uns aber sehr wichtig, zu sehen, dass sich im zukünftigen Bericht über die Rechtsstaatlichkeit auch eine Bewertung der Erfüllung der verschiedenen Konditionen, die im Konditionalitätsmechanismus gesetzlich festgelegt werden, befindet und wir diese darin analysieren können, und auch eine Bewertung der Maßnahmen, die die Mitgliedstaaten ergriffen haben, um die Probleme zu lösen, die vonseiten der Kommission adressiert worden sind.

Des Weiteren wäre es wichtig, eine klare Unterscheidung zwischen einzelnen Problemstellungen und systemischen Problemstellungen zu treffen – da fehlt mir noch die ganz klare Unterscheidung. Es kann sein, dass irgendwann einmal in einem Mitgliedstaat ein Fehler oder eine spezifische Tradition nicht unbedingt toll ist, aber es ist kein grundlegendes Problem, während es bei anderen zu echten systemischen Problemen kommt, die sich quer durch die ganze Verwaltung und quer durch die Finanzierung und quer durch den Staat ziehen. Da muss man dann doch auch die Unterschiede deutlich machen.

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

Franco Roberti, *relatore per parere della commissione giuridica*. – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, il rispetto dello Stato di diritto deve essere una nostra priorità assoluta, politica e istituzionale. Per questo è deprecabile che la passività delle istanze che hanno il dovere di vigilare sulla tutela dei diritti dei cittadini europei abbia portato la situazione a deteriorarsi in modo così preoccupante in Ungheria e in Polonia.

Il nostro compito è di disinnescare con strumenti normativi e persuasivi gli attacchi, anche mediatici, contro magistrati, giornalisti, ONG e persone LGBT, che purtroppo circolano con insistenza nel nostro continente.

Lo Stato di diritto è fondamento dell'Unione europea, lo stiamo vedendo anche in questi giorni, e rafforza la fiducia dei cittadini nei confronti delle istituzioni. Esso è tuttavia fragile, perché si fonda soltanto sul dominio della legge, pretende il dominio esclusivo della legge. Ciò è possibile solo quando i poteri dello Stato sono separati e ben bilanciati, in modo che nessuno di essi possa sopraffare gli altri.

Altre condizioni indispensabili per garantire l'uguaglianza e la tutela dei diritti dei cittadini di fronte alla legge sono l'efficienza dei sistemi giudiziari e l'indipendenza dei magistrati, poiché la gestione efficiente della giustizia si realizza solo dove operano giudici e pubblici ministeri indipendenti, che si danno disponibilità di risorse umane e finanziarie adeguate e di una formazione permanente e professionale dei magistrati stessi: lo stiamo vedendo anche in questi giorni con il tema in discussione dell'applicazione dell'intelligenza artificiale ai sistemi giudiziari.

Inoltre, e finisco, di estrema importanza per un'incisiva lotta alla corruzione è un'amministrazione pubblica efficiente e trasparente, con codici e procedure di gestione tali da prevenire i comportamenti illeciti; dobbiamo puntare al potenziamento di misure atte a limitare la durata e i costi dei contenziosi e dei processi, nonché dei fondi a disposizione per l'assistenza legale e dei mezzi di ricorso per i cittadini bisognosi tali da favorire un accesso alla giustizia per tutti.

Didier Reynders, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, c'est vraiment un plaisir d'être de retour parmi vous pour échanger au sujet du rapport de votre Parlement sur le rapport de la Commission concernant l'état de droit, dont la deuxième édition a été adoptée en juillet de l'année dernière.

La Commission partage des objectifs de votre Parlement, également exprimés dans ce nouveau projet de résolution, en ce qui concerne la promotion et la protection de l'état de droit. Il est essentiel que toutes les institutions de l'Union travaillent ensemble à cet effet. Le rapport sur l'état de droit représente un instrument important dans la poursuite de nos objectifs communs.

Avec la deuxième édition de ce rapport, nous constatons de nouveau que celui-ci a un véritable impact. Il ne s'agit pas seulement d'une évaluation de l'état de droit à des fins analytiques, mais bien d'un instrument qui permet d'influencer les réformes engagées dans nombre d'États membres. Le rapport a aussi prouvé qu'il pouvait servir de base à un véritable dialogue politique sur l'état de droit, au niveau européen comme au niveau national.

The Commission welcomes the draft resolution of your Parliament that we are debating today. I appreciate that it underlines a number of positive aspects of the rule of law report, such as the equal treatment of all the Member States and the fact that the functioning of justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances are all part of this report.

I'm grateful that you recognise all efforts to engage with civil society, giving full credit to the vital importance that civil society organisations play for the proper functioning of the rule of law. Civil society organisations are also very important partners in the preparation of the rule of law report as they provide valuable information on the situation on the ground.

For the 2022 report, we have conducted more than 100 meetings with civil society organisations. We have also received over 250 contributions from stakeholders, many of these from civil society organisations, but also from professional organisations, or from other institutions.

Moreover, your resolution notes that the Commission engaged in debates with your Parliament and with national parliaments. First of all, I have had the opportunity to hold several discussions with this Parliament in the plenary and in several committees.

Let me reiterate that I am ready to engage with you even more, maybe in a more formalised format, and notably in debating the situation of the rule of law in country-specific exchanges regarding all Member States.

As regards national parliaments, last year the rule of law report was the most discussed topic amongst the more than 100 meetings that all members of the Commission had with national parliaments. I can tell you first hand how important and valuable these discussions are for both sides. Without the rule of law report, such informed and objective political debates would not be possible.

Furthermore, the resolution welcomes that the report of this year will include specific recommendations for all the Member States. I also take note of some more critical points of concern and concrete suggestions in your resolution. These are important contributions for further advancing our work.

As regards the call to link the country-specific recommendations with country-concrete tools to be used if Member States will not follow up – allow me to recall that the report is only one of the instruments at our disposal. While there must be synergies between the instruments, they are separate, with different conditions for their use and different objectives. They require a separate and detailed assessment in each case. It will not seem adequate to pre-empt or to rule out possible future decisions to use one of the tools at the time of the adoption of a specific edition of the rule of law report. We need to ensure our ability to react to developing situations with the most appropriate instruments at hand.

Let me also assure you that the Commission does not hesitate to use the instruments we have to protect the rule of law and EU values in general. As you know, most recently the Commission sent a written notification to Hungary under the Conditionality Regulation.

In addition, we pursue the protection of the rule of law through various other initiatives. This includes the recommendation on the safety of journalists adopted last year, our recent proposal to protect journalists and human rights defenders against SLAPPS and the 10th edition of the Justice Scoreboard that I will be presenting tomorrow.

In parallel, the Commission is continuing with its enforcement actions against those Member States that violate EU law, including through daily penalty payments in case of continued failure to respect decisions of the European Court of Justice. Also next week, the Council will be holding a hearing under the Article 7 procedure concerning Hungary, where I will participate.

To conclude, the Commission is now preparing the 2022 rule of law report and we aim to adopt it in July. We will assess developments since the previous report and we will examine the extent to which concerns have been addressed or processed or whether the situation has further deteriorated.

As I said, for the first time, this edition will include country-specific recommendations for all the Member States, which I know was very important for this Parliament. Of course, I am looking forward to discussing this third edition of the report with you, if it's possible, with debates dedicated to all the Member States. But already today I thank you for your attention, not only for my speech, but for the rule of law report since 2020.

Sophia in 't Veld, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs*. – Madam President, first of all, congratulations to the rapporteur. As I was the rapporteur of the initial legislative proposal in October 2016, there is a special place in my heart.

Whereas the idea of the annual rule of law report, or the annual rule of law health check, has been very favourably received by the general public, the Commission has been as eager as a toddler about vegetables. It initially rejected the idea altogether, and only after a few years it introduced a drastically slimmed down version.

Now, the addition of country-specific recommendations in this year's edition is very welcome, but key elements from the 2016 proposal are still missing, notably, the panel of independent experts. And that is important because the Commission is simply not free and independent enough to really critically assess the Member States. It will mince its words. Fortunately, in the Reintke report, there is a proposal to set up a panel by this Parliament. I would really urge the Commission to give a full and swift follow-up to all the elements of the 2016 proposals.

I also think that the timing of the publication of the annual report, at the end of July, is particularly unfortunate. And I ask you, Commissioner, why? Why is it buried in the summer break? We call, instead, for an 'annual values week' in September.

Finally, the EU governance structure should equally be subject to scrutiny, and therefore I'm very happy to note the support of this House for my call for an opinion of the Venice Commission on key democratic principles, in particular, the separation of powers, accountability, and checks and balances.

Isabel Benjumea Benjumea, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Peticiones*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, en la Comisión de Peticiones aprobamos una opinión que tenía dos objetivos principales.

Por un lado, reflejar los principios fundamentales del Estado de Derecho, principios que han de respetar todos y cada uno de los Estados miembros: separación de poderes, independencia e imparcialidad del poder judicial, igualdad ante la ley, ejecución de las sentencias, lucha contra la corrupción y las noticias falsas, protección de los denunciantes y de los periodistas y, por supuesto, honrar a las víctimas del terrorismo poniendo todo el empeño en aclarar los crímenes sin resolver.

Pero, por otro lado, este informe también debía reflejar, y eso es lo que ha hecho, la gran cantidad de peticiones de ciudadanos de la Unión que han llegado a la comisión parlamentaria relacionadas con la defensa del Estado de Derecho y con la denuncia de vulneraciones que se han dado en los territorios de la Unión.

No olvidemos que la defensa del Estado de Derecho ha de ir acompañada siempre de coherencia: ninguna credibilidad tendremos si solo denunciemos violaciones y vulneraciones atendiendo al color político del Gobierno de turno y callando ante otros casos por supuesta cercanía ideológica; este juego, al que se dedican algunos, y no pocos, diputados de esta Cámara, es muy dañino para nuestras instituciones y para nuestro proyecto de derechos y libertades.

Vladimír Bilčík, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I think it's important that we discuss rule of law in this Parliament as much as possible. I also want to thank the rapporteur for the reports, and I'm glad this has become a regular exercise.

Let me focus on one aspect, because I do believe that the 25 February and Russia's attack against Ukraine has been a game changer in so many respects, including also the way we discuss rule of law issues. It has altered the reality of innocent people of Ukraine, but in many respects, our lives too.

Our strong institutions are more important than ever. Our functioning democracy and our freedom are invaluable. The rule of law and democracy can only flourish in an environment with quality, free and independent media, and free of manipulative propaganda. In this House, we do have several tools to tackle the consequences of malign foreign interference.

We, thanks for the work of the INGE Special Committee, know that we have to defend our democracy in the information space. We know who the malign foreign actors are; we know what Russia has been doing to undermine our freedom for many years.

Sadly, with COVID and Russia's war, we find ourselves in an increasingly vulnerable information space within the EU. Fake news and the resulting disinformation aimed at EU citizens is a threat to democracy and the rule of law of our Union, as the spread of disinformation polarises and weakens our institutions.

The Digital Services Act was a step in the right direction, but more needs to be done, especially in the European Media Act, and a set of rules aimed at tackling disinformation to create fair conditions for the media sector and the spread of free and factual information in online platforms. We need free and fair debate, we need facts, and this is the best way to fight for rule of law as well.

Thijs Reuten, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, judges under political pressure, investigative journalists targeted by strategic lawsuits, children learning in school that their only option is to start a traditional family – these people are the story behind the Commission's annual Rule of Law Report. These people are our fellow EU citizens.

Thank you, Terry Reintke, for the excellent collaboration that we had with you this year on the Rule of Law Report; my compliments to you. Thanks to our Parliament, the Commission is now exercising a yearly rule of law review, and even including country-specific recommendations as of next year.

But to protect the core values of the EU, and the fundamental rights of our common Europeans, we need more! We are currently in a two-front struggle: preventing further rule of law violations on the one hand, but also fixing what has gone terribly wrong. That is why we ask for the Commission's Rule of Law Report to be more than just a descriptive document. It needs to be analytical, preventive, and it needs the concrete follow-ups by connecting it to the EU's rule of law instruments. We have them – let's use them!

Autocrats are not deterred by reports nor by Article 7 hearings in the Council we never hear back from. That is, of course, a message to the Council, to the Member States. Dialogue is not the language they speak. The only way to stop undemocratic leaders, undemocratic in behaviour, is by taking real measures and making sure they feel the consequences. No more patience, no more EU money into authoritarian pockets – the rule of law can never be subject to compromise.

Anna Júlia Donáth, *a Renew képviselőcsoport nevében*. – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Engedjék meg, hogy mielőtt kitérnék az előttünk álló jelentéssel kapcsolatos javaslataimra, röviden – magyar képviselőként – hadd reagáljak az Európai Unió jogállamisági politikájára.

Nem szabad a magyar népet kormánya bűneiért büntetni! Küszöbön áll ugyanis egy gazdasági válság, és Magyarország jelenleg nem tud hozzáférni EU-s forrásokhoz. A támogatást a kormánytól kell megvonni, a magyar kormánytól, nem a magyar társadalomtól, akik napról napra sodródnak a létbizonytalanság felé. Az Európai Uniónak azon kell dolgoznia, hogy a pénzt közvetlenül az önkormányzatoknak, civil szervezeteknek, vállalkozásoknak juttassa el. Azon kell dolgoznia, hogy az EU-s pénzeket térkövek és kilátók helyett iskolákra, kórházakra és munkahelyekre költse, és azon kell dolgoznia, hogy az EU-s pénzek egy nemzet gyarapodását szolgálják, egy szűk kör gazdagodása helyett.

A magyarok is, ahogy minden más európai nemzet, létbiztonságot és jogbiztonságot szeretne, kiszámíthatóságot, nyugalmat, békét. Olyan országot, ahol biztonságban érezhetik magukat, és ahol kiszámíthatóan tudnak egyről a kettőre jutni. Egy európai országot. Ez pedig jelenleg csak az Európai Unió támogatásával képzelhető el.

Az Unió előtt álló kihívás tehát nem kicsi, tagállamának állampolgárai nem szenvedhetnek anyagi hátrányt, de közben jogbiztonságukról is gondoskodniuk kell. Ez csak kemény és következetes tárgyalásokkal oldható meg, amihez viszont egyértelmű, ténybeli alapokra van szükség. Épp ezért a küszöbön álló harmadik jogállamisági jelentéssel kapcsolatban három javaslatot tettem. Először is, létesítsünk egyértelmű kapcsolatot a jogállamisági jelentés és a jogállamisági mechanizmus, azaz az EU-s források megvonásával kapcsolatban. Másodszor: vezessünk be egy jogállamisági indexet, amivel értékelni tudjuk a jogállamiság helyzetét egy adott tagállamban. Végeredményben pedig, kapjon külön fejezetet a civil társadalom helyzete, mert a jogállamiság rombolása legtöbbször az ellenük irányuló kormányzati fellépéssel veszi kezdetét.

Kérem Önöket, ezt szem előtt tartva szavazzák meg a riportot.

Alice Kuhnke, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Fru talman, kära kolleger, kära Terry! Du har lyckats samla parlamentet bakom det viktiga och stora att vi inte ska acceptera att situationen för rättsstatens principer i EU fortsätter att urholkas. I stället kräver du och vi med detta betänkande att vi gör mer, att kommissionen gör mer. För det är med sorg vi kan konstatera att bakom de två länder som går främst i ledet vad gäller att inte acceptera rättsstatens principer finns flertalet andra medlemsstater med liknande tendenser. Länder som steg för steg i Polens och Ungerns skugga gör inskränkningar i de friheter som vi vet är avgörande för starka och hållbara demokratier: mediefriheten, minoriteters rättigheter och civilsamhällets möjligheter.

Vi måste, utifrån respekten för de människor som har valt oss och utifrån respekt för de institutioner som vi bär vårt uppdrag på, kräva att kommissionen tar i med hårdhandskarna mot alla medlemsstater som bryter mot rättsstatens principer.

Hélène Laporte, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, la Commission européenne a lancé officiellement, le 27 avril dernier, une procédure administrative contre la Hongrie, ce qui constitue une étape supplémentaire d'un régime de sanctions inédit dans l'histoire de l'Union européenne. Cette situation doit nous amener à réfléchir pour quelles raisons des «traités bis» sont en train de s'écrire, avec l'aval de la CJUE. La procédure, qui pourrait durer entre cinq et neuf mois, comprendra deux cycles de consultation, avec un processus qualifié de collaboratif par les responsables européens – mais permettez-moi d'en douter, tant les conclusions sont connues à l'avance.

Sur le champ temporel des sanctions, des contradictions fâcheuses existent entre le Conseil et la Commission, le premier affirmant qu'aucune mesure ne devrait affecter les paiements du précédent CFP et la seconde indiquant que le mécanisme qui est entré en vigueur depuis le 1^{er} janvier 2021 peut affecter tous les paiements effectués depuis lors, ce qui inclut les paiements relevant du budget précédent qui continueront à être effectués jusqu'en 2023. Ces atermoiements sont révélateurs de certaines incertitudes juridiques liées à ces nouvelles sanctions.

Les responsables de la Commission sont préoccupés par l'incapacité constante à mettre en œuvre les recommandations et les demandes adressées depuis plusieurs années aux autorités polonaises et hongroises. Mais cette situation concerne-t-elle uniquement ces deux pays? Je ne le pense pas. Par exemple, la liberté de la presse ne me semble pas appliquée de manière uniforme au sein de l'Union.

Enfin, je relève avec stupéfaction que, le 3 mai dernier, la délégation française qui préside le Conseil de l'UE était absente des débats concernant les procédures à l'encontre de la Hongrie et de la Pologne. C'est un fait historique révélateur du double discours de la présidence française, qui affiche devant le Conseil son souhait de protéger l'état de droit et l'Union européenne, mais qui, hélas, a déserté les débats au moment d'en discuter.

Dominik Tarczyński, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, I say to the dear leftists, it's been seven years of your criticism and attacks on Poland, and obviously the rule of law is one of the excuses.

Look at the Chamber, where these seven years of your criticism led you to: there's more people watching us from the gallery than MEPs taking a part in this discussion. Well done. Well done. That is the symbol of how many people care about your false accusations – and use of excuses and the rule of law to attack Poland. So I'll tell you what the real reason, what the real pain for you is, to criticise us.

Look at that: Poland is a leader – it's here in red – with our GDP after COVID. That's data. Unemployment in Poland – one of the lowest in the European Union. It's your data – Eurostat's – not ours. If you want to feel free, if you want to feel safe, come to Poland – also your data. Poland is here. Germany is here. One of the safest places in the European Union. These are data. These are official documents. And that's how it is in Poland. It's your data, not ours. This is Eurostat. So if you want to feel safe, be like Poland. If you are looking for low unemployment, be like Poland. If you love freedom, be like Poland.

Die Präsidentin. – Wir lassen überprüfen, ob es okay ist, so ein Schild in die Kamera hineinzuhalten. Ich habe mich jetzt ein wenig erkundigt, aber das müssen wir überprüfen.

Clare Daly, on behalf of The Left Group. – Madam President, I don't know how to respond to our last speaker. Methinks he doth protest too much. But in any case, I want to thank our rapporteur, Terry Reintke, for articulating a really strong position here.

The truth is the Commission's annual rule of law report is an inadequate mechanism. It's uneven, selective in its coverage, not independent, and it avoids specific cases. But even if it were to address our criticisms, it wouldn't do much to stop an existential threat to the rule of law in Europe that doesn't come from within, but which comes from without, from a foreign government. And that is the danger posed by the US prosecution of Julian Assange.

I have to say that the time for fence-sitting has run out. Some people avoid this case because they think it's complicated. It isn't. It's very simple. In 2010, a journalist in Europe published evidence of war crimes and foreign interference by the United States. Nine years later, Donald Trump had him prosecuted for espionage. He faces 175 years. He's been in prison already for three, facing extradition, and a final decision is due today. If the United States can criminalise European journalists, put them in prison, snatch them from our shores, then efforts to enforce Article 2 values are meaningless.

Colleagues, this is our last chance for a say on this case. If Assange is surrendered, he's gone. How can we talk about rule of law and not resoundingly condemn this criminal prosecution and demand his release?

Die Präsidentin. – Ich weiß, das Thema ist sehr emotional, das Herz geht über, und die Redezeit vergeht sehr schnell. Ich ersuche alle Rednerinnen und Redner, sich wirklich an die begrenzte Zeit, die Sie zur Verfügung gestellt bekommen haben, zu halten.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la regressione dello Stato di diritto e della democrazia osservata in alcuni Stati membri rappresenta una minaccia sistemica per l'Unione europea, per i diritti fondamentali e per le libertà dei cittadini. Gli sforzi della Commissione nell'individuare gli sviluppi in settori chiave come il sistema giudiziario, il quadro anticorruzione, il pluralismo dei media e altre questioni riguardanti il sistematico bilanciamento dei poteri non bastano, bisogna andare oltre. Ho sempre sostenuto un meccanismo di monitoraggio ampio, che comprenda tutti i valori europei dell'articolo 2 del trattato sull'Unione europea al fine di tutelarli e, soprattutto, al fine di prevenirne le violazioni.

È un'ipocrisia pensare di contrastare l'insorgere o l'aggravarsi di problematiche riguardanti lo Stato di diritto senza garantire poi un efficace *follow-up* alla relazione annuale. Se essa non verrà presa come riferimento per raccomandazioni stringenti e specifiche per i singoli paesi, per l'attivazione dell'articolo 7 e per il regolamento sulla condizionalità o per procedure di infrazione e altri strumenti pertinenti, è chiaro che non avremo mai un sistema organico di rapide misure preventive, correttive e sanzionatorie.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, o relatório anual sobre o Estado de Direito é um instrumento central para garantir os valores que estão consagrados no artigo 2.º e para garantir que eles são respeitados em toda a União; para identificar e prevenir problemas e para verificar também se eles são cumpridos por todos os Estados-Membros.

Embora o âmbito deste relatório deva ser alargado, ele é já um bom começo e permite uma visão objetiva em áreas que são fundamentais para perceber e apreciar a saúde do Estado de Direito. No entanto, importa que este relatório, no futuro, possa ser apenas um instrumento de um verdadeiro regulamento sobre o Estado de Direito, em que as instituições tenham a capacidade de avaliar e até de abrir procedimentos relativamente aos Estados que não estejam a cumprir as várias dimensões e princípios do Estado de Direito.

E, neste plano, gostaria de dizer que é fundamental que o Conselho avance no procedimento do artigo 7.º. Precisa apenas de maioria qualificada para determinar se há ou não há o risco de violação grave por parte de um Estado-Membro dos valores do artigo 2.º. E, porque não o tem feito, a Comissão também devia, neste relatório, dizer que o Conselho está a falhar nas suas obrigações porque não está a implementar nem a concretizar o artigo 7.º e para isso foi mandatado pela Comissão, no caso da Polónia, e pelo Parlamento, no caso da Hungria. E essa é também uma falha para com o *rule of law* a nível da União Europeia.

O Conselho está a falhar e deve ser sancionado por isso.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Madam President, I send my congratulations to the rapporteur. To protect the rule of law is so essential, not only outside the EU, but especially inside the EU.

I can't resist answering this colleague from ECR. The simple fact in Europe is, if you want to become a member, if you want to stay a member in the European Union, you have to guarantee rule of law and democracy. It's not a 'nice to have', and therefore it is very important that we have the right instruments here at hand to make sure that it happens and that citizens trust us that we can deliver on this essential value of the EU.

Here indeed, Commissioner, we see room for improvement in the reports, especially, on the one hand, regarding the scope. I think that we really have to extend it to cover democracy and fundamental rights, especially also including women's rights, migrants' rights and LGBTIQ rights.

Also, and it was mentioned here already, it doesn't help to treat all Member States the same way, because we cannot step away from the fact that we have Member States – in the plural – in the European Union with systematic and severe attacks and violations of rule of law. We have to address it. We have to make it stronger to keep the trust of the citizens and hopefully also of the rapporteur.

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, cher Didier Reynders, depuis trop longtemps, certains États membres ne respectent pas les valeurs européennes, sans conséquence. Face à ces atteintes répétées à l'état de droit, l'Europe tente de se mobiliser.

Votre rapport, Monsieur le Commissaire, est bien sûr un document fondateur important. Le rapport que nous examinons aujourd'hui propose d'aller plus loin pour mettre en œuvre un certain nombre de mesures correctrices. En effet, l'état de la situation montre des entraves à l'indépendance de la justice, des restrictions à l'encontre de la liberté de la presse et de la liberté d'expression. Mais je crois qu'on en est tous d'accord: les rapports ne sont pas suffisants. À quoi bon analyser, si on n'en tire pas les conséquences? À quoi bon documenter, si on n'agit pas?

Le rapport vous le propose. Vous l'avez indiqué, cher Commissaire Didier Reynders, vous souhaitez aller plus loin. Nous avons bien sûr la procédure du mécanisme de conditionnalité du budget enclenchée à l'égard de la Hongrie. C'est une belle étape, mais avec notre groupe, avec Sophia in 't Veld, qui s'est exprimée tout à l'heure, nous demandons que ce rapport constitue un outil encore plus opérationnel au service de la conditionnalité des fonds européens.

Nous exprimons donc des attentes fortes pour que la prochaine édition – alors, plutôt en septembre qu'en juillet – donne lieu à un large débat et à la construction de nouveaux outils; que ce nouveau rapport poursuive cet objectif, formule des recommandations spécifiques – soit pays par pays, soit par rapport à des objectifs précis – pour répondre aux problèmes identifiés. Nous le devons à nos journalistes, à nos juges – une pensée particulière pour les juges polonais suspendus – et à tous nos citoyens qui s'engagent pour la vie démocratique.

Diana Riba i Giner (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, la salud del Estado de Derecho en Europa no está en su mejor momento. Tampoco la de los derechos fundamentales ni la de la democracia. Por ello, en este robusto informe que ha elaborado mi compañera Terry Reintke, pedimos que el informe anual cubra también estos dos principios fundamentales que constituyen la esencia de la Unión Europea.

Del mismo modo, para que este informe anual sea un ejercicio útil, la Comisión debe proporcionar soluciones para cada problema y también debe garantizar un seguimiento adecuado, incluidos los procedimientos de infracción, los procedimientos del artículo 7 del Tratado de la Unión Europea y los procedimientos de condicionalidad presupuestaria.

Porque, en esta casa, el Estado de Derecho y los derechos fundamentales se defienden. Y no solo para señalar a Polonia o a Hungría. Hay muchos países europeos que presentan preocupantes carencias democráticas y un grave deterioro del Estado de Derecho. Es hora de que la Comisión se tome en serio esta cuestión y actúe con firmeza antes de que sea demasiado tarde. ¿Son los garantes de los Tratados? ¡Demuéstrenlo!

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Reintke! Eigentlich hat ja die spanische Kollegin, die im Petitionsausschuss arbeitet, schon alles zu Ihrem Bericht gesagt, nämlich: Wir sind nicht glaubwürdig, wenn wir nur Regierungen einer bestimmten Couleur Verstöße gegen die Rechtsstaatlichkeit vorwerfen.

Genauso ist es in dem Bericht: Es geht eigentlich nur um Polen und Ungarn. Und da versteigt man sich dann auch zu so absurden Formulierungen wie: „keines der Kriterien würde erfüllt, das eine Demokratie ausmacht“.

Also wir haben gerade in beiden Ländern Wahlen gehabt. Wir haben natürlich auch Gerichte, wir haben Parlamente, wir haben Gewaltenteilung. Und wenn Sie immer die Einsetzung von Richtern in diesen Ländern für undemokratisch halten, dann gebe ich Ihnen mal den Hinweis, zu gucken, wie es in Deutschland läuft – nur mit dem Unterschied, dass in Deutschland auch noch die Staatsanwälte nicht unabhängig, sondern weisungsgebunden sind.

Besonders absurd wird es allerdings, wenn Sie einen zunehmenden Antisemitismus vorwerfen. Ich glaube, in Warschau und in Budapest kann man durchaus mit der Kippa herumlaufen; das mag in Molenbeek, vor allem aber in Neukölln in Berlin zum Beispiel deutlich anders sein. Dort hat gerade das *American Jewish Center Berlin* darauf hingewiesen, dass der Antisemitismus besonders bei Muslimen stark verankert ist und dass von Muslimen der größte Antisemitismus in Deutschland ausginge.

Vielleicht widmen Sie sich auch mal diesem Thema, dann würde der Rechtsstaatlichkeitsbericht auch mal ein bisschen sinnvoller und wahrhafter werden. So, wie er jetzt ist, kann man ihn nur in die Tonne treten. Ich schließe mich da dem Urteil der verehrten spanischen Kollegin an: Sie sind nicht glaubwürdig, und Ihr Bericht ist es überhaupt nicht!

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Żeby uczynić naszą debatę trochę bardziej produktywną, poprosiliśmy wybitnych specjalistów prawa o ocenę ubiegłorocznych sprawozdań Komisji. Ich wstępna ocena potwierdziła, Panie Komisarzu, liczne słabości tych sprawozdań, ale także fakt, który każdemu – nawet takiemu laikowi ja – rzuca się w oczy, gdy do nich zagłąda. Otóż fakt niejednakowego traktowania krajów, państw.

Pokazuje to choćby uderzająca różnica źródeł, na których opierają się te sprawozdania. Na przykład w przypadku Niemiec sprawozdanie opiera się głównie na informacjach rządowych stanowiących 33% źródeł oraz na informacjach własnych Komisji – 32% źródeł, podczas gdy tylko 20% informacji pochodzi z jednostek niezwiązanych bezpośrednio z państwem niemieckim, 7,5% z prasy, 2,5% z organizacji międzynarodowych.

W przypadku Polski sytuacja jest odwrotna. Głównym źródłem są organizacje pozarządowe i media krytyczne wobec rządu.

Nic nie wskazuje na to, żeby w tym roku się coś zmieniło. Zachęcam więc Komisję Europejską, by dokonała eksperymentu myślowego i zmieniła proporcje. I być może wtedy zdziwią się Państwo konkluzjami.

Malin Björk (The Left). – Madam President, the Polish Government representative who is not even here for the debate any more makes a show about Poland, saying it's safe, it's free.

Let me tell you, it's not.

If you're a woman with an unwanted pregnancy, you are not free in Poland. If you are an LGBTI person and you live in one of the Polish 'LGBTI-free zones', you are not safe in Poland. If you are working with solidarity for migrants and refugees, regardless of their background and their colour of skin, you can be subject to governmental harassment. If you work for the independence of the judiciary or for civil society freedoms, the Government will seek to counteract you. That's not free. That's not safe.

So, we don't want more anti-authoritarian, anti-democratic Europe. This is just what Putin would like us to be. He would like these anti-democratic developments to get a hold of Europe and to develop and to get more countries walking that way. But we are not going to let it happen.

So I call on the Commission, I call on the Member States – there is nothing more important than to protect democracy and human rights, please. If we do that, we can then take care of the rest of the planet and create more equality. But we have to get the democracy thing right first.

