

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 6 CZERWCA 2022 R.

(C/2024/6012)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2022-2023

Posiedzenia od 6 do 9 czerwca 2022 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
3. Oświadczenie Przewodniczącego	3
4. Zatwierdzenie protokołów poprzednich posiedzeń	3
5. Skład Parlamentu	3
6. Skład komisji i delegacji	4
7. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu) (działania następcze)	4
8. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu)	4
9. Sprostowanie (art. 241 Regulaminu)	4
10. Podpisanie aktów przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 79 Regulaminu)	4

Spis treści	Strona
11. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół	4
12. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	5
13. Porządek obrad	5
14. Ceremonia z okazji 60. rocznicy wprowadzenia WPR	8
15. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Turcji (debata)	12
16. Plan działania ESDZ w zakresie zmiany klimatu i obronności (debata)	24
17. UE wobec zagrożeń bezpieczeństwa w regionie Indo-Pacyfiku (debata)	30
18. Wyspy i polityka spójności – obecna sytuacja i przyszłe wyzwania (debata)	35
19. Tura pytań (Komisja) Zmniejszyć zużycie pestycydów i lepiej chronić konsumentów	47
20. Wdrożenie art. 17 rozporządzenia w sprawie wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa (krótka prezentacja)	59
21. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych	63
22. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	70
23. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia	70
24. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	70

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 6 CZERWCA 2022 R.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Wznowienie sesji

President. – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday 19 May 2022.

2. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(The sitting opened at 17.02)

3. Oświadczenie Przewodniczącego

President. – Dear colleagues, on Friday last week, a train was derailed in Bavaria. Five passengers lost their lives and forty more were injured, and I know I speak for all the House when I say that our thoughts are with the injured and the relatives of the deceased passengers.

4. Zatwierdzenie protokołów poprzednich posiedzeń

President. – The minutes and the texts adopted at the sittings of 18 and 19 May are available. Are there any comments?

That does not seem to be the case and therefore that means the minutes are approved.

5. Skład Parlamentu

President. – Following the appointment of Chrysoula Zacharopoulou as Minister of State for Development, Francophonie and International Partnerships within the French Government, Parliament takes note of the vacancy of her seat with effect from 20 May 2022, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

I have received notice from the competent French authorities that Max Orville has been elected Member of the European Parliament to replace Ms Zacharopoulou with effect from 20 May 2022.

I wish to welcome our new colleague and note that he will take his seat in Parliament and on its bodies in full enjoyment of his rights under the conditions provided for in the Rules of Procedure.

6. Skład komisji i delegacji

President. – The EPP, S&D, Renew Europe, ID and ECR 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 of the minutes of today's sitting and shall take effect on the date of this announcement.

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

President. – In relation to the decisions by the IMCO and INTA committees to enter into interinstitutional negotiations pursuant to Rule 71(1) announced on Wednesday 18 May, I have received no requests for a vote in Parliament, and the committees may therefore start their negotiations.

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

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

Pursuant to Rule 71(2) Members or political groups reaching at least the medium threshold may request in writing by tomorrow, Tuesday 7 June by midnight, that the decisions to enter into negotiations be put to the vote. If no request for a vote on the decisions to enter into negotiations is made within this deadline, the committees may start negotiations.

9. Sprostowanie (art. 241 Regulaminu)

President. – The IMCO Committee has transmitted a corrigendum to a text adopted by Parliament.

Pursuant to Rule 241(2) that corrigendum will be deemed approved unless, no later than 24 hours after its announcement, a request is made by a political group or Members reaching at least the low threshold that it be put to the vote.

The corrigendum is available on the plenary web page. Its title will be published in the minutes of the sitting.

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

President. – On the signature of acts, I would like to inform you that since the adjournment of Parliament's session on 19 May, I have signed, together with the President of the Council, eight acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure in accordance with Rule 79 of Parliament's Rules of Procedure.

I would also like to inform you that on Wednesday I shall sign, together with the President of the Council, three acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure.

The titles of the acts will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

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

12. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

13. Porządek obrad

President. – We now come to the order of business. The final draft agenda as adopted by the Conference of Presidents on 2 June pursuant to Rule 157 has been distributed.

We were informed that Mr Borrell cannot be present in Strasbourg, and therefore the Question Time with the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative scheduled on Tuesday as the third item in the afternoon is taken out of the agenda. And that means that we can now move to changes that have been requested by political groups.

First, on Tuesday, the Verts/ALE Group, The Left Group and the Renew Group have asked that the debate on the Council and Commission statements on the rule of law and the potential approval of the Polish National Recovery Plan (RRF) be wound up with a resolution. The Renew Group has asked the for resolution to be voted in June I, and that is this session, whereas the Greens and the Left groups have asked for the resolution to be voted in June II.

So I'll give the floor first to Stéphane Séjourné to move the request on behalf of his Group.

Stéphane Séjourné, au nom du groupe Renew. – Madame la présidente, comme vous le savez, cet hémicycle a l'état de droit à cœur, et, après la décision de la Commission, avant le vote au Conseil, il semble pour mon groupe important que le Parlement européen puisse réaffirmer ses positions sur la question polonaise maintenant, par une résolution. Nous en proposons donc une dès cette plénière pour pouvoir avoir plus d'impact, y compris sur les institutions qui auront à traiter ce cas par la suite.

Terry Reintke, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, dear colleagues, you have probably all followed the news that the Commission has given a positive assessment for the RRP of Poland last week. And this despite the fact that not even the conditions that the Commission set itself were met by the Polish Government.

Now we think that this Parliament has been a very strong defender of the rule of law in the past, and we would like to continue on this path, and this is why we want to have a resolution where we clearly state our assessment of the situation. If it can be in June one, I think we would also be fine with that. Otherwise, for June two.

And on a side note, colleagues, I really think that for the debate tomorrow, it is necessary that the Commission President is here herself to listen to what Parliament has to say.

Patryk Jaki (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca. Otóż, Szanowni Państwo, to jest bardzo charakterystyczne, że Państwo wśród kamieni milowych dla Polski przygotowujecie informację, że w Polsce nie wolno robić tego, co wolno robić w waszych państwach. Otóż od samego początku szykanujecie Polskę dlatego, że uważacie, że w Polsce jest upolityczniony sposób wyboru sędziów. Tymczasem jest dokładnie taki sam jak w Hiszpanii. Ale kiedy mówimy, że to jest dokładnie takie same, to wy mówicie, że proszę zobaczcie w opiniach Komisji Weneckiej, która twierdzi, że owszem w niektórych państwach jest to samo, ale są państwa, które mają lepszą kulturę i lepszą tradycję.

Ja chcę zapytać, czy Państwo rzeczywiście uważacie, według takiego rasistowskiego poglądu, że w Polsce jest gorsza tradycja i gorsza kultura. I wśród kamieni milowych, które Polska ma spełnić, uważacie w tej chwili, że Polsce wolno mniej niż innym państwom. Czemu wśród kamieni milowych w takim razie nie ma i nie dajecie informacji o tym, żeby na przykład Francji zakazać dostarczania broni dla Rosji albo na przykład Niemców zobowiązać wśród kamieni milowych do tego, żeby wreszcie dostarczyli Ukrainie broń. Chcecie bronić praworządności, czy chcecie bronić swoich cynicznych nacjonalistycznych i nierealistycznych interesów? O to jest tak naprawdę walka.

(Parliament approved the request)

President. – So there is a majority to have a resolution to wind up the debate in June I.

I'll read out the deadlines now: motions for resolutions then will have to be tabled by Tuesday 7 June at midday. Amendments to the motions for resolutions, and joint motions for resolutions on Wednesday 8 June at noon. Amendments to joint motions for resolutions Wednesday 8 June at 13.00. And split and separate votes Wednesday 8 June at 19.00.

Christine Anderson (ID). – Madam President, I would like to inform you that there is some glitches with the translation. We can hardly understand what's being said. This is unacceptable.

President. – OK, I will send an usher to your desk to see whether in the meantime maybe you can get a headphone from somewhere else.

The problem is everywhere? OK. Is it still like this if I talk now?

Mr Tarabella, can you hear me now? Is it still a problem? Yes, you can speak, of course. Everyone can speak. We just need to know whether we can understand you now.

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Madame la présidente, je faisais quelques gesticulations pour exprimer exactement la même chose que la collègue précédente: on entend les interprètes par morceaux, de manière hachurée. Ce n'est donc pas un problème de connexion là où on est parce que nous sommes plusieurs à avoir le même problème, et dans plusieurs langues apparemment. En tout cas, la cabine française est inaudible parce que la communication est hachée; elle nous parvient par intermittence. J'imagine que c'est un problème technique qui vient de là-bas plutôt que des récepteurs de nos bureaux.

President. – Yes, I see your point now. Yes, it keeps glitching and it keeps breaking up. We'll have to wait a little bit.

It looks like it works now. So we'll try again. Thanks a lot, and apologies.

The ECR Group has asked for Council and Commission statements on the massacre of Christians in Nigeria to be added as the third point in the afternoon for Tuesday. I give the floor to Kosma Złotowski to move the request on behalf of his Group.

Kosma Złotowski, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jeszcze dwa lata temu 340 mln chrześcijan żyło na terenach, gdzie mogli być prześladowani. Dzisiaj to jest 360 mln. I nie dlatego, że ludzie, chrześcijanie, przeprowadzają się w tereny, gdzie są prześladowani. W zeszłym roku zginęło 5 900 chrześcijan właśnie dlatego, że wyznają chrześcijańską religię. To 20% więcej niż rok temu. To jest poważny problem.

A wczoraj doszło do masakry. W niedzielę podczas nabożeństwa w kościele zostało zamordowanych co najmniej 50 osób. Jest to wystarczający powód, żeby tym tematem zajął się Parlament Europejski w debacie. Dlatego grupa ECR składa wniosek o taką debatę.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, no, in verità non mi volevo esprimere contro. Anzi, crediamo che quanto è avvenuto ieri in Nigeria sia un vero e proprio massacro di donne, uomini e bambini e che sicuramente merita un dibattito in plenaria. Chiediamo però al gruppo ECR di valutare la possibilità di non tenere il dibattito domani, ma di rimandarlo a mercoledì.

President. – I see the ECR Group accepts that, so I'll put the request for this item to take place on Wednesday to the vote by roll call.

(Parliament approved the request)

Therefore these items will be added on the Wednesday. We will fit it in.

Also for Wednesday, the ECR Group has asked that the Council and Commission statements on 'Global threats to abortion rights: the possible overturn of abortion rights in the US by the Supreme Court' be taken out of the agenda. I will first give the floor to Margarita de la Pisa Carrión to move the request on behalf of the ECR Group and then to Iratxe García Pérez to speak against.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, en nombre del Grupo ECR. – Señora presidenta, la convivencia pacífica internacional se basa en respetar el rumbo político que cada país decida democráticamente y respetar las decisiones de sus tribunales; no es sensato cuestionarlas aquí, en el Parlamento Europeo, opinando con debates tendenciosos, y menos sobre materias en las que la Unión no tiene competencia.

Pedimos, por lo tanto, que no se lleve a cabo este debate sobre el aborto el próximo miércoles: es una injerencia inadmisibles en la jurisdicción de un país como los Estados Unidos solo porque no les satisface la línea que legítimamente están siguiendo millones de personas, millones de personas que aprecian la vida, que defienden los verdaderos derechos humanos y que, con sentido común, no van a aceptar la imposición de nuevas e inconsistentes ideologías que nos llevan a perder nuestra identidad natural. El aborto es un drama que nadie puede desear, no un derecho.

Quisiera ver en este Parlamento alzarse la voz por la defensa de nuestra dignidad como mujeres apoyando la maternidad. Reflexionen: ¿cuál es el destino de una sociedad que no aprecia la vida?

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, este Parlamento tiene dentro de sus obligaciones preocuparse y trabajar por garantizar los derechos humanos y los derechos fundamentales en todos los lugares del mundo. Nos da igual el país que sea.

Y si este Parlamento tiene que alzar la voz para decirle a la Administración estadounidense que defienda los derechos de sus mujeres, pues lo hacemos, como lo hemos hecho con muchos otros países, garantizando los derechos de las mujeres dentro y fuera de la Unión Europea.

Por lo tanto, los derechos de las mujeres son también derechos humanos y este Parlamento tiene que manifestarse al respecto.

(Parliament rejected the request)

President. – The request is rejected, so the agenda remains unchanged.

For Wednesday, the ID Group has asked for a Commission statement on ‘The Union’s fiscal and monetary options to fight rising prices in the EU’ to be added as a second point in the evening. I give the floor to Nicolaus Fest to move the request on behalf of his Group.

Nicolaus Fest, im Namen der ID-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kollegen! Wir sprechen hier ja oft über Themen, die buchstäblich weit vom europäischen Bürger entfernt sind – dann sollten wir auch die Zeit finden, mal über ein Thema zu sprechen, das jetzt den Bürgern mehr und mehr auf den Nägeln brennt, weil kaum noch ein Bürger weiß, wie er eigentlich die steigenden Preise und vor allem sein Leben und das seiner Familie finanzieren soll.

Und deshalb beantrage ich namens der ID-Fraktion, dass wir die Tagesordnung ergänzen und am Mittwoch eben als zweiten Punkt nach den zwei Abstimmungen dann über die fiskalischen und geldpolitischen Optionen der Union diskutieren und eben auch darüber, wie vielleicht die Union selber zu dieser Teuerung und der Inflation beiträgt. Der Antrag lag bereits mehrfach auf dem Tisch der COP, aber heute baue ich auf Ihre Zustimmung.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, abbiamo appena votato per tenere un dibattito mercoledì su quanto è successo in Nigeria. Quindi rischiamo di avere un dibattito su un tema molto importante, ma in un tempo assolutamente ristretto, a meno che il gruppo ID non decida di cambiare il tema della discussione su tematiche di attualità con questo importante dibattito sull’aumento dei prezzi in Europa.

(Parliament rejected the request)

President. – The request is rejected, so the agenda remains unchanged.

For Thursday, the PPE Group has asked that the debate and the resolution on the Council and Commission statements on ‘The call for a convention for the revision of the Treaties’ taking place on Thursday morning be postponed to the June II part-session. I give the floor to Sven Simon to move the request on behalf of the PPE Group.

Sven Simon, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Madam President, the PPE Group has asked that the debate and the resolution on the Council and Commission statements on the call for a convention for the revision of the treaties taking place on Thursday morning be postponed to the second June part-session.

Europe will not be made at once. With those famous words, Robert Schuman started his famous speech 70 years ago, and it is still true today. In a democracy, people and colleagues want to have time to discuss the things in which they want to be involved. In particular, when we are talking about such an important issue like establishing a convention, for which I am deeply fighting. Most colleagues did not even have the time to read the resolution. We did not even finish negotiating it, so I really ask you to postpone it for two weeks.

Colleagues, we are talking about two weeks. In European history, it's nothing. In a democracy and a democratic process, it means a lot.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben letzte Woche und das ganze Wochenende über diese Entschließung verhandelt, und alle Fraktionen in diesem Haus sind auf die EVP zugegangen. Wir haben sowohl in der Form als auch im Inhalt viel reduziert, um die EVP eben – wie gesagt – mit an Bord zu haben; ich möchte aber noch einmal klarstellen: Das ist keine EVP-Entschließung, sondern eine Entschließung der Fraktionen dieses Hauses.

Und ich möchte noch einmal darauf abstellen, Herr Weber, dass Sie am 30. April noch einmal in der Süddeutschen Zeitung hervorgehoben haben, dass die Bürger eine klare Botschaft erwarten, dass die EU stärker, effizienter, demokratischer und ehrgeiziger werden muss. Das sehen wir genauso – die anderen Fraktionen, die S&D-Fraktion, ich spreche hier für Renew, Greens und auch die Linke. Wir haben jetzt die Möglichkeit, jetzt noch ein Signal zu setzen, damit die französische Präsidentschaft das aufgreifen kann, für den Europäischen Rat.

In der Geschichte Europas war es immer so: Es gibt einen Moment, da muss man springen. Wir haben hier klare und wirklich auf das Minimum reduzierte Forderungen, die wichtig sind. In diesem Sinne bitte ich, dem Antrag nicht stattzugeben.

(Parliament rejected the request)

President. – The request is rejected, so the agenda remains unchanged.

Yes, Mr Simon, you would like to make a point of order.

Sven Simon, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Madam President, on behalf of the EPP, I would request at least to postpone the vote on the resolution. Colleagues need time to discuss. So please postpone at least the vote on the resolution. It is such an important issue that we should not lose the historic moment.

President. – So Mr Simon, your request was to postpone the debate and the resolution, and this plenary has just voted against that request. Are you now putting forward a new request? This is exceptional and not usually done.

I apologise, but the rules say that such requests have to come in one hour before the start of the session. So I am sorry, it cannot be accepted.

But I would ask you, dear colleagues, that this could be very much negotiated and discussed before, so that we really move as an institution in the future on Europe.

So the agenda is adopted, the order of business is thus established.

14. Ceremonia z okazji 60. rocznicy wprowadzenia WPR

President. – The first item is the ceremony on the 60th anniversary of the common agricultural policy. This is an important point, dear colleagues. Today we have with us Minister Fesneau and Commissioner Wojciechowski. A few words from my side before we watch a short video.

Today we mark the 60th anniversary of our common agricultural policy, a monumental policy for our Union. This is a policy that has enabled us to increase productivity, ensure the availability of reasonably priced food and provide fair living standards to farmers.

Colleagues, our common agricultural policy has transformed Europe. Our farmers not only provide us with the food security we need: they also export around EUR 180 billion-worth of agri-products to third countries. Europe's quality products have helped feed the world.

But we must also consider the challenges that lie ahead. Only 11% of farm managers in the EU are under the age of 40. Our agri-sector is in desperate need of an influx of skilled young farmers that can boost innovation. We need to approach farming with a fresh perspective.

We also need to pay closer attention to the quality of our products and the sustainability of production processes. This is why we need to speed up and gear up our efforts to make farming as environmentally friendly as possible. The reform of the common agricultural policy, together with the Farm to Fork strategy, are tailor-made for this purpose.

Another challenge is the rising costs of production that will soon lead to higher food prices. Fertiliser prices rose by 30% since the beginning of 2022. Increases in fuel costs are reaching record levels. Inflationary pressure is having an enormous effect on the day-to-day management of our 10 million farms in the European Union.

And here I must emphasise the immense disruption of trade in grain and cereals as a consequence of Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Blockades of ports and an inability to find alternative ways to transport agricultural products into and out of Ukraine have led to higher prices and a sense of instability. The pressure that it has caused on global food supply chains is extremely worrying. If Ukraine is not allowed to toil its fields, we are looking at a global, multi-year lack of food supplies.

All these challenges need a decisive and firm reaction from us. Agriculture is a strategic sector of our economy.

On this milestone anniversary, let me end by paying tribute to all the people behind the success of our common agricultural policy: the farmers, their families and all other ancillary workers that put a huge effort in the fields, come rain or shine. They are the true narrators of this success story.

(A video was shown in the Chamber)

Marc Fesneau, *président en exercice du Conseil*. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames les Présidentes et Messieurs les Présidents, Monsieur le Commissaire, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires européens, je suis heureux et honoré de pouvoir ce soir m'exprimer devant vous pour célébrer le soixantième anniversaire d'une des premières – parce qu'une des plus anciennes et des plus importantes – politiques de l'Union européenne.

La politique agricole commune – la PAC – est devenue réalité il y a soixante ans. Quelques pays avaient fait le pari de construire ensemble un projet commun de paix après plusieurs décennies de conflits. Accompagner la modernisation de notre agriculture, accroître sa productivité, assurer le revenu agricole, stabiliser les marchés, garantir la sécurité des approvisionnements et assurer l'accès le plus large à l'alimentation, tels étaient alors les objectifs assignés à la PAC.

Au fond, ces objectifs sont toujours au cœur de la PAC aujourd'hui – l'actualité vient cruellement nous le rappeler –, mais d'autres enjeux sont désormais adjoints à cette politique. Aujourd'hui, la pertinence des fondations posées il y a de cela soixante ans est confirmée, à la fois face aux conséquences immédiates des crises que nous traversons, mais aussi pour accélérer les transitions et répondre aux défis de l'avenir. C'est d'ailleurs le sens même de l'histoire qui, depuis soixante ans, nous a poussés à faire évoluer la PAC pour prendre en compte de nouveaux enjeux, notamment en matière d'aménagement du territoire, de préservation des ressources naturelles, de lutte contre le changement climatique et d'adaptation à cet égard, de bien-être animal ou de nutrition.

La PAC s'est aussi adaptée, au fil des élargissements, pour accompagner toute la diversité des productions et des fermes dans toute l'Union européenne, du climat tropical de nos régions ultrapériphériques à un climat quasi polaire au-dessus du 62^e parallèle, en passant par le climat méditerranéen. Avec la création de l'OMC, en 1995, elle a également su s'ouvrir au monde, avec un commerce international croissant.

Au fil des années, la PAC a aussi fait l'objet d'une implication plus forte du Parlement européen, laquelle a abouti, par le traité de Lisbonne, à la mise en œuvre de la codécision sur cette politique, gage d'une légitimité renforcée à son égard. La réciprocité des normes, priorité de la présidence actuelle, conforte encore les principes que je viens d'énoncer.

Tout cela montre que la PAC est, depuis soixante ans, une construction permanente, dont la solidité et l'agilité sont révélées et renforcées par les crises comme par les grandes mutations à l'œuvre, rappelant que la souveraineté alimentaire demeure une priorité stratégique. C'est vrai lorsque nous assistons au retour tragique de la guerre en Europe, car nous avons en mémoire, toutes et tous ici présents, que le projet des bâtisseurs de l'Europe était de concevoir l'agriculture comme un vecteur de paix. C'est pourquoi nous condamnons avec fermeté le chantage à la sécurité alimentaire et l'usage de l'alimentation comme arme dans la guerre en Ukraine.

C'est également vrai parce que construire la souveraineté alimentaire en Europe, c'est aussi bâtir les conditions d'une paix durable. Permettre à l'Europe d'assurer l'approvisionnement de sa population en faisant le choix d'une production suffisante sur son sol plutôt que d'être dépendante des importations était au cœur du projet des pères fondateurs. C'est pour assurer la sécurité de l'alimentation des citoyens européens à prix abordable et pour permettre aux agriculteurs de dégager un revenu suffisant que les premières organisations communes de marché furent décidées, l'agriculture modernisée et la productivité accrue, tout comme la production.

C'est vrai encore sur la question des transitions, qu'il faut accompagner et accélérer – je pense notamment à la transition écologique, au travers du pacte vert. Cette transition agroécologique est au cœur de l'enjeu de souveraineté alimentaire car, non, notre agriculture ne pourra pas produire en quantité et en qualité suffisantes sans une adaptation des systèmes correspondants visant à préserver les moyens de production que sont les sols, la biodiversité et les ressources naturelles telles que l'eau. La souveraineté alimentaire sera résiliente ou ne pourra pas être. Ma conviction est que l'on ne peut dissocier les deux. C'est aussi en cela que consiste le rôle de la PAC: accompagner ces changements et être aux côtés des agriculteurs pour qu'ils les accomplissent. La PAC ne peut réaliser cela seule, et, une fois encore, elle ne doit pas manquer ce rendez-vous.

Mesdames et Messieurs, la crise de la COVID-19, la guerre en Ukraine, le réchauffement climatique démontrent que notre souveraineté alimentaire n'est jamais définitivement acquise. Il est impératif de renforcer la résilience de nos systèmes alimentaires, de nos exploitations agricoles, et de réduire les vulnérabilités de nos chaînes de valeur. La PAC sera donc absolument nécessaire pour assurer notre capacité à produire et à nourrir notre population, tout comme nous avons une responsabilité particulière, nous Européens, en ce qui concerne notre participation à la sécurité alimentaire mondiale.

Les gouvernements, comme le Parlement européen, ne s'y sont pas trompés: le budget de la PAC reste une composante essentielle du budget de l'Union européenne; il reflète l'intérêt stratégique de l'agriculture et de l'alimentation en même temps qu'il est l'expression de la solidarité et de l'ambition européennes pour le monde agricole et rural.

Après soixante ans, la PAC demeure donc plus que jamais une politique fidèle à l'esprit des fondateurs tout en étant résolument moderne, à la fois adaptée à son temps et préparant l'avenir. Il nous revient la responsabilité de préserver, avec nos agriculteurs, cet acquis, symbole puissant d'unité de l'Union européenne et d'attachement profond au projet, si actuel, qu'elle porte depuis sa création.

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, dear Minister, honourable Members. Six years ago, the six founding countries of the European Communities concluded an agreement on the first Common Agricultural Policy for Europe.

With the memories of a devastating war and famine still fresh in their minds, they introduced an agricultural policy with common rules to support farming and ensure food supply.

The Common Agricultural Policy has constantly evolved over the years to meet changing budgetary and economic circumstances, and to match the evolving needs of citizens. However, the original aims of the policy already established under the Treaty of Rome have reminded unchanged – increasing productivity, stabilising markets, providing fair living standards to farmers, assuring the availability of food, and ensuring that this food reaches consumers at reasonable prices.

All of these Treaty objectives serve one overriding purpose – Europe's food security. The importance of our food security has been reinforced during the time of the pandemic, and now even more so in the time of this cruel war triggered in Europe by the Russian aggression against Ukraine.

In particular, this times have shown us that food security is of strategic importance, equal to defence security and energy security. This was reinforced in the most recent European Council conclusions.

We owe our food security first and foremost to our farmers, those who cultivate the land and keep the animals. We thank them for their efforts. We also thank workers along the entire food system, such as those in the processing and distribution systems.

Today, it is hard to imagine what European agriculture would be like without the Common Agricultural Policy. I come from Poland, a part of the European Union which for years remained behind the Iron Curtain. At a time when the Common Agricultural Policy was beginning to operate, when farmers in Western Europe were receiving direct payments and other forms of support, farmers in Eastern Europe were facing a much different reality. They were forced to work on 'kolkhozes', or 'collective farms'.

In the case of Poland, farmers were forced to hand over part of their harvest free of charge to the communist authorities, as part of so-called compulsory supplies. This historical experience is still causing visible differences today, in the development of agriculture and rural areas in different parts of Europe. We should reduce these differences as quickly as possible.

In a wider sense, for the CAP to continue making an effective contribution to food security, we must adapt it to current and future challenges. We must take care to produce the right food today, but also to preserve the potential of our land for tomorrow, for future generations of Europeans.

Fundamentally, we must remember that agriculture is not an industry, land is not a factory, animals are not machines. That is why we are reforming the Common Agricultural Policy, so that agriculture becomes more friendly for the environment, climate, and animal welfare.

However, we must do more to ensure the stability of farmers' incomes. We must do more to support them in crisis situations, which, unfortunately, are starting to become more frequent. We must ensure that living conditions in rural areas are improved, and close the gap between rural and urban conditions. That is the aim of our Long-term Vision for rural areas, adopted in 2021 and targeting significant changes by 2040.

The history of the Common Agricultural Policy fully demonstrates its relevance and success, and today's challenges fully demonstrate the need to continue and develop this policy, for the next generation of Europeans.

Norbert Lins, *Vorsitzender des Ausschusses für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, sehr verehrter Herr Minister, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich freue mich, mit Ihnen heute den 60. Geburtstag der Gemeinsamen Europäischen Agrarpolitik zu feiern.

Wir feiern heute die Bäuerinnen und Bauern, die täglich ihre Felder bestellen, ihre Tiere versorgen, Produkte weiterverarbeiten und nach noch mehr Nachhaltigkeit, hoher Qualität und neuen Innovationen streben. Wir ziehen den Hut vor den hart arbeitenden Europäerinnen und Europäern, die in den Krisen der letzten Jahre dafür gesorgt haben, dass unsere Lebensmittelregale voll waren, und die sich gleichzeitig auf die Herausforderungen der kommenden Zeiten eingestellt haben. Ich möchte diesen Tag dafür nutzen, Danke zu sagen. Wir sagen alle gemeinsam Danke an unsere Bäuerinnen und Bauern, die Lob und Anerkennung verdient haben. Und ich wünsche mir, dass dieser Applaus ihnen gehört.

(Beifall)

Als die GAP vor 60 Jahren ins Leben gerufen wurde, waren die Zeichen von Krieg, Leid und Zerstörung noch überall in Europa deutlich sichtbar. Hunger war vielen Menschen nur zu gut bekannt. Wir sind aufgewachsen in dem Bewusstsein, diese Zeiten lange hinter uns gelassen zu haben, doch der Krieg Russlands in der Ukraine zeigt uns: Unsere europäischen Werte, unsere Freiheit sind alles andere als eine Selbstverständlichkeit.

Natürlich können wir die heutige Situation nicht mit der von vor 60 Jahren vergleichen. Als die GAP gegründet wurde, waren ihre Ziele klar; sie sind schon dargelegt worden: Es ging um ausreichend Nahrungsmittel zu fairen Preisen, es ging um die Förderung der landwirtschaftlichen Produktivität, es ging um die Stabilisierung der Märkte, und es ging um ein angemessenes Einkommen für die landwirtschaftliche Bevölkerung. Diese Ziele sind geblieben. Sie waren und sind das Herzstück der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik.

Doch dazugekommen sind neue Herausforderungen wie die Bekämpfung des Klimawandels oder der Verlust der Artenvielfalt. Heute geht es um ein Gleichgewicht zwischen den wirtschaftlichen, sozialen und ökologischen Säulen der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik.

Doch die Gefahr einer Versorgungskrise vor unserer europäischen Haustür – und damit meine ich nicht nur die Ukraine, ich meine natürlich vor allem auch unsere Nachbarschaft Nordafrika –, die wächst. Putin erpresst die Welt, indem er ihr Weizen vorenthalten will. Wir stehen in der Verantwortung, schnell zu handeln, um Ernährungssicherheit, Nachhaltigkeit und Bezahlbarkeit von Lebensmitteln auch in Zukunft zu gewährleisten.

60 Jahre sind ein Alter, in dem man vor gar nicht langer Zeit noch in einigen Teilen Europas in Rente geschickt wurde. Und auch heute sind immer wieder Stimmen zu hören, die sich genau das für die Gemeinsame Agrarpolitik wünschen. Doch auch wenn die GAP manchmal als ein massiver, vielleicht auch schwerfälliger Tanker wirkt – in Krisenzeiten hat sie sich bewährt. Die Bedeutung der GAP ist klargeworden, indem wir es geschafft haben, auch schnelle und gezielte Hilfe zu leisten. Gerade wieder, Herr Kommissar, auch mit der Reaktion der Kommission auf den russischen Angriff in der Ukraine und die Gefahr für die Versorgungssicherheit waren wir in der Lage, schnell Maßnahmen ins Werk zu setzen, um auch die Produktion im Jahr 2022 zu erhöhen.

Das Gleiche muss uns jetzt auch für 2023 gelingen, damit wir das, was wir versprochen haben, dass wir unserer Nachbarschaft helfen, auch in die Realität umsetzen können. Das muss unser Ziel sein, dass wir in den nächsten Wochen die Voraussetzungen schaffen, dass wir 2023 auch in Europa eine gute Ernte gewährleisten können und wir für unsere Versorgungssicherheit und auch für unsere Nachbarschaft einen Beitrag leisten können.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Sie haben es vielleicht gemerkt: Einige Kolleginnen und Kollegen haben sich eher traditionelle Kleidung heute angezogen, nicht nur, um sozusagen sich selber zu präsentieren, sondern um ihre Region zum Ausdruck zu bringen und um das Motto der Einheit in Vielfalt auch hier im Plenum heute sichtbar zu machen. Ich möchte mal die Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die sich die Mühe gemacht haben, traditionelle Kleidung aus ihrer Region heute anzuziehen, bitten aufzustehen, um damit eben auch die Bedeutung dieser Vielfalt zum Ausdruck zu bringen – Einheit in Vielfalt – und damit auch die diversen landwirtschaftlichen Strukturen in Europa zum Ausdruck zu bringen.

President. – Thank you so much, Mr Lins. The item is now closed.

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: DITA CHARANZOVÁ

místopředsedkyně

15. Sprawozdanie za rok 2021 dotyczące Turcji (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Nacho Sánchez Amor, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the 2021 Commission Report on Turkey (2021/2250(INI)) (A9-0149/2022).

I remind you that free seating is applied, with the exception of the first two rows that are allocated to Group leaders. You will be able to request catch-the-eye and blue cards via your voting machine after having inserted your voting card, therefore I invite you to always bring your voting card with you. Instructions have been made available in the Hemicycle.

Should you wish to register for the catch-the-eye I invite you to do so starting from now, without waiting for the end of the debate. Moreover, I remind you that blue cards can also be raised for a short intervention and will allow a follow-up question.

I would also like to remind you that interventions in the Chamber will continue to be made from the central rostrum, except for catch-the-eye, blue cards and points of order. I therefore kindly invite you to keep an eye on the speakers' list and to approach the rostrum when your speaking time is imminent.