Kinga Gál (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Az európai baloldal évek óta a jogállamiság fogalmát használva folytat politikai rágalomhadjáratot Magyarország és Lengyelország ellen. Most hallottuk imént ennek a legjobb példáját, s ennek egyik legfőbb eszköze sajnos a Bizottság éves jogállamisági jelentése évek óta. Noha a jelentés a tagállamok pártatlan értékelésére lenne hivatott, de a valóságban durva kettős mércét alkalmaz. A benne foglaltak nem tényeken alapulnak, hanem álcivil szervezetek elfogult véleményei, amelyek a politikai nyomásgyakorlást célozzák. Pedig azok csak az immunitásunkat erősítik.

A Bizottság valójában a saját ideológiai elvárásait kéri számon a demokratikusan megválasztott kormányokon. Nálunk nincs probléma a demokráciával. Ahogy ez a mai vita is mutatja: a tények nem érdekelnek senkit. Az Európai Parlament lelkesen asszisztál mindehhez, amit a Bizottság bemutat, és mindenféle szankciókat követel, hogy nyomást gyakoroljon Magyarországra akár a migrációval, vagy épp a gyermekvédelemmel kapcsolatban. Pedig a magyar emberek egy hónappal ezelőtt világosan kimondták: nem kérnek Brüsszel ideológiai kioktatásából. Ideje lenne észrevenni, hogy az ilyen politikailag elfogult jelentések nem szolgálják Európa érdekét, hanem rombolják az európai együttműködést.

Die Präsidentin. – Da wirklich sehr, sehr viele von Ihnen die Redezeit überschreiten, ersuche ich Sie nochmals, wirklich diszipliniert mit der Redezeit umzugehen. Die Debatte verzögert sich. Ich verstehe natürlich voll und ganz all die Einwände, weil das ein so emotionales und wichtiges Thema ist. Nichtsdestotrotz möchten wir doch unseren Zeitplan im Großen und Ganzen einhalten. Daher jetzt gleich meine Bitte an die nächste Rednerin, Frau Isabel Wiseler-Lima, wirklich die eine Minute und 30 Sekunden nicht zu überschreiten.

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, je tiens à remercier le commissaire Reynders. Le rapport annuel de la Commission est une vraie plus-value pour la démocratie dans l'Union européenne. Je voudrais souligner, aussi pour contrer des voix tendancieuses, que dans ce rapport, tous les États membres font l'objet du même examen, selon les mêmes indicateurs, avec la même méthode.

Je voudrais tout de même soulever une critique déjà évoquée l'année passée. Il faut que le rapport fasse une différence très claire entre les violations systémiques et les violations isolées. Souligner cette différence est essentiel. Nous ne pouvons laisser des pays comme la Hongrie ou la Pologne relever l'un ou l'autre point problématique, isolé, dans d'autres pays qui par ailleurs ont des systèmes sains et les laisser mettre ces points isolés à la même enseigne que des violations qui sont, elles, disruptives, systémiques et mettent en danger les fondements mêmes de nos démocraties.

Ensuite, je voudrais relever une vraie inquiétude quant à l'état de droit dans l'Union, au regard du mépris de certains gouvernements à l'égard des arrêts de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne. Les arrêts de la Cour ne sont pas facultatifs, notamment quand ils visent à prévenir toute discrimination. Nous devons trouver le moyen de remédier à ceci.

Enfin, je voudrais finir sur un point qui me tient tout particulièrement à cœur: l'indépendance des médias et la sécurité des journalistes ne sont pas garanties. Or, nous le savons, une information juste et libre est indispensable à la démocratie. Il nous faut trouver les moyens de protéger les journalistes pour qu'ils puissent travailler sereinement et sans autocensure. Le journalisme d'investigation est un rouage important dans la lutte contre la corruption. Il n'est tout simplement pas acceptable que des journalistes soient victimes de harcèlement, d'intimidations ou de menaces de mort. La proposition de directive de la Commission pour agir contre les poursuites abusives, les «SLAPP», est un pas important. Il nous faudra malheureusement encore sûrement faire plus.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario Reynders, desde superar con el impulso decisivo de este Parlamento Europeo esa fase embrionaria de compromiso con el Estado de Derecho, la democracia y los derechos fundamentales consagrados en el artículo 2 del Tratado de la Unión Europea hasta convertir este debate, ya regular, habitual, el debate sobre el informe sobre el Estado de Derecho que presenta anualmente la Comisión, en una institución de este Parlamento Europeo, hemos cubierto efectivamente terreno.

Y la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia e Interior da la bienvenida a este nuevo informe de la Comisión y lo valora positivamente, poniendo de manifiesto, por supuesto, que continúa pendiente la ampliación del espectro de preocupaciones de que se ocupa de modo que no solamente hable del funcionamiento de los sistemas judiciales —que por supuesto—, de la lucha contra la corrupción o del pluralismo informativo, sino que incluya toda forma de abuso de poder, que incluya la no discriminación en el acceso a un juicio justo o que incluya también las condiciones carcelarias: son elementos adicionales.

Pero sobre todo subraya la importancia de que la Comisión, en su informe anual.

En primer lugar, distinga entre lo que son violaciones graves y sistémicas del Estado de Derecho, la democracia y los derechos fundamentales —de modo que marquemos la diferencia con respecto de aquellos países que se encuentran sujetos al procedimiento del artículo 7 y, por cierto, también bajo el foco de la condicionalidad del Estado de Derecho— y aquellas que plantean problemas concretos o específicos, pero que en ningún caso suponen una violación sistémica, ni un riesgo claro de violación de los principios fundamentales del Estado de Derecho.

Y, en segundo lugar, además, nos permita afrontar el déficit de propuestas concretas de mejora de modo que el informe incluya recomendaciones específicas en cada capítulo por país en las que se señale a aquellos países que tengan problemas concretos de cumplimiento de los principios consagrados en el artículo 2 cuál es el camino para la mejora de sus instituciones, el Estado de Derecho, la democracia y los derechos fundamentales.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin! Rechtsstaatlichkeit, Grundwerte und europäische Werte sind in Europa unter Druck. Deswegen müssen wir die verschiedenen Instrumente, die wir haben, konsequent einsetzen, aufeinander abstimmen, und wir müssen den Rechtsstaatsbericht auch weiterentwickeln. Deswegen bedanke ich mich bei der Berichterstatterin Terry Reintke für diesen sehr, sehr guten Bericht.

Aber ich will an dieser Stelle auch sagen: Wenn wir über die Angriffe auf die Rechtsstaatlichkeit in einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten reden, dann muss ich hier auch über einen großen Angriff der Europäischen Kommission auf alle Bürgerrechte der 440 Millionen europäischen Bürger eingehen: Mit der Chatüberwachung, die die Europäische Kommission vorgeschlagen hat, wäre das digitale Briefgeheimnis tot. Das wäre eine Big-Brother-Agentur, die die private Kommunikation der Bürger überwacht. Diese Stasi 2.0 ist aus meiner Sicht abzulehnen. Das hat mit europäischen Werten nichts zu tun. Das sind chinesische Vorbilder.

Ich appelliere an die Europäische Kommission: Nehmen Sie diesen Vorschlag zurück, sonst brauchen Sie in Zukunft nicht mehr über Bürgerrechte zu reden.

Mikuláš Peksa (Verts/ALE). – Pani przewodnicząca, prawni stan nie jest żadnym luksusem. Musi być taki sam wszędzie, a to jak węgry, tak także w Polsce. Dlatego nie możemy pozwolić, aby w Europie zapanowała korupcja, nierówność sądów i cenzura mediów. A dzisiaj szczególnie więcej niż kiedyś musimy bronić te wartości, ponieważ na nich europejska cywilizacja stoi.

Polacy w tym wielu ukraińskich uchodźców potrzebują mieć dostęp do sprawliwych sądów, obiektywnych informacji i potrzebują ochrony podstawowych praw obywatelskich. To by miało być oczywiste. Ja jestem, jak pani informuje, tak całemu Parlamentowi, który tu sprawę wspiera, chciał podziękować, ponieważ się znowu Europejski parlament okazał jako odważniejszy niż grupa państw członkowskich w tym także tego.

Chciałbym teraz poprosić Europejską komisję, aby jasno nazwała te działania, które są potrzebne, a przede wszystkim zapewnić ich wykonanie. A także rozszerzyła zakres spraw takimi sposobami, aby obejmowała także obszar demokracji i podstawowych praw. Dlatego prawni stan jest zawsze na pierwszym miejscu i bez niego skończymy gdzieś w Rosji – w korupcji i w chaosie.

Jean-Paul Garraud (ID). – Madame la Présidente, ce rapport est une nouvelle attaque contre les pays de l'Union qui veulent rester souverains et maîtres de leur destin. Ainsi, la Pologne et la Hongrie, qui ne seulement ne reçoivent aucune aide de la part de l'Union européenne, alors que ces pays accueillent des millions de réfugiés ukrainiens, mais qui n'obtiennent pas non plus le versement des fonds du plan de relance européen auxquels elles ont droit.

La Commission a en effet réussi à contourner le traité qui exige l'unanimité pour suspendre le versement de ces fonds grâce au mécanisme dit «de conditionnalité», validé par la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne et destiné à sanctionner les États qui ne respecteraient pas l'état de droit, notion floue et discutable qui n'est en réalité que le reflet de l'idéologie fédérale et mondialiste de l'Union européenne. La Cour de justice de l'Union européenne a ainsi opéré, en fait, un véritable coup d'état judiciaire et ceci est à rapprocher des conclusions de la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe, où le président français a invité à aller vers des décisions prises non plus à l'unanimité des États membres, mais à la majorité qualifiée, ce qui permettrait d'imposer aux États récalcitrants la même idéologie que nous combattons.

À la faveur des crises sanitaires et internationales, les mondialistes voient une opportunité nouvelle de faire progresser leurs idées. Ils ne veulent pas comprendre que seule une Europe des nations avec des pays forts qui gardent leur identité et leur souveraineté est de nature à renforcer l'Europe. En voulant diluer les peuples et les nations dans un ensemble informe et sans âme, c'est, à terme, l'effacement de l'Europe qui en résultera. Et cela, nous n'en voulons pas.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Unia Europejska to porozumienie państw suwerennych i niezależnych, które oddały wyraźnie określone w traktatach kompetencje na rzecz wspólnoty. Niestety, z czasem niewybieralni urzędnicy bez jakiegokolwiek mandatu demokratycznego przyznali sobie prawo do samodzielnego decydowania, które kompetencje ma wspólnota, a które należą do państwa członkowskiego. W ten sposób narodził się problem praworządności. Nigdy reformy wewnętrzne ani kształt ustrojowy państwa nie zostały oddane do oceny innym instytucjom. Komisyjne sprawozdanie w sprawie praworządności nie ma umocowania w traktatach. Jest nieobiektywne, jednostronne i służy do ataków na państwa członkowskie, np. poprzez powtarzanie „fake newsów” (choćby o sytuacji na granicy polsko-białoruskiej) czy sprawozdań Rady Europy, w której jeszcze kilka miesięcy temu zasiadała Rosja.

Proszę Państwa, to sprawozdanie daje wiarę rosyjskiej propagandzie i dezinformacji o tym, co się dzieje na granicy. To jest skandal. Z jednej strony Komisja wykorzystuje to sprawozdanie do ataku na Polskę za reformy w sądownictwie i rozbiście kastowego systemu sędziowskiego, a z drugiej w sprawozdaniu nie potrafiono potępić Francji za łamanie embarga i dostarczenie do Rosji broni, albo Holandii za łamanie prawa do zgromadzeń i rozpędzanie demonstracji, czy w końcu Niemiec za rosnący antysemityzm, o czym ostrzegają w swoich sprawozdaniach nawet unijne agencje. Dlatego tak jest? Już kończę. Bo Polska mówi „nie” federalistycznej wizji Europy. Żadne Wasze działania nie zmienią naszej postawy, bo Polacy mają suwerenność narodową w sercu, a wolność we krwi.

Die Präsidentin. – Sie haben Ihre Zeit hoffnungslos überzogen. Ich habe versucht, das Mikrofon abzustellen, das ist nicht gleich gelungen. Aber jetzt muss ich streng sein. Wir haben viele Rednerinnen und Redner, die die Zeit absolut überziehen.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, we need to explore this notion of systemic and serious deficiencies on the rule of law because, for some reason, of things like the reiterated case of the European Court of Human Rights on freedom of expression.

Spain is still persecuting people for insulting the king, and yesterday the Belgian courts refused the extradition of Jose Arenas Valtònyc just on these grounds. Or, perhaps, the Council of Europe asking Spain to stop criminalising legitimate political activity, to drop the extradition proceedings against me and my colleagues Carlos Puigdemont and Antoni Comín i Oliveres and refrain from sanctioning politicians for expressing solidarity.

Spain has done none of these in obedience to the recommendations of the Council of Europe. In fact, last week, the former president of Catalonia was convicted again for the exhibition of a bayonet. So, Mr Reynders, when are you going to pay attention to what's going on in Spain?

This is systemic, this is serious. Next year, you will have additional data, like the Pegasus case, that is affecting scores of Catalan dissidents' lawyers. My lawyer, during the process that led to removing my immunity in this Chamber, was being spied on by Spain as the process was going on. Well, if this is not serious and systemic, what is it?

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, vážení kolegové, tato debata mě vždy baví. Vždy to vypadá, že někam posuneme debatu o právním státě, a jak říká klasik: „Skončí to u foukání bolístek z jedné strany na druhou.“ U právního státu je úplně jedno, kdo je z levice, ze středu nebo z pravice. Vážení kolegové, právní stát je nějaká hodnota, na které jsme se všichni shodli, když jsme vstupovali do Evropské unie, a protože jsme se na ní shodli, tak ji musíme dodržovat.

Přece ten, kdo je zkorumpovaný, kdo krade peníze, si nemůže říkat o to, že bude dostávat stále přidáno. Jestliže zkrátka někdo nedodržuje Smlouvy, musí být potrestán. Tato zpráva je dobrý nástroj, je skvělý. Popisuje všechno od Belgie po Rusko, je tam vše zmíněno. Ale víte, co mi tam chybí? A to je prostě to zásadní. Jakým způsobem to budeme řešit? Pokud je něco špatně, musíme tam říct v jaké lhůtě a jaké konkrétní opatření nebo doporučení přijmeme. A protože jste všichni mluvili dlouho a je tady ještě velká řada řečníků, tak budu končit přesně ve svém vyhrazeném čase a popřeji vám krásný večer a příjemné jednání.

Klára Dobrev (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Elegünk van! Képviselőtársaimnak itt, az Európai Parlamentben, és ami még talán nekem fontosabb, sok millió magyar állampolgárnak elege van. Elegünk van azokból az értelmetlen és éppen a lényegét megkerülő vitákból, hogy a jogállamiság megsértése pontosan hol, mikor és mennyivel károsítja meg az Európai Unió költségvetését. Egyértelműen szeretnék fogalmazni, tessék végre megérteni! Magyarországon a jogállamiság lebontásának a lényege, a végső célja az a lopás. A közpénzek ellopása és magánvagyonok felhalmozása. A független sajtó korlátozása, hogy ne is lehessen megtudni, ne lehessen kideríteni, hogy ki, honnan, miért és mennyit lopott. Az Alkotmánybíróság megszállása azért, hogy a lopást lehetővé tevő törvények életben maradjanak. Az Ügyészség megszállása azért, hogy a vádemelésig se juthassanak el azok az ügyek, amelyek a Fidesz legfelsőbb köreit, vagy éppen a miniszterelnök családját érintik.

A jogállamiság lebontásának Magyarországon célja, lényege, értelme a közpénzek ellopása. Az Európai Unió adófizetői pénzének ellopása, ugye ebben nem akarják segíteni a korrump kormányokat? Szeretnék a Bizottsághoz fordulni. Tessék abbagyni a meddő vitákat! Tessék végre cselekedni! Tessék végre eredményeket elérni! Ezt várja el Önöktől ez a Ház, és ami ennél fontosabb, ezt várja Önöktől sok millió európai és köztük jó pár millió magyar állampolgár.

Pierre Karleskind (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, ce rapport, il dit ce que l'on voit, ce que j'ai pu voir quand j'étais en Pologne avec le Président Séjourné. Nous avons vu ces militants harcelés par la police. Nous étions en Hongrie, à Budapest, avec mes collègues Terry Reintke et Fabienne Keller, où nous avons dit non aux attaques contre les LGBT.

Ce rapport, il dit explicitement que ces pays désobéissent clairement aux règles européennes. Car respecter l'état de droit, cela passe forcément d'abord par le respect des règles européennes. C'est ce qui est écrit dans la résolution et c'est ce que nous allons voter.

Alors, dans mon pays, certains veulent désobéir. Nous avons l'habitude que ce message vienne de l'extrême droite. Mais malheureusement, je constate que certains partis qui viennent de groupes qui, ici, ont toujours été les alliés de l'état de droit et des principes européens veulent sacrifier sur l'autel d'un accord électoral, pour quelques circonscriptions, ce beau principe de l'état de droit et nous faire ainsi entrer, l'année prochaine, dans ce rapport de la honte.

Daniel Freund (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Europäische Union hat sich leider in eine selbstgebaute Sackgasse manövriert. Mit dem Veto von Viktor Orbán gegen das russische Ölembargo haben wir aktuell nur noch die Wahl zwischen zwei schlechten Optionen: Entweder wir geben die Einigkeit der Europäer, die Geschlossenheit auf, machen das Embargo im Zweifel ohne Ungarn, oder wir geben seinen Erpressungen nach. Wie teuer das dann wird, wissen wir nicht genau. Aber wir wissen, wo das Geld am Ende landen wird, nämlich in den Taschen seiner korrupten Clique.

Ich habe es satt, dass wir immer wieder in diesen Situationen landen. Denn es wäre ja vermeidbar gewesen, wenn die Europäische Kommission, wenn die Mitgliedstaaten darauf gehört hätten, was das Europäische Parlament seit Jahren sagt – dann hätten wir schon vor langer Zeit Viktor Orbán die Grenzen aufgezeigt, dann hätten wir seine Angriffe auf Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit mit dem Entzug von Geldern sanktioniert oder ihm das Stimmrecht entzogen.

Damit das nicht in ein paar Monaten wieder passiert, damit wir nicht wieder in derselben Situation landen, haben wir jetzt also eine Reihe von Vorschlägen auf den Tisch gelegt. Terry Reintke hat eine lange Liste gemacht, denn Orbán ändert sein Verhalten ja nicht, weil wir jetzt zum dritten Mal einen Bericht schreiben, sondern das muss doch endlich Konsequenzen haben. Ich hoffe sehr, Herr Kommissar, wir bekommen das hin und sorgen dafür, dass nicht der nächste Autokrat die EU lahmlegt.

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, le Parlement européen semble prendre un malin plaisir à attaquer les États qui osent résister à la doxa de l'Union. Le rapport Reintke prend ainsi prétexte de l'examen sur la situation de l'état de droit dans l'Union pour sombrer dans la surenchère par rapport à la Commission. Il attaque la Pologne et la Hongrie de façon incompréhensible, au moment même où ces deux États accueillent de façon exemplaire des millions de réfugiés ukrainiens. Et dans son paragraphe 16, il ose affirmer que le droit de l'Union prime sur les constitutions nationales au mépris de la volonté librement exprimée dans ces mêmes constitutions par des peuples souverains.

Face à ces prétentions, j'affirme que la France et ses partenaires européens ne sont pas des incapables sous tutelle que la Commission et le Parlement pourraient réprimander sur le fondement de considérations subjectives et partiales. Ce sont les États qui sont le véritable moteur de la coopération européenne, il ne faut jamais l'oublier. Ce sont les États qui sont les dépositaires de la souveraineté des peuples et non l'Union européenne.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, nakon pada Berlinskog zida većina komunističke elitističke strukture ostala je na svojim položajima – i dalje su oni profesori na studijima novinarstva ili suci u vrhovnim i ustavnim sudovima. Komunistička politika ih je prije 1990. godine grubo stavila na te pozicije, a danas ih štiti autonomija sveučilišta, autonomija sudstva i autonomija medija u kojima imaju velik vlasnički udio. I naravno, oni biraju ljude koji će ih naslijediti.

Jedine zemlje koje su u bar donekle uspjele zaustaviti taj začarani krug i narušiti taj trajni utjecaj komunista na društvo su Poljska i Mađarska. Dakle, te zemlje nisu narušile vladavinu prava već su uspostavile pluralnost.

Vaše optužbe su nedosljedne i nisu pravedne. Ne smeta vam primjerice što Macron ugrožava neovisnost sudstva u Francuskoj, a za manje stvari optužujete Poljsku. Ne smeta vam kad gradonačelnik Zagreba zabrani zastave Hoda za život i dozvoli samo LGBT zastave a optužujete Mađarsku i Poljsku za manjak pluralnosti!

Dozvolite Mađarskoj i Poljskoj da žive drugačiji svjetonazor od vašeg i sjetite se da je Europska unija nastala na ideji suradnje u različitosti!

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, recimo par riječi o vladavini prava u Hrvatskoj 2021. Zaključno s 2021. Hrvatska je uz dozvolu Komisije ulupala milijardu kuna u restrukturiranje Brodosplita protivno svim preporukama Državne revizije, što sam prijavio svim institucijama. EU nema komentara na to.

2021. hrvatski ministar zdravstva platio je uređaj za zračenje 11,2 milijuna kuna, a talijanski ministar isti taj uređaj platio je pet milijuna. Prijavljen je. EU nema komentara.

2021. hrvatski ministar zdravstva platio je prijatelju propalu stranicu cjepi se, kakvu dizajneri rade za 6-7000 kuna, milijun i sto tisuća kuna. Prijavljen je. EU nema komentara.

2021. bivši ministar poljoprivrede Tolušić prijavljen zbog dva i pol milijuna kuna koje je iz europskih fondova dobio za svoju vinariju. EU nema komentara.

2021. HDZ je stranka koja je na vlasti u Hrvatskoj i pravomoćno je osuđena za kriminal. Na prste dvije ruke ne mogu nabrojati koliko puta je restrukturirao vladu radi korupcije ministara i protiv koliko je ministara podignuta optužnica radi lopovluka. Da je Europska unija uistinu centar vladavine prava, prva bi se ogradila od te stranke, a ne da ih ovdje nagrađuje člancima i funkcijama u europskim odborima, vijećima i komisijama.

Vladavina prava ovdje je mrtvo slovo na papiru. Korupcija se cijeni, a poštenje je za budale.

Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, είδα συναδέλφους να κατακεραυνώνουν και να δίνουν μαθήματα δημοκρατίας εδώ σήμερα και να μην περιμένουν να ακούσουν απάντηση· μόλις πουν το ποίημα τους, αποχωρούν χωρίς να έχουν αντίλογο. Αυτή είναι η δημοκρατία όπως την αντιλαμβάνονται.

To κράτος δικαίου αποτελεί βάση και ασπίδα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, είτε αρέσει σε κάποιους είτε όχι. Οποιοσδήποτε ενέργειες αμφισβητούν το κράτος δικαίου, αμφισβητούν τη θεσμική βάση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Η ετήσια έκθεση της Επιτροπής για το κράτος δικαίου οφείλει να είναι ένα χρήσιμο εργαλείο που να αναδεικνύει τα δημοκρατικά ελλείμματα. Αναπόσπαστο μέρος του συστήματος του κράτους δικαίου αποτελεί και η διαφύλαξη της ελεύθερης και ανεξάρτητης δημοσιογραφίας και η καταπολέμηση των κακόβουλων SLAPP.

Ελεύθερη δημοσιογραφία σημαίνει δημοκρατία. Χωρίς ελεύθερους δημοσιογράφους, κανένας στην Ευρώπη δεν μπορεί να αισθάνεται ελεύθερος. Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση σημαίνει προστασία των ευάλωτων ομάδων, σημαίνει αλληλεγγύη, σημαίνει σεβασμό, σημαίνει, όμως, και υποχρεώσεις και προσηλώνση σε αρχές και αξίες. Χωρίς αρχές και αξίες δεν μπορούμε να είμαστε οικογένεια με προοπτική και μέλλον. Και αυτό, κύριε Επίτροπε, ισχύει όχι μόνο για τα κράτη μέλη, αλλά και για τα κράτη που θέλουν να γίνουν μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και έχουν επίσης υποχρεώσεις, όπως για παράδειγμα η Τουρκία.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Europosłowie PiS-u: jak to jest, że z jednej strony co tydzień ruszajcie na pielgrzymkę do Brukseli po „ojro”, a z drugiej jest Wam ganz egal, czy obywatele Polski dostaną fundusze europejskie? Jak to jest? Robicie to z głupoty czy z wyrachowania?

Zostaliście wybrani po to, aby dbać o prawa obywateli, aby protestować, gdy ktoś majstruje przy uczciwości procesów sądowych, aby starać się, żeby obywatelom żyło się chociaż trochę lepiej w tych trudnych czasach, aby interweniować, gdy ktoś bezprawnie inwigiluje obywateli. Właśnie po to Was wybrano, a Wy wybraliście prywatę i toksyczny związek z Ziobrą zamiast własnych obywateli.

Ten związek kosztuje Polskę miliony euro każdego dnia. My na opozycji wiemy, z kim mamy do czynienia. I dlatego z posłami Platformy, Polski 2050 i Lewicy złożyliśmy poprawkę do omawianego sprawozdania. Chodzi o to, aby fundusze były dostępne bezpośrednio dla samorządu i podmiotów prywatnych.

W ust. 57 wzywamy Komisję do przedstawienia propozycji prawa, aby w razie użycia mechanizmu praworządności pieniądze unijne dotarły do mieszkańców Polski. W przeciwieństwie do Was ludzie w Polsce tych pieniędzy po prostu potrzebują. Pozwólcie im złapać oddech. Zbigniew Ziobro, a zwłaszcza jego „deformy” muszą w końcu odejść.

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na wystąpienie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki)

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), *wystąpienie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Pośle! Używa Pan bardzo wielu ogólników, jeśli chodzi o funkcjonowanie państwa polskiego. Mam uprzejmą prośbę do Pana – i to jest pierwsze pytanie: proszę powiedzieć, który z ministrów poprzedniego rządu ma akt oskarżenia z uwagi na sytuację korupcyjną? Który z ministrów? I drugie pytanie: czy potrafi Pan wskazać w tej chwili w Polsce jakąkolwiek firmę z polskim kapitałem, jakiegokolwiek przedsiębiorcę, jakiegokolwiek przedsiębiorcę z poza Polski, który wykorzystuje środki unijne w Polsce, który jest posądzony o korupcję, który źle używa środków unijnych? Zadam Panu pytanie, ponieważ OLAF – unijny urząd do spraw zwalczania korupcji – mówi bardzo pozytywnie i pochlebnie o tym, jak Polska wykorzystuje środki unijne. Mam więc dwa pytania: który minister ma akt oskarżenia i która firma albo który przedsiębiorca ukradł w Polsce pieniądze unijne?

Łukasz Kohut (S&D), *odpowiedź na wystąpienie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Ale Panie Pośle, ta debata jest o praworządności, nie o wydawaniu środków unijnych, więc proszę nie odwracać kota ogonem. To w odpowiedzi na pierwsze pytanie.

Jeśli chodzi o drugie pytanie, Panie Pośle, tak jak powiedziałem, ta debata jest o praworządności, o tym, że należy w końcu zlikwidować Izbę Dyscyplinarną i wtedy pieniądze do polskich obywateli po prostu trafią. Taka jest prawda.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (Renew). – Madam President, I'm happy to listen to this lively debate. Indeed, it's an important topic to be discussed, and I would like to congratulate the rapporteur and the colleagues for taking a very strong stand on the rule of law issues.

I do believe that the progress reports, the annual reports on the rule of law, undoubtedly added an important instrument to the European Union's toolbox in reflecting the ongoing developments in the Member States. At least, dear Commissioner, Member States cannot complain this time, saying that you are using your instruments in your toolbox for some of them and not for others. It's a horizontal approach for everyone, so that helps in my own country, Bulgaria, as well.

Lastly, we should continue insisting on our call on the scope of the report to be extended to all elements of the rule of law, including equality before the law, monitoring the protection of fundamental rights, the safeguarding of the rights of minorities, access to justice, and the instruments employed in the fight against discrimination and hate speech. I think it is important if we can develop the scope of the mechanism.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Commissioner, Council, the annual rule of law report is vital to preventing and combating rule of law violations, but only if it is followed by concrete actions. That was the right conclusion of the rapporteur.

The Polish Government has crossed all the lines. Judges and journalists are muzzled. Citizens cannot exercise their rights. But the Commission and Council failed to act and become even more silent. And we lack clarity about the actions against Hungary.

Madam President, the current war in Europe is between autocracy and democracy. These were also your words, Mr Reynders. It's not an equal fight. If we want democracy and rule of law to win, we must be more firm and more persistent. And the rule of law report also aims that we act timely upon backsliding countries. And Greece is one of them.

Commissioner, please act upon the pushbacks, and the criminalisation of journalists and NGOs rescuing migrants and defending their rights. Impunity paves the way for autocracy.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle (ID). – Madame la Présidente, le rapport annuel de la Commission sur l'état de droit est l'occasion régulière pour l'Union européenne de démontrer sa nature profondément idéologique. La Pologne et la Hongrie sont des pays incontestablement démocratiques, que vous le vouliez ou non. Le gouvernement hongrois vient d'ailleurs de voir sa majorité politique confirmée et même amplifiée dans les urnes. Quant à la Pologne, elle est en première ligne pour l'accueil des réfugiés ukrainiens.

Mais pour contourner la démocratie, vous avez tordu le sens de la notion d'état de droit. Il repose pourtant sur une première condition impérative: la souveraineté d'un peuple et d'une nation qui se donne ses lois et les respecte. Mais vous, vous utilisez le mot «état de droit» pour désigner l'Etat idéologue, celui qui suit vos principes politiques, au besoin contre le droit.

C'est parce que la Hongrie et la Pologne, soutenues par leurs peuples, contestent votre idéologie unique, que ces deux grandes nations sont accusées d'être antidémocratiques et menacées d'être mises au pilori par les technocrates européens illégitimes, car non élus. À ces nations européennes historiques qui ont subi pendant un demi-siècle les affres du totalitarisme communiste, vous tentez de réappliquer la doctrine Brejnev dite de la «souveraineté limitée». Mais l'URSS s'est écroulée! Alors je souhaite que votre Europe idéologue et carcérale s'écroule à son tour pour laisser place à la véritable Europe des nations, des coopérations, des projets et des libertés.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, statul de drept împreună cu democrația și drepturile fundamentale stau la baza Uniunii Europene și, în realitatea geopolitică actuală, observăm cum aceste valori sunt cele care ne disting pe noi, europenii, de alte state și ne fac mai puternici împreună, mai ales în asemenea împrejurări pline de provocări.

Ele nu au un caracter opțional. Respectarea statului de drept este obligatorie pentru toate statele membre ale Uniunii Europene. Prin urmare, cu toții trebuie să urmărim aceleași reguli ale jocului, iar cei care se abat de la ele trebuie sancționați serios pentru că proiectul european trebuie să reziste oricărui provocări.

Dacă noi, europenii, nu putem respecta în totalitate statul de drept la noi acasă, cum ne putem aștepta să fim credibili în contexte externe? Tocmai de aceea cred că este esențial să ne gândim ce consecințe pot produce abaterile de la reguli și este esențial să punem presiunea necesară pe cei care calcă în picioare valorile care stau la temelia Uniunii Europene, pentru că acele guverne nu produc decât conflicte, suferință, izolare și reducere la tăcere.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señora presidenta, yo acabo de escuchar al señor Lacapelle, he escuchado al señor Lebreton... Vamos a ver: invocar la soberanía o invocar las mayorías parlamentarias no sirve para poder justificar la comisión de delitos o saltarse el Estado de Derecho o no seguir a los tribunales según la jerarquía que corresponde. Vamos a empezar por ahí: no en la Unión Europea. Sobre fuera de la Unión Europea, yo no voy a decir nada, pero no en la Unión Europea. Por eso estamos hoy aquí, para evaluar el Informe sobre el Estado de Derecho. Que el Estado de Derecho en cada uno de los Estados miembros es cosa de todos los europeos.

El informe que votamos mañana incluye recomendaciones que no pueden ser ignoradas. Y tenemos que trabajar sin sesgos —cierto—, sin prejuicios —cierto—, para abordar cada situación de riesgo en cualquier Estado miembro.

Y tenemos que escuchar a la sociedad civil, sobre todo a las asociaciones profesionales en los temas que tienen que ver con la justicia, porque la clave de la democracia es la separación de poderes, el Estado de Derecho y el cumplimiento de las decisiones judiciales en el órgano que corresponda.

La opinión de la Comisión de Peticiones a este informe puso el foco en las entidades subestatales para recordar que también están obligadas a respetar los valores fundamentales de la UE y que los Estados miembros deben actuar cuando no los respeten. Y cuando los Estados miembros no se los hagan respetar a las entidades subestatales, ahí tiene que estar también la Unión Europea, como ha estado en el caso de los espacios libres de LGTB y como tiene que estar en el caso de Cataluña con respecto a algunas decisiones que un gobierno ultranacionalista tampoco quiere acatar.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, felicito mais uma vez a Comissão Europeia e, em particular, o Comissário Reynders por mais este relatório que vem fazendo o seu caminho. O debate sobre o Estado de Direito na União é de enorme importância, mas é mais relevante hoje.

Cito um caso: a Comissão Europeia prepara-se para aprovar o plano de recuperação e resiliência polaco e submetê-lo ao Conselho. O Parlamento não baixou os braços e não vai deixar de exigir que a Polónia cumpra os princípios do Estado de Direito. O mesmo que exige a todos os Estados-Membros, nomeadamente, o primado da legislação comunitária e a separação de poderes.

Reconhecemos o esforço do povo polaco no acolhimento aos refugiados ucranianos, mas é inaceitável que hoje, na Polónia, a legislação proíba os órgãos jurisdicionais polacos de aplicarem diretamente o Direito da União, não esteja ainda salvaguardada a independência judicial, não haja independência do Serviço Central de Combate à Corrupção.

Este Parlamento foi muito claro: o recurso aos fundos europeus exige o respeito dos valores europeus.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jestem Polakiem. Jestem dumny z tego, że jestem Polakiem, i oczywiście mogę słuchać tych kłamstw, które tu padają pod adresem Polski od osób, od europosłów, którzy nie mają pojęcia o polskim systemie prawnym, nie mają elementarnej wiedzy o tym, co dzieje się w Polsce w świecie prawa. Ale podam Państwu dwa przykłady, ponieważ pan poseł Kohut nie chciał odpowiedzieć na moje pytanie. Jedynym oskarżonym o korupcję ministrem jest były minister Sławomir S. z Platformy Obywatelskiej. To jest partia będąca członkiem PPE. To jest jedyny oskarżony w Polsce były minister.

Jest też drugi bardzo drastyczny przypadek – chodzi o dziennikarzy w Polsce. Otóż w 2014 roku, kiedy Polską rządziła Platforma Obywatelska, Agencja Bezpieczeństwa Wewnętrznego weszła do redakcji tygodnika Wprost, związała ręce dziennikarzem, chciała zabrać im komputery i wyprowadziła ich na siłę z ich własnej redakcji. Dlaczego tych przykładów Państwo nie podajecie, choć nie potraficie podać ani jednego przykładu korupcji w obecnej Polsce, w latach 2016-2021.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, statul de drept l-am dezbătut foarte mult. Eu fac parte și din Comisia pentru libertăți civile și justiție, am votat această condiționalitate pentru fonduri europene; fac parte și din Comisia pentru control bugetar, dar sunt și vicepreședinta Comisiei pentru piața internă și neclaritatea care a rămas în mintea cetățenilor este că de ce trebuie să plătească cetățeanul dacă politicienii greșesc – pentru că nefuncționarea statului de drept de fapt depinde de politicieni și nu de simplul cetățean.

Întrebarea pe care v-o adresez acum ar fi: cum să facem ca această condiționalitate să se aplice pentru că da, trebuie să protejăm fondurile europene, pentru că da, trebuie să eliminăm corupția, dar să nu fie afectați cetățenii din țara în care constatăm, instituțiile europene, că sunt încălcate drepturile omului, că nu funcționează justiția, că nu există separarea puterilor în stat, pentru a nu afecta viața cetățenilor. Pentru că nu cred că ne dorim acest lucru prin sancțiunea pe care de fapt o dăm dacă punem condiționalitatea funcționării statului de drept. Și sincer, nu este încă clar cetățenilor și noi ar trebui să știm să explicăm pentru a crește credibilitatea cetățenilor în instituțiile europene.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Didier Reynders, membre de la Commission. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je voudrais d'abord vous remercier pour ce débat, qui démontre le travail que nous devons réaliser ensemble pour faire respecter les valeurs qui, je le répète, ont été approuvées par les États membres à l'occasion de leur adhésion à l'Union européenne ou de leur participation à l'Union européenne, en approuvant les traités. Il ne s'agit pas de règles imposées que la Commission tente de faire respecter et qui relèvent de son bon vouloir: ce sont des valeurs inscrites dans les traités, je le répète, approuvées par les États membres.

Pour ce qui concerne le rapport en lui-même, je voudrais confirmer ce que j'ai déjà dit à plusieurs reprises: c'est le rapport de la Commission. C'est l'évaluation par la Commission de l'état de droit, de manière tout à fait correcte, dans les 27 États membres – quand je dis correcte, c'est-à-dire sur une base égalitaire: nous travaillons de la même façon, avec la même méthodologie et les mêmes principes à l'égard des 27 États membres. Mais c'est l'appréciation de la Commission, après des débats que nous avons, je l'ai rappelé, avec de très nombreux participants, que ce soient les autorités des États membres, les autorités judiciaires ou politiques, mais aussi la société civile et toute une série de parties prenantes. En bout de course, il s'agit bien du rapport de la Commission, dont nous sommes désireux de débattre avec toute une série d'acteurs pour assurer son suivi – et le suivi, nous le faisons dans le cadre du débat, ici, au Parlement européen; nous le faisons aussi dans les parlements nationaux, comme nous le faisons au Conseil, dans différentes formations du Conseil, mais d'abord au Conseil «affaires générales», et comme on le fait dans les États membres avec la société civile.

Le but est d'assurer un suivi permanent de ces rapports successifs. C'est un vrai cycle annuel, avec, dès lors, la volonté d'installer une culture de l'état de droit. Et je voudrais confirmer que le cycle maintenant, c'est vrai, se termine par une adoption par la Commission en juillet, mais nous souhaitons, dès le mois de septembre, entamer le débat et je voudrais dire que je suis tout à fait ouvert à l'idée d'organiser – ce qui a été évoqué – une semaine des valeurs où l'on traiterait non seulement du rapport sur l'état de droit, mais des autres éléments. Il y a un rapport, vous le savez, sur la charte des droits fondamentaux. Il y a des débats sur la démocratie. On est tout à fait prêt à assumer des discussions avec le Parlement européen sur ces différents éléments. J'insiste d'ailleurs pour que nous ayons ce débat sur tous les États membres. Je crois que c'est important, même si je comprends bien la remarque concernant le caractère systématique – que j'ai déjà évoqué moi-même – dans certains États. On peut assurer une différenciation très nette en la matière entre les différents États membres lorsque nous présentons le rapport concernant les différents chapitres nationaux.

C'est un rapport qui vise avant tout la prévention. Et vous l'aurez constaté – je le répète, je suis prêt à en parler avec vous sur chacun des États membres –, de très nombreuses réformes sont mises en œuvre dans un très grand nombre d'États membres pour répondre aux préoccupations exprimées dans le rapport. Ce sera encore plus le cas grâce aux recommandations qui figureront cette année dans le troisième rapport sur l'état de droit, car nous aurons l'occasion de dire clairement, peut-être plus clairement encore que dans les deux premières éditions, les réformes qui sont attendues et donc en débattre avec les États membres. Mais bien entendu, si le dialogue n'est pas suffisant, il faut aller plus loin. Le rapport alors ne suffit pas et nous devons utiliser les autres instruments.

Je terminerai en disant que nous les utilisons régulièrement. Encore aujourd'hui, dans le cadre du Semestre européen, nous avons adopté des recommandations spécifiques par pays qui concernent aussi l'indépendance du pouvoir judiciaire ou des éléments, par exemple, de lutte contre la corruption. Nous avons d'ailleurs traduit ces recommandations spécifiques par pays dans les plans de relance et de résilience. Et vous savez que trois plans doivent encore être approuvés: le plan des Pays-Bas, puisqu'il a été introduit fort tard, mais aussi les plans hongrois et polonais, qui n'ont pas encore été approuvés, ni par la Commission ni a fortiori par le Conseil, et dans lesquels nous reprenons les mêmes demandes sur les réformes qui doivent être réalisées dans ces pays concernant l'état de droit. Vous connaissez les procédures «article 7» qui sont en cours concernant la Hongrie et la Pologne. Pour la conditionnalité, je l'ai rappelé tout à l'heure, nous avons entamé une procédure formelle de notification à l'égard de la Hongrie. Et, vous le savez, des infractions sont réellement et régulièrement présentées devant la Cour de justice, avec des condamnations qui vont jusqu'à des sanctions financières se traduisant par des retenues sur les paiements à verser à un État membre. Je pense à la Pologne en particulier, qui a été condamnée à 1 million d'euros d'astreinte par jour pour non-application des mesures provisoires décidées par la Cour de justice dans le cadre des mécanismes de mise en œuvre de la discipline des magistrats en Pologne.

Nous allons continuer à utiliser tous ces instruments si le rapport ne suffit pas, mais je suis très heureux que nous ayons l'occasion de poursuivre ensemble ces débats sur le cycle permanent que représente maintenant le dépôt du rapport sur l'état de droit et surtout le suivi à assurer dans les institutions européennes, mais aussi au sein des États membres, avec l'ensemble des parties prenantes et en particulier tous les acteurs de la société civile.

PRESEDA: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podprededa

Terry Reintke, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, I would like to thank a lot all the colleagues who have contributed constructively. I think it was a very good debate. Maybe we had some exceptions, but in general, I'm very happy about all the input and the very engaged debate that we have had. And I think that we can clearly see, and a lot of you have given examples for this, that the situation is challenging and that in certain parts it has actually deteriorated. And that is something that we need to strongly keep an eye on, not only in the rule of law report, but also with all the other instruments that we have.

Because I believe that, despite this backlash, we can still make it happen to defend the rule of law in the European Union. But for that, we actually need a European Commission that does not only do the paper work well, but that also has the political will and determination to stand up for the rule of law when wind is blowing in their faces. I hope that with the commitment that the Commissioner has just given, we can see that happen in the future.

Let me take the last of my time to really thank the constructive work that has been put into writing this report, not only the shadow rapporteurs, not only the MEPs, but also the staff, the people from the Secretariat, the APAs. I think we have really pulled this off in a very future-oriented and constructive way, and you have made this report clearer and broader and better.

I really believe that this approach that we form overwhelming big majorities from the left to the EPP to stand up for the rule of law in this House is something that has proven to be very successful. We have actually shown that this is not a matter of whether you are a liberal, a Christian democrat or a green, or whether you are from Finland, Spain or from Poland, that this is really something about the fundament of our societies and of the European Union. I believe that this is important because at the end of the day, it is in all of our interests to defend the rule of law, democracy and fundamental rights.

Having said that, I hope that we can get a very large and broad majority for this report tomorrow, so I ask you for your support tomorrow.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

Hlasovanie sa uskutoční vo štvrtok (19.05.2022).

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Gunnar Beck (ID), *schriftlich*. – Die Europäische Kommission veröffentlicht jedes Jahr ihren Rechtsstaatlichkeitsbericht, der überprüft, ob die Mitgliedstaaten die in Artikel 2 des EU-Vertrags verankerten Werte wie Menschenwürde, Freiheit, Demokratie, Gleichheit und Rechtsstaatlichkeit bei der Umsetzung des EU-Rechtes zureichend beachten. Natürlich ist diese Moralphygiene einseitig und gilt nur für die Mitgliedstaaten, nicht für die EU selbst. Während wir über die Unabhängigkeit der Justiz in Polen sprechen, möchte ich Sie an Folgendes erinnern: Seit dem Inkrafttreten des Vertrags von Lissabon 2009 haben die Mitgliedstaaten 461 begründete Stellungnahmen abgegeben, um, im Einklang mit dem Protokoll Nr. 2 zu den Verträgen, zu signalisieren, dass ein Legislativvorschlag der Kommission ihrer Einschätzung nach gegen das Subsidiaritätsprinzip verstößt. In allen Fällen entschied der Europäische Gerichtshof zugunsten der Kommission. Kein einziges Mal werden die Bedenken der Mitgliedstaaten vom EuGH beachtet! Klingt das nach einer unabhängigen Justiz? Ich denke eher im Gegenteil. Machen wir uns nichts vor: Wenn die EU von Rechtsstaatlichkeit spricht, spricht sie eigentlich von Linksstaatlichkeit. Tatsächlich glaube ich, dass die Rechtsstaatlichkeit bei den Verfassungsgerichten in Ungarn und Polen besser aufgehoben ist als bei den Eurokraten in Brüssel oder Berlin.

Julie Lechanteux (ID), *par écrit*. – L'évaluation, par le Parlement européen, du rapport annuel 2021 de la Commission sur l'état de droit s'apparente de plus en plus à un exercice de critique de la politique intérieure des gouvernements hongrois et polonais, qui sont opposés à la dérive fédéraliste de l'Union européenne prônée par la Commission.

Mais les groupes de la majorité parlementaire qui soutiennent Ursula von der Leyen, et qui prétendent être plus royalistes que le roi en matière de fédéralisme européen, dans leur persistance européiste arrivent même à critiquer la Commission parce que, à leurs yeux, le rapport ne reconnaîtrait pas de manière explicite le fait que le recul de l'état de droit en Pologne et en Hongrie serait un processus délibéré.

J'estime que cette ingérence des institutions européennes dans la politique intérieure de deux pays souverains est insupportable et antidémocratique, d'autant plus que les gouvernements en question ont été formés à la suite d'élections libres et légitimes. C'est pour cela qu'il faut modifier de l'intérieur cette structure européenne pour la transformer en une coopération de nations souveraines, une alliance des nations où la souveraineté de chaque État serait respectée.

Beata Mazurek (ECR), na piśmie. – Traktaty europejskie wyraźnie określają kompetencje Unii Europejskiej na rzecz wspólnoty. Nie ma w nich zapisów o tym, żeby urzędnicy europejscy mieli prawo do określania, czym jest praworządność w odniesieniu do państw członkowskich. Skoro sprawozdanie Komisji Europejskiej nie ma mocy traktatowej, to czy Państwa zdaniem powinno mieć jakąkolwiek moc sprawczą?

Czy uważacie Państwo, że sprawiedliwa jest nierówność w traktowaniu państw członkowskich pod kątem praworządności? Czy sprawozdanie Komisji Europejskiej uwzględnia dostarczanie przez Francję broni do Rosji pomimo nałożonego embarga? Czy w tym sprawozdaniu znajdziemy informację na temat łamania prawa do zgromadzeń w Holandii? Atakujecie Polskę za reformy w sądownictwie, nie mając ani mandatu, ani kompetencji do działania w tym zakresie.

Kuriozalny jest w tej sytuacji fakt, że według danych Eurostatu, to właśnie Polska jest krajem najszybciej odbudowującym PKB po pandemii COVID-19. Polska, która do dziś nie otrzymała środków finansowych związanych z krajowym planem odbudowy, bo połączyliście je z wybiórczo stosowanym przez Was mechanizmem praworządności. Czy naprawdę nie widzicie absurdu tej sytuacji? Zastanówcie się, dokąd to wszystko prowadzi? Przestańcie atakować demokratycznie wybrany polski rząd i skupcie się na efektywnej pracy na rzecz Unii Europejskiej, póki jest jeszcze czas na ratowanie słowa WSPÓLNOTA.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), schriftelijk. – In de aanloop naar het verslag van de Commissie over de rechtsstaat 2022 wil ik een eenvoudige maar duidelijke boodschap brengen.

De staat van de democratie in de wereld baart zorgen. Waar de waarheid niet aan het licht mag komen, functioneert de democratie niet. Helaas daalt het aandeel van democratieën wereldwijd en stijgt het deel van de wereldbevolking dat in autocratische landen woont. Is het tijdperk aangeboren waarin democratie met uitsterven is bedreigd? In Rusland en China is de democratie ver zoek. In de Verenigde Staten staat de democratie onder druk. In onze eigen Europese Unie is de achteruitgang van de rechtsstaat in sommige lidstaten zorgwekkend.

Het is echter Europa's verantwoordelijkheid om de democratie te verdedigen. Dat zijn we aan onszelf verplicht, aan onze burgers, aan onze geschiedenis. Democratie en transparantie gaan hand in hand. Die boodschap, dat voorbeeld moeten we blijven geven aan de rest van de wereld. Daarom doet dit Europees huis van de democratie een oproep aan de Commissie om een offensievere rol te spelen en de democratie te verdedigen met alle middelen waarover ze beschikt.

Bettina Vollath (S&D), schriftlich. – Es sind die Werte des Art 2 AEV, die unsere Gemeinschaft definieren. Der Abbau von Rechtsstaatlichkeit darf nicht zum Trend werden innerhalb unserer Union. Wir können nicht nach außen vermitteln, dass die Kopenhagener Kriterien nur zur Zeit des Beitritts bestehen müssen; und danach schauen wir weg. Wir sind eine Werteunion und müssen darin auch glaubwürdig sein! Das Recht und die sichere Möglichkeit, sich in der Öffentlichkeit kritisch zu äußern, ist ein Kernelement einer freien und demokratischen Gesellschaft, doch wird dies auch innerhalb der EU mehr und mehr erschwert. Die Anwendung von SLAPP-Klagen, die Kontrolle von Staatsmedien und die Überwachung von Medien, Journalist*innen und Menschenrechtsverteidiger*innen durch die Benutzung von Spähsoftware machen aus dieser Grundfreiheit eine gefährvolle Tätigkeit und eine direkte Bedrohung von Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Menschenrechten. Der Bericht der Kommission ist essentiell aber ausbaufähig. Er muss erweitert werden mit einer Bewertung aller im Vorjahr umgesetzten Maßnahmen zur Rechtsstaatlichkeit samt Analyse ihrer Wirksamkeit und Verbesserungsvorschlägen. Doch der Knackpunkt ist folgender: Nur Berichte zu schreiben reicht nicht. Es müssen endlich auch Konsequenzen folgen! Es braucht länderspezifische Empfehlungen und konkrete Folgemaßnahmen, wenn diese Empfehlungen nicht umgesetzt werden. Präventive Wirksamkeit auf politischer Ebene ist unerlässlich, aber nur von Berichten lässt sich kein Autokrat abschrecken.

21. Skład Parlamentu

Predsedajúci. – Kým prejdeme k ďalšiemu bodu, mám tu oznámenie. Príslušné orgány Slovinska oznámili predsednícke Parlamentu zvolenie pána Mateja Žnemeca za poslanca Európskeho parlamentu, ktorý nahradí pani Tanju Fajon, s účinnosťou od 18.05.2022.

A týmto by si sme radi nášho nového kolegu privítali, samozrejme, s tým, že zaujme svoje miesto v Parlamente, v jeho orgánoch a bude v plnom rozsahu požívať práva stanovené v rokovacom poriadku.

22. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Macedonii Północnej (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je rozprava o správe, ktorú predkladá Ilhan Kyuchyuk v mene Výboru pre zahraničné veci o správe Komisie o Severnom Macedónsku za rok 2021 (2021/2248(INI)) (A9-0133/2022).

Ako prvý vystúpi práve spravodajca Ilhan Kyuchyuk na 4 minúty.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk, rapporteur. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, let me start from a geopolitical point of view. There is no doubt that North Macedonia demonstrated the best democratic transition record across the Western Balkan region, in full alignment with the EU's foreign policy, in the face of Russian aggression against Ukraine.

I would like to use this opportunity to congratulate the government of North Macedonia for being such a committed NATO member by taking swift and brave decisions against Putin's war.

On the reform agenda, North Macedonia has delivered sustained results. The report recognises the continuous effort to strengthen the rule of law, judicial independence and minority rights, counter corruption, and transparency and political dialogue between government and opposition parties.

We've been reiterating to both parties, be it in opposition or the government, that when it comes to the European path of the country, it shouldn't be a big challenge to come together and build national consensus. It contains a comprehensive overview of pending reforms that the country should adopt on issues like electoral reform, media improvement, accountability and public institutions, and engagement with civil society. But I am convinced that the government has good heritage and all the potential to move the country's EU integration path forward.

Having said that, and considering the broader geostrategic context, we are all aware that the postponement of the official start of the accession negotiations is a lose-lose situation – both for North Macedonia and for us, for the EU.

As the standing rapporteur, I will continue to call for the long-overdue accession negotiations to officially start, and I'm glad to, and really grateful to see the effort for a positive and sustainable engagement between the governments of Bulgaria and North Macedonia.

These are historic times and they require firm and timely decisions. It is time for leadership. It is not time to follow one or other political opinion. It's time to lead. More than ever today we have to send a strong European message – not to the political elite of North Macedonia or to our member countries, but to the citizens of North Macedonia, because they deserve it.

Времето не е на ничия страна. Времето ни кара да вземем важни решения, които трябва да предопределят бъдещето на региона и бъдещето на Европейския съюз.

От създалата се ситуация губят всички, губи България, губи Република Северна Македония, губи Европейският съюз. Най-вече обаче губят добросъседските отношения и приятелството, и затова насърчавам двете страни да намерят взаимно приемливо решение. Започването на първата междуправителствена конференция не е отстъпление от една или друга национална позиция, не е отстъпление от начертаните червени линии, а е даване на възможност за европейска перспектива на страната Северна Македония. Трябва да го направим това не за някой друг, а за гражданите и най-вече за следващото поколение. Трябва да потърсим европейско решение, което да гарантира правата и свободите на всеки гражданин, живеещ на територията на Северна Македония. Заедно с това обаче, да запазим и достойнството, и перспективата пред страната.

Какво ще бъде успех, питал съм се много пъти. Няма да бъде успех, ако се провалим за пореден път. Успех ще бъде, ако успеем. Нека да си пожелаем да успеем. Аз искам, вярвам, че и много хора в тази зала го искат искрено.

Didier Reynders, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, I am before you tonight on behalf of my colleague, Commissioner Várhelyi who couldn't attend. First, let me thank the rapporteur, Ilhan Kyuchyuk, for the report on North Macedonia.

The Western Balkans have been a priority of this Commission since the beginning, and today they are more than ever a geostrategic priority for us. It is in our common interest to speed up the enlargement process. The EU Member States took an enormously historic decision in March 2020 when they decided to open accession negotiations with North Macedonia and Albania.

Now we need to deliver on our promise and officially launch this process with both countries as soon as possible, and before the end of the French Presidency. To speed up the accession process, the Commission has also upgraded its own toolset. We revised our enlargement methodology, putting an even stronger focus on fundamentals such as the rule of law and democracy. It is important that the EU use the full potential of its instruments, capacities and power.

North Macedonia has demonstrated its commitment to European Union values and determination to advance on its EU path. The country has condemned Russia's military aggression and expressed its firm support to Ukraine and its people. The country is also fully aligned with all the European Union's declarations, statements and restrictive measures on Russia.

At the same time, the country continues to show its determination to advance on EU reforms. As you have rightly pointed out in your report, North Macedonia has maintained a steady pace of progress in the implementation of reforms, in particular in key areas such as the judiciary, the fight against corruption and organised crime.

More than ever, the work of Parliament is key as a forum for political dialogue. It is important that all parties act constructively in this regard. I would like to thank the European Parliament for strengthening democratic processes in North Macedonia, including through the Jean Monnet dialogue.

During this current situation, the EU and North Macedonia are facing common challenges – increase of energy prices, inflation and concerns about the uncertainty of the future. We remain committed to help North Macedonia in every way we can, including through our financial assistance. The implementation of the instrument of pre-accession assistance and of our economic and investment plan will strengthen connectivity and contribute to greener and more digital economies, which will reduce dependencies. To make our investments a success we need the region to push ahead on building a common regional market.

Let me underline also the importance of good neighbourly relations. Pending bilateral issues between Bulgaria and North Macedonia need to be resolved as a matter of priority. The Commission is involved in helping both sides in this process. It is of utmost importance that efforts continue to find a mutually acceptable solution to pending bilateral issues.

To conclude, it is important that North Macedonia continue to deliver on reforms and that the EU deliver in return. The official launch of accession negotiations through the first Intergovernmental Conference will be the strongest possible signal the EU could send to the country, to the region and beyond. Thank you, of course, for your report. Thank you for your attention. I am looking forward to our discussions.

Christian Sagartz, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! In der Vorbereitung zum heutigen Tag habe ich mir die Reden des letzten Jahres durchgelesen. Wenn man den Bericht liest und ansieht, dann werden wahrscheinlich auch heute die Reden von vielen Kolleginnen und Kollegen und die Analyse zum Bericht ähnlich ausfallen. Das ist eine schlechte Nachricht. Das ist deshalb eine schlechte Nachricht, weil in vielen Bereichen Nordmazedonien tiefgreifende Reformen angestrebt hat und umgesetzt hat. Da rede ich nicht von einfachen Gesetzesbeschlüssen – da geht es um das Ändern der Verfassung bis hin zum Landesnamen.

Trotzdem – ja, trotzdem – wurden noch immer keine Beitrittsverhandlungen gestartet, und das spürt man. Ich war mittlerweile dreimal zu Gast in Skopje, und dort spürt man, wenn man mit den Menschen – und nicht nur mit den offiziellen Vertretern des Landes – spricht, diesen Verlust an Glaubwürdigkeit.

Die Europäische Union und Europa insgesamt verlieren am Westbalkan an Glaubwürdigkeit, wenn wir nicht starke Signale senden. Genau dieser Verlust an Glaubwürdigkeit führt dazu, dass andere dieses Vakuum in der Politik nutzen: Russland, China – es werden andere kommen und Angebote machen, und dann liegt es in unseren Händen – insgesamt natürlich auch als Auswirkung der COVID-Pandemie –, jetzt rasch zu handeln. Das beeindruckende Signal der Geschlossenheit nach Putins Angriff auf die Ukraine, das muss überschwappen – auch in einem geschlossenen Vorgehen am Westbalkan. Wir brauchen diese Staaten. Wir brauchen diese Staaten an unserer Seite, wir brauchen sie innerhalb der Europäischen Union.

Ich möchte auch eines ganz deutlich sagen: Ich verstehe auch die Sorgen und Bedenken meiner bulgarischen Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Auch hier appelliere ich an beide Seiten, an Skopje und Sofia, hier möglichst rasch neue Wege zu finden, Alternativen aufzuzeigen, wie man hier fortkommt und nicht am Stand weiterdreht. Ich weiß, das sind schwerwiegende und schmerzhaft Entscheidungen. Aber ich kann nur eines noch mal betonen: Unsere Glaubwürdigkeit steht auf dem Prüfstand. Machen wir den Westbalkan zu einem guten Beispiel dafür, dass europäische Integration gelingen kann!

Tonino Picula, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, congratulations to the rapporteur, Mr Kyuchyuk, but it's another report on North Macedonia where we, unfortunately, cannot welcome an intergovernmental conference and the start of the accession negotiations with the European Union.

North Macedonia did everything it was requested to do, and yet we still do not know the date the country deserves. They underwent substantial reforms, including to strengthening its democracy and fighting against corruption, and even changing their name. And contrary to some others, North Macedonia has fully aligned with the European Union sanctions against Russia. There must be no excuses for further delay if we want to preserve our credibility.

It is also necessary to keep the pro-European aspiration in North Macedonia and the whole Western Balkans region. Given the changed geopolitical context of the Russian aggression on Ukraine, strengthening the enlargement policy is more important than ever. In June, a positive decision on starting the accession negotiations with North Macedonia and Albania is a must.

Tineke Strik, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the people of North Macedonia are being let down. They are waiting now for over ten years for the accession talks to start, while having fulfilled the conditions. Until now, the citizens supported brave pro-EU leaders. But times are changing due to the EU's failure and in a few years' time, the trust of Macedonian citizens in the EU has decreased to less than 15%. This must be a wake-up call to the EU, and especially Bulgaria, that we must live up to our promises now.

Putin's aggression in Ukraine rings another alarm bell. Russian influence is still rising at our doorstep in the Western Balkans. We can make democracy win from autocracy if we practice what we preach. This moment may be the last opportunity, so I urge the Council: no further delays.

Anna Bonfrisco, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie al relatore per il suo lavoro. La Macedonia del Nord conferma di porsi nella tradizione liberale e democratica dell'Unione europea e della NATO, di cui è membro dal 2020, un membro attivo. Inoltre, si allinea alla linea politica estera e di sicurezza e di difesa europea anche contro l'aggressione ingiustificata e illegale russa, avendo deciso di inviare equipaggiamento militare per sostenere l'esercito ucraino nella lotta in favore della libertà e dello Stato di diritto.

Auspichiamo fortemente la continuazione del dialogo bilaterale con la Bulgaria, così da favorire finalmente il processo di riforme nazionali necessarie per una piena collaborazione nella cornice europea, soprattutto per la questione delle minoranze. È questo il momento storico per dimostrare la comune volontà di convergenza verso un'unica, grande e forte famiglia europea, portatrice di valori di libertà e democrazia.