Nacho Sánchez Amor, ponente. – Señora presidenta, señorías, el informe periódico sobre los países candidatos describe sus progresos en el acercamiento a los estándares europeos de todo tipo, y en su núcleo, como es obvio, está el examen de la situación de los derechos y libertades y el Estado de Derecho; no es banal recordarlo en un ambiente en el que los principios y valores suelen ceder a las consideraciones crudamente geopolíticas. La Unión Europea sigue siendo un club de democracias avanzadas, como lo demuestran, más que negarlo, las medidas contra los socios actuales que se desvían de ese principio.

Esta introducción es muy conveniente cuando hablamos de Turquía porque allí todo parece basarse en un cálculo equivocado: puesto que somos útiles desde el punto de vista geopolítico, toda crítica occidental debe ceder y hay que acelerar el proceso de adhesión. Esto es un desenfoque muy perjudicial; lo es, espero, para todas las instituciones, pero desde luego lo es para este Parlamento, y, por eso, en el corazón del informe está la desastrosa situación actual de los estándares democráticos en Turquía, pero es más grave: no se trata solo de ese lamentable nivel, sino de que la tendencia consolidada es a empeorar.

Otros sistemas autoritarios lo son porque no han madurado lo suficiente o porque han parado su impulso democratizador; en el caso de Turquía no se trata de eso, sino de una deliberada regresión desde una situación mejor: la mayoría de los turcos adultos han vivido una Turquía mejor, una Turquía más democrática, más avanzada, más abierta, menos aislada; una incipiente democracia no es en Turquía una aspiración intelectual, sino la experiencia vital de varias generaciones de turcos, turcos y turcas que ven como sus esperanzas democráticas se van por el sumidero en una espiral autoritaria que parece no tener fin.

Un carácter autoritario que es, a estas alturas, cuando todas las coartadas han desaparecido, una política de Estado plenamente deliberada, programada y ejecutada con aterradora frialdad por la élite gobernante: represión sobre una sociedad cada vez más desarmada, sectariamente informada y mantenida con dosis mediáticas patológicas de un nacionalismo que pone por encima de los derechos y la felicidad de los ciudadanos los derechos de la nación.

El núcleo del informe refleja esta situación; además, en los últimos días hemos tenido que añadir nuevos casos de violación de derechos y, si esperáramos dos semanas, tendríamos otro puñado de nuevos casos, algunos incluso anunciados: en unos meses es probable que se ilegalice el tercer partido del país, el HDP, que votaron casi seis millones de ciudadanos y que consiguió cien alcaldías, y todo para ir más cómodamente a las elecciones. Si en esas elecciones futuras se confirma esa tendencia, yo no creo personalmente que el proceso de adhesión pueda sobrevivir cinco años más, por más que ese sea el mejor resorte que tenemos para defender a esa sociedad civil.

El informe examina también otros aspectos de la relación y en el periodo examinado ha habido un mejor tono que en el periodo anterior y se han hecho algunos modestos progresos, pero, de nuevo, en las últimas semanas las tensiones y las declaraciones agresivas sobre Grecia han vuelto a estar sobre el tapete, lo que refuerza una impresión de imprevisibilidad que ayuda a comprender el costosísimo aislamiento político de Turquía.

Luego, la guerra ha ofrecido a Turquía una oportunidad para reivindicarse como un actor importante en materia de seguridad: el intento mediador de Turquía fue bienvenido, aunque haya fracasado, pero lo que no puede hacer Turquía es pretender que, dado ese papel geopolítico, es el momento de acelerar la represión, intentando rebajar las críticas externas; en realidad, lo que está haciendo Turquía es malgastar su escaso crédito internacional, reforzar su mala imagen y subrayar su aislamiento, y este Parlamento, desde luego, no se va a callar ante atropellos como los de Kavala, Kaftancıoğlu, Kılıç o la Universidad Boğaziçi, sea cual sea el papel geopolítico de Turquía.

Un papel, por cierto, nada claro a estas alturas; no es solo no seguir las sanciones, es invitar expresamente a los cleptócratas del Kremlin a disfrutar e invertir en la costa turca, a emitir tarjetas de crédito para los ciudadanos rusos por miles, al aumento exponencial de los vuelos entre Rusia y Turquía, al paso por los estrechos de mercantes civiles que pueden llevar armamento o a la falta de progreso en la exportación de los cereales de Odesa: medidas que, tomadas en su conjunto, se parecen mucho a un sistema para sortear las sanciones.

Si la guerra marca claramente la división entre democracias y sistemas autoritarios, es obvio que Turquía no está en nuestro campo, porque el modelo de sociedad que ofrece es el modelo ruso; si la guerra marca claramente la división entre países que defienden unas relaciones internacionales basadas en el Derecho y no en la fuerza de las armas, es obvio que Turquía, con sus operaciones en Nagorno Karabaj, en Irak o en Siria, no está en nuestro campo; si la guerra marca claramente la división entre aliados militares y rivales, es obvio que Turquía, con su irresponsable veto a Suecia y Finlandia, está haciendo un regalo al Kremlin.

Termino, señora presidenta. Turquía no tiene un problema con Suecia y Finlandia: Turquía tiene un problema con cualquier democracia, y eso es lo que demuestra este informe.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable rapporteur, dear Members of the European Parliament, let me first thank the rapporteur, Mr Sánchez Amor, for his work and the report presented to this House.

Today's debate allows us to take stock of Turkey-EU bilateral relations. Many of the concerns expressed by the European Parliament concur with our own findings and the position taken by the European Council.

It confirms a worrying trend: Turkey has continued to move away from the EU. This is why accession negotiations with Turkey remain at a standstill. As you know, the rule of law and fundamental rights in Turkey remain a key concern. The targeting of political parties, human rights defenders and media represents major setbacks for human rights and runs counter to Turkey's obligations to respect democracy, the rule of law and women's rights. Dialogue on such issues remains an integral part of the EU Turkey relationship.

The Commission remains worried about the overall situation of the judiciary, the rule of law and the respect for fundamental rights in Turkey. Turkey's refusal to implement the rulings of the European Court of Human Rights is particularly troubling. I know that this House has condemned the Osman Kavala case. The Commission will also keep consistently bringing up the case of Mr Kavala with the Turkish interlocutors at all levels.

We will equally keep supporting civil society, human rights and democracy. We will continue to channel our substantial assistance via civil society organisations in line with the long-standing request of the European Parliament. More specifically, under IPA III, we have around EUR 67 million for 2021 to 2023 and around EUR 12 million under the NDICI-Global Europe programme on human rights and democracy for the period between 2021 and 2024.

Turkey remains a key partner for the EU in areas of common interest. It is positive that tensions with Turkey have decreased over the past months as Turkey's provocative actions in the East Mediterranean receded in 2021. In this context, the Commission has started implementing the positive agenda put forward by the EU leaders, and this allowed us to step up high-level dialogue in areas which are clear priority for the EU.

We need to address topics of common challenges such as the green transition, energy and post-COVID recovery. We have recently launched a new instrument, the Turkey Investment Platform, that opens the door to the European Fund for Sustainable Development+ to Turkey, similarly to all other EPA III and NDICI countries. It will leverage funding to Turkish businesses and private sector to address the challenges of the twin digital green transition and provide access to finance for SMEs, including in the fields of connectivity, decarbonisation, energy, public transport, urban development or human capital. This will ensure that we can provide EU guarantees to investments made in Turkey and supported by our partner finance institutions.

Further, we continue our programming discussions on the EUR 3 billion in additional refugee assistance with the Turkish side. Following the mandate of the European Council of June last year, we focus on the continuation of key projects sited under the Facility for Refugees in Turkey. You will recall that last year we agreed on the continuation of key support in the areas of education, basic needs and border management, and our current discussions build on this. Now we are discussing additional basic needs support, protection, socioeconomic support with a view to ensure uninterrupted support to close to 2 million people.

An additional element we will work on is support to secure Turkey's eastern border, to prevent irregular migration in line with our key policy principles. As all the additional funding would be channelled through the EU budget, we are committed to ensure the same level of transparency as for other projects and programmes. In addition, we will continue to invite representatives of this House to the Steering Committee of the Facility for Refugees.

The biggest challenge with Turkey remains the lack of prospect for a solution to the Cyprus issue. We need Turkey to stop its provocative actions in Varosha and exert its influence so that the northern Cypriot community engages in the UN-led settlement negotiations. I would like to thank the European Parliament for having granted additional funds to the EU aid programme for the Turkish Cypriot community this year and in previous years. This year's EUR 1 million will be allocated to confidence-building measures between the two communities in Cyprus in the form of supporting the work of bicomunal committees on cultural heritage and on missing persons.

Finally, regarding the war in Ukraine, Turkey's ongoing active diplomacy and solidarity with Ukraine is essential, including the efforts to achieve a cease-fire. We welcome Turkey playing a constructive role for the de-escalation of the conflict by also recognising the impact of the war on trade, tourism and the economy at large. At the same time, we continue to encourage Turkey to take an even more decisive stance on aligning more with the EU positions. We expect extra vigilance from Turkey when it comes to the prevention of the circumvention of sanctions.

Thank you very much for your attention and I am looking forward to this debate.

Gheorghe-Vlad Nistor, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I will speak in my native tongue. It's easier for me when the subject is a very important one.

Doamna președintă, trăim într-o lume extrem de bizară. Trăim într-o lume cu provocări enorme. Trăim într-o lume în care Europa se confruntă, după atâtea zeci de ani, cu un adevărat război. Iar guvernul de la Ankara știe să joace o carte politică și diplomatică, bazându-se în mod esențial pe argumentele sale militare, pe argumentele sale economice, dar mai ales pe argumentele sale diplomatice.

Toate acestea însă, calitatea de aliat al Republicii Turcia, cu cele mai multe dintre țările noastre în calitate de membru al NATO, nu exonerează guvernul de la Ankara de responsabilitatea încălcării atât de flagrante, repetate și agresive a drepturilor omului și a tuturor principiilor statului de drept. Iar ceea ce în ultima vreme guvernul de la Ankara face în raport cu Republica Cipru și în raport cu Grecia, astăzi, zilele acestea, depășește cu totul imaginația cuiva care spera să trăiască într-o lume a păcii.

Maria Arena, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, on l'a dit, mon collègue Nacho l'a dit, en matière de droits de l'homme, la situation en Turquie est catastrophique. Selon les rapports qui sont à notre disposition, plus de 87 journalistes sont en prison pour cause de terrorisme, pour simplement avoir fait leur travail. Plus d'un millier de personnes ont été arrêtées pour avoir publié des posts, pour diffamation, insulte ou encore propagande terroriste.

Des condamnations à perpétuité sans possibilité de recours, pour M. Osman Kavala. Des étudiants arrêtés pour avoir manifesté pour les droits des LGBT ou encore les féminicides, très nombreux aujourd'hui en Turquie. Des interdictions de partis à l'aube de l'organisation des élections, sans parler du rôle de la Turquie en Syrie, en Libye, à nos portes. Et encore le fait que la Turquie a attaqué une de nos collègues, Evin Incir, qui est ici, également pour de prétendus liens avec des organisations terroristes.

Oui, la Turquie a rompu avec les valeurs qui sont les valeurs démocratiques européennes. Vous avez parlé, Monsieur le Commissaire, du gel de l'adhésion de la Turquie. Bien sûr, mais il y a aussi d'autres instruments qui sont à nos portes. Aujourd'hui, nous avons à notre disposition l'Union douanière, qui est un outil économique avec la Turquie, dont la Turquie bénéficie. Et je pense que cette union douanière doit être revue également.

Malik Azmani, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam Chair, Commissioner, dear colleagues, first of all, I would like to thank, of course, Mr Sánchez Amor, the rapporteur, for all his efforts for this important report, and, of course, also those who were closely involved. Well, Madam Chair, my visit to Turkey a few weeks ago made it perfectly clear that the coming year will become a turbulent one in the EU–Turkey relations. The Turkish reluctance to agree on Finland's and Sweden's NATO applications is just a starter. More issues will arise as we come closer to the Turkish elections in summer next year. My main message is to remain calm. Too much is at stake – migration, security, the economy. The EU and Turkey are important partners. But we also have to be firm and crystal clear: there are red lines. One would be unreasonably obstructing Finland's and Sweden's NATO applications. We expect Turkey, as a long-standing and valued NATO partner, to engage constructively. Another is that Turkey should not become a safe haven for Russian capital and assets, thereby undermining EU sanctions. This would be simply unacceptable to the EU. Let this be a friendly warning to our friends in Turkey.

Sergey Lagodinsky, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, dear rapporteur, dear colleagues, it's the same procedure as every year – almost every year – and honestly, this procedure is getting more and more tiring. Every year we speak about human rights, democracy, about the situation in south-eastern Turkey, about Cyprus, about Greece. And even those of us who are most open towards European perspectives for Turkey are getting tired and are getting frustrated.

But this year there is one more topic, a topic that has a potential not to damage but to destroy our relationship, because it is about security. It's about existential issues for EU members. It's about reliability of Turkey as a defence partner.

Turkish support for Ukraine has been an important cornerstone of Ukraine's defence and we did applaud Turkey for this. But Turkey is blocking NATO's membership of two countries bordering or close to Russia, to the aggressor now. This is an issue of collective security, and this is a question of solidarity with two EU members. And we cannot rely on supportive and understandable behaviour of Turkish government here. And if we can't rely on Turkey in the matter like this, if Turkish Government is using the NATO accession issue to leverage their own agenda, then we have to say to our Turkish partners, this is not the right way to go.

The damage that is being done here to Turkey's reputation as an alliance member is immense and goes beyond what this government imagines. All of us, those who believe in Turkey's European future, are losing our faith. We're losing our faith when we see the ruling on Gezi case. We're losing our faith when we see the position on NATO accession. We call on our Turkish friends, and this report is one of the last calls, to stop this path away from the European Union. Let's work together. Let's return to the same European table.

Nicolaus Fest, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Es kommt nicht häufig vor, dass ich politische Gegner lobe, aber Herr Amor, Ihr Bericht ist wirklich gut. 8,3 Mrd. Euro hat die Türkei bisher aus dem Fonds zur Ermöglichung des Beitritts bekommen, und das Ergebnis ist mehr als unbefriedigend. Aber ich höre schon wieder die Worte der Kommission: Ja, die Türkei sei ein wichtiger Partner, und man müsse einen hochrangigen Dialog führen, und dann gäbe es auch weitere Investitionen. Man fragt sich wirklich, wie lange es noch so weitergehen soll.

Auch was Herr Lagodinsky sagte, ist ja richtig – wir hören das jedes Jahr wieder: Es gibt immer wieder Berichte über die Türkei, und jedes Jahr wird es schlimmer. Wir haben die Unterdrückung von Opposition und Minderheiten, wir haben die Erosion von Grundrechten – vor allem bei Frauen –, wir haben eine komplett politisierte Justiz mit absurden Strafverfahren gegen Regimekritiker, wir haben uferlose Korruption, keinen Willen zur Reform, Geldwäsche, oligarchische Strukturen, Terrorismusfinanzierung, und die Pressefreiheit ist hochgradig gefährdet, und es gibt auch noch harte Homophobie.

Also ganz ehrlich: Was braucht es denn noch, damit man daraus mal irgendwann die richtigen Schlüsse zieht? Wir reden bei jeder Plenartagung über Polen und Ungarn, aber im Vergleich mit der Türkei sind diese beiden Länder geradezu Paradiese der Freiheit, der bürgerlichen Rechte, der funktionierenden Justiz und der Pressefreiheit.

Die Türkei ist ein wichtiger Partner, aber wahrscheinlich ist sie kein wichtiger Partner innerhalb der EU – zumindest nicht unter Erdoğan. Das sollten wir irgendwann einmal zur Kenntnis nehmen und solange Erdoğan dort ist, die Beitrittsverhandlungen definitiv stoppen und auch keine weiteren Gelder an die Türkei überweisen.

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ενωμένη Ευρώπη δημιουργήθηκε στις στάχτες του απάνθρωπου εξτρεμισμού, του εξτρεμισμού που διέπραξε το Ολοκαύτωμα των Εβραίων στο εσωτερικό της Ευρώπης και που απείλησε και υποδούλωσε κράτη εκτός αυτής. Τότε, πολλές ευρωπαϊκές δυνάμεις επέλεξαν το εμπόριο, αντί της έγκαιρης επέμβασης. Επέλεξαν την ησυχία τους, αντί της ανθρώπινης ζωής. Επέλεξαν την πολιτική του κατευνασμού, αντί της αντιμετώπισης του τέρατος. Και σας ρωτάω λοιπόν: είναι ή δεν είναι η Τουρκία ένα εξτρεμιστικό κράτος;

Φαίνεται πως έχουμε μία Ευρώπη που ξέχασε τα μαθήματα που πήρε στον Δεύτερο Παγκόσμιο Πόλεμο, που λησμόνησε την Ιστορία και είναι έτοιμη να την ξαναζήσει. Σύμφωνα με την κυρίαρχη ευρωπαϊκή νοοτροπία, η Ευρώπη δεν θα δίσταζε να πει στον Χίτλερ και στους Εβραίους να λύσουν μεταξύ τους τις διαφορές, ό,τι λείει λίγο πολύ και στους Έλληνες και Κύπριους που αντιμετωπίζουν καθημερινά την τουρκική εγκληματικότητα. Η πολιτική των ίσων αποστάσεων λοιπόν δεν είναι απλώς ντροπή, είναι μία βόμβα στα θεμέλια της Ευρώπης.

(χειροκροτήματα)

Γιώργος Γεωργίου, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας *The Left*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, θέλω να ευχαριστήσω τον κ. Sánchez Amor για την προσπάθεια που κατέβαλε να φέρει μπροστά μας μια ισορροπημένη έκθεση αναφορικά με την πρόοδο στις σχέσεις της Ένωσης με την Τουρκία. Δεν ξέρω βέβαια, αν υπήρξε ποτέ φως στο τούνελ των ευρωτουρκικών σχέσεων. Κάποιοι Ευρωπαίοι, βέβαια, αλληθωρίζοντας κάνουν πως το βλέπουν για να εξυπηρετήσουν το λεγόμενο «κοινό συμφέρον» και κατατάσσουν την Τουρκία, εν μέσω της ρωσικής εισβολής στην Ουκρανία, στη σωστή πλευρά της Ιστορίας. Αυτά είναι ντροπής πράγματα.

Έτσι διαβάζουμε την Ιστορία; Για μια Τουρκία η οποία έκανε επί 48 χρόνια στην Κύπρο ό,τι κάνει και η Ρωσία σήμερα στην Ουκρανία, που συνεχίζει να κατέχει παράνομα ευρωπαϊκό έδαφος, που λειτουργεί αναθεωρητικά σε βάρος της Ελλάδας, που εισβάλλει σε γειτονικές χώρες, που συμπεριφέρεται ως πειρατής στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο, που εισβάλλει στην κυπριακή ΑΟΖ, που εποικίζει την Αμμόχωστο, που διαγράφει τα ψηφίσματα του ΟΗΕ και του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου;

Θέλετε κι άλλα; Δεν σέβεται τις αποφάσεις του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης, φυλακίζει τον Καβαλά και τον Ντεμιρτάς και χιλιάδες άλλους Τούρκους πολίτες, παραβιάζει το κράτος δικαίου και τις θεμελιώδεις ελευθερίες στη χώρα, αλλοτριώνει τη βούληση των συμπατριωτών μας Τουρκοκυπρίων, εργαλειοποιεί το μεταναστευτικό και απειλεί την Ευρώπη. Τώρα απειλεί και το NATO και κάποιοι την τοποθετούν στη σωστή πλευρά της Ιστορίας. Συνεχίζουν να της δίνουν όπλα και πακτωλούς χρημάτων και να της τάζουν και αντίδωρα.

Πώς θα της αναβαθμίσετε την Τελωνειακή Ένωση όταν δεν συμμορφώνεται με την υφιστάμενη και δεν εφαρμόζει το συμπληρωματικό πρωτόκολλο; Πείτε μας επιτέλους την αλήθεια. Η αλήθεια είναι μία: προέχουν πάνω από τις αξίες και το δίκαιο τα γεωπολιτικά συμφέροντα και οι ανταγωνισμοί σε βάρος των λαών. Είναι κρίμα, πραγματικά κρίμα για την Ένωση.

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση χαρακτηρίζει «στρατηγικό εταίρο» την Τουρκία και αναγνωρίζει «τα συμφέροντα και τους στόχους της» στον ανταγωνισμό με την ελληνική αστική τάξη για τη γεωστρατηγική αναβάθμιση τους.

Καλεί το τουρκικό κράτος να διευθετήσει τις βλέψεις του μέσα από «διάλογο και διπλωματία», όπου θα τεθεί το Αιγαίο και η κυπριακή ΑΟΖ ως «κυρίως πιάτο» για συνεκμετάλλευση, την οποία υποστηρίζουν ΗΠΑ, NATO και Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Το ευρωατλαντικό μπλοκ, με το οποίο εναρμονίζεται η ελληνική κυβέρνηση αναλαμβάνοντας μεγάλες ευθύνες, ενθαρρύνει τις τουρκικές υπερπητήσεις, παραβιάσεις, την αμφισβήτηση ελληνικών νησιών, κάνοντας, όπως η Επιτροπή σε δήλωσή της, επικίνδυνη διάκριση σε «κατοικημένα» και μη νησιά. Στο δε Κυπριακό, η μετατροπή του προκλητικού ισχυρισμού περί «ανεπίλυτης σύγκρουσης» σε «ανεπίλυτο πρόβλημα» μέσα στην έκθεση αποσιωπά, σε κάθε περίπτωση, τη 48χρονη τουρκική εισβολή και κατοχή της Κύπρου και προμηνύει οδυνηρούς συμβιβασμούς διχοτομικών «λύσεων».

Το ευρωνατοϊκό στρατόπεδο αποσκοπεί στην ενίσχυση της νοτιοανατολικής πτέρυγας του NATO και παζαρεύει για να κερδίσει την Τουρκία στον ανταγωνισμό με τη Ρωσία. Όχι μόνο δεν εγγυάται ελληνικά και κυπριακά κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα, αλλά οδηγεί σε επικίνδυνες εντάσεις και επώδυνες διευθετήσεις. Οι λαοί πρέπει να επαγρυπνούν.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Madam President, I want to start with thanking the Turkey rapporteur, Nacho Sánchez Amor, for the good work. Dialogue is important, but it must always be based on respect for international law and progress of democracy to ensure a cohesive world and respect for human rights. As the rapporteur clearly stated and rightly stated, we see enormous regression of democracy in Turkey.

In the struggle for international law and democracy must also lie the battle against disinformation. I am therefore worried when, as a female legislator in this European Parliament, together with other Swedish-Kurdish female politicians in my country needing to face disinformation and baseless allegations by far-right Turkish media with ridiculous claims that I have been a part of an armed struggle in Turkey and been sent to this Parliament by PKK. These lies are unacceptable and are a direct attack on our European democracy. The even more ridiculous thing is that it is being echoed by Swedish far-right media as well.

Olof Palme once said, 'For us, democracy is a question of human dignity, and human dignity is political freedom'. Putting those words in the context of today, the spread of disinformation by far-right Turkish media are attacks on European democracy...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, il paraît que le président Erdogan demande que la première ministre suédoise limoge son ministre de la défense, nous l'avons appris ce week-end. Alors puisque le président turc a des exigences, autant lui dire nous aussi ce que nous attendons de lui.

Monsieur Erdogan, cessez de prendre en otage la demande d'adhésion de la Finlande et de la Suède à l'OTAN. Cette demande est légitime. Votre chantage ne l'est pas. Monsieur le Président, cessez de croire que la Turquie est chez elle en Syrie. Vous portez atteinte à la lutte contre Daech, un terrorisme qui a endeuillé notre continent. Monsieur Erdogan, respectez la souveraineté de la Grèce et de Chypre, elle n'est pas négociable. Monsieur le Président, n'achetez pas le blé que la Russie vole aux Ukrainiens, n'accueillez pas à bras ouverts les oligarques.

La guerre d'Ukraine est un tournant historique. Il vous revient cette fois-ci, pour une fois, de mettre la Turquie du bon côté de l'histoire. Vous le pouvez encore, mais le temps presse.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, this is a very good report and a strong report and so it needs to be followed with strong actions. This report highlights that our approach so far has failed to seriously address the human rights crisis in Turkey that is becoming extremely dire alongside the erosion of democracy and the rule of law.

The Turkish authorities have constantly disregarded the rulings by the European Court of Human Rights. We were one month ago, less than one month ago, in this Parliament, discussing the concerns we have on the aggravated life sentence handed to Osman Kavala in 2022. The treatment of migrants at the border in the country is a disgrace for EU because we continue to subcontract how we deal with the situation. We still consider them as a real partner and we act as though we believe that there is a shared mutual respect for human rights, and there is not.

And also, discrimination and criminalisation of Kurds in Turkey is not met with enough scrutiny on our part and in general by international stakeholders. Generalised discrimination of minorities continues, while the European Commission continues to engage in high-level dialogues. Of course, it is a step in the right direction that the EU-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee took place earlier this year. But this report shows that we urgently need a much more severe attitude that can no longer be based on mutual trust.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το μήνυμα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου είναι σαφές και ισχυρό. Η αντιδημοκρατική οπισθοδρόμηση, ο ιστορικός αναθεωρητισμός, η επιθετικότητα της ηγεσίας Ερντογάν απέναντι στην Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο, την απομακρύνουν ολοένα και περισσότερο και από τη δημοκρατία και από το διεθνές δίκαιο και από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Τη μετατρέπουν σε παράγοντα αποσταθεροποίησης και σε έναν αναξιόπιστο και επικίνδυνο εταίρο. Το βλέπουμε και με το πώς συμπεριφέρεται απέναντι στη ρωσική εισβολή στην Ουκρανία και στα αιτήματα της Φινλανδίας και της Σουηδίας.

Κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, αν θέλουμε ειρήνη και σταθερότητα στην περιοχή και δημοκρατία στην Τουρκία, χρειάζεται αυστηρότερη στάση απέναντι στην τουρκική ηγεσία, μεγαλύτερη πίεση, όχι λογική ίσων αποστάσεων, όχι τσάι και συμπάθεια. Και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο είναι σαφές και κατηγορηματικό. Αλλά περιμένουμε και από εσάς της Επιτροπής την ίδια στάση. Όχι «ουδέν σχόλιο» από την εκπρόσωπο της Επιτροπής μετά από την αμφισβήτηση της κυριαρχίας των ελληνικών νησιών. Και περιμένουμε, επιτέλους, από το Συμβούλιο και από τις κυβερνήσεις να υιοθετήσουν το αίτημα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου για εμπάργκο πώλησης όπλων στην ηγεσία Ερντογάν.

Στέλιος Κυμπουρόπουλος (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Κύριε Επίτροπε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, όλοι διαπιστώνουμε πως οι διαπραγματεύσεις με την Τουρκία έχουν βαλτώσει και παρουσιάζεται μία ταχεία υποχώρηση. Η Τουρκία, ενδεικτικά μόνο, εντείνει την επιθετικότητα της κατά της Ελλάδας, αμφισβητώντας την κυριαρχία των ελληνικών νησιών στο Αιγαίο, ασκεί επιθετική πολιτική στην Κύπρο με το άνοιγμα των Βαρωσίων, παραβιάζοντας αποφάσεις του ΟΗΕ, κατηγορεί τη Σουηδία και τη Φιλανδία για δεσμούς με την τρομοκρατία, αποσταθεροποιεί τη Λιβύη και τη Συρία. Αδιαφορεί για τις καταστροφές στην Αγιά Σοφιά, την οποία μετέτρεψε σε τέμενος, καταπιέζει θρησκευτικές ελευθερίες των μειονοτήτων.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ξεκίνησε διαπραγματεύσεις με την Τουρκική Δημοκρατία και όμως, πλέον συνδιαλέγεται με την απομίμηση της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει, σεβόμενη τις αρχές και τις αξίες της, να διατηρήσει παγωμένες τις ενταξιακές διαπραγματεύσεις, μέχρι η Τουρκία να καταλάβει τις δημοκρατικές και σε μεγάλο βαθμό αλλαγές που πρέπει να κάνει στην κυβέρνησή της. Ο διάλογος με ένα αυταρχικό, ανορθολογικό καθεστώς είναι επιβλαβής για την Ένωση και για τον τουρκικό λαό, καθώς νομιμοποιεί την ηγεσία Ερντογάν που τον κρατάει μακριά από το ευρωπαϊκό μέλλον του.

PREDESEDÁ: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podpredseda

Eero Heinäluoma (S&D). – Arvoisa puhemies, meillä on syytä huoleen Turkin viime vuosien kehityksestä. Demokratiaongelmat, mediavapauden rajoittaminen, vallan keskittyminen ja myös Turkin ulkopoliittiset kannanotot herättävät vakavia kysymyksiä, mihin maa on menossa ja kenen ystävä se haluaa olla.

Tänään Turkin johto loukkaa Suomea ja Ruotsia estäessään näiden maiden Nato-jäsenhakemusten etenemisen. Turkin johdon toiminnassa kyse ei ole terrorismin torjunnasta – sillä terrorismin vastustaminen on jokaisen EU-jäsenmaan sisäistävä asia – vaan kyse on Suomen ja Ruotsin Nato-jäsenyyden käyttämisestä pelinappulana Turkin johdon muiden poliittisten ja sotilaallisten tavoitteiden edistämiseen.

EU-parlamentilta odotetaan nyt selkeää kannanottoa, jossa puolustetaan kaikkien EU-maiden perustavaa laatua olevaa oikeutta valita itse turvallisuuspoliittinen suuntauksensa. Ihmettelen, ettei komission edustaja puuttunut tähän asiaan äskeisessä puheenvuorossaan ollenkaan. Suomi ja Ruotsi ansaitsevat meidän kaikkien tuen.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, in Europa is geen plaats voor dit Turkije waar journalisten worden aangevallen, oppositieleiden worden onderdrukt en geweld tegen vrouwen lijkt te worden aanvaard, en dat bindende uitspraken van het Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens naast zich neerlegt.

Geen lidmaatschap, wel een partnerschap. Turkije is immers een belangrijke strategische partner; dat is tijdens de oorlog in Oekraïne nog duidelijker geworden. Dit betekent echter niet dat Europa zijn waarden moet verloochenen.

Ik vraag mij soms af waarom Erdoğan nog tot de Europese Unie wil toetreden. Hij houdt Europa namelijk elke dag voor de gek. Denk daarbij aan zijn chantage tijdens de migratiecrisis of, recentelijker, als partner binnen de NAVO, waar hij zich tegen de toetreding van Zweden en Finland verzet. Kan iemand als hij een partner worden genoemd?

Ik ben daarom heel blij dat het Parlement vandaag een zeer duidelijk standpunt inneemt: dit Turkije kan niet toetreden.

Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Κύριε Επίτροπε, δεν ξέρω αλήθεια πόσο υποκριτικό είναι να μιλάμε πλέον για μια έκθεση, στην οποία συνυπάρχουν στην ίδια πρόταση οι λέξεις «Τουρκία» και «πρόοδος». Δεν ξέρω πλέον αλήθεια πόσο ωφελεί να αραδιάζουμε από αυτό εδώ το βήμα όλα εκείνα τα επιχειρήματα που αποδεικνύουν περίτρανα ότι η Τουρκία του Ερντογάν δεν έχει καμία σχέση με το ευρωπαϊκό οικοδόμημα.

Έστω λοιπόν και αν έχουν κάποιοι κλειστά τα αυτιά τους, εμείς οφείλουμε να στεκόμαστε εδώ, ενώπιόν σας, και να σας θυμίζουμε κάποιες πικρές πραγματικότητες. Το χρωστάμε στα εκατομμύρια των θυμάτων του τουρκικού επεκτατισμού, στους Έλληνες, Ποντίους, Αρμένιους και Κούρδους. Το χρωστάω στους νεκρούς και τους πρόσφυγες της πατρίδας μου, της Κύπρου. Όλοι αυτοί μας κοιτούν σήμερα στα μάτια και μας ρωτούν -σας ρωτούν, κύριε Επίτροπε- για πόσο ακόμα θα υποκρινόμαστε ότι η Τουρκία έχει θέση δίπλα σε δημοκρατικές ευρωπαϊκές κοινωνίες.

Για πόσο ακόμα θα δεχόμαστε τον σφαγέα Ευρωπαίων πολιτών να απαιτεί, να απειλεί, να εωφελείται από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, χωρίς να λογοδοτεί για τα εγκλήματά του. Έχετε κάποια απάντηση να δώσετε στο ερώτημα «συμφέροντα ή αξίες»; Εάν υπήρχε απάντηση και εάν υπηρετούσαμε αξίες και όχι συμφέροντα δεν θα συζητούσαμε καν σήμερα περί έκθεσης προόδου για την Τουρκία.

(χειροκροτήματα)

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, μόνο τους τελευταίους μήνες ο κ. Ερντογάν ζητάει την αποστρατικοποίηση των ελληνικών νησιών του Ανατολικού Αιγαίου, αμφισβητώντας ευθέως την κυριαρχία της Ελλάδας. Συνεχίζει τις προκλήσεις στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο και τις παράνομες ενέργειες στην περικλειστή περιοχή των Βαρωσίων, αδιαφορώντας για τις αποφάσεις του ΟΗΕ. Εκβιάζει την Ευρώπη σχετικά με την είσοδο της Φινλανδίας και της Σουηδίας στο ΝΑΤΟ, ενώ είναι η μόνη χώρα που δεν έχει επιβάλει κυρώσεις στη Ρωσία. Συνεχίζει να παραβιάζει τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα στο εσωτερικό της Τουρκίας, με όποιον αμφισβητεί την εξουσία του να μετατρέπεται απευθείας σε εχθρό του κράτους ή τρομοκράτη, όπως φαίνεται στην περίπτωση του Καβαλά και του Ντεμιρτάς. Επίσης, προσπαθεί να θέσει εκτός νόμου το φιλοκουρδικό κόμμα HDP.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, η Ένωση δεν πρέπει να επαναλάβει με τον Ερντογάν τα λάθη που έκανε με τον Πούτιν. Όποιος αμφισβητεί το διεθνές δίκαιο, όποιος είναι αναθεωρητής, πρέπει να έχει την ίδια αντιμετώπιση. Στοχευμένες, λοιπόν, οικονομικές κυρώσεις σε πρόσωπα που στηρίζουν την κυβέρνηση Ερντογάν, αλλά και ένα πανευρωπαϊκό εμπάργκο όπλων, όπως έχουμε ζητήσει ως Κοινοβούλιο ήδη από τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2020.

(χειροκροτήματα)

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πρέπει να δώσουμε προτεραιότητα στην προάσπιση των δικαιωμάτων των Κούρδων. Ο Ερντογάν επιτίθεται ή και έχει καταλάβει περιοχές των Κούρδων, της Συρίας και του Ιράκ. Δεν σέβεται τη διεθνή νομιμότητα και μπορεί να εξασκείται για περιπέτειες σε βάρος Ελλάδας και Κύπρου. Ο Ερντογάν χαρακτηρίζει τους Κούρδους, όπως και πολλούς πολιτικούς αντιπάλους του, «τρομοκράτες». Αξιοποιεί αυτόν τον αυθαίρετο χαρακτηρισμό για να προβάλει αντιρρήσεις στην ένταξη της Φινλανδίας και της Σουηδίας στο ΝΑΤΟ, ακόμη και για να απειλήσει την Ελλάδα. Με ένα μείγμα δώξεων και ρυθμίσεων προσπαθεί να βγάλει το Λαϊκό Δημοκρατικό Κόμμα (HDP) από τη Βουλή. Η κακομεταχείριση των Κούρδων από τον Ερντογάν και το σύστημα εξουσίας της Τουρκίας πρέπει να παίξουν βασικό ρόλο στην αξιολόγηση εκ μέρους μας της Τουρκίας και της προοπτικής των ευρωτουρκικών σχέσεων.

(χειροκροτήματα)

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, αν θα πρέπει να διδαχτούμε ένα και μόνο πράγμα από την εισβολή Πούτιν στην Ουκρανία, αυτό θα ήταν οπωσδήποτε η μηδενική ανοχή, διότι κάποιοι δυστυχώς εκλαμβάνουν την ανοχή ως αδυναμία. Η Τουρκία συνεχίζει μια τακτική τουλάχιστον επικίνδυνη, πράγμα που έχουμε επισημάνει πολλές φορές. Πατάει διαρκώς σε δύο «βάρκες», μία στην Ανατολή και μία στη Δύση, και θα πρέπει να κληθεί να επιλέξει, χωρίς αστεριώδεις, χωρίς υποσημειώσεις, χωρίς πίσωγυρίσματα, με τρόπο ξεκάθαρο και ευθύ. Δεν μπορεί η Τουρκία να συνεχίσει να απειλεί, να προκαλεί και να εκβιάζει. Δεν πρέπει να δείξουμε άλλη ανοχή. Η Τουρκία δεν μπορεί πάντα να είναι το «άτακτο παιδί» το οποίο ανεχόμαστε, ανεχόμαστε τα κατώματά του και προσπαθούμε να το νουθετήσουμε.

Κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η χώρα μου, η Ελλάδα, απέναντι στις κλιμακούμενες τουρκικές προκλήσεις κάνει το καθήκον της και προς την Ευρώπη και προς τα νότια σύνορά της. Είναι η κατάλληλη στιγμή να κάνει και η Ευρώπη το καθήκον της απέναντι στην Ελλάδα και να πει με πράξεις «φτάνει πια».

(χειροκροτήματα)

Δημήτρης Παπαδάκης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, ευτυχώς που υπάρχει ο στρατηγικός εταίρος που ονομάζεται Τουρκία, η οποία ταυτίζεται με τις κυρώσεις κατά της Ρωσίας, δεν καλοσωρίζει τους Ρώσους ολιγάρχες και δεν συνεχίζει το ανατολικό παζάρι. Ευτυχώς, η Τουρκία δεν εκβιάζει με το μεταναστευτικό και δεν εργαλειοποιεί τους πρόσφυγες. Ευτυχώς που η Τουρκία σέβεται τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα των πολιτών της και δεν βάζει στη φυλακή όποιον διαφωνεί. Έχει καλές σχέσεις με τους γείτονές της και δεν προκαλεί εντάσεις κάθε λίγο και λιγάκι. Δεν κατέχει ευρωπαϊκά εδάφη με τη βία, δεν προκαλεί στο Αιγαίο και δεν επιχειρεί νέα εισβολή στη Συρία τώρα που μιλάμε.

Δυστυχώς για εμάς, αυτό είναι ένα παραμύθι που πολύ θα θέλαμε να είναι αληθινό, αλλά έχει και αυτό τέλος, όπως όλα τα παραμύθια. Όμως, κάποιοι εντός της ευρωπαϊκής οικογένειας θέλουν να πιστεύουν πως αυτό το παραμύθι είναι αληθινό. Για έναν λόγο, για να εξυπηρετήσουν τα οικονομικά συμφέροντα των χωρών τους. Και αυτό το παραμύθι δεν θα έχει ευτυχές τέλος για την ίδια την Ευρώπη, αλλά τραγικό.

(χειροκροτήματα)

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, έχω την ισχυρή πεποίθηση αλλά και απαίτηση η έκθεση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου για την Τουρκία να αρχίζει και να τελειώνει με μια ισχυρότατη, σαφέστατη, αυστηρότατη επισήμανση: ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν ανέχεται κανέναν εισβολέα, ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν μπορεί και δεν πρέπει να έχει οποιαδήποτε σχέση με οποιονδήποτε εισβολέα και μάλιστα με τον εισβολέα των εισβολέων, που εδώ και 48 χρόνια κατέχει ευρωπαϊκό έδαφος χώρας μέλους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης της Κύπρου, παραβιάζει συλλήβδην τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και το κράτος δικαίου, συνεχίζει να απειλεί και να παραβιάζει κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα χωρών μελών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, της Κύπρου και της Ελλάδος, και δεν σεβάστηκε και δεν σέβεται καμία αρχή και καμία αξία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Σε αυτά τα ζητήματα η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να είναι ανυποχώρητη.

Για εμάς που υφιστάμεθα εδώ και 48 χρόνια την τουρκική βαρβαρότητα και εγκληματικότητα, την εισβολή και την κατοχή, για εμένα που μαζί με την οικογένειά μου και 200.000 Ελληνοκύπριους πρόσφυγες σηκώνω το μαρτυρικό σταυρό της προσφυγιάς, δεν επιτρέπεται η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να θεωρεί στρατηγικό εταίρο τον εισβολέα. Από τότε ο εισβολέας, πείτε μου, είναι στρατηγικός εταίρος; Από τότε ο εισβολέας είναι μέρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης;

Οφείλουμε από αυτό το βήμα, από το ισχυρό βήμα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, να στείλουμε ένα ισχυρό μήνυμα προς όλους. Όχι στη 48χρονη κατοχή της Κύπρου μας, της πολυπάθης και πολυβασανισμένης από τον Τούρκο εισβολέα! Όχι στα νέα τετελεσμένα του Ερντογάν και των εγκαθέτων τους στο κατοχικό καθεστώς της Αμμοχώστου και εις βάρος των νομίμων κατοίκων της, των Ελλήνων της Κύπρου!

(χειροκροτήματα)

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αναθεωρητική στάση της Τουρκίας, οι απειλές και οι εκβιασμοί του προέδρου Ερντογάν έχουν υπερβεί κάθε όριο. Τελευταίως, η συνειδητή κλιμάκωση της έντασης, η προσβλητική αναφορά του Ερντογάν στον Έλληνα πρωθυπουργό, τα εκβιαστικά διλήμματα και η περιφρόνηση του διεθνούς δικαίου μας καλούν να αρθούμε στο ύψος των περιστάσεων. Καθημερινές παραβιάσεις και υπερπτήσεις πάνω από την ελληνική επικράτεια ακολουθούνται από μύδρους, μόλις χτες, του προέδρου Ερντογάν εναντίον όσων, αν είναι δυνατόν, άφησαν τα νησιά στην Ελλάδα και επέτρεψαν την είσοδο της Κύπρου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Έφτασε στο σημείο να απειλεί με νέα εισβολή στο Αιγαίο και επανάληψη του 1922.

Συνάδελφοι, οι μέχρι σήμερα επικρίσεις στην τακτική Ερντογάν έχουν αποτύχει, έχουμε αποτύχει. Το χρέος μας επιβάλλει δυναμική αντίδραση, ανάλογη με εκείνη όταν εν μια νυκτί αποφασίσαμε επιβολή κυρώσεων σε βάρος της Ρωσίας για την παράνομη επίθεση κατά της Ουκρανίας. Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με δύο μέτρα και δύο σταθμά δεν νοείται, θα αδικούσε την ιστορική μας ευθύνη απέναντι στους Ευρωπαίους πολίτες και στις δημοκρατικές ηθικές αξίες της Ένωσης.

(χειροκροτήματα)

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συγχαρητήρια στον εισηγητή για την έκθεσή του. Ο νεο-οθωμανικός επεκτατισμός μας έφερε ως εδώ, με θέματα ασφάλειας για τα κράτη της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου, και ιδιαίτερα την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο, αλλά και για άλλα κράτη όπως η Συρία, η Λιβύη, μέχρι και τον Καύκασο, για έναν λόγο: ακολουθήσαμε την πολιτική του κατευνασμού, η οποία τροφοδοτεί δυστυχώς το θηρίο. Ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και διεθνές δίκαιο, και τα δύο, το τουρκικό καθεστώς τα παραβιάζει βίαια. Μετράμε μέρες από τη βίαιη εισβολή της Ρωσίας στην Ουκρανία, αλλά στην περίπτωση της Κύπρου, που συνιστά έδαφος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, μετράμε χρόνια. Σαράντα οκτώ, από το 1974, από την εισβολή και τη συνεχιζόμενη κατοχή εδάφους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Με μια αντίφαση όμως. Στη Ρωσία σωστά επιβάλαμε έξι πακέτα κυρώσεων – στην Τουρκία ούτε ένα. Και τελειώνω με τρεις προτάσεις. Απαγόρευση πώλησης όπλων προς την Τουρκία, απόχωση των κατοχικών στρατευμάτων από την Κύπρο και τέλος, αγαπητέ κύριε Επίτροπε, Τελωνειακή Ένωση, καταγγελία τώρα στον Παγκόσμιο Οργανισμό Εμπορίου, όπως κάνατε και για τη Λιθουανία εναντίον της Κίνας.

(χειροκροτήματα)

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, I wish this report could read differently, but it does indicate how Turkey has backslid in the fundamental principles of democracy. The report calls on Turkey to fully implement all judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, in line with Article 46 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

It reiterates the strong condemnation and regret over Turkey's withdrawal, by presidential decree, from the Council of Europe's Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence.

It asserts that the continued prosecution, censorship and harassment of journalists and independent media, an issue of concern in Turkey, needs to be addressed without delay.

The report goes on and goes on. It does highlight, unfortunately, and expresses deep concern about the state-sponsored deterioration in human rights situation for the LGBTIQI people, in particular with regard to physical attacks and hate crimes, especially against transgender persons and protective bans on pride marches across the country.

I would love to see a different Turkey, but we have a long way to go before it is acceptable to the norms and principles which we prescribe in this particular Parliament.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, year on year, we hear the same rhetoric about Turkey's inability to live up to European values and standards. And yet, at the same time, we're really happy to give them billions on a filthy deal designed to ensure that those fleeing what were often Western-provoked wars in Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria and so on are prevented from exercising their legal right to seek asylum in Europe and kept in Turkey. And people here have criticised Erdogan for instrumentalising migrants. Of course he can, because we fail to live up to our international responsibility. And we have the misnamed Minister for European Values, Schinas, telling us that he has a clear conscience about pushbacks from Greece into Turkey, denying the irrefutable evidence that the Greek Coast Guard are involved in what amounts to murder. Well, you know what? With values like that, I'd say Turkey fits in pretty well. And when you add their incursions again into Syrian sovereignty and undermining Syrian sovereign territory without a word from the European Union, is it any wonder that they don't take seriously anything that the EU says?

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, mi-ar fi plăcut ca acest raport să pună în evidență lucruri care privesc părțile pozitive ale relației dintre Uniunea Europeană și Turcia, însă pare că lipsesc tot mai mult aspectele care ne apropie de Turcia. Tocmai de aceea cred că este esențial să punem presiunea necesară pe Ankara, pentru a nu se îndepărta și mai mult de Uniunea Europeană.

Cred că este absolut fundamental ca în acest context Ankara să nu mai blocheze aderarea Suediei și Finlandei la NATO. Este esențial în contextul actual de securitate, generată de invazia ilegală a Rusiei în Ucraina, să facem tot ce ne stă în putință pentru a ține Turcia de partea noastră, pentru că o Turcie și mai vulnerabilă decât este astăzi, care calcă în picioare, din păcate, democrația, care disprețuiește drepturile omului, nu ne ajută cu nimic. Tocmai de aceea cred că Comisia trebuie să insiste pe această linie, de a o ține, cât se poate, aproape.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, Turkey is a NATO member and is a partner of many EU Member States. So why does the EU actually tolerate what Turkey gets up to? Turkey has been breaking international law on a regular basis for a long time and we put up with it.

Now we complain, and rightly so, about their illegality with Cyprus and Greece. But you know what? I actually think Turkey must be confused because we never said bugger all to them about their illegal occupation of Iraq or their stealing oil, their illegal occupation of Syria, along with the Americans and the Israelis, where oil and food has been stolen.

The inconsistencies of this place makes a mockery of our notion of the rule of law, of fundamental values and European values. Come on, why don't you apply the same rule every day? Are you okay with Turkey continuing to illegally occupy Syria? And now they're threatening to move further into it and take more of it, and you're saying nothing to them. Is it because you basically prefer Erdogan to Assad? Bring in some consistency and you shall have some credibility. Until then, you shall have no credibility.

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

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, *(start of speech off mic)* stressed that the country's accession to the EU is more meaningful than ever.

Turkey remains a key regional partner whose role is pivotal for ensuring the EU's stability and security. At the same time, it cannot justify the continuous backsliding on the rule of law and fundamental rights or bilateral tensions between our Member States and Turkey.

The Commission will continue to be guided by the Council conclusions on Turkey. We will continue working closely with the Turkish counterparts in order to advance cooperation in areas of common interest such as trade, climate, migration, security or health.

At the same time, we will keep raising the concerns and address the points of political differences. The respect for human rights and the rule of law remains a cornerstone for EU-Turkey relations.

In the same vein, reports of flights over Greek inhabited areas by Turkish air fighters are a source of concern. Disputing Greece's sovereignty over some of its islands is counterproductive and contradicts de-escalation efforts in the eastern Mediterranean. Turkey, therefore, is expected to unequivocally commit to good neighbourly relations, international agreements and peaceful settlement of disputes having recourse, if necessary, to the International Court of Justice.

Nacho Sánchez Amor, *ponente.* – Señor presidente, quiero agradecer el trabajo de los ponentes alternativos. Este es un dossier complicado, endemoniado, pero la verdad es que trabajar con ellos lo ha hecho muy fácil.

Nuestro compromiso, señorías, es con un país, no es con un Gobierno. Y cuando pensemos en la relación con el país, pensemos en su sociedad civil, porque somos de lo poco que le queda a esa sociedad civil. No lo olvidemos cuando hablamos de Turquía. Como yo suelo decir: Turquía no es Erdoğan y Erdoğan no es Turquía.

Y vamos a esta diplomacia de bazar del veto a Suecia y Finlandia de la OTAN, que es un veto irresponsable, porque es un regalo político para el Kremlin.

¿Piensa Turquía que Suecia y Finlandia están felices de incorporarse a una alianza en la que uno de sus miembros tiene misiles rusos del mismo tipo que teóricamente podrían ser utilizados contra ellos? ¿No es una burla que Turquía se permita dar lecciones a Suecia sobre su legislación antiterrorista cuando hay un clamor universal por el uso que hace Turquía de la suya?

Quizá Turquía está perdiendo su penúltima oportunidad, pero habrá sido este Gobierno, no lo olvidemos, no la sociedad civil turca.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava k tomuto bodu sa skončila.

Hlasovanie je zajtra.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕСР), в писмена форма. – Уважаеми колеги, поредният доклад за Турция, в който отчетливо личи нелепата, страхлива и беззъба европейска външна политика. Държавата, ръководена от диктатора Ердоган, няма място в Европейския съюз. Нещо повече, тя не е надежден партньор, не е стратегически партньор, не е наш приятел. Напротив, Турция е агресивна държава, където властва идеята за възстановяването на Османската империя, и ако продължавате да си затваряте очите, то това е много лошо.

Може би сте пропуснали, но Ердоган категорично се обяви срещу приемането на Финландия и Швеция в НАТО. В същото време продължава активно да работи с Русия. Продължавате ли да смятате тази държава за съюзна и партньорска? Ако да, то вие сте загубили връзка с реалния свят. Неразбираемо и нелогично е, когато Ердоган води война в Сирия и изнудва Европа с това да пусне потока от нелегални имигранти, ние да говорим за диалог и разбирателство. Не можем и не трябва да допускаме да сме заложници на диктатор, който е решил категорично да не се съобразява нито с международни договори, нито с човешки права, нито с Европейския съюз. Такава държава не може и не е наш партньор и никога няма да бъде. Това трябва да бъде ясно на всеки.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), kirjallinen. – Turkin tilanne on huolestuttava. Maa on kriittisessä asemassa Nato-jäsenenä ja EU:n lähinaapurina, mutta se luisuu yhä kauemmas EU:n jäsenyysskriteereistä ja yhteisistä arvoista. Ei ole EU:n intresseissä, että naapurinamme on tämänkaltainen maa. Turkilla on keskeinen rooli esimerkiksi EU:n pakolaispolitiikassa, eikä tilanne ole kestävä. Meidän on EU:ssa tehtävä kaikkemme Turkin demokraattisen kehityksen vahvistamiseksi. Virallisesti Turkin EU-jäsenyyssprosessi on yhä meneillään, vaikka se on ollut käytännössä jäissä jo vuosia. Turkki on systemaattisesti jättänyt toteuttamatta liittymisneuvotteluihin kuuluvia sitoumuksiaan. Myös Turkin ihmisoikeustilanne heikentyy edelleen, ja parlamentin pitääkin tuomita paine, joka Turkissa kohdistuu kansalaisyhteiskuntaan ja ihmisoikeuksien puolustajiin. EU:n pitäisi myös aktiivisesti tukea Turkin kansalaisyhteiskuntaa. Turkin nykykehitys näkyy esimerkiksi siinä, miten Turkki kiristää tällä hetkellä Naton jäsenmaita hyväksikäyttäen Suomen ja Ruotsin Nato-jäsenyyshakemuksia. Parlamentin pitää vaatia pidättäytymistä tällaisesta painostuksesta. Tällä hetkellä olisi todella tärkeää, että kaikki Nato-liittolaiset ratifioisivat nopeasti Suomen ja Ruotsin Nato-liittymispöytäkirjat.

16. Plan działania ESDZ w zakresie zmiany klimatu i obronności (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Další bod programu rokovania je správa, ktorú predkladá Thomas Waitz v mene Výboru pre zahraničné veci, o Pláne ESVČ v oblasti zmeny klímy a obrany (2021/2102(INI)) (A9-0084/2022).

Thomas Waitz, rapporteur. – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues. First of all, I want to thank all the shadow rapporteurs for the very constructive and compromising way that we were building this file. We were building it before the happenings in Ukraine. And even if the focus has shifted at the moment on security issues that result from the illegal and criminal and inhumane invasion of Putin's troops into Ukraine, the biggest threat, mid- and long-term to our common security is the devastating effects of global warming, causing extreme weather, causing natural catastrophes like droughts, like floods, like tornadoes, like the rising sea level. It has devastating effects on food production. It creates conflicts and fuels conflicts around the world. And it creates a big competition and conflict around resources like land and water.

All sectors of our economy and all sectors of our society actually have to contribute and are contributing to a CO₂ neutral society. While the military services and security services, especially the military services, are not even mentioned in the Paris Agreement – we have to be aware of that – they are one of the biggest emitters and one of the biggest absorbers of fossil fuels that we have in our societies. But through climate mainstreaming by the European Commission and the Green Deal and all of us together, this also has an impact on our security services.

So there is a clear demand also towards the security services to reduce their CO₂ emissions by 30%. And knowing that far more than 50% of the CO₂ emissions actually come from cooling and heating or from procurement and other services, we see that there is a huge potential, even before we start talking of potentially electrifying tanks.

And this may sound like a joke, but I had conversations with generals who saw the security advantage of possibly actually producing their own fuel on the base somewhere in the Sahel zone to actually run some of their equipment without being dependent on fossil fuel deliveries.

We have to be aware that this report is pointing out clearly towards the security needs that we are having also, in terms of cooperation with local populations, which is very much also related to the question whether we are equipped for extreme weather. What advantage does it have if we have equipment on the ground, which we cannot use because it's just too hot or weather extremes are preventing us from using it?

But also equipping our missions with the tools to actually cope with extreme weather can also be of use to also help civilians and local populations to cope with extreme weather. And this cooperation with local populations is also key for us in terms of peacebuilding, in terms of peace making, in terms of also cooperating on local solutions, which also make our civilian and military missions more secure for our staff. So this cooperation, local cooperation, is key. And yes, the experience of many of our generals is that the cooperation, especially with women on the ground, is very much delivering – you'll find this in the report.

We also have to see that we need climate experts in our missions because, meanwhile, we have data where we can actually already see well ahead where potential conflicts or already existing conflicts are accelerating through climate data because a lot of the conflicts that we see are actually based on land and water conflicts. And to use these data to bring them all together, to analyse them and to have people on the ground that are able to cope with this information will allow us and can allow us to also prevent conflicts and prevent actual clashes and violent activities on the ground.

And last but not least, there's a lot of initiatives across all sectors. We're having it in the External Action Service, we're having it in the Defence Fund. NATO is working on climate strategies. National governments are working on climate strategies. And this report also points out that we need to align all of that to one common defence and climate strategy. It is very important that we use the knowledge that is there, the activities that are there, because we need to accept the reality that this is the biggest security threat we have in the long and medium term. We need to be prepared for this. We launched this report with the hope that we're going forward to these long-term solutions with some goals.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, honourable members of the European Parliament, I make this statement on behalf of High-Representative Vice-President Josep Borrell. I would like to thank rapporteur Waitz and all the MEPs who have contributed to this timely report.

In a poll taken by Eurobarometer in January 2022, EU citizens ranked climate change and environmental issues first among the main global threats. It would be more accurate, therefore, to say, as your report rightly does, that climate change acts as a threat multiplier, it exacerbates socioeconomic instability in fragile countries, leading to increased insecurity. This is also what the Strategic Compass clearly highlights upfront.

Global energy transitions will also change the geopolitical landscape and the war in Ukraine is a catalyst in this regard. It provides an additional strategic urgency to invest more in green energy and reduce our external dependencies on oil and gas imports. This applies also to the defence sector and we do have to pay close attention, as your report underlines, to security of supply and manage the dependencies on critical raw materials.

As your report also rightfully emphasizes, our aim is to incentivise Member States to prepare their armed forces for climate change and to contribute to the energy transition of our continent, not to put any constraints or limitations on the use of their equipment.

Greater energy efficiency equals greater operational efficiency and safety. In Afghanistan and Iraq, resupply convoys of fuel and water accounted for 40 to 50% of the casualties.

Later this month, we will present the first joint progress report on the implementation of the climate change and defence roadmap, as well as the concept of an integrated approach for climate change and security and reflect on additional work strands. In this context, we take up your proposal to develop an action plan by 2023 that builds on ongoing work while prioritising and updating our activities in the light of the changed strategic context.

We will take the valuable proposals of your report fully into account as we move forward. The aim is to equip ourselves to tackle the different climate security challenges that we see emerging already today.

Take the example of the Sahel, where climate change is leading to increased instability. We are improving the way our early warning, planning and programming take the relevant climate-related conflict drivers into account. We deployed environmental advisers to our CSDP missions in Mali and in Central African Republic and will start to measure their environmental footprint. To strengthen our strategic foresight on the future operational environment in the Sahel, but also other regions like the Arctic, we propose to prepare a regional or thematic climate trend analysis in line with your report. They will inform our future operational and capability development efforts as our armed forces will need to operate under the more extreme climatic conditions. We have already seen examples of helicopters which cannot fly because the electronics do not work when it is well over 40°C.

Another key challenge is to make the armed forces gradually more energy efficient and sustainable. Their combined energy consumption is comparable to a smaller Member State. We need to invest more in research and development as we are doing through the European Defence Fund and PESCO. And we continue to build on the work done by the European Defence Agency in gathering data on energy efficiency, circular economy, green procurement and energy resilience.

In taking forward all this work, we will continue to cooperate closely with our international partners, notably the United Nations and NATO, but also bilateral partners such as the United States or Canada. Climate change will impact our security landscape for decades to come. It is only by working together that we can address global challenges of such magnitude.

Lukas Mandl, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Herr Kommissar! Wir haben uns für dieses Outfit heute entschieden – viele hier in diesem Haus –, weil wir 60 Jahre EU-Landwirtschaftspolitik begehen. Und das ist eine Erfolgsgeschichte, die auch immer wieder gestärkt werden muss.

Da freut es mich, dass ein österreichischer Landwirt, Thomas Waitz, diesen wichtigen Bericht als Chefverhandler begleitet hat, als Berichterstatter hier im Europäischen Parlament – weil mit dem Klimawandel umzugehen und die Verteidigungspolitik zu aktualisieren und zukunftsfit zu machen, das sind noch keine Erfolgsgeschichten. Deshalb ist es wichtig, beides zu sehen. Es ist auch gut, beides in einem Bericht zu schreiben, und ich sehe den Bericht sehr differenziert.

Ich finde es gut, dass der Klimawandel in diesem Bericht als Sicherheitsrisiko gesehen wird, weil er das ist. Ich zitiere da immer gern David Beasley, den Chef des *World Food Programme*, der betont, nach dem *man-made conflict*, also dem menschengemachten Konflikt, ist der Klimawandel die zweitgrößte Ursache für Krisen. Dem müssen wir begegnen.

Ich sehe es kritisch, wenn gewissermaßen Streitkräfte dazu angehalten werden, ihre Arbeit mehr oder weniger CO₂-neutral zu machen. Das wird nicht gehen. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dem Klimawandel zu begegnen – in der Politik, in allen Gesellschaftsbereichen. Streitkräfte schützen primär Menschen. Wir sind gefordert, auch das Klima zu schützen.

Tonino Picula, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would like to congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Waitz, because I believe the report is timely and shows that this House is a leader in topics that will shape our future.

The world has changed since 24 February, and so the view of many on our defence. We need more cooperation between our Member States and with our partners, through a set of actions.

I believe in importance to prepare for new security challenges affected by the climate change, which could increase threats and have geopolitical consequences. We can already witness that in areas such as the Arctic or the Sahel. I also want to point out the water issue. Due to climate change, water supplies will be affected, while global water demands will rise.

Therefore, I believe we produced an ambitious report to respond to some of the biggest challenges of our time. Our response definitely should be both more environmental and without endangering our safety in these unstable times.

Christophe Grudler, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, avec les crises environnementales qui s'intensifient, nos forces armées européennes mais aussi nos missions et opérations de l'Union doivent affronter les conditions toujours plus difficiles pour agir. Ces mêmes forces armées sont des consommatrices importantes de combustibles fossiles et leurs émissions ne sont pas incluses dans l'accord de Paris sur le climat, comme le rapporteur l'a relevé.

À travers cette résolution, nous appelons donc à ce que les activités militaires prennent toute leur place dans la réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre, mais tout en maintenant évidemment leur efficacité opérationnelle. Pour cela, nous devons avoir une méthodologie commune pour quantifier ces émissions et c'est ce que nous demandons à M. le Haut représentant Borrell.

Ensuite, il nous faut réduire l'impact environnemental de nos activités militaires, que ce soit pour les avions, les chars mais aussi les bâtiments militaires. Nous devons investir dans l'efficacité énergétique et dans les nouvelles énergies. J'insisterai sur un dernier point: réduire l'utilisation des combustibles fossiles dans nos forces armées doit permettre de réduire nos dépendances. En effet, nous sommes très dépendants de pays tiers pour ces combustibles fossiles. Nous en passer permet donc de renforcer notre autonomie stratégique européenne, ce qui est plus que jamais nécessaire.

Bernhard Zimniok, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, werte Kollegen! Was kommt dabei heraus, wenn ein Biobauer Abgeordneter wird und aus welchen Gründen auch immer einen Bericht zur Verteidigungspolitik verfasst? Richtig, elementare militärische Fragen werden mit linksgrüner Ideologie vermischt. Während früher Sun Tzu und Clausewitz gelehrt wurden, soll jetzt stattdessen die Klimaideologie im Verteidigungsbereich Einzug halten.

Wenig überraschend scheitert der Bericht daher auch am Realitätscheck. Die Kernaufgabe des Militärs, durch Abschreckung und Stärke die Sicherheit eines Landes zu gewährleisten, wird durch die in diesem Bericht genannten Forderungen komplett torpediert. Eine davon lautet ernsthaft, dass der Ausbau einer Armee nicht zu einer erhöhten CO₂-Belastung führen darf. In Deutschland haben wir, dank der Altparteien, ein völlig heruntergewirtschaftetes Militär, das zwingend massiver Investitionen und Strukturreformen bedarf. Das ist mit solchen realitätsfernen Vorgaben schlicht unmöglich. Ein Leopard 2 – ein Panzer, für die, die es nicht wissen – schluckt auch weiterhin 530 Liter Diesel pro Stunde oder pro 100 km, sorry. Soll dann lieber ein Panzer gekauft werden, der nicht den Ansprüchen genügt, aber dafür weniger verbraucht, weniger CO₂ ausstößt? Welch ein Wahnsinn.

Es wird sogar gefordert, dass die Regierungen Berichte über die Emissionen des Militärs an die UN und die nationalen Parlamente übermitteln müssen. Dadurch würden aber zentrale Infos wie z. B. militärische Schlagkraft veröffentlicht werden. Sollen wir unseren Gegnern nicht gleich eine konkrete Auflistung unseres Militärs zukommen lassen?

Einigen wir uns doch stattdessen auf etwas, was Sinn ergibt und umsetzbar ist, also beispielsweise, dass die ökologische Perspektive bei künftigen Entscheidungen mit einbezogen wird, z. B. bei Übungen in Friedenszeiten. Der entscheidende Aspekt muss aber natürlich die Verteidigungsfähigkeit sein und bleiben.

Wenn wir aus zukünftigen Krisen oder gar Kriegen siegreich hervorgehen wollen, brauchen wir eine bessere Strategie, Ausrüstung und Kampfkraft und nicht die bessere CO₂-Bilanz. Und genau deswegen müssen diese Entscheidungen auch weiterhin in nationaler Verantwortung bleiben und liegen, damit am Ende nicht ein Biobauer über die nationale Sicherheit in Deutschland entscheidet.

Es sprach ein Oberstleutnant der ehemals guten, glorreichen deutschen Armee.

Alexandr Vondra, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, when I was young and growing up in communist Czechoslovakia, everything had to be explained by a class fight. Now it looks like everything has to be explained with the fight against climate change.

But, frankly, I think the conviction of some of our colleagues here – that the most important mission of our armed forces is to fight climate change and the most important goal of them is to produce tanks, artillery or even jets without any carbon emission – is just ridiculous.

We do have the war behind our backyard, and we should do our best to project authority, power and deterrence. And I guess that if Sir Putin or Emperor Xi Jinping is reading this kind of text, he's just laughing. So, therefore, I'm going to vote against.