La Macedonia del Nord rappresenta un investimento geostrategico a favore della pace, della stabilità e della crescita dell'intero continente europeo; l'Europa sia all'altezza di questa missione.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от илето на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, искам в лично качество да поздравя докладчика за огромната работа, която той свърши и се опита да направи. Това досие е изключително трудно за него в личен и в политически план. И аз го разбирам за усилията, които положи, затова го поздравявам.

Уважаеми колеги, вие искате Македония да започне преговори с Европейския съюз. Чудесно. Това може да стане утре, колеги, утре. За целта е необходимо просто довчера да бъде променена Конституцията, да бъде забранен езикът на омразата, да бъде прекратено унижаването на българската история и да бъдат решени всички тези въпроси. Но вие не искате от Скопие да го направи, а притискате България.

Уважаеми колеги, готови ли сте да започнат тези преговори със съмнителен резултат и изход? Защото да не се лъжем, вие го знаете, разбира се, правителството в Скопие е много компромисно и много проруско в своите действия. Готови ли сте да загубите 7-8 милионна България? Защото това, което се случва в момента, натискът, несправедливият натиск върху българското общество и памет отблъсква българите, разочарова ги и ги прави много евроскептични. На практика този натиск върху България работи за Путин и за руската колона в България и в Европейския съюз. Това ли искате да постигнете? Аз съм сигурен, че го знаете. Това, което се случва, ще бъде катастрофа и ще бъде позор, който ще се пише върху Европейската комисия.

Надявам се да слушате, г-н комисар, това са важни неща. Надявам се да не ровите в телефона. Очевидно ровите в телефона, но това е друга тема. Но колеги, това, което ви казвам, е следното: трябва да се окаже любезен политически натиск върху Скопие да изпълни договора. Никой не иска нищо друго. Това е.

Stelios Kouloglou, on behalf of The Left Group. – Mr President, we have in the European continent a barbaric invasion nowadays, because of nationalism and history, and the question with North Macedonia is what happens if we leave it again to nationalism and history to prevent the future, to destroy the future.

North Macedonia and the government have done everything we have asked, but still the case is not going on. We have to fight the nationalism and the history that prevents that, coming this time from Bulgaria. Also, we have to prevent the nationalism and the history that is coming also from the Greek Government, because after the historic agreement of Prespa, there are three memorandums to be implemented between Greece and North Macedonia to finalise the agreement. And you know what's happening, Mr Commissioner? The Greek Government is not implementing the memorandum, and is not bringing the memorandum to the Parliament to be voted. You know why? Because they are afraid of nationalism and history.

So are you going to do something on that as the Commission? Are you going to ask Mr Mitsotakis to bring the memorandum, as the agreement of Prespa stipulates, or do we leave again history and nationalism to prevent the future?

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, despite undiminished popular support for European integration, trust in the EU as the most important partner and ally for North Macedonia has dropped by 30% in the last two years. This tells us a lot about our relationship with this country which, since it embraced the European perspective in 2004, has undergone significant reforms and international efforts – even changing its official name. Now it is time to give concreteness to Macedonia's EU aspirations, or it will be too late.

June may represent the point of no return. Supporting the accession negotiation means strengthening the EU's role and credibility in the whole Western Balkans region. It means strengthening reformers throughout the region and contrasting and weakening those anti-European forces that depict us as unreliable, and the European future of the Western Balkans as an illusion.

The Commission report on North Macedonia stresses once again how the country has met all the conditions to start negotiations. This Parliament strongly agrees. Our High Representative agrees and – as he referred – the Foreign Affairs Council agrees. We owe it to this country. We owe it to the leaders who reach out to neighbours and minorities at home in the true spirit of reconciliation. We owe it to the North Macedonian people.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, след агресията на Путин в Украйна, сега повече от всякога интеграцията в Европейския съюз на всички страни от Западните Балкани трябва да бъде подкрепена. Македония извървява труден път от зависима единица в бивша Югославия до независима европейска държава. България подкрепя Македония в последните 30 години във всяко отношение по нейния път към Европа. Нашето европейско семейство трябва да бъде единно, силно и с възможности да действа пред заплахите и предизвикателствата около нас.

В интерес на Кремъл би било в нашия Европейски съюз да има неразбирателство, омраза и дискриминация. Затова и всички тези теми, които водят до такива негативни процеси, трябва да бъдат изчистени преди започването на преговорите или поне да има гаранция, че ще бъдат решени по време на преговорния процес. Интеграцията е двупосочна улица, която изисква да се полагат усилия и от двете страни. Въпреки това страната кандидат би трябвало да може да преодолее инерцията и зависимостите от бившата югославска идеология, която доведе до разделянето и пося омразата между две държави с обща история като България и Македония.

Договорот с България трябва да се спазва, особено в частта си за историческото помирение въз основа на общата история. Работата на академичната комисия е в основа на оригинални документи, както и недискриминацията на открито заявяващите своята българска идентичност и произход граждани. Трябва да се предприемат и мерки за преодоляване на говора на омразата, като например промяна в учебните планове и паметниците. Гаранции за постигане на напредък може да бъде преговорната рамка, където да се отчита направеното по тези теми, без да се притесняваме дали ще дойде друго управление в Македония, опозицията сега, която е или не е такава. Призовавам политическата класа на Македония да прояви смелост, смелост и лидерство за започване на преговорите.

(Ораторът приема да отговори на изказване „синя карта“)

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR), изказване „синя карта“. – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, скъпи колега. Копенхагенските критерии са основата на така наречените „европейски ценности“. Сред тях най-важният, за мен поне, е това една държава, която е кандидат за член, да спазва и да защитава всички човешки права на всички свои граждани на своята територия. Вие, както и колегите в Парламента, както и Комисията, многократно сте получавали информация за това, че хора, които усещат себе си като българи, а са македонски граждани, са репресирани от своето правителство в Скопие.

Не мислите ли, че това е ключовият въпрос, който трябва да бъде решен? И това не са двустранни отношения. Това е въпрос на човешки права, това са европейски ценности. Не мислите ли, че той трябва да бъде решен?

Андрей Ковачев (PPE), отговор на изказване „синя карта“. – Уважаеми г-н Джамбазки, това е точно така. Споделявам това, което казвате. Ние не говорим за академичен спор между две държави. Говорим за основни човешки права, дискриминация, говор на омразата, да е опасно да кажеш своето самоопределяне.

Както ние зачитаме самоопределянето на всеки жив човек, който се самоопределя като етнически македонец, така и трябва да бъде зачетено самоопределянето на всеки, който иска да се самоопредели като българин. Да няма от това негативни последици в неговата служба, да няма кариерно развитие, да не могат неговите деца да бъдат заплашвани в училище или да получават обиди от заобикалящата негативна среда, напоена, за съжаление, с омраза и с инерцията от югославското минало.

Andreas Schieder (S&D). – Mr President, North Macedonia has undertaken huge, very huge reforms. And North Macedonia, to say precisely, the people of North Macedonia deserve that we start with the EU negotiations.

The Bulgarian veto does not solve any of the existing problems and none of the issues which were raised today. The veto affects not only North Macedonia negatively, it also affects the European Union negatively, and most negatively affected is Sofia and Bulgaria itself. So I don't know why we are not taking up the chances which are lying on the table for North Macedonia, for Bulgaria and the whole European Union.

So therefore, dear colleagues, it's not any time to waste on huge discussions. It is time to start the negotiations, where you can put every issue you want on the table – that is the best: a 'green light' for the negotiations, for North Macedonia.

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αρχικά εμείς διαφωνούμε απόλυτα με τη χρήση του ονόματος της Μακεδονίας μας από τα Σκόπια. Για εμάς η συζήτηση για τη συγκεκριμένη έκδοση τελειώνει εδώ. Το ότι οι Σκοπιανοί αυτοαποκαλούνται Μακεδόνες αποτελεί τον ορισμό της ιστορικής διαστρέβλωσης, μιας διαστρέβλωσης που προσβάλλει καθημερινά όλους τους Έλληνες πολίτες και ιδιαίτερα τους Έλληνες της Μακεδονίας μας.

Βάσει της κατάπτωσης, λοιπόν, συμφωνίας που υπέγραψε η προηγούμενη ελληνική κυβέρνηση, την οποία δυστυχώς τηρεί πιστά και η τωρινή ελληνική κυβέρνηση, χάνουμε διεθνώς το δικαίωμα στο όνομά μας, που είναι και η ψυχή μας. Για εμάς, όπως έχει τονίσει και ο πρόεδρος μας, ο κ. Κυριάκος Βελόπουλος, οι Σκοπιανοί απαγορεύεται να χρησιμοποιούν καθ' οποιονδήποτε τρόπο το ιερό όνομα της Μακεδονίας μας. Και επειδή η παρούσα έκθεση ζητάει ουσιαστικά την ένταξη των Σκοπίων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, εμείς λέμε ότι τα Σκόπια δεν πρόκειται να μπουν στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση αν δεν μετονομαστούν σε Σκόπια ή σε Βαρντάρσκα ή σε οτιδήποτε άλλο δεν προσβάλλει την ιστορία μας. Έχοντας, λοιπόν, απόλυτη επίγνωση της ιστορικής μας ευθύνης, καταψηφίζουμε τη συγκεκριμένη έκθεση και καλώ και προσκαλώ και παρακαλώ και τους υπόλοιπους Έλληνες ευρωβουλευτές να κάνουν το ίδιο.

Kinga Gál (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Haladéktalanul meg kell tenni a megfelelő lépéseket, hogy megmaradjon az EU hitelessége a bővítési folyamat tekintetében. A nyugat-balkáni bővítés Európa közös biztonsági, gazdasági és geopolitikai érdeke, hiszen a régiót minden oldalról az EU veszi körül. Észak-Macedónia a nyugat-balkáni migrációs útvonalon fekszik, ezért rendkívül fontos szerepe van az illegális bevándorlás megállításában is. Ezen kívül Észak-Macedónia közel 20 éve kitart az európai integráció célkitűzése mellett, és bizonyította elköteleződését a százszázalékos kül- és biztonságpolitikai igazodásában.

Az orosz agresszió és az azt követő biztonsági kihívások miatt kiemelten fontos a nyugat-balkáni régió, és ezzel együtt Észak-Macedónia mielőbbi beemelése az EU közösségébe. Mindnyájunk biztonsági érdeke is ez. Ne állítsuk további kihívások elé a térség európai integráció iránt elkötelezett országait! Tegyük meg mindent a mielőbbi bővítésért!

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Mr President, today we heard Maia Sandu, who asked for membership of Moldova to the European Union. I fully support that. I support the candidacy and the opening of Moldova, of Ukraine, of Eastern Partnership countries. This is a peace and stability issue.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk, I congratulate you on your report. You know what 'minority' means, being of a minority in Bulgaria. But some people here don't know the history of the former Yugoslavia. Identities matter. Identities in the Western Balkans matter more than all, so we should resolve this dispute.

North Macedonia is close to my heart, the same as Bosnia and Herzegovina. Shared power, the Ohrid peace agreement, the Prespa agreement – all these agreements should be respected. Otherwise this fine balance after Milosevic's attack on all these people will never be resolved.

So for all these people in the Eastern part who never went through what happened with Yugoslavia, how it dissolved, I would ask you to just learn a bit about history. What Milosevic started we should really resolve. There are lessons to learn, exercise and try to respect, and not to allow any 'Milosevic' to appear again and the majority to rule over minorities. So respect the agreements, respect minorities, respect shared power, respect the Dayton Peace Agreement.

Dorien Rookmaker (ECR). – Mr President, why are we still having this discussion? The Council decided to start negotiations in 2020. Why are they not getting things done, like they promised the people of the West Balkan countries?

The EU is founded on the promise of peace. Offering all of the Western Balkan countries, especially Macedonia, membership of the EU contributes to peace in Europe. We don't want to give Russia any chance to destabilise the political situation in these countries. But our actions, or rather the lack of action, point in the opposite direction.

Political stability in the Western Balkans is important for humanitarian, economic and political reasons. It makes sense to act accordingly. To make it complete, let's make serious work of visa liberalisation for the people of Kosovo. They are in need of that as well. The Council has to act now!

(Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Г-н Председател, докладът за Северна Македония е вътрешно противоречив. В него липсва най-важното, а то е, че Северна Македония демонстративно не изпълнява договора с България.

България настоява Скопие да започне да изпълнява този договор. А най-важното в него е да се уважава историята и културата на българския народ, да се уважават и зачитат правата на българите. Самият македонизъм е антибългаризъм и национализъм в постоянно действие. Той е война срещу българската история, култура и ярки исторически личности. Родното място на македонизма е Москва, родилният му дом е комунистическият интернационал. Северна Македония не осъществи декомунизация.

Какво ни казват днешните македонски политици? Ще се опитам да го обясня на германските колеги. Те ни казват следното: „Ние сме баварци, затова не сме германци“. Аз не съм съгласен. Мисля, че баварците са германци и мисля, че обща история се прави от общ народ.

(Председателят отнема думата на оратора.)

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, toți știm că Balcanii de Vest fac parte geografic din Europa. Toți știm ceea ce s-a și repetat aici: Consiliul deja a aprobat din 2020 aderarea Macedoniei de Nord la Uniunea Europeană. Și mai știm, sau ar trebui să știm, leadershipul Uniunii Europene, că trebuie să luăm decizii politice în context și contextul acum îl știm cu toții: războiul din Ucraina. Rusia se bucură dacă noi prelungim întârzierea Uniunii Europene cu statele din Balcanii de Vest. De aceea cred că trebuie să urgentăm.

Păcat că nu este aici Consiliul și n-a fost nici la Strasbourg. Consiliul nu ne oferă prezența, să poată să ne asculte aici. Așadar susțin aderarea Macedoniei de Nord și să nu îi dezamăgim, pentru că dacă se va face un sondaj, vom vedea cum scade credibilitatea Uniunii Europene și încrederea, exact pe întârzierea unor decizii.

Și da puteți să probați, domnule comisar, să faceți un sondaj în Macedonia. Dacă cetățenii doresc, noi trebuie să ne întărim Uniunea Europeană cu Balcanii de Vest și cu statele din Parteneriatul Estic. Așadar susțin aderarea Macedoniei, cât mai rapidă, la Uniunea Europeană.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, cred că dezbateră este foarte potrivită în acest context, însă întotdeauna vor exista pretexte pentru a fi mai indulgenți față de anumite state. Tocmai de aceea cred că niciodată nu trebuie să punem semnul egal între administrație și popor. Evident că cetățenii Macedoniei de Nord sunt europeni, își doresc să fie membri ai Uniunii Europene, însă nu ar trebuie să facem abateri de la reguli.

Și îmi doresc foarte mult ca toate disputele care există din rațiuni culturale, lingvistice și istorice să fie gestionate cu foarte multă prudență, cu foarte multă eficiență, astfel încât lucrurile care ne-au separat în trecut să rămână acolo, în istorie, iar viitorul să îl clădim pe noi coordonate care ne-au făcut puternici, pentru că asta înseamnă Uniune Europeană: pace, protecție, inovare și, evident, un viitor mult mai sigur pentru cetățenii noștri. Deci, Macedonia de Nord trebuie să facă parte strategic din Uniunea Europeană.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, mes neturime politiškai ginčytis dėl ilgos istorijos, kurioje persipynę tautų likimai. Mes galime ja didžiūotis. O šiandien turėtume kalbėti apie tai, kad, matydami Rusijos agresiją rytuose, nepaliktume nestabilaus ir nesutariančio pietų flango. Mes turime pakviesti Vakarų Balkanų šalis į stojimo procesą. Aš manau, kad Šiaurės Makedonija yra padariusi didžiulę pažangą per savo pasirengimą kaip šalies kandidatės. Ir mums atverti stojimo procesą svarbu ne tiek dėl Makedonijos, kiek dėl mūsų pačių saugumo, stabilumo ir erdvės nepalikimo Rusijos įtakai šiame regione. Todėl aš labai palaikau kolegų siūlymus, kad dar šių metų birželį būtų atidarytas šitas procesas tiek Šiaurės Makedonijai, tiek ir Albanijai.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Mr President, I want to extend my compliments also to the rapporteur for a good report. I fully agree with what has been said by colleagues Schieder and Olekas. Bulgaria at this critical moment in history has a unique chance to give a strong message to Russia, to Europe and to Skopje. But the time has also come to hold the other 26 Member States accountable for further delay from today onwards, because expressing, like Monday at the Foreign Affairs Council, full commitment and unwavering support is not going to do the trick anymore. The other 26 - Member States have to work together accordingly, to help Bulgaria to overcome this hurdle. Bulgaria has a unique chance to do a historic decision in this lifetime.

(Koniec vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Didier Reynders, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I want to thank you all for this debate and again for your report, because be sure that the Commission counts on the support of this House to remain engaged. More than ever, the European Union needs to deliver on its commitments.

North Macedonia belongs in the European Union, and the official launch of accession negotiations provides the best guarantees to ensure that the rule of law, fundamental rights and European values are implemented in practice in the interests of all citizens. So thanks again for this debate and for your report, and for your support.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk, rapporteur. – Mr President, dear colleagues, thank you all for your strong commitment to the European path of North Macedonia, and thank you for your certainly positive contribution.

I couldn't agree more with the Commissioner that the accession process provides the best way to secure the rule of law, high democratic standards. Certainly – answering to Madame Zovko – the rights of minorities should be at the forefront of this accession process. I am trying to send a clear message in my report as well.

To Mr Yordanov, I would like to assure him that I start with the Friendship Treaty and the Prespa agreement, and I finish my report again with the Friendship Treaty and the Prespa agreement, because they are the backbones of our report – not only our report, but they are the backbones of the strategic relationship between North Macedonia and Bulgaria, and between Greece and North Macedonia. They bring historical reconciliation.

I concur with our colleagues saying that our credibility as the European Union is at stake. Yes, it is at stake because we didn't deliver on our promises. We shouldn't keep giving promises and making again and again the same mistakes.

So to finish on a positive note, thank you colleagues and shadow rapporteurs for your contributions. Certainly, your efforts improved my report, and I'm looking very much forward to have a strong, positive pro-European report by your vote tomorrow – and that is mainly for the citizens of North Macedonia.

The times are critical, and it's certainly not a time to play nationalistic games, but it's time to take courageous pro-European steps. I'm happy that we have the similar approach, not only on my report, but also on the entire Western Balkans, together in this House.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

Hlasovanie sa uskutoční vo štvrtok (19.05.2022).

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Dominique Bilde (ID), *par écrit.* – Il n'est pas souhaitable que la Macédoine du Nord, embourbée dans un litige sans fin avec la Bulgarie, intègre l'Union européenne. L'ouverture des négociations n'est donc pas opportune.

Tout d'abord, je rappelle le niveau très bas des salaires, flirtant avec les minima européens. Il en résulte un risque de concurrence déloyale, pour les Français notamment — risque déjà avéré, puisque du fait de l'Accord de stabilisation et d'association signé avec la Macédoine du Nord, les quotas et droits de douane ont été, pour l'essentiel, levés. Dans ma région du Grand Est, certains entrepreneurs qui tentent courageusement de renouer avec l'illustre tradition textile lorraine se trouveraient balayés par un dumping impitoyable.

Deuxièmement, la Macédoine du Nord est travaillée par d'importantes dissensions religieuses et ethniques, impliquant, en particulier, sa minorité albanaise. S'y ajoute le risque sécuritaire incarné par le retour des djihadistes et l'islam radical, alors même que ce pays (comme tous ceux des Balkans, à l'exception du Kosovo) bénéficie de l'exemption de visa de courte durée de l'Union européenne. Je rappelle d'ailleurs que le terroriste de l'attentat de Vienne de 2020 était un citoyen nord-macédonien.

23. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Albanii (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom rokovania je správa, ktorú predklá Isabel Santos, v mene Výboru pre zahraničné veci, o správe Komisie o Albánsku za rok 2021 [2021/2244(INI)] (A9-0131/2022)

A ako prvá vystúpi v rozprave práve spravodajkyňa pani Isabel Santos na 4 minúty.

Isabel Santos, *Relatora.* – Senhor Presidente, Caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário, a Comissão Europeia tem vindo a afirmar reiteradamente, desde o final de 2019, que a Albânia cumpriu todos os requisitos necessários para avançar para a nova fase de negociação no seu processo de adesão à União Europeia.

No relatório da Comissão, referente aos anos de 2019 e 2020, é clara a recomendação para que se marque a Primeira Conferência Intergovernamental, uma recomendação também partilhada por este Parlamento no relatório subsequente, aprovado em 2021. Reconhecemos, nessa altura, que, apesar da necessidade de continuar a implementar reformas, os critérios para a marcação da primeira conferência já tinham sido atingidos. Apesar disso, chegámos quase a meio do ano de 2022 e a Albânia continua à espera.

Desde então, o país não tem estado parado. Continuou a progredir no seu caminho para a integração europeia, mas o bloqueio do lado da União tem criado um sentimento de frustração na população e nas autoridades, que ameaça afetar o país e o próprio aprofundamento do projeto europeu. É tempo de pôr termo a este impasse.

A Primeira Conferência Intergovernamental tem que ser marcada até final da Presidência francesa do Conselho e lamento que a Presidência não esteja aqui representada neste debate. Era muito importante que isso acontecesse.

Neste relatório, que votaremos amanhã, destaco a importância de avançar no processo de adesão, de forma a não defraudar as expectativas criadas e incentivar a continuação da implementação das reformas no país. Este texto, enriquecido pela contribuição dos meus colegas relatores-sombra, a quem agradeço a excelente colaboração, foi aprovado na Comissão AFET com mais de 90 % de votos a favor, o que fortalece as recomendações nele contidas.

Dessas recomendações, quero destacar a atenção dada às relações entre os diferentes atores da sociedade albanesa, desde logo no que diz respeito ao diálogo entre os diferentes partidos e intervenientes políticos do país, que tem conhecido desde as últimas eleições progressos consideráveis, mas que ainda pode e deve melhorar.

O papel dos média e da sociedade civil deve ser reforçado e toda e qualquer iniciativa legislativa relativa aos média deve respeitar as orientações da Comissão de Veneza.

Quero relembrar ainda a necessidade realçada no relatório de colmatar, antes das próximas eleições gerais, as lacunas que subsistem em matéria de processo eleitoral, atuando em conformidade com as recomendações da OSCE/ODIH.

O relatório destaca a importância dos desenvolvimentos já realizados e o que ainda é necessário fazer nos setores da energia e da proteção ambiental, entre outros, bem como os esforços que têm sido feitos na luta contra o tráfico de seres humanos, armas e bens e a boa cooperação nestas áreas com as agências europeias. Recordo que a Albânia é o único país da região que assinou acordos de cooperação com todas as Agências da União Europeia no domínio da justiça e dos assuntos internos.

Realço ainda, tal como o relatório, o trabalho da Estrutura Especial para o Combate à Corrupção e à Criminalidade Organizada, bem como os progressos alcançados no que se refere à execução de uma reforma global no sistema de justiça, com implementação e continuação de um processo de verificação sem precedentes e o restabelecimento do funcionamento do Tribunal Constitucional e do Tribunal Superior.

Para terminar, quero sublinhar aqui o facto de a Albânia demonstrar, ao longo do tempo, ser um parceiro fiável em matéria de política externa. Tal verificou-se recentemente, mais uma vez, no apoio à Ucrânia, ao sancionar a Rússia e ao acompanhar as posições dos Estados-Membros da União Europeia na Assembleia-Geral das Nações Unidas, bem como na sua condição de membro do Conselho de Segurança.

A Albânia e a Macedónia do Norte ainda terão que atravessar um longo processo de reformas, é verdade, mas é um facto inabalável que já foram cumpridas todas as condições impostas para a marcação da Primeira Conferência Intergovernamental.

O processo de adesão da Albânia não pode ficar refém de discussões paralelas. É tempo de avançar.

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to thank the rapporteur and Ms Santos and this House for putting forward a balanced text on our progress report 2021 on Albania.

Let me start by stressing once again that Albania and the Western Balkans remain a geostrategic priority for the European Union. At this very sensitive time for European security, it is crucial to send the strongest possible signal to our closest neighbours and to repeat our commitment to their EU accession.

Now more than ever, we need to move forward by officially opening accession negotiations with the holding of the first intergovernmental conference. Further delay could have a negative impact on the EU's credibility as a reliable partner, as well as on the stability of the entire region.

We welcome Albania's alignment with the EU's restrictive measures and sanctions against Russia. As was said by the rapporteur, showing its alignment to the EU's CFSP, Albania has used its ongoing term in the UN Security Council to respond to the crisis among like-minded countries. This confirms its full commitment to advance on the EU path.

Therefore, we keep up our engagement with Albania in every way we can, including through our financial assistance. To this end, the economic and investment plan has entered full implementation, and we stand ready to assess what can be accelerated within the IPA assistance. Albania's determination in the pursuit of its EU reform agenda and continuous fulfilment of all Council conditions is all the more remarkable.

The vetting process of the re-evaluation of judges and prosecutors has advanced steadily and continues to deliver tangible results. The extension of the constitutional mandate of vetting has been recently voted. This represents a vote not only for justice reform, but also for Albania's future in the European Union. The institutions for the self-governance of the judiciary have continued to be fully functional and operate effectively.

So the country has delivered tangible and sustainable reform, with the adoption of a number of significant legislations in the areas of the population census and the efficiency of the judiciary.

Nonetheless, we do expect further progress, notably on media freedom, the adoption of the remaining by-laws on minority rights, the judicial map, and the establishment of a new integrated cases management system complying with EU standards.

The Commission will continue to monitor this thoroughly, and the same goes for the track record of the effort to counter corruption and organised crime.

I thank you again for the report first but also for your support, and I'm sure that it will be very important to have a debate today to see how far it is possible to go with your support.

Андрей Ковачев, от името на групата PPE. – Г-н председател, уважаеми колеги, Албания трябва да започне колкото се може по-бързо преговори за членство.

Европейската комисия потвърди многократно, че Албания е покрила изискванията за започване на тези преговори. Поздравявам Тирана за участието ѝ и за пълната ѝ подкрепа за всички политики на Европейския съюз, свързани с войната в Украйна. Реформите обаче трябва да са задълбочени, необратими и да обхващат фундаментални области, като се започне от върховенството на закона и функционирането на демократичните институции. Борбата с корупцията и гарантирането на независимостта на медиите, които да не се притесняват от самоцензура, са важни елементи за демократичната трансформация на албанското общество.

Приветствам законодателните промени, предприети от Тирана, които засилват ефективността на съдебната система, и смятам, че е много важно те да бъдат изпълнявани. Средствата от ИПЗ трябва да бъдат използвани за подкрепа на процеса на реформи, икономическо развитие и повишаване на конкурентоспособността. Бих искал да подчертая решавания принос на Албания за защитата на външните граници на Съюза и за предотвратяването на трансграничната престъпност, както и злоупотребата със свободното придвижване в Европейския съюз. Албания трябва да засили усилията си, за да намали риска от бедност и социално изключване чрез подобряване на достъпа до социални, образователни и здравни услуги за всички части от обществото.

И накрая, Сърбия и Черна гора започнаха поотделно своите преговори. Няма логика, която да обяснява защо трябва да се групират държави. Освен това, един от основните принципи е достиженията на всяка страна да бъдат оценявани отделно. Още веднъж призовавам за незабавно започване на преговори с Албания.

Andreas Schieder, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, thank you Commissioner to be with us for this debate and also for your words and for the content. Sometimes I think maybe we need also you to take over this issue to move quicker forward. But anyway, I want to thank also the rapporteur, Isabel Santos, for this report and everybody who also contributed to this, because I think it's an excellent report which outlined what was done, which is tremendous, and also what needs to be done further. I think it is important in the outline to say also Albania undertook a very important reform and also deserves that we start with the negotiation now.

When we say we wanted negotiations to start, it's not for the Albanian political establishment, it's not for Edi Rama that we need to start – it is for the Albanian people. It is for the Albanian young generation, which also want to see their future in the European Union. They want to see us also to start for them and to open the door to come to this European future. There is a long path, but we have to start to go it.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, dear Isabel, congratulations for your constructive approach, but also congratulations you for your knowledge and dedication, which is very well reflected in the Albania Progress Report. We certainly should recognise Albania's role for regional stability, and its full alignment with the relevant foreign and defence commitments towards NATO and the European Union.

I must say that during the last year in domestic politics, Albania has made progress when it comes to EU integration. That was possible only because of the good relationship between the opposition and the government. I would say that the important and constructive political dialogue and the willingness to compromise on key issues between the government and opposition is vital to advance the EU accession process.

The report also clearly highlights the positive step that the government has taken under the administrative preparations for the upcoming accession negotiations. Of course, we are all aware that Albania has fulfilled the conditions and delivered sustained results across the fundamentals, and is completely ready to convince the first intergovernmental conference. This is something that I fully support. But unfortunately, Albania continues to suffer from the dispute between Bulgaria and North Macedonia.

Certainly, I am the one advocating that the country should have a certain role to play in the European Parliament, in the European Union, and the European Parliament should be vocal in supporting the EU-Atlantic role of both countries.

Thomas Waitz, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, colleagues, first of all, I want to thank our rapporteur, Isabel Santos, and our shadow rapporteurs for holding a very inclusive process when it came to the compromise sessions that we had so that actually we compromised on all points. There is just one minor point on the Vlora airport construction and the reduction of an environmentally protected area, but these concerns we can raise.

On another point, more or less the report reflects very much also the important points that we brought in, important points praising, on the one hand, the substantial reforms Albania has delivered. Albania has done all their homework. Yes, there is a lot of work to do still on media reform, on fighting against criminal activities in the country, on media freedom, clearly. But also on the question of plurality in the country, political plurality. Because what we see now is two parties which are not really reflecting two different political standpoints, but two different regions of the country fighting each other on a very rude way. So, plurality also in terms of party politics is something we have to see.

Then we have the situation that Albania is coupled in their accession talks with North Macedonia. There are some good reasons to do that. But we have to be aware – and this is to the colleagues from the Bulgarian side – that advocating to keep up this veto in terms of having negotiations is blackmailing and not negotiations. Accession negotiations are negotiations, but you first need to accept your partner to negotiate with and you're not just blackmailing your neighbouring country, but you're blackmailing the security interests and the economic interests of the European Union and the whole region. This should be acknowledged. I think we should push all our governments to put pressure on Bulgaria to finally lift this deadlock so we can start accession talks as early as possible.

Anna Bonfrisco, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io sono d'accordo con la Presidente Roberta Metsola sul fatto che l'Unione europea debba pensare a modi per accelerare il processo di allargamento nei Balcani occidentali, perché la stabilità nell'immediato vicinato significa la stabilità nell'Unione. E di fronte a questo nuovo contesto geopolitico dobbiamo chiaramente trovare un modo per pensare alla nostra Europa e alla sua unità, senza indebolirla da dentro.