Mick Wallace, on behalf of The Left Group. – Mr President, the climate change and defence roadmap calls for increased spending in research, technologies and capabilities that would supposedly allow the armed forces to reduce their carbon footprint.

Yet the text allows for the voluntary setting of carbon emissions reductions targets – a weaker position than that contained in the original roadmap. The language in the text centres on efficiency gains rather than absolute reductions that would be achieved by less activity on behalf of the armed forces.

The report repeatedly maintains that these reductions efforts should not affect the performance of the armed forces. In effect, the report is advocating for a massive transfer of public wealth to private arms manufacturing companies to supply innovations and equipment that would not guarantee overall reductions in carbon emissions from the activities of the armed forces.

To achieve these reductions, the EU must scale down military operations. We need to break our link with NATO, we need to look for debt cancellation in affected countries and we should go back to the path of diplomacy to avoid so much military activity.

Javi López (S&D). – Señor presidente, hoy el cambio climático no es solo un gigantesco problema medioambiental, es también una de las mayores amenazas para nuestra seguridad global porque actúa como multiplicador de amenazas y porque tiene enormes implicaciones en términos de seguridad al haber cuatro factores detrás que lo agravan: uno, ahonda en la pobreza; dos, va a multiplicar los desplazamientos forzados; tres, va a incrementar la competencia por los recursos, y cuatro, aumenta la conflictividad en el planeta.

Por todo ello, hoy aquí en el Parlamento aprobamos este informe que debatimos como respuesta a la estrategia de defensa y cambio climático que presentó el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior. Tres mensajes importantes: incorporar la dimensión climática en nuestra política de seguridad y defensa, lograr la descarbonización de nuestros instrumentos en términos de política exterior y de seguridad y, al mismo tiempo, adaptar nuestras misiones a entornos afectados por el cambio climático.

Celebremos que hoy el Parlamento Europeo incorpora la dimensión climática a su política exterior y de seguridad y felicitemos también a la Brújula Estratégica por hacer lo mismo en esta dimensión.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Mr President, so we have a report on the climate change and defence roadmap. A report that calls on the EU to support states in developing their capabilities to tackle environmental crime, further enhance operational effectiveness by reducing the greenhouse gas emissions intensity of military missions and operations and embark on a path towards climate neutrality by 2050 and to mainstream, of course, climate and environmental issues into the ordinary military training system at tactical and strategic levels.

Colleagues, while we are outfitting our battleships with sails, and covering our tanks with solar panels, and replacing our rifles with green lasers powered by pixie dust – woke beams of light – we should ask ourselves, will this deter Russia from future aggression?

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, it's interesting that we're having this discussion at the same plenary when we're voting on the FIT for 55 package, because the truth is that military activity does emit significant amounts of greenhouse gases and pollutants in its production and in its operation.

Yes, we continue to spend billions in a secret manner surrounding its share of emissions. Any attempts that we've made, for example, to try to get the military industry to register and meet its GHG emission reduction standards, or at least to disclose them, have been regularly voted down in this plenary.

We continue to pour billions into military mobility, adapting infrastructure for military use without any heed been paid to the environmental footprint of the same. I have a certain sympathy for some of the comments from colleagues who are aghast at this idea of a kind of green euro-militarism. I agree, but for the complete opposite reason that they put forward, because actually climate change is the biggest challenge facing our planet and militarism in any form undermines that.

So we can't really dress it up. As long as we continue to promote rivalry and division rather than cooperation, then we will fail in our duty.

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

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, honourable Members, we think that the debate today testifies your interest and engagement towards addressing the cross-cutting impact of climate change on security and defence. We reiterate that we will respect the mission-first principle as we need to make sure that the armed forces can do their job, namely to protect and defend us. That said, energy efficiency and the environmental sustainability will strengthen, not hamper our operational efficiency if done in the right way. Your report provides an encouragement to continue to push forward. Thank you.

Thomas Waitz, *rapporteur.* – Mr President, Commissioner, indeed our colleagues from the far right did not do their homework, because Mr so-called *Oberstleutnant* like Mr Zimniok obviously didn't read the report, because what are we talking about there? It's a compromised report with EPP, with social democrats, with liberals. The capabilities of actual military activity, where needed, are not impacted by that report.

We're basically talking about reducing CO₂ emissions by changing the way we cool our houses, how we heat necessary infrastructure, and how we are replacing procurement with products that are less CO₂-emitting or maybe even CO₂-neutral. At a lot of the conversations with the generals, I also learned that the provision of fossil fuels to our missions – for example, in Sahel – is one of the biggest security risks that we have.

Colleagues to the far right – who are not here anymore, unfortunately – Have you realised that our dependency on fossil fuels is one of the biggest security threats we're having at the moment? This counts for the whole society, as it counts for our civilian and military missions. Next time when you walk out here and spread your interesting information, maybe you'll do your homework first and see where the potential lies.

I also learned from a general that even electrifying tanks would be a good idea, because this kind of fuel could be produced right there where the mission is, in the middle of the desert. A tank is so heavy already that the batteries don't matter. But okay, if you in principle want to be against everything that has the name 'climate' and that points out the real and long-standing problems that we have, that's where we are.

Unfortunately, Mick Wallace, you are still here at least. The text says that part of the research money should be used also to develop technologies that omit less CO₂ and are more environmentally friendly. It makes sense to use at least part of the defence money for these kinds of uses, which we could maybe also disseminate for the civilian sector.

Last but not least, I want to thank all the shadow rapporteurs that worked with me again. We had some intensive compromising. We included all the amendments and all the important inputs from all sides, and we produced a balanced report that reflects many views and many political standpoints. This is clearly a report that shows green participation and leadership, but it's clearly a report that includes the whole spectrum of perspectives that are needed for this sector.

I want to thank all of them once again, and I hope we're going to get a big majority in the votes tomorrow.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava k tomuto bodu sa skončila.

Hlasovanie sa uskutoční zajtra.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE), γραπτώς. – Συγχαίρω την Ευρωπαϊκή Υπηρεσία Εξωτερικής Δράσης (ΕΥΕΔ) για τις προσπάθειες αντιμετώπισης των δεσμών μεταξύ κλιματικής αλλαγής και άμυνας με την υποβολή οδικού χάρτη για την κλιματική αλλαγή και την άμυνα. Με αυτό τον οδικό χάρτη, η ΕΥΕΔ προτείνει την ενσωμάτωση της κλιματικής αλλαγής στις αμυντικές δράσεις της ΕΕ, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της Κοινής Πολιτικής Ασφάλειας και Άμυνας (ΚΠΑΑ). Είναι σημαντικό να καθοριστούν εθελοντικοί στόχοι μείωσης των εκπομπών διοξειδίου του άνθρακα των στρατιωτικών αποστολών και επιχειρήσεων και να υιοθετηθεί μια αποτελεσματικότερη πορεία προς την κλιματική ουδετερότητα έως το 2050, χωρίς οι στόχοι αυτοί να θέτουν σε κίνδυνο την ασφάλεια των αποστολών και χωρίς να διακυβεύονται οι επιχειρησιακές ικανότητες των ενόπλων δυνάμεων. Καλώ τον Αντιπρόεδρο της Επιτροπής/Υπάτο Εκπρόσωπο της Ένωσης για θέματα Εξωτερικής Πολιτικής και Πολιτικής Ασφάλειας να διασφαλίσει ότι η προσασία του περιβάλλοντος και η καταπολέμηση της κλιματικής αλλαγής και των επιπτώσεων της θα ενσωματωθούν κατάλληλα στην εξωτερική δράση της Ένωσης και κρίνω σημαντική την ενσωμάτωση εμπειρογνομών του τομέα της κλιματικής ασφάλειας στις αποστολές και επιχειρήσεις ΚΠΑΑ.

17. UE wobec zagrożeni bezpieczeństwa w regionie Indo-Pacyfiku (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu rokovania je správa, ktorú predkladá David McAllister v mene Výboru pre zahraničné veci, o EÚ a bezpečnostných výzvach v indicko-tichomorskom regióne (2021/2232(INI)) (A9-0085/2022).

David McAllister, rapporteur. – Mr President, the Indo-Pacific has become one of the centres of geopolitical gravity and a rallying point for many global players. Its growing economic, demographic and political weight makes it an increasingly important region in shaping the international order. Therefore, the European Union must increase its efforts and step up its strategic engagement with the region.

Last year, first the Council adopted conclusions on an EU strategy for cooperation in the Indo-Pacific, and then the High Representative presented a communication in September last year which reflects the European Union's efforts and ambitions. Tomorrow, we are going to vote in this plenary on the report on the security challenges in the Indo-Pacific. This report, from my point of view, assesses the EU strategy with regard to the security dimension, taking into account national strategies and new developments. Generally, my report focuses on four parts that are of key importance.

First, in security and defence for unity among Member States will be key for the EU to assert effectively our presence in the Indo-Pacific and to achieve the ambition of strategic sovereignty amidst the increasing competition among global and regional powers in the region. In the absence of an overarching security architecture in the Indo-Pacific, the European Union should concentrate its efforts on maintaining a free and open Indo-Pacific for all and on promoting an open and rules-based regional security architecture.

Second, our united approach to the region must also go hand-in-hand with targeted actions aimed at building strong partnerships and security cooperation with Indo-Pacific countries and regional cooperation forums. To do so, we should build on a vast network of trade, partnership and cooperation agreements concluded with a large number of regional countries in the past. A close coordination with our partners in the region is especially important in order to tackle the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine.

The third point: Europe and the countries of the Indo-Pacific share increasingly similar challenges in a number of other security-related areas, such as cyber security, terrorism and non-proliferation. As all these challenges directly affect the EU's own security and prosperity, we need to address them in close cooperation and coordination with regional partners. A particular focus should be given to our key partners and like-minded democracies. Let me name Japan, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand.

Last but not least, the report highlights the necessity to tackle maritime security, cyber, air and space, as well as non-traditional security challenges.

To conclude, let me thank the shadow rapporteurs from all the different political groups and also the team of the High Representative for a really good, constructive and fruitful cooperation on where drafting and working on this report.

Olívér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, honourable Members, I replace the High Representative Vice-President Josep Borrell for this debate and make the following statement on his behalf. Let me thank Rapporteur McAllister and all MEPs who have contributed to this report.

I fully share the views expressed in the report that the EU has a vital geopolitical and economic interest in the stability and prosperity of the Indo-Pacific region. Europe and the Indo-Pacific region are highly interconnected. What happens in the Indo-Pacific has important implications for Europe and vice versa. The region produces 60% of global GDP and is the second largest destination of EU exports. Together, the Indo-Pacific and Europe account for over 70% of global trade in goods and services and over 60% of foreign direct investment flows.

At the same time, a new centre of global competition has emerged in the Indo-Pacific, adding to increasing tensions on trade and supply chains. We live in an era of strategic rivalries and complex security threats. Military spending in the region has risen like nowhere else in the world. The display of force and increasing tensions in regional hotspots, such as in the South and East China Sea and in the Taiwan Strait, may have a direct impact on Europe's security and prosperity. Today, the EU and its Indo-Pacific partners are facing similar challenges. Hybrid and cyber security threats. Disinformation and weaponisation of economic independence.

The EU values-driven approach seeking cooperation beyond geopolitical divides and great power rivalries make us a reliable partner, including with the ASEAN, in navigating and supporting regional stability in the Indo-Pacific. Through its Indo-Pacific strategy, the EU will seek to enhance regional security that is open and based on the rule of law, including secure sea routes and enhanced naval presence in the Indo-Pacific.

In February, we announced the extension of the concept of coordinated maritime presence, the so-called CMP, to the North-Western Indian Ocean. This extension would allow the optimisation of the use of assets that EU Member States are deploying in the region. In line with the EU Indo-Pacific strategy, the strategic compass is very clear about the willingness to build sustainable and proactive partnerships to enhance our presence in this region.

The war in Ukraine has also redefined the EU's global geopolitical role, including in this region. As your report highlighted in the wake of the Ukraine war, the EU's Indo-Pacific strategy is more relevant than ever. It is also more relevant than ever to maintain a free and open Indo-Pacific for all, while building strong and lasting partnerships. Our approach is one of cooperation, not confrontation. Our commitment to the Indo-Pacific region is inclusive of all partners wishing to cooperate with the EU. We will deepen our engagement with the like-minded partners that already have Indo-Pacific approaches of their own.

Let me conclude by welcoming the High-Level Dialogue on the Indo-Pacific that will be organised on 13 and 14 June by the upcoming Czech Presidency of the Council. Thank you very much for your attention.

Attila Ara-Kovács, *a S&D képviselőcsoport nevében.* – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Mindenekelőtt szeretnék gratulálni McAllister úrnak a jelentéshez! Példamutatóan kiváló munkát tett le az asztalra.

Az orosz háború megváltoztatta az egész geopolitikai helyzetet a világban. Fel kell készülnünk, hogy ami Ukrajnával történt, könnyen megtörténhet másutt is. Így mondjuk Tajvanon vagy egyebütt. Az ilyen helyzetekre adott válaszokból az EU sem maradhat ki, tekintettel hatalmi érdekeinkre és a transzatlanti elkötelezettségeinkre.

A jelentés elkészítése során igyekeztünk figyelembe venni az említett új geopolitikai realitás következményeit. Ezek a válságos helyzetek szorosabb együttműködést követelnek a tagállamoktól annak érdekében, hogy az Unió határozottabban tudjon fellépni és megerősödni kerüljön ki belőlük. Amely tagállamok pedig tagadják ennek szükségességét, azok elszigetelik magukat Európán belül. Az Uniónak erre, vagyis az efféle belső kihívásokra is erőteljes válaszokat kell találnia.

Dragoş Tudorache, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, the world was already split before the war in Ukraine. Democracies respecting a rules-based world order on one side are increasingly at odds with autocracies with no regard to international law, territorial integrity, no consideration for human lives or basic rights and freedoms. But we still operate on the world scene with the naive impression that trade and economic interdependencies are sufficient for maintaining regional stability or global security. So we remain ambivalent. We spoke softly against those disregarding our values, against human rights abuses by countries with which we did good business, or against forced labour as an economic growth model. With this report, we are sending a wake-up call. We must stop being ambivalent in the Indo-Pacific. That means taking sides, pursuing our strategic interests, and being outspoken against breaches of our values. On one hand, we must stand much closer by democratic allies in the Indo-Pacific. And we have many. We must support their drive for democracy, for prosperity and for stability in the region even more. And on the other hand, we must look the reality of our relations with China in the eye. Pretending there is no war in Ukraine or continuing trade with Moscow is something we must disentangle from all broad economic interactions. That is what being geopolitical is all about.

Alviina Alametsä, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, what is the role of EU in and with the Indo-Pacific region? I believe that the EU has to participate not only in the economic but also in the political arena, helping to contribute to the stability, development and security of the whole region. We need to have strong cooperation between democracies, aspiring democracies and those who want to protect the rules-based international order. We need to strengthen and diversify our partners in this region. The growing economic and military role of China in the Indo-Pacific must be balanced by others, and we need to secure the stability and the security of the region. And it is welcome that the EU is now increasing presence also in the area of security and defence. With this report, we need better assets and coordination. Climate change has to be central in our security agenda. It threatens this region and the whole world. On some other security issues, the EU has to be quite selective with its partners. But preventing climate crisis must be inclusive and multilateral because it is the challenge of everyone. The Indo-Pacific should have been better incorporated also in the strategic compass, and I hope that will be fixed in the future. We have to recognise the EU's initiatives such as the Global Gateway as playing an important role in our security policies.

Anna Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, much has changed in our approach to the Indo-Pacific since the famous negotiations of the CAI in December 2020. The report being discussed today is probably the best example of this change. Yet when we see the recommendation of [*inaudible*] and think about earlier meanders and mistakes in our policies towards the region, similar to the meanders and mistakes of policies vis-à-vis Russia, we have to question this recommendation. Unity, which is so much appreciated and in the report, is best achieved by unanimous voting in the CFSP.

Özlem Demirel, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Herr Präsident! Was kann man in einer Minute zur Indopazifikstrategie der EU sagen, außer dass die Entwicklungen dort brandgefährlich sind? Die Militarisierungsschübe, die es dort in der Region gibt, sind brandgefährlich. Die Tatsache, dass in dieser Region Stellvertreterkriege auf uns zukommen werden, das kann man bereits jetzt sehen, denn der asiatische Markt ist der Markt der Zukunft.

Und was wir sehen, ist, dass die Widersprüche im Kapitalismus sich zuspitzen, und dass Großmächte nun im eigenen Interesse weiter für Absatzmärkte und Ressourcen streiten und hier auch im indopazifischen Raum. Die Hegemonialmacht USA sagt: China als aufstrebende neue Macht ist mein größter Konkurrent, und spitzt hier die Lage weiter zu. Und die EU geht mit im Schlepptau der USA. Und was unterscheidet sie? Ja, in der Tat, ich kritisiere, dass China den asiatischen Markt, die asiatischen Länder als seinen Hinterhof betrachtet. Aber was macht die EU mit Afrika? Was macht die USA mit Lateinamerika? Was unterscheidet sie hier an dieser Stelle?

Das ist eine imperialistische Politik, die grundtief abzulehnen ist. Was unterscheidet den Krieg zum Beispiel der Russischen Föderation vom Krieg der USA im Irak? Und ich sage das nicht, um das zu relativieren, was Russland in der Ukraine macht, sondern um deutlich zu machen, dass hier unterschiedliche imperiale Mächte auf dem Rücken der Völker weltweit Kriege führen – und das muss man ablehnen.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Presidente, Comissão, queria começar por felicitar o relator. Hoje, como sempre, a União Europeia precisa de aliados para enfrentar desafios na área da segurança, do combate à desinformação, da interferência estrangeira, da proteção de infraestruturas críticas, da segurança das cadeias de abastecimento, do combate às alterações climáticas, da governação dos oceanos e da preservação da biodiversidade do planeta.

Desafios que afetam tanto a União Europeia quanto o Indo-Pacífico e que exigem uma forte cooperação orientada pelos valores europeus. A União Europeia deve intensificar o seu empenho na segurança humana, na erradicação da pobreza, da injustiça social e das violações dos direitos humanos. É essencial que a União Europeia reforce a cooperação de segurança com os parceiros da região do Indo-Pacífico, reconhecendo a diversidade da região, ou seja, uma abordagem única para todos os países não seria a estratégia apropriada.

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, the EU does indeed have a role to play in the Indo-Pacific, both for economic and geopolitical reasons. And that means we cannot allow ourselves to fall into ambivalence. We have to make clear where we stand.

A free and open Indo-Pacific for all: that's one of our commanding goals. This can be and should be supported by a network of trusted connectivity initiatives like the European Global Gateway Initiative. In the centre of our alliance-building in the region, we should focus on like-minded democracies. We need a strategic solidarity with like-minded democracies and also include other, more or less like-minded countries.

And finally, we should not tiptoe around the elephant in the room, which is the PRC's aggressive policy in the Indo-Pacific region, responsible for increasing tensions, be that on the Himalayan borders with India or in the South China Sea. We have to call a spade a spade and we have to make clear that Taiwan is also, for us, a democratic partner that we will not give up on.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, the anti-China policy proposals coming out of the US State Department in recent years are alarming. There are a growing number of influential policymakers who are openly planning a war with China. The report before us calls for the EU to copy the US and NATO and support the creation of a new anti-China alliance with Australia, New Zealand, Japan, South Korea. The Council on Foreign Relations, the Carnegie Endowment, Heritage Foundation, Hudson Institute and the Brookings Institution have all been promoting similar policy proposals in recent months. One recent book written by a CFR member openly calls for military attacks on the Chinese mainland with the aim of countering Chinese economic influence in south-east Asia.

This report before us is further evidence of the dominance of the US and NATO over policy formulation in the EU. We should be cooperating with China, not planning another war to protect the interests of Western financial capital. And keep in mind that China's military spend is still only one third of that of the US, and China hasn't bombed anyone in 40 years.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, comienzo felicitando al señor McAllister por su completo informe. El Indopacífico es una región enorme, densamente habitada y que ocupa un lugar económico y político central en el mundo de hoy. La Unión Europea no puede ser ajena a lo que ocurre en el Indopacífico, dados nuestros lazos con esta zona del mundo, cuya estabilidad, prosperidad, seguridad y conectividad repercute en nosotros.

Estamos viendo cómo el Gobierno de Biden está apostando por relanzar su presencia en la región a través del llamado «marco económico del Indopacífico», al igual que China, que estos días intenta también aumentar su influencia mediante nuevas iniciativas en las islas del Pacífico.

En el Indopacífico hay una serie de países afines muy importantes para la Unión Europea. Pienso, por ejemplo, en Corea del Sur, en Australia o en Japón, con los que tenemos importantes vínculos económicos y también políticos.

La región engloba a países también como China y la India. En estos momentos en que toda la atención está puesta en la guerra de Ucrania, no puedo dejar de expresar mi decepción por la actitud de China y de la India y su abstención en las resoluciones de las Naciones Unidas sobre la agresión de Rusia. La agresión de Rusia a Ucrania es una gravísima violación de los principios básicos del Derecho internacional. Países como China, miembro permanente del Consejo de Seguridad, una potencia global, o la India no pueden ser indiferentes: en esta guerra, no caben neutralidades.

Como diputado de la Comisión de Pesca, quiero insistir en que la Unión tiene que reforzar su cooperación con los países ribereños para que disminuya la pesca ilegal y la sobrepesca en la región del Indopacífico.

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas pirmininke, pirmiausia noriu padėkoti ponui D. McAllisteriui už gerą subalansuotą pranešimą. Kaip Europoje Rusija yra brutali ir aiški grėsmė, taip Ramiojo vandenyno ir Indijos vandenyno regione Kinija yra nemažas iššūkis. Todėl mūsų saugumo, Europos Sąjungos saugumo, išvalgos yra labai reikalingos. Čia kolegos minėjo: rinka, klimato kaita yra labai svarbios (šio regiono šalys galėtų mums būti kaip partnerės), bet ne mažiau svarbu yra socialinė, žmogaus teisių, politika, prekyba, mokslas ir jaunimo reikalai. Todėl aš tikrai norėčiau pakviesti, kad mes daugiau dėmesio skirtume santykiams su šio regiono valstybėmis ir kad Europos Sąjungos vertybės šiame regione taip pat būtų įgyvendinamos.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I think it is incredible how in a very few, short years the EU has gone from not doing geopolitics to an absolute frenzy in it. And the report calls for cooperation with NATO, QUAD, AUKUS, all to deal with what it describes as a lack of an overarching regional security order in the Indo-Pacific. China's economic and political influence in its own geographic neighbourhood is described as a security challenge. It urges the EU to prepare a strategy that would allow us to react against China. It talks about increasing our joint efforts in capability development, building up EU military power to be a credible security actor in the region, and all of this to protect our security interests.

Could we ever open an atlas and could it tell me what is it about Europe that entitles us to speak this way about an entire region of the world with 60% of the world's population as if it belonged to us, as if it was still a colonial backyard of Europeans. This isn't the 19th century. The European Union isn't in a position to boss around the rest of the world. We really seriously need a change in direction.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, îl felicit și eu pe colegul McAllister că acesta este un raport foarte bun. Insist doar pe o chestiune extrem de importantă. Statele Unite trebuie să aibă un partener pe măsura importanței, așa cum este Uniunea Europeană în această regiune și trebuie să fim prezenți acolo, cât mai rapid, cu toată forța.

Avem un obiectiv strategic de atins, acela de a le garanta partenerilor noștri că suntem capabili să dezvoltăm un parteneriat bazat pe cooperare în interesul ambelor părți. Războiul din regiunea noastră ne-a adus în față noi provocări, tocmai de aceea trebuie să fim cu un pas înainte și să ne implicăm din ce în ce mai mult în această regiune.

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση αποτυπώνει τα μεγάλα συμφέροντα σε μια περιοχή που, κατά δήλωση των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών, «σε ένα βαθμό θα κρίνει το μέλλον του κόσμου», και αφορά κρίσιμους ενεργειακούς δρόμους, σπάνιες γαίες και οι γεωστρατηγικής σημασίας χώρες.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, συμμετέχοντας ενεργά μαζί με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και το NATO στον ιμπεριαλιστικό πόλεμο στην Ουκρανία, στη σύγκρουση με τη Ρωσία, είναι επίσης μέρος του ευρωατλαντικού ανταγωνισμού με την Κίνα σε όλα τα επίπεδα, στρατιωτικό, πολιτικό και οικονομικό. Παρεμβαίνει στην Ινδία και σε άλλα κράτη της περιοχής για ευθυγράμμιση με αυτόν το σχεδιασμό, αναπτύσσει τις στρατιωτικές δυνάμεις, όχι μόνο στο πλαίσιο του NATO, αλλά και αυτοτελώς, διαμηνύοντας ότι δεν θα αρκестεί στον ήδη παρόντα γαλλικό στρατό, ούτε θα συμβιβαστεί με σχεδιασμούς που δεν τη λαμβάνουν υπόψη, όπως η AUKUS.

Η επικίνδυνη κλιμάκωση στον ανταγωνισμό των αστικών τάξεων, η αναδιάρθρωση των ιμπεριαλιστικών συμμαχιών, η αντιπαράθεση Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών-Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-NATO με Κίνα και Ρωσία στον Ινδοειρηνικό μεγαλώνει τους κινδύνους για τους λαούς.

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

Olivér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, honourable Members, today's discussions have reiterated our willingness to contribute to the security and prosperity of the Indo-Pacific region in full respect of international law. Growing global challenges call for more multilateral governance and rule-based international cooperation, not less. What happens in Ukraine will have an impact on the Indo-Pacific region. For the Indo-Pacific region, it is therefore important, as it is for Europe, that international law and territorial integrity are respected. Thank you very much for your attention.

David McAllister, *rappporteur*. – Mr President, Commissioner Várhelyi was very precise and I will be just as brief.

I would like to thank all colleagues for their contributions. I thought this was a constructive debate and having listened carefully to all the contributions, let me try to summarise. I guess most of us do agree that for us in the European Union, the Indo-Pacific offers great opportunities, but indeed also poses many challenges. But one thing is clear: our prosperity and economic interests rely on the openness for stability and the security in the region.

Several colleagues mentioned increasing geopolitical competition. Well, yes, this does produce tensions not only in trade and supply chains, but also in broader political and security matters. It is authoritarian regimes in the region that are suppressing democratic principles and human rights and this, in the end, puts regional stability at risk and this also directly affects European security and prosperity.

From my point of view, the key message the European Parliament is sending to the entire Indo-Pacific is that we are ready – ready for deepening cooperation and engagement with our partners and like-minded countries, like-minded democracies in the region, in order to respond to emerging dynamics that are affecting regional but also global stability and security.

To sum up, it is in our joint interest to maintain a free and open Indo-Pacific for all, and it is in our interest to promote a rules-based regional order in line with the principles of democracy, the rule of law, human rights and international law.

I would like to thank once again for the support I received from most of the political groups yesterday, and I am quite convinced that tomorrow we can adopt this report with a large and broad majority in this plenary. Once again, dear colleagues, thank you for a fruitful and constructive debate.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa týmto skončila.

Hlasovanie o tomto bode sa uskutoční zajtra.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Urmas Paet (Renew), *kirjalikult*. – EL ning India ja Vaikse ookeani piirkonna riigid seisavad silmitsi üha sarnasemate julgeolekuprobleemide ja ka mittetraditsiooniliste probleemidega. Viimastel aastatel on piirkonna sündmused, eelkõige Hiina tegevus, põhjustanud intensiivseid geopoliitilisi pingeid ja konkurentsi, mis ohustab reeglitel põhinevat rahvusvahelist korda. Sellega seotud probleemide ja pingete leevendamiseks puuduvad nii üldine piirkondlik julgeolekukord kui ka usalduse suurendamise mehhanism. Selline dünaamika kujutab endast tõsist ohtu piirkonna ja ülemaailmse kogukonna stabiilsusele ja julgeolekule, mõjutades otseselt ELi kui piirkonna riikide peamise poliitilise ja majandusliku partneri strateegilisi huve. Piirkonnas toimuv ideoloogiline võitlus autoritaarsuse ja demokraatia vahel võib mõjutada sarnaste võitluste tulemusi kogu maailmas, sealhulgas ELi läheduses. Stabiilne ja rahumeelne India ja Vaikse ookeani piirkond, mis põhineb rahvusvahelise õiguse järgimisel, on ELi julgeoleku ja huvide kaitsmisel äärmiselt tähtis. Arvestades ka laiemat geopoliitiliselt keerulist olukorda seoses Venemaa agressioonisõjaga Ukraina vastu, peab Euroopa Liit tüürima võimeka kaitsekoostöö liidu poole ning tegema muuhulgas koostööd partneritega India ja Vaikse ookeani piirkonnas.

18. Wyspy i polityka spójności – obecna sytuacja i przyszłe wyzwania (debata)

Predsedajúci. – Dalším bodom programu rokovania je správa, ktorú predkladá Younous Omarjee v mene Výboru pre regionálny rozvoj, o ostrovoch EÚ a politike súdržnosti: súčasná situácia a budúce výzvy (2021/2079(INI)) (A9-0144/2022).

Younous Omarjee, *rappporteur*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous appelons aujourd'hui à construire une vision de long terme pour les îles européennes, appuyée sur un pacte des îles et un agenda insulaire.

L'article 174 du traité est clair: l'Union doit accorder une attention particulière aux régions insulaires, dont les handicaps naturels, graves et permanents sont reconnus. Cette attention particulière, aujourd'hui, Monsieur le Commissaire, n'existe pas suffisamment. C'est un vide à combler, et, disons-le, il y a à l'évidence une sous-estimation de ce que représentent les îles européennes. Car ces îles, ce sont plus de 20 millions d'habitants répartis sur environ 2 400 d'entre elles – principalement en Méditerranée et dans l'Atlantique – et appartenant à 13 États membres, parmi lesquels 3 sont insulaires. En réalité, l'Europe est un archipel, mais elle l'ignore toujours.

Il y a des évidences qu'il est parfois bon de rappeler: vivre sur une île, c'est vivre entouré d'eau, et ce n'est pas vivre sur le continent. Tout y est différent – l'économie, les transports, l'énergie, la gestion des déchets, les logiques d'import, d'export et les surcoûts qu'ils induisent pour tout, l'agriculture, la gestion de l'eau, l'économie bleue –, tout doit y être pensé différemment.

Ce rapport a donc vocation à être fondateur d'une nouvelle relation entre les îles et les institutions européennes, fondée sur la pleine prise en compte de l'article 174 du traité et la mise en œuvre de mesures spécifiques. Cela est pleinement justifié, car l'insularité, ce sont aussi des vulnérabilités supplémentaires accrues par les crises que nous connaissons. Nous le voyons avec la guerre en Ukraine, qui affecte directement ces régions par la suraugmentation des coûts liés à l'insularité et à l'éloignement.

Les îles sont également en première ligne, nous le savons, vis-à-vis des effets du changement climatique, et elles ont été plus durement frappées par la crise de la COVID-19. C'est pourquoi nous demandons tout simplement une meilleure prise en compte des îles dans les règlements et dans les futures discussions budgétaires. D'ores et déjà nous appelons à la réévaluation du régime d'aides d'État, à la suppression du plafond de minimis, à la création d'un programme spécifique pour les îles – comme il en existe un pour les îles grecques – et à la création d'une enveloppe compensatoire – autant d'objectifs que nous nous fixons.

Mes chers collègues, le monde est un monde composé d'îles, et chaque île est un monde en soi-même. L'Europe a, avec ses îles, l'occasion d'être à l'avant-garde pour toutes les îles du monde, de même qu'elle gagnerait à édifier une nouvelle diplomatie insulaire mondiale en s'appuyant sur les PTOM et sur les États tiers. C'est pourquoi notre rapport propose aussi de faire de l'année 2024 l'année européenne des îles.

Pour conclure, mes chers collègues, je vous invite à voter massivement pour ce rapport, qui a vocation à être fondateur, fondateur d'un temps nouveau dans la relation entre les îles et les institutions européennes, et j'appelle la Commission et le Conseil à entendre l'initiative de notre Parlement et à entendre aussi l'impatience des îles, car trop de temps a été perdu. Il est aujourd'hui plus que temps d'agir. Je vous le dis: l'heure des îles a sonné.

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the European Commission is very conscious of the specific challenges faced by islands. Our original data and analyses published in cohesion reports over the years, combined with our practical experience of cohesion programmes and other European investments in islands, give us a clear view of the challenges of insularity.

Last month we adopted a communication on the outermost regions and islands, and we remain committed, through cohesion policy and all investment policies, to a Europe that leaves no region behind, including islands.

The Commission urges Member States to make use of three key cohesion investment tools in cohesion programmes to support islands. Firstly, investment in a smart, digital and green transition. There are numerous opportunities in these policy areas. For example, digital connectivity helps address some of the issues linked to remoteness, and today home offices have become a standard way of operation. Islands can take advantage and become beneficiaries of the recent changes in the world of work, provided that the requisite infrastructure and skills investments are ensured.

We have deliberately simplified the rules, such as the rules on financial allocations, thematic concentration, co-financing rates and programming so that programmes have the flexibility to address the specific needs of islands.

Secondly, we have proposed a specific objective for the tourism and cultural sectors. Islands can benefit from investment focusing on this policy objective, given the importance of this sector for their economies.

Thirdly, our policy objective 'Europe closer to citizens' will invest in bottom-up strategies and community-led local development, which is well suited to supporting communities living in islands. These are the opportunities under cohesion policy. We urge Member States to use them, but other policies should not be forgotten. Specifically, three key opportunities.

Firstly, the dedicated initiatives for islands under rural development, including the circular economy islands and the clean energy islands. In particular, the Commission has established a dedicated secretariat for islands to help them prepare for a clean energy transition.

Secondly, European investment in our digital and innovative future address the needs of islands. The new Connecting Europe Facility has specific provision for subsea cable connections, as well as broadband provision in islands. Horizon Europe has the islands facility providing small grants and technical assistance to implement projects. The Digital Decade targets aim to provide digital connections and digital public services to all Europeans wherever they live, including islands. The recovery and resilience plans have the financial firepower to significantly advance this.

Thirdly, islands and coastal areas are at the forefront of the EU Blue Growth Strategy. The blue economy could be a game changer for islands, leading Europe as we become the world's first carbon-neutral continent.

Our thanks to the rapporteur, Mr Omarjee, for this very timely report. Today, we have a unique opportunity for islands as we programme and launch a broad range of European investment tools. However, we must make sure that these tools work together and that they work in close partnership with the islanders themselves and their representatives. So today's discussion is a very welcome step in that direction.

Πέτρος Κόκκαλης, *Εισηγητής της γνωμοδότησης της Επιτροπής Γεωργίας*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, κύριε Επίτροπε, κύριε εισηγητά, στη χώρα μου, την Ελλάδα, τα νησιά αποτελούν αντικείμενο ενός πολύ επικίνδυνου γεωπολιτικού αναθεωρητισμού. Η έκθεση, όμως, για τα νησιά και την πολιτική συνοχής, την οποία συζητούμε σήμερα, δείχνει την ανάγκη δραστηκής αναθεώρησης του μοντέλου ανάπτυξης των ευρωπαϊκών νησιών. Ο σχεδιασμός μιας σύγχρονης ευρωπαϊκής νησιωτικής πολιτικής και η πιστή εφαρμογή του άρθρου 174 της Συνθήκης μπορούν να μετατρέψουν όλα εκείνα τα γεωγραφικά ή κλιματικά χαρακτηριστικά των νησιών, που συχνά αποτελούν εμπόδια, σε μοχλό ευκαιριών για την ανάπτυξη τους. Με μία τέτοια πολιτική για την προσαρμογή της νησιωτικής οικονομίας στις επιπτώσεις της κλιματικής κρίσης, τα νησιά, ως κλειστά συστήματα με περιορισμένους φυσικούς πόρους, μπορούν να αποτελέσουν πρότυπο ψηφιακής και πράσινης ενεργειακής μετάβασης, ανάδειξης βιοποικιλότητας, της κυκλικής οικονομίας όσον αφορά το νερό, τα υλικά και τα απορρίμματα, αλλά και βιώσιμα διατροφικά συστήματα.

Για τον λόγο αυτό, ζητώ από την Επιτροπή να λάβει δεόντως υπόψη τον πρωταγωνιστικό ρόλο που μπορεί να διαδραματίσει η νησιωτικότητα στην υλοποίηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Πράσινης Συμφωνίας.

Στέλιος Κυμπουρόπουλος, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, θα ήθελα να μοιραστώ μαζί σας τη χαρά μου που φέρνουμε προς ψήφιση στην Ολομέλεια αυτόν τον σημαντικό φάκελο. Θέλω και από αυτό το βήμα να ευχαριστήσω όλους τους συναδέλφους από τις άλλες πολιτικές ομάδες για τη συνεισφορά τους. Με εισηγητή τον κύριο Omarjee είχαμε μια σχεδόν ομόφωνη στήριξη της έκθεσης στην Επιτροπή REGI. Καταφέραμε να τονίσουμε στην έκθεση τη σπουδαιότητα της νησιωτικότητας για την Ευρώπη και να αναδείξουμε τις δυνατότητες των νησιών μας, αλλά και τη συνεισφορά τους στην ευρωπαϊκή οικονομία μέσω της πράσινης ανάπτυξης και του τουρισμού.

Η έκθεση περιγράφει τις οικονομικές, κοινωνικές και περιβαλλοντικές προκλήσεις που αντιμετωπίζουν οι νησιωτικές περιοχές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και ζητάμε αντιστάθμιση μέσω στοχευμένης πολιτικής για τη συνοχή τόσο των κονδυλίων από τον προϋπολογισμό όσο και μιας σειράς δράσεων για την αντιμετώπιση των αναγκών των νησιών.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, σας καλώ να υπερψηφίσετε την αναφορά, ώστε να δώσουμε ένα σαφές μήνυμα στήριξης για τους πολίτες της νησιωτικής Ευρώπης. Η ψήφιση της έκθεσης θα δώσει μια σαφή κατεύθυνση προς την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή για ενίσχυση της ψηφιακής μετάβασης, της βιώσιμης οικονομίας, του βιώσιμου τουρισμού, της αναβάθμισης της ποιότητας ζωής των κατοίκων, της τηλεϊατρικής, της πρωτοβάθμιας φροντίδας υγείας, της διασυνδεσιμότητας με τις ηπειρωτικές περιοχές. Ύψιστο στόχο συνιστά η δημιουργία στρατηγικής για την ευρωπαϊκή νησιωτικότητα. Δίνουμε το στίγμα όλοι μαζί ότι ακόμη και τα ακριτικά νησιά, που αποτελούν το τελευταίο ευρωπαϊκό σύνορο, δεν έχουν εγκαταλειφθεί από εμάς και δημιουργούμε πολιτικές ώστε να βρούμε λύσεις στα προβλήματα.

Josianne Cutajar, *fišem il-grupp S&D*. – President, Sur Kummissarju, ukoll ir-rapporteur, kollegi li hdimna flimkien. L-isfidi li jaffaċċjaw ta' kuljum il-gzejjer Ewropej ilhom snin jiġu injorati. Jien li ġejja mill-gżira t'Għawdex nesperjenza b'mod dirett l-iżvantaġġ ġeografiku u l-effetti tiegħu. Hekk ukoll jesperjenzawhom ċittadini oħrajn li jithabtu man-nuqqas ta' trasport adegwat u affordabbli. U n-negozji tagħna li qed iġorru l-ispejjeż żejda relatati mal-insularità, anke dawk relatati mal-pandemija u l-gwerra.

Din is-sitwazzjoni hemm bżonn li nindirizzawha. L-iżvantaġġi permanenti li jaffaċċjaw il-gzejjer tagħna jeħtieġu soluzzjonijiet permanenti. Din hi r-raġuni għax qed inheggu lill-Kummissjoni Ewropea tidhol f'patt mal-gzejjer Ewropej. Hemm bżonn ta' azzjonijiet ta' tanġibbli biex jiġu meġhuna dawn il-gzejjer. Dan anke biex ikun hemm kundizzjonijiet aktar ugwali maż-żoni aktar ċentrali.

Bil-flessibilità kontinwa rigward għajnuna fuq l-Istat, għall-appoġġ lin-negozji ż-żgħar, bit-tishih tal-konnettività għat-turizmu sostenibbli; dawn kollha huma eżempji konkreti ta' kif nistgħu nġhinu lill-gzejjer tagħna biex ma jaqgħux lura fil-qalba diġitali u, b'mod speċjali, fil-qalba ambjentali li rridu naghmlu.

Din il-ġimġha se nivvutaw fuq il-pakkett ambjentali "Fit for 55", pakkett b'mira u ambizzjonijiet essenzjali iżda li għad ma jikkunsidrax b'mod adegwat ir-realtajiet li jaffaċċjaw il-gzejjer tagħna. Niftakru li ahna niddependu fuq trasport bil-baħar u l-ajru, u għandu jkollna għajnuna speċifika fir-rigward. Għalhekk l-inkluzjoni tal-gzejjer fuq l-aġenda politika tal-Unjoni Ewropea hija l-unika triq 'il quddiem biex nindirizzaw din ir-realtà. Triq li ssahha il-koeżjoni ekonomika, soċjali u territorjali tar-riġuni periferali tal-Unjoni. Din hi, wara kollox, kwistjoni ta' moviment hieles u ġustizzja soċjali mal-gzejjer tagħna, mal-Maltin, l-Ghawdxin u ċ-ċittadini ġejjin mill-gzejjer Ewropej kollha. Grazzi u nhegġgkom tinghaqdu magħna favur dan ir-rapport u favur din il-hidma.

Stéphane Bijoux, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, alors que nous parlons ici, plus de 20 millions d'Européens vivent dans des îles. Et quand on regarde la liste des défis des territoires insulaires: l'adaptation au dérèglement climatique, les défis de l'énergie, les transports, la jeunesse, l'emploi, eh bien on se rend compte que ce sont les grands défis de l'Union européenne et on voit bien immédiatement que nous sommes liés par un destin commun.

Alors, il nous faut une stratégie commune pour compenser les effets de l'insularité, aggravés par l'éloignement et par l'isolement. Ce rapport doit être entendu comme un appel à la mobilisation pour toutes les îles européennes, parce que, de la Méditerranée à l'Océan Indien en passant par l'Atlantique, on voit bien que nos points communs sont plus importants que nos différences.

Et ce rapport est aussi un appel au respect de nos spécificités dans chacun de nos territoires. Nous avons besoin d'une stratégie adaptée à la réalité, aux contraintes, aux défis de chacun de nos territoires, de chacune de nos îles. C'est là, je crois, la clé du succès et de l'efficacité d'une stratégie européenne pour toutes nos îles.

François Alfonsi, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, le rapport d'initiative que nous devons adopter durant cette session est le point de départ d'un processus vital pour l'avenir des territoires insulaires de l'Union européenne. Depuis un quart de siècle, les périodes de programmation de la politique de développement régional de l'Union européenne se sont succédé sans que la situation dans les îles ne se soit améliorée.

Cela se vérifie à travers les indicateurs macroéconomiques comme le PIB, le taux de chômage, le seuil de pauvreté et d'autres encore. Mais cela se vérifie surtout à travers l'accroissement continu des déséquilibres qui affectent les économies insulaires dans leur ensemble. Toujours plus de services, le plus souvent liés au tourisme, mais toujours moins d'industrie, toujours moins d'agriculture, toujours moins de jeunes et de diplômés, toujours moins de recherche et d'innovation.

La crise du COVID a montré que les îles sont des territoires plus vulnérables que les autres, et que leur modèle économique actuel, que les politiques européennes alimentent objectivement, conduit ces territoires dans une impasse. Dans 25 ans, où en serons-nous si nous continuons de la sorte? Dans 25 ans, il n'y aura plus que le tourisme. La déprise agricole abandonnera nos écosystèmes aux incendies et aux catastrophes naturelles. La richesse de la diversité culturelle que chaque île apporte à l'Europe sera éteinte et la biodiversité gravement atteinte. Même le tourisme connaîtra alors le déclin, faute d'avoir su préserver une société équilibrée et résiliente pour l'accueillir.

Il faut changer de politique pour les îles de l'Union européenne. Ce rapport fait à cet effet des propositions constructives et de bon sens. Il énonce une vérité incontournable: l'insularité est un handicap structurel permanent qu'il faut réussir à compenser. Le cumul des effets de l'insularité doit être pris en compte à travers des réglementations différenciées qui établissent une égalité véritable entre les acteurs économiques insulaires et leurs homologues des territoires continentaux. Tel est le plan d'action européen, le pacte pour les îles, que nous demandons à la Commission de réaliser en mettant en œuvre l'article 174 du traité de Lisbonne.

André Rougé, *au nom du groupe ID.* – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le rapporteur, chers collègues, ce rapport regrette le manque de vision de l'Union pour les îles européennes et je voudrais mettre l'accent sur les îles ultrapériphériques françaises, qui souffrent particulièrement depuis cinq ans.

En application de l'article 168 du traité, lié à la santé humaine, la Commission doit prendre en compte les catastrophes sanitaires, notamment le chlordécone, l'accès à l'eau courante et le ravage des algues sargasses, sur lesquelles je me suis déjà beaucoup exprimé.

Ensuite, vu le contexte économique dramatique subi par nos compatriotes ultramarins, le budget du FEDER doit être augmenté et son accès fluidifié, afin que les bénéficiaires puissent en disposer le plus tôt possible, la durée des délais étant telle que les personnes concernées ne peuvent en disposer opportunément. Ces obstacles administratifs les privent d'une capacité d'emprunt. Il conviendrait donc d'imaginer la mise en place d'un mécanisme de garantie européenne rassurant les organismes prêteurs.

De même, le dispositif POSEI doit être prorogé au-delà de cette année et il ne doit pas être abondé au détriment de la PAC et des agriculteurs français durement éprouvés ce week-end encore. Il convient également d'augmenter le budget du régime d'approvisionnement spécifique, dont le montant de 26,9 millions n'a pas été révisé depuis 2013.

Enfin, j'ai proposé la création, sur le modèle de l'Agence spatiale européenne et entre États possédant un domaine maritime, d'une Agence européenne de la mer dont le siège se situerait en outre-mer français. Cette agence de nature intergouvernementale, à laquelle pourraient adhérer des pays hors Union européenne comme le Royaume-Uni, aurait comme axe de développement stratégique l'exploration des ressources énergétiques et minières, hydrocarbures, nodules polymétalliques et mélanges sulfurés, la recherche sur les énergies marines renouvelables, les ressources biologiques animales et végétales, le transport et la surveillance maritime.

Cette coopération ne saurait remettre en question la souveraineté nationale sur les espaces maritimes concernés, non plus que le rôle de surveillance des marines nationales. Cette agence pourra être un lieu de coopération diplomatique sur les questions maritimes et un point de départ de projets commerciaux à l'échelle européenne. Elle bénéficierait d'une considérable importance, alors que les RUP françaises jouent un rôle stratégique indéniable dans l'équilibre géopolitique, notamment dans l'Indo-Pacifique. Monsieur le rapporteur, je regrette que vous n'ayez pas retenu cet amendement pourtant d'intérêt général.

Raffaele Fitto, *a nome del gruppo ECR.* – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, a nome del gruppo dei conservatori, vorrei innanzitutto sottolineare molto positivamente l'ottimo lavoro svolto per predisporre questa relazione e ringraziare in modo particolare tutti i colleghi che hanno lavorato in questa direzione, a partire dal presidente Omarjee.

È sicuramente un momento molto importante, perché l'obiettivo è quello di dare realmente attuazione all'articolo 174 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, ma non solo, e di creare anche uno stimolo forte perché gli Stati membri possano comprendere la rilevanza e l'importanza di questo tema.

Per far questo bisogna individuare innanzitutto i temi fondamentali che riguardano le problematiche delle isole, dallo spopolamento al tema collegato alle catastrofi naturali, ai servizi fondamentali, dai trasporti alla sanità, per cercare di mettere in campo una strategia che sia chiara ed evidente per poter dare risposte adeguate. Inoltre, è necessario modernizzare i servizi fondamentali e le attività principali dal punto di vista produttivo. Mi riferisco all'agricoltura, alla pesca e al turismo.

Per far questo abbiamo bisogno di un lavoro importante e concreto, soprattutto finalizzando le scelte che devono essere portate in campo dal punto di vista del coordinamento, come dicevo prima, fra le politiche dell'Unione europea e quelle degli Stati membri.

Tutto questo non sarà però possibile esclusivamente con le politiche di coesione, ma sarà necessario rendere in sinergia un'azione congiunta, insieme a tutti gli altri programmi di intervento, per poter centrare questo risultato.

Domani voteremo con convinzione questa relazione, che sarà un inizio, perché sicuramente il lavoro da fare ancora sarà molto impegnativo per il futuro delle isole dell'Unione europea.

Maxette Pirbakas (NI). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le rapporteur, mes chers collègues, l'Union européenne a une vraie richesse trop méconnue: ses îles, une richesse géopolitique, une richesse humaine. Ce sont ces îles qui font de nous une puissance globale. Mais au lieu de valoriser cette potentialité, cette spécificité et ces richesses, l'Union européenne maintient ces territoires dans un état socio-économique parfois déplorable. Je parle en particulier des départements d'outre-mer français.

Votre rapport, Monsieur le rapporteur, veut adapter le logiciel européen aux contraintes spécifiques de nos îles. Trop souvent, des politiques conçues pour le continent viennent nous pénaliser injustement, notamment chez nous dans le transport aérien. C'est une très belle ambition, mais qu'on ne retrouve pas malheureusement dans le paquet «Ajustement à l'objectif 55», qui néglige les intérêts de nos outre-mer.

Monsieur le rapporteur, vous êtes comme moi issu d'une île qui souffre. Vous connaissez notre sentiment d'humiliation quand nous en sommes réduits à quémander la simple application des traités. Cela fait des décennies que nous mettons en place des politiques dites de rattrapage. Mais nous ne pouvons plus nous contenter aujourd'hui pour nos outre-mer de politiques de rattrapage qui ne marchent pas. Nous devons avoir un nouveau modèle de développement spécifiquement adapté à nos contraintes.

Hélas, quand je lis les textes «Ajustement à l'objectif 55», je doute que les institutions européennes partagent vraiment notre engagement en faveur des spécificités des îles, notamment d'outre-mer.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Spoštovani gospod poročevalec, gospod Omarjee, spoštovani gospod komisar, gospod predsednik. 20 milijonov Evropejcev živi na 2400 otokih v 13 državah in na mnogih od teh otokov se soočajo z demografskimi problemi, saj mladi zapuščajo otoke.

Naravne ovire, kot je oddaljenost, goratost, pa tudi številne naravne nesreče, kot so požari, pa ne nazadnje tudi ogled otoka La Palma, kjer je vulkan povzročil pravo razdejanje, kažejo na probleme, s katerimi se ukvarjajo otoki. Kmetijstvo, ribištvo, turizem so osnovne dejavnosti, ki običajno dajejo priložnost za zaslužek za življenje. Prav je, da tudi v naših evropskih politikah, ko danes govorimo o digitalizaciji, pomislimo na povezljivost teh otokov, e-zdravje, kako digitalizacijo uporabiti v turizmu, izzive energetike – ta teden bomo govorili o paketu Fit for 55 – tudi dajo priložnost za obnovljive vire in vse to mora biti na otokih deležno posebne pozornosti, pa tudi višjega sofinanciranja.

Gospod poročevalec, z veseljem bom podprl vaše poročilo.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovani predsedavajući, gospodine povjereniče, čestitam izvijestitelju kolegi Omarjeeu i pozdravljam raspravu o ovom važnom izvješću. Već se nekoliko godina u Europskom parlamentu kontinuirano borimo za europske otoke i otočane, njih gotovo 20 milijuna na 2400 naseljenih otoka, ali i na europskoj i na nacionalnoj razini možemo učiniti i više i bolje.

Metodologija te svi relevantni prijedlozi Komisije moraju početi uvažavati inzularnost kao faktor, a zemlje članice podupirati i implementirati ovakve prijedloge u nacionalnim programima. Zakonodavnu podlogu za to već imamo u 174. članku Lisabonskog sporazuma, a imamo i primjer dobre prakse – poseban postotak za otoke u Fondu za pravednu tranziciju.

Otoci u razvoju zaostaju za kopnom u prosjeku oko 20 posto. Dostupnosti javnih usluga je značajno niža, cijene proizvoda su više. Prometno i energetski su ovisni o često neadekvatnoj povezanosti s kopnom, a ekonomski uglavnom o sezonski neodrživom turizmu. No, ne treba govoriti samo o problemima nego i o prilikama za razvoj.

Pilot projekt energetske tranzicije otoka je dokazao da otoci mogu biti predvodnici procesa zelene tranzicije na europskoj razini. Sličan inovativan model trebalo bi primijeniti i na ostale aspekte njihovog razvoja. Kohezijska politika, paket spremnih za 55 i mehanizam za otpornost i razvoj pritom trebaju biti financijske platforme. Otoci ne žive samo ljeti. Otočani zaslužuju ravnopravne uvjete za život i dostupnost usluga tijekom cijele godine.

Stoga se pridružujem pozivu Komisiji da 2024. proglasi godinom otoka te što prije usvoji Europski akcijski plan za otoke.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, în Uniunea Europeană, dar mai ales în Comisia de dezvoltare regională a cărei vicepreședinte sunt avem un motto: „Nu lăsăm pe nimeni în urmă” și vă mulțumesc, domnule comisar, că în discursul dumneavoastră introductiv ați amintit acest lucru. Și astfel încercăm să facem acest lucru cu fiecare raport, cu fiecare opinie.

Trebuie să identificăm provocările tuturor regiunilor și să găsim punctele tari, pentru a ne asigura că toți cetățenii europeni au parte de dezvoltare, de un nivel de trai decent, la care le dă dreptul apartenența la Uniunea Europeană. Poate că insulele sunt departe de mulți dintre noi, dar pot fi un etalon în ceea ce privește modificările climatice și măsurile pe care le luăm pentru a le combate și în același timp pentru bunăstarea socială și eficiența programelor pe care le elaborăm.

Avem nevoie de o mai strânsă legătură cu insulele și cu teritoriile îndepărtate. Trebuie să găsim modalități pentru a crește schimburile economice, sociale, culturale și nu în ultimul rând e nevoie ca atunci când gândim măsuri pentru independența energetică, pentru agricultură și consumul local, pentru diminuarea poluării, să ținem cont de specificul acestor regiuni insulare.

Ignazio Corrao (Verts/ALE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, voglio ringraziare innanzitutto il relatore per questo lavoro importante e utile, e lo faccio da cittadino isolano e da rappresentante di una circoscrizione elettorale che comprende isole dove vivono sei milioni e mezzo di cittadini europei, cittadini che vivono in condizioni di svantaggio nonostante negli anni siano stati elargiti molti fondi.

Tuttavia, questo svantaggio rimane. Perché? Perché c'è incapacità di spesa, mancanza di risorse umane capaci di gestire i procedimenti, assenza di progettazione e mancato raggiungimento di obiettivi. Quindi, secondo me, il vero nocciolo della questione è la necessità che i fondi europei e gli aiuti di Stato seguano una regolamentazione ad hoc per le isole, attraverso un rapporto più diretto tra le isole stesse e la Commissione europea e una vera valutazione d'impatto dei progetti.

Le isole dovrebbero essere il fiore all'occhiello della transizione ecologica e rischiano invece di esserne tagliate fuori. Sappiamo che questo problema esiste e io spero veramente che si faccia qualcosa per fare in modo che i cittadini europei isolani non siano più cittadini di serie B ma passino in serie A, a partire da ora.

Annalisa Tardino (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, avrei voluto anche ringraziare la Commissaria a cui è rivolto il nostro lavoro e il nostro appello, ma vedo che è assente, magari aveva qualcosa di più interessante da fare che ascoltarci.

Io rappresento in quest'Aula le due maggiori isole italiane, la Sicilia e la Sardegna, isole che, solo grazie alla loro straordinaria bellezza e alla grande capacità di adattamento dei cittadini, sopravvivono da decenni a politiche europee inadeguate che non hanno favorito il loro sviluppo.

Non una sola normativa in nessun settore – agricoltura, pesca, turismo, trasporti, solo per citarne alcuni – che abbia tenuto conto delle loro peculiarità. Norme fatte per voi e imposte a noi. Il ricatto della normativa sugli aiuti di Stato a limitare ogni tentativo dello Stato di compensare economicamente gli svantaggi dovuti alla insularità.

Bene che oggi, innanzi agli amministratori, ci sia un fronte trasversale, compatto e unito, che chieda insieme a noi un patto per le isole, un patto strutturato e non legato a singole emergenze, duraturo e che preveda uno sviluppo guidato da una precisa agenda strategica, con compensazioni per i disagi e il riconoscimento, come per le regioni ultraperiferiche, di finanziamenti dedicati.

Lavoro, infrastrutture, trasporti, costi dell'energia e assistenza tecnica: queste sono solo alcune delle nostre esigenze per poter vivere e creare sviluppo nella nostra terra. Di altro, come per esempio di schiavi travestiti da migranti, grazie, ma non ne abbiamo bisogno!

Krzysztof Jurgiel (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzy! Przedstawione w sprawozdaniu propozycje wychodzą naprzeciw art. 174 oraz art. 349 Traktatu z Lizbony. W związku z tym ważna jest deklaracja wskazująca na potrzebę opracowania strategii integracyjnych, które pozwolą wyspom stawić czoła wyzwaniom i pokonać bariery, jakie niesie za sobą ich wyspiarski charakter.

Słusznie Parlament apeluje o przeprowadzenie oceny strategii zapobiegania ryzyku wystąpienia klęsk żywiołowych; wzywa Komisję, by oceniła potrzebę przyjęcia rozporządzenia ustanawiającego szczególne środki w dziedzinie rolnictwa dla wszystkich wysp na poziomie NUTS 2 i NUTS 3; podkreśla potrzebę dalszego wdrażania drugiej deklaracji z Cork w sprawie lepszego życia na obszarach wiejskich; wzywa Komisję do utrzymania długoterminowej stopy współfinansowania dla regionów najbardziej oddalonych na poziomie 85%; wzywa do przyznania dodatkowych środków budżetowych, a także do jak najszybszego sporządzenia paktu wyspiarskiego i planu działania wzorowanego na przyszłym pakcie wiejskim.

Realizacja wyżej wymienionych zadań pozwoli na poprawę spójności ekonomicznej, terytorialnej i spójności społecznej wysp zgodnie z polityką Unii Europejskiej.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση αλλά και η λεγόμενη κοινή στρατηγική για τα νησιά δεν έχει σχέση με τα προβλήματα και τις αγωνίες των νησιωτών. Προωθεί προτεραιότητες του κεφαλαίου, της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των αστικών κομμάτων για την αντιλαϊκή πράσινη ψηφιακή μετάβαση, για ενίσχυση ομίλων της ενέργειας, των μεταφορών, του τουρισμού. Έχει μετατρέψει τον τουρισμό σε χρυσωρυχείο για τους μεγαλοεπιχειρηματίες και σε κάτεργο για τους εργαζόμενους, χωρίς ωράρια, χωρίς δικαιώματα, με εξευτελιστικούς μισθούς. Αφήνει τους νησιώτες εκτεθειμένους, χωρίς αναγκαίες κρατικές υποδομές, χωρίς πολιτική προστασία, με μηδαμινές υπηρεσίες υγείας. Πληρώνουν πανάκριβα καύσιμα και προϊόντα, εισιτήρια που ολόένα αυξάνονται στους ομίλους οι οποίοι επιδοτούνται με άφθονο κρατικό χρήμα, χωρίς να εξασφαλίζουν τις απαραίτητες ακτοπολικές συνδέσεις.

Οι εργαζόμενοι πρέπει να οργανώσουν τον αγώνα τους για συλλογικές συμβάσεις εργασίας, με κατοχυρωμένα ασφαλιστικά δικαιώματα και ωράρια, με αυξήσεις στους μισθούς με βάση τα αιτήματα των ταξικών σωματείων. Να παλέψουν για συχνές φτηνές ακτοπολικές συνδέσεις, όλο το χρόνο, με σύγχρονα και ασφαλή πλοία, με επίκεντρο τις ανάγκες των νησιωτών και όχι τα κέρδη των εφοπλιστών.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πιστεύω ακράδαντα ότι τα νησιά μας αποτελούν τον πραγματικό, τον φυσικό, τον γνήσιο πλούτο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, την ανεκτίμητη αξία που η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, δυστυχώς, μέχρι σήμερα δεν ανέδειξε, γιατί μέχρι σήμερα δεν κατόρθωσε να δημιουργήσει μια ολοκληρωμένη ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική για τα νησιά μας που θα μπορεί πραγματικά να αναδείξει τα συγκριτικά τους πλεονεκτήματα και να δημιουργήσει στα νησιά πηγές ανάπτυξης, προόδου και προοπτικής.

Εμείς που προερχόμαστε από νησιά είμαστε περήφανοι για την προσφορά και τη συνεισφορά μας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Η πατρίδα μου, η Κύπρος, που βρίσκεται στη νοτιοανατολική εσχάτια της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αποτελεί το προκεχωρημένο φυλάκιο και θα μπορούσε να αναδειχθεί σε ενεργειακό κόμβο, σε ενεργειακό κέντρο, αλλά ταυτόχρονα και πρότυπο για τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας, όπως επίσης μπορεί κάλλιστα αυτό που της στερεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μέχρι σήμερα, να φιλοξενήσει ευρωπαϊκό οργανισμό. Και όλα αυτά δεν γίνονται με την ίδια ταχύτητα που θα μπορούσαν να γίνουν εάν δεν ήταν νησί και ανήκε στην ηπειρωτική Ευρώπη.

Θεωρώ ότι ήρθε η ώρα -και να συγχαρώ τον εισηγητή γι' αυτή την εξαιρετική δουλειά και την έκθεση- τα νησιά μας να βρεθούν στο επίκεντρο των πολιτικών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και να αποδείξουμε ότι τα νησιά πραγματικά αξίζουν μιας καλύτερης αντιμετώπισης από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση σε σχέση με την αντιμετώπιση που είχαν δυστυχώς μέχρι σήμερα.

Tsvetelina Penkova (S&D). – Mr President, dear Commissioner, Mr Omarjee, it's been said many times that islands and remote areas are probably the regions that need our support the most. Some of those areas are so isolated that their economy relies only on agriculture and tourism.

Two weeks ago, with colleagues from the Regional Development Committee, we visited the remote Spanish island of La Palma, part of the Canaries, where the volcanic eruption at the end of last year caused tremendous damage. 10% of the agricultural area was destroyed, which accounts for about 40% of the GDP of the island, and 7 000 people have been evacuated. The infrastructure has been destroyed and the total cost of the damage was about EUR 1.2 billion.

The EU has provided EUR 5.4 million from the Solidarity Fund to help the restorations and the renovations of the island. More than EUR 1 billion are provided from cohesion policy funds to the Canary Islands, but they have to be invested appropriately.

This is just one example, in the picture I've painted, to show you how much the EU actually does matter for those regions. This is just one example why we need to invest more in islands and in remote areas. But it also shows us the necessity of a comprehensive European strategy. We don't need just emergency measures. We actually need a long-term, comprehensive, common EU strategy for islands and for remote areas.

Raffaele Stancanelli (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor relatore, le isole, come la mia Sicilia e come la Sardegna, hanno sofferto e stanno soffrendo ancora oggi gli effetti della crisi pandemica che ha duramente colpito la loro naturale vocazione turistica, aggravandone l'isolamento strutturale.

Se a ciò si vanno ad aggiungere anche gli effetti della guerra in Ucraina, con il sensibile aumento dei prezzi del carburante e dell'energia, la situazione rischia di divenire insostenibile per attività come agricoltura, pesca, artigianato e commercio.

Le nostre isole necessitano l'avvio di un processo immediato, in grado di colmare le lacune strutturali che impediscono un loro inserimento reale nel contesto globale. Per questo motivo, un patto per le isole, per come è concepito, strutturato e articolato dal relatore, che mette in campo appunto progettualità di largo raggio e che tenga conto delle esigenze dei territori inserendole all'interno dei meccanismi economici e commerciali, è la strada da seguire. Per questo noi voteremo la relazione, come è stato annunciato anche dal presidente Fitto.

Io penso che l'insularità, quindi, può diventare un elemento positivo e non considerato ancora come un fattore di svantaggio.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, glavni izazovi s kojima se stanovnici otoka suočavaju su nedostatak osnovne infrastrukture, slaba prometna povezanost s kopnom, visoke cijene, nedostatak radne snage te manjak održivih gospodarskih djelatnosti koje nisu isključivo sezonske. Od svega navedenog, otočna područja izložena su depopulaciji i nerazvijenosti, što predstavlja golemi problem. Protiv toga se moramo boriti uz pomoć kohezijske politike, donošenjem mjera vezanih uz gospodarski razvoj i poboljšanjem dostupnosti javnih usluga na otocima, a o tome govori i ovo vrlo dobro izvješće.

Ljudima na otocima moramo ponuditi drugu perspektivu, osim turističke, kako ne bi bili potpuno ovisni o uspjehu ili neuspjehu ljetne sezone. Potrebno je, stoga, potaknuti investicije te omogućiti kvalitetno obrazovanje da bi otočani imali priliku razviti vještine koje su potrebne u različitim sferama gospodarstva. Dalje, potrebno je stimulirati zdravstvene radnike da dođu raditi na otoke te generalno stvoriti okvir kojim ćemo omogućiti da ljudi ostanu na otocima, a naročito naši mladi.

Na kraju, naglasio bih važnost razvoja prometnih veza i širokopojsnog interneta kao javnih usluga da bi se doprinijelo prevladavanju izoliranosti s kojom se stanovnici otoka suočavaju.