Come parlamentare europea italiana ribadisco il forte sostegno al cammino europeo dell'Albania, che è già tracciato e non può essere rallentato, e insieme a questo Parlamento riconosco lo sforzo di riforma e di convergenza dell'Albania per diventare una democrazia compiuta, pluralista e giusta, capace di rafforzare il proprio ruolo regionale, internazionale, all'interno della NATO e nell'allineamento alla politica estera e di sicurezza e di difesa europea, che nella reazione contro l'aggressione russa abbiamo potuto constatare.

Lo Stato di diritto, uno dei valori fondamentali dell'Unione e *conditio sine qua non* per la tutela di tutti gli altri valori fondamentali dell'Unione, deve realizzarsi nella sua pienezza in Albania, così da voltar pagina per sempre col passato. Il popolo albanese vuole l'Europa nel suo futuro, l'Europa faccia la sua parte.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovane dame i gospodo, Albanija se trudi ispuniti službene zahtjeve i u tome ima moju punu podršku.

Međutim, želim napomenuti jednu stvar koja je izrazito važna za sve zemlje kandidatkinje, a to je pojava da uz postojeće zahtjeve koje one moraju ispuniti neki europski lobiji svoje svjetonazorske ciljeve prezentiraju kao službene zahtjeve, a to je neprihvatljivo. Dat ću i jasan primjer. Legalizacija istospolnih brakova nije i ne može biti uvjet za ulazak u Europsku uniju.

Nedopustivo je da ti lobiji zloupotrebljavaju težak položaj zemalja kandidatkinja, da stvaraju mučne pritiske i na taj način usporavaju one reforme koje su stvarno potrebne. Pojedine države mogu imati na vas Albance pojedine zahtjeve. Primjerice, Hrvatska može od vas tražiti da riješite velik problem onečišćenja Jadranskog mora plastikom. No, nijedna zemlja ne smije tražiti od vas nešto što nije u ingerenciji Europske unije.

Zato vas pozivam da se odmah javite nama, zastupnicima u Europskom parlamentu, ako neki europski lobiji na vas stvaraju takav ilegalan pritisak jer mi želimo realan i pošten put Albanije prema članstvu u Europskoj uniji.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Mr President, the status in which we have relegated Albania is something we cannot afford anymore as the geopolitics of our neighbourhood is showing us once again, if there was still any doubt, how the enlargement perspective of the Western Balkans is more important than ever.

I fully agree with High Representative Borrell when he says that this situation is not only harming the candidate countries but is also harming us, presenting tremendous costs in terms of credibility and political perspective. It gives to Russia and other players who want us weak and divided.

Dear colleagues, Albania has made its homework. Albania has achieved concrete reforms and real progress, and is demonstrating its willingness to advance in its accession process. Now it's our turn to deliver. There's still a chance in the June Council to remedy this historical error.

My plea to our Bulgarian friends is to lift their veto so that the Council can do finally the right thing. We have huge challenges coming in the near future. We are all aware of that, and I strongly believe that we can better face them if we overcome our divisions.

Dear colleagues, the time is now. We can't wait anymore because the rest of the world won't wait for us. Albania is Europe. Europe must be together with Albania.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to congratulate the rapporteur, Ms Santos, for an excellent report, and also the shadow rapporteurs, to have this really good and comprehensive report on Albania.

We are going as the Foreign Affairs Committee next week, and I will have the pleasure that we convey the messages that we are having today here. But the one message that we should convey to the Western Balkans, to Albania and to all the other countries – North Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro – is that they are not forgotten. They are not forgotten, they are there and we are there for them. We want them in the European Union.

The enlargement must continue without stopping. There is no other Union than the European Union. There is no other choice than European Union. There is no peace and security without the Western Balkans in the European Union.

As well, I repeat, as I repeated with North Macedonia, together with Moldova, together with Ukraine, we have to consider the European Union as a peace project. It is how it started, and on the way maybe it lost its sense, but now we are coming back to our roots. The European Union is a peace project. We have to bring the Western Balkans to the European Union. We will start with Albania, North Macedonia, and continue. This process will not end.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Mr President, I also want to thank the rapporteur for this very comprehensive and important report. The EU enlargement process is a matter of the future of EU and trust in our Union. We must therefore ensure a clear pathway for those countries aiming to join our Union. When progress is made, appreciation must be shown.

Albania is one of those countries that have shown most progress on their commitment to European integration and democratic transformation, and have clearly shown alignment with the EU foreign policy – not least when it comes to joint actions with the EU Member States after the horrific Russian invasion of Ukraine.

It is time to advance on Albania's accession process. One way of showing the country it is on the right path is by opening the accession negotiations with that country, and to schedule the first intergovernmental conference.

With this said, the Albanian political parties must overcome political disputes to strengthen democracy and the economy further. Every stone must also be turned to fight organised crime and corruption. But it is clear that the Albanian Government and citizens see the European Union as their home.

It is therefore time for us to open up the doors!

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, trecerea spre o democrație reală, puternică este un proces lung și foarte dificil, iar odată create instituțiile democratice funcționale, este nevoie de hotărâre și efort să le menții.

Valorile democratice, drepturile omului, lipsa discriminării, libertatea cuvântului și toate celelalte valori pe care Uniunea Europeană le susține necesită atenție și eforturi permanente.

Pașii făcuți de Albania pentru a se apropia de valorile noastre sunt mari. Procesul a fost unul de lungă durată și anevoios, după decenii de dictatură, după zeci de ani în care societatea civilă, cetățenii, fie ei politicieni sau magistrați sau alte profesii au fost obișnuiți cu un alt mod de viață.

Eforturile Albaniei arată clar dorința de a merge mai departe, de a se alătura Uniunii Europene și chiar dacă mai sunt progrese de făcut, trebuie să acordăm această șansă unui popor care face demersuri susținute de aproape zece ani. Cred că Albania trebuie să treacă la pasul următor, iar Uniunea Europeană trebuie să susțină acest demers.

Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, colleagues, Commissioner, the war in Ukraine is a stark reminder that peace is a fragile thing. In the 1990s, the Western Balkans provided us with this grim reminder. We must never forget that only through cooperation and dialogue do we overcome hatred, competition and violence between nations.

The European Union is a forum for Member States to reach compromise through words, not arms. By invading Ukraine, Russia challenges these core values. The Western Balkans aspire to join the EU because they share these values, but the spectre of war still hangs over the region. By continuing to stall on the aspiration of EU membership of Balkan states, the EU and Member States are threatening a fragile peace, breaking promises and presenting themselves as unreliable partners.

I recently visited Albania, as you can see, and saw first-hand the growing disillusionment with the EU integration process. Albania has made great strides. So we need an immediate start to accession negotiations. If we stall further, not only do we fail to live up to our responsibility, but we risk strengthening the hands of those who undermine the values at the heart of the European Union.

(Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, am vizitat de foarte multe ori Albania și evident că progresele se observă de la un an la altul. Însă nu trebuie să sancționăm o națiune europeană, cu vocație europeană, care aspiră să ajungă în Uniunea Europeană, doar pentru că administrația uneori nu își face temele.

Tocmai de aceea cred că este esențial să punem accent, în negocierile cu Tirana, pe valorile pe care este clădită Uniunea Europeană, pentru că democrația, libertatea de exprimare, drepturile omului nu sunt valori pe care să le negociem cu cineva, cu atât mai mult cu un stat care își dorește să devină membru al Uniunii Europene.

Evident că este o țară cu foarte multe frământări, cu foarte multe dificultăți interne în a înțelege și a implementa o serie de reforme, dar asistența noastră este esențială, pentru că este în interesul strategic al Uniunii Europene ca Albania cât mai rapid să devină membru al UE.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, pirmiausia aš noriu padėkoti savo kolegei Isabelai Santos už tikrai puikiai parengtą pranešimą, taip pat šešėliniams pranešėjams. Man atrodo, kad faktai yra labai aiškūs. Albanija atitinka iškeltus reikalavimus, kurie buvo paskelbti pirmajame susitikime, ji juos įvykdžiusi. Dabar kamuolys yra mūsų pusėje. Mes turime žiūrėti, kad per ilgai užsitęsęs sprendimas nesukeltų nusivylimo. Kaip gydytojas galiu pasakyti, kad kiekvieną veiksmą reikia atlikti laiku. Ir tas laikas yra pradėti derybas dėl stojimo su Albanija. Mes matome, kaip mūsų tam tikras vėlavimas rytų flange leidžia vienam agresoriui pradėti vieną po kito karo veiksmus. Tai šiuo atveju mes tikrai neturime nuvilti Albanijos žmonių. Neturime padaryti vakuumo Vakarų Balkanų regione. Todėl jau birželio mėnesį, aš manau, kad būtinai turime duoti signalą Tarybai, tvirtą Europos Parlamento signalą, kad derybos būtų pradėtos.

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

Didier Reynders, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you again for such a fruitful debate and for the report – and maybe your support. We welcome such Parliament support for Albania's EU integration and its recognition that the country has met all the conditions set by the European Council to officially open accession negotiations.

The future of the entire region lies in the European Union and it is in our strategic interest to bring it closer to the European Union. We look forward to adopting the negotiating framework and holding the first intergovernmental conference with Albania as soon as possible. So thanks again for your support. We will try to move forward.

Isabel Santos, Relatora. – Senhor Presidente, no final deste debate, fica claro o consenso desta Câmara em torno de uma ideia fundamental: a Albânia cumpre todas as condições para que seja marcada a Primeira Conferência Intergovernamental e para que se prossiga, rapidamente, o mais rapidamente possível, com o seu processo de adesão.

A Albânia, como já aqui foi dito, é um país que tem atravessado muitas dificuldades. Atravessou um terramoto, atravessou a COVID, como todos nós, mas, apesar de tudo isso, não abrandou no caminho das reformas da adesão.

Há uma coisa que é claríssima para todos os albaneses: a sua pertença ao espaço da União Europeia e o seu desejo de pertencer a este espaço de paz, de democracia e de progresso. Não lhes podemos negar esse direito porque a Albânia já conquistou esse direito.

Por isso, Senhor Comissário, reafirmo-lhe aqui, agora, depois de ouvir todos os meus colegas, ainda com mais autoridade, o apoio desta Câmara àquilo que tem sido o trabalho realizado pela Comissão no sentido de que se prossiga com o processo de adesão. E lanço aqui o desafio às cadeiras, infelizmente deixadas vazias pelo Conselho, para que o Conselho responda favoravelmente ao repto que lhe está aqui a ser lançado.

Quero aqui lembrar que, depois de todo este tempo, falei aqui deputados dos diversos grupos parlamentares e de diferentes países e todos disseram unanimemente: a Albânia tem todas as condições para que este processo prossiga definitivamente.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

Hlasovanie sa uskutoční vo štvrtok (19.05.2022).

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR), na piśmie. – Jak wiemy, Albania jest krajem kandydującym do UE od 2014 r. Komisja Europejska stale monitoruje postępy wdrażanych reform, szczególnie w obszarze sfery publicznej, niezawisłości sądów, walki z korupcją oraz ochrony praw człowieka.

W marcu 2020 r. została podjęta decyzja o rozpoczęciu negocjacji akcesyjnych i w lipcu 2020 r. projekt ram negocjacyjnych został przedstawiony państwu członkowskim. Jednak ze względu na odmowę przyjęcia przez Bułgarię ram negocjacyjnych w sprawie Macedonii Północnej został zawieszony, ponieważ decyzje dotyczące procesu akcesyjnego obu krajów są ze sobą powiązane.

Chciałbym podkreślić – i o tym też jest mowa w sprawozdaniu – że powinniśmy jako posłowie do Parlamentu Europejskiego wspierać wysiłki Albanii na rzecz dołączenia do wspólnoty państw UE. Oczywiście kolejne reformy są konieczne i potrzebne, natomiast nie widzę powodu do dalszego przekładania rozpoczęcia negocjacji, ponieważ podstawowe warunki zostały spełnione.

Nadmienię, że, moim zdaniem, rozpoczęcie negocjacji z Albanią będzie dodatkowym bodźcem dla tego kraju do przeprowadzenia dalszych niezbędnych reform. Liczę na dalsze reformy Albanii szczególnie w obszarze eliminacji korupcji i działalności przestępczej ze wszystkich dziedzin życia publicznego, w tym publicznych procedur przetargowych i finansowania partii politycznych.

24. Postępowania sądowe przeciwko opozycji i zatrzymanie przywódców związkowych na Białorusi (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je vyhlásenie Komisie o stíhaní opozície a zadržiavaní vedúcich odborových zväzov v Bielorusku (2022/2664(RSP)).

Ako prvý v rozprave vystúpi práve za Európsku komisiu pán komisár Didier Reynders.

Didier Reynders, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, let me thank you all for your relentless efforts in supporting the people of Belarus. It is clear that the European Union remains united in the face of the continued brutal oppression by the Lukashenko regime in its support for the Belarusian people.

Today there are almost 1 200 political prisoners throughout the country, on top of the many thousands who have been detained over the last 18 months for exercising their democratic rights.

The brave leaders and activists of the democratic opposition in Belarus are also under sustained attack. Many, like Viktar Babaryka and Maryia Kalesnikava, are already in prison on politically motivated charges.

Just this month, Sofia Sapega, the girlfriend of blogger Roman Protasevich, who were both detained after the Belarussian authorities forced their flight to land in Minsk in May last year, was sentenced to six years in prison.

Opposition leaders forced into exile, including Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya, Pavel Latushko, and countless others, are facing very serious criminal charges in their absence. The recent assaults on trade union leaders is another illustration of Lukashenko's systematic effort to silence all remaining independent voices in the country.

The European Union has stood by the people of Belarus from the very beginning of their legitimate struggle for democratic freedom. Since August 2020, the European Union has committed about EUR 65 million in direct support to the people of Belarus. Among the beneficiaries are victims of repression, civil society, independent media, [inaudible] small businesses, health and culture.

Civil society actors on the front line have received emergency assistance to resist the regime's repressive actions. The European Union's support has been essential to ensure their safety, maintain their financial and organisational stability in the context of forced liquidation or relocation, and preserve firm grounding in the country.

Independent media inside and outside of Belarus are exposed to growing threats. Thanks to our financial support, independent journalists and social media influencers continue to tell the truth and reach their audiences in Belarus. Belarussian students who were forced to leave the country or unable to continue their studies in Belarus are now benefiting from the opportunity to study in the European Union.

Work on the next assistance package is ongoing to provide further support to civil society, [inaudible] victims of repression and small and medium-sized enterprises in exile. This is a clear demonstration of the EU's long-term commitment to the people of Belarus.

In parallel, we have also suspended all of our engagement with the central authorities, including at the technical or expert level. This, combined with our robust sanctions regime, isolates the Belarusian authorities and shows that they cannot act with impunity. This is important, especially following the support of Lukashenko's regime for the Russian war against Ukraine.

Finally, we have been supporting the International Accountability Platform for Belarus, which has been gathering and preserving evidence of human rights violations committed in Belarus. Let me assure you, we will not forget the victims of Lukashenko's regime. Thank you very much for your support and for your attention. I will, of course, follow your debate and try to understand what more can be done on the basis of your observations.

Sandra Kalniete, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, we cannot and must not forget about the involvement of the Lukashenko regime in Russia's brutal and unprovoked war against Ukraine. Lukashenko now has used his country as a launchpad in a war of aggression. He is extending the use of the death penalty and there is now the prospect of nuclear weapons being deployed in Belarus.

Furthermore, Lukashenko is also fully responsible for the continued brutal and systematic crackdown against his own people. As the Commissioner just said, there are 1 200 political prisoners, and 40 000 people were detained since 2020. The recent systematic persecution of trade unionists shows that Lukashenko is willing to do whatever it takes to suppress the remaining organised voices of dissent and supporters of a democratic Belarus.

Turning to the future, it should be abundantly clear that we cannot treat the Lukashenko regime any differently from Putin's. We must understand Belarus has now become Putin's pawn in his efforts to target the EU, whether as a gateway for artificial mass migration, disinformation, energy manipulation, cyberattacks or illegal smuggling. Lukashenko is famous for being as slippery as an eel. We must make sure he does not escape full responsibility this time.

VORSITZ: NICOLA BEER

Vizepräsidentin

Juozas Olekas, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the Belarus dictator has again showed total disrespect for any legal norms, and again resorted to harassment and imprisonment for any possible opposition to his regime. Now he has targeted trade union leaders as one of the last organised opposition forces. They join in detention thousands of political prisoners, including former presidential candidates who are serving decades-long sentences handed down by the Lukashenko controlled courts.

The European Union should show its solidarity with the detained trade union leaders and request their immediate release. And we should continue our support or maybe strengthening of the Belarus opposition force inside and outside the country. You mentioned this, Commissioner.

Lukashenko should not fool himself that such illegitimate action, the total harassment of the Belarus society, will sooner or later lead to a hard landing and the fall of his regime.

Petras Auštrevičius, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, dear colleagues, Dictator Lukashenko, a vassal of the Russian world, wants to erase Belarus' statehood and independence. Civil society, human rights and political pluralism have no place in Lukashenko's vision for the future of Belarus. The result of his almost three decades of rule: free-thinking and pro-European Belarusians are forced to seek refuge abroad.

Having crushed and imprisoned the political opposition, Lukashenko has now set his sights on the independent trade unions that defy him. The political persecution and imprisonment of trade union activists is completely unacceptable, and requires our strong response.

It is clear that Lukashenko can only be stopped by sanctions and the further isolation of the Belarusian regime. Let us not make the mistakes of the past, when it was thought that dialogue with him would reconcile the democratic choice. Lukashenko is just a vassal of Putin and will not become anything else. His attempt to balance himself and to seek contact with the outside world is merely an attempt to survive.

Colleagues, while being critical about Belarus regime, I strongly believe in the European future of the Belarusian people. And very finally, let us not forget the nuclear power plant in Astravyets on the EU border, which threatens the whole of Europe.

Viola Von Cramon-Taubadel, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, when we condemn Putin for his cruelty in Ukraine, we should never forget that he is not acting alone.

The missiles on Lviv, Kyiv and Vinnytsia were fired from Belarus. Russian troops entered Bucha and Irpin from Belarus, from Gomel. When the Russians started to retreat from Kyiv, they used places in Belarus to send the looted goods. Russians did all this because the Belarusian dictator, Aleksander Lukashenko, allowed them to do so.

Before he became an accomplice to atrocities in Ukraine, Lukashenko spent 27 years torturing his own people. In 2020 we saw the awakening of the free Belarusian spirit. Hundreds of thousands marched in the streets with flowers and white and red flags. They were brutally crushed by Lukashenko's militias.

Just because we do not hear the voices of victims does not mean that the violence has stopped. On the contrary, the number of political prisoners in Belarus has reached more than 1 200. Among them are the trade union leaders and many other innocent representatives who were arrested last April. Their crime was the resistance of the violent regime and their demand for fundamental freedoms.

As the sanctions are starting to become effective, and the income of Lukashenko's regime is drying up, the fall of the regime is inevitable. Our decisive actions now should speed up this fall. Lukashenko belongs in the International Criminal Court, right next to Mr Putin.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous avez parlé de sanctions «robustes». Mais est-ce qu'une seule fois on peut examiner les effets économiques des sanctions que nous avons prises? Parce que les effets politiques, on ne les voit jamais. Jusqu'à présent, je ne connais pas de pays qui ait changé de position après des sanctions. Le résultat de ces sanctions? Les principales sanctions, vous le savez, à l'encontre du Bélarus, ont porté sur l'azote et la potasse, qui sont ses principales productions. Le Bélarus, avec la Chine et la Russie, produit 60 % de la production de ces engrais de potasse. Résultat: après ces sanctions, les prix ont quadruplé. Quadruplé. Quand je prends – et je vous invite à faire la même chose – les statistiques d'Eurostat, je constate que jamais le Bélarus n'a gagné autant d'argent avec cet engrais de potasse. Jamais.

Donc, je veux bien qu'on rajoute des sanctions aux sanctions. J'ai l'impression que ce Parlement est ivre de sanctions. Mais si on ajoute des sanctions, la question qu'il faut se poser, c'est quel est leur effet? Est-ce que c'est simplement de nous faire plaisir dans cet hémicycle? Alors je dis que, bien sûr, la situation au Bélarus doit évoluer. Mais si elle évolue, je pense, contrairement à certains, que ce sera en rétablissant le dialogue plutôt qu'en rajoutant des sanctions aux sanctions.

Résultat de ces sanctions aujourd'hui: les pays que j'ai cités gagnent plus, nos agriculteurs voient les prix des engrais exploser et les consommateurs voient le prix d'une partie des produits agricoles exploser.

Beata Mazurek, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Wielokrotnie dyskutowaliśmy tutaj o reżimie na Białorusi, przyjmowaliśmy projekt rezolucji, podejmowaliśmy decyzję o nakładaniu obostrzeń gospodarczych, restrykcji handlowych, sankcji imiennych wobec samego Łukaszenki i jego najbliższej rodziny. I co? Prezydent Białorusi kolejny raz śmieje nam się w twarz, ignoruje Unię Europejską, ignoruje Międzynarodową Organizację Pracy, do której należy 18 zatrzymanych w połowie kwietnia przedstawicieli Białoruskiego Kongresu Demokratycznego Związków Zawodowych. Łukaszenka dopuszcza się wywoływania ataków hybrydowych na granicy, bojkotuje demokratyczne wybory, wspiera Rosję w działaniach wojennych przeciwko Ukrainie. Zlikwidował prawie 400 organizacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, pracowników kolei stawia w roli podejrzanych o akt terroru za sabotowanie dostaw broni do Rosji. Przypominam, że niedawno białoruski Senat zatwierdził zmiany, w których za dopuszczenie się, a nawet próbę przeprowadzenia aktu terrorystycznego grozi kara śmierci.

Proszę Państwa, czterech pracowników białoruskiej kolei może zostać rozstrzelanych za to, że chcieli zapobiec dostawie broni dla rosyjskiej armii popełniającej ohydne zbrodnie na Ukrainie. Przykład Putina pokazuje wyraźnie, że samo potępienie i przemykanie oczu na reżim, a nawet obejmowanie sankcjami nie wystarczy. Żeby zakończyć bezprawie i terror dyktatury Łukaszenki, konieczne są konkretne działania – działania pomocowe dla organizacji obywatelskich, przedstawicieli związków zawodowych i opozycji. Jednym słowem: mniej gadania, a więcej działania. Wszystkim nam tego życzę.

Özlem Demirel, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! In Belarus haben Arbeiter und Gewerkschaften als Zeichen gegen den Krieg Waffenlieferungen und Nachschub für den russischen Angriffskrieg sabotiert. Diese sehen sich nun massiven Repressionen ausgesetzt. Klar ist aber: Arbeiterinnen müssen das Recht haben, sich in Gewerkschaften für ihre Position zu organisieren. Das gilt für soziale wie für politische Forderungen. Repressionen sind inakzeptabel.

Doch insbesondere in Krisen- und Kriegszeiten werden Gewerkschaftsrechte ausgehöhlt – in Belarus, in Russland und leider auch in der Ukraine. Egal, wo, egal, in welchem Krieg – Arbeiterinnen und das einfache Volk zahlen den höchsten Preis in diesen Kriegen, die nicht in ihrem Interesse geführt werden. Deshalb ist es richtig, dass sie sich dagegen zur Wehr setzen. So haben auch Hafenarbeiterinnen in Italien die Waffenexporte der EU an Saudi-Arabien mit einem Streik gestoppt, die im brutalen Jemenkrieg eingesetzt wurden. Den belarussischen, den italienischen, den Arbeiterinnen weltweit gilt meine Solidarität – sie können Kriege stoppen.

Ich möchte zum Schluss ein Gedicht von Wolfgang Borchert zitieren – der es auf den Punkt bringt: „Du, Mann an der Maschine und Mann in der Werkstatt. Wenn sie dir morgen befehlen, du sollst keine Wasserrohre und keine Kochtöpfe mehr machen – sondern Stahlhelme und Maschinengewehre, dann gibt es nur eins: Sag nein!“

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, it's very clear that the continued persecution of opposition and trade union leaders in Belarus is a heavy crime committed by the illegal Lukashenko regime. Today we are standing together with all the persecuted fighters for a democratic Belarus and with the legitimate leader of democratic Belarus, Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya.

We should not be naive: our appeals to the Lukashenko regime to release imprisoned fighters for democracy will not be answered. That is why we cannot stay only with resolutions, which have been repeating such language for several years.

Belarus is not a far away country somewhere in Africa, with some human rights problems. Belarus happens to be next door to us, in the geographical centre of the European continent. We need to understand our own responsibility, we need to look into what kind of mistakes we have made that allowed those atrocities and that military aggression to happen in the centre of Europe, in our vicinity.

Today we need to learn one very clear lesson: if in our region we are not able to stop an authoritarian regime in its violations of human rights from the very beginning, then at some time later those regimes will become new fascist regimes and international criminal aggressors.

That is why we now need to understand a very simple truth. The situation in Belarus will be radically changed for the better if Putin and Lukashenko are defeated in Ukraine and if Ukraine will get candidate status. Ukraine's success is key for the future of democracy in Belarus and also in Russia. That is why we need to support Ukraine and together with them to win the war in Ukraine. Let's learn our lessons!

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, it was only yesterday on 17 May that Maksim Poznyakov, vice-president of the Belarusian independent trade union, the BKDP, was arrested by the Belarusian state authorities – and he was only elected four days ago to replace the colleagues who were already in jail. I think we see a pattern here.

Over the past few months, trade union leaders in Belarus have been arrested. Their headquarters have been searched and their members are being spied upon. This is an attack on all Belarusian workers and a violation of their rights. The freedom of association and the right to organise are non-negotiable. And therefore, we call for the immediate and unconditional release of all leaders and members of the trade unions in Belarus and for all charges against them to be dropped.

Vlad Gheorghe (Renew). – Domnule președinte, am tratat cu prea mare lejeritate ce se întâmplă dincolo de granițele noastre. Am trecut prea ușor peste încălcarea evidentă a drepturilor fundamentale. Am sprijinit prea puțin pe cei care luptă pentru valorile Uniunii Europene chiar dacă sunt în afara ei.

Belarus este de mai mulți ani un stat care s-a întors împotriva propriilor cetățeni. Și România știe, din păcate, prea bine ce înseamnă asta. Românii știu prea bine cum este să aștepti un ajutor care nu mai vine. În Belarus orice opoziție este acum suprimată violent de regimul prorus Lukașenka. Mulți luptă în exil alții rezistă în pușcării. Cu toții speră că vor primi un ajutor concret.

Simpla condamnare fermă în discursuri și în postări pe *social media* nu îi ajută. Societatea civilă, reprezentanții opoziției, belarușii și cu voturile ignorate și drepturile încălcate așteaptă ca Uniunea ca Europa unită să le stea alături. Nu avem voie să îi dezamăgim. Nu avem voie să renunțăm la cei care nu renunță să lupte pentru democrație.

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzy! Tak, ten kryzys humanitarny i polityczny Białorusi trwa zdecydowanie za długo. Tysiące osób przesładowanych, w więzieniach to tylko dowód na to, że działamy zbyt wolno, zbyt mało konsekwentnie. Bo przecież Parlament Europejski przyjął kilka bardzo konkretnych rezolucji, jeżeli chodzi o działania, a wciąż dochodzi do prześladowania różnych grup zawodowych, społecznych, narodowych. Andrzej Poczobut siedzi w więzieniu. Został skazany na kilka lat tylko dlatego, że jest Polakiem. Mój przyjaciel Siarhiej Korszun został skazany na cztery i pół roku właściwie za nic, bo nawet sam nie pisał żadnych tekstów w sieci, i cierpi jego rodzina. Niektórzy więźniowie nie mają 18 lat, a inni powyżej 70. Na wiele lat skazani do obozów. I co?

Jako Parlament proponowaliśmy komisję wysokiego szczebla, konferencję, którą powinna poprzeć Rada Europejska. Zbieramy materiały w komisjach AFET i DROI, zbieramy tysiące nazwisk osób odpowiedzialnych za zbrodnie. Potrzebne jest postawienie Łukaszenki przed trybunałem, bo on na to zasługuje. Ale do tego potrzebna jest współpraca wszystkich państw członkowskich.

I znowu zwracam się do nieobecnych. Europo! Tak, Parlament Europejski jest ambasadorem głosu wolnych Białorusinów, ale Europo, musisz działać! Niech żyje wolna Białoruś! Niech żyje wolna, demokratyczna Białoruś!

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Madam President, it is precisely one year ago today that the Tut.By website was shut down: 15 arrests followed by subsequent constructed convictions, the dictator's well-known playbook.

By now, we not only speak about Lukashenko's illegitimate regime holding hostage an entire population, but Lukashenko is also fully complicit in Putin's gruesome war and all war crimes that were committed, and he will be held accountable for this.

Prosecution of opposition figures, trade union leaders and other critical voices shows the regime's weakness, turning against his own people. But the brave Belarus people resisting will prevail. We are here to send our support to all representatives of the Belarusian democratic opposition, to union leaders and all the other 1 203 political prisoners, like Viasna's Ales Bialiatski. We assure you: we have not forgotten about Belarus and about you, you will get your country back, and your freedom.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, Įsibėgėjusiam totalitarizmui stabdžių nėra. Taip ir Lukašenkos režimas nusitaiko į vis naujas visuomenės grupes, kurios yra bent kiek nepriklausomos nuo valdžios diktato. Tai nenauja: susidorojimas su kitaminčiais Baltarusijoje tęsiasi jau dešimtmečiais, o po suklastotų rinkimų 2020 m. rugpjūtį tas siautėjimas pasiekė dar didesnę mastą. Imtasi riboti bet kokius visuomeninius judėjimus, laisvą žiniasklaidą, o šių metų balandžio 19 d. įvykdytas 18 profesinių sąjungų lyderių sulaikymas primena mums, kad teisminė valdžia Baltarusijoje tėra režimo instrumentas. Ir tie veiksmai įvykdyti, kai Baltarusija paversta *de facto* agresijos prieš Ukrainą dalyve. Jos šiandieninis režimas suteikė Rusijos kariuomenei ir savo teritoriją, ir oro erdvę, ir logistinę paramą. Taip šiandieninė Baltarusijos valdžia galutinai netenka bet kokio dialogo su mumis, su Vakarų valstybėmis, galimybės. Ir ji vis stiprina represijas prieš tuos, kurie Baltarusijos įtraukimą į karą Ukrainoje išdrįsta kritikuoti. Pritariu, kad Tarptautinė darbo organizacija apskritai suspenduotų Baltarusijos narystę šioje organizacijoje, nes nepriklausomų profesinių sąjungų ten jau galutinai nelikę. O Europos Sąjungos institucijos turi didinti tiesioginę paramą Baltarusijos opozicijai, pilietinei visuomenei, žmogaus teisių gynėjams, nepriklausomai žiniasklaidai, akademinėi bendruomenei ir kitoms nepriklausomoms organizacijoms Baltarusijoje ir už jos ribų.