Kohezijska politika mora biti dovoljno fleksibilna da se može prilagoditi specifičnim problemima otoka jer one su važan dio europskog identiteta i moramo ih učiniti atraktivnima za život u 21. stoljeću.

Salvatore De Meo (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, dal dibattito odierno, purtroppo, emerge che le politiche di coesione europee non sono riuscite negli ultimi anni a far fronte in maniera efficace alle diverse criticità socioeconomiche dei 20 milioni di cittadini che vivono sulle isole dell'Unione europea.

Tale constatazione merita una profonda riflessione, se si considera che proprio dalla piccola isola di Ventotene, nel Mediterraneo, circa ottanta anni fa, muoveva i suoi primi passi il progetto europeo con il manifesto di Altiero Spinelli, con cui si immaginava la realizzazione di un'Europa coesa dal punto di vista politico, sociale e territoriale, un'Europa in cui tutti i cittadini potessero godere degli stessi diritti e degli stessi servizi.

Ad oggi, però, le isole, soprattutto quelle più piccole, come è stato detto dai miei colleghi, soffrono di svantaggi strutturali: la bassa densità di popolazione, il difficile approvvigionamento energetico e idrico, il difficile accesso ai servizi sanitari e culturali, la dipendenza dai trasporti e un'economia quasi esclusivamente legata al turismo, alla pesca o all'agricoltura, pur avendo le isole tante potenzialità.

Questa risoluzione rappresenta un passo importante per la definizione di una strategia che possa colmare il divario socioeconomico tra le isole e le aree continentali, garantendo una loro prospettiva di sviluppo in ragione delle sfide della transizione verde e digitale, ma soprattutto attuando una concreta politica di coesione europea, come previsto dall'articolo 174 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor presidente, mis primeras palabras de agradecimiento al señor Omarjee por haber presentado este informe tan oportuno y gracias, también, a la Comisión.

20 millones de habitantes, 4,6 % de la población de la Unión, representan los ciudadanos que vivimos en islas. 2400 islas de 13 Estados miembros. Yo provengo de Mallorca (Islas Baleares, España).

Desde hace mucho tiempo hay un reconocimiento de que la insularidad es una desventaja estructural permanente y tiene que compensarse. Tenemos muchos desafíos los que vivimos en islas: el tamaño, la presión demográfica, la excepcionalidad, la doble o triple insularidad en algunas ocasiones, la dependencia del transporte marítimo aéreo, la desconexión física del continente, los costes de las exportaciones y las importaciones, dificultades en el mercado laboral, dificultades para poder tener acceso a la educación en condiciones de igualdad, dificultades para el acceso a la sanidad y en materia de agua y energía.

En el caso del turismo, las Islas Baleares dependen prácticamente del turismo. Necesitamos un apoyo fiscal complementario para poder tener un turismo sostenible. Lo mismo ocurre con la agricultura; también la agricultura es muy importante y necesitamos un plan específico para poder ser competitivos. Hemos hecho un llamamiento de las islas desde las Islas Baleares para este o ese, en favor de la agricultura.

Acabo diciendo que también es muy importante eliminar la regla de mínimos, porque las ayudas para paliar la insularidad nunca pueden ser ayudas de Estado: son ayudas para poder ser iguales. No pedimos nada para ser más que nadie; pedimos lo que pedimos para ser iguales.

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, um dos principais desafios cada vez mais frequentes nas ilhas da UE são os fenómenos naturais extremos e os aluviões frequentes provocados pelas alterações climáticas e que são devastadores, devido à falta de gestão e de conservação sustentável dos solos agrícolas e florestais.

Neste sentido, o Fundo de Solidariedade da União Europeia tem de ser melhorado para lidar de forma mais realista com as consequências, tal como reconhece este mesmo relatório. Precisamos de um mecanismo de apoio específico que permita maior elegibilidade para regiões ultraperiféricas da União Europeia, com possibilidade deste fundo ser mobilizado para o financiamento de operações de emergência e a recuperação em caso de danos inferiores a 1% do PIB, quando afetado a uma área reduzida, tendo em conta e considerando a sua localização específica e os seus recursos.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA*varapuhemies*

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, como tantas vezes dito, as ilhas da União Europeia enfrentam, na sua generalidade, desvantagens estruturais permanentes, tais como a pequena dimensão territorial, não raras vezes associada a uma topografia muito difícil, baixa densidade populacional, que se reflete também em mercados internos pequenos e muito dependentes de produtos locais, facto que só conseguem mitigar através de uma outra enorme dependência: a dos transportes marítimos e aéreos.

Além das desvantagens estruturais, as nossas ilhas, em particular as ultraperiféricas, estão ainda na linha da frente das regiões mais afetadas pelas alterações climáticas, sofrendo um aumento da frequência e intensidade de catástrofes naturais com enorme impacto sobre a sua economia, os seus ecossistemas, isto para não falar dos casos em que inclusivamente ceifam vidas humanas.

É, por tudo isto, fundamental a elaboração de uma estratégia específica para as ilhas da União Europeia, com prioridades de ação claramente definidas, de modo a diminuir os impactos das suas desvantagens estruturais e promover o desenvolvimento de medidas de combate, prevenção e ajustamento aos novos desafios que elas têm de enfrentar.

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisario, yo creo que estamos ante un informe muy interesante, con 93 puntos, todos ellos de gran interés. Me gustaría destacar que lo más importante del debate de hoy es poner las islas en el centro.

Necesitamos un pacto europeo por las islas porque, si no, no hay políticas específicas. La única que había era el POSEI, y ya vimos en la reforma cómo se quería recortar su presupuesto. Próximamente, en 2027, no sé qué va a suceder: si va a ser una política dentro de la PAC o una política estatal.

Las islas tienen unas características y una situación que requieren de una ayuda específica, sean las islas ultraperiféricas o no. Yo soy de España, con las Islas Baleares y las Islas Canarias, ultraperiféricas, y requieren medidas específicas. Seamos sensibles también con el paquete de mañana de Objetivo 55, que no es nada sensible, por cierto, con estas islas.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, a realidade das regiões insulares enquadradas na União Europeia é diversa e apresenta desvantagens estruturais relativamente aos territórios continentais motivadas pela sua dimensão, pela baixa densidade populacional, sazonalidade demográfica, alta variação topográfica ou fraca conectividade.

Essas características estruturais exigem uma distinção positiva das políticas de investimento público que possibilitem uma maior coesão territorial e social e contrariem a tendência divergente do desenvolvimento destes territórios.

As ilhas portuguesas são ao mesmo tempo regiões ultraperiféricas, sofrendo dessa dupla insularidade. O desenvolvimento dos arquipélagos dos Açores e da Madeira passa necessariamente pelo investimento na agricultura, pelos apoios à pesca de pequena escala e tradicional, pelo desenvolvimento industrial, o turismo sustentável e a melhoria das acessibilidades, quer entre ilhas, quer com o território continental. Passa também por políticas e por investimentos que concretizem esse desenvolvimento, nomeadamente um POSEI dedicado às pescas e outro aos transportes, como temos defendido e como continuaremos a defender.

Lamentamos que a condicionalidade imposta aos fundos estruturais impacte estas regiões, limitando possibilidades de desenvolvimento que seriam fundamentais.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la Unión Europea no es solamente un territorio contiguo que va desde el Atlántico hasta su frontera con Rusia, con Bielorrusia, con Ucrania o con Turquía. Son también islas en las que viven millones de europeas y europeos que necesitan ese pacto europeo de las islas que propone el ponente Omarjee, que atienda las ayudas de Estado del artículo 107, la política regional del 174 y los problemas de adaptación a la transición verde que requieren las islas como territorio fragmentado, donde hay paro, donde hay necesidad de apoyo al sector primario, pesquero y agrícola, y donde hay necesidad de diversificar la economía con un esfuerzo singular en materia de conectividad que corrija la problemática suscitada por la doble y por la triple insularidad.

Por eso, sí al pacto europeo de las islas. Por eso, sí a la especialización de la política regional y sí a la especialización de las ayudas de Estado, que muestre que la Unión Europea se retrata también en su política de cohesión y de integración regional en las islas, no solamente en el territorio contiguo.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Janusz Wojciechowski, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, thank you very much for this very rich debate. I fully understand how difficult it is for the functioning of the economy on the islands. I had the opportunity to visit the Spanish island of La Palma a few months ago, and it was after the volcano eruption, and it was an opportunity to see the difficulties for the functioning of agriculture and how difficult the recovery is for agriculture after this horrible disaster.

I have taken good note of the various points made and will work with my colleagues in the College, as well as with the Member States, to ensure that islands are not left behind in our efforts for a more cohesive, digital and green Europe.

We have an EU strategy for islands and the Pact of Islands. We have the territorial agenda that provides an action-oriented framework to promote territorial cohesion in Europe as envisaged in the Treaty.

The Territorial Agenda 2030 recognises that Europe has diverse territories such as coastal zones, islands and mountainous areas, inner peripheries, plains, river valleys and lake basins – all these territories have unique development challenges and potential.

There is substantial variation among the island regions, both in terms of GDP per capita levels and economic growth. This suggests that the islands do not face the same development issues, that diversity makes it difficult to approach these regions as a single group. Cohesion policy encourages all Member States and regions to develop their own strategy, taking into account their strengths and weaknesses, including those linked to geographical characteristics.

The European Commission remains committed to islands for all cohesion policy and rural development programmes and for all other instruments addressing the needs of islands under other key policies from Horizon to the Connecting Europe Facility.

Thank you for your commitment as we programme and launch these funds together. We look forward to our collaboration in the coming years.

Younous Omarjee, *rapporteur*. – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais tout d'abord remercier l'ensemble des groupes politiques de la commission du développement régional pour avoir soutenu cette initiative importante pour les îles, et je crois que ce débat est un moment important dans la relation entre les îles de l'Union européenne et les institutions européennes.

J'ai écouté avec beaucoup d'attention le commissaire et je crois que nous devons évacuer tout malentendu. La Commission ne peut pas feindre d'ignorer le sens profond de ce rapport en jouant sur une confusion entre les régions ultrapériphériques et les autres îles, qui ne sont pas visées par l'article 349 du traité et relèvent de son article 174 – je pense en particulier aux îles de la Méditerranée. C'est pourquoi ce rapport vise à une pleine application, aujourd'hui, de l'article 174.

Il est vrai que la Commission – et la politique régionale, et la commission REGI – a un plan d'action ambitieux pour les régions ultrapériphériques. Ce plan d'action ambitieux doit être poursuivi, il doit être maintenu. Mais nous devons aussi entendre les fragilités de toutes les îles et de ce qu'elles peuvent apporter à l'Union européenne.

Nous vous demandons systématiquement, en amont, de tenir compte des fragilités, des particularités, des spécificités aussi bien des régions ultrapériphériques que des autres îles de l'Union européenne, pour toutes les raisons qui ont été explicitées dans ce débat très riche, de qualité, et qui je l'espère va dès aujourd'hui ouvrir un temps nouveau pour que l'Union européenne ait une véritable ambition insulaire.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt. Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 171 artikla)

Caterina Chinnici (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Le regioni insulari europee, 2 400 isole, tra cui la mia regione, la Sicilia, appartenenti a ben 13 Stati membri, con una popolazione stimata a più di 20 000 000 abitanti (4,6 % della popolazione totale dell'UE), rappresentano un patrimonio di inestimabile bellezza e ricchezza sotto il profilo paesaggistico, della biodiversità, culturale e linguistico. La peculiarità geografica di tali territori, tuttavia comporta molteplici svantaggi naturali e strutturali che penalizzano fortemente i cittadini: dipendenza dal trasporto marittimo e aereo, con conseguente aumento dei costi di servizi e prodotti; dipendenza da un numero limitato di prodotti; difficoltà di accesso all'acqua e gestione delle risorse idriche; pressione demografica stagionale. La politica europea di coesione impone di colmare tale «svantaggio geografico». È necessario che la Commissione elabori un «Patto per le isole» e un piano d'azione europeo con l'obiettivo di ridurre il divario socio-economico tra le isole e le aree continentali.

Il pacchetto legislativo Fit for 55 % in fase di attuazione, dovrà tener conto di tale realtà e creare le condizioni affinché tali territori diventino un prezioso laboratorio per le politiche sostenibili in settori quali, l'energia pulita, l'economia circolare, il turismo, la mobilità intelligente, la gestione dei rifiuti e l'economia blu.

19. Tura pytań (Komisja) Zmniejszyć zużycie pestycydów i lepiej chronić konsumentów

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana komission kyselytunti (työjärjestyksen 137 artikla).

Haluan toivottaa tänne juuri saapuneen komission jäsenen Stella Kyriakidesin

tervetulleeksi. Tämän kyselytunnin aiheena on torjunta-aineiden käytön vähentäminen ja kuluttajansuojan vahvistaminen.

Tämä kyselytunti kestää noin 60 minuuttia. Kysymyksiä ei myönnetä etukäteen yksittäisille jäsenille. Kysymyksen esittämiseen varataan yksi minuutti, komission vastaukseen kaksi minuuttia, lisäkysymykseen 30 sekuntia ja vastaukseen kaksi minuuttia.

Mahdollisen lisäkysymyksen on liityttävä ehdottomasti varsinaiseen kysymykseen, eikä se saa muodostaa uutta, itsenäistä kysymystä.

Jos haluatte esittää kysymyksen, pyydän rekisteröimään pyyntönne nyt käyttämällä äänestyskoneenne catch-the-eye-toimintoa sen jälkeen, kun äänestyskortti on syötetty koneeseen.

Ohjeita on saatavilla istuntosalissa.

Muistutan, että voitte valita paikkanne istuntosalissa vapaasti lukuun ottamatta kahta ensimmäistä riviä, jotka on tarkoitettu ryhmien johtajille.

Kyselytunnin puheenvuorot käytetään omalta paikalta. Kehotan kaikkia puhujia pitäytymään kullekin varatussa puheajassa.

Kollegat saattavat tarvita hetken rekisteröidäkseen äänestyskoneella pyyntönsä esittää kysymys. Pyydän teitä rekisteröimään pyyntönne nyt, ja sen jälkeen aloitamme ensimmäisellä kysymyksellä.

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisaria Kyriakides, bienvenida a este turno de preguntas.

La Comisión ha anunciado que próximamente vamos a tener un Reglamento -pensé que sería una Directiva, pero, al parecer, es un Reglamento- sobre un uso más sostenible de los plaguicidas, es decir, sobre su reducción, como se prometía en el Pacto Verde Europeo. Se trata de una demanda de la sociedad, sin duda, pero, desde el primer momento, sí tengo que decirles que nos preocupa, porque el problema para los agricultores no es la reducción de los plaguicidas, sino la falta de alternativas para poder llevarla a cabo.

Por lo tanto, me gustaría que hoy quedase aquí claro, en esta intervención o en las siguientes de mis colegas, cuál va a ser el porcentaje de reducción de los plaguicidas y qué alternativas va a poner la Comisión a disposición de los agricultores para que la sanidad vegetal no se vea perjudicada.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you, MEP Aguilera, for the question. First of all, in terms of the targets that you have asked for, let us go back to the beginning and say a little bit about the ‘farm to fork’ strategy. Farm to fork has been put in place with very clear targets. It’s a strategy that is part of the Green Deal in order for citizens to have safe and affordable foods.

What we have said in our strategy is that, by 2030, we will reduce the use of chemical pesticides by 50%, and again, by 2030, we will reduce the use by 50% of the most hazardous pesticides. You are totally correct in saying that we are putting forward before the summer a new ‘sustainable use of pesticides’ regulation. This is important for us in order to be able to build up our long-term food security and resilience.

But we are fully aware also of the challenges that are going to be faced, and the need to have alternatives, and we are working very closely with the Member States in order to be able to have this. I think that what we also need to say from the very beginning of this interesting debate is that we are aware of the challenges, but doing nothing is clearly not an option. I think we all need to agree on that.

We also know that there are various studies that have shown that the current directive has weaknesses in its implementation. This is why we are going to be moving forward, because over-use of pesticides leads to contamination of our air, of our soil, and it definitely impacts on our health. We will be moving forward while also helping farmers develop other, less hazardous, less dangerous options that they can use. For this we are already moving to encouraging the use of bio-pesticides so that they can be an alternative to chemical pesticides that will allow farmers to continue to be producing in a safe way and also be protecting crops.

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, para que haya responsabilidad y para que sea real esa reducción del porcentaje que quieren ustedes que alcance el 50 %, hay que poner alternativas viables y factibles a disposición de los agricultores desde el momento en que se produce la reducción.

¿Por qué no adelantan la nueva normativa sobre nuevas técnicas de cultivo, que sería una buena salida, junto con los plaguicidas u otras alternativas? Adelanten esa iniciativa o tomen otras iniciativas, pero, a la par que llevan a cabo la reducción, tienen que poner a disposición otros productos.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Yes, and we will be doing everything possible to make these alternatives available. We are going to be using, and this is how we’re going to be moving forward ... We’re going to be giving support to farmers during this transition. They will have the support through the CAP in order that we can move to more environmentally friendly farming. And experience has shown us that we can do this and we are able to move forward by giving them alternatives.

And I believe that this is the way that we are going to be able to deliver on our ambition: by providing alternatives to the chemical pesticides, by encouraging the use of biological alternatives, and by facilitating and using innovation in order to achieve this.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – I am just wondering, Commissioner: what impact assessments have been carried out in the Farm to Fork Strategy to ensure that we will have a sustainable food industry in the years ahead, if we are to reduce and bring forward this regulation with regard to the Sustainable Use of Pesticides Regulation, which I very much support?

We do have to have the research, the innovation, around the alternatives, like bios, like organics, but also even in the context of genetically modified. And I know that we in this House, in previous times, have had major discussions on this particular issue. But we fail to come to a consensus. We fail to understand the science or to accept the science.

So I’m just wondering, have we carried out impact assessments? Do we know that the alternatives will be there immediately? And what other impacts could it have on the cost of food, the drop in yields and production by farmers because they are not able to put chemical pesticides on crops?

So, particularly in view of escalating food costs, inflationary pressures, this is a significant issue and we have to give assurance and clarity to the agricultural sector, the farmers, but also the consumers, not only in terms of the safety of the products, but the cost of the product as well.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – I'm well aware of the concerns, especially due to the current situation that we are living in with the ongoing Russian aggression in Ukraine. However, I will go back to what I said: doing nothing is not an option.

Of course, everything that we are putting forward in 'farm to fork' is based on scientific guidance, and an impact assessment on the targets has been carried out and will be published towards the end of this year. So we are moving very carefully, impact assessments are being carried out and, of course, we are basing all our proposals on science.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – So I welcome that, Commissioner, but I do believe that we actually have to have the publications of these impact assessments in advance of us actually making fundamental decisions around how we farm, how we produce food and how we make sure it's safe, right throughout the process to the tables in homes across Europe. Because we simply cannot hope that there will be some replacements, we have to insist that there will be.

So, we do need to see the impact assessments on the potential drops in yields, the potential spikes in food, but also in what we actually intend to replace these chemical pesticides with.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – For all the initiatives and proposals that are in 'farm to fork', impact assessments are ongoing. I believe that we need to also understand that the current crisis, in fact, should strengthen our resolve, that we need to move forward and strengthen the resilience of our food systems. We will do this without leaving anyone behind. We need to do this having everyone on board and, of course, farmers are very much an important part of this process.

So please appreciate that impact assessments are ongoing. We are constantly in consultation with stakeholders. It is important for us that farmers are supported throughout this transition. But really the alternative of doing nothing, I think, is something that we can all agree is not a viable option.

It is very clear to us – and I will stop here – following the pandemic, how interconnected our health and our environment is, and that we need to move forward in a different way.

Benoît Biteau (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, il y a deux postulats sur lesquels on peut s'appuyer. Le premier, c'est qu'il y a un lien évident entre l'utilisation des pesticides et la santé des consommateurs, et il est de notre devoir de vérifier que la santé des consommateurs n'est plus menacée et de faire en sorte qu'elle ne le soit plus.

L'autre constat – et je suis désolé, mes chers collègues, je vais voler au secours de M^{me} la commissaire –, c'est que d'autres solutions existent. Nous avons des études scientifiques robustes qui démontrent que les substituts aux pesticides ont un nom: l'agronomie. Moi-même qui suis paysan j'en utilise les méthodes depuis très longtemps, et elles fonctionnent à merveille, parce que la biodiversité vient nous aider, parce que le climat est moins violent envers les gens qui travaillent avec ces méthodes alternatives-là.

Nous devons donc faire en sorte que les politiques publiques ne soutiennent que ces méthodes alternatives-là, mais, malheureusement, la PAC n'est pas au rendez-vous, et les plans stratégiques nationaux déposés par la majorité des États membres ne sont pas non plus à la hauteur de ces enjeux.

La question que j'ai donc à vous poser, Madame la Commissaire, est la suivante: comment allons-nous être au rendez-vous que nous avons avec l'histoire avec cette PAC-là et avec les plans stratégiques nationaux qui sont actuellement sur la table?

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – *(begins off microphone)* ... for that input. And it gives me the opportunity to come back to a point as well that there is increasing evidence – and you have already stated that – that alternative products can effectively substitute the use of chemical pesticides. And, in fact, I have data from Spain that show that the use of chemical pesticides in indoor vegetable production in Almeria has been reduced by over 55%, and that over 80% of protected crops now use biological controls to treat pests.

So there are ways forward, and we will be working with Member States, and already are working with Member States, so that they are able to use their CAPs in a way that will support farmers in this transition. I think it is important to show that we do have the science – the figures are very encouraging – that we can work together to reduce the use of pesticides without compromising food security. And I would agree with you totally that this is tied in so closely with health that we need to move forward with this.

So we are committed to moving forward with Farm to Fork, as we have been from the beginning.

Benoît Biteau (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Commissaire, ceci n'est pas une question. Je souhaite amplifier, renforcer mon propos en disant que les substituts aux pesticides ne sont pas forcément de nouveaux pesticides, de nouveaux biopesticides, mais surtout des pratiques agronomiques qui anticipent et qui préviennent les attaques de champignons, d'insectes, en utilisant moins d'azote par exemple. Ce sont des méthodes alternatives qui génèrent de véritables cercles vertueux pour la biodiversité, pour notre santé et pour le climat, et pour l'économie des agriculteurs, par ailleurs. Je vous invite donc à travailler davantage sur ces méthodes, qui se fondent plus volontiers sur l'agronomie que sur des molécules.

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – No, I don't think it was a question, it was more an added explanation. But it is important here to say that exactly the CAP can be used to finance this transition into these different systems of agriculture. And the upcoming SUD revision is going to be very much linked to the CAP synergies. So I think this is correctly the way forward.

Elżbieta Kruk (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Zużycie najniebezpieczniejszych pestycydów w Europie rośnie. W rezultacie Europejczycy są narażeni na coraz większy kontakt z toksycznymi substancjami. Znamy negatywny wpływ pestycydów na zdrowie ludzi i zwierząt oraz na środowisko i różnorodność biologiczną. Trzeba więc pilnie podjąć działania dla promocji i wsparcia rozwiązań alternatywnych. Trzeba prowadzić ogólnoeuropejskie akcje informacyjne, bowiem rolnicy często nie wiedzą, po którą substancję mogą sięgnąć, jeśli chcą zwiększyć bezpieczeństwo żywności. Trzeba stworzyć efektywne instrumenty, aby podnieść opłacalność upraw bez chemii.

Ale czy zaproponowana przez Fransa Timmermansa, wiceprzewodniczącego Komisji Europejskiej, redukcja o 50 % zużycia pestycydów bez uwzględnienia różnych uwarunkowań państw członkowskich jest właściwym i sprawiedliwym rozwiązaniem? Rolnicy w państwach Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej zużywają kilkakrotnie mniej pestycydów w przeliczeniu na hektar niż w wielu krajach Europy Zachodniej. Jeśli redukcja obejmie procentowo równo każde państwo, to w wielu państwach Europy Zachodniej będzie się zużywać nadal więcej środków ochrony niż przed redukcją, np. w Polsce.

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – Thank you for the question. Well, first of all, let me just say that the proposal for the sustainable use of pesticides will be looking at placing targets – I believe strongly that targets are important. This is about reducing the use of chemical pesticides where possible.

We are also working through this on a revision on a range of supporting measures, including what we can put to support others on the market of less hazardous pesticides. But here there will be different starting points for the different Member States, because I think that this is something that we have to recognise.

The Farm to Fork pesticides targets have been established based on the extensive experience that we have on the development of the existing harmonised risk indicator. It makes it clear that the approach will take into account the different starting points and the differences and improvements potential in the Member States. So we will be looking at that.

But I believe that this is the approach we need to go forward with, because if we want to deliver on what citizens are expecting of us – to reduce pesticide use – all Member States will have to make an effort. But we will have different starting points for different Member States.

Elżbieta Kruk (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jeszcze w takim razie, Pani Komisarz, dopytam. Czy nieaktualne są już założenia tego zaproponowanego rozporządzenia, o którym już wspomniałam, wiceprzewodniczącego Komisji Europejskiej Fransa Timmermansa, o redukcji o 50% pestycydów stosowanych w rolnictwie bez uwzględnienia różnicy w uwarunkowaniach krajów członkowskich? Czy celem nie powinno być nie tylko obniżenie, ale i zrównanie zużycia pestycydów na hektar we wszystkich państwach członkowskich?

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – The revision of the Sustainable Use Directive from the very beginning was very clear that it would have targets, but that we would be taking into account the different starting points of Member States. I think that this is necessary in order for us to be able to move forward.

This revision is necessary so that we protect the biodiversity, protect the environment and protect human health. We are working, as I said, on a wide range of measures in order to be able to put this into effect. So we are committed to all the 'farm to fork' targets. I have said this from the beginning; I will keep on repeating it if I must.

Anja Hazekamp (The Left). – Voorzitter, als u een smoothie met bijvoorbeeld kiwi, peer of kersen maakt, krijgt u niet alleen voldoende vezels en vitaminen binnen, maar ook een ongezonde cocktail van pesticiden, die voor een steeds groter deel uit de schadelijkste landbouwgiften bestaat.

Deze gifstoffen hadden allang verboden moeten zijn. Uit recent onderzoek is echter gebleken dat ze juist steeds meer worden gebruikt. Los van de gevaren van afzonderlijke landbouwgiften worden de effecten van gifstoffen nog altijd niet in samenhang beoordeeld. Hiervoor had de Commissie al tien jaar geleden moeten zorgen.

Wanneer worden landbouwgiften eindelijk cumulatief beoordeeld? Wanneer worden de schadelijkste en gevaarlijkste landbouwgiften eindelijk verboden?

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – The Commission's evaluation of the pesticides legislation showed that the work on developing the methodology for the cumulative risk assessment for pesticide residues has been more complex than was initially expected, and that this work definitely needs to be accelerated.

Now as for the risk assessment, in 2020, EFSA delivered two reports assessing the cumulative risks of combined exposure to pesticide residues, and recently published its prospective scenarios for establishing maximum residue levels for pesticides based on the cumulative risk assessment methodology.

The Commission and EFSA have prepared an action plan to speed up the work on further developing the methodology in order to cover other target organs and to gradually implement it into regulatory practice. So the work is continuing and it is considered to be of the highest priority.

Anja Hazekamp (The Left). – Voorzitter, commissaris, bedankt voor uw antwoorden. Volgens de Commissie is de beoordeling van de cumulatieve effecten een ingewikkelde zaak en kan het nog lang duren voordat deze wordt ingevoerd.

Als we consumenten daadwerkelijk tegen het cocktail-effect willen beschermen, kunnen we twee dingen doen: slechts één landbouwgif per gewas toestaan of consumenten rechtstreeks over de gebruikte pesticiden informeren via etiketten.

Is de Commissie bereid dit te doen totdat de cumulatieve effecten goed kunnen worden beoordeeld?

Puhemies. – Komission jäsen Kyriakides, olkaa hyvä.

Anja Hazekamp (The Left). – Yes, thank you. I will try in English then.

As long as the cumulative effects cannot be assessed – and it will take some time and it is complex, I heard – in the meantime, to protect consumers, are you willing to allow only one pesticide per crop to prevent a cocktail effect? Or, another possibility to protect consumers is to fully inform them through the label. So are you willing to put all the pesticides that were used on a specific crop, on the label?

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – First of all, the protection of consumers' health is, of course, the highest priority. It's not something that is disputable, and we're working through 'farm to fork' to ensure that consumers have access to all the information needed. That is done in a variety of ways throughout the farm to fork strategy, because we believe that having informed consumers is the best way forward and we need also to educate consumers. We mustn't forget that it's not only about educating farmers, because farmers are also consumers, but educating consumers as well.

Now, in the EU, as I'm sure you know, food labelling is covered by specific rules, and residues are not considered as ingredients for labelling purposes. In addition, we have a monitoring report by EFSA, for 2020, and more than 94% of the samples that were then analysed for pesticides did not contain any residues, or residues below the legally permitted levels. So the available data that we have indicates that the food placed on the EU market is safe about consumers, and very stringent controls are carried out by the enforcement authorities of Member States.

Our work continues, will continue, and will always continue, to be based on science. It is not about the cost; it is sometimes about the scientific complexity, and the EU has some of the strictest systems in place in the world, I would think, in terms of this.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, pour réduire l'utilisation des pesticides nous devons – et vous l'avez dit – inscrire dans la loi des objectifs obligatoires de réduction au niveau des États membres. Mais nous devons aussi identifier les substances qui seront ciblées en priorité et nous devons interdire les substances les plus nocives, en particulier lorsqu'elles sont répertoriées comme candidates à la substitution.

La Commission obligera-t-elle les États membres à inclure dans leur plan d'action national un plan de substitution des substances, en commençant par les plus toxiques? Si oui, dans quel délai ?

Au-delà de la réduction de l'utilisation des pesticides en agriculture, d'autres mesures pourraient être prises, comme par exemple l'interdiction de ces pesticides dans les espaces publics, dans les aires de jeux pour enfants. C'est déjà le cas en Belgique et en France, alors que, dans d'autres États membres, l'utilisation de tels pesticides se fait encore au sein de ces espaces. Est-ce que vous envisagez d'interdire ces pesticides dans les espaces publics?

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – I think this is a very important issue, as everything else, but it is a very important issue for our citizens. We are considering prohibiting the use of pesticides in sensitive areas, such as certain areas which are used by the general public: parks, playgrounds, areas where there are ecologically sensitive areas such as Natura 2000 sites. Because our whole aim is to protect human health and protect the environment. And there is no reason to use potentially dangerous substances in areas that are used by citizens, especially those which are most vulnerable, which are our children.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Madame la Commissaire, je voulais aussi vous poser une question. On parle ici de leur utilisation par le secteur public dans les espaces publics, mais ces pesticides chimiques connaissent aussi des utilisations privées par des ménages privés, lesquelles sont tout aussi destructrices de la biodiversité. Est-ce que dans ce cas-là aussi vous envisagez des mesures de restriction?

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – We aim to reduce the use of pesticides across the board – I think you're talking about the non-agricultural use of pesticides. We aim to reduce the use of pesticides across the board.

For example, in the upcoming Sustainable Use of Pesticides Directive, we want to reflect on the ways and the clear wish that we see coming from society not to use pesticides in areas such as playgrounds and parks. So we are aiming to reduce the use of pesticides across the board.

Sarah Wiener (Verts/ALE). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin! Sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, danke, dass Sie sich für diesen Austausch zur Verfügung stellen. Sie haben die volle Unterstützung bei der *Farm-to-Fork*-Strategie, denn wir wissen, es eilt und es brennt: Die Kosten der Untätigkeit werden jedes Jahr größer.

Gerade bei den Pestiziden ist es so: Je mehr Pestizide wir ausbringen, desto mehr schädigen sie nicht nur die Bodengesundheit, nicht nur unser eigenes Mikrobiom, sondern sie schädigen einfach auch die Mitwelt, die Umwelt, das Wasser, die Luft, die Tiere, die Bestäuber. Deswegen ist es immanent wichtig, dass wir uns klarmachen: Was ist nachhaltige Landwirtschaft, was bedeutet Nachhaltigkeit? Und das ist sicher nicht die Benutzung von irgendeinem chemischen Pestizid und schon gar nicht von hochgefährlichen Pestiziden.

Ich weiß nicht, ob Sie darüber Bescheid wissen, dass es französische Studien gibt, die 80 % Pestizidreduktion durchgeführt haben und festgestellt haben, dass es keine Ertragsverluste gibt. Es gibt sogar Studien aus Italien, die bei 95 %iger Reduktion von Neonicotinoiden noch immer keine Ertragsausfälle feststellen. Das zeigt ganz deutlich: Wir haben eine Übernutzung von Pestiziden.

Deswegen ist meine Frage: Werden Sie da etwas unternehmen? Werden Sie zu Ihrem Wort stehen? Werden diese SUD und die Ziele der *Farm-to-Fork* auch wirklich von Ihnen vorwärtsgetrieben? Und wird die *sustainable use of pesticides* dann auch wirklich vor dem Sommer vorgestellt?

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Yes, we tend to bring forward this revision before the summer, as we have said. I want to thank you for raising the issue to do with pollinators, and the importance of that.

As you know, it was at my request in June last year that the majority of agriculture ministers supported, in the Council, a specific protection goal for the protection of bees. Of course, we need to do further work on this in order to be able to have the protection goal as well for bumblebees and solitary bees, because we do not have the scientific evidence yet. But the proposal that we are putting forward is to have the highest level of protection.

In terms of the directive that we're putting through, it will share the same objectives as the current legislation, which is to protect biodiversity. But of course, we will be doing this in a way that it can be better implemented, putting specific targets. So thank you for that.

Sarah Wiener (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich habe keine Nachfrage, sondern nur eine Bemerkung: Als Imkerin werde ich genau hinschauen, was Sie bezüglich Bestäubern machen möchten. Sie sind nicht nur verantwortlich für unsere Lebensmittel, sondern Sie sind auch verantwortlich für einen hoffentlich guten und giftfreien Honig.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas pirmininke, gerbiama komisare. Mes čia visi sutinkame, kad reikėtų sumažinti pesticidų naudojimą dėl vartotojų sveikatos, tačiau mažinant pesticidus reikia ūkininkams suteikti galimybę apsaugoti savo pasėlius nuo kenkėjų ir suteikti tam tikrus instrumentus. Jeigu naujos mokslo įdiegimo technologijos, tokios kaip genominės technologijos, kaip genų redagavimas, galėtų suteikti daug galimybių, pavyzdžiui, leisti auginti augalus, kurie atsparesni ligoms, aplinkos sąlygoms, klimato kaitai ir kenkėjų poveikiui. Tai veda prie atsparesnės ir švaresnės žemės ūkio maisto sistemos ir prisideda prie žaliojo kurso. Kalbant apie genominių technologijų saugos problemas nenustatyta naujų pavojų, palyginus su tradiciniu veisimu. Naudojant naujas technologijas netikslių mutacijų yra mažiau nei įprasto veisimo metu. Tiksliai mutagenėzė ir krizagenėzė kelia tokią pat riziką kaip ir įprastinis veisimas. Mano klausimas: kada planuojate pateikti atnaujintus teisės aktus, kad jie geriau atspindėtų mokslo raidą, sudarytų sąlygas Europos Sąjungos mokslininkams ir ūkininkams konkuruoti pasaulinėse rinkose?

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Yes, we want to promote more sustainable farming with the smarter use of inputs. And, of course, in order to be able to move towards more sustainable food systems, we need to, as you say, unlock the potential of new technologies and alternative approaches to farming. For example, we can have precision farming. These technologies must be made available and affordable for farmers. And when we achieve this, it can only be, as I said before, a win-win situation for farmers and the environment.

Now, you mentioned the new genomic techniques, if I understood correctly from the interpretation, we are committed to act in this field given the potential of new genomic techniques to contribute to sustainability objectives. However, we need to take the necessary steps in order to have a robust impact assessment, including a very wide consultation process and a legislative proposal, which is what you ask, if appropriate, will be then put forward in view of the impact assessment. This could be tabled following the impact assessment and the consultation before the summer of next year.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Aš taip pat noriu padėkoti už atsakymą ir lauksime kitų metų, kada Jūsų siūlymas bus pateiktas. Bet aš noriu sugrįžti dar prie klausimo dėl skirtingų pesticidų naudojimo. Kaip Jūs, Komisare, sakėte, kad bus atsižvelgta į startines pozicijas, o ar bus atsižvelgta į tai, kad kai kuriose šalyse ūkininkai jau dabar vartoja mažiau pesticidų ir jie nebus baudžiami už tai, kad bus siūloma jiems sumažinti penkiasdešimt procentų, bet bus suteikta papildoma pagalba, kad jie vartoją mažiau pesticidų negu kitose šalyse?

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – What we are trying to do through Farm to Fork is not to punish anyone. What we want to do is move towards a direction, a direction that will serve health, environment, sustainability and food safety. I think that we can all agree that this is crucial and that the price of inaction is much greater than the way we're going to move forward.

And there will be there will be targets. We will be taking into consideration the starting points of Member States in order to be able to move forward.

And I just want to say again that we will be supporting farmers through the transition of the CAP and of course need to respect those who find more challenges. So let's at least try and agree that we have a common direction in this. And this is not about punishing. The only ones who will be punished if we do not act are going to be future generations.

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ja, Frau Kommissarin, Sie glauben an die Gentechnik. Aber sehen Sie auch, dass bei der Gentechnik in Südamerika und in den USA der Einsatz von Pestiziden gestiegen ist? Glauben Sie tatsächlich, bei der neuen Gentechnik tritt das Gegenteil ein?

Was ist eigentlich eine nachhaltige Nutzung von Pestiziden? *Sustainable use of pesticides* ist für mich ein Begriff, der gar nicht funktioniert. Wir müssen weniger Pestizide einsetzen. Aber was heißt denn nachhaltig? Der Verlust an Biodiversität ist wirklich dramatisch. Und deshalb: Schaffen Sie es wirklich, die Pestizide um 50 % zu reduzieren – gegen den enormen Widerstand der Agrarlobby? Sind Sie sich sicher, dass Sie in der Kommission dafür auch eine Mehrheit bekommen? Es gibt erhebliche Widerstände, wie man so hört.

Eine Frage zum Zulassungsprozess: Jahrelang wurde gesagt: Neonicotinoide sind völlig ungefährlich. Dann merkt man nach 20 Jahren: Nein, das Gegenteil ist richtig: Neonicotinoide sind extrem gefährlich. Wie wollen Sie eigentlich garantieren, dass die Zulassungsprozesse bei Pestiziden in Zukunft so sind, dass wir auf Ungefährlichkeit hoffen können?

Beispiel Glyphosat: Dass die Kommission jetzt wieder Glyphosat zulassen will, halte ich eigentlich für einen Skandal, denn alle wissenschaftlichen Studien zeigen: Glyphosat ist auch giftig.

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – The question was whether we are committed and whether the Commission will be able to move forward. I have said it and I will repeat it again. We have a Farm to Fork strategy. We've put it forward. It's a part of our European Green Deal. It has many, many pillars and strategies, and we are fully committed to its implementation.

Actually, Farm to Fork has as a title – I was reading about it today – 'Our health, our planet, our future'. I think that says it all.

In terms of the revision of the sustainable use of pesticides, I have said that we aim to come forward with that before the summer. The targets are there. The targets are necessary. It's not about banning the use of chemical pesticides, but it's about reducing the use where possible and where there are no viable alternatives. So we are working on a wide range of supporting measures to be able to achieve this and I am sure that once we put forward our proposal, we will have your support.

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Frau Kommissarin, glauben Sie, dass die Mitgliedstaaten da mit Ihnen mitgehen? Denn seit Jahren verweigern ja die Mitgliedstaaten eine Reduzierung, wie sie jetzt eigentlich schon im integrierten Landbau vorgesehen ist. Es gibt keine Berichte aus den Mitgliedsländern, und es werden auch keine Pläne auf den Tisch gelegt, wie Pestizide in den Mitgliedsländern reduziert werden.

Also glauben Sie daran, dass die Mitgliedsländer da mitspielen? Ernsthaft?

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Curiously, yes. I'm going to, definitely. I believe in consultation; I believe in being able to talk; I believe that we have a good working relationship with Member States. We've managed this when we were talking about changing the goals for protection of bees; we got there. So it's about consultation; it's about exchanging. In the end, I believe that we all want the same thing.

So as long as we have the supporting targets in place, as long as we can support our farmers as well, and we aim to do this, I believe, yes.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, l'invasione russa dell'Ucraina ci ha fatto render conto di come, per troppo tempo, abbiamo dato per scontata la sicurezza alimentare. Purtroppo non è così.

Putin ha creato una crisi, sta creando una crisi, con l'accesso al cibo nel bacino del Mediterraneo, minando l'equilibrio geopolitico e creando le condizioni per una ripresa delle ondate migratorie che l'Unione ha già faticosamente affrontato durante le primavere arabe. Un contesto estremamente delicato che, tuttavia, le prime bozze di nuova normativa sui fitofarmaci sembrano del tutto ignorare, Commissaria.

In tali bozze la Commissione stessa stima impatti significativi sulla produzione europea, conseguenti sia all'aumento dei prezzi per i nostri consumatori, sia all'aumento delle importazioni da parte di paesi terzi. Tutto ciò non garantirà alcun rispetto dei nostri standard di sostenibilità e il tutto senza offrire ai nostri agricoltori alcuna alternativa valida all'utilizzo della chimica.

Come hanno detto tanti altri colleghi, Commissaria, non ritiene che sia arrivato il momento di rompere gli indugi e di mettere sul tavolo la nuova normativa sulle biotecnologie sostenibili? Così si potrà finalmente ridurre la chimica.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – The Russian aggression of Ukraine has called for targeted short-term measures, and we have been working at full speed as a Commission to a very rapidly developing situation.

The war in Ukraine, combined with a price surge, has brought forward the links of geopolitics, globalisation and climate change and food security. However, the war in Ukraine does not remove the fact that climate change, biodiversity loss and scarcity are some of the biggest threats facing humanity in the next decades. And the cost of inaction hugely outweighs the costs related to transition. So, we are committed to the Green Deal and Farm to Fork and its ambitions, and we will be working very closely in order to ensure that we are going to be able to support and deal with the fall-back of this war as much as possible.

And let me just say here that we have taken a number of steps already to ensure that we secure as much as possible the movement of food. For example, we adopted solidarity corridors recently in order to enable grain exports from Ukraine. So we will be moving with this as much as possible.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Grazie per la sua risposta, Commissaria, ma la mia domanda è la seguente: non ritiene che ci sia un controsenso se la Commissione, da una parte, vuole aumentare la produzione agricola europea – e infatti abbiamo sospeso temporaneamente l'*ecological focus area*, ovvero la messa a riposo obbligatoria del 5 % della superficie arabile – ma poi, dall'altra parte, presenta una proposta che vorrà ridurre la produzione europea? Credo che ci sia qualche incongruenza che va superata.

Puhemies. – Voisitteko hyvin lyhyesti kiteyttää kysymyksenne, koska meillä ei äsken ollut tulkkausta.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signora Commissaria, adesso mi sente? Molto brevemente le domando come mai la Commissione, da una parte, ha interrotto temporaneamente l'*ecological focus area*, cioè di fatto l'obbligo di messa a riposo del 5 % della superficie arabile per aumentare la produzione europea e, dall'altra parte, con questo provvedimento che si annuncia sui fitofarmaci vuole ridurre la produzione europea? Perché questa è l'analisi di impatto che presenta proprio la proposta stessa della Commissione.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Yes, thank you for that. I'm sorry I didn't have the translation before.

No, it's not going in the opposite direction. In fact, we're not going to be banning the use of pesticides. We're looking to reduce them, as I have said, through the Sustainable Use of Pesticides Regulation, and we will be working towards this in order to be able to achieve what we have already said.

I just wanted to say here that in order to do this, we need to have the systematic application of integrated pest management. This must become the norm. Of course, the war in Ukraine has necessarily made us pause on some actions and take targeted short-term measures, but it is not a reason not to go forward.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, no debate que hoje aqui se promove refere-se, e bem, a necessidade de reduzir o uso de pesticidas, salvaguardando os interesses dos consumidores.

Sucedo que a utilização de pesticidas não se pode dissociar dos fenómenos da crescente concentração da produção agrícola e intensificação do modelo produtivo que, em países como Portugal, nos últimos 30 anos, levaram à perda de centenas de milhares de explorações, sobretudo de pequena dimensão e familiares, e correspondentes postos de trabalho.

No dia em que aqui neste hemiciclo se celebraram os 60 anos da PAC importa recordar as consequências da Política Agrícola Comum naqueles fenómenos, mas também na redução da diversidade biológica na produção agrícola, no abandono de espécies tradicionais, na normalização e padronização da produção. Um caminho que reverte a favor das multinacionais do setor agroalimentar, com a cumplicidade da Comissão Europeia e da UE, favorecendo a superprodução intensiva, a monocultura, a disseminação de OGM associados, tantas vezes, ao aumento de resistências aos pesticidas, impondo a absoluta dependência dos produtores em relação às multinacionais.

Está a Comissão disposta a questionar este caminho?

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – As I have said, we need to maintain viable and competitive agriculture. And with the support under the CAP, we can move to more environmentally friendly farming with reduced inputs that are going to be more resilient to shock.

And the current crisis has reinforced our conviction that the resilience of our food systems needs a fundamental change and reorientation of EU agriculture food systems towards sustainability.

So, I believe that the ambitious farm to fork strategy goals are more relevant now than ever. We need to decrease our overreliance on inputs, including pesticides and fertilisers through innovation, agroecology and the adoption of best practices. And we will be doing this while supporting, of course, farmers through the CAP. We are committed to making this transition to sustainable food systems successful.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, eu percebo que seja difícil, ao fim de tantas perguntas, repetir muitas vezes o mesmo conteúdo e a evidência, enfim, de que há menos disponibilidade por parte da Comissão para, de facto, questionar o que é necessário. Porque reduzir a utilização de pesticidas passa por questionar o modelo produtivo, por direcionar os apoios à pequena e média agricultura, à agricultura familiar, valorizar métodos tradicionais de produção, bem como de espécies tradicionais e autóctones, melhor adaptadas às condições de cada país e que garantam que são menos dependentes do uso deste tipo de fitofármacos das multinacionais do setor.

A questão que se coloca, Senhora Comissária, é se haverá apoios disponíveis direcionados especificamente a este subsector, à pequena e média produção, para alcançar estes fins.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – I believe I have already answered that, and I can just reiterate our commitment to move forward with 'farm to fork' as part of the Green Deal. As I have said, we will be moving forward.

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, eu defendo e acredito que os objetivos delineados nas estratégias do prado ao prato e da biodiversidade são fundamentais para estabelecer o caminho, o rumo para sistemas agroalimentares mais sustentáveis. E, nesse sentido, também devem servir, obviamente, para estimular o aparecimento de soluções inovadoras e respeitadoras do ambiente, como sejam as substâncias ativas biológicas ou a promoção de métodos naturais de controlo de pragas.

E por isso eu pergunto, no contexto desta nova proposta de legislação, como está a ser equacionada, ou se estará a ser equacionada, a necessidade de agilizar o processo de autorização de substâncias que sejam de baixo risco na agricultura e com respeito integral da segurança para a saúde pública e para o meio ambiente.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Yes, we're working towards that in order to make it more agile and to be able to move towards approval more quickly.

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, peço desculpa, mas eu gostaria de fazer uma segunda pergunta, se me é permitido tal como os meus colegas.

Puhemies. – Saatte sen, mutta pitää kiinni puheajasta, sillä nyt alkavat minuutit olla loppu, olkaa hyvä.

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Eu gostaria que o tratamento fosse igual e é uma pergunta muito rápida, uma vez que a resposta da Senhora Comissária também foi muito rápida, está bem? É muito rápida e eu gostaria de perguntar, se me é permitido, em que medida é que nesta nova legislação está a ser equacionada a questão da proteção integrada, desde logo no que toca a uma maior homogeneidade das regras da proteção integrada no contexto da União Europeia.

E devo dizer também que, relativamente à primeira questão, não fiquei totalmente satisfeita, mas compreendo que nesta altura estamos todos muito cansados e com pouca disponibilidade para a resposta.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – No, it's my responsibility to give you answers. So I will come back to your first question.

As you have said, we need to encourage the use of low-risk and biological alternatives. As I have said from the Commission side, we will be expediting the phasing out of the more hazardous pesticides. But together with this, we will be streamlining – and this is what I maybe didn't say correctly – and speeding up the approval and procedures for the low-risk products, because the two have to go hand-in-hand. We have already promoted the micro-organisms with concrete proposals, and we have put forward guidance on semi-chemicals and botanicals.

Efforts are also needed from Member States – and I want to say this here – to speed up their assessments at national level in order to make these alternatives available to farmers. We, from our side, will do everything possible to do this, but we also need to have the commitment from the Member States so that these alternatives reach farmers. If we want to see these alternatives reach the market, resources must be made available for this.

For your second question, if I understood it correctly, integrated pest management is at the very core of the proposal.

Claude Gruffat (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, la Commission prévoit de réduire de 50 % l'utilisation des pesticides, notamment les plus dangereux, d'ici 2030, et je m'en félicite. Mais il lui revient aussi de s'assurer de la bonne application du règlement 1107 de 2009 relatif à la mise sur le marché des pesticides et, surtout, de la jurisprudence de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne d'octobre 2019 qui demande qu'une évaluation sur la toxicité à long terme des pesticides soit réalisée dans leur formulation commerciale complète. Formulation commerciale complète... Ce n'est pas le cas aujourd'hui. Qu'entend alors faire la Commission?

Deuxième point, enfin: pourquoi la Commission n'envisage-t-elle pas de faire apparaître la présence de résidus de pesticides dans les produits alimentaires, notamment à travers l'étiquetage alimentaire? Je n'aurai pas d'autre question.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – As we have said before, the consumers in the EU enjoy the highest protection in the world – I believe your question was on the maximum residue levels – and thanks to our very strict regulation, any pesticide residues in our food, whether produced in the EU or imported, are as low as needed to protect consumer safety. EU rules on pesticide residues apply to all substances because we want to have consumer safety protected.

I welcome all the reports that we have from stakeholders because they allow us to have the information that we need to protect our citizens. These are very complex matters, and we owe clarity to our citizens. What is essential is that we know that the residue levels are above or below our EU levels, and we follow very closely EFSA's recommendations – the report that it publishes every year on pesticide residues. So I believe that this is the way forward, when we are able to assess any of the residues that need to be looked at.

Claude Gruffat (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Commissaire, je reprends la deuxième question que j'avais posée: pourquoi la Commission n'envisage-t-elle pas de faire apparaître la présence de résidus de pesticides dans les produits alimentaires sur l'étiquetage alimentaire? Je parle bien des résidus légaux autorisés; je ne parle pas de dépassements de normes. Je parle de tous les résidus: quand il y a des résidus, pourquoi ne le fait-on pas apparaître sur l'étiquetage alimentaire?

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – As I have already said before, the EU labelling is under a different legislation. We agree with the court ruling – because you mentioned earlier the court ruling – Member States do the assessment for pesticide residues, and we will be looking at this.

Tudor Ciuhodaru (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamna comisar, și eu vreau ca viața fiecărui cetățean european să fie protejată.

Sunt medic de urgență la Iași, la Spitalul Clinic de Urgență Nicolae Oblu și tratez efectele acestor substanțe toxice, o variată gamă de patologii, iar întrebările mele sunt clare. Obiectivele sunt extrem de generoase. Dar vreau să știu și eu cine și cum va verifica ca aceste obiective să fie puse în practică, iar pe de altă parte cine și cum va doza și identifica aceste substanțe.

Și doamna comisar, vă gândiți cumva la o rețea independentă de centre care să asigure aceste evaluări? Pentru că ne-am cam săturat să existe un dublu standard și una să fie într-o parte a Uniunii Europene și alta să fie în cealaltă parte.

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – The European Food Safety Authority publishes each year a report on pesticide residues in food products, which is the most comprehensive report on this issue for the entire of the EU. And samples are analysed under an EU coordinated approach. And there are national control programmes in place.

In case of non-compliance, the Member States take the necessary action, such as withdrawing or recalling the products. And I believe that we have already said that we place extremely high standards as the EU in order to protect our citizens' health.

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Vielen Dank, Frau Kommissarin, dass Sie zu dieser späten Stunde noch bereit sind, Antworten zu geben. Ich mache es auch sehr kurz.

Ich frage mich schon seit längerem, warum wir eigentlich immer wieder zustimmen müssen bzw. in Kenntnis gesetzt werden, dass Rückstandsmengen von Pestiziden, die in der Europäischen Union längst verboten sind, auf Produkten, die nach wie vor in unseren Läden zu kaufen sind, erlaubt werden. Zum Teil werden diese Mengen sogar hochgesetzt, wie eben in einem aktuellen Fall – anscheinend, weil wir ohne Zucchini aus den USA nicht leben können.

Ich frage jetzt die Kommission: Wie gedenkt sie, zukünftig damit umzugehen, dass Pestizide, die aufgrund ihrer Gefährlichkeit in der Europäischen Union verboten sind, auf Importlebensmitteln dennoch zugelassen sind?

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – I have already, I think, said that the data that we have is that the food placed on the EU market is safe for consumers. We have very stringent checks done by the authorities of the Member States, and the consumers in the EU enjoy some of the highest levels of protection in the world. This is thanks to very strict regulations of any pesticide residues in our food, whether it's produced in the EU or whether it is imported, and this is as strict as it needs to be in order to ensure consumer safety.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Commissioner, the European Chemicals Agency's Risk Assessment Committee on glyphosate said last week that it is not justified to conclude that it causes cancer.

However, these findings contradict those of other institutions, including the International Agency for Research on Cancer, which classified glyphosate as probably carcinogenic to humans as far back as 2015.

In an opinion published on 10 January, the French National Commission on Ethics and Alerts in Public Health and the Environment recommended a review of the process used to arrive at the expert opinion on the re-authorisation of glyphosate. The President of that Commission has told *Le Monde* that the renewable assessment report made a drastic selection, excludes most of the studies on glyphosate published in international scientific literature and mainly retains those provided by the industry.

Are you concerned that the European Chemical Agency's Risk Assessment Committee has ignored scientific advice by independent scientists on glyphosate's carcinogenic dangers?

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Glyphosate illustrates the importance that society gives to reducing pesticide use and to moving towards an agriculture system that is closer to nature.

Now, the renewal process is a long and complex one. I am concerned about the delay for the completion of the scientific reviews on glyphosate and the consequences that this may have on the timelines of the overall renewal process. As you know, the current approval of the active substance expires on 15 December 2022. However, we must respect this process and we must ensure that sufficient time is given to the scientific agencies to review – what I can assure you, because I have looked into it – the huge amount of comments of questions and evidence shared by citizens and stakeholders during the public consultation.

I want to be absolutely clear: if evidence emerges that the forthcoming work that the approval criteria laid down in the EU legislation are no longer fulfilled for glyphosate, the Commission will not hesitate to take action to not renew the approval of glyphosate.

Puhemies. – Kiitoksia komission jäsenelle. Kyselytunti on päättynyt. 16 edustajaa teki kysymyksiä, ja komission jäsen Kyriakides vastasi niihin kaikkiin.

20. Wdrożenie art. 17 rozporządzenia w sprawie wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa (krótka prezentacja)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Caroline Roosen kalatalousvaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö yhteisestä kalastuspolitiikasta annetun asetuksen 17 artiklan täytäntöönpanosta (2021/2168(INI)) (A9-0152/2022).

Annan nyt esittelijälle puheenvuoron neljäksi minuutiksi, olkaa hyvä edustaja Roose.

Caroline Roose, *rapporteure*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je suis très heureuse de pouvoir vous présenter ce rapport sur la mise en œuvre de l'article 17 du règlement sur la politique commune de la pêche.

Se pencher sur cet article revient à se demander qui a le droit de pêcher quoi dans l'Union européenne. Pour rappel, le Conseil est chargé de fixer chaque année les totaux admissibles de captures. Ces quotas sont répartis entre les États membres, et c'est chacun d'eux qui décide ensuite des règles selon lesquelles ces quotas sont répartis entre les différents pêcheurs et les organisations de producteurs. C'est donc une compétence des États membres, mais l'article 17 du règlement de la PCP prévoit pour eux un certain nombre d'obligations.

La première est une obligation de transparence. Le rapport pointe le manque de transparence général et le fait que plusieurs États ne rendent pas public le détail des critères qu'ils appliquent pour répartir les quotas de pêche. Il est nécessaire de mettre en place des mécanismes transparents, accessibles, compréhensibles par tout un chacun, non seulement d'un point de vue démocratique, mais aussi pour permettre à tous les pêcheurs d'avoir un accès équitable aux ressources halieutiques.

Le reste de l'article 17 porte sur le type de critères à utiliser et le caractère incitatif des systèmes de distribution. Il prévoit que les États utilisent des critères économiques, environnementaux et sociaux. Le texte anglais, que les colégislateurs ont négocié, est clair: l'utilisation de ces critères est une obligation. C'est aussi le cas dans la plupart des langues de l'Union. Mais il y a des divergences dans certaines versions linguistiques, lesquelles servent aujourd'hui de prétexte pour ne pas appliquer ce que les colégislateurs ont voté.

Le rapport souligne que peu d'États membres utilisent des critères de nature environnementale, sociale ou économique pour répartir les possibilités de pêche, et que, lorsqu'ils sont utilisés, ils ont très peu de poids dans la répartition finale. Aujourd'hui, la majorité des systèmes de répartition reposent largement sur les antériorités de pêche. Notre rapport souligne que cela contribue à renforcer la concentration économique dans le secteur, tout en créant des obstacles et en rendant ce dernier peu attrayant pour les jeunes pêcheurs.

Surtout, ce sont les petits pêcheurs et les pêcheurs artisans qui se retrouvent encore une fois lésés. Je vais vous donner un exemple. En 2020, les petits pêcheurs n'ont reçu qu'une part infime du quota de thon rouge: 3 % en Italie, 12 % en Croatie, 12 % en France, 14 % au Portugal. En France, ces petits pêcheurs ont attaqué en justice l'arrêté de répartition du quota de thon rouge. Le tribunal administratif de Montpellier leur a donné raison en première instance. Alors oui, il y a un appel, mais cela démontre que le système actuel est vu comme injuste et qu'il crée de la frustration et du mécontentement chez les pêcheurs.

Les États membres doivent aussi faire en sorte que leur système d'allocations incite à de meilleures pratiques pour l'environnement. C'est une obligation, et ce n'est pas mis en œuvre! Depuis l'adoption de la dernière réforme, la Commission l'a très peu fait.

Le rapport note qu'aucune procédure en manquement n'a été lancée. Pourtant, la façon dont les quotas de pêche sont répartis est cruciale. Ne nous racontons pas d'histoires: nous ne pourrions pas atteindre les objectifs de la politique commune de la pêche, de la directive-cadre sur le milieu marin, du pacte vert ou de la stratégie de biodiversité sans nous attaquer à la question de la répartition des quotas.

Si les États membres continuent le laisser-faire, qu'ils laissent la petite pêche disparaître, qu'ils ne récompensent pas les pêcheurs qui mettent en place des pratiques de pêche plus vertueuses, nous n'atteindrons pas nos objectifs. Nous le disons donc clairement dans ce rapport: la Commission doit agir.

Le rapport invite la Commission à faire plus pour que les États changent leur système de répartition de quotas de pêche. Partager les bonnes pratiques, publier des lignes directrices, fixer des objectifs, par exemple dans le cadre du plan d'action sur les ressources halieutiques.

Je tiens à remercier les rapporteurs fictifs pour leur collaboration sur ce dossier et je vous invite à voter pour ce rapport et à maintenir les points importants sur lesquels nous nous sommes mis d'accord au sein de la commission de la pêche.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci poděkovat paní zpravodajce za přednesení zprávy. Já to považuji za mimořádně důležité, ač tedy jsem obyvatel vnitrozemského státu. Transparentnost je důležitá, v tomto ohledu je nepochybně nutné apelovat na členské státy, aby dodržely i přístup k informacím, k rozdělování kvót z hlediska hospodářských, sociálních kritérií. Takže toto nepochybně musí mít naši plnou podporu.

Ale chtěl jsem rovněž upozornit jakožto člen výboru ENVI na důležitost udržitelnosti celkového rybolovu, protože jestliže po nájezdech některých lodí budou zůstat zcela mrtvé zóny v našich mořích, tak vlastně nebude ani jaké kvóty rozdělovat. Tudíž to, co zmínila i paní zpravodajka, vlečné sítě, mnohé predátorské praktiky průmyslového rybolovu, to všechno musí být v Evropské unii vyřešeno.

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señora presidenta, quería felicitar por este informe del artículo 17 a la señora Roose, a Pietro Bartolo y al resto de ponentes, porque creo que han hecho un gran trabajo.

Lo que se dice en ese informe es la realidad. Es decir, se desconoce qué criterios tienen los Estados miembros para establecer el reparto de las cuotas. Y un ejemplo muy claro es el plan de recuperación del atún rojo en mi país: el reparto de cuotas durante ese plan de recuperación hizo que al final la pesca más pequeña, la pesca artesanal, se viera perjudicada, especialmente las artes menores.

Por lo tanto, es necesario añadir transparencia al sistema. No puede ser que todos los años en diciembre se haga un TAC, que se reparta a los Estados y que desconozcamos cuáles son los criterios.

Por lo tanto, necesitamos un sistema mucho más transparente y que beneficie a la pesca artesanal claramente, no solo los discursos.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señora presidenta, hablar de manera coherente y realista sobre los criterios de reparto de las posibilidades de pesca de Estado a Estado solo es posible considerando el principio de estabilidad relativa que consagra el artículo 16 del Reglamento (UE) n.º 1380/2013.

Por ello, reclamamos que la Comisión elabore un informe que ofrezca datos que hoy no tenemos para comprender mejor los procedimientos de cada Estado y la diversidad que caracteriza al sector.

La no discriminación entre sus sectores y la utilización de criterios historicistas para realizar la asignación es el mecanismo más social, económico y ambiental que se conoce porque todos los pescadores están obligados por las mismas normas y condiciones. Así se fomenta la estabilidad, se evita enfrentar sectores y queda clara la dependencia de cada flota del estado de los recursos.

Por ello, apoyamos el papel de las cofradías y organizaciones de pescadores en la gestión de las cuotas y nos oponemos a que el relevo generacional se impulse discriminando por edad en la reasignación de cuotas.

Estas son medidas más urgentes que establecer un registro público, pues no hay transparencia posible sin cumplirlas. No hay en este momento datos, pero tampoco habilitación legal para exigirlos, así que mientras esto no lo hagamos y no se cambien las normas, identificar y difundir las mejores prácticas es lo adecuado.

Grace O’Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, the Greens in the European Parliament have long been fighting hard to get this report on fairness and sustainability in fisheries on the agenda. Simply put, we cannot have fairness in fisheries when EU policies encourage the concentration of fishing opportunities in the hands of a few big players. We cannot have sustainability while the EU prioritises industrial fishing methods despite their environmental and social impacts.

In Ireland this is evident, where only 2% of the mackerel quota is allocated to low-impact fishers who often have to stop fishing by mid-year, having met their catch limit.

In the face of biodiversity collapse, overfishing and rapidly warming oceans, the EU must prioritise environmental and social benefits over industrial profits and fisheries. The EU must get serious about enforcing Article 17 of the common fisheries policy and implement the findings of this excellent report by rapporteur Caroline Roose.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, a discussão que hoje aqui tem lugar tem um fundo justo. Como garantir melhores condições de acesso aos recursos para a pequena pesca?

Já a forma enferma de soluções que podem, em rigor, ter um efeito perverso e contrário ao anunciado. As soluções não se encontrarão na centralização da gestão de pescas promovida pela Política Comum de Pescas. Tão pouco em formulações estanques que procurem impor a aplicação de quotas individuais transferíveis com evidências em diversos países de exclusão da pequena pesca, de concentração no setor, além de introduzir uma lógica de privatização dos recursos no acesso ao recurso.

A melhoria do acesso coletivo aos recursos exige, além de uma gestão de proximidade, que cada embarcação da pesca de pequena escala artesanal e costeira possa aceder aos recursos em segurança e adequadas condições de operação. Exige apoios à renovação da frota, intervenção nos custos de produção e na cadeia de comercialização para garantir preços justos à produção, valorizando os rendimentos do setor e dos seus trabalhadores.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, I think there's a certain irony that we're discussing this today when we celebrated the 60th anniversary of the CAP. Because while some farmers benefited from CAP, albeit not small family farms, in an Irish context, our entire fishing sector was sacrificed for membership of the EEC at the time, and of course Brexit has affected it even more, where Ireland has been disproportionately hit in terms of the percentage reduction in quota that we've achieved as a result of trying to get together the trade agreement.

And we have here now an industry on its knees, coastal communities crying out for assistance, no future for young people in fishing, and what funds were made available by the EU were really largely given for decommissioning boats.

The common fisheries policy urgently needs to be reformed, it needs to be revised, but in the meantime, the industry needs help. We talk an awful lot about solidarity; well, the Irish fishing industry certainly needs it. It needs cooperation from bilateral agreements, it needs quota redistribution, sustainability and a favouring of small fishermen.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, Ireland's share of fishing quotas under the common fisheries policy is a scandal. But this report is specifically with how Member States themselves allocate the shares they receive from the EU under the CFP.

Article 17 of the CFP was introduced in the 2013 reform. It requires that Member States allocate fishing opportunities using transparent and objective criteria, including those of an environmental, social and economic nature. This report highlights most Member States have failed to implement Article 17 in any form of a good way.