Marianne Vind (S&D). – Fru formand! I Belarus har vi i den sidste tid været vidne til en voldsom hetz imod fagforeninger og deres repræsentanter. En hetz, der har fundet sted over en længere årrække, men som eskalerede i april, da mindst 18 fagforeningsledere blev fængslet. Det var efter sigende for at forstyrre den offentlige orden, men i virkeligheden for at være kritiske over for det belarusiske styre. Flere af dem venter nu lange fængselsstraffe.

I Belarus har fagforeninger spillet en fuldkommen essentiel rolle ved at kæmpe for et frit og demokratisk Belarus. Jeg fordømmer derfor anholdelserne. At terrorisere fagforeninger er et direkte angreb på de fundamentale rettigheder, og det skal have konsekvenser. Jeg støtter fuldt op om, at EU skal række ud og hjælpe de belarusiske fagforeninger. For de skal vide, at der altid er opbakning og støtte fra EU til frihed, fred og demokrati. Jeg opfordrer derfor til, at regimet i Belarus omgående løslader alle fagforeningsledere, dropper alle anklager og respekterer ILO-konventionerne.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, the illegitimate regime of Aleksander Lukashenko continues to terrorise and oppress the Belarusian people. Today, there are over 1 200 political prisoners in Belarus and 275 civil society and human rights organisations and numerous media outlets have been closed down.

I want to especially mention the case of my brave friend, Pavel Seviarynets, who has already spent nearly 10 years in Lukashenko's jails and who, a year ago, was sentenced to seven more years. It is because of brave people like Pavel, who every day pay a terrible personal sacrifice that we mustn't forget about the plight of the Belarusian people. On the contrary, as we continue to support the people of Ukraine in the face of Russian aggression, we must also redouble our support for the people of Belarus, because we cannot have free and sovereign Ukraine without a free and sovereign Belarus.

Robert Biedroń (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzy! Jedno jest pewne: nie będzie wolnej, bezpiecznej Europy, Unii Europejskiej bez wolnej, bezpiecznej, niezależnej Białorusi. Tej lekcji jeszcze niestety jako Unia Europejska nie odrobiliśmy, bo przez wszystkie lata rządów Łukaszenki naiwnie wierzyliśmy, że Łukaszenkę da się ucywilizować. Tak się niestety nie stało. Nadzieją są tacy odważni ludzie jak dzisiaj omawiani związkowcy. Ja pochodzę z kraju „Solidarności”, z kraju, w którym powstał największy na świecie ruch robotniczy, którego siła obaliła komunizm. Taka jest siła związków zawodowych, także na Białorusi. Tylko ci ludzie nie mogą zostać sami i dlatego Unia Europejska musi zrobić swoją robotę. Musi dać tym ludziom nadzieję, musi zobligować się do konkretnych rzeczy, do wytyczenia mapy drogowej dla Białorusi, pokazania, jakie będą kolejne etapy. W tej sprawie niestety nadal zawodzimy Białorusinów i Białorusinki. *Żywie Białoruś.*

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben hier gehört, dass sich die Situation in Belarus immer weiter zuspitzt, dass der KGB brutal angreift, Gewerkschafterinnen und Gewerkschafter, die Führung inhaftiert, die Menschen bedroht, deren Arbeitsmittel einkassiert und versucht, somit die Gewerkschaftsbewegung auseinanderzubringen, insbesondere um die Mitglieder einzuschüchtern, damit die diesen Bund verlassen, der ja im Vergleich zu den Staatsgewerkschaften – mit seinen 12 000 Mitgliedern im Vergleich zu vier Millionen – relativ klein ist.

Es ist so wichtig, dass wir hier das Signal geben, dass wir hier die Inhaftierten unterstützen. Sie brauchen unseren Schutz, sie brauchen unsere Solidarität, aber auch eben konkrete Unterstützung. Deshalb, glaube ich, ist es ganz, ganz wichtig, dass wir noch einmal ganz klar sagen: Alle politischen Gefangenen müssen freigelassen werden, aber auch wirklich Versammlungsfreiheit, Gewerkschaftsrechte geschützt werden – in Belarus und überall.

Ich will mit einem Zitat der internationalen Sekretärin dieses Bundes der Freien Gewerkschaften, Maryja Taradsezkaja, schließen, die gesagt hat: „Ich glaube an das Universum und an die Gewerkschaften, und ich glaube an die Solidarität und die Handlungsfähigkeit Europas.“

Ilan De Basso (S&D). – Fru talman! Historien lär oss att fria och självständiga fackföreningar många gånger varit drivande för viktiga demokratiska, ekonomiska och sociala reformer.

Tillsammans måste vi nu i Europa agera för ett fritt och demokratiskt samhälle i Belarus. För det som händer där är fruktansvärt. Regelrätta förföljelser av människor som kämpar för att förbättra arbetsvillkoren för vanliga löntagare sker dagligen. Fackliga demokratiska rättigheter i Belarus har under lång tid hotats och eller lyst med sin fränvaro. Dessa attacker mot fria fackförbund och arbetstagare leder också till att Belarus försvagas och isoleras från omvärlden.

Strejker och demonstrationer vid stora företag och arbetsplatser visar att det finns ett starkt stöd för ett fritt och demokratiskt Belarus. Men vi måste göra mer. Därför kräver vi ett omedelbart frisläppande av fängslade fackliga ledare i Belarus. Stödet till det civila samhället ska förstärkas. Fackliga rättigheter är mänskliga rättigheter!

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, arestarea sindicaliştilor din Belarus nu este doar un atac criminal la adresa unor persoane incomode regimului Lukaşenko. Este un atentat la o instituție democratică – sindicatul – și la drepturile fundamentale garantate de Organizația Internațională a Muncii, din care face parte și Belarus.

Nu este întâmplător că, la trei luni de la invazia barbară a Ucrainei, lumea liberă este sfidată din nou de prietenul lui Putin. Aceste două personaje insistă să ne sfideze, călcând în picioare tratate și principii pe baza cărora funcționează democrațiile lumii.

Este evident că numeroasele sancțiuni impuse regimului Lukaşenko nu funcționează. Dictatorul va face în continuare ce vrea și, între timp, oameni care nu și doresc decât să trăiască sub aceleași valori ca orice alt european își pun zi de zi și secundă de secundă libertatea și viața în pericol.

A cere eliberarea acestor oameni nu este deci suficient. Uniunea trebuie să găsească urgent soluții mai curajoase și mai eficiente de a-i sprijini pe cei care se opun dictaturii. Fără sprijinul nostru, schimbarea nu va veni niciodată în Belarus, iar Europa democratică nu va fi niciodată întregă.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 19 aprile è stato un giorno nero nella storia del movimento sindacale in Bielorussia: ben 18 tra leader sindacali e rappresentanti indipendenti sono stati arrestati con l'accusa di aver violato l'ordine pubblico. Questo evento è solo il culmine di un tragico processo iniziato con le elezioni del 2020 e continuato poi con il blocco della società civile e delle organizzazioni per i diritti umani.

L'Unione europea da due anni agisce con fermezza attraverso severe sanzioni nei confronti del regime autoritario di Lukaşenka, che oggi sostiene direttamente la guerra dell'alleato Putin in Ucraina. È necessario, oltre a rinnovare le sanzioni, ribadire la nostra solidarietà al popolo bielorusso, in particolare a quei cittadini che scendono in piazza chiedendo libertà e democrazia.

Chiediamo quindi che vengano rilasciati tutti gli oppositori, i leader, i rappresentanti sindacali detenuti arbitrariamente per motivi politici. Oggi diciamo stop a Putin, ma diciamo anche stop a Lukašěnka.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, nikdy bych si nemyslel, že v 21. století budou v Evropě diktátoři, a pan Lukašenko je zde 27 let. Nikdy bych si nemyslel, že v 21. století je možná přímá válka jednoho evropského státu proti druhému, a máme zde neuvěřitelný konflikt od druhé světové války s desívkami obětmi.

Co potřebujeme pro Bělorusko, je nepochybně jednoznačná podpora běloruskému lidu. Jednoznačná podpora opozici, odborářským svazům, zadržným a vězněným. Potřebujeme nepochybně cestovní mapu toho, jak ukázat na naše sankce a kroky, které budou následovat, když neuspějeme v našich požadavcích. To, co potřebujeme jednoznačně, je podle mého názoru, aby Ukrajina vyhrála. Protože pokud vyhraje Ukrajina, nepochybně padne i běloruský režim a i diktátor Lukašenko.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, este debate e a resolução que o acompanha são mais uma peça do sistemático exercício da União Europeia e das suas Instituições de cínica instrumentalização de direitos e valores para procurar impor o seu domínio sobre os Estados soberanos.

Não por acaso, a resolução ignora a política de interferência dos Estados Unidos da América e da União Europeia na Bielorrússia, insistindo na promoção da desestabilização interna e na política de sanções que visam asfixiar o país, criando dificuldades acrescidas para os povos. Políticas em evidente confronto com o Direito Internacional e a Carta das Nações Unidas, nomeadamente o princípio da não ingerência em assuntos internos de cada país.

Acresce uma visão de dois pesos e duas medidas que procuram impor sobre diferentes matérias, de que é exemplo o princípio da neutralidade, omitindo o papel da NATO e a sua expansão a Leste.

Estamos perante um exercício que não contribui para o necessário desanuviamento na região. Antes se soma à escalada de confrontação, contrária à paz na Europa e no mundo.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Didier Reynders, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you all for your comments and your support in such a difficult situation that we are facing in Belarus.

Your statements confirm the importance and relevance of all support to the people of Belarus. We distinguish very clearly between the government of Belarus and the people of Belarus and their aspirations for democracy. Sanctions target the regime which supports the aggression and these restrictive measures will evolve along with developments on the ground.

Ordinary citizens who are against the Russian invasion of Ukraine will continue to receive our unwavering support. I look forward to continuing and deepening our cooperation, and we will, with the Commission, pursue our shared goal: a free, democratic and prosperous Belarus. And we will continue to see how it is possible to take other kinds of initiatives with your support. Thanks again for that.

Die Präsidentin. – Gemäß Artikel 132 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung wurden fünf Entschließungsanträge eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 19. Mai 2022, statt.

25. Minimalny poziom opodatkowania grup wielonarodowych (debata)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Aurore Lalucq im Namen des Ausschusses für Wirtschaft und Währung über den Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Rates zur Gewährleistung einer globalen Mindestbesteuerung für multinationale Unternehmensgruppen in der Union (COM(2021)0823 – C9-0040/2022 – 2021/0433(CNS)).

Ich darf noch einmal darauf hinweisen, dass Sie mit Ausnahme der ersten zwei Reihen nach vorne aufrücken dürfen, wenn Sie an dieser Debatte jetzt teilnehmen. Sie müssen also nicht im hinteren Teil des Saales verbleiben. Sie haben die Möglichkeit, spontane Wortmeldungen und blaue Karten mit Ihrer elektronischen Stimmkarte abzugeben oder sich auch hier direkt noch zu melden.

Damit kommen wir zur Berichterstatteerin dieses Reports, Frau Kollegin Lalucq, Sie haben das Wort.

Aurore Lalucq, *rapporteuse*. – Madame la Présidente, représentant de la Commission, chers collègues, je tiens à remercier tout d'abord mes corapporteurs, Luděk Niedermayer pour le PPE, Gilles Boyer pour Renew, Claude Gruffat pour les Verts et José Gusmão pour The Left, mais aussi Eugen Jurzyca pour l'ECR. Je ne remercie pas le groupe ID, car il n'était pas présent lors des négociations, comme trop souvent. Je voudrais vous remercier pour ces discussions très franches et très directes que nous avons eues. Je crois qu'on était d'accord pour se dire qu'on n'était pas tout à fait d'accord, mais qu'on avait une compréhension mutuelle de nos désaccords.

Dans mon rapport, j'ai toujours voulu marcher sur deux jambes. La première était de donner une voix forte au Parlement européen – parce que nous ne sommes pas la Commission européenne, nous ne sommes pas le Conseil – et de proposer plus de flexibilité à cet accord à travers la question du taux, du seuil et des exemptions. L'autre jambe, c'était de traiter cet accord avec sérieux et responsabilité, car c'est un accord historique que nous avons entre nos mains, un accord historique qui a demandé des négociations extrêmement fines, du temps de travail et il ne fallait pas faire n'importe quoi, pour le dire très clairement.

Or, lors des négociations, deux visions s'opposaient, deux visions, ma foi, tout à fait légitimes. D'un côté, il y avait une volonté d'avoir plus de flexibilité sur la question du seuil, sur la question du taux et sur la question des exemptions, mais aussi des conséquences sur les pays en voie de développement de cet accord, ce qui était plutôt la ligne défendue par les Verts et les Sociaux-démocrates et The Left. De l'autre côté, deux groupes politiques nous ont dit très clairement que, pour eux, cet accord était fragile – que, déjà, il allait loin pour eux – que cet accord était fragile et que l'urgence était de le consolider, une demande elle aussi parfaitement légitime, d'autant plus que nous sommes dans un contexte qui est celui de l'Ecofin, à un moment où un pays notamment bloque l'accord, ce qui peut le mettre en danger et qui peut par ailleurs avoir des conséquences sur nos partenaires, et sur notre partenaire américain notamment.

Compte tenu de ce contexte, il a été décidé de ne pas toucher aux marqueurs les plus importants de cet accord, c'est-à-dire la question du taux, du seuil et des exemptions, mais, en revanche, d'ajouter des garde-fous sur la question des abus – pour éviter certains types d'abus et le contournement de l'accord, pour réduire la durée de certaines exemptions, proposer également une clause de révision, évaluer l'impact sur les pays en voie de développement et proposer des actes délégués dès lors qu'il y aurait un changement, une évolution de cet accord. Mais – il y a un «mais» –, en échange, nous avons demandé de mettre en place l'accord immédiatement, c'est-à-dire de s'en tenir au calendrier qui avait été proposé initialement par la Commission européenne, et de ne pas reporter l'accord, comme l'a proposé le Conseil, parce que nous avons fait des efforts.

L'idée ici est de parler d'une seule voix, de manière responsable, de montrer que nous, au Parlement européen, nous prenons nos responsabilités. Nous savons faire du compromis entre droite et gauche quand il s'agit de faire un compromis historique, même si nous avons des divergences. Cet accord, forcément, il ne plaît pas à tout le monde: à la fois, on en est satisfait et forcément on est frustré, parce que nous aurions voulu, par exemple, avoir un taux beaucoup plus important ou ce genre de choses. Mais, en revanche, on refuse qu'il soit pris en otage par certains gouvernements, par exemple, qui ont des comptes à régler qui n'ont strictement rien à voir avec les questions fiscales. C'est pourquoi j'espère que demain, nous voterons d'une seule voix la demande de la mise en place, le plus rapidement possible, de cet accord qui, rappelons-le encore, est historique et que nous attendons depuis tant d'années. Nous serions alors le premier continent à le mettre en œuvre. On se plaint souvent de la lenteur de l'Union européenne et là, elle a été très rapide. À nous de faire montre de responsabilité en soutenant cette approche.

Luděk Niedermayer, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, what we are debating today is, I believe, badly needed progress on the global level to address tax avoidance, tax evasion and unfair tax competition.

In my view, it is a great success that more than 100 countries have signed up to this agreement. My dear colleague Ms Lalucq said that this is an historical agreement, and I tend to agree.

As is clear, this is not an EU proposal, it is the implementation of a global agreement. I firmly believe that the approach taken by the Commission, to avoid gold-plating and efforts to improve the text, was the right one and it has my full support.

I am also glad that after the debate that Ms Lalucq has described, we are presenting to the Plenary a text that simply confirms that we support this global agreement, and we believe we should move forward. And I must express gratitude to our rapporteurs' team that we were able, after some discussion, to get to this stage.

The European Parliament only provides the opinion. It is a matter for the Council to agree, but I guess it's very important what kind of message we send to the Council and also to the Europeans.

I hope that the message will be first an urgent call for the Council to go forward without hesitation, to approve and start to implement the agreement; secondly, I believe it should be a signal of the great appreciation of Europeans that there is an ability to find a global agreement on such an important topic; and last not least, I believe it should be an urgent call on other countries to go forward and implement this.

I hope Parliament will provide this signal tomorrow, with a very strong majority. Once more, let me say thank you for the good cooperation with the other rapporteurs.

Marek Belka, *w imieniu grupy S&D*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Parlament zdecydowaną większością głosów przyjmie zapewne sprawozdanie w sprawie minimalnego CIT-u dla wielkich korporacji. Także 26 państw w Unii zgadza się na kompromis zaproponowany przez Francję. Sprawę wetuje jedynie Polska. Władze w Warszawie stają po stronie wielkich międzynarodowych firm ze specjalnych stref ekonomicznych czy rajów podatkowych, a nie po stronie mniejszych polskich przedsiębiorstw. Z nimi lubią się tylko fotografować.

Rząd PiS pokazuje Polskę jako niechętną do kompromisów, obrażalską pannę. Jak wygląda prawdziwa współpraca i budowa wspólnoty, pokazują rządzącym Polacy, otwierając swoje domy sąsiadom z Ukrainy.

Panie Morawiecki! W swoim oficjalnym, a nie medialnym przekazie wspominają Państwo o innych krajach przeciwstawiających się zapisom dyrektywy. Tymczasem tylko Polska ją wetuje. Cytując znany Panu i przez nas lubiany zespół: „Gdzie oni są, ci wszyscy wasi przyjaciele? Zabrakło ich”. Znow.

Billy Kelleher, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, I very much welcome this agreement – an OECD Pillar Two agreement on minimum taxation. And bear in mind, it's not just a European agreement: this is a global agreement. And I urge everybody now to come together to ensure that it is implemented and that there is no further deviation or prevarication.

It was very difficult. My country had major concerns and reservations, but we came to the table in good faith and eventually, like another 137 countries, we signed up to it. So now I would urge the plenary session to send a very strong message to the Council and the broader global community that this taxation of corporates at 15% is fair, is equitable, and it is the right thing to do.

And bear in mind this suits large countries, small countries, developed countries and developing countries. And I think to have certainty and consensus around a global taxation system on corporates, I believe, is a very welcome step in the right direction. And I would urge that we now take this particular decision and implement it quickly. The Lalucq report recommends that, and a strong, broad signal of consensus in this House, both from left and right, would, I believe, send a strong message to the broader global community.

But more important, we now need certainty. We need certainty for business to ensure that they can plan ahead to create opportunities and investment; but more importantly, that Europe remains competitive, that we create employment for our citizens across the entire continent.

So I commend the report and I look forward to voting tomorrow to recommend this to the world.

Claude Gruffat, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, c'est un grand jour pour la fiscalité européenne, car nous scellons, nous, les représentants et représentantes des citoyennes et citoyens européens, le premier pas vers la perte progressive d'intérêt des paradis fiscaux. Alors évidemment, je ne vais pas vous le cacher, j'aurais souhaité un taux un peu plus élevé qui aurait permis une plus grande réaffectation des ressources. J'aurais aussi aimé la fin des exemptions et j'aurais voulu toucher un plus grand nombre de multinationales pour que personne ne triche avec ces règles et que la justice soit enfin rendue pour celles et ceux qui triment et participent à l'effort commun. Mais, comme le disait notre rapporteure tout à l'heure, nous avons préféré trouver un accord et avancer – en tout cas sécuriser ce premier pas pour cet événement européen.

Mais, malheureusement, la position du Parlement que nous discutons aujourd'hui n'est que consultative. J'aurais voulu me tourner vers la Présidence, mais elle n'est pas là, donc je me tourne vers vous, Madame la Commissaire: s'il n'y a pas d'accord le 24, qu'allez-vous faire? S'il n'y a pas d'accord le 17 juin, qu'allez-vous faire et comment allons-nous avancer? Les traités vous donnent les moyens de régler ce dogme injuste qu'est l'unanimité. Les concessions faites pour parvenir à un accord mettent en péril la mise en œuvre de l'accord global. Pourquoi continuer à jouer avec le feu? Pourquoi continuer de risquer sur l'autel des nationalismes toute avancée et tout changement sur des questions aussi fondamentales que la justice fiscale et, donc, la justice sociale?

Les États membres font aujourd'hui passer leurs intérêts avant le bien commun, en tout cas certains États membres. La volonté des citoyennes et des citoyens européens, c'est d'en finir avec l'unanimité en matière de fiscalité. Donc, si vous pouviez nous entendre, merci.

Gunnar Beck, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Dieses Parlament befürwortet das OECD-Abkommen zur Mindestbesteuerung von *multinationals* und gibt vor, es sei ein wichtiger Schritt für mehr Steuergerechtigkeit. Mehr Steuergerechtigkeit liegt besonders uns am Herzen.

Die sozialistische Fraktion aber lud vor Kurzem den brasilianischen Expräsidenten Lula da Silva ein, und zwar hier ins Parlament – denselben da Silva, der gleich zweimal wegen Korruption und Geldwäsche in Brasilien verurteilt und inhaftiert wurde. Und dann ist da noch der ukrainische Präsident Selenskyj, dessen Partei gerade der europäischen Partei ALDE beitrug. Wegen der *Pandora Papers* wissen wir, dass Selenskyj mindestens 40 Millionen Dollar für sich und seine *cronies* in Steueroasen in Sicherheit brachte. Unter seiner Regierungspartei bleibt die Ukraine eines der korruptesten und ärmsten Länder Europas.

Heuchler sonnen sich gerne im Heiligenschein der Entsagung und des Verzichts, aber insgeheim lassen sie sich die Sensationen des Sünders ungern entgehen. Seien Sie also ehrlich: Sie wollen nur mehr Steuern, keine Gerechtigkeit. Meine Fraktion will vor allem weniger Steuern für alle, außer *multinationals*. Und dies wollen wir ohne Wenn und Aber, nur konsequent.

Eugen Jurzyca, *za skupinu ECR*. – Vážená pani predsedajúca, na začiatku tejto iniciatívy bola korektná snaha riešiť problém, že z Európskej únie uniká ekonomická aktivita. A to sa deje z dvoch dôvodov alebo dvoma formami. Jednak je to únik zdaňovania ekonomickej aktivity do daňových rajov a jednak aj únik ekonomickej aktivity kvôli horšiemu podnikateľskému prostrediu. To prvé sa teraz snažíme riešiť zavedením globálnej minimálnej dane. Mali by sme si pritom dať ale pozor, aby sme ju neprijali ako jedinú, inak bude z EÚ ekonomická aktivita unikať naďalej, napríklad do Spojených štátov. To druhé by sme mali riešiť štrukturálnymi reformami, inak nám bude ekonomická aktivita z Únie unikať naďalej, teda aj investície, samozrejme, nie do daňových rajov síce, ale do krajín s efektívnejšími systémami. Každopádne pri takomto obrovskom kroku, ktorý bude mať, samozrejme že, veľa pozitívnych efektov, by Komisia mala mať aj pozitívne aj negatívne efekty dobre zanalyzované a v tom podľa môjho názoru máme dnes rezervy.

José Gusmão, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhor Presidente, há muitas décadas que o problema da evasão fiscal das empresas multinacionais se tem agravado e tem beneficiado do apoio dos grupos políticos da direita e dos países cujos modelos de finanças públicas assentam na expropriação da receita fiscal que pertence a outros Estados por direito.

Esta oposição, aliás, foi muito clara, quer na negociação do acordo da OCDE, quer no debate sobre este relatório, em que se optou, porque a direita fez questão que assim fosse, por simplesmente carimbar o acordo internacional da OCDE.

Esse acordo é um precedente importante que, entendamos, só acontece por causa das crescentes ameaças, ou mesmo medidas concretas, unilaterais, tomadas por Estados para se protegerem e para protegerem a sua receita fiscal do roubo por outros Estados-Membros, no caso da União Europeia, ou Estados simplesmente.

Mas é uma lei muito imperfeita, que tem sido divulgada com uma campanha de publicidade muito enganosa e que teremos que visitar quando se mostrar e quando ficar claro que ela é profundamente insuficiente.

O precedente é importante. A lei terá que ser muito melhorada.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η παρούσα οδηγία αποτελεί προκάλυμμα της νόμιμης φοροαποφυγής των μονοπωλιακών ομίλων. Επιδιώκει έναν προσωρινό συμβιβασμό στα πλαίσια οξυμένων ανταγωνισμών ανάμεσα σε αστικές τάξεις και μονοπώλια που θίγονται από την ευνοϊκότερη μεταχείριση από κάποια κράτη. Στοχεύει να ενισχύσει τη θέση των ευρωπαϊκών μονοπωλίων σε σχέση με αυτά, κυρίως, των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών της Αμερικής και της Κίνας.

Στην Ελλάδα, όπου οι εργαζόμενοι φορολογούνται 23% στο εισόδημα, ο φορολογικός συντελεστής 15% για τους ομίλους αποτελεί πρόκληση. Αφορά ελάχιστους ομίλους και εξαιρεί το εφοπλιστικό κεφάλαιο που φορολογείται εθελοντικά με αποφάσεις των ελληνικών κυβερνήσεων διαχρονικά, ενώ το ίδιο σπάει το ρεκόρ κερδοφορίας το ένα μετά το άλλο. Η προπαγάνδα περί δίκαιης φορολόγησης αποτελεί πολιτική απάτη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, των κυβερνήσεων και των αστικών κομμάτων. Στο άδικο φορολογικό σύστημα της καπιταλιστικής οικονομίας ο λαός πληρώνει το 95% και οι όμιλοι το 5%. Οι εργαζόμενοι, λοιπόν, πρέπει να οργανώσουν την πάλη τους, απαιτώντας φορολόγηση του μεγάλου κεφαλαίου 45% στα κέρδη, κατάργηση όλων των φοροαπαλλαγών, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των εφοπλιστών, των άδικων έμμεσων φόρων και κατοχύρωση αφορολόγητου ορίου που να καλύπτει τις ανάγκες της λαϊκής οικογένειας.

Mairead McGuinness, Member of the Commission. – Madam President. Good evening, colleagues. I want to reassure you, I was actually physically present and I hadn't realised that you had started, Madam President, but I was glad when I entered the chamber to hear a speech with strong support for what we're trying to do collectively here.

So maybe I'll start by highlighting, if that is necessary, that the Commission is fully committed to ensuring the timely implementation of the two-pillar OECD/G20 Agreement. And this is, as I know you will agree, a historic step in reforming international taxation, but it's also an example of multilateral successes that we should all be proud of. As you know, the implementation of the two pillars of the global agreement in 2023 will ensure that our tax system reflects the new reality of our economies and allows for a level playing field between all business models where all companies, including digital ones, pay their fair share of taxes in the right place.

That is why Pillar 2 needs to be urgently adopted. I know that you don't need to be convinced, but I'm really grateful to this Parliament for your constant push for a quick adoption of this important file. And I'd like to thank you for having opted – because of the need for a quick transposition – to adopt the Agreement, and that the text does not propose any significant amendments to the Directive and stays close to the OECD deal, as agreed.

I don't think that I need to dwell on the text of the Directive itself, but only perhaps to underline two points. First, by establishing a minimum level of 15% effective taxation, we put a floor on the race to the bottom on corporate tax rates. I'm well aware that many of you honourable Members wished this rate was higher. Nonetheless, the 15% raise is the one endorsed by all Member States and by our partners at the international level. So I thank you for accepting this race to ensure a swift implementation of the international agreement. In our implementation of Pillar 2, we remain closely aligned with the details of the global agreement, providing only for necessary adjustments to preserve compliance with EU law.

Second, the Directive will apply to all groups with a turnover of more than EUR 750 million. And here I appreciate that Parliament's report stresses the intended scope of the Directive. The Commission agrees with the general spirit of most of the amendments proposed by Parliament, and we, of course, share the sense of political urgency to have a swift adoption and implementation of the Directive.

We have already travelled a long way and expectations are very high. So the ball is now in the court of the Council. I would like to underline that while we fully share the view that there is a need to advance as fast as possible on the finalisation of the Pillar 1 rules, creating a conditionality between the pillars would be legally questionable in the light of case law of the EU Court of Justice.

Let me finish by strongly encouraging the last opposing Member State to reconsider its position and agree to the latest compromise.

Lídia Pereira (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, os impostos são a mais importante fonte de receita pública e uma manifestação do poder soberano dos Estados. São os impostos que financiam os nossos orçamentos e é a carga fiscal que determina melhores ou piores condições para as empresas criarem empregos, gerarem riqueza e contribuírem para o nosso crescimento económico.

A competitividade fiscal é, portanto, uma dimensão incontornável de qualquer estratégia económica. Mas essa competitividade tem de ser justa, equilibrada e, claro, transparente.

O acordo internacional para a tributação das multinacionais, em concreto este Segundo Pilar sobre a taxa mínima efetiva, foi um passo importante. A União liderou nas negociações e vai liderar na aplicação do acordo.

O tempo da discussão tem de se transformar no tempo da ação. O compromisso dos Estados-Membros é essencial para garantir que esta diretiva é aprovada, é bem transposta e é aplicada de forma a salvaguardar a competitividade das nossas economias e a nossa capacidade de atração de investimento.

Infelizmente, a União não está a ser acompanhada, lá fora, pelo compromisso de outros países e, cá dentro, falta ainda decidir sobre o Primeiro Pilar, as regras que lhe garantem a tributação dos lucros gerados no nosso território.

Temos, pois, muito trabalho pela frente e precisamos de maior empenho. E este Parlamento não deixará de exigir isto mesmo.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, en primer lugar, quería agradecer muy especialmente al equipo negociador de la Resolución que votamos mañana, y muy especialmente a la ponente principal, Aurore Lalucq, haber logrado un consenso muy amplio en esta institución para respaldar la propuesta de la Comisión Europea y, sin duda, aumentar la presión sobre algún país en el Consejo que parece que está bloqueando la decisión final de los Estados miembros.

Esta propuesta viene, en mi opinión, a confirmar una reorientación de las políticas globales, del debate global, del pensamiento dominante, de las últimas décadas, que durante todos estos años ha insistido en reducir los impuestos, en atraer inversión mediante la dilución, la fragmentación, del poder de los Estados, de las administraciones públicas, para fijar impuestos y redistribuir la renta: esta propuesta viene a romper ese pensamiento dominante y necesita de un consenso amplio, de un apoyo unánime, como el que vamos a ver mañana de este Parlamento.

Necesitamos también que el Gobierno de Polonia deje de bloquear la adopción de esta Directiva en el Consejo. Aun siendo necesaria la propuesta adicional para implementar el otro pilar de ese acuerdo en la OCDE, ello no puede ser óbice para aprobar ya en el Consejo esta Directiva, y confío en que el apoyo de este Parlamento sirva para respaldar a la Comisión y acabar de convencer a Polonia.

Engin Eroglu (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ja, was wir hier diskutieren, ist wirklich allernötigste Zeit. Wir hätten es schon viel früher machen müssen. Die Wirtschaft hat sich verändert, Konzerne verändern sich. So muss sich auch die Politik verändern. Das ist nun mal Zeit der Dinge.