In Ireland, the allocation of pelagic quota is hugely unfair on the inshore fleet. Just 2% of Ireland's mackerel quota is assigned to vessels under 15 metres, while 98% is assigned to only 50 large boats. This is not a failure of the EU, but of the Irish Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine. Very modest increases could make a massive difference to an awful lot of boats and families and communities around the coast of Ireland.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, first of all I would like to thank the rapporteur, Ms Roose, for this report, which is an important analysis of the current state of implementation of Article 17 of the Common Fisheries Policy Regulation. The Commission welcomes this report, which includes important findings on the implementation of this crucial provision of the common fisheries policy.

As you will know, Article 17 of the Common Fisheries Policy Regulation empowers Member States to allocate national fishing opportunities. This means that Member States have the right to establish their own criteria to suit the specific needs of their fishing sectors. The criteria, including those of an environmental, social and economic nature, must be transparent and objective. They may include, among others, the impact of fishing on the environment, the history of compliance, the contribution to the local economy and historic catch levels.

According to the same Article 17, within the fishing opportunities allocated to them, Member States must endeavour to provide incentives to fishing vessels deploying selective fishing gear or using fishing techniques with reduced environmental impact. This leaves Member States a large discretion as regards the criteria they apply and the weight they give to them.

In 2019, the Commission carried out the study on the ownership and exclusive rights of fisheries means of production. This study suggested the need for greater transparency across the Member States regarding the ultimate beneficiaries and their allocation of quotas. The study also stressed the need for greater understanding of the processes and involved actors. This better understanding would then allow to know whether any further steps are required.

Transparency is indeed crucial and therefore the Commission, as the guardian of the Treaties, has been proactive in seeking to ensure the correct application of Article 17 of the Common Fisheries Policy Regulation. We requested Member States, in 2020, to provide information on their allocation methods of fishing opportunities. All the information received from Member States until now has been used by the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries in its 2020 report on the social dimension of the common fisheries policy. Once the additional outstanding information from Member States will be available, this report will be updated and we will use this information for the upcoming Commission report on the functioning of the common fisheries policy.

Overall, I can say that the Commission welcomes Ms Roose's report on the implementation of Article 17 of the Common Fisheries Policy Regulation, as it provides a basis for a constructive dialogue with Member States on the use of transparent and objective criteria, including environmental, social and economic criteria for allocating the fishing opportunities. Moreover, the Commission wishes to achieve a better common understanding on the application of Article 17 amongst all Member States, clarifying outstanding discrepancies. The Commission will continue to facilitate the exchange of good practices amongst Member States regarding the successful use of social and environmental criteria in particular.

This report by rapporteur Roose, along with the report of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries on the social dimension, comes timely ahead of the preparation of the 2022 Commission report on the functioning of the common fisheries policy.

Therefore I would like to thank the rapporteur and all the shadow rapporteurs again for this very important piece of work.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt. Asiasta äänestetään huomenna.

21. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana maanantai-illan viimeinen asiakohta, minuutin puheenvuorot työjärjestyksen 172 artiklan mukaisesti. Nyt todellakin pyydän, että yksi minuutti olisi yksi minuutti.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρουνίδη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, από την αρχή του έτους η Τουρκία έχει ξεκινήσει κλιμάκωση επιθετικής πολιτικής με fake news και αβάσιμες κατηγορίες σε βάρος της Ελλάδας. Παραβιάζει συστηματικά την εδαφική ακεραιότητα της χώρας μου και τα κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα των νησιών, κατασκευάζοντας ακόμη και πλαστούς χάρτες. Η ένταση που επιδιώκει ο πρόεδρος Ερντογάν περιλαμβάνει εκτός των άλλων εργαλειοποίηση απειλησμένων μεταναστών, τους οποίους μαζικά αποστέλλει διά θαλάσσης και ξηράς μέσω παράνομων κυκλωμάτων λαθρεμπόρων. Από τον Ιανουάριο μέχρι τον Απρίλιο του τρέχοντος έτους εντοπίστηκαν 15.650 παράτυποι μετανάστες στον Έβρο, ενώ το αντίστοιχο διάστημα το 2021 ήταν μόνο 1.400. Επίσης, πριν δεκαπέντε μέρες, 24 Μαΐου, σε μια μέρα μόνο πέντε σκάφη μετέφεραν 500 άτομα από τα τουρκικά παράλια με προορισμό τη Σάμο και τη Χίο. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να αντιδράσει αυτή τη φορά αποτελεσματικά. Τρόποι υπάρχουν, αρκεί να υπάρχει και η πολιτική βούληση.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Sinjura President, l-Ewropa għandha nuqqas ta' haddiema. Malta, pajjiżi, għandha nuqqas kbir ta' haddiema. Ġrejna wara l-Kummissjoni għal snin biex tohrog bi proposti għal rotot ta' migrazzjoni legali għaliex ahna għatxana biex l-ekonomiji tagħna jkomplu jikbru, jissahhu u jghollu 'l fuq il-haddiema magħhom. Izda, kien biss f'April li għadda li dawn ġew ippubblikati. F'pajjiżi, 75% tan-negozji qed jghidu li għandhom bżonn aktar haddiema, waqt il-qgħad hu Prattikament inezistenti.

Wara sentejn ta' pandemija, stabbilimenti qeghdin ikollhom jagħlqu numru ta' granet jew inkella jagħlqu parti mill-operat tagħhom. Din hi realtà ta' hafna pajjiżi Ewropej illum. Kif jidher minn dawn ir-ritratti f'Rotterdam, ilbierah, jew inkella f'Wied il-Għajn, Malta, kif ukoll f'Munich, fil-Germanja. Bħala negozjatur tas-Socjalisti dwar il-migrazzjoni legali, nitlob azzjonijiet aktar mgħaġġla sabiex ikollna aktar proceduri streamlined, komuni u trasferibbli fl-Unjoni Ewropea. B'massimu ta' dewmien stabbiliti inqas minn dak ta' erba' xhur li għandna llum, filwaqt li, fl-istess hin, irridu naraw li l-haddiema kollha jkunu jġu protetti minn esplojtazzjoni u li jkollhom salarji u drittijiet xierqa.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señora presidenta, Senegal ha incumplido el acuerdo pesquero que firmó con la Unión. Ha colocado al borde de la quiebra a unos barcos cañeros que faenan con artes sostenibles y bajo un estricto control. Firmadas, por fin, las licencias que pagaron en enero, han perdido más de un millón de euros que ahora necesitan para volver a la mar tras cinco meses de amarre forzoso. Los hubieran obtenido, como siempre, pescando en condiciones de máxima sostenibilidad ambiental y social. Y habrían repartido valor y prosperidad con la industria local, comprando allí bienes y servicios y manteniendo los contratos, bajo estándares de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo, de cerca de 300 personas que tuvieron que despedir.

Estos pescadores, que se han sentido con toda razón abandonados, merecen reconocimiento, respeto y apoyo para continuar con dos décadas de impecable trayectoria humana y profesional a miles de kilómetros de su casa. Un trabajo duro que prestigia en el mundo la marca Europa.

Por eso exijo al comisario que active las ayudas previstas en el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca para que estos emprendedores de la sostenibilidad puedan recuperar su actividad.

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, so, summer is coming and with it, all the excitement of sun and sea swims. But, sadly, there's not so much excitement in store for locals and visitors to beautiful Bunmahon Beach in Waterford in Ireland. Some months ago, I joined local and national Green Party colleagues in highlighting appalling raw sewage pollutant impacting the river Mahon at that beach where local wastewater systems have gone far beyond capacity.

Ireland has already been fined for lack of compliance under EU legislation, but Bunmahon's issues are not unique within the county or at national or European level. National legislation is adequate, but local agencies must be resourced to act now to avoid sanction and to address a vile situation that threatens local ecosystems, public health, summer tourism potential and the simple joy that children should be able to experience on safe trips to unpolluted beaches.

Virginie Joron (ID). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, la prolongation du passe sanitaire, dont la mise au vote était initialement prévue pour demain, sera finalement votée le 23 juin.

Fournir la preuve de la vaccination contre la COVID-19, de résultats de tests ou de rétablissement afin de pouvoir continuer à se déplacer ou à travailler était un dispositif exceptionnel, qui devait se terminer le 30 juin 2022. Or, la Commission veut le prolonger jusqu'au 30 juin 2023, alors que les risques et l'urgence pandémiques sont aujourd'hui clairement discutables.

De plus, la vaccination n'empêche ni l'infection ni la transmission. En février, une consultation publique de la Commission a été ouverte sur une durée de un mois. Plus de 385 000 personnes se sont exprimées: elles sont majoritairement contre la prolongation de ce code QR.

Pourquoi la Commission, si prompte à communiquer sur la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe, qui se fonde sur l'avis de panels de 200 citoyens, ne tient-elle pas compte de l'avis de plus de 385 000 Européens qui disent non au code QR? Comment traitez-vous cette consultation publique? Compte tenu de ce déni de démocratie, où le débat parlementaire a été supprimé, et au vu de l'ignorance de cette consultation publique, je saisis la médiatrice européenne.

Cristian Terheş (ECR). – Madam President, dear colleagues, we were supposed to vote this plenary on one more year extension of the digital COVID certificate, but the vote was postponed for the next plenary session. The fact that we are still talking about extending this certificate for another year just proves, once again, that this measure was not intended to go to combat COVID, but to lead the European Union from an area of freedom, as the Treaty states, to a digital tyranny. Due to this certificate, millions of Europeans could not exercise their basic fundamental rights unless they were injected against their will with medical products that were tested for a short period of time. We see now many of the vaccinated people who suffer side effects from these medical products, including fatalities.

We were elected by the people to serve them in this Parliament and to make laws to protect them, not to violate their rights or to expose them to health risks, including fatalities. I urge you, therefore, to vote against extending the digital COVID certificate and to make EU once again an area of freedom, not a tyranny or an area of restrictions.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, as populações, os trabalhadores confrontam-se com um brutal aumento do custo de vida. O expressivo aumento da inflação impacta mais significativamente nos preços dos combustíveis e da energia, ou de bens alimentares de primeira necessidade.

Os preços aumentam, o salário mingua, milhões de pessoas apertam ainda mais o cinto. Um aumento do custo de vida indissociável da espiral de sanções que a União Europeia tem vindo a impor, sacrificando os interesses dos países e dos povos da Europa na sua estratégia de instigação do conflito, que serve tão somente aos grandes grupos económicos que, promovendo o aproveitamento e a especulação, engrossam lucros à custa do aumento da exploração e do empobrecimento dos trabalhadores.

Está bem a nu a profunda dependência externa em setores fundamentais. Exige-se outra política de aumento geral de salários, das pensões, de direitos, de valorização dos serviços públicos e apoio à produção nacional, de controlo público de setores estratégicos, enfrentando as imposições da UE e assegurando o desenvolvimento e as soberanias nacionais.

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sessant'anni di PAC, il cui obiettivo dovrebbe essere proprio sostenere l'agricoltura e gli agricoltori, assicurando cibo salubre, di qualità, sostenibile per l'ambiente, capace di creare ricchezza e lavoro, oltre a combattere i cambiamenti climatici.

Con la guerra in Ucraina si rischia di terremotare l'intero sistema alimentare europeo e mondiale, e a questo rischio dobbiamo rispondere riducendo drasticamente la nostra dipendenza da approvvigionamenti esteri e aiutando l'autosufficienza, specie riguardo il grano, nei paesi europei, Italia in testa, il che significa anche gestire con cura fertilizzanti e pesticidi.

Qualcuno invece tenta di approfittare della guerra per tornare indietro a pratiche disastrose dal punto di vista ambientale – parlo di pesticidi e non solo – che porterebbero danni tanto agli agricoltori quanto ai consumatori, cioè a tutti i cittadini europei. Allora serve coraggio. I soldi della PAC sono soldi nostri, miliardi di euro nostri, che vanno usati per andare avanti, non indietro, per sostenere i nostri agricoltori, stimolare la produzione di eccellenza, incoraggiare il biologico e tutelare i cittadini. Mai passi indietro, guardiamo avanti e usiamo bene i nostri soldi.

Iuliu Winkler (PPE). – *(a felszólalás eleje mikrofonon kívül hangzik el)* ... három válság sújtja egyszerre Európát és a világot, tetézve egymást. A klímaválság, a COVID-világjárvány és az ukrajnai háború következményei. A világ kőolaj, földgáz és szén, a hagyományos energiahordozók hiányával küzd. Ez még csak a kezdet, úgy látom, a világgazdaság olyan válságba sodródhat, amilyent még az 1970-es évek elején sem láttunk. A korábbi válságokkal ellentétben most egyszerre van kőolaj-, gáz- és villamosenergia-válság. Éppen emiatt nagyon fontos, hogyan szavazunk az e heti sorsdöntő jelentések kapcsán itt, az Európai Parlamentben. Olyan döntéseket fogunk megszavazni, amelyek egyszerre három prioritást kell követni: a szénmentesítést, az energiabiztonságot és a versenyképességet.

Az energetikai átállásnak méltányosnak kell lennie, ellenkező esetben elveszítjük az állampolgárok bizalmát és támogatását.

Tudor Ciuhodaru (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, onorată comisie, vă solicit din nou introducerea educației pentru sănătate, ca materie obligatorie de studiu în școlile din Europa.

Să știți că poate face diferența dintre viață și moarte și am văzut și în această pandemie, vedem în ceea ce înseamnă creșterea numărului de cancer, incidența bolilor cardiovasculare, că fără măsuri eficiente de prevenție lucrurile acestea nu pot fi corectate.

Poate e nevoie să avem în sfârșit drept de inițiativă la nivelul Parlamentului European pentru ca acest proiect extrem de important să fie pus în practică și o să îmi reamintesc ce spunea un mare scriitor român – Marin Preda, în ultimul său roman, „Cel mai iubit dintre pământeni”, că dacă dragoste nu e, nimic nu e –, eu voi spune că dacă sănătate nu e, nimic nu e și evident că dacă educație nu e, nici sănătate nu e.

Este simplu, ușor de pus în practică și trebuie să devină o problemă la nivel european, care are soluții și poate fi ușor, extrem de ușor rezolvată. Dar, din păcate, Parlamentul European încă nu are drept de inițiativă.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, stimați colegi, suntem la începutul verii și vedem crescând pe zi ce trece prețurile la carburanți și la energie. În perioada de vară aceste creșteri se vor resimți mai mult sau mai puțin, dar trebuie să fim foarte conștienți că, odată cu venirea toamnei și mai ales în iarna care urmează, populația întregii Uniuni Europene va avea foarte mult de suferit din cauza acestei situații grele, cu atât mai mult cu cât avem încă state care nu au aplicat nici un fel de măsuri de protecție socială pentru a combate creșterea prețurilor.

Nu putem să privim indiferenți și să spunem că nu e treaba noastră. Toți cetățenii din Uniunea Europeană sunt treaba noastră, indiferent unde locuiesc. Tocmai de aceea cred că este deosebit de important să abordăm acest subiect acum, cât mai repede și să găsim soluții care să se aplice în toate statele membre. Criza energetică ne privește pe noi toți, mai ales că avem deja foarte multe persoane și gospodării care nu își pot plăti facturile la energie și nu vor putea să-și permită căldură în case.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Aufforstung der Erdoberfläche ist laut einer Studie der Technischen Hochschule Zürich die wirksamste Maßnahme zur Klimarettung. Ein Drittel mehr Waldfläche weltweit würde zwei Drittel des industriell erzeugten Kohlenstoffs absorbieren.

Deutschland ist mit 32 % Forstfläche auf Platz 21 der EU. Mit 10 Prozentpunkten Aufforstung könnten Deutschland und die EU ihren Beitrag zur Klimarettung leisten. Stattdessen erzwingt die EU die grüne Transformation und Deindustrialisierung. Mit Anteilen von jeweils 2 und 8 % an den weltweiten CO₂-Emissionen ist unser Einfluss auf das Weltklima gleich Null. Das Ergebnis kann daher nicht die Klimarettung, sondern nur das Ende unserer Wettbewerbsfähigkeit sein.

Sie wollen dies, denn sonst sprächen Sie hier auch über Aufforstung.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señor presidente, ayer domingo, radicales islámicos perpetraron un grave ataque contra una iglesia en Nigeria. Fueron asesinados más de medio centenar de católicos, entre ellos muchos niños, y el cura que oficiaba la misa fue secuestrado para ser sometido a Dios sabe qué tormentos.

El mes pasado estudiantes musulmanes del mismo país golpeaban, lapidaban y quemaban viva a una niña católica por decir que amaba a Jesucristo. Este Parlamento se negó expresamente a condenar esos hechos salvajes.

En cambio, esta semana vuelven a traer aquí el debate de lo malvada que es Polonia por no poner semáforos con faldas, y nos traen un debate sobre el movimiento provida en los Estados Unidos, sobre una sentencia del aborto que no se ha dictado.

Mientras tanto, aquí en Europa cada vez hay más zonas en las que los Estados no tienen ningún control. En Saint-Denis se pudo ver claramente el otro día y, en España, los Gobiernos socialista y popular miran a otro lado, por ejemplo, en la costa de Almería.

¿Cuándo van a reconocer que gracias a sus complicidades con la invasión inmigratoria han perdido el control sobre muchas zonas de Europa?

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, last week, President von der Leyen said the only reason why we're certainly now at a full crisis is because of this brutal, unjustified war against Ukraine. The war is brutal and all war is never justified, but it is not the cause of the food crisis.

Hunger and famine have been on the rise long before the current conflict. The war certainly hasn't helped. And now EU sanctions and blockades have made things worse. Colonialism, international trade rules and agriculture and IMF structural adjustment programmes have forced countries in the Global South towards export-driven agriculture, leaving them totally vulnerable to shocks.

The roots of this crisis run deep. The EU countries steal trillions from the Global South each year through tax evasion, transfer mispricing, exploitative debt and aid arrangements, and France's colonial currency doesn't help.

The EU continues to have such a devastating role in under developing the Global South. It's reasonable to ask what has the most impact on vulnerable populations in so-called developing countries? Climate system breakdown or having trade relations with the EU? As Jason Hickel keeps reminding us, the only thing developing countries are developing is the Global North.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Madam President, I stand before you today deeply insulted and frankly outraged by these slanderous allegations about lack of freedom of press in Greece. And I ask that instead of listening to these politically motivated accusations, which are fuelled by reports which claim that the press enjoys greater freedom in countries such as Burkina Faso and Chad, where there is military juntas, that you listen to the facts.

And the fact is that Greece's policy on freedom of the press is fully aligned with the Commission recommendations. The Mitsotakis government has fortified our legislative toolbox to protect journalists. It has created a special task force and a media registry, it's providing financial support to local media – so we will not tolerate such slander!

Greece will be a frontrunner in the European Media Freedom Act, and Greece – the cradle of democracy – will, on matters of freedom of the press, as always, lead by example.

Иво Христов (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, предстои Съюзът да вземе решение относно началото на преговорите за разширяване към Западните Балкани. Като аргумент те да започнат с Република Северна Македония се посочва нуждата от бърза писта за Украйна, която е последна по време, но въпросът ѝ не търпял отлагане.

В логиката на много европейски лидери една грешка е повод да ускорим друга грешка, защото всички знаем, че нито Скопие, нито Киев могат скоро да изпълнят критериите от Копенхаген. Боя се, че бързането и занижените изисквания издават непризнатата цел – това е стратегия за разрушаването на Съюза в сегашния му вид с очевидното намерение той да бъде трансформиран в твърдо ядро и санитарна периферия. Рисуваме имплозия заради егоистичните сметки на политически и корпоративни кръгове, чиято източна политика се провали, и в контекста на войната сега свиват амбициите си до комфорта на своите нации. Това е отказ от идеала за мирна и благоденстваща Европа. Съюзът трябва да остане верен на своите ценности и правила. Понякога, казваше Франсоа Митеран, най-спешно е да се изчака. Сега моментът е такъв. Най-неотложното е да не бързаме.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Madam President, the 2022 Nitrates Derogation states that farmers who wish to plough grassland can only do so between 1 March and 31 May. Reseeding is a very important component to increase grass production, but it is also very important to ensure that we comply with the farm to fork strategy and the biodiversity strategy in terms of increasing the uptake of clover planting and also multi-species swards.

Of course, at the same time as we are encouraging those uptakes of those particular plants like clover and multi-species swards, we at the same time ban clover-safe sprays which are there to ensure that the swards are clean of weeds and that we can actually have proper agricultural practices.

So the point I'm trying to make, Commissioner – and we made it earlier as well – is that we don't seem to have joined-up thinking in terms of the farm to fork strategy or the biodiversity strategy, both at national and at European level. I would ask that in the context of those policies in the future, that they would be joined up, that they would address the challenges that farmers are facing, but also put in place measures to ensure there is uniformity at national and European level.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, I wonder how many people here, or people who follow the media across Europe, are aware of the urgency of the humanitarian catastrophe that is accelerating in Afghanistan. Where's the focus on the announcement by the World Food Programme this week that they have to roll back on their commitment? They actually have to stop feeding the hungry so that they can concentrate on the starving. Imagine: they know 18.7 million people need food, but they can only accommodate 10 million, condemning the rest to an agonising death. And why? Because they haven't got the money. Even as the world spends billions on arms, they can't muster USD 3.5 billion to save lives. During the war, the US spent USD 300 million a day for 20 years, but they can't spend USD 300 a day for a fortnight to save lives.

Meanwhile, the borders of Europe are closed. This is barbarism. So the next time we talk about European values, can we think about the bodies and the lives of these people of Afghanistan? Can we call now for a lifting of the sanctions, give them back their money and release money for aid to save lives, not kill them.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Pani predsedajúca, za vlády Roberta Fica dvanásť rokov Slovensko nebolo právnym štátom. Kupovali sa rozsudky, podvádzalo sa, kradlo sa.

Pred deviatimi rokmi bola v Moldave nad Bodvou policajná razia, pri ktorej policajti zbili obyvateľov rómskej osady vrátane žien a detí. Obete tohto násillia boli nielen fyzicky napadnuté a dobité, zbitých dokonca obvinili z krivej výpovede, za ktorú boli následne trestne stíhaní. Aj toto sa dialo za vlád Roberta Fica.

Je absurdné, že po tejto policajnej razii sa prišiel poďakovať policajtom za dobre odvedenú bitku expremiér Fico aj so svojím ministrom Robertom Kaliňákom.

Deväť rokov trvalo, kým sa dočkali spravodlivosti, ku ktorej prispela zmena mafiánskej vlády za súčasnú vládu premiéra Eduarda Hegera, ktorá sa už dva roky snaží dostať Slovensko na cestu právneho štátu. Len vďaka zmene vlády sa podarilo dosiahnuť zmier medzi štátom a sťažovateľmi, ktorý potvrdil Európsky súd pre ľudské práva v Štrasburgu.

Aj táto kauza ukazuje, že Fico s Pellegrinim majú na míle ďaleko od právneho štátu, no veľmi blízko ku korupcii, mafii a porušovaniu zákona.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, cuando la presidenta Von der Leyen anunció en su investidura su ambiciosa agenda verde y su intención de colocar a la Unión Europea en el liderazgo mundial de la lucha contra el calentamiento global, nadie dijo que fuera a ser fácil. Pero una mayoría clara en este Parlamento Europeo apoyamos ese objetivo irrenunciable, un objetivo indisputable.

Además, reclamamos una transición justa a una economía libre de carbono, justa con los sectores vulnerables y justa con los territorios insulares y alejados, como las RUP, que tienen una base jurídica específica para un trato singular que les permita un tiempo razonable de asimilación del objetivo, para que no sea inasumible.

Por eso quiero dar las gracias a quienes van a votar las enmiendas sobre las RUP en la Directiva sobre comercio de derechos emisión en este Pleno de Estrasburgo, porque estoy convencido de que esto les dará el plazo modulado y ajustado a sus necesidades para incorporar energías renovables y cumplir el objetivo de una economía sostenible, verde, azul, circular e innovadora.

Christine Anderson (ID). – Madam President, it was rather absurd when Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, lectured this House on freedom, democracy and the rule of law, considering the quasi totalitarian regime he runs in Canada.

Unvaccinated Canadians are not allowed to board an airplane to leave the country. While unvaccinated passengers pose no risk to anyone, the vaccinated pilots, however, might. This vaccine may have actually rendered them unfit to fly. What a shocker!

But aside from that, countries, which deny their own citizens to leave the country do so because they are a dictatorship. Why is the EU Parliament not all over Trudeau calling him out for these violations of human rights? Oh wait, since the EU Parliament is completely in line with the globalists' sick, brave new world agenda, it only calls out governments which actually respect freedom, democracy and the rule of law.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, al ruim een jaar waarschuwen wij hier voor het verlies aan koopkracht. En ondertussen zijn we ingehaald door de realiteit. En dat komt niet alleen door Poetin en ook niet door de verstoring in leveringsketens. Het is de realiteit van excessieve overheidsuitgaven, een oorlog tegen fossiele brandstoffen, regeldruk op bedrijven en het printen van geld door de Europese Centrale Bank. Dát zijn de wortels van de problemen van hoge inflatie.

Maar wat doet de EU? Meer van hetzelfde: een Green Deal met meer regels, meer belastingen, het coronaherstelfonds – een duurbetaalde sigaar uit eigen doos –, dat Nederland weggooit aan stikstofuitstootvermindering en windenergie op zee. Autobelastingen, CO₂-heffingen en de vliegbelasting krijgen de Nederlanders erbovenop.

Voorzitter, een koopkrachtval vraagt om minder belastingen, minder regels, minder overheid en minder EU. In plaats daarvan voert progressief Europa een oorlog tegen de vrije markt, een oorlog tegen onze spaarders, gepensioneerden en jongeren. Dit beleid moet stoppen.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, o agravamento das condições de vida, o aumento dos custos com a habitação, a perda de poder de compra das famílias, bem como o aumento das taxas de juro, tornam urgente proteger a morada de inúmeras famílias, evitando que fiquem sem teto. Nesse sentido, os Estados devem assumir-se como promotores de habitação pública e dinamizadores das políticas de construção e reabilitação urbana para alargar a oferta da habitação pública a custos compatíveis com os rendimentos das famílias.

Defendemos o reforço do investimento público na reabilitação e construção da habitação pública, que dê respostas às carências habitacionais identificadas, aos trabalhadores e, em particular, aos jovens, possibilitando a autonomização e constituição de família. É preciso aumentar a oferta de habitação pública ao abrigo dos regimes de renda apoiada ou de renda condicionada. Mas para isso é necessário romper com os constrangimentos orçamentais impostos pela União Europeia, seguidos por governos nacionais que, como está à vista, limitam as respostas necessárias à melhoria das condições de vida dos povos.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamna președintă, doamnă comisar, stimați colegi, să ne imaginăm următoarele situații:

— prima: casă mică, la țară, ce adăpostește o familie numeroasă cu patru copii. Singura sursă de căldură sunt lemnele. Venitul nu este nici el suficient pentru a acoperi nici măcar nevoile de bază ale familiei, cu atât mai mult asigurarea stocului necesar de lemne de foc. Prin urmare, supraviețuiesc în frig.

— altă situație: un apartament cu două camere în București, capitală europeană. Ambii soți muncesc zi de zi, însă banii câștigați nu sunt suficienți pentru a acoperi facturile ce au crescut peste noapte de trei-patru ori. Singura soluție: scad la minim posibil temperatura în casă.

Am crede că sunt situații izolate, dar nu, este realitatea pe care o trăiesc milioane de oameni. Sărăcia energetică este o problemă reală. Majoritatea românilor din mediul rural se încălzesc în sezonul rece doar cu lemne. În mediul urban cel puțin 5 milioane de români au trăit adevărate drame în fiecare lună, pentru că nu și-au permis să achite facturile. Ce vor face la iarnă? Acestea sunt preocupările care trebuie să ne frământă în fiecare zi. Să ne gândim la ei.

Jessica Stegrud (ECR). – Fru talman! Ja, det finns inget så permanent som ett tillfälligt EU-bidrag. Handelsunionen har nämligen blivit en bidragsunion, och i takt med nya kriser skapas det nya bidrag och numera skulder för svenska skattebetalare. Medan många svenskar knäcks av skenande bensinpriser och elräkningar, och medan småföretagare, åkerier och bönder går i konkurs, så går deras skattepengar till länder som i stället för att reformera sig har lärt sig att leva på EU-bidrag.

Som exempel har vi Trevi Nano, en liten pittoresk by i Italien med 142 invånare, som nu, likt 20 andra små pittoreska byar, får 200 miljoner kronor i coronabidrag: 1,4 miljoner per invånare. Vilken jackpot! Hur är det ens möjligt, kanske ni undrar. Jo men det är det, tack vare Magdalena Andersson och hennes socialdemokratiska regering, som utan att blinka gång på gång säger ja till kravlösa bidrag av olika slag, av solidaritet, fast inte med svenska folket utan med länder som vägrar reformera sig.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, nevrjeme nezapamćenih razmjera praćeno tućom i snažnim vjetro 25. svibnja pogodilo je sjeverni dio Hrvatske pri čemu su najteže oštećena poljoprivredna gospodarstva u Varaždinskoj, Međimurskoj i Krapinsko-zagorskoj županiji. I dok očekujemo konačnu procjenu prouzročene štete, već sada sa sigurnošću možemo konstatirati da je kao posljedica ovog nevremena stradala polovica cvjećarske proizvodnje u Hrvatskoj, da su zabilježene štete na usjevima i povrću, pri čemu su posebno teško stradali staklenici.

U ovom trenutku ključno je našim poljoprivrednicima osigurati žurnu obnovu poljoprivrednog zemljišta i proizvodnog potencijala. Na raspolaganju stoje sredstva Europskog poljoprivrednog fonda za ruralni razvoj i to putem Programa ruralnog razvoja. I ovaj nesretni događaj pokazao nam je važnost europskih fondova i članstva u EU-u.

U tjednu kada raspravljamo o zakonodavnom paketu za zelenu tranziciju, koji za cilj ima spriječiti neželjene posljedice klimatskih promjena, želim i s ovog mjesta iskazati solidarnost hrvatskim građanima koji su pogođeni ovim snažnim nevremenom. Hvala lijepa.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la sombra del acoso escolar siempre ha acechado a nuestros menores, pero ahora, para los niños que sufren este infierno, ni siquiera su casa es un refugio porque cada vez que sacan el móvil del bolsillo se enfrentan a esa violencia tan cruel. Con la generalización de las redes sociales, estos ataques han adquirido una complejidad inimaginable hace unos años.

La Unión Europea debe ir más allá en la lucha contra el ciberacoso. Necesitamos estudios a nivel europeo que arrojen datos precisos, necesitamos conocer las causas y los orígenes de esta violencia y necesitamos herramientas de prevención y asistencia a los que la sufren.

Debemos poner en marcha una gran estrategia europea de lucha contra el acoso escolar, con la vista puesta en el papel de la tecnología en este asunto. Y el Espacio Europeo de Educación puede ser una vía para implementarla.

El ciberacoso persigue a nuestros menores hasta el último rincón de su vida y los condiciona para siempre. Debemos pararlo cuanto antes.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Madam President, this House constantly debates the rights of migrants, the climate crisis and woke gender issues. This week, you even consider yourselves qualified to pontificate on what level of policy decisions should be taken in the United States.

Meanwhile, the same majority that refuses to recognise most asylum seekers or economic migrants keeps refusing debates on the consequences of mass migration on societal cohesion, as was the case this week.

You shy away from any responsibility for segregation, crime, riots and increased pressure on our welfare systems. In fact, you are no better than our Swedish Minister of Justice Morgan Johansson whose unmatched responsibility aversion caused even moderates to nickname him a 'lying rascal'. He could and he should be deposed by the Swedish Parliament tomorrow. In his spirit, you made sure there is no debate following the Quran riots in Sweden. But let me remind you that you cannot escape the responsibility of tomorrow by evading it today.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl ve své jedné minutě upozornit na naši závislost na čínských kritických surovinách, a to rovněž v důsledku ruské agrese na Ukrajině. Ta přináší nejen tisíce obětí, statisíce zraněných, miliony vyhnaných, ale rovněž další dopady na život každého z nás. Ať je to hrozba hladomoru, přerušení dodavatelských řetězců, ale také přerušení dodávek kritických surovin. Je zcela zjevné, že musíme budovat naši soběstačnost a nezávislost, a je důležité zdůraznit, že potřebujeme rozvinout schéma cirkulární ekonomiky, také vyjednat dobrá partnerství a udržovat dobrá partnerství s africkými zeměmi a nepochybně rovněž vyjednat i dále partnerství s Čínou, protože bohužel její zdroje surovin potřebujeme a válkou na Ukrajině jsou tyto zdroje ohroženy. Je to úkol pro Komisi a pro všechny z nás.

Puhemies. – Käsittely on päättynyt.

22. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

23. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia

Puhemies. – Istunto on päättynyt. Sitä jatketaan huomenna tiistaina 7. kesäkuuta klo 9.00 yhteiskeskustelulla Fit for 55 -lainsäädäntöpaketistä.

Esityslista on julkaistu, ja se on saatavilla Euroopan parlamentin verkkosivustolla.

24. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Istunto päättyi klo 23.12)

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