Wir diskutieren heute die Mindestbesteuerung von internationalen Konzernen mit 15 Prozent. Und es gibt in meinem Heimatland Deutschland kaum einen Wähler, der das nicht auch möchte. Nun ist es ja so, dass wir Freien Wähler und ich keine Freunde von Steuern sind und dass ich eher der Meinung bin, dass der Staat seine Steuern sparsamer halten sollte. Aber das, was wir hier machen, ist wirklich sehr wichtig, und ich bin sehr froh, dass wir hier über Parteigrenzen hinweg, über Nationen hinweg eine große Einigkeit bekommen.

Ich hoffe, dass auch im Rat jeder versteht, wie wichtig es ist, hier diese Mindestbesteuerung von 15 Prozent einzuführen. Denn diese Konzerne – das wissen wir alle – nutzen unser System in der Europäischen Union, das verursacht Kosten, Investitionen, die der Staat erbringen muss, und letztendlich müssen sich auch alle an diesen Kosten beteiligen.

Wir dürfen es nicht zulassen, dass es Länder auf der Welt gibt, die unser System aushöhlen und es uns dann durch Steuervermeidung hier im System schwieriger machen. Wenn wir jetzt diesen großen Schritt mit 15 Prozent machen – und den finde ich wirklich gut –, sei mir noch eine Bitte an die Bundesregierung in Deutschland erlaubt: Es wäre schön, wenn wir die Steuern in Deutschland für den Mittelstand auch in Richtung 15 Prozent bewegen könnten, damit wir sozusagen dort auch wettbewerbsfähig sind.

Ernest Urtausun (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Commissioner, I would like to start by thanking the rapporteur Aurore Lalucq for an excellent report. Tomorrow, the Parliament will speak. Clearly, we want the minimum level of taxation for multinational groups to be swiftly adopted.

I have to say that my group is really puzzled by what is going on in the Council at the moment. That we are not able to agree on that proposal, which is basically what the Commission presented, a copy-paste of the international deal – and it's not something that is really revolutionary, it's an important first step, but it's only a copy-paste of the international deal – is simply unacceptable. We need to tell Poland very clearly that they need to unblock it and they need to do it now.

And if that is not the case, colleagues, the risk really is that if the EU does not apply this deal, the US may not do it either and maybe the whole deal may fall. So, I think we cannot afford to do that. So, all the pressure needs to go to Poland, I hope that next week we will have good news. But otherwise, if that is not the case, we will have no other option than to explore other legal ways, like Article 116, or maybe enhanced cooperation. But we cannot fail this time.

Antonio Maria Rinaldi (ID). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, da italiano e da contribuente non posso che condividere la direttiva che finalmente introduce una imposizione fiscale minima per le multinazionali e, pertanto, va considerato solo come un punto di partenza e non di arrivo.

Difatti il 15 % è una soglia ancora troppo bassa rispetto alla tassazione che viene applicata alle aziende residenti nell'Unione e che non compensa minimamente l'enorme vantaggio competitivo acquisito e consolidato dalle multinazionali.

Vero è che, grazie a questa direttiva, diminuirà il rischio dei fenomeni elusivi messi in essere dai grandi gruppi internazionali, che per troppi anni non hanno contribuito alle entrate dello Stato in cui esercitavano le loro attività poiché non regolamentate.

Applicare una soglia minima del 15 % significa di fatto applicare una tassazione «flat tax» e i cittadini e le imprese residenti nell'Unione non comprenderebbero questa palese e discriminatoria diversità di trattamento.

Ad esempio, in Italia, il mio partito la Lega propone da molto tempo la stessa *flat tax* al 15 % per tutti i redditi, trovando enormi ostacoli anche dalle istituzioni europee, adducendo la non progressività.

Essendo, come tutti voi, eletto dai cittadini e non dalle multinazionali, vorrei che si rivedesse al rialzo la soglia minima del 15%, o, meglio ancora, che si riducessero le aliquote alle piccole e medie imprese.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, wij zijn voor rechtvaardige belastingheffing en zoveel mogelijk een gelijk speelveld. Tegelijkertijd zijn wij ook voorstander van een interne markt met voldoende concurrentie. Dat betekent ook belastingconcurrentie.

Op een moment dat onze burgers keihard worden getroffen door stijgende prijzen, zijn bijkomende lasten voor bedrijven niet het juiste antwoord, want wie gaat extra bedrijfsbelastingen betalen? Werknemers, zoals bleek uit onderzoek van het IMF, consumenten en aandeelhouders. Bijkomende kosten zijn ook extra bureaucratische regels, waar we in de EU helaas al wereldkampioen in zijn. Deze richtlijn leidt ertoe dat grote bedrijven extra advocaten, juristen, accountants en consultancykantoren moeten betalen. Ook overheden zullen een nieuw leger aan bureaucraten moeten aannemen.

Het water loopt altijd naar de zee. Het is een wereldvreemd idee dat landen die nu hun bedrijven al belastingvoordelen toekennen geen andere manier zullen vinden om voordelen toe te kennen aan multinationals. Dit voorstel zal vooral veel ongewenste neveneffecten hebben. Laten we het heroverwegen.

Manon Aubry (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, Macron et la Présidence française nous avaient dit que l'évasion fiscale, promis, c'est fini. Leur absence dans le débat aujourd'hui est certainement le symbole de leur désertion de leur lutte contre l'évasion fiscale. Car ils nous avaient dit que les multinationales allaient enfin payer leurs impôts grâce à ce fameux taux minimum de 15 %. Sauf que ce taux, il est à peine plus élevé que celui du paradis fiscal qu'est l'Irlande, il est trois fois plus bas que celui de la France dans les années 80 et loin des 25 % que nous proposons avec les ONG. Sauf qu'énormément d'entreprises sont exclues du champ. Sauf que certaines activités et certains pays ne seront pas concernés. Bref, ça fait beaucoup de «sauf». Et pour les McKinsey et autres pilleurs fiscaux, on est un peu passé de l'open bar à l'happy hour. Certes, la taille des coupes de champagne a un peu diminué, mais il reste encore beaucoup de chemin à faire.

Bien sûr, nous gagnons une bataille culturelle; je me souviens de l'époque, il y a quelques années, quand je travaillais à Oxfam, où nous étions encore bien loin de ce chemin. Mais, je le dis, chers collègues, passons à la vitesse supérieure et imposons un véritable impôt universel sur les entreprises pour qu'il n'y ait plus de «sauf» et que toutes les entreprises payent enfin leur juste part d'impôts.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Siker, hogy tavaly októberben 137 ország meg tudott egyezni a globális minimumadóról az új híd égisze alatt. Igen ám, de a munka a nemzetközi szintéren nem az elvárható ütemben halad, s az ígéretek betartása is kétségessé vált. Az eredetileg a techóriások megadóztatását célzó, bár mára átalakult első pillér körüli igyekezet teljesen elszállt, így fennáll a veszélye, hogy pont ők fogják megúszni az adófizetést.

Ami viszont bombabiztosan megy előre a Bizottság jóvoltából, az az uniós cégek adóztatásának egységesítése. Az erről szóló irányelv elfogadásával veszélyeztetjük az Unió versenyképességét. Közös érdekünk, hogy ne csak a globális minimumadóról legyen megállapodás, hanem a másik pillérről is. Ha például az USA egy negatív szavazással a szenátusban, vagy Kína nem követi az uniós szabályozást, tovább növeljük azt a szakadékot, amely már most elválaszt minket versenytársainktól. Tényleg lábön szeretnénk lőni magunkat, amikor a háború, az energiaválság és az infláció már amúgy is nehéz helyzetbe hozza a cégeinket? Azt javaslom, ne rohanjunk előre. Az iránytűnk az európai vállalatok és polgárok érdeke legyen, és ne tetszelegjünk az adózás bajnokaiként.

Isabel Benjumea Benjumea (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, el debate de hoy es un debate para ratificar una decisión que han tomado los principales Estados dentro del marco de la OCDE para decidir que haya un tipo mínimo fiscal. Podemos discutir sobre si este tipo mínimo fiscal debería ser más alto o más bajo, pero, verdaderamente, lo que tenemos que hacer es ratificar una decisión que se ha tomado, que es lo que la Comisión está haciendo al poner encima de la mesa esa ratificación.

Ahora bien, lo que a mí me preocupa enormemente es que se aproveche este debate —como se hace siempre en este Parlamento cada vez que hay un debate sobre fiscalidad, como es este debate, que es un debate muy importante— para hablar de más intervencionismo, más burocracia y más costes para las empresas europeas.

Vivimos un momento terrible, un momento en el que arrastramos todavía las consecuencias de la crisis financiera del año 2018, en el que, además, hemos vivido y estamos viendo las consecuencias sociales y económicas de la COVID-19, en el que estamos viviendo las durísimas consecuencias económicas de la invasión ilegal de Rusia en Ucrania. Y, sin lugar a dudas, es el momento para hablar de que tenemos que conseguir que Europa sea más competitiva, que Europa cree más puestos de trabajo, y eso también implica hablar de bajadas de impuestos.

No podemos aprovechar —como ocurre en este Parlamento— cualquier oportunidad para constantemente hablar de la necesidad de subir impuestos. Hay que bajar impuestos. Está probado que eso hace que las empresas tengan más facilidad para crear puestos de trabajo, más facilidad para crecer y crear ese progreso necesario y, por último, más capacidad de recaudación y pagar los tan necesarios gastos sociales.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner, after years of hard work and an international agreement, a minimum tax is right before our eyes, but we cannot grasp it yet.

Because just when solidarity is key, the Polish Government blocks us, blocks us from earning EUR 60 billion extra each and every year. Because Morawiecki doesn't care about Europe; he doesn't care about ending tax avoidance by multinationals; he doesn't even care about his citizens who will gain EUR 2 billion each year from a minimum tax. He only cares about his competences and his power, and he uses his veto in a desperate attempt to get free rein from Brussels – exchanging his 'yes' for a minimum tax for us turning a blind eye while he dismisses judges that don't follow his course and his will.

This is not how the EU works. We don't bargain with our values. Morawiecki, your citizens want a minimum tax; your most important allies, including the US, want a minimum tax; and this Parliament wants a minimum tax.

Thank you, Aurore Lalucq, for a great and excellent report. Let's get on with the job.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επιτροπε, έχουμε έναν διεθνή συμβιβασμό για την εξασφάλιση μιας βασικής ελάχιστης φορολογίας των πολυεθνικών που είναι στη σωστή κατεύθυνση. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο έχουν αναλάβει τις υποχρεώσεις τους· σειρά του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου είναι να ξεπεράσει τις όποιες αναστολές και τα παζάρια και να κινηθεί προς τη σωστή κατεύθυνση. Πρέπει να το κάνει για να στείλει το σωστό μήνυμα.

Η μεγάλη άνοδος του πληθωρισμού που παρατηρείται έχει οδηγήσει τις περισσότερες χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα η Ελλάδα, σε θεαματική άνοδο των καταναλωτικών φόρων, που είναι ιδιαίτερα σκληρή για τα χαμηλά εισοδήματα. Με τη δυναμική που έχει αναπτυχθεί, η φορολογία γίνεται πιο άνηση και άδικη με κίνδυνο να υπάρξουν κοινωνικές συνέπειες. Πρέπει, λοιπόν, να γίνει δικαιότερη και αποτελεσματικότερη η φορολογική επιβάρυνση των ισχυρών της οικονομίας. Με την έκθεση της κυρίας Lalucq πηγαίνουμε προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση, όχι γρήγορα, αλλά ελπίζω σταθερά.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, commissaris, dat we binnen de OESO afspraken hebben gemaakt over een wereldwijd minimumtarief aan belastingheffing voor multinationals is een goede zaak. Hiermee kan immers belastingontwijking worden tegengegaan, en dat is ook voor ons een belangrijk punt.

Waar ik mij wel zorgen over maak, is de royale toekenning van gedelegeerde bevoegdheden aan de Commissie in het verslag zoals dat nu voorligt. Op die manier geven we de Commissie wel heel veel ruimte op het vlak van belastingen en een wel heel ruim mandaat, en ondermijnen we de positie van de lidstaten, terwijl belastingheffing toch echt een bevoegdheid is en moet blijven van de lidstaten.

Ook betreur ik het dat er geen effectbeoordeling is gedaan. Op deze manier is namelijk niet inzichtelijk hoe het voorstel in de praktijk uitwerkt. Het is van belang dat we zo dicht mogelijk blijven bij de wereldwijde afspraken om zo echt een gelijk speelveld te creëren. Alleen dan kunnen we belastingontwijking echt tegengaan.

Chris MacManus (The Left). – Madam President, I want to thank Ms Lalucq. Today is a necessary legal step for the implementation of what was agreed at the OECD, and that agreement should be implemented. It's an agreement among sovereign countries to make sure hugely wealthy and profitable multinationals begin paying a fair share, or at the very least a share. That is long overdue.

All countries which signed up should implement the deal as soon as possible. My party is wary of the EU overstepping on tax policy, which is precisely why we've always argued for a global deal to tackle this issue. The OECD is not representative of the developing world yet it is a step forward.

The Irish model, which sees a huge amount of revenue coming from a tiny number of companies, is fraught with risks and now is the time to invest in a more balanced economy whilst protecting foreign direct investment and the jobs created.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, el acuerdo de la OCDE permite instaurar este impuesto de sociedades mínimo global; es una buena noticia, sin duda, pero fijar el impuesto mínimo en un 15 % de los beneficios creemos que no es suficiente, especialmente en un momento en que hay grandes empresas, como las energéticas, que han tenido beneficios extraordinarios de más de 200 000 millones de euros por el encarecimiento del gas y del petróleo. Es por ello que no podemos aplaudir la propuesta que ha hecho la Comisión para trasponer el acuerdo en la Unión Europea: porque no aumenta el porcentaje del 15 % y, sobre todo, porque tiene muchas, demasiadas, excepciones en su aplicación.

Necesitamos una recaudación tributaria que permita a la Unión implementar políticas sociales suficientes contra las consecuencias de la pandemia, la guerra en Ucrania, la crisis climática, etc. Por tanto, debemos ir más allá no solo en la aplicación del acuerdo de la OCDE, sino también en la construcción de una cooperación tributaria internacional fuerte, permanente, mucho más ambiciosa que la actual, que nos lleve, por ejemplo, a adoptar una tasa sobre las transacciones financieras internacionales: es prioritario. La armonización fiscal a escala mundial debe ser solo la otra cara de la moneda de una armonización fiscal mucho más profunda en el interior de la Unión.

Salvatore De Meo (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, per molto tempo abbiamo assistito a forme di concorrenza fiscale sleale, soprattutto dai gruppi multinazionali e, finalmente, dopo l'intesa tra la maggioranza dei paesi dell'OCSE, l'Europa si avvia con questo passo a recepire un accordo importante per contrastare l'elusione e l'evasione, prevedendo una tassazione minima del 15 %.

Certo, il cammino si prefigura lungo e tortuoso, visto che nell'ultima riunione dei ministri europei dell'Economia non è stata raggiunta l'intesa, evidenziando anche in questo caso la necessità di rivedere alcune regole di funzionamento, prime fra tutte quelle dell'unanimità.

Questa riforma si propone di affrontare le sfide fiscali nate dalla digitalizzazione dell'economia, frenando la corsa di alcune nazioni a creare paradisi fiscali che permettono alle imprese multinazionali di spostare le loro sedi sulla base della convenienza fiscale più favorevole.

Con la tassazione minima dei grandi gruppi, soprattutto quelli extra UE e quelli del mondo digitale, le imposte saranno versate nel paese in cui sono localizzati i beni e le attività che generano reddito. Accolgo con favore questa proposta e auspico che essa costituisca un primo passo verso la costituzione di un regime unico di tassazione all'interno dell'Unione europea e che, soprattutto, in fase di revisione dopo i primi cinque anni, diventi anche più ambizioso per reperire le risorse necessarie per programmi di finanziamento simile al *Next Generation*, necessari ad affrontare le tante sfide.

La strada intrapresa è quella giusta, ma c'è molto ancora da fare, soprattutto all'interno dell'Unione per un'armonizzazione fiscale e una riduzione delle tasse a favore delle piccole e medie imprese.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Madam President, there is one message to the Commissioner: when you go out of this plenary room, take this Parliament seriously. This agreement can be really historic. We are representing the citizens of Europe, and this can be a really great moment.

Denn was muss denn noch alles passieren, damit endlich wirklich diese riesengroße Vermögensungleichheit weltweit auch echt angegangen und geändert wird?

Ein Krieg vor der Haustür, die Lebensmittelpreise gehen in die Höhe, die Energiepreise explodieren, Wohnungspreise sind viel zu hoch. An einer weltweiten, faireren Besteuerung von Unternehmensgewinnen führt kein Weg vorbei. Multinationale Konzerne haben überproportional von den Corona-Hilfspaketen profitiert, auch der Onlinehandel, die Streaming-Plattformen wurden überdurchschnittlich genutzt.

Durch die Einführung dieser globalen Mindeststeuer für Konzerne kann eine echte Umverteilung von Konzernen auf Arbeitnehmer, Arbeitnehmerinnen stattfinden und können Steueroasen trockengelegt werden.

Martin Hlaváček (Renew). – Paní předsedající, paní komisařko, nadnárodní společnosti budou spravedlivě zdaněny pouze tehdy, když budou nová pravidla platit celosvětově. Je zásadní, aby druhý pilíř kopíroval také podstatné změny, které byly dohodnuty v OECD, a aby bylo jen několik odchylek, které přizpůsobují fungování směrnice vnitřnímu trhu. Stejná pravidla by do budoucna měla zajistit i to, že nebude dán prostor pro jejich obcházení a zároveň nebudou naše evropské podniky znevýhodněny.

Stejně důležité je, aby se k dohodě připojilo co nejvíce jurisdikcí. Zejména ty, kde sídlí velké nadnárodní digitální společnosti. Jinak dohodnutá pravidla budou postrádat smysl. A prosím, nezapomínejme také na první pilíř, tedy realokaci práv ke zdanění. Měl by být implementován současně, aby bylo úspěšně završeno to, o co tady usilujeme. Jenom, prosím, paní komisařko, ta navržená transpoziční lhůta není příliš realistická, nevystavujme členské státy tomuto tlaku.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, svijet je sve dalje od ekonomske ravnoteže i pravičnosti. S jedne strane korporacije predvođene investicijskim fondovima poput Avantgarda, BlackRocka, State Streeta i drugih, a s druge strane iz godine u godinu iz krize u krizu sve zaduženije države, zadužene kod banaka kojima su vlasnici opet ovi fondovi.

Vidimo posljednjih godina veliku alokaciju kapitala koja se slijeva prema vrhu. Korporacije se uspinju na planinu kapitala, a države na planinu duga. Uz pomoć algoritama i umjetne inteligencije te potpomognuti enormnim štampanjem novca fondovi su se pretvorili u čudovišta te su čak počeli kupovati i privatne obiteljske kuće. Ako se ovi trendovi nastave, za nekoliko desetljeća više neće imati što kupiti.

Ugrožena je i sama demokracija. Ova Direktiva o osiguranju globalne minimalne razine oporezivanja za multinacionalne skupine slabašna je pokušaj uspostavljanja ove ravnoteže. Ja sam prvi za oporezivanje velikih. Oni moraju vratiti dio onoga što dobiju jer sustav funkcionira na temelju suradnje. Facebook bez vašeg skrolanja nema vrijednosti. Vrijeme je promjena i dividende zaslužuju svi kooperanti u ovom sustavu, a ne samo ekipa iz BlackRocka i njima slični.

Niels Fuglsang (S&D). – Fru formand! I dag siger vi i Europa-Parlamentet ja til at indføre en fælleseuropæisk minimumsselskabsskat på 15%. Vi siger ja til at stoppe ræset mod bunden og den ekstreme skattespekulation, der foregår under dække af bare at være fri konkurrence. Vi har diskuteret det før, men nu er det alvor takket være Aurore Lalucqs betænkning, som vi kommer til at stemme ja til.

EU-Kommissionen er med os. 137 lande er med os. Det er historisk, og derfor vil jeg gerne bede de sidste lande, der stadig tøver, om at bakke op. Det er Polen, vi taler om her, og jeg vil sige: Kære Polen, sidste år skrev vi under på, at det var nødvendigt at indføre en minimumsselskabsskat. Synes I ikke, det er på tide at leve op til den hensigt nu? Jo længere vi trækker tiden, jo mere koster det os. Den aggressive skattejonglering koster os årligt mellem 1200 og 1400 milliarder kroner. Det er penge, vi kunne bruge på grøn omstilling og genopretning. Så, kære Polen, vær sød at lade være med at blokere. Lad os komme i gang med at få vedtaget den minimumsskat nu.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, podporuji tuto dohodu. Děkuji paní komisařce za práci na této dohodě. Myslím si, že v oblasti daní jsme vždycky byli i v mé politické skupině opatrní, obezřetní, ale tohoto kompromisu si ceníme. Musíme se vyvarovat toho, aby odcházel únik právě činností a toho zdanění mimo evropský prostor. A myslím, že tato dohoda i tím, že má celosvětový odraz, tak je cestou správným směrem. Také se musíme vyvarovat minulých excesů, *LuxLeaks*, které vlastně ukazovaly na daňový dumping. Musí existovat daňová soutěž, jsem pro ni, ale musíme se také vyvarovat toho nekalého jednání ze strany některých států. Učinit tedy všechno pro minimalizaci daňových úniků a zachovat snahu o spravedlivé zdanění – to, myslím, že po mnoha letech řečí je velmi dobrý pokrok.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, cred că dezbaterile pe acest subiect duc într-un singur sens și anume că trebuie să ne grăbim să aplicăm acest nivel minim de impozitare pentru multinaționale, pentru că este un lucru așteptat nu numai de noi, de eurodeputații care am vorbit aici, este așteptat de cetățeni, este așteptat de microîntreprinderi, de întreprinderile mici și mijlocii.

Trebuie să ajungem la o etică fiscală în spațiul european, în spațiul Uniunii Europene și da, ca un fost întreprinzător în domeniul întreprinderilor mici și mijlocii, pot să vă spun că sunt presate de multinaționale, pentru că cei mai buni lucrători sunt luați de multinaționale, puterea de investiție, puterea de capitalizare. Și iată, în plus, merg acolo, în zonele în care impozitul este cel mai mic.

De aceea, cred că trebuie să faceți toate eforturile încât să putem să aplicăm cât mai repede. Este un prim pas, poate că ar fi trebuit o rată mai joasă, poate că ar fi trebuit un procent mai mare la impozitare, dar eu cred că nu trebuie să ne blocăm și trebuie să dăm drumul acum la acest sistem propus de dumneavoastră și votat de noi, cu siguranță, mâine.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, a proposta de diretiva sobre um nível mínimo de tributação para os grupos multinacionais, na sequência do acordo do G20, para instituir uma taxa global mínima de 15 % define, é certo, o que até hoje não existe.

Mas vejamos: 15 %. Um valor que evidencia falta de vontade de inverter a baixa tributação do grande capital e que configura um risco real que uma taxa mínima possa passar a ser tida como referência máxima de tributação. Fosse de 25 % e a receita fiscal dos Estados triplicaria.

Uma diretiva que arrisca excluir 85 % a 90 % dos grupos multinacionais, que consagra exceções e isenções, nomeadamente excluindo fundos de investimento e os chamados fundos abutres, responsáveis pela especulação no setor imobiliário, e que alguns podem pretender tomar como um passo no assalto a matéria no domínio da soberania nacional, como é a fiscalidade.

Bem se pode dizer que podemos estar perante uma taxa em que alguma coisa muda para que, no essencial, tudo fique na mesma.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, I really welcome the adoption of a minimum level of 15% of taxation for multinational groups. This has been a bone of contention for many years and indeed it wasn't always Member States' fault because there was competition to get investment. But now that we are putting a floor under it, it establishes a level playing field.

I am also very pleased that the European Union did not act unilaterally and waited for the OECD because the more countries that adopt the minimum level, the less opportunity there is for multinationals to play one off against the other.

The other point I would make is that many citizens probably are paying far greater than 15% tax in their take-home pay. But we look forward to the day, and particularly when we revise this in five years' time, of maybe increasing the minimum level to 20% and reducing the threshold from EUR 750 to 500 billion.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, a implementação na União Europeia do Acordo Global da OCDE é não só histórica como de uma enorme responsabilidade.

Histórica porque abre caminho a uma solução global e de maior justiça fiscal. Histórica porque é um passo importante para reduzirmos os 190 mil milhões de euros anuais que a União Europeia perde em evasão e planeamento fiscal agressivo. Uma verba que daria para financiarmos o *NextGenerationEU* cada quatro anos.

Mas é também uma responsabilidade para continuarmos a dotar a União Europeia de novos recursos próprios, essenciais para financiarmos os investimentos comuns necessários para enfrentar os desafios.

Sem a criação de novos recursos próprios, o financiamento e reembolso da dívida de instrumentos como o *Next GenerationEU* ou outros necessários, no presente ou no futuro, decorrentes, por exemplo, da guerra na Ucrânia, poderão provocar pressões enormes sobre os orçamentos europeus e levar a um aumento insustentável das contribuições nacionais ou de cortes nas políticas europeias.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, our Irish Commissioner, Mairead McGuinness, will be well aware of the fact that the corporate tax rate in Ireland has been 12.5% for a good while. But sadly, some companies get away with paying 2% and some actually get away with paying less. So if it's increasing from 12.5% to 15%, will the likes of Google be paying 4.5% or will they be paying 15%? Because if we don't do away with the loopholes, then it makes a laughing stock of this legislation.

I'm amused to hear people talk about fair taxation for companies: 'oh, will it inhibit their potential to employ workers?' Listen: we're not talking about taxing their turnover, we're talking about taxing their profits. It's outrageous that they wouldn't be paying as much tax as your average worker, and workers are paying 25%, 30%, 35% and 40%. Why aren't companies who are making too much money not prepared to pay the same money as individuals do? That's beyond me!

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Mairead McGuinness, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for a very strong debate. The rapporteur can be very pleased, Ms Lalucq, with the support you are getting for your work.

I am very glad that the Commission and Parliament agree on the need to urgently adopt this file and there is a strong voice in support. So, our appreciation of that. So now it's for the Council, and for the last opposing Member State to agree to the compromise.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you again for the many valuable suggestions on how to improve the legal text of the Commission's proposal. We understand and agree with the spirit of most of Parliament's suggestions and amendments, and they provide valuable food for thought in the ongoing debate on the adoption of the directive in Council, where we are very close to reaching a general approach on the Presidency compromise.

Furthermore, your suggestions will be very useful in the discussions within the so-called implementation framework, which will have to conclude on a number of topics, including safe harbours and exchange of information, and that all EU Member States will then need to implement.

Some colleagues raised the issue about the 15% and I would repeat the point I made in my opening remarks that this is a rate endorsed by all Member States and by our partners at the international level. I really appreciate that Parliament in its majority support that particular rate.

You mentioned, Ms Regner, that this is historic and you are absolutely right. I'm very pleased to be here on behalf of my colleague, Paolo Gentiloni, in this historic moment, because there were times in the past that this was thought not to be possible. But we still have work to do and therefore we very much encourage Parliament to keep the pressure on, and we appreciate this debate, particularly the work of the rapporteur.

Aurore Lalucq, rapporteure. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je pense que les oreilles d'un État ont particulièrement sifflé ce soir. Pour résumer: on reproche souvent à l'Europe d'être lente, de ne rien faire dans le domaine fiscal et de ne pas faire grand-chose dans le domaine social. Mais là, nous avons une Commission européenne qui a réagi extrêmement rapidement – il y a de quoi en être fier – et qui a fait quelque chose de fort dans le domaine fiscal. C'est un accord historique, il faut le souligner, qui, in fine, aura forcément un effet dans le domaine social. Je rappelle quand même que, sur ce continent, les multinationales sont taxées en réalité à hauteur de 9 %, là où les PME le sont à plus de 20 %.

Mais nos efforts sont bloqués. Par quoi sont-ils bloqués? Par un gouvernement. Alors, on pourrait se dire que ce gouvernement n'a pas ratifié l'accord OCDE et que donc, forcément, il s'oppose à la directive. Non. On pourrait dire aussi que la proposition faite par la Commission européenne est tellement différente que, finalement, ce gouvernement s'y oppose. Non plus. On pourrait se dire qu'il y a des difficultés techniques. Les négociateurs ont pourtant été capables de trouver des solutions à tous les problèmes techniques, que ce soient ceux de l'Estonie, de Malte, de Chypre ou de l'Irlande. On pourrait se dire aussi que c'est parce que l'accord ne va pas rapporter d'argent. Pas de pot, là aussi, l'accord va rapporter énormément d'argent au gouvernement polonais.

En fait, si les négociateurs ne trouvent pas de solution, c'est parce que le gouvernement en question ne veut pas de solution, que le problème est ailleurs, qu'il exerce une sorte de chantage, on le sait, qu'il fait pression sur la Commission européenne sur des questions qui ne sont absolument pas liées à la question de la fiscalité. Ce gouvernement veut bloquer, il peut bloquer, donc il bloque. Quitte à mettre en danger cet accord pour nous, les Européens. Quitte à même poser des problèmes à notre partenaire américain.

C'est pourquoi j'espère que, demain, nous allons voter en faveur de cet accord de manière très claire. Et c'est pour ça aussi, à mon avis, qu'il va falloir réfléchir, vous le savez bien, à la question de l'unanimité. Car ce n'est plus possible de travailler dans ces conditions-là. C'est vraiment une prime à la capacité de nuisance en permanence. Ce comportement est en plus c'est particulièrement insidieux dans le sens où, par exemple, nous avons le pacte de stabilité et de croissance, nous avons des accords sur lesquels nous ne sommes pas forcément d'accord, mais ils sont clairs. Voilà, nous pouvons nous y opposer. Être d'accord ou pas d'accord. Mais ils sont clairs. Là, c'est insidieux, c'est insidieux parce que ça nous empêche d'avancer, ça nous empêche de progresser. Et les Européens ne sont pas forcément au courant de ce type de blocage.

Donc, voilà, nous en appelons à la Commission et nous lui mettrons la pression – je pense que c'est une pression qu'elle acceptera – pour sortir de cette unanimité qui nous fait tellement de mal.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 19. Mai 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Marc Botenga (The Left), par écrit. – Quand un accord a été trouvé sur un taux mondial minimum de 15% pour les multinationales, c'était indéniablement une avancée dans la lutte contre les paradis fiscaux et l'évitement fiscal des grandes sociétés. Rappelons-nous que l'Union européenne avait au G-7 défendu un taux d'à peine 12,5%. Quel scandale! L'Europe a vraiment agi en ambassadrice du grand capital. Même le gouvernement américain — pas vraiment un nid de gauchistes — avait proposé 21% comme taux mondial. Le résultat final est loin d'être parfait.

Ce taux de 15% reste loin en dessous du taux de l'impôt des sociétés pratiqué par de nombreux pays européens. Pourtant, depuis le tournant néolibéral des années quatre-vingt, ce taux a déjà été érodé par des politiques néolibérales à travers l'Europe. En Belgique, avant, le taux était de 48%. Pour les plus hauts bénéficiaires, il dépassait même les 50%.

Aujourd'hui, bien des pays européens, dont la Belgique, appliquent un taux d'à peine 25%. Mais cela reste bien plus que les 15% proposés. En outre, toutes les niches fiscales permettent aux multinationales à travers l'Europe de contourner, éviter ou carrément échapper à l'impôt. Il y a encore du boulot. Tax the Rich.

Andżelika Anna Moździanowska (ECR), na piśmie. – Uznając wagę i wartość międzynarodowego porozumienia wokół II filaru OECD, jestem przeciwna szybkiemu przyjęciu dyrektywy implementacyjnej w obecnym kształcie. Moje wątpliwości są następujące:

1. Warunkiem przyjęcia dyrektywy powinno być zakończenie międzynarodowych prac nad I filarem OECD. Unia Europejska nie powinna przystąpić do zmian podatkowych szybciej niż społeczność międzynarodowa, bez gwarancji, że największe międzynarodowe korporacje będą właściwie opodatkowane w ramach I filaru. Dlatego warunkiem skutecznego działania jest traktowanie filaru I i filaru II jako pakietu. Są na to przynajmniej dwie metody. Pierwsza polega na dodaniu do dyrektywy przepisów uzależniających jej wejście w życie od ratyfikacji konwencji międzynarodowej wdrażającej filar I przez wystarczającą liczbę państw (tzw. masa krytyczna). Metoda druga polega na osiągnięciu politycznego porozumienia, że UE nie będzie procedować przedmiotowej dyrektywy co najmniej do momentu wyjaśnienia pojęcia tzw. masy krytycznej w filarze I.

2. Mam poważne wątpliwości co do zaproponowanego przez Komisję zakresu stosowania reguły uwzględnienia dochodu (IIR). IIR powinno być stosowane do wszystkich podmiotów kwalifikowanych bez względu na państwo członkowskie rezydencji. To pozwoli przeciwdziałać dyskryminacji i umożliwi pełną realizację zasad swobody. Z kolei – zgodnie z duchem standardu OECD w zakresie GloBE – przedsiębiorstwa operujące tylko w jednym państwie członkowskim nie powinny być objęte IIR.

Sandra Pereira (The Left), *por escrito*. – Esta proposta de Diretiva sobre um nível mínimo de tributação para os grupos multinacionais define, é certo, o que até hoje não existe. Mas a fixação de uma taxa efetiva mínima de imposto de 15% é algo de muito limitativo, já que não inverte o caminho que tem vindo a ser prosseguido por todos os países da UE, uns mais intensamente do que outros, de baixa tributação dos grandes grupos económicos. Esta é uma opção claramente política e corre o risco de o suposto nível mínimo se transformar numa referência máxima de tributação. Além disso, considerar apenas os grupos multinacionais com um volume de negócios consolidado superior a 750 milhões de euros em, pelo menos, dois dos últimos quatro exercícios fiscais consecutivos é deixar de fora da Diretiva cerca de 90%-85% dos grupos multinacionais! Ao mesmo tempo, também exclui empresas-mãe que sejam fundos de pensões, fundos de investimento ou veículos de investimento imobiliário. Ou seja, os famosos fundos abutres ou aquelas empresas que têm altamente contribuído para a especulação no mercado imobiliário não estão abrangidas por esta Diretiva. No fundo, esta Diretiva não passa de um exercício de baralhar, dar de novo e ficar (quase) tudo na mesma e, descaradamente, ainda tenta interferir numa matéria soberana dos Estados-Membros como é a fiscalidade.

26. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Ausführungen von einer Minute zu wichtigen politischen Fragen (Artikel 172 GO).

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, dok je čitava Europska unija ujedinjena u osudi ruske invazije na Ukrajinu, Srbija, koja želi postati dijelom Europske unije, odbija nedvosmisleno osuditi ruska postupanja i uvesti im ekonomske sankcije.

Doduše, Srbiji rat nije stran. Upravo je odande 90-tih godina pokrenuta agresija na Republiku Hrvatsku koja je rezultirala tisućama pobijenih vojnika i civila te golemim materijalnim razaranja. Nažalost, i danas se iz Srbije pokušava destabilizirati susjedne zemlje poput Crne Gore kojoj se od strane prosrpskih krugova često negira i samo pravo na postojanje i vlastiti identitet.

Ironično je da danas službeni Beograd uvjerava zapadne sile u svoju predanost europskim vrijednostima, a provodi ovakvu politiku. Stoga je krajnji čas da Europska unija od Srbije zatraži da se odredi stoji li doista uz europske vrijednosti ili pripada istoku.

Jedno je, međutim, sigurno. Nikakva srpska hegemonija potpomognuta ruskim novcem i utjecajem ne može i neće proći.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, am ales să vorbesc astăzi despre dubla cetățenie în Uniunea Europeană versus dublul standard. Și de ce am ales acest lucru.

România are peste un milion de lucrători în Spania. Trăiesc acolo, au familii acolo, au copii. Și totuși, nu au acces la toate locurile de muncă – așa cum spunem noi, că în Uniunea Europeană, toți cetățenii europeni au acces – pentru că nu li se acordă dublă cetățenie, li se impune renunțarea la cetățenia română.

Ceea ce este curios însă, Spania are un acord bilateral cu Franța și francezilor li se acordă dublă cetățenie fără să li se impună renunțarea la cetățenie. Ce să explic eu cetățenilor din România? Am fost acolo, m-am întâlnit, contribuie cu munca lor la PIB-ul din Spania și nu am avut un răspuns coerent, pentru că nu mi l-a dat nimeni.

Am făcut o scrisoare și către Comisie, o întrebare scrisă, pentru că mi se pare că suntem din nou discriminați. Din nou nu funcționează unitatea, nu mai avem o Uniune Europeană, nu mai avem o piață unică, nu mai avem liberul acces la locuri de muncă, așa cum se spune în tratat.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, *(inceputul intervenției nu a fost făcut la microfon)* ... întotdeauna un pas mai departe. Inovația este cea care ne-a ajutat să ne îmbunătățim condițiile de viață, de muncă, chiar și aici, în Parlamentul European. Tot inovația este cea care ne poate ajuta să facem trecerea spre o economie verde și o industrie mai puțin poluatoare și spre digitalizare.

Și totuși, vedem că, în ultimii ani, marile idei care se nasc aici, în Uniunea Europeană, sunt puse în practică și comercializate de parteneri din alte țări. Globalizarea a adus o mai bună cooperare economică, iar ultimele crize la nivel mondial ne arată că trebuie să acordăm o importanță mai mare autonomiei și, evident, valorificării ideilor inovative chiar aici, la noi acasă.

Este important să susținem inovația, atât în directivele și regulamentele noastre, cât și în programele și în distribuția fondurilor europene. Trebuie să creăm o piață europeană a inovației și să ne asigurăm că valorificarea ideilor este posibilă și profitabilă în Uniunea Europeană. Este singurul mod de a ne asigura că economia europeană ocupă un loc important pe această piață.

Mounir Satouri (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Shireen Abu Akleh, la mort de cette célèbre journaliste américano-palestinienne a choqué le monde. Elle portait son casque et son gilet pare-balles de presse et a reçu une balle dans la tête. Tuer une journaliste est un crime contre la liberté d'expression qui ne peut rester impuni. Nous réclamons une enquête internationale menée sous l'égide de l'ONU qui puisse déterminer toute la chaîne de responsabilités.

Mais l'horreur ne s'est pas arrêtée à l'assassinat de Shireen. Un autre journaliste qui se trouvait à côté d'elle, Ali Samoudi, a lui aussi pris une balle. L'enquête doit aussi le concerner. Il y a eu les tirs, d'autres morts, des provocations indignes lors de l'enterrement et des arrestations parmi les participants aux funérailles. Mais jusqu'où iront les injustices? Jusqu'où ira l'horreur? Je nous demande d'avoir le courage de prendre les décisions pour réclamer des sanctions pour que ce crime ne reste pas impuni comme d'autres.

André Rougé (ID). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, plus de 90 % des Guadeloupéens et des Martiniquais sont contaminés par le chlordécone, ce qui confère aux Antilles le triste record du monde de nombre de cancers de la prostate. Il conviendrait de décontaminer les sols, les sous-sols, les cours d'eau, les rivages, mais également de mettre en place une aide à la reconversion des parcelles contaminées et de moderniser et de contrôler les sites de production d'eau potable.

En 2022, Guadeloupéens, Martiniquais et Mahorais n'ont toujours pas eu accès à l'eau courante. Les algues sargasses ravagent l'écosystème des Antilles françaises en Martinique et en Guadeloupe. Alors, en application de l'article 168 du traité FUE, qui prévoit un niveau élevé de protection de la santé humaine dans la définition et la mise en œuvre de toutes les politiques et actions de l'Union, quelles mesures la Commission pourrait-elle prendre pour mieux tenir compte de ces catastrophes sanitaires qui frappent les régions ultrapériphériques françaises?

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Paní předsedající, s dovolením bych se ještě jednou vrátil ke Konferenci o budoucnosti Evropy, jejíž výsledky na Den Evropy 9. května prezentovali čelní představitelé Evropské unie s velkou pompou. Chtěl bych naopak konstatovat, že konference ve svých záměrech a posláních zcela selhala. Stejně jako kdysi konvent se stala konference předem připraveným eurofederalistickým cvičením, kde pečlivě vybraní zástupci vytvořili dokonalou „Potěmkinovu vesnici“ s jediným cílem – další přesun pravomocí na evropskou úroveň a jejich centralizace v Bruselu. Naše parlamentní skupina ECR konferenci opustila ještě před jejím ukončením a budeme zásadními oponenty závěrů konference, ať už jde o vytváření celoevropských kandidátních listin, rozšiřování většinového hlasování v Radě anebo zákonodárné iniciativy pro Evropský parlament.

Marc Botenga (The Left). – Voorzitter, iedere keer dat het Europees Parlement vergadert, spreken wij over mensenrechten, stemmen we resoluties, vaak met sancties. Rusland natuurlijk, China, Wit-Rusland, en zo verder. Maar wat mij opvalt, is dat sinds ik Europees Parlementslid ben, we nog geen enkele resolutie gestemd hebben om Israël te veroordelen. Niet één keer een resolutie voor sancties tegen Israël. Zelfs nu, na de moord op die Palestijnse journaliste, de aanval op de begrafenis, het innemen van huizen van Palestijnen door Israëlische kolonisten, het opsluiten van kinderen: zelfs dan vraagt geen enkele traditionele fractie om sancties tegen Israël. Dat is hier taboe, Israël aanpakken.

Dat maakt natuurlijk dat de Europese Unie geloofwaardigheid verliest in de strijd rond mensenrechten. Dat is totaal ongeloofwaardig, want dan zeggen we dat als een land niet doet wat wij willen, dan gaan we klagen over mensenrechten, over democratie. Maar als een land wél doet wat wij willen, als een land ons blindelings volgt en onze geopolitieke belangen dient, dan zwijgen we en dan mag dat land zich alles permitteren. Dat is niet mensenrechten verdedigen, dat is mensenrechten misbruiken voor onze eigen geopolitieke agenda. En dat is onaanvaardbaar.

Tatjana Ždanoka (NI). – Madam President, sadly, a great propaganda campaign was launched in my country, Latvia, to advocate for the demolition of memorial sites and beautiful places of soldiers of the World War II, accompanied by numerous acts of vandalism.

Last Friday, the Riga City Council decided to demolish the biggest memorial monument to the liberators of Riga and Latvia from Nazi occupation. The protest action against this decision was forbidden, and two organisers and myself were detained by the police.

The Latvian authorities, in their decisions, hide behind the events in Ukraine, while in Kyiv itself, on the day of 9 May, an official ceremony was held at the Eternal Flame in memory of those killed during World War II. In Riga thousands of residents brought flowers to our monument on 9 May, but the city authorities defiantly destroyed the flower carpet by tractor on the same night. It is unacceptable.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, as a rapporteur for the energy performance of buildings, I am concerned that we may not reach our targets due to funding issues.

Some 72% of renovations at the moment are self-funded, yet only 18% of consumers are taking loans to renovate their homes, as they are too expensive. So there is a funding gap of EUR 214 billion a year for green financing for residential buildings. These numbers do not seem to add up to the successful harnessing of the renovation wave.

The Commission has already asked the European Banking Authority to develop standards for green loans and green mortgages. The Energy Performance of Buildings Directive, under Article 15, increases the toolbox for Member States in relation to financial incentives and market barriers, including energy-efficiency loans and mortgages for building renovations. Both would greatly facilitate future efforts by the ECB in this direction.

I am calling on the ECB to provide additional incentives for banks to set energy efficiency as a criterion for low interest rates and green mortgages for households so that we can bridge the gap, reduce emissions, make houses more comfortable and healthy, and decrease electricity bills.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, as regiões ultraperiféricas enfrentam limitações permanentes ao seu desenvolvimento, tal como reconhecido no artigo 349.º do Tratado de Funcionamento da União Europeia.

Saúdo, assim, a estratégia renovada para as regiões ultraperiféricas, apresentada pela Comissão Europeia no passado 3 de maio. Uma estratégia que coloca as pessoas em primeiro lugar e que contempla os desafios específicos enfrentados por estas regiões, como a Madeira e os Açores, em Portugal, como as taxas de emprego abaixo da média da União Europeia, especialmente entre os jovens, o alto nível de pessoas em risco de pobreza e o declínio populacional.

Apelo, assim, aos meus colegas para a necessidade de ações imediatas para as regiões ultraperiféricas que promovam uma efetiva coesão social e territorial, através da conectividade aérea e marítima, do emprego e do acesso à formação, e de derrogações na transição ambiental, que permitam às regiões ultraperiféricas a sua plena adaptação.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, the stigma around breaking the law has been significantly eroded by the UK Government. It's not just the personal behaviour of the Prime Minister himself or his very loose grasp of the truth, and it's not just the breach of so many constitutional norms – like the prorogation of parliament and the multiple events being dragged through court – it is, of course, the way that they have tried to disapply the very agreement that they negotiated, signed and ratified: through triggering Article 16, through threatening to do that, through unilateral extensions of the grace periods and, of course, the Internal Market Bill.

So how long can we continue to make concessions? How long can we continue to make concessions that are trousered by the UK Government, and then they come back for more?

But we still have to focus on solutions. I believe the US has a key role to play here. It's always been an honest broker in Northern Ireland and it has something that the UK wants, which is a trade deal. So it needs to provide a pathway to the UK to a trade deal that is contingent on implementing the Withdrawal Agreement and the Protocol.

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, the fatal shooting of journalist Shireen Abu Aqla in Jenin in the West Bank just one week ago is deeply shocking, as were the horrifying scenes of brutality at her funeral. Shireen was shot and her producer and colleague also injured in the course of their work as journalists and while clearly identifiable as press. The critical work of journalists, particularly in places of conflict, underpins human rights and democracy and must be protected.

Only two weeks ago, we marked World Press Freedom Day, which pays tribute to all journalists who have risked or lost their lives in the course of their work. That day also serves as a reminder that accurate information is of vital public good. It is incumbent on us all to ensure that courageous and independent journalists continue to expose injustices without fear or threat of grave violence.

I join the calls from a growing number of organisations for an immediate, independent and transparent investigation into Shireen Abu Aqla's death. Those responsible must be held accountable.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Am Europatag, dem 9. Mai, veröffentlichten 13 Mitgliedstaaten eine gemeinsame Erklärung, in der sie die Kernforderung der Konferenz zur Zukunft Europas ablehnen, das heißt die Forderung nach Vertragsänderungen zur Verwirklichung eines EU-Bundesstaates, der die Souveränität der Mitgliedstaaten auslöschen würde.

Die Zukunftskonferenz fordert faktisch eine EU-Verfassung. 2005 wurde diese Idee nach dem Konvent zur Zukunft Europas bereits in Referenden durch Mehrheiten in Frankreich und den Niederlanden verworfen. Jetzt sprechen sich 13 Mitgliedstaaten dagegen aus. Und da Ungarn eine EU-Verfassung noch entschiedener ablehnt und so die Erklärung nicht zeichnete, haben wir eine Mehrheit, und zwar dagegen.

Wann endlich nimmt die EU das Wort „nein“ in ihr Vokabular auf, das „Nein“ unserer Völker zu immer mehr EU? Das eigene Land auslöschen will nur die deutsche Bundesregierung. Mein Rat daher: Wenn eine deutsche Bundesregierung etwas will, seien sie intuitiv besser dagegen.

José Gusmão (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, a execução pelo Estado de Israel de Shireen Abu Akleh seria, em qualquer outro contexto, um escândalo mundial, até porque foi seguida de mais ataques já depois de a jornalista estar morta. Primeiro, ao seu funeral por ostentar a bandeira do seu país e, depois, com uma campanha de calúnias na imprensa israelita.

No entanto, a autópsia de Shireen revelou também a hipocrisia das Instituições Europeias e o seu silêncio ensurdecedor sobre uma matéria que, em qualquer outro contexto, teria merecido uma condenação veemente e unânime.

É preciso dizer que quem condena umas ocupações e não outras, protege umas vidas e não outras, não defende a paz. Defende um lado, custe esse apoio as vidas que custar. Mas a paz defendia Shireen até ao dia em que foi assassinada. Não a voltaremos a ver, a não ser nos rostos dos que não deixaram de resistir e denunciar uma ocupação criminosa. Mesmo sem o apoio e a solidariedade das Instituições Europeias que tanto pregam os valores dos Direitos Humanos e tão pouco os praticam.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, op 9 mei werd de Conferentie over de toekomst van Europa afgesloten met een heus slotevent in Straatsburg. Kosten noch moeite werden gespaard, kinderen dansten door het Parlement. De voorzitters waren dik tevreden, net als de zorgvuldig uitgekozen burgers. We kregen ronkende speeches van president Macron en natuurlijk Guy Verhofstadt, die hun Europese federalistische dromen uitspraken. Tot zover niets nieuws onder de zon.

Wie mij echter verbaasde, was Commissievoorzitter Ursula von der Leyen, die persoon die verantwoordelijk is om de Verdragen uit te voeren. Zij liet de volgende uitspraak noteren:

Yes, change the Treaties if need be.

De Europese Commissie heeft als taak de Verdragen te bewaken. Het is niet haar taak om zich te begeven op het gladde politieke ijs om haar eigen macht te vergroten. Mevrouw Von der Leyen mag dan wel graag met grote woorden spreken, maar politieke uitspraken over Verdragswijzigingen behoren niet tot haar takenpakket en zijn niet gepast. Wij als Europees Parlement hebben de taak om de Commissie en haar te controleren. Laten wij haar hierop wijzen.

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, τα εργατικά λαϊκά νοικοκυριά βιώνουν αβάσταχτες ανατιμήσεις και στερήσεις σε ρεύμα, καύσιμα και είδη λαϊκής κατανάλωσης, με κίνδυνο επισιτιστικής κρίσης. Ζουν τα αποτελέσματα της στρατηγικής της πράσινης μετάβασης, της ιμπεριαλιστικής σύγκρουσης στην Ουκρανία και των αλληπάλληλων ανταγωνισμών και κυρώσεων. Με επιδοτήσεις και δάνεια για κοινές παραγγελίες, θα ξαναπληρώσει ο λαός την κερδοφορία των ενεργειακών ομίλων.

Οι συστάσεις της Επιτροπής και οι κυβερνήσεις ρίχνουν την ατομική ευθύνη στον λαό, χρεώνοντάς τον έως και για σπατάλες στο ρεύμα. Επιβάλλουν τα καλά και συμφέροντα των ευρωενωσιακών μονοπωλίων της ενέργειας που κάνουν μπίζνες με τη Ρωσία. Ταυτόχρονα, μειοδοούν την προμήθεια του πανάκριβου αμερικανικού LNG, με τους Έλληνες εφοπλιστές να θησαυρίζουν διπλά, μεταφέροντας και αυτό όπως και το ρωσικό πετρέλαιο.

Ο λαός να μη γίνει σάκος του μποξ των ανταγωνισμών Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, ΗΠΑ και NATO με την καπιταλιστική Ρωσία· να δυναμώσει την πάλη του για τα δικά του συμφέροντα, για απεμπλοκή από ιμπεριαλιστικά σχέδια και πολεμικούς εξοπλισμούς με απόσυρση κυρώσεων, κατάργηση των έμμεσων φόρων και πραγματικές αυξήσεις.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, μετά την εισβολή του Πούτιν στην Ουκρανία συντελούνται τεκτονικές αλλαγές στο διεθνές διπλωματικό και γεωστρατηγικό στερέωμα. Νέοι συσχετισμοί, νέες προκλήσεις, με απλά λόγια: είμαστε σε έναν νέο κόσμο. Και χρειαζόμαστε μία νέα διατλαντική στρατηγική συνεργασία. Η επίσκεψη του Έλληνα πρωθυπουργού, Κυριάκου Μητσοτάκη, στις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, όπως και η ιστορική ομιλία του στο αμερικανικό Κογκρέσο, ανέδειξαν πιστεύω με τον καλύτερο δυνατό τρόπο τις νέες απαιτήσεις αλλά και τις νέες προοπτικές μιας ενισχυμένης διατλαντικής συνεργασίας, δείχνοντας τον δρόμο που πρέπει να βαδίσει ολόκληρη η Ευρώπη. Η περαιτέρω ανάπτυξη και σύσφιξη των διατλαντικών μας σχέσεων συνιστά σήμερα μια κομβική στρατηγική επιλογή.

Κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, είναι κοινό μας χρέος αλλά και ιστορική ευθύνη απέναντι στις μελλοντικές γενιές να παλέψουμε, ούτως ώστε η Δημοκρατία, που γεννήθηκε στην Ελλάδα και αποτελεί συνδετικό κρίκο της Ευρώπης με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, να κυριαρχήσει απέναντι σε δυνάμεις αυταρχισμού, αναθεωρητισμού και οπισθοδρόμησης.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, mientras debatimos en este Pleno del Parlamento Europeo, está teniendo lugar la Conferencia de las Regiones Ultraperiféricas en Martinica; regiones ultraperiféricas que son las únicas mencionadas por su nombre en el Derecho europeo, en el Tratado de Lisboa, exactamente para proteger sus singularidades: seis regiones francesas, entre ellas Martinica, dos portuguesas y una española, Canarias.

Y están debatiendo acerca de la estrategia de la Unión Europea para las regiones ultraperiféricas presentada por la comisaria de Cohesión y Reformas Elisa Ferreira. Y está bien, hay que celebrarlo. Pero su defensa no estará completa hasta que no se afirme un tratamiento especial en dos leyes europeas que están siendo debatidas por este Pleno.

La primera es la imposición de un tipo mínimo a los beneficios de las grandes multinacionales. Porque este Parlamento está siendo consultado, pero será a los Gobiernos nacionales, durante el debate definitivo de la Directiva, a los que les corresponda fijar las especialidades de los regímenes fiscales de algunas de estas regiones ultraperiféricas.

La segunda es la modalidad temporal de adaptación a la descarbonización de la economía para que no imponga condiciones inasumibles a regiones que dependen enteramente de su conectividad aérea y del suministro marítimo.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Madam President, the killing of Shireen Abu Aqla on 11 May in Jenin refugee camp was reprehensible. It was an attack not just on the individual, but on the ability for journalists and the press to go about their business to inform the world. I have to say at the outset that we have to have an independent investigation, and the European Union must insist, or else we have to recalibrate our relationship with the Israeli State.

What was done on that day was reprehensible, but the Israeli State was not just content with killing Shireen; it then had to take her dignity in her death by attacking her funeral cortege. It was an outrageous attack on an individual and on their family and what she stood for.

Commissioner, there's no doubt in this House: the Palestinian State is being systematically dismantled by the Israeli State. The two-state solution no longer exists, and if we continue to allow Israel not just to occupy, but to annex and dismantle, the two-state peace strategy will be dead.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, astăzi am avut onoarea de a o asculta în plenul Parlamentului pe Președinta Republicii Moldova, Maia Sandu. Sunt bucuros pentru că cunosc foarte bine situația din Republica Moldova, personal pe doamna Președintă, însă vreau să aduc în discuție o altă temă care ține de Republica Moldova și anume prezența ilegală a trupelor Federației Ruse, de peste 30 de ani, în regiunea transnistreană a Republicii Moldova.

Acolo de peste trei decenii, copiii, oameni de toate vârstele sunt supuși unui proces diabolic de deznaționalizare și le sunt îngrădite drepturile. Sunt oameni care luptă zi de zi pentru demnitatea lor și mă bucur că, la Tiraspol, singura instituție cu predare în limba română rezistă, iar recent directorul ei, care a slujit-o aproape trei decenii, Ion Iovcev, și-a lansat și o carte, „Ostatic în propria țară”, în care redă cu exactitate ceea ce se întâmplă acolo. Trebuie să facem mai mult pentru Transnistria și pentru Republica Moldova.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, na passada sexta-feira, Tatjana Ždanoka, deputada deste Parlamento, foi detida, em Riga, com outros protestantes que se manifestavam, pública e pacificamente, contra a demolição de um monumento de homenagem aos soldados soviéticos no Parque Vitória.

A sua detenção merece repúdio por parte deste Parlamento. Daqui expressamos a nossa solidariedade à Tatiana e àqueles que não abdicam de defender a verdade histórica, os direitos e as liberdades que a luta dos povos garantiram.

A mesma União Europeia que se procura afirmar como paladino dos Direitos Humanos e democracia em diferentes partes do mundo convive, harmoniosamente, com estas violações ou até as promove. De que é exemplo a imposição na União Europeia de censura a órgãos de comunicação social, que se alarga já a atividades culturais e desportivas, ao arrepio de competências e leis nacionais, como é o caso da Constituição da República Portuguesa, impondo uma lógica de pensamento único.

A destruição do património histórico é mais uma face do revisionismo histórico e da tentativa de reescrita da História, visando apagar os feitos alcançados pela União Soviética e pelos comunistas e os direitos e as conquistas alcançados pela luta dos povos.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Madam President, last week, Hong Kong police arrested the brave and peace-loving Cardinal Joseph Zen and three other trustees of the 612 Humanitarian Relief Fund.

The fact that the four trustees have been arrested for collusion with foreign forces under the so-called 'national security law', just days after the election of John Lee as the new Chief Executive, shows without any doubt that Beijing intends to intensify its crackdown on basic rights and freedoms in Hong Kong.

European leaders must condemn these arrests and finally adopt targeted sanctions under the EU Magnitsky Act against individuals and entities responsible for actions undermining international agreements and for oppressing the people of Hong Kong.

Today's global struggle between the free world and non-democratic regimes requires bold leadership. Because if we are not willing to speak up for freedom everywhere, we cannot expect to enjoy freedom anywhere.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, o assassinato de Shireen Abu Akleh por forças israelitas não é caso isolado. Em 2021, nos territórios ocupados da Palestina, houve centenas de situações de abuso contra jornalistas pelas forças israelitas, responsáveis já este ano na escalada de agressão de Israel contra o povo palestino por cerca de 50 mortos, centenas de feridos e detenções de palestinos.

As imagens inenarráveis da agressão ao cortejo fúnebre de Shireen não são apenas condenáveis, são expressão da impune e brutal política de agressão, ocupação e colonização por Israel da Palestina e repressão do seu povo, iniciada há 74 anos com a Nakba.

Senhora Comissária, onde para a cláusula de suspensão do Acordo de Associação UE-Israel? Pela sua conivência e cumplicidade, a União Europeia contribui pela omissão para o agravamento da política israelita, que visa impedir a concretização dos direitos inalienáveis do povo palestino, como consagrado nas resoluções da ONU, designadamente constituir um Estado da Palestina soberano, viável e independente nas fronteiras de 1967, com Jerusalém Leste como capital.

Toda a solidariedade para com a luta do povo palestino!

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, chtěl bych upozornit na riziko hladomoru v důsledku konfliktu na Ukrajině. Vidíme stovky, ba tisíce zločinů na Ukrajině – Buča, Kramatorsk, Irpiň a další. Samozřejmě Ukrajina má naši maximální podporu vojenskou, finanční, zdrojovou a morální. Co je děsivé, jsou důsledky, které se projevují i v razantním zdražování, a zejména potravin. Toto zdražování může mít významný dopad ve třetím světě. Může to být obrovský cenový otřes a může dojít skutečně k hladomoru.

Co bychom měli udělat? Samozřejmě co nejvíce pomáhat Ukrajině, aby tento konflikt vyvolaný Ruskem, jednoznačnou agresí, vyhrála. Za druhé, zajistit možnost zasetí, péče o úrodu pro ukrajinské zemědělce a sklizení. Za třetí, odvoz uvážnutých zemědělských plodin na Ukrajině a samozřejmě cílená podpora ohrožených zemí zejména ze třetího světa. Nejlepší zprávou bude, pokud Ukrajina vyhraje. Nepochybně se tak vyhneme hladomoru.

Chris MacManus (The Left). – Madam President, people in the north of Ireland recently voted to elect Sinn Féin as the largest party to an assembly where everyone bar the DUP wants the Protocol and the Assembly to work.

The British Government loudly proclaim that they are defending the Good Friday Agreement, but the reality is, is that they constantly attack and undermine it. They claim to uphold international law while unilaterally breaching it – not just on the Protocol, but by amnesties for British state forces guilty of human rights abuses.

The DUP's Jeffrey Donaldson proclaims that the Protocol goes against the Good Friday Agreement, when neither he nor his party have ever supported it. Let me be clear: the Good Friday Agreement is under threat from a toxic alliance of the British Government and the DUP, and the European Parliament needs to make it clear that this behaviour is not acceptable.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, Sweden and Finland making moves to join the most aggressive military bloc on Earth is a sign of how rotten and corrupted the political class in Europe has become.

We all know exactly what NATO is: a post-war mechanism designed to maintain US dominance and control over Western Europe, advance US geostrategic interests and violently suppress socialism. To pursue these aims, NATO has partnered with right-wing terrorists and fascists to conduct long campaigns of bloody terror and destabilisation, both in and outside Western Europe. Everywhere it conducts operations, it leaves a trail of destruction and destabilisation behind it, and persists often for decades after the initial act of aggression.

As the Pope has recognised, NATO sowed the seeds of conflict in Ukraine. Who will pay for its facilitation and the prolonging of the war? The US calls the shots, but it's the EU and targeted states that have to deal with the fallout and the instability. NATO will do nothing for a peaceful Europe. It never has and it never will.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

27. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia

Die Präsidentin. – Die Sitzung wird morgen, Donnerstag, 19. Mai 2022, um 8.30 Uhr mit der Aussprache über die Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung im Zusammenhang mit dem europäischen Bildungsraum wieder aufgenommen. Die Tagesordnung wurde veröffentlicht und ist auf der Website des Europäischen Parlaments verfügbar.

28. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 22.20 Uhr geschlossen.)

—

Skróty i symbole

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

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

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

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